Public Safety Canada | Sécurité publique Canada

ARCHIVED - Archiving Content

ARCHIVÉE - Contenu archivé

Archived Content

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

Contenu archivé

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

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

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

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

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

Canada

Catalogue no. 85F0033M — No. 20
ISSN 1496-4562
ISBN 978-1-100-12274-8

Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics Profile Series

Household Income and Victimization in Canada, 2004

by Andrea Taylor-Butts

Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics
19th floor, R.H. Coats Building, Ottawa, K1A 0T6

Telephone: 613-951-9023 Toll-free: 1-800-387-2231

Statistics Canada Statistique Canada

Canada

How to obtain more information

Specifi c inquiries about this product and related statistics or services should be directed to: Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Statistics Canada, Ottawa, Ontario, K1A 0T6 (Toll-free 1-800-387-2231, telephone: 613-951-9023, fax: 613-951-6615).

For information about this product or the wide range of services and data available from Statistics Canada, visit our website at www.statcan.gc.ca, e-mail us at infostats@statcan.gc.ca, or telephone us, Monday to Friday from 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., at the following numbers:

Statistics Canada's National Contact Centre

Toll-free telephone (Canada and United States):

Inquiries line	1-800-263-1136
National telecommunications device for the hearing impaired	1-800-363-7629
Fax line	1-877-287-4369

Local or international calls:

Inquiries line	1-613-951-8116
Fax line	1-613-951-0581

Depository Services Program

Inquiries line	1-800-635-7943
Fax line	1-800-565-7757

To access this product

This product, Catalogue no. 85F0033M, is available free in electronic format. To obtain a single issue, visit our website at www.statcan.gc.ca and select "Publications."

Standards of service to the public

Statistics Canada is committed to serving its clients in a prompt, reliable and courteous manner. To this end, Statistics Canada has developed standards of service that its employees observe. To obtain a copy of these service standards, please contact Statistics Canada toll-free at 1-800-263-1136. The service standards are also published on www.statcan.gc.ca under "About us" > "Providing services to Canadians."

Statistics Canada
Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics

Household Income and Victimization in Canada, 2004

Published by authority of the Minister responsible for Statistics Canada

© Minister of Industry, 2009

All rights reserved. The content of this electronic publication may be reproduced, in whole or in part, and by any means, without further permission from Statistics Canada, subject to the following conditions: that it be done solely for the purposes of private study, research, criticism, review or newspaper summary, and/or for non-commercial purposes; and that Statistics Canada be fully acknowledged as follows: Source (or "Adapted from", if appropriate): Statistics Canada, year of publication, name of product, catalogue number, volume and issue numbers, reference period and page(s). Otherwise, no part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form, by any means—electronic, mechanical or photocopy—or for any purposes without prior written permission of Licensing Services, Client Services Division, Statistics Canada, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada K1A 0T6.

April 2009

Catalogue no. 85F0033M, no. 20

ISSN 1496-4562

ISBN 978-1-100-12274-8

Frequency: Occasional

Ottawa

Cette publication est disponible en français sur demande (nº 85F0033M au catalogue).

Note of appreciation

Canada owes the success of its statistical system to a long-standing partnership between Statistics Canada, the citizens of Canada, its businesses, governments and other institutions. Accurate and timely statistical information could not be produced without their continued cooperation and goodwill.

Preface

This series of profiles provides analysis on a variety of topics and issues concerning victimization, offending and public perceptions of crime and the justice system. The profiles primarily draw on results from the General Social Survey on victimization. Where applicable, they also incorporate information from other data sources, such as the Census of Population and the Incident-based Uniform Crime Reporting Survey.

Examples of the topics explored through this series include: Victimization and offending in Canada's territories, Canadians' use of crime prevention measures and victimization of older Canadians. This is a unique periodical, of great interest to those who plan, establish, administer and evaluate justice programs and projects, or anyone who has an interest in Canada's justice system.

Table of contents

Highlights 6

Introduction 7

Canadians living in low-income households more likely to be 55 or older, unattached, recent immigrants, visible minorities and outside the paid workforce 7

Canadians living in low-income households experience higher rates of violent victimization 9

Victimization rates for personal property theft and property-related household crimes lower for those from low-income households 12

Victims from low-income households experienced more disruption to daily activities 13

Methodology 16

Bibliography 17

Endnotes 18

Cumulative Index 19

Highlights

- Rates of violent crime victimization, including physical assault, sexual assault and robbery, were at least 1.5 times greater for Canadians from low-income households (i.e., under $15,000) compared to those from higher household income groups.

- Motor vehicle theft, theft of household property and vandalism rates for low-income households were nearly half those of high income households.

- Canadians from low-income households were no more likely than their counterparts from other income groups to report their victimizations to police. However, they were more likely to experience a disruption to their daily activities as a result of their victimization.

- Canadians from low-income households were more likely than those from higher income households to believe their neighbourhoods had higher crime rates than elsewhere and to report socially disruptive conditions in their neighbourhoods.

Introduction

The risk of becoming the victim of violent crime or household property crime can vary according to the mix of social, economic and demographic factors that characterize an individual's circumstances. Income is one such factor and is implicated in the risk of both violent and household criminal victimization (Siegel and McCormick, 1999; Besserer and Hendrick, 2001; Gannon and Mihorean, 2005).

Using data primarily from the 2004 General Social Survey (GSS), this report profiles violent and household victimization among Canadians from low-income households (i.e., under $15,000).[1,2] The report also provides information on who victims turn to for help, perceptions of neighbourhood safety as well as fear of crime among Canadians from low-income households.

Canadians living in low-income households more likely to be 55 or older, unattached, recent immigrants, visible minorities and outside the paid workforce

In 2004, about 4% of Canadians or approximately 1.1 million people lived in households with annual earnings below $15,000, according to the GSS (see Text box 1). While individuals living in low-income households differed in their range of personal and household characteristics, some characteristics were more prevalent among low-income households (Table 1).

For example, compared to individuals with household incomes of $60,000 or higher, Canadians living in low-income households had a greater tendency to be aged 55 or older, and were more often unattached (i.e., single, separated, divorced or widowed). Those living in low-income households were more often recent immigrants,[3] visible minorities, retired individuals, homemakers, students and those looking for paid work.

The majority of Canadians with low-incomes occupied one-member households, lived in apartments and rented as opposed to owned.

While these characteristics may be related to household income, as previous research suggests, they may also be associated with an individual's risk of criminal victimization. For example, Gannon and Mihorean (2005) identified low-income, in addition to other factors such as being young, single and unemployed, a resident of a

Text box 1
Household income and the General Social Survey (GSS)

While the 2004 General Social Survey (GSS) collected information on both the personal and household incomes of its respondents, this study examines the relationship between household income and victimization. The impact of personal income on victimization was examined, and it was determined that it was not significantly related to the risk of criminal victimization. It may be that household income, rather than personal income, is a better indicator of one's actual living conditions and socio-economic circumstances (i.e., their access to resources, wealth, status and social advantages) (Headey, 2008; Brady, 2003). Whatever their personal income, individuals who share a household may draw on the resources of other household members to overcome financial burdens and avoid hardships (Bauman, 1999).

Respondents to the 2004 GSS were asked a series of questions about their total household income, before deductions, from all sources during the past 12 months. From this set of questions, several income groups were derived. The lowest income group (i.e., under $15,000) was used as a proxy for low-income households and represented about 4% of Canadians. The highest income group (i.e., $60,000 or more), constituting about 36% of Canadians, was used as a proxy for high income households. However, these income groupings do not take into account the number of people in the household or place of residence, the two primary factors used in calculating Statistics Canada's Low Income Cut-off.[1] As a result, caution should be used when interpreting the results.

The GSS and Statistics Canada's Low Income Cut-offs do show similarities, however, in the factors associated with low incomes. For example, data from the GSS suggest women, unattached individuals and those in lone-parent families are all more likely than their counterparts to live in low-income household.

1. Statistics Canada's Low Income Cut-off represents the after-tax income threshold, below which families or individuals will spend a larger than average share of their income on the necessities of food, shelter and clothing.

rural area as well as frequent participation in evening activities, as increasing one's risk of violent victimization. The chances of experiencing a violation against one's household property are also related to income, along with other factors such as home ownership, length of residency in one's home, urban versus rural location, household size and the type of dwelling in which one lives (Gannon and Mihorean, 2005).[4]

Table 1
Selected personal characteristics of respondents who declared their household income on the General Social Survey, Canada, 2004

	Household income in dollars				
	0 to 14,999	15,000 to 29,999	30,000 to 39,999	40,000 to 59,999	60,000 and over
	percent				
Age group					
Under 25	17	14	16	13	12
25 to 34	13	15	18	22	19
35 to 44	13	15	18	22	26
45 to 54	15	12	14	19	25
55 and over	42	44	34	25	17
Marital status					
Married or common-law	28	49	59	67	76
Single	34	27	27	24	19
Separated or divorced	19	13	10	7	4
Widow or widower	18	11	5	2	1
Immigrant status					
Recent immigrant (arrived between 1999 and 2004)	9	4	4	3	2
Established immigrant (arrived prior to 1999)	16	17	17	17	16
Non-immigrant	75	79	79	80	82
Visible minority status					
Visible minority	16	11	12	11	9
Not a visible minority	83	87	86	88	90
Don't know or not stated	1	1	1	1	1
Main activity					
Working at a paid job or business	18	40	54	64	78
Looking for paid work	6	3	2[E]	1[E]	0.4[E]
Student	17	11	10	9	8
Household work[1]	16	9	8	8	6
Retired	30	33	24	16	7
Other[2]	12	4	2[E]	2	0.8
Evening activities (number per month)					
Less than 10	45	36	29	21	13
10 to 19	19	21	24	25	25
20 to 29	13	17	17	21	24
30 and over	23	26	31	33	38
Household size of respondent					
One household member	50	26	18	12	4
Two household members	26	41	38	37	30
Three household members	12	14	20	20	22
Four household members	7	11	14	19	29
Five household members	3[E]	5	7	9	11
Six household members or more	2[E]	3	3[E]	4	4

See notes at the end of the table.

Table 1 (continued)
Selected personal characteristics of respondents who declared their household income on the General Social Survey, Canada, 2004

	Household income in dollars				
	0 to 14,999	15,000 to 29,999	30,000 to 39,999	40,000 to 59,999	60,000 and over
	percent				
Location of residence					
Urban	74	73	76	78	84
Rural	26	27	24	22	16
Type of dwelling					
Single detached	37	50	57	64	78
Semi-detached, row house or duplex	15	17	16	16	12
Apartment	44	30	24	18	9
Other	4	4	3	2	1
Home ownership					
Own	36	53	65	74	88
Rent	64	47	35	25	12
Length of residency					
Less than 1 year	22	16	15	13	11
1 to 4 years	31	30	31	30	30
5 to 9 years	14	16	15	17	19
10 years or more	33	38	39	40	40

0 true zero or a value rounded to zero
[E] use with caution, coefficient of variation is high (16.6% to 33.3%)
1. Includes taking care of children and maternity or paternity leave.
2. Includes long-term illness and volunteering.
Note: Figures may not add to total due to rounding.
Source: Statistics Canada, General Social Survey, 2004.

Canadians living in low-income households experience higher rates of violent victimization[5]

Canadians living in low-income households were more likely to be the victims of violent crime than were those from households with higher incomes. Similar to previous GSS findings, in 2004, the rate of violent victimization (which includes physical assault, sexual assault and robbery) for individuals from households with incomes below $15,000 was at least 1.5 times greater than the rate for any of the higher income groupings (Chart 1). Similar findings were observed when each of the particular types of violent crime was examined individually (Table 2).

Even when the effects of a number of other factors were taken into account (i.e., age, sex, marital status, employment status, perceptions of neighbourhood crime levels and personal safety), living in a low-income household continued to be a significant predictor of violent victimization (see Text box 2 “Determining the independent effect of household income on the risk of violent victimization” for more details).

In addition to household income, a number of other factors were also found to be significant in predicting violent victimization. More specifically, for those aged 15 to 24 compared to individuals over 55, as well as individuals who were unmarried, Aboriginal or recent immigrants, the odds of violent victimization were greater, relative to their respective counterparts. Other factors, such as participating in several (i.e., 10 or more) evening activities, perceptions of high neighbourhood crime, dissatisfaction with personal safety and fear of criminal victimization, also increased the odds of violent victimization. In contrast, being female and attending school (as a main activity) reduced the odds of being a victim of violent crime.

Chart 1
Canadians from low income households experience higher rates of violent victimization



1. Rates calculated per 1,000 population aged 15 and over.
2. Only comparison between the lowest household income group and the other household income groups are statistically significant.

Note: Violent victimization includes physical assault, sexual assault (including incidents of spousal physical and sexual assault) and robbery.

Source: Statistics Canada, General Social Survey, 2004.

Table 2
Criminal victimization rates by household income group, Canada, 2004

	Household income in dollars				
	0 to 14,999	15,000 to 29,999	30,000 to 39,999	40,000 to 59,999	60,000 and over
	rate per 1,000 population[1]				
Total violent victimization	**156**	**104**	**105**	**94**	**106**
Physical assault[2]	102	68	77	66	80
Sexual assault[3]	38[E]	24[E]	19[E]	21	16
Robbery	17[E]	12[E]	F	7[E]	9[E]
Personal property theft	71	76	92	81	116
	rate per 1,000 households				
Total household victimization	**160**	**223**	**257**	**267**	**300**
Break and enter	41	36	50	41	42
Motor vehicle theft	21[E]	42	39	49	56
Theft of household property	59	84	93	93	104
Vandalism	39	60	74	84	98

[E] use with caution, coefficient of variation is high (16.6% to 33.3%)
F too unreliable to be published
1. Rates calculated per 1,000 population aged 15 and over.
2. Includes incidents of spousal physical assault.
3. Includes spousal sexual assault.

Note: Figures may not add to total due to rounding.

Source: Statistics Canada, General Social Survey, 2004.

Text box 2
Determining the independent effect of household income on the risk of violent victimization

To determine the independent effect of selected variables, particularly household income, on the risk of violent victimization, a multivariate analysis using logistic regression was conducted. Logistic regression allows for multiple factors to be taken into account (i.e., held constant) simultaneously, thereby allowing the impact of each on the likelihood of violent victimization to be assessed. In addition to household income, the regression model employed controlled for the effects of age, sex, marital status, Aboriginal status, immigrant status, employment status/main activity, and the number of evening activities in which individuals participated. As well, perceptions of neighbourhood crime levels, personal safety and fear of crime were also included in the model.

The odds ratio

An odds ratio, a statistic generated by a logistic regression, can be used to assess whether, other things being equal, low-income households are more or less likely to be victimized compared to higher income households, referred to as the reference category. An odds ratio near 1.0 indicates that the sub-group's odds of victimization are no more or less than those of the reference group; an odds ratio greater than 1.0 indicates that the sub-group's odds of victimization are greater than those of the reference group; and an odds ratio less than 1.0 indicates that the sub-group's odds of victimization are lower than those of the reference group.

Text box 3
Types of offences

The 2004 General Social Survey (GSS) measured the extent of criminal victimization by looking at three types of violent crime, theft of personal property and four types of household property crime, according to their definitions in the *Criminal Code*.

When an incident included more than one type of crime, it was classified according to the most serious offence. The rank of offences from most to least serious is sexual assault, robbery, physical assault, break and enter, motor vehicle/parts theft, theft of personal property, theft of household property and vandalism.

Violent offences

Sexual assault: Forced sexual activity, an attempt at forced sexual activity, or unwanted sexual touching, grabbing, kissing or fondling.
Robbery: Theft or attempted theft in which the perpetrator had a weapon or there was violence or the threat of violence against the victim.
Assault: An attack (victim hit, slapped, grabbed, knocked down or beaten), a face-to-face threat of physical harm, or an incident with a weapon present.

Theft of personal property: Theft or attempted theft of personal property such as money, credit cards, clothing, jewellery, a purse or a wallet (unlike robbery, the perpetrator does not confront the victim).

Household offences

Break and enter: Illegal entry or attempted entry into a residence or other building on the victim's property.
Motor vehicle/parts theft: Theft or attempted theft of a car, truck, van, motorcycle, moped or other vehicle or part of a motor vehicle.
Theft of household property: Theft or attempted theft of household property such as liquor, bicycles, electronic equipment, tools or appliances.
Vandalism: Wilful damage of personal or household property, theft or attempted theft of personal property such as money, credit cards, clothing, jewellery, a purse or a wallet (unlike robbery, the perpetrator does not confront the victim).

Victimization rates for personal property theft and property-related household crimes lower for those from low-income households[6,7]

In contrast to their higher rates of violent victimization, Canadians living in low-income households were less likely to be the victims of personal property theft and property-related household crimes.

In a personal theft, personal property such as money, credit cards, clothing, jewellery, a purse or wallet are stolen. However, unlike robbery, the thief does not confront the victim in a personal theft. The rate of personal property theft was lowest among those with household incomes under $15,000 and highest among those with household incomes over $60,000 (71 compared to 116 incidents per 1,000 population) (Table 2).

For property-related household crimes, rates of victimization varied by household income level.[8] Low-income households experienced property crimes such as motor vehicle theft, household theft and vandalism at rates that were nearly half those of the highest household income group (Chart 2). This pattern, similar to that found in the 1999 GSS, was largely true for three of the four property crimes measured on the 2004 GSS, with the exception of break and enters; for these offences, rates were relatively similar across all income categories (Table 2).

Chart 2
Canadians living in low income households less likely to be victims of property-related household crimes



1. Rates of household victimization were calculated per 1,000 households.
Notes: There is no statistically significant difference between individuals from households with incomes of $15,000 to $29,999 versus $30,000 to $39,999 or between individuals from households with incomes of $30,000 to $39,999 versus $40,000 to $59,999. All other household income group differences are statistically significant.
Source: Statistics Canada, General Social Survey, 2004.

Given that household property crimes typically involve theft of or damage to victims' property, it is not unexpected that income would be a relevant factor in the risk of victimization for this type of crime. Income can determine the quantity and quality of property owned, making those with higher incomes more attractive targets for property-related crimes (Thacher, 2004; Clotfelter, 1977; Becker, 1968). Nevertheless, previous GSS-based research suggests that a number of other factors, in addition to

household income, are related to the likelihood of being targeted for a household crime. These factors, including residential stability, familiarity with one's neighbours, the dwelling-type, the location of the home, the number of people living in the household, as well as household income, all have been linked to the risk of household victimization (Gannon and Mihorean, 2005).

Even after taking other such factors (i.e., household size, length of residency, urban or rural location, quality of relationship with neighbours and perceptions of neighbourhood crime) into account, low-income households were still less likely to be the victims of a household property-crime. Taking all other factors into account, having a household income under $15,000 decreased the odds[9] of household victimization by 38%, compared to having a higher household income (see Text box 4 "Determining the independent effect of household income on the risk of household victimization" for more details).

While low income reduced the odds of household victimization, many other factors raised the odds.[10] For example, the odds of being the victim of a household crime were greater among people who considered their neighbours to be generally unhelpful and among those who believed that they live in high crime neighbourhoods, are dissatisfied with their personal safety and those fearful of crime. Living in a semi-detached unit as opposed to some other dwelling-type, urban rather than rural residency and a length of residence under a year also increased the odds of being victimized. Additionally, the odds of victimization rose with the number of individuals living in the household.

Text box 4
Determining the independent effect of household income on the risk of household victimization

To determine the independent effect of household income, along with other selected variables, on the risk of household victimization, a multivariate analysis using logistic regression was conducted. In addition to household income, the regression model employed controlled for the effects of household size, length of residency, type of dwelling, urban or rural location, quality of relationship with neighbours (i.e., perceptions of living in a neighbourhood with helpful neighbours), perceptions of neighbourhood crime, satisfaction of with personal safety and fear of crime (i.e., fear of staying home alone at night).

Victims from low-income households experienced more disruption to daily activities

About one-third of criminal victimization incidents were reported to police, regardless of victims' household incomes. Even when the type of victimization (i.e., violent, household or personal theft) was considered, differences in reporting across the income groups were minimal.[11]

However, Canadians from lower income households cited having suffered more disruption to their daily activities as a result of their victimization than did victims from higher income households. Just over one-third of incidents involving victims from low-income households resulted in a disruption to the victim's daily activities. This was double that of victims from the highest income households.

Such differences in the impact of victimization on the daily life of Canadians from low-income households compared to those from high income households may be related to differences in the type of victimization typically experienced by each group. While Canadians living in high income households are at greater risk of experiencing property-related crimes such as motor vehicle theft, household theft and vandalism, individuals from low-income households are at greater risk of experiencing more serious, violent incidents such as physical assault, sexual assault and robbery. About one-quarter of violent crimes resulted in the physical injury of victims, and victims were left feeling fearful in nearly 1 in 5 violent crime incidents compared to about 1 in 10 non-violent incidents (AuCoin and Beauchamp, 2007).

Canadians living in low-income households more likely than those from higher income households to report socially disruptive conditions in their neighbourhoods

Like most Canadians, those from low-income households generally reported feeling safe from crime. However, individuals from households with low incomes were more likely than those from high income households to report socially disruptive conditions in their neighbourhoods. Specifically, problems such as prostitution and public drunkenness were reported at a rate that was about three times higher for the lowest income group compared to the highest income group. Furthermore, problems such as litter; people sleeping on the streets; loud parties; harassment and attacks motivated by racial intolerance; drug use and trafficking; loitering and vandalism were reported twice as often by the lowest income group compared to the highest income group (Table 3).

Table 3
Perceptions of neighbourhood social disorder, Canada, 2004

	Household income in dollars				
	0 to 14,999	15,000 to 29,999	30,000 to 39,999	40,000 to 59,999	60,000 and over
	percent stating problem is fairly big or very big				
Prostitution	6	5	4	3	2
Public drunkenness	13	10	8	8	5
Garbage or litter lying around	13	10	9	8	5
People sleeping on the streets or in other public places	4	3	3	2	2
Noisy neighbours or loud parties	9	8	6	6	4
Attacks or harassment motivated by race, ethnic origin or religion	4	4	4	3	2
People using or dealing drugs	19	15	13	14	10
People hanging around on the streets	11	8	8	8	6
Vandalism, graffiti and other deliberate property damage	12	10	12	9	8

Note: Figures rounded.
Source: Statistics Canada, General Social Survey, 2004.

The socially disruptive conditions reported by Canadians living in low-income households may reflect crime levels in their neighbourhoods. While relatively small, the proportion of Canadians from low-income households who felt their neighbourhoods had higher crime rates than elsewhere was greater than that from higher income households (12% compared to 8%). Results from previous research indicate that crime is concentrated in some neighbourhoods and suggest that certain demographic, socio-economic and functional (i.e., commercial land-use) neighbourhood characteristics are related to variations in neighbourhood crime rates (Savoie, 2008; Charron, 2008). For example, research findings point to a link between neighbourhoods with higher proportions of residents living in low-income situations and higher rates of violent crime (Savoie, 2008).

Individuals from households in the lowest income group were also more likely than those from the highest income group to feel dissatisfied with their personal safety from crime. Further, Canadians from low-income households expressed higher levels of fear or concern in specific situations such as walking alone at night in their neighbourhood, using public transit after dark, and being at home alone at night (Chart 3).

Canadians from low-income households were more apt to routinely take certain steps to prevent victimization, such as planning travel routes with safety in mind or staying at home at night for fear of going out alone.[12] On the other hand, individuals from the highest income group included locking their car doors as part of their safety routine more often than those from the lowest household income group. Perhaps this difference may be related to an increased likelihood of car ownership and the greater risk for property-related victimization among Canadians living in higher income households.

Chart 3
Canadians from low income households more fearful of crime in certain situations



1. No statistically significant differences between individuals from households with incomes of $0 to $14,999 and those from households with incomes of $60,000 and over.

Source: Statistics Canada, General Social Survey, 2004.

Summary

Canadians living in low-income households (i.e., under $15,000) were more likely than those from higher income households to experience violent victimization, but less likely to be the victims of household property crime or a personal theft. Moreover, even when other factors are taken into consideration, household income was still a significant predictor of both violent and household victimization.

Canadians living in low-income households appear to suffer more disruption to their daily activities as a result of their victimization but, nevertheless, are relatively similar to those from higher household income groups when it comes to reporting their victimization. Regardless of household income, about one-third of incidents were reported to police.

And while Canadians from low-income households generally felt safe from crime, they were more likely than individuals from high income households to believe that their neighbourhoods had higher crime rates than elsewhere and feel dissatisfied with their personal safety.

Methodology

Data source

General Social Survey on victimization

In 2004, Statistics Canada conducted the victimization cycle of the GSS for the fourth time. Previous cycles were conducted in 1988, 1993 and 1999. The objectives of the survey are to provide estimates of the extent to which people experience incidences of eight offence types (assault, sexual assault, robbery, theft of personal property, break and enter, motor vehicle theft, theft of household property and vandalism); to examine risk factors associated with victimization; to examine rates of reporting victimization to police; and to measure fear of crime and public perceptions of crime and the criminal justice system.

Households in the 10 provinces were selected using Random Digit Dialing (RDD). Once a household was chosen an individual 15 years or older was selected randomly to respond to the survey. Households without telephones, households with only cellular phone service, and individuals living in institutions were excluded. These groups combined represented 4% of the target population. This figure is not large enough to significantly change the estimates.

The sample size in 2004 was about 24,000 households, similar to the sample size in 1999 (26,000) and considerably higher than the sample in 1993 and 1988 (10,000 each). Of the 31,895 households that were selected for the GSS Cycle 18 sample, 23,766 useable responses were obtained.

Data limitations

The data that appear in this profile are based on estimates from a sample of the Canadian population and are therefore subject to sampling error. Sampling error refers to the difference between an estimate derived from the sample and the one that would have been obtained from collecting data from every person in the population.

This profile uses the coefficient of variation (CV) as a measure of the sampling error. Any estimate that has a high CV (over 33.3%) has not been published because the estimate is too unreliable. An estimate that has a CV between 16.6 and 33.3 should be used with caution. The symbol ‘E’ is used to identify these estimates.

When comparing estimates for significant differences, we test the hypothesis that the difference between two estimates is zero. We construct a 95% confidence interval around this difference and if this interval contains zero, then we conclude that the difference is not significant. If, however, this confidence interval does not contain zero, then we conclude that there is a significant difference between the two estimates.

In addition, non-sampling errors may have also been introduced. Types of non-sampling errors may include the refusal by a respondent to report, a respondent’s inability to remember or report events accurately, or errors in coding and processing of the data. In addition, individuals who could not speak English or French well enough to complete the survey were not included. For these reasons, the victimization data should be used with caution.

Bibliography

AuCoin, K. and D. Beauchamp. 2007. “Impacts and consequences of victimization, GSS 2004.” *Juristat*. Vol. 27, no. 1. Statistics Canada Catalogue no. 85-002-XPE. Ottawa.

Bauman, K. J. 1999. “Shifting family definitions: The effect of cohabitation and other non-family household relationships on measures of poverty.” *Demography*. Vol. 36, no. 3. p. 315-325.

Becker, G. 1968. “Crime and punishment: An economic approach.” *Journal of Political Economy*. Vol. 76, no. 2. p. 169-217.

Besserer, S. and D. Hendrick. 2001. “The risk of household victimization.” in S. Besserer (ed.) *A Profile of Criminal Victimization: Results of the 1999 General Social Survey*. Statistics Canada Catalogue no. 85-553. Ottawa.

Brady, D. 2003. “Rethinking the sociological measurement of poverty.” *Social Forces*. Vol. 81, no. 3. p. 715-752.

Charron, M. 2008. “Neighbourhood characteristics and the distribution of crime in Saskatoon.” *Crime and Justice Research Paper Series*. Statistics Canada Catalogue no. 85-561-MIE. No. 12. Ottawa.

Clotfelter, C. T. 1977. “Urban crime and household protective measures.” *Review of Economics and Statistics*. Vol. 59, no. 4. p. 499-503.

Gannon, M. and K. Mihorean. 2005. “Criminal victimization in Canada, 2004.” *Juristat*. Vol. 25, no. 7. Statistics Canada Catalogue no. 85-002-XPE. Ottawa.

Headey, B. 2008. “Poverty is low consumption and low wealth, not just low income.” *Social Indicators Research*. Vol. 89. p. 23-39.

Savoie, J. (ed.). 2008. “Neighbourhood characteristics and the distribution of crime: Edmonton, Halifax and Thunder Bay.” *Crime and Justice Research Paper Series*. Statistics Canada Catalogue no. 85-561-MIE. No. 10. Ottawa.

Siegel, L. J. and C. McCormick. 1999. *Criminology in Canada: Theories, Patterns and Typologies*. Toronto. Nelson.

Statistics Canada. 2008. *Income in Canada*. Statistics Canada Catalogue no. 75-202. Ottawa.

Statistics Canada. 2001. “Canadians with low incomes.” *Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics Profile Series*. Statistics Canada Catalogue no. 85F0033MIE. Ottawa.

Thacher, D. 2004. “The rich get richer and the poor get robbed: Inequality in U.S. Criminal Victimization, 1974–2000.” *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*. Vol. 20, no. 2. p. 89-116.

Endnotes

1. Throughout this report, the lowest household income group (i.e., under $15,000) from the GSS is used as a proxy for low-income households and the highest income group (i.e., $60,000 or more) is used as a proxy for high income households. For further information, see Text box 1 “Household income and the General Social Survey (GSS)”.
2. Unless otherwise stated, differences reported are statistically significant.
3. Recent immigrants refer to those who had arrived in Canada during the five years preceding the 2004 GSS.
4. For the most part, this profile examines household income as a single factor relating to the risk of victimization and perceptions of safety and the criminal justice system. Therefore, it is important to keep in mind that household income is but one of several factors (i.e., such as age, sex, immigrant status and visible minority status), many of which may be interrelated, impacting one’s chances of becoming the target of crime or how one perceives crime, safety and the justice system. For more information on these additional factors, please refer to the other profiles in this series.
5. Rates of violent victimization (including incidents of spousal violence) were calculated per 1,000 population aged 15 and over, and are based on incidents that occurred in the 12 months preceding the General Social Survey.
6. Rates of personal property theft were calculated per 1,000 population aged 15 and over.
7. Rates of household victimization were calculated per 1,000 households.
8. There is no statistically significant difference between individuals from households with incomes of $15,000 to $29,999 versus $30,000 to $39,999 or between individuals from households with incomes of $30,000 to $39,999 versus $40,000 to $59,999. All other household income group differences are statistically significant.
9. An odds ratio is used to assess whether, other things being equal, low-income households are more or less likely to be the victim of a household property crime compared to higher income households, referred to as the reference category. An odds ratio less than 1.0 indicates that the sub-group’s odds of victimization are lower than those of the reference group. For more information on odds ratios, see Text box 2 “Determining the independent effect of household income on the risk of violent victimization”.
10. For more information on odds ratios, see Text box 2 “Determining the independent effect of household income on the risk of violent victimization”.
11. Statistical significance testing indicates that household crimes involving victims with incomes of $15,000 to $29,999 were less often reported to police than were incidents involving victims from households with earnings of $30,000 to $49,999 or $60,000 and over.
12. The GSS also asks about the use of other precautionary measures (i.e., the installation of alarm systems, obtaining a dog, taking a self-defence course) throughout one’s lifetime. However, since respondents’ household economic conditions may vary throughout their lifetime, an analysis of the use of these prevention measures by household income is not presented in the present study.

Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics Profile Series
Cumulative Index

Following is a cumulative index of Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics Profile Series published to date:

2009

Household income and victimization in Canada, 2004

2008

Sexual assault in Canada
Immigrants and victimization
Hate crime in Canada
Sexual orientation and victimization
Visible minorities and victimization

2007

Seniors as victims of crime
Criminal victimization in the workplace

2006

Canadians' use of crime prevention measures
Victimization and offending in Canada's territories

2001

Aboriginal people in Canada
Canadians with disabilities
Canadians with literacy problems
Canadians with low incomes
Children and youth in Canada
Immigrants in Canada
Religious groups in Canada
Seniors in Canada
Visible minorities in Canada
Women in Canada