



Abt Associates Inc., Cambridge, Massachusetts

63940

ABT ASSOCIATES INC.
55 WHEELER STREET, CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS 02138
TELEPHONE • AREA 617-492-7100
TWX: 710-3201362

April 12, 1979

✓ VICTIMIZATION
IN
JOLIET AND PEORIA:

TWO YEARS LATER

Richard Ku
Project Director

Submitted to:

Illinois Law Enforcement Commission
120 South Riverside Plaza
Chicago, Illinois 60606

NCJRS
DEC 27 1979
ACQUISITIONS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF FINDINGS.	1
2.	SURVEY METHODOLOGY.	3
2.1	The Instruments	3
2.2	The Samples	4
2.3	Derivation of Victimization Rates	11
3.	FINDINGS AND TABULATIONS.	15
4.	DIFFERENCES BETWEEN VICTIMIZATION AND POLICE STATISTICS .	48
5.	CONCLUDING REMARK	51
APPENDIX A:	SURVEY INSTRUMENTS AND WEIGHTED FREQUENCY TABULATIONS.	52
APPENDIX B:	CONFIDENCE INTERVALS FOR VICTIMIZATION RATES . . .	100
APPENDIX C:	TRAINING OF INTERVIEWERS	115

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The project director wishes to acknowledge the data processing work of Ellie Lee and the contribution of Louis Frisina in preparing the report. Gratitude is also expressed to Cathy Cavey of Abt Associates' Survey Research Group, for directing interviewing operations in the 1978 survey, and to Nationwide Telephone Research of Chicago, Illinois and Scotti Bureau of Peoria, Illinois for conducting the interviews.

1. INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

As part of its evaluation of the Illinois Urban High Crime Reduction program, Abt Associates has conducted two surveys in Joliet and Peoria, two of the cities participating in the program.* These surveys were mandated by the Illinois Law Enforcement Commission, which funds both the program and our evaluation, to provide measurements of crime levels that would include crimes failing to come to the attention of law enforcement officials.** Respondents in some 5000 households in each city were interviewed by telephone in the fall of 1976 and again in 1978, using two cross-sectional samples of randomly-selected telephone numbers.

A report on the 1976 survey was released in February 1977.*** This report included descriptions of the methodology and findings of that earlier survey and drew attention to the differences between victimization and police statistics. Much of this material has been incorporated into the present report, to facilitate comparisons between the two years and to make this report self-contained. The report's main purpose is simply to describe the findings of the two surveys and identify noteworthy changes within and between the two cities. A summary of findings concludes this section of the report. Section 2 describes the survey methodology, while survey findings are presented in Section 3. Differences between victimization and police statistics are recapitulated in Section 4, and concluding remarks are given in Section 5. Three appendices cover the more technical aspects of the surveys and their resulting data bases.

*Other participating cities were Champaign and East St. Louis.

**The survey data will be analyzed together with police statistics and local evaluations of action projects funded under the program in each city, in evaluating impact on crimes targeted for reduction. This analysis and other components of our evaluation will comprise the contents of our final (third-year) evaluation report, forthcoming in October 1979. No attempt is made in this report to attribute changes observed from the surveys to local programs or action projects.

***Victimization in Joliet and Peoria: A Baseline Survey, Abt Associates Report #77-16 (1977).

Summary of Findings

The overall victimization rate for each crime considered failed to show a statistically significant change from 1976 to 1978 in either city. Personal victimizations (robbery and assault) showed slight increases in Joliet while household burglary decreased from 55 to 48 victimizations per thousand households. Households headed by Blacks and those with incomes exceeding \$20,000 per year benefitted most from these reductions, and changes in these subpopulation rates were statistically significant at the normally accepted .05 confidence level. In Peoria, a slight downward (but insignificant) shift in aggravated assault was found (from 12 to 8.5 per thousand age sixteen or over); otherwise, rates exhibited no change of note.

For personal victimizations, increases were observed in the percentage of cases where the offender was not known by the victim. This went from 48 to 58 percent in Joliet, and from 31 to 52 percent in Peoria. However, only the Peoria change was statistically significant. Most of Peoria's shift was accounted for in the assault categories.

The percentage of victimizations reported to the police declined overall and by the type of offense in both cities, but not significantly so. However, significant declines in reporting by Blacks were registered for personal victimizations in Peoria and for household victimizations in Joliet. As in 1976, reasons for not reporting that predominated were "nothing could be done; lack of proof" and "did not think it important enough."

The attitudinal portion of the surveys show slight reductions in the fear of crime in 1978, compared to 1976. Moreover, responses to the question about ways in which local police could improve were indicative of a more positive view towards the police. Specifically, significantly fewer respondents in both cities felt that police need to "be more courteous, improve attitude and community relations." No change was found in respondents' perceptions of the severity of the criminal justice system serving either city.

2. SURVEY METHODOLOGY

Some 5000 household members in Joliet and some 5000 in Peoria were interviewed by telephone in each of the two surveys, to determine victimization experiences, the extent to which these came to official attention, and attitudes toward crime and the criminal justice system. Although Joliet targeted robbery and burglary for reduction and Peoria targeted residential burglary, data on four major crime categories were collected in the surveys: robbery and assault (personal victimizations) and burglary and larceny (household victimizations). Thus robbery and burglary against commercial establishments, included in the scope of Joliet's target crimes, were not included in the scope of the survey. The assault and larceny categories were included in the survey to provide benchmarks in comparisons of robbery and burglary victimization rates from one survey to the next.

The survey methodology is presented in three sections: the instruments, the samples, and derivation of victimization rates. Differences between the 1976 and 1978 surveys are cited in the course of describing each of these main elements.

2.1 The Instruments

Three instruments were used in collecting the survey data. Only minor corrections were made in these instruments between the 1976 and 1978 surveys; for all intents and purposes, the two sets of instruments can be regarded as identical. A Regular Questionnaire was used to record the responses of all eligible contacts who were willing to cooperate.* Questions about the age, race and sex of the respondent and the household head; household income; length of residence at that address; and type of structure were asked in the Regular Questionnaire to permit separate estimates of victimization rates for various demographic subgroups. This instrument also contains questions which screen for possible robbery, assault, burglary and larceny victimizations occurring in the previous six months.**

Screening questions answered in the affirmative triggered one or more Victimization Reports, depending on the number of victimizations indicated. These instruments were designed to capture additional data on each victimization,

*See Section 2.2 for a description of eligibility criteria.

**Since the interviews spanned the months of October and November, screening questions aimed to catch victimizations occurring from May through November of each year.

such as whether the offender was a stranger or was in possession of a weapon (personal victimizations); the cost of repairing damage or replacing stolen items; the location of the incident and its month of occurrence; and consequences of the victimization, including whether or not it was reported to the police. Rather than simply relying on the screening questions, the classification of victimizations as crimes used the data recorded in Victimization Reports.

A one-sixth sub-sample was asked questions about perceptions of safety, fear of crime, ways police services could improve, and the severity of criminal justice sanctions in the Attitudinal Questionnaire, the third instrument used in the surveys.

The three instruments used in our 1976 and 1978 surveys were fashioned after those used in the National Crime Surveys. The wording of questions, response categories, and the skip patterns (particularly in the Victimization Report) are essentially identical. Some minor revisions were made to distinguish burglaries of structures attached to a residence (designated residential burglary A in this report) and those not so attached (residential burglary B).

2.2 The Samples

This section discusses the process by which original lists of telephone numbers were converted into data bases used to derive the results presented in Section 3 below. In 1976, the process began with the identification of telephone exchanges serving Joliet and Peoria. A computer was then used to generate a random series of four-digit numbers within each exchange and to select a random subsample from this list for the Attitudinal Questionnaire. Thus, we began with 11,422 telephone numbers in Joliet, of which 2337 constituted the attitudinal subsample, and with 11,185 in Peoria, of which 2000 were in the attitudinal subsample.

The sample for the 1978 survey took advantage of actual contacts made in the 1976 survey to minimize the number of contact attempts required to reach 10,000 eligible respondents. Starting with each city's list of numbers successfully contacted in 1976, two new lists were created by augmenting the last digit by one or two, respectively (e.g., the telephone number 727-1234 in the original

list of contacts would generate 727-1235 and 727-1236 in the two new lists.) These two lists were merged, and one of each pair of duplicate numbers produced by this procedure was discarded.* This procedure led to substantial savings in the number of contact attempts: only 9066 such attempts were required in Joliet, while only 8956 were needed for Peoria, to surpass the target of 5000 successful contacts in each city.

Non-working telephone numbers were identified immediately from a recorded message. Contacts with businesses or institutions were readily identified and politely terminated, as were households found to be outside city limits. Up to four contact attempts were made for each telephone number to reach a valid respondent.** Valid respondents were household members who were 16 years of age or older. This age was selected because we felt that a child under the age of sixteen would not be sufficiently knowledgeable about crimes committed against the household. For the attitudinal subsample, a male respondent was requested if the last digit of the telephone number was odd; a female if it was even. However, if it was learned that no household member was of the designated sex or that a person of the designated sex would be difficult to reach at that telephone, the interview was conducted with an otherwise qualified person. In general, heavy weekend and evening calls were scheduled to reach more males than could be contacted during weekdays.

A record was made of every contact attempt. The results of an initial contact attempt were indicated on the computer generated phone lists if contact was made with a business, non-working, or out-of-town phone number. All other contact attempts were recorded on the contact record grid, at the top of the Attitudinal and Regular Questionnaires. Information about contact attempts--the day, time, interviewer, and results of the attempt--was noted in every instance other than initial business, non-working and out-of-town phone numbers. These records were used by interviewers in determining optimal times for subsequent attempts. Altogether, 5143 Joliet households were contacted in 1976

*Duplicate pairs would arise whenever two adjacent numbers appeared in the 1976 contact list.

**If the telephone was not answered after twelve rings or a busy signal was reached, a contact attempt was recorded.

and 5909 were contacted in 1978. In Peoria, 5117 and 5212 households were contacted, respectively, in these two years.

As is the case with any survey, a certain percentage of those contacted refused to be interviewed. Also, some contacts were made with non-English-speaking people in both years. Although language problems and refusals were considered as final resolutions, follow-ups in some of these cases were successfully undertaken in 1976. Since we were unable to detect differences between victimization rates for these converted refusals and initial completions, refusals were not recontacted in 1978. Overall completion rates of 89 percent in Joliet and 90 percent in Peoria were achieved in 1976, while in 1978 they were 83 percent in Joliet and 95 percent in Peoria.*

Because ours were telephone interviews, a Victimization Report was completed immediately upon receiving an affirmative response to a screening question.** This differs from the procedure of waiting until all screening questions have been answered before completing any Incident Reports in the face-to-face interviewing mode of the National Crime Surveys.

A certain percentage of all interviewer's work was validated daily by the supervisors. In all cases, telephone lines were connected to supervisor's telephone, which permitted a supervisor to monitor any line at any time without the interviewer's knowledge. This monitoring was intended primarily to provide interviewers with immediate feedback on their performance. Monitoring was performed randomly and respondents' answers were recorded on blank questionnaires at the time of the interview. Immediately after completion of the interview,

*While the training of interviewers and supervisors was conceived identically for the 1976 and 1978 surveys, the interviews themselves were conducted under separate subcontracts for the two cities in 1978; in 1976, Abt Associates' staff leased office space and equipment in Joliet and supervised interviewing in both cities from this site. Shifts in completion rates may in part reflect differences in the persuasiveness of the various groups of interviewers.

**If a single screening question gave rise to several incidents, a Victimization Report was completed for each. "Series victimizations," defined in the National Crime Surveys as three or more events of essentially the same nature occurring within a short time frame, are not included in national publications, and were rarely encountered in our surveys. When they were, judgment was exercised in each individual case to determine an appropriate counting procedure.

the supervisor checked the validation copy against that of the interviewer for recording errors and discussing other problems observed.

At the end of each day's work, all interviewers completed a Daily Report Log, which summarized daily activities and enabled us to monitor the progress of the data collection effort. Refusal rates and completion rates were calculated for each interviewer on a daily basis as another indicator of problems experienced by certain interviewers.

Despite the precautions taken to ensure the accurate completion of questionnaires, the transformation of data from questionnaires into summary statistics is a process fraught with the potential for error. Therefore, detailed procedures were established to detect and correct as many of these errors as possible. Using specially prepared manuals, editors reviewed each interviewer's work for accuracy. These manuals specified what responses were allowable for each question, how these responses should be coded and how they would appear in the data printouts, and under what circumstances a response to each question should be expected. Essentially, these manuals were the instructions followed by the editors in preparing each questionnaire for keypunching.

After keypunching, the data were subject to further computer processing, to resolve inconsistencies, and to merge for each year, the three separate files corresponding to the three questionnaires. Some records were discarded as a result of the merging process, due to failures in matching the telephone number on the Regular Questionnaire with those on the other two questionnaires.

Next, responses were weighted by the reciprocal of the number of telephones in the household to account for the higher probability of selection to the sample that existed for multiple-telephone households (i.e., distinct telephone numbers, not extensions). All of the questionnaires were weighted in this fashion.

Finally, the data base from which tabulations were prepared resulted from the deletion of those cases which failed the specific criteria for inclusion within one of the six categories of crime included in the survey. This final sample (data base) contained 4413 Joliet cases in 1976 and 4667 in 1978. Corresponding figures for Peoria were 4434 and 4704. Tables A and B summarize, for each city, the sample reduction process just outlined. Table C shows statistical profiles of the weighted samples whose responses were used in the tabulations in Section 3. Age and race distributions show little change in

TABLE A

SUMMARY OF THE SAMPLE REDUCTION PROCESS FOR JOLIET: 1976 AND 1978

	<u>Regular Questionnaire</u>		<u>Attitudinal Questionnaire</u>		<u>Victimization Report</u>	
	1976	1978	1976	1978	1976	1978
(1) Sample	11,422	9,066	2,337	1,921		
(2) Business, Institution, Non-Working, Out-of-City	5,057	2,066	1,091	509		
(3) Four Unsuccessful Contacts Attempts	578	753	140	244		
(4) One to Three Unsuccessful Contact Attempts	644	338	190	86		
(5) Contacts with Households	5,143	5,909	916	1,082		
(6) Refusals	519	957	110	251		
(7) Outstanding Language	25	37	12	13		
(8) Completions	4,599	4,915	794	818	926	962
(9) Merged Completions	4,599	4,915	786	800	919	957
(10) Weighted Merged Completions	4,413	4,667	754	759	872	890
(11) Data Base	4,413	4,667	754	759	757	797

TABLE B

SUMMARY OF THE SAMPLE REDUCTION PROCESS FOR PEORIA: 1976 AND 1978

	<u>Regular Questionnaire</u>		<u>Attitudinal Questionnaire</u>		<u>Victimization Report</u>	
	1976	1978	1976	1978	1976	1978
(1) Sample	11,185	8,956	2,000	1,196		
(2) Business, Non-Working Out-of City	4,593	2,430	891	453		
(3) Four Unsuccessful Contacts	429	1,031	154	533		
(4) One to Three Unsuccessful Contact Attempts	1,046	283	137	15		
(5) Contacts	5,117	5,212	818	995		
(6) Refusals	484	251	86	118		
(7) Outstanding Language Problems	7	20	3	2		
(8) Completions	4,626	4,941	729	875	844	910
(9) Merged Completions	4,626	4,941	723	869	838	904
(10) Weighted Merged Completions	4,434	4,704	691	821	798	838
(11) Data Base	4,434	4,704	691	821	704	724

TABLE C

Distribution of Weighted Samples (Individuals) in
Subpopulations: Joliet and Peoria, 1976 and 1978

	<u>Joliet</u>		<u>Peoria</u>	
	1976	1978	1976	1978
<u>Race</u>				
Black	13%	13%	9%	9%
White	87	87	91	91
	(4257)	(4446)	(4371)	(4631)
<u>Age</u>				
16-25	21%	23%	21%	20%
26-59	56	56	55	53
60 and over	23	21	24	27
	(4370)	(4567)	(4417)	(4616)
<u>Sex</u>				
Male	32%	30%	35%	31%
Female	68	70	65	69
	(4369)	(4958)	(4373)	(4697)
<u>Household Income</u>				
under \$10,000	38%	28%	35%	30%
\$10,000-\$20,000	46	42	44	37
\$20,000 or more	16	30	21	33
	(3311)	(3125)	(3274)	(3260)
<u>Length of Time at Present Address</u>				
0-2 years	31%	33%	35%	33%
3-9 years	28	26	29	27
10 or more years	41	41	36	40
	(4350)	(4524)	(4362)	(4610)
<u>Type of Residence</u>				
Single family	75%	76%	79%	79%
Other	25	24	21	21
	(4356)	(4548)	(4368)	(4627)

Source: Regular Questionnaires, 1976 and 1978

Data Base: Weighted Regular Questionnaire respondents (N=4413 in 1976 and N=4667 in 1978 in Joliet; N=4434 in 1976 and N=4704 in 1978 in Peoria).

either city between 1976 and 1978, while in 1978 a slightly higher percentage of females was interviewed in both cities. Shifts in both cities can also be observed in the household income category, with more respondents in the higher income categories in 1978 than in 1976.* Little change is evident in the length of time respondents have lived in their present residence or in the type of housing unit, in either city.

2.3 Derivation of Victimization Rates

After merging Regular Questionnaires with Victimization Reports to enable us to calculate victimization rates for various subgroups of the population, it was still necessary to screen these files further in classifying crime types. This section describes the specifications we used to accomplish this.

Four basic types of crimes were sought by the screening questions (Q1-Q4) of the Regular Questionnaire: robbery, assault, burglary and larceny. Since only dwelling unit respondents were permitted in our final sample, robbery, burglary and larceny incidents that prove to be against commercial establishments or businesses were screened out before the interviews were conducted. Nonetheless, it was still necessary to perform further screening of these crimes due to the possibility of interviewing people who were present during a commercial robbery, but were not personally victimized, or people whose businesses were victimized by burglary or larceny, but no personal property was stolen. These criteria for screening out business crimes are consistent with those used in the National Crime Panel Surveys.**

The second reason for further examination of Victimization Reports was to refine the categories of assault and residential burglary. Assaults in which a weapon was used or where medical attention for an injury was necessary were classified as aggravated assaults, and the remainder as other assaults. For residential burglary, the distinction was made between (a) the illegal entry or break-in of a dwelling unit or other structure attached to it (Resi-

*This shift may simply reflect the effects of inflation during the two-year interval.

**The National Crime Panel surveys draw a separate commercial sample as well, so that a failure to screen these would result in double counting.

dential Burglary A in the tables) and (b) the case where an unattached structure on the property was illegally entered or broken into (Residential Burglary B in the tables), in order to conform with the definition of residential burglary used by the Illinois Department of Law Enforcement.*

Finally, checks were made for the internal consistency of Victimization Reports. If, for a residential burglary (either A or B), there was no evidence of a break-in and nothing was stolen, then the case was discarded.** For robbery and assault, a case was discarded if the respondent indicated that he was not present.***

The conditions described above are set forth in terms of responses to specific questions. Note that since TYPE OF CRIME at the top of the Victimization Report reflects which of the four screening questions were checked on the Regular Questionnaire, only the Victimization Report needed to be consulted in specifying the criteria. These conditions were tested against each Victimization Report in the order described below, and only those meeting one set of conditions were tested against the next set.

Exclusion of Commercial and Business Victimizations

This criterion was applied to cases where TYPE OF CRIME was checked "Robbery," "Burglary" or "Larceny." Cases eliminated were those for which the responses indicated under each of the following questions were checked:

Q8: Where did this incident take place? In or near what kind of place did this happen?

- Inside commercial building, such as store, restaurant, bank, gas station, on a bus or train; or in a station.
- Inside office, factory, or warehouse.

*This distinction was brought to our attention by Aubrey Moore, Executive Director of the Peoria Crime Reduction Council.

**Such an event might occur in the case of an uninterrupted burglary, but it could also be a larceny, where the question concerning method of entry was made to reclassify these. In any event, it occurred infrequently.

***In the case of robbery, the respondent might have misunderstood the screening question, in which case the incident might have been a larceny or a burglary. Because of the ambiguity of these responses, no attempt was made to reclassify these.

Q9: Were you a customer, employee or owner?

- Employee
- Owner
- Other

Q10: Did the person(s) steal or try to steal anything belonging to the (store/restaurant/office/factory/etc.)?

- Yes

Q11: Was something stolen that belonged to you or others in the household?

- No

Exclusion of Burglaries That are Neither Residential Burglary A Nor Residential Burglary B

This criterion was applied to cases where TYPE OF CRIME checked was "Burglary." Cases eliminated were those for which the responses indicated for Q8 occurred as follows:

Q8: Where did this incident take place? In or near what kind of place did this happen?

- At or in vacation home, hotel/motel.
- Inside commercial building, such as store, restaurant, bank, gas station, on a bus or train, or in a station.
- Near own home; yard, sidewalk, driveway, carport, apartment hall (do not include break-ins or attempted break-ins)
- On the street, in a park, field, playground, school grounds, or parking lot.
- Inside school.
- Other (Specify)

Or, where the following combination of responses for Q4 and Q11 was found

Q4: What evidence was there that there was (a break-in/an attempted break-in)? Anything else?

- No evidence.

Q11: Was something stolen that belonged to you or others in the household?

- No

Robbery Conditions

This criterion was applied to cases where TYPE OF CRIME was checked "Robbery." Cases included were those indicating the following answers to Q2 and Q11.

Q2: Were you the only person there besides the offender(s)?

- Yes
- No

Q11: Was something stolen that belonged to you or others in the household?

- Yes

Assault Conditions

This criterion was applied to cases where TYPE OF CRIME was checked "Assault." An incident was designated an other assault if the response to Q2 was one of the following:

Q2: Were you the only person there besides the offender(s)?

- Yes
- No

The incident was designated an aggravated assault if in addition, one of the following response lists were satisfied:

Q3: Did the person(s) have a weapon such as a gun or knife, or use something as a weapon, such as a bottle or wrench?

- Yes

Q15: Were you injured in this incident to the extent that you needed medical attention?

- Yes

Distinction Between Residential Burglary A and Residential Burglary B

Residential Burglaries A is that group of residential burglaries meeting previous criteria for which the response to Q4 is as follows:

Q4: Where did this incident take place? In or near what kind of place did this happen?

- At or in own dwelling unit, or at or in structure with roof attached to dwelling unit. Include garages only if they are attached to dwelling unit.

Larceny Criterion

This criterion was applied to cases where TYPE OF CRIME was checked "Larceny." Cases included only those having the listed answer to Q11:

Q11: Was anything stolen that belonged to you or others in the household?

- Yes

3. FINDINGS AND TABULATIONS

Findings of the 1976 and 1978 surveys of Joliet and Peoria are organized into four categories: overall victimization rates, rates within subpopulations, reporting practices, and attitudes toward crime and criminal justice.

Overall Victimization Rates

Victimization rates for the six types of crime examined remained remarkably stable in both cities. Notable exceptions (but not significant at the five percent level*) were largely in Joliet, where rates per thousand age sixteen or more for robbery and for other assaults increased from 3.4 to 4.3 and 17 to 21, respectively, and residential burglary A declined from 55 to 48 households per thousand. The only change of note in Peoria was a decrease (not statistically significant) in the rate of aggravated assaults, from 12 per thousand to 8.5 per thousand individuals age sixteen or over.

While overall victimization rates showed little change, shifts were observed in the victim-offender relationship. For the three types of personal victimizations (aggravated assault, other assaults and robbery), the percentage in which the offender was termed a stranger significantly rose by twenty-one points in Peoria, from 31 to 52 percent. The corresponding rise in Joliet, from 48 to 58 percent, was not statistically significant. In Peoria, the two assault categories accounted for the upward shift, while in Joliet, all three personal categories exhibited some change.

In Peoria, use of force in the two burglary categories (differing by whether the burglarized structure is attached to the residence) showed declines for single-family housing units, from 93 to 80 percent, and from 78 to 58 percent, respectively. Both of these declines were statistically

*A chi-square test was used to test significance, throughout. The 2 x 2 matrices from which the chi-square statistics are calculated are defined by year (1976, 1978) and whether or not the "attribute" is present (e.g., victimized or not, stranger or not, reported or not), as determined from direct counts. The test statistic was corrected for continuity in cases where the uncorrected chi-square yielded significant differences, as a way of ensuring conservative rejections of the null hypothesis. See Snedecor and Cochran, Statistical Methods, 6th edition, Iowa State University Press (1971), p. 215-219, and Montel and Greenhouse, "What is the Continuity Correction?," The American Statistician Vol. 22, Number 5, December 1968, pp. 27-30.

significant. However, when a correction for continuity is made, the decrease in residential burglary B for single-family units is not significant. The residential burglary B decline by 20 percentage points in use of force, therefore, may have occurred by chance. Other types of structures, while infrequently encountered in Peoria, showed similar trends. By contrast, there was virtually no change in the use of force in Joliet burglaries of either type of housing unit.

Victimization Rates Within Subpopulations

Robbery and other assault categories showed significant increases for Blacks in Joliet, while rates for Whites in all three categories of personal victimization remained relatively stable.* In Peoria, robbery and aggravated assault rates experienced by Blacks declined substantially, while the rate for other assaults increased notably for this group. These changes in the rates for Blacks were highly significant, while again the rates for Whites were relatively stable in Peoria.

An examination of personal victimization rates by age category shows that while the rates themselves fluctuate somewhat, the relative positions of the three categories were the same in 1976 and 1978, with younger groups exhibiting higher rates in both cities. However, significant changes were found in the assault rates for the younger group in both Joliet and Peoria. Specifically, the rate of other assaults for youths in Joliet increased by more than twenty-one points, from 34 to 55 per thousand, and the aggravated assault rate for the younger group in Peoria declined by more than 8 per thousand between 1976 and 1978.

Personal victimization rates showed significant increases for both men and women in Joliet. In Peoria, robbery rates increased somewhat for both sexes, but the observed changes were not significant. The aggravated assault rate for women in Peoria significantly declined by 5.5 per thousand, while the other assault rate for men in Peoria significantly rose by 5 per thousand from 19 to 24.

*Because of the small number of personal victimizations reported to interviewers, rates per thousand are highly susceptible to large fluctuations. Thus, caution should be exercised in the interpretation of shifts in these rates.

In Joliet, households headed by Blacks showed substantial declines in residential burglary A and larceny rates, while those headed by Whites indicated no discernable change. In Peoria, the residential burglary B rate for Blacks dropped by more than 10 per thousand households, while the larceny rate for Blacks significantly increased from 72 to 83 per thousand. Stability of these rates from 1976 to 1978 for Whites is notable.

By age of the household head, Peoria's household victimization rates for the younger group significantly increased by 19 per thousand in the residential burglary A category, while significantly decreasing by 24 per thousand in the larceny category. Other age groups showed only minor (and insignificant) fluctuations in household victimization rates. From 1976 to 1978, stability by age was also evident in Joliet's household rate, with the exception of a significant decrease in the residential burglary A rate for the middle age group and a significant increase in the larceny rate for the younger group. Since the percentage of female household heads in the 1978 survey was double that of the 1976 survey in both cities, the interpretation of household victimization by sex of the household head is of questionable value.*

The decline in Joliet's residential burglary A rate appears to have benefitted mostly those in the income category of over \$20,000 annually. The rate in this category registered a decrease from 68 to 55 burglaries A per thousand households, while rates in the other income categories remained essentially unchanged.

In Peoria, there was a significant increase in the larceny rate for the upper income group (\$20,000 or more annually), while the residential burglary B rate for the lower income group declined significantly, from 10 per thousand in 1976 to 1 per thousand in 1978.

Some changes in burglary and larceny patterns were found in both cities, by length of time at present address with those having the shorter terms of residence exhibiting higher rates. Joliet residents in the 3-9 year category experienced significant declines in the residential burglary A rate and larceny rate, while newer residents (0-2 years) registered 14 per thousand more larcenies.

*This shift may well signify a change in womens' perceptions of their role in the household rather than a greater occurrence of households having no male adult members.

In Peoria, both the 0-2 year category and 10 or more year category saw significant increases in the household larceny rate.

Both single family and other types of housing units experienced declines in burglary rates in Joliet. The results were split in Peoria, with single family units showing a decrease in the burglary rate while other types of units registered increases.

Reporting to the Police

Overall reporting rates declined in both cities, from 57 to 54 percent of all incidents in Joliet and from 54 to 49 percent in Peoria. In both cities declines in reporting occurred for aggravated assault and household larceny. Other assaults in Peoria showed a decline as well, while reporting of robbery and residential burglary B increased. None of the changes in percentage reporting, by offense type, was significant.

In Joliet, the percentage of personal victimizations reported by Blacks declined from 46 to 28 percent, but this change was not statistically significant. The corresponding decline in Peoria, from 65 to 38 percent was significant. By contrast, no change occurred in the percentage of household victimizations reported by Blacks in Peoria, while in Joliet, the decline in reporting from 64 to 48 percent was significant. Households headed by Whites exhibited no significant change in either personal or household victimizations.

"Other" reasons given for not reporting in Joliet generally fell into the categories of "nothing was stolen," "Police won't do anything," "Criminals were young kids," and "Local Neighborhood Matter." In Peoria, respondents who fell into the "other" category did not report to the police because "Resolved matter privately," "Youth crime handled through parents, not police," and "merchandise recovered privately."

Attitudes Toward Crime and Criminal Justice

When asked about ways in which the local police could improve services, respondents in both cities tended to show more favorable attitudes in 1978 than in 1976. Specifically, significantly fewer respondents felt that the police should "be more courteous, improve attitude, community relations" in 1978 than in 1976. Although fewer respondents in both cities felt that

the police should "be more prompt, responsive, alert," the decline from 1976 to 1978 was not statistically significant. In Peoria, the percentage of respondents feeling that "no improvement is needed substantially increased from 8 to 21 percent, among both Blacks and Whites; however, this percentage declined somewhat in Joliet from 12 to 9 percent. Examples of "other" reasons for police improvement in Joliet included "Patrolling more (neighborhood, nighttime, commercial)," "More protection for senior citizens," and "more improved community relations." In Peoria, respondents who offered "other" reasons for police improvement indicated "Patrolling more (schools, neighborhood streets)," "Be more visible," "Improve public image (e.g., reinstate the Officer Friendly Program in schools)," and "more surveillance of speeding and traffic."

Overall, declines were generally registered with respect to fear of crime in both cities. The only exception was a small (and insignificant) increase from 17 to 20 percent of Peoria respondents who indicated that they felt very unsafe alone at night in their own neighborhood. While Blacks indicated greater fear of crime in both cities and both years than did Whites, the number of Black respondents who felt that "crime had increased" significantly declined by 21 percentage points in Joliet and by 15 in Peoria, while Whites indicated no significant change. The reduction in the fear of crime found in both cities overall appears to have been evenly distributed by age group and sex in both cities.

In rating the severity of criminal justice sanctions, both Joliet and Peoria respondents indicated virtually no change from 1976 to 1978. In both years, police were rated as most severe (scoring a median of 5 on a ten-point scale), followed by courts and corrections which scored median ratings of 3.

Table 1

Estimated Six-Month Victimization Rates and
Victimizations for Persons and Households in
JOLIET: 1976 and 1978

	<u>Victimization Rate</u>		<u>Estimated Number of Victimations</u>	
	1976	1978	1976	1978
Robbery ¹	3.4	4.3	191	242
Aggravated Assaults ¹	11.	11.	618	618
Other Assaults ¹	17.	21.	955	1180
Residential Burglary A ²	55.	48.	1394	1216
Residential Burglary B ²	18.	19.	456	481
Household Larceny ²	67.	67.	1698	1698

SOURCE: 1976 - Regular Questionnaires and Victimization Reports (October-November, 1976); 1970 Census
1978 - Regular Questionnaires and Victimization Reports (October-November, 1978); 1970 Census

Base: 1976 - Weighted Regular Questionnaire response (N = 4413)
1978 - Weighted Regular Questionnaire response (N = 4667)

¹ Victimization rates are calculated as the number of persons per thousand, age sixteen or more, who were victims. For both 1976 and 1978, the estimated number of victimizations is based on the 1970 national census (N = 56,170 age 16 and under).

² Victimization rates are calculated as the number of households per thousand that were victimized. For both 1976 and 1978, the estimated number of victimizations is based on the 1970 census (N = 25,342 households).

Table 2

Estimated Six-Month Victimization Rates and
Victimizations for Persons and Households in
PEORIA: 1976 and 1978

	<u>Victimization Rate</u>		<u>Estimated Number of Victimations</u>	
	1976	1978	1976	1978
Robbery ¹	3.2	3.4	288	305
Aggravated Assaults ¹	12.	8.5	1080	765
Other Assaults ¹	19.	19.	1709	1709
Residential Burglary A ²	44.	44.	1861	1861
Residential Burglary B ²	12.	12.	507	507
Household Larceny ²	69.	72.	2918	3045

SOURCE: 1976 - Regular Questionnaires and Victimization Reports (October-November, 1976); 1970 Census
1978 - Regular Questionnaires and Victimization Reports (October-November, 1978); 1970 Census

Base: 1976 - Weighted Regular Questionnaire response (N = 4434)
1978 - Weighted Regular Questionnaire response (N = 4704)

¹Victimization rates are calculated as the number of persons per thousand, age sixteen or more, who were victims. For both 1976 and 1978, the estimated number of victimizations is based on the 1970 national census (N = 89,969 age 16 and under).

²Victimization rates are calculated as the number of households per thousand that were victimized. For both 1976 and 1978, the estimated number of victimizations is based on the 1970 census (N = 42,290 households).

Table 3

Victim-Offender Relationship for Assault and Robbery in
JOLIET: 1976 and 1978

Victim-Offender, Relationship ¹	<u>Aggravated Assault</u>		<u>Other Assaults</u>		<u>Robbery</u>	
	1976	1978	1976	1978	1976	1978
Stranger	48%	59%	41%	50%	79%	94%
Known to Victim	<u>52</u>	<u>41</u>	<u>59</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>6</u>
Total	100% (48)	100% (49)	100% (68)	100% (94)	100% (14)	100% (18)

SOURCE: 1976 - Victimization Reports (October-November, 1976)
1978 - Victimization Reports (October-November, 1978)

Base: 1976 - Weighted assault and robbery victims (N = 130, missing Cases = 9)
1978 - Weighted assault and robbery victims (N = 161, missing Cases = 12)

¹For one offender, the Stranger category includes the items labeled "Total Stranger" or "Person Known by Sight Only." For more than one offender, the stranger category consists only of the item labeled "All Strangers." See Appendix D, Vicimization Report.

Table 4

Victim-Offender Relationship for Assault and Robbery in
PEORIA: 1976 and 1978

Victim-Offender Relationship ¹	Aggravated Assault		Other Assaults		Robbery	
	1976	1978	1976	1978	1976	1978
Stranger	26%	85%	31%	38%	47%	47%
Known to Victim	<u>74</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>69</u>	<u>62</u>	<u>53</u>	<u>53</u>
Total	100% (50)	100% (40)	100% (75)	100% (89)	100% (15)	100% (13)

SOURCE: 1976 - Victimization Reports (October-November, 1976)
1978 - Victimization Reports (October-November, 1978)

Base: 1976 - Weighted assault and robbery victims (N = 140, missing cases = 8)
1978 - Weighted assault and robbery victims (N = 142, missing cases = 5)

¹ For one offender, the Stranger category includes the items labeled "Total Stranger" or "Person Known by Sight Only." For more than one offender, the stranger category consists only of the item labeled "All Strangers." See Appendix D, Vicimization Report.

Table 5

Residential Burglary by Method of Entry
and Type of Residence in
JOLIET: 1976 and 1978

	1976		1978	
	Single Family	Other	Single Family	Other
<u>Method of Entry</u> ¹				
Residential Burglary A				
Force	94%	94%	95%	90%
No Force	6	6	5	10
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%
	(173)	(65)	(160)	(58)
Residential Burglary B				
Force	84%	57%	84%	71%
No Force	16	43	16	29
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%
	(68)	(7)	(72)	(14)

SOURCE: 1976 - Regular Questionnaires and Victimization Reports (October-November, 1976)
1978 - Regular Questionnaires and Victimization Reports (October-November, 1978)

Base: 1976 - Weighted residential burglary victims (N = 313, missing cases = 9)
1978 - Weighted residential burglary victims (N = 304, missing cases = 6)

¹The Force category includes cases where a broken lock or window, a forced door or window, a slashed screen or other evidence of a break-in or attempted break-in was indicated on a Victimization Report. The No Force category consists of cases where no evidence of force was indicated.

Table 6

Residential Burglary by Method of Entry
and Type of Residence in
PEORIA: 1976 and 1978

	1976		1978	
	Single Family	Other	Single Family	Other
<u>Method of Entry</u> ¹				
Residential Burglary A				
Force	93%	95%	80	88
No Force	<u>7</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>12</u>
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%
	(153)	(43)	(143)	(61)
Residential Burglary B				
Force	78%	100%	58	71%
No Force	<u>22</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>42</u>	<u>29%</u>
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%
	(43)	(8)	(48)	(7)

SOURCE: 1976 - Regular Questionnaires and Victimization Reports (October-November, 1976)
1978 - Regular Questionnaires and Victimization Reports (October-November, 1978)

Base: 1976 - Weighted residential burglary victims (N = 247, Missing cases = 4)
1978 - Weighted residential burglary victims (N = 259, Missing cases = 1)

¹ The Force category includes cases where a broken lock or window, a forced door or window, a slashed screen or other evidence of a break-in or attempted break-in was indicated on a Victimization Report.
The No Force category consists of cases where no evidence of force was indicated.

Table 7

Estimated Six-Month Victimization Rates for Personal Crimes
for Individuals Sixteen Years and Older by Race, Age, and Sex of Respondent,
Household Income, and Length of Time at Present Address in
JOLIET: 1976 and 1978

Race, Age, and Sex of Respondent, Household Income, and Length of Time at Present Address	Victimization Rate ¹			
	N	Robbery	Aggravated Assaults	Other Assaults
<u>Total</u>				
1976	4413	3.4	11	17
1978	4667	4.3	11	21
<u>Race</u>				
1976				
Black	567	0.0	23	19
White	3690	3.8	9.5	17
1978				
Black	597	12	23	32
White	3849	3.1	9.1	20
<u>Age</u>				
1976				
16-25 years	906	6.6	30	34
26-59 years	2449	3.3	7.8	16
60 years or older	1015	0.9	3.0	4.9
1978				
16-25 years	1042	6.7	31	55
26-59 years	2550	4.3	7.8	17
60 years or older	975	2.0	0	1.0
<u>Sex</u>				
1976				
Male	1400	5.7	12	21
Female	2964	2.4	11	14
1978				
Male	1491	6.4	16	27
Female	3167	3.2	9.8	20

Table 7 (Continued)

JOLIET: 1976 and 1978

Race, Age, and Sex of Respondent, Household Income, and Length of Time at Present Address	Victimization Rate ¹			
	N	Robbery	Aggravated Assaults	Other Assaults
<u>Household Income</u>				
1976				
\$0-10,000	1273	3.1	17	18
\$10,001 to 20,000	1527	3.9	12	19
\$20,000 or more	511	3.9	2.0	27
Refused	1090	3.7	8.2	9.2
1978				
\$0-10,000	887	5.6	17	25
\$10,001 to 20,000	1320	3.0	11	27
\$20,000 or more	918	3.3	6.5	26
Refused	1541	5.2	11	11
<u>Length of Time at Present Address</u>				
1976				
0-2 years	1344	3.7	20	26
3-9 years	1221	3.3	11	25
10 or more years	1785	3.4	5.0	6.2
1978				
0-2 years	1481	8.7	21	36
3-9 years	1176	2.6	10	20
10 or more years	1867	2.1	5.4	13

SOURCE: 1976 - Regular Questionnaires and Victimization Reports (October-November, 1976)
1978 - Regular Questionnaires and Victimization Reports (October-November, 1978)

Base: 1976 - Weighted Regular Questionnaire response (N = 4413)
1978 - Weighted Regular Questionnaire response (N = 4667)

¹ The victimization rate is expressed as the number of persons per thousand, age sixteen years or more, who were victims.

Table 8

Estimated Six-Month Victimization Rates for Personal Crimes
for Individuals Sixteen Years and Older by Race, Age, and Sex of Respondent,
Household Income, and Length of Time at Present Address in
PEORIA: 1976 and 1978

Race, Age, and Sex of Respondent, Household Income, and Length of Time at Present Address	Victimization Rate ¹			
	N	Robbery	Aggravated Assaults	Other Assaults
<u>Total</u>				
1976	4434	3.2	12	19
1978	4704	3.4	8.5	19
<u>Race</u>				
1976				
Black	406	7.4	57	20
White	3965	2.8	6.8	19
1978				
Black	418	2.4	19	43
White	4213	3.6	7.1	17
<u>Age</u>				
1976				
16-25 years	930	12	30	47
26-59 years	2419	1.7	9.1	16
60 years or older	1068	0.0	0.94	1.9
1978				
16-25 years	924	9.7	22	43
26-59 years	2469	2.0	6.5	19
60 years or older	1223	1.6	2.4	2.4
<u>Sex</u>				
1976				
Male	1516	2.6	11	19
Female	2857	3.2	12	19
1978				
Male	1450	3.4	13	24
Female	3247	3.4	6.5	17.2

Table 8 (Continued)
PEORIA: 1976 and 1978

Race, Age, and Sex of Respondent, Household Income, and Length of Time at Present Address	Victimization Rate ¹			
	N	Robbery	Aggravated Assaults	Other Assaults
<u>Household Income</u>				
1976				
\$0-10,000	1160	3.4	22.	25
\$10,001 to 20,000	1447	2.8	9.7	28
\$20,000 or more	667	7.5	9.0	15
Refused	1144	0.9	5.2	5.2
1978				
\$0-10,000	976	2.0	12	34
\$10,001 to 20,000	1219	4.1	9.0	16
\$20,000 or more	1065	1.9	7.5	15
Refused	1444	4.8	6.2	16
<u>Length of Time at Present Address</u>				
1976				
0-2 years	1527	4.6	15	31
3-9 years	1259	2.4	16	20
10 or more years	1576	3.2	5.7	7.6
1978				
0-2 years	1527	3.9	12	33
3-9 years	1263	4.0	6.3	14
10 or more years	1820	3.3	5.5	12

SOURCE: 1976 - Regular Questionnaires and Victimization Reports (October-November, 1976)
1978 - Regular Questionnaires and Victimization Reports (October-November, 1978)

Base: 1976 - Weighted Regular Questionnaire response (N = 4434)
1978 - Weighted Regular Questionnaire response (N = 4704)

¹ The victimization rate is expressed as the number of persons per thousand, age sixteen years or more, who were victims.

Table 9

Estimated Six-Month Victimization Rates for Household Crimes
by Race, Age, and Sex of Household Head, Household Income,
Length of Time at Present Address and Type of Residence in
JOLIET: 1976 and 1978

Race, Age, and Sex of Household Head, House- hold Income, Length of Time at Present Address and Type of Residence	Victimization Rate ¹			
	N	Residential Burglary A	Residential Burglary B	Household Larceny
<u>Total</u>				
1976	4413	55	18	67
1978	4667	48	19	67
<u>Race</u>				
1976				
Black	569	128	14	65
White	3659	44	18	69
1978				
Black	590	61	20	42
White	3843	47	19	71
<u>Age</u>				
1976				
16-25 years	482	77	12	91
26-59 years	2758	64	23	79
60 years or older	1117	26	9.0	30
1978				
16-25 years	607	68	17	107
26-59 years	2864	52	25	75
60 years or older	1076	30	4.6	28
<u>Sex</u>				
1976				
Male	2929	55	18	77
Female	1438	52	15	47
1978				
Male	1816	48	21	77
Female	2810	48	18	61

Table 9 (Continued)
JOLIET: 1976 and 1978

Race, Age, and Sex of Household Head, Household Income, Length of Time at Present Address and Type of Residence	Victimization Rate ¹			
	N	Residential Burglary A	Residential Burglary B	Household Larceny
<u>Household Income</u>				
1976				
\$0-10,000	1273	61	12	59
\$10,001 to 20,000	1527	46	24	79
\$20,000 or more	511	68	20	106
Refused	1090	55	17	45
1978				
\$0-10,000	887	63	16	52
\$10,001 to 20,000	1320	48	24	70
\$20,000 or more	918	55	26	97
Refused	1541	35	12	56
<u>Length of Time at Present Address</u>				
1976				
0-2 years	1344	71	17	83
3-9 years	1221	62	20	81
10 or more years	1785	39	17	48
1978				
0-2 years	1481	64	14	97
3-9 years	1176	46	24	59
10 or more years	1867	40	21	51
<u>Type of Residence</u>				
1976				
Single Family	3263	54	22	64
Other	1093	60	6.4	78
1978				
Single Family	3466	47	21	66
Other	1082	55	13	76

SOURCE: 1976 - Regular Questionnaires and Victimization Reports (October-November, 1976)
1978 - Regular Questionnaires and Victimization Reports (October-November, 1978)

Base: 1976 - Weighted Regular Questionnaire response (N = 4413)
1978 - Weighted Regular Questionnaire response (N = 4667)

¹The victimization rate is expressed as the number of households per thousand that were victimized.

Table 10

Estimated Six-Month Victimization Rates for Household Crimes
by Race, Age, and Sex of Household Head, Household Income,
Length of Time at Present Address and Type of Residence in
PEORIA: 1976 and 1978

Race, Age, and Sex of Household Head, House- hold Income, Length of Time at Present Address and Type of Residence	Victimization Rate ¹			
	N	Residential Burglary A	Residential Burglary B	Household Larceny
<u>Total</u>				
1976	4434	44	12	69
1978	4704	44	12	72
<u>Race</u>				
1976				
Black	403	87	20	72
White	3935	40	12	69
1978				
Black	409	88	9.8	83
White	4184	40	12	71
<u>Age</u>				
1976				
16-25 years	586	84	5.1	109
26-59 years	2619	44	13	81
60 years or older	1152	28	15	27
1978				
16-25 years	623	103	19	85
26-59 years	2716	43	13	92
60 years or older	1254	20	5.6	26
<u>Sex</u>				
1976				
Male	3014	45	12	78
Female	1357	40	12	44
1978				
Male	1596	32	15	81
Female	3074	50	9.8	67

Table 10 (Continued)
PEORIA: 1976 and 1978

Race, Age, and Sex of Household Head, House- hold Income, Length of Time at Present Address and Type of Residence	Victimization Rate ¹			
	N	Residential Burglary A	Residential Burglary B	Household Larceny
<u>Household Income</u>				
1976				
\$0-10,000	1160	60	10	52
\$10,001 to 20,000	1447	42	14	94
\$20,000 or more	667	38	18	93
Refused	1144	38	9.6	43
1978				
\$0-10,000	976	67	1.0	51
\$10,001 to 20,000	1219	39	18	86
\$20,000 or more	1065	45	21	101
Refused	1444	31	7.6	52
<u>Length of Time at Present Address</u>				
1976				
0-2 years	1527	69	9.2	84
3-9 years	1259	35	14	79
10 or more years	1576	30	15	46
1978				
0-2 years	1527	63	9.8	92
3-9 years	1263	38	19	71
10 or more years	1820	33	8.8	58
<u>Type of Residence</u>				
1976				
Single Family	3432	45	13	65
Other	936	46	8.5	86
1978				
Single Family	3678	39	13	71
Other	949	64	7.4	77

SOURCE: 1976 - Regular Questionnaires and Victimization Reports (October-November, 1976)
1978 - Regular Questionnaires and Victimization Reports (October-November, 1978)

Base: 1976 - Weighted Regular Questionnaire response (N = 4434)
1978 - Weighted Regular Questionnaire response (N = 4704)

¹ The victimization rate is the number of households per thousand households that were victimized.

Table 11

Percent of Victims Reporting to the Police by Crime
JOLIET: 1976 and 1978

Crimes	1976		1978	
	Percent of Cases Reported	Number of Cases	Percent of Cases Reported	Number of Cases
Robbery	70%	15	69%	20
Aggravated Assault	67	49	58	53
Other Assaults	38	75	42	100
Residential Burglary A	62	242	63	222
Residential Burglary B	64	79	66	87
Household Larceny	<u>52</u>	<u>297</u>	<u>46</u>	<u>312</u>
Total	57%	757	54%	797

SOURCE: 1976 - Victimization Reports (October-November, 1976)
1978 - Victimization Reports (October-November, 1978)

Table 12

Percent of Victims Reporting to the Police by Crime
PEORIA: 1976 and 1978

Crimes	1976		1978	
	Percent of Cases Reported	Number of Cases	Percent of Cases Reported	Number of Cases
Robbery	61%	14	78%	16
Aggravated Assault	69	50	64	40
Other Assaults	49	82	40	91
Residential Burglary A	58	197	58	204
Residential Burglary B	50	54	60	55
Household Larceny	<u>47</u>	<u>306</u>	<u>39</u>	<u>338</u>
Total	54%	703 ¹	49%	724

SOURCE: 1976 - Victimization Reports (October-November, 1976)
1978 - Victimization Reports (October-November, 1978)

¹Does not equal 704 because of rounding error in weighting Victimization Reports.

Table 13

Percent Reporting to the Police
JOLIET: 1976 and 1978

	1976		1978	
	Sample Victimizations	Percent Reported	Sample Victimizations	Percent Reported
<u>Personal</u>				
Black	24	46%	39	28%
White	111	51	123	58
<u>Household</u>				
Black	117	66%	73	48%
White	477	56	528	55

SOURCE: 1976 - Regular Questionnaires and Victimization Reports (October-November, 1976)
1978 - Regular Questionnaires and Victimization Reports (October-November, 1978)

Base: 1976 - Weighted victims and victimized households
(N = 729, missing cases = 28)
1978 - Weighted victims and victimized households
(N = 753, missing cases = 10)

Table 14

Percent Reporting to the Police
PEORIA: 1976 and 1978

	1976		1978	
	Sample Victimizations	Percent Reported	Sample Victimizations	Percent Reported
<u>Personal</u>				
Black	34	65%	26	38%
White	111	56	47	52
<u>Household</u>				
Black	72	51%	74	51%
White	473	52	516	47

SOURCE: 1976 - Regular Questionnaires and Victimization Reports (October-November, 1976)
1978 - Regular Questionnaires and Victimization Reports (October-November, 1978)

Base: 1976 - Weighted victims and victimized households (N = 690, missing cases = 14)
1978 - Weighted victims and victimized households (N = 663, missing cases = 4)

Table 15

Reasons Incident Was Not Reported to Police by Race In
JOLIET: 1976 and 1978

	1976				1978			
	¹ Personal		² Household		¹ Personal		² Household	
	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White
<u>Reasons Incident Was Not Reported to the Police</u>								
Nothing could be done; lack of proof	8%	14%	28%	20%	9%	20%	36%	31%
Did not think it important enough	42	6	22	36	32	46	22	39
Police wouldn't want to be bothered	0	4	8	10	4	6	13	5
Didn't want to take time	0	0	2	4	4	1	3	2
Private or personal matter	17	31	2	5	25	28	4	6
Did not want to get involved	33	8	8	4	7	5	3	1
Afraid of reprisal	0	10	2	1	4	0	0	2
Other	<u>33</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>42</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>39</u>	<u>28</u>
	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
	(12)	(51)	(40)	(208)	(23)	(75)	(122)	(377)

SOURCE: 1976 - Regular Questionnaires and Victimization Reports (October-November, 1976)
1978 - Regular Questionnaires and Victimization Reports (October-November, 1978)

Base: 1976 - Weighted victims and households that did not report incident to police (N = 311, Missing cases = 60)
1978 - Weighted victims and households that did not report incident to police (N = 597, Missing cases = 93)

¹ Race of victim for robbery and assault.

² Race of household head for burglary and larceny.

*Percentages add to more than 100 because of multiple responses.

Table 16

Reasons Incident Was Not Reported to Police by Race In
PEORIA: 1976 and 1978

	1976				1978			
	¹ Personal		² Household		¹ Personal		² Household	
	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White
<u>Reasons Incident Was Not Reported to the Police</u>								
Nothing could be done; lack of proof	17%	12%	26%	24%	0%	14%	12%	21%
Did not think it important enough	33	29	26	36	53	36	48	35
Police wouldn't want to be bothered	0	6	15	5	0	4	4	9
Didn't want to take time	0	0	0	6	0	2	2	2
Private or personal matter	0	22	18	5	16	32	10	18
Did not want to get involved	0	4	0	1	6	2	4	2
Afraid of reprisal	25	6	0	1	0	11	0	6
Other	<u>33</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>38</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>30</u>
Total	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
	(12)	(49)	(34)	(224)	(19)	(68)	(31)	(147)

SOURCE: 1976 - Regular Questionnaires and Victimization Reports (October-November, 1976)

1978 - Regular Questionnaires and Victimization Reports (October-November, 1978)

Base: 1976 - Weighted victims and households that did not report incident to police (N = 319, missing cases = 39)

1978 - Weighted victims and households that did not report incident to police (N = 266, missing cases = 75)

¹ Race of victim for robbery and assault.

² Race of household head for burglary and larceny.

*Percentages add to more than 100 because of multiple responses.

Table 17

Police Improvement by Race In
JOLIET: 1976 and 1978

	1976		1978	
	Black	White	Black	White
<u>Ways Local Police Could Improve</u>				
No improvement needed	8%	13%	6%	9%
Hire more policemen	12	12	6	11
Concentrate on more important duties, serious crimes, etc.	8	3	1	*
Be more prompt, responsive, alert	22	7	11	8
Improve training, raise qualifications or pay	1	4	0	1
Be more courteous, improve attitude, community relations	11	4	1	2
Don't discriminate	4	1	1	0
Need more traffic control	3	8	5	2
Need more of a particular type of police service	25	23	24	24
Don't know	33	36	44	44
Other	<u>19</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>8</u>
Total	*	*	*	*
	(108)	(617)	(98)	(619)

SOURCE: 1976 - Regular and Attitudinal Questionnaires (October-November, 1976)
1978 - Regular and Attitudinal Questionnaires (October-November, 1978)

Base: 1976 - Weighted victims and households that did not report incident to police (N = 725, missing cases = 29)
1978 - Weighted victims and households that did not report incident to police (N = 717, missing cases = 10)

*Percentages add to more than 100 because of multiple responses.

Table 18

Police Improvement by Race In
PEORIA: 1976 and 1978

	1976		1978	
	Black	White	Black	White
<u>Ways Local Police Could Improve</u>				
No improvement needed	7%	8%	18%	19%
Hire more policemen	6	10	11	19
Concentrate on more important duties, serious crimes, etc.	7	5	9	6
Be more prompt, responsive, alert	19	8	12	6
Improve training, raise qualifications or pay	0	3	1	2
Be more courteous, improve attitude, community relations	20	7	8	4
Don't discriminate	2	1	2	1
Need more traffic control	1	7	4	7
Need more of a particular type of police service	22	24	21	18
Don't know	30	37	34	37
Other	<u>10</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>14</u>
Total	*	*	*	*
	(56)	(625)	(91)	(717)

SOURCE: 1976 - Regular and Attitudinal Questionnaires (October-November, 1976)
1978 - Regular and Attitudinal Questionnaires (October-November, 1978)

Base: 1976 - Weighted victims and households that did not report incident to police (N = 681, missing cases = 10)
1978 - Weighted victims and households that did not report incident to police (N = 808, missing cases = 14)

*Percentages add to more than 100 because of multiple responses.

Table 19

Attitudes About Crime and the Police
By Race, Age, and Sex of Respondent In
JOLIET: 1976 and 1978

Age, race and sex of respondent	Percent of Respondents Who:			
	Think police protection is poor in own neighborhood	Feel crime in own neighbor- hood is a big problem	Feel crime in neighbor- hood has increased	Feel very un- safe alone at night in own neighborhood
<u>Total</u>				
1976	11	11	25	22
1978	11	8	20	17
<u>Race</u>				
1976				
Black	21	31	41	33
White	9	7	22	19
1978				
Black	18	13	20	26
White	10	8	19	15
<u>Age</u>				
1976				
16-25 years	13	14	26	14
26-59 years	12	10	26	19
60 years or older	7	9	21	34
1978				
16-25 years	11	7	17	14
26-59 years	11	9	24	13
60 years or older	11	9	13	31
<u>Sex</u>				
1976				
Male	9	12	24	10
Female	12	10	25	30
1978				
Male	11	8	18	7
Female	11	9	20	22

SOURCE: 1976 - Regular and Attitudinal Questionnaires (October-November, 1976)
1978 - Regular and Attitudinal Questionnaires (October-November, 1978)

Base: 1976 - Weighted attitudinal responses (N = 754)
1978 - Weighted attitudinal responses (N = 759)

Table 20

Attitudes About Crime and the Police
By Race, Age, and Sex of Respondent In
PEORIA: 1976 and 1978

Age, race and sex of respondent	Percent of Respondents Who:			
	Think police protection is poor in own neighborhood	Feel crime in own neighbor- hood is a big problem	Feel crime in neighbor- hood has increased	Feel very un- safe alone at night in own neighborhood
<u>Total</u>				
1976	9	7	18	17
1978	8	6	10	20
<u>Race</u>				
1976				
Black	17	14	30	28
White	8	6	17	16
1978				
Black	12	12	15	26
White	8	5	10	19
<u>Age</u>				
1976				
16-25 years	8	9	19	13
26-59 years	8	8	19	11
60 years or older	12	4	17	34
1978				
16-25 years	6	5	16	12
26-59 years	10	7	9	15
60 years or older	8	5	11	34
<u>Sex</u>				
1976				
Male	6	5	18	4
Female	11	9	18	26
1978				
Male	7	6	10	8
Female	9	6	11	25

SOURCE: 1976 - Regular and Attitudinal Questionnaires (October-November, 1976)
1978 - Regular and Attitudinal Questionnaires (October-November, 1978)

Base: 1976 - Weighted attitudinal responses (N = 691)
1978 - Weighted attitudinal responses (N = 821)

Table 21

Attitudes by Age In
JOLIET: 1976 and 1978

	<u>16 - 25</u>	<u>26 - 59</u>	<u>60 or older</u>
<hr/>			
Crime in Neighborhood Is Not a Problem			
1976	55%	57%	77%
1978	63	60	75
Good Police Protection in Neighborhood			
1976	40%	49%	57%
1978	52	55	58

SOURCE: 1976 - Regular and Attitudinal Questionnaires (October-November, 1976)
1978 - Regular and Attitudinal Questionnaires (October-November, 1978)

Base: 1976 - Weighted attitudinal responses (N = 754)
1978 - Weighted attitudinal responses (N = 759)

Table 22

Attitudes by Age In
PEORIA: 1976 and 1978

	<u>16 - 25</u>	<u>26 - 59</u>	<u>60 or older</u>
Crime in Neighborhood Is Not a Problem			
1976	62%	64%	70%
1978	73	68	76
Good Police Protection in Neighborhood			
1976	53%	52%	47%
1978	49	59	61

SOURCE: 1976 - Regular and Attitudinal Questionnaires (October-November, 1976)
1978 - Regular and Attitudinal Questionnaires (October-November, 1978)

Base: 1976 - Weighted attitudinal responses (N = 691)
1978 - Weighted attitudinal responses (N = 821)

Table 23

Attitudes About the Criminal Justice System In
JOLIET: 1976 and 1978

Age, race and sex of respondent	Median Ranking Of: ¹			
	Local police	Local judges	Corrections system	Local criminal justice system
<u>Total</u>				
1976	5	2	3	4
1978	5	3	3	4
<u>Race</u>				
1976				
Black	5	3	4	4
White	5	2	3	4
1978				
Black	5	5	5	5
White	5	3	3	4
<u>Age</u>				
1976				
16-25 years	5	3	4	5
26-59 years	5	2	3	4
60 years or older	5	2	4	4
1978				
16-25 years	5	5	5	5
26-59 years	5	3	3	4
60 years or older	4	2	3	4
<u>Sex</u>				
1976				
Male	5	2	3	4
Female	5	3	3	4
1978				
Male	5	3	3	5
Female	5	3	3	4

SOURCE: 1976 - Regular and Attitudinal Questionnaires (October-November, 1976)
1978 - Regular and Attitudinal Questionnaires (October-November, 1978)

Base: 1976 - Weighted attitudinal responses (N = 754)
1978 - Weighted attitudinal responses (N = 759)

¹A '1' is "Much too lenient" and a '9' is "Much too harsh."

Table 24

Attitudes About the Criminal Justice System In
PEORIA: 1976 and 1978

Age, race and sex of respondent	Median Ranking Of: ¹			
	Local police	Local judges	Corrections system	Local criminal justice system
<u>Total</u>				
1976	5	3	3	4
1978	5	3	3	5
<u>Race</u>				
1976				
Black	5	4	4	5
White	5	3	3	4
1978				
Black	5	5	5	5
White	5	3	3	5
<u>Age</u>				
1976				
16-25 years	5	4	4	5
26-59 years	5	3	3	4
60 years or older	5	2	2	4
1978				
16-25 years	5	5	4	5
26-59 years	5	3	4	5
60 years or older	5	3	3	5
<u>Sex</u>				
1976				
Male	5	3	3	4
Female	5	3	3	4
1978				
Male	5	3	3	5
Female	5	3	3	5

SOURCE: 1976 - Regular and Attitudinal Questionnaires (October-November, 1976)
1978 - Regular and Attitudinal Questionnaires (October-November, 1978)

Base: 1976 - Weighted attitudinal responses (N = 691)
1978 - Weighted attitudinal responses (N = 821)

¹A '1' is "Much too lenient" and a '9' is "Much too harsh."

4. DIFFERENCES BETWEEN VICTIMIZATION AND POLICE STATISTICS

This section summarizes the distinctions between measures of crime derived from victimization data and official crime counts made by local police departments. It is extremely important to be familiar with differences between these two data sets in attempting to interpret either one.

The essential distinction between victimization and official measures of crime is reflected in their respective collection procedures. Statistical estimates of victimizations and victimization rates are made from responses to questions asked of a representative sample of the population of interest. Crimes are classified according to various combinations of responses to questions, established by predesignated rules. Rates are calculated from the responses themselves and are associated with statistically distributed confidence intervals which are a function of the size of the sample, the calculated rate, the size of the population at risk, and a designated level of confidence one wants in the estimate. By contrast, official data are counts of criminal events which come to the attention of a law enforcement agency, either by direct observation or by the reporting of the events by others. As with the survey, rules exist for counting and classifying reports of crime. However, such counts are population counts, where in this instance the population refers to the number of crime reports coming to official attention, and not the population of people at risk of being victimized. Rates are generally obtained by dividing these counts by the total population served by the agency, and expressing the result as crimes per 100,000 people.*

The basic distinction described above accounts for most of the differences between official counts and estimates of the number of victimizations. It is probably safe to state that the victimization estimates are generally larger than their corresponding official counts predominantly because of the fact that not all crimes come to official attention. However, other factors may create a positive bias in police statistics. One is the geographic area over which these measures are taken. Survey questions ask residents within

*Note that for a given time frame, this procedure yields no information about differences in the risk of victimization for different population groups.

the jurisdictional limits of the department, regardless of the residence of the victims. From this perspective, official statistics are drawn from a larger geographical base than are victimization estimates.* Another factor distinguishing victimization from official measures is the difference in the age groups for the two. Personal victimizations were calculated for people of age sixteen or above in our survey, while younger victims are included in official statistics. A third factor affecting the difference between victimization and official statistics relates to the limited types of dwelling units contacted in the victimization survey. Institutional groups (e.g., hotels, motels, hospitals, dormitories, and so forth) were not included in our survey. Thus victimization estimates derived from our survey understate official statistics to the degree that people having these types of living arrangements (on a permanent or temporary basis) were victimized and reported the events to the police.

Both survey and official measures of crime include attempted as well as completed crimes. As we noted in our 1976 report, instances where a crime was attempted with no discernable consequence to the victim (e.g., nothing stolen nor injury suffered) often were not reported to the police. In those cases where attempts are brought to the attention of the police, these are counted in official statistics unless a subsequent determination is made that a case is unfounded. In sum, it would appear that the inclusion of attempts in both survey and official measures would lead to greater numbers of victimizations and higher victimization rates, relative to official statistics.

We also note that the Uniform Crime Reporting System of the FBI includes a set of relatively intricate rules for classifying and scoring crimes. The extent to which these are followed by local law enforcement agencies, and their compatibility with the classification criteria used in our survey is difficult to assess. However, this should serve as a further caution that should be exercised in comparing victimization estimates with official crime counts.

As stated in Section 2, commercial victimizations are not included in the scope of our survey. Care was taken to exclude cases where a respondent

*For example, a study performed by the Peoria Crime Reduction Program indicated that over a period of almost eight months, 37 of 190 victims of highway robbery and purse snatch were found to have resided outside Peoria City limits.

witnessed a commercial crime or was an employee of a commercial establishment when a crime was committed against the business, unless the respondent was personally victimized.

In sum, we would generally advise against attempts to integrate victimization and police statistics on the grounds that more is lost to differences in the conceptual frameworks and techniques used in deriving these statistics than can be gained through partially successful integration of the two.

5. CONCLUDING REMARK

As previously mentioned, the findings of our survey were intended as but one of several indicators in evaluating the impact of the Joliet program on robbery and burglary, and that of the Peoria program on residential burglary. Other indicators will be derived from our analysis of official statistics, local evaluations of action projects funded under each program, and our own observations.

The utility of the surveys even as an indicator may be limited by virtue of the fact that they provide victimization rate estimates only for two six-month time frames, and consequently are unable to measure continuous change over time. However, it may be possible to interpret the survey findings with greater insight in the context of these other indicators.

APPENDIX A

SURVEY INSTRUMENTS AND
WEIGHTED FREQUENCY TABULATIONS

APPENDIX A:
SURVEY INSTRUMENTS AND
WEIGHTED FREQUENCY TABULATIONS

This appendix contains copies of the questionnaires and the weighted percentage of times each questionnaire box was checked in response to an interview question. The weighted number of cases on which the distribution is based is indicated underneath in parentheses. Each respondent indicating a check in a box counts once, but the cases themselves are weighted by the reciprocal of the number of distinct telephone numbers in the household, so that cases can occur as fractional values (only five percent of those contacted had more than one telephone number).

The Regular Questionnaire appears first, followed by the weighted frequencies for Joliet, then Peoria. Following this same sequence are the Attitudinal Questionnaire and the Victimization Report.

Abt Associates Inc.
35 Wheeler Street
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138

October, 1978
REGULAR

PHONE NUMBER
(2-8)

Location: Peoria ☐
Joliet ☒

1-1

Day of Week	Month	Day	Time	Inter- viewer	Complete	RESULTS		Business #	Busy	No Answer	Other (SPECIFY)
						Refusal					

1. During the last six months, that is, since ____ (date) ____, did anyone take something directly from you by using force, such as by a stick-up, mugging, or threat; or did anyone try to rob you by using force or threatening to harm you?

NO ☐ 9-1

YES ☐ -2

ASK A → 1A.

How many times did this happen in the past six months?

times
(10)

FILL OUT VICTIMIZATION REPORT FOR EACH
"ROBBERY" INCIDENT.

(Aside from anything already mentioned)

2. In the last six months, did anyone beat you up, attack you, or hit you, or did anyone threaten to beat you up or otherwise threaten you? By threat, we mean threats where you really believed you were going to get hurt.

NO ☐ 11-1

YES ☐ -2

ASK A → 2A.

How many times did this happen in the past six months?

times
(12)

FILL OUT VICTIMIZATION REPORT FOR EACH
"ASSAULT" INCIDENT.

(Aside from anything already mentioned)

3. During the last six months, since ____ (date) ____, did anyone break into or somehow illegally get into your home, garage, or another building on your property, or did you find a door jimmied, a lock forced, or any other signs of an attempted break-in?

NO ☐ 13-1

YES ☐ -2

ASK A → 3A.

How many times did this happen in the past six months?

times
(14)

FILL OUT VICTIMIZATION REPORT FOR EACH
"BURGLARY" INCIDENT.

(Aside from anything already mentioned)

4. Did anyone steal anything that belonged to you, other than a car, truck, or motor vehicle or ATTEMPT to steal anything that belonged to you in the last six months? Do not include pickpocketing or purse-snatching.

NO ☐ 15-1

YES ☐ -2

ASK A → 4A.

How many times did this happen in the past six months?

times
(16)

FILL OUT VICTIMIZATION REPORT FOR EACH
"LARCENY" INCIDENT.

5. INTERVIEWER -- CHECK SEX OF RESPONDENT:

MALE ☐ 17-1

FEMALE ☐ -2

6. How old are you? READ CATEGORIES.

16-21 <input type="checkbox"/> 18-1	30-39 <input type="checkbox"/> -4	60-69 <input type="checkbox"/> -7
22-25 <input type="checkbox"/> -2	40-49 <input type="checkbox"/> -5	70 or older <input type="checkbox"/> -8
26-29 <input type="checkbox"/> -3	50-59 <input type="checkbox"/> -6	refused <input type="checkbox"/> -9

7. What race are you?

Black ☐ 19-1 White ☐ -2 Other ☐ -3 Refused ☐ -4

8. Are you the head of this household?

YES ☐ 20-1 NO ☐ -2

→ SKIP TO Q. 12

9. How old is the head of this household? READ CATEGORIES

18-21 <input type="checkbox"/> 21-1	30-39 <input type="checkbox"/> -4	60-69 <input type="checkbox"/> -7
22-25 <input type="checkbox"/> -2	40-49 <input type="checkbox"/> -5	70 or older <input type="checkbox"/> -8
26-29 <input type="checkbox"/> -3	50-59 <input type="checkbox"/> -6	refused <input type="checkbox"/> -9

10. Is the head of this household male or female?

Male ☐ 22-1 Female ☐ -2

11. What race (is he/she)?

Black ☐ 23-1 White ☐ -2 Other ☐ -3 Refused ☐ -4

12. Which of the following categories best describes the total annual income of everyone over 12 in your household who lives here? By annual income we mean things like wages and salaries (before taxes), commissions, tips, bonuses, dividends, interest, pensions, and regular government or public assistance checks. Is your household's total yearly income (READ CATEGORIES)?

\$0 - 3000 per year <input type="checkbox"/> 24-1	\$10,001 - 15,000 per year <input type="checkbox"/> -4	\$30,001 - 40,000 per year <input type="checkbox"/> -7
\$3001 - 6000 per year <input type="checkbox"/> -2	\$15,001 - 20,000 per year <input type="checkbox"/> -5	over \$40,000 per year <input type="checkbox"/> -8
\$6001 - 10,000 per year <input type="checkbox"/> -3	\$20,001 - 30,000 per year <input type="checkbox"/> -6	refused <input type="checkbox"/> -9

13. How long have you been living at your present address?

less than 6 months ☐ 25-1
6 months - less than a year ☐ -2
1 year - less than 3 years ☐ -3
3 years - less than 5 years ☐ -4
5 years - less than 10 years ☐ -5
10 years or more ☐ -6
don't know ☐ -7
refused ☐ -9

13A. Where did you live six months ago?

Joliet ☐ 26-1
Peoria ☐ -2
elsewhere in Illinois ☐ -3
elsewhere in U.S. ☐ -4
outside U.S. ☐ -5

14. Do you live in a single-family house?

YES ☐ 27-1

NO ☐ -2

REFUSED ☐ -9

15. Do you have another phone number, at this address, where you can receive calls?

ASK A
YES ☐ 28-1

NO ☐ -2

REFUSED ☐ -9

15A. By phone number, we do not mean extension phones. All together, how many different phone lines are there in your home?

☐ phones
(29)

Thank you very much for your cooperation. Goodbye.

For office use only:

converted refusal ☐ 30-1

Spanish ☐ -2

Table A-1
Weighted Frequencies - Regular Questionnaire
JOLIET: 1976 and 1978

<u>Question</u>	<u>1976</u>	<u>1978</u>
1. During the last six months, that is, since <u>(date)</u> , did anyone take something directly from you by using force, such as by a stick-up, mugging, or threat; or did anyone try to rob you by using force or threatening to harm you? .		
No	99%	99%
Yes	*	1
Refused	0	*
Omitted in error	*	*
Total	99% (4413)	100% (4667)
1A. How many times did this happen in the past six months? (Only answered by those that responded "Yes" to Question 1.)		
1	79%	95%
2	17	3
3	0	3
4	4	0
Total	100% (24)	101% (37)
2. In the past six months, did anyone beat you up, attack you, or hit you, or did anyone threaten to beat you up or otherwise threaten you? By threat, we mean threats where you really believed you were going to get hurt.		
No	98%	98%
Yes	2	2
Refused	*	*
Omitted in error	*	*
Total	100% (4413)	100% (4667)
2A. How many times did this happen in the last six months? (Only answered by those that responded "Yes" to Question 2.)		
1	78%	66%
2	18	25
3	3	6
4	1	2
Total	100% (102)	99% (106)

*Less than 0.5 percent.

Question19761978

3. During the last six months, since (date), did anyone break into or somehow illegally get into your home, garage, or another building on your property, or did you find a door jimmied, a lock forced, or any other signs of an attempted break-in?

No	92%	94%
Yes	7	6
Refused	*	*
Omitted in error	*	*
Total	99%	100%
	(4413)	(4667)

3A. How many times did this happen in the last six months? (Only answered by those that responded "Yes" to Question 3.)

1	85%	86%
2	11	11
3	3	1
4	0	1
5	*	0
More than 5	0	*
Total	99%	99%
	(326)	(301)

4. Did anyone steal anything that belonged to you, other than a car, truck, or motor vehicle or ATTEMPT to steal anything that belonged to you in the last six months? Do not include pickpocketing or purse-snatching.

No	93%	94%
Yes	6	5
Refused	0	0
Omitted in error	1	*
Total	100%	100%
	(4413)	(4667)

4A. How many times did this happen in the last six months? (Only answered by those that responded "Yes" to Question 4.)

1	86%	88%
2	10	10
3	3	2
4	1	1
Total	100%	101%
	(279)	(299)

*Less than 0.5 percent.

Question1976 1978

5. Sex of respondent.

Female	67%	68%
Male	32	32
Omitted in error	<u>1</u>	<u>*</u>
Total	100%	100%
	(4413)	(4667)

6. How old are you?

16-21	10%	12%
22-25	10	10
26-29	10	10
30-39	16	20
40-49	13	12
50-59	15	14
60-69	13	12
70 or older	10	9
Refused	1	2
Omitted in error	<u>*</u>	<u>*</u>
Total	99%	101%
	(4413)	(4667)

7. What race are you?

Black	13%	13%
White	84	82
Other	3	3
Refused	*	2
Omitted in error	<u>*</u>	<u>*</u>
Total	100%	100%
	(4413)	(4667)

8. Are you the head of this household?

Yes	57%	84%
No	43	16
Refused	*	*
Omitted in error	<u>*</u>	<u>*</u>
Total	100%	100%
	(4413)	(4667)

*Less than 0.5 percent.

Question19761978

9. How old is the head of this household? (Only answered by those who responded "No" to Question 8.)

16-21	2%	1%
22-25	8	3
26-29	9	4
30-39	23	16
40-49	22	30
50-59	19	23
60-69	11	14
70 or older	5	5
Refused	1	5
Omitted in error	*	0
Total	100%	101%
	(1886)	(745)

10. Is the head of this household male or female? (Only answered by those who responded "No" to Question 8.)

Female	7%	19%
Male	92	78
Refused	*	4
Omitted in error	1	0
Total	100%	101%
	(1886)	(740)

11. What race is (he/she)? (Only answered by those who responded "No" to Question 8.)

Black	12%	12%
White	83	80
Other	4	4
Refused	*	4
Omitted in error	1	*
Total	100%	100%
	(1886)	(741)

Question

1976 1978

12. Which of the following categories best describes the total annual income of everyone over 12 in your household who lives here? By annual income we mean things like wages and salaries (before taxes), commissions, tips, bonuses, dividends, interest, pensions and regular government or public assistance checks. Is your household's total yearly income

\$0-3000	8%	5%
\$3001-6000	10	7
\$6001-10,000	11	8
\$10,001-15,000	20	13
\$15,001-20,000	14	15
\$20,001-30,000	9	14
\$30,001-40,000	2	4
Over \$40,000	1	2
Refused	25	33
Omitted in error	*	*
Total	100% (4413)	101% (4667)

13. How long have you been living at your present address?

Less than 6 months	9%	8%
6 months or more but less than 1 year	6	6
1 year or more but less than 3 years	16	18
3 years or more but less than 5 years	11	10
5 years or more but less than 10 years	16	15
10 years or more	40	40
Don't know	*	*
Refused	1	3
Omitted in error	*	*
Total	99% (4413)	100% (4667)

- 13A. Where did you live six months ago? (Only answered by those who responded "Less than 6 months" to Question 13.)

Joliet	66%	54%
Peoria	*	*
Elsewhere in Illinois	24	35
Elsewhere in U.S.	8	10
Outside U.S.	1	*
Refused	0	*
Omitted in error	1	0
	100% (380)	99% (374)

<u>Question</u>	<u>1976</u>	<u>1978</u>
14. Do you live in a single-family house?		
Yes	74%	74%
No	25	23
Refused	1	2
Omitted in error	*	*
	<u>100%</u>	<u>99%</u>
Total	(4413)	(4667)
15. Do you have another phone number, at this address, where you can receive calls?		
Yes	5%	5%
No	94	92
Refused	1	3
Omitted in error	*	*
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>
Total	(4413)	(4667)
15A. By phone number, we do not mean extension phones. All together, how many different phone lines are there in your home? (Only answered by those who answered "Yes" to Question 15.)		
2	84%	96%
3	2	3
4 or more	*	*
Omitted in error	15	*
	<u>101%</u>	<u>99%</u>
Total	(213)	(239)

Source: Regular Questionnaires (October-Novemeber, 1976 and 1978)
Data Base: Weighted households asked the regular questions (N=4413 in 1976;
N=4667 in 1978).

*Less than 0.5 percent

Table A-2

Weighted Frequencies - Regular Questionnaire
PEORIA: 1976 and 1978

<u>Question</u>	<u>1976</u>	<u>1978</u>
1. During the last six months, that is, since <u>(date)</u> , did anyone take something directly from you by using force, such as by a stick-up, mugging, or threat; or did anyone try to rob you by using force or threatening to harm you?		
No	99%	100%
Yes	*	*
Refused	0	*
Omitted in error	*	*
Total	99%	100%
	(4434)	(4704)
1A. How many times did this happen in the past six months? (Only answered by those that responded "Yes" to Question 1.)		
1	92%	95%
2	8	0
3	0	5
4	0	0
Total	100%	100%
	(26)	(21)
2. In the past six months, did anyone beat you up, attack you, or hit you, or did anyone threaten to beat you up or otherwise threaten you? By threat, we mean threats where you really believed you were going to get hurt.		
No	97%	98%
Yes	2	2
Refused	*	*
Omitted in error	*	*
Total	99%	100%
	(4434)	(4704)
2A. How many times did this happen in the last six months? (Only answered by those that responded "Yes" to Question 2.)		
1	74%	88%
2	18	9
3	5	3
4	3	0
Total	100%	100%
	(103)	(117)

*Less than 0.5 percent

Question19761978

3. During the last six months, since (date), did anyone break into or somehow illegally get into your home, garage, or another building on your property, or did you find a door jimmied, a lock forced, or any other signs of an attempted break-in?

No	94%	94%
Yes	6	6
Refused	*	*
Omitted in error	*	*
Total	100%	100%
	(4434)	(4704)

3A. How many times did this happen in the last six months? (Only answered by those that responded "Yes" to Question 3.)

1	88%	86%
2	10	12
3	1	2
4	0	*
5	*	0
More than 5	*	*
Total	99%	100%
	(270)	(266)

4. Did anyone steal anything that belonged to you, other than a car, truck, or motor vehicle or ATTEMPT to steal anything that belonged to you in the last six months? Do not include pickpocketing or purse-snatching.

No	92%	93%
Yes	6	7
Refused	*	*
Omitted in error	1	*
Total	99%	100%
	(4434)	(4704)

4A. How many times did this happen in the last six months? (Only answered by those that responded "Yes" to Question 4.)

1	91%	89%
2	8	10
3	1	1
4	*	*
Total	100%	100%
	(288)	(326)

<u>Question</u>	<u>1976</u>	<u>1978</u>
5. Sex of respondent..		
Female	64%	69%
Male	34	31
Omitted in error	<u>1</u>	<u>*</u>
Total	99%	100%
	(4434)	(4704)
6. How old are you?		
16-21	10%	9%
22-25	11	10
26-29	10	10
30-39	17	17
40-49	12	11
50-59	14	14
60-69	13	13
70 or older	11	13
Refused	1	2
Omitted in error	<u>*</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	99%	99%
	(4434)	(4704)
7. What race are you?		
Black	9%	9%
White	89	90
Other	1	1
Refused	1	1
Omitted in error	<u>*</u>	<u>*</u>
Total	100%	101%
	(4434)	(4704)
8. Are you the head of this household?		
Yes	59%	90%
No	40	10
Refused	*	*
Omitted in error	<u>*</u>	<u>*</u>
Total	99%	100%
	(4434)	(4704)

Question1976 1978

9. How old is the head of this household? (Only answered by those who responded "No" to Question 8.)

16-21	2%	1%
22-25	7	2
26-29	9	1
30-39	21	16
40-49	21	34
50-59	20	26
60-69	12	10
70 or older	7	5
Refused	1	6
Omitted in error	1	*
Total	101%	101%
	(1778)	(442)

10. Is the head of this household male or female? (Only answered by those who responded "No" to Question 8.)

Female	6%	25%
Male	93	75
Refused	*	1
Omitted in error	1	*
Total	100%	101%
	(1778)	(452)

11. What race is (he/she)? (Only answered by those who responded "No" to Question 8.)

Black	7%	16%
White	90	79
Other	1	*
Refused	1	6
Omitted in error	1	*
Total	100%	101%
	(1778)	(431)

*Less than 0.5 percent

Question1976 1978

12. Which of the following categories best describes the total annual income of everyone over 12 in your household who lives here? By annual income we mean things like wages and salaries (before taxes), commissions, tips, bonuses, dividends, interest, pensions and regular government or public assistance checks. Is your household's total yearly income

\$0-3000	7%	5%
\$3001-6000	8	7
\$6001-10,000	10	9
\$10,001-15,000	18	12
\$15,001-20,000	14	14
\$20,001-30,000	11	15
\$30,001-40,000	3	5
Over \$40,000	2	2
Refused	26	30
Omitted in error	*	*
Total	99%	101%
	(4434)	(4704)

13. How long have you been living at your present address?

Less than 6 months	10%	10%
6 months or more but less than 1 year	7	5
1 year or more but less than 3 years	17	17
3 years or more but less than 5 years	12	11
5 years or more but less than 10 years	16	16
10 years or more	36	39
Don't know	*	*
Refused	1	2
Omitted in error	*	*
Total	99%	100%
	(4434)	(4704)

- 13A. Where did you live six months ago? (Only answered by those who responded "Less than 6 months" to Question 13.)

Joliet	1%	1%
Peoria	62	61
Elsewhere in Illinois	24	27
Elsewhere in U.S.	11	10
Outside U.S.	1	1
Refused	0	*
Omitted in error	1	0
Total	100%	100%
	(439)	(470)

*Less than 0.5 percent

<u>Question</u>	<u>1976</u>	<u>1978</u>
14. Do you live in a single-family house?		
Yes	77%	78%
No	21	20
Refused	1	2
Omitted in error	*	*
Total	99% (4434)	100% (4704)
15. Do you have another phone number, at this address, where you can receive calls?		
Yes	5%	5%
No	94	93
Refused	1	1
Omitted in error	*	*
Total	100% (4434)	100% (4704)
15A. By phone number, we do not mean extension phones. All together, how many different phone lines are there in your home? (Only answered by those who answered "Yes" to Question 15.)		
2	86%	96%
3	2	3
4 or more	*	*
Omitted in error	12	*
Total	100% (207)	99% (225)

Source: Regular Questionnaires (October-November, 1976 and 1978)
Data Base: Weighted households asked the regular questions (N=4434 in 1976;
N=4704 in 1978)

*Less than 0.5 percent

PHONE NUMBER

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

(2-8)

Location: Peoria ☐

Joliet ☒

1-2

Day of Week	Month	Day	Time	Inter-viewer	Complete	RESULTS		Busy	No Answer	Respondent Not In	Other (SPECIFY)
						Refusal	Business #				

INTERVIEWER INSTRUCTIONS: IS THE LAST DIGIT OF THE PHONE NUMBER ODD OR EVEN?

ODD ☐ → RESPONDENT SHOULD BE MALE ADULT

EVEN ☐ → RESPONDENT SHOULD BE FEMALE ADULT

IF PERSON ANSWERING PHONE IS NOT OF THE APPROPRIATE SEX AND AGE, ASK:

"IS THERE A (MALE/FEMALE) ADULT IN THIS HOUSEHOLD?"

NO ☐ → PROCEED WITH INTERVIEW

YES ☐ → SAY: "WE NEED TO GET THE OPINIONS OF EQUAL NUMBERS OF MALES AND FEMALES. SO, I NEED TO TALK TO A (FEMALE/MALE) IN THIS HOUSEHOLD. CAN I SPEAK WITH (HER/HIM) NOW?"

YES ☐ → PROCEED WITH INTERVIEW, RE-READ INTRODUCTION.

NO ☐ → RESCHEDULE INTERVIEW.

I'm going to begin by asking you a few questions about your neighborhood.

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

DON'T
KNOW

1. Do you think police protection in your neighborhood is good, fair or poor? ☐ 9-1 ☐ -2 ☐ -3 ☐ -4
2. What do you think about the speed with which the fire department comes to your neighborhood when called--is that good, fair, or poor? ☐ 10-1 ☐ -2 ☐ -3 ☐ -4

3. Compared to (Joliet/Peoria) as a whole, do you think police protection in your neighborhood is much better, better, about the same, worse, or much worse than in other parts of town?

much better than in other parts of town? ☐ 11-1

better than in other parts of town? ☐ -2

about the same as in other parts of town? ☐ -3

worse than in other parts of town? ☐ -4

much worse than in other parts of town? ☐ -5

don't know ☐ -6

4. In what ways could your local police improve? Any other ways? CHECK ALL THAT APPLY.

No improvement needed ☐ 12-1

Hire more policemen ☐ 13-1

Concentrate on more important duties, serious crime, etc. ☐ 14-1

Be more prompt, responsive, alert ☐ 15-1

Improve training, raise qualifications or pay, recruitment policies ☐ 16-1

Be more courteous, improve attitude, community relations ☐ 17-1

Don't discriminate ☐ 18-1

Need more traffic control ☐ 19-1

Need more of a particular type of police service (such as patrol cars or foot patrols) in certain areas or at certain times ☐ 20-1

Don't know ☐ 21-1

Other ☐ 22-1

Specify

5. I'll read you some things that are problems for some people in their neighborhoods. Please tell me if they are a big problem, somewhat of a problem, or not a problem to you, in your neighborhood.

	Big Problem	Somewhat of a Problem	Not a Problem	Don't Know
A. Crime in the neighborhood - is that a big problem, somewhat of a problem, or not a problem to you?	<input type="checkbox"/> 23-1	<input type="checkbox"/> -2	<input type="checkbox"/> -3	<input type="checkbox"/> -4
B. Abandoned houses or other empty buildings	<input type="checkbox"/> 24-1	<input type="checkbox"/> -2	<input type="checkbox"/> -3	<input type="checkbox"/> -4
C. Litter and trash in the streets --is that a big problem, somewhat of a problem, or not a problem to you in your neighborhood?	<input type="checkbox"/> 25-1	<input type="checkbox"/> -2	<input type="checkbox"/> -3	<input type="checkbox"/> -4

6. Within the past year or two, do you think crime in your neighborhood has increased, decreased, or remained about the same?

Increased ☐ 26-1

Decreased ☐ -2

Remained the same ☐ -3

No opinion ☐ -4

Haven't lived in neighborhood long enough ☐ -5

7. How safe do you feel or would you feel about being out alone in your neighborhood at night? Would you feel very safe, reasonably safe, somewhat unsafe, or very unsafe?

Very safe ☐ 27-1

Reasonably safe ☐ -2

Somewhat unsafe ☐ -3

Very unsafe ☐ -4

Don't know ☐ -5

8. How about during the day--how safe do you feel or would you feel about being out alone in your neighborhood? Would you feel very safe, reasonably safe, somewhat unsafe, or very unsafe?

Very safe ☐ 28-1

Reasonably safe ☐ -2

Somewhat unsafe ☐ -3

Very unsafe ☐ -4

Don't know ☐ -5

9. I'd like you to rate your feelings about the police, judges and other such officials. Please look at your phone dial and imagine that the numbers 1 to 9 represent a range of feelings from "much too lenient"--that's number "one" to "much too harsh"--that's number "nine."

- A. How lenient or harsh are the local police with someone suspected of a crime? If one is "much too lenient" and nine is "much too harsh," what number would best represent your feelings about the police?

☐ (29) (0 = DON'T KNOW OR NO OPINION)

- B. How about the local judges? How lenient or harsh are they towards offenders? Remember, one is "much too lenient" and nine is "much too harsh."

☐ (30) (0 = DON'T KNOW OR NO OPINION)

- C. How about the Corrections System? This system includes things like prisons and parole boards. How harsh or lenient are they?

☐ (31) (0 = DON'T KNOW OR NO OPINION)

- D. What number represents your feelings about the treatment people receive from the entire criminal justice system--that is, everything we just mentioned, taken together? (One means "much too lenient;" nine means "much too harsh.")

☐ (32) (0 = DON'T KNOW OR NO OPINION)

Now I'm going to ask a few other questions.
(BEGIN REGULAR INTERVIEW)

Table A-3

Weighted Frequencies - Attitudinal Questionnaire
JOLIET: 1976 and 1978

<u>Question</u>	<u>1976</u>	<u>1978</u>
1. Do you think police protection in your neighborhood is good, fair, or poor?		
Good	49%	51%
Fair	36	31
Poor	11	10
Don't know	4	7
Omitted in error	0	*
2. What do you think about the speed with which the fire department comes to your neighborhood when called--is that good, fair, or poor?		
Good	68%	64%
Fair	10	13
Poor	3	3
Don't know	18	21
Omitted in error	1	*
3. Compared to (Joliet/Peoria) as a whole, do you think police protection in your neighborhood is much better, better, about the same, worse, or much worse than in other parts of town?		
Much better than in other parts of town	4%	5%
Better than in other parts of town	23	22
About the same as in other parts of town	53	49
Worse than in other parts of town	7	7
Much worse than in other parts of town	10	1
Don't know	10	16
Omitted in error	*	*
4. In what ways could your local police improve? Any other ways? CHECK ALL THAT APPLY.		
	<u>Percent Checked**</u>	
No improvement needed	12%	9%
Hire more policemen	12	10
Concentrate on more important duties, serious crime, etc.	4	1
Be more prompt, responsive, alert	9	9
Improve training, raise qualification or pay, recruitment policies	3	1
Be more courteous, improve attitude, community relations	5	2
Don't discriminate	1	*
Need more traffic control	7	2
Need more of a particular type of police service (such as patrol cars or foot patrols) in certain areas or at certain times	23	24
Don't know	36	44
Other	16	8

*Less than 0.5 percent

**Percentage may add to more than 100% because of possible multiple responses.

Question19761978

5. I'll read you some things that are problems for some people in their neighborhoods. Please tell me if they are a big problem, somewhat of a problem, or not a problem to you in your neighborhood.

Crime in the neighborhood

Big problem	11%	8%
Somewhat of a problem	28	27
Not a problem	60	62
Don't know	1	3
Omitted in error	0	*

Abandoned houses or other empty buildings

Big problem	4%	6%
Somewhat of a problem	6	8
Not a problem	89	85
Don't know	0	1
Omitted in error	4	*

Litter and trash in the streets

Big problem	10%	10%
Somewhat of a problem	20	19
Not a problem	69	70
Don't know	0	*
Omitted in error	0	*

6. Within the past year or two, do you think crime in your neighborhood has increased, decreased, or remained about the same?

Increased	25%	20%
Decreased	6	9
Remained the same	61	60
No opinion	3	4
Haven't lived in neighborhood long enough	6	8
Omitted in error	0	*

7. How safe do you feel or would you feel about being out alone in your neighborhood at night? Would you feel very safe, reasonably safe, somewhat unsafe, or very unsafe?

Very safe	14%	17%
Reasonably safe	42	47
Somewhat unsafe	20	18
Very unsafe	22	17
Don't know	1	12
	0	*

*Less than 0.5 percent

Question19761978

8. How about during the day--how safe do you feel about being out alone in your neighborhood? Would you feel very safe, reasonably safe, somewhat unsafe, or very unsafe?

Very safe	60%	60%
Reasonably safe	34	34
Somewhat unsafe	4	3
Very unsafe	1	2
Don't know	1	1
Omitted in error	0	*

9. I'd like you to rate your feelings about the police, judges, and other such officials. Please look at your phone dial and imagine that the numbers 1 to 9 represent a range of feelings from "much too lenient"--that's number "one"--to "much too harsh"--that's number "nine."

- A. How lenient or harsh are the local police with someone suspected of a crime? If one is "much too lenient" and nine is "much too harsh," what number would best represent your feelings about the police?

1. Much too lenient	11%	12%
2.	2	2
3.	8	7
4.	13	10
5.	34	29
6.	9	9
7.	6	5
8.	2	2
9. Much too harsh	3	3
Don't know or no opinion	11	21

- B. How about the local judges? How lenient or harsh are they towards offenders? Remember, one is "much too lenient" and nine is "much too harsh."

1. Much too lenient	33%	23%
2.	11	8
3.	14	12
4.	9	8
5.	13	13
6.	4	5
7.	2	4
8.	1	2
9. Much too harsh	2	2
Don't know or no opinion	11	24

*Less than 0.5 percent

Question19761978

C. How about the Corrections Systems? This system includes things like prisons and parole boards. How harsh or lenient are they?

1. Much too lenient	20%	19%
2.	10	6
3.	13	11
4.	12	7
5.	17	13
6.	4	5
7.	2	3
8.	2	2
9. Much too harsh	2	4
Don't know or no opinion	16	29

D. What number represents your feelings about the treatment people receive from the entire criminal justice system--that is, everything we just mentioned, taken together? (One means "much too lenient;" nine means "much too harsh.")

1. Much too lenient	14%	13%
2.	4	6
3.	17	9
4.	16	12
5.	22	23
6.	7	7
7.	4	4
8.	2	1
9. Much too harsh	2	3
Don't know or no opinion	11	23

Source: Attitudinal Questionnaires (October-November, 1976 and 1978)

Data Base: Weighted respondents asked attitudinal questions (N=754 in 1976; N=759 in 1978)

*Less than 0.5 percent

Table A-4

Weighted Frequencies - Attitudinal Questionnaire
PEORIA: 1976 and 1978

<u>Question</u>	<u>1976</u>	<u>1978</u>
1. Do you think police protection in your neighborhood is good, fair, or poor?		
Good	51%	54%
Fair	36	31
Poor	9	8
Don't know	4	6
Omitted in error	0	*
2. What do you think about the speed with which the fire department comes to your neighborhood when called--is that good, fair, or poor?		
Good	61%	54%
Fair	11	8
Poor	3	2
Don't know	26	36
Omitted in error	0	*
3. Compared to (Joliet/Peoria) as a whole, do you think police protection in your neighborhood is much better, better, about the same, worse, or much worse than in other parts of town?		
Much better than in other parts of town	5%	5%
Better than in other parts of town	27	23
About the same as in other parts of town	51	46
Worse than in other parts of town	6	6
Much worse than in other parts of town	11	1
Don't know	11	20
Omitted in error	0	*
4. In what ways could your local police improve? Any other ways? CHECK ALL THAT APPLY.		
	<u>Percent Checked**</u>	
No improvement needed	8%	18%
Hire more policemen	10	10
Concentrate on more important duties, serious crime, etc.	5	6
Be more prompt, responsive, alert	9	6
Improve training, raise qualification or pay, recruitment policies	4	2
Be more courteous, improve attitude, community relations	8	4
Don't discriminate	1	1
Need more traffic control	6	7
Need more of a particular type of police service (such as patrol cars or foot patrols) in certain areas or at certain times	24	18
Don't know	36	37
Other	15	13

*Less than 0.5 percent

**Percentage may add to more than 100% because of possible multiple responses.

Question19761978

5. I'll read you some things that are problems for some people in their neighborhoods. Please tell me if they are a big problem, somewhat of a problem, or not a problem to you in your neighborhood.

Crime in the neighborhood

Big problem	7%	6%
Somewhat of a problem	28	22
Not a problem	64	69
Don't know	1	3
Omitted in error	*	0

Abandoned houses or other empty buildings

Big problem	3%	4%
Somewhat of a problem	8	6
Not a problem	89	88
Don't know	1	2
Omitted in error	*	0

Litter and trash in the streets

Big problem	10%	11%
Somewhat of a problem	21	19
Not a problem	68	69
Don't know	*	1
Omitted in error	*	0

6. Within the past year or two, do you think crime in your neighborhood has increased, decreased, or remained about the same?

Increased	18%	10%
Decreased	9	8
Remained the same	65	69
No opinion	2	5
Haven't lived in neighborhood long enough	6	8
Omitted in report	0	0
Refused	0	*

7. How safe do you feel or would you feel about being out alone in your neighborhood at night? Would you feel very safe, reasonably safe, somewhat unsafe, or very unsafe?

Very safe	17%	21%
Reasonably safe	48	41
Somewhat unsafe	18	17
Very unsafe	17	19
Don't know	1	2
Omitted	0	0
Refused	0	*

*Less than 0.5 percent

Question19761978

8. How about during the day--how safe do you feel about being out alone in your neighborhood? Would you feel very safe, reasonably safe, somewhat unsafe, or very unsafe?

Very safe	66%	72%
Reasonably safe	29	24
Somewhat unsafe	3	2
Very unsafe	1	1
Don't know	*	1
Omitted	0	0
Refused	0	*

9. I'd like you to rate your feelings about the police, judges, and other such officials. Please look at your phone dial and imagine that the numbers 1 to 9 represent a range of feelings from "much too lenient"--that's number "one"--to "much too harsh"--that's number "nine."

A. How lenient or harsh are the local police with someone suspected of a crime? If one is "much too lenient" and nine is "much too harsh," what number would best represent your feelings about the police?

1. Much too lenient	11%	7%
2.	3	4
3.	8	7
4.	13	9
5.	36	31
6.	9	7
7.	6	6
8.	2	2
9. Much too harsh	2	3
Don't know or no opinion	10	25

B. How about the local judges? How lenient or harsh are they towards offenders? Remember, one is "much too lenient" and nine is "much too harsh."

1. Much too lenient	24%	17%
2.	11	10
3.	14	11
4.	10	7
5.	17	17
6.	4	4
7.	4	4
8.	1	1
9. Much too harsh	2	2
Don't know or no opinion	12	27

*Less than 0.5 percent

Question19761978

C. How about the Corrections Systems? This system includes things like prisons and parole boards. How harsh or lenient are they?

1. Much too lenient	22%	16%
2.	12	9
3.	15	11
4.	10	7
5.	16	15
6.	4	3
7.	4	4
8.	2	2
9. Much too harsh	2	2
Don't know or no opinion	14	31

D. What number represents your feelings about the treatment people receive from the entire criminal justice system--that is, everything we just mentioned, taken together? (One means "much too lenient;" nine means "much too harsh.")

1. Much too lenient	14%	9%
2.	6	6
3.	14	10
4.	17	11
5.	24	27
6.	7	7
7.	4	4
8.	1	2
9. Much too harsh	2	2
Don't know or no opinion	9	23

Source: Attitudinal Questionnaires (October-November, 1976 and 1978)

Data Base: Weighted respondents asked the attitudinal questions (N=691 in 1976; N=821 in 1976)

*Less than 0.5 percent

PHONE NUMBER

TYPE OF CRIME: ROBBERY ☐ (2-8) → BEGIN WITH Q.1
 9-1
 ASSAULT ☐ → BEGIN WITH Q.1
 -2
 BURGLARY ☐ → SKIP TO Q. 4
 -3
 LARCENY ☐ → SKIP TO Q. 5
 -4

(IF THERE WAS MORE THAN ONE INCIDENT OF THE SAME TYPE OF CRIME WITHIN THE PAST SIX MONTHS: ENTER A "1" IN THE FOLLOWING BOX TO INDICATE THE MOST RECENT INCIDENT: A "2" FOR THE NEXT MOST RECENT INCIDENT: AND SO ON.)

INCIDENT NUMBER (10)

BEGIN BY IDENTIFYING THE INCIDENT YOU ARE ASKING ABOUT--i.e., SAY:

"I'D LIKE TO ASK A FEW QUESTIONS ABOUT (THIS INCIDENT/THE MOST RECENT OF THESE INCIDENTS/THE OTHER INCIDENT YOU MENTIONED)."

1. Was the crime committed by only one or more than one person?

Only one (ASK A) <input type="checkbox"/> 11-1	Don't know (SKIP TO Q.2) <input type="checkbox"/> -2	More than one (ASK B) <input type="checkbox"/> -3
---	---	--

1A. Was the person someone you knew, or a stranger?

Stranger ☐ 12-1

Well-known (friend or relative) ☐ -2

Casual acquaintance ☐ -3

Known by sight only ☐ -4

Don't Know ☐ -5

1B. Were any of the persons known or related to you or were they all strangers?

All strangers ☐ 12-6

All known ☐ -7

Some known ☐ -8

Don't know ☐ -9

2. Were you the only person there besides the offender(s)?

Yes ☐ 13-1

Respondent was not present ☐ -2
(SKIP TO Q.4)

No ☐ -3
(ASK A)

2A. How many of these persons, not counting yourself, were robbed, harmed, or threatened? Do not include persons under 12 years of age.

number of persons
(14-15)

3. Did the person(s) have a weapon such as a gun or knife, or use something as a weapon, such as a bottle or wrench?

No ☐ 16-1

Don't Know ☐ -2

Yes ☐ -3
(ASK A)

3A. What was the weapon? Anything else?

Gun ☐ 17-1

Knife ☐ -2

Gun(s) & Knife(s) ☐ -3

Other ☐ -4

Gun(s) & Other ☐ -5

Knife(s) & Other ☐ -6

Gun(s), Knife(s) and Other(s) ☐ -7

Other(s) (SPECIFY) _____

SKIP TO Q.5

4. What evidence was there that there was (a break-in/an attempted break-in)? Anything else? CHECK ALL THAT APPLY.

Broken lock or window ☐ 18-1
Forced windows or door ☐ 19-1
Slashed screen ☐ 20-1
Other (SPECIFY) ☐ 21-1
No Evidence ☐ 22-1 → SKIP TO Q. 6

5. Was anything that belonged to you or other members of the household damaged but not taken in this incident? For example, was clothing damaged or damage done to a car, etc.?

NO ☐ 23-1

YES ☐ -2 (ASK A)

5A. How much would it cost to repair or replace the damaged items?

\$
(24-27)

ROUND TO NEAREST
DOLLAR

or

Don't know

9 9 9 7
(24-27)

☐ 28-1

6. In what month did this incident occur?

April ☐ 29-1

July ☐ -4

October ☐ -7

May ☐ -2

August ☐ -5

November ☐ -8

June ☐ -3

September ☐ -6

Don't know ☐ -9

7. In what city or town did this incident occur?

Joliet ☐ 30-1 Peoria ☐ -2 elsewhere in Illinois ☐ -3 elsewhere in U.S. ☐ -4 Outside U.S. ☐ -5

8. Where did this incident take place? In or near what kind of place did this happen?

At or in own dwelling unit, or at or in structure with roof attached to dwelling unit. Include garages only if they are attached to dwelling unit.

☐ 31-1

At or in structure on property not attached to dwelling unit.

☐ -2

SKIP TO Q. 11

At or in vacation home, hotel/motel.

☐ -3

Inside commercial building, such as store, restaurant, bank, gas station, on a bus or train; or in a station.

☐ -4

SKIP TO Q. 9

Inside office, factory or warehouse.

☐ -5

Near own home; yard, sidewalk, driveway, carport, apartment hall (do not include break-ins or attempted break-ins).

☐ -6

On the street, in a park, field, playground, school grounds, or parking lot.

☐ -7

SKIP TO Q. 11

Inside school

☐ -8

Other (Specify) _____

☐ -9

9. Were you a customer, employee, or owner?

Customer ☐ 32-1

Employee ☐ -2

Owner ☐ -3

Other (Specify) ☐ -4

10. Did the person(s) steal or try to steal anything belonging to the (store/restaurant/office/factory/etc.)?

Yes ☐ 33-1

No ☐ -2

Don't know ☐ -3

11. Was something stolen that belonged to you or others in the household?

Yes ☐ 34-1

No ☐ -2 → SKIP TO Q. 15

Refused ☐ -9

12. What was taken? Anything else? CHECK ALL THAT APPLY

Cash
(ASK A)

☐ 35-1 → 12A.

How much?

\$

ROUND TO NEAREST DOLLAR

or

(44-47)

Don't Know

(44-47)

☐ 48-1

or

Refused

(44-47)

☐ 48-9

Purse or wallet ☐ 36-1

Part of car (hubcap,
tape deck) ☐ 37-1

Television set ☐ 38-1

Stereo equipment ☐ 39-1

Photographic equipment ☐ 40-1

Jewelry ☐ 41-1

Household Appliances ☐ 42-1

Other (Specify) ☐ 43-1

13. Altogether, what was the value of the property taken? Do not include stolen cash, checks or credit cards-- we are interested only in the value of the property taken.

\$

(49-52)

ROUND TO NEAREST DOLLAR

or

Does Not Apply/
Cash only Taken

(49-52)

☐ 53-6

(or)

Don't Know

(49-52)

☐ 53-1

SKIP TO Q. 15

14. How did you decide the value of the property that was stolen? Any other way? CHECK ALL THAT APPLY.

Original cost ☐ 54-1

Replacement cost ☐ 55-1

Personal estimate of
current value ☐ 56-1

Insurance report estimate ☐ 57-1

Police estimate ☐ 58-1

Don't know ☐ 59-1

Other ☐ 60-1

SPECIFY _____

15. Were you injured in this incident to the extent that you needed medical attention?

Yes ☐ 61-1

No ☐ -2

16. Did you or any household member lose any time from work because of this incident?

No ☐ 62-1

Yes ☐ -2
(ASK A)

15.A How much time was lost altogether?

Less than 1 day ☐ 63-1

Over 10 days ☐ -4

1-5 days ☐ -2

Don't know ☐ -5

6-10 days ☐ -3

CONTINUED

1 OF 2

Were the police informed of this incident in any way?

No ☐ 64-1
(ASK A)

Don't know ☐ -2
(Skip to Q. 18)

17A. What was the reason this incident was not reported to the police? CHECK ALL THAT APPLY.

- Nothing could be done; lack of proof ☐ 65-1
- Did not think it important enough ☐ 66-1
- Police wouldn't want to be bothered ☐ 67-1
- Didn't want to take time; inconvenient ☐ 68-1
- Private or personal matter; didn't want to report it ☐ 69-1
- Did not want to get involved ☐ 70-1
- Afraid of reprisal ☐ 71-1
- Other ☐ 72-1

SPECIFY _____

RETURN TO NEXT QUESTION ON REGULAR QUESTIONNAIRE OR
FILL OUT NEXT VICTIMIZATION REPORT.

Yes ☐ -3
(ASK B)

17B How did they find out about this incident?

- Respondent informed police ☐ 73-1
- Other house hold member informed police ☐ -2
- Someone else told police ☐ -3
- Police on scene ☐ -4

CONTINUE TO Q. 18 ON BACK PAGE.

Have the police arrested anyone in connection with this incident?

No ☐ 74-1
(ASK A)

Don't know ☐ -2

18A. Why not?

- Identity of offender(s) unknown; don't know who did it ☐ 75-1
- Can't locate offender(s) ☐ -2
- No one will press charges ☐ -3
- Don't know ☐ -4
- Other ☐ -5

SPECIFY _____

Yes ☐ -3
(ASK B)

18B What is the status of the case?

- Charges dropped ☐ 76-1
- Awaiting trial ☐ -2
- Tried ☐ -3
- Don't know ☐ -4

ASK C

18C. What were the results of the trial?

Guilty ☐ 77-1 Not guilty ☐ -2
(ASK D)

Don't know ☐ -3

18D. What sentence, if any, did the offender receive?

- Suspended sentence ☐ 78-1
- Fine ☐ -2
- Imprisoned ☐ -3
- Fined and Imprisoned ☐ -4
- Don't know ☐ -5
- Other ☐ -6

SPECIFY _____

RETURN TO NEXT QUESTION ON
REGULAR QUESTIONNAIRE OR FILL
OUT NEXT VICTIMIZATION REPORT

Table A-6

Weighted Frequencies - Victimization Report
JOLIET: 1976 and 1978

<u>Question</u>	<u>1976</u>	<u>1978</u>
Type of crime		
Robbery	2%	2%
Assault	16	19
Burglary	43	39
Larceny	<u>39</u>	<u>39</u>
Total	100% (757)	99% (795)
1. Was the crime committed by only one or more than one person? (Only answered by those who responded "Robbery" or "Assault" to "Type of crime".)		
Only one	65%	66%
More than one	32	2
Don't know	2	33
Omitted in error	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	100% (139)	101% (172)
1A. Was the person someone you knew, or a stranger? (Only answered by those who responded "Only one" to Question 1.)		
Stranger	33%	40%
Well-known (friend or relative)	46%	32
Casual Acquaintance	16	15
Known by sight only	6	10
Don't know	0	4
Omitted in error	<u>0</u>	<u>*</u>
Total	101% (83)	99% (113)
1B. Were any of the persons known or related to you or were they all strangers? (Only answered by those who responded "More than one" to Question 1.)		
All strangers	60%	68%
All known	15	16
Some known	19	16
Don't know	6	*
Omitted in error	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	100% (52)	100% (56)

*Less than 0.5 percent

Question19761978

2. Were you the only person there besides the offender(s)?
(Only answered by those who responded to Question 1.)

Yes

42%

47%

No

5843

Total

100%

100%

(138)

(172)

3. Did the person(s) have a weapon such as a gun or knife, or use something as a weapon, such as a bottle or wrench? (Only answered by those who responded "Yes" or "No" to Question 2.)

No

63%

65%

Yes

25

30

Don't know

126

Total

100%

101%

(138)

(172)

- 3A. What was the weapon? Anything else? (Only answered by those who responded "Yes" to Question 3.)

Gun

19%

27%

Knife

19

27

Gun(s) & knife(s)

3

0

Other

33

36

Gun(s) & other

6

0

Knife(s) & other

6

2

Gun(s), knife(s) & other(s)

11

7

Don't know

0

3

Omitted in error

30

Total

100%

102%

(36)

(51)

4. What evidence was there that there was (a break-in/an attempted break-in)? Anything else? CHECK ALL THAT APPLY. (Only answered by those who responded "Burglary" to "Type of crime?" or "Respondent was not present" to Question 2.)

Broken lock or window

28%

29%

Forced windows or door

46

30

Slashed screen

3

6

Other

24

42

No evidence

911

Total

**

**

(316)

(310)

*Less than 0.5 percent

**Percentage may add to more than 100% because of possible multiple items.

Question19761978

5. Was anything that belonged to you or other members of the household damaged but not taken in this incident? For example, was clothing damaged or damage done to a car, etc.? (Only answered by those who responded "Larceny" to "Type of Crime" and "Yes" or "No" to Question 2.)

No	75%	83%
Yes	20	17
Omitted in error	<u>5</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	100%	100%
	(435)	(484)

- 5A. How much would it cost to repair or replace the damaged items? (Only answered by those who responded "Yes" to Question 5.)

\$1 - 10	19%	17%
\$11 - 25	16	10
\$26 - 50	18	12
\$51 - 100	8	12
\$101 and over	15	21
Don't know	23	28
Omitted in error	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	100%	100%
	(260)	(251)

6. In what month did this incident occur?

April	3%	3%
May	10	7
June	12	12
July	15	14
August	15	16
September	16	14
October	21	19
November	4	10
Don't know	4	6
Omitted in error	<u>0</u>	<u>*</u>
Total	100%	101%
	(757)	(795)

7. In what city did this incident occur?

Joliet	90%	90%
Peoria	*	0
Elsewhere in Illinois	6	8
Other U.S.	0	1
Don't know	*	0
Omitted in error	<u>3</u>	<u>*</u>
Total	100%	99%
	(757)	(795)

*Less than 0.5 percent

Question19761978

8. Where did this incident take place?

At or in own dwelling unit, or at or in structure with roof attached to dwelling unit. Include garages only if they are attached to dwelling unit.

45% 42%

At or in structure on property not attached to dwelling unit.

14 17

At or in vacation home, hotel/motel.

* *

Inside commercial building, such as store, restaurant, bank, gas station, on a bus or train, or in a station.

4 4

Inside office, factory, or warehouse.

1 1

Near own home; yard, sidewalk, driveway, carport, apartment hall (do not include break-ins or attempted break-ins).

18 15

On the street, in a park, field, playground, school grounds, or parking lot.

13 16

Inside school

1 1

Other

3 4

Omitted in error

0 1

Total

99% 101%
(757) (795)

9. Were you a customer, employee or owner? (Only answered by those who responded "Inside commercial building..." or "Inside office,..." to Question 8.)

Customer

60% 43%

Employee

33 42

Owner

5 8

Other

2 8

Omitted in error

0 *

Total

100% 101%
(42) (40)

*Less than 0.5 percent

<u>Question</u>	<u>1976</u>	<u>1978</u>
10. Did the person(s) steal or try to steal anything belonging to the (store/restaurant/office/factory/etc.)? (Only answered by those who responded to Question 9.)		
Yes	15%	16%
No	66	73
Don't know	17	*
Refused	0	11
Omitted in error	<u>5</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	103% (41)	100% (41)
11. Was something stolen that belonged to you or others in the household?		
Yes	68%	65%
No	31	35
Refused	1	*
Omitted in error	<u>0</u>	<u>*</u>
Total	100% (757)	100% (795)
12. What was taken? Anything else? CHECK ALL THAT APPLY. (Only answered by those who responded "Yes" to Question 11.)		
Cash	12%	14%
Purse or wallet	3	4
Part of Car (hubcap, tape deck)	23	11
Television Set	9	4
Stereo equipment	9	8
Photographic equipment	3	2
Jewelry	8	6
Household appliances	2	1
Other	<u>63</u>	<u>74</u>
Total	** (515)	** (517)

*Less than 0.5 percent

**Percentage may add to more than 100% because of possible multiple responses.

Question19761978

12A. How much? Round to nearest dollar. (Only answered by those that responded "Cash" to Question 12.)

\$1 - 10	13%	14%
\$11 - 25	20	22
\$26 - 50	19	15
\$51 - 100	16	10
\$101 and over	23	22
Don't know	8	11
Refused	0	6
Omitted in error	2	0
Total	101%	100%
	(64)	(78)

13. Altogether, what was the value of the property taken? Do not include stolen cash, checks or credit cards--we are interested only in the value of the property taken. (Only answered by those who responded to Question 12.)

No value	5%	*
\$1 - 50	26	37
\$51 - 100	14	14
\$101 - 150	10	9
\$151 - 300	17	17
\$301 and over	18	15
Don't know	8	9
Refused	*	0
Omitted in error	3	0
Total	101%	101%
	(515)	(485)

14. How did you decide the value of the property that was stolen? Any other way? CHECK ALL THAT APPLY. (Only answered by those who responded to Question 13 except for those who responded "Don't know".)

Original	59%	58%
Replacement cost	18	23
Personal estimate of current value	16	19
Insurance report estimate	6	5
Police estimate	1	1
Don't know	1	2
Other	6	2
Total	**	**
	(462)	(442)

*Less than 0.5 percent

Question19761978

15. Were you injured in this incident to the extent that you needed medical attention?

Yes	4%	3%
No	95	97
Refused	*	0
Omitted in error	*	*
Total	99%	100%
	(757)	(795)

16. Did you or any household member lose any time from work because of this incident?

No	91%	91%
Yes	9	9
Refused	*	0
Omitted in error	*	*
Total	100%	100%
	(757)	(795)

16A. How much time was lost altogether? (Only answered by those who responded "Yes" to Question 16.)

Under 1 day	37%	47%
1-5 days	49	45
6-10 days	5	4
Over 10 days	3	4
Don't know	5	1
Omitted in error	2	0
Total	101%	101%
	(65)	(68)

17. Were the police informed of this incident in any way?

No	42%	44%
Yes	56	54
Don't know	1	2
Refused	*	0
Omitted in error	*	*
Total	99%	100%
	(757)	(795)

*Less than 0.5 percent

Question19761978

17A. What was the reason this incident was not reported to the police? CHECK ALL THAT APPLY. (Only answered by those who responded "No" to Question 17.)

Nothing could be done; lack of proof.	19%	28%
Did not think it important enough.	30	38
Police wouldn't want to be bothered.	9	7
Didn't want to take time; inconvenient.	4	2
Private or personal matter; didn't want to report it.	9	11
Did not want to get involved.	6	2
Afraid of reprisal.	3	1
Other	30	27
Total	**	**
	(321)	(351)

17B. How did they find out about this incident? (Only answered by those who responded "Yes" to Question 17.)

Respondent informed police	75%	68%
Other household member informed police	15	18
Someone else told police	8	13
Police on scene	2	2
Burglar alarm	0	0
Omitted in error	0	*
Total	100%	101%
	(426)	(425)

18. Have the police arrested anyone in connection with this incident? (Only answered by those who responded to "Yes" or "Don't know" to Question 17.)

No	86%	85%
Yes	5	8
Don't know	6	7
Refused	*	0
Omitted in error	2	*
Total	99%	100%
	(436)	(444)

*Less than 0.5 percent

**Percentages may add to more than 100% because of possible multiple responses.

<u>Question</u>	<u>1976</u>	<u>1978</u>
18A. Why not? (Only answered by those who responded "No" to Question 18.)		
Identity of offender(s) unknown; don't know who did it.	54%	45%
Can't locate offender(s)	8	11
No one will press charges	4	2
Other	17	16
Don't know	14	25
Refused	0	0
Omitted in error	4	*
Total	101% (377)	99% (376)
18B. What is the status of the case? (Only answered by those who responded "Yes" to Question 18.)		
Charges dropped	29%	25%
Awaiting trial	21	36
Tried	14	20
Peace bond	0	0
Don't know	36	19
Refused	0	*
Omitted in error	0	*
Total	100% (28)	100% (38)
18C. What were the results of the trial? (Only answered by those who responded "Tried" to Question 18B.)		
Guilty	75%	100%
Don't know	25	0
Total	100% (4)	100% (7)
18D. What sentence, if any, did the offender receive? (Only answered by those who responded "Guilty" to Question 18C.)		
Suspended sentence	33%	0
Fine	33	36
Other	0	50
Don't know	0	14
Total	100% (3)	100% (14)

Source: Victimization Reports (October-November, 1976 and 1978)

Data Base: Weighted households asked the victimization questions (N=872 in 1976; N=890 in 1978)

*Less than 0.5 percent

Table A-7

Weighted Frequencies - Victimization Report
PEORIA: 1976 and 1978

<u>Question</u>	<u>1976</u>	<u>1978</u>
Type of crime		
Robbery	2%	2%
Assault	19	18
Burglary	36	35
Larceny	43	45
Total	100% (704)	100% (744)
1. Was the crime committed by only one or more than one person? (Only answered by those who responded "Robbery" or "Assault" to "Type of crime".)		
Only one	67%	74%
More than one	29	24
Don't know	3	1
Omitted in error	2	0
Total	101% (147)	99% (147)
1A. Was the person someone you knew, or a stranger? (Only answered by those who responded "Only one" to Question 1.)		
Stranger	22%	37%
Well-known (friend or relative)	50	42
Casual Acquaintance	24	16
Known by sight only	4	3
Don't know	0	2
Omitted in error	0	*
Total	100% (96)	100% (109)
1B. Were any of the persons known or related to you or were they all strangers? (Only answered by those who responded "More than one" to Question 1.)		
All strangers	37%	56%
All known	35	27
Some known	24	17
Don't know	0	0
Omitted in error	4	0
Total	100% (46)	100% (36)

*Less than 0.5 percent

Question19761978

2. Were you the only person there besides the offender(s)?
(Only answered by those who responded to Question 1.)

Yes	36%	42%
No	<u>64</u>	<u>58</u>
Total	100%	100%
	(148)	(147)

3. Did the person(s) have a weapon such as a gun or knife, or use something as a weapon, such as a bottle or wrench? (Only answered by those who responded "Yes" or "No" to Question 2.)

No	67%	64%
Yes	28	28
Don't know	<u>5</u>	<u>8</u>
Total	100%	100%
	(148)	(147)

- 3A. What was the weapon? Anything else? (Only answered by those who responded "Yes" to Question 3.)

Gun	23%	22%
Knife	14	21
Gun(s) & knife(s)	5	0
Other	40	36
Gun(s) & other	2	0
Knife(s) & other	5	0
Gun(s), knife(s) & other(s)	<u>12</u>	<u>21</u>
Total	101%	100%
	(43)	(40)

4. What evidence was there that there was (a break-in/an attempted break-in)? Anything else? CHECK ALL THAT APPLY. (Only answered by those who responded "Burglary" to "Type of crime?" or "Respondent was not present" to Question 2.)

Broken lock or window	31%	25%
Forced windows or door	39	38
Slashed screen	6	4
Other	29	25
No evidence	<u>11</u>	<u>26</u>
	**	**
Total	(250)	(260)

*Less than 0.5 percent

**Percentage may add to more than 100% because of possible multiple responses.

Question19671978

5. Was anything that belonged to you or other members of the household damaged but not taken in this incident? For example, was clothing damaged or damage done to a car, etc.? (Only answered by those who responded "Larceny" to "Type of Crime" and "Yes" or "No" to Question 2.)

No	83%	89%
Yes	15	11
Omitted in error	3	*
Total	101%	100%
	(454)	(485)

- 5A. How much would it cost to repair or replace the damaged items? (Only answered by those who responded "Yes" to Question 5.)

\$1 - 10	22%	23%
\$11 - 25	11	13
\$26 - 50	14	15
\$51 - 100	10	13
\$101 and over	12	10
Don't know	29	25
Omitted in error	3	*
Total	101%	99%
	(203)	(182)

6. In what month did this incident occur?

April	4%	6%
May	9	10
June	13	12
July	17	19
August	18	18
September	13	19
October	18	14
November	4	*
Don't know	4	1
Omitted in error	*	*
Total	100%	99%
	(704)	(744)

7. In what city did this incident occur?

Joliet	0%	0%
Peoria	94	92
Elsewhere in Illinois	3	6
Other U.S.	0	1
Outside U.S.	0	*
Don't know	*	0
Omitted in error	2	*
Total	100%	99%
	(704)	(744)

Question19761978

8. Where did this incident take place?

At or in own dwelling unit, or at or in structure with roof attached to dwelling unit. Include garages only if they are attached to dwelling unit.

47%

46%

At or in structure on property not attached to dwelling unit.

11

10

At or in vacation home, hotel/motel.

1

1

Inside commercial building, such as store, restaurant, bank, gas station, on a bus or train, or in a station.

7

3

Inside office, factory, or warehouse.

2

1

Near own home; yard, sidewalk, driveway, carport, apartment hall (do not include break-ins or attempted break-ins).

16

20

On the street, in a park, field, playground, school grounds, or parking lot.

12

12

Inside school

*

*

Other

4

6

Omitted in error

*

*

Total

100%

99%

(704)

(744)

9. Were you a customer, employee or owner? (Only answered by those who responded "Inside commercial building..." or "Inside office,..." to Question 8.)

Customer

46%

35%

Employee

42

44

Owner

5

11

Other

3

11

Refused

0

*

Omitted in error

3

*

Total

99%

101%

(59)

(29)

*Less than 0.5 percent

<u>Question</u>	<u>1976</u>	<u>1978</u>
10. Did the person(s) steal or try to steal anything belonging to the (store/restaurant/office/factory/etc.)? (Only answered by those who responded to Question 9.)		
Yes	22%	16%
No	71	68
Don't know	3	10
Omitted in error	3	3
Refused	*	3
Total	99% (59)	100% (29)
11. Was something stolen that belonged to you or others in the household?		
Yes	65%	69%
No	35	31
Refused	0	*
Omitted in error	*	*
Total	100% (704)	100% (744)
12. What was taken? Anything else? CHECK ALL THAT APPLY. (Only answered by those who responded "Yes" to Question 11.)		
Cash	14%	12%
Purse or wallet	4	4
Part of Car (hubcap, tape deck)	21	8
Television Set	3	3
Stereo equipment	6	5
Photographic equipment	2	*
Jewelry	8	7
Household appliances	1	1
Other	61	78
Total	** (456)	** (510)

*Less than 0.5 percent

**Percentage may add to more than 100% because of possible multiple responses.

Question19761978

- 12A. How much? Round to nearest dollar. (Only answered by those that responded "Cash" to Question 12.)

\$1 - 10	20%	12%
\$11 - 25	20	14
\$26 - 50	12	30
\$51 - 100	15	14
\$101 and over	30	21
Don't know	2	5
Refused	0	3
Omitted in error	2	0
Total	101%	99%
	(66)	(60)

13. Altogether, what was the value of the property taken? Do not include stolen cash, checks or credit cards--we are interested only in the value of the property taken. (Only answered by those who responded to Question 12.)

No value	6%	1%
\$1 - 50	31	40
\$51 - 100	14	18
\$101 - 150	11	10
\$151 - 300	14	10
\$301 and over	11	14
Don't know	11	7
Refused	0	*
Omitted in error	2	*
Total	100%	100%
	(457)	(485)

14. How did you decide the value of the property that was stolen? Any other way? CHECK ALL THAT APPLY. (Only answered by those who responded to Question 13 except for those who responded "Don't know".)

Original	53%	50%
Replacement cost	22	27
Personal estimate of current value	19	30
Insurance report estimate	4	4
Police estimate	*	1
Don't know	1	1
Other	7	4
Total	**	**
	(396)	(485)

*Less than 0.5 percent

**Percentage may add to more than 100% because of possible multiple responses.

Question19761978

15. Were you injured in this incident to the extent that you needed medical attention?

Yes	6%	3%
No	93	97
Refused	0	0
Omitted in error	<u>1</u>	<u>*</u>
Total	100%	100%
	(704)	(744)

16. Did you or any household member lose any time from work because of this incident?

No	93%	92%
Yes	6	8
Refused	1	0
Omitted in error	<u>*</u>	<u>*</u>
Total	100%	100%
	(704)	(704)

16A. How much time was lost altogether? (Only answered by those who responded "Yes" to Question 16.)

Under 1 day	37%	46%
1-5 days	46	36
6-10 days	5	0
Over 10 days	7	12
Don't know	2	5
Omitted in error	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	96%	99%
	(43)	(57)

17. Were the police informed of this incident in any way?

No	46%	51%
Yes	52	48
Don't know	1	1
Refused	*	0
Omitted in error	<u>*</u>	<u>*</u>
Total	99%	100%
	(704)	(744)

*Less than 0.5 percent

Question19761978

17A. What was the reason this incident was not reported to the police? CHECK ALL THAT APPLY. (Only answered by those who responded "No" to Question 17.)

Nothing could be done; lack of proof.	22%	34%
Did not think it important enough.	33	34
Police wouldn't want to be bothered.	5	12
Didn't want to take time; inconvenient.	4	1
Private or personal matter; didn't want to report it.	10	12
Did not want to get involved.	2	2
Afraid of reprisal.	3	2
Other	26	27
Total	**	**
	(328)	(380)

17B. How did they find out about this incident? (Only answered by those who responded "Yes" to Question 17.)

Respondent informed police	71%	73%
Other household member informed police	16	17
Someone else told police	1	8
Police on scene	1	2
Burglar alarm	*	0
Omitted in error	*	0
Total	99%	100%
	(369)	(356)

18. Have the police arrested anyone in connection with this incident? (Only answered by those who responded to "Yes" or "Don't know" to Question 17.)

No	82%	88%
Yes	7	5
Don't know	8	7
Refused	*	0
Omitted in error	2	*
Total	99%	100%
	(377)	(364)

*Less than 0.5 percent

**Percentage may add to more than 100% because of possible multiple responses.

Question19761978

18A. Why not? (Only answered by those who responded
"No" to Question 18.)

Identity of offender(s) unknown; don't know who
did it.

50%

58%

Can't locate offender(s)

10

10

No one will press charges

6

6

Other

17

14

Don't know

15

12

Refused

*

0

Omitted in error

2*

Total

100%

100%

(309)

(320)

18B. What is the status of the case? (Only answered
by those who responded "Yes" to Question 18.)

Charges dropped

22%

22%

Awaiting trial

19

27

Tried

38

20

Peace bond

3

0

Don't know

16

31

Omitted in error

3*

Total

101%

100%

(32)

(25)

18C. What were the results of the trial? (Only answered
by those who responded "Tried" to Question 18B.)

Guilty

75%

100%

Don't know

250

Total

100%

100%

(12)

(5)

18D. What sentence, if any, did the offender receive?
(Only answered by those who responded "Guilty" to
Question 18C.)

Fine

22%

0%

Imprisoned

56

40

Other

22

40

Don't know

020

Total

100%

100%

(9)

(5)

Source: Victimization Reports (October-November, 1976 and 1978)

Data Base: Weighted respondents asked the victimization questions (N=798 in 1976;
N=838 in 1978)

*Less than 0.5 percent

APPENDIX B

CONFIDENCE INTERVALS
FOR VICTIMIZATION RATES

APPENDIX B
CONFIDENCE INTERVALS FOR VICTIMIZATION RATES

Tabulations in Section 4 provide six-month victimization rates for selected crimes in Joliet and Peoria, in the years 1976 and 1978. These rates are based on samples. If we were to draw other samples, the victimization rates would vary accordingly. Confidence intervals can be constructed to reflect the degree to which different samples would produce different victimization rates. Tables B-2 through B-7 provide limits of the 95 percent confidence intervals for the victimization rates found in Tables 1, 2, and 7-10. The first step in constructing an interval estimate of a population victimization rate is to choose a desired level of confidence. We have selected the customary 95 percent confidence interval. That is to say, we would want 95 percent of the intervals constructed from a large number of samples to include the unknown population victimization rate.

The second step is to compute the finite population multipliers (fpm) for individuals 16 years and older and households in Joliet and Peoria. The fpm is computed in order to reduce the size of the sampling error. The measurement of this improvement in reliability is affected by incorporating the sampling ratio, the sample size (n) divided by the size of the population (N), in the formula for the standard error. The fpm is:

$$fpm = \sqrt{1 - \frac{n}{N}}$$

The term $1 - n/N$ is the proportion of the population not in the sample. The eight fpm's computed for our two surveys are presented in Table B-1 along with the sample and population sizes. As an example, the fpm of .96 for respondents 16 years and older in Joliet in 1976 constitutes a 4 percent reduction of the sampling error.

Because the formula used to compute the confidence interval in this report is somewhat complicated, a simpler, but closely related formula shall be used as a preliminary presentation of the procedure for computing a confidence interval. An estimate of the standard error must first be obtained:*

$$s_p = \sqrt{\frac{pq}{n}}$$

*A better estimate of the standard error of p is provided by $\sqrt{\frac{pq}{n-1}}$.

Table B-1

Sample Size, Population Size, and Finite Population Multiplier
for Respondents and Households In
JOLIET and PEORIA: 1976 and 1978

	1976			1978		
	Sample Size	1970 Census	Finite Population Multiplier	Sample Size	1970 Census	Finite Population Multiplier
<u>Joliet</u>						
Age 16 years and older	4413	56,170	.96	4667	56,170	.96
Households	4413	25,342	.91	4667	25,342	.90
<u>Peoria</u>						
Age 16 years and older	4434	89,968	.98	4704	89,968	.97
Households	4434	42,290	.95	4704	42,290	.94

where p is the probability of occurrence of the attribute in question (e.g., victimized by robbery), and q = 1-p.

For example, the 1976 victimization rate of 3.4 for robbery in Joliet (Table 1) is based on 15 robberies being detected in 4413 (weighted) telephone interviews. (Working backwards from Table 1, 3.4 times 4413 divided by 1000 equals 15.*) Substitution of the sample values p and q to obtain an estimate of the standard error provides the following:

$$\begin{aligned} s_p &= \sqrt{\frac{(3.4)(996.6)}{4413}} \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{3388.4}{4413}} \\ &= \sqrt{.7678} \\ &= .88 \end{aligned}$$

By adding and subtracting this quantity to and from the sample victimization rate, we obtain the 68 percent confidence interval:

$$\begin{aligned} 3.4 \pm .88, \text{ or} \\ 2.5 - 4.3 \end{aligned}$$

The odds are two to one that the unknown victimization rate** lies in this interval. If more confidence is desired in the assertion that this victimization rate is captured by our confidence interval--say, nineteen to one (95 percent level)--we attach 1.96 standard errors

$$\begin{aligned} 3.4 \pm (1.96)(.88) \\ = 3.4 \pm 1.72, \text{ or} \\ 1.7 - 5.1 \end{aligned}$$

A final adjustment is made by the finite population multiplier for individuals 16 years and older in Joliet:

$$\begin{aligned} 3.4 \pm (.96)(1.96)(.88) \\ = 3.4 \pm 1.66, \text{ or} \\ 1.7 - 5.1 \end{aligned}$$

In this case the fpm adjustment does not change the previously calculated confidence interval.

*This can be done for any of the victimization rate tables to determine the number of victimizations found in the survey.

**The victimization rate is still clouded by measurement problems such as telescoping and forgetting.

***Robert V. Hogg and Allen T. Craig, Introduction to Mathematical Statistics, 3rd edition, New York: Macmillan, 1970, p. 197.

This is not the same confidence interval found in Table 1 because for low probability attributes (e.g., 15 of 4413) a more precise confidence interval can be obtained from the formula:

$$\frac{Y + 2 \pm (fpm) \frac{1.96 \sqrt{[Y(n-Y)/n]} + 1}{n + 4}}$$

where Y is the frequency count of the attribute in the sample, and n is the sample size. Use of this formula for relatively rare events produces a more correct asymmetric confidence interval around the calculated rate. The formula is quite similar to the simpler one used to obtain the confidence interval calculated previously. A worked example of the confidence interval for robbery in Joliet (1976) may help to see the similarity.

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{Y + 2 \pm (fpm) \frac{1.96 \sqrt{[Y(n-Y)/n]} + 1}{n + 4}} \\ &= \frac{15 + 2 \pm (.96) \frac{1.96 \sqrt{[15(4413-15)/4413]} + 1}{4413 + 4}} \\ &= \frac{17 \pm 7.5}{4417} \\ &= 0.00385 \pm 0.00170, \text{ or } .0022 - .0055 \end{aligned}$$

Intervals constructed in this manner contain the unknown population victimization rate 19 times out of every 20. That is to say, we are confident at the 95 percent level that the victimization rate is not less than 2.2, nor greater than 5.5. While the difference in confidence intervals between the two methods is not great, the estimated number of victimizations changes enough to merit notice. For the simpler symmetrical formula, the interval is derived as:

$$\frac{56,170}{1,000} (1.7) - \frac{56,170}{1,000} (5.1), \text{ or } 95-286;$$

while for the more precise formula, it is derived as:

$$\frac{56,170}{1,000} (2.2) - \frac{56,170}{1,000} (5.5), \text{ or } 124-309.$$

Using the second technique, we are more confident that the estimated number of victimizations does not fall below 100, though somewhat less confident that there will not be more than 300 robbery victimizations during the six month period of the survey.

Table B-2

Ninety-Five Percent Confidence Intervals for Estimated Six Month Victimization Rate
and Victimizations for Persons and Households in
JOLIET: 1976 and 1978

	1976		1978	
	Victimization Rate	Estimated Number Of Victimizations	Victimization Rate	Estimated Number of Victimizations
Robbery ¹	2.2 - 5.5	124 - 309	2.9 - 6.6	163 - 371
Aggravated Assaults ¹	9 - 14	480 - 814	9 - 15	506-843
Other Assaults ¹	14 - 21	773 - 1186	18 - 26	1011 - 1460
Residential Burglary A ²	49 - 62	1249 - 1561	42 - 53	1064 - 1343
Residential Burglary B ²	15 - 22	375 - 555	15 - 23	380 - 583
Household Larceny ²	61 - 74	1546 - 1885	61 - 74	1546 - 1885

SOURCE: 1976 - Regular Questionnaires and Victimization Reports (October-November, 1976); 1970 Census
1978 - Regular Questionnaires and Victimization Reports (October-November, 1978); 1970 Census

Base: 1976 - Weighted Regular Questionnaire response (N = 4413)
1978 - Weighted Regular Questionnaire response (N = 4467)

¹Victimization rates are calculated as the number of persons per thousand, age sixteen or more, who were victims. For both 1976 and 1978, the estimated number of victimizations is based on the 1970 national census (N = 56,170 age 16 and under).

²Victimization rates are calculated as the number of households per thousand that were victimized. For both 1976 and 1978, the estimated number of victimizations is based on the 1970 census (N = 25,342 households).

Table B-3

Ninety-Five Percent Confidence Intervals for Estimated Six Month Victimization Rate
and Victimitizations for Persons and Households in
PEORIA: 1976 and 1978

	1976		1978	
	Victimization Rate	Estimated Number Of Victimitizations	Victimization Rate	Estimated Number of Victimitizations
Robbery ¹	1.9 - 5.3	171 - 477	2.2 - 5.5	198 - 459
Aggravated Assaults ¹	9 - 15	795 - 1354	6 - 11	540 - 990
Other Assaults ¹	15 - 23	1370 - 2077	16 - 26	1439 - 2339
Residential Burglary A ²	39 - 51	1652 - 2140	38 - 49	1607 - 2072
Residential Burglary B ²	10 - 16	403 - 664	9 - 15	381 - 634
Household Larceny ²	62 - 76	2634 - 3235	65 - 79	2749 - 3341

SOURCE: 1976 - Regular Questionnaires and Victimization Reports (October-November, 1976); 1970 Census
1978 - Regular Questionnaires and Victimization Reports (October-November, 1978); 1970 Census

Base: 1976 - Weighted Regular Questionnaire response (N = 4434)
1978 - Weighted Regular Questionnaire response (N = 4704)

¹Victimization rates are calculated as the number of persons per thousand, age sixteen or more, who were victims. For both 1976 and 1978, the estimated number of victimizations is based on the 1970 national census (N = 89,969 age 16 and under).

²Victimization rates are calculated as the number of households per thousand that were victimized. For both 1976 and 1978, the estimated number of victimizations is based on the 1970 census (N = 42,290 households).

Table B-4

Ninety-Five Percent Confidence Intervals for Personal Crimes
for Individuals Sixteen Years and Older by Race, Age, and Sex of Respondent,
Household Income, and Length of Time at Present Address in
JOLIET: 1976 and 1978

Race, Age, and Sex of Respondent, Household Income, and Length of Time at Present Address	Confidence Interval ¹			
	N	Robbery	Aggravated Assaults	Other Assaults
<u>Total</u>				
1976	4413	2.2-5.5	9-14	14-21
1978	4667	2.9-6.6	9-15	18-26
<u>Race</u>				
1976				
Black	567	0.0-6.8	14-38	12-34
White	3690	2.4-6.3	7-13	13-21
1978				
Black	597	6.2-24	15-39	21-49
White	3849	1.9-5.4	7-13	16-24
<u>Age</u>				
1976				
16-25 years	906	3-14	25-48	21-43
26-59 years	2449	1.8-6.4	12-22	5-12
60 years or older	1015	0.3-6.0	2-11	1.2-8.6
1978				
16-25 years	1042	4-14	22-43	43-70
26-59 years	2550	2.5-8	5-12	12-22
60 years or older	975	0.8-7.5	0.1-4.0	0-2.2
<u>Sex</u>				
1976				
Male	1400	3-11	8-19	15-30
Female	2464	1.2-4.8	8-15	11-19
1978				
Male	1491	3-11	10-22	19-35
Female	3167	1.8-6	7-14	16-25

Table B-4 (Continued)
JOLIET: 1976 and 1978

Race, Age, and Sex of Respondent, Household Income, and Length of Time at Present Address	Confidence Interval ¹			
	N	Robbery	Aggravated Assaults	Other Assaults
<u>Household Income</u>				
1976				
\$0-10,000	1273	1.0-6.8	12-26	12-27
\$10,001 to 20,000	1527	2.0-8.5	8-18	14-27
\$20,000 or more	511	1-14	1-11	17-45
Refused	1090	1.6-9.3	5-16	5-17
1978				
\$0-10,000	887	3-13	11-27	17-37
\$10,001 to 20,000	1320	1.4-8	17-18	20-37
\$20,000 or more	918	1.3-9.5	3.3-14	18-38
Refused	1541	3-10	7-17	8-18
<u>Length of Time at Present Address</u>				
1976				
0-2 years	1344	1.8-8.6	14-29	19-36
3-9 years	1221	1.5-8.3	7-19	18-35
10 or more years	1785	1.7-7.2	2.8-9.5	4-11
1978				
0-2 years	1481	5-15	15-29	28-46
3-9 years	1176	1-7.4	6-18	13-29
10 or more years	1867	1-5	3-10	9-19

SOURCE: 1976 - Regular Questionnaires and Victimization Reports (October-November, 1976)
1978 - Regular Questionnaires and Victimization Reports (October-November, 1978)

Base: 1976 - Weighted Regular Questionnaire response (N = 4413)
1978 - Weighted Regular Questionnaire response (N = 4667)

¹ Confidence intervals are derived for victimization rates per thousand, age sixteen or more.

Table B-5

Ninety-Five Percent Confidence Intervals for Personal Crimes
for Individuals Sixteen Years and Older by Race, Age, and Sex of Respondent,
Household Income, and Length of Time at Present Address in
PEORIA: 1976 and 1978

Race, Age, and Sex of Respondent, Household Income, and Length of Time at Present Address	Confidence Interval ¹			
	N	Robbery	Aggravated Assaults	Other Assaults
<u>Total</u>				
1976	4434	1.9-5.3	9-15	15-23
1978	4704	2.2-5.5	6.3-12	16-24
<u>Race</u>				
1976				
Black	406	3-22	39-83	10-38
White	3965	1.6-4.9	5-10	15-24
1978				
Black	418	.8-13	10-37	28-67
White	4213	2.2-6	5-10	14-21
<u>Age</u>				
1976				
16-25 years	930	7-21	36-69	21-43
26-59 years	2379	0.7-4.3	12-21	6-14
60 years or older	1068	0-3.6	0.6-6.8	0.3-5.3
1978				
16-25 years	924	5.4-18	14-33	32-58
26-59 years	2469	1-5	4-10	15-26
60 years or older	1223	0.6-6	1-7	1-7
<u>Sex</u>				
1976				
Male	1516	1.1-6.8	7-18	14-27
Female	2857	1.7-6.0	9-16	14-24
1978				
Male	1450	1.6-8	9-20	18-33
Female	3247	2-6	4.3-10	13-22

Table B-5 (Continued)
PEORIA: 1976 and 1978

Race, Age, and Sex of Respondent, Household Income, and Length of Time at Present Address	Confidence Interval ¹			
	N	Robbery	Aggravated Assaults	Other Assaults
<u>Household Income</u>				
1976				
\$0-10,000	1160	1.5-8.8	16-32	18-36
\$10,001 to 20,000	1447	1.2-7.1	6-16	21-37
\$20,000 or more	667	3-17	4-20	8-27
Refused	1144	0.2-5.0	3-11	3-11
1978				
\$0-10,000	976	0.7-7	7.3-21	25-47
\$10,001 to 20,000	1219	2-10	5-16	11-25
\$20,000 or more	1065	0.7-7	4-15	10-24
Refused	1444	2.5-10	3.5-12	11-24
<u>Length of Time at Present Address</u>				
1976				
0-2 years	1527	2.3-9.4	10-22	23-41
3-9 years	1259	0.9-7.0	10-24	14-29
10 or more years	1576	1.4-7.4	3-11	4-13
1978				
0-2 years	1527	2-8.5	8-19	26-43
3-9 years	1263	2-9	3-12	9-22
10 or more years	1820	1.6-7	3-10	8-18

SOURCE: 1976 - Regular Questionnaires and Victimization Reports (October-November, 1976)
1978 - Regular Questionnaires and Victimization Reports (October-November, 1978)

Base: 1976 - Weighted Regular Questionnaire response (N = 4434)
1978 - Weighted Regular Questionnaire response (N = 4704)

¹ Confidence intervals are derived for victimization rates per thousand, age 16 or more.

Table B-6

Ninety-Five Percent Confidence Intervals for Household Crimes
by Race, Age, and Sex of Household Head, Household Income,
Length of Time at Present Address and Type of Residence in
JOLIET: 1976 and 1978

Race, Age, and Sex of Household Head, House- hold Income, Length of Time at Present Address and Type of Residence	Confidence Interval ¹			
	N	Residential Burglary A	Residential Burglary B	Household Larceny
<u>Total</u>				
1976	4413	49-62	15-22	61-74
1978	4667	42-53	15-22	61-74
<u>Race</u>				
1976				
Black	569	106-156	8-27	48-85
White	3659	38-50	14-22	63-78
1978				
Black	590	46-81	13-34	31-60
White	3843	41-53	16-23	64-79
<u>Age</u>				
1976				
16-25 years	482	58-102	7-26	67-114
26-59 years	2758	56-73	19-29	71-89
60 years or older	1117	19-36	6-16	23-41
1978				
16-25 years	607	52-88	10-29	87-132
26-59 years	2864	46-60	21-31	67-84
60 years or older	1076	22-41	2.5-11	21-39
<u>Sex</u>				
1976				
Male	2929	48-63	14-23	69-86
Female	1438	43-64	11-23	38-59
1978				
Male	1816	40-58	13-28	67-89
Female	2810	42-56	14-23	54-69

Table B-6 (Continued)
JOLIET: 1976 and 1978

Race, Age, and Sex of Household Head, Household Income Length of Time at Present Address and Type of Residence	Confidence Interval ¹			
	N	Residential Burglary A	Residential Burglary B	Household Larceny
<u>Household Income</u>				
1976				
\$0-10,000	1273	51-75	8-19	48-72
\$10,001 to 20,000	1527	38-57	18-32	68-93
\$20,000 or more	511	52-92	12-35	84-133
Refused	1090	44-69	12-26	35-58
1978				
\$0-10,000	887	51-80	10-26	41-68
\$10,001 to 20,000	1320	39-60	17-32	59-83
\$20,000 or more	918	43-70	19-38	81-116
Refused	1541	28-45	8.5-19	47-67
<u>Length of Time at Present Address</u>				
1976				
0-2 years	1344	60-84	12-25	71-98
3-9 years	1221	51-76	15-29	68-96
10 or more years	1785	32-48	13-24	40-58
1978				
0-2 years	1481	53-76	10-21	85-112
3-9 years	1176	37-58	17-33	48-72
10 or more years	1867	33-41	16-28	43-61
<u>Type of Residence</u>				
1976				
Single Family	3263	47-62	18-27	57-72
Other	1093	49-74	4-13	65-94
1978				
Single Family	3466	41-54	17-26	59-73
Other	1082	45-69	8.5-21	63-92

SOURCE: 1976 - Regular Questionnaires and Victimization Reports (October-November, 1976)
1978 - Regular Questionnaires and Victimization Reports (October-November, 1978)

Base: 1976 - Weighted Regular Questionnaire response (N = 4413)
1978 - Weighted Regular Questionnaire response (N = 4667)

¹ Confidence intervals are derived for victimization rates per thousand households.

Table B-7

Ninety-Five Percent Confidence Intervals for Household Crimes
by Race, Age, and Sex of Household Head, Household Income,
Length of Time at Present Address and Type of Residence in
PEORIA: 1976 and 1978

Race, Age, and Sex of Household Head, Household Income Length of Time at Present Address and Type of Residence	Confidence Interval ¹			
	N	Residential Burglary A	Residential Burglary B	Household Larceny
<u>Total</u>				
1976	4434	39-51	10-16	62-76
1978	4704	38-49	9-15	65-79
<u>Race</u>				
1976				
Black	403	64-116	11-38	56-106
White	3935	34-46	9-15	62-77
1978				
Black	409	66-118	4.6-24	62-112
White	4184	35-46	9-16	64-79
<u>Age</u>				
1976				
16-25 years	586	65-108	0-11	88-136
26-59 years	2619	38-52	10-18	71-91
60 years or older	1152	20-38	10-23	24-33
1978				
16-25 years	623	83-128	12-33	67-108
26-59 years	2716	36-51	10-18	82-102
60 years or older	1254	14-29	3-11	19-36
<u>Sex</u>				
1976				
Male	3014	39-53	9-17	70-87
Female	1357	31-51	8-19	34-55
1978				
Male	1596	25-41	11-22	70-95
Female	3074	43-58	7-14	60-76

Table B-7 (Continued)
PEORIA: 1976 and 1978

Race, Age, and Sex of House- hold Head, Household Income Length of Time at Present Address and Type of Residence	N	Confidence Interval ¹		
		Residential Burglary A	Residential Burglary B	Household Larceny
<u>Household Income</u>				
1976				
\$0-10,000	1160	48-74	6-17	41-65
\$10,001 to 20,000	1447	33-52	10-22	81-109
\$20,000 or more	667	26-54	11-31	74-116
Refused	1144	29-50	6-17	33-56
1978				
\$0-10,000	976	54-83	0.4-6	40-66
\$10,001 to 20,000	1219	30-50	12-27	73-102
\$20,000 or more	1065	35-59	14-31	86-120
Refused	1444	23-41	4-13	42-64
<u>Length of Time at Present Address</u>				
1976				
0-2 years	1527	58-82	6-15	72-99
3-9 years	1259	27-46	9-21	67-95
10 or more years	1576	24-40	10-22	38-57
1978				
0-2 years	1527	53-76	6.3-16	79-106
3-9 years	1263	29-49	13-28	59-86
10 or more years	1820	26-42	5.7-14	49-69
<u>Type of Residence</u>				
1976				
Single Family	3432	38-52	10-17	57-73
Other	936	35-61	5-17	70-104
1978				
Single Family	3678	33-45	10-17	64-80
Other	949	51-81	4-15	63-95

SOURCE: 1976 - Regular Questionnaires and Victimization Reports (October-November, 1976)
1978 - Regular Questionnaires and Victimization Reports (October-November, 1978)

BASE: 1976 - Weighted Regular Questionnaire response (N = 4434)
1978 - Weighted Regular Questionnaire response (N = 4704)

¹ Confidence Intervals are defined in terms of the number of households per 1000 households that were victimized by burglary or larceny.

APPENDIX C

TRAINING OF INTERVIEWERS

APPENDIX C
TRAINING OF INTERVIEWERS

Training was conducted from a Training Manual* developed specifically for this survey. One day-long training session was held for each cohort of interviewers. Highlighting these sessions were the practice interviews from prepared scripts, in which trainees took turns playing the roles of interviewers and respondents. In this way, sensitive or complex interview scenarios could be resolved in a practice environment. The training agenda appears on the following page.

Daily work procedures were also explained at the training sessions. At the beginning of each work day, interviewers would be assigned a predetermined list of phone numbers to contact. Initial assignments were lists of computer generated phone numbers. Other numbers were assigned for recontact attempts of previously unsuccessful efforts.

Once an apparently successful contact is made, the informed consent of the respondent is a necessary prerequisite of interviewing. To elicit this informed consent by way of introduction, interviewers were instructed to read the following passage to all potential respondents:

Hello. Is this (phone number)?

I'm (interviewer's name) and I'm doing some work for the Illinois Law Enforcement Commission. Your phone number has been Scientifically selected by our computer so that we could ask a few questions, to help us evaluate the Urban High Crime Program. Your cooperation is essential for our evaluation and will only take a few minutes of your time.**

Everything you tell me is strictly confidential. Nonetheless, feel free to refuse to answer any question you don't want to answer. All right?

If the respondent was not believed to be at least sixteen, the interviewer was instructed to ask: "Are you at least sixteen?" If answered in the negative, the interviewer was then to ask for someone who was at least sixteen, and if appropriate, also of a predesignated sex.

*Available at cost from Abt Associates.

** For those responding to the Attitudinal Questionnaire, interviewers were instructed to ask for about ten minutes.

A place of business was usually recognized immediately, and after an apology, an interviewer would disconnect. Businesses operating in households (e.g., physicians) were treated as households only if the household number was on the list and contacted.

As part of their training, all interviewers were briefed about the purposes of the study, the Illinois Law Enforcement Commission, and the local Urban High Crime Reduction programs. This enabled them to deal directly with most questions. Skeptical respondents were encouraged to verify the study's authenticity with the respective local police department (numbers were provided).

CRIME VICTIMIZATION STUDY
TRAINING SCHEDULE

- I. Introduction
 - A. Abt Associates Inc.
 - B. Illinois Law Enforcement Commission
 - C. Study Goals - Urban High Crime Reduction Program
- II. Study Methodology
 - A. Types of Questionnaires
 - B. Designated Respondents
 - C. Sample Selection Procedures
 - 1. Initial Call Records
 - 2. Questionnaire Contact Logs
- III. Elicitation of Cooperation
 - A. Informed Consent - Introductory Statement
 - B. Refusals
 - C. Need for High Cooperation Rates
- IV. General Rules for Interviewing
 - A. Ethics - Confidentiality
 - B. Professionalism - Establishing Rapport
 - C. Bias - And How to Avoid It
 - D. Neutral Probing
 - E. Terminations
- V. Question-by-Question Specifications
 - A. Attitudinal Questionnaire
 - B. Regular Questionnaire
 - C. Victimization Report
- VI. Practice Interviewing - Role Playing
- VII. Work Submission and Administrative Procedures
 - A. Daily Report Log
 - B. Quality Control
 - C. Scheduling hours
 - D. Preparation of Time Sheets

END