

153311

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
West Virginia Statistical Analysis Center

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

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

THE WEST VIRGINIA VICTIMIZATION SURVEY

153311

Christine L. Barr, D.

Ke Sun, Ph.D.

Shiv In Vyas, Ph.D.

West Virginia Statistical Analysis Center
Marshall University

May 1998

ABSTRACT

The West Virginia Victimization Survey was a statewide telephone poll conducted between March 10, 1992 and April 10, 1992 with a sample population of 1201. This study was developed as a project of the West Virginia Statistical Analysis Center in preparation for the Southeastern States Violent Crime Summit (July, 1992) of the U.S. Department of Justice. The purpose of this study was to measure the perceptions of West Virginians toward crime problems, fear of crime, their evaluation of the criminal justice system and personal victimization.

Conclusions

The major conclusions of this study were the following:

- West Virginians were most likely to be the victim of larceny-theft and vandalism than any other crime (Table 1).
- The demographics for the victimization of burglary were higher for those between the ages of 25 and 34; with a yearly family income ranging from \$25,000 to \$29,000; with a college degree; Caucasian; living in a central city; and divorced (Table 2).
- West Virginians who lived in the central city areas were more likely to be victims of motor vehicle theft than any other group (Table 3).
- The highest theft rates were for Caucasian men; aged 18-24; with income above \$30,000; living in a metropolitan but

noncentral area; with advanced college education; and whose marital status was separated (Table 4).

- Being a victim of a robbery was highest for African Americans and those who are divorced (Table 5).

- The highest rates of assault were for West Virginians between the ages of 25-34; with an ethnic background other than Caucasian or African American; with an income of less than \$7,500; were central city residents; and whose marital status was separated (Table 6).

- Being a victim of rape was higher for those between the ages of 18-24; central city residents; and with advanced degrees (Table 7).

- Vandalism was more likely to happen to the 25-34 age group; the ethnic group including Hispanic, Asian and undeclared; a family income between \$30,000 - \$49,000; with a college degree; and people who were single, never married or separated (Table 8).

- People more likely to know a person who was the victim of murder were between the ages of 25-34; men; African American; central city residents and/or separated (Table 9).

- West Virginians on the whole felt that drugs and narcotics were the biggest crime problems in their communities. This was followed by theft and burglary (Table 10). Age placed an interesting variation, in so far as the 18-24 age group regarded drunk driving as the biggest problem in their community. People with an income between \$10,000 - \$14,999 and \$50,000 or

more, however, viewed their biggest problem as vandalism (Table 13).

- Most people thought that they were very and/or fairly safe as they traveled to the work place. They also considered their neighborhoods very or fairly safe. About fourteen percent have placed new security at their homes (Table 10, 14, and 15).

- The majority of West Virginians had guns in their homes and most of them kept guns for both sports and protection (Table 16).

- Sixteen percent of respondents had reported one completed victimization of the seven crimes (burglary, motor vehicle theft, larceny-theft, robbery, assault, rape or vandalism) and eight percent reported at least one attempted victimization (Table 17).

- The majority of West Virginians thought that the courts were too easy on convicted criminals. Most people rated their local police performance as good. The West Virginia State Police received overall higher ratings. About thirty-seven percent of respondents were willing to have their tax money used to support police-related expenses and thirty percent would like to see funds expended on correction related activities, while only 10 percent thought that their money should be used to enhance the courts and thirty-one percent did not know (Table 11).

CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	1
Discussion	3
Recommendations	7
Method	26
Subjects and Sampling	26
The Questionnaire	28
Procedure of Conducting the Survey	29
APPENDIX A	34
The Questionnaire	
APPENDIX B	41
The Telephone Directories	
APPENDIX C	46
West Virginia Demographics	
APPENDIX D	52
List of Tables	

INTRODUCTION

The West Virginia Victimization Survey (WVVS) was initiated and developed for the Southeastern States Violent Crime Summit in Charlotte, North Carolina (July 6 and 7, 1992). The Bureau of Justice Assistance invited the southeastern Statistical Analysis Centers of the Bureau of Justice Statistics, U.S. Department of Justice, to participate in the development of a research agenda for the conference. The outcome was the development of a West Virginia Violent Crime Dataset and the West Virginia Victimization Survey.

The WVVS was designed to elicit responses about criminal victimization during the year of 1991 of West Virginia residents. Additionally, the survey was to provide information on the perception of crime problems and the criminal justice system. Not all crimes were measured, since many offenses are difficult to detect through a survey of the general public. The data collection method was a telephone interview and the sample selection was based on an urban and rural ratio as a representation of the general population in West Virginia (see Appendix C for complete demographics). The population sample for final analyses consisted of 1201 completed questionnaires.

The success of a victimization survey like the WVVS depended on the residents' motivation and ability to identify specific crimes. This required that the victims were not only willing to report the crime but that they also understood what happened and how it happened. The WVVS measured the crimes most likely to be

identified by a general survey: burglary, motor vehicle theft, personal larceny, robbery, aggravated assault, rape, vandalism, and murder. Drug abuse, prostitution, illegal gambling and con games, which are often referred to as victimless crimes were not measured.

The results presented in the tables involve the frequency, percent, and/or rates of victimization or the other ratings examined in the survey. The frequency refers to the number of people who reported victimization or chose a particular answer to a survey question (For example, yes, no, fairly safe, etc.). Two types of percent were calculated according to the type of denominator (either the entire survey population or a subcategory of the population) used in the dividing equation. For example, to determine what percent of the total population had guns in their homes, the number of people who answered Yes to the question (764) was divided by the number of the entire population (1201). $764/1201$ resulted in .636 or 63.6%. However, the percent of victimization of a completed burglary (2.7) for those who were in the 25-34 age group were computed according to the ratio of the number of people who reported the victimization (6) in the age group to the total number of people in the age group (223). Although the data about both completed and attempted crimes are presented in the tables, the descriptions and evaluations of the victimization are mainly based on the information about the completed crimes rather than the merely attempted offenses.

In any criminal encounter, more than one criminal act may be committed against the same individual. For example, a victim may be both robbed and assaulted during the same incident. The WVVS treated two criminal acts against the same person as separate crimes if the victim answered Yes to both items in the survey.

If a person reported that he/she was victimized by the same type of crime more than once during the year of 1991 (for example, the victim's home was burglarized more than once during the period), the WVVS showed the type of crime of which the person was a victim rather than the frequency of the victimization.

Because victimization is part of the National Crime Survey statistics, where victims are asked directly about crimes regardless of whether or not they are reported to the police, no attempt was made in this study to validate these crimes by checking them against Uniform Crime Report sources.

DISCUSSION

The following statements illustrate the type of findings that may be obtained from the data in this report. Tables are referenced in the description of each finding.

A series of questions asked respondents if they were a victim of each of the seven types of crimes (burglary, motor vehicle theft, larceny-theft, robbery, assault, rape, and vandalism, both completed or merely attempted), and if they

personally knew anyone who was the victim of murder during the year of 1991. Table 1 shows that the people were more likely to be the victim of larceny-theft (7% of the respondents) and vandalism (8.4% of the respondents) than the other crimes. The least frequent crime was robbery (0.6% of the respondents).

As shown in Table 2, rates of burglary victimization tended to be higher for those who were between age 25 and 34 (2.7%), with the yearly family income ranging from \$25,000 to \$29,000 (5%), or with a college degree (4.4%), white (1.9%), living in the area of central city (5%), or divorced (2.6%) than for other age, income, education, residence, or marital status categories.

People who lived in the area of central city were more likely to be the victim of motor vehicle theft (2.5%) than the other groups (Table 3).

Theft rates were higher for those who were between the ages 18-24 (9.8%), males (8.4%), white (7.1%), had a family income above \$30,000 (21.9%), living in the metropolitan but noncentral city areas (9.1%), had advanced college education (11.9%), or separated (14.3%) than for the other age, sex, ethnic, income, residence, education, or marital groups (Table 4).

Rates of robbery victimization were highest for black people (2.6%) or people who were divorced (2.6%, Table 5).

People who were between the ages 25-34 (3.1%), with the ethnic background other than white or black (4.8%), or an income less than \$7,500 (4.7%), were central city residents (2.5%) or separated (14.3%), had higher rates of assault victimization than

the other age, ethnic, income, residence or marital groups (Table 6).

Rates of rape victimization were higher for those who were between 18-24 (3.7%), central city residents (2.5%), had advanced college degrees (2.4%) than for the other age, residence and education groups (Table 7).

Rates of vandalism victimization tended to be higher for the 25-34 age group (12.1%), the other ethnic group (14.3%, which includes undeclared groups), people with a family income between \$30,000-\$49,000 (14.8%) or with a college degree (12.3%), or people who were either single and never married (12.6%) or separated (14.3%) than for the other age, ethnicity, income, education, or marital groups, Table 8.

As shown in Table 9, people who were between 25-34 (9.4%), males (9.1%), black (15.8), central city residents (10%), or separated (28.6%) were most likely to have known a person who was the victim of murder during the given period than the other age, sex, ethnic, residence, or marital groups.

Table 10 indicates that drugs and narcotics were rated as the biggest crime problem in the community by most of the respondents (27.6%), followed by theft and burglary (25.4%). The majority rated their work place or places they traveled through as fairly safe (59.3%) or very safe (25.2%). Most people considered their neighborhoods very safe (39.5%) or fairly safe (51.5%). About 14.3% of the respondents placed new security at their homes. The data are presented in Table 10, 14 and 15.

A majority of the respondents believed that the courts were too easy when dealing with convicted criminals (70.7%). Most people rated the police performance in their community as good (45.1%), fair (30.4%) or excellent (10.6%), so were their ratings of the West Virginia State Police (good=52%, fair=20.2%, excellent=16.9%). Of the respondents 37.7% were willing to have their tax money used to support police-related expenses, 30.2% wanted to see the money spent on correction-related activities, and 10.7% of the respondents thought the money should be used to enhance the courts (Table 11).

Although most people perceived drugs as the biggest problem in the community, followed by burglary and theft (Table 10), there were some variations in the ratings among the age and income groups. The 18-24 age group regarded drunk driving as the biggest problem in the community (30.8%). People with income between \$10,000 and \$14,999 or \$50,000 and above viewed the biggest problem as vandalism (Table 13).

As shown in Table 16, about 64% of the respondents had guns in their houses. Most of them kept guns for the purpose of sports (39.7%) or both sports and protection (38.8%).

Of the 1201 respondents 16.5% reported at least one completed victimization of any of the seven crimes (burglary, motor vehicle theft, larceny-theft, robbery, assault, rape, or vandalism). As demonstrated in Table 17 and 18, the 25-34 age group, males, people with income between \$30,000 and \$49,000, residents of central city areas, people with college or advanced

degrees, or the divorced had the higher percent of victimization than the other age, sex, income, residence, education, or marital groups.

Recommendations

The results of this study support the following recommendations:

1. To increase the funding levels for the West Virginia Department of Public Safety and criminal justice agencies in general.
2. To increase the staff and programs of the West Virginia State Police and the Department of Corrections.
3. To encourage the Legislature to release the bonding authority and accelerate the construction of the regional jail facilities.
4. To promote and increase educational training opportunities for the criminal justice system.
5. To increase public awareness of crime and criminality.
6. To initiate further study and statistical analysis of the West Virginia criminal justice system.

Table 1. Percent and rates of victimization, by types of crime

	Percent	Rate per 1,000 persons
BURGLARY		
Attempted	2.7	27
Completed	1.8	18
Total	4.4	44
MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT		
Attempted	1.9	19
Completed	0.7	7
Total	2.6	26
THEFT		
Attempted	1.7	17
Completed	7.0	70
Total	8.7	87
ROBBERY		
Attempted	0.7	7
Completed	0.6	6
Total	1.3	13
ASSAULT & BATTERY		
Attempted	1.6	16
Completed	1.3	13
Total	2.9	29
SEXUAL ASSAULT		
Attempted	0.7	7
Completed	1.0	10
Total	1.7	17
VANDALISM		
Attempted	2.5	25
Completed	8.4	84
Total	10.9	109
MURDER*		
Total	7.5	75

Note. N=1201, the number of respondents in each category is shown in Table 19. The percentage=the number of victimization/the number of respondents in each category. (For example, 22 of the 1201 people reported that they were the victim of completed burglary offense. $22/1201=.0183$ or 1.8%).

* This item shows whether anyone the interviewees personally knew was the victim of murder during the given period.

Table 2. Percent and rates of victimization of burglary, by the interviewees' age, sex, race, income, residence, education, and marital status

	Completed	Rate Per 1,000 person	Attempted	Rate Per 1,000
AGE				
18-24	1.2%	12	1.2%	12
25-34	2.7	27	4.0	40
35-49	2.1	21	2.7	27
50-64	1.1	11	3.2	32
65 +	1.7	17	1.2	12
SEX				
MALE	1.6	16	3.9	39
FEMALE	1.9	19	1.9	19
RACE				
WHITE	1.9	19	2.7	27
BLACK	0.0	0	0.0	0
OTHER	0.0	0	4.8	48
FAMILY INCOME				
-\$7,500	3.5	35	3.5	35
\$7,500-\$9,999	3.2	32	6.5	65
\$10,000-\$14,999	0.6	6	1.3	13
\$15,000-\$24,999	1.9	19	2.3	23
\$25,000-\$29,999	5.0	50	0.0	0
\$30,000-\$49,999	0.5	5	5.5	55
\$50,000 OR MORE	3.1	31	2.3	23
RESIDENCE				
Central City	5.0	50	5.0	50
Metro & Noncent	1.7	17	3.5	35
Nonmetropolitan	1.7	17	2.3	23
YEARS OF SCHOOL COMPLETED				
Less Than 11	1.8	18	2.6	26
High School	1.8	18	3.0	30
Some College	0.9	9	4.2	42
College Degree	4.4	44	0.7	7
Advanced College	0.0	0	0.0	0
MARITAL STATUS				
Single *	0.6	6	3.0	30
Married	1.9	19	2.7	27
Divorced	2.6	26	3.4	34
Widowed	2.2	22	0.7	7
Separated	0.0	0	14.3	143
Other	0.0	0	0.0	0

* In all tables singles included only those who have never been married.

Table 3. Percent and rates of victimization of motor vehicle theft, by the interviewees' age, sex, race, income, residence, education, and marital status

	Completed	Rate Per 1,000 person	Attempted	Rate Per 1,000
AGE 18-24	1.2%	12	3.7%	37
25-34	1.3	13	1.8	18
35-49	0.5	5	2.4	24
50-64	0.7	7	2.5	25
65 +	0.4	4	0.0	0
SEX MALE	0.7	7	2.0	20
FEMALE	0.8	8	1.8	18
RACE WHITE	0.8	8	1.9	19
BLACK	0.0	0	0.0	0
OTHER	0.0	0	4.8	48
FAMILY INCOME				
-\$7,500	1.2	12	2.3	23
\$7,500-\$9,999	1.6	16	3.2	32
\$10,000-\$14,999	0.6	6	0.6	6
\$15,000-\$24,999	0.5	5	0.5	5
\$25,000-\$29,999	0.0	0	4.6	46
\$30,000-\$49,999	0.5	5	0.5	5
\$50,000 OR MORE	1.5	15	4.6	46
RESIDENCE				
Central City	2.5	25	7.5	75
Metro & Noncent	0.4	4	2.2	22
Nonmetropolitan	0.7	7	1.6	16
YEARS OF SCHOOL COMPLETED				
Less Than 11	1.1	11	2.5	25
High School	0.6	6	1.8	18
Some College	1.4	14	1.4	14
College Degree	0.0	0	2.2	22
Advanced College	0.0	0	1.2	12
MARITAL STATUS				
Single	0.0	0	3.0	30
Married	0.8	8	1.9	19
Divorced	1.7	17	2.6	26
Widowed	0.7	7	0.0	0
Separated	0.0	0	0.0	0
Other	0.0	0	0.0	0

Table 4. Percent and rates of victimization of theft, by the interviewees, age, race, income residence, education, and marital status

	Completed	Rate Per 1,000 person	Attempted	Rate Per 1,000
AGE				
18-24	9.8%	98	3.7%	37
25-34	8.9	89	2.7	27
35-49	8.2	82	1.3	13
50-64	6.4	64	1.8	18
65 +	3.3	33	0.8	8
SEX				
MALE	8.4	84	2.0	20
FEMALE	6.2	62	1.5	15
RACE				
WHITE	7.1	71	1.7	17
BLACK	2.6	26	0.0	0
OTHER	4.8	48	0.0	0
FAMILY INCOME				
-\$7,500	4.7	47	0.0	0
\$7,500-\$9,999	6.5	65	1.6	16
\$10,000-\$14,999	5.7	57	1.3	13
\$15,000-\$24,999	6.0	60	1.4	14
\$25,000-\$29,999	5.0	50	3.0	30
\$30,000-\$49,999	10.4	104	3.3	33
\$50,000 OR MORE	11.5	115	0.8	8
RESIDENCE				
Central City	7.5	75	5.0	50
Metro & Noncent	9.1	91	2.6	26
Nonmetropolitan	6.4	64	1.4	14
YEARS OF SCHOOL COMPLETED				
Less Than 11	5.8	58	1.5	15
High School	5.8	58	2.0	20
Some College	6.9	69	2.3	23
College Degree	10.9	109	1.4	14
Advanced College	11.9	119	0.0	0
MARITAL STATUS				
Single	6.0	60	2.4	24
Married	7.6	76	1.9	19
Divorced	6.0	60	0.0	0
Widowed	5.2	52	0.7	7
Separated	14.3	143	14.3	143
Other	0.0	0	0.0	0

Table 5. Percent and rates of victimization of robbery, by the interviewees' age, sex, race, income, residence, education, and marital status

	Completed	Rate Per 1,000 person	Attempted	Rate Per 1,000
AGE				
18-24	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
25-34	1.3	13	0.4	4
35-49	1.1	11	0.8	8
50-64	0.0	0	1.1	11
65 +	0.0	0	0.4	4
SEX				
MALE	0.9	9	0.2	2
FEMALE	0.4	4	0.9	9
RACE				
WHITE	0.5	5	0.4	4
BLACK	2.6	26	0.0	0
OTHER	0.0	0	14.3	143
FAMILY INCOME				
-\$7,500	2.3	23	1.2	12
\$7,500-\$9,999	0.0	0	1.6	16
\$10,000-\$14,999	0.0	0	0.6	6
\$15,000-\$24,999	0.0	0	0.0	0
\$25,000-\$29,999	2.0	20	1.0	10
\$30,000-\$49,999	0.5	5	1.1	11
\$50,000 OR MORE	0.8	8	0.0	0
RESIDENCE				
Central City	0.0	0	2.5	25
Metro & Noncent	2.2	22	0.4	4
Nonmetropolitan	0.2	2	0.6	6
YEARS OF SCHOOL COMPLETED				
Less Than 11	0.0	0	1.5	15
High School	0.4	4	0.2	2
Some College	0.9	9	0.9	9
College Degree	2.2	22	0.7	7
Advanced College	0.0	0	0.0	0
MARITAL STATUS				
Single	2.4	24	0.0	0
Married	0.0	0	0.3	3
Divorced	2.6	26	0.9	9
Widowed	0.0	0	0.0	0
Separated	0.0	0	14.3	143
Other	0.0	0	0.0	0

Table 6. Percent and rates of victimization of assault, by the interviewees' age, sex, race, income, residence, education, and marital status

	Completed	Rate Per 1,000 person	Attempted	Rate Per 1,000
AGE				
18-24	1.2%	12	2.4%	24
25-34	3.1	31	2.7	27
35-49	1.9	19	1.3	13
50-64	0.4	4	1.8	18
65 +	0.0	0	0.4	4
SEX				
MALE	1.6	16	1.8	18
FEMALE	1.2	12	1.4	14
RACE				
WHITE	1.2	12	1.6	16
BLACK	2.6	26	0.0	0
OTHER	4.8	48	0.0	0
FAMILY INCOME				
-\$7,500	4.7	47	3.5	35
\$7,500-\$9,999	1.6	16	1.6	16
\$10,000-\$14,999	1.9	19	1.9	19
\$15,000-\$24,999	0.0	0	1.4	14
\$25,000-\$29,999	5.0	50	0.0	0
\$30,000-\$49,999	1.1	11	2.2	22
\$50,000 OR MORE	0.8	8	0.0	0
RESIDENCE				
Central City	2.5	25	0.0	0
Metro & Noncent	1.7	17	2.2	22
Nonmetropolitan	1.2	12	1.5	15
YEARS OF SCHOOL COMPLETED				
Less Than 11	1.1	11	1.8	18
High School	1.0	10	1.8	18
Some College	1.9	19	1.9	19
College Degree	1.4	14	0.0	0
Advanced College	2.4	24	1.2	12
MARITAL STATUS				
Single	3.0	30	3.6	36
Married	0.8	8	1.4	14
Divorced	3.5	35	1.7	17
Widowed	0.0	0	0.0	0
Separated	14.3	143	0.0	0
Other	0.0	0	0.0	0

Table 7. Percent and rates of victimization of rape, by the interviewees' age, sex, race, income, residence, education, and marital status

	Completed	Rate Per 1,000 person	Attempted	Rate Per 1,000
AGE				
18-24	3.7%	37	0.0%	0
25-34	1.8	18	0.4	4
35-49	0.8	8	1.1	11
50-64	0.7	7	0.7	7
65 +	0.0	0	0.4	4
SEX				
MALE	1.4	14	0.7	7
FEMALE	0.8	8	0.6	6
RACE				
WHITE	1.0	10	0.0	0
BLACK	0.0	0	0.0	0
OTHER	0.0	0	0.0	0
FAMILY INCOME				
-\$7,500	1.2	12	1.2	12
\$7,500-\$9,999	1.6	16	0.0	0
\$10,000-\$14,999	0.0	0	1.3	13
\$15,000-\$24,999	1.4	14	0.0	0
\$25,000-\$29,999	1.0	10	1.0	10
\$30,000-\$49,999	1.1	11	1.1	11
\$50,000 OR MORE	1.5	15	0.0	0
RESIDENCE				
Central City	2.5	25	0.0	0
Metro & Noncent	0.9	9	1.3	13
Nonmetropolitan	1.0	10	0.5	5
YEARS OF SCHOOL COMPLETED				
Less Than 11	1.1	11	0.4	4
High School	0.8	8	0.8	8
Some College	0.9	9	0.9	9
College Degree	0.7	7	0.7	7
Advanced College	2.4	24	0.0	0
MARITAL STATUS				
Single	1.2	12	0.6	6
Married	1.0	10	0.6	6
Divorced	1.7	17	1.7	17
Widowed	0.0	0	0.0	0
Separated	0.0	0	0.0	0
Other	0.0	0	0.0	0

Table 8. Percent and rates of victimization of vandalism, by the interviewees' age, sex, race, income, residence, education, and marital status

	Completed	Rate Per 1,000 person	Attempted	Rate Per 1,000
AGE				
18-24	7.4%	74	2.5%	25
25-34	12.1	121	2.7	27
35-49	8.5	85	2.4	24
50-64	7.5	75	2.8	28
65 +	6.2	62	1.7	17
SEX				
MALE	9.8	98	4.1	41
FEMALE	7.6	76	1.7	17
RACE				
WHITE	8.3	83	2.5	25
BLACK	5.3	53	5.3	53
OTHER	14.3	143	0.0	0
FAMILY INCOME				
-7,500	3.5	35	4.7	47
\$7,500-\$9,999	6.5	65	4.8	48
\$10,000-\$14,999	8.9	89	2.5	25
\$15,000-\$24,999	6.5	65	2.3	23
\$25,000-\$29,999	9.9	99	2.0	20
\$30,000-\$49,999	14.8	148	2.7	27
\$50,000 OR MORE	8.5	85	0.0	0
RESIDENCE				
Central City	10.0	100	2.5	25
Metro & Noncent	10.3	103	3.0	30
Nonmetropolitan	7.9	79	2.3	23
YEARS OF SCHOOL COMPLETED				
Less Than 11	4.4	44	3.7	37
High School	8.0	80	3.0	30
Some College	10.2	102	2.3	23
College Degree	12.3	123	0.7	7
Advanced College	11.9	119	0.0	0
MARITAL STATUS				
Single	12.6	126	1.2	12
Married	7.4	74	2.9	29
Divorced	8.6	86	3.4	34
Widowed	8.1	81	0.7	7
Separated	14.3	143	14.3	143
Other	20.0	200	0.0	0

Table 9. Percent and rates of victimization of murder*, by the interviewees' age, sex, race, income, residence, education, and marital status

	Did you know a victim Of murder	Rate Per 1,000 person
AGE		
18-24	8.5%	85
25-34	9.4	94
35-49	7.7	77
50-64	6.4	64
65 +	5.4	54
SEX		
MALE	9.1	91
FEMALE	6.5	65
RACE		
WHITE	7.1	71
BLACK	15.8	158
OTHER	9.5	95
FAMILY INCOME		
-\$7,500	7.0	70
\$7,500-\$9,999	8.1	81
\$10,000-\$14,999	6.3	63
\$15,000-\$24,999	7.9	79
\$25,000-\$29,999	6.9	69
\$30,000-\$49,999	8.7	87
\$50,000 OR MORE	8.5	85
RESIDENCE		
Central City	10.0	100
Metro & Noncent	9.1	91
Nonmetropolitan	7.0	70
YEARS OF SCHOOL COMPLETED		
Less Than 11	8.7	87
High School	6.8	68
Some College	8.8	88
College Degree	5.1	51
Advanced College	7.1	71
MARITAL STATUS		
Single	8.9	89
Married	7.4	74
Divorced	6.9	69
Widowed	5.9	59
Separated	28.6	286
Other	0.0	0

* Refers to the personal knowledge of a murder of victim.

Table 10. The overall ratings of the biggest crime problem in the community, safety at the work place and in the neighborhood

	Frequency	Percent
BIGGEST CRIME PROBLEM		
Vandalism	230	21.9
Theft or Burglary	266	25.4
Drugs and Narcotics	290	27.6
Drunk Driving	177	16.9
Robbery or Assault	63	6.0
Rape	4	0.4
Other	19	1.8
SAFETY AT WORK PLACE		
Very Safe	307	25.2
Fairly Safe	724	59.3
Fairly Unsafe	95	7.8
Very Unsafe	44	3.6
Don't Know	50	4.1
SAFETY AT NEIGHBORHOOD		
Very Safe	482	39.5
Fairly Safe	628	51.5
Fairly Unsafe	80	6.6
Very Unsafe	20	1.6
Don't Know	10	0.8
IF YOU PLACED ANY NEW SECURITY DEVICES		
Yes	173	14.3
No	1027	84.6
Don't Know	13	1.1
TYPES OF THE DEVICES		
Burglar Alarms	37	0.3
Door Bolts	58	4.7
Extra Door Locks	44	3.6
Window Guards	19	1.5
Police ID Sticker	8	0.6
Guard Dogs	19	1.5
Outside Security Light	34	2.8
Timers	8	0.6
Other	20	1.6

Table 11. Ratings of the performance of the courts, police, and the willingness to use tax money to support the criminal justice system

	Frequency	Percent
HOW THE COURTS DEAL WITH CRIMINALS		
Too Easy	860	70.7
Doing A Good Job	183	15.0
Too Harsh	22	1.8
Don't Know	152	12.5
POLICE'S PERFORMANCE IN THE COMMUNITY		
Excellent	129	10.6
Good	550	45.1
Fair	371	30.4
Poor	127	10.4
Don't Know	42	3.4
WV POLICE'S PERFORMANCE		
Excellent	206	16.9
Good	634	52.0
Fair	246	20.2
Poor	44	3.6
Don't Know	89	7.3
TAX MONEY FOR CRIMINAL JUSTICE AGENCIES		
Police-related	452	36.7
Court-related	132	10.7
Correction-related	372	30.2
Don't Know	377	30.6

Table 12. The frequency and percent of the types of murder victim the interviewees personally knew

	Frequency	Percent
HUSBAND OR WIFE	0.0	0.0
SON OR DAUGHTER	4.0	0.3
PARENTS	2.0	0.2
MOTHER OR FATHER IN LAW	0.0	0.0
BROTHER OR SISTER	0.0	0.0
COUSINS	3.0	0.2
AUNT OR UNCLE	1.0	0.1
NIECE OR NEPHEW	3.0	0.2
NEIGHBOR	13.0	1.1
FELLOW WORKER	4.0	0.3
CLOSE FRIEND	25.0	2.0
OTHER	34.0	2.8

Table 13. Ratings of the biggest crime problem as a function of the interviewees' age, sex, race, income, residence, education, and marital status (percent)

		I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII
AGE	18-24	15.4%	25.6%	21.8%	30.8%	2.6%	0.0%	3.8%
	25-34	25.4	25.9	26.4	15.7	6.1	0.0	0.5
	35-49	21.8	27.6	25.6	16.5	6.2	0.6	1.8
	50-64	22.5	23.4	31.6	16.0	3.3	0.4	2.9
	65 +	21.4	23.6	29.7	13.2	10.4	0.5	1.1
SEX	MALE	22.7	26.4	26.9	15.7	6.0	0.0	2.1
	FEMALE	21.5	24.8	28.1	17.6	6.0	0.0	1.7
RACE	WHITE	22.4	25.4	27.2	16.8	6.0	3.3	1.8
	BLACK	17.2	31.0	31.0	10.3	6.9	0.0	3.4
	OTHER	6.3	12.5	56.3	18.8	0.0	6.3	0.0
FAMILY INCOME								
	-\$7,500	16.0	25.3	36.0	16.0	5.3	1.3	0.0
	\$7,500-\$9,999	13.7	43.1	23.5	11.8	7.8	0.0	0.0
	\$10,000-\$14,999	31.5	16.5	26.0	19.7	4.7	0.0	1.6
	\$15,000-\$24,999	22.6	25.1	23.1	16.9	8.2	0.5	3.6
	\$25,000-\$29,999	22.8	28.3	25.1	13.0	7.6	1.1	1.1
	\$30,000-\$49,999	18.2	27.1	30.6	17.6	4.1	0.0	2.4
	\$50,000 OR MORE	28.9	25.6	24.8	12.4	5.8	0.0	2.5
RESIDENCE								
	Central City	22.9	14.3	37.1	11.4	11.4	0.0	2.9
	Metro & Noncent	24.5	22.4	32.3	12.0	5.2	0.5	3.1
	Nonmetropolitan	21.3	26.5	26.0	18.3	6.0	0.4	1.5
YEARS OF SCHOOL COMPLETED								
	Less Than 11	14.5	27.6	31.7	15.8	8.6	0.5	1.4
	High School	23.2	23.7	29.5	16.5	5.8	0.0	1.4
	Some College	22.5	20.9	25.7	22.5	3.7	1.0	3.7
	College Degree	28.8	31.2	19.2	11.2	6.4	0.8	2.4
	Advanced College	24.4	28.2	24.4	17.9	5.1	0.0	0.0
MARITAL STATUS								
	Single	19.0	24.5	28.5	21.1	5.4	0.0	1.4
	Married	21.9	27.8	26.3	16.0	5.5	0.4	2.1
	Divorced	28.0	17.8	29.0	16.8	6.5	0.9	0.9
	Widowed	20.6	17.6	33.3	17.6	9.8	0.0	1.0
	Separated	14.3	14.3	42.9	0.0	14.3	0.0	14.3
	Other	0.0	33.3	33.3	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0

Note. (1) I=vandalism, II=theft or burglary, III=drugs & narcotics, IV=drunk driving, V=robbery or assault, VI=rape, VII=other.

Table 14. Ratings of safety at the work place as a function of the interviewees' age, sex, race, income, residence, education, and marital status

		Very safe	Fairly safe	Fairly unsafe	Very unsafe	Don't Know
AGE	18-24	19.5%	64.6%	7.3%	7.3%	1.2%
	25-34	26.3	63.4	7.6	2.2	0.4
	35-49	23.8	63.5	7.4	3.4	1.9
	50-64	26.2	57.4	8.9	2.8	4.6
	65 +	27.4	49.0	7.1	5.0	11.6
SEX	MALE	32.0	55.7	6.8	2.5	3.0
	FEMALE	21.3	61.4	8.3	4.2	4.7
RACE	WHITE	24.2	60.2	7.8	3.6	4.2
	BLACK	47.4	42.1	7.9	0.0	2.6
	OTHER	38.1	38.1	9.5	14.3	0.0
FAMILY INCOME						
	-\$7,500	22.1	52.3	10.5	8.1	7.0
	\$7,500-\$9,999	30.6	46.8	4.8	8.1	9.7
	\$10,000-\$14,999	33.5	51.9	7.0	4.4	3.2
	\$15,000-\$24,999	26.0	61.9	7.9	0.9	3.3
	\$25,000-\$29,999	30.7	55.4	11.9	2.0	0.0
	\$30,000-\$49,999	31.7	57.9	8.2	1.6	0.5
	\$50,000 OR MORE	25.4	66.9	3.8	3.1	0.8
RESIDENCE						
	Central City	17.5	57.5	12.5	2.5	10.0
	Metro & Noncent	19.4	61.2	10.3	4.3	4.7
	Nonmetropolitan	26.9	59.1	7.0	3.4	3.6
YEARS OF SCHOOL COMPLETED						
	Less Than 11	21.8	56.0	7.6	5.8	8.7
	High School	25.6	57.3	8.7	4.6	3.6
	Some College	22.2	66.2	8.3	1.4	1.9
	College Degree	30.4	66.7	2.2	0.0	0.7
	Advanced College	31.0	56.0	10.7	1.2	1.2
MARITAL STATUS						
	Single	20.8	64.9	7.7	6.0	0.6
	Married	25.3	59.8	7.7	2.8	4.5
	Divorced	25.9	60.3	9.5	1.7	2.6
	Widowed	28.1	49.6	5.7	7.4	8.1
	Separated	28.6	57.1	11.3	0.0	0.0
	Other	20.0	60.0	20.0	0.0	0.0

Table 15. Ratings of safety in the neighborhood as a function of the interviewees' age, sex, race, income, residence, education, and marital status

		Very safe	Fairly safe	Fairly unsafe	Very unsafe	Don't Know
AGE	18-24	37.8%	54.9%	4.9%	2.4%	0.0%
	25-34	40.2	48.7	9.4	0.4	1.3
	35-49	34.4	54.8	7.9	2.4	0.5
	50-64	44.0	48.2	4.6	1.8	1.4
	65 +	42.3	51.9	4.1	1.2	0.4
SEX	MALE	40.0	50.0	7.3	2.0	0.7
	FEMALE	39.2	52.3	6.2	1.4	0.9
RACE	WHITE	39.8	51.6	6.1	1.6	0.9
	BLACK	28.9	55.3	15.8	0.0	0.0
	OTHER	38.1	47.6	9.5	4.8	0.0
FAMILY INCOME						
	-\$7,500	26.7	58.1	10.5	3.5	1.2
	\$7,500-\$9,999	48.4	33.9	12.9	1.6	3.2
	\$10,000-\$14,999	41.8	53.2	3.2	1.3	0.6
	\$15,000-\$24,999	39.5	50.2	7.9	1.4	0.9
	\$25,000-\$29,999	35.6	52.5	9.9	2.0	0.0
	\$30,000-\$49,999	50.3	40.3	4.4	1.1	0.0
	\$50,000 OR MORE	45.4	50.8	2.3	1.5	0.0
RESIDENCE						
	Central City	22.5	62.5	10.0	5.0	0.0
	Metro & Noncent	37.5	53.9	5.2	2.2	1.3
	Nonmetropolitan	41.0	50.2	6.8	1.4	0.6
YEARS OF SCHOOL COMPLETED						
	Less Than 11	40.7	46.9	7.3	2.9	2.2
	High School	35.0	55.7	6.6	1.8	0.8
	Some College	41.7	50.0	7.4	0.9	0.0
	College Degree	43.5	51.4	4.3	0.7	0.0
	Advanced College	47.6	47.6	4.8	0.0	0.0
MARITAL STATUS						
	Single	39.3	51.2	6.0	2.4	1.2
	Married	38.8	51.9	6.8	1.7	0.9
	Divorced	38.8	50.0	7.8	2.6	0.9
	Widowed	43.0	52.6	4.4	0.0	0.0
	Separated	42.9	42.9	14.3	0.0	0.0
	Other	60.0	40.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Table 16. The frequency and percent of the respondents who own guns and purposes of owning the guns

	Frequency	Percent
DO YOU HAVE GUNS IN YOUR HOUSE		
Yes	764	63.1%
No	420	34.1
PURPOSES OF THE GUNS		
Sports	322	39.7
Protection	110	13.6
Both sports & protection	315	38.8
Other	42	5.2
Don't know	22	2.7

Table 17. Respondents reporting at least one victimization (burglary, motor vehicle theft, larceny-theft, robbery, assault, rape, or vandalism)

	Frequency	Percent
VICTIMIZATION OF A COMPLETED CRIME		
Yes	199	16.5%
No	1002	83.5
VICTIMIZATION OF AN ATTEMPTED CRIME		
Yes	105	8.7
No	1096	91.3

Table 17.A. Respondents reporting at least one completed victimization (burglary, motor vehicle theft, larceny-theft, robbery, assault, rape, or vandalism), by age, sex, race, income residence, education, and marital status

	Total Population	Frequency of Victimization	Percent
AGE			
18-24	82	19	23.1%
25-34	224	59	26.3
35-49	378	66	17.5
50-64	282	40	14.2
65 +	241	23	9.5
SEX			
MALE	441	83	18.8
FEMALE	780	116	14.9
RACE			
WHITE	1,115	190	17.0
BLACK	38	4	10.5
OTHER	21	3	14.3
FAMILY INCOME			
-\$7,500	86	15	17.4
\$7,500-\$9,999	62	9	14.5
\$10,000-\$14,999	158	20	12.7
\$15,000-\$24,999	215	29	13.4
\$25,000-\$29,999	101	19	18.8
\$30,000-\$49,999	183	44	24.0
\$50,000 OR MORE	130	28	21.5
RESIDENCE			
Central City	40	9	22.5
Metro & Noncent	232	48	20.6
Nonmetropolitan	942	141	15.0
YEARS OF SCHOOL COMPLETED			
Less Than 11	275	35	12.7
High School	497	73	14.9
Some College	216	38	17.6
College Degree	138	32	23.2
Advanced College	84	20	23.8
MARITAL STATUS			
Single	168	34	20.2
Married	785	120	15.3
Divorced	116	26	22.4
Widowed	135	17	12.6
Separated	7	1	14.3
Other	5	1	20.0

Table 17.B. Respondents reporting at least one attempted victimization (burglary, motor vehicle theft, larceny-theft, robbery, assault, rape, or vandalism), by age, sex, race, income, residence, education, and marital status

		Total Population	Frequency of Victimization	Percent
AGE	18-24	82	9	11.0%
	25-34	224	27	12.1
	35-49	378	34	9.0
	50-64	282	22	7.8
	65 +	241	11	4.6
SEX	MALE	441	50	11.3
	FEMALE	780	55	7.1
RACE	WHITE	1,115	98	8.5
	BLACK	38	2	5.3
	OTHER	21	4	19.0
FAMILY INCOME	-\$7,500	86	11	12.8
	\$7,500-\$9,999	62	10	16.1
	\$10,000-\$14,999	158	13	8.2
	\$15,000-\$24,999	215	15	7.0
	\$25,000-\$29,999	101	9	8.9
	\$30,000-\$49,999	183	16	8.7
\$50,000 OR MORE	130	9	6.9	
RESIDENCE	Central City	40	7	17.5
	Metro & Noncent	232	18	7.8
	Nonmetropolitan	942	79	8.4
YEARS OF SCHOOL COMPLETED	Less Than 11	275	27	9.8
	High School	497	45	9.1
	Some College	216	23	10.6
	College Degree	138	8	5.8
	Advanced College	84	2	2.4
MARITAL STATUS	Single	168	19	11.3
	Married	785	68	8.7
	Divorced	116	13	11.2
	Widowed	135	3	2.2
	Separated	7	2	28.6
	Other	0	0	0.0

METHOD

Subjects and Sampling

Locality of residence, as used in the WVVS, refers to where a person had lived when he was interviewed, not to the place where a crime occurred. The state is divided into five locality types: central cities, suburb of urban areas, towns away from urban area, the non-central area of a city, and rural areas. The above five areas are further grouped into three categories: central cities, metropolitan areas not located inside central cities (including suburb of urban areas and noncentral areas of city), and nonmetropolitan places (rural areas and towns away from urban areas).

The procedure for selecting the survey sample of 1200 residential phone numbers was based on the consideration of two factors, the first of which was to make sure that the sample was randomly selected so that it represented the general population in West Virginia, and that the ratio of the rural phone numbers to the urban phone numbers in the sample corresponded with the ratio of rural population (about 64%) to the urban population (about 34%). The second consideration involved the requirement that the initially selected phone numbers were to exceed 1,200 so that sufficient numbers of respondents would be included in the sample even after some people refused to participate in the survey or nobody answered the interviewers phone calls. On the basis of the two considerations, a cluster-stratified-systematic sampling method was employed in the procedure.

The first step of the procedure divided the original population into clusters according to geographic areas, excluding the phone directories that contained phone numbers which overlapped with the other books or which included residential phone numbers of other states but didn't specify the phone numbers of West Virginia residents.

In the second step, the selected phone books were classified into rural and urban directories (Table 18). It was decided to select 2410 phone numbers with 1482 numbers (about 62% of 2410) from the rural directories and 930 numbers (about 38% of 2410) from the urban books.

Table 18. The phone directories used for selecting the survey sample (rural v. urban) (see Appendix B)

The Rural Books (N=17)	The Urban Books (N=7)
Berkeley Springs	Beckley
Brandywine	Clendenin (Charleston)
Bruceton Mills	Fairmont
Charles Town	Huntington
Union	Martinsburg
Letart	Parkersburg
New Martinsville	Wheeling (Weirton)
Nicholas County	
Romney	
Rupert	
Webster County	
Burnsville	
Seneca Rocks	
War	
Delbarton & Kermit	
Masontown	
Aurora & Eglon	

Following that, the systematic sampling technique was employed to pick up every "K" number (e.g., every 80th phone number) in the directories according to the ratio of the total available residential phone numbers to the required numbers in either the rural or urban directories. For example, because there were 114,621 and 374,053 residential phone numbers listed in the rural and urban directories, respectively, and we needed to select 1480 phone numbers from the rural directories and 930 phone numbers from the urban directories; a systematic sampling was used by selecting every 77th phone number ($114,621/1480 = 77.4$) from the rural books and every 402nd phone number ($374,053/930 = 402.2$) from the urban directories.

The interviewers actually made 2379 phone calls, 1178 of which were declared invalid, either because the people who answered the calls refused to participate in the survey, or nobody answered the calls, or the interviewers made some errors in recording the interview. The sample for final analyses consisted of 1201 valid cases.

The characteristics of the 1201 interviewees are presented in Tables 20 and 21.

The Questionnaire

The questionnaire used in the survey consisted of 29 questions (Appendix A). Before being adopted in the survey, the questionnaire items were pretested with staff members, graduate students and a small number of residents who answered each question and noted problems of language, comprehension, and

clarity. Minor changes in wording of the items were made on the basis of these pretests. As shown in Table 19, the 29 questions could be classified into five categories: the respondents' perception of crime problems and fear of crime, their evaluations of the criminal justice system, personal victimization, their knowledge of people who were the victims of murder, and the items intended to measure the respondents' general characteristics.

Table 19. The purposes of the items in the survey questionnaire

Item #	The contents of the item
1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 7, 8, 9, 10, 19	crime problems and fear of crime ratings of the criminal justice system
11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17	personal victimization
18	knowledge of a person as a victim of murder
20-29	the interviewee's characteristics, including sex, age, types of residence, ethnicity, education, family yearly income and marital status

Procedure of conducting the survey

Six trained graduate assistants conducted the telephone interviews by dialing the selected numbers in the phone directories from 5pm to 9pm, Monday through Friday and 10am to 5 pm on Saturday. It took about 25 days (3/10/92-4/10/92, excluding Sundays) to complete the survey. All interviewers started the interview with the following introduction:

Hello, my name is _____, and I am calling on behalf of the West Virginia Statistical Analysis Center at Marshall University. We are conducting a survey to discover how West Virginians have been victimized by crime in the past year. This survey is anonymous and consists of 29 short questions. If you would be willing to assist us, I'll begin...First, are you at least 18 years old?

If the respondents agreed to participate in the survey, the interviewers then proceeded to ask the questions and recorded all replies on a coding sheet by marking the appropriate boxes. After completing the interview, the interviewers thanked the respondents for participation and dialed the next selected phone number on the list.

If an interviewer dialed a number and the respondent refused to be a subject in the survey, the interviewer proceeded to call the next phone number. In the case that nobody answered, he/she would try the same number again in the following night. A phone number was treated as an invalid one and put aside after three unsuccessful tries.

Table 20. Characteristics of the interviewees

	Frequency*	Percent
AGE		
18-24	82	6.8
25-34	224	18.6
35-49	378	31.3
50-64	282	23.4
65 and older	241	20.0
SEX		
MALE	441	36.1
FEMALE	780	63.9
RACE		
WHITE	1,115	95.1
BLACK	38	3.1
OTHER	21	1.7
FAMILY INCOME		
LESS THAN \$7,499	86	9.2
\$-7,500-\$9,999	62	6.6
\$10,000-\$14,999	158	16.9
\$15,000-\$24,999	215	23.0
\$25,000-\$29,999	101	10.8
\$30,000-\$49,999	183	19.6
\$50,000 OR MORE	130	13.9
RESIDENCE		
Central City	40	3.3
Surban	232	19.1
Nonmetropolitan	942	77.6
YEARS OF SCHOOL COMPLETED		
Less Than 11	275	22.6
High School or GED	497	40.8
Some College	216	17.7
College Degree	138	11.3
Advanced College	84	6.9
Don't Know	9	0.7
MARITAL STATUS		
Single (Never married)	168	13.8
Married	785	64.6
Divorced	116	9.5
Widowed	135	11.1
Separated	7	0.6
Other	5	0.4

Note.

* Because some respondents in the survey might not answer all questions, the total number of respondents in each category may be less than 1201.

Table 21. The respondents' county of residence

	Frequency	Percent
Barbour	2	.2
Berkeley	58	4.8
Boone	32	2.6
Braxton	19	1.6
Brooke	3	.2
Cabell	22	1.8
Calhoun	2	.2
Clay	47	3.9
Doddridge	10	.8
Fayette	22	1.8
Grant	18	1.5
Greenbrier	65	5.3
Hampshire	38	3.1
Hancock	1	.1
Hardy	18	1.5
Harrison	24	2.0
Jackson	9	.7
Jefferson	71	5.8
Kanawha	89	7.3
Lincoln	2	.2
Marion	22	1.8
Marshall	42	3.4
Mason	10	.8
McDowell	8	.7
Mineral	10	.8
Mingo	71	5.8
Monongalia	41	3.4
Monroe	50	4.1
Morgan	24	2.0
Nicholas	30	2.5
Ohio	2	.2
Pendelton	48	3.9
Pleasants	3	.2
Pocahontas	2	.2
Preston	52	4.3
Putnam	7	.6
Raleigh	38	3.1
Randolph	5	.4
Ritchie	6	.5
Roane	12	1.0
Summers	22	1.8
Taylor	6	.5
Tucker	15	1.2

Table 21 continued

	Frequency	Percent
Tyler	25	2.1
Upshur	1	.1
Wayne	20	1.6
Webster	25	2.1
Wetzel	24	2.0
Wirt	2	.2
Wood	29	2.4
Wyoming	9	.7
Don't know	6	.5

APPENDIX A

The Questionnaire

Case # _ _ _ - _ - _ -

Phone # _ - _ -
Phone Book # _ _ _

WEST VIRGINIA CRIME VICTIMIZATION SURVEY

1. What is the biggest single crime problem in your community?
(select only one)
 - 1. vandalism
 - 2. theft or burglary
 - 3. drugs and narcotics
 - 4. drunk driving
 - 5. robbery or assault
 - 6. rape
 - 7. other
 - 9. Don't know

2. Do you think that the places you work or travel through frequently are safe from crime?
 - 1. Very safe
 - 2. Fairly safe
 - 3. Fairly unsafe
 - 4. Very unsafe
 - 9. Don't know

3. Do you think that the neighborhood around your home is safe from crime?
 - 1. Very safe
 - 2. Fairly safe
 - 3. Fairly unsafe
 - 4. Very unsafe
 - 9. Don't know

4. Have you placed any new devices for security in your home during the past year ?
 - A.
 - 1. yes (check all that apply)
 - 2. no
 - 9. Don't know

 - B.
 - 1. burglar alarms
 - 2. door bolts
 - 3. extra door locks
 - 4. window guards
 - 5. police department identification stickers
 - 6. guard dogs
 - 7. outside security lights
 - 8. automatic timers/electronic timers
 - 9. other

5. Do you have a gun in your house?
 1. yes (if yes, then answer question 6)
 2. no (skip to question 7)
 9. Don't know
6. If you have a gun in your home, do you keep it mainly for
 (check one)
 1. sporting purposes
 2. protection
 3. both sporting purposes and protection
 4. other - specify _____
 9. Don't know
7. In general, when dealing with convicted criminals, do you
 feel the courts are:
 1. too easy
 2. doing a good job
 3. too harsh
 9. Don't know
8. How do you rate the job done by the police or sheriffs
 department in your community?
 1. excellent
 2. good
 3. fair
 4. poor
 9. Don't know
9. How do you rate the job done by the West Virginia State
 Police?
 1. excellent
 2. good
 3. fair
 4. poor
 9. Don't know
10. In order to have a better criminal justice system would you
 be willing to have your taxes used to support any of the
 following (check all that apply)?
 1. more police officers, detectives, and
 investigators
 2. more judges, prosecutors, and courtrooms
 3. more jails and prisons
 9. Don't know or none of the above
11. Burglary. During the past year, did anyone break
 or attempt to break into your home? If yes, then
 1. completed
 2. attempted
 3. No.
 9. Don't know

12. Motor Vehicle Theft. During the past year, did anyone steal or attempt to steal a motor vehicle belonging to you?
If yes, then 1. completed
 2. attempted
 3. No
 9. Don't know
13. Other Theft. During the past year, did anyone steal or attempt to steal any other property or valuable items from you other than the motor vehicle(s)?
If yes, then 1. completed
 2. attempted
 3. No
 9. Don't know
14. Robbery. During the past year, did anyone take or attempt to take something from you by force or threat of force?
If yes, then 1. completed
 2. attempted
 3. No
 9. Don't know
15. Aggravated assault. During the past year, did anyone inflict or attempt to inflict serious bodily harm on you?
If yes, then 1. completed
 2. attempted
 3. No
 9. Don't know
16. Rape or attempted rape. During the past year, were you a victim of rape or attempted rape?
If yes, then 1. completed
 2. attempted
 3. No
 9. Don't know
17. Vandalism or Malicious Mischief. During the past year, did anyone intentionally destroy or damage property (including arson) belonging to you?
If yes, then 1. completed
 2. attempted
 3. No
 9. Don't know

18. Murder. During the past year (1991) was anyone you knew personally the victim of murder?
- A. 1. yes (if yes, identify below)
 2. no (go to question 19)
- B. 1. husband or wife
 2. son or daughter
 3. son-in-law or daughter-in-law
 4. parents
 5. mother-in-law or father-in-law
 6. brother or sister
 7. grandparents
 8. cousin(s)
 9. aunt or uncle
 10. niece or nephew
 11. neighbor
 12. an associate at work
 13. close friend
 14. other
19. If you were a victim of any crime during the last year, did you report the crime(s) to the police or sheriff?
 1. always
 2. sometimes
 3. never
 9. Don't know
20. Sex: 1. Male
 2. Female
21. What year were you born? _____ (Enter two digit-number, eg., 55, 67. Enter 99 for Don't know).
22. Which of the following best describes where you live?
 1. rural area
 2. town away from urban area
 3. suburb of urban area
 4. in a city but not in central area
 5. central area of city
 9. Don't know
23. What is your ethnic background?
 1. white or caucasian
 2. black or African-American
 3. Mexican-American, Spanish or other latin surname
 4. other
 9. Don't know _____

24. How many years of school have you completed?
- | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1. One | <input type="checkbox"/> 9. Nine |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2. Two | <input type="checkbox"/> 10. Ten |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Three | <input type="checkbox"/> 11. Eleven |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 4. Four | <input type="checkbox"/> 12. 12(high school grad or GED) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 5. Five | <input type="checkbox"/> 13. Some College |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 6. Six | <input type="checkbox"/> 14. College Degree |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 7. Seven | <input type="checkbox"/> 15. Advanced College |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 8. Eight | <input type="checkbox"/> 99. Don't know |
25. What type of dwelling do you live in?
- 1. apartment
 - 2. house
 - 3. condominium
 - 4. mobile home
 - 5. other _____
 - 9. Don't know
26. What is your yearly family income?
- 1. less than \$ 5,000
 - 2. \$ 5,000 - \$ 7,499
 - 3. \$ 7,500 - \$ 9,999
 - 4. \$10,000 - \$14,999
 - 5. \$15,000 - \$24,999
 - 6. \$25,000 - \$29,999
 - 7. \$30,000 - \$49,999
 - 8. \$50,000 and above
 - 9. Don't know
27. Are you:
- 1. single and never married
 - 2. married
 - 3. divorced
 - 4. widowed
 - 5. separated
 - 6. other (explain) _____
28. What is the size of your town or city?
- 1. rural
 - 2. less than 2,500
 - 3. 2,501 to 10,000
 - 4. 10,001 to 25,000
 - 5. 25,001 to 50,000
 - 6. 50,001 to 100,000
 - 9. Don't know

29. What is your county of residence? _____

- | | | | |
|--------------------------|----------------|--------------------------|----------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 01. Barbour | <input type="checkbox"/> | 29. Mineral |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 02. Berkeley | <input type="checkbox"/> | 30. Mingo |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 03. Boone | <input type="checkbox"/> | 31. Monongalia |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 04. Braxton | <input type="checkbox"/> | 32. Monroe |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 05. Brooke | <input type="checkbox"/> | 33. Morgan |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 06. Cabell | <input type="checkbox"/> | 34. Nicholas |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 07. Calhoun | <input type="checkbox"/> | 35. Ohio |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 08. Clay | <input type="checkbox"/> | 36. Pendleton |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 09. Doddridge | <input type="checkbox"/> | 37. Pleasants |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 10. Fayette | <input type="checkbox"/> | 38. Pocahontas |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 11. Gilmer | <input type="checkbox"/> | 39. Preston |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 12. Grant | <input type="checkbox"/> | 40. Putnam |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 13. Greenbrier | <input type="checkbox"/> | 41. Raleigh |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 14. Hampshire | <input type="checkbox"/> | 42. Randolph |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 15. Hancock | <input type="checkbox"/> | 43. Ritchie |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 16. Hardy | <input type="checkbox"/> | 44. Roane |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 17. Harrison | <input type="checkbox"/> | 45. Summers |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 18. Jackson | <input type="checkbox"/> | 46. Taylor |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 19. Jefferson | <input type="checkbox"/> | 47. Tucker |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 20. Kanawha | <input type="checkbox"/> | 48. Tyler |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 21. Lewis | <input type="checkbox"/> | 49. Upshur |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 22. Lincoln | <input type="checkbox"/> | 50. Wayne |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 23. Logan | <input type="checkbox"/> | 51. Webster |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 24. Marion | <input type="checkbox"/> | 52. Wetzel |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 25. Marshall | <input type="checkbox"/> | 53. Wirt |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 26. Mason | <input type="checkbox"/> | 54. Wood |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 27. McDowell | <input type="checkbox"/> | 55. Wyoming |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 28. Mercer | <input type="checkbox"/> | 99. Don't know |

THANK YOU FOR PARTICIPATING IN OUR SURVEY.

APPENDIX B

The Telephone Directories

Appendix B. The phone directories used for selecting the survey sample (rural versus urban)

The Rural Books (N=17)	The Urban Books (N=7)
No. 3 BERKELEY SPRINGS Includes: Berkeley Springs	No. 1 BECKLEY Includes: Fayetteville Flat Top Glen Daniel Helen Hinton Meadow Bridge Mt. Hope Mullens Oak Hill Oceana Pineville Rainelle Sophia Wharton Whitesville
No. 5 BRANDYWINE Includes: Brandywine Franklin Harman Riverton	No. 12 CLENDENIN Includes: Arnoldsburg Belle Charleston Clay Clendenin Dunbar Dutch Ridge East Bank Elkview Ivydale Kanawha City Montgomery Newton Pocatalico Ripley Sissonville South Charleston Spencer Walton
No. 6 BRUCETON MILLS Includes: Bruceton Mills	
No. 10 CHARLES TOWN Includes: Charles Town Harpers Ferry Shepardstown	
No. 21 UNION Includes: Alderson. Greenville Hinton Lewisburg Peterstown Union White Sulphur Springs	
No. 26 LETART Includes: Letart New Haven	

Appendix B. The phone directories used for selecting the survey sample (rural versus urban)

The Rural Books (N=17)	The Urban Books (N=7)
<p>No. 36 NEW MARTINSVILLE Includes: Cameron Hundred Middlebourne Moundsville New Martinsville Paden City Reader Salem Sisterville Smithfield West Union</p>	<p>No. 15 FAIRMONT Includes: Blacksville Bridgeport Cheat Lake Clarksburg Core Daybrook Fairmont Fairview Farmington Flemington Grafton Hundred* Joetown Kingwood Laurel Point Lumberport Mannington Monongah Morgantown Mt. Morris Newburg Philippi Pine Grove Reader Reedsville Riversville Rowlesburg Salem Sardis Shinnston Suncrest Tunnelton Wadestown Wallace Worthington</p>
<p>No. 37 NICHOLAS COUNTY Includes: Craigsville Richwood Summersville</p>	
<p>No. 45 ROMNEY Includes: Augusta Burlington Capon Bridge Fort Ashby Levels Maysville Moorefield Paw Paw Petersburg Wardensville</p>	
<p>No. 48 RUPERT Includes: Rupert Meadow Bridge* Rainelle*</p>	
<p>* Listed separately</p>	

Appendix B. The phone directories used for selecting the survey sample (rural versus urban)

The Rural Books (N=17)	The Urban Books (N=7)
No. 50 WEBSTER COUNTY Includes: Cowen Hacker Valley Webster Springs	No. 32 MARTINSBURG Includes: Falling Waters Hedgesville Inwood Martinsburg
No. 52 BURNSVILLE (Sutton) Includes: Burnsville Gassaway Sutton	No. 57 WHEELING (Weirton) Includes: Chester Wellsburg Wheeling Weirton*
No. 53 SENECA ROCKS Includes: Seneca Rocks Onego Circleville Cherry Grove Brandywine* Franklin*	No. 65 PARKERSBURG Includes: Belmont Cairo Dallison Elizabeth Ellenboro Grantsville Harrisville Lawford Lubeck Mineral Wells Parkersburg Pennsboro Ravenswood Rockport Saint Marys Smithville Spencer Valley Mills Vienna Williamstown
No. 55 WAR Includes: War	
No. 61 DELBARTON (Williamson) Includes: Delbarton Matewan Williamson	
No. 70 MASONTOWN Includes: Arthurdale Masontown Reedsville	
* Listed separately	

Appendix B. The phone directories used for selecting the survey sample (rural versus urban)

The Rural Books (N=17)	The Urban Books (N=7)
<p>No. 73 AURORA- EGLON Includes: Canaan Valley Davis Eglon-Aurora Harman Parsons Thomas</p>	<p>No. 80 HUNTINGTON Includes: Alum Creek Apple Grove Barboursville Branchland Buffalo Ceredo Dunlow East Lynn Fort Gay Griffithsville Hamlin Huntington Hurricane Kenova Kermit Leon Milton Nitro Prichard Scott Depot Saint Albans Tyler Heights Union Ridge Wayne Winfield</p>

APPENDIX C

West Virginia Demographics

1990 CENSUS OF POPULATION
West Virginia

POPULATION

Total Population	1,793,477
Land Area (square miles)	24,087
Population Per Square Mile	74.5

Gender	
Male	861,536
Female	931,941

Population by Age Group	
Under 5 Years	106,659
5 To 17 Years	336,918
18 To 24 Years	179,991
25 To 44 Years	532,807
45 To 64 Years	368,205
65 To 84 Years	243,446
85 And Older	25,451
Median Age	35.4

Marital Status	
Married	841,731
Never Married	317,338
Divorced	116,127

Race	
White	1,725,523
Black	56,295

FAMILIES AND HOUSEHOLDS

Total Families	500,259
Married-Couple Families	406,105
With Related Children	194,965

Total Households	688,557
One-Person Households	168,735
Persons Per Household	2.55

Persons In Group Quarters	36,911
In Nursing Homes	12,591
In College Dormitories	15,083
In Correctional Institutions	4,439

HOUSING

Total Housing Units	781,295
Occupied Housing Units	688,557
Owner Occupied	510,058
Percentage Owner Occupied	74.1
Persons Per Unit	2.55

Persons Per Room:	
Units with 1 or Fewer	675,434
Units with More Than 1	13,123

Specified Owner-Occupied Units	350,059
Value Less Than \$50,000	185,276
Value \$50,000-\$149,000	155,706
Value \$150,000-\$299,000	8,198
Value \$300,000 or more	879
Median Value	\$47,900

Renter Occupied	178,499
Percentage Of Occupied Units	25.9
Median Contract Rent	\$221

Specified Renter-Occupied Units:	
Cash Rent Less Than \$250	88,872
Cash Rent \$250 To \$499	53,411
Cash Rent \$500 To \$749	3,312
Cash Rent \$750 To \$999	267
Cash Rent \$1,000 Or More	195

Units in Structure	
1 Unit, Detached	546,165
5 or More Units	49,102
Mobile Home, Trailer, Other	128,168

Vacant Housing Units	92,738
Homeowner Vacancy Rate	2.2
Renter Vacancy Rate	10.1

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census, Summary Tape File 1a, June 1991.

GENERAL DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

Population Characteristics

LAND AREA (SQUARE MILES), 1980	24,119
POPULATION 1986	1,918,000
POPULATION RANK (NATION) 1986	x
POPULATION/SQUARE MILE 1986	79.5
POPULATION 1980 (CORRECTED)	1,950,000
POPULATION CHANGE (NUMBER) 1980-86	(31,000)
POPULATION % CHANGE 1980-86	(1.6)
NATURAL INCREASE: BIRTHS 1980-86	164,000
NATURAL INCREASE: DEATHS 1980-86	120,000
NET MIGRATION 1980-86	(74,000)
% WHITE POPULATION 1984	96.26
% BLACK & OTHER RACES 1984	3.74
MALES PER 100 FEMALES 1984	94.6
% PERSONS UNDER 5 YEARS 1984	7.0
% PERSONS 5-14 YEARS 1984	15.4
% PERSONS 15-24 YEARS 1984	16.2
% PERSONS 25-34 YEARS 1984	16.3
% PERSONS 35-44 YEARS 1984	12.6
% PERSONS 45-54 YEARS 1984	9.5
% PERSONS 55-64 YEARS 1984	10.0
% PERSONS 65-74 YEARS 1984	7.8
% PERSONS 75 & OVER 1984	5.1
POPULATION 1984	1,950,390
% AM. INDIAN, ESKIMO, ALEUT 1980	0.08
% ASIAN & PASIFIC ISLANDER 1980	0.27
% HISPANIC 1980	0.65

Households

HOUSEHOLDS 1985	711,000
HOUSEHOLDS, % CHANGE 1980-85	3.6
PERSONS PER HOUSEHOLD 1985	2.68
HOUSEHOLDS 1980	686,311
% HOUSEHOLDS W/FEMALE HEAD 1980	9.4
% HOUSEHOLDS W/ 1 PERSON 1980	20.7

Other Demographics

BIRTHS 1984	24,585
BIRTHS TO MOTHERS UNDER 20 YRS 1984	17.7
BIRTHS PER 1,000 POPULATION 1984	12.6
DEATHS 1984	19,207
INFANT DEATHS 1984	270
DEATHS PER 1,000 POPULATION 1984	9.8
INFANT DEATHS/1,000 LIVE BIRTHS 1984	11
MARRIAGES 1984	15,513
MARRIAGE RATE 1984	8
DIVORCES 1984	9,629
DIVORCE RATE 1984	4.9

Health

PHYSICIANS (ACTIVE, NON FEDERAL) 1985	3,018
PHYSICIANS/100,000 POPULATION 1985	156
HOSPITALS 1985	74
HOSPITAL BEDS 1985	12,001
HOSPITAL BEDS/100,000 POPULATION 1985	620
NURSING HOMES 1986	163
NURSING HOME BEDS 1986	9,819

Quality of Life

SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFICIARIES 1985	357,600
S.S. BENEFICIARIES/1,000 POPULATION 1985	184.7
SOCIAL SECURITY PAYMENTS (\$1000s) 1985	145,083
SUPPLEM S.S.I. PROGRAM RECIPIENTS JUNE 1986	43,531
SERIOUS CRIMES KNOWN TO POLICE 1985	42,212
VIOLENT CRIMES KNOWN TO POLICE 1985	3,115
SERIOUS CRIMES/100,000 POPULATION 1985	2,234
PUBLIC SCHOOL ENROLLMENT 1986-87	351,837

GENERAL DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

PUBLIC SCHOOL ENROLLMENT 1980	390,653
% POPULATION W/ >=12 YRS. EDUCATION 1980	56
% POPULATION W/ >=16 YRS. EDUCATION 1980	10.4
PERSONS 25 AND OVER	1,147,042
LOCAL GOVT. EXPEND ON EDUCATION (MIL \$) 1982	890.5
LOCAL GOVT. EXPEND-EDUCATION PER CAP (\$) 1982	454

Money Income and Poverty Status

MONEY INCOME PER CAPITA 1985	8,141
MONEY INCOME PER CAPITA RANK (NATION) 1985	x
MONEY INCOME PER CAPITA (CURRENT \$) 1979	6,142
MONEY INCOME PER CAPITA (CONSTANT 1985\$) 1979	9,102
MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME 1979	14,564
% PERSONS BELOW POVERTY LEVEL 1979	15.0
% FAMILIES BELOW POVERTY LEVEL 1979	11.7
FAMILY HOUSEHOLDS 1980	531,248

Housing Characteristics

HOUSING UNITS 1980	747,810
HOUSING UNITS % CHANGE 1970-80	25.2
OCCUPIED HOUSING UNITS 1980	686,311
OCCUPIED HOUSING UNITS % OWNER OCCUPIED 1980	73.6
OCCUPIED HOUSING UNITS % >=2 AUTOS 1980	51.4
MEDIAN VALUE: OCCUPIED HOUSG UNTS (\$) 1980	38,500
NEW PRIVATE HOUSG AUTHORIZED BY PERMIT 1986	1,918
NEW PRIVATE HOUSG AUTHORIZED BY PERMIT 1980-86	14,855
NEW PRIV HOUSG AUTHORIZED BY PERMIT %STOCK 1980	2.0

Labor Force and Earnings

CIVILIAN LABOR FORCE 1986	743,000
CIVILIAN LABOR FORCE % CHANGE 1985-86	(2.7)
CIVILIAN LABOR FORCE - UNEMPLOYED 1986	88,000
CIVILIAN LABOR FORCE - UNEMPLOYMENT RATE 1986	11.8
PRIVATE NONFARM ESTABLISHMENTS 1984	36,499
PRIVATE NONFARM ESTABLISHMENTS CHANGE 1983-84	314
EMP IN PRIVATE NONFARM ESTABLMENTS 1984	439,277
EMP IN PRIV. NONFARM ESTAB. % CHANGE 1983-84	0.1
EMPLOYMENT IN MANUFACTURING 1984	88,163
EMPLOYMENT IN RETAIL TRADE 1984	101,742
EMP IN FINANCE, INSURANCE, REAL ESTATE 1984	22,445
EMPLOYMENT IN SERVICES 1984	103,240
PRIV NONFARM ESTABS ANNUAL PAYROLL 1984	7,820
PRIV NONFM ESTAB AVE ANN PAYROLL/EMP 1984	17,801
PERSONAL INCOME (MILLIONS \$) 1984	18,953.8
PERSONAL INCOME % CHANGE 1980-84	25.4
PERSONAL INCOME PER CAPITA (\$) 1984	9,708
PERS INC: TRANSFER PAYMT (MILLIONS \$) 1984	4,021.4
PERS INC: EARNINGS (MILLIONS \$) 1984	12,667.6
PERS INC EARN: % GOODS-RELATED INDUSTRY 1984	39.4
PERS INC EARN: % MANUFACTURING 1984	19.8
PERS INC EARN: % SERVICE&RELATED 1984	60.8
PERS INC EARN: % RETAIL TRADE 1984	9.3
PERS INC EARN: % FINANCE,INS.,REAL EST 1984	3.8
PERS INC EARN: % SERVICES 1984	16.4
PERS INC EARN: % GOVT. 1984	16.3

Agriculture

FARM EARNINGS (MILLION \$) 1984	(17.2)
FARM EARNINGS % OF TOTAL EARNINGS 1984	(0.1)
FARM EARNINGS (MILLION \$) 1983	(13.6)
FARM EARNINGS (MILLION \$) 1982	(10.0)
FARMS 1982	18,742
FARMS % W/ LESS THAN 50 ACRES 1982	19.5
FARMS % W/ 500 ACRES AND OVER 1982	6.9
FARM OPERATORS % W/ PRINC.OCCUPN-FARMING 1982	38.0
FARM OPERATORS % RESIDING ON FARM 1982	75.4
FARM ACREAGE (1000S ACRES) 1982	3,559.0
FARM ACREAGE % CHANGE 1978-1982	0.8

GENERAL DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

AVERAGE SIZE OF FARM (ACRES) 1982	190.0
IRRIGATED FARM LAND (1000S ACRES) 1982	1.0
CROPLAND (1000S ACRES) 1982	1,319
AVE VALUE LAND & BLDGS/FARM (\$1000s) 1982	129.4
AVE VALUE LAND & BUILDINGS/ACRE (\$) 1982	688
VALUE OF FARM PRODUCTS SOLD (MILLION \$) 1982	242
AVE VALUE PRODUCTS SOLD/FARM (\$) 1982	12,919
% VALUE FARM PRODUCTS SOLD IN CROPS 1982	23.6
% VAL FARM PRDTS SOLD-LIVESTOCK&POULTRY 1982	76.4
% FARMS WITH SALES OF \$10,000 OR MORE 1982	14.9
% FARMS WITH SALES OF \$100,000 OR MORE 1982	2.4

Manufacturing

MANUFACTURING EARNINGS (MILLION \$) 1984	2,513.4
MANUFACTURING EARNINGS % CHANGE 1983-84	6.3
MANUFACTURING ESTABLISHMENTS 1982	1,662
MANUFACTURING ESTAB % W/ >=100 EMPLOYEES 1982	11.5
MANUFACTURING EMPLOYEES (1000s) 1982	95.8
MANUFACTURING EMPLOYEES % CHANGE 1977-1982	(18.1)
MANUFACTURING ANNUAL PAYROLL (MIL \$) 1982	2,007
MANUFACTURING PRODUCTION WORKERS (1000S) 1982	65.2
MANUFACTURING PRODTN WORK HOURS (MIL \$) 1982	121.5
MANUF PRODTN WORKERS WAGES (MIL \$) 1982	1,233
MANUFACTURING WAGES/PRODUCTN WORKER (\$) 1982	18,911
VALUE ADDED BY MANUFACTURE (MIL \$) 1982	4,049.2
MANUF - VALUE OF SHIPMENTS (MIL \$) 1982	9,868.8
MANUF - NEW CAPITAL EXPEND. (\$1000s) 1982	393.7

Construction

VAL CONSTUCTN AUTHRZED BY PERMIT (\$1000s)1986	269,650
VAL NONRESIDTL CONSTR. AUTHRZED (\$1000s) 1986	96,338
% VAL OF NONRES CONSTR AUTHRZED-OFFICE 1986	19.2
% VAL OF NONRES CONSTR AUTHRZED-INDUSTRL 1986	5.6
% VAL OF NONRES CONSTR AUTHRZED-STORES 1986	26.2
VAL RESIDTL CONSTRUCTN AUTHRZED (\$1000s) 1986	83,330
VAL RESIDTL ADDITION&ALTERS AUTH. (\$1000s)1986	28,247

Wholesale and Retail Trade

WHOLESALE TRADE ESTABLISHMENTS 1982	2,380
WHOLESALE TRADE SALES (MILLION \$) 1982	6,101.2
WHOLESALE TRADE PAID EMPLOYEES 1982	25,822
WHOLESALE TRADE ANNUAL PAY (MILLION \$) 1982	429.9
RETAIL TRADE ALL ESTABLISHMENTS 1982	14,416
RETAIL TRADE SALES (MILLION \$) 1982	7,521.1
RETAIL TRADE SALES % CHANGE 1977-1982	32.5
RETAIL TRADE SALES PER CAPITA (\$) 1982	3,835
RETAIL TRADE ESTABLISHMENTS W/ PAYROLL 1982	9,853
RETAIL SALES-ESTAB W/PAYROLL (MIL \$)1982	7,276.8
RETAIL SALES-GEN MRDISE STORES PER CAP (\$)1982	514
RETAIL SALES-FOOD STORES PER CAP (\$) 1982	1,004
RETAIL SALES-APPAREL STORES PER CAP (\$) 1982	168
RETAIL SALES-EAT&DRINK PLACES PER CAP (\$) 1982	267
RETAIL PAID EMPLOY. OF ESTABL W/ PAYROLL 1982	97,330
RETAIL ANNUAL PAY ESTABL W/ PAY (MIL. \$) 1982	820.8

Service Industries

TAXABLE SERVICE ESTABLISHMENTS W/ PAYR 1982	7,424
TAX SVC RECEIPTS ESTABL W/PAYR (MIL\$) 1982	1,759.3
RECEIPTS HOTEL,MOTEL,OTHER LODG (MIL\$) 1982	172.8
RECPTS HEALTH SVC, EXC. HOSPITALS (MIL\$) 1982	583.1
RECEIPTS OF LEGAL SERVICES (MIL\$) 1982	129.6
TAX SVC PAID EMP OF ESTBL W/PAYR (MIL\$) 1982	50,243
TAX SVC ANNUAL PAY OF ESTBL W/PAYR (MIL\$) 1982	633.4

Banking

BANK DEPOSITS (MILLIONS \$) JUNE 1986	12,303
BANK DEPOSITS % CHANGE 1985-86 JUNE	6.4
SAVINGS CAPITAL S&L ASSOCS (MIL. \$) SEPT1986	1,991.7

GENERAL DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

SAVINGS CAPITAL S&L %CHANGE SEPT 1985-86 2.9

Government

FEDERAL FUNDS AND GRANTS (MILLION \$) 1986	5,343.2
FEDERAL FUNDS & GRANTS % CHANGE 1985-86	7.0
FEDERAL FUNDS & GRANTS PER CAPITA (\$) 1986	2,786
FED FUND-DIRECT PAYMTS INDIVID PER CAP (\$)1986	1,804
FED FUND-PROCUREMENT AWARDS PER CAP (\$) 1986	168
FED FUND-SALARIES AND WAGES PER CAP (\$); 1986	253
FED FUND-GRANT AWARDS PER CAP (\$) 1986	524
LOCAL GOVT GENERAL REVENUE (MIL\$) 1981-82	1,620.2
LOCAL GOVT INTERGOVT REV (MIL\$) 1981-82	814.1
LOCAL GOVT INTRGOVT REV %FROM STATE GOV 1981-82	83.5
LOCAL GOVT TAXES (MILLION \$) 1981-82	393.1
LOCAL GOVT TAXES PER CAPITA (\$) 1981-82	200
LOCAL GOVT PROPTY TAX PER CAP (\$) 1981-82	158
LOCAL GOVT DIRECT GEN EXPEND (MIL\$) 1981-82	1,591.1
LOCAL GOVT DIRECT GEN EXPEND % CHANGE 1977-82	87.1
LOCAL GOVT DIRECT GEN EXPEND PER CAP(\$) ¹ 1981-82	811
LOCAL GOVT DIRECT GEN EXP % EDUCATN 1981-82	56.0
LOCAL GOVT DIRECT GEN EXP %HEALTH&HOSP 1981-82	10.9
LOCAL GOVT DIRECT GEN EXP % POLICE 1981-82	3.0
LOCAL GOVT DIRECT GEN EXP %PUBLIC WELF 1981-82	0.1
LOCAL GOVT DIRECT GEN EXP % HIGHWAYS 1981-82	1.9
LOCAL GOVT DEBT OUTSTANDING (MIL \$) 1981-1982	1,952.7
LOCAL GOVT DEBT OUTSTAND PER CAP (\$) 1981-82	996
LOCAL GOVT EMPLOYMENT OCTOBER 1982	65,450
LOCAL GOVT EMP RATE (PER 10,000 POP) OCT 1982	333.8
FEDERAL GOVT CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT 1984	15,414
FED GOVT CIVILIAN EMP EARNING (1000S \$) 1984	386,509

Elections

ELECTIONS-VOTE CAST FOR PRESIDENT 1984	735,742
ELECTIONS-% VOTE FOR LEADING PARTY 1984	55.1
VOTE CAST FOR PRESIDENT-LEADING PARTY **	2

SOURCE: BUREAU OF THE CENSUS, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE.

() : DENOTES NEGATIVE NUMBER

** : 1=DEMOCRATIC, 2=REPUBLICAN

DATA CODES:

na = NOT AVAILABLE

d = SUPPRESSED TO AVOID DISCLOSURE OF CONFIDENTIAL INFO.

x = NOT APPLICABLE

s = SUPPRESSED, DOES NOT MEET PUBLICATION STANDARDS

z = VALUE IS GREATER THAN ZERO BUT LESS THAN HALF OF UNIT SHOWN

APPENDIX D

List of Tables

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Percent and rates of victimization, by types of crime.....	8
2. Percent and rates of victimization of burglary, by the interviewees' age, sex, race, income, residence, education, and marital status.....	9
3. Percent and rates of victimization of motor vehicle theft, by the interviewees' age, sex, race, income, residence, education, and marital status.....	10
4. Percent and rates of victimization of theft, by the interviewees' age, sex, race, income, residence, education, and marital status.....	11
5. Percent and rates of victimization of robbery, by the interviewees' age, sex, race, income, residence, education, and marital status.....	12
6. Percent and rates of victimization of assault, by the interviewees' age, sex, race, income, residence, education, and marital status.....	13
7. Percent and rates of victimization of rape, by the interviewees' age, sex, race, income, residence, education, and marital status.....	14
8. Percent and rates of victimization of vandalism, by the interviewees' age, sex, race, income, residence, education, and marital status.....	15
9. Percent and rates of victimization of murder, by the interviewees' age, sex, race, income, residence, education, and marital status.....	16
10. The overall ratings of the biggest crime problem in the community, safety at work place and in the neighborhood.....	17
11. Ratings of the performance of the courts, police, and the willingness to use tax money to support the criminal justice system.....	18
12. The frequency and percent of the types of murder victim the interviewees personally knew.....	19

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
13. Ratings of the biggest crime problem as a function of the interviewees' age, sex, race, income, residence, education and marital status...	20
14. Ratings of safety at the work place as a function of the interviewees' age, sex, race, income, residence, education and marital status...	21
15. Ratings of safety in the neighborhood as a function of the interviewees' age, sex, race, income, residence, education and marital status...	22
16. The frequency and percent of the respondents who own guns and purposes of owning guns.....	23
17. Respondents reporting at least one victimization (burglary, motor vehicle theft, larceny-theft, robbery, assault, rape, or vandalism).....	23
17.A. Respondents reporting at least one completed victimization (burglary, motor vehicle theft, larceny-theft, robbery, assault, rape, or vandalism), by age, sex, race, income, residence, education, and marital status.....	24
17.B. Respondents reporting at least one attempted victimization (burglary, motor vehicle theft, larceny-theft, robbery, assault, rape, or vandalism), by age, sex, race, income, residence, education, and marital status.....	25
18. The phone directories used for selecting the survey sample (rural v. urban).....	27
19. The purposes of the items in the survey questionnaire	29
20. Characteristics of the interviewees.....	31
21. The respondents' county of residence.....	32