

Arizona Criminal Justice Commission

Statistical Analysis Center Publication

Our mission is to sustain and enhance the coordination, cohesiveness, productivity and effectiveness of the Criminal Justice System in Arizona



The 2013 Arizona Crime Victimization Survey

January

2014

ARIZONA CRIMINAL JUSTICE COMMISSION



Chairperson
DANIEL G. SHARP, Chief
Oro Valley Police Department

Vice-Chairperson
BILL MONTGOMERY
Maricopa County Attorney

JOSEPH ARPAIO
Maricopa County Sheriff

JOSEPH R. BRUGMAN, Chief
Coolidge Police Department

DAVID K. BYERS, Director
Administrative Office of the
Courts

TIMOTHY J. DORN, Chief
Gilbert Police Department

CLARENCE DUPNIK
Pima County Sheriff

CHRIS GIBBS, Mayor
City of Safford

ROBERT C. HALLIDAY, Director
Department of Public Safety

TOM HORNE
Attorney General

BARBARA LAWALL
Pima County Attorney

BRIAN LIVINGSTON, Chairperson
Board of Executive Clemency

WILLIAM PRIBIL
Coconino County Sheriff

SHEILA POLK
Yavapai County Attorney

CHARLES RYAN, Director
Department of Corrections

DAVID SANDERS
Pima County Chief Probation
Officer

STEVEN SHELDON
Former Judge

MARK SPENCER
Law Enforcement Leader

VACANT
County Supervisor

JOHN A. BLACKBURN, JR.
Executive Director

PHILLIP STEVENSON, Ph.D.
Director, Statistical Analysis Center

The Arizona Criminal Justice Commission and the authors of this report would like to thank Charles M. Katz, Ph.D. of the Center for Violence Prevention and Community Safety at Arizona State University for his assistance and support of this project.

This project was supported by Grant # 2010-BJ-CX-K021 awarded to the Arizona Criminal Justice Commission by the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics. Points of view or opinions contained within this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Suggested citation: Stevenson, Phillip (2013). *The 2013 Arizona Crime Victimization Survey*. Arizona Criminal Justice Commission. Phoenix, AZ.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	i
Introduction.....	1
Methodology.....	2
Measures.....	3
Victimization.....	3
Reporting Victimization to the Police.....	4
Perceptions of Crime and Safety.....	4
Perceptions of Police Effectiveness.....	4
Awareness of Victim Services.....	5
Sample.....	5
Findings.....	11
Victimization.....	11
Violent Victimization.....	11
Property Victimization.....	12
Identity Theft Victimization.....	13
Hate Crime Victimization.....	14
Reporting Victimization to the Police.....	15
Any Victimization.....	15
Violent Victimization.....	15
Reasons for Not Reporting Violent Victimization to the Police.....	16
Property Victimization.....	17
Reasons for Not Reporting Property Victimization to the Police.....	18
Identity Theft Victimization.....	19
Reasons for Not Reporting Identity Theft Victimizations to the Police.....	20
Hate Crime Victimization.....	21
Reasons for Not Reporting Hate Crime Victimizations to the Police...	22
Victim Services.....	23
Crime Victim Assistance.....	23
Victim Compensation.....	25
Perceptions of Crime and Safety.....	26
Is crime a problem in your community?.....	26
How safe do you feel?.....	27
Fear of Victimization.....	28
Concern for Home While Out.....	29
Concern for Home While at Home.....	30
Concern about Vandalism of Property.....	31
Why Perceptions of Safety and Fear of Crime Matter.....	32
Perceptions of the Police.....	33
Police Effectiveness.....	33
Conclusion.....	37
References.....	39
Appendix A: Telephone Survey Questionnaire.....	40

List of Tables

Table 1: Full Sample and Population Demographics	6
Table 2: Maricopa County Sample Respondent Demographics.....	8
Table 3: Pima County Sample Respondent Demographics	10
Table 4: Percentage of Respondents Reporting Victimization by Type	11
Table 5: Percentage of Respondents Reporting Violent Victimization by Type	12
Table 6: Percentage of Respondents Reporting Property Victimization	13
Table 7: Percentage of Respondents Who Reported Identity Theft Victimization by Type	13
Table 8: Percentage of Victims who Reported Hate Crime Victimization	14
Table 9: Percentage of Victims who Reported their Victimization to the Police	15
Table 10: Percentage of Violent Victizations Reported to the Police	16
Table 11: Reasons Why Violent Crime Victims Did Not Report Their Victimization to the Police	17
Table 12: Percentage of Property Crime Victims who Reported their Victimization to the Police.....	18
Table 13: Reasons Why Property Crime Victims Did Not Report Their Victimization to the Police	19
Table 14: Percentage of Identity Theft Victims who Reported their Victimization to the Police	20
Table 15: Reasons Why ID Theft Victims Did Not Report Their Victimization to the Police	21
Table 16: Percentage of Hate Crime Victims who Reported their Victimization to the Police.....	22
Table 17: Reasons Why Hate Crime Victims Did Not Report Their Victimization to the Police	23
Table 18: Percentage of Crime Victims Who Received Crime Victim Services.....	24
Table 19: Knowledge of Arizona’s Victim Compensation Program.....	25
Table 20: Knowledge of Arizona’s Victim Compensation Program Among Respondents Who Reported Their Victimization to the Police	26
Table 21: To what degree do you think crime is a problem in your community?.....	27
Table 22: How safe do you feel in your community?.....	28
Table 23: How often are you fearful of being a victim of a violent crime?.....	29
Table 24: How concerned are you about someone breaking into your home while you are not there?.....	30
Table 25: How concerned are you about someone breaking into your home while you are there?.....	31
Table 26: How concerned are you about having your property vandalized?.....	32
Table 27: How effective would you say your police agency is when people in your neighborhood call them for help ?.....	34
Table 28: How effective would you say your police agency is at controlling violent crime?.....	35
Table 29: How effective would you say your police agency is at controlling drugs?.....	36
Table 30: How effective would you say your police agency is at controlling burglary?.....	37

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In the summer of 2011, the Arizona Criminal Justice Commission's Statistical Analysis Center was awarded a grant to conduct an Arizona Crime Victimization Survey. The Arizona Crime Victimization Survey is based on the National Crime Victimization Survey but modified for a brief telephone interview rather than lengthy face-to-face interviews. Although the primary goal of the survey is to produce estimates of violent, property, identity theft, and hate crime victimization for Arizona, Maricopa County, and Pima County, additional information was collected including whether respondents reported their victimization to the police, and if not, the reasons why they chose not to report their victimization. Additional items in the survey captured residents' perceptions of their local police agencies and their effectiveness at addressing violent crime, drug crime, and burglary. Questions were also included in the survey that measured awareness of and access to victim assistance and victim compensation programs. The survey was implemented during February and March of 2013, resulting in 1,878 completed interviews with Arizona residents.

Some of the more notable findings include:

Victimization

- Almost one out of every three Arizona residents was a victim of a violent, property, identity theft, or hate crime in the 12 months prior to their participation in the AZCVS. Residents living in the rural counties of Arizona were less likely to have been victimized than residents of Maricopa or Pima counties.
- Approximately one in twenty Arizona residents statewide experienced a violent victimization in the twelve months preceding the survey.
- Approximately one out of every eight Arizona residents reported being a victim of a property crime.
- A larger percentage of Arizona residents experienced identity theft victimization than any other victimization type asked about on the survey. Approximately one out of six Arizona residents reported being a victim of an identity theft-related crime.
- A relatively small percentage of respondents (3.6 percent) experienced hate crime victimization during the 12 months prior to their participation in the AZCVS.

Reporting Victimization to the Police

- According to the AZCVS, 50.7 percent of violent, property, and identity theft victimizations experienced by Arizona residents statewide were reported to the police. Although there were no differences by region or gender in reporting of victimizations to the police, Hispanic residents were more likely to report their victimizations to the police than non-Hispanic residents.

- Approximately half of the violent victimizations experienced by AZCVS respondents were reported to the police. Males were more likely to report violent victimizations to the police than females. In contrast, females were more likely to report to the police their being threatened with violence than males.
- Rural county respondents were the least likely to report property crime victimization to the police. Half (50.0 percent) of rural county respondents reported their victimization to the police while more than two-thirds of respondents living in Maricopa and Pima counties reported their property crime victimizations to the police.
- Identity theft-related victimizations were the least likely to have been reported to the police. Approximately one-fourth of identity theft-related victimizations experienced by Arizona residents were reported to the police. Rural county residents were more likely to have reported identity theft-related victimizations to the police than Maricopa and Pima County residents.
- Slightly more than one-fourth of hate crime victims statewide reported their victimization to the police. Half of the hate crime victimizations experienced by Pima County residents were reported to the police. In contrast, 6.3 percent of the hate crime victimizations experienced by Maricopa County residents were reported to the police.

Crime Victim Services

- Statewide, 6.0 percent of respondents who experienced victimization in the 12 months prior to participation in the AZCVS reported receiving crime victim services from a governmental or non-profit agency. Respondents who experienced violent crime victimization reported the highest rate of receiving crime victim services (10.8 percent) among all victimization types.
- Respondents who reported their victimization to the police were more likely to have received victim services than those that did not report their crime to the police.
- Statewide, 22.1 percent of victimized respondents reported knowing about Arizona's crime victim compensation program. A larger percentage of respondents from Pima County (25.5 percent) had knowledge of the crime victim compensation program than respondents from Maricopa County (19.2 percent), and a larger percentage of Non-Hispanic residents (25.1 percent) had knowledge of the crime victim compensation program than Hispanic residents (15.1 percent).

Residents Perceptions of Crime and Safety

- Statewide, 15.2 percent of residents reported that crime is always or almost always a problem in their community. A smaller percentage of Maricopa County residents (10.1%) reported that crime is always or almost always a problem than Pima County residents (18.9%) and residents of the other 13 counties in Arizona (17.0%).

- Statewide, the majority of residents (84.5 percent) reported feeling always or almost always safe in their community. In contrast, a relatively small percentage of residents (3.8 percent) reported feeling never or almost never safe in their communities. A larger percentage of Maricopa County (88.3%) and rural county residents (87.0%) reported feeling always or almost always safe than Pima County residents (79.8%).
- A larger percentage of non-Hispanic residents (86.9%) reported feeling always or almost always safe in their community than Hispanic residents (79.0%).
- Statewide, a relatively low percentage of Arizona residents (4.2%) reported being always or almost always fearful of being a victim of violent crime.
- Statewide, approximately one in four Arizona residents (25.8 percent) reported being very concerned about someone breaking into their home while they were out. A larger percentage of Pima County residents (30.1%) reported being very concerned about someone breaking into their home while they are not at home than Maricopa County residents (22.0%).
- More than one out of three Hispanic residents (36.3%) reported being very concerned about someone breaking into their home while they are out, compared to approximately one out of five non-Hispanic residents (21.1%) reporting being very concerned about someone breaking into their home while they are out.
- Statewide, nearly one-third of residents (29.3%) reported that their police agency is very effective when people in their neighborhood call them for help and another 52.8 percent reported that their police agency was effective when people in their neighborhood call them for help.
- Approximately one-third of Maricopa County residents (33.5%) reported that their police agency is very effective when people call them for help. In contrast, approximately one-fourth of Pima County residents (25.2%) reported that their police agency is very effective when people call them for help.
- Approximately three-fourths of residents statewide (77.3%) reported that their local police agency was either very effective or effective at controlling violent crime. Maricopa County had the highest percentage of residents (80.9%) who reported that their police agency was very effective or effective at controlling violent crime and Pima County (73.4%) the lowest.
- Statewide, 57.1 percent of respondents reported that their police agency was very effective or effective at controlling drugs.
- Statewide, 70.2 percent of respondents reported that their police agencies are very effective or effective at controlling burglary.

INTRODUCTION

For more than 30 years, the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) has administered the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS). The NCVS collects self-reported information on criminal victimization from individuals 12 years of age and older. Victimization survey data has allowed researchers to better understand the “dark figure” of crime (i.e., crimes that go undetected and/or unreported), the reasons why crimes go unreported, and has served as a validity check for official data.

Although the NCVS has advanced our understanding of crime, criminal victimization, and the reporting of crime to law enforcement, the NCVS in its current form has limited practical utility at the sub-national level (i.e., state, county, and municipal) due to the concern, real and perceived that estimates derived from national data do not speak to local concerns. Additionally, and perhaps more importantly, collecting the data necessary to measure criminal victimization at the sub-state level is cost prohibitive for BJS.

The inability of the NCVS data to generate local area estimates (i.e., state and sub-state estimates) and the value of local area estimates for local policymakers and practitioners has been well documented in the National Research Council’s report titled, Ensuring the Quality, Credibility, and Relevance of U.S. Justice Statistics (National Research Council 2009). Additionally, Westat, a Washington D.C. based research and statistical survey firm, has recently completed a project that provides BJS with a variety of options for developing local area estimates of victimization from the NCVS. Although BJS and their subcontractors are working to strengthen the NCVS to provide victimization data that is meaningful to local policy and practice, the value of the local area estimates of victimization and an immediate need for victimization data for local policy and practice compelled the Arizona Statistical Analysis Center (AZSAC) to obtain funding to support an Arizona victimization survey that is modeled after the NCVS.

A Brief Summary of Arizona’s Offense Data

Like many states around the country, Arizona has experienced significant declines in violent (i.e., murder and non-negligent manslaughter, forcible rape, robbery, and aggravated assault) and property (i.e., burglary, larceny/theft, motor vehicle theft, and arson) index offense rates since 2000 (Stevenson 2011). Violent and property index offense rates are useful measures of crime and public safety because they allow for reasonable comparisons to be made of crime over time while controlling for changes in population. Yet, in states such as Arizona where the population of many jurisdictions continues to grow, the number of crimes reported to the police better describes the impact of criminal victimization on a community (i.e., the number of individuals directly impacted by crime) and on the criminal justice system and its component agencies than rates of crime.

After generally consistent increases in the number of violent index offenses reported to the police, from 27,281 in 2000 to 30,916 in 2006, the number of violent index offenses has declined to 25,902 in 2012. Even though there were more than 5,000 fewer violent offenses in 2012

compared to 2006, since 2000 there has been an average of 28,304 violent crime victims whose victimization was reported to the police in Arizona each year (Stevenson).

Arizona has enjoyed an even larger decrease in the number and rate of property crimes reported to the police. After an increase in the number of property index offenses reported to the police from 271,811 in 2000 to 318,296 in 2002, the number of property index offenses fell to 224,996 in 2012. Even with the large decline in the number of property index offenses reported to the police from 2002 to 2012, there has been an average of 271,848 property index offense victims each year in Arizona from 2000 to 2012 (Stevenson).

Data on the number of property and violent index offenses begin to describe the magnitude of the work for which the criminal justice system is responsible. These data also begin to describe the need for victim services—criminal justice system support services and services for the financial, physical, emotional, and psychological harm that can be caused by criminal victimization--which is complemented by victimization survey data. The NCVS has revealed that a large percentage of property and violent offenses go unreported to the police. While official crime data illustrates the need for justice system-based personnel, victimization data can lead to a better understanding of criminal victimizations of all kinds and the need for victim services for both governmental and non-governmental organizations.

METHODOLOGY

The Arizona Crime Victimization Survey (AZCVS) instrument is based on the NCVS instrument but modified for a brief telephone interview rather than lengthy face-to-face interviews (Appendix A). Although the primary goal of the survey is to produce estimates of violent, property, identity theft, and hate crime victimization for Arizona, Maricopa County, and Pima County, additional information was collected including whether respondents reported their victimization to the police, and if not, the reasons why they chose not to report their victimization. Additional items in the survey captured residents' perceptions of their local police agencies and their effectiveness at addressing violent crime, drug crime, and burglary. Finally, questions were included in the survey that measured awareness of and access to victim assistance and victim compensation programs.

Employing random digit dialing (RDD) and a computer assisted telephone interviewing (CATI) system from mutually exclusive samples of land line and cell phone numbers, interviews were conducted in both English and Spanish. More than one-fourth of Arizona residents are of Hispanic/Latino ethnicity according to recent Census Bureau estimates, and the ability to conduct interviews in Spanish accommodated the significant Latino population in Arizona. To generate estimates of victimization in Maricopa and Pima counties, a minimum of 800 completed surveys from residents of each of these counties were sought. Available resources allowed for an additional 200 completed surveys from residents of the other 13 counties in Arizona. This sampling strategy allows for victimization estimates and other data to be reported for each of the two largest counties in Arizona, Maricopa and Pima Counties, which comprise more than 75 percent of the population of the state, in addition to statewide estimates.

MEASURES

The findings described in this report must be clearly placed into the context in which the information was obtained. More specifically, it is important to establish for readers of this report the specific questions that led to measures of violent, property, identity theft, and hate crime victimization. This is, in part, because a lay person's understanding of the distinction between, for example, an assault, an aggravated assault, and an attempted murder is not always consistent with how a state's criminal code distinguishes between them. This results in limitations being placed on the comparability of self-reported victimization to official data on offenses that come to the attention of the criminal justice system. Importantly, this does not imply that self-reported victimization information is not valuable to the justice system, nor does it imply that respondents' victimizations, regardless of whether it was reported to the police, is any less legitimate. Instead, it is an acknowledgement that AZCVS measures of victimization types may not match up well to official data on crime. Described below are the various measures discussed in this report and the specific items that were used to create the measures.

Victimization

There were four questions asked of each respondent related to violent crime victimization (see Appendix A for complete survey instrument).

- In the last 12 months, did anyone take or attempt to take something directly from you by using force or threat of force?
- In the last 12 months, did anyone threaten to hit, attack, or assault you?
- In the last 12 months, did anyone injure you with a weapon or assault you with physical force?
- In the last 12 months, did anyone force you or attempt to force you into any unwanted sexual activity?

A single question was also asked that allowed for measures of property crime victimization. More specifically, the question respondents were asked was:

- In the last 12 months, were you the victim of a property crime such as someone attempting to steal or stealing your car, breaking into or trying to break into your home, or vandalizing your property?

In addition to the four questions that capture incidents of violent victimization, the survey also asked a series of questions about identity theft-related victimization. The questions respondents were asked were:

- In the last 12 months, have you discovered that someone used or attempted to use any of your existing credit cards or credit card numbers without your permission?
- In the last 12 months, other than a credit card account, have you discovered that someone used or attempted to use any of your existing accounts such as telephone account or bank account without your permission?

- In the last 12 months, have you discovered that someone used or attempted to use your personal information without your permission to obtain new credit cards or loans, run up debts or open other accounts or otherwise commit theft, fraud or some other crime?

Finally, one question was asked in an attempt to measure hate crime victimization.

- In the last 12 months, do you believe you were the victim of any crime because of any of your personal characteristics?

Reporting Victimization to the Police

One of the more notable and consistent findings of the NCVS is that violent and property crime victims don't always report their victimization to the police. To better understand the degree to which Arizona residents report their victimizations to the police, survey respondents who reported criminal victimizations were asked:

- Did you report it to the police?

This question is used to better understand the percentage of the sample that reported their criminal victimizations to the police and the impact reporting criminal victimization to the police has on knowledge and use of Arizona's victim compensation program and local victim assistance programs.

Perceptions of Crime and Safety

Respondents were asked three questions designed to better understand Arizona residents' perception of crime and safety in their communities. More specifically, respondents were asked:

- How often are you fearful of being the victim of a violent crime?
- To what degree do you think crime is a problem in your community?
- Are you very concerned, a little concerned, or not at all concerned about...
 - ...someone breaking into your home while you are not there?
 - ...someone breaking into your home while you are at home?
 - ...having your property vandalized?

Perceptions of Police Effectiveness

A series of questions were also asked of respondents to better understand their perceptions of the effectiveness of their local police department. Each respondent was asked the following series of questions:

- How effective would you say the police agency that services your community is in each of the following circumstances...
 - ...controlling violent crime?
 - ...controlling drugs?
 - ...controlling burglary?

Although several other questions were asked of respondents regarding their opinions of their local police department and police more generally, summary data on only the questions above are included in this report.

Awareness of Victim Services

One of ACJC's grant program areas is the Crime Victim Services Program. The Crime Victim Services Program is responsible for administering the Crime Victim Compensation and the Crime Victim Assistance programs. To assist the Crime Victim Services Program staff in better understanding Arizona residents' knowledge and use of crime victim services, the following questions were asked of respondents who reported being a crime victim in the 12 months prior to participation in the AZCVS.

- Did you receive any crime victim services after the incident(s) such as services from a victim advocate or counseling?
- Were these services provided by local police, a county attorney's office or a private, non-profit organization outside the criminal justice system?
- Did you find these services very helpful, somewhat helpful, or not at all helpful?
- Did you apply for victim compensation such as financial benefits toward losses resulting from victimization for any of the crimes we have been talking about?

SAMPLE

The AZSAC subcontracted with Arizona State University's Center for Violence Prevention and Community Safety (the Center) to collect victimization survey data. More specifically, the Center collected victimization survey data via a computer assisted telephone interview system in February and March of 2013 from a sample of individuals living in Arizona. In total, 1,878 interviews were completed, 1,336 via a land line phone and 542 via a cell phone, capturing self-reported victimization information and related data. At a 99% confidence level, a sample size of 1,878 respondents yields a confidence interval of +/- three percentage points.

Statewide Sample

Statewide, 1,878 adults ranging in age from 18 to 97 years old participated in the survey (Table 1). Although the statewide sample contains a disproportionate number of respondents from Pima County, many of the characteristics of the statewide sample mirror those of the population of the state. More specifically, the state sample is a fair representation of the population in terms of sex and ethnicity.

In contrast, AZCVS respondents are older and have higher levels of educational attainment than the population of the state. Compared to population level income data, the income levels of respondents are more moderate than the population of the state—in other words, the sample is underrepresented among the poorest and wealthiest Arizona residents. The question of whether the sample is representative in terms of race of respondent is unanswerable because of the different methods used by the census and the AZCVS for collecting race-specific information.

Table 1: Full Sample and Population Demographics		
	Sample	Population[*]
Sex		
Male	46.3%	49.7%
Female	53.7%	50.3%
Age^{**}		
18 – 24	7.4%	13.3%
25 – 34	11.1%	18.0%
35 – 44	11.4%	17.3%
45 – 54	13.4%	17.7%
55 – 64	18.3%	15.2%
65+	30.4%	18.5%
Missing		N/A
Race^{***}		
White	63.4%	84.6%
Black	2.8%	4.5%
Native American/Alaskan Native	2.2%	5.2%
Asian/Pacific Islander	1.8%	3.0%
Ethnicity		
Hispanic/Latino	31.2%	30.1%
Non-Hispanic/Latino	68.8%	69.9%
Income^{****}		
Less than \$10,000	5.1%	8.0%
\$10,000 - \$29,999	17.4%	23.1%
\$30,000 – \$49,999	14.5%	21.6%
\$50,000 - \$99,999	18.4%	30.1%
\$100,000+	8.8%	17.2%
Missing/Refused	35.8%	N/A
Education		
Less than High School	6.7%	14.8%
High School Graduate	20.0%	58.8%
GED	3.7%	
Some College	32.2%	
Bachelor's Degree	21.1%	26.4%
Post Graduate Degree	11.9%	
Missing/Refused	4.4%	N/A
Geographic Area		
Maricopa	45.5%	59.7%
Pima	43.8%	15.3%
Rest of State	10.6%	24.9%

* Population data retrieved from <http://www.workforce.az.gov/census-data.aspx> on November 6, 2013

** Population age data is the percentage of adults 18 and older in the population.

*** 23.1 percent of respondents reported Hispanic/Latino as their race. The ethnicity data reported in this table is from a separate question that only asked whether respondents considered themselves as Hispanic or Latino

**** Arizona income data from the 2010 American Community Survey retrieved from <http://www.usa.com/arizona-state-income-and-careers.htm> on November 6, 2013.

Maricopa County Sample

The Maricopa County sample mirrors the population of the county in terms of sex and ethnicity of respondents (Table 2). Similar to the population of the county, the Maricopa County sample is made up of approximately half males and half females. In terms of ethnicity of respondents, 27.6 percent of respondents in the Maricopa County sample are Hispanic, which is similar to the percentage of the county's population that is Hispanic.

Residents of Maricopa County in the sample are older and have higher levels of educational attainment than the population of the county. Compared to population level income data, the income levels of respondents are more moderate than the population of the state—in other words, when income level of respondent is known, the sample is underrepresented among the poorest and wealthiest Maricopa County residents. The question of whether the sample is representative in terms of race of respondent is unanswerable because of the different methods used by the census and the AZCVS for collecting race-specific information.

Table 2: Maricopa County Sample Respondent Demographics

	Sample	Population*
Sex		
Male	47.4%	49.5%
Female	52.6%	50.5%
Age**		
18 – 24	6.8%	13.5%
25 – 34	9.4%	19.3%
35 – 44	10.1%	18.7%
45 – 54	13.7%	17.9%
55 – 64	18.7%	14.2%
65+	33.6%	16.5%
Missing	7.7%	N/A
Race***		
White	66.2%	85.4%
Black	3.3%	5.4%
Native American/Alaskan Native	1.1%	2.7%
Asian/Pacific Islander	1.3%	3.7%
Ethnicity		
Hispanic/Latino	27.6%	30.0%
Non-Hispanic/Latino	72.4%	70.0%
Income***		
Less than \$10,000	4.3%	5.5%
\$10,000 - \$29,999	15.9%	16.8%
\$30,000 – \$49,999	14.7%	19.4%
\$50,000 - \$99,999	18.8%	32.9%
\$100,000+	10.5%	25.3%
Missing/Refused	35.8%	N/A
Education		
Less than High School	5.8%	15.7%
High School Graduate	20.7%	55.2%
GED	3.3%	
Some College	31.7%	
Bachelor’s Degree	21.5%	29.1%
Post Graduate Degree	13.5%	
Missing/Refused	3.5%	N/A

* Population data retrieved from <http://www.workforce.az.gov/census-data.aspx> on November 6, 2013

** Population age data is the percentage of adults 18 and older in the population.

*** 21.4 percent of respondents reported Hispanic/Latino as their race. The ethnicity data reported in this table is from a separate question that only asked whether respondents considered themselves as Hispanic or Latino

**** Maricopa County income data from the 2010 American Community Survey retrieved from <http://www.usa.com/arizona-state-income-and-careers.htm> on November 6, 2013.

Pima County Sample

The Pima County sample mirrors the population of the county in terms of sex, ethnicity, and educational level of respondents (Table 3). Similar to the population of the county, the Pima County sample is made up of approximately half males and half females. In terms of ethnicity of respondents, 36.0 percent of respondents in the Pima County sample are Hispanic, which is similar to the percent Hispanic in the population of the county. Finally, the percentage of Pima County residents in the AZCVS sample with high school and bachelor's degrees or higher is similar to the level in the population of the county.

In contrast, AZCVS respondents who are residents of Pima County are older and have higher levels of educational attainment than the population of the county. Compared to the population of the county, the income levels of Pima County AZCVS respondents are generally lower but it is important to note that more than one-third of respondents declined to answer the income question. The question of whether the sample is representative in terms of race of respondent is unanswerable because of the different methods used by the census and the AZCVS for collecting race-specific information.

Table 3: Pima County Sample Respondent Demographics		
	Sample	Population[*]
Sex		
Male	45.8%	49.2%
Female	54.2%	50.8%
Age^{**}		
18 – 24	7.8%	14.3%
25 – 34	13.0%	16.7%
35 – 44	13.7%	15.3%
45 – 54	12.9%	17.4%
55 – 64	17.9%	16.2%
65+	27.0%	20.0%
Missing	7.8%	N/A
Race^{***}		
White	60.3%	86.2%
Black	2.7%	4.0%
Native American/Alaskan Native	2.3%	4.2%
Asian/Pacific Islander	1.9%	3.0%
Ethnicity		
Hispanic/Latino	36.0%	35.4%
Non-Hispanic/Latino	64.0%	64.6%
Income		
Less than \$10,000	5.0%	5.2%
\$10,000 - \$29,999	17.1%	19.4%
\$30,000 – \$49,999	14.5%	20.0%
\$50,000 - \$99,999	17.7%	34.8%
\$100,000+	8.5%	20.7%
Missing/Refused	37.2%	N/A
Education		
Less than High School	7.0%	13.0%
High School Graduate	18.2%	57.5%
GED	4.6%	
Some College	32.0%	
Bachelor's Degree	21.7%	29.5%
Post Graduate Degree	11.4%	
Missing/Refused	5.0%	N/A

* Population data retrieved from <http://www.workforce.az.gov/census-data.aspx> on November 6, 2013

** Population age data is the percentage of adults 18 and older in the population.

*** 21.4 percent of respondents reported Hispanic/Latino as their race. The ethnicity data reported in this table is from a separate question that only asked whether respondents considered themselves as Hispanic or Latino

**** Pima County income data from the 2010 American Community Survey retrieved from <http://www.usa.com/arizona-state-income-and-careers.htm> on November 6, 2013.

FINDINGS

The findings presented in this report are organized by topic. Within each topic, the results for the state as a whole are presented and compared to the Maricopa County, Pima County, and rural county samples.

Victimization

Statewide, almost one out of every three Arizona residents reported being a victim of a violent, property, identity theft, or hate crime in the 12 months prior to their participation in the AZCVS (Table 4). Similar percentages of self-reported victimization were found among the Maricopa and Pima County samples. A lower percentage of respondents from the rural counties in Arizona self-reported any victimization (about one in four), although the differences between the statewide and county samples are not statistically significant.

Approximately one out of every three males self-reported victimization of the types asked about in this survey. A smaller percentage of females than males self-reported victimization, although the difference in the percentage of males and females self-reporting victimization was not statistically significant. A similar percentage of Hispanics and Non-Hispanics self-reported victimization of the types asked about in the survey.

Table 4: Percentage of Respondents Reporting Victimization by Type

	Any Victimization	Violent Crime Victimization	Property Crime Victimization	Identity Theft Victimization	Hate Crime Victimization
Region					
Statewide (n=1,878)	30.4%	5.9%	12.0%	17.4%	3.6%
Maricopa County (n=855)	31.1%	5.4%	11.5%	18.1%	3.8%
Pima County (n=823)	31.0%	6.6%	13.6%	16.8%	3.9%
Rural Counties (n=200)	24.5%	5.5%	8.0%	17.0%	2.0%
Gender					
Male (n=870)	33.2%	7.7%	14.4%	18.3%	4.2%
Female (n=1,008)	27.9%	4.4%	10.1%	16.7%	3.2%
Ethnicity					
Hispanic (n=586)	29.4%	7.3%	13.3%	13.1%	3.8%
Non-Hispanic (n=1,292)	30.8%	5.3%	11.5%	19.3%	3.6%

Violent Victimization

Violent victimization is a relatively rare event in Arizona when compared to property, identity theft, and hate crime victimization. Approximately one in twenty Arizona residents statewide self-reported a violent victimization of the type asked about in the survey (Table 5). The percentage of respondents who reported violent victimization statewide was similar to the percentage of respondents who reported violent victimization in each of the three county samples. Although a higher percentage of males and Hispanics reported violent victimization than females and Non-Hispanics, the differences were not statistically significant.

Table 5: Percentage of Respondents Reporting Violent Victimization by Type					
	Violent Crime Victimization	Robbery	Threatened w/Violence	Assault	Sexual Assault
Region					
Statewide (n=1,878)	5.9%	1.5%	3.8%	1.2%	0.3%
Maricopa County (n=855)	5.4%	1.4%	3.2%	1.3%	0.1%
Pima County (n=823)	6.6%	1.7%	4.7%	1.2%	0.5%
Rural Counties (n=200)	5.5%	1.0%	2.5%	0.5%	0.0%
Gender					
Male (n=870)	7.7%	2.0%	4.9%	1.8%	0.5%
Female (n=1,008)	4.4%	1.1%	2.8%	0.6%	0.1%
Ethnicity					
Hispanic (n=586)	7.3%	1.9%	4.6%	1.4%	0.2%
Non-Hispanic (n=1,292)	5.3%	1.3%	3.4%	1.1%	0.3%

Of the four types of violent victimization asked about in the survey, the most frequently reported type of violent victimization was being threatened with violence, followed by robbery, assault, and sexual assault. These general findings on the frequency of violent victimization by type of victimization holds true regardless of where one lives, one's gender, or one's ethnicity.

Although there is little official data specific to threats of violence, in contrast to the victimization data, of the violent index offenses reported to Arizona law enforcement agencies in 2012, there were more than twice as many aggravated assaults reported to the police than robberies, and approximately four times as many robberies reported to the police as forcible rapes (Arizona Department of Public Safety, 2013).

It is also worth noting that among the sample, more males reported being a victim of a sexual assault than females. This is in contrast to national and state victimization data that reveals that women are more likely than males to be victims of sexual assault (e.g., Truman, 2010; Rubin et al., 2011; Hiselman, 2005).

Property Victimization

Arizona residents are twice as likely to be a victim of property crime as violent crime. Approximately one out of every eight Arizona residents reported being a victim of a property crime (Table 6). Although respondents living in the rural counties, females, and non-Hispanics reported less property crime victimization than those living in Maricopa and Pima counties, males, and Hispanics, the differences were not statistically significant.

Table 6: Percentage of Respondents Reporting Property Victimization	
Region	
Statewide (n=1,878)	12.0%
Maricopa County (n=855)	11.5%
Pima County (n=823)	13.6%
Rural Counties (n=200)	8.0%
Gender	
Male (n=870)	14.4%
Female (n=1,008)	10.1%
Ethnicity	
Hispanic (n=586)	13.3%
Non-Hispanic (n=1,292)	11.5%

Identity Theft Victimization

A larger percentage of Arizona residents reported some type of identity theft victimization than any other victimization type asked about on the survey. Statewide, approximately one out of six Arizona residents reported being a victim of an identity theft crime (Table 7). Even though Maricopa County had the highest percentage of residents reporting any type of identity theft victimization, the small differences in the identity theft victimization rate by region are not statistically significant. Similarly, even though the percentage of males that reported identity theft victimization is higher than the percentage of females reporting identity theft victimization, the difference is not statistically significant.

Table 7: Percentage of Respondents Who Reported Identity Theft Victimization by Type				
	Any Identity Theft Victimization	Theft/Use of Credit Card Information	Theft/Use of Personal Account Information	Theft/Use of Personal Information
Region				
Statewide (n=1,878)	17.4%	11.4%	5.0%	5.4%
Maricopa County (n=855)	18.1%	11.8%	4.9%	5.7%
Pima County (n=823)	16.8%	11.2%	5.0%	5.0%
Rural Counties (n=200)	17.0%	10.5%	5.0%	5.5%
Gender				
Male (n=870)	18.3%	11.1%	5.9%	6.2%
Female (n=1,008)	16.7%	11.6%	4.2%	4.7%
Ethnicity				
Hispanic (n=586)	13.1%	6.8%	3.9%	4.1%
Non-Hispanic (n=1,292)	19.3%	13.5%	5.4%	6.0%

The data on identity theft victimization by ethnicity reveals a statistically significant difference between the identity theft victimization rates of Hispanics and non-Hispanics. Nearly one out of

five non-Hispanic residents of Arizona reported identity theft victimization while approximately one in eight Hispanic residents reported identity theft victimization.

Disaggregating the identity theft victimization measure into its component parts reveals additional information about identity theft victimization of Arizona residents. Stealing and/or using someone else’s credit card information (“In the last 12 months, have you discovered that someone used or attempted to use any of your existing credit cards or credit card numbers without your permission?”) is the most prevalent type of identity theft victimization reported by Arizona residents regardless of region, gender, or ethnicity. Stealing and/or using someone’s personal account information (“In the last 12 months, other than a credit card account, have you discovered that someone used or attempted to use any of your existing accounts such as telephone account or bank account without your permission?”) and stealing and/or using someone’s personal information (“In the last 12 months, have you discovered that some used or attempted to use your personal information without your permission to obtain new credit cards or loans, run up debts or open other accounts or otherwise commit theft, fraud or some other crime?”) occurred at similar rates irrespective of region, gender, or ethnicity. In contrast, non-Hispanic Arizona residents were nearly twice as likely to be victims of the theft and/or use of credit card information as Hispanic residents. This suggests that the statistically significant difference between the rates of theft and/or use of credit card information of Hispanic residents and non-Hispanic residents is driving the statistically significant difference in identity theft victimization as a whole.

Hate Crime Victimization

A relatively small percentage of respondents reported hate crime victimization during the 12 months prior to their participation in the AZCVS (Table 8). Hate crimes in the AZCVS could be of any type of crime, contingent upon respondents’ perceptions of feeling targeted because of their personal characteristics. Although there were small differences in hate crime victimization by region, gender, and ethnicity those differences were not statistically significant.

Table 8: Percentage of Victims who Reported Hate Crime Victimization	
Region	
Statewide (n=1,878)	3.6%
Maricopa County (n=855)	3.7%
Pima County (n=823)	3.9%
Rural Counties (n=200)	2.0%
Gender	
Male (n=870)	4.1%
Female (n=1,008)	3.2%
Ethnicity	
Hispanic (n=586)	3.8%
Non-Hispanic (n=1,292)	3.6%

When respondents were asked, “What personal characteristics do you believe (the hate crime) was about?” 46.3 percent of victimizations were perceived to be attacks on the person’s race or

ethnicity, 14.5 percent of victimizations were perceived as attacks on the person’s gender, 7.2 percent were perceived as attacks on the person’s age, 5.8 percent were perceived as attacks on the person’s religion, and 4.3 percent were perceived as attacks on the person’s sexual orientation. Other characteristics that were reported by respondents as the reason for the attack included, political preference, personal preference, and disability.

Reporting Victimization to the Police

Any Victimization

According to recent data from the NCVS, approximately 49.0 percent of violent victimizations and 37.0 percent of property crime victimizations nationally are reported to the police (Truman and Planty, 2012). Although the violent and property crime questions asked in the AZCVS are worded differently from the set of violent and property crime questions in the NCVS, the AZCVS data can help to better understand both the percentage of crimes not reported to the police and the reasons why crimes go unreported in Arizona.

According to the AZCVS, 50.7 percent of violent, property, and identity theft victimizations were reported to the police (Table 9). Although there are some small percentage differences by region and gender, none of the differences in reporting to the police are statistically significant. In contrast, Hispanic respondents were more likely to report their victimization to the police than non-Hispanics.

Table 9: Percentage of Victims who Reported their Victimization to the Police	
	Percentage of Victimization Reported to Police
Region	
Statewide (n=1,878)	50.7%
Maricopa County (n=855)	49.2%
Pima County (n=823)	52.2%
Rural Counties (n=200)	51.0%
Gender	
Male (n=870)	54.0%
Female (n=1,008)	49.3%
Ethnicity	
Hispanic (n=586)	59.9%
Non-Hispanic (n=1,292)	46.7%

Violent Victimization

Statewide, approximately half of the violent victimizations experienced by AZCVS respondents were reported to the police (Table 10). This is consistent with data reported above from the NCVS on violent victimizations that are reported to the police. In both Maricopa and Pima County approximately half of the violent victimizations experienced by respondents were

reported to the police. Although a slightly higher percentage of Maricopa County residents who experienced violent victimizations reported their victimization to the police than Pima County residents, the difference was not statistically significant.

In contrast, nearly two-thirds of AZCVS respondents from the 13 rural counties in Arizona reported their violent victimizations to the police, which is a statistically significant difference from victimization reporting percentages in Maricopa and Pima counties. Regional differences in reporting violent victimization to the police were also evident in the subcategories of violent victimization, specifically, robbery and threatened with violence. Rural respondents that were victims of robbery were less likely to report their victimizations to the police than respondents from Pima or Maricopa County, but were more likely to report being threatened with violence than residents of Pima County. Finally, statewide, all of the assault victimizations experienced by AZCVS respondents were reported to the police, but none of the sexual assault victimizations.

Male respondents were more likely to report their violent victimizations to the police than female respondents. In contrast, female respondents were more likely to report to the police their being threatened with violence than male respondents.

Although a higher percentage of Non-Hispanic respondents reported their violent victimizations to the police than Hispanic respondents, the difference was not statistically significant. The small differences in reporting robbery victimizations and threatened with violence victimizations to the police by ethnicity is also not statistically significant.

Table 10: Percentage of Violent Victimization Reported to the Police					
	Any Violent Victimization	Robbery	Threatened w/Violence	Assault	Sexual Assault
Region					
Statewide (n=1,878)	51.4%	64.3%	33.8%	100.0%	0.0%
Maricopa County (n=855)	52.2%	66.7%	37.0%	100.0%	0.0%
Pima County (n=823)	48.1%	64.3%	30.8%	100.0%	0.0%
Rural Counties (n=200)	63.6%	50.0%	40.0%	100.0%	0.0%
Gender					
Male (n=870)	53.7%	64.7%	25.6%	100.0%	0.0%
Female (n=1,008)	47.7%	63.6%	46.4%	100.0%	0.0%
Ethnicity					
Hispanic (n=586)	48.8%	63.6%	33.3%	100.0%	0.0%
Non-Hispanic (n=1,292)	52.9%	64.7%	34.1%	100.0%	0.0%

Reasons for Not Reporting Violent Victimization to the Police

After respondents were asked whether they reported their violent victimization to the police, if they responded that they did not report their victimization to the police, they were asked why they did not report the victimization. Table 11 summarizes the reasons given for why respondents did not report their violent crime victimization to the police.

Table 11: Reasons Why Violent Crime Victims Did Not Report Their Victimization to the Police	
I dealt with it another way	43 (39.1%)
Misc. (no explanation given)	14 (12.7%)
I was afraid of reprisals by the offender or others	13 (11.8%)
The police wouldn't help	10 (9.1%)
Someone else reported it	9 (8.2%)
It was not important enough to report	7 (6.4%)
The police couldn't do anything about it	5 (4.5%)
It was not my property	5 (4.5%)
I am afraid of the police	2 (1.8%)
The system is bad, reporting it is a waste of time	1 (0.9%)
The police take too long to respond	1 (0.9%)
Total	110 (100.0%)

The most frequent reason given for not reporting violent victimization to the police was that the respondent dealt with the violent victimization in another way. More than one-third of respondents who were victimized by a violent crime and did not report the crime to the police responded that they dealt with their violent victimization in another way. The survey did not ask what the other ways were that respondents used to deal with their violent victimization. Additionally, approximately one out of ten respondents who did not report their violent victimization to the police responded that they were too afraid of reprisals by the offender or others to report (11.8 percent) or that the police wouldn't be helpful if the crime was reported (9.1 percent).

Property Victimization

Rural county respondents were the least likely to report property crime victimization to the police (Table 12). Half (50.0 percent) of rural county respondents reported their victimization to the police while more than two-thirds of respondents living in Maricopa and Pima counties reported their property crime victimizations to the police. When looking at these data by gender, a larger percentage of male than female respondents reported their property crime victimization to the police. Finally, although a larger percentage of non-Hispanic respondents reported their

property crime victimization to the police than Hispanic respondents, the difference is not statistically significant.

Table 12: Percentage of Property Crime Victims who Reported their Victimization to the Police	
	Percentage of Victimizations Reported to Police
Region	
Statewide (n=1,878)	69.6%
Maricopa County (n=855)	70.0%
Pima County (n=823)	69.8%
Rural Counties (n=200)	50.0%
Gender	
Male (n=870)	72.4%
Female (n=1,008)	66.1%
Ethnicity	
Hispanic (n=586)	68.1%
Non-Hispanic (n=1,292)	70.3%

Reasons for Not Reporting Property Crime Victimization to the Police

The most frequently mentioned reason for not reporting property victimization to the police was that the respondent dealt with the victimization in another way (Table 13). Of all the reasons given for not reporting property victimizations to the police, more than one out of five property victimizations went unreported because the respondent dealt with the victimization in another way. The next three most frequently mentioned reasons why respondents did not report their property victimization to the police are, it was not important enough to report (19.7 percent), the police couldn't do anything about it (18.9 percent), and the police wouldn't help (16.7 percent).

Table 13: Reasons Why Property Crime Victims Did Not Report Their Victimization to the Police	
I dealt with it another way	29 (22.0%)
It was not important enough to report	26 (19.7%)
The police couldn't do anything about it	25 (18.9%)
The police wouldn't help	22 (16.7%)
Someone else reported it	8 (6.1%)
Misc. (no explanation given)	6 (4.5%)
I was afraid of reprisals by the offender or others	4 (3.0%)
The system is bad, reporting it is a waste of time	4 (3.0%)
I wasn't aware of being victimized right away	4 (3.0%)
The police take too long to respond	2 (1.5%)
It was not my property	1 (0.8%)
My insurance would not cover it	1 (0.8%)
Total	132 (100.0%)

Identity Theft Victimization

Identity theft victimizations were the least likely of the victimization types asked about on the survey to have been reported to the police. Statewide, approximately one-fourth of identity theft victimizations were reported to the police (Table 14). Respondents in the rural counties of Arizona were more likely to have reported identity theft victimizations to the police than respondents residing in Maricopa and Pima counties. Although there were differences in reporting of victimizations to the police among identity theft victimization subcategories, stealing and/or using respondent's personal information was the only subcategory where statistically significant differences were found. Respondents residing in Pima County were more likely to report the stealing and/or using of respondent's personal information to the police than respondents in Maricopa County or the rural counties of Arizona.

Table 14: Percentage of Identity Theft Victims who Reported their Victimization to the Police				
	Any Identity Theft Victimization	Theft/Use of Credit Card Information	Theft/Use of Personal Account Information	Theft/Use of Personal Information
Region				
Statewide (n=1,878)	27.8%	11.2%	15.1%	8.9%
Maricopa County (n=855)	24.5%	8.9%	14.3%	6.1%
Pima County (n=823)	27.5%	14.1%	14.6%	14.6%
Rural Counties (n=200)	44.1%	9.5%	20.0%	0.0%
Gender				
Male (n=870)	28.3%	12.4%	17.6%	11.1%
Female (n=1,008)	27.4%	10.3%	11.9%	6.4%
Ethnicity				
Hispanic (n=586)	35.1%	20.0%	8.7%	8.3%
Non-Hispanic (n=1,292)	25.6%	9.2%	17.1%	9.1%

Reasons for Not Reporting Identity Theft Victimization to the Police

Like all other types of victimization the AZCVS asked about, the most frequently mentioned reason for not reporting identity theft victimizations to the police was that the respondent dealt with the victimization in another way (Table 15). Of all the reasons given for not reporting identity theft victimizations to the police, almost half went unreported to the police because the respondent dealt with the victimization in another way. The next two most frequently mentioned reasons why respondents did not report their identity theft victimizations to the police are, someone else reported it (16.5 percent) and it was not the respondents' property (12.5 percent).

Table 15: Reasons Why Identity Theft Victims Did Not Report Their Victimization to the Police	
I dealt with it another way	184 (49.9%)
Someone else reported it	61 (16.5%)
It was not my property	46 (12.5%)
The system is bad, reporting it is a waste of time	30 (8.1%)
It was not important enough to report	16 (4.3%)
The police couldn't do anything about it	12 (3.3%)
Misc. (no explanation given)	11 (3.0%)
I was afraid of reprisals by the offender or others	3 (0.8%)
The police take too long to respond	3 (0.8%)
My insurance would not cover it	3 (0.8%)
I wasn't aware of being victimized right away	2 (0.5%)
I am afraid of the police	1 (0.3%)
Total	369 (100.0%)

Hate Crime Victimization

Slightly more than one-fourth of hate crime victims statewide reported their victimization to the police (Table 16). When looking at these same data by region, 50.0 percent of the respondents who live in Pima County and were victims of a hate crime reported their victimization to the police. In contrast, 6.3 percent of the respondents who live in Maricopa County and were victims of a hate crime reported their victimization to the police. One-fourth of rural county residents who were victims of hate crimes reported their victimization to the police. When looking at these data by gender and ethnicity, female and non-Hispanic respondents hate crime victims were more likely to report their victimization to the police than were male and Hispanic residents of Arizona.

Table 16: Percentage of Hate Crime Victims who Reported their Victimization to the Police	
	Percentage of Victimitizations Reported to Police
Region	
Statewide (n=1,878)	27.9%
Maricopa County (n=855)	6.3%
Pima County (n=823)	50.0%
Rural Counties (n=200)	25.0%
Gender	
Male (n=870)	19.4%
Female (n=1,008)	37.5%
Ethnicity	
Hispanic (n=586)	9.1%
Non-Hispanic (n=1,292)	37.0%

Reasons for Not Reporting Hate Crime Victimization to the Police

The most frequently mentioned reason for not reporting hate crime victimizations to the police was that, like all other victimization types, the respondent dealt with the victimization in another way (Table 17). Of all the reasons given for not reporting hate crime victimization to the police, nearly half (44.7% percent) were not reported because the respondent dealt with the victimization in another way. The next two most frequently mentioned reasons why respondents did not report their hate crime victimization to the police were, it was not important enough to report (18.4 percent) and the police wouldn't help (13.2 percent).

Table 17: Reasons Why Hate Crime Victims Did Not Report Their Victimization to the Police	
I dealt with it another way	17 (44.7%)
It was not important enough to report	7 (18.4%)
The police wouldn't help	5 (13.2%)
The police couldn't do anything about it	2 (5.3%)
Someone else reported it	2 (5.3%)
I was afraid of reprisals by the offender or others	2 (5.3%)
It was not my property	1 (2.6%)
I am afraid of the police	1 (2.6%)
Misc. (no explanation given)	(2.6%)
Total	38 (100.0%)

Victim Services

The AZCVS presented an ideal opportunity to collect information about knowledge and use of Arizona's victim assistance and victim compensation programs by Arizona residents. Victim assistance programs are intended to help crime victims with a variety of needs that included, but are not limited to, crisis intervention services, emergency services, counseling and other supportive services, court-related services, and notification services. The victim compensation program provides eligible crime victims with the resources to cover crime-related expenses (e.g., medical costs, mental health counseling, funerals, etc.) that were a result of their victimization.¹

Crime Victim Assistance

Statewide, 6.0 percent of respondents who were victimized in the 12 months prior to participation in the AZCVS reported receiving crime victim services from a governmental (e.g., law enforcement agency, city attorney's office, county attorney's office, etc.) or non-profit

¹ The general eligibility criteria for Arizona's crime victim compensation program includes: The crime occurred in Arizona, or the victim is an Arizona resident who is victimized in an area that lacks a crime victim compensation program, or is a victim of international terrorism; The crime was reported to a police agency within 72 hours of its discovery unless a good cause is shown to justify the delay; The application is filed within two years of the crime, in the county in which the crime occurred, unless good cause is shown to justify the delay; The victim willingly cooperates with law enforcement agencies; The victim suffers a physical injury, a medical condition, mental distress, or death as a direct result of the criminally injurious conduct; The victim incurs an economic loss as a direct result of the crime that is not covered by a benefit or advantage that the person is entitled to receive from another source.

agency (Table 18). Although there are some differences by region in the percentage of victimized respondents who received crime victim services, the differences are not statistically significant. Similarly, the small differences by gender and ethnicity in receiving crime victim services are not statistically significant.

Respondents that reported violent crime victimization in the 12 months prior to participation in the AZCVS reported the highest rate of receiving crime victim services among all victimization types. Approximately one in ten violent crime victims received crime victim services from a governmental or non-governmental organization. In contrast, identity theft victims were the least likely to have received victim services.

Across all categories of victims (i.e., region, gender, ethnicity, and type of victimization), respondents who reported their victimization to the police were more likely to have received victim services than those that did not report their crime to the police. What remains unknown is the reason why respondents who reported their victimizations to the police were more likely to receive victim services. It may be that respondents who reported their victimization to the police were made more aware of victim services by law enforcement officers and/or had easier access to law enforcement and prosecutor-based victim services through participation in the criminal justice system process. An equally plausible explanation could be that respondents who reported their victimization to the police were victims of more serious crimes than respondents who did not report their victimization to the police leading to a greater need for services. It could also be that some other unknown factor contributed to a higher percentage of victims who reported their victimization to the police receiving crime victim services.

Table 18: Percentage of Crime Victims Who Received Crime Victim Services?		
	All Victims	Of Victims Who Reported the Victimization to the Police
Region		
Statewide (n=1,878)	6.0%	9.3%
Maricopa County (n=570)	5.3%	6.9%
Pima County (n=255)	7.1%	12.8%
Rural Counties (n=49)	4.1%	4.0%
Gender		
Male (n=289)	5.9%	9.6%
Female (n=264)	6.0%	9.0%
Ethnicity		
Hispanic (n=586)	6.4%	9.7%
Non-Hispanic (n=398)	5.8%	9.1%
Victimization Type		
Any Victimization (n=570)	6.0%	9.3%
Violent Crime Victim (n=111)	10.8%	14.0%
Property Crime Victim (n=226)	7.1%	10.1%
Identity Theft Victim (n=327)	3.1%	7.7%

The findings from the AZCVS on the utilization of victim services are generally consistent with data from the NCVS. For example, from 1993 to 2009, about nine percent of serious crime victims received assistance from a victim service agency (Langton, 2011). Additionally, as was found among respondents to the AZCVS, victims who report their victimizations to the police are more likely to receive assistance from a victim service agency than those that do not report their victimizations to the police. From 2000 to 2009, approximately 14.0 percent of violent crime victims who reported their victimization to the police received assistance from a victim service agency, compared to 4.0 percent of victims who did not report their victimization to the police (Langton, 2011).

Victim Compensation

Respondents to the AZCVS were also asked whether they knew about Arizona’s crime victim compensation program. Statewide, 22.1 percent of victimized respondents reported knowing about Arizona’s crime victim compensation program (Table 19). A larger percentage of respondents from Pima County (25.4 percent) had knowledge of the crime victim compensation program than respondents from Maricopa County (19.2 percent).

A larger percentage of victimized male respondents (24.6 percent) knew of the crime victim compensation program than victimized female respondents (19.6 percent), although the difference is not statistically significant. Similarly, a larger percentage of victimized Non-Hispanic respondents (25.1 percent) had knowledge of the crime victim compensation program than victimized Hispanic respondents (15.1 percent).

Table 19: Knowledge of Arizona’s Victim Compensation Program				
	Any Victimization	Violent Victimization	Property Victimization	Identity Theft Victimization
Region				
Statewide (n=1,878)	22.1%	24.3%	22.5%	22.3%
Maricopa County (n=855)	19.2%	23.9%	20.3%	19.4%
Pima County (n=823)	25.5%	27.8%	25.4%	24.6%
Rural Counties (n=200)	20.4%	9.1%	16.7%	26.5%
Gender				
Male (n=870)	24.6%	26.9%	25.0%	26.4%
Female (n=1,008)	19.6%	20.5%	19.4%	18.5%
Ethnicity				
Hispanic (n=586)	15.1%	18.6%	23.4%	11.7%
Non-Hispanic (n=1,292)	25.1%	27.9%	22.0%	25.6%

Statewide, 23.2 percent of respondents who were victimized during the 12 months prior to their participation in the AZCVS and reported their victimization to the police knew about the crime victim compensation program (Table 20). When looking at these same data by region, Pima County had the highest percentage of respondents (26.3 percent) who knew about the crime

victim compensation program and rural county respondents had the lowest level of knowledge (16.0 percent).

Similar to the data on awareness of the crime victim compensation program, a higher percentage of victimized males (26.9 percent) than victimized females (18.8 percent) who reported their victimization to the police knew of the crime victim compensation program. Non-Hispanic respondents were also more likely to have knowledge of the crime victim compensation program than Hispanic respondents.

Table 20: Knowledge of Arizona’s Victim Compensation Program Among Respondents Who Reported Their Victimization to the Police				
	Any Victimization Reported to the Police	Violent Victimization Reported to the Police	Property Victimization Reported to the Police	Identity Theft Victimization Reported to the Police
Region				
Statewide (n=1,878)	23.2%	22.8%	23.9%	19.8%
Maricopa County (n=855)	21.4%	16.7%	24.6%	13.2%
Pima County (n=823)	26.3%	30.8%	22.8%	26.3%
Rural Counties (n=200)	16.0%	14.3%	27.3%	20.0%
Gender				
Male (n=870)	26.9%	33.3%	24.4%	24.4%
Female (n=1,008)	18.8%	4.8%	23.3%	15.2%
Ethnicity				
Hispanic (n=586)	16.5%	14.3%	22.2%	0.0%
Non-Hispanic (n=1,292)	26.9%	27.8%	24.8%	28.1%

Perceptions of Crime and Safety

The AZCVS also presented the opportunity to collect information from Arizona residents on their perceptions of crime and safety in their communities. Respondents were asked a series of questions about their perceptions of crime and safety in their communities.

Is crime a problem in your community?

Statewide, 15.2 percent of respondents reported that crime is always or almost always a problem in their community (Table 21). In contrast, 40.0 percent of respondents reported that crime is never or almost never a problem in their community. When looking at the responses to this question by region, 10.1 percent of Maricopa County residents reported that crime was always or almost always a problem. The percentage of Maricopa County respondents who reported that crime was always or almost always a problem was lower than respondents in Pima County or the rural counties of Arizona and the differences were statistically significant. When looking at the gender and ethnicity of the respondent, the small differences in which respondents reported that crime was always or almost always a problem was not statistically significant.

Not surprisingly, respondents who reported no violent, property, or identity theft victimizations in the 12 months prior to completing the survey were the least likely to report that crime was always or almost always a problem in their community. Statewide, 11.4 percent of respondents who experience no victimizations in the 12 months prior to taking the survey reported that crime was always or almost always a problem. In contrast, 22.0 percent of respondents who reported identity theft victimization, 30.1 percent of respondents who reported property crime victimization and 40.5 percent of respondents who reported violent victimization thought that crime was always or almost always a problem in their communities. All of the differences in respondents' perceptions of crime as always or almost always a problem in their community are statistically significant.

Table 21: “To what degree do you think crime is a problem in your community?”			
	Always or Almost Always a Problem	Sometimes a Problem	Never or Almost Never a Problem
Region			
Statewide (n=1,878)	15.2%	43.1%	40.0%
Maricopa County (n=855)	10.1%	43.0%	43.8%
Pima County (n=823)	18.9%	42.6%	36.8%
Rural Counties (n=200)	17.0%	45.5%	36.5%
Gender			
Male (n=870)	16.8%	39.3%	42.2%
Female (n=1,008)	13.8%	46.4%	38.1%
Ethnicity			
Hispanic (n=586)	16.4%	44.9%	37.4%
Non-Hispanic (n=1,292)	14.7%	42.3%	41.2%
Victimization Type			
No Victimization (n=1,308)	11.4%	40.7%	45.9%
Property Crime Victim (n=226)	30.1%	48.7%	20.8%
Violent Crime Victim (n=111)	40.5%	37.8%	18.9%
Identity Theft Victim (n=327)	22.0%	44.6%	32.4%

How safe do you feel?

Statewide, the majority of respondents (84.5 percent) reported feeling always or almost always safe in their community (Table 22). In contrast, few respondents (3.8 percent) reported feeling never or almost never safe in their communities. When looking at these data by region, a larger percentage of Maricopa County and rural county residents reported feeling always or almost always safe compared to Pima County residents.

Although there was a small percentage difference between males and females perceptions of safety, the difference was not statistically significant. In contrast, a lower percentage of Hispanic residents than non-Hispanic residents reported feeling always or almost always safe in their community and that difference was statistically significant.

Table 22: “How safe do you feel in your community?”

	Always or Almost Always Safe	Sometimes Safe	Never or Almost Never Safe
Region			
Statewide (n=1,878)	84.5%	11.6%	3.8%
Maricopa County (n=855)	88.3%	8.0%	3.6%
Pima County (n=823)	79.8%	15.8%	4.1%
Rural Counties (n=200)	87.0%	10.0%	3.0%
Gender			
Male (n=870)	86.1%	9.4%	4.3%
Female (n=1,008)	83.0%	13.5%	3.4%
Ethnicity			
Hispanic (n=586)	79.0%	15.4%	5.5%
Non-Hispanic (n=1,292)	86.9%	9.9%	3.0%
Victimization Type			
No Victimization (n=1,308)	89.7%	8.0%	2.1%
Property Crime Victim (n=226)	62.8%	23.5%	13.7%
Violent Crime Victim (n=111)	58.6%	27.0%	14.4%
Identity Theft Victim (n=327)	77.1%	16.8%	5.8%

There were also statistically significant differences in feelings of safety, based on respondents’ recent history of victimization. Respondents who experienced no victimizations of the type the survey inquired about were the most likely to report feeling always or almost always safe in their community. Statewide, almost nine out of ten Arizona residents who experienced no victimization in the 12 months prior to completing the survey reported feeling always or almost always safe in their community. As might be expected, residents who were victims of a violent crime in the 12 months prior to participation in the AZCVS were the least likely to report feeling safe or almost always safe in their communities.

Fear of Victimization

Statewide, a relatively low percentage of Arizona residents (4.2%) reported being always or almost always fearful of being a victim of violent crime (Table 23). Although there were small percentage differences by region in respondents’ fear of violent crime victimization, none of the differences were statistically significant. Similarly, small percentage differences in respondents’ fear of violent crime victimization by gender and ethnicity were also not statistically significant.

In contrast, respondents’ recent victimization experience was correlated with fear of violent crime victimization. Not surprisingly, respondents who did not report any property, violent, or identity theft victimization in the 12 months prior to completing the victimization survey reported the lowest levels of fear of violent crime victimization (2.7 percent). Respondents who reported being a victim of a violent crime during the 12 months preceding the completion of the

survey were the most likely to report being always or almost always fearful of being a victim of a violent crime. Approximately one out of seven (14.4 percent) Arizona residents who reported being a victim of a violent crime in the 12 months preceding the survey reported being always or almost always fearful of being violently victimized again. Although the percentage of violent crime victims who reported being always or almost always fearful of being a victim of a violent crime was not statistically significantly different from the percentage of property crime victims who reported being always or almost always fearful of being a victim of violent crime, it was statistically significantly higher than the percentage of non-victims and identity theft victims who reported being fearful of being a victim of a violent crime.

Table 23: “How often are you fearful of being a victim of a violent crime?”

	Always or Almost Always Fearful	Sometimes Fearful	Never or Almost Never Fearful
Region			
Statewide (n=1,878)	4.2%	17.9%	77.2%
Maricopa County (n=855)	4.6%	17.9%	77.0%
Pima County (n=823)	3.5%	19.2%	76.7%
Rural Counties (n=200)	6.0%	13.0%	80.5%
Gender			
Male (n=870)	3.6%	15.2%	80.6%
Female (n=1,008)	4.8%	20.3%	74.3%
Ethnicity			
Hispanic (n=586)	5.8%	19.6%	74.4%
Non-Hispanic (n=1,292)	3.6%	17.2%	78.5%
Victimization Type			
No Victimization (n=1,308)	2.7%	13.8%	82.9%
Property Crime Victim (n=226)	8.9%	30.5%	59.7%
Violent Crime Victim (n=111)	14.4%	45.0%	45.0%
Identity Theft Victim (n=327)	6.8%	24.8%	67.9%

Concern for Home While Out

Statewide, approximately one in four Arizona residents (25.8 percent) reported being very concerned about someone breaking into their home while they were out (Table 24). Although there were differences by region in the percentage of respondents who reported being very concerned about someone breaking into their home while they were out, the differences were not statistically significant except for the difference between Pima and Maricopa County. A larger percentage of Pima County residents reported being very concerned about someone breaking into their home while they are not at home than Maricopa County residents.

Males and females statewide have similar levels of concern about someone breaking into their homes while they are not there. Although there are small percentage differences between male and female respondents being very concerned about someone breaking into their home while they are not there, the differences are not statistically significant. In contrast, there was a large

statistically significant difference in respondents concern about someone breaking into their home while they are out by ethnicity of respondent. More than one out of three Hispanic respondents reported being very concerned about someone breaking into their home while they are out, compared to approximately one out of five non-Hispanic respondents reporting being very concerned about someone breaking into their home while they are out.

Not surprisingly, respondents level of concern about someone breaking into their home while they are out varied by their victimization status. Respondents who reported being a victim of a property crime during the 12 months prior to completing the survey were the most likely to report being very concerned about someone breaking into their home while they are out. Nearly half of property crime victims reported being very concerned about someone breaking into their home while they are out. Although a smaller percentage of violent crime victims than property crime victims reported being very concerned about their home being broken into while they are out, the difference was not statistically significant. Illustrating the varying impact that victimization type can have on respondents' concerns about the safety of their home, approximately one-third of identity theft victims reported being very concerned about someone breaking into their home while they are out. Respondents who did not report any victimization during the 12 months prior to completing the survey reported the lowest levels of concern (21.3 percent) about someone breaking into their home while they were out.

Table 24: How concerned are you about someone breaking into your home while you are not there?			
	Very Concerned	A Little Concerned	Not at All Concerned
Region			
Statewide (n=1,878)	25.8%	42.7%	30.0%
Maricopa County (n=855)	22.0%	46.1%	30.2%
Pima County (n=823)	30.1%	39.6%	29.3%
Rural Counties (n=200)	24.5%	41.0%	32.0%
Gender			
Male (n=870)	24.9%	42.8%	30.6%
Female (n=1,008)	26.6%	42.7%	29.5%
Ethnicity			
Hispanic (n=586)	36.3%	37.2%	25.4%
Non-Hispanic (n=1,292)	21.1%	45.2%	32.0%
Victimization Type			
No Victimization (n=1,308)	21.3%	42.7%	34.3%
Property Crime Victim (n=226)	47.3%	38.1%	13.7%
Violent Crime Victim (n=111)	43.2%	45.0%	10.8%
Identity Theft Victim (n=327)	34.3%	43.7%	21.4%

Concern for Home While at Home

A lower percentage of respondents reported being very concerned about someone breaking into their home while they were there than reported being very concerned about someone breaking into their home while they were out. Approximately one out of five respondents statewide

reported that they were very concerned about someone breaking into their home while they were at home (Table 25). Although there were small percentage differences in respondents level of concern about their homes being broken into while they were at home by region and by gender, the differences were not statistically significant.

Similar to other data on fear of crime and safety, the victimization experiences of respondents impacts their level of concern about their homes being broken into while they are at home. Respondents who reported being a victim of a property or violent crime were the most likely to report being very concerned about their homes being broken into while they were there. Slightly more than one-third of property and violent crime victims reported being very concerned about their homes being broken into while they were at home. Approximately one-fourth of respondents who reported being a victim of an identity theft-related crime reported being very concerned about their homes being broken into while they were at home. Respondents who reported no victimization within the 12 months prior to the survey were the least likely to report being very concerned about someone breaking into their home while they were there. Less than one-fifth of respondents who did not experience victimization in the 12 months prior to completing the survey reported being very concerned about someone breaking into their home while they were there.

Table 25: How concerned are you about someone breaking into your home while you are there?			
	Very Concerned	A Little Concerned	Not at All Concerned
Region			
Statewide (n=1,878)	20.9%	32.4%	45.4%
Maricopa County (n=855)	18.5%	33.9%	46.0%
Pima County (n=823)	23.9%	31.1%	43.6%
Rural Counties (n=200)	18.5%	31.0%	50.0%
Gender			
Male (n=870)	18.4%	31.7%	48.0%
Female (n=1,008)	23.0%	32.9%	43.1%
Ethnicity			
Hispanic (n=586)	29.2%	30.9%	38.6%
Non-Hispanic (n=1,292)	17.1%	33.0%	48.5%
Victimization Type			
No Victimization (n=1,308)	17.2%	31.7%	49.8%
Property Crime Victim (n=226)	36.7%	34.1%	27.9%
Violent Crime Victim (n=111)	36.0%	36.9%	25.2%
Identity Theft Victim (n=327)	28.1%	31.8%	38.8%

Concern about Vandalism of Property

Respondents to the AZCVS were also asked the degree to which they were concerned about having their property vandalized (Table 26). Approximately one in five respondents statewide reported being very concerned about their property being vandalized. Although there was

variation by region and gender in the percentage of respondents who reported being very concerned about having their property vandalized, the differences are not statistically significant.

Nearly one in three Hispanic respondents statewide reported being very concerned about their property being vandalized, which was significantly higher than the percentage of non-Hispanic respondents who reported being very concerned about their property being vandalized.

Respondents who were victimized in the 12 months prior to participation in the AZCVS were more likely to be very concerned about having their property vandalized than respondents who were not victimized. Property crime victims had the highest percentage of being very concerned about their property being vandalized, followed by violent crime victims and identity theft victims. Respondents who experienced no victimization in the 12 months prior to their participation in the AZCVS were the least likely to report being very concerned about their property being vandalized.

Table 26: How concerned are you about having your property vandalized?			
	Very Concerned	A Little Concerned	Not at All Concerned
Region			
Statewide (n=1,878)	20.3%	36.6%	41.4%
Maricopa County (n=855)	18.4%	38.0%	41.9%
Pima County (n=823)	22.8%	35.8%	40.0%
Rural Counties (n=200)	18.5%	33.5%	45.0%
Gender			
Male (n=870)	19.2%	37.1%	41.1%
Female (n=1,008)	21.3%	36.1%	41.6%
Ethnicity			
Hispanic (n=586)	27.6%	32.4%	38.2%
Non-Hispanic (n=1,292)	17.0%	38.5%	42.8%
Victimization Type			
No Victimization (n=1,308)	16.6%	35.2%	46.3%
Property Crime Victim (n=226)	43.4%	36.3%	19.9%
Violent Crime Victim (n=111)	34.2%	37.8%	25.2%
Identity Theft Victim (n=327)	25.4%	40.7%	33.3%

Why perceptions of safety and fear of crime matter

In 2010, the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) published *Reducing Fear of Crime: Strategies for Police* (Cordner, 2010). In this report, Cordner makes the case for including fear reduction as part of the work of police agencies, in part, by citing the work of Wesley Skogan of Northwestern University. In 2006, Skogan published, *Police and Community Chicago: A Tale of Three Cities* in which he wrote the following:

“The costs of fear are both individual and collective. Fear can confine people to their homes, and it undermines their trust in their neighbors and, especially, in

their neighbors' children. Fear is a key "quality of life" issue for many people. Research also indicates that concern about crime has bad consequences for the neighborhoods in which we live. Fear leads to withdrawal from public life, and it undermines informal and organized efforts by the community to control crime and delinquency. It is difficult to organize activities in neighborhoods where people fear their own neighbors. Fear undermines the value of residential property and thus the willingness of owners to maintain it properly. When customers—and even employees—fear entering a commercial area, the viability of businesses located there is threatened." (p. 255)

This brief excerpt from Skogan's book illustrates the many consequences of fear from crime—consequences for individuals, neighborhoods, and business owners. While it is true that police agencies must focus on reducing crime and victimization, reducing fear of crime and enhancing personal security remains an important component of the police mission.

Perceptions of the Police

Police Effectiveness

The AZCVS also provided the opportunity to ask respondents a series of questions about the performance of their local police agencies. Respondents were asked for their opinions on the effectiveness of their police agency when people in their neighborhood call them for help (Table 27). Statewide, just less than one-third of respondents reported that their police agency is very effective when people in their neighborhood call them for help and another half reported that their police agency was effective when people in their neighborhood call them for help. Less than one out of every ten respondents reported that the police were ineffective or very ineffective when people in their neighborhood call them for help.

Approximately one-third of Maricopa County respondents reported that their police agency is very effective when people call them for help. In contrast, approximately one-fourth of Pima County respondents reported that their police agency is very effective when people call them for help. Although there were small percentage differences by gender and ethnicity in respondents' opinions about the effectiveness of their police agency when called for help, the differences were not statistically significant.

Respondents who did not experience any victimizations in the past 12 months were the most likely to report that their police agency is very effective when called for help. Nearly one-third (30.5%) of respondents who reported no victimizations in the 12 months prior to participating in the AZCVS responded that their local police agency was very effective when called for help. In contrast, a much lower percentage of respondents (19.8 percent) who experienced a violent victimization in the 12 months prior to participating in the survey reported that their local police agency is very effective when called for help.

Table 27: How effective would you say your police agency is when people in your neighborhood call them for help ?

	Very Effective	Effective	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Not Sure
Region					
Statewide (n=1,878)	29.3%	52.8%	5.8%	1.8%	9.8%
Maricopa County (n=855)	33.5%	51.8%	4.3%	0.8%	9.5%
Pima County (n=823)	25.2%	53.9%	6.9%	2.6%	10.9%
Rural Counties (n=200)	29.0%	52.5%	7.5%	2.5%	6.5%
Gender					
Male (n=870)	26.4%	54.9%	6.1%	1.7%	10.5%
Female (n=1,008)	31.8%	51.0%	5.6%	1.8%	9.2%
Ethnicity					
Hispanic (n=586)	25.8%	54.9%	7.0%	2.4%	9.4%
Non-Hispanic (n=1,292)	31.0%	51.9%	5.3%	1.5%	10.0%
Victimization Type					
No Victimization (n=1,308)	30.5%	53.9%	4.8%	0.9%	9.6%
Property Crime Victim (n=226)	23.9%	54.3%	8.7%	5.8%	5.8%
Violent Crime Victim (n=111)	19.8%	45.9%	16.2%	6.3%	9.9%
Identity Theft Victim (n=327)	26.9%	52.3%	7.6%	2.8%	9.8%

Respondents were also asked for their opinions on their police agency’s effectiveness at controlling violent crime (Table 28). Approximately three-fourths of respondents statewide reported that their local police agency was either very effective or effective at controlling violent crime. Maricopa County had the highest percentage of respondents who reported that their police agency was very effective or effective at controlling violent crime and Pima County the lowest. Although the difference between Maricopa and Pima County was statistically significant, all other differences by region were not statistically significant.

When looking at responses by victimization type, approximately one-fourth of respondents who reported no victimizations in the 12 months prior to participation in the AZCVS reported that their police agency was effective at controlling violent crime, which was higher than all other victimization types. Although there is variation by type of victimization, only the difference between respondents who reported no victimizations and those that reported any other type of victimization in the 12 months prior to their participation in the AZCVS was statistically significant.

Table 28: How effective would you say your police agency is at controlling violent crime?

	Very Effective	Effective	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Not Sure
Region					
Statewide (n=1,878)	23.3%	54.0%	8.2%	1.9%	12.1%
Maricopa County (n=855)	26.2%	54.7%	6.1%	1.3%	11.6%
Pima County (n=823)	20.2%	53.2%	10.4%	2.7%	13.0%
Rural Counties (n=200)	24.0%	54.0%	8.0%	1.0%	10.5%
Gender					
Male (n=870)	23.0%	53.9%	8.6%	2.0%	12.2%
Female (n=1,008)	23.6%	54.1%	7.8%	1.8%	12.0%
Ethnicity					
Hispanic (n=586)	22.9%	55.8%	10.2%	2.2%	8.2%
Non-Hispanic (n=1,292)	23.5%	53.2%	7.3%	1.7%	13.9%
Victimization Type					
No Victimization (n=1,308)	25.2%	55.3%	6.2%	1.2%	11.6%
Property Crime Victim (n=226)	16.4%	46.9%	17.7%	6.6%	11.5%
Violent Crime Victim (n=111)	18.0%	42.3%	19.8%	6.3%	11.7%
Identity Theft Victim (n=327)	18.7%	52.0%	12.5%	2.4%	14.1%

Survey respondents were also asked for their opinions on the effectiveness of their police agency at controlling drugs (Table 29). Statewide, 14.9 percent of respondents reported that their police agency was very effective at controlling drugs and another 42.2 percent reported that their police agency was effective at controlling drugs. Although there is some variation by region in respondents' opinions of their police agency's effectiveness at controlling drugs, the differences are not statistically significant. Similarly, although there was also variation in respondents' opinions of their police agencies' effectiveness at controlling drugs by gender and ethnicity, the differences were not statistically significant.

There were statistically significant differences in respondents' opinions of their police agencies' effectiveness at controlling drugs by victimization type. More than six out of ten respondents (61.6 percent) who reported no victimizations in the 12 months prior to taking the survey also reported that their police agencies were very effective or effective at controlling drugs. Just less than half (48.9 percent) of respondents who reported an identity theft victimization reported that their police agencies were effective or very effective at controlling drugs. Respondents who reported a violent or property victimization in the 12 months prior to participating in the AZCVS were the least likely to report that their police agencies were effective at controlling drugs, 41.6 percent and 42.3 percent, respectively.

Table 29: How effective would you say your police agency is at controlling drugs?

	Very Effective	Effective	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Not Sure
Region					
Statewide (n=1,878)	14.9%	42.2%	18.9%	4.7%	18.6%
Maricopa County (n=855)	16.6%	43.2%	16.5%	3.6%	19.8%
Pima County (n=823)	13.4%	40.6%	21.3%	5.7%	18.3%
Rural Counties (n=200)	14.0%	44.5%	19.5%	5.5%	14.5%
Gender					
Male (n=870)	14.3%	43.9%	20.7%	4.8%	15.5%
Female (n=1,008)	15.5%	40.7%	17.4%	4.7%	21.2%
Ethnicity					
Hispanic (n=586)	15.2%	44.7%	20.3%	5.3%	13.8%
Non-Hispanic (n=1,292)	14.8%	41.0%	18.3%	4.5%	20.7%
Victimization Type					
No Victimization (n=1,308)	15.9%	45.7%	15.5%	3.7%	18.5%
Property Crime Victim (n=226)	10.6%	31.0%	30.1%	11.5%	15.9%
Violent Crime Victim (n=111)	15.3%	27.0%	31.5%	14.4%	9.9%
Identity Theft Victim (n=327)	11.3%	37.6%	24.2%	5.5%	20.8%

Respondents were also asked for their opinions on the effectiveness of their police agencies at controlling burglary (Table 30). Statewide, 70.2 percent of respondents reported that their police agencies are very effective or effective at controlling burglary. Although there is slight variation by region in respondents' opinions of the effectiveness of their police agencies at controlling burglary, the differences are not statistically significant. Similarly, although there are some differences by gender and ethnicity in the percentage of respondents who reported that their police agencies are very effective or effective at controlling burglary, those differences are not statistically significant.

Similar to other questions about the effectiveness of respondents' police agencies, the differences in respondents' opinions of the effectiveness of their police agencies at controlling burglary by type of victimization are statistically significant. Nearly three-fourths of respondents (73.7 percent) who did not report being victimized during the 12 months prior to participation in the AZCVS, reported that their police agencies were very effective or effective at controlling burglary. A much smaller percentage of respondents who experienced victimization during the 12 months prior to participation in the AZCVS, regardless of victimization type, thought that their police agencies were very effective or effective at controlling burglary. The difference in respondents' opinions of their police agencies effectiveness at controlling burglary between respondents who experienced victimization and those who did not are statistically significant.

Table 30: How effective would you say your police agency is at controlling burglary?

	Very Effective	Effective	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Not Sure
Region					
Statewide (n=1,878)	18.7%	51.5%	14.0%	2.6%	12.7%
Maricopa County (n=855)	21.5%	51.8%	13.2%	1.3%	12.0%
Pima County (n=823)	15.8%	51.8%	15.4%	3.9%	12.5%
Rural Counties (n=200)	19.0%	49.5%	11.0%	2.5%	16.0%
Gender					
Male (n=870)	17.7%	50.7%	16.9%	2.9%	11.4%
Female (n=1,008)	19.6%	52.3%	11.4%	2.3%	13.8%
Ethnicity					
Hispanic (n=586)	17.7%	53.6%	14.5%	3.9%	9.6%
Non-Hispanic (n=1,292)	19.2%	50.6%	13.7%	1.9%	14.1%
Victimization Type					
No Victimization (n=1,308)	19.8%	53.9%	10.2%	1.5%	14.2%
Property Crime Victim (n=226)	13.3%	38.5%	31.0%	8.8%	7.1%
Violent Crime Victim (n=111)	10.8%	36.9%	34.2%	9.9%	6.3%
Identity Theft Victim (n=327)	17.7%	47.4%	19.9%	4.6%	9.8%

Conclusion

Since the 1930’s, the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) has been collecting data on criminal offenses that have been reported to the police. These data are routinely used to describe the frequency of property and violent crime in any given year and measure change in property and violent crime over time at the local, state, and national level. Yet, a primary limitation of these data is that they do not include any criminal offenses that do not come to the attention of the police.

To better understand the “dark figure” of crime—the crimes that avoid detection by the criminal justice system—BJS has, since the 1970’s, administered the NCVS which collects information on the frequency and characteristics of criminal victimization directly from crime victims. The NCVS complements official data collected by the FBI and their state and local partners by collecting information on criminal victimization regardless of whether the victimization was reported to the police. Among the many contributions NCVS data has made to the field include estimates of the percentage of violent and property crimes that go unreported to the police and an understanding of the reasons why crime victims do not report their victimizations to the police. But, in contrast to the FBI’s Uniform Crime Reporting Program, NCVS data is generally unavailable at the state and sub-state level, which limits the value of the NCVS data to state and local criminal justice system planning and policy.

To provide Arizona with victimization data that are collected from Arizona residents and can be used to inform state and local criminal justice policy and practice, the AZSAC obtained funding from BJS to conduct the AZCVS. The data from the AZCVS provides criminal justice system

policymakers, practitioners, and researchers with data on the victimization of Arizona residents that complements official offense and arrest data collected by Arizona law enforcement agencies.

The AZCVS data yield many insights into victimization and the perspectives of Arizona residents on crime and the criminal justice system. Estimates generated from the AZCVS reveal that approximately half of violent victimizations and more than two-thirds of property victimizations experienced by Arizona residents were reported to the police. The percentage of violent victimizations reported to the police by Arizona residents is similar to what was found by the NCVS. In contrast, Arizona residents (69.9 percent) reported a higher percentage of property victimizations to the police than residents nationwide (37.0 percent). Additionally, the primary reason given why residents did not report their victimization to the police was because they dealt with the victimization in another, unspecified, way.

Conducting an Arizona-specific victimization survey also allowed for questions to be added that tap into the issues that are currently impacting Arizona's criminal justice system. For example, added to the AZCVS were a series of questions about identity theft-related crimes that revealed that more Arizona residents are impacted by identity theft than violent or property crime. Approximately one out of every six Arizona residents reported being a victim of an identity theft-related crime in the 12 months prior to their taking the survey. Yet, identity theft-related victimizations were the least likely to be reported to the police.

Also added to the AZCVS were questions about residents' knowledge and use of crime victim services (e.g., victim assistance and victim compensation). Although a relatively low percentage of residents that experienced victimization used victim assistance services (6.0 percent), a larger percentage of residents who experienced violent victimization used victim services than residents who experienced other victimization types. It is worth noting that residents who reported their victimization to the police were more likely to have received victim services than residents who did not.

In addition to these general findings, the AZCVS reveals some important gender, ethnic, and regional variation that, because of their national focus, are not revealed by the NCVS. For example, male residents of Arizona were more likely to report violent victimization in general to the police than female residents, although females are more likely to report being threatened with violence than males. A larger percentage of Non-Hispanic residents (86.9 percent) reported feeling always or almost always safe in the community than Hispanic residents (79.0 percent). Finally, a smaller percentage of Maricopa County residents (10.1 percent) reported that crime is always or almost always a problem than Pima County residents (18.9 percent).

The findings discussed here and throughout the report illustrate the value of a state-specific victimization survey that complements what is learned from official data. As the criminal justice system continues to embrace and implement data-driven policy and practice, collecting data that reveals what is unique about Arizona and its criminal justice system is critical to making informed decisions that improve the effectiveness and efficiency of Arizona's criminal justice system.

References

- Arizona Department of Public Safety. 2013. 2012 Crime in Arizona Report. Arizona Department of Public Safety. Phoenix, AZ.
- Cordner, Gary. 2010. Reducing Fear of Crime: Strategies for Police United States Department of Justice, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services. Washington, DC.
- Hiselman, Jennifer. 2005. The Extent and Nature of Adult Crime Victimization in Illinois, 2002 The Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority. Chicago, IL.
- Langton, Lynn. 2011. "Use of Victim Service Agencies by Victims of Serious Crime, 1993 – 2009." United States Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics. Washington, DC.
- National Research Council. 2009. Ensuring the Quality, Credibility, and Relevance of U.S. Justice Statistics. Panel to Review the Programs of the Bureau of Justice Statistics. Robert M. Groves and Daniel L. Cork, eds. Committee on National Statistics and Committee on Law and Justice, Division of Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.
- Rubin, Mark, Jennifer Dodge, and Eric Chiasson. 2011. Maine Crime Victimization Report: Informing Public Policy for Safer Communities. Maine School of Public Service, University of Southern Maine. Portland, ME.
- Skogan, Wesley. 2006. Police and Community in Chicago: A Tale of Three Cities. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Stevenson, Phillip. 2011. Arizona Crime Trends: A System Review. Arizona Criminal Justice Commission. Phoenix, AZ.
- Truman, Jennifer L. and Michael Rand. (2010). "Criminal Victimization, 2009." United States Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics. Washington, DC.

Appendix A

Hello, my name is _____ and I'm calling on behalf of Arizona State University and the Arizona Criminal Justice Commission. We're conducting a study on crime in Arizona and I'd like to speak with someone in your household for a few minutes.

- A. In order to get a balanced sample of Arizona residents, I need to speak with the person 18 years of age or older in your household who had the most recent birthday.

IF RESPONDENT IS THE PERSON – GO TO QUESTION D
IF OTHER PERSON COMES TO PHONE – GO TO QUESTION B
IF RESPONDENT NOT AVAILABLE – ARRANGE CALLBACK
IF REFUSE – THANK AND TERMINATE

- B. Hello, my name is _____ and I'm calling on behalf of Arizona State University and the Arizona Criminal Justice Commission. We're conducting a study on crime in Arizona and I'd like to speak with you for a few minutes.

- C. Before we get started, are you 18 years of age or older?

IF YES: CONTINUE
IF NO: ASK TO SPEAK WITH PERSON 18 OR OLDER, RE-INTRODUCE YOURSELF AND CONTINUE.

IF NONE AVAILABLE, ARRANGE CALLBACK.
IF NONE IN HOUSEHOLD, TERMINATE

- D. Do you consider yourself to be Hispanic or Latino?

Yes...1
No...2

(GO TO Q1)

CELL PHONE VERSION

Hello, my name is _____ and I'm calling on behalf of Arizona State University and the Arizona Criminal Justice Commission. We're conducting a study on crime in Arizona and I'd like to speak with you for a few minutes.

- A. Before we get started, are you 18 years of age or older?

IF YES: CONTINUE
IF NO: THANK AND TERMINATE

- B. Is your residence located in the state of Arizona?

Yes...1
No...2

IF YES: CONTINUE
IF NO: THANK AND TERMINATE

C. And do you consider yourself to be Hispanic or Latino?

Yes...1
No...2

D. Are you currently driving a car, truck or operating machinery?

IF YES: (ARRANGE CALLBACK)
IF NO: (CONTINUE)

1. To begin, how safe do you feel in your community?

(READ EACH EXCEPT NOT SURE/REFUSED)

Always safe...1
Almost always safe...2
Sometimes safe...3
Almost never safe...4
Never safe...5
(DON'T READ) Not sure...6
Refused...7

2. How often are you fearful of being the victim of a violent crime?

(READ EACH EXCEPT NOT SURE/REFUSED)

Never...1
Almost never...2
Sometimes...3
Almost always...4
Always...5
(DON'T READ) Not sure...6
Refused...7

3. To what degree do you think crime is a problem in your community?

(READ EACH EXCEPT NOT SURE/REFUSED)

Never a problem...1
Almost never a problem...2

Sometimes a problem...3
 Almost always a problem...4
 Always a problem...5
 (DON'T READ) Not sure...6
 Refused...7

4. Next, are you very concerned, a little concerned or not at all concerned about each of the following events?

	Very	A Little	Not At All	Not Sure	Refused
A. Someone breaking into your home while you are not there	1	2	3	4	5
B. Someone breaking into your home while you are at home	1	2	3	4	5
C. Having your property vandalized	1	2	3	4	5

5. Next, I'd like to read you a list of events that may or may not have occurred in your life over the last 12 months. As I read each one, please just tell me if it did or did not happen to you.

	Yes	No	Refused
A. In the last 12 months, were you the victim of a property crime such as someone attempting to steal or stealing your car, breaking into or trying to break into your home or vandalizing your	1	2	3
B. In the last 12 months, did anyone take or attempt to take something directly from you by using force or threat of force	1	2	3
C. In the last 12 months, have you discovered that someone used or attempted to use any of your existing credit cards or credit card numbers without your permission	1	2	3
D. In the last 12 months, other than a credit card account, have you discovered that someone used or attempted to use any of your existing accounts such as telephone account or bank account without your permission	1	2	3
E. In the last 12 months, have you discovered that someone used or attempted to use your personal information without your permission to obtain new credit cards or loans, run up debts or open other accounts or otherwise commit theft, fraud or some other crime	1	2	3
F. In the last 12 months, did anyone threaten to hit, attack or assault you	1	2	3
G. In the last 12 months, did anyone injure you with a weapon or assault you with physical force.	1	2	3
H. In the last 12 months, did anyone force you or attempt to force you into any unwanted sexual activity	1	2	3
I. In the last 12 months, do you believe you were the victim of any crime			

because of any of your personal characteristics 1 2 3

INSTRUCTION A

- IF Q5A = 1, GO TO Q6
- IF Q5B = 1, GO TO Q7
- IF Q5C = 1, GO TO Q8
- IF Q5D = 1, GO TO Q9
- IF Q5E = 1, GO TO Q10
- IF Q5F = 1, GO TO Q12
- IF Q5G = 1, GO TO Q13
- IF Q5H = 1, GO TO Q14
- IF Q5I = 1, GO TO Q15
- IF NO/REFUSED TO ALL (A-I), GO TO Q17

6. How many times in the last 12 months were you the victim of a property crime such as someone attempting to steal or stealing your car, breaking into or trying to break into your home or vandalizing your property? (CODE REFUSED 99)

NUMBER:

6a. IF ONE VICTIMIZATION – Did you report it to the police?

No/Zero...1 (GO TO Q6b)

Yes/1 time...2

IF MORE THAN ONE VICTIMIZATION – How many of these times did you report it to the police? (CODE REFUSED 99)

NUMBER: (GO TO Q6c)

6b. Why did you not report your victimization(s) to the police? (DON'T READ; RECORD ALL MENTIONS; REPEAT FOR EACH VICTIMIZATION)

- Someone else reported it...1
- I dealt with it another way...2
- It was not important enough to report...3
- My insurance wouldn't cover it...4
- The police couldn't do anything...5
- The police wouldn't help...6
- I am afraid of the police...7
- I was afraid of reprisal by the offender or others...8
- Other (SPECIFY)

6c. Did you receive any crime victim services after the incident(s) such as services from a victim advocate or counseling?

Yes...1 (GO TO Q6d)
No...2 (GO TO INSTRUCTION A)

6d. Were these services provided by local police, a county attorney's office or a private, non-profit organization outside the criminal justice system?

Local police...1
County attorney...2
Private, non-profit...3

6e. Did you find these services very helpful, somewhat helpful or not at all helpful?

Very helpful...1
Somewhat helpful...2
Not at all helpful...3

(GO TO INSTRUCTION A)

7. How many times in the last 12 months did anyone take or attempt to take something directly from you by using force or the threat of force? (CODE REFUSED 99)

NUMBER:

7a. IF ONE VICTIMIZATION – Did you report it to the police?

(GO TO Q7b) No/Zero...0
Yes/1 time...1

IF MORE THAN ONE VICTIMIZATION – How many of these times did you report it to the police? (CODE REFUSED 99)

NUMBER: (GO TO Q7c)

7b. Why did you not report your victimization(s) to the police? (DON'T READ; RECORD ALL MENTIONS; REPEAT FOR EACH VICTIMIZATION)

Someone else reported it...1
I dealt with it another way...2
It was not important enough to report...3
My insurance wouldn't cover it...4
The police couldn't do anything...5
The police wouldn't help...6
I am afraid of the police...7
I was afraid of reprisal by the offender or others...8
Other (SPECIFY)

7c. Did you receive any crime victim services after the incident(s) such as services from a victim advocate or counseling?

Yes...1(GO TO Q7d)

No...2(GO TO INSTRUCTION A)

7d. Were these services provided by local police, a county attorney's office or a private, non-profit organization outside the criminal justice system?

Local police...1

County attorney...2

Private, non-profit...3

7e. Did you find these services very helpful, somewhat helpful or not at all helpful?

Very helpful...1

Somewhat helpful...2

Not at all helpful...3

(GO TO INSTRUCTION A)

8. How many times in the last 12 months have you discovered that someone used or attempted to use any of your existing credit cards or credit card numbers without your permission? (CODE REFUSED 99)

NUMBER:

8a. IF ONE VICTIMIZATION – Did you report it to the police?

No/Zero...1 (GO TO Q8b)

Yes/1 time...2 (GO TO Q8c)

IF MORE THAN ONE VICTIMIZATION – How many of these times did you report it to the police? (CODE REFUSED 99)

NUMBER:

8b. Why did you not report your victimization(s) to the police? (DON'T READ; RECORD ALL MENTIONS; REPEAT FOR EACH VICTIMIZATION)

Someone else reported it...1

I dealt with it another way...2

It was not important enough to report...3

My insurance wouldn't cover it...4

The police couldn't do anything...5

The police wouldn't help...6
I am afraid of the police...7
I was afraid of reprisal by the offender or others...8
Other (SPECIFY)

8c. Did you receive any crime victim services after the incident(s) such as services from a victim advocate or counseling?

Yes...1 (GO TO Q8d)
No...2 (GO TO INSTRUCTION A)

8d. Were these services provided by local police, a county attorney's office or a private, non-profit organization outside the criminal justice system?

Local police...1
County attorney...2
Private, non-profit...3

8e. Did you find these services very helpful, somewhat helpful or not at all helpful?

Very helpful...1
Somewhat helpful...2
Not at all helpful...3

(GO TO INSTRUCTION A)

9. How many times in the last 12 months, for other than a credit card account, have you discovered that someone used or attempted to use any of your existing accounts such as telephone account or bank account without your permission? (CODE REFUSED 99)

NUMBER:

9a. IF ONE VICTIMIZATION – Did you report it to the police?

No/Zero...0 (GO TO Q9b)
Yes/1 time...1

IF MORE THAN ONE VICTIMIZATION – How many of these times did you report it to the police? (CODE REFUSED 99)

NUMBER: (GO TO Q9c)

9b. Why did you not report your victimization(s) to the police? (DON'T READ; RECORD ALL MENTIONS; REPEAT FOR EACH VICTIMIZATION)

Someone else reported it...1
I dealt with it another way...2
It was not important enough to report...3
My insurance wouldn't cover it...4
The police couldn't do anything...5
The police wouldn't help...6
I am afraid of the police...7
I was afraid of reprisal by the offender or others...8
Other (SPECIFY)

9c. Did you receive any crime victim services after the incident(s) such as services from a victim advocate or counseling?

Yes...1 (GO TO Q9d)

No...2 (GO TO INSTRUCTION A)

9d. Were these services provided by local police, a county attorney's office or a private, non-profit organization outside the criminal justice system?

Local police...1

County attorney...2

Private, non-profit...3

9e. Did you find these services very helpful, somewhat helpful or not at all helpful?

Very helpful...1

Somewhat helpful...2

Not at all helpful...3

(GO TO INSTRUCTION A)

10. How many times in the last 12 months have you discovered that someone used or attempted to use your personal information without your permission to obtain new credit cards or loans, run up debts or open other accounts or otherwise commit theft, fraud or some other crime? (CODE REFUSED 99)

NUMBER:

10a. IF ONE VICTIMIZATION – Did you report it to the police?

No/Zero...0 (GO TO Q10b)

Yes/1 time...1

IF MORE THAN ONE VICTIMIZATION – How many of these times did you report it to the police? (CODE REFUSED 99)

NUMBER: (GO TO Q10c)

10b. Why did you not report your victimization(s) to the police? (DON'T READ; RECORD ALL MENTIONS; REPEAT FOR EACH VICTIMIZATION)

- Someone else reported it...1
- I dealt with it another way...2
- It was not important enough to report...3
- My insurance wouldn't cover it...4
- The police couldn't do anything...5
- The police wouldn't help...6
- I am afraid of the police...7
- I was afraid of reprisal by the offender or others...8
- Other (SPECIFY)

10c. Did you receive any crime victim services after the incident(s) such as services from a victim advocate or counseling?

- Yes...1 (GO TO Q10d)
- No...2 (GO TO INSTRUCTION B)

10d. Were these services provided by local police, a county attorney's office or a private, non-profit organization outside the criminal justice system?

- Local police...1
- County attorney...2
- Private, non-profit...3

10e. Did you find these services very helpful, somewhat helpful or not at all helpful?

- Very helpful...1
- Somewhat helpful...2
- Not at all helpful...3

INSTRUCTION B

IF YES TO EITHER Qs 5C, 5D or 5E, GO TO Q11;
OTHERWISE GO TO INSTRUCTION A

11. Over the last 12 months, how many total dollars, if any, do you estimate you lost while your credit cards, accounts or other personal information were being misused?

AMOUNT:

(GO TO INSTRUCTION A)

12. How many times in the last 12 months did anyone threaten to hit, attack, or assault you? (CODE REFUSED 99)

NUMBER:

12a. What was your relationship, if any, to the person(s) who threatened to hit, attack or assault you? (DON'T READ; RECORD ALL MENTIONS)

Did not see anyone...1

Stranger...2

A casual acquaintance...3

A person or people who are well known to me, excluding family...4

A family member including an unmarried partner living in your home...5

Refused...6

12b. IF ONE VICTIMIZATION – Did you report it to the police?

No/Zero...1 (GO TO Q12c)

Yes/1 time...2

IF MORE THAN ONE VICTIMIZATION – How many of these times did you report it to the police? (CODE REFUSED 99)

NUMBER: (GO TO Q12d)

12c. Why did you not report your victimization(s) to the police? (DON'T READ; RECORD ALL MENTIONS; REPEAT FOR EACH VICTIMIZATION)

Someone else reported it...1

I dealt with it another way...2

It was not important enough to report...3

My insurance wouldn't cover it...4

The police couldn't do anything...5

The police wouldn't help...6

I am afraid of the police...7

I was afraid of reprisal by the offender or others...8

Other (SPECIFY)

12d. Did you receive any crime victim services after the incident(s) such as services from a victim advocate or counseling?

Yes...1 (GO TO Q12e)

No...2 (GO TO INSTRUCTION A)

12e. Were these services provided by local police, a county attorney's office or a private, non-profit organization outside the criminal justice system?

Local police...1

County attorney...2

Private, non-profit...3

12f. Did you find these services very helpful, somewhat helpful or not at all helpful?

Very helpful...1

Somewhat helpful...2

Not at all helpful...3

(GO TO INSTRUCTION A)

13. How many times in the last 12 months did anyone injure you with a weapon or assault you with physical force? (CODE REFUSED 99)

NUMBER:

13a. What was your relationship, if any, to the person(s) who injured you with a weapon or assaulted you with physical force? (DON'T READ; RECORD ALL MENTIONS)

Did not see anyone...1

Stranger...2

A casual acquaintance...3

A person or people who are well known to me, excluding family...4

A family member including an unmarried partner living in your home...5

Refused...6

13b. IF ONE VICTIMIZATION – Did you report it to the police?

No/Zero...0 (GO TO Q13c)

Yes/1 time...1

IF MORE THAN ONE VICTIMIZATION – How many of these times did you report it to the police? (CODE REFUSED 99)

NUMBER: (GO TO Q13d)

13c. Why did you not report your victimization(s) to the police? (DON'T READ; RECORD ALL MENTIONS; REPEAT FOR EACH VICTIMIZATION)

Someone else reported it...1

I dealt with it another way...2

It was not important enough to report...3

My insurance wouldn't cover it...4

The police couldn't do anything...5

The police wouldn't help...6

I am afraid of the police...7

I was afraid of reprisal by the offender or others...8

Other (SPECIFY)

13d. Did you receive any crime victim services after the incident(s) such as services from a victim advocate or counseling?

Yes...1 (GO TO Q13e)

No...2 (GO TO INSTRUCTION A)

13e. Were these services provided by local police, a county attorney's office or a private, non-profit organization outside the criminal justice system?

Local police...1

County attorney...2

Private, non-profit...3

13f. Did you find these services very helpful, somewhat helpful or not at all helpful?

Very helpful...1

Somewhat helpful...2

Not at all helpful...3

(GO TO INSTRUCTION A)

14. How many times in the last 12 months did anyone force you or attempt to force you into any unwanted sexual activity? (CODE REFUSED 99)

NUMBER:

14a. What was your relationship, if any, to the person(s) who forced you or attempted to force you into any unwanted sexual activity? (DON'T READ; RECORD ALL MENTIONS)

Did not see anyone...1

Stranger...2

A casual acquaintance...3

A person or people who are well known to me, excluding family...4

A family member including an unmarried partner living in your home...5

Refused...6

14b. IF ONE VICTIMIZATION – Did you report it to the police?

No/Zero...0 (GO TO Q14c)

Yes/1 time...1

IF MORE THAN ONE VICTIMIZATION – How many of these times did you report it to the police? (CODE REFUSED 99)

NUMBER: (GO TO Q14d)

14c. Why did you not report your victimization(s) to the police? (DON'T READ; RECORD ALL MENTIONS; REPEAT FOR EACH VICTIMIZATION)

- Someone else reported it...1
- I dealt with it another way...2
- It was not important enough to report...3
- My insurance wouldn't cover it...4
- The police couldn't do anything...5
- The police wouldn't help...6
- I am afraid of the police...7
- I was afraid of reprisal by the offender or others...8
- Other (SPECIFY)

14d. Did you receive any crime victim services after the incident(s) such as services from a victim advocate or counseling?

- Yes...1 (GO TO Q14e)
- No...2 (GO TO INSTRUCTION A)

14e. Were these services provided by local police, a county attorney's office or a private, non-profit organization outside the criminal justice system?

- Local police...1
- County attorney...2
- Private, non-profit...3

14f. Did you find these services very helpful, somewhat helpful or not at all helpful?

- Very helpful...1
- Somewhat helpful...2
- Not at all helpful...3

(GO TO INSTRUCTION A)

15. How many times in the last 12 months do you believe you were the victim of any crime because of any of your personal characteristics? (CODE REFUSED 99)

NUMBER:

15a. What personal characteristic do you believe (it was/they were) about? (READ EACH EXCEPT REFUSED)

- Race...1
- Religion...2

Ethnic background...3
Disability...4
Gender...5
Sexual orientation...6
Other (SPECIFY)
Refused...9

15b. IF ONE VICTIMIZATION – Did you report it to the police?

(GO TO Q15c) No/Zero...0
Yes/1 time...1

IF MORE THAN ONE VICTIMIZATION – How many of these times did you report it to the police? (CODE REFUSED 99)

NUMBER: (GO TO Q15d)

15c. Why did you not report your victimization(s) to the police? (DON'T READ; RECORD ALL MENTIONS; REPEAT FOR EACH VICTIMIZATION)

Someone else reported it...1
I dealt with it another way...2
It was not important enough to report...3
My insurance wouldn't cover it...4
The police couldn't do anything...5
The police wouldn't help...6
I am afraid of the police...7
I was afraid of reprisal by the offender or others...8
Other (SPECIFY)

15d. Did you receive any crime victim services after the incident(s) such as services from a victim advocate or counseling?

Yes...1(GO TO Q15e)
No...2 (GO TO INSTRUCTION C)

15e. Were these services provided by local police, a county attorney's office or a private, non-profit organization outside the criminal justice system?

Local police...1
County attorney...2
Private, non-profit...3

15f. Did you find these services very helpful, somewhat helpful or not at all helpful?

Very helpful...1
 Somewhat helpful...2
 Not at all helpful...3

INSTRUCTION C

IF YES TO ANY IN Q 5A-I SERIES, GO TO 16

16. Did you know that some crime victims are eligible to apply for financial benefits as compensation toward losses resulting from victimization?

Yes...1 (GO TO Q16a)
 No...2 (GO TO Q17)

16a. Did you apply for victim compensation such as financial benefits toward losses resulting from victimization for any of the crimes we've been talking about?

Yes...1
 No...2

17. Next, which one of the following law enforcement agencies has primary law enforcement responsibility for policing your neighborhood? (READ EACH EXCEPT REFUSED)

Your local city police...1
 Your county sheriff's office...2
 The Arizona Department of Public Safety...3
 OTHER (SPECIFY)
 (DON'T READ) Refused...9

17a. What is the name of the law enforcement agency that has primary responsibility for policing your neighborhood?

18. Would you be very likely, likely, unlikely or very unlikely to call this police agency under each of the following circumstances?

(ROTATE)

	Very Likely	Likely	Unlikely	Very Unlikely	Not Sure	Refused
A. To report a theft/burglary where you were the victim	1	2	3	4	5	6
B. To report a minor crime	1	2	3	4	5	6
C. To report a serious crime	1	2	3	4	5	6
D. To report a violent crime where you were the victim	1	2	3	4	5	6

19. Next, do you strongly agree, agree, disagree or strongly disagree with each of the following statements about the police agency that serves your community? (ROTATE)

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Sure	Refused
A. They treat people with respect	1	2	3	4	5	6
B. They take time to listen to people . . .	1	2	3	4	5	6
C. They generally act professionally . . .	1	2	3	4	5	6
D. They respect people's rights	1	2	3	4	5	6
E. They treat people fairly	1	2	3	4	5	6
F. They can be trusted to make decisions that are right for my community	1	2	3	4	5	6
G. They usually explain their actions and/or decisions	1	2	3	4	5	6
H. They generally treat racial or ethnic minorities differently.	1	2	3	4	5	6
I. They try to solve problems or do something when called	1	2	3	4	5	6
J. Most police officers in my community do their job well	1	2	3	4	5	6
Most police officers in my community are honest and trustworthy					1 2 3 4 5 6	

20. And along the same line, do you strongly agree, agree, disagree or strongly disagree with each of the following statements? (ROTATE)

Strongly Agree	Strongly Disagree	Not Sure	Refused
A. You should accept police decisions, even if you think they are wrong		1 2 3 4 5 6	
B. You should do what police tell you to do even if you disagree		1 2 3 4 5 6	

21. How effective would you say the police agency that services your community is in each of the following circumstances – very effective, effective, ineffective or very ineffective? (ROTATE)

Very Effective	Effective	Inef. - Not Effective	Very Inef.	Refused
A. When people in your neighborhood call them for help				1 2 3 4 5 6
B. Controlling violent crime				1 2 3 4 5 6
C. Controlling drugs				1 2 3 4 5 6
D. Controlling burglary				1 2 3 4 5 6

22. How often does the police agency that services your community do each of the following – very frequently, frequently, occasionally, rarely, very rarely or never? (ROTATE)

Very Occa- Very Not

Frequently Frequently sionally Rarely Rarely Never Sure Refused
 A. Treat people disrespectfully 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
 B. Use too much force when dealing
 with citizens 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

23. Now before we finish, I'd like to ask you a few questions about yourself for classification purposes. First, in what year were you born?

YEAR: / 1 / 9 / / /

24. What is your marital status?

- Married...1
- Widowed...2
- Divorced...3
- Separated...4
- Never married...5
- Refused...6

25. What is the highest level of regular education you have had the opportunity to complete?

- Less than 12th grade...1
- High school (completed the 12th grade)...2
- Obtained GED...3
- Some undergraduate college...4
- Bachelor's degree...5
- Post graduate degree...6
- Refused...7

26. Are you currently (READ EACH EXCEPT NOT SURE/REFUSED)

- Employed full time...1
- Employed part time...2
- A student...3
- Homemaker...4
- Unemployed...5
- Retired...6
- Disabled...7
- (DON'T READ Not sure...8
- Refused...9

27. Do you own or rent your place of residence?

- Own...1
- Rent...2

Refused...3

28. How long have you lived at your current address? (CODE REFUSED 99)

NUMBER:

29. How many times, if any, have you moved in the past five years?

NUMBER:

30. (CELL ONLY) What is the zip code of your primary place of residence?

/////

31. Which of the following categories best describes your race? (READ EACH EXCEPT REFUSED)

White...1

Black/African American...2

American Indian...3

Asian...4

Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander...5

Other (SPECIFY)

(DON'T READ) Refused...9

32. What language do you usually speak at home?

English...1

Spanish...2

Other...3

Refused...4

33. Was your total family income for last year, I mean before taxes and including everyone in your household, under or over \$30,000?

UNDER \$30,000

Was it under \$10,000...1

or over \$10,000...2

Refused...3

OVER \$30,000

Was it under \$50,000...4

\$50,000 to 99,999...5

or over \$100,000...6

Refused...7

REFUSED OVERALL...8

34. And finally, are you a citizen of the United States? (GO TO CLOSE)

Yes...1

No...2(GO TO 34a)

Refused...3

34a. Are you currently authorized to live in the United States?

Yes...1

No...2

Refused...3

Thank you very much, that completes this interview. My supervisor may want to call you to verify that I conducted this interview so may I have your first name in order that he/she may do so? (VERIFY PHONE NUMBER)

NAME:

PHONE #

FROM SAMPLE:

ZIP CODE: