



A VICTIMIZATION SURVEY OF THE ELDERLY

SOMERSET COUNTY, NEW JERSEY

Stanley F. Ehrlich

Somerset County College

Somerville, New Jersey 08876

January 1980

64430

Preface

This project was funded through New Jersey State Law Enforcement Planning Agency Grant No. A-B: 134-77. The grant was written by and processed through the office of Andrew Consovoy, Somerset County Criminal Justice Planner, who also assisted and provided invaluable logistical support for the project.

Elizabeth Papke and Ann Cosgrove conducted interviews with sensitive questions in a most professional manner. It is only due to their persistence and cajoling that the survey was able to reach the large number of respondents that it did. In addition, they also pretested the survey instrument, and played a major role in the development and revision of the questionnaires. Finally, Liz and Ann performed many of the countless other tasks that enabled the study to be completed.

Data Processing and computer programming was coordinated by Dr. Geraldine Vandenberg. Her assistance especially helped to put the large volume of information into a useable form.

A special thanks to the senior citizens who consented to participate in this study. It is through their willingness to get involved that we are better able to understand the special problems of the elderly in Somerset County. We deeply appreciate their time and cooperation.

NCJRS

JAN 28 1980

ACQUISITIONS

Contents

<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
Preface	i
List of Tables	iii
I. Introduction	1
II. Summary of Findings	3
III. Methodology	5
IV. Limitations of the Study	9
V. Analysis of the Data	12
- The Extent of Crime	13
- Reporting v. Non-reporting	14
- Age	16
- Amount of Loss	16
- Education	18
- Family Income	18
- Location of Offense	19
- Marital Status	20
- Number of Household Members	21
- Relationship to Household Head	22
- Occupation	22
- Value of Dwelling/Rental Amount	23
VI. Policy Implications	26
VII. Tables	29
- Explanation of Tables	29
- Tables	30 - 63
VIII. Appendix	64
- Basic Screen Questionnaire	
- Crime Incident Report	

List of Tables

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
I- 1 Percent of Index Offenses Reported by Victims Age 60 and Over, Somerset County, 1977	30
III- 1 Senior Citizen Sample with Published Telephone Numbers	31
V- 1 Numerical Distribution of Crime Type by Township (Unweighted), 1978	33
V- 2 Number and Rate of Victimizations, by type of crime, 1978	34
V- 3 Percent distribution of victims reporting and not reporting crimes to the police by type of crime	35
V- 4 Percent distribution of victims and non-victims by age	36
V- 5 Percent distribution of victims and non-victims by sex and age	37
V- 6 Percent distribution of victims reporting and not reporting crimes to the police by age	38
V- 7 Percent distribution of all victims reporting and not reporting crimes to the police by sex and age	39
V- 8 Percent distribution of victims reporting and not reporting crimes to the police by amount of loss	40
V- 9 Percent distribution of victims and non-victims by education	41
V-10 Percent distribution of victims and non-victims by sex and education	42
V-11 Percent distribution of victims reporting and not reporting crimes to the police by education	43
V-12 Percent distribution of victims reporting and not reporting crimes to the police by sex and education	44
V-13 Percent distribution of victims and non-victims by family income	45
V-14 Percent distribution of victims reporting and not reporting crimes to the police by family income	46
V-15 Percent distribution of crimes by location of occurrence	47

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
V-16 Percent distribution of victims by sex and location of occurrence	48
V-17 Percent distribution of victims reporting and not reporting crimes to the police by location of occurrence	49
V-18 Percent distribution of victims reporting and not reporting crimes to the police by sex and location of occurrence	50
V-19 Percent distribution of victims and non-victims by marital status	51
V-20 Percent distribution of victims reporting and not reporting crimes to the police by marital status .	52
V-21 Percent distribution of victims and non-victims by number of household members under age 60	53
V-22 Percent distribution of victims reporting and not reporting crimes to the police by number of household members under age 60	54
V-23 Percent distribution of victims and non-victims by number of household members age 60 and over	55
V-24 Percent distribution of victims reporting and not reporting crimes to the police by number of household members over age 60	56
V-25 Percent distribution of victims and non-victims by their relationship to the head of the household .	57
V-26 Percent distribution of victims and non-victims by occupation	58
V-27 Percent distribution of victims and non-victims by occupation sector	59
V-28 Percent distribution of victims reporting crimes to the police by occupation	60
V-29 Percent distribution of victims reporting and not reporting crimes to the police by occupation sector	61
V-30 Percent distribution of victims and non-victims by rental amount and value of dwelling	62
V-31 Percent distribution of victims reporting and not reporting crimes to the police by rental amount and value of dwelling	63

I. Introduction

Prior studies have highlighted the elderly as a vulnerable target for the criminal offender. Lacking the capability to physically defend themselves, afraid to venture far from their dwellings, and often financially unable to relocate to safer surroundings, senior citizens appear especially prone to victimization. In addition, the element of fear that pervades many of their lives may be attributed to a fear of victimization.

Of Somerset County's population of 215,000, approximately 24,000 are citizens age 60 and over. A 1977 analysis of crime among senior citizens showed a relatively low crime rate reported to the police. (See Table I-1) Cursory examination of the data might lead to the conclusion that senior citizens in Somerset County suffer a low rate of crime, possibly due to Somerset's wealthy and rural nature that is generally unscathed by many of the violent crimes that abound in more urbanized areas. Between 1972 and 1977, however, reported Part I offenses in Somerset County increased by 38.2%.

In order to accurately measure the crime situation of its senior citizens, Somerset County received a grant from the New Jersey State Law Enforcement Planning Agency (SLEPA) that covered a multifold purpose:

1. Develop a comprehensive educational program to be presented to all of the elderly citizens in Somerset County to reduce the opportunity for victimization.

2. Reduce the fear and apprehension of crime among the elderly citizens in Somerset County.

3. Reduce crime committed against senior citizens.

4. Conduct a victimization study concerning crime against the elderly in Somerset County.

To accomplish the fourth objective, the Somerset County Board of Chosen Freeholders contracted with Somerset County College to conduct a victimization survey of the elderly. Specifically, the survey was intended to:

1. Estimate the extent of crime among senior citizens (age 60 and over) in Somerset County.

2. Analyze reasons for non-reporting of crimes to the police by senior citizens.

3. Examine characteristics of victims to determine if certain sub-groups suffer from crime at disproportionately higher rates.

4. Recommend policy that might be implemented to alleviate some of the crime problems currently faced by senior citizens.

Prior to conducting the survey, a review of the literature disclosed few research projects similar to this effort. In fact, there have been no published random victimization surveys of the elderly at the county level; most work has entailed interviews with known victims collected from police files. The most comprehensive study to date, still continuing on an on-going basis, is supervised by the National Criminal Justice Information and Statistics Service. Its National Crime Survey is designed to analyze a host of variables regarding crime victims at all age levels on a nationwide basis.

II. Summary of Findings

This victimization survey of the elderly in Somerset County uncovered a high rate of victimization, 331 crimes per 1000 population. The majority of the crimes concerned property, not personal attacks, with many of the incidents appearing to be the type commonly committed by juveniles. In those instances where the victim knew or saw the offender, a juvenile was the perpetrator in almost every case.

Over 83% of all crimes occurred within or near the home, and included petty larcenies, unskilled burglaries, and malicious mischief. Almost one-half of all crimes were not reported to the police, with the principal reason being the victim did not think the incident important enough to report. A higher property loss substantially increased the chances that a crime was reported to the police.

There appears to be a link between education and income, and victimization. In fact, this is confirmed via a relationship between dwelling value and crime; income is tied to education, and better educated, higher income earners reside in dwellings with higher values. Rather than being centered among the elderly poor, middle class senior citizens appear to shoulder the burden of crime. In addition, victimization is spread throughout Somerset County.

To deal most effectively with this problem, action should be taken at the county level, since that would be a logical point to centralize crime prevention, citizen education, and law enforcement efforts. Law enforcement authorities must

recognize that the senior citizen has unique needs and concerns, and the police must be specially trained to deal with these problems. In addition, senior citizens must be educated in ways to reduce the opportunity for victimization, and learn that their fears of violent crimes may be somewhat exaggerated.

III. Methodology

Cost, time, and logistical factors precluded surveying all 24,000 senior citizens in Somerset County. It was possible, however, to interview a sample of the senior citizen population and draw inferences for the entire population.

In order to select a sample of senior citizens for the victimization survey, the Somerset County Office on Aging cooperated with Somerset County College, allowing the College to utilize its mailing list. The list provided names and addresses of approximately 7,000 persons either receiving services from the Office on Aging, and/or members of the many Senior Citizens clubs located throughout the County.

Based upon 1970 census figures and 1978 population estimates, a distribution of senior citizens among the 21 municipalities within Somerset County was calculated. Utilizing these percentages, a proportional sample was selected from the Office on Aging mailing list, totalling 1,020 households.

Concurrent with efforts of sample selection, a questionnaire was developed to collect pertinent information relative to the interests of both policy makers and researchers. After numerous revisions, a questionnaire was drafted utilizing the basic format of the National Crime Survey, modified for the unique requirements of this study. The questionnaire included space for socioeconomic data, as well as for specific information on any victimization(s) that may have occurred. In addition to questions on income, age, education, etc., dwelling value or housing rental costs were included to aid in determining wealth.

Once a working draft questionnaire was completed, the instrument was pretested for accuracy, thoroughness, order and any other problems that might be uncovered. Twenty senior citizen victims from two communities were selected from police files and interviewed; as the questionnaire included two forms (Form 1 for all interviewees, Form 2 for victims only), interviewing known crime victims allowed the interviewers to gain experience with the entire form as well as detect any changes that might be required.

After the pretest was completed and analyzed, additional revisions were undertaken prior to the completion of the final data collection instruments. (See Appendix).

While compiling names for the sample, telephone directories and directory information were used to note the phone numbers of all senior citizens in the sample with published numbers. Of the entire sample, 548 telephone numbers were obtained.

Prior to interviews, letters were sent to the presidents of Senior Citizens clubs throughout Somerset County informing them and their members of the study and the fact that some members would be telephoned. Publicity in the media also alerted senior citizens to the project.

After reviewing alternative methods of collecting information, telephone interviewing was selected for reasons of both efficiency and economy. A few days prior to calling each senior citizen with a published telephone number, a letter was sent informing them they would be called by an interviewer from Somerset County College to gather information for the victimization

study. As table III-I demonstrates, the interviewers were able to complete over 90% of their calls once a respondent was reached.

For those senior citizens with unpublished telephone numbers, a mailing was sent requesting them to provide their telephone number to aid in the survey. A stamped, addressed envelope was also provided. Many of these letters were returned with indications that the parties were either deceased or moved. Ultimately, an additional 40 senior citizens were interviewed.

The interview was designed to elicit information from each senior citizen that might assist in determining if a sub-group exists that is either more or less prone to being victimized by crime. Form 1 included basic household and personal information, along with screening questions to determine if the respondent or the household had been victimized during the period from January 1, 1978 through December 31, 1978. If the interviewer uncovered a possible victimization, Form 2 was utilized to gather facts about the offender (if known), circumstances surrounding the crime, extent of loss or injury, and whether the police had been notified. If the police were not called to report the crime, the questionnaire included statements covering why they had not been notified, and the respondent was asked to select reason(s) for non-notification. On a few occasions, a proxy interview was utilized. If the senior citizen was not available for interview, but another relative was able to provide all of the requested information, the interview was continued.

Upon completion of the interviews, the questionnaires were reviewed for accuracy. When a respondent reported a victimization, the facts of the incident were reviewed, and the crime was either appropriately categorized or not included. There were some instances where crime reporting was inconsistent with information that was presented during the interview. Rather than including incidents that were doubtful, they were eliminated entirely and not included in the final analysis.

Finally, there were seven victims reporting similar occurrences on three or more occasions. If the events appeared to follow a pattern, they were characterized as a series of crime, and counted as three criminal acts. Though some of the respondents reported they were victimized more than three times, that number was arbitrarily chosen to eliminate any possible exaggeration of events and distortion of data. In essence, those crimes that were included in the survey may represent fewer criminal acts than actually occurred during 1978.

IV. Limitations of the Study

Whenever a sample of the population is selected, there are a number of events that may occur to distort statistics derived from that sample. In this study, a number of factors may impact upon the information that was collected, and should be taken into consideration when examining the data presented herein.

First, the Office on Aging mailing list may not have been representative of the senior citizen population of Somerset County. Since it did include senior citizens that were recipients of the programs from that office, those persons may be in need of more assistance than other senior citizens in the County, and possibly poorer. Since one of the conclusions of this study was the relationship between increased wealth and victimization, this potential distortion does not appear sufficient to nullify findings of the survey. The numbers, however, may represent underestimates if the sample over represented poorer senior citizens.

Second, adjusting the senior citizen population of each town based upon total population growth or decline from the 1970 census may not have been accurate. In fact, senior citizen movement may have been greater or less than the total population change in each community. Large variations in this measurement may alter crime rate estimations for the senior citizen population of the County, since the data from each community was weighted to maintain proportions between the communities.

Third, 9.6% of the sample included persons with unlisted telephone numbers that willingly volunteered their numbers to participate in the survey. It cannot be determined if they are representative of the entire unlisted senior citizen population in the County or whether there are substantial differences between senior citizens with listed and unlisted telephone numbers. It should be noted, however, that the 40 senior citizens with unlisted telephone numbers reported crimes at a rate of 325 per 1000 population, while those senior citizens interviewed with listed telephone numbers reported crime at a rate of 332 per 1000 population.

Fourth, research on victimization surveys has revealed a telescoping effect that may occur. Interviewees may project crimes from 1977 into 1978, or may have forgotten crimes that occurred in 1978. Since these interviews were conducted during March, April and May in 1979 regarding crime that may have happened 14-17 months earlier, victims may have forgotten or exaggerated events that occurred. The overall effect of forgetting or projecting crimes, in this particular survey, cannot be accurately determined.

Fifth, there always exists the possibility of fabrication of criminal events. As noted previously, any crimes that were reported were carefully scrutinized, and criminal events were not included in this study if any doubts existed as to their authenticity.

Sixth, amount of loss and dwelling value were generally estimates of the respondent, and may be inaccurate. The upturn

in the housing market makes accurate estimates of value difficult to assess. In addition, determining replacement costs for damaged or stolen property is somewhat uncertain unless the victim replaced or repaired the item(s) after the incident occurred.

Seventh, for obvious reasons, out of county residents who were victimized within Somerset County could not be reached for inclusion in this survey. In addition, as this study only analyzed victimizations within Somerset County, incidents that occurred outside of the County but included County residents, also were not included in the data that was compiled.

Eighth, every resident did not answer every item on the questionnaire. Since the primary objective of this survey was to uncover victimizations, partially completed interviews were included if the questions pertaining to victimization were answered. But it cannot be determined whether those that omitted information for reasons of privacy were representative of the entire senior citizen population.

V. Analysis of the Data

In an attempt to uncover relationships between crime victims and socioeconomic characteristics, ten variables were examined:

1. Age
2. Amount of loss
3. Education
4. Family income
5. Location of Offense
6. Marital Status
7. Number of Household Members
8. Relation to Household Head
9. Occupation
10. Value of Dwelling/Rental Amount

As each variable included a number of categories, data was analyzed in terms of percentages. Each category is listed as a percentage of the entire variable. (i.e., In Table V-4, the 60-64 age group comprises 15.9% of all victims.) The percentages were also utilized to compare victims and non-victims as they relate to each category. (i.e., In Table V-4, the 60-64 age group comprises 15.6% of all non-victims.)

This same format was used to compare victims who reported and those who failed to report crimes to the police. In this manner, it is possible to uncover some common characteristics of each group and highlight segments of the elderly population that require special attention from the law enforcement community.

Discounting series of offenses for which only one incident was included for analysis, and weighing the remaining crimes, 118 crimes are analyzed throughout. For most crimes, however, the offense was against the household, and not against any particular individual within it. Analysis of victims of these property crimes depended upon the respondent; interpretation of the data should include this understanding.

The Extent of Crime:

Of the 417 senior citizens interviewed, 96 reported being victimized. The actual crimes varied from assault to petty larceny, and included a large number of vandalism-type offenses (malicious mischief). The 96 victims reported 138 crimes, yielding a victimization rate of 331 per 1000 population. While this number is high, it includes crimes not traditionally incorporated in the Federal Bureau of Investigation or New Jersey State Police Crime Index. (For 1978, the index offenses included murder, atrocious assault, rape, robbery, larceny, motor vehicle theft, and breaking and entering/burglary.)

While it is important to refrain from making comparisons with published crime statistics due to the different classifications that were utilized, the extent of the crime problem facing senior citizens in Somerset County should not be underestimated. While the problem does not appear to be one of personal safety, senior citizens are beset by property offenses that lead to both economic loss and a sense of frustration that was expressed by a number of survey respondents.

Table V-1 is a numerical distribution of crime by township reported, and type of offense. It includes an indicator so series of similar offenses can be easily recognized. The table is not weighted, and the information that was collected served as the basis for the entire analysis of data.

Table V-2 is the number and rate of victimization by type of crime. It includes the number of each offense reported, as well as a weighted rate per 1000 population. Examining the information that was collected reveals a large percentage of crime that is traditionally committed by juveniles; malicious mischief, petty larceny, unskilled burglary. Whether the senior citizen is singled out by these youthful offenders as a specific target is unknown, but in those few instances where the offender was seen by the victim, a juvenile was generally observed.

Reporting v. Non-Reporting:

There are a number of factors that influence a victim's decision to report a crime to the police. They include the type of offense, extent of loss, confidence in and relations with the local police department, the offender (if known or suspected) and his/her relationship to the victim, past experience with the criminal justice system, location of the offense, advice of friends and relatives, etc. The National Crime Survey has disclosed that at least one-half of all crimes that are committed are not reported to the police, and this survey reached very similar conclusions.

Taking into account multiple victimizations but not multiple victimizations from series of crimes, an analysis of the remaining

118 crimes revealed 61 were reported to the police, while the other 58 were not. (Rounding causes the total to appear as 119.)

For those not reporting crimes to the police, the following reasons were given:

	Number	%
Did not think it important.	32	65.3
Nothing could be done; lack of proof	15	30.6
Police wouldn't want to be bothered	8	16.3
Reported to someone else	4	8.2
Afraid of reprisal.	3	6.1
Private or personal matter	2	4.1
Did not want to get involved	2	4.1
Miscellaneous Reasons	4	8.2

(Note: Percentages exceed 100 due to multiple reasons cited by some victims. The numbers reflect the 49 victims that cited reasons for not reporting a crime to the police.)

It is apparent that most victims felt that many criminal incidents do not warrant attention by the police. While this is especially true of relatively petty offenses or those with little or no loss to the victim, failure to report crimes deprives the police of gaining an accurate picture of crime within each community. Without this information, municipal police departments cannot effectively deploy their resources and appropriately address a problem they may not even know exists.

Not surprisingly, the more serious crimes had a higher rate of reporting than the minor offenses. Assaults, burglary with forcible entry, and larcenies over \$50 all had a substantial

portion of incidents reported. There was far less reporting for petty larcenies and attempted burglaries. Table V-3 reflects the extent of reporting for each type of crime.

Age:

The percentage of victims and non-victims in the 60-69 age range is virtually equal, while the percentages of victims in the 70-79 bracket is higher than non-victims. The reverse is true for those 80 and older. Given these results, no clear pattern exists concerning victimization. Table V-4 depicts these findings, while Table V-5 also distinguishes sex and age of both victims and non-victims.

Similarly, no clear pattern exists for reporting of crimes, though females in the 60-69 age range reported crime at a greater rate than males, while males 70-79 reported crime more often than females. Since the numbers are relatively small and this issue was not pursued in-depth, no explanation is readily available for any differences in victimization or reporting due to age. Table V-6 displays reporting and non-reporting of offenses by age of victims, and Table V-7 adds sex as a variable.

Amount of Loss:

In over one-half of the victimizations uncovered during the course of this study, the amount of loss (property either stolen or damaged) was not available. In some instances, the information was unknown due to a lack of followup by the victim. In other situations, repairs to damaged property were made by the

victim, and no market cost was obtained. Also, some senior citizens reported they did not replace property that was stolen or damaged. An examination of those incidents where loss was estimated revealed that the majority of criminal acts resulting in little or no loss were not reported to the police.

As amount of loss increased, the probability of police reporting also increased. Obviously, increased loss means increased concern on the part of the victim, and/or a chance for partial recovery through insurance or as an itemized deduction on the Federal income tax return. Both methods usually require substantiation of a claim, and a police report is an effective vehicle to accomplish this task.

For very small losses, senior citizens reported they did not want to bother the police or waste their own time with police involvement. They also revealed that a minimal loss was not worth the paperwork or time that they thought would accompany police involvement.

In a very small number of cases, insurance coverage was elicited from the respondent. Nine of the 11 victims possessing insurance for theft/vandalism losses also reported the acts to the police. The numbers are too small, however, to draw any meaningful conclusions.

Table V-8 is the percent distribution of victims reporting and not reporting crimes to the police by amount of loss.

Education:

There appears to exist a relationship between education and victimization. In part, this is probably related to other variables like income and housing, which ultimately place an individual in a relatively better neighborhood which may be more attractive to a criminal offender. Table V-9 relates education to victimization, while Table V-10 includes sex as an additional factor.

Victims with 12 or more years of education also reported victimizations to the police at a rate slightly higher than the total senior citizen population. Victims with an education of 12 or more years comprised 42.2% of male victims and 41.1% of the female victims. As a proportion of those reporting crime, the numbers were 47.6 and 45.0 respectively. Tables V-11 and V-12 reveal reporting information as it relates to education of the victim, and sex and education of the victim.

Family Income:

As income increases, the proportion of victims increases as compared to non-victims. While family income was not available from over 25% of the survey respondents, it is still clear that the family income of senior citizens is somewhat depressed. There were relatively few senior citizens reporting incomes over \$12,000, a standard that provides few luxuries. Some respondents indicated their personal income while not making income of the entire family available. In those instances, family income was considered not available.

Further, it cannot be assumed that those persons who declined to provide their income came from upper-income groups. Some respondents merely did not know the answer to this question, while others found the question very private and did not want their answer disclosed for survey purposes. Table V-13 relates victimization to income categories.

There appears to be no relationship between reporting crimes to the police and income of the family victimized, as disclosed in Table V-14.

Location of Offense:

Over 83% of all crimes occurred either in the home or in an area immediately surrounding it (porch, driveway, lawn, etc.) Though fewer males were interviewed and reported fewer crimes, they did have more victimization occur on the streets than females. Females reported a larger percentage of offenses occurring within the home.

If there is an element of fear felt by senior citizens regarding venturing far from their home, it appears that there is no basis in fact for this apprehension. If they are victimized by crime, they will more probably be victimized either in or around their home. There does exist a need to study habits of senior citizens; were those that were victimized often away from their dwelling, thus making it more susceptible to vandalism or larceny? If this is true, those senior citizens staying home due to fear of crime may not become victims, while other elderly that move about without hesitation (or needless

risk) may be exposing their living quarters.

Table V-15 depicts the location of the various crimes that were uncovered during this study, while Table V-16 analyzes sex of victim and location of occurrence.

Offenses that occurred in the home were reported more often than those occurring in the street, while offenses occurring near the home (malicious mischief, larceny of private property) were reported approximately 50% of the time.

Increased reporting of incidents in the home may be due to the invasion of privacy felt by victims. The thought of a stranger entering one's home is very unsettling to many individuals, and this may cause a stronger response (calling the police) than having a minor piece of property damaged or stolen.

Table V-17 details reporting and non-reporting of crimes by location of occurrence, while Table V-18 includes sex as a factor.

Marital Status:

Marital status does not appear to affect the extent of victimization, with married and widowed senior citizens comprising very similar percentages of both victims and non-victims. Table V-19 details this information.

There are some dissimilarities regarding the reporting of victimization to the police, with married victims comprising a higher percentage of those not reporting crime and widowed senior citizens reporting crime more often. An issue requiring

further study is the impact of a spouse at the crucial decision point of calling the police and reporting a crime. It is possible that a husband and wife may conclude that an event is not worthy of further investigation more often than a single senior citizen; degree of severity may be tempered by the presence of a second party (a spouse). Table V-20 is a percent distribution of victims reporting and non-reporting crimes to the police by marital status.

Number of Household Members:

The questionnaire included questions pertaining to the number of household members age 60 and over as well as under 60 years of age. In over half the sample, the senior citizen interviewed was the only member of the household who was a senior citizen.

No relationship between the number of members age 60 and over and crime was uncovered, though those households with two senior citizens were less likely to report crime. If we assume those two senior citizens were husband and wife, this would confirm a similar finding discussed under marital status; married senior citizens report crime less often than elderly who are widowed or single. Households with a single senior citizen had a far better reporting rate.

In contrast, households with more members under age 60 had a higher rate of crime. This may be partially attributed to the larger household, which statistically increases the chances for victimization within the home. If the senior

citizen is residing with a son or daughter and there are grandchildren present, these households may be in neighborhoods where more juveniles congregate.

Table V-21 and V-22 examine victimization and extent of reporting as compared to number of household members under 60, while Tables V-23 and V-24 detail this information as it relates to number of household members 60 and over.

Relationship to Household Head:

Almost 90% of the sample were either heads of their household or spouses of the head, with the remainder residing with a child or other relative. Regardless of their relationship to the head of the household, there was no impact on the extent of victimization, as evidenced by Table V-25.

Occupation:

There is no difference between the victims and non-victims of crime as they relate to current or most recent occupation, as indicated in Table V-26. Similar proportions of victims and non-victims were professionals, clerical, sales, laborers, etc. Though government employees appear to comprise a larger percentage of victims than non-victims, the large percentage of non-victims whose occupation and sector of employment were unknown precludes a definitive finding. Table V-27 relates victimization to sector of employment.

Interestingly, a large proportion of victims reporting their crimes to the police were laborers, while professionals comprised

a smaller percentage of victims reporting their crimes. This may relate to amount of loss, confidence in the police, attitude toward institutionalized procedures, and other factors not examined in this survey.

Government employees reported crimes at a higher rate as well. It is possible that these individuals have more faith in the processes of government and call the police if they believe the law was broken, though this was not confirmed.

Tables V-28 and V-29 relate crime reporting to occupation and sector of employment, respectively.

Value/Rental:

A substantial number of respondents (41.6%) failed to report the value of their dwelling or monthly rental costs. As income is lowered at retirement age, a value/rental amount is another, and possibly more accurate indicator to assist in determining wealth of the household. Often, for reasons of privacy, and occasionally for reasons of uncertainty about dwelling values, respondents who did provide dwelling values expressed ignorance of housing values, and the resulting guesses probably are underestimates due to the soaring housing market in many parts of Somerset County. For purposes of analysis, it is assumed that errors in judging dwelling values were consistent for both victims and non-victims.

A larger number of victims reported higher values than non-victims. Almost one-half of all victims owned dwellings worth over \$30,000, while 41.6% of all non-victims reported the

same. Senior citizen residents of middle-class communities like Bridgewater and Warren reported high rates of crime, and this may be due to criminal offenders seeking to commit unlawful acts in better neighborhoods. Obviously there is more to steal in terms of value in a better neighborhood, and probably more available for juveniles to damage as well.

Better neighborhoods may also cause residents to take less precautionary measures to prevent being victimized, through a false feeling of security. This would increase the opportunity for offenders to commit crime, opportunity that may not be readily available in communities where residents attempt preventative measures before being victimized. Those communities that border urban areas, such as Franklin and North Plainfield, are expected to have increased amounts of crime as a result of their proximity to high-crime areas. Residents in those areas may react to fears of crime and take positive steps to prevent it; this is probably not true in other middle-class communities not located near urban centers. Table V-30 depicts victimization and value/rental amounts.

Regarding crime reporting to the police, a larger percentage of renters reported crime. Though it is difficult to assess the significance of this finding, it may be surmised that renters either suffer larger losses or wealthier families were better able to absorb their losses from crime and chose not to process their victimization through appropriate channels. There may also be a confidence factor that is not expressed in percentages but merits further exploration; working class

citizens that own lower value dwellings and rent their living quarters instead of owning them, may be more prone to following institutionalized procedures like reporting crime to the police. Table V-31 details reporting and value/rental amount.

VI. Policy Implications

A research study that attempts to determine the extent and type of crime can be a valuable tool to deal with this serious problem. In this instance, a number of useful pieces of information have been derived that have direct implications for the law enforcement community. And, by analyzing the information that is contained in this report, it may be possible to alleviate some of the crime problems currently faced by the senior citizen population in Somerset County.

The recommendations that follow are not listed in order of importance. All are deemed important, though some can be implemented more easily than others. Regardless of the place each item appears on this list, all require further exploration by policy-makers in the criminal justice field.

1. Efforts at fighting crime against the elderly should be countywide, not centered in those communities where high crime is considered traditional. Though there was not a high rate of victimization uncovered in each municipality, the crime problem was pervasive throughout the County. A specially trained unit operating at the County level would be able to provide assistance as needed, and coordinate education, prevention and enforcement efforts throughout the 21 municipalities.

2. There exists a need to divert youthful activity to constructive endeavors. As a significant percentage of the crime suffered by the elderly is commonly committed by juvenile

offenders, deterring juveniles from this activity might possibly reduce some of the problems faced by senior citizens.

3. There is a need for education programs for the elderly to encourage them to report crime and be aware of the benefits of reporting crime to the police. Some elderly live in needless fear of victimization, and it is imperative that the police and senior citizens be aware of the true crime problem in each community. This would enable the police to take appropriate steps to deal with the problem, as well as allow the senior citizen to take measures to prevent being victimized.

4. There is little use for physical defense programs for the elderly in Somerset County, due to the relatively small amount of violent crime. More important is the need to harden crime targets and reduce the opportunity for crime to occur. Specifically, the home and its immediate surroundings appear most prone to criminal activity.

5. Police training should include the particular and special needs of the senior citizen population. Police should be advised on how to best deal with the elderly victim of crime.

6. Senior citizen housing projects should be considered. These apartment complexes place the elderly in a central location and make it easier to protect them. While placing the elderly in one central setting also increases the size of the

target for potential offenders, it also allows for a greater congregation of people that should lead to an increased feeling of security, reduced apprehension, and the opportunity to centralize programs that would allow senior citizens to live meaningful, productive lives.

VII. TABLES

Explanation of Tables:

All tables are weighted, except where indicated, to maintain a proportional representation throughout the 19 townships that were surveyed. In addition, where crime data is included, the number of crimes equals a weighted total of 118. This accounts for some of the 96 victims suffering more than one crime. Those victims that reported a series of a single offense had only one incident included for statistical analysis. Totals may not equal 100.0 percent or 118 crimes, however, due to rounding.

In those tables indicating percentages, the number of crimes is included in parenthesis below or next to each percentage.

Table I-1: Percent of Index Offenses Reported by
Victims Age 60 and Over, Somerset County, 1977

	Index Offenses						
	Murder	Rape	Robbery	Atrocious Assault	Breaking & Entering	Larceny Theft	Motor Vehicle Theft
Number	4	21	139	180	1,960	4,990	414
% Victims 60 and over (N=224)	-	-	2.8	-	13.5	5.8	4.2

Table III-1: Senior Citizen Sample with Published Telephone Numbers

<u>Municipality</u>	<u>CALLS</u>			
	<u>Total</u>	<u>Completed</u>	<u>Refused</u>	<u>Unable to Call</u>
Bedminster	8	6	1	1
Bernards	15	9	1	5
Bernardsville	33	23	2	8
Bound Brook	30	21	4	5
Branchburg	23	20	0	3
Bridgewater	55	37	3	15
Far Hills	3	3	0	0
Franklin	60	44	3	13
Green Brook	9	7	0	2
Hillsborough	36	23	4	9
Manville	26	17	5	4
Montgomery	26	10	5	11
North Plainfield	84	63	3	18
Peapack-Gladstone	11	5	0	6
Raritan	27	18	3	6
Somerville	48	32	4	12
S. Bound Brook	10	7	1	2
Warren	22	20	0	2
Watchung	22	12	1	9
TOTALS	548	377	40	131

Notes: 1. Two municipalities in the Township each had less than 1% of the elderly and were not included in the sample (Millstone and Rocky Hill).

2. Unable to call includes number disconnected, party moved, party deceased, medical problems precluding an interview, language barriers, etc. In addition, if a respondent could not be contacted after 5 attempts, he/she was placed in this category.

Table V-1: Numerical Distribution of Crime Type by Township (Unweighted), 1978

Township	N	Crime Type							Type					Totals		
		Assault	Robbery Without Injury	Purse Snatching	Personal Larceny Without Contact	Burglary Forcible Entry	Burglary Without Forcible Entry	Burglary Attempted Forcible Entry	Household Larceny Under \$50	Household Larceny \$50-\$200	Household Larceny Over \$200	Household Larceny Amount Not Available	Household Larceny Attempted		Motor Vehicle Theft Attempted	Malicious Mischief
Bedminster	8						1									1
Bernards	19					1	1									2
Bernardsville	25								1		3*		1			5
Bound Brook	22	1				1										4
Branchburg	20								1	1						5
Bridgewater	42	1					3	1	5	1			2		8	21
Far Hills	3															0
Franklin	49	4*				2		4	1		3*	1			5	20
Green Brook	10					1	1			1					1	4
Hillsborough	27	3*					2		2	2					1	10
Manville	17								1						1	2
Montgomery	11															0
North Plainfield	65		1	1	2	1	3	4	6	1		2			4	25
Peapack-Gladstone	5															0
Raritan	18						2		2	1		4*		1	1	11
Somerville	35				1										1	2
South Bound Brook	7															0
Warren	21			1a		1	1		5*	5*					4	17
Watchung	13					2			1						3	6
Totals	417	9	1	2	3	11	12	9	25	13	6	9	1	2	35	138

Notes:

- N - total number of respondents for each municipality
- * - denotes a series of crimes is included (3 similar events against the same individual)
- a - incident occurred in North Plainfield

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Table V-2: Number and Rate of Victimizations, by type of crime, 1978

<u>Category and Type of Crime</u>	<u>(Weighted) Rate per 1000</u>	<u>Number Reported</u>
A. Personal Crimes	35.07	15
1. Crimes of Violence	24.78	10
-Assault	22.8	9
-Robbery without Injury	1.98	1
2. Crimes of Theft	10.29	5
a. Personal Larceny with Contact	3.95	2
-Purse Snatching	3.95	2
b. Personal Larceny without Contact	6.34	3
B. Households	281.37	123
3. Burglary	74.78	32
-Forcible Entry	26.14	11
-Unlawful Entry without Force	28.05	12
-Attempted Forcible Entry	20.59	9
4. Household Larceny	119.21	54
-Less than \$50	54.47	25
-\$50-\$200	27.46	13
-Over \$200	13.09	6
-Amount Not Available	20.33	9
-Attempted Larceny	3.86	1
5. Motor Vehicle Thefts	5.12	2
-Attempted	5.12	2
6. Other	82.26	35
-Malicious Mischief	82.26	35

Table V-3: Percent distribution of victims reporting and not reporting crimes to the police by type of crime.

<u>Type of Crime</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Reported</u>	<u>Not Reported</u>	<u>Totals</u>
Assault	5	77.3 (4)	22.7 (1)	100.0
Robbery without Injury	1	0.0	100.0 (1)	100.0
Purse Snatching	2	0.0	100.0 (2)	100.0
Personal Larceny without Contact	3	0.0	100.0 (3)	100.0
Burglary with Forcible Entry	11	91.7 (10)	8.3 (1)	100.0
Burglary without Force	12	45.9 (5)	54.1 (6)	100.0
Attempted Burglary	9	34.1 (3)	65.9 (6)	100.0
Larceny (Under \$50)	21	20.0 (4)	80.0 (17)	100.0
Larceny (\$50-200)	10	74.8 (7)	25.2 (2)	100.0
Larceny (Over \$200)	2	100.0 (2)	0.0	100.0
Larceny (unknown value)	7	58.2 (4)	41.8 (3)	100.0
Attempted Larceny	2	0.0	100.0 (2)	100.0
Attempted Motor Vehicle Theft	2	100.0 (2)	0.0	100.0
Malicious Mischief	34	56.2 (19)	43.8 (15)	100.0
Totals	119	51.3 (61)	48.7 (58)	100.0

Table V-4: Percent distribution of victims and non-victims by age

		<u>AGE</u>					
	<u>Total</u>	<u>Not Available</u>	<u>60-64</u>	<u>65-69</u>	<u>70-74</u>	<u>75-79</u>	<u>80 and over</u>
Victims	100.0	6.0	15.9	23.5	25.2	17.3	12.1
	(118)	(7)	(19)	(28)	(30)	(20)	(14)
Non-Victims	100.0	8.6	15.6	21.9	22.5	12.9	18.5
	(322)	(28)	(50)	(71)	(72)	(41)	(60)

Table V-5: Percent distribution of victims and non-victims by sex and age

		<u>AGE</u>						
		<u>Total</u>	<u>Not Available</u>	<u>60-64</u>	<u>65-69</u>	<u>70-74</u>	<u>75-79</u>	<u>80 and over</u>
Male								
	Victims	100.0	2.0	18.3	22.1	26.6	22.9	8.0
		(45)	(1)	(8)	(10)	(12)	(10)	(4)
	Non-Victims	100.0	12.9	17.4	15.9	27.1	8.1	18.6
		(79)	(10)	(14)	(13)	(21)	(6)	(15)
Female								
	Victims	100.0	8.5	14.4	24.3	24.3	13.8	14.7
		(73)	(6)	(11)	(18)	(18)	(10)	(11)
	Non-Victims	100.0	7.2	14.5	24.0	21.1	14.5	18.6
		(242)	(18)	(35)	(58)	(51)	(35)	(45)

Table V-6: Percent distribution of victims reporting and not reporting crimes to the police by age.

	<u>Total</u>	<u>AGE</u>					
		<u>Not Available</u>	<u>60-64</u>	<u>65-69</u>	<u>70-74</u>	<u>75-79</u>	<u>80 and over</u>
Reporting	100.0	8.2	16.4	19.7	27.9	19.7	9.8
	(61)	(5)	(10)	(12)	(17)	(12)	(6)
Not Reporting	100.0	5.2	13.8	27.6	22.4	15.5	15.5
	(58)	(3)	(8)	(16)	(13)	(9)	(9)

Table V-7: Percent distribution of all victims reporting and not reporting crimes to the police by sex and age.

		<u>AGE</u>						
		<u>Total</u>	<u>Not Available</u>	<u>60-64</u>	<u>65-69</u>	<u>70-74</u>	<u>75-79</u>	<u>80 and over</u>
Male								
	Reported	100.0	0.0	13.9	16.5	40.4	29.2	0.0
		(21)	(0)	(3)	(3)	(8)	(6)	(0)
	Not Reported	100.0	3.7	22.0	26.8	15.1	17.6	14.8
		(25)	(1)	(5)	(7)	(4)	(4)	(4)
Female								
	Reported	100.0	11.4	18.7	20.6	21.1	14.0	14.3
		(40)	(5)	(7)	(8)	(8)	(6)	(6)
	Not Reported	100.0	5.0	9.2	28.8	28.3	13.5	15.2
		(33)	(2)	(3)	(10)	(9)	(4)	(5)

Table V-8: Percent distribution of victims reporting and not reporting crimes to the police by amount of loss.

	<u>Total</u>	<u>Amount of Loss</u>				
		<u>Not Available</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>Less than \$50</u>	<u>\$50-\$200</u>	<u>Over \$200</u>
Reported	100.0	50.8	8.2	8.4	25.4	6.8
	(61)	(31)	(5)	(5)	(15)	(4)
Not Reported	100.0	51.2	7.6	35.1	6.1	0.0
	(58)	(30)	(5)	(20)	(4)	(0)

Table V-9: Percent distribution of victims and non-victims by education

		<u>Grade Completed</u>					
<u>Total</u>		<u>Not Available</u>	<u>8 or less</u>	<u>9-11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13-15</u>	<u>16 and over</u>
Victims	100.0	8.4	36.7	13.1	22.1	11.3	8.4
	(118)	(10)	(43)	(15)	(26)	(13)	(10)
Non-Victims	100.0	10.2	41.3	11.6	21.9	8.0	7.1
	(322)	(32)	(133)	(37)	(70)	(26)	(23)

Table V-10: Percent distribution of victims and non-victims by sex and education.

		<u>Grade Completed</u>						
		<u>Total</u>	<u>Not Available</u>	<u>8 or less</u>	<u>9-11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13-15</u>	<u>16 and over</u>
Male								
	Victims	100.0	6.7	42.2	6.7	24.4	8.4	10.1
		(45)	(3)	(19)	(3)	(11)	(4)	(5)
	Non-Victims	100.0	13.9	40.9	8.0	18.7	7.9	10.7
		(79)	(11)	(32)	(6)	(15)	(6)	(8)
Female								
	Victims	100.0	9.6	33.0	16.9	20.2	13.0	7.4
		(73)	(7)	(24)	(12)	(15)	(10)	(5)
	Non-Victims	100.0	7.9	42.1	12.8	23.1	7.9	5.8
		(242)	(19)	(102)	(31)	(56)	(19)	(14)

Table V-11: Percent distribution of victims reporting and not reporting crimes to the police by education.

	<u>Grade Completed</u>						
	<u>Total</u>	<u>Not Available</u>	<u>8 or less</u>	<u>9-11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13-15</u>	<u>16 and over</u>
Reporting	100.0	11.5	30.4	13.0	22.5	12.1	10.4
	(61)	(7)	(18)	(8)	(14)	(7)	(6)
Not Reporting	100.0	5.2	43.1	13.1	21.8	10.4	6.3
	(58)	(3)	(25)	(8)	(13)	(6)	(4)

Table V-12: Percent distribution of victims reporting and not reporting crimes to the police by sex and education.

		<u>Grade Completed</u>						
		<u>Total</u>	<u>Not Available</u>	<u>8 or less</u>	<u>9-11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13-15</u>	<u>16 and over</u>
Males								
Reported	100.0	9.6	34.4	10.2	23.3	13.4	9.1	
	(21)	(2)	(7)	(2)	(5)	(3)	(2)	
Not Reported	100.0	4.1	48.8	4.3	27.0	4.3	10.9	
	(25)	(1)	(12)	(1)	(7)	(1)	(3)	
Females								
Reported	100.0	10.0	30.9	14.5	22.1	11.4	11.1	
	(40)	(4)	(12)	(6)	(9)	(5)	(4)	
Not Reported	100.0	6.0	38.6	19.7	17.9	15.0	2.8	
	(33)	(2)	(13)	(7)	(6)	(5)	(1)	

Table V-13: Percent distribution of victims and non-victims by family income.

		INCOME								
		Not Available	Under \$1,000	\$1,000 -3,999	\$4,000 -7,999	\$8,000 -11,999	\$12,000 -15,999	\$16,000 -19,999	\$20,000 -24,999	\$25,000 -25,999
	Total									
Victims	100.0	21.7	4.4	29.2	31.5	9.8	2.7	0.0	0.0	0.8
	(118)	(26)	(5)	(35)	(38)	(12)	(3)	(0)	(0)	(1)
Non-Victims	100.0	26.8	3.8	34.0	21.4	7.7	3.6	1.1	1.0	0.6
	(322)	(86)	(12)	(110)	(69)	(25)	(12)	(3)	(3)	(2)

Table V-14: Percent distribution of victims reporting and not reporting crimes to the police by family income.

		INCOME								
<u>Total</u>	<u>Not Available</u>	<u>Under \$1,000</u>	<u>\$1,000 -3,999</u>	<u>\$4,000 -7,999</u>	<u>\$8,000 -11,999</u>	<u>\$12,000 -15,999</u>	<u>\$16,000 -19,999</u>	<u>\$20,000 -24,999</u>	<u>\$25,000 -25,999</u>	
Reporting	100.0	25.1	2.7	30.1	30.3	6.8	3.5	0.0	0.0	1.5
	(61)	(15)	(2)	(18)	(18)	(4)	(2)	(0)	(0)	(1)
Not Reporting	100.0	18.1	6.1	28.2	32.8	13.0	1.8	0.0	0.0	0.0
	(58)	(10)	(4)	(16)	(19)	(7)	(1)	(0)	(0)	(0)

Table V-15: Percent distribution of crimes by location of occurrence.

<u>CRIME</u>	<u>LOCATION</u>				
	<u>Not Available</u>	<u>Home</u>	<u>Commercial Building</u>	<u>Near Home</u>	<u>Street</u>
Assault (5)				5.5 (4)	20.3 (1)
Robbery without Injury (1)					13.7 (1)
Purse Snatching (2)					27.3 (2)
Personal Larceny without Contact. (3)			100.0 (1)		27.4 (2)
Burglary Forcible Entry (11)		32.2 (11)			
Burglary without Force (12)		34.5 (12)			
Burglary Attempted Forcible Entry (9)		25.3 (9)			
Larceny Less than \$50 (21)				27.6 (21)	
Larceny \$50 - \$200 (10)				12.9 (10)	
Larceny Over \$200 (2)				2.4 (2)	
Larceny - Unknown Value (7)				8.7 (7)	
Attempted Larceny (2)				2.1 (2)	
Attempted Motor Vehicle Theft (2)				2.8 (2)	
Malicious Mischief (34)	100.0 (1)	8.0 (3)		38.0 (29)	11.4 (1)
TOTALS	100.0 (1)	100.0 (34)	100.0 (1)	100.0 (76)	100.0 (6)

Table V-16: Percent distribution of victims by sex and location of occurrence.

LOCATION

	<u>Total</u>	<u>Not Available</u>	<u>Home</u>	<u>Commercial Building</u>	<u>Near Home</u>	<u>Street</u>
Male	100.0 (45)	0.0 (0)	20.8 (9)	2.2 (1)	67.3 (31)	9.7 (4)
Female	100.0 (73)	1.7 (1)	33.4 (24)	0.0 (0)	62.6 (46)	2.3 (2)

Table V-17: Percent distribution of victims reporting and not reporting crimes to the police by location of occurrence.

	<u>LOCATION</u>					
	<u>Total</u>	<u>Not Available</u>	<u>Home</u>	<u>Commercial Building</u>	<u>Near Home</u>	<u>Street</u>
Reporting	100.0 (61)	2.0 (1)	34.6 (21)	0.0 (0)	62.3 (38)	1.1 (1)
Not Reporting	100.0 (58)	0.0 (0)	22.3 (13)	1.7 (1)	66.7 (38)	9.3 (5)

Table V-18: Percent distribution of victims reporting and not reporting crimes to the police by sex and location of occurrence.

		<u>LOCATION</u>					
		<u>Total</u>	<u>Not Available</u>	<u>Home</u>	<u>Commercial Building</u>	<u>Near Home</u>	<u>Street</u>
Males:							
-50-	Reported	100.0		35.3		61.4	3.3
		(21)		(7)		(13)	(1)
	Not Reported	100.0		8.6	4.0	72.3	15.1
		(25)		(2)	(1)	(18)	(4)
Females:							
	Reported	100.0	3.1	34.2		62.7	
		(40)	(1)	(14)		(25)	
	Not Reported	100.0		32.5		62.5	5.0
		(33)		(11)		(21)	(2)

Table V-19: Percent distribution of victims and non-victims by marital status.

	<u>MARITAL STATUS</u>						
	<u>Total</u>	<u>Not Available</u>	<u>Married</u>	<u>Widowed</u>	<u>Divorced</u>	<u>Separated</u>	<u>Not Married</u>
Victims	100.0	0.8	49.1	47.4	0.0	0.0	2.7
	(118)	(1)	(58)	(56)	(0)	(0)	(3)
Non-Victims	100.0	0.0	45.1	45.4	2.1	0.3	7.2
	(322)	(0)	(145)	(146)	(7)	(1)	(23)

Table V-20: Percent distribution of victims reporting and not reporting crimes to the police by marital status.

		<u>MARITAL STATUS</u>						
		<u>Total</u>	<u>Not Available</u>	<u>Married</u>	<u>Widowed</u>	<u>Divorced</u>	<u>Separated</u>	<u>Not Married</u>
-52- Reporting		100.0	0.0	43.3	51.4	0.0	0.0	5.3
		(61)	(0)	(26)	(31)	(0)	(0)	(3)
Not Reporting		100.0	1.6	55.2	43.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
		(58)	(1)	(32)	(25)	(0)	(0)	(0)

Table V-21: Percent distribution of victims and non-victims by number of household members under age 60.

		<u>NUMBER</u>					
		<u>Total</u>	<u>Not Available</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3-5</u>
-53- Victims		100.0	0.8	68.6	14.1	5.3	11.2
		(118)	(1)	(81)	(17)	(6)	(13)
Non-Victims		100.0	1.6	76.7	13.2	3.9	4.5
		(322)	(5)	(247)	(43)	(13)	(15)

Table V-22: Percent distribution of victims reporting and not reporting crimes to the police by number of household members under age 60.

		<u>NUMBER</u>					
		<u>Total</u>	<u>Not Available</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3-5</u>
-54- Reporting		100.0	0.0	68.7	13.4	6.3	11.7
		(61)	(0)	(42)	(8)	(4)	(7)
Not Reporting		100.0	1.7	68.5	14.8	4.3	10.8
		(58)	(1)	(39)	(9)	(2)	(6)

Table V-23: Percent distribution of victims and non-victims by number of household members age 60 and over.

		<u>NUMBER</u>				
	<u>Total</u>	<u>Available</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3-5</u>	<u>6 and over</u>
-55-						
Victims	100.0 (118)	0.8 (1)	54.5 (64)	42.7 (51)	1.2 (1)	0.9 (1)
Non-Victims	100.0 (322)	1.0 (3)	54.3 (175)	43.3 (140)	1.4 (5)	0.0 (0)

Table V-24: Percent distribution of victims reporting and not reporting crimes to the police by number of household members over age 60.

	<u>Total</u>	<u>NUMBER</u>				
		<u>Not Available</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3-5</u>	<u>6 and over</u>
Reporting	100.0 (61)	0.0 (0)	62.3 (38)	33.7 (20)	2.3 (1)	1.7 (1)
Not Reporting	100.0 (58)	1.6 (1)	46.2 (27)	52.2 (30)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)

Table V-25: Percent distribution of victims and non-victims by their relationship to the head of the household.

		<u>RELATIONSHIP</u>						
		<u>Total</u>	<u>Not Available</u>	<u>Head</u>	<u>Spouse of Head</u>	<u>Parent of Child</u>	<u>Other Relative</u>	<u>Non-Relative</u>
-57-	Victims	100.0	(0.0)	62.5	23.3	11.8	2.4	0.0
		(118)	(0)	(74)	(28)	(14)	(3)	(0)
	Non-victims	100.0	0.5	65.6	23.0	7.8	1.9	1.2
		(322)	(2)	(212)	(74)	(25)	(6)	(4)

Table V-26: Percent distribution of victims and non-victims by occupation.

	OCCUPATION										
	<u>Total</u>	<u>Not Available</u>	<u>Professional, Technical</u>	<u>Managers, Proprietors</u>	<u>Sales</u>	<u>Clerical</u>	<u>Laborers</u>	<u>Farm</u>	<u>Service Workers</u>	<u>Private Household</u>	<u>Armed Forces</u>
Victims	100.0	19.3	13.1	6.9	5.4	19.7	33.9	0.0	1.6	0.0	0.0
-58-	(118)	(23)	(16)	(8)	(6)	(23)	(40)	(0)	(2)	(0)	(0)
Non-Victims	100.0	26.3	11.9	5.6	2.1	20.2	30.1	1.1	1.7	0.8	0.3
	(322)	(85)	(38)	(18)	(7)	(65)	(97)	(4)	(5)	(3)	(1)

Table V-27: Percent distribution of victims and non-victims by occupation sector.

-59-

		<u>OCCUPATION SECTOR</u>				
	<u>Total</u>	<u>Not Available</u>	<u>Private</u>	<u>Government</u>	<u>Self Employed</u>	<u>Without Pay</u>
Victims	100.0 (118)	17.9 (21)	57.0 (68)	17.9 (21)	6.4 (8)	0.7 (1)
Non-victims	100.0 (322)	25.2 (81)	56.0 (180)	11.7 (38)	6.2 (20)	0.8 (3)

Table V-28: Percent distribution of victims reporting crimes to the police by occupation.

	<u>OCCUPATION</u>							
	<u>Total</u>	<u>Not Available</u>	<u>Professional</u>	<u>Managerial</u>	<u>Sales</u>	<u>Clerical</u>	<u>Laborer</u>	<u>Service</u>
Reporting	100.0	20.0	11.5	7.9	4.8	18.1	36.4	1.4
	(61)	(12)	(7)	(5)	(3)	(11)	(22)	(1)
Not Reporting	100.0	18.6	14.9	5.9	6.0	21.5	31.2	1.8
	(58)	(11)	(9)	(3)	(3)	(12)	(18)	(1)

Table V-29: Percent distribution of victims reporting and not reporting crimes to the police by occupation sector.

		<u>OCCUPATION SECTOR</u>					
		<u>Total</u>	<u>Not Available</u>	<u>Private</u>	<u>Government</u>	<u>Self Employed</u>	<u>Without Pay</u>
-191-	Reporting	100.0	17.3	52.3	22.0	7.0	1.4
		(61)	(11)	(32)	(13)	(4)	(1)
	Not Reporting	100.0	18.6	62.0	13.6	5.8	0.0
		(58)	(11)	(36)	(8)	(3)	(0)

CONTINUED

1 OF 2

Table V-30: Percent distribution of victims and non-victims by rental amount and value of dwelling.

	<u>Total</u>	<u>RENTAL AMOUNT</u>					<u>VALUE OF DWELLING</u>				
		<u>Not Available</u>	<u>Less Than \$100</u>	<u>\$100-\$199</u>	<u>\$200-\$299</u>	<u>\$300-\$999</u>	<u>Less Than \$30,000</u>	<u>\$30,000-\$49,999</u>	<u>\$50,000-\$74,999</u>	<u>\$75,000-\$100,000</u>	<u>Over \$100,000</u>
Victims	100.0	41.6	0.0	0.7	4.7	1.4	2.3	25.6	22.3	1.5	0.0
	(118)	(49)	(0)	(1)	(6)	(2)	(3)	(30)	(26)	(2)	(0)
Non-Victims	100.0	41.6	0.3	2.7	6.1	1.6	6.1	18.9	18.7	3.1	0.9
	(322)	(134)	(1)	(9)	(20)	(5)	(20)	(61)	(60)	(10)	(3)

Table V-31: Percent distribution of victims reporting and not reporting crimes to the police by rental amount and value of dwelling.

	RENTAL AMOUNT					VALUE OF DWELLING					
	Total	Not Available	Less Than \$100	\$100-\$199	\$200-\$299	\$300-\$999	Less Than \$30,000	\$30,000-\$49,999	\$50,000-\$74,999	\$75,000-\$100,000	Over \$100,000
Reporting	100.0	41.7	0.0	1.4	7.2	0.0	2.8	21.2	25.8	0.0	0.0
	(61)	(25)	(0)	(1)	(4)	(0)	(2)	(13)	(16)	(0)	(0)
Not Reporting	100.0	41.5	0.0	0.0	2.1	2.9	1.7	30.1	18.6	3.0	0.0
	(58)	(24)	(0)	(0)	(1)	(2)	(1)	(17)	(11)	(2)	(0)

63-

VIII. APPENDIX

- 6d.** How were you threatened? Any other way? (Mark all that apply)
- 120 1 Verbal threat of rape
 2 Verbal threat of attack other than rape
 3 Weapon present or threatened with weapon
 4 Attempted attack with weapon (for example, shot at)
 5 Object thrown at person
 6 Followed, surrounded
 7 Other - Specify _____

- e.** What actually happened? Anything else? (Mark all that apply)
- 121 1 Something taken without permission
 2 Attempted or threatened to take something
 3 Harassed, argument, abusive language
 4 Forcible entry or attempted forcible entry of house
 5 Forcible entry or attempted entry of car
 6 Damaged or destroyed property
 7 Attempted or threatened to damage or destroy property
 8 Other - Specify _____

- f.** How did the person(s) attack you? Any other way? (Mark all that apply)
- 122 1 Raped
 2 Tried to rape
 3 Hit with object held in hand, shot, knifed
 4 Hit by thrown object
 5 Hit, slapped, knocked down
 6 Grabbed, held, tripped, jumped, pushed, etc.
 7 Other - Specify _____

- 7a.** What were the injuries you suffered, if any? Anything else? (Mark all that apply)
- 123 1 None - SKIP to 9a
 2 Raped
 3 Attempted rape
 4 Knife or gunshot wounds
 5 Broken bones or teeth knocked out
 6 Internal injuries, knocked unconscious
 7 Bruises, black eye, cuts, scratches, swelling
 8 Other - Specify _____

- b.** Were you injured to the extent that you needed medical attention after the attack?
- 124 1 No - SKIP to 9a
 2 Yes

- c.** Did you receive any treatment at a hospital?
- 125 1 No
 2 Emergency room treatment only
126 3 Stayed overnight or longer - How many days? _____

- d.** What was the total amount of your medical expenses resulting from this incident, INCLUDING anything paid by insurance? Include hospital and doctor bills, medicine, therapy, braces, and any other injury-related medical expenses. INTERVIEWER - If respondent does not know exact amount, encourage him to give an estimate.
- 127 0 No cost - SKIP to 9a
 \$ _____,00
 x Don't know

- 8a.** At the time of the incident, were you covered by any medical insurance, or were you eligible for benefits from any other type of health benefits program, such as Medicaid, Veterans' Administration, or Public Welfare?
- 128 1 No
 2 Don't know } SKIP to 9a
 3 Yes

- b.** Did you file a claim with any of these insurance companies or programs in order to get part or all of your medical expenses paid?
- 129 1 No - SKIP to 9a
 2 Yes

- c.** Did insurance or any health benefits program pay for all or part of the total medical expenses?
- 130 1 Not yet settled
 2 None } SKIP to 9a
 3 All
 4 Part

- d.** How much did insurance or a health benefits program pay?
- 131 _____ .00 (obtain an estimate, if necessary)

- 9a.** Did you do anything to protect yourself or your property during the incident?
- 132 1 No - SKIP to 10
 2 Yes

- b.** What did you do? Anything else? (Mark all that apply)
- 133 1 Used/brandished gun or knife
 2 Used/tried physical force (hit, chased, threw object, used other weapon, etc.)
 3 Tried to get help, attract attention, scare offender away (screamed, yelled, called for help, turned on lights, etc.)
 4 Threatened, argued, reasoned, etc., with offender
 5 Resisted without force, used evasive action (ran/drove away, hid, held property, locked door, ducked, shielded self, etc.)
 6 Other - Specify _____

GO TO PAGE 3

NOTES

NOTES

10 Was the crime committed by only one or more than one person?
134 1 Only one 2 Don't know - 3 More than one
SKIP to 11a

135 a. Was this person male or female?
1 Male
2 Female
3 Don't know

136 b. How old would you say the person was?
1 Under 12
2 12-14
3 15-17
4 18-20
5 21 or over
6 Don't know

137 c. Was the person someone you knew or was he a stranger?
1 Stranger
2 Don't know
3 Known by sight only
4 Casual acquaintance
5 Well known

138 d. Was the person a relative of yours?
1 No
Yes - What relationship?
2 Spouse or ex-spouse
3 Parent
4 Own child
5 Brother/Sister
6 Other relative - Specify

139 e. Was he/she -
1 White?
2 Black?
3 Other - Specify
4 Don't know

f. How many persons? 140

141 g. Were they male or female?
1 All male
2 All female
3 Male & female
4 Don't know

142 h. How old would you say the youngest was?
1 Under 12
2 12-14
3 15-17
4 18-20
5 21 or over - SKIP to j
6 Don't know

143 i. How old would you say the oldest was?
1 Under 12
2 12-14
3 15-17
4 18-20
5 21 or over
6 Don't know

144 j. Were any of the persons known or related to you or were they all strangers?
1 All strangers
2 Don't know
3 All relatives
4 Some relatives
5 All known
6 Some known

145 k. How well were they known? (Mark all that apply)
1 by sight only
2 Casual acquaintance(s)
3 Well known

146 l. How were they related to you? (Mark all that apply)
1 Spouse or ex-spouse
2 Parents
3 Own children
4 Brothers/sisters
5 Others - Specify

147 m. Were all of them -
1 White?
2 Black?
3 Other - Specify
4 Combination - Specify
5 Don't know

11a Were you the only person there besides the offender(s)?
148 1 Yes - SKIP to 12a
2 No

149 b. How many of these persons, not counting yourself, were robbed, harmed, or threatened? Do not include persons under 60 years of age.
0 None - SKIP to 12a
Number of persons

150 c. Are any of these persons members of your household now? Do not include household members under 60 years of age.
0 No
Yes - How many, not counting yourself?

151 12a. Was something stolen or taken without permission that belonged to you or others in the household? INTERVIEWER - Include anything stolen from unrecognizable business in respondent's home. Do not include anything stolen from a recognizable business in respondent's home or another business, such as merchandise or cash from a register.
1 Yes - SKIP to 12f
2 No

152 b. Did the person(s) ATTEMPT to take something that belonged to you or others in the household?
1 No - SKIP to 12e
2 Yes

153 c. What did they try to take? Anything else? (Mark all that apply)
1 Purse
2 Wallet or money
3 Car
4 Other motor vehicle
5 Part of car (hubcap, tape-deck, etc.)
6 Don't know
7 Other - Specify

CHECK ITEM C Did they try to take a purse, wallet, or money? (Box 1 or 2 marked in 12c)
 No - SKIP to 17a
 Yes

154 d. Was the (purse/wallet/money) on your person, for instance in a pocket or being held?
1 Yes
2 No } SKIP to 17a

155 e. What did happen? Anything else? (Mark all that apply)
1 Attacked
2 Threatened with harm
3 Attempted to break into house or garage
4 Attempted to break into car
5 Harassed, argument, abusive language
6 Damaged or destroyed property
7 Attempted or threatened to damage or destroy property
8 Other - Specify

156 f. What was taken that belonged to you or others in the household? Anything else?

Cash: \$.00
and/or

Property: (Mark all that apply)

0 Only cash taken
1 Purse
2 Wallet
3 Car
4 Other motor vehicle
5 Part of car (hubcap, tape-deck, etc.)
6 Other - Specify

SKIP to 13c

SKIP to 13a

SKIP to 14a

NOTES

13a Had permission to use the (car/motor vehicle) ever been given to the person who took it?

- 158 1 No
2 Don't know
3 Yes
SKIP to 14a

b. Did the person return the (car/motor vehicle)?

- 159 1 Yes
2 No
SKIP to 14a

c. Was the (purse/wallet/money) on your person, for instance, in a pocket or being held by you when it was taken?

- 160 1 Yes
2 No

Was only cash taken? (Box 0 marked in 12f)

CHECK ITEM D Yes - SKIP to 15a No

14a Altogether, what was the value of the PROPERTY that was taken?

161 INTERVIEWER - Exclude stolen cash, and enter \$0 for stolen checks and credit cards, even if they were used. \$.00

b. How did you decide the value of the property that was stolen? Any other way? (Mark all that apply)

- 162 1 Original cost
2 Replacement cost
3 Personal estimate of current value
4 Insurance report estimate
5 Police estimate
6 Don't know
7 Other - Specify

15a Was all or part of the stolen money or property recovered, not counting anything received from insurance?

- 163 1 None
2 All
3 Part
SKIP to 16a

b. What was recovered? Anything else?

164 Cash: \$.00

and/or

Property: (Mark all that apply)

- 0 Cash only recovered - SKIP to 16a
165 1 Purse
2 Wallet
3 Car
4 Other motor vehicle
5 Part of car (hubcap, tape-deck, etc.)
6 Other - Specify

c. What was the value of the property recovered (excluding recovered cash)?

166 \$.00

16a Was there any insurance against theft?

- 1 No...
167 2 Don't know
3 Yes
SKIP to 17a

b. Was this loss reported to an insurance company?

- 1 No...
168 2 Don't know
3 Yes
SKIP to 17a

c. Was any of this loss recovered through insurance?

- 1 Not yet settled
169 2 No...
3 Yes
SKIP to 17a

d. How much was recovered?

INTERVIEWER - If property replaced by insurance company instead of cash settlement, ask for estimate of value of the property replaced.

170 \$.00

17a Did any household member lose any time from work because of this incident?

- 171 0 No - SKIP to 18a
Yes - How many members?

b. How much time was lost altogether?

- 1 Less than 1 day
172 2 1 - 5 days
3 6 - 10 days
4 Over 10 days
5 Don't know

18a Was anything that belonged to you or other members of the household damaged but not taken in this incident? For example, was a lock or window broken, clothing damaged, or damage done to a car, etc.?

- 173 1 No - SKIP to 19a
2 Yes

b. (Was/were) the damaged item(s) repaired or replaced?

- 174 1 Yes - SKIP to 18d
2 No

c. How much would it cost to repair or replace the damaged item(s)?

175 \$.00
x Don't know SKIP to 19a

d. How much was the repair or replacement cost?

176 x No cost or don't know - SKIP to 19a
\$.00

e. Who paid or will pay for the repairs or replacement? Anyone else? (Mark all that apply)

- 1 Household member
177 2 Landlord
3 Insurance
4 Other - Specify

19a Were the police informed of this incident in any way?

- 1 No
2 Don't know
Yes - Who told them?
178 3 Household member
4 Someone else
5 Police on scene
SKIP to Check Item E

b. What was the reason this incident was not reported to the police? Any other reason? (Mark all that apply)

- 1 Nothing could be done - lack of proof
179 2 Did not think it important enough
3 Police wouldn't want to be bothered
4 Did not want to take time - too inconvenient
5 Private or personal matter, did not want to report it
6 Did not want to get involved
7 Afraid of reprisal
8 Reported to someone else
9 Other - Specify

Is this the last Incident Report to be filled for this person?

CHECK ITEM E No - Go to next Incident Report. Yes - END INTERVIEW. Enter total number of Crime Incident Reports filled for this household in item 39 on EVS - 1

INTERVIEWER: ATTACH SUMMARY OF INCIDENT

**SOMERSET COUNTY
ELDERLY VICTIMIZATION SURVEY**

**BASIC SCREEN QUESTIONNAIRE
FORM EVS-1**

1. Interview identification
Code Name

010

2. Record of interview
Number Date completed

011

3. Reason for noninterview

012 1 Moved
2 Deceased
3 Not Available _____
4 Other (explain) _____

4a. Did you live in this house on Jan. 1, 1978?
013 1 Yes - SKIP to 5 2 No

b. Where did you live on Jan. 1, 1978?
014 Township _____

NOTE: If outside Somerset County,
end interview.

5a. Household members 60 years of age and OVER
015 _____ Total Number If 0, end interview

b. Household members UNDER 60 years of age
016 _____ Total Number
0 None

6. Proxy information - Fill for all proxy interviews

Proxy interview obtained for _____

Proxy respondent name Number

Reason for proxy interview _____

7. Type of Interview

017 1 Personal - Self respondent
2 Telephone - Self respondent
3 Personal - Proxy
4 Telephone - Proxy
5 Other (explain) _____

8. Relationship to Household Head

018 1 Head
2 Spouse of head
3 Parent of child
4 Other relative
5 Non-relative

9. Age last birthday _____
019

10. Marital Status

020 1 Married
2 Widowed
3 Divorced
4 Separated
5 Not married

11. Race

021 1 White
2 Black
3 Other (explain) _____

12. Sex M F
022

13. Highest school grade completed _____
023

14. For the purpose of our Survey, we need to
have a rough indication of family income.
Which income group would you fall into?

- 024 1 Under \$1,000
2 \$1,000 to 3,999
3 4,000 to 7,999
4 8,000 to 11,999
5 12,000 to 15,999
6 16,000 to 19,999
7 20,000 to 24,999
8 25,000 to 29,999
9 30,000 to 39,999
10 40,000 to 49,999
11 50,000 and over

15a. For whom did you (last) work? (Name of company,
business, organization or other employer)

x Never worked - SKIP to 16

b. What kind of business or industry is this? (E.G.: TV and radio
mfg., retail shoe store, State Labor Department, farm)
025 _____

c. Were you -

026 1 An employee of a PRIVATE company, business or
individual for wages, salary or commissions?
2 A GOVERNMENT employee (Federal, State, county,
or local)?
3 SELF-EMPLOYED in OWN business, professional
practice or farm?
4 Working WITHOUT PAY in family business or farm?

d. What kind of work were you doing? (E.G.: electrical
engineer, stock clerk, typist, farmer, Armed Forces)
027 _____

e. Are you retired
028 1. Yes 2. No

16. Type of living quarters
Housing unit

029 1 House, apartment, flat
2 HU in nontransient hotel, motel, etc.
3 HU - Permanent in transient hotel, motel, etc.
4 HU in rooming house
5 Mobile home or trailer
6 HU not specified above - Describe _____

17. Status of living quarters

030 1 Owned or being bought (value) _____
2 Rented for cash (rent) _____
031 3 No cash rent

18. Number of housing units in structure
- | | |
|------------------------------|---|
| 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 1 | 5 <input type="checkbox"/> 5-9 |
| 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | 6 <input type="checkbox"/> 10 or more |
| 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | 7 <input type="checkbox"/> Mobile home or trailer |
| 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 | 8 <input type="checkbox"/> only OTHER units |

19. Does anyone in this household operate a business from this address?
- 1 No
- 2 Yes - What kind of business is that?

20. Now I'd like to ask some questions about crime. They refer only to 1978. Between Jan. 1, 1978 and Dec. 31, 1978, did anyone break into or somehow illegally get into your (apartment/home), garage, or another building on your property.
- Yes - How many times _____
- No

21. (Other than the incident(s) just mentioned) Did you find a door jimmied, a lock forced, or any other signs of an ATTEMPTED break in?
- Yes - How many times _____
- No

22. Was anything at all stolen that is kept outside your home, or happened to be left out, such as a bicycle, a garden hose, or lawn furniture? (other than incidents already mentioned)
- Yes - How many times _____
- No

23. What was the total number of motor vehicles (cars, trucks, etc.) owned by you or any other member of this household during 1978?
- 0 None - SKIP to 26
- 1 1
- 2 2
- 3 3
- 4 4 or more

24. Did anyone steal, TRY to steal, or use (it/any of them) without permission?
- Yes - How many times _____
- No

25. Did anyone steal or TRY to steal parts attached to (it/any of them), such as a battery, hubcaps, tape-deck, etc.?
- Yes - How many times _____
- No

INDIVIDUAL SCREEN QUESTIONS

26. The following questions refer only to things that happened to YOU during the 12 months - between Jan. 1, 1978 and Dec. 31, 1978. Did you have your (pocket picked/purse snatched)?
- Yes - How many times _____
- No

27. Did anyone take something (else) directly from you by using force, such as by a stickup, mugging or threat?
- Yes - How many times _____
- No

28. Did anyone TRY to rob you by using force or threatening to harm you? (other than any incidents already mentioned)
- Yes - How many times _____
- No

29. Did anyone including your children, spouse, or another relative, beat you up, attack you or hit you with something, such as a rock or bottle? (other than any incidents already mentioned)
- Yes - How many times _____
- No

30. Were you knifed, shot at, or attacked with some other weapon by anyone at all? (other than any incidents already mentioned)
- Yes - How many times _____
- No

31. Did anyone including your children, spouse, or another relative, THREATEN to beat you up or THREATEN you with a knife, gun, or some other weapon, NOT including telephone threats? (other than any incidents already mentioned)
- Yes - How many times _____
- No

32. Did anyone TRY to attack you in some other way? (other than any incidents already mentioned)
- Yes - How many times _____
- No

33. During 1978, did anyone steal things that belonged to you from inside ANY car or truck, such as packages or clothing?
- Yes - How many times _____
- No

34. Was anything stolen from you while you were away from home, for instance at work, in a theater or restaurant, or while traveling?
- Yes - How many times _____
- No

35. (Other than any incidents you've already mentioned) was anything (else) at all stolen from you during 1978?
- Yes - How many times _____
- No

36. Did you find any evidence that someone ATTEMPTED to steal something that belonged to you? (other than any incidents already mentioned)
- Yes - How many times _____
- No

37. Did you call the police during 1978 to report something that happened to YOU which you thought was a crime? (do not count any calls made to the police concerning the incidents you have just told me about.)
- No
- Yes - What happened?

38. Did anything happen to YOU during 1978 which you thought was a crime, but did NOT report to the police? (other than any incidents already mentioned)
- No
- Yes - What happened?

39. Do any of the screen questions contain any entries for "How many times?"
- No - End Interview
- Yes - Fill Crime Incident Reports. _____ number completed

END