



ARCHIVED - Archiving Content

Archived Content

Information identified as archived is provided for reference, research or recordkeeping purposes. It is not subject to the Government of Canada Web Standards and has not been altered or updated since it was archived. Please contact us to request a format other than those available.

ARCHIVÉE - Contenu archivé

Contenu archivé

L'information dont il est indiqué qu'elle est archivée est fournie à des fins de référence, de recherche ou de tenue de documents. Elle n'est pas assujettie aux normes Web du gouvernement du Canada et elle n'a pas été modifiée ou mise à jour depuis son archivage. Pour obtenir cette information dans un autre format, veuillez communiquer avec nous.

This document is archival in nature and is intended for those who wish to consult archival documents made available from the collection of Public Safety Canada.

Some of these documents are available in only one official language. Translation, to be provided by Public Safety Canada, is available upon request.

Le présent document a une valeur archivistique et fait partie des documents d'archives rendus disponibles par Sécurité publique Canada à ceux qui souhaitent consulter ces documents issus de sa collection.

Certains de ces documents ne sont disponibles que dans une langue officielle. Sécurité publique Canada fournira une traduction sur demande.

**Programs
Branch**

**User
Report**

**METROPOLITAN TORONTO
COMMUNITY POLICING SURVEY**

**MEASUREMENT OF
VICTIMIZATION**

WORKING PAPER NO. 2

NO. 1987-19

HV
6250.3
.C205
D4
1987
c.2

General Canada
Secretariat

HV
6250.3
.C205
04
1987
c.2

Copyright of this document does not belong to the Crown.
Proper authorization must be obtained from the author for
any intended use.
Les droits d'auteur du présent document n'appartiennent
pas à l'État. Toute utilisation du contenu du présent
document doit être approuvée préalablement par l'auteur.

Jacques de Verteuil
=



METROPOLITAN TORONTO
COMMUNITY POLICING SURVEY

MEASUREMENT OF
VICTIMIZATION

WORKING PAPER NO. 2/

NO. 1987-19

This Working Paper was prepared by the Statistics Division of the
Solicitor General. The ideas and opinions in it do not
necessarily reflect the views of the Ministry.

Ce document de travail est disponible en français.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION	1
SAMPLING, SAMPLE SIZES, AND PRECISION	2
QUESTION STRUCTURE	4
BOUNDING	6
WEIGHTING	7
RESULTS	10
VICTIM MOBILITY	12
CONCLUSIONS	15
REFERENCES	16
APPENDIX	
VICTIMIZATION QUESTIONS COMPARED (CUVS, 1982 & TPS, 1985)	

INTRODUCTION

Victimization Surveys in Canada, the U.S. and Britain have as one of their objectives the measurement of the extent, nature and distribution of crime among the populations surveyed. The Canadian Urban Victimization Surveys (1982 and 1985)¹ provide highly detailed and comprehensive data bases capable of supporting sophisticated analysis to provide estimates of the "dark figure" of certain crimes, to understand better victims' reasons for not reporting their victimizations to the police, and to contribute to the development of policy and programs to assist the victims of crime.

Victimization surveys rely on very large samples to uncover relatively rare crimes and to permit analysis of their characteristics with confidence in their statistical precision. Skogan (1978) maintains that a sample size of 3,000 households is required to produce useful data on common property crimes - even larger samples are required to analyze the characteristics of personal crimes. Sample size, then, is a function of the crime to be studied and not the population size with the result that, even at the community level, large sample sizes are needed to make reliable inferences about the level of crime.

1. The Canadian Urban Victimization Survey (1982) was conducted in seven major urban centres: Greater Vancouver, Edmonton, Winnipeg, Toronto, Montreal, Halifax-Dartmouth and St. John's. A random sample of 61,000 residents 16 years of age or older was asked about their perceptions of crime and the criminal justice system, their experience of certain crimes, and the impact which criminal victimization may have had upon them. A one city replication of this survey was conducted in Edmonton in 1985 with a sample of 10,000 residents.

Because sample size is a major determinant of the cost, these surveys are very expensive and are not a viable option for "community-level" surveys. Questions which purport to measure the incidence of victimization, then, are not appropriate for smaller scale community surveys. Nevertheless, recent surveys of this type have incorporated victimization questions (de Verteuil and Heath, 1987).

This report examines the results of the victimization questions asked in the Metropolitan Toronto Community Policing Survey (Murphy and de Verteuil, 1986). Comparisons are made between these results and those obtained using much larger samples (CUVS, 1982 & 1985) and recommendations for the inclusion of victimization questions in future surveys are presented.

SAMPLING, SAMPLE SIZE AND PRECISION

The objectives of the Metro Toronto Community Policing Survey (TPS) required that three separate samples be drawn representing the communities of Parkdale and Jane-Finch and a "control" group representing Metropolitan Toronto.

The sampling frame was the bank of telephone numbers assigned to residents and business in each of the areas. The frame for each sample was determined by matching the postal codes in each area with the postal codes from billing addresses. From each frame a random sample of 1,500 telephone numbers was generated with the intention of having approximately 450 households in each of the area samples. The extra numbers permitted replacements for business, non-working numbers and non-responses.

Within each household contacted a respondent was randomly selected from among those 16 years and older. This procedure resulted in a systematic sample of household members. Respondent substitution was not permitted. The questionnaire was then administered over the phone. Of the 3,786 telephone numbers attempted 40% refused to be interviewed. A further 12% were invalid or non-residential numbers and 14% could not be completed because of language/ illness problems or the inability to reach the selected respondent. Overall, the response rate was 41% of the legitimate numbers in the sample. The achieved sample sizes were 466 in Metropolitan Toronto, 458 in Parkdale and 441 in Jane-Finch.

These procedures match closely those employed in the conduct of the Canadian Urban Victimization Survey, 1982 (For a detailed report see Hoffman and Catlin, 1985).

While the sample size in Toronto for the CUVS(1982) was approximately 10,000 households, those for the TPS were about 450 households in each of the three survey areas. The very much smaller sample sizes were a function of the objectives of the survey (measurement of the extent and distribution of victimization in the populations was not a specified objective) and of the resources available. Thus, while the level of precision (the percent variation at the 95% confidence level) of the estimates of victimization generated by the CUVS was in the order of 5% for household crimes and 10% for violent crimes, the equivalent variability in the TPS was 24% and 46%, respectively (see Table 1).

Table 1
VICTIMIZATIONS RATES

	TPS, 1985		CUVS, 1985 ⁽¹⁾	
	Rate per Thousand	Two Standard Errors	Rate per Thousand	Two Standard Errors
Violent Crime	83	38	73	7
Household Crime	355	85	317	13

(1) These estimates are from the 1985 victimization survey of 10,000 Edmonton residents. See User Report No. 1986-10 for further details.

QUESTION STRUCTURE

In the CUVS (1982), a very detailed procedure was followed to identify victims of crime and their characteristics.

"... the screen questionnaire, contained items on opinions about crime in the neighbourhood and city, attitudes towards the police, awareness and use of crime prevention programs, as well as demographic and screening questions. The screening questions were used to elicit reports of the eight types of crime included in the survey. The third questionnaire, the crime incident report, was used to record the details of each incident reported by the respondent. It contained questions which would allow for the classification and analysis of the incidents as well as additional items regarding contact with the police and the courts."
(Hoffman and Catlin, 1985, p. 8).

The Toronto Policing Survey differed significantly in that only one questionnaire was used and each respondent's own definition and classification of the event was accepted as the best category in which to place the incident. Victimization incidents were not, therefore, derived from responses to a series of questions. In fact, the screen questions in the CUVS - envisioned primarily as "triggers" - served as the identification and classification questions in the TPS (The similarity between the CUVS screen questions and the victimization questions from the TPS can be seen in Appendix I).

The TPS expanded the screen questions somewhat to inquire where the incidents occurred, whether they were reported to the police and whether anyone else was harmed or threatened during the incidents. In the CUVS these concerns were addressed in much greater detail in the incident report filled out for each incident.

Not asking the level of detail found in the CUVS for each incident puts several restrictions on the TPS methodology.

- Analysis is dependent on definitions not necessarily synonymous with those used by the police thereby eliminating any comparability between the U.C.R. and survey data.
- The ability to weight the responses to estimate incidence in the population is severely restricted.
- Analysis of reporting patterns is severally restricted.

The TPS findings, then, are not necessarily comparable to those obtained by the CUVS nor to official statistics for Toronto. Analysis of CUVS, 1982 data, for example, reveals that 19% of the incidents uncovered by the screen questions were reclassified into other crime categories on the basis of the details gathered in the relevant incident questionnaires. Table 2 shows the proportion of each offence type which was reclassified.

Table 2
Reclassification of Respondents' Victimizations
(CUVS, 1982)

Type of Offence Based on Screen Questionnaire	Proportion Reclassified into Other Categories
Robbery	45%
Assault	6%
Break and Enter	11%
Motor Vehicle Theft	28%
Personal Theft	40%
Household Theft	10%
Vandalism	19%
All Offences	19%

One could assume, then, that comparisons could require a reclassification of in the order of 20% of the incidents uncovered by the TPS to more closely approximate U.C.R. and CUVS definitions.

BOUNDING

One of the factors affecting the accuracy of responses to questions on one's experiences with crime is "external telescoping" or the bringing forward of a victimization incident from outside the reference period. Studies have shown that this phenomena can have a considerable effect on estimates of victimization rates (Skogan, 1981 and Catlin and Murray, 1984). In reverse record checks (where the date of the incident was known from police records) respondents pushed forward about 15% of incidents into the reference period.

To minimize these effects, victimization surveys have used several "bounding" procedures. The CUVS method is to "bound" the beginning and end of the reference period with easily recalled, salient dates - January 1, 1981 to December 31, 1981. The reference year of 1981 is repeated constantly in the screen questions on victimization experiences. For each incident, further questioning locates the incident within the reference period.

In the Toronto Policing Survey bounding procedures were relatively minimal and no attempt was made to locate the incident within the reference period. The interviews were conducted in late November and early December of 1985, respondents were told that the reference period was 1985 and the questions included the use of the phrase "in the last year". Thus the reference period was 11 months, as compared to 12 months for the CUVS because it was felt that salient dates could not be established for a November, 1984 to November 1985, reference period.

The effect on TPS victimization rates of the shortened reference period and the different bounding prompts between the two surveys has not been established.

WEIGHTING

Because the sampling units in each survey (CUVS and TPS) were households (defined by the presence of a telephone number) the probability of inclusion in the sample is the same for each household (assuming one telephone number per household) but the probability of a person being selected is inversely proportional to the size of the household.

In order to produce population estimates of the extent of crime from these survey data, weighting procedures must be applied to compensate for the differences in respondents' probabilities of selection and the probabilities of their victimizations coming to the attention of the survey. The differences in weighting procedures between the CUVS and the TPS are discussed separately.

Household Weights

The household weight used on the CUVS data took into account four factors including adjustments for non-response and multiple residential telephone numbers servicing one residence (see Hofman and Catlin for a more detailed discussion). In the TPS the only factor considered was the completion/refusal rate to compensate for similar adjustments to the person weight. To this point, analysis of the data has not used the household weight since the concern has been primarily with personal rather than with household characteristics. Thus, for example, the percentage of people living in rented accommodations has been more salient than the proportional distribution of rental and owned accommodations in the area.

Person Weight

The person weight is used to adjust for the household size and the probability of selection as a respondent. More precisely, $PW = HW \times \text{number of people over 16 years old in the household}$. In the TPS further adjustments were introduced to ensure age/sex distributions similar to those found in census data and for differential completion rates in various socio-economic segments of society.

Application of the person weight permits us to estimate personal characteristics of the population such as the number of people living in rented accommodations, the perceptions of residents toward crime and the criminal justice system, the personal characteristics of victims and the "victimization" rate (the number of victims per 1,000 population).

Incident Weight

Because a crime incident can involve more than one victim the probability of it coming to the attention of a survey is a function of the number of people harmed or threatened during the incident; the larger the number of victims in any one incident the more likely it is that one of the victims will be selected in the sample. The application of incident weights to the raw data permit the estimation of the number of incidents and the "incident rate" (the number of incidents per 1,000 population or per 1,000 households). In the case of household offences (i.e. break and enter), the incident weight is the same as the household weight.

While the CUVS determined the number of victims for each incident, the TPS questions permit only an approximation of this figure by asking about the presence of others only for groups of incidents (see TPS questions 35 & 37). Analysis of responses revealed that this procedure provided an inadequate weighting base and the incident weight was not used in the analysis of the TPS data.

RESULTS

To contribute to the assessment of the reliability of the TPS methodology in uncovering a "representative" number of victimizations, the CUVS (1982) data were used to determine the approximate number of incidents in each of the areas which should come to the attention of similar sample survey. Table 3 shows the estimated incident rates for Metro Toronto and for two smaller geographic areas within the Metro area.

The smaller areas, entitled Parkdale and North York II, were defined by census tract agglomerations to approximate the TPS study's areas of interest. The boundaries do not, however, match precisely those in the TPS. The rates for Metro Toronto are not directly comparable to previously published rates (see Bulletin Series) because census rather than survey estimates were used to determine the population size and the number of households in each area.

Table 3
Victimizations (CUVS, 1982)

	Metro Toronto	Parkdale	North York II
<u>Incident Rates</u>			
Violent Crimes (aged 15 or over per 1,000 population)	63	71	50
Property Crimes (per 1,000 households)	428	211	329
<u>Reporting Rates</u>			
Violent Crimes	38	63	57
Property Crimes	44	44	50
<u>Distribution of Crimes</u>			
Violent Crimes	25	40	27
Property Crimes	75	60	72

Using these rates the number of incidents which one would expect to uncover in each geographic area were determined. As shown in Table 4 there are considerable differences between the expected frequencies and those actually uncovered. It should also be noted that there do not appear to be any patterns in the direction and magnitude of the differences for each type of crime and geographic area.

Table 4
Incidence for a Survey of 450 Respondents
in Each Geographic Area

	METRO TORONTO		PARKDALE		JANE-FINCH	
	Esti- mated	Uncovered	Esti- mated	Uncovered	Esti- mated	Uncovered
Violent Crimes	28	38	32	53	23	33
Break and Enter	33	66	43	35	23	60
Motor Vehicle Theft	4	10	2	15	6	14
Property Theft	90	36	29	68	72	40
Vandalism	32	57	13	79	24	73
Property Crimes	159	169	87	197	125	187

The weighted estimates of victimization rates (Table 5) also revealed considerable variation between the two surveys in their estimates of the extent of crime, its distribution and reporting patterns (compare Tables 3 & 5).

Table 5

Victimizations (TPS, 1985)

	Metro Toronto	Parkdale	Jane Finch
<u>Victimization Rates</u>			
Violent Crimes (aged 16 or over per 1,000 population)	83 (+46%) ⁽¹⁾	113 (+41%)	67 (+54%)
Property Crimes (per 1,000 households)	355 (+24%)	373 (+21%)	428 (+21%)
<u>Reporting Rates</u> (for most serious victimization)			
Violent Crimes	49%	41%	30%
Property Crimes	58%	58%	54%
<u>Distribution of Crimes</u>			
Violent Crimes	34%	36%	27%
Property Crimes	65%	64%	72%

(1) The numbers in brackets are the confidence intervals for the 95% confidence level (two standard errors). We would expect the true value to fall within this range 95% of the time.

VICTIM MOBILITY

The determination of crime rates in a specific neighbourhood or city requires an estimation of the incidence of crime in that geographic area and the population or number of households in the area. Technically, a crime which occurs outside of the geographic area in question should not be included in the rates even if the victim were a resident of the area.

In the CUVS, the assumption is made that crimes against residents of Toronto, for example, which occurred outside of the city are balanced by crimes which occurred in Toronto to non-residents. In the former case the crimes should not be part of the Toronto rates while in the latter case they should be part of the rates but have no chance of inclusion in the survey estimates. Thus, while survey derived crime rates are often interpreted as those for a city they are in fact estimated rates for the residents of the city.

Because of the mobility of residents within a city the assumption that victimizations against residents of a neighbourhood which occur outside their neighbourhood are balanced by non-resident victimizations within the neighbourhood are untenable. To say, for example, that the violent victimization rate in Parkdale is 1.7 times that in Jane-Finch (see Table 5) is not necessarily an accurate reflection of the extent of crime in each nor of the differential risk of being the victim of a violent crime while in each neighbourhood. It is only saying that Parkdale residents are 1.7 times more likely than are their Jane-Finch counterparts to be the victims of violent crime.

In the TPS, attempts to place the incidence revealed that the proportion of victimizations occurring outside of ones neighbourhood varied greatly among the three samples.

Table 6

**Proportion of Victimizations Occurring Outside
Neighbourhood of Residence (TPS, 1985)**

Neighbourhood of Residence	Violent Crimes	Property Crimes
Metro Toronto	59%	18%
Parkdale	19%	14%
Jane-Finch	37%	12%

The results obtained using very large sample sizes substantiates the variation among areas in victims' place of residence and place of occurrence of victimization. Table 7 shows this variation among the different municipalities or boroughs comprising Metropolitan Toronto.

Table 7
**Proportion of Incidents Occurring Outside
Neighbourhood of Residence (CUVS, 1982)**

Borough of Residence	Violent Crimes	Property Crimes
East York	68%	44%
Etobicoke	64%	34%
North York	45%	30%
Scarborough	43%	27%
Toronto	25%	23%
York	83%	45%

While survey data may provide some indications of the number of victims resident in a given area (regardless of where they were victimized) the information may be of limited use in assessing victims' satisfaction with police performance in the handling of specific types of offences. This is because crime incidents are the responsibility of the police detachment or unit responsible for the area where the crime occurred. In some larger municipalities completely separate policing units are responsible for different sections of the city and victims' level of satisfaction may not relate to the policing unit responsible for their area of residence.

Finally, estimating the level of crime occurring in a specific neighbourhood would have to involve a survey of the entire municipality to identify non-residents victimized in the neighbourhood. This would likely be financially unreasonable if interest were focused on only one or two neighbourhoods.

These factors bring into question the utility of survey data to estimate the extent, nature and distribution of crime in different sections of a municipality. What the data may be good for is to describe the experience of residents, but not neighbourhoods as the units of analysis.

CONCLUSIONS

Analysis of the TPS data reveals clearly that while the sample sizes are sufficient to estimate and to analyze residents' perceptions of their community, crime and the criminal justice system they are not large enough to support precise estimates of the level of crime or of victims' reporting patterns.

Further, the questionnaire structure in the IPS was such that it was difficult to weight the responses to produce population estimates of victimization which would have definitions comparable with those used in the CUVS or by the U.C.R. statistics. The potential value in comparing, then, are negated. Increasing respondent burden by asking for details of each incident (as in the CUVS, for example) is not warranted given the lack of precision resulting from the small sample sizes.

It is recommended that crime or policing surveys of this type avoid attempts to measure the extent of crime - in a city or in one or more communities within the city - and concentrate on collecting perceptual data on residents.

REFERENCES

- Catlin, G. and Murray S, 1984. Report on Canadian Victimization Survey Methodological Pretests. Solicitor General Canada, Programs Branch User Report No. 1984-60.
- de Verteuil, J. and Heath, J., 1987. Surveys to Support Policing and Crime Prevention: Summary Comparisons. Solicitor General Canada, Programs Branch, User Report No. 1987-11.
- Hofmann, H. and Catlin, G., 1985. Crime/Victimization Survey Documentation. Canadian Urban Victimization Survey, 1982. A Report on the Survey Methodology. Solicitor General Canada, Programs Branch User Report No. 1986-17.
- Murphy, C. and de Verteuil, J., 1986. Metropolitan Toronto Community Policing Survey: Working Paper No. 1. Solicitor General Canada, Programs Branch, User Report No. 1986-47.
- Skogan, Wesley, G., 1978. Victimization Surveys and Criminal Justice Planning. U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- _____, 1981. Issues in the Measurement of Victimization. U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.

APPENDIX I

VICTIMIZATION QUESTIONS COMPARED

1. Lead In

CUVS: Now I would like to ask you about some things that may have happened to you last year, that is, from January 1 to December 31, 1981.

TPS:

Now I would like to ask you a few questions about some things that may have happened to you this year (1985). Once again I would like to stress that your answers will be kept completely confidential.

2. Robbery

CUVS:

41 During 1981, did anyone take or try to take something from you by using force or threat of force, such as in a holdup or mugging?

No

Yes → HOW MANY TIMES?

42 Did you have your pocket picked or your briefcase, bag or purse snatched during 1981? (Other than in the incident(s) already mentioned)

No

Yes → HOW MANY TIMES?

1 Only the questions from the CUVS' screen questionnaire are presented here.

TPS:

34. Did anyone take or try to take something from you by using force or threat of force, such as in a holdup, mugging, or purse snatching during this year?

Yes Y → How Many Times? _____

No N → GO TO Q. 36

35. Did this (these) take place in: ENTER NUMBER OF INCIDENTS IN EACH CATEGORY.

	(a)	(b)		(c)	
	How many times?	Did this (these) incident(s) come to the attention of the police? (RECORD NUMBER IN EACH CATEGORY)		Was anyone else over 16 harmed or threatened during this (these) incident(s)?	
		Yes	No	Yes	No
Your neighbourhood?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Elsewhere in Toronto?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Elsewhere in Canada	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Outside Canada	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

3. Assault

CUVS:

FOR THIS SURVEY, AN ATTACK CAN BE ANYTHING FROM BEING HIT, SLAPPED, PUSHED OR GRABBED TO BEING SHOT, RAPED OR BEATEN UP.

45 During 1981, were you knifed, shot or attacked with some other weapon by anyone at all? (Other than in the incident(s) already mentioned)

No

Yes → HOW MANY TIMES?

46 Did anyone beat you up, hit or kick you or throw something at you, such as a rock or bottle? (Other than in the incident(s) already mentioned)

No

Yes → HOW MANY TIMES?

47 Did anyone THREATEN to hit you or beat you up or THREATEN you with a weapon? Do not include threats over the telephone. (Other than in the incident(s) already mentioned)

No

Yes → HOW MANY TIMES?

48 During 1981, did anyone attack or molest you or TRY to attack or molest you while you were in a car, in a public place, at home or anywhere else? (Other than in the incident(s) already mentioned)

No

Yes → HOW MANY TIMES?

TPS: EVERYONE

For this survey, an attack can be anything from being hit, slapped, pushed or grabbed to being shot, raped or beaten up.

36-a) In the last year, did anyone, attack or molest you, try to attack or molest you or threaten to attack or molest you (other than in the incident(s) already mentioned)?

Yes . . . Y - → How Many Times? _____

No . . . N → GO TO Q. 33

-b) How were you attacked? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

- raped 1
- tried to rape 2
- molested 3
- tried to molest 4
- shot 5
- knifed 6
- hit, kicked, slapped, knocked down 7
- grabbed, held, tripped, jumped, pushed 8
- other (specify) _____ 9

37. Did this (these) take place in: ENTER NUMBER OF TIMES IN EACH APLICABLE CATEGORY.

(a)
How many times?

(b)
Did this (these) incident(s) come to the attention of the police?

(c)
Was anyone else over 16 harmed or threatened during this (these) incident(s)?

		Yes	No	Yes	No
Your neighbourhood?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Elsewhere in Toronto?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Elsewhere in Canada?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Outside Canada?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

4. Break and Enter

CUVS:

43 Did anyone break into or illegally enter your (home/apartment), garage or any other building on your property? (Other than in the incident(s) already mentioned)

¹ No . . .

² Yes → HOW MANY TIMES?

44 During 1981, did anyone find a door jimmied, a lock forced or any other signs of attempted illegal entry? (Other than in the incident(s) already mentioned)

¹ No

² Yes → HOW MANY TIMES?

TPS:

EVERYONE

38. Did anyone try to or actually break into or illegally enter your (home/apartment), garage, or any other building on your property? (Other than in the incident(s) already mentioned)

Yes Y → How Many Times? _____

No N → GO TO Q.40

5. Motor Vehicle Theft

CUVS:

NOW I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT THEFT OR DAMAGE TO MOTOR VEHICLES OR OTHER PROPERTY.

49 During 1981, did you or anyone in your household own a motor vehicle (car, truck, motorcycle, etc.)?

¹ No → go to 53

² Yes

↓
How many?

50 Did anyone steal or try to steal (it/any of them)? (Other than in the incident(s) already mentioned)

¹ No

² Yes → HOW MANY TIMES?

51 Did anyone steal or try to steal part of (it/any of them), such as a battery, hubcap, a tapedeck or a radio? (Other than in the incident(s) already mentioned)

¹ No

² Yes → HOW MANY TIMES?

52 Did anyone deliberately damage (it/any of them) during 1981. For example, were tires slashed or an aerial broken? (Other than in the incident(s) already mentioned)

¹ No

² Yes → HOW MANY TIMES?

TPS: Now I would like to ask you some questions about theft or damage to motor vehicles or other property.

40. In the last year, did anyone steal or try to steal a motor vehicle which you owned? (Other than in the incident(s) already mentioned)

Yes Y → How Many Times? _____
No N → GO TO Q.42

41. Did this (these) take place in

	(a) How many times?	(b) Did this (these) incident(s) come to the attention of the police?
		Yes No
Your neighbourhood?	_____	_____
Elsewhere in Toronto?	_____	_____
Elsewhere in Canada?	_____	_____
Outside Canada?	_____	_____

5. Property Theft

CUVS: Note the separation of "personal theft" and "household theft".

53 During 1981, did anyone steal anything that belonged to you personally from inside any car, truck or boat, such as packages or clothing? (Other than in the incident(s) already mentioned)

No
 Yes → HOW MANY TIMES?

54 Was anything stolen that was normally kept outside your home, such as a bicycle or lawn furniture? (Other than in the incident(s) already mentioned)

No
 Yes → HOW MANY TIMES?

55 Was anything that belonged to you stolen from your place of work, from school or from a public place, such as a restaurant or bar? (Other than in the incident(s) already mentioned)

No

Yes → HOW MANY TIMES?

56 Did anyone take something belonging to you from a hotel, vacation home, cottage or while travelling? (Other than in the incident(s) already mentioned)

No

Yes → HOW MANY TIMES?

57 During 1981, did anyone steal or try to steal anything (else) that belonged to you? (Other than in the incident(s) already mentioned)

No

Yes → HOW MANY TIMES?

TPS:

42. Did anyone take anything that belonged to you or this household? (Other than in the incident(s) already mentioned)

Yes . . . Y → How Many Times? _____

No . . . N → GO TO Q. 44

43. Did this (these) take place in

How many times? Did this(these) incident(s) come to the attention of the police?

	How many times?	Yes	No
Your neighbourhood?	_____	_____	_____
Elsewhere in Toronto?	_____	_____	_____
Elsewhere in Canada?	_____	_____	_____
Outside Canada?	_____	_____	_____

6. Vandalism

CUVS: Note also question No. 52 under Motor Vehicle Theft.

58 Did anyone deliberately damage or destroy any property belonging to you or any member of your household, such as a window in your home or a fence in your yard? (Other than in the incident(s) already mentioned)

No

Yes → HOW MANY TIMES?

TPS:

EVERYONE

44 -a During 1985 did anyone deliberately damage your car or any other property belonging to you? (Other than in the incident(s) already mentioned.)

Yes . . . Y → How Many Times _____

No . . . N → GO TO Q. 45

b Did this (these) incidents take place in:

	<u>How Many Times</u>
Your neighbourhood	_____
Elsewhere in Toronto	_____
Elsewhere in Canada	_____
Outside Canada	_____

c Was this vandalism of a car or some other property?

	<u>How Many Times</u>	<u>Did this (these) incident(s) come to the attention of the police?</u>	
		<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
Car	_____	_____	_____
Other, including dwelling	_____	_____	_____



