

7

PUBLIC ATTITUDES TOWARD CORRUPT BUSINESS  
PRACTICES, POLITICS, AND LEADERS OF CANADA

ABSTRACT:

A Preliminary Analysis of Public  
Responses in Lewistown, Virginia

75-10-03-0001  
75-10-03-0002

RECEIVED

34078<sup>sup</sup>  
READING ROOM



College of William and Mary

WILLIAMSBURG, VIRGINIA

PUBLIC ATTITUDES TOWARD CRIMINAL JUSTICE  
AGENCIES, POLICIES, AND LEVELS OF CRIMINAL  
VICTIMIZATION:

A Preliminary Analysis of Citizen  
Responses in Portsmouth, Virginia

73-NI-03-0002  
73-ED-03-0002

prepared by

Charles W. Thomas, Ph.D.  
Research Director  
Metropolitan Criminal Justice Center  
College of William and Mary

&

Cecilia C. Nelson, Ph.D.  
Research Associate  
Survey Research Center  
Virginia Commonwealth University

February, 1975

PUBLIC ATTITUDES TOWARD CRIMINAL JUSTICE AGENCIES,  
POLICIES, AND LEVELS OF CRIMINAL VICTIMIZATION:

A Preliminary Analysis of Citizen  
Responses in Portsmouth, Virginia

During the Winter of 1973-1974 the research staff of the Metropolitan Criminal Justice Center of the College of William and Mary, in cooperation with criminal justice agencies in Chesapeake, Norfolk, Portsmouth, and Virginia Beach, Virginia, designed and conducted a large survey research project which focused on a variety of questions relevant to criminal justice planning activities in these jurisdictions. The topics on which particular attention was focused included the extent and type of criminal victimization that had been experienced by residents of the four-city area, attitudes toward and assessments of the criminal justice agencies which serve the area, evaluations of present or potential programs and policies of these agencies, and attitudes toward a series of contemporary issues related to the criminal justice system. The purpose of this preliminary report is to provide a brief overview of selected findings that have been derived from analysis already completed, an overview which is intended to provide meaningful input into ongoing criminal justice planning.

### The Research Method

Too frequently practical concerns have forced criminal justice personnel to operate without the benefit of input from a representative cross-section of the communities they serve and, instead, to react to individuals and groups whose interests were such that they made their feelings and preferences known. The attitudes, opinions, and experiences of the vast majority of citizens could not be taken into consideration because there has typically been no reasonable means by which such information could be obtained. Thus, the most basic issue addressed in this research has been to counter the problem posed by the paucity of data by soliciting relevant information from as broad a spectrum of the population as was possible. In order to do so, a systematic random sample was drawn from the most current telephone directories that were available in late 1973, telephone directories having been chosen as the source for our sample because it provided the least biased source of names and addresses that we were able to locate. Our sampling procedure yielded a listing of 9,178 households in the four-city area.

The design of our study dictated that the head of each of the 9,178 households be contacted by mail at several points in time in order to maximize the representativeness of the data we obtained. Thus, early in November of 1973 a letter was mailed to each of the households we selected. The letter briefly described the purpose of the research and encouraged

the cooperation of those who would later be asked to provide a fairly substantial amount of information for our analysis. Shortly thereafter each household received a questionnaire and a pre-addressed business return envelope in which the respondents were instructed to place the completed questionnaire. Those from whom completed questionnaires were not received within a short period of time received a reminder letter encouraging them to complete and return the questionnaires they had previously received and, if we still received no response, a fourth mailing which included another copy of the questionnaire and another business return envelope. All mailing envelopes carried a request for an address correction so that we could delete respondents from our sample if they no longer resided in the four-city area. We were forced to delete 1,949 households from our sample because the respondents has moved from the area, died, or could not be reached at the address we obtained from the telephone directories. Of the 7,229 households that we were able to contact, adequately completed questionnaires were returned by 46.1 percent. This provided data on 10,659 individuals in the four-city area who are members of 3,334 households. It should be noted, however, that these returns show a bias in favor of those who were older, white, better educated, higher in occupational prestige, and relatively affluent. In this preliminary report we have not weighted the responses to adjust for these biases, and any interpretation of the results

presented in this report must necessarily take into consideration the fact that, while our sample selection was accomplished in a strictly random fashion, our returns are in some ways not representative of the population in the four-city area. The final report will include analysis of the extent to which, if any, these biases may have affected the results reported herein.

#### Analysis and Findings

Our findings on Portsmouth are based on an analysis of completed returns from 416 households in the city; this number accounts for 1,176 citizens. Relevant statistical information derived from these responses is provided in Appendix A. Comparable information derived from the 3,334 questionnaires obtained from the four-city area is located in Appendix B. The narrative segment of this preliminary report is intended to report the general nature of our findings with regard to criminal victimization experiences, citizens perceptions of crime as a problem in Portsmouth, and citizen attitudes toward criminal justice agencies, policies, and programs.

#### Criminal Victimization in Portsmouth

Turning our attention toward the experiences of those Portsmouth residents in our sample that pertain to their criminal victimization, 22.1 percent of the households in the area report having been victimized on one or more occasions, a rate lower than that noted for the four-city area (28.5 percent). Relative to the entire sample, Portsmouth residents were more frequently the victims of crimes against person than crimes

against property and were thus more likely to report physical harm related to their victimization. The offenses tended to occur outside the home, and the amount of financial loss that was incurred was somewhat higher than that noted for the entire sample. The distribution of offense types on the victimizations that were described by our respondents is provided in Section II of Appendix A. When this pattern of experiences is compared with that of all 3,334 households in the sample, the probability that a Portsmouth resident will become the victim of a criminal offense is relatively low. From the 1,176 citizens represented in our sample of 416 Portsmouth households, 158 separate victimizations were reported. A crude victimization rate per 1,000 people in the population can thus be expressed as being equal to 158 victimizations reported divided by 1,176 citizens of all ages multiplied by 1,000. This yields a crude victimization rate of 134.37 per thousand. The comparison figure for the four-city area is equal to 1,776 victimizations, divided by 10,659 citizens in the sample from whom returns were received, and then multiplied by 1,000, a crude victimization rate of 166.62. Portsmouth residents reported their victimizations to the police less reliably than the entire sample (85.5 percent versus 87.16 percent), but this reporting rate is still higher than that suggested in much prior victimization research. Although the rather small number of non-reported incidents makes any examination of the reasons for non-reporting very speculative, our data suggest that those who failed to report

incidents felt that the offense was minor and that the police probably could not be of assistance to them.

A major point on which the quality of any system of delivering police services may be properly evaluated is, of course, the examination of citizen assessments of the adequacy of police responses to their calls for assistance following a victimization. For that reason, the heads of Portsmouth households which had been victimized were asked additional questions with regard to the quality of the response they received after they reported the offense. This information is summarized in Section III of Appendix A. A substantial majority of those responding to these questions felt that the police response had been prompt (84.7 percent), that the police had been very considerate when they responded to citizen calls for assistance (89.2 percent), and that the police has explained both what needed to be done, and what the citizen could expect in adequate detail (81.5 percent). On balance, with regard to these three measures of citizen evaluations of police performance, Portsmouth respondents were slightly more favorable than were those from other areas studied. On the other hand, Portsmouth residents whose households had been victimized were somewhat less favorable in their evaluation of the quality of the investigative work done by the police (40.3 percent of those responding from Portsmouth were favorable versus 49.6 percent of the entire sample).

When we inquired about the experience which these



respondents had when their complaints resulted in arrest and trial, a sizable majority were either uncertain or negative in their responses to questions about the general handling of their cases (71.1 percent), the extent to which post-arrest procedures were explained to them (67.8 percent), and the length of time required for their cases to be processed (72.2 percent). This would appear to identify a fairly serious problem for criminal justice agencies in Portsmouth, but it should be noted that this negativism is consistent with the evaluations of a majority of the respondents from the entire four-city area.

Citizen Perceptions of Crime as a Social Problem

Although the evaluations of Portsmouth residents that are related to actual experiences as the victims of criminal offenses are clearly relevant to any attempt to evaluate community responses to the criminal justice system, the vast majority of citizens in any metropolitan area do not become the victims of such offenses. Their attitudes and evaluations are no less important, however, and criminal justice planners must take care to include information from this larger group of citizens in their work. One particularly significant area that deserves systematic attention is the assessment of the magnitude of public concern over crime as a social problem. Our research approached this issue in two ways. First, we attempted to measure the relative importance of the crime problem among those who responded to our survey. Second, we raised a number of questions which focused on the extent to which citizens were

fearful that they would become the victims of criminal offenses (see Section IV of Appendix A).

In general, our findings clearly show that Portsmouth residents, not unlike other area residents, view crime as a major social problem and perceive the probability of their becoming the victims of criminal offenses to be rather high. For example, 77.6 percent of our Portsmouth respondents (and 79.2 percent of the total sample) agree that they are more fearful of being victimized than they had ever been previously. This finding is further amplified by the finding that only 23.6 percent of our Portsmouth sample, as compared with 42.1 percent of the total four-city sample, agreed that the danger of becoming the victim of a criminal offense in their city is lower than in many other parts of the country. Thus, not surprisingly, 11.7 percent of our Portsmouth respondents feel that the crime problem in their neighborhood has become so serious that they would like to move out of the neighborhood as soon as possible, a percentage higher than the 7.3 percent of the total sample who suggested that they would like to move from their present neighborhoods.

#### Citizen Evaluations of Police and Court Performance

It would appear obvious that, in an area where crime and possible victimization are major concerns among residents, citizen evaluations of the performance of criminal justice agencies will become a topic of considerable importance. Further, if criminal justice agencies are to effectively serve

a community, it is imperative that they monitor public opinion regarding the quality of their operations. The set of fifteen separate questions regarding relevant aspects of public opinion that were posed in our survey are provided in Section V of Appendix A.

Generally speaking, Portsmouth residents appear quite positive toward both their police and courts, an opinion shared by other area residents to whom these questions were posed. A majority of our Portsmouth respondents (53.6 percent) and our entire sample (78.0 percent) agree that their police departments are doing an effective job. Similarly, a majority of both our Portsmouth sample (51.7 percent) and our total sample (63.7 percent) believe that their court system is performing effectively. Indeed, this entire set of items suggests that area residents feel that these criminal justice agencies are operating in an equitable and just manner that merits more respect than is often forthcoming.

This certainly does not mean that significant minorities do not feel that there is inefficiency, inequity, and discrimination. Many did express negative, sometimes even hostile feelings about police and court activities. On the other hand, it does mean that the majority of area residents are supportive of their police and courts, and this, in turn, implies the presence of a major advantage and resource for those in criminal justice agencies who seek to foster greater involvement of area residents in criminal justice planning and the operation of

criminal justice agencies. Further, our data do not support any hypothesis that would suggest that either the police or the courts are forced to operate within an antagonistic or hostile context.

Public Evaluation of Potential Criminal Justice Programs and Policies

If citizens are supportive of their local criminal justice agencies, and if they feel that crime is a major social problem, we would expect their support and concern to have an impact on their willingness to expand the scope and sophistications of programs and policies related to the operation of the criminal justice system. To determine whether or not this is in fact the case, a series of sixteen questions (see Section VI of Appendix A) were posed to our respondents on a broad variety of topics that are of considerable concern to criminal justice administrators and planners. The results that we obtained in Portsmouth are encouraging. More than one-half of our respondents indicated their support for such programs and policies as assistance to the victims of criminal offenses (83.2 percent), the employment of more judges and prosecutors (58.3 percent), job counseling for ex-convicts (92.5 percent), increases in the size of the police force (64.0 percent), and the release of individuals who are to be tried for criminal acts on their own recognizance (57.7 percent).

Perhaps most importantly, many Portsmouth residents appear interested in becoming personally involved with the activities

of their criminal justice agencies. This is reflected by our respondents expression of interest in information on criminal justice agency activities and their willingness to either become actively involved in some types of programs or support programs and policies that would have a direct impact on them. For example, 76.3 percent of our Portsmouth respondents indicated an interest in receiving a newsletter that would keep them informed about the programs and activities of the police, courts, and related agencies. A considerable number (39.5 percent) would be willing to spend some of their free time each week in working with juvenile or adult offenders. A sizable majority appear willing to support the tax burden required for the expansion of criminal justice agencies, a point illustrated by the fact 88.6 percent approve of substantial increases in the salaries of police officers as a means by which the city could obtain better qualified officers. Thus, there appears to be a real opportunity in Portsmouth to put a high level of public support and willingness to become involved to productive uses.

#### Related Public Attitudes and Opinions

A variety of issues related to criminal justice activities and agencies were explored during the course of our research, issues that included such topics as levels of support for capital punishment, sentencing practices, and opinions on constitutionally guaranteed civil liberties. (See Section VII of Appendix A). Those in our sample support harsher punishment for offenders and a relaxation of many of the constraints that have

been imposed on enforcement agencies by contemporary court decisions. For example, 77.1 percent of the Portsmouth respondents and 80.3 percent of the four-city sample respondents agreed that we should have a mandatory death penalty for some types of particularly serious offenses.

This support for more serious sanctions appears to be premised on the belief that the harsher the punishment an offender receives, the less likely he will be to commit another crime. Thus, 71.6 percent of our Portsmouth sample agreed that longer sentences would lessen the probability that an individual would become reinvolved in crime; 86.3 percent agreed that punishing an offender shows others that crime does not pay even if punishment has no real impact on the offender who is punished. In other words, our respondents appear to favor harsh treatment and a removal of some basic civil liberties because of their belief that this would lessen the problem that they presently confront. Yet this opinion is not supported by correctional research and evaluation, which has demonstrated, instead, that none of our current sentencing patterns and dispositions have much if any rehabilitative or deterrent impact. Thus, these citizens attitudes indicate that criminal justice agencies have not adequately presented the public with hard, objective evidence on these issues.

#### Conclusions

In brief, our preliminary analysis of data obtained from a sample of Portsmouth residents reveals both significant levels

of criminal victimization and the belief among area residents that crime is a major social problem. It is important to note, however, that the majority of those we contacted feel that the criminal justice system in their city is functioning in an efficient and effective manner. Moreover, there appears to be a substantial interest among these citizens in supporting both more extensive criminal justice programs and a greater degree of citizen involvement in the work of criminal justice agencies. These facts speak well of local criminal justice operations and, more importantly, they identify a significant resource upon which responsible agencies can depend in the structuring of their activities.

## APPENDIX A

Section I: Social and Demographic Characteristics of Portsmouth Respondents

- (1) Age:  
Mean = 47.89
- (2) Sex
- |                |       |         |
|----------------|-------|---------|
| 1. Male .....  | N=309 | (74.8%) |
| 2. Female..... | 104   | (25.2%) |
- (3) Race:
- |               |     |        |
|---------------|-----|--------|
| 1. Black..... | 87  | (21.3) |
| 2. White..... | 319 | (78.0) |
| 3. Other..... | 3   | ( 0.7) |
- (4) Martial Status:
- |                   |     |        |
|-------------------|-----|--------|
| 1. Single.....    | 29  | ( 7.1) |
| 2. Married.....   | 305 | (74.2) |
| 3. Separated..... | 11  | ( 2.7) |
| 4. Divorced.....  | 20  | ( 4.9) |
| 5. Widowed.....   | 46  | (11.2) |
- (5) City Live in Now:
- |                        |     |         |
|------------------------|-----|---------|
| 1. Chesapeake.....     |     |         |
| 2. Norfolk.....        |     |         |
| *3. Portsmouth.....    | 416 | (100.0) |
| 4. Virginia Beach..... |     |         |
| 5. Other in Virginia.. |     |         |
- (6) How many years at this address?  
Mean = 13.47
- (7) Own or rent home?
- |              |     |        |
|--------------|-----|--------|
| 1. Own.....  | 297 | (73.5) |
| 2. Rent..... | 107 | (26.5) |
- (8) Education:
- |                                      |     |        |
|--------------------------------------|-----|--------|
| 1. 1st through 8th grade.....        | 84  | (20.7) |
| 2. 9th through 12th grade.....       | 179 | (44.2) |
| 3. Some college.....                 | 97  | (24.0) |
| 4. College degree.....               | 24  | ( 5.9) |
| 5. More than 4 years of college..... | 21  | ( 5.2) |



(9) Occupational Type:			
1. Professional.....	41	(10.6)	
2. Business.....	44	(11.4)	
3. White Collar.....	78	(20.2)	
4. Skilled Manual.....	88	(22.8)	
5. Semi-skilled Manual.....	21	( 5.4)	
6. Unskilled.....	10	( 2.6)	
7. Military.....	17	( 4.4)	
8. Student.....	3	( 0.8)	
9. Unemployed - Retired.....	84	(21.8)	
(10) Are you presently:			
1. Working in primary occupation.....	283	(70.2)	
2. Working in some other occupation.....	17	( 4.2)	
3. Not employed at this time.....	54	(13.4)	
4. Retired.....	49	(12.2)	
(11) Are you the head of the household?			
1. Yes.....	377	(91.7)	
2. No.....	34	( 8.3)	
(12) How many live at this address (counting yourself):			
Mean = 2.83			
(13) Income:			
1. Less than \$2,000.....	12	( 3.0)	
2. \$2,000 - \$3,999.....	36	( 9.1)	
3. \$4,000 - \$8,999.....	73	(18.5)	
4. \$9,000 - \$11,999.....	98	(24.8)	
5. \$12,000 - \$19,999.....	139	(35.2)	
6. \$20,000 and above.....	37	( 9.4)	

## Section II: Criminal Victimization in Portsmouth

(1) Victim Status:			
1. Yes.....	92	(22.1)	
2. No.....	324	(77.9)	
(2) Number of Victimitizations:			
1. One.....	52	(56.5)	
2. Two.....	24	(26.1)	
3. Three.....	9	( 9.8)	
4. Four.....	4	( 4.3)	
5. Five.....	3	( 3.3)	
6. Six.....	-	(----)	
7. Seven.....	-	(----)	
8. Eight or more...	-	(----)	

(3)	Victim of First Offense Reported:		
	1. Recipient of questionnaire.....	47	(50.5)
	2. Wife - Husband.....	13	(14.0)
	3. Son - Daughter.....	17	(18.3)
	4. Family.....	14	(15.0)
	5. Other relatives.....	2	( 2.2)
(4)	Victim of Second Offense Reported:		
	1. Recipient of questionnaire.....	22	(53.7)
	2. Wife - Husband.....	3	( 7.3)
	3. Son - Daughter.....	9	(22.0)
	4. Family.....	7	(17.0)
	5. Other relatives.....	-	(----)
(5)	Victim of Third Offense Reported:		
	1. Recipient of questionnaire.....	12	(75.0)
	2. Wife - Husband .....	-	(----)
	3. Son - Daughter .....	3	(18.8)
	4. Family.....	-	(----)
	5. Other relatives.....	1	( 6.3)
(6)	Physical Harm from First Offense Reported:		
	1. No harm.....	8	(24.2)
	2. Emotional.....	4	(12.1)
	3. Threat.....	6	(18.2)
	4. Attack - minor - no injury.....	14	(42.4)
	5. Attack - disabling injury.....	1	( 3.0)
	6. Attack w/weapon - minor injury.....	-	(----)
	7. Attack w/weapon - disabling injury...	-	(----)
	8. Death.....	-	(----)
(7)	Physical Harm from Second Offense Reported:		
	1. No harm.....	1	( 8.3)
	2. Emotional.....	=	(----)
	3. Threat.....	3	(25.0)
	4. Attack - minor - no injury.....	7	(58.3)
	5. Attack - disabling injury.....	1	( 8.3)
	6. Attack w/weapon - minor injury.....	-	(----)
	7. Attack w/weapon - disabling injury...	-	(----)
	8. Death.....	-	(----)
(8)	Physical Harm from Third Offense Reported:		
	1. No harm.....	1	(20.0)
	2. Emotional.....	=	(----)
	3. Threat.....	1	(20.0)
	4. Attack - minor - no injury.....	2	(40.0)
	5. Attack - disabling injury.....	1	(20.0)
	6. Attack w/weapon - minor injury.....	-	(----)
	7. Attack w/weapon - disabling injury...	-	(----)
	8. Death.....	-	(----)

- (9) Financial Loss from First Offense Reported:  
Mean = \$287.25
- (10) Financial Loss from Second Offense Reported:  
Mean = \$247.57
- (11) Financial Loss from Third Offense Reported:  
Mean = \$346.00
- (12) Place Where First Offense Reported Occurred:  
1. Within home..... 19 (27.9)  
2. Outside home..... 49 (72.1)
- (13) Place Where Second Offense Reported Occurred:  
1. Within home..... 7 (22.6)  
2. Outside home..... 24 (77.4)
- (14) Place Where Third Offense Reported Occurred:  
1. Within home..... 3 (27.3)  
2. Outside home..... 8 (72.7)
- (15) City in Which Offenses Occurred:
- |                                   | <u>First</u> | <u>Second</u> | <u>Third</u> |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|
| 1. Chesapeake.....                | 3            | 2             | 1            |
| 2. Norfolk.....                   | 9            | 3             | 2            |
| 3. Portsmouth.....                | 56           | 31            | 12           |
| 4. Virginia Beach.....            | -            | -             | -            |
| 5. Other in Virginia..            | 2            | -             | -            |
| 6. Other outside of Virginia..... | 7            | 2             | 1            |
- (16) Type of Victimization:
- |  | <u>First</u> | <u>Second</u> | <u>Third</u> |
|--|--------------|---------------|--------------|
| 1. Car theft.....  | 9            | 2             | 1            |
| 2. Armed robbery.....  | 1            | -             | -            |
| 3. Robbery (involving threats).....  | 10           | 3             | 2            |
| 4. Breaking & entering.  | 4            | 3             | 1            |
| 5. Petty larceny (under \$100).....  | 5            | 3             | 3            |
| 6. Burglary (theft that occurs during or as a result of a breaking & entering into a building, in contrast to a car..... | 15           | 5             | 2            |
| 7. Rape.....   | 2            | -             | -            |
| 8. Murder.....   | -            | -             | -            |
| 9. Police brutality....  | -            | -             | -            |
| 10. Hit & run (only where property is involved).....   | -            | 1             | 1            |

	<u>First</u>	<u>Second</u>	<u>Third</u>
11. Bike theft.....	3	3	-
12. Obscene phone calls.....	2	-	-
13. Mugging.....	5	-	-
14. Assault.....	1	2	-
15. Assault & Battery.....	9	5	1
16. Vandalism.....	2	6	1
17. Grand larceny (thefts over \$100).....	6	2	-
18. Theft (undetermined amount.....	2	1	1
19. Child molesting.....	2	-	-
20. Felonious wounding.....	-	-	-
21. Tampering w/mails.....	-	1	-
22. Attempted car theft.....	-	-	-
23. Attempted robbery.....	-	-	-
24. Attempted assault.....	1	-	-
25. Breaking & entering on a car (no theft).....	-	-	-
26. Burglary on a car.....	6	3	1
27. Purse snatching.....	3	1	1
28. Attempted theft.....	1	-	-
29. Attempted breaking & entering.....	-	-	-
30. Non-criminal victim- ization.....	2	-	-
31. Kidnapping.....	-	-	-
32. Forging checks (in- cludes credit cards).....	-	-	-
33. Trespassing (prowling)...	-	-	-
34. Attempted breaking & entering on a car.....	-	-	-
35. Arson.....	-	-	-
36. Extortion.....	-	-	-
37. Attempted rape.....	-	-	-
38. Indecent exposure.....	-	-	-
39. Attempted arson.....	-	-	-
40. Embezzlement and/or fraud.....	-	-	-
41. Not applicable.....	324	375	339

- 17. Did you report first offense to police?
  - 1. Yes..... 83 (94.3)
  - 2. No..... 5 (5.7)
  
- 18. Did you report second offense to police?
  - 1. Yes..... 34 (87.2)
  - 2. No..... 5 (12.8)
  
- 19. Did you report third offense to police?
  - 1. Yes..... 12 (75.0)
  - 2. No..... 4 (25.0)

- (20) Did you have insurance that covered losses (1st offense)?
  - 1. Yes..... 31 (87.2)
  - 2. No..... 49 (12.8)
- (21) Did you have insurance that covered losses (2nd offense)?
  - 1. Yes..... 14 (35.0)
  - 2. No..... 26 (65.0)
- (22) Did you have insurance that covered losses (3rd offense)?
  - 1. Yes..... 3 (20.0)
  - 2. No..... 8 (80.0)
- (23) Regarding the offender, was the offender:
  - 1. A stranger..... 72 (88.9)
  - 2. A casual acquaintance..... 5 (6.2)
  - 3. A close friend..... - (----)
  - 4. Member of the family..... 1 (1.2)
  - 5. Unknown..... 3 (3.7)
- (24) Non-reporting information:
  - 1. Offender was friend..... - (----)
  - 2. Offense too minor..... 1 (9.1)
  - 3. Police couldn't help..... 1 (9.1)
  - 4. Offense partly my fault..... 2 (18.2)
  - 5. Don't wish to appear in court..... - (----)
  - 6. No one should know..... - (----)
  - 7. Afraid to report..... - (----)
  - 8. Would never report an offense..... - (----)
  - 9. Other..... 2 (18.2)
  - 10. Combination of above..... 5 (45.5)

Section III: Victim Evaluations of Criminal Justice Agency Responses

1. Reaction to Police Responses

(1) The police were very considerate when they responded to my call.

*SA	A	U	D	SD
18.5	70.7	0.0	7.6	3.3

(2) The police responded as rapidly as could be expected.

SA	A	U	D	SD
21.7	63.0	1.1	7.6	6.5

\* SA = strongly agree; A = agree; U = uncertain; D = disagree; SD = strongly disagree. In the text, percentages quoted represent the merger of either strongly agree and agree percentages or strongly disagree and disagree percentages.

(3) The police explained what I had to do and what I could expect in adequate detail.

SA	A	U	D	SD
13.0	68.5	3.3	9.8	5.4

(4) I felt that the police did a good job in investigating the offense.

SA	A	U	D	SD
12.0	28.3	32.6	16.3	10.9

## 2. Reaction to Case Processing

(1) Nobody ever explained what was going on to me.

SA	A	U	D	SD
4.4	13.3	67.8	10.0	4.4

(2) I thought the general handling of the case was good.

SA	A	U	D	SD
6.7	10.0	71.1	7.8	4.4

(3) I thought the case took much too long to process.

SA	A	U	D	SD
3.3	7.8	72.2	10.0	6.7

## Section IV: Citizen Perceptions of Crime as a Social Problem

### 1. Perception of Crime Rates

(1) The extent of crime in this city is one of my major concerns.

SA	A	U	D	SD
50.7	41.8	4.4	2.6	0.7

(2) Many people don't seem to realize how serious the crime problem has become in this city.

SA	A	U	D	SD
20.9	40.6	14.7	18.5	5.3

(3) The crime problem in my neighborhood has become so serious that I would like to move as soon as I can.

SA	A	U	D	SD
3.8	7.9	9.4	49.8	29.1

(4) The "crime problem" is just a gimmick that politicians use to get votes.

SA	A	U	D	SD
3.1	2.9	9.4	39.9	44.7

(5) The crime rate in the area where I live seems to be rapidly increasing.

SA	A	U	D	SD
7.0	29.3	24.0	35.3	4.3

2. Fear of Victimization

(1) This city's downtown section just isn't safe at night anymore.

SA	A	U	D	SD
46.2	39.4	6.5	6.5	1.4

(2) I don't really feel that the threat of criminal behavior is any greater today than in the past.

SA	A	U	D	SD
3.6	10.8	4.3	32.5	48.8

(3) The danger of becoming the victim of a criminal offense seems to be lower in this city than in many other parts of the country.

SA	A	U	D	SD
3.4	20.2	19.7	41.1	15.6

(4) I avoid shopping in the downtown section of the city because of the crime problem.

SA	A	U	D	SD
9.9	27.9	15.4	38.7	8.2

(5) During recent years I've become more afraid of being victimized by criminals than I ever was before.

SA	A	U	D	SD
27.6	50.0	7.5	11.5	3.4

(6) My family and I feel reasonably safe and secure in this community.

SA	A	U	D	SD
9.1	56.3	11.1	17.3	6.3

(7) I am confident that police protection in the area of Scope during events there is adequate.

SA	A	U	D	SD
3.6	23.6	55.5	13.0	4.3

(8) Crime is such a problem that this city is simply not a safe place to raise children.

SA	A	U	D	SD
8.4	21.4	20.0	41.6	8.7

(9) The threat of crime has become so great that nobody can feel safe in his own home anymore.

SA	A	U	D	SD
16.6	38.0	8.9	31.7	4.8

(10) Crime has become such a problem in my neighborhood that I'm afraid to go out at night.

SA	A	U	D	SD
7.2	21.6	8.9	50.0	12.3

Section V: Citizen Evaluation of Police and Court Performance

1. Evaluation of Police

- (1) The police in our city are doing an effective job and deserve our thanks.

SA	A	U	D	SD
7.7	45.9	22.6	18.5	5.3

- (2) The police in my community are guilty of discrimination against people like the poor and members of minority groups.

SA	A	U	D	SD
5.3	17.5	24.3	41.3	11.5

- (3) The police don't show the proper respect for citizens.

SA	A	U	D	SD
6.5	18.8	18.8	47.1	8.9

- (4) The police here are too willing to use force and violence.

SA	A	U	D	SD
4.8	13.7	21.6	50.0	9.9

- (5) Police officers in this city are generally no more corrupt than people in any other line of work.

SA	A	U	D	SD
8.4	57.7	15.4	13.2	5.3

- (6) People don't show our police the respect they deserve.

SA	A	U	D	SD
10.1	53.1	13.7	21.4	1.7

2. Evaluation of Courts

- (1) The courts are so slow in processing cases that it is unfair to require the average citizen to come to court as a witness.

SA	A	U	D	SD
8.9	27.6	27.4	32.7	3.4

- (2) I feel that most judges and juries in this area are fair in their decisions.

SA	A	U	D	SD
7.2	57.2	21.2	12.3	2.2

- (3) In general, I feel the court system in this city is doing an effective job..

SA	A	U	D	SD
3.4	48.3	24.8	20.4	3.1



- (4) You don't have a fair chance in the courts in this city unless you have money to hire a good lawyer.
- | SA  | A    | U    | D    | SD  |
|-----|------|------|------|-----|
| 6.5 | 26.2 | 27.2 | 34.9 | 5.3 |
- (5) Too many people are brought to trail for what are really little more than political crimes.
- | SA  | A    | U    | D    | SD  |
|-----|------|------|------|-----|
| 1.9 | 13.0 | 33.9 | 45.9 | 5.3 |
- (6) Members of minority groups in this city are discriminated against by judges and juries.
- | SA  | A   | U    | D    | SD   |
|-----|-----|------|------|------|
| 2.4 | 8.9 | 28.6 | 46.4 | 13.7 |
- (7) Our courts seem to be more interested in protecting the rights of criminals than in protecting the average citizen.
- | SA   | A    | U    | D    | SD  |
|------|------|------|------|-----|
| 10.8 | 26.7 | 18.0 | 39.9 | 4.6 |
- (8) Many innocent people are convicted by the courts.
- | SA  | A    | U    | D    | SD  |
|-----|------|------|------|-----|
| 4.3 | 28.6 | 29.6 | 33.7 | 3.8 |
- (9) There is little justice in this country for those who do not have money, power, or political influence.
- | SA  | A    | U    | D    | SD  |
|-----|------|------|------|-----|
| 9.1 | 26.4 | 14.7 | 41.8 | 7.9 |

Section VI: Public Evaluation of Potential Criminal Justice Programs and Policies

- (1) I would be in favor of a program that would provide some assistance to people who have been the victims of criminal offenses.
- | SA   | A    | U    | D   | SD  |
|------|------|------|-----|-----|
| 18.8 | 64.4 | 10.1 | 5.2 | 1.5 |
- (2) This community should hire more judges and prosecutors in order to speed up the work of the courts.
- | SA   | A    | U    | D    | SD  |
|------|------|------|------|-----|
| 11.1 | 47.2 | 27.2 | 13.8 | 0.7 |
- (3) I would like to receive something like a newsletter that would keep me informed on the programs and activities of the police, courts and related agencies.
- | SA   | A    | U    | D    | SD  |
|------|------|------|------|-----|
| 19.3 | 57.0 | 12.8 | 10.1 | 0.7 |

(4) I think we need a program to provide good employment and job counseling for men and women who are put on probation or who have just been released from prison.

SA	A	U	D	SD
27.1	65.4	4.9	2.2	0.5

(5) I would be willing and able to volunteer some of my free time each week to work with groups like delinquent children, people with drug problems, or those on probation and parole.

SA	A	U	D	SD
9.9	29.6	34.4	23.5	2.6

(6) I think the city government should do more in the area of drug education and drug treatment programs.

SA	A	U	D	SD
21.5	57.0	14.4	5.6	1.5

(7) I would support the establishment of a small treatment center for juvenile delinquents in my section of the city.

SA	A	U	D	SD
12.9	55.5	18.9	10.9	1.7

(8) I would support the establishment of a halfway house program for adult offenders in my section of the city.

SA	A	U	D	SD
7.5	43.1	27.7	17.5	4.2

(9) I approve of the idea of treatment centers and halfway houses, but feel they would not properly be located in my neighborhood.

SA	A	U	D	SD
5.5	39.0	24.1	27.5	4.0

(10) I'd like to see the number of police who patrol my section of the city increased.

SA	A	U	D	SD
13.3	49.1	21.7	15.3	0.5

(11) I think it would help if police officers patrolled the area where I live on foot rather than in patrol cars.

SA	A	U	D	SD
5.7	13.6	16.6	58.9	5.2

(12) In my opinion, the size of the city police force should be increased.

SA	A	U	D	SD
11.3	52.7	25.6	9.4	1.0

- (13) I believe that the city should substantially increase police salaries if this will result in better qualified officers.
- | SA   | A    | U   | D   | SD  |
|------|------|-----|-----|-----|
| 28.2 | 60.4 | 7.3 | 3.4 | 0.7 |
- (14) I would have no objection to women police officers performing the same duties as male police officers in our city.
- | SA   | A    | U   | D    | SD  |
|------|------|-----|------|-----|
| 14.7 | 48.9 | 9.8 | 19.3 | 7.3 |
- (15) There are too many police in my neighborhood.
- | SA  | A   | U   | D    | SD   |
|-----|-----|-----|------|------|
| 0.2 | 0.2 | 7.8 | 68.4 | 23.3 |
- (16) I would not oppose releasing people accused of a crime before their trial if they have ties to the community and therefore are likely to appear for their trial.
- | SA  | A    | U    | D    | SD  |
|-----|------|------|------|-----|
| 7.3 | 50.4 | 18.8 | 18.6 | 4.8 |

Section VII: Related Public Attitudes and Opinions

1. Attitudes Concerning Punishment

- (1) I think we should have a mandatory death penalty for some types of very serious criminal offenses.
- | SA   | A    | U   | D   | SD  |
|------|------|-----|-----|-----|
| 48.3 | 28.8 | 6.3 | 9.9 | 6.7 |
- (2) If judges would give longer sentences to criminals fewer of them would break the law again.
- | SA   | A    | U    | D    | SD  |
|------|------|------|------|-----|
| 34.6 | 37.0 | 12.3 | 13.5 | 2.6 |
- (3) People should only be sent to prison after every other alternative has been tried.
- | SA  | A    | U    | D    | SD   |
|-----|------|------|------|------|
| 5.5 | 24.3 | 11.3 | 39.2 | 19.7 |
- (4) A firm response to those who violate the law would soon reduce the crime rate in our society.
- | SA   | A    | U   | D   | SD  |
|------|------|-----|-----|-----|
| 34.9 | 48.1 | 9.9 | 5.3 | 1.9 |
- (5) Juveniles should never be put in jails or prisons.
- | SA  | A    | U    | D    | SD   |
|-----|------|------|------|------|
| 8.7 | 24.5 | 13.0 | 41.3 | 12.5 |

- (6) Regardless of whether we actually use the death penalty, I think our laws should allow us to put someone to death should the need ever arise.
- | SA   | A    | U    | D    | SD  |
|------|------|------|------|-----|
| 29.6 | 39.4 | 11.1 | 11.3 | 8.7 |
- (7) The more seriously we punish someone for a crime the less likely he will be to break the law again.
- | SA   | A    | U    | D    | SD  |
|------|------|------|------|-----|
| 23.6 | 39.4 | 16.1 | 15.9 | 5.0 |
- (8) Punishing a criminal does little to keep him from committing another crime.
- | SA  | A    | U    | D    | SD   |
|-----|------|------|------|------|
| 6.3 | 25.2 | 12.7 | 43.0 | 12.7 |
- (9) No offense is so serious that it deserves to be punished by death.
- | SA  | A   | U   | D    | SD   |
|-----|-----|-----|------|------|
| 4.8 | 9.4 | 7.9 | 41.1 | 36.8 |
- (10) Regardless of what a person has been convicted of, there are many things other than the offense he committed that must be considered in determining the right sentence.
- | SA   | A    | U   | D    | SD  |
|------|------|-----|------|-----|
| 13.2 | 64.2 | 6.7 | 13.0 | 2.9 |
- (11) Regardless of whether prison sentences keep the person who received the sentence from breaking the law again, they do show others in our society that crime does not pay.
- | SA   | A    | U   | D   | SD  |
|------|------|-----|-----|-----|
| 22.4 | 63.9 | 4.6 | 7.2 | 1.9 |
- (12) It's a good idea to use the death penalty once in awhile just to remind people that we will not tolerate some kinds of behavior.
- | SA  | A    | U   | D    | SD   |
|-----|------|-----|------|------|
| 7.0 | 17.1 | 6.3 | 39.9 | 29.8 |
- (13) Sending criminals to prison is a waste of tax money because it does so little to rehabilitate them.
- | SA  | A    | U    | D    | SD   |
|-----|------|------|------|------|
| 3.1 | 11.1 | 12.0 | 57.9 | 15.9 |
- (14) If people were certain that they would be punished for their actions, there would be far less crime.
- | SA   | A    | U   | D    | SD  |
|------|------|-----|------|-----|
| 29.6 | 52.2 | 5.5 | 11.1 | 1.7 |

(15) Whether we like it or not, we must use the death penalty in some cases if we are to ever control crime.

SA	A	U	D	SD
34.1	37.5	9.4	10.8	8.2

(16) We have a moral obligation to punish people who break the laws.

SA	A	U	D	SD
22.4	63.5	6.3	7.5	0.5

(17) The execution of criminals is a disgrace to a civilized society.

SA	A	U	D	SD
5.5	10.8	12.3	50.5	20.9

(18) We should provide help and assistance as well as punishment for those who break the laws.

SA	A	U	D	SD
16.6	70.0	4.6	7.5	1.4

## 2. Attitudes Concerning Law

(1) We have many laws in our country that are unfair and unjust.

SA	A	U	D	SD
24.0	47.8	17.5	9.6	1.0

(2) If we have to have the death penalty, the only kind that I would approve is one that leaves the decision of whether to use the death penalty, in cases where it is authorized, entirely to the judge or jury.

SA	A	U	D	SD
15.6	47.8	13.0	14.7	8.9

(3) It is our duty to obey the law even though we may not always agree with it.

SA	A	U	D	SD
35.6	58.2	1.7	3.4	1.2

(4) If a law is not fair and just, I feel no responsibility to abide by it.

SA	A	U	D	SD
2.4	11.3	10.6	59.6	16.1

(5) The laws of this country are based on rules and commandments established by God.

SA	A	U	D	SD
7.7	33.7	22.4	26.4	9.9

(6) Laws are made by the powerful to protect their own interests.

SA	A	U	D	SD
4.3	14.7	13.5	57.0	10.6

- (7) Generally, our current criminal laws accurately prohibit those things that the majority of people in our country believe must not be done by good citizens.

SA	A	U	D	SD
10.6	60.1	17.3	10.3	1.7

- (8) There are certain kinds of behavior that are morally wrong and which must always be made illegal.

SA	A	U	D	SD
20.2	54.6	10.6	12.3	2.4

- (9) Laws discriminate against the weak, the poor, and members of minority groups.

SA	A	U	D	SD
7.0	18.0	10.6	45.7	18.8

- (10) Laws are properly used only in order to protect citizens.

SA	A	U	D	SD
8.2	49.8	16.3	23.8	1.9

- (11) The only reason to abide by the law is to avoid being punished.

SA	A	U	D	SD
3.1	7.2	3.6	59.9	26.2

- (12) Laws are for the poor to obey and the rich to ignore.

SA	A	U	D	SD
4.1	7.5	2.9	43.0	42.5

- (13) All citizens should show respect for the law.

SA	A	U	D	SD
56.0	41.3	1.2	0.2	1.2

### 3. Attitudes Concerning Civil Liberties

- (1) The police should have the right to listen to and record telephone conversations if they believe that they need to do so.

SA	A	U	D	SD
11.3	31.5	10.6	23.8	22.8

- (2) Convicted criminals should not have the right to appeal their convictions to a higher court.

SA	A	U	D	SD
9.4	14.2	8.9	45.4	22.1

- (3) Tax money should not be used to pay for jury trials when the offender is obviously guilty.

SA	A	U	D	SD
11.8	21.9	13.2	39.2	13.9

(4) People who do not believe in and support our form of government should be punished.

SA	A	U	D	SD
6.5	19.0	14.2	45.0	15.4

(5) If there is evidence that proves that someone is guilty, it should be used in court regardless of how it was obtained by the police.

SA	A	U	D	SD
18.3	42.1	12.7	20.0	7.0

(6) If we are to protect the rights of the innocent, we must also protect the rights of the guilty.

SA	A	U	D	SD
14.9	66.1	5.5	10.3	3.1

(7) Every citizen has the right to a competent lawyer and should be guaranteed one even if he cannot afford to pay for the service himself.

SA	A	U	D	SD
38.0	57.9	1.4	1.7	1.0

(8) The police should be allowed to stop and search persons on the street if they feel it is necessary.

SA	A	U	D	SD
10.1	32.7	13.0	29.1	15.1

(9) The police should never be allowed to search a private home without a valid search warrant.

SA	A	U	D	SD
46.4	40.6	3.1	7.7	2.2

(10) Protests and demonstrations against our government, even if peaceful, should not allowed in such troubled times as these.

SA	A	U	D	SD
12.0	22.6	13.0	39.2	13.2

(11) When a person is arrested, he should be held in jail until his case comes to trial if the police and prosecutors believe this is necessary.

SA	A	U	D	SD
12.0	47.1	13.2	21.4	6.3

## APPENDIX B

Section I: Social and Demographic Characteristics of All Respondents

(1) Age:			
	Mean =	44.16	
(2) Sex			
	1. Male .....	N=2625	(79.5%)
	2. Female.....	675	(20.5%)
(3) Race:			
	1. Black.....	325	(10.0)
	2. White.....	2893	(88.9)
	3. Other.....	36	( 1.1)
(4) Martial Status:			
	1. Single.....	196	( 5.9)
	2. Married.....	2691	(81.3)
	3. Separated.....	53	( 1.6)
	4. Divorced.....	144	( 4.3)
	5. Widowed.....	227	( 6.9)
(5) City Live in Now:			
	1. Chesapeake.....	371	(11.4)
	2. Norfolk.....	1328	(40.7)
	3. Portsmouth.....	416	(12.7)
	4. Virginia Beach.....	1137	(34.8)
	5. Other in Virginia..	12	( 0.4)
(6) How many years at this address?			
	Mean =	10.15	
(7) Own or rent home?			
	1. Own.....	2429	(74.1)
	2. Rent.....	847	(25.9)
(8) Education:			
	1. 1st through 8th grade.....	374	(11.4)
	2. 9th through 12th grade.....	1272	(38.9)
	3. Some college.....	822	(25.1)
	4. College degree.....	400	(12.2)
	5. More than 4 years of college.....	406	(12.4)



(9) Occupational Type:			
1. Professional.....	469	(15.0)	
2. Business.....	414	(13.2)	
3. White Collar.....	596	(19.1)	
4. Skilled Manual.....	446	(14.3)	
5. Semi-skilled Manual.....	123	( 3.9)	
6. Unskilled.....	56	( 1.8)	
7. Military.....	505	(16.2)	
8. Student.....	54	( 1.7)	
9. Unemployed - Retired.....	462	(14.8)	
(10) Are you presently:			
1. Working in primary occupation.....	2439	(75.0)	
2. Working in some other occupation.....	194	( 6.0)	
3. Not employed at this time.....	317	( 9.8)	
4. Retired.....	300	( 9.2)	
(11) Are you the head of the household?			
1. Yes.....	2982	(90.7)	
2. No.....	306	( 9.3)	
(12) How many live at this address (counting yourself):			
Mean = 3.20			
(13) Income:			
1. Less than \$2,000.....	51	( 1.6)	
2. \$2,000 - \$3,999.....	138	( 4.3)	
3. \$4,000 - \$8,999.....	635	(19.9)	
4. \$9,000 - \$11,999.....	674	(21.1)	
5. \$12,000 - \$19,999.....	1106	(34.6)	
6. \$20,000 and above.....	594	(18.6)	

Section II: Criminal Victimization in All

(1) Victim Status:			
1. Yes.....	948	(28.5)	
2. No.....	2380	(71.5)	
(2) Number of Victimitizations:			
1. One.....	495	(52.0)	
2. Two.....	239	(25.1)	
3. Three.....	150	(15.8)	
4. Four.....	30	( 3.2)	
5. Five.....	16	( 1.7)	
6. Six.....	10	( 1.1)	
7. Seven.....	3	( 0.3)	
8. Eight or more...	9	( 0.9)	

(3) Victim of First Offense Reported:		
1. Recipient of questionnaire.....	496	(53.6)
2. Wife - Husband.....	120	(13.0)
3. Son - Daughter.....	133	(14.4)
4. Family.....	166	(17.9)
5. Other relatives.....	10	( 1.1)
(4) Victim of Second Offense Reported:		
1. Recipient of questionnaire.....	246	(54.5)
2. Wife - Husband.....	34	( 7.5)
3. Son - Daughter.....	86	(19.1)
4. Family.....	76	(16.9)
5. Other relatives.....	9	( 2.0)
(5) Victim of Third Offense Reported:		
1. Recipient of questionnaire.....	121	(55.8)
2. Wife - Husband .....	17	( 7.8)
3. Son - Daughter .....	42	(19.4)
4. Family.....	28	(12.9)
5. Other relatives.....	9	( 4.1)
(6) Physical Harm from First Offense Reported:		
1. No harm.....	63	(28.9)
2. Emotional.....	25	(11.5)
3. Threat.....	45	(20.6)
4. Attack - minor - no injury.....	56	(25.7)
5. Attack - disabling injury.....	10	( 4.6)
6. Attack w/weapon - minor injury.....	7	( 3.2)
7. Attack w/weapon - disabling injury...	6	( 2.8)
8. Death.....	6	( 2.8)
(7) Physical Harm from Second Offense Reported:		
1. No harm.....	24	(32.4)
2. Emotional.....	6	( 8.1)
3. Threat.....	13	(17.6)
4. Attack - minor - no injury.....	23	(31.1)
5. Attack - disabling injury.....	4	( 5.4)
6. Attack w/weapon - minor injury.....	3	( 4.1)
7. Attack w/weapon - disabling injury...	1	( 1.4)
8. Death.....	--	(----)
(8) Physical Harm from Third Offense Reported:		
1. No harm.....	12	(40.0)
2. Emotional.....	--	(----)
3. Threat.....	8	(26.7)
4. Attack - minor - no injury.....	6	(20.0)
5. Attack - disabling injury.....	2	( 6.7)
6. Attack w/weapon - minor injury.....	1	( 3.3)
7. Attack w/weapon - disabling injury...	--	(----)
8. Death.....	1	( 3.3)

- (9) Financial Loss from First Offense Reported:  
Mean = \$279.61
- (10) Financial Loss from Second Offense Reported:  
Mean = \$274.40
- (11) Financial Loss from Third Offense Reported:  
Mean = \$293.84)
- (12) Place Where First Offense Reported Occurred:
  - 1. Within home..... 240 (32.2)
  - 2. Outside home..... 506 (67.8)
- (13) Place Where Second Offense Reported Occurred:
  - 1. Within home..... 103 (28.8)
  - 2. Outside home..... 255 (71.2)
- (14) Place Where Third Offense Reported Occurred:
  - 1. Within home..... 46 (27.4)
  - 2. Outside home..... 122 (72.6)
- (15) City in Which Offenses Occurred:
 

		First	Second	Third
1. Chesapeake.....	53	( 5.9)	29 ( 6.7)	12 ( 5.8)
2. Norfolk.....	374	(41.7)	199 (46.2)	105 (50.7)
3. Portsmouth.....	84	( 9.4)	38 ( 8.8)	18 ( 8.7)
4. Virginia Beach.....	213	(23.7)	105 (24.4)	48 (23.2)
5. Other in Virginia..	32	( 3.6)	15 ( 3.5)	8 ( 3.9)
6. Other outside of Virginia.....	141	(15.7)	45 (10.4)	16 ( 7.7)
- (16) Type of Victimization:
 

	First	Second	Third
1. Car theft.....	61	20	9
2. Armed robbery.....	13	2	-
3. Robbery (involving threats).....	82	27	15
4. Breaking & entering.	31	16	11
5. Petty larceny (under \$100).....	75	48	31
6. Burglary (theft that occurs during or as a result of a breaking & entering into a building, in contrast to a car.....	199	94	38
7. Rape.....	12	3	1
8. Murder.....	4	-	-
9. Police brutality....	1	1	3
10. Hit & run (only where property is involved).....	14	7	4

	<u>First</u>	<u>Second</u>	<u>Third</u>
11. Bike theft.....	32	24	10
12. Obscene phone calls.....	4	2	-
13. Mugging.....	22	3	3
14. Assault.....	22	8	3
15. Assault & Battery.....	33	15	4
16. Vandalism.....	46	44	21
17. Grand larceny (thefts over \$100).....	72	40	22
18. Theft (undetermined amount.....	28	14	10
19. Child molesting.....	4	2	-
20. Felonious wounding.....	4	4	-
21. Tampering w/mails.....	1	2	-
22. Attempted car theft.....	1	2	1
23. Attempted robbery.....	3	4	2
24. Attempted assault.....	8	3	3
25. Breaking & entering on a car (no theft).....	5	2	3
26. Burglary on a car.....	87	46	16
27. Purse snatching.....	24	9	2
28. Attempted theft.....	4	1	1
29. Attempted breaking & entering.....	5	-	-
30. Non-criminal victim- ization.....	13	3	1
31. Kidnapping.....	1	-	-
32. Forging checks (in- cludes credit cards).....	3	-	-
33. Trespassing (prowling)...	5	2	1
34. Attempted breaking & entering on a car.....	1	-	-
35. Arson.....	2	-	2
36. Extortion.....	2	-	-
37. Attempted rape.....	3	-	1
38. Indecent exposure.....	5	3	-
39. Attempted arson.....	1	-	-
40. Embezzlement and/or fraud.....	2	2	-
41. Not applicable.....	2382	2872	3108

17. Did you report first offense to police?
- 1. Yes..... 808 (90.1)
  - 2. No..... 89 (2.7)
18. Did you report second offense to police?
- 1. Yes..... 370 (85.8)
  - 2. No..... 61 (14.2)
19. Did you report third offense to police?
- 1. Yes..... 159 (77.2)
  - 2. No..... 47 (22.8)

(20)	Did you have insurance that covered losses (1st offense)?			
	1. Yes.....	415	(49.9)	
	2. No.....	416	(50.1)	
(21)	Did you have insurance that covered losses (2nd offense)?			
	1. Yes.....	190	(46.9)	
	2. No.....	215	(53.1)	
(22)	Did you have insurance that covered losses (3rd offense)?			
	1. Yes.....	69	(35.4)	
	2. No.....	126	(64.6)	
(23)	Regarding the offender, was the offender:			
	1. A stranger.....	686	(84.4)	
	2. A casual acquaintance.....	59	( 7.3)	
	3. A close friend.....	3	( 0.4)	
	4. Member of the family.....	8	( 1.0)	
	5. Unknown.....	57	( 7.0)	
(24)	Non-reporting information:			
	1. Offender was friend.....	2	( 1.4)	
	2. Offense too minor.....	26	(17.9)	
	3. Police couldn't help.....	41	(28.3)	
	4. Offense partly my fault.....	10	( 6.9)	
	5. Don't wish to appear in court.....	1	( 0.7)	
	6. No one should know.....	2	( 1.4)	
	7. Afraid to report.....	3	( 2.1)	
	8. Would never report an offense.....	1	( 0.7)	
	9. Other.....	21	(14.5)	
	10. Combination of above.....	38	(26.2)	

Section III: Victim Evaluations of Criminal Justice Agency Responses

1. Reaction to Police Responses

(1) The police were very considerate when they responded to my call.

*SA	A	U	D	SD
25.1	61.8	3.3	7.0	2.8

(2) The police responded as rapidly as could be expected.

SA	A	U	D	SD
24.0	61.7	4.3	6.7	3.3

\* SA = strongly agree; A = agree; U = uncertain; D = disagree; SD = strongly disagree. In the text, percentages quoted represent the merger of either strongly agree and agree percentages or strongly disagree and disagree percentages.

(3) The police explained what I had to do and what I could expect in adequate detail.

SA	A	U	D	SD
18.4	64.0	5.5	8.2	3.8

(4) I felt that the police did a good job in investigating the offense.

SA	A	U	D	SD
15.8	33.8	26.0	15.2	9.1

## 2. Reaction to Case Processing

(1) Nobody ever explained what was going on to me.

SA	A	U	D	SD
2.8	7.6	71.1	14.2	4.3

(2) I thought the general handling of the case was good.

SA	A	U	D	SD
5.3	12.4	71.8	6.4	4.0

(3) I thought the case took much too long to process.

SA	A	U	D	SD
3.8	7.4	74.0	12.0	2.7

## Section IV: Citizen Perceptions of Crime as a Social Problem

### 1. Perception of Crime Rates

(1) The extent of crime in this city is one of my major concerns.

SA	A	U	D	SD
34.1	45.1	9.4	10.5	0.9

(2) Many people don't seem to realize how serious the crime problem has become in this city.

SA	A	U	D	SD
12.5	36.6	25.5	22.4	3.0

(3) The crime problem in my neighborhood has become so serious that I would like to move as soon as I can.

SA	A	U	D	SD
1.9	5.4	7.6	46.3	38.9

(4) The "crime problem" is just a gimmick that politicians use to get votes.

SA	A	U	D	SD
2.2	3.3	7.6	43.9	43.0

(5) The crime rate in the area where I live seems to be rapidly increasing.

SA	A	U	D	SD
4.2	21.1	26.5	42.4	5.8

2. Fear of Victimization

(1) This city's downtown section just isn't safe at night anymore.

SA	A	U	D	SD
32.0	31.5	15.8	18.4	2.3

(2) I don't really feel that the threat of criminal behavior is any greater today than in the past.

SA	A	U	D	SD
3.5	12.7	5.9	39.5	38.4

(3) The danger of becoming the victim of a criminal offense seems to be lower in this city than in many other parts of the country.

SA	A	U	D	SD
5.9	36.2	21.1	28.1	8.7

(4) I avoid shopping in the downtown section of the city because of the crime problem.

SA	A	U	D	SD
9.1	20.5	17.7	44.0	8.8

(5) During recent years I've become more afraid of being victimized by criminals than I ever was before.

SA	A	U	D	SD
18.7	45.7	9.7	20.4	5.5

(6) My family and I feel reasonably safe and secure in this community.

SA	A	U	D	SD
12.4	64.4	10.0	10.9	2.2

(7) I am confident that police protection in the area of Scope during events there is adequate.

SA	A	U	D	SD
3.3	30.1	45.4	15.2	5.9

(8) Crime is such a problem that this city is simply not a safe place to raise children.

SA	A	U	D	SD
3.8	13.5	15.7	51.5	15.5

(9) The threat of crime has become so great that nobody can feel safe in his own home anymore.

SA	A	U	D	SD
8.6	27.7	11.8	41.1	10.8

(10) Crime has become such a problem in my neighborhood that I'm afraid to go out at night.

SA	A	U	D	SD
3.9	12.7	8.1	55.3	20.1

Section V: Citizen Evaluation of Police and Court Performance

1. Evaluation of Police

- (1) The police in our city are doing an effective job and deserve our thanks.
- | SA   | A    | U    | D   | SD  |
|------|------|------|-----|-----|
| 17.1 | 60.9 | 12.8 | 7.6 | 1.6 |
- (2) The police in my community are guilty of discrimination against people like the poor and members of minority groups.
- | SA  | A   | U    | D    | SD   |
|-----|-----|------|------|------|
| 2.6 | 9.0 | 22.1 | 49.6 | 16.7 |
- (3) The police don't show the proper respect for citizens.
- | SA  | A    | U    | D    | SD   |
|-----|------|------|------|------|
| 2.9 | 10.9 | 14.4 | 60.2 | 11.6 |
- (4) The police here are too willing to use force and violence.
- | SA  | A   | U    | D    | SD   |
|-----|-----|------|------|------|
| 1.9 | 6.6 | 18.7 | 59.1 | 13.6 |
- (5) Police officers in this city are generally no more corrupt than people in any other line of work.
- | SA   | A    | U    | D   | SD  |
|------|------|------|-----|-----|
| 10.6 | 64.7 | 14.9 | 7.8 | 2.0 |
- (6) People don't show our police the respect they deserve.
- | SA   | A    | U    | D    | SD  |
|------|------|------|------|-----|
| 14.3 | 51.1 | 14.5 | 19.0 | 1.2 |

2. Evaluation of Courts

- (1) The courts are so slow in processing cases that it is unfair to require the average citizen to come to court as a witness.
- | SA  | A    | U    | D    | SD  |
|-----|------|------|------|-----|
| 7.0 | 23.8 | 25.9 | 37.9 | 5.5 |
- (2) I feel that most judges and juries in this area are fair in their decisions.
- | SA  | A    | U    | D   | SD  |
|-----|------|------|-----|-----|
| 8.3 | 63.6 | 18.6 | 7.8 | 1.7 |
- (3) In general, I feel the court system in this city is doing an effective job..
- | SA  | A    | U    | D    | SD  |
|-----|------|------|------|-----|
| 6.0 | 57.7 | 22.9 | 11.5 | 1.8 |



- (4) You don't have a fair chance in the courts in this city unless you have money to hire a good lawyer.
- | SA  | A    | U    | D    | SD  |
|-----|------|------|------|-----|
| 5.5 | 18.4 | 28.6 | 40.5 | 7.0 |
- (5) Too many people are brought to trial for what are really little more than political crimes.
- | SA  | A   | U    | D    | SD  |
|-----|-----|------|------|-----|
| 1.1 | 9.0 | 33.0 | 47.3 | 9.6 |
- (6) Members of minority groups in this city are discriminated against by judges and juries.
- | SA  | A   | U    | D    | SD   |
|-----|-----|------|------|------|
| 1.2 | 5.7 | 27.2 | 50.1 | 15.8 |
- (7) Our courts seem to be more interested in protecting the rights of criminals than in protecting the average citizen.
- | SA  | A    | U    | D    | SD  |
|-----|------|------|------|-----|
| 8.9 | 24.0 | 17.1 | 44.1 | 6.0 |
- (8) Many innocent people are convicted by the courts.
- | SA  | A    | U    | D    | SD  |
|-----|------|------|------|-----|
| 2.1 | 15.4 | 34.0 | 41.8 | 6.8 |
- (9) There is little justice in this country for those who do not have money, power, or political influence.
- | SA  | A    | U    | D    | SD   |
|-----|------|------|------|------|
| 5.9 | 19.2 | 16.9 | 47.8 | 10.2 |

Section VI: Public Evaluation of Potential Criminal Justice Programs and Policies

- (1) I would be in favor of a program that would provide some assistance to people who have been the victims of criminal offenses.
- | SA   | A    | U   | D   | SD  |
|------|------|-----|-----|-----|
| 20.1 | 66.1 | 9.7 | 3.5 | 0.6 |
- (2) This community should hire more judges and prosecutors in order to speed up the work of the courts.
- | SA   | A    | U    | D    | SD  |
|------|------|------|------|-----|
| 13.1 | 47.4 | 27.9 | 10.7 | 1.0 |
- (3) I would like to receive something like a newsletter that would keep me informed on the programs and activities of the police, courts and related agencies.
- | SA   | A    | U    | D    | SD  |
|------|------|------|------|-----|
| 15.6 | 56.3 | 16.5 | 10.8 | 0.7 |

- (4) I think we need a program to provide good employment and job counseling for men and women who are put on probation or who have just been released from prison.
- | SA   | A    | U   | D   | SD  |
|------|------|-----|-----|-----|
| 27.8 | 64.8 | 5.1 | 2.1 | 0.3 |
- (5) I would be willing and able to volunteer some of my free time each week to work with groups like delinquent children, people with drug problems, or those on probation and parole.
- | SA  | A    | U    | D    | SD  |
|-----|------|------|------|-----|
| 7.4 | 31.4 | 37.5 | 21.2 | 2.5 |
- (6) I think the city government should do more in the area of drug education and drug treatment programs.
- | SA   | A    | U    | D   | SD  |
|------|------|------|-----|-----|
| 17.4 | 53.4 | 19.8 | 8.7 | 0.8 |
- (7) I would support the establishment of a small treatment center for juvenile delinquents in my section of the city.
- | SA   | A    | U    | D   | SD  |
|------|------|------|-----|-----|
| 12.3 | 56.5 | 20.4 | 9.4 | 1.4 |
- (8) I would support the establishment of a halfway house program for adult offenders in my section of the city.
- | SA  | A    | U    | D    | SD  |
|-----|------|------|------|-----|
| 8.3 | 43.9 | 28.9 | 16.3 | 2.6 |
- (9) I approve of the idea of treatment centers and halfway houses, but feel they would not properly be located in my neighborhood.
- | SA  | A    | U    | D    | SD  |
|-----|------|------|------|-----|
| 4.9 | 30.2 | 31.0 | 29.4 | 4.5 |
- (10) I'd like to see the number of police who patrol my section of the city increased.
- | SA  | A    | U    | D    | SD  |
|-----|------|------|------|-----|
| 9.3 | 40.0 | 27.4 | 22.5 | 0.9 |
- (11) I think it would help if police officers patrolled the area where I live on foot rather than in patrol cars.
- | SA  | A   | U    | D    | SD  |
|-----|-----|------|------|-----|
| 3.5 | 9.8 | 14.8 | 64.3 | 7.7 |
- (12) In my opinion, the size of the city police force should be increased.
- | SA   | A    | U    | D    | SD  |
|------|------|------|------|-----|
| 10.3 | 47.2 | 31.6 | 10.4 | 0.5 |

(13) I believe that the city should substantially increase police salaries if this will result in better qualified officers.

SA	A	U	D	SD
26.0	60.3	10.0	3.3	0.4

(14) I would have no objection to women police officers performing the same duties as male police officers in our city.

SA	A	U	D	SD
13.9	53.9	9.6	17.4	5.3

(15) There are too many police in my neighborhood.

SA	A	U	D	SD
0.2	0.4	8.6	69.8	20.9

(16) I would not oppose releasing people accused of a crime before their trial if they have ties to the community and therefore are likely to appear for their trial.

SA	A	U	D	SD
6.2	52.5	19.6	17.5	4.0

#### Section VII: Related Public Attitudes and Opinions

##### 1. Attitudes Concerning Punishment

(1) I think we should have a mandatory death penalty for some types of very serious criminal offenses.

SA	A	U	D	SD
53.9	26.4	5.1	8.3	6.2

(2) If judges would give longer sentences to criminals fewer of them would break the law again.

SA	A	U	D	SD
29.5	33.4	14.0	18.5	4.6

(3) People should only be sent to prison after every other alternative has been tried.

SA	A	U	D	SD
5.8	25.5	12.7	38.6	17.4

(4) A firm response to those who violate the law would soon reduce the crime rate in our society.

SA	A	U	D	SD
34.2	47.4	10.8	6.1	1.5

(5) Juveniles should never be put in jails or prisons.

SA	A	U	D	SD
10.3	24.2	14.5	40.2	10.9

- (6) Regardless of whether we actually use the death penalty, I think our laws should allow us to put someone to death should the need ever arise.
- | SA   | A    | U   | D    | SD  |
|------|------|-----|------|-----|
| 34.8 | 39.8 | 8.1 | 11.0 | 6.3 |
- (7) The more seriously we punish someone for a crime the less likely he will be to break the law again.
- | SA   | A    | U    | D    | SD  |
|------|------|------|------|-----|
| 20.2 | 36.5 | 17.8 | 20.6 | 4.9 |
- (8) Punishing a criminal does little to keep him from committing another crime.
- | SA  | A    | U    | D    | SD   |
|-----|------|------|------|------|
| 4.9 | 22.4 | 14.9 | 44.1 | 13.7 |
- (9) No offense is so serious that it deserves to be punished by death.
- | SA  | A   | U   | D    | SD   |
|-----|-----|-----|------|------|
| 4.8 | 6.6 | 7.8 | 40.4 | 40.4 |
- (10) Regardless of what a person has been convicted of, there are many things other than the offense he committed that must be considered in determining the right sentence.
- | SA   | A    | U   | D    | SD  |
|------|------|-----|------|-----|
| 18.4 | 58.8 | 7.0 | 12.8 | 2.9 |
- (11) Regardless of whether prison sentences keep the person who received the sentence from breaking the law again, they do show others in our society that crime does not pay.
- | SA   | A    | U   | D   | SD  |
|------|------|-----|-----|-----|
| 21.1 | 61.2 | 7.4 | 8.4 | 1.9 |
- (12) It's a good idea to use the death penalty once in awhile just to remind people that we will not tolerate some kinds of behavior.
- | SA  | A    | U   | D    | SD   |
|-----|------|-----|------|------|
| 6.6 | 15.6 | 7.3 | 40.5 | 30.0 |
- (13) Sending criminals to prison is a waste of tax money because it does so little to rehabilitate them.
- | SA  | A    | U    | D    | SD   |
|-----|------|------|------|------|
| 3.8 | 13.1 | 14.1 | 53.9 | 15.1 |
- (14) If people were certain that they would be punished for their actions, there would be far less crime.
- | SA   | A    | U   | D    | SD  |
|------|------|-----|------|-----|
| 26.6 | 52.9 | 7.5 | 11.5 | 1.6 |

(15) Whether we like it or not, we must use the death penalty in some cases if we are to ever control crime.

SA	A	U	D	SD
33.4	39.0	9.7	11.3	6.5

(16) We have a moral obligation to punish people who break the laws.

SA	A	U	D	SD
19.3	62.6	8.0	9.0	1.0

(17) The execution of criminals is a disgrace to a civilized society.

SA	A	U	D	SD
4.3	9.0	9.6	50.8	26.2

(18) We should provide help and assistance as well as punishment for those who break the laws.

SA	A	U	D	SD
21.8	67.3	5.2	4.8	0.9

## 2. Attitudes Concerning Law

(1) We have many laws in our country that are unfair and unjust.

SA	A	U	D	SD
21.0	45.5	18.3	13.2	2.0

(2) If we have to have the death penalty, the only kind that I would approve is one that leaves the decision of whether to use the death penalty, in cases where it is authorized, entirely to the judge or jury.

SA	A	U	D	SD
15.2	48.7	13.3	15.9	6.9

(3) It is our duty to obey the law even though we may not always agree with it.

SA	A	U	D	SD
36.7	55.8	3.5	3.2	0.7

(4) If a law is not fair and just, I feel no responsibility to abide by it.

SA	A	U	D	SD
2.1	8.0	10.4	58.8	20.6

(5) The laws of this country are based on rules and commandments established by God.

SA	A	U	D	SD
7.1	31.6	19.7	29.6	12.0

(6) Laws are made by the powerful to protect their own interests.

SA	A	U	D	SD
2.9	12.7	14.2	57.3	12.9

- (7) Generally, our current criminal laws accurately prohibit those things that the majority of people in our country believe must not be done by good citizens.

SA	A	U	D	SD
9.3	64.2	13.1	11.3	2.0

- (8) There are certain kinds of behavior that are morally wrong and which must always be made illegal.

SA	A	U	D	SD
17.5	50.0	12.7	16.4	3.4

- (9) Laws discriminate against the weak, the poor, and members of minority groups.

SA	A	U	D	SD
5.0	15.8	10.5	48.0	20.7

- (10) Laws are properly used only in order to protect citizens.

SA	A	U	D	SD
9.0	46.0	17.6	24.8	2.7

- (11) The only reason to abide by the law is to avoid being punished.

SA	A	U	D	SD
1.4	5.9	2.9	56.0	33.7

- (12) Laws are for the poor to obey and the rich to ignore.

SA	A	U	D	SD
2.6	6.6	4.0	42.4	44.4

- (13) All citizens should show respect for the law.

SA	A	U	D	SD
52.6	44.2	1.2	0.5	1.6

### 3. Attitudes Concerning Civil Liberties

- (1) The police should have the right to listen to and record tel phone conversations if they believe that they need to do so.

SA	A	U	D	SD
11.8	30.0	11.8	26.0	20.3

- (2) Convicted criminals should not have the right to appeal their convictions to a higher court.

SA	A	U	D	SD
5.9	10.4	8.1	46.8	28.7

- (3) Tax money should not be used to pay for jury trials when the offender is obviously guilty.

SA	A	U	D	SD
8.0	16.2	11.2	43.8	20.8

- (4) People who do not believe in and support our form of government should be punished.
- | SA  | A    | U    | D    | SD   |
|-----|------|------|------|------|
| 5.6 | 13.6 | 14.2 | 46.9 | 19.8 |
- (5) If there is evidence that proves that someone is guilty, it should be used in court regardless of how it was obtained by the police.
- | SA   | A    | U    | D    | SD  |
|------|------|------|------|-----|
| 19.7 | 41.0 | 10.6 | 20.6 | 8.1 |
- (6) If we are to protect the rights of the innocent, we must also protect the rights of the guilty.
- | SA   | A    | U   | D   | SD  |
|------|------|-----|-----|-----|
| 18.8 | 63.4 | 5.9 | 9.6 | 2.3 |
- (7) Every citizen has the right to a competent lawyer and should be guaranteed one even if he cannot afford to pay for the service himself.
- | SA   | A    | U   | D   | SD  |
|------|------|-----|-----|-----|
| 42.4 | 53.1 | 1.9 | 2.0 | 0.5 |
- (8) The police should be allowed to stop and search persons on the street if they feel it is necessary.
- | SA  | A    | U    | D    | SD   |
|-----|------|------|------|------|
| 8.9 | 34.3 | 12.8 | 27.6 | 16.4 |
- (9) The police should never be allowed to search a private home without a valid search warrant.
- | SA   | A    | U   | D    | SD  |
|------|------|-----|------|-----|
| 42.4 | 40.4 | 4.3 | 11.2 | 1.6 |
- (10) Protests and demonstrations against our government, even if peaceful, should not allowed in such troubled times as these.
- | SA  | A    | U    | D    | SD   |
|-----|------|------|------|------|
| 8.2 | 17.8 | 11.2 | 44.7 | 18.1 |
- (11) When a person is arrested, he should be held in jail until his case comes to trial if the police and prosecutors believe this is necessary.
- | SA   | A    | U    | D    | SD  |
|------|------|------|------|-----|
| 10.8 | 48.9 | 11.9 | 22.5 | 6.0 |

**END**

*7 articles/summary*