Criminal Victimization
in the United States

1973 Advance Report

Volume 1   May 1975

A National Crime Panel
Survey Report

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

Other National Crime Panel Survey Reports:

Criminal Victimization in the U.S.: January-June 1973

Crimes and Victims: A Report on the Dayton-San Jose Pilot Survey of Victimization

Criminal Victimization Surveys in the Nation's Five Largest Cities: National Crime Panel Surveys of Chicago, Detroit, Los Angeles, New York, and Philadelphia

Criminal Victimization Surveys in 13 American Cities: National Crime Panel Surveys of Boston, Buffalo, Cincinnati, Houston, Miami, Milwaukee, Minneapolis, New Orleans, Oakland, Pittsburgh, San Diego, San Francisco, and Washington, D.C.

Crime in Eight American Cities: National Crime Panel Surveys of Atlanta, Baltimore, Cleveland, Dallas, Denver, Newark, Portland, and St. Louis–Advance Report

Other National Criminal Justice Information and Statistics Service Reports:

Children in Custody: Advance Report on the Juvenile Detention and Correctional Facility Census of 1972-73

Survey of Inmates of Local Jails: Advance Report

National Prisoner Statistics Bulletins:
   Capital Punishment 1971-72
   Capital Punishment 1973
   Prisoners in State and Federal Institutions on December 31, 1971, 1972, and 1973

National Survey of Court Organization

Criminal Justice Agencies in Regions 1-10 (10 volumes)

Sourcebook of Criminal Justice Statistics 1973

Expenditure and Employment in the Criminal Justice System: 1972-73

Historical Statistics on Expenditure and Employment for the Criminal Justice System: 1971-73

Criminal Victimization in the United States

1973 Advance Report

Volume 1   May 1975

A National Crime Panel Survey Report

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

PREFACE

This report is the second to present findings from the National Crime Panel for the United States as a whole and the first to publish data for an entire year. This program, a continuing survey of households and commercial establishments, gauges the extent to which persons age 12 and over, households, and businesses have been victimized by certain types of crime and studies the character and nature of criminal incidents and their victims. Although the survey has initially concentrated on victims of selected crimes, it is anticipated that other topics in the field of criminal justice will be added to the basic questionnaire from time to time. In addition, a continuing program of methodological study is expected to suggest refinements in the questionnaire and in survey procedures. The survey is conducted for the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration by the U.S. Bureau of the Census.

The National Crime Panel surveys focus at present on selected crimes of major concern to the general public. For individuals, these are rape, robbery, assault, and personal larceny; for households, burglary, larceny, and motor vehicle theft; and for commercial establishments, burglary and robbery. For reported incidents (or victimizations), information is obtained, as appropriate, on such matters as the relationship of victim and offender, characteristics of the victim, extent of injuries suffered and amount of economic loss sustained by the victim, time and place of occurrence of the incident, whether a weapon was used, whether the police were notified, and, if not, reasons advanced for not notifying them. This procedure generates a variety of data concerning the circumstances under which such acts occurred and their effects on the victim and also obtains information on crimes not reported to the police, about which very little of a definitive nature is known. Surveys of this kind provide the means for distinguishing between stranger-to-stranger crime and domestic violence, acts which call for varying degrees of response from the criminal justice system. Continuing surveys of victimization produce estimates of change in the levels of crime over time by broad geographic areas and by various demographic categories.

Information in this report was obtained from interviews with a sample of approximately 60,000 households and 15,000 businesses representative of all households and businesses in the 50 States and the District of Columbia. These households and businesses were interviewed twice during the course of the year, at 6-month intervals. Eliminated from consideration were crimes reported as occurring to U.S. residents outside the country and those involving foreign visitors to this country, although it can be safely assumed that the number of such events was extremely small. Also excluded from consideration in this report were "series victimizations." These are groups of three or more victimizations, usually minor and very similar in nature, incurred by a victim unable to identify separately the details of each event, such as specific time and place of occurrence or amount of loss. In 1973, series victimizations comprised about 5 percent of all victimizations reported in the survey.

This report presents data for 1973 on rates of victimizations for persons, households, and businesses. It thus provides an indication of the varying risk that different groups in society ran of being victimized. In the future, it is planned that reports will be prepared periodically comparing rates of victimization with those in the same period of the preceding year. More detailed analysis of the 1973 data covering both victimizations and incidents will be published in an annual report now in preparation.

The specific crimes measured by the Panel surveys are, generally, those that are considered most serious by the general public, and are roughly equivalent with the Index Crimes measured by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. They have also been demonstrated to be statistically measurable, as they involve criminal events with specific victims who are willing to report the circumstances of what happened to them.

By restricting its focus to the crimes mentioned above, the National Crime Panel does not attempt to measure other offenses, many of which do not lend themselves to the survey method. For example, murder and kidnaping are not covered, as the technique of obtaining information about a crime from the victim is inapplicable to murder and unsuitable in the kidnaping of children. Because these crimes almost always come to the attention of the police, they are well measured from these sources. Commercial larcenies (e.g., employee theft and shoplifting) have to date not proved susceptible to measurement by the survey approach because of the limited documentation maintained by most commercial establishments on losses from these crimes. Documentation is also a problem in offenses against government entities, not only for larcenies, but for crimes generally for which records are inadequate for survey purposes. Other types of crimes excluded from the Panel as being incapable of effective measurement by means of personal interviews are the so-called victimless crimes, such as drunkenness, drug abuse, and prostitution; crimes of which the victim may not be aware, such as buying stolen property; and situations in which the victim has shown a willingness to participate in illegal activity, as in gambling and blackmail.

In any criminal incident involving crimes against persons, more than one criminal act can take place. In reports produced from the National Crime Panel, each criminal incident is counted only once and is classified by the most serious act that took place during the incident, the order of seriousness being determined by 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, but the detailed characteristics of the crime would reveal that assault was also involved.

All three of the measured crimes against households—burglary, household larceny, and motor vehicle theft—are crimes that do not involve personal confrontation. Were such confrontations introduced, the crime would become a personal crime, and the victim would no longer be the household itself, but the member of the household involved in the confrontation. For example, a criminal act begun as a burglary would be classified as a robbery if the burglar were surprised by members of the household and, in turn, threatened them.

All data in this report are estimates and are subject both to errors arising from the fact that the information was obtained from a sample rather than a complete census, and also errors associated with the collection and processing of the data. The sources of error for the household survey plus technical data on the sample are discussed in some detail in Appendix II, which also includes generalized tables of standard errors. Appendix III contains a similar discussion for the commercial survey, plus a number of specific examples of standard errors to assist the reader in interpreting the survey data.

Unless appropriately qualified, all analytical statements in this report that involve comparisons have met the test that the differences are at least equal to two standard errors or, in other words, that the chances are at least 95 out of 100 that the difference reported is a true difference, not caused by sampling variability. For example, when the phrase "statistically significant" is used, it means that the difference under discussion has met this standard. Qualified statements, such as "some evidence" or "marginally significant," have met the test that the differences are at least equal to 1.6 standard errors or that the chances are 90 out of 100 that the difference reported is a true one. In most cases, apparent differences that failed to meet these criteria were not discussed in the text.

The tables in Appendix I contain the data on which the analysis is based. Estimates based on about 10 or fewer sample cases were considered statistically unreliable and, although remaining in the tables, are indicated by a symbol to the left of each number.

Although attempts may be made to compare information in this report with data collected from local police agencies by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and published annually in its report, Crime in the United States, Uniform Crime Reports, such attempts are inappropriate because of substantial differences in coverage between the 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 citizens 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. For crimes against persons, the number of victimizations normally is somewhat greater than the number of incidents, because more than one victim may be involved in any given incident. Each victim is asked how many other persons were victimized in a particular incident so that an appropriate correction factor can be applied to avoid double counting of incidents. Victimizations and incidents are equivalent for households and commercial establishments, because in these cases each criminal act is assumed to involve a single victim. In addition, the survey's victimization rates for crimes against households and commercial establishments are based, respectively, on the number of households and businesses, whereas crime rates from police statistics for these crimes are based on the total population.

CONTENTS

GENERAL FINDINGS

Throughout the United States during the year 1973, selected crimes of violence and common theft, including attempts, accounted for approximately 37 million victimizations[1] of persons age 12 and over, households, and businesses. Of the total number of victimizations, about 55 percent involved individuals, 41 percent pertained to households, and 4 percent concerned businesses (Table A).

Table A. Percent distribution of victimizations, by type of crime

Type of crime	Percent
All crimes	100.0
Crimes against persons	54.8
Rape	0.4
Robbery	3.0
Assault	11.2
Personal larceny[2]	40.3
Crimes against households	40.8
Burglary	17.1
Household larceny[2]	20.2
Motor vehicle theft	3.5
Crimes against businesses	4.4
Burglary	3.7
Robbery	0.7

Among these crimes, the single, most prevalent type was personal larceny, accounting for about 40 percent of all victimizations recorded as having occurred during the survey reference period. Other personal crimes, those involving some form of violence or the threat of violence, made up about 15 percent of the total. Household larceny was the most common of the

---

[1] Throughout this report, the yardstick for the measurement of the amount of crime is the victimization rather than the incident. For crimes against persons, the number of victimizations normally is greater than the number of incidents, because more than one victim may be involved in any given incident. For crimes against households and businesses, "victimization" and "incident" are synonymous.

[2] See definitions, page 43. Household larceny refers to the theft or attempted theft of property or cash from the home, involving neither forcible nor unlawful entry, or its immediate vicinity. Personal larceny refers to the theft or attempted theft of property or cash with or without contact between victim and offender, but without force or the threat of force.

household victimizations, accounting for about 20 percent of all crimes; burglary was the more frequent type of commercial victimization.

CRIMES AGAINST PERSONS

The victimization rate for personal larceny was 93 per 1,000 persons age 12 and over (Table 1). By contrast, personal crimes of violence (the combination of rape, robbery, and assault) had a rate of about 34 per 1,000 persons. Of the three violent crimes measured by the National Crime Panel, assault was by far the most prevalent, with a rate of 26 per 1,000, as compared with about 7 for robbery and 1 for rape. When the crimes of robbery and assault were examined in more detail, the less serious forms of these crimes were found to have occurred more frequently. Thus, the victimization rate for robbery and attempted robbery without injury was about twice as high as that for the combined total of robbery and attempted robbery where injury occurred. Likewise, simple assault was more prevalent than aggravated assault, and within each of these categories, attempted assault was more frequent than assault that was carried out. Personal crimes of theft without any contact between victim and offender were far more likely to have occurred than those with brief contact, as in purse snatching and pocket picking. The rates for such crimes during 1973 were about 90 and 3 per 1,000, respectively.

One of the more significant dimensions of personal crime is whether the victim and the offender are in some way acquainted. It is well documented, for example, that homicides generally occur among persons who at least know one another, if they are not actually related in some way. Not so well known is the relationship between victim and offender in the three crimes of violence measured by the National Crime Panel. For 1973, about two-thirds of all personal crimes of violence involved a confrontation between strangers. Table B gives the percent of victimizations committed by strangers for the crimes of rape, robbery, and assault. Converted into rates, there were about 22 violent stranger-to-stranger confrontations per 1,000 population, as compared with 12 where nonstrangers were involved (Table 2).

Table B. Proportion of violent crimes involving strangers

Crime	Percent
All crimes	66
Rape	75
Robbery	86
Assault	60

Assault, which was the most common of the crimes of violence, was less likely than rape or robbery to have involved strangers. Nonetheless, the victimization rate for stranger-to-stranger assault was higher (about 16 per 1,000) than in instances where the offender and victim were at least acquainted (about 10 per 1,000). Attempted assault, whether simple or aggravated, occurred more often between strangers than did assault that resulted in some form of injury. The two major subcategories of robbery, those involving injury and those with no 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 evidence from the survey was sufficient to indicate that it, too, was primarily a crime between persons who were not acquainted.

When victimization rates were examined from the perspective of selected personal characteristics, certain significant differences emerged (Tables 3 through 6). In overall terms, males were more likely than females to have been victimized by personal crimes, but there was no significant difference between rates for blacks and whites. However, there was some evidence that black males had a higher victimization rate than white males. Victimization rates for females were much lower, but there was no significant difference between white and black females in overall personal victimization. Blacks were more likely than whites to have been victimized by rape, robbery, and assault, whereas whites were more likely to have been victims of personal larceny. Excluding rape, the same patterns persisted by race for females, but only for robbery among males. Even though there was no essential difference between white and black males in the overall assault rate, black males were more likely than white males to have been victims of aggravated assault, while white males had a higher victimization rate from simple assault. When males as a group were compared with females, the former

exhibited substantially higher rates of victimization for robbery with and without injury, simple and aggravated assault, and personal larceny.

Age proved to be an important determinant in assessing the likelihood of being victimized by a personal crime. The highest rates of personal victimization were recorded by those in the two youngest groups, covering the ages 12 to 19, with each older group reporting a lower rate than its predecessor; persons 65 and over had the lowest rates of all. For both males and females, essentially the same pattern was manifested, except that males 16-19 appeared to have the highest personal victimization rate, followed closely by males 12-15. For each age category under 35, males had noticeably higher rates than females; over that age, the differences in rates between the sexes, although still significant, were much smaller.

Turning to the specific personal crimes, the general relationship between lower victimization rates and increasing age was evident. 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 specific age groups. Nonetheless, the survey showed that there were substantially more robbery victimizations experienced by persons under 25 years of age than in any of the older age categories. Among assault victims, 25 was also an important dividing line, with the incidence of assault falling off sharply after this age and continuing to fall in each older age group. Personal larceny followed the pattern of all personal crimes: the two youngest age groups had the highest rates, while each older age category had a successively lower rate. For both males and females, the same patterns were evident, except among female robbery victims, where no trend was apparent. There was a sharp decline in the incidence of assault and personal larceny for both males and females age 25 and over, and for males alone in the case of robbery. The tendency for males to be disproportionately victimized by personal crimes was again demonstrated by the figures for robbery, assault and, to a lesser extent, personal larceny.

Substantial differences in victimization appeared when the four major categories of marital status were examined. In aggregate terms for all personal crimes, persons who had never been married had the highest rate and those who were widowed the lowest, largely a reflection of the age

structure of these two groups. Persons who were separated or divorced had high rates of victimization, not much lower than the rates for those who had never been married. Married persons had higher victimization rates than the widowed, but these were considerably lower than the rates among persons in the other two marital groups. This pattern also held true, with one exception, when males and females were considered separately. There was no significant difference between women who had never been married and those who were separated or divorced. Males in all four marital status categories exhibited higher victimization rates than did females in these same categories.

Victimization rates for personal larceny paralleled those for all personal crimes, with persons who had never been married having the highest rates, followed in descending order by the separated or divorced, the married, and the widowed. The same pattern held for both males and females. Robbery victimizations, on the other hand, displayed a different sequence from high to low, with divorced or separated persons having the highest rate, followed by the never married, the widowed, and the married. Females exhibited a similar pattern, except that there was no difference between the victimization rates for never-married persons and widows. The data were not at all conclusive with regard to males, except that married men clearly had the lowest rate, and there was some evidence that separated or divorced men had the highest.

Comparing assault victimizations, on the basis of marital status, the divorced or separated and never-married had much higher rates than the married and widowed. Although the difference was marginal, the divorced or separated were slightly ahead of the never-married. Among women, the separated or divorced had a substantially higher rate of victimization from assault than the never-married, followed by the married and widowed in that order. For men, there was no significant difference between the top two categories, but the married and widowed followed in the same order as for women. Men were again preponderantly the victims of robbery and assault in all marital status groups, with one exception. Among assault victims, there was no statistically significant difference between men and women who had been separated or divorced. One final observation on marital status—assault victimization rates were three to four times higher than those

for robbery in all marital status categories except for widowed persons, where an apparently slightly higher rate for assaults was not statistically significant.

When total personal crimes were examined from the standpoint of the various levels of annual family income, no particular trend emerged, except that those in the highest income level had the highest rate of victimization. However, when a distinction was made between personal crimes of violence and personal larceny, a pattern appeared. Persons in families with annual incomes of less than $3,000 had the highest rate of victimization for crimes of violence, and there was evidence that those with family incomes of $15,000 or more had the lowest rate. Conversely, those in the highest income category reported the highest rate of victimization from personal larceny, presumably because they had more possessions to lose, whereas the two lowest income classes of families, with annual incomes of less than $7,500, had the lowest rates. Compared with the other characteristics discussed earlier, family income did not provide the sharp contrasts in victimization experience that were evident, for example, with age. Even when race was examined, the similarities were more striking than the differences. Comparing victimizations involving families with incomes above and below $7,500, however, blacks in the lower income group were more likely than similarly situated whites to have been victims of violent crimes. Using the $7,500 figure as a dividing line revealed more differences within each racial group than between them. For example, both blacks and whites below this level had higher rates of violent victimizations than did their more affluent counterparts. On the other hand, higher-income whites and blacks were more likely than those earning less than $7,500 to have been victims of personal larceny.

CRIMES AGAINST HOUSEHOLDS

Household larceny was the most common of the three household crimes measured by the survey, accounting for about 49 percent of the total. Burglary came next with approximately 42 percent, and motor vehicle theft was a distant third with 9 percent (Table 7). In contrast to crimes

against persons, the majority of reported household crimes were completed, overwhelmingly so in the case of household larceny, undoubtedly because of the nature of these crimes, which do not involve personal confrontation, so that attempts are difficult to detect without clear evidence, such as a forced door or a broken window, that an offense has taken place. Among incidents of completed burglary, the rate for unlawful entry without force was significantly higher than that for forcible entry.

An examination of selected demographic characteristics of victimized households revealed differences in the impact of the three household crimes (Tables 8 through 10). The rates for all household crimes, as well as for burglary and household larceny, decreased significantly as the age of the household head increased. The same trend held true for motor vehicle theft, except that the difference between the two youngest age groups was only marginally significant. The larceny rate was higher than that for burglary for all age groups between 20 and 64. There was no difference in the victimization rates for these crimes in households headed by persons in the youngest age category, whereas households headed by persons 65 and older had higher rates for burglary than for larceny. In all age groups, rates for burglary and household larceny were substantially higher than the rate for motor vehicle theft.

Households headed by blacks had a substantially higher rate of victimization for the three household crimes, considered together, than did households headed by whites. This higher rate for blacks also characterized burglary and motor vehicle theft, but not household larceny, for which there was no difference between the two groups.

Renters had substantially higher rates of victimization than homeowners for the three types of crimes against households. Households headed by whites showed the same pattern, but black owners had a higher rate for household larceny than black renters, and there was no difference between black renters and owners in the victimization rate for motor vehicle theft. Among homeowners, households headed by blacks had higher victimization rates than those headed by whites for burglary, larceny, and motor vehicle theft. Among renters, black households had a higher burglary rate than white households, but the latter had the higher rate for household larceny. There was no significant difference in the rate for motor vehicle theft.

As was the case with crimes against persons, there were no substantial differences by level of annual family income in the overall victimization rate for crimes against households, although the highest rate occurred in the most affluent households. When the three household crimes were examined individually, certain differences emerged. The lowest rate of burglary occurred in the $10,000 to $14,999 income category for all households, whereas the highest burglary rate occurred in households with less than $3,000 annual income. These same low-income households were the lowest in victimizations arising from household larceny and motor vehicle theft. However, there was no clear pattern with regard to the highest rate for either of these two crimes.

When family income categories were combined into those below $7,500 per year and those with that income level or higher, certain additional patterns became evident. Families in the lower income category had higher burglary rates but lower larceny and motor vehicle rates than did those with higher incomes. This was also the case with families where the household head was white, but in households headed by blacks the situation differed somewhat: Only in motor vehicle theft did a substantial distinction appear, with the higher-income households having a much higher rate of victimization. The data suggest that black households with incomes above the $7,500 level were also more likely to have been victimized by larceny, but income level made no difference in the likelihood of one's home being burglarized.

As has been noted previously, black households had a higher victimization rate for all household crimes than did those headed by whites. With respect to individual household crimes, blacks were much more heavily victimized by burglary than were whites, in both income categories. On the other hand, there was no discernible difference between the races in the rate of victimization from household larceny. In motor vehicle theft, an apparent difference in households under the $7,500 level was not significant, but blacks in the higher income group were victimized at a rate roughly twice that for white households.

Another way of looking at motor vehicle theft is to base the rate on the number of motor vehicles owned, rather than on the number of households. Victimization rates derived in this fashion give a more accurate indication of the "at risk" group for this particular crime. Since there are more motor vehicles than there are households, the overall rate declined when computed on this basis (Table C). Otherwise, the effect was to accentuate differences described earlier. The gap between white and black households, for example, widened considerably. Households where the head was between 12 and 19 years of age experienced a much higher victimization rate than did households headed by persons in any of the older age categories. A similar difference was observed in tenancy arrangements, where there was a greater margin between renters and owners.

Table C. Comparison of victimization rates for motor vehicle theft per 1,000 households and 1,000 motor vehicles owned for the calendar year 1973

Characteristic of household head	Rate per 1,000 households	Rate per 1,000 motor vehicles owned
All households	19.2	13.0
Race		
White	18.4	11.9
Black	24.3	26.3
Age		
12-19	39.3	38.4
20-34	28.6	18.8
35-49	21.3	11.8
50-64	16.1	10.1
65+	5.2	6.1
Tenure		
Owner	15.0	8.8
Renter	26.7	25.1

CRIMES AGAINST BUSINESSES

Of the two commercial crimes measured, burglary was by far the more prevalent, constituting about 83 percent of crimes against businesses during 1973. Relatively small differences among businesses with selected characteristics (Tables 11 and 12) preclude any extended discussion of results. Compared with other kinds of businesses, establishments in retail trade had the highest victimization rate. Businesses with no paid employees had a significantly lower rate of victimization than those with

paid employees. Among the latter, there was evidence that establishments with eight or more employees were more likely to have been victimized than those with seven or fewer employees.

When victimization rates for burglary and robbery of commercial establishments were compared with the rates for the same crimes when committed respectively, against households and individuals, it was clear that the risks of victimization were greater in the commercial sector. Thus, the victimization rate in 1973 for commercial burglary was about twice as high as that for burglary against households. Similarly, robberies of employees of commercial establishments occurred at rates about five times as high as for robberies directed against individuals.

APPENDIX I.
SURVEY DATA TABLES

The appended statistical data tables contain selected victimization rate data for the United States from the National Crime Panel for 1973. The tables are arranged in the sequence in which they are discussed in the text. Tables 1-6 present data on victimization rates for crimes against persons; Tables 7-10 provide information on household victimization rates; and Tables 11 and 12 contain data on rates for victimizations directed against commercial establishments.

All statistical data generated by the survey are estimates, which vary in their degree of reliability and are subject to errors associated with the fact that they were developed from a sample survey rather than from a complete enumeration. The constraints on interpretation and other uses of these data, as well as guidelines for determining their reliability, are set forth in Appendix II (personal and household sectors) and Appendix III (commercial sector). As a general rule, however, estimates based on about 10 or fewer sample cases have been considered unreliable. Although these estimates remain in the data tables, each unreliable figure is indicated by the symbol "1" to its left. The minimum reliable estimates are 10,000 for the personal and household rate tables and 5,000 for the commercial tables.

Each table also contains estimates of the size of every relevant group. These estimates reflect adjustments to independent estimates of the population for the personal and household tables; for the commercial sector the estimates are generated from the survey.

Table 1. Victimization rates, crimes against persons, for the calendar year 1973

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

Type of victimization	Rate
Crimes of violence	33.9
Rape	1.0
Robbery	6.9
Robbery and attempted robbery with injury	2.4
From serious assault	1.3
From minor assault	1.1
Robbery without injury	2.6
Attempted robbery without injury	2.0
Assault	26.0
Aggravated assault	10.4
With injury	3.4
Attempted assault with weapon	7.0
Simple assault	15.6
With injury	3.9
Attempted assault without weapon	11.8
Crimes of theft	93.4
Personal larceny with contact	3.2
Purse snatching	0.7
Attempted purse snatching	0.4
Pocket picking	2.1
Personal larceny without contact	90.3
Total population age 12 and over	162,236,000

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

Table 2. Victimization rates, crimes of violence against persons, for the calendar year 1973, by relationship between victim and offender

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

Type of victimization	Stranger	Nonstranger
Crimes of violence	22.2	11.6
Rape	0.7	0.2
Robbery	5.9	1.0
Robbery and attempted robbery with injury	2.0	0.4
From serious assault	1.2	0.1
From minor assault	0.8	0.3
Robbery without injury	2.2	0.3
Attempted robbery without injury	1.7	0.3
Assault	15.6	10.4
Aggravated assault	6.5	3.9
With injury	1.9	1.5
Attempted assault with weapon	4.6	2.4
Simple assault	9.1	6.5
With injury	1.9	2.0
Attempted assault without weapon	7.2	4.5
Total population age 12 and over	162,236,000	162,236,000

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

Table 3. Victimization rates, crimes against persons, for the calendar year 1973, by sex and race of victim

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

Sex and race	Total crimes against persons	Rape	Robbery With injury	Robbery Without injury	Assault Aggravated	Assault Simple	Personal larceny
Both sexes* (162,236,000)	127.3	1.0	2.4	4.5	10.4	15.6	93.4
White (143,217,000)	127.2	0.9	2.1	3.9	9.5	16.0	94.8
Black (17,107,000)	131.9	1.7	4.9	9.5	18.1	12.7	85.0
Male* (77,161,000)	151.9	[1]0.1	3.4	7.0	15.7	20.0	105.7
White (68,484,000)	151.5	[1]0.1	2.9	6.0	14.8	21.0	106.6
Black (7,749,000)	161.0	[1]0.1	7.6	15.2	24.7	11.7	101.6
Female* (85,075,000)	105.0	1.8	1.4	2.3	5.5	11.6	82.3
White (74,733,000)	104.9	1.7	1.3	2.0	4.7	11.4	83.9
Black (9,359,000)	107.8	3.1	2.6	4.8	12.5	13.5	71.3

NOTE: Detail may not add to total shown because of rounding. Rounded numbers in parentheses refer to population in the group.
*Includes "other races," not shown separately.
[1]Estimate, based on about 10 or fewer sample cases, is statistically unreliable.

Table 4. Victimization rates, crimes against persons, for the calendar year 1973, by sex and age of victim

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

Sex and age	Total crimes against persons	Rape	Robbery With injury	Robbery Without injury	Assault Aggravated	Assault Simple	Personal larceny
Both sexes (162,236,000)	127.3	1.0	2.4	4.5	10.4	15.6	93.4
12-15 (16,559,000)	235.9	1.1	3.0	9.0	16.0	31.0	175.8
16-19 (15,584,000)	237.1	2.7	3.7	6.4	24.6	30.8	168.9
20-24 (17,345,000)	201.2	2.9	3.9	7.2	21.6	28.8	136.8
25-34 (28,141,000)	136.8	1.2	2.0	4.3	11.6	17.3	100.3
35-49 (33,836,000)	95.2	[1]0.3	1.9	2.9	6.7	9.7	73.7
50-64 (30,501,000)	60.7	[1]0.1	1.9	2.5	2.6	5.7	47.9
65 and over (20,272,000)	31.6	[1]0.2	1.6	3.2	1.2	2.4	23.1
Male (77,161,000)	151.9	[1]0.1	3.4	7.0	15.7	20.0	105.7
12-15 (8,415,000)	267.0	[1]0.4	5.0	14.7	22.2	37.5	187.1
16-19 (7,712,000)	285.7	0.0	5.0	10.3	38.7	38.5	193.2
20-24 (8,330,000)	246.7	[1]0.1	5.8	11.8	33.1	37.1	158.8
25-34 (13,708,000)	161.0	[1]0.1	2.1	6.2	17.3	22.2	113.1
35-49 (16,281,000)	104.3	0.0	3.0	4.1	8.9	10.8	77.5
50-64 (14,344,000)	67.8	0.0	3.0	3.3	3.9	7.6	50.0
65 and over (8,371,000)	40.3	0.0	1.9	4.3	1.4	3.6	29.1
Female (85,075,000)	105.0	1.8	1.4	2.3	5.5	11.6	82.3
12-15 (8,144,000)	203.9	1.8	[1]0.9	3.1	9.6	24.3	164.2
16-19 (7,872,000)	189.4	5.3	2.3	2.7	10.7	23.2	145.2
20-24 (9,015,000)	159.1	5.4	2.2	3.0	10.9	21.2	116.4

14

15

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

| Sex and age | Total crimes against persons | Rape | Robbery | | Assault | | Personal larceny |
			With injury	Without injury	Aggravated	Simple	
25-34 (14,432,000)	113.8	2.3	1.9	2.5	6.2	12.7	88.2
35-49 (17,556,000)	86.8	[1]0.5	0.9	1.9	4.8	8.6	70.2
50-64 (16,157,000)	54.4	[1]0.3	1.0	1.7	1.5	4.0	46.0
65 and over (11,901,000)	25.6	[1]0.3	1.5	2.4	1.0	1.6	18.8

NOTE: Detail may not add to total shown because of rounding. Rounded numbers in parentheses refer to population in the group.
[1]Estimate, based on about 10 or fewer sample cases, is statistically unreliable.

Table 5.   Victimization rates, crimes against persons, for the calendar year 1973, by sex and marital status of victim

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

| Sex and marital status | Total crimes against persons | Rape | Robbery | | Assault | | Personal larceny |
			With injury	Without injury	Aggravated	Simple	
Both sexes* (162,236,000)	127.3	1.0	2.4	4.5	10.4	15.6	93.4
Married (95,595,000)	89.2	0.3	1.3	2.6	6.2	9.3	69.5
Widowed (11,496,000)	47.0	[1]0.4	2.3	3.5	2.9	4.6	33.3
Separated, divorced (8,642,000)	183.9	3.7	6.0	9.8	21.7	31.6	111.1
Never married (46,084,000)	215.9	2.0	3.9	7.9	18.8	28.5	154.9
Male* (77,161,000)	151.9	[1]0.1	3.4	7.0	15.7	20.0	105.7
Married (47,859,000)	101.6	Z	1.8	3.7	9.5	12.4	74.0
Widowed (1,811,000)	67.8	0.0	7.1	8.5	[1]5.4	8.1	38.8
Separated, divorced (3,009,000)	208.8	0.0	8.7	15.2	27.5	28.9	128.6
Never married (24,291,000)	250.1	[1]0.2	5.6	12.2	27.2	34.7	170.3
Female* (85,075,000)	105.0	1.8	1.4	2.3	5.5	11.6	82.3
Married (47,736,000)	76.8	0.7	0.8	1.4	2.9	6.2	64.9
Widowed (9,685,000)	43.1	[1]0.5	1.5	2.6	2.4	4.0	32.3
Separated, divorced (5,633,000)	170.6	5.7	4.6	6.9	18.7	33.0	101.8
Never married (21,793,000)	177.7	4.0	1.9	3.0	9.4	21.6	137.8

NOTE: Detail may not add to total shown because of rounding. Rounded numbers in parentheses refer to population in the group.
*Includes marital status not reported, not shown separately.
Z Rate less than 0.05.
[1]Estimate, based on about 10 or fewer sample cases, is statistically unreliable.

Table 6. Victimization rates, crimes against persons, for the calendar year 1973, by race and family income of victim

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

Race and family income	Total crimes against persons	Rape	Robbery		Assault		Personal larceny
			With injury	Without injury	Aggravated	Simple	
All races* (162,236,000)	127.3	1.0	2.4	4.5	10.4	15.6	93.4
Less than $3,000 (15,712,000)	128.7	2.2	4.7	6.9	16.8	19.9	78.1
$3,000-$7,499 (38,487,000)	117.3	1.3	2.5	5.4	13.0	16.5	78.7
$7,500-$9,999 (19,800,000)	122.9	0.8	2.6	4.0	10.0	15.0	90.3
$10,000-$14,999 (41,288,000)	128.1	0.6	1.7	4.2	8.6	14.8	98.2
$15,000 and over (36,601,000)	144.5	0.7	1.6	3.3	7.1	14.5	117.5
White* (143,217,000)	127.2	0.9	2.1	3.9	9.5	16.0	94.8
Less than $3,000 (11,941,000)	126.8	1.9	4.3	5.8	13.8	20.5	80.5
$3,000-$7,499 (31,528,000)	114.8	1.3	2.1	4.4	11.3	17.5	78.2
$7,500-$9,999 (17,654,000)	124.1	0.7	2.5	3.7	10.3	16.0	90.9
$10,000-$14,999 (38,160,000)	127.8	0.7	1.5	3.8	8.6	15.0	98.3
$15,000 and over (34,663,000)	144.7	0.6	1.4	3.1	7.0	14.8	117.8
Black* (17,107,000)	131.9	1.7	4.9	9.5	18.1	12.7	85.1
Less than $3,000 (3,582,000)	133.2	3.4	5.3	10.7	26.2	17.8	69.9
$3,000-$7,499 (6,554,000)	130.0	[1]1.5	4.6	9.4	21.4	11.9	81.3
$7,500-$9,999 (1,900,000)	115.2	[1]1.2	[1]3.4	8.0	8.8	7.9	85.9
$10,000-$14,999 (2,648,000)	141.5	0.0	5.5	10.3	9.3	11.9	104.4
$15,000 and over (1,477,000)	151.1	[1]1.8	[1]4.5	7.5	10.6	7.6	119.1

NOTE: Detail may not add to total shown because of rounding. Rounded numbers in parentheses refer to population in the group.
*Includes income not reported, not shown separately; the "all races" category also includes "other races," not shown separately.
[1]Estimate, based on about 10 or fewer sample cases, is statistically unreliable.

Table 7. Victimization rates, crimes against households, for the calendar year 1973.

(Rate per 1,000 households)

Type of household victimization	Rate
Burglary	92.7
Forcible entry	29.4
Unlawful entry without force	42.6
Attempted forcible entry	20.7
Household larceny	109.3
Completed larceny	101.5
Attempted larceny	7.8
Motor vehicle theft	19.2
Completed theft	12.5
Attempted theft	6.7
Total households	69,422,000

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

Table 8. Victimization rates, crimes against households, for the calendar year 1973, by age of household head

(Rate per 1,000 households)

Age of household head	Total crimes against households	Burglary	Household larceny	Motor vehicle theft
All ages (69,422,000)	221.2	92.7	109.3	19.2
12-19 (1,047,000)	467.4	219.2	208.9	39.3
20-34 (19,284,000)	302.2	122.7	150.9	28.6
35-49 (18,079,000)	251.1	101.4	128.4	21.3
50-64 (17,542,000)	172.8	71.9	84.8	16.1
65 and over (13,470,000)	108.8	55.3	48.4	5.2

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

Table 9. Victimization rates, crimes against households, for the calendar year 1973, by race of household head and tenure

(Rate per 1,000 households)

Race of household head and tenure	Total crimes against households	Burglary	Household larceny	Motor vehicle theft
All races* (69,422,000)	221.2	92.7	109.3	19.2
Owned or being bought (44,647,000)	194.4	78.1	101.3	15.0
Rented (24,775,000)	269.5	118.9	123.9	26.7
White (61,705,000)	215.7	87.7	109.6	18.4
Owned or being bought (41,143,000)	188.1	74.4	99.4	14.2
Rented (20,561,000)	270.9	114.2	130.0	26.7
Black (6,999,000)	269.3	135.5	109.5	24.3
Owned or being bought (3,180,000)	275.3	125.0	126.1	24.2
Rented (3,818,000)	264.3	144.2	95.8	24.3

NOTE: Detail may not add to total shown because of rounding. Rounded numbers in parentheses refer to the number of households in the group.
*Includes "other races," not shown separately.

Table 10. Victimization rates, crimes against households, for the calendar year 1973, by race of household head and family income

(Rate per 1,000 households)

Race of household head and family income	Total crimes against households	Burglary	Household larceny	Motor vehicle theft
All races* (69,422,000)	221.2	92.7	109.3	19.2
Less than $3,000 (9,707,000)	210.7	110.8	89.0	10.9
$3,000-$7,499 (17,990,000)	222.5	96.6	109.6	16.2
$7,500-$9,999 (8,309,000)	228.4	87.6	118.0	22.8
$10,000-$14,999 (15,874,000)	216.0	76.7	116.6	22.6
$15,000 and over (12,907,000)	241.4	97.7	120.0	23.7
White* (61,705,000)	215.7	87.7	109.6	18.4
Less than $3,000 (7,698,000)	201.5	103.1	87.9	10.5
$3,000-$7,499 (15,277,000)	215.5	90.7	109.5	15.3
$7,500-$9,999 (7,511,000)	225.7	83.3	120.8	21.7
$10,000-$14,999 (14,776,000)	210.3	73.3	116.1	21.0
$15,000 and over (12,260,000)	237.3	95.4	119.1	22.8
Black* (6,999,000)	269.3	135.5	109.5	24.3
Less than $3,000 (1,901,000)	246.9	138.4	96.0	12.5
$3,000-$7,499 (2,548,000)	260.0	129.1	112.8	18.1
$7,500-$9,999 (713,000)	274.9	143.7	95.6	35.6
$10,000-$14,999 (931,000)	302.7	128.5	127.8	46.4
$15,000 and over (509,000)	332.3	146.1	144.3	41.9

NOTE: Detail may not add to total shown because of rounding. Rounded numbers in parentheses refer to the number of households in the group. *Includes income not reported, not shown separately; the "all races" category also includes "other races," not shown separately.

Table 11. Victimization rates, crimes against commercial establishments, for the calendar year 1973, by kind of business

(Rate per 1,000 establishments)

Kind of business	Total	Burglary	Robbery
All businesses (6,800,000)	242.5	203.7	38.8
Retail (2,551,000)	328.8	262.4	66.4
Service (2,650,000)	202.9	178.2	24.7
Other (1,599,000)	170.5	152.1	18.3

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

Table 12. Victimization rates, crimes against commercial establishments, for the calendar year 1973, by number of paid employees
(Rate per 1,000 establishments)

Number of paid employees	Total	Burglary	Robbery
All employees* (6,800,000)	242.5	203.7	38.8
None (1,666,000)	181.4	153.2	28.2
1-3 (2,560,000)	229.8	196.0	33.8
4-7 (1,227,000)	284.7	232.7	52.1
8-19 (768,000)	297.1	255.4	41.8
20 or more (556,000)	314.5	254.9	59.6

NOTE: Detail may not add to total shown because of rounding. Rounded numbers in parentheses refer to the number of commercial establishments in the group.
*Includes number of paid employees not available, not shown separately.

Source of data

The household survey of the National Crime Panel focuses on the victimization experiences of persons living in households and in group quarters (dormitories, rooming houses, etc.), but excludes persons who are in institutions, serving as crews of vessels, or are members of the Armed Forces living in military barracks.

Estimates for this survey are based on data obtained from a stratified multistage cluster sample. The primary sampling units comprising the first stage of sampling were formed from counties or groups of counties, including every county in the United States. Approximately 1,930 areas were so formed and grouped into 376 strata. One hundred fifty-six of the strata consist of only one sample area and thus come into sample with certainty. These strata are generally located in larger metropolitan areas and are designated self-representing areas. The remaining 220 strata were formed by combining areas with similar characteristics, such as geographic region, population density, rate of growth, proportion nonwhite, etc. From each stratum, one area was selected with the probability of selection being proportionate to the population of the area. These are called non self-representing areas.

The objective of the remaining stages of sampling was to obtain a self-weighting probability sample of dwelling units and group quarters within each of the selected areas.[1] This involved a systematic selection of enumeration districts (geographic areas used for the 1970 census) with probability of selection proportionate to their 1970 population sizes, and a selection of households within these enumeration districts in clusters of approximately four households. Units built after the 1970 Census that were not included in the above process were sampled primarily from a list of building permits for new construction issued by permit-issuing offices in the sample areas. This sampling was an independent clerical operation. Areas that do not issue building permits were sampled for new construction

---

[1] Self-weighting means that all sample households have the same initial probability of selection.

by means of a sample of area segments. The resulting sample of new con-
struction units is a small part of the total sample, increasing, though,
as the decade progresses.

A total of approximately 75,000 housing units and other living
quarters were designated for the sample, of which about 60,000 were occupied
by households eligible for interview where interviews were actually obtained.
Of the remaining 15,000 units, the large majority were found to be vacant,
demolished, converted to nonresidential use, or ineligible for some other
reason. However, approximately 2,500 were occupied households eligible for
interview but were not interviewed because no one was at home after repeated
visits by the interviewer, or the residents refused to be interviewed, were
temporarily absent, or were unavailable for some other reason. Thus, the
response rate for all eligible households during 1973 was about 96 percent.

A rotation scheme is used for the national sample. The sample of
75,000 households is divided into six groups or rotations. Once the
rotation is fully operative, households in each rotation group will be
interviewed once every 6 months for 3 years, the initial interview being
only for purposes of bounding, i.e., establishing a time frame to avoid
recording duplicative reports on subsequent visits. Each rotation group
is further divided into six panels. One-sixth of each rotation group, or
one panel, is interviewed each month during the 6-month period. Additional
samples of 75,000 households selected in the above manner will be similarly
assigned to rotation groups and panels for subsequent rotation into the
sample. One rotation group will enter the sample every 6 months and a
rotation group from a previous sample will be phased out.

Estimation procedure

The estimation procedure makes extensive use of auxiliary data on
characteristics of the survey population that are believed to be related
to the subject matter of the survey in order to obtain more reliable esti-
mates. These auxiliary data are used in the various stages of ratio
estimation.

The estimation procedure is performed on a quarterly basis to produce
quarterly estimates of total crime victimizations and of the rate of crime
victimization. Sample data from 8 months of interviewing are required to

produce a quarterly estimate. The following chart shows why the months of
February through September are required to produce an estimate for the
first quarter of a year. Similarly, annual estimates are derived by
accumulating data from the four quarterly estimates, which, in turn, are
obtained from 17 months of field interviewing.[1] One purpose of this

Month of interview by month of recall

Month of interview	X's denote months in the 6-month recall period											
	First quarter			Second quarter			Third quarter			Fourth quarter		
	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	June	July	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.
January												
February	X											
March	X	X										
April	X	X	X									
May	X	X	X	X								
June	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				

interviewing scheme and the resulting estimation procedure is to offset ex-
pected biases due to the tendency of respondents to place crime victimizations
in more recent months during the 6-month recall period than when they actually
occurred.

The first step in the estimation procedure is the inflation of the sample
data by the reciprocal of the probability of its selection. An adjustment is
then made to account for the occupied units (and for persons in occupied units)
for which no interview was obtained but which should have been interviewed.

_____
[1]Populations shown in the tables in Appendix I are thus based on an average
for these 17 months and center on the ninth month, in this case, October 1973.

The distribution of the sample usually differs somewhat from the distribution of the total population from which the sample was drawn in terms of such characteristics as age, race, sex, residence, etc. These characteristics are closely correlated with crime victimization measurements made from the sample. Therefore, various stages of ratio estimation are employed to bring the distribution of the sample into closer agreement with the universe distribution, and hence reduce the variability of the sample estimates. Two stages of ratio estimation are employed to estimate personal crime victimization characteristics and these two stages, plus a third stage, are employed to estimate household crime victimization characteristics.

The first stage of ratio estimation is applied only to sample data obtained from non self-representing sampling areas. Its purpose is to reduce the error arising from the fact that one area is selected to represent an entire stratum. Ratios are computed for various categories of race and residence between the weighted 1970 Census counts for all the sample areas in each region and the total population of the region at the time of the 1970 Census.

The second stage of ratio estimation is applied on a person basis and brings the distribution of the sample persons into closer agreement with independent current estimates of the distribution of the population by various age-sex-color categories. The third stage of ratio estimation is applied on a household basis and performs a similar function with regard to the distribution of the population of housing units by residence-tenure categories.

To estimate crimes against households, characteristics of the wife in a husband-wife household and characteristics of the household head in other types of households are used to determine which second-stage ratio estimate factors are to be applied. This is felt to be a better procedure than always using the characteristics of the household head, since sample coverage is generally better for females than for males.

In estimating crimes against persons, a further adjustment is required in those cases where an incident involved more than one person, thereby allowing for the probability that such incidents had more than one chance of coming into the sample. Thus, if it is determined that two persons were

28

victimized in a single incident, the weights used in tabulating incidents and associated characteristics, such as time and place of occurrence, must be reduced by one-half to avoid double counting of incidents. This adjustment is not necessary for estimating household crimes, because each separate criminal act was defined as involving only one household. Where a personal crime is reported in the household survey as occurring simultaneously with a commercial robbery, it is assumed that the _incident_ is represented by the commercial survey and therefore it is not counted as a personal incident as well. However, the details of the personal crime as they affect the victim are included in the _household_ survey.

Series victimizations

As mentioned in the preface, victimizations occurring in series of three or more, where the victim is unable to describe the details of each incident separately, have been excluded from the tables in this report. Because respondents have difficulty in pinpointing the dates of these acts, this information is recorded by the season or seasons of occurrence during the 6-month reference period. All other crimes are tabulated by the quarter of the year in which they took place. Thus, it is not possible, short of allocating multiseasonal crimes to particular months, to produce data for series victimizations for the same time period as for crimes in the regular tables. The nearest approximation to calendar 1973 is to take series victimizations reported during the interview period from April 1973 through March 1974. There is an 87.5 percent overlap between the reporting periods for the regular victimization data and the series victimizations using this approach.

The table on the next page shows that there were slightly more than 1 million series victimizations in the personal crime sector and about 760,000 in the household sector. In the national survey, these tend disproportionately to be either assaults, more likely simple than aggravated, or household larcenies, where the amount of loss was valued at less than $50 or was unknown.

Reliability of the estimates

The particular sample used for this survey is only one of a large number of possible samples of the same size that could have been selected using the same sample design and sample selection procedures. Estimates derived from different samples would differ from each other. The standard

29

Table I. Number of series victimizations and percent distribution of series victimizations compared with victimizations not in series, by type of crime

| Type of crime | Number of series victimizations | Percent distribution | |
		Series 4/73–3/74	Not in series 1973
Crimes against persons	1,052,800	100.0	[2]100.0
Crimes of violence	487,420	46.3	27.1
Rape	[1]8,120	0.8	0.8
Robbery	51,570	4.9	5.5
Robbery and attempted robbery with injury	[1]7,490	0.7	1.9
Robbery without injury	19,950	1.9	2.1
Attempted robbery without injury	24,130	2.3	1.6
Assault	427,730	40.6	20.8
Aggravated assault	134,560	12.8	8.3
With injury	42,530	4.0	2.7
Attempted assault with weapon	92,030	8.7	5.6
Simple assault	293,170	27.9	12.5
With injury	46,630	4.4	3.1
Attempted assault without weapon	246,540	23.4	9.4
Crimes of theft	565,380	53.7	72.9
Personal larceny with contact	[1]9,350	0.9	2.5
Personal larceny without contact	556,030	52.8	70.4
Crimes against households	760,280	100.0	[2]100.0
Burglary	277,560	36.5	41.9
Forcible entry	70,840	9.3	13.3
Unlawful entry without force	150,230	19.8	19.3
Attempted forcible entry	56,500	7.4	9.3
Household larceny	458,150	60.3	49.4
Under $50	318,640	41.9	31.8
$50 or more	88,820	11.7	12.3
Amount not available	31,090	4.1	1.8
Attempted larceny	19,600	2.6	3.6
Motor vehicle theft	24,570	3.2	8.7
Completed theft	[1]8,620	1.1	5.6
Attempted theft	15,950	2.1	3.0

NOTE: Detail may not add to total shown because of rounding.
[1]Estimate, based on 10 or fewer sample cases, is statistically unreliable.
[2]Percents based on 1973 totals of 20,281,700 victimizations against persons and 15,354,200 directed against households.

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 95 out of 100 that the difference would be less than twice the standard error and 99 out of 100 chances that it would be less than $2\frac{1}{2}$ times the standard error.

In addition to sampling error, the survey estimates are subject to nonsampling errors. It is felt that the major source of nonsampling error in this survey results from problems in recalling victimization experiences that have occurred over the 6 months prior to the time of interview. There are several aspects to this recall problem. One is the ability of the respondent to recall all the pertinent events that occurred to him during the 6-month period. Another is when the respondent recalls correctly that a specific event occurred during the reference period, but places it in the wrong month. This source of error is partially offset by the requirement for monthly interviewing and by the estimation procedure mentioned earlier. An additional problem involves telescoping, or bringing within the appropriate 6-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. The effect of telescoping can be 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, he can then determine from discussion with the respondent whether it duplicates the earlier report or is a separate incident.

Methodological research undertaken in preparation for this survey has indicated that substantially fewer incidents of crime are reported when one 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 the general rule of interview. The only exceptions permitted are that the responses for 12- and 13-year-olds are to be obtained from a responsible adult; proxy respondents are also permissible in cases where respondents are physically unable or mentally incompetent to answer the questions or when a household member is away from home and is not expected to return during the survey period.

Despite these attempts to minimize recall problems, memory lapses inevitably occur. Some evidence of the extent of this problem can be obtained from the findings of the reinterview program in which a sample of approximately 5 percent of the interviewed cases in each month are interviewed a second time by a supervisor or a senior interviewer. Differences between the original interview and the reinterview are then reconciled by discussion between the reinterviewer and the respondent. Estimates of crime incident rates from the reinterview survey after reconciliation were slightly higher than estimates obtained in the original survey. However, there was no statistically significant difference between them.

Additional sources of nonsampling error result from other types of response errors, systematic data errors introduced by the interviewer, possible biases resulting from the rotation group pattern used, and mistakes made in coding and processing the data. Many of these errors would also occur in a complete census. Quality control measures, such as interviewer observation, with retraining, as appropropriate, and reinterview, 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 the nonsampling errors, i.e., the part due to random response and interviewer errors but do not reflect any systematic biases in the data.

Computation and application of the standard errors

The standard errors given in Table II are applicable to personal victimization rates, and the standard errors in Table III are applicable to household victimization rates. The standard errors for estimated rates not shown in these tables may be approximated by linear interpolation.

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 will represent the actual standard error quite accurately for the difference between uncorrelated sample estimates. If, however, there is a large 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.

Use of tables of standard errors

Table 1 of this report shows that the total population age 12 and over used as a base for calculating victimization rates for calendar year 1973 was 162,236,000. For these persons the victimization rate for crimes of violence was 33.9 per 1,000 persons. Table II gives, by linear interpolation, 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 fallen within 0.5 of this rate, and the chances are 95 out of 100 that a complete census would have produced an estimate within 1.0 of this rate, or that the 95 percent confidence interval is from 32.9 to 34.9.

Computing the standard error of a difference

Table 4 of this report shows that the number of persons age 12-15 used as a base for calculating victimization rates for calendar year 1973 was 16,559,000. For these persons the victimization rate for personal larceny was 175.8 per 1,000 persons. Table 4 also shows that the number of persons age 16-19 used as a base for calculating victimization rates for calendar year 1973 was 15,584,000. For these persons the victimization rate for personal larceny was 168.9 per 1,000 persons.

The standard error of each of these two rates is obtained from Table II 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 6.9 between the two rates would vary by less than 5.3 from the difference derived from a complete census, or a confidence interval of from 1.6 to 12.2. However, the two standard error, or 95 percent confidence level, would yield an interval of 10.6 points (5.3 x 2), which is larger than the

estimated difference of 6.9, and therefore the difference is not significant at this level. Neither is it significant at the 90 percent level, or 1.6 times the standard error (5.3 x 1.6=8.5), so that not even a qualified statement is permitted with respect to this difference. In other words, the apparent difference between the personal larceny rates for persons 12 to 15 years old and those age 16 to 19 is not statistically significant according to the standards used in analyzing data in this report.

Table II. Standard error approximations for personal victimization rates

(68 chances out of 100)

Base of rate (000)	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
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

Source of data

The national sample for the commercial survey focuses on victimization experiences directed against business enterprises and other organizational entities throughout the United States but excludes all units of Federal, State, or local government. Estimates for this survey are based on data obtained from a stratified multistage cluster sample consisting of a total of 34 sample areas, of which 10 were selected with certainty and are therefore self-representing. The remaining sample areas were chosen from an original total of 240 strata that had been collapsed into 24 large strata, with each of the latter being as homogeneous as possible with respect to size, geographic region, and whether the area was metropolitan or nonmetropolitan. Several stages of selection yielded 24 substrata chosen with equal probability and in such a way to avoid strata used in other current business surveys. Within each stratum, one area was selected to represent the entire stratum, with sample segments 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 canvass the selected segments and conduct interviews at all business establishments and other organizational units located within the boundaries of the segment.

A sample of an estimated 2,900 businesses was designated for interview each month, which has yielded about 2,400 interviewed establishments. Of the 500 businesses that were not interviewed, the large majority were not eligible for interview because the business location was vacant, the building had been demolished, or the business was otherwise not qualified for interview. Businesses eligible for interview where no interview was obtained because the business was temporarily closed during the interview period or because the manager refused to grant an interview amounted to less than 1 percent of those eligible in 1973.

Table III. Standard error approximations for household victimization rates (68 chances out of 100)

Base of rate (000)	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	2.4	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	0.3	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

The sample is divided into six panels, one of which is interviewed each month during a given 6-month period. Unlike the household survey, there is no rotation procedure in the commercial sample. Establishments are therefore 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 victimizations and victimization rates. 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 the tabulation of nationwide estimates. The final weight was the product of the basic weight (500 for the full sample), reflecting each selected establishment's probability of being in sample and an adjustment for noninterview. The noninterview adjustment was calculated for each of 17 kind of business classes and 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 discovered that a business had not operated at the current address for the entire 6-month reference period, an attempt was made to secure information for the balance of the period from any previous business establishment formerly at that location, or in the case of vacancies, from neighboring businesses. However, no further adjustment was made in the weights in case of failure to account for the full reference period.

Series victimizations were not treated separately in the commercial survey because better record keeping enabled business respondents to provide details of multiple victimizations during the 6-month reference period. Thus, all reported incidents of burglary and robbery against commercial establishments are included in the data tables.

Reliability of the 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 sample 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 the coefficients of variation that are presented in this Appendix in the form of standard errors for estimates generated by the survey. 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, the Appendix table displays 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 table permits 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 standard error displayed in the table. 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, the survey estimates of business crime victimizations are also subject to nonsampling errors. Principal among these is the problem of recalling victimization experiences that occurred during the 6 months prior to interview. Because of a number of factors inherent in the nature of the survey, it is likely that these errors are not as prevalent in the commercial survey as they are in the household survey. These factors include more complete record keeping by businesses, the greater likelihood of reporting to police, and 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 in which the interviewer reminds the respondent at the beginning of the interview of any incidents that were reported during the previous interview.

A reinterview program has been instituted in the commercial survey, involving about 3 percent of the interviewed establishments each month. Results to date indicate that differences between the reinterview and the original interview are minimal and are well within sampling error. Another quality control measure involves a recheck of approximately 10 percent of each month's interviewer listing of qualifying establishments to obtain measures of coverage.

Other types of nonsampling error arise from the interview situation and from mistakes made at the processing stage. Quality control measures, similar to those used in the household survey, were employed to keep such errors as low as possible.

Use of the table of standard errors

Table 11 of this report indicates that the victimization rate for robbery of service establishments was 24.7 per 1,000 establishments. Table IV shows that this rate has a standard error of 5.5. Thus, the confidence interval around the estimate is from 19.2 to 30.2, or that 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 95 out of 100 that a complete enumeration would have resulted in an estimate within a range of two standard errors, or from 13.7 to 35.7. Rough approximations of the standard errors of estimates not shown in Table IV may be made by comparing them with estimates in the table for similar rates related to bases of comparable size.

Table IV. Standard error estimates for commercial victimization

(68 chances out of 100)

Characteristic	Victimization rate (per 1,000 establishments)	Standard error
All businesses with burglary or robbery	242.5	15.5
Retail business burglary	262.4	14.2
Service business robbery	24.7	5.5
Burglary of business with:		
No paid employees	153.2	12.7
8 or more paid employees	255.2	21.2

DEFINITIONS

Terms related to crime

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.

Assault - An unlawful physical attack by one person upon another, including both aggravated and simple assault. 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 home or business, usually, but not necessarily, attended by theft. Includes attempted forcible entry.

Forcible Entry - A form of burglary in which force is used to gain entry, (e.g., by breaking a window or slashing a screen).

Household Larceny - Theft or attempted theft of property or cash from the home, involving neither forcible nor unlawful entry, or from its immediate vicinity.

Incident - A specific criminal act involving one or more victims and offenders.

Motor Vehicle Theft - Stealing or unauthorized taking of a motor vehicle, including attempts at such acts. Motor vehicles include automobiles, trucks, motorcycles and any other motorized vehicle that is legally allowed on most roads and highways.

Personal Crimes of Theft - Theft of property or cash, either with contact (but without force or threat of force) or without contact between victim and offender. Equivalent to Personal Larceny.

Personal Crimes of Violence - Rape, robbery of persons, and assault.

Personal Larceny - Equivalent to Personal Crimes of Theft.

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, without direct contact
between victim and offender, of property or cash from any place
other than the victim's home or its immediate vicinity. Also
includes attempted theft.

Rape – Carnal knowledge through the use of force or the threat of force,
including attempts. Statutory rape (without force) is excluded.

Robbery – 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.

Robbery 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 eye,
cuts, scratches, swelling) or undetermined but requiring less
than 2 days of hospitalization.

Robbery without Injury – Theft or attempted theft from a person, accom-
panied by force or the threat of force, either with or without a
weapon, but not resulting in injury.

Simple Assault – Attack without a weapon resulting either in minor
injury (e.g., bruises, black eye, cuts, scratches, swelling) or in
undetermined injury requiring less than 2 days of hospitalization.
Also includes attempted assault without a weapon.

Stranger/Nonstranger – Refers to whether or not the victim of a crime
involving personal contact knew the offender. The offender was
classified as a stranger if the victim so stated, did not know
whether or not he was a stranger, or knew the offender only by
sight. Otherwise, the offender was considered as a nonstranger.

Unlawful Entry – A form of burglary committed by someone having no legal
right to be in the premises even though force is not used.

Victimization – A specific criminal act as it affects a single victim.
In criminal acts against persons, the number of victimizations is
determined by the number of victims of such acts. Because more
than one individual may be victimized during certain crimes
against persons, the number of victimizations is somewhat higher
than the number of incidents. Each criminal act against a house-
hold or commercial establishment is assumed to involve a single
victim, the affected household or establishment.

Victimization Rates – 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.

Other terms

Age – The appropriate age category is determined by the age of the person at his last birthday.

Family Income – Includes the income of the household head and all other persons related to him who live in the sample unit. Covers the previous 12 months and includes wages, salaries, net income from business or farm, pensions, interest, dividends, rent or any other money income.

Household – Consists of the occupants of separate living quarters meeting one 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 Head – One person in each household is designated as the "head." The head is usually the person regarded as the head by the members of the household.

Kind of Business – As used in this report, kind of business is divided into retail, service, and other. Retail businesses are open to the general public and sell goods primarily to individuals for their own use. Service businesses are primarily engaged in providing professional services, lodging, personal or repair services, or amusement or recreation facilities to the general public. "Other" includes as major categories manufacturing, real estate, wholesale, transportation, communications activities, and banks.

Marital Status – Each household member is assigned to one of the following categories: 1) Married, which also includes persons who indicate they have a common-law marriage and persons parted temporarily for reasons other than marital discord (employment, armed services, etc.); 2) Separated or 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 who do not mention common-law marriage.

Race – Determined by the interviewer by observation as white, black, or other. Asked only about persons not related to the household head who were not present at the time of interview.

Tenure – As used in this report, tenure is divided into two categories: 1) Owners, including those who are in the process of buying their living quarters but still are paying on a mortgage, and 2) Renters, which also includes those who occupy their quarters rent-free.

46

47

END