



This estimate is based on an average of 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and reviewing the collection of information, and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188), Washington, DC 20503.



1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave blank)		2. REPORT DATE April 1993		3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED THESIS/DISSERTATION	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE The American Response to Fear of Crime				5. FUNDING NUMBERS	
6. AUTHOR(S) Rickey H. Turner					
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) AFIT Student Attending: University of South Carolina				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER AFIT/CI/CIA- 93-048	
9. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE AFIT/CI 2950 P STREET WRIGHT-PATTERSON AFB OH 45433-7765				10. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER	
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
12a. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for Public Release IAW 190-1 Distribution Unlimited MICHAEL M. BRICKER, SMSgt, USAF Chief Administration				12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE	
13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words)					
<p>DTIC SELECTED AUG 17 1993</p> <p>S B D</p>					
				<p>93-19070</p>	
14. SUBJECT TERMS				15. NUMBER OF PAGES 70	
				16. PRICE CODE	
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT		18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE		19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT	
				20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	

**THE AMERICAN RESPONSE TO
FEAR OF CRIME**

**Prepared as background for
the fear of crime and crime victimization
survey for Shaw AFB**

**Rickey H. Turner
College of Criminal Justice
University of South Carolina**

April 23, 1993

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Heading	Page
Introduction	1
Who Fears Crime	1
Reactions to Fear of Crime	11
Victim Survey Findings and Fear of Crime	18
Police Records and Fear of Crime	20
Reducing Citizens' Fear of Crime	23
Conclusions	25
References	28

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 3

Accession For	
NTIS GRA&I	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DTIC TAB	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unannounced	<input type="checkbox"/>
Justification	
By	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or Special
A-1	

Introduction

A survey of American citizens revealed fear of criminal victimization had a significant influence over peoples lives (Gallup Poll, 1989). The fear of crime has become an important area of research for criminal justice professionals. This paper looked at who feared crime and how citizens reacted to their fear of crime. Next, crime victim survey results and police records of crime were presented to assess whether the publics' fear of crime was justified. Finally some suggestions were presented to reduce citizens' fear of crime.

Who Fears Crime

Skogan (1987) examined the relationship between victimization and fear of crime. He found victims of both personal and property crimes worried more about crime than nonvictims. Direct experience with either a personal crime or a property crime increased the victims concern about that particular type of crime. Previous research maintained only victims of personal, potentially violent crimes, were more likely to alter their behavior because of fear of crime.

Skogan (1987) also analyzed the impact of fear of crime on persons who were isolated from the community or family; had fewer resources for dealing with victimization, such as lower income or lack of education; were thought to be more vulnerable and thus more fearful of crime, such as the elderly or women; or were predisposed to fear based on their personal attitudes. Skogan found no significant impact of victimization on these groups compared to the other group. There was no significant difference in the reaction to victimization for people who were isolated, lacked resources, were more vulnerable, or were predisposed to fear compared to the reaction of victims who did not fall into these categories.

Smith and Hill (1991) found persons who were victims of previous crimes were more likely to fear being victims of crime again. Victims of property crimes and victims of both property and personal crimes were significantly more fearful than those who were

victims of personal crime alone. Smith and Hill, in their study of over 3,000 North Carolina residents, found gender and age as significant predictors of fear of crime. The elderly and females were more afraid of victimization. Education was also strongly associated with fear of crime. Individuals with the least education reported higher fear of victimization.

The findings of Smith and Hill (1991) regarding victimization and fear of crime were supported in part by Kaniasty and Norris (1992). Kaniasty and Norris cited a number of studies which showed fear of crime was the most frequent and lasting consequence of being a victim of crime (p. 216). In their study, Kaniasty and Norris found victims of crime reported greater fear of victimization than nonvictims. However, victims of violent crime were likely to fear future victimization more than victims of property crime. Kaniasty and Norris studied the effects of crime on an individual's feeling of depression, anxiety, fear of crime, and hostility. They found that on average, nine months after the incident, property crime victims still feared victimization; whereas, violent crime victims still experienced strong effects of all four variables. Kaniasty and Norris identified women, younger persons, and those with lower occupational status as having the greatest fear of crime. They maintained the fear of crime may have been the first symptom acknowledged by victims or noticed by associates of victims. Kaniasty and Norris also thought fear may have been the easiest symptom to remedy because it was easier to identify the types of aid which would alleviate fear.

Another finding by Kaniasty and Norris (1992) was nonvictims and property crime victims who actually received support experienced a slight increase in fear. They reasoned the support given to less serious victims may have been aimed at tearing down the illusion that crime could not happen again. Conversely, support given to victims of more violent crime may have been geared toward restoring the victim's sense of safety.

Marshall (1991) studied a sample of residents of Omaha, Nebraska concerning their fear of crime. He concluded that citizens most concerned about crime were less

satisfied with the area where they lived as a good area. These same citizens thought other residents of the same neighborhood were more satisfied with the community the way it was. Consequently, the citizens satisfied with the neighborhood would be less likely to want the neighborhood to change, as would the resident dissatisfied with the neighborhood. Marshall also determined previous research relating age and gender as important influences on a persons fear of crime was partially supported by his study. He concluded females were significantly more fearful of crime than males; however, older persons, on average, were not significantly more fearful than younger persons. In Marshall's sample, persons 50 years of age and older were included in the "old" category because there was not sufficient numbers of persons 65 and older. This may have had some influence on his conclusion that age was not a significant factor in fear of crime.

Baba and Austin (1989) studied the effects of the neighborhood environment on residents sense of safety. They found higher status people were more satisfied with the physical environment of their neighborhood than lower status persons. Also, older residents and persons who owned their homes were more likely to be satisfied with the area where they lived than young people and renters. Race was not a significant factor in environmental satisfaction. Baba and Austin further determined the longer a person resided in a neighborhood the more likely they were to have their home broken into and something stolen from it. The length of residence was a significant factor whereas social class, race, and age were not important indicators of property victimization. Baba and Austin found environmental satisfaction and property victimization as statistically significant influences on perceived neighborhood safety. Residents who were comfortable with the neighborhood and had not been victims of property crimes were more likely to think the neighborhood was safe. However, personal victimization and social participation in the community were not important to residents in assessing the safety of their neighborhood.

Krannich, Berry, and Greider (1989) studied the effects of rapid growth on rural populations in relation to fear of crime. Similar to other studies, Krannich et al. found individuals who reported more victimization were more likely to fear crime. Women were also more fearful. The integration of the individual in the community was related to the fear of crime also. Krannich et al. found as the communities grew in population, the fear of crime among citizens increased. When the population declined back to previous levels residents fear of crime were reduced.

Belyea and Zingraff (1988) found rural residents had a significantly lower fear of crime than urban residents when they controlled for other variables such as age, race, gender, education, and income. However, they also found results similar to other studies when these variables were included. Females, nonwhites, older citizens, the less-educated, and lower income residents reported a greater fear of crime. Individuals who thought crime was increasing in the region reported an increased fear of victimization. The more serious they perceived the crime problem in the community, the more fearful they were. Although urban residents feared crime more than rural residents; residents living in small communities (under 2,500 citizens) reported being less fearful of crime than residents living in rural areas.

Thompson and Norris (1992) in their study of residents of Kentucky, found women, younger persons, those with lower status occupations, and those of lower educational levels had the greatest fear of crime. Their findings supported the conclusion that young persons should fear crime the most because young persons were more likely victims of crime. However, older victims experienced equal levels of fear if they had been victims of a previous crime. Urban residents were more fearful of crime only when they were exposed to greater levels of crime.

LaGrange, Ferraro, and Supaicic (1992) studied the effects of incivilities on citizens perceptions of risk and fear of crime. Incivilities were defined as "low level breaches of community standards that signal an erosion of conventionally accepted norms

and values" (p. 312). Incivilities could include trash and litter, unkept parking lots, condemned houses, graffiti, abandoned cars (disorderly physical surrounds) and drinking, rowdy youth, loiterers, beggars, inconsiderate neighbors (disruptive social behaviors). LaGrange et al. classified the incivilities into two groups. Social incivilities concerned the "untended people and behavior" (p. 313) while physical incivility referred to "untended property" (p. 313). LaGrange et al. found the role of incivilities to be modest in generating feelings of fear. They found when confronted daily with numerous incivilities, people elevated their perception of crime risk. This perception of risk stimulated an increased fear of crime based on such background factors as age, race, gender, time of day, companionship, and feelings of vulnerability (p. 327). They also found rural residents were as concerned about incivilities as were urban residents. Although social and physical incivilities were associated with higher levels of fear of crime, individually, one was not higher correlated than the other. Both social and physical incivility were more predictive of fear of property crime than personal crime.

Warr (1990) reported gender and age were significant determinants of how citizens responded to cues in the environment relating to danger. He considered three variables: novelty or the unfamiliar; darkness; and the presence of others as determinants of how people respond to various cues. He found darkness to be the most influential factor of the three. Persons who may not have been fearful of a situation in the daylight, were significantly more afraid in the same situation after dark. Novelty was another indicator of fear; but, only about a third as significant as darkness. The effects of being alone or with a group was unique for each age/gender group. Young males were the least fearful, with older males and females about equal but higher than young males. Young females were the most fearful of being alone.

When Warr (1990) combined two of the three variables into one situation, he found younger individuals feared being alone at night the most, while older persons feared darkness and unfamiliarity with the environment the most. Finally, when Warr combined

all three variables into one situation he reported unfamiliarity with the situation at night as the most frightening for all four age/gender groups. Young females reported being alone at night as their second most frightening experience.

Next, Warr (1990) altered the situation so that all three variables were present and the individual was faced with a direct and unmistakable threat (man with a knife), he found the situational cues of little or no consequence. From this he concluded the situational cues themselves were not frightening. Instead, situational cues were signs of frightening things, whose meaning was interpreted differently by the individual.

Finally, Warr (1990) considered how the presence of other people affected the individual's fear in situations where crime was not actually imminent. Warr concluded young males were more threatening than females to all four age/gender groups, although the level of fear was different for each group. Young males were less threatening to other young males; but, were especially threatening to females.

Liska and Baccaglioni (1990) examined how coverage of crime and violence in the newspapers affected citizens' fear of crime. They found stories about homicide showed the strongest relationship to fear. However, the relationship was positive for stories about homicide in the first 15 pages of the newspaper and negative for stories in the remaining pages of the newspaper. The relationship was also stronger for local stories in the first 15 pages than for non-local stories of homicide, as well as, for initial reports of homicide compared to follow-up stories. Liska and Baccaglioni found homicide stories affected the public's fear much more than any other crime stories. However, only when the stories concerned the immediate community was the public's fear level increased. When the homicide occurred in other cities, the public's fear level decreased. Based on these findings, Liska and Baccaglioni suggested the net cumulative effects of local and non-local stories of homicide may be small and insignificant.

Another interesting finding from the research of Liska and Baccaglioni (1990) was how homicide stories affected non-whites, males, and young persons more than whites,

females, and elderly citizens. One explanation for this was non-whites, males, and younger persons were more likely victims of homicide; therefore, such stories increased their levels of fear of becoming a victim.

Gordon and Riger (1989) maintained women feared rape second only to murder. In their research, they stated "most women experience fear of rape as a nagging gnawing sense that something awful could happen, an angst that keeps them from doing things they want or need to do, or from doing them at the time or in the way they might otherwise do" (p. 2). They maintained every woman had this fear to some degree and every woman was affected by it. The women Gordon and Riger interviewed said the worst thing about rape was the possibility of getting killed and that if they were not killed the humiliation and stigmatization associated with rape would be terrible. Feelings of guilt, self-blame, that they were being punished for past wrongs, and loss of control over their lives were some of the reasons women gave for rape being so terrifying.

According to Gordon and Riger (1990) black women were more likely than white or Hispanic women to be rape victims. Younger women were more often victims than older women. The highest number of rapes recorded for the last several years occurred in the South, but the highest rate of rape was in the West. More rapes occurred in summer months, especially August, than other seasons.

Lewis and Salem (1986) surveyed 10 cities in the United States, and found approximately 30% of the residents in each city reported fear of crime. Residents perceived increases in crime as indicators of social disorder and their fear increased correspondingly. Citizens' perceptions that crime was increasing were continually reinforced by other visible reminders that the community was changing in threatening ways. Lewis and Salem maintained that "incivility - those features in a community that reflect the erosion of commonly accepted standards and values" (p. xiv) was one factor responsible for producing fear in the public. When the residents of the community felt

powerless to control the level of incivility within their neighborhood, their level of fear increased.

LeBlanc (1993) found fear of crime among citizens in South Carolina rose from 29% in 1991 to 39% in 1992. He also found women more fearful than men in limiting the places they worked, shopped, and would go alone. Eighty-six percent of the respondents in the poll said they were "very-concerned" about violent crime in the state (p. 10A).

Reactions to Fear of Crime

Nasar and Fisher (1992) reported college students feared some areas of a college campus more than others based on the physical environment. Such issues as lighting, avenues of escape for victims, and areas where potential offenders could hide were primary concerns of students. Nasar and Fisher surveyed college students about their reactions to different areas of a college campus based on the students perceptions of the likelihood of victimization. The students reported avoiding areas where they felt vulnerable. The second most likely reaction was to use protective measures such as carrying mace, carrying a gun, walking with keys in hand, or holding onto their wallet (p. 54). The third type of response was categorized as collective action which included walking with friends, going to the area in the company of others, and staying with others (p. 54). Although males and females reported taking avoidance actions as the number one response to fear of victimization, females reported taking multiple actions whereas males more often reported taking only one act.

Marshall (1991) determined citizens most worried about crime were less satisfied with the ability of the police to protect them and were more likely to carry a weapon, mace, or a whistle for protection. This was especially true for females. Another important finding of Marshall was older citizens were more likely than young people to take measures to protect their homes from being victimized. Such measures included locking the residence at night, letting neighbors know when they were away from home for extended periods of time, having special locks installed, or installing a burglar alarm.

Thompson and Norris (1992) found women, younger persons, unmarried persons, and persons with lower-status occupations had the highest incidents of avoidance behavior. Older persons who were victims of violent crime were more likely than nonvictims to practice avoidance behavior. Likewise, married persons who had been previous victims practiced more avoidance behavior than nonvictim married persons. Higher occupational status residents indicated greater avoidance behavior than lower occupational status residents if they had been personally victimized. This behavior included avoiding certain types of people and avoiding certain places where they might otherwise go because of fear of crime.

Liska and Warner (1991) maintained crime, more specifically, fear of crime served a function. Fear of crime, according to Liska and Warner, controlled crime. They proposed that some crimes heighten citizens' fear of crime. After determining robbery was a crime closely associated with fear of crime, Liska and Warner established the fear of robbery reduced social interaction among citizens. Because people did not socialize as much, they were more likely to stay at home. When more people stayed at home, there were fewer opportunities for people to be victimized by crime. Therefore, according to Liska and Warner, crime, in this instance, robbery, served a function in that it kept people at home where they were less likely to be victimized. Because there were fewer victims for criminals to prey upon, the incidence of robbery, as well as other crimes were reduced.

Greenberg and Rubak (1992) maintained just the opposite. By staying home, people may have increased the vulnerability of others to crime since the presence of others was often sufficient to stop a criminal from committing a crime. Therefore, when people stayed at home, they made crime less risky for the criminal and more likely to occur, which in turn reinforced the public's fear of crime.

Archer and Erlich-Erfer (1991) studied the public's reaction to an epidemic of violent crimes in 1973. In the first four months of 1973, 16 dead bodies were found in a city of about 40,000 people. Archer and Erlich-Erfer compared bus revenues for the four

months when the killings occurred, with the same time period the year preceding and the year following the violence. They found a substantial increase (almost double) in revenues for the period of the killings compared to the previous year. Although the revenues from the following year (1974) did not return to 1972 levels, they still were less than the 1973 revenues. Archer and Erlich-Erfer proposed the increase in violence resulted in increased ridership on the public transportation and less hitchhiking. The public's fear resulted in a behavior change; in that, instead of college students hitchhiking rides from the campus to town, the students rode public transportation.

Their study of protective behaviors was further strengthened when Archer and Erlich-Erfer (1991) compared handgun purchases during the time of the killings, to the same time period the previous and following years. They found handgun sales were nearly twice the normal sales volume during the first two months of 1973 when the killings were taking place. During the fourth week of February 1973, handgun sales were more than twice the normal volume. In the same month, more than a dozen homicide victims were found. Archer and Erlich-Erfer maintained these purchases of handguns were in response to an objective danger. There was a highly publicized murderer on the loose and the public's fear was directed at this person. However, after the first killer was arrested, handgun sales increased over the normal levels. When the killer was indicted, handgun sales rose again. Unfortunately, the killings continued and police later arrested a second killer. When the second killer was arrested and later indicted, handgun sales again increased. Archer and Erlich-Erfer proposed the increases in gun sales were the result of people's perception that the community was more dangerous. A second theory they proposed was when a person was arrested, it vacated people's perceptions of why the violence occurred. Some may have thought the killings were drug related, or gang related. When these personal rationalizations for the killings were disconfirmed, people's fears may have been increased which lead them to buy a handgun for personal safety. The

subjective danger may have occurred even after the objective danger was eliminated and may have lasted long after the immediate threat was gone.

By comparing the addresses of handgun purchasers, Archer and Erlich-Erfer (1991) determined the fear was generalized to the entire city and not localized to the immediate area where the killings took place or the bodies recovered. Based on their findings Archer and Erlich-Erfer thought the killings generated an altered sense of well-being or safety in the entire community. Bankston, Thompson, Jenkins, and Forsyth (1990) studied the influence of fear of crime on carrying firearms for protection in Louisiana. The results did not support their theory that fear of crime would lead to increased carrying of firearms. What they did find was that carrying a firearm was more influenced by the culture of the region. They found the southern culture of Northern Louisiana more favorable towards carrying guns compared to the French/Catholic region of Southern Louisiana. Although there could have been a simultaneous relationship between fear of crime and carrying a gun, their findings could not clearly identify it.

In another study related to handguns and fear of crime, Thompson, Bankston, and St. Pierre (1991) examined single female-headed households and their fear of rape related to the possession of a handgun. This study also took place in Louisiana. Thompson et al. found over 36% of the respondents indicated they had a handgun in the household. Women who had been previously victimized were more likely to have a handgun. Handgun possession lowered the degree of fear in previously victimized women. Single women, who headed households and had been victimized previously were more likely to have a handgun in the home as a deterrent to future victimization.

According to Greenberg and Rubak (1992) in an effort to reduce fear, citizens actions included "the purchased expensive alarm systems, extra locks, weapons, watchdogs, and the hiring of private guards" (p. 3). Moore and Trojanowicz (1988) estimated over \$20 billion was spent in the United States on private security. Greenberg and Rubak maintained the fear of crime affected the fabric of society in many ways. When

people stayed locked in their homes, they did not take advantage of parks, theaters, and libraries which could have improved the quality of their lives.

Gordon and Riger (1989) identified several ways women reacted to their fear of crime. The most frequent way was not to ride with male strangers alone after dark, followed by not giving rides to strangers after dark. These responses were followed by: not going to movies alone after dark; not going to bars/clubs alone after dark; not going to the laundromats alone after dark; not walking alone by parks/lots after dark; not going downtown alone after dark; not walking by bars/hangouts alone after dark; not using public transit alone after dark; not walking by groups of boys alone after dark; not walking alone in the neighborhood alone after dark; and finally, not staying home alone after dark (p. 15).

A 10-year study by the University of South Carolina, College of Criminal Justice surveyed over 1,600 South Carolina residents annually about the precautions taken against crime. Over the ten year period included in the survey: 46% said they kept a gun for protection; 39% kept a dog for protection; 71% avoided certain areas; 56% avoided being out alone at night; 45% installed some type of protective device; and 37% took other special precautions to protect themselves against crime (Fear of Crime Poll, 1991).

According to a poll of citizens of South Carolina (LeBlanc, 1993), more than a third of the women and about 20% of the men in the survey limited the time and place they would go to perform certain types of jobs because of fear of crime. Some refused to accept jobs in certain locations. Over half the women and about one-third of the men polled refused to shop in some places after dark. Eighty percent of the women and about 50% of the men polled limited where they would go alone.

Victim Survey Findings and Fear of Crime

According to the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) (February, 1992) victim survey, males were significantly more at risk for violent crimes and theft than females. However, in studies reviewed males normally reported the least amount of fear compared

to females. Individuals under 25 years of age were the most likely victims of violent crime; however, young adults typically demonstrated the least fear levels of all age groups.

Black males had the highest rate of violent victimizations with 53 victimizations for every 1,000 black males, followed by white males at 36 victimizations per 1,000 white males. Black females were the next highest with 28 per 1,000 and white females were the lowest victims of violent crime at 21 per 1,000 (Bureau of Justice Statistics, February, 1992).

According to the BJS (February, 1992), strangers committed more violent crimes than nonstrangers. Sixty-one percent of all violent crimes were committed by strangers which included 82% of all robberies and 57% of all assaults. However, 58% of all rapes were committed by non-strangers. Strangers were more likely to commit crimes against males than females; however, there was no significant difference in victimizations by strangers according to race. These numbers both confirm and contradict some of the results from the studies cited above. Males still reported the least fear of crime; but, continue to suffer the highest number of victimizations. However, the BJS statistics supported the perception of citizens' fear of strangers, because, with the exception of rape, the majority of violent crimes were committed by strangers.

The BJS (February, 1992) reported the streets were the location where most violent crimes occurred. About 41% of all robberies took place on the streets. The victim's home (29%) was the second most frequent place for violent crime, with 35% of the rapes taking place in the victim's home. About half of all violent crimes took place within five miles of the victim's home. These numbers supported the public's fear of crime in their neighborhood.

Over one-third (37%) of the female victims of violent crime sustained injuries as a result of the victimizations. For males, 30% of the violent crime victims sustained injuries. When the robbery or assault offender knew the victim, the likelihood of physical injury to

the victim was significantly greater than when the offender was a stranger (Bureau of Justice Statistics, February, 1992).

Police Records and Fear of Crime

According to official police records, the index crimes in South Carolina (Murder, Rape, Robbery, Aggravated Assault, Breaking or Entering, Larceny, and Motor Vehicle Theft) increased approximately 19% between 1980 and 1989; from about 166,000 crimes to over 197,000 crimes. Violent crimes increased over 42% from 20,148 to over 28,758. The violent crime rate increased over 27% from 64.20 to 81.70 per 10,000 population. The murder rate for the state was reduced over the ten year period from 1.10 to 0.92 per 10,000 residents, a drop of 16.36%. However, the number of rapes increased over 30%, robberies increased approximately 14%, and aggravated assaults increased over 31% over this same ten year period. For nonviolent crimes the increase was from 145,820 to 168,760 or approximately 15.7% increase. The rate of increase for nonviolent crimes was much less than for violent crimes at 3.14%; from 465.00 to 479.60 per 10,000 residents. The ten year trend for breaking or entering decreased about 14.5%; for larceny the rate increased over 12%; and motor vehicle thefts increased almost 15% (South Carolina Governor's Office, 1990). Based on these numbers, the likelihood of becoming a crime victim in South Carolina increased significantly over the 10 year period, especially for violent crime. However, the statistics do not identify how many people may have been victimized more than once in this time frame.

Over half (54%) of the murders in South Carolina in 1991 occurred in a residence. The next highest premise where murders occurred was on the streets and highways (18%). The same locations hold true for most rapes: 65% of the rapes occurred in homes and 15% occurred on streets and highways. For robbery 35% occurred on streets and highways while 20% took place in commercial establishments. Convenience stores and residences each accounted for about 12% and 16% of the robberies respectively. Over half (56%) of the aggravated assaults took place in a residence while, about 24% occurred

on the streets. For breaking and entering, about 63% occurred in a residence with just over 22% in a commercial establishment. Larceny took place in homes (36%) and commercial establishments (29%), too (South Carolina Law Enforcement Division 1991).

In a study of violent crime trends in South Carolina from 1982 to 1991 Jolliff, Loftus, Taylor, and Turner (1992) examined at the relationship of the victim to the offender. They found 78% of the murder victims knew the killer either as an acquaintance or a family member. Sixty-three percent of all rape victims knew their attackers. Most robberies (73%) were committed by strangers. Three-fourths of the aggravated assaults were committed by acquaintances or family members. A new category of crime victim, other forcible sex offenses, was established in 1991. This category included the crimes of forcible sodomy, sexual assault with an object, and forcible fondling. In 1991, of the 1,674 incidents of these crimes, 85% were committed by someone the victim knew; 50% were acquaintances and 35% were family members. Since research studies indicated citizens were fearful of going out alone and refrained from going to certain areas out of fear, many either went out in the company of someone they knew or stayed at home. The statistics from South Carolina crime reports indicated these actions may have made them more vulnerable to becoming violent crime victims. Since a significant amount of reported violent crime occurred in a residence and was committed by someone the victims knew, the very actions people took to protect themselves were the same actions which may have made them more vulnerable to becoming victimized.

Although most research studies found young adults had the least fear of crime, the violent crime statistics for South Carolina from 1982 to 1991 recorded the highest incidence of murder for persons 22-34 years old (Jollif, Loftus, Taylor, and Turner, 1992). Eighty-eight percent of rape victims were under 35 years of age, as were 60% of the robbery victims. Most aggravated assault victims (74%) were also under 35 years of age. Over half (55%) of the victims of other forcible sex offenses were under 31 years of age.

Based on these figures, the most likely victims of violent crime were the ones least likely to fear crime.

Reducing Citizens' Fear of Crime

Kaniasty and Norris (1992) found victims of property crime, violent crime, and nonvictims believed they personally, to some extent, could control their risk of being victimized by crime. Victims of violent crime were more likely to maintain this belief than victims of property crime. Nonvictims were the least likely to maintain this belief.

Kaniasty and Norris (1992) evaluated the effects of social support on victims of crime to determine if some measures were more effective in alleviating a victim's fear of crime than other measures. Perceived support in the form of providing acceptance and opportunities for the victim to ventilate emotions was one of the most effective ways of alleviating a victim's fear. Perceived support in the form of providing guidance and advice on how to deal with the crime or assistance in problem solving, was also effective in protecting victims of violent crime from experiencing excessive fear of crime. The interesting aspect to this support was that the support may or may not have actually been provided to the victim, but at least the victims' felt that if they wanted or needed such support it was available. Victims of violent crime were also less likely to suffer high levels of fear if support was asked for, and received, in the form of providing guidance or advice on how to deal with the crime and providing tangible support; such as cash to replace lost possessions, provide shelter, or obtain transportation. Based on their findings, Kaniasty and Norris proposed support networks should strive to provide concrete and instrumental aid to victims even when it appeared trivial or unconnected to the victim's immediate emotional trauma. Their research indicated some victims' tangible needs, such as financial aid or legal assistance, were not met by traditional programs which focused on emotional needs. Although emotional support was still important to restoring a victim's emotional equilibrium, concrete support was also essential in reducing a victim's fear of future victimization.

Based on their study, Baba and Austin (1989) maintained improving the quality of the neighborhood environmental characteristics would make the residents more interested in improving the appearance of the neighborhood. Improving the neighborhood would get the residents more involved in assessing the quality of the people who live in the neighborhood, which in turn made residents feel more safe in the neighborhood. All of these actions would lead to a reduction in the fear of crime among the residents. The quality of the environment, according to Baba and Austin was measured by such things as keeping litter picked up in the neighborhood, the amount of open space between the houses in the neighborhood, the level of noise in the neighborhood, and the pride the people of the neighborhood took in the neighborhood's appearance. They also considered the manner in which residents looked out for the personal property and homes of other residents, and how trustworthy the residents thought their neighbors were.

Research by Lewis and Salem (1986) suggested when the community got involved and had control over the neighborhood the level of fear in the community was reduced. Communities with strong ties to the political power structure or with a strong lobby for getting services and responses from city leaders were less likely to think of the area as a bad neighborhood. The community needed to see improvements made and requests honored to be satisfied with the neighborhood. Communities who, although organized, but were tied to public assistance type programs, instead of action oriented programs, did not feel the same sense of safety. When community organizations were closely tied to welfare type programs the citizens still felt powerless and subject to victimization. However, when community organizations were geared toward forcing the city to provide police, fire, sewer, water, garbage, zoning, or lighting type services, the citizens felt more in control over their environment and less afraid. When the people of the community could control who moved into the community through zoning, or could get the local government to force absent landlords to maintain abandoned properties, the people felt more a part of the community and were less fearful of crime.

Conclusions

When persons were victimized by crime, they were more likely to be afraid of future victimization, much more than persons who were never victimized. However, the studies differ on whether the fear of crime was related to the type of victimization, i.e. personal versus property victimization. Most studies reported the elderly and females as fearing crime the most. However, official police records and victim surveys indicated these two groups were less likely to be victimized by crime compared to males, especially young males. The research showed when these groups were victimized by violent crime, they suffered more severe injuries than young males.

A healthy respect for crime is a reasonable caution against victimization. Respect for crime causes people to think about their circumstances before undertaking activities which may put them in danger of victimization. However, the study results were mixed on whether staying home or going out with friends or family was actually safer than going out alone. Since many crimes were committed by someone the victim knew or was related to these very actions may increase the persons susceptibility to being victimized. The primary shortcoming in the actions many people took to protect themselves e.g. staying home, avoiding certain places at night, was these actions deprived them of what may otherwise be pleasurable experiences. If a person enjoyed going to the theater or to the movies, but refrained from doing so because of fear of being victimized; that individual was sacrificing hi/her quality of life, perhaps needlessly, from a misperception of where the danger really lies.

The public must be provided information concerning the risks associated with becoming victims of crime. With this information the individual citizen can make rational choices about what activities were relatively safe and what activities were unsafe. Also, the public needs to know where most of the violent crimes are occurring, in one area of the city, in victim's homes. With this information, an informed public could choose what to do and where to go. If a specific area was crime ridden, the residents should

organize and solicit the assistance of police, city planners, and social service agencies to work with them to improve the neighborhood environment. A strong political voice can make necessary changes to improve the residents self-image of the neighborhood, which in turn may motivate them to take more control over the neighborhood themselves. Zoning regulations which prohibit unwanted commercial businesses in a residential neighborhood could preclude troubles later. But, the citizens must petition city leaders to make things happen. When residents organize and feel they have a voice in what takes place in their neighborhood, they are more likely to take responsibility for the neighborhood, which in turn can lessen their fear of crime.

References

- Archer, D. & Erlich-erfer, L. (1991). Fear and loading: Archival traces of the response to extraordinary violence. Social Psychology Quarterly, 54 (4), 343-352.
- Baba, Y. & Austin, D. M. (1989). Neighborhood environmental satisfaction, victimization, and social participation as determinants of perceived neighborhood safety. Environment and Behavior, 21 (6), 763-780.
- Bankston, W. B., Thompson, C. Y., Jenkins, Q. A. L., & Forsyth, C. J. (1990). The influence of fear of crime, gender, and southern culture on carrying firearms for protection. The Sociological Quarterly, 31 (2), 287-305.
- Belyea, M. J. & Zingraff, M. T. (1988). Fear of crime and residential location. Rural Sociology, 53 (4) 473-486.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics. (February, 1992). Criminal victimization in the united states. . 1990(NCJ Publication No. NCJ-134126). Rockville, MD: Bureau of Justice Statistics Clearinghouse.
- Fear of crime poll. (1990). Unpublished manuscript. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina, College of Criminal Justice.
- Gallup Poll. (March/April, 1989). Most important problems. The Gallup Report, (282/283). 6-8.
- Gordon, M. T. & Riger, S. (1989). The female fear. New York: The Free Press.
- Greenberg, M. S. & Ruback, R. B. (1992). After the crime: Victim decision making. New York: Plenum Press.
- Johnson, H. & Lazarus, G. (1989, July). The impact of age on crime victimization rates. Canadian Journal of Criminology, 31 (3), 309-317.
- Jolliff, C. P., Loftus, J. C., Taylor, T. W., & Turner, R. H. (1992). Violent crime and the relationship of gender, race, & age in South Carolina: 1991. Columbia, S.C.: University of South Carolina, College of Criminal Justice.

- Kaniasty, K. & Norris, F. H. (1992). Social support and victims of crime: Matching event, support, and outcome. American Journal of Community Psychology, 20 (2), 211-241.
- Krannich, R. S., Berry, E. H., & Greider, T. (1989). Fear of crime in rapidly changing rural communities: A longitudinal analysis. Rural Sociology, 54 (2), 195-212.
- LaGrange, R. L., Ferraro, K. F., & Supancic, M. (1992). Perceived risk and fear of crime: Role of social and physical incivilities. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency. 29 (3), 311-334.
- LeBlanc, C. (1993, January, 29). Running for cover: Crimes alters S.C. life. The State, pp. 1, 10A.
- Lewis, D. A. & Salem, G. (1986). Fear of crime: Incivility and the production of a social problem. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.
- Liska, A. E. & Baccaglini, W. (1990). Feeling safe by comparison: Crime in the newspapers. Social Problems, 37 (3), 360-374.
- Liska, A. E. & Warner, B. D. (1991). Function of crime: A paradoxical process. American Journal of Sociology, 96 (6), 1441-1463.
- Lurigio, A. J., Skogan, W. G., & Davis, R. C. (Eds.). (1990). Victims of crime: Problems, policies, and programs. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Marshall, C. E. (1991). Fear of crime, community satisfaction and self-protective measures: Perceptions from a midwestern city. Journal of Crime and Justice, 14 (2), 97-121.
- Moore, M. H. & Trojanowicz, R. C. (1988). Policing and fear of crime. Washington D.C.: National Institute of Justice.
- Nasar, J. L. & Fisher, B. (1992). Design for vulnerability: Cues and reactions to fear of crime. Sociology and Social Research, 76, (2). 48-54.
- Skogan, W. G. (1987). The impact of victimization on fear. Crime and Delinquency, 33 (1), 135-154.

- Smith, L. N. & Hill, G. D. (1991). Victimization and fear of crime. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 18 (2), 217-239.
- South Carolina Governor's Office. (1990). South Carolina Criminal Justice Data 1980 - 1989. South Carolina Governor's Office, Division of Public Safety Programs, Office of Criminal Justice. Columbia, SC.
- South Carolina Law Enforcement Division. (1991). Crime in South Carolina. Columbia, SC.
- Thompson, C. Y., Bankston, W. B., & St. Pierre, R. L. (1991). Single female-headed households, handgun possession, and the fear of rape. Sociological Spectrum, 11, 231-244.
- Thompson, M. P. & Norris, F. H. (1992). Crime, social status, and alienation. American Journal of Community Psychology, 20 (1), 97-119.
- Warr, M. (1990). Dangerous situations: Social context and fear of victimization. Social Forces, 68 (3), 891-907.

**ORIGIN AND USE OF
CRIME VICTIMIZATION SURVEYS**

**Prepared as background for
the fear of crime and crime victimization
survey for Shaw AFB**

**Rickey H. Turner
College of Criminal Justice
University of South Carolina**

April 23, 1993

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Heading	Page
Introduction	1
History of Crime Victim Surveys	1
Survey Methods	5
Implementation of Victim Surveys	6
Comparing Survey Results vs Reported Crime	7
Concerns About Comparing Victim Surveys and Crime Reports	8
Problems With Victim Surveys	12
Support for Victim Surveys	14
Methodological Questions Concerning Victim Surveys	17
Failure to Report Crime	19
Reporting Crime to Police	23
Victim Survey Findings	25
Conclusions	33
References	35

Introduction

The Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) has been collecting detailed information concerning the frequency and nature of crime for 20 years in the National Crime Survey. The survey seeks to estimate the amount of crime which took place, much of which was not reported to police. The purpose of this paper was to examine the history of crime victim surveys and how the surveys were developed and implemented. A discussion of how victim surveys compared to police crime reports and researchers' concerns about such comparisons was also included. The benefits and shortcomings of victim surveys were reviewed as well as support for victim surveys. The reasons victims gave for reporting crime and for not reporting crime were identified. Finally, the results of victim surveys were summarized followed by conclusions about how victim survey results can be useful to criminal justice professionals.

History of Crime Victim Surveys

For many years the only means available to assess the magnitude of crime in the United States was official police reports. The primary source of police reporting became the Uniform Crime Report (UCR) compiled by the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) based on the reports of local police agencies. The UCR program has been developing statistics on local police records since 1930 (Bureau of Justice Statistics, February, 1981). Vetter and Silverman (1978) recognized the UCR as the most authoritative source available on the frequency and distribution of crime in the United States, although they cautioned the UCR had some important limitations. Parsonage (1979) stated the UCR was the only compilation of crime statistics on a nationwide basis and represented an important source of information for research on victimization. The UCR typically reported the number of incidents known to the police based on citizen's reporting of crimes or police officer's witnessing a crime being committed (Skogan, 1976b). The UCR was composed of the crimes of murder, and nonnegligent manslaughter, forcible rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny-theft, arson, and motor vehicle theft which

made up the Uniform Crime Reports Crime Index (Bureau of Justice Statistics, February, 1981). If more than one of the indexed crimes occurred during a single incident, only the most serious crime was reported in the UCR. The UCR has long been suspect because of discrepancies in reporting procedures of different police agencies and the political manipulation of crime reports to garner additional police funding, to make a police agency appear more effective in combatting crime, and to enhance the public's perception of the significance of a crime problem. The Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) identified two problems with UCR reporting. First, measurement of crime relied on the diligence of citizens in reporting crimes to police and, second, the UCR relied on police departments reporting of crimes (Bureau of Justice Statistics, February 1989). In the mid-1960's the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice surveyed victims because "Inadequate data existed on the nature and consequences of victimization, and measurement of the total volume of crime and of crime trends was extremely difficult with existing data bases (Bureau of Justice Statistics, February 1989, p. 1).

After the Commission's report the U.S. Bureau of Census, in 1967 and 1968 recommended the collection of victimization data (Bureau of Justice Statistics, February 1989). The National Crime Survey (NCS) was implemented in 1972 to provide data on the level of criminal victimization and to collect data on the characteristics of crime incidence and victims. Six crimes were included in the NCS: rape, robbery, assault, household burglary, personal and household larceny, and motor vehicle theft. The similarity between the UCR index crimes and the NCS was intentional. Two crimes measured in the UCR, murder and arson, were not included in the NCS. Murdered victims could not be surveyed. Arson victims may have been the perpetrators collecting insurance.

The NCS data have been used to inform a variety of audiences concerning crime and crime prevention. Community groups interested in neighborhood watch, victim assistance, and victim compensation programs have studied NCS findings. Police

academies have used NCS findings to train their cadets. Federal, state, and local officials have requested NCS data to inform policy and legislation and to deal with special populations such as teenagers, the elderly, and black victims. Businesses such as insurance companies and marketing research companies seeking to establish the potential market for products such as burglar alarms have used the NCS data (Bureau of Justice Statistics, February 1989 p. 7).

Skogan (1976b) stated victimization surveys were developed "to provide more reliable information about the frequency of crime, and to provide new data on victims, their losses, and costs of crime, and the attitudes of the general public toward crime and the legal process" (p. xvii). The first surveys according to Skogan revealed three to five times more crime, depending on the category, than local police departments reported to the FBI via the UCR. Parsonage (1978) stated victim surveys have shown the actual crime rate was probably twice as high as UCR reports.

Survey Methods

There were two primary types of survey methods. The first was a self-report survey in which individuals were asked about their involvement in committing criminal acts. The self-report survey was one of the first major attempts to identify the extent of unreported criminal activity (Organization For Economic Co-operation and Development, 1976). The major controversy over self-report surveys was whether individuals exaggerated or concealed their criminal activity. Also, self-report surveys did not measure the extent of harm to victims by criminal activity or victims' perceptions of the seriousness of the criminal act or acts. Only the incidents which the perpetrator identified as significant may have been included in the self-report survey. Therefore, self-report surveys were determined not to be very useful for developing indicators of criminal activity.

The second survey method involved victim surveys. Due to the dissatisfaction with self-report surveys a suggestion was made to survey potential victims of crime.

Individuals who suffered the actual harm were thought to be more reliable than either police statistics or self-reports of criminal activity. Another reason was the increased interest on whether the crime victim exposed himself or herself to unnecessary risks or precipitated the victimization by his or her actions or attitudes (Organization For Economic Co-operation and Development, 1976). Victim surveys, according to Sparks, Genn, and Dodd (1977), made an important contribution to the understanding of crime and the development of criminological theories. In addition, victim surveys provided another means of assessing the type and rate of crime separate from police records. However, Sparks et al. (1977) cautioned that victim surveys had limitations as a method of measuring crime and the information these surveys provided was incomplete in some respects. According to the NCS, victims were the immediate source of 60% of crimes known to the police. Other members of the victims households reported 13% of the crimes while witnesses reported 22% of the crimes. Police discovered less than 3% of the crimes known to police (Bureau of Justice Statistics, March, 1988).

Implementation of Victim Surveys

According to Skogan (1976b) the first victimization surveys were conducted in the mid-1960s for the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice. President Johnson directed the Commission to seek new knowledge about crime in America. The Commission issued a summary report of three victimization surveys which the Commission sponsored. Since the Commission's report, victimization surveys have been conducted around the world. In 1972, the United States conducted the first National Crime Survey. The survey was recently renamed the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) to more clearly emphasize the measurement of those victimizations experienced by U. S. citizens. The U. S. Census Bureau interviewed all members of a household 12 years old and older. Approximately 47,000 households were included in the most recent survey (Bureau of Justice Statistics, February 1992). Households stayed in the sample for three years and were interviewed on 6-month intervals.

Research by Kruttschnitt and Dornfeld (1992) regarding domestic violence suggested children younger than 12 years of age were capable of providing reliable responses to victim surveys provided the reference period was appropriate, the questions were pointed, and the topic was familiar to the juvenile. According to Kruttschnitt and Dornfeld, the response effects such as denial or selective inattention were the greatest for children who experienced the least amount of violence.

By the end of 1975, victimization surveys had been carried out by academic researchers or by government or private research organizations in Canada, Australia, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Finland, The Netherlands, Switzerland, England, Holland, West Germany, and Belgium. Cities such as San Diego, Oakland, New Orleans, Dayton, Chicago, San Jose, Detroit, New York, Los Angeles, Minneapolis, Miami, Cincinnati, Toledo, and Houston have conducted victimization surveys in the United States (Organization For Economic Co-operation and Development, 1976; Skogan, 1976b).

Comparing Survey Results vs Reported Crime

Sparks, Genn, and Dodd (1977) reported the early victim surveys revealed the volume of serious crime was between three and ten times higher than crimes recorded by police statistics. According to the BJS more than one-third of the robberies, aggravated assaults, burglaries, and rapes reported in the NCS were not reported to police (Bureau of Justice Statistics, March, 1988).

Nelson (1979) reported several types of crime reports in the NCS were compatible with crimes reported in the UCR. The linear relations between UCR and NCS showed a strong relationship for motor vehicle theft ($r = .91$) and robbery with a weapon ($r = .81$). The relationship for burglary ($r = .69$) was moderate and weak for robbery without a weapon ($r = .56$). For aggravated assault ($r = -.36$), simple assault ($r = .05$), and rape ($r = .04$), the UCR and NCS were independent or negatively related (p. 26).

Concerns About Comparing Victim Surveys and Crime Reports

Sparks et al. (1977) identified several concerns that must be considered when comparing the results of victims surveys to actual police records. Since victim surveys were directed toward individuals, only those crimes reported to police which were directed at individuals should be compared. Victimization which were the result of crimes committed against organizations must be omitted. Police statistics on business crimes and victimless crimes must be omitted. Any criminal acts which were not addressed in the survey must be eliminated from police statistics too. This included fraud, sexual offenses, or any other violation of the law the survey did not ask respondents about.

A second concern identified by Sparks et al. (1977), was that of "indictable" versus "non-indictable crimes". A distinction must be made between what violations of the law the criminal justice system arrested, prosecuted, and convicted an offender for and what violations of the law were often ignored by the criminal justice system. If an offense was committed and the police routinely would not arrest or the courts would not indict a person for the offense, then such acts should be removed from the survey. Comparison of the numbers of acts the public thought were crimes with police and court records would bias the survey.

The classification of incidents was another concern Sparks et al. (1977) identified. In some law enforcement agencies a crime report may process through many bureaucracies before the incident was officially classified according to the crime. The officer responding to the complaint may initially categorize the offense, then the police investigator may reclassify the incident. When the report was sent to the department records section, the crime may have been reclassified again. Finally the state records division may change the nature of the incident again. Care must be taken to ensure the classification of a victim reported incident matched the classification the police used to record the incident. If the victim survey recorded an incident as a burglary and the police

recorded the same incident as a robbery, the comparison of the two statistics would be tainted. The survey must ensure the crimes surveyed were classified using the same criteria the police used.

Some residents included in the survey may have been victimized outside the area surveyed. When this occurred, and the incident was reported, the report was filed with the law enforcement agency having jurisdiction where the incident took place. The victim survey must exclude such incidents from the sample when the incident was not reported to the police agency in the survey area. Likewise, police statistics may have included victims who were not residents of the area surveyed. Using reliable estimates of the number of visitors to the area and estimates of the proportion of crimes reported by non-residents, police statistics must be adjusted accordingly (Sparks et al., 1977; Debow and Reed, 1976). Sparks et al. (1977) maintained the larger the sample size the less important these two adjustments become. Finally, Debow and Reed (1976) discussed the impact of crimes which were reported to the police but not reported to the interviewer. These incidents normally involved such crimes as rape, assault, or robbery. Based on the problems identified, Debow and Reed suggested victim surveys were more useful in studying household victimizations than for personal violence.

Response bias was another concern of Sparks et al. (1977). Non-recall and non-reporting of incidents and telescoping of the time period of the incident must be considered. Telescoping involved including incidents in the survey which occurred prior to or after the time period involved in the survey. Telescoping, non-recall, and non-reporting will be discussed in more detail later. Sparks et al, based on previous sampling, made an assumption that the losses from non-recall and non-reporting and the gains from forward telescoping balanced out. However, they maintained even though the number of incidents may have been unaffected by these effects, the pattern of victimization probably was not. Sparks et al. suggested more prominent events such as burglary were probably

more often remembered and reported, while less significant events such as minor theft were probably under-estimated.

Sparks et al. (1977) cautioned to exclude from police records any individuals excluded from the sample. If only persons above a certain age, such as 18, were surveyed then police statistics must include only persons who were eligible to participate in the survey (i.e. above 18 years of age). Although difficult to adjust for, if only persons who were registered voters, had drivers licenses, or had a home telephone, were included in the sample, allowances must be made for persons who may have been candidates for the survey but did not register to vote, did not drive, or did not have a telephone.

Still another concern addressed by Sparks et al. (1977), was that of in-migration and out-migration. An adjustment, when necessary, must be made for persons who did not live in the survey area for the entire sample time. Also, individuals who lived in the area during the sample period and moved out of the area before the sample was taken required adjustments in the survey results. Sparks et al. chose to assume the effects of migration cancelled each other out in their survey.

Finally, Sparks et al. (1977) stated adjustments to the survey data must account for multiple victims in the same household. The burglary of a house may involve each member of the household, thus each member of the household may have answered that he/she was a victim of a burglary. However, in fact, there was only one burglary.

Problems With Victim Surveys

According to Laub (1990), victimization surveys attempted to identify in a uniform way very complex interactions between people under stressful circumstances. Problems of memory were significant in victim surveys. Factors such as shame and embarrassment made reporting of certain crimes more difficult. Where personal interviews were conducted in the victims home, the environment may inhibit reporting of certain crimes. Laub identified problems with the NCS and systematic response bias. Victims who knew the offender, especially relatives, were less likely to report the incident to interviewers,

even when the incident was reported to police. This was especially true of crimes of rape, assault, date rape, spouse abuse, and elder abuse.

Geis (1990) identified a problem in getting a consensus concerning the best method of obtaining victimization information. Six experts in four countries offered six different opinions on sample size and sampling procedures. The absence of scientific agreement, according to Geis, indicated how dangerous it was to compare the results of one survey to another as though they were measuring the same thing. Geis raised two primary concerns of victim surveys. First, individuals with the most education reported the highest victimization of assaults. His concern was duplicated worldwide. Geis' second concern was that victim surveys carried an ideological load. Because the surveys concentrated on traditional crime, they reinforced the misconception that traditional crime was the majority of the crime problem. This misconception masked the problems created by white-collar crime and other concerns such as air pollution, nuclear neglect, bribery, and other forms of abuse of power which many insisted pose a greater menace than traditional crime.

DuBow and Reed (1976) identified cost as having a major impact on local governments conducting victim surveys through personal interviews. Tuchfarber, Klecka, Bardes, and Oldendick (1976) suggested a well-designed, well executed, personal interview survey of 1,000 households would cost \$75,000-\$100,000. They also suggested a much larger sample size may have been appropriate for many research purposes. In order to achieve an adequate sample size, a large pool of trained interviewers was also deemed necessary (Debow and Reed, 1976). Low victimization rates per person required a large sample of the population to be surveyed to achieve an adequate data base on most crimes. One answer to this problem was to conduct telephone interviews instead of face-to-face interviews.

Another problem identified by DuBow and Reed (1976) was victimization surveys relied on households as sampling units. Relying on households eliminated the study of

crimes occurring in commercial areas. Furthermore, certain built-in biases existed when one member of the household answered for all members of the household.

Johnson and Lazarus (1989) concluded demographic composition, specifically age, contributed significantly to the variances in victimization rates. Using the results of the Canadian Urban Victimization Survey (CUVS), Johnson and Lazarus maintained when the populations of seven Canadian cities were adjusted to factor in the differences in the total number of 16-24 year olds in each city, the victimization rate for each of the cities differed significantly from the rate reported in the CUVS. When Johnson and Lazarus attempted to adjust the victimization rates based on age and gender, very little change was observed in the rate of victimization between the cities. Based on this study, the results of victim surveys must be carefully interpreted to ensure the data collected accurately represents the level of victimization in a specific location, and the results have not been manipulated by the researcher.

Support for Victim Surveys

Geis (1990) regarded victim surveys as the scientific, versus humanitarian, element of the victim movement. He maintained victim surveys provided information on the extent of criminal activity, and on the consequences of criminal activity for those victimized by crime. Geis proposed the most important function of victim surveys was as information gathering devices to identify the public's attitudes toward crime, to develop theories on criminality, and for planning purposes. Victimization surveys, according to Geis, had and would continue to contribute to the solutions concerning the problems of crime and the problems of both offenders and victims. He cited as an example, the NCS identification of the shortcomings of the UCR as an adequate measure of criminal behavior.

McDonald (1976) related that victimization surveys were originally conceived as a more reliable measure of the true amount of crime compared to official crime statistics. According to McDonald, a national conference on victimization surveys determined victim

surveys were methodologically sounder sources of information about victim-criminal-justice relations than police records.

Vetter and Silverman (1978) maintained victimization surveys contributed significantly to "(1) furnishing a means for developing victim topologies; (2) providing data for computing relative risk of victimization for certain segments of the population; (3) assisting in the determination of the costs and effects of crime; and (4) providing greater understanding of why certain crimes are not reported to police" (p. 352).

Pope (1979) declared victimization surveys, as a supplement to official statistics, "provide critical information about victimization experiences and the risk of victimization that is not available elsewhere" (p. 48).

Schneider (1976) studied the uses of a crime victimization study in Portland, Oregon. She concluded that although victimization data was not a complete substitute for official crime records; the data collected from such surveys were beneficial. Victimization data provided important information in understanding whether the crime rate actually changed or whether increased reporting of crimes increased the official records of such crimes. Schneider also determined victimization data permitted evaluators to assess the effectiveness of crime prevention programs and to evaluate the logic of the program. With this information planners and decision makers could decide how or what programs could be altered to increase the likelihood of a program reducing crime. Schneider maintained victimization data was an acceptable substitute for official crime statistics for evaluations assessing the change in the total crime rate.

Inciardi (1976), after studying the results of a victimization survey in Pueblo, Colorado, maintained such surveys provided police administrators with information crucial for planning purposes. More importantly, claimed Inciardi, victim surveys also provided information for planning needs. Data such as the location and characteristics of populations at greatest risk of being victimized; the reason for not reporting crimes and the characteristics of those who did and those who did not report offenses; the nature of

victim-offender relationships in violent personal crimes; and, citizens' attitudes towards police, crime, and fear of crime were available from victimization studies. With these data, Inciardi maintained, police planners could focus on the areas where offense-specific crime prevention programs were needed; identify areas and populations where police-community relations were poor; and, provide direction to the deployment of police throughout the city.

Methodological Questions Concerning Victim Surveys

Retrospective surveys which asked individuals to recall past experiences were prone to a number of potential sources of inaccuracies. The person may fail to remember the events under examination or may choose not to reveal the incident to the survey. When this occurred, the data was lost to the researcher (Sparks, et al. 1977; Skogan, 1976b).

A second problem was one called "telescoping" whereby the individual remembered the incident but mistakenly identified the wrong time period in which it occurred. A victimization survey typically tried to identify the frequency of crime occurring in a specific time period. Telescoping involved placing the event earlier or later than when the incident actually took place. Backward telescoping had the same effect as when the individual failed to remember the incident or chose not to report the incident on the survey. The event was lost to the survey results. Forward telescoping inflated the survey estimate by reporting a victimization as occurring during the sample period when, in fact, it occurred previous to the survey time period. According to Sparks et al. (1977), good questionnaire design and interviewing techniques minimized both nonreporting and telescoping.

To minimize telescoping Sparks et al. (1977) recommended beginning the questions by recalling past events which occurred at the beginning of the reference period. Then follow-up those questions with questions about other events which served as reference points to relate the victimization experiences to. Sparks et al. determined that to

get the same degree of accuracy in a population to estimate victimization, twice as large a sample size was needed if the reference time period was six months compared to one year. If the reference period was only three months, the sample size needed to be twice as large as the six month sample size.

The wording of the question and the order in which the questions were asked improved the respondent's recall. If questions about the victimization experiences were asked too early in the interview, the respondent may not have been comfortable with the subject to disclose or to remember such incidents. Conversely, if victimization questions were asked too late in the interview, the respondent may have been tired or bored and chose not to cooperate with the interviewer. Sparks et al. determined questions about victimization coming near the end of the interview recorded slightly lower reporting. However, the difference was not significant.

Sparks et al. (1977) related the respondent controlled the number of experiences he or she had based on what he/she considered a sufficient amount of time for the interview. When the respondent felt the interview had occupied a sufficient amount of time the number of incidents reported dropped off significantly. A better method was to ask a number of screening questions to determine the number of incidents of each type the individual experienced, then follow-up with more detailed questions about the specific incidents. This was the method used by the NCVS.

Another problem identified by Sparks et al. (1977) occurred when one member of the household responded for the entire household. This often resulted in under-reporting of crime since the person interviewed may not know anything about crimes committed against other family members. A better method was to ask the individual about his/her experiences only, and to estimate the household victimization from data on household size and composition.

Sparks et al. (1977) finding was supported when Smith and Hill (1991) conducted a victimization study which measured only household victimization experiences. One

member of the household was permitted to answer the survey for the entire household. Smith and Hill acknowledged the inability of such a survey to accurately measure individual personal victimization.

Failure to Report Crime

Some victims resisted reporting crimes to police because they did not wish to become involved with authorities (McDonald, 1976). Many citizens who reported their victimizations to police were not fully committed to cooperating with the police. This was evidenced by the victims providing the police false names and addresses.

Hindelang and Gottfredson (1976) surveyed over 1,000 persons and identified ten reasons why citizens decided not to report their victimization to the police. The most common reason given was "the police couldn't do anything about it (p. 63)". Other reasons given were the incident was a private matter, not a criminal affair; the victim was not sure if the real offenders would be caught; the police wouldn't want to be bothered; the victim didn't want to take the time; or did not want to harm the offender; the victim was afraid of reprisal; the victim didn't know how or if they should notify the police; the victim was too confused or upset to notify police; and finally the victim was afraid his insurance would be cancelled.

Some of Hindelang's and Gottfredson's (1976) findings were supported by the study of Biaggio, Brownwell, and Watts (1991). Biaggio et al. studied the victims of sexual offenses and why they did not report the incident to police. Twenty-one incidents of victimization were identified by 12 interviewees. Only 2 of the incidents were reported to someone in a position of authority. In one of the reported incidents, the individual thought the person in a position of authority was "not at all supportive" (p. 38). The primary reasons for the incidents not being reported were the subjects downplayed the significance of the incident or the victims were concerned about how they would be perceived by others. Still, other victims were afraid of retaliation by the offenders; while other victims were too ashamed of the incident or thought the incident was their fault.

Hindelang and Gottfredson (1976) also reported the rate of nonreporting of victimization varied according to the type of crime. Business victimizations were reported more frequently than personal or household victimizations. Completed vehicle theft also had a high rate of reporting while attempted purse snatching and household larceny of items less than \$50.00 were seldom reported. Completed victimizations were reported more frequently than attempted victimizations and victimizations not involving force. If a weapon was used, the victimization was reported more frequently than if the offender did not have a weapon. When the victimization involved personal injury to the victim, the incident was reported more often compared to victimizations which did not involve personal injury. As the amount of monetary loss to the victim increased, the likelihood of reporting the victimization increased, too (Hindelang and Gottfredson, 1976; Sparks et al., 1977).

The characteristics of the victims were also associated with the decision to report the incident to police. Of all the factors available for Hindelang and Gottfredson (1976) to analyze (age, race, sex, family income, marital status, employment, and educational level), age was more often related to the decision to report the incident to police. Generally, victims under 35 years of age reported incidents of victimization less than persons over 35. However, the decision to report the victimization was also influenced by the type of crime, the race of the victim, the income of the victim, as well as, the victim's age.

Knudten, Meade, Knudten, and Doerner (1976) summarized their findings of the problems victims experience as the result of their case coming to the attention of the district attorney's (DA's) office. When the DA's office was involved Knudten assumed the victim or some other person reported the victimization to authorities and an offender was identified and criminal charges filed against the offender. For convenience, the 13 problems identified most often by the victims were grouped into four categories: (1) time related problems: included unnecessary trips; long waiting time; time lost from work or school; the number of adjournments experienced; length of time spent waiting for the case

to be handled on the day of the interview contact; and the total number of days lost from work or school since the case came to the attention of the DA's office; (2) financial problems: to include lost income; transportation and parking costs; (3) court-setting problems: included difficulties in where to go; what to do when once a person arrived; discomfort because of unpleasant waiting conditions; and anxiety because of exposure to threatening or unsettling persons; (4) personal problems: such as child care; arranging transportation; and having a person's property kept as evidence.

Skogan (1976b) indicated reporting practices of victims varied from city to city. Miami, Washington, and Atlanta had relatively high rates of reporting for robbery, while Portland, San Francisco, Los Angeles, and Newark averaged approximately 50% reporting of robbery. His analysis of why victims did not report a crime identified the seriousness of the crime as the primary determinant of whether it was reported or not. The financial loss, whether force was used, whether a weapon was used, the extent of physical injury to the victim, and whether the victim knew the assailant were controlling factors. According to Skogan, individual attributes such as race, sex, income and age were secondary to the nature of the incident when it came to reporting of the incident.

Skogan (1976b) also identified local police practices as a second factor influencing the differences between official police statistics and survey results. The police performed a filtering function for citizen complaints. The police decided which citizen complaints to record and which complaints to handle informally. Offenses reported to the police may have been shifted or downgraded from one category to another or ignored.

Reporting Crime to Police

Smith and Maness (1976) reported the results of their study of burglary victims in Columbia, South Carolina and concluded the primary reason victims gave for reporting the burglary to police was "civic duty". The most frequent response to the question of why did you report the incident to police was the victim thought he or she was obligated to report it. The second most frequent response was so the police could catch the offender.

Other responses included for personal protection, for insurance, to recover the property, to protect the neighborhood, and because the victimization made the victim mad (p. 82).

Schneider, Burcart, and Wilson, (1976) examined the attitude of victims toward police compared to whether or not the victimization was reported to police. They concluded that for personal crimes, victims were more likely to report the incident to police if the victim trusted the police. For low and moderately serious property crimes, persons who trusted the police were more likely to report victimization than individuals who did not trust police. However, for serious property crimes, the level of trust was not a factor. Persons who thought the police had a good chance of catching the offender were more likely to report a serious crime versus persons who thought the police would not catch the offender. The victims of personal crime were more likely to report the crime, if they believed the court would punish the offender compared to victims who did not believe the court would punish the offender.

Based on the conclusions of Schneider et al. (1976), the findings of a study by Brandl and Horvath (1991) concerning victims satisfaction with police provided insight to what victims looked for in police response. The victim's satisfaction was directly related to the type of crime experienced. For personal crimes which included aggravated battery, nonaggravated battery, rape, other sexual assault, and robbery, police professionalism and expectation of response time were closely related to victim satisfaction. For property crimes, the victim's satisfaction was more closely related to the investigative effort of police and police professionalism. In their study, Brandl and Horvath found no relationship between age, income, gender, or educational background and victim satisfaction with police. In summary, their study found the nature of the criminal offense and the behavior and activities of police officers were the primary influences on a victim's satisfaction with police.

Victim Survey Findings

Smith and Hill (1991) in surveying over 3,000 randomly selected households in North Carolina found personal victimization correlated significantly with the age and income of the victim. The younger and poorer participants in the survey were more frequent victims. The education level of the victim was positively correlated with property victimization, whereas, income was negatively associated with property crimes. The higher the income, the less the rate of victimization. Traditional thinking held that the higher the education, the greater the income. But Smith and Hill found the two variables were related to the risk of victimization in opposite ways.

Many of the researchers examined for this study identified the National Crime Victimization Survey, conducted by the Bureau of Census for the U. S. Department of Justice, as the model on which most other surveys were patterned or which most other surveys were compared to. Since the NCVS appeared to be the dominant survey in assessing the level of victimization in the United States, the NCVS findings will be summarized here.

The 1990 NCVS surveyed approximately 95,000 people age 12 and older living in 47,000 households in the United States. Individuals were contacted in person at six month intervals by an interviewer or via telephone. About 10% of the individuals who participated in the survey were interviewed using a Computer-Assisted Telephone Interviewing procedure (Bureau of Justice Statistics, February, 1992).

The NCVS estimated 34.4 million crimes were committed in the United States in 1990 and 34.7 million in 1991 against either individuals or households (Bureau of Justice Statistics, February, 1992 p. 15). Although the number of personal and household crimes was not significantly different from 1990, the number of violent crime attempts increased 11% from 1990 to 1991 (Bureau of Justice Statistics, October, 1992. p. 1). Almost 23 million households in America were victimized by crime in each year 1990 and 1991. This represented 24% of all households in the country (Bureau of Justice Statistics, July 1992,

p. 1). The rate of violent crime victimization in 1990 was 30 victimizations for every 1,000 persons age 12 or older. The rate of theft was 64 thefts for every 1,000 citizens. Seventeen percent of all crimes measured by the NCVS were violent crimes; 62% were personal and household larceny crimes; and, 21% were household burglaries and motor vehicle thefts (Bureau of Justice Statistics, February, 1992 p. 15). Between 1989 and 1990, the levels of personal and household crimes decreased significantly according to the Bureau of Justice Statistics (October 1991, p. 1). Personal crimes decreased 3.6% and household crimes decreased 4.4% in 1990.

Sixty-one percent of all violent crimes were committed by strangers, 42% of rapes, 82% of robberies, and 57% of all assaults were committed by strangers. Most victims of violent crime were males, but there was no significant difference in black and white victimization rates for males. The offender was most often identified as male also, typically a black male victimized another black male and a white male victimized a white male (Bureau of Justice Statistics, February, 1992 p. 53).

The largest proportion of violent crimes occurred on the streets, away from the victim's home. Almost half of the violent crimes occurred within 5 miles of the victim's home. The victim's home was the next most common place for violent crime to occur (Bureau of Justice Statistics, February, 1992 p. 67).

Only 38% of all victimizations were reported to the police. Forty-eight percent of all violent victimizations, 29% of personal thefts, and 41% of all household crimes were reported to police in 1990 (Bureau of Justice Statistics, February, 1992 p. 100). This was up from 1983 when 35% of all crimes were reported to police, with 48% of all violent crimes, 26% of all personal thefts, and 37% of all household crimes (Bureau of Justice Statistics, December, 1985 p. 1). Three-fourths of all vehicle thefts were reported to police in 1990. Vehicle theft was the most reported crime. Completed robberies, assaults, and thefts were more likely reported to police than attempts at these crimes. Females were more likely to report violent victimizations than males. However, violent crimes

ommitted by strangers were no more likely to be reported than those committed by someone the victim knew. The youngest victims in the survey, ages 12-19 were the least likely to report crimes to police. Families with income of \$25,000 or more annually, were more likely to report victimizations than families earning under \$10,000 a year. Normally, as the value of the loss increased the likelihood of the crime being reported also increased (Bureau of Justice Statistics, February, 1992 p. 100).

The most often reason for reporting violent crime was to prevent further crimes from being committed against the victim by the same offender. For household crimes and theft, the most common reason for reporting the crime was so the victim could recover his or her property. When a victim of violent crime did not report the crime to police, the most common reasons given were that the crime was a private matter or that the offender was unsuccessful. The most often cited reason for not reporting household crimes and thefts was the object was recovered, followed by the crime had been reported to some other official. Victims of household crime gave differing reasons for not reporting the crime to police based on the victim's race. White victims more often considered the crime unimportant while black victims felt it was a personal or private matter (Bureau of Justice Statistics, February, 1992 p. 100).

The BJS prepared special reports on some specific categories of victims. These included female victims, black victims, elderly victims, teenage victims, as well as reports on specific crimes such as school crime. Each of these special reports will be briefly summarized.

Female victims of violent crime, although less likely to be victims than males, have slowly increased in numbers since 1973. Females were more likely to be victims of violence between intimates and rape. Women were six times more likely than men to be victimized by a spouse, ex-spouse, boyfriend, or girlfriend. Among violent crime victims, women were victimized 25% of the time by someone they knew intimately. Slightly over half of the victimizations of women by intimates were reported to police; whereas, only

about 45% of the victimizations by friends or acquaintances, not intimates, were reported to police. About half of the women reporting intimate violence to the police did so to stop the violence from happening again. Almost half of the victims who did not report the violence to police, but did report it to the NCS, said it was a private or personal matter which they took care of themselves (Bureau of Justice Statistics, January, 1991, p. 1-3).

From 1979 to 1986 blacks suffered a higher rate of violent and household crime victimizations than whites. Also, violent crimes against blacks were more serious than those committed against whites. Blacks had higher rates of rape, robbery, and aggravated assault, but whites had higher rates of simple assault and personal theft. Offenders were almost twice as likely to have weapons in violent crimes against blacks compared to whites. Blacks were also more likely to be physically attacked during a violent crime. Approximately a third (37%) of crimes against blacks were reported to police compared to 35% for whites. Black victims were more likely to report violent crimes, burglary, and motor vehicle theft while white victims more frequently reported theft and household larceny (Bureau of Justice Statistics, April, 1990, p. 1,8).

The lowest rates of victimization, according to the NCS, occurred among those age 65 and older. However, the NCS related that crimes against this age group were often more serious than crimes against younger age groups. Between 1980 and 1985, elderly victims were more likely to be victimized by persons with guns, were more likely to be victimized by strangers, were more likely to be injured and receive medical care for their injuries, and were less likely than younger victims to be able to protect themselves during a crime. Elderly victims were more likely to report robberies and personal crimes of theft to police than younger victims. For other crimes, there were no measurable differences between the reporting rates of elderly victims and for younger victims (Bureau of Justice Statistics, November, 1987, p. 1,5).

Teenagers, persons age 12 to 19, were more than twice as likely as adults to be victims of violent crime. Additionally, teenagers experienced twice the crime of theft as

did adults. Older teenagers, those 16 to 19, had higher rates of victimization than did teenagers ages 12 to 15. Teenage males were more likely to experience violent crime and crimes of theft compared to teenage females. Black teenagers were 3 to 5 times more likely to be murder victims than white teenagers. Teenagers had the lowest rate of reporting victimization to police of all groups surveyed by the NCS. Violent crimes against adults were almost twice as likely to be reported to police as violent crimes against teenagers. However, crimes against teenagers may not have been reported to police because the victim reported the incident to another authority figure such as a teacher or parent (Bureau of Justice Statistics, May, 1991, pp. 1, 9, 10).

Approximately 9% of the students ages 12 to 19 were the victims of crime in or around their school. About 2% of the students experienced violent crimes while 7% experienced property crimes. These findings were reported by the BJS in a special 6 month study during the first half of 1989 of over 10,000 school age youth. Both males and females were equally victimized and students of different races had about the same amount of violent victimizations. Students who moved quite often were more likely to experience violent victimizations. High school freshmen were more likely to be crime victims than students in all other high school grades. The special survey did not question respondents concerning their reporting of victimizations (Bureau of Justice Statistics, September, 1991, pp. 1, 2).

Using data from the NCS and prior research on in-school victimization by the National Institute of Education's Safe Schools Study; Parker, Smith, Smith, and Toby (1991) studied the relationship between the amount of crime occurring on the streets and in the homes of the school age adolescents between 12 and 19. They found a relationship between the level of victimization in schools and the level of victimization at home and in the streets of these school age persons over relatively short periods of time (3 months for home and 4 months for the street series). Parker et al. concluded increases or decreases in the victimization rate outside of school increased or decreased the victimization rate inside

of schools, over the short term. No relationship was found for long term relationships between the two variables.

The NCS also analyzed crime victimization comparing city, suburban, and rural areas of the United States from 1973 to 1989. The NCS concluded that since 1980, the rates of victimization declined in all three geographic areas. Rural areas accounted for about 16% of violent victimizations, while city and suburban areas accounted for about 42% each. Blacks were more likely victimized by violent crime in cities and suburbs while whites were more frequent victims in rural areas. In the rural areas, the victims reported the offender was more likely a relative or acquaintance, while city and suburban victims were more likely attacked by a stranger. Across all three areas, males were more likely victims than were females for both violent crimes and personal thefts (Bureau of Justice Statistics, June 1992, p. 1).

Conclusions

Victim surveys have limitations; but, they provide additional information which would otherwise not be available to criminal justice professionals. Victim surveys permit an assessment of the amount and type of unreported crime. They also help police planners assess why crimes are and are not reported to police. With this information, the police could adjust, if necessary, police practices which may be inhibiting the public from reporting crimes to police. Victim information also is important in allocating police resources. If a substantial amount of unreported crime involved one segment of the population, was centered in a specific area, or involved a specific type of crime, the police, based on this information could provide services to meet the public's needs. Information such as the risk of victimization could be important in public education programs. Victim surveys provide such information. Victim surveys permit the police to evaluate the effectiveness of crime prevention, public education, and public relations programs. Through victim surveys, police planners could appraise their programs to see which programs were making a difference in citizens' reporting of crimes, protective measures

taken to prevent crimes, and victims' attitudes towards the police. Victim surveys also allow the police to assess the public's needs and tailor police services to those needs.

References

- Biaggio, M. K., Brownell, A., & Watts, D. L. (1991). Reporting and seeking support by victims of sexual offenses. Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 17 (12), 33-42.
- Brandl, S. G., & Horvath, F. (1991). Crime-victim evaluation of police investigation performance. Journal of Criminal Justice, 19 (2), 109-121.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics. (February, 1981). Measuring crime. Washington, DC.: Bureau of Justice Statistics Clearinghouse.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics. (December, 1985). Reporting crimes to the police. (NCJ Publication No. NCJ-99432). Rockville, MD: Bureau of Justice Statistics Clearinghouse.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics. (November, 1987). Elderly victims. (NCJ Publication No. NCJ-107676). Rockville, MD: Bureau of Justice Statistics Clearinghouse.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics. (March, 1988). Report to the nation on crime and justice. (NCJ Publication No. NCJ-105506). Rockville, MD: Bureau of Justice Statistics Clearinghouse.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics. (February 1989). Redesign of the national crime survey. (NCJ Publication No. NCJ-111457). Rockville, MD: Bureau of Justice Statistics Clearinghouse.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics. (April, 1990). Black victims. (NCJ Publication No. NCJ-122562). Rockville, MD: Bureau of Justice Statistics Clearinghouse.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics. (January, 1991). Female victims of violent crime. (NCJ Publication No. NCJ-126826). Rockville, MD: Bureau of Justice Statistics Clearinghouse.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics. (May, 1991). Teenage victims: A national crime survey report. (NCJ Publication No. NCJ-128129). Rockville, MD: Bureau of Justice Statistics Clearinghouse.

- Bureau of Justice Statistics. (September, 1991). School crime: A national crime victimization survey report. (NCJ Publication No. NCJ-131645). Rockville, MD: Bureau of Justice Statistics Clearinghouse.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics. (October, 1991). Criminal victimization 1990. (NCJ Publication No. NCJ-130234). Rockville, MD: Bureau of Justice Statistics Clearinghouse.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics. (February, 1992). Criminal victimization in the united states, 1990. (NCJ Publication No. NCJ-134126). Rockville, MD: Bureau of Justice Statistics Clearinghouse.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics. (June, 1992). Crime victimization in city, suburban, and rural areas. (NCJ Publication No. NCJ-135943). Rockville, MD: Bureau of Justice Statistics Clearinghouse.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics. (July, 1992). Crime and the nation's households, 1991. (NCJ Publication No. NCJ-136950). Rockville, MD: Bureau of Justice Statistics Clearinghouse.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics. (October, 1992). Criminal Victimization 1991. (NCJ Publication No. NCJ-136947). Rockville, MD: Bureau of Justice Statistics Clearinghouse.
- DuBow F. L. & Reed, D. E. (1976) In W. G. Skogan, (Ed.). (1976). Sample surveys of the victims of crime. (pp. 151-173). Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.
- Geis, G. (1990). Crime victims: Practices and prospects. In A. J. Lurigio, W. G. Skogan, & R.C. Davis, (Eds.). (1990). Victims of crime: Problems, policies, and programs. (pp. 251-268). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Hindelang, M. J. & Gottfredson M. (1976). The victim's decision not to invoke the criminal justice process. In W. F. McDonald, (Ed.). (1976). Criminal justice and the victim. (pp. 57-78). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

- Inciardi, J. A. (1976). Criminal statistics and victim survey research for effective law enforcement planning. In E. C. Viano, (Ed.). (1976). Victims and society. (pp. 177-189). Washington DC: Visage Press, Inc.
- Johnson, H. & Lazarus, G. (July, 1989). The impact of age on crime victimization rates. Canadian Journal of Criminology, 31 (3), 309-317.
- Knudten, R. D., Meade, A., Knudten, M., & Doerner, W. (1976). The victim in the administration of criminal justice: Problems and perceptions. In W. F. McDonald, (Ed.). (1976). Criminal justice and the victim. (pp. 115-146). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Kruttschnitt, C. & Dornfeld, M. (May, 1992). Will they tell? Assessing preadolescents' reports of family violence. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 29 (2), 136-147.
- Laub, J. H. (1990) Pattern of criminal victimization in the United States. In A. J. Lurigio, W. G. Skogan, & R. C. Davis, (Eds.). (1990). Victims of crime: Problems, policies, and programs. (pp. 23-49). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Lurigio, A. J., Skogan, W. G., & Davis, R. C. (Eds.). (1990). Victims of crime: Problems, policies, and programs. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- McDonald, W. F. (Ed.). (1976). Criminal justice and the victim. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Nelson, J. F. (1979). Implications for the ecological study of crime: A research note. In W. H. Parsonage, (Ed.). (1979). Perspectives on victimology. (pp. 21-28). Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Organization For Economic Co-operation and Development. (1976). Data sources for social indicators of victimization suffered by individuals. Paris, France: Author.
- Parker, R. N., Smith, W. R., Smith, R., & Toby, J. (1991, March). Trends in victimization in schools and elsewhere, 1974-1981. Journal of Quantitative Criminology, 7 (1), 3-17.

- Parsonage, W. H. (Ed.). (1979). Perspectives on victimology. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Pope, C. E. (1979). Victimization rates and neighborhood characteristics: Some preliminary findings. In W. H. Parsonage, (Ed.). (1979). Perspectives on victimology. (pp. 48-57). Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Schneider, A. L. (1976). Victimization surveys and criminal justice system evaluation. In W. G. Skogan, (Ed.). (1976). Sample surveys of the victims of crime. (pp. 135-150). Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.
- Schneider, A. L., Burcart, J. M., & Wilson II, L. A. (1976). The role of attitudes in the decision to report crimes to the police. In W. F. McDonald, (Ed.). (1976). Criminal justice and the victim. (pp. 89-113). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Skogan, W. G. (Ed.). (1976a). Sample surveys of the victims of crime. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.
- Skogan, W. G. (1976b). Crime and crime rates. In W. G. Skogan, (Ed.). (1976). Sample surveys of the victims of crime. (pp. 105-119). Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.
- Smith, L. N. & Hill, G. D. (1991). Victimization and fear of crime. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 18 (2), 217-239.
- Smith, A. E. & Maness, D. Jr. (1976). The decision to call the police: Reactions to burglary. In W. F. McDonald, (Ed.). (1976). Criminal justice and the victim. (pp. 79-87). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Sparks, R. F., Genn, H. G., & Dodd, D. J. (1977). Surveying victims. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- Tuchfarber, A. J. Jr., Klecka, W. R., Bardes, B. A., & Oldendick, R. W. (1976). Reducing the cost of victim surveys. In W. G. Skogan, (Ed.). (1976). Sample surveys of the victims of crime. (pp. 207-221). Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.
- Vetter, H. J. & Silverman, I. J. (1978). The nature of crime. Philadelphia, PA: W. B. Saunders.
- Viano, E. C. (Ed.). (1976). Victims and society. Washington DC: Visage Press, Inc.

**FEAR OF CRIME AND
CRIME VICTIMIZATION STUDY
SHAW AIR FORCE BASE
FAMILY HOUSING**

**Rickey H. Turner
College of Criminal Justice
University of South Carolina**

April 23, 1993

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This study surveyed 125 households accounting for 448 housing residents of Shaw Air Force Base family housing to assess resident's fear of crime, frequency of crime victimization, and likelihood of reporting crime to security police.

All family housing residents surveyed expressed a low fear of crime. The fear of crime among off-base housing residents was not significantly different from on-base housing residents. Similar to the findings of national studies, the major differences in fear of crime among family housing residents were between males and females. Females worried about their personal safety and felt more threatened when going out after dark.

However, significant differences in victimization were found between off-base family housing residents and on-base residents. Half the off-base housing residents surveyed said they had been victimized by crime compared to 14% of on-base housing residents.

Property crime was the most frequent crime reported, but 29 violent crimes were reported in the survey.

Family size was an important factor in victimization. Households with four or more family members experienced more victimization.

The survey revealed substantial underreporting of crime. Nationally, 38% of all crimes were reported to police. Only 19% of all victimizations on Shaw AFB were reported to security police.

Education programs were needed to inform residents concerning their risk of victimization. Additional studies were needed to clearly identify victims, offenders and reasons for the low reporting of victimization. A neighborhood watch program was recommended to assist security police in identifying offenders and to get the residents involved in protecting themselves from crime.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Heading</u>	<u>Page</u>
Introduction	1
Objectives	3
Limitations	5
Literature Review	7
Fear of Crime	7
Who Fears Crime	8
Reactions to Fear of Crime	9
Public Reactions and Research Results	10
Crime Victimization Surveys	11
Problems With Victim Surveys	12
Support For Victim Surveys	13
Failure to Report Crime	14
Reporting Crime to Police	15
Victim Survey Findings	15
Background	18
Methodology	20
Survey Selection	20
Sample Selection	20
Results	22
Fear of Crime	25
Crime Victimization	27
Discussion	31
Recommendations	39

References	37
Tables	
Table 1: Housing Area Survey Response	23
Table 2: Family Size Survey Response	23
Table 3: Family Size and Location	24
Appendixes	
Appendix A	A
Fear of Crime Survey	A1
Commander/Researcher Letter	A2
Appendix B	B
Survey Response by Rank	B1
Survey Response by Sex and Housing Area	B2
Appendix C	C
Fear of Crime Frequency of Response	C1
Gender and Fear of Crime	C5
Fear of Crime, Family Size, and Gender	C5
Fear of Crime and Gender (Chi-Square test)	C10
Rank and Family Size	C14
Rank and Gender	C15
Rank and Housing Area	C16
Family Size and Housing Area	C17
Fear of Crime and Housing Area	C18
Fear of Crime and Location	C23
Appendix D	D
Crime Victim Frequency of Response	D1

Family Size and Crime Victimization	D9
Housing Area and Crime Victimization	D17
Housing Area, Family Size & # of Victimizations..	D24
Victimization by Location	D39
Appendix E	E
Security Police Crime Reports	E1
Security Police Crime Subjects	E2

Introduction

A survey of American citizens revealed fear of crime as one of the most significant influences affecting peoples lives today (Gallup, 1989). Individuals made decisions on where to work, where to live and what leisure activities to participate in based on their sense of safety. These decisions in turn affected citizens' quality of life.

In addition, reports by the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) indicated crime was much more prevalent than reported by police records. On average, only about 38% of all crimes were reported to police (Bureau of Justice Statistics, February, 1992). The low reporting of crime resulted from a number of reasons, such as: the way crimes were recorded by the Uniform Crime Reports (UCR), victims' fear of reprisals from offenders if they reported the crime to police, or discrepancies in reporting practices of different police agencies. Regardless of the reasons, the results of crime victim surveys indicated crime was a significant factor in the lives of American citizens.

A small segment of the American public consisted of men and women in the United States Armed Forces, and their families. American citizens volunteered to serve in the United States military. Military families lived and worked at military installations across the country and in many foreign countries. Many military families lived in communities surrounding military installations. However, some military installations maintained

housing facilities for military families.

The military installations across the United States were operated with the support of the local communities. Numerous civilian workers were employed to supplement the military specialists. Although civilian workers were not permitted to live in military housing, civilian workers typically lived near the military installation. In addition, numerous civilian contractors worked on the military installation performing specialized tasks. Therefore, the military installations often reflected a cross section of local citizens. Military members, their families, civilian workers, and civilian contractors comprised a diverse population similar to the community surrounding the military installation.

The military families who lived in military housing were likely to encounter crime just as they would in the public sector. The different cultures and backgrounds of the military families living on the installation and the civilians working on the military installation may have enhanced fear of crime among military families. The control the military exerted over military housing facilities may have limited the amount of crime on the installation and the reporting of crime. A comparison between families living in military housing with stringent controls over entry to the housing area and families living in military housing without those controls would permit a study of the effects of the differing security measures on residents'

fear of crime.

Shaw Air Force Base (AFB) was selected for this study. Shaw AFB was located about 35 miles East of Columbia, South Carolina. Shaw AFB maintained 1704 military housing units for military families. Military families were assigned to family housing based on the rank of the military member and family size. All residents volunteered to live in family housing and had to wait for a house to become available. The housing was separated into two different areas. One area was designated on-base housing since the houses were enclosed by a security fence with entry controlled by armed Security Policemen. The second area was designated off-base housing and was located adjacent to the base; however, entry was not controlled and the area was not enclosed. Housing residents could specify which area of housing they wanted; however, waiting time varied with the type of housing the resident selected.

Objectives

The first objective of the study was to determine if there was a difference in fear of crime in Shaw Air Force Base on-base family housing compared to the off-base family housing area. The base family housing was separated into two areas. One part of the base housing area was enclosed by a fence and required individuals entering the housing area to pass through an entry checkpoint controlled by an armed Security Policeman. The other housing area was fenced on three sides but entry was not

controlled by security police and individuals were not required to explain their purpose for entering this area. The study attempted to differentiate the residents' fear of crime based on the area of family housing the resident lived in.

If the degree of control over access to the housing area influences fear of crime, then residents of on-base housing should have a lower fear of crime than residents of off-base housing. The tighter controls placed on entry to on-base housing should make these residents feel more secure and less fearful of crime. Likewise, off-base residents should have a higher fear of crime because entry to the off-base housing area was not monitored the way entry to on-base housing was monitored.

The second objective of the study was to identify any differences in crime victimization between on-base family housing area residents and the off-base housing area residents. The on-base housing area consisted of mostly two and three bedroom duplex style houses. The off-base housing area had more three and four bedroom houses which included multiplex houses. Because of the differences in composition of the two housing areas, in addition to the differences in public accessibility, the study sought to determine if there was a difference in victimization.

A third goal of this study was to compare victimization reports of family housing residents to Security Police crime

reports. Nationwide, victim surveys indicated only about one-third of the incidents of crime were reported to police. This study sought to evaluate whether men and women in the U. S. Air Force and their families reported crime more often than the national average. The structure and control exerted by the United States Air Force on military members and on residents of family housing could have made a difference on the level of reporting of crime.

Limitations

Limitations of the study included the population from which the sample for the survey was selected. Since the sample was selected from military housing residents, the results of the survey may not be applicable to the general population. Further research was needed to determine how military housing residents compared to the population at large.

A second limitation was the nature of the survey. Self-administered surveys have limitations (Babbie, 1973; Sudman, 1967). The respondents degree of fear was difficult to assess. The survey provided four possible answers for each statement. However, no method was provided to determine if one respondent's fear of crime was of the same intensity as another respondent. Therefore, conclusions were made based on whether the respondent's answer indicated fear of crime or no fear of crime.

The security police records used for comparison with the

survey results had serious limitations. The security police records reported all incidents of crime occurring on Shaw Air Force Base or the adjacent areas under the base's jurisdiction, regardless of whether victims lived in base housing or not. The Shaw AFB Budget office conducted an audit of all persons who used the bases' facilities from the surrounding area. These persons included civilian employees, civilian contractors, private businesses; such as, banks and credit union employees, and military retirees. In addition, families with military members who commuted to work and did not live in base housing were also included. The audit determined 52,806 persons made use of the base facilities. However, only military members assigned to Shaw Air Force Base and family members of those living in family housing were included in the totals used for comparison. These individuals had reason to be on the installation on a regular basis either to work or because they lived there; therefore, they had more opportunity to be victimized on base. The total of individuals "regularly on base" equaled 12,263.

Military rank was used as the differentiating factor to test the representativeness of the sample. Appendix B2 identified how the survey sample compared to the housing population by rank. However, no comparison was made between the survey sample and the base population for such factors as age, sex, race, family size, income, length of residence, marital

status, or education level. The sex of the individual completing the survey was requested; however, the sex of the victim was not identified. The income of the military member could have been identified based on rank, however, such factors as a working spouse, two military members in one household, or a military member with income outside the military were not known. The age of household members, length of residence, marital status, education level, family size race, income, and sex of victims were all items for future studies.

Literature Review

A number of studies were conducted measuring the public's fear of crime. This section will review some of the results of those studies. In addition, crime victimization and the disparities between police reports and victim reports of crime were also reviewed.

Fear of Crime

Lewis and Salem (1986) maintained the soaring crime rate and ghetto riots of the late 1960's were the impetus for the concern with the impact of crime on the victim and the community. Fear of crime surveys were implemented to identify the public's concerns. The first surveys revealed almost 50% of the public was afraid to go out in their neighborhood at night. Fear of crime was closely associated with anticipation of the occurrence of a criminal event. Researchers thought prior victimization would increase a person's fear of crime. Victims

of crime would be more fearful than nonvictims. However, researchers found citizens' fear of crime far exceeded the number of citizens victimized by crime.

Who fears crime.

Victim studies found the type of crime people experienced determined their fear of victimization (Skogan, 1987; Smith and Hill, 1991; Kaniasty and Norris, 1991). Fear of crime was found to be the most frequent and lasting consequence of being a victim of crime.

Gender and age were closely associated with fear of crime. Females were significantly more fearful of victimization than males (Marshall, 1991; Krannich, Berry, and Greider, 1989). But, the research was mixed on the relationship of age and fear. Some studies indicated there was no relationship between age and fear of crime (Marshall, 1991). Other studies found the elderly significantly more fearful of crime than younger persons (Warr, 1990; Belyea and Zingraff, 1988). Researchers also found rural residents less fearful of crime than residents of larger cities (Krannich, Berry, and Greider, 1989; Belyea and Zingraff, 1988).

Citizens most fearful of crime were less satisfied with the neighborhood they lived in (Marshall, 1991; Baba and Austin, 1989; Lewis and Salem, 1986). Researchers found the perceived fear of victimization increased when people were confronted daily with numerous incivilities (LaGrange, Ferraro, and Supaicic, 1992). Incivilities included such things as litter,

loitering, condemned houses and businesses, abandoned cars, drinking, beggars, or rowdy teenagers. LaGrange et al. found incivilities more predictive of fear of property crime than personal crime.

Another idea concerned the media's perpetuation of the public's fear of crime. Sensational headlines heightened the public's fear of crime. A study of newspaper coverage of homicide found the stories of homicides in the first 15 pages of the newspaper increased citizen's fear of crime (Liska and Baccaglioni, 1990). However, stories of non-local homicide actually decreased citizens' fear of crime. Based on their findings, Liska and Baccaglioni suggested the effects of newspaper coverage on the public's fear of crime may have been small and insignificant.

Reactions to fear of crime.

Studies found citizens demonstrated a number of different reactions to their fear of crime. LeBlanc (1993) found some people refused to work in areas where they did not feel safe. Citizens also limited the time and place where they performed certain types of jobs. Over half of the women surveyed and about a third of the men refused to shop in some places after dark, while 80% of the women and about 50% of the men limited where they would go alone. Similar findings were found in other studies (Nasar and Fisher, 1992; Thompson and Norris, 1992;). Other reactions people took were to carry a gun, carry mace,

take public transportation instead of hitchhiking, walk with keys in hand, and hold onto their wallet when going in areas where they felt unsafe (Archer and Erlich-Erfer, 1991; Marshall, 1991; Thompson, Bankston, and St. Pierre, 1991). Older citizens took additional measures to protect their homes from victimization. Protective measures included locking doors, having special locks installed, installing security systems, buying watchdogs, and hiring private security guards (Greenberg and Rubak, 1992; Marshall, 1991).

Perhaps the most frequently cited reaction to fear of crime was to avoid people and places. Avoidance actions were much more prevalent at night than in the daytime (Gordon and Riger, 1989; Nasar and Fisher, 1992; Marshall, 1991; Thompson and Norris, 1992; LeBlanc, 1993). By altering their behavior in this manner, the individual suffered by not participating in the activities he or she enjoyed. Thus, the loser once again was the individual citizen.

Public reactions and research results.

The public reaction to fear of crime did not always correspond with research findings about crime. Most research studies found young males, under 25 years of age, had the least fear level of all age groups; however, this age group was also the most likely victim of crime. Black males had the highest rate of victimization with 53 victimizations for every 1,000 black males. White males were next with 36 victimizations per

1,000 white males. Black females suffered 28 victimizations per 1,000, while white females were victimized at a rate of 21 per every 1,000 white females (Bureau of Justice Statistics, February, 1992). Fear of crime studies revealed females were one of the most fearful of being victimized, while victim studies found females the least likely victims.

Victims studies and police records conflicted concerning the relationship between crime victims and offenders. According to the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) (February, 1992), strangers committed more violent crimes than nonstrangers. Sixty-one percent of all violent crimes were committed by strangers; however, 58% of rapes were committed by nonstrangers. These statistics supported the public's fear of strangers committing most crime. However, a study of police records in South Carolina over a ten year period revealed most violent crimes were committed by family or acquaintances (Jolliff, Loftus, Taylor, and Turner, 1992). This finding contradicted the results of the victimization surveys. However, it also identified one of the discrepancies between victim surveys and police statistics. If police records were accurate, the public should fear people they know more than strangers.

Crime Victimization Surveys

In the mid-1960s, the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice undertook the first victim surveys because of dissatisfaction with the UCR reporting

system (Bureau of Justice Statistics, February 1989). The National Crime Survey (NCS) was implemented in 1972 to provide information about the level of victimization and to collect data on the characteristics of crime incidence and victims. Victim assistance and compensation groups, neighborhood watch groups, police academies, federal, state, and local officials have used NCS data to inform policymakers and implement legislation. Insurance companies, and marketing research companies looking for potential markets have all benefited from NCS data. The first victim surveys revealed three to five times more crime than police records indicated (Skogan, 1976). The 1990 NCS revealed only about 38% of all victimizations were reported to police. Forty-eight percent of all violent victimizations; 29% of the personal thefts; and 41% of all household crimes; were reported to police (Bureau of Justice Statistics, February, 1992).

Since the first victimization surveys were implemented, academic researchers, government, or private research organizations conducted victimization surveys in 13 countries and 14 American cities by 1975 (Organization For Economic Co-operation and Development, 1976; Skogan, 1976).

Problems with victimization surveys.

Victimization surveys were not without problems. Similar to the UCR, problems of failure to report victimization due to shame, embarrassment, and forgetfulness plague victimization

surveys. When the offender was a family member, victims were reluctant to report victimization to interviewers (Laub, 1990). Even supposed experts could not agree on the best method of obtaining victimization data (Geis, 1990). The fact that individuals with more education reported the highest number of assaults was also a concern of researchers. This trend was duplicated worldwide (Geis, 1990). The cost of victimization surveys was another factor considered by researchers. An interview survey of 1,000 households could cost \$75,000-\$100,000 (DuBow and Reed, 1976; Tuchfarber, Klecka, Bardes, and Oldendick, 1976). Low victimization rates per person required a large sample size and a large trained staff to administer the survey in order to achieve an adequate amount of data on crime.

Support for victim surveys.

Although acknowledging the limitations of victim surveys, researchers offered support for victim survey results. Victim surveys provided information concerning the extent of criminal activity and the consequences of criminal activity on those victimized by it. Victim surveys helped researchers identify the public's attitudes on crime, develop theories on criminality, and were helpful for planning purposes. Other support for victimization surveys included as a means of developing victim topologies, providing data on risk of victimization, determining the costs and effects of crime, and information on why people did not report crimes to police.

Additional uses of victim surveys were to evaluate police crime prevention programs, to assess police-community relations, and to measure the change in the total crime rate (Geis, 1990; Pope, 1979; Vetter and Silverman, 1978; McDonald, 1976; Schneider, 1976; Inciardi, 1976).

Failure to report crime.

Thirty-eight percent of all victimizations were reported to police. Researchers found numerous reasons why victims failed to report crime. Some victims did not want to become involved. Even victims who reported crimes to police did not fully cooperate, giving police false names and addresses (McDonald, 1976). Other researchers found victims did not think the police could do anything about the crime; thought the incident was a private matter, not a police matter; or victims did not know if the offender would be caught and feared retaliation if they reported the crime. Some victims did not want to bother the police, did not want to take the time, or did not want to harm the offender. Victims of sexual offenses downplayed the significance of the event or were afraid of how they would be perceived if they reported the crime. Other victims of sexual offenses were too ashamed to report the crime or blamed themselves for the incident (McDonald, 1976; Hindelang and Gottfredson, 1976; Biaggio, Brownwell and Watts, 1991).

Problems associated with the criminal justice system precluded other victims from reporting crimes. Victims cited

several reasons for not reporting crimes to police, such as: long waiting times for cases to be brought to trial; financial problems to include lost income, transportation, and parking costs; court-setting problems, such as where to go and being exposed to threatening or unsettling persons after arriving at court; and personal problems, such as child care and having their property kept as evidence (Knudten, Meade, Knudten, and Doerner, 1976).

Reporting crime to police.

To improve the reporting of crime, police needed to examine the reasons why persons reported victimization. Some studies concluded citizens thought they were obligated to report the crime to police. Other responses included, so the police could catch the offender, to recover lost property, to punish the offender, for insurance reasons, to protect others from the same crime, and because the victim was mad as a result of the crime (Smith and Maness, 1976; Schneider, Burcart, and Wilson, 1976). The citizen's confidence in the ability of the police to catch the offender was a factor in whether the incident was reported or not. If victims thought the police could catch the offender, they were more likely to report a crime than if they thought it unlikely the police would catch the offender.

Victim survey's findings.

Almost 23 million households were victimized by crime in both 1990 and 1991, representing 24% of all households in the

country. The NCS, later renamed the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS), estimated 34.4 million crimes were committed in the United States in 1990 and 34.7 million in 1991. These crimes were committed against individuals or households, not businesses. On average, 30 out of every 1,000 persons age 12 and older were victimized by violent crime in 1990. Sixty-four out of every 1,000 persons experienced a theft. Strangers committed 61% of all violent crimes; 42% of all rapes, 82% of all robberies, and 57% of all assaults. Most of the victims of violent crime, except rape, were males, with about equal representation of black and white males. Most violent crimes occurred on the streets within five miles from the victim's home. The victim's home was the second most likely place where a violent crime occurred (Bureau of Justice Statistics, July, 1992; February 1992).

The number of females victimized by violent crime has slowly increased since 1973. Women were six times more likely than men to be victimized by a spouse, ex-spouse, boyfriend, or girlfriend. About one-fourth of the female victims of violent crime were victimized by someone they knew intimately (Bureau of Justice Statistics, January, 1991).

Race was another factor differentiating crime victims. Blacks suffered a higher rate of violent crime than whites. Blacks had higher rates of rape, robbery, and aggravated assault, while whites had higher rates of simple assault and

personal theft. Violent crimes against blacks involved weapons more often than violent crimes against whites (Bureau of Justice Statistics, April, 1990).

Elderly victims were especially vulnerable victims. Victims over 65 years of age suffered the lowest rates of victimization. However; according to the BJS, crimes against this age group were often more serious than crimes against younger age groups. Between 1980 and 1985 elderly victims were more often victimized by persons with guns, more likely victimized by strangers, more likely injured and received medical care for their injuries, and less likely than younger victims to be able to protect themselves during a crime (Bureau of Justice Statistics, November, 1987).

Teenagers were more than twice as likely as adults to be victims of violent crime and theft. Male teens experienced more violent crimes than females. Black teenagers were 3 to 5 times more likely murdered than white teenagers. High school freshmen were crime victims more than students in all other school grades (Bureau of Justice Statistics, May, 1991; September, 1991).

Researchers found a correlation between school crime and crime in the streets and homes. Parker, Smith, Smith, and Toby (1991) concluded the amount of crime occurring in schools was related to the amount of crime occurring on the streets and in the homes of school age adolescents between 12 and 19 years of age. The increase or decrease in victimization inside the

school, increased or decreased correspondingly to the victimization rate at home or in the streets of the school age children over relatively short periods of time.

Background

Shaw Air Force Base family housing consisted of 1704 housing units ranging from single family dwellings to duplexes and multiplexes. Not all housing units were occupied as some buildings were removed from service for renovation or were transitioning from one occupant to another. Individuals assigned to Shaw Air Force Base were eligible for family housing based on the rank of the military member, family size, and availability of housing. Waiting time for housing varied from two months up to eight months depending on the size of the quarters needed.

The family housing units were separated into four distinctive areas. The Shaw Heights on-base housing area consisted of 495 two and three bedroom, mostly duplex style housing units and ten four bedroom, single family dwellings. The Shaw Heights housing area was classified as on-base housing because it was enclosed by a six-foot fence. Entry was controlled by security police who manned two entry and exit gates. Individuals requesting entry to the base presented identification to the security police along with a valid need to enter the base. Examples of a valid need were: work, to visit a housing resident, or to conduct official business.

The off-base housing area was located adjacent to the air base in one geographic area with a four foot fence on three sides; however, the entry and exit points were not continually manned by security police. The fourth side of the off-base housing area was open to a public road with signs posted at the entry points specifying the area was government property and entry was restricted to authorized individuals. Security police patrols conducted random checks of the entry points; however, most of the time the entry points were not monitored by security police. Security police patrolled all housing areas 24-hours a day.

The off-base housing area comprised three different sections of housing. The Shaw Heights off-base housing section consisted of 400 duplex style, two and three bedroom houses. Shaw Heights contained 184 two bedroom units and 216 three bedroom units. Shaw Manor included 300 duplex and multiplex houses. Most of the housing was three bedrooms (268) units followed by four bedroom (24) and two bedroom (8) units. The Palmetto Heights housing section consisted of 499 duplex style units with 90 three bedroom and 409 four bedroom houses in the area.

Not all the housing units were occupied. Family housing consisted of the 1704 total housing units. At the time of the survey 1596 houses were occupied. The remaining 108 houses were unoccupied due to renovation or in transition from one occupant

to another.

A September, 1992 audit of the number of personnel assigned to Shaw Air Force Base reported 2,723 military members living in base housing. The number of military members was greater than the number of housing units because some couples were both members of the Air Force. The 2,723 military personnel, along with their 6,331 family members, resulted in a total base housing population of 9,054.

Methodology

Survey Selection

The Shaw survey was based on one used by Smith and Hill (1991) to assess victimization and fear of crime in a North Carolina study. Smith and Hill judged the form to be reliable, producing a Cronbach's alpha estimate of .82. A copy of the survey was included in Appendix A.

Sample Selection

A systematic sampling method was used to select survey recipients. The roster of family housing residents, obtained from the Family Housing Office, identified 1692 residents including military members living in leased off-base housing in the Sumter and Columbia area. Residents of leased houses were deleted from the housing roster because crimes occurring off the installation were not reported to the base security police, but to local police authorities. A total of 106 families living in leased housing were excluded. The base survey potentially

involved 1596 families. Every eighth household was selected to receive a survey. The result was 202 households received surveys.

Each selected survey household received a letter from the Deputy Commander of the 363d Mission Support Group authorizing the survey, encouraging residents to participate, and identifying where residents could call to get any questions answered. Below the commander's letter was a letter from the researcher outlining the purpose of the survey, identifying that participation was voluntary, response was anonymous, and the telephone number of the researcher. A copy of the letter was included in Appendix A. A stamped self-addressed envelope to return the completed survey was provided.

The survey asked the respondent to indicate their rank, family size, the gender of individual completing the survey, and the building number of their residence. Names were not requested, but each survey was numbered so returns could be monitored.

Prior to the surveys distribution, a notice was placed in The Spirit, a free weekly newspaper about Shaw Air Force Base. Copies of The Spirit were delivered to all family housing residents. The notice informed housing residents about the survey and encouraged participation. A second notice was placed in the paper the week following delivery of the surveys as a reminder to housing residents. A third notice was placed in The

Spirit three weeks after the surveys were delivered as a final reminder to residents to return the surveys.

Surveys were hand delivered on February 4, 1993 by the researcher to 198 households. Four households were mailed surveys due to the senior rank of the military member. If a family member answered the door, the researcher explained the purpose of the survey and asked for the individual's cooperation and participation in completing and returning the survey. Although precise records were not maintained, at over half of the households an adult answered the researchers knock on the door. None of the adults answering the door refused to accept the survey. If a child answered the door, and no adult was available, the survey was left with the child along with a request for the child to give the survey to the parents.

Results

One hundred twenty-five of the surveys were returned (61.8%). A total of four housing areas comprised family housing. For tabulation purposes, the four housing areas were identified as area 1 (Shaw Heights on-base), area 2 (Shaw Heights off-base), area 3 (Shaw Manor off-base), and area 4 (Palmetto Heights off-base). Table 1 provided a breakdown of the survey response from each housing area.

Overall, 48 of the surveys (38.4%) returned were from on-base households and 77 (61.6%) of the returned surveys were from off-base households. There were 505 (29.6%) total housing

units in the on-base area and 1199 (70.4%) of all housing units were off-base. The total number of housing units did not account for units under renovation or empty awaiting occupancy.

Table 1

Housing Area and Survey Response		
Housing Area	Frequency	Percent
1	48	38.4
2	22	17.6
3	25	20.0
<u>4</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>24.0</u>
Total	125	100.0

Table 2 identified a breakdown of the family size of survey respondents. The small number of households with six family members made separate analysis of these households impractical.

Table 2

Family Size and Survey Response		
Family Size	Frequency	Percent
2	26	20.8
3	33	26.4
4	37	29.6
5	25	20.0
<u>6</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3.2</u>
Total	125	100.0

The survey requested the rank of the military member. Analysis by rank revealed 18 surveys returned from officers

(14.4%) and 107 surveys returned by enlisted persons (85.6%). A further breakdown of rank was outlined in Appendix B2. Analysis of survey results by rank was not conducted because of the low number of surveys from each different rank. Appendix B2 also identified the number of surveys sent to housing residents and compared the survey sample to the base housing population.

Table 3 separated the respondents according to family size and location. Individuals were asked to identify the gender of the person completing the survey form. Fifty-one of the respondents were male (50.5%) and 50 were female (49.5%). Appendix B3 contained an analysis of the survey results from each area of housing based on the respondent's gender. Twenty-two males and 19 females from on-base housing answered the survey. Twenty-nine males and 31 females from off-base housing responded. Twenty-four respondents did not indicate their gender.

Table 3

Family Size and Location

Family Size	Off-Base	%	On-Base	%	Total	%
2	13	10.4	13	10.4	26	20.8
3	12	9.6	21	16.8	33	26.4
4	25	20.0	12	9.6	37	29.6
5	23	18.4	2	1.6	25	20.0
6	4	3.2	0	0.0	4	3.2
Total	77	61.6	48	38.4	125	100.0

Fear of Crime

Respondents were presented eight statements and four choices for responding to each statement, indicating their fear of crime. The four choices were: strongly disagree, disagree, agree, and strongly agree. Whether the individual agreed or disagreed with the statement indicated the fear of crime. For example; in statement 1, When I am away from home, I worry about the safety of my property; a response of strongly disagree or disagree, indicated the person was not worried about their property, so the person did not have a significant fear of crime. However, a response of agree or strongly agree indicated the person had a fear of crime. For tabulation purposes, a response of strongly disagree or strongly agree was not given greater value than a response of disagree or agree. Because there was no method of measuring the level of fear from one survey response to another, each response was given equal value and the overall results were measured as to whether the response indicated a fear of crime or no fear of crime.

Appendix C contained the results of the fear of crime survey. The fear of crime among survey respondents was low (Appendixes C2 to C5). However, most housing residents thought crime was more serious than the newspapers and TV said (64.5%).

Appendix C6 identified respondents fear of crime according to gender and the family size. Males in households of three family members responded more often than females, while females in four

person households responded more often than males.

Significant differences in fear of crime were found when responses were analyzed according to respondent's gender (Appendixes C7 to C14). A chi-square analysis determined females worried about their personal safety from crime and criminals much more than males ($p = 0.022$; Appendix C11). Also, females felt more threatened than males when going out in the community or neighborhood after dark ($p = 0.007$; Appendix C14).

Appendixes C15, C16, and C17 separated respondents fear of crime by rank and family size, gender and housing area. Statistical analysis by rank was not performed due to the small representation in some ranks. The highest number of responses were from mid level enlisted airman, E4, E5, and E6.

Appendix C18 provided a breakdown by family size and housing area. Off-base housing areas 2, 3, and 4 were about equally represented.

Appendixes C19 thru C23 identified responses for each fear of crime statement by housing area. Responses revealed no individual housing area was more fearful of crime than another.

Finally, fear of crime responses from the three off-base housing areas were combined and compared to responses from on-base housing residents (Appendixes C24 to C27). A chi-square test was performed on each individual statement about fear of crime. No statistically significant differences were indicated between on-base responses and off-base responses. However, on

two statements, over half the responses indicated an increased fear of crime. On statement seven, 54.4% of the respondents did not feel safe going anywhere in the community or neighborhood after dark (Appendix C27). On statement eight, 64% of the respondents indicated crime was more serious than the newspapers and TV said (Appendix C27). Again, on both statements the differences were not statistically significant. More than twice as many off-base residents worried about the safety of their property when they were away from home compared to on-base residents (Appendix C24).

Crime Victimization

The crime victimization survey asked 15 questions about possible crimes experienced by a household. After each question the respondent indicated either "no" (the household did not experience the crime) or "yes" (the household experienced the crime) and the number of times the household was victimized by the specific type of crime.

Appendix D contained the results of the crime victimization survey. The difference in crime victimization between on-base and off-base was measurably different. Off-base households experienced 149 victimizations compared to 20 victimizations for on-base households. The difference was statistically significant; (Chi-Square DF = 1, Value = 10.519, p = 0.001). Fourteen percent of on-base housing residents were victimized by crime while 50% of the off-base housing residents were

victimized. Each individual question was not statistically significant primarily because of the low frequency of victimization for on-base residents. However, some noticeable differences in victimization between the on-base and off-base housing areas were highlighted.

Appendixes D2 thru D9 contained the responses for each victimization question. Property crimes were the most frequent crimes. One hundred forty property crimes were reported (82.8%) compared to 29 crimes of violence (17.2%).

Appendixes D10 thru D17 separated victimizations by family size. Family size was a factor in victimization. A chi-square analysis found family size significant in relation to victimization (DF =1, Value = 5.507, p = 0.019) when the household included four or more family members. The majority of victimizations occurred in families with four or five family members because only four households had six family members.

Appendixes D18 thru D24 included victimization by housing area. Off-base housing residents were victimized more often than on-base residents. Housing area 4 had the most incidents with 60 (40.2%), followed by area 2 with 46 incidents (27.8%), and area 3 had the lowest number of victimizations in off-base housing with 30 (20.1%). On-base housing had 20 incidents (11.8%).

Appendixes D25 thru D39 combined housing area, family size and victimization. The larger the family size the greater

likelihood of victimization. More victimizations occurred in housing area 4 than any other housing area. The total households surveyed, by family size, was included below each appendix. Comparison of responses on questions with only a few responses may appear large when the low frequency of victimization created the high percentage.

Finally, Appendixes D40 thru D47 analyzed survey results by location. Victimization in the three off-base housing areas were combined and compared to on-base victimization totals.

Property crime was more prevalent in off-base housing. Off-base residents experienced nine times the incidents of someone trying to damage, destroy, or attempt to destroy their home or property around their home, compared to on-base residents (Appendix D40). Off-base residents experienced six times more theft of items kept outside the home such as bicycles, garden hoses, or tools (Appendix D41). On-base housing residents recorded two incidents of theft at work, school, or traveling, compared to 13 such incidents for off-base housing residents (Appendix D42). Off-base housing residents experienced twice as many incidents of having a purse or wallet snatched or pockets picked compared to on-base housing residents (Appendix D43). Only one household reported having the door jimmied, a lock forced, or some sign of attempted break-in from on-base houses while eight such incidents occurred in off-base housing (Appendix D44).

Violent crime was also more prevalent off-base. Only one on-base resident experienced someone attacking, beating up, or hitting them compared to ten such incidents in off-base housing (Appendix D45). Five off-base incidents where someone was threatened with violence were reported, while none of the on-base residents experienced such actions (Appendix D46).

On-base residents experienced 20 victimizations compared to 149 victimizations of off-base residents. Approximately twice the number of persons living in off-base housing responded to the survey compared to on-base housing. However, off-base residents experienced 7.5 times the number of victimizations of on-base residents.

A study of security police records revealed substantial underreporting of crime (Appendix E). The security police reported 661 on-base incidents for 1992. The survey did not ask respondents for crimes of suicide or attempted suicide; therefore, eight such incidents reported to security police were eliminated reducing the total crimes reported to security police to 653. A population of 12,263 individuals included all military members assigned to Shaw Air Force Base and families living in base housing was used for comparison. This population figure did not account for civilian employees, contractors, military retirees, and families of military members living in the community around Shaw Air Force Base. The 653 crimes reported for the 12,263 population equaled 1 crime for every 19

persons. Only 5.2% of the bases' population was victimized by crime. However, using the survey results of 169 victimizations for 448 residents surveyed, the ratio of victimization equaled 1 crime for every 3 base housing residents. The survey results indicated 37.7% of the base housing residents were victimized by crime. If all civilian employees and contractors working on the base, plus the military retirees and family members living in the community around the base were included, the difference in victimization between the base population and surveyed population would have been even greater.

Discussion

The discussion concentrated on the objectives of the study. The first objective was to assess the fear of crime among residents in family housing at Shaw Air Force Base. The second objective was to identify victimization in the family housing area and to compare victimization between the on-base housing area and the off-base housing area. A third objective was to compare victim reports of crime to the security police reports of crime to see if military members and their families reported crime more frequently than national victim surveys indicated. Each goal was discussed separately.

From the survey results there was not a significant fear of crime among housing residents. Statistically, the responses of the on-base housing residents were not significantly different from the responses of off-base housing residents. Although

residents of off-base housing expressed concern over the amount of crime which took place, such concern was not found in the survey responses. A number of possible explanations for this can be offered.

First, the civilian population outside the base was small. The off-base housing area was fenced on three sides by a 4-foot fence preventing routine access to much of the housing area. Although residents of off-base housing verbally expressed concern to the researcher about the lack of entry controls, public access to the off-base housing area was limited. The area North of the off-base housing was mostly rural. The North side was also overgrown with dense brush and trees. No entry points were located on the North side of the housing area. Access to the housing area from the East and South was from Frierson Road; otherwise known as, Route 364. Six streets entered the off-base housing area from Frierson Road. These streets permitted immediate access to housing areas 2 and 3. A sign identifying the area as government property and restricting entry to authorized individuals was posted at each entrance. Two entry points were located on the West side of off-base family housing from Route 441. Both entry points faced primarily commercial business areas. Only two commercial establishments were adjacent to the off-base housing area; one a day care center, the second a restaurant. Both businesses were outside housing area 4. The seclusion of the off-base housing

area may have contributed to the low fear of crime.

A second explanation was the controls placed on military families living in base housing. Families living in base housing were subject to stringent controls. The family housing office monitored the condition of the area. A housing maintenance office ensured the housing was functional and maintained according to standards. Houses were not allowed to deteriorate or decay the way houses may have in the civilian sector. If a house was not properly maintained by the occupant, the occupant could be required to vacate the house. Thus, the condition of the neighborhood was constant and not allowed to deteriorate. Therefore, the condition of the neighborhood may have been responsible for the low fear of crime.

Still another explanation was the likelihood that the people living outside the military housing area were also military families. Shaw Air Force Base was ten miles from Sumter, the nearest large community, and 35 miles from Columbia, the nearest metropolitan community. The area surrounding the base was a convenient place for military members to live and commute to work. The similarities between base residents and the surrounding community were another reason the off-base housing residents may not have had a high fear of crime.

The one variable with a significant difference in fear of crime was gender. Females expressed more fear of crime than males, especially when going out at night. These findings were

similar to national studies of fear of crime (Marshall, 1991; Krannich, Berry, and Greider, 1989). Women had a higher fear of crime than men. Although researchers found women were victimized less frequently than men, the victimization of women was steadily increasing (Bureau of Justice Statistics, January, 1991). The fear of victimization may have lead women to stay at home with people they knew instead of going out. However, women were often victimized by someone they knew; therefore, staying at home may have contributed to womens' victimization.

The second objective was to determine if victimization differed between on-base and off-base family housing. Significantly more crime occurred in off-base housing than on-base housing. Again, a number of explanations for the increased crime in off-base housing were possible.

The density of the population of off-base residents compared to on-base residents was one explanation for more crime in off-base housing. The off-base housing area contained multiplex houses; whereas, the on-base housing area contained only duplex or single family houses. Also, on-base housing consisted of mostly two and three bedroom units. The off-base housing consisted of fewer two bedroom houses and more three and four bedroom houses. Larger families lived in the larger houses; thus, the density of population in off-base housing may have increased the victimization of off-base housing residents.

Family size was another explanation for the increased

victimization of off-base housing residents. Larger families lived in the bigger houses. The off-base housing area contained more three and four bedroom houses. BJS (May, 1991; September, 1991) surveys found teenagers more likely victims of crime than young children. Teenagers were victims of violent crime and theft twice as often as adults. Because more four bedroom houses were located in area 4, the largest families lived in area 4. The larger families may have included older children, who were more likely victims of crime. The statistical significance of family size and crime supported this explanation. Fifty-two off-base households had four or more family members. Only 14 households in on-base housing had four or more family members.

Another explanation was that outsiders committed many of the crimes in off-base housing. The large number of unidentified subjects listed in the security police report supports this idea. Unidentified subjects committed 169 larcenies and destroyed 136 pieces of government property and 50 pieces of nongovernment property. However, since security police did not know who committed the crimes, the crimes could have been committed by outsiders or by individuals living in military housing. If many of the crimes were committed by outsiders, off-base residents should have had a greater fear of crime than on-base housing residents.

Contradicting the theory that outsiders committed many of the

crimes in off-base family housing, was the fact that only one entry point allowed outsiders direct access to housing area 4 where the highest number of crimes occurred. Housing area 4 had only two entry and exit points; one from within the off-base housing area and one from outside the installation. Housing areas 2 and 3 had a total of seven entry points; however, both areas had less crime than area 4. If nonmilitary individuals committed many of the crimes in housing area 4, they had to travel through all of housing area 2 or 3 to get to area 4. Or, a great many unauthorized individuals were entering housing area 4 through one off-base entry point. Base officials could verify this by screening all entry into housing area 4. Screening the access points would allow base officials to determine if unauthorized persons were entering the housing area.

A third objective was to determine if military families reported victimization more frequently than the national average of 38%. About 19% of all victimizations occurring in Shaw Air Force Base family housing were reported to security police. This 19% reporting figure assumed the survey sample of 448 housing residents, or about 5% of the 9,054 housing residents, was representative of the base housing population. The 169 incidents reported to security police would also have represented only 5% of all victimizations. If this 5% were representative of all crime, then it was estimated approximately 3380 incidents of crime occurred in family housing in 1992. A

total of 653 incidents of crime were reported to security police in 1992. If all 653 incidents were reported by base housing residents only 19% of the estimated 3380 incidents were reported to security police.

However, the family housing population represented only part of the total base population. Military families living in the area surrounding the base as well as civilian employees, civilian contractors, and employees of private businesses such as banks and credit unions could also have reported victimization on Shaw AFB to security police. The total number of people who frequented the base was much larger than the 9,054 persons living in family housing. Therefore, the reporting of victimization would have been even less than 19%, perhaps as low as 14% of all victimization were reported to police.

A number of explanations were discussed for the low reporting of crime. First, a military member could have reported an incident to officials other than security police. The military member's Commander or First Sergeant encouraged reporting problems to them if the individual needed help. Some incidents may have been reported to these individuals. The military emphasized the chain of command, and every military member had a supervisor. The supervisor was responsible for helping the military member if he or she had problems. An incident may have been reported to the supervisor. The office of social actions and the office of mental health assisted when military members

had problems. An incident may have been identified to these professionals. The chaplains also counseled and assisted military members with family difficulties, so an incident could have been reported to the chaplain. Other options were the inspector general complaint system, the family housing office, or local police officials.

Another explanation for not reporting the incident was the military disciplinary system. Every military member was accountable for his or her behavior and conduct of family members. If a family member committed a crime, the military member was responsible for the individual. The victim may have resolved the incident with the offender or the offender's parents rather than reporting the incident to security police. When an incident was reported to security police, the offender and the military member responsible for the offender was identified on the complaint. A copy of the complaint was forwarded to the military member's Commander. The Commander determined what disciplinary action to administer to the military member. If the military member was guilty of committing a crime, a number of options were possible. A letter of counseling or letter of reprimand were standard actions for minor incidents. For serious incidents, the military member could be fined, given extra duty, or demoted. For major incidents, the military member could be court martialed and sentenced to prison, fined, demoted, and/or discharged from the

Air Force. The military member was also responsible for controlling the actions of family members. If a family member committed the offense the family could be required to vacate family housing. The offense would have been dealt with by local judicial authorities, not the military justice system. To protect the military member from possible disciplinary actions, a victim may not have reported the incident to security police.

Other explanations for not reporting victimization included the reasons cited by studies of victims. Some victims thought the police could not do anything about the crime; therefore, did not report the incident. Other victims were embarrassed to report the crime or were afraid of retaliation by the offender if they reported the crime. Some victims thought the victimization was a private matter and did not reported it to police (McDonald, 1976; Hindelang and Gottfredson, 1976; Biaggio, Brownwell, and Watts, 1991).

Recommendations

Fear of crime among on-base family housing residents was not significantly different from off-base family housing residents. However, females were more fearful about their safety than males. Additional studies were needed to determine the basis for females heightened fear of crime. Educating women on their risks of crime should reduce women's fear of victimization. However, caution must be exercised to ensure females understand their risks of victimization from people they know.

The differences in victimization between on-base and off-base family housing also required further study identifying the victims and the offenders. Since the majority of crime was property crime, it may be difficult to find the offender. However, if a pattern of victimization was found, efforts to reduce or eliminate the threat could be undertaken. For example; if most of the stolen property was unsecured, education efforts must focus on securing personal property.

The reasons for the low reporting of victimization also needed further study. If the incidence of crime are as numerous as the study estimates indicated, the underreporting of crime was significant. The reasons for failure to report must be discovered, before efforts can be undertaken to improve the reporting of crime.

Alternative methods of controlling victimization could be implemented before installing a fence around the off-base housing area. A neighborhood watch program would involve the residents in protecting one another from crime and could be implemented with little cost. The military structure already established in the residents of military housing should make the setting ideal for organizing a citizens' watch program. If residents of a neighborhood organized, the residents should know who belongs in the neighborhood and who did not belong. Strangers should be reported to security police. Identifying and reporting strangers could reduce or eliminate crimes

perpetuated by nonbase residents. A neighborhood watch program could also identify if base residents committed crimes against their neighbors.

One recommendation to reduce crime in the off-base housing area frequently expressed was to fence the entire area and control entry similar to the way entry was controlled for the on-base housing area. Fencing the housing area may be premature until further studies identify who committed the crimes. The higher incidence of crime in housing area 4, with limited access makes the idea of fencing the housing area of questionable value in preventing crime. Based on research studies, the higher density population combined with larger families and older juveniles on area 4 may have a greater impact on crime and victimization than the lack of a security fence and entry controls (Bureau of Justice Statistics, May, 1991; September, 1991; June, 1992).

This study resulted in some preliminary findings about fear of crime in base housing and identified significant differences in victimization between on-base and off-base family housing areas. The study also identified a substantial underreporting of crime. However, the conclusions of the study must be accepted as preliminary and requiring further study. More research must be performed to identify specific variables which increased victimization in off-base housing and who the victims were in relation to such variables as age and sex. In addition,

more research was needed to identify why victimization was not reported to security police and what actions base officials could take to improve the reporting of crime.

References

- Archer, D. & Erlich-Erfer, L. (1991). Fear and loading: Archival traces of the response to extraordinary violence. Social Psychology Quarterly, 54 (4), 343-352.
- Baba, Y. & Austin, D. M. (1989). Neighborhood environmental satisfaction, victimization, and social participation as determinants of perceived neighborhood safety. Environment and Behavior, 21 (6), 763-780.
- Babbi, E. R. (1973). Survey research methods. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Belyea, M. J. & Zingraff, M. T. (1988). Fear of crime and residential location. Rural Sociology, 53 (4) 473-486.
- Biaggio, M. K., Brownell, A., & Watts, D. L. (1991). Reporting and seeking support by victims of sexual offenses. Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 17 (1/2), 33-42.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics. (November, 1987). Elderly victims. (NCJ Publication No. NCJ-107676). Rockville, MD: Bureau of Justice Statistics Clearinghouse.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics. (February 1989). Redesign of the national crime survey. (NCJ Publication No. NCJ-111457). Rockville, MD: Bureau of Justice Statistics Clearinghouse.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics. (April, 1990). Black victims. (NCJ Publication No. NCJ-122562). Rockville, MD: Bureau of Justice Statistics Clearinghouse.

Bureau of Justice Statistics. (January, 1991). Female victims of violent crime. (NCJ Publication No. NCJ-126826). Rockville, MD: Bureau of Justice Statistics Clearinghouse.

Bureau of Justice Statistics. (May, 1991). Teenage victims: A national crime survey report. (NCJ Publication No. NCJ-128129). Rockville, MD: Bureau of Justice Statistics Clearinghouse.

Bureau of Justice Statistics. (February, 1992). Criminal victimization in the united states, 1990. (NCJ Publication No. NCJ-134126). Rockville, MD: Bureau of Justice Statistics Clearinghouse.

Bureau of Justice Statistics. (July, 1992). National update. (NCJ Publication No. NCJ-137059). Rockville, MD: Bureau of Justice Statistics Clearinghouse.

DuBow F. L. & Reed, D. E. (1976) In W. G. Skogan, (Ed.). (1976). Sample surveys of the victims of crime. (pp. 151-173). Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.

Gallup Poll. (March/April, 1989). Most important problems. The Gallup Report, (282/283). 6-8.

Geis, G. (1990). Crime victims: Practices and prospects. In A. J. Lurigio, W. G. Skogan, & R.C. Davis, (Eds.). (1990). Victims of crime: Problems, policies, and programs. (pp. 251-268). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Gordon, M. T. & Riger, S. (1989). The female fear. New York: The Free Press.

- Greenberg, M. S. & Ruback, R. B. (1992). After the crime: Victim decision making. New York, NY: Plenum Press.
- Hindelang, M. J. & Gottfredson M. (1976). The victim's decision not to invoke the criminal justice process. In W. F. McDonald, (Ed.). (1976). Criminal justice and the victim. (pp. 57-78). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Inciardi, J. A. (1976). Criminal statistics and victim survey research for effective law enforcement planning. In E. C. Viano, (Ed.). (1976). Victims and society. (pp. 177-189). Washington DC: Visage Press, Inc.
- Johnson, H. & Lazarus, G. (July, 1989). The impact of age on crime victimization rates. Canadian Journal of Criminology, 31 (3), 309-317.
- Jolliff, C. P., Loftus, J. C., Taylor, T. W., & Turner, R. H. (1992). Violent crime and the relationship of gender, race, & age in south carolina: 1991. Columbia, S.C.: University of South Carolina, College of Criminal Justice.
- Kaniasty, K. & Norris, F. H. (1992). Social support and victims of crime: Matching event, support, and outcome. American Journal of Community Psychology, 20 (2), 211-241.
- Knudten, R. D., Meade, A., Knudten, M., & Doerner, W. (1976). The victim in the administration of criminal justice: Problems and perceptions. In W. F. McDonald, (Ed.). (1976). Criminal justice and the victim. (pp. 115-146). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

- Krannich, R. S., Berry, E. H., & Greider, T. (1989). Fear of crime in rapidly changing rural communities: A longitudinal analysis. Rural Sociology, 54 (2), 195-212.
- LaGrange, R. L., Ferraro, K. F., & Supancic, M. (1992). Perceived risk and fear of crime: Role of social and physical incivilities. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 29 (3), 311-334.
- LeBlanc, C. (1993, January, 29). Running for cover: Crime alters S.C. life. The State, pp. 1, 10A.
- Lewis, D. A. & Salem, G. (1986). Fear of crime: Incivility and the production of a social problem. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.
- Liska, A. E. & Baccaglioni, W. (1990). Feeling safe by comparison: Crime in the newspapers. Social Problems, 37 (3), 360-374.
- Lurigio, A. J., Skogan, W. G. & Davis, R. C. (Eds.). (1990). Victims of crime: Problems, policies, and programs. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Marshall, C. E. (1991). Fear of crime, community satisfaction and self-protective measures: Perceptions from a midwestern city. Journal of Crime and Justice, 14 (2), 97-121.
- McDonald, W. F. (Ed.). (1976). Criminal justice and the victim. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Nasar, J. L. & Fisher, B. (1992). Design for vulnerability: Cues and reactions to fear of crime. Sociology and Social Research, 76, (2). 48-54.

- Organization For Economic Co-operation and Development. (1976). Data sources for social indicators of victimization suffered by individuals. Paris, France: Author.
- Parker, R. N., Smith, W. R., Smith, R., & Toby, J. (1991, March). Trends in victimization in schools and elsewhere, 1974-1981. Journal of Quantitative Criminology, 7 (1), 3-17.
- Pope, C. E. (1979). Victimization rates and neighborhood characteristics: Some preliminary findings. In W. H. Parsonage, (Ed.). (1979). Perspectives on victimology. (pp. 48-57). Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Schneider, A. L., Burcart, J. M., & Wilson II, L. A. (1976). The role of attitudes in the decision to report crimes to the police. In W. F. McDonald, (Ed.). (1976). Criminal justice and the victim. (pp. 89-113). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Skogan, W. G. (Ed.). (1976). Sample surveys of the victims of crime. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.
- Skogan, W. G. (1987). The impact of victimization on fear. Crime and Delinquency, 33 (1), 135-154.
- Smith, L. N. & Hill, G. D. (1991). Victimization and fear of crime. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 18(2), 217-239.
- Smith, A. E. & Maness, D. Jr. (1976). The decision to call the police: Reactions to burglary. In W. F. McDonald, (Ed.). (1976). Criminal justice and the victim. (pp. 79-87). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Sudman, S. (1967). Reducing the cost of surveys. Chicago, IL: Aldine.

- Thompson, C. Y., Bankston, W. B., & St. Pierre, R. L. (1991).
Single female-headed households, handgun possession, and the
fear of rape. Sociological Spectrum, 11, 231-244.
- Thompson, M. P. & Norris, F. H. (1992). Crime, social status,
and alienation. American Journal of Community Psychology, 20
(1), 97-119.
- Tuchfarber, A. J. Jr., Klecka, W. R., Bardes, B. A., &
Oldendick, R. W. (1976). Reducing the cost of victim surveys.
In W. G. Skogan, (Ed.). (1976). Sample surveys of the victims
of crime. (pp. 207-221). Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.
- Vetter, H. J. & Silverman, I. J. (1978). The nature of crime.
Philadelphia, PA: W. B. Saunders.
- Viano, E. C. (Ed.). (1976). Victims and society. Washington DC:
Visage Press, Inc.
- Warr, M. (1990). Dangerous situations: Social context and fear
of victimization. Social Forces, 68 (3), 891-907.

APPENDIX A

Complete the following questionnaire based on your experience in family housing at Shaw AFB during calendar year 1992. If you did not live in family housing for all of 1992, consider only that portion of the year you lived in family housing. IF more than one military member lives in the household please indicate the highest ranking military member. Also, identify the number of the building you live in, not the street address. Circle the answer that most closely reflects your opinion of the statement below.

Rank of military member: _____ Family Size: _____ Building Number: _____
Sex of person completing questionnaire: M F

1. When I am away from home, I worry about the safety of my property.
(Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Agree, Strongly Agree)
2. I worry a great deal about my personal safety from crime and criminals.
(Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Agree, Strongly Agree)
3. Even in my own home, I'm not safe from people who want to take what I have.
(Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Agree, Strongly Agree)
4. There are some parts of the base that I avoid during the day because of fear of crime.
(Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Agree, Strongly Agree)
5. There are some parts of the base that I avoid at night because of fear of crime.
(Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Agree, Strongly Agree)
6. I feel safe going anywhere in my community or neighborhood in the daytime.
(Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Agree, Strongly Agree)
7. I feel safe going anywhere in my community or neighborhood after dark.
(Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Agree, Strongly Agree)
8. Crime is more serious than the newspapers and TV say.
(Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Agree, Strongly Agree)

For the following questions please consider only the incidents which occurred on Shaw AFB either in family housing or other base facilities such as the commissary, exchange, hospital, or workplace. Do not include incidents which occurred off the base such as at shopping malls, at restaurants, or at a place of employment off base.

9. During 1992, did anyone damage, destroy or attempt to destroy your home or any property around your home?
NO ___ YES ___ How many times? _____
10. During 1992, did anyone steal or try to steal a car, truck, motorcycle, or other motor vehicle owned by you or other members of your household?
NO ___ YES ___ How many times? _____
11. During 1992, did anyone steal anything from inside your home, such as a stereo, TV, jewelry, gun or purse, etc.?
NO ___ YES ___ How many times? _____

12. During 1992, did anyone steal anything that is kept outside your home such as a bicycle, a garden hose, or tools?
NO ___ YES ___ How many times? _____
13. During 1992, did anyone steal parts attached to a car, truck, or other vehicle owned by any member of your household, such as a battery, hubcaps, or tapedeck?
NO ___ YES ___ How many times? _____
14. During 1992, did you or any member of your household have anything stolen from them while they were away from home, for instance, at work, school, in a theater, in a restaurant, or while traveling?
NO ___ YES ___ How many times? _____
15. During 1992, did you or any member of your household have a purse or wallet snatched or pockets picked?
NO ___ YES ___ How many times? _____
16. During 1992, did you or any member of your household have something stolen from inside a car or truck, such as packages or clothing?
NO ___ YES ___ How many times? _____
17. During 1992, did anyone break into or somehow illegally get into your house, garage, or another building on your property?
NO ___ YES ___ How many times? _____
18. During 1992, did you find a door jimmied, a lock forced, or any other signs of an attempted break-in?
NO ___ YES ___ How many times? _____

During 1992, were you or any member of your household a victim of any of the following violent crimes?

19. Did anyone take something or attempt to take something directly from you or any member of your household by using force, such as a stick-up, mugging, or threat?
NO ___ YES ___ How many times? _____
20. Did anyone beat-up, attack, or hit you or any member of your household?
NO ___ YES ___ How many times? _____
21. Were you or any member of your household knifed, shot at, or attacked with some other weapon by anyone?
NO ___ YES ___ How many times? _____
22. Did anyone threaten to beat-up or threaten you or any member of your household with a knife, gun, or some other weapon?
NO ___ YES ___ How many times? _____
23. Did anyone rape or attempt to rape you or any member of your household?
NO ___ YES ___ How many times? _____



DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

363d FIGHTER WING (ACC)

SHAW AIR FORCE BASE, SOUTH CAROLINA

FROM: 363 SG/CC
504 Shaw Drive
Shaw AFB, SC 29152-5028

SUBJ: Crime Victimization Survey

TO: All Family Housing Residents

1. Captain Rickey H. Turner is authorized to conduct a Crime Victimization Survey of the family housing area on Shaw AFB. Captain Turner is a Security Police Officer completing a Master's Degree at the University of South Carolina. The results of the survey will be used to assist the security police in identifying the type of crimes not reported to police and developing programs to reduce the incidence of crime in our housing areas.

2. The identity of the survey participants will not be made public. I encourage all housing residents contacted to cooperate fully in the survey. If you have any questions regarding the survey, please contact security police at 668-3626.

MICHAEL B. EHRLICH, Lt Col, USAF
Deputy Commander

Dear Family Housing Residents,

I am surveying the residents of family housing for the base Security Police. The survey is to identify trends in crime based on the reports of crime victims. In addition, I will be assessing the perceptions of family housing residents regarding their sense of safety. Participation in the survey is voluntary and neither the survey nor my report will identify any individual or family member who responds to the survey. Please complete the enclosed survey and return it to me by February 10, 1993 in the self-addressed, stamped envelope. If you would like to discuss the survey, call me at 1-695-0191 or include a telephone number on the survey form where I may contact you (either work or home) and a convenient time for me to call you. Thank-you for your time and prompt response to the survey.

Rickey H. Turner, Captain, USAF

SCN# USAF 93-16 (EXP 1 JUN 93)

Global Power For America

APPENDIX B

Survey Response by Rank

Rank	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E*)	(F)	(G)	(H**)
	Returned Survey	%	Sent Survey	%	%	Total	Housing %	Response Total %
01	3	2.4	5	2.5	60.0	19	1.2	15.8
02	3	2.4	2	1.0	150.0	22	1.4	13.6
03	6	4.8	6	3.0	100.0	48	3.0	12.5
04	1	0.8	2	1.0	50.0	22	1.4	4.5
05	2	1.6	2	1.0	100.0	9	0.6	22.2
06	3	2.4	4	2.0	75.0	15	0.9	20.0
E1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	7	0.4	0.0
E2	0	0.0	3	1.5	0.0	30	1.9	0.0
E3	6	4.8	9	4.5	66.7	115	7.2	5.2
E4	24	19.2	61	30.2	39.3	453	28.4	5.3
E5	37	29.6	50	24.8	74.0	463	29.0	8.0
E6	33	26.4	34	16.8	97.1	219	13.7	15.1
E7	3	2.4	20	9.9	15.0	138	8.6	2.2
E8	3	2.4	4	2.0	75.0	31	1.9	9.7
E9	1	0.8	0	0.0	100.0	5	0.3	20.0
Total	125	100.0	202	100.0	62.0	1596	100.0	8.0

Totals rounded to nearest percentage point.

* Response percentage (E) equals the number of surveys returned (A) divided by the number of surveys sent (C).

** Response total percentage (H) equals the total number of residents in housing (F) divided by the number who returned the survey (A).

**Survey Response by
Sex and Housing Area**

<u>Sex</u>	<u>Area 1</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Area 2</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Area 3</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Area 4</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>%</u>
Male	22	21.78	9	8.91	7	6.93	13	12.87	51	50.50
Female	19	18.81	8	7.92	13	12.87	10	9.90	50	49.50
Total	41	40.59	17	16.83	20	19.80	23	22.77	101	100.00

Failed to Identify Gender 24

* Totals rounded to nearest percentage point.

APPENDIX C

Fear of Crime Frequency of Response

Question 1. When I am away from home, I worry about the safety of my property.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	8	6.5
Disagree	59	47.6
Agree	43	34.7
<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>11.3</u>
Total	124	100.0

No Response 1

* Totals rounded to nearest percentage point.

Question 2. I worry a great deal about my personal safety from crime and criminals.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	16	12.9
Disagree	71	57.3
Agree	28	22.6
<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>7.3</u>
Total	124	100.0

No Response 1

* Totals rounded to nearest percentage point.

Question 3. Even in my home, I'm not safe from people who want to take what I have.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	23	18.7
Disagree	70	56.9
Agree	23	18.7
<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>5.7</u>
Total	123	100.0

No Response 2

* Totals rounded to nearest percentage point.

Question 4. There are some parts of the base that I avoid during the day because of fear of crime.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	67	54.5
Disagree	50	40.7
Agree	5	4.1
<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0.8</u>
Total	123	100.0

No Response 2

* Totals rounded to nearest percentage point.

Question 5. There are some parts of the base that I avoid at night because of fear of crime.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	31	25.6
Disagree	44	36.4
Agree	35	28.9
<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>9.1</u>
Total	121	100.0

No Response 4

* Totals rounded to nearest percentage point.

Question 6. I feel safe going anywhere in my community or neighborhood in the daytime.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	1	0.8
Disagree	19	15.2
Agree	55	44.0
<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>40.0</u>
Total	125	100.0

No Response 0

* Totals rounded to nearest percentage point.

Question 7. I feel safe going anywhere in my community or neighborhood after dark.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	22	17.9
Disagree	44	35.8
Agree	38	30.9
<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>15.4</u>
Total	123	100.0

No Response 2

* Totals rounded to nearest percentage point.

Question 8. Crime is more serious than the newspapers and TV say.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	5	4.0
Disagree	39	31.5
Agree	66	53.2
<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>11.3</u>
Total	124	100.0

No Response 1

* Totals rounded to nearest percentage point.

Gender and Fear of Crime

Gender	Frequency	Percent
Male	51	40.8
Female	50	40.0
<u>Not Specified</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>19.2</u>
Total	125	100.0

* Totals rounded to nearest percentage point.

Fear of Crime, Family Size, and Gender

Family Size	Male	Percent	Female	Percent	Total	Percent
2	10	9.90	10	9.90	20	19.80
3	17	16.83	7	6.93	24	23.76
4	13	12.87	19	18.81	32	31.68
5	10	9.90	12	11.88	22	21.78
<u>6</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0.99</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1.98</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2.97</u>
Total	51	50.50	50	49.50	101	100.00

Failed to Respond or Identify Gender 24

* Totals rounded to nearest percentage point.

Question 1. When I am away from home, I worry about the safety of my property.

Response	Male	Percent	Female	Percent	Total	Percent
Strongly Disagree	6	5.94	2	1.98	8	7.92
Disagree	24	23.76	26	25.74	50	49.50
Agree	17	16.83	17	16.83	34	33.66
<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3.96</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>4.95</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>8.91</u>
Total	51	50.50	50	49.50	101	100.00

Failed to Respond or Identify Gender 24

* Totals rounded to nearest percentage point.

Question 2. I worry a great deal about my personal safety from crime and criminals.

Response	Male	Percent	Female	Percent	Total	Percent
Strongly Disagree	12	11.88	3	2.97	15	14.85
Disagree	30	29.70	28	27.72	58	57.43
Agree	8	7.92	14	13.86	22	21.78
<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>.99</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>4.95</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>5.94</u>
Total	51	50.50	50	49.50	101	100.00

Failed to Respond or Identify Gender 24

* Totals rounded to nearest percentage point.

Question 3. Even in my home, I'm not safe from people who want to take what I have.

Response	Male	Percent	Female	Percent	Total	Percent
Strongly Disagree	14	14.00	6	6.00	20	20.00
Disagree	29	29.00	28	28.00	57	57.00
Agree	7	7.00	12	12.00	19	19.00
<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1.00</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>3.00</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>4.00</u>
Total	51	51.00	49	49.00	100	100.00

Failed to Respond or Identify Gender 25

* Totals rounded to nearest percentage point.

Question 4. There are some parts of the base that I avoid during the day because of fear of crime.

Response	Male	Percent	Female	Percent	Total	Percent
Strongly Disagree	34	33.66	25	24.75	59	58.42
Disagree	15	14.85	21	20.79	36	35.64
Agree	2	1.98	3	2.97	5	4.95
<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.00</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>.99</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>.99</u>
Total	51	50.50	49	49.50	101	100.00

Failed to Respond or Identify Gender 24

* Totals rounded to nearest percentage point.

Question 5. There are some parts of the base that I avoid at night because of fear of crime.

Response	Male	Percent	Female	Percent	Total	Percent
Strongly Disagree	20	20.20	8	8.06	28	28.28
Disagree	14	14.14	21	21.21	35	35.35
Agree	12	12.12	16	16.16	28	28.28
<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>5.05</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>3.03</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>8.08</u>
Total	51	51.52	48	48.48	99	100.00

Failed to Respond or Identify Gender 26

* Totals rounded to nearest percentage point.

Question 6. I feel safe going anywhere in my community or neighborhood in the daytime.

Response	Male	Percent	Female	Percent	Total	Percent
Strongly Disagree	0	0.00	1	.99	1	.99
Disagree	6	5.94	10	9.90	16	15.84
Agree	18	17.82	23	22.77	41	40.59
<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>26.73</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>15.84</u>	<u>43</u>	<u>42.57</u>
Total	51	50.50	50	49.50	101	100.00

Failed to Respond or Identify Gender 24

* Totals rounded to nearest percentage point.

Question 7. I feel safe going anywhere in my community or neighborhood in after dark.

Response	Male	Percent	Female	Percent	Total	Percent
Strongly Disagree	6	5.94	11	10.89	17	16.83
Disagree	14	13.86	22	21.78	36	35.64
Agree	14	13.86	17	16.83	31	30.69
<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>16.83</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.00</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>16.83</u>
Total	51	50.50	50	49.50	101	100.00

Failed to Respond or Identify Gender 24

* Totals rounded to nearest percentage point.

Question 8. Crime is more serious than the newspapers and TV say.

Response	Male	Percent	Female	Percent	Total	Percent
Strongly Disagree	2	1.98	1	.99	3	2.97
Disagree	21	20.79	13	12.87	34	33.66
Agree	24	23.76	28	27.72	52	51.49
<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3.96</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>7.92</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>11.88</u>
Total	51	50.50	50	49.40	101	100.00

Failed to Respond or Identify Gender 24

* Totals rounded to nearest percentage point.

Fear of Crime and Gender

Question 1. When I am away from home, I worry about the safety of my property.

Fear	Males	%	Females	%	Total	%
No	30	29.70	28	27.72	58	57.43
<u>Yes</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>20.79</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>21.78</u>	<u>43</u>	<u>42.57</u>
Total	51	50.50	50	49.50	101	100.00

Failed to Identify Gender 24

Chi-Square DF=1 Value=0.082 Prob=0.774

Question 2. I worry a great deal about my personal safety from crime and criminals.

Fear	Males	%	Females	%	Total	%
No	42	41.58	31	30.69	73	72.28
<u>Yes</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>8.91</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>18.81</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>27.72</u>
Total	51	50.50	50	49.50	101	100.00

Failed to Identify Gender 24

Chi-Square DF=1 Value=5.220 Prob=0.022

Question 3. Even in my own home, I'm not safe from people who want to take what I have.

Fear	Males	%	Females	%	Total	%
No	43	42.57	35	34.65	78	77.23
Yes	8	7.92	15	14.85	23	22.77
Total	51	50.50	50	49.50	101	100.00

Failed to Identify Gender 24

Chi-Square DF=1 Value=2.941 Prob=0.086

Question 4. There are some parts of the base that I avoid during the day because of fear of crime.

Fear	Males	%	Females	%	Total	%
No	49	48.51	46	45.54	95	94.06
Yes	2	1.98	4	3.96	6	5.94
Total	51	50.50	50	49.50	101	100.00

Failed to Identify Gender 24

Chi-Square DF=1 Value=0.752 Prob=0.386

Question 5. There are some parts of the base that I avoid at night because of fear of crime.

Fear	Males	%	Females	%	Total	%
No	34	33.66	31	30.69	65	64.36
<u>Yes</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>16.83</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>18.81</u>	<u>36</u>	<u>35.64</u>
Total	51	50.50	50	49.50	101	100.00

Failed to Identify Gender 24

Chi-Square DF=1 Value=0.240 Prob=0.624

Question 6. I feel safe going anywhere in my community or neighborhood in the daytime.

Fear	Males	%	Females	%	Total	%
No	45	44.55	39	38.61	84	83.17
<u>Yes</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>5.94</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>10.89</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>16.83</u>
Total	51	50.50	50	49.50	101	100.00

Failed to Identify Gender 24

Chi-Square DF=1 Value=1.889 Prob=0.169

Question 7. I feel safe going anywhere in my community or neighborhood after dark.

Fear	Males	%	Females	%	Total	%
No	31	30.69	17	16.83	48	47.52
<u>Yes</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>19.80</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>32.67</u>	<u>53</u>	<u>52.48</u>
Total	51	50.50	50	49.50	101	100.00

Failed to Identify Gender 24

Chi-Square DF=1 Value=7.263 Prob=0.007

Question 8. Crime is more serious than the newspapers and TV say.

Fear	Males	%	Females	%	Total	%
No	23	22.77	14	13.86	37	36.63
<u>Yes</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>27.72</u>	<u>36</u>	<u>35.64</u>	<u>64</u>	<u>63.37</u>
Total	51	50.50	50	49.50	101	100.00

Failed to Identify Gender 24

Chi-Square DF=1 Value=3.180 Prob=0.075

Rank and Family Size

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Family Size</u>					<u>Total</u>	<u>Percent</u>
	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>		
01	1	1	0	0	1	3	2.40
02	2	0	1	0	0	3	2.40
03	2	0	2	2	0	6	4.80
04	0	1	0	0	0	1	.80
05	0	0	1	1	0	2	1.60
06	2	0	1	0	0	3	2.40
E1	0	1	0	0	0	1	.80
E3	4	2	0	0	0	6	4.80
E4	4	9	8	2	0	23	18.40
E5	6	12	8	10	1	37	29.60
E6	3	6	15	9	0	33	26.40
E7	0	1	0	1	1	3	2.40
E8	2	0	0	0	1	3	2.40
E9	0	0	1	0	0	1	.80
Total	26	33	37	25	4	125	100.00
%	20.80	26.40	29.60	20.00	3.20		

* Totals rounded to nearest percentage point.

Rank and Gender

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Gender</u>		<u>Total</u>	<u>Percent</u>
	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>		
01	0	2	2	1.98
02	1	2	3	2.97
03	2	4	6	5.94
04	1	0	1	0.99
05	1	1	2	1.98
06	0	1	1	0.99
E1	0	1	1	0.99
E3	3	2	5	4.95
E4	8	11	19	18.81
E5	16	12	28	27.72
E6	15	12	27	26.73
E7	1	1	2	1.98
E8	2	1	3	2.97
E9	1	0	1	0.00
Total	51	50	101	100.00

Failed to Respond or Identify Gender 24

* Totals rounded to nearest percentage point.

Rank and Housing Area

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Area 1</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Area 2</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Area 3</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Area 4</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>%</u>
01	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.80	2	1.60	3	2.40
02	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	2.40	0	0.00	3	2.40
03	0	0.00	0	0.00	4	3.20	2	1.60	6	4.80
04	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.80	1	0.80
05	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.80	1	0.80	2	1.60
06	2	1.60	0	0.00	1	0.80	0	0.00	3	2.40
E1	1	0.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.80
E3	4	3.20	2	1.60	0	0.00	0	0.00	6	4.80
E4	12	9.60	4	3.20	6	4.80	1	0.80	23	18.40
E5	17	13.60	9	7.20	6	4.80	5	4.00	37	29.60
E6	10	8.00	7	5.60	3	2.40	13	10.40	33	26.40
E7	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	2.40	3	2.40
E8	1	0.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	1.60	3	2.40
E9	1	0.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.80
Total	48	38.40	22	17.60	25	20.00	30	24.00	125	100.00

Failed to Respond 0

* Totals rounded to nearest percentage point.

Family Size and Housing Area

Family

<u>Size</u>	<u>Area 1</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Area 2</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Area 3</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Area 4</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>%</u>
2	13	10.40	4	3.20	5	4.00	4	3.20	26	20.80
3	21	16.80	7	5.60	1	0.80	4	3.20	33	26.40
4	12	9.60	8	6.40	12	9.60	5	4.00	37	29.60
5	2	1.60	3	2.40	6	4.80	14	11.20	25	20.00
6	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.80	3	2.40	4	3.20
Total	48	38.40	22	17.60	25	20.00	30	24.00	125	100.00

* Totals rounded to nearest percentage point.

Fear of Crime and Housing Area

Possible responses to the following questions of fear of crime included:

(1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Agree, and (4) Strongly Agree.

Question 1. When I am away from home, I worry about the safety of my property.

<u>Resp</u>	<u>Area 1</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Area 2</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Area 3</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Area 4</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>%</u>
1	3	2.42	0	0.00	2	1.61	3	2.42	8	6.45
2	27	21.77	13	10.48	9	7.26	10	8.06	59	47.58
3	14	11.29	6	4.84	12	9.68	11	8.87	43	34.68
4	3	2.42	3	2.42	2	1.61	6	4.84	14	11.29
Total	47	37.90	22	17.74	25	20.16	30	24.19	124	100.00

Response Missing 1

Question 2. I worry a great deal about my personal safety from crime and criminals.

<u>Resp</u>	<u>Area 1</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Area 2</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Area 3</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Area 4</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>%</u>
1	7	5.65	2	1.61	3	2.42	4	3.23	16	12.90
2	28	22.58	15	12.10	12	9.68	16	12.90	71	57.26
3	9	7.26	3	2.42	8	6.45	8	6.45	28	22.58
4	3	2.42	2	1.61	2	1.61	2	1.61	9	7.26
Total	47	37.90	22	17.74	25	20.16	30	24.19	124	100.00

Response Missing 1

Question 3. Even in my own home, I'm not safe from people who want to take what I have.

<u>Resp</u>	<u>Area 1</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Area 2</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Area 3</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Area 4</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>%</u>
1	10	8.13	2	1.63	3	2.44	8	6.50	23	18.70
2	28	22.76	14	11.38	12	9.76	16	13.01	70	56.91
3	8	6.50	3	2.44	8	6.50	4	3.25	23	18.70
4	1	0.81	2	1.63	2	1.63	2	1.63	7	5.69
Total	47	38.21	21	17.07	25	20.33	30	24.39	123	100.00

Response Missing 2

Question 4. There are some parts of the base that I avoid during the day because of fear of crime.

<u>Resp</u>	<u>Area 1</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Area 2</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Area 3</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Area 4</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>%</u>
1	28	22.76	11	8.94	10	8.13	18	14.63	67	54.47
2	16	13.01	11	8.94	13	10.57	10	8.13	50	40.65
3	2	1.63	0	0.00	2	1.63	1	0.81	5	4.07
4	1	0.81	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.81
Total	47	38.21	22	17.89	25	20.33	29	23.58	123	100.00

Response Missing 2

Question 5. There are some parts of the base that I avoid at night because of fear of crime.

<u>Resp</u>	<u>Area 1</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Area 2</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Area 3</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Area 4</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>%</u>
1	15	12.40	4	3.31	3	2.48	9	7.44	31	25.62
2	15	12.40	9	7.44	11	9.09	9	7.44	44	36.36
3	15	12.40	9	7.44	6	4.96	5	4.13	35	28.93
4	2	1.65	0	0.00	4	3.31	5	4.13	11	9.09
Total	47	38.84	22	18.18	24	19.83	28	23.14	121	100.00

Response Missing 4

Question 6. I feel safe going anywhere in my community or neighborhood in the daytime.

<u>Resp</u>	<u>Area 1</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Area 2</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Area 3</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Area 4</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>%</u>
1	0	0.00	1	0.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.80
2	9	7.20	2	1.60	4	3.20	4	3.20	19	15.20
3	19	15.20	11	8.80	16	12.80	9	7.20	55	44.00
4	20	16.00	8	6.40	5	4.00	17	13.60	50	40.00
Total	48	38.40	22	17.60	25	20.00	30	24.00	125	100.00

Response Missing 0

Question 7. I feel safe going anywhere in my community or neighborhood after dark.

<u>Resp</u>	<u>Area 1</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Area 2</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Area 3</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Area 4</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>%</u>
1	6	4.88	4	3.25	5	4.07	7	5.69	22	17.89
2	16	13.01	8	6.50	12	9.76	8	6.50	44	35.77
3	16	13.01	7	5.69	8	6.50	7	5.69	38	30.89
4	9	7.32	3	2.44	0	0.00	7	5.69	19	15.45
Total	47	38.21	22	17.89	25	20.33	29	23.58	123	100.00

Response Missing 2

Question 8. Crime is more serious than the newspapers and TV say.

<u>Resp</u>	<u>Area 1</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Area 2</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Area 3</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Area 4</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>%</u>
1	2	1.61	3	2.42	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	4.03
2	15	12.10	4	3.23	5	4.03	15	12.10	39	31.45
3	27	21.77	14	11.29	16	12.90	9	7.26	66	53.23
4	4	3.23	1	0.81	3	2.42	6	4.84	14	11.29
Total	48	38.71	22	17.74	24	19.35	30	24.19	124	100.00

Response Missing 1

Fear of Crime and Location

Question 1. When I am away from home, I worry about the safety of my property.

	Fear Off-Base	%	On-Base	%	Total	%
No	37	29.60	31	24.80	68	54.40
<u>Yes</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>32.00</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>13.60</u>	<u>57</u>	<u>45.60</u>
Total	77	61.60	48	38.40	125	100.00

Chi-Square DF=1 Value=3.257 Prob=0.071

Question 2. I worry a great deal about my personal safety from crime and criminals.

	Fear Off-Base	%	On-Base	%	Total	%
No	52	41.60	36	28.80	88	70.40
<u>Yes</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>20.00</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>9.60</u>	<u>37</u>	<u>29.60</u>
Total	77	61.60	48	38.40	125	100.00

Chi-Square DF=1 Value=0.791 Prob=0.374

Question 3. Even in my own home, I'm not safe from people who want to take what I have.

	Fear	Off-Base	%	On-Base	%	Total	%
No	56	44.80	39	31.20	95	76.00	
<u>Yes</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>16.80</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>7.20</u>	<u>48</u>	<u>38.40</u>	
Total	77	61.60	48	38.40	125	100.00	

Chi-Square DF=1 Value=1.177 Prob=0.278

Question 4. There are some parts of the base that I avoid during the day because of fear of crime.

	Fear	Off-Base	%	On-Base	%	Total	%
No	74	59.20	45	36.00	119	95.20	
<u>Yes</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2.40</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2.40</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>4.80</u>	
Total	77	61.60	48	38.40	125	100.00	

Chi-Square DF=1 Value=0.359 Prob=0.549

Question 5. There are some parts of the base that I avoid at night because of fear of crime.

	Fear Off-Base	%	On-Base	%	Total	%
No	48	38.40	31	24.80	79	63.20
<u>Yes</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>23.20</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>13.60</u>	<u>46</u>	<u>36.80</u>
Total	77	61.61	48	38.40	125	100.00

Chi-Square DF=1 Value=0.064 Prob=0.800

Question 6. I feel safe going anywhere in my community or neighborhood in the daytime.

	Fear Off-Base	%	On-Base	%	Total	%
No	66	52.80	39	31.20	105	84.00
<u>Yes</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>8.80</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>7.20</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>16.00</u>
Total	77	61.60	48	38.40	125	100.00

Chi-Square DF=1 Value=0.436 Prob=0.508

Question 7. I feel safe going anywhere in my community or neighborhood after dark.

	Fear	Off-Base	%	On-Base	%	Total	%
No	32	25.60	25	20.00	57	45.60	
<u>Yes</u>	<u>45</u>	<u>36.00</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>18.40</u>	<u>68</u>	<u>54.40</u>	
Total	77	61.60	48	38.40	125	100.00	

Chi-Square DF=1 Value=1.320 Prob=0.251

Question 8. Crime is more serious than the newspapers and TV say.

	Fear	Off-Base	%	On-Base	%	Total	%
No	28	22.40	17	13.60	45	36.00	
<u>Yes</u>	<u>49</u>	<u>39.20</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>24.80</u>	<u>80</u>	<u>64.00</u>	
Total	77	61.60	48	38.40	125	100.00	

Chi-Square DF=1 Value=0.012 Prob=0.915

APPENDIX D

Crime Victim Frequency of Response

Question 9. During 1992, did anyone damage, destroy or attempt to destroy your home or any property around your home?

Response	Frequency	Percent
0	105	84.0
1	11	8.8
2	6	4.8
3	2	1.6
<u>4</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0.8</u>
Total	125	100.0

Totals rounded to nearest percentage point.

Question 10. During 1992, did anyone steal or try to steal a car, truck, motorcycle, or other motor vehicle owned by you or other members of your household?

Response	Frequency	Percent
0	122	97.6
<u>1</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2.4</u>
Total	125	100.0

Totals rounded to nearest percentage point.

Question 11. During 1992, did anyone steal anything from inside your home, such as a stereo, TV, jewelry, gun or purse, etc.?

Response	Frequency	Percent
0	122	97.6
1	1	0.8
2	2	1.6
Total	125	100.0

Totals rounded to nearest percentage point.

Question 12. During 1992, did anyone steal anything that is kept outside your home such as a bicycle, a garden hose, or tools?

Response	Frequency	Percent
0	97	77.6
1	18	14.4
2	8	6.4
3	2	1.6
Total	125	100.0

Totals rounded to nearest percentage point.

Question 13. During 1992, did anyone steal parts attached to a car, truck, or other vehicle owned by any member of your household, such as a battery, hubcaps, or tapedeck?

Response	Frequency	Percent
0	123	98.4
1	2	1.6
Total	125	100.0

Totals rounded to nearest percentage point.

Question 14. During 1992, did you or any member of your household have anything stolen from them while they were away from home, for instance, at work, school, in a theater, in a restaurant, or while traveling?

Response	Frequency	Percent
0	110	88.0
1	8	6.4
2	5	4.0
3	2	1.6
Total	125	100.0

Totals rounded to nearest percentage point.

Question 15. During 1992, did you or any member of your household have a purse or wallet snatched or pockets picked?

Response	Frequency	Percent
0	116	92.8
1	8	6.4
2	1	0.8
<hr/>		
Total	125	100.0

Totals rounded to nearest percentage point.

Question 16. During 1992, did you or any member of your household have something stolen from inside a car or truck, such as packages or clothing?

Response	Frequency	Percent
0	120	96.0
1	4	3.2
2	1	0.8
<hr/>		
Total	125	100.0

Totals rounded to nearest percentage point.

Question 17. During 1992, did anyone break into or somehow illegally get into your house, garage, or another building on your property?

Response	Frequency	Percent
0	122	97.6
1	2	1.6
2	1	0.8
Total	125	100.0

Totals rounded to nearest percentage point.

Question 18. During 1992, did you find a door jimmied, a lock forced, or any other signs of an attempted break-in?

Response	Frequency	Percent
0	116	92.8
1	6	4.8
2	2	1.6
3	1	0.8
Total	125	100.0

Totals rounded to nearest percentage point.

Question 19. Did anyone take something or attempt to take something directly from you or any member of your household by using force, such as a stick-up, mugging, or threat?

Response	Frequency	Percent
0	124	99.2
<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0.8</u>
Total	125	100.0

Totals rounded to nearest percentage point.

Question 20. Did anyone beat-up, attack, or hit you or any member of your household?

Response	Frequency	Percent
0	114	91.2
1	6	4.8
2	4	3.2
<u>5</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0.8</u>
Total	125	100.0

Totals rounded to nearest percentage point.

Question 21. Were you or any member of your household knifed, shot at, or attacked with some other weapon by anyone?

Response	Frequency	Percent
0	123	98.4
<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1.6</u>
Total	125	100.0

Totals rounded to nearest percentage point.

Question 22. Did anyone threaten to beat-up or threaten you or any member of your household with a knife, gun, or some other weapon?

Response	Frequency	Percent
0	120	96.0
1	3	2.4
<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1.6</u>
Total	125	100.0

Totals rounded to nearest percentage point.

Question 23. Did anyone rape or attempt to rape you or any member of your household?

Response	Frequency	Percent
0	125	100.0

Totals rounded to nearest percentage point.

Family Size and Crime Victimization

Question 9. During 1992, did anyone damage, destroy or attempt to destroy your home or any property around your home?

# of Crimes	Family Size											
	2	%	3	%	4	%	5	%	6	%	total	%
0	24	19.20	29	23.20	35	28.00	15	12.00	2	1.60	105	84.00
1	2	1.60	3	2.40	2	1.60	2	1.60	2	1.60	11	8.80
2	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	6	4.80	0	0.00	6	4.80
3	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	1.60	0	0.00	2	1.60
4	0	0.00	1	0.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.80
Total	26	20.80	33	26.40	37	29.60	25	20.00	4	3.20	125	100.00

Question 10. During 1992, did anyone steal or try to steal a car, truck, motorcycle, or other motor vehicle owned by you or other members of your household?

# of Crimes	Family Size											
	2	%	3	%	4	%	5	%	6	%	total	%
0	26	20.80	32	25.60	37	29.60	24	19.20	3	2.40	122	97.60
1	0	0.00	1	0.80	0	0.00	1	0.80	1	0.80	3	2.40
Total	26	20.80	33	26.40	37	29.60	25	20.00	4	3.20	125	100.00

Question 11. During 1992, did anyone steal anything from inside your home, such as a stereo, TV, jewelry, gun or purse, etc.?

# of Crimes	Family Size										total	%
	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		
0	26	20.80	33	26.40	35	28.00	24	19.20	4	3.20	122	97.60
1	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.80	0	0.00	1	0.80
2	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	1.60	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	1.60
Total	26	20.80	33	26.40	37	29.60	25	20.00	4	3.20	125	100.00

Question 12. During 1992, did anyone steal anything that is kept outside your home such as a bicycle, a garden hose, or tools?

# of Crimes	Family Size										total	%
	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		
0	24	19.20	26	20.80	28	22.40	16	12.80	3	2.40	97	77.60
1	0	0.00	7	5.60	6	4.80	4	3.20	1	0.80	18	14.40
2	2	1.60	0	0.00	3	2.40	3	2.40	0	0.00	8	6.40
3	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	1.60	0	0.00	2	1.60
Total	26	20.80	33	26.40	37	29.60	25	20.00	4	3.20	125	100.00

Question 13. During 1992, did anyone steal parts attached to a car, truck, or other vehicle owned by any member of your household, such as a battery, hubcaps, or tapedeck?

# of Crimes	Family Size											
	2	3	4	5	6	total						
0	26	20.80	32	25.60	37	29.60	25	20.00	3	2.40	123	98.40
1	0	0.00	1	0.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.80	2	1.60
Total	26	20.80	33	26.40	37	29.60	25	20.00	4	3.20	125	100.00

Question 14. During 1992, did you or any member of your household have anything stolen from them while they were away from home, for instance, at work, school, in a theater, in a restaurant, or while traveling?

# of Crimes	Family Size											
	2	3	4	5	6	total						
0	26	20.80	30	24.00	30	24.00	20	16.00	4	3.20	110	88.00
1	0	0.00	1	0.80	4	3.20	3	2.40	0	0.00	8	6.40
2	0	0.00	1	0.80	2	1.60	2	1.60	0	0.00	5	4.00
3	0	0.00	1	0.80	1	0.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	1.60
Total	26	20.80	33	26.40	37	29.60	25	20.00	4	3.20	125	100.00

Question 15. During 1992, did you or any member of your household have a purse or wallet snatched or pockets picked?

# of Crimes	Family Size											
	2	%	3	%	4	%	5	%	6	%	total	%
0	26	20.80	29	23.20	33	26.40	24	19.20	4	3.20	116	92.80
1	0	0.00	4	3.20	3	2.40	1	0.80	0	0.00	8	6.40
2	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.80
Total	26	20.80	33	26.40	37	29.60	25	20.00	4	3.20	125	100.00

Question 16. During 1992, did you or any member of your household have something stolen from inside a car or truck, such as packages or clothing?

# of Crimes	Family Size											
	2	%	3	%	4	%	5	%	6	%	total	%
0	26	20.80	30	24.00	36	28.80	24	19.20	4	3.20	120	96.00
1	0	0.00	2	1.60	1	0.80	1	0.80	0	0.00	4	3.20
2	0	0.00	1	0.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.80
Total	26	20.80	33	26.40	37	29.60	25	20.00	4	3.20	125	100.00

Question 17. During 1992, did anyone break into or somehow illegally get into your house, garage, or another building on your property?

# of Crimes	Family Size											
	2	3	4	5	6	total						
0	26	20.80	32	25.60	36	28.80	24	19.20	4	3.20	122	97.60
1	0	0.00	1	0.80	0	0.00	1	0.80	0	0.00	2	1.60
2	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.80
Total	26	20.80	33	26.40	37	29.60	25	20.00	4	3.20	125	100.00

Question 18. During 1992, did you find a door jimmied, a lock forced, or any other signs of an attempted break-in?

# of Crimes	Family Size											
	2	3	4	5	6	total						
0	25	20.00	30	24.00	33	26.40	24	19.20	4	3.20	116	92.80
1	0	0.00	2	1.60	3	2.40	1	0.80	0	0.00	6	4.80
2	1	0.80	1	0.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	1.60
3	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.80
Total	26	20.80	33	26.40	37	29.60	25	20.00	4	3.20	125	100.00

Question 19. Did anyone take something or attempt to take something directly from you or any member of your household by using force, such as a stick-up, mugging, or threat?

# of	Family Size											
<u>Crimes</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>total</u>	<u>%</u>
0	26	20.80	33	26.40	36	28.80	25	20.00	4	3.20	124	99.20
1	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.80
Total	26	20.80	33	26.40	37	29.60	25	20.00	4	3.20	125	100.00

Question 20. Did anyone beat-up, attack, or hit you or any member of your household?

# of	Family Size											
<u>Crimes</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>total</u>	<u>%</u>
0	25	20.00	31	24.80	34	27.20	21	16.80	3	2.40	114	91.20
1	1	0.80	2	1.60	1	0.80	2	1.60	0	0.00	6	4.80
2	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.80	2	1.60	1	0.80	4	3.20
5	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.80
Total	26	20.80	33	26.40	37	29.60	25	20.00	4	3.20	125	100.00

Question 21. Were you or any member of your household knifed, shot at, or attacked with some other weapon by anyone?

# of	Family Size											
<u>Crimes</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>total</u>	<u>%</u>
0	26	20.80	32	25.60	37	29.60	24	19.20	4	3.20	123	98.40
1	0	0.00	1	0.80	0	0.00	1	0.80	0	0.00	2	1.60
Total	26	20.80	33	26.40	37	29.60	25	20.00	4	3.20	125	100.00

Question 22. Did anyone threaten to beat-up or threaten you or any member of your household with a knife, gun, or some other weapon?

# of	Family Size											
<u>Crimes</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>total</u>	<u>%</u>
0	26	20.80	32	25.60	36	28.80	23	18.40	3	2.40	120	96.00
1	0	0.00	1	0.80	0	0.00	1	0.80	1	0.80	3	2.40
2	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.80	1	0.80	0	0.00	2	1.60
Total	26	20.80	33	26.40	37	29.60	25	20.00	4	3.20	125	100.00

Question 23. Did anyone rape or attempt to rape you or any member of your household?

# of	Family Size											
<u>Crimes</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>% total</u>	<u>%</u>	
0	26	20.80	33	26.40	37	29.60	25	20.00	4	3.20	125	100.00

Housing Area and Crime Victimization

Question 9. During 1992, did anyone damage, destroy or attempt to destroy your home or any property around your home?

# of Crimes	Housing Area								Total	%
	<u>1</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>%</u>		
0	46	36.80	18	14.40	19	15.20	22	17.60	105	84.00
1	2	1.60	2	1.60	5	4.00	2	1.60	11	8.80
2	0	0.00	1	0.80	1	0.80	4	3.20	6	4.80
3	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	1.60	2	1.60
4	0	0.00	1	0.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.80
Total	48	38.40	22	17.60	25	20.00	30	24.00	125	100.00

Question 10. During 1992, did anyone steal or try to steal a car, truck, motorcycle, or other motor vehicle owned by you or other members of your household?

# of Crimes	Housing Area								Total	%
	<u>1</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>%</u>		
0	47	37.60	22	17.60	25	20.00	28	22.40	122	97.60
1	1	0.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	1.60	3	2.40
Total	48	38.40	22	17.60	25	20.00	30	24.00	125	100.00

Question 11. During 1992, did anyone steal anything from inside your home, such as a stereo, TV, jewelry, gun or purse, etc.?

# of	Housing Area								<u>Total</u>	%
	<u>1</u>	%	<u>2</u>	%	<u>3</u>	%	<u>4</u>	%		
0	48	38.40	21	16.80	24	19.20	29	23.20	122	97.60
1	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.80	1	0.80
2	0	0.00	1	0.80	1	0.80	0	0.00	2	1.60
Total	48	38.40	22	17.60	25	20.00	30	24.00	125	100.00

Question 12. During 1992, did anyone steal anything that is kept outside your home such as a bicycle, a garden hose, or tools?

# of	Housing Area								<u>Total</u>	%
	<u>1</u>	%	<u>2</u>	%	<u>3</u>	%	<u>4</u>	%		
0	44	35.20	15	12.00	17	13.60	21	16.80	97	77.60
1	3	2.40	4	3.20	5	4.00	6	4.80	18	14.40
2	1	0.80	3	2.40	3	2.40	1	0.80	8	6.40
3	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	1.60	2	1.60
Total	48	38.40	22	17.60	25	20.00	30	24.00	125	100.00

Question 13. During 1992, did anyone steal parts attached to a car, truck, or other vehicle owned by any member of your household, such as a battery, hubcaps, or tapedeck?

# of		Housing Area								
<u>Crimes</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>%</u>
0	47	37.60	22	17.60	25	20.00	29	23.20	123	98.40
1	1	0.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.80	2	1.60
Total	48	38.40	22	17.60	25	20.00	30	24.00	125	100.00

Question 14. During 1992, did you or any member of your household have anything stolen from them while they were away from home, for instance, at work, school, in a theater, in a restaurant, or while traveling?

# of		Housing Area								
<u>Crimes</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>%</u>
0	46	36.80	17	13.60	22	17.60	25	20.00	100	88.00
1	1	0.80	1	0.80	3	2.40	3	2.40	8	6.40
2	1	0.80	2	1.60	0	0.00	2	1.60	5	4.00
3	0	0.00	2	1.60	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	1.60
Total	48	38.40	22	17.60	25	20.00	30	24.00	125	100.00

Question 15. During 1992, did you or any member of your household have a purse or wallet snatched or pockets picked?

# of	Housing Area									
<u>Crimes</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>%</u>
0	45	36.00	21	16.80	24	19.20	26	20.80	116	92.80
1	3	2.40	1	0.80	1	0.80	3	2.40	8	6.40
2	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.80	1	0.80
Total	48	38.40	22	17.60	25	20.00	30	24.00	125	100.00

Question 16. During 1992, did you or any member of your household have something stolen from inside a car or truck, such as packages or clothing?

# of	Housing Area									
<u>Crimes</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>%</u>
0	47	37.60	20	16.00	24	19.20	29	23.20	120	96.00
1	1	0.80	1	0.80	1	0.80	1	0.80	4	3.20
2	0	0.00	1	0.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.80
Total	48	38.40	22	17.60	25	20.00	30	24.00	125	100.00

Question 17. During 1992, did anyone break into or somehow illegally get into your house, garage, or another building on your property?

# of	Housing Area									
<u>Crimes</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>%</u>
0	47	37.60	21	16.80	25	20.00	29	23.20	122	97.60
1	1	0.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.80	2	1.60
2	0	0.00	1	0.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.80
Total	48	38.40	22	17.60	25	20.00	30	24.00	125	100.00

Question 18. During 1992, did you find a door jimmied, a lock forced, or any other signs of an attempted break-in?

# of	Housing Area									
<u>Crimes</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>%</u>
0	47	37.60	19	15.20	23	18.40	27	21.60	116	92.80
1	1	0.80	2	1.60	1	0.80	2	1.60	6	4.80
2	0	0.00	1	0.80	0	0.00	1	0.80	2	1.60
3	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.80	0	0.00	1	0.80
Total	48	38.40	22	17.60	25	20.00	30	24.00	125	100.00

Question 19. Did anyone take something or attempt to take something directly from you or any member of your household by using force, such as a stick-up, mugging, or threat?

# of		Housing Area								
<u>Crimes</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>%</u>
0	48	38.40	21	16.80	25	20.00	30	24.00	124	99.20
1	0	0.00	1	0.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.80
Total	48	38.40	22	17.60	25	20.00	30	24.00	125	100.00

Question 20. Did anyone beat-up, attack, or hit you or any member of your household?

# of		Housing Area								
<u>Crimes</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>%</u>
0	47	37.60	19	15.20	24	19.20	24	19.20	114	91.20
1	1	0.80	2	1.60	0	0.00	3	2.40	6	4.80
2	0	0.00	1	0.80	0	0.00	3	2.40	4	3.20
5	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.80	0	0.00	1	0.80
Total	48	38.40	22	17.60	25	20.00	30	24.00	125	100.00

Question 21. Were you or any member of your household knifed, shot at, or attacked with some other weapon by anyone?

# of		Housing Area								
<u>Crimes</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>%</u>
0	47	37.60	22	17.60	25	20.00	29	23.20	123	98.40
1	1	0.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.80	2	1.60
Total	48	38.40	22	17.60	25	20.00	30	24.00	125	100.00

Question 22. Did anyone threaten to beat-up or threaten you or any member of your household with a knife, gun, or some other weapon?

# of		Housing Area								
<u>Crimes</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>%</u>
0	48	38.40	21	16.80	25	20.00	26	20.80	120	96.00
1	0	0.00	1	0.80	0	0.00	2	1.60	3	2.40
2	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	1.60	2	1.60
Total	48	38.40	22	17.60	25	20.00	30	24.00	125	100.00

Question 23. Did anyone rape or attempt to rape you or any member of your household?

# of		Housing Area								
<u>Crimes</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>%</u>
0	48	38.40	22	17.60	25	20.00	30	24.00	125	100.00

**Housing Area, Family Size,
and Total # of Victimizations**

**For comparison, below each question's total is the total households surveyed by family size.

Question 9. During 1992, did anyone damage, destroy or attempt to destroy your home or any property around your home?

Housing		Family Size										
<u>Area</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>total</u>	<u>%</u>
1	0	0.00	1	3.03	0	0.00	1	3.03	*		2	6.06
2	1	3.03	4	12.12	1	3.03	2	6.06	*		8	24.24
3	1	3.03	1	3.03	1	3.03	3	9.09	1	3.0	7	21.21
4	0	0.00	1	3.03	0	0.00	14	42.42	1	3.0	16	48.48
	2	6.06	7	21.21	2	6.06	20	60.60	2	6.06	33	100.00

** 26 20.80 33 26.40 37 29.60 25 20.00 4 3.20 125 100.00

Total percentage rounded to nearest percentage point.

*Housing area had no families respond to survey with six family members.

Question 10. During 1992, did anyone steal or try to steal a car, truck, motorcycle, or other motor vehicle owned by you or other members of your household?

Housing		Family Size										
<u>Area</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>total</u>	<u>%</u>
1	0	0.00	1	33.33	0	0.00	0	0.00	*		1	33.33
2	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	*		0	0.00
3	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
4	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	33.33	1	33.33	2	66.67
	0	0.00	1	33.33	0	0.00	1	33.33	1	33.33	3	100.00

** 26 20.80 33 26.40 37 29.60 25 20.00 4 3.20 125 100.00

Total percentage rounded to nearest percentage point.

*Housing area had no families respond to survey with six family members.

Question 11. During 1992, did anyone steal anything from inside your home, such as a stereo, TV, jewelry, gun or purse, etc.?

Housing		Family Size										
<u>Area</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>total</u>	<u>%</u>
1	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	*		0	0.00
2	0	0.0	0	0.00	2	40.00	0	0.00	*		2	40.00
3	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	40.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	40.00
4	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	20.00	0	0.00	1	20.00
	0	0.00	0	00.00	4	80.00	1	20.00	1	0.00	5	100.00

** 26 20.80 33 26.40 37 29.60 25 20.00 4 3.20 125 100.00

Total percentage rounded to nearest percentage point.

*Housing area had no families respond to survey with six family members.

Question 12. During 1992, did anyone steal anything that is kept outside your home such as a bicycle, a garden hose, or tools?

Housing		Family Size										
<u>Area</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>total</u>	<u>%</u>
1	2	5.00	3	7.50	0	0.00	0	0.00	*		5	12.50
2	2	5.00	1	2.50	5	12.50	2	5.00	*		10	25.00
3	0	0.00	1	2.50	6	15.00	4	10.00	0	0.00	11	27.50
4	0	0.00	2	5.00	1	2.50	10	25.00	1	2.50	14	35.00
	4	10.00	7	17.00	12	30.00	16	40.00	1	2.50	40	100.00

** 26 20.80 33 26.40 37 29.60 25 20.00 4 3.20 125 100.00

Total percentage rounded to nearest percentage point.

*Housing area had no families respond to survey with six family members.

Question 13. During 1992, did anyone steal parts attached to a car, truck, or other vehicle owned by any member of your household, such as a battery, hubcaps, or tapedeck?

Housing		Family Size										
<u>Area</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>total</u>	<u>%</u>
1	0	0.00	1	50.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	*		1	50.00
2	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	*		0	0.00
3	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
4	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	50.00	1	50.00
	0	0.00	1	50.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	50.00	2	100.00

** 26 20.80 33 26.40 37 29.60 25 20.00 4 3.20 125 100.00

Total percentage rounded to nearest percentage point.

*Housing area had no families respond to survey with six family members.

Question 14. During 1992, did you or any member of your household have anything stolen from them while they were away from home, for instance, at work, school, in a theater, in a restaurant, or while traveling?

Housing			Family Size									
<u>Area</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>total</u>	<u>%</u>
1	0	0.00	1	4.17	2	8.33	0	0.00	*		3	12.50
2	0	0.00	5	20.83	6	25.00	0	0.00	*		11	45.83
3	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	8.33	1	4.17	0	0.00	3	12.50
4	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.17	6	25.00	0	0.00	7	29.17
	0	0.00	6	25.00	11	45.83	7	29.17	0	0.00	24	100.00

** 26 20.80 33 26.40 37 29.60 25 20.00 4 3.20 125 100.00

Total percentage rounded to nearest percentage point.

*Housing area had no families respond to survey with six family members.

Question 15. During 1992, did you or any member of your household have a purse or wallet snatched or pockets picked?

Housing		Family Size										
<u>Area</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>total</u>	<u>%</u>
1	0	0.00	2	20.00	1	10.00	0	0.00	*		3	30.00
2	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	10.00	0	0.00	*		1	10.00
3	0	0.00	1	10.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	10.00
4	0	0.00	1	10.00	3	30.00	1	10.00	0	0.00	5	50.00
	0	0.00	4	40.00	5	50.00	1	10.00	0	0.00	10	100.00

** 26 20.80 33 26.40 37 29.60 25 20.00 4 3.20 125 100.00

Total percentage rounded to nearest percentage point.

*Housing area had no families respond to survey with six family members.

Question 16. During 1992, did you or any member of your household have something stolen from inside a car or truck, such as packages or clothing?

Housing		Family Size										
<u>Area</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>total</u>	<u>%</u>
1	0	0.00	1	16.67	0	0.00	0	0.00	*		1	16.67
2	0	0.00	2	33.33	1	16.67	0	0.00	*		3	50.00
3	0	0.00	1	16.67	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	16.67
4	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	16.67	0	0.00	1	16.67
	0	0.00	4	66.67	1	16.67	1	16.67	0	0.00	6	100.00

** 26 20.80 33 26.40 37 29.60 25 20.00 4 3.20 125 100.00

Total percentage rounded to nearest percentage point.

*Housing area had no families respond to survey with six family members.

Question 17. During 1992, did anyone break into or somehow illegally get into your house, garage, or another building on your property?

Housing		Family Size										
<u>Area</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>total</u>	<u>%</u>
1	0	0.00	1	25.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	*		1	25.00
2	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	50.00	0	0.00	*		2	50.00
3	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
4	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	25.00	0	0.00	1	25.00
	0	0.00	1	25.00	2	50.00	1	25.00	0	0.00	4	100.00

** 26 20.80 33 26.40 37 29.60 25 20.00 4 3.20 125 100.00

Total percentage rounded to nearest percentage point.

*Housing area had no families respond to survey with six family members.

Question 18. During 1992, did you find a door jimmied, a lock forced, or any other signs of an attempted break-in?

Housing		Family Size										
<u>Area</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>total</u>	<u>%</u>
1	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	7.69	0	0.00	*		1	7.69
2	2	15.38	1	7.69	1	7.69	0	0.00	*		4	30.77
3	0	0.00	1	7.69	3	23.08	0	0.00	0	0.00	4	30.77
4	0	0.00	2	15.38	1	7.69	1	7.69	0	0.00	4	30.77
	2	15.38	4	30.77	6	46.15	1	7.69	0	0.00	13	100.00

** 26 20.80 33 26.40 37 29.60 25 20.00 4 3.20 125 100.00

Total percentage rounded to nearest percentage point.

*Housing area had no families respond to survey with six family members.

Question 19. Did anyone take something or attempt to take something directly from you or any member of your household by using force, such as a stick-up, mugging, or threat?

Housing			Family Size									
<u>Area</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>total</u>	<u>%</u>
1	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	*		0	0.00
2	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	100.00	0	0.00	*		1	100.00
3	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
4	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	100.0	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	100.00

** 26 20.80 33 26.40 37 29.60 25 20.00 4 3.20 125 100.00

Total percentage rounded to nearest percentage point.

*Housing area had no families respond to survey with six family members.

Question 20. Did anyone beat-up, attack, or hit you or any member of your household?

Housing			Family Size									
<u>Area</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>total</u>	<u>%</u>
1	0	0.00	1	5.26	0	0.00	0	0.00	*		1	5.26
2	1	5.26	1	5.26	2	10.53	0	0.00	*		4	21.05
3	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	26.32	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	26.32
4	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	5.26	6	31.58	2	10.53	9	47.37
	1	5.26	2	10.53	4	21.05	6	31.58	2	10.53	19	100.00

** 26 20.80 33 26.40 37 29.60 25 20.00 4 3.20 125 100.00

Total percentage rounded to nearest percentage point.

*Housing area had no families respond to survey with six family members.

Question 21. Were you or any member of your household knifed, shot at, or attacked with some other weapon by anyone?

Housing		Family Size										
<u>Area</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>total</u>	<u>%</u>
1	0	0.00	1	50.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	*		1	50.00
2	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	*		0	0.00
3	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
4	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	50.00	0	0.00	1	50.00
	0	0.00	1	50.00	0	0.00	1	50.00	0	0.00	2	100.00

** 26 20.80 33 26.40 37 29.60 25 20.00 4 3.20 125 100.00

Total percentage rounded to nearest percentage point.

*Housing area had no families respond to survey with six family members.

Question 22. Did anyone threaten to beat-up or threaten you or any member of your household with a knife, gun, or some other weapon?

Housing		Family Size										
<u>Area</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>total</u>	<u>%</u>
1	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	*		0	0.00
2	0	0.00	1	14.29	0	0.00	0	0.00	*		1	14.29
3	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
4	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	28.57	3	42.86	1	14.29	6	85.71
	0	0.00	1	14.29	2	28.57	3	42.86	1	14.29	7	100.00

** 26 20.80 33 26.40 37 29.60 25 20.00 4 3.20 125 100.00

Total percentage rounded to nearest percentage point.

*Housing area had no families respond to survey with six family members.

Question 23. Did anyone rape or attempt to rape you or any member of your household?

Housing		Family Size										
<u>Area</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>total</u>	<u>%</u>
1	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	*		0	0.00
2	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	*		0	0.00
3	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
4	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00

** 26 20.80 33 26.40 37 29.60 25 20.00 4 3.20 125 100.00

Total percentage rounded to nearest percentage point.

*Housing area had no families respond to survey with six family members.

Victimization by Location

Question 9. During 1992, did anyone damage, destroy or attempt to destroy your home or any property around your home?

Victim of <u>Crime</u>	Housing Area		Housing Area		<u>Total</u>	<u>%</u>
	<u>Off-Base</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>On-Base</u>	<u>%</u>		
No	59	47.20	46	36.80	105	84.00
Yes	18	14.40	2	1.60	20	16.00
Total	77	61.60	48	38.40	125	100.00

Question 10. During 1992, did anyone steal or try to steal a car, truck, motorcycle, or other motor vehicle owned by you or other members of your household?

Victim of <u>Crime</u>	Housing Area		Housing Area		<u>Total</u>	<u>%</u>
	<u>Off-Base</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>On-Base</u>	<u>%</u>		
No	75	60.00	47	37.60	122	97.60
Yes	2	1.60	1	0.80	3	2.40
Total	77	61.60	48	38.40	125	100.00

Question 11. During 1992, did anyone steal anything from inside your home, such as a stereo, TV, jewelry, gun or purse, etc.?

Victim	Housing Area		Incidents		Incidents	
	of	Incidents	Incidents			
<u>Crime</u>	<u>Off-Base</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>On-Base</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>%</u>
No	74	59.20	48	38.40	122	97.60
<u>Yes</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2.40</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.00</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2.40</u>
Total	77	61.60	48	38.40	125	100.00

Question 12. During 1992, did anyone steal anything that is kept outside your home such as a bicycle, a garden hose, or tools?

Victim	Housing Area		Incidents		Incidents	
	of	Incidents	Incidents			
<u>Crime</u>	<u>Off-Base</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>On-Base</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>%</u>
No	53	42.40	44	35.20	97	77.60
<u>Yes</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>19.20</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3.20</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>22.40</u>
Total	77	61.60	48	38.40	125	100.00

Question 13. During 1992, did anyone steal parts attached to a car, truck, or other vehicle owned by any member of your household, such as a battery, hubcaps, or tapedeck?

Victim	Housing Area					
	of Incidents			Incidents		
<u>Crime</u>	<u>Off-Base</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>On-Base</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>%</u>
No	76	60.80	47	37.60	123	98.40
Yes	1	0.80	1	0.80	2	1.60
Total	77	61.60	48	38.40	125	100.00

Question 14. During 1992, did you or any member of your household have anything stolen from them while they were away from home, for instance, at work, school, in a theater, in a restaurant, or while traveling?

Victim	Housing Area					
	of Incidents			Incidents		
<u>Crime</u>	<u>Off-Base</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>On-Base</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>%</u>
No	64	51.20	46	36.80	110	88.00
Yes	13	10.40	2	1.60	15	12.00
Total	77	61.60	48	38.40	125	100.00

Question 15. During 1992, did you or any member of your household have a purse or wallet snatched or pockets picked?

Victim	Housing Area		Incidents		Total	
	of	Incidents	Incidents			
<u>Crime</u>	<u>Off-Base</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>On-Base</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>%</u>
No	74	56.80	45	36.00	116	92.80
<u>Yes</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>4.80</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2.40</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>7.20</u>
Total	77	61.60	48	38.40	125	100.00

Question 16. During 1992, did you or any member of your household have something stolen from inside a car or truck, such as packages or clothing?

Victim	Housing Area		Incidents		Total	
	of	Incidents	Incidents			
<u>Crime</u>	<u>Off-Base</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>On-Base</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>%</u>
No	73	58.40	47	37.60	120	96.00
<u>Yes</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3.20</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0.80</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>4.00</u>
Total	77	61.60	48	38.40	125	100.00

Question 17. During 1992, did anyone break into or somehow illegally get into your house, garage, or another building on your property?

Victim of Crime	Housing Area		Housing Area		Total	%
	Off-Base	%	On-Base	%		
No	75	60.00	47	37.60	122	97.60
Yes	2	1.60	1	0.80	3	2.40
Total	77	61.60	48	38.40	125	100.00

Question 18. During 1992, did you find a door jimmied, a lock forced, or any other signs of an attempted break-in?

Victim of Crime	Housing Area		Housing Area		Total	%
	Off-Base	%	On-Base	%		
No	69	55.20	47	37.60	116	92.80
Yes	8	6.40	1	0.80	9	7.20
Total	77	61.60	48	38.40	125	100.00

Question 19. Did anyone take something or attempt to take something directly from you or any member of your household by using force, such as a stick-up, mugging, or threat?

Victim	Housing Area		Incidents		Total	%
	of	Incidents	On-Base	%		
<u>Crime</u>	<u>Off-Base</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>On-Base</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>%</u>
No	76	60.80	48	38.40	124	99.20
<u>Yes</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0.80</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.00</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0.80</u>
Total	77	61.60	48	38.40	125	100.00

Question 20. Did anyone beat-up, attack, or hit you or any member of your household?

Victim	Housing Area		Incidents		Total	%
	of	Incidents	On-Base	%		
<u>Crime</u>	<u>Off-Base</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>On-Base</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>%</u>
No	67	53.60	47	37.60	114	91.20
<u>Yes</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>8.00</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0.80</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>8.80</u>
Total	77	61.60	48	38.40	125	100.00

Question 21. Were you or any member of your household knifed, shot at, or attacked with some other weapon by anyone?

Victim	Housing Area		Incidents		Total	
	of	Incidents	Incidents	%	%	%
<u>Crime</u>	<u>Off-Base</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>On-Base</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>%</u>
No	76	60.80	47	37.60	123	98.40
<u>Yes</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0.80</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0.80</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1.60</u>
Total	77	61.60	48	38.40	125	100.00

Question 22. Did anyone threaten to beat-up or threaten you or any member of your household with a knife, gun, or some other weapon?

Victim	Housing Area		Incidents		Total	
	of	Incidents	Incidents	%	%	%
<u>Crime</u>	<u>Off-Base</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>On-Base</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>%</u>
No	72	57.60	48	38.40	120	96.00
<u>Yes</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>4.00</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.00</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>4.00</u>
Total	77	61.60	48	38.40	125	100.00

Question 23. Did anyone rape or attempt to rape you or any member of your household?

Victim	Housing Area					
of	Incidents	Incidents				
<u>Crime</u>	<u>Off-Base</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>On-Base</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>%</u>
No	77	61.60	48	38.40	125	100.00

APPENDIX E

Shaw Air Force Base
 Security Police Crime Reports*
 January 1, 1992 - December 31, 1992

<u>Crimes Against Persons</u>		<u>Other Security Police Responses</u>	
Murder	0	Disturbance	3
Rape	2	Smuggling	0
Robbery	0	Black Market	0
Assaults	45	Trespass	26
Manslaughte	0	Disorderly Conduct	6
Sex Offenses	2	<u>Other Sp Responses</u>	<u>66</u>
Suicides	8	Total	101
Domestic Dist	36		
<u>Other</u>	<u>13</u>		
Total	106		
<u>Crimes Against Property</u>		<u>Total Crimes Reported</u>	
Arson	0	Crimes Against Persons	106
Burglarly	11	Crimes Against Property	454
Larceny	217	<u>Other SP Responses</u>	<u>101</u>
Auto Theft	3	Total	661
Willful Prop Dest	147		
(Non-government)			
Willful Prop Dest	65	Total Crimes Reported	661
(Government)		<u>Suicides (Not on Survey)</u>	<u>-8</u>
<u>Other</u>	<u>11</u>	Total Crimes Surveyed	653
Total	454		

*Includes only incidents taking place on Shaw Air Force Base.

Shaw Air Force Base
 Security Police Crime Reports**
 January 1, 1992 - December 31, 1992

Security Police Crime Subjects

<u>Crime</u>	<u>Military</u>			<u>Unidentified</u>	
	<u>Military</u>	<u>Civilian</u>	<u>Dependent</u>	<u>Others</u>	<u>Subjects</u>
Murder	0	0	0	0	0
Rape	3	0	0	0	0
Robbery	0	0	0	0	0
Assault	42	0	9	14	5
Manslaughter	0	0	0	0	0
Sex Offenses	9	0	1	0	0
Suicides	8	0	8	0	0
Domestic Dist	41	0	41	2	0
<u>Other Personal</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>
Total Personal	105	0	60	18	5

Crimes

** Includes all incidents taking place on Shaw Air Force Base and incidents involving arrest of Air Force members off the installation.

<u>Crime</u>	Military			Unidentified	
	<u>Military</u>	<u>Civilian</u>	<u>Dependent</u>	<u>Others</u>	<u>Subjects</u>
Arson	0	0	0	0	0
Burglarly	0	0	4	1	8
Larceny	18	0	24	33	169
Auto Theft	1	0	1	0	1
Property Dest	4	0	6	4	136
(Non Government)					
Property Dest	11	0	10	8	50
(Government)					
<u>Other Property</u>	<u>48</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>0</u>
Total Property	82	0	45	54	364

Crimes

<u>Crime</u>	Military			Unidentified	
	<u>Military</u>	<u>Civilian</u>	<u>Dependent</u>	<u>Others</u>	<u>Subjects</u>
Disturbance	0	0	1	2	1
Smuggling	0	0	0	0	0
Black Market	0	0	0	0	0
Trespass	2	0	5	23	0
Disorder	19	0	0	8	0
<u>Other Responses</u>	<u>51</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>2</u>
Total Other	72	0	15	68	3

Police Responses