

THE NATIONAL CRIME VICTIMIZATION SURVEY REDESIGN: MEASURING THE IMPACT OF NEW METHODS

Carol Persely

U.S. Bureau of the Census, Washington, DC 20233

Key Words: New Questionnaire, CATI, Overlap

I. Introduction

The U.S. Census Bureau has been testing new methods (NM) for the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) since 1988. The NM include a new NCVS questionnaire, an increased use of centralized Computer-Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI) and a change in the definition of a series crime. During an 18-month overlap period (January 1992 through June 1993), we used the NM in one half of the sample and the old methods (OM) in the other half of the sample. The overlap allows us to measure differences between the NM and OM.

It's important that we understand the impact of the NM because this relates to our understanding of crime in the nation. We want to understand what part of the difference we see is due to true trends in crime and what part is due to a change in the methodology. Comparing NM data to OM data from the same time period allows us to make assumptions about the amount of the change that is due to the NM.

This paper is one of a series that assesses the impact of the NM. In this paper, we explore the data to isolate key variables that relate NM data to OM data. We plan to use the measured difference between the NM and OM during the overlap to predict what the OM time series would have looked like under the NM and vice versa.

In order to model the difference between the NM and the OM, we want to find breakdowns of the data that the NM impact differentially. The most basic breakdown of the data is the type-of-crime breakdown. We already know that the impact of the NM differs by type of crime. Our results show higher crime rates under the NM: 47% higher for personal crimes and 23% higher for property crimes (Table 1).

This paper reports the general results of research undertaken by Census Bureau staff. The views expressed are attributable to the author and do not necessarily reflect those of the Census Bureau.

So, we need to take this difference into account for modeling.

In this paper we explore differences between sub-populations of demographic, geographic and incident-characteristic groups using data from the overlap to find sub-populations that are associated with the increase we see in crime rates. We want to include a variable in our model if the impact of the NM differs by sub-population. If we don't see a significant difference for a particular variable, then we need to explore further to decide whether or not the variable enhances our prediction.

II. Background of the NCVS

The NCVS was begun in 1972 (known then as the National Crime Survey (NCS)) to collect data on crime victimization in the United States. The Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) sponsors the NCVS. The Census Bureau collects and processes the data. We currently interview about 48,000 households (roughly 91,000 persons) in the full sample. A household is contacted 7 times over a 3-year period. The first interview is used for bounding purposes only and does not contribute to the estimates. During the interview, we ask respondents aged 12 and over about victimizations occurring in the last 6 months. We measure personal crimes such as rape/sexual assault, robbery and assault, and property crimes such as burglary, motor vehicle theft and theft.

In the late 1970s, crime experts agreed that the OM were flawed: they believed crime was underreported and that crime estimates had high measurement error. At the same time, BJS wanted to broaden the scope of crime data collected. So, BJS decided to redesign the NCS questionnaire⁵. The main changes to the NCS questionnaire are that the NCVS asks specific questions about rape and crimes committed by family members to improve collection of these types of crimes; it eliminates yes/no questions and uses groups of short cues to break the monotony of yes/no questions and to stimulate recall; it states the purpose of the survey more clearly and reduces the number of ambiguous terms so the respondent better understands what we're trying to measure; it asks lifestyle questions to stimulate thoughts about

different types of situations in which the respondent may have been victimized; and it reminds the respondent of the reference period to reduce telescoping^{2,3}.

III. Design of Phase-In of the NM

In 1988 and part of 1989, the Census Bureau conducted small non-production pretests to refine the methods. Data from these pretests were not fully edited and weighted and did not contribute to published estimates.

Following this, there were three production phases in the testing and introduction of the NM using 5%, 10%, and 50% of the sample. During the 50-50 sample split, which is the concern of this paper, we randomly divided our sample into two halves, as described below. Starting in July 1993, we use the NM in 100% of the sample.

We randomly selected interviewers to use either the NM or the OM. This resulted in an approximate 50-50 sample split of interviewer workloads between the methods. To select interviewers, we paired similar one to four interviewer primary sampling units (PSUs) based on region, crime rate, the number of interviewers in the PSU, and whether or not the PSU was self-representing. From each pair, one PSU was randomly assigned to the NM while the other PSU remained with the OM. In PSUs with five or more interviewers, we split the interviewers into two groups with one group randomly assigned to the NM and the other to the OM. The NM and OM samples were weighted separately, each to national population totals.

Throughout the paper, we test for significance based on a confidence coefficient of .90. When conducting multiple comparisons of contrasts, we use the Tukey method of multiple comparison. We derive the appropriate confidence coefficient for contrasts using a family confidence coefficient of .90. Variances are based on parameters from a generalized variance formula derived from the stratified jackknife method. The difference of ratios is the difference between the NM to OM ratio for two subgroups.

IV. Impact of the NM on Crime Rates by Type of Crime

Table 1 shows the overall impact of the NM on crime rates during the overlap by type of crime. The NM generally result in higher crime rates than the OM: 47% higher for personal crimes, 53% higher for

crimes of violence, 165% higher for rape, 57% higher for assault, 23% higher for property crimes, 20% higher for burglary and 27% higher for theft. We could not detect a difference for robbery, purse snatching/pocket picking or motor vehicle theft.

Crimes of violence are the largest part of personal crime. Most of the increase in violent crime is due to the NM impact on assaults. And most of the increase in assaults is due to higher simple assault rates under the NM. Simple assaults are less serious in nature than aggravated assaults. While for aggravated assaults, there is a weapon present and/or serious injury occurs, for simple assaults there is no weapon present and if there is injury, it is minor. Simple assaults also include attempted assault without a weapon.¹ We modified the NCVS screener to specifically ask about grabbing, punching and choking. We believed that since there was no cue for these types of incidents in the NCS screener, they may have been underreported. And the increase we see in simple assaults under the NM supports this idea.

The NCVS screener also asks "lifestyle" questions about frequency of shopping, evening activities and use of public transportation. It was hoped that these lifestyle cues would stimulate recall. We also changed the way the screener asks about theft. Under the OM, we see: "Did anyone steal things that belonged to your from inside any car or truck, such as packages or clothing? Was anything stolen from you while you were away from home, for instance at work, in a theater or restaurant, or while traveling?...Was anything (else) at all stolen from you...?" Under the NM, we see instead, a series of short cues: "Was something belonging to you stolen such as -- things that you carry, like luggage, a wallet, purse, briefcase, book -- clothing, jewelry, or calculator -- bicycle or sports equipment -- things in your home -- like a TV, stereo, or tools," etc. Most of the impact in property crime is due to the NM impact on theft rates. Burglary rates also increased under the NM. It is difficult to assess whether the increases we see are due to the new lifestyle cues, the series of short cues, or some combination of both. But the NM have the desired effect for property crimes.

As we begin looking at sub-populations based on demographic, geographic and incident characteristic, some crime categories will have insufficient sample size to be of interest. So, for subsequent analysis we'll only look at the following crime categories: crimes of violence, including rape, robbery and assault, and property crimes, including burglary, motor vehicle

theft and theft. In the sections below, we explore differences, first, for crimes of violence and, then, for property crimes.

V. Impact of the NM on Crime Rates for Crimes of Violence by Demographic Variables

We look at different demographic variables for crimes of violence to see if the NM impacted sub-populations of these variables differentially. In most cases, we see higher crime rates under the NM for crimes of violence including assaults. The NM impact some demographic sub-populations differentially.

We revised the NCVS screener to cue more specifically about rape/sexual assault where, historically, most victims are female. So, not surprisingly, the relative impact of the NM on rape rates is greater for females than for males (Table 2). In fact, the overall increase we see in rape (Table 1) is due to the impact of the NM on females. The NM result in higher crime rates for males and females for most crime categories considered. However, other than for rape, we could not detect a difference in the relative impact of the NM between males and females.

We changed the NCVS screener to emphasize that assault includes grabbing, punching and choking because we believed that these types of incidents were underrepresented. When comparing violent crime rates for Blacks and Whites under the OM, we see that Blacks already have higher violent crime rates than Whites including higher rates for robbery and assault, especially aggravated assault. There was no significant difference between the simple assault rate for Blacks and Whites when comparing OM rates for the two groups. So, we theorized that a group that experiences a larger number of more serious violent crimes might be less likely to recall less serious violent crimes. We hoped that the new cues would cause a greater increase in rates of violent crime for Blacks due to greater response for simple assaults. The overlap data did not confirm this hypothesis. The NM result in higher crime rates for Whites for most violent crime categories considered (Table 3). The NM show no significant difference in any crime category for Blacks. The relative impact of the NM is larger for Whites than for Blacks for crimes of violence, including assault. So, this result was the opposite of we expected.

Historically, we see that violent crime rates increase with education. However, researchers generally agree

that this result is counterintuitive.⁴ When we revised the questionnaire, we hoped the new cues and more precise wording would better capture crime among victims with lower education. However, we find just the opposite. We look at crime rates for the population aged 25 and over by education category (Table 4). We see an increase in the crime rates for the high school and college-educated groups for some categories while we see no significant difference in crime rates for the elementary-educated group. And we see a greater impact of the NM on the college-educated group for crimes of violence versus the elementary-educated group.

The NM result in higher crime rates for crimes of violence including assault within household income group of the victim (Table 5). The impact of the NM for crimes of violence including rape and assault differs by income. Rape rates for victims in the low-income group (less than \$35,000) increase while there is no significant change for rape rates in the high-income group (\$35,000 or more). So, the low-income group is associated with the overall increase we see in the rape rate. The NM have a larger impact on the high-income group than the low-income group for crimes of violence including assault. This result is consistent with what we saw for education.

The NM result in higher crime rates for most crime categories considered for victims under 50 (Table 6). We find no significant difference in the relative impact of the NM between victims under 50 and 50 plus.

The NM result in higher rates for crimes of violence including assault within ethnicity (Table 7). We see no difference in the relative impact of the NM between Hispanics and Non-Hispanics for crimes of violence.

VI. Impact of the NM on Crime Rates for Crimes of Violence by Geographic Variables

For geographic variables, we see results similar to those for demographic variables. The NM result in higher rates for crimes of violence including assault by urban/suburban/rural group (Table 8) and by region (Table 9).

We had no reason to believe that the NM would impact geographic sub-populations differentially. The results we see confirm this. We see no obvious pattern of differential impact for the geographic variables.

VII. Impact of the NM on Crime Rates for Crimes of Violence by Incident-Characteristic Variables

While demographic and geographic variables relate more to the victim, variables for incident characteristics relate more to a specific criminal occurrence. Incident characteristics include such things as the relationship of the victim to the offender and whether or not a crime was reported to the police. We look at incident characteristics for crimes of violence to see if the NM impact sub-populations of these variables differentially. The results we see are encouraging.

We revised the NCVS screener to emphasize that our definition of crime includes crimes committed by non-strangers -- people we know such as spouses, ex-spouses, friends, etc. The NM result in higher crime rates for crimes committed by strangers and non-strangers for crimes of violence including assault (Table 10). The NM result in higher rape rates for non-stranger crime. The NM have a larger impact on non-stranger than stranger crime for crimes of violence. So, the changes we made to the screener have the desired effect.

One of the ways in which the NCVS differs from the Federal Bureau of Investigation's Uniform Crime Report is that it collects data on *unreported* crime as well as reported crime. So, it is important that the NM reliably measure unreported crime. The NM result in higher crime rates for crimes of violence including assaults for both reported and unreported crime (Table 11). We see that the impact of the NM is differential by reporting status: the NM have a larger impact on unreported crime than reported crime for crimes of violence including assault. So, we are doing an even better job of measuring unreported crime.

VIII. Impact of the NM on Property Crime Rates by Demographic Variables

We look at different demographic variables for property crimes to see if the NM impact sub-populations of these variables differentially.

The results for property crimes by age of the head of household differ from what we saw for crimes of violence by age. For crimes of violence, the NM result in higher violent crime rates for the younger group, with no significant difference between age

groups. For property crimes including thefts, the NM result in higher crime rates for both age of head of household groups (Table 12). The NM result in higher burglary rates for the 35+ group. The NM tend to have a larger impact on the older group than the younger group: we see this for property crimes including burglary and theft. In fact, the overall increase in burglary we see in Table 1 is due to the impact of the NM on the older group.

Households headed by Non-Hispanics have higher crime rates for property crimes including burglaries under the NM (Table 13). Both ethnic groups have higher theft rates under the NM. For crimes of violence, we didn't see a difference in the impact of the NM by ethnicity of the victim. However, for property crimes, we see that the NM have a larger impact on the Non-Hispanic group than the Hispanic group.

The NM result in higher crime rates for both income groups for property crimes including burglaries and thefts (Table 14). When comparing income groups we see that the NM have a larger impact on the high-income group for property crimes including burglaries and thefts.

The NM result in higher crime rates for households headed by Whites, Blacks and other races for property crimes including theft (Table 15). The NM result in higher burglary rates for both the White and Black groups and lower motor vehicle theft rates for households headed by other races. There are no significant differences in the impact of the NM between groups of race of head of household. For crimes of violence, we see a greater impact of the NM on the White group than on the Black group. So, the results by race differ for property crimes and crimes of violence.

IX. Impact of the NM on Property Crime Rates by Geographic Variables

We look at different geographic variables for property crimes to see if the NM impact sub-populations of these variables in different ways. As with personal crimes, we have no reason to expect the NM to impact the geographic sub-populations in different ways.

The NM result in higher crime rates for property crimes including thefts for urban, suburban and rural groups (Table 16). They result in higher burglary rates for the urban group. For the most part, we see

no significant difference in the way the NM impact urban, suburban and rural groups.

The NM result in higher crime rates in the Midwest, South and West for property crimes (Table 17). The NM result in higher theft rates in all regions. For the most part, the impact of the NM does not differ significantly by region.

X. Impact of the NM on Property Crime Rates by Police-Reporting Status

The NM result in higher crime rates for property crime including theft both for crimes reported to police and not reported to police (Table 18). The NM result in higher burglary rates for crimes not reported to police. The impact of the NM is larger on property crimes for crimes not reported to police than for crimes reported to police. These results are consistent with results we saw for personal crimes.

XI. Conclusions

In summary, we see an overall increase in crime rates due to the NM for crimes of violence including rape and assault, and property crimes including burglary and theft. Most sub-populations of demographic, geographic and incident-characteristic variables also show an increase in crime rates for crimes of violence including assault and property crimes including theft. So the NM generally have the desired effect on crime rates.

Besides gaining a general understanding of the data, our goal is to explore the data to find variables that are important to include in our models. We eventually want to model the overlap data to link the OM time series to the NM time series. If the impact is different among sub-populations for a particular demographic, geographic or incident characteristic, then it is important to include this variable in models of the overlap.

Since the impact of the NM is differential by type of crime, it is important that we form different models by this most-basic breakdown. However, we must strike a balance between creating a model for each type of crime and functionality: a model for every crime category may become unwieldy.

The demographic and incident-characteristic variables are clearly critical in our modeling efforts. But, the results for geographic variables are inconclusive and require further exploration.

For crimes of violence, we find differential impacts between sub-populations of the demographic variables by sex, race, educational attainment, and annual family income of the victim. We also find differential impacts between some sub-populations of victim-offender relationship and police-reporting status. Age and ethnicity of victim and geographic variables did not yield statistically significant differences. Although, there is evidence of a differential impact for some variables, there may have been insufficient sample to detect these differences.

For property crimes, we find differential impacts between sub-populations of demographic variables by age and ethnicity of head of household and annual family income. Race of head of household and geographic variables did not yield statistically significant differences and require further exploration before including them in our models.

It will be interesting to continue to explore the impact of the NM. There are other demographic and incident-characteristic variables available that we did not discuss in this paper that we may want to consider for modeling. We also need to explore the possibility of interactions between variables. So further research is needed.

References

1. Criminal Victimization in the United States, 1992, U.S. Department of Justice, 1994.
2. Hubble, David L., "National Crime Survey New Questionnaire Phase-In Research: Preliminary Results," presented at the International Conference on Measurement Errors in Surveys, Tucson, AZ, 1990.
3. Hubble, David L., "The National Crime Victimization Survey Redesign: New Questionnaire and Procedures Development and Phase-In Methodology," presented at the 1995 Joint Statistical Meetings, Orlando, FL, 1995.
4. Skogan, Wesley G., "The Polls--A Review: The National Crime Survey Redesign," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, Vol. 54, 1990.
5. Redesign of the National Crime Survey, U.S. Department of Justice, 1989.

Table 1
1992 NM and OM Victimization Rates

	NM	OM	%Diff
Personal crimes	50.7	34.4	47.4 *
Crimes of violence	49.0	32.1	52.7 *
Rape	1.8	0.7	164.7 *
Robbery	6.1	5.9	2.7
Assault	40.0	25.5	57.1 *
Aggravated	11.1	9.0	23.3 *
Simple	28.9	16.5	75.2 *
Purse snatching/ pocket picking	1.8	2.4	-25.0
Property crimes	325.3	264.5	23.0 *
Burglary	58.6	48.9	19.9 *
Motor vehicle theft	18.5	20.1	-8.1
Theft	248.2	195.5	27.0 *

* NM to OM difference is significant.

Table 2
1992 NM and OM Victimization Rates for Persons
By Sex of Victim

	NM	OM	% Diff
Crimes of violence			
Male	59.5	38.8	53.4 *
Female	39.1	25.9	51.1 *
Rape			
Male	0.2	0.6	-73.7 **
Female	3.3	0.8	328.3 **
Robbery			
Male	8.1	8.1	-0.1
Female	4.2	3.9	6.4
Assault			
Male	50.9	30.1	69.1 *
Female	29.7	21.1	40.6 *

* NM to OM difference is significant.

Male to female diff. of ratios is significant.

Table 3
1992 NM and OM Victimization Rates for Persons
By Race of Victim

	NM	OM	% Diff
Crimes of violence			
White	47.8	29.9	59.6 **
Black	57.3	50.4	13.8 #
Rape			
White	1.7	0.6	165.7 *
Black	2.6	1.3	105.2
Robbery			
White	4.8	4.7	1.9
Black	14.8	15.6	-5.4
Assault			
White	40.3	24.6	63.5 **
Black	38.3	33.5	14.2 #

* NM to OM difference is significant.

White to Black diff. of ratios is significant.

Table 4
1992 NM and OM Victimization Rates for Persons
By Educational Attainment
For the Population Aged 25+

	NM	OM	% Diff
Crimes of violence			
Elementary	15.1	14.6	4.0 #
High School	29.4	19.2	53.0 *
College	38.7	21.9	77.2 **
Rape			
Elementary	0.7	0.0	N
High School	1.0	0.2	568.6 *
College	0.8	0.7	20.9
Robbery			
Elementary	3.5	5.5	-36.4
High School	4.4	3.6	21.9
College	3.5	4.4	-20.8
Assault			
Elementary	10.6	9.1	16.5
High School	23.5	15.4	52.6 *
College	33.7	16.8	101.0 *

* NM to OM difference is significant.

Elem. to coll. diff. of ratios is significant.

Table 5
1992 NM and OM Victimization Rates for Persons
By Annual Family Income of Victim

	NM	OM	% Diff
Crimes of violence			
<\$35,000	57.9	39.6	46.0 **
\$35,000+	40.9	22.5	82.1 **
Rape			
<\$35,000	2.6	0.7	279.5 **
\$35,000+	0.5	0.8	-31.5 #
Robbery			
<\$35,000	7.9	7.2	10.4
\$35,000+	3.9	4.2	-7.7
Assault			
<\$35,000	46.0	31.8	44.8 **
\$35,000+	35.6	17.5	103.4 **

* NM to OM difference is significant.

<\$35,000 to \$35,000+ diff. of ratios is significant.

Table 6
1992 NM and OM Victimization Rates for Persons
By Age of Victim

	NM	OM	% Diff
Crimes of violence			
12-49	66.0	43.0	53.4 *
50+	9.4	7.5	25.1
Rape			
12-49	2.5	0.9	173.2 *
50+	0.2	0.2	10.8
Robbery			
12-49	7.8	7.6	2.7
50+	2.1	2.2	-6.7
Assault			
12-49	54.2	34.5	57.0 *
50+	7.0	5.1	37.0

* NM to OM diff. is significant.

Table 7
1992 NM and OM Victimization Rates for Persons
By Ethnicity of Victim

	NM	OM	% Diff
Crimes of violence			
Hispanic	55.6	38.2	45.8 *
Non-Hispanic	48.4	31.4	54.2 *
Rape			
Hispanic	1.6	0.7	151.9
Non-Hispanic	1.8	0.7	161.4 *
Robbery			
Hispanic	11.4	10.6	6.7
Non-Hispanic	5.6	5.4	3.3
Assault			
Hispanic	42.1	26.9	56.5 *
Non-Hispanic	39.8	25.3	57.7 *

* NM to OM difference is significant.

Table 8
1992 NM and OM Victimization Rates for Persons
By Type of Locality of Residence of Victim

	NM	OM	% Diff
Crimes of violence			
Urban	61.2	43.2	41.7 *
Suburban	48.0	28.3	70.0 *
Rural	38.2	25.2	51.4 *
Rape			
Urban	2.0	0.9	119.5 *
Suburban	1.5	0.7	113.0 *
Rural	2.1	0.4	427.7 *
Robbery			
Urban	10.8	10.8	0.0
Suburban	5.5	4.4	23.9
Rural	2.3	2.7	-13.3
Assault			
Urban	47.2	31.5	50.0 *
Suburban	40.2	23.1	73.6 *
Rural	32.3	22.1	46.0 *

* NM to OM difference is significant.

Table 9
1992 NM and OM Victimization Rates for Persons
By Region

	NM	OM	% Diff
Crimes of violence			
Northeast	36.4	23.3	56.3 *
Midwest	51.4	30.7	67.4 *
South	38.2	31.7	20.7 *
West	72.5	44.4	63.4 *
Rape			
Northeast	1.4	0.6	136.0
Midwest	2.7	0.9	200.1 *
South	1.5	0.5	240.4 *
West	1.5	1.0	50.5
Robbery			
Northeast	5.8	6.1	-4.8
Midwest	6.2	3.8	60.5 *
South	5.3	6.1	-13.4
West	7.4	8.0	-7.1
Assault			
Northeast	28.3	16.6	70.4 *
Midwest	41.8	26.0	60.7 *
South	29.9	25.1	19.3 *#
West	62.5	35.4	76.4 *#

* NM to OM difference is significant.

South to West diff. of ratios is significant.

Table 10
1992 NM and OM Victimization Rates for Persons
By Victim-Offender Relationship

	NM	OM	% Diff
Crimes of violence			
Stranger	26.5	19.5	35.5 *#
Non-Stranger	22.5	12.8	75.0 *#
Rape			
Stranger	0.6	0.3	82.6
Non-Stranger	1.2	0.4	220.3 *
Robbery			
Stranger	4.4	4.8	-9.3
Non-Stranger	1.6	1.2	39.3
Assault			
Stranger	20.9	14.4	45.8 *
Non-Stranger	19.1	11.3	68.3 *

* NM to OM difference is significant.

Stranger to non-stranger diff. of ratios is sig.

Table 11
1992 NM and OM Victimization Rates for Persons
By Police-Reporting Status

	NM	OM	% Diff
Crimes of violence			
Rep. to Police	21.0	16.0	31.6 *#
Not Rep. to Police	27.5	15.7	75.0 *#
Rape			
Rep. to Police	0.6	0.4	60.9
Not Rep. to Police	1.2	0.3	273.4 *
Robbery			
Rep. to Police	3.6	3.0	17.8
Not Rep. to Police	2.5	2.9	-14.5
Assault			
Rep. to Police	16.5	12.6	31.3 *#
Not Rep. to Police	23.1	12.5	84.6 *#

* NM to OM difference is significant.

Reported to not reported diff. of ratios is sig.

Table 12
1992 NM and OM Victimization Rates for Households
By Age of Head of Household

	NM	OM	% Diff
Property crimes			
12-34	411.0	369.4	11.3 *#
35+	291.9	225.7	29.3 *#
Burglary			
12-34	69.8	69.9	-0.2 #
35+	54.2	41.1	31.9 *#
Motor vehicle theft			
12-34	24.5	29.0	-15.4
35+	16.2	16.8	-4.0
Theft			
12-34	316.6	270.5	17.1 *#
35+	221.5	167.7	32.0 *#

* NM to OM difference is significant.

12-34 to 35+ diff. of ratios is significant.

Table 13
1992 NM and OM Victimization Rates for Households
By Ethnicity of Head of Household

	NM	OM	% Diff
Property crimes			
Hispanic	426.6	388.3	9.8 #
Non-Hispanic	318.2	255.1	24.8 **
Burglary			
Hispanic	70.3	69.9	0.7
Non-Hispanic	57.9	47.3	22.3 *
Motor vehicle theft			
Hispanic	36.7	48.6	-24.5
Non-Hispanic	17.4	18.0	-3.2
Theft			
Hispanic	319.5	269.9	18.4 *
Non-Hispanic	243.0	189.8	28.0 *

* NM to OM difference is significant.
Hispanic to Non-Hispanic diff. of ratios is sig.

Table 14
1992 NM and OM Victimization Rates for Households
By Annual Family Income

	NM	OM	% Diff
Property crimes			
<\$35,000	311.6	265.1	17.5 **
\$35,000+	372.7	281.4	32.4 **
Burglary			
<\$35,000	64.7	55.5	16.7 *
\$35,000+	50.8	39.6	28.2 *
Motor vehicle theft			
<\$35,000	16.1	19.6	-17.9
\$35,000+	21.6	20.3	6.6
Theft			
<\$35,000	230.8	190.1	21.4 **
\$35,000+	300.3	221.5	35.6 **

* NM to OM difference is significant.
<\$35,000 to \$35,000+ diff. of rat. is sig.

Table 15
1992 NM and OM Victimization Rates for Households
By Race of Head of Household

	NM	OM	% Diff
Property crimes			
White	315.6	258.6	22.1 *
Black	390.6	303.3	28.8 *
Other	347.2	283.6	22.4 *
Burglary			
White	53.1	46.4	14.5 *
Black	98.2	68.4	43.5 *
Other	59.9	44.3	35.2
Motor vehicle theft			
White	16.3	17.4	-5.9
Black	34.9	37.1	-6.0
Other	17.0	34.5	-50.8 *
Theft			
White	246.2	194.8	26.3 *
Black	257.6	197.8	30.2 *
Other	270.4	204.8	32.0 *

* NM to OM difference is significant.

Table 16
1992 NM and OM Victimization Rates for Households
By Type of Locality of Residence

	NM	OM	% Diff
Property crimes			
Urban	403.3	340.2	18.6 *
Suburban	321.8	245.8	30.9 *
Rural	246.8	201.3	22.6 *
Burglary			
Urban	78.3	60.1	30.2 *
Suburban	51.1	44.6	14.7
Rural	50.2	41.7	20.3
Motor vehicle theft			
Urban	31.7	35.3	-10.2
Suburban	16.7	17.3	-3.3
Rural	7.4	6.2	19.8
Theft			
Urban	293.3	244.7	19.9 **
Suburban	254.0	184.0	38.1 **
Rural	189.2	153.4	23.4 *

* NM to OM difference is significant.
Urban to suburban diff. of ratios is significant.

Table 17
1992 NM and OM Victimization Rates for Households
By Region

	NM	OM	% Diff
Property crimes			
Northeast	218.3	198.9	9.8
Midwest	312.3	246.0	26.9 *
South	305.9	265.7	15.2 *
West	461.5	357.3	29.2 *
Burglary			
Northeast	36.4	31.8	14.6
Midwest	59.9	47.4	26.3 *
South	61.2	51.1	19.9 *
West	72.3	65.4	10.5
Motor vehicle theft			
Northeast	16.0	25.6	-37.7 **
Midwest	14.5	16.2	-10.5
South	14.3	17.5	-18.2
West	31.7	23.9	32.7 **
Theft			
Northeast	165.9	141.5	17.3 *
Midwest	237.9	182.4	30.4 *
South	230.4	197.1	16.9 *
West	357.6	268.1	33.4 *

* NM to OM difference is significant.
NE to W diff. of ratios is significant.

Table 18
1992 NM and OM Victimization Rates for Households
By Police-Reporting Status

	NM	OM	% Diff
Property crimes			
Rep. to Police	110.0	96.0	14.6 **
Not Rep. to Police	212.8	165.1	28.9 **
Burglary			
Rep. to Police	29.8	26.2	13.8
Not Rep. to Police	28.5	21.9	30.0 *
Motor vehicle theft			
Rep. to Police	14.2	15.0	-5.8
Not Rep. to Police	4.3	4.9	-11.7
Theft			
Rep. to Police	66.1	54.8	20.6 *
Not Rep. to Police	180.0	138.3	30.2 *

* NM to OM difference is significant.
Reported to not reported diff. of ratios is sig.