

WHO PAYS FOR A LIFE OF CRIME? AN EMPIRICAL ASSESSMENT OF THE ASSORTED VICTIMIZATION COSTS POSED BY CAREER CRIMINALS

MATT DELISI* AND JEWEL M. GATLING

Iowa State University

Little research has investigated the victimization costs posed by habitual offenders. The current study seeks to fill this void using a cohort of 500 adult career criminals. The group amassed 29,882 arrests including 58 murders, 201 rapes, 55 kidnappings, 405 armed robberies, and 1101 aggravated assaults; 2801 felony convictions, and 1739 prison sentences. Their collective criminal behavior generated \$415,804,000 in victim costs, \$137,305,000 in criminal justice costs, and \$14,736,500 in lost earnings. The average career criminal created \$831,608 in victim costs, \$274,610 in criminal justice system costs, and \$29,473 in lost productivity, a total in excess of \$1.14 million. Because a relatively small group of 500 offenders produced in excess of \$570 million in human, victimization, and attendant costs, we conclude that, per capita, career criminals are among the most socially costly individuals in American society.

Keywords: Career criminals; Chronic delinquent; Costs of crime; Habitual offender; Recidivism; Victimization

INTRODUCTION

As they are responsible for the lion's share of crime, career criminals are a primary focus of criminologists and policy makers. If career criminals could be reliably identified, incapacitated, or even predicted, the nation could experience dramatic reductions in crime. Motivated by such a possibility, the criminal career paradigm has developed into a dominant area of scholarship within criminology and a multitude of theoretical and empirical (Wilson and Herrnstein, 1985; Gottfredson and Hirschi, 1986; Walters, 1990; Moffitt, 1993), methodological (Britt, 1996; Land *et al.*, 1996; Bushway *et al.*, 2001; DeLisi, 2001a), and policy-based (von Hirsch, 1985; Greenwood and Turner, 1987; Haapanen, 1990) efforts deal explicitly with career criminals. Consequently, much is known about the parameters of the criminal career, the epidemiology of various types of offenders, and the ability of public policy to effectively control high-rate offenders. Unfortunately, relatively little research has investigated the various victimization and social costs denoted by the most active offenders. This paper seeks to fill this void in the literature and answer these questions using a study group of 500 adult habitual criminals selected from an urban jail in the western United States.

*Iowa State University, 203A East Hall, Ames, Iowa 50011–1070, USA; Tel: (515) 294 8008; Fax: (515) 294 2303; Email: delisi@iastate.edu

LITERATURE REVIEW

The annual criminal justice and victimization costs of crime are substantial, varied, and expansive. Local, state, and federal governments annually expend \$146 billion on the police, courts, and corrections. The costs of crime exceed the mere operational costs of the criminal justice system, however. Crime victims miss an average of 3.4 days of work per offense. In one year, this totals \$876 million in lost workdays (Anderson, 1999). Each year more than 1.4 million patients are treated in hospital emergency rooms for nonfatal injuries sustained in interpersonal violence (Rand, 1997). According to the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS), more than 28 million crimes were reported in 1999 with a total monetary cost of \$15.6 billion (US Department of Justice, 2001). The NCVS underestimates the incidence of victimization because only victims aged 12 or older are included in the survey. Miller *et al.* (1996) conducted a more comprehensive investigation of criminal victimization by utilizing the NCVS and additional extant sources of data. They found that approximately 49 million victimizations and attempted victimizations occur annually an estimate that is 175 percent higher than the NCVS. Furthermore, they estimated both direct (e.g., property loss and damage, productivity losses, and outlays for medical expenses) and indirect costs (e.g., pain and suffering, emotional trauma, disability, and risks of death) of victimization and found that the costs of crime exceeded \$450 billion annually. Per capita, this equated to a crime tax of \$1800.

Various types of crime denote their own social burdens. The costliest crime from a victimization perspective is homicide-rape with a monetized cost of more than \$3 million (Miller *et al.*, 1996; Post *et al.*, 2002). The implications of lethal violence extend far beyond monetary value, of course. Armour (2002) recently reviewed studies of the victimization experiences of covictims of homicide, the family and friends of homicide victims, and found that they experienced a *mélange* of mental health problems including posttraumatic stress disorder, nightmares, fear, anger, survivor guilt, hyper-vigilance, and an assortment of other bereavement conditions that seriously jeopardize prosocial development. Similarly, Max and Rice (1993) examined the assorted costs related to firearm-related crimes and found that these resulted in \$1.4 billion of direct health care costs such as hospitalization, rehabilitation, medication, medical equipment and supplies, and related physician and health care provider services. Victim injuries resulted in \$1.6 billion in lost worker productivity and the estimated lost productivity caused by the premature death of homicide victims totaled a staggering \$17.4 billion. In sum, the yearly losses from firearm-caused injuries and deaths exceeded \$20 billion. Post *et al.* (2002) replicated the methods developed by Miller *et al.* (1996) to examine tangible and intangible costs of sexual assault in Michigan. They found that the victimization costs of rape, sexual assault, and rape-homicides exceeded \$24 billion annually. Per Michigan resident, this equated to a rape tax of \$700.

In terms of sheer monetary costs, nothing can compare to the devastation wrought by white-collar crime. According to researchers from the National White Collar Crime Center, the cumulative costs of crimes including employee theft, insurance fraud, corporate tax fraud, counterfeiting, money laundering, savings and loan fraud, and arson for profit ranged from \$426 billion to \$1.7 trillion (Helmkamp *et al.*, 1997). Check fraud alone accounted for \$10 billion in victimization costs and \$24 million per day in victimization costs were generated by on-line credit card fraud (National White Collar Crime Center, 2003).

Serious criminal victimization produces a series of immediate and longitudinal consequences beyond the instant crime itself. These include a variety of direct, indirect, tangible, and intangible costs, such as medical care, mental health treatment and counseling, potentially higher insurance premiums, insurance deductible payments, property loss,

uncompensated employment loss, overall quality of life, emotional distress, and pain and suffering. In his review of the empirical studies of the costs of crime, Anderson (1999, p. 614) found that prior estimates of the annual total victimization costs of crime ranged from \$100 to 728 billion. When additional costs of crime such as the opportunity costs of victims, criminals, and prisoners; the fear of crime and being victimized; and the costs of private security and self-defense are considered, Anderson (1999) estimated that the net annual cost burden of crime exceeded \$1 trillion!

A preponderance of the victimization costs are related to the treatment and therapy needed to help recover from being a crime victim. In fact, Cohen and Miller (1998) estimated that mental health care costs for crime victims ranged from \$5 to 7 billion annually. Miller *et al.* (1996) estimated that between 10 to 20 percent of mental health care expenditures were directly attributable to crime. These aggregate estimates of victimization do not necessarily convey the visceral implications of victimization, however. For example, Sheridan *et al.* (2001) recently conducted a study of 95 stalking victims and found that victims experienced an assortment of deleterious emotional outcomes. Victims reported feelings of being terrorized and emotionally imprisoned, acute fear, powerlessness, reduced self-esteem, anger, and outrage. Sizable percentages of victims reported radical life adjustments to avoid their stalker, including moving to another country! In sum, victimization poses an assortment of affective, behavioral, and cognitive consequences including anxiety, avoidant behavior, depression, fear of crime, posttraumatic stress disorder, reduced self-esteem, substance abuse, and suicide (Cohen, 1988; Cohen and Miller, 1998; Miller *et al.*, 1996; Britt, 2001; Ruback and Thompson, 2001; Thornberry *et al.*, 2001; Doerner and Lab, 2002; Menard, 2002; Shaffer and Ruback, 2002).

Finally, another critical byproduct of criminal victimization, particularly when sustained early in life, is the resultant increased risk of offending for the victim. Several criminologists have empirically examined the "cycle of violence" whereby today's victim develops into tomorrow's victimizer. An array of studies have established links between serious child abuse and maltreatment victimization and delinquency (Doerner, 1988), childhood victimization, running away from home, and encountering the attendant risk factors (Kaufman and Widom, 1999), abuse history and subsequent psychopathology (Muller *et al.*, 2001; Shaffer and Ruback, 2002; Weeks and Widom, 1998; Weiler and Widom, 1996), victimization and a multiplicity of problems such as substance abuse, alcoholism, crime, and school failure (Perez and Widom, 1994; Widom & White, 1997; Thornberry *et al.*, 2001), and being raised by punitive, neglectful, unloving, or deviant parents and demonstrating later antisocial behavior (Glueck and Glueck, 1950; Robins, 1966; Loeber and Stouthamer-Loeber, 1986; McCord, 1983; Widom, 1989; Henry *et al.*, 1993; Haapasalo and Pokela, 1999; Fagan, 2001; Thornberry *et al.*, 2001).

CURRENT FOCUS

To date, the victimization literature contains aggregate information about the assorted costs of crime and detailed information about the unique costs of specific criminal offenses. By and large, prior researchers have not investigated the victimization costs posed by individual offenders such as career criminals. An exception is the seminal study by Cohen (1998). Using the monetized estimates that he and his collaborators have developed in previous research (see Cohen, 1988; Cohen *et al.*, 1994; Miller *et al.*, 1996), Cohen quantified the various costs that a young career criminal would prospectively inflict over his or her criminal career, including the annual victim and criminal justice-related costs per Index crime. He found that (1998, p. 17) "the total external costs of a life of crime are estimated to range from

approximately \$1.5 to \$1.8 million. Of that amount, about 25% are tangible victim costs, 50% lost quality of life, 20% criminal justice costs, and 5% offense productivity losses." Again, these estimates forecast what a probable career criminal would cost society. The current study seeks to examine this issue *retrospectively* using the observed offending patterns of 500 adult habitual offenders. In this respect, the current study builds on the important work by Cohen (1998) to arrive at an empirical understanding of the victimization and social costs inflicted by the worst offenders.

METHODS

Sample and Data

By definition, the most severe offenders are also the most rare (Moffitt, 1993; DeLisi, 2001b), thus they rarely appear in general population samples and even cohort designs. Consequently, an offender sample is needed to yield enough severe offenders (Cernkovich *et al.*, 1985; DeLisi, 2001b). From 1995 to 2000, the current author was employed as a pretrial services officer or bond commissioner at a large urban jail located in the western United States. Their function was to interview all criminal defendants brought to the jail and obtain employment, residency, and criminal history for bond setting. Bond commissioners had the authority to release eligible defendants on recognize bonds and were the primary mechanism to control jail overcrowding. This work experience permitted constant access (the bond commissioner unit was staffed around the clock) to all arrestees who were brought to the jail during this period.

In this jurisdiction, any offender whose criminal record contained 30 or more arrest charges was classified as a "frequent offender" by administrative order from the chief district judge and district attorneys office. This selection criterion was selected because it included only the highest-rate defendants who were also disproportionately involved in violent felony offending. The commonly-used criminological measure for habitual offending, five or more arrests, was rejected because it produced too many offenders, was not cost-effective for sentencing reasons, and tended to include low-level offenders engaged in benign criminal offending. The frequent offender classification was used to identify and nominate offenders for community social service programs, declare eligibility for habitual offender sentencing, and preclude consideration for personal recognizance bonds. in th and was therefore not cost-effective. During the data collection period, 25 640 defendants were processed, 500 of whom (less than 2 percent) qualified for frequent/habitual offender status.

Defendants self-reported their criminal history, including all police contacts, arrests, court actions, and sentences. The self-report method was problematic with career criminals whom had records that included potentially hundreds of arrests, convictions, and various punishments. This career often spanned decades and chronicled events when defendants were frequently intoxicated on alcohol and illicit substances. For these and other reasons, the validity and internal consistency of self-reports from the worst offenders was often unreliable (Simon, 1999; DeLisi, 2001b). Therefore, self-reported criminal histories were supplemented with official rap sheets from the Interstate Identification Index (III) system. Under the III system, the FBI maintains an automated criminal record containing data for each state holding criminal history information on an individual. The III records were accessed using the National Crime Information Center (NCIC) telecommunications lines that retrieve criminal records from repositories (US Department of Justice, 2000). The use of both self-report and official records bolstered the concurrent validity of the criminal career information herein (Geerken, 1994).

Monetization Procedures and Measures

Cohen (Cohen *et al.*, 1994; Miller *et al.*, 1996; 1998, pp. 9–10) and his colleagues devised a formula for monetizing a criminal career to determine the lifetime external costs:

$$\sum_{ij}(1 - \beta\gamma^{j-1}) \lambda_{ij} [VC_i + CJ_i + CI*T_i + W*T_i] \quad (1)$$

where λ = mean number of offenses; VC = victim costs of crime; CJ = costs of criminal justice investigation, arrest, adjudication; CI = cost of incarceration in days; T = average time served; β = discount rate; W = opportunity cost of offender's time, I = crime 1 through crime I ; j = year 1 through year J of crime.

This produced assorted cost estimates of specific criminal offenses. Victim costs included tangible costs, intangible costs, and risk of death (where applicable). Criminal justice costs were also produced and included the annualized costs of investigation, legal defense, incarceration, parole, and probation. Lost earnings equaled the average yearly income lost due to incarceration. For the present study, these estimates were adjusted for inflation using the inflation calculator produced by the Consumer Price Index and expressed in 2002 dollars. This yielded average victim costs for murder (\$3670412), rape (\$115731), robbery (\$17528), aggravated assault (\$45731), kidnapping (\$168398), burglary (\$1854), larceny (\$494), motor vehicle theft (\$5000), arson (\$46816), drunk driving (\$22472), simple assault (\$11735), and child abuse (\$74906). Total annualized criminal justice costs were produced for murder (\$144918), rape (\$3193), robbery (\$7693), aggravated assault (\$5183), burglary (\$2675), larceny (\$1521), and motor vehicle theft (\$3430). Annual lost earnings per sentence of incarceration equaled \$8474.

Prior research focused almost exclusively on Index offenses and thus ignored legally less serious but more prevalent crimes such as Part II offenses included in the *Uniform Crime Reports*. Fortunately, the National Institute on Drug Abuse (1998) has calculated the criminal justice costs for four additional offenses, public intoxication/vagrancy/disorderly conduct (\$103), prostitution (\$521), drug violations (\$38719), and possessing or receiving stolen property (\$4963). These estimates were similarly adjusted for inflation, expressed in 2002 dollars, and included herein.

Data analysis was straightforward. The incidence for each criminal offense was multiplied by the respective monetized victim costs, monetized criminal justice costs, and lost earnings costs. Table I provides univariate statistics of the criminal history of the offenders in the sample. Table II provides the average victimization cost inflicted per offense and Table III provides the average criminal justice system-related costs posed per offense.

RESULTS

As shown in Table I, these 500 offenders who constituted just 2 percent of all arrestees over the data collection period inflicted a voluminous amount of victimization. On average, career criminals were arrested approximately 60 times during their offending career, including an assortment of crimes involving interpersonal violence and property damage and loss. Defendants accrued more than five felony convictions and served more than three prison sentences over their criminal career. This resulted in the loss of \$29473 in lost income due to incarceration. In the aggregate (multiplying the sample size and the various offense means), the sample netted 29882 arrests. The career criminals were extensively involved in the most serious forms of crime or *mala in se* offenses. Their aggregate arrest count included 58 murders, 201 rapes, 55 kidnappings, 405-armed robberies, and 1101 aggravated assaults.

TABLE I Univariate Statistics for Arrests, Convictions, and Incarcerations Per Career Criminal

<i>Offense</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Standard Deviation</i>	<i>Range</i>
Murder	0.12	0.39	0-3
Rape	0.40	1.74	0-31
Robbery	0.81	1.80	0-14
Aggravated assault	2.20	2.67	0-16
Kidnapping	0.11	0.45	0-4
Burglary	4.04	4.96	0-35
Larceny	7.44	9.78	0-84
Motor vehicle theft	1.62	2.81	0-24
Arson	0.09	0.47	0-6
Drunk driving	2.34	2.94	0-17
Simple assault	4.06	4.26	0-27
Child abuse	1.36	2.65	0-16
Vagrancy/disord conduct	9.59	14.22	0-114
Prostitution	0.54	4.65	0-70
Drug violations	5.38	9.32	0-102
Stolen property	0.30	1.23	0-17
Total arrests	59.76	30.63	30-267
Felony convictions	5.60	5.06	0-33
Prison sentences	3.48	4.29	0-28
Lost wages (\$)	29 473	36 395	0-237 272

They were convicted of 2801 felony offenses and sentenced to 1739 prison terms. Overall, more than \$14.7 million in lifetime income was lost because of their incarcerations.

As shown in Table II, the victim costs for the twelve crimes were substantial, particularly for interpersonal violence such as murder, rape, aggravated and simple assault, and child abuse. On average, career criminals posed \$831 608 in costs related to the victim's lost wages, medical care, mental health treatment, pain and suffering, risk of death, and related expenses. Put another way, the average career criminal created victim costs that were 28 times his or her own lost income due to time spent in prison. Obviously, offenders who committed crime above the average levels of offending created more victim costs. For example, an offender who was arrested three times for murder generated more than \$11 million in victim costs for the murder offense alone. The aggregate victim costs created by the cohort (\$831 608 500) was \$415 804 000.

TABLE II Average Victimization Costs Per Offense Posed Per Career Criminal (in 2002 Dollars)

<i>Offense</i>	<i>Mean (\$)</i>	<i>Standard Deviation</i>	<i>Range</i>
Murder	425 768	1 425 546	0-11 100 000
Rape	46 524	201 200	0-3 587 661
Robbery	14 198	31 494	0-245 392
Aggravated assault	100 700	122 021	0-731 696
Kidnapping	18 524	74 989	0-673 592
Burglary	7486	9193	0-64 890
Larceny	3674	4831	0-41 496
Motor vehicle theft	8110	14 063	0-120 000
Arson	4307	21 957	0-280 896
Drunk driving	52 674	66 111	0-382 024
Simple assault	47 621	50 023	0-316 845
Child abuse	102 022	198 763	0-1 198 496
Total per career criminal	831 608	1 509 175	494-11 100 000

TABLE III Average Annual Criminal Justice Costs Per Offense Posed Per Career Criminal (in 2002 Dollars)

<i>Offense</i>	<i>Mean (\$)</i>	<i>Standard Deviation</i>	<i>Range</i>
Murder	16 811	56 285	0-434 754
Rape	1284	5551	0-98 983
Robbery	6231	13 822	0-107 702
Aggravated assault	11 413	13 829	0-82 928
Burglary	10 802	13 264	0-93 625
Larceny	11 313	14 875	0-127 764
Motor vehicle theft	5563	9647	0-82 320
Vagrancy/disord conduct	1272	1620	0-13 184
Prostitution	279	2423	0-36 470
Drug violations	208 153	360 998	0-3 949 338
Possess stolen property	1489	6080	0-84 371
Total per career criminal	274 610	372 942	721-4 092 104

As indicated in Table III, career criminals created an average of \$274 610 in criminal justice system-related costs for the included offenses. These costs were approximately one-third of the total victim costs that they created. The aggregate criminal justice system costs posed by the career criminals was \$137 305 000. Even among the high-rate offenders in this sample, there is observable heterogeneity in their offending patterns and attendant criminal justice system experiences. The highest rate offenders totaled 3 murder arrests, 31 rape arrests, 14 robbery arrests, 16 aggravated assault arrests, 35 burglary arrests, 84 theft arrests, 24 motor vehicle theft arrests, and more than 100 arrests for nuisance-oriented crimes. Overall, the costliest offender posed more than \$4 million in criminal justice system related costs.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Before discussing the implications of these findings, some admonitions about the limitations of these data need to be addressed. First, estimates of the assorted monetized costs of crime are, simply, estimates. Although we employed similar methodological procedures that others have used in the literature (Cohen *et al.*, 1994; Miller *et al.*, 1996; Cohen, 1998; Post *et al.*, 2002), the costs of crime and its control can vary considerably across and within jurisdictions. For example, judicial districts provide variable types of programs and services for crime victims and are differentially vigilant in collecting monies from criminal offenders to serve as restitution to crime victims. Similarly, incarceration costs vary widely across criminal justice systems. These differences in judicial philosophy, political culture, victim advocacy and resource mobilization, and cost of living can obviously influence the assorted costs of crime. Second, 12 crimes were included in the current analysis based on monetization estimates created by Cohen and his colleagues and NIDA. Unfortunately, this excluded other costly criminal offenses, such as weapons possession, forgery, and fraud. Furthermore, the habitual offenders used here had extensive histories of failing to appear in court and failing to comply with the various conditions of sanctions such as bond, probation, and parole. The exclusion of these offenses suggests that the current findings are conservative underestimates of the actually victim and criminal justice system costs posed by high-rate offenders. Third, although these offenders were arrested in multiple states ($M = 2.90$, $SD = 2.81$, range = 1-25), they may not be generalizable to offenders from other areas of the country.

Career criminals are disproportionately responsible for the majority of crime (Glueck & Glueck, 1950; Wolfgang *et al.*, 1972; Cernkovich *et al.*, 1985; Wilson & Herrnstein, 1985; Greenwood & Turner, 1987; Haapanen, 1990; Moffitt, 1993; Robins, 1966; Tracy & Kempf-Leonard, 1996; Cohen, 1998; DeLisi, 2001a, b). Curiously, prior research has generally ignored the attendant victim and social costs that are a consequence of their large volume of criminal offending. Using a cohort of serious offenders, we were able to quantify some of the costs associated with their antisocial behavior. The aggregate victim costs, which included tangible and intangible costs, equaled \$415 804 000. The burden to pay off this criminal debt fell directly onto the victim through hospital payments for physical and mental treatment, loss of work related earnings, and emotional distress. An inordinate amount of resources, for this cohort \$137 305 000, was needed to arrest, prosecute, punish, and treat career criminals. Due to time lost to incarceration, the chronic offenders here lost nearly \$15 million in income. At the individual-level, the average career criminal costs society more than \$1.14 million a finding comparable to Cohen's (1998) estimate. The total costs exceeded \$570 million.

The findings have clear implications for two competing areas of social service and criminal justice, prevention, and retributive justice. If career criminals will cost victims and taxpayers more than \$1 million each, it behooves policy makers to appropriate funds to programs with proven track records of success in preventing serious and violent behavior. Since career criminals tend to demonstrate severe antisocial behavior in early childhood effective strategies need to begin as early as conception (Hawkins *et al.*, 1995). The landmark Prenatal and Infancy Home Visitation by Nurses study by Olds *et al.* (1998a) is one of the most impressive efforts aimed at the prevention of the conduct that will contribute to career criminality. Using an experimental design, treatment groups of impoverished, at-risk pregnant women were serviced by nurse home visitors who helped the women improve their prenatal health, the care provided to infants and toddlers, and the overall human development of both the mothers and children. A matched control group received none of these services. A 15-year follow-up revealed dramatic reductions in criminal and analogous behaviors for the treatment group. Compared to the control group, there were 79 percent fewer reports of child abuse and neglect, 44 percent fewer maternal substance abuse problems, 69 percent fewer maternal arrests, 60 percent lower incidence of running away, and 56 percent fewer arrests on the part of the children. In other words, the program sharply reduced the very risk factors that tend to characterize the home environments of habitual offenders. The cost of the program was recovered by the child's fourth birthday and the total cost per family was \$3200 (Olds *et al.*, 1998b).

Experimental design programs have furnished impressive reductions in aggressive behavior among children who have already demonstrated antecedent behaviors of chronic criminality. For example, Satterfield *et al.* (1987) studied two groups of hyperactive 5-year old boys who were medicated to control their aggressive behavior. The parents of the boys in the treatment group received parenting training specifically dealing with behavior management. The boys received individual-, group-, and educational-therapy aimed toward at learning, modeling, and adopting appropriate behavior to replace their aggressive behavior. A 9-year follow-up indicated that the experimental boys were three times less likely than the control group to be institutionalized for criminal behavior and also experienced significantly fewer arrests for violent crimes. Other studies also found that the nascent criminal careers of seriously antisocial, aggressive, and violent youth could be effectively precluded by cost-effective programs that serve the delinquent youth, their family, and other social peers (for reviews, see Brewer *et al.*, 1995; Mihalic *et al.*, 2001).

Prevention is the ideal approach to addressing career criminals because it is exceedingly less expensive than criminal justice interventions, represents a more humanistic and proactive approach to social problems, and, most importantly, it demonstratively precludes crime and

victimization. Unfortunately, there are thousands of career criminals, like those in the current study group, who appear far beyond prevention and even rehabilitation as means to mollify their criminal conduct. Clearly, these career offenders are and should be the primary foci of retributive justice policies such as life imprisonment and, where applicable, capital punishment. The current criminal offenders were convicted of more than five felonies and served more than three stints in prison each. Thus, from the standpoint of “three strikes and you’re out” policies, the study group, on average, had exceeded this recidivism benchmark by two additional felony convictions. For the most high-rate offenders, a life of crime included dozens, at times even hundreds of arrests; years of community supervision; and scores of commitments to jail and prison. For them, a life of crime was a longitudinal series of offending and punishment. However, a life of crime also produced burdensome victim, criminal justice, and social costs. Habitual offenders usually do not pay these tabs instead they are passed on to society in a variety of ways (Anderson, 1999).

Doerner and Lab (2002, p. 1) suggested that, “Something not very funny happened on the way to a formal system of justice. The victim got left out.” Unfortunately, this has also been the case in scholarly investigations of career criminals. Many have documented that career recidivists repeatedly violate the law, but few have attended to the concomitant victimization. The victimization wrought by the worst offenders carries a hefty price tag averaging \$1.14 million. The many qualitative consequences of these criminal victimization are incalculable. In this sense, career criminals stand as one of the costliest groups in American society.

Acknowledgements

This paper was presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Society of Criminology, November 19–22, 2003, Denver, Colorado.

References

- Anderson, D. A. (1999). The aggregate burden of crime. *Journal of Law and Economics*, **42**, 611–642.
- Armour, M. P. (2002). Experiences of covictims of homicide: implications for research and practice. *Trauma, Violence, and Abuse*, **3**, 109–124.
- Brewer, D. D., J. D. Hawkins, R. F. Catalano and H. J. Neckerman (1995). Preventing serious, violent, and chronic juvenile offending: A review of evaluations of selected strategies in childhood, adolescence, and the community. In J. C. Howell, B. Krisberg, J. D. Hawkins, and J. J. Wilson (Eds.) *Serious, Violent and Chronic Juvenile Offenders* (pp. 61–141). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Britt, C. L. (1996). The measurement of specialization and escalation in the criminal career: An alternative modeling strategy. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, **12**, 193–222.
- Britt, C. L. (2001). Health consequences of criminal victimization. *International Review of Victimology*, **8**, 63–73.
- Bushway, S. D., A. R. Piquero, L. M. Broidy, E. Cauffman and P. Mazerolle (2001). An empirical framework for studying desistance as a process. *Criminology*, **39**, 491–515.
- Cernkovich, S. A., P. C. Giordano and M. D. Pugh (1985). Chronic offenders: The missing cases in self-report delinquency research. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, **76**, 705–732.
- Cohen, M. A. (1988). Pain, suffering, and jury awards: A study of the cost of crime to victims. *Law and Society Review*, **22**, 537–555.
- Cohen, M. A. (1998). The monetary value of saving a high-risk youth. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, **14**, 5–33.
- Cohen, M. A. and T. R. Miller (1998). The cost of mental health care for victims of crime. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, **13**, 93–110.
- Cohen, M. A., T. R. Miller and S. B. Rossman (1994). The costs and consequences of violent behavior in the United States. In A. J. Reiss, Jr. and J. A. Roth (Eds.) *Understanding and Preventing Violence, Volume 4: Consequences and Control* (pp. 67–166). Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Doerner, W. G. (1988). Child maltreatment seriousness and juvenile delinquency. *Youth and Society*, **19**, 197–224.
- Doerner, W. G. and S. P. Lab (2002). *Victimology*, 3rd edn. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson.
- DeLisi, M. (2001a). Scaling archetypal criminals. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, **26**, 77–92.

- DeLisi, M. (2001b). Extreme career criminals. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, **25**, 239–252.
- Fagan, A. A. (2001). The gender cycle of violence: comparing the effects of child abuse and neglect on criminal offending for males and females. *Violence and Victims*, **16**, 457–474.
- Geerken, M. R. (1994). Rap sheets in criminological research: considerations and caveats. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, **10**, 3–21.
- Glueck, S. and E. T. Glueck (1950). *Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Gottfredson, M. and T. Hirschi (1986). The true value of lambda would appear to be zero: An essay on career criminals, criminal careers, selective incapacitation, cohort studies, and related topics. *Criminology*, **24**, 213–234.
- Greenwood, P. W. and S. Turner (1987). *Selective Incapacitation Revisited: Why the High-Rate Offenders are Hard to Predict*. Santa Monica, CA: Rand.
- Haapanen, R. A. (1990). *Selective Incapacitation and the Serious Offender: A Longitudinal Study of Criminal Career Patterns*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Haapasalo, J. and E. Pokela (1999). Child-rearing and child abuse antecedents of criminality. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, **4**, 107–127.
- Hawkins, J. D., R. F. Catalano and D. D. Brewer (1995). Preventing serious, violent, and chronic juvenile offending: Effective strategies from conception to age 6. In J. C. Howell, B. Krisberg, J. D. Hawkins, and J. J. Wilson (Eds.) *Serious, Violent and Chronic Juvenile Offenders* (pp. 47–60). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Helmkamp, J. C., K. J. Townsend and J. A. Sundra (1997). *How Much Does White Collar Crime Cost?* Morgantown, WV: National White Collar Crime Center.
- Henry, B., T. E. Moffitt, L. Robins and F. Earls (1993). Early family predictors of child and adolescent antisocial behavior: Who are the mothers of delinquents? *Criminal Behavior and Mental Health*, **3**, 97–118.
- Kaufman, J. G. and C. S. Widom (1999). Childhood victimization, running away, and delinquency. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, **36**, 347–370.
- Land, K. C., P. L. McCall and D. S. Nagin (1996). A comparison of poisson, negative binomial, and semiparametric mixed poisson regression models: With empirical applications to criminal careers data. *Sociological Methods and Research*, **24**, 387–442.
- Loeber, R. and M. Stouthamer-Loeber (1986). Family factors as correlates and predictors of juvenile conduct problems and delinquency. In N. Morris and M. Tonry (Eds.) *Crime and Justice: An Annual Review of Research*, Vol. 7 (pp. 29–149). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Max, W. and D. P. Rice (1993). Shooting in the dark: Estimating the cost of firearm injuries. *Health Affairs*, **12**, 171–185.
- McCord, J. (1983). A forty-year perspective on the effects of child abuse and neglect. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, **7**, 265–270.
- Menard, S. (2002). *Short- and Long-Term Consequences of Adolescent Victimization*. Bulletin. Washington, DC: US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Mihalic, S., K. Irwin, D. Elliott, A. Fagan and D. Hansen (2001). *Blueprints for Violence Prevention*. Bulletin. Washington, DC: US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Miller, T. R., M. A. Cohen and B. Wiersema (1996). *Victim Costs and Consequences: A New Look*. Final Summary Report Presented to the National Institute of Justice. Washington, DC: US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs.
- Moffitt, T. E. (1993). Life-course persistent and adolescence-limited antisocial behavior: A developmental taxonomy. *Psychological Review*, **100**, 674–701.
- Muller, R. T., K. E. Lemieux and L. A. Sicoli (2001). Attachment and psychopathology among formerly maltreated adults. *Journal of Family Violence*, **16**, 151–169.
- National Institute on Drug Abuse (1998). *The Economic Costs of Alcohol and Drug Abuse in the United States*. Washington, DC: US Department of Health and Human Services, National Institutes of Health.
- National White Collar Crime Center (2003). *Check and Credit Card Fraud, WCC Issue Papers*. Morgantown, WV: National White Collar Crime Center Administration and Research Office.
- Olds, D., et al. (1998). Long-term effects of nurse home visitation on children's criminal and antisocial behavior: 15-year follow-up of a randomized trial. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, **280**, 1238–1244.
- Olds, D., P. Hill, S. Mihalic and R. O'Brien (1998). *Blueprints for Violence Prevention, Book Seven: Prenatal and Infancy Home Visitation by Nurses*. Boulder, CO: Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence.
- Perez, C. M. and C. S. Widom (1994). Childhood victimization and long-term intellectual and academic outcomes. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, **18**, 617–633.
- Post, L. A., N. J. Mezey, C. Maxwell and W. N. Wilbert (2002). The rape tax: Tangible and intangible costs of sexual violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, **17**, 773–782.
- Rand, M. R. (1997). *Violence-Related Injuries Treated in Hospital Emergency Departments*. Washington, DC: US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Robins, L. N. (1966). *Deviant Children Grown Up*. Baltimore, MD: Williams and Wilkins.
- Ruback, R. B. and M. P. Thompson (2001). *Social and Psychological Consequences of Violent Victimization*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

- Satterfield, J. H., B. T. Satterfield and A. M. Schell (1987). Therapeutic interventions to prevent delinquency in hyperactive boys. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, **26**, 56–64.
- Shaffer, J. N. and R. B. Ruback (2002). *Violent Victimization as a Risk Factor for Violent Offending among Juveniles*. Bulletin. Washington, DC: US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Sheridan, L., G. Davies and J. Boon (2001). The course and nature of stalking: A victim perspective. *Howard Journal of Criminal Justice*, **40**, 215–234.
- Simon, L. M. J. (1999). Are the worst offenders the least reliable? *Studies on Crime and Crime Prevention*, **8**, 210–224.
- Thornberry, T. P., T. O. Ireland and C. A. Smith (2001). The importance of timing: The varying impact of childhood and adolescent maltreatment on multiple problem outcomes. *Development and Psychopathology*, **13**, 957–979.
- US Department of Justice (2000). *Survey of State Criminal History Information Systems, 1999*. Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- US Department of Justice (2001). *Criminal Victimization in the United States, 1999 Statistical Tables National Crime Victimization Survey*. Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- von Hirsch, A. (1985). *Past or Future Crimes: Deservedness and Dangerousness in the Sentencing of Criminals*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Walters, G. D. (1990). *The Criminal Lifestyle: Patterns of Serious Criminal Conduct*. Newbury Park, CA: SAGE.
- Weeks, R. and C. S. Widom (1998). Self-reports of early childhood victimization among incarcerated adult male felons. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, **13**, 346–361.
- Weiler, B. L. and C. S. Widom (1996). Psychopathy and violent behavior in abused and neglected young adults. *Criminal Behavior and Mental Health*, **6**, 253–271.
- Widom, C. S. (1989). Child abuse, neglect, and violent criminal behavior. *Criminology*, **27**, 251–271.
- Widom, C. S. and H. R. White (1997). Problem behaviors in abused and neglected children grown up: prevalence and co-occurrence of substance abuse, crime, and violence. *Criminal Behavior and Mental Health*, **7**, 287–310.
- Wilson, J. Q. and R. J. Herrnstein (1985). *Crime and Human Nature: The Definitive Study of the Causes of Crime*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Wolfgang, M. E., R. M. Figlio and T. Sellin (1972). *Delinquency in a Birth Cohort*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Biographies

Matt DeLisi is an assistant professor in the Department of Sociology and Coordinator of Criminal Justice Studies at Iowa State University.

Jewel Gatling is a graduate student in the Department of Sociology at Iowa State University.