
IMPACT OF VICTIMIZATION WITH A REFERENCE OF LIFE STYLES OF VICTIMS

Rakesh Kumar

BA.LLB

ABSTRACT

According to the life-course theory and the cycle of violence hypothesis, early youth exploitation has effects and results that can seek after an individual for a mind boggling span and continue impacting them various years afterward. Their bearing begins with an exploitation that develops hostility and apprehension in the midst of their headway into adolescence, which grows expulsion from their mates and further continues assessments of self-hatred, unpleasant and forceful conduct, and singularity.

As these behaviors appear inside the individual, they respond to their condition in manners that either increase their future lack of protection to later victimization, or every so often it will enhance the likelihood that this individual will wind up savage towards others and exploit diverse individuals. The current paper highlights the impact of victimization with a reference of their life styles.

KEYWORDS: Victimization, Victim, Life style

INTRODUCTION

The conduct of the victims of animosity and shock towards others constructs their chances of presenting a wild offense or other criminal behaviors and leads them to confinement in the midst of pre-adulthood. Moreover, conclusions of self-hatred, apprehension, hostility, and sadness affect their experiences while they are confined; impacting change, searching for sanctuary, hoping to express a "serious individual" picture, or indicating vulnerabilities, for instance, withdrawal, hopelessness, and deficiency.

The manner in which they adapt to their new condition can affect paying little mind to whether they transform into the unpleasant aggressors among their partners, or they experience victimization while they are detained. If they are left to fight for themselves and change as per their best limit, the consequences of confinement can help the cycle of ruthlessness and engender this single life-course heading.

There are harmless bad behavior where there is no recognizable confirmation of an individual that has continued damage infraction. Regular model consolidate encroachment of laws covering open decency or open demand yet since there is no recognizable injured individual the component of fault is lesser.

Physical nonattendance or being dark means the nonappearance of awareness of the people in question. As communicated over, all of the conditions have exploited people anyway if is either a non considerable and non individual unfortunate casualties or the activity don't have the legitimate remain along these lines realizing diminishing of genuineness of bad behavior. The brunt of bad behavior other than 'office' or business bad behavior is borne by individual people. Anyway the casualties of bad behavior, as it were, ignored in an extensive bit of the

standard criminological compositions. Just in post prandial and political discourses is the scrape of the unfortunate casualty referenced, he has been frightfully overlooked. Such investigates has been done in the past around there show that the activity of the unfortunate casualty is repeat basic to the criminal demonstration, not simply as for the past he could have played in turning away it, yet moreover in perspective of the past he consistently plays in the demonstration itself.

Verbalizations like 'injured individual tendency,' 'unfortunate casualty precipitation' and 'victim artificiality', have been used to insinuate the way that the unfortunate casualty is frequently a guarantee to the demonstration in fluctuating degrees reaching out from essential lack of regard or heedlessness through to think about induction.

Social specialists are not to be considered responsible for the manner by which others may scrutinize the work they convey. In its own one of a kind terms such an obstruction is perfectly steady, Fortunately a growing number of social scientists, immense quantities of them ladies' activists, have imagined that it was hard to partake in the issues significant to social legitimate endeavor demonstrates an explicit male instructed method for audit the world.

They have as needs be attempted to make sensible frameworks more with respect to a human science which handles regard obligation instead of regard opportunity. That is a vow to see the covered suppositions under staying the advancement of speculation and practice which don't relate to women's experience anyway just to men's.

IMPACT OF VICTIMIZATION WITH A REFERENCE OF LIFE STYLES OF VICTIMS

Victimology remain confined to offering elucidations of individual events by reference to their individual, empowering attributes It can't by contingent upon this thought, offer illuminations of rehashing instances of exploitation.

The game plan of criminal law is of exceptionally charming interest and requires unraveling of the store certainties in which its assets are felt by the express, the overall population, the criminal and last yet not just the base fundamental, the person in question. The setting and moreover limit of the institutionalizing rules from the perspective of the managing rules from the perspective of the regularizing rules from the perspective of the unfortunate casualty reasonably requires in-depth consider and furthermore legitimate state activity in India. Bad behavior hurt our social surface, and every casualty of bad behavior perseveres.

As a system, we respond by anchoring the guilty party and rebuking them for their criminal demonstrations. Regardless, the criminal value system must achieve more than repelling the criminal. It must endeavor to recover the wounds energetic, physical and financial - caused by bad behavior. This is troublesome anyway fundamental goal.

It is almost impossible to predict exactly what effects an individual victim will suffer. People react very differently to similar offences and where one person may be seriously affected, another might experience only minor or short-term effects. Those who are more vulnerable (such as people who are poor, live in deprived areas or have other life stressors) and those who have been previously victimised are more likely to find a greater impact on them.

The effects of a crime can be felt not only by the individual who the criminal justice system treats as the direct victim, but also by their family and those close to them. Crime against businesses is also not an effect-free area as both managers and staff are likely to be affected.

The knowledge of victimization and its shock can spread out through a neighbourhood creating a 'ripple effect'.

Some effects may only be short-term. Victims tend to cope with financial loss (though not time off work) quite quickly, by using their own resources, or with the help of friends and family. However, psychological and social effects can be very long-lasting, over months or even years. A small proportion of the most seriously affected (who tend to be victims of serious physical assaults, robberies and particularly rape, as well as the relatives of victims of homicide) may develop PTSD, which will need professional psychiatric or psychological help.

Crime surveys such as the Crime Survey for England and Wales administered in 2013/14 (previously known as the British Crime Survey) and the International Crime Victim Survey (ICVS) which was last carried out in 2004/05, provide interesting insights into the effects of victimization.

One striking and consistent observation is that the emotional effects of victimization do not differ much when we compare victims of different types of crime, including nonviolent and violent crime, though more serious crime tends to produce more adverse effects.

Of course, some effects are crime-specific. For example, victims of non-violent offences will not suffer any direct physical harm and financial loss is more directly associated with property crime.

The seemingly perfectly rational responses to victimization just mentioned seem less certain, however, when we consider individual preferences as determined by self-control. First, it may be that the pains of victimization fail to outweigh the advantages of unstructured and unmonitored social activity with peers. Put differently, one may prefer activities with high risk of victimization because victimization may be a small price to pay for spending time with one's peers and doing what one pleases away from prying adult eyes. As we observed earlier, this appears to be the case among those with low self-control—one might expect that people possessing low self-control would tend to self-select into risky situations and friendships with delinquents.

Second, any meaningful change arising from a victimization incident assumes the willingness of the former victim to reflect and anticipate how his or her actions might have contributed to the risk of victimization. Since low self-control is the habit of not acting as if long-term risks mattered, such reflection appears exceedingly unlikely among those who lack self-control. Indeed, a central tenet of self-control theory is that there is considerable stability in the rank-ordering of people based on their criminality, and that little (besides age) would have any lasting effect on this.

DISCUSSION

Those who did not receive effective socialization and thus to acquire self-control tend to engage in crime and "crime analogous" behavior. That is, those who possess low self-control tend to be self-centered, belligerent, lazy, thrill seeking, impulsive, and oriented toward the "here and now" as opposed to anticipating future consequences. Low self-control frees the individual from the fear of the consequences of criminal and analogous behaviors, like heavy drinking, drug use, broken relationships, unstable work histories, and lack of educational achievement. While many other factors besides self-control may be responsible for these

self-destructive outcomes, low self-control corresponds with the undesirable life circumstances.

The unwillingness to plan ahead coupled with impulsivity have clear implications for victimization, as one can reasonably infer that much individual victimization prevention (e.g., carrying mace, locking doors) assumes that people can foresee themselves as possible victims and take steps to prevent that outcome. Implementing precautions against victimization also frequently requires effort: Even hiding valuables in one's car before quickly going into the grocery store entails thought and time, and thus some inconvenience, even if minor. The lack of diligence (i.e., laziness) therefore makes taking precautions at least somewhat unattractive in the short-term. Although victimization may sometimes happen anyway to those who diligently take precautions and who cause others to have no grievances against them, low self-control clearly has implications for transforming individuals into worthwhile and poorly defended targets for crime.

Lifestyle/routine activities theory suggests that the most convenient, visible, and accessible targets for crime are individuals with whom one spends time. One is likely to know about the valuables possessed by one's peers, as well as their routines and vulnerabilities.

Spending time with delinquents leads to certain advantages: companionship and excitement, among others. Costs might include a lowered reputation and greater (and unwelcome) scrutiny from authorities. According to the research, an additional cost of spending time with delinquent peers is victimization. While there is no guarantee that experiencing victimization will be sufficient to offset the advantages of associating with delinquent peers, the rational choice model would lead one to expect to see, on balance, a consistent tendency for erstwhile victims to shed their delinquent companions and associate with those who are less dangerous. The same would be true of other lifestyles connected to victimization, like committing crime, drinking large amounts of alcohol, and using drugs.

More specifically, quick and easy pleasure tends to motivate those with low self-control, whereas those with more self-control are to a greater degree motivated by a combination of fear of negative consequences as well as the anticipated rewards of pleasurable activity. A clear difference between self-control theory and thin rational choice models is the acknowledgement that lifestyle choices and victimization are to a significant degree driven by differences in individual preference functions. To be more specific, consider the following. The notion of "fool me once, shame on you; fool me twice, shame on me" suggests that victims of crime would rationally reflect on their experiences and alter behaviors and circumstances that might have contributed to their risk of victimization. Someone who was victimized by strangers on the way home from a bar may elect to stay home more often, or drink less, or go with close friends or family.

An individual victimized by his or her friends may choose to terminate the relationships with the current peer group and start anew. Such changes to one's lifestyle, in response to victimization, would be quite reasonable to a rational individual.

CONCLUSION

Victimology remain confined to offering elucidations of individual events by reference to their individual, empowering attributes It can't by contingent upon this thought, offer illuminations of rehashing instances of exploitation. Amir's examination of ambush affected a strong response for different reasons. Not solely are there observational difficulties with



his revelations. The related hints of attributing flaw to the injured individual are to a great degree difficult to deny in any case purposely characterized to thought might be.

REFERENCES

1. Adams, Stuart. 2014. Evaluation: A way out of rhetoric. In Rehabilitation, recidivism, and research, edited by Robert Martinson, Ted Palmer, and Stuart Adams. Hackensack, New Jersey: National Council on Crime and Delinquency.
2. Allen, Francis A. 2011. The decline of the rehabilitative ideal: Penal policy and social purpose. New Haven: Yale University Press.
3. Andrews, D.A. 2015. The psychology of criminal conduct and effective treatment, In What works: Reducing reoffending, edited by James McGuire. West Sussex, England: John Wiley & Sons.
4. Andrews, D.A., and James Bonta. 2014. The psychology of criminal conduct. 2d ed. Cincinnati: Anderson Publishing Company.
5. Andrews, D.A., Craig Dowden, and Paul Gendreau. 2010. Clinically relevant and psychologically informed approaches to reduced re-offending: A meta-analytic study of human service, risk, need, responsivity, and other concerns in justice contexts. Unpublished manuscript, Carleton University.
6. Andrews, D.A., and R.D. Hoge. 2014. The psychology of criminal conduct and principles of effective prevention and rehabilitation. Forum on Corrections Research 7 (1): 34–36.
7. Andrews, D.A., J.J. Kiessling, Dave Robinson, and Susan Mickus. 2015. The risk principle of case classification: An outcome evaluation with young adult probationers. Canadian Journal of Criminology 28 (4): 377–384.