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The 1992 Georgia Victimization Survey

Executive Summary

In late July and early August 1992, 989 residents in Georgia were interviewed over the telephone for a victimization survey sponsored by the Governor's Criminal Justice Coordinating Council. Of this number, 817 constituted a statewide stratified random sample. Overall, compared to the statewide population, this sample had higher percentages of whites and of women and was better educated. An additional 172 respondents (all residents of the city of Atlanta) were interviewed, for a total sample from Atlanta (including those in the statewide sample) of 234.

All respondents were asked questions about victimizations during the prior year and, for violent crimes, whether family members had been victims. They were also asked about their familiarity with and use of various service programs (e.g., victim/witness assistance, rape crisis centers). In addition to these questions, respondents were asked about their fear of crime in general, fear of specific types of crime, the precautions they take to prevent crime, their perception of disorder in their neighborhood, and their judgment of police performance. For the Atlanta sample, we compared responses to questions assessing fear of crime and police performance to survey responses gathered by the Census Bureau for the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) in 1971.

Statewide victimization rates appeared to be higher than those reported by the National Crime Victimization Survey, a national survey conducted by the Bureau of Justice Statistics. In Georgia, victimization rates were higher for men than for women and for blacks than for whites. Black males had the highest victimization rates of any group. Because telephone surveys underrepresent the poor, actual victimization rates may be higher than those reported here.

Most of the crimes (62%) were reported to have been committed by strangers, although that generalization was not true for sexual assaults and attempted assaults. In slightly more than half of the cases (52%), victims said their first action after the crime was to report the crime to the police. Of the remaining cases, a sizable number said they spoke with someone first, consistent with prior research showing that victims often rely on others for support, information, and advice. Overall, 63% of the crimes were eventually reported to the police, with reporting rates ranging from 31% (sexual assault) to 77% (burglary). In response to questions about whether their family members had ever suffered criminal victimizations, surprisingly high percentages of respondents replied affirmatively: over 1% of respondents said that someone in their family had been murdered, and about 6% of all respondents said that family members had suffered sexual assaults, domestic abuse, or robbery.

Respondents were also asked whether they knew if seven different victim services were located in their county and whether they had ever used any of those services. Most respondents knew whether or not there was a rape crisis center, a battered women's shelter, legal aid, and mental health/counseling in their county. However, respondents were less knowledgeable about victim/witness assistance programs, DUI counseling programs, and victim compensation programs. Generally, only small percentages of the sample had ever used any of the services, with individuals who had been victims of violent crimes in the past year being slightly more likely to have used the services.
In terms of the attitudinal questions, females were more afraid of crime in general and they took more precautions to prevent crime than did males. Compared to whites, blacks had higher fear of crime and perceived more disorder in their neighborhood. The highest fear respondents had was of being in a drunk driving crash. City residents were more afraid of crime and perceived more disorder in their neighborhood than did residents of towns, suburbs, and rural areas.

Victimizations and attitudinal responses for the Atlanta sample were generally consistent with results for the statewide sample. A comparison of Atlantans' judgments about their chances of being attacked or robbed and their judgments about the safety of their neighborhood with responses given in the 1971 LEAA study showed that Atlantans today feel slightly safer than they did 20 years ago. In terms of police performance, Atlantans today rate the police higher than did Atlantans 20 years ago.

The results from this survey have implications in terms of information campaigns for making victim services programs better known, as well as for giving information to citizens statewide in their role as potential advisors and supporters to crime victims. Further, the finding, both statewide and in Atlanta, that blacks rated police performance significantly lower than did whites has relevance for policy makers concerned about the potential negative repercussions of such racial polarization. Suggestions for future victimization surveys are also included.
The 1992 Georgia Victimization Survey

This study consists of two parts, a statewide random sample of 817 individuals, and a random sample of 234 Atlanta residents, the 62 residents who were in the statewide sample and an additional 172 Atlanta citizens who were also interviewed. After a brief explanation of the methodology used in the study, the first part describes the participants in the statewide sample and characterizes their victimizations during the prior year. This descriptive information is followed by a discussion of their knowledge and use of victim services, their fear of crime, their precautionary behaviors, and their perceptions of neighborhood disorder. The second part of this paper gives the same information for the sample of Atlanta residents and also compares their responses to those given by Atlantans 20 years ago.

Statewide Sample

To discover the extent of violent crime in Georgia, we conducted a statewide stratified random sample telephone survey. Telephone surveys are probably the most cost-effective way to collect quality data (Lavrakas, 1987), because response rates are generally much better when respondents are contacted by phone than in person, especially when questions are personal. Further, because it is generally very difficult to obtain valid addresses, a random mail survey is not feasible. Finally, telephone interviews are generally cheaper than other methods.

Because of the expense associated with mail surveys, we chose a telephone survey, which was conducted by the Center for Public and Urban Research at Georgia State University. Households were sampled from a database purchased from Survey Samplings Inc., a Connecticut-based company that maintains a database containing all active telephone exchanges. The company identifies all working exchanges (the first three numbers of the seven digit phone number) and working blocks (the fourth and fifth numbers). Each working exchange is assigned to the specific county in which it is used. The sample for the state of Georgia was stratified by county population, so that the chance of a person from any particular county being included in the sample was proportional to the number of residents in that county compared to the state population. The company then selected the sample for the state by randomly generating the last two digits for the working exchanges and working blocks. From this pool of numbers, businesses were eliminated. This methodology ensures that the final sample will include both new and unlisted telephone numbers. According to Survey Samplings, Inc., recent telephone surveys have had cooperation rates of 54% in the Southeast, somewhat lower than for other parts of the country. Cooperation is also generally lower in big cities than in suburban and rural areas.

Although a sample is the only feasible way to study victimizations and to assess attitudes, it must be noted that there are potential problems with using samples. First, individuals who cannot be reached may be systematically different from those who are included in the study. For example, Groves and Kahn (1979) found that people without telephones were likely to live in single adult households, to be less educated, to be poorer, to be minorities, and to be employed in an occupation that is nonprofessional and nonmanagerial. Although more people have telephones now than when that study was conducted, there is still some bias in using telephones. For the present study, individuals who do not have a telephone are undoubtedly less well off and probably more transient than individuals who do have phones.

Obtaining an adequate response rate to a mail survey requires at least three mailings. First, there is an initial letter, in which the purpose of the survey is described and respondents are alerted to the fact that they will shortly receive a survey. Then, the survey is sent with a postage-paid return envelope. Following the survey, one or two reminders (sometimes with an additional copy of the questionnaire) are sent. Obviously, these multiple mailings can be very expensive for a sample size sufficient to give relatively stable estimates (roughly 750 individuals).
If these individuals are more likely to be victims of crime, this bias may mean that the victimizations reported here underestimate the true amount of victimizations in the state. This bias is probably more of a problem in rural areas than in Atlanta, where phone ownership rates are very high. A second source of bias in the sample concerns those individuals with phones who did not agree to participate in the study.

**Method**

**Respondents**

The sample consisted of 817 residents of Georgia, 317 males and 500 females, who ranged in age from 18 to 83. In the final sample, 130 of Georgia’s 159 counties were represented. As would be expected from a statewide stratified sample, the metropolitan Atlanta area comprised about half of the sample.

The sample was four-fifths white, one-sixth black, and 2 percent other (Asian, Hispanic, Native American). A small number of respondents (.6%) did not give their race. Almost all the sample (88%) had a high school diploma, and 31% had at least a college degree. Annual household incomes ranged from less than $7,500 (7.1% of the sample) to over $75,000 (11.1% of the sample). Most of the sample (40.1%) had annual incomes between $25,000 and $50,000. Three-fourths of the sample (75.6%) owned their residences, and most (73.3%) lived in single-family dwellings. Their households ranged in size from 1 to 10 (Mean = 2.9; Median = 3.0), with the number of children ranging from 0 to 9 (Mean = .9; Median = 0). Of the 817 households, 369 had children. Some of this information, summarized in Table 1, is compared to available statewide data from the 1990 Census. Compared to the statewide population, the sample had a higher percentage of women, included a higher percentage of whites, and was better educated. This slight bias might mean that the number of reported victimizations underestimates the true figure.

**Procedure**

**Sampling strategy.** Trained interviewers called each of the households identified in the sample pool of numbers. When someone in the home was reached, the interviewer read a brief statement introducing the study as being sponsored by the Governor’s Criminal Justice Coordinating Council. He or she then asked for the person in the household over 18 who had had the most recent birthday (see Henry, 1990, p. 93), a procedure that controls for the fact that in telephone surveys it is generally easier to reach women than men and older than younger individuals (Lavrakas, 1987, p. 54). When the person with the most recent birthday came to the phone, the interviewer described the study, asked if the individual understood what was involved, and then asked for the person’s consent to participate. When that introduction was completed, the interview began. The interviews were conducted during the last two weeks of July and the first week of August, 1992. On the average, interviews took 18 minutes 50 seconds to complete.

Most telephone calls did not result in a completed interview, because of nonworking numbers. Other households were not included because no one answered the telephone, even after the household was called eight times. Of the 1,727 households contacted, 817 (47.3%) completed the interview, only slightly less than the typical response rate, but not surprising given the sensitive nature of the questions. In terms of the survey, it might be that persons who were interested in criminal justice issues or who had been victimized were more likely to agree to the interview. If this is true, then crime victims might be overrepresented in the final sample.
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Table 1. Description of Statewide Sample and Comparison to 1990 Census Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statewide Sample</th>
<th>1990 Census Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>817 respondents*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317 males (38.8%)</td>
<td>48.5% male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 females (61.2%)</td>
<td>51.5% female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range: 18 - 83 (Mean = 42.8; Median = 40)</td>
<td>Median = 31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82% white</td>
<td>70.1% white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16% black</td>
<td>26.8% black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2% other</td>
<td>3.1% other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12% less than high school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29% high school diploma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3% technical training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25% some college</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21% college degree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% graduate education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88% High School Graduates</td>
<td>70.9% High School Graduates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31% College Graduates</td>
<td>19.3% College Graduates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7% &lt; $7,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% $7,501 - $15,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17% $15,001 - $25,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17% $25,001 - $35,000 (Median)</td>
<td>Median 1989 income = $29,021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23% $35,001 - $50,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14% $50,001 - $75,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11% &gt; $75,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29% rural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11% town away from urban area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35% suburb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17% city outside central area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7% central area of city</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Individuals under 18 were excluded.

Instrument. Items on the questionnaire, a copy of which is presented in the Appendix, were taken from several preexisting scales. The first 5 items, which measured fear of crime, were taken from victimization surveys used in Kentucky and North Carolina. These five measures of fear were combined to create a single measure of fear of crime, which had high internal reliability (alpha = .77). The next two items, also related to fear of crime, were taken from the National Crime Survey conducted by the Census Bureau and Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) in Atlanta and 12 other cities.
in 1971 (Garofalo, 1977). The next 7 questions, taken from the recent North Carolina survey, asked respondents how likely they thought they were to be a victim of the crimes listed (burglary, auto theft, robbery, assault, sexual assault, domestic assault, a drunk driving crash). The next 12 items, which were taken from the Police Foundation’s study of the effectiveness of police foot patrols in Houston and Newark (Pate, Wycoff, Skogan, & Sherman, 1986), assessed respondents’ attitudes about the disorder in their community (e.g., abandoned buildings, public drinking) and police performance. The nine measures of signs of disorder were combined to create a single measure of neighborhood disorder, which had high internal consistency (alpha = .76).

The next 15 items came from the precautionary scale of Norris (1992), which has been used in prior surveys in Kentucky and South Carolina. These 15 behaviors were combined to create a single measure of precautionary behavior (alpha = .70). The next 7 questions asked respondents about whether they would advise relatives to report victimizations (robbery with and without a weapon, sexual assault by a known or unknown offender, assault on an elderly female relative, wife abuse, assault) to the police. These questions about normative beliefs were taken from studies by Greenberg and Ruback (1992), who had adapted them from items originally appearing in the National Survey of Crime Severity (Wolfgang, Figlio, Tracy, & Singer, 1985). The next 3 items, taken from Public Opinion About Crime (Garofalo, 1977), asked respondents about their perceptions of the police, their chances of being robbed, and their perception of the media’s reporting of crime.

The next group of questions concerned whether the respondent had been a crime victim between July 4, 1991 and July 4, 1992. Specifically, respondents were asked whether they had been a victim of robbery, attempted robbery, aggravated assault, attempted assault, sexual assault, burglary or attempted burglary, or theft or vandalism of property. If they said they had been a victim of a crime in the prior year, they were then asked who the offender was (stranger, acquaintance, well known person, family member), what was the first action they took after the crime (called the police, talked to someone, some other action), and whether or not they reported the crime to the police. In addition, respondents were asked if anyone in their family had ever been a victim of murder, unwanted sexual activity, assault, or robbery. They were also asked if any children in their household had been victims of these crimes.

Respondents were also asked if they knew whether or not each of seven different victim services programs was located in their county. They were also asked whether or not they or anyone in their family had ever used any of the service programs. The final group of questions asked respondents about demographic and descriptive information (race, education, age, size of household, income, sex, type of home, zip code, and county of residence).

Results

Victimizations

Respondents were asked whether they had been the victim of any of several completed or attempted crimes. Of the 817 respondents, 73 said they were a victim of at least one type of violent crime, 69 were victims of at least one attempted violent crime, and 113 said they were victims of at least one completed or attempted violent crime. When property crimes are included, 264 individuals were victims of one or more crimes during the study year.
Table 2 presents the breakdown of victims by race and sex. As can be seen there, 14% of the entire sample suffered a violent victimization (robbery, attempted robbery, or any type of assault) during the prior year. Further, 32% suffered some victimization, violent or nonviolent, during the prior year (all percentages may be 3 points higher or lower due to sampling error). As can be seen in the table, males had higher victimization rates than did females, and blacks had higher victimization rates than did whites. Black males had the highest victimization rates, whereas white females had the lowest victimization rates.

| Table 2. Percent by Race and Sex of Individuals Victimized - Statewide Sample |
|----------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
|                                  | White |          | Black |          |
|                                  | Male  | Female   | Male  | Female   |
| Number in Sample                 | 269   | 290      | 36    | 93       |
| Any Violent Crime                | 16%   | 10%      | 19%   | 19%      |
| Any Crime                        | 36%   | 28%      | 44%   | 39%      |

*Includes 29 members of other races. Sampling error is plus or minus 3 percentage points.

Table 3 provides information by race and sex about the victims of each of the violent and property crimes asked about in the survey. Listed in the table for each crime are the percentage of females and percentage of blacks. The table suggests that, excepting sexual assault, females were less likely than males to be victimized, in that the percentages of females victimized were slightly less than the percentage of female respondents in the survey (61%). In contrast, given that blacks comprised just under 16% of the sample, it is clear that blacks were more likely to be victimized. Under the practice of the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS), the number of attempted assaults shown in the table (55) would be reduced by 13, because that is the number of respondents who said the threat was made over the telephone.
Table 4 provides information about whether the offender was a stranger and what victims did after they were victimized, in terms of whether they reported immediately or did something else and in terms of whether they ever reported the crime. In the first column is the number of respondents statewide who said they had been a victim of each type of crime during the preceding year. In the second column is the number of individuals who were victimized by strangers. Thus, for robbery, 13 of the 20 victimizations were committed by strangers. In the third column is the number of victims who reported immediately after the crime was over or the crime was discovered. For robbery, 9 of the 20 victims reported immediately, meaning that 11 victims took some other action. In the final column is the number (and percentage) of victims who eventually reported the crime. For robbery, 14 of the 20 victims eventually reported. For the crime of theft or vandalized property, the number of crimes committed by strangers may be increased by as many as 13, because that number of individuals did not respond to the question and probably did not know the offender.

Table 3. Characteristics of Victims

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Crime</th>
<th>Number of Victims</th>
<th>Percent Female</th>
<th>Percent Black</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempted Robbery</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated Assault</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempted Assault</td>
<td>55*</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Assaults</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Assaults</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Attacks</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary/</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempted Burglary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft/Vandalism</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any Property Crime</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any Violent Crime</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any Crime</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>454</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The National Crime Victimization Survey would reduce this number by 13, the number of threats made over the telephone.
Table 4. Characteristics of Victimization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Crime</th>
<th>Number of Victims</th>
<th>Stranger</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Number Who Reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Offender</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14 (70%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempted Robbery</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13 (65%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated Assault</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12 (46%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempted Assault</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28 (51%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Assaults</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8 (42%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Assaults</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5 (31%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Attacks</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5 (36%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary /</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempted Burglary</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>98 (77%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft / Vandalism</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>104 (67%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>283 (62%)</td>
<td>235 (52%)</td>
<td>287 (63%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 describes the total number of victimizations respondents suffered. As can be seen there, 79 individuals reported experiencing one violent crime, 20 reported two victimizations, 6 reported three victimizations, 7 reported four victimizations, and 1 reported five violent victimizations. For property crimes, 122 reported one victimization and 81 reported two victimizations. The last line in the table, which combines both of these, indicates that 147 respondents reported one victimization, 75 reported two victimizations, 25 reported three victimizations, and 17 reported four or more victimizations.

Table 5. Number of Respondents Suffering Victimizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Crime</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any Violent Crime</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any Property Crime</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any Crime</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition to asking respondents whether they had been victimized during the prior year, we also asked them whether anyone in their household had ever been a victim of murder, sexual assault, domestic assault, and robbery. Table 6 presents the number of individuals who said someone in their household had been so victimized, the percentage of the total sample that this number represents, the number of these victimizations that were against children under 12, and the number of these cases in which the victim was advised to report. Thus, for sexual assault, 49 respondents (6% of the sample) reported a victimization in their family. Of these 49 cases, 19 were against children, and 28 had been advised to report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime</th>
<th>Number (%)</th>
<th>Number Against Child</th>
<th>Number Advised to Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Murder</td>
<td>13 (1.6%)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Assault</td>
<td>49 (6.0%)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Assault</td>
<td>48 (5.9%)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>51 (6.2%)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 presents information about respondents' knowledge and use of victim services. Respondents were asked whether each of seven different programs was available in their county. For rape crisis centers, battered women's shelters, legal aid, and mental health counseling, almost all respondents knew whether or not there was such a program in their county. However, for victim/witness assistance programs, DUI counseling programs, and victim compensation, about half of all respondents did not know whether such a program existed in their county. In terms of being used, most programs had been used by only a small percentage of people, with violent victims being more likely than the overall sample to have used the services.

In addition to questions about their own and their family's victimization, respondents were also asked what kind of precautions they took to prevent crime. Table 8 presents a ranking of the 15 items included in the survey. The actions respondents performed most commonly were locking their car when they were away from home, relying on their neighbors to report suspicious behavior, and locking their doors and windows. The least common actions were getting professional advice regarding home security, having a gun or dog for protection, relying on neighbors to house sit when they are gone, and establishing Neighborhood Watch programs.
### Table 7. Knowledge and Use of Victim Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Victim Service</th>
<th>In County?</th>
<th>Used it?</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>Entire Sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Witness Assistance</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape Crisis Centers</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battered Women's Shelters</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Aid</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health/Counseling</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUI Counseling</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Compensation</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding.

### Table 8. Precautionary Behaviors Taken by Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lock car, away</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbors report suspicions</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbors keep eye out</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lock doors, windows</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deadbolt locks</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra steps in crowd</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbors bring in mail</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lock car at home</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan route</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone back</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get someone to go with you</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Watch*</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbors house-sit</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gun/dog for protection</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice, home security*</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*1 = Almost Never, 2 = Some of the Time, 3 = Most of the Time, 4 = All of the Time
In addition to precautions, respondents were also asked about their fear of crime in general, fear of particular types of crime, and factors related to fear of crime, specifically perceptions of disorder in their community and the performance of police. Each of these questions was analyzed using a 2 x 2 x 2 analysis of variance, where the grouping variables were sex of respondent, race (white vs. black), and type of area in the state (urban vs. suburban/rural). Table 9 presents the significant differences in sex and race on these questions. As can be seen in the table, females took more precautions, were more afraid of crime, and saw more disorder in their community than did men. Blacks were more afraid of crime, saw more disorder in their community, and rated police performance lower than did whites. Not shown in the table is the fact that city residents were more afraid of crime than were non-city residents and city residents saw more disorder in their community than did non-city residents.

Fear was significantly related to precautionary behaviors, \( r = .37, n = 815, p < .001 \). Age was unrelated to fear of crime, negatively related to perceptions of disorder, \( r = -.13, n = 797, p < .001 \), and positively related to precautionary behaviors, \( r = .14, n = 797, p < .001 \). That is, older individuals tended to see less disorder in their community and took more precautions. Income was negatively related to fear, \( r = -.13, n = 746, p < .001 \), and to perceptions of disorder, \( r = -.23, n = 746, p < .001 \). Individuals with higher incomes were less afraid of crime and saw their neighborhoods as having less disorder.

Respondents were also asked how likely it would be that six different crimes (burglary, auto theft, robbery, assault, sexual assault, family abuse) would occur during the next year. For four of the crimes (sexual assault, assault, robbery, and auto theft) females thought it was significantly more likely that they would be victimized than did males. For three crimes (family abuse, sexual assault, and assault), blacks thought it was significantly more likely that they would be victimized than did whites. City residents thought they were significantly more likely to be victims of robbery and assault (Means = 2.18 and 2.16, respectively) than were suburban/rural residents (Means = 1.97 and 1.94, respectively). In addition to these crimes, respondents were asked how likely it would be that they would be victims of a drunk driving crash. This judgment was not affected by respondents' sex, race, or residential location. Significantly, however, respondents had the highest fear of being a victim of a drunk driving crash.

---

\(^2\)The symbol \( r \) represents the correlation between two variables, which can range in size from -1.00 to +1.00. A correlation of 0 means there is no relationship between two variables. The symbol \( p \) stands for the probability of a finding occurring by chance. Thus, \( p < .001 \) means that the result could have occurred by chance only 1 in 1,000 times. At such a level of probability, we can safely assume that the reported relationship is not due to chance. The symbol \( n \) stands for the number of respondents used to compute the correlation.
Perceptions of the police and media. In addition to the overall assessment of police performance shown in Table 9, respondents were asked more specific questions about police performance. Each of these questions was also analyzed by the 2 x 2 x 2 analysis of variance used above. On all three questions, blacks rated police performance lower than did whites. Specifically, blacks were more likely than whites to say police did not make enough contact with community residents, that police stop too many people on the streets without good reason, and that police are too tough on the people they stop. Compared to women, men overall thought police were too tough on people they stop. On the question concerning police stopping too many people without good reason, white men and white women did not differ significantly in their responses to the question. However, black men were significantly more likely to endorse that statement than were black women and both white men and white women.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Overall Mean</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>W</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Precautions</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of Crime</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Disorder</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Performance</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Higher numbers mean more precautions, more fear, more disorder, and better performance.
-- means no significant difference between groups
In terms of crime reporting by the media, 55% of the sample thought there is more crime than what the media reports, 37% thought the level of crime is about what the media reports, and 8% thought the level of crime is less than what the media reports. Compared to males, females believed the crime rate is significantly higher than what the media reports.

Normative beliefs. To try to understand respondents’ beliefs about reporting crimes to the police, we presented them with seven different scenarios and asked them if they would advise a family member who was so victimized to report the crime. Each of these scenarios was analyzed by a 2 x 2 x 2 analysis of variance (sex x race x urban vs. suburban/rural location). This analysis revealed one consistently significant effect, an interaction of sex and location on three crimes ($10 robbery with a lead pipe, sexual assault by a stranger, and man beats his wife) and a marginally significant effect on a fourth (stranger beats a family member). On all four variables the pattern was the same. Rural men were more likely to believe the crime should be reported than were urban men. In contrast, urban women were more likely to believe the crime should be reported than were rural women.

Summary of the Statewide Sample

Victimizations. The victimization rates reported in this study were surprisingly high. Data from the 1990 National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS; Rand, 1991) indicate that 23.7% of households suffered a criminal victimization, down from 32.1% in 1975. Comparable figures for violent crime (rape, robbery, and assault together) showed a drop from 5.8% of households in 1975 to 4.7% in 1990. That Georgia has a higher rate than the national figures may be cause for concern.

It must be remembered, however, that there is more error associated with the Georgia survey than with the national survey. First, there is a problem with "telescoping," the tendency respondents have to place a crime within a time frame even though it occurred before or after the time period began. Thus, in this study, respondents may have said they were victimized during the July 4th to July 4th period, even though they had been victimized before or after then. The NCVS guards against telescoping by interviewing respondents every six months, and asking them if they had been victimized since they were last interviewed (i.e., during the prior six-month period). To incorporate such a time-bounding procedure in Georgia would be expensive, but it would certainly give more accurate estimates of victimization. Also, the NCVS uses face-to-face interviews over a continuing time period, so that respondents have a level of trust in the interviewers that cannot be obtained in a one-shot telephone survey.

A second problem with the current study concerns selection bias in the sample. The roughly 5-10% of the state's population that is without a telephone were excluded. Those people without telephones are probably more transient, poorer, and have higher victimization rates than the group included in the present sample. A second source of bias concerns the relatively high proportion of educated respondents. Research suggests that educated respondents are more likely to report victimizations than are less educated individuals because of their sensitivity to physical contact and property rights. Thus, the inclusion of a high proportion of educated individuals may inflate the rate of victimizations.

An additional source of bias concerns the relatively high rate of refusal to participate in the study. One way that this bias could have worked is to overinclude victims in the study. That is, only individuals motivated to participate (i.e., victims) answered the questionnaire. And, as is true of all surveys, it is possible that respondents did not tell the truth, either increasing or decreasing their actual number of victimizations. Guarding against this bias, however, is the likelihood that individuals disposed to lie would probably have refused to be interviewed (Lavrakas, 1987).
In sum, some factors might mean victims are overrepresented in this sample, whereas other factors might mean victims are underrepresented. The exact amount of bias of each of these two sources in unknown, and they may well cancel each other out.

Consistent with prior research in other states, this survey indicated fairly high levels of fear of crime and that this fear was greater among women than men, among blacks than whites, and among urban residents than among suburban or rural residents. The greatest fear was of a drunk driving crash. The only factor that mattered in terms of respondents' judgments about the kind of job the police were doing was race: blacks thought the police were doing a significantly worse job than did whites.

**Policy relevant findings.** From Table 4, it is apparent that in only about half of the cases did victims report the crime immediately to the police. That victims delay before calling the police is important because for many crimes waiting too long before reporting the crime can mean the difference between being able and not being able to make an arrest (Spelman & Brown, 1981; Van Kirk, 1978).

For about a fifth of the victims in this study (21%), the first action they took, rather than calling the police, was to talk with someone else, an action especially true for rape victims in this study. That victims talk with others before deciding to call or not to call the police is consistent with research we have conducted with rape victims at the Rape Crisis Center at Grady Hospital (Ruback & Ivie, in press) and, more generally, with theft, burglary, and robbery victims (Greenberg & Ruback, 1992).

This advice is important because victims generally rely on others to help them decide whether or not to call the police (Ruback, Greenberg, & Westcott, 1984). As can be seen in Table 6, many individuals did not advise family members to report even very serious violent crimes to the police. One implication of these findings is that, if the Criminal Justice Coordinating Council is concerned with increasing reporting, one target for action is individuals who serve as advisors to victims, that is, friends and family. An option might be something like the campaign against drunk drivers (e.g., "Friends don't let friends drive drunk."), where potential advisors are told, "Friends don't blame crime victims. Friends give help and support."

About half of the respondents in the sample did not know whether three victim programs were located in their county: victim/witness assistance programs, DUI counseling, and victim compensation. One implication of these findings is that, for counties that have such programs, citizens need to be better informed about their existence. We could not compute whether or not respondents were correct in saying there were or were not programs in their county because there is no central registry of victim agencies in the state, a list that might be helpful in the future. The study also indicated that Neighborhood Watch programs and having police experts give advice about how to reduce crime are not much used in the state.
Atlanta Sample

In addition to the 817 respondents in the statewide survey, 172 residents of the city of Atlanta were randomly sampled, for a total of 234 individuals who said they lived in Atlanta. Of this number, there were 87 males and 147 females. There were 139 whites, 90 blacks, 3 Native Americans, and 2 persons who did not give their race. Respondents ranged in age from 18 to 90 (\(M = 42.6; \) Median = 38). The median income was between $25,000 and $35,000. About 86% of the sample had a high school diploma, and 49% had a college degree. This discussion of the results from the Atlanta sample follows the same sequence as that used for the entire statewide sample. Recent census data show that only 3.6% of Atlanta’s 394,017 citizens do not have a telephone. Thus, there is some reason to believe that this potential source of bias is relatively small.

Table 10 presents a breakdown of victims in Atlanta by race and sex. As can be seen, 11% of the entire sample suffered a violent victimization during the prior year, and 37% suffered either a violent or property victimization during the study period (all percentages may be 6 points higher or lower due to sampling error). As was true of the statewide sample, males had higher victimization rates than did females and blacks had higher victimization rates than did whites. Because the sample size is small, the error associated with the figures is fairly large. Thus, for most of the remaining tables, the numbers reported by respondents are given but are not converted into percentages. This absence of percentages is to remind the reader that these figures should not be used as estimates of the population figures.

| Table 10. Percent by Race and Sex of Individuals Victimized - Atlanta Sample |
|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
|                  | White            |                  | Black            |                  |
|                  | Male  | Female | Male  | Female | TOTAL |
| Number in Sample |       |        |       |        |       |
| 60               | 79    |        | 27    | 63     | 234*  |
| Any Violent Crime| 10%   | 8%     | 15%   | 16%    | 11%   |
| Any Crime        | 10%   | 8%     | 15%   | 16%    | 37%   |

*includes 5 people of other or unknown races. Sampling error is plus or minus 6 percentage points.

Table 11 provides information by race and sex regarding the victims of each of the violent and property crimes asked about in the survey. In the Atlanta sample, 63% were female, so that the observed percentages suggest that Atlanta females were victimized less than were males. The percentage of blacks in the Atlanta sample (39%) is lower than the observed percentages, indicating that blacks were disproportionately victimized.
Table 11. Characteristics of Victims - Atlanta Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Crime</th>
<th>Number of Victims</th>
<th>Percent Female</th>
<th>Percent Black</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempted Robbery</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated Assault</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempted Assault</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Assaults</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Assaults</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Attacks</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempted Burglary</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft/Vandalism</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any Property Crime</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any Violent Crime</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any Crime</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>149</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12 provides information about whether or not the offender was a stranger and what victims did after they were victimized, in terms of whether they reported immediately and whether they ever reported the crime. In the first column is the number of Atlanta residents who said they had been a victim of each type of crime during the preceding year. In the second column is the number of individuals who were victimized by strangers. The third column gives the number who said their first action was to report the crime, and the fourth column gives the total number who at some point reported the crime.
Table 13 describes the total number of victimizations respondents suffered. As can be seen there, 26 (11%) individuals reported experiencing one or more violent crimes. For property crimes, 72 individuals (31%) reported one or more victimizations. The last line in the table, which combines both of these, indicates that 86 respondents (37%) reported at least one victimization: 44 reported one victimization, 29 reported two victimizations, 8 reported three victimizations, and 5 reported four or more victimizations.
In addition to asking respondents whether they had been victimized during the prior year, we also asked them whether anyone in their household had ever been a victim of murder, sexual assault, domestic assault, or robbery. Table 14 presents the number of individuals who said someone in their household had been so victimized, the percentage of the total sample that this number is, the number of these victimizations that were against children under 12, and the number of these cases whether the victim was advised to report. Thus, for sexual assault, 22 respondents (9% of the sample) reported a victimization in their family. Of these 22 cases, 5 were against children under 12, and 17 had been advised to report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime</th>
<th>Number (%</th>
<th>Number Against Child</th>
<th>Number Advised to Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Murder</td>
<td>5 (2.1%)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Assault</td>
<td>22 (9.4%)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Assault</td>
<td>22 (9.4%)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>35 (15%)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15 presents information about Atlantans’ knowledge and use of victim services. Respondents were asked whether each of seven different programs was available in their county. For rape crisis centers, battered women’s shelters, legal aid, and mental health counseling, almost all respondents knew whether or not there was such a program in their county. However, as at the state level, for victim/witness assistance programs, DUI counseling programs, and victim compensation, about half of all respondents did not know whether such a program existed in their county. In terms of utilization, most programs had been used by only a small percentage of individuals, a rate that was somewhat higher for individuals who had been victims of violent crime during the prior year.
In addition to questions about victimizations, respondents were also asked what kind of precautions they took to prevent crime. Table 16 presents the ranking of the 15 items included in the survey. Compared to the statewide sample (presented in Table 8), Atlanta residents were more likely to lock their cars, to use deadbolts, and to make use of police services (i.e., Neighborhood Watch and advice for home security).

Table 15. Knowledge and Use of Victim Services - Atlanta Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Victim Service</th>
<th>In County?</th>
<th>Used it?</th>
<th>Violent Victims Only (26)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Don't Know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Witness Assistance</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape Crisis Centers</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battered Women’s Shelters</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Aid</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health/Counseling</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUI Counseling</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Compensation</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding.
In addition to their precautionary behaviors, respondents were also asked about their fear of crime in general, fear of specific types of crime, and about factors related to fear of crime, specifically perceptions of disorder in their community and the performance of police. Each of these questions was analyzed using a 2 x 2 analysis of variance, where the variables were sex of respondent and race (white vs. black). Table 17 presents the significant differences in sex and race on these questions. As can be seen in the table, women took more precautions, were more afraid of crime, and saw more disorder in their community than did men. Blacks were more afraid of crime, saw more disorder in their community, and rated police performance lower than did whites.

In addition to their precautionary behaviors, respondents were also asked about how likely it is that six different crimes (burglary, auto theft, robbery, assault, sexual assault, family abuse) would occur during the next year. For four of the crimes (family abuse, sexual assault, assault, and robbery) females thought it was significantly more likely that they would be victimized than did males. For two crimes (family abuse, assault), blacks thought it was significantly more likely that they would be victimized than did whites. In addition to these crimes, respondents were asked how likely it would be that they would be victims of a drunk driving crash. Females were significantly more afraid of this crime than were males.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 16. Precautionary Behaviors Taken by Respondents - Atlanta Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scale Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lock car, away</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deadbolt locks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lock car at home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra steps in crowd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lock doors, windows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbors report suspicions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbors bring in mail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbors keep eye out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Watch*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone back</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get someone to go with you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbors house-sit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice, home security*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gun/dog for protection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 = Almost Never  *1 = No; 4 = Yes
2 = Some of the Time
3 = Most of the Time
4 = All of the Time
Perceptions of the police and media. In addition to the overall assessment of police performance shown in Table 17, respondents were also asked more specific questions about police performance. Each of these questions was also analyzed by the 2 x 2 analysis of variance used above. On all three questions, blacks rated police performance lower than did whites. As was true at the state level, blacks were more likely than whites to say police did not make enough contact with community residents, that police stop too many people on the streets without good reason, and that police are too tough on the people they stop. In terms of crime reporting by the media, 50% thought crime is greater than what the media reports, 41% thought it is about what the media reports, and 9% thought crime is about what the media reports.

Table 17. Comparisons by Sex and Race of Fear of Crime and Other Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Overall Mean</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>W</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Precautions</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of Crime</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Disorder</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Performance</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Higher numbers mean more precautions, more fear, more disorder, and better performance. - means no significant difference between groups.

Likelihood of Crimes Occurring in Next Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime</th>
<th>Overall Mean</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>W</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family Abuse</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Assault</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Theft</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drunk Driving Crash</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 = Very Unlikely; 4 = Very Likely - means no significant difference between groups.
Compared to whites, blacks were significantly more likely to believe that crime is higher than what the media reports.

**Normative beliefs.** Atlantans' responses to the seven scenarios designed to discover whether they would advise a family member who was so victimized to report the crime were analyzed by a 2 x 2 analysis of variance (sex x race). This analysis revealed marginally significant interaction effects (both p's = .055) on the items dealing with sexual assault by a stranger and a teenage boy beating an elderly woman. On the first item, black males and white females said they would be less likely to advise reporting the crime than would white males and black females. On the second item, black males said they would be less likely to advise reporting than would white males, white females, or black females.

**Comparison with 1971 Survey**

In 1971, the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration and the Census Bureau conducted a survey of citizens in 13 major cities in the United States, of which Atlanta was one. Three of the questions used in that survey were repeated in the present one. Table 18 presents the percentages for each of the options to the questions. As can be seen there, fewer Atlanta residents today think their chances of being attacked or robbed have increased, as compared to responses given in 1971. Further, more Atlantans today think their neighborhood is safe as compared to residents' responses 20 years ago. Finally, more Atlanta residents today think the police are doing a good job than did Atlantans 20 years ago.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 18. Comparison of Attitudes from 1971 and 1992 Atlanta Residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived chances of being attacked or robbed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gone down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971 (LEAA/Census)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992 (SAB)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood safety at night</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very unsafe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971 (LEAA/Census)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992 (SAB)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Police performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971 (LEAA/Census)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992 (SAB)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comparison of the Statewide and Atlanta Data

Compared to the statewide survey, respondents in Atlanta reported higher levels of crime, higher fear of crime, and more precautions to prevent crime. As at the state level, blacks have a more negative view of police performance, but Atlantans in 1992 seem to have a more positive opinion about the crime rate and police performance than did Atlantans in 1971.

Suggestions for Future Surveys

As a general reference point for criminal justice policy in the state, it is probably a good idea to conduct a victimization survey on an annual or biennial basis. But even assuming that there will be a victimization survey conducted on a regular basis, other options should be considered.

1) One option is to include a few questions (e.g., fear of crime, satisfaction with the criminal justice system) on a quarterly basis as part of a general statewide survey. This option would be a relatively inexpensive way to get a continuous update on what Georgians are thinking. The major disadvantage is that only a few questions could be asked.

2) A second option, which would be used in conjunction with an annual survey, would be to divide the state into five areas. With every annual survey, one of these five areas of the state would be oversampled, as was done with Atlanta in the present survey. Coverage of the areas would then be rotated, so that every five years there would be an update of each area of the state.

3) A third option is to change the length of the survey. A shorter survey would mean that for the same amount of money, more households could be contacted. However, the larger sample size would not greatly change the confidence that could be placed on the results from the sample and would probably not be cost effective. Alternatively, the survey could be made longer. With this additional time, it would be easier to inquire about specific issues (e.g., drug crimes, spouse abuse) in depth.

4) A fourth option is to conduct a longitudinal survey of respondents, so that every household in the survey would be interviewed three times (initially, six months later, and then six months after that). Thus, for any one interview period, one-third of the sample would be in their first interview, one-third in their second interview, and one-third in their final interview. The advantage of this longitudinal approach is that it would provide the best estimate of crime in the state. And, if this procedure were used in conjunction with census tract information so that underrepresented groups were included, the final sample would better represent the state population as a whole. Interviews would also serve to cross-validate the information gathered by the phone surveys, meaning more confidence can be placed in the telephone survey results. However, it must be noted that this approach would be more costly than annual telephone surveys.

Each of these options had advantages and disadvantages. The basic questions are two: (a) What information would the Criminal Justice Coordinating Council like to have on a systematic basis? and (b) How much money is available to obtain it? One key point is that with the present survey, the Council has established baseline data in terms of victimizations, reporting, precautionary behaviors, and fear of crime. With this information, the Council can now assess changes as a function of external events (e.g., a major increase or decrease in drug usage) and of programmatic interventions instituted by the Council.
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Appendix

Questionnaire used in the Victimization Survey
We would like to begin by asking you a few questions that deal with the extent to which you worry about being victimized by crime in certain situations. For each of the following, tell me if the situation applies to you very often, sometimes, rarely, or never.

VARIABLE: Q1
How often does fear of crime prevent you from doing things you would like to do?
(1) VERY OFTEN
(2) SOMETIMES
(3) RARELY
(4) NEVER
(9) N/A

Q2
When you leave home, how often do you think about being robbed or physically assaulted?
(1) VERY OFTEN
(2) SOMETIMES
(3) RARELY
(4) NEVER
(9) N/A

Q3
When you leave your home, how often do you think about it being broken into or vandalized while you are away?
(1) VERY OFTEN
(2) SOMETIMES
(3) RARELY
(4) NEVER
(9) N/A

Q4
How often do you worry that your loved ones will be hurt by criminals?
(1) VERY OFTEN
(2) SOMETIMES
(3) RARELY
(4) NEVER
(9) N/A

Q5
How often do you feel afraid of being attacked or assaulted?
(1) VERY OFTEN
(2) SOMETIMES
(3) RARELY
(4) NEVER
(9) N/A

Q6
How safe do you feel or would you feel being out alone in your neighborhood at night? Do you feel .... (READ RESPONSES EXCEPT N/A)
(1) VERY SAFE
(2) REASONABLY SAFE
(3) SOMEWHAT UNSAFE
(4) VERY UNSAFE
(9) N/A
Q7
How about during the day - how safe do you feel or would you feel being out alone in your neighborhood? Do you feel ... (READ RESPONSES EXCEPT N/A)
(1) VERY SAFE
(2) REASONABLY SAFE
(3) SOMEWHAT UNSAFE
(4) VERY UNSAFE
(9) N/A

Next, we would like to ask you about the likelihood of you or your property being victimized by various types of criminal activity. For each of the following types of crimes, please tell me if you think it is very unlikely, unlikely, likely, or very likely to happen to you in the next year.

Q8
Someone breaking into your home and taking something.
(1) VERY UNLIKELY
(2) UNLIKELY
(3) LIKELY
(4) VERY LIKELY
(9) N/A

Q9
Someone stealing a motor vehicle belonging to you.
(1) VERY UNLIKELY
(2) UNLIKELY
(3) LIKELY
(4) VERY LIKELY
(9) N/A

Q10
Someone taking something from you by force.
(1) VERY UNLIKELY
(2) UNLIKELY
(3) LIKELY
(4) VERY LIKELY
(9) N/A

Q11
Someone beating or attacking you.
(1) VERY UNLIKELY
(2) UNLIKELY
(3) LIKELY
(4) VERY LIKELY
(9) N/A

Q12
Someone forcing you to have any sexual activity against your will.
(1) VERY UNLIKELY
(2) UNLIKELY
(3) LIKELY
(4) VERY LIKELY
(9) N/A

Q13
Being beaten or attacked by a member of your family or someone in your household.
(1) VERY UNLIKELY
(2) UNLIKELY
(3) LIKELY
(4) VERY LIKELY
(9) N/A
Q14
Being a victim of a drunk driving crash.
(1) VERY UNLIKELY
(2) UNLIKELY
(3) LIKELY
(4) VERY LIKELY
(9) N/A

Next, we would like to read to you a number of conditions that may or may not be a problem in your neighborhood. For each of these, please tell me if they are a big problem, somewhat of a problem, or not a problem in your neighborhood.

Q15
Dirty streets and sidewalks.
(1) BIG PROBLEM
(2) SOME PROBLEM
(3) NO PROBLEM
(4) N/A

Q16
Too few recreational programs for young people.
(1) BIG PROBLEM
(2) SOME PROBLEM
(3) NO PROBLEM
(9) N/A

Q17
Police not making enough contact with residents.
(1) BIG PROBLEM
(2) SOME PROBLEM
(3) NO PROBLEM
(9) N/A

Q18
Groups of people hanging around on corners.
(1) BIG PROBLEM
(2) SOME PROBLEM
(3) NO PROBLEM
(9) N/A

Q19
Beggars or panhandlers.
(1) BIG PROBLEM
(2) SOME PROBLEM
(3) NO PROBLEM
(9) N/A

Q20
People saying insulting things or bothering people as they walk down a street.
(1) BIG PROBLEM
(2) SOME PROBLEM
(3) NO PROBLEM
(9) N/A

Q21
Police stopping too many people on the streets without good reason.
(1) BIG PROBLEM
(2) SOME PROBLEM
(3) NO PROBLEM
(9) N/A
Q22
Abandoned houses or other empty buildings in this area.
(1) BIG PROBLEM
(2) SOME PROBLEM
(3) NO PROBLEM
(9) N/A

Q23
Truancy. (School age children who skip school)
(1) BIG PROBLEM
(2) SOME PROBLEM
(3) NO PROBLEM
(9) N/A

Q24
People drinking in public places.
(1) BIG PROBLEM
(2) SOME PROBLEM
(3) NO PROBLEM
(9) N/A

Q25
Poor street lighting.
(1) BIG PROBLEM
(2) SOME PROBLEM
(3) NO PROBLEM
(9) N/A

Q26
Police being too tough on people they stop.
(1) BIG PROBLEM
(2) SOME PROBLEM
(3) NO PROBLEM
(9) N/A

Next we would like to ask you a few questions about safety precautions some people might take from time to time. For each of the following, please tell me if you follow the precaution all of the time, most of the time, some of the time, or almost never.

Q27
How often do you keep your doors and windows locked while you are in your home?
(1) ALL OF THE TIME
(2) MOST OF THE TIME
(3) SOME OF THE TIME
(4) ALMOST NEVER
(9) N/A

Q28
When you have been visiting a friend or relative, how often do you telephone back to say you have arrived safe at home?
(1) ALL OF THE TIME
(2) MOST OF THE TIME
(3) SOME OF THE TIME
(4) ALMOST NEVER
(9) N/A
Q29
How often do you and your neighbors keep an eye on each other's home.
(1) ALL OF THE TIME
(2) MOST OF THE TIME
(3) SOME OF THE TIME
(4) ALMOST NEVER
(9) N/A

Q30
When in a crowd, how often do you take extra steps to protect your belongings, like putting your wallet in your front pocket or holding your purse close to your body?
(1) ALL OF THE TIME
(2) MOST OF THE TIME
(3) SOME OF THE TIME
(4) ALMOST NEVER
(9) N/A

Q31
If something suspicious was going on, how often would your neighbors report it to the police?
(1) ALL OF THE TIME
(2) MOST OF THE TIME
(3) SOME OF THE TIME
(4) ALMOST NEVER
(9) N/A

Q32
When you go out after dark, how often do you get someone to go with you?
(1) ALL OF THE TIME
(2) MOST OF THE TIME
(3) SOME OF THE TIME
(4) ALMOST NEVER
(9) N/A

Q33
When you go out, how often do you plan your route to avoid potentially dangerous places?
(1) ALL OF THE TIME
(2) MOST OF THE TIME
(3) SOME OF THE TIME
(4) ALMOST NEVER
(9) N/A

Q34
How often do you use deadbolt locks on your doors?
(1) ALL OF THE TIME
(2) MOST OF THE TIME
(3) SOME OF THE TIME
(4) ALMOST NEVER
(9) N/A

Q35
When parking your car at home, how often do you lock the doors or keep it in a locked garage?
(1) ALL OF THE TIME
(2) MOST OF THE TIME
(3) SOME OF THE TIME
(4) ALMOST NEVER
(9) N/A
Q36
When parking your car away from home, how often do you lock the doors?
(1) ALL OF THE TIME
(2) MOST OF THE TIME
(3) SOME OF THE TIME
(4) ALMOST NEVER
(9) N/A

Q37
When you are going away for a few days, how often do you have a neighbor bring in your newspapers or mail?
(1) ALL OF THE TIME
(2) MOST OF THE TIME
(3) SOME OF THE TIME
(4) ALMOST NEVER
(9) N/A

Q38
How often do your neighbors "house-sit" for one another?
(1) ALL OF THE TIME
(2) MOST OF THE TIME
(3) SOME OF THE TIME
(4) ALMOST NEVER
(9) N/A

Q39
How often do you take something with you (like a dog or a gun) for protection?
(1) ALL OF THE TIME
(2) MOST OF THE TIME
(3) SOME OF THE TIME
(4) ALMOST NEVER
(9) N/A

Q40
The next two questions you can answer with a simple "yes" or "no". Does your neighborhood participate in a police-sponsored neighborhood watch program?
(1) NO
(2) YES
(9) N/A

Q41
Has a crime prevention officer come to your home and advised you about things you could do to prevent crime?
(1) NO
(2) YES
(9) N/A

R52
The following questions ask you to imagine what advice you would give to a relative if he or she were a victim of crime. For each of the following situations, please tell me if you would:
Strongly advise them not to report the crime
Advise them not to report the crime
Advise them to report the crime
Strongly advise them to report the crime

*** ENTER ONE (1) TO CONTINUE ***
Q42
A person does not have a weapon. He threatens to harm your relative unless your relative gives him money. Your relative gives him $10 and is not harmed.
(1) STRONGLY ADVISE THEM NOT TO REPORT
(2) ADVISE THEM NOT TO REPORT
(3) ADVISE THEM TO REPORT
(4) STRONGLY ADVISE THEM TO REPORT
(9) N/A

Q43
A person, armed with a lead pipe, robs your relative of $10. Your relative is injured and requires hospitalization.
(1) STRONGLY ADVISE THEM NOT TO REPORT
(2) ADVISE THEM NOT TO REPORT
(3) ADVISE THEM TO REPORT
(4) STRONGLY ADVISE THEM TO REPORT
(9) N/A

Q44
An unknown man forces a female relative to perform a sexual act with him.
(1) STRONGLY ADVISE THEM NOT TO REPORT
(2) ADVISE THEM NOT TO REPORT
(3) ADVISE THEM TO REPORT
(4) STRONGLY ADVISE THEM TO REPORT
(9) N/A

Q45
A boyfriend forces a female relative to perform a sexual act with him.
(1) STRONGLY ADVISE THEM NOT TO REPORT
(2) ADVISE THEM NOT TO REPORT
(3) ADVISE THEM TO REPORT
(4) STRONGLY ADVISE THEM TO REPORT
(9) N/A

Q46
A high school boy beats one of your elderly female relatives with his fists. She requires hospitalization.
(1) STRONGLY ADVISE THEM NOT TO REPORT
(2) ADVISE THEM NOT TO REPORT
(3) ADVISE THEM TO REPORT
(4) STRONGLY ADVISE THEM TO REPORT
(9) N/A

Q47
A man in your family beats his wife with his fists. She requires hospitalization.
(1) STRONGLY ADVISE THEM NOT TO REPORT
(2) ADVISE THEM NOT TO REPORT
(3) ADVISE THEM TO REPORT
(4) STRONGLY ADVISE THEM TO REPORT
(9) N/A

Q48
An unknown man beats a family member with his fists. Your relative requires hospitalization.
(1) STRONGLY ADVISE THEM NOT TO REPORT
(2) ADVISE THEM NOT TO REPORT
(3) ADVISE THEM TO REPORT
(4) STRONGLY ADVISE THEM TO REPORT
(9) N/A
Q49
What about your local police? Would you say, in general, that your local police are doing a good job, an average job, or a poor job?
(1) GOOD
(2) AVERAGE
(3) POOR
(9) N/A

Q50
I am going to read you three statements. Please tell me which one you agree with the most.
(1) My chances of being attacked or robbed have GONE UP in the past few years.
(2) My chances of being attacked or robbed have GONE DOWN in the past few years.
(3) My chances of being attacked or robbed haven’t changed in the past few years.
(9) N/A

Q51
I’m going to read three more statements. Please tell me which one you agree with the most.
(1) Crime is LESS serious than the newspapers, radio and TV say.
(2) Crime is MORE serious than the newspapers, radio, and TV say.
(3) Crime is about as serious as the newspapers, radio, and TV say.
(9) N/A

Next, we would like to find out if you have been a victim of any of the following crimes in the past year. Please be assured that all of your responses are completely confidential.

Q52
Did anyone take something directly from you by force or threat of force?
(1) NO
(2) YES
(9) N/A

Q53
Was it a stranger, a casual acquaintance, a person well known to you but not a family member, or a family member?
(1) A STRANGER
(2) CASUAL ACQUAINTANCE
(3) WELL KNOWN PERSON BUT NOT FAMILY MEMBER
(4) FAMILY MEMBER
(9) N/A-REFUSED

Q54
What was the first thing you did after the crime occurred?
(READ THE RESPONSES)
(1) TALKED TO SOMEONE
(2) CALLED THE POLICE
(3) OTHER

Q55
Who did you talk to?
(1) FRIEND
(2) RELATIVE
(3) MEMBER OF CLERGY
(4) STRANGER
(9) N/A-REFUSED
Q56 Did you report the crime to the police?
(1) NO
(2) YES
(9) N/A-REFUSED

Q57 Did anyone try to rob you by force?
(1) NO
(2) YES
(9) N/A

Q58 Was it a stranger, a casual acquaintance, a person well known to you but not a family member, or a family member?
(1) A STRANGER
(2) CASUAL ACQUAINTANCE
(3) WELL KNOWN PERSON BUT NOT A FAMILY MEMBER
(4) FAMILY MEMBER
(9) N/A-REFUSED

Q59 What was the first thing you did after the crime occurred?
(READ THE RESPONSES)
(1) TALKED TO SOMEONE
(2) CALLED THE POLICE
(3) OTHER

Q60 Who did you talk to?
(1) FRIEND
(2) RELATIVE
(3) MEMBER OF CLERGY
(4) STRANGER
(9) N/A-REFUSED

Q61 Did you report the crime to the police?
(1) NO
(2) YES
(9) N/A-REFUSED

Q62 Were you knifed, shot at or attacked with some other weapon?
(1) NO
(2) YES
(9) N/A

Q63 Was it a stranger, a casual acquaintance, a person well known to you but not a family member, or a family member?
(1) A STRANGER
(2) CASUAL ACQUAINTANCE
(3) WELL KNOWN PERSON BUT NOT FAMILY MEMBER
(4) FAMILY MEMBER
(9) N/A-REFUSED

Q64 What was the first thing you did after the crime occurred?
(READ THE RESPONSE)
(1) TALKED TO SOMEONE
(2) CALLED THE POLICE
(3) OTHER
Q65
Who did you talk to?
(1) FRIEND
(2) RELATIVE
(3) MEMBER OF CLERGY
(4) STRANGER
(9) N/A-REFUSED

Q66
Did you report the crime to the police?
(1) NO
(2) YES
(9) N/A-REFUSED

Q67
Did anyone threaten to beat you up or threaten you with a knife, gun, or other weapon?
(1) NO
(2) YES
(9) N/A

Q68
Was it a stranger, a casual acquaintance, a person well known to you but not a family member, or a family member?
(1) A STRANGER
(2) CASUAL ACQUAINTANCE
(3) WELL KNOWN PERSON BUT NOT FAMILY MEMBER
(4) FAMILY MEMBER
(9) N/A-REFUSED

Q69
What was the first thing you did after the crime occurred?
(READ THE RESPONSES)
(1) TALKED TO SOMEONE
(2) CALLED THE POLICE
(3) OTHER

Q70
Who did you talk to?
(1) FRIEND
(2) RELATIVE
(3) MEMBER OF CLERGY
(4) STRANGER
(9) N/A-REFUSED

Q71
Did you report the crime to the police?
(1) NO
(2) YES
(9) N/A-REFUSED

Q72
Were any of these threats on the telephone?
(1) NO
(2) YES
(9) N/A

Q73
Did anyone hit you, attack you, or beat you up (other than the incident already mentioned)?
(1) NO
(2) YES
(9) N/A
Q74
Was it a stranger, a casual acquaintance, a person well known to you but not a family member, or a family member?
(1) A STRANGER
(2) CASUAL ACQUAINTANCE
(3) WELL KNOWN PERSON BUT NOT A FAMILY MEMBER
(4) FAMILY MEMBER
(9) NA/REFUSED

Q75
What was the first thing you did after the crime occurred?
READ THE RESPONSES
(1) TALKED TO SOMEONE
(2) CALLED THE POLICE
(3) OTHER

Q76
Who did you talk to?
(1) FRIEND
(2) RELATIVE
(3) MEMBER OF CLERGY
(4) STRANGER
(9) N/A-REFUSED

Q77
Did you report the crime to the police?
(1) NO
(2) YES
(9) N/A-REFUSED

Q78
Did anyone force you, or attempt to force you, to engage in any unwanted sexual activity with them?
(1) NO
(2) YES
(9) N/A

Q79
Was it a stranger, a casual acquaintance, a person well known to you but not a family member, or a family member?
(1) A STRANGER
(2) CASUAL ACQUAINTANCE
(3) WELL KNOWN PERSON BUT NOT A FAMILY MEMBER
(4) FAMILY MEMBER
(9) NA/REFUSED

Q80
What was the first thing you did after the crime occurred?
READ THE RESPONSES
(1) TALKED TO SOMEONE
(2) CALLED THE POLICE
(3) OTHER

Q81
Who did you talk to?
(1) FRIEND
(2) RELATIVE
(3) MEMBER OF CLERGY
(4) STRANGER
(9) N/A-REFUSED
Q82
Did you report the crime to the police?
(1) NO
(2) YES
(9) N/A-REFUSED

Q83
Did anyone try to attack you in some other way (other than any incidents already mentioned)?
(1) NO
(2) YES
(9) N/A

Q84
Was it a stranger, a casual acquaintance, a person well known to you but not a family member, or a family member?
(1) A STRANGER
(2) CASUAL ACQUAINTANCE
(3) WELL KNOWN PERSON BUT NOT A FAMILY MEMBER
(4) FAMILY MEMBER
(9) N/A-REFUSED

Q85
What was the first thing you did after the crime occurred?
(read the responses)
(1) TALKED TO SOMEONE
(2) CALLED THE POLICE
(3) OTHER

Q86
Who did you talk to?
(1) FRIEND
(2) RELATIVE
(3) MEMBER OF CLERGY
(4) STRANGER
(9) N/A-REFUSED

Q87
Did you report the crime to the police?
(1) NO
(2) YES
(9) N/A-REFUSED

Q88
Did anyone break in or try to break into your car or truck, home or some other building on your property?
(1) NO
(2) YES
(3) N/A

Q89
Was it a stranger, a casual acquaintance, a person well known to you but not a family member, or a family member?
(1) A STRANGER
(2) CASUAL ACQUAINTANCE
(3) WELL KNOWN PERSON BUT NOT FAMILY MEMBER
(4) FAMILY MEMBER
(5) N/A-REFUSED
Q90
What was the first thing you did after the crime occurred?
(READ THE RESPONSES)
(1) TALKED TO SOMEONE
(2) CALLED THE POLICE
(3) OTHER

Q91
Who did you talk to?
(1) FRIEND
(2) RELATIVE
(3) MEMBER OF CLERGY
(4) STRANGER
(9) N/A-REFUSED

Q92
Did you report the crime to the police?
(1) NO
(2) YES
(9) N/A-REFUSED

Q93
Did anyone damage, steal or try to steal something that belonged to you?
(1) NO
(2) YES
(9) N/A

Q94
Was it a stranger, a casual acquaintance, a person well known to you but not a family member, or a family member?
(1) A STRANGER
(2) A CASUAL ACQUAINTANCE
(3) WELL KNOWN PERSON BUT NOT FAMILY MEMBER
(4) FAMILY MEMBER
(9) N/A-REFUSED

Q95
What was the first thing you did after the crime occurred?
(READ THE RESPONSES)
(1) TALKED TO SOMEONE
(2) CALLED THE POLICE
(3) OTHER

Q96
Who did you talk to?
(1) FRIEND
(2) RELATIVE
(3) MEMBER OF THE CLERGY
(4) STRANGER
(9) N/A-REFUSED

Q97
Did you report the crime to the police?
(1) NO
(2) YES
(9) N/A-REFUSED
Please tell me if any of the following crimes have ever been committed against other members of your household.

Q98  
Murder  
(1) NO  
(2) YES  
(9) N/A

Q99  
Was the crime reported to the police by a family member?  
(1) NO  
(2) YES  
(9) N/A

Q100  
Was the crime committed against a child living in your household?  
(1) NO  
(2) YES  
(9) N/A

Q101  
Has anyone in your household been subjected to unwanted sexual activity?  
(1) NO  
(2) YES  
(9) N/A

Q102  
Did you advise them to report the crime to the police?  
(1) NO  
(2) YES  
(9) N/A

Q103  
Was this crime committed against a child living in your household?  
(1) NO  
(2) YES  
(9) N/A

Q104  
Has anyone in your household been beaten or attacked?  
(1) NO  
(2) YES  
(9) N/A

Q105  
Was this crime committed against a child living in your household?  
(1) NO  
(2) YES  
(9) N/A

Q106  
Did you advise them to report the crime to the police?  
(1) NO  
(2) YES  
(9) N/A

Q107  
Has anyone in your household had something taken by force?  
(1) NO  
(2) YES  
(9) N/A
Q108
Was this crime committed against a child living in your household?
(1) NO
(2) YES
(9) N/A

Q109
Did you advise them to report the crime to the police?
(1) NO
(2) YES
(9) N/A

I am going to read a list of victim service programs that are available in many areas. Please tell me if you think there is one of these programs in your county.

Q110
Victim-Witness Assistance
(1) NO
(2) YES
(9) DON'T KNOW

Q111
Have you or any member of your family used it?
(1) NO
(2) YES
(9) N/A

Q112
Rape Crisis Centers
(1) NO
(2) YES
(9) DON'T KNOW

Q113
Have you or any member of your family used it?
(1) NO
(2) YES
(9) N/A

Q114
Battered Women's Shelters
(1) NO
(2) YES
(9) DON'T KNOW

Q115
Have you or any member of your family used it?
(1) NO
(2) YES
(9) N/A

Q116
Legal Aid Services
(1) NO
(2) YES
(9) DON'T KNOW

Q117
Have you or any member of your family used it?
(1) NO
(2) YES
(9) N/A
Q118  
Counseling/Mental Health Services  
(1) NO  
(2) YES  
(9) DON'T KNOW

Q119  
Have you or any member of your family used it?  
(1) NO  
(2) YES  
(9) N/A

Q120  
Assistance for DUI Crash Victims  
(1) NO  
(2) YES  
(9) DON'T KNOW

Q121  
Have you or any member of your family used it?  
(1) NO  
(2) YES  
(9) N/A

Q122  
Victim Compensation Programs  
(1) NO  
(2) YES  
(9) DON'T KNOW

Q123  
Have you or any member of your family used it?  
(1) NO  
(2) YES  
(9) N/A

Finally, we would like to ask you a few questions about your background. Please keep in mind that this information is for statistical purposes only and that your responses are completely confidential.

RACE  
With which racial/ethnic group do you most strongly identify?  
Are you... (READ LIST)  
(1) WHITE CAUCASIAN  
(2) AFRICAN-AMERICAN, BLACK  
(3) ASIAN, ORIENTAL  
(4) HISPANIC  
(5) NATIVE AMERICAN, ESKIMO, ALUET, ETC  
(8) REFUSED  
(9) DK/NA
EDU
What is the highest level of education that you have completed?
(Do not read categories - let respondent tell you, then code. If respondent hesitates, then offer help by reading list. If you are not sure what respondent means, then clarify.)
(1) Less than high school graduate
(2) High school graduate
(3) Some college, associate's degree
(4) College degree - bachelor's degree
(5) Some graduate school
(6) Professional or graduate degree
(7) Vocational or technical training
(8) Refused
(9) N/A

YOB
In what year were you born?
(Code no answer or refused as 2000)

HOUS
How many people live in your household, including yourself?
(Code no answer as 99)

JUV
How many of these are under the age of 18?
(Code no answer or refused as 99)
(Code (0) zero as 88)

INCOME
In 1991, was your total household income ... (read responses) (when respondent says "yes" code number of category)
(1) Less than $7,500
(2) Less than $15,000
(3) Less than $25,000
(4) Less than $35,000
(5) Less than $50,000
(6) Less than $75,000
(7) More than $75,000
(9) No answer/refused ** do not read this response **

HOUSING
Do you own or rent your home?
(1) Own
(2) Rent
(9) N/A

TYPE
Which of the following best describes the type of home you live in?
(1) Single family dwelling
(2) Multi-family dwelling
(3) Apartment
(4) Mobile home
(9) N/A
YEARS
How long have you lived in this home
(CODE NUMBER OF YEARS - ROUND OFF TO NEAREST WHOLE NUMBER)
(CODE NO ANSWER OR REFUSED AS 99)

AREA
Which of the following best describes the area in which you live?
(READ RESPONSES)
(1) RURAL AREA
(2) TOWN AWAY FROM URBAN AREA
(3) SUBURB OF AN URBAN AREA
(4) IN A CITY BUT NOT IN THE CENTRAL AREA
(5) CENTRAL AREA OF A CITY
(9) N/A

ZIP
What is your zipcode?
(CODE NO ANSWER AS 99999)

COUNTY
What county do you live in?
(CODE NO ANSWER OR REFUSED AS 170)

SEX
***ENTER GENDER BY VOICE***
(1) MALE
(2) FEMALE

Thank you for your time this completes the survey.

ATLANTA
(0) Other
(1) City