62999

MIDWOOD PERCEIVES CRIME

AN ATTITUDINAL SURVEY

BY

MKDC - LEAA PROJECT

RICHARD SHAPIRO
PROJECT DIRECTOR

INTRODUCTION

On May 22, 1978, the Midwood Kings Highway Development Corporation received a grant award from the United States Department of Justice, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) to conduct a Community Anti-Crime Program in our area.

The LEAA's stated objective for this type of program reads "To assist community organizations, neighborhood groups and individual citizens to become actively involved in activities designed to prevent crime, reduce the fear of crime, and contribute to neighborhood revitalization."

In order to implement the reduction of the fear of crime, it was necessary to establish the initial levels of fear present in the community at the start of the program. This report deals in detail with the prevalent attitudes in the Midwood section of Brooklyn, N.Y. in June and July 1978. Forthcoming reports will deal with shifts in attitudes by conducting identical surveys on an annual basis.

One of the necessities of conducting such an in depth survey is availability of computer hardware and software. We had no funds available for this project in our original grant award. We therefore approached Brooklyn College of the City University of New York in July of 1978 with the completed questionnaires and asked their assistance. In August, they accepted but required us to reduce the data to cards on our own. This was done manually and was completed in October 1978. In May 1979, we were finally notified that personnel was available to write the programs necessary. The data was run beginning May 22, 1979. All costs in programming and computer time were waived.

We now have firm commitments from Brooklyn College for the swift completion and processing of our first follow-up survey, which should be conducted in July 1979 and ready for publication by August.

We have directed many of our program components toward effecting the perceptions of crime and relative safety. It will be helpful to us, to not only gauge our impacts, but to be able to see where we must refine and concentrate our efforts where necessary.

I. DEMOGRAPHICS

1) Sex: Male: 47%
Female: 53%

2) Race: White: 75.8%
Black: 15.6%
Other: 8.6%

3) Occupation:

Unemployed (includes retirees)	16.1%
Housewife	25.7%
Student	15.1%
Blue Collar	7.0%
Clerical	6.5%
Technical	4.2%
Professional	15.1%
Managerial	7.8%

4) Income (annual)

Under $2000	7.8%
2000-2999	11.7%
3000-5999	15.6%
6000-9999	20.0%
10000-14,999	14.5%
15,000 +	25.5%

5) Household Size

One	9.4%
Two	20.3%
Three	24.9%
Four	23.6%
Five +	21.8%

6) Age

65+	22.0%
45-64	20.2%
44-25	37.3%
24-15	17.1%
Under 15	3.4%

Conclusions: The demographic data of those surveyed closely matches the overall make-up of our community. The figures relate a middle class community with a 24% minority population. The sample population is typical of a residential community, many people who do not work (retirees, housewives), people who are approaching the upper age brackets in large numbers. This middle class transitional community is subject to pressures of problems on the elderly, of crime, and of sufficient income to "escape" these pressures if necessary by moving, a choice we have

discouraged them from making.

II. ATTITUDES

7) Within the past year or two, do you think that crime in your neighborhood has increased, decreased, or remained about the same:

51.4%	Increased
9.9%	Decreased
23.9%	Same
9.4%	Don't Know
5.5%	New Resident - Don't Know

Public perception relative trend in this area is obvious. It reflects a negative outlook further explored in other questions.

11) Within the past year or two, do you think that crime in the United States has increased, decreased, or remained about the same?

69.1%	Increased
10.9%	Decreased
10.6%	Same
7.5%	Don't Know

It is interesting to note that almost 18% of the surveyed population considers the national picture worse than the local one; and that the bulk of the "switch" (13%) comes from those who considered that crime in the area had stabilized. It must be assumed that this portion of the population considers our area substantially better off than the nation as a whole.

10) How about any crimes which may be happening in your neighborhood - would you say they are commited mostly by the people who live here in this neighborhood or mostly by outsiders?

14.1%	No crimes happening in neighborhood
10.9%	People living here
33.3%	Outsiders
24.7%	Equally by both
16.4%	Don't Know

Considering the experiences of local police, that the majority of crimes in this area are committed by local residents, it is interesting to note that only 10.9% of those surveyed perceive the situation correctly. We do not consider this particular bit of misinformation as needing correction, however, since we would prefer to increase Answer #1 as opposed to Answer #2.

14) How safe do you feel or would you feel being out alone in your neighborhood during the night?

11.2%	Very Safe
34.8%	Reasonable Safe
33.0%	Somewhat Safe
19.7%	Very Unsafe

The almost 50-50 split between those on the "positive" side and those on the "negative" side of this question is inconsistent with other measures of attitudes. We had expected a greater percentage of those surveyed to feel "very unsafe" at night due to the great tendency of this community to exhibit behavioral patterns typical of fear of nighttime crime. Stores close early, parks and streets empty out, people become generally more defensive in their behavior. Perhaps they were unwilling to admit their fears openly for the questionnaire - but a majority (52.7%) still significantly felt less then reasonably safe out at night.

15) How safe do you feel or would you feel being out alone in your neighborhood during the day?

33.6%	Very Safe
36.7%	Reasonably Safe
19.5%	Somewhat Safe
7.3%	Very Unsafe

Here, as expected, the overwhelming majority feels no qualms about daytime activity in the area.

18) How do you think your neighborhood compares with others in New York City in terms of crime? Would you say it is

13.5%	Much more dangerous
14.5%	More dangerous
33.8%	About average
30.1%	Less dangerous
6.2%	Much less dangerous

28% of the sample population felt that this area is more or much more dangerous than the rest of the city. This is significant in that considering the prevailing impression of New York City as a high crime area, it was not expected that such a substantial portion of the population would consider Midwood as worse.

24) Which of the following statements do you agree with the most?

41.3% My chances of being attacked or robbed have gone up in the last few years.

15.1% My chances of being attacked or robbed have gone down in the last few years.

20.9% My chances of being attacked or robbed have not changed in the past few years.

22.6% No opinion, Don't know.

A major perceptual question as to trends in crime rates, 41.3% see the situation as it actually stood with increasing crime rates. Perhaps the 22.6% no opinions reflect new arrivals or people unwilling to state (as above question #14) any fears on this subject.

25) Which of the following statements do you agree with the most?

23.8% Crime is less serious than the newspapers and TV say.

24.0% Crime is more serious than the newspapers and TV say.

38.6% Crime is about as serious as the newspapers and TV say.
12.0% Don't Know.

This question merely surveyed the publics perception of media crime reporting, and the rather even distribution of responses shows no particular ambivalence toward the media.

21) Would you say in general, that your local police are doing a good job, an average job, or a poor job?

58
18.9% Good
39.1% Average
31.8% Poor
8.4% No opinion
1.8% No response
40

The 31.8% response "Poor" reflects a significant citizen dissatisfaction with police performance which has been evidenced to us repeatedly throughout program implementation.

22) In what ways could they improve?

7.0% No improvement needed
43.2% Need more police
19.2% Patrol more
17.8% Be more prompt
1.4% Improve training
1.9% Raise qualifications
3.0% Raise pay
4.3% Be more courteous, concerned
2.2% Don't discriminate

The three areas cited most often for improvement in police performance are closely related. The need for more police manpower is traditionally cited by the NYPD to improve response time (promptness) and to expand patrol. It is significant to note however that 37.0% of respondents felt that these two categories (patrol & promptness) could be improved without an increase in manpower.

23) Which of the reasons above (question 22) would you say is most important?

20.6%	Patrol more
19.8%	Need more police
15.9%	Be more courteous, concerned
14.3%	Be more prompt
7.7%	More training
5.8%	Don't discriminate
5.5%	No improvement
5.2%	Raise qualifications
5.2%	Raise pay

It is interesting to note the realignment of answers simply by asking the respondent to prioritize the list. 23.4% of those surveyed shifted their answer from more police to other categories. This shows a significant lack of confidence in the NYPD standard line - "We need more cops". Perhaps without a conscious decision, people are refuting, as are crime statistics, the axiom that quantity equals quality. This is encouraging in that it seems to indicate an opening in attitudes and perceptions which may allow further accurate pictures to enter.

III BEHAVIOR

19) Are there some parts of New York City you would like to go during the day, but are afraid to because of crime?

57.7%	No
34.0%	Yes
8.3%	No response

The key to this question lies in the phrase "you would like to go to". Those surveyed were not asked about the city as a whole. We were seeking behavioral changes caused by perception of crime. Few residents want under any circumstances to pay a visit to our tra ditional high crime areas. But if they altered their behavior - to not go to a particular museum, restaurant, etc. - as 34.0% stated - it represents a significant change.

20) Are there some parts of New York City you would like to go during the evening but are afraid to because of crime?

47.0%	No
45.4%	Yes
7.6%	No response

Similar to question #19 (above), we targeted the behavioral alteration. A full 10% of respondents shifted down to fear of nighttime crime. Should we consider the economic impact alone of 45.4% of a middle class community not going to places in the evening which they would otherwise like to go, we begin to appreciate the importance of perception of crime to the future of our city.

16) Is the neighborhood dangerous enough to make you think seriously about moving elsewhere?

59.0%	No
17.4%	Yes, but can't afford to
7.8%	Yes, but can't find other housing
7.5%	Yes, but relatives or friends nearby
3.1%	Yes, but convenient to work
3.4%	Yes, plan to move soon
1.9%	Other reasons

41% of respondents considered crime serious enough to consider moving. The uprooting of a family is one of the most serious behavioral changes one can make, impacting not only the family itself but the community which the family leaves. Rapid turnover of apartments and housing stock is a fatal sign to any traditionally stable community. We must reverse this particular attitude since the reasons cited for staying are tenuous at best. Perhaps more significant than any other finding in the questionnaire, we must watch future surveys very carefully to see if any of these behavioral indicators have reversed.

26) Do you think people in general have limited or changed their activities in the past few years because they are afraid

of crime?

66.7% Yes
20.7% No
12.6% No response

See comments below (Question 28)

27) Do you think people in this neighborhood have limited or changed their activities in the past few years because they are afraid of crime?

72.6% Yes
24.4% No
2.9% No response

See comments below (Question 28).

28) In general, have you limited or changed your activities in the past few years because of crime?

55.1% Yes
42.8% No
2.1% No responses

These last three questions point out several interesting perceptions of the behavioral patterns of others, as well as direct evidence of behavioral change by the majority of respondents. 22.1% of "No" respondents changed their answers to "Yes" (if the ratios base of response to Question 28 is held as a constant) over the three questions. People perceive others as having done more than themselves to restrict their activities vis-a-vis crime. They perceive the neighborhood as being untypically affected in relation to people in general. This would appear to point to an unwarranted negativism related through comments like "everybody in Midwood is living behind barbed wire". The speaker almost universally exempts himself and his immediate acquaintences, but is sincere in his belief that others are doing so.

It is still significant to note that 5.5% of respondents openly admit to restricting their activities in reaction to

criminality. The word "limited" in the question puts a psychological connotation on the question different than, for instance, a person who joined a civilian patrol, which is an expansion of activity rather than a limitation.

LEAA CRIME SURVEY 05/22/79

FILE LEAA (CREATION DATE = 05/22/79) PRETEST

X1 SEX

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
MALE	1.	181	47.0	47.0	47.0
FEMALE	2.	204	53.0	53.0	100.0
	TOTAL	386	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.530	STD ERR	0.025	MEDIAN	1.556
MODE	2.000	STD DEV	0.500	VARIANCE	0.250
KURTOSIS	-1.996	SKEWNESS	-0.120	RANGE	1.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	2.000		

VALID CASES 385 MISSING CASES 0

LEAA CRIME SURVEY

05/22/79

FILE LEAA (CREATION DATE = 05/22/79) PRETEST

X2 RACE

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
WHITE	1.	292	75.8	75.8	75.8
BLACK	2.	60	15.6	15.6	91.4
OTHER	3.	33	8.6	8.6	100.0
	TOTAL	385	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.327	STD ERR	0.032	MEDIAN	1.159
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	0.627	VARIANCE	0.393
KURTOSIS	1.678	SKEWNESS	1.729	RANGE	2.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	3.000		

VALID CASES 385 MISSING CASES 0

LEAA CRIME SURVEY 05/22/79

FILE LEAA (CREATION DATE = 05/22/79) PRETEST

X3 OCCUPATION

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
UNEMPLOYED	1.	62	16.1	16.2	16.2
HOUSEWIFE	2.	99	25.7	25.9	42.1
STUDENT	3.	58	15.1	15.2	57.3
BLUECOLLAR	4.	27	7.0	7.1	64.4
CLERICAL	5.	25	6.5	6.5	70.9
TECHNICAL	6.	16	4.2	4.2	75.1
PROFESSIONAL	7.	58	15.1	15.2	90.3
MANAGERIAL	8.	30	7.8	7.9	98.2
	9.	7	1.8	1.8	100.0
	0.	3	0.8	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	385	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	3.853	STD ERR	0.125	MEDIAN	3.017
MODE	2.000	STD DEV	2.441	VARIANCE	5.957
KURTOSIS	-1.134	SKEWNESS	0.542	RANGE	8.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	9.000		

VALID CASES 382 MISSING CASES 3

LEAA CRIME SURVEY 05/22/79

FILE LEAA (CREATION DATE = 05/22/79) PRETEST

X4 INCOME

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
UNDER $2000	1.	30	7.8	8.1	8.1
$2000-2999	2.	45	11.7	12.2	20.3
$3000-5999	3.	60	15.6	16.2	36.5
$6000-9999	4.	77	20.0	20.8	57.3
$10000-14999	5.	56	14.5	15.1	72.4
$15000+	6.	98	25.5	26.5	98.9
	8.	4	1.0	1.1	100.0
	0.	15	3.9	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	385	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	4.076	STD ERR	0.086	MEDIAN	4.149
MODE	6.000	STD DEV	1.662	VARIANCE	2.764
KURTOSIS	-0.885	SKEWNESS	-0.217	RANGE	7.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	8.000		

VALID CASES 370 MISSING CASES 15

LEAA CRIME SURVEY

05/22/79

FILE LEAA (CREATION DATE = 05/22/79) PRETEST

X5 HOUSEHOLD SIZE

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
ONE	1.	36	9.4	9.4	9.4
TWO	2.	78	20.3	20.3	29.6
THREE	3.	96	24.9	24.9	54.5
FOUR	4.	91	23.6	23.6	78.2
FIVE +	5.	84	21.8	21.8	100.0
	TOTAL	385	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	3.283	STD ERR	0.065	MEDIAN	3.318
MODE	3.000	STD DEV	1.269	VARIANCE	1.610
KURTOSIS	-1.039	SKEWNESS	-0.175	RANGE	4.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	5.000		

VALID CASES 385 MISSING CASES 0

LEAA CRIME SURVEY 05/22/79

FILE LEAA (CREATION DATE = 05/22/79) PRETEST

X6 AGE

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
65+	1.	84	21.8	22.0	22.0
45_64	2.	77	20.0	20.2	42.3
25_44	3.	142	36.9	37.3	79.5
15_24	4.	65	16.9	17.1	96.6
UNDER 15	5.	13	3.4	3.4	100.0
	0.	4	1.0	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	385	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	2.596	STD ERR	0.057	MEDIAN	2.708
MODE	3.000	STD DEV	1.109	VARIANCE	1.231
KURTOSIS	-0.827	SKEWNESS	0.024	RANGE	4.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	5.000		
VALID CASES	381	MISSING CASES	4		

LEAA CRIME SURVEY

05/22/7

FILE LEAA (CREATION DATE = 05/22/79) PRETEST

X7 RECENT CRIME RATE

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
INCREASED	1.	198	51.4	51.4	51.4
DECREASED	2.	38	9.9	9.9	61.3
SAME	3.	92	23.9	23.9	85.2
DONT KNOW	4.	36	9.4	9.4	94.5
NEW RESIDENT	5.	21	5.5	5.5	100.0
	TOTAL	385	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	2.075	STD ERR	0.065	MEDIAN	1.472
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	1.271	VARIANCE	1.617
KURTOSIS	-0.633	SKEWNESS	0.775	RANGE	4.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	5.000		

VALID CASES 385 MISSING CASES 0

LEAA CRIME SURVEY 05/22/79

FILE LEAA (CREATION DATE = 05/22/79) PRETEST

X8 SPECIFIC CRIME RATE

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
NO	1.	202	52.5	52.7	52.7
YES	2.	146	37.9	38.1	90.9
	3.	25	6.5	6.5	97.4
	4.	8	2.1	2.1	99.5
	5.	2	0.5	0.5	100.0
	0.	2	0.5	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	385	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.595	STD ERR	0.038	MEDIAN	1.448
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	0.749	VARIANCE	0.561
KURTOSIS	2.579	SKEWNESS	1.419	RANGE	4.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	5.000		

VALID CASES 383 MISSING CASES 2

LEAA CRIME SURVEY

05/22/79

FILE LEAA (CREATION DATE = 05/22/79) PRETEST

X10 WHO COMMITS CRIME

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
NO CRIMES	1.	54	14.0	14.1	14.1
LIVING HERE	2.	42	10.9	10.9	25.0
OUTSIDER	3.	128	33.2	33.3	58.3
EQUALLY	4.	95	24.7	24.7	83.1
DONT KNOW	5.	63	16.4	16.4	99.5
	8.	2	0.5	0.5	100.0
	0.	1	0.3	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	385	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	3.211	STD ERR	0.066	MEDIAN	3.250
MODE	3.000	STD DEV	1.291	VARIANCE	1.666
KURTOSIS	-0.045	SKEWNESS	-0.039	RANGE	7.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	8.000		

VALID CASES 384 MISSING CASES 1

LEAA CRIME SURVEY

05/22/79

FILE LEAA (CREATION DATE = 05/22/79) PRETEST

X11 US CRIME RATE

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
INCREASED	1.	266	69.1	69.1	69.1
DECREASED	2.	42	10.9	10.9	80.0
SAME	3.	41	10.6	10.6	90.6
DONT KNOW	4.	29	7.5	7.5	98.2
	5.	7	1.8	1.8	100.0
	TOTAL	385	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.621	STD ERR	0.054	MEDIAN	1.224
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	1.059	VARIANCE	1.121
KURTOSIS	1.248	SKEWNESS	1.558	RANGE	4.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	5.000		

VALID CASES 385 MISSING CASES 0

LEAA CRIME SURVEY

05/22/79

FILE LEAA (CREATION DATE = 05/22/79) PRETEST

X12 US SPECIFIC CRIMES

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
NO	1.	209	54.3	54.6	54.6
YES	2.	143	37.1	37.3	91.9
	3.	16	4.2	4.2	96.1
	4.	7	1.8	1.8	97.9
	5.	2	0.5	0.5	98.4
	7.	1	0.3	0.3	98.7
	8.	5	1.3	1.3	100.0
	0.	2	0.5	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	385	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.640	STD ERR	0.054	MEDIAN	1.416
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	1.056	VARIANCE	1.116
KURTOSIS	17.418	SKEWNESS	3.573	RANGE	7.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	8.000		

VALID CASES 383 MISSING CASES 2

LEAA CRIME SURVEY

05/22/79

FILE LEAA (CREATION DATE = 05/22/79) PRETEST

X14 SAFE AT NIGHT

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
VERY SAFE	1.	43	11.2	11.2	11.2
REASONABLY SAFE	2.	134	34.8	34.8	46.0
SOMEWHAT SAFE	3.	127	33.0	33.0	79.0
VERY UNSAFE	4.	76	19.7	19.7	98.7
	5.	1	0.3	0.3	99.0
	6.	2	0.5	0.5	99.5
	8.	2	0.5	0.5	100.0
	TOTAL	385	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	2.673	STD ERR	0.053	MEDIAN	2.622
MODE	2.000	STD DEV	1.037	VARIANCE	1.075
KURTOSIS	2.669	SKEWNESS	0.772	RANGE	7.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	8.000		

VALID CASES 385 MISSING CASES 0

LEAA CRIME SURVEY

05/22/79

FILE LEAA (CREATION DATE = 05/22/79) PRETEST

X15 SAFE IN DAY

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
VERY SAFE	1.	129	33.5	33.6	33.6
REASONABLY SAFE	2.	141	36.6	36.7	70.3
SOMEWHAT SAFE	3.	75	19.5	19.5	89.8
VERY UNSAFE	4.	28	7.3	7.3	97.1
	5.	3	0.8	0.8	97.9
	6.	5	1.3	1.3	99.2
	7.	3	0.8	0.8	100.0
	0.	1	0.3	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	385	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	2.120	STD ERR	0.058	MEDIAN	1.947
MODE	2.000	STD DEV	1.134	VARIANCE	1.286
KURTOSIS	2.814	SKEWNESS	1.383	RANGE	6.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	7.000		

VALID CASES 384 MISSING CASES 1

FILE LEAA (CREATION DATE = 05/22/79) PRETEST

X16 MOVING

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
NO	1.	227	59.0	59.0	59.0
YES CANT AFFORD	2.	67	17.4	17.4	76.4
YES CANT FIND	3.	30	7.8	7.8	84.2
YES RELATIONS NEAR	4.	29	7.5	7.5	91.7
YES CONVENIENT	5.	12	3.1	3.1	94.8
YES SOON	6.	13	3.4	3.4	98.2
OTHER	7.	6	1.6	1.6	99.7
	8.	1	0.3	0.3	100.0
	TOTAL	385	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.961	STD ERR	0.077	MEDIAN	1.348
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	1.509	VARIANCE	2.277
KURTOSIS	2.287	SKEWNESS	1.721	RANGE	7.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	8.000		
VALID CASES	385	MISSING CASES	0		

FILE LEAA (CREATION DATE = 05/22/79) PRETEST

X17 REASON FOR MOVING

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
NO	1.	47	12.2	12.4	12.4
YES CANT AFFORD	2.	110	28.6	28.9	41.3
YES CANT FIND	3.	65	16.9	17.1	58.4
YES RELATIONS NEAR	4.	34	8.8	8.9	67.4
YES CONVENIENT	5.	13	3.4	3.4	70.8
YES SOON	6.	5	1.3	1.3	72.1
OTHER	7.	13	3.4	3.4	75.5
	8.	93	24.2	24.5	100.0
	0.	5	1.3	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	385	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	4.021	STD ERR	0.133	MEDIAN	3.008
MODE	2.000	STD DEV	2.602	VARIANCE	6.770
KURTOSIS	-1.255	SKEWNESS	0.599	RANGE	7.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	8.000		

VALID CASES 380 MISSING CASES 5

LEAA CRIME SURVEY

05/22/79

FILE LEAA (CREATION DATE = 05/22/79) PRETEST

X18 NEIGHBORHOOD VS CITY

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
MCUH MORE DANGEROUS	1.	52	13.5	13.5	13.5
MORE DANGEROUS	2.	56	14.5	14.5	28.1
ABOUT AVERAGE	3.	130	33.8	33.8	61.8
LESS DANGEROUS	4.	116	30.1	30.1	91.9
MUCH LESS DANGEROUS	5.	24	6.2	6.2	98.2
	6.	3	0.8	0.8	99.0
	7.	2	0.5	0.5	99.5
	8.	2	0.5	0.5	100.0
	TOTAL	385	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	3.081	STD ERR	0.063	MEDIAN	3.150
MODE	3.000	STD DEV	1.232	VARIANCE	1.517
KURTOSIS	0.794	SKEWNESS	0.216	RANGE	7.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	8.000		

VALID CASES 385 MISSING CASES 0

FILE LEAA (CREATION DATE = 05/22/79) PRETEST

X19 CITY CRIME DAY

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
NO	1.	222	57.7	57.7	57.7
YES	2.	131	34.0	34.0	91.7
	3.	23	6.0	6.0	97.7
	4.	5	1.3	1.3	99.0
	5.	4	1.0	1.0	100.0
	TOTAL	385	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.540	STD ERR	0.039	MEDIAN	1.367
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	0.756	VARIANCE	0.572
KURTOSIS	4.135	SKEWNESS	1.751	RANGE	4.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	5.000		

VALID CASES 385 MISSING CASES 0

LEAA CRIME SURVEY

FILE LEAA (CREATION DATE = 05/22/79) PRETEST

X20 CITY CRIME NIGHT

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
NO	1.	180	46.8	47.0	47.0
YES	2.	174	45.2	45.4	92.4
	3.	15	3.9	3.9	96.3
	4.	5	1.3	1.3	97.7
	5.	3	0.8	0.8	98.4
	6.	3	0.8	0.8	99.2
	7.	2	0.5	0.5	99.7
	9.	1	0.3	0.3	100.0
	0.	2	0.5	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	385	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.695	STD ERR	0.049	MEDIAN	1.566
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	0.962	VARIANCE	0.925
KURTOSIS	15.790	SKEWNESS	3.183	RANGE	8.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	9.000		
VALID CASES	383	MISSING CASES	2		

FILE LEAA (CREATION DATE = 05/22/79) PRETEST

X21 CITY POLICE RATING

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
GOOD	1.	72	18.7	18.9	18.9
AVERAGE	2.	149	38.7	39.1	58.0
POOR	3.	121	31.4	31.8	89.8
DONT KNOW	4.	32	8.3	8.4	98.2
	5.	2	0.5	0.5	98.7
	6.	3	0.8	0.8	99.5
	8.	2	0.5	0.5	100.0
	0.	4	1.0	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	385	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	2.375	STD ERR	0.053	MEDIAN	2.295
MODE	2.000	STD DEV	1.033	VARIANCE	1.067
KURTOSIS	4.299	SKEWNESS	1.216	RANGE	7.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	8.000		

VALID CASES 381 MISSING CASES 4

LEAA CRIME SURVEY 05/22/79

FILE LEAA (CREATION DATE = 05/22/79) PRETEST

X22 IMPROVE POLICE

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
NO IMPROVEMENT	1.	26	6.8	7.0	7.0
MORE POLICE	2.	160	41.6	43.2	50.3
MORE PATROL	3.	71	18.4	19.2	69.5
MORE PROMPT	4.	66	17.1	17.8	87.3
IMPROVE TRAINING	5.	5	1.3	1.4	88.6
RAISE QUALIFICATIONS	6.	7	1.8	1.9	90.5
RAISE PAY	7.	11	2.9	3.0	93.5
MORE CONCERN	8.	16	4.2	4.3	97.8
DONT DISCRIMINATE	9.	8	2.1	2.2	100.0
	0.	15	3.9	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	385	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	3.154	STD ERR	0.096	MEDIAN	2.494
MODE	2.000	STD DEV	1.854	VARIANCE	3.437
KURTOSIS	2.098	SKEWNESS	1.613	RANGE	8.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	9.000		

VALID CASES 370 MISSING CASES 15

FILE LEAA (CREATION DATE = 05/22/79) PRETEST

X23 IMPORTANT POLICE IMPROVEMENT

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
NO IMPROVEMENT	1.	20	5.2	5.5	5.5
MORE POLICE	2.	72	18.7	19.8	25.3
MORE PATROL	3.	75	19.5	20.6	45.9
MORE PROMPT	4.	52	13.5	14.3	60.2
IMPROVE TRAINING	5.	28	7.3	7.7	67.9
RAISE QUALIFICATIONS	6.	19	4.9	5.2	73.1
RAISE PAY	7.	19	4.9	5.2	78.3
MORE CONCERN	8.	58	15.1	15.9	94.2
DONT DISCRIMINATE	9.	21	5.5	5.8	100.0
	0.	21	5.5	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	385	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	4.497	STD ERR	0.128	MEDIAN	3.788
MODE	3.000	STD DEV	2.451	VARIANCE	6.008
KURTOSIS	-1.133	SKEWNESS	0.478	RANGE	8.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	9.000		

VALID CASES 364 MISSING CASES 21

FILE LEAA (CREATION DATE = 05/22/79) PRETEST

X24 CHANCES OF CRIME

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
CHANCES UP	1.	158	41.0	41.3	41.3
CHANCES DOWN	2.	58	15.1	15.1	56.4
CHANCES SAME	3.	80	20.8	20.9	77.3
DONT KNOW	4.	53	13.8	13.8	91.1
	5.	11	2.9	2.9	94.0
	6.	5	1.3	1.3	95.3
	7.	6	1.6	1.6	96.9
	8.	8	2.1	2.1	99.0
	9.	4	1.0	1.0	100.0
	0.	2	0.5	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	385	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	2.488	STD ERR	0.089	MEDIAN	2.078
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	1.751	VARIANCE	3.067
KURTOSIS	2.437	SKEWNESS	1.495	RANGE	8.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	9.000		

VALID CASES 383 MISSING CASES 2

LEAA CRIME SURVEY

05/22/79

FILE LEAA (CREATION DATE = 05/22/79) PRETEST

X25 CRIME SERIOUSNESS

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
LESS SERIOUS	1.	91	23.6	23.8	23.8
MORE SERIOUS	2.	92	23.9	24.0	47.8
ABOUT SAME	3.	148	38.4	38.6	86.4
DONT KNOW	4.	46	11.9	12.0	98.4
	5.	2	0.5	0.5	99.0
	8.	4	1.0	1.0	100.0
	0.	2	0.5	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	385	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	2.467	STD ERR	0.059	MEDIAN	2.557
MODE	3.000	STD DEV	1.146	VARIANCE	1.312
KURTOSIS	3.958	SKEWNESS	1.052	RANGE	7.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	8.000		

VALID CASES 383 MISSING CASES 2

LEAA CRIME SURVEY

05/22/79

FILE LEAA (CREATION DATE = 05/22/79) PRETEST

X26 ACTIVITY CHANGES

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
YES	1.	254	66.0	66.7	66.7
NO	2.	79	20.5	20.7	87.4
	3.	26	6.8	6.8	94.2
	4.	19	4.9	5.0	99.2
	8.	3	0.8	0.8	100.0
	0.	4	1.0	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	385	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.549	STD ERR	0.052	MEDIAN	1.250
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	1.008	VARIANCE	1.017
KURTOSIS	12.558	SKEWNESS	2.917	RANGE	7.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	8.000		

VALID CASES 381 MISSING CASES 4

FILE LEAA (CREATION DATE = 05/22/79) PRETEST

X27 NEIGHBORHOOD ACTIVITY CHANGES

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
YES	1.	278	72.2	72.6	72.6
NO	2.	94	24.4	24.5	97.1
	3.	8	2.1	2.1	99.2
	8.	3	0.8	0.8	100.0
	0.	2	0.5	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	385	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.342	STD ERR	0.039	MEDIAN	1.189
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	0.773	VARIANCE	0.597
KURTOSIS	41.517	SKEWNESS	5.344	RANGE	7.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	8.000		

VALID CASES 383 MISSING CASES 2

LEAA CRIME SURVEY 05/22/79

FILE LEAA (CREATION DATE = 05/22/79) PRETEST

X28 PERSONAL ACTIVITY CHANGES

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
YES	1.	210	54.5	55.1	55.1
NO	2.	163	42.3	42.8	97.9
	3.	2	0.5	0.5	98.4
	4.	3	0.8	0.8	99.2
	7.	1	0.3	0.3	99.5
	8.	2	0.5	0.5	100.0
	0.	4	1.0	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	385	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.514	STD ERR	0.040	MEDIAN	1.407
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	0.780	VARIANCE	0.608
KURTOSIS	30.149	SKEWNESS	4.200	RANGE	7.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	8.000		

VALID CASES 381 MISSING CASES 4

END