

Assessment of the V.I.C.T.I.M. Project

by

Bruce K. Britton, Robert S. Baron,

Alice K. Sanders, Stephen S. Fox

74-DF-07-0006

NCJRS

JUN 25 1976

ACQUISITIONS

39190

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
Introduction.	1
Method.	4
Results	7
Discussion.	14
Appendix I.	19
Appendix II	22
Appendix III.	31

List of Tables

	<u>Page</u>
Table 1 - Comparisons between the contacted victim group and the non-contacted victim group.....	9
Table 2 - Attitudes of victims and non-victims toward police...	11
Table 3 - The number of times a group was most favorable, least favorable or intermediate toward the Des Moines Police across the 50 attitude items.....	12

This study was part of a project funded by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. The project was designated as the V.I.C.T.I.M. project. It involved the following: In August of 1974 the Des Moines Police Department began an experimental program of contacting burglary victims and discussing with them 1) whether there were any additional leads or other information about the crime that were not mentioned earlier and 2) ways in which they (the victims) could minimize the threat of break-ins. In addition the visiting officer left pamphlets about minimizing the threat of breaking-and-entering and etched the victim's social security number on any valuables the victim designated.

One aspect of the V.I.C.T.I.M. project was that some assessment be made of how the program affected police-community relations. This report provides this assessment along with a description of how the assessment was conducted.

The reader should note that the major focus of this report is whether or not the V.I.C.T.I.M. project: 1) improved public attitudes toward the police; 2) was an effective means of providing burglary victims with preventive information such that they: a) remembered it; b) instituted preventive procedures; and c) mentioned this information to others.

A final focus of this report is 3) the extent to which the V.I.C.T.I.M. project aided in the solution of burglary cases involved (e.g., by uncovering new leads, etc.).

Information on points 1 and 2 comes from interviews and questionnaire responses collected by our staff while information on point 3 comes from

the report written by the V.I.C.T.I.M. project personnel (i.e., police officers) following their visit to the burglary victim. (Burglary victims and other participants in this study will hereafter be referred to as "subjects").

In order to draw conclusions about points 1 and 2 (listed above) three groups of subjects will be compared. One group will be those subjects who were burglarized and then randomly assigned to be visited by an officer as part of the V.I.C.T.I.M. project. These people will be called contacted victims. A second group of subjects will be people who were burglarized and then randomly assigned to be not visited. These people will be referred to as non-contacted victims. The third group of subjects will be people who reported to our staff that they had not been victimized by a burglary in the last year. These people will be called non-victim controls. By comparing the responses of contacted victims to non-contacted victims we can directly assess the effects of being in the V.I.C.T.I.M. project since that is the only difference between these two groups.

Comparing the two victim groups to the non-victim control subjects allows us to determine if non-victims felt differently about the police department and crime prevention. This comparison, however, does not tell us if being victimized caused any differences we observe in attitudes since people could not very well be randomly assigned to be victims and non-victims. As a result these two groups may represent different types of people. In fact, in our sample non-victims tended to be wealthier and slightly older than victims. Thus it is possible that any attitude differences we observe between these groups may have existed before the victims were victimized.

Plan of this report.

This report contains an Introduction, a Method section, a Results section, and a Discussion section. The Introduction explains: why the assessment was conducted; what data it focuses on and how conclusions will be drawn (i.e., what groups will be included in the study and why). The Method section describes briefly the number of subjects and how they were selected, the general procedure usually followed by the V.I.C.T.I.M. project personnel, and the general procedure followed by our assessment staff of interviewers. The results section presents the data and in the discussion section we offer some conclusions.

Method

Subjects.

253 subjects in total were asked to participate in this assessment study. Of these, 222 subjects agreed to do so: 79 in the contacted victim group, 69 in the non-contacted victim group, and 74 in the non-victim control group. Fourteen of these people were Black, 1 was a Native American Indian, and the remainder were Caucasian. The average age was 41 years, the average yearly income \$13,000, and the average educational level was 1.8 years of college. This is a description of the average breaking-and-entering victim who reported the case to the police. This sample may not be representative of all victims since we cannot know the characteristics of breaking-and-entering victims who fail to report the crime. Certainly the victim population in our sample is not representative of the entire population of Des Moines. Victims in our sample tend to be business owners or self-employed people. Therefore, their average income and educational level is higher than what would be typical of the total population of the city. The non-victim controls were selected so they would be similar to the victims. Therefore, the proportion of non-victims who owned businesses is larger in our sample than in the population at large. This probably accounts for the smaller number of minorities, the higher level of education and the higher average income than one would expect to find in the general community. Another 14 subjects also participated, but their data was discarded because they failed to fully complete the questionnaire.

Any person who had reported to the police that he or she had been the victim of a breaking-and-entering after May, 1974, was eligible to be in the V.I.C.T.I.M. project. The assessment staff randomly assigned 25% of

these subjects to be eligible as non-contacted victims, and the remaining 75% were eligible to be contacted victims. Of those eligible as non-contacted victims, 90% consented to participate. The assessment staff then randomly selected 90 subjects to be in the non-victim control group after first establishing that they had not been burglarized in the last year. 82% of these subjects consented to be in the assessment study.

Procedure on V.I.C.T.I.M project.

Most victims actually contacted by the V.I.C.T.I.M. project had either one or two officers visit them in their home or place of business. The officers involved in the project were Sergeant Kail and Master Patrolmen Nichols, Lunders and Viers. These visits frequently were preceded by a phone call to the subject to arrange the visit. The typical visit was as follows: Once the officer was in the subject's home or place of business, he informed the subject that his visit was a routine part of the burglary investigation. He reviewed the burglary incident and asked the subject if there were any additional information to report such as lost merchandise, identification on the stolen goods, leads about suspects, etc. The officer also provided subjects with tips and pamphlets on burglary prevention, frequently giving subjects specific advice regarding how the subjects own particular location could be better protected. This advice often involved such things as better lighting, better door locks, and better window locks, etc. Finally the officer also offered to engrave the subjects' social security number on any valuables. Following this, the officer left and completed a report (Appendix #1). Occasionally however there were exceptions to this typical procedure. A number of V.I.C.T.I.M. visits were done entirely over the phone making some parts of the procedure

impossible (e.g., pamphlets, engraving, etc.). Also in a number of cases the visits were not at the site of the breaking-and-entering. Finally, occasionally the person contacted by the V.I.C.T.I.M. staff was not the actual victim of the breaking-and-entering (e.g., the owner of the stolen goods) but a close relative or employee who was familiar with the crime.¹

Procedure on the assessment project.

The first stage in the assessment project was to develop an easily understood, inoffensive and unambiguous questionnaire that measured subjects' attitudes toward the police. The final questionnaire (see Appendix 2) was compiled after earlier versions were tested in Iowa City and Des Moines.

After this, actual data collection began. All subjects received a phone call from Alice Sanders who urged them to allow an interviewer to contact them. In this and all subsequent contacts the assessment staff emphasized to subjects that they were free to not cooperate. If the subject agreed to participate, Ms. Sanders made an interview appointment. A copy of the telephone contact procedure is in Appendix 3.

One of four interviewers (Harold Cook, John Baraniecki, Robert Gray and Chris Pond) then met the subject at the arranged time and place. At this meeting the interviewer had the subject complete the questionnaire. If any questions arose about an item on the questionnaire, the interviewer tried to clarify things. In addition interviewers probed the subjects to see if they had any particular reason for their responses. This hopefully made the interview contact less impersonal and helped to establish rapport

1. We do not have an accurate way of estimating the number of these various exceptions.

between the interviewer and the subject. In addition, it allowed subjects to express opinions that may not have been adequately tapped by the questionnaire items. Finally the interviewers thanked the subjects and left. All evaluation interviews were done in person with the victim or with the person visited by the police when the person was not the victim (see Footnote 1). In every case the interviewer was ignorant about which of the 3 conditions the subject was in.

Statistical note on data analysis.

The statistical procedures used in this project assess how likely it is that any difference between groups is just a random or chance event. If it seems that there is less than 5 chances in 100 that a difference is due to chance, it is called a significant difference and two values are presented: the F value and the p value. The larger the F value and the lower the p value, the lower the likelihood that a difference is due to chance. The p value states how likely it is that the difference is in fact due to chance. In short, a significant p value would be indicated by a p less than .05.

If our statistics indicate that there are less than 10 chances in 100 that a difference is due to chance, it is called a marginally significant difference. When either a marginally significant or significant difference is reported, F and p values are presented in the text, and group averages (also called group means) are presented in Tables 1 or 2.

Results

As noted in the introduction, there were two comparisons of major interest: 1) the difference between contacted and non-contacted victims and 2) the difference between victims and non-victims. An analysis of

variance statistical procedure tested these comparisons to see if any observed differences were greater than what would be expected by chance alone. A one factor analysis of variance having three levels (one for each condition) was conducted for each questionnaire item. The 2 degrees of freedom in this analysis were partitioned so that separate analyses could be done on each of the two comparisons described directly above.

The overall results can be summarized quite simply. In general, attitudes toward the police were slightly positive in all groups, with average responses on all items on the positive end of the scale. There were few differences between contacted and non-contacted victims (comparison # 1). Non-victim controls tended to have less favorable attitudes toward the police than the two victim groups (comparison # 2).

Comparison # 1: There were no significant differences in attitudes toward the local police between the victims who were contacted by the police and those who were not contacted. However, the contacted victims were more likely to remember receiving burglary prevention information from the police ($F = 16.48, p < .001$) and were better able to list the burglary preventive information they received ($F = 12.26, p < .001$). In addition, contacted victims were more likely to report that they passed this preventive information on to others ($F = 7.69, p < .006$). However they did not list a significantly larger number of persons to whom they passed on this information than did non-contacted victims ($F < 1, p > .75$). Non-contacted victims were more likely to report having taken burglary preventive action than contacted victims ($F = 4.11, p < .05$), but non-contacted victims did not list significantly more preventive actions taken than contacted victims ($F < 1, p > .40$). All means for these items are presented in Table 1.

Table 1

Comparisons between the contacted victim group
and the non-contacted victim group

	<u>Contacted Victims</u>	<u>Non-contacted Victims</u>
% of subjects who reported that they had received burglary- preventive information from police	72%	41%
Average # of burglary-preventive items mentioned by subjects	1.3	0.6
% of subjects who reported telling the burglary-preventive information to other persons	48%	38%
Average number of persons to whom subjects reported telling the information	2.3	2.6
% of subjects who reported taking burglary-preventive action	78%	86%
Average number of burglary-preventive actions reported by subjects	1.1	1.2

Comparison # 2: A number of significant and marginally significant differences in attitudes were found when victims and non-victims were compared. The non-victim thinks police: are less law abiding ($F = 3.75$, $p < .06$); are lazier ($F = 6.32$, $p < .02$); are more closed-minded ($F = 3.55$, $p < .07$); frequently accept small favors ($F = 3.28$, $p < .08$); are more likely to help them if they have a problem ($p < .02$). Also, non-victims tend to be slightly older than victims, and to have a slightly higher income. All means for these items are presented in Table 2.

These significant and marginally significant differences suggest a pattern. Four of these five differences indicate that non-victims are less favorable toward the police than victims. The pattern on all 50 questionnaire items is generally consistent with this trend if one examines which of the 3 groups is most positive or negative toward the police. On this analysis a group was only considered to be the most positive or negative if it was at least .05 scale units more extreme than others. (If two groups were tied, both were deemed to be extreme). The results of this supplementary analysis are presented in Table 3. The results clearly indicate that non-victims generally hold the least favorable attitudes toward the Des Moines Police of the 3 groups. They are most frequently the group that is most negative toward the police. In addition they are least frequently the group that is most positive toward the police.

The results in Table 3 were statistically analyzed with a chi-square analysis comparing the non-victims with the combined victim groups. This analysis showed a significant chi-square ($df = 2$, $\chi^2 = 11.89$, $p < .005$).

Finally we will consider the number of leads which V.I.C.T.I.M.

Table 2

Attitudes of victims and non-victims toward police

	<u>Victims</u>	<u>Non-victims</u>
Lazier	4.4 ¹	4.0
More closed-minded	4.3 ¹	4.0
Frequently accept small favors	3.9 ²	3.5
Probably would not go out of his way to help me	5.0 ²	5.6
Average age	39.7 years	44.8 years
Income	\$12,000	\$15,000

1. All figures in these rows refer to a 7-point scale where a value of 1 means "much" lazier or more closed-minded; a value of 4 means "average"; a value of 7 means "much more" industrious or open-minded.
2. All figures in these rows refer to a 7-point scale where a value of 1 means "strongly agree" with the sentiments: "I believe police officers in Des Moines frequently accept small favors," and "If I asked an officer for help, he probably would not go out of his way to help me," respectively. A value of 4 means "neither agree nor disagree"; a value of 7 means "strongly disagree".

Table 3

The number of times a group was most favorable,
least favorable or intermediate toward the Des Moines Police
across the 50 attitude items

	Contacted Victims	Non-contacted Victims	Non-victim Controls
Most favorable ¹	14	24	9
Intermediate	21	19	17
Least favorable	15	7	24

1. To be most or least favorable, a group had to be more extreme than others by .05 scale units.

interviews provided for the burglary cases involved. As a result of V.I.C.T.I.M. team interviews with the 79 cases of contacted victims, there were a total of four new suspects identified, one previously unreported serial number of stolen property was reported, and there were no arrests made or return of any stolen property.

Discussion

The main findings regarding the worth of the V.I.C.T.I.M. project were as follows.

- 1) Attitudes toward the police were slightly positive in all conditions. While the average response was not extremely favorable, it seems safe to conclude that for this sample there was no strong anti-police bias.
- 2) There is absolutely no indication that contacts made by the V.I.C.T.I.M. staff changed the attitudes of burglary victims toward the police.
- 3) The V.I.C.T.I.M. contacts very rarely provided additional leads facilitating crime solution.
- 4) The V.I.C.T.I.M. staff contacts however did give contacted victims preventive information which they apparently remembered. This conclusion is based on the finding that they were better able to list preventive steps than non-contacted victims. Unfortunately this information did not affect the contacted victims' behavior since it seems they took no more preventive action than non-contacted victims. This conclusion is based on the fact that when subjects were asked to list the burglary preventive actions they had taken, there were no differences between contacted and non-contacted victim groups. Indeed non-contacted victims were more likely than contacted victims to claim that they had taken such action, but since they did not list more actions than contacted victims, this claim must be viewed as suspect. In the same vein one must be cautious in interpreting the fact that contacted victims were more likely to say that they passed burglary preventive information on to friends. Contacted and non-contacted victims did not differ in the number of people they claimed they gave information to, and so it seems likely that no actual

difference exists in the extent to which subjects passed information on.

In other words, visits from the V.I.C.T.I.M. staff did not improve people's attitudes toward police, provide many new investigatory leads, or increase crime preventive actions. This result could be attributed to one or more of several factors.

1) Conceivably, the measure used by the assessment staff might have been insensitive to real differences that did exist between groups. However, the presence of readily interpretable attitude differences between the non-victim control and victim groups suggests the attitude measures were sensitive enough to pick up the differences between the victim groups, if any had existed. It is possible however that the low frequency of reported leads is due to the fact that many of these could have been passed on informally (by word of mouth) but not recorded in the report of V.I.C.T.I.M. staff visit. Even though the interview form in question explicitly asks if new suspects or leads were uncovered, it is conceivable (although not very likely) that this request was occasionally ignored. Thus using these forms as a measure conceivably could be an insensitive procedure.

2) It may be that the execution of the visits by the V.I.C.T.I.M. staff was inadequate. There is some indication that the execution may have been faulty. A number of contacts were made solely by phone. Conversations with the members of the police team indicate that there was less than an hour of training for the project, and that frequently there were other competing duties required of them. In addition, there seemed to be no strong commitment to the human relations aspect of the project.¹ It

2. This impression applies primarily to the V.I.C.T.I.M. staff. We have little information on attitudes among commanding personnel.

is interesting to note that the V.I.C.T.I.M. staff did have a good deal of expertise and enthusiasm about burglary prevention. Providing this information to victims was the one aspect of the V.I.C.T.I.M. project which came closest to having positive results.

3) It may be that such visits, however well executed, are not capable of producing change in the target attitudes or behaviors.

The final finding of interest is that breaking-and-entering victims seem generally more favorable toward the police than non-victims. This could be true for a variety of reasons. As noted it could be a result of non-random assignment, that is, a pre-existing difference between differing populations. Alternatively, it could be due to the fact that being burglarized 1) reminds people of their dependence on the police for adequate protection, 2) makes them feel more vulnerable to threat, or 3) leads them to identify more with vested authority than with deviant populations. Other explanations could be offered, but unfortunately one cannot really evaluate them adequately without more experimental work.

Recommendations

It is possible that selected police officers might, through extensive training, be made capable of interacting with crime victims in such a way as to change their attitudes toward the police in a positive direction. Only by diverting the bulk of the funding of the project into training could this be done. Even with adequate funding, this would be a risky procedure, since the training might not be effective. In most cities, police attitudes will probably pose one problem with such training. In Des Moines we saw indications that within the department, human relations

and public relations work seems to not be held in high esteem, particularly among line officers who understandably value the more active aspects of police work. If this is true, volunteers for such human relations training must buck prevailing attitudes within the department and this is bound to undermine their enthusiasm for and commitment to such training. The benefits of such a procedure would, moreover, consist only of attitude change of a small number of crime victims. Benefits of this magnitude seem hardly worth the cost of training.

If the department wishes to mount a public relations campaign to change the image of the police, professional advertising concerns probably should be retained. If the department wishes to change the behavior of the police so as to make a better impression on the public, the first priority is to undertake a comprehensive open ended attitude survey to determine public impressions of police behavior and their reactions to them. In-depth interviews should be conducted to determine the reasons behind the attitudes. What would be of particular interest would be to elicit from people what they most like and dislike about their police staff. The survey contained in this report is unfortunately not particularly well suited for this purpose since it was not designed as an open ended probe. Additionally, the subject sample in the present report is not as representative as one would like for this purpose. If these additional procedures reveal that negative attitudes are based on police behavior, then the target behavior should be analyzed with a view toward altering it.

With somewhat less training, officers could provide useful advice to burglary victims on how to alter their premises to make future burglaries

less likely. Conceivably this might reduce the total number of burglaries. Since many premises which are burglarized once are repeatedly burglarized, and each burglary is costly to the city and to the police department, the money benefits from this approach might be considerable, and enough to justify the training cost. One member of the police team prepared a list of burglar alarm concerns in Des Moines. This, and things like it, might have been effective in encouraging burglary preventive action. Unfortunately, he was instructed not to distribute the list because of potential legal problems. Such obstacles to effective burglary prevention should be removed.

In summary, we are skeptical about the value of such projects as this, which demand of the police skills, abilities and commitments beyond those which can realistically be expected. In terms of future funding, allocation should be made for expert feasibility studies to assess the extent to which police departments are realistically willing, capable and committed to the success of work of this kind.

Appendix I

DES MOINES POLICE DEPARTMENT
VICTIMIZATION PROGRAM QUESTIONNAIRE

Case No. _____

Victim's Name: _____

Victim's Address: _____

Date and Time of occurrence: _____

Length of time since last contacted by
this department concerning this case: _____

1. Additional information known to victim on case that would assist in further investigation.
 - a. Suspects:

 - b. Serial numbers:
2. Any suggestions by victims on future investigation that would assist department personnel in understanding the problems of the victim.
3. Methods used by the first element at the scene.
4. Attitude of the department personnel concerned with the investigation.
 - a. Patrolman:

 - b. Identification:

 - c. Follow-up:

 - d. Others:
5. Victim's opinion of the competence of the
 - a. Patrolman:

 - b. Identification:

c. Follow-up:

d. Others:

6. Protective devices in operation:

7. Suggestions made to the victim concerning prevention of future break-ins.

8. Were any items marked for identification?

a. Articles marked:

b. Mark used:

9. Preventive measures taken to prevent future break-ins.

10. Was a supplemental report made to this case? Yes____ No____

11. As a result of this follow-up, has the clearance classification investigation status changed? Yes____ No____

12. Was any property found or recovered as a result of this visitation?

13. Arrests made as a result of this visitation.

Victimization Officer's Name_____

Appendix II

This is a survey being conducted by Iowa State University in Ames and by The University of Iowa in Iowa City. If you have any questions or comments about the study, or if you wish to check on anything please write or call (collect) to either:

Professor Bruce Britton
Department of Psychology
Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa 50010
Phone: 515-294-1744 (office), 515-292-1589 (home)

Professor Robert Baron
Spence Laboratory
The University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa 52242
Phone: 319-353-5945 (office), 319-626-6331 (home)

Professor Stephen Fox
Department of Psychology
The University of Iowa
Iowa City, IA 52242
Phone: 319-353-3228

The survey concerns how people in general feel about their police departments. It will be conducted much like TV ratings. Your feelings will be averaged with the feelings of other people so we can form some composite picture of what people in your area think of the police. Your name will not be mentioned in any report nor will such information be released under any circumstances without your consent.

Although we have the consent of the police to conduct this research, we are not affiliated with the police, and you are under no obligation to complete this questionnaire. Your individual feelings are quite important to us, since you personally have been selected scientifically so that we can have as representative (accurate) a sample of the community as possible, but the choice to participate or not is completely up to you. Please write your initials in this space to indicate that you have read the instructions listed above. _____

Thank you,

Dr. Bruce Britton
Professor Robert Baron
Professor Stephen Fox

PLEASE READ THIS

Please read each question carefully. If you have any questions about an item, feel free to ask the interviewer for assistance. In general, we are interested in how you feel the average Des Moines policeman compares to the average citizen. That is, we are not interested in the very best or very worst policemen.

All of the questions in this study are concerned with your attitudes toward the police in your community, and not toward police in large cities, on television, etc. Therefore, please restrict your answers to your opinions and ideas about the police in Des Moines. ON ALL QUESTIONS, CIRCLE THE NUMBER THAT BEST EXPRESSES YOUR FEELINGS. DO NOT CIRCLE WORDS. Thank you.

SECTION I: On the items below, please compare policemen to the average citizen. If, for example, you think policemen are much taller than average, you would circle #7 on the sample below. #5 indicates that policemen are slightly taller than average.

Sample:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
much shorter			average			much taller

In your opinion, are policemen:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
much less law-abiding			average			much more law-abiding

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
much more prejudiced			average			much more unprejudiced

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
much worse			average			much better

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
much sadder			average			much happier

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
much more dishonest			average			much more honest

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
much more careless			average			much more careful

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
much more untrustworthy			average			much more trustworthy

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
much more cowardly			average			much braver

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
much more unpleasant			average			much more pleasant

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
much more stupid			average			much smarter

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
much more unfair			average			much more fair
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
much more unimaginative			average			much more imaginative
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
much more unconcerned			average			much more concerned
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
much less helpful			average			much more helpful
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
much more unfriendly			average			much more friendly
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
much more cruel			average			much more kind
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
much dirtier			average			much cleaner
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
much lazier			average			much more industrious
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
much duller			average			much more exciting
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
much more close-minded			average			much more open-minded
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
much more quick-tempered			average			much slower-to-anger

SECTION II:

1. Most policemen try to do their jobs well.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
strongly agree	agree	slightly agree	neither agree nor disagree	slightly disagree	disagree	strongly disagree

2. Policemen are generally unpleasant people.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
strongly agree	agree	slightly agree	neither agree nor disagree	slightly disagree	disagree	strongly disagree

3. Policemen are as successful at solving crimes as is possible.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
strongly agree	agree	slightly agree	neither agree nor disagree	slightly disagree	disagree	strongly disagree

4. Most policemen are rather lazy.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
strongly agree	agree	slightly agree	neither agree nor disagree	slightly disagree	disagree	strongly disagree

5. Policemen do as good a job as can be expected.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
strongly agree	agree	slightly agree	neither agree nor disagree	slightly disagree	disagree	strongly disagree

SECTION III: In this section, when we use the term "Policeman," please assume that we are referring to the "average" policeman.

6. How do you feel about socializing with off duty policemen at parties, clubs, taverns, restaurants, etc.?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
extremely eager	eager	slightly eager	neither eager nor reluctant	slightly reluctant	reluctant	extremely reluctant

7. How would you feel about becoming a personal friend of a new neighbor who was a policeman?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
extremely eager	eager	slightly eager	neither eager nor reluctant	slightly reluctant	reluctant	extremely reluctant

8. How would you feel about allowing a policeman to join your circle of personal friends?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
extremely eager	eager	slightly eager	neither eager nor reluctant	slightly reluctant	reluctant	extremely reluctant

9. How would you feel about letting an off-duty policeman into your home?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
extremely eager	eager	slightly eager	neither eager nor reluctant	slightly reluctant	reluctant	extremely reluctant

10. I would go out of my way to help a police officer find his way.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
strongly agree	agree	slightly agree	neither agree nor disagree	slightly disagree	disagree	strongly disagree

11. If it was not dangerous for me, I would go out of my way to help a police officer in trouble.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
strongly agree	agree	slightly agree	neither agree nor disagree	slightly disagree	disagree	strongly disagree

12. If I asked an officer for help, he probably would not go out of his way to help me.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
strongly agree	agree	slightly agree	neither agree nor disagree	slightly disagree	disagree	strongly disagree

13. In general, I feel that the police have my best interest at heart.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
strongly agree	agree	slightly agree	neither agree nor disagree	slightly disagree	disagree	strongly disagree

14. I can trust the police to treat me with respect.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
strongly	agree	slightly	neither agree	slightly	disagree	strongly
agree		agree	nor disagree	disagree		disagree

15. I generally dislike policemen.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
strongly	agree	slightly	neither agree	slightly	disagree	strongly
agree		agree	nor disagree	disagree		disagree

16. I am generally somewhat nervous around policemen.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
strongly	agree	slightly	neither agree	slightly	disagree	strongly
agree		agree	nor disagree	disagree		disagree

17. I generally don't trust policemen.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
strongly	agree	slightly	neither agree	slightly	disagree	strongly
agree		agree	nor disagree	disagree		disagree

SECTION IV:

18. I believe that the police care more about solving crimes against the rich than against the poor.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
strongly	agree	slightly	neither agree	slightly	disagree	strongly
agree		agree	nor disagree	disagree		disagree

19. I believe that the police are generally prejudiced against young people.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
strongly	agree	slightly	neither agree	slightly	disagree	strongly
agree		agree	nor disagree	disagree		disagree

20. I believe that the police are generally prejudiced against minorities.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
strongly	agree	slightly	neither agree	slightly	disagree	strongly
agree		agree	nor disagree	disagree		disagree

21. I believe that police officers in Des Moines frequently accept small favors.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
strongly	agree	slightly	neither agree	slightly	disagree	strongly
agree		agree	nor disagree	disagree		disagree

22. I believe that police officers in my city frequently accept money bribes.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
strongly agree	agree	slightly agree	neither agree nor disagree	slightly disagree	disagree	strongly disagree

23. Police officers are often more interested in covering up their mistakes than in solving crimes.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
strongly agree	agree	slightly agree	neither agree nor disagree	slightly disagree	disagree	strongly disagree

24. Police officers are more interested in protecting other policemen than in solving crimes.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
strongly agree	agree	slightly agree	neither agree nor disagree	slightly disagree	disagree	strongly disagree

25. Police officers aren't smart enough to be effective in preventing and solving crimes.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
strongly agree	agree	slightly agree	neither agree nor disagree	slightly disagree	disagree	strongly disagree

26. Police officers use brutality against suspects on occasion.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
strongly agree	agree	slightly agree	neither agree nor disagree	slightly disagree	disagree	strongly disagree

27. Do you think in general that individual policemen are overworked?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
greatly over- worked	moderately overworked	slightly overworked	not over- worked	slightly under- worked	moderately underworked	greatly underworked

28. Do you think in general that individual policemen are underpaid for their job?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
greatly under- paid	moderately underpaid	slightly underpaid	not under- paid	slightly overpaid	moderately overpaid	greatly overpaid

29. Do you think that the quality of the police force is improving or getting worse?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
greatly improving	moderately improving	slightly improving	holding steady	slightly worsening	moderately worsening	greatly worsening

SECTION V: Only answer this section if you have been burglarized in the last year.

(Please answer #D and 41 even if you were not burglarized.)

30. In my particular case, I feel that many of the police involved are only going (or only went) through the motions of an investigation.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
strongly agree	agree	slightly agree	neither agree nor disagree	slightly disagree	disagree	strongly disagree

31. In my particular case, the police have done as good a job as could be expected.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
strongly agree	agree	slightly agree	neither agree nor disagree	slightly disagree	disagree	strongly disagree

32. If there were anything I could to help police solve this crime, I would be willing to do it.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
strongly agree	agree	slightly agree	neither agree nor disagree	slightly disagree	disagree	strongly disagree

33. What was the financial value of your loss? \$ _____

34. Were you insured? Yes ___ No ___

35. Did you receive any information from the police about how to prevent future breakins? Yes ___ No ___

36. If yes, could you list the things they mentioned?

37. If you received information about preventing future breakins, did you give this information to other people? Yes ___ No ___

If yes, how many people did you tell? _____

38. Did you take any action to prevent future breakins?

Yes ___ No ___ No, but I am planning some. _____

39. What actions have you taken already?

40. What is your age? _____

41. Are you or any members of your immediate family police officers, or have they been in the last three years? Yes ___ No ___

If yes, whom? _____

Appendix III

Telephone contact procedure used by assessment staff.

Hello, is S there? Hi, my name is Alice Sanders, and I'm calling you from Iowa State University. We're doing a research project right now in Des Moines for the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. That's a federal agency that has been funding a program in Des Moines for the police department, and the purpose of this program was to improve the investigations of breakings-and-enterings and to help prevent them in the future. So we are calling you in reference to the breaking-and-entering you had last (say fall or winter) (or in the non-victim control group, see brackets below). We are contacting only 200 people in the city who have been victims of this kind of crime to find out how they feel about the police in Des Moines and how satisfied they were with the way their investigations were conducted. To do this we'd like to have you fill out a short questionnaire. It only takes 10 or 15 minutes, and we could have one of our graduate students bring it to you at your convenience. Would that be possible?

We are telling everyone we call that although we are not working with the police, we can give you the name of someone in the police department you can call to check us out. (If they want the name, we give them the name of Sgt. Kail.) Also we want you to know that any remarks you make on the questionnaire or to the interviewer verbally will be completely confidential. This is entirely anonymous; no names will be attached to the report we make up for the LEAA.

Non-victim control group - [We are contacting 300 people in the city of Des Moines, 200 who have been the victims of breaking-and-enterings in the last year and 100 who have not. We are calling you as part of the group who have not been broken into within the last year. Is it

correct that you have not had a recent breakin? (If yes, continue.)]

END