If you have issues viewing or accessing this file contact us at NCJRS.gov.

ري وي <u>7</u>





UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE ADMINISTRATION WASHINGTON, D. C. 20531

Frances Witlock National Criminal Justice Reference Service Box 6000 Rockville, Md. 20850

Dear Ms. Witlock:

Enclosed please find two documents produced by the Georgia State Crime Commission under grant No. 77-SS-99-6024. These are submitted to you as part of LEAA close out procedure.

If you have any questions concerning these documents, please contact me at 492-9066.

Sincerely,

INM ianne W. Zawitz Mat

National Criminal Justice Information and Statistics Service

DATER 10 25 LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE ADMINISTRATION NCJRS ACTION INITIATOR REFERRAL ACTION RECORD · Rackmales) NCJRS USER NO. (11 any) **REQUESTER** (Name and Title) ORGANIZATION/ACTIVITY TELEPHONE NO. CJRS ADDRESS To A. Chiang OCT 26 1979 ACTION REQUESTED ACQUISITIONS The enclosed two documents are not to be announced on SNI. They are forwarded to you for inclusion They are forwarded to you for inclusion on the Data Base. Availability Service is the steoryia State Crime Commission 1: ACTION TAKEN A 26 78. Hank you. CO FORM 6900/2 (11-72) 1303 1973 03

ANALYSIS OF BURGLARIES IN GEORGIA FROM JANUARY - JUNE, 1977

State Crime Commission

April, 1978

62625

I TIRS

OCT 26 1979

I. Introduction and Methodology

ACQUISITIONS

During 1976 in Georgia, 71,984 burglaries were reported to law enforcement agencies. This crime, which accounted for 30 percent of all serious crimes during that period, increased 18.5 percent between 1973 and 1976.

This report attempts to document the nature of these crimes in Georgia. The state's 159 counties were divided into three categories based on population, and differences in characteristics of burglaries committed in each category were examined. This was done because knowledge of either the differences or similarities of these characteristics might enable crime reduction and target hardening programs to concentrate on the type of burglary most prevalent in that general area.

Information on the characteristics of burglaries used in this report was obtained from the Georgia Crime Information Center's (GCIC) Uniform Crime Report (UCR) Program for the period January 1 through June 30, 1977. Although summary information on the volume of crime has been available from the UCR Program of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) for many years, detailed data on the type, location and time of burglaries is available from only the GCIC system which has replaced the FBI program. Since GCIC released their initial UCR data for the first six months of 1977, this was the only period on which this report could be based.

It should be noted that this report was intended to investigate burglary at a macro and not a micro level. Characteristics of over 31,000 burglaries were examined, but only within three population groups to drtermine whether similarities or differences existed in the group's profiles. To be truly effective, this approach would have to be undertaken at the micro level by each jurisdiction. This would require analysis of crimes by beat, zone or census tract, and is obviously not feasible for a statewide report.

Two methods of dividing the state into groups were tested to determine the better approach. The first used population density as the criterion; the second used population. Correlation analysis indicated that population density accounted for over 80 percent of the variance, but that population accounted for over 94 percent. The latter was chosen, based on the assumption that if population was a better predictor of volume then it would likely be a better criterion to use in analyzing burglary characteristics.

Due to the fact that Fulton and DeKalb counties are so populous that they have the potential to skew results of any analysis of this type, these two counties were designated as a separate category. The remaining counties were separated into several sets of categories. One set included three categories, each containing one-third of the counties. Another set contained three categories, each with one-third of the population. Two sets were developed after visually examining the distribution of counties by population.

Analysis of the population-burglary correlates for each category in these sets indicated the best overall correlations were found in the set that divided the remaining counties into two groups, with the break at a population of 50,000. The following table presents pertinent information for the three categories. Since twelve counties with a combined population of 1.6 percent of the state's total reported either no crimes or no burglaries, these counties were excluded from the analysis.

TABLE 1

SUMMARY INFORMATION ON COUNTIES BY CATEGORY

Category	Size in Population	Number of Counties	Total Population	Percent of State Population
1	0 - 48,000	128	2,020,100	40.3%
2	48,001 - 260,000	17	1,854,700	37.0
3	470,000 - 585,700	2	1,055,700	21.1
TOTAL		147	4,930,500	98.4%

II. Findings

Table 2 includes information on characteristics of burglaries reported during the first six months of 1977 in the categories described in Table 1. The higher burglary rates per 100,000 population in categories 2 and 3 reflect the difference in percentages of population and burglaries within the groups. Fulton and DeKalb counties with 21.4 percent of the population account for 32.3 percent of the burglaries, whereas counties with less than 50,000 people have 41.0 percent of the population and 22.0 percent of the burglaries.

Clearance rates, which indicate the percentage of burglaries cleared by law enforcement by the arrest of one or more persons, are the lowest for counties with 50,000 to 260,000 people but are the highest in Fulton and DeKalb counties. These two counties account for 43.0 percent of all burglary clearances in the state and 33 percent of all persons arrested for burglary.

Information on the type of burglaries indicates 76.5 percent were committed with the use of force, 17.5 percent required no force, and 6.0 percent were attempts. A slight trend is evident for no-force burglaries, with the higher population groups reporting smaller percentages of no-force burglaries. The smallest population group of counties reported the smallest percentages of attempted burglaries.

Of all reported burglaries, 63.5 percent were committed in residential areas and 36.5 percent in non-residential areas. Night burglaries (6:00 p.m. - 6:00 a.m.) accounted for 40.1 percent, day burglaries for 52.6 percent, and unknown time burglaries for 7.3 percent. A very slight trend is evident in higher percentages of residential burglaries for the larger population categories. No trend is evident for night-day percentages, but counties with less than 50,000 population reported the highest percentage of burglaries occurring at unknown times.

The combined location and time variables indicates that residential-day burglaries outnumber residential-night burglaries by almost a 2 to 1 margin. Non-residential burglaries occur in approximately equal volume during day and night hours. No trends are evident except for a slight downward trend in percentages of non-residential day burglaries in the larger population groups. For the entire state, adults arrested for burglary outnumber juveniles by a margin of 1.65 to 1. The more populous regions apparently have a higher involvement of juveniles in burglaries, since the ratio of adults to juveniles decreases from 2.2 to 1 for counties with less than 50,000 people to 1.2 to 1 for Fulton and DeKalb counties.

Table 3 includes Pearson correlation coefficients for selected variable pairs. These coefficients indicate the strength and direction of relationships between two variables. A coefficient of 1.0 indicates a perfect one-toone relationship; a coefficient of 0.0 indicates no relationship exists. A positive coefficient indicates both variables progress in the same direction, whereas negative coefficients indicate that one variable increases as the other decreases. An "ns" indicates that the correlation was not significant at the .05 level, which means that the probability of designated relationships occurring by chance was less than 5 percent.

The correlation analysis indicates that population is a better indicator of burglary incidence than density and is equal to density as a predictor when correlated with burglary rate. No significant correlations emerged from the analysis of burglary incidence and various characteristics of the crime in the state. In category 2, however, which includes counties with 50,000 to 260,000 people, a relatively strong correlation exists between the incidence of burglary and the percentage of crimes that occur at night. Also in this category, the percentage of attempted burglaries increases and the percentage of burglaries occurring at unknown times decreases as the volume of crimes increases.

The counties in population category 2 exhibited relatively strong and negative correlations between clearance rates and both the percentage of burglaries occurring in residential areas and the percentage of attempted burglaries. The remaining significant correlations involving clearance rates were all very weak.

Analyses involving burglary rates indicate that in population category 2, strong positive relationships exist with percentage of attempted burglaries and fairly strong negative relationships exist with percentage of burglaries occurring at unknown times. Either very weak or non-significant correlations exist with the remaining variables.

III. Conclusions

Perhaps the most significant conclusion available from analyzing characteristics of burglaries among different population groups in Georgia is that very few differences exist in the crime's profile in various regions of the state. The more populous regions, especially Fulton and DeKalb counties, have a higher concentration of crimes, but striking differences in type, location or time of burglaries do not exist.

Several factors tend to indicate, however, that reporting procedures may vary among regions of the state. The higher than average percentage of burglaries occurring at unknown times in counties with less than 50,000 people may indicate the need for better investigative reporting. The smaller than average percentage of attempted burglaries in these counties may result from hesitation on the part of victims to report such crimes, or hesitation by law enforcement agencies to record the crimes. If the latter case is true, this could explain the higher clearance rates for these counties, since correlation analysis indicates a weak association between higher clearance rates and smaller percentages of attempted burglaries, and between higher burglary rates and higher percentages of attempted burglaries.

As stated in the introduction to this report, analyses of this type can be undertaken at a more detailed level. For example, an agency might sub-divide the number of non-residential burglaries into several different types of categories. Time of indicents could be counted according to shift and location according to zone or beat. Such an analysis could also be helpful in manpower allocation programs.

TABLE 2

.

٠.

CHARACTERISTICS OF BURGLARIES

	CATEGORY							
VARIABLE	1		2		3		TOTAL	
Burglary Rate per 100,000 population	. 340		770		955		634	
per 100,000 burglaries	13.8		11.5		19.4		14.6	
<pre>lype force no force attempt total Location - Time residential non-residential total night day ur own total res-night res-day res-unk non-res-night non-res-day non-res-unk total</pre>	5,140 $1,451$ 281 $6,872$ $3,906$ $2,966$ $6,872$ $2,412$ $3,700$ 760 $6,872$ $1,123$ $2,341$ 442 $1,289$ $1,359$ -318 $6,872$	74.8% 21.1 4.1 $100.0%$ $56.8%$ 43.2 $100.0%$ $35.1%$ 53.8 11.1 $100.0%$ $16.3%$ 34.1 6.4 18.8 19.8 4.6 $100.0%$	$ \begin{array}{r} 10,676\\2,627\\983\\14,286\\\hline\\9,198\\5,088\\14,286\\\hline\\5,957\\7,628\\701\\14,286\\\hline\\3,364\\5,338\\496\\2,593\\2,290\\205\\14,286\\\hline\\\end{array} $	74.7% 18.4 6.9 $100.0%$ $64.4%$ 35.6 $100.0%$ $41.7%$ 53.4 4.9 $100.0%$ $23.6%$ 37.4 3.5 18.1 16.0 1.4 $100.0%$	$\begin{array}{r} 8,069\\ 1,405\\ \underline{601}\\ 10,075\\ \hline \end{array}$ $\begin{array}{r} 6,714\\ \underline{3,361}\\ 10,075\\ \hline \end{array}$ $\begin{array}{r} 4,160\\ 5,113\\ \underline{802}\\ 10,075\\ \hline \end{array}$ $\begin{array}{r} 2,315\\ 3,934\\ 465\\ 1,845\\ 1,179\\ \underline{337}\\ 10,075\\ \hline \end{array}$	$80.1\% \\ 13.9 \\ 6.0 \\ 100.0\% \\ 66.6\% \\ 33.4 \\ 100.0\% \\ 41.3\% \\ 50.7 \\ 8.0 \\ 100.0\% \\ 23.0\% \\ 39.1 \\ 4.6 \\ 18.3 \\ 11.7 \\ 3.3 \\ 100.0\% \\ 80.0\% \\ 100$	23,885 5,483 1,865 31,233 19,818 11,415 31,233 12,529 16,431 2,263 31,233 6,802 11,613 1,403 5,727 4,828 860 31,233	76.5% 17.5 6.0 $100.0%$ $63.5%$ 36.5 $100.0%$ $40.1%$ 52.6 7.3 $100.0%$ $21.8%$ 37.2 4.5 18.3 15.5 2.7 $100.0%$
· · ·								

TABLE 2 (continued)

.

VARIABLES	1		2		3		TOTAL	
Number of Counties	128	87.0%	17	11.6%	2	1.4%	147	100.0%
Number of Burglaries	6,872	22.0%	14,286	45.7%	10,075	32.3%	31,233	100.0%
Population (1976)	2,020,100	41.0%	1,854,700	37.6%	1,055,700	21.4%	4,930,500	100.0%
Number of Clearances	945	20.8%	1,645	36.2%	1,955	43.0%	4,545	100.0%
Number of Adult Arrests Number of Juvenile Arrests total	1,035 <u>474</u> <u>1,509</u>	68.6% <u>31.4</u> 100.0%	1,016 <u>599</u> <u>1,615</u>	62.9% <u>37.1</u> <u>100.0%</u>	803 <u>655</u> <u>1,458</u>	55.1% 44.9 100.0%	2,854 <u>1,728</u> <u>4,582</u>	62.3% <u>37.7</u> 100.0%

TABLE 3 CORRELATIONS OF SELECTED VARIABLES

ĺ

Variable	Þair
----------	------

. .

Category

•	•	1	_2	3	state
Burglary	- population	.84	.87	correlations	. 94
•	- density	.72	.60	not applicable	.80
	- juvenile arrest	.20	ns	in this group	.17
	- force %	19	ns		ns
	- no force %	.17	ns		ns
	- attempt %	ns	.43		ns
	- res. %	ns	ns		ns
	- non-res. %	ns	ns		ns
	- night %	ns	.56		ns
	∽ day %	ns	ns		ns
•	- unk %	ns	50		ns
Clearance	- population	15	ns		ns
' Rate	- density	17	ns		ns
	- juvenile arrest %	.28	ns		.26
	- force %	.22	ns		.22
	- no force %	18	ns		18
	- attempt %	ns.	49		14
	- res. %	ns	57		ns
	- non-res. %	ns	.57		ns
	- night %	ns	ns		ns
	- day %	ns	ns		ns
	- unk %	ns	ns		ns
Burglary	- population	. 40	ns		. 50
Rate	- density	.41	ns		.50
	- juvenile arrest %	ns	ns		.15
•	- force %	15	ns		14
	- no force %	ns	ns		ns
	- attempt %	ns	.75		.23
	- res. %	ns	ns		.17
	- non-res. %	ns	ns		17
	- night %	ns	ns		ns
	- day %	ns	ns		ns
	- unk %	ns	44		14

NOTES: 1) ns signifies a non-significant correlation at a .05 level.