

STUDIES IN CRIME AND LAW ENFORCEMENT

IN MAJOR METROPOLITAN AREAS.

VOLUME I

Section I

Measurement of the Nature and Amount of Crime

by Albert J. Reiss, Jr.

Section II

Public Perceptions and Recollections

About Crime, Law Enforcement, and Criminal Justice

by Albert J. Reiss, Jr.

This report is being reproduced by the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice as a reference document. The views and findings contained herein are those of the authors and are not necessarily endorsed by the Commission or its staff.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The studies reported in these two volumes owe much to many people and to their organizations. For each of the four papers, I have tried to acknowledge the generosity and assistance of those who made the particular study possible or to those who shared in the immediate preparation of the materials for the manuscript.

Given the scope of these studies, there are many persons who contributed in gathering the data or who provided information to whom I am indebted but who must accept a general note of appreciation. There are especially the 36 observers and their supervisors in the three cities who did yeoman service. The many staff officers in police departments who provided information and assistance likewise is appreciated. A special thanks must go to Richard Golden, Director, Data Systems Division, Chicago Police Department and his programmer, Mary Mrjenovich for their assistance in providing special tabulations for Chicago. Deputy Superintendent William J. Taylor, Chief of the Bureau of Personnel and Deputy Superintendent John J. Bonner, Planning and Research Division of the Boston Metropolitan Police Department likewise were very helpful. The many police officers and citizens who cooperated with the field staff of the Institute for Social Research, though unnamed, are not unappreciated.

Special thanks are due Fred Inbau and Northwestern University School of Law and Robert Sheehan and Timothy Moran of Northwestern University for housing the field operations of the police observation studies.

The staff of the Survey Research Center Institute for Social Research of the University of Michigan has been most helpful. To Leslie Kish and Irene Hess of the Sampling Section, John Scott of the Field Section,

and to the Director, Angus Campbell, special recognition in appreciation.

To my long time friend and sometime colleague, Lloyd E. Ohlin of the National Crime Commission, an especially warm thanks for patience and understanding.

Those who work most closely and intimately with a principal investigator from day to day are sorely tried and often go unrewarded as they share an irregular schedule with long hours. I have tried to acknowledge my special thanks to the assistants who worked with me: Howard Aldrich, Stephen Cutler, Donald Dickson, Jack Faber, James Norr, John Maniha and Maureen Mileski. To John Spores and Larry Tiffit; to Donald Black, my collaborator in the police observation studies, an especial note of gratitude. Without, however, the dedication and competence of the administrative and secretarial staff of the Department of Sociology and the Center for Research on Social Organization of The University of Michigan, no schedule would have been met, delayed as some may appear to have been for those who waited for results. Administrative officers Mary Alyce La Forest and Jaye Palmer and the secretarial staff of Judith and Sharon McEndarfer and Mrs. Aled Wold are especially to be complimented for their assistance.

Through all of this my wife and children have been especially patient. May they share in any virtue that accrues from the effort.

I bear responsibility for the faults as well as the virtues of these several studies. Anyone who has tried to undertake several field investigations within a short period of time will appreciate the fact that much is left undone. These are not polished or finished products. Yet hopefully they have provided a factual basis for the work of the National Crime Commission and for others who may work on the problems of crime, law enforcement, and the administration of criminal justice.

Albert J. Reiss, Jr.
University of Michigan

	<u>Page</u>
Premises Where Victimization Occurs in Major Crimes Against the Person, By Race and Sex of Victims and Offenders	102
Forcible Rape and Assault with Intent to Rape	103
Robbery and Attempts to Rob	108
Major Assaults with A Dangerous Weapon: Assaults with a Gun	110
Assaults with A Knife or Other Cutting Instrument	112
Assaults with Other Dangerous Weapons	118
Assaults with Injury Without a Dangerous Weapon and Battery Involving Physical Contact	118
Threats With and Without A Dangerous Weapon	122
All Major Offenses Against Persons	126
Victimization by Offenders in Each Major Offense Against the Person on Street and Residence Premises	131
The Experience of White Male Victims	131
The Experience of White Female Victims	135
The Experience of Negro Male Victims	138
The Experience of Negro Female Victims	140
Survey Incidence of Crime Victimization	143
Major Problems in Sample Survey Estimation of Crime	144
Estimating Offense Rates from Victim Information	166
Comparison of Police Statistics and Survey Estimates	168
Crime Statistics on Arrest	171
Conclusion	182
 <u>SECTION II: PUBLIC PERCEPTIONS AND RECOLLECTIONS ABOUT CRIME, LAW ENFORCEMENT, AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE</u>	
Introduction	1
 <u>Part I: Evaluations and Images of Owners and Managers of Businesses and Organizations Toward the Police and Police Service</u>	
	4

STUDIES IN CRIME AND LAW ENFORCEMENT
IN MAJOR METROPOLITAN AREAS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

VOLUME I

<u>Section I: MEASUREMENT OF THE NATURE AND AMOUNT OF CRIME</u>	<u>Page</u>
Introduction	1
Problems of Measurement Posed by an Index of Crime.	3
Criteria for Measuring Crime	6
Some Ways of Measuring Selected Major Crimes	12
Criminal Homicide	14
Forcible Rape	18
Robbery	21
Aggravated and Simple Assault	26
Victims and Offenders in Offenses of Rape, Robbery, and Assault	29
Probability of Becoming a Victim of a Major Crime Against the Person	39
Race and Sex of Offenders and Their Victims in Major Offenses Against the Person	48
Modal Types of Victims, Offenders, and Victim-Offender Relationships in Major Crimes Against the Person	59
Burglary	65
Larceny: Theft	69
Auto Theft	74
A Survey of Crimes Against Businesses and Organizations	77
Burglaries Against Businesses and Organizations	80
Robbery Against Businesses and Organizations	82
Shoplifting Against Businesses and Organizations	84
Entrepreneurial Actions in Dealing with Shoplifting	90
Passing Bad Checks	96

Section II: CAREER ORIENTATIONS, JOB SATISFACTION, AND THE ASSESSMENT OF LAW ENFORCEMENT PROBLEMS BY POLICE OFFICERS

	<u>Page</u>
Conduct of Officer and General Emotional State of Citizen	29
Conduct of Officer and General Demeanor of Citizen	33
Conduct of Officer and Sobriety of Citizen.	37
'Prejudice' in Officer's Behavior and General Emotional State of Citizen	41
'Prejudice' in Officer's Behavior and Citizen's Demeanor	45
'Prejudice' of Officer and Sobriety of Citizen	48
Police Behavior and the Role of the Citizen in the Situation	51
Police-Suspect Transactions	67
Personal and Property Searches	80
Field Interrogations	94
Admissions or Confessions	108
The Use of Threats	113
Citizen Requests for Consultation with a Third Party	119
Apprising of Rights	124
Police Attitudes Toward Negroes	132
Introduction	1
Design of the Studyd.	2
Officer Orientation to A Police Career and Police Morale	5
Officer Satisfaction with His Job	43
Officer Satisfaction with His Assignment.	52
Officer Perceptions of Relations Between Police and the Public and Changes in Them	71
Police and Relations with Local Government and its Legal System	94
Officer Perceptions of Problems in Law Enforcement and in Their Relations with the System of Justice	109

	<u>Page</u>
Evaluations of the Police	5
Experiences with the Police	10
Images of the Police	18
PART II:	
<u>Citizen Perceptions and Recollections about Crime, Law Enforcement, and Criminal Justice.</u>	22
Citizen Perceptions About Crime in Their Area	23
Perceptions of Law Enforcement	35
Public Acquaintance and Contact with the Police	58
Citizen Cooperation and Mobilization of the Police	67
Citizen Perceptions of Officer Misconduct . .	69
Public Attitudes Toward the System of Justice	78
Citizen Actions to Protect Themselves From Crime and Perceptions of What Should be Done About the Crime Problem	91
A Concluding Note	112
Appendix A: <u>Survey Instrument for A Study of Crime Against Residents of Metropolitan Areas</u>	1
Appendix B: <u>Survey Instrument for A Study of Law-Enforcement Contacts in Metropolitan Areas</u>	1

VOLUME II

<u>Section I: PATTERNS OF BEHAVIOR IN POLICE AND CITIZEN TRANSACTIONS</u>	
Introduction	1
Mobilization of the Police	2
Empirical Study of Police and Citizen Transactions	13
Profile of the Citizen Participants in Encounters	16
Some Aspects of Police-Citizen Interaction. .	26

	<u>Page</u>
Concluding Note	123
Appendix A: <u>Survey Instrument for A Study of Police Attitudes</u>	1

MEASUREMENT OF THE NATURE AND AMOUNT OF CRIME*

by

Albert J. Reiss, Jr.

*The research reported herein was supported by Grant Award 006, Office of Law Enforcement Assistance, U.S. Department of Justice under the Law Enforcement Assistance Act of 1965. Publication does not necessarily reflect the views of officials of the Department of Justice. The assistance of Jack Faber, Maureen Mileski, and John Spores in the preparation of tabular materials and of Otis Dudley Duncan and Beverly Duncan for critical comment is gratefully acknowledged.

MEASUREMENT OF THE NATURE AND AMOUNT OF CRIME

To understand crime in any society, it is necessary to define and classify crimes and to measure the frequency with which they occur. It is no simple matter to define, classify, and measure crime. Some of the problems in measuring the nature and amount of crime in the United States and its subdivisions such as states or communities are considered below. A few observations about problems in defining and classifying crimes seems appropriate before considering these problems.

There is no rational classification of crimes based on a set of properties that define all crimes. Quite commonly, statutory law provides a definition of crimes. In practice nonetheless some organization has the responsibility to develop means to define and classify crimes covered by statutes. Most commonly, crimes are defined by organizations that are part of the legal system--the police, prosecution, and judiciary. Other organized ways of knowing whether crimes have occurred are possible, however, such as the sample survey.

Our knowledge of whether something occurs then, whether deaths, illness, or crimes, is a function of some organized means of knowing, such as respectively, the death registration system based on voluntary reporting from counties and states, the National Health Interview Sample Survey, and the FBI Uniform Crime Reports system based on reporting from police departments. No attempt is made to review the problems that arise for each and every organized system of intelligence on crime. Only two such organized systems, police departments and sample surveys, are considered below. Even within these organized systems, there are many problems of definition and classification. Police departments, for example, classify crimes by their complaint status (reported or known to the police), by department rules as to their bona fide status (whether offenses reported or known to the police are either bona fide or false or baseless complaints), and whether bona

vide complaints are cleared by arrest.^{1/} The Uniform Crime Reports classify some crimes as "Index" crimes and as Part I and Part II offenses.^{2/} Measurement of the amount of crime for any such classification obviously depends upon how the offense is known and classified as well as upon what is included within the definition of the class.

How valid any organized means of knowing, classifying, and measuring crimes are can only be determined when there are independent ways to assess the amount of crime and knowledge of the organized ways of gathering, classifying, and reporting information on crimes. At the present time in the United States the main measures of the amount of crime derive from police department statistics. Police departments base their reporting systems upon the Uniform Crime Reporting System, though in some cases they have local and state reporting systems as well. National estimates are based on aggregate data from the voluntary reporting system of police departments to the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The FBI Uniform Crime Reports summarize these aggregate statistics to estimate the amount of crime and changes in that amount.

The Uniform Crime Reporting System has been subject to critical examination by the Federal Bureau of Investigation's Advisory Committee on Uniform Crime Records of the International Association of Chiefs of Police and by criminologists. No attempt is made to review these criticisms here. They make

¹ Parenthetically, it should be noted that it is impossible to ascertain from reports how many complaints originally classified as false or baseless are later cleared by an arrest, how many arrests "clear" offenses never reported to the police, or how many complaints considered "unfounded" are later changed to bona fide complaints. The Uniform Crime Reporting System make provision for correcting such "errors", but the system for reporting does not permit one to determine accurately the nature and amount of kinds of error. See Uniform Crime Reporting Handbook, U.S. Dept. of Justice: Federal Bureau of Investigation, Washington, USGPO, 1965, pp. 45-47.

² Ibid., p. 4, p. 10, and p. 56.

several things apparent however that generate our main concern. They make apparent that current methods of gathering and reporting information on crime do not provide a valid picture of the amount of crime in the society or any of its jurisdictions and that the FBI Crime Index does not provide a reliable basis for determining whether crime is increasing or decreasing in the United States.^{3/} Despite these criticisms, it is apparent that the public and their policy makers form judgments on the basis of these measures. Our main goal, therefore, is to examine other ways of measuring crime, ways that provide more rational information bases for action both by the public and their policy makers.

Problems in Measurement Posed by an Index of Crime

At first glance, it would appear that a single index or measure of the amount of crime in the United States or any of its jurisdictions is an important item of information. Just as we measure a death rate, so we may measure a crime rate. Such reasoning rests, however, on some misconceptions about both death and crime rates.

We shall consider first some misconceptions about the interpretation of simple rates such as a death or crime rate. Any simple rate consists of but two elements, a population that is exposed to the occurrence of some event (the denominator) and a count of the events (the numerator). Both of these elements are measured for a given point or period of time. In calculating a crude death rate, for instance, it is the practice to report the number of deaths for some unit of population, such as every 100 or 1000 persons, for

³ See for example, T. Sellin and M. E. Wolfgang, The Measurement of Delinquency, New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1964, Albert D. Biderman, "Social Indicators" in Raymond A. Bauer, (ed), Social Indicators, Cambridge, Mass.: The M.I.T. Press, 1966, pp. 111-119.

some unit of time, such as a month or a calendar year. These rates are deliberately termed crude because we know that with- in a given period of time not everyone in the population is equally exposed to the risk of death. There are important differences, for example, according to age and sex. For that reason we "refine" the denominator and calculate death rates separately for each subgroup of the population. These are generally termed specific rates; the death rate for a parti- cular race, age, and sex subgroup--say Negro women, aged 20 to 24--is a race-age-sex specific death rate.

Though such crude and specific rates are useful for some purposes, they are limited either for an analysis of the causes of death or as a basis for public policies about how to reduce the death rate. The main reason for this limitation is that we know people die from many different "causes". Death from an automobile accident is quite different from death due to lung cancer. Obviously public policy will be quite different when one tries to reduce the death rate due to factors connected with driving automobiles than when it has some relationship to lung cancer, such as smoking. To go one step further, we learned a great deal scientifically about causes of death by classifying types of death and searching for their causes. When one has an understanding of death from a particular cause, one may calculate a separate rate for deaths from that cause. Thus we now calculate a death rate for diseases causally related to smoking, including among these diseases cancer of the lung, larynx, and lip, and chronic bronchitis.^{4/}

The analogy to crime should be clear. We know that crime is not a unitary phenomenon nor are causes the same for all types of crime. Furthermore, even in the absence of causal

⁴Mortality from Diseases Associated with Smoking: United States, 1950-64, National Center for Health Statistics, Series 20, No. 4, October, 1966, pp. 2-9.

knowledge, we know that policies and practices for crime control differ considerably depending upon the conditions under which types of crime occur. A simple crime rate, therefore, is of little use either for purposes of causal analysis or for public policy.

The analogy between death and crime rates should not be overdrawn lest it lead to further misconceptions. Some of these differences merit attention since they should influence our choice of measures of crime.

First death is an event that occurs for every member of the population; but every member of the population is not a victim of a crime. In addition, some persons can never be a victim of a given type of crime. Second, death can occur only once for any member of the population while crime, like illness or accidents, can occur repeatedly. For that reason one has multiple victimization and multiple offenses. There is, third, the fact that crime is a relational phenomenon between victims and offenders, so that one can calculate offense, victim and offender rates. And indeed, a crime may involve a single victim, several victims, a diffuse public, or a corporate organization. Furthermore the exposed population is not always made up of persons. It may consist of organizations such as businesses, or even the general public, as in offenses against public order. Fourth, an offender can commit several crimes at the same point in time. An offender may assault the owner of an automobile, steal his car, and the possessions that are in it. Fifth, the relative absence of completeness in "registration" of offenses, offenders, and victims poses major problems of meaningful interpretation of changes in rates. Under present organizational systems for gathering and processing intelligence on crimes, we lack the knowledge that would permit us to separate "actual increase" from a "registration" increase.

Finally, for many classes of crimes, unlike most classes of death, it is important to know where the crime occurred regardless of where the "victim" resides. The failure to separate place of occurrence from place of residence of victim, however, makes for difficulties in interpreting rates based on an exposed population of residents for any given jurisdiction in the United States. This problem arises from the way data are processed in registration systems.

It should be evident therefore that any simple crime rate, unlike a death rate, lacks the specification necessary for reasonable interpretation. The problem therefore becomes one of deciding what kinds of rates does it make sense to calculate given our current knowledge of the causes of crime, the situations under which crimes occur, our aims in public information, our goals in the formation of public policy to deal with crime, and our goals in the development of organizational strategies to reduce crime.

Criteria for Measuring Crime

This paper illustrates more rational ways that crime may be measured than those currently in use. The criteria of rationality employed are: (1) that the information in the rate count the events for the appropriate exposed population; (2) that the choice of rate be appropriate to the data available and the goals for its use; (3) that rate information permit a potential victim or an organization dealing with a "crime problem" to calculate action more rationally.

No attempt is made to develop measures appropriate to all types of crime. It is not at all apparent what measures are appropriate for many white-collar crimes or for organized crimes, given our current information systems. Except for the calculation of some specific rates and sample survey

estimates of crime, discussion is generally confined to the Part I offenses of criminal homicide, forcible rape, robbery, assault, burglary, larceny, and auto theft. Considering these Part I offenses, some general problems in selecting the exposed population and in the count of offenses are first raised. An attempt is made to make clear what information is appropriate to a rate for each of these types of crime. It will become evident in the illustrations which follow that current information systems make it difficult to do more than approximate some of the criteria. Nonetheless, no criteria are chosen that are not readily available within present information systems or that could be included with very little effort.

For those unfamiliar with the Uniform Crime Reporting System several important features of the reporting system should be understood before considering specific rates based on them. First, each crime or attempted crime is counted in only one crime classification. When several different Part I offenses are committed by a person or group at the same time, the offense is classified in the highest ranking offense in the rank order of Part I offenses: criminal homicide, forcible rape, robbery, assault, burglary, larceny-theft, and auto theft. Thus a crime involving the murder of a rape victim is classified as a criminal homicide, not as both a rape and a homicide. Legally an offender could be charged with both offenses.

Second, the number of offenses counted in any criminal event is classified differently for crimes against persons and crimes against property. For offenses against the person, the number of offenses counted is the number of persons unlawfully killed, raped, maimed, wounded, or assaulted, plus any attempts to do so. For offenses against property, an offense is counted only for each distinct operation or

attempt. The criterion "operation" relates to a crime incident; hence if 20 people are robbed in a tavern, it is counted as one offense, not 20. The distinction between crimes against persons versus property is not a distinction between persons as victims and households or organizations as victims since persons are victims when their property is taken.

Third, it should be clear that a distinction is made between the complaint or report of an offense and its bona fide status. The number of offenses reported or known to the police differs from the number of actual offenses reported in that the latter count results when the former is reduced by the number of false or baseless complaints as determined from department rules for "unfounding" a complaint.

Finally, there are problems in classifying crimes arising from the organized ways police have for knowing when events that are classified as crimes occur. The main ways they have for knowing them are by responses to citizen complaints that such an event is in progress or has occurred or by some proactive police strategy for gathering intelligence on events that potentially might be crimes, such as by routine patrol or detective work.

A little reflection on what comes to the police as complaints or even as observations by police officers readily suggests that the problem of determining whether an event is to be classified as a crime depends upon the nature of the information received. Generally the police must evaluate information initially received from citizens by investigating whether or not their complaint constitutes a crime event. Obviously officer discretion or judgment as well as departmental criteria affects the classification of such events as crimes. But citizen reports do not present a homogeneous set of events where the same criteria can readily be applied as to whether or not the event has occurred. This is

particularly so for the criteria to judge whether or not the event actually occurred.

The problem of knowing whether an event has occurred is especially difficult where the determination depends upon the status of the complainant, of witnesses, or of offenders. Some offenses are known to the police only through an arrest situation where the offender is present. This is particularly true for offenses involving morals or violations of moral codes. Thus, the police do not usually know crimes of drunkenness except through the arrest of persons who are called "drunks". One clearly cannot have an offense of resisting arrest by an officer without some person under arrest engaging in resisting behavior. On the other hand, crimes against property can be known to the police even though no offender ever is known. Events of shoplifting can be determined only by observation; this is much less likely to be the case for burglary where evidence of entry, etc. makes determination less difficult. Offenses against the public peace and order occur only when there is a complainant present, while burglary can occur without the presence of a complainant. Some offenses have only testimony or behavior as evidence while for others there is physical evidence.

Given the diversity of sources and types of information on crimes, the procedures one has for determining whether a crime has occurred must vary. It is doubtful therefore whether it makes much logical sense to compute an overall measure of crime, if by that is meant a measure of whether events have occurred. Crime in that sense is unlike births or deaths, where the event is more clearly specified. It is much more like illness, where the organized procedures of medicine are the major basis for knowing and classifying illness. Subjective accounts of either illness or crime by complainants pose

problems of validity. So do "professional" determinations where the procedures rest largely on "accounts" or "judgment" rather than on observation or means of measurement. Much of the difficulty in crime reporting like that in illness reporting arises from our present procedures of "diagnosing" events that come to our attention.

Surveying the seven Part I offenses, it is evident that the exposed population is not logically the same for all offenses. Yet the UCR system uses the total population resident in a jurisdiction as the exposed population for the calculation of its Index of Crime and for all crime rates that are Part I offenses. Apart from the fact that the total population rarely should be thought of as potential victims of most crimes (even when population is the logical base for the crime, younger age groups rarely are victims of most offenses involving persons), only some subgroups are clearly eligible for particular kinds of crime. To begin with, the exposed population for some offenses is women only. This is true for forcible rape, and for purse-snatching, with and without force. The offense of pocket-picking is generally defined as an offense against men, so that the logical base should be men. Indeed, among Part I offenses men and women are the logical exposed population for only homicides, muggings and certain kinds of stick-ups, and assaults.

The logical exposed population for almost all other Part I offenses is an organization. For offenses of burglary, the organization is either a household unit (or residential dwelling) or a business-industrial organization. Indeed, police statistics often differentiate between a residential and a business burglary. For offenses of robbery, there is a distinct class involving banks. Apart from banks, many robberies are against businesses or organizations rather than against persons as victims. The logical base, therefore, for

these robberies is organizations.

Larcenies include a hodge-podge of exposed populations. Larceny of bicycles has a logical base either of number of bicycles or bicycle owners. Larceny from autos or of auto accessories has a logical base of automobile owners of registered automobiles. The same is true for auto theft. Indeed, the annual report of the Auto Theft Committee of the International Association of Chiefs of Police, Inc., presents national statistics on auto theft only by number of passenger cars registered. Offenses involving automobiles should logically distinguish between passenger cars and other types of vehicles. The offense of shop-lifting included in larceny-theft is generally limited to retail trade establishments while larceny from telephone booths is generally against a single organization. Theft from coin-operated machines at most has a base of all industrial and business establishments, including public organizations.

It is reasonable then to propose that an exposed population (the denominator in the calculation of rates) be selected according to the type of offense and the status of the victim in the offense for purposes of calculating crime rates. Quite clearly where the exposed population is the number of organizations, such rates may be quite different in size from those that would be obtained were the general population used as the base for calculating the rate. This will be evident in examples below.

The count of events also poses problems for the rational calculation of rates. For some purposes one is interested in offense rates and therefore is interested in the number of offenses that have occurred. Such information is important for programs of crime control. Yet, for other purposes, one is interested in the probability of victimization. Given the fact that there is multiple victimization over a period of

time, the victimization rates are lower than the offense rates. For still other purposes one is interested in the relationship between the victim and the offender and one may wish to count victims by some characteristics of the offender. One may wish, for instance, to know what is the likelihood that women will be assaulted by men. Or one may want to know what is the likelihood that women will be assaulted in street settings. The exposed population may be the same in both cases--the number of women--but the count of events will be different.

Quite plainly, too, one is interested in other kinds of rates to understand the crime problem. Some of these such as offender or arrest rates, or rates of offenses cleared by arrest and of persons charged through arrest are related to the administrative processing of crimes or offenders. Likewise one may be interested in victim or offender rates such as the incidence of multiple victimization or an offense rate for offenders. Much less attention is given to these rates in this paper, though patently they deserve consideration in any comprehensive evaluation of crime statistics.

Some Ways of Measuring Selected Major Crimes

The system of Uniform Crime Reporting calculates an offense rate for every 100,000 inhabitants in the United States, and for selected regions and jurisdictions.^{5/} Offenses, for which rates are calculated use as a base the total population resident in a jurisdiction. As noted earlier, however, given our criteria, the total resident population is not generally the logical base for most offenses in the crime index.

⁵Crime in the United States: Uniform Crime Reports for the United States, U.S. Department of Justice, Annual Reports.

Indeed, since it is known that the probability for most offenses against persons varies considerably by the age and sex of the person, age-sex specific rates are a more meaningful kind of rate than a crude rate for persons of all ages. An attempt is made in this and following sections to show how some selected crimes against persons and property might be calculated using the information available in the files of major metropolitan police departments and appropriate information for the exposed population available from U.S. Census sources.

For purposes of illustrating differences in rates for offenses, different exposed populations are used depending upon the type of offense. Whenever annual rates are calculated for the resident population, the estimated size of the population is taken as of July 1 of the year for which the rate is calculated.

There is no standard population aggregate for which a rate must be calculated. Some rates are calculated for every 1,000, others for every 10,000, and still others for every 100,000 inhabitants. The UCR calculates all crime rates for every 100,000 inhabitants. Unfortunately the size of the unit often gives a social significance of "high" or "low" to the rate that is not intended. For example in 1965 there was an estimated resident population of 191,890,000 in the United States and 206,661 aggravated assaults. The UCR reported the rate of aggravated assaults as 106.6 per 100,000 inhabitants. If every 10,000 inhabitants were the base, the rate would be 10.7. It would of course be only 1.1 for every 1,000 inhabitants. Obviously the rate "looks bigger" if we report it for every 100,000 than for every 1,000 inhabitants.

Conventionally, a unit of population is selected so as to avoid rates that normally are less than 1. For purpose of this report the unit selected for rate calculation was 10,000 inhabitants because it seemed a more meaningful unit for citizens to interpret city rates that often are compared

females is small between the ages of 1 to 14. From age 20 to age 64, the rate for males is about three times that for females. After age 65, the rate is four times that for females.

The probability that one will be a victim of a homicide then varies markedly by age and sex of persons. While 1 in every 6,000 males aged 25-29 was a victim of a homicide in 1965, only 1 in every 151,000 males aged 5-14 was a victim. The comparable rates for females were 1 in every 21,000 females aged 25-29 and 1 in every 282,000 for females aged 10-14.

Unfortunately, the current reporting system does not make it possible to calculate age-sex rates for murder victims by their race.^{6/} Race-age data available from UCR reports disclose, however, that 53 per cent of all homicide victims are Negro.

Homicide rates by race and age are given in Table 2. The homicide rate for nonwhites (over 99 per cent of the nonwhite victims are Negro) was about 9 times greater than

^{6/} Race-age-sex specific rates of homicide can be computed, however, from data available in Mortality Statistics, Bureau of the Census, U. S. Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C. Such rates are computed for the United States and are available in Vital Statistics, Special Reports, National Office of Vital Statistics, Federal Security Agency. Mortality statistics, however, are not strictly comparable with police department statistics, partly owing to distinctions as to criminal and non-criminal homicide. For a discussion of these differences, see Marvin Wolfgang, Patterns in Criminal Homicide, New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966, esp. Chapters 1 and 2. Wolfgang has computed race-age-sex specific rates for homicides known to the police of Philadelphia for the period 1948-52. They show important differences according to the race and sex of victims, particularly that Negroes are liable to homicide victimization considerably earlier in life than are whites. Ibid., Chapter 4, esp. pp. 65-70.

Table 2: Homicide Rates by Race and Age, United States, 1965.

Age	Estimated Total Resident U. S. Population by Race ^{1/} (in thousands)		Number of Homicide Victims by Race ^{2/}		1965 Race-Sex Homicide Rates per 10,000		Ratio of 1 Homicide to Population (in thousands)	
	White	Nonwhite	White ^{3/}	Nonwhite ^{4/}	White	Nonwhite	White	Nonwhite
Total	170,747	23,072	4,021	4,715	0.2	2.0	42	5
Under 1 year	3,219	639	72	40	0.2	0.6	44	15
1-4	13,942	2,635	135	62	*	0.2	103	42
5-9	17,540	2,979	82	38	*	0.1	213	78
10-14	16,324	2,632	58	39	*	0.1	281	67
15-19	14,802	2,152	267	351	0.2	1.6	55	6
20-24	11,721	1,611	467	593	0.3	3.7	25	3
25-29	9,858	1,346	415	711	0.4	5.3	24	2
30-34	9,638	1,309	402	605	0.4	4.7	24	2
35-39	10,577	1,343	403	623	0.4	4.6	26	2
40-44	11,099	1,311	383	503	0.3	3.8	29	3
45-49	10,312	1,137	329	364	0.3	3.2	31	3
50-54	9,538	1,033	267	262	0.3	2.5	36	4
55-59	8,320	836	219	162	0.3	1.9	38	5
60-64	7,101	708	179	95	0.2	1.3	40	7
65-69	5,815	483	105	66	0.2	1.3	55	7
70-74	4,782	407	87	42	0.2	1.0	55	10
75 years & over	6,157	511	102	46	0.2	0.9	60	11
Age Unknown	---	---	49	113	---	---	---	---

^{1/} Source: Population Estimates, Current Population Reports, Series P-25, No. 321, November 30, 1965, Table 2.

^{2/} Source: Uniform Crime Reports, 1965, Table 17.

^{3/} Indians in Table 17 are classified as white; 51 of the 4,021 whites are classified as Indian.

^{4/} There are 4,693 Negro, 16 Chinese, and 6 Japanese victims classified as nonwhite.

*Less than .05 Homicides per 10,000 Population.

than that for whites in 1965. While the likelihood of victimization was greater for nonwhites than whites at all ages, it is much less so for persons under 14 and age 60 and over. The disparity is particularly great beginning in the mid-twenties where, for example, 1 in every 2,000 nonwhites was a victim of a homicide in 1965 as compared with 1 of every 24,000 whites. Were data available by sex as well, the probability of victimization for nonwhite males aged 25-29 would undoubtedly be even greater--perhaps as high as 1 in every 1,000 nonwhite males aged 25-29.

Forcible Rape:

Forcible rape is one of the major crimes in the UCR Index for which a rate is calculated. The total resident population is considered the exposed population in calculating the rape rate.^{7/} Yet as noted earlier, rape is a crime committed by men against women. Logically then, rape offender rates should have "eligible" males as their base population and rape offense or victim rates should have "eligible" females as their exposed population. Since the probability of being raped varies considerably by age, age-specific rape rates are more meaningful than a crude rate for women of all ages. Unfortunately reliable data of rapes by age of victim are not available for the U.S. at the present time, though police records generally include information on the age of rape victims.

Whether a crude rate of forcible rape should include women of all ages is open to question, despite the occasional report of rapes of the very young. Table 3 was prepared to illustrate

⁷ Statistics on forcible rape include both assaults and assaults to commit the offense of forcible rape.

the differences in the size of a rate of forcible rape when different exposed populations are used.

In 1965 there was an estimated total resident population of 193,818,000 in the United States and 22,467 forcible rapes or assaults to commit a forcible rape. The UCR reported the rate of forcible rape as 11.6 per 100,000 inhabitants, or (as in Table 3) a rate of 1.2 for every 10,000 inhabitants. A crime of forcible rape (or attempt) occurred then for every 8,541 persons resident in the United States in 1965.

Table 3: Rates of Forcible Rape for Selected Exposed Populations, United States, 1965.

1965 Population and Offenses Known to Police	Total Number	Rate Per 10,000	Ratio of Rapes to Persons
Exposed Population: ^{1/}			
Total Resident Population	193,818,000	1.2	1:8,627
All females	98,704,000	2.3	1:4,394
Females, 14 years and over	71,052,000	3.2	1:3,161
Offenses Known to the Police: ^{2/}			
Forcible Rapes, and Attempts	22,467		

^{1/} Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Population Estimates, Current Population Reports, Series P-25, No. 321, November 30, 1965, Table 2.

^{2/} Source: Crime in the United States, Uniform Crime Reports: 1965, U.S. Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation, July, 1966.

There may be some use in knowing that there were 1.2 forcible rapes or attempts for every 10,000 inhabitants in the U.S. in 1965 or that such a crime was committed for every 8,541 persons in the U.S., even though by definition only women can be victims of rape. Generally, however, both citizens and the police are more interested in the question either of how many total forcible rapes there were (the total is an indicator of the magnitude of the problem for policing) or of what is the likelihood that a person will be a victim of a given type of crime.

Nationally, the forcible rape rate was 2.3 per 100,000 women of all ages; 1 of every 4,392 women in the United States in 1965 was either a victim of a forcible rape or of an attempt to rape with force. Accepting the fact that rape of a female under age 14 is uncommon, a forcible rape rate also was calculated for females 14 years old and over. In 1965 that rate was 3.2 per 10,000, or 1 in every 3,161 women 14 years old and over was a victim of a forcible rape or attempt to rape with force.

By way of further illustration, forcible rape rates were calculated for the city of Chicago. There were 1,223 forcible rapes reported for Chicago in 1965. Since 1965 population estimates were not readily available for Chicago, the 1960 Census was used to calculate the rates. The 1965 rape rate was 3.4 per 10,000 for all residents of Chicago; it was 6.7 per 10,000 women of all ages, or 9.1 per 10,000 women 14 years of age and older. The Chicago rate is almost three times that for the nation as a whole. One of every 1,100 women 14 years old and over in Chicago in 1965 was a victim of a forcible rape or an attempt to rape, assuming no repeated victimization during the year.

It should be obvious that current practices of reporting rates of forcible rape for all residents understate the

probability for victims of rape.

It is known that younger women more often are victims of rape than are older women. Since age of the rape victim almost always is known to the police, it would seem worthwhile to calculate rates for different age groups. Similarly, since in most major cities, as well as perhaps nationally, Negro women are more likely to be raped than are white women, such rates should be calculated for women of a given race and age. Finally, as shall be shown later, the race of the suspect or offender is known in a substantial proportion of cases. Since the public often misinterprets data on forcible rapes because they are not given information by characteristics of the suspect or offender, it should be useful, at least annually, to provide probabilities of victimization by race of victim and offender. The calculation of such rates is illustrated later using data for the city of Chicago.

Robbery:

Robbery is a form of theft where the offender uses force or violence to obtain property from a victim or threatens the victim by use of threats, weapons, or other means, to obtain the property. The UCR classifies robberies into two major groups: armed robberies where a dangerous weapon is used and strong-arm robberies where force is used without a weapon. Information also is provided on the place of occurrence of the robberies: highway (streets, alleys, etc.); commercial houses, gas or service stations, and chain stores; residence (anywhere on premises); bank; and miscellaneous. Rates are calculated only for all robberies in the UCR report.

Table 4 presents information on robberies attempting to show the likelihood that a given type of robbery occurs, including the likelihood that it will occur in particular

Table 4: Robbery Rates by Type of Robbery, United States and Chicago, Illinois, 1965.

Type of Robbery	Number of Inhabitants, Establishments, or Households	Number of Robberies	Rate per 10,000	Ratio of 1 Robbery to Inhabitants, Establishments, Households
United States: ^{1/}				
Total Index	193,818,000 ^{a/}	118,916	6.1	1,630
Armed, any weapon		68,496	3.5	2,830
Strong-arm, no weapon		50,420	2.6	3,844
Total Index	137,496,000 ^{b/}	118,916	8.6	1,156
Armed, any weapon		68,496	5.0	2,007
Strong-arm, no weapon		50,420	3.7	2,727
Chicago: ^{2/}				
Total Index	3,550,404 ^{c/}	14,888	41.9	238
Armed, any weapon		7,365	20.7	482
Strong-arm, no weapon		7,523	21.2	471
Total Index	2,630,047 ^{d/}	14,888	56.6	177
Armed, any weapon		7,365	28.0	357
Strong-arm, no weapon		7,523	28.6	350
Place of Occurrence				
Street, highways, etc.	2,630,047 ^{d/}	8,654	32.9	304
Establishments	69,482 ^{e/}	1,782	256.5	39
Residence	1,383,519 ^{f/}	2,164	15.6	639
Residence	2,630,047 ^{d/}	2,164	8.2	1,215
Miscellaneous	---	2,888	---	---

^{1/} Source: Uniform Crime Reports, 1965, Table 1 and p. 11.

^{2/} Source: Chicago Police Department, Data Systems Division, Monthly Return A's submitted to FBI.

^{a/} 1965 U. S. population estimates taken from Population Estimates, Current Population Reports, U. S. Bureau of the Census, Series P-25, No. 321, November 30, 1965, Table 2; total resident population, all ages.

^{b/} Ibid., Table 2, resident population, 14 years and over.

(CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)

^{c/} 1960 U. S. Census of Population, Vol. I, Part 15, Table 20; resident population, all ages.

^{d/} Ibid., Table 20, resident population, 14 years and over.

^{e/} Sources: 1963 Census of Business, Table 3 and 1963 Census of Manufactures, Table 4.

^{f/} Estimate, Chicago Housing Authority.

places. Detailed information by place of occurrence is provided for the city of Chicago only, since the UCR data are not given by place of occurrence.

Rates are shown both for the exposed population of all residents and for residents, 14 years of age and over. Since robbery victims rarely are under 14 years of age, the population 14 years old and over seems the more appropriate one for which to calculate robbery rates. When robbery rates are computed for place of occurrence, the unit of exposure is varied depending upon the type of place. For robberies in streets, highways, or alleys, the exposed population is considered that of persons aged 14 and older. Where robberies occur in establishments, the exposed population is considered that of all commercial establishments; for residence robberies, it is considered to be all households in the city. There is some question about the accuracy of the count of establishments and households for the city of Chicago. All establishments included in the censuses of business and manufactures are included in the total count in 1963 and used as the base for 1965 offense data. Excluded from these counts are offices; however robberies in offices generally are included in "miscellaneous". Were establishments adopted as the exposed unit for calculating robberies of commercial houses, gas or service stations, chain stores, and banks, attention should

be given to insuring that only those types of establishments are included for robberies reported in these classes. It is possible that the census figure overstates the number of establishments, given what is reported as offenses of robbery in these classes.

For the U. S. as a whole, the rate of armed robbery is greater than that for strong-arm robbery. Given the fact that some persons are robbed more than once in the same year, there is some overestimation of the likelihood of victimization as stated in Table 4. Nonetheless, multiple victimization is considerably lower for robbery than for burglary. When multiple victimization from robbery occurs in the same year, it is most likely to occur for commercial establishments. Considering persons 14 years old and over the likelihood that a resident of the U, S. would be a victim of robbery was 1 in 1,156 persons in 1965. In the city of Chicago, 1 in every 177 persons of these ages was a robbery victim, assuming no multiple victimization. One in every 357 persons was a victim of an armed robbery.

In an important sense these probabilities are misleading, however. From the standpoint of the police, of course, a robbery is an offense regardless of the number of persons who are robbed whenever it is a distinct operation involving one or more robbers and one or more victims. The number of robberies however necessarily underestimates the number of persons who are victims of robberies in the sense that some of their property was taken by force or at least they were threatened by loss of property in a robbery encounter. Neither the number of persons committing the offense nor the number of victims in the offense then determines the number of offenses; rather it is the operation or situation that determines whether it is an offense of robbery.

One way of attempting to estimate probability of victimization is to compute rates for place of occurrence. At least for robberies in establishments, one can ask what is the likelihood that a robbery of an establishment will occur, or what is the likelihood that a robbery of a household will occur. The number of persons who are victims is not material to the definition of households or establishments. From Table 4, it can be seen that the likelihood that a robbery would occur in an establishment in Chicago was considerably higher than the likelihood that a robbery would occur in or about residence premises. One in every 39 establishments was robbed, assuming no multiple victimization. (The figure overstates victimization as data from sample surveys on multiple victimization in robberies of business establishments below shown.) Yet, by comparison only 1 in every 639 households was robbed, assuming no multiple victimization.

If one assumes that robberies in streets or public ways involve persons primarily 14 years old and over, then the likelihood of being robbed in public ways in Chicago was 1 in every 304 persons 14 years old and over. The likelihood that a person of these ages will be robbed in or about a residence is only about a fourth as great, since 1 in every 1,215 persons was a robbery victim in or about a residence premises in Chicago. Assuming that the offense of robbery occurring in a residence is directed against the household, the likelihood of a household being robbed was 1 in every 639 households in Chicago in 1965.^{8/}

Assuming that robberies of business establishments are primarily directed against owners or employees who are in

^{8/} Given the system for reporting robberies in or about residence premises, it is not clear whether such victims are clearly residents of the household or residence premises where the robbery occurs.

direct contact with the public, the likelihood that a person will be robbed in such a role in Chicago is much greater than it is that he will be robbed in a citizen role, either in the streets or in or about residence settings.

The foregoing analysis and the data in Table 4 point up the difficulties in interpreting either rates of probabilities of victimization for robberies. Considerable attention should be given to separating robberies where persons are victims in public ways from those that occur in residence settings, and both, in turn, should be separated from what are essentially robberies of business establishments. It seems clear that the probability of victimization from a robbery is considerably greater if one operates a business--including particular types of business--than if one is in other settings. While it may be difficult to develop statistics that take account of multiple victimization, it may not be out of the question to count the number of victims in robbery offenses where the victim is in no way part of an establishment.

Aggravated and Simple Assault:

The UCR system defines an aggravated assault as an unlawful attack by one person upon another for the purpose of inflicting severe bodily injury through means likely to produce death or great bodily harm. Statistics on aggravated assaults include attempts as well. The UCR reports acquire statistics on type of aggravated assault according to the type of weapon or force used and on simple or nonaggravated assaults, though generally no rates are calculated for types of aggravated assault or simple assaults. Simple assaults include assault and battery, injury caused by culpable negligence, intimidation, coercion, resisting or obstructing an officer, hazing, pointing a gun in jest, and any attempts to commit these

offenses. Assaults with personal means such as hands, fists, or feet are included in this category unless they result in serious personal injury such as broken bones or internal injuries, when they are classified as aggravated assaults.

Table 5 was prepared to provide more detailed information on victimization from assaults, both aggravated and simple assaults, and by type of aggravated assault. The crude rates and probability statements of victimization by assault overstate the likelihood that a person will be a victim of an assault since no account is taken of multiple victimization. Furthermore, as data in Table 6 on victims and offenders in assaults disclose, there are marked differences according to the race and sex of the victim and offender as well.

For the U. S. as a whole, in 1965 the likelihood of victimization from an aggravated assault was 1 in 956 inhabitants of all ages or 1 in 678 inhabitants 14 years old and over, assuming no multiple victimization from an aggravated assault. The likelihood of victimization was greatest for assault with a knife or other cutting instrument, the common form of assault for Negro male offenders and victims as is clear from data in Table 6 for Chicago. Though one is least likely to be a victim of an aggravated assault with a firearm, almost one in 4,000 persons is a victim of such an assault or an attempt with a firearm.

Data for Chicago in Table 5 show that 1 in every 91 persons 14 years old and over or 1 in 123 persons of all ages was a victim of an assault in 1965, assuming no multiple victimization. There were about 1.8 simple assaults for every aggravated assault in Chicago in 1965 with a rate of 39.5 aggravated assaults per 10,000 inhabitants for all persons 14 years and over as compared with a rate of 70.4 per 10,000 for simple assaults. Unlike the national data, statistics on assaults for Chicago show almost no difference

Table 5: Aggravated and Other Assault Rates by Type of Assault, United States and Chicago, Illinois, 1965.

Type of Aggravated Assault	Number of Inhabitants	Number of Assaults	Rate per 10,000	Ratio of 1 Assault to Inhabitants
United States: ^{1/}				
All aggravated assault	193,818,000 ^{a/}	202,661	10.5	956
with firearm	137,496,000 ^{b/}		14.7	678
with knife/cutting instrument		34,452	2.5	3,991
with blunt/dangerous weapon		72,958	5.3	1,885
with hands, fists, feet, etc.		44,586	3.2	3,084
Chicago: ^{2/}				
All aggravated assault	3,550,404 ^{c/}	10,382	29.2	342
with firearm	2,630,047 ^{d/}		39.5	253
with knife/cutting instrument		1,294	4.9	2,032
with blunt/dangerous weapon		5,303	20.2	495
with hands, fists, feet, etc.		2,495	9.5	1,054
Other assaults, not aggravated	3,550,404 ^{c/}	1,290	4.9	2,039
All assaults	2,630,047 ^{d/}	18,504	52.1	192
	3,550,404 ^{c/}		70.4	142
	2,630,047 ^{d/}	28,886	81.4	123
			109.8	91

^{1/}Source: Uniform Crime Reports, 1965, Table 1 and p. 8. The number of aggravated assaults by type of assault is calculated from the percentage distribution in the text on page 8.

^{2/}Source: Chicago Police Department, Data Systems Division, Monthly Return A's submitted to FBI.

^{a/}1965 U. S. population estimates taken from Population Estimates, Current Population Reports, U. S. Bureau of the Census, Series P-25, No. 321, November 30, 1965, Table 2; total resident population, all ages.

(CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)

^{b/}Ibid., Table 2; resident population, 14 years and over.

^{c/}1960 U. S. Census of Population, Vol. I, Part 15, Table 20; resident population, all ages.

^{d/}Ibid., Table 20; resident population, 14 years and over.

in the likelihood of assault with a firearm and assault with "personal weapons" such as hands, fists, feet or other bodily means. It is possible, that, the use of personal means is most subject to judgement in classification since inclusion within this category involves a judgement about the extent of personal injury. Differences among jurisdictions in the rate of aggravated assault may arise in part because of the inclusion of only some assaults with personal weapons or means as aggravated assaults.

The crude rates for aggravated assault in Table 5 need considerable refinement by race and sex of victim, and perhaps age as well, since the likelihood of victimization varies considerably by race and sex. High as some of the probabilities of victimization from aggravated or simple assault are in Table 5, as Table 6 shows, Negro men and women are more likely to be victims of assaults of all kinds than are white men and women.

Victims and Offenders in Offenses of Rape, Robbery and Assault

Crime statistics for arrested offenders in the United States generally show that the crime rate is higher among Negroes than among whites in cities with multiracial populations. Some, if not most of the difference in the crime rate of Negroes and whites or their respective rates of offense can be attributed to differences in their age and socioeconomic status compositions.

Table 6: Rates of Victimization Per 10,000 Residents by Race and Sex of Victim for Selected Crimes Against The Person: Chicago, Illinois, September 1965 to March 1966.*

Race and Sex of Victim	Offenders					Offenders				
	White		Negro		Total	White		Negro		Total
	Male	Female	Male	Female		Male	Female	Male	Female	
	All Forcible Rapes					All Attempts to Rape				
White Male										
White Female	.52		.23		.74	.35		.16		.51
Negro Male								4.28		4.43
Negro Female	.15		13.65		13.80	.15				
Total	.23		1.56		1.79	.16		.53		.69
	All Armed Robbery					All Strong-armed Robbery				
White Male	1.86		4.25	.06	6.17	1.74	.03	3.82	.04	5.63
White Female	.50	.01	.58	.01	1.10	.84	.02	2.25	.09	3.20
Negro Male	.96	.08	32.99	.46	34.49	.46		40.77	.38	41.61
Negro Female	.18	.04	9.40	.22	9.84	.07		11.69	.47	12.24
Total	1.03	.02	5.96	.09	7.11	1.07	.02	7.46	.14	8.69
	Assault and Battery: Shot or Attempted					Assault and Battery: Cut, Stabbed, or Attempted				
White Male	.38	.03	.13		.55	1.24	.26	.32	.03	1.86
White Female	.03	.01	.03		.07	.29	.07	.09	.07	.52
Negro Male	.21		7.62	2.80	10.63	.59		22.35	14.19	37.13
Negro Female			2.03	.29	2.32	.07	.04	10.71	4.21	15.03
Total	.18	.02	.99	.29	1.48	.66	.13	3.40	1.81	6.01
	Assault and Battery: Injured or Attempted, Dangerous Weapon					Assault and Battery: Serious Injury With Hands, Fists, Feet, Etc.				
White Male	1.24	.05	.38	.01	1.69	.97	.05	.23		1.25
White Female	.25	.02	.03	.01	.31	.36	.04	.08	.03	.51
Negro Male	.38		8.83	2.26	11.47	.21		3.43	.21	3.85
Negro Female	.15		4.90	.95	5.99	.04		4.10	.36	4.50
Total	.64	.03	1.51	.32	2.49	.55	.04	.89	.07	1.54

(CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)

Table 6: Rates of Victimization Per 10,000 Residents by Race and Sex of Victim for Selected Crimes Against The Person: Chicago, Illinois, September 1965 to March 1966.* (Continued)

Race and Sex of Victim	Offenders					Offenders				
	White		Negro		Total	White		Negro		Total
	Male	Female	Male	Female		Male	Female	Male	Female	
	Assault and Battery: Minor Injury- No Dangerous Weapon					Assault and Battery: Physical Contact- Insulting or Provoking				
White Male	8.39	.28	2.26	.15	11.08	2.08	.11	.60	.08	2.87
White Female	4.87	.89	.47	.21	6.45	1.72	.15	.45	.10	2.43
Negro Male	1.67	.13	29.26	3.60	34.66	.63	.04	5.94	.42	7.03
Negro Female	.80	.07	37.76	5.48	44.12	.29		9.55	1.56	11.40
Total	5.50	.50	7.85	1.07	14.71	1.61	.11	2.00	.28	4.00
	Assault and Battery: Threat With Dangerous Weapon					Assault and Battery: Threat With No Dangerous Weapon				
White Male	.90	.02	.46		1.38	1.21	.03	.43	.04	1.71
White Female	.49	.07	.12	.02	.70	.57	.15	.13	.10	.96
Negro Male	.59		7.66	1.17	9.42	.13		4.65	.13	4.90
Negro Female	1.75	.07	7.33	1.27	8.82	.07		4.79	.80	5.66
Total	.62	.04	1.73	.25	2.64	.73	.07	.89	1.60	2.12
	All Offenses									
White Male	20.06	.87	12.87	.41	34.22					
White Female	10.79	1.43	4.63	.64	17.49					
Negro Male	5.82	.25	163.63	25.62	195.32					
Negro Female	2.11	.25	120.22	15.65	138.23					
Total	12.97	.99	35.04	4.49	53.48					

*Source: Special Tabulation, Chicago Police Department Data Systems Division.

Crimes involve not only offenders, however, but victims as well. Much interest attaches, therefore, to the question whether the victims of crime distribute themselves much as do the offenders. Where the rate of arrests for Negro offenders is higher than for whites, the rate of victimization of the Negro population is expected to be high. But even if the rate of victimization is high, the question remains whether most offenders select victims from their own or another race.

Closely related to this question is one of whether and to what extent women are likely to be victims of crimes, and more particularly whether in the commission of criminal offenses, the offender crosses both race and sex lines in the choice of a victim.

These questions are considered below by examining the race and sex of offenders and their victims for crimes of rape, robbery and assault of the person. The data were secured from the Chicago Police Department for the period September, 1965 to March, 1966. They represent those cases that have passed an initial detective investigation and "unfounding" process. Some undoubtedly were unfounded on later investigation, so that all cannot be considered bona fide reports in terms of their final classification in the police files.

Nonetheless, the rate of unfounding will be fairly low since the majority of cases are unfounded in the original screening. The data on victims can be considered reasonably reliable and valid since the data most usually are secured from the victim as complainant. The information is secured from some other person for only a small proportion of the cases due usually to the fact that the victim is unable to communicate the information. The data on the offender population is secured in two ways. When an arrest is made

either at the time of the complaint or subsequently by detectives, the information is secured for the arrested person. For all other cases, the information on the offender is secured from the victim. Police departments generally classify this latter as "suspect" information. It provides a description of the alleged offender they seek to locate and arrest.

Suspect information is subject of course to unreliability in reporting since the only way that it can be verified is through a process that includes not only arrest but canons of proof. Generally, however, suspect information as verified through subsequent investigation and arrest is highly reliable, at least so far as the race and sex of the offender are concerned.

There nonetheless are questions of whether victims are more likely to misperceive the race and sex of some race-sex combination of victim and offender. For example, are whites more likely to misperceive the race of the offender than are Negroes? Are white women more likely to misperceive a male offender as Negro than Negro women are to misperceive a male offender as white? There are reasons to believe that some misperception may occur, particularly since race identification is more difficult at some times of the day and certain offenders that would be classified as white by the police department more likely may be misperceived as Negro because of the color of their skin, e.g, Puerto Ricans. Often the only basis for the race identification is skin color; it is likely that whites are more likely to misperceive skin color in race terms than are Negroes. There is no way of assessing this form of bias in the data.

Tabulations for Tables 6 and 7 assume there is only one victim and one suspect or offender for every offense. Some of the offenses, in fact, involved multiple victims from a single offender and multiple offenders for a single victim.

Table 7: Per Cent Distribution of Victims and Offenders By Race and Sex for Selected Crimes Against Persons: Chicago, Illinois, September 16, 1965 to March 2, 1966.¹

Race and Sex of Victim	Race and Sex of Offenders						Race and Sex of Offenders					
	White		Negro		Total		White		Negro		Total	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Per Cent	Num-ber	Male	Female	Male	Female	Per Cent	Num-ber
	All Forcible Rapes						All Attempts to Rape					
White Male	12		5		17	79	21		10		31	54
White Female												
Negro Male	1		82		83	380	2		67		69	122
Negro Female									77		100	176
Total	13		87		100	459	23		77		100	176
	All Armed Robbery						All Strong-Armed Robbery					
White Male	10		23	*	34	610	8	*	17	*	25	556
White Female	3	*	4	*	6	117	4	*	11	*	15	340
Negro Male	1	*	43	1	45	824	*		44	*	45	994
Negro Female	*	*	14	*	15	271	*		14	1	15	337
Total	15	*	84	1	100	1822	12	*	86	2	100	2227
	Assault and Battery: Shot or Attempted						Assault and Battery: Cut, Stabbed, or Attempted					
White Male	10	1	3		14	54	8	2	2	*	12	184
White Female	1	*	1		2	7	2	*	1	*	4	55
Negro Male	1		48	18	67	254	1		35	22	58	887
Negro Female			15	2	17	64	*	*	19	8	27	414
Total	12	1	67	20	100	379	11	2	57	30	100	1540
	Assault and Battery: Injured or Attempted, Dangerous Weapon						Assault and Battery: Serious Injury With Hands, Fists, Feet, Etc.					
White Male	19	1	6	*	26	167	24	1	6		32	124
White Female	4	*	1	*	5	33	10	1	2	1	14	54
Negro Male	1		33	9	43	274	1		21	1	23	92
Negro Female	1		21	4	26	165	*		29	3	32	124
Total	26	1	61	13	100	639	36	2	58	5	101	394

(CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)

Table 7: Per Cent Distribution of Victims and Offenders By Race and Sex for Selected Crimes Against Persons: Chicago, Illinois, September 16, 1965 to March 2, 1966.¹ (Continued)

Race and Sex of Victim	Race and Sex of Offenders						Race and Sex of Offenders					
	White		Negro		Total		White		Negro		Total	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Per Cent	Num-ber	Male	Female	Male	Female	Per Cent	Num-ber
	Assault and Battery: Minor Injury- No Dangerous Weapon						Assault and Battery: Physical Contact- Insulting or Provoking					
White Male	22	1	6	*	29	1095	20	1	6	1	28	284
White Female	14	2	1	1	18	685	18	2	5	1	25	258
Negro Male	1	*	18	2	22	828	1	*	14	1	16	168
Negro Female	1	*	27	4	32	1215	1	*	26	4	31	314
Total	37	3	53	7	100	3823	40	3	50	7	100	1024
	Assault and Battery: Threat With Dangerous Weapon						Assault and Battery: Threat With No Dangerous Weapon					
White Male	13	*	7		20	136	22	1	8	1	31	169
White Female	8	1	2	*	11	74	11	3	3	2	19	102
Negro Male	2		28	4	33	225	1		20	1	22	117
Negro Female	1	*	30	5	36	243	*		24	4	29	156
Total	24	2	66	10	100	678	34	4	55	7	100	544
	All Offenses											
White Male	15	1	9	*	25	3381						
White Female	8	1	4	1	13	1859						
Negro Male	1	*	29	4	34	4666						
Negro Female	*	*	24	3	28	3807						
Total	24	2	66	8	100	13713						

¹Source: Special Tabulations, Chicago Police Department Data Systems Division.

*Less than 0.5 per cent.

The proportion of cases where there are multiple victims from a single offender is low so that there is little bias from an offender being included more than once in the population of offenders. There also may be some bias from an offender being counted more than once for committing one offense of this kind during the six month period. Where there are multiple offenders for a single victim, the data actually underestimate the number of offenders. However, this has little, if any, effect on the race-sex classification of the offender, since there are few cases of cross-race, multiple offenders of suspects, and few offenses where both men and women are the offenders in major crimes against the person.

In tabulating offense data to make victim and offender comparisons possible, the practice is to identify a major offender or suspect in cases of multiple offenders. The data in Tables 6 and 7 should be affected little, if at all, by the inclusion of multiple victims and offenders so far as comparisons of race and sex of victims and offenders are concerned. Their inclusion, however, affects observed rates of victimization or of offenders.

Throughout this section some general terms are used to refer to the offense categories. A few words must be said about a number of them to guard against a misinterpretation in their use. The term "major crimes against the person" is used to refer to the crimes of Robbery (Armed and Strong-Armed); Rape (Forcible Rape or Assaults or Attempts with Intent to Rape); Assault and Battery (Shot or Attempted; Cutting, Stabbing or Attempted; Injured or Attempted with Other Dangerous Weapon; Serious Injury with Hands, Fists, Feet, Etc.; Minor Injury With No Dangerous Weapon; Physical Contact by Insult or Provocation; Threat with a Dangerous Weapon and Threat with No Dangerous Weapon). This definition of major crimes is not the same as UCR Index crimes against the person nor of their Part I crimes against the person.

Among the Index crimes against the person excluded are homicide and larcenies from persons, e.g., purse-snatching or larceny from pockets. At the same time, while all Part I assaults are included above, the Index crimes include only aggravated assaults (assaults with a gun, knife or cutting instrument, other dangerous weapon or aggravated with hands, fists, feet, etc., and all attempts at the same).

It should be clear also that statements about the sex of victims or offenders in "major crimes against the person" include victims and offenders of specific crimes only when the crime is relevant for a sex group. Thus, males are victims only of crimes of robbery and assault and battery, though they are by definition the sole offenders in rape cases, while females are victims of rape, robbery and assault and battery, but offenders for only the two latter major types of crime.

The term "rate of victimization" is employed to speak of the chances that one may be a victim of a crime against the person in this section. The rates given in Tables 6 and 7, however, substantially underestimate the actual chances of one's being a victim, during the six month period for which the data were available (or for an annual period if the rates are doubled to provide a rough estimated annual rate). The main reason for this underestimation is that the tables include only those cases where both the victim and the offender's race and sex were known. Information was available for the race and sex of the victim and offender in only 62 per cent of all cases; for 66 per cent of all cases there was information on the race of both victim and offender. There is substantial variation by type of offense, however. For rapes, information on the race of victim or offender was lacking for only 8 per cent of all rapes and attempts to rape. For all aggravated assaults, information was available in 70 per cent of the offenses; it was somewhat greater for simple assaults, depending upon the type of assault. Only among

robberies is the information particularly poor; for only 50 per cent of armed robberies and 58 per cent of strong-armed robberies was information on the race and sex of both victim and offender available.

The available data make it possible to state probabilities of victimization by race quite accurately; it is largely the absence of information on offenders that leads to substantial underestimation of the probability of a person of a given race and sex being victimized by a person of a given race and sex. The nonreporting of information on victims seems closely related to type of offense and accounts for most of the "missing" information. Nonetheless, a comparison of the distribution of offenses where race of both victim and offender were known with the distribution of offenses where only the race of the victim was known (94 per cent of all cases) shows only very small differences in the distributions. While the available data do not permit estimation of the probability of victimization by type of offender, it seems doubtful that there are biases operating that would distort the patterns observed in victim-offender relationships.

The data in Table 6 are rates of victimization for race-sex groups and the total population of Negroes and whites resident in the city of Chicago. The exposed population for each race-sex group is their population aged 14 and over; the sum for the race-sex subgroups is the total population. Excluded then from the resident population of Chicago for purposes of calculating these rates are all persons classified as "other races" and all persons aged 13 and under classified as Negro or whites.

Victim status, of course, is related to other characteristics of the person, particularly his age and socioeconomic status. Unfortunately these data on victims and their offenders are lacking so that rates of victimization by age, race,

and sex or by age, race, sex and socioeconomic status cannot be calculated.

The rates in Table 6 can be regarded as "minimum" probabilities that a person in a given race-sex group will be a victim of an offender of a given race and sex (columns (1) - (4) in rows (1) - (4)), the probability that a person of a given race and sex will be a victim (column (5) in rows (1) - (4)), and the probability that a person in the total population will be a victim of an offender of a given race and sex (columns (1) - (5) in row (5)). The probabilities that a person in a given race-sex group will be a victim of an offender of a given race and sex are in the body of each table for major types of offense and for all major offenses against the person. The probability that a person of a given race and sex will be a victim is given in the last column for each table while the last row, "Total", gives the probability that a person will be a victim of an offender of a given race and sex.

Probability of Becoming A Victim of A Major Crime Against the Person:

Knowing the race and sex composition of the offender population, what expectation might one have about becoming a victim of an offender of a given race and sex? Assuming that offenders make no selection of their victims on the basis of race and sex characteristics, any resident of Chicago should expect the chance is greatest of being a victim of a Negro male offender. On an annual basis, one would estimate that about 70 of every 10,000 persons ages 14 and over would be victims of a Negro male offender (based on an observed six month rate of 35.04 per 10,000). Next most likely is that one would be a victim of a white male offender, though one should expect this to occur only about one-third as often as that of being

a victim of a Negro male offender (a six-month rate of 12.97 for white male offenders compared with that of 35.04 for Negro male offenders in Table 6). Next in order of likelihood is that one would be a victim of a Negro female offender, but the risk is only slightly more than one-third that of being a victim of a white male offender. Yet, it is more than four times that of being a victim of a white female offender for it is quite unlikely that one would be a victim of a white female offender. The data emphasize also that one is more likely to be a victim of a male offender of either race than of a female offender of either race.

Based on a rank order of chances of being a victim of an offender of a given race and sex, one should expect one's chances are greatest for being victimized by a Negro male offender, followed in order by the white male offender, the Negro female offender, and the white female offender. This same rank order holds for the offenses of forcible rape and assaults with intent to rape. Were victims selected at random, a woman is more likely to be a rape victim of a Negro than a white male. It holds as well for both major forms of robbery, with one being most likely to be a victim of a Negro male in an armed or strong-armed robbery followed by risk of victimization from a white male. For armed and strong-armed robbery the chances that one would be victimized by a Negro or white female are really very small; nonetheless they are smallest for victimization by a white female.

The likelihood of being a victim of an offender of a given race and sex is somewhat different for assault and battery, however. Only in cases of an injury or attempt to injure with a dangerous weapon, serious injury with use of hands, fists, feet, etc., minor injury without a dangerous weapon, physical contact by insult or provocation, and in threats with a dangerous weapon does their rank order of

offender-specific victimization rates hold for the total population.

Where cases involve the use of a gun, knife or other cutting instrument or an attempt to use them, the rank order of offender-specific victimization rates changes. While it still is true that one is most likely to be a victim of a Negro male offender, the second highest victimization rate is observed for Negro female offenders. And again, victimization by a white female in a shooting, cutting or stabbing is infrequent. Indeed the probability of being cut or stabbed by a Negro female is more than two and one half times that for a white male while the probability of being cut or stabbed by a Negro male is almost five times that for a white male.

If one calculates the victimization rate by offenders of a given race and sex for threats without a dangerous weapon, victimization by a Negro woman is most probable followed by such threats from a Negro male. Such threats should occur least often from a white female.

These risks for major types of offenses against the person are summarized in Chart I.

The rank order of offender race-sex specific victimization rates for the total population of a city may well give rise to public expectations about their likelihood of being victimized by an offender of a given race and sex, particularly since information on the race and sex of offenders or arrested persons generally is made available to the public while that for the race and sex of their victims is not. Despite such offender rates, offenders "select" their victims on the basis of race and sex so that expectations built upon the rank order of offender race-sex specific victimization rates for the total population do not generally hold.

Whether or not for most offenses, offenders are causally motivated to select a victim on the basis of their race and

Chart I: Rank Order of Offender Race-Sex Specific Victimization Rates for the Total Population by Selected Major Offense Against the Person.

Type of Offense Against the Person	Rank Order of Offender Race-Sex Specific Victimization Rates for the Total Population*			
	Rank I	Rank II	Rank III	Rank IV
All offenses	NM	WM	NF	WF
Forcible Rape	NM	WM	--	--
Assault/Intent to Rape	NM	WM	--	--
Armed Robbery	NM	WM	NF	WF
Strong-Armed Robbery	NM	WM	NF	WF
Shot or Attempted	NM	NF	WM	WF
Cut, Stabbed, or Attempted	NM	NF	WM	WF
Injury/Dangerous Weapon	NM	WM	NF	WF
Injury/Hands, Fists, Feet, Etc.	NM	WM	NF	WF
Injury/No Dangerous Weapon	NM	WM	NF	WF
Physical Contact-Insult, Provoke	NM	WM	NF	WF
Threat/Dangerous Weapon	NM	WM	NF	WF
Threat/No Dangerous Weapon	NF	NM	WM	WF

* "W" = White; "N" = Negro; "M" = Male; "F" = Female.

sex is difficult to say. The patterns of residential and social segregation of the races may well be a major factor

influencing a person of a given race to "select" a victim of the same race, since citizens of the same race are the most "available opportunity". Apart from a few crimes that by definition specify the sex of the victim or the offender (rape, for example), opportunities to commit crimes against men appear greater than those to commit the same crime against women. Patterns of public movement and private contact among men and women appear to make men the more likely victims. Women, for example, are less likely to go out unaccompanied at night and white women probably do not enter high rate crime areas inhabited primarily by Negroes, to cite another example. The availability of victims for offenders then is influenced by patterns of residence and of daily living.

Knowing the race and sex of victims and the frequency with which members of any race-sex group are victims of crimes and knowing the frequency of each race-sex group in the total population aged 14 and over, the chances that a person of a given race-sex group will be a victim of a major crime against the person can be calculated. These rates are given in the total column for "All Offenses" in Table 6.

For all major offenses against the person, the rate of victimization is highest for Negro males. Doubling the six month rates in Table 6 and assuming there is no multiple victimization during the year, 391 Negro males of every 10,000 Negro males (or almost 4 of every 100) are victims of a major crime of robbery or of assault and battery.

The second highest rate of victimization for major offenses against the person is that for Negro females. Making the same assumptions about annual rate and multiple victimization as for Negro males, an estimated 276 of every 10,000 Negro women (or somewhat less than 3 in 100) are victims of a major crime of rape, robbery or assault and battery in a year in Chicago.

White men and women have much lower rates of victimization than do Negroes. About 64 in every 10,000 white males are

estimated to be victims of robbery or assault and battery in a year (or less than one in every 100 white males) and only 35 white women of every 10,000 white women are estimated to be victims of rape, robbery, and assault and battery in a year.

Thus any Negro man in Chicago has a risk factor as a victim more than six times that of a white male and more than 11 times that of a white female. Among women, the Negro woman in Chicago has a risk factor as a victim about eight times that of a white woman and more than four times that of a white male.

A rank order of victimization exists in Chicago then such that Negro males should have the highest expectation that they will be victims of a major crime against the person, followed in order of risk by Negro females, white males, and white females.

This same rank order holds for the offenses of forcible rape and assaults with intent to rape. Negro women are far more likely to be victims of a forcible rape or of an assault with intent to rape than are white women. Indeed the probability that a Negro woman will be a victim of a forcible rape is about 18 times greater than that for white women.

The rank order holds as well for both major types of robbery. Negro males run the greatest risk of being a victim of an armed or strong-armed robbery. Their probability of being a victim of a robbery is substantially greater than that for Negro women who are next in order of risk. The probability for a Negro male is over three times that for a Negro female. White males have an even lower probability of being a victim of an armed or strong-armed robbery than do Negro females and the probability is lowest for white women.

The pattern of risk among race-sex groups does not hold for all forms of assault and battery, however. It holds for the serious offenses with a dangerous weapon. Thus the Negro male runs the greatest risk of being shot, cut or stabbed or

injured with some other dangerous weapon, or in being threatened with a dangerous weapon followed in order by the Negro female, white male, and white female. It is striking how much greater is the risk for the Negro male and female in being a victim of an assault, attempted assault, or a threat with a dangerous weapon than for the white male or female. For example, the risk of a Negro male being shot is roughly 20 times greater than that for a white male while the Negro female risk of being shot is over four times that of a white male. Clearly, too, it is the Negro man and woman who run the risk in being assaulted with a knife or other cutting instrument. The probability that a Negro male will be stabbed is 20 times that for a white male while the probability for a Negro woman is more than eight times that for the white male.,

Surprisingly perhaps to all but the police, it is the Negro woman who takes the greatest risk that she will be a victim of serious injury from the use of hands, fists, feet or other part of the body in an assault. She likewise assumes the greatest risk for minor injury without a dangerous weapon, in physical contact with insult or provocation and in threats without a dangerous weapon. For all of these, the Negro male has the second highest probability of being a victim, while the white woman runs the lowest risk.

Indeed, it is altogether clear that the white woman has a low probability of being a victim of any major offense against the person. Furthermore, the white male always has the second lowest probability of being a victim of a major crime against the person in all types of major offenses against the person. For all major crimes against the person then, the probability of being a victim is greater for any Negro man or woman than for any white man or woman. The Negro male runs the greatest risk of being a victim of an offense involving a dangerous weapon and robbery. The Negro woman

runs the greatest risk of being a victim of rape and all forms of assault and battery that do not involve a dangerous weapon. This does not mean that the Negro woman does not assume a high risk for all serious assaults since not only does she run a fairly high risk in offenses involving dangerous weapons but she runs the greatest risk for offenses involving serious injury with the hands, fists, feet or other parts of the body. Below it will be shown that this risk is a function of the relationship the Negro man and woman have to one another as victim and offender.

Quite clearly, too, race is more important than sex in the risk one takes in being a victim of a major crime against the person, as Chart II on risks of victimization for a person of a given race and sex shows.

A comparison of the offender-race-sex specific victimization rates for the total population with the probabilities that a person of a given race and sex will be a victim (calculated as a rate of victimization per 10,000 persons aged 14 and over of that race and sex) shows differences in the rank order of probability of being a victim of an offender of a race-sex group and the rank-order of victimization of the same race-sex groups. The reader may wish to compare the rank order of offender race-sex specific victimization rates with the rank order of risk of victimization or the actual rates for subgroups in Table 6 to verify this conclusion.

The rank order of offender race-sex specific victimization rates and of victimization rates by race and sex of victims for all offenses can be summarized as follows:

Offender Race-Sex Specific Victimization Rates for the Total Population		Total Victimization Rates by Race and Sex of Victim	
Negro Male	35.04	Negro Male	195.32
White Male	12.97	Negro Female	138.23
Negro Female	4.49	White Male	34.22
White Female	.99	White Female	17.49

Chart II: Rank Order of Victimization Rates by Race and Sex of Victim for Selected Major Offenses Against the Person

Type of Offense Against the Person	Rank Order of Victimization Rates by Race and Sex of Victim*			
	Rank I	Rank II	Rank III	Rank IV
All Offenses	NM	NF	WM	WF
Forcible Rape	--	NF	--	WF
Assault/Intent to Rape	--	NF	--	WF
Armed Robbery	NM	NF	WM	WF
Strong-Armed Robbery	NM	NF	WM	WF
Shot or Attempted	NM	NF	WM	WF
Cut, Stabbed, Attempted	NM	NF	WM	WF
Injury/Other Dangerous Weapon	NM	NF	WM	WF
Injury/Hands, Fists, Feet, Etc.	NF	NM	WM	WF
Injury/No Dangerous Weapon	NF	NM	WM	WF
Physical Contact/Insulting, Provoking	NF	NM	WM	WF
Threat/Dangerous Weapon	NM	NF	WM	WF
Threat/No Dangerous Weapon	NF	NM	WM	WF

* "W" = White; "N" = Negro; "M" = Male; "F" - Female.

It is apparent that for a member of the total population victimization by a Negro male is most probable and that it is

the Negro male who is most likely to experience victimization. It also is apparent that a member of the total population is least often victimized by a white female and she has the lowest risk of victimization. However, while the white-male-offender victimization rate for the total population ranks second, it is the Negro female who is second in risk of victimization. Correlatively, the white male has the second lowest risk of victimization but the Negro-female-offender victimization rate for the total population ranks second.

These relative differences do not hold for all major types of crimes against the person, however. They hold only for both major forms of robbery, for injury with other dangerous weapons, and for threats with a dangerous weapon. Although the Negro woman runs the second highest risk in being a victim of a shooting, cutting or stabbing, it also is apparent that Negro-female-offender victimization rate for the total population ranks second. And, while in offenses involving serious injury with hands, fists, feet or other part of the body, injury without a dangerous weapon, and physical contact with insults or provocation the Negro-male-offender and white-male-offender victimization rates are highest, it is the Negro woman who is the most likely victim. Thus for these offenses of assault and battery, the Negro woman runs a far greater risk of being offended against than anyone runs relatively in being a victim of a Negro woman for those offenses.

Race and Sex of Offenders and Their Victims In Major Offenses Against the Person

Ranked in order of chances of being a victim of an offender of a given race and sex, a resident's chances, irrespective of his own race and sex, in major crimes against the person are

greatest for victimization by a Negro male offender, followed in order by the white male offender, the Negro female offender, and the white female offender. These offender-specific victimization rates apparently mold public expectations about their chances of being victimized. When held by members of some race-sex subgroups, these expectations are false or misleading, particularly as they apply to certain types of offenses against the person. The offender-specific victimization rates for race-sex subgroups of victims will be examined by assessing what is the probability that a member of each subgroup will be a victim of an offender of a given race and sex. Thus the characteristics of the victim as well as those of the offender will be taken into account. In particular it will be shown that differences in the pattern of offender-specific rates in major crimes against the person for the total population and for the white population are greater than differences for the total population and the Negro population.

The actual experience of victimization of persons of a given race and sex by offenders of a given race and sex provide the data for calculating offender-specific rates of victimization for race-sex subgroups of the population in Table 6. These may be regarded as minimum probabilities during a six month period that a person of a given race-sex subgroup will be victimized by some person of his own, and the opposite, race and sex.

A number of propositions are stated that summarize the risk of victimization persons in a given race, sex, or race-sex subgroup assume relative to other race, sex, or race-sex subgroups.

1. In major crimes against the person, females are more likely to be a victim of males than males are of females, irrespective of the race of victims and of offenders. The following corollaries may be stated:

- 1a. A white female is more likely to be a victim of a white male than a white male is to be a victim of a white female.
- 1b. A white female is more likely to be a victim of a Negro male than is a Negro male to be a victim of a white female.
- 1c. A Negro female is more likely to be a victim of a Negro male than is a Negro male to be a victim of a Negro female.
- 1d. A Negro female is more likely to be a victim of a white male than is a white male to be a victim of a Negro female.

These differences between the victimization of men and women hold for all major crimes against the person with one exception: a Negro male is more likely to be shot, cut or stabbed by a Negro female than is a Negro female to be shot, cut, or stabbed by a Negro male. The differences are especially great for cutting and stabbing with a knife or other instrument. Though Negro females run a fairly high risk of being cut or stabbed by a Negro male, the Negro male runs an even greater risk that he will be cut or stabbed by a Negro female.

It is noteworthy, too, that a white woman is almost ten times more likely to be a victim of a white male than is a white male to be a victim of a white female.

Though for all crimes against the person, the probability that a white female will be victimized by a Negro male is less than half that of being victimized by a white male, the probability that a white female will be victimized by a Negro male is more than twice the probability that a Negro female will be victimized by a white male, and 18 times greater than the probability that a Negro male will be victimized by a white female. This perhaps is so for two main reasons--white

females have the lowest offender rate among offender groups and white females are least likely when committing an offense to cross race lines.

2. Males are more likely to be victims of other males than of females from either race. The following corollaries may be stated:

- 2a. A white male is more likely to be victimized by a white male than by a white female.
- 2b. A white male is more likely to be victimized by a Negro male than by a Negro female.
- 2c. A Negro male is more likely to be victimized by a Negro male than by a white female.
- 2d. A Negro male is more likely to be victimized by a Negro male than by a Negro female.

These differences between the victimization of men by men as compared with men by women hold for all major crimes against the person, except that in all assault and battery offenses, other than physical contact with insult or provocation, a Negro male is more likely to be victimized by a Negro female than by a white male.

The differences in male risk of victimization by the same sex as compared with the opposite sex are very substantial for both white and Negro males.

3. In major crimes against the person, females are more likely to be victims of the opposite sex than of the same sex, regardless of race. The following corollaries may be stated:

- 3a. A white female is more likely to be victimized by a white male than she is by a white or Negro female.
- 3b. A white female is more likely to be victimized by a Negro male than she is by a white or Negro female.
- 3c. A Negro female is more likely to be victimized by a Negro male than she is by a white or Negro female.
- 3d. A Negro female is more likely to be victimized by a white male than she is by a white female, though she is more likely to be victimized by a Negro female than by a white male.

The basic relationship holds for all corollaries other than the case where the Negro woman is victimized by the white male. While her chances of victimization by the white male are greater than her chances of victimization by the white female, she is more likely to be victimized by another Negro female than she is by the white male.

These differences between the victimization of women by men as compared with women by women hold for all major types of crime against the person with but a few exceptions. The main exceptions stem from the fact that Negro women run a substantially higher risk of victimization from other Negro women and the relatively low rate of victimization of the Negro woman by the white male, as already noted. The only crime against the person where Negro women are more likely to be the victim of a white male than of a Negro woman is in threats with a dangerous weapon. The other exceptions occur for minor injury with no dangerous weapon and threats without a dangerous weapon. For these offenses, a Negro woman appears more likely to be a victim of a white woman than a white man.

While it is clear that both Negro and white women are more likely to be victimized by men of the same and opposite race than they are by women of either race, it should be clear that their risk of victimization by a man is considerably greater for men from their own than from the opposite race. These differences will be discussed in our next proposition.

4. A person of a given race and sex is more likely to be a victim of his own race and sex than of an offender from the opposite race, regardless of sex. The following corollaries may be stated:

- 4a. A white male is more likely to be a victim of a white male than he is to be a victim of a Negro male or female.
- 4b. A white female is more likely to be a victim of a white female than she is of a Negro female though

she is more likely to be a victim of a Negro male than she is of a white female.

- 4c. A Negro male is more likely to be a victim of a Negro male than he is of a white male or female.
- 4d. A Negro female is more likely to be a victim of a Negro female than she is of a white male or female.

The basic relationships hold except for the case of the victimization of the white female where for all major offenses against the person, other than minor injury without a dangerous weapon and threats without a dangerous weapon, she is more likely to be victimized by a Negro male than by a white female. This exception derives in part from the fact that white females have very low offense rates resulting in a low rate of victimization of white females by white females.

5. A white person is more likely than a Negro person of the same sex to be a victim of a person of the other race and sex. This proposition is understood more readily in terms of its corollaries:

- 5a. A white male is more likely to be the victim of a Negro man or woman than is a Negro man to be victimized by a white man or woman.

While this proposition holds for all major offenses against the person, the fact that a white male is more likely to be victimized by a Negro man or woman than a Negro man is to be victimized by a white man or woman is accounted for primarily by the fact that a white male is more likely to be victimized by a Negro male in offenses of armed and strong-armed robbery, assaults involving injury with hands, fists, feet, etc., minor injury without a dangerous weapon, and threats without a dangerous weapon. Actually, the Negro male is somewhat more likely to be the victim of a white male in shootings and cuttings or stabbings than is the white male to be victimized by the Negro male, and there are virtually

no differences in their risks for injury with a dangerous weapon, and physical contact with insult or provocation.

The risk of victimization of a white male by a Negro male is small with the exception of robbery so that a white male's expectation of victimization by a Negro person in assault and battery should be low.

5b. A white female is more likely to be a victim of a Negro male or female than is a Negro female to be a victim of a white man or woman.

While this proposition holds for all major offenses against the person, a Negro woman runs a higher risk of being assaulted by a white male in injury with a dangerous weapon and in minor injury without a dangerous weapon. In all cases of victimization, however, the probabilities are so low as to emphasize that cross-race victimization of the white woman is small.

White women are more likely to be victimized by Negro women than vice versa in all offenses except armed robbery and threats with a dangerous weapon, but their probabilities are so very low that they may fluctuate considerably over time.

It should be noted especially that although a white woman is somewhat more likely to be victimized by a Negro male in forcible rape than is a Negro woman to be victimized by a white male in forcible rape, the probabilities of either event occurring are extremely small. Furthermore, there are no differences for assault with intent to rape. It should be quite apparent then that a white woman or a Negro woman has little reason to expect that she will be raped or assaulted with an intent to rape by a male of the opposite sex even though the white woman may run a slightly greater risk for forcible rape by the Negro male than the Negro woman runs in forcible rape by a white male. Indeed since the former is more likely to be reported to the police than the latter, it

may be doubted that any real difference exists between the risk of white and Negro women.

6. A Negro is more likely to be a victim of another Negro than is a white of another white, regardless of sex. This proposition is more readily understood in the terms of its corollaries:

6a. Negroes are more likely to be victims of other Negroes of the same sex than are whites.

A Negro male is more likely to be a victim of a Negro male than is a white male of a white male and a Negro female is more likely to be a victim of a Negro female than is a white female of a white female. The within sex victimization rates of Negroes then are higher than the comparable within sex rates for whites.

6b. Negroes are more likely to be victims of persons of the opposite sex than are whites.

A Negro woman is more likely to be a victim of a Negro male than is a white woman of a white male and the Negro male is more likely to be victimized by a Negro female than is a white male by a white woman. In short, Negro men and women have to fear victimization from one another more than do white men and women.

It is apparent from the data in Table 6 that the risk of victimization of a Negro woman by a Negro male is very high--considerably higher than the risk of victimization that a white male has from a white male.

Indeed, Table 6 makes abundantly clear that it is the Negro citizen who runs the high risk of victimization in a city such as Chicago. The two highest rates of victimization in Table 6 for all major offenses against the person involve the Negro male as offender. They are those of Negro male victim and offender (163.63) and Negro female victim by Negro male offender (120.22). The next highest risk is that

for a Negro male victimized by a Negro female (25.62). The fourth highest risk is that assumed by the white male from a white male (20.06) followed by the risk a Negro female assumes from a Negro female (15.65). It is apparent that all cases of victimization of Negro by Negro are included in these high risk groups but for whites only those cases of white male victimization by white male offender are included.

7. The highest risk of victimization for persons in each race-sex subgroup occur when the male of their race is the offender. More specifically, the highest risk of victimization for persons in each race-sex subgroup are these:

- 7a. A white woman is most likely to be a victim of a white male except for robbery and strong-armed robbery where she is most likely to be a victim of a Negro male, though the difference is substantial only for strong-armed robbery.
- 7b. A white male is most likely to be a victim of a white male.
- 7c. A Negro woman is most likely to be a victim of a Negro male.
- 7d. A Negro male is most likely to be a victim of a Negro male.

The lowest rates of victimization for all major crimes against the person in Table 6 are a function of the fact that white females have an extremely low rate as offenders and that Negro women though having a much higher rate than white women, offend primarily against Negro men. Thus the lowest rates of victimization for all major crimes against the person arise for the white woman against Negro men and women. The Negro man and woman assumes very little risk of victimization by a white woman. The next lowest rates of victimization occur for the white man or woman victimized by a Negro woman.

8. When race lines are crossed then in major crimes against the person, the men and women of either race, with

few exceptions, run little risk of victimization from women of the opposite race. More specifically, the lowest risk of victimization for persons in each race-sex subgroup are these:

- 8a. A white woman is less likely to be a victim of a Negro woman than of white men or women, or of Negro males, for all offenses against the person other than strong-armed robbery.
- 8b. A white male is less likely to be a victim of a Negro female than of a white female, or of Negro males or females, for all offenses but armed and strong-armed robbery.
- 8c. A Negro woman is less likely to be a victim of a white woman than of Negro males or females, or of white males.
- 8d. A Negro male is less likely to be a victim of a white woman than of a white man, or of a Negro man or woman.

Somewhat higher, though still comparatively low rates of victimization in major crimes against the person, are observed when the male of either race crosses race lines in selecting a female victim. Table 6 makes clear that the white woman runs a higher risk of victimization from a Negro man (4.63) than does the Negro woman from the white man (2.11). When a man crosses race lines to "select" a female offender then, the white woman runs a risk roughly twice that of the Negro woman. This is not the case, however, for all major offenses against person as Table 6 shows. It has already been noted that the white woman may run a slightly greater risk for forcible rape. But the main difference arises because the white woman is more likely to be the victim of robbery by a Negro male than a Negro woman is to be a victim of robbery by white male. This is not surprising since such robberies generally occur in places of business in Negro areas where

the business has white employees. For some offenses of assault and battery, the Negro woman is more likely to be victimized by a white male than is a white woman to be victimized by a Negro male. This is true for the offenses of injury or an attempt to injure without dangerous weapons, minor injury without a dangerous weapon, and threat with a dangerous weapon. Since the differences in the risk run by white as compared with Negro women being victimized by a man from the other race are small for all other types of assault and battery, it can be said that in robbery the white woman runs a higher risk of being victimized by the Negro male than does the Negro woman by the white man while in assault and battery, the Negro woman runs the higher risk.

It has been noted that one's expectations about personally being victimized in a crime can be misleading when based on statistics about offenders. White victims in American society can particularly be misled in their expectations about exposure to victimization from Negroes. Several findings from Table 6 provide more realistic expectations for members of each race-sex subgroup in Chicago if one is calculating the risk to which one is exposed of becoming a victim of a major crime against the person. These findings may very well hold for most jurisdictions in the United States.

1. On the whole, white men and women take much lower risks of victimization in major crimes against the person than do Negro men and women.

2. When persons in any race-sex subgroup calculate the risk to which one is exposed of becoming a victim of a major crime against the person, one has most to fear from persons of one's own race.

3. Men run the greatest risk of becoming a victim of other men of their race.

4. Women run the greatest risk of being victimized by men of their race.

5. White women are least likely to become a victim in a major crime against the person while Negro women run a risk that is substantially greater than that for white males.

6. When race lines are crossed in major crimes against the person, the Negro male is the most likely offender. A white male is more likely to be victimized by the Negro male than is a Negro male to be victimized by a white male. White women run about half as great a victimization by Negro as white men.

7. The risk to which one is exposed of becoming a victim of a major crime against the person varies somewhat by type of major crime. When race lines are crossed in major crimes against the person, whites are most likely to be victimized by Negroes in crimes of robbery. Correlatively, Negroes are more likely to be victimized by whites in crimes of assault and battery.

The police and the public generally become aware of the crime problem through statistics on offenses and on offenders. Rarely is a report given on the victims of offenders. These findings may help to clarify how statistics on offenses and offenders may mislead the public about the risk to which one is exposed of becoming a victim of a major crime against the person because they do not take account of the fact that the relative proportion of race-sex subgroups varies in the population and that offenders "select" their victims on the basis of race and sex.

Modal Types of Victims, Offenders, and Victim-Offender Relationships in Major Crimes Against the Person

The population of victims and offenders now is examined from the standpoint of potential police and legal processing of offenders in major crimes against the person. What type

of offender, victim, and combination of victim, and combination of victim and offender are the police, the prosecutor, and perhaps judges (if there is no differential selection for trial proceedings) likely to confront in their work? Table 7 presents the percentage distribution of victims and offenders by race and sex for selected major crimes against the person.

The modal type of offender, victim, and relationship between victim and offender by their race and sex is presented in Chart III.

The modal type of offender among race-sex subgroups in all major crimes against the person is the Negro male. Not only is he the modal type of offender but in no case did he commit less than one-half of all offenses in each major type of crime against persons. Furthermore, the Negro male accounted for over three-fourths of all offenders in major crimes of forcible rape, attempts to rape, armed robbery, and strong-armed robbery in Chicago during the six month period.

The modal type of victim among race-sex subgroups varies by major type of crime against the person. The Negro female is the modal type of victim in forcible rape, assault with intent to rape, and all assault and battery other than assaults or threats involving a dangerous weapon. The Negro male is the modal victim for offenses of robbery and major assaults that involve injury with a dangerous weapon.

Negroes are the modal type of victim in all major crimes against the person then, except that the white male is the modal victim in threats without a dangerous weapon and is equally as liable to victimization as the Negro female in injury where hands, feet, or other parts of the body are used in an assault.

The role of victim is more widely distributed among race-sex subgroups of the population than is the role of offender. Only among rape offenses, where more than 50 per cent of the

Chart III. Modal Type of Offender, Victim, and Victim and Offender Relationship by Race and Sex for Selected Major Offenses Against the Person.

Major Offense Against the Person	Modal Type Of:					
	Offender		Victim		Victim-Offender Relationship	
	Status	Per Cent	Status	Per Cent	Status	Per Cent
All Offenses	NM	66	NM	34	NM-NM	29
Forcible Rape	NM	87	NF	83	NF-NM	82
Assault/Intent to Rape	NM	77	NF	69	NF-NM	67
Armed Robbery	NM	84	NM	45	NM-NM	43
Strong-Armed Robbery	NM	86	NM	45	NM-NM	44
Shot or Attempted	NM	67	NM	67	NM-NM	48
Cut, Stabbed, Attempted	NM	57	NM	58	NM-NM	35
Injury/Other Dangerous Weapons	NM	61	NM	43	NM-NM	33
Injury/Fists, Feet, Hands, Etc.	NM	58	NF-WM	32	NF-NM	29
Minor Injury/No Dangerous Weapon	NM	53	NF	32	NF-NM	27
Physical Contact/Insulting, Provoking	NM	50	NF	31	NF-NM	26
Threat/Dangerous Weapon	NM	66	NF	36	NF-NM	30
Threat/No Dangerous Weapon	NM	55	WM	31	NF-NM	24

victims of forcible rape and assault with intent to rape are Negro women, and shootings or cuttings and stabbings where more than 50 per cent of the victims are Negro males, are the majority of victims from a single race-sex subgroup.

For all major crimes against the person, the modal type of victim-offender relationship involves Negroes as victims and offenders. For all offenses, the Negro male victimized by a Negro male is the modal type of victim-offender relationship. The Negro woman as victim of the Negro male is the modal victim-offender relationship in offenses of rape and assault with intent to rape. Apart from rape offenses, however, the Negro female as victim of a Negro male is the modal type of victim-offender relationship in all offenses of assault and battery other than those where injury is sustained through use of a dangerous weapon.

The white woman is the least likely offender in all major crimes against the person. For all major offenses against the person, she comprises but two per cent of all offenders, and for no specific offense against the person does she comprise more than four per cent of all offenders.

Indeed the role of offender in the population has an anomalous quality. Negro males comprise the smallest proportion of the combined population of Negro and white men and women. Yet they commit two-thirds of all major offenses against the person. White females comprise the largest proportion of the combined population (41.5 per cent) and yet they commit only two per cent of all major offenses against the person.

The white female is the least likely victim in all major crimes against the person, other than assault involving physical contact with insult or provocation. As previously noted, however, she is more likely to appear as a victim of an offense than as an offender. (Of course, it must be borne in mind that she cannot be an offender in

offenses of rape, still the same is true for Negro women.) The white woman is the victim in 13 per cent of all offenses against the person. In no case does she appear as the modal type of victim, however.

The white woman appears as a victim of Negro male in forcible rape and assault with intent to rape about five times as often as the Negro woman appears as the victim of a white male. This gives rise to the impression that the white woman is far more likely to be victimized by the white male. Yet as previously shown, the white woman's chances of being raped by a Negro male are very little different from those of the Negro woman being raped by the white male.

Examination of Table 7 shows that certain kinds of victim-offender relationships are infrequent in all major types of offenses against the person. No attempt is made to summarize all of these here; the reader can determine them by inspection of the table. In general, for all offenses of robbery and assault and battery, it is unlikely that one will encounter an offense where either white or Negro women victimize any person of the other race. Generally, too, one infrequently encounters an offense where a white woman is the offender.

Much interest attaches to the incidence of victimization across race lines. In Chart IV are summarized the type of victim-offender relationships that occur most, and least, frequently when race lines are crossed in committing major offenses against the person.

In major offenses against the person where the victim and offender differ in race, it is clear that, except for rape, the modal relationship involves a white male as the victim of a Negro male. For rape offenses, the more likely relationship involves the white female as the victim of the Negro male. Perhaps police, judicial, and public views are shaped by perceptions of offenses where race lines are

Chart IV: Most and Least Frequent Victim and Offender Relationship When Victim and Offender Differ in Race for Selected Major Crimes Against the Person.

Major Offense Against the Person	When Victim and Offender Differ in Race:			
	Least Frequent Victim-Offender Relationship		Most Frequent Victim-Offender Relationship	
	Status	Per Cent	Status	Per Cent
All Offenses	NMF-WF	*	WM-NM	9
	WM-NF	*		
	NF-WM	*		
Forcible Rape	NF-WM	1	WF-NM	5
Assault/Intent to Rape	NF-WM	2	WF-NM	10
Armed Robbery	NWF-WF	*	WM-NM	23
	WMF-NF	*		
Strong-Armed Robbery	NMF-WF	--	WM-NM	17
Shot or Attempted	NMF-WF	--	WM-NM	3
	WMF-NF	--		
	WF-WM	--		
Cut, Stabbed, Attempted	NM-WF	--	WM-NM	2
Injury/Other Dangerous Weapon	NMF-WF	--	WM-NM	6
Injury/Fists, Feet, Hands, Etc.	NMF-WF	--	WM-NM	6
	WM-NF	--		
Minor Injury/No Dangerous Weapon	NMF-WF	*	WM-NM	6
	WM-NF	*		
Physical Contact/Insulting, Provoking	NM-WF	*	WM-NM	6
Threat/Dangerous Weapon	NF-WF	*	WM-NM	7
	WF-NF	*		
Threat/No Dangerous Weapon	NMF-WF	--	WM-NM	8

* = Less than 0.5 per cent; -- = no observed cases.

crossed, neglecting, of course, to take into account the fact that these do not reflect one's chances of becoming a victim.

When race-sex lines are crossed in committing a major offense against the person, some victim-offender combinations did not occur during the six month period. These usually involved a Negro male or female as victim of a white female.

Burglary:

When a person unlawfully enters a dwelling unit, commercial establishment, or any other building or structure to steal or commit any felony, it is considered burglary, an index crime in the UCR classification. It should be clear from the definition of a burglary that while the "victims" of burglary may be one or more persons--the owner or owners of the establishment--the unit to which the burglary attaches is some structure--e.g., a dwelling unit, a commercial establishment, a public building, or any erection or appurtenance thereto. Yet, the UCR reporting system calculates rates of burglary for persons rather than structures or establishments.

From the standpoint of both the problems of policing and from the public, the logical question would appear to be, what is the likelihood that some structure or establishment that I own, rent, or occupy will be burglarized. Furthermore, it seems reasonable to assume that there are differences in the rate of burglary according to the type of structure or establishment that is involved in the burglary. This is recognized in police statistics in that residential (dwelling unit or household) burglaries are separated from nonresidential burglaries. For these reasons, Table 8 was prepared to illustrate the substantial differences in rate of burglary according to the type of structure or establishment involved in the burglary.

Table 8: Burglary Rates by Type of Burglary, United States and Chicago, 1965.

Type of Burglary	Number of Inhabitants, Households, or Establishments	Number of Burglaries	Rate per 10,000	Ratio of 1 Burglary to Inhabitants/ Households/ Establishments
United States: ^{1/}				
Total Index	193,818,000 ^{a/}	1,173,201	60.53	165
Residence	57,251,000 ^{b/}	580,735	101.43	98
Night		297,993	52.04	192
Day		282,742	49.39	202
Nonresidence	3,384,398 ^{c/}	592,466	1,750.58	6
Night		538,499	1,591.12	6
Day		53,967	159.46	62
Chicago, Ill.: ^{2/}				
Total Index	3,550,404 ^{d/}	30,020	84.55	118
Residence	1,383,519 ^{e/}	18,790	135.81	74
Nonresidence	82,104 ^{f/}	11,230	1,367.78	7

^{1/} Source: Uniform Crime Reports, 1965. Table 14 provides a percentage distribution for burglaries in 646 cities 25,000 and over. This distribution is applied to the burglary total in Table 1 to provide estimates for total U. S. burglaries.

^{2/} Source: Chicago Police Department, Data Systems Division, Monthly Return A's submitted to FBI.

^{a/} Source: Population Estimates, Current Population Reports, Series P-25, No. 321, November 30, 1965, Table 2; total resident population, all ages.

^{b/} Source: Current Population Reports, "Households and Families by Type: 1965", Series P-20, No. 14, July 2, 1965.

^{c/} Source: 1965 County Business Patterns, Table 2.

(CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)

^{d/} Source: 1960 U.S. Census of Population, Vol. I, Part 15, Table 20; resident population, all ages.

^{e/} Source: 1960 U.S. Census of Population and Chicago Housing Authority.

^{f/} Sources: 1965 County Business Patterns, Table 2 for Cook County; 1963 Census of Business, Table 3; and 1963 Census of Manufactures, Table 4 for Chicago, Illinois.

Table 8 presents rates of burglary separately for residential and nonresidential units or establishments. The household rather than the dwelling unit was used as the exposed population for residential burglaries since generally residential burglaries are reported for a household rather than a dwelling unit. In as much as the Current Population Reports of the Bureau of the Census provide current estimates for number of households in the United States, the estimate of number of households to which residential burglaries apply is easily obtained. While some agency in most major U. S. cities does likewise for households in that city, the estimates may be somewhat less reliable. Nonetheless for purposes of illustration in Table 8, the estimate for Chicago suffices.

There are somewhat more problems in obtaining an estimate of the number of establishments that comprise the exposed population for nonresidential burglaries. Though technically, burglaries of ships, vessels, and railroad cars are included in the nonresidential burglary classification, their numbers are not included in the exposed "population" in Table 8 since it is difficult to estimate their numbers. Indeed, it seems not unreasonable to assume that a revised system of crime reporting would separate these kinds of burglaries from all other nonresidential burglaries. Estimates of

nonresidential units apart from these "movable establishments" were obtained from census and social security reporting systems. County Business Patterns of the U. S. Bureau of the census provides a count of all establishments in the Standard Industrial Classification of the United States other than households that have one or more employees for which social security payments are made. This count was used as an estimate of the number of establishments in the United States. For Chicago, the censuses of business and manufactures in 1963 were used to provide an estimate, supplementing these counts with data from County Business Patterns for all 80's in the SIC (educational, legal, medical, and nonprofit organizations). There are some differences in the estimates one secures from census and from social security sources, based largely on what is the reporting unit. For retail trade and some services, County Business Patterns underestimates the number of units since a larger unit is the payroll unit. Nonetheless, the estimates are sufficiently reliable to make possible a crude estimate of the burglary rate against establishments.

In 1965, the UCR reported a burglary rate of 605.3 per 100,000 inhabitants in the U.S.; the rate of burglary for Chicago was 845.5 per 100,000 inhabitants (or 60.5 and 84.5 respectively per 10,000 inhabitants in Table 8). When rates are calculated separately for residential and nonresidential structures, it is apparent that the rate of burglary is much greater.

The rate of burglary for every 10,000 households was 101.43 for the U.S. and 135.81 for Chicago. Although the rate of multiple burglaries against an establishment is quite high, as will be shown in the survey data below, assuming no multiple victimization from burglary, 1 in every 98 households in the United States and 1 in every 74 in

Chicago would have been a victim of a burglary in 1965.

For nonresidential units, the rates are considerably higher. For the U.S., the rate is 1,750.58 per 10,000 establishments; it is somewhat lower for Chicago, 1,367.78. Assuming no multiple victimization, this is a burglary rate of one for every 6 establishments in the U.S. and 1 for every 7 in Chicago. Quite clearly, the use of inhabitants rather than establishments as the exposed unit for burglary grossly underestimates the risk of burglary.

Table 8 also provides information on the rate of burglary against type of establishments by night or day reported time of entry. Although UCR reports such statistics only for cities of 25,000 or more inhabitants, the distribution for these cities was applied to the burglary total for the U.S. to provide estimates for the U.S. as a whole in Table 8. There are no significant differences in the rate of burglary for residences by night and day periods. But there are very substantial differences for nonresidential units. While the rate of burglary was 1 for every 6 nonresidential units at night, it was only one for every 62 during the day.

From these illustrations, it would seem that both the public and the police could derive more information about the problem of burglary by using establishments and households rather than population as the exposed population in calculating burglary rates. Thus while in the U.S. in 1965 there would be little difference in the rate of residential and nonresidential burglary were inhabitants used as the exposed unit, there are very substantial differences when households are the unit for residential burglary and establishments as the unit for nonresidential burglary.

Larceny-Theft:

The UCR system defines larceny-theft as the felonious stealing, taking and carrying, leading, riding or driving

away of the personal property of another without any claim or right and with intent to deprive of ownership or to convert such property to the use of the taker or another. In the Uniform Crime Reporting system larceny and theft mean the same thing, though robbery is defined as "a special and vicious type of theft" and classified separately as is auto theft. Larceny is considered an index crime only when the valuation of the stolen property is in excess of \$50.

On a supplement to Return A, the UCR system provides additional detail on the nature of larcenies. The major categories for which number of offenses are reported include: pocket-picking, purse-snatching, shoplifting, larceny from autos, larceny of auto accessories, bicycles, larceny from buildings other than shoplifting, larceny from coin-operated machines except those in buildings, and a residual category, "all other larcenies". While the UCR calculates a rate of larceny for every 100,000 inhabitants, it should be apparent from this classification of larcenies that not all population groups are equally liable as victims. For example, purse-snatching is a crime against women while pocket-picking is a crime against men, for the most part. Furthermore, shoplifting is an offense against establishments, while larcenies of accessories and from autos are against owners of motor vehicles, of bicycles against bicycle owners, and so on. It would seem reasonable then to calculate rates of larceny, insofar as possible, for the different types of exposed units or populations.

Table 9 was prepared to illustrate the substantial differences in larceny-theft rates according to the type of population or unit that risks that type of offense. Since persons under 14 are not generally the victims of pocket-picking or purse-snatching, all men 14 years and over are taken as the exposed population for pocket-picking while

Table 9: Larceny Rates by Type of Larceny, United States and Chicago, Illinois, 1965.

Type of Larceny	Number of Offenses	Number of Inhabitants/ Establishments/ Registrations	Rate per 10,000	Ratio of 1 Offense to Inhabitants Establishments/Registrations
United States: ^{1/}				
Total Index	762,352	193,818,000 ^{a/} 137,496,000 ^{b/}	39.33 55.44	251 180
Chicago, Ill.: ^{2/}				
Total Index	68,558	3,550,404 ^{c/} 2,630,047 ^{d/}	193.09 261.81	52 38
Pocket Picking	1,285	1,262,825 ^{e/}	10.17	983
Purse Snatching	3,019	1,367,222 ^{f/}	22.08	453
Shoplifting	5,432	29,775 ^{g/}	1,824.65	5.5
From Buildings	10,804	1,434,848 ^{h/}	75.29	133
Coin Operated Machines	200	---	---	---
Bicycle Theft	8,609	---	---	---
From Auto	12,713	988,394 ^{i/}	128.62	78
Auto Accessory	16,815	988,394 ^{i/}	170.12	59
All Other	9,681	---	---	---

^{1/} Source: 1965 Uniform Crime Reports, Table 1.

^{2/} Source: Chicago Police Department, Data Systems Division, Monthly return A's submitted to FBI.

^{a/} See Table 5, Footnote "a".

^{b/} See Table 5, Footnote "b".

^{c/} 1960 U. S. Census of Population, Vol. I, Part 15, Table 20, total resident population.

^{d/} Ibid., resident population, 14 years old and over.

(CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)

e/ Ibid., males 14 years old and over.

f/ Ibid., females 14 years old and over.

g/ All retail trade establishments, 1963 Census of Business, Table 3.

h/ Includes 1,383,519 estimated households (See footnote "e", Table 8) and all establishments (52,329) other than retail trade (See footnote "f", Table 8).

i/ Chicago Police Department, Planning and Research Division; data are for all passenger and business vehicles.

all women 14 years old and over represent the presumably exposed population for purse-snatching. The number of establishments in retail trade provide the exposed units for shoplifting while all other establishments and households are the base for larceny from buildings. The number of auto registrations provide the exposed unit for larcenies from autos and of auto accessories. While vehicle registrations is a more reasonable base as an exposed population than inhabitants, the count of offenses is for all automobiles, including those owned by residents outside of a city or jurisdiction. This problem is discussed further in the analysis of auto theft offenses. Though counts may be available on number of bicycles, none was available for use in Table 9. Similarly, no rate is calculated for larceny from coin operated machines since the number of such machine owners in Chicago is not known. Finally, while the "all other" category includes a substantial number of larcenies, no rate is calculated since more detailed analysis of what is included should be undertaken to determine appropriate units of exposure to risk of these offenses.

Table 9 is limited largely to analysis of larceny rates for the more detailed categories of larceny, using data from

Chicago, Illinois, by way of illustration. The detailed classification of larcenies for Chicago is not tabulated by valuation under and over \$50. Of the 68,558 larcenies known to the police in Chicago in 1965, only 25.3 per cent were \$50 and over.

For all larcenies in Chicago in 1965 the rate was 261.8 per 10,000 inhabitants 14 years old and over. The rate of pocket-picking for men is 10.17 per 10,000 while that of purse-snatching for women is 22.08 per 10,000. Thus the probability that a woman will be a victim of a purse-snatching is more than twice that a man will have his pocket picked, assuming no multiple victimization. Indeed, assuming no multiple victimization, while 1 in every 453 women are victims of a purse snatching in Chicago, only 1 in every 983 men is a victim of a pocket picking.

Even though the survey on shoplifting from businesses and organizations indicates substantial underreporting of shoplifting, almost 1 in every 6 retail trade establishments reported shoplifting (assuming no multiple victimization) for a rate of 1,824 per 10,000 retail trade establishments. While larceny from buildings is substantial in volume, the rate is much lower than that for shoplifting. About 1 in every 133 buildings, including households and all other establishments, was victimized by larceny, assuming no multiple victimization.

The rates of larceny from autos and of auto accessories also are high, though it is not known how many of the offenses were against nonresidents of the city of Chicago. Quite clearly such offenses should be counted separately for resident and nonresidents if a meaningful rate is to be calculated.

The data in Table 9, were they to be regarded as very crude probabilities of victimization from different types of larceny show that the probability of victimization varies considerably depending upon one's status as owner and as

citizen. Thus if one owns a retail trade establishment, one runs a very high risk of victimization from shoplifting-- indeed given underreporting from shoplifting it is doubtful whether the rate is much under 100 per cent. If that is true, the figure in Table 9 gives a rough indication of the extent to which such larcenies are not reported to the police. It also is clear that automobile owners run a high risk of victimization of their property in autos and of accessories from the auto; yet this probability is below that of having the auto stolen as the data in Table 10 show. Since it is not known how much of the reported larceny from autos and of auto accessories may occur in connection with reporting of a stolen auto, it is not possible to calculate the rate of occurrence of larceny from autos and of auto accessories independent of the rate of theft of autos. Yet automobile owners may very well be interested in both rates as should the police.

Auto Theft:

Each theft or attempted theft of a motor vehicle is counted as an offense. Motor vehicles include both passenger and business vehicles whether automobiles, trucks, buses, motorcycles, motor scooters or other self propelled vehicles that run on a surface. Counted as auto theft are all cases where automobiles are taken by persons who are not lawfully entitled to have them, even if later abandoned. Thus "joy ride" thefts are counted as auto thefts even though in many jurisdictions they are treated as misdemeanors rather than felonies. When an auto is taken in a burglary or robbery, it is counted only as a burglary or robbery, however.

The UCR system calculates auto theft rates for every 100 000 inhabitants though many of these persons are not of an age to own an automobile and many who are may not possess one

so that they could be victims of such a theft. Furthermore, auto theft statistics are kept by place of occurrence of the theft not by place of residence of owner. Both types of statistics seem useful since they provide different types of information. From the standpoint of policing one is interested in knowing how many auto thefts occur within the jurisdiction and how many are recovered within it since these are police matters. From the standpoint of the victim however one is interested in the probability that his auto will be stolen. Ideally one would want to calculate both types of rates. This necessitates gathering information on both the number of automobiles held by residents in an area and the number of transient vehicles that enter an area over a given period of time. Lacking information on the number of different vehicles from outside a jurisdiction that enter a jurisdiction during a period of time--say a year--it is difficult to calculate an annual rate of theft for vehicles of nonresidents. Nonetheless a meaningful rate could be calculated for residents.

The data in Table 10 are intended to show the difference in rates of automobile theft using number of registered motor vehicles as contrasted with numbers of inhabitants as the exposed population. First, let us consider the information for the U.S. since the problem of transient vehicle rates does not apply for the U.S. as a whole (or at least only to a very small degree since relatively few foreign vehicles enter the U.S.). In 1960 the rate of motor vehicle theft was 17.69 per 10,000 population but 43.11 per 10,000 motor vehicle registrations. By 1965 the population rate had risen to 25.10 while that for motor vehicle registrations was 53.84. There was a 52.8 per cent increase in motor vehicle thefts during this five-year period, a 7.7 per cent increase in population and a 22.3 per cent increase in motor vehicle registrations.

The auto theft rate for Chicago is substantially higher than that for the U.S., when either population or motor

Table 10: Auto Theft Rates, United States, 1960 and 1965, Chicago, Illinois, 1965.

Type of Vehicle Related Offense	Number of Auto Thefts	Number of Inhabitants ^{3/}	Rate per 10,000 Population	Number of Motor Vehicle Registrations ^{4/}	Rate per 10,000 Registrations	Ratio of 1 Car Stolen to Auto Registrations
United States: ^{1/}						
1960 Auto Theft	318,500	179,992,000	17.69	73,877,000	43.11	232
1965 Auto Theft	486,568	193,818,000	25.10	90,357,000	53.84	186
Chicago, Ill.: ^{2/}						
1965 Auto Theft	29,055	3,550,404	81.83	988,394	293.96	34

^{1/}Source: Uniform Crime Reports, 1960 and 1965; Table 1.

^{2/}Chicago Police Department, Data Systems Division, "Return B: Annual Return of Offenses Known to the Police"; year ending December 31, 1965.

^{3/}Source: U. S. population taken from U. S. Bureau of the Census, Population Estimates, Current Populations Reports, Series P-25, No. 321, November 30, 1965; total resident population. Chicago population taken from U. S. Census of Population, Vol. I, Part 15, Table 20; total resident population.

^{4/}U. S. registrations taken from Statistical Summary, U. S. Bureau of Public Roads; Chicago registrations secured from Chicago Police Department, Planning and Research Division; data are for all passenger and business vehicles. For Chicago, there are an additional 9,608 motorcycles and scooters registered.

vehicle registrations is used as the base. Yet the difference between the two rates is greater for Chicago than it is for the U.S. Much of this difference may be accounted for by differences in the number of transient-owned vehicles stolen in Chicago. Undoubtedly some differences in auto theft rates among the major cities of the United States may be a function of their differences in size of territory and population. Thus Boston, with a very small proportion of both the population and of the territory of the SMSA within the city limits, has one of the highest auto theft rates in the United States. Yet it also has one of the largest daily movement of vehicles through the central city. Though clearly such vehicles are stolen in the central city, the rate in no sense reflects a rate against residents of the city of Boston. The likelihood that a vehicle of a Boston city resident may be stolen could be little different from that for residents of surrounding areas or of other cities were statistics calculated for Boston owners who had their motor vehicle stolen in Boston.

Statistics on motor vehicle theft would seem to be in particular need of revision both as to the basis of classification, the counting of offenses, and the logical base for the calculation of rates.

A Survey of Crimes Against Businesses and Organizations:

An attempt was made to estimate the rate of crime against businesses and organizations in high crime rate areas of three cities, Boston, Chicago, and Washington, D.C. A sample survey of businesses and organizations was drawn from two police precincts in Boston, two in Chicago, and four in Washington, D.C.

The two precincts in Boston are Dorchester and Roxbury. Dorchester is primarily a white residential area where the income of the inhabitants ranges from low to middle income.

Irish people comprise the largest ethnic group. Among the white areas outside downtown Boston, Dorchester has the highest crime rate. The major housing project in the precinct is peopled mostly by Negroes, and there is a small Negro area bordering on the other precinct selected--Roxbury. Roxbury is largely made up of low income Negro families, though there still are some white families scattered through much of the precinct. The area has a very high crime rate for Boston, and it is somewhat higher than that of Dorchester.

In Chicago a predominately white and a predominately Negro area also were selected. Town Hall is primarily white, and, for a white area in Chicago, its crime rate is fairly high. There is a substantial number of low income Southern white migrants in Town Hall, and about 20,000 Puerto Ricans also live in the area. There is considerable variation in income and ethnic composition of the population, ranging from very low income, through working class, to middle income, and some upper middle income whites who reside in a strip of modern high-rise apartments along the lake shore. A few Negro families are included in a housing project at one end of the precinct. Fillmore is in marked contrast to Town Hall. Except for a small Italian settlement, the area is made up primarily of Negro families, many of whom are recent migrants from the South. The average income is low, and the population has a high density. The crime rate is high, considerably higher than the Town Hall rate.

Police precincts 6, 10, 13 and 14 were selected in Washington, D.C. They include over 40 per cent of the population in the District. Precincts 6 and 14 are low in crime rates relative to population while precincts 13 and 14 are high. Although about two-thirds of the District population is nonwhite, about 90 per cent of the residents in the 14th precinct, three-fourths of those in the 10th and 13th, and a little more than one-half of those in the 6th are nonwhite.

The purpose of the survey was to determine independent of police department statistics what the nature of the crime problem is for businesses and organizations in these areas with respect to burglary, robbery, and shoplifting. Though it was originally hoped that rates of crime for these selected offenses against businesses and organizations could be compared with those calculated from police department statistics, it was not possible to do so as police statistics are not tabulated in detail sufficient to make the comparison with the businesses and organizations that constituted the sampling frame for the sample survey investigation.

A main advantage of the sample survey data presented below is that it provides statistical information not only on a rate against businesses and organizations but a rate of multiple victimization as well.

For Boston and Chicago, police precinct lists of all businesses and organizations were used as sampling frames while for Washington, D.C., the sampling frame was the real property inventory for the District. A random sample was drawn from each list to yield about 100 completed interviews in each of the police precincts.

The number of completed interviews with owners or managers of businesses and organizations in each police precinct is as follows:

<u>Precinct</u>	<u>Number in Sample</u>
Boston, Dorchester.....	98
Boston, Roxbury.....	92
Chicago, Town Hall.....	109
Chicago, Fillmore.....	97
Washington, D. C., #6.....	109
Washington, D. C., #10.....	89
Washington, D. C., #13.....	77
Washington, D. C., #14.....	<u>97</u>
Total.....	768

It will be noticed that the number of businesses and organizations sampled is slightly larger in the predominantly white precincts. These are also the precincts with the lower crime rates in each city. The difference seemingly are insufficient to bias representativeness for each precinct, however.

Burglaries Against Business and Organizations

Almost one of every five businesses and organizations in the eight police districts combined were burglarized during the year period used in this survey (July 1, 1965 to June 30, 1966). See Table 11. The rate of burglary is almost 32 per 100 businesses and organizations.

There is both variation by city and by police district but it is not altogether related to differences in crime rates of the areas. If we assume, as the police statistics of the three cities indicate, that Dorchester in Boston, Town Hall in Chicago, and Precinct #6 in D.C. have lower crime rates than the other survey areas in these cities, the burglary rates are not altogether consistent with this fact. In Chicago, Town Hall has a much lower rate than Fillmore. While District #6 in D.C. has a lower rate than Districts #13 and #14, it is about the same as that for District #10, a higher crime rate area. But in Boston, Dorchester has a slightly higher rate of burglary against businesses and organizations than does Roxbury and a somewhat higher percentage of them experienced burglary during the year period.

Among the cities, Chicago has a substantially lower rate in both districts than does any district of the other cities. Particular attention is called to the fact that the rate of burglary within a year's time runs as high as 51.8 for District #13 in Washington D.C., involving almost a third of all businesses and organizations sampled in that area to as low as 4.0 for Town Hall in Chicago.

Table 11: Burglaries, Robberies and Shoplifting Against Businesses and Other Organizations for One Year (July 1, 1965-June 30, 1966) in Eight Police Districts.

City and Police District	Burglaries per 100 Organizations	Per Cent of Organizations that were Burglarized	Robberies per 100 Organizations	Per Cent of Organizations that were Robbed	Per Cent Reporting Shoplifting
All Districts	31.6	19.8	9.9	7.4	46.8
Boston-Dorchester	45.9	27.6	3.1	3.1	46.9
Boston-Roxbury	40.9	25.8	2.2	2.2	49.5
Chicago-Town Hall	4.0	3.1	5.1	4.1	31.6
Chicago-Fillmore	19.1	13.5	13.5	11.2	50.6
D. C., #6	29.4	19.3	6.4	6.4	38.5
D. C., #10	27.4	19.0	15.5	10.7	51.2
D. C., #13	51.8	32.1	16.1	14.3	60.7
D. C., #14	42.9	23.1	22.0	12.1	53.8

The burglary rate is a function both of the number of organizations burglarized and of the number of times an organization is burglarized in a given period of time. From Table 12 we can see that roughly 61 per cent of all businesses and organizations burglarized during the year had only one burglary. They accounted, however, for only 38 per cent of all burglaries reported by all organizations in that period. Another 25 per cent of all establishments burglarized had two burglaries during the year. Places with one and two burglaries accounted for 70 per cent of all burglaries reported as occurring during the year. Nine per cent of all establishments burglarized had three or more burglaries while four per cent had four or more burglaries.

Table 12: Multiple Offenses of Robbery and of Burglary Against Businesses and Organizations for Eight Police Districts Combined (Based on those victimized at least once).

Number of Times Offenses Occurred Against Organization	Per Cent of All Organizations Robbed	Cumulative Per Cent of All Robberies	Per Cent of All Organizations Burglarized	Cumulative Per Cent of All Burglarizations	Burglary Victims per 100 Organizations	Robbery Victims per 100 Organizations
None	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
One	79.6	60.5	61.3	38.3	12.1	6.0
Two	12.9	80.2	25.3	70.0	5.0	0.9
Three	5.6	92.9	9.1	87.2	1.9	0.4
Four	---	92.9	2.1	92.5	0.4	---
Five	1.9	100.0	1.4	97.0	0.3	0.1
Six	---		---	97.0	---	
Seven	---		0.8	100.0	0.1	
Total	100.0		100.0		19.8	7.4

Robbery Against Businesses and Organizations

There are no adequate police statistics for these police districts on robberies against employees of businesses and other organizations while engaging in their work. Police statistics on robberies in establishments for Chicago indicate a rate of 256 per 10,000 establishments (or less than 3 per 100 establishments). Comparable statistics are not available for Boston and Washington, D.C.

Somewhat more than seven per cent of all business and organizations in the eight police districts combined experienced at least one robbery during the year period July 1, 1965 to

June 30, 1966. See Table 11. The rate of robbery, taking account of multiple victimizations during the year, is almost 10 per 100 business and organizations.

As for burglary, so for robbery, we observe variation by city and police district (See Table 11). And as for burglary, there is no consistency between the overall crime rate of the area and the rate for robbery against businesses and organizations, though the pattern in Chicago and D. C. conforms to the expectation that the lower crime rate areas will have a lower robbery rate. This is not the case in Boston, though it must be pointed out that the robbery rate in Boston is very low in both precincts.

The low rate of robbery in both precincts in Boston is coupled with a high rate of burglary against businesses and organizations in these precincts. These data are consistent with those from the police observation done in these areas in that almost no calls for service witnessed by observers were for robbery of a business or organization while there were a large volume of breaking and entering calls from businesses and organizations. Indeed, almost no robberies of any kind were observed in these Boston precinct observation studies. It seems reasonable to assume then that these areas of Boston are high burglary-low robbery areas.

The rate of robbery runs rather high in some precincts. More than 10 per cent of all establishments in three of the D.C. precincts and in Fillmore in Chicago were robbed at least once during the year and the rate is one in five for District #14 in D.C.

From Table 12 it can be seen that among organizations that were robbed during the year, 80 per cent experienced only one robbery. They accounted for 61 per cent of all robberies. However 13 per cent experienced two robberies during the year. Places with one or two robberies account for 80 per cent of all robberies reported. Eight per cent

Table 13: Theft by Clients or Customers from Businesses and Organizations by Type of Organization: Eight Police Districts Combined.

Types of Business or Organization	Per Cent of Industry Experiencing Shoplifting	Per Cent of All Shoplifting	Per Cent Experiencing Shoplifting of All Organizations	Per Cent of All Organizations in Samples
Construction	30.0	1.8	0.8	2.8
Durable Goods	11.5	0.9	0.4	3.6
Nondurable Goods Mfg.	33.3	1.8	0.9	2.5
Transportation	6.3	0.3	0.1	2.2
Wholesale and Retail Trade	64.6	73.2	34.3	53.1
Finance, Insurance, Real Estate	25.0	1.8	0.8	3.3
Business, Personal and Prof. Services	29.3	20.2	9.5	32.3
Public Administration	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1
All Organizations	46.8	100.0	46.8	100.0

of all organizations robbed had 3 or more robberies during the year.

Shoplifting Against Businesses and Organizations

The offense of shoplifting generally is limited to wholesale and retail establishments and to certain kinds of business, personal, and professional services establishments that sell merchandise as well as services, e.g., taverns, repair establishments, or beauty parlors. These all sell some merchandise that can be taken and that the owner regards as "shoplifting". From Table 13 we can see that 73.2 per cent of all reports of shoplifting occurred in wholesale and retail trade establishments. An additional 20.2 per cent occurred in businesses that

CONTINUED

1 OF 4

are classified as business, personal, or professional service establishments. Over 93 per cent of all shoplifting reported then occurred in these types of businesses. While it is difficult to determine whether the other 7 per cent of reported instances are bona fide cases of shoplifting, in most cases some merchandise was sold--e.g., a manufacturer that has a retail outlet in connection with the manufacturing establishment.

Of the organizations in the study, we can see from Table 13 that 46.8 per cent reported some shoplifting. Fifty-three per cent of all businesses and organizations were classified as wholesale and retail trade establishments and 65 per cent of them reported some shoplifting. This is the highest rate for any type of establishment in the study. Yet high as this figure is, it may well represent underreporting since most small businesses have poor inventory control and report shoplifting only if they apprehend someone engaged in it. Nonetheless as Table 13 shows, with only a few exceptions, at least one-fourth of the establishment in any industry group reported some shoplifting.

Some shoplifting was reported then by 47 per cent of all businesses in eight police districts. It was somewhat lower in the primarily white areas that included middle-income residents in Chicago and Washington, D.C., but not in Boston. See Table 14.

The question arises as to how serious are the losses from shoplifting. Unfortunately most businesses lack inventory control and accounting systems that permit them to make valid estimates of the amount lost through shoplifting. Most estimates provided by the owners and managers in this survey therefore are at best in the nature of "informed guesses". Whether on the average they over- or underestimated values is difficult to say since detailed studies of such losses for different

Table 14: Per Cent of Inventory Estimated by Owners/Managers Lost from Shoplifting Each Year For All Businesses and Organizations Reporting Shoplifting: Eight Police Districts.

City and Police Districts	Per Cent of Inventory Taken by Shoplifters ^{1/}										Total*	Per Cent Don't Know Value	Per Cent Reporting Shoplifting
	Very Little or Less Than One	1.0-1.9	2.0-3.9	4.0-5.9	6.0-7.9	8.0-9.9	10.0 or More						
All Districts	39.6	20.9	15.9	11.6	1.9	0.8	9.3	100.0	23.2	46.8			
Boston, Dorchester Boston, Roxbury	45.9 56.8	21.6 10.8	21.6 13.5	5.4 8.1	---	---	5.4	99.9 100.0	19.6 19.6	46.9 49.5			
Chicago, Town Hall Chicago, Fillmore	16.6 23.7	41.7 21.0	16.7 13.2	12.5 13.2	---	---	---	100.0 100.0	22.6 15.6	31.6 50.6			
D.C., # 6	53.1	9.4	12.5	9.4	3.1	3.1	9.4	100.0	23.8	38.5			
D.C., # 10	33.3	30.0	16.7	10.0	---	3.3	6.7	100.0	30.2	51.2			
D.C., # 13	36.0	20.0	16.0	16.0	---	---	12.0	100.0	26.5	60.7			
D.C., # 14	42.9	20.0	17.1	20.0	---	---	---	100.0	28.6	53.8			

^{1/} Excluding per cent that could not estimate value of property lost through shoplifting.

*Includes only those establishments where the owner/manager estimated value of merchandise taken.

size and kinds of businesses are lacking. Tables 14, 15, and 16 provide owner or manager estimates of the kind and nature of their losses due to shoplifting.

Considering all businesses that claimed some loss due to shoplifting (Table 14), 23 per cent say they cannot estimate the per cent of their inventory that is lost through shoplifting. An additional 40 per cent estimate that it is only a very small amount, or less than one per cent. Excluding those businesses that cannot estimate their losses, the median per cent of inventory loss falls between one and two per cent. Nonetheless, about nine per cent report that they lose ten per cent or more of their inventory.

Almost 16 per cent place their loss between two and four per cent and an additional twelve per cent between four and six per cent. All in all then about 28 per cent of all businesses experiencing shoplifting place their losses between two and six per cent of their inventory.

There is a substantial group of nine per cent of all businesses that place their losses at ten per cent or more. While there is no way of determining whether this is a valid estimate, given the nature of the distribution of losses in Table 14, there is reason to doubt that this is a valid estimate. There is a sharp drop in estimated loss at six per cent such that only about two per cent claim they lose as much as six to eight per cent of their inventory and less than a one per cent places their losses between eight and ten per cent. For this reason we are inclined to doubt the validity of most of the estimates of 10 per cent or more in losses.

With the exception of the Town Hall District in Chicago, the modal inventory loss due to shoplifting is less than one per cent. The median loss reported is between one and two per cent in all districts other than Roxbury in Boston and District 6 in Washington, D.C. where it is less than one per

cent. Since these districts are markedly different in population characteristics, and perhaps even in their business composition, it is doubtful whether this difference is due to some characteristic common to the areas.

Table 15 presents information on the type of merchandise most commonly taken in shoplifting. Among the items categorized, food is the most common, accounting for about 27 per cent of the organizations reporting shoplifting. The next most common item taken in shoplifting is clothing and footwear, with 16 per cent of all organizations reporting this item. 28 per cent of the organizations report that it is miscellaneous small items of less than \$10 in value. Miscellaneous items of more than \$10 in value accounts for 9 per cent while liquor or beer accounts for about 7 per cent. There is some variation in the kind of items taken among the districts. Differences here probably are due somewhat to the pattern of business establishments in the area.

An attempt was made to secure the estimated dollar value losses due to shoplifting over a period of time (See Table 16). The period beginning January 1, 1965 was taken as the period for which owners or managers were to estimate their losses. Most referred their estimates to a year period of time, but 32 per cent refused to make an estimate on the grounds they had no good idea of the dollar value lost through shoplifting. They know it occurs and have caught customers shoplifting, but they have no accurate estimate of how much they lose in this way over a given period of time.

Of those who estimated dollar value losses, the modal value for all districts combined was less than \$100. The median value of losses was between \$100 and \$500. Over one-fifth of the owners and managers estimating losses placed their loss over \$1000. Considering the fact that much of this loss is in terms of small items, many of which are of less than \$10 in value, the volume of shoplifting from these estimates would be quite large.

TABLE 15: Per Cent Distribution of Merchandise Owners/Managers Reported as Most Commonly Taken by Shoplifters:^{1/} All Businesses or Organizations in Eight Police Districts.

City and Police Districts	Major Type of Merchandise Taken ^{2/}								Total
	Food	Liquor or Beer	Tobacco Items	Clothing and Footwear	Jewelry	Misc. Small Items (less than \$10)	Misc. Large Items (\$10 or more)	Other Items	
All Districts	26.6	7.2	1.3	15.9	0.9	28.1	9.1	10.9	100.0
Boston, Dorchester	37.8	6.7	---	---	2.2	35.5	6.7	11.1	100.0
Boston, Roxbury	28.3	8.7	2.2	15.2	---	30.4	10.9	4.3	100.0
Chicago, Town Hall	6.9	6.9	---	10.3	---	51.7	3.4	20.7	99.9
Chicago, Fillmore	21.9	---	2.4	26.9	2.4	26.9	7.3	12.2	100.0
D.C., # 6	27.5	12.5	---	12.5	---	17.5	12.5	17.5	100.0
D.C., # 10	20.0	12.5	2.5	25.0	2.5	17.5	12.5	7.5	100.0
D.C., # 13	33.3	6.1	---	24.2	---	21.2	3.0	12.1	99.9
D.C., # 14	30.4	4.3	2.2	15.2	---	28.3	13.0	6.5	99.9

^{1/} Includes only those businesses (organizations) reporting shoplifting.

^{2/} There were 4.8 per cent of all businesses that did not specify the kind of merchandise most commonly taken.

An estimate of the volume of shoplifting since January, 1965 also was requested (See Table 17). Only eight per cent refused to make an estimate of the number of occurrences of shoplifting over this period of time. The modal category for all districts combined is 100 or more instances of shoplifting (35 per cent of all businesses estimating frequency of shoplifting). The next most frequently occurring interval is four or fewer instances with 27 per cent. Apart from the open-ended interval of 100 or more instances, there do not appear to be any fluctuations in estimates, suggesting that in the aggregate the estimates may conform to some reality dimension of amount of shoplifting they experience--even though they may over- or underestimate the actual amount.

Entrepreneurial Actions in Dealing with Shoplifting

Among organizations reporting shoplifting, it is less common to call the police than to deal with them by other means. (See Table 18.) Only about 37 per cent of all owners and managers said they usually call the police when they find adults engaged in shoplifting (33 per cent call both for adults and juveniles). Another five per cent will call the police only if the offender refuses to pay. Altogether 58 per cent of all owners and managers say they do not call the police when they find someone shoplifting. They prefer to handle the matter by other means, or to "forget" about it.

The most common method for dealing with shoplifters when the police are not called is to request payment for the article taken. This accounts for about 44 per cent of all owners and managers. Forty per cent make both adults and juveniles pay while four per cent request it only of adults and call the parents of the juvenile--requesting in many cases that they pay. Twelve per cent ask the offender never

Table 16: Per Cent Distribution of Owners/Managers Estimates that Shoplifting Occurred Since January 1965 For His Business or Organization:^{1/}
Eight Police Districts.

City and Police Districts	Estimated Number of Occurrences of Shoplifting								Per Cent Can't Estimate
	1-4	5-9	10-19	20-49	50-99	100 or More	Total		
All Districts	27.0	14.9	8.4	7.3	7.3	35.1	100.0	8.1	
Boston, Dorchester	29.4	11.8	11.8	11.8	5.8	29.4	100.0	24.4	
Boston, Roxbury	36.9	13.2	10.5	7.9	2.6	28.9	100.0	9.5	
Chicago, Town Hall	30.4	13.0	4.3	8.7	4.3	39.2	99.9	25.8	
Chicago, Fillmore	30.7	15.4	2.6	5.1	5.1	41.0	99.9	7.1	
D.C., # 6	25.0	15.6	12.5	18.8	9.4	18.8	100.1	17.9	
D.C., # 10	17.9	21.4	10.7	---	10.7	39.3	100.0	31.7	
D.C., # 13	17.9	14.2	10.7	---	17.9	39.3	100.0	17.6	
D.C., # 14	25.0	15.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	45.0	100.0	16.7	

^{1/} Includes only those businesses (organizations) reporting shoplifting.

Table 17: Per Cent Distribution of Owners/Managers Estimates of Dollar Value Lost Through Shoplifting Since January, 1965: Businesses and Organizations^{1/} in Eight Police Districts.

City and Police Districts	Estimated Dollar Value Lost							Total	Can't Estimate
	\$1-\$99	\$100-\$499	\$500-\$999	\$1,000-\$2,499	\$2,500-\$4,999	\$5,000 and Over			
All Districts	38.5	31.5	8.4	13.6	2.8	5.2	100.0	32.2	
Boston, Dorchester	45.5	45.5	9.0	---	---	---	100.0	26.7	
Boston, Roxbury	45.4	22.7	9.1	13.6	9.1	---	99.9	42.1	
Chicago, Town Hall	52.0	24.0	---	16.0	4.0	4.0	100.0	19.4	
Chicago, Fillmore	34.4	28.1	9.4	21.9	---	6.2	100.0	21.9	
D.C., # 6	29.6	25.9	3.7	18.5	3.7	18.5	99.9	28.9	
D.C., # 10	28.6	42.9	19.0	9.5	---	---	100.0	46.2	
D.C., # 13	42.3	23.1	15.4	19.2	---	---	100.0	23.5	
D.C., # 14	29.6	37.0	3.7	11.1	7.4	11.1	99.9	43.7	

^{1/} Includes only those businesses (organizations) reporting shoplifting.

Table 18: Per Cent Distribution of How Owners/Managers of Businesses Deal With Shoplifters: Eight Police Districts.^{1/}

City and Police Districts	Action by Owner/Manager								Total Per Cent
	Calls the Police				Calls Police Only if Offender Refuses to Pay	Does Not Call the Police			
	For Adults and Juveniles	For Adults but Parents for Juveniles	For Adults but not Children if Return Mdse.	Adults Must Pay; Calls Parents for Juveniles		Adults and Juveniles Must Pay	Asks Offender Never to Return	Informal Depends on Circumstances	
All Districts	32.9	2.9	0.8	5.4	3.7	40.1	11.7	2.5	100.0
Boston, Dorchester	21.4	---	---	3.6	3.6	53.6	14.3	3.6	100.1
Boston, Roxbury	21.2	3.0	---	6.1	---	57.6	12.1	---	100.0
Chicago, Town Hall	29.2	---	4.2	4.2	12.5	29.1	16.7	4.2	100.1
Chicago, Fillmore	45.5	---	3.0	---	9.1	24.2	12.1	6.1	100.0
D.C., # 6	40.8	7.4	---	14.8	---	25.9	7.4	3.7	100.0
D.C., # 10	39.4	6.1	---	6.1	---	42.4	6.1	---	100.1
D.C., # 13	48.0	---	---	---	---	36.0	16.0	---	100.0
D.C., # 14	21.6	5.4	---	8.1	5.4	45.9	10.8	2.7	99.9

^{1/} Includes only those businesses (organizations) reporting shoplifting.

to return. Again some variation occurs by district, though it is not patterned according to population characteristics of the district, nor by city.

For those owners or managers who do not call the police, their reason for not mobilizing them was ascertained (See Table 19). About 26 per cent say they find the police response an inadequate means of handling the matter. About 11 per cent of all owners and managers give as their reason for not doing anything that the police are too lenient in handling shoplifters; fourteen per cent believe that the police cannot do anything, mainly because of the way the matter would be handled in the courts.

Thirty-eight per cent do not want to take action because they do not want to take the consequences of calling the police. Twenty-three per cent give as their reason that they consider it a small matter while 15 per cent say they don't want to get involved with the police and courts. Eleven per cent prefer to handle it personally, though only two per cent of all owners and managers say they want this course of action because they can recover their losses.

The reasons given for not calling the police are to some extent at variance with their own reports of their behavior. Only two per cent say they do not call the police because they can recover their own losses, though forty-nine per cent report actually trying to make the offender pay for his loss. Compare Tables 18 and 19. Here again a discrepancy is found between the reasons given for not mobilizing the police and reports of how they behave toward violators. It seems reasonably clear that businessmen in their behavior prefer to handle shoplifting by informal nonlegal rather than by formal legal means.

Table 13: Per Cent Distribution of Reasons Given By Owners/Managers For Not Calling the Police to Handle Shoplifters: 1/ Eight Police Districts.

City and Police Districts	Reason For Not Calling the Police									
	Police Response Inadequate		Evaluation of Consequences		Personal Action Preferred		Doesn't Do Any Good	Doesn't Know Why	Total Per Cent	
	Police Do Not Do Any-thing	Police Cannot Do Any-thing	Doesn't Want To Be In-volved	Considers A Small Matter	Prefers to Handle Personally	Own Action Can Recover Losses				
All Districts	10.7	14.5	14.5	23.5	9.0	2.1	6.0	19.7	100.0	
Boston, Dorchester	2.6	13.1	7.9	23.7	15.8	5.3	7.9	23.7	100.0	
Boston, Roxbury	15.8	2.6	21.1	44.7	5.3	---	2.6	7.9	100.0	
Chicago, Town Hall	4.5	4.5	13.6	27.3	9.1	---	13.6	27.3	99.9	
Chicago, Fillmore	11.1	22.3	18.5	25.9	11.1	---	3.7	7.4	100.0	
D.C., # 6	7.4	11.1	11.1	22.2	7.4	3.7	7.4	29.6	99.9	
D.C., # 10	11.1	25.9	14.8	14.9	3.7	3.7	3.7	22.2	100.0	
D.C., # 13	13.0	26.1	13.0	13.0	13.0	---	---	21.8	99.9	
D.C., # 14	18.8	15.6	15.6	9.4	6.2	3.1	9.4	21.9	100.0	

1/ Includes only those owners/managers who do not call the police for shoplifters.

Passing Bad Checks

Not all businesses and organizations in the sample cash checks. Overall, 14 per cent of all organizations in the sample do not cash checks. Most of these have no customers. Considering only those organizations that have customers who request that checks be cashed, only one-half of them actually cash checks (Table 20).

Surprisingly, 36 per cent of all those who have check cashing customers say they honor almost all requests for check-cashing. Fourteen per cent limit their cashing to only certain "risks" or known customers. Another five per cent usually do not cash checks, though they make an occasional exception.

Forty-five per cent of all businesses with check cashing customers say they do not cash checks under any circumstances. The main reason given is that they have had bad experience in losses when they have cashed checks, though 10 per cent of all owners or managers say they do not keep enough cash on hand to cash checks. This latter figure runs as high as 20 per cent in Fillmore, Chicago where the robbery rate is high, and in two of the D. C. districts it is somewhat higher; these districts also have high robbery rates.

Owners and managers who cash checks were asked about their experience with "bad check passing". About 15 per cent said they had a real problem with bad checks though they continue the policy of cashing checks, at least for some customers. Another 40 per cent say they have some problem while 45 per cent say they have no problem with bad check passing.

Attempts were made to learn from those who cash checks how frequently they have trouble with bad checks. Twenty-seven per cent said they had no such experience since January 1965, a percentage well below that saying that bad checks are no problem to them. (See Table 21.) Examining the distribution of number of times they experienced bad check passing in 1965

Table 20: Per Cent of Owners/Managers of Businesses Reporting Conditions For Cashing Checks in Eight Police Districts. ^{1/}

City and Police Districts	Cashes Checks		Does Not Cash Checks			Total Per Cent	No Check Cashing Customers		
	All Requests or Few Exceptions	Cashes Only Certain "Risks"	An Occasional Exception	Never Has Enough Cash	Had Bad Experience			No Reason Given Why Not	All Other Reasons Why Not
All Districts	36.0	14.3	5.0	9.7	18.2	11.4	5.4	100.0	14.2
Boston, Dorchester	44.8	18.4	8.1	9.2	11.5	6.9	1.1	100.0	11.2
Boston, Roxbury	28.2	15.5	7.0	9.9	26.8	9.9	2.8	100.1	23.7
Chicago, Town Hall	38.2	21.0	2.6	---	7.9	17.1	13.2	100.0	22.4
Chicago, Fillmore	31.2	3.9	3.9	20.7	16.9	13.0	10.4	100.0	13.5
D.C., # 6	42.6	13.8	3.2	7.4	18.1	9.6	5.3	100.0	13.7
D.C., # 10	25.6	11.5	5.1	12.8	23.1	15.4	6.4	99.9	7.1
D.C., # 13	30.9	10.9	1.8	14.5	27.3	12.7	1.8	99.9	1.8
D.C., # 14	42.4	17.9	7.7	5.1	17.9	7.7	1.3	100.0	14.3

^{1/}Excludes all cases where the concern has no check cashing customers.

Table 21: Per Cent of Owners/Managers Reporting "Bad Check" Problems in Cashing Checks: Business in Eight Districts.^{1/}

City and Police Districts	Owners/Managers Who Cash Checks Have			
	Real Problem With Bad Checks	Some Problem With Bad Checks	No Problem With Bad Checks	Total Per Cent
All Districts	15.5	39.5	45.0	100.0
Boston, Dorchester	3.4	44.8	51.8	100.0
Boston, Roxbury	19.3	45.2	35.5	100.0
Chicago, Town Hall	18.7	34.9	46.4	100.0
Chicago, Fillmore	11.1	37.0	51.9	100.0
D.C., # 6	15.7	33.3	51.0	100.0
D.C., # 10	17.2	41.4	41.4	100.0
D.C., # 13	21.7	34.8	43.5	100.0
D.C., # 14	23.4	42.6	34.0	100.0

^{1/}Excludes all businesses that do not cash checks.

Table 22: Per Cent Distribution of Number of Times Owner/Manager Experienced Bad Check Passing Since January, 1965: Eight Police Districts.^{1/}

City and Police Districts	Number of Times Bad Checks Passed									Total Per Cent
	1-4	5-9	10-19	20-29	30-99	100-299	300 or More	Can't Recall	None	
All Districts	32.5	9.9	10.3	5.0	5.3	1.3	1.3	7.6	26.8	100.0
Boston, Dorchester	39.2	14.3	7.1	1.8	1.8	---	---	8.9	26.8	99.9
Boston, Roxbury	40.0	10.0	13.3	6.7	---	---	---	10.0	20.0	100.0
Chicago, Town Hall	30.2	7.0	7.0	4.6	7.0	---	---	9.3	34.9	100.0
Chicago, Fillmore	29.6	11.1	7.4	3.7	---	---	---	14.8	33.3	99.9
D.C., # 6	21.1	11.5	15.4	1.9	3.8	1.9	5.8	5.8	32.7	99.9
D.C., # 10	30.9	3.8	11.5	11.5	3.8	3.8	---	3.8	30.9	100.0
D.C., # 13	21.2	13.0	13.0	8.7	8.7	---	4.3	---	30.5	100.0
D.C., # 14	42.2	6.7	8.9	6.7	15.6	4.4	---	6.7	8.9	100.1

^{1/}Includes only businesses reporting they cash checks.

Table 23: Per Cent Distribution of How Owners/Managers of Businesses Deal With Bad Check Problems in Eight Police Districts.^{1/}

City and Police Districts	Does Not Call Police					Total Per Cent	
	Calls the Police	Calls Only If Can't Collect	Calls Offender And Requests Make Good	Collection or Detective Agency Given Problem	Forgets About It		All Other Ways of Handling
All Districts	19.0	8.1	53.9	3.2	4.5	11.3	100.0
Boston, Dorchester	36.6	7.3	43.9	---	4.9	7.3	100.0
Boston, Roxbury	25.0	12.5	50.0	4.2	---	8.3	100.0
Chicago, Town Hall	7.1	7.1	60.7	7.1	3.6	14.3	99.9
Chicago, Fillmore	11.1	5.6	55.6	---	5.6	22.1	100.0
D.C., # 6	14.3	8.6	45.7	8.6	5.7	17.1	100.0
D.C., # 10	5.6	11.1	77.8	---	---	5.6	100.1
D.C., # 13	18.7	12.5	50.0	---	6.2	12.5	99.9
D.C., # 14	19.5	4.9	58.6	2.4	7.3	7.3	100.0

^{1/} Includes only businesses reporting they cash checks.

(in Table 22), about a third say that it was fewer than five checks. This is in fact the modal and median category for those who report bad check passing experiences during this period. Nonetheless, about 12 per cent report that they took 20 or more bad checks in this period. Given the frequency distribution of reported bad check passing, the volume of bad check passing that goes unreported to the police is substantial.

Again owners and managers were asked whether the police are mobilized when they know a person has given them a bogus check and why they did not mobilize the police. (See Table 23.) Only 19 per cent of all owners and managers say they call the police when they are given a bad check. Another 8 per cent say they will do so if they can't collect. Thus only 27 per cent say they call the police under any circumstance. This is below the percentage saying they call the police for shoplifting and only slightly above the percentage who call for employee theft.

The most common response as with shoplifting is to request that the offender "make good". This accounts for 54 per cent of all businesses that have bad check problems. Only a small percentage gives the problem over to some agency for collection, a further confirmation that informal rather than formal organizational means are used to deal with bad check offenders.

Quite clearly then, businesses and organizations do not rely primarily on law enforcement agents to deal with their bad check problems. It seems apparent that offenses in which an owner or manager has taken some responsibility for the relationship with the offender--either because he has hired him as an employee or because he has placed some trust in him by cashing a check--is one where he is unlikely to call the police and one where he is likely to use personal means for dealing with the offender. In the case of employee honesty, this includes negative sanctions of discharge. In the case of bad checks, it relies heavily on restitution.

It is not known how often owners or managers use threats

of police or other legal sanctions if the offender does not make resitution. On a small proportion voluntarily say they will call the police if the offender does not make good. It seems reasonable to assume, however, that in many cases there is an implied threat of some kind used to take more formal action against the offender, if not an actual one.

Premises Where Victimization Occurs in Major Crimes Against the Person, by Race and Sex of Victims and Offenders

There are a number of ways that the social environment is viewed as a causal factor in crime. The social environment is seen as causing some persons to become criminal offenders. It also is presumed to have an effect on who becomes a victim of a crime. Furthermore, it is thought that the social structure of opportunities to commit crime affects both the prevalence and incidence of crime. Finally, the structure of the entire legal system from law enforcement to corrections is believed to have consequences for offending, victimization, and the prevalence and incidence of crime.

This report focuses on how the social environment enters into the relationship between the victim and the offender for particular major crimes against the person. It specifically addresses itself to two questions. Are persons of a given race and sex who are victimized by an offender of a given race and sex in a particular crime against the person more likely to be victimized in certain kinds of situations than others and more (or less likely) to be victimized in that kind of situation than are persons in another kind of victim-offender relationship? And, second, do the kinds of premises or places where crimes occur lend themselves to the intervention of law enforcement agents?

The police have long been aware of the relationship between the place where a crime takes place and the type of crime that occurs. Some kinds of offenses are actually defined in terms of a place of occurrence. It is common to speak of street robberies or residential burglaries, for

example. Furthermore, some offenders are seen as following a particular modus operandi that includes a type of premises, e.g., second-story man or bank robber. Despite this recognition and the fact that police departments often keep information on premises of occurrence so as to develop information on crime patterns to deploy law enforcement agents, little attention has been paid to the kinds of situations where particular kinds of persons are likely to be victimized by given kinds of offenders. Tables 24 to 29 provide information on this subject.

A word of caution is needed about the interpretation of data in these tables. Not infrequently there are only a few persons or a given race and sex who are victimized by a person of a given race and sex in a particular type of crime. When therefore we provide information on where the offenses occur, there may be considerable error in the estimated per cent of persons victimized in that kind of place because of what may be regarded as a small sample of a particular kind of victim-offender relationship. For this reason we shall focus primarily on comparisons where there are substantial numbers of persons in a given victim-offender relationship.

Forcible Rape and Assault with Intent to Rape

It is immediately apparent in Table 24 that a majority of all victims of forcible rape are victimized in a residence. Fifty-three per cent of all white women victimized by a white male, fifty-four per cent of white women victimized by a Negro male and forty-eight per cent of Negro women victimized by a Negro male are victims in a public housing or other residence, though most are victims in the latter type of residence.

Since this category of premises includes only those cases where the forcible rape occurred inside the residence proper--

excluding offenses occurring outside the living quarters as in a hall, stairwell, porch or yard--it is immediately apparent as well that law enforcement officials can do little to prevent this kind of forcible rape. Other studies conclude that rapes within living quarters usually involve victims and offenders who are known to one another. This only adds to the problem of preventive law enforcement.

What is also surprising is how few of the offenses of forcible rape occur in what might be called public places such as school property, parks, alleys, or streets. Almost none of the forcible rapes occurred on school or park property. And of the rapes of white females by white males and of Negro females by Negro males, no more than one-eighth occurred in this kind of setting. It may well be that the presence of both the public and of the police in public settings substantially reduces the likelihood that a woman will be a victim of a forcible rape in this situation.

There is some evidence that this is the case when one examines the data for assault with intent to rape. The percentage of white females victimized in public settings is substantially greater for assaults with intent to rape than for forcible rape. Indeed, almost one-half of the offenses of assaults to rape that white men attempt against white women and that Negro men attempt against white women occur in a street setting. If one adds the public setting of parks or school grounds, an absolute majority of assaults with attempts to rape occur in these settings. See Table 24.

There is another interesting side to this problem if one asks, what is the likelihood that a white or Negro woman who is approached by an offender with intent to rape in a public setting will actually be a victim of a forcible rape. Of the 35 white women who were victims of a white or Negro male in a public setting, only 20 per cent were victims of a

Table 24: Per Cent of Persons of A Given Race and Sex Victimized By An Offender of A Given Race and Sex In Forcible Rape and Assault with Intent to Rape Offenses By Premises or Place of Occurrence of Offense: Chicago, Illinois.^{1/}

Premises or Place of Occurrence of Offense	Forcible Rape				Attempt to Rape			
	Offender and Victim ^{2/}							
	WM		NM		WM		NM	
	WF	NF	WF	NF	WF	NF	WF	NF
Public Housing	2	--	4	8	--	--	--	5
Residence, excpt. Public	51	--	50	40	32	25	29	47
Railroad Property	2	--	4	*	--	--	--	--
Street	7	25	13	12	49	25	47	18
Park or School	--	--	--	2	2	--	6	--
All other	38	75	29	38	17	50	18	30
Per Cent Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Number of Victims	55	4	24	376	37	4	17	118

^{1/}Data were secured by special tabulation from the Chicago Police Department Data Systems Division for the reporting periods beginning September 16, 1965 and ending March 2, 1966.

^{2/}Offender is listed first with victims on line below:
W = White; N = Negro; M = Male; F = Female.

*Less than 0.5 per cent.

forcible rape. The situation however is very different from the Negro female. Of the 75 Negro women who were approached by an offender with intent to rape in a public setting, about 70 per cent were victims of a forcible rape. Thus we have reason to believe that it is not the public setting, per se that accounts for the difference, but the overall "completion rate" is greater against Negro women, i.e., white women more often "discern", imagine, or are able to "thwart" intent to rape.

We might ask however whether there is any difference in the likelihood of a white woman who is assaulted in a public setting become a victim of a forcible rape according to whether the offender is a white or Negro male. The answer is, there is very little difference, though 25 per cent of the white women approached by a Negro male were victims of a forcible rape, while 17 per cent of the white women approached by a white male in a public setting were actually raped. There are only two cases of a Negro woman being approached by a white male in a public setting, one of which is a forcible rape. About 70 per cent of all Negro women approached by a Negro male in a public setting become victims of a forcible rape. We thus must conclude that it is not the public setting per se, but probably factors in the setting of the offense and the race status of the victim. Whether this means that white women are better able to frighten or otherwise avoid forcible rape in the public setting or/and that Negro women behave differently in such settings, or yet other factors account for the difference is not known.

Negro women who either are assaulted with an intent to rape or victims of a forcible rape are more likely to be accosted in a residential than in all other settings if the offender is a Negro male. But if the offender is a white

Table 25: Per Cent of Persons of A Given Race and Sex Victimized By An Offender of A Given Race and Sex In Armed Robbery and Strong-Armed Robbery Offenses By Premises or Place of Occurrence of Offense: Chicago, Illinois.^{1/}

Premises or Place of Occurrence of Offense	Armed Robbery										Strong-Armed Robbery											
	Offender and Victim ^{2/}					Offender and Victim ^{2/}					Offender and Victim ^{2/}					Offender and Victim ^{2/}						
	WM		NM		NF	WM	WF	NM	NF	WM	WF	NM	NF	WM	WF	NM	NF	WM	WF	NM	NF	
Taxicab	4		43			4		15	3		2						1					
Delivery Trucks	1					6											1					
Newsboys (Street)	1					1		5			3						1					
Newsboys (Premises)			4			*		4			1						1					
Other Street Robberies	34		22		20	43		48	44		62		100		82		61		72		65	
Park Property	1					1		*	*		3						1				*	
Tavern or Liquor Store	12					4		2	1		1						1					
Drug Store	5					1		*									*					
Cleaners	1				20			*	4								*					
Super Market	3					1		*	1								*					
Currency Exchange						1																
Gas Station						4		2														
Bank						4					1											
Other Business					20	7		2			3						2					1
Residence Hallway/Porch	5		4			10		8	24		3						8					13
Other Residence	6				20	4		4	8		6						3					7
All other Premises	16		10		20	14		10	15		15						20					14
Per Cent Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Number of Victims	184	53	23	5	420	62	788	259	2	377	239	974	322	11	89	172	2	100	100	100	100	100

^{1/} Source: See Table 24.

^{2/} Offender listed first with victims on line below: W = White; N = Negro; M = Male; F = Female.

*Less than 0.5 per cent.

male, the likelihood is that it will be in some other setting, i.e., a setting that is not a public place.

Robbery and Attempts to Rob

Robberies clearly are most likely to occur either in street and public settings or in places of business. (See Table 25.) This is true for both armed and strong-armed robberies. With few exceptions less than 15 per cent of all robberies committed by white and Negro men against white and Negro victims occur inside a living unit and generally a smaller proportion occurs in some other part of the residence such as a hallway or porch. All in all, less than one-half of the robberies committed by a white or Negro man against any white or Negro woman occurs outside a public or business premise.

There are some substantial differences according to whether one is a victim of an armed as compared with a strong-armed robbery, however. Quite clearly for every offender-victim race-sex comparison for armed and strong-armed robbery, more of the strong-armed robbery offenses occur on public than on business premises. More than one-half of all victims in any race-sex group who are robbed by a white or Negro male (See Table 25) are victims in a street robbery. By comparison, fewer than one-half of all comparable victim-offender subgroups are victims in a street robbery when the offense is armed robbery.

Nonetheless, when one examines armed robbery offenses by victim-offender status in types of premises, one notes that white males are more likely than Negro males to victimize persons of any race and sex in a business than a street setting. In fact, when white males commit an armed robbery their victim is either as likely, or less likely, to be in a public

as compared with a business setting. But Negro males commit armed robbery far more often in street settings. The surprising thing perhaps is that more armed robberies do not occur in business places than is the case.

There are several patterns of victim-offender relationship in premises that are apparent in Table 25. Forty-three per cent of the Negro males who were victims of a white male in an armed robbery were taxicab drivers. Only four per cent of all white males who were victimized by a Negro male in an armed robbery were taxicab drivers. The comparable percentage for a Negro victim of a Negro offender in armed robberies is 15 per cent. Nonetheless, a Negro male taxicab driver is more likely to be victimized by a Negro male than a white male in an armed robbery offense, since far fewer of the Negro males who are victims while driving cabs are victimized by a white male.

Women who are victims of a white male in an armed robbery are most likely to be victimized in a place of business, but when they are victimized by a Negro male in an armed robbery, it is quite unlikely that it will be in a place of business. The pattern is somewhat different for males. While all males who are victims of armed robberies are equally, or more likely to be victimized in a public setting (including taxicabs) than they are in a place of business, the white male who is offended against by a Negro male in an armed robbery is most likely to be victimized in "a place of business of the race-sex groups." This should surprise no one since opportunities to rob white businessmen generally are higher, even in Negro areas.

Among types of business premises, it is clear that white operators of taverns and liquor stores and of gas stations are more vulnerable to armed robbery by a white or Negro male

than are owners or managers of other types of businesses. Negro males who own or work in a gas station are vulnerable to armed robbery by white males. On the other hand, it seems clear that persons who work in business places have little to fear by way of a strong-armed robbery. Apparently if you work in a place of business, and you are a victim of a robbery, you are almost always going to be confronted by an armed man.

Major Assaults with A Dangerous Weapon

Assaults with A Gun

The victim and offenders in all assaults with a gun are white and Negro men and Negro women. The Negro woman in our sample, however, is victimized in assaults with a gun only by Negro men and she did not offend against white men in any such assaults. The most common event in all assaults with a gun is for a Negro man to be shot by a Negro man. The next most common event in an assault with a gun is for a Negro woman to be shot by a Negro man, followed by that of a white man being the victim of a white man.

The most common premises for persons to be victimized in all major assaults against the person with a dangerous weapon are the private residence and public premises. See Tables 26, 27, and 28.

For all persons victimized by a white male offender in an offense with a gun, (Table 26) the most common place of occurrence is public premises. The most common public premises is the street. However, 6 per cent of all white male victims of white offenders in shootings were victimized on school property or in a public park. Although the residence is the second most common place for an assault on a white male by a white male with a gun, it accounts for only a fifth or less of the settings where a white male is victimized by a white male in assaults with a gun.

Table 26: Per Cent of Persons of A Given Race and Sex Victimized By An Offender of A Given Race and Sex in Major Assaults With A Dangerous Weapon (or Attempts to Assault With A Dangerous Weapon) By Premises or Place of Occurrence of the Assault: Chicago, Illinois.^{1/}

Premises or Place of Occurrence of Offense	Shot or Attempted												
	Offender						Victim ^{2/}						
	WM			NM			WM			NF			
	WM	WF	NM	WF	WM	NF	WF	WM	NM	WF	WM	NM	NF
School Property	3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--
Public Housing	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	31	--	--	4	--
Residence, except. Public	16	33	20	--	23	--	--	31	61	--	--	61	25
Railroad Property	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Other Transport Property	--	--	--	--	8	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--
Street	50	67	60	67	38	--	67	43	19	--	--	19	38
Park	3	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	7	--
Tavern	8	--	--	--	--	--	--	10	--	--	--	7	13
All Other Premises	20	--	20	33	31	--	33	11	9	--	--	9	25
Total Per Cent	100	100	100	100	100	--	100	100	100	100	--	100	101
Total Victims	38	3	5	3	13	--	3	182	67	--	--	67	8

^{1/} Source: See Table 24.

^{2/} Offender listed first with victims on line below: W = White; N = Negro; M - Male; F = Female.

The pattern of victimization on premises is somewhat different for Negroes. Negro men and women most commonly victimize one another in an offense with a gun when they are in a private residence. Other data show this usually takes place in the residence of the woman when they are not married. The second most common premises for victimization of Negroes by other Negroes in assaults with a gun is street premises. The tavern is a fairly common setting for the shooting of Negro men and women by other Negroes however, accounting for 10 per cent of all shootings of Negro men by other Negro men. Eight per cent of shootings of white males by white males, however, occur in tavern premises.

White male victims in the aggregate run their greatest risk of being shot in a street, park or school premises, since 50 per cent of all white men who were shot by a white woman or by a Negro man or woman were victimized on such premises. The next most common premises for victimization of white men by these offenders is the residence, accounting for 18 per cent of all white male victims. By way of contrast 45 per cent of all Negro men who are shot by a white man (none was shot by a white woman) or by a Negro woman were victimized in a residence. Nevertheless, 38 per cent of the Negro men were victimized by white men or Negro women in a street setting. Thus four-fifths of all Negro male victims by shooting are shot on residence or street premises.

Assaults with A Knife or Other Cutting Instrument

Elsewhere it has been noted that Negro men and women are the most common victims and offenders in assaults with a knife or other cutting instrument. It is the most common way for Negro men and women to victimize one another in assaults with a dangerous weapon, (see Table 27) accounting

Table 27: Per Cent of Persons of A Given Race and Sex Victimized By An Offender of A Given Race and Sex in Major Assaults With A Dangerous Weapon (or Attempts to Assault With A Dangerous Weapon) By Premises or Place of Occurrence of the Assault: Chicago, Illinois.^{1/}

Premises or Place of Occurrence of Offense	Cut, Stabbed, or Attempted														
	Offender						Victim ^{2/}								
	WM			WF			WM			WF					
	WM	NF	NM	WF	NF	NM	WM	NF	NM	WF	NF	NM			
School Property	1	--	7	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	14	1	1
Public Housing	2	3	--	--	--	3	--	4	10	9	4	9	14	8	5
Residence, excpt. Public	31	58	7	14	50	72	100	50	40	62	27	62	33	63	37
Railroad Property	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	*	--	--	--	--
Other Transport Property	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	50	--	--	*	--	--	--	--
Street	37	23	58	12	57	12	57	50	30	17	46	17	33	20	33
Park	1	--	--	--	--	57	--	--	--	--	11	4	14	3	16
Tavern	11	3	14	4	29	13	9	11	20	7	10	7	33	5	8
All Other Premises	17	13	14	8	--	9	20	14	14	14	10	14	33	5	8
Total Per Cent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	99	100	100
Total Victims	123	31	14	26	7	1	32	10	10	295	534	295	3	339	116

^{1/} source: See Table 24.

^{2/} Offender listed first with victims on line below: W = White; N = Negro; M = Male; F = Female.

*Less than 0.5 per cent.

for 63 per cent of all assaults with a dangerous weapon of Negro men and women by Negro men and 64 per cent of all such assaults of Negro women by Negro men and women. White men are about equally likely to be victimized by "some other" dangerous weapon as by a knife or other cutting instrument, both of which, however, are more likely occurrences for them than assault with a gun.

The most common premises for a person to be victimized in an assault with a knife or other cutting instrument depends largely upon the sex of the victim and of the offender. See Table 27.

White and Negro women are most commonly victimized in assaults with a knife by white and Negro men in a residence with the street being the second most common setting. These two settings account for almost all of the cuttings or stabbings of white and Negro women by white men.

When white and Negro women are victimized by another woman, the premises patterns are less clear, partly because the number of cases is small except for the victimization of Negro women by Negro women. What appears to be the case is that white women are more commonly victimized in a street than in a residence setting when the white or Negro woman is the offender, while Negro women are more commonly victimized in the residence than in the street setting when the white woman is the offender.

Quite clearly when men are victimized by other men in cuttings, stabbings, and attempts to cut or stab they are more commonly victimized in a street than a residence setting--the obverse of the case for women. This is most striking for the cross-race victimization of the white or Negro man. It is quite unlikely, in fact, that a male who is victimized by

a male offender of the other race will be victimized in a residence. Indeed, in the cross-race victimization of males by males in a cutting or stabbing, the second most common place of occurrence is a tavern. This perhaps is not surprising since cuttings and stabbings frequently arise from quarrels or arguments. Given patterns of segregation that tend to limit interaction across race lines in the private residence, the public setting of the street or the public place such as the tavern are the more common places of cross-race interaction and contact and, therefore, of victimization.

When men are victimized by women of their own race in assaults with cutting instruments, however, they are more commonly victimized in a residence than on a street or in some other public setting. This perhaps is not surprising since it is the most likely setting for their intimate interaction and, therefore, for quarrels and arguments leading to violence to arise. There are too few cross-race male victims of women offenders in cuttings and stabbings to warrant any conclusions.

Thus for male victims in assaults with cutting instruments, the sex of offenders is more important than their race in determining the most likely premises where victimization will occur.

White male victims in the aggregate run a slightly greater risk that they will be victimized on public premises (38 per cent of all white male victims) than in a private residence (35 per cent) in cuttings and stabbings. But Negro males in the aggregate run a somewhat greater risk of victimization in a private residence (46 per cent of all Negro male victims) than on public premises (38 per cent). About 10 per cent of all white male victims compared with 7 per cent of all Negro male victims are victimized in a tavern.

Table 28: Per Cent of Persons of A Given Race and Sex Victimized By An Offender of A Given Race and Sex in Major Assaults With A Dangerous Weapon (or Attempts to Assault With A Dangerous Weapon) By Premises or Place of Occurrence of the Assault: Chicago, Illinois.^{1/}

Premises or Place of Occurrence of Offense	Serious Injury or Attempted: Other Dangerous Weapon															
	Offender and Victim ^{2/}															
	WM				WF				NM				NF			
	WM	WF	NM	NF	WM	WF	NM	NF	WM	WF	NM	NF	WM	WF	NM	NF
School Property	1	4	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Public Housing	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Residence, excpt. Public	16	59	--	--	--	--	--	11	--	3	1	--	--	--	--	--
Railroad Property	--	--	--	75	80	100	--	--	--	2	13	--	--	--	--	--
Other Transport Property	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	3	33	27	58	--	--	--	--	6
Street	34	19	--	--	--	--	--	3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	68
Park	2	--	56	25	20	--	--	5	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Tavern	20	11	11	--	--	--	--	56	67	43	19	--	--	--	--	--
All Other Premises	25	7	33	--	--	--	--	3	--	8	1	--	--	--	--	15
Total Per Cent	100	100	100	100	100	100	--	20	--	8	1	100	--	--	--	--
Total Victims	123	27	9	4	5	2	--	101	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	10
								38	3	211	135	1	1	54	4	2

^{1/}Source: See Table 24.

^{2/}Offender listed first with victims on line below: W = White; N = Negro; M = Male; F = Female.

Table 29: Per Cent of Persons of A Given Race and Sex Victimized By An Offender of a Given Race and Sex in Assault and Battery Involving Injury or Physical Contact Without Weapons (or Attempts at Same) By Premises or Place of Occurrence of the Offense: Chicago, Illinois.^{1/}

Premises or Place of Occurrence of Offense	Serious Injury/Hands, Fists, Feet, Other Body											
	Offender and Victim ^{2/}											
	WM				NM				NF			
	WM	WF	NM	NF	WM	WF	NM	NF	WM	WF	NM	NF
School Property	4	--	20	--	22	11	9	2	--	--	--	10
Public Housing	1	3	--	--	--	22	7	9	--	--	--	10
Residence, excpt. Public	22	71	--	--	--	11	13	58	--	67	20	30
Railroad Property	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Other Transport Property	1	--	--	--	9	11	2	--	--	--	--	--
Street	38	24	40	--	52	22	50	24	--	--	--	50
Park	1	--	--	--	4	--	--	1	--	--	--	--
Tavern	6	3	--	100	4	--	4	--	--	--	40	--
All Other Premises	27	--	40	--	9	22	15	6	--	33	40	--
Total Per Cent	100	101	100	100	100	99	100	100	--	100	100	100
Total Victims	96	38	5	1	23	9	82	113	--	3	5	10

^{1/}Source: See Table 24.

^{2/}Offender listed first with victims on line below: W = White; N = Negro; M = Male; F = Female.

Assaults with Other Dangerous Weapons

White and Negro men are the most common victims and offenders in assaults with dangerous weapons other than a gun or a knife or other cutting instruments. White men are about equally common as victims and as offenders while Negro men are more common as offenders than as victims. The Negro woman is more common as a victim than as an offender largely owing to the fact that she is more likely to be a victim of a Negro male than she is to offend against him.

As for assaults with a knife or other cutting instrument, the most common place for a person to be victimized in assaults with some other dangerous weapon depends largely upon the sex of the victim or of the offender. Indeed the patterns for premises of victimization among race-sex victimization groups is almost the same in assaults with other dangerous weapons as it is in assaults with a knife or other cutting instrument. See Table 28.

Assaults with Injury without A Dangerous Weapon and Battery Involving Physical Contact

The most common victim from assaults involving serious injury in the use of hands, fists, feet or other parts of the body, in minor injury without a dangerous weapon, and in assault and battery involving physical contact with insults or provocation is the Negro woman. (See Table 29.) The next most common victim is the white man. The Negro male is the third most common victim in assaults involving serious or minor injury without a dangerous weapon but the white woman is the third most common victim in assault and battery involving physical contact through insults or provocation.

Table 30: Per Cent of Persons of A Given Race and Sex Victimized By An Offender of A Given Race and Sex in Assault and Battery Involving Injury or Physical Contact Without Weapons (or Attempts at Same) By Premises or Place of Occurrence of the Offense: Chicago, Illinois.¹

Premises or Place of Occurrence of Offense	Minor Injury/No Dangerous Weapons															
	Offender						Victim ²									
	WM		WF		NM		NF		WM		WF		NM		NF	
School Property	4	1	5	9	33	11	4	6	2	13	41	1	9	25	9	7
Public Housing	1	1	13	9	27	4	2	4	10	33	4	9	50	25	100	100
Residence, except. Public	13	54	13	27	27	14	14	14	50	33	33	50	25	100	100	100
Railroad Property	*	*	3	5	33	1	6	1	*	33	1	1	1	1	1	1
Other Transport Property	1	23	60	32	41	49	42	51	24	33	36	13	47	47	47	47
Street	48	1	3	5	33	2	4	1	2	33	4	7	8	4	4	4
Park	1	10	16	8	11	18	28	16	13	13	23	18	8	18	18	18
Tavern	10	5	3	5	33	1	4	7	2	7	7	8	4	4	4	4
All Other Premises	22	16	16	8	11	18	28	16	13	13	23	18	8	18	18	18
Total Per Cent	100	100	100	100	99	100	100	100	101	99	100	100	100	100	100	100
Total Victims	829	518	40	22	3	223	50	699	1040	15	22	86	151	151	151	151

¹/Source: See Table 24.

²/Offender listed first with victims on line below: W = White; N = Negro; M = Male; F = Female.

*Less than 0.5 per cent.

Table 31: Per Cent of Persons of A Given Race and Sex Victimized By An Offender of A Given Race and Sex in Assault and Battery Involving Injury or Physical Contact Without Weapons (or Attempts at Same) By Premises or Place of Occurrence of the Offense: Chicago, Illinois.^{1/}

Premises or Place of Occurrence of Offense	Physical Contact/Insulting or Provoking															
	Offender							Victim ^{2/}								
	WM		WF		NM		NF		WM		WF		NM		NF	
School Property	3	3	6	100	13	17	22	10	3	38	45	7	3	10	3	7
Public Housing	*	2	--	--	--	--	--	5	8	--	--	21	8	5	8	21
Residence, except. Public	14	38	13	--	25	20	5	15	42	25	--	30	42	15	42	30
Railroad Property	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Other Transport Property	1	2	--	--	--	8	3	3	27	13	9	2	3	3	27	2
Street	47	33	44	--	38	27	39	37	27	13	27	50	37	37	13	50
Park	1	1	6	--	--	2	3	1	1	--	--	--	1	1	--	--
Tavern	12	4	19	--	--	2	2	7	3	2	--	--	7	7	2	3
All Other Premises	22	17	12	--	24	12	17	22	16	25	19	10	22	22	16	10
Total Per Cent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Total Victims	206	183	6	1	8	48	59	142	263	8	11	10	101	100	100	100

^{1/} Source: See Table 1.

^{2/} Offender listed first with victims on line below: W = White; N = Negro; M = Male; F = Female.

*Less than 0.5 per cent.

When men are victimized by other men in assaults without a dangerous weapon or in assault and battery involving physical contact through insults or provocation, the most common place of victimization is street premises (see Tables 30 and 31). The second most common premises where men victimize one another in these offenses is a private residence, but it is considerably less common than victimization on public premises. While some of these assaults occur in conjunction with other offenses, it can be assumed that many such incidents arise in conjunction with arguments or quarrels that lead to assault. Quite clearly then race is relatively unimportant in determining the place where men victimize one another in these offenses of assault. It suggests also that when men interact in private residential settings, their arguments and quarrels are unlikely to lead to violence that entails mobilizing the police.

When, however, a man of either race is the victim of a woman of the other race in an assault without a dangerous weapon, he is more commonly victimized in a residence. This finding fits with the general pattern of cross-race victimization of a man by a woman. The more intimate interaction settings that lead to quarrels and arguments that in turn lead to violence against the person arise in the more private setting of the home. Violence as in an assault is the outcome of a "domestic disturbance."

In offenses of assault and battery involving physical contact with insults or provocation, the street is the more common setting of victimization for all male victims regardless of the race and sex of the offender. When a man charges a woman with assault and battery where physical contact with insults and provocation are the offensive conduct, probably

their relationship either is far less intimate or their quarrels and arguments in public settings are controlled to the degree that they restrict the outcome to less violent ends or others prevent them from taking more violent action.

As for most assaults where a Negro woman is the victim, the most common place where Negro women are victimized by a male in assaults without a dangerous weapon is the private residence. Although the results are less clear for women being victimized by women in these offenses, generally the street premises is the more common place of occurrence.

Threats with and without A Dangerous Weapon

Negroes are the most common victim of threats with a dangerous weapon. Negro women are somewhat more likely to be victims of such threats than are Negro men. White women are least commonly victims of a threat with a dangerous weapon. In threats without a dangerous weapon, white men are the most common victim, followed by Negro women, then Negro men, with white women being the least common as victims.

In threats with and without a dangerous weapon where the male is victimized by a male, the most common place for the offense to occur is a street. See Tables 32 and 33. The pattern of occurrence of the offense is very like that for actual assaults with a dangerous weapon.

Generally when women are the victims in threats with and without a dangerous weapon, the most likely place of occurrence for threats with a dangerous weapon is a residence while the street is more common for assaults without a dangerous weapon. There are a few exceptions, however.

Table 32: Per Cent of Persons of A Given Race and Sex Victimized By An Offender of A Given Race and Sex In Threats of Assault and Battery (or Attempts at Same) By Premises or Place of Occurrence of the Offense: Chicago, Illinois.^{1/}

Premises or Place of Occurrence of Offense	Threats With A Dangerous Weapon											
	Offender and Victim ^{2/}						Offender and Victim ^{2/}					
	WM			NM			WM			NM		
	WF	NM	NF	WF	NM	NF	WF	NM	NF	WF	NM	NF
School Property	1	2	---	1	8	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Public Housing	---	2	7	---	---	6	---	---	---	---	---	---
Residence, excpt. Public	18	58	7	2	23	52	---	---	---	---	---	---
Railroad Property	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Other Transport Property	---	---	7	6	---	1	---	---	---	---	---	---
Street	38	25	43	32	38	21	---	---	---	100	27	---
Park	1	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Tavern	10	6	---	11	---	1	---	---	---	---	4	---
All Other Premises	32	7	36	38	31	19	---	---	---	---	---	34
Total Per Cent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Total Victims	89	52	14	45	13	202	2	28	2	2	28	35

^{1/} Source: See Table 24.

^{2/} Offender stated first with victims on line below: W = White; N = Negro; M = Male; F = Female.

Table 33: Per Cent of Persons of A Given Race and Sex Victimized By An Offender of A Given Race and Sex In Threats of Assault and Battery (or Attempts at Same) By Premises or Place of Occurrence of the Offense: Chicago, Illinois.^{1/}

Premises or Place of Occurrence of Offense	Threats Without A Dangerous Weapon															
	Offender and Victim ^{2/}															
	WM				WF				NM				NF			
	WM	WF	NM	NF	WM	WF	NM	NF	WM	WF	NM	NF	WM	WF	NM	NF
School Property	6	3	---	---	---	19	---	---	40	29	23	11	25	36	---	27
Public Housing	1	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	4	9	25	---	---	5
Residence, excpt. Public	16	39	---	---	33	19	---	---	7	21	13	48	25	---	67	27
Railroad Property	1	---	33	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Other Transport Property	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	2	---	1	---	---	---	---	---
Street	32	33	33	100	67	31	---	---	31	36	35	10	---	36	---	27
Park	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	2	---	---	2	---	---	---	---
Tavern	8	2	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	4	2	---	---	---	---
All Other Premises	36	26	33	---	---	31	---	---	18	14	20	18	25	28	33	14
Total Per Cent	100	100	99	100	100	100	---	---	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Total Victims	120	61	3	2	3	16	---	---	42	14	111	132	4	11	3	22

^{1/}Source: See Table 1.

^{2/}Offender stated first with victims on line below: W = White; N = Negro; M = Male; F = Female.

Table 34: Per Cent of Persons of A Given Race and Sex Victimized By An Offender of A Given Race and Sex in All Major Crimes Against the Person, Except Homicide, By Premises or Place of Occurrence: Chicago, Illinois.^{1/}

Premises or Place of Occurrence of Offense	All Major Crimes Against Persons															
	Offender and Victim ^{2/}															
	WM				WF				NM				NF			
	WM	WF	NM	NF	WM	WF	NM	NF	WM	WF	NM	NF	WM	WF	NM	NF
School Property	3	1	3	5	2	7	33	---	5	4	3	1	15	28	1	6
Public Housing	1	1	1	3	6	3	---	14	*	1	2	8	2	1	7	8
Residence, excpt. Public	14	45	6	28	57	27	---	29	4	12	13	42	27	3	58	30
Railroad Property	*	*	1	---	---	---	---	---	*	*	*	*	---	---	---	---
Other Transport Property	*	*	2	4	---	1	17	---	4	1	1	*	---	1	*	*
Taxicab	1	---	7	---	---	---	---	---	2	---	4	---	---	---	---	---
Delivery Trucks	*	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	2	---	*	---	---	---	---	---
Newsboys, Street	*	---	1	---	---	---	---	---	*	---	4	---	---	---	---	---
Newsboys, Other Premises	*	---	1	---	---	---	---	---	*	---	3	---	---	---	---	---
Street	44	29	51	34	12	39	17	14	50	54	49	26	24	44	20	38
Parks	1	*	---	2	1	1	---	---	1	1	*	1	1	---	---	---
Tavern or Liquor Store	10	4	3	3	7	9	17	---	3	1	5	2	12	---	5	7
Drug Store	1	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	*	---	*	---	---	---	---	---
Cleaners	*	1	---	2	---	---	---	---	---	*	*	*	---	---	---	*
Super-Market	*	*	---	---	---	---	---	---	*	---	*	*	---	---	---	---
Gas Station	1	---	2	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	*	---	---	---	---
Bank	---	*	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	*	---	---	---	---	*
Other Businesses	1	1	1	2	---	---	---	14	3	1	1	*	---	---	---	*
Residence/Hallway or Porch	1	1	1	---	1	---	---	---	6	4	4	3	---	---	1	*
All Other Premises	22	17	20	17	14	13	16	29	19	21	11	15	20	22	8	11
Total Per Cent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Total Victims	1981	1147	139	58	86	152	6	7	1272	492	3909	3311	41	68	612	431

^{1/}Source: See Table 1.

^{2/}Offender listed first with victims on line below: W = White; N = Negro; M = Male; F = Female.

*Less than 0.5 per cent.

White women when victimized in threats with a dangerous weapon by a Negro man or woman are more likely to be threatened in a street than in a residence setting. Furthermore, in threats without a dangerous weapon when a woman is victimized by a man of her own race, she is more commonly victimized in residence than in street premises. Again these patterns of victimization seem to mirror patterns of interaction within and between races.

All Major Offenses Against Persons

Looked at from the standpoint of the aggregate of victims among Negroes and whites in Chicago during the six month period for which these data were gathered (see Table 34), the Negro male was the most common victim (4699) and the Negro female was the second most common victim (3824). The white male was the third most common victim in frequency of occurrence (3640) while the white woman was least common as a victim (1967). From the study of rates of victimization reported earlier, it is known that this made the risk of victimization much higher for Negroes than whites since Negroes comprise a much smaller proportion of the total population in Chicago than do whites.

Now it is asked, what are the most common premises where a victim of a given race and sex may expect to be a victim of a major offense against the person from an offender of a given race and sex? The data in Table 34 summarize the data from all major offenses against the person.

Generally, regardless of the race and sex of the offender, a man in Chicago is most commonly victimized on street premises. The likelihood is much lower that he will be victimized in a residence. There is one exception that merits attention. When a man is victimized by a woman of

victimized by a man or woman of their own race, the most common place of occurrence of the offense against the person is the residence. When women are victimized by a man or woman of the other race, the most common place of occurrence is the street. There is one exception, though the number of cases is very small. Apparently Negro women who are victimized by white women in a major offense against the person are somewhat more likely to be victimized in a residence than on street premises.

Again, the place of victimization would seem to be a consequence of patterns of social interaction. In social situations that lead to conflict, the woman is most likely to associate with members of her own race in a residence. However, in cross-race contacts she is more likely to interact with women outside the home. Hence when conflict arises among women of different races, it generally occurs outside the home.

These patterns of interaction in premises that lead to an assault or battery can be summarized as follows:

1. Men are most likely to meet with other men outside the home. The kind of situations that involve men in conflict also are unlikely to arise in the intimate setting of the home. Therefore when conflict arises among men that eventuates in an assault or battery, it most likely arises in settings outside the home.

Nonetheless it is not altogether clear why the most common setting for an assault or battery offense involving men as victims and offenders arises on street premises. Some offenses that arise in public settings and involve a charge of assault or battery also involve another offense that is generative of conflict, e.g., drunkenness. Yet victims of assault or battery on street premises would not seem to be primarily victims of "multiple" offenses.

his own race, he is far more likely to be victimized in a residence than on a street premises.

This finding seems closely related to the patterns of interaction among men and women in our society, particularly to the conditions under which conflict between them arises that is likely to lead to assault or battery. A man and woman of the same race more likely than not are related in a domestic relationship. When conflict arises in the domestic relationship, they usually are at home. If violence results, the man or woman is victimized at home by a spouse or "lover."

On the other hand, men are more likely to meet one another outside the home, regardless of race. It is somewhat surprising nevertheless that when conflict arises between men, it is most likely to arise in the public context of the street. This may be due in part to the fact that assault occurs in connection with other offenses that arise in the street, but there must be other reasons as well why the street is the most common setting. Certainly a substantial proportion of these conflicts arise from drinking--the tavern is the third most common setting for men to be victims of an assault and battery; some of the conflict that arises among drunks perhaps later erupts in street fights. More needs to be learned, however, about the specific kinds of situations that lead to conflict among men in the streets, conflict that results in violence against the person.

The pattern of victimization on premises is somewhat different for women. The race of the offender is far more important in determining the premises of victimization of women in an assault or battery offense. When women are

2. Men and women of the same race meet one another most frequently in the domestic setting of the private residence, at least in meetings that potentially lead to conflict. Conflict is endemic to the domestic relationship; quite commonly the police are called to deal with a "domestic disturbance." Observation of these domestic disturbances discloses that in a substantial proportion of them there is a high potential for violence. It is not surprising therefore that assault or battery involving men and women of the same race arises most commonly in the domestic setting of the private residence.

There is one major exception to this pattern of victimization in crimes against the person: robbery. But robbery rarely occurs among persons who commonly are in interaction with one another. Women who are victims of men of their own race in an armed- or strong-armed robbery generally are victimized in the street or in a place of business. The findings then hold only for all assaults or battery rather than for all major offenses against the person.

3. Race does not seem to be much of a factor in determining the place where men of one race victimize men of another race in all major offenses against the person. It does seem to be a factor though in the victimization of women in all major offenses against the person. Particular attention is drawn to the fact that white women who are victimized by Negro men in all major crimes against the person are more usually victimized in street premises. It perhaps is least common in cross-race interaction among persons in our society for a white woman to interact with a Negro man in a setting that will lead to conflict where violence against the person is an outcome of the conflict. It also

is relatively uncommon for them to meet within the private dwelling unit, at least in such a way that they will come into conflict. Hence it is not surprising that white women are unlikely to be victimized by Negro men in a major offense against the person within a dwelling unit. Such victimization occurs primarily outside the dwelling unit and then most commonly as victims in offenses of robbery. From this one might surmise that white women rarely become victims of Negro men in an assault or battery except as relative "strangers." They rarely are unable, therefore, to identify the man who offends against them.

4. Since a substantial amount of assault and battery occurs in a public setting such as the street, it seems clear that much of it potentially falls within the purview of the police, for public settings are most accessible to them.

Nonetheless, for certain types of offenses against the person such as rape, and particularly for all offenses against the person where women are the victims, the police are unable to enter the setting until the offense has been committed. A somewhat anomalous condition exists then such that a woman is most likely to be victimized in situations where she is least accessible to preventive action from the police while men are most likely to be victimized in situations where the police may be able to engage in preventive action.

Victimization by Offenders in Each Major Offense Against the Person on Street and Residence Premises

Two findings have been noted: (1) A large proportion of all victim experiences occur either on street or on residence premises; (2) The race and sex of the victim and of the offender varies with the place of occurrence of the offense in major types of offenses against the person. Turning attention instead to the premises where an offense may occur against a victim and asking what proportion of the offenses of a particular kind occur against a victim of a given race and sex by offenders of a given race and sex on that premises, other questions can be raised. For example, what proportion of white male victims are victimized by offenders of each race and sex for armed robbery on street premises? Are more of the offenses against white males in a street setting committed by members of one race-sex subgroup than others? What are the most common offenses against them in a street setting? Tables 35 to 38 provide data to answer these questions for each major race-sex subgroup of victims.

The Experience of White Male Victims

Eighty-nine per cent of the offenses against the white male victims in street settings were committed by a white male (52 per cent) or a Negro male (37 per cent). An additional nine per cent were committed by males of other races. Thus 98 per cent of all white males victimized in street settings in major offenses against the person were victimized by other males. See Table 35. Clearly, a white male is very unlikely to be victimized by a woman in a street setting in any major offense against the person.

There is some variation, however, in what is the race of the offender who will victimize him in street settings

Table 35: Per Cent of Offenders of Each Race and Sex Subgroup for White Male Victims by Each Major Offense Against the Person on Street and Residence Premises: Chicago, Illinois.^{1/}

Premises and Type of Crime Against Person	Victim and Offenders ^{2/}						Total		
	White Male Victimized By:						Per Cent Total	Number	Per Cent
	WM	WF	NM	NF	OM	OF			
Street Premises:									
Armed Robbery	23	--	68	--	9	--	100	267	16
Strong-Armed Robbery	28	--	61	1	10	*	100	374	23
Shot or Attempted	68	4	18	--	11	--	100	28	2
Cut, Stabbed or Attempted	55	4	22	1	15	--	100	83	5
Other Dangerous Weapon	58	1	29	--	12	--	100	73	4
Inj./Hands, Fists, Feet, Etc.	72	2	24	--	2	--	100	50	3
Minor Inj./No Dang. Weapon	72	--	20	1	7	*	100	552	33
Physical Contact	72	3	18	1	6	--	100	130	8
Threat/Dang. Weapon	62	--	25	--	13	--	100	55	3
Threat/No Dang. Weapon	66	3	22	--	9	--	100	58	3
All Offenses	52	1	37	1	9	--	100	---	100
Total Number	873	14	623	10	148	2	---	1670	
Residence Premises:									
Armed Robbery	39	--	57	4	--	--	100	28	7
Strong-Armed Robbery	39	*	46	4	11	--	100	28	7
Shot or Attempted	60	10	30	--	--	--	100	10	2
Cut, Stabbed or Attempted	59	30	5	2	3	2	100	64	16
Other Dangerous Weapon	74	15	4	--	4	4	100	27	7
Inj./Hands, Fists, Feet, Etc.	91	4	--	--	4	--	100	23	6
Minor Inj./No Dang. Weapon	73	15	7	4	1	--	100	143	35
Physical Contact	76	5	8	5	5	--	99	37	9
Threat/Dang. Weapon	89	--	6	--	5	--	100	18	4
Threat/No Dang. Weapon	68	4	11	4	14	--	100	28	7
All Offenses	68	12	13	3	4	--	100	---	100
Total Number	275	49	53	11	16	3	---	406	

^{1/}Source: See Table 1.

^{2/}W = White; N = Negro; M = Male; F = Female.

*Less than 0.5 per cent.

depending upon the type of major crime against the person. More than six of every ten times that a white male is victimized in a robbery in a street setting, the offender is a Negro male. Indeed, this is the only type of offense where the proportion of Negro male offenders is above the average for offenses against white males.

Seven out of ten times that a white male is victimized in assaults that involve the use of hands, fists, feet, or other parts of the body and he sustains serious injury, in assaults where he sustains minor injury without a dangerous weapon, and in assault and battery with physical contact involving insults or provocation the offender is a white male. This is virtually the case, too, when he is shot in a street setting, since 68 per cent of the offenders in shootings of a white male in the street were white males. For all other assault and battery offenses, other than cuttings, stabbings and attempts at the same and for threats to assault, a white male is more likely to be assaulted by a white than a non-white male in a street setting. Indeed his chances in all assault and battery cases or in threats are generally only about one-in-five that the offender will be a Negro male. It is somewhat higher for threats with a dangerous weapon and all assaults with other dangerous weapons.

The situation is only somewhat different when the white male is offended against in a residence setting. Eight out of ten times the offender in a residence setting will be a male with 68 per cent of the offenders being white males and only 13 per cent Negro males. Since other nonwhite males commit 4 per cent of the offenses against white males in a residence setting, in 85 per cent of the cases where the white male is a victim of a major offense against the person in a residence, his assailant is a male. Only 12 per cent of the offenders against white males in a residence setting

are white women and but three per cent are Negro women. Quite clearly then, even within the residence, a white male is most likely to be victimized by another male--most usually a white male.

Yet, there is some variation in what type of offender will victimize a white male in a residence depending upon the type of major crime against the person. Though it is unlikely he will be robbed in a residence, the offender in such cases is almost always a male. Yet he is somewhat more likely to be victimized by a Negro than by a white male in either armed or strong-armed robbery in a residence.

In no major offense against the person is a white male more likely to be victimized by a white woman than by a white man within the residence setting. It is clear that a white woman will rarely victimize him in a residence in a robbery or in a threat with a dangerous weapon. The white male is more likely to be a victim of a white woman in a residence in a cutting or stabbing than in any other major offense against the person. Thirty per cent of the assailants against white men in this offense in a residential setting were white women.

About nine of every ten times that a white man is a victim of a serious injury with hands, fists, feet, or other part of the body and in threats with a dangerous weapon, the offender is a white male.

Are there differences in victim experience in street as compared with residence settings in liability to particular kinds of major offenses against the person? Data in the last column of Table 35 give the victims of each major type of offense against the person as a proportion of all victims in given premises.

A higher proportion of the white male victims in street settings than on residence premises are victims of robbery. But there are about three times as many white male victims of a cutting or stabbing in a residential as compared with a street setting. More of the white male victims in residential than

in street settings in fact are victims of all other forms of assault and battery, other than a shooting.

The Experience of White Female Victims

For all major offenses against the person that occur in street settings, the white woman is somewhat more likely to be offended against by a woman than is a white man to be offended against by a woman in these settings. (See Table 36.) Yet for only 12 per cent of all major offenses against her on street premises was the offender a woman--more commonly a white than a Negro woman. Yet it is clear that when a white woman is offended against on the street in all major crimes, she must expect that her assailant will be a man. When she is victimized in a major crime against the person in a street setting in Chicago, while her assailant is more likely a white man (46 per cent of all offenders in this setting), it not uncommonly is a Negro man (36 per cent of all offenders).

Indeed, in certain kinds of major offenses against the person a white woman is more likely to be offended against by a Negro than a white man in street settings. When offended against in an armed or strong-armed robbery in the streets, a white woman is more often a victim of a Negro than a white man. She is much less likely to be offended against by a Negro than a white man in all offenses of assault and battery and threats of violence. This is true also for offenses of forcible rape and assault with intent to rape in street settings. Yet, in Chicago, she is more likely to be offended against by a Negro male in a rape or forcible rape in a street setting, than she is likely to be offended against by a Negro male in assaults and battery offenses in a street setting. Thus while white women are less often victims of forcible rape and assaults with intent to rape in street settings than they are of all other major offenses against the person in street settings other than

Table 36: Per Cent of Offenders of Each Race and Sex Subgroup for White Female Victims by Each Major Offense Against the Person on Street and Residence Premises: Chicago, Illinois.^{1/}

Premises and Type of Crime Against Person	Victim and Offenders ^{2/}						Total		
	White Women Victimized By:						Per Cent Total	Number	Per Cent
	WM	WF	NM	NF	OM	OF			
Street Premises:									
Forcible Rape	45	--	33	--	22	--	100	9	1
Assault to Rape	62	--	28	--	10	--	100	29	4
Armed Robbery	30	2	60	2	6	--	100	50	7
Strong-Armed Robbery	24	1	66	3	6	--	100	258	35
Shot or Attempted	50	--	50	--	--	--	100	4	1
Cut, Stabbed or Attempted	35	20	15	15	15	--	100	20	3
Other Dang. Weapon	56	--	22	--	22	--	100	9	1
Inj./Hands, Fists, Feet, Etc.	69	15	15	--	--	--	100	13	2
Minor Inj./No Dang. Weapon	61	20	11	4	3	1	100	193	26
Physical Contact	67	8	15	3	7	--	100	89	12
Threat/Dang. Weapon	59	--	23	9	9	--	100	22	3
Threat/No Dang. Weapon	53	15	15	12	3	2	100	34	5
All Offenses	46	8	36	4	6	*	100	---	100
Total Number	330	60	265	29	43	3	---	730	
Residence Premises:									
Forcible Rape	50	--	50	--	--	--	100	41	6
Assault to Rape	57	--	24	--	19	--	100	21	3
Armed Robbery	47	--	53	--	--	--	100	15	2
Strong-Armed Robbery	59	--	29	--	12	--	100	17	3
Shot or Attempted	50	50	--	--	--	--	100	2	*
Cut, Stabbed or Attempted	75	4	17	--	4	--	100	24	4
Other Dang. Weapon	84	11	5	--	--	--	100	19	3
Inj./Hands, Fists, Feet, Etc.	87	--	3	7	--	3	100	31	5
Minor Inj./No Dang. Weapon	86	8	2	--	3	1	100	324	50
Physical Contact	81	2	11	--	6	--	100	86	13
Threat/Dang. Weapon	72	14	7	--	7	--	100	42	6
Threat/No Dang. Weapon	77	10	10	--	3	--	100	31	5
All Offenses	80	6	9	--	4	1	100	---	100
Total Number	521	41	58	2	27	4	---	653	

^{1/}Source: See Table 1.

^{2/}W = White; N = Negro; M = Male; F = Female.

*Less than 0.5 per cent.

shootings, assault with other dangerous weapons, serious injury with hands, fists, feet, etc., and threats with a dangerous weapon, their perception of victim experience may be formed more by the former than by the latter experience. Furthermore, since in the serious offense of robbery, their assailant is more likely to be a Negro than a white man, there are other bases for forming a perception of victimization by Negro men. Thus while overall white women are somewhat more likely to be victimized by white than Negro men in all major offenses against the person in street settings, the fact that they are more likely to be victimized by a Negro than a white male in offenses of robbery and that one out of three offenders against white women in forcible rape and assault with intent to rape in street settings are Negro men may have the greater effect on the perceptions white women hold of victimization in street settings.

Within the residence, women generally are victimized by men. Eighty per cent of white women who were victims in a residence were victims of white men; nine per cent were victims of Negro men and 4 per cent of other nonwhite men. Thus 93 per cent of the white female victims in a residence setting were victimized by men. The offender against her in most other cases is a white woman.

For the more serious offenses of forcible rape and armed robbery, a white woman is about equally likely to be victimized in her home by a Negro as by a white male. In a residence setting, she also is fairly often a victim of a nonwhite male in an assault with intent to rape and a strong-armed robbery from a nonwhite male. These offenses comprise only 14 per cent of all white female experiences as victims of major offenses against the person in the home, however.

About one in ten white women when in a residence are victimized by another white woman in assaults with other

dangerous weapons and in threats with and without a dangerous weapon. Eight of every ten white female victims while in a residence are victimized by a white male in assaults that do not involve guns, knives, or sex.

Almost one of every ten white women who are victimized in a residence are victims of a forcible rape or assault with intent to rape. Nevertheless, one-half of all white women victimized in a residence are victims of an assault without a dangerous weapon and where they sustain only minor injury. Indeed, three-fourths of all white women who are victimized in a residence are victims where they sustain only minor injury, where no major weapon actually is used, or where they simply are threatened with violence.

The Experience of Negro Male Victims

The Negro male, like the white male, is a victim of other males in street settings. Nine out of ten times in all major offenses against the person, he is victimized by another Negro male. In only three per cent of victim experiences of Negro males in a street setting is his assailant a white male. See Table 37.

A Negro male on street premises is almost always victimized by another Negro male in offenses that involve robbery and threats without a dangerous weapon. The latter is particularly noteworthy since it is clear that such threats do not involve a cross-race contact. Only in offenses that involve assault and battery with physical contact through insult or provocation is there a one in ten chance that the offender against a Negro male in a street setting is a white male.

Negro men, like white men, are unlikely to be victimized by women on street premises. The chances that a Negro male will be victimized by a Negro woman are greater however for assaults, attempts, and threats that involve a dangerous weapon than for all other major offenses against the person.

Table 37: Per Cent of Offenders of Each Race and Sex Subgroup for Negro Male Victims by Each Major Offense Against the Person on Street and Residence Premises: Chicago, Illinois.^{1/}

Premises and Type of Crime Against Person	Victim and Offenders ^{2/}						Total		
	Negro Male Victimized By:						Per Cent Total	Number	Per Cent
	WM	WF	NM	NF	OM	OF			
Street Premises:									
Armed Robbery	1	--	97	1	1	--	100	386	18
Strong-Armed Robbery	2	--	97	1	--	--	100	570	27
Shot or Attempted	3	--	81	14	2	--	100	96	5
Cut, Stabbed or Attempted	2	--	77	21	--	--	100	327	15
Other Dang. Weapon	5	--	86	8	1	1	100	106	5
Inj./Hands, Fists, Feet, Etc.	5	--	95	--	--	--	100	43	2
Minor Inj./No Dang. Weapon	6	--	90	3	1	--	100	396	19
Physical Contact	12	--	79	7	2	--	100	67	3
Threat/Dang. Weapon	7	--	81	10	2	--	100	82	4
Threat/No Dang. Weapon	2	--	98	--	--	--	100	40	2
All Offenses	3	--	90	6	1	--	100	---	100
Total Number	71	1	1901	121	17	2	---	2113	

Residence Premises:									
Armed Robbery	--	--	94	6	--	--	100	34	4
Strong-Armed Robbery	--	--	96	4	--	--	100	25	3
Shot or Attempted	1	--	58	41	--	--	100	98	11
Cut, Stabbed or Attempted	--	--	40	60	--	--	100	359	41
Other Dang. Weapon	--	--	60	39	1	--	100	95	11
Inj./Hands, Fists, Feet, Etc.	--	--	92	8	--	--	100	12	1
Minor Inj./No Dang. Weapon	4	--	66	30	--	--	100	143	16
Physical Contact	--	--	84	16	--	--	100	25	3
Threat/Dang. Weapon	1	--	77	21	1	--	100	68	8
Threat/No Dang. Weapon	--	--	82	12	6	--	100	17	2
All Offenses	1	--	58	41	--	--	100	---	100
Total Number	8	--	507	359	3	--	---	876	

^{1/}Source: See Table 1.

^{2/}W = White; N = Negro; M = Male; F = Female.

*Less than 0.5 per cent.

Two out of 10 Negro male victims of a cutting or stabbing in a street setting are victims of a Negro woman.

The situation is quite different when a Negro male is victimized in a residence, however. With only an occasional exception, the offender against a Negro male in a residence is a Negro man or woman. See Table 36. Within the residence, in fact, he is more likely to be victimized by a Negro woman in a cutting or stabbing than he is to be victimized by a Negro man. And in fact for all offenses involving the actual use of dangerous weapons, four out of ten times (or more) his assailant is a Negro woman. Within the confines of the private place then, a Negro man has reason to expect violence with a dangerous weapon from a Negro woman.

Further support is found for this in that four of every 10 Negro male victims in a residence are victims of a cutting, stabbing, or attempt at the same. An additional 11 per cent are victims in a shooting, and another 11 per cent are victims in an assault with another dangerous weapon. For all of these offenses his risk of victimization in the home by a Negro woman is high--in six of every 10 offenses against him in the home then, a Negro male is a victim of a serious assault with a dangerous weapon and given the frequency of the occurrence of each, he has a somewhat better than even chance that his assailant will be a woman if he is attacked in a residence. The Negro male clearly has reason to anticipate that he will experience serious injury when he is a victim of a major offense against the person in the home. Indeed, only 25 per cent of all white men are victims from these same offenses in a residence setting as compared with 63 per cent of all Negro men.

The Experience of Negro Female Victims

Both on street and residence premises, the Negro woman almost always is victimized by another Negro. Interestingly

enough, the person who offends against her more likely is a woman if she is a victim of a major offense against the person in the street than in a residence. Nine out of ten times in a major offense against her in a residence, a Negro woman is a victim of a Negro man. It is rare, indeed that a Negro woman is a victim of another woman in a street or residence setting, and it is quite unlikely that she will be a victim of a white man in either setting. See Table 38.

In a street setting, a Negro woman is unlikely to be a victim of a forcible rape by a white man and her chances are less than one in ten that her assailant will be a white male in an assault with intent to rape in the streets. She likewise almost always will be victimized by a Negro male if she is a victim of a robbery in a street. But if she is shot in the street, her assailant more likely than not is a Negro woman and her chances are almost even that her assailant will be a Negro woman if she is cut or stabbed in the street. She therefore risks serious body injury from a Negro woman if guns or knives are used against her in the street.

When she is in a residence, however, her assailant almost always is a Negro male. This is true even for the use of dangerous weapons, though 2 of every 10 Negro women victims of a cutting or stabbing in the home are victimized by a Negro woman. Clearly within the home, it is the conflict between a Negro man and a Negro woman that leads to her experiences as a victim.

However a Negro woman is much less likely to be a victim of some offenses against the person in the home than she is in the street. Thus while 14 per cent of all Negro women victims in the home are victims of a forcible rape or assault with intent to rape, only 6 per cent are victims of these offenses in the street--and, indeed, in actual numbers, she is more likely to be victimized in the home than in the street from these offenses. A higher proportion of Negro female

Table 38: Per Cent of Offenders of Each Race and Sex Subgroup for Negro Female Victims by Each Major Offense Against the Person on Street and Residence Premises: Chicago, Illinois.^{1/}

Premises and Type of Crime Against Person	Victim and Offenders ^{2/}						Total		
	Negro Female Victimized By:						Per Cent Total	Number	Per Cent
	WM	WF	NM	NF	OM	OF			
Street Premises:									
Forcible Rape	2	--	98	--	--	--	100	46	4
Assault to Rape	8	--	91	--	--	--	99	23	2
Armed Robbery	1	*	97	3	--	--	101	118	11
Strong-Armed Robbery	1	--	94	4	*	*	99	221	21
Shot or Attempted	--	--	17	83	--	--	100	18	2
Cut, Stabbed or Attempted	1	--	56	43	--	--	100	89	8
Other Dang. Weapon	3	--	76	21	--	--	100	33	3
Inj./Hands, Fist, Feet, Etc.	--	--	85	15	--	--	100	33	3
Minor Inj./No Dang. Weapon	2	--	76	22	*	*	100	323	31
Physical Contact	3	--	82	15	--	--	100	87	8
Threat/Dang. Weapon	2	--	88	10	--	--	100	48	5
Threat/No Dang. Weapon	10	--	62	29	--	--	101	21	2
All Offenses	2	*	83	15	*	*	100	-----	100
Total Number	20	1	874	161	2	2	----	1060	

Residence Premises:									
Forcible Rape	--	--	99	--	1	--	100	152	10
Assault to Rape	2	--	98	--	--	--	100	56	4
Armed Robbery	5	--	95	--	--	--	100	21	1
Strong-Armed Robbery	--	--	100	--	--	--	100	21	1
Shot or Attempted	--	--	94	6	--	--	100	32	2
Cut, Stabbed or Attempted	*	--	80	20	--	--	100	232	15
Other Dang. Weapon	3	--	83	12	2	--	100	96	6
Inj./Hands, Fist, Feet, Etc.	--	--	96	4	--	--	100	68	4
Minor Inj./No Dang. Weapon	1	--	92	7	*	*	100	559	36
Physical Contact	2	--	88	10	--	--	100	126	8
Threat/Dang. Weapon	2	1	89	9	--	--	101	117	8
Threat/No Dang. Weapon	--	--	90	9	1	--	100	71	5
All Offenses	1	*	90	8	1	*	100	-----	100
Total Number	16	2	1397	127	8	1	----	1551	

^{1/}Source: See Table 1.

^{2/}W = White; N = Negro; M = Male; F = Female.

*Less than 0.5 per cent.

victims in the home than in the street are found in offenses that involve the use of dangerous weapons or threats to use them, except for victimization by shooting.

It is not surprising, on the other hand, that a Negro woman is far more likely to be a victim of a robbery in the street than she is in the home--both absolutely and relative to all other major offenses against her.

Survey Incidence of Crime Victimization

Criminal statistics are for the most part based on data from law enforcement, correctional and judicial systems of reporting. Though an occasional study has been made asking either known offenders or selected populations of students about their past experiences as offenders, there are almost no known studies of questioning persons about their experience as victims of crime.

The "offenses known to the police" are generally regarded as the best available measure of the amount of crime in the society since the police nominally are the first agency to process crimes. At the same time there is awareness of the fact that for a variety of reasons persons do not report crimes to the police, suggesting that police statistics underestimate the amount of crime in the society and the degree of victimization of citizens from crimes. Just how substantial is the volume of unreported crime and victim experiences is unknown. It is generally known that for some crimes such as automobile thefts and homicides, underreporting is very low; on the other hand it is generally thought that underreporting of victimization to the police is greatest for crimes where there is a compliant victim, particularly those crimes where the victim engaged in deviant behavior. Between these two extremes, however, it is not known just how much crime goes unreported to the police, thereby making it difficult to determine accurately the volume of both crime and victimization in the society.

Although there are a number of ways that one might attempt to estimate the extent of underreporting of crime in the society--and no single way would seem to be the best way to get underreporting for all types of crime--the sample survey appears perhaps the most logical means. The sample survey is designed to question a probability sample of the population about their experience with crime over a period of time. Since the survey is based on voluntary reporting to an interviewer, it is reasonable to assume that some types of victim or crime experiences will be underreported, particularly those where the person was in some way implicated in illegal activity. Nonetheless, where such factors are not operating on reporting, it would seem to have the advantage of providing an anonymous means of obtaining victim experiences of crime.

A cross-section of households in a high and a low crime rate area of both Boston and Chicago were selected for the sample survey investigation of victimization from crime. These areas, Dorchester and Roxbury in Boston and Fillmore and Town Hall in Chicago are described earlier in this report. Before undertaking a description of the results of this investigation, some problems in such surveys are reviewed.

Major Problems in Sample Survey Estimation of Crime:

Four major types of problems in using the sample survey as a means of estimating the kind and amount of crime are discussed: (1) problems of sampling and gaining access to respondents; (2) problems in the validity and reliability of respondent reporting; (3) problems in estimating the incidence of victimization and comparability of these estimates with police statistics; (4) problems of interpreting the kind and amount of crime from sample survey estimates.

1. Problems of sampling and gaining access to respondents:

To estimate both the amount of crime and victimization from crime, information was to be secured from a universe of

citizens. The sampling problem begins with defining an appropriate sampling frame, i.e., a way of defining the units that are to be sampled. It proved difficult to secure economical sampling frames for the resident samples.

For residents, a household sample was selected, since potentially either the entire household is victimized by a crime as in a burglary of a residence, or one or more of its members are victims as persons, whether or not they are victimized within the dwelling unit. Nonetheless there are problems of whom is to be selected as the respondent to provide the information and what kind of information can be gained for other members of the household. Because of problems of reliability and validity of reporting on victim experiences for members of the household other than oneself and also because of the difficulty in interviewing young persons--problems discussed below--only respondents 18 years of age and over were considered eligible for selection within households. The selection of these persons within households was randomized, since failure to do so would seriously bias the reporting of certain kinds of crime, as for example crimes against males if largely women are selected as respondents.

The randomization of the selection of the respondent, however, meant that the average cost per interview is higher since it necessitates call-backs to locate and secure the cooperation of the respondent that is randomly selected within a household. It seems quite clear, however, that when one compares the respondent selection for the NORC national sample and those done by the method selected for this study, that the latter method despite its higher average cost provides a more valid description of crimes against the person.

Selection of households in terms of a specific sampling frame poses problems of cost. To reduce costs and to avoid clustering of sample units, a sampling frame of addresses

rather than of areas is desirable. There is good reason to avoid high clustering of areas in an area probability sample on the assumption that crime is not uniformly spread across even very small areas of a city. The polling lists provided a sampling frame for Boston. But in Chicago, an area probability sample was selected.

Having selected a household, there are very real problems in gaining access to respondents to secure the required information. For any sample survey of residents, there is some loss due to the fact that some respondents never can be located for an interview, even when someone has been contacted in the household. There always are some refusals to cooperate as well. In general we know that it is harder to gain access, it is somewhat harder to locate the respondent desired from a very low income than from a very high income respondent. Both of these problems were apparent in our surveys of residents, but they pose somewhat more serious problems for a study that attempts to estimate crime in high and low income areas.

In both Chicago and Washington, D. C. there were a fairly large number of respondents located in buildings with resident managers who function to control access to the tenants. While letters could be addressed to respondents in these buildings, they could not always be located by phone if the manager denied such information or if he refused to allow the interviewer to ring the bell of the respondent. The non-response rate is much higher for such buildings in both cities, leading to some difficulty in estimating crime for high income respondents.

There was less difficulty in getting access to buildings in low income areas but there were very real problems in finding respondents at home for interview. This substantially increased the call-back rate in these areas. Since a substantial proportion of all respondents resided in low income high crime rate areas, such surveys have a higher average interview

cost than is typical of the sample survey of a cross-section of the population. For these reasons, it also takes a longer time to complete the survey in an area. These problems in sampling and locating respondents suggest that local sample surveys of crime are somewhat more costly than is generally true of sample surveys. Furthermore, the overall response rate is below that in the typical sample survey, being as low as 62 per cent for the Town Hall area in the study.

2. Problems in the validity and reliability of respondent reporting.

2a. Selecting the respondent for interview.

Early pre-tests disclosed that any respondent selected provides reasonably complete information for crimes against the household and for those where the respondent personally was a victim. Respondents are not very reliable reporters for crimes against other members of the household. This was assessed by interviewing independently several members of a household. In gathering information then, respondents were selected at random within the household so that valid and reliable information could be gained for each type of respondent in a household.

Young respondents are relatively uninformed about offenses against the household or against other members of the household. For that reason, no one was interviewed in the household who was under 18 years of age. This means that no reliable estimate can be made for offenses against such persons, though such offenses are included in official police statistics as crimes known to the police.

2b. Salience of crime to respondents.

Before pre-testing ways of securing information on crime or victim experiences, it was assumed that being a victim of a crime is a very salient experience to a person. Although we assumed that this would be somewhat more likely where the

person experienced victimization through actual contact with an offender than where only his property was involved, surprisingly pre-tests over a two year period disclosed that crime has low salience for a substantial majority of the population.

Several things about the salience of crime became apparent through pre-testing and doing the studies. One is that respondents need considerable time to think about and remember all of their crime experiences. This may stretch over days or weeks as a time interval of recollection. Without such an opportunity, a respondent tends to focus on the most recent events. Recognizing this the study focuses on estimates for the most recent periods of time rather than on any long term estimates. This suggests that no single sample survey can provide data on trends in crime; rather one must rely on repeated surveys of a population over time to estimate changes in kinds and amount of crime.

2c. Effects of questioning about victim experience on the respondent.

Apart from the fact that citizens have problems in recalling experiences with crime or crimes against their household, the nature of the interview itself poses real problems in gaining information.

It is commonly assumed that respondents experience great difficulty in reporting certain kinds of very personal victim experiences. It is commonly assumed, for example, that women will be reluctant to talk about their experiences in rape situations or that any victim experience that involves deviant status for the victim will not be reported. The study does not provide sufficient information on this point. There is reasonable assurance that experiences women have as rape victims are reported without great reluctance on the part of the respondent, particularly the low income

respondent. There is much less assurance that deviants or upper income respondents report their victim experiences, however. Lacking information on the deviant status of the person reporting on a crime, it cannot be known whether there is underreporting because of his deviance.

A second important problem is how the structure of the interview affects respondent reporting. Early pre-testing provided a convincing demonstration that any technique based on asking the respondent whether they had a particular kind of victim experience followed by questioning about that experience produced a "ceiling effect" on the number of victim experiences for a respondent. It soon became clear that a respondent controls the number of experiences he or she had on the basis of what they consider a sufficient amount of time they have given the interviewer. Furthermore, if the respondent is asked whether this kind of crime occurred against them or any other member of the household, a similar control of information about crime against themselves and other household members results.

Since the primary goal of the survey was to estimate the kind and amount of crime, to overcome these defects in structuring the interview a schedule was developed that first secured all of the information for the respondent as a victim. After gaining information on all his victim experiences, a separate victim experience schedule was taken for each reported experience. This procedure yielded a considerably higher number of average experiences per respondent. It should be clear then that the quality of the estimate secured from the sample survey depends very much upon how one secures the information on experience. Any technique for securing the information that prolongs getting the information from the respondent will lead to considerable underreporting of victim experiences.

2d. Reliability and validity of reporting.

Despite attempts to secure information on all victim experiences during a recent time interval, the more serious problem remains one of underreporting rather than overreporting. All examinations of the data for overreporting suggest that respondents generally report events that they regard as crimes. While some of these experiences might not be defined as crimes from a legal or police point of view, a matter discussed below, this problem can be handled by classification. The reports themselves do not appear to involve fabrication on the part of the respondent, but rather a difference in conception of what constitutes a crime against them.

Underreporting constitutes a more serious problem however. A separate study was undertaken of citizens who called the police where an observer reported on the interaction that took place between the police and the citizens. A sample of these observed incidents of police-citizen interaction was selected and several months later an interview taken with the person who was known to have reported a victim experience to the police in the presence of an observer. Surprisingly, over 20 per cent of these citizens who were known to have called the police failed to report that victim experience to the interviewer when the same schedule was used to secure crime experiences as was used with the cross-section sample. Police departments do not report a similar problem on follow-up through detective investigation, though that does not mean the problem does not arise in police work since no study has been made of this problem for police departments. Sometimes police detectives may report such experiences as failure to locate the victim; in other cases they may be cloaked as an "unfounded" report of a crime. In any event, it suggests that further work on this problem seems necessary.

Finally, there are some difficult questions about the bona fide quality of the event itself. This problem was discussed somewhat with respect to overreporting. Police departments have an organizational procedure for handling this problem, usually defined as follow-up through detective investigation. When in their judgment the facts do not warrant the complaint, the complaint is unfounded, either by the detective or by some superior officer or unit that actually makes the decision about "unfounding" the reported event.

The study was not designed to follow-up the report of victim events for which the police were not notified. It could be argued that many of these would be unfounded on detective investigation. Internal evidence suggests that for the most part these are bona fide victim experiences.

The question can also be raised whether the offenses reported would be actionable in a legal sense. An attempt was made to judge the credibility of the respondent's report of the incident applying a rather crude set of criteria of credibility. Two criteria were applied, the interviewer's judgment of the credibility of the respondent and a rebuttable presumption of credibility of the respondent's description of the incident. Both of these criteria are on the side of credibility of the respondent's account. For a 50 per cent sample of respondents that included 502 reported incidents, for only 12 incidents was the respondent's credibility questioned.

An attempt also was made to judge the sufficiency of evidence offered in description of the incident. A lawyer familiar with the criminal law utilized two criteria to make a crude judgment of sufficiency of evidence. The evidence was considered insufficient if it appeared highly unlikely that the respondent could offer evidence to the police that a crime had occurred or if it appeared doubtful that the

incident involved an "offender." He also made a judgment whether the incident was in fact a crime based on the Criminal Codes of Illinois and Massachusetts.

These judgments are not altogether independent of one another. The three questions asked essentially were: "Is the respondent probably telling the truth (credibility)?" "Assuming the incident happened as the respondent described it, is it a crime (a violation of a Criminal Code)?" And, "assuming the incident happened as the respondent described it, and if it is a criminal violation, could the respondent prove that it occurred (sufficiency of evidence)?" The first two judgments are reasonably independent of one another but the last depends upon the second.

Using these three criteria, a decision was made whether or not the incident was legally "actionable." If the respondent is probably not telling the truth, if the offense is not criminal, and/or if the incident probably did not happen at all, the incident is considered "not actionable." It should be clear that the amount of loss or damage or the presence or absence of witnesses and similar criteria that often may govern "actionability" are not included in this judgment. Considering the three criteria, 106 of the 502 incidents (21 per cent) were not considered actionable. Somewhat more than half of these were not considered actionable though they involved a criminal offense. Eleven per cent of all incidents were defined as nonactionable criminal incidents because they did not meet the criteria of credibility or sufficiency of evidence.

By these admittedly rather crude criteria at least four of every five incidents reported are considered bona fide incidents. Only these incidents are considered in the estimation of crime. Furthermore, in actually estimating the incidence of crime based on reporting from citizens, an unbounding rate was applied based on an unbounding rate for the

department. Yet the unbounding rate itself is a crude one since it is not broken down adequately by type of incident; there may be differentials by type of crime that are not taken into account.

3. Estimating incident of victimization.

3a. Choice of a victimization rate.

The proportion of persons who have been victims of a crime varies among areas of a city. And, indeed, to a degree the proportion of persons who have been victims varies somewhat independently of the crime rate itself since the crime rate depends upon a rate of multiple victimization. It was found, for example, that the percent of persons victimized from July 1, 1965 through June 30, 1966 in all four precincts was 33 per cent but this varied from a high of 39 per cent in Roxbury and 32 per cent in Dorchester of Boston to 30 per cent in Fillmore and 26 per cent in Town Hall, Chicago. While Roxbury, Boston had the highest gross offense rate of .50 for this period followed by .48 for Dorchester, Boston, the gross rate was .31 for Town Hall and .22 for Fillmore, Chicago.

There are a number of ways of estimating victimization then. One can compute, as above, the proportion of persons with one or more victim experiences in a given period of time. This proportion will always be below a victim experience rate--here called a victimization rate--since it does not take into account multiple victimization. Both rates are of some interest since it is possible that high crime rate areas are characterized more by multiple victimization than they are by number of victims. Put another way, high crime rate areas are both multiple offender and multiple victim areas. Such a finding seems of some importance in that it poses problems for the multiple victim. In any crime prevention program, more research and attention needs

to be directed to the multiple victim as well as to the multiple offender.

The period of time for which the victimization rate is to be calculated is also important. Memory affects the reliability of reporting victim experiences and there is some seasonal variation in the crime rate. Thus one would not expect the same amount of crime to be reported for each quarter of the year, particularly for kinds of crime. It is not an easy matter therefore to determine how much of the difference in reporting for a given quarter of the year is due to seasonal variation in crime and how much to memory factors. In any case, there is a sharp decrement in reports of victim experiences over time so that clearly memory is an important factor in periods as recent as two years.

For purposes of comparison with police department data, it was decided to take a one year period for calculating victim experience rates. However, since recency of event appears to affect reporting, the most recent year period was chosen as the period for which data were to be used to estimate victimization rates. This was the period of July 1, 1965 through June 30, 1966. This report period is not identical with the police department annual report period which generally is a calendar year. Nonetheless both logically relate to a year's period of time.

3b. Problems of selecting a base population or universe for estimates.

Rates of victimization for persons generally are computed for the resident population of an area. Unfortunately there are no good estimates of the population resident in the police precincts in 1966 for which data were gathered. The best estimates of current population readily available are those that can be made from the area probability sample such as the one in Chicago, or by using the 1960 census data for a

police district. Both of these estimates of current population present problems. Population movement since the 1960 census may render the count fairly unreliable as an estimate of current population, particularly for areas as small as a police precinct. The estimate from the sample itself is subject to sampling variability and at best permits a range of estimates. This means that whenever the sample survey is used as a means of determining victimization rates, there is a problem of whether one has reliable estimates of the current population which is used as a base for the rate. Estimation of current population is not a major problem for national surveys since there are reliable estimates of the U. S. population. Some state and local areas provide such estimates as well, but they are rarely provided for the kinds of areas such as a police precinct.

The resident victimization rates in this study are based on population counts from the 1960 census. There is no way of knowing how unreliable these estimates are, though the count falls within the estimates made from the sampling procedure. The problem of reliability of the population estimate does not appear to be a serious one in this study since the goal was not so much the precision of the estimate but the gross comparison of differences in rates obtained from police statistics as compared with the sample survey. Both the police and the sample survey rates are calculated for the same population base, so both have in common this imprecision in estimate.

Some of the crime that occurs in an area is against persons who are transient in the area. These will be reported as crimes known to the police in that area and in the calculation of an offense rate will be included as offenses against the base resident population. The inclusion of offenses against transients in the area while reflecting crime that occurs in the area distorts the

estimation of crime against residents of the area. At the same time, if one includes from the resident survey' crimes against the residents that occur elsewhere, one has distorted the description of crime that occurs within the area. Insofar as possible then, the survey procedure should exclude all crimes that occur to residents outside the area. At the same time, the resident survey failing to provide information on crimes against transients in the area will not be comparable with police statistics that include them. Lacking a way of removing crimes against transients from the police statistics, the police statistics are not strictly comparable with those from the resident survey.

For Boston and Chicago no reliable estimates were secured of the transient population in the study areas and at the same time transients could not be eliminated from the police statistics. Thus the two sets of data are not strictly comparable in this respect. Parenthetically, it should be said that it seems worthwhile for police departments to report separately the crimes against residents and non-residents if the object is to calculate a victim risk rate.

3c. Estimation of frequency of occurrence.

There is evidence that respondents do not provide a complete account of all of their victim experiences. As indicated earlier, following up experiences reported to the police, it is known that some victims failed to report this experience on later interview. There also are reasons to believe that there are recall difficulties and problems of motivating the respondents to continue to report information on their experiences. This suggests that the estimates from the survey are minimal rather than maximal estimates. In short, current survey instruments while making substantial inroads into dealing with what is called the "dark figure" problem in estimating crime, i.e., how much crime goes unreported

or do not appear in official police statistics, do not provide maximal estimates. Further work is necessary both with the survey instrument and through other means if an estimate of the actual amount of crime that occurs in an area over a given period of time is to be made.

3d. Comparability of victimization rates with offenses or crimes known to the police.

It has already been noted that there are several senses in which one may speak of a victimization rate. One way to regard such a rate is as a statement of the probability that a person or a household or dwelling unit will be victimized by a crime. Some attempt was made to calculate such victimization probabilities earlier in this report. These estimates were based however on all major crimes against persons known to the police where a suspect was identified. Probabilities were calculated for all major offenses against persons for a population of a given race and age. It should be clear that this probability almost always will differ from the probability that any person will be a victim of such offenses one, two, three or more times.

There are a number of ways that data from surveys on victim experiences are not comparable with metropolitan police department data on offenses known to the police. The major sources of noncomparability are as follows:

(a) Survey data are reports on persons as victims; police data are based on reports of offenses. An offense may have more than one victim. For example, a robbery offense may involve several people in a business establishment as victims. For police department statistics there could be a report of one or more offenders arrested in this robbery but only one offense. While their reports also will include information on the number of persons who were robbed, each person robbed is not reported as a separate offense. Yet if we were to conduct a survey, each of the victims would

report they were robbed.

There likewise are differences because of the fact that some kinds of offenses do not have persons who are immediately identifiable as a victim. This may be the case for certain types of offenses where the public more generally is defined as the victim. For example, a person might be charged with disorderly conduct in public, but no one other than the police officer who makes the arrest would be present. Or, there may be offenses of a collusive nature where it would be difficult to define a victim since the alleged victim does not regard himself as victimized. This would be true, for example, of an illegal sale of alcohol. Though such offenses occur and it may be possible in many cases to identify the offender, it is not even in all cases possible to define a victim beyond that of disturbing the public peace or offending standards of public decency, or beyond that of attributing a legal status to a person that automatically defines the person as legally victimized. In any case, reports of such offenses will not usually be obtained through a survey procedure.

For still other offenses, as when the offense is against property, it may be difficult to determine who is victimized. If articles are stolen from the household, shall one consider all members as victimized, or only those whose particular property seems to be involved? Shall only the owner of the automobile that is stolen or all members of his family be considered the victims of an automobile theft? For purposes of the survey all such offenses against property were arbitrarily assigned as victimizing all adult members of the household.

(b) Offense data are reported for place of occurrence of the offense while victim data are reported by the residence of the victim. Thus in any sample survey one has offenses reported that occurred outside the police district where a person resides. Correlatively, police data include nonresidents

Table 39: Estimates of Gross Rate and Volume of Offenses by City and Police District from Survey Victimization Reports for Period July 1, 1965 through June 30, 1966.

	City and Police District			
	Dorchester	Roxbury	Fillmore	Town Hall
1. Total number of respondents.	182	169	143	101
2. Number of incidents of which respondent was victim during period.	100	124	48	43
3. <u>Gross victimization rate.</u> (Line 2/Line 1)	.55	.73	.34	.43
4. Number of single-victim offenses.	37	54	20	21
5. Number of "entire household" incidents.	60	66	27	21
6. Eligible persons per household (age 18 or over).	1.9	2.0	2.3	1.9
7. Offense equivalent for "entire household" incidents. (Line 5/Line 6)	32	33	12	11
8. Other multiple-victim incidents.	3	4	1	1
9. Number of victims per other multiple-victim incident.	2.33	2.25	2	2
10. Offense equivalent for other multiple-victim incidents. (Line 8/Line 9)	1	2	*	*
11. Offense equivalent for all incidents. (Sum of Lines 4, 7, and 10)	70	89	32	32
12. Less: correction for estimated baseless complaints. (4.4% of Line 11)	-3	-4	-1	-1
13. "Actual offense" equivalent.	67	85	31	31
14. <u>Gross offense rate.</u> (Line 13/Line 1)	.48	.50	.22	.31
15. Estimates of population age 17.4 or over.	60,640	52,550	84,800	130,200
16. Gross estimate of offenses. (Line 14 x Line 15)	29,107	26,275	18,656	40,362

*Less than 1. (CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)

Table 39: Estimates of Gross Rate and Volume of Offenses by City and Police District from Survey Victimization Reports for Period July 1, 1965 through June 30, 1966. (Continued)

	City and Police District			
	Dorchester	Roxbury	Fillmore	Town Hall
17. Proportion of incidents claimed reported to the police.	.32	.41	.38	.37
18. Gross estimate of reported offenses. (Line 16 x Line 17)	9,314	10,772	7,089	14,934
19. Proportion of incidents classed Part I.	.56	.60	.79	.67
20. Gross estimate of Part I offenses. (Line 16 x Line 19)	16,300	15,765	14,738	27,043
21. Part I offense rate. (Line 20/Line 15)	.27	.30	.17	.21
22. Proportion of Part I claimed reported to police.	.36	.43	.29	.48
23. Gross estimate of reported Part I offenses. (Line 22 x Line 20)	5,868	6,779	4,274	12,980
24. Gross estimate of rate of reported Part I offenses. (Line 23/Line 15)	.10	.13	.05	.10
25. Proportion of incidents classed as Index offenses.	.33	.48	.50	.43
26. Gross estimate of Index offenses. (Line 25 x Line 16)	9,605	12,612	9,328	17,356
27. Gross estimate of rate of Index offenses. (Line 26/Line 15)	.16	.24	.11	.13
28. Proportion of Index offenses claimed reported to police.	.55	.53	.38	.56
29. Gross estimate of reported Index offenses. (Line 26 x Line 28)	5,283	6,684	3,545	9,719
30. Gross estimate of rate of reported Index offenses. (Line 29/Line 15)	.09	.13	.04	.07

who were victims of offenses in the precinct.

(c) As previously noted, police statistics presumably result from some procedures of investigation of the bona fide status of the victim or complainants report about the crime, or they result from the report of a police officer's who viewed the crime. Generally detective investigation forms the basis of determining whether certain crimes represent bona fide complaints. Police departments attempt to eliminate false reports or claims that a crime has occurred. There is no similar way in the survey procedure itself of determining the bona fide nature of the complaint though presumably such reports of victim experiences that were or were not reported to the police could be investigated.

(d) Police statistics include offenses against non-residents, businesses and organizations, and public order while a survey of residents will not generally bring out such offenses. Sometimes a person who owns a business thinks of himself as having been victimized in the offenses and will report it in a survey.

3e. Rendering victim and offense data comparable.

Given the differences between survey and offense data it was necessary to render them as comparable as possible to effect comparisons between them. The calculations involved are presented in Table 39. Very briefly, the major steps in rendering the data comparable were: (1) eliminating all respondent reports of victimization outside the neighborhood; (2) adjustment of victim totals to take account of offenses that were attributed to the entire household rather than to the respondent, using a factor of the number of persons 18 years old or over in the household in the entire sample since a separate calculation for one precinct based on the actual computation for each household yielded almost no difference in the adjusted rate; (3) reduction of the number of offenses that might be baseless or unfounded by applying the police

department rate of unbounding; (4) elimination of the offenses that a respondent says were not reported to the police so that only offenses reported to the police are included.

In this procedure, no account was taken of other factors that might affect the comparability of the statistics, e.g., the length of time that the resident was in the area or of offenses that may have occurred against persons who moved from the area during the past year. Since the rate of in-and-out-movement did not appear to be unusually high for our areas, this may not seriously affect the statistics. It should be apparent that any survey for any area always will have difficulty obtaining data on out-movers, though adjustments could be made for those who moved into the district by length of time in the district.

The police data could not be similarly adjusted for any of the Boston or Chicago precincts, though that would have been desirable. Among the sources of noncomparability that lie within the police data are these: (1) the inclusion of offenses where there is no clear victim other than the public or where there is mutual victimization; (2) the inclusion of offenses against business establishments and other organizations; (3) the inclusion of offenses against persons under 18 years of age. Failure to eliminate these offenses means that the police figures are higher than they would be if rendered comparable with those for the survey. Hence comparisons result in more conservative estimates for the sample survey.

4. Problems of interpreting survey and police data comparisons.

From the foregoing it should be clear that there are problems in deriving survey data and in rendering them comparable with police data. These problems prevent precise estimates for either set of data. It is obvious that maximum

estimates of victims are not obtained from the survey data and that a greater range of offenses are included in the police than in the survey data when victim data are converted to offense data.

Recognizing these problems, any lack of comparability of survey with police data is such that the survey data underestimate offenses. By not adjusting the police data for offenses not included in the survey data, there likewise is error on the side of conservative estimates for the survey data. Therefore conclusions about differences between data from police statistics and those from the survey are based on procedures that give the "benefit of doubt" to the police statistics.^{9/}

Nonetheless, the problem remained that when a higher crime rate is observed using survey than police data, one cannot estimate just how much more crime there is in the society than is shown from police statistics. There is reason to believe that it is more than our difference calculations show; just how much more remains unascertained.

Finally, it is difficult to determine what the differences might be between survey and police estimates were police data based on all complaints to the police and all crimes viewed by them whether or not there was a complainant. The survey procedure in the nature of the case seems a poor way to obtain information on crimes against the public where there is no obvious citizen victim. Police data always will

^{9/} A more detailed discussion of some of these problems can be found in Albert D. Biderman, et. al., "Salient Findings on Crime and Attitudes Toward Law Enforcement in the District of Columbia", Preliminary Technical Report, Bureau of Social Science Research, Inc., Washington, D. C., May 28, 1966.

underestimate where the citizen is unwilling to mobilize the police or the police officer is motivated for some reason not to make an official report. In any case, the two organizational ways of gathering information probably never shall provide mutually inclusive kinds of data; they can only provide comparable estimates for offenses where there are victims who potentially could mobilize the police.

There is one other problem that merits attention in evaluating data on victimization obtained from a survey of households or residents. It could easily be assumed that, relative to police data, reports from interviews would include a substantial proportion of crimes that might be considered as too minor to report to the police. This does not appear to be the case as only 11 per cent of all incidents reported could not be considered criminal incidents. A much higher proportion of all calls for police service to any metropolitan police department is a noncriminal incident.

Furthermore, of the 89 per cent that could be classified as criminal incidents, 47 per cent were classified as Part I offenses under the UCR system. This does not mean of course that all of the Part I offenses would be considered felonies under the criminal codes of Illinois and Massachusetts. Under the criminal codes of one or both of these states, for example, the following Part I offenses would not be considered felonies: auto thefts not for gain or for use in the commission of a criminal offense; larceny under \$100 in Massachusetts and under \$150 in Illinois; and, in Massachusetts, breaking and entering with intent to commit a misdemeanor. Indeed, only 35 per cent of all of the offenses classified as criminal under their statutes. All in all, however, it would appear that incidents reported to the interviewers

as crimes were more likely to be serious criminal matters and to less often involve noncriminal matters than is true for any major metropolitan police department. If anything, then, the survey procedure is biased against securing the more "trivial" incident and recall tends to take only the more "salient", serious experiences.

Taking only those incidents that occurred during the year for which estimates of the rate of victimization are made in Table 39, it can be seen that elimination of incidents according to the procedures described above results in an even higher proportion of all incidents being classified as Part I criminal offenses (see Table 40). Indeed, 48 per cent of all the incidents were classified as index crimes and over one-half were Part I offenses.

Table 40: Types of Criminal Incidents for Respondents in Four Police Precincts.

Type of Incident	Number	Per Cent
Forcible rape and attempts	2	0.7
Aggravated assaults and attempts	20	7.0
Robbery armed/with force	13	4.7
Burglary and attempts	63	22.2
Larceny, \$50 and over	21	7.4
Auto theft	17	6.0
Larceny, under \$50	34	12.0
Simple assault	10	3.5
Sex offenses	7	2.4
Fraud, forgery	13	4.7
Threats, n.e.c.	16	5.6
All other	67	23.8
Total	283	100.0

While no direct comparison can be made with police data for these cities, there is a rough ordering among index crimes comparable to that for the police data. Such differences as occur suggest higher reporting of aggravated assault and burglary in the survey as compared with the police data. This should not be at all surprising since such offenses on the face of it would appear less likely to be reported to the police.

Estimating Offense Rates from Victim Information

There are a number of ways that one can characterize the extent of victimization from crime for a population. Table 39 provides a gross victimization rate for the population in the four police districts studied in Boston and Chicago. The gross victimization rate is based on the total number of crime incidents that all residents 18 years of age and over reported occurred to them during the period July 1, 1965 through June 30, 1966.

There is considerable variation in the gross victimization rate both by city and by district within city. The Boston precincts have considerably higher gross victimization rates than do those in Chicago. Since the response rates in Chicago were lower than those in Boston, it is possible that some of the city difference is due to differences in response rates. The gross victimization rate varies from a high of 73 per 100 residents in Roxbury, Boston to a low of 34 per 100 residents in Fillmore, Chicago.

The gross victimization rate is based on all incidents reported, since some residents are victimized more than once within a time period as long as a year, the gross victimization rate will be greater than a net victimization rate for households. The per cent of households where one or more persons were victimized one or more times during the year is as follows: Dorchester, 32 per cent; Roxbury, 39 per cent;

Fillmore, 30 per cent; Town Hall, 26 per cent. Overall, 33 per cent of all households reported one or more crime incidents for the calendar year. Comparing this net rate for households with the gross victimization rate in Table 39, it can be seen that the gross victimization rate is almost twice as great as the probability that a household will be victimized one or more times during the year. For example, while the gross victimization rate for Roxbury, Boston was 73 in 100, the likelihood that one's household will be victimized one or more times during the year was considerably less (though still high), 39 in 100.

Table 39 summarizes the calculations for a crude estimate of the annual offense rate for the residents in the precincts based on their reports of victimization. Only those incidents where the respondent was victimized within his own neighborhood are included in the estimate. Since only about one-sixth of the respondents moved during 1965 or 1966, in- and out-mobility from the precinct is neglected in making the estimates. The estimated rates are based on incidents that the respondents said occurred in their own house, their own block, or elsewhere in their own neighborhood.

As a first step in converting victim data to offense data, all "single victim" were separated from all "entire household" offenses. An offense such as auto theft or breaking and entering, for example, could be reported by every member of a household rather than by the respondent only. Any incident, therefore, that could be reported by every member of the household was classified as a household offense. By the survey method such offenses have a chance of being included in the total incident figure equal to the number of eligible respondents in the household when compared with the inclusion of offenses where only one person is a victim. The number of persons 18 years old or over in each precinct was used to obtain an "offense equivalent" for all household offenses.

Similarly, all multiple victim incidents are converted to an "offense equivalent" base. The crude estimates of offenses however does not take account of the fact that residents do not report all these incidents to the police. While there is some variation in the proportion respondents claim they reported to the police by precinct, only about 36 per cent of the incidents were said to have been reported to the police. This suggests that a very substantial amount of crime in these precincts goes unreported to the police. There is reason to believe, however, as reported to the police, are on the side of underestimation. Hence the proportion actually reported probably is higher.

Comparison of Police Statistics and Survey Estimates

To compare the crude estimates of offenses from the survey with those for police precincts, it is necessary to render the police data comparable with those from the survey. Police statistics include incidents that are not reported on the survey. Among the major kinds of such offenses are those related to offenses against organizations or establishments such as nonresidential burglaries, against public order, and those where persons are self- or mutual-victims. In addition, police statistics include crimes against non-residents and against persons under 18 years of age.

Unfortunately no data were available on crime against non-residents in these precincts nor against persons under 18 years of age so that the police statistics could not be adjusted for these factors. In Table 41, adjustments were made for nonresidential burglaries and for the crimes involving self- or mutual-victimization or against public order such as gambling, liquor law violations, vagrancy, stolen property, and drug law violations.

Table 41: Volume of Offenses Known to the Police and Gross Rates for Index and Non-Index Crimes in Police Districts of Boston and Chicago, 1965.

City and Police District	Total Population 18 Years and Over ^{1/}	Offenses Known to the Police: ^{2/}			Offenses Against Mature Citizens: ^{3/}			Rate of Offenses Against Mature Citizens:					
		Index Offenses	Non-Index Offenses	All Offenses Known	Index Offenses	Non-Index Offenses	All Offenses Known	Index Offenses	Non-Index Offenses	All Offenses Known			
Chicago:													
Town Hall	130,228	4,895	6,896	11,791	4,372	5,517	9,889	.03	.04	.07			
Fillmore	84,897	7,449	8,833	16,282	6,732	7,066	13,798	.08	.08	.16			
Boston:													
Dorchester	60,640	2,162	4,692	6,854	1,881	3,754	5,635	.03	.06	.09			
Roxbury	52,550	4,197	9,242	13,439	3,651	7,394	11,045	.07	.14	.21			

^{1/} Source: 1960 U. S. Census of Population, Census Tracts...1960.

^{2/} Source: Annual Summary, Chicago Police Department; Annual Summary, Metropolitan Boston Police Department.

^{3/} All non-residential burglaries were subtracted from Index offenses based on percentages of all burglaries in Boston that are non-residential burglaries and actual figures for precincts in Chicago; the proportion of offenses in the city that were against public order and of self- or mutual-victimization was used to eliminate these offenses from the non-index crimes.

When comparison is made between the gross offense rate in Table 39 and the offense rate for offenses known to the police, there is considerable difference in the rates such that there are much higher rates for the survey data. Much of this difference, however, seems to be accounted for the failure of citizens to mobilize the police as the data in Table 39 show. Nonetheless, comparing the estimates for reported index offenses (line 30 in Table 39) with those derived from police statistics in Table 41, it can be seen that except for the Fillmore district in Chicago, the rates from the survey are higher. Indeed, for Dorchester, Boston, they are three times greater and for Roxbury, Boston, and Town Hall, Chicago, roughly twice as great. Only for Fillmore; Chicago are the survey estimates below that for the police statistics and much of this may be an artifact of the conditions under which the survey in that area was conducted.

All in all it seems clear that the survey procedure results in the detection of a large volume of unreported crime. Even the crude comparisons in Table 39 and 41, however, suggest that the rate of reported index offenses is greater than that shown in police statistics.

Though as indicated earlier, incidents were initially screened to eliminate possible false or baseless reports, an additional correction was introduced in Table 39 to approximate an unbounding procedure. Though data on rates of unbounding for complaints originating in these police districts were not available from the police departments, an overall unbounding rate of 4.4 per cent was applied to the incidents to approximate a departmental unbounding rate.

With these adjustments, "offense equivalents" are given in line 13 of Table 39 and a gross offense rate provided in line 14. Multiplying these rates by the estimated number of

persons 18 years of age and over in these precincts, a crude estimate of the number of offenses that would obtain in these precincts during a year is obtained. Comparing these crude estimates with the number of offenses reported in the police statistics (see Table 41), it can be seen that in all cases the estimated number exceeds the number actually reported. The differences are particularly striking for all but the Fillmore district in Chicago. The gross estimate of offenses is more than five times as great as police statistics show in Dorchester, Boston, more than three times as great in Town Hall, Chicago, and twice as great for Roxbury, Boston. Perhaps a main reason why the estimate is not substantially different from the reported police figure for Fillmore, Chicago, is that the Fillmore district was the scene of riots not long after interviewing began and the interviewers reported greater difficulty in obtaining information following the riots. There is evidence in the interviews that this is the case.

Crime Statistics on Arrest

Earlier, emphasis was placed on the fact that statistics on crimes against the persons vary considerably by race and sex of the person and probably also by age. This was demonstrated for major crimes against the person so far as the probabilities of victimization by race and sex are concerned. Homicide data from other studies also show varying probabilities by age as well as by race and sex of victims as well as offenders.

It should likewise be clear that rates of arrest by race, sex, and age of offender clearly would aid our understanding of offense patterns. Table 42 was prepared from data for Seattle, Washington and New Orleans, Louisiana to illustrate the considerable variation in arrest rates by race, age, and sex of offenders for selected criminal offenses. Quite

clearly there is considerable variation by each of these factors. Thus on the whole in both of these cities offenses were more likely to be committed by Negroes than whites, by men than women, and by younger than by older persons. Yet as detailed examination of Table 42 shows, there is considerable variation in race-sex-age rates by type of offense.

A few illustrations from Table 42 may serve to demonstrate the value of these data for an understanding of offender patterns in these cities, at least insofar as they can be determined from statistics on arrest. Auto theft may serve as an example of an offense that is predominately concentrated in the young age groups, being highest for persons 15 to 19 years of age. Indeed for Seattle, Washington, while the rate for all Negro males is only 41.5 per 10,000 males, it is 507 per 10,000 for Negro males age 15 to 19. Or, while it is only 12.8 for white males, it is 148.9 for white males aged 15 to 19. Quite clearly too, the only white women involved were in the 15 to 19 year age group in both cities and the same was true for Negro women in Seattle, though not New Orleans.

Assaults, both aggravated and simple, present a somewhat different pattern. Although rates of assault are high for young age groups, all age groups up to age 45 have rates above the average for all ages for both men and women.

Differences in the way that jurisdictions prefer charge for minor offenses likewise become apparent in these data. It is clear that in New Orleans disorderly conduct is the more likely charge than drunkenness, while in Seattle the reverse is the case. The rates of drunkenness nonetheless are highest in the age groups 40-55 for white men and women in both cities; the pattern is less clear for Negro drunk arrests, though above average rates are found for these age groups in both cities.

Table 42: Arrest Rates Per 10,000 Population^{a/} for Selected Part I and Part II Offenses Charged on Arrest, by Race, Sex, and Age of Offender: New Orleans, Louisiana and Seattle, Washington, 1965.^{b/}

City, Race and Sex of Offender, and Offense Charged	Age Groups											Total					
	14 & under	15-19	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	45-49	50-54	55-59	60-64		65 & over				
MURDER AND NONNEGLIGENT MANSLAUGHTER:																	
<u>New Orleans:</u>																	
White: Male	---	1.5	5.3	2.7	0.8	2.9	0.7	---	2.5	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1.0
Female	---	---	---	---	---	---	0.7	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	0.1
Negro: Male	---	15.6	22.2	15.6	11.1	10.8	8.3	6.7	7.2	6.3	---	---	---	---	---	---	5.9
Female	---	1.1	1.2	---	3.7	2.4	2.7	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	0.7
<u>Seattle:</u>																	
White: Male	---	1.2	---	0.6	0.6	---	0.6	---	0.7	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	0.2
Female	---	---	---	---	---	0.6	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	0.1
Negro: Male	---	---	12.3	---	11.1	26.0	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	3.8
Female	---	---	---	---	---	---	10.6	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	0.8
FORCIBLE RAPE:																	
<u>New Orleans:</u>																	
White: Male	---	1.5	8.8	0.9	---	2.2	1.6	0.8	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1.0
Female	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Negro: Male	---	54.2	38.1	17.2	14.3	6.2	6.7	3.3	1.8	2.1	---	---	---	---	---	---	9.0
Female	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
<u>Seattle:</u>																	
White: Male	---	1.2	1.8	0.6	0.6	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	0.3
Female	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Negro: Male	---	63.4	12.3	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	4.6
Female	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Table 41: Arrest Rates Per 10,000 Population^{a/} for Selected Part I and Part II Offenses Charged on Arrest, by Race, Sex, and Age of Offender: New Orleans, Louisiana and Seattle, Washington, 1965.^{b/} (CONTINUED)

City, Race and Sex of Offender, and Offense Charged	Age Groups												Total
	14 & under	15-19	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	45-49	50-54	55-59	60-64	65 & over	
ROBBERY:													
New Orleans:													
White: Male	---	30.1	45.8	23.9	3.1	5.8	3.2	---	---	---	---	---	---
Female	---	2.1	1.0	1.3	---	0.8	0.7	0.7	1.6	---	---	---	7.4
Negro: Male	---	109.5	123.7	104.7	26.9	15.4	8.3	5.0	---	---	---	---	0.6
Female	---	5.5	3.6	1.3	2.4	1.2	---	---	---	---	---	---	24.9
Seattle:													
White: Male	0.9	15.5	11.2	7.5	7.7	4.9	2.4	1.2	---	---	---	---	1.0
Female	---	1.1	0.6	1.4	0.7	0.6	---	---	---	---	---	---	3.5
Negro: Male	8.5	202.8	49.3	53.3	33.2	60.7	28.7	---	---	---	---	---	0.3
Female	4.0	43.7	11.9	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	32.3
AGGRAVATED ASSAULT:													
New Orleans:													
White: Male	---	18.0	29.8	21.3	12.5	6.5	6.4	6.3	5.8	0.9	---	---	7.1
Female	---	---	3.0	1.8	0.8	1.3	2.9	---	0.7	---	---	0.7	0.7
Negro: Male	---	72.2	99.9	60.9	44.3	29.3	41.6	20.0	10.8	10.5	13.3	12.9	24.5
Female	---	12.2	21.9	22.0	24.4	14.5	12.0	4.5	3.1	---	---	1.2	7.5
Seattle:													
White: Male	---	4.3	1.8	3.1	0.6	1.2	1.2	0.6	---	---	---	---	1.0
Female	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Negro: Male	---	63.4	37.0	53.3	22.1	17.3	57.4	13.5	50.9	---	---	---	16.1
Female	2.0	10.9	---	11.4	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	21.5
													2.3

-174-

(CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)

Table 42: Arrest Rates Per 10,000 Population^{a/} for Selected Part I and Part II Offenses Charged on Arrest, by Race, Sex, and Age of Offender: New Orleans, Louisiana and Seattle, Washington, 1965.^{b/} (CONTINUED)

City, Race and Sex of Offender, and Offense Charged	Age Groups												Total
	14 & under	15-19	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	45-49	50-54	55-59	60-64	65 & over	
BURGLARY:													
New Orleans:													
White: Male	---	67.2	116.5	41.6	14.9	22.4	16.8	11.0	6.6	0.9	---	---	19.4
Female	---	0.7	3.0	3.6	1.5	---	0.7	4.9	---	---	---	---	0.9
Negro: Male	---	272.0	264.9	210.9	112.4	69.4	54.9	23.4	5.4	6.3	---	---	63.6
Female	---	4.4	7.3	5.2	3.7	3.6	1.3	1.5	---	---	---	---	1.8
Seattle:													
White: Male	12.8	93.1	19.4	10.7	7.1	3.1	4.8	3.7	1.9	1.4	---	---	12.8
Female	0.2	0.6	---	0.7	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	0.1
Negro: Male	72.2	608.4	61.6	74.6	22.1	17.3	---	---	---	---	---	---	75.4
Female	4.0	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1.5
LARCENY-THEFT:													
New Orleans:													
White: Male	---	61.2	68.3	44.3	25.8	33.2	30.4	26.0	20.5	16.2	15.1	3.3	22.5
Female	---	13.9	24.1	11.7	15.0	4.7	6.5	9.1	2.2	6.4	1.0	3.8	6.6
Negro: Male	---	166.1	204.6	129.7	110.8	72.1	84.9	40.0	16.3	14.7	10.0	4.8	51.7
Female	---	85.1	76.5	38.8	30.5	33.8	21.4	9.0	4.7	5.5	5.6	2.4	20.6
Seattle:													
White: Male	6.9	94.3	44.0	24.5	16.7	23.8	18.5	22.6	25.2	11.3	16.4	5.7	21.5
Female	2.4	35.4	14.1	12.2	4.8	6.7	3.9	1.7	4.2	2.0	1.4	0.8	5.9
Negro: Male	53.1	747.8	172.4	202.3	177.0	78.0	67.0	135.1	39.9	106.4	62.7	16.1	130.0
Female	18.0	338.4	202.9	45.6	41.6	47.2	53.1	27.6	19.4	---	---	18.9	60.5

-174a-

(CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)

Table 42: Arrest Rates Per 10,000 Population^{a/} for Selected Part I and Part II Offenses Charged on Arrest, by Race, Sex, and Age of Offender: New Orleans, Louisiana and Seattle, Washington, 1965.^{b/} (CONTINUED)

City, Race and Sex of Offender, and Offense Charged	Age Groups												Total
	14 & under	15-19	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	45-49	50-54	55-59	60-64	65 & over	
AUTO THEFT:													
New Orleans:													
White: Male	---	51.3	28.9	14.2	6.3	8.7	2.4	0.8	0.8	0.9	1.2	0.7	7.8
White: Female	---	2.8	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	0.2
Negro: Male	---	120.3	66.6	31.3	12.7	3.1	1.7	---	---	---	---	---	15.8
Negro: Female	---	---	2.4	1.3	1.2	1.2	---	---	---	---	---	---	0.4
Seattle:													
White: Male	6.6	148.9	12.9	4.4	0.6	0.6	0.6	1.2	0.6	---	---	---	12.8
White: Female	0.2	2.2	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	0.2
Negro: Male	23.4	507.0	24.6	---	---	---	---	13.5	---	---	---	---	41.5
Negro: Female	---	10.9	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	0.8
OTHER ASSAULTS:													
New Orleans:													
White: Male	---	128.3	214.5	147.0	86.8	95.2	97.5	63.8	36.1	22.4	11.6	4.0	59.5
White: Female	---	1.4	15.8	11.7	9.7	6.7	5.8	2.8	4.4	1.6	---	---	3.8
Negro: Male	---	275.6	401.3	290.6	218.5	189.6	154.8	100.1	74.1	37.7	26.6	21.0	106.0
Negro: Female	---	43.1	63.2	59.5	41.4	48.3	29.4	18.0	15.6	3.7	5.6	---	20.9
Seattle:													
White: Male	0.6	35.4	28.8	28.9	20.5	19.0	22.1	14.1	9.7	10.6	1.7	1.1	12.2
White: Female	---	2.7	1.7	---	2.1	0.6	0.6	0.6	1.2	---	---	0.3	0.6
Negro: Male	10.6	304.2	307.9	266.2	143.8	225.3	143.5	189.2	119.8	85.1	31.4	0.3	122.3
Negro: Female	2.0	65.5	71.6	22.8	10.4	---	21.2	---	---	---	---	---	13.6

(CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)

Table 42: Arrest Rates Per 10,000 Population^{a/} for Selected Part I and Part II Offenses Charged on Arrest, by Race, Sex, and Age of Offender: New Orleans, Louisiana and Seattle, Washington, 1965.^{b/} (CONTINUED)

City, Race and Sex of Offender, and Offense Charged	Age Groups												Total
	14 & under	15-19	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	45-49	50-54	55-59	60-64	65 & over	
FORGERY AND COUNTERFEITING:													
<u>New Orleans:</u>													
White: Male	---	9.8	15.8	8.0	11.7	8.7	2.4	0.8	---	---	1.2	---	3.9
Female	---	2.8	2.3	3.6	---	1.3	---	1.4	---	---	---	---	0.7
Negro: Male	---	20.5	33.3	54.7	34.8	30.8	20.0	---	---	2.1	---	---	11.7
Female	---	---	9.7	5.2	1.2	6.0	---	---	---	---	---	---	1.5
<u>Seattle:</u>													
White: Male	0.2	8.1	11.7	11.3	5.8	4.3	3.6	2.5	---	2.1	---	---	3.3
Female	0.2	3.3	2.3	---	0.7	1.1	0.6	---	0.6	---	---	---	0.6
Negro: Male	---	63.4	49.3	42.6	77.4	17.3	19.1	---	---	---	---	---	18.5
Female	4.0	43.7	11.9	22.8	---	7.9	---	---	---	---	---	---	7.6
STOLEN PROPERTY: BUYING, RECEIVING, POSSESSING:													
<u>New Orleans:</u>													
White: Male	0.2	21.9	28.0	13.3	8.6	7.2	6.4	5.5	17.2	3.6	4.6	1.3	7.7
Female	---	3.5	5.3	0.9	5.2	2.7	6.5	1.4	---	2.4	3.0	---	2.0
Negro: Male	---	40.9	73.0	40.6	30.1	12.3	20.0	20.0	5.4	4.2	10.0	3.2	15.2
Female	---	21.0	12.2	14.2	3.7	7.3	4.0	1.5	4.7	---	---	---	4.5
<u>Seattle:</u>													
White: Male	---	5.6	12.3	10.7	3.2	3.7	3.0	1.2	2.6	2.1	---	---	2.9
Female	---	0.6	1.1	0.7	---	1.1	---	---	---	---	---	---	0.2
Negro: Male	2.1	38.0	135.5	63.9	33.2	52.0	9.6	---	20.0	---	---	---	24.6
Female	---	---	11.9	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	0.8

(CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)

-176-

Table 42: Arrest Rates Per 10,000 Population^{a/} for Selected Part I and Part II Offenses Charged on Arrest, by Race, Sex, and Age of Offender: New Orleans, Louisiana and Seattle, Washington, 1965.^{b/} (CONTINUED)

City, Race and Sex of Offender, and Offense Charged	Age Groups												Total
	14 & under	15-19	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	45-49	50-54	55-59	60-64	65 & over	
VANDALISM:													
<u>New Orleans:</u>													
White: Male	0.2	52.1	42.0	22.1	7.0	7.2	7.2	3.2	1.6	0.9	2.3	0.6	9.7
Female	---	2.1	2.3	1.8	0.8	1.3	2.2	---	---	0.8	---	---	0.7
Negro: Male	---	39.7	39.7	12.5	19.0	17.0	5.0	8.3	1.8	2.1	3.3	---	9.1
Female	---	1.1	3.6	1.3	2.4	2.4	1.3	1.5	---	---	---	1.2	0.8
<u>Seattle:</u>													
White: Male	0.8	9.3	11.2	2.5	1.9	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.9	0.7	---	---	2.4
Female	---	---	0.6	---	0.7	---	---	0.6	---	---	---	---	0.1
Negro: Male	4.3	25.4	---	---	11.1	17.3	9.6	---	---	---	---	---	6.2
Female	---	---	11.9	---	---	15.7	---	---	---	---	---	---	2.3
WEAPONS: CARRYING, POSSESSING, ETC.:													
<u>New Orleans:</u>													
White: Male	---	29.4	39.4	23.0	14.1	8.7	5.6	8.7	4.1	0.9	2.3	0.7	8.9
Female	---	---	---	---	1.5	0.7	0.7	---	---	---	---	---	0.2
Negro: Male	---	162.4	191.9	117.2	87.1	49.3	48.3	28.4	19.9	25.2	26.6	11.3	45.8
Female	---	6.6	8.5	6.5	11.0	3.6	4.0	3.0	---	---	---	---	2.8
<u>Seattle:</u>													
White: Male	---	6.2	7.0	1.3	1.3	2.5	1.2	1.8	0.7	---	---	0.4	1.5
Female	---	1.1	0.6	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	0.1
Negro: Male	2.1	114.1	73.9	74.6	22.1	8.7	28.7	13.5	39.9	21.3	---	---	25.4
Female	---	10.9	23.9	---	10.4	---	10.6	---	---	---	---	---	3.8

(CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)

-177-

Table 42: Arrest Rates Per 10,000 Population^{a/} for Selected Part I and Part II Offenses Charged on Arrest, by Race, Sex, and Age of Offender: New Orleans, Louisiana and Seattle, Washington, 1965.^{b/} (CONTINUED)

City, Race and Sex of Offender, and Offense Charged	Age Groups												Total
	14 & under	15-19	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	45-49	50-54	55-59	60-64	65 & over	
PROSTITUTION AND COMMERCIALIZED VICE:													
<u>New Orleans:</u>													
White: Male	---	---	6.1	9.7	2.4	1.4	2.4	2.4	2.5	---	---	2.0	1.9
Female	---	5.6	18.1	10.8	12.0	3.3	2.9	0.7	0.7	0.8	---	0.8	3.6
Negro: Male	---	---	4.8	3.1	3.2	1.5	3.3	3.3	---	2.1	---	---	1.2
Female	---	5.5	21.9	12.9	8.5	6.0	2.7	1.5	---	1.8	---	---	4.0
<u>Seattle:</u>													
White: Male	---	---	0.6	0.6	---	0.6	---	---	---	---	---	---	0.1
Female	---	22.9	23.7	14.3	3.5	0.6	---	---	---	1.4	---	---	3.1
Negro: Male	---	12.7	37.0	42.6	11.1	8.7	28.7	---	---	---	---	---	10.0
Female	---	141.9	883.1	307.5	135.3	86.6	42.5	27.6	---	---	---	---	108.9
SEX OFFENSES, EXCEPT RAPE AND PROSTITUTION:													
<u>New Orleans:</u>													
White: Male	---	2.3	4.4	5.3	2.4	7.2	4.8	1.6	2.5	1.8	2.3	1.3	2.4
Female	---	---	---	---	2.3	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	0.2
Negro: Male	---	1.2	1.6	1.6	---	1.5	1.7	---	---	---	---	1.6	0.6
Female	---	---	---	---	---	1.2	---	---	---	---	---	---	0.2
<u>Seattle:</u>													
White: Male	0.5	18.0	15.3	16.3	6.4	11.6	11.3	4.3	6.5	6.3	6.0	1.8	6.8
Female	0.5	7.6	2.3	0.7	---	1.1	---	---	---	---	---	---	0.9
Negro: Male	---	50.7	110.8	21.3	22.1	26.0	38.3	13.5	20.0	42.6	---	---	21.5
Female	4.0	98.3	23.9	22.8	10.4	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	12.1

-178-

(CONTINUE ON NEXT PAGE)

2 OF 4

CONTINUED

Table 42: Arrest Rates Per 10,000 Population^{a/} for Selected Part I and Part II Offenses Charged on Arrest, by Race, Sex, and Age of Offender: New Orleans, Louisiana and Seattle, Washington, 1965.^{b/} (CONTINUED)

City, Race and Sex of Offender, and Offense Charged	Age Groups											Total
	15-19	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	45-49	50-54	55-59	60-64	65 & over	
DRUNKENNESS:												
New Orleans:												
White: Male	10.6	19.3	41.6	45.4	114.7	141.4	141.0	141.2	99.6	82.2	35.0	56.9
Female	---	0.8	5.4	6.7	4.7	8.0	10.5	8.8	2.4	1.0	---	3.2
Negro: Male	38.5	90.4	89.1	80.7	64.8	101.5	50.0	54.2	54.5	43.2	8.1	36.9
Female	---	---	---	3.7	4.8	---	4.5	1.6	1.8	---	4.7	1.3
Seattle:												
White: Male	9.3	305.8	379.5	496.8	664.4	882.8	858.3	853.2	659.4	601.0	224.5	381.2
Female	1.1	44.0	44.3	55.3	61.1	63.3	67.2	72.7	46.3	25.1	11.2	29.4
Negro: Male	50.7	541.9	724.2	1050.9	1447.1	2459.3	2973.0	2275.5	1531.9	1818.2	611.9	874.3
Female	10.9	83.5	159.5	83.3	70.8	212.3	68.9	116.3	24.3	83.7	---	55.2
DISORDERLY CONDUCT:												
New Orleans:												
White: Male	261.2	455.3	358.6	406.0	705.5	900.3	907.5	785.9	621.0	552.3	245.9	403.7
Female	29.9	59.6	65.8	69.6	62.8	85.6	49.8	53.8	27.2	5.0	5.0	33.8
Negro: Male	657.0	1058.1	781.1	666.5	662.9	755.7	637.0	582.0	461.0	395.5	159.9	379.4
Female	64.1	113.0	82.8	117.0	77.4	92.3	78.2	26.5	14.7	19.6	36.8	45.2
Seattle:												
White: Male	37.2	37.0	15.7	8.3	9.8	8.4	9.8	5.8	4.2	1.7	0.7	9.1
Female	3.3	8.5	2.9	2.8	1.7	1.1	0.6	---	0.7	---	---	1.2
Negro: Male	114.1	110.8	106.5	55.3	130.0	57.4	67.6	39.9	21.3	62.7	---	49.2
Female	10.9	35.8	113.9	---	15.7	10.6	---	19.4	---	---	---	15.1

(CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)

Table 42: Arrest Rates Per 10,000 Population^{a/} for Selected Part I and Part II Offenses Charged on Arrest, by Race, Sex, and Age of Offender: New Orleans, Louisiana and Seattle, Washington, 1965.^{b/} (CONTINUED)

City, Race and Sex of Offender, and Offense Charged	Age Groups												Total
	14 & under	15-19	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	45-49	50-54	55-59	60-64	65 & over	
VAGRANCY:													
New Orleans:													
White: Male	---	570.7	640.1	423.2	362.2	705.5	810.0	873.7	694.7	490.9	451.6	193.7	406.7
Female	---	41.7	73.9	40.6	29.9	24.7	34.1	18.2	40.6	8.8	6.0	4.6	21.2
Negro: Male	---	2303.3	2285.9	1282.6	869.1	723.0	642.5	403.5	374.1	345.8	285.8	142.1	580.8
Female	---	92.9	108.1	40.1	37.8	39.9	32.1	18.0	14.0	5.5	5.6	16.6	26.8
Seattle:													
White: Male	0.1	3.1	3.5	3.8	5.1	11.0	12.5	18.3	10.3	9.2	9.5	1.1	5.6
Female	---	---	---	1.4	1.4	0.6	---	1.7	---	---	---	---	0.2
Negro: Male	---	24.4	61.6	117.2	77.4	130.0	201.0	270.7	179.6	191.5	125.4	32.2	80.7
Female	---	---	23.9	45.6	10.4	23.6	10.6	27.6	19.4	24.3	41.8	---	12.1
ALL OFFENSES:													
New Orleans:													
White: Male	---	1,610	2,244	1,547	1,272	2,036	2,312	2,268	1,900	1,430	1,220	544	1,200
Female	---	55	263	195	184	152	208	127	132	66	19	16	103
Negro: Male	---	4,807	5,847	3,900	2,933	2,412	2,431	1,685	1,482	1,177	867	421	1,643
Female	---	369	353	344	361	313	254	165	98	38	50	69	166
Total Population	---	1,486	1,799	1,305	989	1,117	1,214	1,055	895	667	555	219	713
Seattle:													
White: Male	37	801	739	654	697	903	1,120	1,070	1,039	791	699	254	575
Female	10	171	130	106	87	100	83	88	87	56	32	13	64
Negro: Male	189	3,688	2,512	2,535	2,212	2,730	3,598	4,230	3,493	2,617	2,226	853	1,882
Female	62	993	1,527	843	343	346	414	220	194	73	209	19	359
Total Population	31	549	501	473	453	550	662	629	585	447	357	125	352

(CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)

Table 42: Arrest Rates Per 10,000 Population^{a/} for Selected Part I and Part II Offenses Charged on Arrest, by Race, Sex, and Age of Offender: New Orleans, Louisiana and Seattle, Washington, 1965.^{b/} (CONTINUED)

^{a/} It was not possible to secure estimates of the 1965 population for race-age-sex subgroups in either New Orleans or Seattle. The 1960 population for these race-age-sex subgroups, therefore, is used. Caution is necessary in interpreting the figures within the tables therefore since changes after 1960 could substantially alter the rates for any subgroup.

^{b/} Appreciation is expressed to the following for providing the special tabulations for this table: Superintendent Joseph I. Giarusso and Deputy Chief Alfred Theriot, Sr. of the New Orleans Police Department; A. T. Labatut, Bureau of EDP, City of New Orleans; Chief F. C. Ramon, Assistant Chief M. E. Cook, Inspector J. V. Fineran, and Mrs. Caroline Arwine of the Data Processing Section, Seattle Police Department.

Particularly striking, too, is the fact that arrest rates for race-sex-age groups are generally higher in Seattle than in New Orleans (except for arrests for prostitution and commercialized vice for whites in New Orleans). This, despite the fact that the scale of such operations probably is greater in New Orleans than Seattle.

Arrest rates, like most crime statistics, fail to separate arrests of transients from those of residents and the statistics for any given year are for arrests rather than for persons under arrest one or more times. Hence arrest rates for jurisdictions may vary considerably depending upon the degree of transiency of the population in an area and police and court procedures that may affect repeated arrest. Some indication of the kind of transiency in an area may be obtained from the police statistics themselves, assuming that vagrancy arrests to a degree reflect transiency in an area. The very substantial vagrancy arrests in New Orleans for both whites and Negroes as contrasted with Seattle, fit common-sense ideas that transiency is greater for New Orleans.

Despite the fact that arrests of transients and repeated arrests are reflected in the police statistics, it nonetheless is surprising that the young Negro male in both New Orleans and Seattle has such a high probability of arrest. Indeed, in New Orleans the rate for Negro males aged 20 to 24 was 5,847 per 10,000, a rate more than 16 times that for Negro females in this age group and more than two and one-half times that for white males in this age group. Furthermore, the rate for Negro males age 20-24 is more than seven times that in the upper age groups for Negro males.

Conclusion

Current systems of crime reporting contain some misconceptions about simple rates such as a crude crime rate. Some of these misconceptions are discussed in this report

and proposals made for more specific measures of crime. Particularly attention is focused on the need to identify the exposed population for which crime rates are calculated, the desirability of obtaining specific rates for both victims and offenders, and the need for developing statistical programs that provide information for the calculation of such rates. Examples of the kind of statistics that it is believed will be more useful, given current aims in public information about crime and the formation of public policy and organizational strategies to deal with crime, are given by way of illustration of what could be done.

PUBLIC PERCEPTIONS AND RECOLLECTIONS ABOUT CRIME,
LAW ENFORCEMENT, AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE*

by

Albert J. Reiss, Jr.**

The University of Michigan

May, 1967

*The research reported herein was supported by Grant Award 006, Office of Law Enforcement Assistance, U. S. Department of Justice under the Law Enforcement Assistance Act of 1965, and by a grant from the National Science Foundation. Publication does not necessarily reflect the views of officials of either granting agency.

**The assistance of Howard Aldrich and Jack Faber in the preparation of tabular materials is gratefully acknowledged.

In many major metropolitan centers today, if not in the country as a whole, problems of crime and law enforcement command the attention of the public. For many inhabitants, particularly within the inner core of our cities, crime ranks first among the problems they regard as confronting our society.

A major objective of this study was to investigate how citizens are affected by the crime problem as they define and experience it. This report deals primarily with the effects of crime on the lives of citizens and their organizations, their attitudes toward law enforcement and the judicial system, and the nature of public information about these matters.

Two major surveys were conducted. One survey of businesses and other organizations was designed to investigate the crime problems of managers and owners of businesses or other organizations in high crime rate areas of three cities. The other survey was designed to obtain information on how crime affects the lives and impressions of a cross-section of adult citizens in these same communities.

The survey of businesses and other organizations was undertaken in two police districts of Boston, two in Chicago, and four in Washington, D. C. At least one white and one Negro police precinct with a high crime rate was selected in each city.^{1/} The universe of organizations in each precinct consisted of all businesses and organizations located there with the exception of private professional offices and public or quasi-public organizations such as schools, utilities, parks and other recreation facilities, most medical facilities, and public transportation. In addition to all private business organizations, the universe includes all industrial establishments, churches and synagogues, and special purpose buildings located in the area.

1. For a description of these precincts, see Section I of this volume, Measurement of the Nature and Amount of Crime.

For Boston and Chicago, the police department inventory of all nonresidential premises in the area was used as the universe from which the sample was drawn. The Real Property Inventory of Washington, D. C. was used to define the universe for the District precincts. The sampling fraction varied considerably among the precincts both as a function of their territorial size and of the concentration of organizations in the area.

The number of business and organizations secured for each sample together with the response rate is given below:

City and Precinct		Number in Sample	Response Rate
Boston:	Dorchester	98	86.7
	Roxbury	96	82.1
Chicago:	Town Hall	104	80.6
	Fillmore	100	80.6
Washington, D. C.:	6th Precinct	111	82.8
	10th Precinct	96	89.7
	13th Precinct	96	88.1
	14th Precinct	99	93.4
Total		800	85.2

The sampling frame for the cross-section of the adult population differed for Boston and Chicago. The voting census of the Boston population prepared annually by the Boston Police

Department comprised the sampling frame for that city. An area probability sample was drawn for the Chicago precincts.

The universe consisted of the adult population in each police precinct. Any household member 18 years of age or older was considered an eligible respondent. Only one respondent was selected in each dwelling unit. Although all dwellings within a precinct had equal probability of selection, members of the adult population had unequal chances of selection because the probability of selection varied with the number of adult members of the household. A sample was drawn for each precinct to yield approximately 200 interviews for that precinct. For a variety of reasons the response rate was lower in Chicago than Boston. This was mainly due to the fact that refusal rates were greater in the upper income, high rise apartment areas of Chicago's Town Hall District. Actually 183 completed interviews were obtained for the Boston, Dorchester area and 170 for its Roxbury area. There were 168 completed interviews for Chicago's Fillmore area but only 154 for the Town Hall area. Overall the completion rate was just under 70 per cent.

Interviews were completed by the field staff of the Survey Research Center of the University of Michigan. The main field work was completed between July and October, 1966.

The report is divided into two main sections. The first main section presents information on the evaluations and images of owners and managers of businesses and organizations toward law enforcement agencies and officers. The second main section presents information on how crime affects the lives of residents in high crime rate areas and their perceptions of the law enforcement and criminal justice systems.

Although the results are presented for police districts, the respondents in Dorchester, Boston and Town Hall, Chicago are white respondents while those in Roxbury, Boston and Fillmore, Chicago are Negro. Education and income were controlled in comparisons, though not generally included in the tables.

Evaluations and Images of Owners and Managers of
Businesses and Organizations Toward the Police
and Police Service

Much of the discussion that revolves around "police-community relations" neglects the relation of the relatively isolated citizen or group to the police. The interest rather focuses on police-minority group relations. Special emphasis usually is placed upon the establishment of channels of communication between those who would complain and those who would explain.

Some models of police-community relations focus upon the patrolman on the beat in the neighborhood setting. The implicit model, more often than not, derives from the anachronistic image of the foot patrolman on the beat rather than from the bureaucratized and perhaps relatively impersonal motorized patrol system. In any case, whether the concern is with the adaption of urban policing to the rise of civil rights organizations and self-conscious minorities or with the officer walking his beat, a good part of routine police-citizen situations go unnoticed.

Not only is there little interest in the average citizen-- who may well live eight stories above the nearest patrol car-- but there is surprisingly little consideration of police relations with businesses and other organizations. Indeed, it is of some relevance that the growth of large-scale industry and business has brought with it a growth of private police systems in the United States. Whatever the historical bases for this dual growth may have been, a significant portion of the private sector is not in practice the responsibility of public police forces.

Still, however, the great majority of businesses and organizations remain dependent upon city police departments. In some urban areas over half of the businesses and organizations are without theft insurance, and a large proportion can

afford only minimal protective measures such as burglar alarms, reinforced locks or armored car service. For such businesses as these the cost of crime losses can mean the difference between profit and bankruptcy. For such businesses, further, the police are understandably one of the more salient and significant units in the social environment.

The business or organization located in a high crime rate area, because of the fact of crime alone--not to mention the greater likelihood that it will be without theft insurance or adequate protective measures against crime--is particularly vulnerable to crime, and hence, more dependent upon the police than a business or organization in a relatively lower crime rate area. An important question arises then as to whether differences exist between the policing and the relations between the police and businessmen in high crime rate areas as compared with lower crime rate areas. Some of the attitudes, experiences, and expectations with regard to the police of proprietors and managers of businesses and organizations in eight police districts in Boston, Chicago, and Washington, D.C. provide some answer to this question.

Evaluations of the Police

The managers and proprietors were asked to evaluate the kind of job the police do in their areas. Three choices were given: "very good", "fairly good", and "not too good". Before the data are presented, however, it is important to emphasize that these evaluations of the police arise from a perhaps quite limited perspective--that of the manager or owner of a business or organization. One can only speculate at this point as to the bases for these evaluations. Police officers probably are quite correct in thinking that some citizens simply are "cop haters" while others are "cop

lovers". Prejudice in one direction or the other can be expected to operate as much in attitudes toward the police as in those held toward any other controversial group in society. On the other hand, it is likely that most attitudes lie somewhere between the extremes. It remains difficult to draw inferences about the determinants of any attitudes; rather, the safer course is to seek out associations or correlations between particular attitudes and other characteristics of the persons holding them. In this report associations between attitudes and expectations toward the police and the city and intra-city locale of the persons holding them are considered. It cannot be shown, however, that any associations are necessarily of a causal nature. It is extremely difficult to make a causal analysis of attitude formation. The analysis undertaken in this report does not permit causal inference.

In the aggregate the great majority--80 per cent--of managers and proprietors think that the police are doing either a "very good" or a "fairly good" job. (See Table 1) Of these a little over half think that the job being done is "very good". Only 12 per cent say the job is "not too good". Taking all of the cities together, then, there seems to be general satisfaction with police services. Among the cities there is one noticeable difference: Boston managers and owners clearly are less favorable in their evaluations of the police than are the managers and owners in Chicago and Washington, D.C.

The differences across precincts are most clear if the proportions of managers and owners saying "not too good" are examined. With one exception the managers and owners in the higher crime rate areas have less favorable opinions about police efficiency than do those in the lower crime rate areas. Precinct 14 in Washington, D.C., is the exception. But Roxbury owners and managers are less satisfied with the

Table 1: Per Cent of Businesses and Organizations Classified by Opinions Owners/Managers Have of the Kind of Job the Police Are Doing in Their Areas for Eight Police Districts in Three Cities.

City and Police District	Opinion of the Kind of Job the Police Are Doing in Their Area				Total Per Cent
	Very Good	Fairly Good	Not Too Good	Doesn't Know	
All Districts	43	37	12	7	99
Boston, Dorchester	32	47	14	7	100
Boston, Roxbury	30	38	23	9	100
Chicago, Town Hall	51	34	2	13	100
Chicago, Fillmore	45	36	14	5	100
D.C., #6	55	31	7	6	99
D.C., #10	41	43	13	3	100
D.C., #13	47	34	14	4	99
D.C., #14	42	37	16	4	99

police than those in Dorchester, and the same holds true of Fillmore as against Town Hall owners and managers. The same difference is evident when Districts 10 and 13 are compared with District 6 in Washington, D.C.

The respondents also were asked whether or not they thought the police were not doing a good job in some respects, apart from their overall evaluation of them. Again, the owners and managers in high crime rate areas are more negatively critical of the police than we find in the other districts. (See Table 2) In every precinct, however, more than a majority apparently have no criticisms of the police. In Town Hall, the lower crime rate area of Chicago, only 13 per cent of the managers and owners think that police work is not as good as it should be.

Table 2: Per Cent of Owners/Managers Who Think the Police in Some Respects Are Not Doing A Good Job for Eight Police Districts in Three Cities.

City and Police District	In Some Respects the Police Are Not Doing A Good Job			Total Per Cent
	Agrees	Disagrees	Doesn't Know	
All Districts	32	64	4	100
Boston, Dorchester	38	58	4	100
Boston, Roxbury	41	54	5	100
Chicago, Town Hall	13	81	6	100
Chicago, Fillmore	33	65	2	100
D.C., #6	28	68	4	100
D.C., #10	33	63	5	101
D.C., #13	39	60	1	100
D.C., #14	37	61	2	100

The respondents who expressed the belief that police work is not as good as it should be were asked to suggest means by which policing could be improved. Taking the owners and managers from all three cities together the two most common suggestions were 1.) increase police manpower and 2.) increase patrol work. (See Table 3) Twenty-eight per cent suggested the former; 26 per cent the latter. Only 7 per cent were of the opinion that better quality police are needed. Quite a large proportion of the responses fall into the "other" category, a catch-all category. Some owners and managers suggest increasing the use of dogs, on-the-scene investigation, enforcement of curfew, human relations workshops, integration of the police department, and so on. It is interesting that some managers and owners seemingly echo police attitudes. In the "other" category we find complaints, for example, that policemen have too much paperwork to do, a common source of

Table 3: Per Cent Distribution of Opinions Held by Owners/Managers on How the Police Could be Improved for Eight Police Districts in Three Cities (Includes Only Owners/Managers With Opinions).

City and Police District	Ways the Police Could Be Improved										Total Per Cent
	Increase Manpower	Better Quality Police	Increase Patrol Work	Improve Courts	Harsher Court Punishments	Increase Police Authority	Improve Public	Other			
All Districts	28	7	26	4	2	6	3	24	100		
Boston, Dorchester	35	7	45	1	--	--	1	10	99		
Boston, Roxbury	32	8	45	2	--	2	2	10	101		
Chicago, Town Hall	31	5	21	--	3	2	--	38	100		
Chicago, Fillmore	23	7	31	--	3	9	7	20	100		
D.C., #6	27	10	14	11	4	7	2	25	100		
D.C., #10	23	5	16	8	3	9	5	31	100		
D.C., #13	23	5	20	7	--	5	5	36	101		
D.C., #14	31	8	21	6	1	8	3	21	99		

discontent for police officers. Other respondents mentioned that the courts interfere with police efficiency or effectiveness, and still others criticize the public in general. Finally, some owners and managers--about 6 per cent--agree with those officers who think the police should be given more authority. That so many owners and managers express attitudes that essentially do not "blame" individual officers for the failures of policing indicates that these people extend a good deal of sympathy and "backing" to the police. The differences among cities and precincts are not significant or consistent on this dimension.

Experiences With the Police

Since the introduction of motorized patrol a recurring question has been raised as to the consequences for police-citizen relations of the relative elimination of foot patrol work. It generally is assumed that police-citizen relations have become more impersonal. Though there are of course no data on police-citizen relations before motorized patrol was instituted--so an historical comparison is impossible--cities differ according to how much they continue to use foot patrolmen, so comparisons between cities nevertheless are possible.

One index of the nature of police-citizen relations as far as their degree of impersonality is concerned is the proportion of citizens who know a policeman well enough to talk with him. Of all the managers and owners interviewed, 61 per cent know at least one police officer well enough to carry on a conversation with him. (See Table 4) There is far more foot patrol work in Washington, D.C., than in either Boston or Chicago, but, with one exception, the Washington owners and managers are not significantly more

Table 4: Per Cent of Businesses and Organizations Classified by Whether or Not Owners/Managers Know Any Police-men Well Enough to Talk With Them for Eight Police Districts in Three Cities.

City and Police District	Knows Policemen Well Enough To Talk With Them		Total Per Cent
	Knows At Least One	Does Not Know Any	
All Districts	61	39	100
Boston, Dorchester	68	32	100
Boston, Roxbury	63	37	100
Chicago, Town Hall	40	60	100
Chicago, Fillmore	60	40	100
D.C., #6	67	33	100
D.C., #10	60	40	100
D.C., #13	77	23	100
D.C., #14	62	38	100

likely to be acquainted with police officers. The exception is Precinct 13, where 77 per cent of the owners and managers know officers well enough to talk with them, a proportion higher than those found in any other precinct of the three cities. Precinct 13 is the highest crime rate area of the four selected in Washington.

The smallest proportion, 40 per cent, is found in Chicago's Town Hall, a relatively low crime rate area. However, the proportions in general are not consistently related to the crime rates of the precincts. The proportion knowing policemen is a little higher in Boston's Dorchester than in Roxbury, for example. Of course, the degree to which owners and managers are acquainted with some police officers may be related to their experiences with crime, either as victims or complainants. Nonetheless, other data below suggest that it is more likely to be at the initiative of the officer--he gets to know the businessman--rather than at the "initiative"

of the businessman.

On the other hand, there is the question of how often managers and owners talk with the officers with whom they are acquainted. In this regard there are fairly small but consistent differences between the higher and the lower crime rate areas. (See Table 5) The differences are most visible when the categories are collapsed into two, those who talk with officers at least every day and those who talk with officers less frequently than every day. It then becomes apparent that managers and proprietors in high crime areas talk with their police acquaintances more often than do those in relatively lower crime areas. Nevertheless, in nearly every case--Precinct 10 being the one exception--the modal frequency is less than once a week. Overall, 30 per cent of the owners and managers who have police acquaintances

Table 5: Per Cent of Businesses and Organizations Classified by How Often Owners/Managers Talk With Police Officers for Eight Police Districts in Three Cities (Includes Only Owners/Managers Who Know Policemen Well Enough to Talk With Them).

City and Police District	Frequency With Which They Talk With Policemen				Total Per Cent
	Several Times Per Day	Every Day	Several Times Per Week	Less Than Once A Week, Rarely, Never	
All Districts	9	21	30	40	100
Boston, Dorchester	3	24	31	42	100
Boston, Roxbury	7	16	38	40	101
Chicago, Town Hall	12	12	22	54	100
Chicago, Fillmore	11	23	29	38	101
D.C., #6	14	20	27	39	100
D.C., #10	12	25	35	27	99
D.C., #13	4	31	24	40	99
D.C., #14	7	20	28	45	100

talk with them at least every day. This is probably a higher proportion than critics of motorized patrol work might expect. Furthermore, the differences between Washington, D.C., where foot patrol still is used quite heavily, and the other cities are not significant. That is, where police officers still "walk a beat" a good deal, the owners and managers of businesses and organizations do not talk with policemen significantly more frequently than do owners and managers in cities where foot patrol is nearly nonexistent.

Those who favor a return to foot patrol often mourn the loss of informed, person-to-person interaction between the police and citizens. They argue that in the days of foot patrol citizens could relate to policemen, and vice versa, in a less "official" way; they could "know" one another, and policemen were therefore more a part of the community and more efficient in their duties. The point is that foot patrol allows citizens and officers to "visit" one another, to initiate and to maintain close ties.

There are data pertaining to how owners and managers become acquainted with police officers. If the advocates of foot patrol are correct there is reason to expect police-citizen acquaintanceships to arise more informally or casually in Washington, D.C., than they do in Boston or Chicago. The evidence supports this expectation to some extent. It is not that Washington owners and managers become acquainted with officers in purely informal encounters, however; it is more in the course of quasi-official visits by officers that they get to know one another. These contacts are initiated by the officers, but they do not involve investigations or complaints; rather they are merely "checks" to see if everything is O.K., to see if there has been any trouble lately, and so on. This is not an uncommon kind of introduction for officers in Boston and Chicago, but it is more common in

Washington, D.C., and it may be related to the greater use of foot patrol in that city.

With the exception of Precinct 13, in Washington, D.C., owners and managers are slightly more likely to get acquainted with officers in purely informal encounters. In Boston and Chicago, on the other hand, these acquaintanceships are more apt to arise as a result of contacts with officers who are passing by the business or organization in the course of handling other matters or as a result of the officers stopping by the business as customers. Looking at all of the cities combined it is clear that acquaintanceships are quite unlikely to grow out of official police visits during investigations or the handling of complaints. Also it is clear that owners and managers very rarely initiate contacts with police officers wholly out of a general felt insecurity or need. Rather, the relationships arise either as a result of routine police checks, or they are more desultory and casual in their origin. It may be that there would be more of these relationships if police officers were to take even more initiative themselves, rather than leaving so much to chance. It seems indisputable that this would be neither a waste of police time nor unimportant from the point of view of police-public relations.. (See Table 6)

Moreover, good relations with members of the public can benefit the police in every concrete ways. One way comes with whatever easier access to information they may achieve. It is reasonable to assume that police officers are more likely to meet with success when they seek information if they are on "good terms" with their potential informants. About one-third of the managers and owners in all three cities help the police by providing them with information. (See Table 7) This proportion does not take into account the large number of owners and managers who never are asked for information, however. Still, the proportion seems rather small. It will

Table 6: Per Cent of Businesses and Organizations Classified by How Owners/Managers Became Acquainted With Police Officers for Eight Police Districts in Three Cities (Includes Only Those Owners/Managers With Police Acquaintances).

City and Police District	How Owners/Managers Became Acquainted With Police Officers								Total Per Cent
	Investigation or Response to Call	Other Official Police Business (eg, foot patrolman's check)	Police Pass By Other Business	Owner/Manager Initiated Contact of Need	Informal Police Visit	Through Other Reason(s)	Police As Customer(s)	Other	
All Districts	5	34	15	1	14	13	16	3	101
Boston, Dorchester	5	24	17	--	15	14	21	5	101
Boston, Roxbury	9	20	33	--	5	11	20	2	100
Chicago, Town Hall	2	24	20	--	15	10	20	10	101
Chicago, Fillmore	6	19	13	--	22	26	15	--	101
D.C., #6	7	51	14	--	13	3	9	3	100
D.C., #10	--	46	8	2	16	14	14	--	100
D.C., #13	4	51	7	2	9	11	16	--	100
D.C., #14	4	33	5	5	20	16	15	2	100

Table 7: Per Cent of Owners/Managers Who Help the Police By Giving Them Information for Eight Police Districts in Three Cities.

City and Police District	Helps the Police By Giving Them Information		Total Per Cent
	Does	Does Not	
All Districts	34	66	100
Boston, Dorchester	23	77	100
Boston, Roxbury	33	67	100
Chicago, Town Hall	33	67	100
Chicago, Fillmore	32	68	100
D.C., #6	38	62	100
D.C., #10	40	60	100
D.C., #13	38	62	100
D.C., #14	36	64	100

be remembered that the owners and managers of businesses and organizations in high crime rate areas are less satisfied with the police than are those in the relatively lower crime rate areas. Yet it is clear that the owners and managers in the high crime areas are no less likely to provide the police with information, according to their self-reports, at least. In fact, looking across the cities they are slightly more likely, in general, to provide such information. This is hardly surprising, however. In high crime rate areas the owners and managers are less satisfied with the police, but they do not as a rule "blame" the individual policemen for the failures of the policing system. Furthermore, it probably is fair to say that they are in no position to be reckless with their relations to the police. Businessmen no doubt realize that police officers are neither beneath going "out of their way" for some citizens, nor above giving less than the best service to others. Police behavior--when they are seeking

information--can come very close to bargaining behavior.

Differences between the three cities are small, but it does appear that Washington owners and managers are a little more likely to provide information to the police than are the owners and managers in the other cities. Whether or not this difference is related to the differences in the use of foot patrol is quite problematic. Those who give the police information report that it usually concerns neighborhood problems or information about wanted persons. Less frequently they report that the information concerns recently committed crimes. It must be emphasized that most of the owners and managers report that they are never asked for information, that there is no occasion for them to provide it. Of the total only 3 per cent of the owners and managers report that they do not give the police information because they fear the consequences of "getting involved". In short, then, it appears that the police receive rather good cooperation from owners and managers from whom they solicit information, but they nevertheless solicit it from only a fairly small proportion of all owners and managers.

One crude index of the strength of the relationships between policemen and owners and managers may be the extent to which the owners and managers do small favors for officers. It is sometimes the practice for businessmen to give, for example, discounts or free coffee and soft drinks to officers. If these favors are interpreted as means to obtaining greater police concern or efficiency, then one might argue that they indicate more the weakness or superficiality of police-businessman relations than they do the strength of these ties. But even if these relationships are partially supported by the favors alone, it necessarily follows--if this argument is correct--that the relationships would be even weaker without the favors. Furthermore, in many cities it is clear that small favors are given merely as an

expression of appreciation or merely because they are traditional. Some policemen say that merchants and businessmen--restauranters, for example--will give favors to officers "just so they can have policemen around for show".

Twenty-five per cent of the owners and managers report that they do small favors for policemen. Given that all of the organizations in the sample are not business concerns, this figure is fairly substantial. (See Table 8) The differences between cities are not large, but owners and managers in Chicago report the practice proportionately less. As in the giving of information, owners and managers of businesses and organizations in high crime rate areas do at least "their share". Though somewhat more owners and managers in high crime areas are negatively critical of the police, individual policemen in these areas at least receive favors from as large a proportion of owners and managers as do officers in areas with comparatively lower crime rates. Roxbury and Fillmore owners and managers are slightly more likely to do favors for officers than are owners and managers in Dorchester and Town Hall, respectively. In Washington, D.C., however, the practice is a little less common in the high crime rate precincts. The favor most frequently reported is the giving of discounts. Also frequent are reports that free coffee, soft drinks, free merchandise and free services are given.

Images of the Police

Apart from the way owners and managers of businesses and organizations evaluate the police, and apart from the experiences they have had with policemen, there is the matter of how they perceive or describe the officers in their area. These perceptions or descriptions might be called their images of the police. A central part of the

Table 8: Per Cent of Owners/Managers Who Do Small Favors For Policemen (E.g., By Giving Free Coffee, Discounts, Etc.) for Eight Police Districts in Three Cities.

City and Police District	Do Small Favors For Policemen		Total Per Cent
	Does	Does Not	
All Districts	25	75	100
Boston, Dorchester	24	76	100
Boston, Roxbury	31	69	100
Chicago, Town Hall	15	85	100
Chicago, Fillmore	20	80	100
D.C., #6	31	69	100
D.C., #10	21	79	100
D.C., #13	29	71	100
D.C., #14	31	69	100

police image turns on the question of police efficiency. How do the police respond when help is needed?

Citizens understandably measure police efficiency partly in terms of the speediness or rapidity of police responses to calls for help or assistance. Efficient police are partially equated with fast police. The owners and managers were asked to estimate the time it would take for the police to arrive at the business or organization if they were called. Almost one-half of the owners and managers estimated that the police would arrive in less than 6 minutes. (See Table 9) This probably is a smaller proportion than the police officials in these cities would expect, since they typically estimate the average elapsed time before arrival as something less than six minutes. There is reason to think that the Chicago Police Department, with more modern communications and more mobile patrol units, is capable of answering calls faster than the police in Boston or Washington, D.C. Chicago owners and managers do estimate a faster police response than do the owners and managers

Table 9: Per Cent of Businesses and Organizations Classified by Owners'/Managers/ Estimates of the Time It Would Take For the Police to Arrive If Called for Eight Police Districts in Three Cities.

City and Police District	Number of Minutes It Would Take for Police to Arrive								Total Per Cent
	1-4	5	6-9	10-14	15-19	20-29	30 or more	Doesn't Know	
All Districts	25	23	9	14	7	5	6	10	99
Boston, Dorchester	22	27	15	12	6	6	8	4	100
Boston, Roxbury	19	24	14	10	6	6	12	9	100
Chicago, Town Hall	35	29	8	16	3	1	--	8	100
Chicago, Fillmore	40	16	11	11	7	6	1	7	99
D.C., #6	21	29	6	21	5	3	5	11	101
D.C., #10	21	20	6	10	10	5	15	12	99
D.C., #13	27	22	2	12	14	10	5	8	100
D.C., #14	17	15	6	21	10	5	6	21	101

in Boston and Washington, D.C. The slowest response is estimated by the owners and managers in Precinct 14 of Washington, D.C., where only 32 per cent estimate the response at less than 6 minutes. It is likely that the wider use of foot patrol, as well as a less efficient communications system, contributes to a slower response time in parts of Washington; nevertheless, Precincts 6 and 13 have estimates right at the average for all of the cities and precincts. The times estimated by owners and managers in the high crime rate areas of Boston and Chicago are higher than are those estimated in the relatively lower crime rate areas. This may contribute--along with the high crime rates themselves--to the lower evaluations of the police in the high crime precincts. In Boston and Chicago, then, those owners and managers who are

more likely to have their enterprises victimized are also more likely to expect a relatively slower police response to a call for help. In Boston's Roxbury and in Precinct 10 of Washington, both high crime rate areas, over 10 per cent of the owners and managers estimate that it would take the police 30 minutes or more to arrive at a call for help. Right or wrong, these images surely reflect a good deal of disenchantment with the police on the part of owners and managers who are particularly dependent upon the police. Put another way, police efficiency is seen as lower where it is relatively more important and consequential.

Citizens have images not only of the police in general but of the patrolmen in their neighborhoods in particular. The owners and managers were asked whether or not they thought that the best uniformed officers in the department are assigned in their area. From the data it is evident that such a question is quite difficult for a citizen to answer. Sixty-eight per cent of the owners and managers in all three cities say that they do not know one way or the other; and, of course, this very likely is an "honest" response, since probably only a small number have had sufficient experience with officers from all or most precincts of their city. In every precinct, those who are willing to advance an opinion are more likely to hold the more negative view of the police in their area, i.e., they do not think the men assigned to their area are the best in the city. (See Table 10) Of those giving opinions, moreover, the owners and managers in the high crime areas are more likely to take the negative view of the police than are those in the lower crime rate areas. It is possible that this is merely a chance result of the differences in those who were willing to give an opinion at all, but this is unlikely, given that these results are fully consistent with what one would expect in the light of the findings discussed earlier. To repeat, then, the image of the police is somewhat less positive in the eyes of the owners

Table 10: Per Cent of Owners/Managers Who Think That the Best Uniformed Officers in the Department Are Assigned in Their Area for Eight Police Districts In Three Cities.

City and Police District	The Best Uniformed Officers In the Department Are Assigned			Total Per Cent
	Thinks So	Does Not Think So	Does Not Know	
All Districts	13	19	68	100
Boston, Dorchester	16	25	59	100
Boston, Roxbury	10	20	70	100
Chicago, Town Hall	9	10	81	100
Chicago, Fillmore	15	20	65	100
D.C., #6	9	12	79	100
D.C., #10	8	23	69	100
D.C., #13	13	23	64	100
D.C., #14	21	24	55	100

and managers who operate businesses and organizations in relatively high crime rate areas than it is for those in lower crime rate areas. A greater need for the police, then, is coupled with an image of a police system with a lesser likelihood of satisfying such a need.

Citizen Perceptions and Recollections about Crime, Law Enforcement, and Criminal Justice

There is a far from perfect relationship between the perceptions and attitudes persons hold and either their behavior or the conditions that objectively obtain in their environment. There are a number of reasons why this is so. Among the more important is the fact that perceptions are relative both to values held and to conditions around one. There is further the fact that pluralistic ignorance often

prevails in a population--one shares a common perception learned from others, yet few persons actually hold this as their private view. Added to this is the fact that people incorporate their own and other's experiences in ways that preclude their assessing the environment in an objective fashion.

The examination of perceptions or attitudes about the crime problem that follows more often than not is at variance with some of the objective conditions of the environment where these people live and even at variance with their experiences. Nonetheless, such perceptions are important since they define the situation for them.

Citizen Perceptions About Crime in Their Area

The areas chosen for study in Boston and Chicago are regarded among those with the highest crime rate areas for Negro and white citizens respectively. The crime rate for Roxbury, the predominantly Negro area of Boston is twice that of Dorchester, a high crime rate white area adjacent to it. Similarly, the crime rate for the Fillmore district of Chicago, an urban Negro ghetto with an Italian fringe area, is twice that of Town Hall, a Gold Coast and slum area made up largely of white inhabitants.

The casual visitor to these areas in either city will see marked differences in the character of the housing and other facilities. While there is urban blight in both the white and Negro areas of Boston and Chicago, much of the Negro area in both cities has deteriorated housing. There are other differences as well with both white areas having more middle and even upper middle income housing.

It might easily be assumed that such differences might affect both the satisfaction with living in these areas and a concern with the crime problem. The crime rate, after all, as reported by the police is twice as high in the Negro as in the white areas. And the differences in aesthetic, cultural,

and recreational qualities of the areas likewise is striking. Clearly the white areas are overall the "more desirable" residential areas in both cities. Below is presented the per cent distribution of those who agreed: "on the whole do you like living in this neighborhood"?

City and District (Or Race)	Male			Female			Total
	Less than H.S.	High School	Some College	Less than H.S.	High School	Some College	
Boston: Dorchester (white)	67	75	77	71	68	100	72
Roxbury (Negro)	83	67	75	62	61	14	63
Chicago: Town Hall (white)	69	70	72	76	83	86	77
Fillmore (Negro)	62	73	43	68	65	60	65

It is immediately evident that while Negro residents were somewhat less likely than white residents to say they liked living in the neighborhood where they reside, almost two-thirds of the adult residents in Negro areas said that on the whole they liked living there. There are no consistent differences by the sex or educational attainment of the adult respondent. Negro women in Roxbury, Boston were somewhat less likely to say they liked living in Roxbury than were Negro men, particularly if they had some college education. In general Negroes with some college education seem less satisfied with living in their neighborhood than do Negroes from other levels of education.

What is it that they especially like about living where they do? Although somewhat more Negroes than whites say they like nothing about living in their neighborhood (see Table 11), the large majority emphasize that it is "a nice place" to live. Roughly the same proportions of Negro and white respondents emphasize the safety, quietness, and respectability of their neighborhood. Indeed more than one-fourth of the residents in each precinct emphasize these qualities of their neighborhood (see Table 11). Again there are no consistent differences among residents by their sex and educational level.

There are some things that a substantial proportion of residents in all precincts do not like about their neighborhood as can be seen in Table 12. About a third of the Negro and of the white residents in Chicago said they didn't dislike anything about their neighborhood but in Boston about two and one-half times as many white as Negro residents said they disliked nothing about their neighborhood.

Although there is a substantial minority of persons in each precinct who mention disliking it because they do not like the moral character of their neighborhood (there is too much crime, too many deviant or disreputable persons, and it is an unsafe place to live), more of the residents mentioned disliking where they lived because of convenience or slum conditions. About equal proportions of Negro and white residents (11 to 15 per cent) do not like their neighborhood because it has too many deviant residents. Yet while roughly equal proportions of Negro and white residents in Chicago and in Roxbury, Boston said they did not like living where they did because there is too much crime, those in Dorchester, Boston failed to mention this as a reason for not liking the neighborhood. One is inclined to conclude that the more obvious convenience features of landscape and daily life condition ones liking or disliking a neighborhood rather than its moral qualities or the extent of crime in it.

Table 11: Per Cent Distribution of Main Thing Respondent Likes About Living Around Here:
Four Police Districts in Boston and Chicago.

City and Police District	Crime Features of Neighborhood:						Other Features:		Nothing Liked About It	Per Cent Total
	Free From Crime	Free of Deviant Persons	Safe	Respectable	Quiet	Well Policed	Nice Place to Live	Can't Say		
All Districts	1	*	2	12	13	*	58	5	9	100
Boston:										
Dorchester	1	1	--	15	12	1	63	3	5	101
Roxbury	2	1	1	12	12	--	52	7	13	100
Chicago:										
Town Hall	--	--	6	11	11	--	61	9	2	100
Fillmore	2	--	3	10	16	--	55	3	12	101

-26-

*0.5 per cent, or less.

266-261 O - 67 - 15

Table 12: Per Cent Distribution of Main Thing Respondent Doesn't Like About Living Around Here:
Four Police Districts in Boston and Chicago.

City and Police District	Crime Features of Neighborhood:				Other Features:				Nothing Disliked About It	Total Per Cent
	Too Much Crime	Has Deviant Persons	Not Safe Place	Disreputable Behavior Goes On	Changing Ethnic-Class Race	Slum Conditions	Poor Conveniences	Can't Say		
All Districts	10	12	1	*	4	11	23	4	35	100
Boston:										
Dorchester	--	15	--	*	5	8	20	*	43	100
Roxbury	12	12	2	--	5	13	31	8	17	100
Chicago:										
Town Hall	15	11	--	--	11	2	27	2	32	100
Fillmore	11	13	1	--	--	17	18	6	34	100

*0.5 per cent, or less.

-27-

Women with some college education seem somewhat more likely to be concerned about the moral qualities of their neighborhood than do men and than women at other educational levels, but the differences are not great. No doubt this is due in part to the high residential segregation by social class within these neighborhoods, so that the more educated and higher income residents maintain neighborhoods within the larger area that they on the whole like. It is clearest perhaps in Chicago where the Gold Coast with its high rise apartments--though far from crime free--is rather effectively contained from the slum sections of the precinct. So are the more working class sections of that precinct segregated from the slum sections. And ethnic islands, such as those inhabited by Puerto Ricans, are the modern ghettos.

Despite the rather high crime rates in the white areas and the very substantial ones in the Negro areas, a majority of residents think their neighborhoods are reasonably free of crime and problems that might get them into trouble. A majority of residents see it as no worse than most other areas of their city. They are without a doubt not basing their judgement on a rational calculation of probabilities of victimization from crime or upon other differences among the areas of their city.

Tables 13 and 14 give information on how residents compare their neighborhood with other neighborhoods and their concern with the crime problem in their neighborhood. A majority do not see behavior or activity in their neighborhood as giving it a "bad name", though Negro residents are more likely to see their neighborhood as having things going on that give it a bad name than are white residents. See Table 13.

The sex and educational level of residents do not make for consistent differences in assessing whether things go on in the neighborhood that give it a bad name as the

Table 13: Per Cent Distribution of Comparisons Respondent Makes of His Neighborhood With Other Neighborhoods: Four Police Districts in Boston and Chicago.

City and Police District	Things Here Give It A Bad Name	Kinds of Things That Give It A Bad Name:					Per Cent Total	People Here Are:			Per Cent Total
		Crime and Deviant Persons	Low Class or Not Responsible Behavior	Slum Conditions	All Other	Nothing Gives It A Bad Name		Quiet	Some Noisy and Disturb	Can't Say	
All Districts	35	18	12	2	3	65	100	62	37	1	100
Boston:											
Dorchester Roxbury	29 46	18 22	9 19	1 2	1 3	71 54	100 100	74 54	25 46	1 *	100 100
Chicago:											
Town Hall Fillmore	25 35	9 19	9 10	4 2	2 4	76 65	100 100	77 49	21 51	2 --	100 100

*0.5 per cent, or less.

Table 14: Per Cent Distribution of Respondents Assessment of Crime Problem in the Neighborhood:
Four Police Districts in Boston and Chicago.

City and Police District	Do People Living in this Neighborhood:			Per Cent Total	When you think about the chances of getting robbed, threatened, beaten up or any thing of that sort, would you say your neighborhood is (compared to other neighborhoods in town):						Per Cent Total
	Keep Out of Trouble With Law	(Some) Have Trouble With Law	Don't Know		Very Safe	About Average	Less Safe	One of the Worst	Don't Know	No Answer	
All Districts	67	24	9	100	20	53	19	4	4	*	101
Boston:											
Dorchester	82	10	8	100	33	47	15	1	2	2	100
Roxbury	65	25	10	100	7	46	34	8	5	--	100
Chicago:											
Town Hall	76	19	5	100	21	68	11	--	--	--	100
Fillmore	44	44	12	100	17	62	9	4	8	--	100

-30-

(CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)

Table 14: Per Cent Distribution of Respondents Assessment of Crime Problem in the Neighborhood:
Four Police Districts in Boston and Chicago. (Continued)

City and Police District	Is there so much trouble in this neighborhood that you would like to move away if you could?				Per Cent Total	How about crimes in your neighborhood--are they committed mostly by:					Per Cent Total
	Yes	Very Safe or No	All Other	Don't Know		People Who Live Here	Half and Half	Outsiders	Don't Know Who Does	No Answer	
All Districts	20	77	*	3	100	14	11	41	32	2	100
Boston:											
Dorchester	13	84	--	3	100	13	11	42	30	4	100
Roxbury	30	66	--	4	100	13	14	42	29	2	100
Chicago:											
Town Hall	11	86	--	2	99	21	5	55	19	--	100
Fillmore	18	77	1	4	100	13	9	33	45	--	100

-31-

*0.5 per cent, or less.

distribution below shows:

City and District (or Race)	Male			Female			Total
	Less Than H.S.	High School	Some College	Less Than H.S.	High School	Some College	
Boston:							
Dorchester (white)	11	25	46	38	36	16	
Roxbury (Negro)	54	40	67	51	36	57	
Chicago:							
Town Hall (white)	8	20	28	40	35	40	
Fillmore (Negro)	31	18	43	35	17	50	

Among white males in both Chicago and Boston, the more education, the more likely one is to see the area as having behavior or activity that gives it a bad name. Likewise it would seem that Negro men and women with a high school education are less likely to see the area having things that give it a bad name than are Negro men and women with more or less than a high school education. An obvious rationale for these patterns is lacking.

Except for Chicago's Fillmore district, a majority of the residents see their neighborhood as quiet compared with other neighborhoods in the city, though Negroes clearly see their neighborhoods as having some people who are noisy and disturbing more often than do residents of white neighborhoods. See Table 13. One's sex or education makes little difference in this perception.

Again, except for Chicago's Fillmore district, a majority of the residents see people in the neighborhood as keeping out of trouble with the law (See Table 14). Yet white residents are more likely to see their neighborhood as free of persons who get in trouble with the law than are Negroes, with sex and educational level making for no difference in one's perception.

A majority of the residents see their neighborhood as very safe or about average when compared with other neighborhoods of the city. While 33 per cent of the white residents in Boston's Dorchester and 21 per cent in Chicago's Town Hall regard their neighborhood as very safe, only 7 per cent of the Negroes in Roxbury and 17 per cent in Fillmore regard their neighborhood as very safe.

Yet a substantial majority of the residents (77 per cent) do not feel there is so much trouble in their neighborhood that they want to move away. White residents are less likely to want to move than are Negro residents because of trouble in their neighborhood. See Table 14.

A sizeable minority--in some cases a slight majority--of the residents are concerned with the crime problem or features of it in their neighborhood. This is particularly true for Negro adults in Roxbury but it is also more true for Negroes in Fillmore, Chicago as contrasted with white adults in either city.

A third of all adults believe there are things going on in their neighborhood that give it a bad name. They are most likely to mention the crime problem in the neighborhood or that deviant persons of one kind or another as what gives it a bad name. An appreciable minority also mention "low class" or "irresponsible behavior" by some residents as what gives it a bad name. (See Table 13.)

Almost one-half of the Negro residents see their neighborhood as having some fairly noisy people who disturb others (Table 13).

Yet such problems are not severe enough to cause most residents to want to move away. There is a minority of 1 in 5, however, that does feel there is so much trouble in the neighborhood that they would like to move away though one's sex or education does not appear to affect appreciably this desire to move. Roxbury residents are most likely to want to move--almost one in three express a desire to move because of trouble in the neighborhood. They clearly see

their neighborhood as less safe than do residents in any other area with 34 per cent of Roxbury adults seeing their neighborhood as less safe than most in Boston and 8 per cent seeing it as one of the worst. Somewhat surprisingly, perhaps, women do not appear to see their neighborhood as less safe than do men nor does education appear to have an appreciable effect on this judgement. Parenthetically, it should be remarked that the latter perceive the reality as it exists in terms of the police defined crime problem in Boston. See Table 14.

Though 1 in 4 adult respondents think that people living in their neighborhood have some trouble with the law, 44 per cent of all Fillmore residents see some of their neighbors that way. Despite the fact that they see their neighbors as having some trouble with the law, they are less willing to attribute the major crime problem in the neighborhood to them. Fourteen per cent of all residents see the crimes in the neighborhood as committed primarily by the people who live in the area with an additional 11 per cent seeing it about half due to outsiders. While Town Hall residents are more likely to see crime in the area committed by neighborhood residents than are the residents of the other areas; only about 1 in 4 residents see at least part of the crime problem as due to neighbors.

Alternatively, 41 per cent attribute the crime problem as due entirely to outsiders; more than half of all the residents see all or at least half of the problem due to outsiders (Table 14). This is most true for residents in Town Hall, Chicago. Again we observe some disjuncture between their assessment of reality and objective conditions. Only in the very literal sense of "next door" neighbors or those in one's block or building would the majority of crime in an area not be committed by persons who live close to one. A majority of offenders for a small area such as a census tract come from the immediate and adjacent census tracts. There are few outsiders who commit crimes in an area in the

sense that they are people who are altogether unfamiliar with the neighborhood and its residents.

The interesting question arises why there is this disjuncture between the objective conditions of a residential area and the perceptions residents have of living conditions and the crime problem in their area. Undoubtedly some of the disjuncture is more apparent to outsiders than real to insiders in the sense that judgements are relative to ones prior experiences and choices. A selective process goes on such that those who remain in these areas adapt to the conditions there, partly by altering their perceptions to reduce the dissonance created by their choices and partly because they make other investments. Correlatively, those who flee the inner city have less tolerance for the conditions for such areas. And indeed, though we lack information for those who left the area or for those resident in the outer reaches of the metropolitan area, there is some evidence in the reasons people give for choosing to live in these areas that they have a greater tolerance for the conditions there.

Perceptions of Law Enforcement

A resident population is highly dependent upon the public police for service in our society. Organizations may resort to a private police but only an occasional citizen can afford to do so. What is more, a democratic society such as ours institutionalizes in the law protection through a public police.

There is a high degree of ambivalence on the part of the public toward the police. Ambivalence is more likely to characterize dependency in a case. But perhaps it is more likely to do so for dependency upon the police for two main reasons. One reason is that Americans never have accepted in the English or European sense the full necessity and responsibility of the police for the public welfare. They fail to grant status honor to the police and are deeply

ambivalent about whether policing is congruent with democratic institutions. So deep seated is this ambivalence in many Americans, that one senses they have an uneasy 'truce' with the police to grant them as little power as necessary. But what power is necessary?

A second major reason why Americans are ambivalent stems from their more immediate experiences today. Many Americans today are upset by their experiences as victims of crime or at least by their perception that there is a 'crime problem' in the United States. They also perceive that the police are the main source of immediate protection against crime--their most obvious 'safeguard' so to speak. They see law enforcement and strengthening of it as the most obvious solution to the inconvenience, losses, and anxiety they experience from crime. They are in a kind of 'double bind'. They are sceptical, if not distrustful, of police power, yet they see police power as the most obvious solution to their problem. They respect the police function but are distrustful of them in some ways. They are sympathetic with them in the difficulty of their job but seem afraid to allow them discretion. They fear the police but they fear crime more. Although these phrases perhaps over-dramatize the ambivalence of many Americans perhaps, the data below draw attention to these themes.

Even though as noted above a majority of residents tend to perceive their neighborhoods as about average or safer than others in the city, a very substantial majority believe that there has been an increase in violent crime in their city. An absolute majority of 57 per cent (Table 26) think that there is very much more. A somewhat greater proportion of Boston than Chicago residents, whether Negro or white, see very much more crime in their city. White residents in both cities are somewhat more likely to see a very substantial increase in crime than are Negro residents, but the differences are small. Since Negroes more often are victims of crime than are whites--and indeed the probability

of victimization for Negroes is considerably greater-- obviously the objective probabilities are far from perfectly correlated with perceptions. It is possible of course that the absolute increase in crime for whites is greater, but there is no good evidence to support that contention. Only a very small proportion of all residents see a decrease in crime and but 11 per cent see little change.

The more education one has, the more likely one is to see a substantial increase in crime without respect to race. And men are somewhat more likely than women to regard the increase in crime as substantial.

The majority of citizens have not had to call the police about someone living in their neighborhood--though they may have called them for some other service or for some experience as the victim of a crime. Only 17 per cent of all persons say they have called the police about someone in the neighborhood since living there. See Table 15. There are almost no differences between Negroes and whites in the proportion saying they have called the police about someone in the neighborhood since living there, and there are no important differences by the sex or educational level of the respondent.

It should be apparent from an examination of Table 15 that there is an obvious memory factor, however, in reporting whether one has called the police, granted even a fairly high transiency rate in these neighborhoods. Most residents who reported calling the police said they called within the past six months. See Table 15. Given the obvious effects of recall in this case, these are clearly very minimal estimates. Yet they do indicate that almost 1 in every 5 households have an adult who said they called the police about someone in the neighborhood since living there-- indeed 1 in every 10 has done so within the last six months.

On the whole, residents of Boston and Chicago see the police as doing a good job, but it is evident that whites are more satisfied with the job that the police are doing than are Negroes in both cities. See Table 16. Although 29

Table 15: Per Cent Distributions For Respondent's Having to Call the Police About Someone in their Neighborhood. Districts in Boston and Chicago.

City and Police District	Has Called Police Since Living Here	Last Time Police Were Called Since Living Here:								Never Called Police	Per Cent Total
		Since July 1	April-June 1966	Jan.-March 1966	July-Dec. 1965	Jan.-July 1965	1964	1962-1963	Before 1962		
All Districts	17	7	5	1	2	1	1	1	*	.82	100
Boston:											
Dorchester	18	9	3	1	2	2	1	1	--	81	101
Roxbury	19	6	7	--	2	1	--	2	1	82	100
Chicago:											
Town Hall	17	6	2	--	2	2	4	--	--	83	99
Fillmore	15	6	6	1	1	--	1	--	--	85	100

*0.5 per cent, or less.

Table 16: Per Cent Distribution of Evaluation Respondent Makes of the Kind of Job the Police are Doing in His Neighborhood: Four Police Districts in Boston and Chicago.

City and Police District	Kind of job police are doing:				Per Cent Total	Do the police get along better, worse, or about the same with the people who live here as they do with people in other neighborhoods?			Per Cent Total
	Very Good	Fairly Good	Not Too Good	Can't Say		Better	About the Same	Worse	
All Districts	29	41	20	10	100	25	67	8	100
Boston:									
Dorchester	47	33	11	9	100	31	63	6	99
Roxbury	17	41	35	7	100	13	70	17	100
Chicago:									
Town Hall	36	46	15	3	99	41	54	5	100
Fillmore	18	47	18	17	100	18	78	4	100

per cent of all respondents thought the police were doing a very good job, twice as many whites as Negroes in Chicago thought they were doing a very good job and more than two and one-half times as many whites as Negroes in Boston thought they were doing a very good job. Less than 1 in 5 Negroes in either city see the police as doing a very good job. Almost one-half of both whites and Negroes in Chicago think that the police are doing a fairly good job, however. And while Negroes in Boston rate the police as doing a fairly good job more than do whites, three times as many Negroes in Boston as whites see the police as doing 'not too good' a job (over one-third of the Negroes in Roxbury are clearly dissatisfied with the police).

When residents were asked whether they thought the police get along better, worse, or about the same with the people who live in their neighborhood as compared with people in other neighborhoods, 1 in 4 thought they get along better. But clearly whites are far more likely to share this perspective than are Negroes. About two and one-half times as many whites as Negroes think the police do a better job in their neighborhood than elsewhere in the city. Nonetheless, Negroes in Chicago's Fillmore as compared with whites in Town Hall, did not rate the police as doing a worse job in their neighborhood than in other neighborhoods and they were but a minority of 5 per cent. The Negroes in Boston, however were almost three times as likely to say that the police did a worse job in their neighborhood than did the whites in Dorchester. See Table 16.

Neither one's sex nor educational level exercises much influence on one's perceptions of the kind of job the police are doing in the neighborhood and of how the police get along with people in their neighborhood as compared with people in other neighborhoods.

Residents do not on the whole perceive the police as operating with universalistic standards of justice however.

They see them as exercising differential treatment depending upon 'who you are'. Table 17 shows that 42 per cent of all adult residents believe that how police treat you depends upon who you are and 16 say that sometimes this is true. There are no very marked differences by the race of the respondent with Negroes only slightly more likely to affirm that the police engage in the differential application of justice. It is nonetheless true that whites are more likely than Negroes to affirm that police officers are universalistic in their application of norms. Perceptions of treatment are relatively uninfluenced by the sex or educational level of respondents.

Whenever a respondent believed that how the police treat you depends upon who you are, he was asked what sort of people he believed are well treated by the police and what sort are treated not so well. Eighteen per cent of all respondents believed that members of some race or ethnic group are treated poorly by the police and 12 per cent regard members of some deviant status or behavior such as drunks, bums, or criminal suspects, or persons who are disrespectful or resistant to police authority as poorly treated by the police. Yet 43 per cent see some groups as being treated well by the police. Were one to weigh their responses in a balance of differential treatment, it seems clear that more people see the police as applying differential justice by exempting persons or treating them 'better' than by the more punitive application of justice or treating them 'poorly'. See Table 17.

When persons of deviant status or behavior are seen as targets of poor treatment (by 4 per cent of the respondents,) the most frequently mentioned are drunks and bums with a minority mentioning prostitutes, homosexuals, or beatniks. Two per cent mention criminal suspects as receiving poor treatment from the police. An equal proportion--six per cent--mention deviant behavior with respect to police expectations as mention deviant behavior with respect to social

Table 17: Respondent's Perceptions of How Police Treat People: Four Police Districts in Boston and Chicago.

City and Police District	Does how police treat you depend on who you are?				Per Cent Total	Race-ethnic groups seen as targets of poor treatment:						Per Cent Total
	Yes	Sometimes	No	Can't Say		No Mention	Negroes Only	Negroes and Other	Spanish Speaking	All Other	No Answer	
All Districts	42	16	36	6	100	79	14	2	*	2	3	100
Boston:												
Dorchester	42	13	40	5	100	85	7	2	--	2	4	100
Roxbury	46	14	34	6	100	75	20	3	1	--	1	100
Chicago:												
Town Hall	33	17	48	2	100	84	2	2	--	10	2	100
Fillmore	39	24	28	9	100	74	20	1	1	1	3	100

*0.5 per cent, or less.

(CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)

288-361 0-57-15

Table 17: Respondent's Perceptions of How Police Treat People: Four Police Districts in Boston and Chicago. (Continued)

City and Police District	Deviant Groups Seen As Targets of Poor Treatment:				Per Cent Total	Groups Seen As Treated Well by The Police:					Per Cent Total
	No Deviant Mentioned	Drunks, Bums, Deviants	Criminals, Suspects	Disrespectful or Resistant to Authority		No Mention of Well Treated	Rich and Respectable	Whites	Negroes	No Answer	
All Districts	88	4	2	6	100	53	35	8	--	4	100
Boston:											
Dorchester	90	4	2	4	100	41	50	5	--	4	100
Roxbury	87	7	2	4	100	47	45	6	--	2	100
Chicago:											
Town Hall	88	5	2	5	100	67	26	--	--	7	100
Fillmore	88	2	--	10	100	56	22	17	--	5	100

(CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)

Table 17: Respondent's Perceptions of How Police Treat People: Four Police Districts in Boston and Chicago. (Continued)

City and Police District	How police treat people suspected of breaking the law:						Per Cent Total	How many police do you think there are in Boston/Chicago who just enjoy pushing people around or giving them a hard time?					Per Cent Total
	Too Lenient	About Right	Harsh Only If Need To	Both Lenient and Harsh	Too Harsh	Can't Say		Many	Quite A Few	Small Number	None	Can't Say	
All Districts	8	25	4	5	6	53	100	7	18	51	7	17	100
Boston:													
Dorchester	8	26	5	5	2	55	101	--	10	66	10	15	101
Roxbury	6	18	4	7	11	54	100	9	25	42	4	20	100
Chicago:													
Town Hall	17	31	5	7	10	30	100	8	13	64	8	7	100
Fillmore	7	28	1	4	6	54	100	11	25	33	5	25	99

norms that confer a deviant status. At least six per cent of the population seems correctly aware of the fact that any resistance to police authority or a lack of respect for it in any form is likely to result in differential treatment by the police. Both the survey of police officer attitudes and observation of police behavior in transactions with citizens confirm the fact that the police behave differentially toward persons who show disrespect for, or who resist their authority.

Social class more than race orientations account for perceptions of groups seen as treated better by the police. Thirty five per cent of all residents interviewed saw the rich and respectable as treated better by the police while only 8 per cent mentioned whites. Although there are some differences by race of respondent, Negroes, particularly in Roxbury, are almost as likely as whites to see the rich and respectable treated better. See Table 17. There is a marked city difference with Chicago citizens only half as likely to see differential treatment for the rich and respectable as do Boston citizens. This probably represents a real difference between the police forces of the two cities.

Among those who see ethnic or race groups as the targets of differential treatment by the police, Negroes select Negroes as targets. At least 1 in every 5 Negroes believes that Negroes are treated differently by the police when they are given an unstructured probe for determining what groups they think are treated poorly by the police. In Chicago's Town Hall District, nevertheless, there is a substantial minority of Puerto Ricans who regard themselves as being treated differentially by police officers. See Table 17. Since no other minority group that currently is reputed to receive differential treatment from the police was represented in the districts selected for study, it probably accounts for why they are not mentioned. It

probably is true that members of any low status minority group in American cities perceive themselves as the object of differential treatment by the police.

All residents were specifically asked whether they think that being a Negro makes a difference in how one is treated by the police. (Table 18). The proportion who agree that is so was 38 per cent of all residents (as compared with the 16 per cent who mentioned Negroes in response to the unstructured question). The proportion of those who agree includes some who believe they receive more rather than less equitable treatment as Table 18 also shows. Even this proportion agreeing that Negroes get differential treatment is only somewhat above that of those who mention the rich and respectable as receiving better treatment, and there is reason to believe that a specific question about the rich and respectable receiving better treatment would increase that proportion who agree.

Not unexpectedly Negroes are more likely to agree than are whites that being a Negro makes a difference in how one is treated by the police. What is surprising is that while almost the same proportion of Negroes in Roxbury (46 per cent) and in Fillmore (44 per cent) believe that being a Negro makes a difference in how one is treated, 33 per cent of the whites in Dorchester as compared with only 14 per cent of the whites in Town Hall believe that it makes a difference. Whether this is due to the fact that Roxbury and Dorchester are adjacent communities and therefore residents have a better opportunity to observe differences in treatment, or whether the reality is of a different order in the two cities cannot be ascertained from this investigation.

Respondents who believed that it makes a difference were asked how they thought it makes a difference (Table 18). About 1 in 5 believe that Negroes get more equitable treatment but this is largely accounted for by the fact that whites in Dorchester, Boston hold that belief. Only

Table 18: Per Cent Distribution of Perceptions of Whether Being A Negro Makes A Difference in How One is Treated by the Police in Two Districts of Boston and Chicago.

City and Police District	Does being a Negro make a difference?			Per Cent Total	In what ways does it make a difference?					Per Cent Total
	Yes	No	Can't Say		Equitable Treatment	Unjust Treatment	Both	Makes No Difference	Can't Say	
All Districts	38	52	10	100	4	22	2	64	8	100
Boston:										
Dorchester	33	58	9	100	9	17	3	67	4	100
Roxbury	46	43	11	100	2	29	2	57	11	101
Chicago:										
Town Hall	14	76	10	100	2	10	2	86	--	100
Fillmore	44	43	13	100	2	26	1	60	11	100

(CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)

Table 18: Per Cent Distribution of Perceptions of Whether Being A Negro Makes A Difference in How One is Treated by the Police in Two Districts of Boston and Chicago. (Continued)

City and Police District	What have you personally seen that affected your ideas?					Per Cent Total
	Rudeness, Impolite	Treated Unfairly In Arrest, Suspicion	Physical Mistreatment	Heard of Bad Only	Makes No Difference	
All Districts	2	5	5	18	70	100
Boston:						
Dorchester	1	4	1	18	76	100
Roxbury	2	7	9	21	61	100
Chicago:						
Town Hall	--	2	--	7	91	100
Fillmore	4	6	6	20	64	100

2 per cent of all other whites and of Negroes believe the Negro is getting more equitable treatment; a very small percentage believe that some Negroes get more equitable treatment while for others it is more unjust. Roughly 1 in 5 persons believe that the Negro gets more unjust treatment but the differences between Negroes and whites who hold this belief is not as great as some might expect (See Table 18). There is a substantial minority of whites in Dorchester (17 per cent) and of whites in Town Hall (10 per cent) who believe that the Negro gets poorer treatment.

Respondents were asked whether they had any evidence of mistreatment of Negroes, particularly whether they had seen any such mistreatment or simply heard of it. (Table 18). Five per cent say they have seen Negroes physically mistreated; an additional 5 per cent say they have witnessed other unfair treatment in arrest or being held on suspicion charges; and, 2 per cent mention rudeness or impoliteness. Of those who report seeing bad treatment, it was not expected that the bulk of reports of mistreatment would focus on forms of 'justice' other than manners (rude or impolite). The reason for this should be clear to the reader who has examined the study of police-citizen transactions. "Bad" manners or forms of etiquette are far more common in police handling of citizens than are other forms of differential treatment by the police. Is it possible that at least some citizens have come to regard 'police' etiquette as different from 'civil' etiquette?

That 1 in 10 respondents report seeing Negroes treated unfairly is substantial. Much of the reporting is by Negroes with only 2 per cent of Town Hall whites in Chicago reporting seeing unfair treatment (although 6 per cent of Dorchester whites report seeing unfair treatment).

The city differences are apparent in hearsay reports of bad treatment as well (Table 18). Roughly 1 in 5 whites

and Negroes in Boston report they have heard of bad treatment of Negroes while only 7 per cent of the whites in Chicago as compared with 20 per cent of the Negroes report such hearsay evidence. In fact, about 9 of every 10 whites in Chicago's Town Hall believe that race makes no difference in how you are treated by the police while Negroes in Boston and Chicago are fairly in agreement; at least a third of both groups believe that it does make a difference. Nonetheless it may not be anticipated by some readers that two-thirds of all Negroes when defining how and in what ways being a Negro makes a difference in how he is treated by the police do not maintain that race makes a difference.

There is much controversy about how citizens view the police as treating persons who are suspected of breaking the law. As Table 17 makes clear, a very substantial proportion of citizens do not feel they know enough to make a judgement; 53 per cent of all citizens said they could not make a judgement. About 1 in 4 citizens believe the police treat suspects 'about right' with almost no differences among Negroes and whites in Chicago in this perception but with Boston Negroes somewhat less likely than Boston whites to believe that the police treatment is 'about right'. A minority of 8 per cent believes that police treatment of suspects is too lenient; only whites in Town Hall, Chicago are more likely to hold that view than the citizens in the other communities. There is an additional minority of 5 per cent that holds the police are both too lenient and too harsh with suspects so that all in all about 13 per cent say that the police at times are too lenient. By contrast, at least 18 per cent say the police are at times too harsh with suspects if one includes those who see them as 'usually too harsh,' those who regard them as 'harsh only if they need to' and those who see them as 'both lenient and harsh'. On balance then there are somewhat more citizens who regard the police as 'too harsh' rather than 'too lenient' with

suspects. The differences between Negroes and whites differ by city. Whites in Chicago believe that the police are both too lenient and too harsh (including all categories in Table 17) while in Boston, Negroes are about twice as likely (22 per cent) as whites (12 per cent) to believe the police are too harsh though they differ little in their perceptions of leniency on the part of the police in dealing with suspects.

Most citizens do not believe that most police officers 'enjoy pushing people around' or 'giving them a hard time'. See Table 17. Only from 8 to 11 per cent of the white citizens in Chicago and of Negro citizens in Boston believe there are many officers who behave that way. Nonetheless 1 in 4 Negroes in both Boston and Chicago believe there are quite a few who behave that way and 1 in 10 white citizens agree with them.

Only a minority of citizens (7 per cent) believe that no police officers enjoy pushing people around or giving them a hard time--a professional ideal. But about half of all respondents do think it is only a small number of officers who behave 'unprofessionally'. Whites are more likely than Negroes to believe that it is only a small number of officers or that no police officer enjoys pushing people around, yet more Negroes than whites do not express an opinion.

Throughout these comparisons of how citizens regard the conduct of the police with citizens, when race and sex of citizens are controlled, educational level does not appear to influence perception of police conduct. Nonetheless both sex and education appear to have some influence on perceptions. The following example illustrates the nature of that effect.

Returning to the question of respondent perceptions of whether being a Negro makes a difference in how he is treated by the police, the percent of respondents who said

yes by their race and sex is as given below:

Sex of Respondent	Race of Respondent		Total Per Cent Yes
	Negro	White	
Male	57	38	48
Female	44	29	36
Total	50	33	41

It is clear there is both a race and a sex difference in perceptions about whether being a Negro makes a difference in how one is treated by police. Negroes are more likely than whites to think that it makes a difference and males more than females. More importantly, however, the Negro male is most likely to believe that it makes a difference while the white female is least likely to believe that it makes a difference.

Now these differences are remarkably close to experiences as offenders and as victims by race and sex and in turn the likelihood that one will have contact with the police. One might also guess that it fits a model of the likelihood of differential treatment by the police with the Negro male most likely to be treated unjustly and the white female least likely.

The effect of education is less clear as the following example for the same class of perceptions illustrates:

Education of Respondent	Race of Respondent		Total
	Negro	White	
Less than H.S.	49	22	39
High School	56	34	44
Some College	40	46	44
Total	50	33	41

The effect of education is very apparent for white citizens. The more education one has, the more likely one is to believe that being a Negro makes a difference in how one is treated by the police. Not so for Negroes. What is unexpected is to find that Negroes with at least some college education do not believe that being a Negro makes a difference in how one is treated by the police.

To understand why education might not show the expected effect, it must be remembered that the survey questioned respondents in high crime rate Negro and white areas respectively. The white areas have proportionally more educated middle and upper middle class respondents in them than when compared with the Negro areas. Possibly one has a more selected sample of Negroes with 'some college' than of whites; there may be disproportionately fewer who have completed a college degree program in the sample of Negroes than of whites. Other interpretations are possible, however, including some that might argue there are factors influencing educated Negro respondents to perceive the situation different from less educated Negroes.

Regardless of how one interprets the effect of education on this opinion, it is evident that education in and of itself does not have such a pervasive effect that it operates independently of other factors.

There is considerable evidence that focal concerns of police culture are the twinned symbols of respect and deference from the public and prestige for their role in society. Lacking status honor for their occupation, they seek prestige. Engaged in what they often define as unpopular work where authority must be sustained, they seek to command respect. The survey of police attitudes reported in this volume indicates these are focal concerns and that a sizeable segment of the police do not believe they are given the proper amount of deference or respect. The observational study of police-citizen transactions also

reported in this volume likewise shows that failure to grant deference and respect to the police leads to less civil treatment by the police.

Earlier it was noted that the public in a broad sense has ambivalent attitudes toward the police. A substantial segment of the public is favorably disposed toward the police, yet they show some deep ambivalence toward them. Though the data are not as readily available, it might also be said that the police are deeply ambivalent toward the public. The police occupational culture tends to set the officer apart from the public and to characterize the public in relatively unfavorable terms. To a degree the public that is regularly policed provides more problems for them. At the same time the police engage, in day to day relations with people in their territory that they find satisfying. Such differences in contact contributes to feelings of ambivalence on their part.

How accurate are the police in their perceptions about the public's view of respect for them? All adult residents were asked, "Considering everything about the way that the police do their job, would you say that you had great respect for them, mixed feelings, or little or no respect for them?" A slight majority say that they have great respect for the police, though more white than Negro respondents report great respect for the police. See Table 19. Yet what is equally striking is that a substantial minority acknowledge their ambivalent feelings toward the police by saying they have mixed feelings about them. Negroes are more likely than whites to report mixed feelings.

Only a minority of 7 per cent of all citizens say they have little or no respect for the police, although 1 in 10 Negroes in both Boston and Chicago say they have little or no respect for the police (see Table 19). Such a minority, if they come into frequent encounters with the police may well contribute to the police officer's image

Table 19: Per Cent Distributions of Residents Respect for the Police and Prestige Given Them for Residents in Four Police Districts in Boston and Chicago.

City and Police District	Considering everything about the way police do their job, would you say that you had:				Per Cent Total	If a young man had a choice between being a policeman and a job paying as much in the construction business, would he make a mistake if he became a policeman?			Per Cent Total	Some people say you would have to replace half the police now on the force to get a really good police force here:		Per Cent Total
	Great Respect for Police	Mixed Feelings About Them	Little or No Respect for Them	Can't Say		Yes	Depends	No		Agrees	Dis-agrees	
All Districts	54	37	7	2	100	26	6	68	33	67	100	
Boston:												
Dorchester	59	37	3	1	100	29	7	64	26	74	100	
Roxbury	43	43	10	4	100	22	7	71	45	55	100	
Chicago:												
Town Hall	72	21	7	--	100	20	2	78	26	74	100	
Fillmore	53	35	10	2	100	30	8	62	34	66	100	

of disrespect from the public.

The city differences are worth noting. Citizens of Chicago are more likely to say that they have great respect for the police than are citizens of Boston. This is true for comparison of both Negro and white citizen groups in the two cities.

About one of every four citizens believes that public opinion of the police has changed in the past five years. Among those who regard it as changing, the large majority (63 per cent) believe that the public has changed in a more negative fashion. Here is an example of pluralistic ignorance since a sizeable minority of these respondents did not report themselves as holding particularly negative feelings toward the police. Their perceptions of change in public opinion may be formed more by media reports of dissatisfaction with the police or by other forums of opinion than by their own views.

Among those who say public opinion toward the police as changing in the past five years, there is a substantial difference in the perception of Negroes and whites as the distribution below shows:

Perceived Change in Public Opinion Toward Police	Race and Sex of Respondent				Total Per Cent
	Negro		White		
	Male	Female	Male	Female	
Favorable	29	32	45	33	35
Mixed	--	--	7	2	2
Unfavorable	71	68	48	65	63
Total	100	100	100	100	100

Among Negroes, there is almost no difference between men and women in their perception of change in public opinion toward the police but white women were much more likely than white

men to see opinion as changing in an unfavorable direction.

Education does not appear to have a consistent relationship to perceived change in opinion toward the police for both Negroes and whites. Among whites, the college educated were more likely than those without a college education to see the change as favorable but among Negroes those with less than a high school education were most likely to see opinion as changing favorably.

Apart from a judgement about the police as the agents of law enforcement, the public views other aspects of the police, particularly the prestige of the job and how well police officers do their job. Some mention has already been made of these aspects of public evaluation of the police. An attempt was made, however, to get an assessment of public opinion of the prestige of the police occupation by having them make a choice between police work and a job in the construction business paying as much money. They were asked if a young man would make a mistake if he became a policeman rather than taking a job in the construction business paying as much money; 68 per cent felt the young man would not be making a mistake and 6 per cent felt it depended on factors related to the two jobs. Yet 1 in 4 citizens believe that he would be making a mistake, suggesting at least that they assess police work as having less opportunity and perhaps prestige as well. There are no differences by race, though there are by precinct in the cities (see Table 19).

To assess how well they thought the average police officer was doing his job, citizens were told: "Some people say you would have to replace half of the police now on the force to get a really good police force here." They then were asked whether they agreed with that assessment of the police or not. As Table 19 shows, a third of all citizens agreed with the statement, indicating that they do not have a high degree of confidence in the average police officer of

their city. Negroes showed less confidence than did whites. A fourth of the whites in both cities agreed that they thought at least half of the officers would have to be replaced, but 45 per cent of the Negroes in Roxbury, Boston held that view and a third of the Negroes in Chicago's Fillmore district held that view.

The Chicago, Fillmore district was the scene of riots during the study and there was objective evidence of discontent with the police among a substantial segment of the Fillmore residents during the riots. It may well be that there is a similarly high potential for riot in Roxbury given this rather substantial degree of lack of confidence in the Boston police. Indeed to an extent this question serves as a measure of hostility toward the police.

Public Acquaintance and Contact with the Police.

There are few social roles in the society where contact with the public is as pervasive as it is with the police. Public roles are most likely to generate frequent or pervasive role contacts. Many parents and all children come into contact with the public school teacher. Perhaps next to the school teacher, a substantial proportion of citizens at one time or another have some contact with a police officer.

Such contacts with police officers are by no means always contacts with him in his official role as an officer, however. Contacts with the police in their official role were measured in a number of ways in this study. Table 15 shows that 17 per cent of all citizens called the police about someone in their neighborhood since they moved there; there was no differences by race of resident. Another measure of official contact with the police was to ask them when was the last time they talked with a policeman about something official, like getting a ticket or reporting something that was wrong (see Table 21). Only 30 per cent of all residents said they had never talked with a policeman about something official. Six per cent said they had

Table 20: Per Cent Distribution of Kind of Personal Relationships Residents Have With Police Officers for Residents in Four Police Districts of Boston and Chicago.

City and Police District	Kind of Personal Relationship With Police Officers:										Per Cent Total
	Knows No Officers	Friend on Force	Relative on Force	Both Friends and Relatives	Knows Name of Officer on Force	Knows Name of Officer Not on Force	Says Hello to Officer on Force	Says Hello to Officer Not on Force	No Answer		
All Districts	45	17	6	3	14	2	10	2	2	2	101
Boston:											
Dorchester Roxbury	28 48	22 14	11 2	7 1	15 18	1 2	12 9	1 2	3 3	3 3	100 99
Chicago:											
Town Hall Fillmore	52 60	7 18	7 2	2 --	10 11	2 1	17 7	2 2	-- --	-- --	99 101

(CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)

Table 20: Per Cent Distribution of Kind of Personal Relationships Residents Have With Police Officers for Residents in Four Police Districts of Boston and Chicago. (Continued)

City and Police District	Last social contact with a policeman:						Per Cent Total	Was social or official contact with policeman most recent?				Per Cent Total
	Within Past Week	Week To A Month Ago	Month to Year Ago	More Than A Year Ago	Never	Can't Say		No Contact	Social Most Recent	Official Most Recent	Can't Remember	
All Districts	22	12	18	16	31	1	100	15	50	34	2	101
Boston:												
Dorchester	33	15	22	15	14	1	100	7	66	37	--	100
Roxbury	18	9	21	12	36	4	100	21	48	27	4	100
Chicago:												
Town Hall	21	17	19	11	32	--	100	9	40	49	2	100
Fillmore	13	7	9	25	45	1	100	19	35	44	2	100

-60-

Table 21: Per Cent Distributions for Kind of Official Relationships Residents Have With Police Officers for Residents in Four Police Districts in Boston and Chicago.

City and Police District	Last official contact with a policeman:						Per Cent Total	How contact was made:				Per Cent Total
	Within Past Week	Week to Month Ago	Month to Year Ago	More Than A Year Ago	Never	Don't Remember		Phone	In Person	Both	No Official Contact	
All Districts	6	9	26	28	30	1	100	16	45	8	30	99
Boston:												
Dorchester	8	9	23	30	29	1	100	17	44	10	29	100
Roxbury	4	8	26	26	33	3	100	14	45	5	33	97
Chicago:												
Town Hall	8	13	19	32	28	--	100	15	48	9	28	100
Fillmore	4	7	34	27	28	--	100	17	45	10	28	100

=61=

(CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)

Table 21: Per Cent Distributions for Kind of Official Relationships Residents Have With Police Officers for Residents in Four Police Districts in Boston and Chicago. (Continued)

City and Police District	Reason For Official Contact With A Policeman:										Per Cent Total
	No Official Contact	Crime Against Person	Crime Against Property	Civil Complaint	Domestic Disturbance	Other Disturbance, Nuisance	Request for Police Service	Traffic	All Other	Can't Remember	
All Districts	30	10	18	1	2	7	8	17	3	4	100
Boston:											
Dorchester Roxbury	29 33	5 12	19 20	3 1	2 3	9 5	16 5	11 13	4 2	2 5	100 99
Chicago:											
Town Hall Fillmore	28 28	11 12	17 13	-- --	2 2	6 7	9 3	21 26	4 3	2 6	100 100

done so within the past week, 9 per cent more than a week ago but less than a month ago and 26 per cent more than a month but less than a year ago. Overall 41 per cent of the residents interviewed claimed they had some official contact with a police officer during the past year.

There was not much variation by police precinct in the proportion claiming some official contact with the police during the past year (Table 21). It was somewhat higher (45 per cent) than the average for Negroes in Chicago's Fillmore and somewhat below for Negroes in Boston's Roxbury.

Over one-half of the citizens said they had their last official contact with a police officer in person; 45 per cent made only personal contact and 8 per cent by phone and personal contact. An additional 16 per cent made contact by phone. There are almost no differences by race (or precinct) in the way contact was made with the police in an official role. Table 21.

Most citizens made their official contact with the police in the role of complainant; 28 per cent of all citizens mobilized them for criminal matters--10 per cent for crimes against their person and 18 per cent for crimes against their property. Disturbances accounted for an additional 9 per cent; mobilization for civil complaints, 1 per cent; and, for other police service, 8 per cent. In all then 37 per cent of the citizens were in the role of complainant when they had an official contact with the police and 10 per cent made requests for police service. For an additional 17 per cent of official encounters traffic offenses served as the basis for contact. There are only small differences between Negroes and whites in the proportion mobilizing the police for crimes against property but Negroes were more likely than whites in Boston to mobilize the police for crimes against the person. Correlatively whites in Boston were more likely to request police service.

All in all then official contact with the police for these citizens is more likely to involve criminal than traffic matters. Furthermore, citizens were as likely to mobilize the police for disturbances and noncriminal matters as they were to be involved with them in traffic encounters.

Within the sample, somewhat more than two-thirds have had official contact with the police so far as they can remember and roughly the same proportion have had some social contact with a police officer. Compare Tables 20 and 21.

As compared with the 41 per cent of residents who said they had some official contact with a police officer during the past year, 52 per cent claimed they met an officer in some nonofficial or social contact during the past year (see below and Tables 20 and 21). There are very substantial differences

City and Police District	Per Cent Official Contact in Past Year	Per Cent Social Contact in Past Year	Per Cent Without Social or Official Contact
All Districts	41	52	15
Boston: Dorchester	40	70	7
Roxbury	38	48	21
Chicago: Town Hall	40	57	9
Fillmore	45	29	19

in the percent of citizens claiming social contact with a police officer, however. Negroes were less likely than whites in both cities to say they had some social contact with an officer in the past year. Only 29 per cent of the Negroes in Chicago's Fillmore said they had a nonofficial contact with police officers as compared with 45 per cent

who said they had an official one. In all other districts nonofficial contacts exceeded official contacts.

The ratio of official to nonofficial contacts is a crude measure of the relationship of a police department to a community. Presumably the police-community relations programs want to increase the ratio of nonofficial to official contacts with the police.

There may be special factors accounting for differences in nonofficial contacts with the police. Some of the differences relate to the kind of patrol the police do. Foot patrol may increase such contacts over mobile patrol. There is somewhat more foot patrol in Boston than in Chicago, but the differences due to this would be small. Boston officers, however, spent more time out of their car in nonofficial contacts than do Chicago officers and this is more likely to account for some of the difference.

Where an officer lives also influences nonofficial contact between the public and the police. The high rate for Boston's Dorchester undoubtedly is accounted for in part by the fact that a fair number of the Boston officers live in Dorchester; this is perhaps somewhat more true for the "Irish" than other ethnic officers in the department.

There is some confirmation for these speculations in Table 20. The precincts are ranked in social contacts just about as they are in terms of per cent who claim they know an officer. Sixty nine per cent of the citizens in Dorchester make some claim to knowing a police officer as do 48 per cent in Chicago's Town Hall, 49 per cent in Boston's Roxbury but only 40 per cent in Chicago's Fillmore. If one considers friends and relatives on the force as a measure of more intimate social contacts, the following proportions obtain: Dorchester, 40 per cent; Fillmore, 20 per cent; Roxbury 17 per cent; Town Hall, 16 per cent. From this measure, the substantially larger proportion of friends or relatives on the force in Dorchester might account for

much of the considerably higher proportion of social contacts in Dorchester. Indeed, 18 per cent of Dorchester's residents claim to have a relative on the force and 29 per cent claim to have a friend on the force (Table 20).

Some differences in social contact of citizens and officers among the precincts undoubtedly is accounted for by casual social encounters with the police. This is apparent in that Town Hall residents in Chicago are more than twice as likely as Fillmore residents to say they know an officer on the force to whom they "say hello".

Some further evidence for differences in social contact opportunities and experiences among the precincts is provided by an answer to the question: "Which contact--the social or the official one--was most recent?" There were 15 per cent of all residents who said they had neither an official or a social contact with the police. About 1 in 5 Negroes in both cities said they had no contact with the police but it was less than 1 in 10 for whites in both cities. Quite clearly the probability that a citizen will meet a police officer in some encounter during a year is quite high. Yet the probability that a Negro resident will have some encounter is less than the probability that a white resident will have one.

Table 20 provides information whether the social or the official contact was most recent. In interpreting the data in the table it should be kept in mind that if a citizen had only one or the other kind of contact then that contact is considered the most recent. Somewhat surprisingly Boston residents were more likely than Chicago residents to report their social contact as more recent. This was expected for Dorchester, Boston where the per cent of social contacts was so high

There are then differences among the precincts in the kind of social contacts one makes with police officers. Dorchester clearly seems to maximize opportunities for more social contacts with police officers as relatives and friends. Town Hall seems to provide more opportunities for casual encounters.

Citizen Cooperation and Mobilization of the Police

There is considerable question about the willingness of citizens to mobilize the police and to cooperate with them in investigation or in the reporting of crimes. In the first section of this volume, it was noted that there is considerable crime where the citizen is a victim and yet they say they did not report it to the police. The most frequent reason they give for not reporting a crime to the police is that they believe it is useless or futile to do so. At least half of the victims who failed to report a victim experience to the police gave this reason. They regard the experience either as so minor that the police shouldn't be bothered with it or that they believe the police wouldn't want to be bothered with it. They can't see that the police could do anything about it in any case. Their attitude is in this sense quite realistic--many of these events could not be 'solved' by police investigation even were the resources to be allocated to doing so, itself a highly unlikely event, given limited police resources for investigation.

A second main reason given by respondents is that it is too troublesome to report the event. They give as reasons that it takes too much of their time, that they do not want to be bothered with being a complainant in court, and similar instances of not wanting to take the time. Most of these events apparently are regarded as minor in the sense that they are 'not worth the time'.

There is little evidence that citizens fail to report crimes to the police because they hold some negative expectation about what the police will do if they report it. In short, they do not seem to fail to report because they believe that the police are 'against them'.

Residents also were asked whether they ever had seen or witnessed an event that looked like it might be a crime that they did not report to the police. Only 1 per cent

of all residents said they had seen such an event and not reported it. Considering the main reasons they give for not reporting it, we find a pattern similar to that for not reporting their own experiences.

All residents also were told: "A number of people don't call the police when they see someone commit a crime." They then were asked: "What do you think are some of the main reasons why people don't call the police in such cases?"

The two major reasons given by residents why they think people don't call the police in such cases are that people don't want to be bothered by taking the time or by getting involved, given by 44 per cent of all residents, and that people have some reason for not reporting it, such as protecting the offender, fear of reprisal, or that it is none of their business, given also by 44 per cent of all residents. One-half of all residents then reply in terms that suggest either the citizen is disengaged from it or that he is so engaged in it that he can't afford to get involved by reporting it. Only one per cent said they thought it was that such citizens would feel it was useless, and 2 per cent said they thought people were unaware of how to report it. Eight per cent did say that they thought citizens might not want to report it because they felt the police wouldn't do anything about it or that they might not come when called. Few mentioned that they felt such persons feared trouble from the police if they were to report it.

Overall, then, most citizens do not regard the failure of other citizens to mobilize the police as a matter of their having a negative evaluation of how the police will respond to them. Indeed both their own behavior in calling the police with reasonable frequency and the reasons they give why they, themselves do not, call the police suggest that they regard citizens themselves, as the main source of nonreporting.

Quite clearly citizens do not always feel the obligation to call the police to report a crime. Though the evidence cannot be mobilized from the survey in any manner of proof, there does seem to be reason to believe that citizens do not call the police unless they regard a matter as something where they were seriously wronged or they are personally affronted, or where they have something personally to gain from it, such as gain from an insurance claim. But any gain has to be worth the effort of calling the police and 'getting involved'. Apart from such motivations to call the police citizens are inclined to disengage themselves from any responsibility to call the police.

Citizen Perceptions of Officer Misconduct

Citizen perceptions of officer misconduct is shaped both by their experiences in transactions with them and by their sharing in a forum of public opinion. Earlier the perceptions citizens have of how officers behave improperly in their judgment toward persons who have broken the law, and how they believe officers apply differential standards of justice toward various groups or persons was discussed. Here we turn to some perceptions citizens have of various kinds of personal misconduct by police officers. For some of these forms of misconduct there is a simple report of hearsay but for most part they were asked about what they saw or experienced. The survey could not determine the validity of either fact or opinion.

An unexpectedly large proportion of the citizens reported that they think the police in their district takes bribes and payoffs--38 per cent in Table 22. Negroes in both cities reported the police take bribes and payoffs more than did whites. Indeed one-half of the citizens in Chicago's Fillmore think the police take bribes and payoffs. For those who believe it was true, they were asked whether 'most' or

Table 22: Per Cent Distribution of Resident Perceptions of Whether Police Take Bribes and Payoffs for Four Police Districts in Boston and Chicago.

City and Police District	Do you think the police in this district take bribes and payoffs?			Per Cent Total	If R believes they take bribes or payoffs, is it true for:			Per Cent Total
	Yes	No	Can't Say		Most	Some		
All Districts	38	27	35	100	32	68	100	
Boston:								
Dorchester	32	40	28	100	33	67	100	
Roxbury	41	19	40	100	42	58	100	
Chicago:								
Town Hall	35	18	47	100	22	78	100	
Fillmore	50	30	20	100	25	75	100	

just 'some' officers took bribes and payoffs. A third of all adult citizens who believe the police take bribes and payoffs believe that most officers will take them. However, citizens in Chicago--both Negro and white--who believe officers take bribes and payoffs were less likely to say that most take them than were citizens in Boston.

Were the reality of police conduct to accord with citizen beliefs in these areas, then one would be forced to conclude that there is considerable police-public collusion in these districts. This is not to say that most citizens engage in such conduct with most police officers. But a substantial proportion of citizens do believe that some police officers are in collusion with some citizens, and a surprising minority believes that this is true for most police officers in their district.

Almost a third of the adult residents report they have seen a police officer do something they felt was wrong and an additional 17 per cent say they have been told by someone about something a police officer did that was wrong. Almost one-half of all residents then report they either saw or heard about a police officer doing something that was wrong. There are small differences between Negroes and whites in their reports of officer misconduct, but the differences are not large. See Table 23.

Considering in Table 23 what was the most serious thing they saw a policeman doing that they regard as wrong, the major or most serious misconduct they report relates to the threat or undue use of physical force against the citizen--most reporting its actual use. (Table 23). There, of course, is considerable difficulty attendant upon determining when the use of physical force is 'necessary' and when there 'actually' is undue use of force. Officers are empowered to use force, if necessary, to effect a lawful arrest. Lacking

Table 23: Per Cent Distribution of Residents Perceptions and Recollections of Wrong Doing by A Policeman for Residents in Four Police Districts in Boston and Chicago.

City and Police District	Ever seen a policeman doing anything you felt was wrong:			Per Cent Total	Has anyone ever told you about something they saw a policeman do that was wrong?				Per Cent Total	Per Cent Saw or Heard Wrong Doing
	Yes	No	Can't Say		Yes	No	Can't Say	Saw Doing Wrong		
All Districts	30	68	2	100	17	50	3	30	100	47
Boston:										
Dorchester	27	72	1	100	19	52	2	27	100	46
Roxbury	33	64	3	100	16	48	3	33	100	49
Chicago:										
Town Hall	32	68	--	100	19	47	2	32	100	51
Fillmore	29	69	2	100	16	51	4	29	100	45

-72-

(CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)

Table 23: Per Cent Distribution of Residents Perceptions and Recollections of Wrong Doing by A Policeman for Residents in Four Police Districts in Boston and Chicago. (Continued)

City and Police District	Major serious things saw that a policeman did that was wrong.										Per Cent Total
	Undue Use of Physical Force	Threat of Force	Solicit- ing A Bribe	Accept- ing A Bribe	Tolerat- ing Organized Crime	Saw in or Coming Out Illegal Place	Other Part I or Part II Crime	All Other	No Answer	Never Saw or Heard Wrong Doing	
All Districts	14	2	2	8	*	1	2	1	2	68	100
Boston:											
Dorchester	13	1	1	7	--	1	2	1	3	71	100
Roxbury	16	2	2	9	1	2	3	--	1	64	100
Chicago:											
Town Hall	9	--	2	15	--	--	2	--	--	72	100
Fillmore	15	5	3	5	--	--	2	2	2	66	100

*0.5 per cent, or less.

(CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)

-73-

Table 23: Per Cent Distribution of Residents Perceptions and Recollections of Wrong Doing by A Policeman for Residents in Four Police Districts in Boston and Chicago. (Continued)

City and Police District	Minor things saw or heard that a policeman did that was wrong:									Per Cent Total
	Free Meals	Officer Gambled	Discourteous	Drinking on Duty	Sleeping on Duty	Ignoring A Complaint	All Other	No Answer	None Mentioned or No Wrong Doing Mentioned	
All Districts	1	*	1	8	*	2	3	2	83	100
Boston:										
Dorchester	3	--	1	11	--	4	1	3	77	100
Roxbury	--	--	1	8	1	2	2	1	85	100
Chicago:										
Town Hall	--	--	4	11	--	--	4	--	81	100
Fillmore	--	1	--	4	--	--	5	2	88	100

*0.5 per cent, or less.

(CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)

-74-

Table 23: Per Cent Distribution of Residents Perceptions and Recollections of Wrong Doing by A Policeman for Residents in Four Police Districts in Boston and Chicago. (Continued)

City and Police District	Resident has seen police use physical force and judges it to be:								Per Cent Total
	Per Cent Saw Physical Force Used	Saw force used:					Per Cent Never Seen Force Used	Per Cent No Answer	
		Used Proper Amount of Force	Used Force in Self Defense	Degree of Force Used Unwarranted	Was Not Necessary to Use Force	Can't Say			
All Districts	25	7	2	7	6	3	72	3	100
Boston:									
Dorchester	29	9	3	8	6	3	70	1	100
Roxbury	25	6	2	10	6	1	68	7	100
Chicago:									
Town Hall	21	9	2	6	4	--	79	--	100
Fillmore	24	5	1	10	6	2	75	1	100

285-261 O - 57 - 18

-75-

further information on whether the force was used in a lawful situation and the conditions under which it was used, there is no way of assessing the validity of their complaints about officer misconduct in the use of force. In Chicago and Boston more Negro than white residents report they saw force or threats of force used unduly. Indeed twice as many Negroes as whites in Chicago make such reports. The differences are much smaller for Negroes and whites in Boston.

An additional 10 per cent report seeing an officer solicit or accept a bribe. While the differences between Negro and white reports are small in Boston, more than three times as many white as Negro residents in Chicago report officers accepting a bribe--15 per cent of all white residents report they have seen an officer accept a bribe. It should be borne in mind that these reports of experiences are cumulated over a long period of time so that it is not possible to assess current practice within the police department. Nonetheless such experiences, even over a long period of time, have contributed to a public image of the police.

Only a very small proportion of the adult citizens report officers as engaging in a Part I or Part II crime--but two per cent--and there are no differences by race of citizen.

Considering citizen reports of seeing officers engage in misconduct, their major complaints are about the use of force and the soliciting and accepting of bribes. That more than 1 in 4 citizens claim they have seen an officer at some time or other do something they thought was wrong undoubtedly contributes to both their ambivalence toward the police and to some negative image of them. Again, it must be emphasized that these data pertain to the life experience of the citizen, not necessary to any recent period of time. Given the effects of recall over time, however, there is reason to assume that for many of these citizens they are reporting on a fairly recent event. Nonetheless the responses are biased toward the

"most serious" thing they ever saw, since they were asked to report the 'most serious' event.

Citizens also reported certain 'minor' infractions that they either saw or heard about a police officer doing what they regarded as wrong: 17 per cent of the citizens reported some minor infraction. More Negro than white citizens reported such infractions. The main infraction reported is drinking on duty; white citizens reported this infraction more often than Negro citizens. Table 23 summarizes citizen reports of minor infractions by police officers.

Above it was noted that when respondents were asked to report the most serious thing they ever saw an officer do that they thought was wrong, 14 per cent mentioned the undue use of force as the most serious thing. When citizens were specifically asked (Table 23) whether they ever saw the police use physical force, 25 per cent report they have seen an officer use physical force. Of these, 7 per cent judged the degree of force used was not warranted by the situation and another 6 per cent said that it was not necessary to use any force. Negroes were somewhat more likely to judge the degree of force used was unwarranted than were whites, but the differences are not large. From these two questions 14 and 13 per cent of the residents respectively believe that police officers have used force unduly. And what may surprise some, the differences between white and Negro residents in reporting they have seen force used unduly is not large. Indeed in Table 23 it can be seen that 6 per cent of the citizens in 3 of the 4 districts say that it was not necessary to use force.

Again, while caution must be exercised in accepting citizen reports as bona fide, it nonetheless provides some indication of the volume of citizens who at one time or another could have made a complaint against the police for undue use of force. Indeed some of them may very well have

made it, though unfortunately they were not asked whether or not they reported it. Furthermore, there is no way of knowing against whom the force was used, though in any case the citizen could have served as a complainant or witnessed for a complainant.

It should also be apparent in Table 23 that 9 per cent report that in their judgment the officer used the proper amount of force, and 2 per cent report that he used it in self defense. White citizens were somewhat more likely than Negro citizens to report that the proper amount of force was used in the encounter.

Public Attitudes Toward the System of Justice.

Within the legal system of the United States the separation of functions and roles among the law enforcement, public prosecution, and judicial organizations sets the stage for conflict among them in criminal matters.

Some conflict is inevitable in such a system, given the fact that the law enforcement agents largely control the case inputs into the legal system through their power of arrest. Apart from the decision to arrest, however, police control over dispositions in the legal system is almost entirely indirect, resting in their role of providing evidence and testimony for the prosecution in particular cases.

The public prosecutor with the initial control over the case output process may come into conflict with both the police and the judicial organizations. The prosecutor occupies a kind of 'middleman' role between functionaries in the two organizations. It is not surprising, therefore, that his primary task often becomes one of the bargaining agent between agents of the two organizations, rather than that of a person who defends the public interest per se.

The courts are in the role of principal agents of control over the final output from the system by their power

of disposition of legal cases. In fact they may share that power with a corrections system and sharing it may substantially restrict their actual power of disposition over them.

The court, nevertheless, is powerless to control case inputs into the system apart from taking punitive sanctions toward agents in other legal roles or by appeals to the legislative process. The major form of sanctioning agents available to them is to 'deny a case' to those who control the inputs--the public prosecutors and the police.

Though conflict is endemic in the system, then, so far as citizens are concerned, they generally are unaware of the systemic origins of the conflict and attempts to resolve it. Furthermore, since each organization has relations with an external environment as well, each is attempting to balance interests with respect to their environment. The police, perhaps, are most vulnerable to control from their external environment and the courts the least. Even the power to legislate is for the most part subject to judicial review.

Yet the power of the courts over the disposition of cases and to sanction the other agents in the system may create problems for them in their relations with the larger environment that includes the public. Members of the public may not comprehend the legal issues yet they may take a stance with respect to the issues or particular cases. Furthermore, it is in the arena of public opinion in a democratic society that many of the conflicts between organizations are played out if not resolved.

Public perceptions that there is a rise in crime in the United States when coupled with their ambivalence toward the police sets the stage for public entry into the debate when the U. S. Supreme Court renders decisions with respect to the legality of police actions. The situation is particularly complicated since the public has fragmented into separate publics not only over the specific issues of legality of police action but over the more central constitutional issues to which they relate.

In the conflict over these issues that has ensued, the public gradually has come to take sides whether on the issues of civil review of the police or on those relating to the protection of rights of the offender and the accused. Yet it is difficult to discern publics of any substantial scope that align themselves in clear 'pro' or 'anti' positions with respect to these issues. While there are some groups that are pro-police and anti-court, and vice versa, such groups do not appear to comprise a majority of the public. What is more likely to be the case is that citizens will be more or less 'pro' or 'anti' on particular issues, indicating again their deep ambivalence toward the whole process of crime and justice.

Some attempt was made to discern public concerns over these issues. See Table 24.

One of the issues over which people may divide is the question of whether 'the courts have gone too far in making rules favoring and protecting people who get into trouble with the law'. Many members of the public are anxious about the crime situation as they define it and even though the legal decisions may be less pervasive in their impact than the public or police perceive them to be, they may view with alarm such decisions lest they not be in the interest of protecting them. Attempts by the court to balance individual and collective interests may nevertheless be viewed as 'going too far' one way or the other.

Elsewhere in Volume II of this supplement, it is reported that 9 of every 10 police officers think the court has gone 'too far' in making rules favoring and protecting people who get into trouble with the law. As the data in Table 24 indicate, 1 in 5 people do not believe they are sufficiently well informed to make a judgment on the issue while no police

Table 24: Per Cent Distribution of How Residents Perceive Rights of Offenders Before the Law for Residents in Four Police Districts of Boston and Chicago.

City and Police District	Do you think the courts have gone too far in making rules favoring and protecting people who get into trouble with the law?						Per Cent Total
	Yes, Too Much Offender Protection	Yes, Generally	Pro and Con	No, Generally	No, Not At All	Can't Say	
All Districts	40	6	1	4	30	19	100
Boston:							
Dorchester	52	6	1	1	18	22	100
Roxbury	31	9	3	3	38	16	100
Chicago:							
Town Hall	33	5	--	2	33	26	99
Fillmore	33	--	--	8	31	28	100

(CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)

Table 24: Per Cent Distribution of How Residents Perceive Rights of Offenders Before the Law for Residents in Four Police Districts of Boston and Chicago. (Continued)

City and Police District	Do you think too much attention is being given to protecting rights of people who get into trouble with the police?												Total Per Cent Yes
	Per Cent Yes	Per Cent No	Can't Say	Per Cent Total	Reasons why too much attention given:							Can't Say	
					Police Interrogations or Confessions	Police Stop and Frisk	Hands of Police Tied	Too Many Loop-holes for Criminals	Too Much Crime	Other Reasons for Too Much Attention			
All Districts	38	34	28	100	4	1	6	12	8	4	3	38	
Boston:													
Dorchester	57	20	23	100	3	2	11	15	10	6	10	57	
Roxbury	30	46	24	100	7	--	4	13	6	--	--	30	
Chicago:													
Town Hall	45	33	22	100	5	--	7	10	7	7	9	45	
Fillmore	21	40	39	100	--	--	1	6	7	3	4	21	

-82-

(CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)

Table 24: Per Cent Distribution of How Residents Perceive Rights of Offenders Before the Law for Residents in Four Police Districts of Boston and Chicago. (Continued)

City and Police District	Concern of Respondent over treatment of offenders: Respondent is disturbed about:									Per Cent Total
	Soft Treatment of Offenders	Inequitable Results of Justice	Violation of Individual Rights	Soft Treatment of Individual Rights	Inequities of Individual Rights	All of These	All Other	Accepts Things As Are	Can't Say	
All Districts	32	7	7	2	1	1	3	22	25	100
Boston:										
Dorchester	44	7	4	1	--	1	4	16	23	100
Roxbury	25	7	11	2	2	1	2	28	22	100
Chicago:										
Town Hall	43	10	--	2	2	--	2	31	10	100
Fillmore	22	7	8	5	1	2	1	17	37	100

-83-

(CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)

Table 24: Per Cent Distribution of How Residents Perceive Rights of Offenders Before the Law for Residents in Four Police Districts of Boston and Chicago. (Continued)

City and Police District	What about judges and sentences they hand out? Respondent mentions leniency:						Per Cent Total
	For Types of Offenders or Offenses	For Some Courts or Judges	For Both Offenders and Judges	General Leniency	No Mention of Leniency		
All Districts	20	3	*	26	51		100
Boston:							
Dorchester	22	3	--	30	45		100
Roxbury	19	2	--	20	59		100
Chicago:							
Town Hall	19	6	3	22	50		100
Fillmore	20	2	--	30	48		100

*0.5 per cent, or less.

officer failed to make one. Nonetheless, 46 per cent of all citizens are in general agreement with the police. Among those expressing an opinion more than half are in a pro-police-anti-court position. Of all adults interviewed, 40 per cent believed that the rules favored the offender too much and 30 per cent did not believe that the court had gone too far. In Boston, whites were more likely than Negroes to believe that the rules favored the offender too much; Chicago citizens did not differ much in their 'anti-court' views. The climate of opinion in Boston is different from that in Chicago, there being perhaps less active anti-court organization in the Chicago area.

All adult residents also were asked (Table 24) whether they thought too much attention is now being given to protecting the rights of people who get into trouble with the police. A third of all residents are unwilling to express a judgment but somewhat more (38 per cent) agree with this judgment than oppose it (34 per cent). There is a substantial difference by race of the respondent however. Among those expressing an opinion an absolute majority of the whites believe too much attention is being given to protecting the rights of people who get into trouble with the police while the reverse is true for Negroes.

There are differences by city as well. Both Negroes and whites in Boston are more likely than comparable aggregates in Chicago to believe that offender rights are being given too much attention.

That the public takes a position on these issues that is generally reasonably informed with respect to the specific decisions at issue is also clear from data in Table 24. Among those who believe too much attention is being given to the rights of offenders, the most common complaint is

that there are too many loopholes for offenders, a complaint of about one-third of those believing offender rights are overprotected. About an equal proportion give reasons that relate to the legality of police means, relating to the right of the police to interrogate or use confessions or to stop and frisk, or, more generally, that the 'hands of the police are tied'. Yet there is a sizeable minority that bases their view largely on the opinion that there is too much crime today.

All residents also were asked what concerned them most about the treatment of offenders today. One in 4 residents could not say what bothered them, if anything. Yet almost a third believe that there is too much 'soft treatment of offenders' and 7 per cent felt there is inequity in justice. One in 10, however, is concerned with the fact that the rights of the offender are dealt with improperly. As Table 24 shows, however, whites are far more likely than Negroes to be concerned about the soft treatment of offenders while Negroes are far more often concerned with the violation of the rights of the offender.

Generally the public reads the 'crime news' and they become involved in major cases that come to trial. There is reason to believe that they take sides in such major cases and act as jurors or jurists, as the case may be, reaching a verdict or a decision as to disposition. For that reason, all residents were asked to evaluate the sentencing behavior of judges. Almost exactly one-half of all citizens responded that there was too much leniency in the system in some respect. One in five citizens believes there is too much leniency for at least some offenses and offenders. One in 4 believes there is a general tendency for leniency in the system. See Table 24.

Just as it is difficult to characterize an individual respondent as clearly pro- or anti- police, so it is difficult to classify many as pro- or anti-court since there is a substantial minority that believes the U. S. Supreme Court has gone too far but that criminal courts are not too lenient. Yet overall, there is considerable sentiment for the police in the stance they take on the issues, though it must be remembered that a sizeable minority of the public either is uninformed about the issues or has not arrived at a position with respect to them.

It is clear that citizen views of the legality of police means are not always judged within a context of their applicability to them. This is understandable given their anxieties and concerns about their desires for protection from victimization from crime on the one hand and from the arbitrary use of police power on the other.

All citizens were asked about their views whether the police should have the right to stop them and question or search them. See Table 25. A substantial majority of the citizens believe that the police should at least under some conditions be able to stop and ask them their name and address (79 per cent); an absolute majority of 56 per cent sets no conditions for stopping and asking them to identify themselves. In Boston there are no differences between Negroes and whites with almost 6 of 10 citizens saying they would not object to the police asking them to stop and identify themselves by name and address under any conditions. In Chicago the situation is somewhat different. The proportion is the same as in Boston for white citizens in Town Hall but Negroes in Fillmore are less likely to agree to being stopped to identify themselves under any conditions; they are more likely to express contingent conditions themselves.

Table 25: Per Cent Distribution of Resident's Opinions About the Right of the Police to Stop or/and Search and Interrogate Them for Residents of Four Police Districts in Boston and Chicago.

City and Police District	Should a police officer have the right to stop you anywhere outside your home and--							
	Ask you to give your name and address		Ask about what you are doing there, where you have been, etc.		To search you if he stops you		To question you if he believes you have committed a crime	
	Yes	Depends	Yes	Depends	Yes	Depends	Yes	Depends
All Districts	56	23	27	31	18	29	69	29
Boston:								
Dorchester	59	18	27	29	17	28	74	25
Roxbury	58	22	24	33	15	28	63	34
Chicago:								
Town Hall	62	21	42	35	26	30	77	23
Fillmore	48	32	20	29	20	32	66	34

- 88 -

3 OF 4

CONTINUED

At the same time it must be remembered that 2 of every 10 citizens do not believe the police have a right to stop and ask under any conditions. There are no significant differences between Negroes and whites in this respect.

There is a falling off in citizen agreement that the police have a right to do more than ask the citizen to identify himself. Only 27 per cent agree that he can question them as to what they are doing there, where they have been, and 'things like that'. Another 31 per cent are willing to allow such questions under certain conditions; or, only 6 in 10 express some willingness to be questioned about their reasons for being where they are. There is one major exception in that white citizens in Town Hall, Chicago were more likely to agree that they could be questioned about their whereabouts; 42 per cent agree to such questioning under any conditions and 35 per cent agree to it under certain conditions; the Negro citizens in Chicago's Fillmore are in sharp disagreement with them in this respect.

Even smaller proportions are willing to be searched if they are stopped. Yet 2 in 10 citizens is willing to be searched under any conditions, if stopped, and almost 3 in 10 are willing to be searched under some conditions, if stopped. Again, white citizens in Town Hall, Chicago, are most willing to be unconditionally searched, if stopped.

Given the fact that some citizens have great difficulty in seeing themselves in the role of an offender or in conditions where the police would stop them to question them about their whereabouts, and also given the fact that a sizeable minority always places conditions on their agreement about police rights, all citizens were asked: "Suppose a policeman thinks you have committed a crime; should he have a right to question about a lot of things to find out?" Seven in every

ten citizens agree that the police should have such a right and the remaining agree that an officer should have such a right under some conditions, generally reasonable assurance that a crime was committed. Almost no citizens then are opposed to allowing the police the right to question them if there is reasonable assurance of wrong-doing.

White citizens are somewhat more likely than Negro citizens to grant the right to question by the police unconditionally if they are suspected of wrong-doing. Assuming that Negroes at least perceive themselves as more often subject to improper questioning--for which there is some evidence in the survey--then it is not surprising that they are more likely to attach conditions to the right of the police to question them. Their answers suggest that they are more opposed to 'arbitrary forms of questioning' than they are to the officer's right to question, if suspected of wrong-doing. Most citizens do not qualify their answers with mention of their 'constitutional rights' under questioning.

Experience of course can change the way that a citizen perceives his rights vis-a-vis those of the police. A substantial proportion of these citizens have had contact with the police in an official role. Generally their transactions probably were ones where they took the role of complainant or where at most they were in the role of a 'minor offender', such as in violation of a traffic ordinance. Unfortunately it is not known how many citizens were in the role of more serious offenders. Citizens involved in more serious offenses may be more aware of problems of rights in transactions with the police. Since many residents probably had no contacts with the police where they regarded their own rights as problematic, they may be more willing to permit the police greater discretion in police citizen encounters than the law or the courts may warrant.

Citizen Actions to Protect Themselves From Crime and Perceptions of What Should be Done About the Crime Problem

Given citizen concern with the crime problem, it is not unreasonable to expect that they would take some steps to protect themselves, particularly since these citizens live in the higher crime rate areas of the city. Furthermore, it should be expected that they would be more involved in the issues of doing something about it. They might be expected to have specific views on measures to deal with the crime problem.

All residents were asked what they thought was the most important thing that could be done to cut down the amount of crime in their neighborhood. While it was possible to code most of their responses in terms of a single main proposal, for some more than one proposal was coded. A striking fact is that an absolute majority of the residents make proposals that could be characterized as taking measures that can be described as repressive of crime and criminals or as protective of citizens rather than measures that deal with amelioration of the social conditions that lead to crime or moral measures that would make people conform better to the laws or norms of society. Forty-two per cent of all residents would take only repressive or protective measures such as to increase and strengthen the police, have stricter laws, more convictions and stiffer sentences, enforcement of curfews and crackdowns on teenagers, and the punishment of parents as well as juveniles. An additional 11 per cent would take some repressive measures, 7 per cent combining them with ameliorating social conditions and 4 per cent with moral measures.

Only 8 per cent of all citizens recommend measures that would deal with what often are regarded by criminologists as the more fundamental conditions that lead to crime. These included proposals for more jobs, more youth and recreation programs, better housing and education, or integration of the

racers. And only 6 per cent emphasize moral training or leadership including better child training and supervision and moral leadership by citizens or religious leaders, factors that psychologists or psychiatrists might emphasize.

When the specific proposals for dealing with the crime problem that were classed as repressive or protective are examined in detail, citizens in high crime rate areas were most likely to demand more police and stronger police protection. A third of all citizens made proposals of this kind. Eight per cent of all citizens want stricter laws, and sentences, more convictions, and better enforcement of curfews; six per cent would 'crackdown' on teenagers and gangs. Fourteen per cent mention other repressive measures that should be taken.

Considering proposals for dealing with the social conditions of crime, the major proposals made are for youth and recreation programs given by 12 per cent of all residents. But 5 per cent of the residents mentioned more job opportunities as a way of dealing with the crime problem.

Among the moral measures mentioned, better child training and more supervision by parents was mentioned by 10 per cent of all citizens in these areas, the majority however focusing on supervision rather than child training.

If one regards these general tendencies of citizens seriously then clearly there is more support for repressive and enforcement measures than there is for the proposals of social scientists that would undertake programs regarded as getting to the 'causes' of crime. Looked at from another perspective, clearly social science knowledge has not been so widely disseminated in the population, or at least accepted, that it can gain strong support from the citizenry in high crime rate areas.

The degree to which citizens are involved in the problems of crime, law enforcement and the legal system in their city should be reflected in their knowledge of the crime problem in their city as presented in police statistics about crime, in their familiarity with the police department and their rights before the law. Although it was not possible to explore their knowledge in detail, Table 26 presents two measures of their knowledge of the crime problem--whether crimes of violence are increasing and an estimate of the number of persons who are murdered each month--one measure of their familiarity with the police department--whether or not they know the name of the chief of police--and a measure of their knowledge of their access to the legal system--whether or not citizens know of their subpoena power.

During 1964 and 1965, the years immediately prior to the study, there was no dramatic rise in the crime rate in either Chicago or Boston. Chicago showed only a slight increase in rates of homicide and rape from 1964 to 1965 and some actual decrease in robbery and aggravated assault rates--the major crimes against the person. Indeed until shortly before the study was in the field, citizens in Chicago were more or less exposed to a 'stable' crime situation, if not one in which they believed it actually was decreasing. For Boston, there were somewhat greater increases in aggravated assault and robbery rates from 1964 to 1965, but citizens were not exposed to media releases about increase in those types of crime.

For both cities, however, and more particularly Boston, there was considerable media attention to violence in organized crime. Boston, of course, in recent years had dealt with national headline news in the "Boston strangler" and other episodes. It is difficult to know to what extent citizen attitudes are formed by the occasional crime or the media preoccupation with certain kinds of crime

Table 26: Per Cent Distributions of Residents Knowledge of Crime and Policing in Their City for Residents of Four Police Districts in Boston and Chicago.

City and Police District	Does resident know name of chief of police?				Per Cent Total
	Knows Present Chief	Knows Name Similar	Gives In-correct Name	Says Doesn't Know	
All Districts	49	1	1	49	100
Boston:					
Dorchester	45	2	1	52	100
Roxbury	29	1	--	70	100
Chicago:					
Town Hall	75	--	--	25	100
Fillmore	65	--	--	35	100

-94-

(CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)

Table 26: Per Cent Distributions of Residents Knowledge of Crime and Policing in Their City for Residents of Four Police Districts in Boston and Chicago. (Continued)

City and Police District	Would you say there has been an increase in violent crime here in _____?						Per Cent Total	Does "R" know of subpoena power?			Per Cent Total
	Very Much More	Just A Little More	Not Much Difference	No Change	A Decrease	Don't Know		Yes	No	No Answer	
All Districts	57	20	11	3	2	7	100	28	61	1	100
Boston:											
Dorchester	67	19	7	1	1	4	99	25	75	--	100
Roxbury	60	11	12	1	2	13	99	35	65	--	100
Chicago:											
Town Hall	50	32	11	6	1	--	100	32	66	2	100
Fillmore	46	22	13	5	4	9	99	22	78	--	100

(CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)

-95-

Table 26: Per Cent Distributions of Residents Knowledge of Crime and Policing in Their City for Residents of Four Police Districts in Boston and Chicago. (Continued)

City and Police District	About how many people would you guess are murdered in (city) each month?										Per Cent Total	
	9 or less	10-19	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	70-79	80-89	90 or More		Can't Say
All Districts	34	16	10	2	1	4	1	1	*	6	25	100
Boston:												
Dorchester	53	16	8	2	--	2	--	--		4	15	100
Roxbury	37	16	10	--	--	3	--	--		4	30	100
Chicago:												
Town Hall	30	9	9	4	2	14	4	4	2	4	18	99
Fillmore	12	22	14	2	1	2	--	--	--	10	35	100

*0.5 per cent, or less.

and how much their attitudes derive from aggregative statistics. In any case, neither city was gripped by a "crime wave" prior to this time. During the period the study was in the field, Chicago experienced riots in the Fillmore district that may have had an effect on the attitudes of some citizens.

Table 26 shows that 57 per cent of the citizens do believe there is very much more violent crime in their city, though more Boston than Chicago citizens share that view. Negroes were somewhat less likely than whites to believe that it was increasing. It is obvious that the views of a majority of citizens are not in accord with what police department statistics disclosed. And only a minority of about 1 in 10 residents perhaps reflect the situation as department releases presented the crime picture. Of course, these perceptions were obtained from citizens in high crime rate areas. Their perceptions may be formed far more by their perception of what goes on in their areas than by what takes place in the city. There have been substantial changes in these areas during the past decade such that the crime rate is much higher today.

There was an average of 33 homicides a month in Chicago in 1965 as compared with somewhat fewer than 5 a month in Boston. Negroes were less willing to hazard a guess or report what they knew than were whites in both cities. A third of all Negroes did not make an estimate. It is apparent that the city differences reflect differences in order of magnitude of homicide between the two cities. But citizens in Chicago markedly underestimate the number of homicides while those in Boston are much closer to the actual rate. It seems doubtful, however, that citizens are making their estimates on the basis of actual knowledge. Rather it seems that substantial numbers don't 'believe' there could be a large number of homicides. There is of course some substantial overestimation in both cities, but much more so

in Chicago than in Boston. Undoubtedly the fact that Chicago averages a little more than 1 homicide a day as compared with only somewhat more than one a week in Boston has an effect on the crime news in the two cities. This in turn might convey to some citizens in Chicago a much higher crime rate than actually is the case.

Only a minority of citizens in Table 26 are aware of their power to obtain a writ commanding a person to appear in court to testify as a witness. Somewhat unexpectedly, there are city differences in this respect. For Boston, Negroes were more likely than whites to acknowledge their subpoena power while the reverse is true for Chicago.

There is a substantial difference between residents of the two cities in their familiarity with the name of the chief of the department. More than twice as many citizens in Chicago as Boston know the name of Superintendent O. W. Wilson, the commanding officer of the Chicago Police Department. Three out of 4 white residents in Town Hall know his name. Indeed only 45 per cent of the residents of Dorchester in Boston and 29 per cent in Roxbury could name Edmund McNamara as Commissioner of Police for the Boston Metropolitan Police Department.

Commissioner McNamara's tenure in Boston is of less duration than that of Superintendent Wilson in Chicago. Nonetheless, even the casual observer of the two cities would probably conclude that all media in Chicago give greater coverage to the Chicago Police Department than do the Boston media to their department. Regularly scheduled news conferences and television programs with the Superintendent of the Chicago police undoubtedly has contributed to the high "acquaintance" of Chicago citizens with their chief.

There are a variety of ways that citizens attempt to protect themselves against crime. They may attempt to reduce the risk of being a victim of crime by changing their habits of living or by increasing their means of

protection. Or, they may attempt to reduce the risk of loss from crime if they are victimized. The major way to reduce losses is to cover them by purchasing insurance. For some citizens, psychological defenses may operate as well.

No attempt was made to measure psychological defenses against victimization from crime. Rather information was gathered on how citizens may have altered their behavior as a result of perceptions of the crime problem, what steps they had taken to insure against losses, and what measures they had to protect themselves in case of an attempted crime.

Table 27 provides information on whether or not the residents of these high crime rate areas carry insurance that protects their house and belongings against theft and burglary. Only a little more than 1 in 3 persons reported carrying insurance. More Boston than Chicago residents reported carrying insurance and there were more whites than Negroes in Boston with insurance policies against theft and burglary. The most common policy carried is a general home owners policy with a minority carrying a policy for burglary or theft only.

Why should such a substantial proportion of citizens not carry insurance? Considering the reasons they give for not carrying insurance in Table 27, the major reason given is that they cannot afford insurance--17 per cent gave that reason. More Negroes than whites said they could not afford insurance. About an equal percentage seemed to have no real reason for not taking out an insurance policy and there are almost no race differences in that respect. For 14 per cent of all residents, however, the reason given is that they cannot see any need for it. This was given by almost 1 in 3 residents in Chicago's Town Hall district; more whites than Negroes in Boston gave the same reason. Only a minority of all residents say they have actually been refused an insurance policy, all of them residing in Boston's Roxbury. A minority also indicates they intend to insure.

Table 27: Per Cent Distribution of Residents Possession of Insurance for Residents in Four Police Districts in Boston and Chicago.

City and Police District	Do you have an insurance policy that protects house and belongings against theft and burglary?					
	Per Cent Yes	General Home Owners	Theft or Burglary Only	Fire and Theft or Burglary	Other	Don't Know
All Districts	35	24	6	3	1	1
Boston:						
Dorchester	48	39	2	6	--	1
Roxbury	30	20	6	--	1	3
Chicago:						
Town Hall	27	18	5	2	2	--
Fillmore	29	13	12	3	1	--

-100-

(CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)

Table 27: Per Cent Distribution of Residents Possession of Insurance for Residents in Four Police Districts in Boston and Chicago. (Continued)

City and Police District	Why haven't you taken out insurance of this kind?								
	Per Cent No Insurance	Refused A Policy	Intends to Insure	Can't Afford Insurance	No Need For It	Can't Say	Just Rent	All Other	No Answer
All Districts	64	2	2	17	14	18	2	4	5
Boston:									
Dorchester	52	--	2	12	12	18	1	2	4
Roxbury	70	6	--	29	8	16	5	5	1
Chicago:									
Town Hall	73	--	2	9	31	16	2	11	2
Fillmore	71	--	4	13	13	22	2	1	16

-101-

Apart from the fact that about 1 in 6 citizens say they cannot afford to carry an insurance policy, the major reasons for not carrying any policy do not seem to fit the realities of their living in high crime rate areas. Judgements of course are relative and it is possible that a majority of those who say they have no need for an insurance policy or that they just can't say why they don't have one are persons who do not own homes and their personal property is fairly meager.

Residents of high crime rate areas clearly take steps to protect themselves against crime by changing their habits of daily living. See Table 28. Only a little less than 4 in 10 residents report they have not changed their habits in any way. In Boston, white residents were more likely to say they had not changed their habits in any way while in Chicago Negro residents were slightly more likely to say they had not changed in any way. More than a fourth of all residents report changing three or more of their personal habits including staying off the streets at night, using taxis at night, avoiding being out alone, and avoiding talking to strangers. The proportion was lowest in Chicago's Fillmore district.

Women were much less likely than men of both races to say they had not changed their habits in any way as the following distribution shows:

Number of Habits Changed	Race and Sex of Respondent			
	Negro		White	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
None at all	50	33	66	33
Only one	23	19	20	18
Two	14	15	5	11
Three	11	14	4	17
Four	3	18	3	15
Five or more	--	2	2	6
Total	100	100	100	100

Table 28: Per Cent Distribution of Things Residents Have Done to Protect Themselves Against the Dangers of Crime for Residents in Four Police Districts in Boston and Chicago. (Continued)

City and Police District	Have changed habits because of fear of crime:				Total number of habit changes mentioned:							Per Cent Total		
	Stay Off Streets At Night	Use Taxis or Car at Night	Avoid Being Out Alone or Stay Home	Don't Talk to Strangers	All Other	None	One	Two	Three	Four	Five		Six or More	No Answer
All Districts	43	21	39	35	8	38	19	14	14	12	2	--	1	100
Boston:														
Dorchester Roxbury	38 50	18 33	40 40	32 44	12 8	41 26	20 21	11 16	14 16	11 17	2 2	--	1 2	100 100
Chicago:														
Town Hall Fillmore	45 40	23 9	42 33	36 29	8 5	42 47	17 16	11 18	11 13	13 6	6 --	--	--	100 100

(CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)

Table 28: Per Cent Distribution of Things Residents Have Done to Protect Themselves Against the Dangers of Crime for Residents in Four Police Districts in Boston and Chicago. (Continued)

City and Police District	When you go out, do you carry anything to protect yourself?						When do you carry something?					Per Cent Total
	Per Cent Yes	What do you carry?					When Out Alone	Some Places or Times	At Night	Always	Never	
		Fire-arm	Knife/Cutting	Striking Object	All Other	No Answer						
All Districts	9	*	6	2	*	1	1	1	2	5	91	100
Boston:												
Dorchester	3	--	1	1	--	1	--	1	2	--	97	100
Roxbury	19	--	10	6	2	1	1	3	7	6	81	98
Chicago:												
Town Hall	6	--	6	--	--	--	2	--	2	2	94	100
Fillmore	8	1	7	--	--	--	1	--	3	4	91	99

*0.5 per cent, or less.

(CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)

-104-

Table 28: Per Cent Distribution of Things Residents Have Done to Protect Themselves Against the Dangers of Crime for Residents in Four Police Districts in Boston and Chicago.

City and Police District	THINGS DONE ABOUT HOUSE/APARTMENT:									
	Per Cent Yes	Put Locks on Door:				Put Locks or Bars on Windows:				
		Why Decided?				Per Cent Yes	Why Decided?			
		Was Victim	Knows Victims	Mass Media on Crime	Prevalence of High Crime		Was Victim	Knows Victims	Mass Media on Crime	Prevalence of High Crime
All Districts	28	9	4	3	7	10	1	*	*	4
Boston:										
Dorchester	28	.6	3	6	6	6	--	--	1	2
Roxbury	36	13	5	1	10	18	4	1	1	2
Chicago:										
Town Hall	29	9	7	--	4	4	--	--	--	2
Fillmore	17	7	1	1	6	10	2	--	--	7

*0.5 per cent, or less.

(CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)

-105-

Table 28: Per Cent Distribution of Things Residents Have Done to Protect Themselves Against the Dangers of Crime for Residents in Four Police Districts in Boston and Chicago. (Continued)

City and Police District	THINGS DONE ABOUT HOUSE/APARTMENT:											
	Additional Lights					Other Measures Taken:						
	Per Cent Yes	Why Decided?				Total Per Cent Other	Keep Dog	Keep Lights on/Door Locked	Keep Money/Valuables Away	Keep Club/Gun	Stay at Home	All Other
		Was Victim	Knows Victims	Mass Media on Crime	Prevalence of High Crime							
All Districts	5	--	*	--	2	22	6	10	*	1	1	4
Boston:												
Dorchester	3	--	1	--	--	20	7	9	1	--	--	3
Roxbury	8	--	--	--	3	25	5	12	--	2	2	4
Chicago:												
Town Hall	--	--	--	--	--	36	7	18	--	--	2	9
Fillmore	6	--	--	--	4	8	4	3	--	--	--	1

*0.5 per cent, or less.

(CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)

-106-

Table 28: Per Cent Distribution of Things Residents Have Done to Protect Themselves Against the Dangers of Crime for Residents in Four Police Districts in Boston and Chicago. (Continued)

City and Police District	Household member owns weapon and use for which it is intended:					
	Per Cent Own Firearm	Sport, Hunting, Marksmanship Only	Protection Only	Both Sport and Protection	For Use In Job	For Collection Only
All Districts	14	5	4	3	1	1
Boston:						
Dorchester	10	5	--	2	2	1
Roxbury	11	1	8	1	--	1
Chicago:						
Town Hall	25	11	7	7	--	--
Fillmore	14	6	4	4	--	--

-107-

Sex is more important than race in accounting for a change in habits, however. There is little difference in the proportion of Negro and white women reporting numbers of change in habits. However, race is important for males. Negro males are more likely to report they changed their habits than are white males, particularly in the proportions reporting two or more changes in habits. This should not be unexpected if one takes account of the fact that the crime rate in the Negro areas in the survey is twice as high as that in the white areas. Yet the probability that a Negro woman will be victimized is much greater than that a white woman will be victimized and the difference in probabilities is not reflected for them.

Looking at the specific ways that people have changed their habits because of a fear of crime against them (Table 28), the largest proportion--50 per cent--report staying off the streets at night and avoid being out alone or simply staying home at night--39 per cent. Yet a substantial proportion said they did not talk to strangers--35 per cent--and 21 per cent report they use only a car or taxi when they go out at night. About 8 per cent mention other changes in their habits such as never going into public parks at night or walking their dog at night. Area differences are more important than race differences in accounting for differences in habit changes. Thus Roxbury Negroes more often report they stay off the streets at night than do Dorchester whites while Town Hall whites were slightly more likely than Fillmore Negroes to say they stay off the streets at night.

There are, both race and sex differences in changing habits of daily living. For reports of staying off the streets at night, 50 per cent of both Negro and white women say they have changed in that way but twice as many Negro men (32 per cent) as white men (16 per cent) report they stay off the street at night. The same pattern holds for use of taxis (or car) at night. Twenty-eight per cent of the women

in both cities say they go out at night only in a car or taxi; this is true for 14 per cent of Negro males but only 7 per cent of the white males.

Similarly in changing one's habits by avoiding talking to strangers, Negro and white women show the same proportion changing--about 40 per cent. More than twice as many Negro (27 per cent) as white men (12 per cent), however, report they avoid talking to strangers.

The situation is somewhat different for avoiding being out alone at night (or always staying home at night unless they use cars or taxis). About the same proportion of Negro and white men--15 per cent--say they avoid being out alone at night but 46 per cent of the Negro women and 52 per cent of the white women say they avoid being out alone or do not go out at all at night. Sex but not race seems important in accounting for patterns of going out at night.

There are no sex or race differences of any consequence in the proportion reporting other changes in behavior with 9 per cent of white men and women and 8 per cent of Negro men and women reporting such changes. There seems good reason to regard these reports of changes in behavior as valid ones, given the relationships observed.

Education has some effect on whether or not one changes one's habits because of perceptions of the crime situation, but the effect is less than that for sex and not always independent of race. For Negroes, education has no effect in the proportion reporting they have not changed at all; 41 per cent of the Negroes at each educational level say they have not changed. For whites, there is a small difference with somewhat fewer of the college educated--six per cent--saying they have not changed at all. For both Negroes and whites, however, the more education, the more reporting only one habit change.

Education has some effect on the type of habit change. Those with less education in both races are more likely to

avoid going out alone at night, though this does not appear to be affected by the use of taxis or cars at night since there are much smaller differences by education for that habit change. Among Negroes, the college educated are less likely to say they stay off the streets at night while the reverse is true for whites.

Perhaps the single most significant change in behavior as a consequence of one's perception of crime is whether one carries something to protect oneself when going out. Table 28 shows that almost 1 in 10 residents in high crime rate areas report they carry something to protect themselves. One in every 5 Negroes in Boston reports carrying something for protection as compared with 1 in every 33 whites in Boston. For the most part citizens arm themselves either with a knife (or some other cutting instrument) or with some striking object such as a club or stick. Overall, knives or other cutting instruments were reported for the majority of those who carry something for protection when going out. Only in Chicago's Fillmore did anyone report carrying a gun for protection.

Those who carry something for protection report for the most part that they always carry it--5 per cent of all residents say they always carry it, though Negroes are more likely to report they always carry it than are whites.

The race of the resident is far more important than his sex in determining whether anything will be carried for protection when going out. Educational level has almost no effect on whether a resident will carry something for protection when going out. Negroes of both sexes (23 per cent of the males and 16 per cent of the females) were far more likely to carry something for protection than were whites (5 per cent of males and 4 per cent of females). Quite evidently Negroes fear crime in the streets more than do whites, if this is taken as a measure of their fear in going out.

Another major way that residents may seek to protect themselves is to possess a firearm that can be used for protection. Fourteen per cent of all residents say they own a firearm. One in 10 Boston residents said they owned a firearm but 1 in 4 white residents in Chicago and 1 in 7 Negro residents in Chicago say they own one. See Table 28. Only about half of those owning a firearm, however, say they keep it for protection. The other half say it is used for sporting purposes only; a very few say it is in a collection or they have it for their job. Almost all Negroes in Boston say they have a firearm for protection, only and more than one-half of the Negroes in Chicago who have a firearm say it is for protection. No whites in Boston said they kept a firearm for protection, only, but half of the whites in Chicago say they kept one at least partly for protection.

Potentially at least 1 in 7 households in high crime rate areas has a firearm that can be used by some member of the household for purposes of either protection or assault. There is no evidence that Negroes are more likely to own firearms than whites. There is almost no difference in the proportion of Negroes and whites in Boston reporting owning a firearm and in Chicago more whites than Negroes reported owning a firearm.

Additional protection of the household can be gotten by securing the dwelling unit in various ways such as putting additional locks on the door, locks or bars on the windows, and additional lighting in dark places. All residents were specifically asked about whether or not they had taken some measures to protect their place of residence, and if so they were specifically questioned about those measures.

Thirty-two per cent of all residents said they had done something to their house or apartment as a means of protection.

If a resident did at least one thing, he was quite likely to take a second measure for protection of his dwelling unit as well. Twenty-eight per cent of all residents said they had put additional locks on their doors. There are city differences in this respect, with whites in Chicago more likely to have done so and Negroes in Roxbury more likely to have done so.

The addition of locks and bars to windows was more common among Negro residents in both cities with more than twice as many Negroes as whites in both cities having taken this means of protection. Undoubtedly the fact that slum areas are more extensive in the Negro than in the white precincts selected in both cities might account for this difference. Older slum dwelling units afford less protection.

Only a small proportion of residents had additional lighting installed, but again Negro residents more often took that step. Such lighting was generally interior hall lighting or porch lighting to afford protection against being assaulted inside the building.

Twenty-two per cent of all residents reported taking other kinds of measures to protect themselves (Table 28). Six per cent acquired a dog. This was only somewhat more common among white than Negro residents. The other major measure taken was to keep the door locked at all times and generally to keep the lights on at night as well, reported by 10 per cent of all residents. There are area differences in this practice.

A Concluding Note

No attempt is made here to summarize how residents and owners or managers of businesses and other organizations perceive the crime problem or of how they behave in an environment where the rate of crime is high.

Several main conclusions bear repetition here. Citizens who live in high crime rate areas of our cities are concerned with the problem of personal safety. Even though they do not perceive their neighborhoods as places where crime is a way of life, they do see crime as increasing and fear for their own safety in many ways. Indeed, the surprising thing is that they may alter their behavior more than their attitudes and perceptions in their anxiety over the crime situation. Women are more anxious about the crime situation than are men, and for many problems, Negroes more than whites.

Citizens of these areas are not inclined to approach the problem of a solution to the crime problem by taking measures that would deal with the causes of crime. Rather they opt for more and stricter law enforcement, more severe penalties for offenders, and stricter laws. They would repress rather than reorganize to deal with the problem.

On the whole citizens are reasonably positive in their attitudes toward the police. They nonetheless report specific attitudes that indicate they think the police in their city could be better, that they do not think of them as free from misconduct, and that they do not believe many police officers behave in a professional manner toward citizens. Negroes are less positive toward the police than are whites, but there is a substantial minority within both groups that would opt for a more professional police, if some of the measures are taken as indicators of professionalization of the police.

It is doubtful that most citizens would see themselves in a pro- or anti-police position or in a pro or anti-civil rights position. They are concerned about the crime problem and many of their attitudes and perceptions relate more

to these concerns than they do to any position vis-a-vis the law enforcement or criminal justice system.

Finally, it should be noted that survey results for a cross-section of the U. S. population might well disclose a somewhat different picture of the crime problem and of citizen perceptions toward law enforcement and criminal justice. Yet, that should not in any way obviate the importance of how residents in high crime rate areas of our large metropolitan cities regard crime. For it is there that much of the problem exists today, certainly in a more exacerbated form.

APPENDIX A
SURVEY INSTRUMENT
FOR
A STUDY OF CRIME AGAINST RESIDENTS
OF METROPOLITAN AREAS

Survey Research Center
The University of Michigan
Project 947
June, 1966

Sam. Bk. No. _____

Do not write in above space.

A STUDY OF CRIME AGAINST RESIDENTS OF METROPOLITAN AREAS

1. Place Interviewer's Label Here

2. PSU: _____

3. Your Int. No. _____

4. Date of Int. _____

5. Length of Int. _____

(minutes)

I'm _____ (name) from the Survey Research Center at the University of Michigan. We're doing a study for the National Crime Commission on crime against residents in the community. As you may know, the President and the Congress appointed a Commission to look into the problems of crime and law enforcement in our country and to come up with some solutions. I'd like to talk to you because you can help the Commission in their work by your answers in this study. Your answers are strictly confidential since this is a statistical study and no names are used.

1. About how long have you lived at this address?

_____ Years (IF MORE THAN 15 YEARS OR ALWAYS LIVED HERE, SKIP TO Q.6, PAGE 2)

2. Since 1950, what is the longest time you have lived at any one address?

_____ Years

3. Just before you moved here, in what city did you live?

_____ CITY OR TOWN _____ STATE

(IF (WASHINGTON/CHICAGO/BOSTON) ASK:)

3a. What was your address? _____

3b. Was that in the city or in the suburbs?

1. City

2. Suburbs

4. For how long did you live there
_____ Years

5. If you think back to about 1950, since that time, what city did you live in most of the time?
_____ City _____ State

(IF (WASHINGTON/CHICAGO/BOSTON) ASK:)

5a. What was your address? _____

5b. Was that in the city or in the suburbs?

1. City

2. Suburbs

→ (ASK EVERYONE)

6. On the whole, do you like living in this neighborhood, or not?

1. Yes, like

2. No

6a. What are the main things you especially like about living around here?

6b. Are there any things you don't like? (IF YES, DESCRIBE)

6c. What are the main things you don't like about living around here?

6d. Are there any things you do like? (IF YES, DESCRIBE)

7. Compared to other neighborhoods, do things go on here that might give this neighborhood a bad name?

1. Yes

2. No → SKIP TO Q. 8

7a. What kinds of things might give this neighborhood a bad name?

7b. What do you think can be done about it? _____

8. Are the people living in this neighborhood quiet or are some pretty noisy and disturb the neighborhood?

1. Quiet

2. Some noisy

9. Would you say that the people living in this neighborhood keep out of trouble with the law, or are there some who regularly get in trouble with the law?

1. Keep out of trouble

2. Some get in trouble

10. Have you ever had to call the police about anyone in this neighborhood?

1. Yes

2. No

10a. When was the last time you called them about someone in the neighborhood?

_____ Date

10b. What was that about? _____

11. When you think about the chances of getting robbed, threatened, beaten up, or anything of that sort, would you say your neighborhood is (READ ALTERNATIVES):

- 1. Very safe as compared to other neighborhoods in town? → SKIP TO Q. 12
- 2. About average?
- 3. Less safe than most?
- 4. One of the worst in town?
- (8. Don't know - DO NOT READ)

11a. Is there so much trouble in this neighborhood that you would like to move away from here if you could?

1. Yes
 2. No
 3. Other (Specify) _____

12. How about crimes happening in your neighborhood--would you say that they are committed mostly by the people who live here in this neighborhood or mostly by outsiders?

- 1. People who live here
- 2. Half and half
- 3. Outsiders
- 8. Don't know who commits them

13. What types of people do you think they (the people who commit crimes) might be?

14. I am going to show you some cards about different kinds of crimes. I would like you to tell me if any of the things on each card have happened to you personally in 1965 or 1966. By a crime, I mean anything somebody could be sent to prison or fined for doing or even trying to do.

(IF RESPONDENT BALKS AT SERIES, SAYING HE HAS NEVER HAD ANY CRIMES HAPPEN TO HIM, SAY:) We have found that many of the things we are interested in are hard to remember unless we ask specifically about them. I'm sure we'll find going through the cards a big help.

HAND CARDS A-J TO R, ONE AT A TIME; PROCEED THROUGH SERIES, READING ALL ITEMS ON EACH CARD, GIVING RESPONDENT AMPLE TIME TO CONSIDER AND REPLY TO EACH ITEM ON EACH CARD.

IF A CRIME IS MENTIONED IN Q. 14, THEN ASK Q. 14a WHETHER THE SAME KIND OF CRIME AS THAT JUST DESCRIBED HAS HAPPENED TO RESPONDENT AT ANY OTHER TIME DURING 1965-66.

(IF YES TO Q. 14)

14. Has that happened to you in 1965 or 1966?

14a. How many times has that happened to you in 1965 or 1966?

CARD A: BURGLARY--BREAKING AND ENTRY

- 1. Someone breaking into your home? (Or garage, shed, store, office?) 2. No 1. Yes → _____ Times
- 2. Trying to break in? 2. No 1. Yes → _____ Times
- 3. Have you ever found:
 - (a) a door jimmied? 2. No 1. Yes → _____ Times
 - (b) a lock forced? 2. No 1. Yes → _____ Times
 - (c) a window forced open? 2. No 1. Yes → _____ Times
- 4. Has something been taken or stolen from your home? (Or from a garage, shed, store, or office?) 2. No 1. Yes → _____ Times
- 5. Has anyone tried to steal anything of yours from a locker or safe? 2. No 1. Yes → _____ Times

(IF YES TO Q. 14)

14. Has that happened to you in 1965 or 1966?

14a. How many times has that happened to you in 1965 or 1966?

CARD B: ROBBERY

- 1. Something taken directly from you by force or by threatening to harm you? 2. No 1. Yes → _____ Times
- 2. Hold up or stick up? 2. No 1. Yes → _____ Times
- 3. Mugging or yoking? 2. No 1. Yes → _____ Times
- 4. Strong-arm robbery? 2. No 1. Yes → _____ Times
- 5. Money or bicycles taken by force? 2. No 1. Yes → _____ Times
- 6. Violent purse snatching? 2. No 1. Yes → _____ Times
- 7. Any attempts to rob you by force? 2. No 1. Yes → _____ Times

CARD C: THEFT-STEALING

ANYTHING ELSE STOLEN:

- 1. Car stolen? 2. No 1. Yes → _____ Times
- 2. Things stolen from car? 2. No 1. Yes → _____ Times
- 3. Hub caps, tires, battery taken from car? 2. No 1. Yes → _____ Times
- 4. Bicycle stolen? 2. No 1. Yes → _____ Times

(CARD C CONTINUED NEXT PAGE)

(IF YES TO Q. 14)

14. Has that happened to you in 1965 or 1966?

14a. How many times has that happened to you in 1965 or 1966?

(CARD C CONTINUED)

- 5. Purse snatched, things taken from purse? 2. No 1. Yes → _____ Times
- 6. Pocket picked? 2. No 1. Yes → _____ Times
- 7. Coat or hat stolen in restaurant or bar? 2. No 1. Yes → _____ Times
- 8. Things stolen from you while on bus, train, boat or plane? In a station? 2. No 1. Yes → _____ Times
- 9. Luggage stolen? 2. No 1. Yes → _____ Times
- 10. Things taken from mail-box? 2. No 1. Yes → _____ Times
- 11. Any attempts to steal anything? 2. No 1. Yes → _____ Times

CARD D: VANDALISM OR ARSON

THINGS PURPOSELY DAMAGED OR SET FIRE TO:

- 1. Window broken maliciously? 2. No 1. Yes → _____ Times
- 2. Property broken or damaged deliberately? 2. No 1. Yes → _____ Times
- 3. Fire deliberately set? 2. No 1. Yes → _____ Times

(CARD D CONTINUED NEXT PAGE)

(IF YES TO Q. 14)

14. Has that hap-
pened to you in
1965 or 1966?

14a. How many
times has that
happened to you
in 1965 or 1966?

(CARD D CONTINUED)

- 4. Car damaged maliciously--
antenna broken, lights
broken, tires slashed,
paint scratched? 2. No 1. Yes → _____ Times
- 5. Walls marked, fences or other
property on premises damaged? 2. No 1. Yes → _____ Times
- 6. Teenagers or children bother-
ing you by mischief? 2. No 1. Yes → _____ Times

CARD E: ASSAULT

SOMEONE TRYING TO HURT YOU
PHYSICALLY OR THE THREAT OF
INJURY IN ANY OF THESE WAYS:

- 1. Beaten up? 2. No 1. Yes → _____ Times
- 2. Attacked with a weapon (club,
knife, gun, hammer, bottle,
chair)? 2. No 1. Yes → _____ Times
- 3. Stones or other dangerous
objects thrown at you? 2. No 1. Yes → _____ Times
- 4. Hit or kicked? 2. No 1. Yes → _____ Times
- 5. Fight picked with you? 2. No 1. Yes → _____ Times
- 6. Any attempts or threats to
assault you or beat you up? 2. No 1. Yes → _____ Times

(IF YES TO Q. 14)

14. Has that hap-
pened to you in
1965 or 1966?

14a. How many
times has that
happened to you
in 1965 or 1966?

CARD F: SERIOUS AUTO OFFENSES

- 1. Hit and run accident? 2. No 1. Yes → _____ Times
- 2. Trying to force you off the
road or into an accident? 2. No 1. Yes → _____ Times
- 3. Deliberately driving a car at
you? 2. No 1. Yes → _____ Times
- 4. Someone failing to identify
himself after damaging or
running into your car? 2. No 1. Yes → _____ Times

CARD G: SEX OFFENSES

- 1. Someone peeping in your windows? 2. No 1. Yes → _____ Times
- 2. Indecent exposure in front of
you? 2. No 1. Yes → _____ Times
- 3. Rape or attempted rape? 2. No 1. Yes → _____ Times
- 4. Molested or sexually abused? 2. No 1. Yes → _____ Times

CARD H: THREATS

- 1. Blackmail? 2. No 1. Yes → _____ Times
- 2. Threatening or obscene or in-
sulting letters or telephone
calls? 2. No 1. Yes → _____ Times

(CARD H CONTINUED NEXT PAGE)

(IF YES TO Q. 14)

14. Has that happened to you in 1965 or 1966?

14a. How many times has that happened to you in 1965 or 1966?

(CARD H CONTINUED)

- 3. Someone demanding money with threat to harm you if you don't pay? 2. No 1. Yes → _____ Times
- 4. Someone demanding anything else with threats? 2. No 1. Yes → _____ Times
- 5. Someone threatening to make a false report about you to the police or to your employer or someone else? 2. No 1. Yes → _____ Times
- 6. Someone selling "protection"? 2. No 1. Yes → _____ Times

CARD I: FRAUDS, FORGERIES, SWINDLES

- 1. Passing worthless check, counterfeit money? 2. No 1. Yes → _____ Times
- 2. Someone forging your name to something? 2. No 1. Yes → _____ Times
- 3. Someone pretending to be somebody else to get you to give something or do something? 2. No 1. Yes → _____ Times
- 4. Being cheated by a confidence game? A swindle? 2. No 1. Yes → _____ Times
- 5. Selling you worthless things by making false claims about them? 2. No 1. Yes → _____ Times

(CARD I CONTINUED NEXT PAGE)

(IF YES TO Q. 14)

14. Has that happened to you in 1965 or 1966?

14a. How many times has that happened to you in 1965 or 1966?

(CARD I CONTINUED)

- 6. Selling you something stolen or something they had no right to sell? 2. No 1. Yes → _____ Times
- 7. Embezzling: misusing money you trusted someone with? 2. No 1. Yes → _____ Times

CARD J: OTHER CRIMES

- 1. False testimony against you in court? 2. No 1. Yes → _____ Times
- 2. False accusation to police? 2. No 1. Yes → _____ Times
- 3. Illegal action by police or other officials? 2. No 1. Yes → _____ Times
- 4. Kidnapping? 2. No 1. Yes → _____ Times
- 5. Prowler? 2. No 1. Yes → _____ Times
- 6. Defamation of character or slander--someone trying to ruin your reputation? 2. No 1. Yes → _____ Times
- 7. ANYTHING ELSE? 2. No 1. Yes → _____ Times

Specify: _____

INTERVIEWER: ADD THE TOTAL NUMBER OF INCIDENTS THAT R HAS REPORTED IN 14a AS HAPPENING TO HIM IN 1965 OR 1966:

_____ TOTAL

15 Now thinking back over your entire life, what would you say was the worst crime that has ever happened to you--the very worst thing in all your life? (IF R SAYS NO CRIMES HAVE EVER HAPPENED TO HIM SAY: "I mean at any time in your life, no matter how long ago." IF STILL NO: "Not even little kinds of things that I've mentioned?")

16. INTERVIEWER: COMPLETE AN INCIDENT FORM FOR EACH INCIDENT MENTIONED IN Q. 14 AND 14a. IF THE INCIDENT HAPPENED TO R AT OTHER TIMES DURING 1965 OR 1966, BE SURE TO COMPLETE AN INCIDENT FORM FOR EACH TIME IN 1965 OR 1966. IF "WORST" CRIME IS ONE WHICH HAPPENED IN 1965 OR 1966, INDICATE BY CHECKING "1" FOR Q. I-2b AND "1" FOR Q. I-2c. IF "WORST" DID NOT OCCUR IN 1965 OR 1966, BE SURE TO COMPLETE AN INCIDENT FORM FOR IT. "WORST" CRIME IS (CHECK ONE):

- 1. Same as one in Q. 14 or Q. 14a
- 2. New incident form completed
- 3. No crimes ever

Now we'd like to go back to the first incident you mentioned that happened to you and ask you a few more details about it.

17. Now, I'd like to ask you whether any of the things on each card have happened to anyone who lives here with you, that is anything that has happened in 1965 or 1966.

(HAND CARDS A-J TO R, ONE AT A TIME, PROCEED THROUGH SERIES BUT THIS TIME DO NOT READ EACH ITEM ON THE CARD. IF R READS, AS YOU HAND EACH CARD, ASK, "Has anything on this card happened in 1965 or 1966 to anyone who lives here with you?" IF R HAS DIFFICULTY READING, READ ALL ITEMS ON EACH CARD. RECORD ALL THESE INCIDENTS IN Q. 17a-17b.

17a. What happened and to whom did it happen?

17b. How many times has that happened to (VICTIM) or to anyone else who lives here in 1965 or 1966?

(SERIES CONTINUED NEXT PAGE)
[RECORD CRIMES ON P. 13]

17a. What happened?	To whom? (VICTIM: SPECIFY RELATIONSHIP TO R)	17b. How many times has that happened in 1965 or 1966?
1. _____	_____	_____
2. _____	_____	_____
3. _____	_____	_____
4. _____	_____	_____
5. _____	_____	_____
6. _____	_____	_____

(IF NOT MENTIONED IN Q. 17)

18. Has anyone picked a fight or beaten up your children, stole things from them at school, stolen their toys, or bothered or molested them in 1965 or 1966?

1. Yes → RECORD IN Q. 17a 2. No

(IF NOT MENTIONED IN Q. 17)

19. How about auto theft, has the car of anyone who lives here been stole or broken into in 1965 or 1966?

1. Yes → RECORD IN Q. 17a 2. No

(IF NOT MENTIONED IN Q. 17)

20. Has anyone taken something from the (house/apartment) that belongs to someone who lives here in 1965 or 1966?

1. Yes → RECORD IN Q. 17a 2. No

(IF NOT MENTIONED IN Q. 17)

21. Has anyone who lives here had any property stolen in 1965 or 1966?

1. Yes → RECORD IN Q. 17a 2. No

22. Thinking about other members of your household--what would you say was the very worst crime that ever happened to any one of them?

23. INTERVIEWER: COMPLETE AN INCIDENT FORM FOR EACH INCIDENT RECORDED IN Q. 17a. IF INCIDENT HAPPENED TO ANOTHER MEMBER OF R'S HOUSEHOLD OR MORE THAN ONCE TO THE SAME HOUSEHOLD MEMBER, BE SURE TO COMPLETE AN INCIDENT FORM FOR EACH TIME IN 1965 OR 1966. IF "WORST" CRIME IS ONE WHICH HAPPENED IN 1965 OR 1966, INDICATE BY CHECKING "1" FOR Q. I-2b AND "1" FOR Q. I-2c. IF "WORST" DID NOT OCCUR IN 1965 OR 1966, BE SURE TO COMPLETE AN INCIDENT FORM FOR IT. OTHER HOUSEHOLD MEMBERS' WORST CRIME IS (CHECK ONE):

- 1. Same as one in Q. 17a
- 2. New incident form completed
- 3. No crimes ever

Now we'd like to get a few more details about the first incident you mentioned that happened to FIRST OTHER HOUSEHOLD MEMBER VICTIM.

→ (ASK EVERYONE)

24. (Other than what you have told me about already) has any relative or close friend of yours ever been seriously injured as a result of a crime? (IF ASKED FOR DEFINITION, "SERIOUSLY INJURED" MEANS: Requiring a stay in the hospital or permanent physical impairment.)

- 1. Yes
- 2. No → GO TO Q. 25

24a. Could you tell when that happened? (IF MORE THAN ONE SUCH CASE, ASK FOR THE MOST RECENT.)

_____ Month _____ Year

24b. To whom did this happen? (SPECIFY RELATIONSHIP TO R. IF RESPONDENT IS REFERRING TO MORE THAN ONE VICTIM, ASK FOR RELATIONSHIP OF "the one closest to you.")

25. Besides the things that have happened to you or the other people in your house, have you ever seen anything happening that you thought was against the law, a crime or probably a crime?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No → GO TO Q. 26

25a. What happened? (IF MORE THAN ONE, ASK ABOUT THE MOST RECENT)

25b. Did you call or tell the police about it or get someone else to report it?

- 1. Yes → SKIP TO Q. 25d
- 2. No

25c. Why didn't you tell the police about it? (PROBE FULLY. IF MORE THAN ONE REASON GIVEN, ASK WHICH WAS MOST IMPORTANT AND UNDERLINE IT.)

(SKIP TO Q. 26)

(ASK ONLY OF PEOPLE WHO SAID YES, THEY REPORTED IN Q. 25b)

25d. Did you ever see a crime or something that looked like it might be a crime and not tell the police about it? (IF NO, PROBE:) You never saw any other crime?

- 1. Never saw any other crime → (SKIP TO Q. 26)
- 2. Saw but always reported → (SKIP TO Q. 26)
- 3. Saw but did not report

25e. Why didn't you report it? (PROBE FULLY. IF MORE THAN ONE REASON GIVEN, ASK WHICH WAS MOST IMPORTANT AND UNDERLINE IT.)

→ (ASK EVERYONE)

26. A number of people don't call the police when they see someone commit a crime. What do you think are the main reasons why people don't call the police in such cases?

27. Do you think a police officer should have the right to stop you any where outside your home and ask you to identify yourself by giving your name and where you live?

- 1. Yes
 - 2. Depends
 - 3. No
- ASK 27a., THEN SKIP TO Q. 29

27a. Why do you feel this way? _____

28. How about asking you more than your name and address? Do you think a police officer should have the right (be able) to ask you questions about what you are doing there, where you have been, and things like that?

- 1. Yes
- 2. Depends
- 3. No

28a. Why do you think he should (not) have the right to do that?

→ (ASK EVERYONE)

29. Do you think that a police officer should have a right to search if he stops you?

- 1. Yes
- 2. Depends
- 3. No

29a. Why do you feel this way? _____

30. Suppose a police officer thinks you may have committed a crime. Should he have the right to question you about a lot of things to find out? (IF R SAYS HE NEVER DOES ANY THING WRONG, SAY: "Well let's just suppose.")

- 1. Yes
- 2. No

30a. Why do you think he should (not) have the right to ask that? _____

31. Now we'd like to ask you if you have ever been in a court where a criminal case was being tried either as a witness or as a member of a jury. First, have you ever been in court as a witness in a criminal case?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No → SKIP TO Q. 32

31a. When was the last time?
 _____ Month _____ Year

31b. Were you asked to be a witness for the defense or for the prosecution?
 1. Defense 2. Prosecution 3. Don't know

31c. How many times did you appear at court (in connection with this case)?
 _____ Times

31d. Did you have to take off time from work to appear?
 1. Yes 2. No

31e. How much time did you take off (for the longest time you spent at court)?

31f. How long did you spend (what was the longest time you spent) at court?

31g. Were you generally satisfied with the way the case was tried?
 1. Yes 2. No

31h. Why not?

→ (ASK EVERYONE)

32. Did anyone ever ask you to be a witness and you weren't for some reason?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No

32a. What was the reason you weren't a witness?

33. If you were to have the information (again), would you volunteer to be a witness?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No

33a. Why do you feel this way?

34. Have you ever served on a jury or a grand jury?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No

35. Were you ever on trial as a defendant in a criminal case?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No

35a. What kind of case was that?

35b. How did it come out?

36. Thinking about crime in this neighborhood, do you think things have been getting better, getting worse or staying about the same during the past few years?

1. Better

3. Worse

2. Same

8. Don't know

36a. In what ways?

37. What do you think would be the most important thing that can be done here to cut down the amount of crime in this neighborhood?

Anything else?

38. (Other than what you've told me) do you think there's a lot, something, or very little that you as an individual can do about crime in this neighborhood?

1. A lot

2. Something

3. Very little

8. Don't know

38a. Why do you feel this way?

39. What about the city government, (the mayor and council/the District Commission). Do you feel they are doing a very good job, a fairly good job, or not too good a job when it comes to fighting crime and protecting citizens against crime?

1. Very good job

2. Fairly good job

3. Not too good a job

39a. Why is that?

40. Have you ever gotten together with other people around here or has any group or organization you belong to met and discussed the problem of crime or taken some sort of action to combat crime?

1. Yes

2. No

40a. Who got together about this?

40b. What did you do?

41. Turning now to a different subject: The demonstrations, marches, and picketing in the news today--How do you feel about them? Do you think they are generally good or bad? (PROBE FOR FULL AND COMPLETE RESPONSE, E.G., "Why?")

42. Do you think these demonstrations, marches and picketing are a very serious, a somewhat serious, or no danger to keeping order in our cities?

1. Very serious

2. Somewhat serious

3. No danger

8. Don't know

43. Whenever there are demonstrations, marches, or picketing these days, the police are there to handle matters that may come up. How do you feel about the way they usually handle such matters here in (Boston/Chicago/Washington, D.C.). Do you feel they do a very good job, a fairly good job, or a poor job?

- 1. Very good
- 2. Fairly good
- 8. Don't know
- 3. Poor

<p>43a. What do you like about the way the police handle these situations?</p> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/>	<p>43c. What don't you like about the way they handle these situations?</p> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/>
<p>43b. Are there any ways they might better handle these situations? (DESCRIBE)</p> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/>	<p>43d. How might they better handle these situations?</p> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/>

44. Now, we'd like to ask you some questions about the law and courts here: From your own experience or from what you hear, do you think that the criminal courts in (Washington/Boston/Chicago) always give people accused of crimes a fair trial?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No

44a. In what ways might some one not get a fair trial? _____

45. How do you feel about the laws and sentences that are usually handed out in criminal cases here. What about the judges and the sentences that are usually handed out? Do you think they are too lenient, too harsh, or about right? (PROBE FOR FULL AND COMPLETE RESPONSE, E.G., "In what ways?")

46. Turning now to the courts and their rulings, do you think that the courts have gone too far in making rules favoring and protecting people who get into trouble with the law? (PROBE FOR FULL AND COMPLETE RESPONSE, E.G., "In what ways?")

47. Do you think that too much attention now is being given to protecting the rights of people who get into trouble with the police?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- 8. Don't know

47a. Why do you say that? _____

48. Now, we'd like to talk about the police in this neighborhood: would you say that in general the police in this neighborhood are doing a very good job, a fairly good job, or not too good a job?

- 1. Very good
- 2. Fairly good
- 3. Not too good
- 8. Don't know

48a. Are there any particular ways they aren't doing a good job?

1. Yes
2. No

48b. In what ways? _____

48c. In what ways aren't they doing a good job?

49. Do you think the police get along better, worse, or about the same with the people who live in this neighborhood as they do with people in other neighborhoods in (Washington/Chicago/Boston)?

- 1. Better
- 2. About the same
- 3. Worse

49a. Is that mostly because of the way the people who live here are or because of the way the police are?

1. People who live here
2. Both
3. Police
8. Don't know

50. Compared to other neighborhoods, do the (Washington/Chicago/Boston) police have a higher reputation or a poorer reputation in this neighborhood?

- 1. Higher
- 2. Same
- 3. Poorer
- 8. Don't know

51. Some people say that how the police treat you depends on who you are. Do you think this is true?

- 1. Yes
- 2. Sometimes
- 3. No → SKIP TO Q. 51

51a. What sort of people are treated well and what sort are treated not so well?

WELL TREATED:

POORLY TREATED:

(IF NEGROES ARE MENTIONED ASK Q. 51b.)

51b. What have you personally seen that affected your ideas of how the police treat Negroes in (Washington/Chicago/Boston)?

(ASK IF NEGROES NOT MENTIONED IN Q. 51a. OR R ANSWERED "No" TO Q. 51.)

51c. If a man is a Negro, do you think this usually makes a difference in how he is treated by the police in (Washington/Chicago/Boston)?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No

51d. In what way? _____

51e. What have you personally seen that affected your ideas of how the police treat Negroes in (Washington/Chicago/Boston)?

52. Do you think that the police are generally too lenient, too harsh, or about right in dealing with people who are suspected of breaking the law?

53. How many police do you think there are on the (Washington/Chicago/Boston) police force who just enjoy pushing people around and giving them a hard time? Would you say there are many, quite a few, or only a small number?

1. Many	2. Quite a few	3. Small number	4. None	8. Don't know
---------	----------------	-----------------	---------	---------------

54. Some people say that police officers take bribes and payoffs. Do you think that the police in this (district/precinct) [area] are doing that?

1. Yes	2. No	8. Don't know
--------	-------	---------------

54a. Would you say that most of the officers or only some of them do that?

1. Most	2. Some
---------	---------

55. If there were more Negroes on the police force, do you think people in your neighborhood would cooperate more, about the same, or less with the police?

1. More	2. Same	3. Less	8. Don't know
---------	---------	---------	---------------

55a. Why would this make people (more/less) cooperative? _____

56. Now we'd like to turn to a slightly different topic--the general public's opinion of the police. Do you think that the general public's opinion of the police has changed in the past five years?

1. Yes

2. No

8. Don't know

56a. In what ways has it changed? _____

57. In the last few years, do you think that the police have changed in the way they act toward the public?

1. Have changed

2. Have not changed

8. Don't know

57a. In what ways have they changed? _____

58. Do you think that in general the public helps as much as they should when they see police officers in trouble?

1. Yes

2. No

8. Don't know

58a. Are there any ways they could help more? (IF YES, DESCRIBE)

58b. In what ways could they help more?

59. Why do you think they don't help more? _____

60. Do you think there should be more use of police dogs than there is now?

1. Yes

2. No

60a. Why do you say that? _____

61. If a young man had a choice between being a city policeman and getting a job paying just as much in the construction business do you think he would be making a mistake if he became a policeman?

1. Yes

2. No

61a. Why do you feel this way? _____

62. Some people say you would have to replace at least half the police now on the force to get a really good police force here in (Washington, Chicago/Boston). Do you think that is true or not?

1. Yes, true

2. No, not true

62a. Why do you say that? _____

63. Do you think the (City/D.C. Metropolitan) police should be paid very much more, somewhat more, or about what they are paid now?

1. Very much more

2. Somewhat more

3. Same pay

4. Less

8. Don't know

64. Considering every thing about the way the police do their job would you say that you had, great respect for the police, or little respect for them, or mixed feelings about them?

- 1. Great respect
- 2. Little respect
- 3. Mixed feelings
- 8. Don't know

65. Now I'd like to ask some other questions. Do you have a good friend or a relative who is a member of the (D.C. Metropolitan/Chicago/Boston) police force? (IF YES, PROBE TO ASCERTAIN RELATIONSHIP.)

- 1. Yes
- 2. No → SKIP TO Q. 65b.

65a. Who?

- 1. Friend
- 2. Relative
- 3. Both

SKIP TO Q. 66

65b. Do you know any policemen well enough to call them by name?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No

65c. Is he a member of the (D.C. Metropolitan/Chicago/Boston) police force?

- 1. Yes → SKIP TO Q. 66
- 2. No → SKIP TO Q. 66

65d. Do you know any policemen well enough to say hello to?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No

65e. Is he a member of the (D.C. Metropolitan/Chicago/Boston) police force?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No

66. When was the last time you talked to a policeman about something official--like getting a ticket or reporting something that was wrong? (IF NEVER, PROBE: Not even for anything like getting a driver's license or anything like that?)

- 1. Within past week
- 2. More than a week but less than a month ago
- 3. More than a month but less than a year ago
- 4. More than a year ago
- 0. Never → (SKIP TO Q. 68)

66a. Did you talk by telephone or in person?

- 1. Telephone
- 2. In person

66b. What was the reason for your speaking to the policeman? (DESCRIBE FULLY BEING SURE TO INDICATE THE KIND OF INCIDENT INVOLVED, ITS SERIOUSNESS, AND THE ROLE OF R.)

67. On the whole did the policeman (policemen) in this case act as you think (he/they) should?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- 3. Yes & No (mixed reaction)
- 4. Yes & No (different policemen)

67a. What did you like about the way (he/they) acted? _____

67b. What didn't you like about the way (he/they) acted? _____

(IF NOT SPECIFICALLY MENTIONED)

67c. How did the officer(s) treat you as a person? (How did you feel about what he did to you as a person?)

→ (ASK EVERYONE)

68. When was the last time you talked with a policeman about something that was not official--socially, or just to say hello, or even out of curiosity to ask what was going on?

- 1. Within past week
- 2. More than a week but less than a year ago
- 3. More than a month but less than a year ago
- 4. More than a year ago
- 0. Never

(IF THERE IS ANY DOUBT AS TO WHETHER THE OFFICIAL OR THE SOCIAL CONTACT WAS MOST RECENT, ASK Q. 69; IF NO DOUBT, CHECK WITHOUT ASKING)

69. Which contact - the social or the official one - was most recent?

- 1. Official
- 2. Social
- 3. No contact

70. Have you yourself ever seen a policeman doing anything you felt was wrong?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No

<p>70a. What is the most serious thing you ever saw a police officer do that was wrong?</p> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/>	<p>70b. Has anyone told you about something they saw a police officer do that was wrong?</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/> 1. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> 2. No</p> <hr/> <p>70c. What was the most serious thing anyone told you they saw a police officer do that was wrong?</p> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/>
---	--

(ASK UNLESS ALREADY MENTIONED IN Q. 70)

71. Have you ever had an experience where you saw a police officer using physical force of some kind toward a person?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No

71a. How do you feel about the way he handled the situation? _____

72. Other than regular police work, do you know of anything the police are doing to work with people in this community?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No

72a. What are they doing?

72b. How do you feel about what they are doing?

72c. Have you personally had any kind of contact with the police in connection with that? (DESCRIBE)

72d. Is there anything you think the police should be doing to work with the people in this community? (DESCRIBE)

73. Since there has been all this talk about crime, we would like to know if you yourself have done anything in any way to protect yourself against the dangers of crime. First lets talk about what you have done about the dangers of crime. First lets talk about what you have done about your (house/apartment). Do you have any special locks on your doors, locks or bars on windows, additional lights outside your (house/apartment)?

1. Yes

2. No → SKIP TO Q. 74

(IF YES, INDICATE ALL THAT APPLY AND ASK:)

73a. What made you decide (to put them on/to do that)? (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

	73a. Why decided?
<u> </u> 1. Locks on door →	_____
<u> </u> 2. Locks or bars on windows →	_____
<u> </u> 3. Additional lights →	_____

74. What else, if anything, have you done to protect your (house/apartment)?

74a. What made you decide to do that? _____

75. Do you own or rent this (house/apartment)?

1. Own → SKIP TO Q. 76

2. Rent

(IF RENTS, ASK:)

75a. Have the owners or managers of the building done anything to protect it from crime or mischief, like putting more secure locks on entrances, locks or bars on windows, additional lights, provided a doorman, or done something else to protect against crime?

1. Yes

2. No

(INDICATE WHAT WAS DONE)

 1. More secure locks on building entrances

 2. Locks or bars on windows

 3. Additional lights

 4. Doorman, other attendant

 7. Other, (SPECIFY) _____

75b. What is your monthly rent, including utilities?

\$ _____

(IF OWNS:)

76. What is the present market value of your house?

\$ _____

→ (ASK EVERYONE)

77. How many rooms are there in your (house/apartment), not counting bathrooms?

_____ Rooms

78. Do you own an automobile?

- 1. Yes → SKIP TO Q. 79
- 2. No

78a. Does anyone else in the family (living here with you) own an automobile?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No → SKIP TO Q. 81

(ASK IF ANY AUTOMOBILES IN HOUSEHOLD)

79. Do any of these automobiles (Does this automobile) have theft insurance or a comprehensive policy that includes theft insurance?

- 1. Yes (any one)
- 2. No

80. What do you (or other members of the family) do, if any thing, to protect the car(s)? (READ ALTERNATIVES AND CHECK AS MANY AS APPLY)

- 1. Lock on hood
- 2. Lock doors
- 3. Put in garage
- 7. Other (SPECIFY) _____
- 0. Nothing

→ (ASK EVERYONE)

81. Are you a licensed driver?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No

82. Is anyone else in your household a licensed driver?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No

83. In what ways, have you changed your habits because of fear of crime:

- 1. Stay off streets at night
- 2. Use taxis at night
- 3. Avoid being out alone
- 4. Avoid talking to strangers
- 7. Other (SPECIFY) _____
- 0. Have not changed ways at all

84. When you go out, do you ever carry anything to protect yourself?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No

84a. What do you carry? _____

84b. When do you do this? _____

85. Do you now have an insurance policy that protects your house and belongings against theft or burglary?

1. Yes

2. No

85a. What kind of insurance policy is it? Is it a general home owners policy, or is it a policy just on theft or burglary, or is it some other kind?

- 1. General home owners
- 2. Theft or burglary only
- 3. Other (SPECIFY) _____
- 8. Don't really know

85b. Is there any reason why you haven't taken out insurance of this kind?

SKIP TO Q. 87

(ASK Q. 85c IF R HAS THEFT INSURANCE AND HAD NO ROBBERY OR BURGLARY OR THEFT INCIDENTS FROM HOUSE. IF HAS HAD SU^{CH} INCIDENTS, SKIP TO Q. 86)

85c. Have you ever filed a claim on this policy for theft or burglary?

1. Yes

2. No → SKIP TO Q. 86

85d. How long ago was that?

_____ Date

85e. What was it for? _____

85f. Did you get the amount of money you felt it was worth?

1. Yes

2. No

(IF HAS INSURANCE AND HAS HAD THEFT INCIDENTS)

86. Has there ever been a time when you could have filed a claim and didn't for some reason?

1. Yes

2. No

86a. What was the reason you didn't file a claim? _____

(ASK EVERYONE)

→ 87. Do you or does any member of the household own a firearm (a gun of any kind--pistol, rifle, shotgun)?

1. Yes

2. No → GO TO Q. 88

87a. Is the weapon for use in hunting or protection or perhaps some of both?

- 1. Hunting, marksmanship, sport
- 2. Protection
- 3. Both
- 4. Only as part of protective service job
- 5. None of the above (curio, collector, ornamental)
- 7. Other (SPECIFY) _____

88. Now I'd like to ask you some other questions. Do you know the name of the chief of police here in (Washington/Chicago/Boston)?

_____ (Name)

89. Would you say there has been an increase in violent crime here in (Washington/Chicago/Boston)? I mean attacks on people--like shootings, stabbings, and rapes. Would you say that there's now very much more of this sort of thing, just a little bit more, not much difference, or that there is no more than five years ago? (IF RESPONDENT HAS BEEN A RESIDENT LESS THAN 5 YEARS: Well, from what you've heard....)

- 1. Very much more .
- 2. Just a little bit more
- 3. Not much difference
- 4. No increase
- 5. Even less
- 8. Don't know

90. About how many people would you guess are murdered in (Washington/Chicago/Boston) each month: Just give me your best guess. (PROBE: 1, 5, 10, 50, 100?)

_____ Actual number _____ No idea at all

91. If you were accused of a crime and you knew of someone who could clear your name but for some reason didn't want to get involved, how could you get that person to make a statement at your trial?

1. Yes, knows of subpoena power

2. No, don't know

92. Now just a few questions about the people who live here and we'll be through. How many people are there, children as well as adults, in your family who live at this address with you? (NOT COUNTING RESPONDENT)

_____ People

93. Are there any (other) people who share this (house/apartment) with you?

1. Yes

2. No

93a. How many?

94. Have all the people living here now lived here since January 1965?

1. Yes

2. No

(IF NO, PROBE TO GET AGE AND SEX AND NUMBER OF MONTHS LIVED IN THE HOUSEHOLD.)

	AGE	SEX	NUMBER OF MONTHS
a.	___	___	___
b.	___	___	___
c.	___	___	___
d.	___	___	___

95. Has anyone moved out of the household since January 1965? (INCLUDE DECEASED)

1. Yes

2. No

(IF YES, PROBE TO GET AGE AND SEX AND MONTHS LIVED IN HOUSEHOLD FROM JANUARY 1965 TO TIME LEFT)

	AGE	SEX	NUMBER OF MONTHS
a.	___	___	___
b.	___	___	___
c.	___	___	___
d.	___	___	___

96. Are you (READ ALTERNATIVES):

1. Married

2. Widowed

3. Divorced

4. Separated

5. Never married

97. What is your occupation? _____

97a. What kind of work do you do on your job? _____

98. What is the highest grade you attended in school? (CIRCLE HIGHEST LEVEL)

___ Never attended school

K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 High School Diploma

College 1 2 3 4 5 6 or more

Bus/Tech 1 2 3 4 or more INDICATE IF HAS HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA

1. Yes

2. No

(ASK Q. 99 IF R NOT HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD AND LIVES WITH OTHERS. IF RESPONDENT IS HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD, LIVES ALONE, OR THERE IS NO ACKNOWLEDGED HEAD, SKIP TO Q. 102.)

99. What is the occupation of the head of the household? _____

99a. What kind of work does he do on his job? _____

100. What is his marital status (READ ALTERNATIVES):

1. Married

2. Widowed

3. Divorced

4. Separated

5. Never married

101. What was the last grade in school attended by the head? (CIRCLE HIGHEST LEVEL)

___ Never attended school

K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 High School Diploma

College 1 2 3 4 5 6 or more

Bus/tech 1 2 3 4 or more INDICATE IF HAS HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA

1. Yes

2. No

→ (ASK EVERYONE)

102. Which of the people living here were working at a regular job last week?

___ 0. None

___ 1. Male head only

___ 2. Female head only

___ 3. Both male head and female spouse

___ 4. One person, other than head or spouse

___ 5. More than one person, but none of the above applicable

103. About what was your total family income last year--1965--from all the members of the family together including all sources such as wages, profits, interest, and so on? (HAND CARD) Just give me the letter on the card that fits.

___ a. Under \$3,000

___ e. \$10,000-\$14,999

___ b. \$3,000-\$4,999

___ f. \$15,000-\$19,999

___ c. \$5,000-\$6,999

___ g. \$20,000-\$24,999

___ d. \$7,000-\$9,999

___ h. \$25,000 and over

104. Does anyone here work nights--3 nights a week or more outside the home regularly?

1. Yes

2. No

105. Is there someone, other than a child under 10, who is usually at home here during the day?

1. Yes

2. No

106. Do you have a telephone here in this (house/apartment)?

1. Yes

2. No

106a. Is there a phone in the building that you can use whenever you want to?

1. Yes

2. No

107. How near by is the closest store that sells liquor?

- 1. Same building
- 2. Adjacent building
- 3. Less than one block
- 4. One block but less than two
- 5. Two to three blocks
- 6. More than three blocks

108. Thank you for your cooperation. That completes the questions we have. Is there anything else you'd like to mention about the problem of crime in this area that you think the National Crime Commission ought to be informed about?

109. Would you like to hear how this survey came out? (IF YES, THEN SAY:)
Let's see, I have your address on this cover sheet. Could you give me your name? Thank you.

_____ (NAME)

APPENDIX B
SURVEY INSTRUMENT
FOR
A STUDY OF
LAW ENFORCEMENT CONTACTS
IN METROPOLITAN AREAS

Survey Research Center
The University of Michigan
Project 947
July, 1966

Sam. Bk. No. _____

Do not write in above space

PLACE INTERVIEWER'S LABEL HERE

Your Interview Number _____

A STUDY OF LAW ENFORCEMENT CONTACTS IN METROPOLITAN AREAS

INCIDENT FORM FOR Q. 16 and Q. 17a.

I-1. Contact Identification and Report. (NOTE THAT "VICTIM"
WILL ALWAYS BE THE RESPONDENT).

1-1a. Listed as incident: A B C D E F

in question: 16 17a

1-1b. When did that incident occur? (See question 16
or 17b.)

MONTH

DATE

1-2. Now I'd like to talk with YOU about the incident that
happened to you on _____ (most recently, or since
June 1). Would you tell me a little bit more about
what happened? (IN DESCRIPTION OF VICTIMIZATION OR
INCIDENT, BE SURE TO SPECIFY WHETHER ACTUAL, ATTEMPT,
OR THREAT OF CRIME AS WELL AS SPECIFIC DETAILS, e.g.
"The door was jimmied on the garage in back of the
house.")

(UNLESS CLEAR FROM THE DESCRIPTION OF THE INCIDENT, ASK:)

I-3. Were you present when the (incident/crime) took place?

- 1. YES
- 2. NO

I-4. Was anyone (else) around when this happened?

- 1. YES
- 2. NO → SKIP TO Q. I-5
- 8. DON'T KNOW ←

I-4a. Who were they? (SPECIFY RELATIONSHIP TO VICTIM)	I-4b. Sex	I-4c. What is (his/her) age about?
A. _____	M F	_____ years
B. _____	M F	_____ years
C. _____	M F	_____ years
D. _____	M F	_____ years
E. _____	M F	_____ years
F. _____	M F	_____ years

I-4d. Did you ask (him/her/any of them) to be a witness for you?

- 1. YES
- 2. NO → GO TO I-4i-k

I-4e. Did (he/she/they) agree to serve as witness for you if you needed them?

- 1. YES → SKIP TO I-5
- 2. NO
- 8. DON'T KNOW → SKIP TO I-5

I-4f. Why did (he/she/they) refuse to be a witness for you?

I-4g. Is there any way you could have made (him/her/any of them) be a witness for you if you needed them?
 1. YES 2. NO → GO TO I-5

I-4h. In what way?

(ASK I-4 i-k IF DIDNT ASK BYSTANDER(S) TO BE WITNESS(ES))

I-4i. Why didn't you happen to ask anyone to be a witness?

I-4j. Is there any way you could have made a person be a witness for you if you needed him?
 1. Yes 2. No

I-4k. In what way?

→ (ASK EVERYONE)

I-5 Where did this incident happen--in or near your home, within a block of your house, in the neighborhood or else where in (Washington/ Chicago/Boston)?

- 1. at home
 - 2. near home
 - 3. within a block of the house
 - 4. in neighborhood
 - 5. elsewhere in (Washington/ Chicago/ Boston)
- } SKIP TO I-5b.

(IF AT OR NEAR HOME)

I-5a. Just where (at/near) home did it take place?

- One room apartment
- Inside house or in multi-room apt. (SPECIFY ROOMS): _____
- On landing, hall or stairway (i.e., inside an apartment building, but outside of the apartment)
- In lobby of apartment building
- On porch
- In yard, driveway, or parking area
- Alley, sidewalk or street (which?) _____
- Other place near home (SPECIFY) _____

→ GO TO I-6

(ASK I-5b IF WITHIN BLOCK, IN NEIGHBORHOOD, OR ELSEWHERE)

I-5b. Just where (within a block/in the neighborhood/elsewhere in the city) did it take place)?

 In a yard, driveway, or parking area

 Alley, sidewalk or street (which?)

 Park, field, or playground

 Vacant lot

 Public conveyance or station

 R's place of work (SPECIFY office, factory, etc.)

 Retail establishment or bank (SPECIFY)

 Tavern, restaurant, pool hall (SPECIFY)

 Other place (SPECIFY)

(ASK EVERYONE)

I-6. Were you or was anyone with you threatened in any way--with some weapon or with words or in some other way?

1. Yes 2. No → SKIP TO I-7

I-6a. Who was threatened? (CHECK ALL WHO WERE THREATENED LETTERS INDICATE PERSONS IDENTIFIED IN I-4a.)

 R A B C D E F

I-6b. How were (you/they) threatened-- with some weapon, or words, or what? (IF DIFFERENT METHODS FOR DIFFERENT VICTIMS, PREFACE DESCRIPTION BY LETTER OF VICTIM)

I-7. Was anyone injured or hurt by what happened?

1. YES 2. NO → (SKIP TO Q. I-8)

I-7a. How was the injury inflicted? (IF VICTIM WAS HIT, INDICATE INSTRUMENT USED.) (IF DIFFERENT METHODS USED FOR DIFFERENT VICTIMS, PREFACE DESCRIPTION BY LETTER OF VICTIM)

I-7b. How serious was the injury? (CHECK APPROPRIATE BOX FOR EACH VICTIM)

R	A	B	C	D	E	
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	0. No injury
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	1. Minor injury
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	2. Treated at emergency center or by doctor and released
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	3. Hospitalized overnight or longer
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	4. Died from injuries

(CHECK ONE; DO NOT ASK)

R was treated or hospitalized for injury (Continue with I-7c or 7d)

R was not injured or suffered only minor injury not requiring treatment (SKIP TO I-8)

(IF R TREATED OR HOSPITALIZED)

(ASK I-7c IF R IN HOSPITAL OVER NIGHT OR LONGER)

I-7c. How long did you have to stay in the hospital?
_____ days

I-7d. (In addition to the time you spent in the hospital)
How many times did you have to go to a doctor's
office, a clinic or medical center, or a hospital?
_____ total times

I-7e. Did you have to take off time from work for any of
these treatments?

1. YES

2. NO

I-7f. In all, how much time did you have to take off?
_____ HOURS

I-7g. How much did the total treatment of your injuries
cost (including hospitalization)? \$ _____

I-7h. How was this paid? (If R has not yet paid, ask:
How will this be paid?)

- _____ 1. R's (or R's household's) insurance or
medical coverage or plan
- _____ 2. Insurance of other (SPECIFY) _____
- _____ 3. Out of R's (or R's household's) pocket
- _____ 4. Out of some other's pocket (SPECIFY) _____
- _____ 5. Welfare, city or country aid (SPECIFY) _____
- _____ 6. Other (SPECIFY) _____

→ → → → (ASK EVERYONE)

I-8. Was any money or property taken or was there an attempt
to take any of your money or property?

- _____ 1. Yes, money or property was taken
- _____ 2. Yes, only an unsuccessful attempt was made to
take money or property
- _____ 3. Offense not directed in any way to money or property
→ (SKIP TO I-9p.10.)

(ASK I-8a-p. IF THREAT, ATTEMPT OR ACTUAL TAKING OF MONEY OR
PROPERTY)

I-8a. What money or property (was taken/was there an attempt
to take)? (CHECK ALL CATEGORIES BELOW THAT APPLY)

(ASK ONLY ABOUT ITEMS ACTUALLY TAKEN)

I-8b. About how much was that worth? (IN TERMS OF WHAT R PAID)

- A. Currency, money, or checks ... _____ 1. TAKEN (VALUE) \$ _____
_____ 2. ATTEMPT OR THREAT ONLY
- B. Clothing _____ 1. TAKEN (VALUE) \$ _____
_____ 2. ATTEMPT OR THREAT ONLY
- C. Household goods _____ 1. TAKEN (VALUE) \$ _____
_____ 2. ATTEMPT OR THREAT ONLY
- D. Automobile _____ 1. TAKEN (VALUE) \$ _____
_____ 2. ATTEMPT OR THREAT ONLY
- E. Auto parts, accessories _____ 1. TAKEN (VALUE) \$ _____
_____ 2. ATTEMPT OR THREAT ONLY
- F. Jewelry _____ 1. TAKEN (VALUE) \$ _____
_____ 2. ATTEMPT OR THREAT ONLY
- G. Bicycle _____ 1. TAKEN (VALUE) \$ _____
_____ 2. ATTEMPT OR THREAT ONLY
- H. Negotiable instruments,
credit cards _____ 1. TAKEN (VALUE) \$ _____
_____ 2. ATTEMPT OR THREAT ONLY
- I. Other (SPECIFY) _____ 1. TAKEN (VALUE) \$ _____
_____ 2. ATTEMPT OR THREAT ONLY

(SERIES CONTINUED NEXT PAGE)

(IF PROPERTY TAKEN OR AN ATTEMPT OR THREAT)

I-8c. How did (OFFENDER) go about (taking/trying to take) it?

- 1. Violence
- 2. Threat of violence
- 3. Forcible entry
- 4. Entry with force
- 5. Stealth
- 6. Fraud
- 7. Other false claim (DESCRIBE) _____
- 8. Other (DESCRIBE) _____

(SERIES CONTINUES NEXT PAGE)

(IF MONEY OR PROPERTY TAKEN, ASK I-8d; IF ONLY ATTEMPT OR THREAT, SKIP TO Q. I-9., p. 10)

I-8d. How much, if any, of the actual stolen property or money did you get back?

(IF ANYTHING RECOVERED ASK)

I-8e. How was it recovered? _____

(IF NOT TOTALLY RECOVERED)

I-8f. Were you repaid in any way for the loss--say by insurance, or in some other way?

1. YES

2. NO → SKIP TO I-8j.

I-8g. How were you repaid? _____

I-8h. What per cent of the loss did that cover?
_____ per cent

I-8i. Did you have any trouble collecting? (IF YES, DESCRIBE TROUBLE)

→ GO TO Q. I-9, p. 10

(IF NOT REPAID)

I-9g. Do you have any insurance that would cover loss for damages?

1. Yes

2. No (SKIP TO I-91)

I-9h. Have you filed a claim to cover the loss?

1. Yes

2. No (SKIP TO I-9k)

I-9i. Does it look as though you will get all that you claimed?

1. Yes GO TO I-10

2. NO

I-9j. Why not? _____

(SKIP TO I-10)

I-9k. Why didn't you file a claim? _____

SKIP TO I-10

(IF NO DAMAGE INSURANCE)

I-9l. Why don't you carry insurance for damages to your property? _____

(ASK EVERYONE)

I-10. Did the police learn about this incident?

1. Yes

2. No (SKIP TO Q. I-14, p. 18)

I-10a. How did the police first learn about it?

Personally to a Policeman:

Reported by:	Phone	At the Station	Elsewhere
Respondent	_____	_____	_____
Witness	_____	_____	_____
Offender	_____	_____	_____
Observed directly by Police _____			
Other (SPECIFY) _____			

I-10b. How long after the police learned about the (INCIDENT) was it before they came?

- ___ 1. Police were there as it happened and observed it directly.
- ___ 2. Right away or within 5 minutes
- ___ 3. Short time after, or within 6 to 15 minutes
- ___ 4. 15 minutes to 29 minutes
- ___ 5. 30 minutes to 59 minutes
- ___ 6. An hour to two hours
- ___ 7. More than two hours (SPECIFY EXACT LENGTH OF TIME) _____

I-10c. What did the police do? _____

I-10d. Did you ask the police to do anything while they were handling your case?

1. Yes

2. No

I-10e. What did you ask them to do? _____

I-10f. How did the police respond to what you asked them to do--did they do it, or what? _____

I-10g. Would you say that you were completely satisfied with the way the police who first came handled the matter?

1. Yes

2. No

I-10h. What did you like about the way it was handled? _____

I-10j. What didn't you like about the way it was handled? _____

I-10i. Is there anything you didn't like about the way it was handled? (IF YES, DESCRIBE) _____

I-10k. Is there anything you did like about the way it was handled? (IF YES, DESCRIBE) _____

I-11. Did the police follow up your case in any way?

1. Yes

2. No

I-11a. Who came? _____

I-11b. What did they do? _____

I-11c. (Other than what you've told me) Did any detectives or other police officers come to see you after the police first came to handle the matter?

1. Yes

2. No

I-11d. Who came? _____

I-11e. What did they do? _____

CHECK ONE - DO NOT ASK

Case followed up by other police officers or by detectives or by both - GO ON TO I-11f.

No follow up by police officer of any kind - SKIP TO I-12.

(IF FOLLOWED UP BY OTHER OFFICERS OR DETECTIVES)

I-11f. Were you completely satisfied with the way that the detectives/other officers) handled your case?

1. Yes

2. No

I-11g. What did you like about the way it was handled? _____

I-11i. What didn't you like about the way it was handled? _____

I-11h. Is there anything you didn't like about the way it was handled? (IF YES, DESCRIBE) _____

I-11j. Is there anything you liked about the way it was handled? (IF YES, DESCRIBE) _____

I-12. Looking back on the whole, do you think the (policeman/policemen) in this case acted or behaved toward you as (he/they) should?

- 1. Yes
- 2. Yes and No
- 3. No

I-12a. What was it (he/they) did that you liked? _____

I-12b. Was there anything (he/they) did that you didn't like? (IF YES, DESCRIBE) _____

I-12c. What was it (he/they) did that you didn't like? _____

I-12d. Was there anything (he/they) did that you did like? (IF YES, DESCRIBE) _____

I-13. How did you feel about the way the officer(s) treated you as a person?

(IF NOT SPECIFICALLY MENTIONED, ASK)

I-13a. Did (he/they) do anything that made you angry with the way (he/they) treated you?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- 3. Don't know

I-13b. What did (he/they) do that made you feel that way? _____

(IF NOT SPECIFICALLY MENTIONED, ASK)

I-13c. Was there anything (he/they) did that made you feel (he/they) (was/were) against you as a person?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- 3. Don't know

I-13d. What? _____

→ → (SKIP TO I-15)

(IF R SAYS POLICE DID NOT LEARN OF INCIDENT, ASK I-14)

I-14. Why wasn't it reported? (UNDERLINE THE MOST IMPORTANT REASON) _____

(ASK EVERYONE)

I-15. Was the crime committed by only one or more than one person?

- ___ 1. Evidence indicates only one offender
- ___ 2. Evidence indicates more than one offender

I-15a. How many of them do you think there were?

(NUMBER OF OFFENDERS)

___ 7. Uncertain (SPECIFY)

I-16. Do you know who it was who committed the crime or were there any suspects?

- ___ 1. Absolutely no idea who or what kind of person(s) did it. (SKIP TO Q. I-19 p. 25.)
- ___ 2. Saw or heard offenders but don't know who they were (SKIP TO Q. I-16b.)
- ___ 3. Suspects only
- ___ 4. Offender(s) definitely identified and R knows who they are

I-16a. Was it anyone you know personally or that you met before?

- ___ 1. Immediate family member (SPECIFY) _____
- ___ 2. Relative (SPECIFY) _____
- ___ 3. Friend
- ___ 4. Neighbor
- ___ 5. Acquaintance or other known to victim previously (SPECIFY HOW MET OR KNOWN BEFORE)
- ___ 6. Business relationship, offender a client
- ___ 7. Business relationship, offender a vendor, delivery boy, etc.
- ___ 0. Stranger

I-16b. What was (his/her/their) race?

- ___ 1. Only Negro person(s)
- ___ 2. Only white person(s)
- ___ 3. Only other non-white person(s)
- ___ 4. Both white and Negro person(s)
- ___ 5. Other (SPECIFY) _____
- ___ 8. Unknown

I-16c. (IF ONE OFFENDER)

How old do you think the (OFFENDER) was?

(IF MORE THAN ONE)

How old was the youngest? (THEN) And how old was the oldest?

"Only one" or youngest of "More than one"

If "More than one, "Oldest"

- | | | |
|-----|---------------------|-----|
| ___ | Child (under 10) | ___ |
| ___ | Juvenile (10-17) | ___ |
| ___ | Young adult (18-22) | ___ |
| ___ | Adult (over 22) | ___ |
| ___ | Unknown | ___ |

I-16d. Sex of offender(s)?

- ___ 1. All male
- ___ 2. All female
- ___ 3. Male and female
- ___ 4. Unknown

- I-16e. Do you know where the offender(s) lived?
- 1. Definitely (Washington/Chicago/Boston)
 - 2. Definitely outside (Washington/Chicago/Boston)
 - 8. Not sure or unknown
- I-16f. Do you think the offender(s) (was/were) sane?
- 1. R asserts offender(s) sane
 - 2. R asserts perhaps insane
 - 3. R asserts not insane
 - 8. R says he has no idea
- I-16g. What do you think the offender(s) motive was?
- 1. Gain
 - 2. Mischief, prank, fun
 - 3. Grievance, quarrel (except domestic)
 - 4. Domestic and lover's quarrels
 - 5. Penalty evasion (as in hit-&-run accident, escaping from an officer)
 - 6. Other utility (unauthorized use or property, joy-riding)
 - 7. Sex
 - 8. Drunk
 - 9. Other irrational
 - 10. Unintentional or accident
 - 11. Other (SPECIFY) _____

(ASK Q. I-17 ONLY IF OFFENDER(S) OR SUSPECTS IDENTIFIED)

I-17. Did the police ask you to bring charges or sign a complaint?

- 1. Yes, advised me to press charges, take out warrant, sign a complaint
- 2. Police left it up to me
- 3. No, didn't mention it
- 4. No, advised against it
- 5. No, said I couldn't press charges
- 8. Don't know

I-17a. Did you 'sign a complaint/press charges) (anyway)?

1. Yes → SKIP TO I-18 2. No

↓

I-17b. Why not?

- 1. Because of personal, business or family ties
- 2. Because it wasn't worth all the trouble involved
- 3. Because it might cause other trouble for respondent
- 4. Because the laws don't offer any real remedy
- 5. Because the police arrested suspects or offenders
- 7. Other (SPECIFY) _____

(IF SUSPECT IDENTIFIED OR OFFENDER WAS KNOWN ASK I-13)

I-18. Did anything further go on in connection with this incident--was an arrest made, or did it go to court or what?

- 0. Nothing has happened (GO TO I-18a)
- 1. Arrest was made (GO TO Q. I-18b)
- 2. Arrest was made and gone to court (GO TO Q. I-18b)
- 3. Other (SPECIFY) _____

(GO TO I-18b)

I-18a Do you expect that there will be anything further going on in connection with this incident?

- 1. No further activity anticipated (GO TO I-18o, p. 24)
- 2. Pending (SPECIFY) _____

→ (GO TO I-18o, p. 24)

I-18b. (IF R SIGNED A COMPLAINT OR IF AN ARREST WAS MADE, ASK)
Was the offender or suspect jailed?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- 8. Don't know

I-18c. Was the offender released from jail (on bail)?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- 8. Don't know

I-18d. Did the case go to court yet?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No → GO TO I-18o
- 8. Don't know ←

I-15e. Was (he/they) tried for the original charge or with a more minor charge?

- 1. Original
- 2. More minor
- 8. Don't know

I-18f. How do you feel about (his/her/them) being tried that way? _____

CONTINUED

4 OF 4

I-18g. Did you have to go to court in connection with the case?

1. Yes

2. No

I-18h. How many times have you had to go in connection with the case?

_____ TIMES

I-18i. Did you have to take time off from work to appear?

1. Yes

2. No

I-18j. How much time did you take off? _____

I-18k. Was there anyone who was a witness when the case was tried in court, either for you or for the offender?

_____ 1. Yes, for R.

_____ 2. Yes, for offender

_____ 3. Yes, for both

_____ 4. No → SKIP TO Q. I-18n

I-18l. Were you satisfied with what the witness(es) said for you? (IF NO, DESCRIBE) _____

I-18m. How did you feel about what the witness(es) said for the offender? _____

I-18n. What happened when the case came up in court--is the case being continued, (was he/were they) fined, acquitted or freed, sentenced, or what?

(SPECIFY) _____

I-18o. Apart from what the police did, how do you feel about what else (has been/is being) done with your case? Would you say you are completely satisfied, fairly satisfied, or not too satisfied about what (has been/is being) done about the incident?

1. Completely satisfied

8. Don't know

2. Fairly satisfied

3. Not too satisfied

I-18p. What in particular do you like about the way it (was/is being) handled? _____

I-18q. Is there anything you are dissatisfied with about the way it (was/is being) handled? (IF YES, DESCRIBE)

I-18r. What in particular don't you like about the way it (was/is being) handled?

I-18s. Is there anything you like about the way it (was/is being) handled? (IF YES, DESCRIBE)

→ (ASK EVERYONE)

I-19. Have you gone to see a lawyer in connection with this incident?

1. Yes

2. No → SKIP TO I-20

I-19a. Why did you first go to see him? _____

I-19b. Is he still handling the matter for you?
 1. Yes 2. No

I-19c. What (has he advised/did he advise) you to do? _____

I-19d. Are you satisfied with the way that he (has handled/ been handling) the case for you?
 (IF NO, WHY NOT) _____

I-19e. About how much has this cost you (so far)? \$ _____

(ASK EVERYONE)

I-20. Did you try to get help or advice from anyone else in connection with this incident, like from your family, friends, someone in the neighborhood or a professional person like a social worker or minister?

1. Yes

2. No → SKIP TO I-21

I-20a. Who was that?

I-20b. What did you ask them to do (for you)?

I-20c. Were they able to help you?

1. Yes

2. No

I-20d. How?

I-20e. Why weren't they able to help you?

I-21. Now a few specific details about the incident: Do you recall on what day of the week the incident happened?

1. Monday

2. Tuesday

3. Wednesday

4. Thursday

5. Friday

6. Saturday

7. Sunday

8. Don't know

I-22 About what time of day was that?

(SPECIFY)

A.M.

P.M.

8. Don't know

I-22a. Was it between midnight and 4 A.M. in the wee hours of the morning, between 4 A.M. and 8 A.M. in the early morning, between 8 A.M. and noon in the morning, between noon and 4 P.M. in the afternoon, between 4 P.M. and 8 P.M. in the evening, or between 8 P.M. and midnight at night.

- ___ a. 12 midnight to 4 A.M.--wee hours of morning
- ___ b. 4 A.M. to 8 A.M.--early morning
- ___ c. 8 A.M. to 12 noon--morning
- ___ d. 12 noon to 4 P.M.--afternoon
- ___ e. 4 P.M. to 8 P.M.--evening
- ___ f. 8 P.M. to 12 midnight--night

I-23. (Other than time off for treatment) did this incident cause you to lose any days from work?

1. YES

2. NO

I-23a. In all, how much time did you lose from work?

INTERVIEWER: GO TO NEXT INCIDENT THAT HAS HAPPENED SINCE JUNE 1 OF THIS YEAR, 1966; OR, IF NO MORE INCIDENTS, RETURN TO QUESTIONNAIRE, Q. 19, page 13.