



Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report

Crime Prevention Measures

By Catherine J. Whitaker
BJS Statistician

Law enforcement agencies and other organizations concerned with crime prevention have increasingly urged the public to take steps to make their homes, neighborhoods, and workplaces safer from the threat of crime. This report presents information from the Victimization Risk Survey (VRS), administered to 21,016 persons age 16 and older in 11,198 households in February 1984 as a supplement to the ongoing National Crime Survey. It shows that substantial numbers of Americans have taken at least one of three specific crime prevention measures at home and were working in establishments where security features existed.¹ The survey found that:

- One-third of American households reported one or more of the following crime prevention measures: having a burglar alarm (7%), participating in a neighborhood watch program (7%), or engraving valuables with an identification number (25%).
- While black and white households were equally likely to have taken at least one of the three home crime prevention measures, Hispanics were less likely than non-Hispanics to have taken at least one such measure.
- About half of all households with incomes of \$50,000 or more reported at least one of the crime prevention measures, compared to about one-fifth of households with incomes below \$7,500.

¹For more information on the Victim Risk Survey and the National Crime Survey see "Methodological note," p. 6.

March 1986

The Victimization Risk Survey (VRS) was administered in February of 1984 as a one-time supplement to the ongoing National Crime Survey of the Bureau of Justice Statistics. The VRS supplement collected information about crime prevention measures taken at home and at the workplace and about individuals' perception of the safety of their homes, neighborhoods, and places of work.

This special report examines several home crime prevention measures in detail: using burglar alarms, engraving valuables, and participating in neighborhood watch programs. Among the most

interesting findings are that two-fifths of the households in communities with neighborhood watch programs participate in these programs and a fourth of all households have engraved their valuables with an identification number. The report also examines the characteristics of households and businesses that have taken crime prevention measures.

The findings of this report highlight the efforts of citizens to combat crime, thus providing policymakers and practitioners with valuable information on crime prevention.

Steven R. Schlesinger
Director

- Respondents in 19% of the households reported that a neighborhood watch program existed in their area. Where a program was reported, 38% of households participated.
- Two-thirds of the employed survey respondents reported the presence of at least one security feature at their place of work. The most frequently cited workplace security features were a receptionist to screen persons entering the workplace (42%), a burglar alarm system (33%), and guards (30%).
- Ninety percent of respondents working at places with more than 50 employees reported some security features at work, compared to about half of those working at places with 10 or fewer employees.

- Workers employed in manufacturing were most likely to have security measures at their place of work; persons employed in agriculture, forestry, fisheries, mining, or construction were the least likely.

Crime prevention at home

Citizens may act in ways that deter crime for a variety of reasons. Some of these actions may be only secondarily related to crime prevention, and some may have nothing to do with crime. For example, the residents of a third of the households surveyed owned a dog. Although most household residents probably regarded their dogs as family pets, some dogs may have been chosen for their ability to intimidate strangers. Similarly, while homeowners may install alarm systems to prevent bur-

glary, they may also do so to reduce insurance premiums. Consequently, while it is relatively easy to measure specific crime prevention measures households have taken, it is more difficult to identify the reasons underlying these actions.

One-third of American households reported using at least one of the following three crime prevention measures: having a burglar alarm (7%), participating in a neighborhood watch program (7%), or engraving valuables with an identification number (25%) (table 1). These proportions show some variation when the characteristics of the household respondents or the characteristics of the household itself are examined.²

Age. Household respondents age 65 or older were less likely than younger ones to report that their valuable possessions had been engraved. The proportions of households that had a burglar alarm or had participated in a neighborhood watch program did not appear to be related to the age of the household respondent.

Race. Black households were more likely than white households to participate in neighborhood watch programs, but there were no measurable differences in the proportions of black and white households with burglar alarms or with engraved valuables.

Ethnicity. Hispanics were less likely than non-Hispanics to participate in a neighborhood watch program or to engrave valuables with an identifying number. However, about the same percentage of Hispanics and non-Hispanics had burglar alarms.

Educational attainment. Households where the respondent had completed at least one year of college were the most likely to have engraved their valuables. Households where the respondent had only an elementary education were the least likely. Households with college-educated respondents were more likely than others to have installed burglar alarms or to have joined a neighborhood watch program.

Home ownership. A higher percentage of homeowners than renters had taken each of the three crime prevention measures. About twice as many homeowners as renters had burglar alarms (8% vs. 4%); 10% of the homeowners participated in neighborhood

²The household respondent was any household member who could supply information about the household. In 94% of the cases the household respondent was either the household head or the head's spouse.

Table 1. Home crime prevention measures by selected demographic characteristics

Demographic characteristics ^a	Percent of households that:			
	Have a burglar alarm	Joined a neighborhood watch program	Engraved valuables with an identifying number	Have taken at least one of these measures
Total	7%	7%	25%	33%
Age				
16-19	—	6	36	41
20-24	4	4	30	34
25-34	5	7	29	35
35-49	8	10	29	38
50-64	3	9	23	32
65 and over	6	6	16	23
Race				
White	6	7	26	33
Black	8	10	23	33
Other	—	—	24	32
Ethnic origin				
Non-Hispanic	7	8	26	34
Hispanic	6	5	16	23
Educational attainment^b				
Elementary school	5	4	12	18
High school	6	6	24	32
College	9	10	32	41
Family income^c				
Less than \$7,500	5	4	16	22
\$7,500-9,999	5	5	20	26
\$10,000-14,999	4	6	22	28
\$15,000-24,999	5	7	28	35
\$25,000-29,999	7	9	31	40
\$30,000-49,999	8	11	32	41
\$50,000 or more	16	15	35	51
Tenure				
Owned	8	10	27	36
Rented	4	4	23	27
Number of persons in household				
1	7	5	19	26
2-3	7	8	27	35
4-5	7	10	29	38
6 or more	4	7	22	29
Number of units in structure				
1	7	9	27	36
2-3	5	5	21	27
4-9	5	3	22	27
10 or more	6	3	17	22
Mobile home	3	3	27	31
Location of residence^d				
Metropolitan area				
Central city	8	9	24	34
Suburban area	8	8	28	36
Nonmetropolitan area	4	5	23	29

—Too few cases to obtain statistically reliable data.

^aIndividual characteristics are those of the household respondent.

^bEducational attainment is the highest grade or year completed.

^cIncome is that of all family members during the 12 months prior to the interview.

^dA metropolitan area is a county or counties that contain a city or cities having at least 50,000 total population. A central city is the largest city of a metropolitan area. A suburban area is the portion outside the central city. Nonmetropolitan areas include rural areas and cities of fewer than 50,000.

watch programs but only 4% of the renters; and a higher percentage of homeowners than renters had engraved their valuables (27% vs. 23%).

Household size. The use of home protection measures did not vary consistently by household size. Households in the two-to-five-person range were more likely to have engraved valuables than single-person households. Four-to-five person households were about twice as likely as single-person households to participate in neighborhood watch programs. There is some evidence that large households (six or more persons) were less likely to have burglar alarms.

Number of units in structure.

Persons in single-family homes were about three times more likely than those living in buildings with four or more units to participate in neighborhood watch programs. Moreover, persons in single-family units (including mobile homes) were the most likely to have engraved their valuables. There was no measurable difference in the proportions having burglar alarms.

Location of residence. Households in metropolitan areas were more likely than those in nonmetropolitan areas to have burglar alarms or to participate in neighborhood watch programs. Suburban households were more likely than

those in either central cities or non-metropolitan areas to have engraved their valuables.

Family income

Half the families in the highest income category (\$50,000 or more) had taken at least one of the three crime

prevention measures. This proportion was higher than that for any other income group and more than twice as high as the percentage for households with incomes less than \$7,500. The proportion in the highest income category with engraved valuables was about twice as high as that for households with incomes less than \$7,500. Households in the highest income category were about twice as likely as those with incomes of \$30,000-49,999 and about three times as likely as those with incomes less than \$7,500 to have a burglar alarm. The proportion of households participating in neighborhood watch was about four times as great for households with incomes of \$50,000 or more as for those with incomes less than \$7,500.

The relationship between family income and crime prevention measures may result in part from the costs of some of these measures. High-income families may be more able to afford burglar alarm systems; they may also own a number of valuables that could be engraved.

To determine whether the relationships between demographic characteristics and crime prevention measures are present at different incomes, households were examined separately for three income categories: low (less than \$10,000), middle (\$10,000-24,999), and high (\$25,000 or more).

Many of the relationships previously described between demographic characteristics and crime prevention measures are present within each income category. However, this was not always the case. For example, homeowners in general were more likely to use crime prevention measures than renters, but this was not true for the low-income group (table 2). The proportions of central city and nonmetropolitan households that took crime prevention measures did not differ for those with incomes below \$25,000.

High-income nonmetropolitan households were as likely as high-income metropolitan households to have engraved valuables. The percentage of households in different locations at each income level with engraved valuables was as follows:

Location of residence	Income level		
	Low	Middle	High
Central city	17%	25%	33%
Suburban area	21	27	32
Nonmetropolitan area	15	25	31

Neighborhood watch programs

About one family in five reported that they lived in areas with neighborhood watch programs (table 3). Black households were more likely than white households to have a neighborhood watch program; homeowners more likely than renters; and families with incomes of \$50,000 or above more likely than families with incomes below \$50,000.³

One in four of the central-city households had a crime watch program in their neighborhood, 1 in 5 of the suburban households, and 1 in 8 of the nonmetropolitan households.

A substantial proportion of households that were located in areas with neighborhood watch programs participated in these programs (table 4). The overall figure was 38%. About 44% of the households with family incomes of \$25,000 or more participated, compared with 29% of those with incomes of less than \$10,000. A higher proportion of four-to-five-person households participated in neighborhood watch than did

³The difference between those with incomes of \$50,000 or more and those with incomes of \$30,000 to \$49,999 is significant at the 90% confidence level.

Table 2. Home crime prevention measures by family income and selected demographic characteristics

Demographic characteristics ^a	Percent of households taking at least one crime prevention measure with family incomes of		
	Less than \$10,000	\$10,000-24,999	\$25,000 or more
Age			
16-19	43%	38%	42%
20-24	32	37	41
25-34	25	35	41
35-49	25	33	45
50-64	20	30	43
65 and over	18	28	35
Race			
White	22	32	43
Black	26	36	50
Other	—	29	41
Ethnic origin			
Non-Hispanic	24	33	43
Hispanic	17	22	35
Educational attainment^b			
Elementary school	15	19	29
High school	24	32	40
College	33	37	46
Tenure			
Owned	23	34	44
Rented	23	29	34
Number of persons in household			
1	19	30	37
2-3	26	32	44
4-5	27	35	43
6 or more	21	30	36
Number of units in structure			
1	23	34	45
2-3	22	28	39
4-9	23	30	33
10 or more	18	24	28
Mobile home	26	36	30
Location of residence^c			
Metropolitan area			
Central city	24	33	46
Suburban area	26	33	44
Nonmetropolitan area	21	31	38

Note: Home crime prevention measures are: having a burglar alarm, engraving valuable property, and joining a neighborhood watch program. Family income is that of all family members during the 12 months prior to the interview.

—Too few cases to obtain statistically reliable data.

^aIndividual characteristics are those of the household respondent.

^bEducational attainment is the highest year or grade completed.

^cA metropolitan area is a county or counties that contain a city or cities having at least 50,000 total population. A central city is the largest city of a metropolitan area. A suburban area is the portion outside the central city. Nonmetropolitan areas include rural areas and cities of fewer than 50,000.

Table 3. Households reporting a neighborhood watch program in their area

Demographic characteristics ^a	Percent of households
Total	19%
Race	
White	19
Black	23
Other	20
Ethnicity	
Non-Hispanic	20
Hispanic	16
Family income^b	
Less than \$7,500	14
\$7,500-9,999	14
\$10,000-14,999	16
\$15,000-24,999	19
\$25,000-29,999	22
\$30,000-49,999	25
\$50,000 or more	30
Tenure	
Owned	21
Rented	16
Number of units in structure	
1	21
2-3	17
4-9	15
10 or more	15
Mobile home	13
Location of residence^c	
Metropolitan area	
Central city	25
Suburban area	21
Nonmetropolitan area	12

^aIndividual characteristics are those of the household respondent.

^bIncome is that of all family members during the 12 months prior to the interview.

^cA metropolitan area is a county or counties that contain a city or cities having at least 50,000 total population. A central city is the largest city of a metropolitan area. A suburban area is the portion outside the central city. Nonmetropolitan areas include rural areas and cities of fewer than 50,000.

single-person households. The proportion of homeowners was nearly twice as high as the proportion of renters. About 44% of households in single-family homes participated in neighborhood watch programs, compared with 16% of household respondents in buildings of 10 units or more.

Although those who resided in nonmetropolitan areas were only about half as likely as central city residents to have a neighborhood watch program in their community (12% vs. 25%), there is some evidence that they were more likely to participate in such programs when they existed.

It is possible that because of the higher population density in central cities, neighborhood watch programs can function successfully with lower percentages of participation by area residents, while in nonmetropolitan areas greater participation by area residents is essential to the operation of the program. In addition, more residents in nonmetropolitan areas than in central cities may be acquainted with their neighbors, may be more knowledgeable about community concerns and issues, and may be more likely to participate in crime prevention programs as a result.

Crime prevention measures and fear of crime

About 32% of the household respondents felt that their neighborhood was very safe from crime; 59% felt their neighborhood was fairly safe; and 10% felt their neighborhood was unsafe.

Those who felt their neighborhood was very safe from crime were less likely to have taken at least one crime prevention measure than those who felt their neighborhoods were unsafe or only fairly safe (table 5).

Other crime prevention measures

Although household respondents were asked about only three crime prevention measures the household may have taken, survey interviewers recorded the presence of a variety of features in or

around the house or apartment building in which the household was located. These included:

- a fence or barricade at the entrance
- a doorkeeper, guard, or receptionist
- an intercom or phone to gain access to the building
- surveillance cameras
- bars on windows or doors
- signs indicating alarms or security devices
- other warning signs (such as "beware of dog").

Twenty percent of the households surveyed were in structures with at least one of these features (table 6). The proportion was highest for households located in buildings of 10 or more units. It was also higher for households in central cities than for nonmetropolitan households and for renters rather than owners. The most common security feature for households located in buildings with 10 or more units was an intercom or telephone system to control access. This feature was present for 36% of the households.

Security measures at work

The VRS elicited information about security measures at the workplace for all respondents who had worked outside the home at only one location during the previous 6 months. Specifically, they were asked whether there was:

- a receptionist or guard who checked people coming in

Table 4. Participation in a neighborhood watch program for households in neighborhoods with these programs

Demographic characteristics ^a	Participation in neighborhood watch			Total
	Yes	No	Not ascertained ^b	
Total	38%	60%	2%	100%
Age				
16-19	33	67	—	100
20-24	26	73	—	100
25-34	35	62	3	100
35-49	43	56	—	100
50-64	45	53	—	100
65 and over	32	64	4	100
Race				
White	38	60	2	100
Black	42	55	—	100
Other	—	67	—	100
Ethnic origin				
Non-Hispanic	39	59	2	100
Hispanic	29	66	—	100
Educational attainment^c				
Elementary school	34	64	—	100
High school	35	63	3	100
College	42	55	2	100
Family income^d				
Less than \$10,000	29	67	4	100
\$10,000-24,999	38	61	—	100
\$25,000 or more	44	54	2	100
Tenure				
Owned	45	53	2	100
Rented	23	75	3	100
Number of persons in household				
1	29	68	—	100
2-3	39	59	2	100
4-5	45	53	—	100
6 or more	34	65	—	100
Number of units in structure				
1	44	54	2	100
2-3	26	73	—	100
4-9	21	75	—	100
10 or more	16	79	—	100
Mobile home	36	61	—	100
Location of residence^e				
Metropolitan area				
Central city	34	64	2	100
Suburban area	40	58	2	100
Nonmetropolitan area	42	56	—	100

Note: Percentages may not total to 100 because of rounding.
^aToo few cases to obtain statistically reliable data.
^bIndividual characteristics are those of the household respondent.
^cIncludes responses of "don't know."
^dEducational attainment is the highest grade or year completed.
^eIncome is that of all family members during the 12 months prior to the interview.
^fA metropolitan area is a county or counties that contain a city or cities having at least 50,000 total population. A central city is the largest city of a metropolitan area. A suburban area is the portion outside the central city. Nonmetropolitan areas include rural areas and cities of fewer than 50,000.

Table 5. Home crime prevention measures by fear of neighborhood crime

Crime prevention measures	Household respondent reports that neighborhood is		
	Very safe	Fairly safe	Fairly or very unsafe
Total	100%	100%	100%
None	68%	64%	63%
At least one	30%	34%	35%
Burglar alarm	6	7	8
Engraved valuables	24	26	27
Participate in neighborhood watch	7	8	7

Note: Whether or not crime prevention measures were used was not known in about 2% of the cases.

Table 6. Security features observed by survey interviewers by selected household characteristics

Household characteristics	Percent of households with one or more security features
Total	20%
Number of units in structure	
1	13
2-3	13
4-9	20
10 or more	56
Mobile home	16
Location of residence*	
Metropolitan area	
Central city	30
Suburban area	19
Nonmetropolitan area	12
Tenure	
Owned	16
Rented	26

Note: Security features observed by survey interviewers consisted of: a fence or barricaded entrance; a doorkeeper, guard, or receptionist; an intercom or phone; surveillance camera; signs indicating security or burglar alarm systems; other warning signs; bars on the windows or doors.
 *A metropolitan area is a county or counties that contain a city or cities having at least 50,000 total population. A central city is the largest city of a metropolitan area. A suburban area is the portion outside the central city. Nonmetropolitan areas include rural areas and cities of fewer than 50,000.

Table 7. Percent of respondents who reported specific security measures at work by size of establishment

Security measures	Number of employees in establishment			
	Total ^a	1-10	11-50	51 or more
Percent of respondents who reported:				
Receptionist or guard who checks people in	42%	22%	40%	65%
Burglar alarm system	33	26	38	43
Police or guard for protection	30	11	18	54
Pass or I.D. required for entrance	19	5	8	38
Entry or gate kept locked during working hours	16	9	12	26
Surveillance camera	16	6	11	28
Guard dog	2	4	2	3
At least one of these measures	67	53	71	80
Of respondents reporting security measures, percent who reported:^b				
One	37%	63%	49%	22%
Two	26	23	30	25
Three	16	8	13	20
Four or more	21	6	8	32

^a Total category includes respondents for whom size of establishment was not known or not ascertained.

^b Percentages may not total to 100 because of rounding.

- a burglar alarm system
- police or guards for protection
- pass or ID required for entrance
- an entry or gate kept locked during working hours
- surveillance cameras
- guard dogs.

Two-thirds of those asked about security at the workplace stated that at least one of these means of protection was used at their place of employment (table 7). Among those reporting security measures, some 37% worked at places with only one means of protection; 26% at places with two; 16% at places with three; and 21% at places with four or more of the specified measures.

A higher percentage of respondents who worked in large establishments, that is, those with 51 or more employees, reported security measures than those who worked in smaller ones. Ninety percent of respondents at large establishments reported one or more crime prevention measures, compared with 71% of those working at medium-sized establishments (11-50 employees), and 53% of those at small establishments (10 or fewer employees). In addition, a higher percentage of those working at large establishments

Table 8. Percent of respondents who reported at least one security measure at work by type and size of establishment

Type of establishment	Number of employees in establishment			
	Total ^a	1-10	11-50	51 or more
Total	67%	53%	71%	80%
Manufacturing	83	60	76	94
Finance	74	63	87	97
Public administration	73	63	75	91
Professional services	71	61	70	85
Transportation	60	56	75	89
Trade (wholesale and retail)	59	50	64	88
Business and entertainment services	54	48	76	92
Agriculture, forestry, fisheries, mining, and construction	37	37	64	80

*Total category includes respondents for whom size of establishment was not known or not ascertained.

reported multiple security measures than did respondents who worked in smaller establishments. Of those who reported one or more security measures at work, 32% of the employees at large firms reported four or more measures compared with 6% of those at small establishments. Respondents at large establishments were more likely than those at medium-sized and small establishments to report each type of security measure except guard dogs, which were rarely reported for establishments of any size.

Respondents who worked at small and medium-sized establishments were more likely to report a burglar alarm or a receptionist than any other security feature. Medium-sized establishments were reported as about equally likely to have a receptionist as they were to have a burglar alarm. Respondents at large establishments most frequently mentioned receptionists (65%), guards (54%), or burglar alarms (43%).

The percentage of respondents who

reported security features at work varied by type of establishment. About four-fifths of respondents in manufacturing indicated that there were one or more security measures at work (table 8). About three-fourths of those in public administration, professional services, and finance noted at least one crime prevention measure at work. The lowest proportion of respondents with one or more crime prevention measures at work were in agriculture, forestry, fisheries, mining, and construction activities. These tend to be outdoor activities making it more difficult to install security measures.

Within each establishment type the proportion of respondents with security measures at work rose with the number of employees. For example, almost all respondents in finance, manufacturing, business and entertainment, and public administration with more than 50 employees reported at least one security measure, while about half to two-thirds of those in these types of establishments with 10 or fewer employees reported one or more security measures.

Fear of crime at work

More than 9 in 10 persons surveyed felt very or fairly safe in their place of work. This was true whether or not there were any security features at the workplace. In general, the proportion who felt "very safe" as opposed to "fairly safe" increased with the increase in safety features (table 9).

Very few persons—about 1 in 10—felt in danger of being the victim of a crime by a fellow employee. Slightly more in establishments with more than 50 employees—about 1 in 6—expressed fear of possible victimization. This may simply be because those working in larger establishments were less likely to be personally acquainted with all their coworkers and were more concerned about crimes of theft or violence committed by unknown persons.

Table 9. Respondents' perception of safety at workplace by number of security measures

Number of security measures at workplace	Percent of respondents who reported their workplace to be:				
	Total	Very safe	Fairly safe	Fairly or very unsafe	Don't know
None	100%	43%	49%	8%	1%
At least one	108	51	43	6	*
One	100	47	46	7	—
Two	100	51	43	6	—
Three	100	51	44	4	—
Four	100	60	36	4	—
Five or more	100	61	34	5	—

Note: Percentages may not total to 100 due to rounding.
*Less than 0.5%.
—Too few cases to obtain statistically reliable data.

Methodological note

The National Crime Survey measures personal crimes of violence (rape, robbery, and assault), personal crimes of theft (larceny with or without contact), and household crimes (burglary, household larceny, and motor vehicle theft). A representative national sample of about 127,000 persons in 60,000 households are interviewed twice a year. Each month a sixth of the sample are interviewed about criminal incidents, including those not reported to the police, that occurred during the previous 6 months. Definitions of the demographic characteristics used in this report and complete descriptions of the NCS sample design and data collection methods can be found in Criminal Victimization in the United States, 1983, Bureau of Justice Statistics, NCJ-96459 (Washington, D.C.: August 1985).

The Victimization Risk Survey was administered as part of the National Crime Survey in February of 1984. In addition to the usual questions asked on the NCS, interviewers obtained information from respondents about work, leisure activities, and crime prevention measures to identify possible sources of vulnerability to crime. After leaving each interviewed household, interviewers recorded information about household security measures and neighborhood characteristics that may influence the risk of victimization.

Questions about home crime prevention measures were asked of the household respondent. For each household one knowledgeable person was selected to answer questions pertaining to the entire household. The household respondent was not necessarily the head of household, that is, one of the persons who owned or rented the housing unit. In 94% of the cases, however, the head of household or spouse served as the household respondent. The household respondent had to be at least 18 years of age unless the household head or spouse was under 18. Since questions about home crime prevention measures were asked of the household respondent, the personal demographic characteristics are those of the household respondent and not necessarily those of the head of household.

A total of 11,719 households and 24,220 individuals completed the basic NCS questions in February 1984. Of these, 21,016 individuals in 11,198 households completed the VRS supplements. VRS supplements were not completed by persons aged 12-15 or by proxy respondents. A small number of respondents who answered the regular

NCS questions refused to answer the VRS supplement.

Since the VRS supplement was a 1-month sample, usual NCS weighting procedures to obtain annual estimates and rates cannot be used. However, each 1-month sample is representative of the U.S. population. The percentages presented in this report are based on unweighted totals. Significance tests have been modified to account for the use of unweighted rather than weighted data. All comparisons presented in the text are significant at the 95% confidence level or above, except where the phrase "some evidence" is used, indicating significance at the 90% confidence level. Differences in percentages that are below the 90% confidence level are referred to as "not measurably different." More information on estimation procedures can be found in Appendix III of Criminal Victimization in the United States, 1983 ("Survey Methodology and Standard Errors").

Copies of the VRS supplement are available from BJS.

Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Reports are prepared principally by BJS staff under the direction of Joseph M. Bessette, deputy director for data analysis. This report was written by Catherine J. Whitaker. It was edited by Carol Kalish, assisted by Marianne Zawitz. Marshall DeBerry, Anita Timrots, and Gertrude Thomas provided statistical assistance. Marilyn Marbrook, publications unit chief, administered report production, assisted by Millie Baldea, Tina Dorsey, and Joyce Stanford.

March 1986, NCJ-100438

Bureau of Justice Statistics reports

(revised February 1986)

Call toll-free 800-732-3277 (local 251-5500) to order BJS reports, to be added to one of the BJS mailing lists, or to speak to a reference specialist in statistics at the Justice Statistics Clearinghouse, National Criminal Justice Reference Service, Box 6000, Rockville, MD 20850. Single copies of reports are free; use NCJ number to order. Postage and handling are charged for bulk orders of single reports. For single copies of multiple titles, up to 10 titles are free; 11-40 titles \$10; more than 40, \$20; libraries call for special rates.

Public-use tapes of BJS data sets and other criminal justice data are available from the Criminal Justice Archive and Information Network, P.O. Box 1248, Ann Arbor, MI 48106 (313-763-5010).

National Crime Survey

Criminal victimization in the U.S.:

- 1983 (final report), NCJ-98459, 10/85
- 1982 (final report), NCJ-92820, 11/84
- 1973-82 trends, NCJ-90541, 9/83
- 1981 (final report), NCJ-90208
- 1980 (final report), NCJ-84015, 4/83
- 1979 (final report), NCJ-76710, 12/81

BJS special reports:

- The use of weapons in committing crimes, NCJ-99643, 1/86
- Reporting crimes to the police, NCJ-99432, 12/85
- Locating city, suburban, and rural crime, NCJ-99535, 12/85
- The risk of violent crime, NCJ-97119, 5/85
- The economic cost of crime to victims, NCJ-93450, 4/84
- Family violence, NCJ-93449, 4/84

BJS bulletins:

- Criminal victimization, 1984, NCJ-98904, 10/85
- Households touched by crime, 1984, NCJ-97689, 8/85
- The crime of rape, NCJ-96777, 3/85
- Household burglary, NCJ-96021, 1/85
- Criminal victimization, 1983, NCJ-93869, 6/84
- Violent crime by strangers, NCJ-80829, 4/82
- Crime and the elderly, NCJ-79614, 1/82
- Measuring crime, NCJ-75710, 2/81

Response to screening questions in the National Crime Survey (BJS technical report), NCJ-97624, 7/85

Victimization and fear of crime: World perspectives, NCJ-93872, 1/85

The National Crime Survey: Working papers, vol. I: Current and historical perspectives, NCJ-75374, 8/82

vol. II: Methodological studies, NCJ-90307, 12/84

Crime against the elderly in 26 cities, NCJ-76706, 1/82

The Hispanic victim, NCJ-69261, 11/81

Issues in the measurement of crime, NCJ-74682, 10/81

Criminal victimization of California residents, 1974-77, NCJ-70944, 6/81

Restitution to victims of personal and household crimes, NCJ-72770, 5/81

Criminal victimization of New York State residents, 1974-77, NCJ-66481, 9/80

The cost of negligence: Losses from preventable household burglaries, NCJ-53527, 12/79

Rape victimization in 26 American cities, NCJ-55878, 8/79

Criminal victimization in urban schools, NCJ-56396, 8/79

Crime against persons in urban, suburban, and rural areas, NCJ-53551, 7/79

An introduction to the National Crime Survey, NCJ-43732, 4/78

Local victim surveys: A review of the issues, NCJ-39973, 6/77

Expenditure and employment

Justice expenditure and employment, 1982 (BJS bulletin), NCJ-98327, 8/85

Justice expenditure and employment in the U.S.: 1980 and 1981 extracts, NCJ-96007, 6/85

1971-79, NCJ-92595, 11/84

1979 (final report), NCJ-87242, 12/83

Corrections

BJS bulletins and special reports:

Capital punishment 1984, NCJ-98398, 8/85

Prison admissions and releases, 1982, NCJ-97995, 7/85

Prisoners in 1984, NCJ-97118, 4/85

Examining recidivism, NCJ-96501, 2/85

Returning to prison, NCJ-95700, 11/84

Time served in prison, NCJ-93924, 6/84

Prisoners in State and Federal institutions on Dec. 31, 1982 (final), NCJ-93311, 12/84

Capital punishment 1982 (final), NCJ-91533, 11/84

1979 survey of inmates of State correctional facilities and 1979 census of State correctional facilities:

BJS special reports:

The prevalence of imprisonment, NCJ-93657, 7/85

Career patterns in crime, NCJ-88672, 6/83

BJS bulletins:

Prisoners and drugs, NCJ-87575, 3/83

Prisoners and alcohol, NCJ-86223, 1/83

Prisons and prisoners, NCJ-80697, 2/82

Veterans in prison, NCJ-79232, 11/81

Census of jails and survey of jail inmates:

Jail inmates, 1983 (BJS bulletin), NCJ-99175, 11/85

The 1983 jail census (BJS bulletin), NCJ-95536, 11/84

Jail inmates 1982 (BJS bulletin), NCJ-97161, 2/83

Census of jails, 1978: Data for individual jails, vols. I-IV, Northeast, North Central, South, West, NCJ-72279-72282, 12/81

Profile of jail inmates, 1978, NCJ-85412, 2/81

Parole and probation

BJS bulletins:

Probation and parole 1984, NCJ-100181, 2/86

Setting prison terms, NCJ-76218, 8/83

Parole in the U.S., 1980 and 1981, NCJ-87387, 3/86

Characteristics of persons entering parole during 1978 and 1979, NCJ-87243, 5/83

Characteristics of the parole population, 1978, NCJ-66479, 4/81

Parole in the U.S., 1979, NCJ-69562, 3/81

Courts

BJS bulletins:

The growth of appeals: 1973-83 trends, NCJ-96381, 2/85

Case filings in State courts 1983, NCJ-95111, 10/84

BJS special reports:

Felony sentencing in 18 local jurisdictions, NCJ-97681, 6/85

The prevalence of guilty pleas, NCJ-96018, 12/84

Sentencing practices in 13 States, NCJ-95399, 10/84

Criminal defense systems: A national survey, NCJ-94630, 8/84

Habeas corpus, NCJ-82948, 3/84

Case filings in State courts 1983, NCJ-95111, 10/84

State court caseload statistics, 1977 and 1981, NCJ-87587, 2/83

Supplement to the state court model statistical dictionary, NCJ-98326, 9/85

The prosecution of felony arrests: 1980, NCJ-97684, 10/85

1979, NCJ-86482, 5/84

State court organization 1980, NCJ-76711, 7/82

State court model statistical dictionary, Supplement, NCJ-98326, 9/85

1st edition, NCJ-62320, 9/80

A cross-city comparison of felony case processing, NCJ-55171, 7/79

Federal offenses and offenders

BJS special reports:

Pretrial release and misconduct, NCJ-96132, 1/85

BJS bulletins:

Bank robbery, NCJ-94463, 8/84

Federal drug law violators, NCJ-92692, 2/84

Federal justice statistics, NCJ-80814, 3/82

Privacy and security

Computer crime:

BJS special reports:

Electronic fund transfer fraud, NCJ-96666, 3/85

Electronic fund transfer and crime, NCJ-92650, 2/84

Computer security techniques,

NCJ-84049, 9/82

Electronic fund transfer systems and crime, NCJ-83736, 9/82

Legislative resource manual, NCJ-76890, 9/81

Expert witness manual, NCJ-77927, 9/81

Criminal justice resource manual, NCJ-61550, 12/79

Privacy and security of criminal history information:

Compendium of State legislation, 1984 overview, NCJ-98077, 9/85

A guide to research and statistical use, NCJ-69790, 5/81

A guide to dissemination, NCJ-40000, 1/79

Compendium of State legislation:

NCJ-48981, 7/78

1981 supplement, NCJ-79652, 3/82

Criminal justice information policy:

Crime control and criminal records (BJS special report), NCJ-99176, 10/85

State criminal records repositories (BJS technical report), NCJ-99017, 10/85

Data quality of criminal history records, NCJ-98079, 10/85

Intelligence and investigative records,

NCJ-95787, 4/85

Victim/witness legislation: An overview, NCJ-94365, 12/84

Information policy and crime control strategies (SEARCH/BJS conference), NCJ-93926, 10/84

Research access to criminal justice data, NCJ-84154, 2/83

Privacy and juvenile justice records, NCJ-84152, 1/83

Survey of State laws (BJS bulletin), NCJ-80836, 6/82

Privacy and the private employer, NCJ-79651, 11/81

General

BJS bulletins:

Police employment and expenditure, NCJ-100117, 2/86

Tracking offenders: The child victim, NCJ-95785, 12/84

The severity of crime, NCJ-92326, 1/84

The American response to crime: An overview of criminal justice systems, NCJ-91936, 12/83

Tracking offenders, NCJ-91572, 11/83

Victim and witness assistance: New State laws and the system's response, NCJ-87934, 5/83

Bureau of Justice Statistics annual report, fiscal 1985, NCJ-100182, 4/86

National survey of crime severity, NCJ-96017, 10/85

Sourcebook of criminal justice statistics, 1984, NCJ-96382, 10/85

Criminal victimization of District of Columbia residents and Capitol Hill employees, 1982-83, NCJ-97982: Summary, NCJ-96567, 9/85

The DC crime victimization study implementation, NCJ-96595, 9/85, \$7.60 domestic/\$9.20 Canadian/\$12.60 foreign

The DC household victimization survey data base: Documentation, NCJ-98586, \$6.40/\$8.40/\$11

User manual, NCJ-98597, \$8.20/\$9.80/\$12.80

BJS telephone contacts '85, NCJ-98292, 8/85

How to gain access to BJS data (brochure), BC-000022, 9/84

Proceedings of the 2nd workshop on law and justice statistics, 1984, NCJ-93310, 8/84

Report to the nation on crime and justice:

The data, NCJ-67066, 10/83

Dictionary of criminal justice data terminology: 2nd ed., NCJ-76939, 2/82

Technical standards for machine-readable data supplied to BJS, NCJ-75318, 6/81

To be added to any **BJS mailing list**, copy or cut out this page, fill it in and mail it to:

National Criminal Justice Reference Service
User Services Dept. 2
Box 6000
Rockville, MD 20850

If the name and address on the mailing label attached are correct, check here and don't fill them in again. If your address does not show your organizational affiliation (or criminal justice interest) please add it below. If your name and address are different from the label, please fill them in:

Name:

Title:

Organization:

Street or box:

City, State, Zip:

Telephone: ()

Interest in criminal justice:

Please add me to the following list(s):

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Justice expenditure and employment reports
Annual spending and staffing by Federal, State, and local governments and by function (police, courts, corrections, etc.) | <input type="checkbox"/> Courts reports
State court caseload surveys, model annual State reports, State court organization surveys |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Computer crime reports
Electronic fund transfer system crimes | <input type="checkbox"/> Corrections reports
Results of sample surveys and censuses of jails, prisons, parole, probation, and other data |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Privacy and security of criminal history information and information policy
New legislation; maintaining and releasing intelligence and investigative records | <input type="checkbox"/> National Crime Survey reports
The only regular national survey of crime victims |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Federal statistics
Data describing Federal case processing, from investigation through prosecution, adjudication, and corrections | <input type="checkbox"/> Sourcebook of Criminal Justice Statistics
Annual data from 153 sources in an easy-to-use, comprehensive format (400+ tables, sources, index) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> BJS Bulletins and Special Reports
Timely reports of the most current justice data | <input type="checkbox"/> Send me a registration form for NIJ Reports (issued 6 times a year), which abstracts both private and government documents published in criminal justice. |

You will be asked each year if you wish to stay on the mailing list. If you do not reply, we are required by law to remove your name.

U.S. Department of Justice
Bureau of Justice Statistics

Official Business
Penalty for Private Use \$300

BULK RATE
POSTAGE & FEES PAID
DOJ/BJS
Permit No. G-91

Washington, D.C. 20531

Special Report