

155661

**U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Justice**

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the National Institute of Justice.

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been
granted by
Hawaii Department of the Attorney
General/Crime Prevention Division

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the copyright owner.

Crime Trend Series

Uniform Crime Reporting Program in Hawaii

Department of the Attorney General, Crime Prevention Division

Robert A. Marks, Attorney General

Ruth I. Tsujimura, First Deputy Attorney General

AUG 9 1995

Alan T. Shimabukuro, Administrator

ACQUISITIONS

Comparison Between Hawaii's 1993 Uniform Crime Reporting Program and Crime Victimization Survey Results

Thomas M. Green, James R. Richmond and JoAnn E. Taira

On July 29, 1994, the Department of the Attorney General released the annual *Crime in Hawaii* report. This report is based on data submitted on a monthly basis to the Crime Prevention Division by the county police departments as part of the Federal Bureau of Investigation's (FBI) Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) program. *Crime in Hawaii* details the number of reported Index Offenses¹, percentage of offenses cleared, value of property stolen and recovered, the number juvenile and adult arrests, the number of law enforcement employees, and the number of law enforcement officers killed and assaulted.

One week later, on August 5, 1994, the Department of the Attorney General released a second report which focused on crime: *Crime and Justice in Hawaii*. This report was based on the state's first, comprehensive crime victimization survey. The survey, which had an adjusted response rate of 54.3 percent, asked Hawaii residents about their concerns and fears about crime, their attitudes about the criminal justice system, and their experiences as crime victims.

The results published in the two reports are strikingly different, even to the most casual observer. The number of reported offenses is far less than estimates derived from the victim survey. Efforts to reconcile the two reports must consider a number of factors, including how the data were collected, the nature of the data, and sources of error. The purpose of this report is to examine the results of the two reports and make comparisons where appropriate.

Methodology

The UCR program measures police workload and activity. Local police departments voluntarily report information to the FBI including the numbers of crimes reported to police, arrests made by police and other administrative information. Since there are numerous differences in criminal codes throughout the United States, the UCR program uses a standard set of definitions for each offense. Law enforcement agencies submit data in accordance to these definitions rather than local statutes. This standardization allows for interjurisdictional comparisons and internal validity of national totals. Specific definitions of offenses, as well as reporting criteria, are contained in the FBI's

publication *Uniform Crime Reporting Handbook*.

The UCR program in Hawaii is summary based: that is, it does not collect data on incidents, victim characteristics (except for murder), or differentiate between military, visitor, or resident victims or offenders. Moreover, local law enforcement agencies do not currently collect data on hate crimes, as requested in the Hate Crimes Statistics Act of 1990.

Each county has dedicated personnel for the UCR program. Police accounts of reported offenses and arrests are reviewed and summarized on UCR forms on a monthly basis. Those forms are then forwarded to the Crime Prevention Division (CPD), which functions as the state clearinghouse for the UCR program. Once the forms are checked for accuracy, CPD staff forward copies of the forms to the FBI. When all counties have submitted forms for a given year (the FBI imposed deadline is usually around the second week of April), CPD compiles all the data to produce *Crime in Hawaii*.

The crime victimization survey utilized a questionnaire based on the National Crime Victimization

Survey (NCVS) conducted annually for the past 20 years by the U.S. Department of Justice. The basic questioning strategy (i.e. question order, phrasing, and categories of information) mirrors the NCVS and is virtually identical to questionnaires used in other states.

Three thousand (3,000) Hawaii residents were randomly selected to participate in the survey from a list derived from the 1990 census. The questionnaires, with a cover letter from Attorney General Robert A. Marks and a stamped return envelope, were bulk-mailed in mid-January, 1994. A follow-up postcard was mailed first-class in early February to remind survey recipients to return the survey and to identify those questionnaires which were undeliverable. Additional questionnaires were mailed to those who moved and left a forwarding address. Out of the 2,537 who had a current mailing address, 1,377 returned a survey for an adjusted response rate of 54.3 percent.

Strengths & Weaknesses

The UCR program in Hawaii provides an excellent basis for our understanding of crime in the state. Data have been collected using the standardized reporting guidelines since the early 1970s. The consistency of the program allows for comparisons over time and between jurisdictions. UCR arrest data provides specific information concerning the age, sex, and race/ethnicity of arrestees and includes juveniles as well as adults.

The greatest weakness of the UCR program is that it is limited to official (reported) offenses and some crimes are consistently

underreported. Changes in policy and practice can affect reporting procedures. Some crimes are inherently difficult to classify: the definition of aggravated assault is subject to interpretation and may result in variations between agencies or between years. The Hawaii UCR program also uses the "Hierarchy Rule" in counting offenses: only the most serious offense is recorded. Therefore, if someone is killed during a robbery, only murder is recorded, not the crime of robbery. The Hawaii UCR program does not collect data on hate crimes.

The major strength of victim surveys is that they measure both reported and unreported crime. In addition, the Hawaii survey measures residents' concerns and fears about crime, and measures residents' attitudes about the criminal justice system. While the results can and will be called into question as to their accuracy, the Hawaii study results are very similar to those reported in other states.

There are several potential weaknesses for victim surveys in general: there may be a selection bias (who chooses to respond); respondents may overreport events (report events outside the study period); respondents may underreport (not report events which actually occurred); and they are limited in scope (e.g. does not collect information about homicide or crimes involving businesses). There is some evidence which suggests the first three weaknesses may not be especially problematic for the Hawaii survey, but the last weakness is certainly true. One additional shortcoming of the Hawaii survey is that it excluded juveniles: the mailing list from which the random sample was drawn included only the names and addresses of adults.

Assumptions

In order to compare the UCR and crime victimization survey data, four assumptions must be made. The first assumption is that the survey results are representative of the state's population. While this is discussed at length in *Crime and Justice in Hawaii*, several points should be emphasized. First of all, the original list of 3,000 names was a computer-generated random sample of all adults surveyed in the 1990 census. Census data are more complete than other sources for identifying the residents of the state (e.g. phone books or driver's licenses/state identification cards). Second, the random sample was representative of the state's population by geographic distribution, race/ethnicity, and income. The sample did, however, overrepresent males: approximately half of the state's population are male, and almost two-thirds of the survey respondents were male. When the sample was weighted to adjust for the disparity, there were no significant differences from the unweighted sample in the responses to individual questions. Therefore, considering the manner in which the sample was derived and the distribution of the responses, it is safe to say that the survey respondents are representative of the state's adult population. In addition to supporting the validity of the survey results, the representativeness of the sample allows the results to be generalized to the total adult population.

The second assumption concerns the population estimate used to generalize the survey results. Estimates for the number of males and females 18 years old and over in 1993 were based on demographic changes between the 1980 and 1990 census.

Table 1 below illustrates how the estimates were developed.

UCR-defined offense categories. The survey was not designed with

Table 1: Resident Population, State of Hawaii²		
	1980	1990
Total population	964,691	1,108,229
Number 18 years and older	689,108	828,103
% 18 years and older	71.433%	74.723%
Number of males 18 years and older	353,167	335,941
% males of 18 years and older total	51.250%	50.672%
Number of females 18 years and older	335,941	408,490
% females of 18 years and older total	48.750%	49.328%

By applying the change in percentages over the ten year period to 1993, it is possible to estimate the number of adult males and females in the state (see Table 2 below).

exact comparability in mind; questions were not worded to read "Were you the victim of an aggravated assault" followed by the UCR definition of aggravated assault.

Table 2: Population of the State of Hawaii	
Total State Population 1993:	1,171,592 ³
% 18 years and older:	75.71%
Number 18 years and older:	887,012
% Males of 18 years and older total:	50.498%
Number of Males 18 years and older:	447,923
% Females of 18 years and older total:	49.502%
Number of Females 18 years and older:	439,089

It is important to remember that these figures are estimates; therefore, the figures which will represent the number of crime victims should also be treated as estimates. At the very least, the overall margin of error for the survey (plus or minus 1.3 percent at the 95 percent confidence level) should be applied to the estimated number of crime victims.

The third assumption concerns the comparability of questions in the crime victimization survey with the

Survey questions described events in a manner designed to include as many types of victimization as possible. In the strictest sense, the two reports on crime are not comparable in this regard. However, some questions are worded in a way to allow a comparison with UCR data as long as it is not taken too literally, keeping in mind some of the basic differences between the two sources of data.

The fourth assumption is perhaps

the most critical and most difficult to assess: accuracy of the data. Generally, this discussion revolves around two points: overreporting and underreporting. The first concern, overreporting, concerns survey respondents saying an event occurred when, in fact, it did not. This situation could arise if someone were to make-up an event, or report something which occurred outside the survey period; in terms of the 1994 survey, this would involve recalling an event which occurred before the January 1 to December 31, 1993 period. The National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) attempts to control for the possibility of overreporting by interviewing the same household for a period of three years at six month intervals, thereby establishing a clear baseline and reference point.

To date, much of the research which has examined the accuracy of victim surveys has considered the greater problem to be underreporting, that is, survey respondents not recalling or not including events which did occur during the study period. In addition to addressing the potential problem of overreporting, one of the motives behind the NCVS moving from one year to six month survey intervals was to reduce underreporting by shortening the recall period. It is estimated that a three-month recall period would yield victimization rates that are 10 to 20 percent higher than the six-month period (Skogan, 1990). Moreover, several studies have indicated that persons who were known to have reported victimization to the police failed to volunteer the event in follow-up interviews (Reiss, 1967; Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, 1974; Hildelang and Gottfredson, 1976).

Even assuming that the tendency to

overreport is negated (or at least mitigated) by the tendency to underreport (which the literature suggests is more likely), one additional factor supports a contention that the rate of victimization in the Hawaii study and the estimates of the number of victims which result from those rates are conservative: the study did not include persons under the age of 18. The most recent NCVS survey, which included interviews with persons 12 years and older, found the highest rate of victimization for personal crimes among those age 20 to 24 years (177.0 per 1,000 persons), followed by 16 to 19 year olds (172.7) and 12 to 15 year olds (171.0). The victimization rates for crimes of personal theft were similar: 20 to 24 year olds (106.9), 12 to 15 year olds (95.3), and 16 to 19 year olds (94.8) (U.S. Department of Justice, 1994). It is only reasonable to assume that the number of crime victims would increase if 12 to 18 year olds had been included in the Hawaii study.

There are aspects of both reporting programs which call into question their respective results. It is possible to go forward with a comparison of the results of the two programs, however, if one keeps in mind that there are some basic differences and several sources of error for each. Such a comparison is valuable in order to get at least a sense of the relative amount of crime which may go unreported in the State of Hawaii.

In order to put Hawaii's crime victimization survey results in perspective, results from recent surveys in several other jurisdictions were considered for comparison. In 1994, Minnesota conducted a mail survey covering events which took

place in 1993. The questionnaire used in Minnesota is virtually identical to the one used by Hawaii's crime victimization survey in question wording and order. The survey included respondents as young as 15 years (Lewis et al., 1994).

The North Carolina Department of Crime Control and Public Safety and the Governor's Crime Commission conducted a two part survey in 1992 to measure the nature and extent of violent crime in that state for 1991. The first part of the survey involved telephone interviews; the second part used a mailed survey with questions nearly identical to Hawaii's and Minnesota's questionnaires. The North Carolina report included the results of the two surveys; data on the mailed survey alone will be discussed in this report. The age of survey respondents ranged from 16 to 90 (Pelfry et al., 1992). Since the North Carolina survey did not measure victimization of property crimes, the data are comparable to Hawaii's and Minnesota's results for violent crimes only.

The South Dakota Office of the Attorney General conducted a mail survey in 1992 to obtain residents' views on drugs and crime within the state. The survey instrument was similar in scope to the ones mentioned above, but used different wording for the questions. As a result, some crime categories are much broader and the data less specific. The final report did not describe the age range of the survey respondents other than 98 percent were over the age of 19 years (Brekke et al., 1993).

From 1984 to 1989, the Arkansas Crime Information Center conducted

a mailed public opinion poll which also measured crime victimization. The questionnaire was structured in a manner similar to South Dakota's; that is, the questions concerned broad crime categories rather than specific events. The survey sample was drawn from drivers' license records and included individuals under the age of 18 (7 percent of the total), but did not specify an age range (Arkansas Crime Information Center, 1990). Only the results from the most recent poll will be used for comparison.

Results from the most recent National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) (1992) will be the last source of comparison for the Hawaii crime survey results. The NCVS conducts both in-person and phone interviews. Interviewers use two forms. The first form is designed to obtain basic demographic information and to screen for crime incidents. This screening form is the model for the Hawaii, Minnesota, and North Carolina mail surveys. The second form captures detailed information about each crime incident. The results are published as rates in two categories: crimes against persons, including violent crimes and theft (expressed as rates per 1,000 persons age 12 years or older) and household crimes, including burglary, household larceny, and motor vehicle theft (expressed as rates per 1,000 households). Thus, if 5 people in the same household were assaulted, 5 assault victimizations would be recorded; if those same 5 people had their house burglarized, 1 burglary incident would be recorded. The two categories cannot be combined (U.S. Department of Justice, 1994). While the rates can be expressed as percentages to compare with the other surveys, the NCVS uses

different bases (12 years and older for personal crimes and households for certain property crimes) and relies exclusively on interviews. (South Dakota consciously decided to use a mail survey rather than interviews to allow survey participants more privacy and confidentiality, Brekke et al., 1993).

Table 3 below is a comparison between the five states and NCVS of the percentage of survey respondents who were victims of any crime and the UCR state rankings by crime rates for 1992 (Department of the Attorney General, 1994).

Table 3: Comparison of Survey Results and UCR State Rankings		
	Survey - Victim of Any Crime	UCR State Rankings by Total Crime Rate
Hawaii (1993)	39%	12
Minnesota (1993)	31%	35
North Carolina (1991)	Not Available	17
South Dakota (1991)	17%	49
Arkansas (1989)	36%	31
NCVS (1992)	9% (Personal) 15% (Household)	

The 1994 Survey of Crime and Justice in Hawaii addresses this offense by asking in Question number 29: "Did anyone force you, or attempt to force you to have sexual intercourse with them?" An affirmative response to that question meets the UCR definition of rape, but only if males from the survey are excluded. Overall, 2.2 percent of the female survey respondents answered affirmatively to the question (0.9 percent of all respondents). The number of rapes revealed by the two different sources are shown below (see Table 4).

those 16 years and older). In 1992, Hawaii had the 29th highest rape rate among the 50 states and the District of Columbia (Department of the Attorney General, 1994).

The results published in the Minnesota crime victimization study (Lewis et al., 1994) suggest an even higher rape rate: 1.6 percent of survey respondents (males and females) reported being forced to, or attempted to, have sex in 1993. The Minnesota report does not provide separate figures for women only, and the responses are weighted, preventing an estimate of the actual number of victims. Therefore, it is not possible to estimate what percentage of rapes are reported in Minnesota. In 1992, Minnesota had the 27th highest rape rate in the U.S. (Department of the Attorney General, 1994).

The Hawaii results are also consistent with the findings of the North Carolina survey. The North Carolina results (Pelfrey et al., 1992) indicate that 1.4 percent of the survey respondents in North Carolina were victims of rape or attempted rape in 1991. The survey

results include both men and women and, based on 1991 population estimates for those 16 years of

Comparisons

RAPE

Four crime categories are assessed by both the Hawaii UCR program and the crime victimization survey: rape, robbery, assault, and theft. The most serious offense covered by both the UCR program and the crime victimization survey is rape. The *Uniform Crime Reporting Handbook* (1984) defines rape as "the carnal knowledge of a female forcibly and against her will" (page 10) and includes attempts as well as completed acts.

Table 4: Rape in the State of Hawaii 1993	
UCR - Official Reports	394
Crime Victimization Survey	9,660

Based on these figures, 4.1 percent of the 9,660 rapes which occurred in 1993 resulted in an official report. It is important to note for this and subsequent comparisons that UCR data include female victims of any age, while the estimated number of victims based on survey results are derived from the population from which the survey sample was drawn (e.g. in Hawaii, only those 18 years and older; in North Carolina, only

age and older (U.S. Department of Commerce, 1992), the number of rape victims total 73,836.

In order to compare the survey results with the number of official (UCR) reports, it is necessary to include only women rape victims from the survey. If 60 percent of the North Carolina rape victims were women (the 1992 NCVS reported approximately 60 percent of rape

victims are female), the estimated number of female rape victims would total 44,302; 5.3 percent of this number was reported to the North Carolina UCR program in 1991 (2,331) (U.S. Department of Justice, 1992). If Hawaii's figure of 85 percent of rape victims were females is used to estimate the number of rape victims in North Carolina, the rate of reporting drops to 3.7 percent. In 1992, North Carolina had the 34th highest rape rate in the U.S. (Department of the Attorney General, 1994).

In South Dakota, 0.4 percent of the survey respondents (males and females) indicated they were the victims of rape (Brekke et al., 1993). Using the same procedure as above, the estimated number of female rape victims age 18 and older (at least 98 percent of the survey respondents were age 19 years and older) in South Dakota in 1991 totaled 1,207 (U.S. Department of Commerce, 1992). The number of reported rapes in South Dakota in 1991 was 279 (U.S. Department of Justice, 1992), or 23.1 percent of the total number of estimated victims. Again, if Hawaii's 85 percent-female victims figure is used to calculate the number of adult females who were raped, the rate of reporting falls to 16.2 percent. In 1992, South Dakota had the 12th highest rape rate (Department of the Attorney General, 1994).

The 1989 crime victimization survey in Arkansas revealed that 1.0 percent of all respondents were rape victims (Arkansas Crime Information Center, 1990). Again, using the same methods, the total number of female rape victims age 18 years and over (U.S. Department of Commerce, 1991) is estimated to be 10,542, of which 8.8 percent (924)

were reported (U.S. Department of Justice, 1990). If the percentage of Arkansas female rape victims is the same as in Hawaii (85 percent), the percentage of rapes which are reported would be closer to 6.2 percent. In 1992, Arkansas had the 25th highest rape rate (Department of the Attorney General, 1994).

According to the NCVS, 0.07 percent of those surveyed were the victims of rape in 1992, including 0.08 percent of the women and 0.06 percent of the men (U.S. Department of Justice, 1994). The NCVS figures are only slightly higher than the reported rape rate in the UCR program: 0.04 per hundred residents (0.04 percent) (United States Department of Justice, 1993). According to the NCVS, 52.5 percent of the rapes in 1992 were reported to the police (U.S. Department of Justice, 1994).

These results are summarized below in Table 5.

ROBBERY

The second most serious crime measured by both the UCR program and the Hawaii crime victimization survey is robbery. The *Uniform*

Crime Reporting Handbook (1984) defines robbery as "the taking or attempting to take anything of value from the care, custody, or control of a person or persons by force or threat of force or violence and/or by putting the victim in fear" (page 12).

Two questions in the Hawaii crime victimization survey correspond to the UCR definition of robbery: number 24 ("Did anyone take something directly from you by using force, such as by a stick-up, mugging or threat?") and number 25 ("Did anyone TRY to rob you by using force or threatening to harm you (other than any incident already mentioned?") (emphasis in the original). Survey respondents who responded affirmatively to either or both question(s) would meet the UCR definition of robbery. The number of robberies produced from the two sources are shown in Table 6 (see page 7).

Based on these figures, 4.9 percent of the 24,836 robberies or attempted robberies which occurred in 1993 resulted in an official report. Survey respondents were nearly equally divided between victims of robbery and victims of attempted robbery: 1.4 percent and 1.5

Table 5: Rape			
	Females and Males	Females Only	UCR Ranking by Rape Rate (1992)
Hawaii (1993)	0.9%	2.2%	29
Minnesota (1993)	1.6%	N/A	27
North Carolina (1991)	1.4%	N/A	34
South Dakota (1991)	0.4%	N/A	12
Arkansas (1989)	1.0%	N/A	25
NCVS (1992)	0.07%	0.08%	

Table 6: Robbery in the State of Hawaii 1993

UCR - Official Reports	1,214
Crime Victimization Survey	24,836

percent, respectively. There was also some overlap: 13 percent of the respondents were **both** robbery and attempted robbery victims; 87 percent were victims of either a robbery or an attempted robbery. While this overlap would affect the number of persons who were robbery victims (2.8 percent of all respondents), it does not affect the number of robbery incidents. In 1992, Hawaii had the 37th highest robbery rate in the country (Department of the Attorney General, 1994).

In Minnesota, 2.2 percent of the survey respondents were robbery, or attempted robbery, victims (Lewis et al., 1994). In 1992, Minnesota ranked 35th in robbery rate in the U.S. (Department of the Attorney General, 1994).

Of the North Carolina survey respondents, 2.3 percent reported a robbery or attempted robbery in 1991 (Pelfry et al., 1992), a total of 121,302 victims age 16 years and older. In 1991, there were 11,990 reported robberies in North Carolina (U.S. Department of Justice, 1992), 9.9 percent of survey total. In 1992, North Carolina ranked 17th highest for robbery rate in the U.S. (Department of the Attorney General, 1994).

Only 0.4 percent of the South Dakota survey respondents were robbery victims in 1991 (Brekke et al., 1993). There is no indication in the South Dakota report that attempted robberies are included in the robbery figures. Based on these figures, the estimated number of

robbery victims age 18 years and older totals 2,012. In 1991, there were 132 reported robberies, or robbery attempts, in South Dakota (U.S.

Department of Justice, 1992), 6.6 percent of the number derived from the survey. South Dakota had the 49th highest robbery rate in 1992 (Department of the Attorney General, 1994).

According to the NCVS, 51.1 percent of the robberies in 1992 were reported to the police (U.S. Department of Justice, 1994).

The figures for Hawaii, Minnesota, North Carolina, South Dakota, Arkansas, and the U.S. (NCVS) are listed below in Table 7.

Table 7: Robbery

	Robbery	UCR Ranking by Robbery Rate (1992)
Hawaii (1993)	2.8%	37
Minnesota (1993)	2.2%	35
North Carolina (1991)	2.3%	17
South Dakota (1991)	0.4%	49
Arkansas (1989)	0.7%	30
NCVS (1992)	0.6%	

The Arkansas Crime Poll (1990) revealed that 0.7 percent of survey respondents were robbery victims in 1989 (with no mention of attempted robbery). The estimated number of robbery victims age 18 years and older (only 7 percent of the survey respondents were under the age of 18) is 12,299, while the number of reported robberies and robbery attempts in 1989 was 2,660 (U.S. Department of Justice, 1990). Based on these figures, the percentage of actual robberies reported to law enforcement agencies was 21.6 percent.

The 1992 NCVS (U.S. Department of Justice, 1994) reported that 0.6 percent of those 12 years old and over were robbery or attempted robbery victims. The 1992 reported robbery rate was 0.3 percent (U.S. Department of Justice, 1993).

ASSAULT

The offense of assault is more difficult to compare using UCR and crime victimization survey results. Reported offense data are collected in the UCR program for both aggravated assault ("an unlawful attack by one person upon another for the purpose of inflicting severe or aggravated bodily injury. This type of assault usually is accompanied by the use of a weapon or by means likely to produce death or great bodily harm.") (*Uniform Crime Reporting Handbook*, page 16) and other assaults (including "all assaults which do not involve the use of a firearm, knife, cutting instrument, or other dangerous weapon and in which there were no serious or aggravated injuries to the victims", e.g. simple assault, assault and battery, intimidation, coercion,

and all attempts to commit these offenses) (page 17). Aggravated assault is an Index Crime for which reported offenses are included in the Hawaii UCR report; other assaults are Part II offenses, and, while data on the number of reported offenses are collected, they have not been included in the Hawaii UCR report to date.

The questions in the Hawaii crime victimization survey which correspond to UCR definitions of assault are number 26 ("Were you attacked with a knife, gun, or other weapon by anyone at all (other than any incidents already mentioned)?"), number 27 ("Did anyone THREATEN to beat you up or THREATEN you with a knife, gun or some other weapon NOT including telephone threats (other than any incidents already mentioned)?") (emphasis in the original), number 28 ("Did anyone beat you up, attack you or hit you with something such as a rock or bottle (other than any incidents already mentioned)?"), and number 31 ("Did anyone try to attack you in some other way (other than any incidents already mentioned)?"). The problem in comparing the survey results with the UCR data is that the survey questions are not discrete assault categories. While question number 26 matches the UCR definition of aggravated assault, questions 27, 28, and 31 could be classified aggravated assault or other assault. In addition, an affirmative response to question 27 could fit the statutory definition of terroristic threatening in the first or second degree (HRS §707-716 and §707-717, respectively), which can appear in the UCR data as aggravated assault (if a weapon is used) or under Part II arrests for "All Other Offenses" (if it involves a threat without a weapon).

For the purpose of comparing the two measures of crime for assaults, it is necessary to combine the reported UCR totals for aggravated and other assaults, and combine the number of affirmative responses to questions 26 (0.9 percent responded affirmatively), 27 (6.0 percent), 28 (1.5 percent), and 31 (3.5 percent). The results are summarized below in Table 8.

Table 8: Assault in the State of Hawaii 1993	
<u>UCR - Official Reports</u>	
Aggravated Assault	1,408
Other Assaults	12,669
Total Reported Assaults	14,077
<u>Crime Victimization Survey</u>	
Question 26	7,983
Question 27	53,221
Question 28	13,305
Question 31	31,045
Total Assaults or Threats	105,554

The total number of threats and assaults reported to the Hawaii UCR program represents 13.3 percent of the number of threats and assaults from the crime victimization survey. Slightly more than half (50.4 percent) of the assaults revealed in the crime victimization survey involved threats. In 1992, Hawaii had the 46th highest aggravated assault rate in the U.S. (Department of the Attorney General, 1994).

There is one other UCR offense category where threats or some attacks may be recorded: "All Other Offenses." This category⁴ (*Uniform Crime Reporting Handbook*, page 81) involves Part II Offenses only, and, as such, only arrest data are available. As is often the case with the UCR program, it is not possible to disaggregate the "All Other Offenses" to

know how many involve threats (e.g. terroristic threatening). In 1993, there were 17,463 arrests statewide reported to the UCR program for the category "All Other Offenses". Even if as many as one-third of "All Other Offenses" arrests involved reported threats or attacks, the UCR total would still only account for 18 percent of the number of attacks and threats

revealed by the crime victimization survey.

A comparison among the survey results obtained in Hawaii, Minnesota, North Carolina, South Dakota, Arkansas, and the U.S. is also somewhat problematic.

The results of the Minnesota survey are directly comparable to Hawaii's results: that survey used the same questions as Hawaii and reported the results in the same manner. In 1993, 0.5 percent of the Minnesota survey respondents were assaulted with a weapon, 5.3 percent were threatened, 2.6 percent were beaten up, and 1.4 percent were victims of another form of attack (Lewis et al., 1994). Minnesota had the 42nd highest reported aggravated assault rate in 1992 (Department of the Attorney General, 1994).

North Carolina reported assault victimization data in two categories: the percentage who were assaulted with weapons (1.0 percent) and the percentage who were attacked, hit or beaten (5.5 percent) (Pelfry et al., 1992). The North Carolina survey results translate into a total of

BENJAMIN J. CAYETANO

GOVERNOR



MARGERY S. BRONSTER

ATTORNEY GENERAL

STEVEN S. MICHAELS

FIRST DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL

**STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL**

CRIME PREVENTION DIVISION

810 RICHARDS STREET, SUITE 701

HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813

(808) 586-1416

FAX (808) 586-1424

May 31, 1995

National Institute of Justice/NCJRS
Acquisition Department
Box 6000
Rockville, MD 20850

Dear Ramesh C. Sharma,

In response to your April 7, 1995 letter, we have enclosed the documents we published in the past two years.

You will also find enclosed a listing of videos that have been produced by our office. Our policy is to provide a copy to any interested party as long as they provide us with a blank VHS tape and a self-addressed stamped envelope.

We welcome the opportunity to participate in the NCJRS information network.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Lisa Pardini".

Lisa Pardini
Clearinghouse Researcher

encl

342,810 persons age 16 years and older who were assaulted in 1991. During that same year, 29,265 aggravated assaults were reported. However, the UCR program does not publish the number of other assaults, making it impossible to develop an estimate of the percentage of all that are reported to police. In 1992, North Carolina had the 17th highest reported aggravated assault rate in the U.S. (Department of the Attorney General, 1994).

South Dakota and Arkansas also reported two categories of assaults: assaults with a weapon and assaults with a body. In South Dakota, 0.6 percent of the survey respondents were assaulted with a weapon and 1.6 percent were assaulted with the offender's body (Brekke et al., 1993). Without the number of reported assaults which are not aggravated, it is not possible to estimate the percentage of assaults reported to police. In 1992, South Dakota had the 44th highest aggravated assault rate nationwide (Department of the Attorney General, 1994).

In 1989, 1.5 percent of Arkansas survey respondents indicated they had been assaulted with a weapon and 7.7 percent had been assaulted with a body. Among the 50 states and District of Columbia, Arkansas had the 23rd highest reported aggravated assault rate.

The NCVS reports both completed and attempted aggravated and simple assaults: 0.9 percent and 1.7 percent, respectively. According to

the NCVS, approximately 49.4 percent of all assaults were reported to the police in 1992 (U.S. Department of Justice, 1994). Also in 1992, the reported aggravated assault rate was 0.4 percent (U.S. Department of Justice, 1993).

These results are presented below in Table 9.

pocket-picking, purse-snatching, shoplifting, theft from motor vehicles, bicycle theft, theft from buildings where the offender has legal access, and theft from coin-operated machines.

There are four questions in the crime victimization survey which correspond to the UCR definitions

Table 9: Assaults or Threats

	Assault with Weapon	Threatened	Beaten Up	Other Attack	UCR Ranking by Agg. Assault Rate (1992)
Hawaii (1993)	0.9%	6.0%	1.5%	3.5%	46
Minnesota (1993)	0.5%	5.3%	2.6%	1.4%	42
North Carolina (1991)	1.0%	N/A	5.5%	N/A	17
South Dakota (1991)	0.6%	N/A	1.6%	N/A	44
Arkansas (1989)	1.5%	N/A	7.7%	N/A	23
NCVS (1992)	0.9% (Aggravated)	N/A	1.7% (Simple)	N/A	

BURGLARY/LARCENY-THEFT

Comparing Hawaii's UCR data and the crime victimization results for the crimes of burglary and larceny-theft also involve overlapping definitions. The *Uniform Crime Reporting Handbook* (1984) defines burglary as "the unlawful entry of a structure to commit a felony or a theft" (page 20) and includes the forcible entry, unlawful entry with no force or attempted forcible entry into an apartment, church, factory, office, public building, school, or warehouse. The *Handbook* defines larceny-theft as "the unlawful taking, carrying, leading, or riding away of property from the possession or constructive possession of another" (page 24) and includes

of burglary and larceny-theft: question number 32 ("Did anyone break in or try to break into your car or truck, home or some other building on your property?"); question number 33 ("Did anyone steal things that belonged to you from inside ANY car or truck (such as packages or clothing)?") (emphasis in the original); question number 34 ("Was anything stolen from your home while you were away from home, for instance at work, in a theater or restaurant, or while traveling?"); and question number 35 ("Was anything else at all stolen from you (other than any incidents already mentioned)?"). Questions number 32 and 35 could either be burglary or larceny-theft, while number 33 describes one type of larceny-theft and number 34 corre-

sponds to one type of burglary. As in the case of assaults and threats, the affirmative responses to these four questions will be added together to compare with the number of UCR burglaries and larceny-thefts (see Table 10).

replied affirmatively to the first question, and 26.2 percent responded affirmatively to the second (Lewis et al., 1994). In 1992, Minnesota had the 34th highest burglary rate and 25th highest larceny-theft rate in the U.S. (Department of the Attorney General, 1994).

number of victims based on the survey results (245,980). Approximately 32.0 percent (71,487) of the estimated 223,139 larceny-thefts were reported to the police in 1989. Overall, Arkansas ranked 23rd in reported burglaries rates and 34th in reported larceny-thefts (Department of the Attorney General, 1994).

Table 10: Burglary and Larceny-Theft in the State of Hawaii 1993

<u>UCR - Official Reports</u>	
Burglary	13,310
Larceny-Theft	51,912
Total Reported Thefts	65,222
<u>Crime Victimization Survey</u>	
Question 32	235,058
Question 33	151,679
Question 34	117,086
Question 35	70,961
Total Thefts	574,784

The total number of reported thefts, including those classified as burglary or larceny-theft, is equal to 11.3 percent of the total number of thefts enumerated on the crime victimization survey. In 1992, Hawaii ranked 18th in burglary rates and 3rd in larceny theft (Department of the Attorney General, 1994).

A comparison between Hawaii and other states reveals the use of some different crime classifications and reporting practices. Unlike the other offense categories described above, the Minnesota survey included only two questions relating to theft, compared to the 4 questions in the Hawaii survey: "Did anyone break in or try to break in to your car or truck, home or some other building on your property?" and "Did anyone damage, steal or try to steal something that belonged to you?" Over 17 percent of survey respondents

being a victim of burglary and 8.9 percent were theft victims (Brekke et al., 1993). Based on South Dakota's 1991 population of those 18 years and older, the approximate number of burglary victims equals 23,641, with 4,146 reports to the UCR program (17.5 percent). The estimated number of larceny-theft victims totals 44,767, with 15,412 UCR reported offenses (34.4 percent) (U.S. Department of Justice, 1992). In 1992, South Dakota had the 50th highest burglary rate and 47th highest larceny-theft rate nationwide (Department of the Attorney General, 1994).

Fourteen percent of Arkansas survey respondents reported being a burglary victim in 1989, and 12.7 percent were victims of theft (Arkansas Crime Information Center, 1990). The number of reported burglaries in 1989, 29,093, is about 11.8 percent of the estimated

The North Carolina survey did not report results for property crimes. Both South Dakota and Arkansas collapsed all theft data into two categories: burglary and theft. In 1991, 4.7 percent of those surveyed in South Dakota reported

The NCVS reported thefts in two distinctly different manners: those committed against a person, deriving the rate (percentage) of victimization from the population age 12 years and older, and as those committed against a household, with rate (percentage) based on the total number of households. In 1992, 5.9 percent of the population 12 years and older were theft victims (U.S. Department of Justice, 1994), or approximately 12,210,830; in 1992, there were 3.1 reported larceny-thefts per 100 U.S. inhabitants (U.S. Department of Justice, 1993). According to the NCVS, 29.5 percent of the thefts in 1992 were reported to the police. In addition, 13.2 percent of the U.S. households were burglarized in 1992, with 58.3 percent of those victimizations being reported to the police (U.S. Department of Justice, 1994).

In the comparison in Table 11 (see page 11), the personal theft total is included under "Theft" and the household theft total is included under "Burglary." None of the figures in Table 11 include motor vehicle theft.

This is not a particularly helpful comparison, since each jurisdiction reported thefts in a different manner. The problem is compounded by not being able to determine how many individuals were affected by these crimes: some individuals were victims in more than one category of

Table 11: Theft

	Car, Truck or Home Break-in	Stolen from Car or Truck	Stolen From Home While Away	Stolen-Other
Hawaii (1993)	26.5%	17.1%	13.2%	8.0%
Minnesota (1993)	17.1%	26.2%		
South Dakota (1991)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Arkansas (1991)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
NCVS (1992)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Table 11: Theft

	Burglary	Theft	UCR Ranking by Burglary Rate (1992)	UCR Ranking by Larceny-Theft Rate (1992)
Hawaii (1993)	N/A	N/A	18	3
Minnesota (1993)	N/A	N/A	34	25
South Dakota (1991)	4.7%	8.9%	9	18
Arkansas (1991)	14.0%	12.7%	23	34
NCVS (1992)	13.2%	5.9%		

theft. Two states reported the percentage of survey respondents who were the victims of any type of property crime: Hawaii (35 percent) and Minnesota (28 percent).

One additional comparison can be made concerning theft using the two measures of crime. The UCR program collects information for each subclassification of larceny-theft; theft from motor vehicles is one of those subclassifications.

Question number 33 asks whether anything was stolen that was inside a car or truck. Table 12 is a comparison of those data.

Based on these figures, 9.7 percent of thefts from motor vehicles revealed by the crime victimization survey resulted in an official report. None of the other crime victimization surveys include this specific type of theft.

Table 12: Theft from Motor Vehicles in the State of Hawaii 1993

UCR - Official Reports	14,771
Crime Victimization Survey	
Question Number 33	151,679

Discussion

The results of Hawaii's first, comprehensive crime victimization survey are difficult to interpret. The percentage and number of crime victims revealed by the survey and the degree to which crimes go unreported is shocking. The results of a comparison between the survey and the Uniform Crime Reporting program raises questions about the accuracy and reliability of both sources of data.

This report did not attempt to measure the reliability and validity of the UCR program. There is a great deal of stability in the manner in which the data are collected, recorded, and reported. While the Hawaii program has never been audited, it is generally regarded as an accurate reflection of police workload and a good barometer for the measurement of crime in the state.

The crime victimization survey is a new source of information which deserves scrutiny. That scrutiny is the purpose of this report. Without several years of data to use for comparison, it is useful to use the results of similar studies in other states and the United States to see if the results from the Hawaii survey are comparable. Unfortunately, only three states (to date) have used nearly identical survey instruments (Hawaii, Minnesota, and North Carolina). Therefore, some of the comparisons in this report can be considered, justifiably, "stretching it."

Of the 6 surveys used for comparison, Hawaii's survey revealed the highest annual percentage of respondents who indicated that they were the victim of any incident that

could be considered a crime: 39 percent. This distinction should not be surprising when one considers Hawaii's ranking by UCR crime rates. Of the 50 states and District of Columbia, Hawaii had the 12th highest crime rate in 1992. Arkansas, where 36 percent of the residents indicated that they were a crime victim in 1989, ranked 31st in overall crime rate in 1992 (32nd in 1989). Minnesota, which used virtually the same survey as Hawaii, found that 31 percent of the residents were crime victims in 1993 and ranked 35th in overall crime rate for 1992. South Dakota, with one of the lowest total crime rates (49th highest, or 3rd lowest, in 1992), found 17 percent of its citizens were crime victims in 1991. Hawaii's survey results are consistent with what would be expected from UCR rankings for total crime rate.

Rape provides the most clear comparison of victim survey results since the definition is generally agreed upon. One difference does arise, however, in how male rape victims are reported. The UCR program does not include males in its rape statistics. The victim surveys reported the percentage of respondents who had been raped and did not make a distinction between male and female victims.

Among the 5 states, Hawaii had the second lowest percentage of victims, and the second lowest UCR rape rate. None of the results from the 5 victims surveys were wildly different from any of the others.

The comparison between victim survey and UCR data reveal two apparent inconsistencies. The first concerns South Dakota, which had the lowest percentage of survey

respondents who said they were raped and the highest UCR rape rate ranking (12th in the U.S. in 1992). One possible explanation is that a higher percentage of those who were crime victims reported the incident to the police. With its relatively low population (ranked 45th), it would not take many rape victims (0.4 percent of the population) reporting that offense to produce a higher UCR rape rate. The other likely explanation is that rape was underreported on the crime victimization survey; that is, that there were a number of rape victims who did not indicate such on the victim survey. Of course, it is also possible that the South Dakota sample, which resulted in 1,418 responses, systematically or unsystematically missed some rape victims. If 5 additional respondents had indicated that they were raped, the percentage of South Dakotans who were victimized would have doubled. This inconsistency cannot be resolved with the data available.

The second inconsistency involves the NCVS and is more surprising. The percentage of rape victims in the U.S. study is nearly 13 times less than in Hawaii, almost 23 times less than in Minnesota, and even 5.7 times less than in South Dakota. Moreover, the percentage of males and females who reported being the victim of rape differs by only 0.02 percent: 0.06 versus 0.08 percent, respectively. Based on these figures, approximately 60 percent of the rape victims are females, 40 percent male. In the Hawaii study, 85 percent of the rape victims were female. Common sense would suggest that the NCVS figures either overrepresent male victims or underrepresent female victims.

Two other concerns are raised by the NCVS results and are discussed

on page 6: the NCVS rape totals are only slightly higher than the UCR reported rape figures; and the NCVS reports that 53 percent of all rapes are reported to the police. A number of rape studies have found that the percentage of crimes reported is much lower than the NCVS figures: 7 percent (Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate 1991; Center For Women Policy Studies, 1994), 6.7 to 10 percent (Citizens for Justice and Crime Victims, 1990), 4 percent (Elias, 1986), and 16 percent (Kilpatrick et al., 1992).

There are several problems with the methodology of the NCVS which could affect the accuracy of the rape data (Koss, 1990). First of all, interviews are not conducted in private; victims of spousal, friend, or acquaintance rape (the majority of rape victims) may be reluctant to report the incident(s) if the offender is nearby. Second, interviewers are not matched to interviewees by gender or race/ethnicity, perhaps causing some victims not to report rape(s). Third, multiple incidents of rape involving the same person are excluded from the calculation of rape rates in the NCVS. Since multiple victimizations are most likely to involve family, friends, or acquaintances (Koss, 1990), the incidence of stranger rape is exaggerated compared to familial and acquaintance rape.

This latter point is partially reflected in the survey results from Hawaii, Minnesota, and North Carolina. In the Hawaii survey, 26.7 percent of the rapes or other sexual assaults involved strangers; in Minnesota, 13 percent; and North Carolina, 0 percent. The 1992 NCVS reported a much higher percentage of rapes by strangers: 44.0 percent.

Hawaii's survey results for robbery are very similar to those obtained by Minnesota and North Carolina: 2.8 percent, 2.2 percent, and 2.3 percent, respectively. South Dakota and Arkansas had much lower rates: 0.4 percent and 0.7 percent, respectively. Two aspects of survey methodologies used by the different states help explain the two groupings. First, Hawaii, Minnesota, and North Carolina used identical questions to measure the incidence of robbery: the questions asked "Did anyone take something directly from you by using force, such as a stick-up, mugging or threat?" and "Did anyone TRY to rob you by using force or threatening to harm you (other than any incident already mentioned)?" South Dakota and Arkansas phrased questions in a similar manner, asking if the respondent had been the victim of a robbery (South Dakota supplied a definition of robbery: "property or valuables taken directly from you under actual or threatened force"). The questions used by Hawaii, Minnesota, and North Carolina describe actions rather than relying on the respondent to match an action with a definition, in this case robbery. This is an important distinction. The Hawaii, Minnesota, and North Carolina questioning casts a wider net; yet, anyone who responded affirmatively to either question is, by statutory definition, a robbery victim. Robbery victims in South Dakota and Arkansas may have had something taken, but did not think of it as "robbery;" the lay distinction between robbery and theft is not as clear as statutory or UCR definitions.

The second aspect of the different questioning strategies is perhaps more important in explaining the two groupings of states by robbery

rates. Hawaii, Minnesota, and North Carolina asked about attempted as well as completed robberies, whereas South Dakota and Arkansas only include completed robberies. The UCR program and the Hawaii Revised Statutes include attempts under the definition of robbery. If only completed robberies were included, the Hawaii, Minnesota, and North Carolina rates would be cut in half.

Of course, a third explanation is that Hawaii, Minnesota, and North Carolina have more robberies. This explanation is at least partially borne out by UCR rankings: North Carolina ranked 2nd highest among the five states based on survey results and highest based on UCR rankings; Minnesota ranked 3rd in both survey results and UCR rankings; and Hawaii had the highest percentage of its survey respondents who said they were robbery victims and the 4th highest UCR ranking.

The surveys of the 5 states had two categories of assault that were similar: assault with a weapon and bodily assault (beaten up). The survey results were close to UCR rankings. Minnesota, South Dakota, and Hawaii had the lower percentage of survey respondents who were assaulted with a weapon, respectively, and in UCR rankings (Hawaii, South Dakota, and Minnesota, respectively). The percentage of Hawaii survey respondents who were assaulted with a weapon (0.9 percent) is the same as NCVS victims for aggravated assault.

Hawaii had the lowest percentage of survey respondents who were beaten up, followed by South Dakota and Minnesota. This ranking is identical to the UCR ranking for aggravated

assault. The percentage of NCVS victims of simple assault, 1.7 percent, is slightly higher than the percentage of Hawaii survey respondents who were beaten up (1.5 percent).

Victim survey results for burglary and theft are not readily comparable. Hawaii and Minnesota both asked about break-ins to car, truck, or home, with a much higher rate of affirmative responses in Hawaii (26.5 percent versus 17.1 percent). Hawaii also had higher percentages of respondents indicate that something was stolen from their car, truck or home than Minnesota. This is not surprising: Hawaii had the 18th highest burglary rate in the U.S. in 1992 and the 3rd highest larceny-theft rate, versus Minnesota's rankings of 34th and 25th, respectively.

From a comparison of four crime categories (rape, robbery, assault, and theft), it appears that Hawaii's crime victim survey results are not surprising when compared with survey results from Minnesota, North Carolina, South Dakota, and Arkansas. Hawaii's survey results rankings among the other 4 states are consistent with its UCR rankings. While the rankings are consistent, this comparison cannot really address the exact magnitude of crime victimization in Hawaii. The proportion of Hawaii residents who are crime victims could vary by several percentage points and not affect the state's ranking.

One final issue concerning the proportion of the crimes that are reported to the police needs to be addressed. There were a number of similarities among the 5 states used in this analysis in the percentage of crime victimizations accounted for

by UCR results: for example, about 4 percent of the rapes in Hawaii were reported in 1993, about 3 to 5 percent in North Carolina in 1991, and 6 to 8 percent in Arkansas in 1989. However, there is a large discrepancy between the number of survey respondents who said they reported their victimization and the number of offenses actually reported to the police.

The Hawaii survey asked "If anything happened to you last year which you thought was a crime, did you report it to the police?" 17.4 percent said always, 8.3 percent said sometimes, 8.1 percent said never, and 66.1 percent indicated that they were not the victim of a crime. The first obvious discrepancy is that 39 percent of the survey respondents answered affirmatively to questions which describe events that are crimes; this is 5 percent more than what would be expected when subtracting 66 percent (the number indicating that they were not a crime victim) from 100 percent. The discrepancy could be the result of survey respondents not defining events which occurred as a crime. For example, someone who said they were beaten up or threatened may not consider that a crime. This type of interpretation could result in the respondent saying they were not the victim of a crime when, in fact, they were.

The second discrepancy becomes apparent when the number of victims who said they always reported crimes to the police are calculated. Thirty-nine (39) percent of Hawaii's adult population were crime victims, a total of 345,937 persons. Of those, 38 percent said they always reported any crime to the police, a total of 131,456. Nineteen (19) percent of the crime

victims said they sometimes reported crimes to the police; if they reported one-half of the crimes of which they were a victim, it would total 32,864. Based on these figures, one would expect 164,320 crimes reported to the police in 1993. In 1993 in the State of Hawaii, there were 67,870 reported Index Offenses, excluding murder, motor vehicle theft, and arson, which the crime victimization survey did not measure.

The concern raised by these figures is that the number of survey respondents who said they were crime victims and who said they reported the event to the police is 2.4 times larger than the UCR figures for reported offenses. There are two explanations for this discrepancy: 1) the number of respondents who said they were the victim of a crime is overreported in the survey results or 2) the number of respondents who said they always reported crimes to the police is overreported. As discussed earlier in this report, previous research suggests that overreporting crime victimization is less likely than underreporting (Reiss, 1967; Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, 1974; Hildelang and Gottfredson, 1976).

There is evidence that survey respondents overreported that they notified the police when they were the victim of a crime. A total of 14 percent of those who said they always report crimes to the police were not crime victims in 1993. Those respondents may have interpreted the question to be "If something had happened to you last year which you thought was a crime, would you have reported it?" It is also clear from the survey results that a number of respondents did not consider the events in which

they were victims to be a crime: 25 percent of those who were victimized said they were not the victim of a crime when answering the question about reporting crimes to the police. It appears, then, that some survey respondents said they report crimes to the police when they were not victims and some victims did not report because they did not consider their victimization to be a crime.

The results of Hawaii's first comprehensive crime victimization survey should, at the very least, provide a good baseline for future studies. It is important that future studies address the greatest limitation of the first study: the exclusion of juveniles. However, this study offers an important look at the nature and true extent of crime in Hawaii and should be invaluable to policy makers and service providers.

Endnote

¹ The eight Index Offenses include murder, forcible rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny-theft, motor vehicle theft, and arson.

² *The State of Hawaii Data Book 1992*. The Department of Business, Economic Development and Tourism.

³ The 1993 State population estimate was provided by the Department of Business, Economic Development and Tourism, 1994.

⁴ "All Other Offenses" includes admitting minors to improper places; Abduction and compelling to marry; Bigamy and polygamy; Blackmail and extortion; Bribery; Combination in restraint of trade,

trusts, monopolies; Contempt of court; Criminal syndicalism; Discrimination, unfair competition; Kidnaping; Marriage within prohibited degrees; Offenses contributing to juvenile delinquency, such as employment of children in immoral vocations or practices, admitting minors to improper places, etc.; Perjury and subornation of perjury; Possession, repair, manufacture, etc., of burglar's tools; Possession of drug paraphernalia; Possession or sale of obscene literature, pictures, etc.; Public nuisances; Riot and rout; Trespass; Unlawfully bringing weapons into prisons or hospitals; Unlawfully bringing drugs or liquor into state prisons, hospitals, etc., furnishing to convicts; Unlawful disinterment of the dead and violation of sepulture; Unlawful use, possession, etc., of explosives; Violations of state regulatory laws and municipal ordinances; Violation of quarantine; All offenses not otherwise classified; and All attempts to commit any of the above.

References

Arkansas Crime Information Center. 1990. *A Public Opinion Report from the Arkansas Crime Poll, 1989*.

Brekke, Donald G., Wanda L. Fergen, Halley L. Lee, and Anita K. Wyly. 1993. *Public Opinions on and Perceptions of Drugs and Crime in South Dakota*. Office of Attorney General, Criminal Statistics Analysis Center.

Center For Women Policy Studies. 1994. *Violence Against Women as Bias Motivated Hate Crime: Defining the Issues*.

Citizens For Justice and Crime Victims. *Victim's Voice* 8(3): February. Portland, Oregon.

Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate. 1991. *Violence Against Women: The Increase of Rape in America 1990*.

Department of the Attorney General. 1994. *Crime in Hawaii 1993*. Crime Prevention Division.

Elias, Robert. 1986. *The Politics of Victimization: Victims, Victimology and Human Rights*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Hildeland, M., and M. Gottfredson. 1976. The Victim's Decision Not to Invoke the Criminal Justice Process. In William McDonald (ed.) *Criminal Justice and the Victim*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publishing.

Kilpatrick, Dean G., Christine N. Edmunds, and Anne Seymour. 1992. *Rape in America: A Report to the Nation*. National Victim Center and Crime Victims Research and Treatment Center.

Koss, M.P. 1990. *Rape Incidence: A Review and Assessment of the Data*. Testimony to the Committee on Judiciary, U.S. Senate. August 29. In: Center For Women Policy Studies. 1994. *Violence Against Women as Bias Motivated Hate Crime: Defining the Issues*.

Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. 1974. *Crime and Victims: A Report on the Dayton-San Jose Pilot Survey of Victimization*. Washington, D.C. National Criminal Justice Information and Statistics Center.

Lewis, Ray, Dan Storkamp, Carol Mickolich Weber, Dean Zumach, Michelle Powell, and Amy McKenney-Maki. 1994. *Troubling Perceptions*. Minnesota Planning.

Pelfry, William V., Robert M. Bohm, Charles W. Dean, John A. Humphrey, Laura J. Moriarty, Michael L. Vasu, Gary W. Willis, Margaret A. Zahn. 1992. *The North Carolina Violent Crime Assessment Project*. North Carolina Governor's Crime Commission.

Reiss, Albert J., Jr. 1967. *Studies in Crime and Law Enforcement in Major Metropolitan Areas*. President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Skogan, Wesley G. 1974. The Validity of Official Crime Statistics: An Empirical Investigation. *Social Science Quarterly* 55(1):25-38.

Skogan, Wesley G. 1990. The Polls - A Review: The National Crime Survey Redesign. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 54:256-272.

The State of Hawaii Data Book 1992. The Department of Business, Economic Development and Tourism, 1993.

Uniform Crime Reporting Handbook. 1984. Federal Bureau of Investigation.

U.S. Department of Commerce. 1991. *Statistical Abstract of the United States*. U.S. Bureau of the Census.

U.S. Department of Commerce. 1992. *Statistical Abstract of the United States*. U.S. Bureau of the Census.

U.S. Department of Justice. 1990.
Crime in the United States 1991.
Federal Bureau of Investigation.

U.S. Department of Justice. 1992.
Crime in the United States 1991.
Federal Bureau of Investigation.

U.S. Department of Justice. 1993.
Crime in the United States 1992.
Federal Bureau of Investigation.

U.S. Department of Justice. 1994.
*Criminal Victimization in the
United States, 1992*. Office of
Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice
Statistics.

**Other
publications
available
from
the**

**Crime
Prevention
Division:**

Crime and Justice in Hawaii, July 1994

Crime in Hawaii 1993, July 1994

Crime Trend Series:

Crimes Committed with Firearms in the State of Hawaii, April, 1994

Property Crimes 1978-1992, November 1993

Juvenile Arrests 1980 and 1992, July 1993

Murder Victim and Offender Characteristics, 1980-1991, June 1993

Drug Abuse Arrests, 1980-1991, December 1992

Please call the Crime Prevention Division at (808) 586-1416 for any of the publications listed above or to be included on our mailing list.

The data for the Crime Trend Series comes from the Uniform Crime Reporting Program (UCR). The UCR Program in Hawaii gathers offense and arrest data from each of the four county law enforcement agencies: Honolulu, Hawaii, Kauai and Maui.

The Research and Statistics Branch of the Crime Prevention Division, Department of the Attorney General, operates as a clearinghouse for the UCR Program, reporting the county offense and arrest data to the Federal Bureau of Investigation and publishing the results annually in *Crime in Hawaii*.

September 1994

Department of the Attorney General
Crime Prevention Division
810 Richards Street, Suite 701
Honolulu, HI 96813