

## NORMATIVE VICTIMOLOGY – SUFFICIENCY OR SELF-GIVENNESS<sup>1</sup>

**Kostić Miomira**

Full Professor, Faculty of Law, University of Niš  
kosticm@prafak.ni.ac.rs

### **Abstract**

In the paper, the author emphasizes the importance of victimology as a sub-discipline of criminology, which deals with issues of victimization, victimogenesis and resilience. In addition to the study of victims of crimes and other punishable acts, a liberal current has also developed in victimology, which includes not only victims of street crime, but also issues of victims of less visible forms of crime, such as white-collar crime and structural crime. In her paper, the author emphasizes the issue of resilience. In the literature, there is an understanding that everyone has the capacity for resilience. However, the individual must find himself in certain situations that will precede the fact that one person will be able to develop resilience, so everyone needs some support.

**Keywords:** victimology; development; penalty; resilience.

### **Introduction**

Victimology is seen as a sub-discipline of criminology, which includes different groups of people and the interests they represent. It is an area in which numerous debates and analyzes are conducted and which brings together intellectuals, activists of non-governmental organizations and legislators, so in this "boiling mixture" numerous tensions arise (Walklate, 2007, pp. 29-30). Some authors note that victimology is "a specific and respectable academic scientific discipline. A new branch of victim science, but with a transparent and distinctive range, a comprehensive and interdisciplinary research process" (Ramljak & Simović, 2006, p. 3). Or, "victimology, in the simplest terms, is the science of the victim," as Šeparović claims (Šeparović, 1988, p. 5). Nevertheless, regardless of the central focus on studying the personality of the victim, all his activities in interaction in the mechanism of suffering (victimization) (Ramljak & Simović, 2006, p. 3), i.e. the phenomenological and etiological features of a certain personality and the process of his suffering, there is also a need to study collective and abstract victims, then mass victims at violations of the norms of international humanitarian law or victims of certain forms of deviance, such as prostitution or drug addiction, for example.

In addition, some prominent victimologists, such as Andzenga, define victimization itself as a "representation", the way in which an individual perceives himself as a victim or groups of persons as victims, i.e. a form of subjective perception, through which a significant influence is achieved on the level of their victimization. The number of "others" (other actors) is large: friends, relatives, observers, citizens, i.e. all those who have knowledge of victimization, then organizations that express a certain professional interest (state bodies or non-governmental organizations), as well as the perpetrators themselves. They all, individually, bring their "subjective" perception into the "objective" event. Representation/perception occupies a central place in the victimological way of thinking, research and intervention when the process of victimization is studied as part of a social conflict. The goal is to change the representations/perceptions

---

<sup>1</sup> This paper is a result of theoretical research, financed by the Ministry of Science, Technological Development and Innovation of the Republic of Serbia, according to the contract no. 451-03-65/2024-03/ 200120 of 5th February 2024.

of the victims during the therapy, as well as their emotional response to it, which is, in fact, the main destination of progress in the victims' recovery (Ronel, Jaishankar, & Bensimon, 2008, pp. 3-4).<sup>2</sup> That is why the very term "victimization" begins, by itself, to acquire a negative level of perception. People who have participated in the process of victimization reject that level and are more inclined to use terms that emphasize their ability to overcome their own suffering (Ronel, Jaishankar, & Bensimon, 2008, pp. 3-4). An example of the use of different terms having an essential and not a formal meaning is the name of the Jews who survived the Holocaust during the Second World War. At first they were called "Holocaust Rescued", which meant that they were kept alive thanks to the efforts of others. Recently, many want to be called "Holocaust Survivors", because this new term indicates a change in status, from passive victims to active resistance givers, who survived thanks to their own efforts (Ronel, Jaishankar, & Bensimon, 2008, pp. 3-4).

In 2000, Ben-David presented the "victimology of the victim" ("Victim's Victimology"), as a new orientation, based on the need to carry out victimological research and practice. This orientation is focused on the representations of the victims and indicates the importance of the scientific methodology that will be applied in relation to the expressed needs and interests of the victims themselves and represents an example of change, in which the self-awareness of the victims' needs becomes the primary focus, and not their rights, as it imposes society. It is clear that the process of "giving voice" (Ronel, Jaishankar, & Bensimon, 2008, p. 4) to victims' needs does not exclude giving voice to victims' rights, so that the former adds a new dimension to the latter.

Then, in recent victimology works, it is clearly pointed out that "we are deceiving ourselves if we think that the behavior of corporations is irrelevant, even in relation to the narrow definition of criminality. In many ways, corporate misbehavior appears to be far more premeditated than most street crime, which we commonly accept as criminal behavior and victimization (Ellias, 2024)."

In addition, a liberal current has developed in victimology, which includes not only victims of street crime, but also issues of victims of less visible forms of crime, such as white-collar crime and structural crime (Konstantinović-Vilić, Nikolić-Ristanović, & Kostić, 2009, pp. 461-462).<sup>3</sup>

That is why Mears observes that "victimology has too many voices to allow any coherence in the way of its communicated understanding of the world" (Walklate, 2007, pp. 29-30), while Rock notes its "Catholic" nature (Walklate, 2007, pp. 29-30). Pointing even to broader concepts within the discipline, Fata (Fattah), a Canadian victimologist, insists on separating what he calls "humanistic victimology" from "scientific victimology (Walklate, 2007, pp. 29-30)." Namely, by making this distinction, Fata puts in the foreground the points of departure that arise from comparing the claims about victimization made by those who belong to movements for the protection of victims, on the one hand, and those whose understandings about victimization are more impartial, academic, or more scientific. nature, on the other hand. The need for such a separation arose at a time when this victimologist was writing "extremely appropriately", giving strong conservative political tones, combined with many understandings derived from the victim's rights movement in North America and their ability to gain the attention of the state. However, this potpourri of activism and political influence on the side of the "voice of the victims" is something that also occurred in the developed countries of Western Europe, England and Wales, for example, despite the relatively neutral position of the victim support movement in these countries (Konstantinović-Vilić & Nikolić-Ristanović,

---

<sup>2</sup> An illustrative example of this can be found in a recent survey of Jewish settlers in the Gaza Strip, during their forced evacuation by the Israeli authorities. Namely, the claim about the importance of the perception of the victims in this case refers to the development of victimization and the changes that occurred in the play both in the victims and in the aggressors, all in the context of the evacuation. The answer was in the collective singing of the evacuees and in the reactions that singing produced.

<sup>3</sup> Then, the radical-critical direction influenced the further expansion of the subject of victimology, so as a subject of interest, in addition to victims of crime, there are also victims of other forms of human suffering, due to: pollution of the human environment, injuries and damage to health at work, brutality of the police, discriminatory institutions and the actions of other holders of power and privileges.

2003, p. 18).<sup>4</sup> Until the early nineties of the 20th century, both the number and the variety of understandings of groups and individuals who advocated for the rights of victims in those countries, as well as the process of political concentration of victims' interests, grew (Walklate, 2007, pp. 29-30).

Therefore, in the development of victimology, it is possible to identify several different directions, whose subject and time determinations vary depending on the approach of individual victimologists (Konstantinović-Vilić, Nikolić-Ristanović, & Kostić, 2009, p. 461).

## 1. Development of the criminal victimology

Nevertheless, there is agreement on the beginnings of the victimological approach in criminology, which undoubtedly belong to: Hentig (von Hentig), Wertham (Wert-ham), as well as Mendelsohn. In 1941, Hentig published an article entitled: "Remarks on the Interaction of Perpetrator and Victim" ("Remarks on the Interaction of Perpetrator and Victim"), and later, in 1948, a book on criminology, *The Criminal and His Victim*, in which he dedicated one chapter to the victim of a crime. Hentig treated the victim as a participant in the crime. He classified the victims according to the nature of their participation in the criminal event. He then pointed out that studying the role of the victim can lead to better crime prevention (Van Dijk, 2024, p. 1).

In 1947, Mendelsohn presented his article in French, at a congress in Bucharest, in which he used the coin "victimology". Similar to Hentig, Mendelsohn focused his attention on the role of victims in the process of "precipitation/overcoming" into criminality of violence, through provocations, for example (Van Dijk, 2024, p. 1). That is why, for Mendelsohn, the victim's behavior had to be taken into account as a mitigating circumstance for punishing the perpetrator. Precisely because of this, the most important level of political criticism directed against criminal victimology was that this co-producer of victimology created arguments for blaming the victims for their fate. Seen from a historical perspective, Mendelsohn in 1956, when in his first works he focused attention on the participation of the victim in the crime, expressed his intention to provide defense to the perpetrators, by shifting part of the blame for the suffering to the victim. In his later victimology works, as with other authors, the victim's participation in the crime was analyzed in such a way as to explain the dynamics of criminal behavior, without any intention of the victim being the one who contributes to it (Van Dijk, 2024, pp. 2-3).

Mendelsohn, when developing a more pronounced legalistic approach in the typology of victims (in contrast to Hentig), in his later ideas, changed his concept of "victim guilt" to the concept of "precipitating/overpowering the victim". Since then, the concepts of lifestyle and "prevailing victimhood" have formed the essence, the core of most of the traditional victimology approach and best exemplify what Miers (Miers, 1989) calls positivist victimology. Positivist victimology itself implies "identifying factors that contribute to a non-random pattern of victimization, focusing on violent interpersonal crimes, as well as trying to identify victims who may be contributing to their own victimization (Walklate, 2007, pp. 31-32)." The grouping of similar understandings, under the name of positivist victimology, corresponds to what Vockleitova identified as "conventional victimology" in 1989, and Carmen in 1990 as "conservative victimology" (Walklate, 2007, pp. 31-32).

Under these understandings, criminality usually means everything that includes "normal", ordinary crime, which takes place "in public", such as, for example, theft or street crime. Therefore, it is the criminality of everyday life that ignores the private sphere of one's home, as well as the inner sphere of business corporations. It is such an understanding of criminality that is combined with a conservative approach in politics and that was discussed in the first indications of social movements that dealt with victims' issues. This approach was also characteristic of the initial research on criminal victimization, and Carmen wrote about it: "Conservatives within victimology and the victims' rights movement see the criminal

---

<sup>4</sup> This outcome best illustrates the theoretical and scientific claim that the difficulty in defining the concept of a scientific discipline is related to the definition of the content of its subject, the methods used when studying that subject, different ideological conceptions and approaches of researchers.

justice system as a guarantor of retributive justice - providing the victim with satisfaction through the knowledge that the perpetrators will be punished for their crimes (Walklate, 2007, pp. 32-36)."

However, looking at street crime (phenomenological-etiological), as well as its victimological connotations, is impossible to begin without considering the context of the relationship between social and retributive justice and the appearance of poverty as a criminogenic factor that affects that relationship.

From the point of view of the relationship between social justice and criminal justice, certain questions can be asked: with social justice - about what is necessary for a society to be justly constituted; in criminal justice - on the basics of fair punishment (Kostić, 2007, pp. 5-14). What is in favor of social justice usually includes the assumption that a society can be just only if it has taken steps to ensure a fair distribution (redistribution) of social wealth at its disposal, and if there is no equality at its disposal (Kostić, 1997, pp. 223-229),<sup>5</sup> then at least the necessity of meeting the basic needs of the members of that society (Konstantinović-Vilić, Nikolić-Ristanović, & Kostić, 2009, pp. 266-267).

The redistributive concept of social justice and the retributive concept of criminal justice form two basic and often connected starting points of their conditioning. One is an empirical connection, and the other is a normative one.

The empirical basis is that it is a certain form of redistributive justice essential for reducing the scope of crime in advanced industrial societies. Inequality in the distribution of income directly affects the level of crime. The normative basis is that the criminal sanctions prescribed by law, when pronounced and acted upon, are deficient when they are pronounced on those persons to whom social justice was not even available before the crime was committed, hence the claim that "retributive justice is possible only in the context of redistributive social justice" (Konstantinović-Vilić, Nikolić-Ristanović, & Kostić, 2009, pp. 266-267).

Such and similar theoretical disagreements had an impact on the further development of the victimological approach. A significant moment for the development of victimology was the year 1968, when Schafer published the book *The Victim and His Criminal: A Study into Functional Responsibility*. In the very title, which paraphrases the title of Hentig's book, the victim is "at the core of this monograph" (Van Dijk, 2024, p. 2). Skefer presents victimology as an independent study of the relationship and interaction between the perpetrator and the victim before, during and after the crime.

As an additional explanation of the victim's "predominance" in the events that resulted in the criminal act, there is also consideration of the perpetrator's obligation to do good, by indemnifying the victim, which also falls under the subject of interest in victimology. This understanding of the subject was also developed by the Dutch victimologist Nagel in his works on "victimological thought" in criminology. Like other trailblazers in the field, Nagel advocates an interactionist victimology. He was primarily interested in explaining the relationship between the perpetrator and the victim after the crime was committed. In Nagel's opinion, the criminal justice system should strive to satisfy the need for the perpetrator to pay for his actions, as well as for the victim to have a need for retribution, to which is added the need for reconciliation (Van Dijk, 2024, p. 2).

Fata, according to the views expressed in his book *Is the victim to blame? (Is the Victim to Blame?)* from 1971, also belongs to the first generation of those who belong to the direction of criminal victimology.

All these authors, whose pioneering works influenced the constitution of victimology, were criminal lawyers and/or criminologists. Their field of interest was the victim, as a key figure in the social processes that resulted to or arose from the crime. Efforts to study the role of the victim, as a person who "prevailed"

---

<sup>5</sup> There are different criteria for classifying needs. Numerous divisions are mentioned in the literature - into general and specific needs, constant and variable, irreplaceable and replaceable, postponeable and irreplaceable, natural, physical and luxury, real and imaginary, etc. Of particular importance is the division according to the way in which needs are met. Thus, they can be distinguished: personal (when a person satisfies them as an individual and decides on the type, priority, method and time of satisfaction); common (which are expressed in the circle of interested parties and constitute a synthesis, not a mechanical sum of personal needs) and general social needs (which are met in the whole society and under the same conditions for all members of the social community).

in committing a crime, continued in the empirical research of Wolfgang (Wolfgang) in 1958, as well as in Amir's (Amir) rape research. The key point of their teachings is in the victim and his "predominance" or predominance in the commission of the crime, as a neutral, non-legalistic approach, which was thought to explain the manifestation of the criminal act.

## 2. Later development of victimology concepts

The main direction of victimology is usually called general victimology ("general victimology"). Like criminal victimology, this direction was first explicitly explained by Mendelson. In 1956, in one of his post-war works, Mendelssohn presented his general teaching on what he then called "victimity" (Dussich, 2009),<sup>6</sup> which should be reduced by preventive activity and assistance to victims. In later works, Mendelssohn proposed the establishment of clinics for victims, in which assistance would be provided to victims, based on a special personal, social and cultural theory of rehabilitation (Van Dijk, 2024, p. 3).

Thus, Mendelssohn's interest was diverted from crime and crime prevention, to the prevention and facilitation of victimhood, in the broadest sense. Mendelssohn believed that subjects of study should include not only victims of crime and abuse of power, but also victims of accidents, natural disasters, and "other acts of God. (Van Dijk, 2024, p. 3)" He advocated the development of general victimology, as a discipline on its own grounds, independent of criminology and criminal law, which will help states to minimize human suffering. This attitude was certainly derived from Mendelssohn's personal experience as a victim of basic human rights violations during the Second World War.

Although Mendelson was never involved in the establishment of concrete relief for victims, he can still be considered the spiritual father of what is now called the "movement for victims", which has been developing in both developed and less developed countries of the world since the seventies of the last century. As a visible consequence of that movement, in many countries, the provisions regulating the criminal procedure have been changed in such a way as to ensure a better position for the victims of crime. Victimologists became victims' advocates, with victimology transformed from a victimology of acts to a victimology of actions. In parallel with the global change seen in this way, clinical trials, which include victims of crimes and accidents, have expanded during the last twenty years. A key segment in that research field is how people under traumatic stress should be helped or how the consequences of post-traumatic stress should be prevented or treated. Regardless of the fact that criminologists, criminal lawyers and social psychologists have made an important contribution to this specific scientific knowledge, Van Dijk believes that "most of the work in this field has been or is being done by psychiatrists and clinical psychologists" (Van Dijk, 2024, p. 3).

The reach of this type of research is not limited to victims of crime. The exact nature of the serious life events that cause traumatic stress is of little importance. That is why attention should be focused on treatment and prevention or mitigation of harmful consequences (Van Dijk, 2024, p. 3).<sup>7</sup> Post-traumatic stress disorders have also been observed in victims of accidental events, as well as in natural disasters or traffic accidents.

That's why Mendelson called this whole direction in victimology general victimology. From the presented understanding, it is clear that this direction differs not only in its determination of the area that deals with victimology, but also in the expressed focus on help or treatment, rather than on the analysis of the genesis of victimization. A slogan that would correspond to this direction of victimology would be that

---

<sup>6</sup> In recent approaches to the study of restorative justice and victimology, some authors explain the meaning of certain terms, which are not commonly used in victimology works in the local language. Thus, the term "victimity" denotes all common features of victims; "victim" means that a person has the character of a victim; "victimogenic" ("victimogenic") that which creates/forms victims; and "victimogenesis" ("victimogenesis") which means the origin or cause of victimization.

<sup>7</sup> Much research is focused on the issues of surviving the Holocaust and other atrocities committed during World War II and on the best methods to help the victims in their mirrored behavior.

"victimology should not aim to interpret victims, but to help them. Therefore, an alternative name would be 'help-oriented victimology'" (Van Dijk, 2024, p. 5).

General victimology has also attracted political criticism. The argument is that people who have suffered some minor hardship also claim to be victims, thus ignoring personal responsibility. The US is a country that is claimed to represent a "culture of resentment". In this context, the "therapeutic culture" and the "victimization industry" are also mentioned. Nevertheless, taking into account all the seriousness of victimization, as a subject of victimological discussion, this critical attitude, in itself as an isolated discussion, has no significance. However, a critical attitude towards the possible exaggerations of "applied victimology", as Van Dijk notes, must be welcomed (Van Dijk, 2024, p. 5).

At the end of his critical stance, Van Dijk notes that in some clinical studies of crime victims, the criminal nature of the victim's problems has been neglected. Instead, attention is focused on the patient's clinical symptoms. Criminal lawyers are sometimes happy to accept a medical approach to victims. If the issues of crime victims can be successfully transferred to the professions that provide treatment, then the criminal justice system "does not need to bother with this and can occupy itself exclusively with the relationship between the state and the perpetrator" (Van Dijk, 2024, p. 5). In that case, there are no political pressures to change the existing criminal procedure. And therefore, Van Dijk emphasizes once again the role of criminal victimologists and their cooperation with feminist-oriented victimologists/victimologists, in providing support against such professional coalitions that do not act in the best interest of the victim.

In general, many criminologists expressed other critical views on this topic, and in a broader sense. Thus, Cressey gave a rather strict critical position in 1992, about victimology in general, and the attitude towards victims: "Victimology is... a non-academic program under which a mishmash of ideas, interests, ideological positions and research methods have been arbitrarily gathered. .. (i) it is characterized by a discrepancy between two equally desirable orientations towards human suffering - humanistic and scientific... (However, the humanistic approach tends to be condemned because it is considered more propaganda and less science, and the scientific approach tends to be condemned because it is not focused enough on social action. Perhaps it would be better if each of the positions of the victimologist is excluded, if it is separated from the other and if it forms a community outside the shadow of the victimological umbrella" (Ellias, 2024, p. 9).

In fact, Kress's opinion is a strongly expressed position similar to that expressed by Van Dijk at the expense of general victimology and the clinical approach to the victim. Namely, interpreting Cressi's indignation, Elias further explains that this approach by Cressi resulted from an overemphasized victimological attitude on the part of victims' representatives, whose "zeal" for promoting politics in favor of the victim "affects our ability to conduct objective scientific research" (Ellias, 2024, p. 12).

Cressy's thoughts were echoed by Fata, who points out that victimology has strayed too far from theory and science and "became too ideological, activist and politically oriented. Victims' advocates are sometimes so engrossed in painting an angry picture that they distort the crime, its impact, its frequency and its victims" (Ellias, 2024, p. 12). Fata provides an illustration of the danger of "missionary zeal", often practiced by victims' advocates: the "crusade" against child abuse often led to false accusations; presumption of guilt, hasty separation of the child and unnecessary fear and suspicion among parents, those who professionally care for children and the children themselves. Victims' advocates also risk stigmatizing victims as helpless beings by providing unjustified special treatment for them, taking into account that in any society victims should have the right to help.

Similar to the opinion of Cressi and Fata, Harding expresses his critical position, stressing that the politicization of victimology has "perverted" criminal justice, with fatal consequences for both approaches. The victims' rights movement, Harding emphasizes, has promoted rights selectively - for certain victims, as well as the unjustified assumption that victims' rights are more important than rights or values in society as a whole. This perpetuates a false zero-sum battle between the interests of victims and the interests of perpetrators, which promotes an ineffective, conservative criminal policy (Ellias, 2024, p. 12).

### 3. On resilience in victimology

Regardless of academic discussions, the possibility of becoming a victim of crime is a daily reality in any person's life. The fact, undeniably and indisputably accepted, is that the victims of a criminal act are faced with a new challenge - and that is the fear suffered and the reactions to it. "Their world has been turned upside down and they have to deal with it as best they can (James, 2024)." Some victims are traumatized to such an extent that they can get personal and mental health difficulties, which further hinder their daily existence. However, many of the victims still manage to "weather the storm", without seeking professional help or even avoiding attracting any attention from victim assistance services. These people are considered to be able to sort out their own sources of strength and rebuild their lives. Professionals dealing with victims of crime usually encounter victims when they are largely exhausted by the victimization they have suffered. That is why the understanding that all victims are traumatized has developed. In fact, victims of crime are thought to be able to display different levels of resilience and a wide range of responses, positive and negative coping with adversity, and the ability to move forward (James, 2024).

In works from the field of psychology, in the nineties of the last century, a new direction was developed from the results of research on individual differences in sensitivity to stress. The direction "health-oriented" is based on the belief of experts that "the human species has an innate capacity to overcome unfavorable life circumstances and situations", that is, resilience (Shannon, Danielle, & Frederick, 2020).<sup>8</sup> This claim is supported by the very biological, physical structure of the human body, i.e. in the muscular and skeletal system.<sup>9</sup>

Individuals with the capacity for resilience are in fact such persons who possess a certain set of postulates or attitudes about themselves that influence their actions and the skills they develop. On the other hand, those actions, as well as the skills they possess, influence the set of postulates and attitudes, so there is a continuous interactive and dynamic process between them (Brooks & Sam, 2024).

In the literature, there is an understanding that everyone has the capacity for resilience. However, the individual must find himself in certain situations that will precede the fact that one person will be able to develop resilience, so everyone needs some support (Shannon, Danielle, & Frederick, 2020). That is, in some scientific circles, there is an understanding that resilience refers only to some individuals who have already overcome certain stresses or adversities. However, it is a concept that needs to be expanded to become a primary focus in every person's personal life, regardless of whether that person has experienced adversity on a larger scale. This is because every individual normally experiences some level of stressful and challenging situations in everyday life (Brooks & Sam, 2024).

The resilient structure of one's personality consists, in fact, of several factors, such as: a feeling of control over one's life; the art of strengthening one's resilience to stress; existence of empathy; demonstrating the ability to communicate and other interpersonal skills; having real problem-solving and decision-making skills; setting realistic goals and expectations; learning, both from success and from failure; acting as a useful member of the social community; living a responsible life, based on serious values; feeling special when helping others to feel good, etc (Brooks & Sam, 2024).

However, today's voluminous literature on resilience was preceded by findings and research conducted by psychologist Amy Werner, so she is considered the founder of the idea of resilience (Zotović, 2002, pp. 3-23)<sup>10</sup> in developmental psychology. She is often called the "mother of resilience" because of her initial and basic research in this area. Werner conducted a thirty-seven-year study of the inhabitants of the

---

<sup>8</sup> The word resilience itself can be defined in several ways, such as: the ability to "bounce" back into a frame, position, or the ability to restore strength, spirit, and humor quickly and energetically. Psychological strength itself is a person's ability to successfully overcome the psychological stresses and adversities of modern society.

<sup>9</sup> The resilience of an individual's physical characteristics is reflected in the self-healing ability of the human body (broken bones, muscle injuries, etc., which can be restored by themselves).

<sup>10</sup> Resilience research shows how individuals successfully develop despite the risk for mental illness and adverse living conditions; and demonstrate that factors often referred to as risk factors are not reliable predictors of psychopathology.

island of Kauai. The sample included 505 respondents who were born in 1955. Half of the children, whose parents were sugarcane plantation workers, were born into poverty. As the sugar industry collapsed during the difficult years that followed, it almost certainly meant that these children would continue to live in poverty. The respondents grew up in an environment filled with fear, abuse and alcoholism. Werner believes that, if one starts from the theoretical concept of the victim in order to forecast the future life of the examined children, a simple conclusion can be drawn that these children will determine their future by the age of twenty, so that they will continue to live a life filled with crime, alcoholism, unemployment and hopelessness. However, the research results showed that one third of those children did not fall into the described situation. In fact, they were all good students and started successful careers, and described themselves as "competent adults (Shannon, Danielle, & Frederick, 2020)."

The results of the aforementioned research are just an illustration of the importance that learning about resilience has for crime victims. Casarez-Levison, for example, developed a simple model of how people move from the position of a member of the general population to the position of a victim, and from there to earning the title of "survivor." She pointed out that people move from the state that preceded the commission of the crime (pre-victimization) to the criminal act (victimization), and from there to the initial mastery and adaptation (transition) and finally, to continuing with their lives (resolution). The model is even simplified, in that the attention is focused on the psychological strength that the person was able to express before and during the criminal event, as well as on that strength that is even more visible, as the person faces the crime and moves forward (James, 2024).

Peterson and Seligman (Peterson, Seligman) identified character traits of resilience and ability, which are common to different cultural-logical settings. The list contains the following character traits of resilience, which are distinguished based on human abilities: wisdom and knowledge: creativity, curiosity, open spirit, love or learning to love and perspective; daring: boldness, persistence, correctness and vitality; humanity: love, kindness and social intelligence; righteousness: civic spirit, fearlessness and the ability to be a leader; sobriety: forgiveness/mercy, modesty/decency, prudence and self-control; transcendence: appreciation of beauty, gratitude, hope, humor and wit (James, 2024).

Questions related to the explanation of resilience in the victimological approach are impossible to end with one attitude, conclusion or approach.

These brief reflections on and from victimology should only serve as a reminder that the trauma and pain of criminal victimization must be endured with fortitude and dignity. All those who experienced being victims should, however, be reminded of those circumstances.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Brooks, R. , Sam G. , *The Power of Resilience*, <https://www.audible.com/pd/The-Power-of-Resilience-Audiobook/1639294856> , Accessed: 10.5.2024.
- Ellias, R. , „Paradigms and Paradoxes of Victimology“, [https://www.academia.edu/35320425/Elias\\_Paradigms\\_and\\_Paradoxes\\_of\\_Victim](https://www.academia.edu/35320425/Elias_Paradigms_and_Paradoxes_of_Victim), Accessed 31.03.2024.
- Dussich, J. *Keynote speech for the 12<sup>th</sup> Annual Restorative Justice Conference in Fresno Oct 20 '06*, <http://peace.fresno.edu/rjp/docs/2006Dussich.doc>, Accessed: 9.11.2009.
- James K. H., „Victimization, Resilience and Meaning-Making: Moving Forward in Strength“, *Victims of Crime Research Digest, Issue No. 2*, Department of Justice Canada, [http://www.justice.gc.ca/eng/pi/rs/rep-rap/rd-rr/rd09\\_2-rr09\\_2/p1.html](http://www.justice.gc.ca/eng/pi/rs/rep-rap/rd-rr/rd09_2-rr09_2/p1.html), Accessed: 5.5.2024.
- J.J.M. van Dijk, „Introducing Victimology“, <chromeextension://efaidnbmninnibpcjpcglcfindmkaj/https://research.tilburguniversity.edu/file/s/1411974/INTRODUC.PDF> , Accessed 29.04.2024.



- Konstantinović-Vilić, S., Nikolić-Ristanović, V., Kostić, M. (2009). *Kriminologija*, Pelikan, Niš.
- Konstantinović-Vilić, S., Nikolić-Ristanović, V. (2003). *Kriminologija*, Centar za publikacije pravnog fakulteta u Nišu.
- Kostić, M. (2007). „Uspostavljanje standarda za restorativnu pravdu“, *Temida*, Beograd.
- Kostić, M. (1997). „Potrebe, socijalne razlike i kriminalitet“, Zbornik sa naučnog skupa: *Uzroci i posledice socijalne diferencijacije u našem društvu danas*, Priština, 1997.
- Ramljak, A., Simović, M. (2006). *Viktimologija*, Panevropski univerzitet Apeiron, Fakultet pravnih nauka Banja Luka, Banja Luka.
- Ronel, N., Jaishankar, K., Bensimon, M., (2008). *Trends and Issues in Victimology*, Cambridge Scholars Publishing. [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/261676355\\_Trends\\_and\\_issues\\_in\\_victimology](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/261676355_Trends_and_issues_in_victimology), Accessed: 30.04.2024.
- Shannon K. Cheng, Danielle D. King, and Frederick L. Oswald. (2020). Understanding How Resilience is Measured in the Organizational Sciences. *Human Performance Understanding How Resilience is Measured in the Organizational Science* Accessed: 1-34. 10.05.2024. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/340488258>
- Šeparović, Z. (1988). *Viktimologija - studije o žrtvama*, Informator, Zagreb.
- Zotović, M. (2002). „Stres i posledice stresa: prikaz transakcionističkog teorijskog modela“, *Psihologija*, [www.doiserbia.nbs.bg.ac.yu/.../ft.aspx?id=0048-57050201003Z](http://www.doiserbia.nbs.bg.ac.yu/.../ft.aspx?id=0048-57050201003Z), Accessed: 24.4.2024.
- Walklate, S. (2007). *Imagining the Victim of Crime*, McGrawHill, Open University Press.