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This study deals with the analysis of public opinion about crime and attitudes regarding criminal justice issues along two major dimensions. The first part concerns how respondents rank crime among a list of nine social problems (unemployment, high interest rates, inflation, crime, the high cost of living, moral decline, taxes, dissatisfaction with the government, and Reagan). The second dimension examines some research questions. These are whether there was any association between the respondents' perception of crime trends and each of the following: demographic background, neighborhood safety, the death penalty, gun ownership, frequency of locking doors, avoidance of teenagers, and the evaluation of police job performance; and also whether there was any association between the respondents' victimization experience and seriousness of crime and police job performance. The data were obtained from the archives of the Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research in Michigan.
The dissertation is organized into five chapters. The first chapter contains the introduction. The second chapter deals with the review of literature. The third chapter deals with methodology. The fourth chapter deals with data analysis, and the fifth chapter deals with the interpretation of findings and conclusions.

The study shows that there is a general agreement among the respondents that unemployment is the most important problem in the country. Also, there was no association between victimization experience and perception of crimes. There was no association between victimization experience, per se, and the evaluation of police job performance. Demographic variables were found not to be good predictors of respondents' perception of crime.

Only a part of the original data for this survey was used in the dissertation. The analysis of the remaining parts of the original data should complement the findings in this dissertation.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. INTRODUCTION</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement of the Problem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance of the Problem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The History of Public Opinion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Opinion on Crime and Criminal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Crime Trends and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seriousness of Crime</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Opinion on the Criminal Justice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System: The Courts, the Police and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Opinion on Capital Punishment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and on the Possession of Firearms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Opinion Concerning Sex Crimes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. METHODOLOGY</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of the Sample</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Modification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Questions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistical Measures Used</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. DATA ANALYSIS</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examination of the Research Questions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Findings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. INTERPRETATION OF FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limitations of the Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions of the Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggestions for Further Research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| APPENDICES | 148 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY | 178 |
Federal Bureau of Investigation statistics show that the chances of a citizen becoming the victim of a crime were about two and one-half times greater in 1971 than in 1960 (90). Other sources seem to suggest that the rate of violent crimes also continues to increase; the Uniform Crime Reports recorded the rate of violent crimes as 136 victims per 100,000 people in 1965; the rate increased to 485 victims per 100,000 by 1975 (119). The 1983 Uniform Crime Reports (122) show that between 1978 and 1982 street robbery increased by 49 per cent: robbery of commercial houses up by 10 per cent, robbery of convenience stores up by 9 per cent, robbery of residential buildings up by 27 per cent, and robbery of banks up by 19 per cent. The same report shows that in 1982 a violent crime was committed every 25 seconds, one property crime was committed every 3 seconds, one murder every 25 seconds, one forcible rape every 7 minutes, and one aggravated assault every 49 seconds. Oatman (87) also observes that between 1960 and 1977 crimes of violence increased by 180 per cent.
The real number of crimes may actually be higher than the Uniform Crime Reports data indicate. Some scholars (31, 83, 85) have observed that many crimes may not actually appear in the Uniform Crime Reports. The Uniform Crime Reports are usually compiled from the records of some 15,000 law enforcement agencies across the United States (6, 18, 31, 78, 87, 104). Variations in the definition of crime among different local agencies and alleged political pressures on local police to inflate or under-report actual crime figures, as well as other variables, create doubt about the accuracy of the crime figures which are reported to the Federal Bureau of Investigation (19, 41). There is also a lack of attention to white-collar crimes (87). These may include politicians taking a bribe, a merchant cheating a customer, a lawyer swindling a client, or a physician injuring a patient (87). The Uniform Crime Reports use a crime index which contains only seven categories of offenses: forcible rape, robbery, criminal homicide, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny over $50, and automobile theft.

In addition, some crimes may not even be reported to local agencies. Victims of rape may fail to report some instances of crime either because they are embarrassed or because they fear the police cannot or will not act. Victims of property offenses may fail to report some
instances of crime because they fear reprisals; those whose property has been stolen may fear that their insurance premiums will increase (19). Both victims and law enforcement agencies may obscure the actual picture of crimes committed by their failures to report crimes accurately.

In the past two decades, crimes—particularly those committed in the streets—have become the subject of intense interest to most Americans, especially to those who live in large cities where most crimes occur (61). Even when people have not themselves been victims, crime frequently affects the ways in which they carry out their social activities; these may include the ways they travel, the extent to which they go out at night, or the manner in which they perceive their neighbors (113).

Crime has been recognized as a pervasive social problem in America for some time. However, the proportion of citizens who rate crime as a major social problem has varied considerably from one decade to another. People tend to perceive the seriousness of crime in different ways. Some perceive the crime rate to be increasing both nationally and locally. Others perceive the crime rate to be going up only nationally. Still others may see an increasing rate of crime only on the local level. Still others may see crime rates as politically manipulated.
Pepinski and Jesilow (89, p. 11) observe that as early as 1858 a New York police chief had used increased arrest rates for political purposes. The police chief told the city council that the city was "caught up" in a crime rate which could be curtailed only by the expansion of police manpower. Jacob (57) also observes that police expenditures are directly related to perceived increases in crime rates. He observes that in Houston, Phoenix, and Philadelphia, police expenditures increased slightly as perceived increases in crime occurred. McPherson (76) reports that many who perceive the national crime rate to be increasing nevertheless perceive their own neighborhoods to be safe from crime. Garofalo (45) states that in a thirteen-city national crime survey respondents perceived that the crime rate increased more rapidly at the national level than it did at the neighborhood level. McIntyre (75) and Biderman et al. (6) reached the same conclusions.

Not all observers agree that the crime rate in America is increasing. Pepinski and Jesilow (89), for example, assert that accounts given of urban centers in the 1800s and early 1900s show that crime was a real threat in America. They assert that people today are in no greater danger of being robbed or physically hurt than they were 150 years ago. They regard the perceived increase in crime rate as a myth. They further assert that a "burst" of government
energy has resulted in bringing more criminals to trial. Pepinski and Jesilow (89) further assert that the apparent increase in crime may be partly due to the increase in the number of people who may be wrongly convicted each year. The crime rate may also appear to increase because more offenders may plead guilty to avoid the ordeals which court trials entail. Pepinski and Jesilow (89) also assert that crime statistics may indicate official reaction to crime rather than the extent of crime.

Reiss (94, p. 37) also discounts the belief that crime is increasing. He asserts, for example, that the better the police department becomes, the more crime will be known to the police without any actual increase. Perceived increase in crime may be due to the reduction in the "dark" figure of crime. Reiss also points out that increases in larceny rates may be due to an increase in the cost of goods.

Research on crime as a social problem must be based upon an accurate account of the phenomenon in its true perspective. An accurate picture of the extent of crime can be obtained by using a combination of data from the Uniform Crime Reports, victimization surveys and public opinion surveys. It is through a combination of these sources that one can grasp the public's perception of the seriousness of crime in an accurate manner. The public's perception of the seriousness of crime will also be reflected in what the
public thinks the solutions to the problem of crime should be. Public perception of the crime rate may also affect what individuals decide to do in order to reduce the possibilities of becoming victims.

Individuals may resort to some specific behavioral patterns as adjustments to the perceived seriousness of crime. These strategies may include avoidance of those considered or defined as strangers, avoidance of dark places at night, or avoidance of street corners where teenagers congregate. Some home protection measures may also be taken. These may include fortifying one's house with steel bars, installing alarm systems or locks, or erecting barbed wire fences around the house. Self-protective measures include carrying firearms, carrying tear gas canisters (although these methods may themselves be against the law), or learning some self-defense tactics such as judo or karate. People may also form crime watch groups, neighborhood patrol groups, or vigilante groups. The present study may provide significant insights into the relationship between behavior patterns and public perception of the seriousness of crime.

Source of Data

This study, which is exploratory research, is based on the original data which were obtained in tape from the archives of the Inter-University Consortium for Political
and Social Research. The survey (according to the agency mentioned above) was conducted by Chilton Research Services at Randor, Pennsylvania, for the American Broadcasting Corporation in December, 1982. The study will emphasize exploratory and descriptive rather than inferential techniques. The study will examine the relationship between experience and perception. These are not trend data but taken with other public opinion data it adds to our knowledge of trends in public opinion research, especially the perceptions of the relative importance of crime as a problem in America.

The survey was conducted through the use of a questionnaire on a sample of 2,464 respondents. The items of the questionnaire tapped information regarding the respondent's fear of being a victim of a crime, perception of the seriousness of crime in the United States, evaluation of the judicial and penal systems, assessment of police performance, and confidence in the ability of the police to prevent crime. The aspects of the survey which are of interest to this work will be addressed in the section of this study dealing with research questions.

Statement of the Problem

Basically, this research will be concerned with an analysis of the variability of public opinion about crime along two major dimensions. The first dimension will be a
measure of how respondents rank crime among other social problems such as unemployment, high interest rates, inflation, the high cost of living, moral decline, taxes, and dissatisfaction with the government and Reagan. The second dimension will study if and how respondents adjust their behavior to cope with the perceived increase or decrease in the crime rate.

Before 1960, crime was not considered to be a major social problem according to various public opinion polls. Prior to 1960, the Gallup organization had conducted any number of surveys which asked respondents to mark a list of social problems in order of their perceived seriousness. On many occasions, crime was not included in the list. According to Mauss (71), in 1963 a Gallup survey contained open-ended questions concerning problems facing the country. Most of the respondents declared juvenile delinquency (rather than adult crime) as the most serious social problem facing the country. Toward the end of that decade, public opinion polls began to show that crime was being ranked as the second most serious problem after the Vietnam war (71). A 1967 Gallup public opinion poll revealed that respondents felt it unsafe to walk in certain areas near their homes at night (42).

Erskine (33) observes that people's perceptions of crime during this period might have been affected by two factors:
the emergence of various social movements and the publicity accorded such movements. These were the Vietnam war protests, the civil rights movements, and the "hippie" or counter cultural movement. These social movements reflected disrespect for the constituted authorities, that is, "the establishment." Some crimes which were committed during this period were reported with great sensationalism. Examples were the publicity given to mass murders and the sensational reports of the assassinations of some prominent political figures. Those prominent political figures who were assassinated included President J. F. Kennedy in 1962, and later Robert F. Kennedy and Martin Luther King. These assassinations received widespread coverage, not only in America but all over the world. Indeed, the June 17, 1968, issue of Newsweek carried an extensive coverage of Robert Kennedy's assassination. The following week, June 24, 1968, Newsweek carried a headline entitled, "A Question on Guns." The paper contained an extensive discussion on issues concerning gun control. Many issues of Newsweek and other newspapers during the summer of 1968 carried news of campus disorder and crime. The impression created by these reports was that a breakdown of law and order was imminent. It is understandable, therefore, that respondents would tend to rank crime as the most serious social problem.
Some of the statements made above seem to imply a relationship between the publicity given to crimes and public opinion. It must be stated that there is no agreement among scholars on the relationship between news reporting and perceptions of crime.

Shelley and Ashkins (102, p. 494) point out that editors tend to choose "hard" news if it reflects severe disruptions of, or a threat to the community, particularly if it can be shown in a manner which displays action, drama, and appears live. Kleinman and David (61) assert that news media may shape respondents' perceptions of crime. Hibbard (52) discovered that, contrary to the expectation that news media may not influence perceptions of crime, the overall relationship between media emphasis on crime and public opinion about the prevalence of crime was statistically significant. Davis (23) concludes that public opinion may reflect trends in the amount of crime news rather than in actual crime trends.

Other observers point out that there is no relationship between the amount of attention devoted to crime by the mass media and people's perception of crime. Roshier (97) maintains that, although the press may present a consistently biased impression of crime and criminals through their process of selection, there is little evidence
that this influences the public's perception of and opinion about crime. Garofalo (46) also observes that the public's view of crime over time displays little agreement with either police figures or mass media's portrayal of crime. Sacco (99) similarly sees no relationship between crime perception and the mass media. Shelley and Ashkins (102) also assert that the public's view of crime trends over time displays little agreement with either police figures or trends in crime news reporting.

These data do not contain any information on the respondents' frequency of watching the television or reading newspapers. Consequently, the study will not address the problem of how exposure to mass media affects the respondents' perceptions of crime or any aspect of the criminal justice system.

In 1967, according to the Gallup Poll, 46 percent of Americans believed that crime was on the increase (42). This number climbed to 70 per cent by 1975. It was also revealed through the polls conducted by the Harris organization that many Americans believed that whatever measures had been hitherto attempted in solving the crime problem had failed. Furstenberg (41) reports that a poll was conducted in Baltimore in 1969 in which people were asked to rank a list of domestic problems in terms of
degrees of seriousness. The majority of respondents ranked crime and lawlessness as the most important social problem.

The mood of Americans seems to have been accurately summarized by Reiss (94, p. 35).

During the past few years, Americans have come to believe that they are being engulfed by a crime wave. In opinion polls, they rank crime as the number one problem of the nation. They speak gloomily of moral decay and disrespect for the rules of the law.

Thus toward the end of the 1960s, crime had come to occupy a prominent place on a list of what Americans regarded as major social problems.

Indeed, crime was a major domestic issue in the 1968 presidential election campaign when Richard Nixon adopted the "Law and Order" stance while Hubert Humphrey was forced to be on the defensive (94). This was a clear indication of the awareness of the potential relationship between people's perception of the seriousness of crime and their voting behavior. If citizens perceive crime as a major social problem, they may attempt to do something about it by electing a president who might favor tougher laws that would, in their view, reduce crime.

The shift in public opinion about the seriousness of crime was reflected in the enactment of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act which became effective in 1968. This Act was aimed at controlling crimes, most especially those committed in the streets. The enactment of the code
was applauded by those who craved a restoration of "law and order" in American society.

During the period between the middle of the 1970s and the beginning of the 1980s there had been no major social movements such as had occurred a decade earlier. However, it is to be observed that the general official crime rate has increased. Since the 1980s, there have been no major social upheavals which compare to those observed from the early 1960s to early 1970s (especially the civil rights movement, major foreign war, political assassinations, and so on). It is to be speculated that in the 1980s crime will not claim the type of attention which it did from the mid 1960s to early 1970s. This research should clarify the assumption.

Common sense dictates that when a person perceives the crime rate to be going up, he or she will consider making necessary behavioral adjustments. These may include locking one's doors, acquiring firearms for protection, blaming the police for failure to catch the offenders, and so on. It is anticipated that this study will clarify these assumptions regarding social perception and behavior. Although many surveys and opinion polls have focused on measuring general attitudes about crime, few have devoted much attention to the way in which attitudes about crime relate to behavior, especially the behaviors which may be adaptations to perceived conditions of increasing or decreasing crime trends.
Dubow et al. (27) point out, for example, that residents of high crime areas may have lower perceptions of personal risk than might be expected. Individuals residing in these areas may see themselves as bigger, smarter, tougher or more cautious than most people. The same authors also assert that many people who perceive an overall level of danger in automobile use may discount their own personal risk because they believe that they are better drivers.

Garofalo (44) observes that the differences in the degree to which crime is perceived as increasing or decreasing depends on whether the respondent is asked about the nation or the neighborhood. As mentioned earlier, a survey of thirteen cities across the United States was conducted by Garofalo (45). In the survey, respondents were asked whether they perceived the crime rate to be increasing faster at the local or national level. A majority of the respondents thought that the crime rate increased faster at the national level than at the local level. This shows that even though respondents might perceive the crime rate to be high in the country as a whole, they may perceive their own neighborhoods to be safer. This shows that people's perception of the crime trend in the nation as a whole may not always be consistent with their perceptions of the crime trend in their immediate environments.
The major thrust of this research will be to analyze dimensions of public opinion with regard to public perceptions of the seriousness of crime. The study will also focus on how the respondents' perceptions of the seriousness of crime are related to other experiences or opinions about crime. The study will also examine the respondents' perceptions of crime trends, whether they think that the crime rate is going up or down, and also whether there is any association between this perception and certain behaviors.

Perceptions of crime and behavioral reactions to crime tend to interact and affect each other. To fully understand behavioral reactions to crime, it is necessary to understand perceptions that help shape and direct these behavioral reactions. Garofalo (45) points out that, in a survey conducted by the Census Bureau in the mid 1970s, between 35 per cent and 56 per cent of adults limited or changed their activities because of their perception of crime. Garofalo (45) also refers to an earlier study in Washington, D.C., where respondents were asked their response to perceived dangers of crime. Some respondents indicated that they stayed off the streets at night, improved locks, or simply avoided being alone at night. Some respondents claimed that they minimized the impact of burglary by buying insurance. Others engaged in group actions which involved general
street surveillance, working out intervention strategies or using escort programs (45, p. 32). One's perception of crime may also lead to withdrawal behavior or total isolation. These two measures may be taken to minimize the risks of victimization.

Although one's perception of crime may influence one's response behavior, this response behavior may indeed be shaped by available opportunities. Skogan (105) reminds us that opportunities for action are shaped by the options which are made available to individuals. These may include proximity to services (especially police stations), physical surroundings, employment opportunities, access to transportation, and so on. Some of the situations referred to above are sometimes determined by individuals' social statuses. For example, the poor living in high crime areas may value their safety and hope that neighborhood gangs may not harass them. Unfortunately, these individuals may not possess the economic and institutional capacities to enable them to live in safer neighborhoods or choose appropriate modes of transportation which will minimize their chances of being victimized.

Significance of the Problem

The study of public opinion is important to the understanding of crime as a social problem. Public opinion defines what constitutes crime and, in some cases, it
determines the feasibility of alternative methods of crime prevention and law enforcement (75). Many Americans who show some concern about crime have identified the nation's crime situation as a social problem (71, 116). Those Americans who regard the traditional methods of controlling crime as problematic would like to solve the problem by effecting some changes in the present social order. This may be in the form of advocating for more equitable distribution of resources among various groups or some changes in the criminal justice system. For example, the National Advisory Committee of Criminal Justice Standards and Goals (84) outlined a series of standards and goals and priorities for correctional reform. They encouraged public opinion to focus on and press for correctional reform. Both the Chamber of Commerce of the United States (1972) and the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice (1965) advocate for citizen support and involvement in community-based programs which would help to offer alternatives to traditional incarceration in the prisons. The community-based program referred to above, if thoroughly carried out, might help to encourage early resocialization by treating offenders in the community, thereby promoting rehabilitation of offenders.

In many ways people's ideas regarding solutions to crime and social upheaval reflect on the underlying causes
of crime. Through the analysis of public opinion data, some of these underlying concepts are revealed. Since 1946, poll data have revealed the importance of the crime problem (113). These crime problems range from fear of walking in the streets at night to attitudes towards capital punishment.

In a democratic society policy makers must be sensitive to public opinion. In order to act on behalf of the community and to gauge whether they have the implicit or explicit approval of their constituents, political leaders must continuously assess popular views on many subjects. It is necessary to find out, through public opinion poll data, whether citizens think the crime rate is going up or down or how crime ranks among other social problems.

Public opinion polls on crime, coupled with official crime statistics, provide a more sensitive measure of crime trends because they seem to complement each other, thus helping us to understand the nature of crime. Many commentators have observed, for example, that the uniform crime report compiled by the Federal Bureau of Investigation might not be an accurate measure of the crime rate.

Nappier (83) observes that the actual crime rate is at least double or triple the rate officially reported. Burman (13) observes that official statistics might understate or
exaggerate actual arrest figures. Cressey (22) had earlier made similar observations. By combining the Uniform Crime Index reports, victimization studies, and opinion poll results, one is able to have a more accurate picture of the crime situation. As Miethe (79) observes, public opinion and official crime statistics could form the basis for making legal prescriptions consistent with public sentiments, thereby affecting the ways in which police and prosecutorial resources are allocated.

Public opinion does not define crime but may lead to the labeling of some actors as criminals. Such labeling may result in those labeled seeing themselves as criminals and thus being indirectly forced to repeat criminality (98).

Public opinion on crime and criminal law is also of interest to the students of the conflict perspective. They may view criminal law as a device by which those who possess political power control those who are powerless (45). It is through the analysis of public opinion that such conflicts may become more apparent. For example, studies of public opinion concerning the death penalty show that more members of minority groups are likely to oppose those laws that concern the death penalty (119). Black Americans, for example, are more likely to perceive criminal injustice (14, 49). Other studies have shown that some groups may perceive
the police and prisons as instruments of oppression used by those in power against less powerful citizens (5, 98).

The analysis of a public opinion survey may provide a clear rationale for the setting of statutory punishments. Irion (55, p. 3) has observed, "for an understanding of human events in the United States, an appreciation of the influence of public opinion is perhaps the most important prerequisite." Many philosophers, like Tonnies, Gustave Le Bon, Alex de Tocqueville, and Lasswell, to name a few, have long recognized the important connection between democracy and public opinion. Lasswell (66) comments that the level of democratic attainment depends upon public opinion. Indeed, Thomas Jefferson's Declaration of Independence and Thomas Paine's emphasis on the importance of public opinion are examples of extreme faith in public opinion (55). Commenting on the overwhelming importance of public opinion, Alex de Tocqueville (25) even feared a situation where man's opinion might rule without sufficient individual expressions. Harold Lasswell (66) observes that the level of democratic attainment depends on public opinion. Most of the commentators referred to above base the authority for law in public opinion. Consequently, legislators sometimes view public opinion with seriousness. For instance, Rossi et al. (98) report that the Colorado state legislature has sometimes required that surveys of crime seriousness be
undertaken among the general public and among criminal justice personnel. This was considered necessary for drafting of a revised criminal code based on sentencing which would be fair and just.

It must also be noted that studies that establish the relationship between individual perceptions of the seriousness of crime and other aspects of crime are very important. Such studies will shed much light on how individuals cope with or without the perceived threat of crime. Such studies might further improve our understanding of how respondents spend their leisure time or adjust to life in their neighborhoods. For example, the elderly may be afraid to venture out at night and women may be afraid to go to PTA meetings which take place at night. The knowledge gained from this study may be of importance to those who are interested in examining how public opinion on certain social problems changes over time. It can also increase our understanding of the quality of life in the community. The knowledge gained from this study may help policy makers who might be interested in integrating public opinion into the planning process for the United States as a whole and for its various geographical subdivisions.
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CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Research into public opinion as it relates to crime has existed for the past fifty years; however, the concept of public opinion seems almost timeless. Public opinion on matters of concern to the nation has always been freely expressed by citizens of democratic societies. This behavior contrasts sharply with autocratic regimes where public opinion which is critical of the existing authorities is either suppressed or is forced to exist in clandestine forms (127). Speier maintains that in democratic societies people outside the government usually claim as their right that their opinion should influence or determine the actions, personnel, and indeed, the structure of the government. Public opinion represents a form of communication from the citizens to their government.

The History of Public Opinion

The present interest in public opinion in America can be traced to earlier European history where it had taken root, especially in England by the time of the revolution in 1688 (127). Speier has offered a very concise description
of the development of the public opinion process. A brief summary of Speier's work will be presented. The history of public opinion is very necessary as it throws more light on the understanding of the subject. Like the history of democracy, it helps us to appreciate how public opinion has developed to the state in which it is observed in America today. Speier maintains that the formation of public opinion, especially as it was observed in Europe (mostly in England and France), was accelerated by three main factors. These included the increasing number in the population who were becoming literate, the advancement of the printing press, and the development of many gathering (public) places where people could get together and exchange ideas on a variety of topics.

In England, coffee houses developed all over the country. These coffee houses provided opportunities for citizens to meet and engage in news gathering, political debates, literary criticism, and other forms of public opinion processes. In France, the saloons served the same function as the English coffee houses. Unfortunately, Germany did not develop coffee houses or saloons. The country was too poor and too militarized to engage in such activities. In America, circulation libraries were developed where printed materials were available to
disseminate information on matters of general interest to the public.

The French Revolution of 1789 laid much emphasis on public opinion as one of the most valuable rights of people. In France, censorship had been abolished as early as 1695. James Necker popularized the term public opinion on the eve of the French Revolution (128).

Comments by some European philosophers reveal a great deal of interest in public opinion as an essential ingredient of a democratic government. Yeric and Todd (149) have sketched the contribution of the earlier European thinkers that link public opinion to the democratic government. The following will be a brief summary of their work. Yeric and Todd (149) observe that Plato (427-347 B.C.) was the first philosopher to indicate how important it was for citizens to participate in the democratic process. Plato believed that only philosophers had the necessary background to rule. Aristotle (384-322 B.C.), on the other hand, embraced the idea of free expression of popular attitudes. Niccolo Machiavelli (1469-1527) believed that public opinion was useful if it could be manipulated for the achievement of power. Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679) perceived public opinion as a necessary condition for commitment to social contract. The importance of social contract between the government and the governed was also stressed by John Locke (1632-1704).
Yeric and Todd (149) assert that Jacques Rousseau, David Hume, and Jacques Mecker all stressed the importance of public opinion in any democratic government.

Just as the concept of democracy could be said to have originated in Europe, so also could it be said of the tradition of using public opinion to measure the sentiments of the people on many issues of concern in the United States. In a democratic government, those who govern must be sensitive to the opinion of those governed. It is not surprising therefore that in the United States the government has always paid great attention to public opinion. Smith (124), for example, observes that in a democratic society, the areas that the public worries about tell a great deal about how society perceives and interprets a given moment.

In the United States, the development of subscription libraries did much to disseminate information on a wide range of issues to the general public. One example was the library founded by Franklin in Philadelphia in 1732 (127). Other libraries sprang up, mainly in urban centers across the United States. Great importance has always been given to public opinion as an integral part of the democratic system in the United States. It has always been realized that public opinion would safeguard morality and reasonableness in government policies.
As early as 1909, President Taft had observed that, in international affairs, few nations would risk facing the condemnation of international public opinion (127). Although in America public opinion has always been expressed through ballots, the news media, and through the activities of pressure groups, interest in survey methods to gauge public opinion is only about five decades old.

One of the first sources of information on public opinion was the Literary Digest, a magazine with a large nationwide circulation. The journal is also credited with carrying out early scientific studies of public opinion (45). The magazine entered the polling field in 1916. It asked its readers to assess the chances of President Wilson or Charles Evans Hughes of winning the forthcoming elections (45).

In the first quarter of the twentieth century, people were developing more interest in asking respondents what they thought about many things that affect the American society (67). Also by this time, developments in statistical methods had proved that sampling produced accurate results in many fields. What remained was to develop the techniques for actual measurement of public opinion (67). The job of systematically surveying public opinion on a national scale and at regular intervals began in the United States in the second half of the 1930s (122). In the 1930s, economic
matters and social welfare were the topics which interested researchers (122). Later, interest was shown on other problems which afflicted the American society, including war issues and the American-Russian relationship.

As early as 1935, the Gallup organization conducted surveys in which respondents were asked what they considered to be the most important problem facing the country. Similar questions were asked in polls conducted by the Harris organization (between 1953 and 1983), the Roper organization (1977), and the National Opinion Research Center (1950s and 1960s). Smith (125) notes that approximately 125 surveys were conducted by the organizations mentioned above between 1946 and 1976—all featuring the same question, "What is the most important problem facing the country today?"

The polls which were conducted in America between 1946 and 1976 contained questions designed to elicit identification of those problems with which American society was preoccupied. The questions were drawn to elicit responses in three major categories of social problems: foreign affairs, domestic issues, and other remaining issues.

The foreign affairs category concerned questions dealing with world politics, especially the relationship between the United States and other superpowers, especially the Soviet Union. It also concerned the United States as
it related to other countries outside the Soviet Union. The category of domestic issues was further divided into economic, social control, government, and other items which were classified as "miscellaneous." Economic issues included inflation, unemployment, taxes, and so on. Social control issues focused on crime, violence, moral decline, civil rights, and the general criminal justice system. Government issues concerned corruption, lack of leadership, and inefficiency.

A look into the history of opinion poll research reveals certain trends in the importance which Americans attach to the social problems that confront the country at any particular time. At the end of the second world war, for example, much emphasis was placed on the peacetime economy. Toward the end of the 1940s, public attention shifted from "economy" to "foreign affairs" as the cold war between the West and the East heated up (125, p. 165). Between 1950 and 1963, "foreign affairs" continued to dominate public opinion polls. As Smith (125, p. 167) has observed, the category of "public affairs" was ranked as the first of the major social problems in forty-three out of forty-five surveys conducted during this period by a plurality of 35 to 40 per cent. In 1963, however, social control, rather than foreign affairs, was regarded as the
most important social problem. This period followed the onset of the civil rights movement (125).

In 1965, "foreign affairs" regained the public's attention because of the Vietnam war. "Foreign affairs" was almost always the primary concern of Americans from 1965 to 1970 (125).

During the 1940s, the polls revealed that "social control" was not regarded as the most serious problem. However, between 1965 and 1967, there was a general period of unrest and fear generated by an apparent moral decline, race riots, and widespread violence of all kinds. This violent behavior reached its peak in 1967 when, according to the Kerner Commission (125, p. 367), there were eight major and thirty-three serious riots during the first nine months of the year. Although public concern about "social control" seemed to have declined between 1968 and 1969, the campus riots of the spring and summer of 1970 helped to restore this concern as shown in the polls conducted in 1971 (125).

During 1971 and 1972, race riots and violent political confrontations subsided. The end of riots, of violent political confrontations, and of unrest in general contributed to the further decline of public interest in "social control" issues between 1973 and 1974. Since then, public opinion about the areas of "social control" has consisted largely of worry about crime which remains at about
the levels of the 1960s (125, p. 368). A review of
the literature related to the public opinion of crime,
especially that of the past decade, should reveal the
direction of public thinking and concerns in this area.

The history of the development of public opinion is
very necessary as it throws more light on the understanding
of the subject. As mentioned earlier, one could trace the
development of interest in public opinion to Europe,
especially in England and France, where coffee houses and
saloons served as forums where topics of common interest
were discussed. Although interest in public opinion has
always existed in the United States, the scientific
techniques for analyzing public opinion were not developed
until the third decade of this century. The early public
opinion studies focused on social issues which could be
divided into three major categories. They were: foreign
affairs, domestic issues, and those issues falling outside
those outlined above.

The contemporary public opinion process differs from
that of five decades ago, especially in the size of the
publics within which the process occurs (1). There has been
a tremendous growth in mass media which diffuse a great
amount of material to the large publics (1). With the
development of cable and satellite communications there has
been an increase in the remoteness of the sources of
communication from the reader, the listener and the viewer. Face-to-face contact with the source of information (1) has been replaced by secondary contacts. Advancements in the development of the computer and statistical techniques have made it easier to process information faster and to be able to make predictions more accurately. All these developments have resulted in the better use of public opinion polls either as indicators of the society's thinking or as sources of policy formation.

Public Opinion on Crime and Criminal Justice

While a wide array of literature is available on many aspects of social problems in America, the focus of the literature review will be on the study of public opinion as it relates to crime generally and on different aspects of the criminal justice system: the courts, the police and correctional institutions. While a general review of literature will be made here, the next chapter will focus specifically on the research questions of this study, what prior studies have revealed about the research questions, and what this study might find. The review of literature will focus on the seriousness of crime as compared to other social problems. This is the first part of the problem which this study addresses. The other aspects concern the perception of respondents as to an increase or decrease in
the crime rate and also their opinions of the criminal justice system.

The Most Important Problem

As mentioned earlier, researchers have been concerned about what problem Americans consider the most important among a list of social problems. The focus of this paper is to discover how respondents have rated crime among a list of other social problems. This is extremely important in view of the attention which continues to be focused on crime in the United States. Reis (113) maintains, for example, that, in 1981, thirty per cent of households in the United States reported one or more victimizations. He also observes that American society ranked among the most violent of modern societies. He also observes that the United States reported a homicide rate of 8.8 per 100,000 inhabitants as compared, for example, with 2.8 for Finland, 2.6 for Canada, Denmark, England, Greece, Ireland, and the Netherlands.

As Reis (113) has further observed, crime is consequential for the quality of life in a society. It possibly affects the allocation of resources for insurance, law enforcement, personal and public safety. Available literature indicates that, for the past decades, researchers have shown much interest on how crime ranks among other social problems.
Dubow et al. (27) maintain that crime has not always been as much of a public preoccupation as it has been in the past two decades, during which respondents have almost consistently indicated that the crime rate continues to increase. Such observation has also been recorded by McIntyren (91).

Early opinion poll surveys focusing on crime were carried out by such research organizations as The National Opinion Research Center, The Gallup and Harris Poll organizations. Topics of interest covered by these organizations centered mainly on perceptions of crime, its seriousness as compared to other social problems, attitudes toward capital punishment, gun control, the police, abortion, victimization, rape, and so on. From these earlier polls, the picture of crimes as it appeared to the general public could be observed.

Between 1953 and 1983, the Gallup organization conducted a series of polls in which they tried to find out what the American public considered to be the most important problem facing the country. Between 1953 and 1956, keeping peace was considered the most serious problem facing the country (54). In 1957, race relations was considered to be the most important problem. In 1958, unemployment was considered to be the most important problem facing America (54). Between 1959 and 1963, keeping the world peace was
again considered to be the most important problem facing the country by respondents.

Between 1964 and 1972, Vietnam was considered to be the most important problem facing the country. This was a result of the war which was being fought in Vietnam by America during the period. Between 1974 and 1981, those who responded to public opinion polls conducted by the Gallup organization considered high cost of living to be the most important problem facing the country. The second most important problem in 1973 and 1974 was Watergate. Between 1975 and 1981, unemployment was considered the second most important problem. It was only in 1978 and 1979 that energy problems displaced unemployment as the second most important problem facing the country. Between 1982 and 1983, unemployment was considered by most respondents to be the most important problem facing the country. Cost of living was considered to be the second most important problem facing the country in 1982 and 1983, respectively (54). The polls have not consistently revealed that a majority of American respondents consider crime as the most important problem facing the country; yet the polls indicate that Americans viewed crime as a problem. In 1965, 2 percent of those polled considered crime as a problem, and 3 percent thought that lack of moral standards was a problem (46).
In a survey conducted in 1967, nearly 50 per cent of respondents believed that the crime rate in the country was increasing (21). In 1968, more Americans considered crime as an important problem facing the country. By August of that year, 21 per cent considered crime as a social problem compared with 29 per cent and 15 per cent who thought so in July and May of the same year, respectively. As mentioned earlier, it is suggested that campus unrest and assassinations of political leaders must have been responsible for the figures obtained for 1968 (21).

By 1970, only 7 per cent of Americans polled regarded crime as the most important problem facing the country (47). In 1971, the figure again jumped to 12 per cent and for 1972 it was 6 per cent for August and 10 per cent for July (48).

By 1973, the number again had jumped to 17 per cent (49). The number decreased and later stabilized at 4 per cent for 1974 and 1975, respectively, slightly increasing to 8 per cent in 1976 and dropping to 3 per cent for 1979, 2 per cent in 1980, and 4 per cent in 1981 (51, 52, 53).

The literature on public opinion on crime reveals some interesting findings. The American public seems concerned about crime; they even believe that the rate might be going up. Yet, they don't seem to believe that crime is the most important problem facing the country. Occasionally, one gets the impression from the mass media that the country is
being engulfed by crime, yet the major concern of many
Americans seems to be basically economic. Consequently,
unemployment and high cost of living have constantly
dominated the minds of those who were asked to indicate the
most serious problem facing America.

Perception of Crime Trends and
Seriousness of Crime

Basically, the perception of crime involves what people
think about crime. Perception of crime may be molded by
many factors. These may include personal victimization
experience, victimization of relatives and friends (69).
Perception of crime also involves beliefs about crime, the
assessment of risk, or the fear of victimization (123).
Skogan believes that, on the basis of direct and indirect
experience, it is possible for people to develop images of
the world around them. Fact images, cognitive components of
respondents' world view, play an important role in shaping
how they react to events and other actors (123).

Fact images deal with the amount and changes in the
amount of crime. Skogan points out that belief about crime
and its distribution may reveal that people see crime as a
problem which occurs somewhere else. People's perception of
crime trends may influence what they do to minimize victimi-

zation. A study of respondents' perceptions of crime may
reveal whether or not people of different demographic
backgrounds will rate a particular crime as having the same
degree of seriousness.

Both direct and indirect experience with crime can
shape people's perceptions of crime. While personal
victimization can affect one's perception, indirect
experience through the news media can also affect one's
perception of crime. Funkhouser (43) points out, for
example, that the mass media continue to be the major source
of knowledge for many people who have had no direct
experience with crime. Thus, trends in the incidence of
crime as portrayed by the news media may have effects on the
perception of crime that are independent of the overall
level of crime (21, 27, 31). These authors maintain that
the perception of crime risk is influenced more by perceived
changes in crime rates than by the actual level of crime.
For example, a low crime rate that suddenly increases may
result in people psychologically and behaviorally adjusting
themselves to perceived risks. This may lead to increased
fear of crime. Conklin (21) maintains that people may
react to their fears of crime where much crime may not even
exist. Fears may not be grounded in reality.

Officially reported crime rates could also influence
people's perceptions of crime. Davis (24), for example,
points out that in Colorado, while official rates were
declining in absolute terms, newspapers were giving a more
extensive coverage of crime. Consequently, the general public perceived the crime rate to be increasing. Fishman (38) finds that an increase in news coverage of crimes against the elderly in New York City led to a great increase in fear even though the reported crime rate increases were of far lesser magnitude than was reported in newspapers. Sheley and Ashkins (121) explore the relationship between news reporting on crime in newspapers and on television to actual crime. The study concluded that media reporting on crime patterns bear little relationship to the reality of crime as reflected in police statistics. Springer (129) notes that in an earlier study some respondents perceived a public park as a dangerous place even though, officially, in the views of the police and of park and recreation officials, the public park, in fact, had a low crime rate. In explaining their reasons for avoiding the park, the respondents noted lack of visibility of the park to many passers-by. They also expressed the opinion that a robbery in a park may be more threatening than a robbery in a crowded street. These perceptions may have been instrumental in the production of low crime rates in parks because people avoid them.
The Gallup organization often asked respondents more detailed questions on crime. For example, respondents were asked if there were more crimes in the area in which they lived presently than one year earlier. In 1972, 1975, 1977, 1981, and 1982, 51 per cent, 50 per cent, 43 per cent, 54 per cent and 47 per cent, respectively, answered in the affirmative. Another question concerned whether there was an area within a mile of the respondents' places of residence where they would be afraid to walk at night. In 1965, 34 per cent answered in the affirmative. The figures for 1967, 1972, 1975, 1977, 1979, 1981, and 1982 were 31, 42, 45, 45, 42, 45, and 48 per cent, respectively. One could observe that, even though many Americans have not considered crime as the most important problem in the country, they nevertheless show some anxiety about its rate of increase.

Harris (62) also points out that, based on a telephone survey of 1250 adults representing a cross-section of the population, there appears to have been a dramatic rise in the number of Americans who feel that the crime rate in their area is increasing. In the same survey, 68 per cent said that crime was on the upswing compared to 48 per cent saying so in 1978.
The other aspect of the study of seriousness of crime concerns whether certain crimes can be rated consistently across various groups. If so, the consistency might indicate that there is a normative structure which is widely diffused and cognitively appreciated by most segments of the population (117). On the other hand, lack of consistency in rate might indicate a conflict in the way different groups perceive certain crimes (59, p. 352).

Gibbons (58) studied the relationships between punitive sanctions directed at offenders and public sentiments about appropriate penalties. Citizens indicated the punishment which they felt was most appropriate for twenty different crimes. The most visible and coercive offenses received the most severe penalty choices.

Rossi and others (116) conducted a study in which respondents rated a group of crimes according to their perceived degrees of seriousness. Those crimes against persons, especially murder, received the highest seriousness ratings. Crimes against property in which no action was taken against people were rated significantly lower. At the end of the list were those offenses often classified as misdemeanors, for example, "disturbing the peace" or being drunk in public. There was considerable agreement among different groups on the relative ordering
of criminal acts. The more highly educated and the younger the respondents, the more likely were their individual ratings of criminal acts to agree with the average computed for the entire sample (116, p. 237). The study cited above also concluded that the norms defining how serious various criminal acts are considered to be are quite widely distributed among different groups. These groups are blacks and whites, males and females, high and low socio-economic levels, and different levels of educational attainment.

Figlio (36) focuses on the determination of subjective severities of various kinds of criminal offenses as judged by incarcerated offenders and by non-offenders. Both offenders and non-offenders agreed as to the ordering of certain offenses along a scale of least to most serious offenses. Chilton (18) interviewed a sample of 535 students who were asked to group a selected list of offenses according to their degrees of seriousness. Those offenses which involved physical victimization were viewed as being more serious than victimless crimes; however, there was a substantial lack of agreement on the seriousness of all kinds of drug use. Those students from junior high school to college viewed the use of marijuana less seriously than did other students. Conversely, university students generally regarded assaultive offenses and robbery as more serious than did junior high students.
Thomas and others (136) observed differences in the ranking of offenses between those respondents in higher and lower socio-economic brackets. There was a high level of agreement among both groups, not only on the rankings of crime but also on the length of sentences which should be assigned to a set of possible offenses. There was, however, an age and race difference in ranking of offenses according to perceived seriousness. Older respondents were more harsh in their sentencing than younger ones. Black respondents were more lenient in the sentences they assigned for homicide, rape, and the sale of drugs to minors than were white respondents; however, blacks were more severe in the sanctions they felt appropriate for possession of marijuana, gambling, and prostitution.

In 1978, Roth (118) replicated an earlier study by Selling and Wolfgang. He discovered that white collar crimes involving $10,000 or more were found to be regarded as far more serious than larceny of the same amount. They were rated as equivalent in seriousness to such crimes as rape and kidnapping. In general, smuggling and the sale of drugs received higher seriousness scores than possession or use of drugs.

Blum-West and Hembroth (1982) discovered that crimes of violence were considered more serious than crimes against
property and the so-called "victimless" crimes. Subjects were asked to rank ten crimes according to their degrees of seriousness. The result of the study also demonstrated that the public's perception of the seriousness of a crime varies with (1) the intent of the person committing an offense, (2) the motive for the act, (3) the similarity between offender and victim, and (4) the social consequence of the offense committed.

Miethe (95) concludes that ratings of crime seriousness reflect an underlying normative structure. He points out that, generally, crimes involving physical harm are judged more serious than many other types of crimes. He asserts that the concept of seriousness may imply the moral indignation or moral wrongfulness.

Cullen et al. (23) reported a significant variation in the mean seriousness scores for the offenses they used and the same 140 offenses earlier tested in Baltimore by Rossi et al. (116). On a one to nine scale, the sample by Rossi et al. showed a mean of 6.27, whereas Cullen et al. registered a mean of 6.91. Cullen and his associates conclude, for example, that their results demonstrated an increased public condemnation of white-collar crimes when compared with the earlier work of Rossi and others.

Hagan (59) concludes that Black Americans are considerably more likely than whites to perceive criminal injustice.
Criminal injustice means the perceived discrimination in courts from their policies and other arms of the criminal justice system. He also concludes that the perception of criminal injustice varies with social class and the perception of conflict. The perception of criminal injustice is also more pronounced in the metropolitan centers than in rural areas. He also asserts that the influence of class is less than that of race in perception of criminal injustice in America.

Miethe (96) examines the strategies for measuring "consensus" in public evaluation of crime. The study contrasts with earlier studies which tend to conclude that different social groups agree on their evaluations of the seriousness of the crime. He argues that the term "consensus" had not been operationally defined in previous studies. He distinguishes between what he calls "global" and "local" types of consensus. He defines "global consensus" as an agreement in ratings across the total list of items included in a scale. "Local consensus," on the other hand, deals with agreement in the rating of items that are more similar on a scale or a particular type of crime. He observes that previous studies focused on global consensus.

Miethe (95) observes that individual level comparisons and the analysis of within-group variations reveal greater agreement among whites than blacks. He cautions that by
investigating different types of consensus ratings and the factors that contribute to such ratings, researchers would be in a better position to determine whether studies of crime seriousness would be useful for judicial decision making.

Cullen et al. (23) ask whether the concept of consensus in crime seriousness is an empirical reality or merely a methodological artifact. They suggest that consensus is affected by the rating task given to the subjects, the operational definition of consensus, and the type of offense under investigation. They also assert that many studies on crime seriousness ignore within-crime variability and that such studies are based on consistency rather than agreement. They conclude that traditional measurement techniques provide only a limited assessment of the concept of consensus (23).

In instruments measuring crime seriousness, there is an overrepresentation of violent or very serious offenses. This may slightly inflate the unanimity of opinion. The authors also caution that the pool of items selected on a survey can diminish or enhance consensus. They caution against the temptation to reify consensus.

Pontell et al. (109) examine the views of a sample of 105 police chiefs throughout the United States concerning ranking of sixty criminal offenses according to their degrees of seriousness. The results indicate that the chiefs see most crimes in very much the same light as do
those citizens surveyed by Rossi et al. (116) in 1974. There is also considerable consensus among police chiefs throughout the country in their views concerning the seriousness of crime.

In 1981, McCleary et al. (89) examined the effects of legal education and work experience on perceptions of the seriousness of crime. A high degree of consensus was found between a sample of criminal justice bureaucrats and a group of citizens surveyed earlier. Both groups seem to agree that the most serious crimes are those against the person, especially crimes of murder, rape, and assault.

Miller (97) examined the possible effects of public perception of crime (which may be unfounded or unsubstantiated) on community or property. The study shows that if potential property buyers and appraisers perceive an area to be crime-ridden they will be reluctant to invest money in real estate there.

Also, in 1982, Taub et al. (133) examined the relationship between fear of crime and the composition of residents in a particular neighborhood. The study was conducted in eight Chicago neighborhoods. The study concludes that the fear of crime was noticeable in old neighborhoods. This fear resulted in the undermining of neighborhood appearance and lowering of property values.
Lampe (79) examined the effects of a person's sex on perceptions of crime and criminals. It was concluded that only slight differences existed between the sexes in their knowledge or perceptions of crimes committed in their communities.

Carter (16) examined the interaction of Hispanics with the criminal justice system in Texas. Such variables as experiences with the criminal justice system and attitudes and perceptions were examined. He concluded that Hispanics in Texas feel "less safe" concerning crime than the general population. They do not feel that police could reduce the incidence of crime, and they do not feel that they have adequate police protection. They evaluate the police lower on job evaluation than the general population does. The study also concludes that Hispanics feel that the criminal courts are fair and just and that, generally, Hispanics possess a strong punitive rather than rehabilitative attitude towards corrections.

The concept of "perception" is very important to the study of public opinion on crime. Perception, dealing with what respondents "think" about crime or the criminal justice system, is closely interwoven with people's attitudes. The study of respondents' perceptions, as indicated in the review of literature, indicates what people think about the crime trend, whether they think the crime rate is increasing
or decreasing. People's opinions about crime may be shaped either by direct experience with crime or by indirect experience with crime, for example, when a neighbor is victimized or when one observes crime trends as they are presented through the mass media.

The literature review also indicates how people of diverse demographic backgrounds may rate a particular crime or a set of crimes. The process of rating may reveal that there is a general agreement among respondents on the severity of a crime. On the other hand, such ratings may reveal that different groups rate some crimes differently on a scale of severity.

It is also to be observed from the review of literature that some relationship may exist between what people think about crime and what they do about it. Skogan (123) observes, for example, that in a study which was conducted by the Census Bureau in the mid 1970s, thirty-five to fifty-six percent of adults limited or changed their activities because of crime. People also took personal precautions, increased household surveillance, and formed neighborhood watch groups as responses to the threat of crime. This particular topic is addressed in this study as elaborated in the next chapter.

The review of literature also reveals that paradoxes exist between "what people think and what they do about crime." Skogan (123, p. 35) observes that those who take
more household protection are more likely to live in the suburbs where the threat of crime is felt less than would be the case in the inner city areas. It is hoped that this study will contribute to our understanding of persons' perceptions and reactions to their threat of crime.

Public Opinion on The Criminal Justice System: The Courts, the Police, and Corrections

The study of public opinion is very useful to the understanding of the criminal justice system in any society. The impact of public opinion is usually felt in the area of policy formation. As Lane and Sears (80) have observed, government policy on matters pertaining to the criminal justice system is shaped by the opinion of members of the political community. Indeed, the legitimacy of any regime rests on the opinion of the public. Public opinion is necessary when the government seeks support for allocation of funds for all branches of the criminal justice system. It is through the examination of public opinion that policy makers can discover whether the public recognizes the difficulties faced by the police, the prisons, and the courts. Difficulties may involve the purchase of new equipment, personnel problems, and the establishment of new programs. For the public to actively participate in the matters pertaining to the criminal
justice system, it must understand the issue. The study of public opinion reveals whether or not the public understands the issues.

Benson (6) reported on a survey which was conducted in the St. Louis Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area. This survey, conducted in the summer of 1977, studied the effects political alienation has on the perception of police performance. The survey shows that public ratings of police are generally quite high. However, those lacking trust in police integrity and who viewed crime as increasing, expressed estrangement from the political process. Also, those who were nonwhite or of lower class, were found to be more likely to rate police performance more negatively than others.

Brown and Coulter (12) examined response attitudes in three specific aspects of police performance: police response time, police treatment of people, and the generally perceived quality of police service. These factors were found to be significantly related to overall citizen satisfaction with the police.

In 1971, Richard L. Block (7) analyzed the data collected by the National Opinion Research Center (NORC). He examined the relationship between fear of crime and "fear of the police." He concluded that the fear of crime is only weakly related to either support for increased
police power or protection from them. Other surveys that measured attitudes towards the police in the early 1970s include those by Smith and Hawkins (124), Furstenberg and Wellford (44), Phillips and Coates (108), Chackerian and Barret (17), and Hahn (60).

McEwen and Connors (90) conducted a survey on the evaluation of differential police response programs. This was a program dealing with alternative methods of police response to citizens' calls for police service other than immediate dispatch of a patrol unit. The study also examined citizens' acceptance and satisfaction with such alternative means of communication as mail-in reports of crimes, telephone reporting of crimes, and so on. The study concluded that citizens prefer that patrol officers report to the scene of the crime even though a delay may occur between crime report and the arrival of the patrol officer.

Another study by Blum-West (9) deals with why people report crimes to the police. The findings show that college-age persons are the least likely to report crimes to the police. The study also suggests that the norms and values related to historical experiences and cultural perspectives may influence attitudes toward the police.

Many surveys have examined public opinion of the courts. Fagan (34) described public attitudes toward the courts. He concluded that public opinion surveys
consistently show that there are generally high levels of support for the court system. The public also perceives the court system as being "too lenient." This attitude toward the courts reflects the results of a public opinion survey conducted by the Gallup organization in 1978. At that time, 48.9 per cent of the respondents expressed the view that the court is "not harsh enough" (50).

The Edwin T. Meredith Foundation of Iowa conducted a public opinion survey on the Iowa court system. The study concluded that Iowa citizens do not have a thorough and accurate knowledge of their state's court system. Other studies dealing with the judicial system include those of Gaynes (57), Kirby and McKnight (73), Fleming (39), Gambitta and May (55), and Izzett (68).

Bouma (11) observes the demise of rehabilitation as a primary goal of the correction process as one of the most dramatic developments in contemporary American criminology. Emphasis on rehabilitation has been replaced by emphasis on retribution. He traces this change to many factors which include a trend towards conservatism in the United States, adoption of more punitive approaches to offenders, and the view that society does not have the right to change an offender's behavior or personality. Also, empirical evidence seems to suggest that rehabilitation programs have failed to
achieve their goals and the perception by the public seems to be that offenders must receive their just dessert.

Moore and Teske (99) conducted a statewide victimization survey in 1979. Focus was also on the respondents' perceptions of crime and the criminal justice system in Texas. Responses on perception of crime suggest that rural residents have relatively little fear of victimization. They also show that prime concerns of rural residents focus on theft, drugs, and traffic accidents. Rural residents, however, use fewer security devices in their homes and on their property and are less likely than statewide residents to keep a gun for the sole purpose of protection.

Severy and others (120) also conducted a survey to assess the degree of potential community support for each of five proposed non-residential programs and an institutional type of juvenile facility. The survey revealed that all community groups preferred non-incarceration programs, especially restitution.

Rector (111) examined attitude change by theorizing that if there is going to be a reallocation of funds from institutions to community-based correctional services, repressive public attitudes must be changed through public education by correctional professionals and more active citizen participation in social control functions.
Another study conducted by the Oregon Law Enforcement Council examined the attitudes of Oregonians about crime and the criminal justice system. The study revealed that 39 per cent thought that crime in their neighborhood had increased, only 3 per cent thought that crime had decreased, and 85 per cent supported capital punishment. Respondents also rated the construction of a new maximum prison as the best alternative to prison overcrowding, followed by regional jails and work camps.

Warr et al. (141) examined the norms, theories of punishment, and publicly preferred penalties for crimes. The study concludes that when age and prior record of the offender are held constant, seriousness of the offense is the central criterion that determines appropriate punishment.

Bouma (11) examined some factors believed to be related to the shift in the emphasis of corrections from rehabilitation to punishment. The study also revealed that the public is becoming increasingly critical of sentences and dispositions that do not appear to render significant punitive consequences for crimes. Other studies dealing with corrections include those of Stasny and Tyranauer (130), Barrum et al. (5), Kercher and Dull (72), Riley and Rose (114), Wald (139), Yeomans (148), and Juliani (71).
A bond election was held on prison construction in November, 1981. Voters told the state officials that costly and wasteful prison expansion was no longer an acceptable solution to prison overcrowding. Alternative options which could be implemented immediately included regular bail review hearings and handling parole violators through increased supervision or community-based programs. Needed reforms in correctional management included a review of classification standards to reduce maximum security imprisonments, more reentry and pre-release programs, and expanded use of good time and work time credits.

The analysis of public opinion is very crucial to the identification of social problems, especially those dealing with the criminal justice system. It is very necessary because it is the public which usually provides the money which is essential to improving the criminal justice system. Financial assistance may include the recruiting and training of personnel, purchasing new equipment, building new prisons or effecting community-based programs.

The review of literature on the public opinion and the police reveals some interesting findings. While the general public rates the police fairly well, it appears as if the members of the minorities rate the police worse than the general public. It also seems as if there is no consistent relationship between fear of crime and the way
in which police performance is rated. This study attempts to discover a relationship between how respondents rate the police and their perception of crime trends.

While the review of literature reveals a general support of the courts, there is a general feeling among the public that the courts are not harsh enough. This feeling, on further examination, also results in a demise of support for rehabilitation. This might be partly responsible for the sharp increase in the prison population across the United States in the decade between the mid-1970s and the mid 1980s (14).

Public Opinions on Capital Punishment and on the Possession of Firearms

The literature on capital punishment is very extensive; however, a detailed and extensive review of the literature on the subject is beyond the scope of this research because this study only slightly deals with some aspects of capital punishment. Historically, the use of capital punishment as a form of deterrence dates back to many centuries. Since the founding of the United States, the use of capital punishment has been invoked as a means of curbing crimes, especially those involving murder.

Opinions are divided on the efficacy of capital punishment as a deterrence to crime. Those who oppose the practice maintain that the use of capital punishment
discriminates against the poor and the minorities. While capital punishment has been abolished in some states, it has been retained in others.

Another subject which has excited much debate in the United States is the possession of firearms. Those who advocate the control of sales and possession of firearms, especially hand guns, see it as a way of preventing firearms from getting into the hands of those who might use them to commit crimes. But those who are opposed to the control of sales and possession of firearms argue that such practices violate the citizens' right to possess arms as a means of personal protection as guaranteed by the United States Constitution.

In 1972, in Furman vs. Georgia, the Supreme Court of the United States ruled that the imposition and carrying out of the death penalty constitutes cruel and unusual punishment, thereby violating the rights guaranteed by the Eighth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution (106). Recently, another ruling by the United States Supreme Court states that some citizens could be excluded from serving on a jury on the basis of their belief concerning capital punishment. The debate still continues among the citizens of the United States as to whether or not capital punishment should continue to be used.
Time Magazine of January 24, 1983, in an article entitled "An Eye for an Eye," reviews the history of the current debate over capital punishment, citing relevant Supreme Court decisions, state laws, and other relevant studies. The article also profiles several inmates on death row.

Handberg et al. (61) examined the impact of an execution picture viewed by a group of Florida high school students. The attitudes of the students towards the death penalty were examined both before and after the execution picture was shown. There was little change in the attitudes of the respondents toward capital punishment. Other studies dealing with the public opinion on the death penalty include those of Ellsworth and Ross (30) and Moore and Abney (100).

Miller (1981) carried out a survey of attitudes of inmates of a prison to see whether they thought capital punishment was a deterrent to crime. This study followed the famous Gilmore case. Miller concludes that capital punishment has only little deterrent value.

A lot of attention has been focused on gun ownership and registration. Dubow et al. (27) observe that the sales of long guns doubled between 1962 and 1978. Within the same period, sales of handguns had quadrupled. Fear of crime, civil disorder, and the anticipation of stricter firearm
laws are generally given as reasons for this behavior. A study by Kluin (76) asked respondents if gun control was a legal and effective means of controlling crime in the United States. Many of the respondents believed that regulating handgun ownership does not necessarily violate the second amendment, which guarantees individuals the right to bear arms.

In 1959, 77.9 per cent of Gallup Poll respondents favored obtaining a police permit to own guns. The figures for 1966 and 1975 were 69.5 per cent and 67 per cent, respectively.

Feagin (35) compared the attitudes of blacks and whites on defense of private homes. He discovered that 65 per cent of blacks indicated they had to be prepared to defend their own homes against crime and violence. Only 28 per cent of blacks felt that home defense should be left to the police. Among the white respondents, however, the figures were 52 per cent and 41 per cent, respectively. The study clearly shows that blacks have less confidence in the police than whites for the task of protecting their homes against crime and violence.

In a study by Maxfield (87), he concludes that surveys of individuals who own guns show that such individuals tend to be less fearful of being crime victims. Another study by Williams et al. (142) studied the question of possessing
firearms in the home. The study concluded that single urban women who are Protestant and who live in the South favored the use of force as a means of social control. Other studies on the subject of firearms include those of Clotfelter (19), the University of South Carolina College of Criminal Justice (138), Schuman and Presser (119), and Wright (146).

The use of capital punishment dates back many centuries into the history of penology. There is yet no consensus on the efficacy of its use as a deterrence to crime, especially those crimes involving murder. Public opinion on capital punishment seems to vary with the perception of crime trends. Public opinion on the possession, sale and ownership of firearms also changes with time and events. During the time of rising crime rates and assassinations of prominent political leaders, debates on the control of firearms seem to intensify. There seems to be no consistent public opinion on matters that pertain to the possession of firearms.

Public Opinion Concerning Sex Crimes

Recently, researchers have begun to show an interest in studies dealing with marital rape. This interest could be seen as having developed from the continued attention which has been devoted to family violence. The subject of marital rape remains very controversial as many people
still find it hard to accept the fact that rape could occur between a husband and wife. Those who focus attention on marital rape seem to have been encouraged by the feminist perspective which asserts that a woman should have a right to control her body, a right which extends to whether or not she should have sex with her partner.

A study by Jeffords and Dull (70) revealed that 35 per cent of the Texans who were interviewed favored a law by which a wife could accuse her husband of rape. Those most likely to favor this law were white female, young, unmarried single, or educated persons. Each of these groups was seen as having more modern attitudes towards sex roles.

Finkelhor and Yllo (37) examine marital rape. The studies by the authors focus on results of in-depth interviews with women whose husbands or partners had used force or threat of force to have sex with them. The study cited above reveals that as of January 1982, about 36 of the 50 states and the District of Columbia exempt a husband from prosecution for rape of his wife. Finkelhor and Yllo conclude their findings by observing that it is doubtful that the elimination of this exclusion would radically change the extent of spousal rape because of the reluctance of women to report such an incident as crime. Howell (66) interviewed about eighty persons who have been involved with spouse abuse. He examined the opinions and beliefs about
wife beating in Kentucky and tried to determine how this problem is treated by both public and private agencies. A general profile of the battering male is provided, sketched largely from the descriptions offered by the abused spouse and behavioral science professionals. The study points out that an earlier study by a Louis Harris poll revealed that more than one in five Kentucky women have experienced violence from their spouses. The study concludes that there is an urgent need to acknowledge wife battering as a serious and pervasive crime in the state.

Mazelan (88) examined stereotypes and perceptions of rape victims. This report compared public perceptions of rape in the United Kingdom, victims' own perceptions, and how they were seen by others. Subjects viewed rape victims as either prostitutes or tarts who probably behave and dress in a provocative manner or as young, attractive flirts who were simply naive.

Williams and Holmes (142) examined judgment of rape victims in a social context. Public attitude data suggest that public responses to rape are differentiated by certain variables, namely age, sex, and race. So also are related categoric risks as well as certain attitudinal variations about sex roles. Other studies on rape include those of Williams (142) and Speas and Thorpe (126).
Conclusion

The history of interest in public opinion can be traced back to Europe, especially in England and France, where it was regarded as very essential to the democratic process. Originally, people met in coffee houses (as in England) and in saloons (as in France) to exchange opinions on matters of public interest.

In America, public opinion has always been regarded as an essential part of the democratic government. In the 19th century, the development of circulatory libraries accelerated the development of literacy in the general population which also led to more interest in public opinion. Although scholars have always paid attention to the public opinion process, it was not until the early part of this century that techniques were developed to more accurately analyze public opinion on many issues, which range from matters that deal with American foreign policy to issues of domestic or national concerns.

In the early 1930s, when the techniques for studying public opinion had been well-established, respondents were usually given a list of social problems out of which they were expected to indicate the most important ones. Originally, the list of problems centered around foreign affairs but it later included such domestic problems as
inflation, unemployment, and later, crime. The review of literature reveals that Americans have consistently been concerned with such problems as inflation, unemployment, government corruption, and so on. Although respondents have indicated some concerns for crime as a social problem, the majority has not considered it as the most important problem facing the nation.

Perception of crime trends as revealed by respondents' answers to some questions has also been of interest to the researcher of public opinion. Researchers have been interested in finding out whether respondents consider the crime rate to be going up or down and how they react to perceived trends in crime. Emphasis has been on whether there is any association between what respondents "think" and what they also do as a consequence. People's opinions are also sought on the criminal justice system (the courts, police and corrections).

In the next chapter, many research questions have been formed around the issues which have been raised in this review of the literature. In addition, brief reviews are made on former research dealing with the research questions, and more questions are raised as to whether this study would agree with or contradict former findings. In places where former studies are not available to draw any
conclusions, the findings of this study should fill that void.
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CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This chapter focuses on those methodological issues which are relevant to this study. Since the study is based on secondary data, concern will focus on the analysis of data more than data collection. As mentioned earlier, the original survey was carried out by Chilton Research Services of Radnor, Pennsylvania, for American Broadcasting Corporation (ABC) News. Interviews were conducted on a sample of 2,464 respondents during December, 1982. Respondents were asked questions which tapped their perceptions of crime and the criminal justice system. Questions assessed the respondents' fears of being victims of crime, perceptions of the seriousness of crime in America, and their evaluations of the criminal justice system. Other questions also pertained to the respondents' opinions about government spending, the state of the economy and President Reagan's policies.

The main focus of this study will be those aspects of the original data which concern respondents' opinions about crime and the criminal justice system. The study could be divided into two major parts: The first part concerns
respondents’ perception of the seriousness of crime in relation to other social problems in the United States. The second part examines the relationship between respondents’ perceptions of the seriousness of crime and other variables.

Description of the Sample

The original source of the data for this study was identified in the first chapter. The data were made available in part by the Inter University Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR #8100). The data were originally collected by Chilton Research Services for the American Broadcasting Corporation News.

The following variables were used in the study:

1. Social problems which affect the people of the United States.

2. Whether the respondent’s car or property has been vandalized within the past one year.

3. Whether the home of the respondent’s neighbor has been burglarized within the past one year.

4. Whether the respondent’s neighbor’s car has been vandalized within the past one year.

5. Whether the respondent’s neighbor was vandalized within the past one year.

6. Whether crime is considered an important social problem in the United States.

7. The respondent’s victimization experience, especially if his or her car has been vandalized.

8. The respondent’s victimization experience, especially if his or her home has been burglarized.
9. The respondent's victimization experience, especially if he or she has been robbed on the street.

10. Whether crime is increasing or decreasing on the national level.

11. Does the respondent think that the neighborhood crime rate is increasing or decreasing ("going up or down").

12. Does the respondent approve or disapprove of the police department?

13. Does the respondent think that the police are 100% effective?

14. Does the respondent try to avoid groups of teenagers?

15. The question concerns the frequency at which the respondent locks his or her doors.

16. This variable concerns whether the respondent recommends the death penalty for those who have committed murder.

17. This variable concerns whether the respondent keeps guns or revolvers at home.

18. The variable is the respondent's educational achievement, that is, the highest educational level which the respondent attained.

19. The variable addresses the respondent's age in terms of his or her year of birth.

20. The variable concerns the respondent's race.

21. This variable concerns the respondent's social class.

22. This variable concerns the respondent's annual income.

23. This variable concerns the respondent's sex, whether male or female.

There are some words which have been most frequently used in this study. They are operationally defined as indicated below:
Perception.--Operationally defined as what the respondent "thinks" or the opinion he or she holds about a particular subject.

Crime trend.--Refers to whether the crime rate is increasing or decreasing either at the national or the neighborhood level.

Victimization experience.--Whether the victim has ever been a victim of a particular crime, for example, victim of robbery on the street, victim of home burglary, or victim of property vandalism.

Seriousness of crime.--Refers to whether the respondent thinks that crime in itself is a very serious, somewhat or not so serious problem in America.

Social class.--The study assumes that when asked, most people are likely to say they belong to either the middle class or the working class. On the basis of this assumption, social class is dichotomized and respondents are asked to identify themselves as either middle or working class. This was how the study was done.

The survey for this study was conducted by Chilton Research Services of Radnor, Pennsylvania, for the American Broadcasting News. Interviews were conducted during December of 1982 with a nationwide sample of 2,464 respondents. The United States was divided into nine regions. These regions were: New England states with 136
respondents, Middle Atlantic states with 414 respondents, East North Central states with 439 respondents, West North Central states with 211 respondents, South Atlantic states with 395 respondents, East South Central states with 153 respondents, West South Central states with 277 respondents, Mountain states with 124 respondents, and Pacific states with 315 respondents. The descriptive statistics for the sample are shown in Appendix A.

It was not indicated in the original data whether the sample (2,464), which was drawn from all regions of the United States, was a stratified random sample or not. However, an examination of some demographic variables in the sample and a look at the 1980 United States census make it tempting to conclude that, indeed, the sample was a random stratified sample. For example, the sample data contained 92 per cent white and 8 per cent black after the categories had been collapsed. In the 1980 census, the population was 83.1 per cent white and 11.7 per cent black (6). Also, the 1980 census shows 51.4 per cent females and 48.6 per cent males. In the data, females were 42.7 per cent as compared to 57.3 per cent males.

The original data contain some interesting information. There were only two social classes, namely the middle class and the working class. There were six categories for race and seventy-five categories for age, which were represented
by the last two digits of the year in which the respondents were born. As a result of this, some data modifications were necessary.

Data Modifications

The variable age which contained seventy-five categories in the original data was collapsed to four categories. These categories were: (1) those born between 1900 and 1920, (2) those born between 1921 and 1940, (3) those born between 1941 and 1964, and (4) those born between 1889 and 1899. The corresponding age categories were 66 to 86 years, 46 to 65 years, 22 to 45 years, and 86 to 97 years.

In the study, most of the variables were independent variables. The dependent variables were social problems in America, importance of crime in the United States, and perception of increase or decrease in crime nationally.

Research Questions

In order to analyze the data, nine research questions will be investigated. These research questions address two main issues. The first issue deals with how the respondents ranked crime among nine social problems. The second issue deals with the respondents' perceptions on crime and criminal justice issues. The elements of the nine research questions are addressed below:
(1) what the respondent thinks is the most important problem facing the country;

(2) whether there will be a relationship between the respondents' demographic background (race, age, sex, and social class) and their perception of the crime trend;

(3) whether there will be a specific relationship between the respondents' perception of neighborhood safety and their perception of crime trends nationally;

(4) whether there will be some relationship between the respondents' victimization experience and their perception of the seriousness of crime;

(5) whether there will be a relationship between the respondents' opinions concerning the death penalty and their perception of crime trends;

(6) whether those who support gun ownership will perceive crime trend to be in an upward direction;

(7) whether there will be a relationship between the respondents' evaluation of the police and their perception of crime trends and also their victimization experience;

(8) whether there will be some association between the respondent's frequency of locking home or apartment when leaving home and their perception of crime trends;

(9) whether there will be some association between the respondents' avoidance of teenage groups and their perception of crime trends.
First of all, each question will be presented as it appeared in the questionnaire of the American Broadcasting Corporation's poll of public opinion on crime. Following this will be the research question as formulated for the purposes of this study.

**Question (1).** In your (R's) opinion, what do you think is the most important problem facing this country today?

(1) Unemployment
(2) High interest rates
(3) Inflation
(4) Economy/High cost of living
(5) Crime
(6) Moral decline
(7) Taxes
(8) Dissatisfaction with government
(9) Reagan

**Research Question 1.**—Will there be a relationship between the respondents' demographic backgrounds (race, age, sex and social class) and their opinions of what they perceive to be the most important social problem in the country? For example, members of a minority group may believe that unemployment is the most important social problem in the country. Members of the lower class may have similar opinions. On the other hand, members of the middle and upper classes who are not preoccupied with the problems of employment may focus on moral decline or taxes as the most important problem. The research question also asks whether there is a consensus on what Americans think the most important problem facing the country is.
Question (18). Just your (R's) best guess, would you say that the crime rate in this country is going up, going down or what?

(1) Going up  
(2) Going down  
(3) Staying about the same  
(0) NA/Refused  
(9) DK/No opinion

Research Question 2.--Will there be a relationship between the respondents' demographic backgrounds (race, age, sex and social class) and their perceptions of crime trends, especially whether the crime rate is going up or down?

Garofalo (5) points out, for example, that in a survey of public opinion about crime conducted in eight selected cities in America, 82 per cent of the respondents perceived the crime rate to be going up. In another crime survey (9) conducted by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration of Justice Department, it was discovered that more females (76%) than males (73%) believed that the crime rate was increasing. In another study reported earlier by Kleinman and David (7), 32 per cent of black respondents perceived the crime rate as increasing while 24 per cent of the white respondents shared similar opinions. The study concludes that the discrepancy could be a result of both races living in neighborhoods with different daily experiences with crime.

Question (64). And what about the neighborhood where you (R) live, would you say that violent crime is going up or going down or what?
Research Question 3. -- Will there be a specific relationship between the respondents' perceptions of neighborhood safety and their perceptions of crime trends nationally?

While respondents might perceive the nation's crime rate to be going up, they might perceive their neighborhoods to be safe. As Conklin (1) has rightly observed, respondents might blame any occurrence of crime on "outsiders" while believing their own neighborhoods to be safe. To perceive one's neighborhood to be safe in the midst of a national crime wave may be a psychological adjustment necessary in order to make the respondents' neighborhoods more livable.

Question (11). Have you had your car or some other property vandalized within the past year?

(1) Yes
(2) No
(9) DK/NA

Research Question 4. -- Will there be some relationship between the respondents' victimization experiences and their perceptions of the seriousness of crime?

Garofalo (5) argues that there will be no difference in the way victims and non victims perceive the seriousness of crime. He reports that 67 per cent of those who had had
victimization experience believed that their chances of being attacked or being robbed had gone up. Of those with no previous victimization experience, 61 per cent held similar beliefs.

Many reasons might account for this similarity in perception. Those who had been victimized might blame their experiences on their own carelessness rather than the rising crime rate. They might think that the experiences might have been avoided if they had been more careful. Non-victims might credit their non-victimization experiences to the care they have taken to avoid crimes. On the other hand, both groups might agree that the crime rate has in fact gone up. It will be instructive to see whether this study will confirm or refute Garofalo's (5) claim.

Question (57). Are you in favor of the death penalty for persons convicted of murder?

(1) Yes
(2) No
(0) NA/Refused
(9) DK/No opinion

Research Question 5.—Will there be a relationship between the respondents' opinions regarding the death penalty and their perceptions of crime trends?

Respondents who perceive the crime rate as rising may believe that the solution to the problem lies in the execution of those most dangerous to the society. This is particularly evident in situations where those who have earlier committed
murder are released after a brief period of incarceration only to repeat the same offenses of homicide after their release. Those who perceive the crime rate as rising may view capital punishment as an effective deterrent.

Question (58). Do you have any guns or revolvers in your home?

(1) Yes
(2) No
(0) NA/Refused
(9) DK/No opinion

Research Question 6.--Will those who support gun ownership be those who also perceive the crime trend to be in an upward direction?

In the years between 1962 and 1968, the sales of guns doubled. Dubow et al. (3) observe that during the same period the sales of handguns quadrupled. This time of record sales of guns also corresponds to that time when most concern about the rising rate of crime was expressed in different opinion polls (3).

Maxfield (8) points out that, in a study conducted in Minnesota on why respondents carried guns or other weapons, many of the respondents answered that they carried guns because of perceived increase in crime rate. Fear of crime was evident among respondents. Carrying a gun served as a means of decreasing fear of being a crime victim. When the crime rate is perceived to be on the increase, citizens may find gun ownership very attractive as a means of protection.
Question (33). Do you approve or disapprove of the way your police department is handling its job.

(1) Approve
(2) Disapprove
(0) NA/Refused
(9) DK/No opinion

Research Question 7.---Will there be a relationship between the respondents' evaluations of the police (i.e., how well police are doing their job) and their perceptions of crime trends?

The job of the police is to protect citizens from becoming victims of crime. It is to be expected that those who perceive the crime rate to be on the increase might perceive the police as not doing their jobs. Garofalo (5) observes that 40 per cent of those who have been victims of crime (compared to 46 per cent of non-victims) evaluated police performance as good. In the same study, a majority of white respondents rated police performance as good while the opposite occurred among black respondents. The same study also showed that young people (who are most likely to be victims of crime) rate the police more poorly than older people.

Question (54). How often do you lock up your home or apartment when you go out---would you say you always lock it when you go out, sometimes lock it up or almost never lock it up?

(1) Always
(2) Sometimes
(3) Never
(0) NA/Refused
Research Question 8.--Will there be some association between the respondents' frequency of locking home or apartments when leaving home and their perceptions of crime trends? It is expected that those who perceive the crime rate to be going up will take precautionary measures to lessen their chances of victimization.

Question (53). If you saw a group of teenagers on a street corner, would you tend to avoid walking past them or not?

(1) Yes, would avoid
(2) No, would not avoid
(0) NA/Refused
(9) DK/No opinion

Research Question 9.--Will there be some association between the respondents' avoidance of teenage groups on a street corner and their perceptions of crime trends? It is expected that those who perceive the crime rate to be going up will respond by avoiding those situations which might expose them to crime. As Dubow et al. (3) have pointed out, citizens tend to base their behavior on their assessments of crime rates and the probability of victimization. Dubow et al. also point out that people often think that crime is more likely to occur at night where young people hang out, drink and play music. Avoiding these situations will be a way of responding to a perceived crime rate.

Conklin (1) and Ennis (4) both report that the perception of crime risk is influenced more by perceived
changes in the crime rates than by the actual level of crime rates. It is hoped that this study will throw more light on this claim.

Statistical Measures Used

The kinds of statistical techniques used in this study were those normally used for descriptive purposes. The computer was used for the purposes of computation and treatment of data. Computations were made with the help and application of different programs: the SPSSX, the Statistical Packages for the Social Sciences and Music, McGill University System of Interactive Computer. Those statistical measures used included percentages and measures of association. The nature of each research question dictated which appropriate statistical measures were used.

Percentages were used, especially in the first research question where the focus was on the percentage of the respondents who considered crime as the most important problem as compared to eight other social problems. Gamma was chosen as a statistical measure because we are mainly interested in the association between two (2) specific variables, especially those variables which tap the respondents' attitudes or perceptions about crime and their responses to these perceptions.
Conclusion

This study was based on data which was collected by Chilton Research Services for the American Broadcasting Corporation (ABC) News. Since the study is based on the use of secondary data, attention is focused on the analysis of data rather than their collection. The analysis of the data is in two parts. The first part analyzes the ranking of crime among nine social problems. Analysis revealed whether differences exist in the way respondents with different demographic backgrounds view crime as a social problem. The second part of the study examines the relationship which exists between peoples' perceptions of crime and their opinions on other aspects of the criminal justice system or what they do as responses to their perceptions.
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CHAPTER IV

DATA ANALYSIS

Introduction

The data for this study were analyzed through a quantitative examination of nine research questions as stated in Chapter III. The work will emphasize descriptive statistical techniques rather than inferential ones; and it will focus on the relationship between variables. The first research questions will examine whether there are differences (based on some demographic variables: race, age, sex, and social class) in what respondents believe to be the most important problem in the United States. The multiple response, which is a form of cross-tabulation (statistical package for social sciences) was used in examining the first hypothesis. In research questions two through nine, Gamma, a measure of association, was used to measure the relationship between variables.

Examination of the Research Questions

The research questions were examined in the order in which they were stated in Chapter III. The first research question was stated as: Will there be a relationship between the respondents' demographic backgrounds (race, age,
sex, and social class) and their opinions on what they perceive to be the most important problem facing the country? This research question presumes that what is considered as the most important problem will depend on what preoccupies the minds of a particular social group. For example, members of minority groups and those in the lower class may focus their attention on unemployment, and those in the middle and upper classes may focus on taxes and moral decline.

The examination of the research question failed to confirm the expected relationship. Both blacks and whites, for example, rated unemployment to be the most important problem in the country. Following unemployment, in rank order fashion, were economy (or high cost of living) followed by inflation. Only 3.1 per cent of the whites and 3.2 per cent of the blacks rated crime as the most important problem. Both whites and blacks rated crime as the fifth most important problem in the country.

The results indicate that respondents of all age categories consider unemployment to be the most important problem facing the nation. However, 11.1 percent of those between 87 to 97 years old consider crime to be the second most important problem facing the country. It is also to be observed that only 2.4 per cent of respondents in the 22 to 45 years age category consider crime to be the most important
problem facing the country. Both male and female respondents considered unemployment to be the most important problem facing the country. However, females are twice as likely as males (4.5 per cent to 2.1 per cent) to consider crime to be the most important problem facing the country (see Appendix C).

There were no differences in the way in which respondents in both classes (middle class and working class) perceived what the country's most important problem is. It is to be observed, however, that while 46.3 per cent of middle class respondents considered unemployment to be the most important problem facing America, 50.7 per cent of the respondents in the working class category also considered it to be the most important problem. This partly confirms the observation that people in the working class category would show more concern with unemployment than those in the middle class category. Incidentally, both classes show equal concern for moral decline (see Appendix B).

The second research question was stated as: Will there be a relationship between the respondents' demographic background (race, age, sex and social class) and their perception of crime trends, especially whether the crime rate is going up or down? In a survey carried out by National Crime Survey in 1975, it was discovered that more females (76%) than males (73%) believed that the crime
rate was going up. Kleinman and David (10) also point out that while 32 per cent of black respondents perceived the crime rate to be going up, only 24 per cent of white respondents shared similar opinions.

The empirical examination of the second research question shows that, while there is no association between age and perception of crime trends (Gamma = 0.02), there is a very little association between sex and perception of crime trends (Gamma = 0.24). There is also a very little association between social class and perception of crime trends (Gamma = 0.24). When race is examined, however, a different story emerges. The study shows that there is a moderate association between race and perception of crime trends (Gamma = 0.35). The study shows that whites (91.2%) perceive the crime rate to be increasing while only 9% of Blacks perceive the crime rate to be increasing. This study contrasts with the earlier conclusion reached by Kleinman and David (10) who conclude that more blacks than whites perceive the crime rate to be increasing.

In the empirical examination of research questions two through nine, a measure of association is sought. The statistical measure used is that of Gamma.

Gamma is a measure of association developed by Goodman and Kruskal (11). It makes use of the information obtained about one variable to tell us about the second variable.
Gamma is a symmetric measure because any contingency table yields only one value of gamma regardless of whether the row variable or column variable is logically dependent or independent (11).

There are some conditions under which the use of Gamma is very appropriate. These include measures of association between ordered variables and when cross tabulation of any size is used (14). The value of Gamma ranges from -1 to +1. As observed by Mueller et al. (14), Gamma is not limited by marginal frequencies and, hence, its interpretation as a relative reduction in error measure is therefore free of the specific marginal distribution.

In interpreting Gamma, its numerical value gives the percentage of guessing errors eliminated by using knowledge of one variable to predict the other (14). Positive signs mean that the variables being examined increase together. On the other hand, negative signs mean that as one variable increases, the other decreases. For example, a Gamma of -1 means that for untied pairs the order on one variable is the reverse on the other. On the other hand, when the value of Gamma is +1 it means that order is the same on both independent and dependent variables for all untied pairs. A Gamma of +1 is perfect predictability of all pairs involving no ties. A Gamma of zero indicates that among all untied pairs
there are exactly as many pairs with reversed orders on the two variables as there are pairs with the same orders (14).

Operationally measures of association are defined as high, moderate, low or nonexistent (3). Unfortunately, and as has been observed by Costner (3), reasonable clarity remains to be achieved despite many suggestions which have attempted to clarify selected measures of association. Garofalo (7) for example, classifies degrees of association in terms of values of Gamma as high (.76 to .89), strong (.48 to .55), moderate (.35 to .39), and weak (.21). For the purposes of this study, Garofalo's measure will be used mainly because his study also addresses public opinion on crime.

The third research question was stated as: Will there be a specific relationship between the respondents' perceptions of neighborhood safety and their perceptions of the nation's crime trends? This research question assumes that while respondents perceive the nation's crime rate to be on the upswing, they perceived their neighborhoods as safe. The empirical examination of the research question confirms the expected relationship. There is no association between the way respondents perceive the crime trend in their neighborhood and that in the nation (see Appendix E). For the research question stated above Gamma is 0.13. There is poor association between the way respondents view the crime
situation nationally and at the local level. This confirms what was earlier observed.

The fourth research question was stated as:  There will be some relationship between the respondents' victimization experiences and their perceptions of the seriousness of crime. Garofalo (7), for example, argues that there will be no difference between victims and non-victims on how they perceive the seriousness of crime. Kleinman and David (10), Biderman et al. (1), and Ennis (6) found no relationship between victimization experiences and the respondents' perceptions of the seriousness of crime.

The empirical examination of the research question above does not confirm the expected relationship mentioned above. It must be mentioned, however, that different victimization experiences may affect the respondents' perceptions of the seriousness of crime. The Gamma between being a victim of street robbery and perceptions of the seriousness of crime was .24 (see Appendix G); that between having been burglarized and perception of seriousness of crime was 0.03 (see Appendix J). The Gamma between victim of vandalism and perception of the seriousness of crime was .08 (see Appendix H).

The fifth research question stated:  There will be a relationship between the respondents' opinions regarding the death penalty and their perceptions of crime trends.
This perspective assumes that those who view the crime rate as going up would view the death penalty as a way of deterring those who might commit murder. The empirical examination of the research question above does poorly confirm the expected relationship between the respondents' opinions on crime trends and the death penalty for murder. The association between the two variables mentioned above is illustrated by the value of Gamma which is 0.15 (see Appendix K). This research supports the earlier conclusion by Taylor et al. (19, p. 413). They discovered, for example, that there is no relationship between fear of crime and capital punishment.

The sixth research question was stated as: Will those who support gun ownership be also those who perceive the crime trend to be in the upward direction? The empirical examination of the research question did not confirm the expected relationship (see Appendix L). The research question was examined further. For example, it was discovered that a weak relationship exists between being robbed on the street and having a gun or revolver at home (Gamma = .24) (see Appendix M). On the other hand, there were very poor associations between one's home being burglarized and one's possession of guns or revolver at home (Gamma = .14) (see Appendix N). The association between being a victim of car or property vandalism and having guns...
or revolvers at home was indicated by a Gamma of .02 (see Appendix O). This is an indication of no relationship.

The findings here support some earlier findings. Gorse and Beran (8) found little relationship between risk of victimization and gun ownership. McClain (12) draws similar conclusions.

The seventh research question was stated as: Will there be a relationship between the respondents' evaluations of the police and their perceptions of crime trends? Decker (4) observes, for example, that being a victim of crime was not related to the evaluation of police performance. Garofalo (7), Jacob (9), and Smith (17) all arrive at similar conclusions. The empirical examination of the hypothesis fails to confirm any association between perception of crime trends and the evaluation of the police job performance (see Appendix P). Our study shows that Gamma, which shows the degree of association between the respondents' perceptions of crime trends and the evaluations of police job performances, is 0.08. Earlier studies have failed to establish any association between victimization experience and the evaluation of police job performance (7, 9, 17). Our study shows that the relationship between victimization experience and evaluation of the police job performance may be affected by the nature of victimization experience. For example, the degree of association between
car or property victimization and approval of the police department is a weak one (Gamma = 0.23). Home burglary victimization (victim exp. 2) and approval of police department is very poor (Gamma = 0.15). On the other hand, there is a moderate association between having been a victim of street robbery (victim exp. 3) and approval of police department (Gamma = 0.33). One could conclude, therefore, that the nature of victimization could affect the respondents' evaluations of the police departments (see Appendix Q, R, and S).

The eighth research question was stated as: Will there be some association between the respondents' frequency of locking homes or apartments when leaving home and their perceptions of crime trends nationally? The empirical examination of the research question does not confirm the expected relationship. The association between the perceptions of crime trends and the frequency of locking doors is reflected in the value of Gamma, which is 0.16 (see Appendix T).

Although the association between the two variables measured above are low, the study confirms the expectation that those who perceive the crime rate to be going up will likely take precautionary measures. Eighty-five per cent of the respondents who think that the crime rate is going up
also took precautionary measures by locking their doors. On the other hand, only 4.8 per cent of the respondents show that they never lock their doors and who also believe that the crime rate is going up. There seems to be a direct relationship here between perceptions of crime trends and precautionary measures.

The research question was examined further to determine the strength of the association between different kinds of victimization experiences and the precautionary measure of locking doors. Our research shows that those whose homes have been burglarized show more precautionary measures (locking their doors) than those who have been robbed on the streets or those whose cars or other property have been vandalized. The degree of association between being the victim of home burglary and frequency of locking doors is Gamma of 0.37. That between being robbed on the street and frequency of locking doors is Gamma of 0.20. The association between having been a victim of car or property vandalism is Gamma of 0.19. Thus, we can conclude that a moderate association exists between types of victimization experiences and taking precautionary measures of locking one's door. Our data thus suggest that precautionary behavior may be affected by types of victimization experiences.
The ninth research question was stated as: Will there be some association between the respondents' avoidance of teenage groups on a street corner and their perceptions of crime trends? As Dubow et al. (5) have stated, citizens tend to base their behavior on their assessments of crime rates and the probability of victimization. The examination of the research question confirms only a fairly weak relationship between perception of crime trends on the national level and avoidance of groups of teens. The value of Gamma is 0.27. This is a slightly moderate association.

Summary of Findings

The analysis of this data does not indicate support for most of the research questions examined in this study. Most of these research questions seem to be common assumptions about peoples' opinions as they relate to some social problems, especially those dealing with the criminal justice systems. This study threw some light on these assumptions by subjecting them to empirical examinations.

The first research question, which suggested that there would be a relationship between the respondents' age, sex, social class, and race and what they consider to be the nation's most important problem, was not confirmed. It was, however, observed that the respondents in the 87 to 97 age group ranked crime as the second most important problem
facing the country. This is rather interesting noting that this is the least victimized of all age groups (16).

The second research question, which suggested that there would be a relationship between the respondents' demographic variables (age, sex, social class and race), was only partially confirmed by this study.

The third research question, which states whether there would be some association between the respondents' perceptions of the crime trend nationally and at the neighborhood level, was not supported by this study.

The fourth research question, which asked whether there would be a relationship between victimization and seriousness of crime, was not completely supported by this study. It was discovered, however, that the association between perception of seriousness of crime and victimization varies by the nature or type of victimization experience. There is a stronger association between street robbery experience and seriousness of crime than those between home burglary or property vandalism experiences and seriousness of crime.

The fifth research question, which asked whether there would be a relationship between the respondents' opinions concerning the death penalty and perception of crime trends in America, was not confirmed by this study.
The sixth research question suggested that those who support gun ownership would also perceive the nation's crime trends to be in the upward direction. This study did not support the assumptions of the research question.

The seventh research question suggested that there would be a relationship between the respondents' evaluations of the police and their perceptions of crime trends. The study did not confirm the relationship. This question was probed further to see whether there would be a relationship between victimization experience and the evaluation of the police. There was no relationship between victimization experience (per se) and the evaluation of the police. On further analysis, it was revealed that there was a moderate association between evaluation of police job performance and having been a victim of street robbery. This victimization experience thus differs from that of home burglary and car or property vandalism.

The eighth research question, which suggested the existence of an association between frequency of locking doors and perceptions of crime trends, was not supported by the research. However, home burglary victimization was found to be moderately associated with frequency of locking doors. This type of victimization experience was found to be more related to the frequency of locking one's doors than the other two types of victimization experiences (having
been robbed on the street or having experienced car or property vandalism).

The ninth research question suggested an association between the avoidance of groups of teens and perception of crime trends. The research only weakly supported this association.

Conclusion

This study demonstrates that there is a general agreement among the respondents on what is considered the most important social problem in America. This agreement as demonstrated from the study traverses social and economic differences. Although 93.1 per cent of the respondents believe that crime is an important social problem in America, they don’t regard it as the most important problem. The study reveals that those problems which the respondents believe to be most important are economic in nature.

The study also reveals that common assumptions about how people view crime generally or how they view some aspects of the criminal justice system are not borne out by empirical research. For example, it is usually assumed that there will be an association between victimization experience and perceptions of crime trends nationally. It is also generally assumed that different social groups will view the nation’s crime trend differently. All these were not borne out by empirical research. The study does show,
however, that there is a relationship between different kinds of victimization experience and perceptions about crime or the criminal justice system.

Finally, the data show that to predict the respondents' perception of the seriousness of crime we must look beyond victimization experience and those demographic variables used in the data analysis.
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CHAPTER V

INTERPRETATION OF FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION

In this chapter, the major empirical findings will be examined and evaluated. The extent to which the stated objectives of the study mentioned at the beginning of the study have been met will be examined.

The research has clearly demonstrated that the majority of Americans continue to regard the most important problem in the country as basically economic (either unemployment, high cost of living or inflation). This perception is shared by all ethnic, economic, sex, and age groups. Our finding concurs with the assertion made by Miethe (32) that one of the most consistent findings of criminological research is that different social groups seem to agree on their ratings of seriousness of crime. Although the majority of the respondents (93.1 per cent) consider crime to be an important social problem in America, less than 5 per cent consider it to be the most important problem. These findings confirm the earlier ones by the Gallup organization (34). For example, the Gallup organization indicates that between 1973 and 1982 it was discovered that either unemployment or high cost of living was
consistently regarded as the most important problem facing America (12).

It is to be observed also that the Uniform Crime Reports (42) show that the crime rates between 1963 to 1967 were lower than for those between 1978 and 1982. For example, the crime rate for 1963 was 1198.3 crimes per 100,000 inhabitants. The rate for 1964 was 1361.2, for 1965 it was 1434.3. In 1966, it was 1656 and in 1967 it was 1921.7 per 100,000 inhabitants. The Uniform Crime Reports showed a crime rate of 5109 per 100,000 inhabitants for 1978. It was 5524.1 for 1979 and it stood at 5899.1 for 1980. It was 5799.9 for 1981 and it registered 5553.1 for 1982. Despite the higher crime rates for the years from 1978 to 1982, the public did not perceive crime as threatening as it was between 1963 and 1967.

As we mentioned in the first chapter, it is possible that the extensive publicity which the mass media gave crime, social movements and campus unrest towards the end of the 1960s and early 1970s may have affected the respondents' perceptions. Erskine (10) points out, for example, that people's perceptions are affected by the publicity given to crime and social movements, the types that were observed in America in the late 1960s and early 1970s. Funkhouser (11) observes that the public relies on the mass media as its major source of information,
especially for those who have had no direct experience with crime. Hibbard and others (21) also assert that the mass media set agenda for public discussions leading to shared beliefs about the incidence of a problem. Gomme (18) observes that exposure to the news media may stimulate fear of crime. It is hardly surprising to discover that the news media may have a direct or an indirect influence on the perceptions of many Americans. Yeric and Todd (45) have observed, for example, that an average American spends nearly three hours each day watching the television, two hours each day listening to the radio, 20 minutes reading a newspaper. This extended period of exposure to the mass media will definitely play a great part in the socialization of the American public's view about particular social problems.

We found no association between the respondents' perceptions of crime trends nationally and neighborhood safety. This study confirms previous research findings on the subject. Garofalo (14), McIntyre (28), and Biderman (4) have reached the same conclusion. Skogan (35) suggests that there are tendencies among respondents to think that the crime problem is worse somewhere else. Garofalo (14) observes that, while only 40 per cent believed that crime in their neighborhoods had increased, 80 per cent believed that the crime rate had increased nationally. Mande and Butler
(30) conducted a study in Colorado where they discovered that most respondents saw crime as occurring somewhere else other than in their own community. Winslow (44) drew the same conclusion. So also did Kleinman and David (26) and Dubow (8). McPherson (29) asserts that more people perceive rising crime as more of a national than a neighborhood problem. The original suspicion may be supported that perceiving crime as occurring outside one's immediate environment may be a psychological adjustment that is necessary for making one's neighborhood more livable.

The findings of this study do not confirm the research question that asks whether there will be some association between victimization experience and the perception of crime trends. Our finding is consistent with earlier conclusions. Stinchcombe (38, p. 123) concludes,

Individuals who have been victimized or who live in high crime areas are no more likely to support punishment measures than more fortunate individuals. McIntyre (28) finds no relationship between victimization experience and perceptions of crime. Similar conclusions are reached by Kleinman and David (36), Biderman et al. (4), and Ennis (9). McIntyre (28, p.37) explains,

Most incidents of victimization do not appear to constitute very important events in a person's life experience. If the experience of victimization is not a major event in the lives of most people, it is understandable that this experience does not determine their attitudes concerning crime.
McIntyre further points out that most people are not victimized sufficiently often for that to have a serious impact on them. Winslow (44) and Thomas and Hyman (41) drew similar conclusions. This study, however, shows that the different types of victimization may show different levels of association with perception of seriousness of crime. The level of association between the victimization experience of having been robbed in the street and perception of seriousness of crime is higher than that for home burglary or property vandalism.

This research did not confirm the research question that there would be a relationship between perceptions regarding the death penalty and the respondents' perceptions concerning the crime trends. This conclusion confirms the earlier one by Taylor et al. (39) who concluded that individuals who are afraid or who have been victimized are no more likely to support harsher sanctions than those individuals for whom crime is not a salient problem. It must be pointed out, however, that study shows that eighty-two per cent of those who support capital punishment for murderers also believe the country's crime rate to be going up. Interestingly enough, the opinions of Americans have assumed a "roller-coaster" fashion on this subject. In 1953, sixty-eight per cent of the respondents favored capital punishment for murderers; in 1956, it dropped to
fifty-three per cent. For 1960, it was forty-five per cent; it dropped further to forty-two per cent in 1965; and by 1969 it was fifty-one per cent. This figure was almost consistent for the years up to 1976 when it jumped to 65 per cent (6). It climbed further to sixty-six per cent in 1981 (6). These reports show that there is a parallel between support for harsher punishment and fear of crime. This study thus fairly supports this observation.

These research findings failed to show any association between perception of crime trends and possession of firearms. Even when the relationship between victimization experience and gun ownership was examined, the association was low. This study confirms earlier findings by Stinchcombe (38) and by Gorse and Beran (19) and also by the New American Library (1). The New American Library (1) study found that association between gun ownership and reading news about violent crimes to be very low indeed (Gamma=0.13).

Earlier research findings throw more light on why the association between gun ownership and crime perception or victimization experience was so low. McClain (27) asserts that it is possible that victims of violent crimes react by not wanting to be associated with weapons possibly because weapons were used in the attack, or they may associate weapons with crime. Dubow and others (88) observe that more
gun owners live in predominantly rural areas where there is less crime and lower levels of fear of crime. Gorse and Beran (19) studied victimization perceptions and behavioral reactions in a small Ohio town. The town's residents perceived very little risk of victimization by crime, yet a very high proportion of the residents owned guns.

One problem which one may encounter is methodological in nature. Many respondents may intentionally refuse to correctly answer questions because gun ownership still constitutes a very sensitive issue. Consequently, respondents may lie to interviewers in order to conceal the fact that they own guns. They might be afraid of the possibility of their guns being confiscated, especially if such guns have not been registered (38). In America, the gun issue continues to be a sensitive and emotional issue.

This study did not confirm any association between perception of crime trends and the evaluation of the police. While this study did not confirm any association between victimization experience per se and evaluation of the police, it was discovered that, of all the three types of victimization experiences in this study, the highest association existed between street robbery experience and the evaluation of the police. The findings, however, partly confirm Garofalo's earliest conclusion that 40% of those who have been victims of crime compared with 46% of
those who have not been victims approved of the police. The corresponding figures in this study are 68.2 and 80.9 per cent, respectively.

Generally, the police are positively evaluated by most respondents. This confirms earlier studies by Hindelang (23), Thomas and Hyman (41), Nehnevajsa (33), Teske and others (40), the Houston study (24), Jacob (25), and Barley and Mendelson (2). These studies found no appreciable differences in the ways in which victims and non-victims evaluated the police. Barley and Mendelson, for example, found no association between victimization experience and perception of the police at a Gamma of -.03. Brent Smith (36) found no association between perception of crime and perceived police performance (Gamma = -.20). He also found no association between victimization experience and evaluation of police job performance (Gamma = .14). Others also drew similar conclusions. These include Smith and Hawkins (37), Gourley (20), Cleaver et al. (5), White (43) and Decker (7).

This study particularly focused on the police because they are the most visible part of the criminal justice system and as Benson (3) has observed, being the most visible and obstructive agents of governmental authority, what the people think about them and their work is very important. The average law abiding citizen has little
contact with most parts of the criminal justice system, the prosecutor's office, criminal courts, parole boards, prisons and so on (14). Most work of the police is also performed while they are in contact with the general public. As a result, it is very important to monitor what the public thinks about the police.

Cleaver (5) observes that one of the ironies of police and community relations is that,

The high visibility of the police via the mass media of public reaction against police has created the impression that public attitudes (towards the police) are predominantly negative.

Empirical evidence suggests the opposite. The overwhelming majority of the American citizens tend to support the police. As Garofalo (14, p. 29) has observed, the police are not "blamed" for any perceived rise in the crime rate. The present study shows that reducing the amount of victimization may not necessarily improve police-community relations. This perspective is also shared by Smith and Hawkins (37) and is important for police policy.

There was an empirical evidence to indicate that there is little association between the respondents' perceptions of crime trends and the frequency of locking doors (Gamma=.16). This may be due to the fact that respondents perceive crime to be increasing nationally, rather than in their neighborhoods. As previously indicated, respondents, even those who live in high crime areas, tend to perceive
their neighborhoods as safer than many other neighborhoods. The trend in the national crime rate seems "too distant" in the thinking of the respondents; as such, it may fail to elicit any protective behavior on their part.

When we looked at victimization experience, a different picture emerged. In this study it was discovered that the association is higher between victimization experience and the frequency of locking doors than between the perception of criminal trends and the frequency of locking doors. The association between home burglary victimization and frequency of locking doors was a Gamma of .37. This Gamma is higher than that for other types of victimizations.

The association between street robbery victimization experience and the frequency of locking doors is Gamma of .20. That between car or property vandalism experience and the frequency of locking door is Gamma of .19. Here, we can conclude that a type of victimization experience can lead to protective behavior. Those whose homes have been burglarized would take precautionary measures to reduce future victimization. Since the crimes of street robbery, car and property vandalism and burglary are most likely to occur in the respondents' neighborhoods, it is expected that the degree of association between experience and behavior would be higher. Garofalo (14) points out, for example, that property crimes (burglary, larceny, and other
forms of theft) were perceived to affect people's opinions of crime trends at the neighborhood level. This conclusion supports Jacob's (25) assumption that the perception of crime might be molded by personal experience or victimization of relatives or friends.

The study offers only some support for the assumption that there would be an association between the perception of crime trends and avoidance of groups of teens (Gamma=.27). Again, respondents may perceive the rise in crime rate to be a national, rather than a neighborhood, problem. Contacts with teenagers will most probably take place in the proximity of the respondents' homes where crime is not perceived as a serious problem.

Some independent variables, car or property vandalism experience, avoidance behavior, social class, year of birth and sex all failed to predict the respondents' perceptions of seriousness of crime. Our study seems to confirm an earlier, similar study by Garofalo (15) who attempted to predict fear of crime from respondent's total personal victimization experience, age, sex, race, income and comparative neighborhood danger. All the independent variables in his study were only able to predict 26 per cent of the variance in the dependent variable. He concluded that unexplained variations might be due to measurement error. The variables used might be imperfect
indicators of the concepts of the model. Like the model in the present study, the effect of the media remained unmeasured. It is safe to assume that many of the problems above could be applied to our findings.

Limitations of the Study

One of the limitations of this study is methodological in nature. As happens in many studies using secondary analysis of data, the researcher may not know enough about the original procedures to make a sound judgment about the errors in the data. The time lag between time of data collection and data analysis may limit the scope of generalization of our findings. For example, the low associations among variables may be due to a methodological error.

The data fails to address the issue of what kind of crime is going up at the national level. This issue is resolved, however, when the respondent is asked whether he or she thinks violent crime is going up or down. Studies have demonstrated that people have different perceptions about violent and nonviolent crimes. This problem of validity might have affected responses that compared national with neighborhood crimes. It may also have affected the dependent variable—national crime trends. It is possible that respondents would have answered
differently if they were asked whether violent and/or non-violent crimes in America were increasing or decreasing.

One of the flaws in the data is lack of any questionnaire items that sufficiently deal with the issue of the news media. The only question on the news media deals with whether respondents think that the television news gives too much attention to stories about crime. A question dealing with the frequency at which respondents are in contact with the mass media would have been most beneficial. Given these data and the procedures, the effect of the mass media remains unmeasured. Strong evidence from literature suggest that the amount of media attention which is given to an issue strongly influences the visibility of the issue to the public (11, 10). Erskine points out, for example, that, shortly after the assassination of President Kennedy, 73 per cent of those interviewed thought that the crime rate was rising. By 1969, the figure was 35 per cent. By 1970 when the reports of campus unrest were in the headlines, 62 per cent of those interviewed thought that the crime rate was going up. Again, by 1973 when the protests had subsided, only 48 per cent thought that the crime rate was going up. Erskine concludes by observing that those events (campus unrest, political assassination, and racial unrest) contributed to a sense of uneasiness among Americans.
Contributions of the Study

One of the major findings of the study is that it demonstrated the centrality of the American people's thinking on the most important problem facing the country. It is rather interesting that, despite the different claims made by successive administrations concerning the state of the economy, the majority of Americans remain convinced that the most important problem in the country is unemployment. Despite this finding, which confirms earlier ones, the unemployment statistics appear not to be a threat to most Americans. For example, the unemployment rates for 1950, 1955, 1960, 1965, 1970, 1975, and 1980 are 5 per cent, 5 per cent, 6 per cent, 4 per cent, 4 per cent, 8 per cent, and 6.5 per cent, respectively. It could be suggested that the anxiety expressed by most Americans hardly seems justified by solid data.

The study demonstrates, again, that the majority of the American public thinks positively of the police. Traditionally, the police have always thought that the society had negative feelings towards them. This has tended to make the police have a negative feeling towards the general public, thus leading to a situation of a self-fulfilling prophecy (41). Those involved with the policies involving police-community relations should find some of the conclusions reached in this study useful.
The study also improved the understanding of the association between victimization experience and the perception of the police. Contrary to earlier findings, it was discovered that, instead of looking at victimization experiences per se, we should look at different types of victimization experiences.

This study, which shows some association between having been a victim of home burglary and the frequency of locking doors, means that victimization experience may affect precautionary measures.

This research shows that to clearly understand the relationship that exists between victimization experience and other behaviors it is helpful to distinguish between different types of victimization experience. The study confirms the findings of other researchers that perception of crime may be molded by direct personal experience.

Suggestions for Further Research

Because of the size of the data set used for this study, it is impossible to analyze all the information it contains in a single dissertation. It is hoped that the variables which we have isolated and analyzed have added to our understanding of public opinion on crime. We hope that the analyses of the other parts of the data will add more to our knowledge of public opinion on crime.
It would be very useful to analyze the opinions of the respondents as they concern the other parts of the criminal justice system. Those questions that address the prisons and sentencing should add to our knowledge of the criminal justice system.

It would be interesting to see how different demographic groups account for the reasons why people commit crimes. Many studies have shown that, in the past decade, the prison population across the United States has doubled. This is supposed to be partly due to the public's cry for harsher sentences. The analysis of these data should illuminate our views in this area. It would be very useful to analyze the data using the perception of the neighborhood crime trend as the dependent variable. Such studies could lead to comparative analyses.

The study concerning firearms could focus on whether more citizens should carry firearms for protection. This could add to our knowledge of how much the American citizens trust the law enforcement agents with adequately protecting them. All these should complement our present knowledge and broaden our perspectives on public opinion on crime and the criminal justice system.
Conclusion

This study demonstrates that the majority of Americans still show more concern for economic issues than those issues dealing with crime. To the respondents in our study unemployment is the most important problem facing America.

There is little association between the respondents' perceptions of crime trends in America and neighborhood safety. As earlier studies have suggested, people have tendencies to think that the crime problem is worse somewhere else.

No association was discovered between victimization experience and possession of firearms. There was also no association between victimization experience per se and evaluation of the police. When we examined different types of victimization experience, we discovered some association between street robbery victimization experience and perception of the police department. While no association was discovered between frequency of locking one's doors and the perception of crime trends, we saw that there was a moderate association between home burglary victimization experience and the frequency of locking one's doors.

There are some limitations of this study. The data do not distinguish between what kind of crime the respondents should look at at the national level. No distinction was made between violent or non-violent crimes.
This might have affected the kind of responses that we got. Questions concerning exposure to the news media were conspicuously absent.

Our study does have some merits. It has revealed, once again, the centrality of the American people's thinking when it concerns the identification of what is thought to be the most important problem facing America. It has revealed again, as demonstrated by former studies, that the society does not "hate" the police. It has shown that, when examining the issues concerning victimization experience, it is useful to distinguish between different types. Finally, our study has empirically examined and clarified some issues concerning common assumptions about how the public views the problems of crime and the criminal justice system.

Suggestions for further study include the examination of what respondents think cause crime, whether it is necessary to carry firearms for protection, and how respondents perceive the courts, prisons, and other parts of the criminal justice system.
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APPENDICES
## APPENDIX A

### DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS FOR THE SAMPLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Name</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Absolute Frequencies</th>
<th>Valid Percentage</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ranking of social problems in</td>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the U.S.</td>
<td>High interest rates</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inflation</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economy or high cost of</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>living</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moral Decline</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Taxes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dissatisfaction with</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reagan</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2464</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether neighbor's home was</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1202</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>burglarized</td>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>1212</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2464</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether respondent was</td>
<td>Last year</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vandalized within last year</td>
<td>Year before</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1456</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2464</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether neighbor's car was</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1201</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vandalized</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1208</td>
<td>50.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2464</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable Name</td>
<td>Categories</td>
<td>Absolute Frequencies</td>
<td>Valid Percentage</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether neighbor was vandalized within year</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>66.8</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>1264</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2464</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The importance of crime problem in U.S.</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>2117</td>
<td>93.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not so important</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Somewhere in between</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inappropriate</td>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2464</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether respondent's car or property was vandalized Victim Exp 1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1432</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1008</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>.413</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2464</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether respondent's home was burglarized Victim Exp 2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1942</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2464</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether respondent was robbed on the street Victim Exp 3</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2254</td>
<td>91.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2464</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX A—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Name</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Absolute Frequencies</th>
<th>Valid Percentage</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whether crime going up or down</td>
<td>Going up</td>
<td>2044</td>
<td>83.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Going down</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staying about the same</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether neighborhood crime rate going up or down</td>
<td>Going up</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Going down</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staying about the same</td>
<td>1305</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether respondent approves of police</td>
<td>Approve</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>79.9</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disapprove</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether police department is 100% effective</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>80.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether respondent avoids groups of teenagers</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>983</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1448</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX A—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Name</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Absolute Frequencies</th>
<th>Valid Percentage</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How frequent respondent locks door</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>2070</td>
<td>84.3</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2464</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether respondent recommends death penalty for murder</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>81.1</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2464</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether respondent has guns or revolvers at home</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1175</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1238</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2464</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent's last grade of school attained</td>
<td>8th gr or less</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some high schl</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High schl grad</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College grad</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post grad</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2464</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent's year of birth</td>
<td>1900-1920</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1921-1940</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1941-1964</td>
<td>1401</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1889-1899</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2464</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# APPENDIX A—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Name</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Absolute Frequencies</th>
<th>Valid Percentage</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent's</td>
<td>Middle class</td>
<td>1125</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social class</td>
<td>Working class</td>
<td>1299</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2464</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent's</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>2226</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>race</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2464</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent's</td>
<td>Under $8000</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gross income</td>
<td>$8000-$12000</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$12001-$20000</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$20001-$30000</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$30001-$50000</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than $50000</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2464</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent's</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1413</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1051</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2464</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX B

### SOCIAL CLASS AND THE RANKING OF SOCIAL PROBLEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SClass</th>
<th>Unemployment</th>
<th>High Int. Rate</th>
<th>Inflation</th>
<th>Economy or High Cost</th>
<th>Crime</th>
<th>Moral Decline</th>
<th>Taxes</th>
<th>Diss. with govt.</th>
<th>Reagan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Middle Class</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Class</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX C

RESPONDENTS' SEX BY RANKING OF PROBLEMS IN THE UNITED STATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Unemployment</th>
<th>High Int. Rate</th>
<th>Inflation</th>
<th>Economy or High Cost</th>
<th>Crime</th>
<th>Moral Decline</th>
<th>Taxes</th>
<th>Diss. with govt.</th>
<th>Reagan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=2043
APPENDIX D

RACE BY RANKING OF SOCIAL PROBLEMS IN THE UNITED STATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Unemployment</th>
<th>High Int. Rate</th>
<th>Inflation</th>
<th>Economy or High Cost</th>
<th>Crime</th>
<th>Moral Decline</th>
<th>Taxes</th>
<th>Diss. with govt.</th>
<th>Reagan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>887</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=2003
APPENDIX E

THE RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF NATIONAL CRIME TREND AND NEIGHBORHOOD CRIME TREND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nation's Crime Rate</th>
<th>Neighborhood Crime Rate</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Going Up</td>
<td>Going Down</td>
<td>Staying About Same</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going up</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going down</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staying about same</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 2367; Gamma = 13
## APPENDIX F

### RANKING OF SOCIAL PROBLEMS IN THE UNITED STATES

**AS DETERMINED BY AGE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Unemployment</th>
<th>High Int. Rate</th>
<th>Inflation</th>
<th>Economy or High Cost</th>
<th>Crime</th>
<th>Moral Decline</th>
<th>Taxes</th>
<th>Diss. with govt.</th>
<th>Reagan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22 to 45</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 to 65</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66 to 86</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87 to 97</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=2025
APPENDIX G
PERCEPTION OF THE IMPORTANCE OF CRIME IN AMERICA AS DETERMINED BY VICTIMIZATION EXPERIENCE (VICTIM EXP. 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How important is the crime problem in the United States?</th>
<th>Victim of Street Robbery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victim Exp. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>92.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not so important</td>
<td>86.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhere in between</td>
<td>93.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 2266; Gamma = .24
APPENDIX H

PERCEPTION OF IMPORTANCE OF CRIME IN AMERICA
AS DETERMINED BY VICTIMIZATION
EXPERIENCE (VICTIM EXP. 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How Important is the Crime Problem in the U.S.?</th>
<th>Victims of Car or Property Vandalism/Victim Exp. 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Important problem</td>
<td>No 59.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes 40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not so important</td>
<td>No 57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes 43.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhere in between</td>
<td>No 48.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes 57.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(N = 2254; \Gamma = 0.08\)
APPENDIX I

PERCEPTION OF IMPORTANCE OF CRIME IN AMERICA AS DETERMINED BY VICTIMIZATION EXPERIENCE (VICTIM EXP. 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How important is the crime problem in the U.S.?</th>
<th>Victims of Home Burglary/ Victim Exp. 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important problem</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not so important</td>
<td>77.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhere in between</td>
<td>86.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 2252; Gamma = 0.03
APPENDIX J

ANNUAL CRIME RATES IN THE UNITED STATES 1963-1982*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Crimes</td>
<td>1198.3</td>
<td>1361.2</td>
<td>1434.3</td>
<td>1656.0</td>
<td>1921.7</td>
<td>2234.8</td>
<td>2740.5</td>
<td>2906.7</td>
<td>2829.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murder</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forcible Rape</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>78.3</td>
<td>102.1</td>
<td>131.0</td>
<td>171.5</td>
<td>187.1</td>
<td>179.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agg. Assault</td>
<td>78.4</td>
<td>96.6</td>
<td>106.6</td>
<td>118.4</td>
<td>128.0</td>
<td>141.3</td>
<td>162.4</td>
<td>176.8</td>
<td>186.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>517.6</td>
<td>580.4</td>
<td>605.3</td>
<td>699.6</td>
<td>811.5</td>
<td>915.1</td>
<td>1067.7</td>
<td>1148.3</td>
<td>1126.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larceny</td>
<td>324.3</td>
<td>368.2</td>
<td>393.3</td>
<td>456.8</td>
<td>527.2</td>
<td>636.0</td>
<td>859.4</td>
<td>909.2</td>
<td>882.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Theft</td>
<td>211.6</td>
<td>242.0</td>
<td>251.0</td>
<td>284.0</td>
<td>331.0</td>
<td>389.1</td>
<td>453.5</td>
<td>456.5</td>
<td>423.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### APPENDIX J

**ANNUAL CRIME RATES IN THE UNITED STATES 1963-1982**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Crimes</td>
<td>4116.4</td>
<td>4821.4</td>
<td>5281.7</td>
<td>5266.4</td>
<td>5055.1</td>
<td>5109.3</td>
<td>5521.5</td>
<td>5899.9</td>
<td>5799.9</td>
<td>5553.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murder</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forcible Rape</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>33.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>182.4</td>
<td>208.8</td>
<td>218.2</td>
<td>195.8</td>
<td>187.1</td>
<td>191.3</td>
<td>212.1</td>
<td>243.5</td>
<td>250.6</td>
<td>231.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agg. Assault</td>
<td>198.4</td>
<td>214.2</td>
<td>227.4</td>
<td>228.7</td>
<td>241.5</td>
<td>255.9</td>
<td>279.1</td>
<td>290.6</td>
<td>280.9</td>
<td>280.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>1210.8</td>
<td>1429.0</td>
<td>1525.9</td>
<td>1439.4</td>
<td>1410.9</td>
<td>1423.7</td>
<td>1499.1</td>
<td>1668.2</td>
<td>1632.1</td>
<td>1475.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larceny</td>
<td>2051.2</td>
<td>2473.0</td>
<td>2804.8</td>
<td>2921.3</td>
<td>2729.9</td>
<td>2743.9</td>
<td>2988.4</td>
<td>3156.3</td>
<td>3122.3</td>
<td>3069.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Theft</td>
<td>440.1</td>
<td>460.6</td>
<td>469.4</td>
<td>446.1</td>
<td>447.6</td>
<td>454.7</td>
<td>498.5</td>
<td>494.6</td>
<td>468.7</td>
<td>452.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX K

PERCEPTION OF CRIME TRENDS IN AMERICA AS DETERMINED BY PERCEPTION OF DEATH PENALTY FOR MURDERERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is the U.S. crime rate going up or down?</th>
<th>Do you support the death penalty for murder?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Going up</td>
<td>Yes  82.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going down</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staying about same</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 2329; Gamma = 0.15
APPENDIX L

THE ASSOCIATION BETWEEN GUN OWNERSHIP AND PERCEPTION OF CRIME TRENDS IN AMERICA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is the crime rate in the U.S. going up or down?</th>
<th>(Gun Ownership) Do you have guns/revolvers at home?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going up</td>
<td>49.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going down</td>
<td>42.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staying about same</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 2391; Gamma = 0.10
APPENDIX M

THE ASSOCIATION BETWEEN BEING A VICTIM OF STREET ROBBERY AND FIREARMS OWNERSHIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Victim Exp. 3) Robbed on the street?</th>
<th>Do you own guns or revolvers at home?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>49.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=2405; Gamma=.24
APPENDIX N

THE ASSOCIATION BETWEEN BEING A VICTIM OF HOME BURGLARY BY FIREARMS OWNERSHIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Home Burglarized?</th>
<th>Do you own guns or revolvers at home?</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>50.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 2390; Gamma = 15
### APPENDIX O

THE ASSOCIATION BETWEEN BEING A VICTIM OF CAR/PROPERTY VANDALISM AND FIREARMS OWNERSHIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Car/property vandalized</th>
<th>Gun Ownership</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>51.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>51.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 2390; Gamma = 0.02
APPENDIX P

THE ASSOCIATION BETWEEN EVALUATION OF POLICE PERFORMANCE AND PERCEPTION OF CRIME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is the U.S. Crime Rate Going Up or Going Down?</th>
<th>Approval or Disapproval of Police Department Handling Their Jobs</th>
<th>Approval</th>
<th>Disapproval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Going up</td>
<td></td>
<td>79.4</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going down</td>
<td></td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staying about the same</td>
<td></td>
<td>81.6</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 2379; Gamma = .08
APPENDIX Q

THE ASSOCIATION BETWEEN VICTIMIZATION EXPERIENCE (VCTM EXP. 1) AND EVALUATION OF THE POLICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Car or Property Vandalized? (Vctm Exp. 3)</th>
<th>Approve</th>
<th>Disapprove</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>83.2</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 2379; Gamma = .23
APPENDIX R

THE ASSOCIATION BETWEEN VICTIMIZATION EXPERIENCE (VCTM EXP. 2) AND EVALUATION OF THE POLICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Home Burglarized Vctm Exp. 2</th>
<th>Approve or Disapprove of Police Department?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>80.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>75.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 2381; Gamma = .15
APPENDIX S

THE ASSOCIATION BETWEEN VICTIMIZATION EXPERIENCE (VCTM EXP. 3) AND EVALUATION OF THE POLICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Robbed on The Street of the Police Dept.</th>
<th>Approve</th>
<th>Disapprove</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vctm Exp. 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>80.9</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 2395; Gamma = 0.33
APPENDIX T

THE ASSOCIATION BETWEEN FREQUENCY OF LOCKING DOORS AND PERCEPTION OF U.S. CRIME TREND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception of U.S. Crime Trend</th>
<th>Frequency of Locking Door</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going up</td>
<td>85.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going down</td>
<td>79.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staying about same</td>
<td>80.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 2431; Gamma = 0.16
APPENDIX U

THE ASSOCIATION BETWEEN VICTIMIZATION EXPERIENCE, HOME BURGLARIZED, AND FREQUENCY OF LOCKING DOORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Home Burglarized</th>
<th>Frequency of Locking Door</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vctm Exp 2</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>91.2</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 2433; Gamma = 0.37
APPENDIX V

THE EXPERIENCE OF HAVING BEEN ROBBED ON THE STREET AND FREQUENCY OF LOCKING DOOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Robbery on Street</th>
<th>Frequency of Locking Door</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vctm Exp. 3</td>
<td>Always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>83.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>88.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 2448; Gamma = 0.20
APPENDIX W

THE ASSOCIATION BETWEEN CAR OR PROPERTY VANDALISM AND FREQUENCY OF LOCKING DOORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Car or Property Vandalized</th>
<th>Frequency of Locking Doors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vctm Exp. 1</td>
<td>Always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>82.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>87.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 2432; Gamma = 0.19
### APPENDIX X

**THE ASSOCIATION BETWEEN PERCEPTION OF CRIME TREND AND AVOIDANCE OF GROUPS OF TEENAGERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>U.S. Crime Rate Going Up/Down</th>
<th>Avoidance of Groups of Teens</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Going Up</td>
<td></td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>57.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going Down</td>
<td></td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>70.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staying About the Same</td>
<td></td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>70.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 2409; Gamma = 0.27
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