

# **THE HOUSTON VICTIM RECONTACT EXPERIMENT**

## **APPENDICES**



# THE HOUSTON VICTIM RECONTACT EXPERIMENT

## APPENDICES

- APPENDIX A: THE FEAR REDUCTION PROGRAM
- APPENDIX B: SUPPORTING STATISTICAL TABLES
- APPENDIX C: MEASUREMENT AND SCALING IN THE EVALUATION SURVEY
- APPENDIX D: EVALUATION SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE
- APPENDIX E: HOUSTON'S VICTIM INFORMATION FORM
- APPENDIX F: HOUSTON'S CRIME SPECIFIC VICTIM QUESTIONNAIRE
- APPENDIX G: HOUSTON'S LETTER TO UNCONTACTED VICTIMS

APPENDIX A  
THE FEAR REDUCTION PROGRAM

## THE FEAR REDUCTION PROGRAM

The program described in this report was one of several strategies tested as part of a Fear Reduction Program which was carried out in Houston, Texas, and Newark, New Jersey, in 1983 and 1984. The police departments in these two cities were invited to design and implement strategies to reduce fear of crime. The Police Foundation with funding provided by the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) provided technical assistance to the departments during the planning phase of the program and conducted rigorous evaluations of the strategies which were developed. NIJ also supported a dissemination program, in which the National Conference of Mayors, the Police Executive Research Forum, the National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives, and the National Sheriffs' Association sent representatives to observe the strategies in action and report on them to their members. The questions they asked and the written observations they shared with the Houston and Newark departments provided constructive criticism of the program implementation process.

## PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

The overall goal of the program was to find new ways to help citizens gain a realistic picture of the crime problems facing their neighborhoods, reduce excessive fear of crime, encourage greater positive police-citizen cooperation in crime prevention, spark increased awareness among people of the steps which they could take to reduce crime, and help restore their confidence in the police and faith in the future of their communities.

In each city a number of different strategies were developed which addressed these issues. Previous research has found crime to be only one of the causes of fear and declining community morale, so those strategies addressed a broad spectrum of issues. Some focused upon reducing physical disorder, including trash and litter, abandoned buildings, graffiti, and deterioration. Others targeted social disorder, including loitering, harassment, disorderly street behavior, and violations of rules of conduct on mass transit. A number were designed to increase the two-way flow of information between citizens and the police. From the police side this included developing new mechanisms to gather information about community problems often of a seemingly "nonpolice" nature, assisting citizens in organizing to address such problems, and testing new mechanisms to "spread the word" about community programs and the things that individual citizens could do to prevent crime.

#### SITE SELECTION

Houston and Newark were selected as examples of two different types of American cities. Houston is a relatively young city, with low population density and a developing municipal infrastructure, while Newark is a mature city with high population density and no significant growth. Because they are so different, some of the strategies they developed for the Fear Reduction Project were unique, but most addressed the same underlying problems and many were surprisingly similar. The two cities were also selected because of the capacity of their police departments to design and manage a complex experimental program.

Within each city, "matched" neighborhoods were selected to serve as testing grounds for the strategies. Because Newark has a predominantly black population, five physically similar areas with a homogeneous racial composition were selected. The heterogeneous nature of Houston called for the selection of neighborhoods with a population mix more closely resembling that of the city as a whole. In both cities the selected areas were approximately one square mile in size, and physically separated from each other. Site selection was guided by the 1980 Census, observations of numerous potential sites, and extensive discussions with police crime analysts and district commanders in the cities.

#### THE TASK FORCE PLANNING PROCESS

In both cities, the program planning process had to design programs which met two constraints: they could be carried out within a one-year time limit imposed by the National Institute of Justice, and they could be supported entirely by the departments--there was no special funding available for these projects.

The planning processes themselves took different forms in the two cities. In Houston, one patrol officer from each of the four participating police districts was assigned full time for two months to a planning Task Force, which was headed by a sergeant from the Planning and Research Division. A civilian member of the Planning and Research Division also served on the Task Force. During the planning period the group met regularly with staff members of the Police Foundation to discuss past research related to the project. They also read studies of the fear of crime, and visited other cities to examine projects which appeared relevant

to fear reduction. By April, 1983, the group had formulated a set of strategies which they believed could be implemented effectively in Houston and had the potential to reduce citizen fear.

Then, during April and May the plan was reviewed and approved by Houston's Chief of Police, the department's Director of Planning and Research, by a panel of consultants assembled by the Police Foundation, and by the Director of the National Institute of Justice.

In Newark, the Task Force included several members of the police department as well as representatives of the Mayor's office, the Board of Education, the New Jersey Administrative Office of the Courts, the Essex County Courts, the Newark Municipal Courts, the Essex County Probation Department and the Graduate School of Criminal Justice of Rutgers University. The group met once or twice a week for a month to discuss the general problems of fear, then broke into several committees to consider specific program possibilities. In April, 1983 the committees submitted lists of proposed programs to the entire task force for approval. These programs were reviewed by the panel of consultants, assembled by the Police Foundation and by the Director of the National Institute of Justice.

#### TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE BY THE POLICE FOUNDATION

The Police Foundation provided the departments with technical assistance throughout the planning stages of the Fear Reduction Project. Its staff assisted the departments in locating potentially relevant projects operating in other cities, accumulated research on fear and its causes, arranged for members of the Task Forces to visit other departments, and identified consultants who assisted the departments in program planning and implementation. This activity was supported by the National Institute of Justice.

## STRATEGIES DEVELOPED BY THE TASK FORCE

In Houston, strategies were developed to foster a sense that Houston police officers were available to the public and cared about individual and neighborhood problems. Some of the strategies also were intended to encourage citizen involvement with the police and to increase participation in community affairs. The strategies included community organizing, door-to-door police visits, a police-community newsletter, recontacts with crime victims, and a police-community storefront office.

The Newark strategies were directed at the exchange of information and the reduction of social and physical disorder. The police strategies included door-to-door visits, newsletters, police-community storefronts, and the intensified enforcement and order maintenance. In association with the Board of Education, recreational alternatives to street-corner loitering were to be provided. With the cooperation of the courts system, juveniles were to be given community work sentences to clean up deteriorated areas; with the assistance of the municipal government, abandoned or deteriorated buildings were to be demolished and delivery of city services intensified.

## IMPLEMENTATION OF THE STRATEGIES

Responsibility for implementing the strategies in Houston was given to the planning Task Force, which then consisted of a sergeant, four patrol officers, and a civilian member of the department. Each of the patrol officers was directly responsible for the execution of one of the



strategies. They were joined by three additional officers; two from the Community Services Division were assigned to work on the community organizing strategy, and another was assigned to work on the door-to-door contact effort. During the implementation period, two more officers were assigned to the victim recontact program and another to the community organizing strategy.

During the nine-to-twelve month period that the strategies were operational, the original Task Force members assumed total responsibility for implementation. They conducted much of the operational work themselves and coordinated the few other officers from each patrol district who were involved in program implementation. When implementation problems required swift and unique solutions (a condition common during the start up period), the Task Force officers worked directly with the district captains and/or with the sergeant from Planning and Research who headed the Task Force. This sergeant would, in turn, take direct action or work with the Director of Planning and Research or with one of the Deputy Chiefs over the patrol districts and/or with the Assistant Chief in charge of Operations. The amount of responsibility placed on the task force members had some of the disadvantages which can exist when the traditional chain of command is circumvented, but it had the advantage that Task Force members felt ownership of, and pride in, the program they had designed.

In Newark, responsibility for implementing each program component was assigned to one or more officers, who in turn were monitored by the program coordinator and his assistant. Those officers working in particular patrol divisions--those in the community police center and those making door-to-

door contacts--reported formally to the division Captain and informally to the program coordinator, who, at the beginning of the program was still a Lieutenant. This somewhat ambiguous reporting structure created some delays, lack of coordination and misunderstanding during the early months of program implementation; these problems were largely overcome with the cooperative efforts of the parties involved. Officers who implemented the other programs reported directly to the program coordinator, a system which worked effectively throughout the program.

#### THE OVERALL EVALUATION DESIGN

All of the strategies tested in Houston and Newark were to be evaluated as rigorously as possible. Two of them--the victim recontact program in Houston and police-community newsletters in both cities--were evaluated using true experiments, in which randomly selected groups of citizens were either contacted by the program or assigned to a noncontacted control group. The other strategies, including the one reported here, were area-wide in focus, and were evaluated using pre- and post-program area surveys. Surveys were also conducted in a comparison area, in which no new programs were implemented, in each city.

APPENDIX B  
SUPPORTING STATISTICAL TABLES

Table B-1

## Multivariate Correlates of Treatment-Control Status

Explanatory Factors	Treatment or Control Multiple Regression	
	Beta	(sigf)
Crime Type		
burglary victim	-.12	(.18)
personal victim	-.05	(.66)
Seriousness		
weapon present	-.10	(.33)
gun present	-.08	(.39)
injury level	.06	(.41)
shock reported	.05	(.36)
loss over \$100	.02	(.67)
Incident Features		
at or near home	.08	(.34)
know offenders	-.13	(.04)*
Other Victimization		
total number	-.07	(.28)
number violent	-.00	(.95)
number predatory	.02	(.71)
know assault victim	.01	(.92)
know robbery victim	.01	(.90)
know burglary victim	.06	(.30)
Personal Attributes		
sex--female	-.01	(.89)
age	-.08	(.24)
education	.08	(.18)
length of residence	.01	(.87)
marital--single	-.02	(.69)
black	.00	(.99)
hispanic	-.04	(.55)
asian or other	.01	(.87)
rent home	.01	(.92)
Know families in the area (count)	-.00	(.99)
Proactive contact with police	.02	(.73)
Elapsed time between crime and survey	-.02	(.75)
	R =	.002
	adj	
	(N)	350

\* indicates significant difference  $p \leq .05$

Table B-2  
 Mean Difference Between Treatment  
 and Control Victims on Survey Outcome Measures  
 Fear of Personal Victimization in Area

Fear	Items	Means		(Significance of Difference)	(N)
		Control	Treatment		
Scale Score		1.64	1.67	(.58)	(351)
Q34	Unsafe at night	2.48	2.45	(.83)	(351)
Q35	Fear going places	0.51	0.49	(.67)	(350)
Q43	Worry robbery	1.90	2.01	(.22)	(351)
Q44	Worry attack	1.64	1.74	(.25)	(351)

T-tests of significance of mean differences

High scores all = Fearful

Table B-2 - continued

Mean Difference Between Treatment  
and Control Victims on Survey Outcome Measures

Perceived Area Personal Crime Problems

Personal Crime Problems Items	Means		(Significance of Difference)	(N)
	Control	Treatment		
Scale Score	1.57	1.69	(.05)*	(351)
Q116 People attacked	1.48	1.66	(.02)*	(349)
Q117 People robbed	1.89	2.03	(.11)	(350)
Q12 Rape problem	1.29	1.37	(.23)	(341)
Q39 Area crime up in past year	2.38	2.39	(.95)	(334)

High scores all = Fearful

\*indicates significance  $p < .05$

T-tests of significance of means differences

Table B-2- continued  
 Mean Difference Between Treatment  
 and Control Victims on Survey Outcome Measures

Concern About Area Property Crime Problems

Property Crime Concern Items	Means		(Significant Difference)	(N)
	Control	Treatment		
Scale Score	2.11	2.18	(.30)	(351)
Q45 Worry burglary	2.38	2.47	(.24)	(351)
Q47 Worry auto	2.08	2.16	(.33)	(344)
Q68 Burglary problem	2.31	2.43	(.13)	(351)
Q70 Auto vandalism	2.11	2.19	(.40)	(347)
Q71 Auto theft problem	2.21	2.18	(.68)	(348)

High scores all = Fearful

T-tests of significance of mean differences

High scores all = Fearful

Table B-2 - continued

Mean Difference Between Treatment  
and Control Victims on Survey Outcome Measures

Satisfaction With Area

Residential Commitment Items	Means		(Significance of Difference)	(N)
	Control	Treatment		
Scale Score	2.23	2.17	(.36)	(351)
Q5 Area gotten better	1.77	1.76	(.92)	(349)
Q14 Satisfied place to live	2.95	2.84	(.26)	(351)
N1 Area will get better	1.94	1.89	(.55)	(346)
-----				
N2 Likely will live here next year	3.97	3.90	(.68)	(348)
Q11 Area a place where people help each other	.48	.43	(.39)	(346)

High scores all = Satisfaction

Items below dotted line did not form a scale

T-tests of significance of mean differences



Table B-2 - continued

Mean Difference Between Treatment  
and Control Victims on Survey Outcome Measures

Evaluation of Police Service

Police Evaluation Items	Means		(Significance of Difference)	(N)
	Control	Treatment		
Scale Score	3.18	3.22	(.61)	(351)
Q50 Prevention	3.16	3.27	(.37)	(346)
Q51 Help victims	3.20	3.41	(.11)	(344)
Q57 Polite	3.30	3.23	(.43)	(335)
Q58 Helpful	3.08	3.11	(.77)	(344)
Q59 Fair	3.20	3.12	(.26)	(343)

High scores all = positive evaluations

T-tests of significance of mean differences

Table B-2 - continued  
 Mean Difference Between Treatment  
 and Control Victims on Survey Outcome Measures  
 Defensive Behaviors to Avoid Personal Crime

Defensive Behavior Items		Control	Means Treatment	(Significance of Difference)	(N)
Scale	Score	.40	.40	(.95)	(351)
Q80	Escort	.35	.38	(.55)	(351)
Q81	Avoid areas	.39	.39	(.99)	(350)
Q82	Avoid people	.51	.53	(.83)	(350)
Q86	Avoid going out	.34	.30	(.36)	(351)

High scores Q80-82 all = Take actions.

T-tests of significance of mean differences

Table B-2 - continued

Mean Difference Between Treatment  
and Control Victims on Survey Outcome Measures

Household Crime Prevention Efforts

Household Crime Prevention Items	Means		(Significance of Difference)	(N)
	Control	Treatment		
Count Q74a-Q85	1.59	1.57	(.85)	(351)
Q74a Locks	.331	.282	(.31)	(349)
Q75a Outdoor lights	.246	.236	(.83)	(349)
Q76a Timers	.103	.103	(.99)	(348)
Q77a Marking	.142	.168	(.51)	(349)
Q78a Bars	.074	.103	(.35)	(350)
Q85 Have neighbor watch house	.703	.680	(.64)	(350)

High Scores Q74-78a = "Yes" "Since July 1983"  
Q85 - Hi = "Yes" Last time away

T-test of significance of mean differences

APPENDIX C

SCALING THE VICTIM RECONTACT PROGRAM EVALUATION DATA

## APPENDIX C

### SCALING THE VICTIM RECONTACT PROGRAM EVALUATION DATA

This report describes how analytic scales were developed for the Fear Reduction Project's Victim Recontact Program evaluation. These scales measure the central outcomes of interest in this project: perceptions and fear of crime, evaluations of the quality of police service, residential satisfaction, and crime related behaviors. Each measure is a composite of responses to three or more items which were included in the surveys to tap those dimensions. Such multiple-item scales give us more reliable, general, stable measurements of peoples attitudes and experiences than do responses to single survey questions.

### CRITERIA

In each case the goal was to arrive at scales with the following properties:

1. Responses to a set of items should be consistent (all positively correlated). This was established by examining their inter-correlations, after some items were rescored for directionality of wording. A summary measure of the overall consistency of responses to a set of items is Cronbach's Alpha, which is an estimate of their joint reliability in producing a scale score for an individual.
2. Item responses should be homogeneous, or single-factored (indicating they all measure "the same thing"). This was established by a principle components factor analysis of the items hypothesized to represent a single dimension. The items were judged homogeneous when they all loaded only on the first factor (their "principle component").
3. The items should share a substantial proportion of their variance with the hypothesized underlying dimension (perhaps precluding them from being significantly linked to other conditions or events). This was demonstrated in two ways. Good items were those which evidenced a high correlation with others in the set. This was measured by their item-to-total correlation ("corrected" by excluding them from that particular total). Items were judged useful when, in a principal components factor analysis, the factor on which they fell accounted for a high proportion of their total variance (they had a high "communality").
4. The items on their face should be related to the demonstration program (suggesting they could be responsive to the intervention). Survey questions which "scale together" based upon their naturally occurring covariation are not necessarily all useful if they

should not be affected by the program. The substantive utility of individual items cannot be statistically demonstrated; it is an argument.

The statistical analyses described above were done using SPSS-X. That program's RELIABILITY procedure generated inter-item correlations, calculated item-to-total correlations, and estimated a reliability coefficient (Cronbach's Alpha) for each set of item responses. FACTOR was used to extract the principal component from sets of items hypothesized to be unidimensional. A value of 1.0 was used in the diagonal of the correlation matrix to be factored, so the analysis tests how much of the total variance in the items is explained by the factor.

The scales were originally developed using large surveys of the residents of ten experimental and treatment areas in Houston and Newark. Those data were gathered as pretests for other Police Foundation Fear Reduction experiments. All conclusions about the scaling of items were confirmed using the survey data gathered from victims for this study. Victims are a rather unique subpopulation, and there was no guarantee that measures standardized on general population samples would be similarly useful for them. However, as many of the outcome measures examined here were to be used in other Fear Reduction Program evaluations, whenever possible their content was to be kept unchanged. As will be documented below, the outcome measures generally scaled in similar fashion for this sample of victims and other Houston residents.

#### FEAR OF AREA PERSONAL CRIME

Eight items were included in the survey to represent this general construct. Analysis of the large scale surveys indicated one should be dropped, and that the remaining set was two-factored.

The original items asked about the extent to which stranger assault, rape, and robbery were problems in the area, how worried the respondents were about being robbed, attacked, or being at home when someone broke in ("home invasion"), how safe they felt out alone in the area at night, and if there was a place nearby where they were afraid to walk. An examination of correlations among these items indicated that worry about home invasion was only moderately correlated with the others, and excluding it from the group would improve the reliability of the resulting scale.

Excluding this item but using all of the others would yield an additive scale with a high reliability. However, a factor analysis of the set suggested they were not unidimensional. In the large surveys, three items asking about "how big a problem" specific personal crimes were in the area tapped a different dimension than those asking people how afraid they were about personally being victimized by the same types of crime. These respondents seemed to distinguish between personal risks and their general assessments of area problems. The two clusters of items loaded very distinctly on their unique factors, with high loadings. Among victims the

items were less strongly two-factored. The second factor, loading heavily on items about area personal crime problems, was almost significant, however (it had an eigenvalue of .92). This was strong enough to retain the separate status of the two measures.

Based upon this analysis, the following items were combined to form the FEAR measure:

- Q34: How safe would you feel being outside alone in this area at night? (Very safe to very unsafe)<sup>1</sup>
- Q35: Is there any place in this area where you would be afraid to go alone either during the day or at night? (Yes or no)
- Q43: [How worried are you that] someone will try to rob you or steal something from you while you are outside in this area? (very worried to not worried at all)
- Q44: [How worried are you that] someone will try to attack you or beat you up while you are outside in this area? (Very worried to not worried at all)

For the victim sample, these items were added together to form a scale with a reliability of .72. The average item-total correlation of its components was .41 (the range was .29-.59), and the first factor explained 56 percent of the total variation in responses to the items. Responses to Q35 were dichotomous, and as a result the item had only about two-thirds of the variance of Q43 and Q44, and one-half that of Q34. If such disparities are extreme, the items making up a simple additive scale will have a differential impact upon its total variation, and thus it will not actually represent its apparent content. However, in this case there was no meaningful difference between the simple additive alpha and the alpha for a standardized scale score which equated the variances of its component parts. As a result, a simple additive scale score will be employed. A high score on FEAR indicates respondents are fearful.

The remaining items were combined to form the PCPROB (personal crime problem) measure:

[...please tell me whether you think it is a big problem, some problem, or no problem here in this area?]

- Q114: People being attacked or beaten up by strangers?
- Q117: People being robbed or having their money, purses or wallets taken?
- Q121: Rape or other sexual assaults?

1. A few respondents who indicate that they "never go out" were rescored as "very unsafe" (see below).

Because responses to these items all were measured on the same three-position set of response categories, the scale scores were generated by simply adding them together. As they had about the same mean and standard deviation (the rape question was somewhat lower on both), the items all contribute about equally to the total score for each individual. The average correlation among them was .49 (range .41-.59). The factor lying behind these items accounted for 66 percent of their total variance. The reliability of the scale is .74. A high score on PCPROB indicates that these personal crimes were seen as "big problems in the area."

#### CONCERN ABOUT PROPERTY CRIME

There were five candidate items in this cluster. Three asked "how big a problem" burglary, auto theft, and auto vandalism were in the area, and two "how worried" respondents were about being victimized by burglary and auto theft or vandalism. Other research on concern about victimization or assessments of risk indicates the distinction between personal and property crimes is a fundamental one, and that perceptions of the two are best gauged separately. (Auto vandalism was experimentally included among a set of "disorder" items which included other vandalism activities, but empirically it belongs in this cluster of crimes):

[...please tell me whether you think it is a big problem, some problem, or no problem here in this area.]

Q68: People breaking in or sneaking into homes to steal things?

Q70: Cars being vandalized--things like windows or radio aeri<sup>als</sup> being broken?

Q71: Cars being stolen?

Q45: [How worried are you that] someone will try to break into your home while no one is there? (Not worried at all to very worried)

Q47: [How worried are you that] someone will try to steal or damage your car in this area? (Not worried at all to very worried)

These items were combined to form a multiple item scale, CONPROP (concern about property crime). They were substantially intercorrelated in the victim sample (an average "r" of .42), each evidenced a high item-to-total correlation, the group formed an additive scale with an Alpha of .79, and they were single factored. The first factor explained 54



Because responses to these items all were measured on the same three-position set of response categories, the scale scores were generated by simply adding them together. As they had about the same mean and standard deviation (the rape question was somewhat lower on both), the items all contribute about equally to the total score for each individual. The average correlation among them was .49 (range .41-.59). The factor lying behind these items accounted for 66 percent of their total variance. The reliability of the scale is .74. A high score on PCPROB indicates that these personal crimes were seen as "big problems in the area."

#### CONCERN ABOUT PROPERTY CRIME

There were five candidate items in this cluster. Three asked "how big a problem" burglary, auto theft, and auto vandalism were in the area, and two "how worried" respondents were about being victimized by burglary and auto theft or vandalism. Other research on concern about victimization or assessments of risk indicates the distinction between personal and property crimes is a fundamental one, and that perceptions of the two are best gauged separately. (Auto vandalism was experimentally included among a set of "disorder" items which included other vandalism activities, but empirically it belongs in this cluster of more serious crimes):

[...please tell me whether you think it is a big problem, some problem, or no problem here in this area.]

Q68: People breaking in or sneaking into homes to steal things?

Q70: Cars being vandalized--things like windows or radio aerals being broken?

Q71: Cars being stolen?

Q45: [How worried are you that] someone will try to break into your home while no one is there? (Not worried at all to very worried)

Q47: [How worried are you that] someone will try to steal or damage your car in this area? (Not worried at all to very worried)

These items were combined to form a multiple item scale, CONPROP (concern about property crime). They were substantially intercorrelated in the victim sample (an average "r" of .42), each evidenced a high item-to-total correlation, the group formed an additive scale with an Alpha of .79, and they were single factored. The first factor explained 54

percent of the total variance in the five items. This consistency differed from similar personal-crime items--there were no empirical distinctions between perceived household risk and area property crime problems. Because all of the items employed similar three-category responses and they had about the same means and standard deviations, they were scaled by adding them together. A high score on CONPROP identifies respondents who think these are "big problems."

Note that other evaluation reports in this series do separate the "problems" and "worry" items, but among victims they simply were too strongly single-factored to consider those subsets as measures of distinct constructs.

#### SATISFACTION WITH AREA

Satisfaction with area was probed by responses to three questions:

- Q5: In general, since July of 1982, would you say this area has become a better place to live, gotten worse, or stayed about the same? (better, worse, or about the same)
- Q14: On the whole, how do you feel about this area as a place to live? Are you ... very satisfied to very dissatisfied?
- N1: All things considered, what do you think this area will be like a year from now? Will it be a better place to live, have gotten worse, or stayed about the same? (better, worse, or about the same)

(Note that question N1 was not included in several other Fear Reduction Project surveys.) Responses to these questions were correlated an average of .44 (range .41-.47), and had similar variances. Added together they formed a scale with a reliability of .69. Their underlying factor explained 63 percent of the variance in these three items. A high score on NBSATIF identifies respondents who think their area is a good place to live, has been getting better, and will get better in the near future.

#### GENERAL EVALUATIONS OF THE POLICE

A number of questions in the survey gathered evaluations of police service. Some items focused upon recent, specific police-citizen encounters which were identified in the survey, while others were "generic" and referenced more global opinions. Eight generic items were included in the questionnaire, and they revealed two distinct clusters of opinion: one referring to proactive, aggressive police action, and the other to the quality of services provided citizens and anticipated police demeanor in

police-citizen encounters. A question referring to the strictness of traffic law enforcement was inconsistently correlated with most of the items, and had a low correlation with the other measures of police aggressiveness; it was excluded completely.

The largest set of items formed a distinct factor, and make up an additive measure, POLEVAL (evaluations of police). They are:

- Q50: How good a job do you think [police] are doing to prevent crime? (very good to very poor job)
- Q51: How good a job do you think the police in this area are doing in helping people out after they have been victims of crime? (very good to very poor job)
- Q57: In general, how polite are the police in this area when dealing with people? (very polite to very impolite)
- Q58: In general, how helpful are the police in this area when dealing with people around here? (very helpful to not helpful at all)
- Q59: In general, how fair are the police in this area in dealing with people around here? (very fair to very unfair)

The simple additive combination of these items has a reliability of .84, and they were correlated an average of .48 (range .33-.63). (The high reliability of the scale comes in part from the fact that there are more items in it than in most of the scales presented here.) They were single factored, and their principal factor explained 57 percent of the total variation in the items. There was some variation in the response format for these items, but differences in the variances in the items were not great enough to preclude adding them together in simple fashion to form POLEVAL. A high score on this measure points to a favorable evaluation of the police.

#### CRIME-RELATED BEHAVIORS

There are a number of anti-crime actions taken by many city residents which are relevant for this evaluation. Some involve crime prevention activity, while others are defensive in nature. One consequence of confidence which might be inspired by the Victim Recontact project could be to increase the willingness of people to go out freely under previously fear-provoking circumstances; the crime prevention materials distributed to most of those contacted by the program may have stimulated positive actions to prevent victimization and reduce area crime.

Four questions in the surveys probed the extent to which respondents took defensive actions to protect themselves from personal victimization in public locations. They were asked:

The next questions are about some things people might do when they go out after dark. Now think about the last time you went out in this area after dark.

Q80: Did you go with someone else to avoid crime? (yes or no)

Q81: The last time you went out after dark in this area, did you stay away from certain streets or areas to avoid crime? (yes or no)

Q82: When you last went out after dark in this area, did you stay away from certain types of people to avoid crime? (yes or no)

Q86: In general, how often do you avoid going out after dark in this area because of crime? (never go out to never avoid)

In survey questions like this, a few respondents inevitably respond that they "never go out." With the exception of the disabled this is highly unlikely, and people who answer in this way frequently are fearful and score as high "avoiders" on other measures. For analytic purposes it is useful to count them along with the others. The "message" they are communicating seems to be that "its a dangerous place out there," so we classed them as "precaution takers" and assigned them "yes" responses to these items.

Note that most of these questions all call for self-reports of very recent behaviors. In any individual case they may not reflect general patterns of behavior, lending error to our measure. However, this approach avoids to a certain extent asking respondents to attempt to typify or generalize about their behavior (this is a difficult task for researchers), and the recency of the referent behavior should increase the accuracy with which it is recalled. Both of these should help differentiate these responses from attitude or opinion dimensions, moving them closer to measures of behavioral outcomes.

Responses to these four items were very consistent. They were correlated an average of .41 (range .33-.57), and formed a simple additive scale with a reliability of .73. The first factor explained 56 percent of the total variance in these four items. The last item, Q86, was rescored so that it's four response categories ranged in value between zero and one, like the others. The items then all had similar means and standard deviations. The resulting scale PRECAUTN is a simple additive combination of the four.

A second set of behaviors measured in the survey referred to household crime prevention activities. Questions in the survey which tapped these activities included:

The next few questions are about things that some people might do for protection from crime.

Q74: Have any special locks been installed in this home for security reasons? (yes or no)

Q75: Have any special outdoor lights been installed here to make it easier to see what's going on outside your home? (yes or no)

Q76: Are there any timers for turning your lights on and off at night? (yes or no)

Q77: Have any valuables here been marked with your name or some number? (yes or no)

Q78: Have special windows or bars been installed for protection? (yes or no)

Q85: Think about the last time when no one was home for at least a day or two. Did you ask a neighbor to watch your home? (yes or no)

For all of the items above except Q85, positive responses were followed up by the question, "Was this since July of 1983?" This reference period identifies whether or not these tactics were adopted during the Victim Recontact program period. It is positive responses to this follow up question which are examined here, with all other respondents being classified as nonadopters.

Responses to these questions all were positively intercorrelated. The correlations often were low, however, probably due to the extremely skewed marginal distributions of many of them. Only a few of our respondents reported participating in home security survey, and 10 percent reported having timers, 16 marked their property, and 9 percent installed special security windows or bars. Nonparametric measures of association

between these items--which are not affected by their skewed marginals--were more robust. Correlations between reports of the more normally distributed activities (31 percent installed special locks, 24 percent outdoor lights, and 69 percent reported having neighbors watch their homes recently) were somewhat higher.

If added together, responses to these items would form a scale with a reliability of .48. However, there were many very small correlations among some of the items (they averaged only .14). Also, a factor analysis of the entire set indicated they were not single-factored. Responses to Q75 and Q76, two questions about lighting, were correlated .41 and "went together" separately in a strong factor. Responses to questions about locks, window bars, and property marking also went together, although more weakly. So, in this evaluation we pursued two strategies with regard to household prevention activities. First, we occasionally simply added together the number of "yes" responses to six of the items, as a count of actions taken. About 18 percent of the victim sample scored a "zero" on this count, while 37 percent recalled taking one recent crime prevention measure. Only 8 percent of the group fell in the 4-6 actions range. Also, this report also analyzes the adoption of these measures separately.

#### DISTRIBUTION OF SCALE SCORES

As they were to be used in multivariate regression analyses, it was important that the distribution of the outcome measures described above approximate the assumptions of regression. This was helped by the fact that most of them took on a wide range of values, because they are scale scores. In addition, the scores were examined for non-normality. None of them were significantly skewed, so they are used here in their original distributions.

#### THE REPRODUCEABILITY OF SCALES AMONG SUBPOPULATIONS

Tables B-1 summarizes the reliabilities for the scales discussed above, and also presents them for some comparison populations. One comparison population is respondents to a larger Police Foundation survey conducted in the Federal Maxey area of Houston. This area lies in the heart of the police district from which victims were selected for this experiment. Table B-1 also presents scale reliabilities for all five Houston neighborhoods surveyed as part of the Fear Reduction Project. These comparisons are based upon a similar scaling of the survey items, with the exception of NBSATIF, as noted.

While the reliabilities presented here fluctuate somewhat from place to place, the generalizability of the scales used in the evaluation is evident. There is no evidence that special measures must be tailored for any particular group, including victims; rather, the various analyses based upon this data can employ virtually the same measures throughout.

#### A NOTE ON CALCULATING SCALE SCORES

There is a scattered amount of missing data for all of these items. There was somewhat more missing data for questions dealing with the police than for generic questions about neighborhood conditions, probably reflecting many people's true ignorance of police affairs. The exact number of victims responding to each survey item is presented in the supporting statistical tables in Appendix A. Because a number of these scales summarize responses to several questions, if one missing element for a scale led to the complete exclusion of a respondent, the number of cases available for analysis would drop substantially. Because these items are single-factored and internally consistent, a better strategy is to let responses to components of a scale which are present "stand in" for occasional missing data. This was accomplished by basing each individual's calculated score on the sum of valid responses, standardized by the number of valid responses ( $\text{score} = \frac{\text{sum of response values}}{\text{number of valid responses}}$ ). Neither excluding respondents because of nonresponse nor fabricating data for them in the form of imputed values (such as sample means or "hot deck" values) is likely to be a superior strategy, in light of our scaling approach to measurement. (See Kalton, 1983)

Table B-1

## Comparative Scale Reliabilities

Scale	Houston Victims	Houston Federal-Maxey	Houston Five Areas
Fear of Personal Victimization in Area	.72	.71	.69
Perceived Area Personal Crime Problems	.74	.78	.80
Concern About Area Property Crime	.79	.80	.79
Satisfaction With Area	.69	.51*	.44*
Evaluation of Police Service	.81	.82	.80
Defensive Behaviors to Avoid Personal Crime	.73	.68	.72
(number of cases)	(351)	(506)	(1672)

\* Two item (Q5 and Q14) scale

Reliability estimate is Cronbach's Alpha



APPENDIX D  
EVALUATION SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

ADDRESS LABEL

RESPONDENT #			CITY	AREA	VERSION		DAY		MONTH		
1	2	3			4	5	6	7	8	9	10
					V	F					

**CITIZENS'  
ATTITUDE SURVEY  
VF VERSION**

Hello, my name is \_\_\_\_\_ and I work for a national research organization in Washington, D.C. [SHOW I.D. CARD]

We recently mailed a letter to this household about a survey we are doing to find out the problems people are having in this area and what they think can be done to improve the quality of life around here. The information you give us will help develop programs to address these problems. Everything you tell us will be kept strictly confidential and it will be used only to prepare a report in which no individual's answers will ever be identified. Your participation is voluntary but your cooperation will be very helpful.

TIME INTERVIEW BEGAN: \_\_\_\_\_ A.M.  
P.M.

Q1. First, I have a few questions about this part of Houston [SHOW MAP].  
How long have you lived at this address? (12-13)(14-15)

YEARS MONTHS  
DON'T KNOW . . . . . 9999

Q2. Before you moved here, did you live somewhere else in this area,  
somewhere else in Houston, somewhere outside of the city of Houston or  
have you always lived here?

SOMEWHERE IN THIS AREA . . . . . 1  
SOMEWHERE IN THIS CITY . . . . . 2 (16)  
OUTSIDE OF THIS CITY . . . . . 3  
ALWAYS LIVED HERE . . . . . 4  
DON'T KNOW . . . . . 9

Q3. Do you own or rent your home?

OWN (INCLUDES STILL PAYING) . . . . . 1  
RENT . . . . . 2  
REFUSED . . . . . 8 (17)  
DON'T KNOW . . . . . 9

Q4. About how many families do you know by name in this area?

NUMBER  
DON'T KNOW . . . . . 99 (18-19)  
REFUSED . . . . . 88

Q5. In general, since July of 1983, would you say this area has become a  
better place to live, gotten worse, or stayed about the same?

BETTER . . . . . 3  
WORSE . . . . . 1  
ABOUT THE SAME . . . . . 2 (20)  
DON'T KNOW . . . . . 9

Q11. In some areas people do things together and help each other. In other  
areas people mostly go their own way. In general, what kind of area  
would you say this is, is it mostly one where people help each other, or  
one where people go their own way?

HELP EACH OTHER . . . . . 1  
GO THEIR OWN WAY . . . . . 0 (21)  
DON'T KNOW . . . . . 9

Q14. On the whole, how do you feel about this area as a place to live? Are  
you...

very satisfied, . . . . . 4  
somewhat satisfied, . . . . . 3  
somewhat dissatisfied, or . . . . . 2 (22)  
very dissatisfied? . . . . . 1  
DON'T KNOW . . . . . 9

N1. All things considered, what do you think this area will be like a year  
from now? Will it be a better place to live, have gotten worse, or  
stayed about the same?

BETTER . . . . . 3  
WORSE . . . . . 1 (23)  
SAME . . . . . 2  
DON'T KNOW . . . . . 9

N2. How likely is it that you will still be living in this area a year from now? Is it...

very likely, . . . . . 5  
somewhat likely, . . . . . 4  
somewhat unlikely, or . . . . . 2  
very unlikely? . . . . . 1  
DON'T KNOW . . . . . 9  
50-50 (VOL) . . . . . 3

Q34. How safe would you feel being outside alone in this area at night? Would you feel ...

very safe, . . . . . 4  
somewhat safe, . . . . . 3  
somewhat unsafe, or . . . . . 2  
very unsafe? . . . . . 1  
DON'T GO OUT AT NIGHT . . . . . 7  
DON'T KNOW . . . . . 9

Q35. Is there any place in this area where you would be afraid to go alone either during the day or after dark?

NO . . . . . 0 [SKIP TO Q39]  
YES . . . . . 1  
DON'T KNOW . . . . . 9 [SKIP TO Q39]

Q38. Would you be afraid to go there during the day, after dark, or both?

DAY TIME . . . . . 1  
AFTER DARK . . . . . 2  
BOTH . . . . . 3  
DON'T KNOW . . . . . 9

Q39. Since July of 1983, has the amount of crime in this area increased, decreased or stayed about the same?

INCREASED . . . . . 3  
DECREASED . . . . . 1  
ABOUT THE SAME . . . . . 2  
DON'T KNOW . . . . . 9

Q40. Do you believe you usually get a true picture of crime in this area?

NO . . . . . 0  
YES . . . . . 1  
DON'T KNOW . . . . . 9

Q41. Where do you get information about crime in this area? [PROBE: Where else do you get information? CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY]

- a. NONE/NO INFORMATION . . . . . 1
- b. TELEVISION . . . . . 1
- c. RADIO . . . . . 1
- d. CITY NEWSPAPER . . . . . 1
- e. NEIGHBORHOOD NEWSPAPER . . . . . 1
- f. RELATIVES, FRIENDS, NEIGHBORS . . 1
- g. COMMUNITY MEETINGS . . . . . 1
- h. POLICE OFFICERS . . . . . 1
- i. POLICE NEWSLETTER . . . . . 1
- j. POLICE STATION/OFFICE . . . . . 1
- k. GROUPS/ORGANIZATIONS . . . . . 1
- l. PAMPHLETS AND BROCHURES . . . . . 1
- m. OTHER \_\_\_\_\_ . . . . . 1
- n. DON'T KNOW . . . . .

Q42. Since July of 1983, have you seen any brochures, pamphlets or newsletters which describe what you can do to protect yourself and your home from crime?

NO . . . . .	0	(43)
YES . . . . .	1	
DON'T KNOW . . . . .	9	

Now, I am going to read a list of things that you may think are problems in this area. After I read each one, please tell me whether you think it is a big problem, some problem, or no problem here in this area.

	<u>BIG PROBLEM</u>	<u>SOME PROBLEM</u>	<u>NO PROBLEM</u>	<u>DON'T KNOW</u>	
Q114. People being attacked or beaten up by strangers? . . . . .	3	2	1	9	(44)
[PROMPT: Do you think that is a big problem, some problem, or no problem in this area?]					
Q117. People being robbed or having their money, purses or wallets taken? . . . . .	3	2	1	9	(45)
Q118. Gangs? . . . . .	3	2	1	9	(46)
Q120. Sale or use of drugs in public places? . . . . .	3	2	1	9	(47)
Q121. Rape or other sexual attacks? . . . . .	3	2	1	9	(48)
[PROMPT AS NECESSARY: Do you think that is a big problem, some problem, or no problem in this area?]					
Q17. Police not making enough contact with residents? . . . . .	3	2	1	9	(49)
Q21. Police stopping too many people on the streets without good reason in this area? . . . . .	3	2	1	9	(50)
Q26. Police being too tough on people they stop? . . . . .	3	2	1	9	(51)
[PROMPT: Do you think that is a big problem, some problem, or no problem in this area?]					
Q68. People breaking in or sneaking into homes to steal things? . . . . .	3	2	1	9	(52)
Q70. Cars being vandalized--things like windows or radio aerials being broken? . . . . .	3	2	1	9	(53)
Q71. Cars being stolen? . . . . .	3	2	1	9	(54)

Now, I'd like to ask you a few questions about things that might worry you in this area.

How worried are you that:

	VERY WORRIED	SOMEWHAT WORRIED	NOT WORRIED AT ALL	N/A	DON'T KNOW	
Q43. someone will try to rob you or steal something from you while you are outside in this area? . . . . .	3	2	1	7	9	(55)
[PROMPT AS NECESSARY: Are you very worried, somewhat worried, or not worried at all?]						
Q44. someone will try to attack you or beat you up while you are outside in this area? . . . . .	3	2	1	7	9	(56)
Q45. someone will try to break into your home while no one is here? . . . . .	3	2	1	7	9	(57)
Q46. How about when someone is home, how worried are you that someone will try to break into your home while someone is here? . . . . .	3	2	1	7	9	(58)
[PROMPT AS NECESSARY: Are you very worried, somewhat worried, or not worried at all?]						
Q47. someone will try to steal or damage your car in this area? . . . . .	3	2	1	7	9	(59)
Q48. someone will deliberately try to hurt your children while they are playing or walking in this area? . . . . .	3	2	1	7	9	(60)
Q49. When it comes to the prevention of crime in this area, do you feel that it's more the responsibility of the residents or more the responsibility of the police?						
RESIDENTS . . . . .	3					
POLICE . . . . .	1					(61)
BOTH . . . . .	2					
OTHER . . . . .	4					
[SPECIFY]						
DON'T KNOW . . . . .	9					
Q50. Now, let's talk about the police in this area. How good a job do you think they are doing to prevent crime? Would you say they are doing a...						
very good job, . . . . .	5					
good job, . . . . .	4					(62)
fair job, . . . . .	3					
poor job, or . . . . .	2					
very poor job? . . . . .	1					
DON'T KNOW . . . . .	9					

Q51. How good a job do you think the police in this area are doing in helping people out after they have been victims of crime? Would you say they are doing a...

very good job, . . . . . 5  
good job, . . . . . 4  
fair job, . . . . . 3  
poor job, or . . . . . 2  
very poor job? . . . . . 1  
DON'T KNOW . . . . . 9

(63)

Q52. How good a job are the police in this area doing in keeping order on the streets and sidewalks? Would you say they are doing a...

very good job, . . . . . 5  
good job, . . . . . 4  
fair job, . . . . . 3  
poor job, or . . . . . 2  
very poor job? . . . . . 1  
DON'T KNOW . . . . . 9

(64)

N3. Do you know of any special police office you can call to talk about crime problems?

NO . . . . . 0  
YES . . . . . 1  
DON'T KNOW . . . . . 9

(65)

Q57. In general, how polite are the police in this area when dealing with people around here? Are they...

very polite, . . . . . 4  
somewhat polite, . . . . . 3  
somewhat impolite, or . . . . . 2  
very impolite? . . . . . 1  
DON'T KNOW . . . . . 9

(66)

Q58. In general, how helpful are the police in this area when dealing with people around here? Are they...

very helpful, . . . . . 4  
somewhat helpful, . . . . . 3  
not very helpful, or . . . . . 2  
not helpful at all? . . . . . 1  
DON'T KNOW . . . . . 9

(67)

Q59. In general, how fair are the police in this area in dealing with people around here? Are they...

very fair, . . . . . 4  
somewhat fair, . . . . . 3  
somewhat unfair, or . . . . . 2  
very unfair? . . . . . 1  
DON'T KNOW . . . . . 9

(68)

Q60. Have you seen a police officer in this area within the last 24 hours?

NO . . . . . 0  
YES . . . . . 1 [SKIP TO Q63]  
DON'T KNOW . . . . . 9

(69)

Q61. What about within the last week? Have you seen a police officer in this area?

NO . . . . . 0  
YES . . . . . 1  
DON'T KNOW . . . . . 9

(70)

Q63. Do you know any of the police officers who work in this area?

NO . . . . . 0  
YES . . . . . 1  
DON'T KNOW . . . . . 9

(71)



Next, I would like to ask you about some things which may have happened since July of 1983. As I read each one, please think carefully and tell me if it happened since July of 1983. It doesn't matter whether you think it was serious or not, or who else was involved.

	NO	YES	DON'T KNOW	II. [IF "YES"] How many times did this happen since July of 1983?	
V1. Since July of 1983 has anyone broken into your home, garage, or another building on your property to steal something? . . .	0	1	9	A. _____	(72) (73)
V2. (Other than that,) have you found any sign that someone tried to break into your home, garage, or another building on your property to steal something? . . . . .	0	1	9	A. _____	(74) (75)
V3. Have you had anything taken from inside your home, garage, or another building on your property since July of 1983, by someone like a visitor? . . . . .	0	1	9	A. _____	(76) (77)
V4. To the best of your knowledge, has anything of value been stolen from your mailbox since July of 1983, or has anyone tried to? . .	0	1	9	A. _____	(78) (79)
V5. Excluding motor vehicles or bicycles have you had anything stolen that you left outside your home?	0	1	9	A. _____	(80) (81)
V6. Since July of 1983, has anyone damaged or defaced your home or the building you live in, for example, by writing on the walls, breaking windows? . . . . .	0	1	9	A. _____	(82) (83)
V7. Have you or anyone in this household owned a car or truck since July of 1983? . . . . .	0	1	9		(84)
[IF "NO" TO Q.V7 SKIP TO V11.]					
V8. Did anyone steal that (car/truck), or try to, since July of 1983? . .	0	1	9	A. _____	(85) (86)
V9. Did anyone take anything from inside your (car/truck), or try to steal any parts of it? . .	0	1	9	A. _____	(87) (88)
V10. (Other than that), did anyone deliberately damage your (car/truck) or vandalize it? . . . . .	0	1	9	A. _____	(89) (90)
V11. How about bicycles or motorcycles? Has anyone in this household owned a bike or motorcycle since July of 1983? . .	0	1	9		(91)
[IF "NO" TO V11 SKIP TO V13, AFTER FOLLOWING-UP ANY "YES" FOR V1-V10]					
V12. Did anyone steal, or try to steal that (motorcycle/bicycle)? .	0	1	9	A. _____	(92) (93)

Now, I have a few questions about some things that may have happened to you personally since July of 1983.

	NO	YES	DON'T KNOW	II. [IF "YES"] How many times did this happen since July of 1983?	
V13. Since July of 1983, has anyone stolen something directly from you <u>by force</u> or after threatening you with harm? . . . . .	0	1	9	A. _____	(94) (95)
V14. (Other than that,) has anyone <u>tried</u> to take something from you by force even though they did <u>not</u> get it? . . . . .	0	1	9	A. _____	(96) (97)
V15. Since July of 1983, has anyone picked your pocket or taken a bag or package directly from you, <u>without</u> using force or threatening you? . . . . .	0	1	9	A. _____	(98) (99)
V16. (Other than that,) has anyone physically attacked you or actually been violent with you in an argument or fight? . . . . .	0	1	9	A. _____	(100) (101)
V17. Since July of 1983, has anyone threatened or tried to hurt you even though they did not actually hurt you? . . . . .	0	1	9	A. _____	(102) (103)
V18. Have you received any threatening or obscene phone calls since July of 1983? . . . . .	0	1	9	A. _____	(104) (105-1)
V19. Has anyone sexually attacked you, or tried to, since July of 1983? . . . . .	0	1	9	A. _____	(107) (108)

Q122. After any incident in which you were a victim, did the police call you later to see if there was any additional assistance you might need?

NO . . . . . 0 [SKIP TO Q87] (109)  
 YES . . . . . 1  
 NEVER A VICTIM . . . . . 8 [SKIP TO Q87]  
 DON'T KNOW . . . . . 9 [SKIP TO Q87]

F1. Did you find the officer who called...

very helpful, . . . . . 4  
 somewhat helpful, . . . . . 3 (110)  
 not very helpful, or . . . . . 2  
 not at all helpful? . . . . . 1  
 DON'T KNOW . . . . . 9

F2. Was the officer who called...

very polite, . . . . . 4  
 somewhat polite, . . . . . 3  
 somewhat impolite, or . . . . . 2 (111)  
 very impolite? . . . . . 1  
 DON'T KNOW . . . . . 9

F3. Was the officer who called ....

very concerned, . . . . .	4	
somewhat concerned, . . . . .	3	(112)
not very concerned, or . . . . .	2	
not at all concerned? . . . . .	1	
DON'T KNOW . . . . .	9	

F4. Did the officer tell you about any agencies or organizations which might be able to assist you?

NO . . . . .	0 [SKIP TO F7]	
YES . . . . .	1	(113)
DON'T KNOW . . . . .	9 [SKIP TO F7]	

F5. Did you make contact with any of the agencies or organizations?

NO . . . . .	0 [SKIP TO F7]	
YES . . . . .	1	(114)
DON'T KNOW . . . . .	9 [SKIP TO F7]	

F6. In general, did you find the agency(ies)...

very helpful . . . . .	4	
somewhat helpful, . . . . .	3	(115)
not very helpful, or . . . . .	2	
not at all helpful? . . . . .	1	
DON'T KNOW . . . . .	9	
SOME WERE/SOME WEREN'T . . . . .	5	

F7. After the call from the officer, did you receive any crime prevention information in the mail?

NO . . . . .	0	
YES . . . . .	1	(116)
DON'T KNOW . . . . .	9	

F8. Do you think the police department should continue to call crime victims to offer them support?

NO . . . . .	0	
YES . . . . .	1	(117)
DON'T KNOW . . . . .	9	

Q87. Now, I would like to ask you about any other contacts you may have had with the Houston police since July of 1983. Since July of 1983 have you...

	NO	IF YES, ASK: Did (this/any of these) happen in this area?		NO	YES	
		YES	DON'T KNOW			
Q87. reported a crime to the police? . . . . .	0	1	9	87a. 0	1	(118) (119)
Q88. contacted the police about something suspicious?. . . . .	0	1	9	88a. 0	1	(120) (121)
Q89. Since July of 1983, have you reported a traffic accident to the police? . . . . .	0	1	9	89a. 0	1	(122) (123)
Q90. reported any other problem to the police? . . . . .	0	1	9	90a. 0	1	(124) (125)
Q91. Since July of 1983, have you contacted the police for information about how to prevent crime? . . . . .	0	1	9	91a. 0	1	(126) (127)
Q92. asked the police for any other information? . . . . .	0	1	9	92a. 0	1	(128) (129)

**INTERVIEWER BOX C**

CHECK Q87 THROUGH Q92. CIRCLE ONE AND FOLLOW SKIP INSTRUCTIONS

*NO* TO Q87 THROUGH Q92 . . . . .	1 [SKIP TO Q101]	
*YES* TO TWO OR MORE ITEMS . . . . .	2 [ASK Q93]	(130)
*YES* TO ONE ITEM . . . . .	3 [SKIP TO Q94]	

Q93. Which one of these contacts with the police was the most recent? Did it involve...  
[READ CATEGORIES CIRCLED "YES" IN Q87.-Q92. AND CIRCLE APPROPRIATE CODE BELOW]

- A crime (Q87) . . . . . 1
  - Something suspicious (Q88) . . . . . 2
  - A traffic accident (Q89) . . . . . 3
  - Any other problem (Q90) . . . . . 4
  - Crime prevention information (Q91) . . . . . 5
  - Other information (Q92) . . . . . 6
  - DON'T KNOW . . . . . 9
- (131)

Next, I have a few questions about the last time you contacted the police.

That is when you \_\_\_\_\_ . [READ RESPONSE FROM Q93.]

Q94. The last time you contacted the police, did the police clearly explain what action they would take in response to your contact?

- NO . . . . . 0
  - YES . . . . . 1
  - DON'T KNOW . . . . . 9
- (132)

Q95. Did you find the police ...

- very helpful, . . . . . 4
  - somewhat helpful, . . . . . 3
  - not very helpful, or . . . . . 2
  - not at all helpful? . . . . . 1
  - DON'T KNOW . . . . . 9
- (133)

Q96. When you talked to the police did you find them...

- very polite, . . . . . 4
  - somewhat polite, . . . . . 3
  - somewhat impolite, or . . . . . 2
  - very impolite? . . . . . 1
  - DON'T KNOW . . . . . 9
- (134)

Q97. How fairly were you treated by the police that time? Were they...

- very fair, . . . . . 4
  - somewhat fair, . . . . . 3
  - somewhat unfair, or . . . . . 2
  - very unfair? . . . . . 1
  - DON'T KNOW . . . . . 9
- (135)

Q98. After this recent experience, would you be more or less likely to contact the police in the future?

- MORE LIKELY . . . . . 3
  - NO CHANGE . . . . . 2
  - LESS LIKELY . . . . . 1
  - DON'T KNOW . . . . . 9
- (136)

Q101. Since July of 1983, have you been in a car or on a motorcycle which was stopped by the police?

NO . . . . .	0	
YES . . . . .	1	
DON'T KNOW . . . . .	9	(137)

Q104. Since July of 1983, have you been stopped and asked questions by the police when you were walking?

NO . . . . .	0	
YES . . . . .	1	
DON'T KNOW . . . . .	9	(138)

<u>INTERVIEWER BOX E</u>		
CHECK Q101 AND 104. CIRCLE ONE AND FOLLOW SKIP INSTRUCTION		
"YES" TO BOTH Q101 AND Q104 . . . . .	1	[ASK Q106]
"YES" TO EITHER Q101 OR Q104 . . . . .	2	[SKIP TO Q107]
"NO" TO BOTH Q101 AND Q104 . . . . .	3	[SKIP TO Q124]

(139)

Q106. Which of these stops by the police was the most recent? Was it when you were...

stopped in a motor vehicle, or . . . . .	1	
stopped on foot? . . . . .	2	
REFUSED . . . . .	8	
DON'T KNOW . . . . .	9	(140)

Q107. (When/The last time) the police stopped you, did they clearly explain why they stopped you?

NO . . . . .	0	
YES . . . . .	1	
DON'T KNOW . . . . .	9	(141)

Q108. Did the police clearly explain what action they would take?

NO . . . . .	0	
YES . . . . .	1	
DON'T KNOW . . . . .	9	(142)

Q109. Did you find the police ...

very polite, . . . . .	4	
somewhat polite, . . . . .	3	
somewhat impolite, or . . . . .	2	
very impolite? . . . . .	1	
DON'T KNOW . . . . .	9	(143)

Q110. How fair were they? Were they...

very fair, . . . . .	4	
somewhat fair, . . . . .	3	
somewhat unfair, or . . . . .	2	
very unfair? . . . . .	1	
DON'T KNOW . . . . .	9	(144)

Now, I would like to ask you a few questions about people you know in Houston.

Q124. Do you personally know anyone in Houston whose home or apartment has been broken into, or had an attempted break-in since July of 1983?

NO . . . . .	0 [SKIP TO Q126]	(145)
YES . . . . .	1	
DON'T KNOW . . . . .	9 [SKIP TO Q126]	

Q125. Did (this/any of these) break-in(s) happen in this area?

NO . . . . .	0	(146)
YES . . . . .	1	
DON'T KNOW . . . . .	9	

Q126. Do you personally know anyone in Houston who has been robbed on the street or had their purse or wallet taken since July of 1983?

NO . . . . .	0 [SKIP TO Q128]	(147)
YES . . . . .	1	
DON'T KNOW . . . . .	9 [SKIP TO Q128]	

Q127. Did (this/any of these) crime(s) take place in this area?

NO . . . . .	0	(148)
YES . . . . .	1	
DON'T KNOW . . . . .	9	

Q128. Do you personally know anyone in Houston who has been attacked by strangers since July of 1983?

NO . . . . .	0 [SKIP TO Q131]	(149)
YES . . . . .	1	
DON'T KNOW . . . . .	9 [SKIP TO Q131]	

Q129. Did (this/any of these) attack(s) take place in this area?

NO . . . . .	0	(150)
YES . . . . .	1	
DON'T KNOW . . . . .	9	

Q131. During the past week, other than going to work, on how many days did you go somewhere in this area during daylight hours?

# OF DAYS _____		(151)
REFUSED . . . . .	8	
DON'T KNOW . . . . .	9	

Q132. What about after dark? During the past week, other than going to work, on how many nights did you go somewhere in this area after dark?

# OF NIGHTS _____		(152)
REFUSED . . . . .	8	
DON'T KNOW . . . . .	9	

The next few questions are about things that some people might do for protection from crime.

	NO	YES	IF YES, ASK:		Was that since July of 1983?			
			DON'T KNOW	REFUSED	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW	
Q73. Has there been a crime prevention inspection of your home by a police officer or some specially trained person? . . . . .	0	1	9	8	Q73a. 1	0	9	(153)(154)
Q74. Have any special locks been installed in this home for security reasons? . . . . .	0	1	9	8	Q74a. 1	0	9	(155)(156)
Q75. Have any special outdoor lights been installed here to make it easier to see what's going on outside your home? . . . . .	0	1	9	8	Q75a. 1	0	9	(157)(158)
Q76. Are there any timers for turning your lights on and off at night? . . . . .	0	1	9	8	Q76a. 1	0	9	(159)(160)
Q77. Have any valuables here been marked with your name or some number? . . . . .	0	1	9	8	Q77a. 1	0	9	(161)(162)
Q78. Have special windows or bars been installed for protection? . . . . .	0	1	9	8	Q78a. 1	0	9	(163)(164)

Q79. Thinking of all the things that people can do to protect their home, that is, installing special locks, lights, timers, bars, etc., how much safer do you think they can make your home? Would you say they can make your home...

a lot safer, . . . . .	3	
somewhat safer, or . . . . .	2	(165)
not much safer at all? . . . . .	1	
DON'T KNOW . . . . .	9	

The next questions are about some things people might do when they go out after dark. Now, think about the last time you went out in this area after dark.

	NO	YES	NEVER GO OUT	DON'T KNOW	
Q80. Did you go with someone else to avoid crime? . . . . .	0	1	2	9	(166)
Q81. The last time you went out after dark in this area, did you stay away from certain streets or areas to avoid crime? . . . . .	0	1	2	9	(167)
Q82. When you last went out after dark in this area, did you stay away from certain types of people to avoid crime? . . . . .	0	1	2	9	(168)

Q83. Thinking of all the things that people can do when they go out after dark, that is, get someone to go with them or avoid certain places or avoid certain types of people, how much safer do you think these actions can make you? Would you say they can make you ...

a lot safer, . . . . .	3	
somewhat safer, or . . . . .	2	(169)
not much safer at all? . . . . .	1	
DON'T KNOW . . . . .	9	

Q84. Let's talk about the last time you invited someone from outside this area to visit you here at night. Did you give your guest warnings or suggestions about what to do to avoid possible crime problems?

NO . . . . .	0	
YES . . . . .	1	(170)
NO OUTSIDE GUESTS . . . . .	5	
DON'T KNOW . . . . .	9	

Q85. Think about the last time when no one was home for at least a day or two. Did you ask a neighbor to watch your home?

NO . . . . .	0	
YES . . . . .	1	(171)
SOMEONE ALWAYS HOME . . . . .	5	
DON'T KNOW . . . . .	9	

Q86. In general, how often do you avoid going out after dark in this area because of crime? Do you avoid going out most of the time, sometimes, or never?

NEVER GO OUT AFTER DARK . . . . .	4	
MOST OF THE TIME . . . . .	3	(172)
SOMETIMES . . . . .	2	
NEVER . . . . .	1	
DON'T KNOW . . . . .	9	

Now, I'd like to ask you a few questions about yourself and the people that live here...

Q133. In what year were you born?

YEAR _____		
REFUSED . . . . .	8888	(173-176)

Q134. Are you presently employed full-time, part-time, a homemaker, or unemployed? [IF OTHER PROBE: What is that?]

WORKING FULL-TIME . . . . .	0	
WORKING PART-TIME . . . . .	1	
HOMEMAKER . . . . .	2	(177)
UNEMPLOYED . . . . .	3	
RETIRED . . . . .	4	
DISABLED . . . . .	5	
STUDENT . . . . .	6	
OTHER _____ . . . . .	7	
REFUSED . . . . .	8	
DON'T KNOW . . . . .	9	

Q135. Are you currently...

married, . . . . .	1	
living with someone as partners, . . . . .	2	
widowed, . . . . .	3	
divorced, . . . . .	4	} [SKIP TO QN4]
separated, or . . . . .	5	
never married? . . . . .	6	
REFUSED . . . . .	8	



Q136. Is (your husband/wife/the person you live with) presently working full-time or part-time, homemaker, or unemployed? [IF OTHER PROBE: What is that person doing?]

WORKING FULL-TIME . . . . .	0	
WORKING PART-TIME . . . . .	1	
HOMEMAKER . . . . .	2	(179)
UNEMPLOYED . . . . .	3	
RETIRED . . . . .	4	
DISABLED . . . . .	5	
STUDENT . . . . .	6	
OTHER . . . . .	7	
REFUSED . . . . .	8	
DON'T KNOW . . . . .	9	

N4. Including yourself, how many people 19 years and older currently live here?

# OF ADULTS _____		
REFUSED . . . . .	8	(180)
DON'T KNOW . . . . .	9	

Q137. How many people under 19 years old live here?

# OF CHILDREN _____		
REFUSED . . . . .	88	(181-182)
DON'T KNOW . . . . .	99	

[ANSWER Q138 AND Q139 BY OBSERVATION ONLY IF OBVIOUS]

Q138. What is your racial or ethnic background? Are you...

black, . . . . .	1	
white, . . . . .	2	(183)
hispanic, . . . . .	3	
asian/pacific islander, . . . . .	4	
american indian, or . . . . .	5	
something else? _____	6	
[SPECIFY]		
REFUSED . . . . .	8	
DON'T KNOW . . . . .	9	

Q139. RESPONDENT SEX:

MALE . . . . .	1	(184)
FEMALE . . . . .	2	

Q140. What was the highest grade or year of school that you completed? [CIRCLE HIGHEST]

NONE . . . . .	1	
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL . . . . .	2	
SOME HIGH SCHOOL . . . . .	3	
HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATE . . . . .	4	
SOME COLLEGE . . . . .	5	
COLLEGE GRADUATE [BACHELORS] . . . . .	6	(185)
POST GRADUATE . . . . .	7	
REFUSED . . . . .	8	
DON'T KNOW . . . . .	9	

Q141. We also would like to have an idea about your household income in 1983. Here is a card [GIVE CARD TO RESPONDENT] with some general categories on it. Please tell me which category includes your total household income--what everyone here made together last year? You don't have to give me the actual total--just tell me the correct letter.

- A . . . . . 1
- B . . . . . 2
- C . . . . . 3
- D . . . . . 4
- E . . . . . 5
- F . . . . . 6
- G . . . . . 7
- REFUSED . . . . . 8
- DON'T KNOW . . . . . 9

} [SKIP TO Q143]

(186)

Q142. [IF "REFUSED" OR "DON'T KNOW"] Would you just indicate if it was under \$15,000 in 1983, or over \$15,000?

- UNDER \$15,000 . . . . . 0
- OVER \$15,000 . . . . . 1
- REFUSED . . . . . 8
- DON'T KNOW . . . . . 9

(187)

Q143. Now, in case my supervisor wants to call and verify this interview could I please have your telephone number?

\_\_\_\_\_ [NUMBER]

- REFUSED . . . . . CODE: 888-8888
- NO PHONE . . . . . CODE: 999-9999

(188-194)

CLOSING STATEMENT

"Thank you very much, that completes the survey. You've been very helpful."

TIME INTERVIEW ENDED \_\_\_\_\_ A.M.  
P.M.

INTERVIEWER: I certify that I followed the procedures and rules in conducting this interview.

(195-196)

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_ Interviewer # \_\_\_\_\_



APPENDIX E

HOUSTON'S VICTIM INFORMATION FORM

## VICTIM INFORMATION FORM

## SECTION I

TO BE COMPLETED FROM THE NARRATIVE SECTION OF INCIDENT REPORT OF ALL CASES WHICH QUALIFY BY CRIME TYPES, INCLUDING BOTH EVEN AND ODD INCIDENT NUMBERS.

1. Incident number: \_\_\_\_\_
2. Victim's name: \_\_\_\_\_
3. Did the victim know the suspect?
  - No . . . . . 0
  - Yes. . . . . 1
  - Don't know . . . . . 2
4. Did the suspect have a weapon while committing the crime?
  - No . . . . . 0
  - Yes. . . . . 1
  - Don't know . . . . . 2 (SKIP TO NO. 7)
5. What was the weapon?
  - Gun . . . . . 1
  - Knife . . . . . 2
  - Club, stick, bat . . . 3
  - Other, (SPECIFY) . . . 4

---
6. Was the weapon used against the victim?
  - No . . . . . 0
  - Yes. . . . . 1
  - Don't know . . . . . 2

VICTIM INFORMATION FORM, p. 2

7. Did the victim sustain any physical injuries?

No . . . . . 0

Yes, minor, required no medical treatment. . . . . 1

Yes, required medical treatment and release. . . . . 2

Yes, required at least overnight hospitalization . . . . . 3

8. Did the responding officer report the victim as being emotionally upset (e.g., crying, screaming, yelling, perhaps in shock)?

No . . . . . 0

Yes. . . . . 1

---

SECTION II

---

TO BE COMPLETED FOR ALL CASES FOR WHICH THE INCIDENT NUMBER IS EVEN AND IN WHICH THE CALLER WAS ABLE TO REACH THE VICTIM BY TELEPHONE.

---

9. Contact attempt: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

(MARK THROUGH NUMBER OF EACH UNSUCCESSFUL ATTEMPT AND CIRCLE THE NUMBER OF THE ATTEMPT AT WHICH CONTACT IS MADE.)

10. Date of successful contact: \_\_\_ \_\_\_ \_\_\_ 8 \_\_\_

11. Contact initiation time: \_\_\_ \_\_\_ \_\_\_

Did the victim indicate need for any type of assistance?

No . . . . . 0 (SKIP TO NO. 14)

Yes. . . . . 1

13. Did the caller feel that she was able to give the victim the assistance the victim needed?

No . . . . . 0 (EXPLAIN \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Yes, but only partially. . . . . 1 (EXPLAIN \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Yes, fully . . . . . 2

14. Did caller refer the victim to some other agency or source of assistance?

No . . . . . 0 (SKIP TO NO. 16)

Yes. . . . . 1

15. What type of referral was made?

Name of Agency

Counseling . . . . . 01 \_\_\_\_\_

Health care. . . . . 02 \_\_\_\_\_

Financial assistance . . . . . 03 \_\_\_\_\_

Legal assistance . . . . . 04 \_\_\_\_\_

Community action or  
advocacy . . . . . 05 \_\_\_\_\_

Public works . . . . . 06 \_\_\_\_\_

Crime prevention . . . . . 07 \_\_\_\_\_

Emergency housing. . . . . 08 \_\_\_\_\_

Emergency food . . . . . 09 \_\_\_\_\_

Other (SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_ 10 \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

16. Does the victim think the cost of any medical treatment will be covered by insurance?

- No . . . . . 0
- Yes, partially . . . . . 1
- Yes, completely or almost completely . . . 2
- Does not apply, no injury. . . . . 8
- Does not know . . . . . 9

17. Does the victim think the cost of any financial losses from stolen or damaged property will be covered by insurance?

- No . . . . . 0
- Yes, partially . . . . . 1
- Yes, completely or almost completely . . . 2
- Does not apply, no losses. . . . . 8
- Does not know . . . . . 9

18. Did the victim provide the caller with additional information for the police about the case?

- No . . . . . 0 (SKIP TO NO. 20)
- Yes. . . . . 1

19. What type of information did the victim provide? (CHECK ALL THAT WERE PROVIDED.)

- Additional property missing
- Descriptions of suspects
- Descriptions of weapons
- Descriptions of vehicles
- Information about witnesses
- Other (SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_



20. Did the caller provide the victim additional information about the case?

No . . . . . 0 (SKIP TO NO.22 )

Yes. . . . . 1

21. What type of information was provided the victim? \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

22. Caller's sense of victim's response to the call. Victim seem to respond:

Positively: . . . . . 1

Neutrally . . . . . 2

Negatively. . . . . 3

23. Contact termination time: \_\_\_\_\_

APPENDIX F

HOUSTON'S CRIME SPECIFIC VICTIM QUESTIONNAIRE



QUESTIONNAIRE FOR BURGLARY VICTIMS

1. Is there any additional information that you would like to include on this report?
2. Is there any additional property missing that was not previously included in this report?
3. Have you identified a witness of any additional witnesses?
4. Are there any further description on the suspect (s) or the vehicle (s) used in the burglary?
5. If we recover any of your property, will you be able to identify it?  
How?
6. Have you been able to properly secure your home since the incident occurred?  
Would you like to receive some crime prevention information?
7. I have \_\_\_\_\_ as your incident number. Do you have this number?
8. Are there any other problems that I can assist you with?

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR BURGLARY MOTOR VEHICLE VICTIMS

1. Is there any additional information that you would like to add to this report?
2. Was there any additional property taken in this incident that was not previously included in this report?
3. Have you identified a witness or any additional witnesses?
4. Do you have a further description of the suspect (s)?
5. Is this the correct license plate number and description of your vehicle?
6. I have \_\_\_\_\_ as your incident number, do you have this number?
7. Are there any other problems that I can assist you with?

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR AUTO THEFT VICTIMS

1. Is this the correct license plate number and description of your vehicle?
2. Is there any additional informatiin you would like to include to this report?
3. Was there any additional property taken from your vehicle?
4. Have you been contacted concerning the location of your vehicle?  
(If recovered)
5. Have you identified a witness or any additional witnesses to this incioent?
6. Do you have any additional information on the suspect (s)?
7. I have \_\_\_\_\_ as your incident number. Do you have this number?
8. Do you have any additional information on the suspect (s)?

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR ROBBERY VICTIMS

1. Is there any additional information that you would like to include on this report?
2. Was there any additional property stolen that is not included in this report?
3. Do you have any further information on the description of the suspect(s) or the vehicle (s) used in the Robbery?
4. Do you have any additional information on the type weapon used?
5. Have you identified a witness or additional witnesses?
6. If we recover any of your property, will you be able to identify it?  
How?
7. I have \_\_\_\_\_ as your case number. Do you have this number?
8. Are there any other problems that I can assist you with?

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THEFT VICTIMS

1. Is there any additional information that you would like to add to this report?
2. Was there any additional property taken in this incident that was not previously included in this report?
3. Have you identified a witness or any additional witnesses?
4. Do you have a further description of the suspect (s) or the vehicle(s) used in the incident?
5. If we recover any of your property will you be able to identify it?  
How?
6. I have \_\_\_\_\_ as your case number, Do you have this number?
7. Are there any other problems I can assist you with?



QUESTIONNAIRE FOR ASSAULT VICTIMS

1. Is there any additional information that you would like to include on this report?
2. Have you identified a witness of any additional witnesses to this incident?
3. Do you have any additional information on the suspect (s)?
4. Are you acquainted with the suspect (s)? How well do you know suspect(s)?
5. Have you or would you like to file charges on the suspect (s)? (If so, give complainant needed information to file).
6. I have \_\_\_\_\_ as your case number, do you have this number?
7. Are there any other problems that I can assist you with?

APPENDIX G

HOUSTON'S LETTER TO UNCONTACTED VICTIMS

The Houston Police Department offers help to recent victims of crime through its victim callback program. This program is designed to help recent victims of crime during the period of re-adjustment which often follows the victimization experience. We are interested in your well-being and would like to assist you during this time by providing you with information about your case, crime prevention tips, and any other assistance you may need.

Unfortunately, we have been unable to contact you by phone. If you would like our assistance, please contact one of our Victim Assistance Officers at 221-0711. Both male and female officers are available to talk with you. Please contact us between the hours of 9:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m., Monday through Friday.

sincerely,

J. Jackson, Police Officer  
Planning and Research Division

JJ