

THE AFTERMATH OF  
CRIMINAL VICTIMIZATION:  
A STATEWIDE SURVEY

RESEARCH REPORT SERIES  
NUMBER 3

100808

KENTUCKY  
CRIMINAL  
JUSTICE



STATISTICAL  
ANALYSIS  
CENTER

RMSTRONG  
GENERAL

URBAN STUDIES CENTER  
UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE

# KENTUCKY CRIMINAL JUSTICE STATISTICAL ANALYSIS CENTER

## THE MISSION

The Kentucky Criminal Justice Statistical Analysis Center (SAC) was established in 1984 as a centralized clearinghouse for criminal justice statistics. A major objective of SAC is to gather concrete data about the criminal justice system in Kentucky and to disseminate that data statewide. With this information, policymakers will be better able to make criminal justice decisions.

## THE STAFF

Co-Directors: C. Bruce Traughber  
Office of the Attorney General  
Commonwealth of Kentucky

Knowlton W. Johnson, Ph.D.  
Urban Studies Center  
College of Urban & Public Affairs  
University of Louisville

Manager: Jack B. Ellis

University Faculty: Gordon S. Bonham, Ph.D.  
Gary W. Sykes, Ph.D.  
Gennaro F. Vito, Ph.D.  
Deborah G. Wilson, Ph.D.

Research Analyst: Linda Burgess

## THE RESEARCH REPORT SERIES

- Persistent Felony Offenders in Kentucky: A Profile of the Institutional Population (1985)
- Child Abuse and Neglect in Kentucky: 1978-1984 (1985)
- The Aftermath of Criminal Victimization: A Statewide Survey (1985)
- An Offender-Based Tracking System Study of Three Judicial Districts in the Commonwealth of Kentucky (1985)
- A Data Inventory of Kentucky's Criminal Justice Agencies (1985)
- Strengthening Kentucky's Capacity to Produce Criminal Justice Statistical Information: A Needs-Use Assessment (1985)

## THE CENTER

The Kentucky Criminal Justice Statistical Analysis Center is housed in the Office of the Attorney General, Commonwealth of Kentucky, and operated by the Urban Studies Center--the policy research component of the College of Urban & Public Affairs--in cooperation with the U.S. Bureau of Justice Statistics.

SAC is available to assist you in meeting your data and information needs. For more information contact:

Mr. Jack B. Ellis  
Urban Studies Center  
College of Urban & Public Affairs  
University of Louisville  
Louisville, Kentucky 40292  
(502) 588-6626

**THE AFTERMATH OF CRIMINAL VICTIMIZATION:  
A STATEWIDE SURVEY**

Research Report Series: Number 3

Conducted by  
Urban Studies Center  
College of Urban and Public Affairs  
University of Louisville

Knowlton W. Johnson, Ph.D.  
Gary W. Sykes, Ph.D.  
Edwin F. Snow, M.A.

**NCJRS**

**JAN 20 1986**

**ACQUISITIONS**

for  
Kentucky Criminal Justice Statistical Analysis Center

**David L. Armstrong**  
Attorney General

December 1985

## AUTHORS' NOTES

The research team for this study consisted of Dr. Knowlton Johnson, Principal Investigator; Dr. Gary Sykes, Associate Professor of the School of Justice Administration; and Mr. Edwin Snow, Project Manager. Dr. Johnson was responsible for directing all aspects of the study including the conceptual framework, research measures, research design, analysis and dissemination strategies; presenting the results at a statewide conference; and drafting the final report. Dr. Sykes was responsible for conducting the computer analysis, presenting the results at a statewide conference, and drafting the final report. Mr. Snow supervised the pretest, data collection, coding and editing. All members of the research team assisted in critiquing and revising the final report.

### U.S. Department of Justice National Institute of Justice

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the National Institute of Justice.

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been granted by

~~Public Domain/Bureau of Justice  
Statistics/US Dept. of Justice~~

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the copyright owner.

This report is a product of the Kentucky Criminal Justice Statistical Analysis Center.

### Co-Directors

Knowlton W. Johnson  
Urban Studies Center

C. Bruce Traugher  
Office of the Kentucky Attorney General

The SAC is funded by the Bureau of Justice Statistics, U. S. Department of Justice Grant No. 84-BJ-CX-0013. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the Bureau of Justice Statistics or the University of Louisville as a whole, its trustees, chief administrative officers, or any division of the University.



COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY  
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

DAVID L. ARMSTRONG  
ATTORNEY GENERAL

FRANKFORT  
40601

November 21, 1985

Dear Friend:

The Kentucky Criminal Justice Statistical Analysis Center is now one year old. This report is one of six work products developed by SAC in its first year of operation. Each of these reports validates, I believe, the hard work and effort that went into getting the SAC started.

I am firmly convinced that the lack of good data and analyses has contributed to the problems we face in the criminal justice system. The SAC staff and I are committed to overcoming this deficiency in our criminal justice system.

The entire SAC Team deserves to be acknowledged for their efforts. The SAC has also had strong support and encouragement from the Bureau of Justice Statistics, U.S. Department of Justice--especially from our grant coordinator, Mr. Don Manson.

Please take the time to study this research. We can all learn from it. If you have questions, please feel free to contact me or the SAC staff. Together, we can make a difference for criminal justice in Kentucky.

Sincerely,

DAVID L. ARMSTRONG  
Attorney General

DLA/mb

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

One of the major projects of the Kentucky Criminal Justice Statistical Analysis Center (SAC) during its first year assessed victimization patterns and examined the lives of victims after being touched by crime. Studying the aftermath of both violent and property criminal victimization goes beyond prevailing victimization studies which generally describe the prevalence of crime.

In the spring of 1985, a statewide, two-stage stratified random citizen survey was conducted using random-digit-dialing procedures. The sampling design resulted in 557 interviews representing (on a weighted basis) 3,843 Kentucky households. The survey responses and results were representative of the telephone households across the Commonwealth of Kentucky. The margin of error of the weighted sample was approximately +1 percent.

The highlights of the major findings are presented below.

### Crime Victimization in Kentucky

- Over 20 percent (20.2%) of the households in Kentucky experienced a crime between May 1984 and April 1985. Nationally, 26 percent of the households experienced either a crime of violence or theft.
- About 6 percent (5.6%) of the households in Kentucky were touched by violent crime between May 1984 and April 1985, compared to the national rate of 4.9 percent for 1984.
- Approximately 19 percent (18.6%) of the households in Kentucky were touched by a property crime between May 1984 and April 1985, compared to the national rate of approximately 25.5 percent of the households touched by larceny, burglary and auto theft.
- The north central region of the state experienced the highest level of violent crime, while the region in eastern Kentucky experienced high rates of property crime.
- The most severe crimes (burglary, robbery, physical attacks using weapons, sexual assault, and property thefts greater than \$499.00) were concentrated in the north central region where 47 percent of such severe crime was reported.
- Black citizens did not appear to have higher rates of victimization than white citizens; nationally blacks had higher victimization rates.
- Higher income groups experienced greater amounts of property crime, while lower income groups experienced a higher level of violent crime.

- Both violent and property crime were lowest during the summer months, with violent crime increasing during late fall and peaking during spring. This finding may have been influenced by memory recall of the respondents.
- Over half of all crimes committed went unreported to the police (51.7%). The most common reasons for not reporting these crimes were lack of proof (48%), not important enough (30.3%), and regarded as a private matter (15.7%).
- Only 11.9 percent of the property crime victims said they knew the identity of the offender while 51.6 percent of the violent crime victims knew their assailant; 68 percent of the victims who knew the offender said it was a relative, acquaintance, or neighbor.

#### **The Aftermath of Criminal Victimization: Victim Response**

- Victim household respondents scored significantly higher on measures of depression than households of a subsample of nonvictims; household respondents touched by a combination of violent crime and property crime reported the highest levels of depression among the victim subgroups.
- Fear of crime among households touched by both property and violent crime during the year exhibited greater concern for their personal safety than property or violent victim households or nonvictim households. While the difference was less, there was a higher level of fear of crime in households touched by property crime as well as those experiencing violent crime when compared to households without crime.
- Crime prevention measures which indicated a concern about taking precautions against subsequent victimization showed that those who experienced multiple victimization (property and violent crime) and property crime were significantly more likely to be security conscious than households with nonvictims.

#### **Victim Awareness and Use of Formal Support Services**

- A majority of citizens in Kentucky reported generally positive experiences with the police; and most citizens surveyed said they would definitely or probably cooperate with criminal justice officials in the future.
- A large majority of Kentucky residents expressed awareness of victim and crime prevention programs available in the state, but few crime victims used victim assistance programs.
- Nearly one-half of the respondents said they used crime prevention programs; operation identification and child identification were most frequently used.

## Use and Application of the Findings

- Violent crime in Kentucky is higher than the national average; this suggests that additional resources should be allocated to assist victims of violent crime.
- Households experiencing violent crime and multiple victimizations (property and violent crime) exhibited higher levels of depressive symptoms; attention should be paid to treating the psychological consequence of being victimized.
- Households experiencing multiple victimizations (property and violent crime) exhibited higher levels of fear of crime and security consciousness; investing in environmental changes such as street lighting, may lessen the fear of crime or the need to be overly security conscious.
- The survey found that few victims used victim assistance programs in the state; victim assistance programs need to be strengthened and victims encouraged to participate in these programs.
- Longitudinal research needs to be conducted to determine whether criminal victimization negatively affects the quality of life of Kentuckians.



**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**Letter from the Attorney General . . . . .** iii

**Executive Summary . . . . .** iv

**List of Tables . . . . .** viii

**List of Illustrations . . . . .** ix

**Background and Purpose . . . . .** 1

**Methods and Procedures . . . . .** 3

    Interview . . . . . 3

    Sample . . . . . 3

    Screening Selection . . . . . 4

    Weighting . . . . . 6

    Data Processing and Analysis . . . . . 6

**Results of the Study . . . . .** 8

    Kentucky Households Touched by Crime . . . . . 8

    The Aftermath of Being Criminally Victimized . . . . . 16

    Victim Awareness of and Experience with Formal Support Services . . 22

**Use and Application of the Findings . . . . .** 29

    Usefulness for Justifying Additional  
    Resources for Victim Programming . . . . . 29

    Application of Findings for Victim  
    Program Change and New Development . . . . . 30

    Implications for Future Research . . . . . 30

**References . . . . .** 31

**Appendices**

LIST OF TABLES

1.	Actual Numbers of Questionnaire Responses by Type of Label Within the Identified Screener Response Category . . . . .	5
2.	Percentage of Households in Kentucky and U.S. (1984) Touched by Crime During the Twelve Months Prior to the Interview . . . . .	9
3.	Percent and Type of Victimization per Household by Region in Kentucky . . . . .	10
4.	Percent of Serious Crime by Household and Incident by Region . . . . .	12
5.	Percent of Sample Households Experiencing Crime by Race . . . . .	14
6.	Percent of Households Experiencing Crime by Income . . . . .	15
7.	Crime Victims' Satisfaction with the Kentucky Criminal Justice System and Their Willingness to Cooperate in the Future . . . . .	23

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

1.	Percent of Total Crime, Violent and Property Crime by Month . . . .	13
2.	Average Level of Depression of Household Respondents by Type of Victimization . . . . .	18
3.	Average Level of Fear of Crime of Household Respondents by Type of Victimization . . . . .	19
4.	Average Level of Security Consciousness of Household Respondents by Type of Victimization . . . . .	21
5.	Crime Victim Awareness by Type of Program . . . . .	25
6.	Household Victims and Nonvictims Awareness of Crime Prevention Programs by Program Type . . . . .	26
7.	Household Victims and Nonvictims Use of Crime Prevention Programs by Program Type . . . . .	27

# THE STUDY

## BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE

In July 1984, the Kentucky Governor issued an executive order giving the attorney general authority to seek federal funds from the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) to strengthen the criminal justice statistical capabilities in the Commonwealth. As a result, a grant was awarded a few months later (September 1984) to establish the state's first Criminal Justice Statistical Analysis Center (SAC). The SAC was placed in the Attorney General's Office but was mandated to be operated by the Urban Studies Center in the College of Urban and Public Affairs at the University of Louisville.

One of the major projects initiated by the Kentucky SAC during its first year assessed the statewide crime victimization patterns and also examined the victims' lives after being touched by crime. Historically, only a few states have surveyed citizens to establish statewide patterns of crime (U.S. Department of Justice, 1983). Similarly, fewer studies have focused on the consequences of crime as it relates to the health and welfare of citizens (Karmen, 1984). This study, designed to address both concerns, looked at victim rates, victim awareness of various programs, and victim participation in assistance efforts.

The SAC study went beyond the traditional victimization studies by focusing not only on the extent and nature of crime as reported by victims, but also on the aftermath of both violent and property criminal victimization (O'Brien, 1985). Additionally, a new differential sampling design was employed, unique to victimization research but widely used in other areas, to ensure that a substantial number of interviews were conducted with people who have selected characteristics but comprise a small proportion of the total population. In this study, the small subgroup included households whose members have been touched by crime.

The three key policy questions providing a framework for the study were:

- What is the prevalence and pattern of criminal activity in Kentucky as compared to national profiles?
- What are the key differences in the perceptions and behavior of citizens touched by crime and those who have not experienced crime?
- What is the overall level of awareness and reaction of crime victims to the formal support systems provided by criminal justice agencies, victim programs and crime prevention programs?

Before each of these questions is addressed, there is a discussion of the research methods, the sample and the results. Use and application of the findings are also highlighted.

## METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The study was based on telephone interviews with a random stratified sample of 557 households in Kentucky. Interviews were conducted in May-July 1985 focusing on crime experiences of household members during the previous twelve months. Households were stratified according to screener question responses about being victims of violent crimes, property crimes or no crime. The different probabilities of selection for the complete interview are reflected in designated weights. Estimates in this report are properly adjusted to reflect Kentucky as a whole, within the range of accuracy of a sample of this size. These aspects of the survey are discussed below, with additional details in Appendix A.

### Interview

During May, June and July 1985, 557 household respondents were interviewed by telephone to determine if any member had been the victim of a crime ranging from the theft of a small item to murder. Household members experiencing crime, either personally or through the experience of another member of the household, were asked questions about their perceptions and experiences with the criminal justice system and victim assistance programs. All respondents were asked questions about awareness and participation in crime prevention programs. General information on each household was also included. The interview took 16 to 59 minutes, depending on the household responses, and averaged 28 minutes. The content of the interview was based partly on recent similar surveys, particularly the 1985 Louisville crime survey (Johnson and Burgess, 1985). The survey instrument, pretested on 24 households selected to represent different parts of Kentucky, can be found in Appendix D.

### Sample

The household sample was determined by a two-stage cluster approach adapted for telephone interviewing. This form of random-digit dialing assured that every household with a telephone had equal probabilities of inclusion in the sample while maintaining some efficiency in field procedures (Waksberg, 1978). Therefore, unlisted or unpublished numbers had the same probability as listed numbers. Approximately 88 percent of Kentucky households have

telephones. Initially, 190 households were randomly identified within five Kentucky regions proportionate to the number of telephone households in each region. An additional 32 (total of 33) households differing only in the last two digits of the telephone number were identified for each of the initial 190 households. Screening information was obtained from 81-88 percent of the identified households. Once the household was determined as eligible for the complete interview, 82 percent gave the requested information.

### **Screening Selection**

The study plan included a substantial number of interviews with households experiencing both a violent crime and a property crime. National estimates available in the spring of 1985 indicated that about 6 percent of households experienced a violent crime annually, about 24 percent a property crime, and about 70 percent no crime (U.S. Department of Justice, 1983). Therefore, the screening procedure attempted to oversample victim households so that approximately the same number of interviews would be conducted within each of the three household strata. Each screener respondent was asked a set of four questions, two about violent crime and two about property crime. Every household experiencing a violent crime became eligible for the complete interview; about one in four households experiencing a property crime without a violent crime was selected for interview, and one in eleven experiencing neither type of crime was interviewed.

In total, 5,037 households were screened with the four screening questions generating about 73 percent accuracy in identifying victims of violent crime and 85 percent accuracy in identifying victims of property crime. The fact that the screening questions did not correctly identify all victim households and that Kentucky has a lower property crime rate than the nation yielded unequal numbers of interviews in the three strata (Table 1). However, this did not affect the estimates for Kentucky as a whole.



Table 1

Actual Numbers of Questionnaire Responses by Type of Label  
Within the Identified Screener Response Category

SCREENER RESPONSE	QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSE				
	<u>Total</u>	<u>Violent</u>	<u>Violent &amp; Property</u>	<u>Property</u>	<u>NonVictims</u>
<u>Violent</u>	<u>94</u>	<u>36</u>	<u>48</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>2</u>
Violent label	56	21	30	5	0
Property label	27	9	14	2	2
All label	11	6	4	1	0
<u>Property</u>	<u>168</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>130</u>	<u>13</u>
Violent label	1*	0	0	1	0
Property label	115	1	19	86	9
All label	52	1	4	43	4
<u>No Crime</u>	<u>295</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>275</u>
Violent label	0	0	0	0	0
Property label	3*	0	0	1	2
All label	292	2	3	14	273
<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>557</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>74</u>	<u>153</u>	<u>290</u>

\* Interviewer failed to follow instructions.

The survey procedures established that 33 residences would be screened from each primary sampling unit (a block of 100 telephone numbers with the same first five-digits). Of these 33 residences, 3 were eligible for interview regardless of their responses to the screener questions ("All" label), 8 were eligible for interview if they had experienced either a property or violent crime ("Property" label), and 22 were eligible for interview only if they had experienced a violent crime ("Violent" label). Once the eligibility of the household was determined, an interview respondent was randomly selected from adult household members. The one exception was in situations of domestic violence where the interview was conducted with the female screener respondent. In these cases the female was interviewed to minimize the chances of retaliation.

### **Weighting**

A sampling weighting procedure was applied to data for the three households strata to reflect their different probabilities of selection for interview. All household respondents were interviewed regardless of label instructions if the screener respondent indicated someone had been the victim of a violent crime. The interview responses from these 94 violent crime households were weighted by a factor of one. Data from 168 households with property crime indicated in the screener were weighted by a factor of three (inverse of the probability of selection from the 8 "Property" labels plus 3 "All" labels out of 33 total labels). Data from 295 households with no screener indication of crime were weighted by a factor of eleven (inverse of the probability of selection from the 3 "All" labels out of 33). All population estimates were based on weighted numbers; the statistical significance of these estimates was based on unweighted data from completed interviews (n = 557). The exception was the estimated household percent victimized by a violent or property crime where the weighted number of screened households (n = 3,843) represented the approximate number of households that would have been interviewed without the subsampling of noncrime households.

### **Data Processing and Analysis**

Following the interview phase, staff members of the Survey Research Unit coded the items not precoded by the interviewer. Codes for open-ended

questions were independently developed by two staff members, and then the lists were consolidated and clarified. The data response, keyed by the Louisville Tabulating Company, were processed on the University of Kentucky IBM 3083 computer.

Percentages were calculated for the people responding in categories shown in the tables. If an unknown or missing data category is not shown, it was excluded from the calculations. Missing data were also excluded from calculations of all descriptive statistics produced in this study. This has the effect of inputting to missing cases the average characteristics of the known cases. For making crime estimates for the general population of Kentucky, the weighted sample of 3,843 households has a margin of error of plus or minus 0.8 percent for the violent crime households and plus or minus 1.2 percent for property crime households. Significance for the weighted sample and the standard error of the population was calculated using a two-tailed Z-test for the difference in proportions. Differences in means for the unweighted sample was determined using a two-tailed T-test. A chi-square statistic was used to determine the generalizability of contingency table results and an F statistic was used in the case of multiple correlations. Statements such as "greater than," "less than," "different than," etc., have all been tested at the  $p=0.05$  level and been found to be statistically significant.

## RESULTS OF THE STUDY

### Kentucky Households Touched by Crime

The first policy question addressed in the study was "What is the prevalence, nature and pattern of crime in Kentucky as compared to the nation?" To this end, the analysis focused on households victimized by crime including crime patterns by type, region of the state, month of the year, race, and income. Additionally, the percentage of reported and unreported crime and victim-offender relationships were analyzed.

About 20 percent (20.2%) of Kentucky's households experienced a violent or theft crime in the 12 months prior to the interview compared to the national figure for the year 1984 of 26 percent (Table 2). In terms of violent crime, the statewide number of households was 5.6 percent which was significantly higher than the national figure of 4.9 percent. Property crime was 18.6 percent in Kentucky, significantly lower than the national average of 24.6 percent. It should be noted that violent and property crime percentages cannot be summed because some households experienced both violent and property crime and therefore were counted in both categories.

Since differences exist among researchers over the classification of burglary as a violent or property crime, it is necessary to analyze this type of crime separately. Over 6 percent (6.2%) of Kentucky's households experienced a burglary or attempted burglary which is not significantly different compared to the national figure of 5.5 percent.

Regional breakdowns among households surveyed revealed significant variations statewide. Table 3 on page 10 shows that the most urbanized area of Kentucky (North Central region) experienced higher rates of violent victimization per household than the other regions (Midwest and Northeast). These crime patterns are similar to the national victimization rates in 1984 in urban and rural areas for violent crime (6.3%) and property crime (3.7%). The highest victimization rates for property crime occurred in the Southeastern region (Cumberland Valley, Kentucky River, and Big Sandy) with 21.8 percent of the households touched by crime. The lowest property crime victimization was found in the Western region (Purchase, Green River, and Pennyrite) with 15.2 percent. (See Figures 1A and 2A in Appendix B for regional maps of Kentucky's pattern of victimization.)

Generally speaking, Kentucky's violent crime rate is higher than the national rate, but about the same in the more urbanized areas as the national rate. Property crime rates are significantly lower in Kentucky and the overall crime rates for both property and violent crime rates are also less than national rates. Regionally speaking, the midwest and northeast are significantly lower in violent crime than the North Central region which is more urbanized. All regions have lower property crime rates than the national rate with the Western and Northeastern regions significantly lower than the statewide rate of 18.6 percent.

Table 2

Percentage of Households in Kentucky and U.S. (1984)  
Touched by Crime During the Twelve Months Prior to the Interview

N = 3,843\*

<u>Households</u>	<u>Kentucky # of Households</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>U.S. (1984) # of Households</u> ***	<u>Percent</u>
Total	1,263,887	100.0%	87,693,000	100.0%
<u>Touched By:</u>				
Violent Crime	70,777	5.6**	4,306,000	4.9
Burglary or Attempted Burglary	78,360	6.2**	4,790,000	5.5*
Property Crime (including Burglary)	235,082	18.6**	21,967,230	25.5
Any Crime	255,305	20.2	22,786,000	26.0

\* Weighted sample.

\*\* Property plus violent crime does not equal the total because some households are touched by both property and violent crimes.

\*\*\* U.S. Department of Justice, 1985.

Table 3

Percent and Type of Victimization  
Per Household by Region in Kentucky

N = 3,843\*

<u>Region</u>	<u>Total No. of Households</u>	<u>% Property**</u>	<u>% Violent**</u>	<u>% Total</u>
Total	1,263,887	18.6	5.6	20.2
Midwest (n=617)				
Barren River				
Lake Cumberland	203,039	19.7	3.7	20.7
Lincoln Trail				
North Central (n=1,204)				
KIPDA	396,015	20.0	7.4	22.9
Northern Kentucky				
Northeast (n=859)				
Bluegrass				
Buffalo Trace	282,549	16.5	3.8	16.6
FIVCO				
Gateway				
Southeast (n=537)				
Big Sandy				
Kentucky River	176,454	21.8	5.5	22.8
Cumberland Valley				
Western (n=626)				
Purchase				
Pennyrile	205,830	15.2	5.5	17.2
Green River				
*Weighted sample				
**Property plus violent crime does not equal the total because some households are touched by both property and violent crimes.				

Since the survey asked respondents items which covered all types of criminal victimization, including minor events such as vandalism and minor thefts, total incidents of the most serious property and violent crimes were analyzed for regional variations. For purposes of this study, serious crime

incidents involved burglaries, robberies, personal attacks with a weapon, sexual assaults, and property losses in excess of \$499.00. Using this measure, only 25 percent of all crimes identified by respondents were "serious" crimes. The regional breakdown of serious crime incidents differs substantially from the regional measures of household crime (Table 4). The North Central region accounted for 11.8 percent of all serious crimes occurring in the Commonwealth. This represents nearly half (47.5%) of the serious crime incidents reported in this survey, while containing only 31.1% of the households.

The distribution of both violent and property crime over the 12 months prior to the interview gives some idea as to the patterns of variability of these crimes during the course of a year. Since the interviews were conducted over a three month period, the crimes occurring in May, June, and July of 1985 were collapsed with May, June, and July of 1984 in order to suggest monthly levels of various crimes. Generally, these patterns appear to follow overall levels partially related to respondent recall, i.e., the greater the time lapse between the incident and interview, the less likely the respondent will remember the incident.

Figure 1 on page 13 illustrates the monthly percentages for total crime, property crime and violent crime across the Commonwealth from May 1984 to April 1985. Total crime patterns over the year indicate that the highest levels might occur in the months of June and January immediately following the holiday season.

There appear to be some notable variations in the violent crime trend relative to the property crime trend. Both property and violent crime appear to be at their lowest during the summer months, with violent crime increasing toward the end of the year as the holiday period approaches. The most significant periods of violent crime, however, appear to be during April, May and June; however, May and June are months in which respondent recall might be a factor. As shown in Figure 1, property and total crime tend to fluctuate together since the volume of property crime is much greater.

Nationally, in 1984 and in previous years, a higher percentage of black than white households were victimized by violent crime. In Kentucky, black households, which constitute a relatively small percentage of all households, were not significantly different from white households in the percentage experiencing violent or property crime. Table 5 on page 14 indicates that

Table 4

Percent of Serious Crime by Household and Incident  
by Region

N = 3,843

<u>Region</u>	<u>Households</u>	<u>Percent of Surveyed Households Reporting Serious Crime</u>	<u>% of Serious Crime Incident in Kentucky</u>
Total	1,263,887	4.9	100.0
Midwest			
Barren River			
Lake Cumberland	203,039	3.8	15.1
Lincoln Trail			
North Central			
KIPDA	396,015	11.8	47.5
Northern Kentucky			
Northeast			
Bluegrass			
Buffalo Trace	282,549	3.8	15.1
FIVCO			
Gateway			
Southeast			
Big Sandy			
Kentucky River	176,454	3.2	12.9
Cumberland Valley			
Western			
Purchase			
Pennyrile	205,830	2.3	9.4
Green River			






FIGURE 1: PERCENT OF TOTAL CRIME, VIOLENT AND PROPERTY CRIME BY MONTH

Table 5  
Percent of Sample Households Experiencing Crime  
by Race

N = 550\*

<u>Race of Household</u>	<u>Type of Victimization</u>		
	<u>Property Crime</u>	<u>Violent Crime</u>	<u>No Crime</u>
White	36.3	17.9	45.8
Black	32.1	17.0	50.9

Note: Detail does not add to total because of overlap in households touched by crime, i.e., multiple victimizations

\* Unweighted sample

property and violent crime were reported by 36.3 percent and 17.9 percent of the white households, respectively; while 32.1 percent and 17.0 percent of black households experienced either a property or a violent crime. These differences in victimization rates were not statistically significant.

The percent of households touched by all types of crime varies by family income level: it is lower for households with an annual income level below \$5,000 (Table 6) and higher for households with incomes above \$35,000. Violent crime appears higher for lower income households while property crime is higher for households in the top income categories. This pattern appears to mirror national patterns (U.S. Department of Justice, 1985). The higher rates of violent crime in Kentucky are found in households with an income of less than \$5,000 and between \$5,000 and \$14,999 where 13.3 percent and 8.8 percent, respectively, reported a violent criminal event. Nationally, a comparable income group experienced a violent household crime rate of 4.8 percent. The differences may be due to the small number of respondents in the categories, especially since almost a third of those interviewed failed to give income information.

The percentage of crimes reported to the police are higher in Kentucky than in the nation as a whole (results not in table form). When victim

respondents of this survey were asked whether or not the police were informed of this incident 49.3 percent said "yes," while 50.7 percent answered "no." In listing reasons for not reporting the incident to the police, 48 percent believed that nothing could or would be done (lack of proof often cited), 30.3 percent felt that the incident was not important enough, and 15.7 percent said that they regarded the incident as a private, personal matter. Interestingly, only one percent felt that the police would not want to be bothered, 2.3 percent simply didn't want to take the time, and only one percent said they did not want to get involved.

Additional items in the survey, also not reported in tabular form, attempted to look at the factors surrounding the criminal event. Of the victim households surveyed, 21.2 percent of the respondents said that they knew the person committing the offense. Of the victims who knew the offender, 15.7 percent said he or she was a relative, 31.4 percent said the offender was an acquaintance, 21.5 percent listed the perpetrator as a neighbor, and 31.4 percent responded that the offender was someone else that they knew.

Table 6  
Percent of Households Experiencing Crime  
by Income

N = 384\*

Type of Victimization	Income					
	<\$5,000	\$5,000- 14,999	\$15,000 -24,999	\$25,000 -34,999	\$35,000 -44,000	\$45,000+
Total Crime	28.9	33.3	28.9	36.8	48.0	42.0
Property	15.6	24.5	21.1	35.3	41.7	35.5
Violent	13.3	8.8	7.8	1.5	6.3	6.5
Sample size	(45)	(102)	(90)	(68)	(48)	(31)

\* Unweighted

Note: Detail does not add to total because of multiple victimizations.

## **The Aftermath of Being Criminally Victimized**

Generally speaking, victimization studies largely attempt to analyze and measure patterns of crime. The uniqueness of this crime victim study is that it also examines what happens to the life of crime victims in comparison to households not victimized. The key policy question being addressed is: **What are the significant differences in the perceptions and behavior of citizens touched by crime as compared to those who have not experienced crime?** In answering this question, attention was given to measuring three potential consequences of being victimized: mental health (depression scale), fear of victimization (fear of crime scale) and response to this fear (security consciousness index). These measures are assumed to be symptomatic of conditions that may impede the quality of life. The types of crime under study are compared below according to these indicators.

**Mental Health Differences by Crime Type:** To what extent do crime victims vary from the general population when it comes to feelings of depression? A well known 20-item depression scale, used in this study, was developed by researchers at the National Institute of Mental Health (Radloff, 1977). Examples of these items include: How many days during the last week did you: not feel like eating? not shake off the blues? have trouble keeping your mind on what you were doing? feel like a failure? have trouble sleeping? Respondent answers were scaled based on a point total to each of the 20 items (see Appendix C for a list of these items and response frequencies).

In this study Multiple Classification Analysis (MCA) was used to compare depression score means of residents experiencing violent crime, property crime, and both types of crime in a single year with household respondents not touched by crime (Kim and Kohout, 1975). This analysis procedure also allowed for adjustments in the subgroup means due to the effects of sex, race, and education differences in depression across the crime types. In short, MCA controlled for the impact of the variables which were found in a preliminary correlation analysis to be significantly related to depression.

The analysis focused primarily on differences in depression scores of respondents living in homes touched by crime and those living in households not experiencing crime. The importance of examining household differences was based on the assumption that victimization may also impact on others not victimized but living in the same primary group environment.

Figure 2 shows that the overall mean score on the depression scale for the total sample is 12.64 (scores range from 0 to 51); however when mean scores are calculated for subgroups by crime types, significant differences in the level of depression are revealed. Depression reported by respondents of property victim households (mean score of 12.63) differs significantly from those not touched by crime (9.95). In addition, respondents in violent crime households, and to a greater extent households experiencing both property and violent crime, indicated significantly higher depression (mean scores of 17.47 and 20.15) than the noncrime households.

Overall, the data tend to demonstrate that crime victimization relates significantly to measures of depressive symptoms. The strength of this finding is unusual in survey research. While it is tempting to conclude that crime causes depression, this study (which contains data collected at one point in time) can only conclude that the two are related. It might be suggested, however, that because of the relationship between criminal victimization and depression, being a victim of crime will not likely enhance the quality of life.

**Fear of Crime Differences by Crime Type:** To what extent do crime victims vary from the general population when it comes to their fear of crime? To measure this potential consequence for being criminally victimized, respondents were asked a series of six questions that were found through factor analysis to be unidimensional in the previously mentioned Louisville crime survey. Examples of these questions include: How safe do you feel walking alone in your neighborhood or walking alone outside of your neighborhood? How much does the fear of crime prevent you from doing things you like to do? How often do you think about being robbed or assaulted?

A factor analysis revealed that these six items correlated highly and therefore appear to be measuring the same dimension of fear as in the Louisville crime survey. Respondents' answers were scaled based on the number of affirmative responses to each of the items (see Appendix C for the factor analysis results). Multiple Classification Analysis was again conducted to uncover differences, if any, in the fear of crime by type of victimization (nonvictims, violent, property, and those experiencing both types of crime in a single year).

Figure 3 on page 19 shows that the overall mean score on the Fear of Crime scale for the total sample is 5.68 (scores range from 0 to 18).





FIGURE 2: AVERAGE LEVEL OF DEPRESSION  
OF HOUSEHOLD RESPONDENTS  
BY TYPE OF VICTIMIZATION

\* ADJUSTED FOR THE EFFECTS OF: SEX, AGE AND EDUCATION



**FIGURE 3: AVERAGE LEVEL OF FEAR OF CRIME  
OF HOUSEHOLD RESPONDENTS  
BY TYPE OF VICTIMIZATION**

\* ADJUSTED FOR THE EFFECTS OF: SEX, AGE AND EDUCATION

Property victim households' fear of crime is significantly higher than the subgroup of households not touched by crime, mean scores of 5.88 as compared to 4.74. Violent crime victims' households also reported a higher level of fear (7.42) while households experiencing both property and violent crime reported even greater fear of crime (7.96) than the noncrime household subgroup (4.74).

As in the case of depression differences of citizens touched by crime, the difference in level of fear of being victimized is higher for violent crime victims than nonvictims, and the greatest between households experiencing violent crime or both violent and property crime. Respondents touched by violent crime experience higher levels of fear than those touched by property crime; the multiple victimization subgroup reported the highest levels of fear. While crime victimization may not cause fear, fear in and of itself may be a symptom of poor quality of life.

**Security Consciousness Differences By Crime Type:** To what extent do crime victims vary from the general population when it comes to taking security steps at home to prevent being victimized? Respondents were given a list of 15 security measures that may be taken to prevent crime. They were asked to indicate whether they took these precautions always, most of the time, some of the time, or none of the time. Examples of these precautions include: keep a dog for protection, consider moving because of feeling unsafe, lock doors and windows, lock garage, and lock car away from home. Respondents' answers were summed to form a security consciousness index. (See Appendix C for these items and response frequencies.) Using Multiple Classification Analysis, comparisons were made in respondents' levels of security consciousness by the type of victimization (violent, property, and violent and property during a single year) and households not touched by crime. Figure 4 presents the household comparisons.

The security consciousness pattern across crime types varies to some extent with the fear of crime by types of crime discussed earlier. The overall mean score on the security consciousness index for the total sample is 10.15 (scores range from 0 to 20). In comparison, property victim households are significantly different from the subgroup of those not touched by crime, (mean score of 10.39 as compared with 9.61). There is no difference, however, in the level of security consciousness of households touched by violent crime and those experiencing no crime. Households experiencing both a property and






FIGURE 4: AVERAGE LEVEL OF SECURITY CONSCIOUSNESS OF HOUSEHOLD RESPONDENTS BY TYPE OF VICTIMIZATION

\* ADJUSTED FOR THE EFFECTS OF: SEX, AGE AND EDUCATION

violent crime, reflecting previous findings, expressed significantly more frequent security-related behavior (mean 11.71) than the noncrime subgroup.

While the relationship between type of crime and security consciousness is not exactly the same as other results in violent crime households reported in this section, these findings do suggest that victimization may be a correlate to the quality of life of citizens in Kentucky, i.e., both property and multiple victimization households have significantly higher levels of concern about security than households not touched by crime. These results also continue to raise some question about the relationship between property crime experiences in the household and the quality of life. In future analysis of the data, burglary as the most serious property crime will be analyzed separately to ascertain whether these quality of life measures (depression, fear and security consciousness) in this study are similar for victims of different violent crimes or other property crimes. Future results will be reported in a special SAC research bulletin.

#### **Victim Awareness of and Experience with Formal Support Services**

Another policy concern that this study addresses is awareness and experiences that victims have with various formal support services including the criminal justice system in Kentucky, victim assistance programs, and crime prevention services. Two general policy questions provided the framework for this facet of the study:

- **What is the overall experience of victims with the different components of the criminal justice process?**
- **What is the crime victim's level of awareness and use of victim and crime prevention programs and, in the case of crime prevention, how does this awareness and use level compare with nonvictims?**

Victims' perceptions of and experiences with the criminal justice process were measured by asking six questions relating to police and prosecutor behavior and the victims' willingness to cooperate in the future. Approximately 10 percent of the respondents of the survey had some contact with one or more criminal justice officials. Table 7 shows 76.5 percent of the victims having contact with the criminal justice system responded that the police were extremely or somewhat helpful, while 79.9 percent were very satisfied or simply satisfied with police handling of the incident.

Sixty-seven percent responded that police were also very courteous. Crime victims may be less satisfied with prosecutors. Forty-one percent of the victim respondents judged prosecutors as not helpful or were not satisfied with the handling of their case. This percentage compares to only 15 percent who indicated that the police were not helpful or were not satisfied with the handling of their case. Since there were only 14 respondents who had contact with prosecutors, this difference, although statistically significant, has such a small sample size that caution should be exercised with this conclusion.

Table 7

Crime Victims' Satisfaction with the Kentucky Criminal Justice System  
and Their Willingness to Cooperate in the Future

	<u>Extremely Helpful/Very Satisfied</u>	<u>Somewhat Helpful or Satisfied</u>	<u>Not At All Helpful or Satisfied</u>	<u>Don't Know</u>	<u>N =</u>	
Police Helpful?	36.3%	40.2%	18.5%	5.0%	159	
Satisfied with Police?	46.8	33.0	15.2	5.0	158	
Police Courteous?	66.8	21.4	5.0	6.8	159	
Prosecutor Satisfaction	22.7	36.4	40.9	0.0	14	
	<u>Definitely Would</u>	<u>Probably Would</u>	<u>Might</u>	<u>Definitely Would Not</u>	<u>No Answer</u>	<u>N =</u>
Will Contact Police the Future	79.3%	13.4%	4.6%	2.7%	0.0%	165
Will Recommend to Other Victim or Witness to Get Involved	64.5	29.3	3.6	2.6	0.0	161

Regardless of their experiences with the police and prosecutors, an overwhelming number of victims said that they would definitely or probably contact police or prosecutors in the future (93%) and would definitely or probably recommend to other victims or witnesses that they get involved in the criminal justice system (94%).

Figure 5 displays in graphic form crime victims' levels of awareness of various victim services throughout the state. Most victims are aware of victim services relating to rape relief, spouse abuse relief, legal aid, child abuse and counseling for crime. Respondents were not as aware of general victim assistance programs--only 37 percent reported being aware. In an effort to get a relative measure of victim service use, victims were asked what services they had used. Only 9 percent of the victims indicated using any type of victim related service (not reported in table form).

These findings show that victim awareness of programs for victims is high, whereas these services are underutilized. In future analyses of this data, which will be reported in a special SAC bulletin, use of informal support systems such as relatives will be examined.

Figure 6 on page 26 presents a comparison of crime victims' and nonvictims' levels of awareness by program type. In general, victim and nonvictim households reported being most aware of Operation Identification, Neighborhood Watch, and Child Identification programs. The security survey crime prevention program is the least known program. The statistically significant differences in the levels of awareness of crime victims and nonvictims were Operation Identification (76 percent as compared to 70 percent), the Neighborhood Watch programs (87 percent as compared to 79 percent), and the Child Identification Program (76 percent as compared to 71 percent).

Figure 7 on page 27 compares crime victims with nonvictims on their use of crime prevention programs. In general, citizen use of crime prevention programs is much lower than their level of awareness. Operation Identification and Child Identification are, however, the most used programs in the state. The least used program was the McGruff-Crime Fighting Dog Program.

Difference in the crime prevention program use by victim and nonvictim households varied. In the case of the Block Watch and Security Survey programs, crime victims reported significantly less use than did nonvictims.

It should be noted that use of crime prevention programs was considerably higher than use of crime victim programs; 47 percent of the victims and 52 percent of the nonvictims reported using at least one type of crime prevention program (not in graphic form).




FIGURE 5: CRIME VICTIM AWARENESS  
BY TYPE OF PROGRAM




FIGURE 6: HOUSEHOLD VICTIMS AND NONVICTIMS AWARENESS OF CRIME PREVENTION PROGRAMS BY PROGRAM TYPE




FIGURE 7: HOUSEHOLD VICTIMS AND NONVICTIMS USE OF CRIME PREVENTION PROGRAMS BY PROGRAM TYPE

**Summary:** This examination of victim awareness of and experience with formal support services shows that a majority of citizens in Kentucky have had good experiences with the police and, to a lesser extent, with prosecutors. Most are willing to cooperate in the future. A large majority of Kentucky residents are also aware of victim and crime prevention programs that are available for use. Unfortunately, victim programs are being underutilized. Crime prevention programs are utilized significantly more than are victim assistance programs.



## USE AND APPLICATION OF THE FINDINGS

This statewide crime survey focused on key policy questions that address the extent and nature of victimization in Kentucky, differences in the perceptions and behavior of citizens touched by crime as compared to those who have not experienced crime, and crime victims' awareness of and experiences with various formal support service systems. The findings have application in three general ways. They can provide guidance for modifying and developing programs and services for crime victims, for obtaining additional funds for victims of crime, and for conducting future research for Kentucky's criminal justice agencies.

### **Usefulness for Justifying Additional Resources for Victim Programming**

Crime victims are often overlooked at the state and local levels of government. These findings, generalizable to the state of Kentucky, can be useful in a number of ways to officials who are in positions to provide services to crime victims. Foremost, the findings show that while crime may be stable in Kentucky and the nation at large, crimes of violence in Kentucky currently occur more frequently than the national average. Resources must be allocated to assist victims of violent crime. These resources could be in the form of legislative appropriations targeted specifically for violent crime victim assistance at the police, prosecution, and judicial stages of the criminal justice system dealing with violent offenders. Additionally, special funds might be allocated for victims of violent crime to be administered by the Victim Compensation Board as well as appropriations for funding for private programs designed to provide services to victims of violent crime.

Further, the findings also indicate that households which experience violent crimes and both property and violent crime (i.e., multiple victimizations) exhibit higher levels of depressive symptoms and enhanced concern regarding the fear of crime; multiple victimized households also reported more wariness in security matters. Taken together, such relationships suggest the indirect costs of crime, especially violent crime. Kentucky's more significant rates of violent crime, higher than the national average, suggest that citizens in the Commonwealth suffer in ways that are not readily apparent. The consequences of multiple victimization and violent crime can contribute to greater demand on mental health services as well as

divert consumer spending away from other areas toward the purchase of security-related systems and services. In the final analysis, these are the indirect or hidden costs of crime which need to be addressed in planning and spending decisions for any preferred future in the Commonwealth.

#### **Application of Findings for Victim Program Change and New Development**

The findings presented in this report can provide guidance to program change and new development for crime victim services in Kentucky. Most important is that programs have to provide special services to victims who are suffering from depression and fear of crime. It is also important to focus attention on other household dwellers who have been exposed to acts of violence, though they were not personally victimized.

Giving attention to existing victim and crime prevention programs is also important. Special attention should be given to stimulating utilization of these existing services, especially victim services. Importantly, any new development should be evaluated.

#### **Implications for Future Research**

This study has raised a number of questions not addressed in this investigation. First, it is important to follow up on the respondents of this study to determine cause-effect relationships between crime and quality of life as measured by depression, fear of crime and security consciousness. Second, burglary should be analyzed separately to ascertain whether or not its affects are similar to property or violent crime. Third, it is important to examine the extent to which informal support systems such as relatives are used as compared with formal support systems. Finally, it is important for Kentucky to seek outside funding from federal and private foundations in order to implement and evaluate innovative demonstration projects.

## REFERENCES

- Johnson, K. W., Burgess, L. (1985) "Fear of Crime Victimization and Crime Prevention in Louisville, Kentucky: Summary, A Study Conducted for the Louisville Public Safety and Health Cabinet." Louisville: Urban Studies Center.
- Karmen, A. (1984) Crime Victims: An Introduction to Victimology. Monterey: Brooks/Cole.
- Kim, J., Kohout, F. J. (1975) "Analysis of Variance and Covariance: Subprograms Anova and Oneway." Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, Second Edition, McGraw-Hill.
- O'Brien, R. M. (1985) "Crime and Victimization Data." Law and Criminal Justice Series, Volume 4, Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Radloff, L. (1977) "The CES-D Scale: A Self-Report Depression Scale for Research in the General Population." Applied Psychological Measurement, 1: 385-401.
- U.S. Department of Justice (1985) Households Touched by Crime, 1984, Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- (1983) Criminal Victimization in the United States: 1973-1981, Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Waksberg, J. (1978) "Sampling Methods for Random Digit Dialing." Journal of the American Statistical Association, 75:40-46.

# APPENDICES

**APPENDIX A**

**Methods and Procedures**

The Statewide Victimization Survey was a telephone survey of the households of Kentucky. This section of the report details the methods and procedures used.

The survey was conducted by trained interviewers of the Urban Studies Center from its telephone interviewing facility. Interviewers worked shifts which allowed most households to be reached within three calls, even though the Urban Studies Center policy makes at least five attempts to reach each number. Most of the interviewing was concentrated during evening and weekend hours (Table A-1).

<u>Time Period</u>	<u>Hours</u>	<u>Percent of Hours</u>
Weekday mornings	60	17
Weekday afternoons	70	19
Weekday evenings	140	39
Weekends	90	25
Total	360	100

Whenever a telephone number rang with no answer, it was set aside to be tried during a different time period. Once attempts had been made in all four time periods, the fifth call could be at any time. If the telephone was answered at a residence, but either no adult household member was home, or the selected respondent was not available, the interviewer inquired about the best time to find the appropriate person home. Future contacts were then made around the suggested time. Every number was redialed until one of the following final results occurred:

- The interview was completed;
- The interview was refused at two separate times;
- The number was not in service or was a business number;
- There was no answer after five attempts;
- The selected respondent was not available during the interview period;
- Illness, language problem, or mental incapacity prevented an interview from being conducted.

## Geography Coverage

The respondent was selected to be representative of each of five regions within the Commonwealth of Kentucky as well as the Commonwealth as a whole. The five geographical regions with their associated Area Development Districts selected characteristics of those regions from the 1980 Census; the number of primary sample units (PSU's) within each region are shown in Table A-2.

Region	1980 Census Population	1980 Census Households			Survey PSU's	
		Total	Phone	% of Ph	Number	Percent
Central (Lincoln Trail, Barren River, Lake Cumberland)	605,756	203,039	171,560	15.4	30	15.8
North Central (KIPDA, Northern Kentucky)	1,117,945	396,015	371,783	33.4	63	33.2
Northeast (Bluegrass, Buffalo Trace, FIVCO, Gateway)	808,990	282,549	248,931	22.3	42	22.1
Southeast (Big Sandy, Kentucky River, Cumberland Valley)	543,753	176,454	134,169	12.0	23	12.1
Western (Purchase, Pennyrile, Green River)	584,333	205,830	187,603	16.8	32	16.8
TOTAL	3,660,777	1,263,887	1,114,046	100.0	190	100.0

## The Sample

The sampling method was a two-stage cluster approach adapted for telephone interviewing, a form of Random Digit Dialing (RDD) (Waksberg, 1978). RDD is simply telephone interviewing using a series of randomly generated phone numbers. Such a method lowers field work costs yet maintains high quality data. RDD has the advantage of including in the sample those households with unlisted telephone numbers. This is especially important in

urban areas where one can expect a higher percentage of unlisted phone numbers than in rural areas.

The form of RDD employed involved a two-stage clustering method. The first stage involved computer generation of random numbers comprised of eight digits. The numbers were a composite of the three-digit area code, a three-digit prefix, and a two-digit random number ranging from 00 to 99. Figuratively, the first stage would appear as:

(AAA) PPP - NN

Where AAA was the area code, PPP was a random selection from among the prefixes serving the county or group of counties, and NN was a random number from the range 00-99.

The second stage consisted of the interviewer selecting a number from a list of all two-digit numbers ranging from 00-99. The list was randomly ordered for each first stage number. The second stage two-digit number was dialed after the first stage stem, thus creating the full digits necessary for the phone number.

The clustering aspect of the process involved the identification of the primary sampling unit (PSU). A member of the field staff dialed the first-stage stem plus the first second-stage number from the random digit listing. Whenever a residence was encountered, the first stage stem was considered a PSU and included in the sample. As many of the remaining 99 second stage numbers were dialed as needed to identify 33 eligible residences. If the first telephone number dialed reached a business or was not in service, the remaining numbers were excluded from the sample. In cases where the first call was unanswered, the number was redialed four additional times at various times of the day and various days of the week.

The third stage of the sample was based on national crime statistics, with a violent crime rate about six percent and a property crime rate about 24 percent. For efficiency of the sample, it was desired to complete approximately the same number of interviews in each of the following strata:

- Households experiencing violent crime during the previous 12 months;
- Households experiencing property crime but not a violent crime;
- Households experiencing no crime during the previous 12 months.

The initial target sample size for each of these strata was 300 completed interviews. Cost factors, however, indicated that 900 interviews would be practicable only if the national rates held up for Kentucky and screening was



100 percent efficient. The fall-back position was to complete all of the planned screening contacts regardless of the number of completed interviews in each strata.

In order to obtain 300 violent crime interviews with only six percent of the households having experienced this type of crime in a year, and assuming 80 percent of the eligible households would grant the interview, 6,250 households would need to be screened ( $300/.06/.80 = 6,250$ ). With this as the initial target, it was decided to use 190 Primary Sampling Units with 33 residential contacts per PSU ( $190 \times 33 = 6,270$ ). Within the cluster of 33 residential contacts, all households reporting on the screener that a violent crime had been experienced by a family member during the previous months were eligible for a complete interview. Since about four times as many households were expected to have experienced a property crime only than to have experienced a violent crime (24 vs 6 percent), about a fourth of the households reporting a property crime on the screener were eligible for the complete interview. Finally, about one in 11 households were expected to have experienced no crime as had experienced a violent crime (70 vs 6 percent), so one out of 11 households reporting no crime on the screener were eligible for interview. To ensure these ratios, each cluster of 33 residential contacts (each PSU) had labels preprinted as follows:

- 'ALL' was preprinted on three of the 33 labels to designate that the household was eligible for an interview regardless of the screener responses;
- 'PROPERTY' was preprinted on eight labels of the 33 to designate the household was eligible for the interview only if it had reported a property or a violent crime on the screener note--this should have been five labels to achieve the expected ratio, but the mistake worked in favor of the study;
- 'VIOLENT' was preprinted on 22 of the 33 labels to designate the households that were eligible for interview only if a violent crime had been reported in response to screener questions.

Following through the arithmetic of this sample plan, the study expected to have interviews with 301 victims of violent crimes, 400 victims of property crimes without violent crime, and 320 interviews with households experiencing no crime. The calculations for each preprinted label are:

- Label says 'ALL' (3 of 33):
  - 6,270 x 3/33 = 570 @ 80% = 456 potential households
  - 456 @ 6% = 27 with a violent crime
  - 456 @ 24% = 109 with a property crime
  - 456 @ 70% = 320 with no crime.
- Label says 'PROPERTY' (8 OF 33):
  - 6,270 X 8/33 = 1520 @ 80% = 1216 potential households
  - 1216 @ 6% = 73 with a violent crime
  - 1216 @ 24% = 292 with a property crime.
- Label says 'VIOLENT' (22 out of 33):
  - 6,270 x 22/33 = 4180 @ 80% = 3344 potential households
  - 3344 @ 6% = 201 with a violent crime.

Summarizing from the above, and assuming crime reported on the screener would be as accurate as in the questionnaire where more questions were included, Table A-3 shows the expected number of completed questionnaires by type of crime experiences, according to the label statement at the third level of sampling.

Table A-3				
Expected Number of Household Interviews by Crime Experience and Label				
<u>Label</u>	<u>Crime Experience</u>			<u>Total</u>
	<u>Violent</u>	<u>Property</u>	<u>None</u>	
All	27	109	320	456
Property	73	292	0	365
Violent	200	0	0	200
TOTAL	300	401	320	1,021

The actual results of crime experience by label are shown in Table A-4. As can be seen when Table A-3 and A-4 are compared, the actual deviated quite a bit from the expected. This is due to three major differences between the actual and the expected: crime rate, screening efficiency and response rate.

Table A-4

## Actual Number of Household Interviews by Crime Experience and Label

<u>Label</u>	<u>Crime Experience</u>			<u>Total</u>
	<u>Violent</u>	<u>Property</u>	<u>None</u>	
All	20	58	277	355
Property	43	89	13*	145
Violent	51	6*	0	57
TOTAL	114	153	290	557

\*=Questionnaire respondent gave different information than the screener respondent (15 cases) and interviewer completed questionnaire in error (4 cases).

When both the expected and actual numbers of completed interviews are percentaged on the row or 'Label' totals, the differences between the expected and actual crime rates can be seen in Table A-5. Since the screener did not enter into the selection for households where an 'ALL' label was encountered, this row of Table A-5 demonstrates the differences most clearly. There was no difference in the expected and actual percent of households experiencing a violent crime (six percent each), but there was a substantial difference between the expected and actual property crime experience (24 vs. 16 percent), and the expected and actual percentage of households experiencing no type of crime during the previous 12 months. Among the group that were designated for interview, if they had experienced either a property or violent crime, a greater percentage than expected indicated they had experienced a violent crime. We expected a ratio of violent to property crime of 1:4 on the 'PROPERTY' label, but actually experienced a ratio of 1:2. Kentucky had a much lower rate of property crime than expected; the number of interviews conducted with households experiencing a property crime would have been even more underrepresented if we had not made a mistake and took every third property crime household than every fourth as planned.

Table A-5

Percent of Households by Expected and Actual Crime Experience  
According to Sampling Label Expected Actual

<u>Label</u>	<u>Violent</u>	<u>Property</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>Total</u>
		<u>Percent</u>		
All	6/6	24/16	70/78	100/100
Property	20/30	80/61	0/9	100/100
Violent	100/89	0/11	0/0	100/100

Table A-6 shows the expected and actual numbers of interviews percentaged on the column totals. This makes it easier to compare the expected and the actual efficiency of the screener in properly identifying households. It was expected that 67 percent of the households which had experienced a violent crime would be interviewed from the set of screened households with a 'VIOLENT' label. In actuality, only 45 percent of the households victimized by a violent crime were picked up in this group. The two screener questions on violent crime only identified 73 percent of the households that reported experiencing a violent crime during the later interview. Households who had experienced both violent crime and property crime were particularly susceptible to having that violence missed by the screener. It may very well be that the property crime was the salient crime, with only a minor form of violence accompanying it which was not thought of until the detailed probes during the complete interview.

A greater percentage of property crime was picked upon the 'ALL' labels than expected, indicating that the screener was not totally efficient for picking up property crime either. Other comparisons showed that 85 percent of households experiencing a property crime were correctly identified on the screener. This is a better rate than violent crime, but less than the 100 percent accuracy used in the initial calculations. It should be noted that there were a few cases where crime was reported on the screener but not reported during the main interview. Part of this was due to the interview respondent not always being the same as the screener respondent.

Table A-6

Percent of Households by Expected and Actual Sampling Labels  
According to Interview Reporting of Crime

<u>Label</u>	<u>Violent</u>	<u>Property</u>	<u>NonVictim</u>
		<u>Percent</u>	
All	9/18	27/38	100/96
Property	24/38	73/58	0/4
Violent	67/45	0/4	0/0
TOTAL	100/100	100/100	100/100

The overall response rate to the survey was lower than expected. In contrast to the 80 percent response used in planning this study, the actual response was 66 to 72 percent. The higher figure is the response rate if those telephone numbers which were not answered during five attempts are assumed to be nonresidences. The lower figure is the response rate if all numbers called were never answered and are assumed to be residences with occupants away or difficult to find.

The overall response rate has two major components: 1) the response to the screener; and 2) the response to the interview. The product of these two components produce the overall or total response rate. The screener response is the proportion of identified residences from whom screening information was obtained, whether or not the household had experienced a violent or property crime. The interview response is the proportion of households eligible for the complete interview and from whom a complete interview was obtained. The responses to the study are shown in Table A-7.

The screener response can be computed only as a range. This is due to the uncertainty of knowing whether the telephone numbers not answered in five attempts connect to a residence or not. Since the numbers were randomly generated, some of the numbers not answered during five attempts at different times of the day and different days of the week could be numbers connected to a telephone booth; numbers for which the phone seemed to be ringing but actually were not in service; numbers connected to vacation homes which are occupied infrequently. However, some were connected to residences at which no one was home during any of the five scheduled attempts. If all the 523

numbers not answered connected to residences, the screener response was 81 percent (5,037/6,225). On the other hand, if those numbers not answered in five attempts did not connect to residences, then the screener response was 80 percent (5,037/6,225-523). Therefore, the true screener response rate lies within the range of 81-88 percent.

Table A-7

Number of Residential Numbers by Survey Results

<u>Survey Results</u>	<u>Number</u>
Total possible residential numbers	6,225
Screener completed	5,037
Eligible for interview	682
Completed interviews	557
Terminated interviews	32
Interview refused after screening	54
Respondent not reached in five attempts	39
Household not eligible for interview	4,355
Screener not completed	1,188
Refused screener	665
Number not answered in five attempts	523

The interview response rate was 82 percent (557/682). Therefore, the overall response rate lies within the range of 66-72 percent ( $0.82 \times 0.81$  to  $0.82 \times 0.88$ ).

Weights

Different households had different probabilities of being interviewed, depending upon whether or not the screener respondent indicated that someone in the household had been the victim of a crime during the previous twelve months. Since the data were not to be analyzed separately within different screening strata, weights were applied to each case to adjust for the different probabilities of being included in the sample for the complete interview. The weights approximate the number of interviews that would have

been conducted if all households where the screener indicated no crime and property crime had been interviewed.

Interviewed households for whom the screener response indicated they were victims of a violent crime were always interviewed regardless of which label applied to the telephone number (3 "ALL", 8 "PROPERTY" and 22 "VIOLENT" out of 33 labels). They had a probability of selection of 1.0, with the inverse of this producing a weight of 1.0.

Interviewed households for whom the screener response indicated they were a victim of a property crime, but not a violent crime, were eligible for interview 11 times in each cluster of 33 (3 "ALL" and 8 "PROPERTY" out of 33 labels). Therefore, they had a selection probability of one in eleven with the inverse of this producing a weight of 1.0.

The actual and weighted numbers of interviews are shown in Table A-8. These weights are not dependent upon the answers made during the complete interview, but the ones during the screener; therefore, they do not have analytic meaning within themselves. However, weighted percentages or means do have meaning and are used throughout this report. For purposes of calculation standard errors of estimates (determining statistical significance), weighted figures are not always appropriate. For general purposes, the unweighted number of interviews are used as the appropriate sample size for calculating standard errors. The weighted number (3,843) is used for estimating the overall rates of victimization. This is due to the fact that over 5,000 households were screened, and the screener responses to victimization among those interviewed largely predicted victimization as reported on the main interview. More refined estimates of standard errors would require a complex approximation, such as balance half-sample replication procedures.

Table A-8		
Unweighted and Weighted Number of Households Interviewed by Response to Victimization Questions on the Screener		
<u>Screener response</u>	<u>Unweighted</u>	<u>Weighted</u>
Victim reported on screener	94	94
Property crime reported on screener	168	504
No crime reported on screener	295	3,245
Total	557	3,843

**APPENDIX B**

**Kentucky's Pattern of Victimization**

**Figures 1A and 2A**




# FIGURE 1A: Regional Crime Patterns in Kentucky

## Percentage of Households Touched by Violent Crime

Statewide  
Violent Crime: 5.6%


B-1



# FIGURE 2A: Regional Crime Patterns in Kentucky Percentage of Households Touched by Property Crime June 1984 - June 1985

Statewide  
Property Crime: 18.6%

B-2



**APPENDIX C**

Depression Items and Response Frequencies

Factor Analysis of Fear of Crime Items

Security Consciousness Items and Response Frequencies

Depression Items and Response Frequencies

	<u>less than 1 day</u>	<u>1-2 days</u>	<u>3-4 days</u>	<u>5-7 days</u>	<u>Total</u>
During the last week how many days were you bothered by things that don't usually bother you?	58%	26%	10%	6%	100%
How many days did you not feel like eating; that is, your appetite was poor?	68	20	6	6	100
How many days did you feel that you could not shake off the blues even with help from your family and friends?	67	20	8	5	100
How many days did you feel that you were just as good as other people?	4	3	8	85	100
How many days did you have trouble keeping your mind on what you were doing?	45	31	11	13	100
How many days did you feel depressed?	63	24	8	5	100
How many days did you feel that everything you did was an effort?	35	29	13	23	100
How many days did you feel hopeful about the future?	7	10	18	65	100
How many days did you feel you life had been a failure?	86	8	3	3	100
How many days were you fearful?	84	9	4	3	100

Depression Items and Response Frequencies (Continued)

	<u>less than 1 day</u>	<u>1-2 days</u>	<u>3-4 days</u>	<u>5-7 days</u>	<u>Total</u>
How many days was your sleep restless?	48%	31%	10%	11%	100%
How many days did you feel happy?	3	8	20	69	100
How many days did you talk less than usual?	60	30	7	3	100
How many days did you feel lonely?	69	21	6	4	100
How many days did you feel that other people were unfriendly?	73	14	9	4	100
How many days did you feel that you were enjoying life?	6	7	15	72	100
How many days did you have crying spells?	87	10	2	1	100
How many days did you feel sad?	64	24	9	3	100
How many days did you feel that people disliked you?	85	11	2	2	100
How many days did you feel as if you could not "get going"?	42	34	12	12	100

Factor Analysis of Fear of Crime Items

	<u>Loading</u>	<u>Percent</u>
How safe do you feel walking alone in your neighborhood during the day? Would you say you feel . . .	0.67	
Very safe		77
Somewhat safe		18
Somewhat unsafe		3
Very unsafe		<u>2</u>
		100
How safe do you feel outside in your neighborhood at night?	0.68	
Very safe		40
Somewhat safe		36
Somewhat unsafe		13
Very unsafe		<u>11</u>
		100
How much does fear of crime prevent you from doing things you would like to do?	0.73	
Very safe		7
Somewhat safe		24
Somewhat unsafe		28
Very unsafe		<u>41</u>
		100
When you leave your house or apartment, how often do you think about being robbed or physically assaulted?	0.78	
Very safe		9
Somewhat safe		23
Somewhat unsafe		35
Very unsafe		<u>33</u>
		100

Factor Analysis of Fear of Crime Items (Continued)

	<u>Loading</u>	<u>Percent</u>
When you leave your house or apartment, how often do you think about it being broken into or vandalized while you're away?	0.68	
Very safe		14
Somewhat safe		29
Somewhat unsafe		31
Very unsafe		26
		<u>100</u>
When you're in your home, how often do you feel afraid of being attacked or assaulted by someone that you know such as a relative, neighbor, or acquaintance?	0.59	
Very safe		1
Somewhat safe		5
Somewhat unsafe		14
Very unsafe		80
		<u>100</u>

Security Consciousness Items and Response Frequencies

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>Partially</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Total</u>
Keep the locks on your windows and doors in working order?	93%	4%	3%	100%
Lock the doors and windows before leaving?	86	9	5	100
Close and lock garage or outbuilding doors before leaving?	73	9	18	100
Lock vehicle doors when leaving them parked at home?	44	11	45	100
Lock vehicle when parked away from your home?	80	11	9	100
Have you engraved most of your valuable property with identification numbers?	25	13	62	100
Do you have antiburglary stickers or warning decals on the windows or doors of your home?	18	3	79	100
Do you keep a dog for protection?	27	8	65	100
Have you moved or considered moving to a safer neighborhood during the last year?	7	1	92	100
Have you changed the places where you shop because of concern for safety during the last year?	3	2	95	100



Security Consciousness Items and Response Frequencies (Continued)

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Total</u>
Do you usually leave the lights, radio or TV on when you go out to make people think someone is home?			
Yes, lights	67%	33%	100%
Yes, radio	13	87	100
Yes, TV	6	94	100
Do you stop the newspaper and mail when you are going to be away from home for more than a day?	40	60	100
Do you usually ask for identification from home servicemen?	44	56	100
Do you keep one or more weapons in your home for protection from crime?	61	39	100
Do you have an operating burglar alarm system in your home or apartment?	6	94	100

**APPENDIX D**

1985 Louisville Crime Survey

RESPONDENT SELECTION

\_\_\_\_\_ Household ID [17-19]

\_\_\_\_\_ Phone No. \_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_\_ [27-36]

Label [20-25] Time Zone \_\_\_\_\_ E C [37]

\_\_\_\_\_ (sample) [26] Date \_\_\_\_\_ 85 [38-43]  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Mo Day

Interviewer ID \_\_\_\_\_ [44-47]

A. I now need to select the person in your house to talk to.

My instructions are to talk with the (youngest man in the household who is 18 years or older).

**REPEAT LEAD-IN IF NECESSARY**

Hello, I'm \_\_\_\_\_ from a research unit of the University of Louisville. We are conducting a study on behalf of the Attorney General of Kentucky about issues of public safety and how they affect the lives of citizens throughout Kentucky. We are talking to some people who have not been victims of crimes, and we are talking with some people who have been victims.

**IF THERE IS NO ONE OF THE DESIGNATED SEX IN THE HOUSEHOLD, THEN ASK FOR THE EQUIVALENT AGED PERSON OF THE OPPOSITE SEX.**

**"ADULT" = 18 YEARS OR OLDER (Can only interview persons younger than 18 if they are heads of household) REPEAT ABOVE LEAD-IN IF NECESSARY WHEN APPROPRIATE RESPONDENT COMES TO THE PHONE, THEN PROCEED TO QUESTIONNAIRE.**

**ELIGIBLE RESPONDENT CALLBACK RECORD**

So I will know who to ask for, please give me (his/her) first name.

ELIGIBLE PERSON'S NAME \_\_\_\_\_

When would be the best day and time to talk with (him/her)?

DATE AND TIME \_\_\_\_\_

DATE	TIME	RESULTS	INTERVIEWER NAME

I: Interview  
 T: Termination  
 REF: Refusal  
 RCB: Request Callback

STATE-WIDE CRIME SURVEY OF CITIZENS IN KENTUCKY  
Kentucky Criminal Justice Statistical Analysis Center

\_\_\_\_\_

Label	Card 1	[1-6] [7]
(Sample)		[8]

\_\_\_\_\_

SCREENER

We are conducting a study on behalf of the Attorney General of Kentucky about issues of public safety and how they affect the lives of citizens throughout Kentucky. We are talking to some people who have not been victims of crimes, and we are talking with some people who have been victims. The first questions I have refer to things that have happened to you or any person who lives in this household with you. They also refer only to things that happened (during the last 12 months) during the last year, between May \_\_\_\_\_, 1984 and May \_\_\_\_\_, 1985.

1. During the last year did anyone take or try to take something from you or from someone living with you by using a weapon or force or threat of force?

Yes   No  
 1    2   [9]

2. Were you or someone living with you beaten up, attacked, raped, or otherwise threatened or abused during the last 12 months? (NOT INCLUDING TELEPHONE THREATS)

1    2   [10]

INTERVIEWER CHECK:

"YES" TO AT LEAST ONE QUESTIONS 1-2, GO TO RESPONDENT SELECTION.

"NO" TO BOTH QUESTIONS 1-2, CONTINUE.

3. Between May \_\_\_\_\_, 1984 and May \_\_\_\_\_, 1985, did anyone break in or try to break into your house or apartment, garage or other building?

Yes   No  
 1    2   [11]

4. Did anyone damage, steal or try to steal something that belonged to you or to someone living with you during the past year? Including breaking into or stealing any of your cars or trucks?

1    2   [12]

---

**INTERVIEWER CHECK:**

"YES" TO AT LEAST ONE QUESTION 3-4:

LABEL SAYS "ALL" OR "PROPERTY," GO TO RESPONDENT SELECTION.

LABEL SAYS "VIOLENT," CONTINUE.

"NO" TO ALL QUESTIONS 3-4:

LABEL SAYS "ALL," GO TO RESPONDENT SELECTION.

LABEL SAYS "VIOLENT" OR "PROPERTY," CONTINUE.

---

5. In what county do you live? \_\_\_\_\_ [13-15]

Thank you very much. Those are all the questions I need to ask you.

6. SEX OF RESPONDENT: FEMALE...1 [16]  
MALE.....2

STATEWIDE CITIZEN CRIME SURVEY

Time Started  :

1. **INTERVIEWER: CHECK SEX OF RESPONDENT**

MALE 1  
FEMALE 2 [48]

2. What is your marital status? Are you?

Married for the first time 1  
Never married 2 [49]  
Remarried 3  
Widowed 4  
Separated 5  
Divorced 6  
NO RESPONSE 8

3. When is your birthday?

Month \_\_\_\_\_   [50-51]  
Day \_\_\_\_\_   [52-53]  
Year \_\_\_\_\_   [54-55]  
NO RESPONSE 70

4. What is your employment status? Are you presently:

	Working full-time (even if on strike)	1	
	Working part-time (less than 30 hrs/week)	2	
<b>CONTINUE</b>	Homemaker (not working or a degree student)	3	[56]
	Student (and not employed in permanent job)	4	
	Laid off	5	
	Unemployed	6	
	Retired (and not presently working full-time)	7	
	Other (disabled, leisured, on social security and never worked, etc.)	8	
	Specify _____		

**IF NOT PRESENTLY WORKING, ASK THE NEXT QUESTION: OTHERWISE GO TO 5**

4a. Have you held a regular job, either full-time  
or part-time, during the last five years?

Yes	1	
No	2	[57]
DON'T KNOW	3	
SKIP	9	

5. Do you have more than one phone number at this address?

<b>CONTINUE</b> ←	Yes	1	
<b>SKIP TO 6</b> ←	No	2	[58]

5a. How many (including this one)? \_\_\_\_\_ [59]

5b. How many are used for business only? \_\_\_\_\_ [60]

6. What is the highest grade (or year) of regular school that you completed?

\_\_\_\_\_ [61-62]

**NOTE:**  
 00=NO SCHOOLING  
 01 TO 08=GRADE SCHOOL  
 09 TO 12=HIGH SCHOOL  
 13 TO 16=COLLEGE (INCLUDES JUNIOR COLLEGE, BUSINESS COLLEGE)  
 17+=GRADUATE SCHOOL  
 77=DON'T KNOW  
 88=NO RESPONSE

7. How many people, including yourself, currently live in this household?

[63-64]

--	--

8. How many are 18 years and older?

[65-66]

--	--

SOCIAL PARTICIPATION SECTION

The next few questions are about people's social activities:

9. During the last few weeks, how many times did you get together with friends--I mean, things like going out together or visiting in each other's homes?

- |                  |   |  |
|------------------|---|--|
| None             | 1 |  |
| Once or twice    | 2 |  |
| 3 to 5 times     | 3 |  |
| 6 to 10 times    | 4 |  |
| 11 or more times | 5 |  |
| NO RESPONSE      | 8 |  |

[67]

10. About how many neighbors do you know well enough to visit with?

- |                   |   |  |
|-------------------|---|--|
| None              | 1 |  |
| 1 to 3 neighbors  | 2 |  |
| 4 to 8 neighbors  | 3 |  |
| 9 to 15 neighbors | 4 |  |
| 16 or more        | 5 |  |
| NO RESPONSE       | 8 |  |

[68]



11. What about organizations such as church and school groups, labor unions, or social, civic, and fraternal clubs. About how many do you take an active part in?

None	1	
1	2	
2	3	[69]
3 to 4	4	
5 or more	5	
NO RESPONSE	8	

12. How often do you visit with family and relatives who live outside your home? Would you say--(READ CHOICES):

Daily (almost daily)	1	
Several times a week	2	
Every week or so	3	
Several times a month	4	[70]
Monthly	5	
Less than once a month (or)	6	
Less than once a year	7	
NO RESPONSE	8	

13. Thinking about the best friend you now have, how close are you to that friend in being able to share your innermost thoughts, worries, and feelings? Would you say you are--(READ CHOICES):

Extremely close	1	
Very close	2	
Somewhat close	3	
Slightly close, or	4	[71]
Not close at all	6	

**DO NOT READ**

NO BEST FRIEND	7	
NO RESPONSE	8	

14. If everything went badly, how many people could you turn to for real comfort and support? (READ CHOICES)

None	1	
1 to 5	2	
6 to 15	3	
16 to 20	4	[72]
21 or more	5	
NO RESPONSE	8	

FEAR/SAFETY QUESTIONS

PSU# \_\_\_\_\_ [1-6]  
CARD 2 [7]

Most of us don't think a lot about personal safety in our daily lives even though we have opinions about it.

15. How safe do you feel walking alone in your neighborhood during the day? Would you say you feel...

Very safe	1	
Somewhat safe	2	
Somewhat unsafe, or	3	
Very unsafe	4	[8]

**DO NOT READ**

DON'T KNOW	5	
------------	---	--

I DON'T WALK ALONE DURING THE DAY	6	
--------------------------------------	---	--

NO RESPONSE	8	
-------------	---	--

16. How safe do you feel outside in your neighborhood at night?

Very safe	1	
Somewhat safe	2	
Somewhat unsafe	3	
Very unsafe	4	[9]

**DO NOT READ**

DON'T KNOW	5	
------------	---	--

I DON'T GO OUT (OR OUT ALONE) AT NIGHT	6	
---	---	--

NO RESPONSE	8	
-------------	---	--

17. How much does fear of crime prevent you from doing things you would like to do?

Very much	1	
Somewhat	2	
Rarely, or	3	
Never (not at all)	4	

**DO NOT READ**

NO RESPONSE	8	[10]
-------------	---	------

18. When you leave your house or apartment, how often do you think about being robbed or physically assaulted?

Very often	1
Sometimes	2
Rarely, or	3
Never	4

**DO NOT READ**

[11]

NO RESPONSE	8
-------------	---

19. When you leave your house or apartment, how often do you think about it being broken into or vandalized while you're away? L

Very often	1
Sometimes	2
Rarely, or	3
Never	4

**DO NOT READ**

[12]

NO RESPONSE	8
-------------	---

20. When you're in your home, how often do you feel afraid of being attacked or assaulted by someone that you know such as a relative, neighbor, or acquaintance?

Very often	1
Sometimes	2
Rarely	3
Never	4
NO RESPONSE	8

[13]

I want to remind you that this is a University study, conducted on behalf of the Kentucky Attorney General. Your voluntary participation is appreciated very much and your answers will be kept strictly confidential and seen only by University staff members.

MENTAL HEALTH SCALE

Next I'd like to ask you some questions about just this past week. They have to do with the kind of feelings that people have. As I mention each, please tell me how many days you felt that way during the past week...since last \_\_\_\_\_ (day).

**READ RESPONSE CHOICES AFTER EACH QUESTION**

<b>Probe</b>	: Would you say, it was:	<u>less than 1 day</u>	<u>1-2 days</u>	<u>3-4 days</u>	<u>5-7 days</u>	<b>DON'T READ N.R.</b>	
21.	During the last week how many days were you bothered by things that don't usually bother you?	1	2	3	4	8	[14]
22.	How many days did you not feel like eating; that is, your appetite was poor?	1	2	3	4	8	[15]
23.	How many days did you feel that you could not shake off the blues even with help from your family and friends?	1	2	3	4	8	[16]
Remember, these are about how you felt this <u>past week</u> .							
24.	How many days did you feel that you were just as good as other people?	1	2	3	4	8	[17]
25.	How many days did you have trouble keeping your mind on what you were doing?	1	2	3	4	8	[18]
26.	How many days did you feel depressed?	1	2	3	4	8	[19]
27.	How many days did you feel that everything you did was an effort?	1	2	3	4	8	[20]

**READ RESPONSE CHOICES AFTER EACH QUESTION**

<b>Probe</b> : Would you say it was:	<u>less than 1 day</u>	<u>1-2 days</u>	<u>3-4 days</u>	<u>5-7 days</u>	<b>DON'T READ</b> N.R.	
28. How many days did you feel hopeful about the future?	1	2	3	4	8	[21]
29. How many days did you feel your life had been a failure?	1	2	3	4	8	[22]
30. How many days were you fearful?	1	2	3	4	8	[23]
31. How many days was your sleep restless?	1	2	3	4	8	[24]
32. How many days did you feel happy?	1	2	3	4	8	[25]
During the past week...						
33. How many days did you talk less than usual?	1	2	3	4	8	[26]
34. How many days did you feel lonely?	1	2	3	4	8	[27]
35. How many days did you feel that other people were unfriendly?	1	2	3	4	8	[28]
36. How many days did you feel that you were enjoying life?	1	2	3	4	8	[29]
37. How many days did you have crying spells?	1	2	3	4	8	[30]
38. How many days did you feel sad?	1	2	3	4	8	[31]
39. How many days did you feel that people disliked you?	1	2	3	4	8	[32]
40. How many days did you feel as if you could not "get going"?	1	2	3	4	8	[33]

Now, I'd like to ask some questions about crime. They refer only to the last 12 months, that is, since this time last year. (These questions are somewhat different from the ones I asked you earlier.)

41. During the last 12 months, did anyone break into your apartment/home, garage, or another building on your property?

<b>CONTINUE</b>	Yes	1	
			[34]
<b>SKIP TO 42</b>	No	2	
	NO RESPONSE	8	

41a. (If YES) How many times? **RECORD # IN BOX**   [35-36]

41b. What month and year did this happen? \_\_\_\_\_ | \_\_\_\_\_ [37-38]

42. Did you find a door jimmied, a lock forced, or any other signs of an ATTEMPTED break-in during the last 12 months?

<b>CONTINUE</b>	Yes	1	
			[39]
<b>SKIP TO 43</b>	No	2	
	NO RESPONSE	8	

42a. (If YES) How many times? **RECORD # IN BOX**   [40-41]

42b. What month and year did this happen? \_\_\_\_\_ | \_\_\_\_\_ [42-43]

43. Did anyone steal or TRY TO STEAL A VEHICLE OR PART OF (it/any of them), such as battery, hubcaps, tape-deck, etc. from you or anyone else in your household?

<b>CONTINUE</b>	Yes	1	
			[44]
<b>SKIP TO 44</b>	No	2	
	No auto	3	
	NO RESPONSE	8	

43a. (If YES) How many times? **RECORD # IN BOX**   [45-46]

43b. What month and year did this happen? \_\_\_\_\_ | \_\_\_\_\_ [47-48]

44. Have people in your household had their pockets picked or purses snatched?

<b>CONTINUE</b> ← Yes	1	[49]
No	2	
<b>SKIP TO 45</b> ← NO RESPONSE	8	

44a. (If YES) How many times? **RECORD # IN BOX**   [50-51]

44b. What month and year did this happen? \_\_\_\_\_ [52-53]

45. Since this time last year, did anyone take something directly from you or anyone else in your household by using force such as a stick-up, mugging, or threat?

<b>CONTINUE</b> ← Yes	1	[54]
No	2	
<b>SKIP TO 46</b> ← NO RESPONSE	8	

45a. (If YES) How many times? **RECORD # IN BOX**   [55-56]

45b. What month and year did this happen? \_\_\_\_\_ [57-58]

46. Did anyone TRY to rob you or anyone else in your household by using force or threatening to harm you?

<b>CONTINUE</b> ← Yes	1	
No	2	[59]
<b>SKIP TO 47</b> ← NO RESPONSE	8	

46a. (If YES) How many times? **RECORD # IN BOX**   [60-61]

46b. What month and year did this happen? \_\_\_\_\_ [62-63]

47. Did anyone beat up, sexually attack or hit you or anyone else in your household with something?

<b>CONTINUE</b> ← Yes	1	[64]
<b>SKIP TO 48</b> ← No	2	
NO RESPONSE	8	

47a. (If YES) How many times? **RECORD # IN BOX**   [65-66]

47b. What month and year did this happen? \_\_\_\_\_ [67-68]

48. Were you or anyone else in your household knifed, shot at, or attacked with some other weapon by anyone at all?

<b>CONTINUE</b> ← Yes	1	
<b>SKIP TO 49</b> ← No	2	[69]
NO RESPONSE	8	

48a. (If YES) How many times? **RECORD # IN BOX**   [70-71]

48b. What month and year did this happen? \_\_\_\_\_ [72-73]

49. Did anyone THREATEN to beat you up or attack you or anyone else in your household with a knife, gun, or some other weapon not including telephone threats?

<b>CONTINUE</b> ← Yes	1	
<b>SKIP TO 50</b> ← No	2	[74]
NO RESPONSE	8	

49a. (If YES) How many times? **RECORD # IN BOX**   [75-76]

49b. What month and year did this happen? \_\_\_\_\_ [77-78]



50. Did anyone TRY to attack you or anyone else in your household in some other way?

- CONTINUE  Yes 1
- SKIP TO 51  No 2 [8]
- NO RESPONSE 8

50a. (If YES) How many times?  RECORD # IN BOX  [9-10]

50b. What month and year did this happen? \_\_\_\_\_ [11-12]

51. During the last 12 months, did anyone steal things that belonged to you or anyone else in your household from inside any car or truck, such as packages or clothing?

- CONTINUE  Yes 1
- SKIP TO 52  No 2 [13]
- NO RESPONSE 8

51a. (If YES) How many times?  RECORD # IN BOX  [14-15]

51b. What month and year did this happen? \_\_\_\_\_ [16-17]

52. Was anything stolen from you or anyone else in your household while somewhere other than at home, for example, at work, in a theatre or restaurant, or while traveling?

- CONTINUE  Yes 1
- SKIP TO 53  No 2 [18]
- NO RESPONSE 8

52a. (If YES) How many times?  RECORD # IN BOX  [19-20]

52b. What month and year did this happen? \_\_\_\_\_ [21-22]

53. Was anything (else) stolen from you or anyone else in your household during the last 12 months?

**CONTINUE** ← Yes

1

**SKIP TO 54** ← No  
NO RESPONSE

2

[23]

8

53a. (If YES) How many times? **RECORD # IN BOX**

--	--

[24-25]

53b. What month and year did this happen? \_\_\_\_\_

[26-27]

54. Did you find any evidence that someone ATTEMPTED to steal something that belonged to you or anyone else in your household?

**CONTINUE** ← Yes

1

**SKIP TO 55** ← No  
NO RESPONSE

2

[28]

8

54a. (If YES) How many times? **RECORD # IN BOX**

--	--

[29-30]

54b. What month and year did this happen? \_\_\_\_\_

[31-32]

55. Did anything else happen during the last 12 months that you thought was serious enough to report to the police--such as a car accident involving a drunken driver, or something else you haven't mentioned yet

55a. Yes - What happened? **BRIEFLY DESCRIBE AND ANSWER**

No **SKIP TO 56**

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

[33-34]

55b. During this/these incident(s), was a household member injured, attacked or threatened, or was something damaged or stolen or an attempt made to damage or steal something that belonged to him/her?.

**IF YES, MAKE SURE DETAILS ON TYPE OF CRIME ARE INCLUDED IN ABOVE DESCRIPTION.**

**CONTINUE**

Yes

1

No

2

**SKIP TO 56**

NO RESPONSE  
SKIP

8  
9

[35]

55c. (If YES) How many times? **RECORD # IN BOX**

[36-37]

55d. What month and year did this happen? \_\_\_\_\_

[38-39]

56. Did anything else happen during the last 12 months which you thought was a crime, but did NOT report to the police?

56a. Yes - What happened? **BRIEFLY DESCRIBE AND ANSWER**

No **IF NO INCIDENTS, SKIP TO "REMINDER", PAGE 25. OTHERWISE, TO NEXT PAGE.**

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

[40-41]

56b. During this/these incident(s), was a household member attacked or threatened, or was something damaged or stolen or an attempt made to damage or steal something that belonged to him/her?

**IF YES, MAKE SURE DETAILS ON TYPE OF CRIME ARE INCLUDED IN ABOVE DESCRIPTION.**

**CONTINUE** ← Yes 1  
**GO TO TOTAL** ← No 2  
NO RESPONSE 8  
SKIP 9

[42]

56c. (IF YES) HOW MANY TIMES? **RECORD # IN BOX**

[43-44]

56d. What month and year did this happen? \_\_\_\_\_

[45-46]

**TOTAL INCIDENTS** →

[47-48]

**IF NO INCIDENTS, SKIP TO "REMINDER", PAGE 25. OTHERWISE, CONTINUE.**

CRIME SEVERITY SECTION

The next few questions are about the crime incident you mentioned. IF MORE THAN ONE: Thinking only about the most serious incident...

These additional questions will allow us to compare your incident relative to many others. Some of them may seem out-of-place but just answer them as best you can.

57. In what month did this incident occur? [49-50]

Jan	Feb	March	April	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	N.R.	SKIP
01	02	03	04	45 (1984) 55 (1985)	46 (1984) 56 (1985)	07	08	09	10	11	12	88	99

58. Was something damaged or taken without permission that belonged to you or others in the household?

<b>CONTINUE</b> ← Yes, both damaged and stolen	1	
<b>CONTINUE</b> ← Yes, something stolen	2	
<b>SKIP TO 58b</b> - Something damaged	3	[51]
<b>SKIP TO 59</b> - NO	4	
SKIP	9	

58a. What did they take?

A. Car--How many?	1	[52]
SKIP	9	
B. Other property	1	[53]
SKIP	9	

58b. What was the total value of the property stolen or damaged? \_\_\_\_\_ [54-58]

58c. Did the property that was stolen or damaged belong to you personally?

Yes	1	
No	2	[59]
SKIP	9	

59. Did this incident involve the unlawful entrance of a house, apartment, garage or some other property (other than a vehicle)?

<b>CONTINUE</b>	Yes	1	
<b>SKIP TO 60</b>	No	2	[60]
	SKIP	9	

59a. How many buildings were forcibly entered? \_\_\_\_\_ [61-62]

60. Was anyone injured, raped, attacked or threatened in any way either physically or verbally during this incident?

<b>CONTINUE</b>	Yes	1	
	Yes, self	2	[63]
<b>SKIP TO 64, PAGE 19</b>	No	3	
	SKIP	9	

60a. Was anyone killed?

<b>CONTINUE</b>	Yes	1	
			[64]
<b>SKIP TO 60b</b>	No	2	
	SKIP	9	

60a1. How many were killed? \_\_\_\_\_ [65-66]

60b. Were you or anyone else raped during this incident?

<b>CONTINUE</b>	Yes	1	
	Self	2	[67]
<b>SKIP TO 60c</b>	No	3	
	SKIP	9	

60b1. How many people? \_\_\_\_\_ [68-69]

60c. Was anyone hospitalized or treated after an initial examination?

<b>CONTINUE</b>	Yes	1	
	Self	2	[70]
<b>SKIP TO 60d</b>	No	3	
	SKIP	9	

60c1. How many people? \_\_\_\_\_ [71-72]

60d. Did anyone require professional medical treatment but not hospitalization?

<b>CONTINUE</b> ← Yes	1	
Self	2	[8]
<b>SKIP TO 60e</b> - No	3	
SKIP	9	

60d1. How many people? \_\_\_\_\_ [9-10]

60d2. Was this a result of a sexual assault?

Yes	1	[11]
No	2	

60e. Did any victims of this incident receive injuries that did not require professional medical attention?

<b>CONTINUE</b> ← Yes	1	
<b>SKIP TO 60f</b> - No	2	[12]
SKIP	9	

60e1. How many people? \_\_\_\_\_ [13-14]

60f. Was anyone threatened with any type of weapon or instrument?

<b>CONTINUE</b> ← Yes	1	
<b>SKIP TO 60g</b> - No	2	[15]
SKIP	9	

60f1. How many people? \_\_\_\_\_ [16-17]

60g. During this incident, was anyone threatened verbally or by physical abuse or restraint, gestures, etc.?

<b>CONTINUE</b> ← Yes	1	
<b>SKIP TO 61</b> - No	2	[18]
SKIP	9	

60g1. How many people? \_\_\_\_\_ [19-20]

61. How many victims were there? (total)

[21-22]

NO RESPONSE 88  
SKIP 99

61a. Were you one of the victims?

Yes 1  
No 2 [23]  
NO RESPONSE 8  
SKIP 9

62. How many victims were...

Female [24-25]

Male [26-27]  
SKIP 99

63. What were the ages of the victims--  
from youngest to oldest?

[28-29]

[30-31]

[32-33]

[34-35]

[36-37]

SKIP 99

64. Did you or anyone else in the household  
know the person(s) who committed this  
crime?

**CONTINUE** Yes 1 [38]

**SKIP TO 65** No 2  
NO RESPONSE 8  
SKIP 9

64a. Was this person(s) a...

Relative 1  
Acquaintance 2  
Neighbor 3 [39]  
Other 4  
NO RESPONSE 8  
SKIP 9



65. Were the police informed of this incident?

<b>SKIP TO 66</b> ← Yes	1	[40]
<b>ASK 65a</b> ← No	2	
SKIP	9	

65a. Why not?

\_\_\_\_\_ [41]

SOCIAL SUPPORT QUESTIONS

66. When things like the (most serious) incident you mentioned happen, some people like to talk it over with other people. After this incident occurred, did you talk to . . .

**READ EACH ITEM**

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>D.K.</u>	<u>N.R.</u>	<u>SKIP</u>	
a relative?	1	2	3	8	9	[42]
a friend?	1	2	3	8	9	[43]
a neighbor?	1	2	3	8	9	[44]
a co-worker?	1	2	3	8	9	[45]

67. What about professional people? For example, did you talk about what happened with . . .

**READ EACH ITEM**

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>D.K.</u>	<u>N.R.</u>	<u>SKIP</u>	
a medical doctor	1	2	3	8	9	[46]
a counselor	1	2	3	8	9	[47]
a minister	1	2	3	8	9	[48]
a social worker	1	2	3	8	9	[49]
anyone else? (Specify)	1	2	3	8	9	[50]

68. Were you able to get all the help you needed to deal with the situation?

Yes	1	
No	2	[51]
Didn't need help	3	
Don't Know	4	
NO RESPONSE	8	
SKIP	9	

69. Did you take any prescribed medication (for your nerves) because of this incident?

Yes 1  
No 2  
NO RESPONSE 8  
SKIP 9

[52]

**IF INCIDENT WAS NOT REPORTED TO POLICE  
(NO TO 65) SKIP TO 79, PAGE 24.  
OTHERWISE, CONTINUE.**

VICTIM ASSISTANCE SECTION

**THIS SECTION WILL ONLY BE ASKED OF  
RESPONDENTS WHO REPORTED INCIDENTS TO POLICE.  
IF MORE THAN ONE INCIDENT WAS REPORTED TO POLICE,  
AGAIN REFER TO THE MOST SERIOUS.**

Now, I want you to think back to the situation or incident that you reported to the police.

**READ RESPONSE CHOICES AFTER EACH ITEM**

	<u>Extremely</u>	<u>Somewhat</u>	<u>Not at All</u>	<u>D.K.</u>	<u>N.R.</u>	<u>SKIP</u>	
70. Would you say that the police were extremely, somewhat, or not at all helpful to you?	1	2	3	4	8	9	[53]
71. How satisfied were you with the officer who took your report?	1	2	3	4	8	9	[54]
72. How courteous was the officer to you?	1	2	3	4	8	9	[55]
73. Were you interviewed by a detective?							

74. Has anyone been arrested for this crime/  
incident you reported?

<b>IF YES, CONTINUE</b>	Yes	1	
	No	2	
<b>IF NO, SKIP TO 77</b>	Don't Know	3	[57]
	NO RESPONSE	8	
	SKIP	9	

Now I'd like to ask you about your involvement  
in the case after the arrest.

75. Was a trial scheduled for this case?

<b>CONTINUE</b>	Yes	1	
<b>SKIP TO 76</b>	No	2	[58]
	NO RESPONSE	8	
	SKIP	9	

75a. Did you testify in court?

	Yes	1	
	No	2	[59]
	Case has not come up yet	3	
	NO RESPONSE	8	
	SKIP	9	

76. Has the prosecuting attorney's  
office contacted you?

<b>CONTINUE</b>	Yes	1	
<b>SKIP TO 77</b>	No	2	[60]
	NO RESPONSE	8	
	SKIP	9	

76a. How satisfied were you with the way in  
which the prosecuting attorney's office  
handled (is handling) your case?

	Very satisfied	1	
	Somewhat, or	2	[61]
	Not at all satisfied	3	
	NO RESPONSE	8	
	SKIP	9	

77. How likely is it that you will contact the police or the prosecuting attorney's office if the situation arises in the future?

Would you say you:

Definitely will	1
Probably will	2
Might, or	3
Definitely will not contact the officials	4
SKIP	9

[62]

78. If you knew a victim or witness who was trying to decide whether or not to become involved with the police, how likely is it that you would advise them to contact the authorities and become a witness?

Would you say you:

Definitely would	1
Probably would	2
Might, or	3
Would advise them <u>not</u> to contact the authorities	4
NO RESPONSE	8
SKIP	9

[63]

VICTIM ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

79. I'm going to read you a list of programs that are available in many areas. As I read the list, please tell me if you were aware of any of these programs in your area, and if you or anyone in your household used any of them.

**Ask for all "Yes" Answers**

	Aware of a program of this type				Have used it				
	Yes	No	N.R.	Skip	Yes	No	N.R.	Skip	
79. Victim Assistance	1	2	8	9	1	2	8	9	[8-9]
80. Rape Relief Centers	1	2	8	9	1	2	8	9	[10-11]
81. Spouse Abuse Centers	1	2	8	9	1	2	8	9	[12-13]
82. Legal Aid Services	1	2	8	9	1	2	8	9	[14-15]
83. Child Abuse Centers or Services	1	2	8	9	1	2	8	9	[16-17]
84. Counseling or Mental Health Services	1	2	8	9	1	2	8	9	[18-19]
85. Other services for victims (Specify)	1	2	8	9	1	2	8	9	[20-21]

**FOR ANY PROGRAMS USED, ASK THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS:**

Would you say the \_\_\_\_\_ program/service was:

	Extremely	Somewhat	Not at All	N.R.	Skip	
	Helpful	Helpful	Helpful			
86. Victim Assistance	1	2	3	8	9	[22]
87. Rape Relief Center	1	2	3	8	9	[23]
88. Spouse Abuse Center	1	2	3	8	9	[24]
89. Legal Aid Service	1	2	3	8	9	[25]
90. Child Abuse Service	1	2	3	8	9	[26]
91. Counseling or Mental Health Services	1	2	3	8	9	[27]
92. Other services for victims (Specify)	1	2	3	8	9	[28]

**REMINDER:**

I want to remind you that this is a study by the University of Louisville and the state Attorney General and we want to reassure you that your answers will be kept strictly confidential.

CRIME PREVENTION

The next set of questions have to do with crime prevention. First, we're interested in the way in which you use locks to protect your property. As I read from a list, tell me if, generally speaking, you take these precautions.

Do you generally...

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>Yes, Partially</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>N.R.</u>	
93. keep the locks on your windows and doors in working order?	1	2	3	8	[29]
94. lock the doors and windows before leaving?	1	2	3	8	[30]
95. close and lock garage or outbuilding doors before leaving?	1	2	3	8	[31]
96. lock vehicle doors when leaving them parked at home?	1	2	3	8	[32]
97. lock vehicle when parked away from your home?	1	2	3	8	[33]
98. Have you engraved most of your valuable property with identification numbers?	1	2	3	8	[34]
99. Do you have antiburglary stickers or warning decals on the windows or doors of your home?	1	2	3	8	[35]
100. Do you keep a dog for protection?	1	2	3	8	[36]
101. Have you moved or considered moving to a safer neighborhood during the last year?	1	2	3	8	[37]
102. Have you changed the places where you shop because of concern for safety during the last year?	1	2	3	8	[38]

103. Do you usually leave the lights,  
radio or TV on when you go out to  
make people think someone is home?

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>N.R.</u>	
Yes, lights	1	2	8	[39]
Yes, radio	1	2	8	[40]
Yes, TV	1	2	8	[41]

104. Do you stop the newspaper and mail when you are  
going to be away from home for more than a day?

Yes		1	
No		2	
<b>DO NOT READ</b>			[42]
Have neighbor get it		3	
NO RESPONSE		8	

105. Do you usually ask for identification from  
home servicemen?

Yes		1	
No		2	[43]
NO RESPONSE		8	

106. Do you keep one or more weapons in  
your home for protection from crime?

Yes		1	
No		2	[44]
NO RESPONSE		8	

107. Do you have an operating burglar alarm  
system in your home or apartment?

Yes		1	
No		2	[45]
NO RESPONSE		8	

Now I'd like to ask you about several crime prevention programs operated by local or state police. As I read the list, please tell me whether or not you personally have heard of or used any of the information or services provided by these programs.

<u>Programs</u>	<u>HAVE HEARD OF</u>			<u>HAVE USED</u>				
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>N.R.</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>N.R.</u>	<u>Skip</u>	
108. Operation Identification	1	2	8	1	2	8	9	[46-47]
109. McGruff-Crime Fighting Dog	1	2	8	1	2	8	9	[48-49]
110. Neighborhood Watch	1	2	8	1	2	8	9	[50-51]
111. Home Security Surveys	1	2	8	1	2	8	9	[52-53]
112. Vehicle Identification	1	2	8	1	2	8	9	[54-55]
113. Child Identification	1	2	8	1	2	8	9	[56-57]
114. Other programs related to crime prevention? (Specify)	1	2	8	1	2	8	9	[58-59]

**READ**

Now, I would like to ask you some classification questions about you and your household for statistical purposes.

**PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS**

- 115. What is your zip code? \_\_\_\_\_ [60-64]
- 116. What county do you live in? \_\_\_\_\_ [65-67]
- 117. Is your racial background:
  - White 1
  - American Indian 2
  - Black 3 [68]
  - Other 4
  - Specify \_\_\_\_\_
  - NO RESPONSE 8



118. For our last question, we need to know about your total household income for last year. If you would prefer not to answer, we'll go on, otherwise, I'll read some categories, and you can stop me when I come to the category that corresponds to your household income.

Less than \$5,000	1	
\$5,000 (up to 15,000)	2	
\$15,000 (up to 25,000)	3	
\$25,000 (up to 35,000)	4	
\$35,000 (up to 45,000)	5	
\$45,000 or more	6	[69]
NO RESPONSE	8	

This completes the interview. We appreciate very much your taking the time to participate in our study. Would you like the phone number here at the University to call this summer and request a copy of the study's results?

IF YES, REPEAT: 502/588-6626.

IF NO, REPEAT: Thank you again for participating!

We'd like to contact you next year for some follow up information. Could you please give me your name and the name and phone number of another person who would know where to find you if this number is not working.

RESPONDENT:

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Phone \_\_\_\_\_

CONTACT:

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Phone \_\_\_\_\_

Thank you very much.

END

TIME ENDED 

	:	
--	---	--

NO. MINUTES 

--	--

 [70]

**KENTUCKY CRIMINAL JUSTICE STATISTICAL ANALYSIS CENTER  
STEERING COMMITTEE**

**Ernie Allen**  
Director  
Public Health & Safety Cabinet  
City of Louisville

**Vic Hellard, Jr.**  
Director  
Legislative Research Commission  
Commonwealth of Kentucky

**E. Austin, Jr.**  
Secretary  
Cabinet for Human Resources  
Commonwealth of Kentucky

**Paul F. Isaacs**  
Public Advocate  
Department for Public Advocacy  
Commonwealth of Kentucky

**David H. Bland**  
DHB Consulting  
Versailles, Kentucky

**John Kearns**  
Circuit Court Clerk  
Harrison County, Kentucky

**Robin Crigler**  
Director  
Kentucky Commission on Women

**Robert M. Kirtley**  
County Attorney  
Daviess County, Kentucky

**William "Bill" Dillard**  
Sheriff  
Christian County, Kentucky

**James Knauf**  
Jailor  
Kenton County, Kentucky

**Morgan T. Elkins**  
Commissioner  
Kentucky State Police

**Ronald W. McBride**  
Chief  
Ashland Police Department  
Ashland, Kentucky

**J. Price Foster**  
Dean  
College of Urban & Public Affairs  
University of Louisville

**Gentry McCauley, Jr.**  
Commonwealth Attorney  
Fourteenth Judicial District  
Commonwealth of Kentucky

**Larry Hayes**  
Secretary of the Cabinet  
Governor's Office  
Commonwealth of Kentucky

**George W. Wilson**  
Secretary  
Corrections Cabinet  
Commonwealth of Kentucky