

## **REPORTING CRIMES TO THE POLICE: THE STATUS OF WORLD RESEARCH**

**WESLEY G. SKOGAN**

*Since the mid-1960s there has been a great deal of interest around the world in the use of sample surveys of the general population to study crime. The advantages of doing so have been discussed in detail many times (National Research Council, 1976; Biderman, 1967). Crime surveys have been conducted in many nations, a practice that is continuing despite their heavy cost. Large-scale national surveys have been conducted in the United States, the Netherlands, Australia, Great Britain, and Sweden. Smaller but regular national studies have been carried out in the rest of Scandinavia, and there has been a national survey in Spain. There have been large surveys of victimization in individual cities in Germany, Switzerland, and England. Statistics Canada has completed very large studies of seven major cities, including two surveys of Vancouver, and the Israeli Census Bureau has added victimization questions to a national survey. In addition, small but useful city studies have been conducted in Mexico, Colombia, Israel, and Belgium. The four islands that make up the Dutch Antilles also have been surveyed. The findings of these surveys have accumulated to the point where it is possible to perceive cross-national regularities—or clear inconsistencies—in what they reveal.*

Many reviews of victimization research have been principally methodological in character (but see Reiss, 1982; Gottfredson and Hindelang, 1981). This article emphasizes what they have found concerning the rate at which victimizations are reported to the police. Gottfredson and Gottfredson (1980) argue that the decision to report

---

I would like to thank Richard Block for helpful comments on a draft of this article. Work on this report was supported in part by Grant 81-IJ-CX-0069 awarded by the National Institute of Justice, U. S. Department of Justice, under the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended. Points of view or opinions stated in this article are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U. S. Department of Justice.

support services in many nations, but virtually all such programs rely upon police or related referrals for securing access to clients. Public compensation of crime victims and (usually) private insurance payment is precluded unless the police are notified.

Nonreporting also limits the deterrent capacity of the criminal justice system, thus subverting one of its most important functions. Apprehension rates that take into account in their denominator offenses that go unreported would more accurately reflect the very low levels of certainty of punishment that characterize most jurisdictions. Differential non-reporting determines which victimizers are vulnerable to arrest and which are not. This could raise significant equity issues if differential attention by the criminal justice system is cast along race, sex, or age lines as a result. It also raises further doubts about our knowledge of offenders, much of which is drawn from profiles of criminals who have been apprehended.

Patterns of reporting also affect the police mandate. If most incidents brought to the attention of the police feature attacks by strangers on vulnerable individuals, the definition of the police role as "crime-fighting protectors of the weak" seems valid. On the other hand, if domestic disputes, conflicts between neighbors or across generations, and violence among young males or in settings such as schools were more prominent, their task definition could become more complex. Also, instances of reported crime are increasingly important raw material for systematic planning, workload forecasting, and budget development by police and correctional agencies.

The apparent frequency and mix of crimes that face the police in various parts of the city could be affected dramatically by differences in reporting practices. Nonreporting is thus a potential source of resource misallocation, leaving some areas of a city underprotected. It certainly presents problems to criminologists using official data to study the spatial-ecological distribution of crime, due to the differential validity of official crime counts for social areas (Brantingham and Brantingham, 1981). Nonreporting also is tremendously threatening to the validity of evaluations of crime prevention programs. When citizens become more involved in prevention activities it is reasonable to assume that they will call the police more often when they are victimized. As a result, we may falsely conclude that "nothing works" when official crime statistics for experimental areas stay high or continue to climb.

Finally, *who* reports or not is a significant issue. If the poor, racial minorities, and those who feel they are systematically mistreated by the police are less willing to report their experiences, all of the consequences

crimes may be the most influential one made in the criminal justice system, emphasizing the role of citizens as gatekeepers for all that may follow. Victim surveys were originally conceived to probe the volume and nature of the "dark figure" of crimes that escaped official notice, and virtually every victimization study has examined this question. (A major exception is the Swedish national survey of 1978; see Sveriges Officiella Statistik, 1981.)

Much of this discussion involves the findings of the U.S. National Crime Survey (NCS), because it is the largest effort of the kind. However, the findings of surveys conducted elsewhere add to and sometimes challenge those of the NCS. This review does not consider experimental studies of bystander intervention, a related topic of interest both in the United States and abroad (Van Dijk, 1983). It also avoids consideration of "behavioral intention" studies, which ask people if they would report or intervene in various vignettes. These are fraught with methodological problems of their own. Methodological issues involved in measuring victimization will intrude. There is so much interest in pursuing victimization research that attention to methodological issues that confound comparative analysis is crucial. Our understanding of the problems involved in assessing victimization accurately has progressed to the point where future investigations of empirical regularities and anomalies in crime reporting could share a common set of research tools, enhancing our confidence in the findings.

#### *THE SIGNIFICANCE OF CRIME REPORTING*

Perhaps the most frequently examined aspect of victimization is the reporting of crimes to the police. One of the principal motives for conducting such surveys has been to understand more fully the incidence and distribution of unreported crime. In addition to being numerous, the findings of these studies have been remarkably consistent. In every jurisdiction there is a great deal of unreported crime—even in the most "civil" places, where cooperation with the police was presumed to be high—and everywhere the decision to report seems to be dominated by a rational calculus regarding the costs and benefits of such action.

The decision by victims, their confidants, or bystanders to report crimes to the police is fraught with implications for the parties involved and the community. Victims of crimes that go unreported may be cut off from ameliorative services. There is tremendous interest in victim

TABLE 1: Comparative Reporting Rates for Individual Robbery and Household Burglary: City and National Surveys

Jurisdiction	Robbery	Burglary	Source
Toronto	—	44	Waller and Okihiro (1978: 40)
Inner London	—	51	Sparks et al. (1977: Table 6-6)
Zurich	—	64	Clinard (1978: Table 4-1)
Stuttgart	—	52	Clinard (1978: Table 4-1)
Gottingen	—	50	Kirchhoff and Kirchhoff (1984)
Vancouver	49	62	Corrado et al. (1980)
Thirteen U.S. cities (1974-1975)	minimum median maximum	44 53 63	U.S. Department of Justice (various years) Braithwaite and Biles (1979: Table 2)
Australia	60	68	Central Bureau of Statistics (1981: author's calculation)
Israel	—	68	Block (1983b) Van Dijk and Steinmetz (1980b: Table 8)
Netherlands	63	—	U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics (1983)
1977	—	81	U.S. National Crime Survey 1973 1981
1976	—	83	47 51
1978	—	83	England and Wales 47 67
			Hough and Mayhew (1983)

#### THE FREQUENCY OF REPORTING

Data on the reporting of incidents to the police were gathered via follow-up questions given to respondents who had been identified as victims in a survey. Typically, they were asked if the events in which they were involved came to the attention of the police, and if not, why not. Less frequently, those who were involved in reported incidents were asked why they *were* brought to the attention of the authorities. These responses and related data from the survey can be used to examine the frequency and correlates of reporting.

The results of a number of such studies are summarized in Table 1. Table 1 focuses upon two types of crime: individual robbery and household burglary. These are both fairly well measured in victim surveys (unlike, for example, assault), enhancing the validity of the figures. The top of Table 1 reports data for individual cities, and the bottom reports the results of national surveys. With one or two exceptions the figures in Table 1 are most remarkable for their similarity.

Except for U.S. studies, there are few entries in the robbery column of Table 1, for it takes a very large survey to gather enough reports of predatory personal crimes to analyze them. The Dutch reporting figure for robbery, for example, is based upon an analysis of only 51 sample cases—the total “take” of victims for this crime in their 1977 national survey. While national victim studies have been conducted in all of Scandinavia, those nations have the same “problem”: There was not enough personal crime there for a normal-sized sample survey to uncover enough victims to examine their experiences—including reporting—in detail. The large Australian national survey of 1975, the British Crime Survey, and Statistics Canada’s study of Vancouver all revealed robbery reporting rates within the same range as U.S. city and national studies. The median “around the world” rate for robbery reporting was about 56%, with England and Wales (at 47%) and the Netherlands (63%) defining the outer boundaries of the spread. Differences between 1973 and 1981 reporting rates for the United States do not reflect a consistent trend for robbery over that period (U.S.

Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1983: Table 5). Some U.S. city victimization surveys uncovered robbery reporting figures lower than Vancouver’s (including Portland, Denver, and Dallas), but most lay within this range. A small survey in the Dutch Antilles set the figure there at only 45%, for “robbery on the street” (Spieckenheuer, 1982: Table 6).

There are many useful figures in the burglary column, for it is frequent enough to appear often in modestly budgeted surveys. With the exception of national surveys of the Netherlands, most of the city and

disconcerting findings. Schneider (1977) found only about one-half of such "reported" incidents in Portland, Oregon, police files, while in Sweden, Persson (1980) found only 1 clear match in 78 attempts. There are a number of possible explanations for this, including the following: (1) the police did not properly record the complaint or later discarded it, and (2) victims' reports in survey interviews are so (necessarily) sketchy it is quite difficult to make such matches. However, the magnitude of the mismatch in these studies is such that further work on the reliability and validity of self-report measures of crime reporting should be near the top of the research agenda in this area.

The cross-national *comparability* of these figures is also uncertain. These data all are based upon reports of concrete behaviors, usually those of the person being interviewed, and these are more likely than measures of attitudes to be standardizable across cultures (Verba, 1977). The nations in Table 1 are all Western industrial democracies, with professionalized and bureaucratized police. Surveys indicate that most of their citizens assume the police to be at least somewhat responsive to their needs. This equates to a certain degree the social significance of contacting the police about one's problems. All of these nations are largely wired for telephones. This is important, for it equates one significant cost of calling the police (see below). Near the bottom of this scale is England. In a study of reported burglaries there (Maguire, 1982), about 20% were reported by victims walking (or driving) to a station house; the comparable figure from a recent study of four medium-sized U.S. cities was under 2% (Speelman and Brown, 1981). Presumably, in less developed nations that proportion generally would be much higher. While there are important arguments for the conceptual equivalence of these indicators, there remain many differences in sampling, field procedures, response rates, data processing, and estimation; there may even be differences in which respondents are chosen to recall crime incidents, which may affect their comparative validity (for an extensive discussion of these, see Block, 1983a). Small details, such as how analysts handle "series incidents" (which strike victims so frequently they cannot be described separately), affect estimates of reporting rates, for it appears that these crimes are less frequently reported to the police (Paez and Dodge, 1982). And finally, the lesson of Dutch figures for burglary is clear: Fine definitional differences in the crimes under investigation or in their operational measurement—especially when they are related to incident seriousness—will confound comparative research. This is true within as well as between nations. Of course, some

country studies reviewed in Table 1 uncovered reporting rates of between 45% and 67% for burglary. The over-time differences in reporting of burglary in the United States illustrated in Table 1 do reflect a general trend: Reporting levels were up significantly almost every year during that period (U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1983; Table 5). There are a number of reasons that burglary reporting levels should be high in Holland, where national surveys set them at about 82%. Burglary in the Netherlands technically includes only the actual "breaking and entering" of a dwelling, while in the United States and the United Kingdom simple trespass defines the crime. Also, there are no "attempted" burglaries in Holland (they fall into another crime category), while attempts are frequent in the United States and Canada. In the NCS for 1980, 21% of all burglary incidents involved only evidence of attempted forcible entry (U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1983). A national survey of Jewish residents of Israel (Central Bureau of Statistics, 1981) set their reporting rate for actual "breaking into a dwelling" at 80%, similar to that of Holland. In the Dutch Antilles, which follows practice in the Netherlands, the reporting figure for breaking and entering was 75% (Spickenhauer, 1982; Table 6). In addition, a rigorous comparison of U.S. and Dutch residential burglary indicates that victims in the Netherlands *lose* more when a break-in occurs. These differences in the severity of burglary, some of which are definitional, are related to differential reporting within countries, and may explain differences between them. Finally, a larger proportion of Dutch victims report being insured against loss, and a larger proportion collect on their insurance (Block, 1984). As is discussed below, being insured is a powerful determinant of crime reporting.

We know little about the *validity* of survey measures of crime reporting anywhere. Currently we rely upon a single "yes-no" indicator that doubtless is subject to numerous measurement errors. In the cultures represented in Table 1, crime reporting is widely seen to be a socially desirable act, and there is doubtless some pressure to indicate to interviewers (especially those from government agencies) that one has done the right thing. There are substantial panel effects on the crime reporting measure in the NCS, with experienced respondents being more likely to indicate that they had called the police when victimized (Murphy and Cowan, 1976). As a result, that survey probably overestimates crime reporting rates. Two attempts to trace victimizations said to be reported to actual police incident reports came up with

list of victims' reasons for nonreporting in virtually every survey that has been conducted. In Schwind's Gottingen, West Germany, survey the "small damage involved" was cited by 41% of nonreporters, and in Stephan's study of Stuttgart, West Germany, this reason also was the most frequently given (Kirchhoff and Kirchhoff, 1984). It is offered most often for cases that on other measures do appear to be less serious. Analysis of city victimization data by Hindelang and Gottfredson (1976) reveals that this rationale is most often cited in cases involving attempted rather than completed crimes, those not involving a weapon, crimes without financial loss, and those resulting in no injury. Analytically, these are the major incident-related correlates of reporting (Green, 1981; Block and Block, 1980; Skogan, 1976).

#### *Insurance*

For victims involved, securing restorative services, recovering their goods, or claiming compensation or a private insurance payment provides a concrete basis for action. In NCS data for 1973, 74% of insured burglaries were reported, while only 44% of uninsured burglaries were brought to the attention of the police. The figures for insured and uninsured household larcenies were 45% and 18%, respectively (author's computation; see also Van Dijk and Vianen, 1978; Waller and Okihiro, 1978). Schwind's Gottingen survey is one of the few that find no relation between insurance and crime reporting (Kirchhoff and Kirchhoff, 1984).

#### *Obligation and Efficacy*

Victims' reporting decisions seem to be shaped by other beneficial aspects of such action. One such benefit is that it enables them to be "good citizens." When asked why they did report, most victims most frequently refer to their obligation to do so (Maguire, 1982; Smith and Maness, 1976). They also frequently mention the desire to prevent future crime or get criminals out of circulation (Waller and Okihiro, 1978; Sparks et al., 1977; Ziegenhagen, 1976; Smith and Maness, 1976). There is a general correspondence between the solution rate for various types of crime and the frequency with which they are reported, reflecting the possible accuracy with which people make those assessments (Skogan, 1976). Schneider et al. (1976) found that a victim's belief that the police would be able to catch offenders and the courts would convict them encouraged reporting. Schreider et al. and Smith and Maness

reasons for cross-jurisdictional differences in reporting reflect differences in crime patterns as well. One potential reason for low rates of robbery reporting in the U.S. cities mentioned above is that in all of them robbery relatively infrequently involved a weapon and only rarely a gun. The presence of a weapon of any kind is an indicator of incident seriousness, and the use of a gun is a significant predictor of reporting. Patterns of firearm use will vary enormously across nations. More research on the issue of comparative validity, and more coordination of data collection efforts when it is possible to standardize them, clearly is called for.

### *THE DETERMINANTS OF REPORTING*

Research on citizen crime reporting suggests that a "cost-benefit" metaphor could summarize much of what we have learned about it to date. The decision to report or not seems to be rooted in direct experience and reflects the pros and cons of involving the authorities—or taking other actions—when it seems useful and appropriate.

#### *Seriousness*

Most of the explainable variance in reporting is related directly to characteristics of the incident. Whether an offense was completed or only attempted, if there was an injury or financial loss, and other elements of seriousness are by far the strongest predictors of reporting. In the NCS for 1973, the correlation (*gamma*) between reporting and whether a robbery was successful or not was .53, and it was .70 between robbery reporting and whether or not the victim required medical care (author's computation from original data). Gottfredson and Hindelang (1979) found that reporting varied from 38% to 74% across four categories of seriousness based upon Sellin-Wolfgang scores, using NCS data. Schwind's (1984) survey of Bochum, West Germany, found that 50% of all "aggravated thefts" were reported, but only one in six of "less serious thefts." In Holland, 76% of burglaries in which nothing of particular value was stolen were reported, but that figure quickly rose to over 95% when serious losses were incurred (Buikhuisen, 1975).

Victims' expressed reasons for not reporting can frequently be summarized using a cost-benefit metaphor. The most commonly reconstructed motive for nonreporting is that the crime was "not serious enough." A variant of this rationale is highest or next to the top on the

service, or poor experiences with the police and victim nonreporting in inner-city London. Very small or nonexistent effects of attitudes toward the police have been uncovered in local American surveys (Hawkins, 1973; Reynolds and Blyth, 1976; Schneider et al., 1976); the U.S. Census Bureau's massive city surveys (Garofalo, 1977); Gottingen (Kirchhoff and Kirchhoff, 1984); Sheffield, England (Mawby, 1983); and Toronto (Waller and Okihiro, 1978). The reporting of personal crimes in U.S. cities ranges only from 47% to 51% across a general measure of satisfaction with police performance (Garofalo, 1977: 30). Schneider's study in Portland, Oregon, employed more and better measures of attitudes toward the police than do most surveys, including items inquiring if people thought they would be well treated by the police, get serious attention if they called them, and see some real effort on the part of the police to handle their problem. But these also were related to reporting only among the most trivial offenses. Even in a recent riot area in Manchester, England, Tuck and Southgate (1981) found whites and West Indian blacks reported victimizations to the police at the same rate, and thus despite the greater hostility of blacks toward the police. (And even there the leading posterior reason given for nonreporting was "not serious enough.") The effect of attitudes toward the police seems most significant in Marzanera's (1984) Mexican survey. It may be significant that overall levels of distrust of the police were quite high there. In every other case where they have been examined in detail such assessments seem to have an effect only among less serious crimes, which go unreported for a variety of reasons.

### Culpability

There is some evidence that the past behavior of victims may affect their willingness to report to the police. The Sparks et al. (1977) survey of inner-London neighborhoods included a series of questions probing the frequency of illegal acts by their *respondents*, including victims. They found that self-reported offenders were less likely than those without a "spoiled identity" to report offenses to the police. In the recent British Crime Survey, 12% of respondents under 30 years old who reported "never" participating in a series of offenses were victims of violent assault, but the comparable figure was 40% for self-confessed recent offenders (Hough, 1983). People also may be loath to report trouble they "got themselves into." The survey for the Crime Commission conducted by Biderman and his colleagues (1967) dealt in passing

(1976) also report that there is widespread belief among victims and nonvictims that the police cannot do much to recover stolen property; a concrete motive for frequent nonreporting.

A frequently quoted reason for nonreporting is that "nothing could be done" or there was "lack of proof." In the United States this is the second most frequently cited reason for nonreporting of both personal and household crimes (U.S. Department of Justice, 1981: Table 97). A related rationale, that "the police can't do anything," was the second most common reason for nonreporting in inner London (Sparks et al., 1977) and Gottingen (Kirchhoff and Kirchhoff, 1984), and stood at the top of the list in Toronto (Waller and Okihiro, 1978). This is a questionnaire response open to some interpretation, and it is sometimes described as meaning that victims have no confidence in the police. However, an analysis of the characteristics of crimes for which both forms of "can't do anything" responses are most frequently given indicate that they often involve strangers and are crimes for which victims are unable to recall suspect descriptions and about which they can supply few details (Skogan and Antunes, 1979). None of these features would bode well for the police "doing anything." In the absence of such information at the scene of the crime the police are very unlikely to make an arrest (Maguire, 1982; Mawby, 1979; Greenwood et al., 1975). As Sparks et al. (1977: 124) also found, perceptions that the police cannot do anything reflect "the facts of the case," not attitudes toward the police. Garofalo (1977) reports that the frequency of giving this reason for nonreporting is unrelated to responses to another NCS item asking victims to rate the quality of their city police. This further reinforces the interpretation that this is an incident-specific, "reality-testing" response on the part of victims of difficult-to-solve crimes.

### Attitudes Toward Police

There is a surprisingly limited role for attitudes toward the police in victim decision making. Given the sometimes extremely hostile relationship between the police and elements of the citizenry—especially in the United States—it was expected that fear of the police or suspicion that they would deliver inadequate service would be significantly related to calling for their aid. However, hardly anywhere does that seem an important consideration once a crime has occurred, especially if it was by any measure a serious one. Sparks et al. (1977) found only a very weak relationship between dislike for the police, bad expectations about

reporting seem to be mediated principally by home ownership. Controlling for other factors, owners and residents of single-family dwellings (the two tend to go together in North America) are more likely to report burglaries to the police (Waller and Okihiro, 1978). Having insurance, which is an extremely strong correlate of theft reporting when the level of loss reaches \$100 (Skogan, 1976), also is linked to home ownership and thus to income (Skogan and Maxfield, 1981).

Surprisingly, race differences are small in crime reporting, both in American surveys and the one conducted in inner London. In the United States, in fact, blacks report some categories of victimizations at a higher rate than do their white counterparts. This is due partly to the fact that personal crimes recalled by black victims are generally more serious than those mentioned by whites, more frequently (for example) involving the presence of a weapon, actual physical assault, personal injury, and need for medical care. This may be an artifact of differential respondent productivity (Skogan, 1981). However, when incidents that are recalled are controlled for their seriousness, there are still no major race differences in reporting.

It long has been assumed that interracial crimes in America are overrepresented in official statistics, as they are presumably more often reported by victims and recorded by the police. However, neither the Crime Commission's national survey nor the NCS lends much support to the overreporting hypothesis. Block (1974) found a difference of only one percentage point between reporting rates for white-on-white and black-on-white assaults. Among NCS assaults involving strangers, cross-racial incidents are reported 39% of the time and same-race incidents 41% of the time (author's computation).

Reporting is most frequent among the elderly. Victims 60 years old and older reported 51% of all personal incidents in which they were involved between 1973 and 1978, while the comparable figure for all others was 42% (author's computation). In multiple regression analyses of Dutch data on burglary and assault reporting, age is the first personal characteristic to enter, following several incident attributes (Van Dijk and Steinnetz, 1980b: Tables 10, 11). The most substantial pool of unreported crime is that affecting young males, and principally falls in the assault category. A great deal of disputatious violence among males under age 30 goes unreported. In assault, the NCS for the period 1973-1978 indicates that crimes involving teenage male victims were reported only 29% of the time. For males in their thirties the figure was 51%, and for females in their thirties, 59%. Some of this may be due to

with the frequency of this circumstance. In that survey, 25% of all victims agreed that they were negligent or had done something foolish that contributed to their plight. Block (1974) found assault victims who reported that they had themselves been drinking at the time of the incident notified the police 48% of the time, compared to an overall reporting rate for assaults in the NORC victim survey of 56%. Further, assaults that Block distinguished as "fights" were less often reported than incidents in which victims did not reply in kind. Due either to shame, embarrassment, or a concern about their own labeling by the police, victims may have reasons for not wanting to get involved with the authorities.

### *Demographics*

A consistent finding of victim surveys is that crime reporting is relatively independent of the personal attributes of victims. Within major crime categories there are few impressive differences between blacks and whites, men and women, or high- and low-income families, in the extent to which they mobilize the police when victimized. Nonreporting also is not particularly related to the size or type of community in which victims live. One might expect crime reporting to be higher in urban areas, where informal mechanisms of social control are weaker and the police are often relied upon to regulate conflict and resolve disputes. However, Laub (1981) found no important differences between reporting rates by type of crime in urban, suburban, and rural jurisdiction.

Sex differences in reporting are small but consistent: Women (and especially black women) are more likely than men to report, even controlling for type of crime (Green, 1981). This is true in London, the Netherlands, and American city and national surveys (where the gap is about five percentage points in several major crime categories). While very small, differences in reporting across income levels are of interest because various groups seem to end up at the same point for different reasons. In robbery, for example, different elements of seriousness seem to drive reporting among upper- and lower-income victims. Those at the bottom of the income ladder are more frequently beaten up or otherwise assaulted when they are robbed. Upper-income victims experience less physical assault in robbery, but they lose significantly more money. The sum of these effects seems to wash out income-related differences in reporting (author's computations). Other class-related factors in crime

category in which this was a major concern was assault (U.S. Department of Justice, 1981: Table 97). And, of course, when relationships may continue the threat of reprisal for involving the police looms larger. While fear of reprisal gets few overall mentions in German and U.S. surveys (about 3% in Göttingen and 1% in NCS personal crimes), it is a more frequently expressed motive for nonreporting (over 10% of all reasons given) in rape cases (U.S. Department of Justice, 1981: Table 97). In Fishman's (1984) survey of two neighborhoods in Haifa, most incidents of personal violence involved quarrels between relatives or neighbors, and he found fear of revenge to be the second leading reason given for the nonreporting of events in that category.

### *Third Parties*

There has been less research on the role of *others* in crime reporting, although persons other than the victim report a great deal of crime and there is some evidence that they can play an important role in shaping victims' decisions about what to do when a crime occurs. Close studies of police files indicate that substantial numbers of incidents are reported to them by persons other than the victim. In Amir's (1971) study of rape in Philadelphia, about one-half of all offenses were reported by intermediaries, principally family members. In a study of almost 300 victims of personal offenses in 2 cities in England's industrial Midlands, Shapland (1982) found that less than one-half of those incidents were reported by their victims; most of the remainder were brought to police attention by friends, neighbors, witnesses, and passersby. Some crime involving serious injury also must be reported by hospital personnel, although it is difficult to find much evidence on this point.

None of the above studies, based as they are on officially recorded crimes, speak very definitively about the role of persons other than the victim in crime reporting. As Mayhew (1978) argues, there are several reasons bystanders may not react affirmatively even when they see evidence of a crime. They may not define the incident as a "crime" (as in some cases of violence or personal abuse), and they may be reluctant to intervene if the situation is ambiguous or their responsibility unclear (as when they see a "suspicious person"). They may identify with, or even know, the offender rather than the victim. Existing studies often identify nonvictim crime reporters as friends or relatives of the victim. In a medium-sized English city, Bottomley and Coleman (1980) found that only 3% of all incidents were reported by members of "the general public," people not linked in any clear way to the victims of those crimes.

low levels of reporting by youthful victims of offenses that took place in school. An important (but as yet undocumented) role for informal social processes in the reporting decision may be found in peer-group social codes that emphasize subgroup solidarity over the value of crime reporting (Gottfredson and Gottfredson, 1980).

### *Relationships*

Victim surveys currently are not very good at assessing the frequency of nonstranger assaults (Skogan, 1981; Sparks, 1981), so it is difficult to discern if those crimes among young males were disproportionately acquaintance-party cases. Existing variation in victim-offender relationships—which is contributed by the related-party cases that victims choose to tell interviewers about—seems generally unrelated to reporting. This is particularly true for assaultive violence, both in the NCS (Green, 1981; U.S. Department of Justice, 1981: Table 89) and in the inner-London survey (Sparks et al., 1977). (But Block, 1974, found a correlation of +.27 between relational distance and notifying the police of assaults, using NORC's survey for the U.S. Crime Commission.) However, the long-standing suspicion that police records greatly underestimate the volume of such offenses is not adequately testable with the data. This is unfortunate, for the extent of victim-offender relationships has important policy relevance and personal consequences for victims. In a small survey of personal crime victims in New York City, Ziegenhagen (1976) found that 18% had applied for some form of public or private assistance, but that only 11% were successful. One reason for disqualification—and for others not applying in the first place—was that the state of New York required the parties in such incidents to be unrelated in order for victims to receive benefits. Ziegenhagen estimated that 30%-40% of personal crime victims in New York were thereby disqualified.

In the NCS the largest differences in reporting between stranger and nonstranger cases are found for rape. In sexual assaults picked up in surveys, nonstranger incidents often go unreported. This should not be surprising. "Relatedness" implies complex, enduring, structured relationships between victims and offenders that the police find difficult to penetrate. The denser the network of relationships that bind the parties in such incidents, the less victims may be inclined to involve strangers—the police—in the case. Among the reasons given for nonreporting in the NCS, that it was a "private or personal matter" makes up more than 20% of responses concerning rape. The only other

personal crimes in the NCS is "reported to someone else." This reason also stands third for all types of incidents in Australia (Braithwaite and Biles, 1979). In the United States this response is most common for personal thefts (16.5% of reasons) and simple assault (11% of reasons; U.S. Department of Justice, 1981: Table 97). It is not at all clear who these "someone elses" are, or what *they* do with the case, and most attempts to reconcile NCS and official crime counts treat those as not being reported. This may be an error, however, and those classified as "nonreporters" might not agree with their appellation. The British Crime Survey (Hough and Mayhew, 1983) gets around this by asking if each incident "came to the attention of the police."

#### *Self-Help*

Finally, under some circumstances the settlement of cases may not be official or authoritative at all. Small surveys of victims have found that "took care of it myself" is often given as a reason for nonreporting (Ziegenhagen, 1976). In the Netherlands, "settled the matter myself" was the number-one reason for nonreporting of violent assault (Van Dijk and Steinmetz, 1980b). There needs to be more research, perhaps of an anthropological character, on the "rough justice" involved in this form of informal dispute resolution.

#### *THE CONSEQUENCES OF NONREPORTING*

Victimization research in a number of nations indicates that the reporting of incidents to the police is largely an incident-specific phenomenon, dominated by the particular features of the event in which the victim was involved. However it is measured, the seriousness of the crime seems to prevail. Both incident-based Sellin-Wolfgang seriousness scores (Hindelang, 1976) and victims' subjective ratings of the seriousness of their experience (Sparks et al., 1977) point to the same conclusion. And the leading rationale for nonreporting is that a crime is "not serious enough," indicating that victims might actually recognize their behavior in research reports.

The principal effect of nonreporting is to divert the attention of the criminal justice system from less serious and attempted-but-not-completed incidents. The resulting pool of crimes unknown to the police—the dark figure—is disproportionately likely to feature less

It may be that relational ties are necessary in most cases to overcome such barriers to reporting. However, from the point of view of crime prevention it is critical to understand the actions or inactions of "pure" bystanders and what converts them into witnesses, or at least what stimulates them to mobilize the police. The potential they present for crime prevention may be very large. For example, in a survey in Amsterdam fully 58% of respondents claimed they personally had witnessed one or more crimes during the past two years (Van Dijk, 1983). Neighborhood surveillance programs and other community crime prevention efforts always attempt to encourage onlooker reporting, using a variety of strategies (for a review of these, see Feins, 1983). They emphasize the responsibility of residents for intervening in events in their neighborhood, stressing the importance of reporting suspicious persons or activities and even trivial crimes. This is aimed at decreasing the ambiguity problem identified by Mayhew (1978). These programs also promote neighbor-to-neighbor social and organizational contacts, which build the personal linkages that seem to play such an important role in the notification process.

Others also may play an important social role in defining an event as a crime, deciding if it is serious enough to report, or if it is the sort of thing appropriate for the police to handle. People frequently turn to others for help in defining their situation. They may need information or assistance that they do not define as being within the police realm even when that situation is the result of a crime. Their problem may be an emotional one, stemming from the trauma of victimization, or it may be one of anxiety, mistrust, fear, or panic. They often are uncertain about what to do when they know their attacker. In a survey study of crime victims selected from police records it was revealed that such discussions took place with others *before* the police were called in 26% of incidents. These consultations consumed a considerable proportion of the "true" response time of the police—the total elapsed time between the completion of a crime and the arrival of the responding officer (Spelman and Brown, 1981; see also Van Kirk, 1977).

There are many circumstances under which victims are encouraged *not* to call the police when a crime occurs, but to notify other authorities. In many circumstances "official" procedures call for school principals, security directors, building managers, commanding officers, and others to be informed when a crime occurs, not the police. This is obscured in most studies of nonreporting "to the police" (as in official NCS reports), but it turns out that the third most frequent reason for "nonreporting" of

competition with a host of other factors that begin to affect victim behavior.

This leaves unanswered an important question: If reporting propensities are rooted in direct personal experience, determined largely by the seriousness of the incident, is it possible to change them consciously? Presumably a society's official systems of intelligence gathering and institutional adaptation would function more effectively on the basis of better information. The research issue is, Can victims be encouraged to report more fully? The relationship between attitudes toward the police and reporting offers only a weak mechanism for affecting such a change, and, because reporting is largely unrelated to general beliefs about crime or even personal fear of crime, it seems unlikely that citizen education programs, public relations campaigns, and the like would show much effect. In a provocative argument, Van Dijk (1982) hypothesizes that victim behavior—at least in the Netherlands—is highly sensitive to police treatment of complaints. He indicates that when the police began to ignore petty thefts and minor assaults in Holland during the mid-1970s (and this was due to their reading of prosecution policies), victims stopped reporting those offenses in the first place. The marginal frequencies of prosecution dismissal, police recording, and citizen reporting of such crimes is consistent with Van Dijk's argument, but it posits a complex feedback process demanding great sensitivity to policy changes on the part of mass publics. There certainly is ample evidence that unsatisfactory service by responding officers can have negative consequences for victims' evaluations of the police and general satisfaction with their performance (Shapland, 1982; Parks, 1976; Smith and Hawkins, 1973).

The unresponsiveness of the American police to citizens' complaints was documented in the U.S. Crime Commission's first national survey. Victims then reported that the police did not come in 23% of the cases in which they were summoned. They also indicated the police did not write up their incidents as crimes 25% of the time, although it is not clear in the survey data if they wanted them to or if it was warranted (Ennis, 1967). However, it appears that none of the attitudes this sort of treatment engenders are related strongly to crime reporting. And, although there is some controversy about the integrity of the implementation of its treatments, the findings of the Kansas City Preventive Patrol Experiment indicated that service-related variations in policing did not have significant effects on levels of crime reporting there (Kelling et al., 1974). The data Van Dijk musters on prosecutors,

injury, smaller financial losses, and less use of weapons (especially guns; Skogan, 1977). This sets a lower bound on the level of seriousness of crimes that are in turn investigated and—perhaps—officially recorded by the police, for the overwhelming majority of criminal incidents such as these are brought to their attention by citizens rather than through their daily routines (Burrows, 1982; Block and Block, 1980; Hindelang and Gottfredson, 1976).

What we have learned about crime reporting has a number of important implications for victims, the police, and the community. If victims were insured, we can be confident they often did what was necessary to file a claim. Whether qualified victims filed for appropriate public compensation depends upon their jurisdiction of residence, and is harder to discern in American data. Nonreporting is so substantial that it certainly sets some limits on the deterrent capacity of the criminal justice system. However, an analysis of the information that victims of unreported crime would be capable of giving the police if they had called them indicates that most of those incidents probably would not have been solved (Skogan and Antunes, 1979). Thus two more significant consequences of nonreporting are that it keeps official crime clearance rates up and that it cuts down on police paperwork.

Surprisingly, nonreporting does not seem to shield particular groups of offenders systematically from official view, except for (perhaps) one's friends and relations. Differences between the social profiles of offenders that we would draw from unreported, reported, and even officially recorded crime are small (Hindelang, 1981). Current methods for assessing the frequency of nonstranger crimes are so weak that they preclude making any strong statement about the impact of victim-offender relationships upon reporting. However, we suspect the police are spared many crimes involving parties known to one another, reducing somewhat the "social worker" dimension of their job.

The weak relationship between nonreporting and most demographic groupings indicates that the benefits of more complete reporting do not favor any particular group. Race and income differences in reporting are not impressive, while the differences favoring women and the elderly would not have many implications for the allocation of police resources across geographic areas. Perhaps most significantly, victims seem to swallow whatever reservations they may have about the police when they are faced with the concrete reality of being victimized. Only when the incident is not at all serious do unfavorable opinions or past experiences seem to play much of a role in reporting, and then they are in

the police, and the Dutch public still do not settle the claim that the size of the dark figure is sensitive to institutional responsiveness to victims' complaints.

If a cost-benefit calculus indeed plays an important role in shaping victim reporting, we should see changes in the volume of such reports when the costs of doing so go up or down, as well as when (as in the case of Holland) the apparent benefits of reporting shift. One empirical outcropping of this could be found in the impact of making available a simpler 911 (in the United States) emergency police telephone number on the volume and nature of calls to the police. This presumably reduces the cost of reporting in the form of the effort involved or complexity to be overcome. Unfortunately, there seem to be no good studies examining this interruption upon time-series data on the volume and nature of such calls. Presumably the former would increase, and the bulk of that rise would be concentrated in less serious or suspicious person categories.

There is some evidence that citizen *involvement* in crime prevention efforts pays dividends of this type. In Schneider's (1977) evaluation of a neighborhood-based crime prevention program in Portland, Oregon, she found that levels of participation in crime reduction were strongly related to reporting practices. Citizens who were aware of crime problems, who cooperated with programs, and who were active in their communities were more likely to call upon the police when they were victimized. Other forms of engagement were important as well. Victims who were knowledgeable about local government and who understood local issues also were more likely to notify the police. This may be partly a selection artifact, due to other characteristics of citizens who get involved in programs, but it hints that the active involvement of the citizenry in crime prevention programs would enhance the quality of official data on levels of crime as well.

## REFERENCES

- Biderman, A.  
1967 "Surveys of population samples for estimating crime incidence." *Annals of the Amer. Academy of Pcl. and Social Sci.* 374 (November): 16-33.
- Biderman, A., L. Johnson, J. McIntyre, and A. Weir  
1967 Report on a Pilot Survey in the District of Columbia on Victimization and Attitudes Toward Law Enforcement. Washington, DC: President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice.
- Block, R.  
1974 "Why notify the police: the victim's decision to notify the police of an assault." *Criminology* 11: 555-569.
- 1983a "A comparison of national crime surveys." Presented at the World Congress of Criminology, Vienna, September.
- 1983b Personal communication.
- 1984 "The impact of victimization, rates and patterns: a comparison of the Netherlands and the U.S." in R. Block (ed.) *Victimization and Fear of Crime: World Perspectives*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Block, R. and C. Block  
1980 "Decisions and data: the transformation of robbery incidents into official robbery statistics." *J. of Criminal Law and Criminology* 71: 622-636.
- Bottomley, A. K. and C. A. Cojeman  
1980 "Police effectiveness and the public: the limitations of official crime rates," in R. Clarke and J. M. Hough (eds.) *The Effectiveness of Policing*. Farnborough, England: Gower.
- Braithwaite, J. and D. Biles  
1979 *Crime Victimization and Reportability Rates: A Comparison of the United States and Australia*. Canberra: Australian Institute of Criminology.
- 1984 "Victims and offenders: the Australian experience," in R. Block (ed.) *Victimization and Fear of Crime: World Perspectives*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics
- Brantingham, P. and P. Brantingham  
1981 "Introduction: the dimensions of crime," in P. Brantingham and P. Brantingham (eds.) *Environmental Criminology*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Buikhuisen, W.  
1975 Registered and Non-Registered Crime. Den Hague, Netherlands: Research and Documentation Centre, Ministry of Justice.
- Burrows, J.  
1982 "How crimes come to police attention." *Home Office Research Bull.* 13: 12-14.
- Central Bureau of Statistics (Israel)  
1981 Victimization Survey 1979 (Special Series 664). Jerusalem: Author.
- Cinard, M.  
1978 Cities with Little Crime: The Case of Switzerland. New York: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Corrado, R., W. Glackman, and R. Roesch  
1980 Vancouver Victimization Survey 1979: Extent and Distribution of Victimization. Vancouver, BC: Criminology Research Centre, Simon Fraser University.
- Ennis, P.  
1967 *Criminal Victimization in the United States: A Report of a National Survey*.
- Amir, M.  
1971 *Patterns of Forcible Rape*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.
- Aromaa, K.  
1984 "Three surveys of violence in Finland," in R. Block (ed.) *Victimization and Fear of Crime: World Perspectives*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Australian Bureau of Statistics  
1979 *General Social Survey: Crime Victims*, May 1975. Canberra: Author.

- Fear of Crime: World Perspectives. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Laub, J. 1982 "Ecological considerations in victim reporting to the police." *J. of Criminal Justice* 19: 419-430.
- Maguire, M. 1982 Burglary in a Dwelling: The Offender, the Offender, and the Victim. London: Heinemann.
- Manzanera, L. 1982 "Victimization in a Mexican city," in R. Block (ed.) *Victimization and Fear of Crime: World Perspectives*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Mawby, R. 1975 Policing the City. Farnborough, England: Saxon House.
- 1983 "Contrasting measurements of area crime rates." Plymouth Polytechnic, England. (unpublished)
- Mayhew, P. 1978 "Crime in public view: surveillance and crime prevention." Presented at the annual meeting of the American Society of Criminology, Dallas, November.
- Murphy, L. and C. Cowan 1976 "Effects of bounding on telescoping in the National Crime Survey." Presented at the annual meeting of the American Statistical Association, Boston, August.
- National Research Council 1976 Surveying Crime. Washington, DC: Author.
- Paez, A. and R. W. Dodge 1982 Criminal Victimization in the U.S.: 1979-80 Changes, 1973-80 Trends. Washington, DC: Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Parks, R. 1976 "Police response to victimization: effects on citizen attitudes and perceptions," in W. Skogan (ed.) *Sample Surveys of the Victims of Crime*. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.
- Persson, L.G.W. 1980 "Hidden criminality: theoretical and methodological problems, empirical results." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Stockholm.
- Reiss, A., Jr. 1982 "How serious is serious crime?" *Vanderbilt Law Rev.* 35: 541-585.
- Reynolds, P. and D. Blyth 1976 "Occurrence, reaction to, and perception of victimization in an urban setting: analysis of a survey of the Twin Cities region." University of Minnesota. (unpublished)
- Schneider, A. 1977 The Portland Forward Records Check of Crime Victims: Final Report. Eugene: Oregon Research Institute.
- Schneider, A., J. Burcart, and L. A. Wilson II 1976 "The role of attitudes in the decision to report crimes to the police," in W. McDonald (ed.) *Criminal Justice and the Victim*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Schwind, H.-D. 1984 "Investigations of non-reported offenses," in R. Block (ed.) *Victimization and Fear of Crime: World Perspectives*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Washington, DC: President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice.
- Feins, J. 1983 Partnerships for Neighborhood Crime Prevention. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.
- Fishman, G. 1984 "Differential victimization patterns: an analysis of crime victims in polar neighborhoods in Haifa," in R. Block (ed.) *Victimization and Fear of Crime: World Perspectives*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Garofalo, J. 1977 "The Police and Public Opinion: An Analysis of Victimization and Attitude Data from Thirteen American Cities. Washington, DC: National Criminal Justice Information and Statistics Service, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration.
- Gottfredson, M. and D. Gottfredson 1980 Decisionmaking in Criminal Justice. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.
- Gottfredson, M. and M. Hindelang 1979 "A study of the behavior of law." *Amer. Soc. Rev.* 44: 3-17.
- 1981 "Sociological aspects of criminal victimization." *Annual Rev. of Sociology* 10:7-128.
- Green, G. 1981 "Citizen reporting of crime to the police: an analysis of common theft and assault." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.
- Greenwood, P., J. Chaiken, J. Petersilia, and L. Prushoff 1975 *The Criminal Investigation Process*, Vol. 3: Observations and Analysis. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.
- Hawkins, R. 1973 "Who called the cops: decisions to report criminal victimization." *Law and Society Rev.* 7: 427-444.
- Hindelang, M. 1976 Criminal Victimization in Eight American Cities. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.
- 1981 "Variations in sex-race-age specific incidence rates of offending." *Amer. Soc. Rev.* 46: 461-474.
- Hindelang, M. and M. Gottfredson 1976 "The criminal justice system: public attitudes and involvement," in W. McDonald (ed.) *Criminal Justice and the Victim*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Hindelang, M., M. Gottfredson, and J. Garofalo 1978 *The Victims of Personal Crime*. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.
- Hough, M. 1983 "Victims of violent crime." Presented at the Thirty-Third International Course in Criminology, Vancouver, British Columbia, March.
- Hough, M. and P. Mayhew 1983 *The British Crime Survey: First Report*. London: Home Office Research.
- Kelling, G., T. Pate, D. Dieckman, and C. E. Brown 1974 *The Kansas City Preventive Patrol Experiment: A Technical Report*. Washington, DC: Police Foundation.
- Kirchhoff, G. F. and C. Kirchhoff 1984 "Victimological research in Germany," in R. Block (ed.) *Victimization and*

- U.S. Department of Justice  
1981 Criminal Victimization in the United States 1979. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics  
1980 Criminal Victimization in the United States: Summary Findings of 1978-1979, and Changes in Crime and of Trends Since 1973. Washington, DC: Author.
- 1983 Criminal Victimization in the United States: 1980-81 Changes Based upon New Estimates. Washington, DC: Author.
- Van Dijk, J.  
1982 "The victim's willingness to report to the police: a function of prosecution policy," in H. Schneider (ed.) *The Victim in International Perspective*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- 1983 Bystanders' Intervention in a Crime. Den Hague, Netherlands: Research and Documentation Centre, Ministry of Justice.
- Van Dijk, J. and C. Steinmetz  
1980a The Burden of Crime on Dutch Society 1973-1979. Den Hague, Netherlands: Research and Documentation Centre, Ministry of Justice.
- 1980b The RCD Victim Surveys 1974-1979. Den Hague, Netherlands: Research and Documentation Centre, Ministry of Justice.
- Van Dijk, J. and A. C. Vianen  
1978 Criminal Victimization in the Netherlands: Victim Surveys 1974-1977. Den Hague, Netherlands: Research and Documentation Centre, Ministry of Justice.
- Van Kirk, M. L.  
1977 Response Time Analysis. Kansas City, MO: Kansas City Police Department.
- Verba, S.  
1977 "The cross-national program in political and social change," in A. Szalai and R. Petrella (eds.) *Cross-National Comparative Survey Research*. New York: Pergamon.
- Waller, I. and N. Okhiyo  
1978 Burglary: The Victim and the Public. Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press.
- Ziggenhagen, E.  
1976 "Toward a theory of victim-criminal justice system interactions," in W. McDonald (ed.) *Criminal Justice and the Victim*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Shapland, J.  
1982 "The victim in the criminal justice system." Home Office Research Bull. 14: 21-23.
- Skogan, W.  
1976 "Citizen reporting of crime: some national panel data." Criminology 13: 535-549.
- 1977 "Dimensions of the dark figure of unreported crime." *Crime & Delinquency* 23: 41-50.
- 1981 Issues in the Measurement of Victimization. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Skogan, W. and G. E. Antunes  
1979 "Information, apprehension, and deterrence: exploring the limits of police productivity." *J. of Criminal Justice* 7: 217-241.
- Skogan, W. and M. Maxfield  
1981 Coping with Crime: Individual and Neighborhood Reactions. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Smith, A. and D. Mares  
1976 "The decision to call the police: reactions to burglary," in W. McDonald (ed.) *Criminal Justice and the Victim*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Smith, P. and R. Hawkins  
1973 "Victimization, types of citizen-police contacts, and attitudes toward police." *Law and Society Rev.* 8: 135-152.
- Sparks, R., H. Genin, and D. Dodd  
1977 Surveying Victims: A Study of the Measurement of Criminal Victimization, Perceptions of Crime, and Attitudes to Criminal Justice. New York: John Wiley.
- Spelman, W. and D. Brown  
1981 *Calling the Police: Citizen Reporting of Serious Crime*. Washington, DC: Police Executive Research Forum.
- Spieckheuer, J.L.P.  
1982 *Bevolking en Crimineleit op de Nederlandse Antillen*. Den Hague, Netherlands: Research and Documentation Centre, Ministry of Justice.
- Steinmetz, C.  
1979 An Empirically Tested Analysis of Victimization Risks. Den Hague, Netherlands: Research and Documentation Centre, Ministry of Justice.
- Sveri, K.  
1982 "Comparative analyses of crime by means of victim surveys: the Scandinavian experience," in H. Schneider (ed.) *The Victim in International Perspective*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Sveriges officiella Statistik  
1981 *Victims of Violence and of Property Crimes* 1978 (trans.). Stockholm: Statistiska Centralbyrån.
- Teske, R. and H. Arnold  
1982 "Comparison of the criminal statistics of the United States and the Federal Republic of Germany." *J. of Criminal Justice* 10: 359-374.
- Tuck, M. and P. Southgate  
1981 *Ethnic Minorities, Crime and Policing*. Home Office Research Study 70. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.