

THEME

This is to certify that the

thesis entitled

# Victimization Trend In Korea: A Test Of Routine Activity Theory

presented by

Junseob Moon

has been accepted towards fulfillment of the requirements for

Master of Science degree in Criminal Justice

Major professor

Date <u>11/18/02</u>

**O**-7639

MSU is an Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Institution

# LIBRARY Michigan State University

## PLACE IN RETURN BOX to remove this checkout from your record. TO AVOID FINES return on or before date due. MAY BE RECALLED with earlier due date if requested.

DATE DUE	DATE DUE	DATE DUE

6/01 c:/CIRC/DateDue.p65-p.15

# VICTIMIZATION TREND IN KOREA: A TEST OF ROUTINE ACTIVITY THEORY

By

Junseob Moon

# A THESIS

Submitted to Michigan State University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

# MASTER OF SCIENCE

School of Criminal Justice

#### ABSTRACT

# VICTIMIZATION TREND IN KOREA: A TEST OF ROUTINE ACTIVITY THEORY By

Junseob Moon

Routine Activity Theory (RAT) is a commonly used approach for explaining criminal victimization in Western society (Mustaine & Tewsbury, 1998). However, there is no study to explain the victims' routine activities and the criminal victimization in Korea, even though the lifestyle in Korea has become more western.

The objective of this study is to examine the RAT using the Korean crime victimization data. The Korean victimization survey is analyzed to find out the relationship between an individuals' daily routine activity and his or her actual victimization experience through micro-level analysis. The present study examines the key concepts underlying RAT (motivated offenders, suitable target, and absence of guardianship) to examine patterns of victimization in Korea. Measures of each concept are developed and evaluated in terms of their ability to explain individuals' risks of property and violent crimes.

This study uses nationally represented samples of 2,100 subjects over the age of 15 or above, collected through face-to-face interviews spanning 10 days from 1 May 1999 to 10 May 1999. For this study, Chi-square and logistical regression are used.

According to this study, the single and the young, who spend the more time outside the home are significant factors to explain victimization. The finding shows that the home is the safest place in Korea, since there is no personal level victimization (including sexual crime) in Korea.

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Hard work alone would not have been sufficient to complete this thesis. It also involved supporting of some very fine people, though I could never name them all.

The author wishes here to express his immeasurable gratitude to the faculty members in the School of Criminal Justice, Michigan State University. I would like to contributions of the practicum committee members, Dr. Sheila Royo Maxwell, Dr. Mahesh Nalla, and Dr. Vince Hoffman, whose suggestions and guidance made this thesis attainable.

It is obvious that this research could not be completed without the cooperation of Dr. Byung-In Cho, Senior researcher in the Korean Institute of Criminology.

Most of all, I dedicate this work to my family members. To my parent, Sang-Woo Moon and Jung-Hee Choi, for their consistent encouragement and pride in everything I have done (well, almost everything). Also, they were always enthusiastic and supportive about my endeavors, always at my side, and offering loving encouragement. They are always with me.

iii

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES vi
LIST OF FIGURESvii
INTRODUCTION 1
Purpose of Study 8
LITERATURE REVIEW10
Routine Activity Theory12
INTRODUCTION TO KOREA
Population
Crime in Korea 21
METHOD
Sample
Variables
Independent Variables
Demographic Factor
Lifestyle Factors 30
Guardianship Factors
Dependent Variables
Research Questions
Analytic Technique 37
RESULT
Victims' Characteristics on personal level victimization (larceny, robbery,
and assault)
Victims' Characteristics on sexual victimization
The predictors of routine activities of victims on personal level victimization
The predictors of routine activities of victims on sexual victimization 48

CONCLUSION	. 50
APPENDICES	55
Appendix A. Survey Questionnaire (Korean Version)	56
Appendix B. Survey Questionnaire (English Version)	100
Appendix C. Approval of the University Committee on Research invol	ving
Human Subjects (UCRIHS)	142
BIBLIOGRAPHY	143
Bibliography	144

# LIST OF TABLE

Table 1. Number of reported major penal code offenses (1989 - 1999)
Table 2. The trends of victimization on robbery and larceny       25
Table 3. Descriptive of demographic factors
Table 4. Descriptive of lifestyle factors
Table 5. Descriptive of guardianship factors
Table 6. Descriptive of dependent variables
Table 7. Victims' characteristics of personal level crime
Table 8. Victims' characteristics of sexual crime44
Table 9. Characteristics of victims regressed on the number of conditions
(Personal level victimization)47
Table 10. Characteristics of victims regressed on the number of conditions
(Sexual victimization)48

# LIST OF FIGURE

Figure 1. Number of reported major penal code offenses (1989 -1999) ......24

#### Introduction

Generally crimes are comprised of three elements: the offender, the victim, and their interaction. However, in the past years, criminologists were primarily interested in and focused on criminals, rather than on victims of crime. This often meant they ignored the role of places and targets in criminal events (Weisburd. 1997). Criminologists focused on the criminal and the factors surrounding the criminal. For example, they examined why some people commit crimes and others do not and why some commit crimes at very high rates and others do not. They also looked at age factors, such as at what age people begin committing crimes and at what age they stop. Rarely, if ever, did these criminologists shift their primary focus to look at the victims. Starting in the 1960s, the research model that focused only on the criminal changed, as several social movements started to pay attention to the victims of crime, instead of only those that committed the crime (Karmen, 2000).

An emphasis in the trend of criminological studies from the study of criminal offenders to the study of victim's behaviors and victims was developed during the 1970s (Jensen & Brownfield, 1986). In an early classical text, *The* 

*Criminal and His Victim* (1948), von Hentig explored the relationship between the criminal and the victim. This is the first study that addresses the nature of the victim. von Hentig tried to explain that the victim was often a factor in the criminal act and expanded upon this notion (1948). von Hentig expressed that "increased attention should be paid to the crime – the provocative function of the victim." He claimed that "With a thorough knowledge of the inter-relations between doer and sufferer, new approaches to the detection of crime will be opened (p 450)."

Many of scholars credit Beniamin Mendelsohn as the 'father' of victimology. Mendelsohn coined the term "victimology" (Doer & Lab, 1998; Koichi, 1996; Lee, 2000). Mendelsohn, like von Hentig, was interested in the relationship between victims and offenders (Doerner & Lab, 1998). He used a questionnaire to ask about the situation in a criminal offense. By interviewing victims as well as bystanders and witnesses, he discovered a strong interpersonal relationship between victims and offenders (Doerner & Lab, 1998; Lee, 2000; Walklate, 1989).

Mendelsohn made six categories based on legal considerations of victims' blaming degree; completely innocent victims, victims with minor guilt or victims

due to ignorance, victims as guilty as the offender, victims guiltier than an offender, victims most guilty, and simulating or imaginary victim (Doerner & Lab, 1998; Lee, 2000; Walklate, 1989). His classification was used in many recent studies, both in criminology and victimology. Mendelsohn's work is some of the most prominent in the areas of criminology and victimology (Doerner & Lab, 1998).

However, the early victimologist generally failed to focus on the damage inflicted on the victims by their offenders. Also, the early victimologists were not interested in efforts regarding the victim's rehabilitation or recuperation. In an attempt to understand the causes of crime, they concentrated on how the victim contributed to his or her demise. Eventually, the idea of victim precipitation emerged from this preoccupation of 'blaming the victim'. The victim blaming contained in some of early victimological studies can be seen in the ways in which the police, courts, social workers and victim support agencies interact with victims (Williams, 1999).

The critical victimology, however, shows much more interest in the practical effects of theories and policies upon actual victims, and in the dynamic relationship between theorizing and dealing with victims. Critical victimology is

one of the recent trends in victimology. Mawby and Walklate (1994) defined critical victimology as "an attempt to examine the wider social context in which some versions of victimology have become more dominant than others and also to understand how those versions of victimology are interwoven with questions of policy response and service delivery to victims of crime (p.21)." It began by deconstructing the assumptions beneath the individualistic, victim blaming tradition (Walklate, 1989) but rapidly moved on to consider ways of improving services to victims and of altering traditional thinking about victims' right (Mawby & Walklate, 1994; Mullender, 1996).

After the emergence of victimology, many criminal justice and victimology scholars have tried to gauge the extent of criminal victimization. Gauging this extent has been a long time goal in this area (Doerner & Lab, 1998). In the United States, information about crime and victimization had been based mostly on the Uniform Crime Report (UCR). Although the UCR was and is still widely used, many criminologists have argued that the statistics officially recorded by the police, or any other agent of the criminal justice system for the matter, are not an accurate measure of crime and victimization (Doerner & Lab, 1998; Walklate, 1989). Much research has been conducted in the last century in an effort to

demonstrate that officially recorded statistics of crime underreport crime, leading to the so-called 'hidden crime' in society. For a long time, criminologists have widely believed that the true amount of crime is largely unknown. The unknown quantity of crime in any given society is known as the 'dark figure' of crime (Doerner & Lab, 1998).

The criticism and dissatisfaction with official records as an accurate measure of the amount and distribution of crime has led criminologists to construct an alternative measure of crime. The effort toward this end result is the victimization survey, which is based on interviews with samples of individuals who answer questions concerning their experiences with victimization (O'Brien, 1985). The victimization survey uses dramatically different measures of crime compared to official measures because they rely on ordinary citizens to remember and report to an interviewer their experiences as victims (Kim, Shim, & Cho, 1991).

In Korea, the difference between the official data and victimization survey has not yet been systematically studied. Also, the study field and view towards this issue is very limited. In addition to this, the victimization survey, which is the basis of the study, has been conducted sporadically and differentially. Therefore, in order to clarify the overall crime level and to understand the sociological reasons of crime, various studies and improvements both in the quantity and quality of studies are necessary.

Routine activity theory is a western-based theory that has been tested many times over in the United States. This theory has repeatedly proven to be reliable, and continues to be used throughout America, England, Australia, and Great Britain. Primarily, this theory is used when cities have "unstoppable" crimes. By unstoppable means crimes that continue to take place with police action or when police tactics have no discernible effect. At this time, it is better to focus on the victims instead of the criminals if the particular crime is to be controlled. By focusing on the victims, we can identify particular traits or variables that are present when the majority of the crimes occur. Consider this situation, a city if suffering from a large number of rapes in a certain suburban area, and police or public actions have no effect. In this situation, it would definitely be prudent to utilize the routine activity theory. In using this theory, we could identify which traits or variables seem to be present when the rapes occur. For example, if it could be found that one particular factor was present in most of the crimes we would seek to eliminate this factor from the suburban area. If the

factor in question was lighting, which deals with the guardianship aspect of the routine activity theory, it would be looked to eliminate all the dark spots in that area. New streetlight fixtures would be erected, broken streetlights would be repaired, and it would be even possibly bring in high visibility police call boxes. From past experiences, these lighting measures would definitely have an effect on the rapes, much more so than if the police had chosen to concentrate on the criminals themselves instead of the victims.

Routine activity theory is a commonly used approach for explaining criminal victimization in Western society (Mustaine & Tewksbury, 1998). However, there is no study to explain the victims' routine activities and the criminal victimization in Korea, even though the lifestyle in Korea has become more western. Cohen and Felson (1979) argued that the routine activity theory helps assemble some diverse and previously unconnected criminological analyses into a single substantive framework. Victimization is associated with lifestyle, daily routines, and demographics and for this reason, the routine activity theory is not only limited to western countries.

The objective of this study is to examine the routine activity theory using the Korean crime study. The crime victimization data from the Korean

victimization survey will be analyzed to find out the relationship between an individuals' daily routine activity and his or her actual victimization experience through micro-level analysis.

## **Purpose of Study**

Victimology is a new field of inquiry in the social sciences, including Korea. In recent years in Korea, many scholars have tried to focus on the victims of crime, but there is no study that has measured the victims' characteristics. Moreover, systematic research on the effects of victimization has not been conducted, and the survey itself is still very limited in Korea.

Despite these difficulties, there have been three victimization surveys conducted in Korea: once in Seoul in 1991, and after that, twice nationwide: in 1993 and again 1998 by the Korean Institute of Criminology. Studies that have used these data, however, had been descriptive studies. Moreover, a major threat to reliability has been the use of different guestionnaires.

This study attempts to investigate the extent and aspects of criminal victimization, to discover specific characteristics of victims and offenders, and to analyze those factors affecting micro-level (individual) criminal victimization in

Korea, based on the routine activity theory. As the routine activities of the persons change, the aspect of personal criminal victimization of these individuals also changes. Routine activity theory suggests that the social context of criminal victimization is a central issue in understanding victimization risks (Lynch, 1987; Mustaine & Tewksbury, 1997). Personal lifestyles and routine activities of individuals could partially explain personal criminal victimizations in Korea.

The present study examines the key concepts underlying Routine Activities Theory (motivated offenders, suitable target, and absence of guardianship) to examine patterns of victimization in Korea. Measures of each concept are developed and evaluated in terms of their ability to explain individuals' risks of property and violent crimes.

The purpose of this study is to test empirically the routine activity theory, and examine similarities and differences in major factors associated with the personal – level victimization in Korea. Through this study, this approach can be used to explain crime rates, and may be used to plan for future needs of criminal justice services and personnel.

#### **Literature Review**

In the United States, the first victimization surveys were accomplished in the late 1960s (e.g., Biderman, Johnson, McIntyre & Weir, 1967; Reiss, 1967; Ennis, 1967), then methodology was studied and improved (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1970; LEAA, 1972, 1974), and the National Crime Survey was implemented in 1972. The National Crime Survey was renamed to the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS), which more clearly reflect the emphasis on the measurement of victimization experienced by U.S. citizens (Doerner & Lab. 1998). The NCVS collects detailed information about certain criminal offenses, both attempted and completed, that concern the general public and law enforcement (O'Brien, 1985). These offenses include the frequency and nature of rape, robbery, assault, household burglary, personal and household theft, and motor vehicle theft (O'Brien, 1985).

Victimization surveys, however, have limitations. First, the NCVS does not measure homicide or commercial crime (Levitt, 1999). Second, the researchers who conduct these surveys find that those interviewed tend to incorrectly remember exactly when a crime occurred; such as in property offenses, where victims often forget how much the losses were (Pursley, 1994).

Third, by far the major problem associated with the victimization survey technique is its cost (Doerner & Lab, 1998). The greatest advantages come from surveys at the local level that focus on what can be done to upgrade neighborhood crime prevention and police effectiveness programs (Doer & Lab, 1998). However, the cost of conducting victimization surveys on an annual basis in most communities would be prohibitive, and most communities simply cannot afford them. Those limitations can affect their accuracy.

During the past decades, many scholars and researchers have been interested in the question of personal differences in criminal victimization, especially explanations of why crimes occur and why some people rather than others are more likely to become the victims of crime. Kennedy and Sacco (1997) pointed out that there are two major explanations related to causation of victimization (p.93). The first explanation is questions of opportunity and attempts to understand the ways in which victimization episodes are distributed in time and space. The second major explanation type is intended to illuminate how victims and offenders affect and are affected by each other in the context of social change. As mentioned above, for this study, the crime trend is tested by routine activities theory, since this approach can be used to explain crime rates, and plan future needs for criminal justice services and personnel (Cohen & Felson, 1979; Cohen & Cantor, 1981; Cohen, 1981; Messner & Tardiff, 1985; Felson, 1987).

### **Routine Activity Theory**

In recent year, there are several attempts to specify the conditions necessary for victimization. These efforts go under such names as the "routine activity approach" (Cohen & Felson, 1979), the "opportunity perspective" (Cornish & Clarke, 1986; Mayhew et al., 1976), and the "lifestyle opportunity" perspective (Hindelang, Gottfredson, & Garofalo, 1978).

Routine activity theory is one of the most popular theories used to explain victimization. Routine activity theory suggests that "differences in victimization risk are due to differences in the routine activities of persons (Lynch, 1991: 545)." Crime and everyday life makes routine activity theory and its developments since 1979 by Cohen and Felson, accessible to students and scholars (Thompson & Fisher, 1996). Routine activity has been defined as "recurrent and prevalent activities (especially formalized work, provision of food and shelter, and leisure activities), which provide for basic population and individual needs" (Cohen & Felson, 1979: 593). Hence, routine activities may occur at home or away from home, although the primary activity examined in most previous studies is the amount of time spent outside the home with nonhousehold members (Cohen & Felson, 1979).

Routine activity theory focuses on certain social circumstances that cause victimization, which means that the person's daily routine lifestyle characteristics affect the criminal situation by determining how often suitable targets can be faced with motivated offenders (Copes, 1999). In other words, this theory sees crime as a function of people's everyday behavior and seeks to explain the occurrence of criminal acts as the confluence of the following circumstances (Cohen & Felson, 1979; Felson, 1986, 1994; Garofalo, 1987; Lynch, 1987; Miethe, et al., 1987; Miethe & Meier, 1990). First, there must be a motivated offender, who must be motivated and able to commit crime. While most theories tried to explain crime by focusing only on the offender, Cohen and Felson (1979) maintained that offenders represent just one element of the criminal situation. Second, there must be a *suitable target*. For these crimes to occur, there must be an object toward which the offender acts. For example, there must be a car before auto - theft can occur, a person present for an assault, or an unlocked

window to break into. Third, a suitable target must exist in the *absence of capable guardianship*. Capable guardianship means anybody or anything that might prevent the victimization from occurring.

As used by Cohen and Felson (1979), the term does not refer only, or even mainly, to formal law enforcement in any narrow sense but to the whole range of factors that protect persons and property by discouraging offending. For the criminal act occurring, the target and the offender must be at the same place at the same time.

The general point is that measuring routine activities only in terms of the total amount of time persons spend away from home is problematic unless adjustments are made for persons exposure risk by considering the nature and temporal patterning of these activities (Stafford & Galle, 1984).

Many scholars have used routine activity theory to examine personal – level criminal victimization from several methodological perspectives within a variety of social contexts (Cohen & Felson, 1979; Garafalo, Siegel, & Laub, 1987; Lynch, 1987; Miethe, Stafford, & Long, 1987; Messner & Tardiff, 1985; Sherman, Gartin, & Buerger, 1989). In terms of this theory, the relationships between demographic variables and personal victimization can be attributed to differences

in lifestyle. Hindelang and his colleagues (1978) argued, "this is because various constellations of demographic characteristics are associated with role expectations and structural constraints that, mediated through individual and subcultural adaptations, channel lifestyles (p. 246)."

Miethe and his colleagues (1987) theorized that the temporal dimension of routine activity theory was an important indicator of a person's lifestyle and that this factor is separate from, and mediate the effect of, social demographic variables on victimization. They tried to assess the extent to which the measures of major activity during the daytime (outside the home) and frequency of nighttime activity away from home mediated the relationship between demographic factors and violent victimization, and between these factors and property victimization. They found that even if major activities during daytime and nighttime intervened in the relationship between victimization and selected demographic factors, they did so more strongly for property than for violent victimizations.

Many studies found that demographic factors affected criminal victimization. The young, residents of urban areas, males and singles (unmarried persons) are exposed to motivated offenders because they are usually spending

their nighttime away from home (Gottfredson, 1984; Hindelang, et, al., 1978; and Mustaine & Tewksbury, 1998). Some studies, based on the National Crime Survey and British Crime Survey, showed that age, race, sex and marital status are generally among the most powerful predictors of interpersonal victimization (Cohen et al., 1981; Gottfredson, 1984, 1986; Laub, 1990), as well as larceny victimization (Cohen & Cantor, 1980).

Based on the former studies, given that victimization rates are higher in nonhousehold locales (streets, parks, other buildings), persons whose major daytime activity has changed from "in home" (e.g., homemakers, unemployed), to "outside the home" (e.g., in school, employed) should experience an increased risk of victimization (Cohen & Felson, 1979). The fact that predatory crime occurs disproportionately during evening hours should result in an increased risk of victimization among persons who increase their nighttime activity outside the home over time (Cohen & Felson, 1979).

Among the various criminal behaviors, theft is one of the most frequently occurring crimes in the United States (Mustaine & Tewksbury, 1998). More than 22.7 million people were victimized with theft offenses in 1994, representing 56% of all the criminal victimization that occurred in that year (Bureau of Justice

Statistics, 1995). According to the previous research, individual behaviors and social background are the most important factors that determine theft victimization (Mustaine & Tewsbury, 1998).

Messer and Tardiff (1985) examined that the location of homicide (at home versus away from home) and the nature of the victim and perpetrator relationship could be predicted by the ability of several social demographic variables – gender, race, age, marital status, and employment status. They found that females, blacks, and Hispanics were more likely to be murdered by family members and friends than were others. They also found that women, the very young and old, and unemployed persons were more likely to be victimized at home than were persons in the respective comparison groups.

Many scholars have been using the routine activity theory to strongly support the idea that movement into the public domain increases one's risk for victimization (Mustaine & Tewksbury, 1999). The person's routine activities and lifestyle can be shown that movement in public places makes one a suitable target. For example, employed persons are more likely to be victimized than unemployed persons in the public locales, however, the unemployed are more often victimized than those individuals who stay in their homes for whatever reason (Cohen & Cantor, 1981; Cohen, Cantor, & Kluegel, 1981). Some studies show that the persons who have the higher economic or symbolic value are more attractive targets, and thus are at greater risk of victimization than others (Lynch, 1987; Miethe & Meier, 1990). Therefore, persons with higher income, social status, and education, who probably own more valuable properties, are more attractive to criminals and therefore are assumed to have higher risk of victimization (Cohen, et al., 1981; Miethe & Meier, 1994; Van Dijk, Mayhew, and Killias, 1990). Gottfredson (1984) demonstrated that persons spending nighttimes outside the home for leisure (e.g., at bars, movie, etc.) suffer a higher risk of victimization than those confining their leisure time to the home (see also Corrado, Roesch, Glackman, Evans, & Leger, 1980; van Dijk & Steinmetz, 1984).

Regardless of the theoretical perspective of researchers, research indicates that offenders generally use distinguishing environmental stimuli that function as cues to provide important information about the potential targets (Bennett & Wright, 1984; Brantingham & Brantingham, 1978, 1981; Brown & Altman, 1981; Cromwell, Olson, & Avary, 1991; Wright & Decker, 1994). Personal – level criminal acts have reported a preference for targets that exhibit 'useful' characteristics, such as poor street lighting, lots of bushed obstructing entry points, and quiet streets, which may result in low levels of surveillability and an abundance of hiding places (Litkermann, 1973; Phelan, 1977), which,

environmental characters, are also related to the guardianship of potential victims.

The routine activity analytical frameworks are said to assume as given the motivation to offend, and state that patterns in daily vocational and victimized by altering levels of exposure to potential offenders.

## **Introduction to Korea**

# Population

The population of South Korea was estimated at approximately 47,470,969 in 2000 estimated (CIA, 2000). The annual growth rate has been steadily declining since the 1960s and is now 0.93 % based on the annual birthrate of 15.12 per 1,000 (CIA, 2000). The majority of the people live in the South and southwestern coastal area. Seoul is the most populous region with 20% of the population followed by North Kyoung-sang Province (14.5%), South Jul-la province (12.7%), and Kyoung-Ki province.

The pace of the urbanization was highest in the large metropolitan cities, such as Seoul and Pusan, which averaged 9% annually between 1960s and 1970s. Seoul itself contains one out of every five South Korean. Government efforts to stem the flow of the population from rural areas to towns include the new community movement, launched in 1971. This movement was designed to stimulate the rural environment by channeling state development funds to rural areas and this is successfully finished.

South Korea is the world's most ethnically and linguistically homogeneous nation. Virtually the entire population is of Korean origin and there is no evidence

of non-Mongoloid admixture. There is no national ethnic minority. The total resident, non-Korean population is estimated at no more than 50,000 of whom the majority is Nationalist Chinese. There are no widespread anti-western feelings among the native population (CIA, 2000).

# Crime in Korea

Crime is a problem in Korea. Several changes in the economic opportunity structure and activity patterns in Korea have taken place in recent years. There have been major increases in traveling outside of the country, the single household, high educational level, and female labor force participation (especially married women), and the percent of unattended house during the daytime. A basic premise underlying the routine activity theory is that these change in routine activity patterns increase target suitability and motivated offenders, and decrease guardianship, and therefore affect the social and temporal distribution of victimization.

According to the official criminal statistics, the total crime rate in Korea is 3,454 cases per 100,000 people. The crime rates (except traffic accidents) have increased 55.6% in last 14 years (517,691 cases in 1984 to 805,764 cases in

1997) (The Korean Supreme Prosecutor's Office, 1998). From these statistics, it can be said that murder does not show much increase, but robbery, rape, and arson has increased 3 to 6 times during the last 30 years.

Murder has risen from 500 cases in 1968 to 789 cases in 1997, which shows continuous rise and falls between 500 and 800 cases. Robbery has increased by approximately 4.5 times during the last 30 years from 946 cases in 1968 to 4,284 cases in 1997. Seen from the yearly rates, the 1979 rate seems similar or a little decreased compared to that of 1968, however, the numbers skyrocketed since then; 2,374 cases in 1980, 3,135 cases in 1985, and 4,195 cases in 1990. In 1991, the rate declined to 2,766 cases, but shot again to 4,496 in 1994, which reached the peak.

The rate decreased from 3,414 cases in 1995 to 3,586 cases in 1996. The number was 4,282 in 1997, which was increased by 6,96 compared to the previous year. Rape had rose from 1,350 cases in 1968 to 7,120 cases in 1997, which shows approximately by 5.3 times during the last 30 years.

The data show that since the early 1980's, which was the end of the 3<sup>rd</sup> Economic Development Movement in Korea, the serious crime rates had significantly increased because the economic situation was getting better in that

	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998
Theft	100600	65031	87124	77094	60492	57219	60790	68812	80995	87860
Robbery	4085	4195	2766	2549	2876	4469	3414	3586	4282	5407
Rape	5102	5519	5175	5465	7051	6169	4912	5688	5665	6016
Assault	1									
& Bodily	25629	25524	25627	24799	27917	30400	28151	29240	28488	33835
injury										

Table 1. Number of reported major penal code offenses (1989 - 1998)\*\*

\*Source: Crime Statistics (1999)

era (White Book, 1999). This seems to defy current criminological thought. Therefore, this trend shows that the lifestyle and routine activity in Korea has been changed in that period (e.g., high income, working condition, outdoor activities, and so on.), and this situation affected the crime rates.

As shown table 1, the crime rates in Korean during 1997 to 1998 were dramatically increased, since the Asian Economic Crisis was started in 1997. During the crisis, livelihood – related crimes were especially increased, for example, theft and robbery. Theft had increased from 68,812 cases in 1996 to 80,995 cases in 1997, and continuously increased in 1998. All other criminal code offenses have been increased since 1994.



Figure 1. Number of reported major penal code offenses (1989 - 1998)

The objective of this study is to adapt the routine activity theory using the Korean crime study. The crime victimization data resulting from Korean victimization survey will be analyzed to find out the relationship between an individual's daily routine activities and his or her actual victimization experience through micro-level analysis.

## Method

The purpose of this study is to find special characteristics of personal level victimization in Korea. To examine the personal – level criminal victimization, data are analyzed from Victimization Survey in Korea conducted in 1998 by the Korean Institute of Criminology (KIC). The following is a discussion of the research question and the related hypotheses.

The general characteristics of samples in original research are categorized by the respondents' residential region, personal socio – economical level, and households' socio – economic characteristics. In this study, however, the total victimization information is used.

# Sample

This study uses nationally represented samples of 2,100 subjects over the age of 15 or above. Che-ju Island was not in this sampling frame due to cost effectiveness concerns. Data were collected through face-to-face interviews spanning 10 days from 1 May 1999 to 10 May 1999.

## Variables

For this study, the demographic variables (sex, age, family annual income, educational level, etc.), the lifestyle variables (daytime activity, nighttime activity, leisure activity, fear of crime, etc.), and the guardianship variables (times of house vacancy, perception toward the police, residential circumstance condition, self defense, etc.) are used. There are further explanations below.

### 1. Independent variables

The variable posited to mediate the impact of demographic attributes on the likelihood of victimization is the measure of the quantity and nature of routine activities outside the home. As mentioned above, many previous studies have examined the routine activity theory to explain criminal victimization, but they used different ways to test the routine activity theory. Three factors are tested in this study: demographic factor, lifestyle factor, and absence of capable guardians.

#### Demographic Factors

The demographic factors used in this study are gender, marital status, age, educational level, occupation, and household income are used. Gender was coded into two dummy categories, male (= 1) and female (= 0). Most studies
have found that persons who are more likely to be victimized are singles and/or males (Mustaine & Tewksbury, 1998). Marital status was dichotomized into single or not. The single includes 'widowed', ' separated', 'divorced', and 'never married'. The 'separated' status is still legally 'married' status, however, since the separated person lives alone, this is included in the 'single' variable in this study.

Consequently, marital status, also serves as a proxy measure for the availability of capable guardians (Maxfield, 1987). Due to the overall low frequencies of each occupational category, these occupational categories were recoded into a new category called "employed". Table 3 is a summary table indicating sample sizes and percentages of demographic variables.

#### Lifestyle factors

'Lifestyle factors' are any activities that put someone at risk for victimization and could include routine lifestyle and that the visibility to offenders or their informants. Tremblay and Tremblay (1998) said "a crucial lifestyle variable is the amount of time a person spends in public places and among nonfamily members (p.295)." They also said that "an important routine activity

Demographic	N	%
Gender	2,100	
Male	1,048	49.9
Female	1,052	50.1
Age		
Range	13-87	
Mean	37.3	
Educational Level	2,097	
Never been school	61	2.9
Elemantary school	179	8.5
Middle school	234	11.2
High school	867	41.3
Community College	234	11.2
4-year University	488	23.3
Graduate school	34	1.6
Employment	2,077	
No	898	42.8
Yes	948	56.8
Household Monthly Income <korean won=""></korean>	1,941	
Mean	1,994,700	
Range	0-20,000,000	

# Table 3. Descriptive of demographic factors

variable is the 'away from household activity ratio'- an index designed to measure variations over time in crime opportunity levels (p.295)."

The four variables used for measuring lifestyle (see Table. 4) were

relation to victimization in this study are commute, daytime activity, transportation,

and nighttime activity. The variable named 'commute' was obtained from

dichotomous variable (yes - no). The 'transportation' variable was recoded into

three categories: public (=1), private (=2), and private/risky (=3). The 'public'

transportation includes urban bus, village bus, seat bus, cross-country bus, commute bus, school bus, subway, train, and taxi. The 'private' transportation includes car, and RV or van. The 'private/risky' transportation includes bicycle or walk, which can be included into the 'private' transportation. Since these are riskier than other 'private' transportation, it was separately categorized. The 'daytime activity' was categorized into two domains: home/school (=1) and work (=2). The daytime activity at school is nonhousehold activity, however, since the school is one of the safest places in Korea from personal victimization, this activity was combined with 'household' activity.

The 'nighttime activity' variable indicates if the respondent's evening activity away from home more than once a week or not. A measure of the individual's nighttime activity was dummy coded, more than once a week (= 1) and less than once a week or never (= 0). The persons who spend their evening time away from home more than others increase their encounters with potential offenders and are at greater risk of individual victimization (Mustaine & Tewksbury, 1998). Given that victimization occurs disproportionately at night,

Lifestyle	N	%
Commute	2,100	
No	743	35.4
Yes	1,357	64.6
Transportation	1,347	
Public	684	50.7
Private	397	29.5
Private/Risky	266	19.8
Daytime Activity	2,057	
At home or At School	952	46.3
At Working Place or Outside	1,105	53.7
Nighttime Activity	2,097	
More than once a week	987	47.1
Less than once a week or Never	1,110	53.0

#### Table 4. Descriptive of lifestyle factors

the frequency of nighttime entertainment (evening activity) was the best available measure of a nonhousehold activity that should increase exposure to risk (Hindelang et al., 1978).

# Guardianship factors

The concept of ' capable guardianship' is not clearly defined in past researches. However, Eck and Weisburd (1995) defined a 'guardian' as a person who can protect a target (P. 5), including friends and formal authorities such as police and security personnel, 'intimate handlers' such as parents,

Guardianship	<u>N</u>
Self-defense activity (scale: 5-25)	
Avoid specific area	
Do not walk alone at night	
Postpone a night schedule	
Do not carry much cash	
Do not take a cap alone at night	
	Cronbach's Alpha = 0.79
Perception toward the neighbor (scale: 4-16)	
Help each other	
Know well each other	
Rent easily personal possessives	
Share information on the neighborhood	
	Cronbach's Alpha = 0.88
Perception toward the neighborhood (scale: 4-16)	
Trash disposed carelessly	
Vacant houses or land	
Many dark and secluded places	
Specific place with delinquent juveniles	
	Cronbach's Alpha = 0.63
Perception toward the police work (scale: 3-12)	
Patrol well	
Immediate dispatch	
Trust police work	
	Cronbach's Alpha = 0.74

Table 5.	Descriptive	of	quardianshir	factors
			g	

teachers, coaches, friends, employers, and 'place managers' such as janitors,

and apartment managers (Eck, 1994;Eck & Weisburd, 1995:5, 6, 55; Felson,

1986, 1995:21).

			N	%
Personal	Total		2,100	
		No	1,893	89.8
		Yes	207	10.2
	Larceny		2,100	
		Νο	1,955	93.1
		Yes	145	6.9
	Robbery		2,100	
		No	2,077	98.9
		Yes	23	1.1
	Assault		2,100	
		Νο	2,061	98.1
		Yes	39	1.9
Sexual	Sexual [Felony]		1,044	
		No	983	94.2
		Yes	61	5.8

# Table 6. Descriptive of dependent variable

# 2. Dependent variable

Personal – level victimization and sexual victimization are analyzed.

Personal-level victimization includes personal-level larceny, personal-level robbery, injured or nearly injury by an assault, and sexual assault and harassment. Sexual assault and harassment was asked only to female respondents.

The experiences of the personal victimization, except sexual assault and harassment, were computed into one category, which includes all three victimization experiences: personal - level larceny, personal – level robbery, and

injured or nearly injured by an assault. Due to the overall low frequencies of each victimization category, these victimization categories were combined into a new category, called "victimized". Table 6 is a summary table indicating sample size and percentages of each victimization variable. The respondents answered each victimization question based on their victimization experiences during 1998. All dependent variables were dichotomized (victimization =1 or novictimization=0).

## **Research questions**

As mentioned previously, the general purpose of this study is to find the special characteristics of personal –level victimization in Korea. In this section, the questions are developed based on the literature review. As mentioned before, personal life style and routine activities affect personal victimization. However, personal lifestyle and routine activities differ in many ways from society to society. The uniqueness of each society in its culture, political situation, population size, composition, factors associated with personal – level victimization vary among different routine activities, and wealth generates different criminal victimization styles. Therefore, this study assumes that there would be variations in the

personal – level victimization in different routine activities.

This study tests the following hypothesis:

H<sub>0</sub>: There is no relationship between victims' routine activities and

personal level victimization (larceny, assault, robbery, and sexual crime).

H<sub>a</sub>: There is a relationship between victims' routine activities and personal level victimization (larceny, assault, robbery, and sexual crime).

# Analytic technique

A total of two bivariate analyses and two of multivariate analyses were tested.

To conduct bivariate analysis of effects, Chi-square analysis is used to address the relationship of each factor of routine activities theory and the personal level victimization, including larceny, robbery, assault, and sexual crime. To test the demographic factors, this study considers gender, age, marital status, educational level, and income. Also to measure the lifestyle factors, this study is considers commute, transportation, daytime activity, and nighttime activity. This analysis is used to test the absence of guardianship factors affects the victimization. Regression analyses were used to assess the effects of demographic,

lifestyle, and guardianship variables on the dependent measure while controlling for other variables. The appropriate regression analysis for models with a binary dependent variable, such as victimization/non-victimization, is logistical regression (Long, 1997). Many criminal justice researchers have used this model, although it is the most appropriate for a dichotomous dependent variable.

#### Results

This chapter presents the results of the study. It presents information on the characteristics of victims and the effects of these characteristics on their victimization. Also, it presents information on the types of routine activities of victims and their impact on victimization.

# Victims' Characteristics on personal level victimization (larceny, robbery, and assault)

Table7 presents base line information on the victims on personal level victimization sampled for this study. As shown the table, some characteristics are vastly different between victims and non-victims. Results indicate that nine variables significantly related to the victimization: marital status (p<.01), educational level (p<.05), age (p<.001), household income (p<.01), commute (p<.01), daytime activity (p<.01), self-defense activity (p<.01), perception towards the neighborhood (p<.001), and perception towards the police work (p<.05) were significantly related to the personal level victimization.

While many formal studies have shown that gender is one of the most significant variables to measure victimization, this variable is not significant in this

	Victimization				
	N	0	Y	ES	
	N	%	N	%	
Gender					
0 Female	950	49.8	102	52.8	
1 Male	957	50.2	91	47.2	
Marital Status					••
0 Not married	821	43.1	104	54.5	
1 Married	1083	56.9	87	45.5	
Employment					
0 No	806	42.7	92	48.2	
1 Yes	1080	57.3	99	51.8	
Educational Level					+
1 Never been school	59	3.1	2	1.0	
2 Less than high school	390	20.5	23	11.9	
3 High school	780	41.0	87	45.1	
4 Community college	208	10.9	26	13.5	
5 4-year University or higher	467	24.5	55	28.5	
\ge					***
Mean	37	.6	33	2.9	
Median	35	5.0	30	0.0	
nco <b>me (Korean Won</b> )					**
Mean	19	6.8	22	25.2	
Median	11	2.4	20	0.0	
Commute					**
0 No	693	36.3	50	<b>25.9</b>	
1 Yes	1214	63.7	143	74.1	
Daytime Activity					**
1 Mostly at home	552	27.9	33	17.5	
2 Mostly at school	345	18.5	52	27.5	
3 Mostly at work	1001	53.6	104	55.0	
lighttime activity					
1 Almost everyday	252	13.2	35	18.1	
2 Once in two or three dats	267	14.0	35	18.1	
3 Once a week	363	19.1	35	18.1	
4 Once or twice a month	483	25.4	51	26.4	
5 Hardly ever	418	22.0	28	14.5	
6 Never	121	6.4	9	4.2	
Self defense activity					**
Mean	8.	16	8.	94	
Median	7	,	:	8	
leighbor					
Mean	13	.08	12	.85	
Median	7	,	1	3	
leighborhood					***
Mean	8.:	21	8.	87	
Median	8	3		9	
Police work	-				•
Mean	7.1	73	7.	45	
Median	£	1		8	

# Table 7. Victims' characteristics of Personal level crime

Note: \* = p<.05, \*\*=p<.01, \*\*=p<001

analysis. The measure of marital status indicated that 54.5% of victims were single compared to 45.5% of married victims, which meant that the single was more vulnerable on the personal level victimization. The contingency table for educational level showed that almost 90 percent of victims had high school degree or higher. The higher the educational level, the higher the victimization. Among them, the person who completed high school is the most victimized (45.1% of total victims.) The mean age of victims was 32.9 years old, while nonvictims' average age was 37.6 years old. The formal research also shows that age is one of the most striking indicators of crime victimization (Hindelang, et al., 1977; Markides & Tracy, 1976), and this study also showed the victims were more likely to be the young on the personal level victimization in Korea. Related to the average household income of the victims, 2,225,200 Korean Won (\$1.00 = 1,300 Won, in February, 2002) a month, which was almost 10% higher than nonvictims' household monthly income. The higher socio-economical status, the more the victimization of personal level victimization in Korea.

Almost three quarters of victims were commuting, while 63.7% of nonvictims did stayed home or at school. This result indicated that many crimes occurred when the people commuted or were away from home. More than half of victims (55%) spent their time at the working place when they were victimized, while twenty-seven percent (27%) of victims spent their time at school, and less than twenty percent (17.5%) of victims were victimized at home.

Four measures of 'guardianship' are included in the analysis. Cohen and Felson (1979) created the individual activity ratio to indicate the extent to which individuals are 'unprotected' by perception of their environment. The person's self defense activities, their perception towards the neighborhood, and the perception towards the police work were significantly related in the personal level victimization.

#### Victims' Characteristics on sexual victimization

Table 8 provides baseline data on the victims of sexual victimization sampled for this study. As shown in the table, some characteristics are vastly different between victims and non-victims. The sexual victimization was affected by the victims' marital status (p<.001), educational level (p<.01), age (p<.001), commute (p<.001), daytime activity (p<.001), nighttime activity (p<.001), self defense activity (p<.05), perception towards the neighbor (p<.05), perception towards the neighborhood (p<.01), and perception towards the police work (p<.001) were significantly related to the personal level victimization.

Table 8 showed that over 85 percent of the female victims were single, while almost half of non-victims were single. The persons with higher educational background were more likely to be victimized than with lower educational background, while there were 5 percent of non-victims who had never been to school. The average of victims was 25.5 years old, comparing to the non-victim's average age of 38.1 years old. This result showed that young women were more vulnerable to sexual crime.

According to the results, the person with higher household income was victimized more than with lower household income. The average household level income of victims was almost 10 percent higher than non-victims' average household income. Almost 80 percent of sexual crime occurred outside the home during the daytime, since 46.7 percent of victims were at work place and 3 percent of victims were at school. Nighttime activities were also significantly affected to the sexual victimization. Almost 80 percent of victims were going out more than once or more a month at night, while over 40 percent of non-victims

•	Victimization				
	N	10	Y	ES	
	Ν	%	Ν	%	
Marital Status					***
0 Not married	410	41.8	52	85.2	
1 Married	572	58.2	9	14.8	
Employment					
0 No	527	54.3	35	57.4	
1 Yes	444	45.7	26	42.6	
Educational Level					**
1 Never been school	45	4.6	0	0.0	
2 Less than high school	231	23.5	3	4.9	
3 High school	410	41.8	28	45.9	
4 Community college	106	10.8	12	19.7	
5 4-year University or higher	190	19.3	18	29.5	
Age					***
Mean	3	8.1	2	5.5	
Median	3	5.0	2	2.0	
Income (Korean Won)					
Mean	19	5.4	21	4.7	
Median	18	0.0	20	0.0	
Commute					***
0 No	483	49.1	15	24.6	
1 Yes	500	5.9	46	75.4	
Daytime Activity					***
1 Mostly at home	404	42.0	44	18.3	
2 Mostly at school	159	16.5	21	35.0	
3 Mostly at work	400	41.5	28	46.7	
Nighttime activity					***
1 Almost everyday	86	8.8	12	19.7	
2 Once in two or three days	78	8.0	11	18	
3 Once a week	142	14.5	12	19.7	
4 Once or twice a month	266	27.1	19	31.1	
5 Hardly ever	315	32.1	7	11.5	
6 Never	94	9.6	0	0	
Self defense activity					•
Mean	9.	.69	10	.67	
Median		9	-	10	
Neighbor					•
Mean	13	.19	12	. 16	
Median		14	1	2	
Neighborhood					**
Mean	8.	.22	9.	.13	
Median		8		9	
Police work					***
Mean	7.	.78	6.	.98	
Median		8		7	

# Table 8. Victims' characteristic of Sexual Crime

Note: \* = p<.05, \*\*=p<.01, \*\*\* =p<.001

answered about their nighttime activities as 'hardly ever or never.'

For measuring the guardianship factors, the victim's self-defense activity, perception towards the neighbor, neighborhood, and the police work are significantly related to the sexual victimization.

#### The predictors of routine activities of victims on personal level

#### victimization

After examining the difference of routine activities on between victims and non-victims, the following section examines the predictors of routine activities of all victims on personal level victimization using logistical regression (Refer to table 9). The bivariate models used earlier do not statistically control for the effects of multiple variables on routine activities, logistic regression models are used to examine the effects of victims' routine activities on the personal level victimization.

Logistic regression is the most appropriate method if analysis for two reasons (Aldrich & Nelson, 1984; Hanushek & Jackson, 1977). First, the operationalizations include both continuous and categorical variables. Second, the measure of victimization is a skewed dichotomous variable. This allows a

clearer examination of the factors that may attribute to victims being victimized under certain conditions. The aim to see whether the routine activity of victims is contingent upon their routine activity itself, or other characteristics of victims. The findings from the logistic regression analysis of the effects of routine activities on personal level victimization experiences appear in Table 9 and are guite mixed. For instance, two proximities to demographic measures (employment and household income), one lifestyle measure (daytime activity), and two guardianship measures (self-defense activity and perception towards neighborhood) are associated with personal level victimization experience. The employed person carries a higher risk of victimization on personal level crimes. Also, the person who has higher household income is more likely to be victimized on the personal level victimization. Among the lifestyle factors, the daytime activity was the only significant factor. The persons who spent more time outside during the daytime were more likely to be victimized on personal level crime. The person who was doing or having self-defense activity has less chance to be victimized. It meant that self-defense activity was helpful to prevent victimization from personal level crime. Perception toward their neighborhoods was also significant.

		Full Model			
Variable	В	S.E	Exp (B)		
Constant	-3.61	0.81			
Gender	-0.02	0.20	0.9928		
Age	-0.01	0.01	1.0046		
Marital Status	0.08	0.23	0.7449		
Employment	-0.43	0.22	0.7736	•	
Educational level	0.01	0.03	1.0490		
Household Income (Korean Won)	0.00	0.00	1.0014	**	
Commute	0.00	0.27	1.2303		
Daytime Activity	-0.75	0.32	0.2938	*	
Nighttime Activity	0.12	0.18	1.0447		
Self-Defense Activity	0.08	0.03	1.0487	**	
Perception towards Neighbor	0.01	0.03	1.0494		
Perception towards Neighborhood	0.15	0.04	1.1550	***	
Perception towards police work	-0.06	0.05	0.9050		
Log-likelihood	1170.6	6			
Chi-square	52.74	1			
R-square	0.1				

# Table 9. Characteristics of Victims Regressed on the Number of Conditions(Personal level victimization)

\* p<.05, \*\* p<.01, \*\*\* p<.001.

# The R square of personal level victimization indicates that 10 percent of

the variance in personal level crime was explained by the independent variables.

In summary, employment status, household income, daytime activity,

self-defense activity, and perception toward the neighborhoods were identified as

significant predictors of victimization of personal level crime.

	Full Model			
Variable	В	S.E	Exp(B)	
Constant	-1.06	1.48		
Age	-0.04	0.02	0.9588	*
Marital Status	-1.51	0.46	0.1745	**
Employment	0.13	0.33	1.6796	*
Educational Level	0.02	0.10	1.0320	*
Household Income (Korean Won)	0.00	0.00	1.0007	**
Commute	-0.49	0.55	0.7979	
Daytime Activity	-0.29	0.60	1.4361	
Nighttime Activity	0.08	0.32	1.2606	
Self-Defense Activity	0.08	0.05	1.1106	
Perception towards Neighbor	-0.02	0.05	0.9884	
Perception towards Neighborhood	0.14	0.08	1.1612	
Perception towards police work	-0.19	0.10	0.9073	*
Log-likelihood	427.	21		
Chi-square	71.6	58		
R-square	0.2	0		

Table 10. Characteristics of Victims Regressed on the Number of Conditions(Sexual victimization)

# The predictors of routine activities of victims on sexual victimization

The findings from the logistic regression analysis of the effects of routine activities on sexual level victimization experiences appear in Table 10. The result shows that age, marital status, employment status, educational level, household level income, and perception towards police work were significant factors to predict victimization of the sexual crime.

According to the result, the employed person carries a higher risk of

victimization on sexual level crimes. Also, the person who has higher household income is more likely to be victimized on the sexual level victimization characteristics. The age variable is also showed significant statistical result. It means that the younger female individual is more likely to be victimized on the sex-related crime. Marital status is also the important factor to predict the victimization on the sex crime, which means that the single are more vulnerable on this type of crime. On the sexual victimization, no life style shows statistically significant in this study. Perception towards police work is statistically significant. The persons who have been victimized have more negative perception towards the police work.

The R square of sexual level victimization indicates that 20 percent of observed variability in sexual level crime was explained by the independent variables.

In summary, age, marital status, employment status, household income, and perception toward police work were identified as significant predictors of victimization of sexual level crime.

#### Conclusion

The popularity of the routine activity approach for the explanation of victimization and crime rates has dramatically increased in the last few years. Social differentiation in the likelihood of victimization is commonly attributed to differences in routine activities/lifestyles that place suitable targets who lack guardianship on proximity to motivated offenders.

This study used theory and research on personal level crimes to provide conceptualizations of central concepts from a routine activities approach to criminal victimization. By laying out this framework, it was able to assess the importance of individual characteristics in personal level victimization.

The primary question addressed in this study was "there is a relationship between the personal victimization and routine activities." The result of this study suggest that routine activities are a population vulnerable to crime victimization, and the some routine activities that characterize the personal lifestyle contribute to the victimization of personal level victimization.

Based on the logistic regression results, it appears that demographic factor has a significant amount of explanatory potential when it comes to influences over women's sexual victimization. Variation in the personal level

incidences of larceny, robbery, and assault appears to be result of a variety of demographic factors (such as employment status, household income), a lifestyle factor (such as daytime activity), and guardianship factors (such as perception towards their neighborhood, and self-defense activities). On the other hand, variation in the sexual level victimization appears to the result of a variety of demographic factors (such as age, marital status, employment status, and household income) and a guardianship factor (such as perception towards police work). These indicators provide support for routine activity explanations for personal level victimization in Korea.

Additionally, and of equal importance, are the measures that are not important predictors of personal level victimization. As previous research has shown, lifestyle factors are influential in aiding to our understanding of personal level victimization determinants, however, in this study, these factors are not influential in the personal level victimization in Korea. This is of particular interest because it is the contention of routine activity scholars that the effects of a person's status on his or her risk of victimization will be negated when personal lifestyle characteristics and activities are considered. This research provides strong support for the notion that it is not whom the persons are that determines

their chances for victimization but rather what they do, where they are, and with whom they come in contact.

In personal level crimes, this study found that the single who is working is more likely to be a victim. However, as shown before, most females are faced on the sexual crime threat, since the employment status, daytime activities, nighttime activities, and other independent variables are statistically significant on the sexual victimization. Most people think that the sexual crime is most occurred at home, but this study shows that the home is the safest place since there was no victimization at home.

Interestingly, the big difference between the western society and Korea is that gender is not the significant variable to predict the victimization, while most studies conducted in the western society have shown the gender is the most significant variable to measure the personal level victimization.

Although these findings provide for a clear and relatively thorough understanding of victimization risks in Korea, they must be viewed in light of limitations of this study. There are some problems shown in victim survey. First possible problem is *cost of large samples*. It is indicated that most large-scale public opinion surveys are conducted with sample sized of less than a thousand

or two. Victim surveys require such large samples because there are few crime cases shown among the sample. This means that the most majority of respondents are not likely to have been victimized in the past year or six months, it becomes necessary to interview large numbers to get only a few victims. Glaser (1978) explains that by using official statistics one must survey ten respondents to obtain one victim. For more rare victimizations such as rape, even larger numbers are needed to obtain a few cases. Also, because sampling error is proportionate to the size of the sample instead of the size of the population being sampled, one often needs as large a sample to estimate victimizations in small or large cities as would be necessary for the entire nation.

Second, *false reports* on the part of respondents may produce erroneous victim data. Some falsity in victim reports should be expected according to Levine (1976), who found that respondents were inaccurate in disclosing behavior with respect to voting, finances, business practices, sexual behavior, academic performance, and other activities. Certainly, one would be overoptimistic in assuming greater accuracy in recall of criminal victimization.

*Mistaken reporting* is another source of error in victim surveys. Thomas' "definition of the situation" holds that, if individuals inaccurately feel that a situation is real, it is nevertheless real in its consequences (Thomas & Swaine,

1928). A person who has lost something may inaccurately but honestly, believe it was stolen. *Poor memory* on the part of those surveyed is another potential limitation in surveying possible victims of crime. Memory failure, or recall decay, refers to the phenomenon of progressive memory loss as the distance increase s between the time of the event and the time of the interview concerning the event.

A principal type of memory fading in victim surveys is *telescoping* – the tendency of respondents to move forward and report as having occurred event that actually took place before the reference period. That is, a crime that happened two years ago is mistakenly reported as having taken places within the last six months. *Overreporting* in victimization surveys may be accounted for by the fact that when asked, respondents will report to interviewers acts that they ordinarily would regard as too trivial or unimportant to warrant police attention. Much of the deep, dark figure of crime consists of minor property crime, a good proportion of which would most likely have been unfounded by police (Black, 1970).

There is another possible limitation that is shown in this study, since this study is using the secondary data. The major disadvantages of secondary

sources analysis are as follows: First, sometimes the purpose of the original data collection is incidentally related to the researcher's goals and interests. Specific questions that researchers would prefer to ask may not be included in available data. Second, there is no way that researchers can reconstruct missing data in available secondary data. Data reliability can be affected by the nonresponse and the incompleteness of information, which may be an important limitation. Third, researchers must often speculate about the meaning of phraseology in various documents, and they lack the opportunity of obtaining further clarification from respondents. And finally, researchers must devise codes to classify the contents of documents a nalyzed. If their analyses are conducted over time, it is possible that missing information may exist frustrating their coding efforts.

Despite the shortcomings of victim surveys and secondary data analysis that have been elaborated, it should be pointed out the no method of data gathering is perfect. Many of these sources of error are not the sole province of victim surveys, but may apply equally to some of the other techniques of data gathering. Victim surveys are a relatively young endeavor in criminal justice. Much has already been learned, and much has yet to be learned in future methodological analyses. This study tests an important body of theory within victimization research that is commonly accepted but not well supported on the victimized situation in Korea. A strong case has be made a strong case that different opportunity structures exist for personal level victimization and that multi-level analysis reveals the complexity of the opportunity structures of crime events. Also, differences in the opportunity structures underlying the personal level crimes, included larceny, burglary, assault, and sexual crimes, in large part account for differences in the ability of the routine activity theory to explain them.

The answers given to the research question in this article raise some meaningful questions for future research. Based on the answers, future research should focus on the effects of heterogeneity in the patterns of routine activities. First, questions about the effects of more detailed indicators of people's routine activities should be put on the agenda of victimological research in a life history approach. Second, the scope of future studies can be testing more dynamic hypotheses derived from routine activity theory. As some scholars have argued, a individual's risk of victimization will be related not only to patterns of routine activities but also to changes in these patterns.

In conclusion, the findings of this article stress the importance of the

developments in criminology toward more studies in criminal victimization in Korea. It is hope that future studies on victimization will make frequent use of the routine activity approach, so that they can provide powerful insights into the causal process behind criminal victimization. Replications will also give insight in whether the results of this study are specific for the Koreans or even for the data set used. APPENDICES

Appendix A. Survey Questionnaire (Korean Version)

한국의 범죄피해에 대한 조사

안녕하십니까? 한국형사정책연구원은 여러 가지 범죄현상을 연 구하고 범죄에 대한 대책을 마련하고자 정부에서 만든 연구기관 입니다. 저희 연구원에서는 우리 국민들이 얼마나 많은 범죄피해 를 입고 있는지 파악하기 위하여 정기적으로 '한국의 범죄피해에 대한 조사'를 수행하고 있습니다.

이 조사는 1991년에 처음 실시된 이래 네번째 실시되는 것으로 국민 여러분께서 범죄에 대한 두려움 없이 안전한 사회생활을 영 위할 수 있도록 범죄발생을 억제하고 범죄피해에 대한 예방책을 마련하고자 하는 목적을 가지고 있습니다.

이 조사에서는 응답자의 비밀이 완전히 보장됩니다. 귀하가 조 사대상자로 선정된 것은 제비뽑기 식으로 이루어졌을 뿐만 아니 라 조사결과도 무기명으로 통계적으로 처리되기 때문에 개인 신 상에 대해서는 전혀 밝혀지지 않습니다. 또한 연구결과는 순수한 학문적 연구목적 이외에는 전혀 사용되지 않을 것입니다.

응답자로 선정된 귀하의 성의있는 답변은 귀하를 비롯하여 주 위의 여러 사람들이 당할 수 있는 범죄피해를 줄이고 범죄에 대 한 여러 가지 대책을 마련하기 위하여 반드시 필요하오니, 부디 협조하여 주시기 바랍니다. 바쁘신 중에도 귀중한 시간을 내어 저희 연구에 협조하여 주신 데 대하여 감사드립니다.

> 1999년 5월 일 한국형사정책연구원

이 조사는 한국형사정책연구원의 범죄동향연구팀에서 주관하 고 있습니다. 조사와 관련하여 의문사항이 있으시면 언제든지 아 래로 연락하여 주시기 바랍니다.

한국형사정책연구원 범죄동향연구팀 (전화 02-575-5288)

# <응답시 주의사항>

이 질문지는 흰색과 노란색으로 구분되는 2개의 부분으로 이루 어져 있습니다. 먼저 이것을 확인하여 주십시오.

첫째, 자료분석을 위하여 귀하에 대한 몇 가지 질문과 귀하의 일상생활에 대하여 간략하게 여쭈어 보고자 합니다. 또한 귀하께 서 <u>작년 1년 동안(1998년 1월 1일부터 1998년 12월 31일까지)</u> 여 러 가지 범죄로부터 피해를 당한 적이 있는지에 대하여 여쭈어 보도록 하겠습니다. 이 부분은 질문지 가운데 <u>흰색</u>으로 되어 있 으며 질문지를 받으신 <u>모든 분께서 빠짐없이 대답</u>해 주셔야 하는 부분입니다.

둘째, 작년 1년 동안 <u>범죄로부터 피해를 당한 경험이 있는 분</u> 들에 한하여 각각의 범죄에 대하여 약간의 추가적인 질문을 드리 고자 합니다. 이 부분은 질문지 가운데 <u>노란색</u>으로 되어 있으며, 앞의 흰색 부분에서 범죄피해가 있었다고 대답한 분들께서 자신 이 경험한 범죄피해에 대하여 추가적인 대답을 해주셔야 하는 부 분입니다.

이 질문들에 대한 귀하의 솔직한 응답은 범죄없는 밝은 우리사 회를 건설하기 위하여 반드시 필요하오니, 다소의 번거로움이 있 더라도 성실하게 대답하여 주시기를 다시 한번 간곡히 부탁드립 니다. 감사합니다.

\*\*\* 이 선 아래는 전산처리를 위한 것이니 기재하지 마십시오

	지역	번호		일련	번호	카드
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
						1

\* 먼저 우리 사회의 범죄현상에 대해 귀하의 의견을 여쭈어 보겠습니다.

귀하는 범죄사건에 대한 소식이나 내용을 주로 무엇을 통해 얻고 있습니까?
 (한가지만 표시하여 주시기 바랍니다)

1) 가족	2) 친구	3) 이웃
4) 신문	5) 텔레비전	6) 라디오
7) 잡지	8) 기타(구체적으	으로:)

- 귀하가 생각하기에 최근 몇년 사이 우리나라 전체의 범죄발생 추세가 어떻게 되었다고 보십니까?
  - \_\_\_\_ 1) 크게 중가하였다
  - \_\_\_\_ 2) 중가한 편이다
  - \_\_\_\_ 3) 그저 그렇다
  - \_\_\_\_ 4) 감소한 편이다
  - \_\_\_\_ 5) 크게 감소하였다
- 귀하가 생각하기에 최근 몇년 사이 살고 있는 동네의 범죄발생 추세가 어떻게 되었다고 보십니까?
  - \_\_\_\_ 1) 크게 중가하였다
  - \_\_\_\_ 2) 중가한 편이다
  - \_\_\_\_ 3) 그저 그렇다
  - \_\_\_\_ 4) 감소한 편이다
  - \_\_\_\_ 5) 크게 감소하였다
- 귀하는 다음 중에서 우리나라에서 가장 문제가 되는 범죄는 무엇이라고 생각하 십니까? (한가지만 표시하여 주시기 바랍니다)

1	2	3	4	1
8	9	10	11	12

- 5. 귀하가 사시는 집 근처의 거리를 밤중에 혼자 걸을 때 귀하는 얼마나 두려움을 느끼십니까?
  - \_\_\_\_ 1) 매우 두렵다
  - \_\_\_\_ 2) 두려운 편이다
  - \_\_\_\_ 3) 그저 그렇다
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 4) 두렵지 않은 편이다
  - \_\_\_\_ 5) 전혀 두렵지 않다
- 6. 모든 사람들은 자기가 범죄피해를 당할지도 모른다는 두려움을 가지고 있습니다. 다음은 귀하의 일상생활에서 평소에 느끼는 범죄피해에 대한 두려움을 묻는 문항 입니다. 왼쪽의 항목을 읽어보시고 오른쪽에 귀하께서 느끼는 두려움의 정도를 표 시해 주십시오.

	<ol> <li>①전혀</li> </ol>	②그렇지	③그런	④매우
	그렇지	않은	편이다	그렇다
	않다	편이다		
가) 자동차나 자동차의 부속품을 도난				
당할까봐 두렵다				
나) 집을 비운 사이에 도둑이 들어와서				
돈이나 물건을 훔쳐갈까봐 두렵다				
다) 집안에 강도가 침입하여 가족을				
위협하거나 폭행하여 돈이나 물건을				
빼앗아갈까봐 두렵다				
라) 집밖에서 소매치기, 날치기, 들치기 둥을				
당하여 돈이나 물건을 잃어버릴까봐 두렵다				
마) 집밖에서 강도에게 위협이나 폭행을				
당하여 돈이나 물건을 빼앗길까봐 두렵다				
바) 누군가에게 속아서 돈이나 재산을 사기				
당할까봐 두렵다				
사) 폭행을 당하여 피해를 입을까봐 두렵다			<del></del>	
아) 성폭행이나 성회롱을 당할까봐 두렵다				<u></u>

5	6-가 나		다	라	마	바	사	아
13	3 14 15		16	17	18	19	20	21
				1				

7. 귀하는 범죄피해로부터 귀하와 귀하의 집을 보호하기 위해 다음과 같은 조치를 취 하신 적이 있으십니까?

	①그렇다	②아니다
가) 밤에 잘 때 꼭 창문까지 잠그고 잔다		
나) 현관이나 창문에 이중자물쇠를 설치하였다		
다) 창문밖에 쇠창살을 설치하였다		
라) 비디오폰을 설치하였다		
마) 관할 경찰서(파출소)에 비상벨, 방범전화를 연결하였다		
바) 민간경비회사와 경비계약을 맺고 있다		
사) 이사를 갈 경우 그 동네의 치안문제에 신경을 쓴다		

8. 귀하는 만약을 대비해서 호신도구를 가지고 다니십니까? 호신도구를 가지고 다니신다면 어떠한 것입니까? (한가지만 표시해 주십시오)

\_\_\_\_ 0) 가지고 다니지 않는다

1) 호루라기	2) 스프레이
3) 손전둥	4) 가스총
5) 몽둥이	6) 칼
7) 공기총	8) 기타(구체적으로 :)

9. 귀하께서는 범죄피해로부터 자신을 보호하기 위해서 다음과 같은 조치를 얼마나

취하십니까?	①전혀 ②가끔 ③자주 ④항상
	그렇지 그렇다 그렇다 그렇다
	않다
가) 범죄피해를 당할까봐 어떤 곳을 피해 다닌다	
나) 밤에 혼자 다니기 무서워 누군가와 같이 다닌다	
다) 밤에 일이 있어도 밖에 나가기가 무서워서	
그 일을 다음으로 미룬다	
라) 되도록 현금을 갖고 다니지 않는다	
마) 밤에는 혼자 택시를 타지 않는다	
바) 하루 이틀 정도 집을 비워 놓았을 때 이웃집에	
돌보아 달라고 부탁한다	
사) 민간방범대원활동을 하는 등 범죄예방활동에	
직접 참여한다	

7-가 나 다 라 마 바 사 8 9-가 나 다 라 마 바 사 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36

- 10. 귀하가 살고 있는 집에 강도가 침입하거나 도둑이 들 가능성은 어느 정도라고 생각하십니까?
  - \_\_\_\_ 1) 아주 높다
  - \_\_\_\_ 2) 높은 편이다
  - \_\_\_\_ 3) 그저 그렇다
  - \_\_\_\_ 4) 낮은 편이다
  - \_\_\_\_ 5) 아주 낮다
- 11. 귀하는 개인적으로 강도나 절도, 소매치기, 폭행, 성폭력 등의 범죄에 피해를 입을 가능성은 어느 정도라고 생각하십니까?
  - \_\_\_\_ 1) 아주 높다
  - \_\_\_\_ 2) 높은 편이다
  - \_\_\_\_ 3) 그저 그렇다
  - \_\_\_\_ 4) 낮은 편이다
  - \_\_\_\_ 5) 아주 낮다

\* 다음은 귀하의 신상에 대해 몇 가지 사항을 여쭈어 보겠습니다.

- 1. 귀하의 성별은 무엇입니까?
  - \_\_\_\_ 1) 남자 \_\_\_\_ 2) 여자
- 2. 귀하의 나이는 만 나이로 몇 세입니까? 만 \_\_\_\_\_ 세
- 3. 귀하의 결혼상태는 어떠합니까?
  - \_\_\_\_ 1) 미혼 \_\_\_\_\_ 2) 기혼 동거
  - \_\_\_\_ 3) 기혼 별거 \_\_\_\_ 4) 이혼
  - \_\_\_\_ 5) 배우자 사별

\_\_\_\_ 6) 기타(구체적으로 : \_\_\_\_\_)

10	11	#	1	2		3
37	38	39	40	41	42	43
		2				

4. 귀하와 같이 살고 있는 사람(가족)은 본인을 포함하여 모두 몇 사람입니까?

- 가) 20세 미만 남자 \_\_\_\_\_ 명, 여자 \_\_\_\_\_ 명
- 나) 20세-64세 남자 \_\_\_\_\_ 명, 여자 \_\_\_\_\_ 명
- 다) 65세 이상 남자 \_\_\_\_\_ 명, 여자 \_\_\_\_\_ 명
- 5. 귀하의 가족내 위치는 무엇입니까?
  - \_\_\_\_ 1) 세대주
  - \_\_\_\_ 2) 세대주의 배우자
  - \_\_\_\_ 3) 세대주의 부모(장인·장모 포함)
  - \_\_\_\_ 4) 세대주의 형제자매(시동생 처남 포함)
  - \_\_\_\_ 5) 세대주의 자녀(며느리·사위 포함)
  - \_\_\_\_ 6) 기타(구체적으로 : \_\_\_\_\_ )
- 6. 귀하는 현재 살고 있는 동네에서 얼마나 오래 거주하고 있습니까?
   \_\_\_\_\_(년)
- 7. 귀하께서는 어디까지 학교를 다니셨습니까?
  - \_\_\_\_ 1) 무학, 학교에 다닌 적이 없다
  - \_\_\_\_ 2) 초등학교 \_\_\_\_ 3) 중학교
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 4) 고등학교 \_\_\_\_\_ 5) 전문대학
  - \_\_\_\_ 6) 4년제 대학 \_\_\_\_ 7) 대학원 이상
  - 7-1. 그 학교를 졸업하셨습니까?
    - \_\_\_\_ 1) 졸업 \_\_\_\_ 2) 중퇴 \_\_\_\_ 3) 재학중 \_\_\_\_ 4) 비해당
- 8. 귀하나 가족은 자동차(자가용, 승용차, 승합차, 트럭 등)를 소유하고 있습니까? ① 있다 ② 없다
  - 가) 본인 \_\_\_\_ \_\_\_ \_\_\_ 나) 가족(본인 포함) \_\_\_\_ \_\_\_

4-フト	-(남)	가-	(व)	4-	(남)	4-	(વ)	다-	(남)	다-	(여)	5	(	3	7	7-1	8- 가	ч
44	45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60	61	62
< 직업범주표 : 다음 페이지 9번 문항의 보기 >

<전문·기술직> 01) 자연 및 기술 관련 엔지니어 02) 대학교수, 연구원 03) 의사, 치과의사, 한의사 04) 수의사, 약사 06) 회계사, 변호사, 판사, 검사 05) 간호사 07) 교사 08) 종교인 10) 체육인, 예술가, 연예인 12) 기타 전문직(학원강사, 번역 등) 09) 언론인, 방송인 11) 항공기·선박 승무원 <행정·관리직> 21) 기업체 경영주(5인 이상 고용) 22) 대기업체 간부(부장 이상) 23) 고급공무원(중앙관서 과장, 지방관서 국장 이상) 25) 군인(소령이상), 경찰(경정이상) 24) 사회단체간부 26) 사무관련 사업체 경영주(5인 미만 고용) 27) 기타 행정·관리직 <사무직> 32) 일반공무원(사무관 이하) 31) 일반사무직원(과장 이하) 33) 사회단체 직원 34) 경리 및 출납원 35) 운송 및 통신관리원 36) 전화 및 우편 사무원 37) 군인(위관급, 하사관), 경찰(경감이하), 소방수, 간수 38) 기타 사무직 <판매직> 41) 소.도매 상인(5인미만 고용) 42) 판매점원 43) 부동산 중개인 44) 판매대리인 및 외판원 45) 행상, 노점상 46) 기타 판매직 주인 <서비스직> 52) 음식점, 여관 등의 종업원 54) 청소원, 파출부 56) 기타 서비스지 즉이(사지고 51) 음식점, 여관 등의 주인 53) 이.미용사, 세탁소, 목욕탕 55) 보안엄무 종사자, 수위, 경비 56) 기타 서비스직 주인(사진관 등) <농·어업직> 

 61) 부농(2정보, 6000평이상)
 62) 중농(1-2정보, 3000-5999평)

 63) 소농(0.5-1정보, 1500-2999평)
 64) 빈농(0.5정보,1500평미만), 소작농

 65) 농업노동자, 품일꾼
 66) 낙농업자, 양계, 원예, 과수원

 67) 선주 및 수산양식업자 68) 어부 및 수산업 종사자 69) 기타 농어업직 <생산직> 71) 생산직 사업체 경영자(5인 미만), 생산감독(주임 및 반장) 72) 숙련기능공 73) 견습공, 비숙련공 75) 운전사 (자동차, 중장비) 74) 막노동자, 단순노무자 77) 기타 생산직 76) 광부 <미취업> 81) 학생 82) 주부 83) 군인(사병) 84) 무직(실업) 85) 정년퇴직, 연금생활자 86) 기타 미취업자 <분류불눙> 99) 분류불능(구체적으로 무엇 : \_\_\_\_

- 위하 본인과 귀댁 세대주의 현재 직업은 각각 무엇입니까? 본인이 세대주인 경우에 는 똑같이 표기하여 주시기 바랍니다. (옆 페이지의 직업범주표를 참고)
  - 가) 본인의 직업 : \_\_\_\_\_
  - 나) 세대주의 직업 : \_\_\_\_\_
- 10. 귀댁의 <u>월 평균 총수입(</u>상여금, 재산소득 등 포함)이 얼마인지 말씀해주십시오.
  - 가) 본인 소득 : \_\_\_\_\_ 만원
  - 나) 가구 전체소득 : \_\_\_\_\_ 만원
- 11. 귀하는 지금 어떤 집에서 살고 계십니까?
  - \_\_\_\_ 1) 자가(가족 소유 포함)
  - \_\_\_\_ 2) 전세(월세 없는 경우만)
  - \_\_\_\_ 3) 월세(보중부 월세 포함)
  - \_\_\_\_ 4) 기타(무상으로 세든 집 포함)
- 12. 우리 사회의 최하충을 1로 하고, 최상충을 7로 할 때 귀하는 어디에 속한다고 생각하십니까?

최하충		중간층				
F	1	1 1 N N		ť	1	· 1
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)

\* 다음은 귀하의 일상생활 및 주변 환경에 대하여 여쭈어 보겠습니다.

- 1. 귀하는 통근(출퇴근)이나 통학을 하고 있습니까?
  - \_\_\_\_ 1) 한다 (☞ 1-1번 문항으로)
  - \_\_\_\_ 2) 안한다 (☞ 2번 문항으로)

9-	가	9-	나	10-7}		10-나			11	12	#	1			
63	64	65	66	67	68	69	70	71	72	73	74	75	76	77	78
														3	

<통근·통학을 하는 경우>
1-1. 귀하께서는 몇 시에 집을 나가서 몇 시에 귀가하십니까?
(오전/오후) 시에 나가 (오전/오후) 시에 귀가
1-2. 통근 또는 통학하는데 걸리는 시간은 어느 정도입니까? 시간 분 정도
1-3. 직장이나 학교까지 가기 위해 <u>주로 이용하는</u> 교통수단은 무엇         입니까? (가장 주된 것 <u>한가지만</u> 표시해 주십시오)        01) 시내버스, 마을버스      02) 좌석버스        03) 시외버스      04) 통근버스, 통학버스        05) 전철, 지하철      06) 기차        09) 자전거      10) 걸어 다닌다

2. 귀하는 낮에 주로 어디에서 활동하십니까?

- \_\_\_\_ 1) 거의 집에 있다
- \_\_\_\_ 2) 거의 학교에 나간다
- \_\_\_\_ 3) 회사 사무실에서 근무한다
- \_\_\_\_ 4) 공장이나 현장에서 근무한다
- \_\_\_\_ 5) 시장이나 백화점과 같이 사람이 많이 오가는 장소에서 활동한다
- \_\_\_\_ 6) 거래처 사람을 만나기 위하여 많이 돌아다니는 편이다

3. 귀하는 작년(1998년)에 직장이나 학교 일로, 혹은 친구들과의 모임이 있어서
 늦게(대략 저녁 10시 이후) 집에 들어간 경우는 평균적으로 어느 정도입니까?

\_\_\_\_ 6) 거의 없음

- \_\_\_\_ 1) 거의 매일 \_\_\_\_\_ 2) 이삼일에 한번 정도
- \_\_\_\_ 3) 일주일에 한번 정도 \_\_\_\_ 4) 보름에 한번 정도
- \_\_\_\_ 5) 한달에 한번 정도
- \_\_\_\_ 7) 전혀 없음

카드 1-1				1-2			1-	-3	2	3	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
2											

- 4. 귀하의 댁에서는 작년(1998년)에 가족이 전부 외출하거나 출근하여 집을 비워둔 적 이 평균적으로 얼마나 자주 있었습니까?(맞벌이의 경우도 집을 비우면 이에 해당)
  - \_\_\_\_ 1) 일주일에 한번 이상 \_\_\_\_ 2) 한달에 한두번 정도
  - \_\_\_\_ 3) 두세달에 한두번 정도 \_\_\_\_ 4) 6개월에 한두번 정도
  - \_\_\_\_ 5) 일년에 한두번 정도 \_\_\_\_ 6) 거의 없음
  - \_\_\_\_ 7) 전혀 없음
- 5. 명절이나 휴가 때처럼 하루나 이틀 정도 집을 비워 놓으실 때는 집의 안전을 위해서 귀하는 다음 중 어떤 조치를 취하십니까?(한가지만 선택해 주십시오)
  - \_\_\_\_ 1) 아무 조치도 취하지 않는다
  - \_\_\_\_ 2) 신문이나 우유 등의 배달을 중지시킨다
  - \_\_\_\_ 3) 안에 사람이 있는 듯하게 위장하여 놓는다
  - \_\_\_\_ 4) 이웃집에 가끔 돌보아 달라고 부탁한다
  - \_\_\_\_ 5) 친척이나 가족 가운데 한 사람에게 집을 지키도록 부탁한다
  - \_\_\_\_ 6) 아파트 경비에게 알린다
  - \_\_\_\_ 7) 민간에서 운영하는 경비회사에 경비를 맡긴다
  - \_\_\_\_ 8) 기타(구체적으로 : \_\_\_\_\_\_ )
- 6. 귀하는 작년(1998년)에 쇼핑이나 시장을 보기 위하여 평균적으로 얼마나 자주 외출을 하셨습니까?
  - \_\_\_\_ 1) 거의 매일 \_\_\_\_\_ 2) 이삼일에 한번 정도
  - \_\_\_\_ 3) 일주일에 한번 정도 \_\_\_\_ 4) 보름에 한번 정도
  - \_\_\_\_ 5) 한달에 한번 정도 \_\_\_\_ 6) 거의 안함
  - \_\_\_\_ 7) 전혀 안함
- 7. 귀하가 통근이나 통학 이외의 일로 외출을 하는 경우에 주로 이용하는 교통수 단은 무엇입니까?(한가지만 표시하여 주십시오)
  - \_\_\_\_ 01) 일반 시내버스, 마을버스 \_\_\_\_ 02) 좌석버스
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 03) 시외버스 \_\_\_\_\_ 04) 통근버스, 통학버스 \_\_\_\_\_ 05) 전철, 지하철 \_\_\_\_\_ 06) 기차
  - \_\_\_\_ 07) 택시 \_\_\_\_ 08) 숭용차, 그레이스, 봉고 등
  - \_\_\_\_ 09) 자전거 \_\_\_\_\_ 10) 걸어 다닌다
  - \_\_\_\_ 11) 기타(구체적으로 : \_\_\_\_\_ )

4	5	6	7		
13	14	15	16	17	

8. 다음의 각 문장에 대하여 귀하의 경우는 여	어떠한지 밀	말씀해 주시:	기 바랍니디	7.
	①전혀	②그렇지	③그런	④매우
	그렇지	않은	편이다	그렇다
	않다	편이다		
가) 나는 외출할 때 정장보다 캐주얼을				
입는 경우가 많다				
나) 나는 외출할 때 수수한 것보다				
화려한 옷차림을 하는 경우가 많다		<u> </u>		
다) 나는 외출할 때 눈에 띄는 화려한				
악세사리를 하는 경우가 많다	<u> </u>	<u> </u>		
라) 나는 평소에 용돈을 많이 쓰는 편이다				
표시해 주시기 바랍니다.	-			
	①전혀	②그렇지	③그런	④매우
	그렇지	않은	편이다	그렇다
	않다	편이다		
가) 우리동네의 이웃사람들은 어려운				
일이 있으면 서로 잘 돕는다				
나) 이웃사람들은 서로서로 잘 알고				
지내는 편이다				
다) 이웃사람들은 물건을 빌려쓰고				
빌려주기도 한다				
라) 이웃사람들과 동네에서 일어나는				
일에 대해 자주 이야기한다				
마) 이웃사람들은 동네의 각종행사				
및 모임에 협조하여 참여한다				

8-7}	ч	다	라	9-가	ч	다	라	마
18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26

10. 다음은 귀하가 사시는 동네의 주변환경에	관한 🤅	질문입	니다. 잘	읽어보시고	해당
되는 곳에 표시하여 주시기 바랍니다.					
	(1	)전혀	②그렇지	③그런	④매우
	-	1렇지	않은	편이다	그렇다
		않다	편이다		
가) 우리동네에는 주위에 쓰레기가					
아무렇게나 버려져 있다					
나) 우리동네에는 사람이 살지 않은 채					
내버려 둔 빈집이나 빈터가 있다	-				
다) 우리동네에는 어둡고 후미진 곳이 많다					
라) 우리동네에는 불량청소년들이 자주					
모이는 장소가 있다	-				
<ol> <li>다음은 귀하가 살고 계시는 동네의 경찰</li> <li>니다. 귀하의 의견을 솔직히 말해주시기 </li> </ol>	발동에 귀 바랍니다	관한 7	]하의 의 <sup>;</sup>	견을 알아보	고자 합
	①전 <sup>·</sup>	혀 (	2)그렇지	③그런	④매우
	그렇	지	않은	편이다	그렇다
	않다	ŀ	편이다		
가) 우리 동네의 경찰들은 순찰활동을					
잘하고 있다		_			
나) 우리 집에 범죄사건이 발생하여 신고					
한다면 경찰은 즉시 출동할 것이다	····	_	<u> </u>	<del></del>	
다) 범죄사건이 발생하여 신고한다면					
경찰은 범인을 잡아 줄 것이다		-			

12. 귀하는 다음의 각 문장에 대하여 어떻게 생각하십니까?

- 가) 우리사회는 범죄로부터 안전하다
  - \_\_\_\_ l) 전적으로 동의한다
  - \_\_\_\_ 2) 동의하는 편이다
  - \_\_\_\_ 3) 그저 그렇다
  - \_\_\_\_ 4) 동의하지 않는 편이다
  - \_\_\_\_ 5) 전적으로 동의하지 않는다

10-7}	나	다	라	11 - 7}	나	다	12 - 가
27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34

- 나) 내가 사는 동네는 범죄로부터 안전하다
  - \_\_\_\_ l) 전적으로 동의한다
  - \_\_\_\_ 2) 동의하는 편이다
  - \_\_\_\_ 3) 그저 그렇다
  - \_\_\_\_ 4) 동의하지 않는 편이다
  - \_\_\_\_ 5) 전적으로 동의하지 않는다
- 다) 우리 집은 범죄로부터 안전하다
  - \_\_\_\_ 1) 전적으로 동의한다
  - \_\_\_\_ 2) 동의하는 편이다
  - \_\_\_\_ 3) 그저 그렇다
  - \_\_\_\_ 4) 동의하지 않는 편이다
  - \_\_\_\_ 5) 전적으로 동의하지 않는다

ч	다	#		
35	36	37		
		4		

\* 다음은 귀하가 당한 범죄피해를 생각하는데 도움이 되도록 몇가지 경험
 을 간단히 여쭈어 보겠습니다. 귀하가 <u>작년(1998년) 1년 동안</u> 당한 경험
 을 잘 생각하시어 대답해 주시기 바랍니다.

작년(1998년) 1년 동안에 귀하나 가족이 교통사고를 당한 경험이 있습니까?
 \_\_\_\_ 1) 있다 (☞ 1-1번 문항으로)
 \_\_\_\_ 2) 없다 (☞ 2번 문항으로)

1-1. 몇 번이었는지 말씀해 주십시오? \_\_\_\_\_ 번

 작년(1998년) 1년 동안에 귀하는 누군가에게 <u>속아서</u> 돈이나 재산을 주거나 빼앗긴 적(사기)이 있습니까? 강도나 절도를 당한 경우는 여기에 해당되지 않습니다.

- \_\_\_\_ 1) 있다 (☞ 2-1번 문항으로)
- \_\_\_\_ 2) 없다 (☞ 3번 문항으로)

< 그런 일이 있다고 대답한 경우 >	
----------------------	--

2-1. 몇 번이었는지 말씀해 주십시오? \_\_\_\_\_ 번

3. 작년(1998년) 1년 동안에 귀하가 경찰관이나 읍·면·동사무소, 군청, 시청 등의 공 무원에게 일을 잘 봐달라고 돈, 금품 등(뇌물)을 준 적이 있습니까?

- \_\_\_\_ 1) 있다 (☞ 3-1번 문항으로)
- \_\_\_\_ 2) 없다 (☞ 다음 페이지로)

-----< 그런 일이 있다고 대답한 경우 >------3-1. 몇 번이었는지 말씀해 주십시오? \_\_\_\_\_ 번

1	1-	-1	2	2-1		3	3-1		#
38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47
									5

\* 다음은 귀하께서 <u>작년 1년(1998년 1월 1일부터 1998년 12월 31일)동안</u> 당한 범죄 피해에 대하여 여쭈어 보겠습니다.

<ol> <li>작년(1998년)에 귀하의 가족이 사용하는 자동차의 부속품(카스테레오, 타이어, 엔 진 부품, 자동차 용품 등)을 도난당한 적이 있습니까?</li> <li> 0) 비해당(자동차를 소유하고 있지 않다)</li> <li> 1) 있다 (- 1-1번 문항으로)</li> <li> 2) 없다 (- 2번 문항으로)</li> </ol>
<ul> <li>&lt; 그런 일이 있다고 대답한 경우 &gt;</li> <li>1-1. 몇 번이었는지 말씀해 주십시오?</li> <li>☆ 노란색 부분에서 &lt;자동차 부품 절도&gt;에 대답하여 주십시오 ☆</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>2. 작년(1998년)에 귀하나 가족이 소유하고 있는 자동차(자가용, 승용차, 승합차, 트릭 등)를 도난 당한 일이 있습니까?</li> <li>0) 비해당(자동차를 소유하고 있지 않다)</li> <li>1) 있다 (☞ 2-1번 문항으로)</li> <li>2) 없다 (☞ 3번 문항으로)</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>&lt; 그런 일이 있다고 대답한 경우 &gt;</li> <li>2-1. 몇 번이었는지 말씀해 주십시오?</li> <li>☆ 노란색 부분에서 <u>&lt;자동차 절도&gt;</u>에 대답하여 주십시오 ☆</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>3. 작년(1998년)에 귀하의 집에 도둑이 들어와서 돈(현금, 수표, 유가중권 등)이나 물 (귀금속, 텔레비전, 오디오, 컴퓨터 등)을 몰래 훔쳐간 적이 있거나 훔쳐가고자 한 적이 있습니까? (단, 도둑이 가족을 위협하거나 폭행한 경우에는 이 문항에 해당 지 않습니다)</li> <li>1) 있다 (☞ 3-1번 문항으로)</li> <li>2) 없다 (☞ 4번 문항으로)</li> </ul>
< 그런 일이 있다고 대답한 경우 >

1	1-	-1	2	2-	-1	3	3-	-1
48	49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56

4	작년(1998년)에	귀하의	집에 깅	<b>}</b> 도가	침입하여	귀하의	가족을	위협하거니	┟ 폭행	하여
	돈(현금, 수표, ·	유가중권	등)이니	∤ 물건	(귀금속,	텔레비전	<u>년</u> , 오디오	, 컴퓨터	둥)을	빼앗
	아 간 적이 있거	너나 빼앗	아 가고	1자 한	적이 있는	습니까?				

\_\_\_\_ 1) 있다 (☞ 4-1번 문항으로)

\_\_\_\_ 2) 없다 (☞ 5번 문항으로)

< 그런 일이 있다고 대답한 경우 >	
4-1. 몇 번이었는지 말씀해 주십시오?	번
☆ 노란색 부분에서 <u>&lt;주거침입 강도&gt;</u> 에	대답하여 주십시오 ☆

5. 작년(1998년)에 귀하는 집 밖에서 소매치기나 날치기, 들치기 등을 당하여 돈(현금, 수표, 유가중권 등)이나 물건(귀금속, 시계, 핸드백, 가방, 카세트 등)을 잃어버린 적 이 있거나 잃어버릴 뻔한 적이 있습니까? (단, 폭행이나 협박이 있었던 경우는 이 문항에 해당되지 않습니다)

\_\_\_\_ 1) 있다 (☞ 5-1번 문항으로)

\_\_\_\_ 2) 없다 (☞ 6번 문항으로)

-----< 그런 일이 있다고 대답한 경우 >------5-1. 몇 번이었는지 말씀해 주십시오? \_\_\_\_\_ 번

\_\_\_\_ ☆ 노란색 부분에서 <u><대인 절도></u>에 대답하여 주십시오 ☆\_\_\_\_\_

- 6. 작년(1998년)에 귀하는 집 밖에서 강도에게 위협이나 폭행을 당하여 돈(현금, 수표, 유가증권 등)이나 물건(귀금속, 시계, 핸드백, 가방, 카세트 등)을 빼앗긴 적이 있거 나 빼앗길 뻔한 적이 있습니까?
  - \_\_\_\_ 1) 있다 (☞ 6-1번 문항으로)
  - \_\_\_\_ 2) 없다 (☞ 7번 문항으로)

< 그런 일이 있다고 대답한 경우 >---- 6-1. 몇 번이었는지 말씀해 주십시오?
 ★ 노란색 부분에서 <대인 강도>에 대답하여 주십시오 ☆ -----

 4
 4-1
 5
 5-1
 6
 6-1

 57
 58
 59
 60
 61
 62
 63
 64
 65

- 7. 작년(1998년)에 귀하는 누군가에게 폭행을 당하여 신체적 피해를 입은 적이 있거나 피해를 입을 뻔한 적이 있습니까? 단, 앞 문항에서 대답한 강도는 여기서 제외하여 주시기 바랍니다.
  - \_\_\_\_ 1) 있다 (☞ 7-1번 문항으로)
  - \_\_\_\_ 2) 없다 (☞ 8번 문항으로)
- < 그런 일이 있다고 대답한 경우 >
   7-1. 몇 번이었는지 말씀해 주십시오?
   ☆ 노란색 부분에서 <폭행 및 상해>에 대답하여 주십시오 ☆

< <u>다음 부분은 여자분들께만 해당되는 질문입니다</u> >
8. <u>작년(1998년)</u> 에 귀하는 누군가에게 <u>강간이나 성폭력 또는 성회롱</u> 을
당한 적이 있거나, 당할 뻔한 적이 있었습니까?
1) 있다 (☞ 8-1번 문항으로)
2) 없다
< 그런 일이 있다고 대답한 경우 >
8-1. 몇 번이었는지 말씀해 주십시오 번
☆ 노란색 부분에서 <u>&lt;성폭력 및 성회롱&gt;</u> 에 대답하여 주십시오 ☆
< 다음 페이지에 계속됩니다 >

\*\* 위에서 작년 1년(1998년) 동안 범죄로 피해를 입은 경험이 있다고 대답하신 분께서는 각 범죄에 대한 사항을 좀 더 자세히 여쭈어 보고자 하오니 번거로 우시더라도 잊지 마시고 노란색으로 된 부분의 해당되는 질문(☆로 표시)에 대 답하여 주시기 바랍니다. 위에서 질문 받으신 범죄로 인한 피해가 하나도 없으 신 분은 여기서 질문이 모두 끝났습니다. 귀하의 협조에 다시 한번 진심으로 감사드립니다.

7	7-	-1	8	8-	-1
66	67	68	69	70	71

< 노란색 부분 응답시 주의사항 및 응답해야 할 부분 >

노란색으로 된 부분은 앞(흰색으로 된 부분)에서 <u>작년에 범죄</u> <u>로부터 피해를 입은</u> 적이 있다고 하신 분들께서 대답하셔야 하는 부분입니다. 여기서는 귀하가 당한 범죄 피해의 내용에 대하여 몇 가지 구체적인 사항을 여쭈어 보도록 하겠습니다.

동일한 유형의 범죄에 의해 여러 번 피해를 입으신 분께서는 가장 나중에 일어난 일에 대해서 대답하여 주시기 바랍니다. 앞 에서 귀하가 피해를 당했다고 표시하신 범죄에 <u>해당하는 질문</u>에 대해 솔직하게 대답하여 주시기를 부탁드립니다.

앞에서 피해를 당했다고 표시하지 않은 범죄에 대한 질문은 대 답하지 마시기 바랍니다.

피해 입은 범죄의 내용	** 대답해주실 부분 **
< 자동차 부품 절도 >	노란색 2 - 3페이지
< 자동차 절도 >	노란색 4 - 5페이지
< 주거침입 절도 >	노란색 6 - 7페이지
< 주거침입 강도 >	노란색 8 - 11페이지
< 대인 절도 >	노란색 12 - 13페이지
< 대인 강도 >	노란색 14 - 17페이지
< 폭행 및 상해 >	노란색 18 - 21페이지
< 성폭력 및 성회롱 >	노란색 22 - 25페이지

----- < 자동차 부품 절도 > 귀하는 앞에서 <u>작년(1998년)</u>에 자동차 부품을 도난 당한 적이 있다고 대답하셨습니다. 그런 일이 여러 번 있을 경우에는 <u>가</u> <u>장 나중에 일어난 일에 대해서</u> 대답해 주시기 바랍니다.

- 1. 자동차 부품을 도난 당한 곳은 어디였습니까?
  - \_\_\_\_ 1) 주택가
  - \_\_\_\_ 2) 직장 근처의 업무지역
  - \_\_\_\_ 3) 시장, 백화점 근처의 상가지역
  - \_\_\_\_ 4) 공공주차장
  - \_\_\_\_ 5) 길가 임시주차
  - \_\_\_\_ 6) 그 밖의 곳(구체적으로 : \_\_\_\_\_\_)

2. 그 사건은 몇 월에 일어났습니까?

\_\_\_\_\_ 월

3. 그 사건이 일어난 시간은 대략 몇 시쯤입니까?

(오전 / 오후 ) \_\_\_\_\_ 시

4. 그때 도난 당한 부품은 다음 중 어떤 것입니까? (한가지만 표시하여 주십시오)

01) 엔진	02) 캬브레타
03) 밧데리(뱃터리)	04) 타이어, 스페어 타이어
05) 백미러	06) 깜박이 둥, 전구
07) 바퀴 캪	08) 자동차 수리 공구
09) 외부 장식용 악세사리	10) 내부 장식용 악세사리
11) 카 스테레오(오디오)	12) 기타(구체적으로 :)

5. 그때 도난 당한 부품은 값으로 따지면 대략 얼마나 됩니까?

\_\_\_\_ 만원

카드	1		2	:	3		1		Ę	5	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
3											

6. 그 사건을 경찰에 신고하셨습니까?

\_\_\_\_ 1) 신고했다 (☞ 6-1번, 6-2번 문항으로)

\_\_\_\_ 2) 신고하지 않았다 (☞ 6-3번 문항으로)

< 신고를 한 경우 >
6-1. 신고에 대하여 경찰은 어떠한 조치를 하였습니까?
\_\_\_\_\_1) 아무런 조치도 하지 않았다
\_\_\_\_\_2) 전화로 피해상황을 확인하였다
\_\_\_\_\_3) 직접 방문하여 피해내용을 확인하였다.
\_\_\_\_\_4) 적극적인 수사를 통하여 사건을 해결해 주었다.
6-2. 신고를 처리한 경찰의 조치에 만족하셨습니까?
\_\_\_\_\_1) 아주 만족하였다
\_\_\_\_\_1) 아주 만족하였다
\_\_\_\_\_3) 그저 그렇다
\_\_\_\_\_3) 그저 그렇다

\_\_\_\_ 4) 불만족한 편이었다

\_\_\_\_ 5) 아주 불만족하였다

< 신고를 하지 않은 경우 >
6-3. 왜 신고하지 않으셨습니까?
1) 피해가 심각하지 않았기 때문이다
2) 개인적으로 해결했기 때문이다
3) 중거가 없었기 때문이다
4) 다른 기관(예, 보험회사)에 신고하였기 때문이다
5) 경찰이 아무 조치도 취하지 않을 것 같았기 때문이다
6) 경찰에서 귀찮게 할 것 같았기 때문이다
7) 범인이 아는 사람이었기 때문이다
8) 보복이 두려워 감히 신고할 생각을 하지 못하였다
9) 기타(구체적으로 : \_\_\_\_\_\_)

6	6-1	6-2	6-3	#
13	14	15	16	17
				1

< 자동차 절도 >
 귀하는 앞에서 <u>작년(1998년)</u>에 자동차를 도난 당한 적이 있다
 고 대답하셨습니다. 그런 일이 여러 번 있을 경우에는 <u>가장</u>
 <u>나중에 일어난 일에 대해서</u> 대답해 주시기 바랍니다.

- 1. 자동차를 도난 당한 곳은 어디입니까?
  - \_\_\_ 1) 주택가
  - \_\_\_\_ 2) 직장 근처의 업무지역
  - \_\_\_\_ 3) 시장, 백화점 근처의 상가지역
  - \_\_\_\_ 4) 공공주차장
  - \_\_\_\_ 5) 길가 임시주차
  - \_\_\_\_ 6) 그 밖의 곳(구체적으로 : \_\_\_\_\_)
- 2. 그 사건은 몇 월에 일어났습니까?

## \_\_\_\_ 월

- 3. 그 사건이 일어난 시간은 대략 몇 시쯤입니까?
   (오전 / 오후) \_\_\_\_\_ 시
- 4. 그 차를 다시 찾으셨습니까?

   \_\_\_\_\_1) 다시 찾았다
   \_\_\_\_\_2) 찾지 못했다
- 5. 그 사건을 경찰에 신고하셨습니까?
  \_\_\_\_ 1) 신고했다 (☞ 5-1번, 5-2번 문항으로)
  \_\_\_\_ 2) 신고하지 않았다 (☞ 5-3번 문항으로)

18         19         20         21         22         23         24                    24	1	2		2 3			4	5
	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	

< 신고를 한 경우 >
5-1. 신고에 대하여 경찰은 어떠한 조치를 하였습니까?
1) 아무런 조치도 하지 않았다
2) 전화로 피해상황을 확인하였다
3) 직접 방문하여 피해내용을 확인하였다.
4) 적극적인 수사를 통하여 사건을 해결해 주었다.
5-2. 신고를 처리한 경찰의 조치에 만족하셨습니까?
l) 아주 만족하였다
2) 만족한 편이었다
3) 그저 그렇다
4) 불만족한 편이었다
5) 아주 불만족하였다



5-1	5-2	5-3	#	
25	26	27	28	
			2	

--- < 주거침입 절도 > 귀하는 앞에서 <u>작년(1998년)</u>에 집에 도둑이 든 적이 있다 고 대답하셨습니다. 그런 일이 여러 번 있을 경우에는 <u>가</u> <u>장 나중에 일어난 일에 대해서</u> 대답해 주시기 바랍니다.

1. 그 사건은 몇 월에 일어났습니까?

\_\_\_\_ 월

- 2. 그 사건이 일어난 시간은 대략 몇 시쯤입니까?
   (오전 / 오후) \_\_\_\_\_ 시
- 3. 그 때 집에는 모두 몇 사람이 있었습니까?
   남자 \_\_\_\_\_ 명과 여자 \_\_\_\_\_ 명

4. 잃어버린 물건은 다음 중 어떤 것입니까? (한가지만 표시하여 주십시오)

01) 텔레비전, 비디오, 전축	02) 카메라, 비디오 카메라
03) 시계, 반지 둥 귀금속	04) 현금, 수표, 유가중권
05) 미술품, 골동품	06) 가구, 병풍
07) 옷, 입을 것	08) 식료품, 먹을 것
09) 기타 가전제품	10) 벼, 보리 둥의 농산물
11) 기타(구체적으로 :)	

5. 잃어버린 돈이나 물건을 값으로 따지면 대략 얼마나 됩니까?

\_\_\_\_\_ 만원

6. 그 사건을 경찰에 신고하셨습니까?

- \_\_\_\_ 1) 신고했다 (☞ 6-1번, 6-2번 문항으로)
- \_\_\_\_ 2) 신고하지 않았다 (☞ 6-3번 문항으로)

]	1	2	2	3-(	남)	3-(	(व)		4			5			6
29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44

< 신고를 한 경우 >
6-1. 신고에 대하여 경찰은 어떠한 조치를 하였습니까?
1) 아무런 조치도 하지 않았다
2) 전화로 피해상황을 확인하였다
3) 직접 방문하여 피해내용을 확인하였다.
4) 적극적인 수사를 통하여 사건을 해결해 주었다.
6-2. 신고를 처리한 경찰의 조치에 만족하셨습니까?
1) 아주 만족하였다
2) 만족한 편이었다
3) 그저 그렇다
4) 불만족한 편이었다
5) 아주 불만족하였다



6-1	6-2	6-3	#
45	46	47	48
			3

---- < 주거침입 강도 >-----귀하는 앞에서 <u>작년(1998년)</u>에 집에 강도가 침입한 적이 있다 고 대답하셨습니다. 그런 일이 여러 번 있을 경우에는 <u>가장</u> <u>나중에 일어난 일에 대해서</u> 대답해 주시기 바랍니다.

1. 그 사건은 몇 월에 일어났습니까?

\_\_\_\_ 월

2. 그 사건이 일어난 시간은 대략 몇 시쯤입니까?
 (오전 / 오후) \_\_\_\_\_ 시

- 3. 그 때 집에는 모두 몇 사람이 있었습니까?

   남자 \_\_\_\_\_ 명과 여자 \_\_\_\_\_ 명
- 4. 그 때 침입한 강도는 모두 몇 명이었슙니까? 남자 \_\_\_\_\_ 명과 여자 \_\_\_\_\_ 명

 5. 강도의 나이는 대략 몇 살 정도로 보였습니까?

 (여러 명일 경우에는 가장 주된 역할을 한 사람에 대해서 대답해 주십시오)

 \_\_\_\_\_1) 10대
 \_\_\_\_\_2) 20대

 \_\_\_\_\_3) 30대
 \_\_\_\_\_4) 40대

\_\_\_\_ 5) 50대 이상 \_\_\_\_ 6) 잘 모르겠다

6. 강도(들)은 다음 중 어떤 사람입니까?

- \_\_\_\_ 1) 가족 가운데 한 사람이다
- \_\_\_\_ 2) 친척 가운데 한 사람이다
- \_\_\_\_ 3) 친구나 애인이다
- \_\_\_\_ 4) 직장이나 학교의 동료 또는 상사이다
- \_\_\_\_ 5) 이웃집 사람이다
- \_\_\_\_ 6) 가족이나 친척, 친구, 회사 동료는 아니지만 잘 알고 지내던 사람이다
- \_\_\_\_ 7) 몇 번 정도 만난 적이 있는 사람이다
- \_\_\_\_ 8) 전혀 모르는 사람이다.

	1		2	3-(	남)	3-(	여)	4-(	남)	4-(	여)	5	6
49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60	61	62

7. 그 때에 범인은 어떤 무기를 들었거나 사용하였습니까? (한가지만 표시)

- \_\_\_\_ 1) 무기가 없었다 \_\_\_\_ 2) 칼
- \_\_\_\_ 3) 총(가스총 포함) \_\_\_\_ 4) 몽둥이
- \_\_\_\_ 5) 기타(구체적으로 : \_\_\_\_\_)
- 8. 그 때 강도가 귀댁의 여자를 강간하였거나 강간하려고 하였습니까? \_\_\_\_1) 그렇다 \_\_\_\_2) 아니다
- 9. 그 때에 신체적인 피해를 입은 가족은 모두 몇명입니까?

모	두		명
---	---	--	---

- 10. 그 때에 가족들이 입은 신체적인 피해는 다음 중 어느 정도였습니까?
  - \_\_\_\_ 1) 신체적인 피해를 입지 않았다
  - \_\_\_\_ 2) 경상(전치 3주 미만)
  - \_\_\_\_ 3) 중상(전치 3주 이상)
  - \_\_\_\_ 4) 사망
  - \_\_\_\_ 5) 기타(구체적으로 : \_\_\_\_\_)

11. 그 때 잃어버린 물건은 다음 중 어떤 것입니까? (한가지만 표시하여 주십시오)

- \_\_\_\_ 01) 텔레비전, 비디오, 전축
   \_\_\_\_ 02) 카메라, 비디오 카메라

   \_\_\_\_ 03) 시계, 반지 등 귀금속
   \_\_\_\_ 04) 현금, 수표, 유가증권

   \_\_\_\_ 05) 미술품, 골동품
   \_\_\_\_ 06) 가구, 병풍
- \_\_\_\_ 07) 옷, 입을 것 \_\_\_\_ 08) 식료품, 먹을 것
- \_\_\_\_ 09) 기타 가전제품 \_\_\_\_ 10) 벼, 보리 등의 농산물
- \_\_\_\_ 11) 기타(구체적으로 : \_\_\_\_\_)
- 12. 그 때에 잃어버린 돈과 물건을 값으로 따지면 대략 얼마나 됩니까?

\_\_\_\_\_ 만원

7	8	9	)	10	1	1			12		
63	64	65	66	67	68	69	70	71	72	73	74

- 13. 피해를 당하면서 귀하는 어떤 대용을 하였습니까?
  - \_\_\_\_ 1) 범인에 대해 힘으로 대항하였다
  - \_\_\_\_ 2) 범인을 말로써 위협하고자 하였다
  - \_\_\_\_ 3) 피해를 입지 않기 위하여 범인에게 사정하였다
  - \_\_\_\_ 4) 사건이 일어나고 있는 동안 경찰이나 다른 기관에 신고하였다
  - \_\_\_\_ 5) 소리를 질러 이웃이나 다른 사람의 도움을 요청하였다
  - \_\_\_\_ 6) 범인으로부터 도망가고자 하였다
  - \_\_\_\_ 7) 그냥 당하고만 있었다
  - \_\_\_\_ 8) 기타(구체적으로 : \_\_\_\_\_ )
- 14. 귀하가 취한 행동이 당시 상황에 어떻게 도움이 되었습니까?
  - \_\_\_\_ 1) 피해를 입지 않게 되었다
  - \_\_\_\_ 2) 피해를 다소 덜 입게 되었다
  - \_\_\_\_ 3) 별로 도움이 되지 않았다
  - \_\_\_\_ 4) 범인을 자극하여 더 큰 피해를 입었다
- 15. 그 사건을 경찰에 신고하셨습니까?
  - \_\_\_\_ 1) 신고했다 (☞ 15-1번, 15-2번 문항으로)
  - \_\_\_\_ 2) 신고하지 않았다 (☞ 15-3번 문항으로)

13	14	15
75	76	77

< 신고를 한 경우 >
15-1. 신고에 대하여 경찰은 어떠한 조치를 하였습니까?
1) 아무런 조치도 하지 않았다
2) 전화로 피해상황을 확인하였다
3) 직접 방문하여 피해내용을 확인하였다.
4) 적극적인 수사를 통하여 사건을 해결해 주었다.
15-2. 신고를 처리한 경찰의 조치에 만족하셨습니까?
1) 아주 만족하였다
2) 만족한 편이었다
3) 그저 그렇다
4) 불만족한 편이었다
5) 아주 불만족하였다

< 신고를 하지 않은 경우 >
15-3. 왜 신고하지 않으셨슙니까?
1) 피해가 심각하지 않았기 때문이다
2) 개인적으로 해결했기 때문이다
3) 중거가 없었기 때문이다
4) 다른 기관(예, 보험회사)에 신고하였기 때문이다
5) 경찰이 아무 조치도 취하지 않을 것 같았기 때문이다
6) 경찰에서 귀찮게 할 것 같았기 때문이다
7) 범인이 아는 사람이었기 때문이다
8) 보복이 두려워 감히 신고할 생각을 하지 못하였다
9) 기타(구체적으로 : )

카드	15-1	15-2	15-3	#
1	2	3	4	5
4				4

--- < 대인 절도 > 귀하는 앞에서 <u>작년(1998년)</u>에 집 밖에서 소매치기, 날치기, 들치기를 당한 적이 있다고 대답하셨습니다. 그런 일이 여러 번 있을 경우에는 <u>가장 나중에 일어난 일에 대해서</u> 대답해 주시기 바랍니다.

- 1. 그 사건은 어디에서 일어난 것입니까?
  - \_\_\_\_ 01) 집 근처
  - \_\_\_\_ 02) 학교나 직장
  - \_\_\_\_ 03) 시장, 백화점, 상점 등
  - \_\_\_\_ 04) 은행이나 우체국 등 공공기관
  - \_\_\_\_ 05) 술집, 여관 등의 유흥업소
  - \_\_\_\_ 06) 골목길과 큰길 등 길거리
  - \_\_\_\_ 07) 공원이나 야외의 한적한 곳
  - \_\_\_\_ 08) 지하철, 버스, 택시 등의 대중교통 수단
  - \_\_\_\_ 09) 기차역, 버스터미날 등
  - \_\_\_\_ 10) 그 밖의 곳(구체적으로 : \_\_\_\_\_ )
- 2. 그 사건은 몇 월에 일어났습니까?

## \_\_\_\_\_ 월

- 3. 그 사건이 일어난 시간은 대략 몇 시쯤입니까?
   (오전 / 오후) \_\_\_\_\_ 시
- 4. 그때에 빼앗기거나 잃어버린 돈과 물건을 값으로 따지면 대략 얼마나 됩니까?

\_\_\_\_\_ 만원

5. 그 사건을 경찰에 신고하셨습니까?

\_\_\_\_ 1) 신고했다 (☞ 5-1번, 5-2번 문항으로)

\_\_\_\_ 2) 신고하지 않았다 (파 5-3번 문항으로)

]	l		2	3	3			4			5
6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17





5-1	5-2	5-3	#
18	19	20	21
			5

--- < 대인 강도 > 귀하는 앞에서 <u>작년(1998년)</u>에 집 밖에서 강도를 당한 적이 있다고 대답하셨습니다. 그런 일이 여러 번 있을 경우에는 <u>가</u> <u>장 나중에 일어난 일에 대해서</u> 대답해 주시기 바랍니다.

- 1. 그 사건은 어디에서 일어난 것입니까?
  - \_\_\_\_ 01) 집 근처
  - \_\_\_\_ 02) 학교나 직장
  - \_\_\_\_ 03) 시장, 백화점, 상점 등
  - \_\_\_\_ 04) 은행이나 우체국 등 공공기관
  - \_\_\_\_ 05) 술집, 여관 등의 유흥업소
  - \_\_\_\_ 06) 골목길과 큰길 등 길거리
  - \_\_\_\_ 07) 공원이나 야외의 한적한 곳
  - \_\_\_\_ 08) 지하철, 버스, 택시 등의 대중교통 수단
  - \_\_\_\_ 09) 기차역, 버스터미날 등
  - \_\_\_\_ 10) 그 밖의 곳(구체적으로 : \_\_\_\_\_ )
- 2. 그 사건은 몇 월에 일어났슙니까?

\_\_\_\_ 월

- 3. 그 사건이 일어난 시간은 대략 몇 시쯤입니까?
   (오전 / 오후) \_\_\_\_\_ 시
- 4. 그 때 강도는 모두 몇 명이었습니까?남자 \_\_\_\_\_ 명과 여자 \_\_\_\_\_ 명
- 5. 강도의 나이는 대략 몇 살 정도로 보였습니까?

(여러 명일 경우에는 가장 주된 역할을 한 사람에 대해서 대답해 주십시오)

- \_\_\_\_ 1) 10대 \_\_\_\_ 2) 20대
- \_\_\_\_ 3) 30대 \_\_\_\_ 4) 40대
- \_\_\_\_ 5) 50대 이상 \_\_\_\_ 6) 잘 모르겠다

	l	2	2	:	3	4-(	남)	4-(	여)	5
22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32

- 6. 강도(들)은 다음 중 어떤 사람입니까?
  - \_\_\_\_ 1) 가족 가운데 한 사람이다
  - \_\_\_\_ 2) 친척 가운데 한 사람이다
  - \_\_\_\_ 3) 친구나 애인이다
  - \_\_\_\_ 4) 직장이나 학교의 동료 또는 상사이다
  - \_\_\_\_ 5) 이웃집 사람이다
  - \_\_\_\_ 6) 가족이나 친척, 친구, 회사 동료는 아니지만 잘 알고 지내던 사람이다
  - \_\_\_\_ 7) 몇 번 정도 만난 적이 있는 사람이다
  - \_\_\_\_ 8) 전혀 모르는 사람이다.
- 7. 그 때에 범인은 어떤 무기를 들었거나 사용하였습니까?
  - \_\_\_\_ 1) 무기가 없었다 \_\_\_\_ 2) 칼
  - \_\_\_\_ 3) 총(가스총 포함) \_\_\_\_ 4) 몽둥이
  - \_\_\_\_ 5) 기타(구체적으로 : \_\_\_\_\_ )

< 여자만 대답해 주십시오 > \_\_\_\_\_
 8. 그 때에 강도가 귀하를 강간하였거나 강간하려고 하였습니까?
 \_\_\_\_ 1) 그렇다 \_\_\_\_ 2) 아니다

- 9. 그 때에 귀하가 입은 신체적인 피해는 다음 중 어느 정도였습니까?
  - \_\_\_\_ 1) 신체적인 피해를 입지 않았다
  - \_\_\_\_ 2) 중상(전치 3주 이상)
  - \_\_\_\_ 3) 경상(전치 3주 미만)
  - \_\_\_\_ 4) 기타(구체적으로 : \_\_\_\_\_)
- 10. 그때 빼앗기거나 잃어버린 돈이나 물건은 대략 얼마나 됩니까? 대략 \_\_\_\_\_ 만원
- 11. 피해를 당하는 현장에 귀하가 잘 알고 있는 동료나 친구, 애인이 있었습니까?

   \_\_\_\_\_1) 있었다
   \_\_\_\_\_2) 없었다

6	7	8	9	10					11
33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42

- 12. 같이 피해를 당한 사람이 있습니까?
  - \_\_\_\_ 1) 있다 \_\_\_\_ 2) 없다
- 13. 피해를 당하면서 귀하는 어떤 대응을 하였습니까?
  - \_\_\_\_ 1) 범인에 대해 힘으로 대항하였다
  - \_\_\_\_ 2) 범인을 말로써 위협하고자 하였다
  - \_\_\_\_ 3) 피해를 입지 않기 위하여 범인에게 사정하였다
  - \_\_\_\_ 4) 사건이 일어나고 있는 동안 경찰이나 다른 기관에 신고하였다
  - \_\_\_\_ 5) 소리를 질러 이웃이나 다른 사람의 도움을 요청하였다
  - \_\_\_\_ 6) 범인으로부터 도망가고자 하였다
  - \_\_\_\_ 7) 그냥 당하고만 있었다
  - \_\_\_\_ 8) 기타(구체적으로 : \_\_\_\_\_\_ )
- 14. 귀하가 취한 행동이 당시 상황에 어떻게 도움이 되었습니까?
  - \_\_\_\_ 1) 피해를 입지 않게 되었다
  - \_\_\_\_ 2) 피해를 다소 덜 입게 되었다
  - \_\_\_\_ 3) 별로 도움이 되지 않았다
  - \_\_\_\_ 4) 범인을 자극하여 더 큰 피해를 입었다
- 15. 그 사건을 경찰에 신고하셨습니까?
  - \_\_\_\_ 1) 신고했다 (☞ 15-1번, 15-2번 문항으로)
  - \_\_\_\_ 2) 신고하지 않았다 (☞ 15-3번 문항으로)

15
46

/ 시그르 하 겨우 \
15-1. 신고에 대하여 경찰은 어떠한 조치를 하였습니까?
1) 아무런 조치도 하지 않았다
2) 전화로 피해상황을 확인하였다
3) 직접 방문하여 피해내용을 확인하였다.
4) 적극적인 수사를 통하여 사건을 해결해 주었다.
15-2. 신고를 처리한 경찰의 조치에 만족하셨습니까?
1) 아주 만족하였다
2) 만족한 편이었다
3) 그저 그렇다
4) 불만족한 편이었다
5) 아주 불만족하였다

< 신고를 하지 않은 경우 > \_\_\_\_\_\_\_
15-3. 왜 신고하지 않으셨습니까?
\_\_\_\_\_\_1) 피해가 심각하지 않았기 때문이다
\_\_\_\_\_\_2) 개인적으로 해결했기 때문이다
\_\_\_\_\_\_3) 중거가 없었기 때문이다
\_\_\_\_\_\_4) 다른 기관(예, 보험회사)에 신고하였기 때문이다
\_\_\_\_\_\_5) 경찰이 아무 조치도 취하지 않을 것 같았기 때문이다
\_\_\_\_\_\_6) 경찰에서 귀찮게 할 것 같았기 때문이다
\_\_\_\_\_\_6) 경찰에서 귀찮게 할 것 같았기 때문이다
\_\_\_\_\_\_7) 범인이 아는 사람이었기 때문이다
\_\_\_\_\_\_8) 보복이 두려워 감히 신고할 생각을 하지 못하였다
\_\_\_\_\_\_9) 기타(구체적으로 : \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_)

15-1	15-2	15-3	#
47	48	49	50
			6

---- < 폭행 및 상해 >----귀하는 앞에서 <u>작년(1998년)</u>에 폭행을 당한 적이 있다고 대답 하셨습니다. 그런 일이 여러 번 있을 경우에는 <u>가장 나중에</u> <u>일어난 일에 대해서</u> 대답해 주시기 바랍니다.

- 1. 그 사건은 어디에서 일어난 것입니까?
  - \_\_\_\_ 01) 귀하의 집
  - \_\_\_\_ 02) 가해자의 집
  - \_\_\_\_ 03) 친구나 친척의 집
  - \_\_\_\_ 04) 직장이나 학교
  - \_\_\_\_ 05) 술집이나 여관 등
  - \_\_\_\_ 06) 지하철이나 버스 등 대중교통 수단 내
  - \_\_\_\_ 07) 사람들이 많이 다니는 길거리나 시장
  - \_\_\_\_ 08) 사람들이 많이 다니지 않는 골목
  - \_\_\_\_ 09) 공원이나 야외의 한적한 곳
  - \_\_\_\_ 10) 기타(구체적으로 : \_\_\_\_\_)
- 2. 그 사건은 몇 월에 일어났습니까?

## \_\_\_\_\_ 월

- 3. 그 사건이 일어난 시간은 대략 몇 시쯤입니까?
   (오전 / 오후) \_\_\_\_\_ 시
- 4. 귀하를 폭행한 사람은 모두 몇 명이었슙니까? 남자 \_\_\_\_\_ 명과 여자 \_\_\_\_\_ 명
- 5. 그 사람의 나이는 대략 몇 살 정도로 보였습니까?

(여러 명일 경우에는 가장 주된 역할을 한 사람에 대해서 대답해 주십시오)

- \_\_\_\_ 1) 10대 \_\_\_\_ 2) 20대
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3) 30대 \_\_\_\_\_ 4) 40대
- \_\_\_\_ 5) 50대 이상 \_\_\_\_ 6) 잘 모르겠다

	L	2	2	:	3	4-(	남)	4-(	여)	5
51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60	61

- 6. 귀하를 폭행한 사람(들)은 다음 중 어떤 사람입니까?
  - \_\_\_\_ 1) 가족 가운데 한 사람이다
  - \_\_\_\_ 2) 친척 가운데 한 사람이다
  - \_\_\_\_ 3) 친구나 애인이다
  - \_\_\_\_ 4) 직장이나 학교의 동료 또는 상사이다
  - \_\_\_\_ 5) 이웃집 사람이다
  - \_\_\_\_ 6) 가족이나 친척, 친구, 회사 동료는 아니지만 잘 알고 지내던 사람이다
  - \_\_\_\_ 7) 몇 번 정도 만난 적이 있는 사람이다
  - \_\_\_\_ 8) 전혀 모르는 사람이다.
- 7. 그 사람이 어떤 식으로 폭행을 하였습니까?
  - \_\_\_\_ 1) 붙잡거나 흔들었다
  - \_\_\_\_ 2) 손으로 때렸다
  - \_\_\_\_ 3) 발로 찼다
  - \_\_\_\_ 4) 의자 등의 가구로 때렸다
  - \_\_\_\_ 5) 칼, 몽둥이를 휘둘렀다
  - \_\_\_\_ 6) 돌, 쇳덩어리 등으로 때렸다
  - \_\_\_\_ 7) 총을 쏘거나 위협하였다
  - \_\_\_\_ 8) 기타(구체적으로 : \_\_\_\_\_ )
- 8. 피해를 당하는 현장에 귀하가 잘 알고 있는 동료나 친구, 애인이 있었습니까?

   \_\_\_\_ 1) 있었다
   \_\_\_\_ 2) 없었다
- 9. 그때 같이 피해를 당한 사람이 있습니까?

   \_\_\_\_\_1) 있다
   \_\_\_\_\_2) 없다
- 10. 그 때에 귀하가 입은 신체적인 피해는 다음 중 어느 정도였습니까?
  - \_\_\_\_ 1) 신체적인 피해를 입지 않았다
  - \_\_\_\_ 2) 경상(전치 3주 미만)
  - \_\_\_\_ 3) 중상(전치 3주 이상)
  - \_\_\_\_ 4) 기타(구체적으로 : \_\_\_\_\_)

6	7	8	9	10
62	63	64	65	66

- 11. 피해를 당하면서 귀하는 어떤 대응을 하였습니까?
  - \_\_\_\_ 1) 범인에 대해 힘으로 대항하였다
  - \_\_\_\_ 2) 범인을 말로써 위협하고자 하였다
  - \_\_\_\_ 3) 피해를 입지 않기 위하여 범인에게 사정하였다
  - \_\_\_\_ 4) 사건이 일어나고 있는 동안 경찰이나 다른 기관에 신고하였다
  - \_\_\_\_ 5) 소리를 질러 이웃이나 다른 사람의 도움을 요청하였다
  - \_\_\_\_ 6) 범인으로부터 도망가고자 하였다
  - \_\_\_\_ 7) 그냥 당하고만 있었다
  - \_\_\_\_ 8) 기타(구체적으로 : \_\_\_\_\_\_ )
- 12. 귀하가 취한 행동이 당시 상황에 어떻게 도움이 되었습니까?
  - \_\_\_\_ 1) 피해를 입지 않게 되었다
  - \_\_\_\_ 2) 피해를 다소 덜 입게 되었다
  - \_\_\_\_ 3) 별로 도움이 되지 않았다
  - \_\_\_\_ 4) 범인을 자극하여 더 큰 피해를 입었다
- 13. 그 사건을 경찰에 신고하셨슙니까?
  - \_\_\_\_ 1) 신고했다 (☞ 13-1번, 13-2번 문항으로)
  - \_\_\_\_ 2) 신고하지 않았다 (☞ 13-3번 문항으로)

11	12	13
67	68	69
	_	

 < 신고를 한 경우 >
13-1. 신고에 대하여 경찰은 어떠한 조치를 하였습니까?
1) 아무런 조치도 하지 않았다
2) 전화로 피해상황을 확인하였다
3) 직접 방문하여 피해내용을 확인하였다.
4) 적극적인 수사를 통하여 사건을 해결해 주었다.
13-2. 신고를 처리한 경찰의 조치에 만족하셨습니까? 1) 아주 만족하였다 2) 만족한 편이었다 3) 그저 그렇다 4) 불만족한 편이었다 5) 아주 불만족하였다



13-1	13-2	13-3	#
70	71	72	73
			7

< 성폭력 및 성회롱 >
 귀하는 앞에서 <u>작년(1998년)</u>에 강간이나 성폭력 또는 성회롱
 을 당한 적이 있거나, 당할 뻔한 적이 있다고 대답하셨습니
 다. 아래의 질문에 응답해주시기 바랍니다. 이 질문은 <u>여자들</u>
 <u>에게만 해당</u>됩니다.

1. 그 사건은 다음 중 어느 것이었습니까? (당한 적이 있는 것은 모두 표시) ①그렇다 ②아니다

가)	성적으로 불쾌하거나 모욕적인 말, 욕을 들었다	 
나)	누군가로부터 음란전화를 받아본 적이 있다	 
다)	손을 잡거나 신체의 일부분을 만졌다	 
라)	몸을 강제로 밀착시키고 가슴이나 엉덩이를 만졌다	 
마)	강제로 키스를 하였다	 
바)	성기를 손으로 만졌다	 
사)	강제로 성행위를 하고자 했으나 실패하였다	 
아)	강제로 성행위를 하였다	 

\* 일반적으로 위에 제시한 여러 사건 가운데 1)번이 가장 심각하고, 7)번이 상대적으로 덜 심각하다고 할 수 있습니다. 작년 한해(1998년) 동안 이러 한 사건을 여러 번 당한 분께서는 <u>가장 심각한 사건</u>에 대해서 <u>아래의 질</u> 문<u>에</u> 응답해 주시기 바랍니다.

2. 그 사건은 어디에서 일어난 것입니까?

- \_\_\_\_ 01) 귀하의 집 \_\_\_\_ 02) 가해자의 집
- \_\_\_\_ 03) 친구나 친척의 집 \_\_\_\_ 04) 직장이나 학교
- \_\_\_\_ 05) 여관 등의 숙박업소 \_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_ 07) 버스나 지하철 안
- \_\_\_\_ 09) 백화점이나 시장
- \_\_\_\_ 11) 주차장
- \_\_\_\_ 13) 공중화장실
- \_\_\_\_ 15) 기타(구체적으로 : \_\_\_\_\_)
- 카드
   1-가
   나
   다
   라
   마
   바
   사
   아
   2

   1
   2
   3
   4
   5
   6
   7
   8
   9
   10
   11

   5

- \_\_\_\_ 06) 술집 등의 유흥업소
- \_\_\_\_ 08) 지하철, 터미날, 철도역 구내
- \_\_\_\_ 10) 지하도
- \_\_\_\_ 12) 뒷골목이나 길거리
- \_\_\_\_ 14) 공원이나 야외의 한적한 곳

3. 그 사건은 몇 월에 일어났습니까?

\_\_\_\_\_ 월

4. 그 사건이 일어난 시간은 대략 몇 시쯤입니까? (오전 / 오후) \_\_\_\_\_ 시

- 5. 범인은 모두 몇 명이었습니까?

   남자 \_\_\_\_\_ 명과 여자 \_\_\_\_\_ 명
- 6. 범인의 나이는 대략 몇 살 정도로 보였습니까?
   (여러 명일 경우에는 가장 주된 역할을 한 사람에 대해서 대답해 주십시오)
   \_\_\_\_ 1) 10대
   \_\_\_\_ 2) 20대
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 3) 30대 \_\_\_\_\_ 4) 40대
  - \_\_\_\_ 5) 50대 이상 \_\_\_\_ 6) 잘 모르겠다

7. 범인(들)은 다음 중 어떤 사람입니까?

- \_\_\_\_ 1) 가족 가운데 한 사람이다
- \_\_\_\_ 2) 친척 가운데 한 사람이다
- \_\_\_\_ 3) 친구나 애인이다
- \_\_\_\_ 4) 직장이나 학교의 동료 또는 상사이다
- \_\_\_\_ 5) 이웃집 사람이다
- \_\_\_\_ 6) 가족이나 친척, 친구, 회사 동료는 아니지만 잘 알고 지내던 사람이다
- \_\_\_\_ 7) 몇 번 정도 만난 적이 있는 사람이다
- \_\_\_\_ 8) 전혀 모르는 사람이다.

8. 그 때에 범인(들)은 귀하를 어떻게 위협하거나 폭행하였습니까?

- \_\_\_\_ 1) 위협이나 폭행을 가하지는 않았다
- \_\_\_\_ 2) 욕하거나 말로 위협하였다
- \_\_\_\_ 3) 붙잡거나 흔들었다
- \_\_\_\_ 4) 손으로 때리거나 발로 찼다
- \_\_\_\_ 5) 칼이나 흉기로 위협하였다
- \_\_\_\_ 6) 칼이나 흉기를 사용하여 폭행하였다
- \_\_\_\_ 7) 기타(구체적으로 : \_\_\_\_\_ )

3		4		5-(남)		5-(વ્વે)		6	7	8
12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22

- 9. 그 때에 돈이나 물건을 빼앗기기도 하였습니까? \_\_\_\_1) 그렇다 \_\_\_\_2) 아니다
- 10. 피해를 당하는 현장에 귀하가 잘 알고 있는 동료나 친구, 애인이 있었습니까?

   \_\_\_\_\_1) 있었다
   \_\_\_\_\_2) 없었다
- 11. 같이 피해를 당한 사람이 있습니까?

   \_\_\_\_\_1) 있다
   \_\_\_\_\_2) 없다
- 12. 피해를 당하면서 귀하는 어떤 대응을 하였습니까?
  - \_\_\_\_ 1) 범인에 대해 힘으로 대항하였다
  - \_\_\_\_ 2) 범인을 말로써 위협하고자 하였다
  - \_\_\_\_ 3) 피해를 입지 않기 위하여 범인에게 사정하였다
  - \_\_\_\_ 4) 사건이 일어나고 있는 동안 경찰이나 다른 기관에 신고하였다
  - \_\_\_\_ 5) 소리를 질러 이웃이나 다른 사람의 도움을 요청하였다
  - \_\_\_\_ 6) 범인으로부터 도망가고자 하였다
  - \_\_\_\_ 7) 그냥 당하고만 있었다
  - \_\_\_\_ 8) 기타(구체적으로 : \_\_\_\_\_\_ )
- 13. 귀하가 취한 행동이 당시 상황에 어떻게 도움이 되었습니까?
  - \_\_\_\_ 1) 피해를 입지 않게 되었다
  - \_\_\_\_ 2) 피해를 다소 덜 입게 되었다
  - \_\_\_\_ 3) 별로 도움이 되지 않았다
  - \_\_\_\_ 4) 범인을 자극하여 더 큰 피해를 입었다
- 14. 그 사건을 당한 후에 그 내용을 누구에게 제일 먼저 이야기하였습니까?
  - \_\_\_\_ 1) 가족(부모, 형제) \_\_\_\_ 2) 친구나 애인
  - \_\_\_\_ 3) 직장동료 \_\_\_\_\_ 4) 상담소
  - \_\_\_\_ 5) 경찰에 신고 \_\_\_\_ 6) 기타(구체적으로 : \_\_\_\_\_)
  - \_\_\_\_ 7) 아무에게도 말하지 않았다

1
27 28

15. 그 사건을 경찰에 신고하셨습니까?

\_\_\_\_ 1) 신고했다 (☞ 15-1번, 15-2번 문항으로)

\_\_\_\_ 2) 신고하지 않았다 (☞ 15-3번 문항으로)

< 신고를 한 경우 > \_\_\_\_\_\_
15-1. 신고에 대하여 경찰은 어떠한 조치를 하였습니까?
\_\_\_\_\_\_ 1) 아무런 조치도 하지 않았다
\_\_\_\_\_\_ 2) 전화로 피해상황을 확인하였다
\_\_\_\_\_\_ 3) 직접 방문하여 피해내용을 확인하였다.
\_\_\_\_\_\_ 4) 적극적인 수사를 통하여 사건을 해결해 주었다.
15-2. 신고를 처리한 경찰의 조치에 만족하셨습니까?
\_\_\_\_\_\_ 1) 아주 만족하였다
\_\_\_\_\_\_ 2) 만족한 편이었다
\_\_\_\_\_\_ 3) 그저 그렇다
\_\_\_\_\_\_ 4) 불만족한 편이었다
\_\_\_\_\_\_ 5) 아주 불만족하였다



15	15-1	15-2	15-3	#
29	30	31	32	33
			_	8
/ ㅈ사의 기계사하 \				
--				
< 오 가는 가세지 & > ☆ 이 부분은 조사하러 나간 조사원들이 기재하는 부분입니다 ☆				
1. 조사대상 지역(조사대상 가구가 위치한 주변)의 특성        1) 농어촌의 일반 마을      2) 농어촌의 상업·행정 중심지        3) 도시적 특성을 가진 농촌      4) 도시의 단독·연립 주택지역        5) 대규모 아파트단지      6) 도시의 상업지역, 유흥가        7) 도시의 공업지역      8) 기타(구체적으로:)				
2. 조사대상자의 거주주택 유형 1) 단독주택 2) 연립주택 3) 다세대주택 4) 저충(5충 이하) 아파트 5) 고충(6충 이상) 아파트 6) 기타(구체적으로 :)				
3. 조사방법 1) 면접 2) 응답자 기재 3) 병행				
4. 응답자 협조도 1) 상 2) 중 3) 하				
5. 흰색 부분에 옹답자가 피해를 입었다고 대답한 범죄가 있습니까? 1) 있다 2) 없다				
<ul> <li>6. (범죄피해가 표시되어 있는 경우) 노란색 부분의 해당되는 질문에 빠짐없이 대답하고 있습니까?</li> <li>1) 그렇다2) 아니다3) 비해당</li> </ul>				
7. 총 소요시간 분				
조 사 원 : 대학교, 이름 , 전화 : 조사일시 : 월 일 시 분부터 월 일 시 분까지 조사지역 : 시/도 구/시/군 동/면				

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41

## Appendix B. Survey Questionnaire (English Version)

# Victimization Survey in Korea

<How to answer the questions>

This questionnaire contains two parts; Yellow and White.

First, to analyze the data, we would like to ask some questions including your lifestyle. We also would like to aske how many times you were victimized during the last year (Jan, 1st, 1998 to Dec, 31st, 1998). These questionnaires are printed on the white color paper. Please try to answer every question.

Second, this part is the additional questions for whom there was an experience of victimization during the last yeat. This part is printed on the yellow paper, and please answers the question if you have an experience of victimization in the last year.

\*\*\* Do not fill out under this line.

	지역	번호	일련	카드		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
						1

\* Following questions are on our societies crime phenomenon.

- 1. How do you learn about or hear the news of a crime? (Please select only ONE item.)
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 1) Family \_\_\_\_\_ 2) Friend \_\_\_\_\_ 3) Neighbor
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 4) Newspaper \_\_\_\_\_ 5) Television \_\_\_\_\_ 6) Radio

\_\_\_\_\_ 7) Magazine \_\_\_\_\_ 8) Other(Specifically:\_\_\_\_\_\_)

2. What do you think of the rate of total crime occurrence rate in Korea recently?

- \_\_\_\_ 1) Increased rapidly
- \_\_\_\_ 2) Increased
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3) No much difference
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4) Decreased
- \_\_\_\_\_ 5) Decreased rapidly

3. What do yo think of the crime occurrence rate in your neighborhood recently?

- \_\_\_\_\_1) Increased rapidly
- \_\_\_\_ 2) Increased
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3) No much difference
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4) Decreased
- \_\_\_\_\_ 5) Decreased rapidly

4. What do you think is the most problematic crime in Korea? (Please select only ONE item.)

- \_\_\_\_ 01) Homicide \_\_\_\_ 02) Robbery
- \_\_\_\_ 03) Rape/Sexual harrassment \_\_\_\_ 04) Assault
- \_\_\_\_ 05) Ransom/Slave trade \_\_\_\_ 06) larceny, pick-pocket
- \_\_\_\_ 07) fraud \_\_\_\_\_ 08) embazzlement, misappropriation
- \_\_\_\_ 09) cornering and hoarding \_\_\_\_ 10) corruption, bribe
- \_\_\_\_ 11) juvenile delinquency \_\_\_\_ 12) others(specifically:\_\_\_\_)

1	2	3	4				
8	9	10	11	12			

- 5. How do you feel when walking alone in your neighborhood at night?
  - \_\_\_\_\_1) Very scared
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 2) Scared
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 3) Neutral
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 4) Not so scared
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 5) Never scared
- 6. Everyone fear that they would become a crime victim themselves.

This question asks about the fear of crime you have in your routine life. Check the rate after reading the sentences on the left.

## ①strongly@moderately3moderately4strongly

disagree	disagre	e agree	agree
a) Afraid of auto or auto part thefts.			
b) Afraid of houshold theft when the home			
is empty.			
c) Afraid of household theft accompanied			
by threatening or assault.			
d) Afraid of theft outside(including pickpocket,	,		
snatching, and shoplifting)			
e) Afraid of theft outside accompanied by			
threatening or assault.		<u> </u>	
f) Afraid of fraud			
g) Afraid of assauld			
h) Afraid of sexual attack or harressment		<u> </u>	

5	6-7}	ч	다	라	마	바	사	아
13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21

7. Have you ever tried anything below to protect yourself and your house from crime?

		①Yes	② No
<ul> <li>a) Lock the doors and windows before to bed</li> </ul>	ore going		
b) Double-lock the windows and the	entrance		
c) put iron bars outside the windows	5		
d) put the video camera or CCTV			
e) set up the emergency line or bel	which is directly		
connect to the police office or po	olice box		
f) install the private security system			
g) concern about the neighborhood s	security when you		
move to other place			
<ul> <li>8. Do you have(carry) any self-defence</li> <li>(Please select only ONE item.)</li> <li>0) Don't carry any</li> </ul>	e utilities? If you d	o, what is	it?
1) whistle	2) pepper sp	rav	
3) flash light	4) pepper ga	s gun	
5) control bat	6) knife	5 84.1	
7) pistol	8) others(spe	cifically :	)
9. How often do you act as below to g	protect yourself from ①never②s	m crime? some-3ofte times	en@always
a) avoid specific areas in fear of cri	me	. <u></u>	
b) don't walk alone at night			
c) postpone a plan scheduled at nigh	it because		
of fear of crime	<del></del>		
d) don't carry much amount of cash			
e) don't take a cab alone at night	<del>_</del>		
f) ask a neighbor to look after your	home		
while your away			
g) volunteerly join the community cr	ime prevention		
program			<u> </u>

10. How much do you feel the probability that your house will be robbed?

- \_\_\_\_ 1) very high
- \_\_\_\_ 2) high
- \_\_\_\_ 3) neutral
- \_\_\_\_ 4) low
- \_\_\_\_\_ 5) very low

11. How much do you feel the probability that you will be the victim of the crime such as robbery, theft, assault, pickpocket, and sexual assault?

- \_\_\_\_ 1) very high
- \_\_\_\_ 2) high
- \_\_\_\_ 3) neutral
- \_\_\_\_ 4) low
- \_\_\_\_\_ 5) very low

### \* Question on Personal Information

- 1. What is your gender?

   \_\_\_\_\_1) Male
   \_\_\_\_\_2) Female
- 2. What is your age?
- 3. What is your marital status?
  - \_\_\_\_ 1) Single (never married) \_\_\_\_ 2) married
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 3) separated \_\_\_\_\_ 4) divorced
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 5) widows \_\_\_\_\_ 6) other(specifically : \_\_\_\_\_\_)

10	11	#	1		2	3		
37	38	39	40	41	42	43		
		2						

4. How man are there in your family including you	rself?
---	--------

- a) Under 20 years old
   Male \_\_\_\_\_, Female \_\_\_\_\_

   b) 20-64 years old
   Male \_\_\_\_\_, Female \_\_\_\_\_
- c) 65 or more Male\_\_\_\_\_ , Female \_\_\_\_\_
- 5. What is your position in your family?
  - \_\_\_\_\_1) householder
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 2) spouse of the householder
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 3) parents of the householder(including mother-in-law &father-in-law)
  - \_\_\_\_4) siblings of the householder(including brother-in-law & sister-in-law)
  - \_\_\_\_5) children of the householder(including daughter-in-law & son-in-law)
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 6) other(specifically : \_\_\_\_\_\_ )
- 6. How long have you lived in the present address?

\_\_\_\_\_ (years)

- 7. What is your educational level?
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 1) never been to school
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 2) elementary school \_\_\_\_\_ 3) middle school
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 4) high school \_\_\_\_\_ 5) community college
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 6) 4-year university \_\_\_\_\_ 7) graduate school
  - 7-1. Did you finish the above educational level?
    - \_\_\_\_\_ 1) graduate \_\_\_\_\_ 2) drop out of school
    - \_\_\_\_\_ 3) attending school \_\_\_\_\_ 4) no category
- 8. Do you or your family own vehicles?(including car, van, truck)

① yes ② no

- 가) yourself
- 나) family(including yourself) \_\_\_\_\_

4-7}	-(남)	가-	(여)	4-	(남)	나-	(여)	다-	(남)	다-	(여)	5	e	5	7	7-1	8-7}	4
44	45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60	61	62

< Job Categories : The answer for Question in the next page> <Professional · technical Job> 01) Engineer 02) Professor, Researcher 03) Medical Doctor, Dentist, Herbalist 04) Veterinarian, Pharmacist 05) Nurse 06) Accountant, Judge, Prosecutor, Lawyer 07) Teacher 08) Religious 09) press member 10) Entertainer, Athlete, Artist 11) Crew (Ship, Airplane) 12) Others(translator, institute teacher) <the executive · administrative staff> 21) CEO(More than 5 employees) 22) The executives of a enterprise 23) High rank officer 24) The executives of NGO 25) Professional soldier (a major or higher rank), Police (higher rank) 26) CEO (company related to the clerical work) 27) Other administrator <Desk work> 31) General desk worker(at least the chief of section position 32) public officer(at least an assistant junior officer position) 33) NGO staff 34) cashier, paymaster 35) Communication 36) Postman 37) Soldier (lower rank), police(lower rank), firefighter, correctional officer 38) Other <Sales industry> 41) Whole seller or retail seller (less than 5 employees) 42) Sales clerk 43) Reality dealer 44) Salesman 45) Stailman 46) Others <Service> 51) Owner (Restaurant, Beauty salon, motel, etc) 52) Employee (Restaurant, Beauty salon, motel, etc) 53) Hair stylist, Cleaner 54) Janitor, housekeeper 55) Security guard 56) Others <Agricultural · fishing industry> 62) Middle class farmer 61) Rich farmer 63) Small farmer 64) Poor farmer 65) Farmer 66) Daily farming, orchardist 67) Ship owner, fish-raising industry 68) Fisherman 69) Other oroductive industrv> 71) Production company owner (less than 5 employee), Production director 72) Technician 73) Apprentice 74) Worker 75) Diver (Auto, heavy equipment) 76) Minor 77) Other <non-worker> 81) Student 82) Housewife 83) Soldier 84) Unemployed person 85) Retire 86) Other <non-classified> 99) Cannot classification(Specifically :

9. What is you and your householder's occupation? If you are the householder, check the same one.(See the table of occupation category)

a) your occupation:

b) householder's occupation:

10. How much in your average monthly income? (including bonus & special income)

- a) personal income : \_\_\_\_\_ won
- 나) household income : \_\_\_\_\_ won

### 11. What kind of house do you live in?

- \_\_\_\_\_1) own(including family owned house)
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2) deposit basis(not including monthly payment)
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3) lease(including deposit based lease)
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4) others
- 12. How do you think your social level? (1=lowest, 7=highest) lowest middle highest (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7)

\* Question on your daily life and surrounding environment.

- 1. Do you commute?
  - \_\_\_\_\_1) yes (\*\* go to question 1-1)
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 2) no (\*\* go to question 2)

9-	・가	9-	4		10-가				10-	-4		11	12	#	1
63	64	65	66	67	68	69	70	71	72	73	74	75	76	77	78
														3	

<pre><if answered="" yes="" you=""></if></pre>	
1-1. What time do you go to work and what time do you back how $1-1$ .	ne?
go to work at (AM/PM)	
back home at (AM/PM)	
1-2. How long does it take to work (school)?	
hour(s) minute(s)	
1-3. What kind of transportation do you take?	
(Please select only ONE item.)	
01) urban bus, village bus 02) seat bus	
03) cross-country bus 04) commute bus/school bu	S
05) subway 06) train	
07) taxi 08) car, RV or van	
09) bicycle 10) walk	
11) other(specifically: )	

2. Where do you spend your time during the day?

- \_\_\_\_\_1) almost at home
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2) almost at school
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3) work at the office
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4) work in a factory or the site
- \_\_\_\_\_ 5) at markets or department stores where there are many people
- \_\_\_\_\_ 6) move around meeting buyers

3. How often did you go home late (after 10 pm) after work, school, or a get together with friends last night?

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1) almost everyday \_\_\_\_\_ 2) once in a two or three days
- \_\_\_\_ 3) once a week

\_\_\_\_\_ 4) once in 15 days

- \_\_\_\_ 5) once a week
- \_\_\_\_\_ 7) never

\_\_\_\_ 6) hardly ever

카드		1-	-1		1-2			1-	-3	2	3
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
2											

4. How often was your house completely empty?

- \_\_\_\_\_1) more than once a week \_\_\_\_\_2) once or twice a month
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3) once or twice in two or three months\_\_\_\_4) once or twice in half year
- \_\_\_\_\_ 5) once or twice a year \_\_\_\_\_ 6) hardly ever
- \_\_\_\_ 7) never

5. What do you do to keep your house safe when you leave the house for a day or two? (please select ONLY one item)

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1) nothing
- \_\_\_\_ 2) stop milk or newspaper delivery
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3) disguise somebody in the house
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4) ask a neighbor to take care of the house
- \_\_\_\_ 5) ask a relative to take care of the house
- \_\_\_\_ 6) notify the apartment security guard
- \_\_\_\_\_ 7) use the private security company
- 8) other(specifically:\_\_\_\_\_\_)

6. How often did you go shopping last year (1998)?

- \_\_\_\_\_1) almost everyday \_\_\_\_\_2) once in two or three days
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3) once a week \_\_\_\_\_ 4) once in 15 days
- \_\_\_\_ 5) once a month \_\_\_\_ 6) hardly ever
- \_\_\_\_ 7) never

7. What transportation system do you use when going out apart from community? (please select ONLY one item)

- \_\_\_\_ 01) rural bus, village bus \_\_\_\_ 02) seat bus
- \_\_\_\_ 03) cross-country bus \_\_\_\_ 04) commute bus, school bus

\_\_\_\_ 06) train

- \_\_\_\_ 05) subway
- \_\_\_\_ 07) taxi \_\_\_\_\_ 08) car, RV, minivan
- \_\_\_\_ 09) bicycle \_\_\_\_ 10) walk
- \_\_\_\_ 11) others(specifically : \_\_\_\_\_ )

6	7		
15	16	17	
	15	15 16	

8. Please answer according to your s	situation. trongly②m	oderately3n	noderately	④strongly
	disagree	disagree	agree	agree
<ul> <li>a) I prefer to dress casually rather than formally when I go out.</li> <li>b) I dress gaudily rather than plain when I go out.</li> <li>c) I wear outstanding and sumptuot</li> </ul>	ly 15	·		
accessories.				
d) I spend much pocketmoney.	<del></del>			

9. This is a question on your neighbors. Please mark on the appropriate answer.

(Ds)	trongly@n	noderately	moderatel	y@strongly
	disagree	disagree	agree	agree
a) Our neighbors help each other				
through in difficult situations.				
b) Our neighbors know each other				
quite well.		<u> </u>		
c) Our neighbors lend or borrow				
each other's possessives.				
d) Our neighbors share information				
on the neighborhood.				
e) Our neighbors cooperate and				
join in various neighborhood ever	nts	<u> </u>		

8-가	ч	다	라	9-가	ч	다	라	마
18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26

10. This question is on your neighborhood. Please mark on the appropriate answer.

①st	rongly@n	noderately3mo	derately@str	ongly
di	sagree	disagree	agree	agree

a)	There are trash disposed carelessly			
	in our neighborhood.		 	
b)	There are vacant houses or land			
	in our neighborhood.		 	
c)	There are many dark and secluded			
	places in our neighborhood.		 <u> </u>	
d)	There is a specific place with delinquent			
	juveniles on our neighborhood.	. <u></u>	 	

11. This question is on police activities. Please mark on the appropriate answer.

Dstrongly Qmoderately Gmoderately Gstrongle
disagree disagree agree agree
a) The police in our neighbor is
doing patrol very well.
나) I think the polich are immediately
sent when I report the accident.
다) If I report the criminal situation to the police,
they should arrest the criminal.
12. What is your opinion on these comments?
a) Our community is safe from crime.
1) strongly agree
2) moderately agree
3) neutral
4) moderately disagree
5) strongly agree

A COLUMN TWO IS NOT	10 가	4	다	라	11-가	ч	다	12-가
	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34

- b) Our neighborhood is safe from crime.
- \_\_\_\_1) strongly agree
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2) moderately agree
- \_\_\_\_ 3) neutral
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4) moderately disagree
- \_\_\_\_ 5) strongly agree
- c) My house is safe from crime.
- \_\_\_\_\_1) strongly agree
- \_\_\_\_ 2) moderately agree
- \_\_\_\_ 3) neutral
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4) moderately disagree
- \_\_\_\_ 5) strongly agree

ч	다	#	
35	36	37	
		4	

\* This following questions ask you a few experience to help you think about the criminal victimization you have experienced. Please limit the experiences to one year (1998).

1. Have you or your family experienced a traffic accident during last year (1998)?

\_\_\_\_\_ 1) Yes (\* go to question 1-1)
\_\_\_\_\_ 2) No (\* go to question 2)
< If you answered YES, >
1-1. How many times? \_\_\_\_\_\_ times

2. Have you experienced fraud during last year(1998)? (exclude 강도와 절도 for this question.)

1) Yes (\*\* go to question 2-1)
2) No (\*\* go to question 3)
< If you answered YES, >
2-1. How many times? \_\_\_\_\_\_ times

3. Have you offered bribe to police or public officer during last year (1998)?

\_\_\_\_ 1) Yes (\*\* go to question 3-1)

\_\_\_\_ 2) No (\*\* go to the next page)

3-1. How many times? \_\_\_\_\_ times

1	1-	-1	2	2.	-1	3	3-	-1	#
38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47
									5

\* The following questions ask the criminal victimization you have experienced last yeat (from 1/1/98 to 12/31/98).

1. Did you experience auto-part (car stereo, tires, engine, car accesories, etc.) last year?

0) do not own a vehicle
1) Yes (🖙 go to question 1-1)
2) No (** go to question 2)
I-1. How many times?? times
<ul> <li>2. Have you experienced car (car, van, mini-van, truck) theft last year (1998)?</li> <li> 0) Do not own a vehicle</li> <li> 1) Yes (* go to question 2-1)</li> <li> 2) No (* go to question 3)</li> </ul>
< If you answered YES, > 2-1. How many times?? times A Please answer the questions for <a href="mailto:section"></a> <a href="mailto:section"></a> <a href="mailto:section"></a>
<ul> <li>3. Has a thief intended or completed theft of your house-hold possessives(jewelry, audio, TV, computer) or money (cash, check, stock) last year?(Do not include threatening and assault.)</li> <li> 1) Yes (* go to question 3-1)</li> <li> 2) No (* go to question 4)</li> </ul>
<pre>&lt; If you answered YES, &gt;</pre>
3-1. How many times? times
$\Rightarrow$ Please answer the questions for <u>section</u> $\Rightarrow$
1 1-1 2 2-1 3 3-1
48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56

4. Has a thief assaulted or threatened your family members and/to steal money or house-hold possessives last year?

\_\_\_\_\_1) Yes (☞ go to question 4-1)
 \_\_\_\_\_2) No (☞ go to question 5)

and lost or nearly lost either money or possessives (jewelry, watch, bag, handbag, cassette player) last year? (Do not include threaten or assault.) \_\_\_\_\_1) Yes (\*\* go to question 5-1)

\_\_\_\_\_ 2) No (region to question 6)

< If you answered YES, >
5-1. How many times? \_\_\_\_\_ times
☆ please answer the questions for <<u>personal larceny> in</u>
the yellow section ☆

6. Have you ever been threatened or assaulted and lost or nearly lost either money or personal belongings outside last year?

\_\_\_\_\_1) Yes (☞ go to question 6-1)
\_\_\_\_\_2) No (☞ go to question 7)

6-1. How many times? \_\_\_\_\_\_times
☆ Please answer the questions <br/>section ☆

4	4-	-1	5	5	-1	6	6-	-1
57	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65

7. Were you injured or nearly injured by an assault last year? (Please do not include burglary from the previous question.)

1) Yes (🍽 go to question 7-1)
2) No (12 go to question 8)
< If you answered YES, >
7-1. How many times? times
$\dot{x}$ Please answer the questions for $\leq$ assault and bodily injury> in yellow section. $\dot{x}$

<u>The following questions are only for females</u> >
8. Have you ever experienced or nearly experienced rape, sexual
assaulted or sexual harassment last year?
$\_$ 1) Yes ( $r$ go to question 8-1)
2) No
<pre>&lt; If you answered YES,&gt;</pre>
8-1. how many times? times $\Rightarrow$ Please answer the question for <u><sexual and<="" assault="" u=""></sexual></u>
<u>harassment&gt;</u> in yellow section $\Rightarrow$
<pre>Continued to the next page &gt;</pre>

\*\* If you answered 'yes' to the above questions asking your experience of crime during 1998, please answer the questions in the yellow section.

If you have no experience in crime last year, your questions are over.

Thank you for your cooperation.

7	7-1		8	8-1	
66	67	68	69	70	71

< How to answer in Yellow part questionnaire >

Contents of Victimization	** Answer-Part **
< Auto-Part Theft >	Yellow part p. 2 - 3
< Auto Theft >	Yellow part p. 4 - 5
< Household-level Burglary >	Yellow part p. 6 - 7
< Household-level Robbery >	Yellow part p. 8 - 11
< Personal-level Larceny >	Yellow part p. 12 - 13
< Personal-level Robbery >	Yellow part p. 14 - 17
< Injured by an assault >	Yellow part p. 18 - 21
< Sexual assault and harassment >	Yellow part p. 22 - 25

You answered yes to the questions on auto-part theft in the previous section. If you have several experiences on this kind of crime, please answer the following questions based on the most current incident.

- 1. Where was the place of crime?
  - \_\_\_\_ 1) Household area
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 2) Business district
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 3) Near department stores and markets
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 4) Public parking lot
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 5) Temporary parking
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 6) other (specifically :\_\_\_\_\_\_)
- 2. The month of the crime :
- 3. What was the approximate time of the crime?

\_\_\_\_\_ (am/pm)

- 4. What was the part you got robbed? (please select only one item)
  - \_\_\_\_\_\_01) engine
     \_\_\_\_\_\_02) carburetor

     \_\_\_\_\_\_03) battery
     \_\_\_\_\_\_04) tire, spare tire

     \_\_\_\_\_\_05) back mirror
     \_\_\_\_\_\_06) indicator, light bulb

     \_\_\_\_\_\_07) hub cap
     \_\_\_\_\_\_08) repair kit

     \_\_\_\_\_\_09) exterior accessories
     \_\_\_\_\_\_10) interior accessories

     \_\_\_\_\_\_11) car stereo
     \_\_\_\_\_\_12) other (specifically :\_\_\_\_\_)

5. How much was the approximate value of the item?

\_\_\_\_\_ won

카드	1		2	:	3		4		Ę	5	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
3											

6. Did you report the incident to the police?

\_\_\_\_ 1) Yes (🖙 6-1, 6-2)

\_\_\_\_ 2) No (🕶 6-3)

< Reported >

6-1. What was the police reaction to the report?

\_\_\_\_\_1) No reaction was conducted.

\_\_\_\_\_ 2) Verified the damage by phone.

\_\_\_\_\_ 3) Verified the damage by an actual visit.

\_\_\_\_\_ 4) Solves the crime through active research.

6-2. Were you satisfied about the police reaction?

\_\_\_\_\_1) Very satisfied

\_\_\_\_\_ 2) Satisfied

\_\_\_\_ 3) Neutral

\_\_\_\_\_ 4) Not satisfied

\_\_\_\_\_ 5) Not satisfied at all

< Not reported >
6-3. Why didn't you report the incident?
\_\_\_\_\_\_1) Because the loss wasn't serious.
\_\_\_\_\_2) Because the incident was solved personally.
\_\_\_\_\_3) Because there wasn't any proof.
\_\_\_\_\_3) Because there wasn't any proof.
\_\_\_\_\_4) Reported to another authorization (e.g., insurance company).
\_\_\_\_\_5) Thought the police would be little help.
\_\_\_\_\_6) Thought the police would be inquisitive.
\_\_\_\_\_7) The criminal was an acquaintance.
\_\_\_\_\_8) Fear of revenge.
\_\_\_\_\_9) other (specifically :\_\_\_\_\_\_)

6	6-1	6-2	6-3	#
13	14	15	16	17
				1

— < Auto theft > \_\_\_\_\_\_
You answered yes to the questions on auto theft in the previous section. If you have several experiences on this kind of crime, please answer the following questions based on the most current incident.

- 1. Where was the place of auto theft?
  - \_\_\_\_ 1) household area
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 2) business district
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 3) near department stores and markets
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 4) public parking lot
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 5) temporary parking
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 6) other (specifically : \_\_\_\_\_)
- 2. The month of the crime :
- 3. What was the approximate time of the crime? \_\_\_\_\_ (am/pm)
- 4. Did you find your car?
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 1) Yes \_\_\_\_\_ 2) No
- 5. Did you report the incident to the police?
  - \_\_\_\_ 1) Yes (☞ 5-1, 5-2) \_\_\_\_ 2) No (☞ 5-3)

1	2	2		3	4	5
18	19	20	21	22	23	24

< Reported >
5-1. What was the police reaction to the report?
1) No reaction was conducted.
2) Verified the damage by phone.
3) Verified the damage by an actual visit.
4) Solves the crime through active research.
5-2. Were you satisfied about the police reaction?
1) Very satisfied
2) Satisfied
3) Neutral
4) Not satisfied
5) Not satisfied at all
<pre> &lt; Not reported &gt;</pre>
5-3. What was the reason?
1) Found the car before reporting.
2) Reported to another authorization (e.g., insurance company).

5-3. What w	vas the reason?
1) [	Found the car before reporting.
2) (	Reported to another authorization (e.g., insurance company).
3) *	Thought the police would be little help.
4) *	Thought the police would be inquisitive.
5) '	The criminal was acquaintance.
6) [	Fear of revenge
7)	other (specifically:

5-1	5-2	5-3	#
25	26	27	28
			2

< Household- level burglary>
You answered yes to the questions on household
burglary in the previous section. If you have several
experiences on this kind of crime, please answer the
following questions based on the most current incident.

- 1. The month of the crime :
- What was the approximate time of the crime?
   \_\_\_\_\_ (am/pm)
- 3. How many persons were in the house at the time? \_\_\_\_\_ male(s) and \_\_\_\_ female(s)
- 4. What did you get robbed? (Please select only one item)
  - 01) TV, audio
     02) camera, camcoder

     03) jewelry such as watch, ring
     04) cash, check, stock
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 05) art pieces, antiques \_\_\_\_\_ 06) furniture, folding screen
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 07) clothes \_\_\_\_\_ 08) food
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 09) other electric appliances \_\_\_\_\_ 10) agricultural products like rice
  - \_\_\_\_ 11) other (specifically :\_\_\_\_)
- 5. How much was the approximate value of the item?

\_\_\_\_\_ won

- 6. Did you report the incident to the police?
  - \_\_\_\_ 1) Yes (🕶 6-1, 6-2)
  - \_\_\_\_ 2) No (🕶 6-3)

[	1		2	2	3-(	남)	3-(	લ)	4	1			5			6
29	3	Ю	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44

<pre>&lt; Reported &gt;</pre>	
6-1. What was the polic	e reaction to the report?
1) No reaction	was conducted.
2) Verified the	damage by phone.
3) Verified the	damage by an actual visit.
4) Solves the c	rime through active research.
6-2. Were you satisfied 1) Very satisfied 2) Satisfied 3) Neutral 4) Not satisfied 5) Not satisfied	about the police reaction? ed at all

---- < Not reported >

6-3. What was the reason?
1) The damage was not very serious.
2) The crime was solved personally.
3) There wasn't any proof.
4) Reported to another authorization (e.g., insurance company).
5) Thought the police would be little help.
6) Thought the police would be inquisitive.
7) The criminal was an acquaintance.
8) Fear of revenge.
9) other (specifically :)

6-1	6-2	6-3	#
45	46	47	48
			3

You answered yes to the questions on robbery in the previous section. If you have several experiences on this kind of crime, please answer the following questions based on the most current incident.

1. The month of the crime :

- 2. What was the approximate time of the crime? \_\_\_\_\_ (am/pm)
- 3. How many persons were in the house at the time? \_\_\_\_\_ male(s) and \_\_\_\_ female(s)
- 4. How many robbers were related to the crime? \_\_\_\_\_ male(s) and \_\_\_\_\_ female(s)

5. What was the approximate age of the suspect? (If several, answer based on the main suspect)

- \_\_\_\_ 1) 10s \_\_\_\_ 2) 20s \_\_\_\_ 3) 30s \_\_\_\_ 4) 40s
- \_\_\_\_\_ 5) over 50s \_\_\_\_\_ 6) could not identify
- 6. Who were the suspects?
  - \_\_\_\_\_1) family member
  - \_\_\_\_ 2) relative
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 3) friend or lover
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 4) colleague or boss
  - \_\_\_\_ 5) neighbor
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 6) close acquaintance
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 7) acquaintance (met once or twice)
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 8) totalstranger

	1		2	3-(	남)	3-(	(વ)	4-(	남)	4-(	여)	5	6
49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60	61	62

- 7. Did the suspect carry or use a weapon? (please select only one item)
- 1) no weapon \_\_\_\_\_ 2) knife \_\_\_\_\_ 3) pistol (include pepper gas) \_\_\_\_\_ 4) bat \_\_\_\_\_ 5) other (specifically :\_\_\_\_\_)
  8. Did the suspect attempt to rape or actually raped a female? \_\_\_\_\_\_ 1) Yes \_\_\_\_\_ 2) No
  9. How many family members got physically injured? total :\_\_\_\_\_
  10. What was the extent of the injury? \_\_\_\_\_\_ 1) were not physically injured \_\_\_\_\_\_ 2) slight injury(complete cure after 3 weeks or less) \_\_\_\_\_\_ 3) serious injury(complete cure after 3 weeks or more)
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 4) killed
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 5) other (specifically:\_\_\_\_\_)

11. What did you get robbed? (please select only one item)

- \_\_\_\_ 01) TV, video, audio \_\_\_\_\_ 02) camera, camcoder
- \_\_\_\_\_ 03) jewelry(e.g., watches, rings) \_\_\_\_\_ 04) cash, check, stock
- \_\_\_\_\_ 05) art pieces, antiques \_\_\_\_\_ 06) furniture, folding screen
- \_\_\_\_\_ 07) clothes \_\_\_\_\_ 08) food
- \_\_\_\_\_ 09) other electric appliances \_\_\_\_\_ 10) agricultural product like rice
- \_\_\_\_\_ 11) other (specifically :\_\_\_\_\_)
- 12. How much was the approximate value of the item?

\_\_\_\_\_ won

7	8	5	)	10	1	1			12		
63	64	65	66	67	68	69	70	71	72	73	74

- 13. What was your reaction to the attack?
  - \_\_\_\_\_1) Resisted by force.
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 2) Threatened with words.
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 3) Pleaded for less damage.
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 4) Reported to the police or other authorization during the attack.
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 5) Asked neighbors or other people for help.
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 6) Tried to escape from the robber.
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 7) Suffered the attack.
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 8) other (specifically :\_\_\_\_\_\_ )
- 14. How did your reaction affect the attack?
  - \_\_\_\_ 1) Caused no damage.
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 2) Caused less severe damage.
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 3) Caused not much difference.
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 4) Overreaction caused more severe damages to the victim.
- 15. Did you report the incident to the police?
  - \_\_\_\_ 1) Yes (🕶 15-1, 15-2)
  - \_\_\_\_ 2) No (🕶 15-3)

13	14	15
75	76	77

——— < Reported >
15-1. What was the police reaction to the report?
1) No reaction was conducted.
2) Verified the damage by phone.
3) Verified the damage by an actual visit.
4) Solves the crime through active research.
15-2. Were you satisfied about the police reaction?
1) Very satisfied
2) Satisfied
3) Neutral
4) Not satisfied
5) Not satisfied at all
<pre> &lt; Not reported &gt;</pre>
15-3. What was the reason?
1) The victimization was not very serious.
2) The crime was solved personally.
3) There wasn't any proof.
4) Reported to another authorization (ex., insurance company).
5) Thought the police would be little help.
6) Thought the police would be inquisitive.

\_\_\_\_\_7) The criminal was an acquaintance.

\_\_\_\_\_ 9) other (specifically :\_\_\_\_\_\_ )

\_\_\_\_ 8) Fear of revenge.

카드	15-1	15-2	15-3	#
1	2	3	4	5
4				4

— <Personal-level Larceny > \_\_\_\_\_\_
You answered yes to the question on personal-level larceny in the previous section. If you have several experiences on this kind of crime, please answer the following questions based on the most current incident.

- 1. Where was the place of the incident?
  - \_\_\_\_ 01) near home
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 02) school or workplace
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 03) market, department store,
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 04) public authorization such as post office and bank
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 05) bars and motels
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 06) streets like allies
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 07) park or retired (quite) places
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 08) public transportation such as bus, taxi, and subway
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 09) train station or bus terminal
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 10) other (specifically : \_\_\_\_\_\_ )
- 2. The month of the crime :
- 3. What was the approximate time of the crime? \_\_\_\_\_ (am/pm)
- 4. What is the value of the item or the amount of cash you got robbed?

\_\_\_\_\_ won

- 5. Did you report the incident to the police?
  - \_\_\_\_ 1) Yes (🖙 5-1, 5-2)
  - \_\_\_\_ 2) No (🕶 5-3)

]	1	2		:	3		4		5		
6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17

<ul> <li>5-1. What was the police reaction to the report?</li> <li>1) No reaction was conducted.</li> <li>2) Verified the damage by phone.</li> <li>3) Verified the damage by an actual visit.</li> <li>4) Solves the crime through active research.</li> </ul> 5-2. Were you satisfied about the police reaction? <ul> <li>1) Very satisfied</li> <li>2) Satisfied</li> <li>3) Neutral</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>1) No reaction was conducted.</li> <li>2) Verified the damage by phone.</li> <li>3) Verified the damage by an actual visit.</li> <li>4) Solves the crime through active research.</li> </ul> 5-2. Were you satisfied about the police reaction? <ul> <li>1) Very satisfied</li> <li>2) Satisfied</li> <li>3) Neutral</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>2) Verified the damage by phone.</li> <li>3) Verified the damage by an actual visit.</li> <li>4) Solves the crime through active research.</li> </ul> 5-2. Were you satisfied about the police reaction? <ul> <li>1) Very satisfied</li> <li>2) Satisfied</li> <li>3) Neutral</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>3) Verified the damage by an actual visit.</li> <li>4) Solves the crime through active research.</li> <li>5-2. Were you satisfied about the police reaction?</li> <li>1) Very satisfied</li> <li>2) Satisfied</li> <li>3) Neutral</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>4) Solves the crime through active research.</li> <li>5-2. Were you satisfied about the police reaction?</li> <li>1) Very satisfied</li> <li>2) Satisfied</li> <li>3) Neutral</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>5-2. Were you satisfied about the police reaction?</li> <li>1) Very satisfied</li> <li>2) Satisfied</li> <li>3) Neutral</li> </ul>
3) Neutral
4) Not satisfied
5) Not satisfied at all

<pre>&lt; Not reported &gt;</pre>
5-3. What was the reason?
1) The victimization was not very serious.
2) The incident was solved personally.
3) There wasn't any proof.
4) Reported to another authorization (e.g., insurance company)
5) Thought the police would be little help.
6) Thought the police would be inquisitive.
7) The criminal was an acquaintance.
8) Fear of revenge.
$\_$ 9) other (specifically : $\_$ )

5-1	5-2	5-3	#
18	19	20	21
			5

<Personal-level Robbery> You answered yes to the question on personal-level robbery in the previous section. If you have several experiences on this kind of crime, please answer the following questions based on the most current incident.

- 1. Where was the place of the incident?
  - \_\_\_\_ 01) near home
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 02) school or work place
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 03) market, department store, store
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 04) public authorizations such as bank and post office
  - \_\_\_\_ 05) places of amusement (ex, bar, motel..)
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 06) streets like allies
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 07) park or retired (quite) places
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 08) public transportation such as taxi, bus, and subway
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 09) train station or bus terminal
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 10) other (specifically:\_\_\_\_\_\_ )
- 2. The month of the crime :
- 3. What was the approximate time of the crime? \_\_\_\_\_ (am/pm)
- How many robbers were related to the crime?
   \_\_\_\_\_ male(s) and \_\_\_\_\_ female(s)
- 5. What was the approximate age of the suspect?
  - (If several, answer based on the main suspect)

1) 10s	2) 20s
3) 30s	4) 40s

5) over 50s	6) could not identify

1		2		3		4-(남)		4-(વ્વે)		5
22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32

- 6. Who were the suspects?
  - \_\_\_\_\_1) one of the family members
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 2) one of the relatives
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 3) friend or lover
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 4) colleague or boss
  - \_\_\_\_ 5) neighbor
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 6) close acquaintance other than family or friend
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 7) acquaintance (met once or twice)
  - \_\_\_\_ 8) total stranger
- 7. Did the suspect carry or use a weapon?
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 1) no weapons \_\_\_\_\_ 2) knife
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 3) pistol(include pepper gas) \_\_\_\_\_ 4) bat
  - \_\_\_\_\_5) other (specifically :\_\_\_\_\_\_)

8. Did the suspect try to rape or assult you?
1) Yes
2) No

- 9. What was the extent of the injury?
  - \_\_\_\_\_1) were not physically injured
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 2) slight injury(complete cure after 3 weeks or less)
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 3) serious injury(complete cure after 3 weeks or more)
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 4) other (specifically:\_\_\_\_\_)
- 10. What is the value of the item or the amount of cash you got robbed?

\_\_\_\_\_ 2) No

\_\_\_\_\_ won

- 11. Was a friend, colleague or lover on the site of the incident?
  - \_\_\_\_ 1) Yes

6	7	8	9		11				
33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42

12. Did you have companies when you victimized?

\_\_\_\_\_ 1) Yes \_\_\_\_\_ 2) No

- 13. What was your reaction to the attack?
  - \_\_\_\_\_1) Resisted by force.
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 2) Threatened with words.
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 3) Pleaded for less damage.
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 4) Reported to the police or other authorization during the attack.
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 5) Asked neighbors or other people for help.
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 6) Tried to escape from the robber.
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 7) Suffered the attack.
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 8) other (specifically :\_\_\_\_\_\_ )
- 14. How did your reaction affect the attack?
  - \_\_\_\_\_1) Caused no damage.
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 2) Caused less severe damage.
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 3) Caused not much difference.
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 4) Overreaction caused more severe damages to the victim.
- 15. Did you report the incident to the police?
  - \_\_\_\_ 1) Yes (🕶 15-1, 15-2)
  - \_\_\_\_ 2) No (🕶 15-3)

13	14	15
44	45	46
	13 44	13     14       44     45



< Not reported >
15-3. What was the reason?
1) The damage was not serious
2) The incident was solved personally
3) There wasn't any proof
4) Reported to another authorization (e.g., insurance company).
5) Thought the police would be little help.
6) Thought the police would be inquisitive.
7) The criminal was an acquaintance.
8) Fear of revenge
9) other (specifically :)

15-1	15-2	15-3	#
47	48	49	50
			6

---- < Injured or nearly injured by an assault > ---You answered yes to the question on assault in the previous section. If you have several experiences on this kind of crime, please answer the following questions based on the most current incident.

- 1. Where was the place of the incident?
  - \_\_\_\_ 01) your place
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 02) the suspect's place
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 03) friend or relative's place
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 04) work place or school
  - \_\_\_\_ 05) bar or motel
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 06) inside public transportation
  - \_\_\_\_ 07) the crowded place (ex., market, department store.)
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 08) uncrowded places (ex. the byway)
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 09) park or retired (quiet) places
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 10) other (specifically :\_\_\_\_\_)
- 2. The month of the crime :
- 3. What was the approximate time of the crime? \_\_\_\_\_ (am/pm)
- 4. How many persons were related to the crime? \_\_\_\_\_ male(s) and \_\_\_\_\_ female(s)
- 5. What was the approximate age of the suspect?
  - (If several, answer based on the main suspect)

1) 10s	2) 20s
3) 30s	4) 40s

 57	005			4)	4(
5		50		$\sim$	

 5)	over	50s	 6)	could	not	identify

1		2		3		4-(남)		4-(여)		5
51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60	61
- 6. Who were the suspects?
  - \_\_\_\_\_1) one of the family members
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 2) one of the relatives
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 3) friend or lover
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 4) colleague or boss
  - \_\_\_\_ 5) neighbor
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 6) close acquaintance other than family or friend
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 7) acquaintance (met once or twice)
  - \_\_\_\_ 8) total stranger
- 7. How did the suspect assaulted you?
  - \_\_\_\_\_1) holded or shaked
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 2) slapped with hands
  - \_\_\_\_ 3) kicked with feet
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 4) hit with furniture like chairs and tables
  - \_\_\_\_ 5) waved bats or knives
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 6) hit with rock or metal
  - \_\_\_\_\_7) threatened or shot a gun
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 8) other (specifically:\_\_\_\_\_\_)
- 8. Was a friend, colleague or lover on the site of the incident?
- 9. Did you have companies when you victimized?
  - \_\_\_\_ 1) Yes \_\_\_\_ 2) No
- 10. What was the extent of the injury?
  - \_\_\_\_\_1) were not physically injured
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 2) slight injury(complete cure after 3 weeks or less)
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 3) serious injury(complete cure after 3 weeks or more)
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 4) other (specifically:\_\_\_\_\_)

6	7	8	9	10
62	63	64	65	66

- 11. What was your reaction to the attack?
  - \_\_\_\_\_1) Resisted by force.
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 2) Threatened with words.
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 3) Pleaded for less damage.
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 4) Reported to the police or other authorization during the attack.
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 5) Asked neighbors or other people for help.
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 6) Tried to escape from the robber.
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 7) Suffered the attack.
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 8) other (specifically :\_\_\_\_\_\_ )
- 12. How did your reaction affect the attack?
  - \_\_\_\_\_1) Caused no damage.
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 2) Caused less severe damage.
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 3) Caused not much difference.
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 4) Overreaction caused more severe damages to the victim.
- 13. Did you report the incident to the police?

\_\_\_\_ 1) Yes (🕶 13-1, 13-2)

\_\_\_\_ 2) No (🕶 13-3)

11	12	13
67	68	69



<pre>&lt; Not reported &gt;</pre>
13-3. What was the reason?
1) The damage was not serious
2) The incident was solved personally
3) There wasn't any proof
4) Reported to another authorization (e.g., insurance company).
5) Thought the police would be little help.
6) Thought the police would be inquisitive.
7) The criminal was an acquaintance.
8) Fear of revenge
9) other (specifically :)

13-1	13-2	13-3	#
70	71	72	73
			7

-- < Sexual assault and sexual harassment > You answered yes to the question on sexual assault and sexual harassment in the previous section. Please answer the following questions. This section is for females only.

1. What was the actual incident? (please check every item you a	are included)
ÛY	es ②No
가) heard bad/insulted word about sex	
나)experience to get a obscene telephone call from someone _	
다) hold hand or touch somewhere on my body	
라) bodily stick by force, and touch my hip and breast	
마) kiss by force	
바) touch my genitals	
사) Try to sexual relationship by force, but failed	
아) Do sex by force	

\* Generally, option 1) is regarded the most serious, and 7) is the least serious. If you experienced several incidents shown above, please answer the below questions based on the most serious incidents you experienced.

2. Where was the place of the incident?

- \_\_\_\_\_ 01) your residence \_\_\_\_\_ 02) suspect's residence
- \_\_\_\_\_ 03) friend or relative's residence \_\_\_\_\_ 04) work place or school
- \_\_\_\_\_ 05) accommodation \_\_\_\_\_ 06) places of amusement
- \_\_\_\_ 07) bus or subway
- \_\_\_\_\_ 08) subway station, bus terminal, or train station
- \_\_\_\_\_ 09) department store or market \_\_\_\_\_ 10) underpass
- \_\_\_\_ 11) parking lot \_\_\_\_\_ 12) alley or street
- \_\_\_\_ 13) public restroom \_\_\_\_\_ 14) park or retired (quite) places ) \_\_\_\_\_ 15) other (specifically :\_\_\_\_

카드	1-가	ч	다	라	마	바	사	아	1	2
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
5										

3. The month of the crime :

- 4. What was the approximate time of the crime? \_\_\_\_\_ (am/pm)
- 5. How many persons were related to the crime? \_\_\_\_\_ male(s) and \_\_\_\_ female(s)
- 6. What was the approximate age of the suspect? (If several, answer based on the main suspect)

1) 10s	2) 20s
3) 30s	4) 40s

- \_\_\_\_ 5) over 50s \_\_\_\_ 6) could not identify
- 7. Who were the suspects?
  - \_\_\_\_\_1) one of the family members
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 2) one of the relatives
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 3) friend or lover
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 4) colleague or boss
  - \_\_\_\_ 5) neighbor
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 6) close acquaintance other than family or friend
  - \_\_\_\_\_7) acquaintance (met once or twice)
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 8) total stranger

8. How did the suspect(s) threaten or assault?

- \_\_\_\_\_1) did not threaten or assault
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2) threatened with words
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3) holded or shaked
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4) slapped with hands or kicked with feet
- \_\_\_\_\_ 5) threatened with knife for a weapon
- \_\_\_\_\_ 6) assaulted with knife or a weapon
- \_\_\_\_\_ 7) other (specifically :\_\_\_\_\_\_ )

3	4	1	5-(	남)	5-(	여)	6	7	8
13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22
	13	13 14	4 13 14 15	4     5-0       13     14     15     16	4     5-(甘)       13     14     15     16     17       0     0     0     0     0	4     5-(甘)     5-(       13     14     15     16     17     18       Ⅰ     Ⅰ     Ⅰ     Ⅰ     Ⅰ     Ⅰ	4 5-(남) 5-(여) 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	4     5-(甘)     5-(여)     6       13     14     15     16     17     18     19     20	4     5-(남)     5-(여)     6     7       13     14     15     16     17     18     19     20     21

- 9. Did you get robbed?
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 1) Yes \_\_\_\_\_ 2) No
- 10. Was a friend, colleague or lover on the site of the incident?\_\_\_\_\_1) Yes \_\_\_\_\_2) No
- 11. Did you have companies when you victimized?
- 12. What was your reaction to the attack?
  - \_\_\_\_1) Resisted by force.
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 2) Threatened with words.
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 3) Pleaded for less damage.
  - 4) Reported to the police or other authorization during the attack.
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 5) Asked neighbors or other people for help.
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 6) Tried to escape from the robber.
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 7) Suffered the attack.
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 8) other (specifically :\_\_\_\_\_\_ )
- 13. How did your reaction affect the attack?
  - \_\_\_\_\_1) Caused no damage.
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 2) Caused less severe damage.
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 3) Caused not much difference.
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 4) Overreaction caused more severe damages to the victim.
- 14. Who did you tell the incident to right after it happened?
  - \_\_\_\_\_1) family (parents, sibling) \_\_\_\_\_2) friend or lover
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 3) colleague \_\_\_\_\_\_ 4) counsellor
  - \_\_\_\_ 5) police

- \_\_\_\_\_ 6) other (specifically : \_\_\_\_\_)
- \_\_\_\_\_ 7) didn't tell anybody

9	10	11	12	13	14
23	24	25	26	27	28

15. Did you report the incident to the police?

\_\_\_\_ 1) Yes (🕶 15-1, 15-2)

\_\_\_\_ 2) No (🕶 15-3)

< Reported >
15-1. What was the police reaction to the report?
\_\_\_\_\_\_1) No reaction was conducted.
\_\_\_\_\_\_2) Verified the damage by phone.
\_\_\_\_\_\_3) Verified the damage by an actual visit.
\_\_\_\_\_\_4) Solves the crime through active research.
15-2. Were you satisfied about the police reaction?
\_\_\_\_\_1) Very satisfied
\_\_\_\_\_2) Satisfied
\_\_\_\_\_3) Neutral
\_\_\_\_\_4) Not satisfied at all

< Not reported >
15-3. What was the reason?
\_\_\_\_\_\_1) The damage was not serious
\_\_\_\_\_2) The incident was solved personally
\_\_\_\_\_3) There wasn't any proof
\_\_\_\_\_4) Reported to another authorization (e.g., insurance company).
\_\_\_\_\_5) Thought the police would be little help.
\_\_\_\_\_6) Thought the police would be inquisitive.
\_\_\_\_\_7) The criminal was an acquaintance.
\_\_\_\_\_8) Fear of revenge
\_\_\_\_\_9) other (specifically :\_\_\_\_\_\_)

15	15-1	15-2	15-3	#
29	30	31	32	33
				8

## Appendix C. Approval of the University Committee on Research involving Human Subject (UCRIHS)

## MICHIGAN STATE

UNIVERSITY

December 17, 2001

Shelia Royo MAXWELL TO: 560 Baker Hall

RF<sup>.</sup> IRB # 00-803 CATEGORY: 1-E EXEMPT RENEWAL APPROVAL DATE: December 17, 2001

TITLE: VICTIMIZATION SURVEY IN KOREA: CHARACTERISTIC OF VICTIMIZATION ON PERSONAL LEVEL CRIME IN KOREA

The University Committee on Research Involving Human Subjects' (UCRIHS) review of this project is complete and I am pleased to advise that the rights and welfare of the human subjects appear to be adequately protected and methods to obtain informed consent are appropriate. Therefore, the UCRIHS APPROVED THIS PROJECT'S RENEWAL.

RENEWALS: UCRIHS approval is valid for one calendar year, beginning with the approval date shown above. Projects continuing beyond one year must be renewed with the green renewal form. A maximum of four such expedited renewal are possible. Investigators wishing to continue a project beyond that time need to submit it again for complete review.

REVISIONS: UCRIHS must review any changes in procedures involving human subjects, prior to initiation of the change. If this is done at the time of renewal, please use the green renewal form. To revise an approved protocol at any other time during the year, send your written request to the UCRIHS Chair, requesting revised approval and referencing the project's IRB# and title. Include in your request a description of the change and any revised instruments, consent forms or advertisements that are applicable.

PROBLEMS/CHANGES: Should either of the following arise during the course of the work, notify UCRIHS promptly: 1) problems (unexpected side effects, complaints, etc.) involving human subjects or 2) changes in the research environment or new information indicating greater risk to the human subjects than existed when the protocol was previously reviewed and approved.



If we can be of further assistance, please contact us at 517 355-2180 or via email: UCRIHS@pilot.msu.edu.

OFFICE OF RESEARCH Sincerely,

AND GRADUATE STUDIES

ly Committee on Ashir Kumar, M.D. arch involving UCRIHS Chair Hemen Subjects

Michigan State University 246 Administration Building East Lansing, Michigan 48824-1046 AK: 517/355-2180 FAX: 517/353-2976 CC: Junseob Moon

Web: www.msu.edu/user/ucrihs E-Mail: ucrihe@msu.edu

3012 Sam Houston Ave, Apt. E Huntsville, TX 77340

kb

The Michigan State University IDEA is institutional Diversity Excellence in Action MSU is an allormative-action soul-coportunity institution

.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aldrich, J. & Nelson, F. (1984). <u>Linear Probability, Logit, and Probit Models</u>. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Bebbett, T., & Wright, R. (1983). Burglars perception of targets. <u>Home Office</u> <u>Research Bulletin</u>, 15, 18-20.
- Brantingham, P., & Brantingham, P. (1978). Residential Burglary and Urban Form. <u>Urban Studies</u>, 12, 273-284.
- Brown, B., & Altman, I. (1981). Territoriality and residential crime: A conceptual frame work. In P. Brantingham & Brantingham, P. (Eds.), <u>Environmental</u> <u>Criminology</u>. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics (1995). <u>Criminal Victimization in the United States</u>. Washington D. C.: Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Clarke, R., Ekblow, P., Hough, M., & Mayhew, P. (1985). Elderly Victims of Crime and Exposure to Risk. <u>Howard Journal of Criminal Justice</u>. 24, 1-9.
- Cohen, L. (1981). Modeling Crime Trends: A Criminal Opportunity Perspective. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 18, 138-162.
- Cohen, L. E., & Cantor, D. (1981). Residential Burglary in the United States: Life – style and Demographic Factors Associated with the Probability of Victimization. <u>Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency</u>, 17, 113–127.
- Cohen, L. E., Cantor, D., & Kluelgel, J. (1981). Robbery Victimization in the U. S.: Analysis of a Nonrandom Event. <u>Social Science Quarterly</u>, 62, 644 – 657.
- Cohen, L. E., & Felson, M. (1979). Social Change and Crime Rate Trends: A Routine Activities Approach. <u>American Sociological Review</u>, 44, 588-608.
- Cohen, L. E., Kluegal, J., & Land, K. (1981). Social Inequality and Criminal Victimization. <u>American Sociological Review</u>, 46, 505-524.

- Copes, H. (1999). Routine Activities and Motor Vehicle Theft: A Crime Specific Approach. Journal of Crime and Justice, 22, 125 146.
- Cornish, D. B., & Clarke, R. V. (1986). <u>The Reasoning Criminal.</u> New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Corrado, R., Roesch, W., Glackman, J., Evans, J., & Leger, G. (1980). Lifestyles and Personal Victimization: A Test of the Model with Canadian Data. <u>Journal</u> <u>of Criminal Justice</u>, 3, 129–139.
- Cromwell, P., Olson, J., & Avary, D. (1991). Breaking and Entering: An Ethnographic Analysis of Burglary. In Clarke, R., & Hope, T. (Eds.), <u>Coping</u> with burglary. Boston, MA: Kluwer – Nijoff.
- Doerner, W. G., & Lab, S. P. (1998). <u>Victimology</u>. Cincinnati; OH. Anderson Publishing Co.
- Eck, J. (1994). <u>Drug Markets and Drug Places: A Case Control Study of the</u> <u>Spatial Structure of Illicit Drug Dealing</u>. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Maryland.
- Eck, J., & Weisburd, D. (1995). <u>Crime and Place</u>. Monsey, NY: Criminal Justice Press.
- Felson, M. (1987). Routine Activities and Crime Prevention in the Developing Metropolis. <u>Criminology</u>, 25, 911-931.
- Felson, M. (1983). Ecology of Crime. In S. Kadish (Ed.), <u>Encyclopedia of Crime</u> and Justice.
- Felson, M. (1986). Linking the Criminal Choices, Routine Activities, Informal Control, and Criminal Outcomes. In Derrick Cornish & Ronald Clarke (Eds.), <u>The Reasoning Criminal: Rational Choice Perspectives on Offending</u>. NY: Springer – Verlag.

(1995). Those Who Discourage Crime. In John Eck & David Weisburd (Eds.), <u>Crime and Place</u>. Monsey, NY: Criminal Justice Press.

Garofalo, J., Siegel, L., & Laub, J. (1987). School – Related Victimizations Among Adolescents: An Analysis of National Crime Survey (NCS) Narratives. Journal of Quantitative Criminology, 3, 321 – 338.

Glaser, D. (1971). Social Deviance. Chicago; IL. Markham Publishing Co.

-----. (1978). <u>Crime in Our Changing Society</u>. New York: Holt.

- Hanushek, E. A., & Jackson, J. E. (1977). <u>Statistical Methods for Social Scientists</u>. New York: Academic Press.
- Hindelang, M., Gottfredson, M. R., Dunn, C. S., & Parisi, N. (Eds.) (1977). <u>Sourcebook of Criminal Justice Statistics – 1976</u>. GPO.
- Hindelang, M., Gottfredson, M. R., & Garofalo, J. (1978). <u>Victims of Personal</u> <u>Crime: An Empirical Foundation for a Theory of Personal Victimization.</u> Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.
- Karmen, A. (2000). Victims of Crime: Issues and Patterns. In Sheley, J. (Eds.). <u>Criminology</u>, (pp. 165-189). Wadsworth, Thomson Learning.
- Kennedy, L., & Sacco, V. (1997). <u>Crime Victims in Context</u>. Roxbury Publishing Company; Los Angeles; CA.
- Kim, J., Shim, Y., & Cho, J. (1991). <u>What is the victimization survey (Written in</u> <u>Korean</u>). Seoul; Korea. The Korea Institute of Criminology.
- Koichi, Miyazawa (1996). <u>The Introduction of Victimology</u>. (Translated in Korean by Chang, K. W., 1998). Cho-Sa-Yeon-Ku. Tokyo; Japan.

Kurian, G. (1987). Encyclopedia of the Third World. MA: Facts on File, Inc.

Lauritsen, J. L., & Quinet, K. F. D. (1995). Repeat Victimization among adolescents and Young Adults. <u>Journal of Quantitative Criminology</u>, 11, 143 – 166. Lee, H. (2000). From Victim Compensation Schemes to Reparative Justice. Korean Journal of Victimology, 8, 402 – 429.

Letkemann, P. (1973). Crime as Work. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice – Hall.

- Levitt, S. D. (1999). The Changing Relationship between Income and Crime Victimization. <u>Economic Policy Review</u>. 87 98.
- Long, J. S. (1997). Regression Models for Categorical and Limited Dependent Variables. Thousand Oaks. CA: Sage.
- Lynch, J. P. (1987). Routine Activity and Victimization at Work. <u>Journal of</u> <u>Quantitative Criminology</u>, 3, 283 – 300.
- Lynch, J. P. (1991). Victim Behavior and the Risk of Victimization: Implications of Activity – Specific Victimization Rates. In Kaiser, G., Kury, H., & Albrecht, H. J. (Eds.), <u>Victims and Criminal Justice: Theoritical Research</u> (pp. 543-566).
   Freigburg, Germany; Eigenverlag Max-Planck-Institut.
- Lynch, J., & Cantor, D. (1992). Ecological and Behavioral Influences on Property Victimization At Home: Implications for Opportunity Theory. <u>Journal of</u> <u>Research in Crime and Delinquency</u>, 29, 335-362.
- Markides, K. S., & Tracy, G. S. (1976). The Effect of the Age Structure of a Stationary Population on Crime Rates. <u>Journal of Criminal Law and</u> <u>Criminology</u>, 67, 351-355.
- Maxfield, M. G. (1987). Household Composition, Routine Activity, and Victimization: A Comparative Analysis. <u>Journal of Quantitative Criminology</u>, 301-320.
- Messner, S. F., & Tardiff, K. (1985). The Social Ecology of Urban Homicide: An Application of the 'Routine Activities' Approach. <u>Criminology</u>, 23, 241 267.

Miethe, T. D., & Meier, R. (1990). Opportunity, Choice, and Criminal victimization:

A Test of a Theoretical Model. <u>Journal of Research in Crime and</u> <u>Delinquency</u>, 27, 243 – 66.

------ (1994). <u>Crime and Its Social Context: Toward and</u> <u>Integrated Theory of Offenders, Victims, and Situations</u>. Albany: State University of New York Press.

- Miethe, T. D., Stafford, M. C., Long, J. S. (1987). Social Differentiation in Criminal Victimization: A Test of Routine Activities/Lifestyle Theories. <u>American</u> <u>Sociological Review</u>, 52, 184 – 194.
- Mustaine, E. E., & Tewksbury, R. (1998). Predicting Risks of Larceny Theft Victimization: A Routine Activity Analysis Using Refined Lifestyle Measures. <u>Criminology</u>, 36, 829-857.

for Women's Stalking Victimization. <u>Violence Against Women</u>, 5, 43-62.

- O'Brien, R. M. (1985). Crime Facts: Victim and Offender Data. In Sheley, J. (Eds.) <u>Criminology (pp. 56-83)</u>. Wadsworth Thomson Learning
- Pursley, R. (1994). <u>Introduction to Criminal Justice</u>. New York, NY: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Sherman, L. W., Gartin, P. R., & Buerger, & Buerger, M. E. (1989). Hot Spots of Predatory Crime: Routine Activities and the Criminology of Place. <u>Criminology</u>, 27, 27 – 55.
- Stefford, M. C., & Galle, O. R. (1984). Victimization Rates, Exposeure to Risk, and Fear of Crime. <u>Criminology</u>, 22, 173-185.
- Tremblay, M., & Tremblay, P. (1998). Social Structure, Interaction Opportunities, and the Direction of Violent Offenses. <u>Journal of Research in Crime and</u> <u>Delinquency</u>, 35, 295-315.
- The Korean Supreme Prosecutor's office. (1998). <u>The White Book in Crime</u>. Seoul; Korea.

Thompson, C. Y., & Fisher, B. (1996). Predicting Household Victimization

Utilizing a Multi-Level Routine Activity Approach. <u>Journal of Crime and</u> <u>Justice</u>, 14, 49-66.

- van Dijk, J., Mayhew, P., & Killias, M. (1990). <u>Experiences of Crime across the</u> <u>World: Key Findings of the 1898 International Crime Survey</u>. Deventer, the Netherlands: Kluwer.
- van Dijk, J., & Steinmetz, C. (1984). The Burden of Crime in Dutch Society. In Block, R. (Eds.), <u>Victimization and Fear of Crime: World Perspectives</u>, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C.
- von Hentig, H. (1948). <u>The Criminal and His Victims: Studies in the Sociobiology</u> of Crime. New Heaven: Yale University Press.
- Walklate, S. (1989). <u>Victimology: The Victim and the Criminal Justice Process</u>. London: Unwin Hyman.
- Wright, R., & Decker, S. (1994). <u>Burglars on the Job: Street Life and Residential</u> <u>Break-Ins</u>. Boston, MA: Northeastern University Press.
- Weisburd, D. (1997). <u>Reorienting crime prevention research and policy: from the</u> <u>causes of criminality to the context of crime</u>. National Institute of Justice Research Report. Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Justice.