



# **Measuring Adult Criminal Victimization: Findings from the Anchorage Adult Criminal Victimization Survey**

Report to the  
Bureau of Justice Statistics

by

Matthew J. Giblin  
York College of Pennsylvania

for the

Alaska Justice Statistical Analysis Center  
Justice Center  
University of Alaska Anchorage



JC 0109.021

July 2003

# **Measuring Adult Criminal Victimization: Findings from the Anchorage Adult Criminal Victimization Survey**

Report to the

Bureau of Justice Statistics

by

Matthew J. Giblin  
York College of Pennsylvania

for the

Alaska Justice Statistical Analysis Center  
Justice Center  
University of Alaska Anchorage

JC 0109.021

July 2003

This research was supported by Grant No. 2001-BJ-CX-K030 awarded by the Bureau of Justice Statistics, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. Points of view in this document are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice. All contents within, including any errors or omissions, remain the responsibility of the author.

# Contents

<b>Acknowledgments .....</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>Highlights .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Overview of the Anchorage Adult Criminal Victimization Survey .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>2</b>
The Need for the AACVS .....	2
The AACVS Survey Instrument .....	3
Methods .....	3
Table 1. Last Disposition of Calls Made to 3,460 AACVS Telephone Numbers .....	4
Survey Respondents .....	5
Table 2. Demographic Characteristics of AACVS Respondents and Municipality of Anchorage Residents Based on Census 2000 .....	5
<b>Findings from the Victimization Survey .....</b>	<b>7</b>
Victimization Type and Rates .....	7
Table 3. Reported Victimization Types and Rates .....	7
Victimization Characteristics .....	8
Table 4. Personal Victimizations by Demographic Characteristics .....	8
Reporting Crimes to the Police .....	10
Table 5. Reasons for Not Reporting Victimization to Police .....	10
<b>Findings from the Community Policing Addendum .....</b>	<b>11</b>
Community Attitudes Regarding Neighborhood and City Quality of Life .....	11
Crime and Disorder in Respondent Neighborhoods .....	11
Table 6. Resident Satisfaction with Neighborhood Quality of Life .....	12
Table 7. Resident Satisfaction with City Quality of Life .....	13
Table 8. Percent of Respondents Identifying Conditions in Neighborhood .....	14
Table 9. Type of Serious Crime which Respondents Said Occurred in Neighborhood .....	14
Fear of Crime .....	15
Table 10. Sources of Information Regarding Serious Crime for Respondents Indicating that Serious Crime had Occurred in Their Neighborhood .....	15
Table 11. Respondent Level of Fear in Neighborhood .....	16
Table 12. Respondent Level of Fear in City .....	17
Table 13. Respondents Indicating that Disorder Made Them Feel Less Safe, by Type of Disorder Most Affecting Feelings of Safety .....	18
Protective Measures .....	19
Table 14. Percent of Respondents Indicating that They Take Protective Measures, by Protective Measures Taken at Home .....	19
Community Meetings .....	20
Table 15. Residents Fearful of Street Crime, by Type of Protective Measures Taken Outside the Home .....	20
Table 16. Percent of Residents Hearing About and Attending Community Meetings Concerning Crime .....	21

Contact with Local Police .....	22
Table 17. Contact with Local Police During Preceding 12-Month Period .....	22
Police Activities .....	23
Satisfaction with Local Police .....	23
Table 18. Resident Satisfaction with Local Police .....	24
Table 19. Level of Satisfaction with Police, by Respondent's Perception of Level of Police Presence .....	25
Table 20. Satisfaction with Police, by Respondent Knowledge of Community Policing and Perception of Community Policing in Local Department .....	25
<b>Appendix A. Victimization Definitions .....</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>Appendix B. Victimizations Reported by Specific Crime Type .....</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>Appendix C. Response and Cooperation Rates .....</b>	<b>33</b>

## Acknowledgments

Data for this project were collected as part of the Anchorage Adult Victimization Survey. The project was funded by a grant from the U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics to the Justice Center at the University of Alaska Anchorage as part of the 2001 State Justice Statistics program.

The author wishes to express his gratitude to Robert Langworthy, Darryl Wood, Antonia Moras, and Melissa Green for their constant assistance and patience with this project. The author would also like to extend his deepest appreciation to Heidi Wood and Kara McComas. Their contributions to the Anchorage Adult Victimization Survey ranged from software testing to interviewing and were critical to the success of the project. Additional thanks go to William Watson, Travis Harding, and Jim Stoneking. Their interviewing skills contributed greatly to the AACVS. Finally, thanks go to Jessica Smith, Hillary Pearson, and Richard Curtis for their assistance.

Opinions and analysis presented are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect those of the Justice Center, University of Alaska Anchorage; York College of Pennsylvania; or the Bureau of Justice Statistics.

## **Measuring Adult Criminal Victimization: Findings from the Anchorage Adult Criminal Victimization Survey**

### **Highlights**

- More than one-quarter (N=208, 27%) of survey respondents reported being victimized at least once during the year preceding the interview. Altogether, these 208 respondents experienced 284 separate victimization incidents.
- Larceny was the most common victimization type, accounting for nearly two-thirds of all victimizations reported. The most common violent victimization type was assault (both aggravated and simple).
- The “typical” violent victimization involved a single male offender age 30 or older. Relatively few violent crimes involved multiple offenders.
- Only about 35 percent of all victimizations, property or violent, were reported to the police. Most respondents suggested that they did not report the incident because it was a minor crime.
- The overwhelming majority of respondents (92%) are satisfied or very satisfied with the quality of life in their neighborhood. Slightly fewer (87%) reported being satisfied or very satisfied with the quality of life in their city.
- Many residents (63%) reported at least some disorderly conditions in their neighborhood. The most commonly cited disorderly conditions included poor lighting, empty lots, and public drinking and drug use.
- Most residents (81%) were not overly fearful (not very fearful, not at all fearful) of crime in their neighborhood. When asked about their level of fear of crime in the city, only 53 percent reported being not very fearful or not at all fearful.
- Respondents took a variety of protective measures in response to crime. The most common response was that residents looked out for each other’s safety. Nearly 40 percent reported keeping guns in the home and nearly 40 percent reported installing outside automatic lighting.
- Few (10%) residents heard about community meetings regarding crime and even fewer (2.4%) had actually attended one during the previous year.
- Two-thirds of respondents reported no change in the level of police presence in their neighborhood during the previous year. Few residents reported a decrease in police presence during the previous year. Nearly 15 percent reported never seeing police in their neighborhood.
- The vast majority of respondents (88.8%) were satisfied or very satisfied with the police in their neighborhood. Respondents who believed that the local police were doing community policing and respondents who saw an increase in police presence during the previous year were more satisfied than those who did not share such a belief.

# Overview of the Anchorage Adult Criminal Victimization Survey

## Introduction

Since 1973, the National Crime Victimization Survey has been administered annually to a national sample of households. The value of this national survey program is unequivocal: the survey captures unreported or underreported criminal events that are not available using official crime data such as the Uniform Crime Reports. However, the data collected are most useful in identifying crime trends nationwide. The national scope of the survey makes it impossible to extract crime data for smaller geographic areas, thus limiting the utility of this data for Anchorage residents and policymakers with criminal justice concerns. To compensate for this limitation, the Justice Center at the University of Alaska Anchorage administered a local version of the National Crime Victimization Survey during second quarter 2002. By surveying adult residents of Anchorage, the project, titled the Anchorage Adult Criminal Victimization Survey (hereafter referred to as the AACVS) generated a wealth of information on crime victimization, neighborhood conditions, fear, and policing in Anchorage. This report presents the results of the AACVS.

## The Need for the AACVS

Accurate measures of crime are essential for the formulation of criminal justice policy, the creation of prevention and intervention programs, and the development of criminological theory. There are two primary established crime data collection programs in operation in the United States.<sup>1</sup> The first, the Uniform Crime Reports (UCR) compiled by the FBI, relies on data provided by local police departments. These departments, in turn, are collecting data on crimes known or reported to the police. Statewide UCR statistics are available and are published annually; in Alaska, this information is included in the Department of Public Safety's yearly publication, *Crime Reported in Alaska*. However, despite several strengths (e.g., comprehensive homicide reports, descriptions of general crime trends), the UCR suffers the major limitation of only including crimes reported to the police, a significant weakness when one considers that a substantial portion of all crimes go unreported. This underreporting and the resulting underestimate of crime have led to the emergence of additional measures of crime.

To complement the UCR, the Bureau of Justice Statistics conducts an annual nationwide survey, the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS), to estimate rates of victimization across the country. This collection effort, begun in 1973, counts victimization regardless of whether or not the offense was reported to the police. While this data collection is successful in describing trends in national victimization rates, in providing characteristics of criminal victimization, and in documenting the

---

<sup>1</sup> A third program, the National Incident Based Reporting System, is designed to improve the reporting and statistical analysis capacity of law enforcement agencies. However, despite the growth of the NIBRS program and its potential to improve crime reporting, only 22 states currently have the system in place (see JSRA at <http://www.jrsa.org/ibrrc/index.html>).

so-called “dark figure of crime,” it has limited value to state and local policymakers, researchers, and practitioners. Since the NCVS is based on a national sample of respondents, individual communities or states represent only a small portion of the overall sample, thereby prohibiting the extraction of reliable state and local crime statistics. For example, Alaska’s population is approximately one-fifth of one percent of the nation’s population. As a result, it is highly unlikely that a significant number of Alaskans are interviewed in the NCVS to allow for estimates of crime rates.

In sum, the value of existing crime data collection programs for state and local officials is limited by the weaknesses inherent in both official crime statistics and national survey data. The limitations of official crime data are well-noted in criminological literature. The underreporting associated with UCR crime data contributes to an incomplete account of crime. While the National Crime Victimization Survey overcomes this limitation by documenting reported and unreported crime, its national scope prohibits its use in local policymaking and research. As a result, for local communities to better understand crime in their area it is necessary to duplicate the NCVS data collection effort at a local level. By administering a local crime victimization survey, policymakers, practitioners, and researchers are able to retain the completeness of the national NCVS while making victimization data more meaningful to local communities. Anchorage, Alaska, like most other cities, needs accurate and comprehensive crime data in order to assist in local criminal justice policymaking. Without more complete statistics, the crime picture in Anchorage is likely to be incomplete. It is precisely this incompleteness that this project attempted to overcome.

### **The AACVS Survey Instrument**

The AACVS was administered during second quarter 2002 using an instrument that was a near exact replica of the instrument used as part of the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) data collection program. The NCVS questions are time-tested (the program began in 1973) and comprehensive; questions address both violent and property victimizations regardless of whether or not the victimizations were actually reported to law enforcement. An additional series of questions was included in the AACVS. The U.S. Department of Justice’s Office of Community-Oriented Policing Services recently created the COPS Addendum, comprising questions pertaining to fear of crime, quality of life, perceptions of the police, and personal safety measures taken.

### **Methods**

The AACVS was administered using a computer-assisted telephone survey system to a sample of adult residents of Anchorage, Alaska. A single respondent from each selected household was selected to participate in the survey; households were selected using a random digit dialing (RDD) method. The RDD method ensured that all households with telephones, regardless of whether or not the household’s telephone number was listed in a directory, had an equal chance of being contacted by Justice Center researchers. This increases the likelihood that the households contacted were representative of all Anchorage residents.



A team of five research assistants administered the survey to residents selected through the RDD method. Once a household was contacted, interviewers introduced the survey to the individual who answered the phone and attempted to secure his or her participation in the survey. The research assistants placed most calls on weekdays between the hours of 10:00 am and 9:00 pm though they generally avoided placing calls during the dinnertime hours between 5:00 pm and 7:00 pm. On a small number of occasions, calls were made on weekends or outside of the designated calling hours; these calls primarily resulted from call-backs scheduled with the respondent or an individual familiar with the respondent's schedule.

### *Last Disposition of Telephone Numbers*

Each of the 3,460 telephone numbers randomly generated was dialed at least once and as many as nine times during the administration of the survey. Table 1 presents the last disposition for each of the 3,460 numbers.<sup>2</sup>

**Table 1. Last Disposition of Calls Made to 3,460 AACVS Telephone Numbers<sup>1</sup>**

	N	%	Cumulative %
<b>Interviews</b>			
Completed	733	21.18 %	21.18 %
<b>Eligible, non-interviews</b>			
Refusals	368	10.64 %	31.82 %
Interview break-offs	30	0.87	32.69
Respondent not available	11	0.32	33.01
Hearing problem	21	0.61	33.61
Language problem	55	1.59	35.20
<b>Unknown eligibility, non-interview</b>			
No answer	454	13.12 %	48.32 %
Answering machine/voice mail	599	17.31	65.64
Telephone busy	31	0.90	66.53
<b>Not eligible</b>			
Not in service/temp. not in service	584	16.88 %	83.41 %
Non-normal (fast busy)	198	5.72	89.13
Business, government, non-residential	200	5.78	94.91
Fax/data line	91	2.63	97.54
No adults 18+ in household	7	0.20	97.75
Pager/beeper	1	0.03	97.77
Number changed	9	0.26	98.03
Cell phone	3	0.09	98.12
No ring	1	0.03	98.15
Disconnected/temp. disconnected	5	0.14	98.29
Misc.	56	1.62	99.91
Non-working number	3	0.09	100.00

<sup>1</sup> Additional calls were made to secure 48 more completed responses. The call dispositions are not included here due to changes in the use of CATI software. See footnote 2 in text for information.

<sup>2</sup> Although Table 1 indicates that only 733 completed responses were obtained during survey administration, the remainder of this report uses a base of 781 completed responses. The 48 respondent discrepancy is the result of changes in the use of the CATI software. The software was used until mid-June 2002 at which time call attempts were continued without the aid of the call management functions of the CATI software. Additional calls were made to telephone numbers where the last disposition was busy, no answer, or answering machine. The content of the survey and its administration did not change but the call management function was no longer in place. As a result, last disposition data was not available beyond the point at which the original 733 interviews were secured. However, an additional 48 completed responses were obtained during the last part of June 2002. The dispositions of calls made to obtain these 48 interviews are not included in Table 1.

The final sample consisted of completed interviews from 781 respondents, representing a cooperation rate of 60.2 percent (see Appendix C for summary of cooperation rate computation). Given the relative rarity of criminal victimization, particularly violent victimization, the rates of violent victimization described throughout this report are based on very low numbers of victimizations. These rates should not be viewed as firm estimates of crime in Anchorage. More confidence can be given to property crime rates due to the relatively high incidence of property crime in Anchorage.

## Survey Respondents

Comparisons of AACVS respondent characteristics and Anchorage Census 2000 data reveal striking similarities between the two. Given that the survey was based on an RDD method of selecting households, it is not surprising that the two are similar. Table 2 presents frequency distributions for respondents in the AACVS survey and Census 2000. The frequency distributions for race, age, and Hispanic origin are roughly equivalent.

**Table 2. Demographic Characteristics of AACVS Respondents and Municipality of Anchorage Residents Based on Census 2000**

		AACVS Respondents		2000 Census	
		N	%	N	%
<b>Sex</b>	Male (age 18 or older)	299	38.3 %	92,953	50.4 %
	Female (age 18 or older)	481	61.6	91,459	49.6
	Refused	1	0.1	--	--
<b>Race<sup>1</sup></b>	White	597	76.5 %	188,009	72.2 %
	African-American	40	5.1	15,199	5.8
	Alaska Native/American Indian	49	6.3	18,941	7.3
	Asian/Pacific Islander	21	2.7	16,856	6.5
	Other	22	2.8	5,703	2.2
	Multiracial	27	3.5	15,575	6.0
	Don't know	1	0.1	--	--
	Refused	23	2.9	--	--
<b>Hispanic origin<sup>1</sup></b>	Hispanic	41	5.2 %	14,799	5.7 %
	Non-Hispanic	723	92.6	245,484	94.3
	Don't know	1	0.1	--	--
	Refused	16	2.0	--	--
<b>Age</b>	18-19	33	4.2 %	7,192	3.9 %
	20-24	60	7.7	17,694	9.6
	25-34	164	21.0	40,113	21.8
	35-44	179	22.9	48,210	26.1
	45-54	167	21.4	38,803	21.0
	55-64	106	13.6	18,158	9.9
	65+	57	7.3	14,242	7.7
	Don't know	1	0.1	--	--
	Refused	14	1.8	--	--
<b>Household Income (# and % of households)<sup>2</sup></b>					
	Less than \$50,000	283	36.2 %	42,108	44.3 %
	\$50,000 or more	344	44.0	52,972	55.7
	Don't know	37	4.7	--	--
	Refused	117	15.0	--	--

<sup>1</sup> Census data related to race and Hispanic origin refer to the entire population while the data for the AACVS refer to respondents age 18 years and older.

<sup>2</sup> A \$50,000 dividing mark was used since the Census and AACVS categories only corresponded at this mark.

At first glance, there appears to be disparity in the household income category, 44 percent of AACVS households and 55.7 percent of Census 2000 households reported household incomes of \$50,000 or greater.<sup>3</sup> However, this disparity is largely due to the number of household respondents in the AACVS survey who refused to answer or did not know their household income. If the “don’t know” and “refused” categories are excluded, 54.9 percent of AACVS households had incomes of \$50,000 or greater, nearly identical to the percent reported in Census 2000. Of course, we must exercise caution in stressing this similarity since we do not know whether those who did not respond or did not know are similar to those individuals who actually responded to the question. Of the characteristics subjected to comparison, only sex differs substantially; the AACVS sample is disproportionately female when compared to Anchorage Census 2000 data. The research method is likely the factor contributing to this difference. The RDD method ensures the random selection of households. Recall that each household has an equal chance of being selected for inclusion in the study. The method does not, however, provide for random selection of respondents within households.

The remainder of this report presents substantive findings from the AACVS. Section 2 describes results from the victimization portion of the survey, including type and rate of victimization, characteristics of victimizations, and reporting to the police. Section 3 presents findings from the Community Policing Addendum, including issues related to resident fear, perceptions of quality of life, and perceptions of the police.

---

<sup>3</sup> Later analyses examining income include eight separate categories instead of the simple \$50,000 dichotomy. The dichotomy is used here due to the fact that \$50,000 is the only place where Census and AACVS categories correspond.

## Findings from the Victimization Survey

### Victimization Type and Rates

Respondents to the AACVS reported a total of 284 separate victimizations to survey interviewers, including 54 violent crimes, 2 completed pocket pickings, and 228 property crimes.<sup>4</sup> The victimizations were experienced by 208 residents, more than one-quarter (26.6%) of the total interview sample of 781. Of these 208 respondents, 152 (73.1%) reported one victimization in the year prior to the interview, 44 (21.1%) reported two victimizations, seven (3.3%) reported three victimizations, two (.9%) reported four victimizations, and three (1.4%) reported five victimizations.<sup>5</sup>

Specific crime designations are assigned to each incident based on answers to questions presented throughout the AACVS. Table 3 presents the number and type of victimizations reported and the rate per 1,000 respondents.<sup>6</sup> Property victimization rates (burglary/forcible entry, larceny, motor vehicle theft) are expressed as a rate per 1,000 households while violent victimization rates (robbery, assault, threats) and pocket picking are expressed as a rate per 1,000 individuals.<sup>7</sup> In the AACVS, property victimization rate of 291.9 per 1,000 far surpassed the violent victimization rate of 69.1. Clearly, the most common victimization involved a larceny or attempted larceny; nearly two-thirds of all victimizations reported in the AACVS were larceny-related. Burglary/forcible entry, though considerably less common than larceny, was the second-most experienced victimization. Respondents were less frequently the victims of violent crimes although actual, attempted, and threatened assaults were quite common, affecting approximately 1 in 20 survey respondents.

**Table 3. Reported Victimization Types and Rates**

Victimization type	N	Rate per 1,000 respondents
<b>Violent victimizations</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>69.1</b>
Completed/attempted robbery	7	9.0
Assault (aggravated & simple)	28	35.9
Verbal threat of assault	17	21.8
Verbal threat of rape/verbal threat of sexual assault	2	2.6
<b>Completed pocket picking</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2.6</b>
<b>Property victimizations</b>	<b>228</b>	<b>291.9</b>
Larceny/attempted larceny	185	236.9
Burglary/forcible entry	30	38.4
Completed/attempted motor vehicle theft	13	16.6

<sup>4</sup> Each of the 781 respondents currently resided in Anchorage. All but 27 of the 284 incidents occurred in the same city as the respondent's residence. Of the 27 cases that did not occur in the same city as the place of residence, 17 involved larceny, three involved completed motor vehicle theft, three involved completed burglary with forcible entry, and one each involved completed burglary without forcible entry, simple assault, and attempted robbery. For the purposes of this report, all victimizations are included in the analyses regardless of whether or not the victimization occurred in Anchorage.

<sup>5</sup> Eight of the 284 incidents were considered series; that is, the respondent described the most recent incident but acknowledged that the victimization had occurred five or more times during the previous year, the incidents were similar in detail, and indistinguishable from one another. Five of these series incidents were personal crimes and three were property crimes.

<sup>6</sup> A similar table with finer crime distinctions is available in Appendix B.

<sup>7</sup> The NCVS does not classify pocket picking as either a property crime or a violent crime. As such, it will be its own category throughout this report.

## Victimization Characteristics

### *Violent Crimes*

The data gathered allow for a more thorough examination of the characteristics of the 284 victimizations. Some of these characteristics are discussed here. First, Table 4 shows the demographic characteristics of the victims in the 54 violent crime incidents. Extreme caution must be exercised before making any substantive conclusions based on the rates disaggregated by gender, race, age, and income. Given the very small number of violent victimizations reported in the survey, the

**Table 4. Personal Victimizations by Demographic Characteristics**

		Total number of respondents	Victimizations	
			N	Rate per 1,000 <sup>1</sup>
Total personal victimization rate		781	54	69.1
Sex				
	Male (age 18 or older)	299	20	66.9
	Female (age 18 or older)	481	24	49.9
	Refused	1	--	--
Race <sup>1</sup>				
	White	597	39	65.3
	African-American	40	3	75.0
	Alaska Native/American Indian	49	7	142.9
	Asian/Pacific Islander	21	--	--
	Other	22	--	--
	Multiracial	27	5	185.2
	Don't know	1	--	--
	Refused	23	--	--
Hispanic origin <sup>1</sup>				
	Hispanic	41	3	73.2
	Non-Hispanic	723	51	70.5
	Don't know	1	--	--
	Refused	16	--	--
Age				
	18-19	33	5	151.5
	20-24	60	6	100.0
	25-34	164	18	109.8
	35-44	179	12	67.0
	45-54	167	10	59.9
	55-64	106	2	18.9
	65 +	57	1	17.5
	Don't know	1	--	--
	Refused	14	--	--
Household income (# and % of households)				
	Less than \$10,000	17	4	235.3
	\$10,000-\$19,999	41	4	97.6
	\$20,000-\$29,999	76	9	118.4
	\$30,000-\$39,999	69	12	173.9
	\$40,000-\$49,999	80	5	62.5
	\$50,000-\$59,999	79	3	38.0
	\$60,000-\$69,999	52	4	76.9
	\$70,000 or more	213	10	46.9
	Don't know	37	2	54.1
	Refused	117	1	8.5

<sup>1</sup> Rates for each category are computed by dividing the number of victimizations by the number of respondents and multiplying by 1,000. For example, for male respondents, 20 is divided by 299 and the quotient is then multiplied by 1,000.

individual cell counts are very small and the rates are very sensitive to minor changes.<sup>8</sup> For example, we could not conclude from this table that individuals in the Asian/Pacific Islander category experience no violent victimizations. The only thing that we can say is that Asian/Pacific Islander respondents in the AACVS sample did not report any violent victimizations.

The table shows that, at least in the sample of 781 respondents interviewed for the AACVS, younger individuals, those with household incomes below \$40,000, Alaska Natives, and multi-racial respondents were the victims of violent crimes at higher rates than other respondents. In each case, the victimization rate is well above the rate of 69.1 per 1,000 for the sample as a whole.

Respondents knew about the number of offenders in all 54 violent victimization incidents. Of the 54 violent victimizations, 47 (87.0%) involved only a single offender as reported by the respondents. In these 47 incidents, a male was the perpetrator 91.5 percent of the time. In 6.4 percent of incidents, the offender was perceived to be under the age of 18 while more than half (63.8%) of incidents, the offender was believed to be age 30 or older. Nearly three-quarters (70.2%) of victims knew the offender or had seen him/her before.

In seven of the 54 violent victimizations, the respondent reported multiple offenders (2 offenders in 5 cases, 3 offenders in 1 case, and 4 offenders in 1 case). In 57.1 percent of these cases, the offenders were perceived to be all male while in 14.3 percent of cases, the offenders were both male and female. In only one incident where multiple offenders were involved was the oldest offender perceived to be age 30 or above. The victim knew all or some of the offenders in 42.9 percent of the multiple offender incidents.

Weapons were used in nearly one-fifth of all violent crime victimizations (20.8%), including four aggravated assaults, one attempted robbery, four attempted aggravated assaults, and one threatened assault. Of the 11 incidents where a weapon was used, five (45.5%) involved the use of a blunt object, four (36.4%) involved the use of a handgun, while the remaining three (27.3%) involved the use of either a firearm other than a handgun, a knife, or a sharp object other than a knife.

### *Property Crimes*

Since very few property crime victims knew anything about the perpetrator of the property crime. The characteristics of the offender and the weapon, if any, used will not be presented. However, other characteristics of property crimes will be presented in this section. Property crime victimizations occurred at or immediately near the residence of the respondent. In 26.3 percent of cases, the crime occurred in the respondent's dwelling or a detached building on the property. In another 41.2 percent of cases, the incident happened in the respondent's yard, driveway, apartment hall, laundry area, or storage area, or on the sidewalk or street immediately adjacent to the property. Other common property crime locations include school buildings/on school property (6.1%) or commercial parking lots/garages (5.7%). The remaining cases occurred in a variety of places including, but not limited to, a friend or relative's house, a street not adjacent to the respondent's own dwelling, and commercial buildings.

Nearly 91 percent (90.8%, N=207) of the 228 property crime victimizations involved the actual taking of some item. Commonly taken items include bicycles or bicycle parts (15.9% of the 207

<sup>8</sup> Instead of reporting no victimizations or a victimization rate of 0 for certain demographic categories, cells with no entries will be denoted with the symbol --.--.

property victimizations involving stolen items), portable electronics not television/stereo system (10.6%), tools or office equipment (10.1%), personal/portable objects (9.7%), motor vehicle parts (9.2%), toys or recreational equipment (8.2%), and cash (6.8%). Note that multiple items could have been taken in each incident. The property was rarely recovered once taken; in fact, in only 16.4 percent of property victimizations involving actual theft did the respondent recover all or some of the stolen items.

## Reporting Crimes to the Police

One of the primary strengths of victimization surveys when compared to official statistics is the ability of victimization surveys to document crimes regardless of whether or not they are reported to the police. This is especially important given the rate of underreporting. In the AACVS, nearly two-thirds (65.8%) of the 284 violent, pocket picking, and property victimizations went unreported. Somewhat unexpectedly, the percent of property victimizations that go unreported (66.2%) is nearly identical to the percent of violent victimizations that go unreported (63.0%). Neither of the two pocket picket incidents was reported to the police. A total of 187 out of 284 victimizations went unreported to the police (four respondents did not know whether crime was reported). As Table 5 shows, the most common reason for not reporting the offense, given for 37.4 percent of all unreported victimizations, was the belief that it was a minor crime. Other common reasons given include inability to recovered stolen property (12.3% of all unreported victimizations), lack of proof (11.2%), reported to other official (9.6), personal matter (9.1%), and not important to police (9.1%).

**Table 5. Reasons for Not Reporting Victimization to Police**

Crimes were not reported in 187 incidents.

Reason	N	% of all unreported incidents <sup>1</sup>
Minor crime	70	37.4 %
Cannot recover property	23	12.3
Lack of proof	21	11.2
Reported to other official	18	9.6
Other	18	9.6
Personal matter	17	9.1
Not important to police	17	9.1
Child offender	11	5.9
Don't know	10	5.3
Police inefficient	6	3.2
Fear reprisal	6	3.2
No insurance	5	2.7
Not clear it was a crime	4	2.1
Police biased	4	2.1
Too inconvenient	4	2.1
To protect offender	3	1.6
Found out too late	2	1.1
Advised not to report	2	1.1
Refused	1	0.5

<sup>1</sup> Percents do not total 100% since multiple reasons were allowed.



## **Findings from the Community Policing Addendum**

### **Community Attitudes Regarding Neighborhood and City Quality of Life**

All respondents were asked to identify their level of satisfaction with the quality of life in their neighborhood and in their city. Table 6 presents the findings regarding neighborhood quality of life. Clearly, the vast majority of residents are satisfied with the quality of life in their neighborhood. In fact, approximately 9 out of 10 residents (92.2%) reported that they were either satisfied or very satisfied. The mean rating for all respondents was 3.35 on a four-point scale (1 representing very dissatisfied and 4 representing very satisfied). The mean ratings were largely consistent across sex, race, and Hispanic origin categories. However, significant differences emerged depending upon the age and household income of the respondent. Older residents, specifically those age 55 and above, expressed greater satisfaction with the quality of life in their neighborhoods when compared to younger residents. In addition, Table 6 shows that, as respondents' reported household income increases, so too does their level of satisfaction with the police.

Respondents generally expressed satisfaction with the quality of life in their city as well. Table 7 shows that nearly 87 percent of respondents reported that they were either satisfied or very satisfied with the quality of life in the city. Note that, although residents are generally satisfied, their mean rating for the quality of life in the city (3.03) is considerably less than their rating for neighborhood quality of life (3.35). In other words, as a group, the respondents are more satisfied with the quality of life within their neighborhoods than they are with the quality of life in the city as a whole ( $p < .001$ ). Focusing only on responses for city quality of life, other differences are evident. First, the mean rating for male respondents (3.10) is significantly higher than the mean rating for female respondents (3.00). Second, white respondents have a higher mean rating (3.08) than any other group. The difference between whites and Alaska Native/American Indian respondents (2.77) is significant. Finally, respondents with household incomes between \$50,000 and \$59,999 were more satisfied with the quality of life in their city than were other groups, particularly those with household incomes between \$20,000 and \$29,999.

### **Crime and Disorder in Respondent Neighborhoods**

Table 8 reports on neighborhood conditions commonly referred to as disorder. These conditions include social/behavioral disorder (illegal public drinking/drug use, public drug sales, prostitution, panhandling/begging, loitering/hanging out, truancy, transients or homeless sleeping on streets or benches) and physical disorder (abandoned cars/buildings, rundown/neglected buildings, poor lighting, overgrown shrubs/trees, trash, empty lots, vandalism or graffiti). The most commonly cited condition, identified by 23 percent of respondents, was poor lighting in their neighborhood. Nearly one in five respondents identified empty lots (19.1%) and illegal public drinking and/or drug use (8.6%) as conditions occurring within their neighborhood. Less common were public drug sales (10.6%) and prostitution (4.9%).



**Table 6. Resident Satisfaction with Neighborhood Quality of Life<sup>1</sup>**

*Question:* How satisfied are you with the quality of life in your neighborhood? Are you very satisfied, satisfied, dissatisfied, or very dissatisfied?

	Total respondents	Mean rating <sup>2</sup>	Dissatisfied		Satisfied	
			% very dissatisfied	% dissatisfied	% satisfied	% very satisfied
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>778</b>	<b>3.35</b>	<b>1.5 %</b>	<b>6.3 %</b>	<b>47.6 %</b>	<b>44.6 %</b>
<b>Sex</b>						
Male	296	3.38	0.7 %	4.4 %	51.0 %	43.9 %
Female	481	3.34	2.1	7.3	45.5	45.1
Refused	1	2.00	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Race</b>						
White	594	3.39	1.3 %	5.7 %	46.0 %	47.0 %
African-American	40	3.33	2.5	5.0	50.0	42.5
Alaska Native/American Indian	49	3.14	4.1	12.2	49.0	34.7
Asian/Pacific Islander	21	3.38	0.0	4.8	52.4	42.9
Other	22	3.41	0.0	4.5	50.0	45.5
Multi-racial	27	3.22	0.0	7.4	63.0	29.6
Don't know	1	3.00	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Refused	23	3.09	4.3	13.0	52.2	30.4
<b>Hispanic origin</b>						
Hispanic	41	3.37	0.0	2.4	58.5	39.0
Non-Hispanic	720	3.36	1.5	6.4	46.9	45.1
Don't know	1	4.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Refused	16	3.06	6.3	12.5	50.0	31.3
<b>Age**</b>						
18-19	33	3.06	6.1 %	6.1 %	63.6 %	24.2 %
20-24	60	3.28	1.7	3.3	60.0	35.0
25-34	164	3.26	1.2	10.4	50.0	38.4
35-44	177	3.37	1.1	7.9	43.5	47.5
45-54	166	3.36	2.4	3.6	50.0	44.0
55-64	106	3.48	0.0	3.8	44.3	51.9
65+	57	3.63	0.0	3.5	29.8	66.7
Don't know	1	4.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Refused	14	3.00	7.1	14.3	50.0	28.6
<b>Household income*</b>						
Less than \$10,000	17	3.12	11.8 %	0.0 %	52.9 %	35.3 %
\$10,000-\$19,999	39	3.13	2.6	12.8	53.8	30.8
\$20,000-\$29,999	76	3.20	2.6	10.5	51.3	35.5
\$30,000-\$39,999	69	3.25	0.0	10.1	55.1	34.8
\$40,000-\$49,999	80	3.35	2.5	5.0	47.5	45.0
\$50,000-\$59,999	79	3.41	0.0	5.1	49.4	45.6
\$60,000-\$69,999	52	3.42	0.0	1.9	53.8	44.2
\$70,000 or more	213	3.46	0.5	6.6	39.9	53.1
Don't know	37	3.27	5.4	2.7	51.4	40.5
Refused	116	3.40	1.7	4.3	46.6	47.4

1 Excludes respondents answering don't know/refuse to question about satisfaction (n=3) and one respondent for whom race information was missing from the race/fear cross-tabulations.

2 Meaning ratings are based on a four-point scale ranging from very dissatisfied (1) to very satisfied (4). Higher mean ratings indicate greater satisfaction.

\* Differences significant (p < .05). \*\*Differences significant (p < .001).

**Table 7. Resident Satisfaction with City Quality of Life<sup>1</sup>**

*Question:* How satisfied are you with the quality of life in your city? Are you very satisfied, satisfied, dissatisfied, or very dissatisfied?

		Total respondent	Mean rating <sup>2</sup>	Dissatisfied		Satisfied	
				% very dissatisfied	% dissatisfied	% satisfied	% very satisfied
All respondents		769	3.03	0.9 %	12.7 %	68.5 %	17.8 %
Sex							
	Male	293	3.10	0.3 %	9.9 %	69.6 %	20.1 %
	Female	475	3.00	1.3	14.3	68.0	16.4
	Refused	1	2.00	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
Race							
	White	589	3.08	0.5 %	10.5 %	69.8 %	19.2 %
	African-American	39	3.00	2.6	10.3	71.8	15.4
Alaska Native/American Indian		48	2.77	6.3	20.8	62.5	10.4
	Asian/Pacific Islander	21	2.95	0.0	19.0	66.7	14.3
	Other	22	2.77	0.0	31.8	59.1	9.1
	Multi-racial	26	2.88	0.0	30.8	50.0	19.2
	Don't know	1	3.00	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
	Refused	22	3.05	0.0	9.1	77.3	13.6
Hispanic origin							
	Hispanic	41	2.95	0.0	22.0	61.0	17.1
	Non-Hispanic	712	3.04	1.0	12.1	69.1	17.8
	Don't know	1	4.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
	Refused	15	2.93	0.0	20.0	66.7	13.3
Age							
	18-19	31	2.81	6.5 %	6.5 %	87.1 %	0.0 %
	20-24	59	3.07	0.0	6.8	79.7	13.6
	25-34	163	3.02	0.0	12.9	71.8	15.3
	35-44	176	3.06	1.7	11.9	64.8	21.6
	45-54	165	3.07	0.6	11.5	67.9	20.0
	55-64	104	2.95	1.0	22.1	57.7	19.2
	65 +	56	3.11	0.0	8.9	71.4	19.6
	Don't know	1	4.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
	Refused	14	2.86	0.0	21.4	71.4	7.1
Household income*							
	Less than \$10,000	17	2.94	0.0 %	23.5 %	58.8 %	17.6 %
	\$10,000-\$19,999	37	2.92	2.7	16.2	67.6	13.5
	\$20,000-\$29,999	75	2.88	1.3	20.0	68.0	10.7
	\$30,000-\$39,999	68	2.90	0.0	23.5	63.2	13.2
	\$40,000-\$49,999	79	3.04	3.8	11.4	62.0	22.8
	\$50,000-\$59,999	78	3.21	0.0	7.7	64.1	28.2
	\$60,000-\$69,999	52	3.08	0.0	9.6	73.1	17.3
	\$70,000 or more	212	3.08	0.0	11.3	69.3	19.3
	Don't know	36	2.94	2.8	13.9	69.4	13.9
	Refused	115	3.06	0.9	7.0	77.4	14.8

<sup>1</sup> Excludes respondents answering don't know/refuse to question about satisfaction (n=12) and one respondent for whom race information was missing from the race/fear cross-tabulations.

<sup>2</sup> Meaning ratings are based on a four-point scale ranging from very dissatisfied (1) to very satisfied (4). Higher mean ratings indicate greater satisfaction.

\* Differences significant (p < .05).

\*\*Differences significant (p < .01)

**Table 8. Percent of Respondents Identifying Conditions in Neighborhood**

(N = 781)

*Question:* Do any of the following conditions or activities exist in your neighborhood?

Condition	Yes	No	Don't know	Refused
Abandoned cars/buildings	14.1 %	84.9 %	0.9 %	0.1 %
Rundown/neglected buildings	15.4	84.3	0.3	0.1
Poor lighting	23.0	76.3	0.5	0.1
Overgrown shrubs/trees	17.9	81.0	0.9	0.1
Trash	15.1	84.6	0.1	0.1
Empty lots	19.1	80.2	0.6	0.1
Illegal public drinking/drug use	19.1	74.3	6.5	0.1
Public drug sales	8.6	80.2	11.1	0.1
Vandalism or graffiti	18.8	80.5	0.5	0.1
Prostitution	4.9	88.9	6.1	0.1
Panhandling or begging	10.2	89.5	0.1	0.1
Loitering or hanging out	18.4	81.3	0.1	0.1
Truancy/youth skipping school	15.1	64.8	20.0	0.1
Transients/homeless sleeping on streets or benches	10.6	88.9	0.4	0.1

In addition to questions about disorder, residents were also asked to indicate whether any serious crime had occurred within their neighborhood during the past 12 months. Nearly one-quarter of all respondents (23.3%) acknowledged that some type of serious crime had occurred during the past year. These respondents were then asked to identify the types of crimes occurring. The most commonly cited crime was breaking and entering; nearly 10 percent of all respondents (9.6%) stated that breaking and entering had occurred within their neighborhood during the previous 12 months (see Table 9). Between 6 and 7 percent of residents reported that thefts of personal property (6.0%), violent physical attacks (6.8%), and crimes committed with guns (6.4%) had occurred.

**Table 9. Type of Serious Crime which Respondents Said Occurred in Neighborhood<sup>1</sup>***Question:* Which of the following types of serious crime do you know to have occurred in your neighborhood during the last 12 months?

Crime	Residents reporting these crimes in neighborhood	
	N	% of all residents
People openly selling drugs	34	4.4 %
People using drugs	43	5.5
Auto theft	30	3.8
Theft of personal property	47	6.0
Breaking and entering to steal	75	9.6
Violent physical attacks	53	6.8
Crimes committed with guns	50	6.4
Sexual assault/rape	8	1.0
Murder	26	3.3

<sup>1</sup> This question asked of only those respondents indicating that some serious crime had occurred in their neighborhood (N = 182).

In order to determine where respondents obtain their information about crime, the 182 respondents who reported that serious crime had occurred in their neighborhood were asked to identify how they found out about crime. Table 10 presents the findings. Respondents indicating that serious crime had occurred within their neighborhood generally learned of the crime through conversations with neighbors, neighborhood association newsletters, and/or community meetings (55.5%). A large number of respondents (57.7%) reported that they found out about crime because they were either the victim of a crime, they witnessed a criminal act, and/or they knew of someone who had been victimized. Slightly more than one-quarter (26.9%) of respondents reporting serious crime suggested that their information about crime comes from the media. Relatively few (7.1%) received their information about crime directly from the police. Overall, more than 60 percent (60.4%) of the 781 survey respondents considered themselves well-informed about crime in their neighborhood.

**Table 10. Sources of Information Regarding Serious Crime for Respondents Indicating that Serious Crime had Occurred in Their Neighborhood**

N = 182

*Question:* How did you find out about this/these [serious] crimes?

Source of information	Respondents indicating source as way they found out about crime	
	N	Percent <sup>1</sup>
Respondent or someone they knew victimized	54	29.7 %
Witnessed acts	51	28.0
Through conversations, community meetings, neighborhood newsletters	101	55.5
Directly from police	13	7.1
From media	49	26.9
From public kiosk/substation	0	0.0
Other	18	9.9

<sup>1</sup> Percent totals do not equal 100% since some respondents indicated multiple sources.

## Fear of Crime

Survey respondents were asked several questions concerning their level of fear in their neighborhood and the city. Respondents indicated that they were not overly fearful of crime in their neighborhood. The mean rating (1.91) was very close to “not very fearful” on the four-point scale (1 representing not at all fearful and 4 very fearful). Only about 1 in 5 respondents (20.5%) acknowledged being very fearful or somewhat fearful of crime in their neighborhood. The analysis revealed that female respondents were more fearful than male respondents. In addition, respondents answering

“don’t know” to the household income question had significantly lower levels of fear than respondents with other income categories.<sup>9</sup>

**Table 11. Respondent Level of Fear in Neighborhood<sup>1</sup>**

*Question:* How fearful are you about crime in your neighborhood? Are you very fearful, somewhat fearful, not very fearful, or not at all fearful?

	Total respondents	Mean rating <sup>2</sup>	Not fearful		Fearful	
			% not at all fearful	% not very fearful	% fearful	% very fearful
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>778</b>	<b>1.91</b>	<b>32.1 %</b>	<b>47.3 %</b>	<b>17.7 %</b>	<b>2.8 %</b>
<b>Sex**</b>						
Male	297	1.81	36.4 %	46.8 %	16.2 %	0.7 %
Female	480	1.97	29.6	47.7	18.5	4.2
Refused	1	3.00	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
<b>Race*</b>						
White	595	1.91	31.3 %	48.6 %	17.8 %	2.4 %
African-American	40	1.75	45.0	37.5	15.0	2.5
Alaska Native/American Indian	49	2.18	24.5	40.8	26.5	8.2
Asian/Pacific Islander	20	1.80	40.0	45.0	10.0	5.0
Other	22	1.68	59.1	18.2	18.2	4.5
Multi-racial	27	1.85	22.2	70.4	7.4	0.0
Don't know	1	4.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Refused	23	1.87	30.4	52.2	17.4	0.0
<b>Hispanic origin</b>						
Hispanic	41	1.93	39.0	39.0	12.2	9.8
Non-Hispanic	720	1.92	31.4	48.2	17.9	2.5
Don't know	1	1.00	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Refused	16	1.81	43.8	31.3	25.0	0.0
<b>Age</b>						
18-19	33	1.64	54.5 %	27.3 %	18.2 %	0.0 %
20-24	60	1.78	38.3	46.7	13.3	1.7
25-34	164	1.93	32.3	46.3	17.7	3.7
35-44	176	1.99	27.8	49.4	18.8	4.0
45-54	167	1.98	26.3	52.1	19.2	2.4
55-64	106	1.89	34.9	44.3	17.9	2.8
65+	57	1.77	38.6	47.4	12.3	1.8
Don't know	1	2.00	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
Refused	14	2.00	28.6	42.9	28.6	0.0
<b>Household Income**</b>						
Less than \$10,000	17	2.18	47.1 %	5.9 %	29.4 %	17.6 %
\$10,000-\$19,999	40	2.20	32.5	30.0	22.5	15.0
\$20,000-\$29,999	75	1.96	29.3	49.3	17.3	4.0
\$30,000-\$39,999	69	2.04	24.6	47.8	26.1	1.4
\$40,000-\$49,999	80	1.89	35.0	45.0	16.3	3.8
\$50,000-\$59,999	79	2.03	21.5	55.7	21.5	1.3
\$60,000-\$69,999	52	1.87	32.7	50.0	15.4	1.9
\$70,000 or more	213	1.87	30.0	54.0	14.6	1.4
Don't know	36	1.50	61.1	27.8	11.1	0.0
Refused	117	1.83	35.9	46.2	17.1	0.9

<sup>1</sup> Excludes respondents answering don't know/refuse to question about satisfaction (n=3), and one respondent for whom race information was missing from the race/fear cross-tabulations.

<sup>2</sup> Meaning ratings are based on a four-point scale ranging from not at all fearful (1) to very fearful (4). Higher mean ratings indicate greater levels of fear.

\* Differences significant (p<.05). \*\*Differences significant (p<.01).

<sup>9</sup> Table 11 indicates significant differences in fear based on race. The analysis was unstable and the significance level influenced by the single respondent answering “don’t know” to the race question. Excluding this respondent, no significant differences exist.

Respondents' level of fear in their city (2.41) was higher than respondent level of fear in their neighborhood (1.91) and the differences were statistically significant ( $p < .001$ ). Table 12 shows that nearly half (46.6%) of all respondents expressed some fear about crime in their city. Once again, female respondents reported higher levels of fear than male respondents. Respondents with household incomes in the \$10,000-\$19,999 and \$30,000-\$39,999 categories also reported higher levels of fear in the city.

**Table 12. Respondent Level of Fear in City<sup>1</sup>**

*Question:* How fearful are you about crime in your city? Are you very fearful, somewhat fearful, not very fearful, or not at all fearful?

	Total respondents	Mean rating <sup>2</sup>	Not fearful		Fearful	
			% not at all fearful	% not very fearful	% fearful	% very fearful
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>773</b>	<b>2.41</b>	<b>10.6 %</b>	<b>42.8 %</b>	<b>41.8 %</b>	<b>4.8 %</b>
<b>Sex**</b>						
Male	296	2.23	15.5 %	48.6 %	32.8 %	3.0 %
Female	476	2.51	7.6	39.3	47.3	5.9
Refused	1	3.00	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
<b>Race</b>						
White	589	2.40	8.8 %	46.0 %	41.9 %	3.2 %
African-American	40	2.30	22.5	35.0	32.5	10.0
Alaska Native/American Indian	49	2.55	18.4	20.4	49.0	12.2
Asian/Pacific Islander	21	2.38	14.3	38.1	42.9	4.8
Other	22	2.55	18.2	22.7	45.5	13.6
Multi-racial	27	2.52	3.7	44.4	48.1	3.7
Don't know	1	4.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Refused	23	2.22	17.4	47.8	30.4	4.3
<b>Hispanic origin</b>						
Hispanic	41	2.44	14.6	31.7	48.8	4.9
Non-Hispanic	715	2.41	10.1	43.6	41.5	4.8
Don't know	1	3.00	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Refused	16	2.19	25.0	37.5	31.3	6.3
<b>Age</b>						
18-19	33	2.42	3.0 %	54.5 %	39.4 %	3.0 %
20-24	60	2.32	10.0	50.0	38.3	1.7
25-34	161	2.34	13.0	45.3	36.6	5.0
35-44	177	2.47	8.5	41.2	44.6	5.6
45-54	167	2.41	10.2	43.7	41.3	4.8
55-64	106	2.46	13.2	34.0	46.2	6.6
65+	55	2.42	10.9	40.0	45.5	3.6
Don't know	1	2.00	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
Refused	13	2.31	15.4	38.5	46.2	0.0
<b>Household Income*</b>						
Less than \$10,000	17	2.18	35.3 %	17.6 %	41.2 %	5.9 %
\$10,000-\$19,999	39	2.69	12.8	17.9	56.4	12.8
\$20,000-\$29,999	74	2.35	12.2	44.6	39.2	4.1
\$30,000-\$39,999	69	2.57	2.9	46.4	42.0	8.7
\$40,000-\$49,999	80	2.48	8.8	38.8	48.8	3.8
\$50,000-\$59,999	78	2.45	6.4	46.2	43.6	3.8
\$60,000-\$69,999	52	2.31	9.6	53.8	32.7	3.8
\$70,000 or more	213	2.43	8.0	44.1	44.6	3.3
Don't know	36	2.25	22.2	38.9	30.6	8.3
Refused	115	2.26	15.7	46.1	34.8	3.5

<sup>1</sup> Excludes respondents answering don't know/refuse to question about satisfaction (n=8) and one respondent for whom race information was missing from the race/fear cross-tabulations.

<sup>2</sup> Meaning ratings are based on a four-point scale ranging from not at all fearful (1) to very fearful (4). Higher mean ratings indicate greater levels of fear.

\* Differences significant ( $p < .05$ ). \*\*Differences significant ( $p > .001$ ).

For most respondents, fear of crime went unchanged during the year preceding the survey interview. Of the 160 respondents who were somewhat or very fearful of crime in their neighborhood and the 360 respondents who were somewhat or very fearful of crime in their city, 62.5 percent and 73.1 percent, respectively, indicated that their level of fear had not changed during the preceding 12 months. Nevertheless, fear did change for some respondents. Nearly one-third (29.4%) of respondents who reported some level of fear of crime in their neighborhood acknowledged that their level of fear had increased while 7.5 percent reported a decrease. For respondents reporting fear of crime in their city, 22.8 percent indicated that their fears had increased while 3.6 percent reported that their fears had decreased during the prior year.

Recall the earlier finding that a sizeable number of respondents reported certain disorderly behaviors (illegal public drinking/drug use, public drug sales, prostitution, panhandling/begging, loitering/hanging out, truancy, transients homeless sleeping on streets or benches) and disorderly conditions (abandoned cars/buildings, run down/neglected buildings, poor lighting, overgrown shrubs/trees, trash, empty lots, vandalism or graffiti) in their neighborhood. Slightly more than 60 percent (61.5%) of respondents reported at least one of these disorderly behaviors or conditions in their neighborhood. These 480 respondents were then asked to indicate whether the condition(s) made them feel less safe. About one-quarter (22.9%) of these respondents stated that one or more of the conditions made them feel less safe in their neighborhood. As evident in Table 13, respondents who felt less safe due to the disorderly conditions most often cited illegal public drinking and drug use (17.3%), public drug sales (16.4%), loitering or hanging out (13.6%), and poor lighting (12.7%) as the conditions most affecting their feelings of safety.

**Table 13. Respondents Indicating that Disorder Made Them Feel Less Safe, by Type of Disorder Most Affecting Feelings of Safety<sup>1</sup>**

N = 110

*Question:* Which one of the conditions just mentioned affects your feeling of safety the most?

Type of disorder	Number	Percent
Illegal public drinking/drug use	19	17.3 %
Public drug sales	18	16.4
Loitering or hanging out	15	13.6
Poor lighting	14	12.7
Vandalism or graffiti	11	10.0
Transients/homeless sleeping on streets or benches	11	10.0
Truancy/youth skipping school	5	4.5
Abandoned cars/buildings	4	3.6
Panhandling or begging	3	2.7
Overgrown shrubs/trees	2	1.8
Trash	2	1.8
Prostitution	2	1.8
Rundown/neglected buildings	1	0.9
Refused	1	0.9
Empty lots	0	0.0
Don't know	2	1.8

<sup>1</sup> Asked of 110 respondents reporting that neighborhood disorder made them feel less safe.

About one in five residents (17.9%) reported that they were afraid of becoming victims of street crime. These 140 respondents were then asked the type of street crime they were most afraid of. More than 20 percent (21.4%) of respondents indicated that they were most afraid of assaults not involving a gun, 19.3 percent were most afraid of robbery, 19.3 percent were most afraid of sexual assault/rape, 16.4 percent were most afraid of assault involving a gun/hurting with a deadly weapon, and 11.4 percent were most afraid of murder. The remaining 12.1 percent answered “don’t know” to the question.

## Protective Measures

The AACVS contained a series of questions designed to identify measures survey respondents took to protect themselves from crime. Table 14 presents the findings from this line of questioning. When asked whether they took any of the protective measures, one measure was overwhelmingly reported by a majority of respondents. Nearly three-quarters (73%) of respondents suggested that they look out for each other’s safety. Other common measures included keeping weapons in the home (41.2%) and installing outside/automatic lighting (38.3%). Very few residents asked the police to do security checks (2.9%) or attended neighborhood watch meetings (3.6%).<sup>10</sup>

**Table 14. Percent of Respondents Indicating that They Take Protective Measures, by Protective Measures Taken at Home**

N = 781

*Question:* Here are some things people DO to protect themselves or their property from crime that takes place AT HOME. In the past 12 months, have you done any of these things to protect yourself from crime in the home, in a direct response to you or your family's fear of crime?

Protective measure	Yes	No	Don't know	Refused
Attend neighborhood watch meeting	3.6 %	96.0 %	0.1 %	0.3 %
Watch out for each other's safety	73.0	26.0	0.8	0.3
Installed security system	11.5	85.7	0.3	2.6
Asked police to do security check	2.9	95.8	0.4	0.9
Have guard dogs at home	24.7	73.8	0.1	1.4
Engraved identification numbers on property	18.7	79.9	0.1	1.3
Installed extra locks	27.3	71.1	0.3	1.4
Keep weapons in the home	41.2	54.9	0.4	3.5
Added outside/automatic lighting	38.3	60.6	0.0	1.2
Took other precautions	11.4	86.9	0.5	1.2

A specific set of protective measures questions were directed toward the 140 respondents who indicated that they feared becoming victims of street crime. Behavioral modifications when away from home were the measures most commonly cited by respondents fearful of street crime. About half of the 140 respondents no longer take certain routes when outdoors (49.3%), avoid going out alone (50%), and/or avoid going out at night (44.3%).

<sup>10</sup> The question asked respondents to identify measures taken in direct response to crime. It is possible that residents answered the question without thinking solely of crime. For example, respondents might have kept guns in the home for hunting purposes yet could have reported it here even though the possession of firearms might not have been a direct response to crime. As a result, the numbers should be viewed with caution.



**Table 15. Residents Fearful of Street Crime, by Type of Protective Measures Taken Outside the**

N = 140

*Question:* Here are some things people do to avoid becoming a victim of crime that takes place outside the home. In the past 12 months, have you done any of these things?

Protective measure	Number	Percent
Avoid going out alone	70	50.0 %
No longer take certain routes	69	49.3
Avoid going out at night	62	44.3
Carry self-defense weapon	36	25.7
Relocated outside of neighborhood	30	21.4
Made an effort to get to know police	26	18.6
Attend community meetings	24	17.1
Carry self-defense warning device	21	15.0
Took a self-defense class	21	15.0
Took other measures	11	7.9
Did not do anything	17	12.1

## Community Meetings

Several of the questions addressed earlier demonstrated that attending neighborhood watch meetings is not necessarily a common protective measure taken against crime. Several additional questions address the issue of community meeting attendance specifically, regardless of whether it is considered a protective measure or not. Table 16 shows that the vast majority of respondents (90.1%) never heard about any community meetings concerning crime during the previous 12 months. Clearly, there are two ways of looking at this figure. First, one can argue that the reason why so few people heard about community meetings concerning crime was that few meetings concerning crime were held. Second, the community meetings might not be publicized adequately or the respondent might be outside the channels through which meetings are announced. Both explanations are plausible but the AACVS does not provide any definitive answer to the question. Of the 75 respondents who heard about community meetings regarding crime, more than one-quarter (25.3%) attended one or more in the past year. Nevertheless, as Table 16 shows, only about 3 out of every 100 respondents overall reported attending a community meeting concerning crime during the previous year.

Fifty-six respondents acknowledged hearing about community meetings concerning crime though they did not attend any of these meetings. These 56 respondents were then asked to specify the reason why they did not attend any community meetings concerning crime. The most commonly cited reason for lack of attendance was “no time” (28.6%). Other reasons include meetings taking place during work (19.6%), lack of concern about crime (16.1%), and attendance would not help (5.4%). A sizeable number of respondents indicated “other” (28.6%) for their reason for not attending. Some of the “other” reasons reported include but are not limited to laziness, others in family attend, lack of ambition, too tired/late at night, and attending meetings in area of employment rather than area of residence.

**Table 16. Percent of Residents Hearing About and Attending Community Meetings Concerning Crime**

N = 781

*Question:* In the past 12 months, have you heard about any community meetings concerning crime taking place in your neighborhood?

*Question:* In the past 12 months, have you attended any of these community meetings?

		Total respondents	Percent who heard about community meetings concerning crime			Percent who attended meeting concerning crime <sup>1</sup>
			Yes	No	Don't know	
All respondents		781	9.6 %	90.1 %	0.3 %	2.4 %
Sex						
	Male	299	9.4 %	90.3 %	0.3 %	2.0 %
	Female	481	9.8	90.0	0.2	2.7
	Refused	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
Race						
	White	597	8.4 %	91.5 %	0.2 %	2.0 %
	African-American	40	20.0	80.0	0.0	5.0
	Alaska Native/American Indian	49	10.2	89.8	0.0	4.1
	Asian/Pacific Islander	21	4.8	95.2	0.0	0.0
	Other	22	13.6	81.8	4.5	4.5
	Multi-racial	27	22.2	77.8	0.0	7.4
	Don't know	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Refused	23	4.3	95.7	0.0	0.0
Hispanic origin						
	Hispanic	41	9.8 %	87.8 %	2.4 %	0.0 %
	Non-Hispanic	723	9.5	90.3	0.1	2.5
	Don't know	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
	Refused	16	12.5	87.5	0.0	6.3
Age						
	18-19	33	9.1 %	90.9 %	0.0 %	0.0 %
	20-24	60	5.0	95.0	0.0	1.7
	25-34	164	9.1	90.2	0.6	2.4
	35-44	179	11.2	88.8	0.0	1.1
	45-54	167	7.2	92.8	0.0	2.4
	55-64	106	12.3	87.7	0.0	5.7
	65+	57	12.3	86.0	1.8	3.5
	Don't know	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
	Refused	14	14.3	85.7	0.0	0.0
Household Income						
	Less than \$10,000	17	0.0 %	100.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %
	\$10,000-\$19,999	41	19.5	80.5	0.0	2.4
	\$20,000-\$29,999	76	7.9	92.1	0.0	1.3
	\$30,000-\$39,999	69	11.6	88.4	0.0	2.9
	\$40,000-\$49,999	80	15.0	83.8	1.3	3.8
	\$50,000-\$59,999	79	8.9	91.1	0.0	2.5
	\$60,000-\$69,999	52	15.4	84.6	0.0	5.8
	\$70,000 or more	213	8.0	92.0	0.0	2.3
	Don't know	37	10.8	89.2	0.0	0.0
	Refused	117	4.3	94.9	0.9	1.7

<sup>1</sup> Only respondents indicating that they had heard of community meetings concerning crime were asked this follow-up question. However, figures represent the percent of residents identified in the total respondents column.

## Contact with Local Police

The survey revealed that nearly half of all respondents (49.3%) had some type of contact with local police during the 12-month period immediately preceding the survey (see Table 17). The likelihood of contact was approximately equal regardless of sex, race, Hispanic origin, or income. However, there was variation in contact depending upon the age group of the respondent. Older individuals age 55 and over were less likely to have 12-month contact with police. Only 40.6 percent of respondents in the 55-64 age category and 31.6 percent of respondents in the 65 and above

**Table 17. Contact with Local Police During Preceding 12-Month Period**

*Question:* In the past 12 months, have you been in contact with the local police for any reason?

		Yes		No		Chi-square
		N	%	N	%	
<b>All respondents</b>		<b>385</b>	<b>49.3 %</b>	<b>396</b>	<b>50.7 %</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>Sex</b>						1.864
	Male	141	47.2 %	158	52.8 %	
	Female	243	50.5	238	49.5	
	Refused	1	100.0	0	0.0	
<b>Race<sup>1</sup></b>						5.038
	White	302	50.6 %	295	49.4 %	
	African-American	15	37.5	25	62.5	
	Alaska Native/American Indian	24	49.0	25	51.0	
	Asian/Pacific Islander	8	38.1	13	61.9	
	Other	11	50.0	11	50.0	
	Multi-racial	14	51.9	13	48.1	
	Don't know	0	0.0	1	100.0	
	Refused	10	43.5	13	56.5	
<b>Hispanic origin</b>						1.037
	Hispanic	21	51.2	20	48.8	
	Non-Hispanic	356	49.2	367	50.8	
	Don't know	0	0.0	1	100.0	
	Refused	8	50.0	8	50.0	
<b>Age</b>						15.912*
	18-19	17	51.5 %	16	48.5 %	
	20-24	28	46.7	32	53.3	
	25-34	87	53.0	77	47.0	
	35-44	90	50.3	89	49.7	
	45-54	94	56.3	73	43.7	
	55-64	43	40.6	63	59.4	
	65 +	18	31.6	39	68.4	
	Don't know	1	100.0	0	0.0	
	Refused	7	50.0	7	50.0	
<b>Household Income</b>						8.908
	Less than \$10,000	9	52.9 %	8	47.1 %	
	\$10,000-\$19,999	19	46.3	22	53.7	
	\$20,000-\$29,999	31	40.8	45	59.2	
	\$30,000-\$39,999	31	44.9	38	55.1	
	\$40,000-\$49,999	48	60.0	32	40.0	
	\$50,000-\$59,999	39	49.4	40	50.6	
	\$60,000-\$69,999	28	53.8	24	46.2	
	\$70,000 or more	110	51.6	103	48.4	
	Don't know	15	40.5	22	59.5	
	Refused	55	47.0	62	53.0	

<sup>1</sup> Race information was missing for one respondent.

\* p < .05

age category reported any contact with the police during the previous year. This stands in contrast to the other age groups where roughly half of respondents had 12-month contact with the police.

## Police Activities

Survey respondents were asked a number of questions regarding police activities in their neighborhood. First, they were asked to identify whether the level of police presence in their neighborhood had changed during the previous year. Most respondents (66.6%) reported no change in the level of police presence while a smaller proportion reported either an increase (11.1%) or a decrease (4.6%) in presence. Approximately 15 percent (14.6%) indicated that they never see police in their neighborhood.

Except for the 114 residents who reported never seeing police in their neighborhood, respondents were asked to indicate the types of activities they saw the police engaging in within their neighborhood during the preceding year. The responses included: talking with residents (32.1%), getting involved with kids (18.6%), opening substations (9.9%), facilitating crime watch/prevention activities (9.7%), attending community meetings (7.2%), and talking with businesses (4.8%). Nearly a quarter of respondents (23.7%) reported seeing police doing “other” activities, the most commonly cited being patrol.

Respondents were asked to specify whether their local police department was doing community policing.<sup>11</sup> About 1 in 5 residents (20.7%) said that their local department was doing community policing and another 6.9 percent indicated that the department was doing community policing “somewhat.” About half (51.7%) of respondents stated that their department was not doing community policing. Of the 216 residents who said that their department was doing community policing (“yes” or “somewhat”), most (62%) knew that they were doing so because they saw police actually engaging in activities such as attending community meetings, working with businesses, increasing foot/vehicle/bike patrols, increasing presence in high-crime areas, increasing traffic stops, running youth programs, and conducting crime prevention activities.

## Satisfaction with Local Police

Table 18 shows that residents are overwhelmingly satisfied with their local police. In fact, 88.8 percent of respondents indicated that they were either satisfied or very satisfied with their local police. No significant differences were found with regard to sex, race, Hispanic origin, age, and household income.

Although survey respondents were generally quite supportive of police, their level of satisfaction does vary depending upon factors associated with the local police department. Citizen satisfaction is related to changes in the level of police presence in their neighborhood during the preceding year. As evident in Table 19, residents reporting that police presence in their neighborhood remained the same or increased during the preceding year were significantly more satisfied with the police than were residents who reported a decrease in police presence or who indicated that they never see police in their area ( $p < .001$ ). In fact, the satisfaction with police scores for residents noticing an

<sup>11</sup> The definition of community policing was provided to the respondent and based on a definition developed by the COPS office. The definition read, “Community policing involves police officers working with the community to address the causes of crime in an effort to reduce the problems themselves and the associated fear, through a wide range of activities.”

**Table 18. Resident Satisfaction with Local Police<sup>1</sup>**

*Question:* In general, how satisfied are you with the police who serve your neighborhood?  
Are you very satisfied, satisfied, dissatisfied, or very dissatisfied?

		Total respondents	Mean rating <sup>2</sup>	Dissatisfied		Satisfied	
				% very dissatisfied	% dissatisfied	% satisfied	% very satisfied
All respondents		718	3.11	1.8 %	9.5 %	64.8 %	24.0 %
Sex							
	Male	282	3.12	0.7 %	11.0 %	63.5 %	24.8 %
	Female	435	3.10	2.5	8.5	65.7	23.2
	Refused	1	4.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Race <sup>1</sup>							
	White	552	3.12	1.6 %	9.2 %	64.7 %	24.5 %
	African-American	37	3.11	2.7	13.5	54.1	29.7
Alaska Native/American Indian		46	3.20	2.2	8.7	56.5	32.6
	Asian/Pacific Islander	18	2.94	0.0	16.7	72.2	11.1
	Other	19	3.05	0.0	15.8	63.2	21.1
	Multi-racial	25	3.08	0.0	4.0	84.0	12.0
	Don't know	1	3.00	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
	Refused	19	2.84	10.5	5.3	73.7	10.5
Hispanic origin							
	Hispanic	36	3.11	0.0	11.1	66.7	22.2
	Non-Hispanic	668	3.11	1.6	9.6	64.5	24.3
	Don't know	1	3.00	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
	Refused	13	2.85	15.4	0.0	69.2	15.4
Age							
	18-19	30	2.90	6.7 %	10.0 %	70.0 %	13.3 %
	20-24	55	3.18	1.8	3.6	69.1	25.5
	25-34	152	3.02	2.0	13.2	65.8	19.1
	35-44	166	3.08	3.0	10.2	62.7	24.1
	45-54	155	3.18	0.6	6.5	67.1	25.8
	55-64	97	3.13	1.0	11.3	60.8	26.8
	65 +	49	3.27	0.0	6.1	61.2	32.7
	Don't know	0	--	--	--	--	--
	Refused	14	3.07	0.0	14.3	64.3	21.4
Household income							
	Less than \$10,000	16	3.13	6.3 %	6.3 %	56.3 %	31.3 %
	\$10,000-\$19,999	41	3.00	4.9	12.2	61.0	22.0
	\$20,000-\$29,999	67	3.03	3.0	6.0	76.1	14.9
	\$30,000-\$39,999	65	3.14	1.5	10.8	60.0	27.7
	\$40,000-\$49,999	73	3.14	0.0	12.3	61.6	26.0
	\$50,000-\$59,999	76	3.16	1.3	7.9	64.5	26.3
	\$60,000-\$69,999	48	3.13	2.1	8.3	64.6	25.0
	\$70,000 or more	202	3.12	1.0	10.4	63.9	24.8
	Don't know	26	2.92	7.7	11.5	61.5	19.2
	Refused	104	3.13	1.0	7.7	68.3	23.1

<sup>1</sup> Excludes respondents answering don't know/refuse to question about satisfaction (n=63) and one respondent for whom race information was missing from the race/fear cross-tabulations.

<sup>2</sup> Meaning ratings are based on a four-point scale ranging from very dissatisfied (1) to very satisfied (4). Higher mean ratings indicate greater satisfaction.

increase in police presence were three-fifths of a point higher than scores for respondents who saw a decrease in police presence.

Table 20 shows that respondent satisfaction with police is also related to community policing issues. Most respondents (52.2%) were unfamiliar with the term “community policing” but familiarity was unrelated to satisfaction with the police. Whether respondents believed that their local police department was in fact *doing* community policing was, however, related to satisfaction. Recall,

**Table 19. Level of Satisfaction with Police, by Respondent's Perception of Level of Police Presence<sup>1</sup>**

*Question:* In the past 12 months, have you observed any increases or decreases in police officer presence in your neighborhood or did the number stay the same?

*Question:* In general, how satisfied are you with the police who serve your neighborhood? Are you very satisfied, satisfied, dissatisfied, or very dissatisfied?

Change in level of presence	Number of respondents	Mean rating <sup>2</sup>	Level of satisfaction with police in neighborhood			
			% very dissatisfied	% dissatisfied	% satisfied	% very satisfied
Increased	83	3.28	1.2 %	7.2 %	54.2 %	37.3 %
Decreased	34	2.68	5.9	29.4	55.9	8.8
No change	489	3.14	1.4	7.4	66.9	24.3
Never see police in neighborhood	94	2.94	3.2	14.9	67.0	14.9
Don't know	18	3.17	0.0	11.1	61.1	27.8

<sup>1</sup> Respondents answer don't know/no opinion or refuse (n = 63) to satisfaction question excluded above.

<sup>2</sup> Mean ratings are based on 4-point satisfaction scale. Differences are significant (p < .001).

respondents were provided with a definition of community policing developed by the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services and included within the COPS supplement. They were then asked to indicate whether they felt that their neighborhood police were doing community policing. Respondents indicating that their neighborhood police department was doing community policing were more satisfied with the police than those respondents who indicated that the police were not doing community policing or were only somewhat doing community policing (p < .001). The satisfaction scores differed by nearly two-fifths of a point on the four point satisfaction scale.

**Table 20. Satisfaction with Police, by Respondent Knowledge of Community Policing and Perception of Community Policing in Local Department<sup>1</sup>**

*Question:* Are you familiar with the term 'community policing'?

*Question:* Community policing involves police officers working with the community to address the causes of crime in an effort to reduce the problems themselves and the associated fear, through a wide range of activities. Based on the definition, do you think the police in your neighborhood practice community policing?

*Question:* In general, how satisfied are you with the police who serve your neighborhood? Are you very satisfied, satisfied, dissatisfied, or very dissatisfied?

			Level of satisfaction with police in neighborhood			
	Number of respondents	Mean rating <sup>2</sup>	% very dissatisfied	% dissatisfied	% satisfied	% very satisfied
Familiar with community policing?						
Yes	333	3.14	1.5 %	9.9 %	62.2 %	26.4 %
No	375	3.09	2.1	8.8	67.2	21.9
Don't know	10	3.00	0.0	20.0	60.0	20.0
Are local police doing community policing?*						
Yes	157	3.36	0.6 %	2.5 %	56.7 %	40.1 %
No	372	2.98	3.2	13.4	65.3	18.0
Somewhat	49	3.00	0.0	20.4	59.2	20.4
Don't know	140	3.20	0.0	2.9	74.3	22.9

<sup>1</sup> Respondents answer don't know/no opinion or refuse (n = 63) to satisfaction question excluded above.

<sup>2</sup> Mean ratings are based on 4-point satisfaction scale (1 = very dissatisfied, 4 = very satisfied).

\* Differences significant (p < .001).

## **Appendix A. Victimization Definitions**

Below are the definitions of the crime types measured in the AACVS. Respondents are presented with a series of questions. Crime types are assigned based on the respondent answers to these questions. Crime types are listed in the order of possible assignment. That is, starting with completed rape, the incident is assigned the first crime type for which it meets all definitional requirements. Thus, implicit in each definition is the fact that the incident does not meet the definition of any of the earlier crime types.

### **Completed Rape**

1. Respondent or household member present when incident occurred, and
2. At least one of the following must be true of incident
  - a. Attack described by respondent as rape
  - b. Injuries suffered described as rape

### **Attempted Rape**

1. Respondent or household member present when incident occurred, and
2. At least one of the following must be true of incident
  - a. Attack described as attempted rape
  - b. Injuries suffered described as attempted rape
  - c. Attempted attack or threat described as verbal threat of rape AND accompanied by attempted attack or threat described as weapon present/threat with weapon, shot at but missed, attempted attack with sharp object/knife, attempted attack with a weapon other than a gun/knife/sharp object, object thrown at person, followed or surrounded, and/or hit/slap/hold/hit/push.

### **Sexual Attack with Serious Assault**

1. Respondent or household member present when incident occurred, and
2. At least one of the following must be true of incident
  - a. Attack described as sexual assault other than rape
  - b. Injuries described as sexual assault other than rape
  - c. Attempted attack or threatened attack described as unwanted sexual contact with force or without force
3. At least one of the following must be true of incident
  - a. Weapon type used was firearm, knife, other sharp object, blunt object, or other weapon
  - b. Injuries suffered described as sexual assault other than rape, knife/stab wounds, gunshot wounds, broken bones/teeth knocked out, internal injuries, and/or knocked unconscious
  - c. Attempted attack or threatened attack described as weapon present/threat with weapon, shot at but missed, attempted attack with sharp object/knife, attempted attack with a weapon other than a gun/knife/sharp object, and/or object thrown at person.
  - d. Injuries suffered described as bruises, cuts, scratches, chipped teeth, black eye, or other AND more than one day spent in hospital.



**Sexual Attack with Minor Assault**

1. Respondent or household member present when incident occurred, and
2. At least one of the following must be true of incident
  - a. Attack described as sexual assault other than rape
  - b. Injuries described as sexual assault other than rape
  - c. Attempted attack or threatened attack described as unwanted sexual contact with force or without force
4. At least one of the following must be true of incident
  - a. Injuries suffered described as bruises, cuts, scratches, chipped teeth, black eye, or other AND one day or less spent in hospital.
  - b. Attempted attack or threatened attack described as unwanted sexual contact with force or without force AND attempted attack or threatened attack described as followed or surrounded or tried to hit, slap, knock down, grab, hold, trip, jump, etc.

**Completed Robbery with Injury from Serious Assault**

1. Respondent or household member present when incident occurred
2. At least one of the following must be true of incident
  - a. Injuries suffered described as knife/stab wounds, gunshot wounds, broken bones/teeth knocked out, internal injuries, and/or knocked unconscious AND something stolen or taken without permission
  - b. Injuries suffered described as bruises, cuts, scratches, chipped teeth, black eye, or other AND weapon used was firearm, knife, other sharp object, blunt object, or other weapon AND something stolen or taken without permission
  - c. Injuries suffered described as other AND more than one day spent in hospital AND something stolen or taken without permission

**Attempted Robbery with Injury from Serious Assault**

1. Respondent or household member present when incident occurred
2. At least one of the following must be true of incident
  - a. Injuries suffered described knife/stab wounds, gunshot wounds, broken bones/teeth knocked out, internal injuries, and/or knocked unconscious AND offender attempted to take something without permission
  - b. Injuries suffered described as bruises, cuts, scratches, chipped teeth, black eye, or other AND weapon used was firearm, knife, other sharp object, blunt object, or other weapon AND offender attempted to take something without permission
  - c. Injuries suffered described as other AND more than one day spent in hospital AND offender attempted to take something without permission.

**Aggravated Assault Completed with Injury**

1. Respondent or household member present when incident occurred
2. At least one of the following must be true of incident:
  - a. Injuries suffered described knife/stab wounds, gunshot wounds, broken bones/teeth knocked out, internal injuries, and/or knocked unconscious AND no theft or attempted theft involved.



- b. Injuries suffered described as bruises, cuts, scratches, chipped teeth, black eye, or other AND weapon used was firearm, knife, other sharp object, blunt object, or other weapon AND no theft or attempted theft involved.
- c. Injuries suffered described as other AND more than one day spent in hospital AND no theft or attempted theft involved.

### **Completed Robbery with Injury from Minor Assault**

- 1. Respondent or household member present when incident occurred
- 2. Injuries suffered described as bruises, cuts, scratches, chipped teeth, black eye, or other AND something stolen or taken without permission.

### **Attempted Robbery with Injury from Minor Assault**

- 1. Respondent or household member present when incident occurred.
- 2. Injuries suffered described as bruises, cuts, scratches, chipped teeth, black eye, or other AND offender attempted to take something without permission.

### **Simple Assault Completed with Injury**

- 1. Respondent or household member present when incident occurred.
- 2. Injuries suffered described as bruises, cuts, scratches, chipped teeth, black eye, or other AND no theft or attempted theft involved.

### **Completed Robbery without Injury**

- 1. Respondent or household member present when incident occurred.
- 2. At least one of the following must be true of incident:
  - a. Attack described as shot, hit with gun held in hand, stabbed/cut with knife or sharp object, hit with object other than a gun, hit by thrown object, hit/slapped/knocked down, grabbed/held/tripped/jumped/pushed, or other type of attack AND something stolen or taken without permission.
  - b. Attempted attack or threatened attack described as shot at but missed, attack with knife/sharp object, attack with weapon other than gun/knife/sharp object, object thrown at person, followed or surrounded, tried to hit/slap/hold/push, or other attempted or threatened attack AND something stolen or taken without permission.
  - c. Attempted attack or threatened attack described as verbal threat to kill or verbal threat of attack (other than rape) or weapon present/threatened with weapon AND something stolen or taken without permission.

### **Attempted Robbery without Injury**

- 1. Respondent or household member present when incident occurred.
- 2. At least one of the following must be true of incident:
  - a. Attack described as shot, hit with gun held in hand, stabbed/cut with knife or sharp object, hit with object other than a gun, hit by thrown object, hit/slapped/knocked down, grabbed/held/tripped/jumped/pushed, or other type of attack AND offender attempted to take something without permission.

- b. Attempted attack or threatened attack described as shot at but missed, attack with knife/sharp object, attack with weapon other than gun/knife/sharp object, object thrown at person, followed or surrounded, tried to hit/slap/hold/push, or other attempted or threatened attack AND offender attempted to take something without permission.
- c. Attempted attack or threatened attack described as verbal threat to kill or verbal threat of attack (other than rape) or weapon present/threatened with weapon AND offender attempted to take something without permission.

### **Attempted Aggravated Assault with Weapon**

- 1. Respondent or household member present when incident occurred.
- 2. Weapon type used was firearm, knife, other sharp object, blunt object, or other weapon AND attempted attack or threatened attack described as shot at but missed, attack with knife/sharp object, attack with weapon other than gun/knife/sharp object, object thrown at person, followed or surrounded, tried to hit/slap/hold/push, or attack described as hit with gun held in hand, stabbed/cut with knife or sharp object, hit with object other than a gun, hit by thrown object, hit/slapped/knocked down, grabbed/held/tripped/jumped/pushed, or other type of attack.

### **Threatened Assault with Weapon**

- 1. Respondent or household member present when incident occurred.
- 2. Weapon type used was firearm, knife, other sharp object, blunt object, or other weapon.

### **Sexual Assault without Injury**

- 1. Respondent or household member present when incident occurred.
- 2. At least one of the following must be true of incident:
  - a. Attack described as sexual assault other than rape.
  - b. Attempted attack or threatened attack described as unwanted sexual contact with force.

### **Unwanted Sexual Contact without Force**

- 1. Respondent or household member present when incident occurred.
- 2. Attempted attack or threatened attack described as unwanted sexual contact without force.

### **Assault without Weapon without Injury**

- 1. Respondent or household member present when incident occurred.
- 2. At least one of the following must be true of incident:
  - a. Attack described as hit by thrown object, attack with weapon other than gun/knife/sharp object, hit/slapped/knocked down, grabbed/held/tripped/jumped/pushed, or other attack.
  - b. Attempted attack or threatened attack described as verbal threat to kill or verbal threat of attack (other than rape) AND attempted attack or threatened attack described as followed or surrounded, object thrown at person, tried to hit/slap/hold/trip/push or other type of attempted or threatened attack.
  - c. Attempted attack or threatened attack described as object thrown at person, hit/slap/hold/hit/push, or other attempted or threatened attack.

### **Verbal Threat of Rape**

1. Respondent or household member present when incident occurred.
2. Attempted attack or threatened attack described as verbal threat of rape.

### **Verbal Threat of Sexual Assault**

1. Respondent or household member present when incident occurred.
2. Attempted attack or threatened attack described as verbal threat of sexual assault other than rape.

### **Verbal Threat of Assault**

1. Respondent or household member present when incident occurred.
2. Attempted attack or threatened attack described as verbal threat to kill or threat of attack (other than rape).

### **Completed Purse Snatching**

1. Respondent or household member present when incident occurred.
2. Item stolen was a purse on the person of the victim

### **Attempted Purse Snatching**

1. Respondent or household member present when incident occurred.
2. Item attempted to be stolen was a purse on the person of the victim.

### **Completed Burglary, Forcible Entry**

1. Evidence of forcible entry or attempted forcible entry (e.g., door or window broken or tampered with).
2. Offender actually gained entry.

### **Attempted Forcible Entry**

1. Evidence of forcible entry or attempted forcible entry (e.g., door or window broken or tampered with).
2. Offender did not gain entry.

### **Completed Burglary, Unlawful Entry without Force**

1. Offender actually gained entry.
2. No evidence of forcible entry or attempted forcible entry.

### **Attempted Motor Vehicle Theft**

1. Offender(s) attempted to take certain item(s).
2. Item was a car or other motor vehicle.

**Attempted Larceny**

1. Offender(s) attempted to take certain item(s).
2. Item was not a car or other motor vehicle.

**Completed Motor Vehicle Theft**

1. Offender(s) actually took certain item(s).
2. Item was a car or other motor vehicle AND permission had not been granted to take vehicle OR, if permission was granted, the vehicle was not returned.

**Completed Larceny**

1. Offender(s) actually took certain item(s).
2. Item was not a car or other motor vehicle.

## Appendix B. Victimization Reported by Specific Crime Type

The table below displays the victimization incident by crime type. The crime types are disaggregated beyond what is displayed in Table 3. Given space limitations and the low incidence of certain crime types, the decision was made to aggregate into broader categories for Table 3.

Victimization type	N
<b>Personal victimizations</b>	
Completed robbery with injury from minor assault	1
Completed robbery without injury	1
Attempted robbery with injury from serious assault	1
Attempted robbery without injury	4
Completed aggravated assault with injury	6
Attempted aggravated assault with weapon	4
Threatened assault with weapon	2
Completed simple assault with injury	3
Assault without weapon without injury	13
Verbal threat of rape	1
Verbal threat of sexual assault	1
Verbal threat of assault	17
<b>Completed pocket picking</b>	2
<b>Property victimizations</b>	
Larceny	179
Attempted larceny	6
Completed burglary, forcible entry	7
Completed burglary, unlawful entry without force	16
Attempted forcible entry	7
Completed motor vehicle theft	9
Attempted motor vehicle theft	4

## Appendix C. Response and Cooperation Rates

Response and cooperation rates were computed using guidelines established by the American Association of Public Opinion Research (AAPOR). The distinction between the AACVS response rate and the AACVS cooperation rate is that the former includes in the denominator calls made to households where no interview was secured and eligibility for the project could not be determined (e.g., no answer, answering machine, busy signal). The exact computations are as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Response rate} &= I / I + UK + ENI \\ \text{Cooperation rate} &= I / I + ENI\end{aligned}$$

where I equals the total number of completed interviews, UK equals the total number of households for which eligibility was not determined and no interviews were secured (e.g., no answer, busy signal, answering machine), and ENI equals the total number of eligible households for which no interview was secured (e.g., refusals, hearing problems, respondent not available). Using the numbers presented in Table 1, the AACVS response and cooperation rates are as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Response rate} &= 733 / 733 + 485 + 1084 = 31.8\% \\ \text{Cooperation rate} &= 733 / 733 + 485 = 60.2\%\end{aligned}$$

It should once again be noted that these rates are based on calls made to obtain the first 733 completed interviews (see footnote 2 in text). The dispositions of calls made to obtain the remaining 48 completed interviews are not included. However, it is possible to speculate about the impact these dispositions would have had on the response and cooperation rates computed above. The additional calls were drawn from a list of telephone numbers for which the last disposition was no answer, answering machine/voice mail, and busy signal. No new numbers beyond the original 3,460 were dialed. If the additional calls needed for the 48 extra interviews were included in the computation, the response rate could only rise due to one or more of the following reasons. The 48 additional interviews would be added to the numerator (completed interviews) and remain in the denominator since the telephone numbers dialed were part of the unknown eligibility, non-interview group. Obviously, some of the additional calls would be refusals but this fact would not change the response rate since both refusals (eligible, non-interviews) and unknown eligibility, non-interview numbers are both included in the denominator of the response rate computation. Only the categorization of the telephone number would change while the response rate would remain unchanged. Finally, some of the dispositions would undoubtedly change from unknown eligibility, non-interview to not eligible. This would again increase the response rate since not eligible numbers are not included in the denominator of the calculation. As a result, the smaller denominator would increase the overall response rate. In sum, the response rate of 31.8 percent listed above is certainly a conservative estimate. Due to the fact that 48 additional interviews were secured, the actual response rate is at least 33.9 percent assuming that no call dispositions were changed to the not eligible category.

Estimating cooperation rates with the 48 additional interviews is more complex. Telephone numbers categorized as unknown eligibility, non-interview are not included in the denominator. Therefore, the impact of the additional calls needed to secure the 48 interviews depends upon the extent to which the calls were reclassified as completed interviews or eligible, non-interviews. We have no way of estimating the breakdown of dispositions for the additional calls but we do not believe that the ratio of completed interviews to refusals or other eligible, non-interviews was any different than during the portion of the AACVS where the CATI call management function was used. We assume that the approximately 60 percent of the additional calls resulted in completed interviews and approximately 40 percent resulted in refusals or other eligible, non-interviews. This assumption would not change the original cooperation rate calculation from above. Thus, the estimated cooperation rate is approximately 60.2 percent.