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Abstract

The empirical research literature on criminal victimization and fear of crime among older adults is reviewed and critiqued. While the literature indicates that older adults are generally less likely to be victimized than younger adults but more likely to be afraid of being victimized, a critical assessment of the literature suggests that these differences may be exaggerated by methodological flaws including not controlling for risk factors. Suggestions for improving the research methodology and theory of victimization studies are discussed. Finally, it is suggested that cross-cultural comparative studies are needed to begin to identify societal determinants of victimization.
Criminal victimization is offensive to the collective conscience especially when the victims are relatively vulnerable physically, socially and psychologically as in the case of the elderly. Most of the victimization research on older adult populations has focused on two areas, the etiology of criminal victimization and the fear of crime among older adults. This review will summarize and critique the empirical research in these two areas and suggest directions that are needed in future research. Only research on noninstitutionalized populations in the United States that have been criminally victimized will be reviewed.

Criminal Victimization of Older Adults

Summary of Previous Research

Data from nearly 20 years of national surveys of criminal victimization of random probability samples of the U.S. population has consistently found that older adults are generally less likely to be criminally victimized than any other age groups for most crimes (Ennis, 1967; Cook et al., 1978; U.S. Congress, 1981; Jaycox et al., 1982). Both elderly and nonelderly are more likely to be victims of household crimes than of personal crimes. Victimization rates are generally twice as high for nonelderly adults as for elderly adults for burglary, two to three times higher for household larceny, and four to five times higher for auto theft. Among personal crimes, rates of victimization are more than four times higher for nonelderly adults for violent crime, including robbery, rape, and assault; and nearly five times higher for
theft. More detailed examination of the data on specific crimes has revealed only two crimes for which older adults are more victimized than younger adults, purse snatching and robbery with injury, especially among residents of urban areas.

Not all older adults are equally likely to be victimized. Even among older adults, as age increases, criminal victimization continues to decrease (Cunningham, 1976; U.S. Congress, 1981; Liang and Sengstock, 1981). With the exceptions of rape and purse-snatching, men are approximately twice as likely to be victimized as older women (Jaycox et al., 1982; Liang and Sengstock, 1981). Older Blacks are twice as likely to be victimized as older whites (Jaycox et al., 1982; Liang and Sengstock, 1981). Older adults living in central cities are more likely to be victims of crime than other older adults. The differences are especially dramatic for victimization rates for violent crimes which are as much as thirteen times higher for central city residents in larger cities (Jaycox et al., 1982; Forston and Kitchens, 1974). Older adults who are not married and those who live alone are also more likely to be victimized (Jaycox et al., 1982; Liang and Sengstock, 1981). Older adults in age-segregated housing are less likely to be victimized than older adults in age-integrated housing (Gubrium, 1974; Kahana et al., 1977). Income and education have not been found to be consistently related to the victimization of older adults (Liang and Sengstock, 1981) but when income has been found to have an effect, it is generally the poorest older adults who are the most likely to be victimized (Cunningham, 1976). The probability of being victimized has been
found to increase among older adults as the size of the community of residence increases (Liang and Sengstock, 1981). In a study of older adults in Kansas City, Missouri whose victimizations had been reported to the police Cunningham (1976) found that living in or near a high crime neighborhood increased the probability of victimization and that most serious crimes were committed against older adults in their own homes of the immediate neighborhoods. Many stated that there was no one in their neighborhood on whom they could rely for aid. One-fifth had serious handicaps, with great difficulty in walking or joint movement and impairment of hearing and sight the most common.

Critique of Previous Research

The definitions of criminal victimization and the research methodology that were used in ten empirical studies that have examined criminal victimization of the elderly are summarized in Table 1. It is immediately obvious that there has been very little research on criminal victimization of older adults, especially research which is designed specifically to examine the problem of criminal victimization of older adults. Of the nine studies referenced, two are descriptive reports of the nationally representative National Crime Panel Survey (Jaycox, et al., 1982; U.S. Congress, 1981) while two others use secondary analysis of the NCP data. A fifth study which was the first study to document that older adults are generally less victimized than younger adults, also is a descriptive report on data that are
nationally representative (Ennis, 1967). Two other studies include a community survey of a low income neighborhood in Houston, Texas (Forstan and Kitchens, 1974) and a community survey in the Detroit area (Kahana, et al. 1977). These seven studies just described use self-reported data from community surveys to measure the extent of victimization. The final three studies use interview methods with victims whose cases have been reported to the police in three urban areas, Boston, Massachusetts (Conklin, 1976), Kansas City, Missouri (Cunningham, 1976) and San Antonio, Texas (Lindquist and Duke, 1982).

PLACE TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

The first issue to be addressed is whether or not the available data have demonstrated that older adults are, in fact, less likely to be criminally victimized. Based on their research with reported cases of victimization in San Antonio, Lindquist and Duke (1982) argue that previous studies have not taken the risk factor into account in computing victimization rates. The authors argue that older adults are at least risk, because they do not work and because they take precautions such as restricting travel out of the home especially at night, shopping and travelling in groups. Because they are at less risk it should be expected that they would be victimized less. The authors argue that, if the degree of being at risk were controlled, older adults might be over, rather than undervictimized.

Second, even if older adults are victimized less, other researchers have argued the consequences are more serious financially, physically,
psychologically and socially.

In an analysis of data from the National Crime Panel in 1973 and 1974 Cook, Skogan, Cook and Antunes (1975) found that median value of property loss in household crimes including both burglary and larceny tended to decline with age. However, when a relative measure of loss which expressed the value of the loss as a percent of monthly income was used, a curvilinear relationship emerged with the hardest hit groups being the very young and older households. Absolute value of financial loss in personal crimes peaked among those aged 33-39 and declined with age. However, relative loss varied directly with age. In his study of crimes reported to the police in Kansas City, Cunningham (1976) found that for robbery, burglary and larceny victims, while the absolute loss in terms of dollars tended to increase with income level of the victim, the relative amount lost, expressed in terms of percentage of monthly income, tended to be highest for the lower income groups. For example, while the average older victim of larceny with an income over $10,000 lost on the average 8 percent of her monthly income, the average victim with an income between $1,000 - $3,000 lost 43 percent of her monthly income.

When Cook et al. (1978) examined their national data on physical injuries it was found that older adults were the least likely group to be attacked but when they were attacked they were among the most likely to be injured, were the most likely to have internal injuries of be knocked unconscious and were the most likely to receive bruises, cuts, black eyes and scratches. The percent of those injured victims who needed
medical care tended to peak with the middle-aged but the percent 65 and older was greater than that of any group less than 40 years of age. The median medical expense was higher than for any age group except those aged 33 to 39 and the median medical expense as a percent of monthly income was more than twice as high for the aged than for any other age group. Conklin (1976) found that the older victim of robbery was more often alone when attacked than the younger victim, and, in spite of older victims being less likely to resist, force involving shoving, pushing or knocking down the victim was more often used against the older victim than the younger victim and older victims were more often injured. Withdrawal is the most often reported social response to criminal victimization among the elderly. For example, Cunningham (1976) found that a small percentage of the victims moved but that forty percent reported that they no longer go certain places or engage in some activities because of their victimization experience. Fear of crime as a psychological response to crime will be discussed in detail in the next section.

There are a number of critiques of the methodology of victimization studies in general that are also special problems for researchers of criminal victimization of older adults. The methodology for the victimization survey was developed in the 1970's in an effort to get more valid estimates of the extent of criminal victimization in the United States than was possible with crimes reported to the police. As Sparks (1982, pp. 65-80) has recently discussed at length, there is a great need for more research on the reliability and validity of the victimization
studies. Methodological problems that were revealed in pretests of the National Crime Panel Surveys with a general population indicate that major problems include lack of recall of criminal incidents which becomes worse as the length of the interval since the incident increases. It is not known how much the problem of recall varies among different groups of respondents. There is some suggestion that older adults may be less likely to recall a particular incident than younger people, but there may also be differences in the kinds of incidents recalled by younger adults and older adults. The NCP pretest data also indicate that respondents are most likely to recall events that are salient to them, with burglaries and robberies being most frequently recalled. Sparks has suggested that questions needed to be worded carefully so that they stimulated memories of the time period referenced and so that they may jog the memories of events that have been forgotten. Third, there is a problem of definition. Respondents may not recall incidents because they do not define them as crimes. Older adults for example, who have lived all their lives in a culture which accepts family violence as a norm may fail to report physical assault by a family member because it is not defined as a crime. Questions needed to be worded to ask about specific types of actions to avoid this problem. A fourth major problem is remembering when an incident occurred. Sparks reports that in a one year recall period there is a forward telescoping of events that occurred toward the beginning of the year and a backward telescoping of events that occurred more recently in time with a general population. Remembering the time when an incident occurred may be especially problematic for the elderly and
get worse as age increases. Fifth, reports of incidents become more inaccurate the further back in time one goes. Sparks has suggested that for a general population the time period spanned should not exceed six months. The optimal time period may be shorter for older adults. Sixth, series victims, those victims who are victimized on so many occasions that they cannot remember the details of separate instances and cannot give more than approximate dates, create special problems for the victimization survey in terms of how these victimizations are to be counted. These types of victims may be especially difficult to handle in studies of older victims because of the special problems related to memory already discussed. Nor is this likely to be an inconsequential problem among older adults. Conklin, for example, found that over one-fourth of all older victims of robbery, burglary and larceny were multiple victims and most multiple victims were victimized over and over in the same ways. Seventh, it is difficult to check on the validity of incidents that are reported with respondents who deliberately fabricate instances of who tell the researcher what the respondent thinks the interviewer wants to hear. Fortunately, NCP studies indicate this is not a serious problem in the general population but it may be more so with the aged, particularly those who are lonely or mentally impaired. Eighth, variations in reporting related to differences in methods of interviewing including telephone interviews and face-to-face interviews need further study especially in these days of decreased funding for social science research. While some research indicates telephone interviews produce fewer reports of incidents, other research indicates that
the differences are not great. This may not be as true with an older adult population many of whom are likely to have some hearing impairment. Sparks concludes his critique that overall these problems are most likely to have resulted in underreporting of victimization rates in general in the NCP surveys. If data are underreported for the general population, the data for the older adults is likely to have even greater bias. This bias is important, especially as the data tend to indicate that the elderly are undervictimized. More studies of validity and reliability of victimization data, especially for the elderly are needed.

Community surveys of noninstitutionalized populations are expensive ways to find crime victims in terms of time, effort and money because of their relative rarity. Sparks (1982) has suggested that we might learn more from studying specially selected groups than from broad surveys where victimization is relatively rare. He especially suggests that high risk groups and high harm groups be studied. High risk groups are those groups in which a relatively high proportion suffer some form of victimization in a given period of time. Institutional locales, such as nursing homes, are especially prone to having high risk populations. All nursing homes are affected in one way or another by internal theft (Hacker, 1977). It is a common, yet often not discussed, phenomenon which strikes every nursing home regardless of the caliber of staff or residents. The Subcommittee on Long Term Care of the Senate Special Committee on Aging (1974) has determined that misappropriation and theft are among the most important nursing home abuses. High risk groups might also include
noninstitutionalized residents of high crime areas such as America's Skid Rows (Jones, 1977). High harm groups are defined as those groups for whom criminal victimization may be rare but when it does occur may have especially serious social, psychological and/or biological consequences. Among the elderly, those who suffer from gross fraud (Geis, 1976; McGhee, 1983; Elmore, 1981), sexual assault (Groth, 1978; Riger and Gordon, 1981), elder abuse (Pedrick-Cornell and Gilles, 1982) and murder (Kunkle and Humphrey, 1982-1983) may be especially likely to be harmed. For both these groups the multiple or series victim would be an especially important target group since this small number of victims account for a disproportionate number of victimizations and are especially likely to suffer adverse social, psychological and physical consequences (Sparks, 1982). Longitudinal research designs should be encouraged since it is only through longitudinal designs that questions about multiple victimization and the consequences of victimization can be determined (Sparks, 1982).

As great as the need for further methodological work, is the need for the development of a theoretical model of criminal victimization in general and of the elderly specifically. Of the studies of criminal victimization reviewed only one, Liang and Sengstock (1981) cast their research in terms of a theoretical model that could begin to explain why some older adults are victimized and others are not.

Their model combines elements from Hindelang's (1978) model of personal victimization and economic utilitarian models of criminal behavior. According to Hindelang, one's lifestyle determines the risk
of victimization. Exposure to victimization may be affected by characteristics associated with residence (where one resides, time spent away from home, and where time is spent), associating with people who have the characteristics of criminal offenders, and exposure to high risk situations. Liang and Sengstock argue that Hindelang's theory is not linked to a general theory of criminal behavior that takes into consideration the roles of the criminal offender and the criminal justice system. To correct this deficiency, Liang and Sengstock propose to incorporate elements of the utilitarian model of criminal behavior proposed by Becker (1968). In this model, criminals rationally weight their incentives and risks vis-a-vis the victim and the criminal justice system in deciding whether or not to act. Characteristics of the victim and the environment thus weigh heavily in the decision of the criminal to commit a criminal act. Unfortunately, because the researchers were using secondary analysis, they were not able to operationalize their predictor variables directly and had to use instead individual victim characteristics (age, sex, race, marital status, education, income) and environmental characteristics (community size) as proxy measures because, they argue, these variables are correlated with Hindelang's lifestyle concept, indicators of which are not measured in the dataset used. Their model is an important step however that needs further development. A model which takes offender characteristics and motivations into account is especially needed to counter the implied assumption of victimization that only the victim is to blame for his victimization.

In addition to the theories of Hindelang and Becker reviewed by
Liang and Sengstock, Sparks has identified six types of victim characteristics which may increase the probability of victimization and therefore should be included in a theory of victimization. These six types are 1) precipitation, in which the victim acts in a manner that precipitates or encourages victimization; 2) facilitation, in which the victim takes no active part in the crime but deliberately, negligently, or unconsciously places himself or herself in a special risk (temptation opportunity situations); 3) vulnerability, in which some people because of attributes or unusual behavior or place in the social system are more vulnerable to crime than others (including ecological vulnerability, arising from the environment, status vulnerability arising from membership in a given social category or social class, and role vulnerability resulting from specific, durable social relationships from which an individual cannot readily withdraw); 4) opportunity; 5) attractiveness from the criminal's point of view; and 6) impunity, in which attributes, actions, and/or situations of certain persons make them tempting targets because it is easy to get away with.

Consequences

Fear of Crime

The consequence of crime that has received the bulk of the research attention in the United States is the fear of crime. Gerontologists have been puzzled by the apparent paradox that while the research on criminal victimization indicates that older adults are the least likely to be victimized by crime, they are the most likely to report fear of
crime.

A number of factors consistently have been found to predict fear of crime among older adults. Fear of crime increases with age (Lebowitz, 1975; Clemente and Kleinman, 1976, 1977; Ragan, 1977; Rosenfeld, 1981; Braungart, Braungart and Hozer, 1980) and since the 1960's has been increasing faster for older adults than for other age cohorts (Cutler, 1979-1980). Older women consistently report more fear than older men (Lebowitz, 1975; Clemente and Kleinman, 1976, 1977; Sundeen and Mathieu, 1976, 1977; Ragan, 1977; and Braungart, Braungart and Hozer, 1980). Minorities are more fearful than Anglos (Clemente and Kleinman, 1976, 1977; Ragan, 1977; and Braungart, Braungart and Hozer, 1980). Other factors that are related to fear of crime are living alone (Braungart, Braungart and Hozer, 1980); not being married (Braungart, Braungart and Hozer, 1980); living in a large community (Lebowitz, 1975; Lawton and Yaffee, 1980); and being in poor health (Sundeen and Mathieu, 1976, 1977; Braungart, Braungart and Hozer, 1980). Numerous measures of income have been found to be related to fear of crime including low absolute levels of income (Lebowitz, 1975; Clemente and Kleinman, 1976, 1977; Sundeen and Mathieu, 1976, 1977; Ragan, 1977); subjective estimates of income including reporting not having enough money to meet present needs and fear of not having enough money to meet future needs (Eve and Eve, 1984). Community characteristics, such as age integrated housing (Sundeen and Mathieu, 1976, 1977; Sherman, Newman and Nelson, 1976; Lawton and Yaffee, 1980), a negative perception of the neighborhood (Sundeen and Mathieu, 1976, 1977), and feeling that the neighbors would not help if there was trouble (Sundeen
and Mathieu, 1976, 1977) also increase the fear of crime. Time spent away from home (Sundeen and Mathieu, 1976, 1977) and reported frequency of loneliness (Eve and Eve, 1984) have also been found to be related to fear. Finally, having been previously criminally victimized (Sundeen and Mathieu, 1976, 1977; Lawton and Yaffee, 1980) and a high local crime rate (Sundeen and Mathieu, 1976, 1977; Janson and Ryder, 1983) increase fear. Fear of crime, in turn, has also been found to have negative effects on the general sense of well-being of older adults (Lawton and Yaffee, 1980).

Critique

While most gerontological research has begun with the assumption that there is a paradoxical relationship between the relatively low rates of criminal victimization of older relations and the relatively high fear of crime, that assumption has got to be conclusively demonstrated empirically. As discussed in the previous section on victimization, victimization rates of older adults may not be lower when risk factors are controlled. Similarly, controlling for risk factors in measures of fear of crime may reveal that these fears are not relatively higher than those of younger age groups (Lindquist and Duke, 1982).

There are a number of other observations that can be made about the methodology of the fear of crime studies which are briefly summarized in Table 2. First, the operational definitions of fear of crime can be questioned. The most commonly accepted measure is "Is there anywhere around here - that is within a mile - where you would be afraid to walk at night?". That question is used in the best national studies
available including the National Crime Panel, the National Opinion Research Center's General Social Survey and the Gallup Poll. While it is an acceptable measure of fear of walking in the dark, it is not even in terms of face validity an obvious choice for a measure of fear of criminal victimization. Another problem in the operationalization of fear of crime has been the failure to distinguish between fear of crime, i.e. one's perception of his own chances of being victimized, and concern about crime, i.e., one's estimate of the seriousness of crime in the country (Furstenberg, 1971). In most of the studies reviewed, the operational measure used would easily be confounding fear of personal victimization and concern about crime generally. For instance, in the example cited above, a respondent might express a general concern about the probability of being victimized if one were to walk alone at night in a given area but not rank the probability of being personally victimized very high because of precautions taken to reduce personal risk, including avoiding walking in the area.

PLACE TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE

In addition to methodological problems, previous research in victimization has suffered from inadequate conceptual models. Two recently developed models which are highly promising and need further testing are summarized below. A first framework has recently been suggested by Yin (1980) based on his review of the literature on fear of crime among the elderly and is concerned specifically with fear of crime as a unique phenomenon. The model contains three types of
determinants of fear of crime: 1) individual determinants, 2) social determinants, and 3) psychological determinants. The individual determinants include demographic characteristics which include sex, age, race and social class; and residential locale, which can include variables such as types of housing, age-composition of housing, age-composition of neighborhoods, location of neighborhoods and the city size. There are four types of social determinants. The first, previous victimization, ease of recuperation, and the seriousness of the experience in terms of physical and financial loss. The second social determinant, interactions about crime, may include talking with others as well as the influence of the mass media. Third, extensiveness of the social support network may include both the quantity and quality of social relationships of the older person. The final social determinant is involvement in the neighborhood network. The individual and social determinants are mediated through three intervening psychological determinants including, the perceived probability of being victimized, the perceived seriousness of the victimization and perceived ability to recuperate physically, emotionally and financially.

The second model, developed by Lawton, Nahemow, Yaffee and Feldman (1976) treats fear of crime as a specific case of a more general phenomenon of a response of an individual to a perceived environmental stress. Lawton et al., suggest that fear of criminal victimization among the elderly must be understood within the total biological, psychological and social reality of the older adults. Older adults do suffer physical decrements with age. 85 percent have one or more chronic illnesses.
and approximately half have some impairment in activity. Psychologically, older adults also suffer age related reductions in vision, hearing, muscular strength, coordination and reaction time which lead to decreases in information processing efficiency especially in a complex, unfamiliar, fast-paced environment. The personality changes with age from active mastery in which the individual sees himself as capable of dealing with problems to passive mastery where he merely responds to his environment trying to accept and adapt. Active mastery is similar to Rotter's concept of internal locus of control while passive mastery is related to an external locus of control. Socially, older persons experience greater economic and social deprivation. Lawton, et al. suggest that the theoretical models developed by Lazarus (1966), Cassell (1975) and Schooler (1975) in their stress models may be useful for understanding fear of crime among the elderly. In brief, individuals constantly assess information from their environments whether or not a threat exists in that environment. Once a potential threat is identified, the individual assesses his capacity to deal with the threat. The assessment of the threat and the potential to deal with it produces anxiety or strain in the individual which, in the extreme case may produce psychological symptoms. Coping behaviors may be used to reduce strain in some cases while in other situations the threat may be chronic, requiring constant vigilance. Other theories have suggested that social integration into primary social networks may ameliorate the effects of strain (Caplan, Cassel and Gore, 1977). In a partial test of a model which incorporated measures of social stress and social integration, Eve and Eve (1984)
were able to explain nearly ten percent of the variance in fear of burglary among older adults.

Conclusions

This review of the literature has found that previous research has identified apparent age differences in the probability of being criminally victimized and in fear of crime. The critique of the methodology of the victimization studies has suggested that it is possible that some of the apparent age differences may be due to methodological flaws which underestimate the true rates of victimization among all age groups but especially among the elderly, making the apparent differences even greater. It has been suggested that future research in criminal victimization should control for age-related risk factors in computing victimization rates; should measure the age differences in physical, psychological and social consequences of victimization; should improve the reliability and validity of victimization studies by designing studies to increase the correct recall of criminal incidents; and should focus more on the high risk and high harm groups among the elderly, especially using longitudinal designs that can trace the consequences of victimization. There is also a need for the development of models that can explain why some older people are more victimized than others. Further studies that incorporate these suggestions are likely to find age differences reduced but may continue to find older adults are less victimized. If that occurs, then the question of why the difference occurs remains to be answered. One approach to answering this question would
be to study the offenders and their motivations for selecting certain targets. Elderly adults may be perceived as easier targets for numerous reasons including decreased physical and psychological functioning, but they may be perceived as less desirable targets for many reasons including generally having less money and other valuables, having their homes occupied more often during the day, and societal norms which proscribe harming older adults. No studies were identified which focused on the offenders perspective which could greatly increase knowledge of causes of victimization.

The review also revealed an apparent paradox in the U.S. literature, that older adults are least likely to be criminally victimized but most likely to be afraid of victimization. Again, studies which control for risk factors and differential consequences of criminal victimization may reduce the gap between victimization rates and fear of crime. Measures of fear of being victimized need to be refined to reflect differences in fear of personal victimization and concern about crime in general and to focus on differences in fear of victimization from different crimes. Theoretical models which explain criminal victimization may find that the determinants of fear differ for specific types of crimes.

Finally, there is a serious lack of comparative studies of criminal victimization of older adults. Are patterns of criminal victimization and fear of crime the same in other countries as in the United States? One avenue that might be explored would be the relationship between societal attitudes toward the aged and normative prescriptions and proscriptions for treatment of the elderly in general and the
victimization of older adults. Other factors might include differences in the roles of older adults in the social, economic and family institutions of the countries. Societal differences in the level of economic development and the organization of the distribution of economic rewards within the society may also be important. Comparative studies have a great potential to identify possible determinants of victimization and therefore should be pursued.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition of Victimization</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ennis, 1967</strong></td>
<td><strong>Multistage probability sample of 9,644 households (Conducted by the National Opinion Research Center)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports in interview survey of criminal victimization the previous 12 months</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jaycox, Center, and Ansello, 1982; U.S. Congress, 1981</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Incidents of criminal victimization in the previous 6 months including personal (rape, robbery, assault, personal larceny) and household (burglary, larceny, and motor vehicle theft) victimization</td>
<td>Continuous multistage probability rotating panel sample of 60,000 households (&quot;National Crime Panel Survey&quot; conducted by the U.S. Bureau of the Census for the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Incidents of criminal victimization in previous year</td>
<td>Multistage probability sample of 8 cities in Law Enforcement Assistance Administration's high impact crime reduction program (Atlanta, Baltimore, Cleveland, Dallas, Denver, Newark, Portland, Oregon, St. Louis) conducted in 1972 and 1975 (&quot;Eight Cities Survey&quot; conducted by the U.S. Bureau of the Census)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Incidents of criminal victimization in the previous year</td>
<td>Multistage probability sample of 10,000 households in 5 largest cities in the U.S. (New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, Detroit, Philadelphia) conducted in 1972 and 1975 (&quot;Five Cities Survey&quot; conducted by the U.S. Bureau of the Census)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Incidents of criminal victimization in the previous year</td>
<td>Multistage probability sample of 10,000 households in 13 cities (Boston, Buffalo, Houston, Miami, Milwaukee, Minneapolis, Cincinnati, New Orleans, Oakland, Pittsburgh, San Diego, San Francisco, Washington, D.C.) conducted in 1974 (&quot;Thirteen Cities Survey&quot; conducted by the U.S. Bureau of the Census)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Data Collection Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conklin, 1976</td>
<td>847 police reports or robbery in Boston, Mass., in a 6 month period from January to June 1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cunningham, 1976</td>
<td>Interviews with victims, next-of-kin, police, witnesses and offenders of 1800 cases reported to police in Kansas City between September 1978 and February 1984 for adults aged 18 years or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forston and Kitchens, 1974</td>
<td>Nonproportionate stratified probability survey of 800 white, Black and Mexican-American adults aged 15 years and over living in Houston's Model Neighborhood Area in June 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kahana, Liang, Felton, Fairchild and Harel, 1977</td>
<td>Random sample of 154 community residents from Hamtrack, Michigan drawn from voter registration lists; random sample of 47 residents of Hamtrack, Michigan public housing projects; random sample of 148 community residents of Oak Park, Michigan from voter registration lists; random sample of 53 residents from public housing projects in Oak Park, Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindquist and Duke, 1982</td>
<td>10,090 offense reports that occurred to persons 12 years of age or older in San Antonio, Texas in 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition of Fear of Crime</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebowitz, 1975</td>
<td>Multistage probability sample of 1504 adults aged 18 years or more in the United States in the National Opinion Research Center's 1973 General Social Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Is there any area around here—that is, within a mile—where you would be afraid to walk alone at night?&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Is there any area around here—that is, within a mile—where you would be afraid to walk alone at night?&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sundeen and Malthieu, 1976, 1977</td>
<td>Interview survey of 50 residents of a retirement community and 84 senior center participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thermometer-like scale ranging from 1 to 11 for fear of burglary, fear of robbery and fear of consumer fraud</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rayan, 1977</td>
<td>Stratified multistage area probability sample of 1269 Anglos, Blacks and Mexican-Americans aged 45-74 years in Los Angeles County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name three greatest problems found these days; does crime in the streets create a special problem getting around; does living in a high crime neighborhood create a serious problem?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosenfeld, 1975</td>
<td>Multistage probability sample of adults aged 18 years or more in the United States in the National Opinion Research Center's 1977 General Social Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) &quot;Is there any area around here—that is, within a mile—where you would be afraid to walk alone at night?&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) &quot;How safe do you feel or would you feel being out alone in your neighborhood during the day?&quot; &quot;How safe do you feel being out alone in your neighborhood during the night?&quot; &quot;Are there some parts of this metropolis where you have a reason to go or would like to go during the day but are afraid to because of crime?&quot; &quot;Are there some parts of this metropolitan area where you have a reason to go or would like to go at night but are afraid to because of crime?&quot; &quot;In general, have you limited or changed your activities in the past few years because of crime?&quot;</td>
<td>Multistage probability sample of 10,000 households in 13 cities (Boston, Buffalo, Houston, Miami, Milwaukee, Minneapolis, Cincinnati, New Orleans, Oakland, Pittsburgh, San Diego, San Francisco, Washington D.C.) conducted in 1974 (&quot;Thirteen Cities Survey&quot; conducted by the U.S. Bureau of the Census)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherman, Newman, and Nelson, 1976</td>
<td>Nonprobability sample of residents of three types of public housing in Albany-Troy, New York area (64 in age integrated housing, 55 in age segregated housing, 50 in mixed housing setting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cutler, 1979-1980</td>
<td>Multistage probability sample of 3,532 noninstitutionalized adults in the United States, a Gallup Poll conducted by the American Institute of Public Opinion; Multistage probability sample of 1,499 noninstitutionalized adults 18 years of age and older in the United States as a part of the National Opinion Research Center's 1976 General Social Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawton and Yaffee, 1980</td>
<td>Three-stage probability sample of 662 elderly residents of public housing environments of the United States conducted in 1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braungart, Braungart and Hoger, 1980</td>
<td>Multistage probability sample of 1499 noninstitutionalized adults 18 years of age and older in the United States conducted as a part of the National Opinion Research Center's 1976 General Social Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jansen and Ryder, 1983</td>
<td>Stratified multistage area probability sample of 1269 Anglos, Blacks and Mexican-Americans aged 45-74 years in Los Angeles County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eve and Eve, 1984</td>
<td>Availability sample of 8065 older Texans including participants in social service programs and volunteer organizations for older adults</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>