

# Criminal Victimization in the United States

1973

---

No. SD-NCP-N-4

December 1976

A National Crime  
Survey Report

NCJRS

MAR 30 1977

ACQUISITIONS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE  
Law Enforcement Assistance Administration  
National Criminal Justice  
Information and Statistics Service

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE  
Law Enforcement Assistance Administration

Richard W. Velde, Administrator

Henry F. McQuade  
Deputy Administrator  
for Policy Development

Paul K. Wormeli  
Deputy Administrator  
for Administration

Harry Bratt, Assistant Administrator  
National Criminal Justice Information and Statistics Service

Benjamin H. Renshaw, Director  
Statistics Division

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This report was prepared for the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration by the Bureau of the Census. In the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, general supervision was supplied by Charles R. Kindermann, assisted by Dawn D. Nelson. Collection and processing of data for the household survey were conducted in the Bureau of the Census under the general supervision of Marvin M. Thompson, Demographic Surveys Division, assisted by Linda R. Murphy, Dolores A. Piekut, and Robert L. Goodson. For the commercial survey, the direction of data collection and processing activities was under the general supervision of Caesar G. Hill, Business Division, assisted by Chester E. Bowie. The report was prepared in the Crime Statistics Analysis Staff under the general supervision of Robert P. Parkinson. Adolfo L. Paez directed and edited the report. Contributing analysts included Richard W. Dodge, George M. Dickerson, Norman F. Howard, Harold R. Lentzner, and J. Frederick Shenk. A technical review of the report was performed by Paul J. Bettin and Masato Asanuma, Statistical Methods Division, under the general supervision of David V. Bateman.

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

United States. National Criminal Justice Information and  
Statistics Service.  
Criminal victimization in the United States.

(A national crime panel survey report. Report no. SD-  
NCP-N-4).

1. Victims of crime—United States. 2. Crime and  
criminals—United States. I. Title.  
HV6791.U55 1976 364 75-619157

## PREFACE

Presenting the most comprehensive set of results yet released under the National Crime Panel program, this publication contains data about selected crimes of violence and theft for calendar year 1973 for the Nation as a whole. It succeeds an advance report published in May 1975. The program, based on continuing surveys of a representative national sample of households and businesses, was created to assess the character and extent of selected forms of criminal victimization. The surveys have been designed and conducted for the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration by the U.S. Bureau of the Census.

As presently constituted, National Crime Panel surveys focus on certain criminal offenses, whether completed or attempted, that are of major concern to the general public and law enforcement authorities. For individuals, these are rape, robbery, assault, and personal larceny; for households, burglary, household larceny, and motor vehicle theft; and for commercial establishments, burglary and robbery. In addition to enabling measurement of the extent to which such crimes occur, the surveys permit examination of the characteristics of victims and the circumstances surrounding the criminal acts, exploring, as appropriate, such matters as the relationship between victim and offender, characteristics of offenders, extent of victim injuries, economic consequences to the victims, time and place of occurrence,

use of weapons, whether the police were notified, and, if not, reasons advanced for not informing them.

Although the program has a general objective of developing insights into the impact of selected crimes upon victims, it is anticipated that the scope of the surveys will be modified periodically to address other topics in the field of criminal justice. In addition, continuing methodological studies are expected to yield refinements in survey questionnaires and procedures.

Information in this report was derived from interviews with the occupants of about 65,000 housing units (160,000 persons) and 15,000 businesses representative of those in the 50 States and the District of Columbia. Respondents who yielded the 1973 data were interviewed twice during the course of the appropriate data collection period, at 6-month intervals. Eliminated from consideration were crimes experienced by U.S. residents outside the country and those involving foreign visitors to this country, although it can be assumed that such events were relatively rare. Respondents furnished detailed personal and household data (or information about commercial establishments), in addition to particulars on criminal acts they incurred.

In relation to crimes against persons, National Crime Panel survey results are based on either of two units of measure—victimizations or incidents. A victimization is a

specific criminal act as it affects a single victim. An incident is a specific criminal act involving one or more victims and one or more offenders. For reasons discussed in the appropriate analytical and technical sections of this report, the number of personal victimizations is somewhat greater than that of personal incidents. As applied to crimes against households and commercial establishments, however, the terms "victimization" and "incident" are synonymous.

All statistical data in this report are estimates subject to errors arising both from the fact that they are based on information obtained from sample surveys rather than complete censuses and that recording and processing mistakes invariably occur in the course of a large-scale data collection effort. As part of a discussion of the reliability of estimates, these sources of error are discussed more fully in Appendixes III and IV. It should be noted at the outset, however, that with respect to the effect of sampling errors, estimate variations can be determined rather precisely. In the Detailed Findings section of this report, categorical statements involving analytical comparisons have met statistical tests that the differences are equivalent to or greater than two standard errors, or, in other words, that the chances are at least 95 out of 100 that each difference described did not result solely from sampling variability; qualified statements of comparison have met significance tests that the differences are within the range of 1.6 to 2 standard errors, or that there is a likelihood equal to at least 90 (but less than 95) out of 100 that the differences noted did not result solely from sampling variability. These conditional statements are characterized by the use of expressions such as "some indication," "less conclusively," "marginal indication," "marginally significant," and "based on less conclusive data." Apparent differences between two values, or among several related ones, that failed to meet either of these criteria generally have been identified as lacking statistical significance; besides explicit statements to that effect, a variety of expressions, including "no meaningful difference," "not valid," "no true difference," and "no pattern," denotes these findings. In some instances, however, apparent differences between values that failed to meet either statistical criteria have not been

discussed. In the Selected Findings section, all comparative statements passed the two standard error test.

The 100 tables in Appendix I display the data that formed the basis for the analytical sections of this report. The three appendixes that follow contain materials to facilitate further analyses and other uses of the data. Appendix II contains facsimiles of the questionnaire forms used in conducting the household and commercial surveys, whereas Appendixes III and IV have standard error tables and guidelines for their use. The latter two appendixes also include technical information concerning sample design, estimation procedures, and sources of nonsampling error.

Attempts to compare information in this report with data collected from police agencies by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and published annually in its report, *Crime in the United States, Uniform Crime Reports*, are inappropriate because of substantial differences in coverage between this survey and police statistics. A major difference arises from the fact that police statistics on the incidence of crime are derived principally from reports that persons make to the police, whereas survey data include crimes not reported to the police, as well as those reported. Personal crimes covered in the survey relate only to persons age 12 and over, whereas police statistics count crimes against persons of any age. Furthermore, the survey does not measure some offenses, e.g., homicide, kidnaping, white collar crimes, and commercial larceny (shoplifting and employee theft), that are included in police statistics, and the counting and classifying rules for the two programs are not fully compatible.

Unlike the crime rates developed from police statistics, the personal victimization rates cited in this report are based on victimizations rather than on incidents and are calculated on the basis of the population age 12 and over rather than on the total population. As indicated earlier, personal victimizations outnumber personal incidents. National Crime Panel rates of victimization for crimes against households and commercial establishments are based, respectively, on the number of households and businesses, whereas rates derived from police statistics for these crimes are based on the total population.



# CONTENTS

	Page
Preface .....	iii
The national surveys .....	1
Crimes against persons .....	3
Crimes against households .....	4
Crimes against commercial establishments .....	4
Selected findings .....	5
Detailed findings .....	13
Rates of victimization .....	15
Victim characteristics .....	17
Crimes against persons .....	18
Sex, age, and race .....	18
Marital status .....	20
Annual family income .....	21
Crimes against households .....	21
Race and age of head of household .....	21
Annual family income .....	22
Number of persons per household .....	23
Form of tenure .....	24
Number of housing units per structure .....	24
Crimes against commercial establishments .....	25
Victimization of central city, suburban, and nonmetropolitan residents .....	27
Crimes against persons .....	27
Crimes against households .....	29
Victim-offender relationship in personal crimes of violence .....	31
Offender characteristics in personal crimes of violence .....	35

Crime characteristics . . . . .	39
Time of occurrence . . . . .	40
Crimes against persons . . . . .	40
Crimes against households . . . . .	41
Crimes against commercial establishments . . . . .	42
Place of occurrence . . . . .	42
Crimes against persons . . . . .	42
Crimes against households . . . . .	43
Larcenies without victim-offender contact . . . . .	44
Crimes against commercial establishments . . . . .	44
Number of offenders in personal crimes of violence . . . . .	45
Use of weapons . . . . .	45
Personal crimes of violence . . . . .	45
Robbery of commercial establishments . . . . .	46
Physical injury to victims of personal crimes of violence . . . . .	46
Characteristics of the injured . . . . .	47
Medical expenses and health insurance . . . . .	47
Hospital care . . . . .	48
Economic losses . . . . .	49
Crimes against persons . . . . .	50
Crimes against households . . . . .	51
Crimes against commercial establishments . . . . .	53
Time lost from work . . . . .	53
Crimes against persons . . . . .	54
Crimes against households . . . . .	55
Crimes against commercial establishments . . . . .	55
Reporting of victimizations to the police . . . . .	57
Crimes against persons . . . . .	57
Personal crimes of violence . . . . .	58
Personal crimes of theft . . . . .	60
Crimes against households . . . . .	61
Burglary . . . . .	61
Household larceny . . . . .	62
Motor vehicle theft . . . . .	62
Crimes against commercial establishments . . . . .	63
Appendix I. Survey data tables . . . . .	65
Appendix II. Survey instruments . . . . .	123
Appendix III. Household survey: Technical information and standard error tables . . . . .	145
Sample design and size . . . . .	145
Estimation procedure . . . . .	146
Series victimizations . . . . .	148
Reliability of estimates . . . . .	148
Standard error tables and calculations . . . . .	149
Appendix IV. Commercial survey: Technical information and standard error tables . . . . .	155
Sample design and size . . . . .	155
Estimation procedure . . . . .	156
Reliability of estimates . . . . .	156
Standard error tables and calculations . . . . .	157
Glossary of terms . . . . .	159

# TABLES

	Page
Appendix I	
General findings	
1. Personal, household, and commercial crimes: Number and percent distribution of victimizations, by sector and type of crime, 1973	67
2. Personal, household, and commercial crimes: Victimization rates, by sector and type of crime, 1973	68
Victim characteristics	
3. Personal crimes: Victimization rates for persons age 12 and over, by type of crime and sex of victims, 1973	68
4. Personal crimes: Victimization rates for persons age 12 and over, by type of crime and age of victims, 1973	69
5. Personal crimes: Victimization rates for persons age 12 and over, by sex and age of victims and type of crime, 1973	69
6. Personal crimes: Victimization rates for persons age 12 and over, by type of crime and race of victims, 1973	70
7. Personal crimes: Victimization rates for persons age 12 and over, by type of crime and sex and race of victims, 1973	70
8. Personal crimes: Victimization rates for persons age 12 and over, by race and age of victims and type of crime, 1973	71
9. Personal crimes: Victimization rates for persons age 12 and over, by race, sex, and age of victims and type of crime, 1973	72
10. Personal crimes: Victimization rates for persons age 12 and over, by type of crime and marital status of victims, 1973	72
11. Personal crimes: Victimization rates for persons age 12 and over, by sex and marital status of victims and type of crime, 1973	73
12. Personal crimes: Victimization rates for persons age 12 and over, by type of crime and annual family income of victims, 1973	73
13. Personal crimes: Victimization rates for persons age 12 and over, by race and annual family income of victims and type of crime, 1973	74
14. Household crimes: Victimization rates, by type of crime and race of head of household, 1973	74
15. Motor vehicle theft: Victimization rates on the basis of thefts per 1,000 households and of thefts per 1,000 vehicles owned, by selected household characteristics, 1973	75
16. Household crimes: Victimization rates, by type of crime and age of head of household, 1973	75
17. Household crimes: Victimization rates, by type of crime and annual family income, 1973	76

Tables continued

18. Household burglary: Victimization rates, by race of head of household, annual family income, and type of burglary, 1973 .....	76
19. Household larceny: Victimization rates, by race of head of household, annual family income, and type of larceny, 1973 .....	77
20. Motor vehicle theft: Victimization rates, by race of head of household, annual family income, and type of theft, 1973 .....	
21. Household crimes: Victimization rates, by type of crime and number of persons in household, 1973 .....	78
22. Household crimes: Victimization rates, by type of crime, form of tenure, and race of head of household, 1973 .....	78
23. Household crimes: Victimization rates, by type of crime and number of units in structure occupied by household, 1973 .....	79
24. Commercial crimes: Victimization rates, by characteristics of victimized establishments and type of crime, 1973 .....	79

Victimization of central city, suburban,  
and nonmetropolitan residents

25. Personal crimes: Victimization rates, by type of crime and type of locality of residence of victims, 1973 .....	80
26. Personal crimes: Victimization rates for persons age 12 and over, by type of locality of residence, race and sex of victims, and type of crime, 1973 .....	80
27. Household crimes: Victimization rates, by type of crime and type of locality of residence, 1973 .....	81
28. Household crimes: Victimization rates, by type of locality of residence, race of head of household, and type of crime, 1973 .....	81

Victim-offender relationship in personal  
crimes of violence

29. Personal crimes of violence: Number of victimizations and victimization rates for persons age 12 and over, by type of crime and victim-offender relationship, 1973 .....	82
30. Personal crimes of violence: Percent of victimizations involving strangers, by sex and age of victims and type of crime, 1973 .....	82
31. Personal crimes of violence: Percent of victimizations involving strangers, by sex and race of victims and type of crime, 1973 .....	83
32. Personal crimes of violence: Percent of victimizations involving strangers, by sex and marital status of victims and type of crime, 1973 .....	83
33. Personal crimes of violence: Percent of victimizations involving strangers, by race and annual family income of victims and type of crime, 1973 .....	84

Tables continued

Offender characteristics in personal crimes of violence

34. Personal crimes of violence: Percent distribution of single-offender victimizations, by type of crime and perceived age of offender, 1973 .....	84
35. Personal crimes of violence: Percent distribution of single-offender victimizations, by type of crime and perceived race of offender, 1973 .....	85
36. Personal crimes of violence: Percent distribution of single-offender victimizations, by type of crime, age of victims, and perceived age of offender, 1973 .....	85
37. Personal crimes of violence: Percent distribution of single-offender victimizations, by type of crime, race of victims, and perceived race of offender, 1973 .....	86
38. Personal crimes of violence: Percent distribution of multiple-offender victimizations, by type of crime and perceived age of offenders, 1973 .....	86
39. Personal crimes of violence: Percent distribution of multiple-offender victimizations, by type of crime and perceived race of offenders, 1973 .....	87
40. Personal crimes of violence: Percent distribution of multiple-offender victimizations, by type of crime, age of victims, and perceived age of offenders, 1973 .....	87
41. Personal crimes of violence: Percent distribution of multiple-offender victimizations, by type of crime, race of victims, and perceived race of offenders, 1973 .....	88

Crime characteristics

42. Personal crimes: Number of incidents and victimizations and ratio of incidents to victimizations, by type of crime, 1973 .....	88
43. Personal crimes of violence: Percent distribution of incidents, by victim-offender relationship, type of crime, and number of victims, 1973 .....	89
44. Personal crimes of violence: Number and percent distribution of incidents, by type of crime and victim-offender relationship, 1973 .....	90
45. Personal, household, and commercial crimes: Percent distribution of incidents, by type of crime and time of occurrence, 1973 .....	91
46. Personal robbery and assault by armed or unarmed offenders: Percent distribution of incidents, by type of crime and offender and time of occurrence, 1973 .....	92
47. Personal crimes of violence: Percent distribution of incidents, by victim-offender relationship, type of crime, and time of occurrence, 1973 .....	92
48. Selected personal and household crimes: Percent distribution of incidents, by type of crime and place of occurrence, 1973 .....	93
49. Personal robbery and assault by armed or unarmed offenders: Percent distribution of incidents, by type of crime and offender and place of occurrence, 1973 .....	93

Tables continued

50. Personal crimes of violence: Percent distribution of incidents, by victim-offender relationship, type of crime, and place of occurrence, 1973 .....	94
51. Larcenies not involving victim-offender contact: Percent distribution of incidents, by type of crime and place of occurrence, 1973 .....	94
52. Larcenies not involving victim-offender contact: Percent distribution of incidents, by type of crime, place of occurrence, and value of theft loss, 1973 .....	95
53. Personal crimes of violence: Percent distribution of incidents, by victim-offender relationship, type of crime, and number of offenders, 1973 .....	95
54. Personal crimes of violence: Percent of incidents in which offenders used weapons, by type of crime and victim-offender relationship, 1973 .....	96
55. Personal crimes of violence: Percent distribution of types of weapons used in incidents by armed offenders, by victim-offender relationship, type of crime, and type of weapon, 1973 .....	96
56. Commercial robbery: Percent of incidents in which offenders used weapons, by type of crime and type of weapon, 1973 .....	96
57. Personal robbery and assault: Percent of victimizations in which victims sustained physical injury, by selected characteristics of victims and type of crime, 1973 .....	97
58. Personal crimes of violence: Percent of victimizations in which victims incurred medical expenses, by selected characteristics of victims and type of crime, 1973 .....	97
59. Personal crimes of violence: Percent distribution of victimizations in which victims incurred medical expenses, by selected characteristics of victims, type of crime, and amount of expenses, 1973 .....	98
60. Personal crimes of violence: Percent of victimizations in which injured victims had health insurance coverage or were eligible for public medical services, by selected characteristics of victims, 1973 .....	98
61. Personal crimes of violence: Percent of victimizations in which victims received hospital care, by selected characteristics of victims and type of crime, 1973 .....	99
62. Personal crimes of violence: Percent distribution of victimizations in which victims received hospital care, by selected characteristics of victims, type of crime, and type of hospital care, 1973 .....	100
63. Personal, household, and commercial crimes: Percent of victimizations resulting in economic loss, by type of crime and type of loss, 1973 .....	101
64. Personal crimes of violence: Percent of victimizations resulting in economic loss, by type of crime, type of loss, and victim-offender relationship, 1973 .....	102
65. Personal and household crimes: Percent distribution of victimizations resulting in economic loss, by race of victims, type of crime, and value of loss, 1973 .....	103

Tables continued

66. Selected personal crimes: Percent distribution of victimizations resulting in theft loss, by race of victims, type of crime, and value of loss, 1973 .....	105
67. Personal and household crimes: Percent distribution of victimizations resulting in theft loss, by race of victims, type of crime, and proportion of loss recovered, 1973 .....	106
68. Personal and household crimes: Percent distribution of victimizations in which theft losses were recovered, by type of crime and method of recovery of loss, 1973 .....	107
69. Household crimes: Percent distribution of victimizations resulting in theft loss, by value of loss and type of crime, 1973 .....	107
70. Commercial crimes: Percent of victimizations resulting in economic loss, by kind of establishment, type of crime, and type of loss, 1973 .....	108
71. Commercial burglary: Percent distribution of victimizations resulting in economic loss, by kind of establishment and value of loss, 1973 .....	108
72. Commercial robbery: Percent distribution of victimizations resulting in theft loss, by kind of establishment and value of loss, 1973 .....	108
73. Commercial crimes: Percent distribution of victimizations resulting in theft loss, by proportion of loss recovered and type of crime, 1973 .....	109
74. Personal, household, and commercial crimes: Percent of victimizations resulting in loss of time from work, by type of crime, 1973 .....	109
75. Personal and household crimes: Percent of victimizations resulting in loss of time from work, by type of crime and race of victims, 1973 .....	110
76. Personal crimes of violence: Percent of victimizations resulting in loss of time from work, by type of crime and victim-offender relationship, 1973 .....	110
77. Personal and household crimes: Percent distribution of victimizations resulting in loss of time from work, by type of crime and number of days lost, 1973 .....	111
78. Personal crimes of violence: Percent distribution of victimizations resulting in loss of time from work, by number of days lost and victim-offender relationship, 1973 .....	111
79. Personal and household crimes: Percent distribution of victimizations resulting in loss of time from work, by race of victims, type of crime, and number of days lost, 1973 .....	112
80. Commercial crimes: Percent distribution of victimizations, by type of crime and number of days lost from work, 1973 .....	112

Reporting of victimizations to the police

81. Personal, household, and commercial crimes: Percent of victimizations reported to the police, by type of crime, 1973 .....	113
--	-----

Tables continued

82. Personal crimes: Percent of victimizations reported to the police, by selected characteristics of victims and type of crime, 1973 .....	113
83. Personal crimes: Percent of victimizations reported to the police, by type of crime, victim-offender relationship, and sex of victims, 1973 .....	114
84. Personal crimes: Percent of victimizations reported to the police, by type of crime, victim-offender relationship, and race of victims, 1973 .....	114
85. Personal crimes: Percent of victimizations reported to the police, by type of crime and age of victims, 1973 .....	115
86. Personal crimes of violence: Percent of victimizations reported to the police, by age of victims and victim-offender relationship, 1973 .....	115
87. Personal and household crimes: Percent of victimizations reported to the police, by type of crime and type of locality of residence, 1973 .....	116
88. Personal and household crimes: Percent of victimizations reported to the police, by type of crime and size of central city of residence, 1973 .....	116
89. Household crimes: Percent of victimizations reported to the police, by type of crime, race of head of household, and form of tenure, 1973 .....	117
90. Household crimes: Percent of victimizations reported to the police, by type of crime and annual family income, 1973 .....	117
91. Household crimes: Percent of victimizations reported to the police, by value of loss and type of crime, 1973 .....	118
92. Personal and household crimes: Percent distribution of reasons for not reporting victimizations to the police, by type of crime, 1973 .....	118
93. Personal crimes of violence: Percent distribution of reasons for not reporting victimizations to the police, by victim-offender relationship and type of crime, 1973 .....	119
94. Personal and household crimes: Percent distribution of reasons for not reporting victimizations to the police, by type of crime and type of locality of residence, 1973 .....	119
95. Personal and household crimes: Percent distribution of reasons for not reporting victimizations to the police, by type of crime and size of central city of residence, 1973 .....	120
96. Household crimes: Percent distribution of reasons for not reporting victimizations to the police, by race of head of household and type of crime, 1973 .....	120
97. Household crimes: Percent distribution of reasons for not reporting victimizations to the police, by annual family income, 1973 .....	121
98. Household crimes: Percent distribution of selected reasons for not reporting victimizations to the police, by race of head of household and annual family income, 1973 .....	121
99. Household crimes: Percent distribution of reasons for not reporting victimizations to the police, by type of crime and value of theft loss, 1973 .....	122



Tables continued

100. Commercial crimes: Percent distribution of reasons for not reporting victimizations to the police, by type of crime, 1973 ..... 122

Appendix III

I. Personal and household crimes: Number and percent distribution of series victimizations (4/73-3/74) and of victimizations not in series (1973), by sector and type of crime ..... 151

II. Personal crimes: Standard error approximations for estimated number of victimizations and incidents ..... 152

III. Household crimes: Standard error approximations for estimated number of victimizations ..... 152

IV. Personal crimes: Standard error approximations for estimated victimization rates ..... 153

V. Household crimes: Standard error approximations for estimated victimization rates ..... 153

VI. Personal crimes: Standard error approximations for estimated percentages of victimizations ..... 154

VII. Household crimes: Standard error approximations for estimated percentages of victimizations ..... 154

Appendix IV

VIII. Commercial crimes: Standard error estimates for number of victimizations, by type of crime ..... 158

IX. Commercial crimes: Standard error estimates for victimization rates, by characteristics of establishments and type of crime ..... 158



## THE NATIONAL SURVEYS

The National Crime Panel is a program designed to develop information not otherwise available on the nature of crime and its impact on society by means of victimization surveys of the general population. Based on representative samplings of households and commercial establishments, the surveys elicit information about experiences, if any, with selected crimes of violence and theft, including events that were reported to the police as well as those that were not. By focusing on the victim, the person likely to be most aware of details concerning criminal events, the surveys generate a variety of data, including information on the circumstances under which such acts occurred and on their effect.

As one of the most ambitious efforts yet undertaken for filling some of the gaps in crime data, victimization surveys are expected to supply the criminal justice community with new insights into crime and its victims, complementing data resources already on hand for purposes of planning, evaluation, and analysis. The surveys cover many crimes that, for a variety of reasons, are never brought to police attention. They also furnish a means for developing victim profiles and, for identifiable sectors of society, yield information necessary to compute the relative risk of being victimized. Victimization surveys also have the capability of distinguishing between stranger-to-stranger and domestic violence and between armed and strong-arm assaults and robberies. They can tally some of the costs of crime in terms of

injury or economic loss sustained, and they can provide greater understanding as to why certain criminal acts are not reported to police authorities. Conducted periodically in the same area, victimization surveys provide the data necessary for developing indicators sensitive to fluctuations in the levels of crime; conducted under the same procedures in different areas, they provide a basis for comparing the crime situation between two or more localities or types of localities.

Victimization surveys, such as those conducted under the National Crime Panel program, are not without limitations, however. Although they provide information on crimes that are of major interest to the general public, they cannot measure all criminal activity, as a number of crimes are not amenable to examination through the survey technique. Surveys have proved most successful in estimating crimes with specific victims who understand what happened to them and how it happened and who are willing to report what they know. More specifically, they have been shown to be most applicable to rape, robbery, assault, burglary, and both personal and household larceny, including motor vehicle theft. Accordingly, the National Crime Panel was designed to focus on these crimes. Murder and kidnaping are not covered. The so-called victimless crimes, such as drunkenness, drug abuse, and prostitution, also are excluded, as are those crimes for which it is difficult to identify knowledgeable respondents or to locate compre-

hensive data records, as in offenses against government entities.<sup>1</sup> Examples of the latter are income tax evasion and the theft of office supplies. Crimes of which the victim may not be aware also cannot be measured effectively by the survey technique. Buying stolen property may fall into this category, as may some instances of fraud and embezzlement. Attempted crimes of most types probably are underrecorded for this reason. Commercial larcenies (e.g., employee theft and shoplifting) have to date not proved susceptible to measurement or study by means of the survey approach because of the limited documentation maintained by most commercial establishments on losses from these crimes. Finally, events in which the victim has shown a willingness to participate in illegal activity also are excluded. Examples of the latter, which are unlikely to be reported to interviewers, include gambling, various types of swindles, con games and blackmail.

The success of any victimization survey is highly contingent on the degree of cooperation that interviewers receive from respondents. In the National Crime Panel surveys that yielded data relevant to calendar year 1973, interviews were obtained in 96 percent of the housing units occupied by persons eligible for interview. In the commercial sector, the response rate was about 99 percent.

Data from victimization surveys also are subject to limitations imposed by victim recall, i.e., the ability of respondents to remember incidents befalling them or their households, and by the phenomenon of telescoping, that is, the tendency of some respondents to recount incidents occurring outside (usually before) the referenced time frame. This tendency is controlled by using a bounding technique, whereby the first interview serves as a benchmark, and summary records of each successive interview aid in avoiding duplicative reporting of criminal victimization experiences; information from the initial interview is not incorporated into the survey results.

Another of the issues related in part to victim recall ability involves the so-called series victimizations. Each series consists of three or more criminal events similar, if not identical, in nature and incurred by persons unable to identify separately the details of each act, or, in some

cases, to recount accurately the total number of such acts. Because of this, no attempt is made to collect information on the specific month, or months, of occurrence of series victimizations; instead, such data are attributed to the season, or seasons, of occurrence. Had it been feasible to make a precise tally of victimizations that occurred in series and to determine their month of occurrence, inclusion of this information in the processing of survey results would have caused certain alterations in the portrayal of criminal victimization. Perhaps most importantly, rates of victimization would have been higher. Because of the inability of victims to furnish details concerning their experiences, however, it would have been impossible to analyze the characteristics and effects of these crimes. But, although the estimated number of series victimizations was appreciable, the number of victims who actually experienced such acts was small in relation to the total number of individuals who were victimized one or more times and who had firm recollections of each event. Approximately 1.8 million series victimizations against persons or households, each encompassing at least three separate but undifferentiated events, were estimated to have occurred during a 12-month period commencing with the spring of 1973. A further discussion about series victimizations, as well as a table in which they are broken out by type of crime, can be found in Appendix III of this report.

Data emanating from the National Crime Panel surveys can be examined from various perspectives. They can be analyzed along topical lines, by subjects such as "crime characteristics"; they can be grouped into crimes against persons and crimes against property; they can focus on specific crimes; or they can be classified according to victim characteristics. This report is organized topically. Internally, most chapters are subdivided according to the applicable targets, or sectors, of criminal victimization dealt with by the program—persons, households, and commercial establishments. Within each sector, the analysis focuses on specific crimes. In the discussion that follows, the relevant crimes for each sector are described in detail.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>2</sup>Definitions of the measured crimes do not necessarily conform to any Federal or State statutes, which vary considerably. They are, however, compatible with conventional usage and with the definitions used by the Federal Bureau of Investigation in its annual publication *Crime in the United States, Uniform Crime Reports*. Succinct and precise definitions of the crimes and other terms used in National Crime Panel survey reports appear in the Glossary of Terms, at the end of this report.

<sup>1</sup>Other than government-operated liquor stores and transportation systems, which fall within the purview of the program's commercial sector, government institutions and offices are outside the scope of the program. Pretests have indicated that government organization records on crime generally are inadequate for survey purposes.

## Crimes against persons

In this study, crimes against persons have been divided into two general types: crimes of violence and crimes of theft. Personal crimes of violence (rape, personal robbery, and assault) all bring the victim into direct contact with the offender. Personal crimes of theft may or may not involve contact between the victim and offender.

Rape, one of the most serious and least common of all the crimes measured by the National Crime Panel, is carnal knowledge through the use of force or the threat of force, excluding statutory rape (without force). Both completed and attempted acts are included, and incidents of both homosexual and heterosexual rape are counted.

Personal robbery is a crime in which the object is to relieve a person of property by force or the threat of force. The force employed may be a weapon (armed robbery) or physical power (strong-arm robbery). In either instance, the victim is placed in physical danger, and physical injury can and sometimes does result. The distinction between robbery with injury and robbery without injury turns solely on whether the victim sustained any injury, no matter how minor. The distinction between a completed robbery and an attempted robbery centers on whether the victim sustained any loss of cash or property. For example, an incident might be classified as an attempted robbery simply because the victim was not carrying anything of value when held up at gunpoint. Attempted robberies, however, can be quite serious and can result in severe physical injury to the victim.

The classic image of a robber is that of a masked offender armed with a handgun and operating against lone pedestrians on a city street at night. Robbery can, of course, occur anywhere, on the street or in the home, and at any time. It may be an encounter as dramatic as the one described, or it may simply involve being pinned briefly to a schoolyard fence by one classmate while another classmate takes the victim's lunch money.

Assaults are crimes in which the object is to do physical harm to the victim. The conventional forms of assault are "aggravated" and "simple." An assault carried out with a weapon is considered to be an aggravated assault, irrespective of the degree of injury, if any. An assault carried out without a weapon is also an aggravated assault if the attack results in serious injury. Simple assault occurs when the injury, if any, is minor

and no weapon is used. Within the general category of assault are incidents with results no more serious than a minor bruise and incidents that bring the victim near death—but only near, because death would turn the crime into homicide.

Attempted assaults differ from assaults carried out in that in the latter the victim is actually physically attacked and may incur bodily injury. An attempted assault could be the result of bad aim with a gun or it could be a nonspecific verbal threat to harm the victim. It is difficult to categorize attempted assault as either aggravated or simple because it is conjectural how much injury, if any, the victim would have sustained had the assault been carried out. In some instances, there may have been no intent to carry out the crime. Not all threats of harm are issued in earnest; a verbal threat or a menacing gesture may have been all the offender intended. The intent of the offender obviously cannot be measured in a victimization survey. For the National Crime Panel, attempted assault with a weapon has been classified as an aggravated assault; attempted assault without a weapon has been considered as simple assault.

Although the most fearsome form of assault is the brutal, senseless attack by an unknown assailant, it is also the most rare. Much more common is an incident where the victim is involved in a minor scuffle or a domestic spat. There is reason to believe that incidents of assault stemming from domestic quarrels are underreported in victimization surveys because some victims do not consider such events crimes or are reluctant to implicate family members or relatives, who in some instances may be present during the interview.

Personal crimes of theft (i.e., personal larceny) involve the theft of cash or property by stealth. Such crimes may or may not bring the victim into direct contact with the offender. Personal larceny with contact encompasses purse snatching, attempted purse snatching, and pocket picking. Personal larceny without contact entails the theft by stealth of numerous kinds of items, which need not be strictly personal in nature. It is distinguished from household larceny solely by place of occurrence. Whereas the latter transpires only in the home or its immediate environs, the former can take place at any other location. Examples of personal larceny without contact include the theft of a briefcase or umbrella from a restaurant, a portable radio from the beach, clothing from an automobile parked in a shopping center, a bicycle from a schoolground, food from a shopping cart in front of a supermarket, etc. Lack of force is a major identifying element in personal larceny.

Should, for example, a woman become aware of an attempt to snatch her purse and resist, and should the offender then use force, the crime would escalate to robbery.

In any criminal incident involving crimes against persons, more than one criminal act can take place. A rape may be associated with a robbery, for example. In classifying the survey-measured crimes, each criminal incident has been counted only once, by the most serious act that took place during the incident, ranked in accordance with the seriousness classification system used by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The order of seriousness for crimes against persons is: rape, robbery, assault, and larceny. Consequently, if a person were both robbed and assaulted, the event would be classified as robbery; if the victim suffered harm, the classification would be robbery with injury.

## Crimes against households

All three of the measured crimes against households—burglary, household larceny, and motor vehicle theft—are crimes that do not involve personal confrontation. If there were such confrontation, the crime would be a personal crime, not a household crime, and the victim no longer would be the household itself, but the member of the household involved in the confrontation. For example, if members of the household surprised a burglar in their home and then were threatened or harmed by the intruder, the act would be classified as assault. If the intruder were to demand or take cash and/or property from the household members, the event would classify as robbery.

The most serious of the crimes against households is burglary. Burglary is the illegal or attempted entry of a structure. The assumption is that the purpose of the entry was to commit a crime, usually theft, but no additional offense need take place for the act to be classified as burglary. The entry may be by force, such as picking a lock, breaking a window, or slashing a screen, or it may be through an unlocked door or an open window. As long as the person entering had no legal right to be present in the structure, a burglary has occurred. Furthermore, the structure need not be the house itself for a household burglary to take place. Illegal entry of a garage, shed, or any other structure on

the premises also constitutes household burglary. In fact, burglary does not necessarily have to occur on the premises. If the breaking and entering occurred in a hotel or in a vacation residence, it would still be classified as a burglary for the household whose member or members were involved.

As mentioned earlier, household larceny occurs when cash or property is removed from the home or its immediate vicinity by stealth. For a household larceny to occur within the home itself, the thief must be someone with a right to be there, such as a maid, a delivery man, or a guest. If the person has no right to be there, the crime is a burglary. Household larceny can consist of the theft of jewelry, clothes, lawn furniture, garden hoses, silverware, etc.

The theft or unauthorized use of motor vehicles, commonly regarded as a specialized form of household larceny, is treated separately in the National Crime Panel surveys. Completed as well as attempted acts involving automobiles, trucks, motorcycles, and other vehicles legally entitled to use public streets are included.

## Crimes against commercial establishments

Although commercial crimes, as the term is used in this report, consist primarily of victimizations of business establishments, they also include a relatively small number of offenses committed against certain other organizations, described in the introduction to Appendix IV.

Only two types of commercial crimes are measured by the National Crime Panel surveys: robbery and burglary. These crimes are comparable to robbery of persons and burglary of households except that they are carried out against places of business rather than individuals or households. Unlike household burglary, however, commercial burglaries can take place only on the premises of business firms. In a robbery of a commercial establishment, as in a personal robbery, there must be personal confrontation and the threat or use of force. Commercial robberies usually occur on the premises of places of business, but some can happen away from the premises, such as during the holdup of sales or delivery personnel away from the establishment.

## SELECTED FINDINGS





## GENERAL

Crimes measured by the surveys resulted in an estimated 37.7 million victimizations of persons, households, and businesses across the Nation in 1973, including both completed and attempted offenses.

The less serious types of offenses, namely personal and household larcenies, accounted for some three-fifths of the total.

Rape, robbery of persons and businesses, and assault—offenses that involve personal confrontation and violence or its threat—made up some 15 percent of the crimes.

With a victimization rate of 204 per 1,000 establishments, burglary of business places posed the greatest threat among targets at risk.

The 5.5 million violent personal crimes translated to a rate of 34 per 1,000 persons age 12 and over.

Among the relevant crimes, the least frequent was rape, for which women had a rate of 2 per 1,000.

The less serious (or costly) forms of personal robbery and assault, as well as of household burglary and larceny, outnumbered the more serious forms of each of these crimes.

## Personal victim characteristics

The danger of personal attack was relatively greater for males, younger persons, blacks, the poor, and for those separated or divorced; for crimes of theft, males, young persons, whites, and the more affluent were the most likely victims.

Men were twice as likely as women to have been victims of personal crimes of violence [Table 3].

Aside from rape, personal larceny with contact was the only crime for which women had a higher rate than men [Table 3].

Young persons (age 12-24) had the highest risk for violent crimes; the danger declined with age [Table 4].

For personal crimes of theft, the rate among teenagers was some 7 to 8 times higher than that for those 65 and over [Table 4].

Comparing matching age groups, men uniformly had higher rates for violent crimes than did women [Table 5].

Blacks had higher victimization rates than whites for rape, robbery, and assault, as well as for the more injurious forms of the latter two crimes [Table 6].

Ranked by a race-sex variable, rates for violent crimes were highest for black males, followed by white males, black females, and white females [Table 7].

Blacks age 20 and over were robbed at two to three times the rate of their white counterparts [Table 8].

Individuals who were divorced or separated had the highest rate for personal crimes of violence, followed by those who had never been married, by married persons, and by those who were widowed [Table 10].

For crimes of theft, persons who had never been married had the highest rate and widowed persons had the lowest [Table 10].

The incidence of violent crimes was highest among members of lower income families [Table 12].

Wealthier persons were relatively more vulnerable to personal crimes of theft [Table 12].

## Household victim characteristics

Crimes against household property generally affected blacks, younger persons, renters, and members of large households more than others.

Whites were more likely victims of burglary involving unlawful entry (without force), whereas blacks were more probable victims of those entailing forcible entry, whether attempted or completed [Table 14].

Blacks were more likely than whites to have sustained motor vehicle thefts or the costlier household larcenies [Table 14].

For household larceny and burglary, rates of victimization declined successively as the age of the head of household rose [Table 16].

Burglary rates for householders in the uppermost and lowermost income groups were the highest of all, although the figures for these two groups did

not differ significantly from one another [Table 17].

The poorest householders had the lowest rates for household larceny and motor vehicle theft [Table 17].

The vulnerability to household crimes tended to increase as the number of persons per household increased [Table 21].

For each of the three household crimes, white renters had a higher risk than white homeowners; among blacks, however, this pattern failed to apply [Table 22].

Black homeowners recorded higher rates for each of the three household crimes than did white homeowners [Table 22].

Residents of single-unit dwellings were relatively safer from burglary and motor vehicle theft than those in multiunit housing [Table 23].

## Commercial victim characteristics

Retail stores had the highest burglary and robbery rates.

For each of the crimes, there was no significant difference between rates recorded by service and wholesale firms [Table 24].

Variables concerning the volume of revenue and number of employees yielded little insight on the degree of vulnerability to victimization [Table 24].

## Victimization of central city, suburban and non-metropolitan residents

With respect to the personal and household crimes, the risk of victimization generally was highest for central city residents, and lowest for the nonmetropolitan population, with suburbanites ranking in between.

For personal crimes of violence, the rate among residents of cities of a half to 1 million population

was about double that of the nonmetropolitan population [Table 25].

Rates for violent crimes were higher in each size class of central city than in the corresponding suburbs [Table 25].

Relative to population size, personal robberies were more prevalent in the largest cities than elsewhere in the Nation [Table 25].

The incidence of assault in cities of 1 million or more residents did not differ significantly from that in nonmetropolitan localities and most suburban areas [Table 25].

Whether they lived in a central city, suburb, or nonmetropolitan area, black males had the highest victimization rate for violent crimes [Table 26].

Householders in three of four city-size classes recorded higher household burglary rates than those in the respective suburbs; nonmetropolitan householders had the lowest rate of all [Table 27].

Rates for forcible entry of homes were uniformly higher in central cities than in suburbs [Table 27].

Burglary was more prevalent among black householders in central cities and suburbs than among their white counterparts [Table 28].

The motor vehicle theft rate in nonmetropolitan places was about one-fourth that in the largest cities [Table 27].

## Victim-offender relationship in personal crimes of violence

Stranger-to-stranger violent crimes accounted for some two-thirds of the victimizations and had an overall rate of 22 per 1,000, compared with 12 per 1,000 for those by acquaintances or relatives.

Rapes and robberies were more likely than assaults to have been committed by strangers [Table 30].

Males, both white and black, had higher proportions of violent crimes at the hands of strangers than did females of either race [Table 31].

The younger the victim, the greater the likelihood that the offender was not a stranger [Table 30].

Divorced and separated persons—particularly women—were more likely to have been victimized by nonstrangers than those in the other categories of marital status [Table 32].

There was a tendency for the proportion of stranger-to-stranger crimes to rise as the level of affluence increased [Table 33].

## Offender characteristics in personal crimes of violence

Most single-offender violent crimes were perceived to have been committed by persons over age 20 and by whites, but such was not the case with respect to crimes involving two or more offenders.

Sixty-four percent of single-offender and 26 percent of multiple-offender crimes were committed by persons age 21 and over [Tables 34, 38].

Two-thirds of single-offender and 46 percent of multiple-offender violent crimes were ascribed to whites [Tables 35, 39].

Most of the crimes were intraracial rather than interracial in character [Tables 37, 41].

White victims ascribed relatively more single-offender crimes to blacks than blacks did to whites [Table 37].

Blacks were subject to a proportionately greater amount of intraracial violence at the hands of two or more offenders than whites [Table 41].

Regarding single-offender robberies, there was no significant difference between those attributed to whites and blacks, but relatively more multiple-offender robberies were said to have been committed by blacks [Tables 35, 39].

Blacks were robbed almost exclusively by members of their own race, but substantial proportions of robberies of whites were ascribed to blacks [Tables 37, 41].

## Crime characteristics

The circumstances under which crimes occurred varied appreciably depending on the type of offense involved, and their effects upon the various sectors of society also differed.

Personal victimizations outnumbered personal incidents by about 1.3 million, in part because about one-tenth of the incidents of violent crimes were committed against two or more victims [Tables 42, 43].

Although the differences were small, assaults were less likely than either rapes or personal robberies to have been perpetrated against a single victim [Table 43].

### Time of occurrence

Considered separately, the more serious personal crimes—rape, robbery with injury, and aggravated assault—were more likely to have happened at night, as were the household crimes and commercial burglary [Table 45].

Personal larcenies were predominantly daytime offenses [Table 45].

Assaults and personal robberies by armed offenders occurred mainly at night [Table 46].

A majority of stranger-to-stranger violent crimes took place at night, whereas most offenses by nonstrangers were in the daytime [Table 47].

Forcible-entry burglaries of homes were more likely to have been successful during the day than at night [Table 45].

### Place of occurrence

Streets and other outdoor areas were the most common sites for personal crimes of violence and larceny without contact [Tables 48, 51].

Rape was more likely than the other personal crimes to have happened within the victim's home [Table 48].

A substantial proportion of personal larcenies entailing losses under \$50 occurred in school buildings [Table 52].

Among offenses with victim-offender contact, robbery was the leading street crime [Table 48].

### Number of offenders in personal crimes of violence

An estimated 64 percent of violent crimes were committed by a lone offender, 32 percent by two or more [Table 53].

Although single-offender acts predominated for rape and assault, most robberies were committed by two or more persons [Table 53].

### Use of weapons

Thirty-eight percent of personal crimes of violence and 61 percent of commercial robberies were carried out by armed persons [Tables 54, 56].

In personal robbery, the mere presence of a weapon had no apparent bearing on the likelihood of victim injury [Table 54].

Offenders who were strangers to the victims were more likely than those who were not strangers to have used firearms [Table 55].

In aggravated assault, offenders more frequently used weapons other than firearms or knives [Table 55].

Robbers armed with knives or weapons other than firearms were more likely than those armed with firearms to have inflicted victim injuries [Table 55].

In assaults, offenders armed with firearms or knives were less apt than those wielding other weapons to have used the weapons in ways that resulted in injuries to the victims [Table 55].

In commercial robbery, firearms were the most common weapon, and there was an association between their presence and the successful execution of the crimes [Table 56].

### Injury to victims

The victims were injured in about three-tenths of all personal robberies and assaults [Table 57].

Those injured by assault were more likely to have been women, poor people, and persons victimized by nonstrangers [Table 57].

Victims had health insurance or access to public medical care in about three-fifths of the crimes resulting in injury [Table 60].

In 7 percent of all violent crimes, the victims were hospitalized [Table 61].

Blacks were hospitalized relatively more often than whites [Table 61].

Emergency rooms administered to the injured in three-fourths of the hospitalization cases [Table 62].

Injured black victims were more likely than their white counterparts to have been hospitalized as inpatients [Table 62].

## Economic losses

Although there were exceptions for specific types of crime, most offenses resulted in economic losses [Table 63].

The two commercial crimes, plus motor vehicle theft, were the costliest crimes [Tables 65, 71, 72].

In about seven-tenths of personal crimes and over half of household crimes resulting in loss, these losses were equivalent to less than \$50 [Table 65].

For both personal and household crimes, blacks incurred relatively higher losses than whites [Table 65].

Excluding cases of motor vehicle theft, no recovery of losses was effected in the vast majority of personal, household, and commercial crimes entailing property theft [Tables 67, 73].

Whites were somewhat more likely than blacks to have fully recovered stolen personal or household property [Table 67].

## Time lost from work

Relatively few crimes led to losses of time from work [Table 74].

About one-tenth of personal crimes of violence resulted in such losses, with about one-fourth of these lasting less than a day [Tables 74, 77].

Among household crimes, motor vehicle thefts were

more likely to have resulted in worktime losses, followed by burglary and larceny [Table 74].

As an outcome of personal or household crimes, blacks generally stayed off their jobs for longer periods than whites [Table 79].

## Reporting of victimizations to the police

Although the proportion of crimes reported to the police varied markedly in relation to their type and severity, there was consistency among reasons given for the failure to notify.

For specific crimes, the police notification rates ranged from a low of 21 per 100 for personal larceny without contact to a high of 86 per 100 for commercial robbery [Table 81].

There were no significant differences according to victim sex and race in the percentages of personal crimes reported [Table 82].

Violent crimes against teenagers were among the least well reported [Table 85].

Forty-five percent of personal crimes of violence were reported, and there was a tendency to report offenses by strangers more readily [Table 83].

City residents were slightly more likely than non-metropolitan ones to have reported personal and household crimes [Table 87].

Personal and household reporting rates tended to be higher in the largest cities [Table 88].

Homeowners were slightly more likely than renters to have reported household crimes [Table 89].

Although there were no differences in the overall reporting of household crimes according to race, reporting rates for poor people were lower than those among the affluent [Tables 89, 90].

The higher the value of losses, the more likely household crimes were to be reported [Table 91].

Victims most often attributed their failure to have notified the police to two beliefs—that nothing could have been done and that the crime was not important enough [Tables 92, 100].



## DETAILED FINDINGS





## RATES OF VICTIMIZATION

As determined by the National Crime Panel surveys, approximately 37.7 million victimizations stemming from selected crimes of violence and common theft, including attempts, occurred in the United States during 1973. About 20.7 million of these victimizations were against persons age 12 and over, another 15.4 million were directed at households, and 1.6 million affected business establishments and other organizations.

Of the various types of crime measured by the program, personal crimes of theft (that is, personal larceny) were the most prevalent, accounting for 15.2 million victimizations, or about two-fifths of the total number. With about 7.6 million victimizations reported to have occurred during the year, larceny also was the leading offense against households, outnumbering household burglary by some 1.2 million victimizations. Combined, larcenies against persons and households constituted approximately three-fifths of all survey-measured crimes. Personal crimes of violence (i.e., rape, robbery of individuals, and assault combined into a single category) totaled 5.5 million victimizations. Within the commercial sector, burglary was by far the more frequent of the two relevant crimes, outnumbering robbery by about 5 to 1.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>A detailed breakdown of the number and percent distribution of victimizations by sector and type of crime is found in Table 1, Appendix I. In general, the organization of tables in that appendix parallels the sequence of the analytical discussion. All statistics appearing in the text have been drawn from tables in the appendix.

In order to assess the impact of these criminal acts upon society and the business community, rates of victimization have been calculated for each crime. Consisting of the number of victimizations associated with a specific crime, or grouping of crimes, divided by the number of persons or units (whether households or businesses) in the particular group under consideration, victimization rates are measures of occurrence. For crimes against persons, the rates are based on the total number of individuals age 12 and over, or on whatever portion of this population is being examined. Crimes against households are regarded as being directed against the household as a unit rather than against the individual members; in calculating a rate, therefore, the denominator of the fraction consists of the number of households in question. Similarly, the rates for each of the two crimes against commercial establishments are related to the number of businesses being studied. Whereas this section of the report consists of a general discussion of the incidence of crime, the chapter that follows focuses on variations in the degree of vulnerability, or risk—as portrayed through victimization rates—experienced by persons and entities classified into subgroups on the basis of characteristics shared in common.

As indicated in the preface, a victimization is a specific criminal act as it affects a single victim. With respect to crimes against persons, it is possible for more than one victimization to occur at the same time, as in the simultaneous robbery of two or more individuals.

Also, it is possible for one person to be victimized several times during the course of the reporting period, in this case, calendar year 1973. Some individuals no doubt are more vulnerable to victimization than others, whether because of lifestyle, occupation, place of residence, carelessness, or circumstances beyond personal control. Victimization of households and businesses, unlike those of persons, cannot involve more than one victim during any given criminal act, but there can be repeated victimizations, at varying time intervals, of units of either type. Notwithstanding these inherent variations in the actual degree of threat, rates of victimization are more meaningful from an analytical standpoint than are the levels of victimization which appear on Table 1. Thus, although it may be useful to learn that commercial robberies made up about 1 percent of all criminal victimizations measured by the National Crime Panel in 1973 and that personal robberies amounted to 3 percent of the total, examination of the corresponding rates of victimization reveals that the risk of robbery was greater for businesses than it was for individuals by a factor of about 5 to 1. Similarly, the threat of burglary against places of business as contrasted to households was roughly 2 to 1, even though burglary victimizations of the latter outnumbered those against the former by a margin of more than 4 to 1.

From the perspective of victimization rates for specific crimes, commercial burglary—with a rate of 204 per 1,000 businesses—posed the greatest threat among targets at risk. Two of the household crimes, larceny and burglary, followed in that order with rates substantially below that for commercial burglary, 109 and 93 per 1,000 households, respectively. Personal larceny without contact between victim and offender had the fourth highest victimization rate (90 per 1,000 persons age 12 and over), with commercial robbery in fifth place with a rate of 39 per 1,000 businesses. Offenses involving personal contact between victim and offender made up 4 of the 5 crimes with the lowest victimization rates. Assault led these with 20 victimizations per 1,000 persons of the relevant ages, followed by robbery (7), personal larceny with contact (3), and rape (1). The only noncontact crime in this group was motor vehicle theft,

with 19 victimizations per 1,000 households. Because not all householders possess motor vehicles and many have more than one, a more meaningful estimate of the risk of motor vehicle theft is obtained by basing the rate on the number of motor vehicles owned, rather than on the number of households. Computed on this basis, the rate of motor vehicle theft was reduced to 13, but did not alter its standing relative to the other measured crimes.

When the violent crimes of personal robbery and assault were examined in more detail, the less serious forms of each were found to have occurred more frequently.<sup>2</sup> Thus, the victimization rate for robbery not resulting in victim injury (5 per 1,000 persons) was about twice as high as that for robbery with such injury (2). Likewise, simple assault (16 per 1,000) was more prevalent than aggravated assault (10), and within each of these categories, attempted assault was more frequent than assault actually carried out. For each of the three household crimes, the majority of reported crimes were completed, rather than attempted, overwhelmingly so in the case of household larceny. This undoubtedly related to the nature of these crimes, which do not involve personal confrontation, so that many attempts are likely to remain undetected. With regard to household burglary, the less serious form of the crime, unlawful entry without force, had a higher rate (43 per 1,000 households) than did forcible entry (29). For household larceny, victimizations resulting in losses valued at less than \$50 had a substantially higher rate (70) than did those of \$50 or more (27). Completed victimizations were more common than attempts for each of the commercial crimes as well, and were more prevalent by approximately the same proportion, roughly 3 to 1.

---

<sup>2</sup>In this and other sections of the report, there were too few sample cases of rape to permit detailed, statistically meaningful analysis. Because of the scarcity of sample cases and the resulting unreliability of estimates, moreover, several data tables do not separately display statistics on rape; in those instances, the data on rape were combined with those on personal robbery and assault, and they are reflected in entries for personal crimes of violence.

## VICTIM CHARACTERISTICS

Based on an analysis of victimization rates for 1973, this chapter examines the status of U.S. residents and businesses with respect to the crimes measured under the National Crime Panel program. In order to provide an indication of the varying degree to which different sectors of society and the business community were affected by the relevant crimes, the general rates of victimization discussed in the preceding section have been broken down on the basis of certain fundamental attributes, or variables. For the pertinent crimes against persons age 12 and over, five variables have been used: sex, age, race, marital status, and annual family income. The last-named variable reflects the monetary income from all sources received by the head of the household and all relatives of that individual living in the same household unit, but excludes the income of household members unrelated to the head person. With reference to crimes against households, six variables were applied. Two of these—age and race—are based on the personal characteristics of those who headed households at the time of the surveys. An additional two variables—form of tenure and number of housing units per structure—are indicative of living arrangements. A fifth variable—number of persons in the household—refers to all members of the household, irrespective of age and relationship to the head of the household. The sixth variable—annual family income—is defined in the same

manner as with personal crimes.<sup>3</sup> In relation to crimes against places of business, three variables were distinguished: kind of establishment, gross annual receipts, and average number of paid employees.

Concerning the analytical treatment of victimization rates for crimes against persons and households, the discussion of victim characteristics generally begins with consideration of each variable independently of all others. Within the framework of statistically significant relationships, this approach permitted a more thorough assessment of the impact of each crime. For characteristics such as sex and race, which have few component categories, it often was feasible to examine in detail various forms of a specific crime. However, for multi-category variables, such as age and income, the analysis generally had to be conducted with more highly combined data. Similarly, when two or more variables were linked, as in the joint treatment of income and race, it generally was necessary to combine either the crime categories or the variable categories, or both. The analysis of three variables at once, limited to one table

---

<sup>3</sup>For crimes against persons and households, victimization rates also were calculated on the basis of an additional variable, locality of residence. These data are analyzed in the chapter that follows.

(personal victimization rates by race-sex-age), was by necessity conducted at the highest level of aggregation, crimes of violence and crimes of theft, because findings were not statistically sound for the more detailed crime categories. In addition to guiding the interpretation of findings, these considerations also are reflected in the format and content of the Appendix I data tables.

## Crimes against persons

### Sex, age, and race

As reflected by rates of victimization for most of the measured personal crimes, males clearly were more likely than females to have been victimized during 1973. Women had lower rates for each of the crimes except personal larceny involving victim-offender contact and rape, an offense for which the victims almost exclusively were female. The overall rate for crimes of violence against males (46 per 1,000 persons age 12 and over) was twice that for females (23), a ratio that reflected the predominance of males as victims of assault and robbery. Having recorded higher rates for both robbery with and without victim injury, males were victims of robbery at 2.5 times the rate for females (10 and 4 per 1,000, respectively). Males also had appreciably higher rates for aggravated and simple assault. For crimes of theft, the differences, though less dramatic, were still pronounced, males (106) having been victimized at approximately 1.3 times the rate for females (82). As noted, however, females had a higher rate for personal larceny with contact (4) than did males (3).

As in the case of the sex variable, age proved to be an important characteristic for assessing the likelihood of being victimized by a personal crime. For the violent crimes combined, the highest rates of victimization were recorded by persons in the three youngest groups, covering the ages 12-24, with each group 25 and over having a lower rate than its predecessor. Basically similar patterns prevailed for robbery and assault; however, because the rates often were quite low and the differences between them slight, it was not always possible to find statistically valid differences between the values for specific age groups. Nonetheless, there were relatively more robbery victimizations experienced by persons under 25 years of age, who had an average rate of 11, than in any of the older categories. Among assault victims, age 25 also was an important dividing line, with the incidence of assault declining sharply with the 25-34 age group and continuing to drop with each older

category. The rate for persons age 20-24 was 50, that for individuals 25-34 was 29, and the figures declined thereafter to a rate of 4 among the elderly. In essence, the rates associated with personal crimes of theft followed the pattern for crimes of violence as a whole: the two youngest age groups had the highest rates (176 and 169, respectively), whereas each older age category had a successively lower rate, that for the elderly (23) having been about 7.5 times lower than that for persons age 12-15. Rates for personal larceny without victim-offender contact determined this sequence. For personal larceny with such contact, there was no marked relationship between age and victimization.

For both males and females, similar patterns were evident with respect to the relationship between age and victimization experience, except among female robbery victims, for whom there were virtually no significant differences between rates for the various age groups. Males age 12-24 had the highest rates for total crimes of violence, averaging 87 per 1,000 persons of the relevant ages, as did females 12-24 (averaging 42), whereas males 65 and over (11) and females 50 and over (8) had the lowest rates. Similarly, there was a sharp decline in the incidence of assault and of the nonviolent crimes of theft for both males and females age 25 and over, and for males alone in the case of robbery. With respect to the latter crime, males age 12-15 were victimized at a rate (20) some three times greater than that for males in the three senior-most age categories, among whom the average rate was 6. Once again, the tendency for males in each age group to be disproportionately victimized was demonstrated by the rate figures for robbery, assault, and, to a lesser extent, personal crimes of theft. Comparing matching age groups, for example, males had higher overall rates than females for crimes of violence. With respect to crimes of theft, the rates for males also were generally higher than those for females, except in the 50-64 age bracket, where they were not significantly different; and, among persons age 35-49, where the evidence bearing out a higher rate for males was not conclusive.

For each of the violent crimes considered separately, blacks had higher rates of victimization than whites. At an aggregate level, therefore, the rate for crimes of violence among blacks (47 per 1,000) was appreciably higher than that for whites (32). Blacks also were more frequent victims of robbery, both with and without victim injury. And, whereas whites had a higher simple assault rate (16) than blacks (13), blacks were the

more likely victims of aggravated assault (18 versus 10 for whites). Examination of the frequency of occurrence for personal crimes of theft showed that whites, because of their greater propensity to suffer larcenies without contact, had a higher overall rate (95) of victimization than blacks (85); the latter, however, were about twice as apt to have been victims of personal larceny with contact.

Persons racially classified as other than white or black had a lower rate (26) for crimes of violence than did blacks, but the apparent difference between the rates for whites and "others" was not significant. Although there were no meaningful differences between the robbery rate for members of other races and that for either whites or blacks, individuals in the other race category did have the lowest assault rate (16) of the three groups. Persons of other races also had a lower rate for personal crimes of theft (70) than did whites, and there was some evidence that it was effectively lower than the rate for blacks as well.

When the sex and race variables were examined jointly, it was found that black males were victimized by crimes of violence, in the aggregate, at a higher rate (59 per 1,000) than any other group, followed by white males (45), black females (37), and white females (21). Essentially the same pattern applied to the overall rate for robbery, although the rate for white males was not conclusively higher than that for black females, a circumstance no doubt related to the lack of significant differences between the rates for robbery with and without victim injury recorded by the two groups. For assault, the males of each race had the highest rates (36 each) and white females, the lowest (16). With respect to the four sex-race categories, the rates for aggravated assault generally adhered to the pattern for crimes of violence, except that, once again, there was no significant difference between the rates for white males and black females. By contrast, white males had the highest victimization rate for simple assault, but apparent differences between the corresponding rates for black males and white females, and for black males and black females, were not significant; there was some indication that the simple assault rate for black females was effectively higher than that for white females. Rates for the aggregate of crimes of theft indicated that males of either race were victimized relatively as often, followed by black females (84) and white females (71). For personal larceny without contact, white males had the highest rate. A different ranking appeared for larceny

with contact; the rates for black males and females were the highest, that for white males, the lowest.

Juxtaposition of the age and race variables underscored previous findings concerning the propensity of blacks and youth to have been victimized disproportionately by crimes of violence, and of whites and younger persons, by crimes of theft. Blacks had higher victimization rates for crimes of violence than whites in four of the seven age categories; apparent differences in rates for the groups between 16 and 34 were statistically insignificant. The rate for blacks age 65 and over was roughly double that among elderly whites. The pattern was even stronger in the case of robbery, with blacks in each age group except the first two being victimized at about two to three times the rate of whites in the corresponding age brackets. The robbery victimization rates for blacks in the two youngest groups also were higher, although less conclusively, than those for whites. For assault, the differences between rates for the two races generally were not significant, but blacks age 35-49 had a higher rate than their white counterparts, and there was some indication that this also was true for blacks age 12-15. On the other hand, when aggravated assault was considered separately, it was shown that black youths under age 25 were victimized at a higher rate (29 per 1,000) than white youths (20), whereas blacks 25 and over had a rate (11) about twice that of whites in the same age group (5). Simple assault rates exhibited significant variation between blacks and whites under age 25, with the latter having the higher rate (32 vs. 22). However, the evidence that whites age 25 and over had a higher simple assault rate (9) than their black counterparts (7) was not as strong.

Comparison of the overall rates for personal crimes of theft indicated that whites age 12-19 were victimized relatively more than blacks of the same age; there was less firm evidence that whites age 35-49 had a higher rate than blacks of like age, but there were no significant differences between rates for the other specific race-age categories. When rates for the two forms of personal larceny were examined separately using age 25 as a dividing point, the incidence of personal larceny without contact was higher among whites, whether age 12-24 (163 per 1,000) or 25 and over (62), than for blacks in the matching groups (115 and 56). For personal larceny with contact, blacks in each age category had higher rates than whites.

In addition to confirming the general conclusion that crimes of violence posed the greatest threat for

males, younger persons, and blacks, victimization rates calculated on the basis of a race-sex-age variable revealed a number of more detailed findings. Except among black females, for example, each group under age 25 showed considerably higher rates than their older counterparts. There was some indication that the rate for black males age 12-15 was effectively higher (102) than that for their white counterparts (77), but apparent differences between rates for black males and white males age 16-34 were not significant. On the other hand, older black males (age 35 and over) had rates up to three times higher than those of white males in the corresponding age group. The evidence suggested that the rate for black females age 12-15 may have been effectively higher than that for white females of the same age and that black females age 16-19 and 25-49 had higher rates than their white counterparts. Among females age 20-24 and those 50 and over, however, there were no true differences between rates distinguished on the basis of race.

For crimes of theft, in the aggregate, there were no significant differences between rates for male whites and blacks of any age group except the two youngest (12-19), where whites showed markedly higher rates. In contrast, white females exhibited a higher rate than black females in four of the seven age categories and some indication of a higher rate in a fifth age group; there were no significant differences between rates for women of each race in the 25-34 and 65 and over age groups.

### Marital status

Differentiated on the basis of marital status, individuals evidenced marked contrasts in the degree to which they were criminally victimized during 1973. For crimes of violence as a whole, persons classified as divorced or separated had the highest rate (73 per 1,000 persons age 12 and over), followed by the never-married (61) and the married (20); those who were widowed had the lowest rate (14). The pronounced differences between the two high rates, on the one hand, and the lowest rate, on the other, largely reflected the age structure of the groups in question. With respect to robbery, the sequence of rates that prevailed for crimes of violence was altered by a reversal of the relative standings of rates for widowed and married persons; thus, the rates ranged from a high of 16 per 1,000 among the divorced or separated to a low of 4 for married individuals. Regarding assault, divorced or separated persons (53)

and the never-married (47) had much higher rates than individuals who were married (16) or widowed (7); however, the difference between the two highest rates was only marginally significant.

For personal crimes of theft, the relative risk of victimization was somewhat different from that for violent crimes as a group. Although widowed persons once again had the lowest victimization rate (33), those who had never been married had the highest (155), followed in descending order by divorced and separated persons (111) and married ones (69). This pattern was governed by the more prevalent of the two crimes of theft, personal larceny without victim-offender contact. For larcenies with such contact, the only clear-cut distinction among the four marital status categories applied to married persons, who had the lowest rate (2); there was some indication that divorced or separated persons had the highest rate (8).

When males and females were considered separately, marital status appeared to have somewhat differing effects on the likelihood of victimization. Among males the never-married, as well as those divorced or separated, had far higher rates than did either the married or widowed. The rates for violent crimes among married males and widowers were comparable, but the former had a higher rate for crimes of theft, specifically for personal larceny without contact. On the other hand, among females, the divorced or separated had the highest rate for crimes of violence as a group, as well as for robbery and assault considered separately, whereas the never-married had the highest rate for crimes of theft and personal larceny without contact. Widowed persons of each sex had the lowest rates for assault and personal larceny without contact. For crimes of violence as a whole, however, apparent differences between rates for widowed and married males and females were not meaningful; this circumstance was related to the fact that married persons of each sex recorded the lowest robbery rates, whereas widowed ones had relatively lower assault rates. Underscoring the prevalence of higher victimization rates for violent crimes among males, females in each of the marital status categories generally had lower rates than their male counterparts. This was uniformly the case for robbery and, excluding one marital status group, for assault; the exception concerned divorced and separated persons, among whom the apparent difference between rates according to sex was statistically insignificant. For crimes of theft, females in three of the four marital categories had lower

rates than males; the seeming difference between the rates for widows and widowers was not meaningful.

### Annual family income

Although apparent differences between victimization rates for specific income groups were not statistically significant in all instances, crimes involving victim-offender contact, especially violent offenses, tended to be more readily associated with members of lower income families. Conversely, the incidence of the only crime without victim-offender contact, i.e., personal larceny without contact, was higher among wealthier individuals. Persons in families with annual incomes of less than \$3,000 clearly had the highest victimization rate (50 per 1,000) for crimes of violence as a group, and there was marginal indication that those with family incomes of \$15,000 or more had the lowest rate (averaging 27); the apparent difference between rates for those earning \$15,000-\$24,999 and \$25,000 or more was not meaningful. Generally comparable patterns were evident for robbery and assault considered separately. Those in the lowest income category had the highest rates for robbery (12) and assault (37); those in the \$15,000 or more bracket had the lowest rate for robbery (5), but the income category identified with the lowest ranking rate for assault could not be established conclusively.

Persons in the highest annual income category, \$25,000 or more, had the highest overall rate of victimization for personal crimes of theft (131 per 1,000), presumably because they had more possessions at risk than less affluent families. The same standing applied with regard to personal larceny without contact, but not to larceny with contact. Persons in the two lowest income classes, with yearly family incomes not exceeding \$7,499, had the lowest rates, both at the overall level (78 and 79, respectively) and for personal larceny without contact (72 and 75). On the other hand, persons from families with annual incomes of less than \$3,000 had the highest rate of victimization from personal larceny with contact (7), that is, purse snatching and pocket picking.

Examination of rates of victimization from the perspective of income and race considered jointly tended to reinforce findings to the effect that lower income persons and blacks were most likely to have experienced personal crimes of violence and that wealthier individuals were most vulnerable to personal crimes of theft.

Thus, for crimes of violence considered as a group, both whites and blacks whose families earned less than \$7,500 annually had higher victimization rates than their more affluent counterparts. With regard to rate differences between the races, blacks in each of the two income categories below \$7,500 had higher figures for violent crimes than did whites in the corresponding brackets. The pattern for robbery was even stronger, blacks having higher rates than whites in three of the five income groupings for which there were sufficient sample cases on which to base reliable estimates. In a fourth category, \$15,000-\$24,999, the higher rate for blacks was marginally significant. The \$7,500-\$9,999 income category was the only one for which statistical significance was lacking for the apparent difference between robbery rates for blacks and whites. Although blacks in the less than \$3,000 income group had a higher assault rate (44 per 1,000) than similarly situated whites (34), the reverse was true with regard to the \$7,500-\$9,999 and \$15,000-\$24,999 levels; apparent differences between rates for two of the remaining income brackets were not significant, and, in the case of the assault rate for blacks in the uppermost income group, the rate was based on too few sample cases to be considered reliable. When the aggregate rates for personal crimes of theft were compared, no significant differences emerged between the figures for blacks and whites in matching income categories. Within the white and black communities alike, however, those earning \$7,500 or more were more apt than lower income persons to have been victims of crimes of theft.

## Crimes against households

### Race and age of head of household

Households headed by blacks were more likely (135 per 1,000 households) than those headed either by whites (88) or by members of other races (105) to have been burglarized during 1973. However, the seeming difference between the burglary rate for whites and those classified as belonging to minorities other than the black race was statistically insignificant. Concerning the subcategories of burglary, whites had a higher rate than blacks for the less serious form of the crime, unlawful entry without force, but blacks were more probable victims of burglaries entailing forcible entry, whether referring to completed or attempted acts. The rate for

completed forcible entries among blacks also was higher than that for persons who were members of other (nonwhite) races, and there was some indication that blacks also had a higher rate than "others" for attempts at forcible entry.

Persons belonging to racial minorities other than the black race recorded the lowest rate for household larceny (85 as contrasted to 110 for each of the larger groups). As was the case with burglary, the more serious type of larceny, that involving losses valued at \$50 or more, made a greater impact upon blacks than it did upon whites or "others." Regarding the less costly larcenies, members of other races recorded the lowest rate of all (46), but the apparent difference between the rates for white and black householders was not significant. White householders experienced relatively more attempted larcenies than did black ones.

Among the three racial groups, whites had the lowest incidence of motor vehicle theft (18 per 1,000 households), but the rates for blacks and "others" did not truly differ. Although blacks had a higher rate than whites for the completed form of the crime, the two groups recorded equivalent rates for attempts at motor vehicle theft. Using overall rates calculated on the basis of motor vehicles owned rather than on a household count, the gap widened between the incidence of motor vehicle thefts committed against whites and blacks.

In relation to the age of persons who headed households, the incidence of each of the two more prevalent offenses against households—burglary and larceny—decreased for those classified in successively older age groups. For each of these crimes, the rate among householders headed by individuals in the youngest age group (12-19) was some four times greater than that for persons in the senior-most age group (65 and over). This general trend also applied to motor vehicle theft, except that statistical significance was lacking for the apparent difference between rates for heads of household in the two youngest age groups; whether calculated on the basis of 1,000 households or 1,000 motor vehicles owned, the rate of motor vehicle theft was much higher among households headed by persons age 12-19 than for those 65 and over.

Concerning two of the forms of burglary, completed and attempted forcible entry, the decrease in the likelihood of victimization with increased age held true, except that, for attempts, apparent differences between rates for the two youngest age groups were statistically

insignificant. This pattern also applied in the main to unlawful entry without force; however, equivalent rates were registered by heads of household classified in the 20-34 and 35-49 age brackets. Irrespective of the value of losses, the victimization rate for household larceny tended to decrease as the age of the head person increased, although for larcenies amounting to \$50 or more, the differences between rates for households headed by persons age 20-34 compared to those 12-19 and 35-49 were only marginally significant. The apparent gradual decline in rates for attempts at household larceny was statistically unfounded; nevertheless, households headed by persons age 65 and over had the lowest rate. Similarly, as relates to motor vehicle theft, the rates for attempts at the crime formed no statistically meaningful pattern, but the oldest heads of household had the lowest rate. As was the case with the overall motor vehicle theft rate, the relationship between increased age and declining rates for completed thefts did not apply to households headed by individuals in the two youngest age groups.

#### Annual family income

Families in the highest and lowest income brackets had virtually equivalent rates of victimization (111 and 112 per 1,000 households, respectively), and were more likely than those in the intervening categories to have experienced household burglaries. The lowest overall burglary rate (77) was registered by families in the \$10,000-\$14,999 income range, who also had the lowest rate for the unlawful entry form of the crime (36); in contrast, families with yearly incomes of \$25,000 or more had the highest rate for unlawful entry (65). Concerning rates for completed forcible entry, no meaningful pattern emerged according to income. For attempts at forcible entry, the highest rate (26) was associated with those in the lowest income group; however, that figure differed only marginally from the rate for families in the \$3,000-\$7,499 bracket (22).

Presumably because they had fewer material possessions to lose, families in the less than \$3,000 income category had the lowest victimization rates for both household larceny (89) and motor vehicle theft (11). In fact, these low-income families had the lowest household larceny rate irrespective of the value of loss; among the remaining income groups, no meaningful pattern emerged. Insofar as motor vehicle theft was concerned, families with annual incomes of less than \$3,000 also



had the lowest rate for completed theft; for attempts, families in that group and those in the \$3,000-\$7,499 range had comparable rates, both of which were lower than those for families with incomes above \$7,499.

Calculated on the basis of a race-by-income variable, and using the \$7,500 annual income figure as a dividing point, white householders with incomes below that amount had a higher burglary rate than did more affluent members of the same race. There was no corresponding difference for blacks, however; the risk of burglary was fairly evenly spread across income categories. For household larceny, the pattern applicable to burglary against whites was reversed: lower-income whites were less apt to have been victimized than whites with annual incomes of \$7,500 or more, irrespective of whether the losses amounted to less than \$50 or to that sum or more. Among black householders, a similar relationship between income and the overall rate for larceny was less strong; nevertheless, larcenies valued at \$50 or more also occurred most often among blacks with incomes of \$7,500 or more. With respect to motor vehicle theft, clear-cut distinctions became apparent when rates were examined using the \$7,500 dividing line. Irrespective of racial classification, and for completed and attempted vehicle thefts alike, the wealthier householders were most likely to have been victimized.

As noted previously, black householders had higher victimization rates than white householders for two of the relevant offenses, burglary and motor vehicle theft, as well as for the more serious forms of burglary and household larceny. Application of an income-by-race variable served to emphasize this relatively heavier burden of victimization. Whether classed in the less than \$7,500 or in the \$7,500 or more annual family income categories, blacks had a higher burglary rate than comparably situated whites; this finding also applied to forcible entry, whether attempted or completed. In the case of unlawful entry without force, however, white householders with incomes of \$7,500 or more had a higher rate than blacks in the matching income group.

Income levels did not appear to exert a marked influence over the likelihood that householders of differing races would experience household larcenies. Thus, as was the case when the race variable was used alone, blacks differentiated according to incomes above and below \$7,500 had higher rates for household larcenies worth \$50 or more than did whites in the corresponding income category.

Concerning motor vehicle theft, the prevalence of a higher incidence of the crime among black householders as opposed to white ones did not apply to families with annual incomes below \$7,500. Both for completed and for attempted vehicle thefts, there were no true differences between the rates for these lower income families distinguished by race. In contrast, black families having incomes of \$7,500 or more had higher rates—for both completed and attempted thefts—than did whites with equivalent incomes.

### Number of persons per household

The vulnerability to criminal victimization generally tended to increase in relation to the size of the household, as measured by the number of members. Thus, although a gradual rise in rates in tandem with increased household size applied only to larceny, the burglary rate was highest among households having six or more persons (120), and the highest rates for motor vehicle theft were recorded by households with four or five (24) and six or more (26) members; the latter two figures, however, did not differ significantly.

With respect to each of the specific offenses, the lowest burglary rate (87) occurred among households having two or three members, although the difference between this figure and that for one-member households (93) was marginally significant. Households in each of those size classes had the lowest rates for burglaries involving unlawful entry without force (both 37); the rates increased for households in the two succeeding classes. The overall trend did not apply to burglaries entailing forcible entry, for which households made up of four or five members had the lowest rate (24). Concerning attempted forcible entry, the incidence according to size class did not differ significantly from the average rate for that offense.

The general trend in overall rates for household larceny—a somewhat gradual increase accompanying growth in household size—also held true for completed crimes resulting in losses valued either at less than \$50 or at \$50 or more. Likewise, it applied to attempted larcenies, except that there was no difference between the rates for households in two size classes (two or three vs. four or five members). Similarly, the rates for completed motor vehicle theft rose as the household size increased, but statistical significance could not be attached to the apparent difference between figures for households in the two largest categories.

## Form of tenure

Distinguished on the basis of the two forms of household tenancy arrangement, those living in rented dwellings had an appreciably higher risk of victimization by each of the three crimes than did those living in owner-occupied homes. For burglary, the rates among renters and owners were 119 and 78 per 1,000, respectively; for household larceny, they were 124 and 101; and, for motor vehicle theft, 27 and 15.<sup>4</sup> This general pattern applied to the population at large and, more specifically, to households headed by whites, but it was not uniformly reflected in the victimization rates for households headed by blacks. With reference to household larceny, for example, black homeowners had a higher rate (126) than black renters (96); this also held true for larceny losses amounting to less than \$50 or to \$50 or more, but not for attempted larcenies, for which there was no true difference between the rates for black owners and renters. Among blacks, moreover, the form of tenure played no perceptible role insofar as motor vehicle theft was concerned: under each form of tenure, there were no significant differences between rates for completed and attempted vehicle thefts committed against blacks. Only with respect to household burglary did the findings for blacks roughly parallel those for whites: the overall risk of burglary was greater for renters (144) than it was for homeowners (125), chiefly because of a higher incidence of attempts at forcible entry among renters. There were no valid differences between the rates recorded by black owners and renters for completed forcible entry and for unlawful entry without force.

As suggested by the foregoing findings, contrasts existed in the degree to which specific crimes posed a threat for householders of differing racial makeup, even when they lived under comparable forms of tenancy. Among homeowners, blacks had an appreciably higher overall burglary rate (125) than did whites (74); this also was true for completed and attempted forcible entry, but not for unlawful entry without force, for which there was no meaningful difference between rates for blacks and whites. Likewise, black homeowners had a higher household larceny rate (126) than white homeowners (99), irrespective of the value of the stolen items.

---

<sup>4</sup>Calculated on the basis of 1,000 motor vehicles owned rather than on 1,000 households, the gap between rates for motor vehicle theft widened to 25 (renters) and 9 (owners).

Reversing the general pattern, however, white homeowners had a higher incidence of attempts at household larceny than did blacks. For motor vehicle theft, black homeowners clearly had a higher rate (24) than whites (14), a relationship that also carried over to the completed form of the crime and, with marginal significance, to attempts as well.

Contrasting with the observations concerning the risk of victimizations against homeowners belonging to each of the two races, a mixed picture emerged for those occupying rented dwelling units. Black renters had a higher rate (144) for burglary than did white renters (114); but, whereas black renters also demonstrated a greater susceptibility to forcible entry (whether completed or attempted), white renters were more apt to have experienced unlawful entry without force. Reversing the situation that pertained to burglary, household larceny was more likely to have been committed against white renters (130) than against black renters (96), a finding that also applied to attempted larcenies and to completed ones involving losses valued at less than \$50 and, less conclusively, to those of \$50 or more. Concerning motor vehicle theft, there was no statistical evidence to support the ostensible difference between rates for black and white renters.

## Number of housing units per structure

For two of the three measured crimes—burglary and motor vehicle theft—householders occupying single-unit housing sustained relatively fewer victimizations than those living in buildings that contained two or more units. Residents of these one-unit structures had the lowest overall burglary rate (85). And, excluding housing structures classified as “other than housing units” (a category including dormitories, rooming houses, and other group quarters), householders in single-unit structures also had the lowest rates for forcible entry, whether completed or attempted. However, there was no statistically valid pattern of differences between rates for unlawful entry without force. Besides having the lowest overall rate for motor vehicle theft (15), the occupants of single-unit housing also had the lowest rate for completed vehicle theft (10); for attempts at such theft, no size class ranked lowest of all.

Perhaps because no statistically valid pattern was apparent with respect to possible relationships between the number of housing units per structure and the more

prevalent form of household larceny (i.e., that resulting in losses valued at less than \$50), meaningful observations could not be made concerning the overall rate for that crime.

## Crimes against commercial establishments

As indicated previously, burglary was by far the more prevalent of the two measured offenses against places of business. For establishments of all kinds, the victimization rate for burglary (204 per 1,000 establishments) was some five times higher than that for robbery (39). Distinguished on the basis of primary activity, establishments in retail trade registered the highest burglary rate (262); with a ratio of some four burglaries for each robbery, retail businesses also had the highest robbery rate (66). For each of the crimes considered separately, apparent differences between rates for

wholesale and service establishments were not statistically significant.

Although the pertinent information was not obtained from some 14 percent of all businesses, volume of revenue did not appear to be a useful variable for assessing the likelihood of victimization by either of the two offenses. Excluding businesses that did not have sales income, there was nevertheless some indication that establishments having gross annual receipts of less than \$10,000 had the lowest burglary rate (152). As for robbery, apparent differences between rates for businesses differentiated by the amount of receipts proved not to be valid.

Businesses without paid employees tended to have lower victimization rates than those having paid employees. Among the latter, there appeared to be an overall correspondence between a larger number of employees and a higher risk of victimization, although statistical significance could not be attached to apparent differences between rates for specific size classes.



# VICTIMIZATION OF CENTRAL CITY, SUBURBAN, AND NONMETROPOLITAN RESIDENTS

As indicated in the preceding chapter, individuals sharing certain socioeconomic characteristics evidenced differences in the extent of vulnerability to criminal attack, as measured by rates of victimization. In this chapter, further assessment is made, also on the basis of victimization rates, concerning patterns of crime against residents of different types of localities.<sup>5</sup> The discussion focuses on the type of locality in which the victim lived at the time of the interview, not on the location where each victimization occurred, although the two places probably were the same in the vast majority of cases.<sup>6</sup> A basic distinction is made among central city, suburban, and nonmetropolitan populations. Together, the first two populations represent those persons living in Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas (SMSA's), or metropolitan areas; the nonmetropolitan population

<sup>5</sup>The discussion is confined to crimes against persons and households; because of the limited size of the commercial sample, it was not feasible to present data on commercial victimizations on the basis of a type-of-locality variable. Definitions of the types of localities used in this chapter, as well as in the one concerning the reporting of victimizations to the police, appear in the Glossary of Terms, at the end of this report.

<sup>6</sup>According to data from victimization surveys conducted in 13 large cities in 1974, the volume of victimizations resulting from personal crimes experienced by respondents at localities other than the city of residence at the time of the interview varied from 9 to 20 percent.

refers to those residing in places outside SMSA's. To further distinguish degrees of vulnerability to crime, residents of central cities and their surrounding urban fringes have been categorized within the following four ranges of central city size: 50,000-249,999; ¼ to ½ million; ½ to 1 million; and 1 million or more.

## Crimes against persons

For personal crimes of violence considered as a group, the residents of nonmetropolitan areas, as well as those living in suburban places within the smallest class of SMSA, had the lowest victimization rates (24 and 27 per 1,000 population age 12 and over, respectively), although the difference between the two figures was only marginally significant. By contrast, the victimization rate for central cities having populations of ½ to 1 million was 52 per 1,000, highest among the four categories of city size; the rates for the other city groupings were insufficiently different to permit clear-cut ranking. In each case, the rate for crimes of violence was higher in the central cities than in the corresponding suburban areas, although the difference was marginally significant for SMSA's with cities in the ¼ to ½ million range.

Among the specific crimes of violence, robbery

provided the clearest distinctions in the risk of victimization according to type of locality of residence; there were too few cases of rape to allow meaningful analysis, and little emerged in the way of a pattern for assault. The highest victimization rate for robbery was in the largest cities, about 18 per 1,000; cities in the ½ to 1 million class had the next highest rate (14). The other two city groups were lower, but not significantly different from each other. Suburban areas, with one exception, had lower robbery victimization rates than their respective central cities; the exception involved the ¼ to ½ million category. The lowest robbery rate, approximately one-sixth that of cities in the largest class, was registered by residents of nonmetropolitan areas and of suburbs of central cities in the 50,000-249,999 range.

Assault victimization rates formed a less consistent pattern than was the case with robbery. The two highest assault rates were recorded by those in central cities within two size classes, 50,000-249,999 and ½ to 1 million. However, the rate for suburban residents of the latter group was only marginally lower than that for their central city counterparts and not significantly different from the rate for persons living in the smallest cities. Among the four city groups, the largest (1 million or more) had the lowest assault victimization rate (23 per 1,000), a figure that was not significantly different from that for any of the suburban areas (except for that in the ½ to 1 million class) or from that for nonmetropolitan areas.

As indicated in a previous section, personal larceny without contact dominated crimes of theft, so that a discussion of the latter constitutes essentially a discussion of its most significant component. The only difference between the two categories in terms of victimization and place of residence was for crimes of theft—residents of nonmetropolitan areas recorded the lowest rate (74 per 1,000) and those of cities of 1 million or more the next lowest rate (86); for personal larceny without contact there was no significant difference between rates for these two types of localities. The three areas with the highest victimization rates for both crimes of theft and personal larceny without contact were cities of ½ to 1 million, their suburban areas, and cities of 50,000-249,999. City-suburban comparisons revealed no differences between rates for central city residents and for suburbanites in both the ¼ to ½ million and ½ to 1 million size classes. The largest cities had a lower rate of theft victimization than did their fringe areas, whereas the smallest cities showed the opposite pattern.

The small number of cases of personal larceny with contact (purse snatching and pocket picking) precluded extended analysis of data on area of residence. However, there was sufficient statistical evidence to warrant the conclusion that these crimes primarily were concentrated in the largest cities, with the highest rates in the two biggest size classes and marginal indication that cities in the 1 million or more category had the highest rate.

Other differences in the impact of victimization according to type of locality of residence were evident when the race and sex of victims were examined. For this analysis, data on central cities, irrespective of size, were grouped into a single category, as were those on suburban areas. For whites, both male and female, the victimization rate for crimes of violence was highest in the central cities, next highest in the suburban areas, and lowest in the nonmetropolitan areas; statistical significance was lacking for the seemingly comparable pattern among black males and females. Whether they lived in a central city, in a suburb, or outside an SMSA, black males registered the highest rate for crimes of violence, followed by white males, black females, and white females.

With respect to robbery, white male and white female residents of central cities both registered higher victimization rates than their counterparts in the suburbs, who, in turn, had higher rates than those living outside a metropolitan area. Black males living in central cities had a higher rate (31 per 1,000) than black males in the urban fringes (16), but the apparent difference between rates for black males from the suburbs and those living outside SMSA's was not statistically significant. There were too few cases involving black females living outside central cities for meaningful comparisons to be made. Within the central cities, black males had the highest robbery victimization rate (31), followed by white males (16) and black females (10); the difference between the rate for white females (6) and black females was marginally significant. Because blacks accounted for a relatively small share of the population in suburbs and nonmetropolitan areas, a number of apparent differences between robbery rates proved not to be significant. Nonetheless, black males living in the suburbs appeared to have a marginally higher victimization rate than their white male counterparts.

The pattern for assault victimization was less clear than that for robbery. Irrespective of type of locality of residence, there was no significant difference between victimization rates for blacks, either male or female.

Among white females, those living in central cities had the highest rate, and those in nonmetropolitan areas had the lowest. White males evidenced a similar pattern, although the difference between the rate for those living in the central cities, as contrasted to that for those in the urban fringes, was marginally significant. Black females tended to be victimized by assault at a higher rate than white females in central cities, in suburbs, and in nonmetropolitan areas, although the difference between rates for residents of areas outside SMSA's was not conclusive. Black females also appeared to be less likely assault victims in all three types of localities than either black males or white males, but the differences between rates were not statistically significant in every instance. The seeming differences between rates for black males and white males lacked significance.

Residents of nonmetropolitan areas, whether black or white, male or female, had lower victimization rates for personal crimes of theft than residents of either the central cities or the suburbs. There was no significant difference between rates for the central cities and suburbs, except that white males living in the cities apparently were more likely to have been victimized by these crimes than their counterparts in the urban fringes. There was some indication that white male residents of cities and of nonmetropolitan areas had the highest victimization rate for crimes of theft. They also had a higher rate than either black or white females living in the suburbs. White females had a higher rate than black females in the cities and outside SMSA's, but there was no real difference between rates for white females and black females in the urban fringes.

## Crimes against households

With some marked exceptions, households situated in central cities tended to have a higher risk of victimization than those in the suburbs, which, in turn, tended to have higher victimization rates than their counterparts in nonmetropolitan areas.

Regarding burglary against central city residents, no clear pattern developed. The highest burglary rates, not significantly different from one another, were recorded by those in cities in the 50,000-249,999 and ½ to 1 million size classes. The lowest rates were registered by households in cities with ¼ to ½ million population and 1 million or more; the rates for those two classes of city also did not truly differ from one another. Except for central cities with 1 million or more residents, where the

apparently higher burglary rate for cities *vis-a-vis* their suburbs did not represent a true difference, cities in each of the other size classes had higher victimization rates than their respective suburban areas. Households in nonmetropolitan areas had a burglary rate (71) below those of households in central cities and suburbs, irrespective of size.

Examination of burglaries involving forcible entry sharpened the distinction in victimization rates between the cities and their respective suburbs: in all cases, the rate was higher in the cities. Moreover, suburban areas had lower rates than those for any of the cities, regardless of size class, although the difference between rates for the smallest central cities and the suburbs of the largest cities was marginal. The pattern with respect to household burglaries committed through unlawful entry was more mixed. Cities in the 50,000-249,999 size class had the highest victimization rate (58), although the difference between that rate and the one for cities with ½ to 1 million population (50) was only marginally significant. No size class clearly had the lowest rate, but the rate (34) for the largest central cities was well below average. For SMSA's in which the central cities had populations in the 50,000-249,999 range, the victimization rate for household burglary involving unlawful entry was higher in the central cities than in the urban fringes. The reverse was true for SMSA's in which the central cities had 1 million or more inhabitants, and there was no difference between rates for cities and suburbs in the other two SMSA size classes.

In terms of the relative effect of forcible entry and unlawful entry, only in the largest cities were the rates for the former higher than those for the latter. Elsewhere, there was no significant difference between the rates (e.g., in cities in the ¼ to ½ million and ½ to 1 million size classes) or the rate for unlawful entry was higher (e.g., all other areas).

Grouping the four classes of central cities together into one category and performing a similar operation for the suburban areas provided sufficient data for examining differences between household burglary victimization rates by race of the head of household. Even so, some apparent differences between rates for black and white households did not meet the criteria for statistical significance. Black households in central cities and in suburban areas registered higher burglary rates than white households, but the apparently higher victimization rate for black households in nonmetropolitan areas was not significantly different from that for white households in those areas.

Patterns of victimization according to area of residence were less clear-cut for household larceny than for household burglary. The lowest victimization rate (72) from household larceny was found among households in central cities with 1 million or more inhabitants, and the second lowest rate (92) occurred in nonmetropolitan areas. Households in central cities of the smallest size class (i.e., those with 50,000-249,999 residents) registered the highest rate (149). Cities of this size, as well as those with  $\frac{1}{4}$  to  $\frac{1}{2}$  million population, had higher rates than their respective urban fringes, but the opposite was true with respect to cities of 1 million or more inhabitants. Population size did not markedly affect household larceny rates for suburban areas; among the four size classes no figure clearly ranked high or low.

White households in central cities, considered as a group, reported a higher victimization rate from household larceny than did black households in the same areas, but the reverse was true in the suburbs. There was also some indication that black households in nonmetro-

politan areas had a higher rate than their white counterparts.

As in the case of burglary, motor vehicle theft appeared to be more heavily concentrated in the central cities. There was some indication that the highest vehicle theft rates occurred among households in the two largest city classes and in the suburban areas of cities of  $\frac{1}{2}$  to 1 million population. Except for cities in the  $\frac{1}{2}$  to 1 million class, motor vehicle theft was reported to have occurred at a higher rate among households in the central cities than among those in their respective urban fringes. Nonmetropolitan area households had by far the lowest rate (9) of victimization from motor vehicle theft, the rate being only about one-fourth that for households in the largest central cities.

With respect to motor vehicle theft, there were no significant differences between rates for white households and black households, either in the central cities as a whole or in the nonmetropolitan areas. The higher rate for black households in suburban areas was marginally significant.



## VICTIM-OFFENDER RELATIONSHIP IN PERSONAL CRIMES OF VIOLENCE

One of the more significant dimensions of personal crime concerns the relationship between victim and offender. Public attention about crime in the streets in large measure has focused on unprovoked physical attacks made on citizens by unknown assailants. The nature of the relationship between victim and offender is a key element to understanding crime and judging the risks involved for the various groups in society. Heretofore, the only available national statistics on the matter have been for homicide; these have demonstrated that the great majority of murder victims were at least acquainted with their killers, if not related to them. With respect to the personal crimes of violence that it measures, the National Crime Panel survey makes possible an examination of the relationship between victim and offender.<sup>7</sup>

Strangers were reported to have been the offenders in some two-thirds of victimizations stemming from the personal crimes of violence counted as having occurred during 1973. To express the relative risks of being victimized by known or unknown offenders, there were about 22 stranger-to-stranger violent confrontations per

---

<sup>7</sup>The relationship between victim and offender is a recurrent theme in various chapters of this report. Conditions governing the classification of crimes as having involved "strangers" or "nonstrangers" are set forth in the Glossary of Terms, listed under each of those categories.

1,000 population age 12 and over, as compared with 12 involving nonstrangers.

Assault, the most common of the crimes of violence, was less likely than rape or robbery to have involved strangers.<sup>8</sup> Nonetheless, the victimization rate for stranger-to-stranger assault was higher (16 per 1,000) than in instances where the offender and victim were at least acquainted (10). Attempted assault, whether simple or aggravated, occurred more often between strangers than did assault that resulted in some form of injury. The two main subcategories of robbery, those resulting in victim injury and those with no such injury, also revealed a preponderance of stranger-to-stranger relationships. Although rape was by far the least prevalent of the three personal crimes of violence, the data were sufficient to indicate that it, too, was primarily a crime between persons who were not acquainted.

When viewed in conjunction with the nature of the relationship between victim and offender, demographic

---

<sup>8</sup>Previous research has shown that persons tend to report fewer crimes than befall them when they are acquainted with or related to the offenders. Among the survey-measured crimes, assault logically would seem to be most affected by this kind of underreporting. Because of this, there probably was a substantial undercount of assaults involving nonstrangers, resulting in an artificially high proportion of those committed by strangers. Further treatment of this matter appears under the discussion of reliability of estimates, Appendix III.

characteristics of victims provided a more definitive picture of the varying risk of victimization. Males, both white and black, had higher proportions of violent victimizations at the hands of strangers than did white or black females, respectively. This also was true for robbery and assault, although the greater proportion for black males over black females was marginal in the case of robbery. Within each sex category, the proportion of stranger-to-stranger victimizations involving blacks and whites was roughly comparable for robbery, but higher for whites in the case of assault.

The younger the victim, the more likely the offender was to have been an acquaintance or relative. This was the case for crimes of violence as a group and, to a lesser extent, for robbery. For persons age 12-15, about 57 percent of violent victimizations were committed by strangers, compared with 77 percent for those who were 50 and over. The figures for robbery covered a smaller range; nonetheless, the proportion among persons age 12-19 (80 percent) clearly was lower than that among individuals age 50 and over, for whom some 93 percent of robbery victimizations were at the hands of strangers. Assault presented no clear-cut pattern with respect to victim age and susceptibility to victimization by strangers. Among males, the two youngest age groups had the lowest percentage of stranger-to-stranger victimizations for all crimes of violence; there was no clear indication of the highest incidence. Below age 50, females in each age group had less likelihood than males of being victimized by strangers, although the difference was marginal for the 16-19 age group; at age 50 and over, the pattern did not apply. In the case of robbery, the proportion of victimizations perpetrated by strangers upon male victims covered a rather narrow range from about 82 to 94 percent, with males under age 25 reporting lower stranger-to-stranger contact. For robberies of women, the range was much wider, from about 65 to 94 percent, with those who were 50 and over, recording higher proportions of confrontations with strangers than did younger women. As for assault, men had higher proportions of victimizations committed by strangers than did women in each category below age 50, although the difference was less firm for those age 16-19. For the two oldest age groups, apparent differences were not significant.

Divorced and separated persons in general, and especially women, were victimized far less by strangers than those in other marital status groups. About half of the violent crimes against divorced or separated persons

were perpetrated by strangers; for those in other marital status categories, victimizations by strangers clearly predominated. Among men, statistical significance could not be attached to the apparent differences in stranger-to-stranger violent crimes according to marital status. Divorced and separated women had by far the lowest proportion of violent victimizations by strangers, about 38 percent; none of the other percentages was clearly highest. The percent of stranger-to-stranger victimizations for all crimes of violence was higher for men than for women in three of the four marital status groups, but the apparent difference among the widowed was not statistically significant. In the case of robbery victimizations, the range of percentages for men (85-93) was narrower than for women (68-94), but there were few significant differences between percentage figures according to marital status category for either sex. Separated and divorced men and, to a limited degree, married men as well, had higher proportions of victimizations committed by strangers than did women in each corresponding group. Males reported a higher proportion of encounters with strangers in assault victimization than did women in each of the marital status categories, except among the widowed, for whom the ostensible difference was not significant. Divorced and separated women reported that unknown persons perpetrated only about 29 percent of the assaults in which they were victims.

The proportion of stranger-to-stranger crime generally tended to rise as the level of annual family income increased, although the evidence suggests that this variable did not distinguish gradations in the degree of risk of victimization as sharply as others. Making distinction between members of families with annual family incomes of less than \$7,500 and those earning \$7,500 and over, the former were more likely to have been victimized by violent crimes perpetrated by persons whom they knew, or to whom they were related. There was a greater difference between blacks in the two income groups than there was for whites, for whom there was only some indication that income level made a difference. Blacks in the less than \$7,500 income bracket had a lower percent of stranger confrontations than did their white counterparts, but the apparent higher proportion of victimizations by strangers for blacks in the higher income level was not a true difference. In the case of robbery, both whites and persons with incomes of \$7,500 and over were more apt to have been victimized by strangers than was the case for those with lower family incomes, although the

evidence was less than conclusive. Assaults, as demonstrated earlier, were more likely than robberies to have occurred between acquaintances and relatives, although in most cases the majority of victimizations were between strangers. An exception to this pattern applied to lower-income blacks, for whom only 43 percent of

assault confrontations involved strangers. There was some indication that lower-income whites were more likely to have been victimized by persons with whom they were acquainted or related than were higher income whites, but not to the extent experienced by lower-income blacks.



## OFFENDER CHARACTERISTICS IN PERSONAL CRIMES OF VIOLENCE

The National Crime Panel survey gathered data on three characteristics of offenders—sex, age, and race—as perceived by the victims of personal crimes of violence. Because these crimes often were stressful, if not traumatic experiences, resulting in confusion or even physical harm to the victims, it is quite likely that, in contrast to other survey findings, data concerning offender characteristics were subject to a greater degree of distortion arising from erroneous responses. In addition to inaccuracies associated with any blurring effect of the event upon a victim's perceptibility, many of the crimes occurred under somewhat vague circumstances, particularly those that happened at night; and, irrespective of the time of occurrence, it can be assumed that offenders, particularly those unacquainted with or unrelated to the victims, may have attempted to conceal their identities during the commission of the crimes. Furthermore, it is possible that victim preconceptions, or prejudices, at times may have influenced the attribution of offender characteristics, particularly when circumstances surrounding the crimes were vague. Thus, for example, an individual who was beaten and robbed might well have resolved doubts about the characteristics of the attacker by drawing upon a stereotype of the "typical mugger."<sup>9</sup> If victims tended to misidentify a

<sup>9</sup>For discussion concerning the reliability of victims' perceptions and the issue of stereotyping, see Robert Buckhout, "Eyewitness Testimony," *Scientific American*, Vol. 231, No. 6, pp. 23-31, December 1974.

particular trait (or a set of them) more than others, bias would have been introduced into the findings. With respect to any possible biases inherent in these data, no method has been developed for determining which characteristics are more subject to such distortion or for measuring the impact of a given type of bias.<sup>10</sup>

Among data gathered on the characteristics of the perpetrators of personal crimes of violence, those relating to the sex variable indicated that an overwhelming majority of the crimes—some nine-tenths—were attributed to male offenders. Largely because of this, the analysis of survey findings focuses on the two other offender characteristics, age and race.<sup>11</sup>

Survey findings revealed that, for personal crimes of violence as a group, single-offender victimizations most frequently were committed by persons reported to have

---

<sup>10</sup>Victim misperceptions as they relate to the race of offenders, together with the lack of methods for assessing the extent of biases associated with such misperceptions, have been alluded to by Albert J. Reiss, Jr. See, *Studies in Crime and Law Enforcement in Major Metropolitan Areas*, Vol. 1, p. 33, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1967.

<sup>11</sup>The distinction between juvenile and adult offenders was a main objective in gathering data on the ages of offenders. This fact, coupled with the anticipated difficulty of assigning adult offenders to specific age categories, led to the selection of two basic groups—persons under age 21 and those 21 and over, with the juvenile ages broken out in more detail.

been over age 20 (64 percent).<sup>12</sup> Some 33 percent of these victimizations were attributed to persons age 12-20, and only 1 percent to children under age 12. Among violent victimizations said to have involved offenders age 12-20, equivalent proportions (13 percent for each) were committed by persons in the 15-17 and 18-20 age groups, whereas a lower proportion (7) was ascribed to youngsters age 12-14. Findings for each of the personal crimes of violence considered separately tended to parallel the general pattern, although statistical significance did not apply in every instance.

Compared with single-offender victimizations, those carried out by two or more persons were characterized by a higher proportion of younger offenders. Roughly 48 percent were committed by two or more offenders perceived to have been between the ages 12 and 20. The proportion was higher than that attributed to individuals age 21 and over or to persons of mixed ages.<sup>13</sup> The number of violent crimes carried out by pairs or groups of youngsters under age 12 was so small that the resulting data were not considered reliable.

When the estimated age of single offenders was considered in relation to the age of the victim, several patterns were apparent. Crimes of violence committed against individuals age 12-19 were about twice as likely to have been attributed to offenders age 12-20 (64 percent) than to persons age 21 and over (33). Once again, few assailants were identified as having been under age 12, irrespective of the category of victim age and for single- and multiple-offender crimes alike. In contrast, for victims over age 19, most victimizations were carried out by offenders judged to have been age 21 and over. For robbery and assault considered separately, the relationships between victim age and offender age

generally were compatible with the findings for crimes of violence as a whole.

Approximately 71 percent of all multiple-offender violent crimes against persons age 12-19 were attributed to assailants all of whom were in the 12-20 age group. Offenders of mixed ages were held responsible for about 19 percent of these victimizations, and those age 21 and over for some 8 percent. Victims age 20-34 perceived that the attackers in multiple-offender crimes were more likely to have been over age 20 than 12-20 or mixed. In contrast to victims age 20-34, persons age 35 and over were more vulnerable to victimization by younger persons. Individuals age 50 and over were attacked more frequently by youngsters in the 12-20 age group than by older or mixed-age groups. Although apparent differences were not always statistically significant, the patterns for multiple-offender robbery and assault generally conformed to that for violent crimes as a group.

Data concerning the race of perpetrators of personal crimes of violence showed that approximately two-thirds of all single-offender victimizations were committed by individuals perceived as white, 29 percent as black, and 4 percent as members of other races. Irrespective of the type of crime and number of offenders involved, victims seldom identified offenders as other than white or black. For multiple-offender victimizations, about 46 percent were attributed exclusively to whites, roughly 41 percent to blacks, and some 7 percent to assailants of mixed races.

When the racial classifications of victim and offender were juxtaposed, the data revealed that most of the measured violent crimes were intraracial in character. In about three-fourths of all single-offender victimizations of whites and in nine-tenths of the corresponding crimes against blacks, offenders were perceived by victims to have been members of their own race. However, the relative frequency of interracial victimization differed somewhat for members of the two races; white victims ascribed a higher proportion of single-offender victimizations to blacks (20 percent) than black victims did to whites (8). As for multiple-offender victimizations of whites, the assailants were more likely to have been perceived as all white (53 percent) than either as all black (33) or as racially mixed (7). Blacks were subject to a proportionally greater amount of intraracial violent crimes at the hands of two or more offenders than whites; roughly 84 percent of these multiple-offender victimizations were committed by blacks.

---

<sup>12</sup>Throughout this section, as well as in the relevant data tables, a basic distinction is made between "single-offender" and "multiple-offender" victimizations. The latter category refers to crimes committed in concert by two or more persons. A discussion concerning the number of offenders involved in the commission of personal crimes of violence is contained in the section on crime characteristics.

<sup>13</sup>As applied to multiple-offender victimizations, terms such as "persons of mixed ages" refer to cases in which the offenders' ages were perceived by victims to have been classifiable under more than one of the designated age groups. Similarly, expressions such as "racially mixed" and "offenders of mixed races" apply to situations in which victims were attacked by two or more individuals perceived to have been members of more than a single racial group; in other words, such terms refer to the interracial composition of the assailants and not to persons having racially mixed antecedents.

Among the specific types of crimes of violence committed by single offenders, statistical significance could not be attached to the apparent difference between rapes committed by whites and blacks. White victims of rape were more likely to have perceived their attackers as white (62 percent) than as black (31). Black victims of that crime identified members of their own race as offenders in about nine-tenths of the victimizations, but estimates of rapes by whites, as well as by offenders belonging to other races, were based on too few sample cases to be reliable. Statistical reliability also could not be attached to survey results concerning the racial classification of multiple offenders involved in rape.

Although no meaningful differences were evident between blacks and whites for single-offender robbery victimizations, a higher proportion of multiple-offender robberies was attributed to blacks (63 percent) than to whites (23) or racially mixed offenders (6). There was marginal indication that white victims of lone offenders were more likely to have been robbed by whites (52 percent) than by blacks (41). Blacks, however, were robbed almost exclusively (93 percent) by members of

their own race. For multiple-offender robberies, both white and black victims indicated that a sizable proportion of victimizations was carried out by blacks; among black victims, however, the proportion (86 percent) of robberies by blacks was greater than that among white victims (56).

Compared with the two other personal crimes of violence, assault was characterized by a higher degree of involvement by white offenders than black offenders in both single- and multiple-offender victimizations alike. For crimes involving lone offenders, victims designated their assailants as white in approximately seven-tenths of the cases and as black in roughly one-fourth; for multiple-offender victimizations, the respective figures were about 57 and 30 percent. A comparison of the races of victim and offender showed that assaults were by and large intraracial. Among single-offender assaults, members of the same racial group as the victim accounted for approximately 79 percent of those against whites and for some 87 percent of those against blacks. For victimizations carried out by two or more offenders, the corresponding estimates were about 64 and 81 percent.





## CRIME CHARACTERISTICS

This section of the report details certain characteristics of the crimes measured by the National Crime Panel survey for 1973. With respect to crimes against persons in which contact occurred between victim and offender, some of the topics covered are based on incident data and others on victimization data. This difference in treatment stems from the fact that incident data are designed to permit the study of certain circumstances surrounding the occurrence of criminal acts, whereas victimization data enable assessment of the consequences of such acts for those who were victimized. Thus, the analysis of four subjects—time of occurrence, place of occurrence, number of offenders, and use of weapons—is based on incidents. The victimization serves as the basic unit of measure for the three remaining topics: victim injury, economic losses, and time lost from work.

Another difference in the analytical treatment of data stems from the relevance of a given characteristic to the various types of crime. For example, characteristics such as time of occurrence and economic loss are pertinent to each of the survey-measured crimes. Other characteristics, including use of weapons and injury to victims, are applicable only to those crimes which bring victim and offender into contact and are accompanied by the use, or threatened use, of force.

As indicated elsewhere in this report, victimiza-

tions ordinarily outnumber incidents because more than one individual was victimized during certain incidents of a personal crime and because some persons were victimized during the course of commercial burglaries or robberies. Overall, the survey enumerated a total of approximately 19.3 million criminal incidents against persons age 12 and over, as opposed to about 20.7 million personal victimizations. Virtually all (98 percent) incidents of personal larceny with contact were committed against a single victim; multiple-victim purse snatchings and pocket pickings were rare events. Among personal crimes of violence, a large majority (89 percent) also were experienced by single victims; about 8 percent involved two victims; 2 percent, three victims; and only 1 percent, four or more victims. Although the differences were slight, assaults were less likely than either rapes or robberies to have been perpetrated against a single victim. However, for the latter two crimes, there was no significant difference between the proportions involving one victim. In fact, the number of multiple-victim incidents of rape was based on too few sample cases to be statistically reliable. In aggregate terms, although the difference was small, violent crimes involving nonstrangers (i.e., persons who were related, well known to, or casually acquainted with one another) were more likely to have been single-victim incidents than those involving strangers.

The connection between victim and offender, a recurring theme in the various parts of this section, appeared to have a differential effect on certain of the circumstances and outcomes of the relevant crimes. About 64 percent of the incidents of personal crimes of violence measured by the National Crime Panel survey for 1973 were committed by strangers.<sup>14</sup> Turning to the specific types of crime, the number of incidents in which the victim did not know the offender amounted to approximately 74 percent of all rapes, 85 percent of all robberies, and 59 percent of all assaults. The two types of personal robbery, those resulting in victim injury and those without such outcome, also revealed a preponderance of stranger-to-stranger confrontations. Attempted assault, whether of the simple or aggravated type, occurred relatively more often between strangers than did assaults resulting in some form of victim injury. In fact, assaults attended by harm to the victim were about evenly divided between those in which the offenders were strangers and nonstrangers.

## Time of occurrence

Information on the time of day when criminal incidents occur can be essential to law enforcement officials concerned with patterns of criminal behavior, as well as to citizens wishing to lower the risk of being personally victimized. For each of the crimes measured by the National Crime Panel survey, data on when incidents occurred were obtained for three broad time intervals: the daytime hours (6 a.m. to 6 p.m.); the first half of nighttime (6 p.m. to midnight); and the second half of nighttime (midnight to 6 a.m.).

Considerable variation was evident according to type of crime as to the time of day when incidents occurred. Personal crimes of theft, especially those involving contact between victim and offender (pocket picking and purse snatching), were predominantly daytime offenses. Two of the personal crimes of violence, rape and robbery, were more likely to have occurred at night, whereas assault incidents were about equally divided between day and night. However, aggravated

assaults were more likely to have happened at night, as were personal robberies with injury.

The pattern of occurrence for commercial robbery was comparable with that of assault. Crimes against households, together with commercial burglaries, were more apt to have taken place at night, although this varied from a slight majority among incidents of household burglary, through a substantial margin for motor vehicle theft, to an overwhelming preponderance for commercial burglary. Among crimes entailing personal confrontation, victims almost always knew the time of occurrence. As for offenses without victim-offender contact, the proportion of incidents for which times remained unknown (including both those completely unknown and those for which the interval of night was unknown) varied from about 18 percent for personal larceny without contact to 49 percent for commercial burglary. For the former crime, as well as for household burglary and household larceny, the proportions of incidents for which the time was not known at all was greatest. The victims of motor vehicle theft and especially commercial burglary had more difficulty than other victims in placing the incident within one of the two nighttime intervals.

### Crimes against persons

As a whole, incidents involving crimes against persons were more likely to have occurred during the day than at night. Of nighttime personal crimes, about two-thirds occurred before midnight. When crimes against persons were divided into the two components, crimes of violence and crimes of theft, a contrasting pattern emerged. A majority of crimes of violence (52 percent) occurred at night, and about four-fifths of these took place from 6 p.m. to midnight. Personal crimes of theft, on the other hand, were reported as happening more often during the day (53 percent).

Among the relevant personal crimes of violence, approximately three-fifths of all rapes (including attempts) occurred at night. About one-fifth of the total took place between midnight and 6 a.m., which was a higher proportion than for either robbery or assault. Robbery also was predominantly a nighttime crime, with about 55 percent of the incidents occurring at night. The proportion of robberies that took place during the 12 daytime hours was roughly the same as that occurring between 6 p.m. and midnight. Robbery incidents result-

---

<sup>14</sup>In an earlier section, the analysis of victim-offender relationships in personal crimes of violence was based exclusively on victimization data. Incident data on the same subject are introduced at this point because units of measure of both kinds (victimizations and incidents) are used in this section.

ing in victim injury were more likely to have taken place at night (62 percent) than those in which no such injury was inflicted (51). About 69 percent of robberies (including attempts) that resulted in serious injury to the victims occurred at night, a circumstance no doubt related to the pattern of weapons use by offenders. Use of a weapon in the commission of robbery was considerably more likely to have been the case at night (66 percent) than during the day (33). In fact, some 53 percent of all robberies by armed offenders occurred between 6 p.m. and midnight. Conversely, more robbery incidents where no weapon was used took place during daytime hours (54 percent) than at night (45).

Assaults were about evenly divided between those happening during the day and those taking place at night. However, aggravated assaults were more apt to have occurred at night (57 percent) than during the day, whereas simple assaults were more likely to have happened between 6 a.m. and 6 p.m. As with robbery, assaults perpetrated by armed offenders were more likely to have occurred at night (58 percent).

Examination of the violent crimes combined from the viewpoint of the relationship between victim and offender revealed that a majority of those perpetrated by strangers took place at night, whereas those involving nonstrangers were more likely to have occurred during the day. Considered separately, each of the crimes of violence showed a similar tendency for stranger-to-stranger encounters to happen at night. For incidents involving nonstrangers, there were too few sample cases of rape and robbery to permit a clearcut determination of the time of occurrence; however, assaults at the hands of acquaintances or relatives occurred more often during daytime hours than at night.

As was observed earlier, personal crimes of theft occurred more often during daytime than at night. This was especially true in cases of personal larceny involving contact between victim and offender, for which about 64 percent of the incidents took place between 6 a.m. and 6 p.m. Incidents of personal larceny without contact also were more likely to have happened during the day (53 percent) than at night (36). Because crimes of theft are predominantly acts involving no contact between victim and offender, there was a substantial proportion of the total (11 percent) for which the time of occurrence was unknown or not reported by the victim; for an additional 7 percent of nighttime incidents, the time of occurrence could not be placed before or after midnight.

## Crimes against households

As a group, and among incidents for which the time of occurrence was ascertained, household crimes were mainly nighttime offenses—51 percent having occurred between 6 p.m. and 6 a.m., as compared with 29 percent during the day. Because these crimes involved no confrontation between a household member and an offender, for about one-fifth of the incidents respondents were unable to determine whether they occurred during the day or night. Excluding these incidents, some 64 percent occurred at night. Among nighttime incidents, 12 percent could not be placed before or after midnight. But, for nighttime incidents for which a more precise time of occurrence was known, 55 percent happened before midnight—a more even distribution of incidents before and after midnight than was the case with personal crimes.

Contrasting with household crimes as a group, incidents of household burglary were more evenly divided between those reported to have occurred during the day and at night, but the majority (54 percent) for which a time was known took place at night. For about one-fourth of burglary incidents, the time of occurrence was unknown. Nighttime burglaries were more likely to have occurred before than after midnight. Completed burglaries (those involving forcible entry and unlawful entry) displayed a similar pattern with respect to time of occurrence as did all burglaries, except that there was no significant difference between the proportions of daytime and nighttime unlawful entries. Excluding incidents for which the time was completely unknown, about 63 percent of attempts at forcible entry occurred at night. Forcible-entry burglaries that occurred during the day had a greater degree of “success” (ratio of completed forcible entries to the sum of completed and attempted ones), 66 percent, than those committed at night (56).

Household larceny was more likely to have occurred at night (55 percent) than during the day (24). When the time interval at night was ascertained, there was no significant difference between incidents before and after midnight. Some one-fourth of the incidents that took place at night could not be assigned to a specific 6-hour interval. In addition, for about 21 percent of all larceny incidents, the time of occurrence was unknown. Roughly three-fifths of larcenies with stolen items valued at \$50 or more occurred at night, compared with

52 percent of those calculated at less than \$50. In the costlier thefts, the proportion for which the time of day was unknown was lower (16 percent) than that for larcenies under \$50 (23). Attempted larcenies, which accounted for some 7 percent of all larcenies, took place for the most part at night (76 percent); only about 15 percent happened during the day. Of nighttime attempts where the time was known, more occurred after midnight than before. Compared with completed household larcenies, there were very few attempted larcenies for which the time was unknown (only about 8 percent), suggesting that many of these incidents may have involved offenders who were frightened off by members of the household. This inference is supported by the prevalence of nighttime incidents among attempts at household larceny.

Motor vehicle theft, third of the measured household crimes, was preponderantly a nighttime offense, with approximately 71 percent of the incidents occurring at night and only some 22 percent during the day. Unlike burglary and household larceny, there were few cases (about 7 percent) in which the time was totally unknown. Significance could not be attached to the difference between the percentages of thefts before and after midnight. Completed motor vehicle thefts took place more often in the daytime hours (24 percent) than did attempts (18).

### Crimes against commercial establishments

The two commercial crimes measured in the National Crime Panel had different patterns as to the time of day incidents occurred. Burglaries were overwhelmingly nighttime crimes, 85 percent having taken place between 6 p.m. and 6 a.m., reflecting the fact that most businesses operate during the day and thus are unlikely to be burglarized during those hours. In about 47 percent of incidents occurring at night, it was not possible to specify whether the burglary was committed before or after midnight. Among nocturnal burglaries for which the time was known, about 3½ times as many incidents occurred after midnight as before. Robberies on the premises of a commercial establishment or of an employee on business outside the establishment were about evenly divided between night and day as to time of occurrence. In contrast to commercial burglaries, about three times as many nighttime robberies took place before midnight as afterwards. Because the victims

of commercial robberies were confronted by their offenders, there were very few cases for which the time of the incident was not known.

## Place of occurrence

Besides influencing the deployment of law enforcement resources, knowledge concerning the types of settings where criminal acts take place can affect citizen mobility and behavior. For certain crimes not involving contact between victim and offender, moreover, the classification of incidents is determined on the basis of their place of occurrence. Thus, by definition, the vast majority of household burglaries recorded by the National Crime Panel survey occurred at principal residences, with a small percentage being perpetrated at second homes or at places, such as hotels or motels, occupied by household members temporarily away from home. On the other hand, personal crimes can occur almost anywhere individuals congregate—in their own residences, in other private dwellings, in public buildings, on the street, in parks or playgrounds, or in the course of travel. Incidents reported in the household survey were grouped into six categories, two of which pertained to the respondent's home and its immediate vicinity. Other categories used were as follows: inside a nonresidential building; inside a school; on the street or in a park, playground, schoolground, and parking lot; and a residual category, covering places, such as vacation lodgings or other temporary living quarters, not belonging to the victim.<sup>15</sup>

Because personal larceny without contact and household larceny are distinguished from one another solely on the basis of where incidents occur, they are treated in an integrated manner and referred to as "larcenies" in this section, an approach differing from that taken elsewhere in the report.<sup>16</sup> Therefore, the

---

<sup>15</sup>For purposes of brevity, the category "on the street or in a park, playground, schoolground, and parking lot" is referred to by phrases such as "on the street or in other outdoor areas" and "on the street or elsewhere outdoors."

<sup>16</sup>Combined, incidents of personal larceny without contact and household larceny constituted about 98 percent of the three types of larceny and roughly three-fifths of all survey-measured incidents. Of the two types of larceny not involving victim-offender contact, personal larceny without contact accounted for 65 percent of total incidents and household larceny for 33 percent.

discussion of crimes against persons is confined to the four offenses entailing contact between victim and offender: rape, robbery, assault, and personal larceny with contact. Similarly, the analysis of data on place of occurrence for crimes against households is limited to household burglary and motor vehicle theft.

For reasons akin to those governing the classification of household burglary, most of the commercial crimes took place on the premises of business establishments. These crimes aside, however, the most common location for criminal offenses was on the street or in other outdoor areas; robbery of persons and motor vehicle theft had the greatest proportions of incidents occurring at these sites. Larcenies, especially those involving losses valued at less than \$50, had the highest proportion of incidents taking place inside schools. In comparison with other crimes, larceny and motor vehicle theft had the greatest share of crimes occurring in the immediate vicinity of the home. Except for household burglary, rape was more likely than any other crime to have happened in the victim's own home. Among criminal incidents entailing victim-offender contact, personal larceny with contact had the greatest proportion of incidents occurring in nonresidential buildings.

### Crimes against persons

Personal crimes of violence most frequently occurred on the street or elsewhere outdoors (48 percent) and next most frequently in nonresidential buildings (14). Those happening in or near the victim's residence together accounted for about one-fifth. Only some 7 percent of crimes of violence took place inside schools. Among the three specific crimes of violence, rape was the most likely to have occurred in the victim's home—in some 29 percent of the cases. Although the most common place for rape to have occurred appeared to be in outdoor areas, the finding in this regard, based on a small number of sample incidents, was only marginally significant. Robbery clearly was the leading street crime among offenses involving victim-offender contact, with three-fifths of all incidents having taken place on streets or in other outdoor places. Robbery and assault occurred in victim's homes with comparable frequency (11 percent). Assault occurred most commonly in outdoor settings away from the victim's home (45 percent) and was more likely than either of the other two violent crimes to have taken place inside nonresidential buildings.

The more serious forms of robbery, incidents in which the offender wielded a weapon and those where injury was inflicted on the victim, did not differ substantially from the less serious robbery incidents in terms of location. Robberies with a weapon rarely were committed inside schools (about 2 percent), whereas some 11 percent of robberies in which no weapon was present took place in school buildings. There also was marginal indication that the proportion of robberies with weapons that occurred on the streets or in other open places was effectively greater (64 percent) than those where no weapon was used (56).

A somewhat clearer relationship between location and severity of the incident was apparent in the case of assault. Assaults by unarmed offenders were more likely to have occurred inside schools than were assaults by armed offenders, although the proportion of assaults taking place in schools was small, regardless of severity. Assaults in which the offenders used weapons were more likely to have occurred on the street or in other outdoor places than were those in which no weapon was used (48 and 43 percent, respectively). Assaults by unarmed offenders were more common inside the home than were assaults where a weapon was employed (12 to 9 percent, respectively).

Personal larceny with contact, consisting of purse snatching and pocket picking, was heavily concentrated in two locations—inside nonresidential buildings and on the street. Together, these categories accounted for some three-fourths of all such incidents, whereas only some 6 percent happened in or near the victim's residence.

The relationship of victim and offender made a substantial difference in the location of crimes of violence. In about 58 percent of the relevant incidents, stranger-to-stranger violent crimes occurred on the street or elsewhere outdoors, whereas only 29 percent of the same types of offenses involving victims who knew or were related to the offender took place in such areas. About one-third of crimes of violence involving non-strangers occurred either inside or in the immediate vicinity of the victim's home; the comparable figure for stranger-to-stranger confrontations was 13 percent. Violent crime inside schools was more often associated with nonstranger incidents (10 percent) than with those in which the offender was a stranger (5).

With regard to the place of occurrence of the two more frequent types of violent crime, robbery and assault, the patterns of victim-offender relationship generally were similar. However, in terms of number of

incidents, there were about 10 times as many assaults involving persons known or related to the victim as there were robberies, and there were about 2½ times more assaults than robberies in the case of stranger-to-stranger confrontations. Robberies involving strangers were more likely than assaults involving strangers to have taken place on the street or elsewhere outdoors, although the difference was only marginally significant. For robbery and assault alike, street confrontations between non-strangers constituted about the same proportion of the respective number of incidents, roughly three-tenths. Proportionally, more assaults than robberies occurred in nonresidential buildings, regardless of victim-offender relationship. Among nonstranger encounters, on the other hand, a higher proportion of robberies (31 percent) than assaults (21) took place inside the victim's home. For incidents between nonstrangers, there was marginal indication that the proportion of robberies inside school buildings was higher than that for assaults in settings of the same type. Relative to their number, stranger-to-stranger assaults and robberies occurred inside schools at about the same rate, which was lower than the proportion for each crime where non-strangers were concerned.

### Crimes against households

Approximately 96 percent of the recorded household burglaries involved the entry or attempted entry of the victim's principal home, with the remainder having occurred at secondary residences or temporary quarters. Whether involving forcible entry or unlawful entry, the proportions remained essentially unchanged.

As would be expected, motor vehicle thefts occurred in locations offering the greatest opportunities—on the street and in other outdoor places, as well as in the immediate vicinity of the victim's home. About 94 percent of all motor vehicle thefts took place in these settings, with the street category by far the most common. The data appear to indicate that vehicles kept in garages were far more secure from theft than those left in outdoor places, but there was insufficient detail on the circumstances of these crimes to ascertain the degree to which victims may have unwittingly cooperated with the thief or unauthorized user by leaving the ignition and/or the vehicle unlocked or by leaving the keys readily accessible.

### Larcenies without victim-offender contact

When personal larceny without contact and household larceny were combined, the two leading locations where these crimes occurred were near the victim's home and on the street or other outdoor area, each accounting for some three-tenths of these incidents. Among the remaining place categories, school buildings accounted for an appreciable percentage, whereas the least common place was inside the victim's home.<sup>17</sup>

Variations with respect to the pattern of occurrence were evident within each of the value of loss categories. Larcenies valued at less than \$50 took place most frequently in the immediate vicinity of the victim's home (29 percent), followed closely by those occurring on the street or elsewhere outdoors (26) and by incidents happening inside schools (23). Where property loss was set at \$50 or more, the most frequent locations for larcenies were on the street and other open areas (about 37 percent) and near home (30). School buildings were the least likely place for the more costly larcenies to have occurred. Incidents of attempted larceny were most likely of all larcenies to have taken place on the street or in other outdoor settings (46 percent); together with incidents occurring near the home, these two locations accounted for about 78 percent of all attempted larcenies, as contrasted with 60 percent for all larcenies.

### Crimes against commercial establishments

Of the two crimes against places of business and other organizations measured by the National Crime Panel, only robbery incidents could have occurred away from the business establishment. However, the overwhelming majority of commercial robberies (about 94 percent) occurred on the premises of the business; the remainder involved employees on duty away from the establishment, such as couriers and sales and delivery persons.

<sup>17</sup>To have been classified as a larceny within the victim's own home, the offense had to have been committed by a person admitted to the residence or by someone having customary access to it, such as a deliveryman, servant, acquaintance, or relative. Otherwise, the crime would have been classified as a burglary or, if force or its threat were used, as a robbery.

## Number of offenders in personal crimes of violence

As indicated earlier, roughly nine-tenths of all incidents of personal crimes of violence were committed against a single victim. A clear, although smaller, majority of violent crimes also involved a single offender. Approximately 64 percent of all personal crimes of violence were committed by lone offenders and an additional 32 percent by two or more offenders; for about 3 percent of the incidents, victims either did not know how many offenders participated or the information was not available.

Although personal crimes of violence committed by solitary offenders outnumbered those involving two or more offenders by about 2 to 1, this finding concealed a marked contrast in the pattern of offender involvement among the relevant crimes. Whereas some eight-tenths of rapes and seven-tenths of assaults were perpetrated by individuals acting alone, most robbery incidents (55 percent) were committed in concert by two or more persons.

A contrast in the pattern of offender involvement also was uncovered by examination of data on violent crimes from the standpoint of victim-offender relationship. Collectively, multiple-offender violent crimes were more prevalent (40 percent) among confrontations between strangers than among those involving non-strangers (18). In fact, offenders who were acquainted with or related to their victims were more apt to have acted alone in the commission of each of the pertinent crimes—rape, robbery, and assault. Among stranger-to-stranger encounters, single-offender incidents constituted a majority in cases of rape and assault, but not of robbery, for which some three-fifths of the incidents were carried out by at least two offenders.

## Use of weapons

Generally regarded among the most fearsome and potentially injurious of personal experiences, criminal attacks by armed offenders can occur in a variety of circumstances and involve weapons of many kinds. For

incidents involving four of the crimes measured by the National Crime Panel survey—rape, robbery of persons, assault, and robbery of places of business—it was determined whether or not the offenders used weapons, and, if so, the type of weapons concerned.<sup>18</sup> With respect to personal crimes of violence, the survey recorded the type, or types, of weapons observed by victims during each incident, but not the number of weapons. If, for example, two firearms and a knife were used by offenders during a personal robbery, the incident was recorded as one in which a firearm and a knife were present. However, for cases of armed robbery of commercial establishments in which weapons of more than one type were observed, only a single type—that considered most lethal—was listed. Concerning the treatment of data on types of weapons, a difference also existed between the personal crimes and commercial robbery. For the former, weapons of all kinds, including those of unknown or unrecognized types, were considered. For commercial robbery, however, the analysis was limited to data on weapons that were recognized by victims. As applied to types of weapons, the term “other” refers to objects such as clubs, stones, bricks, and bottles.

### Personal crimes of violence

Approximately 38 percent of all personal crimes of violence were committed by armed offenders. Of the three types of violent crime, personal robbery was most likely to have been committed by individuals using weapons, and rape was least likely. A larger proportion of stranger-to-stranger violent crimes involved weapons (41 percent) than did incidents between nonstrangers (32). This pattern also held for robbery and assault, but not for rape.

Armed offenders were no more likely to have used firearms than knives or other weapons in the commission of personal crimes of violence. For all violent crimes, as well as for rape, robbery, and assault considered separately, weapons of unidentifiable types accounted for

---

<sup>18</sup>For purposes of tabulation and analysis, the mere presence of a weapon constituted “use.” In other words, the term “weapons use” applies both to situations in which weapons served for purposes of intimidation, or threat, and to those in which they actually were employed as instruments of physical attack.

only a small proportion of the total. There was some indication that in stranger-to-stranger incidents firearms were more likely to have been used than knives, but the differences between the proportion of other weapons (31 percent) and that for knives (29) or firearms (34) were not statistically significant. In contrast, when the victims of violent crimes were acquainted with or related to the offender, other weapons and, with less certainty, knives were used more frequently than firearms. The seeming difference between the proportions recorded for knives and other weapons was not statistically significant, however.

Roughly one-fourth of all rape incidents were perpetrated by armed offenders, a proportion that also applied in cases of stranger-to-stranger attacks. Among the types of weapons identified by rape victims, firearms accounted for some 43 percent and others, excluding knives, for about three-tenths; the number of sample cases of rape committed by offenders armed with knives was too small to yield a statistically reliable estimate.

Armed offenses accounted for some 48 percent of all incidents of personal robbery. Although a higher proportion of stranger-to-stranger robbery was carried out by armed persons (51 percent) than was the case in incidents between nonstrangers (33), the presence of a weapon had no bearing on the likelihood that injury was inflicted on the victim of robbery.

Objects classified as other weapons were less likely to have been used in committing personal robbery (24 percent) than firearms (35) or knives (35). Turning to the specific forms of robbery, incidents resulting in victim injury were more frequently associated with the use of knives and other weapons than with firearms; however, for robberies not involving victim injury, firearms (45 percent) and knives were more common than other weapons. Stranger-to-stranger robberies were more apt to have been committed by offenders bearing firearms or knives than other weapons. For robberies committed by nonstrangers, there were no significant differences among the frequencies at which weapons of differing types were used.

In some 35 percent of all assault incidents, offenders were reported to have been armed; the proportion was slightly higher for stranger-to-stranger incidents than for those between nonstrangers. By definition, all of these incidents were classified as aggravated assault.

Weapons other than firearms or knives were used more frequently in the commission of aggravated assault. In fact, among assaults resulting in victim injury, about

three-fifths involved these other types of weapons, compared with one-fifth or less for knives and firearms. However, for incidents involving attempted assault with a weapon, firearms were more likely to have been used (37 percent) than other weapons (27) or, with less certainty, knives (32). In addition, there was some indication that knives were used more frequently than other weapons in attempts. From the standpoint of victim-offender relationship, unknown assailants used firearms and other weapons more frequently than knives. On the other hand, when the victim of aggravated assault knew the offender, firearms were less apt to have been used than other weapons or, less conclusively, knives.

### Robbery of commercial establishments

Approximately three-fifths of all robberies of places of business were carried out by offenders wielding weapons—whether firearms, knives, and/or other types—that were seen and recognized by individuals at the scene of the crime. Among the various types of weapons, firearms were the most commonly used, in roughly half of the relevant incidents. Indicating a possible relationship between the presence of a weapon and a higher rate of “success,” weapons—particularly firearms—were more likely to have been employed in completed robberies (68 percent) than in attempted ones (39). Whereas firearms were used in about one-fifth of attempted robberies, the proportion for completed incidents was roughly three-fifths.

## Physical injury to victims of personal crimes of violence

Physical injury to victims occurred in some three-tenths of all personal robbery and assault victimizations. Furthermore, in about 6 percent of all the victimizations resulting from the three personal crimes of violence combined, the injured persons were known to have incurred medical expenses. An additional 2 percent of the total victimizations were committed against individuals who either were unsure that they had borne such expenses or were unable to estimate the amounts charged. Although based on incomplete information, data on medical charges indicate that about 43 percent



of the costs amounted to less than \$50, whereas one-fifth involved \$250 or more. Certain of these expenses were defrayed, at least in part, through health insurance benefits. As of the date of the crime, victims of approximately 62 percent of the victimizations resulting in victim injury reported that they had some form of health insurance coverage or were eligible for public medical services. A substantial proportion of medical expenses was for hospital care, which victims received in about 7 percent of the victimizations. Victimizations leading to emergency room treatment outnumbered those requiring hospitalization on an inpatient basis by about 3 to 1.

The characteristics of victims who sustained injury during the commission of violent crimes are examined in this section of the report. For victims who were harmed to the extent that they required medical attention, survey results pertaining to hospitalization, medical expenses, and health insurance also are analyzed. From a statistical standpoint, data concerning rape generally were based on too few sample cases to permit separate, statistically reliable treatment of the topic.

### Characteristics of the injured

For personal robbery and assault considered collectively, the proportion of victimizations in which females sustained physical injury was somewhat higher (32 percent) than that of males (28).<sup>19</sup> Statistical significance could not be attached to the apparent difference between the proportion of white victims of the two violent crimes who sustained injury (29 percent) and that of black ones (32). Similarly, categorization of victims by age failed to reveal any significant differences between the percentages of those who were injured. However, for robberies and assaults involving persons who were acquainted with one another, if not related, the proportion of victimizations attended by victim injury was higher than that for confrontations between strangers.

<sup>19</sup>Information was gathered concerning the injuries sustained by victims of each of the three personal crimes of violence. However, during the preparation of this report, the requisite data were not available for calculating the proportion of rape victimizations in which victims were injured. Therefore, information on the percent of crimes in which victims were harmed is confined to personal robbery and assault. For each of these crimes, the types of injuries concerned are described in the Glossary of Terms, under "Physical injury."

Approximately 34 percent of all personal robbery victimizations resulted in victim injury. Concerning the sex, race, and income of robbery victims, as well as their relationship with the offender, significant differences between rates of injury did not emerge. Grouped by age, robbery victims failed to form a pattern with respect to those who were more apt to have suffered injury, although a lower proportion of those age 12-15 was harmed (25 percent) than was true among the victim population as a whole.

With respect to assault, physical injury was the outcome of some 28 percent of the victimizations. Males were less likely (26 percent) than females (31) to have sustained injury, but there was no true difference between the corresponding proportions for whites (27) and blacks (31) and no discernible pattern of injury rates according to the age of victims. Victims in each of the two annual income groups of less than \$7,500 were more likely to have experienced injury than those in each of the higher income levels. Also, smaller proportions of persons with yearly earnings of \$7,500-\$9,999 and \$10,000-\$14,999 sustained injury than did assault victims in general; however, the seemingly lower than average rates for individuals in the two uppermost income brackets were not statistically significant. A greater percentage of victims who knew or were related to the offender were injured as a consequence of assault (33 percent) than was the case for victimizations in which the offender was a stranger (24).

### Medical expenses and health insurance

As indicated earlier, about 6 percent of victimizations involving personal crimes of violence were known to have led to expenditures for medical treatment.<sup>20</sup> There was some indication that the proportion of victimizations in which blacks incurred such charges was effectively higher (8 percent) than that among whites (6). However, victimizations involving strangers were no

<sup>20</sup>The discussion on medical expenses is based solely on victimizations in which the victims knew with certainty that such expenses were incurred and also knew, or were able to estimate, their amount. Because they do not take into consideration data on victims who were unaware that charges for medical care were sustained, as well as data on persons unable to estimate the amount of such costs, the survey findings understate somewhat the number of victimizations in which medical expenses were sustained by victims. Because of the absence of complete data, findings on the costs of medical treatment also may be subject to certain distortion.

more likely than those committed by nonstrangers to have resulted in medical expenditures. Suggesting that many of the injuries were minor, about 43 percent of victimizations resulting in medical charges were for amounts less than \$50. Some 37 percent fell into the \$50-\$249 range, and the remaining 20 percent exceeded \$249. From the standpoints of victim-offender relationship and victim race, differences between amounts expended for medical care generally lacked statistical significance.

In about 62 percent of the victimizations in which personal injury resulted from the commission of violent crimes, the victims reported having some kind of health insurance coverage, or were eligible to receive medical services under public welfare programs such as Medicaid, or from governmental agencies such as the Veterans Administration. There was some indication that the proportion of victimizations of whites in which the victims had health coverage or access to public medical care was effectively higher (66 percent) than the proportion among blacks (52). Although the trend pointing to a correspondence between increased affluence and a greater likelihood of having insurance coverage lacked statistical significance, a higher proportion (77 percent) of persons belonging to families earning \$15,000 or more a year reported having such insurance than the victim population as a whole, and there was marginal indication that this also held true for those in the \$10,000-\$14,999 income range.

In approximately 7 percent of all robbery victimizations, the victims incurred expenditures for medical treatment received as a result of injuries suffered during the crimes. The difference recorded by black and white victims was insignificant. In some 38 percent of the victimizations for which there were medical costs, the amount in question was less than \$50; a comparable proportion of the victimizations were in the \$50-\$249 category, and about one-fourth were in excess of \$249.

Concerning assault, in about 6 percent of the victimizations the victims reported they were billed for personal medical services attendant to the crimes. From either of two perspectives, victim race and relationship between victim and offender, the proportions of victimizations in which there were medical costs were not statistically dissimilar. Approximately 43 percent of assault victimizations leading to medical expenses involved amounts less than \$50, 38 percent were in the \$50-\$249 range, and 19 percent were for \$250 or more; seeming differences in those proportions according to

victim race and victim-offender relationship generally were not statistically meaningful.

### Hospital care

As a group, victims of violent crimes received hospital treatment in the aftermath of their experience in roughly 7 percent of the victimizations, a proportion that did not differ significantly according to sex or by type of victim-offender relationship. The rate of hospitalization was higher for victimizations involving blacks (12 percent) than for those of whites (6). Although statistical significance could not be attached to the apparent correspondence between increased age and a higher rate of hospitalization, youngsters age 12-19 were less likely to have obtained hospital treatment than were victims in the 20-34 and 50-64 age groups, and, less conclusively, than those in the two remaining categories (35-49 and 65 and over) as well.

In about three-fourths of all violent crimes leading to victim hospitalization, the required treatment was administered in emergency rooms, the remaining proportion having involved admissions overnight or longer. There was some indication that males (29 percent) were more likely than females (19) to have been hospitalized on an inpatient basis. Similarly, there was some indication that blacks were more apt than whites to have been hospitalized on an inpatient basis, 36 percent of violent victimizations of blacks and 23 percent of those against whites having resulted in victim admissions for a minimum of one night. However, the relationship between victim and offender did not have a differential impact either on the type of admission or on the duration of inpatient confinement.

Hospital care for injuries sustained by victims during the course of personal robberies was obtained in about one-tenth of the victimizations. Whether based on victim sex or race or on victim-offender relationship, seeming differences between proportions of victimizations leading to such care were not statistically significant. Likewise, there emerged no meaningful pattern concerning a possible correspondence between victim age and hospitalization.

Among robbery victimizations leading to the hospitalization of victims, 65 percent involved emergency room treatment and the remainder were for care on an inpatient basis. No sample cases were recorded of instances in which robberies committed by offenders known or related to the victim resulted in hospitaliza-

tion on an inpatient basis. The number of sample cases of black robbery victims who were hospitalized as inpatients was too small to yield statistically reliable data. In 79 percent of robbery victimizations of females resulting in hospitalization, the treatment took place in emergency rooms, compared to 61 percent among robberies of males, with the remaining persons of each sex having been admitted for a minimum of one night.

Turning to assault, hospital care was obtained by victims of that crime in about 7 percent of the victimizations, the proportion of blacks who received such care having been higher than that for whites. However, other characteristics associated with the crimes, including victim sex and age, as well as victim-offender relationship, failed to identify persons who were especially likely to have been hospitalized.

Concerning assault victimizations that led to victim hospitalization, about 77 percent of the cases involved emergency room treatment and the remainder were for inpatient care lasting a minimum of one night. Blacks were more likely than whites to have been hospitalized on an inpatient basis, and there was some indication that the percentage of blacks (21) who received inpatient care lasting 1 to 3 days was effectively higher than the corresponding figure among whites (7). In other words, whereas some 82 percent of the hospital treatment cases of whites took place in emergency rooms, the proportion for blacks was 59, with the remaining victims of each race having been hospitalized overnight or longer. Examination of data on the sex of assault victims and on victim-offender relationship revealed no significant differences with respect to the type of hospital admission.

## Economic losses

In this section of the report and in the relevant data tables, the term "economic loss" applies to the theft and/or damage of property resulting from completed crimes, as well as to the damage of property associated with attempted crimes.<sup>21</sup> The term "property" includes both cash and items of all kinds. Data on the measurement of loss include references to items reported by

---

<sup>21</sup> Although much of the analysis and statistical data in this section is based on economic losses stemming from theft and/or damage of property, certain tables and parts of the textual discussion deal with theft and damage losses independently of one another; thus, the expressions "theft loss" and "damage loss" also appear in the pertinent places of the report.

respondents as having no monetary worth. These could include losses of trivial, truly valueless objects, or ones having considerable sentimental or intrinsic importance. Although data on losses having "no monetary value" can be found under distinct categories in the appended tables, for purposes of analysis such losses were included in the "less than \$50" category.

The term "recovery" is used in the context of compensation for, or restoration of, *theft* losses from any source or by means—whether retrieved by the victim, returned by the police, returned by some benefactor, paid for through insurance coverage, etc. Although the survey measured recoveries effected by any of these methods, it was designed to identify only one of them—compensation through insurance.

For one of the measured personal crimes—assault—information on economic loss relates solely to property damage, because the commission of theft in conjunction with assault results in classification of the event as robbery. Inasmuch as the survey was not designed to measure instances of attempted pocket picking, only completed pocket picking victimizations were classified, which by definition resulted in economic loss through theft. There were a few sample cases in which property damages also attended the crime.

The majority of survey-measured victimizations, whether incurred by persons, households, or commercial establishments, resulted in economic losses. However, most personal crimes of violence did not, as a group, have economic consequences because of the numerical predominance of assaults (relatively few of which entailed property damage). That category of crime aside, certain general patterns emerged with respect to the economic losses associated with offenses directed at property rather than individuals. As might be anticipated with respect to criminal offenses that differ from one another solely on the basis of place of occurrence, comparable proportions (roughly 19 in every 20) of personal larcenies without contact and household larcenies entailed economic losses. The frequencies with which burglarized households and commercial establishments experienced economic losses also approximated each other, even though it appeared that businesses suffered property damages (with and without theft) relatively more often than did households.

Despite these similarities, pronounced differences existed concerning the impact of losses. In general, victimized commercial establishments experienced more costly crimes, i.e., those resulting in losses worth \$50 or

more, than did persons and households; however, motor vehicle theft was among the most costly crimes. For household crimes, and to a lesser extent for personal crimes, the economic burdens of victimization generally were greater for blacks than for whites. Conversely, whites were more likely than blacks to have recovered or received compensation for their losses. For individuals of either race, however, there was no recovery of losses in a vast majority of cases.

### Crimes against persons

Approximately three-fourths of all personal victimizations measured by the survey resulted in economic loss through theft and/or damage to property. Some 72 percent of the victimizations involved theft losses, whereas another 5 percent entailed property damage only. Combining those with and without theft, however, 13 percent of the crimes were accompanied by damage losses.<sup>22</sup> With respect to crimes of violence, roughly one-fourth of all victimizations resulted in economic loss. By contrast, losses were sustained in about 96 percent of personal crimes of theft (the aggregate of the two types of larceny against individuals); the balance constituted attempts at theft not attended by property damage.

About seven-tenths of the personal victimizations resulting in economic loss involved property items valued at less than \$50 (including those of no monetary value); two-tenths of the losses were in the \$50-\$249 range, with the remaining proportion comprising losses of \$250 or more and those of unknown value. Differences between whites and blacks with respect to the worth of losses were not substantial. Whites had a higher proportion (34 percent) of losses valued at less than \$10 than did blacks (27), whereas the latter had a somewhat greater proportion in the \$50-\$249 category; otherwise, apparent differences were statistically insignificant. In about eight-tenths or more of all personal victimizations resulting in theft loss, nothing was recovered by the victim from any source, including insurance firms. Whether in part or in full, restitution for losses through theft occurred relatively more often in personal robbery victimizations than in personal crimes of theft. Full

recovery of loss from all personal crimes resulting in theft was slightly more apt to have been effected in victimizations involving whites (8 percent) than in those in which blacks were victims (5).

Because of the prevalence of assault victimizations, which by definition do not entail theft, only about 12 percent of all crimes of violence involved theft losses; these stemmed either from robbery or from rape accompanied by robbery. Twelve percent of the crimes resulted in damage only. In all, some 15 percent of victimizations involving personal crimes of violence resulted in property damage, a proportion that did not differ with respect to the kind of victim-offender relationship.

Approximately three-fifths of violent crimes with theft and/or damage involved losses of less than \$50, including those of no monetary value; 7 percent resulted in losses of \$250 or more. Since assault losses are limited to property damage, it was not surprising to find that a higher proportion of assaults (70 percent) than robberies (54) involved losses worth less than \$50. An estimated one-tenth of robbery losses were in the \$250 or more category, compared with only about 2 percent of assault losses. Blacks appeared to have suffered somewhat more costly losses than whites. For example, approximately 36 percent of the economic losses sustained by blacks during crimes of violence were valued at \$50 or more, compared with 26 percent for whites. Some 30 percent of losses by blacks fell in the \$50-\$249 range as opposed to 19 percent for those by whites; however, there was no real difference between the proportions of economic loss in the \$250 or more category for either race.

About one-fourth of all rape victimizations resulted in economic losses by the victims, a significant number of these having resulted from property damages without theft; however, the number of theft losses experienced by rape victims was based on too few sample cases to be statistically reliable. The data relating to economic losses of rape victims were too tenuous for more conclusive findings to be drawn.

Some two-thirds of all personal robbery victimizations had economic consequences for the victims. An estimated 59 percent resulted in theft losses, including 11 percent with associated damages, the remainder having been attempted robberies; another 7 percent entailed property damage only. Not surprisingly, economic losses occurred more readily (76 percent) in conjunction with robberies resulting in victim injury than in those without such injury (60).

---

<sup>22</sup> Throughout this discussion on economic loss, the percent of victimizations with theft loss plus the percent of victimizations with damage loss will exceed the percent of victimizations involving economic loss because some victimizations entailed losses of both types.

For all robberies, approximately 54 percent involved thefts and/or damages worth less than \$50. Only about one-tenth involved losses of \$250 or more. In terms of the amount of economic loss, there was no significant difference between robberies with and without injury.

With respect to the value of stolen property, it was found that whites experienced a higher proportion (29 percent) of theft losses of less than \$10 than did blacks (18); conversely, there was some indication that blacks had a higher proportion of robbery losses of \$50-\$99. No other significant differences between the races emerged with respect to value of losses from theft.

In roughly three-fourths of completed robbery victimizations, theft losses were not recovered by the victim. Losses were fully recovered in about 11 percent of the cases and partially recovered in 15 percent, although the two figures did not differ significantly. Of victimizations in which partial or total recovery was effected, a majority involved compensation or restoration methods other than insurance. Insurance reimbursements only accounted for about one-tenth of recoveries. There was no significant difference between blacks and whites with respect to recovery of robbery losses.

Approximately 14 percent of the assault victimizations resulted in damage to the victim's property. An estimated seven-tenths of assaults with property damage involved losses valued at less than \$50 and about 15 percent caused damages of \$50 or more; some 2 percent were \$250 or more.

The large majority (96 percent) of personal crimes of theft, synonymous with personal larceny, resulted in economic loss. Distinguishing among the types of losses, 84 percent of the crimes involved theft only, 10 percent entailed both damage and loss, and 3 percent reflected damages without theft. Most personal larceny losses (71 percent) were calculated at less than \$50. Victimizations involving victim-offender contact resulted in a considerably lower proportion of economic losses worth less than \$10, but in relatively more losses in the \$10-\$49 and \$50-\$249 ranges, than did those without such contact. Overall, there appeared to be no substantial difference between blacks and whites with respect to the economic losses that accompanied personal crimes of theft. However, whites sustained a somewhat greater proportion of losses valued at less than \$50 than did blacks (71 percent and 66 percent, respectively).

An estimated 86 percent of all personal larcenies with contact between victim and offender, i.e., purse

snatchings and pocket pickings, had the outcome of loss through theft. Additionally, some 3 percent resulted in damage losses only to the victim's property. Of all victimizations involving theft and/or damage, about 62 percent resulted in losses valued at less than \$50; 28 percent in losses of \$50-\$249; and 4 percent in losses of \$250 or more. In roughly 7 out of 10 personal larcenies with contact that entailed economic consequences, victims failed to recover, or to be compensated for, the thefts. A portion of theft losses was recovered in roughly one-fourth of the victimizations, whereas the entire loss was recovered in about 8 percent.

Reflecting the prevalence of completed victimizations as opposed to attempts, roughly 94 percent of the measured personal larcenies without contact culminated in loss through theft; about 10 percent were accompanied by damage loss; and some 3 percent involved damage loss only. Among victimizations resulting in economic loss, approximately 7 out of 10 involved property worth less than \$50; another 20 percent involved losses of \$50-\$249; and 4 percent, losses of \$250 or more. In some 84 percent of the victimizations, nothing was recovered. Complete restitution for property theft occurred in about 7 percent of all victimizations, and partial recovery was affected in about 9 percent. Whether partial or complete, insurance compensation for theft losses occurred in about 3 out of 10 cases.

### Crimes against households

An estimated 9 out of every 10 household crimes resulted in economic loss to householders. About 79 percent constituted theft losses, whereas another 12 percent involved property damage only. Considering those with and without theft, however, one-fourth of the household victimizations were accompanied by damage losses. Of the three measured household crimes, theft losses were sustained most frequently and damage losses least frequently in cases of household larceny, a crime for which the occurrence of attempts probably is underreported and which normally does not entail the use of force.

Economic loss in more than half of all household crimes was estimated at less than \$50. This was the case in a majority of household larceny losses, as well as in about 47 percent of burglary losses. In contrast, most motor vehicle thefts involved losses well above \$50. When losses from theft alone were considered, it was

shown that householders suffered losses worth \$1,000 or more relatively most frequently in motor vehicle theft victimizations and least often in household larcenies.

There was a significant relationship between the race of the head of household and the amount of loss. When the three crimes were considered collectively, for instance, black householders experienced a higher proportion of economic losses valued at \$50 or more, as well as at \$250 or more, than did white householders. About 57 percent of the losses sustained by whites were valued at less than \$50, as opposed to about 46 percent for blacks. Race also appeared to be related to amount of loss recovered, white householders having recovered theft losses relatively more often than black ones. For all households, theft losses remained totally unrecovered in about three-fourths of victimizations entailing theft. Complete recovery of theft losses occurred in roughly one-tenth, and partial recovery in about 13 percent, of the relevant victimizations. Among thefts for which there was recovery, insurance compensation covered the losses, at least partially, in approximately 28 percent of the cases; in some two-thirds of the victimizations, however, any recovery of theft losses took place by some means other than insurance.

About 86 percent of all household burglaries caused economic losses of some kind; some two-thirds involved theft losses, and another 21 percent resulted solely in damage losses. Combining those with and without theft, property damages took place in roughly 4 out of 10 burglaries. Reflecting the more frequent occurrence of damages, relatively more forcible entries resulted in economic losses than did unlawful entries without force.

In approximately 47 percent of burglaries attended by economic loss, the value was less than \$50. Householders sustained the greatest losses during burglaries attended by forcible entry. An estimated 6 of every 10 forcible entries resulted in losses valued at \$50 or more and roughly one-third involved \$250 or more; for unlawful entry (without force), the corresponding figures were about 45 and 12 percent. Overall, losses from attempted forcible entry, almost entirely in the form of property damage, were smaller than those for the other two types of burglary, and about 35 percent were of no monetary value. Only about 5 percent of attempted forcible entry losses were in the \$50 or more range. Some 2 percent of attempted forcible entries actually resulted in property theft, i.e., household larceny; such larcenies were effected in conjunction with

attempts at burglary and, in accordance with the crime classification scheme, were categorized under the more serious of the two offenses.

An examination of data on economic losses stemming from burglary revealed that black householders suffered a higher proportion of losses in the \$50 or more category (47 percent) than did white householders (43). This difference was accounted for entirely by the relatively greater number of losses valued at \$250 or more sustained by blacks.

With respect to theft losses associated with burglary it was discovered that roughly 57 percent involved property worth \$50 or more. Only about 7 percent of the victimizations resulted in theft losses of \$1,000 or more.

In some 77 percent of all cases of property theft committed during household burglaries, the losses were unrecovered and there was no compensation for the theft. In 16 percent of the victimizations some part of the value of the loss was recovered, and in 7 percent, the entire loss was recovered. Black householders were less likely than white ones to have recovered theft losses, at least in part; moreover, blacks effected complete restoration of theft losses in a smaller proportion of victimizations (3 percent) than did whites (8). Partial or total recovery of such losses was achieved through insurance in about 45 percent of the cases.

Turning to household larceny, about 95 percent of the victimizations resulted in economic loss. Property theft losses were sustained in 93 percent of the larcenies, and damage losses alone in about 2 percent. Counting those with and without theft, some 8 percent of the victimizations involved damage. Approximately seven-tenths of the relevant crimes involved economic losses of less than \$50. Only about 4 percent involved losses of \$250 or more, as compared with some one-third involving losses of less than \$10. Because they did not result in theft, attempted larcenies had relatively lower losses than completed ones. Thus, only 10 percent of the losses associated with attempts were valued at \$50 or more, compared with 27 percent for completions. Furthermore, roughly 3 of every 10 attempts entailed economic losses of no monetary value, in contrast to only 1 percent for completed crimes. Black householders experienced a somewhat higher proportion of economic losses of \$50 or more (31 percent) than did whites (26). When the value of stolen property alone was considered, the relatively small proportion of high loss victimizations

again was evident. Roughly 1 percent of the completed larcenies involved theft losses worth \$1,000 or more, and only about 3 percent resulted in losses ranging from \$250 to \$999.

In some 83 percent of the household larcenies, there was no recovery whatsoever of theft losses, whereas only 8 percent of the cases resulted in total recovery. The apparent difference between the percentages of black and white householders among whom theft losses went unrecovered was not significant. However, the proportion of victimizations in which such losses were fully recovered was higher among whites (9 percent) than for blacks (5). Recovery was accomplished through insurance alone in some 23 percent of the cases.

With respect to the third crime against households—motor vehicle theft—about two-thirds of the victimizations were completed crimes that resulted in losses through theft. Roughly 57 percent of the attempts resulted in property damage, as did 31 percent of the completed crimes. In all, 85 percent of the victimizations were attended by some sort of economic loss. Among these, some three of every four victimizations resulted in losses valued at \$50 or more, 63 percent of them in losses of \$250 or more. Not surprisingly, substantially higher economic losses were connected with completed thefts than with attempts, 81 percent of the former having resulted in losses worth \$250 or more. An insignificant portion of completed victimizations involved losses calculated at less than \$50. On the other hand, some 62 percent of the attempts resulted in damages valued at less than \$50, whereas about one in five involved losses of \$50 or more. In terms of the distribution of the value of losses, there were no significant differences between white and black householders. An examination of theft losses alone showed that most (84 percent) fell in the \$250 or more range, but there was no significant difference between those in the \$250-\$999 and \$1,000 or more categories.

Relative to the other measured crimes against households, the recovery rate for motor vehicle theft victimizations was good, total restoration of losses having occurred in over half the cases. Partial recovery took place in one of four thefts, while in a slightly smaller proportion, nothing was recovered. Race of household head did not appear to be a determinant of whether or not recovery was accomplished. Reimbursement through insurance accounted for about 13 percent of all recovery actions.

## Crimes against commercial establishments

An estimated 89 percent of commercial victimizations measured by the survey resulted in economic loss to the operators of business establishments, and in the vast majority of instances there was no recovery of losses. Some three-fifths of the crimes had theft losses, and damages alone were associated with another 27 percent. However, joining property damage only cases with those that also involved theft revealed that damages were sustained in 63 percent of the crimes. With respect to kind of business, there were no significant variations among the proportions of victimizations resulting in economic loss, or in the amount of loss.

About 9 out of 10 burglaries of places of business resulted in economic loss; roughly 59 percent entailed theft and 73 percent, damage. About 41 percent of the relevant burglaries involved economic losses valued at \$50 or less; one-quarter, \$51-\$250; and about three-tenths, more than \$250. The large majority (90 percent) of theft losses from burglary were not recovered; only about 2 percent of the losses were recovered in full, whether through insurance or other means.

Roughly four-fifths of all commercial robbery victimizations resulted in economic loss. Approximately three-quarters involved theft losses, and about 13 percent, damage losses, the latter arising mainly from attempted robberies. Some 64 percent of robbery victimizations entailed the theft of property worth more than \$50, with about three-tenths of the thefts valued at more than \$250. In an estimated 79 percent of the victimizations, there was no restoration whatsoever of losses. Full recoveries, including those effected through insurance, were achieved in some 13 percent of the robberies.

## Time lost from work

Working individuals who are injured during the course of a criminal attack and become incapacitated to some degree, as well as those who sustain economic losses and personal inconveniences related to criminal events may well be obliged to stop working for varying lengths of time before being able to resume normal activities. In addition to reasons associated with medical

conditions, victimized persons might find it necessary to suspend their work in order to attend to such matters as the filing of police reports, preparation of insurance claims, and replacement of stolen or damaged property. For each personal and household crime, the National Crime Panel survey gauged the cumulative amount of worktime lost by all household members in the aftermath of a victimization. Although it probably can be assumed that for most cases of personal crimes of violence it was the victim who lost time from work, the survey did not record the identity of the household member concerned.<sup>23</sup> Once it was determined that a curtailment of work took place, the amount of time lost was recorded and categorized for analysis as less than 1 day; 1-5 days; 6 or more days; and length of time unknown.

Relatively few victimizations, whether committed against persons, households, or commercial establishments, led to worktime losses. In general, and as might well be expected, the more injurious types of crime, as well as those having more serious economic consequences, tended to be more likely to result in work interruptions. For several of the measured crimes—household burglary, motor vehicle theft, and, less conclusively, personal crimes of violence—it was found that black victims were more likely than white ones to have lost time from work. In addition, the data revealed that black victims of violent crimes, of personal crimes of theft, and of household crimes, were more apt than their white counterparts to have remained away from work for longer lengths of time.

### Crimes against persons

In about one-tenth of all victimizations stemming from personal crimes of violence, the victims or other household members lost time from work as a consequence of the experience. Although statistical significance could not be attached to the difference between the proportions of rapes (15 percent) and robberies (11) resulting in the loss of worktime, there was some indication that the figure for each of those crimes was higher than the corresponding percentage for assault (9). Among blacks, there was marginal indication that the

<sup>23</sup>In the interest of brevity, most references to the loss of worktime are stated as applying to the victim, overlooking the fact that, for crimes against persons, it may have been nonvictims (such as relatives or other household members) who lost worktime.

proportion of violent victimizations attended by loss of worktime (12 percent) was effectively higher than that for whites (9). Similarly, there was some indication that victimizations involving nonstrangers were relatively more likely to have resulted in the suspension of work by the victim (11 percent) than were those entailing stranger-to-stranger encounters (9).

Of violent crimes reported to have led to loss of time from work, some 48 percent of the absences were of 1–5 days duration; proportionately, absences lasting less than 1 day and those of 6 or more days did not differ significantly. Perhaps linked to the prevalence among blacks of higher victimization rates for certain of the more serious forms of violent crime, black victims were more likely than whites to have lost more than 5 workdays; the proportions of victimizations concerned were about 44 percent for blacks and 21 for whites. In contrast, whites were more likely (29 percent) than blacks (14) to have stayed away from work for less than 1 workday. For the third category of time loss, 1–5 days, the difference between the two races was statistically insignificant.

As previously indicated, approximately 15 percent of all rape victimizations, including completions and attempts, resulted in the loss of worktime. In roughly three-fourths of the relevant cases, the number of days lost was within the 1–5 range. Because the number of sample cases of rape victims who lost time from work was small, statistically meaningful analysis on the characteristics of such victims was precluded.

As could be anticipated, the 11 percent of robbery victimizations that led to worktime loss consisted mainly of offenses in which the victims sustained injury; the relevant figures were 23 percent for robbery with injury and 5 percent for robbery without injury. By victim race and victim-offender relationship, the apparent differences between percentages of victimizations attended by loss of worktime lacked statistical significance. Among robbery victimizations in which victims missed work, about 20 percent involved less than 1 day; 49 percent, 1–5 days; and 31 percent, 6 days or more.

Paralleling the findings for robbery, a relationship was evident between the severity of assault and loss of worktime—the proportion of aggravated assaults with that outcome having been greater (13 percent) than that of simple assaults (6). Assaults perpetrated by persons acquainted with or related to the victim were somewhat more likely (10 percent) than those committed by



strangers (8) to have brought about work losses. However, differences in the corresponding proportions according to victim race were insignificant. The relative distribution of length of worktime lost by assault victims was as follows: less than 1 day, 30 percent; 1–5 days, 46 percent; and 6 days or more, 23 percent.

Only about 3 percent of all personal crimes of theft were followed by worktime loss, a proportion that applied to each of the two forms of the crime, those with and without victim-offender contact. There was no statistically significant difference between the proportions of crimes of theft against whites and blacks resulting in abstentions from work. Most (65 percent) of the applicable victimizations involved losses of less than 1 workday, whereas only 5 percent were for 6 days or more. The predominance of losses of less than 1 day was associated chiefly with the victimizations of whites among whom some seven-tenths of the work absences lasted that long; the corresponding proportion for victimizations affecting blacks was about three-tenths. Conversely, blacks were more likely than whites to have lost 1–5 days of work.

### Crimes against households

Probably because of the inconveniences related to the deprivation of commuter automobiles and of vehicles used in earning a livelihood, motor vehicle thefts were more likely than either household burglaries or larcenies to have led to the curtailment of work by one or more members of the affected household. A difference also existed between the latter two crimes, burglaries more frequently having resulted in worktime losses than household larcenies. Of all household victimizations resulting in worktime losses, some 48 percent involved absences lasting less than 1 day, whereas only about 1 in 20 were of more than 5 days duration.

About 6 percent of all household burglaries resulted in worktime losses, the proportion for forcible entries having been higher than that for unlawful entries without force and for attempts at forcible entry. Burglaries of households headed by blacks were more likely (10 percent) than those headed by whites (5) to

have caused such losses. Among burglaries resulting in missed work, some nine-tenths of the total fell into categories of fewer than 6 days, and only 4 percent involved losses of 6 days or more.

Comparatively few household larceny victimizations—only 2 percent—caused persons to stay away from their jobs, and such work abstentions as occurred tended to be of short duration. There was no significant difference by race in the percent of victimizations in which household members lost worktime. The more costly larcenies, those involving the theft of items worth \$50 or more, were more apt (4 percent) to bring about worktime losses than was the case with those valued at less than \$50 (1 percent); based on less conclusive data, attempted larcenies also resulted in a higher rate of work loss (3) than did the completed larcenies of less than \$50. As for the length of time lost from work, the number of victimizations involving more than 5 days was based on too few sample cases to be statistically reliable, and those of less than 1 day outnumbered those of 1–5 days by approximately 2 to 1.

Time was lost from work by members of households that experienced motor vehicle theft in about 16 percent of the measured victimizations. Completed thefts were linked to a higher rate of worktime loss (22 percent) than attempted ones (5). Whereas about one-fourth of victimizations of black households caused losses of worktime, the figure for white households was 15 percent. About half of the motor vehicle thefts resulted in worktime losses of 1–5 days, followed by those in which less than 1 day (40 percent) and 6 days or more (9) were concerned.

### Crimes against commercial establishments

As a consequence of burglaries of commercial establishments, time was lost from work by persons—whether owners, operators, or employees of the firms concerned—in about 8 percent of the victimizations. For robberies of business places, the corresponding figure was some 11 percent. The worktime lost was about evenly divided between less than 1 day and 1 day or more.



## REPORTING OF VICTIMIZATIONS TO THE POLICE

The advent of victimization surveys makes possible for the first time the measurement of the volume of certain types of crime that are not reported to law enforcement authorities. Prior to these surveys, crime statistics reflected only those incidents that were reported to the police and that the police felt to be legitimate criminal offenses. The first victimization surveys revealed a large amount of crime not reported to the police.<sup>24</sup> This finding has been corroborated by results of the National Crime Panel surveys. In addition to determining the proportion of the relevant crimes which come to police attention, the surveys have been able to identify differences between the proportion, or rate, with which crimes against persons, households, and commercial establishments are brought to police attention and to report on the reasons for not notifying police. The 1973 national survey and surveys conducted in selected large cities during the years 1972-75 generally have shown that, among the measured crimes, those committed against persons were least likely to have been reported to the police, whereas crimes against businesses were most likely.

Survey interviewers asked respondents who had been victimized whether or not the police learned of the

offense, either as a result of personal notification by a member of the household, by someone else, or because the police were on the scene at the time of the crime; comparable information was obtained on burglary and robbery of places of business. In this report, however, the means by which police learned of the victimization are not distinguished, the overall proportion made known to them being of primary concern. Thus, when reference is made to the reporting of victimizations to the police, all methods mentioned above are included.

For each victimization listed as unreported to the police, interviewers recorded all reasons given by each respondent for having failed to report. As a result, the number of reasons cited exceeded that of applicable victimizations. For purposes of analysis, the text and accompanying data tables on reasons for not reporting refer to the percentage distribution of the sum of all responses.

### Crimes against persons

As indicated by the victims of one or more of the measured crimes against persons, the police were apprised or learned of the occurrence of some 28 percent of all recorded victimizations. Personal crimes of violence, however, were shown to have been reported relatively more often than personal crimes of theft, and

---

<sup>24</sup>President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, *The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society*, pp. 20-22, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1974.

this relationship held true irrespective of the sex, race, or age of the victim.

For all personal crimes combined, males and females reported their victimization experiences to the police in roughly equal proportions. When the race of victims was examined, no difference was evident in the reporting rates of whites or blacks with respect to total crimes against persons. For such crimes, victims age 12-19 were the least likely to have reported their experiences to the police, only 17 percent of the victimizations involving members of this age group having come to the attention of the authorities. The proportion increased for each of the next two age groups.

For all personal crimes, the type of locality of residence was not an important determinant of the likelihood of reporting a victimization to the police. Nevertheless, crimes committed against persons residing within the Nation's central cities were reported to the police slightly more often (29 percent) than those carried out against persons living in nonmetropolitan areas (27). Among suburbanites, the proportion of victimizations attended by police notification (28 percent) did not differ significantly from that for central city and nonmetropolitan area residents. Examination of reporting rates among central city residents grouped by size of place revealed that persons in cities of 50,000-249,999 inhabitants were less likely to have reported personal victimizations than those living in cities having populations of ½ to 1 million or 1 million or more.

Of the reasons given for not informing law enforcement authorities about personal victimizations, a majority fell into two categories—a belief that nothing could have been done about the crime (29 percent) and the feeling that the crime was not important enough to report (27). Fear of reprisal, the belief that the police would not want to be bothered, and a reluctance to take the time to report were infrequently cited. This response pattern was common to victims in central cities, irrespective of city size, to victims in metropolitan areas outside central cities, and to those in nonmetropolitan places.

### Personal crimes of violence

Some 45 percent of all violent crimes were brought to police attention. With respect to the specific types of crime, personal robbery was more likely to have been

reported than personal assault, but the proportion of rapes reported did not truly differ from that for either of the other two offenses. A higher proportion of violent crimes against females was reported than of that against males (49 and 42 percent, respectively); this also held true for robbery and assault, considered separately. The relationship between victim and offender appeared to influence the reporting of victimizations, those involving strangers having been reported more frequently (47 percent) than those between nonstrangers (41). This was true among male victims, and there was marginal indication that it was true for females as well. Irrespective of victim-offender relationship, violent crimes against females were better reported than those against males.

No statistically significant differences existed between the proportions of violent crimes brought to police attention by whites and blacks; this also was true for personal robbery and assault considered separately. Victimizations carried out against whites by strangers were more likely to have been reported (47 percent) than those committed by nonstrangers (39), but there was no corresponding difference among blacks. For violent crimes committed by strangers, there was no difference between the proportions reported by blacks and whites; however, victimizations of blacks by nonstrangers led to a higher degree of reporting (51 percent) than did the respective offenses against whites (39).

About one-third of all personal crimes of violence committed against youngsters age 12-19 were brought to police attention, a smaller proportion than for any of the older age groups. Robbery and assault victimizations of individuals in this age group also were least likely to have been reported. In addition, personal crimes of violence committed against victims age 12-19 and 20-34 were more likely to have been reported to the authorities if the offender was a stranger rather than a nonstranger; for persons in the two oldest age groups the apparent differences between reporting rates were not statistically significant.

The most common reason advanced for not reporting personal crimes of violence to the police was that the experience was not important enough (25 percent). Other frequently cited responses were that nothing could have been done and that the victimization was a private or personal matter. For crimes of violence involving strangers, the nonreporting of victimizations

was mainly attributed to the lack of importance attached to the event and to the belief that nothing could have been accomplished. On the other hand, when nonstrangers were involved, the most frequently cited response was that the victimization was a private or personal matter (30 percent).

For the population at large, approximately 44 percent of all rape victimizations were recorded as having been reported to the police. Among females alone, there was some indication that the proportion of stranger-to-stranger encounters brought to the attention of the police was effectively higher than that between nonstrangers.

The difference between the proportion of rape victimizations reported to law enforcement officers by white (41 percent) and black (52) victims was statistically insignificant. Rapes committed against persons in the youngest age group (12-19) were reported about 45 percent of the time, and those against persons 20-34 in about 38 percent of the cases; here again, however, no significant difference existed between the two proportions. There was some indication that rapes of residents of nonmetropolitan areas were reported more often (62 percent) than those of persons in the environs of metropolitan areas (38).

Among rape victims who failed to inform law enforcement authorities of the attack, the privacy of the matter was a frequently cited reason. Fear of reprisal and the belief that nothing could have been done also were relatively common responses. However, statistical significance was absent among apparent differences in the frequencies with which those reasons were given.

According to the survey, some 51 percent of all personal robbery victimizations were reported to the authorities. No statistically significant difference existed between the reporting rates for victims residing in metropolitan and nonmetropolitan areas. Robberies accompanied by victim injury produced a higher proportion of reporting (62 percent) than did those not characterized by victim injury (46). Robberies of females were more likely to have been reported (63 percent) than those of males (47), and stranger-to-stranger offenses were reported relatively more often (53) than those involving nonstrangers (41). Of robberies directed at males, a higher proportion of those between strangers were brought to police attention (49 percent) than those involving nonstrangers (32); for robberies of

females, the difference between the corresponding proportions was not significant. Whether or not the offender was known to the victim, robberies of females were more apt to have been reported than those of males.

For whites and blacks alike, law enforcement authorities were informed of the occurrence of about half of all personal robberies; no true difference existed between reporting rates by members of the two races for robbery with and without injury. In addition, for stranger-to-stranger robberies, there was no statistically significant difference between the percent of cases reported. However, blacks were more likely (63 percent) than whites (36) to have reported robberies committed by nonstrangers. Whites made known to police a higher proportion of robberies committed by strangers (55 percent) than those committed by nonstrangers (36), but for blacks the apparent difference between the corresponding proportions was not truly significant.

Overall, about three-tenths of the robberies carried out against persons age 12-19 were reported to the police, a much lower proportion than for any other age group. A similar pattern existed for robberies not attended by victim injury; and for robberies with injury, persons age 12-19 had a lower reporting rate than all others except individuals age 35-49.

The reason most frequently cited by victims for not reporting personal robbery to the police was the impression that nothing could have been done (31 percent); this was true as well for robbery without injury and, with less certainty, for robbery with injury. Stranger-to-stranger robberies showed a similar response pattern; for those involving nonstrangers, there was marginal indication that "private or personal matter" was the most common response.

As determined by the survey, about 43 percent of all assault victimizations were reported to the authorities. In relative terms, such notification attended aggravated assault (52 percent) more frequently than simple assault (37) and assault resulting in victim injury (53) more often than attempts at assault (39). Assaults against females were more apt to have been reported (47 percent) than assaults of males (41); this also was true for simple assault, attempted assault, and, with marginal certainty, aggravated assault.

The relationship between victim and offender did not appear to cause substantial variations in the report-

ing of assault victimizations to the police. When victim injury was present, however, the proportion of stranger-to-stranger assaults reported (57 percent) exceeded that of nonstranger assaults (48). Assaults of males by strangers were more likely to have been reported (43 percent) than those committed by nonstrangers (37); there was no corresponding difference for females. For assaults carried out by strangers, there was no significant difference between the proportions reported by male and female victims; for assaults involving nonstrangers, those against females were more apt to have been reported (47 percent) than those against males (37).

With respect to race, there was some indication that white victims of simple assault reported a higher proportion of the victimizations than black victims of the same crime. However, for all assaults, as well as for aggravated assault considered separately, there were no significant differences between the percentages for members of each race. Assaults against whites by strangers were more likely to have been reported (45 percent) than those carried out by nonstrangers (40); based on less conclusive data, the opposite was true for blacks. For victimizations in which the offender was a stranger, there was no statistically significant difference between the reporting rates by members of the two races, but for nonstranger assaults, blacks recorded a higher proportion of reporting (49 percent) than did whites (40).

Victims in the youngest age category reported the lowest proportion of assaults to the police (32 percent); this finding also applied to aggravated assault, except that the difference between reporting rates for persons in the youngest and oldest age groups was marginally significant. Assaults involving victims age 35-49 were more apt to have been reported (58 percent) than those carried out against persons age 20-34 and 50-64 (48 for both). Persons in each of the age groups, except 65 and over, reported aggravated assault relatively more often than simple assault; for those in the oldest group, the apparent difference between reporting rates lacked statistical significance. With regard to area of residence, assault victims living in nonmetropolitan areas informed authorities about the victimizations more often (46 percent) than did central city dwellers (41).

Of all reasons given by assault victims for not notifying law enforcement authorities, the largest proportion, 28 percent, was attributed to the belief that the event was not important enough. This response was the most frequently cited for simple assault, as well, and was one of the more common for aggravated assault.

## Personal crimes of theft

Approximately 22 percent of all personal crimes of theft enumerated in the survey were brought to the attention of law enforcement authorities. Personal larcenies characterized by contact between victim and offender were more apt to have been reported than larcenies without such contact. Males and females registered roughly equal reporting rates for all crimes of theft and for each of the two types of personal larceny crimes of theft against whites were reported relatively more frequently (22 percent) than the corresponding victimizations of blacks (19). About 12 percent of all crimes of theft carried out against persons age 12-19 were reported, roughly half the proportion of that for persons in the next older age group. A comparable pattern was evident for both larceny with and without contact. With regard to the victim's locality of residence persons in nonmetropolitan areas reported a slightly lower proportion of crimes of theft than did those residing in central cities or in the outlying communities within metropolitan areas.

The reason most often given for not reporting personal crimes of theft to the police was that nothing could have been done about the victimization (32 percent). This held true for larceny with and without contact. The next most frequent response recorded was that the victimization was not important enough (27 percent), followed by the reply that the crime was reported to someone else (20). Combined, these three responses accounted for about four-fifths of all the reasons given by victims. Fear of reprisal, reluctance to take the time, and the belief that the police would not want to be involved were infrequently cited.

About one-third of all larcenies with contact were brought to the attention of the authorities. No statistically significant differences in reporting were evident according to sex, race, and locality of residence.

Of the reasons given for not reporting larcenies with contact, the belief that nothing could have been done was the most common. Some 43 percent of all responses fell into this category.

About one-fifth of all victimizations involving personal larceny without contact were reported to the police, the lowest proportion among the five survey-measured crimes against persons. No true difference existed between the proportion reported for crimes against males and that against females; however, larcenies without contact carried out against whites were

more likely to have been reported than those directed at blacks (22 and 18 percent, respectively). Persons residing in nonmetropolitan areas recorded a lower proportion of reporting than those in communities surrounding central cities and, based on less conclusive data, within the central cities themselves.

Victims of larceny without contact who failed to inform the police of the victimization usually believed that nothing could have been done about the crime (32 percent). The next most common response was "not important enough" (28 percent) followed by "reported to someone else" (20).

## Crimes against households

Approximately 37 percent of the relevant household victimizations were reported to the police. Victimization directed at householders who owned or were buying their residence were reported at a slightly higher rate (38 percent) than those carried out against renters (36). Regardless of whether they were owners or renters, householders were most likely to have reported motor vehicle thefts, followed by burglary and household larceny. Overall, no statistically significant differences between rates of reporting were recorded for households headed by whites and for those headed by blacks, irrespective of the form of tenure. Among whites, homeowners had a higher proportion of reporting (38 percent) than renters (36); but, for blacks, there was no significant difference between the two tenure categories.

Law enforcement authorities were said to have been contacted in about 31 percent of all household victimizations carried out against families with annual incomes of less than \$3,000, a proportion that was lower than that for any other income group. Victimized households situated in nonmetropolitan areas had a lower rate of police reporting than did households in either of the two categories of metropolitan area, for which the percentages were not statistically different. Among victimized households located within central cities, those in communities of 1 million or more were more apt to have reported to the police than households in less populated cities.

Not surprisingly, the reporting of household victimizations varied in relation to the size of the loss. For all household crimes, the proportion reported rose sharply as the value of the loss increased, from a low of 11 percent for crimes involving losses of less than \$10 to a

high of 86 percent for those involving losses set at \$250 or more. This overall trend also was applicable to burglary and household larceny considered separately.

The majority of reasons given by victimized householders for not informing the police about their experiences were divided into two categories: a belief that nothing could have been done (36 percent) and a feeling that the victimization was not important enough (30). Responses indicating a fear of reprisal, a belief that authorities would not want to be bothered, or a reluctance to allocate the necessary time to report were far less numerous. No significant differences were evident in the relative distributions of reasons given by blacks and whites. Respondents from households with annual incomes of less than \$15,000 were more likely to have stated that nothing could have been done rather than the opinion that the victimization was unimportant; among the more affluent, however, there was no statistical difference between the frequency of the two responses. The overall distribution of reasons for not reporting household crimes changed in relation to the value of loss. As the value increased, the proportion of responses categorized as "not important enough" decreased, from a high of 37 percent for victimizations involving losses worth less than \$50 (including those of no value) to a low of 5 percent for victimizations with losses of \$250 or more. Also, householders who incurred losses of \$250 or more were more likely to have based their reticence on private or personal factors (18 percent) than was the case among those who suffered losses of less than \$50 (5 percent).

The two explanations most frequently offered by victimized householders in metropolitan and nonmetropolitan localities alike for failing to notify the authorities were that nothing could have been done about the offense and that it was not important enough to merit police attention. Respondents from households located within central cities and those from households in nonmetropolitan areas were most likely to have expressed the conviction that nothing could have been done about the crime. On the other hand, there was no significant difference between the frequency with which suburban householders gave the two leading reasons.

### Burglary

Of the more than 6.4 million burglaries carried out against households in 1973, approximately 46 percent were reported to law enforcement authorities. Some

seven-tenths of all forcible entries were brought to the attention of the police, a considerably higher proportion than that for unlawful entries (36 percent) or attempted forcible entries (30). Householders residing in owner-occupied homes were more apt to have reported all burglaries, as well as those involving forcible and unlawful entry considered separately, than families living in rental units. Regardless of the form of tenure, there were no significant differences between the overall burglary reporting rates by whites and blacks. Among whites, homeowners reported a higher proportion of burglaries to the police than renters (48 and 42 percent, respectively), but the apparent difference between the figures for black owners and renters lacked statistical significance.

Households in which annual family income was \$3,000 or more were more apt to have reported burglaries than those earning less than \$3,000; the relationship also applied to forcible entries and, based on less conclusive data, to unlawful entries. About nine-tenths of all burglary victimizations resulting in losses worth \$250 or more were reported to the police, the highest rate of reporting among the various loss categories. Burglaries with \$50-\$249 losses were the next best reported, whereas only about 18 percent of burglaries involving losses of less than \$10 came to police attention. The burglarizing of households located within central cities and surrounding metropolitan areas was more likely to have prompted police notification than was the case in nonmetropolitan areas.

The reasons given for failure to report household burglaries to the police reflected the opinions that nothing could have been done (36 percent) and that the victimization was not important enough to merit police attention (25). Other responses accounted for only a small share of the total. There were no statistically significant divergences in the answers of blacks and whites.

### Household larceny

During the 1973 reference period, roughly one-fourth of all household larcenies were reported to the authorities. Completed larcenies were brought to their attention relatively more frequently (25 percent) than attempted ones (20), and a higher proportion of completed larcenies resulting in losses set at \$50 or more were reported (52) than those involving smaller losses (15). With respect to tenure, homeowners reported a higher proportion of all larcenies and of completed larcenies than did renters. For attempted larceny,

however, there was no significant difference between the reporting rates of victimized owners and renters. Some one-fourth of the victimizations carried out against households headed by whites were reported to the police, compared to about 19 percent for blacks. In addition, white owners and renters were more likely than black householders in the corresponding tenure categories to have notified the police. When white households were examined separately, those owning their own dwelling had a higher rate of police reporting (26 percent) than renters (24); such was not the case among black owners and renters. Families earning less than \$3,000 annually registered the lowest reporting rate of any income group (19 percent).

Household larcenies involving losses worth less than \$10 were reported about 9 percent of the time; in contrast, approximately 63 percent of those resulting in a loss of \$250 or more were brought to police attention. Larcenies carried out against households located inside central cities were less apt to have been reported (23 percent) than those experienced by households in adjacent metropolitan communities (26) or, less conclusively, in nonmetropolitan areas (25) as well.

The reasons most frequently given for not reporting household larcenies to law enforcement officials were a feeling that nothing could have been done (36 percent), followed by a belief that the victimization was not very important (34). For black households, the first response (38 percent) was more common than the second (28), but for white households there was no significant difference between the two (36 and 35, respectively).

### Motor vehicle theft

Approximately two-thirds of all motor vehicle thefts were brought to the attention of the police. Some 86 percent of all completed thefts were reported to the police, whereas the relevant proportion for attempts was 32 percent. There were no statistically significant deviations in the overall reporting rates across income and tenure categories. There was some indication that blacks were more likely to have reported motor vehicle thefts than whites. Victimized householders within central cities recorded a higher rate of reporting (70 percent) than those in nonmetropolitan areas (59).

As was the case for household burglary and larceny, the most commonly cited reason for failure to report motor vehicle thefts was that nothing could have been done (37 percent). The insignificance of the event was the next most common response (23 percent).



## Crimes against commercial establishments

According to the survey, approximately eight-tenths of the 1.6 million measured victimizations of places of business were reported to law enforcement authorities.

Broken down by type of crime, 86 percent of all robberies and 79 percent of the burglaries were reported. The failure to report robberies and burglaries of commercial establishments was most often attributed to the belief that there was nothing that could have been done and to the feeling that the crime was not important enough.



## APPENDIX I

### SURVEY DATA TABLES

The statistical data tables in this appendix contain results of the National Crime Panel surveys for calendar year 1973. They are grouped along topical lines, generally paralleling the sequence of discussion in the section entitled "Detailed Findings."

All statistical data generated by the surveys are estimates that vary in their degree of reliability and are subject to variances, or errors, associated with the fact that they were derived from sample surveys rather than complete enumerations. The constraints on interpretation and other uses of the data, as well as guidelines for determining their reliability, are set forth in Appendix III (personal and household sectors) and Appendix IV (commercial sector). As a general rule, however, estimates for each of the sectors based on zero or about 10 or fewer sample cases have been considered unreliable. Such estimates, qualified by means of footnotes to the data tables, were not used for analytical purposes in this report. For data pertaining to the personal and household sectors, a minimum estimate of 10,000, as well as rates or percentages based on such a figure, was considered reliable. For commercial data, the corresponding figure was 5,000.

Victimization rate tables 3 through 28 parenthetically display the size of each group for which a rate was computed; as with the rates, these control figures are

estimates. On tables dealing with personal crimes, the control figures reflect estimation adjustments based on a post-Census population estimate. For household and commercial victimization rates, the control numbers were generated by the surveys themselves.

#### General findings (Tables 1 and 2)

These two tables display the number and percent distribution of victimizations, as well as rates of victimization. Each table covers all measured crimes, broken out to the maximum extent possible insofar as the forms, or subcategories, of each crime are concerned.

#### Victim characteristics (Tables 3-24)

The tables contain victimization rate figures for crimes against persons age 12 and over (3-13), households (14-23), and commercial establishments (24).

#### Victimization of central city, suburban, and nonmetropolitan residents (Tables 25-28)

Tables are based on victimization rates by SMSA locality variables. They cover crimes against persons and households.

**Victim-offender relationship in  
personal crimes of violence  
(Tables 29-33)**

There is one victimization rate table, and four percentage distribution tables reflect victim characteristics for violent crimes involving strangers.

**Offender characteristics in  
personal crimes of violence  
(Tables 34-41)**

Four tables present information on the offenders only and four have data on the characteristics of both victims and offenders. A basic distinction also is made between single- and multiple-offender victimizations.

**Crime characteristics (Tables 42-80)**

Tables 42-44 support the discussion of the distinc-

tion between victimizations and incidents, as they relate to crimes against persons. Major topical areas covered by the remaining tables include: time of occurrence (45-47); place of occurrence (48-52); number of offenders (53); use of weapons (54-56); physical injury to victims (57-62); economic losses (63-73); and time lost from work (74-80). As applicable, the tables cover crimes against persons, households, and places of business, or on parts of those sectors (e.g., commercial robbery). When the data were compatible in terms of subject matter and variable categories, more than one sector was included on a table.

**Reporting of victimizations  
to the police  
(Tables 81-100)**

Information is displayed on the extent of reporting and on reasons for failure to report. Certain of the tables display data on more than one sector.

**Table 1. Personal, household, and commercial crimes: Number and percent distribution of victimizations, by sector and type of crime, 1973**

Sector and type of crime	Number	Percent of crimes within sector	Percent of all crimes
All crimes	37,656,900	...	100.0
Personal sector	20,653,600	100.0	54.8
Crimes of violence	5,493,600	26.6	14.6
Rape	159,700	0.8	0.4
Completed rape	46,400	0.2	0.1
Attempted rape	113,300	0.5	0.3
Robbery	1,120,100	5.4	3.0
Robbery with injury	385,900	1.9	1.0
From serious assault	210,300	1.0	0.6
From minor assault	175,600	0.9	0.5
Robbery without injury	734,200	3.6	1.9
Assault	4,213,800	20.4	11.2
Aggravated assault	1,681,200	8.1	4.5
With injury	545,300	2.6	1.4
Attempted assault with weapon	1,135,900	5.5	3.0
Simple assault	2,532,700	12.3	6.7
With injury	625,600	3.0	1.7
Attempted assault without weapon	1,907,100	9.2	5.1
Crimes of theft	15,160,000	73.4	40.3
Personal larceny with contact	512,400	2.5	1.4
Purse snatching	179,000	0.9	0.5
Completed purse snatching	106,200	0.5	0.3
Attempted purse snatching	72,900	0.4	0.2
Pocket picking	333,300	1.6	0.9
Personal larceny without contact	14,647,600	70.9	38.9
Total population age 12 and over	162,236,300	...	...
Household sector	15,354,200	100.0	40.8
Burglary	6,433,000	41.9	17.1
Forcible entry	2,043,700	13.3	5.4
Unlawful entry without force	2,955,400	19.2	7.8
Attempted forcible entry	1,434,000	9.3	3.8
Household larceny	7,590,700	49.4	20.2
Less than \$50	4,887,200	31.8	13.0
\$50 or more	1,887,000	12.3	5.0
Amount not available	271,500	1.8	0.7
Attempted larceny	545,100	3.6	1.4
Motor vehicle theft	1,330,500	8.7	3.5
Completed theft	865,300	5.6	2.3
Attempted theft	465,300	3.0	1.2
Total number of households	69,421,700	...	...
Commercial sector	1,649,100	100.0	4.4
Burglary	1,385,000	84.0	3.7
Completed burglary	1,029,100	62.4	2.7
Attempted burglary	355,900	21.6	0.9
Robbery	264,100	16.0	0.7
Completed robbery	196,000	11.9	0.5
Attempted robbery	68,100	4.1	0.2
Total number of commercial establishments	6,799,900	...	...

NOTE: Detail may not add to total shown because of rounding. Percent distribution based on unrounded figures.

.... Represents not applicable.

**Table 2. Personal, household, and commercial crimes: Victimization rates, by sector and type of crime, 1973**

Sector and type of crime	Rate	Base of rate
<b>Personal sector</b>		
Crimes of violence	34	Per 1,000 persons age 12 and over
Rape	1	
Completed rape	2	
Attempted rape	1	
Robbery	7	
Robbery with injury	2	
From serious assault	1	
From minor assault	1	
Robbery without injury	5	
Assault	26	
Aggravated assault	10	
With injury	3	
Attempted assault with weapon	7	
Simple assault	16	
With injury	4	
Attempted assault without weapon	12	
Crimes of theft	93	
Personal larceny with contact	3	
Purse snatching	1	
Completed purse snatching	1	
Attempted purse snatching	2	
Pocket picking	2	
Personal larceny without contact	90	
<b>Household sector</b>		
Burglary	93	Per 1,000 households
Forcible entry	29	
Unlawful entry without force	43	
Attempted forcible entry	21	
Household larceny	109	
Less than \$50	70	
\$50 or more	27	
Amount not available	4	
Attempted larceny	8	
Motor vehicle theft	19	
Completed theft	12	
Attempted theft	7	
<b>Commercial sector</b>		
Burglary	204	Per 1,000 commercial establishments
Completed burglary	151	
Attempted burglary	52	
Robbery	39	
Completed robbery	29	
Attempted robbery	10	

NOTE: Detail may not add to total shown because of rounding.  
Z Less than 0.5 per 1,000.

**Table 3. Personal crimes: Victimization rates for persons age 12 and over, by type of crime and sex of victims, 1973**

(Rate per 1,000 population age 12 and over)

Type of crime	Both sexes (162,236,300)	Male (77,161,000)	Female (85,075,300)
Crimes of violence	34	46	23
Rape	1	12	2
Completed rape	2	12	1
Attempted rape	1	12	1
Robbery	7	10	4
Robbery with injury	2	3	1
From serious assault	1	2	1
From minor assault	1	1	1
Robbery without injury	5	7	2
Assault	26	36	17
Aggravated assault	10	16	6
With injury	3	5	2
Attempted assault with weapon	7	11	4
Simple assault	16	20	12
With injury	4	4	3
Attempted assault without weapon	12	16	8
Crimes of theft	93	106	82
Personal larceny with contact	3	3	4
Purse snatching	1	2	2
Pocket picking	2	3	1
Personal larceny without contact	90	103	79

NOTE: Detail may not add to total shown because of rounding. Numbers in parentheses refer to population in the group.

Z Less than 0.5 per 1,000.

<sup>1</sup>Estimate, based on about 10 or fewer sample cases, is statistically unreliable.

**Table 4. Personal crimes: Victimization rates for persons age 12 and over, by type of crime and age of victims, 1973**

(Rate per 1,000 population in each group)

Type of crime	12-15 (16,558,600)	16-19 (15,583,900)	20-24 (17,344,600)	25-34 (28,140,600)	35-49 (33,836,400)	50-64 (30,500,500)	65 and over (20,271,800)
Crimes of violence	60	68	64	36	22	13	9
Rape	1	3	3	1	<sup>1</sup> 2	<sup>1</sup> 2	<sup>1</sup> 2
Robbery	12	10	11	6	5	4	5
Robbery with injury	3	4	4	2	2	2	2
From serious assault	1	2	2	1	1	1	1
From minor assault	2	2	2	1	1	1	1
Robbery without injury	9	6	7	4	3	2	3
Assault	47	55	50	29	16	8	4
Aggravated assault	16	25	22	12	7	3	1
With injury	6	8	7	4	2	1	1
Attempted assault with weapon	10	17	14	8	5	2	1
Simple assault	31	31	29	17	10	6	2
With injury	9	9	7	4	2	1	<sup>1</sup> 2
Attempted assault without weapon	22	22	22	13	8	5	2
Crimes of theft	174	169	137	100	74	48	23
Personal larceny with contact	2	4	5	3	2	3	4
Purse snatching	1	1	1	1	1	1	2
Pocket picking	1	3	3	2	1	2	2
Personal larceny without contact	174	164	132	97	72	44	19

NOTE: Detail may not add to total shown because of rounding. Numbers in parentheses refer to population in the group.

Z Less than 0.5 per 1,000.

<sup>1</sup>Estimate, based on about 10 or fewer sample cases, is statistically unreliable.

**Table 5. Personal crimes: Victimization rates for persons age 12 and over, by sex and age of victims and type of crime, 1973**

(Rate per 1,000 population in each group)

Sex and age	Crimes of violence	Rape	Robbery			Assault			Crimes of theft	Personal larceny	
			Total	With injury	Without injury	Total	Aggravated	Simple		With contact	Without contact
<b>Male</b>											
12-15 (8,415,000)	80	<sup>1</sup> 2	20	5	15	60	22	38	187	2	185
16-19 (7,712,400)	93	<sup>1</sup> 0	15	5	10	77	39	39	193	6	188
20-24 (8,330,100)	88	<sup>1</sup> 2	18	6	12	70	33	37	159	4	154
25-34 (13,708,400)	48	<sup>1</sup> 2	8	2	6	40	17	22	113	2	111
35-49 (16,280,600)	27	<sup>1</sup> 0	7	3	4	20	9	11	77	1	76
50-64 (14,343,900)	18	<sup>1</sup> 0	6	3	3	11	4	8	50	3	47
65 and over (8,370,600)	11	<sup>1</sup> 0	6	2	4	5	1	4	29	3	26
<b>Female</b>											
12-15 (8,143,600)	40	2	4	<sup>1</sup> 1	3	34	10	24	164	2	162
16-19 (7,871,500)	44	5	5	2	3	34	11	23	145	3	142
20-24 (9,014,500)	43	5	5	2	3	32	11	21	116	5	112
25-34 (14,432,200)	26	2	4	2	2	19	6	13	88	4	84
35-49 (17,555,700)	17	<sup>1</sup> 2	3	1	2	13	5	9	70	3	67
50-64 (16,156,600)	8	<sup>1</sup> 2	3	1	2	6	1	4	46	4	42
65 and over (11,901,200)	7	<sup>1</sup> 2	4	1	2	3	1	2	19	4	15

NOTE: Detail may not add to total shown because of rounding. Numbers in parentheses refer to population in the group.

Z Less than 0.5 per 1,000.

<sup>1</sup>Estimate, based on zero or on about 10 or fewer sample cases, is statistically unreliable.

**Table 6. Personal crimes: Victimization rates for persons age 12 and over, by type of crime and race of victims, 1973**

(Rate per 1,000 population age 12 and over)

Type of crime	White	Black	Other
	(143,217,000)	(17,107,300)	(1,912,100)
Crimes of violence	32	47	26
Rape	1	2	11
Robbery	6	14	10
Robbery with injury	2	5	14
From serious assault	1	3	12
From minor assault	1	2	12
Robbery without injury	4	9	16
Assault	26	31	16
Aggravated assault	10	18	13
With injury	3	6	12
Attempted assault with weapon	7	12	11
Simple assault	16	13	13
With injury	4	3	12
Attempted assault without weapon	12	10	11
Crimes of theft	95	85	70
Personal larceny with contact	3	7	6
Purse snatching	1	2	12
Pocket picking	2	5	14
Personal larceny without contact	92	78	64

NOTE: Detail may not add to total shown because of rounding. Numbers in parentheses refer to population in the group.

<sup>1</sup>Estimate, based on about 10 or fewer sample cases, is statistically unreliable.

**Table 7. Personal crimes: Victimization rates for persons age 12 and over, by type of crime and sex and race of victims, 1973**

(Rate per 1,000 population age 12 and over)

Type of crime	Male		Female	
	White	Black	White	Black
	(68,484,400)	(7,748,700)	(74,732,600)	(9,358,600)
Crimes of violence	45	59	21	37
Rape	2	2	2	3
Robbery	9	23	3	7
Robbery with injury	3	8	1	3
Robbery without injury	6	15	2	5
Assault	36	36	16	26
Aggravated assault	15	25	5	13
Simple assault	21	12	11	14
Crimes of theft	107	102	84	71
Personal larceny with contact	2	8	3	6
Personal larceny without contact	104	93	81	66

NOTE: Detail may not add to total shown because of rounding. Numbers in parentheses refer to population in the group.

Z Less than 0.5 per 1,000.



Table 8. Personal crimes: Victimization rates for persons age 12 and over, by race and age of victims and type of crime, 1973

(Rate per 1,000 population in each group)

Race and age	Crimes of violence	Rape	Robbery			Assault			Crimes of theft	Personal larceny	
			Total	With injury	Without injury	Total	Aggravated	Simple		With contact	Without contact
White											
12-15 (14,093,000)	58	1	11	3	8	45	14	31	186	2	184
16-19 (13,344,000)	68	2	9	3	6	56	23	33	178	5	173
20-24 (15,072,000)	65	3	10	4	6	52	21	31	138	4	135
25-34 (24,754,500)	36	1	6	2	4	29	11	18	101	2	98
35-49 (29,905,100)	20	<sup>1</sup> Z	4	1	2	16	6	10	75	2	74
50-64 (27,591,000)	12	<sup>1</sup> Z	4	2	2	8	2	6	49	3	46
65 and over (18,457,400)	8	<sup>1</sup> Z	4	1	2	3	1	2	22	3	19
Black											
12-15 (2,280,400)	78	12	18	6	13	58	27	31	117	13	114
16-19 (2,071,200)	74	5	15	6	10	54	37	17	113	13	110
20-24 (2,022,200)	64	<sup>1</sup> 3	19	6	13	42	25	17	135	13	123
25-34 (2,877,600)	44	13	12	4	8	29	18	11	103	7	96
35-49 (3,463,500)	37	<sup>1</sup> Z	14	6	8	23	14	9	64	5	59
50-64 (3,692,800)	20	10	11	<sup>1</sup> 3	8	9	5	4	41	10	31
65 and over (1,699,600)	18	10	12	<sup>1</sup> 4	9	6	<sup>1</sup> 3	12	30	9	21

NOTE: Detail may not add to total shown because of rounding. Numbers in parentheses refer to population in the group.

Z Less than 0.5 per 1,000.

<sup>1</sup>Estimate, based on zero or on about 10 or fewer sample cases, is statistically unreliable.

**Table 9. Personal crimes: Victimization rates for persons age 12 and over, by race, sex, and age of victims and type of crime, 1973**

(Rate per 1,000 population in each group)

Race, sex, and age	Crimes of violence	Crimes of theft
<b>White</b>		
<b>Male</b>		
12-15 (7,186,600)	77	200
16-19 (6,633,800)	94	203
20-24 (7,318,400)	87	157
25-34 (12,198,200)	49	113
35-49 (14,538,000)	25	77
50-64 (13,022,300)	17	50
65 and over (7,587,000)	9	28
<b>Female</b>		
12-15 (6,906,400)	38	171
16-19 (6,710,200)	42	154
20-24 (7,753,600)	43	120
25-34 (12,556,300)	23	88
35-49 (15,367,100)	15	73
50-64 (14,568,600)	8	47
65 and over (10,870,400)	6	18
<b>Black</b>		
<b>Male</b>		
12-15 (1,143,100)	102	110
16-19 (991,200)	88	137
20-24 (891,400)	97	183
25-34 (1,268,000)	38	117
35-49 (1,520,600)	43	80
50-64 (1,217,900)	31	51
65 and over (716,500)	28	42
<b>Female</b>		
12-15 (1,137,300)	54	124
16-19 (1,080,000)	62	90
20-24 (1,130,800)	38	97
25-34 (1,609,500)	49	92
35-49 (1,943,000)	33	52
50-64 (1,474,900)	11	32
65 and over (983,100)	11	22

NOTE: Numbers in parentheses refer to population in the group.

**Table 10. Personal crimes: Victimization rates for persons age 12 and over, by type of crime and marital status of victims, 1973**

(Rate per 1,000 population age 12 and over)

Type of crime	Never married (46,083,900)	Married (95,594,600)	Widowed (11,496,100)	Divorced and separated (8,641,600)
Crimes of violence	61	20	14	73
Rape	2	Z	1Z	4
Robbery	12	4	6	16
Robbery with injury	4	1	2	6
From serious assault	2	1	1	4
From minor assault	2	Z	1	2
Robbery without injury	8	3	3	10
Assault	47	16	7	53
Aggravated assault	19	6	3	22
With injury	6	2	1	9
Attempted assault with weapon	13	4	2	12
Simple assault	28	9	5	32
With injury	7	2	1	10
Attempted assault without weapon	21	7	3	21
Crimes of theft	155	69	33	111
Personal larceny with contact	4	2	5	8
Purse snatching	1	1	3	4
Pocket picking	3	1	2	4
Personal larceny without contact	151	67	29	103

NOTE: Detail may not add to total shown because of rounding. Numbers in parentheses refer to population in the group; excludes data on persons whose marital status was not ascertained.

Z Less than 0.5 per 1,000.

<sup>1</sup>Estimate, based on about 10 or fewer sample cases, is statistically unreliable.

**Table 11. Personal crimes: Victimization rates for persons age 12 and over, by sex and marital status of victims and type of crime, 1973**

(Rate per 1,000 population age 12 and over)

Sex and marital status	Crimes of violence	Rape	Robbery			Assault			Crimes of theft	Personal larceny	
			Total	With injury	Without injury	Total	Aggravated	Simple		With contact	Without contact
<b>Male</b>											
Never married (24,290,500)	80	12	18	6	12	62	27	35	170	4	166
Married (47,858,900)	28	12	6	2	4	22	10	12	74	2	72
Widowed (1,811,400)	29	10	16	7	9	14	15	8	39	15	34
Divorced and separated (3,008,700)	80	10	24	9	15	56	27	29	129	7	121
<b>Female</b>											
Never married (21,793,400)	40	4	5	2	3	31	9	22	138	4	134
Married (47,735,700)	12	1	2	1	1	9	3	6	65	2	63
Widowed (9,684,700)	11	12	4	1	3	6	2	4	32	5	28
Divorced and separated (5,633,000)	69	6	12	5	7	52	19	33	102	8	93

NOTE: Detail may not add to total shown because of rounding. Numbers in parentheses refer to population in the group; excludes data on persons whose marital status was not ascertained.

Z Less than 0.5 per 1,000.

<sup>1</sup>Estimate, based on zero or on about 10 or fewer sample cases, is statistically unreliable.

**Table 12. Personal crimes: Victimization rates for persons age 12 and over, by type of crime and annual family income of victims, 1973**

(Rate per 1,000 population age 12 and over)

Type of crime	Less than \$3,000 (15,712,400)	\$3,000-\$7,499 (38,487,100)	\$7,500-\$9,999 (19,800,300)	\$10,000-\$14,999 (41,288,300)	\$15,000-\$24,999 (27,722,800)	\$25,000 or more (8,878,000)
<b>Crimes of violence</b>	50	39	33	30	28	25
Rape	2	1	1	1	1	12
<b>Robbery</b>	12	8	7	6	5	5
Robbery with injury	5	3	3	2	2	2
From serious assault	2	1	1	1	1	12
From minor assault	2	1	1	1	1	1
Robbery without injury	7	5	4	4	3	1
<b>Assault</b>	37	29	25	23	22	4
Aggravated assault	17	13	10	9	7	20
With injury	7	5	3	3	2	7
Attempted assault with weapon	10	8	7	6	5	2
Simple assault	20	16	15	15	15	5
With injury	6	5	3	3	3	13
Attempted assault without weapon	14	12	12	12	12	3
<b>Crimes of theft</b>	78	79	90	98	112	10
Personal larceny with contact	7	4	3	2	2	131
Purse snatching	2	2	1	1	1	3
Pocket picking	4	2	2	1	2	11
Personal larceny without contact	72	75	87	96	111	2

NOTE: Detail may not add to total shown because of rounding. Numbers in parentheses refer to population in the group; excludes data on persons whose income level was not ascertained.

Z Less than 0.5 per 1,000.

<sup>1</sup>Estimate, based on about 10 or fewer sample cases, is statistically unreliable.

**Table 13. Personal crimes: Victimization rates for persons age 12 and over, by race and annual family income of victims and type of crime, 1973**

(Rate per 1,000 population age 12 and over)

Race and income	Crimes of violence	Rape	Robbery			Assault			Crimes of theft	Personal larceny	
			Total	With injury	Without injury	Total	Aggravated	Simple		With contact	Without contact
<b>White</b>											
Less than \$3,000 (11,940,500)	46	2	10	4	6	34	14	21	80	5	75
\$3,000-\$7,499 (31,527,900)	37	1	7	2	4	29	11	17	78	3	75
\$7,500-\$9,999 (17,654,400)	33	1	6	3	4	26	10	16	91	3	88
\$10,000-\$14,999 (38,160,100)	30	1	5	1	4	24	9	15	98	2	96
\$15,000-\$24,999 (26,090,400)	28	1	4	1	3	23	7	15	113	2	111
\$25,000 or more (8,572,500)	25	Z	5	1	3	20	7	13	132	4	128
<b>Black</b>											
Less than \$3,000 (3,582,000)	63	3	16	5	11	44	26	18	70	11	59
\$3,000-\$7,499 (6,553,500)	49	11	14	5	9	33	21	12	81	7	74
\$7,500-\$9,999 (1,900,300)	29	11	11	13	8	17	9	8	86	7	79
\$10,000-\$14,999 (2,647,500)	37	10	16	6	10	21	9	12	104	4	100
\$15,000-\$24,999 (1,278,900)	28	12	12	14	8	14	17	17	122	13	119
\$25,000 or more (198,400)	55	10	111	16	16	144	133	111	102	10	102

NOTE: Detail may not add to total shown because of rounding. Numbers in parentheses refer to population in the group; excludes data on persons whose income level was not ascertained.

Z Less than 0.5 per 1,000.

<sup>1</sup>Estimate, based on zero or on about 10 or fewer sample cases, is statistically unreliable.

**Table 14. Household crimes: Victimization rates, by type of crime and race of head of household, 1973**

(Rate per 1,000 households)

Type of crime	All races (69,421,700)	White (61,704,600)	Black (6,998,700)	Other (718,400)
Burglary	93	88	135	105
Forcible entry	29	26	63	32
Unlawful entry without force	43	43	37	49
Attempted forcible entry	21	19	36	24
Household larceny	109	110	110	85
Less than \$50	70	71	68	46
\$50 or more	27	27	32	25
Amount not available	4	4	5	15
Attempted larceny	8	8	5	19
Motor vehicle theft	19	18	24	35
Completed theft	12	12	17	21
Attempted theft	7	7	7	14

NOTE: Detail may not add to total shown because of rounding. Numbers in parentheses refer to households in the group.

<sup>1</sup>Estimate, based on about 10 or fewer sample cases, is statistically unreliable.

Table 15. Motor vehicle theft: Victimization rates on the basis of theft per 1,000 households and of thefts per 1,000 vehicles owned, by selected household characteristics, 1973

Characteristic	Rate per 1,000 households	Rate per 1,000 motor vehicles owned
Race of head of household		
All races <sup>1</sup>	19	13
White	18	12
Black	24	26
Age of head of household		
12-19	39	39
20-34	29	19
35-49	21	12
50-64	16	10
65 and over	5	6
Form of tenure		
Owned or being bought	15	9
Rented	27	25

<sup>1</sup>Includes data on "other" races, not shown separately.

Table 16. Household crimes: Victimization rates, by type of crime and age of head of household, 1973

(Rate per 1,000 households)

Type of crime	12-19 (1,047,100)	20-34 (19,283,600)	35-49 (18,079,200)	50-64 (17,542,200)	65 and over (13,469,700)
Burglary	219	123	101	72	55
Forcible entry	64	40	30	23	18
Unlawful entry without force	124	52	52	33	24
Attempted forcible entry	31	31	19	16	13
Household larceny	209	151	128	85	48
Less than \$50	133	96	82	55	34
\$50 or more	51	39	35	20	8
Amount not available	17	5	4	3	3
Attempted larceny	19	12	7	6	4
Motor vehicle theft	39	29	21	16	5
Completed theft	26	18	14	11	3
Attempted theft	13	11	7	5	2

NOTE: Detail may not add to total shown because of rounding. Numbers in parentheses refer to households in the group.

<sup>1</sup>Estimate, based on about 10 or fewer sample cases, is statistically unreliable.

Table 17. Household crimes: Victimization rates, by type of crime and annual family income, 1973

(Rate per 1,000 households)

Type of crime	Less than \$3,000 (9,707,300)	\$3,000-\$7,499 (17,990,400)	\$7,500-\$9,999 (8,308,800)	\$10,000-\$14,999 (15,873,500)	\$15,000-\$24,999 (9,852,600)	\$25,000 or more (3,054,800)
Burglary	111	97	88	77	93	112
Forcible entry	36	34	27	24	27	28
Unlawful entry without force	49	41	40	36	47	65
Attempted forcible entry	26	22	20	17	19	19
Household larceny	89	110	118	117	119	123
Less than \$50	61	72	76	75	76	75
\$50 or more	19	25	30	29	33	38
Amount not available	4	4	4	4	2	4
Attempted larceny	6	9	8	9	7	6
Motor vehicle theft	11	16	23	23	24	24
Completed theft	8	12	14	14	14	15
Attempted theft	3	4	9	8	10	9

NOTE: Detail may not add to total shown because of rounding. Numbers in parentheses refer to households in the group; excludes data on persons whose income level was not ascertained.

Table 18. Household burglary: Victimization rates, by race of head of household, annual family income, and type of burglary, 1973

(Rate per 1,000 households)

Race and income	All burglaries	Forcible entry	Unlawful entry without force	Attempted forcible entry
White				
Less than \$3,000 (7,697,700)	103	31	49	23
\$3,000-\$7,499 (15,277,400)	91	28	42	21
\$7,500-\$9,999 (7,510,900)	83	23	42	18
\$10,000-\$14,999 (14,775,700)	73	21	36	17
\$15,000-\$24,999 (9,299,800)	90	25	47	18
\$25,000 or more (2,960,100)	113	28	66	18
Black				
Less than \$3,000 (1,900,600)	138	54	47	38
\$3,000-\$7,499 (2,547,900)	129	65	33	31
\$7,500-\$9,999 (713,300)	144	75	24	45
\$10,000-\$14,999 (930,600)	129	60	38	31
\$15,000-\$24,999 (448,700)	152	82	37	33
\$25,000 or more (59,900)	104	141	140	123

NOTE: Detail may not add to total shown because of rounding. Numbers in parentheses refer to households in the group; excludes data on persons whose income level was not ascertained.

<sup>1</sup>Estimate, based on about 10 or fewer sample cases, is statistically unreliable.

Table 19. Household larceny: Victimization rates, by race of head of household, annual family income, and type of larceny, 1973

(Rate per 1,000 households)

Race and income	All household larcenies <sup>1</sup>	Completed larceny		Attempted larceny
		Less than \$50	\$50 or more	
<b>White</b>				
Less than \$3,000 (7,697,700)	88	59	19	7
\$3,000-\$7,499 (15,277,400)	109	73	23	9
\$7,500-\$9,999 (7,510,900)	121	77	30	9
\$10,000-\$14,999 (14,775,700)	116	75	28	9
\$15,000-\$24,999 (9,299,800)	117	76	32	7
\$25,000 or more (2,960,100)	124	76	38	6
<b>Black</b>				
Less than \$3,000 (1,900,600)	96	66	18	6
\$3,000-\$7,499 (2,547,900)	113	66	36	5
\$7,500-\$9,999 (713,300)	96	60	32	23
\$10,000-\$14,999 (930,600)	128	78	39	24
\$15,000-\$24,999 (448,700)	154	89	58	25
\$25,000 or more (59,900)	273	257	216	20

NOTE: Detail may not add to total shown because of rounding. Numbers in parentheses refer to households in the group; excludes data on persons whose income level was not ascertained.

<sup>1</sup>Includes data, not shown separately, on larcenies for which the value of loss was not ascertained.

<sup>2</sup>Estimate, based on zero or on about 10 or fewer sample cases, is statistically unreliable.

Table 20. Motor vehicle theft: Victimization rates, by race of head of household, annual family income, and type of theft, 1973

(Rate per 1,000 households)

Race and income	All vehicle thefts	Completed theft	Attempted theft
<b>White</b>			
Less than \$3,000 (7,697,700)	10	8	3
\$3,000-\$7,499 (15,277,400)	15	11	4
\$7,500-\$9,999 (7,510,900)	22	14	8
\$10,000-\$14,999 (14,775,700)	21	13	8
\$15,000-\$24,999 (9,299,800)	23	13	9
\$25,000 or more (2,960,100)	23	14	9
<b>Black</b>			
Less than \$3,000 (1,900,600)	12	10	12
\$3,000-\$7,499 (2,547,900)	18	14	4
\$7,500-\$9,999 (713,300)	36	18	17
\$10,000-\$14,999 (930,600)	46	34	13
\$15,000-\$24,999 (448,700)	40	118	122
\$25,000 or more (59,900)	156	138	119

NOTE: Detail may not add to total shown because of rounding. Numbers in parentheses refer to households in the group; excludes data on persons whose income level was not ascertained.

<sup>1</sup>Estimate, based on about 10 or fewer sample cases, is statistically unreliable.

Table 21. Household crimes: Victimization rates,  
by type of crime and number of persons  
in household, 1973

(Rate per 1,000 households)

Type of crime	One (13,647,900)	Two-three (33,781,600)	Four-five (16,402,400)	Six or more (5,586,000)
Burglary	93	87	95	120
Forcible entry	34	30	24	30
Unlawful entry without force	37	37	51	69
Attempted forcible entry	21	20	20	21
Household larceny	64	100	142	180
Less than \$50	42	64	93	110
\$50 or more	13	24	35	55
Amount not available	3	4	5	4
Attempted larceny	5	8	8	12
Motor vehicle theft	11	19	24	26
Completed theft	7	12	16	19
Attempted theft	5	7	8	7

NOTE: Detail may not add to total shown because of rounding. Numbers in parentheses refer to households in the group; excludes data on households whose number of persons could not be ascertained.

Table 22. Household crimes: Victimization rates, by type of crime, form of tenure,  
and race of head of household, 1973

(Rate per 1,000 households)

Type of crime	Owned or being bought			Rented		
	All races <sup>1</sup> (44,646,800)	White (41,143,200)	Black (3,180,400)	All races <sup>1</sup> (24,774,900)	White (20,561,400)	Black (3,818,200)
Burglary	78	74	125	119	114	144
Forcible entry	24	21	64	40	35	62
Unlawful entry without force	38	38	33	51	54	40
Attempted forcible entry	17	16	27	28	25	42
Household larceny	101	99	126	124	130	96
Less than \$50	66	65	79	78	83	58
\$50 or more	25	23	39	32	33	27
Amount not available	4	3	4	5	4	5
Attempted larceny	7	7	4	9	10	5
Motor vehicle theft	15	14	24	27	27	24
Completed theft	9	9	16	18	18	17
Attempted theft	6	5	8	9	9	7

NOTE: Detail may not add to total shown because of rounding. Numbers in parentheses refer to households in the group.

<sup>1</sup>Includes data on "other" races, not shown separately.



Table 23. Household victimization rates, by type of crime and number of units in structure occupied by household, 1973

(Rate per 1,000 households)

Type of crime	One <sup>1</sup> (49,510,700)	Two (5,552,800)	Three (1,589,000)	Four (2,120,100)	Five-nine (3,063,800)	Ten or more (6,579,600)	Other than housing units (479,200)
Burglary	85	98	111	123	126	110	154
Forcible entry	26	35	46	42	49	34	22
Unlawful entry without force	41	39	36	45	48	51	121
Attempted forcible entry	18	23	29	35	28	25	211
Household larceny	110	93	98	160	129	96	130
Less than \$50	71	62	66	106	79	55	87
\$50 or more	27	21	21	40	33	30	31
Amount not available	4	4	6	25	4	3	24
Attempted larceny	8	5	25	10	12	9	27
Motor vehicle theft	15	28	39	24	32	28	214
Completed theft	10	19	25	18	22	17	29
Attempted theft	6	8	15	6	9	11	25

NOTE: Detail may not add to total shown because of rounding. Numbers in parentheses refer to households in the group; excludes data on households whose number of units in structure could not be ascertained.

<sup>1</sup>Includes data on mobile homes, not shown separately.

<sup>2</sup>Estimate, based on about 10 or fewer sample cases, is statistically unreliable.

Table 24. Commercial crimes: Victimization rates, by characteristics of victimized establishments and type of crime, 1973

(Rate per 1,000 establishments)

Characteristic	Burglary	Robbery
Kind of establishment		
All establishments (6,799,900)	204	39
Retail (2,551,000)	262	66
Wholesale (327,200)	194	23
Service (2,649,600)	178	25
Other (1,272,000)	141	17
Gross annual receipts <sup>1</sup>		
Less than \$10,000 (1,156,700)	152	22
\$10,000-\$24,999 (790,400)	204	38
\$25,000-\$49,999 (720,800)	204	45
\$50,000-\$99,999 (849,100)	267	54
\$100,000-\$499,999 (1,199,000)	250	50
\$500,000-\$999,999 (247,400)	236	37
\$1,000,000 or more (397,200)	247	46
No sales (496,300)	159	24
Average number of paid employees <sup>2</sup>		
1-3 (2,560,300)	196	34
4-7 (1,227,100)	233	52
8-19 (767,800)	255	42
20 or more (555,700)	255	60
None (1,665,800)	153	28

NOTE: Numbers in parentheses refer to commercial establishments in the group. Detail may not add to total shown because of rounding.

<sup>1</sup>Excludes data on establishments for which the amount of gross annual receipts was not ascertained.

<sup>2</sup>Estimate, based on about 10 or fewer sample cases, is statistically unreliable.

<sup>3</sup>Excludes data on establishments for which the average number of paid employees was not ascertained.

Table 25. Personal crimes: Victimization rates, by type of crime and type of locality of residence of victims, 1973

(Rate per 1,000 resident population age 12 and over)

Type of crime	Metropolitan areas									Nonmetropolitan areas (51,210,800)	
	All areas (162,236,300)	50,000 to 249,999			250,000 to 499,999		500,000 to 999,999		1,000,000 or more		
		Central cities (14,955,500)	Outside central cities (19,424,700)	Central cities (9,417,400)	Outside central cities (14,084,900)	Central cities (10,068,500)	Outside central cities (14,453,900)	Central cities (14,977,100)	Outside central cities (13,643,500)		
Crimes of violence	34	45	27	39	33	52	37	44	37	24	
Rape	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	2	2	1	
Robbery	7	8	3	9	6	14	6	18	9	3	
Robbery with injury	2	3	1	3	2	5	2	7	3	1	
Robbery without injury	5	5	2	6	4	9	4	12	6	2	
Assault	26	35	24	29	26	36	31	23	27	21	
Aggravated assault	10	15	9	14	10	14	12	10	9	8	
Simple assault	16	19	15	16	16	22	19	14	18	12	
Crimes of theft	93	112	94	100	101	119	118	86	97	74	
Personal larceny with contact	3	3	2	4	2	7	3	9	4	1	
Personal larceny without contact	90	109	92	96	99	113	115	76	94	72	

NOTE: The population range categories shown under the heading "Metropolitan areas" are based only on the size of the central city and do not reflect the population of the entire metropolitan area. Numbers in parentheses refer to population in the group. Detail may not add to total shown because of rounding.

Z Less than 0.5 per 1,000.

<sup>1</sup>Estimate, based on about 10 or fewer sample cases, is statistically unreliable.

Table 26. Personal crimes: Victimization rates for persons age 12 and over, by type of locality of residence, race and sex of victims, and type of crime, 1973

(Rate per 1,000 resident population age 12 and over)

Area and race and sex	Crimes of violence <sup>1</sup>	Robbery			Assault			Crimes of theft		
		Total	With injury	Without injury	Total	Aggravated	Simple	All crimes of theft	Personal larceny with contact	Personal larceny without contact
All areas										
White male (68,484,400)	45	9	3	6	36	15	21	107	2	104
White female (74,732,700)	21	3	1	2	16	5	11	84	3	81
Black male (7,748,600)	59	23	8	15	36	25	12	102	8	93
Black female (9,358,600)	37	7	3	5	26	13	14	71	6	66
Metropolitan areas										
Central cities										
White male (17,922,400)	59	16	6	10	43	19	23	121	3	118
White female (20,366,700)	29	6	2	4	20	6	14	96	7	89
Black male (4,495,600)	70	31	12	19	39	25	13	109	8	101
Black female (5,729,700)	41	10	4	6	27	11	16	74	9	65
Outside central cities										
White male (27,928,000)	46	8	2	6	38	15	23	113	2	111
White female (29,947,200)	21	3	1	2	16	5	12	92	2	90
Black male (1,433,200)	51	16	<sup>2</sup> 2	13	35	25	10	117	12	105
Black female (1,577,800)	38	<sup>2</sup> 6	<sup>2</sup> 1	<sup>2</sup> 4	28	18	10	90	<sup>2</sup> 1	89
Nonmetropolitan areas										
White male (22,634,000)	32	4	1	3	28	11	17	87	1	86
White female (24,418,800)	15	1	1	1	13	4	9	64	1	63
Black male (1,819,800)	40	8	<sup>2</sup> 2	6	32	23	9	72	<sup>2</sup> 5	67
Black female (2,051,100)	24	<sup>2</sup> 2	<sup>2</sup> 0	<sup>2</sup> 2	21	13	8	49	<sup>2</sup> 2	48

NOTE: Numbers in parentheses refer to population in the group. Detail may not add to total shown because of rounding.

Table 27. Household crimes: Victimization rates, by type of crime and type of locality of residence, 1973

(Rate per 1,000 households)

Type of crime	Metropolitan areas										
	All areas (69,421,800)	50,000 to 249,999			250,000 to 499,999			500,000 to 999,999			1,000,000 or more (5,638,400)
		Central cities (6,643,900)	Outside central cities (7,934,100)	Central cities (4,234,200)	Outside central cities (5,844,700)	Central cities (4,587,900)	Outside central cities (5,927,400)	Central cities (6,915,500)	Outside central cities (5,638,400)	Nonmetropolitan areas (21,695,700)	
Burglary	93	125	85	111	81	135	92	106	100	71	
Forcible entry	29	38	24	43	27	50	29	44	31	18	
Unlawful entry without force	43	58	41	42	39	50	44	34	45	40	
Attempted forcible entry	21	30	19	26	15	34	20	28	23	13	
Household larceny	109	149	109	131	115	131	125	72	119	92	
Completed larceny <sup>1</sup>	101	116	101	122	106	122	117	66	109	86	
Less than \$50	70	97	69	85	73	82	82	42	77	61	
\$50 or more	27	35	29	33	29	36	32	20	28	22	
Attempted larceny	8	11	8	9	9	9	8	6	10	6	
Motor vehicle theft	19	18	16	23	17	30	30	34	22	9	
Completed theft	12	13	10	16	10	18	17	23	14	6	
Attempted theft	7	5	6	6	6	12	13	11	8	3	

NOTE: The population range categories shown under the heading "Metropolitan areas" are based only on the size of the central city and do not reflect the population of the entire metropolitan area. Numbers in parentheses refer to households in the group. Detail may not add to total shown because of rounding.  
<sup>1</sup>Includes data, not shown separately, on larcenies for which the value of loss was not ascertained.

Table 28. Household crimes: Victimization rates, by type of locality of residence, race of head of household, and type of crime, 1973

(Rate per 1,000 households)

Area and race	Burglary	Household larceny	Motor vehicle theft
All areas			
White (61,704,600)	88	110	18
Black (6,998,700)	135	110	24
Metropolitan areas			
Central cities			
White (17,667,600)	110	123	27
Black (4,354,800)	155	103	28
Outside central cities			
White (23,901,500)	86	115	20
Black (1,189,700)	130	139	30
Nonmetropolitan areas			
White (20,135,500)	69	91	9
Black (1,454,200)	82	106	8

NOTE: Numbers in parentheses refer to households in the group.

Table 29. Personal crimes of violence: Number of victimizations and victimization rates for persons age 12 and over, by type of crime and victim-offender relationship, 1973

(Rate per 1,000 persons age 12 and over)

Type of crime	Involving strangers		Involving nonstrangers	
	Number	Rate	Number	Rate
Crimes of violence	3,607,700	22	1,885,900	12
Rape	120,400	1	39,200	Z
Completed rape	35,000	Z	11,400	Z
Attempted rape	85,500	1	27,800	Z
Robbery	959,200	6	160,900	1
Robbery with injury	320,500	2	65,500	Z
From serious assault	186,500	1	23,800	Z
From minor assault	134,000	1	41,700	Z
Robbery without injury	638,800	4	95,400	1
Assault	2,528,000	16	1,685,800	10
Aggravated assault	1,049,100	6	632,100	4
With injury	308,800	2	236,600	1
Attempted assault with weapon	740,300	5	395,500	2
Simple assault	1,479,000	9	1,053,700	6
With injury	306,700	2	318,800	2
Attempted assault without weapon	1,172,200	7	734,800	5

NOTE: Detail may not add to total shown because of rounding.

Z Less than 0.5 per 1,000.

Table 30. Personal crimes of violence: Percent of victimizations involving strangers, by sex and age of victims and type of crime, 1973

Sex and age	Crimes of violence	Rape	Robbery			Assault		
			Total	With injury	Without injury	Total	Aggravated	Simple
Both sexes	66	76	86	83	87	60	62	58
12-15	57	72	79	73	82	52	58	48
16-19	64	71	82	76	85	60	62	59
20-24	69	77	84	84	84	65	69	62
25-34	67	77	85	73	91	62	63	62
35-49	64	76	89	89	90	57	58	56
50-64	74	72	94	94	94	64	59	66
65 and over	82	100	91	97	89	69	65	72
Male	71	120	88	89	88	66	68	65
12-15	62	10	82	75	85	56	62	52
16-19	66	10	84	88	82	63	65	61
20-24	76	10	87	92	84	74	76	72
25-34	76	100	94	89	96	72	72	72
35-49	74	10	94	94	94	67	65	69
50-64	77	10	94	92	96	67	63	69
65 and over	79	10	90	93	89	65	65	65
Female	55	77	78	71	83	48	47	48
12-15	48	87	65	160	66	44	48	43
16-19	59	71	74	151	94	55	51	57
20-24	54	79	74	62	82	47	47	47
25-34	51	76	70	55	82	43	40	45
35-49	50	76	79	74	81	43	47	41
50-64	70	72	95	100	92	57	49	60
65 and over	86	100	92	100	88	75	64	82

Table 31. Personal crimes of violence: Percent of victimizations involving strangers, by sex and race of victims and type of crime, 1973

Sex and race	Crimes of violence	Rape	Robbery			Assault		
			Total	With injury	Without injury	Total	Aggravated	Simple
Both sexes								
White	67	76	86	82	88	62	66	59
Black	61	72	87	86	88	47	47	48
Male								
White	72	<sup>1</sup> 25	88	88	88	68	70	66
Black	70	<sup>1</sup> 0	91	90	92	57	58	57
Female								
White	57	77	79	68	86	50	52	49
Black	48	76	77	76	78	36	31	41

<sup>1</sup>Estimate, based on zero or on about 10 or fewer sample cases, is statistically unreliable.

Table 32. Personal crimes of violence: Percent of victimizations involving strangers, by sex and marital status of victims and type of crime, 1973

Sex and marital status	Crimes of violence	Rape	Robbery			Assault		
			Total	With injury	Without injury	Total	Aggravated	Simple
Both sexes								
Never married	66	78	83	80	85	61	64	58
Married	70	76	90	89	90	65	67	64
Widowed	72	<sup>1</sup> 00	93	96	91	54	53	55
Separated and divorced	51	64	80	70	85	41	42	41
Male								
Never married	69	<sup>1</sup> 0	85	86	85	65	69	61
Married	75	<sup>1</sup> 00	93	91	94	70	69	71
Widowed	79	<sup>1</sup> 0	93	92	93	63	<sup>1</sup> 56	68
Separated and divorced	71	<sup>1</sup> 0	90	96	86	63	63	63
Female								
Never married	58	82	75	62	83	52	50	54
Married	60	75	82	85	81	53	60	50
Widowed	69	<sup>1</sup> 00	94	100	90	51	51	50
Separated and divorced	38	64	68	44	84	29	25	30

<sup>1</sup>Estimate, based on zero or on about 10 or fewer sample cases, is statistically unreliable.

**Table 33. Personal crimes of violence: Percent of victimizations involving strangers, by race and annual family income of victims and type of crime, 1973**

Race and annual family income	Crimes of violence	Rape	Robbery			Assault		
			Total	With injury	Without injury	Total	Aggravated	Simple
<b>All races<sup>1</sup></b>								
Less than \$3,000	63	93	79	75	81	57	59	55
\$3,000-\$7,499	62	67	84	83	85	55	55	56
\$7,500-\$9,999	67	72	89	86	91	61	68	56
\$10,000-\$14,999	67	68	85	82	86	62	64	61
\$15,000-\$24,999	68	81	92	90	93	62	71	58
\$25,000 and over	75	<sup>2</sup> 100	88	85	90	72	71	72
<b>White</b>								
Less than \$3,000	66	94	77	72	81	61	63	59
\$3,000-\$7,499	64	71	84	84	84	59	61	57
\$7,500-\$9,999	66	<sup>2</sup> 64	89	84	93	61	69	56
\$10,000-\$14,999	66	68	85	79	87	62	64	61
\$15,000-\$24,999	68	78	90	88	91	63	73	58
\$25,000 and over	75	<sup>2</sup> 100	88	<sup>2</sup> 82	90	72	70	73
<b>Black</b>								
Less than \$3,000	58	92	84	82	85	46	50	41
\$3,000-\$7,499	54	<sup>2</sup> 50	86	79	90	40	39	43
\$7,500-\$9,999	71	<sup>2</sup> 100	86	<sup>2</sup> 100	80	59	<sup>2</sup> 54	<sup>2</sup> 65
\$10,000-\$14,999	77	<sup>2</sup> 0	88	93	86	68	71	66
\$15,000-\$24,999	70	<sup>2</sup> 100	100	<sup>2</sup> 100	100	40	<sup>2</sup> 28	52
\$25,000 and over	<sup>2</sup> 68	<sup>2</sup> 0	<sup>2</sup> 100	<sup>2</sup> 100	<sup>2</sup> 100	<sup>2</sup> 60	80	<sup>2</sup> 0

<sup>1</sup>Includes data on "other" races, not shown separately.

<sup>2</sup>Estimate, based on zero or on about 10 or fewer sample cases, is statistically unreliable.

**Table 34. Personal crimes of violence: Percent distribution of single-offender victimizations, by type of crime and perceived age of offender, 1973**

Type of crime	Total	Perceived age of offender						Not known and not available
		Under 12	12-20				21 and over	
			Total	12-14	15-17	18-20		
Crimes of violence	100	1	33	7	13	13	64	2
Rape	100	<sup>1</sup> 1	18	12	8	8	78	13
Robbery	100	<sup>1</sup> 2	36	6	14	16	58	6
Robbery with injury	100	<sup>1</sup> 0	35	<sup>1</sup> 4	15	16	54	11
Robbery without injury	100	<sup>1</sup> 2	37	7	14	15	59	4
Assault	100	1	33	7	13	13	64	2
Aggravated assault	100	1	31	6	13	11	66	2
Simple assault	100	1	35	8	13	14	63	1

NOTE: Detail may not add to total shown because of rounding.

<sup>1</sup> Less than 0.5 percent.

<sup>2</sup> Estimate, based on zero or on about 10 or fewer sample cases, is statistically unreliable.

Table 35. Personal crimes of violence: Percent distribution of single-offender victimizations, by type of crime and perceived race of offender, 1973

Type of crime	Total	Perceived race of offender			
		White	Black	Other	Not known and not available
Crimes of violence	100	66	29	4	1
Rape	100	52	43	13	12
Completed rape	100	38	56	13	13
Attempted rape	100	57	38	14	11
Robbery	100	42	51	5	3
Robbery with injury	100	48	40	15	17
Robbery without injury	100	39	55	5	11
Assault	100	70	25	3	1
Aggravated assault	100	67	30	3	11
Simple assault	100	73	23	4	1

NOTE: Detail may not add to total shown because of rounding.

<sup>1</sup> Estimate, based on about 10 or fewer sample cases, is statistically unreliable.

Table 36. Personal crimes of violence: Percent distribution of single-offender victimizations, by type of crime, age of victims, and perceived age of offender, 1973

Type of crime and age of victims	Total	Perceived age of offender						Not known and not available
		Under 12	12-20				21 and over	
			Total	12-14	15-17	18-20		
Crimes of violence <sup>1</sup>								
12-19	100	1	64	17	29	19	33	1
20-34	100	<sup>2</sup> Z	16	1	4	11	82	1
35-49	100	<sup>2</sup> 1	15	<sup>2</sup> 1	7	7	80	4
50-64	100	<sup>2</sup> 1	16	<sup>2</sup> 0	8	8	77	6
65 and over	100	<sup>2</sup> 1	19	<sup>2</sup> 2	<sup>2</sup> 4	14	72	<sup>2</sup> 8
Robbery								
12-19	100	<sup>2</sup> 1	67	20	30	17	29	<sup>2</sup> 3
20-34	100	<sup>2</sup> 0	20	<sup>2</sup> 0	<sup>2</sup> 4	15	76	<sup>2</sup> 4
35-49	100	<sup>2</sup> 0	24	<sup>2</sup> 0	<sup>2</sup> 11	<sup>2</sup> 12	70	<sup>2</sup> 7
50-64	100	<sup>2</sup> 0	<sup>2</sup> 24	<sup>2</sup> 0	<sup>2</sup> 11	<sup>2</sup> 13	64	<sup>2</sup> 12
65 and over	100	<sup>2</sup> 0	<sup>2</sup> 27	<sup>2</sup> 0	<sup>2</sup> 7	<sup>2</sup> 20	58	<sup>2</sup> 15
Assault								
12-19	100	2	65	17	29	19	32	1
20-34	100	<sup>2</sup> Z	16	2	4	11	82	1
35-49	100	<sup>2</sup> 1	14	<sup>2</sup> 1	6	6	83	3
50-64	100	<sup>2</sup> 2	14	<sup>2</sup> 0	7	7	80	<sup>2</sup> 4
65 and over	100	<sup>2</sup> 2	<sup>2</sup> 12	<sup>2</sup> 0	<sup>2</sup> 2	<sup>2</sup> 10	83	<sup>2</sup> 3

NOTE: Detail may not add to total shown because of rounding.

<sup>Z</sup> Less than 0.5 percent.

<sup>1</sup> Includes data on rape, not shown separately.

<sup>2</sup> Estimate, based on zero or on about 10 or fewer sample cases, is statistically unreliable.

Table 37. Personal crimes of violence: Percent distribution of single-offender victimizations, by type of crime, race of victims, and perceived race of offender, 1973

Type of crime and race of victims	Total	Perceived race of offender			
		White	Black	Other	Not known and not available
Crimes of violence					
White	100	75	20	4	1
Black	100	8	88	12	12
Rape					
White	100	62	31	14	12
Black	100	11	89	10	10
Robbery					
White	100	52	41	5	12
Black	100	10	93	13	14
Robbery with injury					
White	100	60	32	16	13
Black	100	10	84	15	11
Robbery without injury					
White	100	49	45	5	11
Black	100	10	97	12	12
Assault					
White	100	79	16	3	1
Black	100	10	87	12	11
Aggravated assault					
White	100	80	17	3	12
Black	100	11	86	11	13
Simple assault					
White	100	79	16	4	1
Black	100	8	89	13	10

NOTE: Detail may not add to total shown because of rounding.

Z Less than 0.5 percent.

<sup>1</sup>Estimate, based on zero or on about 10 or fewer sample cases, is statistically unreliable.

Table 38. Personal crimes of violence: Percent distribution of multiple-offender victimizations, by type of crime and perceived age of offenders, 1973

Type of crime	Total	Perceived age of offenders				Not known and not available
		All under 12	All 12-20	All 21 and over	Mixed ages	
Crimes of violence	100	1Z	48	26	22	4
Rape	100	10	32	43	116	19
Robbery	100	11	48	28	19	5
Robbery with injury	100	1Z	45	29	18	7
Robbery without injury	100	11	49	27	20	3
Assault	100	1Z	48	25	23	3
Aggravated assault	100	1Z	41	28	26	5
Simple assault	100	1Z	54	23	21	2

NOTE: Detail may not add to total shown because of rounding.

Z Less than 0.5 percent.

<sup>1</sup>Estimate, based on zero or on about 10 or fewer sample cases, is statistically unreliable.



Table 39. Personal crimes of violence: Percent distribution of multiple-offender victimizations, by type of crime and perceived race of offenders, 1973

Type of crime	Total	Perceived race of offenders				
		All white	All black	All other	Mixed races	Not known and not available
Crimes of violence	100	46	41	3	7	3
Rape	100	45	129	17	116	13
Robbery	100	23	63	4	6	4
Robbery with injury	100	24	63	11	8	14
Robbery without injury	100	22	63	5	6	3
Assault	100	57	30	3	7	3
Aggravated assault	100	51	35	4	6	4
Simple assault	100	62	27	2	7	2

NOTE: Detail may not add to total shown because of rounding.

<sup>1</sup>Estimate, based on about 10 or fewer sample cases, is statistically unreliable.

Table 40. Personal crimes of violence: Percent distribution of multiple-offender victimizations, by type of crime, age of victims, and perceived age of offenders, 1973

Type of crime and age of victims	Total	Perceived age of offenders				Not known and not available
		All under 12	All 12-20	All 21 and over	Mixed ages	
Crimes of violence <sup>1</sup>						
12-19	100	<sup>2</sup> Z	71	8	19	2
20-34	100	<sup>2</sup> Z	25	43	27	5
35-49	100	<sup>2</sup> 0	36	39	23	<sup>2</sup> 3
50-64	100	<sup>2</sup> 1	43	29	20	7
65 and over	100	<sup>2</sup> 1	48	31	12	<sup>2</sup> 7
Robbery						
12-19	100	<sup>2</sup> 0	76	8	14	<sup>2</sup> 1
20-34	100	<sup>2</sup> 1	30	39	24	7
35-49	100	<sup>2</sup> 0	33	37	27	<sup>2</sup> 3
50-64	100	<sup>2</sup> 1	39	34	17	<sup>2</sup> 9
65 and over	100	<sup>2</sup> 2	46	32	<sup>2</sup> 13	<sup>2</sup> 8
Assault						
12-19	100	<sup>2</sup> Z	70	7	20	2
20-34	100	<sup>2</sup> Z	23	44	28	5
35-49	100	<sup>2</sup> 0	38	40	20	<sup>2</sup> 3
50-64	100	<sup>2</sup> 0	49	23	23	<sup>2</sup> 5
65 and over	100	<sup>2</sup> 0	54	<sup>2</sup> 31	<sup>2</sup> 10	<sup>2</sup> 5

NOTE: Detail may not add to total shown because of rounding.

Z Less than 0.5 percent.

<sup>1</sup>Includes data on rape, not shown separately.

<sup>2</sup>Estimate, based on zero or on about 10 or fewer sample cases, is statistically unreliable.

**Table 41. Personal crimes of violence: Percent distribution of multiple-offender victimizations, by type of crime, race of victims, and perceived race of offenders, 1973**

Type of crime and race of victims	Total	Perceived race of offenders				
		All white	All black	All other	Mixed races	Not known and not available
Crimes of violence <sup>1</sup>						
White	100	53	33	4	7	3
Black	100	8	84	22	4	23
Robbery						
White	100	28	56	5	8	3
Black	100	26	86	22	22	24
Assault						
White	100	64	23	3	7	3
Black	100	10	81	22	26	21

NOTE: Detail may not add to total shown because of rounding.

<sup>1</sup>Includes data on rape, not shown separately.

<sup>2</sup>Estimate, based on about 10 or fewer sample cases, is statistically unreliable.

**Table 42. Personal crimes: Number of incidents and victimizations and ratio of incidents to victimizations, by type of crime, 1973**

Type of crime	Incidents	Victimizations	Ratio
Crimes of violence	4,621,800	5,493,600	1:1.19
Rape	153,100	159,700	1:1.04
Completed rape	45,800	46,400	1:1.01
Attempted rape	107,300	113,300	1:1.06
Robbery	950,800	1,120,100	1:1.18
Robbery with injury	345,700	385,900	1:1.12
From serious assault	192,500	210,300	1:1.09
From minor assault	153,200	175,600	1:1.15
Robbery without injury	605,100	734,200	1:1.21
Assault	3,518,000	4,213,800	1:1.20
Aggravated assault	1,313,200	1,681,200	1:1.28
With injury	458,000	545,300	1:1.19
Attempted assault with weapon	855,200	1,135,900	1:1.33
Simple assault	2,204,800	2,532,700	1:1.15
With injury	554,200	625,600	1:1.13
Attempted assault without weapon	1,650,600	1,907,100	1:1.16
Crimes of theft	14,709,400	15,160,000	1:1.03
Personal larceny with contact	483,600	512,400	1:1.06
Purse snatching	174,700	179,000	1:1.02
Completed purse snatching	103,100	106,200	1:1.03
Attempted purse snatching	71,600	72,900	1:1.02
Pocket picking	308,900	333,300	1:1.08
Personal larceny without contact	14,225,800	14,647,600	1:1.03

NOTE: Detail may not add to total shown because of rounding.

Table 43. Personal crimes of violence: Percent distribution of incidents, by victim-offender relationship, type of crime, and number of victims, 1973

Relationship and type of crime	Total	One	Two	Three	Four or more
All incidents					
Crimes of violence	100	89	8	2	1
Rape	100	96	14	12	10
Completed rape	100	99	11	10	10
Attempted rape	100	95	15	12	10
Robbery	100	93	5	2	11
Robbery with injury	100	95	3	11	11
Robbery without injury	100	91	6	2	11
Assault	100	88	8	2	2
Aggravated assault	100	84	11	3	3
Simple assault	100	90	7	2	1
Involving strangers					
Crimes of violence	100	88	8	2	2
Rape	100	95	15	12	10
Completed rape	100	98	12	10	10
Attempted rape	100	93	17	12	10
Robbery	100	92	5	2	11
Robbery with injury	100	95	4	11	11
Robbery without injury	100	91	6	2	11
Assault	100	86	10	2	2
Aggravated assault	100	82	12	3	3
Simple assault	100	89	8	2	1
Involving nonstrangers					
Crimes of violence	100	91	6	2	1
Rape	100	100	10	10	10
Completed rape	100	100	10	10	10
Attempted rape	100	100	10	10	10
Robbery	100	94	13	12	11
Robbery with injury	100	98	11	11	12
Robbery without injury	100	92	15	12	12
Assault	100	90	7	2	1
Aggravated assault	100	87	8	3	12
Simple assault	100	92	6	1	11

NOTE: Detail may not add to total shown because of rounding.

Z Less than 0.5 percent.

<sup>1</sup>Estimate, based on zero or on about 10 or fewer sample cases, is statistically unreliable.

Table 44. Personal crimes of violence: Number and percent distribution of incidents, by type of crime and victim-offender relationship, 1973

Type of crime	All incidents		Involving strangers		Involving nonstrangers	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Crimes of violence	4,621,800	100	2,980,300	64	1,641,500	36
Rape	153,100	100	113,800	74	39,200	26
Completed rape	45,800	100	34,400	75	11,400	25
Attempted rape	107,300	100	79,500	74	27,800	26
Robbery	950,800	100	807,700	85	143,100	15
Robbery with injury	345,700	100	286,200	83	59,500	17
From serious assault	192,500	100	172,000	89	20,600	11
From minor assault	153,200	100	114,300	75	38,900	25
Robbery without injury	605,100	100	521,400	86	83,700	14
Assault	3,518,000	100	2,058,800	59	1,459,200	41
Aggravated assault	1,313,200	100	796,500	61	516,700	39
With injury	458,000	100	256,800	56	201,200	44
Attempted assault with weapon	855,200	100	539,700	63	315,400	37
Simple assault	2,204,800	100	1,262,300	57	942,500	43
With injury	554,200	100	261,400	47	292,800	53
Attempted assault without weapon	1,650,600	100	1,000,900	61	649,700	39

NOTE: Detail may not add to total shown because of rounding.

Table 45. Personal, household, and commercial crimes: Percent distribution of incidents, by type of crime and time of occurrence, 1973

Type of crime	Total	Daytime		Nighttime			Not known and not available
		6 a.m.-6 p.m.	Total	6 p.m.-midnight	Midnight-6 a.m.	Not known	
All personal crimes	100	52	40	25	9	5	8
Crimes of violence	100	47	52	41	11	12	1
Rape	100	39	61	41	20	10	10
Robbery	100	44	55	44	11	12	11
Robbery with injury	100	38	62	47	14	10	12
From serious assault	100	31	69	53	16	10	11
From minor assault	100	47	53	41	12	10	10
Robbery without injury	100	48	51	41	10	12	11
Assault	100	49	51	40	11	12	11
Aggravated assault	100	42	57	44	13	12	12
With injury	100	42	57	41	16	12	12
Attempted assault with weapon	100	42	58	45	12	12	11
Simple assault	100	53	47	38	9	12	1
With injury	100	47	53	41	12	10	12
Attempted assault without weapon	100	54	45	36	8	12	1
Crimes of theft	100	53	36	21	8	7	11
Personal larceny with contact	100	64	35	28	6	11	11
Purse snatching	100	67	32	28	14	10	11
Pocket picking	100	62	36	27	8	11	12
Personal larceny without contact	100	53	36	20	8	17	11
All household crimes	100	29	51	22	18	12	21
Burglary	100	36	41	21	12	8	23
Forcible entry	100	38	44	25	11	8	18
Unlawful entry without force	100	37	36	17	10	8	27
Attempted forcible entry	100	28	48	21	18	8	24
Household larceny	100	24	55	20	20	15	21
Less than \$50	100	25	52	19	17	16	23
\$50 or more	100	24	59	23	23	13	16
Amount not available	100	27	43	16	12	15	30
Attempted larceny	100	15	76	27	35	14	8
Motor vehicle theft	100	22	71	32	30	9	7
Completed theft	100	24	69	32	29	9	6
Attempted theft	100	18	75	33	32	10	7
All commercial crimes	100	13	80	14	31	34	8
Burglary	100	6	85	11	35	40	9
Robbery	100	50	49	34	13	2	1

NOTE: Detail may not add to total shown because of rounding.

Z Less than 0.5 percent.

<sup>1</sup>Estimate, based on zero or on about 10 or fewer sample cases, is statistically unreliable.

Table 46. Personal robbery and assault by armed or unarmed offenders: Percent distribution of incidents, by type of crime and offender and time of occurrence, 1973

Type of crime and offender	Total	Daytime 6 a.m.-6 p.m.	Nighttime			Not known	Not known and not available
			Total	6 p.m.-midnight	Midnight-6 a.m.		
Robbery							
By armed offenders	100	33	66	53	13	<sup>1</sup> Z	<sup>1</sup> 1
By unarmed offenders	100	54	45	35	10	<sup>1</sup> 0	<sup>1</sup> 1
Assault							
By armed offenders	100	42	58	44	13	<sup>1</sup> Z	<sup>1</sup> 1
By unarmed offenders	100	52	47	38	9	<sup>1</sup> Z	1

NOTE: Detail may not add to total shown because of rounding.

Z Less than 0.5 percent.

<sup>1</sup>Estimate, based on zero or on about 10 or fewer sample cases, is statistically unreliable.

Table 47. Personal crimes of violence: Percent distribution of incidents, by victim-offender relationship, type of crime, and time of occurrence, 1973

Relationship and type of crime	Total	Daytime 6 a.m.-6 p.m.	Nighttime			Not known	Not known and not available
			Total	6 p.m.-midnight	Midnight-6 a.m.		
Involving strangers							
Crimes of violence	100	44	55	43	12	<sup>1</sup> Z	1
Rape	100	36	64	43	21	<sup>1</sup> 0	<sup>1</sup> 0
Robbery	100	42	57	45	12	<sup>1</sup> Z	<sup>1</sup> 1
Assault	100	45	54	42	12	<sup>1</sup> 0	1
Involving nonstrangers							
Crimes of violence	100	54	46	36	10	<sup>1</sup> Z	<sup>1</sup> Z
Rape	100	48	52	36	<sup>1</sup> 16	<sup>1</sup> 0	<sup>1</sup> 0
Robbery	100	56	42	34	8	<sup>1</sup> 0	<sup>1</sup> 2
Assault	100	54	46	36	10	<sup>1</sup> Z	<sup>1</sup> Z

NOTE: Detail may not add to total shown because of rounding.

Z Less than 0.5 percent.

<sup>1</sup>Estimate, based on zero or on about 10 or fewer sample cases, is statistically unreliable.

**Table 48. Selected personal and household crimes: Percent distribution of incidents, by type of crime and place of occurrence, 1973**

Type of crime	Total	Inside own home	Near own home	Inside non-residential building	Inside school	On street or in park, playground, school-ground and parking lot	Elsewhere
Crimes of violence	100	12	9	14	7	48	11
Rape	100	29	14	16	12	41	17
Robbery	100	11	8	8	6	60	6
Robbery with injury	100	13	7	6	5	63	6
Robbery without injury	100	10	8	10	7	58	6
Assault	100	11	10	16	7	45	12
Aggravated assault	100	10	10	15	4	47	14
Simple assault	100	12	9	16	9	43	11
Personal larceny with contact	100	2	4	39	7	37	12
Motor vehicle theft	100	1	30	2	10	64	3
Completed theft	100	1	29	2	10	65	4
Attempted theft	100	1	34	1	10	62	12

NOTE: Detail may not add to total shown because of rounding.

<sup>1</sup>Estimate, based on zero or on about 10 or fewer sample cases, is statistically unreliable.

**Table 49. Personal robbery and assault by armed or unarmed offenders: Percent distribution of incidents, by type of crime and offender and place of occurrence, 1973**

Type of crime and offender	Total	Inside own home	Near own home	Inside non-residential building	Inside school	On street or in park, playground, school-ground and parking lot	Elsewhere
Robbery							
By armed offenders	100	12	9	7	12	64	7
By unarmed offenders	100	11	7	9	11	56	6
Assault							
By armed offenders	100	9	10	15	4	48	14
By unarmed offenders	100	12	9	16	9	43	11

NOTE: Detail may not add to total shown because of rounding.

<sup>1</sup>Estimate, based on about 10 or fewer sample cases, is statistically unreliable.

**Table 50. Personal crimes of violence: Percent distribution of incidents, by victim-offender relationship, type of crime, and place of occurrence, 1973**

Relationship and type of crime	Total	Inside own home	Near own home	Inside non-residential building	Inside school	On street or in park, playground, school-ground and parking lot	Elsewhere
Involving strangers							
Crimes of violence	100	6	8	14	5	58	9
Rape	100	25	16	16	12	48	12
Robbery	100	8	8	9	5	65	6
Assault	100	4	7	17	6	55	11
Involving nonstrangers							
Crimes of violence	100	22	12	13	10	29	14
Rape	100	41	10	16	10	121	32
Robbery	100	31	8	15	17	30	9
Assault	100	21	13	14	10	30	14

NOTE: Detail may not add to total shown because of rounding.

<sup>1</sup>Estimate, based on zero or on about 10 or fewer sample cases, is statistically unreliable.

**Table 51. Larcenies not involving victim-offender contact: Percent distribution of incidents, by type of crime and place of occurrence, 1973**

Type of crime and place of occurrence	Percent within type	Percent of total
Total	...	100
Household larceny	100	35
Inside own home	14	5
Near own home	86	30
Personal larceny without contact	100	65
Inside nonresidential building	14	9
Inside school	26	17
On street or in park, playground, schoolground, and parking lot	46	30
Elsewhere	14	9

... Represents not applicable.



**Table 52. Larcenies not involving victim-offender contact:  
Percent distribution of incidents, by type of crime, place  
of occurrence, and value of theft loss, 1973**

Type of crime and place of occurrence	Less than \$50	\$50 or more	Amount not available	Attempted larceny
Total	100	100	100	100
Household larceny	33	37	44	37
Inside own home	4	7	8	5
Near own home	29	30	36	33
Personal larceny without contact	67	63	56	63
Inside nonresidential building	10	10	9	5
Inside school	23	3	16	7
On street or in park, playground, and parking lot	26	37	24	46
Elsewhere	8	13	8	4

NOTE: Detail may not add to total shown because of rounding.

**Table 53. Personal crimes of violence: Percent distribution of incidents, by victim-offender relationship, type of crime, and number of offenders, 1973**

Relationship and type of crime	Total	One	Two	Three	Four or more	Not known and not available
All incidents						
Crimes of violence	100	64	14	7	11	3
Rape	100	80	9	11	9	11
Robbery	100	41	27	15	14	4
Robbery with injury	100	37	22	18	19	4
Robbery without injury	100	43	29	13	11	4
Assault	100	70	10	6	10	3
Aggravated assault	100	66	11	6	11	6
Simple assault	100	72	10	6	10	2
Involving strangers						
Crimes of violence	100	55	17	9	14	5
Rape	100	77	12	11	19	12
Robbery	100	36	28	16	15	5
Robbery with injury	100	30	24	19	21	5
Robbery without injury	100	39	30	14	12	4
Assault	100	61	12	7	14	5
Aggravated assault	100	56	14	6	15	9
Simple assault	100	64	12	8	14	3
Involving nonstrangers						
Crimes of violence	100	82	8	4	6	12
Rape	100	89	13	10	18	10
Robbery	100	70	17	6	17	10
Robbery with injury	100	69	13	10	19	10
Robbery without injury	100	71	20	14	15	10
Assault	100	83	7	4	5	12
Aggravated assault	100	81	8	5	7	12
Simple assault	100	84	7	4	5	12

NOTE: Detail may not add to total shown because of rounding.

Z Less than 0.5 percent.

<sup>1</sup>Estimate, based on zero or on about 10 or fewer sample cases, is statistically unreliable.

**Table 54. Personal crimes of violence: Percent of incidents in which offenders used weapons, by type of crime and victim-offender relationship, 1973**

Type of crime	All incidents	Involving strangers	Involving nonstrangers
Crimes of violence	38	41	32
Rape	24	27	<sup>1</sup> 15
Robbery	48	51	33
Robbery with injury	47	51	31
Robbery without injury	49	51	35
Assault <sup>2</sup>	35	37	33
Aggravated assault	95	96	92

<sup>1</sup>Estimate, based on about 10 or fewer sample cases, is statistically unreliable.

<sup>2</sup>Includes data on simple assault, which by definition does not involve the use of a weapon.

**Table 55. Personal crimes of violence: Percent distribution of types of weapons used in incidents by armed offenders, by victim-offender relationship, type of crime, and type of weapon, 1973**

Relationship and type of crime	Total	Firearm	Knife	Other	Type unknown
All incidents					
Crimes of violence	100	31	30	33	6
Rape	100	43	<sup>1</sup> 25	29	<sup>1</sup> 3
Robbery	100	35	35	24	6
Robbery with injury	100	18	33	38	11
Robbery without injury	100	45	37	16	<sup>1</sup> 3
Aggravated assault	100	30	27	37	6
With injury	100	15	19	59	8
Attempted assault with weapon	100	37	32	27	5
Involving strangers					
Crimes of violence	100	34	29	31	5
Rape	100	41	<sup>1</sup> 27	<sup>1</sup> 28	<sup>1</sup> 3
Robbery	100	35	36	23	5
Aggravated assault	100	34	25	36	6
Involving nonstrangers					
Crimes of violence	100	24	32	38	6
Rape	100	<sup>1</sup> 48	<sup>1</sup> 18	<sup>1</sup> 35	<sup>1</sup> 0
Robbery	100	29	28	34	<sup>1</sup> 9
Aggravated assault	100	24	32	38	6

NOTE: Detail may not add to total shown because of rounding.

<sup>1</sup>Estimate, based on zero or on about 10 or fewer sample cases, is statistically unreliable.

**Table 56. Commercial robbery: Percent of incidents in which offenders used weapons, by type of crime and type of weapon, 1973**

Type of crime	All types	Firearm	Knife	Other
Robbery	61	49	7	4
Completed robbery	68	59	6	3
Attempted robbery	39	21	11	8

NOTE: The data are based solely on weapons of types recognized by persons on the scene at the time of the incident. For each robbery in which more than one weapon was used, the identity of only the most lethal kind of weapon was recorded. Thus, the sum of the proportions of recognized types of the three categories of weapons equals the proportion of incidents in which weapons were used. Detail may not add to total shown because of rounding.

**Table 57. Personal robbery and assault: Percent of victimizations in which victims<sup>1</sup> sustained physical injury, by selected characteristics of victims and type of crime, 1973**

Characteristic	Robbery and assault	Robbery	Assault
<b>Sex</b>			
Both sexes	29	34	28
Male	28	33	26
Female	32	38	31
<b>Age</b>			
12-15	30	25	31
16-19	31	36	29
20-24	29	35	27
25-34	27	32	27
35-49	28	39	24
50-64	30	43	23
65 and over	32	34	29
<b>Race</b>			
White	29	34	27
Black	32	34	31
<b>Victim-offender relationship</b>			
Involving strangers	27	33	24
Involving nonstrangers	34	41	33
<b>Annual family income</b>			
Less than \$3,000	37	40	35
\$3,000-\$7,499	32	32	33
\$7,500-\$9,999	25	39	21
\$10,000-\$14,999	25	29	24
\$15,000-\$24,999	26	33	24
\$25,000 or more	24	31	22
Not available	31	43	27

**Table 58. Personal crimes of violence: Percent of victimizations in which victims incurred medical expenses, by selected characteristics of victims and type of crime, 1973**

Characteristic	Crimes of violence <sup>1</sup>	Robbery	Assault
<b>Race</b>			
All races <sup>2</sup>	6	7	6
White	6	7	5
Black	8	7	7
<b>Victim-offender relationship</b>			
Involving strangers	6	7	5
Involving nonstrangers	6	<sup>3</sup> 4	6

NOTE: Data include only those victimizations in which victims knew with certainty that medical expenses were incurred and also knew, or were able to estimate, the amount of such expenses.

<sup>1</sup>Includes data on rape, not shown separately.

<sup>2</sup>Includes data on "other" races, not shown separately.

<sup>3</sup>Estimate, based on about 10 or fewer sample cases, in statistically unreliable.

**Table 59. Personal crimes of violence: Percent distribution of victimizations in which victims incurred medical expenses, by selected characteristics of victims, type of crime, and amount of expenses, 1973**

Characteristic and type of crime	Total	Less than \$50	\$50-\$249	\$250 or more
<b>Race</b>				
All races <sup>1</sup>				
Crimes of violence <sup>2</sup>	100	43	37	20
Robbery	100	38	36	26
Assault	100	43	38	19
White				
Crimes of violence <sup>2</sup>	100	43	38	19
Robbery	100	34	36	30
Assault	100	44	39	16
Black				
Crimes of violence <sup>2</sup>	100	46	33	21
Robbery	100	<sup>a</sup> 51	<sup>a</sup> 37	<sup>a</sup> 12
Assault	100	39	32	29
<b>Victim-offender relationship</b>				
Involving strangers				
Crimes of violence <sup>2</sup>	100	38	41	21
Robbery	100	35	38	27
Assault	100	37	42	21
Involving nonstrangers				
Crimes of violence <sup>2</sup>	100	51	32	17
Robbery	100	<sup>a</sup> 67	<sup>a</sup> 16	<sup>a</sup> 17
Assault	100	49	35	16

NOTE: Data include only those victimizations in which victims knew with certainty that medical expenses were incurred and also knew, or were able to estimate, the amount of such expenses. Detail may not add to total shown because of rounding.

<sup>1</sup>Includes data on "other" races, not shown separately.

<sup>2</sup>Includes data on rape, not shown separately.

<sup>a</sup>Estimate, based on about 10 or fewer sample cases, is statistically unreliable.

**Table 60. Personal crimes of violence: Percent of victimizations in which injured victims had health insurance coverage or were eligible for public medical services, by selected characteristics of victims, 1973**

Characteristic	Percent covered
<b>Race</b>	
All races <sup>1</sup>	62
White	66
Black	52
<b>Annual family income</b>	
Less than \$3,000	50
\$3,000-\$7,499	54
\$7,500-\$9,999	66
\$10,000-\$14,999	74
\$15,000 or more	77

<sup>1</sup>Includes data on "other" races, not shown separately.

**Table 61. Personal crimes of violence: Percent of victimizations in which victims received hospital care, by selected characteristics of victims and type of crime, 1973**

Characteristic	Crimes of violence <sup>1</sup>	Robbery	Assault
<b>Sex</b>			
Both sexes	7	9	7
Male	8	9	7
Female	7	8	6
<b>Age</b>			
12-19	5	4	5
20-34	8	11	7
35-49	8	9	8
50-64	11	17	7
65 and over	12	11	<sup>a</sup> 12
<b>Race</b>			
White	6	8	6
Black	12	13	10
<b>Victim-offender relationship</b>			
Involving strangers	7	10	6
Involving nonstrangers	7	7	7

<sup>1</sup>Includes data on rape, not shown separately.

<sup>2</sup>Estimate, based on about 10 or fewer sample cases, is statistically unreliable.

Table 62. Personal crimes of violence: Percent distribution of victimizations in which victims received hospital care, by selected characteristics of victims, type of crime, and type of hospital care, 1973

Characteristic and type of crime	Total	Emergency room care	Inpatient care			
			Total	1-3 days	4 days or more	Not available
Sex						
Both sexes						
Crimes of violence <sup>1</sup>	100	74	26	11	12	3
Robbery	100	65	35	14	15	26
Assault	100	77	23	10	11	22
Male						
Crimes of violence <sup>1</sup>	100	71	29	11	15	4
Robbery	100	61	39	16	15	27
Assault	100	75	25	9	14	23
Female						
Crimes of violence <sup>1</sup>	100	81	19	11	27	22
Robbery	100	79	21	24	13	24
Assault	100	81	19	14	25	10
Race						
White						
Crimes of violence <sup>1</sup>	100	78	23	9	12	23
Robbery	100	66	34	15	15	25
Assault	100	82	18	7	11	21
Black						
Crimes of violence <sup>1</sup>	100	64	36	17	14	25
Robbery	100	69	31	28	19	24
Assault	100	59	41	21	13	27
Victim-offender relationship						
Involving strangers						
Crimes of violence <sup>1</sup>	100	72	28	11	13	23
Robbery	100	61	39	15	17	26
Assault	100	77	23	9	12	21
Involving nonstrangers						
Crimes of violence <sup>1</sup>	100	78	22	10	10	23
Robbery	100	100	0	0	0	0
Assault	100	76	24	11	10	23

NOTE: Detail may not add to total shown because of rounding.

<sup>1</sup>Includes data on rape, not shown separately.

<sup>2</sup>Estimate, based on zero or on about 10 or fewer sample cases, is statistically unreliable.

Table 63. Personal, household, and commercial crimes: Percent of victimizations resulting in economic loss, by type of crime and type of loss, 1973

Type of crime	All economic losses	Theft losses			Damage losses		
		All theft losses	With damage	Without damage	All damage losses	With theft	Without theft
All personal crimes	77	72	8	64	13	8	5
Crimes of violence	25	12	2	10	15	2	12
Rape	24	16	14	11	23	14	19
Completed rape	39	115	110	15	34	110	24
Attempted rape	19	12	12	10	19	12	17
Robbery	66	59	11	48	18	11	7
Robbery with injury	76	63	21	42	34	21	13
Robbery without injury	60	57	6	51	9	6	4
Assault	14	...	...	...	14	...	14
Aggravated assault	17	...	...	...	17	...	17
Simple assault	11	...	...	...	11	...	11
Crimes of theft	96	93	10	84	12	10	3
Personal larceny with contact	88	86	4	82	6	4	3
Purse snatching	67	59	17	53	14	17	8
Pocket picking	100	100	12	98	12	12	10
Personal larceny without contact	96	94	10	84	12	10	3
All household crimes	90	79	13	65	25	13	12
Burglary	86	65	21	44	42	21	21
Forcible entry	95	79	58	21	74	58	16
Unlawful entry without force	88	85	4	81	7	4	3
Attempted forcible entry	70	2	1	11	69	1	68
Household larceny	95	93	6	87	8	6	2
Completed larceny	100	100	7	93	7	7	...
Attempted larceny	26	...	...	...	26	...	26
Motor vehicle theft	85	65	20	45	40	20	20
Completed theft	100	100	31	69	31	31	...
Attempted theft	57	...	...	...	57	...	57
All commercial crimes	89	61	36	25	63	36	27
Burglary	90	59	41	17	73	41	31
Robbery	80	75	8	67	13	8	6

NOTE: Detail may not add to total shown because of rounding. Because both theft and damage losses occurred in some victimizations, the sum of entries under "all theft losses" and "all damage losses" does not equal the entry shown under "all economic losses."

... Represents not applicable.

<sup>1</sup>Estimate, based on zero or on about 10 or fewer sample cases, is statistically unreliable.

Table 64. Personal crimes of violence: Percent of victimizations resulting in economic loss, by type of crime, type of loss, and victim-offender relationship, 1973

Type of crime	All economic losses	Theft losses			Damage losses		
		All victimizations	Involving strangers	Involving nonstrangers	All victimizations	Involving strangers	Involving nonstrangers
Crimes of violence	25	12	16	5	15	15	15
Rape	24	16	17	13	23	19	36
Robbery	66	59	59	57	18	17	21
Robbery with injury	76	63	63	61	34	34	36
Robbery without injury	60	57	57	53	9	9	11
Assault	14	...	...	...	14	13	14
Aggravated assault	17	...	...	...	17	17	17
Simple assault	11	...	...	...	11	11	12

NOTE: Because both theft and damage losses occurred in some victimizations, the sum of entries under each "all victimizations" category does not equal the entry shown under "all economic losses."

... Represents not applicable.

<sup>1</sup>Estimate, based on about 10 or fewer sample cases, is statistically unreliable.



Table 65. Personal and household crimes: Percent distribution of victimizations resulting in economic loss, by race of victims, type of crime, and value of loss, 1973

Race and type of crime	Total	No monetary value	Less than \$10	\$10-\$49	\$50-\$249	\$250 or more	Not known and not available
<b>All races<sup>1</sup></b>							
All personal crimes	100	3	33	34	20	4	5
Crimes of violence <sup>2</sup>	100	13	23	25	21	7	11
Robbery	100	4	25	25	28	10	8
Robbery with injury	100	7	21	23	29	9	11
Robbery without injury	100	<sup>2</sup> 2	27	26	27	11	6
Assault	100	24	21	25	13	2	14
Aggravated assault	100	22	17	26	18	<sup>2</sup> 2	15
Simple assault	100	25	26	24	9	<sup>2</sup> 2	13
Crimes of theft	100	2	34	35	20	4	5
Personal larceny with contact	100	<sup>2</sup> 2	18	42	28	4	6
Personal larceny without contact	100	2	35	35	20	4	5
All household crimes	100	5	23	28	23	14	8
Burglary	100	9	15	23	25	18	11
Forcible entry	100	5	8	14	26	34	13
Unlawful entry without force	100	1	17	31	33	12	5
Attempted forcible entry	100	35	22	16	5	<sup>2</sup> 2	22
Household larceny	100	2	32	35	23	4	5
Completed larceny	100	1	32	35	23	4	5
Attempted larceny	100	29	20	30	9	<sup>1</sup> 1	12
Motor vehicle theft	100	4	3	8	12	63	10
Completed theft	100	<sup>0</sup> 0	<sup>2</sup> 2	<sup>2</sup> 2	10	81	8
Attempted theft	100	16	13	33	17	<sup>2</sup> 2	19
<b>White</b>							
All personal crimes	100	2	34	34	20	4	5
Crimes of violence <sup>2</sup>	100	14	24	24	19	7	11
Robbery	100	4	28	25	25	11	8
Robbery with injury	100	8	23	25	27	8	10
Robbery without injury	100	<sup>1</sup> 1	31	25	23	13	6
Assault	100	25	21	24	13	3	14
Aggravated assault	100	24	16	23	19	<sup>3</sup> 3	15
Simple assault	100	25	25	25	9	<sup>3</sup> 3	14
Crimes of theft	100	1	35	35	20	4	4
Personal larceny with contact	100	<sup>2</sup> 2	19	43	27	4	4
Personal larceny without contact	100	1	36	35	20	4	4
All household crimes	100	5	24	28	23	13	7
Burglary	100	9	16	23	26	17	10
Forcible entry	100	6	9	15	25	33	12
Unlawful entry without force	100	1	18	31	34	12	5
Attempted forcible entry	100	35	21	16	4	<sup>2</sup> 2	23
Household larceny	100	2	33	35	22	4	5
Completed larceny	100	1	33	35	22	4	5
Attempted larceny	100	30	20	30	8	<sup>1</sup> 1	11
Motor vehicle theft	100	4	3	8	12	62	10
Completed theft	100	<sup>0</sup> 0	<sup>2</sup> 2	<sup>2</sup> 2	12	81	7
Attempted theft	100	17	13	33	15	<sup>3</sup> 3	19

Table 65. Personal and household crimes: Percent distribution of victimizations resulting in economic loss, by race of victims, type of crime, and value of loss, 1973—continued

Race and type of crime	Total	No monetary value	Less than \$10	\$10-\$49	\$50-\$249	\$250 or more	Not known and not available
Black							
All personal crimes	100	4	27	34	23	5	7
Crimes of violence <sup>2</sup>	100	10	19	25	30	6	11
Robbery	100	<sup>3</sup> 5	16	25	36	9	8
Robbery with injury	100	<sup>3</sup> 6	17	18	33	<sup>3</sup> 12	<sup>3</sup> 13
Robbery without injury	100	<sup>3</sup> 5	16	29	38	<sup>3</sup> 7	<sup>3</sup> 6
Assault	100	18	25	27	14	<sup>3</sup> 0	15
Aggravated assault	100	<sup>3</sup> 14	19	33	<sup>3</sup> 17	<sup>3</sup> 0	<sup>3</sup> 17
Simple assault	100	<sup>3</sup> 30	<sup>3</sup> 46	<sup>3</sup> 7	<sup>3</sup> 6	<sup>3</sup> 0	<sup>3</sup> 11
Crimes of theft	100	2	29	35	22	5	6
Personal larceny with contact	100	<sup>3</sup> 1	13	37	33	<sup>3</sup> 4	12
Personal larceny without contact	100	3	30	35	21	5	6
All household crimes	100	5	16	25	24	18	11
Burglary	100	9	10	19	24	23	15
Forcible entry	100	2	3	12	29	37	16
Unlawful entry without force	100	<sup>3</sup> 2	12	32	29	15	11
Attempted forcible entry	100	37	25	15	<sup>3</sup> 6	0	17
Household larceny	100	2	26	35	28	3	66
Completed larceny	100	1	27	35	28	3	6
Attempted larceny	100	<sup>3</sup> 23	<sup>3</sup> 19	<sup>3</sup> 23	<sup>3</sup> 0	<sup>3</sup> 0	<sup>3</sup> 35
Motor vehicle theft	100	2	<sup>3</sup> 3	8	<sup>3</sup> 6	67	13
Completed theft	100	<sup>3</sup> 0	<sup>3</sup> 0	<sup>3</sup> 1	<sup>3</sup> 4	84	12
Attempted theft	100	<sup>3</sup> 12	<sup>3</sup> 15	37	<sup>3</sup> 16	<sup>3</sup> 0	<sup>3</sup> 20

NOTE: Detail may not add to total shown because of rounding.

<sup>2</sup> Less than 0.5 percent.

<sup>1</sup> Includes data on "other" races, not shown separately.

<sup>2</sup> Includes data on rape, not shown separately.

<sup>3</sup> Estimate, based on zero or on about 10 or fewer sample cases, is statistically unreliable.

Table 66. Selected personal crimes: Percent distribution of victimizations resulting in theft loss, by race of victims, type of crime, and value of loss, 1973

Race and type of crime	Total	No monetary value	Less than \$10	\$10-\$49	\$50-\$99	\$100-\$249	\$250 or more	Not available
All races <sup>1</sup>								
Robbery	100	<sup>2</sup> 1	26	27	16	14	11	4
Crimes of theft <sup>3</sup>	100	1	36	36	11	9	4	3
White								
Robbery	100	<sup>2</sup> 1	29	27	13	14	12	4
Crimes of theft <sup>3</sup>	100	1	36	36	11	9	4	3
Black								
Robbery	100	<sup>2</sup> 2	18	27	24	14	9	<sup>2</sup> 5
Crimes of theft <sup>3</sup>	100	1	30	37	14	9	5	4

NOTE: Detail may not add to total shown because of rounding.

<sup>1</sup>Includes data on "other" races, not shown separately.

<sup>2</sup>Estimate, based on about 10 or fewer sample cases, is statistically unreliable.

<sup>3</sup>Includes both personal larceny with contact and personal larceny without contact.

Table 67. Personal and household crimes: Percent distribution of victimizations resulting in theft loss, by race of victims, type of crime, and proportion of loss recovered, 1973

Race and type of crime	Total	None recovered	Some recovered			Proportion unknown	All recovered	Not available
			Total	Less than half	Half or more			
All races <sup>1</sup>								
All personal crimes <sup>2</sup>	100	83	10	3	3	3	8	<sup>3</sup> Z
Robbery	100	74	15	6	4	5	11	<sup>3</sup> Z
Crimes of theft	100	83	10	3	3	3	7	<sup>3</sup> Z
Personal larceny with contact	100	69	24	16	5	3	8	<sup>3</sup> O
Personal larceny without contact	100	84	9	3	3	3	7	<sup>3</sup> O
All household crimes	100	76	13	3	5	4	11	<sup>3</sup> Z
Burglary	100	77	16	4	8	4	7	<sup>3</sup> Z
Household larceny	100	83	9	2	2	4	8	<sup>3</sup> Z
Motor vehicle theft	100	20	25	6	16	3	55	<sup>3</sup> O
White								
All personal crimes <sup>2</sup>	100	82	10	3	4	3	8	<sup>3</sup> Z
Robbery	100	74	14	6	4	4	12	<sup>3</sup> Z
Crimes of theft	100	83	10	3	4	3	8	<sup>3</sup> Z
Personal larceny with contact	100	63	29	20	6	3	9	<sup>3</sup> O
Personal larceny without contact	100	83	9	3	3	3	8	<sup>3</sup> Z
All household crimes	100	76	13	3	5	4	12	<sup>3</sup> Z
Burglary	100	75	17	5	8	4	8	<sup>3</sup> Z
Household larceny	100	82	9	2	2	4	9	<sup>3</sup> Z
Motor vehicle theft	100	19	26	6	17	3	56	<sup>3</sup> O
Black								
All personal crimes <sup>2</sup>	100	84	10	3	3	4	5	<sup>3</sup> O
Robbery	100	74	18	7	<sup>3</sup> 5	6	8	<sup>3</sup> O
Crimes of theft	100	86	9	3	2	4	5	<sup>3</sup> O
Personal larceny with contact	100	84	11	<sup>3</sup> 6	<sup>3</sup> 1	<sup>3</sup> 4	5	<sup>3</sup> O
Personal larceny without contact	100	86	9	2	3	4	5	<sup>3</sup> O
All household crimes	100	80	12	3	3	5	8	<sup>3</sup> Z
Burglary	100	84	12	3	4	5	3	<sup>3</sup> Z
Household larceny	100	85	10	3	1	5	5	<sup>3</sup> Z
Motor vehicle theft	100	26	22	<sup>3</sup> 7	9	<sup>3</sup> 6	52	<sup>3</sup> O

NOTE: Detail may not add to total shown because of rounding.

Z Less than 0.5 percent.

<sup>1</sup>Includes data on "other" races, not shown separately.

<sup>2</sup>Includes data on rape, not shown separately, but excludes data on assault, which by definition does not involve theft.

<sup>3</sup>Estimate, based on zero or on about 10 or fewer sample cases, is statistically unreliable.

**Table 68. Personal and household crimes: Percent distribution of victimizations in which theft losses were recovered, by type of crime and method of recovery of loss, 1973**

Type of crime	Total	Insurance only	Other method only	Both insurance and other method	Method not available
All personal crimes <sup>1</sup>	100	27	71	2	<sup>2</sup> Z
Robbery	100	10	88	1	<sup>2</sup> 0
Robbery with injury	100	9	89	<sup>2</sup> 2	<sup>2</sup> 0
Robbery without injury	100	11	88	<sup>2</sup> 1	<sup>1</sup> 0
Crimes of theft	100	28	70	2	<sup>2</sup> Z
Personal larceny with contact	100	<sup>1</sup> 6	93	<sup>2</sup> 0	<sup>2</sup> 1
Personal larceny without contact	100	30	68	2	<sup>2</sup> Z
All household crimes	100	28	66	5	Z
Burglary	100	45	51	3	<sup>2</sup> 1
Household larceny	100	23	74	2	<sup>2</sup> Z
Motor vehicle theft	100	13	73	14	<sup>2</sup> Z

NOTE: Detail may not add to total shown because of rounding.

Z Less than 0.5 percent.

<sup>1</sup>Includes data on rape, not shown separately, but excludes data on assault, which by definition does not involve theft.

<sup>2</sup>Estimate, based on zero or on about 10 or fewer sample cases, is statistically unreliable.

**Table 69. Household crimes: Percent distribution of victimizations resulting in theft loss, by value of loss and type of crime, 1973**

Value of loss	All household crimes	Burglary	Household larceny	Motor vehicle theft
Total	100	100	100	100
No monetary value	1	1	1	<sup>1</sup> 0
Less than \$10	24	13	33	<sup>1</sup> Z
\$10-\$49	29	25	36	<sup>1</sup> Z
\$50-\$99	13	14	14	2
\$100-\$249	13	19	9	10
\$250-\$999	11	17	3	41
\$1,000 or more	6	7	1	43
Not available	4	4	4	3

NOTE: Detail may not add to total shown because of rounding.

Z Less than 0.5 percent.

<sup>1</sup>Estimate, based on zero or on about 10 or fewer sample cases, is statistically unreliable.

Table 70. Commercial crimes: Percent of victimizations resulting in economic loss, by kind of establishment, type of crime, and type of loss, 1973

Kind of establishment and type of crime	All economic losses	Theft losses			Damage losses		
		All theft losses	With damage	Without damage	All damage losses	With theft	Without theft
<b>Retail</b>							
All commercial crimes	89	63	38	26	63	38	26
Burglary	91	59	46	14	77	46	31
Robbery	81	78	7	72	10	7	3
<b>Wholesale</b>							
All commercial crimes	91	59	33	26	65	33	32
Burglary	93	57	35	22	71	35	36
Robbery	80	80	13	66	13	13	10
<b>Service</b>							
All commercial crimes	87	57	21	37	63	21	43
Burglary	87	57	33	24	63	33	30
Robbery	74	63	10	53	21	10	10
<b>Other</b>							
All commercial crimes	89	64	37	27	62	37	26
Burglary	90	63	41	22	68	41	27
Robbery	84	71	15	66	17	15	13

NOTE: Detail may not add to total shown because of rounding. Because both theft and damage losses occurred in some victimizations, the sum of entries under "all theft losses" and "all damage losses" does not equal the entry shown under "all economic losses."

<sup>1</sup>Estimate, based on zero or on about 10 or fewer sample cases, is statistically unreliable.

Table 71. Commercial burglary: Percent distribution of victimizations resulting in economic loss, by kind of establishment and value of loss, 1973

Kind of establishment	Total	Less than \$10	\$10-\$50	\$51-\$250	\$251 or more	Not available
All establishments	100	19	22	26	30	3
Retail	100	17	21	27	33	2
Wholesale	100	17	22	24	35	12
Service	100	23	23	26	24	3
Other	100	16	22	24	34	3

NOTE: Detail may not add to total shown because of rounding.

<sup>1</sup>Estimate, based on about 10 or fewer sample cases, is statistically unreliable.

Table 72. Commercial robbery: Percent distribution of victimizations resulting in theft loss, by kind of establishment and value of loss, 1973

Kind of establishment	Total	Less than \$10	\$10-\$50	\$51-\$250	\$251 or more	Not available
All establishments	100	3	14	35	29	19
Retail	100	3	12	37	32	16
Service	100	15	20	40	14	21
Other	100	12	18	12	39	129

<sup>1</sup>Estimate, based on about 10 or fewer sample cases, is statistically unreliable.

Table 73. Commercial crimes: Percent distribution of victimizations resulting in theft loss, by proportion of loss recovered and type of crime, 1973

Proportion of loss recovered	All commercial crimes	Burglary	Robbery
Total	100	100	100
None recovered	88	90	79
Some recovered	8	8	8
Less than half	2	2	12
Half or more	5	5	6
All recovered	4	2	13

NOTE: Detail may not add to total shown because of rounding.

<sup>1</sup>Estimate, based on about 10 or fewer sample cases, is statistically unreliable.

Table 74. Personal, household, and commercial crimes: Percent of victimizations resulting in loss of time from work, by type of crime, 1973

Type of crime	Percent
All personal crimes	4
Crimes of violence	10
Rape	15
Completed rape	17
Attempted rape	15
Robbery	11
Robbery with injury	23
Robbery without injury	5
Assault	9
Aggravated assault	13
Simple assault	6
Crimes of theft	3
Personal larceny with contact	3
Personal larceny without contact	3
All household crimes	5
Burglary	6
Forcible entry	10
Unlawful entry without force	4
Attempted forcible entry	3
Household larceny	2
Less than \$50	1
\$50 or more	4
Amount not available	12
Attempted larceny	3
Motor vehicle theft	16
Completed theft	22
Attempted theft	5
All commercial crimes	8
Burglary	8
Robbery	12

<sup>1</sup>Estimate, based on about 10 or fewer sample cases, is statistically unreliable.

**Table 75. Personal and household crimes: Percent of victimizations resulting in loss of time from work, by type of crime and race of victims, 1973**

Type of crime	White	Black
All personal crimes	4	6
Crimes of violence	9	12
Rape	14	<sup>1</sup> 16
Robbery	11	13
Assault	8	11
Crimes of theft	3	3
Personal larceny with contact	3	<sup>1</sup> 2
Personal larceny without contact	3	3
All household crimes	4	9
Burglary	5	10
Household larceny	2	3
Motor vehicle theft	15	25

<sup>1</sup>Estimate, based on about 10 or fewer sample cases, is statistically unreliable.

**Table 76. Personal crimes of violence: Percent of victimizations resulting in loss of time from work, by type of crime and victim-offender relationship, 1973**

Type of crime	All victimizations	Involving strangers	Involving nonstrangers
Crimes of violence	10	9	11
Rape	15	15	<sup>1</sup> 18
Robbery	11	11	12
Assault	9	8	10

<sup>1</sup>Estimate, based on about 10 or fewer sample cases, is statistically unreliable.



**Table 77. Personal and household crimes: Percent distribution of victimizations resulting in loss of time from work, by type of crime and number of days lost, 1973**

Type of crime	Total	Less than 1 day	1-5 days	6 days or more	Not known and not available
All personal crimes	100	43	39	16	2
Crimes of violence	100	26	48	25	11
Rape	100	14	77	119	10
Robbery	100	20	49	31	10
Assault	100	30	46	23	1
Crimes of theft	100	65	27	5	3
Personal larceny with contact	100	168	132	10	10
Personal larceny without contact	100	65	27	5	3
All household crimes	100	48	43	5	4
Burglary	100	47	45	4	4
Household larceny	100	62	31	12	14
Motor vehicle theft	100	40	49	9	12

NOTE: Detail may not add to total shown because of rounding.

<sup>1</sup>Estimate, based on zero or on about 10 or fewer sample cases, is statistically unreliable.

**Table 78. Personal crimes of violence: Percent distribution of victimizations resulting in loss of time from work, by number of days lost and victim-offender relationship, 1973**

Number of days lost	All victimizations	Involving strangers	Involving nonstrangers
Total	100	100	100
Less than 1 day	26	25	29
1-5 days	48	47	49
6 days or more	25	27	22
Not known and not available	11	11	11

NOTE: Detail may not add to total shown because of rounding.

<sup>1</sup>Estimate, based on about 10 or fewer sample cases, is statistically unreliable.

Table 79. Personal and household crimes: Percent distribution of victimizations resulting in loss of time from work, by race of victims, type of crime, and number of days lost, 1973

Race and type of crime	Total	Less than 1 day	1-5 days	6 days or more	Not known and not available
<b>White</b>					
All personal crimes	100	48	37	13	
Crimes of violence	100	29	49	21	2
Crimes of theft	100	70	23	4	1
All household crimes	100	52	39	5	3
Burglary	100	51	40	4	4
Household larceny	100	65	30	12	4
Motor vehicle theft	100	45	45	9	14
<b>Black</b>					
All personal crimes	100	20	47	33	1
Crimes of violence	100	14	42	44	10
Crimes of theft	100	29	56	12	2
All household crimes	100	33	58	16	14
Burglary	100	38	56	13	13
Household larceny	100	42	42	16	10
Motor vehicle theft	100	16	71	11	2

NOTE: Detail may not add to total shown because of rounding.

<sup>1</sup>Estimate, based on zero or on about 10 or fewer sample cases, is statistically unreliable.

Table 80. Commercial crimes: Percent distribution of victimizations, by type of crime and number of days lost from work, 1973

Type of crime	Total	None	Less than 1 day	1 day or more
All commercial crimes	100	92	4	4
Burglary	100	93	4	4
Robbery	100	89	5	6

NOTE: Excludes data on a small number of victimizations for which the amount of time lost was unavailable.

**Table 81. Personal, household, and commercial crimes:  
Percent of victimizations reported to the police,  
by type of crime, 1973**

Type of crime	Percent
All personal crimes	28
Crimes of violence	45
Rape	44
Robbery	51
Robbery with injury	62
From serious assault	71
From minor assault	52
Robbery without injury	46
Assault	43
Aggravated assault	52
With injury	59
Attempted assault with weapon	48
Simple assault	37
With injury	47
Attempted assault without weapon	34
Crimes of theft	22
Personal larceny with contact	32
Purse snatching	36
Pocket picking	31
Personal larceny without contact	21
All household crimes	37
Burglary	46
Forcible entry	70
Unlawful entry without force	36
Attempted forcible entry	30
Household larceny	25
Completed larceny <sup>1</sup>	25
Less than \$50	15
\$50 or more	52
Attempted larceny	20
Motor vehicle theft	67
Completed theft	86
Attempted theft	32
All commercial crimes	80
Burglary	79
Robbery	86

<sup>1</sup>Includes data, not shown separately, on larcenies for which the value of loss was not ascertained.

**Table 82. Personal crimes: Percent of victimizations  
reported to the police, by selected characteristics  
of victims and type of crime, 1973**

Characteristic	All personal crimes	Crimes of violence	Crimes of theft
Sex			
Both sexes	28	45	22
Male	28	42	22
Female	28	49	22
Race			
White	28	45	22
Black	29	47	19

Table 83. Personal crimes: Percent of victimizations reported to the police, by type of crime, victim-offender relationship, and sex of victims, 1973

Type of crime	All victimizations			Involving strangers			Involving nonstrangers		
	Both sexes	Male	Female	Both sexes	Male	Female	Both sexes	Male	Female
Crimes of violence	45	42	49	47	45	52	41	36	47
Rape	44	<sup>1</sup> 58	43	48	<sup>1</sup> 100	48	31	<sup>1</sup> 48	29
Robbery	51	47	63	53	49	66	41	32	53
Robbery with injury	62	58	70	66	60	82	44	45	43
From serious assault	71	67	85	71	66	94	66	75	<sup>1</sup> 53
From minor assault	52	44	62	58	49	73	31	<sup>1</sup> 19	39
Robbery without injury	46	41	59	47	43	57	39	26	65
Assault	43	41	47	44	43	47	41	37	47
Aggravated assault	52	50	57	52	51	57	51	48	56
With injury	59	55	69	60	57	71	59	52	67
Attempted assault with weapon	48	47	50	49	48	52	47	45	49
Simple assault	37	34	42	39	37	43	35	29	42
With injury	47	46	48	55	56	52	39	31	46
Attempted assault without weapon	34	31	40	35	32	40	33	28	40
Crimes of theft	22	22	22	...	...	...	...	...	...
Personal larceny with contact	32	32	33	33	32	33	<sup>1</sup> 26	<sup>1</sup> 29	<sup>1</sup> 16
Purse snatching	36	<sup>1</sup> 76	35	36	<sup>1</sup> 76	35	<sup>1</sup> 24	<sup>1</sup> 10	<sup>1</sup> 24
Pocket picking	30	31	30	31	31	31	<sup>1</sup> 26	<sup>1</sup> 29	<sup>1</sup> 10
Personal larceny without contact	21	21	22	...	...	...	...	...	...

... Represents not applicable.

<sup>1</sup>Estimate, based on zero or on about 10 or fewer sample cases, is statistically unreliable.

Table 84. Personal crimes: Percent of victimizations reported to the police, by type of crime, victim-offender relationship, and race of victims, 1973

Type of crime	All victimizations		Involving strangers		Involving nonstrangers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Crimes of violence	45	47	47	44	39	51
Rape	41	52	47	51	<sup>1</sup> 24	<sup>1</sup> 57
Robbery	52	50	55	48	36	63
Robbery with injury	62	59	67	59	40	<sup>1</sup> 60
From serious assault	72	66	73	68	69	<sup>1</sup> 52
From minor assault	52	48	60	43	<sup>1</sup> 24	<sup>1</sup> 65
Robbery without injury	46	45	48	43	32	65
Assault	43	45	45	40	40	49
Aggravated assault	51	54	52	49	48	59
With injury	57	66	59	62	55	69
Attempted assault with weapon	48	48	50	43	45	53
Simple assault	38	31	40	27	35	35
With injury	48	36	56	28	40	39
Attempted assault without weapon	35	30	36	26	34	34
Crimes of theft	22	19	...	...	...	...
Personal larceny with contact	34	29	35	26	<sup>1</sup> 10	<sup>1</sup> 56
Purse snatching	35	34	36	<sup>1</sup> 32	10	<sup>1</sup> 100
Pocket picking	33	28	34	24	10	<sup>1</sup> 51
Personal larceny without contact	22	18	...	...	...	...

... Represents not applicable.

<sup>1</sup>Estimate, based on zero or on about 10 or fewer sample cases, is statistically unreliable.

Table 85. Personal crimes: Percent of victimizations reported to the police, by type of crime and age of victims, 1973

Type of crime	12-19	20-34	35-49	50-64	65 and over
All personal crimes	17	33	37	35	37
Crimes of violence	32	50	58	56	58
Rape	45	38	<sup>1</sup> 63	<sup>1</sup> 77	<sup>1</sup> 70
Robbery	30	60	57	69	65
Robbery with injury	42	69	55	84	77
From serious assault	52	73	64	87	84
From minor assault	37	64	42	78	<sup>1</sup> 67
Robbery without injury	25	55	58	57	59
Assault	32	48	58	48	49
Aggravated assault	36	55	69	62	59
With injury	47	63	76	71	<sup>1</sup> 81
Attempted assault with weapon	37	51	65	59	<sup>1</sup> 38
Simple assault	26	44	51	42	44
With injury	33	56	73	54	<sup>1</sup> 45
Attempted assault without weapon	23	40	45	39	44
Crimes of theft	12	25	31	29	29
Personal larceny with contact	16	30	39	41	41
Purse snatching	<sup>1</sup> 16	38	<sup>1</sup> 31	41	47
Pocket picking	16	27	45	41	36
Personal larceny without contact	11	25	31	28	27

<sup>1</sup>Estimate, based on about 10 or fewer sample cases, is statistically unreliable.

Table 86. Personal crimes of violence: Percent of victimizations reported to the police, by age of victims and victim-offender relationship, 1973

Age	All victimizations	Involving strangers	Involving nonstrangers
12-19	32	34	28
20-34	50	52	46
35-49	58	58	58
50-64	56	53	63
65 and over	58	61	46

Table 87. Personal and household crimes: Percent of victimizations reported to the police, by type of crime and type of locality of residence, 1973

Type of crime	All areas	Metropolitan areas		Nonmetropolitan areas
		Central cities	Outside central cities	
All personal crimes	28	29	28	27
Crimes of violence	45	44	44	47
Rape	44	41	38	62
Robbery	51	52	51	52
Assault	43	41	43	46
Crimes of theft	22	22	23	20
Personal larceny with contact	32	33	32	33
Personal larceny without contact	21	22	22	19
All household crimes	37	39	38	32
Burglary	46	49	48	38
Household larceny	25	23	26	25
Motor vehicle theft	67	70	66	59

Table 88. Personal and household crimes: Percent of victimizations reported to the police, by type of crime and size of central city of residence, 1973

Type of crime	All central cities	50,000 to 249,999	250,000 to 499,999	500,000 to 999,999	1,000,000 or more
All personal crimes	29	27	28	31	30
Crimes of violence	44	40	45	47	46
Rape	41	<sup>1</sup> 25	<sup>1</sup> 73	52	36
Robbery	52	48	48	54	53
Assault	41	38	43	44	41
Crimes of theft	22	22	22	24	22
Personal larceny with contact	33	25	34	41	30
Personal larceny without contact	22	21	21	22	21
All household crimes	39	38	38	38	43
Burglary	49	48	49	47	51
Household larceny	23	25	23	21	20
Motor vehicle theft	70	77	70	66	69

<sup>1</sup>Estimate, based on about 10 or fewer sample cases, is statistically unreliable.

Table 89. Household crimes: Percent of victimizations reported to the police, by type of crime, race of head of household, and form of tenure, 1973

Type of crime	All households <sup>1</sup>			White households			Black households		
	Both forms	Owned	Rented	Both forms	Owned	Rented	Both forms	Owned	Rented
All household crimes	37	38	36	37	38	36	38	37	38
Burglary	46	48	43	46	48	42	47	49	45
Forcible entry	70	76	64	72	78	65	65	67	64
Nothing taken	47	56	38	49	58	41	26	<sup>2</sup> 38	<sup>2</sup> 15
Something taken	77	81	72	79	84	73	70	70	70
Unlawful entry without force	36	39	33	36	39	33	33	30	34
Attempted forcible entry	30	32	29	31	32	30	28	31	27
Household larceny	25	26	23	25	26	24	19	19	19
Completed larceny <sup>3</sup>	25	26	23	26	27	24	19	19	19
Less than \$50	15	16	13	15	16	13	13	14	12
\$50 or more	52	53	50	55	57	52	31	28	35
Attempted larceny	20	21	19	21	21	21	<sup>2</sup> 7	<sup>2</sup> 11	<sup>2</sup> 5
Motor vehicle theft	67	67	67	66	66	66	74	73	74
Completed theft	86	86	86	85	85	85	93	90	94
Attempted theft	32	35	28	32	35	29	30	<sup>2</sup> 36	<sup>2</sup> 25

<sup>1</sup> Includes data on "other" races, not shown separately.

<sup>2</sup> Estimate, based on about 10 or fewer sample cases, is statistically unreliable.

<sup>3</sup> Includes data, not shown separately, on larcenies for which the value of loss was not ascertained.

Table 90. Household crimes: Percent of victimizations reported to the police, by type of crime and annual family income, 1973

Type of crime	Less than \$3,000	\$3,000-\$7,499	\$7,500-\$9,999	\$10,000-\$14,999	\$15,000-\$24,999	\$25,000 or more	Not available
All household crimes	31	35	37	38	41	44	43
Burglary	38	44	45	46	53	55	52
Forcible entry	59	67	74	71	83	79	72
Unlawful entry without force	27	33	36	36	42	48	47
Attempted forcible entry	27	30	25	31	36	41	33
Household larceny	18	22	25	27	27	28	28
Completed larceny <sup>1</sup>	18	23	25	28	27	29	29
Less than \$50	11	14	16	16	15	16	19
\$50 or more	41	47	49	59	56	56	49
Attempted larceny	25	18	21	16	28	<sup>2</sup> 18	<sup>2</sup> 23
Motor vehicle theft	73	65	66	68	64	71	69
Completed theft	85	80	88	88	87	95	94
Attempted theft	38	27	31	35	34	<sup>2</sup> 33	<sup>2</sup> 12

<sup>1</sup> Includes data, not shown separately, on larcenies for which the value of loss was not ascertained.

<sup>2</sup> Estimate, based on about 10 or fewer sample cases, is statistically unreliable.

Table 91. Household crimes: Percent of victimizations reported to the police, by value of loss and type of crime, 1973

Value of loss <sup>1</sup>	All household crimes	Burglary	Household larceny	Motor vehicle theft
Less than \$10	11	19	9	0
\$10-\$49	22	27	20	<sup>2</sup> 100
\$50-\$249	55	59	50	76
\$250 or more	86	89	63	89

<sup>1</sup>The proportions refer only to losses of cash and/or property and exclude the value of property damage.

<sup>2</sup>Estimate, based on about 10 or fewer sample cases, is statistically unreliable.

Table 92. Personal and household crimes: Percent distribution of reasons for not reporting victimizations to the police, by type of crime, 1973

Type of crime	Total	Nothing could be done; lack of proof	Not important enough	Police would not want to be bothered	Too inconvenient or time consuming	Private or personal matter	Fear of reprisal	Reported to someone else	Other and not given
All personal crimes	100	29	27	6	3	5	1	18	11
Crimes of violence	100	17	25	6	3	16	4	11	17
Rape	100	15	<sup>1</sup> 5	<sup>1</sup> 7	<sup>1</sup> 4	24	14	<sup>1</sup> 6	26
Robbery	100	31	18	8	4	9	5	8	17
Robbery with injury	100	28	11	7	<sup>1</sup> 5	17	6	7	18
Robbery without injury	100	32	20	9	3	6	4	9	17
Assault	100	15	28	5	3	18	3	12	17
Aggravated assault	100	17	21	6	2	20	4	9	19
Simple assault	100	13	31	5	3	16	3	13	16
Crimes of theft	100	32	27	5	3	2	Z	20	10
Personal larceny with contact	100	43	14	4	5	5	3	11	16
Personal larceny without contact	100	32	28	5	3	2	Z	20	10
All household crimes	100	36	30	8	2	5	1	4	13
Burglary	100	36	25	8	2	5	1	6	16
Forcible entry	100	30	21	10	3	8	2	7	20
Unlawful entry without force	100	38	23	7	2	6	1	6	16
Attempted forcible entry	100	35	29	8	2	2	1	7	15
Household larceny	100	36	34	8	2	5	Z	3	11
Completed larceny	100	36	34	8	2	5	Z	3	11
Attempted larceny	100	36	31	7	<sup>1</sup> 1	4	10	3	17
Motor vehicle theft	100	37	23	7	4	7	10	3	19
Completed theft	100	20	11	3	2	27	10	<sup>1</sup> 2	34
Attempted theft	100	43	27	8	5	11	10	3	14

NOTE: Detail may not add to 100 percent because of rounding.

Z Less than 0.5 percent.

<sup>1</sup>Estimate, based on zero or on about 10 or fewer sample cases, is statistically unreliable.



**Table 93. Personal crimes of violence: Percent distribution of reasons for not reporting victimizations to the police, by victim-offender relationship and type of crime, 1973**

Victim-offender relationship and type of crime	Total	Nothing could be done; lack of proof	Not important enough	Police would not want to be bothered	Too inconvenient or time consuming	Private or personal matter	Fear of reprisal	Reported to someone else	Other and not given
Involving strangers									
Crimes of violence	100	24	25	7	4	8	3	10	19
Rape	100	17	<sup>1</sup> 6	<sup>1</sup> 8	<sup>1</sup> 6	18	11	<sup>1</sup> 7	28
Robbery	100	34	18	10	4	5	4	7	18
Assault	100	20	29	6	4	9	3	11	19
Involving nonstrangers									
Crimes of violence	100	7	25	5	1	30	5	13	14
Rape	100	<sup>1</sup> 8	<sup>1</sup> 2	<sup>1</sup> 3	<sup>1</sup> 0	39	<sup>1</sup> 21	<sup>1</sup> 5	21
Robbery	100	12	17	<sup>1</sup> 1	<sup>1</sup> 0	32	<sup>1</sup> 8	15	15
Assault	100	6	26	5	1	30	4	13	14

NOTE: Detail may not add to 100 percent because of rounding.

<sup>1</sup>Estimate, based on zero or on about 10 or fewer sample cases, is statistically unreliable.

**Table 94. Personal and household crimes: Percent distribution of reasons for not reporting victimizations to the police, by type of crime and type of locality of residence, 1973**

Type of crime and area of residence	Total	Nothing could be done; lack of proof	Not important enough	Police would not want to be bothered	Too inconvenient or time consuming	Private or personal matter	Fear of reprisal	Reported to someone else	Other and not given
Crimes against persons									
Metropolitan areas									
Central cities	100	31	25	6	3	5	1	16	12
Outside central cities	100	27	28	5	3	5	1	19	11
Nonmetropolitan areas	100	29	27	5	3	6	1	18	11
Crimes against households									
Metropolitan areas									
Central cities	100	38	29	8	3	5	1	5	13
Outside central cities	100	33	33	8	2	5	1	4	15
Nonmetropolitan areas	100	39	28	8	2	6	1	3	13

NOTE: Detail may not add to 100 percent because of rounding.

Table 95. Personal and household crimes: Percent distribution of reasons for not reporting victimizations to the police, by type of crime and size of central city of residence, 1973

Type of crime and size of central city of residence	Total	Nothing could be done; lack of proof	Not important enough	Police would not want to be bothered	Too inconvenient or time consuming	Private or personal matter	Fear of reprisal	Reported to someone else	Other and not given
Crimes against persons									
All central cities	100	31	25	6	3	5	1	16	12
50,000 to 249,999	100	27	27	5	3	6	1	20	10
250,000 to 499,999	100	28	26	6	4	5	1	17	12
500,000 to 999,999	100	32	25	6	3	4	1	16	12
1,000,000 or more	100	37	23	8	4	4	1	12	12
Crimes against households									
All central cities	100	38	29	8	3	5	1	5	13
50,000 to 249,999	100	34	32	7	2	6	1	4	13
250,000 to 499,999	100	36	28	9	3	6	<sup>1</sup> 1	5	12
500,000 to 999,999	100	41	27	7	3	5	<sup>1</sup> 2	6	12
1,000,000 or more	100	40	27	8	3	3	1	5	14

NOTE: Detail may not add to 100 percent because of rounding.

Z Less than 0.5 percent.

<sup>1</sup>Estimate, based on about 10 or fewer sample cases, is statistically unreliable.

Table 96. Household crimes: Percent distribution of reasons for not reporting victimizations to the police, by race of head of household and type of crime, 1973

Race and reason	All household crimes	Burglary	Household larceny	Motor vehicle theft
White				
Total	100	100	100	100
Nothing could be done; lack of proof	36	36	36	38
Not important enough	31	25	35	22
Police would not want to be bothered	8	8	8	7
Too inconvenient or time consuming	2	2	2	4
Private or personal matter	5	6	5	7
Fear of reprisal	1	1	Z	10
Reported to someone else	4	6	3	3
Other and not given	13	16	11	19
Black				
Total	100	100	100	100
Nothing could be done; lack of proof	38	39	38	33
Not important enough	26	22	28	29
Police would not want to be bothered	9	8	9	16
Too inconvenient or time consuming	3	2	3	18
Private or personal matter	6	4	8	14
Fear of reprisal	1	<sup>1</sup> 1	<sup>1</sup> 1	10
Reported to someone else	5	7	2	13
Other and not given	14	17	11	16

NOTE: Detail may not add to 100 percent because of rounding.

Z Less than 0.5 percent.

<sup>1</sup>Estimate, based on zero or an about 10 or fewer sample cases, is statistically unreliable.

Table 97. Household crimes: Percent distribution of reasons for not reporting victimizations to the police, by annual family income, 1973

Reason	Less than \$3,000	\$3,000-\$7,499	\$7,500-\$9,999	\$10,000-\$14,999	\$15,000-\$24,999	\$25,000 or more	Not available
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Nothing could be done; lack of proof	35	37	39	37	34	31	37
Not important enough	25	30	30	32	34	33	26
Police would not want to be bothered	7	9	8	8	7	7	9
Too inconvenient or time consuming	3	2	3	2	3	3	3
Private or personal matter	7	6	5	5	4	5	5
Fear of reprisal	2	<sup>1</sup> 2	<sup>1</sup> 2	1	<sup>1</sup> 2	<sup>1</sup> 1	<sup>1</sup> 1
Reported to someone else	7	3	4	3	3	3	6
Other and not given	14	13	11	13	15	17	14

NOTE: Detail may not add to 100 percent because of rounding.

Z Less than 0.5 percent.

<sup>1</sup>Estimate, based on about 10 or fewer sample cases, is statistically unreliable.

Table 98. Household crimes: Percent distribution of selected reasons for not reporting victimizations to the police, by race of head of household and annual family income, 1973

Race and income	Total	Nothing could be done; lack of proof	Not important enough	All other and not given
White				
Less than \$3,000	100	34	26	40
\$3,000-\$7,499	100	37	31	33
\$7,500-\$9,999	100	39	30	31
\$10,000-\$14,999	100	37	32	31
\$15,000-\$24,999	100	34	34	32
\$25,000 or more	100	31	32	37
Black				
Less than \$3,000	100	40	22	38
\$3,000-\$7,499	100	38	26	36
\$7,500-\$9,999	100	35	29	36
\$10,000-\$14,999	100	38	28	35
\$15,000-\$24,999	100	36	33	31
\$25,000 or more	100	<sup>1</sup> 31	<sup>1</sup> 49	<sup>1</sup> 20

NOTE: Detail may not add to 100 percent because of rounding.

<sup>1</sup>Estimate, based on about 10 or fewer sample cases, is statistically unreliable.

Table 99. Household crimes: Percent distribution of reasons for not reporting victimizations to the police, by type of crime and value of theft loss, 1973

Type of crime and value of loss <sup>1</sup>	Total	Nothing could be done; lack of proof	Not important enough	Police would not want to be bothered	Too inconvenient or time consuming	Private or personal matter	Fear of reprisal	Reported to someone else	Other and not given
All household crimes	100	37	31	8	2	6	1	3	12
Less than \$50	100	35	37	8	2	5	Z	2	10
\$50-\$249	100	44	11	8	3	8	1	4	20
\$250 or more	100	33	5	7	<sup>2</sup> 2	18	<sup>2</sup> 2	7	27
Burglary	100	39	22	7	2	7	1	6	16
Less than \$50	100	36	29	7	2	6	1	6	12
\$50-\$249	100	43	10	8	4	8	<sup>2</sup> 1	5	21
\$250 or more	100	39	<sup>2</sup> 3	<sup>2</sup> 6	<sup>2</sup> 3	13	<sup>2</sup> 2	8	26
Household larceny	100	36	34	8	2	5	Z	2	11
Less than \$50	100	34	39	8	2	4	Z	2	9
\$50-\$99	100	44	14	8	3	9	<sup>2</sup> Z	4	18
\$100-\$249	100	47	8	10	3	7	<sup>2</sup> 1	3	20
\$250 or more	100	40	<sup>2</sup> 4	10	<sup>2</sup> 1	12	<sup>2</sup> 2	8	22
Motor vehicle theft	100	19	10	<sup>2</sup> 2	<sup>2</sup> 3	29	<sup>2</sup> 0	<sup>2</sup> 3	35
Less than \$250	100	28	15	<sup>2</sup> 0	<sup>2</sup> 0	<sup>2</sup> 22	<sup>2</sup> 0	<sup>2</sup> 0	34
\$250-\$999	100	19	<sup>2</sup> 6	<sup>2</sup> 6	<sup>2</sup> 4	32	<sup>2</sup> 0	<sup>2</sup> 2	30
\$1,000 or more	100	10	<sup>2</sup> 9	<sup>2</sup> 0	<sup>2</sup> 2	31	<sup>2</sup> 0	<sup>2</sup> 5	43

NOTE: Detail may not add to 100 percent because of rounding.

Z Less than 0.5 percent.

<sup>1</sup>The proportions refer only to losses of cash and/or property and exclude the value of property damage.

<sup>2</sup>Estimate, based on zero or on about 10 or fewer sample cases, is statistically unreliable.

Table 100. Commercial crimes: Percent distribution of reasons for not reporting victimizations to the police, by type of crime, 1973

Reason	Burglary and robbery	Burglary	Robbery
Total	100	100	100
Nothing could be done; lack of proof	34	34	29
Not important enough	30	30	30
Police would not want to be bothered	4	4	<sup>1</sup> 4
Too inconvenient or time consuming; did not want to become involved	4	4	11
Reported to someone else	6	6	15
Other and not given	22	21	32

NOTE: Detail may not add to total shown because of rounding.

<sup>1</sup>Estimate, based on about 10 or fewer sample cases, is statistically unreliable.

## APPENDIX II

### SURVEY INSTRUMENTS

For the household segment of the National Crime Panel surveys, a basic screen questionnaire (Form CS-1) and a crime incident report (Form NCS-2) were used to elicit information on the relevant crimes committed against the household as a whole and against any of its members age 12 and over. Form NCS-1 was designed to screen for all instances of victimization before details of any specific incident were collected. The screening form also was used for obtaining information on the characteristics of each household and of its members. Household screening questions were asked only once for each household, whereas individual screening questions were asked of all members age 12 and over. However, a knowledgeable adult member of the household served as a proxy respondent for 12- and 13-year-

olds, incapacitated persons, and individuals absent during the interviewing period.

Once the screening process was completed, the interviewer obtained details of each revealed incident, if any. Form NCS-2 included questions concerning the extent of economic loss or injury, characteristics of offenders, whether or not the police were notified, and other pertinent details.

In the commercial survey, basically comparable techniques were used to screen for the occurrence of burglary and robbery incidents and to obtain details concerning those crimes. Form CVS-100 contained separate sections for screening and gathering information on the characteristics of business places, and for eliciting data on the relevant crimes.



NCS 1 and 2

FORM **NCS-1 AND NCS-2**  
(8-18-75)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS  
ACTING AS COLLECTING AGENT FOR THE  
LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE ADMINISTRATION  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

**NATIONAL CRIME SURVEY  
NATIONAL SAMPLE**

**NCS-1 - BASIC SCREEN QUESTIONNAIRE  
NCS-2 - CRIME INCIDENT REPORT**

**NOTICE** - Your report to the Census Bureau is confidential by law (U.S. Code 42, Section 3761). All identifiable information will be used only by persons engaged in and for the purposes of the survey, and may not be disclosed or released to others for any purpose.

Sample (cc 4) <b>JO</b>	Control number (cc 5) PSU Segment Ck Serial
Household number (cc 2)	Land use (cc 9-11)

**INTERVIEWER:** Fill Sample and Control numbers, and items 1, 2, 4, and 9 at time of interview.

**1. Interviewer identification**  
Code \_\_\_\_\_ Name \_\_\_\_\_

**2. Record of interview**  
Line number of household respondent (cc 12) \_\_\_\_\_ Date completed \_\_\_\_\_

**3. TYPE Z NONINTERVIEW**  
Interview not obtained for Line number \_\_\_\_\_

*NOTE: Fill NCS-7 Noninterview Record, for Types A, B, and C noninterviews.*

Complete 14-21 for each line number listed.

**4. Household status**

1  Same household as last enumeration  
2  Replacement household since last enumeration  
3  Previous noninterview or not in sample before

**5. Special place type code (cc 6c)**  
\_\_\_\_\_

**6. Tenure (cc 8)**

1  Owned or being bought  
2  Rented for cash  
3  No cash rent

**7. Type of living quarters (cc 15)**

**Housing unit**

1  House, apartment, flat  
2  HU in nontransient hotel, motel, etc.  
3  HU - Permanent in transient hotel, motel, etc.  
4  HU in rooming house  
5  Mobile home or trailer  
6  HU not specified above - Describe \_\_\_\_\_

**OTHER Unit**

7  Quarters not HU in rooming or boarding house  
8  Unit not permanent in transient hotel, motel, etc.  
9  Vacant tent site or trailer site  
10  Not specified above - Describe \_\_\_\_\_

**8. Number of housing units in structure (cc 26)**

1  1                      5  5-9  
2  2                      6  10 or more  
3  3                      7  Mobile home or trailer  
4  4                      8  Only OTHER units

**ASK IN EACH HOUSEHOLD:**

**9. (Other than the ... business) does anyone in this household operate a business from this address?**

1  No  
2  Yes - What kind of business is that? \_\_\_\_\_

**INTERVIEWER:** Enter unrecognizable businesses only

**10. Family income (cc 27)**

1  Under \$1,000  
2  \$1,000 to 1,999  
3  2,000 to 2,999  
4  3,000 to 3,999  
5  4,000 to 4,999  
6  5,000 to 5,999  
7  6,000 to 7,499  
8  7,500 to 9,999  
9  10,000 to 11,999  
10  12,000 to 14,999  
11  15,000 to 19,999  
12  20,000 to 24,999  
13  25,000 to 49,999  
14  50,000 and over

**11a. Household members 12 years of age and OVER**  
\_\_\_\_\_ Total number

**b. Household members UNDER 12 years of age**  
\_\_\_\_\_ Total number  
o  None

**12. Crime Incident Reports filled**  
\_\_\_\_\_ Total number - Fill item 31 on Control Card  
o  None

**13a. Use of telephone (cc 25)**

Phone in unit (Yes in cc 25a)

Phone interview acceptable? (cc 25c or 25d)

1  Yes . . . . . } SKIP to next applicable item  
2  No - Refused number

Phone elsewhere (Yes in cc 25b)

Phone interview acceptable? (cc 25c or 25d)

3  Yes . . . . . } SKIP to next applicable item  
4  No - Refused number

5  No phone (No in cc 25a and 25b)

**13b. Proxy information - Fill for all proxy interviews**

(1) Proxy interview obtained for line number \_\_\_\_\_

Proxy respondent name	Line number
Reason for proxy interview	

(2) Proxy interview obtained for line number \_\_\_\_\_

Proxy respondent name	Line number
Reason for proxy interview	

If more than 2 Proxy Interviews, continue in notes.

**CENSUS USE ONLY**

(031) \_\_\_\_\_ (032) \_\_\_\_\_ (033) \_\_\_\_\_

PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS											
14. NAME (of household respondent)	15. TYPE OF INTERVIEW	16. LINE NO.	17. RELATIONSHIP TO HOUSEHOLD HEAD	18. AGE LAST BIRTH-DAY	19. MARITAL STATUS	20a. RACE	20b. ORIGIN	21. SEX	22. ARMED FORCES MEMBER	23. Education - highest grade	24. Education - complete that year?
KEYER - BEGIN NEW RECORD		(cc 12)	(cc 13b)	(cc 17)	(cc 18)	(cc 19a)	(cc 19b)	(cc 20)	(cc 21)	(cc 22)	(cc 23)
Last	(034) 1 <input type="checkbox"/> Per - Self-respondent 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Tel. - Self-respondent 3 <input type="checkbox"/> Per. - Proxy } <i>Fill 13b on cover page</i> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> Tel. - Proxy 5 <input type="checkbox"/> NI - <i>Fill 16-21</i>	(035) Line No.	(036) 1 <input type="checkbox"/> Head 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Wife of head 3 <input type="checkbox"/> Own child 4 <input type="checkbox"/> Other relative 5 <input type="checkbox"/> Non-relative	(037) Age	(038) 1 <input type="checkbox"/> M. 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Wd. 3 <input type="checkbox"/> D. 4 <input type="checkbox"/> Sep. 5 <input type="checkbox"/> NM	(039) 1 <input type="checkbox"/> W. 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Neg. 3 <input type="checkbox"/> Ot.	(040) 1 <input type="checkbox"/> M 2 <input type="checkbox"/> F	(041) 1 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes 2 <input type="checkbox"/> No	(042) Grade	(043) 1 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes 2 <input type="checkbox"/> No	
<b>CHECK ITEM A</b>		Look at item 4 on cover page. Is this the same household as last enumeration? (Box 1 marked) <input type="checkbox"/> Yes - SKIP to Check Item B <input type="checkbox"/> No				26d. Have you been looking for work during the past 4 weeks? (051) 1 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes No - When did you last work? 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Less than 5 years ago - SKIP to 28a 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 5 or more years ago } SKIP to 29 4 <input type="checkbox"/> Never worked					
(044) 25a. Did you live in this house on April 1, 1970? 1 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes - SKIP to Check Item B 2 <input type="checkbox"/> No		b. Where did you live on April 1, 1970? (State, foreign country, U.S. possession, etc.) State, etc. _____ County _____				(052) 27. Is there any reason why you could not take a job LAST WEEK? 1 <input type="checkbox"/> No Yes - 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Already had a job 3 <input type="checkbox"/> Temporary illness 4 <input type="checkbox"/> Going to school 5 <input type="checkbox"/> Other - Specify → _____					
(045) c. Did you live inside the limits of a city, town, village, etc.? 1 <input type="checkbox"/> No 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes - Name of city, town, village, etc. _____		(046) _____ (Ask males 18+ only)				28a. For whom did you (lost) work? (Name of company, business, organization or other employer) (053) x <input type="checkbox"/> Never worked - SKIP to 29					
<b>CHECK ITEM B</b>		Is this person 16 years old or older? <input type="checkbox"/> No - SKIP to 29 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes				b. What kind of business or industry is this? (E.g.: TV and radio mfg., retail shoe store, State Labor Department, farm) (054) _____					
(048) 26a. What were you doing most of LAST WEEK - (working, keeping house, going to school) or something else? 1 <input type="checkbox"/> Working - SKIP to 28a 6 <input type="checkbox"/> Unable to work - SKIP to 26d 2 <input type="checkbox"/> With a job but not at work 7 <input type="checkbox"/> Retired 3 <input type="checkbox"/> Looking for work 8 <input type="checkbox"/> Other - Specify → _____ 4 <input type="checkbox"/> Keeping house 5 <input type="checkbox"/> Going to school (If Armed Forces, SKIP to 28a)		b. Did you do any work of all LAST WEEK, not counting work around the house? (Note: If farm or business operator in HH, ask about unpaid work.) (049) 0 <input type="checkbox"/> No Yes - How many hours? _____ - SKIP to 28a				c. Were you - (055) 1 <input type="checkbox"/> An employee of a PRIVATE company, business or individual for wages, salary or commissions? 2 <input type="checkbox"/> A GOVERNMENT employee (Federal, State, county, or local)? 3 <input type="checkbox"/> SELF-EMPLOYED in OWN business, professional practice or farm? 4 <input type="checkbox"/> Working WITHOUT PAY in family business or farm?					
(050) c. Did you have a job or business from which you were temporarily absent or on layoff LAST WEEK? 1 <input type="checkbox"/> No 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes - Absent - SKIP to 28a 3 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes - Layoff - SKIP to 27						d. What kind of work were you doing? (E.g.: electrical engineer, stock clerk, typist, farmer, Armed Forces) (056) _____					
						e. What were your most important activities or duties? (E.g.: typing, keeping account books, selling cars, Armed Forces)					
Notes											



HOUSEHOLD SCREEN QUESTIONS		
29. Now I'd like to ask some questions about crime. They refer only to the last 6 months - between _____ 1, 197__ and _____, 197__ During the last 6 months, did anyone break into or somehow illegally get into your (apartment/home), garage, or another building on your property?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes - How many times? <input type="checkbox"/> No	32. Did anyone take something belonging to you or to any member of this household, from a place where you or they were temporarily staying, such as a friend's or relative's home, a hotel or motel, or a vacation home?
30. (Other than the incident(s) just mentioned) Did you find a door jimmied, a lock forced, or any other signs of an ATTEMPTED break in?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes - How many times? <input type="checkbox"/> No	33. What was the total number of motor vehicles (cars, trucks, etc.) owned by you or any other member of this household during the last 6 months? <b>(057)</b> <input type="checkbox"/> None - SKIP to 36 <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 or more
31. Was anything at all stolen that is kept outside your home, or happened to be left out, such as a bicycle, a garden hose, or lawn furniture? (other than any incidents already mentioned)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes - How many times? <input type="checkbox"/> No	34. Did anyone steal, TRY to steal, or use (it/any of them) without permission? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes - How many times? <input type="checkbox"/> No
		35. Did anyone steal or TRY to steal parts attached to (it/any of them), such as a battery, hubcaps, tape-deck, etc.? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes - How many times? <input type="checkbox"/> No
INDIVIDUAL SCREEN QUESTIONS		
36. The following questions refer only to things that happened to YOU during the last 6 months - between _____ 1, 197__ and _____, 197__ Did you have your (pocket picked/purse snatched)?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes - How many times? <input type="checkbox"/> No	46. Did you find any evidence that someone ATTEMPTED to steal something that belonged to you? (other than any incidents already mentioned) <input type="checkbox"/> Yes - How many times? <input type="checkbox"/> No
37. Did anyone take something (else) directly from you by using force, such as by a stickup, mugging or threat?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes - How many times? <input type="checkbox"/> No	47. Did you call the police during the last 6 months to report something that happened to YOU which you thought was a crime? (Do not count any calls made to the police concerning the incidents you have just told me about.) <input type="checkbox"/> No - SKIP to 48 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes - What happened?  <b>(058)</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
38. Did anyone TRY to rob you by using force or threatening to harm you? (other than any incidents already mentioned)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes - How many times? <input type="checkbox"/> No	
39. Did anyone beat you up, attack you or hit you with something, such as a rock or bottle? (other than any incidents already mentioned)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes - How many times? <input type="checkbox"/> No	
40. Were you knifed, shot at, or attacked with some other weapon by anyone at all? (other than any incidents already mentioned)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes - How many times? <input type="checkbox"/> No	Look at 47. Was HH member 12+ attacked or threatened, or was something stolen or an attempt made to steal something that belonged to him? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes - How many times? <input type="checkbox"/> No
41. Did anyone THREATEN to beat you up or THREATEN you with a knife, gun, or some other weapon, NOT including telephone threats? (other than any incidents already mentioned)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes - How many times? <input type="checkbox"/> No	<b>CHECK ITEM C</b> →
42. Did anyone TRY to attack you in some other way? (other than any incidents already mentioned)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes - How many times? <input type="checkbox"/> No	48. Did anything happen to YOU during the last 6 months which you thought was a crime, but did NOT report to the police? (other than any incidents already mentioned) <input type="checkbox"/> No - SKIP to Check Item E <input type="checkbox"/> Yes - What happened?  <b>(059)</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
43. During the last 6 months, did anyone steal things that belonged to you from inside ANY car or truck, such as packages or clothing?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes - How many times? <input type="checkbox"/> No	
44. Was anything stolen from you while you were away from home, for instance at work, in a theater or restaurant, or while traveling?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes - How many times? <input type="checkbox"/> No	Look at 48. Was HH member 12+ attacked or threatened, or was something stolen or an attempt made to steal something that belonged to him? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes - How many times? <input type="checkbox"/> No
45. (Other than any incidents you've already mentioned) was anything (else) at all stolen from you during the last 6 months?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes - How many times? <input type="checkbox"/> No	<b>CHECK ITEM D</b> →  <b>CHECK ITEM E</b> → Do any of the screen questions contain any entries for "How many times?" <input type="checkbox"/> No - Interview next HH member. End interview if last respondent, and fill item 12 on cover page. <input type="checkbox"/> Yes - Fill Crime Incident Reports.

PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS											
14. NAME	15. TYPE OF INTERVIEW	16. LINE NO.	17. RELATIONSHIP TO HOUSEHOLD HEAD	18. AGE LAST BIRTH-DAY	19. MARITAL STATUS	20a. RACE	20b. ORIGIN	21. SEX	22. ARMED FORCES MEMBER	23. Education—highest grade	24. Education—complete that year?
KEYER — BEGIN NEW RECORD		(cc 12)	(cc 13b)	(cc 17)	(cc 18)	(cc 19a)	(cc 19b)	(cc 20)	(cc 21)	(cc 22)	(cc 23)
Last	(034) 1 <input type="checkbox"/> Per. — Self-respondent 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Tel. — Self-respondent	(035)	(036) 1 <input type="checkbox"/> Head 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Wife of head	(037)	(038) 1 <input type="checkbox"/> M. 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Wd. 3 <input type="checkbox"/> D. 4 <input type="checkbox"/> Sep. 5 <input type="checkbox"/> NM	(039) 1 <input type="checkbox"/> W. 2 <input type="checkbox"/> NegJ 3 <input type="checkbox"/> Ot.	Origin	(040) 1 <input type="checkbox"/> M 2 <input type="checkbox"/> F	(041) 1 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes 2 <input type="checkbox"/> No	(042) Grade	(043) 1 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes 2 <input type="checkbox"/> No
First	3 <input type="checkbox"/> Per. — Proxy } <i>Fill 13b on cover page</i> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> Tel. — Proxy } 5 <input type="checkbox"/> NI — <i>Fill 16-21</i>	Line No.	3 <input type="checkbox"/> Own child 4 <input type="checkbox"/> Other relative 5 <input type="checkbox"/> Non-relative	Age							
<b>CHECK ITEM A</b> Look at item 4 on cover page. Is this the same household as last enumeration? (Box 1 marked) <input type="checkbox"/> Yes — SKIP to Check Item B <input type="checkbox"/> No				26d. Have you been looking for work during the past 4 weeks? (051) 1 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes No — When did you last work? 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Less than 5 years ago — SKIP to 28a 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 5 or more years ago } SKIP to 36 4 <input type="checkbox"/> Never worked							
25a. Did you live in this house on April 1, 1970? (044) 1 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes — SKIP to Check Item B 2 <input type="checkbox"/> No				27. Is there any reason why you could not take a job LAST WEEK? (052) 1 <input type="checkbox"/> No Yes — 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Already had a job 3 <input type="checkbox"/> Temporary illness 4 <input type="checkbox"/> Going to school 5 <input type="checkbox"/> Other — Specify →							
b. Where did you live on April 1, 1970? (State, foreign country, U.S. possession, etc.) State, etc. _____ County _____				28a. For whom did you (last) work? (Name of company, business, organization or other employer) (053) x <input type="checkbox"/> Never worked — SKIP to 36							
c. Did you live inside the limits of a city, town, village, etc.? (045) 1 <input type="checkbox"/> No 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes — Name of city, town, village, etc. _____				b. What kind of business or industry is this? (E.g.: TV and radio (e.g., retail shoe store, State Labor Department, farm) (054) _____							
(046) (Ask males 18+ only)				c. Were you — (055) 1 <input type="checkbox"/> An employee of a PRIVATE company, business or individual for wages, salary or commissions? 2 <input type="checkbox"/> A GOVERNMENT employee (Federal, State, county, or local)? 3 <input type="checkbox"/> SELF-EMPLOYED in OWN business, professional practice or farm? 4 <input type="checkbox"/> Working WITHOUT PAY in family business or farm?							
d. Were you in the Armed Forces on April 1, 1970? (047) 1 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes 2 <input type="checkbox"/> No				d. What kind of work were you doing? (E.g.: electrical engineer, stock clerk, typist, farmer, Armed Forces) (056) _____							
<b>CHECK ITEM B</b> Is this person 16 years old or older? <input type="checkbox"/> No — SKIP to 36 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes				e. What were your most important activities or duties? (E.g.: typing, keeping account books, selling cars, Armed Forces) (056) _____							
26a. What were you doing most of LAST WEEK — (working, keeping house, going to school) or something else? (048) 1 <input type="checkbox"/> Working — SKIP to 28a 6 <input type="checkbox"/> Unable to work — SKIP to 26d 2 <input type="checkbox"/> With a job but not at work 7 <input type="checkbox"/> Retired 3 <input type="checkbox"/> Looking for work 8 <input type="checkbox"/> Other — Specify → 4 <input type="checkbox"/> Keeping house 5 <input type="checkbox"/> Going to school (If Armed Forces, SKIP to 28a)				b. Did you do any work at all LAST WEEK, not counting work around the house? (Note: If farm or business operator in HH, ask about unpaid work.) (049) 0 <input type="checkbox"/> No Yes — How many hours? _____ — SKIP to 28a							
c. Did you have a job or business from which you were temporarily absent or on layoff LAST WEEK? (050) 1 <input type="checkbox"/> No 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes — Absent — SKIP to 28a 3 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes — Layoff — SKIP to 27				36. The following questions refer only to things that happened to YOU during the last 6 months — between _____, 197____ and _____, 197____. Did you have your (pocket picked/purse snatched)? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes — How many times? _____ <input type="checkbox"/> No _____							
37. Did anyone take something (else) directly from you by using force, such as by a stickup, mugging or threat? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes — How many times? _____ <input type="checkbox"/> No _____				46. Did you find any evidence that someone ATTEMPTED to steal something that belonged to you? (other than any incidents already mentioned) <input type="checkbox"/> Yes — How many times? _____ <input type="checkbox"/> No _____							
38. Did anyone TRY to rob you by using force or threatening to harm you? (other than any incidents already mentioned) <input type="checkbox"/> Yes — How many times? _____ <input type="checkbox"/> No _____				47. Did you call the police during the last 6 months to report something that happened to YOU which you thought was a crime? (Do not count any calls made to the police concerning the incidents you have just told me about.) (058) <input type="checkbox"/> No — SKIP to 48 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes — What happened? _____							
39. Did anyone beat you up, attack you or hit you with something, such as a rock or bottle? (other than any incidents already mentioned) <input type="checkbox"/> Yes — How many times? _____ <input type="checkbox"/> No _____				48. Did anything happen to YOU during the last 6 months which you thought was a crime, but did NOT report to the police? (other than any incidents already mentioned) (059) <input type="checkbox"/> No — SKIP to Check Item E <input type="checkbox"/> Yes — What happened? _____							
40. Were you knifed, shot at, or attacked with some other weapon by anyone at all? (other than any incidents already mentioned) <input type="checkbox"/> Yes — How many times? _____ <input type="checkbox"/> No _____				<b>CHECK ITEM C</b> Look at 47 — Was HH member 12+ attacked or threatened, or was some- thing stolen or an attempt made to steal something that belonged to him? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes — How many times? _____ <input type="checkbox"/> No _____							
41. Did anyone THREATEN to beat you up or THREATEN you with a knife, gun, or some other weapon, NOT including telephone threats? (other than any incidents already mentioned) <input type="checkbox"/> Yes — How many times? _____ <input type="checkbox"/> No _____				48. Did anything happen to YOU during the last 6 months which you thought was a crime, but did NOT report to the police? (other than any incidents already mentioned) (059) <input type="checkbox"/> No — SKIP to Check Item E <input type="checkbox"/> Yes — What happened? _____							
42. Did anyone TRY to attack you in some other way? (other than any incidents already mentioned) <input type="checkbox"/> Yes — How many times? _____ <input type="checkbox"/> No _____				<b>CHECK ITEM D</b> Look at 48 — Was HH member 12+ attacked or threatened, or was some- thing stolen or an attempt made to steal something that belonged to him? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes — How many times? _____ <input type="checkbox"/> No _____							
43. During the last 6 months, did anyone steal things that belonged to you from inside ANY car or truck, such as packages or clothing? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes — How many times? _____ <input type="checkbox"/> No _____				<b>CHECK ITEM E</b> Do any of the screen questions contain any entries for "How many times?" <input type="checkbox"/> No — Interview next HH member. End interview if last respondent, and fill item 12 on cover page. <input type="checkbox"/> Yes — Fill Crime Incident Reports.							
44. Was anything stolen from you while you were away from home, for instance at work, in a theater or restaurant, or while traveling? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes — How many times? _____ <input type="checkbox"/> No _____											
45. (Other than any incidents you've already mentioned) Was anything (else) at all stolen from you during the last 6 months? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes — How many times? _____ <input type="checkbox"/> No _____											

**PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS**

14. NAME	15. TYPE OF INTERVIEW	16. LINE NO.	17. RELATIONSHIP TO HOUSEHOLD HEAD	18. AGE LAST BIRTH-DAY	19. MARITAL STATUS	20a. RACE	20b. ORIGIN	21. SEX	22. ARMED FORCES MEMBER	23. Education - highest grade	24. Education - complete that year?
KEYER - BEGIN NEW RECORD		(cc 12)	(cc 13b)	(cc 17)	(cc 18)	(cc 19a)	(cc 19b)	(cc 20)	(cc 21)	(cc 22)	(cc 23)
Last	(034) 1 <input type="checkbox"/> Per. - Self-respondent 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Tel. - Self-respondent	(035)	(036) 1 <input type="checkbox"/> Head 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Wife of head 3 <input type="checkbox"/> Own child 4 <input type="checkbox"/> Other relative 5 <input type="checkbox"/> Non-relative	(037) Age	(038) 1 <input type="checkbox"/> M. 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Wd. 3 <input type="checkbox"/> D. 4 <input type="checkbox"/> Sep. 5 <input type="checkbox"/> NM	(039) 1 <input type="checkbox"/> W. 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Neg. 3 <input type="checkbox"/> Ot.	Origin	(040) 1 <input type="checkbox"/> M 2 <input type="checkbox"/> F	(041) 1 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes 2 <input type="checkbox"/> No	(042) Grade	(043) 1 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes 2 <input type="checkbox"/> No
First	3 <input type="checkbox"/> Per. - Proxy } <i>Fill 13b on cover page</i> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> Tel. - Proxy } 5 <input type="checkbox"/> NI - <i>Fill 16-21</i>	Line No.									

**CHECK ITEM A** Look at item 4 on cover page. Is this the same household as last enumeration? (Box 1 marked)  
 Yes - SKIP to Check Item B  No

25a. Did you live in this house on April 1, 1970?  
 (044) 1  Yes - SKIP to Check Item B 2  No

b. Where did you live on April 1, 1970? (State, foreign country, U.S. possession, etc.)  
 State, etc. \_\_\_\_\_ County \_\_\_\_\_

c. Did you live inside the limits of a city, town, village, etc.?  
 (045) 1  No 2  Yes - Name of city, town, village, etc. \_\_\_\_\_

(046) \_\_\_\_\_

(Ask males 18+ only)

d. Were you in the Armed Forces on April 1, 1970?  
 (047) 1  Yes 2  No

**CHECK ITEM B** Is this person 16 years old or older?  
 No - SKIP to 36  Yes

26a. What were you doing most of LAST WEEK - (working, keeping house, going to school) or something else?  
 (048) 1  Working - SKIP to 28a 6  Unable to work - SKIP to 28d  
 2  With a job but not at work 7  Retired  
 3  Looking for work 8  Other - Specify \_\_\_\_\_  
 4  Keeping house  
 5  Going to school  
*(If Armed Forces, SKIP to 28a)*

b. Did you do any work at all LAST WEEK, not counting work around the house? (Note: If farm or business operator in HH, ask about unpaid work.)  
 (049) 0  No Yes - How many hours? \_\_\_\_\_ - SKIP to 28a

c. Did you have a job or business from which you were temporarily absent or on layoff LAST WEEK?  
 (050) 1  No 2  Yes - Absent - SKIP to 28a  
 3  Yes - Layoff - SKIP to 27

26d. Have you been looking for work during the past 4 weeks?  
 (051) 1  Yes No - When did you last work?  
 2  Less than 5 years ago - SKIP to 28a  
 3  5 or more years ago } SKIP to 36  
 4  Never worked

27. Is there any reason why you could not take a job LAST WEEK?  
 (052) 1  No Yes - 2  Already had a job  
 3  Temporary illness  
 4  Going to school  
 5  Other - Specify \_\_\_\_\_

28a. For whom did you (last) work? (Name of company, business, organization or other employer)  
 (053) \_\_\_\_\_  
 Never worked - SKIP to 36

b. What kind of business or industry is this? (E.g.: TV and radio mfg., retail shoe store, State Labor Department, farm)  
 (054) \_\_\_\_\_

c. Were you -  
 (055) 1  An employee of a PRIVATE company, business or individual for wages, salary or commissions?  
 2  A GOVERNMENT employee (Federal, State, county, or local)?  
 3  SELF-EMPLOYED in OWN business, professional practice or farm?  
 4  Working WITHOUT PAY in family business or farm?

d. What kind of work were you doing? (E.g.: electrical engineer, stock clerk, typist, farmer, Armed Forces)  
 (056) \_\_\_\_\_

e. What were your most important activities or duties? (E.g.: typing, keeping account books, selling cars, Armed Forces)  
 (056) \_\_\_\_\_

**INDIVIDUAL SCREEN QUESTIONS**

36. The following questions refer only to things that happened to YOU during the last 6 months between \_\_\_\_\_, 197\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_, 197\_\_\_\_. Did you have your (pocket picked/purse snatched)?  
 Yes - How many times? \_\_\_\_\_  
 No

37. Did anyone take something (else) directly from you by using force, such as by a stickup, mugging or threat?  
 Yes - How many times? \_\_\_\_\_  
 No

38. Did anyone TRY to rob you by using force or threatening to harm you? (other than any incidents already mentioned)  
 Yes - How many times? \_\_\_\_\_  
 No

39. Did anyone beat you up, attack you or hit you with something, such as a rock or bottle? (other than any incidents already mentioned)  
 Yes - How many times? \_\_\_\_\_  
 No

40. Were you knifed, shot at, or attacked with some other weapon by anyone at all? (other than any incidents already mentioned)  
 Yes - How many times? \_\_\_\_\_  
 No

41. Did anyone THREATEN to beat you up or THREATEN you with a knife, gun, or some other weapon, NOT including telephone threats? (other than any incidents already mentioned)  
 Yes - How many times? \_\_\_\_\_  
 No

42. Did anyone TRY to attack you in some other way? (other than any incidents already mentioned)  
 Yes - How many times? \_\_\_\_\_  
 No

43. During the last 6 months, did anyone steal things that belonged to you from inside ANY car or truck, such as packages or clothing?  
 Yes - How many times? \_\_\_\_\_  
 No

44. Was anything stolen from you while you were away from home, for instance at work, in a theater or restaurant, or while traveling?  
 Yes - How many times? \_\_\_\_\_  
 No

45. (Other than any incidents you've already mentioned) Was anything (else) at all stolen from you during the last 6 months?  
 Yes - How many times? \_\_\_\_\_  
 No

46. Did you find any evidence that someone ATTEMPTED to steal something that belonged to you? (other than any incidents already mentioned)  
 Yes - How many times? \_\_\_\_\_  
 No

47. Did you call the police during the last 6 months to report something that happened to YOU which you thought was a crime? (Do not count any calls made to the police concerning the incidents you have just told me about.)  
 (058)  No - SKIP to 48  
 Yes - What happened? \_\_\_\_\_

**CHECK ITEM C** Look at 47 - Was HH member 12+ attacked or threatened, or was something stolen or an attempt made to steal something that belonged to him?  
 Yes - How many times? \_\_\_\_\_  
 No

48. Did anything happen to YOU during the last 6 months which you thought was a crime, but did NOT report to the police? (other than any incidents already mentioned)  
 (059)  No - SKIP to Check Item E  
 Yes - What happened? \_\_\_\_\_

**CHECK ITEM D** Look at 48 - Was HH member 12+ attacked or threatened, or was something stolen or an attempt made to steal something that belonged to him?  
 Yes - How many times? \_\_\_\_\_  
 No

**CHECK ITEM E** Do any of the screen questions contain any entries for "How many times?"  
 No - Interview next HH member. End interview if last respondent, and fill item 12 on cover page.  
 Yes - Fill Crime Incident Reports.

PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS													
14. NAME	15. TYPE OF INTERVIEW	16. LINE NO.	17. RELATIONSHIP TO HOUSEHOLD HEAD	18. AGE LAST BIRTH-DAY	19. MARITAL STATUS	20a. RACE	20b. DRIGIN	21. SEX	22. ARMED FORCES MEMBER	23. Education - highest grade	24. Education - complete that year?		
KEYER - BEGIN NEW RECORD		(cc 12)	(cc 13b)	(cc 17)	(cc 18)	(cc 19a)	(cc 19b)	(cc 20)	(cc 21)	(cc 22)	(cc 23)		
Last	(034) 1 <input type="checkbox"/> Per. - Self-respondent 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Tel. - Self-respondent	(035)	(036) 1 <input type="checkbox"/> Head 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Wife of head	(037)	(038) 1 <input type="checkbox"/> M. 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Wd. 3 <input type="checkbox"/> D. 4 <input type="checkbox"/> Sep. 5 <input type="checkbox"/> NM	(039) 1 <input type="checkbox"/> W. 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Neg. 3 <input type="checkbox"/> Ot.		(040) 1 <input type="checkbox"/> M 2 <input type="checkbox"/> F	(041) 1 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes 2 <input type="checkbox"/> No	(042)	(043) 1 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes 2 <input type="checkbox"/> No		
First	3 <input type="checkbox"/> Per. - Proxy } <i>Fill 13b on cover page</i> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> Tel. - Proxy } 5 <input type="checkbox"/> NI - <i>Fill 16-21</i>	Line No.	3 <input type="checkbox"/> Own child 4 <input type="checkbox"/> Other relative 5 <input type="checkbox"/> Non-relative	Age			Origin			Grade			
<b>CHECK ITEM A</b>		Look at item 4 on cover page. Is this the same household as last enumeration? (Box 1 marked) <input type="checkbox"/> Yes - <i>SKIP to Check Item B</i> <input type="checkbox"/> No											
25a. Did you live in this house on April 1, 1970? (044) 1 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes - <i>SKIP to Check Item B</i> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> No		26d. Have you been looking for work during the post 4 weeks? (051) 1 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes No - When did you last work? 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Less than 5 years ago - <i>SKIP to 28a</i> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 5 or more years ago } <i>SKIP to 36</i> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> Never worked											
b. Where did you live on April 1, 1970? (State, foreign country, U.S. possession, etc.) State, etc. _____ County _____		27. Is there any reason why you could not take a job LAST WEEK? (052) 1 <input type="checkbox"/> No Yes - 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Already had a job 3 <input type="checkbox"/> Temporary illness 4 <input type="checkbox"/> Going to school 5 <input type="checkbox"/> Other - Specify _____											
c. Did you live inside the limits of a city, town, village, etc.? (045) 1 <input type="checkbox"/> No 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes - Name of city, town, village, etc. _____ (046) (Ask males 18+ only)		28a. For whom did you (lost) work? (Name of company, business, organization or other employer) (053) x <input type="checkbox"/> Never worked - <i>SKIP to 36</i>											
d. Were you in the Armed Forces on April 1, 1970? (047) 1 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes 2 <input type="checkbox"/> No		b. What kind of business or industry is this? (E.g.: TV and radio mfg., retail shoe store, State Labor Department, farm) (054) _____ c. Were you - (055) 1 <input type="checkbox"/> An employee of a PRIVATE company, business or individual for wages, salary or commissions? 2 <input type="checkbox"/> A GOVERNMENT employee (Federal, State, county, or local)? 3 <input type="checkbox"/> SELF-EMPLOYED in OWN business, professional practice or farm? 4 <input type="checkbox"/> Working WITHOUT PAY in family business or farm?											
<b>CHECK ITEM B</b>		Is this person 16 years old or older? <input type="checkbox"/> No - <i>SKIP to 36</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes											
26a. What were you doing most of LAST WEEK - (working, keeping house, going to school) or something else? (048) 1 <input type="checkbox"/> Working - <i>SKIP to 28a</i> 6 <input type="checkbox"/> Unable to work - <i>SKIP to 26d</i> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> With a job but not at work 7 <input type="checkbox"/> Retired 3 <input type="checkbox"/> Looking for work 8 <input type="checkbox"/> Other - Specify _____ 4 <input type="checkbox"/> Keeping house (If Armed Forces, <i>SKIP to 28a</i> ) 5 <input type="checkbox"/> Going to school		b. Did you do any work at all LAST WEEK, not counting work around the house? (Note: If former business operator in HH, ask about unpaid work.) (049) 0 <input type="checkbox"/> No Yes - How many hours? _____ - <i>SKIP to 28a</i>											
c. Did you have a job or business from which you were temporarily absent or on layoff LAST WEEK? (050) 1 <input type="checkbox"/> No 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes - Absent - <i>SKIP to 28a</i> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes - Layoff - <i>SKIP to 27</i>		d. What kind of work were you doing? (E.g.: electrical engineer, stock clerk, typist, farmer, Armed Forces) (056) _____ e. What were your most important activities or duties? (E.g.: typing, keeping account books, selling cars, Armed Forces) (056) _____											
INDIVIDUAL SCREEN QUESTIONS													
36. The following questions refer only to things that happened to YOU during the last 6 months - between _____, 197_____ and _____, 197_____. Did you have your (pocket picked/purse snatched)? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes - How many times? <input type="checkbox"/> No				46. Did you find any evidence that someone ATTEMPTED to steal something that belonged to you? (other than any incidents already mentioned) <input type="checkbox"/> Yes - How many times? <input type="checkbox"/> No									
37. Did anyone take something (else) directly from you by using force, such as by a stickup, mugging or threat? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes - How many times? <input type="checkbox"/> No				47. Did you call the police during the last 6 months to report something that happened to YOU which you thought was a crime? (Do not count any calls made to the police concerning the incidents you have just told me about.) (058) <input type="checkbox"/> No - <i>SKIP to 48</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes - What happened? _____									
38. Did anyone TRY to rob you by using force or threatening to harm you? (other than any incidents already mentioned) <input type="checkbox"/> Yes - How many times? <input type="checkbox"/> No				48. Did anything happen to YOU during the last 6 months which you thought was a crime, but did NOT report to the police? (other than any incidents already mentioned) (059) <input type="checkbox"/> No - <i>SKIP to Check Item E</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes - What happened? _____									
39. Did anyone beat you up, attack you or hit you with something, such as a rack or bottle? (other than any incidents already mentioned) <input type="checkbox"/> Yes - How many times? <input type="checkbox"/> No				<b>CHECK ITEM C</b>				Look at 47 - Was HH member 12+ attacked or threatened, or was something stolen or an attempt made to steal something that belonged to him? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes - How many times? <input type="checkbox"/> No					
40. Were you knifed, shot at, or attacked with some other weapon by anyone at all? (other than any incidents already mentioned) <input type="checkbox"/> Yes - How many times? <input type="checkbox"/> No				49. Did anything happen to YOU during the last 6 months which you thought was a crime, but did NOT report to the police? (other than any incidents already mentioned) (059) <input type="checkbox"/> No - <i>SKIP to Check Item E</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes - What happened? _____									
41. Did anyone THREATEN to beat you up or THREATEN you with a knife, gun, or some other weapon, NOT including telephone threats? (other than any incidents already mentioned) <input type="checkbox"/> Yes - How many times? <input type="checkbox"/> No				<b>CHECK ITEM D</b>				Look at 48 - Was HH member 12+ attacked or threatened, or was something stolen or an attempt made to steal something that belonged to him? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes - How many times? <input type="checkbox"/> No					
42. Did anyone TRY to attack you in some other way? (other than any incidents already mentioned) <input type="checkbox"/> Yes - How many times? <input type="checkbox"/> No				50. Do any of the screen questions contain any entries for "How many times?" <input type="checkbox"/> No - Interview next HH member. End interview if last respondent, and fill item 12 on cover page. <input type="checkbox"/> Yes - Fill Crime Incident Reports.									
43. During the last 6 months, did anyone steal things that belonged to you from inside ANY car or truck, such as packages or clothing? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes - How many times? <input type="checkbox"/> No				<b>CHECK ITEM E</b>									
44. Was anything stolen from you while you were away from home, for instance at work, in a theater or restaurant, or while traveling? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes - How many times? <input type="checkbox"/> No													
45. (Other than any incidents you've already mentioned) Was anything (else) at all stolen from you during the last 6 months? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes - How many times? <input type="checkbox"/> No													



PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS											
14. NAME	15. TYPE OF INTERVIEW	16. LINE NO.	17. RELATIONSHIP TO HOUSEHOLD HEAD	18. AGE LAST BIRTH-DAY	19. MARITAL STATUS	20a. RACE	20b. ORIGIN	21. SEX	22. ARMED FORCES MEMBER	23. Education - highest grade	24. Education - complete that year?
KEYER - BEGIN NEW RECORD		(cc 12)	(cc 13b)	(cc 17)	(cc 18)	(cc 19a)	(cc 19b)	(cc 20)	(cc 21)	(cc 22)	(cc 23)
Last	(034) 1 <input type="checkbox"/> Per. - Self-respondent 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Tel. - Self-respondent	(035)	(036) 1 <input type="checkbox"/> Head 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Wife of head	(037)	(038) 1 <input type="checkbox"/> M. 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Wd.	(039) 1 <input type="checkbox"/> W. 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Neg. 3 <input type="checkbox"/> Ot.		(040) 1 <input type="checkbox"/> M 2 <input type="checkbox"/> F	(041) 1 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes 2 <input type="checkbox"/> No	(042)	(043) 1 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes 2 <input type="checkbox"/> No
First	3 <input type="checkbox"/> Per. - Proxy } <i>Fill 13b on cover page</i> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> Tel. - Proxy } 5 <input type="checkbox"/> NI - Fill 16-21	Line No.	3 <input type="checkbox"/> Own child 4 <input type="checkbox"/> Other relative 5 <input type="checkbox"/> Non-relative	Age			Origin		Grade		
<b>CHECK ITEM A</b> Look at item 4 on cover page. Is this the same household as last enumeration? (Box 1 marked) <input type="checkbox"/> Yes - SKIP to Check Item B <input type="checkbox"/> No				26d. Have you been looking for work during the post 4 weeks? (051) 1 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes No - When did you last work? 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Less than 5 years ago - SKIP to 28a 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 5 or more years ago } SKIP to 36 4 <input type="checkbox"/> Never worked							
25a. Did you live in this house on April 1, 1970? (044) 1 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes - SKIP to Check Item B 2 <input type="checkbox"/> No				27. Is there any reason why you could not take a job LAST WEEK? (052) 1 <input type="checkbox"/> No Yes - 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Already had a job 3 <input type="checkbox"/> Temporary illness 4 <input type="checkbox"/> Going to school 5 <input type="checkbox"/> Other - Specify							
b. Where did you live on April 1, 1970? (State, foreign country, U.S. possession, etc.) State, etc. _____ County _____				28a. For whom did you (lost) work? (Name of company, business, organization or other employer) (053) x <input type="checkbox"/> Never worked - SKIP to 36							
c. Did you live inside the limits of a city, town, village, etc.? (045) 1 <input type="checkbox"/> No 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes - Name of city, town, village, etc. _____ (046) (Ask males 18+ only)				b. What kind of business or industry is this? (E.g.: TV and radio mfg., retail shoe store, State Labor Department, farm) (054)							
d. Were you in the Armed Forces on April 1, 1970? (047) 1 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes 2 <input type="checkbox"/> No				c. Were you - (045) 1 <input type="checkbox"/> An employee of a PRIVATE company, business or individual for wages, salary or commissions? 2 <input type="checkbox"/> A GOVERNMENT employee (Federal, State, county, or local)? 3 <input type="checkbox"/> SELF-EMPLOYED in OWN business, professional practice or form? 4 <input type="checkbox"/> Working WITHOUT PAY in family business or form?							
<b>CHECK ITEM B</b> Is this person 16 years old or older? <input type="checkbox"/> No - SKIP to 36 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes				d. What kind of work were you doing? (E.g.: electrical engineer, stock clerk, typist, farmer, Armed Forces) (056)							
26a. What were you doing most of LAST WEEK - (working, keeping house, going to school) or something else? (048) 1 <input type="checkbox"/> Working - SKIP to 28a 6 <input type="checkbox"/> Unable to work - SKIP to 28a 2 <input type="checkbox"/> With a job but not at work <input type="checkbox"/> Retired 3 <input type="checkbox"/> Looking for work <input type="checkbox"/> Other - Specify _____ 4 <input type="checkbox"/> Keeping house <i>(If Armed Forces, SKIP to 28a)</i> 5 <input type="checkbox"/> Going to school				e. What were your most important activities or duties? (E.g.: typing, keeping account books, selling cars, Armed Forces) (050)							
b. Did you do any work at all LAST WEEK, not counting work around the house? (Note: If form of business operator in HH, ask about unpaid work.) (049) 0 <input type="checkbox"/> No Yes - How many hours? _____ - SKIP to 28a				Individual Screen Questions							
c. Did you have a job or business from which you were temporarily absent or on layoff? LAST WEEK? (050) 1 <input type="checkbox"/> No 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes - Absent - SKIP to 28a 3 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes - Layoff - SKIP to 27				36. The following questions refer only to things that happened to YOU during the last 6 months - between _____, 197____ and _____, 197____. Did you have your (pocket picked/purse snatched)? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes - How many times? _____ <input type="checkbox"/> No _____							
37. Did anyone take something (else) directly from you by using force, such as by a stickup, mugging or threat? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes - How many times? _____ <input type="checkbox"/> No _____				46. Did you find any evidence that someone ATTEMPTED to steal something that belonged to you? (other than any incidents already mentioned) <input type="checkbox"/> Yes - How many times? _____ <input type="checkbox"/> No _____							
38. Did anyone TRY to rob you by using force or threatening to harm you? (other than any incidents already mentioned) <input type="checkbox"/> Yes - How many times? _____ <input type="checkbox"/> No _____				47. Did you call the police during the last 6 months to report something that happened to YOU which you thought was a crime? (Do not count any calls made to the police concerning the incidents you have just told me about.) (058) <input type="checkbox"/> No - SKIP to 48 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes - What happened? _____							
39. Did anyone beat you up, attack you or hit you with something, such as a rock or bottle? (other than any incidents already mentioned) <input type="checkbox"/> Yes - How many times? _____ <input type="checkbox"/> No _____				48. Did anything happen to YOU during the last 6 months which you thought was a crime, but did NOT report to the police? (other than any incidents already mentioned) (059) <input type="checkbox"/> No - SKIP to Check Item E <input type="checkbox"/> Yes - What happened? _____							
40. Were you knifed, shot at, or attacked with some other weapon by anyone at all? (other than any incidents already mentioned) <input type="checkbox"/> Yes - How many times? _____ <input type="checkbox"/> No _____				<b>CHECK ITEM C</b> Look at 47 - Was HH member 12+ attacked or threatened, or was something stolen or an attempt made to steal something that belonged to him? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes - How many times? _____ <input type="checkbox"/> No _____							
41. Did anyone THREATEN to beat you up or THREATEN you with a knife, gun, or some other weapon, NOT including telephone threats? (other than any incidents already mentioned) <input type="checkbox"/> Yes - How many times? _____ <input type="checkbox"/> No _____				<b>CHECK ITEM D</b> Look at 48 - Was HH member 12+ attacked or threatened, or was something stolen or an attempt made to steal something that belonged to him? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes - How many times? _____ <input type="checkbox"/> No _____							
42. Did anyone TRY to attack you in some other way? (other than any incidents already mentioned) <input type="checkbox"/> Yes - How many times? _____ <input type="checkbox"/> No _____				<b>CHECK ITEM E</b> Do any of the screen questions contain any entries for "How many times?" <input type="checkbox"/> No - Interview next HH member. End interview if last respondent, and fill item 12 on cover page. <input type="checkbox"/> Yes - Fill Crime Incident Reports.							
43. During the last 6 months, did anyone steal things that belonged to you from inside ANY car or truck, such as packages or clothing? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes - How many times? _____ <input type="checkbox"/> No _____											
44. Was anything stolen from you while you were away from home, for instance at work, in a theater or restaurant, or while traveling? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes - How many times? _____ <input type="checkbox"/> No _____											
45. (Other than any incidents you've already mentioned) Was anything (else) at all stolen from you during the last 6 months? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes - How many times? _____ <input type="checkbox"/> No _____											

NCS 2 INCIDENT REPORT

KEYER - BEGIN NEW RECORD	Notes	<p><b>NOTICE</b> - Your report to the Census Bureau is confidential by law (U.S. Code 42, Section 3761). All identifiable information will be used only by persons engaged in and for the purposes of the survey, and may not be disclosed or released to others for any purpose.</p> <p>FORM <b>NCS-2</b> (6-10-75)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE BUREAU OF THE CENSUS ACTING AS COLLECTING AGENT FOR THE LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE ADMINISTRATION U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>CRIME INCIDENT REPORT</b> NATIONAL CRIME SURVEY - NATIONAL SAMPLE</p>
<p>Line number <b>(101)</b></p> <p>Screen question number <b>(102)</b></p> <p>Incident number <b>(103)</b></p>		
<p><b>1a. You said that during the last 6 months - (Refer to appropriate screen question for description of crime). In what month (did this/did the first) incident happen? (Show flashcard if necessary. Encourage respondent to give exact month.)</b></p> <p><b>(104)</b> _____ Month (01-12)      Year 197 _____</p> <p><b>(105) CHECK ITEM A</b> → Is this incident report for a series of crimes?                  1 <input type="checkbox"/> No - <b>SKIP</b> to 2                  2 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes - (Note: series must have 3 or more similar incidents which respondent can't recall separately)</p> <p><b>b. In what month(s) did these incidents take place? (Mark all that apply)</b></p> <p><b>(106)</b> *                  1 <input type="checkbox"/> Spring (March, April, May)                  2 <input type="checkbox"/> Summer (June, July, August)                  3 <input type="checkbox"/> Fall (September, October, November)                  4 <input type="checkbox"/> Winter (December, January, February)</p> <p><b>c. How many incidents were involved in this series?</b></p> <p><b>(107)</b>                  1 <input type="checkbox"/> Three or four                  2 <input type="checkbox"/> Five to ten                  3 <input type="checkbox"/> Eleven or more                  4 <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know</p>	<p><b>5a. Were you a customer, employee, or owner?</b></p> <p><b>(113)</b>                  1 <input type="checkbox"/> Customer                  2 <input type="checkbox"/> Employee                  3 <input type="checkbox"/> Owner                  4 <input type="checkbox"/> Other - Specify _____</p> <p><b>b. Did the person(s) steal or TRY to steal anything belonging to the store, restaurant, office, factory, etc.?</b></p> <p><b>(114)</b>                  1 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes                  2 <input type="checkbox"/> No                  3 <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know } <b>SKIP</b> to Check Item B</p> <p><b>6a. Did the offender(s) live there or have a right to be there, such as a guest or a workman?</b></p> <p><b>(115)</b>                  1 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes - <b>SKIP</b> to Check Item B                  2 <input type="checkbox"/> No                  3 <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know</p> <p><b>b. Did the offender(s) actually get in or just TRY to get in the building?</b></p> <p><b>(116)</b>                  1 <input type="checkbox"/> Actually got in                  2 <input type="checkbox"/> Just tried to get in                  3 <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know</p> <p><b>c. Was there any evidence, such as a broken lock or broken window, that the offender(s) forced his way in/TRIED to force his way in) the building?</b></p> <p><b>(117)</b> *                  1 <input type="checkbox"/> No                  Yes - What was the evidence? Anything else? (Mark all that apply)                  2 <input type="checkbox"/> Broken lock or window                  3 <input type="checkbox"/> Forced door or window                  4 <input type="checkbox"/> Slashed screen                  5 <input type="checkbox"/> Other - Specify _____ } <b>SKIP</b> to Check Item B</p>	<p><b>INTERVIEWER:</b> If this report is for a series, read the following statement. (The following questions refer only to the most recent incident.)</p> <p><b>2. About what time did (this/the most recent) incident happen?</b></p> <p><b>(108)</b>                  1 <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know                  2 <input type="checkbox"/> During the day (6 a.m. to 6 p.m.)                     At night (6 p.m. to 6 a.m.)                     3 <input type="checkbox"/> 6 p.m. to midnight                     4 <input type="checkbox"/> Midnight to 6 a.m.                     5 <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know</p>
<p><b>3a. In what State and county did this incident occur?</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Outside U.S. - <b>END INCIDENT REPORT</b></p> <p>State _____ County _____</p> <p><b>b. Did it happen INSIDE THE LIMITS of a city, town, village, etc.?</b></p> <p><b>(110)</b> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> No                  2 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes - Enter name of city, town, etc. _____</p> <p><b>(111)</b> [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]</p>	<p><b>d. How did the offender(s) (get in/try to get in)?</b></p> <p><b>(118)</b>                  1 <input type="checkbox"/> Through unlocked door or window                  2 <input type="checkbox"/> Had key                  3 <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know                  4 <input type="checkbox"/> Other - Specify _____</p>	<p><b>3a. In what State and county did this incident occur?</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Outside U.S. - <b>END INCIDENT REPORT</b></p> <p>State _____ County _____</p> <p><b>b. Did it happen INSIDE THE LIMITS of a city, town, village, etc.?</b></p> <p><b>(110)</b> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> No                  2 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes - Enter name of city, town, etc. _____</p> <p><b>(111)</b> [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]</p>
<p><b>4. Where did this incident take place?</b></p> <p><b>(112)</b>                  1 <input type="checkbox"/> At or in own dwelling, in garage or other building on property (Includes break-in or attempted break-in) } <b>SKIP</b> to 6a                  2 <input type="checkbox"/> At or in a vacation home, hotel/motel }                  3 <input type="checkbox"/> Inside commercial building such as store, restaurant, bank, gas station, public conveyance or station } <b>ASK</b> 5a                  4 <input type="checkbox"/> Inside office, factory, or warehouse }                  5 <input type="checkbox"/> Near own home; yard, sidewalk, driveway, carport, apartment hall (Does not include break-in or attempted break-in) }                  6 <input type="checkbox"/> On the street, in a park, field, playground, school grounds or parking lot } <b>SKIP</b> to Check Item B                  7 <input type="checkbox"/> Inside school }                  8 <input type="checkbox"/> Other - Specify _____</p>	<p><b>7a. Did the person(s) have a weapon such as a gun or knife, or something he was using as a weapon, such as a bottle, or wrench?</b></p> <p><b>(120)</b> *                  1 <input type="checkbox"/> No                  2 <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know                  Yes - What was the weapon? Anything else? (Mark all that apply)                  3 <input type="checkbox"/> Gun                  4 <input type="checkbox"/> Knife                  5 <input type="checkbox"/> Other - Specify _____</p> <p><b>b. Did the person(s) hit you, knock you down, or actually attack you in any way?</b></p> <p><b>(121)</b>                  1 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes - <b>SKIP</b> to 7f                  2 <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p><b>c. Did the person(s) threaten you with harm in any way?</b></p> <p><b>(122)</b>                  1 <input type="checkbox"/> No - <b>SKIP</b> to 7e                  2 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes</p>	<p><b>Was respondent or any other member of this household present when this incident occurred? (If not sure, ASK)</b></p> <p><b>(119) CHECK ITEM B</b> →                  1 <input type="checkbox"/> No - <b>SKIP</b> to 13a                  2 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes</p>

CRIME INCIDENT QUESTIONS - Continued

7d. How were you threatened? Any other way? (Mark all that apply)

123  Verbal threat of rape  
 Verbal threat of attack other than rape  
 Weapon present or threatened with weapon  
 Attempted attack with weapon (for example, shot at)  
 Object thrown at person  
 Followed, surrounded  
 Other - Specify \_\_\_\_\_

} SKIP to 10a

e. What actually happened? Anything else? (Mark all that apply)

124  Something taken without permission  
 Attempted or threatened to take something  
 Harassed, argument, abusive language  
 Forcible entry or attempted forcible entry of house  
 Forcible entry or attempted entry of car  
 Damaged or destroyed property  
 Attempted or threatened to damage or destroy property  
 Other - Specify \_\_\_\_\_

} SKIP to 10a

f. How did the person(s) attack you? Any other way? (Mark all that apply)

125  Raped  
 Tried to rape  
 Hit with object held in hand, shot, knifed  
 Hit by thrown object  
 Hit, slapped, knocked down  
 Grabbed, held, tripped, jumped, pushed, etc.  
 Other - Specify \_\_\_\_\_

8a. What were the injuries you suffered, if any? Anything else? (Mark all that apply)

126  None - SKIP to 10a  
 Raped  
 Attempted rape  
 Knife or gunshot wounds  
 Broken bones or teeth knocked out  
 Internal injuries, knocked unconscious  
 Bruises, black eye, cuts, scratches, swelling  
 Other - Specify \_\_\_\_\_

b. Were you injured to the extent that you needed medical attention after the attack?

127  No - SKIP to 10a  
 Yes

c. Did you receive any treatment at a hospital?

128  No  
 Emergency room treatment only  
 Stayed overnight or longer - How many days? \_\_\_\_\_

129 \_\_\_\_\_

d. What was the total amount of your medical expenses resulting from this incident, INCLUDING anything paid by insurance? Include hospital and doctor bills, medicine, therapy, braces, and any other injury-related medical expenses. INTERVIEWER - If respondent does not know exact amount, encourage him to give an estimate.

130  No cost - SKIP to 10a  
 \$ \_\_\_\_\_  
 Don't know

9a. At the time of the incident, were you covered by any medical insurance, or were you eligible for benefits from any other type of health benefits program, such as Medicaid, Veterans' Administration, or Public Welfare?

131  No  
 Don't know  
 Yes

b. Did you file a claim with any of these insurance companies or programs in order to get part or all of your medical expenses paid?

132  No - SKIP to 10a  
 Yes

9c. Did insurance or any health benefits program pay for all or part of the total medical expenses?

133  Not yet settled  
 None  
 All  
 Part

} SKIP to 10a

d. How much did insurance or a health benefits program pay?

134 \$ \_\_\_\_\_ 00 (Obtain an estimate, if necessary)

10a. Did you do anything to protect yourself or your property during the incident?

135  No - SKIP to 11  
 Yes

b. What did you do? Anything else? (Mark all that apply)

136  Used/brandished gun or knife  
 Used/tried physical force (hit, chased, threw object, used other weapon, etc.)  
 Tried to get help, attract attention, scare offender away (screamed, yelled, called for help, turned on lights, etc.)  
 Threatened, argued, reasoned, etc., with offender  
 Resisted without force, used evasive action (ran/drove away, hid, held property, locked door, ducked, shielded self, etc.)  
 Other - Specify \_\_\_\_\_

11. Was the crime committed by only one or more than one person?

137  Only one  
 Don't know  
 More than one

} SKIP to 12a

a. Was this person male or female?

138  Male  
 Female  
 Don't know

b. How old would you say the person was?

139  Under 12  
 12-14  
 15-17  
 18-20  
 21 or over  
 Don't know

c. Was the person someone you knew or was he a stranger?

140  Stranger  
 Don't know  
 Known by sight only  
 Casual acquaintance  
 Well known

} SKIP to e

d. Was the person a relative of yours?

141  No  
 Yes - What relationship?  
 Spouse or ex-spouse  
 Parent  
 Own child  
 Brother or sister  
 Other relative - Specify \_\_\_\_\_

e. Was he/she -

142  White  
 Negro  
 Other? - Specify \_\_\_\_\_  
 Don't know

} SKIP to 12a

f. How many persons?

143 \_\_\_\_\_

g. Were they male or female?

144  All male  
 All female  
 Male and female  
 Don't know

h. How old would you say the youngest was?

145  Under 12  
 12-14  
 15-17  
 18-20  
 21 or over - SKIP to j  
 Don't know

i. How old would you say the oldest was?

146  Under 12  
 12-14  
 15-17  
 18-20  
 21 or over  
 Don't know

j. Were any of the persons known or related to you or were they all strangers?

147  All strangers  
 Don't know  
 All relatives  
 Some relatives  
 All known  
 Some known

} SKIP to m

k. How well were they known? (Mark all that apply)

148  By sight only  
 Casual acquaintance(s)  
 Well known

} SKIP to m

l. How were they related to you? (Mark all that apply)

149  Spouse or ex-spouse  
 Parents  
 Own children  
 Brothers/sisters  
 Other - Specify \_\_\_\_\_

m. Were all of them -

150  White?  
 Negro?  
 Other? - Specify \_\_\_\_\_  
 Combination - Specify \_\_\_\_\_  
 Don't know

SAMPLE



CRIME INCIDENT QUESTIONS - Continued

12a. Were you the only person there besides the offender(s)?  
 (151) 1  Yes - SKIP to 13a  
 2  No

b. How many of these persons, not counting yourself, were robbed, harmed, or threatened? Do not include persons under 12 years of age.  
 (152) 0  None - SKIP to 13a  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Number of persons

c. Are any of these persons members of your household now? Do not include household members under 12 years of age.  
 (153) 0  No  
 Yes - How many, not counting yourself?  
 \_\_\_\_\_

(ALSO MARK "YES" IN CHECK ITEM I ON PAGE 12)

13a. Was something stolen or taken without permission that belonged to you or others in the household?  
 INTERVIEWER - Include anything stolen from unrecognizable business in respondent's home. Do not include anything stolen from a recognizable business in respondent's home or another business, such as merchandise or cash from a register.  
 (154) 1  Yes - SKIP to 13f  
 2  No

b. Did the person(s) ATTEMPT to take something that belonged to you or others in the household?  
 (155) 1  No - SKIP to 13e  
 2  Yes

c. What did they try to take? Anything else? (Mark all that apply)  
 (156) \* 1  Purse  
 2  Wallet or money  
 3  Car  
 4  Other motor vehicle  
 5  Part of car (hubcap, tape-deck, etc.)  
 6  Don't know  
 7  Other - Specify \_\_\_\_\_

CHECK ITEM C  Did they try to take a purse, wallet, or money? (Box 1 or 2 marked in 13c)  
 No - SKIP to 18a  
 Yes

d. Was the (purse/wallet/money) on your person, for instance in a pocket or being held?  
 (157) 1  Yes } SKIP to 18a  
 2  No }

e. What did happen? Anything else? (Mark all that apply)  
 (158) \* 1  Attacked  
 2  Threatened with harm  
 3  Attempted to break into house or garage  
 4  Attempted to break into car  
 5  Harassed, argument, abusive language  
 6  Damaged or destroyed property  
 7  Attempted or threatened to damage or destroy property  
 8  Other - Specify \_\_\_\_\_

} SKIP to 18a

f. What was taken that belonged to you or others in the household? Anything else?  
 (159) Cash: \$ \_\_\_\_\_ .00  
 and/or  
 Property: (Mark all that apply)  
 (160) \* 0  Only cash taken - SKIP to 14c  
 1  Purse  
 2  Wallet  
 3  Car  
 4  Other motor vehicle  
 5  Part of car (hubcap, tape-deck, etc.)  
 6  Other - Specify \_\_\_\_\_

Was a car or other motor vehicle taken? (Box 3 or 4 marked in 13f)  
 CHECK ITEM D  No - SKIP to Check Item E  
 Yes

14a. Had permission to use the (car/motor vehicle) ever been given to the person who took it?  
 (161) 1  No ..... } SKIP to Check Item E  
 2  Don't know }  
 3  Yes

b. Did the person return the (car/motor vehicle)?  
 (162) 1  Yes  
 2  No

Is Box 1 or 2 marked in 13f?  
 CHECK ITEM E  No - SKIP to 15a  
 Yes

c. Was the (purse/wallet/money) on your person, for instance, in a pocket or being held by you when it was taken?  
 (163) 1  Yes  
 2  No

Was only cash taken? (Box 0 marked in 13f)  
 CHECK ITEM F  Yes - SKIP to 16a  
 No

15a. Altogether, what was the value of the PROPERTY that was taken?  
 INTERVIEWER - Exclude stolen cash, and enter \$0 for stolen checks and credit cards, even if they were used.  
 (164) \$ \_\_\_\_\_ .00

b. How did you decide the value of the property that was stolen? Any other way? (Mark all that apply)  
 (165) \* 1  Original cost  
 2  Replacement cost  
 3  Personal estimate of current value  
 4  Insurance report estimate  
 5  Police estimate  
 6  Don't know  
 7  Other - Specify \_\_\_\_\_

16a. Was all or part of the stolen money or property recovered, not counting anything received from insurance?  
 (166) 1  None } SKIP to 17a  
 2  All }  
 3  Part

b. What was recovered? Anything else?  
 (167) Cash: \$ \_\_\_\_\_ .00  
 and/or  
 Property: (Mark all that apply)

(168) \* 0  Cash only recovered - SKIP to 17a  
 1  Purse  
 2  Wallet  
 3  Car  
 4  Other motor vehicle  
 5  Part of car (hubcap, tape-deck, etc.)  
 6  Other - Specify \_\_\_\_\_

c. What was the value of the property recovered (excluding recovered cash)?  
 (169) \$ \_\_\_\_\_ .00

**CRIME INCIDENT QUESTIONS - Continued**

17a. Was there any insurance against theft?

(170) 1  No . . . . . } SKIP to 18a  
 2  Don't know }  
 3  Yes

b. Was this loss reported to an insurance company?

(171) 1  No . . . . . } SKIP to 18a  
 2  Don't know }  
 3  Yes

c. Was any of this loss recovered through insurance?

(172) 1  Not yet settled } SKIP to 18a  
 2  No . . . . . }  
 3  Yes

d. How much was recovered?

INTERVIEWER - If property replaced by insurance company instead of cash settlement, ask for estimate of value of the property replaced.

(173) \$ \_\_\_\_\_ .

18a. Did any household member lose any time from work because of this incident?

(174) 0  No - SKIP to 19a  
 Yes - How many members? \_\_\_\_\_

b. How much time was lost altogether?

(175) 1  Less than 1 day  
 2  1-5 days  
 3  6-10 days  
 4  Over 10 days  
 5  Don't know

19a. Was anything that belonged to you or other members of the household damaged but not taken in this incident? For example, was a lock or window broken, clothing damaged, or damage done to a car, etc.?

(176) 1  No - SKIP to 20a  
 2  Yes

b. (Was/were) the damaged item(s) repaired or replaced?

(177) 1  Yes - SKIP to 19d  
 2  No

c. How much would it cost to repair or replace the damaged item(s)?

(178) \$ \_\_\_\_\_ .  } SKIP to 20a  
 x  Don't know }

d. How much was the repair or replacement cost?

(179) x  No cost or don't know - SKIP to 20a  
 \$ \_\_\_\_\_ .

e. Who paid or will pay for the repairs or replacement? Anyone else? (Mark all that apply)

(180) 1  Household member  
 2  Landlord  
 3  Insurance  
 4  Other - Specify \_\_\_\_\_

20a. Were the police informed of this incident in any way?

(181) 1  No  
 2  Don't know - SKIP to Check Item G  
 Yes - Who told them?  
 3  Household member  
 4  Someone else } SKIP to Check Item G  
 5  Police on scene

b. What was the reason this incident was not reported to the police? Any other reason? (Mark all that apply)

(182) 1  Nothing could be done - lack of proof  
 2  Did not think it important enough  
 3  Police wouldn't want to be bothered  
 4  Did not want to take time - too inconvenient  
 5  Private or personal matter, did not want to report it  
 6  Did not want to get involved  
 7  Afraid of reprisal  
 8  Reported to someone else  
 9  Other - Specify \_\_\_\_\_

**CHECK ITEM G** → Is this person 16 years or older?  
 No - SKIP to Check Item H  
 Yes - ASK 21a

21a. Did you have a job at the time this incident happened?

(183) 1  No - SKIP to Check Item H  
 2  Yes

b. What was the job?

(186) 1  Same as described in NCS-1 items 28a-e - SKIP to Check Item H  
 2  Different than described in NCS-1 items 28a-e

c. For whom did you work? (Name of company, business, organization or other employer)

d. What kind of business or industry is this? (For example: TV and radio mfg., retail shoe store, State Labor Dept., farm)

(187)

e. Were you -

(188) 1  An employee of a PRIVATE company, business or individual for wages, salary or commissions?  
 2  A GOVERNMENT employee (Federal, State, county or local)?  
 3  SELF-EMPLOYED in OWN business, professional practice or farm?  
 4  Working WITHOUT PAY in family business or farm?

f. What kind of work were you doing? (For example: electrical engineer, stock clerk, typist, farmer)

(189)

g. What were your most important activities or duties? (For example: typing, keeping account books, selling cars, finishing concrete, etc.)

Summarize this incident or series of incidents.

**CHECK ITEM H** → \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

Look at 12c on Incident Report. Is there an entry for "How many?"

**CHECK ITEM I** →  No  
 Yes - Be sure you have an Incident Report for each HH member 12 years of age or over who was robbed, harmed, or threatened in this incident.

Is this the last Incident Report to be filled for this person?

**CHECK ITEM J** →  No - Go to next Incident Report.  
 Yes - Is this the last HH member to be interviewed?  
 No - Interview next HH member.  
 Yes - END INTERVIEW. Enter total number of Crime Incident Reports filled for this household in Item 12 on the cover of NCS-1.

**SAMPLE**

<b>NOTICE</b> - Your report to the Census Bureau is confidential by law (Public Law 93-83). All identifiable information will be used only by persons engaged in and for the purposes of the survey, and may not be disclosed or released to others for any purpose.					FORM <b>CVS-100</b> 16-21-741 U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC STATISTICS ADMINISTRATION BUREAU OF THE CENSUS ACTING AS COLLECTING AGENT FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE ADMINISTRATION U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE						
<b>I. IDENTIFICATION CODES</b>											
a. PSU	b. Segment	c. Line No.	d. Part	e. Panel							
f. RO		g. Interviewer code			h. Total number of incidents						
<b>COMMERCIAL CRIME VICTIMIZATION SURVEY NATIONAL SAMPLE</b>											
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>											
Good morning (afternoon). I'm Mr(s.) _____ (your name) _____ from the U.S. Bureau of the Census. We are conducting a survey in this area to measure the extent to which businesses are victims of burglaries and/or robberies. The Government needs to know how much crime there is and where it is to plan and administer programs which will have an impact on the crime problem. You can help by answering some questions for me.											
<b>Part I - BUSINESS CHARACTERISTICS</b>											
2a. Did you (the owner) operate this establishment at this location during the entire 6-month period ending _____ ? 1 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes - SKIP to 3a 2 <input type="checkbox"/> No - How many months during the designated period? ..... Months					7. Did anyone else operate any departments or concessions or some other business activity in this establishment during the 6-month period ending _____ ? 1 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes - List each department, concession, or other business activity on a separate line of Section V of the segment folder, if not already listed. Complete a separate questionnaire for each one that falls on a sample line. 2 <input type="checkbox"/> No						
b. What were these months? 1 <input type="checkbox"/> Jan.      4 <input type="checkbox"/> Apr.      7 <input type="checkbox"/> July      A <input type="checkbox"/> Oct. 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Feb.      5 <input type="checkbox"/> May      8 <input type="checkbox"/> Aug.      B <input type="checkbox"/> Nov. 3 <input type="checkbox"/> Mar.      6 <input type="checkbox"/> June      9 <input type="checkbox"/> Sept.      C <input type="checkbox"/> Dec.					<b>DO NOT ASK ITEM 8 UNTIL PART II AND ANY INCIDENT REPORTS HAVE BEEN COMPLETED</b>						
c. The last time we were here (Mr(s.) _____ gave information for) this establishment (was vacant). Did anyone else own this establishment during the 6-month period ending _____ ? 1 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes - Enter name _____ 2 <input type="checkbox"/> No 3 <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know - Inquire at neighboring establishment. <i>INTERVIEWER - Complete additional questionnaire(s) by contacting the former owner(s) or for vacant establishments by contacting neighboring establishments. Complete separate questionnaires to account for all months of reference period.</i>											
3a. Is this establishment owned or operated as an incorporated business? 1 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes - SKIP to 4      2 <input type="checkbox"/> No					8. What were your approximate gross sales of merchandise and/or receipts from services at this establishment for the previous 12 months ending _____ ? (Estimate annual sales and/or receipts if not in business for entire 12 months.) 1 <input type="checkbox"/> None 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Under \$10,000 3 <input type="checkbox"/> \$10,000 to \$24,999 4 <input type="checkbox"/> \$25,000 to \$49,999 5 <input type="checkbox"/> \$50,000 to \$99,999 6 <input type="checkbox"/> \$100,000 to \$499,999 7 <input type="checkbox"/> \$500,000 to \$999,999 8 <input type="checkbox"/> \$1,000,000 and over 9 <input type="checkbox"/> Other - Specify _____						
b. How is this business owned or operated? 1 <input type="checkbox"/> Individual proprietorship 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Partnership 3 <input type="checkbox"/> Government - Continue interview ONLY if liquor store or any type of transportation 4 <input type="checkbox"/> Other - Specify _____					<b>INTERVIEWER USE ONLY</b>						
4. Do you (the owner) operate more than one establishment? 1 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes      2 <input type="checkbox"/> No					9a. Record of interview (1) Date _____ (2) Name of respondent _____ (3) Title of respondent _____ (4) Telephone Area code Number Extension _____						
5. Excluding you (the owner) (the partner) how many paid employees did this establishment average during the 6-month period ending _____ ? 1 <input type="checkbox"/> None      4 <input type="checkbox"/> 8 to 19 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 1 to 3      5 <input type="checkbox"/> 20 or more 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 to 7					b. Reason for non-interview <b>TYPE A</b> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> Occupant in business during survey period but unable to contact 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Refusal and in business during survey period 3 <input type="checkbox"/> Other Type A - Specify _____ <b>TYPE B</b> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> Present occupant not in business during survey period 5 <input type="checkbox"/> Vacant or closed 6 <input type="checkbox"/> Other Type B (Seasonal, etc.) - Specify _____ <b>TYPE C</b> 7 <input type="checkbox"/> Occupied by nonlistable activity 8 <input type="checkbox"/> Demolished 9 <input type="checkbox"/> Other Type C - Specify _____						
6a. What do you consider your kind of business to be at this location? <div style="text-align: right; border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; width: fit-content; margin-left: auto;">OFFICE USE ONLY</div>											
b. Mark (X) one box <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top;"> <b>RETAIL</b>                              1 <input type="checkbox"/> Food                              2 <input type="checkbox"/> Eating and drinking                              3 <input type="checkbox"/> General merchandise                              4 <input type="checkbox"/> Apparel                              5 <input type="checkbox"/> Furniture and appliance                              6 <input type="checkbox"/> Lumber, hardware, mobile home dealers                              7 <input type="checkbox"/> Automotive                              8 <input type="checkbox"/> Drug and proprietary                              9 <input type="checkbox"/> Liquor                              A <input type="checkbox"/> Gasoline service stations                              B <input type="checkbox"/> Other retail                         </td> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top;"> <b>WHOLESALE</b>                              C <input type="checkbox"/> Durable                              D <input type="checkbox"/> Nondurable  <b>MANUFACTURING</b>                              E <input type="checkbox"/> Durable                              F <input type="checkbox"/> Nondurable  <b>REAL ESTATE</b>                              G <input type="checkbox"/> Apartment rental office                              H <input type="checkbox"/> Other real estate  <b>SERVICE</b>                              I <input type="checkbox"/> SERVICE                              J <input type="checkbox"/> BANKS                              K <input type="checkbox"/> TRANSPORTATION                              L <input type="checkbox"/> ALL OTHERS - Specify _____                         </td> </tr> </table>					<b>RETAIL</b> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> Food 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Eating and drinking 3 <input type="checkbox"/> General merchandise 4 <input type="checkbox"/> Apparel 5 <input type="checkbox"/> Furniture and appliance 6 <input type="checkbox"/> Lumber, hardware, mobile home dealers 7 <input type="checkbox"/> Automotive 8 <input type="checkbox"/> Drug and proprietary 9 <input type="checkbox"/> Liquor A <input type="checkbox"/> Gasoline service stations B <input type="checkbox"/> Other retail	<b>WHOLESALE</b> C <input type="checkbox"/> Durable D <input type="checkbox"/> Nondurable <b>MANUFACTURING</b> E <input type="checkbox"/> Durable F <input type="checkbox"/> Nondurable <b>REAL ESTATE</b> G <input type="checkbox"/> Apartment rental office H <input type="checkbox"/> Other real estate <b>SERVICE</b> I <input type="checkbox"/> SERVICE J <input type="checkbox"/> BANKS K <input type="checkbox"/> TRANSPORTATION L <input type="checkbox"/> ALL OTHERS - Specify _____					
<b>RETAIL</b> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> Food 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Eating and drinking 3 <input type="checkbox"/> General merchandise 4 <input type="checkbox"/> Apparel 5 <input type="checkbox"/> Furniture and appliance 6 <input type="checkbox"/> Lumber, hardware, mobile home dealers 7 <input type="checkbox"/> Automotive 8 <input type="checkbox"/> Drug and proprietary 9 <input type="checkbox"/> Liquor A <input type="checkbox"/> Gasoline service stations B <input type="checkbox"/> Other retail	<b>WHOLESALE</b> C <input type="checkbox"/> Durable D <input type="checkbox"/> Nondurable <b>MANUFACTURING</b> E <input type="checkbox"/> Durable F <input type="checkbox"/> Nondurable <b>REAL ESTATE</b> G <input type="checkbox"/> Apartment rental office H <input type="checkbox"/> Other real estate <b>SERVICE</b> I <input type="checkbox"/> SERVICE J <input type="checkbox"/> BANKS K <input type="checkbox"/> TRANSPORTATION L <input type="checkbox"/> ALL OTHERS - Specify _____										

<b>Part II – SCREENING QUESTIONS</b>																					
<p>a. The last time this establishment was interviewed, _____ burglary(ies) were reported in _____ (month) and _____ robbery(ies) were reported in _____ (month).</p> <p>b. Now I'd like to ask some questions about particular kinds of theft or attempted theft. These questions refer only to this establishment for the 6-month period ending _____.</p>																					
<p><b>10. During this period did anyone break into or somehow illegally get into this place of business?</b></p> <p>1 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes – How many times? → <input style="width: 50px;" type="text"/> Number <i>(Fill an Incident Report for each)</i></p> <p>2 <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p><b>18. Why hasn't this establishment ever been insured against burglary and/or robbery?</b></p> <p>1 <input type="checkbox"/> Couldn't afford it</p> <p>2 <input type="checkbox"/> Couldn't get anyone to insure you</p> <p>3 <input type="checkbox"/> Didn't need it</p> <p>4 <input type="checkbox"/> Self-insured</p> <p>5 <input type="checkbox"/> Premium too expensive</p> <p>6 <input type="checkbox"/> Other – Specify <input style="width: 50px;" type="text"/></p>																				
<p><b>11. (Other than the incident(s) just mentioned,) during this period did anyone find a door jimmied, a lock forced, or any other signs of an ATTEMPTED break-in?</b></p> <p>1 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes – How many times? → <input style="width: 50px;" type="text"/> Number <i>(Fill an Incident Report for each)</i></p> <p>2 <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p><b>19a. What security measures, if any, are present at this location now, to protect it against burglary and/or robbery?</b></p> <p>a. Mark (X) all that apply</p> <p>1 <input type="checkbox"/> Alarm system – outside ringing, building alarm . . . . .</p> <p>2 <input type="checkbox"/> Burglar alarm – inside ringing</p> <p>3 <input type="checkbox"/> Central alarm – rings at police department or security agency</p> <p>4 <input type="checkbox"/> Reinforcing devices, such as bars on windows, gates, gates, etc. . . . .</p> <p>5 <input type="checkbox"/> Guard, watchman . . . . .</p> <p>6 <input type="checkbox"/> Watch dog . . . . .</p> <p>7 <input type="checkbox"/> Firearms . . . . .</p> <p>8 <input type="checkbox"/> Cameras . . . . .</p> <p>9 <input type="checkbox"/> Mirrors . . . . .</p> <p>A <input type="checkbox"/> Locks . . . . .</p> <p>B <input type="checkbox"/> Comply with National Banking Act (for banks only) . . . . .</p> <p>C <input type="checkbox"/> Lights – outside or additional inside . . . . .</p> <p>D <input type="checkbox"/> Other – Specify <input style="width: 50px;" type="text"/></p> <p>E <input type="checkbox"/> None</p>																				
<p><b>12. During this period were you, the owner, or any employee held up by anyone using a weapon, force or threat of force on these premises?</b></p> <p>1 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes – How many times? → <input style="width: 50px;" type="text"/> Number <i>(Fill an Incident Report for each)</i></p> <p>2 <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p><b>b. When were these security measures first installed or otherwise undertaken?</b></p> <p>Enter the appropriate code from the list given below.</p> <p>b. Codes</p>																				
<p><b>13. (Other than the incident(s) already mentioned,) did anyone ATTEMPT to hold up you, the owner, or any employee by using force or threatening to harm you while on these premises?</b></p> <p>1 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes – How many times? → <input style="width: 50px;" type="text"/> Number <i>(Fill an Incident Report for each)</i></p> <p>2 <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p><b>Codes for use in Item 19b</b></p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left; padding: 2px;">LESS THAN 1 YEAR AGO</th> <th style="text-align: left; padding: 2px;">MORE THAN 1 YEAR</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="padding: 2px;">1 – January</td> <td style="padding: 2px;">7 – July</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 2px;">2 – February</td> <td style="padding: 2px;">8 – August</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 2px;">3 – March</td> <td style="padding: 2px;">9 – September</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 2px;">4 – April</td> <td style="padding: 2px;">A – October</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 2px;">5 – May</td> <td style="padding: 2px;">B – November</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 2px;">6 – June</td> <td style="padding: 2px;">C – December</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 2px;"></td> <td style="padding: 2px;">D – 1–2 years ago</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 2px;"></td> <td style="padding: 2px;">E – 2–5 years ago</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 2px;"></td> <td style="padding: 2px;">F – More than 5 years ago</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	LESS THAN 1 YEAR AGO	MORE THAN 1 YEAR	1 – January	7 – July	2 – February	8 – August	3 – March	9 – September	4 – April	A – October	5 – May	B – November	6 – June	C – December		D – 1–2 years ago		E – 2–5 years ago		F – More than 5 years ago
LESS THAN 1 YEAR AGO	MORE THAN 1 YEAR																				
1 – January	7 – July																				
2 – February	8 – August																				
3 – March	9 – September																				
4 – April	A – October																				
5 – May	B – November																				
6 – June	C – December																				
	D – 1–2 years ago																				
	E – 2–5 years ago																				
	F – More than 5 years ago																				
<p><b>14. (Other than the incident(s) just mentioned,) during this period were you, the owner, or any employee held up while delivering merchandise or carrying business money outside the business?</b></p> <p>1 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes – How many times? → <input style="width: 50px;" type="text"/> Number <i>(Fill an Incident Report for each)</i></p> <p>2 <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p><b>20. INTERVIEWER CHECK ITEM</b> →</p> <p>Were there any incidents reported in 10–15?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No – Detach Incident Reports, enter "0" in Item 1h on page 1, and continue with Item 8.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes – Enter number of incidents in Item 1h on page 1, and continue with first Incident Report.</p>																				
<p><b>15. (Other than the incident(s) just mentioned,) did anyone ATTEMPT to hold up you, the owner, or any employee while delivering merchandise or carrying business money outside the business?</b></p> <p>1 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes – How many times? → <input style="width: 50px;" type="text"/> Number <i>(Fill an Incident Report for each)</i></p> <p>2 <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p><b>NOTES</b></p>																				
<p><b>16a. Is this establishment insured against burglary and/or robbery by means other than self-insurance?</b></p> <p>1 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>2 <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>3 <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know } SKIP to 17a</p> <p><b>b. Does the insurance also cover other types of crime losses, such as vandalism or shoplifting and employee theft?</b></p> <p>1 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>2 <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>3 <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know } SKIP to 19a</p>	<p><b>17a. Has this establishment ever been insured against burglary and/or robbery by means other than self-insurance?</b></p> <p>1 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>2 <input type="checkbox"/> No – SKIP to 18</p> <p>3 <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know – SKIP to 19a</p> <p><b>b. Did the insurance also cover other types of crime losses, such as vandalism or shoplifting and employee theft?</b></p> <p>1 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>2 <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p><b>c. Did you drop the insurance or did the company cancel your policy?</b></p> <p>1 <input type="checkbox"/> Businessman dropped it . . . . . } SKIP to 19a</p> <p>2 <input type="checkbox"/> Insurance company cancelled policy</p>																				

**INCIDENT REPORT**  
COMMERCIAL CRIME VICTIMIZATION SURVEY - NATIONAL SAMPLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC STATISTICS ADMIN.  
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS  
ACTING AS COLLECTING AGENT FOR  
LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE ADMIN.  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

FORM CVS-100 (6-21-74)

INCIDENT NUMBER  
Record which incident (1, 2, etc.) is covered by this page

9- Incident No.  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9

IDENTIFICATION CODE

a. PSU    b. Segment    c. Line No.    d. Part    e. Panel    f. RO

You said that during the 6 months beginning \_\_\_\_\_ and ending \_\_\_\_\_ (refer to screening questions 10-15 for description of crime).

1. In what month did this (did the first) incident happen?  
 1  Jan.    4  April    7  July    A  Oct.  
 2  Feb.    5  May    8  Aug.    B  Nov.  
 3  Mar.    6  June    9  Sept.    C  Dec.

2. About what time did it happen?  
 1  During the day (6 a.m. - 6 p.m.)  
 At night (6 p.m. - 6 a.m.)  
 2  6 p.m. - Midnight  
 3  Midnight - 6 a.m.  
 4  Don't know what time at night  
 5  Don't know

3. Where did this incident take place?  
 1  At this place of business  
 2  On delivery  
 3  Enroute to bank  
 4  Other - Specify \_\_\_\_\_

4. Were you, the owner, or any employee present while this incident was occurring?  
 1  Yes  
 2  No - SKIP to 10  
 3  Don't know

5a. Did the person holding you up have a weapon or something that was used as a weapon, such as a bottle or wrench?  
 1  Yes  
 2  No  
 3  Don't know } SKIP to 6a

b. What was the weapon? (Mark (X) all that apply)  
 1  Gun  
 2  Knife  
 3  Other - Specify \_\_\_\_\_

6a. How many persons were involved in committing the crime?  
 1  One - Continue with 6b below  
 2  Two  
 3  Three  
 4  Four or more } SKIP to 6e  
 5  Don't know - SKIP to 7a

b. How old would you say the person was?  
 1  Under 12    4  18-20  
 2  12-14    5  21 or over  
 3  15-17    6  Don't know

c. Was the person male or female?  
 1  Male  
 2  Female  
 3  Don't know

d. Was he (she) -  
 1  White?  
 2  Black?  
 3  Other? - Specify \_\_\_\_\_ } SKIP to 7a  
 4  Don't know

e. How old would you say the youngest person was?  
 1  Under 12    4  18-20  
 2  12-14    5  21 or over - SKIP to 6g  
 3  15-17    6  Don't know

f. How old would you say the oldest person was?  
 1  Under 12    4  18-20  
 2  12-14    5  21 or over  
 3  15-17    6  Don't know

g. Were they male or female?  
 1  All male    3  Male and female  
 2  All female    4  Don't know

h. Were they -  
 1  Only white?  
 2  Only black?  
 3  Only other? - Specify \_\_\_\_\_  
 4  Some combination? - Specify \_\_\_\_\_  
 5  Don't know

7a. Were you, the owner, or any employee injured in this incident, seriously enough to require medical attention?  
 1  Yes - How many? \_\_\_\_\_ Number  
 2  No - SKIP to 9a

b. How many of them stayed in a hospital overnight or longer?  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Number

8. Of those receiving treatment in or out of a hospital, did this business pay for any of the medical expenses not covered by a regular health benefits program?  
 1  Yes - How much was paid? \$ \_\_\_\_\_ 00  
 2  No  
 3  Don't know

9a. Did any deaths occur as a result of this incident?  
 1  Yes  
 2  No - SKIP to 15a

b. Who was killed? (Mark (X) all that apply)  
 1  Owner(s) ..... How many? \_\_\_\_\_  
 2  Employees .....  
 3  Customers .....  
 4  Innocent bystander(s) .....  
 5  Offender(s) .....  
 6  Police .....  
 7  Other - Specify \_\_\_\_\_

10. Did the offender enter, attempt to enter, or remain in this establishment illegally?  
 1  Yes  
 2  No

Discontinue use of Incident Report. Enter at the top of this sheet "Out of Scope-Larceny," erase incident number, change the answers to screening questions 10-15, change number of incidents in Item 1b, page 1, and go on to the next reported incident. If no other incidents are reported, return to page 1 and complete items 8 and 9 and end the interview.

11. Did the offender(s) actually get in or just try to get in?  
 1  Actually got in  
 2  Just tried to get in

12. Was there a broken window, broken lock, alarm, or any other evidence that the offender(s) forced (tried to force) his (their) way in?  
 1  Yes  
 2  No - SKIP to 14

13. What was the evidence? (Mark all that apply)  
 1  Broken lock or window  
 2  Forced door  
 3  Alarm  
 4  Other - Specify \_\_\_\_\_ } SKIP to 15a

14. How did the offender(s) get in (try to get in)?  
 1  Through unlocked door or window  
 2  Had a key  
 3  Other - Specify \_\_\_\_\_  
 4  Don't know

INCIDENT REPORT

SAMPLE

**INCIDENT REPORT – Continued**

**15a. Was anything damaged in this incident? For example, a lock or window broken, damaged merchandise, etc.**  
 1  Yes  
 2  No – SKIP to 16a

**b. Was (were) the damaged item(s) repaired or replaced?**  
 1  Yes – SKIP to 15d  
 2  No

**c. How much would it cost to repair or replace the damages? (Estimate)**  
 \$ \_\_\_\_\_ . **00** } SKIP to 15e  
 X  Don't know

**d. How much did it cost to repair or replace the damages?**  
 \$ \_\_\_\_\_ . **00**  
 V  No cost – SKIP to 16a  
 X  Don't know

**e. Who paid or will pay for the repairs or replacement? (Mark (X) all that apply)**  
 1  This business  
 2  Insurance  
 3  Owner of building (landlord)  
 4  Other – Specify \_\_\_\_\_  
 5  Don't know

**16a. Did the offender(s) take any money, merchandise, equipment, or supplies?**  
 1  Yes  
 2  No – SKIP to 18a

**b. How much money was taken? → \$** \_\_\_\_\_ **00**

**c. What was the total value of merchandise, equipment, or supplies taken?**  
 \$ \_\_\_\_\_ **00**  
 V  None } SKIP to 17a  
 X  Don't know

**d. How was the value (merchandise, equipment, or supplies taken) determined?**  
 1  Original cost  
 2  Replacement cost  
 3  Other – Specify \_\_\_\_\_

**17a. How much, if any, of the stolen money and/or property was recovered by insurance?**  
 \$ \_\_\_\_\_ **00**  
 V  None – Why not?   
 1  Didn't report it  
 2  Does not have insurance  
 3  Not settled yet  
 4  Policy has a deductible  
 5  Money and/or merchandise was recovered  
 X  Don't know

**b. How much, if any, of the stolen money and/or property was recovered by means other than insurance?**  
 \$ \_\_\_\_\_ **00**  
 V  None } SKIP to 18a  
 X  Don't know

**c. By what means was the stolen money and/or property recovered?**  
 1  Police  
 2  Other – Specify \_\_\_\_\_

**NOTES**

**18a. Did you, the owner, or any employee here lose any time from work because of this incident?**  
 1  Yes – How many people? →   
 2  No – SKIP to 19a

**b. How many work days were lost altogether?**  
 1  Less than 1 day  
 2  1–5 days  
 3  6–10 days  
 4  Over 10 days – How many? →   
 5  Don't know

**19a. Were any security measures taken after this incident to protect the establishment from future incidents?**  
 1  Yes  
 2  No – SKIP to 20a

**b. What measures were taken? (Mark (X) all that apply)**  
 1  Alarm system – outside ringing  
 2  Burglar alarm – inside ringing  
 3  Central alarm  
 4  Reinforcing devices, grates, gates, bars on window, etc.  
 5  Guard, watchman  
 6  Watch dog  
 7  Firearms  
 8  Cameras  
 9  Mirrors  
 A  Locks  
 B  Lights – outside or additional inside  
 C  Other – Specify \_\_\_\_\_

**20a. Were the police informed of this incident in any way?**  
 1  No  
 2  Don't know – SKIP to 21  
 Yes – Who told them?   
 3  Owner(s)  
 4  Employee  
 5  Someone else  
 6  Police on scene } SKIP to 21

**b. What was the reason this incident was not reported to the police? (Mark (X) all that apply)**  
 1  Nothing could be done – lack of proof  
 2  Did not think it important enough  
 3  Police wouldn't want to be bothered  
 4  Did not want to take the time – too inconvenient  
 5  Private or personal matter, did not want to report it  
 6  Did not want to get involved  
 7  Afraid of reprisal  
 8  Reported to someone else  
 9  Other – Specify \_\_\_\_\_

**21. INTERVIEWER CHECK ITEM** → Are there more incidents to record?  
 No – Return to page 1, complete items 8 and 9, and end interview.  
 Yes – Fill the next Incident Report.

TRANSCRIBE THE IDENTIFICATION CODES FROM ITEM 1 OF THE COVER SHEET AND COMPLETE A SEPARATE INCIDENT REPORT FOR EACH INCIDENT.

FORM **CVS-100** (6-21-74)  
 U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
 SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC STATISTICS ADMIN.  
 BUREAU OF THE CENSUS  
 ACTING AS COLLECTING AGENT FOR  
 LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE ADMIN.  
 U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

**IDENTIFICATION CODE**

a. PSU	b. Segment	c. Line No.	d. Part	e. Panel	f. RO
--------	------------	-------------	---------	----------	-------

**INCIDENT REPORT**  
**COMMERCIAL CRIME VICTIMIZATION SURVEY - NATIONAL SAMPLE**

9. Incident No.  **INCIDENT NUMBER**  
 Record which incident (1, 2, etc.) is covered by this page

You said that during the 6 months beginning \_\_\_\_\_ and ending \_\_\_\_\_ (refer to screening questions 10-15 for description of crime).

1. In what month did this (did the first) incident happen?

1 <input type="checkbox"/> Jan.	4 <input type="checkbox"/> April	7 <input type="checkbox"/> July	A <input type="checkbox"/> Oct.
2 <input type="checkbox"/> Feb.	5 <input type="checkbox"/> May	8 <input type="checkbox"/> Aug.	B <input type="checkbox"/> Nov.
3 <input type="checkbox"/> Mar.	6 <input type="checkbox"/> June	9 <input type="checkbox"/> Sept.	C <input type="checkbox"/> Dec.

7a. Were you, the owner, or any employee injured in this incident, seriously enough to require medical attention?

1  Yes - How many? \_\_\_\_\_ Number

2  No - SKIP to 9a

b. How many of them stayed in a hospital overnight or longer? \_\_\_\_\_ Number

2. About what time did it happen?

1  During the day (6 a.m. - 6 p.m.)  
 At night (6 p.m. - 6 a.m.)

2  6 p.m. - Midnight

3  Midnight - 6 a.m.

4  Don't know what time at night

5  Don't know

8. Of those receiving treatment in or out of a hospital, did this business pay for any of the medical expenses not covered by a regular health benefits program?

1  Yes - How much was paid? \$ \_\_\_\_\_

2  No

3  Don't know

3. Where did this incident take place?

1  At this place of business

2  On delivery

3  Enroute to bank

4  Other - Specify \_\_\_\_\_

9a. Did any deaths occur as a result of this incident?

1  Yes

2  No - SKIP to 15a

4. Were you, the owner, or any employee present while this incident was occurring?

1  Yes

2  No - SKIP to 10

3  Don't know

b. Who was killed? (Mark (X) all that apply)

1  Owner(s) \_\_\_\_\_

2  Employees \_\_\_\_\_

3  Customers \_\_\_\_\_

4  Innocent bystander(s) \_\_\_\_\_

5  Offender(s) \_\_\_\_\_

6  Police \_\_\_\_\_

7  Other - Specify \_\_\_\_\_

c. How many?  \_\_\_\_\_

**SKIP to 15a**

5a. Did the person holding you up have a weapon or something that was used as a weapon, such as a bottle or wrench?

1  Yes

2  No

3  Don't know } SKIP to 6a

b. What was the weapon? (Mark (X) all that apply)

1  Gun

2  Knife

3  Other - Specify \_\_\_\_\_

6a. How many persons were involved in committing the crime?

1  One - Continue with 6b below

2  Two

3  Three } SKIP to 6c

4  Four or more

5  Don't know - SKIP to 7a

b. How old would you say the person was?

1  Under 12

2  12-14

3  15-17

4  18-20

5  21 or over

6  Don't know

c. Was the person male or female?

1  Male

2  Female

3  Don't know

d. Was he (she) -

1  White?

2  Black?

3  Other? - Specify \_\_\_\_\_ } SKIP to 7a

4  Don't know

e. How old would you say the youngest person was?

1  Under 12

2  12-14

3  15-17

4  18-20

5  21 or over - SKIP to 6g

6  Don't know

f. How old would you say the oldest person was?

1  Under 12

2  12-14

3  15-17

4  18-20

5  21 or over

6  Don't know

g. Were they male or female?

1  All male

2  All female

3  Male and female

4  Don't know

h. Were they -

1  Only white?

2  Only black?

3  Only other? - Specify \_\_\_\_\_

4  Some combination? - Specify \_\_\_\_\_

5  Don't know

10. Did the offender enter, attempt to enter, or remain in this establishment illegally?

1  Yes

2  No

*Discontinue use of Incident Report. Enter at the top of this sheet "Out of Scope-Larceny," erase incident number, change the answers to screening questions 10-15, change number of incidents in Item 1h, page 1, and go on to the next reported incident. If no other incidents are reported, return to page 1 and complete items 8 and 9 and end the interview.*

11. Did the offender(s) actually get in or just try to get in?

1  Actually got in

2  Just tried to get in

12. Was there a broken window, broken lock, alarm, or any other evidence that the offender(s) forced (tried to force) his (their) way in?

1  Yes

2  No - SKIP to 14

13. What was the evidence? (Mark all that apply)

1  Broken lock or window

2  Forced door

3  Alarm

4  Other - Specify \_\_\_\_\_ } SKIP to 15a

14. How did the offender(s) get in (try to get in)?

1  Through unlocked door or window

2  Had a key

3  Other - Specify \_\_\_\_\_

4  Don't know

INCIDENT REPORT

SAMPLE

**INCIDENT REPORT – Continued**

**15a. Was anything damaged in this incident? For example, a lock or window broken, damaged merchandise, etc.**  
 1  Yes  
 2  No – SKIP to 16a

**b. Was (were) the damaged item(s) repaired or replaced?**  
 1  Yes – SKIP to 15d  
 2  No

**c. How much would it cost to repair or replace the damages? (Estimate)**  
 \$ \_\_\_\_\_ .00 } SKIP to 15e  
 X  Don't know

**d. How much did it cost to repair or replace the damages?**  
 \$ \_\_\_\_\_ .00  
 V  No cost – SKIP to 16a  
 X  Don't know

**e. Who paid or will pay for the repairs or replacement? (Mark (X) all that apply)**  
 1  This business  
 2  Insurance  
 3  Owner of building (landlord)  
 4  Other – Specify \_\_\_\_\_  
 5  Don't know

**16a. Did the offender(s) take any money, merchandise, equipment, or supplies?**  
 1  Yes  
 2  No – SKIP to 18a

**b. How much money was taken? → \$ \_\_\_\_\_ .00**

**c. What was the total value of merchandise, equipment, or supplies taken?**  
 \$ \_\_\_\_\_ .00  
 V  None } SKIP to 17a  
 X  Don't know

**d. How was the value (merchandise, equipment, or supplies taken) determined?**  
 1  Original cost  
 2  Replacement cost  
 3  Other – Specify \_\_\_\_\_

**17a. How much, if any, of the stolen money and/or property was recovered by insurance?**  
 \$ \_\_\_\_\_ .00  
 V  None – Why not?    
     1  Didn't report it  
     2  Does not have insurance  
     3  Not settled yet  
     4  Policy has a deductible  
     5  Money and/or merchandise was recovered  
 X  Don't know

**b. How much, if any, of the stolen money and/or property was recovered by means other than insurance?**  
 \$ \_\_\_\_\_ .00  
 V  None } SKIP to 18a  
 X  Don't know

**c. By what means was the stolen money and/or property recovered?**  
 1  Police  
 2  Other – Specify \_\_\_\_\_

**18a. Did you, the owner, or any employee here lose any time from work because of this incident?**  
 1  Yes – How many people? →   
 2  No – SKIP to 19a

**b. How many work days were lost altogether?**  
 1  Less than 1 day  
 2  1–5 days  
 3  6–10 days  
 4  Over 10 days – How many? →   
 5  Don't know

**19a. Were any security measures taken after this incident to protect the establishment from future incidents?**  
 1  Yes  
 2  No – SKIP to 20a

**b. What measures were taken? (Mark (X) all that apply)**  
 1  Alarm system – outside ringing  
 2  Burglar alarm – inside ringing  
 3  Central alarm  
 4  Reinforcing devices, grates, gates, bars on window, etc.  
 5  Guard, watchman  
 6  Watch dog  
 7  Firearms  
 8  Cameras  
 9  Mirrors  
 A  Locks  
 B  Lights – outside or additional inside  
 C  Other – Specify \_\_\_\_\_

**20a. Were the police informed of this incident in any way?**  
 1  No  
 2  Don't know – SKIP to 21  
 Yes – Who told them?  } SKIP to 21  
     3  Owner(s)  
     4  Employee  
     5  Someone else  
     6  Police on scene

**b. What was the reason this incident was not reported to the police? (Mark (X) all that apply)**  
 1  Nothing could be done – lack of proof  
 2  Did not think it important enough  
 3  Police wouldn't want to be bothered  
 4  Did not want to take the time – too inconvenient  
 5  Private or personal matter, did not want to report it  
 6  Did not want to get involved  
 7  Afraid of reprisal  
 8  Reported to someone else  
 9  Other – Specify \_\_\_\_\_

**21. INTERVIEWER CHECK ITEM** ▶ Are there more incidents to record?  
 No – Return to page 1, complete Items 8 and 9, and end interview.  
 Yes – Fill the next Incident Report.

NOTES



TRANSCRIBE THE IDENTIFICATION CODES FROM ITEM 1 OF THE COVER SHEET AND COMPLETE A SEPARATE INCIDENT REPORT FOR EACH INCIDENT.

FORM CVS-100 (6-21-74) U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC STATISTICS ADMIN. BUREAU OF THE CENSUS ACTING AS COLLECTING AGENT FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE ADMIN. U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

IDENTIFICATION CODE
o. PSU b. Segment c. Line No. d. Part e. Panel f. RO

INCIDENT REPORT COMMERCIAL CRIME VICTIMIZATION SURVEY - NATIONAL SAMPLE
9. Incident No. INCIDENT NUMBER Record which incident (1, 2, etc.) is covered by this page

You said that during the 6 months beginning \_\_\_\_\_ and ending \_\_\_\_\_ (refer to screening questions 10-15 for description of crime).

1. In what month did this (did the first) incident happen?
1 Jan. 4 April 7 July A Oct.
2 Feb. 5 May 8 Aug. B Nov.
3 Mar. 6 June 9 Sept. C Dec.

2. About what time did it happen?
1 During the day (6 a.m. - 6 p.m.)
At night (6 p.m. - 6 a.m.)
2 6 p.m. - Midnight
3 Midnight - 6 a.m.
4 Don't know what time at night
5 Don't know

3. Where did this incident take place?
1 At this place of business
2 On delivery
3 Enroute to bank
4 Other - Specify \_\_\_\_\_

4. Were you, the owner, or any employee present while this incident was occurring?
1 Yes
2 No - SKIP to 10
3 Don't know

5a. Did the person holding you up have a weapon or something that was used as a weapon, such as a bottle or wrench?
1 Yes
2 No
3 Don't know } SKIP to 6a

b. What was the weapon? (Mark (X) all that apply)
1 Gun
2 Knife
3 Other - Specify \_\_\_\_\_

6a. How many persons were involved in committing the crime?
1 One - Continue with 6b below
2 Two
3 Three } SKIP to 6c
4 Four or more
5 Don't know - SKIP to 7a

b. How old would you say the person was?
1 Under 12 4 18-20
2 12-14 5 21 or over
3 15-17 6 Don't know

c. Was the person male or female?
1 Male
2 Female
3 Don't know

d. Was he (she) -
1 White?
2 Black?
3 Other? - Specify \_\_\_\_\_ } SKIP to 7a
4 Don't know

e. How old would you say the youngest person was?
1 Under 12 4 18-20
2 12-14 5 21 or over - SKIP to 6g
3 15-17 6 Don't know

f. How old would you say the oldest person was?
1 Under 12 4 18-20
2 12-14 5 21 or over
3 15-17 6 Don't know

g. Were they male or female?
1 All male 3 Male and female
2 All female 4 Don't know

h. Were they -
1 Only white?
2 Only black?
3 Only other? - Specify \_\_\_\_\_
4 Some combination? - Specify \_\_\_\_\_
5 Don't know

7a. Were you, the owner, or any employee injured in this incident, seriously enough to require medical attention?
1 Yes - How many? \_\_\_\_\_ Number
2 No - SKIP to 9a

b. How many of them stayed in a hospital overnight or longer?
Number

8. Of those receiving treatment in or out of a hospital, did this business pay for any of the medical expenses not covered by a regular health benefits program?
1 Yes - How much was paid? \$ \_\_\_\_\_
2 No
3 Don't know

9a. Did any deaths occur as a result of this incident?
1 Yes
2 No - SKIP to 15a

b. Who was killed? (Mark (X) all that apply)
c. How many?
1 Owner(s)
2 Employees
3 Customers
4 Innocent bystanders
5 Offender(s)
6 Police
7 Other - Specify \_\_\_\_\_

SKIP to 15a

10. Did the offender enter, attempt to enter, or remain in this establishment illegally?
1 Yes
2 No

Discontinue use of Incident Report. Enter at the top of this sheet "Out of Scope-Larceny," erase incident number, change the answers to screening questions 10-15, change number of incidents in item 1b, page 1, and go on to the next reported incident. If no other incidents are reported, return to page 1 and complete items 8 and 9 and end the interview.

11. Did the offender(s) actually get in or just try to get in?
1 Actually got in
2 Just tried to get in

12. Was there a broken window, broken lock, alarm, or any other evidence that the offender(s) forced (tried to force) his (their) way in?
1 Yes
2 No - SKIP to 14

13. What was the evidence? (Mark all that apply)
1 Broken lock or window
2 Forced door
3 Alarm
4 Other - Specify \_\_\_\_\_ } SKIP to 15a

14. How did the offender(s) get in (try to get in)?
1 Through unlocked door or window
2 Had a key
3 Other - Specify \_\_\_\_\_
4 Don't know

I N C I D E N T R E P O R T

**INCIDENT REPORT – Continued**

**15a. Was anything damaged in this incident? For example, a lock or window broken, damaged merchandise, etc.**  
 1  Yes  
 2  No – SKIP to 16a

**b. Was (were) the damaged item(s) repaired or replaced?**  
 1  Yes – SKIP to 15d  
 2  No

**c. How much would it cost to repair or replace the damages? (Estimate)**  
 \$ \_\_\_\_\_ .00 } SKIP to 15e  
 X  Don't know

**d. How much did it cost to repair or replace the damages?**  
 \$ \_\_\_\_\_ .00  
 V  No cost – SKIP to 16a  
 X  Don't know

**e. Who paid or will pay for the repairs or replacement? (Mark (X) all that apply)**  
 1  This business  
 2  Insurance  
 3  Owner of building (landlord)  
 4  Other – Specify \_\_\_\_\_  
 5  Don't know

**16a. Did the offender(s) take any money, merchandise, equipment, or supplies?**  
 1  Yes  
 2  No – SKIP to 18a

**b. How much money was taken? → \$ \_\_\_\_\_ .00**

**c. What was the total value of merchandise, equipment, or supplies taken?**  
 \$ \_\_\_\_\_ .00 } SKIP to 17a  
 V  None  
 X  Don't know

**d. How was the value (merchandise, equipment, or supplies taken) determined?**  
 1  Original cost  
 2  Replacement cost  
 3  Other – Specify \_\_\_\_\_

**17a. How much, if any, of the stolen money and/or property was recovered by insurance?**  
 \$ \_\_\_\_\_ .00  
 V  None – Why not?    
     1  Didn't report it  
     2  Does not have insurance  
     3  Not settled yet  
     4  Policy has a deductible  
     5  Money and/or merchandise was recovered  
 X  Don't know

**b. How much, if any, of the stolen money and/or property was recovered by means other than insurance?**  
 \$ \_\_\_\_\_ .00  
 V  None  
 X  Don't know } SKIP to 18a

**c. By what means was the stolen money and/or property recovered?**  
 1  Police  
 2  Other – Specify \_\_\_\_\_

**18a. Did you, the owner, or any employee here lose any time from work because of this incident?**  
 1  Yes – How many people? → Number \_\_\_\_\_  
 2  No – SKIP to 19a

**b. How many work days were lost altogether?**  
 1  Less than 1 day  
 2  1–5 days  
 3  6–10 days  
 4  Over 10 days – How many? → Days \_\_\_\_\_  
 5  Don't know

**19a. Were any security measures taken after this incident to protect the establishment from future incidents?**  
 1  Yes  
 2  No – SKIP to 20a

**b. What measures were taken? (Mark (X) all that apply)**  
 1  Alarm system – outside ringing  
 2  Burglar alarm – inside ringing  
 3  Central alarm  
 4  Reinforcing devices, grates, gates, bars on window, etc.  
 5  Guard, watchman  
 6  Watch dog  
 7  Firearms  
 8  Cameras  
 9  Mirrors  
 A  Locks  
 B  Lights – outside or additional inside  
 C  Other – Specify \_\_\_\_\_

**20a. Were the police informed of this incident in any way?**  
 1  No  
 2  Don't know – SKIP to 21  
      Yes – Who told them?    
         3  Owner(s)  
         4  Employee  
         5  Someone else } SKIP to 21  
         6  Police on scene

**b. What was the reason this incident was not reported to the police? (Mark (X) all that apply)**  
 1  Nothing could be done – lack of proof  
 2  Did not think it important enough  
 3  Police wouldn't want to be bothered  
 4  Did not want to take the time – too inconvenient  
 5  Private or personal matter, did not want to report it  
 6  Did not want to get involved  
 7  Afraid of reprisal  
 8  Reported to someone else  
 9  Other – Specify \_\_\_\_\_

**21. INTERVIEWER CHECK ITEM** Are there more incidents to record?  
 No – Return to page 1, complete items 8 and 9, and end interview.  
 Yes – Fill the next Incident Report.

NOTES

## APPENDIX III

### HOUSEHOLD SURVEY: TECHNICAL INFORMATION AND STANDARD ERROR TABLES

With respect to crimes against persons and households, survey results contained in this report are based on data gathered from residents throughout the Nation, including persons living in group quarters, such as dormitories, rooming houses, and religious group dwellings. Crewmembers of merchant vessels, Armed Forces personnel living in military barracks, and institutionalized persons, such as correctional facility inmates, did not fall within the scope of the survey. Similarly, U.S. citizens residing abroad and foreign visitors to this country were not under consideration. With these exceptions, individuals age 12 and over living in units designated for the sample were eligible to be interviewed in person.

Each interviewer's first contact with a unit selected for the survey was in person, and, if it was not possible to secure interviews with all eligible members of the household during this initial visit, interviews by telephone were permissible thereafter. The only exemptions to the requirement for personal interview applied to 12- and 13-year-olds, incapacitated persons, and individuals who were absent from the household during the entire field interviewing period; for such persons, interviewers were required to obtain proxy responses from a knowl-

edgeable adult member of the household. Survey records were processed and weighted, yielding results representative both of the Nation's population as a whole and of sectors within society. Because they are based on a sample survey rather than a complete enumeration, the results are estimates.

#### Sample design and size

Estimates emanating from the survey are based on data obtained from a stratified multistage cluster sample. In designing the sample, the first stage consisted of the formation of primary sampling units comprising counties or groups of counties, including every county in the Nation. Approximately 1,930 of these units were so formed and grouped into 376 strata. Among these strata, each of 156 represented a single area and thus came into the sample with certainty. These strata, designated self-representing areas, generally contained the larger metropolitan areas. The remaining 220 strata were formed by combining areas that shared certain characteristics in common, such as geographic region, population density, population growth rate, proportion of nonwhite population, etc. From each stratum, one area was

selected for the sample, the probability of selection having been proportionate to the area's population; areas so chosen are referred to as being non-self-representing.

The remaining procedures were designed to ensure a self-weighting probability sample of dwelling units and group quarters within each of the selected areas.<sup>1</sup> This involved a systematic selection of enumeration districts (geographic areas used for the 1970 Census), with the probability of selection being proportionate to their 1970 population size, followed by the selection of clusters of approximately four housing units each from within each enumeration district. To account for units built within each of the sample areas after the 1970 Census, a sample was drawn, by means of an independent clerical operation, of permits issued for the construction of residential housing. Jurisdictions that do not issue building permits were sampled by means of a sample of area segments. These supplementary procedures, though yielding a relatively small portion of the total sample, enabled persons occupying housing built after 1970 to be properly represented in the survey. As the decade progresses, newly constructed units will account for an increased proportion of the total sample.

A total of approximately 80,000 housing units and other living quarters were designated for the sample. For purposes of conducting the field interviews, the sample was divided into six groups, or rotations, each of which contained housing units whose occupants were to be interviewed once every 6 months over a period of 3 years; the initial interview was for purposes of bounding, i.e., establishing a time frame to avoid duplicative recording of information on subsequent interviews. Each rotation group was further divided into six panels. Individuals occupying housing units within one-sixth of each rotation group, or one panel, were interviewed each month during the 6-month period. Because the survey is continuous, additional housing units are selected in the manner described and assigned to rotation groups and panels for subsequent incorporation into the sample. A new rotation group enters the sample every 6 months, replacing a group phased out after being in the sample for 3 years.

Among the 80,000 housing units designated for the sample that was to provide information relating to calendar year 1973, interviews were obtained from the occupants of about 65,000. The large majority of the

remaining 15,000 units were found to be vacant, demolished, or converted to nonresidential use or were otherwise ineligible for the survey. However, approximately 2,500 of the 15,000 units were occupied by householders who, although eligible to participate in the survey, were not interviewed because they could not be reached after repeated visits, declined to be interviewed, were temporarily absent, or were otherwise not available. Thus, the occupants of about 96 percent of all eligible housing units, or some 160,000 persons, participated in the survey.

### Estimation procedure

In order to enhance the reliability of the estimates presented in this report, the estimation procedure incorporated extensive auxiliary data resources on those characteristics of the population that are believed to bear on the subject matter of the survey. These auxiliary data were used in the various stages of ratio estimation.

The estimation procedure is performed on a quarterly basis to produce quarterly estimates of the volume and rates of victimization. Sample data from 8 months of field interviewing are required to produce these quarterly estimates. As shown on the following chart, data collected during the months of February through September are required to produce an estimate for the first quarter of any given calendar year. Similarly, annual estimates are derived by accumulating data from the four quarterly estimates which, in turn, are obtained from a total of 17 months of field interviewing.<sup>2</sup> One purpose of this interviewing scheme and the resulting estimation procedure was that of offsetting expected biases associated with the tendency of respondents to place criminal victimizations in more recent months during the 6-month recall period than when they actually occurred.

The first step in the estimation procedure was the inflation of the sample data by the reciprocal of the probability of its selection. An adjustment was then made to account for occupied units (and for persons in occupied units) that were eligible for the survey but where it was not possible to obtain an interview.

Ordinarily, the distribution of the sample population differs somewhat from the distribution of the total

---

<sup>1</sup>Self-weighting means that each sample household had the same initial probability of being selected.

---

<sup>2</sup>Thus, the population and household figures shown on the victimization rate tables in Appendix I were based on an average for these 17 months, centering on the ninth month of the survey reference period, in this case, October 1973.

Month of interview by month of recall

(X's denote months in the 6-month recall period)

Month of interview	Period of reference (or recall)											
	First quarter			Second quarter			Third quarter			Fourth quarter		
	Jan.	Feb.	March	April	May	June	July	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.
January	X											
February	X	X										
March	X	X	X									
April	X	X	X	X								
May	X	X	X	X	X							
June	X	X	X	X	X	X						
July		X	X	X	X	X	X					
August			X	X	X	X	X	X				
September				X	X	X	X	X	X			
October					X	X	X	X	X	X		
November						X	X	X	X	X	X	
December							X	X	X	X	X	X

population from which the sample was drawn in terms of such characteristics as age, race, sex, residence, etc. Because of this, various stages of ratio estimation were employed to bring distributions of the two populations into closer agreement, hence reducing the variability of sample estimates. Two stages of ratio estimation were used in producing data relating to crimes against persons; the same two stages, plus a third, were applied for data on household crimes.

The first stage of ratio estimation was applied only to data records obtained from sample areas that were non-self-representing. Its purpose was to reduce the error arising from the fact that one area was selected to represent an entire stratum. For various categories of race and residence, ratios were calculated reflecting the relationships between weighted 1970 Census counts for

all sample areas in each region and the total population of the region at the time of the Census.

The second stage of ratio estimation was applied on a person basis and brought the distribution of the sample persons into closer agreement with independent post-Census estimates of the distribution of the population by various age-sex-color categories. The third stage of ratio estimation was applied on a household basis and performed a similar function with regard to the distribution of the stock of housing units by residence-tenure categories.

Concerning the estimation of data on crimes against households, characteristics of the wife in a husband-wife household and characteristics of the head of household in other types of households were used to determine which second-stage ratio estimate factors were to be

applied. This procedure is thought to be more precise than that of uniformly using the characteristics of the head of household, since sample coverage generally is better for females than for males.

In producing estimates of personal *incidents* (as opposed to those of *victimizations*), a further adjustment was made in those cases where an incident involved more than one person, thereby allowing for the probability that such incidents had more than a single chance of coming into the sample. Thus, if two persons were victimized during the same incident, the weight assigned to the record for that incident (and associated characteristics) was reduced by one-half in order not to introduce double counts into the estimated data. A comparable adjustment was not made in estimating data on crimes against households, as each separate criminal act was defined as involving only one household. When a personal crime was reported in the household survey as having occurred simultaneously with a commercial burglary or robbery, it was assumed that the commercial survey accounted for the incident and, therefore, it was not counted as an incident of personal crime. However, the details of the outcome of the event as they related to the victimized individual would be reflected in the household survey results.

### Series victimizations

As mentioned in the chapter entitled "The National Surveys," victimizations that occurred in series of three or more and for which the victim was unable to describe separately the details of each event have been excluded from the analysis and data tables in this report. Because respondents had difficulty pinpointing the dates of these acts, this information was recorded by the season (or seasons) of occurrence within the 6-month reference period and tabulated by the quarter of the year in which the data were *collected*. For the majority of crimes, however, the data were tabulated on the basis of the specific month of *occurrence* to produce quarterly estimates. Although no direct correspondence exists between the two sets of data, near compatibility between reference periods can be achieved by comparing the data on series victimizations gathered by interviewers from April 1973 through March 1974 with the regular (i.e., non-series) victimizations for calendar year 1973. This approach results in an 87.5 percent overlap between reporting periods for the two data sets.

Table I, at the end of this appendix, is based on such a comparison. It shows that there were slightly

more than 1 million series victimizations in the personal crime sector and about 760,000 in the household sector. Efforts are underway to study the nature of series victimizations, focusing on their relationship to regular victimizations.

### Reliability of estimates

The particular sample employed for this survey was one of a large number of possible samples of equal size that could have been used applying the same sample design and selection procedures. Estimates derived from different samples would differ from each other. The standard error of a survey estimate is a measure of the variation among the estimates from all possible samples and is, therefore, a measure of the precision with which the estimate from a particular sample approximates the average result of all possible samples. The estimate and its associated standard error may be used to construct a confidence interval, that is, an interval having a prescribed probability that it would include the average result of all possible samples. The chances are about 68 out of 100 that the survey estimate would differ from the average result of all possible samples by less than one standard error. Similarly, the chances are about 90 out of 100 that the difference would be less than 1.6 times the standard error; about 95 out of 100 that the difference would be 2.0 times the standard error; and 99 out of 100 chances that it would be less than 2.5 times the standard error. The 68 percent confidence interval is defined as the range of values given by the estimate minus the standard error and the estimate plus the standard error; the chances are 68 in 100 that a figure from a complete census would fall within that range. Likewise, the 95 percent confidence interval is defined as the estimate plus or minus two standard errors.

In addition to sampling error, the estimates presented in this report are subject to nonsampling error. Major sources of such error are related to the ability of respondents to recall victimization experiences and associated details that occurred during the 6 months prior to the time of interview. Research on the capacity of victims to recall specific kinds of crime, based on interviewing persons who were victims of offenses drawn from police files, indicates that assault is the least well recalled of the crimes measured by the National Crime Panel program. This may stem in part from the observed tendency of victims not to report crimes committed by offenders known to them, especially if they are relatives. In addition, it is suspected that, among certain societal

roups, crimes that contain the elements of assault are a part of everyday life and, thus, are simply forgotten or are not considered worth mentioning to a survey interviewer. Taken together, these recall problems may result in a substantial understatement of the "true" rate of victimization from assault.

Another source of nonsampling error related to the recall capacity of respondents entails the inability to place the criminal event in the correct month, even though it was placed in the correct reference period. This source of error is partially offset by the requirement for monthly interviewing and by the estimation procedure described earlier. An additional problem involves telescoping, or bringing within the appropriate month period incidents that occurred earlier—or, in a few instances, those that happened after the close of the reference period. The latter is believed to be relatively rare because the bulk of the interviewing takes place during the first week of the month following the reference period. In any event, the effect of telescoping is minimized by the bounding procedure described above. The interviewer is provided with a summary of the incidents reported in the preceding interview and, if a similar incident is reported, it can then be determined from discussion with the respondent whether the reported incident is indeed a new one.

Methodological research undertaken in preparation for the National Crime Panel program indicated that substantially fewer incidents of crime are reported when the household member reports for all persons residing in the household than when each household member is interviewed individually. Therefore, the self-response procedure was adopted as a general rule; allowances for proxy response under the contingencies discussed earlier are the only exceptions to this rule.

Additional nonsampling errors can result from incomplete or erroneous responses, systematic mistakes introduced by interviewers, possible biases associated with the sample rotation scheme, and improper coding and processing of data. Many of these errors would also occur in a complete census. Quality control measures, such as interviewer observation, with retraining and interviewing, as appropriate, as well as edit procedures in the field and at the clerical and computer processing stages, were utilized to keep such errors at an acceptably low level. As calculated for this survey, the standard errors partially measure only those nonsampling errors arising from random response and interviewer errors; they do not, however, take into account any systematic biases in the data.

## Standard error tables and calculations

For survey estimates relevant to the personal and household sectors, the standard errors displayed on tables at the end of this appendix can be used for gauging sampling variability. These errors are approximations and suggest an order of magnitude of the standard error rather than the precise error associated with any given estimate. Table II contains the standard error approximations applicable to estimated levels, or numbers, of criminal incidents and victimizations within the personal sector. Standard errors pertaining to household victimizations are given on Table III. Tables IV and V contain standard errors applicable to personal and household victimization rates, respectively. And Tables VI and VII give standard errors for percentages of personal and household victimizations, respectively.

The standard error of a difference between two sample estimates is approximately equal to the square root of the sum of the squares of the standard errors of each estimate considered separately. This formula represents the actual standard error quite accurately for the difference between uncorrelated sample estimates. If, however, there is a high positive correlation, the formula will overestimate the true standard error of the difference and if there is a large negative correlation, the formula will underestimate the true standard error of the difference. To illustrate the application of standard errors in measuring sampling variability, refer to Data Table 3, Appendix I, which shows that the total population age 12 and over used as a base for calculating victimization rates for calendar year 1973 was 162,236,300. For these persons the victimization rate for crimes of violence was 34 per 1,000. Linear interpolation of values in Table IV of this appendix yields a standard error of 0.5 for this victimization rate. Thus, the chances are 68 out of 100 that a complete census figure would have differed from this rate by no more than 0.5, plus or minus. And, the chances are 95 out of 100 that the estimate would have differed from a census figure by less than twice this standard error, or that the 95 percent confidence interval associated with the rate is from 33 to 35.

Data Table 4 of this report shows that the number of persons age 12-15 used as a base for calculating victimization rates was 16,558,600. For these persons the victimization rate for personal crimes of theft was 176 per 1,000. Table 4 also shows that, for persons age 16-19, the base for calculating victimization rates was

15,583,900; among this group the victimization rate for crimes of theft was 169.

The standard error of each of these two rates is obtained from Table IV by linear interpolation. The standard error of the difference is approximately equal to  $\sqrt{(3.7)^2 + (3.8)^2} \doteq 5.3$ . This means that the chances are 68 out of 100 that the estimated difference of 7 between the two rates would vary by less than 5.3 from the difference derived from a complete census; in other words, the confidence interval is about 1.7 to 12.3.

However, the two standard error (95 percent confidence) level yields an interval of some 10.6 points ( $5.3 \times 2$ ), which is larger than the estimated difference of 7 points; therefore, the difference is not significant at the 95 percent confidence level. Also, it is not significant at the 90 percent level, which is 1.6 times the standard error ( $5.3 \times 1.6 = 8.5$ ). Thus, in accordance with standards observed in analyzing survey results in this report, statistical significance would *not* be attached to the difference between the two victimization rates.



Table I. Personal and household crimes: Number and percent distribution of series victimizations (4/73-3/74) and of victimizations not in series (1973), by sector and type of crime

Sector and type of crime	Series victimizations		Victimizations not in series	
	Number	Percent in sector	Number	Percent in sector
Personal sector	1,052,800	100.0	20,653,600	100.0
Crimes of violence	487,420	46.3	5,493,600	26.6
Rape	18,120	0.8	159,700	0.8
Robbery	51,570	4.9	1,120,100	5.4
Robbery with injury	17,490	0.7	385,900	1.9
Robbery without injury	44,080	4.2	734,200	3.6
Assault	427,730	40.6	4,213,800	20.4
Aggravated assault	134,560	12.8	1,681,200	8.1
With injury	42,530	4.0	545,300	2.6
Attempted assault with weapon	92,030	8.7	1,135,900	5.5
Simple assault	293,170	27.9	2,532,700	12.3
With injury	46,630	4.4	625,600	3.0
Attempted assault without weapon	246,540	23.4	1,907,100	9.2
Crimes of theft	565,380	53.7	15,160,000	73.4
Personal larceny with contact	19,350	0.9	512,400	2.5
Personal larceny without contact	<sup>2</sup> 556,030	52.8	14,647,600	70.9
Household sector	760,280	100.0	15,354,200	100.0
Burglary	277,560	36.5	6,433,000	41.9
Forcible entry	70,840	9.3	2,043,700	13.3
Unlawful entry without force	150,230	19.8	2,955,400	19.2
Attempted forcible entry	56,500	7.4	1,434,000	9.3
Household larceny	458,150	60.3	7,590,700	49.4
Less than \$50	318,640	41.9	4,887,200	31.8
\$50 or more	88,820	11.7	1,887,000	12.3
Amount not available	31,090	4.1	271,500	1.8
Attempted larceny	19,600	2.6	545,100	3.6
Motor vehicle theft	24,570	3.2	1,330,500	8.7
Completed theft	18,620	1.1	865,300	5.6
Attempted theft	15,950	2.1	465,300	3.0

NOTE: Detail may not add to total shown because of rounding. The incompatibility of time frames is discussed under "Series Victimizations," this appendix.

<sup>1</sup>Estimate, based on about 10 or fewer sample cases, is statistically unreliable.

<sup>2</sup>As originally tabulated, personal larceny without contact was classified as a household crime, i.e., larcenies occurring away from home. Because these crimes generally have involved the theft of items belonging to individuals rather than to the household as a unit, it was decided to retabulate these larcenies within the personal sector. However, household larcenies away from home that occurred in series were not retabulated on this basis, with the result that this figure is not fully compatible with the corresponding one for victimizations not in series.

**Table II. Personal crimes: Standard error approximations for estimated number of victimizations and incidents**

(63 chances out of 100)

Size of estimate (thousands)	Standard error
25	6,400
50	9,200
100	13,000
250	20,000
500	30,000
750	36,000
1,000	42,000
2,000	62,000
3,000	78,000
5,000	107,000
10,000	169,000
15,000	228,000
20,000	285,000
25,000	340,000
50,000	616,000
80,000	946,000
100,000	1,164,000
120,000	1,383,000
160,000	1,819,000
165,000	1,874,000

**Table III. Household crimes: Standard error approximations for estimated number of victimizations**

(68 chances out of 100)

Size of estimate (thousands)	Standard error
25	5,300
50	7,600
100	11,000
250	17,000
500	24,000
750	30,000
1,000	35,000
2,000	50,000
3,000	62,000
5,000	83,000
10,000	126,000
15,000	165,000
20,000	200,000
25,000	236,000
35,000	305,000
50,000	406,000
65,000	506,000
70,000	539,000

**Table IV. Personal crimes: Standard error approximations  
for estimated victimization rates**

(68 chances out of 100)

Base of rate (thousands)	Estimated rate per 1,000 persons											
	.25 or 999.75	.5 or 999.5	.75 or 999.25	1 or 999	2.5 or 997.5	5 or 995	10 or 990	30 or 970	50 or 950	100 or 900	250 or 750	500
50	2.9	4.1	5.0	5.8	9.1	12.9	18.2	31.3	39.9	55.0	79.3	91.6
250	1.3	1.8	2.2	2.6	4.1	5.8	8.2	14.0	17.9	24.6	35.5	41.0
500	0.9	1.3	1.6	1.8	2.9	4.1	5.8	10.0	13.0	17.0	25.0	29.0
750	0.8	1.1	1.3	1.5	2.3	3.4	4.7	8.0	10.0	14.0	20.0	24.0
1,000	0.7	0.9	1.2	1.3	2.1	2.9	4.1	6.7	8.7	12.0	17.0	20.0
2,000	0.5	0.7	0.8	0.9	1.5	2.0	2.9	5.0	6.3	8.7	13.0	15.0
3,000	0.4	0.5	0.7	0.8	1.2	1.6	2.3	4.0	5.2	6.7	10.0	12.0
5,000	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.9	1.3	1.8	3.1	4.0	5.5	8.0	9.4
10,000	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.7	0.9	1.3	2.2	2.8	3.9	5.6	6.5
15,000	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.5	0.7	1.1	1.8	2.3	3.1	4.6	5.3
20,000	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.5	0.6	0.9	1.5	2.0	2.7	4.0	4.6
25,000	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.8	1.4	1.8	2.5	3.6	4.1
50,000	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.6	1.0	1.3	1.7	2.5	2.9
80,000	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.5	0.8	1.0	1.3	2.0	2.3
100,000	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.7	0.9	1.2	1.7	2.1
120,000	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.7	0.8	1.1	1.6	1.9
165,000	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.5	0.7	0.9	1.4	1.6

**Table V. Household crimes: Standard error approximations  
for estimated victimization rates**

(68 chances out of 100)

Base of rate (thousands)	Estimated rate per 1,000 households									
	.5 or 999.5	1 or 999	2.5 or 997.5	5 or 995	10 or 990	50 or 950	100 or 900	250 or 750	350 or 650	500
100	2.4	3.4	5.4	7.6	10.0	23.0	32.0	46.0	50.0	52.0
250	1.5	2.1	3.4	4.8	6.8	15.0	20.0	30.0	32.0	34.0
500	1.1	1.5	2.4	3.4	4.8	10.0	15.0	20.0	23.0	24.0
1,000	0.8	1.1	1.7	2.4	3.4	7.3	10.0	15.0	16.0	17.0
3,000	0.4	0.6	1.0	1.4	2.0	4.3	5.7	8.3	9.4	10.0
5,000	0.4	0.5	0.8	1.1	1.5	3.3	4.6	6.8	7.3	7.8
10,000	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.8	1.0	2.3	3.2	4.6	5.1	5.2
15,000	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.6	0.9	1.9	2.7	3.8	4.2	4.4
20,000	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.7	1.6	2.2	3.1	3.4	3.6
25,000	0.2	0.2	0.4	0.5	0.7	1.5	2.0	3.0	3.2	3.4
35,000	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.6	1.2	1.7	2.5	2.8	2.9
50,000	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.5	1.0	1.5	2.1	2.3	2.4
70,000	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.9	1.2	1.8	1.9	2.0

**Table VI. Personal crimes: Standard error approximations  
for estimated percentages of victimizations**

(68 chances out of 100)

Base of percent (thousands)	Estimated percent of personal victimizations					
	1 or 99	2.5 or 97.5	5 or 95	10 or 90	25 or 75	50
20	2.88	4.52	6.31	8.69	12.54	14.48
30	2.35	3.69	5.15	7.10	10.24	11.83
50	1.82	2.86	3.99	5.50	7.93	9.16
75	1.49	2.34	3.26	4.49	6.48	7.48
100	1.29	2.02	2.82	3.89	5.61	6.48
250	.82	1.28	1.79	2.46	3.55	4.10
500	.58	.90	1.26	1.74	2.51	2.90
750	.47	.74	1.03	1.42	2.05	2.37
1,000	.41	.64	.89	1.23	1.77	2.05
2,000	.29	.45	.63	.87	1.25	1.45
3,000	.24	.37	.52	.71	1.02	1.18
5,000	.18	.29	.40	.55	.79	.92
10,000	.13	.20	.28	.39	.56	.65
15,000	.11	.17	.23	.32	.46	.53
20,000	.09	.14	.20	.27	.40	.46
25,000	.08	.13	.18	.25	.35	.41
50,000	.06	.09	.13	.17	.25	.29
80,000	.05	.07	.10	.14	.20	.23
100,000	.04	.06	.09	.12	.18	.20
120,000	.04	.06	.08	.11	.16	.19
165,000	.03	.05	.07	.10	.14	.16

**Table VII. Household crimes: Standard error approximations for estimated percentages of victimizations**

(68 chances out of 100)

Base of percent (thousands)	Estimated percent of household victimizations					
	1 or 99	2.5 or 97.5	5 or 95	10 or 90	25 or 75	50
50	1.51	2.37	3.31	4.55	6.57	7.59
75	1.23	1.93	2.70	3.72	5.37	6.20
100	1.07	1.68	2.34	3.22	4.65	5.37
250	.68	1.06	1.48	2.04	2.94	3.39
500	.48	.75	1.05	1.44	2.08	2.40
1,000	.34	.53	.74	1.02	1.47	1.70
3,000	.19	.31	.43	.59	.85	.98
5,000	.15	.24	.33	.46	.66	.76
10,000	.11	.17	.23	.32	.46	.54
15,000	.09	.14	.19	.26	.38	.44
20,000	.08	.12	.17	.23	.33	.38
25,000	.07	.11	.15	.20	.29	.34
35,000	.06	.09	.13	.17	.25	.29
50,000	.05	.07	.10	.14	.21	.24
65,000	.04	.07	.09	.13	.18	.21
70,000	.04	.06	.09	.12	.18	.20
72,000	.04	.06	.09	.12	.17	.20

## APPENDIX IV

### COMMERCIAL SURVEY: TECHNICAL INFORMATION AND STANDARD ERROR TABLES

Commercial victimization survey results contained in this publication are based on data personally gathered by interviewers from the operators (usually managers or owners) of places of business and certain other organizational entities throughout the United States. Although focusing on commercial establishments, survey coverage extended to a relatively small number of other organizations, such as those engaged in religious, political, and cultural activities. Most units of Federal, State, and local government were excluded. In applicable jurisdictions, however, liquor stores and transportation systems operated by government were within the scope of the survey; these were the only exceptions to the general exclusion of government-operated entities. Because they were based on a sample survey rather than complete enumeration, all survey results are estimates.

#### Sample design and size

Survey estimates were obtained from a stratified multistage cluster sample consisting of a total of 34 sample areas, 10 of which were selected with certainty and, therefore, were self-representing. The remaining sample areas were chosen from an original total of 240 strata that had been collapsed into 24 large strata, with 10 in each of the latter being as homogeneous as possible with respect to size, geographic region, and

metropolitan character. Several stages of selection yielded 24 strata chosen with equal probability and in a manner to avoid strata used in other current business surveys. Within each stratum, one area was selected to represent the entire stratum, sample segments having been selected within each area. In the 10 certainty sample areas, a sample of segments was drawn at the rate of 1 in 24 from among those segments not in current use. Interviewers canvassed the selected segments and conducted interviews at all business establishments and other organizational units located within the boundaries of each segment.

A sample consisting of an estimated 2,900 places of business was designated for interview each month, yielding about 2,400 interviewed establishments. At a large majority of the 500 remaining businesses, it was not possible to conduct interviews because the business locations were vacant, buildings had been demolished, or the businesses were otherwise not qualified for interview. Establishments eligible for interview but where no interviews were obtained because the business was temporarily closed during the interview period, or because the operator refused to grant an interview, amounted to fewer than 1 percent of those eligible for the interviews on which the 1973 survey results are based.

For purposes of conducting the interviews, the sample was divided into six panels, one of which was interviewed each month during a given 6-month period. Although the survey is continuous, it differs from the household survey in that a rotation procedure is not employed. Establishment operators are interviewed every 6 months for an indefinite period.

### Estimation procedure

The estimation procedure is performed on a quarterly basis, as in the household survey, to produce quarterly estimates of burglary and robbery victimizations and of victimization rates for each of those crimes. Annual data represent the accumulation of the appropriate quarterly figures, with rates computed over an average base for the year.

Data records produced from survey interviews were assigned final weights, applied to each usable data record, enabling nationwide estimates to be tabulated. The final weight was the product of the basic weight (500 for the full sample), reflecting each selected establishment's probability of being in the sample and an adjustment for noninterview. A noninterview adjustment was calculated for each of 17 classes of business; it was equal to the total number of data records required in each class divided by the number of usable records actually collected. This factor was then applied to each usable record in the particular kind of business category.

If an interviewer determined that a business had not operated at the listed address for the entire 6-month reference period, an attempt was made to secure information for the balance of the period from whatever firm previously occupied the location or, in the case of vacancies, from neighboring businesses. However, in cases of failure to account for the full reference period, no further weighting adjustment was made.

Series victimizations were not treated separately in the commercial sector because recordkeeping generally enabled respondents to provide details of whatever multiple victimizations may have occurred during the 6-month reference period. Thus, all reported incidents of burglary and robbery against commercial establishments are reflected in the data tables.

### Reliability of estimates

Survey results presented in this report concerning the criminal victimization of commercial establishments

are estimates that were derived through probability sampling methods rather than from a complete enumeration. The sample used was only one of many of the same size that could have been selected utilizing the same sampling design. Although the results obtained from any two samples might differ markedly, the average of a number of different samples would be expected to be in near agreement with the results of a complete enumeration using the same data collection procedures and processing methods. Similarly, the results obtained by averaging data from a number of subsamples of the whole sample would be expected to give an order of magnitude of the variance between any single subsample and the grouping of subsamples. Such a technique, known as the random group method, was used in calculating coefficients of variation, presented in this appendix in the form of standard errors for estimates generated by the surveys. Because the standard errors are the products of calculations involving estimates derived through sampling, each error in turn is subject to sampling variability.

In order to gauge the extent of sampling variability inherent in the commercial survey results, standard errors have been derived for a number of business characteristics. Generalized standard errors, such as those developed in connection with the household survey, were not calculated. Instead, two tables in this appendix display standard errors from the sample observations for estimated values pertaining to selected characteristics of business establishments. While these standard errors partially gauge the effect of nonsampling error, they do not take into account any biases that may be inherent in the survey results.

When used in conjunction with the survey results, the standard error tables permit the construction of intervals containing the average result of all possible samples with a prescribed level of confidence. Chances are about 68 out of 100 that any given survey result would differ from results that would be obtained from a complete enumeration using the same procedures by less than the applicable standard error. Doubling the interval increases the confidence level to 95 chances out of 100 that the estimated value would differ from the results of a complete count by less than twice the standard error.

As in the household survey, estimates on crimes against businesses are subject to nonsampling errors, principal among these being the problem of recalling victimizations applicable to the 6 months prior to

interview. Because of a number of factors, however, it is likely that these errors were less prevalent in the commercial survey than they were in the household survey. These factors include the greater likelihood of recordkeeping and of reporting to police by businesses, as well as the concentration of the survey on two of the more serious crimes, burglary and robbery. To control for the telescoping problem, a bounding procedure is used whereby respondents are reminded at the beginning of each interview of any incidents that were reported during the previous interview.

Other nonsampling errors may have arisen from inefficient interviewing and from data processing mistakes. However, quality control measures similar to those used in the household survey were adopted to minimize such errors.

#### Standard error tables and calculations

In order to measure the sampling variability associated with selected results of the commercial survey, standard errors are presented in two tables in this

appendix. The first of these, Table VIII, contains standard errors applicable to the estimated number of commercial victimizations, by type of crime. For each of the measured offenses, Table IX displays standard errors for estimated victimization rates, by kind of establishment and gross annual receipts.

To illustrate the use of the error tables, assume that one wished to measure the variance associated with the robbery victimization rate against service enterprises—25 per 1,000 establishments, as shown on Data Table 24 and on Error Table IX. The latter reveals that the applicable error for this rate is 5.5. Thus, the confidence interval surrounding the estimate is about 19.5 to 30.5; in other words, the chances are about 68 out of 100 that the results of a complete census would have produced an estimate within this range. Similarly, the chances are about 95 out of 100 that a complete enumeration would have resulted in an estimate within the range of two standard errors, or from about 14 to 36. For estimated numbers and rates not shown on Tables VIII and IX, rough approximations of standard errors may be made by utilizing the standard errors for similar values having bases of comparable size.

**Table VIII. Commercial crimes: Standard error estimates for number of victimizations, by type of crime**

(68 chances out of 100)

Type of crime	Estimated number of victimizations	Standard error
Burglary	1,385,000	98,300
Completed burglary	1,029,100	70,000
Attempted burglary	355,900	31,700
Robbery	264,100	17,200
Completed robbery	196,000	15,500
Attempted robbery	68,000	2,200

**Table IX. Commercial crimes: Standard error estimates for victimization rates, by characteristics of establishments and type of crime**

(68 chances out of 100)

Characteristic	Burglary		Robbery	
	Estimated rate	Standard error	Estimated rate	Standard error
Kind of establishment				
All establishments	204	12.0	39	6.3
Retail	262	14.2	66	10.0
Wholesale	194	27.9	23	12.7
Service	178	16.0	25	5.5
Gross annual receipts				
Less than \$10,000	152	15.8	22	5.3
\$10,000-\$24,999	204	18.4	38	9.4
\$25,000-\$49,999	204	24.3	45	7.3
\$50,000-\$99,999	267	22.4	54	17.9
\$100,000-\$499,999	250	22.8	50	7.1
\$500,000-\$999,999	236	33.3	37	11.0
\$1,000,000 or more	247	29.9	46	13.0
No sales	159	24.3	14	2.2

<sup>1</sup> Estimate, based on about 10 or fewer sample cases, is statistically unreliable.



## GLOSSARY OF TERMS

- age—The appropriate age category is determined by each respondent's age as of the last day of the month preceding the interview.
- aggravated assault—Attack with a weapon resulting in any injury and attack without a weapon resulting either in serious injury (e.g., broken bones, loss of teeth, internal injuries, loss of consciousness) or in undetermined injury requiring 2 or more days of hospitalization. Also includes attempted assault with a weapon.
- annual family income—Includes the income of the household head and all other related persons residing in the same household unit. Covers the 12 months preceding the interview and includes wages, salaries, net income from business or farm, pensions, interest, dividends, rent, and any other form of monetary income. The income of persons unrelated to the head of household is excluded.
- assault—An unlawful physical attack, whether aggravated or simple, upon a person. Includes attempted assaults with or without a weapon. Excludes rape and attempted rape, as well as attacks involving theft or attempted theft, which are classified as robbery.
- attempted forcible entry—A form of burglary in which force is used in an attempt to gain entry.
- burglary—Unlawful or forcible entry of a residence or business, usually, but not necessarily, attended by theft. Includes attempted forcible entry.
- Central city—The largest city (or “twin cities”) of a standard metropolitan statistical area (SMSA), defined below.
- Commercial crimes—Burglary or robbery of business establishments and certain other organizations, such as those engaged in religious, political, or cultural activities. Includes both completed and attempted acts. Additional details concerning entities covered by the commercial survey appear in the introduction to Appendix IV.
- Forcible entry—A form of burglary in which force is used to gain entry (e.g., by breaking a window or slashing a screen).
- Head of household—For classification purposes, only one individual per household can be the head person. In husband-wife households, the husband arbitrarily is considered to be the head. In other households, the head person is the individual so regarded by its members; generally, that person is the chief breadwinner.
- Household—Consists of the occupants of separate living quarters meeting either of the following criteria: (1) Persons, whether present or temporarily absent, whose usual place of residence is the housing unit in question, or (2) Persons staying in the housing unit who have no usual place of residence elsewhere.
- Household crimes—Burglary or larceny of a residence, or motor vehicle theft. Includes both completed and attempted acts.

**Household larceny**—Theft or attempted theft of property or cash from a residence or its immediate vicinity. Forcible entry, attempted forcible entry, or unlawful entry are not involved.

**Incident**—A specific criminal act involving one or more victims and offenders. In situations where a personal crime occurred during the course of a commercial burglary or robbery, it was assumed that the commercial victimization survey accounted for the incident and, therefore, it was not counted as an incident of personal crime. However, details of the outcome of the event as they related to the victimized individual would be reflected in data on personal victimizations.

**Kind of establishment**—Determined by the sole or principal activity at each place of business.

**Larceny**—Theft or attempted theft of property or cash without force. A basic distinction is made between personal larceny and household larceny.

**Marital status**—Each household member is assigned to one of the following categories: (1) Married, which includes persons having common-law unions and those parted temporarily for reasons other than marital discord (employment, military service, etc.); (2) Separated and divorced. Separated includes married persons who have a legal separation or have parted because of marital discord; (3) Widowed; and (4) Never married, which includes those whose only marriage has been annulled and those living together (excluding common-law unions).

**Metropolitan area**—Abbreviation for “Standard metropolitan statistical area (SMSA),” defined below.

**Motor vehicle**—Includes automobiles, trucks, motorcycles, and any other motorized vehicles legally allowed on public roads and highways.

**Motor vehicle theft**—Stealing or unauthorized taking of a motor vehicle, including attempts at such acts.

**Nonmetropolitan area**—A locality not situated within an SMSA. The category covers a variety of localities, ranging from sparsely inhabited rural areas to cities of fewer than 50,000 population.

**Nonstranger**—With respect to crimes entailing direct contact between victim and offender, victimizations (or incidents) are classified as having involved nonstrangers if victim and offender either are related, well known to, or casually acquainted with one another. In crimes involving a mix of stranger and nonstranger offenders, the events are classified under nonstranger. The distinction between stranger

and nonstranger crimes is not made for personal larceny without contact, an offense in which victims rarely see the offender.

**Offender**—The perpetrator of a crime; the term generally is applied in relation to crimes entailing contact between victim and offender.

**Offense**—A crime; with respect to personal crimes, the two terms can be used interchangeably irrespective of whether the applicable unit of measure is a victimization or an incident.

**Outside central cities**—See “Suburban area,” below.

**Personal crimes**—Rape, robbery of persons, assault, personal larceny with contact, or personal larceny without contact. Includes both completed and attempted acts.

**Personal crimes of theft**—Theft or attempted theft of property or cash, either with contact (but without force or threat of force) or without direct contact between victim and offender. Equivalent to personal larceny.

**Personal crimes of violence**—Rape, robbery of persons, or assault. Includes both completed and attempted acts.

**Personal larceny**—Equivalent to personal crimes of theft. A distinction is made between personal larceny with contact and personal larceny without contact.

**Personal larceny with contact**—Theft of purse, wallet, or cash by stealth directly from the person of the victim, but without force or the threat of force. Also includes attempted purse snatching.

**Personal larceny without contact**—Theft or attempted theft, without direct contact between victim and offender, of property or cash from any place other than the victim’s home or its immediate vicinity. In rare cases, the victim sees the offender during the commission of the act.

**Physical injury**—The term is applicable to each of the three personal crimes of violence, although data on the proportion of rapes resulting in victim injury were not available during the preparation of this report. For personal robbery and attempted robbery with injury, a distinction is made between injuries from “serious assault” and “minor assault.” Examples of injuries from serious assault include broken bones, loss of teeth, internal injuries, and loss of consciousness, or undetermined injuries requiring 2 or more days of hospitalization; injuries from minor assault include bruises, black eyes, cuts, scratches, and swelling, or undetermined injuries

requiring less than 2 days of hospitalization. For assaults resulting in victim injury, the degree of harm governs classification of the event. The same elements of injury applicable to robbery with injury from serious assault also pertain to aggravated assault with injury; similarly, the same types of injuries applicable to robbery with injury from minor assault are relevant to simple assault with injury.

**ce**—Determined by the interviewer upon observation, and asked only about persons not related to the head of household who were not present at the time of interview. The racial categories distinguished are white, black, and other.

**ce**—Carnal knowledge through the use of force or the threat of force, including attempts. Statutory rape (without force) is excluded. Includes both heterosexual and homosexual rape.

**ce** of victimization—See “Victimization rate,” below.

**ce**—Theft or attempted theft, directly from a person or a business, of property or cash by force or threat of force, with or without a weapon.

**ce** with injury—Theft or attempted theft from a person, accompanied by an attack, either with or without a weapon, resulting in injury. An injury is classified as resulting from a serious assault if a weapon was used in the commission of the crime or, if not, when the extent of the injury was either serious (e.g., broken bones, loss of teeth, internal injuries, loss of consciousness) or undetermined but requiring 2 or more days of hospitalization. An injury is classified as resulting from a minor assault when the extent of the injury was minor (e.g., bruises, black eyes, cuts, scratches, swelling) or undetermined but requiring less than 2 days of hospitalization.

**ce** without injury—Theft or attempted theft from a person, accompanied by force or the threat of force, either with or without a weapon, but not resulting in injury.

**ce** assault—Attack without a weapon resulting either in minor injury (e.g., bruises, black eyes, cuts, scratches, swelling) or in undetermined injury requiring less than 2 days of hospitalization. Also includes attempted assault without a weapon.

**ce** standard metropolitan statistical area (SMSA)—Except in the New England States, a standard metropolitan statistical area is a county or group of contiguous counties that contains at least one city of 50,000

inhabitants or more, or “twin cities” with a combined population of at least 50,000. In addition to the county, or counties, containing such a city or cities, contiguous counties are included in an SMSA if, according to certain criteria, they are socially and economically integrated with the central city. In the New England States, SMSA’s consist of towns and cities instead of counties. Each SMSA must include at least one central city, and the complete title of an SMSA identifies the central city or cities.

**ce** Stranger—With respect to crimes entailing direct contact between victim and offender, victimizations (or incidents) are classified as involving strangers if the victim so stated, or did not see or recognize the offender, or knew the offender only by sight. In crimes involving a mix of stranger and nonstranger offenders, the events are classified under nonstranger. The distinction between stranger and nonstranger crimes is not made for personal larceny without contact, an offense in which victims rarely see the offender.

**ce** Suburban area—The county, or counties, containing a central city, plus any contiguous counties that are linked socially and economically to the central city. On data tables, suburban areas are categorized as those portions of metropolitan areas situated “outside central cities.”

**ce** Tenure—Two forms of household tenancy are distinguished: (1) Owned, which includes dwellings being bought through mortgage, and (2) Rented, which also includes rent-free quarters belonging to a party other than the occupant and situations where rental payments are in kind or in services.

**ce** Unlawful entry—A form of burglary committed by someone having no legal right to be on the premises even though force is not used.

**ce** Victim—The recipient of a criminal act; usually used in relation to personal crimes, but also applicable to households and commercial establishments.

**ce** Victimization—A specific criminal act as it affects a single victim, whether a person, household, or commercial establishment. In criminal acts against persons, the number of victimizations is determined by the number of victims of such acts; ordinarily, the number of victimizations is somewhat higher than the number of incidents because more than one individual is victimized during certain incidents, as well as because personal victimizations that

occurred in conjunction with either commercial burglary or robbery are not counted as incidents of personal crime. Each criminal act against a household or commercial establishment is assumed to involve a single victim, the affected household or establishment.

**Victimization rate**—For crimes against persons, the victimization rate, a measure of occurrence among population groups at risk, is computed on the basis

of the number of victimizations per 1,000 resident population age 12 and over. For crimes against households, victimization rates are calculated on the basis of the number of incidents per 1,000 households. And, for crimes against commercial establishments, victimization rates are derived from the number of incidents per 1,000 establishments.

**Victimize**—To perpetrate a crime against a person, household, or commercial establishment.