


National Criminal Justice Reference Service



This microfiche was produced from documents received for inclusion in the NCJRS data base. Since NCJRS cannot exercise control over the physical condition of the documents submitted, the individual frame quality will vary. The resolution chart on this frame may be used to evaluate the document quality.



MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS-1963-A

Microfilming procedures used to create this fiche comply with the standards set forth in 41CFR 101-11.504.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the author(s) and do not represent the official position or policies of the U. S. Department of Justice.

National Institute of Justice
United States Department of Justice
Washington, D. C. 20531

7/9/84

Not in database

An Evaluation of Roseburg's Residential And Commercial Crime Prevention Project

Prepared By The
Oregon Law Enforcement Council

93206

93206

AN EVALUATION OF ROSEBURG'S
RESIDENTIAL AND COMMERCIAL
CRIME PREVENTION PROJECT

April, 1981



Victor Atiyeh
Governor

Dave Frohnmayer
Chairman
Oregon Law Enforcement Council

Keith A. Stubblefield
Administrator
Oregon Law Enforcement Council

Prepared under Grant Number 76-TA-10-0002, 78-A-253.1 and 80-A-253.1 from the U.S. Department of Justice, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration and the Oregon Law Enforcement Council.

"Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the Department of Justice."

U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Justice

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the National Institute of Justice.

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been granted by

Public Domain/LEAA
U.S. Department of Justice

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the copyright owner.

Oregon Law Enforcement Council (OLEC) staff responsible for the production of this report is:

Clinton Goff, Ph.D.
Supervisor, Data Analysis and Evaluation Unit

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Appreciation is extended to the following individuals for their cooperation, assistance, and support in conducting this evaluation and in the preparation of this report:

Charles F. Wuergler
Chief of Police, City of Roseburg

Corporal Lou Boler
Crime Prevention Officer, City of Roseburg

Special thanks are extended to Dennis A. Pearson, Former OLEC staff member who was primarily responsible for the baseline and follow-up surveys and the accompanying baseline report, and Stan Woodwell who assisted with the data processing. Jeanne Bittner graciously typed the drafts and the final report.

Information regarding this report and the previous report can be obtained by writing or phoning the author at:

Oregon Law Enforcement Council
2001 Front Street N.E.
Salem, OR 97310
Phone: (503) 378-4359

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS	
Residential Survey Findings	v
Residential Program Recommendations	vii
Commercial Survey Findings.	viii
Commercial Program Recommendations.	x
PART I - THE RESIDENTIAL SURVEY	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
A. Purpose of the Survey	2
B. Methodology	3
C. The Questionnaire	4
D. The Residential Samples	4
Baseline Sample Returns.	5
Follow-up Sample Returns	5
II. Findings	6
A. Proportion Victimized	6
1. Property Crimes.	6
2. Violent Personal Crimes.	7
B. Crime Frequency	9
C. Comparison of Projected and Officially Reported Totals	11
D. Comparison of Citizens' Crime Prevention Behaviors and Participation.	14
E. Relationship Between The Practice of Crime Prevention Actions and Victimization	16
F. Comparison of Perceptions of Crime and Crime-Related Issues	24
G. Priorities for Police Activities.	27
H. Community Issues.	29

	<u>Page</u>
PART II - THE COMMERCIAL SURVEY	
I. INTRODUCTION	31
A. Purpose of the Survey	31
B. The Questionnaire	31
C. The Sample.	32
II. FINDINGS	34
A. Number and Proportion of Businesses Victimized.	34
B. Details Related to Individual Crime Offenses.	37
Burglary	37
Dollar Loss of Merchandise & Building Damage	38
Shoplifting.	39
Employee Thefts.	41
C. Awareness of Crime Prevention Program and Changes in Business Security	43
BIBLIOGRAPHY	47
APPENDICES	
Appendix A - The Residential Questionnaire	
Appendix B - Cover Letter and Follow-up Correspondence	
Appendix C - Census and Sample Age Distribution Comparisons and Sample Weights	
Appendix D-1 - Relationships Between Citizens' Crime Prevention Actions and Theft/Attempted Theft Victimization	
Appendix D-2 - Relationships Between Citizens' Crime Prevention Actions and Property Crime/Attempted Property Crime Victimization	
Appendix E - The Commercial Questionnaire	

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Residential Survey Findings

Victimization surveys of 500 households were conducted two years apart to measure the level of crime, primarily the property crimes of burglary and theft, over the preceding 12-month period. The surveys also measured the changes in crime prevention precautions and actions the citizens have followed in an effort to reduce their likelihood of being victimized.

The major findings from the residential surveys and the analysis of changes over the time periods are:

1. There has been a small, but insignificant, decrease in the percent of the Roseburg households experiencing one or more burglaries from the baseline to follow-up survey periods. The results indicated that 4.4 percent of the households were victims in the baseline period compared to 4.0 percent who experienced a burglary during the "follow-up" time period two years later.
2. The attempted residential burglaries increased over the two-year period. One percent of the households reported an attempted burglary compared to 2.6 percent for the "follow-up" survey.
3. Personal and household theft (larceny) increased over the two years. Ten percent of the respondents reported one or more thefts in the baseline survey and this increased to 13 percent in the "follow-up" survey. However, this increase of over 3 percent was not statistically significant.
4. Based on the findings from the two surveys, the incidence (occurrence) and frequency of violent personal crimes--robbery, rape, aggravated assault and their attempts--occurs relatively infrequently in Roseburg. The survey estimates for these specific crime offenses should be considered with caution because of the small number of survey-disclosed incidents. (The small number reduces the reliability of our estimates.) However, with these precautionary notes the incidence and numbers of aggravated assaults and attempts may be quite higher at the "follow-up" period compared to the baseline period.

5. Measures of crime prevention precautions the citizens practice indicated that most stayed at similar levels between the two surveyed time periods. For some crime prevention actions, the Roseburg program and citizens may have reached a "ceiling effect." For example, 89 percent indicated they lock their house/apartment doors when leaving at both surveyed time periods (Table 4).

Other crime prevention measure the citizens can practice showed a significant decrease from the baseline to the follow-up survey. The percent who indicated they close and lock their garage dropped from 70 percent to 63 percent. Likewise, the percent of the respondents who indicated their door and window locks were operable dropped from 95 percent to 89 percent (Table 4).

6. Although there was a significant increase in the percent who indicated they have displayed anti-burglary warning decals on their doors/windows, (from 4.9% to 8.4%), this small amount indicates there needs to be a great effort to increase the citizens' participation in this practice.

7. The number who indicated they have engraved their valuable property with an identification number (Oregon Driver's License number is preferable) remained at the same level over the two periods--19.8 and 19.4 percent, respectively.

8. The relationship between the practice of crime prevention measures and being a property crime victim of burglary and attempted burglary; thefts (and attempts), including motor vehicle thefts; and the two combined was tested for each survey period. The Roseburg findings do not demonstrate support for the program. That is, implementing or practicing crime prevention precautions did not significantly reduce the likelihood of the respondents from being victimized compared to those who did not follow such practices.

Results from the baseline survey indicated only one of the statistical tests of the relationship was significant. The test inspecting "marking personal property for identification" and burglary (and attempts) victimization was significant, but in a negative program sense. A greater proportion who had marked their property indicated they were victimized

than those not engraving property. We think this finding results from the respondents taking the action after they were victimized. Additional questions were added to the follow-up survey to determine the timing factor. The results from the two items indicated the majority of the victims had not marked their property or displayed the warning decals, either before or after the crime (Tables 6 and 7).

9. Sections of the survey also provided for the Roseburg citizens' priorities for the police activities in case of budget cutbacks. The ranking of the top three to retain were: (1) Investigating serious violent crime, (2) Respond to traffic accidents and other emergencies, and (3) Investigation of illegal hard drug selling (Table 9).

10. The citizens' rating of 14 community issues in terms of their seriousness indicated the top three were: (1) Cost of living, (2) Property Tax, and (3) Alcohol Abuse. Juvenile delinquency and property crime were the highest ranked crime problems in the 5th and 6th positions. Comparative ratings from the statewide survey are also provided (Table 10).

Residential Program Recommendations

1. The Roseburg Crime Prevention Program needs to make a larger effort that will lead to the citizens increasing the use of burglary warning decals (stickers) and the engraving of appropriate valuable property that is likely to be stolen--TVs, radios, stereo systems, cameras, appliances, tools, bicycles, etc.
2. The message and program operations has to be strong and persistent enough to induce the citizens to take these actions before they have become a victim. Several methods should be utilized to help produce the desired program effects.
 - a. The program should focus on utilizing the media--TV, radio, newspaper, billboards--as well as brochures developed by the program.
 - b. The program should consider organizing and implementing methods for face-to-face contact with the majority of the household residents

to ensure that decals are posted and the appropriate property is engraved. In addition, the residents should be reinforced (or reminded) of the knowledge of other crime prevention actions that could be followed (for example, neighborhood house watching).

- c. Civic and/or volunteer groups could be enlisted and trained to deliver these services and inform the citizens of the actions and security measures they can take.
- d. An explicit method for follow-up to see what action(s) has been taken or not should help remind the citizens to implement the security measures. The follow-up would be preferable if it were, also, on a face-to-face basis but follow-up by telephone should help encourage "implementation" of crime prevention measures. It is recommended the follow-up occur within four to six weeks after the initial contact.

In summary, to maximize crime prevention programs' (as well as other "prevention" programs) opportunity of being effective in deterring crime, action must be taken by the citizens to implement and follow the precautions. Knowledge by the citizens of what should be done without implementation does not represent or produce crime prevention program effects.

Commercial Survey Findings

Concurrent with the residential victimization surveys, an independent sample of 100 commercial establishments were surveyed for each of the two time periods. The purposes were to measure the changes in the crimes affecting the businesses and the crime prevention actions they have implemented to deter or decrease the losses resulting from crime. The crime prevention officer focused the majority of his efforts toward commercial crime prevention during the latter project years.

The major findings from the commercial surveys and the changes in crime level, dollar losses, and crime prevention measures are:

1. The most prevalent of the crimes affecting the businesses are shoplifting and worthless checks. For the businesses subject to these types of crime, approximately 80 percent were victims one or more times of both crime types during the baseline and follow-up survey periods.

2. A sizeable reduction in burglaries was observed from the baseline to follow-up period two years later. Over 20 percent (21.3%) were victims of one or more burglaries during the 12-month baseline period and this decreased to 12.8 percent for the follow-up period. The Z test of proportions resulted in a value of -1.49 ($p = .07$); which does not quite reach the level to be statistically significant ($Z = -1.65$, $p < .05$, 1-tail test--we expected the property crimes to decrease with the crime prevention program).
3. A significant decrease in attempted burglaries was observed over the two years. The businesses experiencing an attempted burglary decreased from 14.8 percent to 6.3 percent ($Z = -1.81$, $p = .04$).
4. The only other type of crime (of the 10 types measured) that reflects a significant change over the two years was credit card fraud. Our estimates of businesses suffering losses from this crime increased from 14 percent (13.5%) to 39 percent ($Z = 3.82$, $p = .0001$).
5. Commercial robbery has not been a problem in Roseburg for either time period. Only one incident was disclosed in the baseline survey and none were in the follow-up survey.
6. The monetary losses from shoplifting continue to be quite sizeable over the two years. Estimated annual losses ranged as high as \$10,000 for one business reporting in both surveyed time periods. With some precautions in the loss estimates given in the report, shoplifting losses appear to be increasing in the Roseburg business community. The median (mid-point) value of the dollar loss per business rose from \$200 in the base period to \$525 in the follow-up period.
7. Although there has been a slight increase in the proportion of businesses victimized by employee thefts between the two years, the average (mean) dollar loss per business has significantly decreased. The "estimated" average loss per business was \$4,123 for the base period and this decreased to \$619. By omitting the one high reported loss of \$30,000 in the baseline period from the calculations, the difference between the two time periods is still significant.

8. Approximately 60 percent of the surveyed businesses indicated they were aware of Roseburg's Crime Prevention program. The major source of awareness or knowledge has been through the media--radio, TV, and newspapers. Twelve percent indicated their source was through personal contact with the Crime Prevention Officer.
9. Improved door locks have been the most frequent type of improved business security over the past five years. Thirty-seven percent indicated they had made this type of improvement followed by 27 percent who had improved external lighting (Table 6).
10. Similar to findings in the residential section and other commercial burglary evaluations (Pearson, 1980), an important problem is that the majority of the businesses do not establish or make changes to deter victimization or reduce losses until after they have been victimized one or more times.

Commercial Program - Recommendations

1. The Roseburg Crime Prevention program needs to emphasize the importance to the business community of implementing or changing crime prevention measures now before they experience a burglary or additional loss of property through shoplifting and/or employee theft. The Chamber of Commerce and/or other business or civic organizations might be the best forum to present this message.
2. It would be beneficial if the Crime Prevention Program had sufficient staffing to implement an on-site follow-up process to determine if the recommended changes in security precautions and/or business procedures (re check cashing, credit cards, and employee thefts) have been implemented.
3. With the increases observed over the two years in credit card fraud, additional information and procedures should be implemented by those businesses accepting credit cards (measures that can be taken).

4. Information should be provided the business in written form of the preventive actions and policies they can follow to reduce employee thefts. Perhaps, the incidence of employee theft can be reduced, in addition to the losses incurred by the businesses. The list of actions provided in the first Roseburg Victimization Report (Pearson, 1978, p. F6-7) should be provided to the business establishments.
5. The Crime Prevention Program should emphasize the materials and methods to decrease the crime of shoplifting. We observe that only 14 percent of the survey respondents indicated they had made changes to discourage shoplifting.

We assume the business community is aware of the Oregon Laws (ORS 30.870 and 30.875) that provide for the owner to collect civil damages for shoplifting. In addition to collecting for the actual retail value (limits not to exceed \$500 for an adult or emancipated minor and \$250 for the parents of an unemancipated minor), the owner may collect an additional penalty of not less than \$100 nor more than \$250.

If the businesses cannot reduce their losses through the more inexpensive methods of store- and clerk-operating procedures, they may want to consider hiring floor walkers (store detectives) on a full- or part-time basis to observe and apprehend shoplifters.

PART I - THE RESIDENTIAL SURVEY

I. INTRODUCTION

The Roseburg Burglary Reduction Project was initiated in FY 1974 in an attempt to reduce the number of incidences of residential (household) burglaries. Beginning in July, 1977, the project expanded to include not only residential burglary but also efforts to affect commercial burglary, theft, fraud and the incidence of other Part I crimes and vandalism. The crime prevention officer devoted the majority of his efforts to the commercial establishments during this time period.

The project has operated over these past six years primarily with one officer devoting approximately 50 percent of his time directly on crime prevention activities, enlisting citizen participation through the media, public presentations, and face-to-face contact. Approximately one-fourth of his time has been involved in training other officers in crime prevention techniques and the balance devoted to crime investigation.

The program, of course, was directed on a citywide basis as Roseburg is a medium-sized Oregon city with an estimated population of 17,300 residents in 1979 (Center for Population Research and Census, PSU).

The evaluation of crime prevention projects traditionally has relied, with some notable exceptions (Cirel, P., 1977; Goff, C. et al., 1973; Schneider, A., 1975; and Wittemore, S., 1977) on reported crime and clearance rates for selected target crimes. Despite the use of these reported rates as indicators of crime prevention program effects, there are potentially misleading and invalidating consequences of relying solely on reported rates as the primary source of program input. Paul Cirel, et al. (1977) in the report on Seattle's Exemplary Community Crime Prevention Project, describes the major weakness of using police records as an accurate indication of program success or failure, particularly when such a program involves the somewhat contradictory goals of reducing the incidence of crime, while at the same time increasing the public's willingness to report crime. Cirel, et al. (1977) states:

Victimization surveys show that only about half of the burglaries committed are actually reported to the police, due to citizen apathy or belief that the police cannot help anyway. Program success in increasing citizen reporting of burglaries could mask its crime reduction impact and might even produce an

increase rather than decrease in burglary reports in neighborhoods receiving the services of the CCPP (Community Crime Prevention Program). Since the program goals have opposite effects on police burglary data, an independent source of data is needed to assess the program's impact on burglary. Victimization surveys provide that data... (p. 47)

Funding was provided as part of Roseburg's Crime Prevention Grant in FY 1976 to develop the baseline victimization data and citizens' crime prevention behaviors/actions for their expanded residential and commercial crime prevention project. Unfortunately, it does not provide a true baseline measure (pre-program) as is the case in other crime prevention evaluations on-going in other Oregon cities--Ashland, Central Point, and Gresham. An OLEC Evaluation Unit member was assigned to develop, conduct, and analyze victimization data for the "baseline" period with the plan to conduct the "follow-up" survey two years later. The second survey was planned and conducted to determine the direction and magnitude of any changes in criminal victimization, reporting behavior, and knowledge and practice of crime prevention activities.

A. Purpose of the Survey

There were five primary objectives to be realized through the mail-out survey. These were:

1. To provide a measure of the rate of residential criminal victimization in the City of Roseburg for the crimes of burglary, theft, auto theft, robbery, assault, and rape. The primary focus was on the property crimes of burglary and theft.
2. To provide a measure of the difference between the number of victimizations and the number of these victimizations reported to the police for each crime.
3. To provide a measure of community knowledge and use of crime prevention precautions and perceptions of crime.
4. To estimate the sample and population dollar loss due to property crime.

5. To use the above obtained measures as baseline data to be compared with a follow-up survey conducted two years after the expanded crime prevention program operation.

B. Methodology

The basic design of the Roseburg residential victimization survey was patterned after a similar mail-out survey developed and implemented in Texas by the Statistical Analysis Center of the Texas Department of Public Safety (St. Louis, A., 1976, 1978). These studies were designed to provide an indication of the crime rates for burglary, theft, motor vehicle theft, robbery, rape, and assault "independent of the usual data collection process of the UCR" (Uniform Crime Reports). Besides this primary objective, the Texas survey seeks to gauge the monetary, physical, and mental costs of crimes incurred by victims.

The Texas survey was designed to yield the percentage of the population victimized by seven types of crime, and hence, does not yield an index of crime which is comparable to the FBI's UCR data. The UCR statistics reflect the total number and rate per 100,000 population for Part I and II. Since that count and rate does not take multiple incidents into account, only the most serious crime is counted in each incident involving more than one crime. In addition, since the FBI data does not determine the number of persons who were victimized by more than one incident of the same crime, it is not possible to extract from the UCR the proportion of the population which has been the victim of one or more types of serious crime, or any crime for that matter.

The Roseburg surveys were both victim and incident centered. That is, both the proportion of the sample experiencing each type of crime and the frequency with which each type of crime was committed were measured.

The baseline period covered from July, 1976 through June, 1977 while the "follow-up" survey covered the period two years later, July, 1978 through June, 1979.

C. The Questionnaire

Appendix A contains a copy of the questionnaire used in the survey. The first eight questions contain the actual crime experience questions. Vandalism was included in the follow-up survey but not the first (pre) survey. Questions nine and ten deal with any personal medical or psychological injury caused by any victimization. The costs due to property loss, medical or psychological counseling, wages lost from work, legal expenses or other costs are listed in response to questions 11 through 14.

The location and place where each crime occurred are asked in questions 15 and 16. The respondent's reporting behavior of crime is measured with questions 17 through 19. Questions 20 through 28 seek the respondent's views concerning a variety of crime-related issues. Several questions pertaining to certain demographic information are listed next. The questionnaire concludes with a series of ten crime prevention items which assess the citizen's awareness of and participation in Roseburg's crime prevention program.

D. The Residential Samples

The baseline and follow-up samples (independently drawn at two separate times) were composed of a listing of 520 individuals residing within separate households in the city. Those individuals were selected at random from the 1976 Johnson's City Directory and the current telephone directory for Roseburg.¹ Questionnaires were initially mailed to 500 individuals and follow-up reminders were sent out according to a schedule similar to the Texas Victimization Surveys. This schedule consisted of the initial mailing and three follow-up mailings at two-week intervals to the remaining nonrespondents. The cover letter and follow-up correspondence are presented in Appendix B.

¹Individuals with addresses outside the city boundaries were excluded from the sample. The Division of Motor Vehicles Drivers' License file served as the sampling frame from which a random sample of individuals was selected for the other crime prevention evaluations in Ashland, Central Point, Gresham and the later annual statewide survey.

Baseline Sample Returns

At the time the final questionnaire was returned, 80 days from the initial mailing, 85 percent (which is a very high return rate) had returned complete and useable surveys. The mean (average) number of days before return was 15.2 days; the median (mid-point of distribution) number was 10.8 days; and the mode (most frequent) was four days.

The final sample consisted of 444 residents, or 2.6 percent of the estimated 1977 population and 13.7 percent of the total estimated households in Roseburg. Because of the type of sample frame used, only persons 20 years of age or older were included in the final data analysis. Apparently, the combination use of the telephone directory and Johnson's City Directory sample was biased to the near exclusion of persons under 20 years of age. However, a representative sample of the adult (20+) Roseburg population was obtained and where discrepancies occurred, the results were weighted to correct for the differences. Therefore, the results are based on the actual age distribution of the Roseburg residents.

Appendix C (Table C-1) lists the census and corresponding victimization age categories, the percentages of the total 20+ age group each category represents, and the weight attached to each age group. This weight was then multiplied by the number of persons victimized in each crime category to bring the sample into correspondence with the general population age distribution.

Follow-up Sample Returns

As previously discussed, the sample selection process and mail-out procedures were the same as for the baseline survey. A slightly higher return was received on the follow-up survey. Eighty-eight percent (456 of 520) were returned within 68 days of the initial mailing. The summary measures for the number of days between the initial mailing and return were:

mean (average) number = 16.7 days
median (mid-point) number = 12.6 days
mode (most frequent) number = 4.0 days

Table C-2 in Appendix C shows the weights assigned to the age groups to bring the sample into correspondence with the general population age distribution.

II. FINDINGS

A. Proportion Victimized

1. Property Crimes

The primary crimes that the residential program expected to impact were the property crimes of burglary and, to a lesser extent, larceny (theft). Therefore, these were the crimes we were primarily interested in measuring through the victimization surveys. It would have required a much larger sample (and expense) to uncover a sufficient number of victimizations in order that the incidence could be reliably estimated for the infrequent personal crimes of robbery, assault and rape.

Table 1 lists the proportion victimized one or more times for the baseline period (July, 1976-June, 1977) and the follow-up period two years later (July, 1978-June, 1979). The absolute difference and the statistical test (Z test for proportions) between the proportions victimized for the property offenses are also provided in Table 1. The Z score values were tested for significance by 1-tail tests; i.e., we expected the proportion of households/persons victimized to decrease.

The results indicate that 4.4 percent of the households were victims of a burglary two years ago compared to 4.0 percent who experienced a burglary during the "follow-up" time period. This indicates a slight decrease in completed residential burglaries but the difference is not significant (Z value of .292). The sample frequency and projected citywide frequency (total numbers) will be presented in the next section of the report.

The survey results indicate that attempted residential burglaries increased over the two-year period. Only one percent of the households reported an attempted burglary during the baseline period compared to 2.6 percent for the follow-up period. This increase in proportions victimized is significant ($Z = -1.77, p < .05$).

The survey results also indicate an increase in the proportion of the population being a larceny (theft) victim. Approximately 13 percent experienced a larceny during the 12-month follow-up period compared to ten (10) percent for the baseline. However, this difference was not a statistically significant increase. A significant increase was noted for the proportion reporting an attempted larceny. However, those reporting an attempted larceny comprise a very small proportion of the population--.2 of one percent in the baseline and 1.9 percent in the follow-up period.

The citizens reported a very low incidence of motor vehicle theft or attempts in both the baseline and follow-up periods. Less than one percent of the survey respondents reported a motor vehicle theft during either survey 12-month period. Virtually the same proportion reported an attempted motor vehicle theft across the two surveyed time frames, although slightly higher for the follow-up period.

2. Violent Personal Crimes

Because of the low incidence of completed violent crime, the reliability of the estimates obtained from the victimization surveys have to be considered with caution. The National Crime Survey, for instance, considers estimates based on ten or fewer crimes reported to be unreliable and excludes them from the analysis (U.S. Department of Justice, 1977).

Table 1
COMPARISON OF 1976-1977/1978-1979
RESIDENTIAL VICTIMIZATION PROPORTIONS

Type of Crime	1976-77 % Victimized 1 or More Times	1978-79 % Victimized 1 or More Times	Differ- ence	Z- Test	Signi- ficance
Burglary	4.4%	4.0%	-.4%	Z= +.292	N.S.
Attempted Burglary	1.0%	2.6%	+1.6%	Z= -1.77*	.05
Larceny	10.2%	13.4%	+3.2%	Z= -1.45	N.S.
Attempted Larceny	.2%	1.97%	+1.7%	Z= -2.33**	.01
Motor Vehicle Theft	.7%	.7%	0.0	Z= 0.0	N.S.
Attempted Motor Vehicle Theft	.8%	1.4%	+.6%	Z= -1.07	N.S.
Assault W/Body	.2% ¹	1.4%	+1.2%	Z= -2.00	N.A. ¹
Attempted Assault W/Body	.8% ¹	3.1%	+2.3%	Z= -2.56	N.A. ¹
Assault W/Weapon	0.0%	0.0%	0.0	Z= 0.0	N.S.
Attempted Assault W/Weapon	.2% ¹	1.4%	+1.2%	Z= 1.96%	N.A. ¹
Robbery	.2% ¹	.5%	.3%	Z= -.75	N.S.
Attempted Robbery	0.0%	0.0%	0.0	Z= 0.0	N.A. ¹
Rape	0.0%	.2%	.2%	Z= -.95	N.S.
Attempted Rape	0.0%	.2%	.2%	Z= -.95	N.S.

¹Proportions based on less than ten (10) survey-disclosed incidents; therefore, these estimates may not be reliable and tests of significance are not reported.

Using this as a criteria for inclusion, we would only provide estimates for the crimes of assault with body and attempted/threatened assault with body. Actually, none of the violent crime categories--robbery, rape, assault with weapon, assault with body and their respective attempts--attained a reporting level of ten or more incidents in the baseline survey.

B. Crime Frequency

Table 2 lists the sample frequency of each type of crime and the projected frequency for the entire City of Roseburg for the two time periods. The Table also indicates the basis on which the city frequency was projected--either a household unit or the estimated population 20 years of age and older.

The projected number of burglaries for the base period (July, 1976-June, 1977) was 373 contrasted to 312 for the follow-up period (July, 1978-June, 1979). These estimates indicate a decrease of 61 in total number of citywide burglaries. Recall that the percent of households burglarized one or more times showed a slight, but insignificant, decrease from 4.4 percent to 4.0 percent.

The projected number of attempted burglaries increased from 101 at the base period to 179, an increase of 78, for the follow-up survey two years later.

The citywide estimates for victims of larceny (theft) showed a considerable increase in the total numbers. (The estimates were based on the populations as opposed to households). The estimate for the period of July, 1976 through June, 1977 was a total of 1,470. This increased to slightly over 2,000 (2,012) for a comparable period two years later. The percent of individuals victimized by larceny showed the largest absolute increase, approximately three percent, but the difference was not statistically significant.

Table 2
 SAMPLE AND PROJECTED CRIME FREQUENCIES FOR
 BASELINE AND FOLLOW-UP SURVEYS

Type of Crime	1976-77 Survey (433)		1978-79 Survey (425)		Based On
	Sample Freq.	Proj. City Freq.	Sample Freq.	Proj. City Freq.	
Burglary	26	373	21	312	Household
Attempted Burglary	7	101	12	179	Household
Larceny (Theft)	58	1,470	78	2,012	Population 20 Yrs. +
Attempted Larceny	11	279	10	258	Population 20 Yrs. +
Motor Vehicle Theft	3	43	3	45	Household
Attempted Motor Vehicle Theft	4	57	6	89	Household
Vandalism	NA		76	1,131	Household
Attempted Vandalism	NA		14	208	Household
Robbery	1	25	2	51	Population 20 Yrs. +
Attempted Robbery	0	0	0	0	
Rape	0	0	1	13*	Females
Attempted Rape	0	0	3	39*	Females
Assault W/Weapon	0	0	0	0	Population 20 Yrs. +
Attempted Assault W/Weapon	1	25	9	232	Population 20 Yrs. +
Assault W/Body	1	25	20	516	Population 20 Yrs. +
Attempted Assault W/Body	5	127	71	1,830	Population 20 Yrs. +

*Based on Female population estimates.

The projected number of attempted larcenies remained virtually the same with a slight decrease from 279 to 258.

The projected number of motor vehicle thefts remained about identical at 43 and 45 for the two surveyed time periods. The projected number of attempted motor vehicle thefts increased from 57 to 89 attempts. Again, those estimates for completed and attempted motor vehicle thefts should be considered with caution as they are based on less than ten incidents reported for each of the two surveys.

The projected total numbers of vandalism and attempts for the latter surveyed period are included in Table 2. It is estimated there were approximately 1,100 vandalism cases for that 12-month period. Approximately one in ten households (11.5 percent) were victims of vandalism with one household reporting four (4) separate victimizations during the 12-month period.

C. Comparison of Projected and Officially Reported Totals

Table 3 contains the comparative figures for the projected and officially reported (Oregon Uniform Crime Reports) crimes for the two respective time periods. Several relationships among the figures are noted. First, considering the change from the base to follow-up periods, it is noted the projected total number of burglaries reflect a decrease of 16 percent compared to a 11 percent increase in officially reported burglaries. This would tend to give further evidence of Cirel's (1977) and others contention of the necessity to have victimization data opposed to official reported crime to determine the effectiveness of crime prevention programs. The ratio of the number of burglaries projected by the victimization survey opposed to officially reported to the police varied approximately three to four times as great.

It is interesting to note the similarity in the percentage increase in larceny by both the survey and official crime reports. The increase, based on the survey figures, amounts to 36.9 percent compared to an increase of 34.0 percent from the crime reports. Again, the total number of larcenies is approximately three times larger than reported to the police.

Table 3
 COMPARISON OF SURVEY-PROJECTED AND
 OFFICIAL REPORTED (OUCR) CRIME TOTALS FOR
 SURVEY TIME PERIODS

Offense	July '76 June '77	July '78 June '79	Difference	Percent Change
Burglary				
Survey Projected	373	312	- 61	-16.4%
OUCR	99	110	+ 11	+11.1%
Attempted Burglary				
Survey Projected	101	179	+ 78	+77.2%
OUCR	NA	NA	--	--
Larceny				
Survey Projected	1,470	2,012	+542	+36.9%
OUCR	497 ¹	666 ¹	+169	+34.0%
Attempted Larceny				
Survey Projected	279	258	-21	-7.5%
OUCR	NA	NA	--	--
Motor Vehicle Theft				
Survey Projected	43 ²	45 ²	+2	+4.7%
OUCR	59	72	+13	+22.0%
Attempted Motor Vehicle Theft				
Survey Projected	57 ²	89 ²	+32	+56.1%
OUCR	NA	NA	--	--

¹OUCR (Oregon Uniform Crime Reporting) Larceny figures represent all reported larcenies, excluding shoplifting and Larcenies from a building.

²Estimated totals may not be reliable as they are based on fewer than 10 incidents reported in the respective surveys.

Projected motor vehicle thefts based on the survey are less than those reported to the police. One explanation that fewer auto thefts are reported on victimization surveys than are actually reported to the police is that auto theft has been shown to have one of the highest reporting rates of any crime.¹ Therefore, a small discrepancy should be expected between the two figures of auto theft. Another reason for the under-reporting of auto theft in the Roseburg survey is that those responding may have only indicated auto thefts occurring to themselves and not for other family members who may have been the victim of auto theft. Since auto theft and burglaries are treated as household crimes rather than personal crimes, projections from the surveyed sample to the population 20 years and older of Roseburg are made on the basis of the number of households, not the population in those age groupings.

The discrepancy between victimization and UCR data has occurred in past victimization and uniform crime report (UCR) comparisons. Decker (1977) found that in comparing NCS victimization rates with UCR rates in 26 cities, victimization rates exceeded UCR rates for burglary by 3 times and for larceny by 3.5 times. However, in the case of motor vehicle theft, victimization figures fell 10 percent below those actually reported to the police (1977, p. 51).

Decker found in his comparison of UCR and National Crime Survey (NCS) data in 26 large American cities that "...although there are substantial differences in the absolute amounts of crime each data source reveals, the relative pattern of covariation between the two is rather similar (51-52). He found significant correlations between UCR and NCS victimization data, ranging from $r = +.45$ for violent

¹The national average auto theft reporting rate according to the 1976 National Crime Survey (NCS) is 94.7 percent, whereas the average reporting rate for total property crime ranges between 48.6 to 64.7 percent. For personal crimes, the reporting rates range from 41.2 to 75.3 percent (1976, p. 50).

crime to $r = +.72$ for property crime (average $r = +.66$).¹ In fact, all crime rates were significantly related with the exception of aggravated assault. His conclusion is that "(o)fficial measures of crime provided a relatively good indication of the distribution of Part I crimes as measured by victim surveys" (1977).

D. Comparison of Citizens' Crime Prevention Behaviors and Participation

The following section describes and compares the changes over the two years of Roseburg's citizens' awareness of the crime prevention program and their actions related to crime prevention activities.

The citizens' responses to the crime prevention questions for the "baseline" and "follow-up" periods are presented in Table 4.

In general, it appears there has not been much change in the citizens' behaviors that would lead to deterring burglars and/or to reduce their opportunity of being victimized.

The majority of the citizens are aware of the city's crime prevention program as 68 and 64 percent indicated for the 1976 and 1978 periods, respectively.

The largest source of information about the program has come from the media with "word of mouth" through an acquaintance or neighbor the second highest method of awareness. It should be mentioned that only one response category to this question was provided for coding on the baseline survey. Thus, if a person indicated their awareness from the media as well as from one of the other methods, only the media response was counted. Hence, the relatively high media response rate for 1976 is partially inflated by this procedure.

¹Correlation (r) is an index which shows the direction and amount of relationship between two sets of values. Direction is expressed as positive (+) if values for both sets of values increase proportionately, or negative (-) if numbers for one set of values rise while the other lowers proportionately. A correlation is strongest when $r = +$ or $- 1.0$ and lowest when $r = .00$.

Table 4
CITIZENS' PRACTICE OF CRIME PREVENTION MEASURES AT
BASELINE AND FOLLOW-UP SURVEY PERIODS

Crime Prevention Item		Baseline 1976-77		Follow-up 1978-79	
		No.	%	No.	%
1. Crime Prevention Awareness Program	Yes	265	67.6%	264	63.6%
	No	127	32.4%	151	36.4%
2. Method of Awareness	Media Meeting	198	76.1%	177	67.0%
	Word of Mouth	9	3.3%	21	8.0%
	Block Meeting	32	12.4%	76	28.8%
	Personal Contact	4	1.4%	6	2.3%
	With Officer	6	2.4%	18	6.8%
	Other Source	11	4.4%	16	6.1%
3. Lock House Doors	Yes	355	89.2%	371	88.5%
	No	43	10.8%	48	11.5%
4. Close and Lock Garage Door	Yes	216	69.5%	214	62.8%
	No	95	30.5%	127	37.2%
5. Vehicle Doors Locked Near Home	Yes	228	60.1%	266	65.0%
	No	151	39.9%	143	35.0%
6. Vehicle Doors Locked Away From Home	Yes	322	85.2%	358	88.3%
	No	56	14.8%	48	11.7%
7. Anti-Burglary Stickers Displayed	Yes	19	4.9%	35	8.4%
	No	375	95.1%	377	91.6%
8. Property Engraved	Yes	77	19.8%	78	19.4%
	No	315	80.2%	327	80.6%
9. Door and Window Locks Operable	Yes	375	94.9%	376	89.0%
	No	20	5.1%	46	11.0%
10. Firearm in Home for Protection	Yes	156	39.8%	160	39.0%
	No	236	60.2%	250	61.0%
11. Burglar Alarm at Home	Yes	13	3.3%	12	2.9%
	No	384	96.7%	411	97.1%

The vast majority of the citizens exercised basic home and car security measures. It is noted that approximately 90 percent indicate they lock the doors to their home when leaving while 85 and 88 percent indicated they lock their vehicle when parked away from home for the respective years. However, there was a statistically significant decrease in the proportion who indicate they close and lock their garage door and have their doors and window locks in operable condition.

There has been a significant increase in the proportion who indicate they have displayed "anti-burglary" warning decals on their doors and/or windows. However, the proportion is still relatively low as only 8.4 percent so indicated compared to approximately 5 percent (4.9) for the baseline period. Thus, this deterrent process that can be undertaken by the citizens is not being utilized.

Virtually the same percentage indicate they have engraved or "marked" their property for identification purposes. The figures for 1976 and 1978 were 19.8 and 19.4 percent, respectively, or only two out of five respondents. Again, this action that can be taken by the citizens to (1) help deter burglars or (2) to help ensure the return of the property to the rightful owner in case it is stolen and later recovered by the police should be more widely publicized to encourage the citizens to take these measures. However, we realize the citizens have to take the initiative to help themselves, as well as the police.

E. Relationship Between the Practice of Crime Prevention Actions and Victimization

The primary question relating to the effectiveness of a crime prevention program is to determine the relationship between practicing crime prevention measures or precautions and the likelihood of being victimized. In short, will it make a difference if one takes these precautions and the resulting probability of being burglarized or becoming the victim of a property crime? In order to determine this relationship and help answer this question, the citizens' responses indicating their utilization of crime prevention

practices were examined with their indication of whether or not they had been a property crime victim that year. Thus, the responses to the crime prevention questions were dichotomized in YES-NO categories and paired with whether or not they had been the victim of one or more completed or attempted property crimes. The property crimes inspected separately were (1) completed and/or attempted burglary, (2) completed and/or attempted motor vehicle theft and other completed and/or attempted theft, and (3) the above two categories combined.

The statistics utilized to test the relationship between the variables was chi-square. The phi statistic is also reported to provide a measure of the strength of the relationship.

The data and statistics for the baseline and follow-up surveys inspecting the relationship between the individual crime prevention behaviors (or precautions) and being a burglary victim are presented in Table 5.

Similar data for the two years and the other crime categories are presented in Tables D-1 and D-2 in the Appendix.

In inspecting the data, the numbers and percents that one should focus on to understand the relationship we are testing are those in the two lower cells (bottom row). For example, the relationship (for the baseline period) between locking house doors and burglary victimization shows that 5.3 percent who lock their house doors responded they were victims of a burglary or attempted burglary compared to 4.2 percent who do not regularly lock their house doors.

The only significant difference in the baseline year was the relationship between the marking of one's personal property for identification purposes and being a burglary or attempted burglary victim. This same relationship also was found for the other two property crime categories--other theft and/or auto theft and burglary and theft combined (see Table D-1 and D-2 in the Appendix).

Table 5

TEST OF RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN CITIZENS' CRIME PREVENTION ACTIONS AND BURGLARY/ATTEMPTED BURGLARY VICTIMIZATION

		Baseline Period (July '76-June '77)			Follow-up Period (July '78-June '79)			
1. Are you aware of Roseburg's Crime Prevention Program?								
Burglary or Attempted Burglary Victim	No	255 96.1%	117 92.5%	372 (94.9%)	No	246 93.2%	143 95.1%	389 (93.9%)
	Yes	10 3.9%	9 7.5%	20 (5.1%)	Yes	18 6.8%	7 4.9%	25 (6.1%)
		265 (67.6%)	127 (32.4%)	392	264 (63.6%)	151 (36.4%)	414	
		$\chi^2 = 2.245$ p < .13 NS ¹			$\chi^2 = .605$ p < .44 NS			
		$\chi^2 = 1.568$ p < .21 NS ¹			$\chi^2 = .318$ p < .57 NS			
		Phi = .076			Phi = .038			

2. Do you regularly lock house doors when leaving?

		Baseline Period			Follow-up Period			
Burglary or Attempted Burglary Victim	No	336 94.7%	41 95.8%	377 (94.8%)	No	349 93.9%	45 93.0%	394 (93.8%)
	Yes	19 5.3%	2 4.2%	21 (5.2%)	Yes	23 6.1%	3 7.0%	26 (6.2%)
		355 (89.2%)	43 (10.8%)	398	371 (88.5%)	48 (11.5%)	420	
		$\chi^2 = .096$ p < .76 NS ¹			$\chi^2 = .061$ p < .80 NS			
		$\chi^2 = 0.0$ p < 1.00 NS ¹			$\chi^2 = 0.0$ p < 1.00 NS			
		Phi = .016			Phi = .012			

*Corrected

Table 5 Cont'd.

TEST OF RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN CITIZENS' CRIME PREVENTION ACTIONS AND BURGLARY/ATTEMPTED BURGLARY VICTIMIZATION

		Baseline Period (July '76-June '77)			Follow-up Period (July '78-June '79)			
3. Do you keep your garage door closed and locked at all times when not in use?								
Burglary or Attempted Burglary Victim	No	201 93.1%	92 97.4%	294 (94.4%)	No	196 91.6%	120 94.2%	316 (92.6%)
	Yes	15 6.9%	3 2.6%	17 (5.6%)	Yes	18 8.4%	7 5.8%	25 (7.4%)
		216 (69.5%)	95 (30.5%)	311	214 (62.8%)	127 (37.2%)	341	
		$\chi^2 = 2.242$ p < .13 NS			$\chi^2 = .788$ p < .37 NS			
		$\chi^2 = 1.511$ p < .22 NS			$\chi^2 = .453$ p < .50 NS			
		Phi = .085			Phi = .048			

4. Do you keep your vehicle doors locked when parked near your home?

		Baseline Period			Follow-up Period			
Burglary or Attempted Burglary Victim	No	215 94.3%	143 94.8%	358 (94.5%)	No	249 93.8%	134 93.8%	384 (93.8%)
	Yes	13 5.7%	8 5.2%	21 (5.5%)	Yes	16 6.1%	9 6.2%	26 (6.2%)
		228 (60.1%)	151 (39.9%)	379	266 (65.0%)	143 (35.0%)	409	
		$\chi^2 = .040$ p < .84 NS			$\chi^2 = .003$ p < .96 NS			
		$\chi^2 = 0.0$ p < 1.00 NS			$\chi^2 = 0.0$ p < 1.00 NS			
		Phi = .01			Phi = .003			

*Corrected

Table 5 Cont'd.

TEST OF RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN CITIZENS' CRIME PREVENTION ACTIONS AND BURGLARY/ATTEMPTED BURGLARY VICTIMIZATION

		Baseline Period (July '76-June '77)			Follow-up Period (July '78-June '79)		
		Yes	No		Yes	No	
Burglary or Attempted Burglary Victim	No	303 94.1%	54 96.8%	358 (94.5%)	No	338 94.2%	43 90.7% (93.8%)
	Yes	19 5.9%	2 3.2%	21 (5.5%)	Yes	21 5.8%	4 9.3% (6.2%)
		322 (85.2%)	56 (14.8%)	378	358 (88.3%)	48 (11.7%)	406
		$\chi^2 = .645$ p < .42 NS			$\chi^2 = .878$ p < .35 NS		
		$*\chi^2 = .236$ p < .63 NS			$*\chi^2 = .381$ p < .54 NS		
		Phi = .041			Phi = .046		

6. Have you placed anti-burglary stickers (decals) on your windows and/or doors?

		Baseline Period			Follow-up Period		
		Yes	No		Yes	No	
Burglary or Attempted Burglary Victim	No	18 91.7%	357 95.1%	375 (95.0%)	No	35 100.0%	354 93.7% (94.2%)
	Yes	2 8.3%	18 4.9%	20 (5.0%)	Yes	0 0.0%	24 6.3% (5.8%)
		19 (4.9%)	375 (95.1%)	395	35 (8.4%)	377 (91.6%)	412
		$\chi^2 = .460$ p < .50 NS			$\chi^2 = 2.322$ p < .13 NS		
		$*\chi^2 = .022$ p < .88 NS			$*\chi^2 = 1.308$ p < .25 NS		
		Phi = .034			Phi = .075		

*Corrected

Table 5 Cont'd.

TEST OF RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN CITIZENS' CRIME PREVENTION ACTIONS AND BURGLARY/ATTEMPTED BURGLARY VICTIMIZATION

		Baseline Period (July '76-June '77)			Follow-up Period (July '78-June '79)		
		Yes	No		Yes	No	
Burglary or Attempted Burglary Victim	No	67 86.3%	305 97.1%	372 (94.9%)	No	74 94.5%	308 94.4% (94.4%)
	Yes	11 13.7%	9 2.9%	20 (5.1%)	Yes	4 5.5%	18 5.6% (5.6%)
		77 (19.8%)	315 (80.2%)	392	78 (19.4%)	327 (80.6%)	405
		$\chi^2 = 14.90$ Sig. p < .0001			$\chi^2 = .002$ p < .97 NS		
		$*\chi^2 = 12.75$ Sig. p < .0004			$*\chi^2 = 0.0$ p < 1.00 NS		
		Phi = .195			Phi = .002		

8. Are all your door and window locks in operable condition?

		Baseline Period			Follow-up Period		
		Yes	No		Yes	No	
Burglary or Attempted Burglary Victim	No	356 94.7%	19 95.8%	375 (94.7%)	No	354 94.1%	43 93.2% (94.0%)
	Yes	20 5.3%	1 4.2%	21 (5.3%)	Yes	22 5.9%	3 6.8% (6.0%)
		375 (94.9%)	20 (5.1%)	396	376 (89.0%)	46 (11.7%)	422
		$\chi^2 = .050$ p < .82 NS			$\chi^2 = .066$ p < .80 NS		
		$*\chi^2 = 0.0$ p < 1.00 NS			$*\chi^2 = 0.0$ p < 1.00 NS		
		Phi = .011			Phi = .012		

*Corrected

Table 5 Cont'd.

TEST OF RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN CITIZENS' CRIME PREVENTION ACTIONS AND BURGLARY/ATTEMPTED BURGLARY VICTIMIZATION

		Baseline Period (July '76-June '77)			Follow-up Period (July '78-June '79)			
		Yes	No		Yes	No		
Burglary or Attempted Burglary Victim	No	151 96.6%	220 93.4%	371 (94.7%)	No	145 90.4%	240 96.1% 385 (93.9%)	
	Yes	5 3.4%	16 6.6%	21 (5.3%)	Yes	15 9.6%	10 3.9% 25 (6.1%)	
			156 (39.8%)	236 (60.2%)	392			160 (39.0%) 250 (61.0%) 410
		$\chi^2 = 1.963$ $p < .16$ NS $*\chi^2 = 1.371$ $p < .24$ NS Phi = .071			$\chi^2 = 5.466$ $p < .02$ Sig. $*\chi^2 = 4.524$ $p < .03$ Sig. Phi = .115			

10. Do you have a burglar alarm system in your home?

		Yes	No		Yes	No		
Burglary or Attempted Burglary Victim	No	13 100.0%	363 94.6%	376 (94.8%)	No	10 79.6%	388 94.5% 398 (94.0%)	
	Yes	0 0.0%	21 5.4%	21 (5.2%)	Yes	2 20.4%	23 5.5% 25 (6.0%)	
			13 (3.3%)	384 (96.7%)	397			12 (2.9%) 411 (97.1%) 423
		$\chi^2 = .758$ $p < .38$ NS $*\chi^2 = .059$ $p < .81$ NS Phi = .044			$\chi^2 = 4.65$ $p < .03$ Sig. $*\chi^2 = 2.38$ $p < .12$ NS Phi = .105			

*Corrected

The results for this relationship are in the opposite direction of program expectations; those who marked their property were victimized more (not less) than those who had not marked their property. We think one plausible explanation for this finding in the baseline year is that the residents decided to mark their property after they had been a burglary or theft victim. We added a question to the follow-up survey to try to determine the time factor (before or after a victimizations) for the crime prevention items of marking property and placing anti-burglary warning decals on the windows and doors.

Although there was not an overall significant difference in whether they had placed warning decals or marked their property and resulting victimization in the follow-up period, the results indicate the residents are not disposed to take such actions even after being victimized. Table 6 shows the numbers and percent from the item relating to displaying decals and Table 7 for the item relating to engraving their property.

Table 6

	Decals Before Crime	Decals After Crime	Decals Not Displayed Before or After Crime
Burglary Victim	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	19 19 100.0%

Table 7

	Engraved Before Crime	Engraved After Crime	Not Engraved Before or After Crime
Burglary Victim	4 23.5%	0 0.0%	13 17 76.5%

The figures indicate that none of the burglary victims displayed the warning decals either before or after the crime. Likewise, three-fourths did not engrave their remaining valuables even after being burglarized. For both crime prevention precautions, no one indicated they had taken the action after the burglary to, perhaps, deter future burglaries.

F. Comparison of Perceptions of Crime and Crime-Related Issues

The following section describes the results and changes over the two years in the Roseburg citizens' perceptions of crime and criminal justice issues. We included three items in the follow-up survey that were not included in the baseline survey.

One of these questions related to the residents' perceptions of crime in their neighborhood. Their responses to this item (and the other items) are presented in Table 8. Approximately half of the residents felt that crime in their neighborhood had stayed about the same during the past year, 20 percent thought that crime had increased and only 4 percent thought that crime had decreased.

The next item inspected was whether the respondents believed they were likely to be the victim of a crime during the next year. Eleven percent answered "Yes" at the baseline period contrasted to 14.6 percent at the follow-up period. However, the chi-square value computed from the response categories (yes, no, no opinion) and the two time periods is not significant ($\chi^2 = 2.496, 2 \text{ df}, \text{N.S.}$).

The types of crimes the respondents thought most likely to occur to them personally and in their neighborhood are provided in the next two items. It is observed a considerably larger proportion felt they might be victimized by a burglary at the time of the follow-up survey. Fear of the other crimes remained essentially the same as they were for the baseline period.

Table 8

ROSEBURG CITIZENS' PERCEPTION OF CRIME AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE ISSUES AT BASELINE AND FOLLOW-UP SURVEY PERIOD

ISSUE/QUESTION ¹	BASELINE SURVEY	FOLLOW-UP SURVEY
1. Likely crime victim next year:		
Yes	11.0%	14.6%
No	55.3%	51.7%
No Opinion	33.5%	33.8%
2. Within the past year, crime in your neighborhood has:		
Increased		19.7%
Decreased	(Not asked in	4.4%
Stayed About Same	Baseline	48.9%
No Opinion	Survey)	19.5%
Haven't lived here that long		7.4%
3. Crime most likely to occur to you:		
No particular crime	61.7%	46.3%
Armed Robbery	1.5%	.8%
Robbery - Not Armed	.9%	2.2%
Burglary	29.8%	43.3%
Rape or Attempted Rape	.9%	.2%
Theft (Contact With You)	2.1%	2.3%
Assault	.2%	.5%
Other Crime	3.0%	4.3%
4. Crime most likely in neighborhood:		
No Particular Crime	35.7%	30.5%
Armed Robbery	.7%	.6%
Robbery - Not Armed	9.1%	8.1%
Burglary	47.4%	52.8%
Rape or Attempted Rape	1.3%	.8%
Theft (Contact With You)	1.0%	.5%
Assault	0.0	.3%
Other Crime	4.8%	6.4%
5. Place where I feel the safest:		
Home	84.7%	79.3%
Streets Near My Home	.4%	.9%
At Work	14.5%	13.9%
Streets Away From Home or Work	.4%	1.1%
Other Location ²		4.7%

¹For complete wording of questions, see Questionnaire in Appendix A.
²This response choice was not included in Baseline Survey

Table 8 (Cont'd.)

ROSEBURG CITIZENS' PERCEPTION OF CRIME AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE ISSUES AT BASELINE AND FOLLOW-UP SURVEY PERIOD

ISSUE/QUESTION1	BASELINE SURVEY	FOLLOW-UP SURVEY
6. Place where I feel the most danger:		
Home	5.8%	6.8%
Streets Near My Home	7.2%	10.0%
At Work	4.8%	5.2%
Streets Near Work	3.2%	3.4%
Streets Away From Home or At Work	71.5%	63.4%
Other Location	7.3%	11.2%
7. More funds and personnel devoted to combat and prevent juveniles from becoming adult criminals:		
Agree	69.2%	77.1%
Disagree	13.9%	6.9%
No Opinion	17.0%	16.0%

There has been a significant increase in the proportion of residents who "Agree" that more funds and personnel should be devoted to prevent juveniles from becoming adult criminals. Over 75 percent of the respondents indicated this choice at the last survey period.

G. Priorities for Police Activities

A special item was included in the follow-up survey to obtain the citizens' priorities for the police in case of further "tight budgets" and the need for a cutback in services. Seventeen police activities were listed and the respondents were asked to indicate (rank) three they would reduce first and the three most important to retain. The ranks were given a weight of 1, 2, or 3 to reflect the appropriate magnitude and summed to provide a score to indicate its relative position among the 17 functions and activities.

The functions are listed in Table 9 by order of priority that the citizens think should be retained. The rank and score for the particular item in terms of the rating for "reducing" that function is also provided in the table. For example, the citizens think the most important activity to retain is in the area of "investigating serious violent crime." (Likewise, that item received the lowest score in terms of their ranking of functions they would "reduce.")

Providing crowd control services was the item the citizens indicated would be their first priority if a reduction in services was necessary through a reduction of the police budget and subsequent loss of officers/resources. Investigating "victimless" crime (gambling, prostitution, etc.) was the second priority for reduction and responding to complaints (barking dogs, loud parties, etc.) was the third priority.

Table 9
 CITIZENS' RANKING OF POLICE FUNCTIONS AND ACTIVITIES
 TO RETAIN OR REDUCE

FUNCTION	RANKED TO RETAIN	SCORE	RANKED TO REDUCE	SCORE
Investigating serious violent crime	1	535	17	5
Respond to traffic accidents and other emergencies	2	299	15	7
Investigation of illegal hard drug selling	3	291	14	12
Investigating serious property crime	4	235	16	6
Patrolling the community	5	197	12	24
Enforcing traffic laws	6	111	9	54
Analysis of methods and problems for use of manpower/resources	7	104	7	84
Investigation of hard drug usage	8	57	13	18
Provide crime prevention program and information	9	41	5	189
Respond to complaints (dogs, loud parties, etc.)	10	29	3	313
Investigating minor violent crime (minor assaults, threats, etc.)	11.5	23	11	25
Purchasing up-to-date equipment, vehicles, etc.	11.5	23	6	124
Investigation of marijuana selling	13	16	10	41
Providing crowd control services	14	12	1	471
Investigate minor property crime (minor theft, vandalism)	15.5	8	8	59
Investigation of marijuana usage	15.5	8	4	212
Investigating "victimless" crime (gambling, prostitution, etc.)	17	4	2	343

Resources devoted to providing crime prevention programs and information ranked number 9 in the priority order of retaining services while it received the fifth-highest priority in their ranking of functions in case of necessary reductions.

H. Community Issues

Fourteen community issues were listed ranging from the "cost of living" to "white collar crime" and the citizens were asked to indicate the seriousness of each item by scoring it on a five-point scale. The scale ranged from 1 "Not a Problem at All" to 5 to indicate a "Very Serious Problem."

The issues are listed in order by the citizens' view of their seriousness (Table 10). The cost of living was viewed overall as the most serious problem followed by property tax and alcohol abuse. The highest ranking crime issue was juvenile delinquency in fifth place, followed by property crime (burglary, theft) in sixth position. The three issues felt to be the least serious were poverty, violence in the home, and white collar crime in the 12th, 13th, and 14th positions, respectively.

We have included for comparative purposes the ranking of these same 14 issues resulting from OLEC's Statewide Serious Crime Surveys for 1979 and 1980. The 1979 ranking most closely corresponds to the Roseburg survey time period. By observation, the ranking of the community issues by the statewide sample is quite similar to the Roseburg's citizens--the top four (4) issues were closely ranked as well as the lower three(3). For the state as a whole, violent crime moved from fifth position in 1979 to 10th in 1980 while unemployment moved from the ninth position to number five (5).

Table 10
 RANKING OF COMMUNITY ISSUES BY ROSEBURG CITIZENS AND
 STATEWIDE SAMPLE

ISSUE	ROSEBURG RANKINGS	MEAN SCORE	STATEWIDE 1979	RANKING 1980
Cost of Living	1	3.78	1	1
Property Tax	2	3.66	3	2
Alcohol Abuse	3	3.27	2	3
Drug Abuse	4	3.18	4	4
Juvenile Delinquency	5	3.12	6	6
Property Crime	6	3.02	7	7
Unemployment	7	2.83	9	5
Quality of Education	8	2.81	8	9
Land Use/Zoning	9	2.74	12	8
Violent Crime	10	2.73	5	10
Pollution/Environmental Concerns	11	2.43	10	11
Poverty	12	2.37	11	12
Domestic Violence	13	2.28	14	14
White Collar Crime	14	2.13	13	13

PART II - THE COMMERCIAL SURVEY

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Purpose of the Survey

The U.S. Department of Commerce estimated that in 1975, \$23.6 billion were lost through commercial crime in the United States. In its report entitled The Cost of Crimes Against Business, researchers from the Bureau of Domestic Commerce also discovered among other things that:

-- Small businesses suffer from crime more than larger firms.

-- Retailers are hardest hit, followed by service industries, manufacturers, and wholesalers.

-- Businesses spent \$4.5 billion in crime prevention programs in 1975 (U.S. Department of Commerce, 1976).

Clearly, on a national basis, commercial crime accounts for tremendous dollar losses. As an indication of the magnitude of commercial losses, the estimated \$23.6 billion in commercial property is 7.3 times larger than all commercial and residential Part I property offenses reported to the FBI in 1975.

A commercial crime survey was developed and conducted simultaneously with the Roseburg residential surveys at the baseline and follow-up periods. The Roseburg Crime Prevention project officer was available to conduct security checks and offered information on the methods to prevent or decrease the losses through burglary, bad checks, shoplifting, employee thefts, and vandalism.

B. The Questionnaire

Appendix E contains a copy of the commercial survey instrument. The survey covered those crimes which are thought to affect the greatest number of businesses. The instrument sought to measure the proportion of businesses affected by burglary, robbery, worthless

checks, worthless credit card transactions, shoplifting, employee theft and vandalism. In addition to measuring the incidences of these crimes, the survey attempted to measure the estimated monetary loss for each type of crime, whether the crimes were reported, and the reasons for not reporting the crimes.

C. The Sample

A list of commercial (shops, stores, manufacturers) and professional (medical, engineers, etc.) establishments compiled by the Roseburg Chamber of Commerce was used as the sample frame. This list contains approximately 300 shops, stores, clinics, factories, and offices within and adjacent to the City of Roseburg. A random sample of 100 Roseburg establishments was independently drawn for the baseline and follow-up surveys. The time periods covered corresponded to the residential surveys--July, 1976 through June, 1977 for the baseline and July, 1978 through June, 1979 for the follow-up period.

The administration and follow-up procedures were the same as for the residential surveys. The return rate for both the baseline and follow-up survey was considered very good. Ninety questionnaires (90%) were completed and returned for the baseline and 86 (86%) for the follow-up survey two years later.

The summary statistics for the length of time between mail-out and return for each survey are presented in Table 1.

Table 1

Summary Statistics for Days Before Return for
Baseline and Follow-up Commercial Surveys

	(N=90) Baseline Survey	(N=86) Follow-up Survey
Mean (Average)	13.1 days	13.2 days
Median	5.2	5.9
Standard Deviation	14.4	12.2
Range	61.0	43.0

The type of business of the survey respondents for each survey period are presented in Table 2.

Table 2
Commercial Sample by Business Type

Type of Business	(N=90) Baseline Survey		(N=86) Follow-up Survey	
	N	%	N	%
Food (Grocery)	6	6.7%	3	3.5%
Eating/Drinking	2	2.2%	10	11.6%
General Merchandise	4	4.4%	4	4.7%
Apparel	4	4.4%	6	7.0%
Furniture/Appliance	1	1.1%	1	1.2%
Lumber/Hardware	1	1.1%	2	2.3%
Automotive	9	10.0%	6	7.0%
Drug	4	4.4%	1	1.2%
Manufacturing	3	3.3%	2	2.3%
Real Estate	6	6.7%	8	9.3%
Service	11	12.2%	12	14.0%
Bank	1	1.1%	1	1.2%
Other	34	37.8%	27	31.4%
Not Reported	4	4.4%	3	3.5%
TOTALS	90	99.8%	86	100.0%

II. Findings

A. Number and Proportion of Businesses Victimized

Table 3 lists the ten types of crime measured in the baseline and follow-up surveys. Figures are provided which indicate the number of businesses reporting one or more incidents of each type of crime in addition to the percentage of the sample victimized.

As one can observe, shoplifting and worthless checks are the most prevalent of the crimes. Approximately 80 percent of the businesses subject to this type of crime reported one or more incidents at both the survey periods. Similarly, the receipt of worthless checks (not sufficient funds) affected over three-fourths of the businesses that accept checks.

One out of five businesses (21.3%) were victims of a completed burglary during the period covered by the baseline survey. However, this decreased for the survey period two years later to 12.8 percent of the surveyed businesses, or approximately one out of eight businesses. The statistical test values to infer whether the changes are significant are presented in Table 4.¹ The Z value of -1.49 does not attain the accepted $p < .05$ level but indicates a sizeable reduction has occurred as the probability equals .07.

The decrease in attempted burglaries from 14.8 percent to 6.3 percent is significant ($p = .0351$).

The only other type of crime that reflects a significant change over the two years was credit card fraud. However, we find that the proportion of businesses suffering losses from this crime increased from 13.5 percent to 39.1 percent. This could be a result of the growth in the number of credit cards issued nationwide and, hence,

¹The Z values were tested utilizing one-tail of the distribution as we expected a decrease to occur for the property crimes, especially burglary, at the follow-up survey period.

more cards available to be stolen and utilized. It could also reflect the economic conditions of rising costs over this time period and customers exceeding their credit limitations on their charge cards.

Table 3
Number and Percent of Commercial Victimitations
For The Baseline and Follow-up Surveys

Crime	Baseline Survey		Follow-up Survey	
	Number Victimized	Percent of Sample	Number Victimized	Percent of Sample
Burglary	19	21.3%	11	12.8%
Attempted Burglary	12	14.8%	5	6.3%
Worthless Checks	68	78.2%	63	76.8%
Employee Theft	20	24.1%	23	28.7%
Credit Card Fraud	5	13.5%	18	39.1%
Shoplifting	28	82.4%	23	76.7%
Robbery	1	1.1%	0	0.0%
Attempted Robbery	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Vandalism	26	30.2%	21	26.2%
Miscellaneous Crime	5	7.0%	2	2.7%

Table 4

Z Tests Between Proportion of Businesses Victimized at
Baseline and Follow-up Survey Periods

Crime	Baseline Period % Victimized	Follow-up Period % Victimized	Z	Significance Level(1-tail)
Burglary	21.3%	12.8%	-1.49	p = .07 N.S.
Attempted Burglary	14.8%	6.3%	-1.81	p = .04 Sig.
Worthless Checks	78.2%	76.8%	-.19	p = .42 N.S.
Employee Theft	24.1%	28.7%	.69	p = .25 N.S.
Credit Card Fraud	13.5% ¹	39.1%	3.82	p = .0001 Sig.
Shoplifting	82.4%	76.7%	-.93	p = .18 N.S.
Vandalism	30.2%	26.2%	-.59	p = .28 N.S.
Robbery	1.1% ²	0.0% ²		
Attempted Robbery	0.0% ²	0.0% ²		
Miscellaneous Crime	7.0% ²	2.7% ²		

¹This percent based on fewer than 10 reported incidents so it may be unreliable.

²Since these percents were based on fewer than 10 reported incidents each survey year, no statistical tests were performed.

The proportion of the businesses experiencing employee theft and vandalism remained virtually the same over time. There was a slight increase in employee theft as our estimate rose to 29 percent (up 5%) while vandalism decreased by four percent.

It is very good to see that commercial robbery has not been a problem in Roseburg for either surveyed period. There was only one reported robbery in the base period and none were disclosed in the follow-up survey.

B. Details Related to Individual Crime Offenses

The following section discusses the survey items relating to each particular crime type. It is thought this format will provide the reader a better understanding of the changes in the problems and behaviors that have occurred.

Burglary

The reader will recall that the proportion of the businesses victimized by one or more burglaries during the time periods decreased from 21.3 percent to 12.8 percent. Although this reduction was not significant (p = .07, Table 4), it does show a favorable reduction in businesses burglarized.

In terms of the absolute numbers of burglaries disclosed by the survey samples, 16 businesses reported a total of 39 burglaries in the baseline period while 10 victimized businesses reported a total of 18 burglaries during the follow-up surveyed period. With the exception of one business reporting 12 burglaries during the baseline period, the distribution of the frequencies of burglaries for the two periods are quite similar. The great majority of the businesses experienced no burglaries at either period while those who were victimized experienced only one burglary over the 12-month period.

The range of the number of burglaries for victims at the baseline period was 12, i.e., from 0 to 12 (0 through 6 if we exclude the one business reporting 12). For the follow-up period, the range in number of burglaries was 5--0 through 5.

Two t-tests for independent samples were computed comparing the total numbers of burglaries between the two periods. The first included all 90 scores (includes the value of 12) for the baseline period and results in a t-test value of 1.25, which does not indicate a significant reduction ($t \geq 1.65$, for $p < .05$; 1-tail test, 120 degrees of freedom). The average (mean) number of

burglaries for the base period was .43 (s.d. = 1.51) and .21 (s.d. = .72) for the follow-up period. The mean for those businesses who experienced at least one burglary was 2.44 (s.d. = 2.87) for the base period compared to 1.80 (s.d. = 1.32) for the sample two years later.

The second t-test compared the two samples but excluded the one value of 12 burglaries in the base period as this seemed "unique" or "deviate" from all the others. This resulted in a t-test value of .78 which indicates the numbers of burglaries across the two periods are similar. This is reflected in a revised average (mean) value of .30 (s.d. = .87) for the base period contrasted to .21 (s.d. = .72) for the follow-up period. As for the subset of businesses experiencing one or more burglaries, the exclusion of this value reduces the mean to 1.80 (s.d. = 1.37) burglaries which is identical to the mean for this subset in the follow-up period (s.d. = 1.32).

Dollar Loss of Merchandise and Building Damage

The respondents were asked to indicate the dollar loss of their merchandise or goods as a result of a burglary. The ten businesses experiencing burglaries during the baseline period reported losses ranging from \$40 to \$5,100. One other business reported a loss of \$4,000. For the follow-up survey period, nine businesses indicated burglary losses ranging from a low of \$40 to a high of \$1,450. Excluding the two high values from the baseline figures, the average (mean) loss was \$349.75 (s.d. = \$465) compared to \$330.67 (s.d. = \$454) for the follow-up period. A comparison of the dollar losses resulted in an insignificant t-test value of .10.

Another item asked the dollar loss due to damage committed during the burglary to the building or other fixtures. The average (mean) for the base period was \$167.20 (s.d. = \$326) contrasted to \$271.38 (s.d. = \$338) for the follow-up period. The difference between these two damage amounts, although quite sizeable, was not significant ($t = -.77$, N.S., d.f. = 16).

Not many of the commercial businesses surveyed have a burglar alarm system. Approximately one in ten (11.5%) indicated they had an alarm system in the base period contrasted to 16 percent at the follow-up survey period. These differences reflect an insignificant increase in the installation of an alarm system for their business.

The reporting of completed and attempted commercial burglaries to the police has been very high for both survey time periods. Those businesses having a burglary or an attempt in the baseline period indicated they reported 78 percent to the police. The reporting figure rose higher after two years of the program as 86 percent indicated they reported the crimes to the police. This apparent high reporting of these crimes indicates a high degree of trust in the Roseburg Police Department by the business community. Insurance coverage for losses or damages may be a factor, also.

For those few who did not report the crime or attempt to the police, the reason most often indicated was they thought that "...nothing can be done--lack of proof."

Shoplifting

Shoplifting continues to be a pervasive and costly crime for the business community and the consumer. Approximately 35 percent (38% in the first survey and 36% in the second) of the respondents indicate their businesses are the types that are subject to shoplifting. However, within these businesses 82 percent in the base survey and 77 percent in the follow-up survey experienced losses to shoplifters.

The number of shoplifting incidents is very difficult to determine (or even estimate) due to the nature of the crime. The range of the "estimates" by the respective store personnel for the 12-month period varied from 1 to 250 in the baseline survey and from 1 to 500 in the survey two years later.

Similarly, the estimate of the dollar loss from the shoplifting incidents are difficult to measure and compare.

For example, dollar losses ranged from \$5 to \$10,000 from 19 businesses who provided estimates in the baseline survey. Estimated losses ranged from \$25 to \$10,000 in the follow-up survey.

Comparisons of total and average (mean) dollar losses between the two survey periods may be somewhat unreliable because of the fairly small number of estimates on which they are based; the wide range (variability) of values; and the variability of the types of businesses providing estimates (for example, some stores such as a large department/variety compared to a florist shop are more likely to experience shoplifting losses). However, with these factors in mind, shoplifting losses appear to be increasing in Roseburg. The median (mid-point) value of the dollar losses rose from \$200 in the baseline to \$525 in the follow-up survey.

The item relating to losses from shoplifting as a percent of gross sales is probably a better measure of change in shoplifting losses. The values ranged from one to twenty (20) percent in the base period and one to ten (10) percent in the follow-up period. The median (mid-point) value was 1.21 and 1.25 percent in the baseline and follow-up surveys, respectively. The most frequent value given in both surveys was one (1) percent.

There has been an increase in the proportion of businesses who have or established a formal shoplifting policy. For those businesses subject to shoplifting, approximately 25 percent indicated they had a policy in the baseline year and this rose to 33 percent for the period two years later. The vast majority (93%) of the businesses indicated their employees knew and were following the policy.

Only five (5) businesses indicated they detained shoplifters in the baseline survey compared to four (4) in the latest survey. Within these groups, however, two businesses indicated they had a total of four (4) arrested in the base year but this increased to a total of

116 for the four businesses in the follow-up period (one business reported a total of 98 shoplifters arrested). These numbers, together with the increase in shoplifting policies, would indicate the business community may be moving toward a "get tough" policy toward shoplifters.

When asked to indicate the reason why the stores were not detaining persons for arrest by the police, the most frequent reason given was "...nothing can be done--lack of proof."

Employee Thefts

Although the surveyed businesses reported a slight increase in the proportion victimized by employee theft between the two years, the change was not significant ($Z = -.6676$). Twenty-four percent thought they were victimized in the base period and this rose to 29 percent for the follow-up two years later.

For the subset of businesses who estimated the number of employee thefts occurring over the 12-month periods, the number of incidents per business ranged from 1 to 25 for the base period to 1 to 20 for the follow-up period.

The comparison of the average (mean) number per business (for those providing an estimate) across the two periods are very similar. The average (mean) number per business was 4.78 for the base period compared to 4.08 in the latter survey period. The difference between these mean values is not significant ($t = .25$, N.S., d.f. = 19).

There was a wide variation in the amount of dollar loss to employee theft between the two survey periods. The estimated business loss ranged from \$50 to \$30,000 in the first survey contrasted to \$15 to a high of \$2,000 in the follow-up survey.

This wide difference between the two survey periods produced a significant finding in terms of average (mean) dollar loss per business. The "estimate" for the first period was \$4,123 compared to \$619 for the follow-up ($t = 1.86, p < .05, d.f. = 30, 1\text{-tail test}$). A significant difference between the two periods remains even if we delete the extreme high loss of \$30,000 reported by one of the businesses in the base period (the highest loss value then is \$10,000 compared to the high estimate of \$2,000 for the follow-up survey).

As was the case for shoplifting, the businesses victimized by employee theft estimate their losses as amounting to one to two percent of their gross sales. The average (mean) value from the first survey was higher due to one business reporting an estimate of ten percent of their gross sales. However, the most frequent estimate given for both time periods was one percent.

Approximately half of the businesses indicated they took action against employees committing theft. A total of 25 employees were discharged from a subset of businesses reporting in the first survey time period compared to a total of 20 in the second survey. Hardly any of the businesses involve the police in handling employee thefts. Only one employee was indicated to have been arrested in the base survey and none were indicated to have been arrested in the follow-up period two years later.

The major reason employees give for not reporting employee thefts to the police is that "...nothing can be done--lack of proof." However, in the last survey, three of the twenty who responded indicated "fear of a civil suit" that might result from falsely accusing an employee.

C. Awareness of Crime Prevention Program and Changes in Business Security

Approximately 60 percent of the businesses indicated they were aware of Roseburg's Crime Prevention program. Table 5 lists the sources the respondents checked for learning about the program. The respondents could check more than one source for knowledge or contact with the programs. The major source of awareness or knowledge about the program has been through the media--radio, television, and newspaper articles. The other sources were checked about the same extent as we find that 12 percent indicated their sources was through personal contact with the crime prevention officer. Only one indicated their awareness came through a crime prevention neighborhood block meeting.

Table 5
Information Sources for Knowledge of
Crime Prevention Program

Source	Number	Percent
Media--Radio, TV, Newspaper	25	29.1%
Public Meeting	11	12.8%
Word of Mouth	11	12.8%
Crime Prevention Block Meeting	1	1.2%
Contact with C.P. Officer	10	11.6%
Other Source	1	1.2%

On the follow-up survey the respondents were asked to indicate what type(s) of changes had been made to improve their business' security within the past five years. The types of improvements indicated are presented in Table 6.

The most frequent type of improvement made has been to improve door locks. Nearly 40 percent of the sample indicated they had made this type of improvement. Additionally, approximately 40 percent had either established or improved their check cashing/credit card policy to reduce their losses from worthless checks or credit card fraud. Twenty-three percent had also made some changes to try to discourage or prevent losses from employee thefts.

Table 6
Type of Changes Made to Improve Business Security
(Past 5 years)

Type of Improvement	(N = 86)	
	Number	% of Sample
No Improvements Made	25	29.1%
Improved External Lighting	23	26.7%
Improved Internal Lighting	18	20.9%
Improved Door Locks	32	37.2%
Improved Window or Skylight Security	5	5.8%
Installed or Improved Fence	6	7.0%
Installed New Alarm System	4	4.7%
Improved Existing Alarm System	4	4.7%
Changes to Discourage Shoplifting	12	14.0%
Established Check Cashing/Credit Card Policy	18	20.9%
Improved Existing Check Cashing/Credit Card Policy	17	19.8%
Discourage Employee Theft	20	23.3%
Use Guard Dogs	0	--
Security Guard (Full/Part Time)	13	15.1%
Other	3	3.5%

Changes in external and internal lighting was indicated by 27 and 21 percent of the businesses, respectively. Other deterrent measures such as installing or improving alarm systems or fences were implemented or changed to a lesser extent. Cost factors involved may be one of the primary reasons these measures are not utilized as frequently, especially in the case of alarm systems. Fences would only be appropriate for certain types of businesses.

One of the last items of the follow-up survey attempted to gain some measure of the relationship between being the victim of a crime and the improvements taken are not to deter or prevent further victimization. These findings should be considered with some caution due to the small sample size and, possibly, the wording of the items. However, based on the responses the results indicate similar behavior as found in other commercial and residential crime prevention programs. A crucial finding that has important implications for the community and crime prevention personnel is the majority of the businesses do not establish or make changes to deter or prevent victimization until after they have been victimized one or more times.

Although a greater number of businesses indicated they have established or improved their security measures than those not making any improvements, the majority of the businesses (22) indicated they made the changes after being victimized as opposed to those (15) who were not a crime victim but made some security improvements.

The last item inspected the relationship between knowledge of security measures or precautions gained from the crime prevention program and whether or not the businesses had made improvements. The responses from the item indicated that eight (8) businesses made improvements based on information gained through the crime prevention program. This contrasts to the 24 who indicated they had made improvements without knowledge of the crime prevention program. The interpretation given to these figures may be somewhat misleading because the respondents may have made the improvements prior to Roseburg's program concentration on assisting commercial establishments.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Cirel, P. et al. Community Crime Prevention Program, Seattle, Washington. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1977.
- Decker, S.H. "Official Crime Rates and Victim Surveys: An Empirical Comparison." Journal of Criminal Justice, 5:47-54, 1977.
- Goff, C. et al. Portland Impact Evaluation Plan. Salem, Oregon: Oregon Law Enforcement Council, 1973.
- Pearson, D. Residential and Commercial Victimization in Roseburg, 1976-1977. Salem, Oregon: Oregon Law Enforcement Council, 1978.
- Pearson, D. Evaluation of Multnomah County's Commercial Burglary Prevention Project. Salem, Oregon: Oregon Law Enforcement Council, 1980.
- Schneider, Anne L. et al. Evaluation of the Portland Neighborhood-Based Anti-Burglary Program. Eugene, Oregon: Oregon Research Institute, 1975.
- St. Louis, A. Victims of Crime in Texas: The 1975-76 Texas Crime Trend Survey. Austin, Texas: Statistical Analysis Center, Texas Department of Public Safety, December, 1976.
- _____. Victims of Crime--The Texas Crime Trend Survey. Austin, Texas: Statistical Analysis Center, Texas Department of Public Safety, February, 1978.
- U.S. Department of Commerce, Domestic and International Business Administration, Bureau of Domestic Commerce. The Cost of Crimes Against Business. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1976.
- U.S. Department of Justice, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. Criminal Victimization in the United States, A Comparison of 1975 and 1976 Findings. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1977.
- _____. Criminal Victimization Surveys in Eight American Cities, A Comparison of 1971/72 and 1974/75 Findings. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1976.
- Whittemore, Sherrill L. Evaluation of the City of Portland's Crime Prevention Bureau Program. Portland, Oregon: Office of Justice Programs, 1977.

APPENDIX A
THE RESIDENTIAL QUESTIONNAIRE



ROSEBURG

A-1
SERIOUS **CRIME** SURVEY

THIS BOOKLET CONTAINS QUESTIONS ABOUT YOUR EXPERIENCES AND VIEWS OF CRIME IN ROSEBURG.

YOU HAVE BEEN SELECTED THROUGH A RANDOM SELECTION PROCEDURE TO HELP GIVE AN ACCURATE AND REPRESENTATIVE PICTURE OF CRIMINAL VICTIMIZATION. THE INFORMATION GAINED THROUGH THIS STUDY MAY BE USED IN MAKING FUTURE CRIMINAL JUSTICE DECISIONS. BECAUSE OF THIS, IT IS IMPORTANT THAT WE RECEIVE YOUR COOPERATION IN FILLING OUT THIS BOOKLET.

YOUR ANSWERS WILL BE TREATED CONFIDENTIALLY. EACH BOOKLET IS NUMBERED SO THAT WE CAN KEEP TRACK OF ALL QUESTIONNAIRES RETURNED TO US.

PLEASE TAKE THE FEW MINUTES REQUIRED TO ANSWER THE QUESTIONS IN THIS BOOKLET. THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION.

INSTRUCTIONS

Please read each question carefully before responding. Do not skip any questions unless there are instructions to do so.

Indicate the number of times within the period July 1, 1978 to June 30, 1979, that each of the following occurred. If the crime didn't occur in this time period, please enter "0" in the appropriate space.

SAMPLE

Number of Times
Event Occurred

1. BURGLARY

Between July 1, 1978 and June 30, 1979, did anyone break into your home or apartment and steal something?

- 1 1. Yes, my property was stolen. If answer is yes, how many times were you burglarized?
- 2 2. An attempt was made, but it failed. If answer is yes, how many times was a burglary attempted?
- 0 3. No, no burglary or attempted burglary occurred.

This example shows that between July 1, 1978 to June 30, 1979 the person filling it out experienced one burglary and two attempted burglaries.

Please complete every question that applies to you. Remember, this survey is for the period July 1, 1978 to June 30, 1979; please do not include crimes happening prior to or after this period of time.

PART 1. CRIME EVENTS

Number of Times
Event Occurred

1. BURGLARY

Between July 1, 1978 and June 30, 1979, did anyone break into your home or apartment and steal something?

- 1. Yes, my property was stolen. If answer is yes, how many times were you burglarized?
- 2. An attempt was made, but it failed. If answer is yes, how many times was a burglary attempted?
- 3. No, no burglary or attempted burglary occurred.



2. ROBBERY

Did anyone take money or any other valuables directly from you under the threat or actual use of force?

- 1. Yes, I was robbed. If answer is yes, how many times were you robbed?
- 2. Someone tried to rob me, but they failed. If answer is yes, how many times was robbery attempted?
- 3. No, no robbery or attempted robbery occurred.



A-2

3. ASSAULT WITH WEAPON

Did anyone beat you or attack you with a knife, gun, club, or other weapon?

- 1. Yes, I was hit or struck by another person. If answer is yes, how many times were you attacked?
- 2. I was threatened, but not actually struck. If answer is yes, how many times was an attack attempted?
- 3. No, no attack or threat with a weapon occurred.




Number of Times
Event Occurred

4. ASSAULT WITH BODY

Did anyone threaten you or attack you with their fists, feet, or other bodily attack?

- 1. Yes, I was hit or struck by another person. If yes, how many times were you the victim of such an assault?
- 2. I was threatened but not actually hit. If yes, how many times were you threatened?
- 3. No, I was not threatened or attacked.



5. RAPE

Did anyone try to sexually assault, molest, or rape you?

- 1. Yes, I was assaulted and forcibly raped. If yes, how many times were you raped?
- 2. I was assaulted and touched, but not raped. If yes, how many times were you sexually assaulted?
- 3. No, I was not sexually assaulted or raped.



6. MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT

Did anyone steal your auto, truck or motorcycle?

- 1. Yes, auto. If yes, how many times?
- 2. Yes, truck. If yes, how many times?
- 3. Yes, motorcycle. If yes, how many times?
- 4. Vehicle theft attempted only. If yes, how many times?
- 5. No, no motor vehicle thefts or attempted thefts occurred.



Number of Times
Event Occurred

7. OTHER THEFT

Was any other property or valuable item stolen from you that is not mentioned above?

- 1. Yes, property or valuables were stolen. If yes, how many times?
- 2. Someone tried to steal my property but they failed. If yes, how many times?
- 3. No, no other thefts.

8. VANDALISM

Did someone intentionally or recklessly damage or destroy property belonging to you?

- 1. Yes, my property was intentionally or recklessly damaged or destroyed. If yes, how many times?
- 2. Someone tried to damage or destroy my property, but failed. If yes, how many times?
- 3. No, no vandalism.

NOTICE

IF YOU WERE A VICTIM OF ANY CRIME MENTIONED SO FAR, PLEASE CONTINUE WITH QUESTION 9.

IF YOU WERE NOT A VICTIM OF ANY OF THESE CRIMES, SKIP TO QUESTION 22.



A-3

9. PERSONAL INJURY

Were you physically injured from any crime?

- 1. No, no injury at all.
- 2. Yes, but no medical help required. If yes, how many times?
- 3. Yes, medical first aid required. If yes, how many times?
- 4. Yes, hospitalization was required for overnight care or longer. If yes, how many times?

10. Were you mentally or psychologically injured from any crime?

- 1. No, no mental injury.
- 2. Yes, some mental or psychological injury, but no treatment was required. If yes, how many times?
- 3. Yes, some mental or psychological injury, and counseling and/or medication was prescribed. If yes, how many times?
- 4. Yes, much counseling and/or medication prescribed to ease mental or psychological injury. If yes, how many times?

11. If you were a victim of a crime, was a weapon used? (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

- 1. No crime occurred to me.
- 2. Gun
- 3. Knife
- 4. Club
- 5. Other weapon
- 6. Bodily threats, fists, feet, etc.
- 7. No weapon used.

NOTICE

WE ARE INTERESTED IN SEPARATING PROPERTY LOSS DUE TO VANDALISM FROM PROPERTY LOSS DUE TO OTHER PROPERTY CRIMES (BURGLARY, ROBBERY, THEFT AND AUTO THEFT). FOR THIS REASON QUESTION 12 ASKS FOR THE DOLLAR VALUE OF PROPERTY LOSSES RESULTING FROM VANDALISM AND QUESTION 13 ASKS FOR PROPERTY LOSS AS A CONSEQUENCE OF ALL PROPERTY CRIMES EXCEPT VANDALISM.

12. PROPERTY LOSS

If your property was vandalized, what was the dollar value of the loss. (DO NOT INCLUDE LOSS FROM BURGLARY, ROBBERY, THEFT OR AUTO THEFT.)

- 1. None, no loss
- 2. Under \$5
- 3. \$5 or more, but less than \$20
- 4. \$20 or more, but less than \$200
- 5. \$200 or more, but less than \$1000
- 6. \$1000 or more, but less than \$5000
- 7. \$5000 or more/write in amount below

13. If your property was burglarized, stolen, or robbed, what was the dollar value of the loss? (DO NOT INCLUDE LOSS FROM VANDALISM)

- 1. None, no loss
- 2. Under \$5
- 3. \$5 or more, but less than \$20
- 4. \$20 or more, but less than \$200
- 5. \$200 or more, but less than \$1000
- 6. \$1000 or more, but less than \$5000
- 7. \$5000 or more/write in amount below

14. COSTS OF CRIME TO VICTIM

Did any of the following costs of a crime apply to you? (DO NOT INCLUDE COSTS RESULTING FROM VANDALISM) (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

- 1. Yes, cost of medical or psychological treatment.
- 2. Yes, legal expenses
- 3. Yes, wages lost from work
- 4. Other costs not listed above
- 5. No, none of the above crime costs apply to me.

15. NON-PROPERTY DOLLAR LOSS

What was the total cost to you of any medical or legal expenses or wages lost from work or for any other reason other than the value of property involved in the crime(s) itself as covered in Question 13. (DO NOT INCLUDE LOSS FROM VANDALISM)

A-4

- 1. None, no costs to me.
- 2. Under \$200
- 3. \$201 to \$500
- 4. \$501 to \$1000
- 5. \$1001 to \$2000
- 6. \$2001 to \$5000
- 7. Over \$5000/write in amount below: _____

16. Did your insurance cover any of the costs or expenses from the crime? (PROPERTY AND INJURY COSTS COMBINED--DO NOT INCLUDE LOSS FROM VANDALISM)

- 1. Yes, all of the expenses.
- 2. Yes, over half or 50% of the costs.
- 3. Yes, but less than half of the costs.
- 4. No, none of the expenses were covered by insurance.
- 5. No crime occurred to me.

17. PLACE

If you were the victim of any of the crimes mentioned above, where did this event(s) or attack(s) take place? List type(s) of crime under each place a crime occurred.

- 1. In the street, near home, (within a few blocks) _____ (type(s) of crime)
- 2. In the street, away from home. _____ (type(s) of crime)
- 3. In a store, bar, or other commercial location. _____ (type(s) of crime)
- 4. In my home or apartment. _____ (type(s) of crime)
- 5. In my apartment building. _____ (type(s) of crime)
- 6. At work, on the job. _____ (type(s) of crime)
- 7. At school. _____ (type(s) of crime)
- 8. Other location not listed. _____ (type(s) of crime)
- 9. No crime occurred to me.

18. TIME OF YEAR

In what month did each crime occur? Write crime type below each date of occurrence.

- 1. No crimes in the past year
- 2. July, 1978 _____ (type(s) of crime)
- 3. August, 1978 _____ (type(s) of crime)
- 4. September, 1978 _____ (type(s) of crime)
- 5. October, 1978 _____ (type(s) of crime)
- 6. November, 1978 _____ (type(s) of crime)
- 7. December, 1978 _____ (type(s) of crime)
- 8. January, 1979 _____ (type(s) of crime)
- 9. February, 1979 _____ (type(s) of crime)
- 10. March, 1979 _____ (type(s) of crime)
- 11. April, 1979 _____ (type(s) of crime)
- 12. May, 1979 _____ (type(s) of crime)
- 13. June, 1979 _____ (type(s) of crime)

19. NOTICE TO POLICE

Were the police or other law enforcement authorities notified of any crimes against you?

- 1. Yes, in each and every incident of crime.
- 2. Yes, but not every crime was reported.
- 3. No, no crimes were reported to the police.
- 4. No crime occurred.

20. NO NOTICE TO POLICE

What crime or crimes were not reported to the police?

- 1. No crime occurred.
- 2. All crimes reported to police.
- 3. A crime was not reported to police.

List crime not reported:

- 1. _____
- 2. _____
- 3. _____
- 4. _____

- 21. REASONS FOR NOT REPORTING CRIME**
 Why didn't you or another household member report the crime to the police? (CHECK SINGLE MOST IMPORTANT REASON)
- 1. No crime occurred.
 - 2. All crime was reported to police.
 - 3. Useless to report, nothing will be done.
 - 4. Afraid of retaliation.
 - 5. Afraid of police investigation.
 - 6. Was not important enough.
 - 7. Too much time involved, loss of work, etc.
 - 8. Afraid or embarrassed by prosecutor's questions or investigation.
 - 9. Too busy with other matters.
 - 10. Other, list _____

A-5

PART 2. PERCEPTIONS OF CRIME AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE

- 22.** Within the past year, do you think that crime in your neighborhood has increased, decreased, or stayed about the same?
- 1. Crime has increased.
 - 2. Crime has decreased.
 - 3. Crime has stayed about the same.
 - 4. No opinion.
 - 5. Haven't lived here that long.
- 23.** Do you believe that you are likely to be the victim of a crime during the next year?
- 1. Yes
 - 2. No
 - 3. No opinion

- 24.** Which crime do you think is most likely to occur to you?
- 1. No particular crime.
 - 2. A robbery by a person armed with a dangerous or deadly weapon.
 - 3. A robbery by a person without a dangerous or deadly weapon.
 - 4. A break-in or burglary of my home.
 - 5. A rape or attempted rape.
 - 6. A theft of my wallet or purse or other valuable property directly from my person.
 - 7. A violent assault or beating.
 - 8. An attempt to murder.
 - 9. Other crime, list _____

- 25.** What crime is most likely to occur in your neighborhood?
- 1. No particular crime.
 - 2. A robbery by a person armed with a dangerous or deadly weapon.
 - 3. A robbery by a person without a dangerous or deadly weapon.
 - 4. A break-in or burglary in my home.
 - 5. A rape or attempted rape.
 - 6. A theft of my wallet or purse or other valuable property directly from my person.
 - 7. A violent assault or beating.
 - 8. An attempt to murder.
 - 9. Other crime, list _____

- 26.** The place where I feel the safest from crime is: (PLEASE CHECK ONLY ONE)
- 1. In my home.
 - 2. On the streets near my home.
 - 3. At work.
 - 4. On the streets near work.
 - 5. On the streets away from home or work.
 - 6. Other, write in location: _____

- 27.** The place where I feel the most danger from crime is: (PLEASE CHECK ONLY ONE)
- 1. In my home.
 - 2. On the streets near my home.
 - 3. At work.
 - 4. On the streets near work.
 - 5. On the streets away from home or work.
 - 6. Other, write in location: _____

- 28.** More funds and personnel should be devoted to combat and prevent juveniles (under 18) from becoming adult criminals.
- 1. Agree
 - 2. Disagree
 - 3. No opinion

19. If law enforcement budgets are cut, which THREE of the following should be reduced first? (Mark 1, 2, 3) Which THREE would you think most important to retain? (Mark 1, 2, 3)

- | REDUCE FIRST
(Mark 1, 2, 3)
MARK ONLY THREE | RETAIN
(Mark 1, 2, 3)
MARK ONLY THREE |
|--|---|
| ___ 1. Providing crowd-control services for parades, sports events, etc. | 1. ___ |
| ___ 2. Enforcing traffic laws | 2. ___ |
| ___ 3. Responding to complaints (barking dogs, loud vehicles or parties, etc.) | 3. ___ |
| ___ 4. Responding to traffic accidents and other emergencies | 4. ___ |
| ___ 5. Analyzing enforcement methods, crime problems, locations, and prevention so as to determine best use of manpower and resources. | 5. ___ |
| ___ 6. Investigation of illegal hard drug selling. | 6. ___ |
| ___ 7. Investigation of illegal hard drug usage. | 7. ___ |
| ___ 8. Investigation of marijuana selling | 8. ___ |
| ___ 9. Investigation of marijuana usage | 9. ___ |
| ___ 10. Investigating serious violent crime (assault, murder, robbery, etc.) | 10. ___ |
| ___ 11. Investigating serious property crime (auto theft, burglary, major vandalism, etc.) | 11. ___ |
| ___ 12. Investigating minor violent crime (threats, minor assaults, etc.) | 12. ___ |
| ___ 13. Investigating minor property crime (minor theft, minor vandalism) | 13. ___ |
| ___ 14. Investigating "victimless" crime (gambling, prostitution, etc.) | 14. ___ |
| ___ 15. Purchasing up-to-date equipment, vehicles, etc. | 15. ___ |
| ___ 16. Patrolling the community | 16. ___ |
| ___ 17. Providing crime prevention programs, information, and services such as neighborhood meetings or use of engraving tools. | 17. ___ |

A-6

20. Rate the seriousness in your community of each item by circling a number between 1 and 5.

- EXAMPLE:
- | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| Not a
Problem
At All | 1 2 3 4 5 | Very
Serious
Problem |
|----------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------|
1. Cost of Living 9. Property Crime
(burglary, theft, etc.)
- 1 2 3 4 5
2. Quality of Education 10. Property Taxes
- 1 2 3 4 5
3. Violence Between Household Members 11. Unemployment
- 1 2 3 4 5
4. Juvenile Delinquency 12. Violent Crime
(assault, rape, etc.)
- 1 2 3 4 5
5. Pollution/Environmental Concerns 13. Land Use/Zoning Issues
- 1 2 3 4 5
6. Drug Abuse 14. White Collar Crime
(embezzlement, fraud, etc.)
- 1 2 3 4 5
7. Alcohol Abuse
- 1 2 3 4 5
8. Poverty
- 1 2 3 4 5

PART 3. CRIME PREVENTION ACTIVITIES

31. Are you aware that the Roseburg Police Department has a crime prevention program?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No

32. Have you or a member of your family been contacted by or received information about Roseburg's crime prevention program through any of the following sources?

- 1. Radio/T.V./Newspaper articles
- 2. Public or organization meetings
- 3. Word of mouth
- 4. Crime prevention block meeting
- 5. Personal contact with Roseburg's crime prevention officer
- 6. Other source, list _____

33. Do you regularly lock all the doors to your home when leaving it?

- A-7
- 1. Yes
 - 2. No

34. Do you keep your garage door closed and locked at all times when not in use?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No

35. Do you keep your vehicle doors locked when parked near your home?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No

36. Do you keep your vehicle doors locked when your vehicle is parked at some other location away from your home?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No

37. Have you marked your personal property for identification?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No

38. If you were the victim of a burglary or theft during July 1, 1978 to June 30, 1979, was your property engraved? (PLEASE CHECK ONLY ONE)

- 1. Does not apply, I wasn't a victim.
- 2. Engraved before the crime occurred.
- 3. Engraved after the crime occurred.
- 4. Not engraved before or after the crime occurred.

39. Have you placed antiburglary stickers on your windows and/or doors?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No

40. If you were the victim of a property crime (theft or burglary) during July 1, 1978 to June 30, 1979, were anti-burglary stickers or warning decals displayed? (PLEASE CHECK ONLY ONE)

- 1. Does not apply, I wasn't a victim.
- 2. Decals displayed before the crime occurred.
- 3. Decals displayed after the crime occurred.
- 4. Decals not displayed before or after the crime occurred.

41. Are all your door and window locks in operable condition?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No

42. Do you keep a firearm in your home for protection?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No

43. Do you have a burglar alarm system in your home?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No

PART 4. DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION FOR STATISTICAL PURPOSES ONLY

44. What is your sex?

- 1. Male
- 2. Female

45. What is your age?

- 1. 15 or under
- 2. 16 or 17
- 3. 18 or 19
- 4. 20-22
- 5. 23-25
- 6. 26-29
- 7. 30-40
- 8. 41-50
- 9. 51-65
- 10. Over 65

46. What is your racial or ethnic background?

- 1. Mexican, Spanish, or other Latin.
- 2. White or Caucasian
- 3. Black or Negro
- 4. Other, list _____

47. What income bracket does your total or gross family income fall into?

- 1. \$3,000 or less
- 2. \$3,001-\$6,000
- 3. \$6,001-\$10,000
- 4. \$10,001-\$15,000
- 5. \$15,001-\$25,000
- 6. \$25,001-\$50,000
- 7. Over \$50,000

48. What is the highest grade in school you have completed?

- 1. Less than 8th grade.
- 2. 8th to 11th grade.
- 3. High School graduate.
- 4. College, 1-3 years
- 5. Technical School.
- 6. College graduate.
- 7. Professional or advanced degree beyond 4 years of college.

49. How many people live with you in your home, apartment, or household?

- 1. Myself only
- 2. One other
- 3. Two others
- 4. Three others
- 5. Four others
- 6. Five other
- 7. Six others
- 8. Seven other
- 9. Eight other
- 10. Nine or more

50. During the past year, what was your main employment or activity?

- 1. Full-time employment outside home.
- 2. Part-time employment outside home.
- 3. Student.
- 4. Housewife or homemaker.
- 5. Unemployed.
- 6. Disabled.
- 7. Retired.
- 8. Other, list _____

51. How long have you lived at your present address?

- 1. 1 year or less.
- 2. 2 years or less.
- 3. 5 years or less.
- 4. 10 years or less.
- 5. Over 10 years.

Thank you for filling out this questionnaire.
Please place it in the return envelope and drop
it in the mail.

APPENDIX B
COVER LETTER AND FOLLOW-UP CORRESPONDENCE

CHARLES F. WUERGLER
~~XXXXXXXXXX~~
Chief of Police

Phone (503) 673-6633

CITY OF ROSEBURG

POLICE DEPARTMENT
774 S. E. Rose Street
ROSEBURG, OREGON 97470

Dear Roseburg Citizen:


Your police department needs your help! We are conducting a crime trend survey designed to more accurately measure the crime problems in Roseburg. As you may be aware, distribution of police resources and establishment of priorities are usually based on statistics derived from crimes reported to the police. It is generally believed that many crimes are not reported for various reasons. If this is true in our community, your assistance may well help us understand and address the true crime picture.

You are one of 500 Roseburg citizens who have been selected at random. Enclosed with this letter is a questionnaire booklet and a stamped, self-addressed envelope. Please read the instructions carefully, be sure to include the number of incidents and not overlook the questions on the back of the last page. The information you submit will be treated anonymously and confidentially. The number appearing on the booklets face enables us to keep track of them.

Remember, by knowing what crimes occur, when they occur, who they are perpetrated against as well as which areas of the city are involved, your police department will be able to do a better job for you.

If the person to whom this letter is addressed is unable to complete the questionnaire, you can assist us by having any adult, over 18 years of age, who has lived in the home since July 1, 1976, complete the questionnaire.

I would like to thank you in advance for your assistance and cooperation and also advise you that this project was funded by the Oregon Law Enforcement Council.


Charles F. Wurgler
Chief of Police

Have you returned your "Survey of Crime in Roseburg" to us?

We need your response to help us develop crime trends in Roseburg.

Since you are one of only 500 Roseburg residents who are in our sample, your response is very important. Please complete the questions and return it to us.

If you have already returned your form, we thank you for your participation and cooperation.

Charles F. Wuergler
Chief of Police

Roseburg, Oregon

Postcard Reminder--sent to all non-respondents during the second-week and sixth-week followup.

CHARLES F. WUERGLER
Chief of Police

Phone (503) 673-6633

CITY OF ROSEBURG

POLICE DEPARTMENT
774 S. E. Rose Street
ROSEBURG, OREGON 97470
September 22, 1977

Dear Roseburg Citizen:


Several weeks ago a pamphlet questionnaire was mailed to you entitled "Survey of Serious Crime in Roseburg", and we have not yet received your reply. Realizing that many of our citizens were on vacation at that time or that mail can be lost or misplaced, I am enclosing another pamphlet for your consideration.

I would like to emphasize the importance of your cooperation in this survey. You are one of only 500 persons selected to participate in this effort. The information you and your fellow citizens provide will help your police department to do a better job for you.

If you have already mailed me your original pamphlet within the last 3 or 4 days, ignore this request. If not, I again request your cooperation by taking the time to fill out the questionnaire and return it to me in the enclosed, self addressed envelope. Remember, your answers will be treated anonymously and confidentially.

Thank you again for your assistance in helping your police department do a better job for you.

Very truly yours,


Charles F. Wuergler
Chief of Police

CFW:1a

APPENDIX C
 CENSUS AND SAMPLE AGE DISTRIBUTION
 COMPARISONS AND SAMPLE WEIGHTS

Table C-1
 Census and Sample Age Distribution Comparison
 and Sample Weights
 SAMPLE FOR 1976-77 BASELINE SURVEY

Census Age Categories	% of Total	Survey Age Categories	% of Total	Corrective Weights
20-29	20.6%	20-29	7.6%	2.7105
30-39	16.4%	30-39	18.5%	.8865
40-49	19.0%	40-49	22.6%	.8407
50-64	25.1%	50-64	27.0%	.9296
65+	18.8%	65+	24.2%	.7777

Table C-2
 Census and Sample Age Distribution Comparison
 and Sample Weights
 SAMPLE FOR 1978-79 FOLLOW-UP SURVEY

Census Age Categories	% of Total	Survey Age Categories	% of Total	Corrective Weights
20-29	20.6%	20-29	17.2%	1.199
30-39	16.4%	30-39	16.7%	.981
40-49	19.0%	40-49	15.0%	1.266
50-64	25.1%	50-64	26.6%	.944
65+	18.8%	65+	24.5%	.768

APPENDIX D-1
 RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN CITIZENS' CRIME PREVENTION ACTIONS
 AND THEFT/ATTEMPTED THEFT VICTIMIZATION

Table D-1
 TEST OF RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN CITIZENS' CRIME PREVENTION
 ACTIONS AND THEFT/ATTEMPTED THEFT VICTIMIZATION
 (Including Motor Vehicle)

		Baseline Period (July '76-June '77)			Follow-up Period (July '78-June '79)			
1. Are you aware of Roseburg's Crime Prevention Program?								
		Yes	No		Yes	No		
Theft or Attempted Theft Victim	No	239 90.3%	114 90.1%	354 (90.2%)	No	225 85.0%	128 85.2%	354 (85.4%)
	Yes	26 9.7%	12 9.9%	38 (9.8%)	Yes	38 14.5%	22 14.8%	61 (14.6%)
		265 (67.6%)	127 (32.4%)	392	264 (63.6%)	151 (36.4%)	414	
		$\chi^2 = .002$ p = .96 NS			$\chi^2 = .004$ p = .95 NS			
		$\chi^2 = 0.0$ p = 1.00 NS			$\chi^2 = 0.0$ p = 1.00 NS			
		Phi = .002			Phi = .003			
2. Do you regularly lock house doors when leaving?								
		Yes	No		Yes	No		
Theft or Attempted Theft Victim	No	321 90.5%	39 89.8%	360 (90.4%)	No	318 85.8%	40 82.4%	350 (85.4%)
	Yes	34 9.5%	4 10.2%	38 (9.6%)	Yes	53 14.2%	9 17.6%	61 (14.6%)
		355 (89.2%)	43 (10.8%)	398	371 (88.5%)	48 (11.5%)	420	
		$\chi^2 = .020$ p = .88 NS			$\chi^2 = .398$ p = .53 NS			
		$\chi^2 = 0.0$ p = 1.00 NS			$\chi^2 = .172$ p = .68 NS			
		Phi = .007			Phi = .031			

*Corrected

Table D-1 Cont'd.

TEST OF RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN CITIZENS' CRIME PREVENTION ACTIONS AND THEFT/ATTEMPTED THEFT VICTIMIZATION (Including Motor Vehicle)

		Baseline Period (July '76-June '77)			Follow-up Period (July '78-June '79)			
3. Do you keep your garage door closed and locked at all times when not in use?								
Theft or Attempted Theft Victim	No	Yes 196 90.9%	No 84 88.9%	281 (90.3%)	No	Yes 181 84.5%	No 108 84.9%	288 (84.6%)
	Yes	20 9.1%	11 11.1%	30 (9.7%)	Yes	33 15.5%	19 15.1%	52 (15.4%)
		216 (69.5%)	95 (30.5%)	311	214 (62.8%)	127 (37.2%)	341	
		$\chi^2 = .318 \quad p = .57$			$\chi^2 = .014 \quad p = .90 \text{ NS}$			
		$*\chi^2 = .127 \quad p = .72$			$*\chi^2 = 0.0 \quad p = 1.00 \text{ NS}$			
		Phi = .032			Phi = .007			

4. Do you keep your vehicle doors locked when parked near your home?

		Baseline Period			Follow-up Period			
Theft or Attempted Theft Victim	No	Yes 207 91.1%	No 133 88.2%	341 (89.9%)	No	Yes 227 85.3%	No 121 84.5%	347 (85.0%)
	Yes	20 8.9%	18 11.8%	38 (10.1%)	Yes	39 14.7%	22 15.5%	61 (15.0%)
		228 (60.1%)	151 (39.9%)	379	266 (65.0%)	143 (35.0%)	409	
		$\chi^2 = .839 \quad p = .36 \text{ NS}$			$\chi^2 = .045 \quad p = .83 \text{ NS}$			
		$*\chi^2 = .550 \quad p = .46 \text{ NS}$			$*\chi^2 = .005 \quad p = .95 \text{ NS}$			
		Phi = .047			Phi = .011			

*Corrected

Table D-1 Cont'd.

TEST OF RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN CITIZENS' CRIME PREVENTION ACTIONS AND THEFT/ATTEMPTED THEFT VICTIMIZATION (Including Motor Vehicle)

		Baseline Period (July '76-June '77)			Follow-up Period (July '78-June '79)			
5. Do you keep your vehicle doors locked when parked away from home?								
Theft or Attempted Theft Victim	No	Yes 288 89.5%	No 52 93.5%	341 (90.1%)	No	Yes 305 85.1%	No 40 83.0%	345 (84.9%)
	Yes	34 10.5%	4 6.5%	37 (9.9%)	Yes	53 14.9%	8 17.0%	61 (15.1%)
		322 (85.2%)	56 (14.8%)	378	358 (88.3%)	48 (11.7%)	406	
		$\chi^2 = .856 \quad p = .35 \text{ NS}$			$\chi^2 = .147 \quad p = .70 \text{ NS}$			
		$*\chi^2 = .466 \quad p = .49 \text{ NS}$			$*\chi^2 = .028 \quad p = .87 \text{ NS}$			
		Phi = .048			Phi = .019			

6. Have you placed anti-burglary stickers (decals) on your windows and/or doors?

		Baseline Period			Follow-up Period			
Theft or Attempted Theft Victim	No	Yes 17 85.7%	No 340 90.6%	356 (90.3%)	No	Yes 32 90.8%	No 321 85.1%	353 (85.6%)
	Yes	3 4.3%	35 9.4%	38 (9.7%)	Yes	3 9.2%	56 14.9%	59 (14.4%)
		19 (4.9%)	375 (95.1%)	395	35 (8.4%)	378 (91.5%)	412	
		$\chi^2 = .502 \quad p = .48 \text{ NS}$			$\chi^2 = .844 \quad p = .36 \text{ NS}$			
		$*\chi^2 = .010 \quad p = .75 \text{ NS}$			$*\chi^2 = .444 \quad p = .51 \text{ NS}$			
		Phi = .036			Phi = .045			

*Corrected

Table D-1 Cont'd.

TEST OF RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN CITIZENS' CRIME PREVENTION ACTIONS AND THEFT/ATTEMPTED THEFT VICTIMIZATION (Including Motor Vehicle)

		Baseline Period (July '76-June '77)			Follow-up Period (July '78-June '79)		
		Yes	No		Yes	No	
Theft or Attempted Theft Victim	No	64 82.7%	291 92.4%	355 (90.5%)	64 82.1%	283 86.5%	347 (85.6%)
	Yes	13 17.3%	24 7.6%	37 (9.5%)	14 17.9%	44 13.5%	58 (14.4%)
		77 (19.8%)	315 (80.2%)	392	78 (19.4%)	327 (80.6%)	405

$\chi^2 = 6.69$ p = .01 Sig.
 $\chi^2 = 5.62$ p = .02 Sig.
 Phi = .131

$\chi^2 = .980$ p = .32 NS
 $\chi^2 = .657$ p = .42 NS
 Phi = .049

3. Are all your door and window locks in operable condition?

		Yes			No		
		Yes	No		Yes	No	
Theft or Attempted Theft Victim	No	339 90.3%	18 91.4%	357 (90.3%)	325 86.5%	37 79.0%	362 (85.7%)
	Yes	37 9.7%	2 8.6%	38 (9.7%)	51 13.5%	10 21.0%	61 (14.3%)
		375 (94.9%)	20 (5.1%)	396	376 (89.0%)	46 (11.0%)	422

$\chi^2 = .029$ p = .87 NS
 $\chi^2 = 0.0$ p = 1.00 NS
 Phi = .009

$\chi^2 = 1.889$ p = .17 NS
 $\chi^2 = 1.328$ p = .25 NS
 Phi = .067

*Corrected

Table D-1 Cont'd.

TEST OF RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN CITIZENS' CRIME PREVENTION ACTIONS AND THEFT/ATTEMPTED THEFT VICTIMIZATION (Including Motor Vehicle)

		Baseline Period (July '76-June '77)			Follow-up Period (July '78-June '79)		
		Yes	No		Yes	No	
Theft or Attempted Theft Victim	No	136 87.5%	217 92.1%	354 (90.2%)	134 83.9%	217 86.5%	351 (85.5%)
	Yes	20 12.5%	19 7.9%	38 (9.8%)	26 16.1%	34 13.5%	60 (14.5%)
		156 (39.8%)	236 (60.2%)	392	160 (39.0%)	250 (61.0%)	410

$\chi^2 = 2.272$ p = .13 NS
 $\chi^2 = 1.778$ p = .18 NS
 Phi = .076

$\chi^2 = .548$ p = .46 NS
 $\chi^2 = .356$ p = .55 NS
 Phi = .037

10. Do you have a burglar alarm system in your home?

		Yes			No		
		Yes	No		Yes	No	
Theft or Attempted Theft Victim	No	11 86.7%	347 90.5%	359 (90.4%)	10 84.5%	352 85.7%	362 (85.7%)
	Yes	2 13.3%	36 9.5%	38 (9.6%)	2 15.5%	59 14.3%	61 (14.3%)
		13 (3.3%)	384 (96.7%)	397	12 (2.9%)	411 (97.1%)	423

$\chi^2 = .218$ p = .64 NS
 $\chi^2 = 0.0$ p = 1.0 NS
 Phi = .023

$\chi^2 = .014$ p = .91 NS
 $\chi^2 = 0.0$ p = 1.0 NS
 Phi = .006

*Corrected

APPENDIX D-2
 RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN CITIZENS' CRIME PREVENTION ACTIONS
 AND PROPERTY CRIME/ATTEMPTED PROPERTY CRIME VICTIMIZATION

Table D-2
 TEST OF RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN CITIZENS'
 CRIME PREVENTION ACTIONS AND
 PROPERTY CRIME/ATTEMPTED PROPERTY CRIME VICTIMIZATION¹

		Baseline Period (July '76-June '77)			Follow-up Period (July '78-June '79)			
1. Are you aware of Roseburg's Crime Prevention Program?								
		Yes	No		Yes	No		
Property or Attempted Property Victim	No	230 86.7%	106 83.4%	336 (85.6%)	No	210 79.6%	123 81.9%	333 (80.4%)
	Yes	35 13.3%	21 16.6%	56 (14.4%)	Yes	54 20.4%	27 18.1%	81 (19.6%)
		265 (67.6%)	127 (32.4%)	392	264 (63.6%)	151 (36.4%)	414	
		$\chi^2 = .749$ p = .39 NS			$\chi^2 = .310$ p = .58 NS			
		$*\chi^2 = .507$ p = .48 NS			$*\chi^2 = .183$ p = .67 NS			
		Phi = .044			Phi = .027			
2. Do you regularly lock house doors when leaving?								
		Yes	No		Yes	No		
Property or Attempted Property Victim	No	303 85.4%	38 87.7%	341 (85.6%)	No	299 80.6%	39 79.9%	338 (80.5%)
	Yes	52 14.6%	5 12.3%	57 (14.4%)	Yes	72 19.4%	10 20.1%	82 (19.5%)
		355 (89.2%)	43 (10.8%)	398	371 (88.5%)	48 (11.5%)	420	
		$\chi^2 = .174$ p = .67 NS			$\chi^2 = .013$ p = .91 NS			
		$*\chi^2 = .035$ p = .85 NS			$*\chi^2 = 0.0$ p = 1.00 NS			
		Phi = .021			Phi = .005			

*Corrected

¹Property Crime and Attempts include the Burglary and Thefts (including motor vehicle) Victimization

Table D-2 Cont'd.

TEST OF RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN CITIZENS' CRIME PREVENTION ACTIONS AND PROPERTY CRIME/ATTEMPTED PROPERTY CRIME VICTIMIZATION¹

		Baseline Period (July '76-June '77)			Follow-up Period (July '78-June '79)					
		Yes	No		Yes	No				
3. Do you keep your garage door closed and locked at all times when not in use?	Property or Attempted Property Victim	No	182 84.0%	83 87.1%	264 (85.0%)	No	167 78.3%	100 79.2%	268 (78.6%)	
		Yes	34 16.0%	12 12.9%	47 (15.0%)	Yes	46 21.7%	26 29.3%	73 (21.4%)	
			216 (69.5%)	95 (30.5%)	311	214 (62.8%)	127 (37.2%)	341		
			$\chi^2 = .484$ p = .49 $*\chi^2 = .274$ p = .60 Phi = .039			$\chi^2 = .040$ p = .84 NS $*\chi^2 = .004$ p = .95 NS Phi = .011				

4. Do you keep your vehicle doors locked when parked near your home?

		Yes			No					
		Yes	No		Yes	No				
4. Do you keep your vehicle doors locked when parked near your home?	Property or Attempted Property Victim	No	194 85.4%	127 84.1%	322 (84.9%)	No	213 80.3%	114 79.9%	328 (80.2%)	
		Yes	33 14.6%	24 15.9%	57 (15.1%)	Yes	52 19.7%	29 20.1%	81 (19.8%)	
			228 (60.1%)	151 (39.9%)	379	266 (65.0%)	143 (35.0%)	409		
			$\chi^2 = .110$ p = .74 NS $*\chi^2 = .034$ p = .85 NS Phi = .017			$\chi^2 = .008$ p = .93 NS $*\chi^2 = 0.0$ p = 1.00 NS Phi = .004				

*Corrected

¹Property Crime and Attempts include the Burglary and Thefts (including motor vehicle Victimization)

Table D-2 Cont'd.

TEST OF RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN CITIZENS' CRIME PREVENTION ACTIONS AND PROPERTY CRIME/ATTEMPTED PROPERTY CRIME VICTIMIZATION¹

		Baseline Period (July '76-June '77)			Follow-up Period (July '78-June '79)					
		Yes	No		Yes	No				
5. Do you keep your vehicle doors locked when parked away from home?	Property or Attempted Property Victim	No	270 83.9%	52 91.9%	322 (85.1%)	No	287 80.2%	37 78.3%	325 (80.0%)	
		Yes	52 16.1%	5 8.1%	56 (14.9%)	Yes	71 19.8%	10 21.7%	81 (20.0%)	
			322 (85.2%)	56 (14.8%)	378	358 (88.3%)	48 (11.7%)	406		
			$\chi^2 = 2.435$ p = .12 NS $*\chi^2 = 1.842$ p = .17 NS Phi = .080			$\chi^2 = .100$ p = .75 NS $*\chi^2 = .014$ p = .90 NS Phi = .016				

6. Have you placed anti-burglary stickers (decals) on your windows and/or doors?

		Yes			No					
		Yes	No		Yes	No				
6. Have you placed anti-burglary stickers (decals) on your windows and/or doors?	Property or Attempted Property Victim	No	15 77.4%	323 86.2%	338 (85.7%)	No	32 90.8%	302 79.7%	333 (80.9%)	
		Yes	4 22.6%	52 13.8%	56 (14.3%)	Yes	3 9.2%	76 20.1%	79 (19.1%)	
			19 (4.9%)	375 (95.1%)	395	35 (8.4%)	378 (91.6%)	412		
			$\chi^2 = 1.169$ p = .28 NS $*\chi^2 = .561$ p = .45 NS Phi = .054			$\chi^2 = 2.447$ p = .12 NS $*\chi^2 = 1.793$ p = .18 NS Phi = .077				

*Corrected

¹Property Crime and Attempts include the Burglary and Thefts (including

Table D-2 Cont'd.

TEST OF RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN CITIZENS' CRIME PREVENTION ACTIONS AND PROPERTY CRIME/ATTEMPTED PROPERTY CRIME VICTIMIZATION¹

	Baseline Period (July '76-June '77)			Follow-up Period (July '78-June '79)				
	Yes	No		Yes	No			
Property or Attempted Property Victim	No	54 70.1%	282 89.7% (85.8%)	No	60 76.6%	268 81.9% (80.9%)		
	Yes	23 29.9%	32 10.3%	55 (14.2%)	Yes	18 23.4%	59 18.1% (19.1%)	
		77 (19.8%)	315 (80.2%)	392		78 (19.4%)	327 (80.6%)	405
	$\chi^2 = 19.63$	$p = .001$	Sig.	$\chi^2 = 1.149$	$p = .28$	NS		
	$*\chi^2 = 18.05$	$p = .001$	Sig.	$*\chi^2 = .831$	$p = .36$	NS		
	Phi = .224			Phi = .053				

8. Are all your door and window locks in operable condition?

	Yes			No				
	Yes	No		Yes	No			
Property or Attempted Property Victim	No	321 85.4%	18 87.2% (85.5%)	338	No	306 81.3%	36 76.7% (80.8%)	341
	Yes	55 14.7%	3 12.8%	57 (14.5%)	Yes	70 18.7%	11 23.1% (19.2%)	81
		375 (94.9%)	20 (5.1%)	396		376 (89.0%)	46 (11.0%)	422
	$\chi^2 = .051$	$p = .82$	NS	$\chi^2 = .516$	$p = .47$	NS		
	$*\chi^2 = 0.0$	$p = 1.00$	NS	$*\chi^2 = .271$	$p = .60$	NS		
	Phi = .011			Phi = .035				

*Corrected

¹Property Crime and Attempts include the Burglary and Thefts (including motor vehicle) Victimization

Table D-2 Cont'd.

TEST OF RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN CITIZENS' CRIME PREVENTION ACTIONS AND PROPERTY CRIME/ATTEMPTED PROPERTY CRIME VICTIMIZATION¹

	Baseline Period (July '76-June '77)			Follow-up Period (July '78-June '79)				
	Yes	No		Yes	No			
Property or Attempted Property Victim	No	131 84.1%	204 86.2% (85.4%)	335	No	122 76.4%	208 83.1% (80.5%)	330
	Yes	25 15.9%	32 13.8%	57 (14.6%)	Yes	38 23.6%	42 16.9% (19.5%)	80
		156 (39.8%)	236 (60.2%)	392		160 (39.0%)	250 (61.0%)	410
	$\chi^2 = .340$	$p = .56$	NS	$\chi^2 = 2.74$	$p = .10$	NS		
	$*\chi^2 = .191$	$p = .66$	NS	$*\chi^2 = 2.34$	$p = .13$	NS		
	Phi = .029			Phi = .082				

9. Do you keep a firearm in your home for protection?

	Yes			No				
	Yes	No		Yes	No			
Property or Attempted Property Victim	No	11 86.7%	328 85.5% (85.6%)	340	No	8 64.1%	334 81.3% (80.8%)	342
	Yes	2 13.3%	55 14.5%	57 (14.4%)	Yes	4 35.9%	77 18.7% (19.2%)	81
		13 (3.3%)	384 (96.7%)	397		12 (2.9%)	411 (97.1%)	423
	$\chi^2 = .013$	$p = .91$	NS	$\chi^2 = 2.253$	$p = .13$	NS		
	$*\chi^2 = 0.0$	$p = 1.00$	NS	$*\chi^2 = 1.280$	$p = .26$	NS		
	Phi = .006			Phi = .073				

*Corrected

¹Property Crime and Attempts include the Burglary and Thefts (including motor vehicle) Victimization

CONTINUED

1 OF 2

SURVEY OF COMMERCIAL

CRIME

IN ROSEBURG

THIS BOOKLET CONTAINS QUESTIONS ABOUT YOUR EXPERIENCES WITH COMMERCIAL CRIME IN ROSEBURG.

YOU AND OTHER BUSINESSMEN IN ROSEBURG HAVE BEEN SELECTED THROUGH A RANDOM SELECTION PROCEDURE TO HELP GIVE AN ACCURATE AND REPRESENTATIVE PICTURE OF COMMERCIAL CRIMINAL VICTIMIZATION. THE INFORMATION GAINED THROUGH THIS STUDY MAY BE USED IN MAKING FUTURE CRIMINAL JUSTICE DECISIONS. BECAUSE OF THIS, IT IS IMPORTANT THAT WE RECEIVE YOUR COOPERATION IN FILLING OUT THIS BOOKLET.

YOUR ANSWERS WILL BE TREATED CONFIDENTIALLY. EACH BOOKLET IS NUMBERED SO THAT WE CAN KEEP TRACK OF ALL THE QUESTIONNAIRES SENT TO CITIZENS.

PLEASE TAKE THE FEW MINUTES REQUIRED TO ANSWER THE QUESTIONS IN THIS BOOKLET. THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION.

I. WHAT TYPE OF BUSINESS DO YOU OPERATE?

1. 1. Retail:
2. 2. Wholesale
2. 1. Food (Grocery)
2. 2. Eating and/or drinking
3. 3. General merchandise
4. 4. Apparel
5. 5. Furniture and/or appliance
6. 6. Lumber, hardware, mobile home dealer
7. 7. Automotive
8. 8. Drug
9. 9. Manufacturing
10. 10. Real estate
11. 11. Service
12. 12. Bank
13. 13. Other (specify) _____

II. BURGLARY: Burglary is committed when someone breaks and enters your business when it is closed.

3. Did your business experience a burglary between July 1, 1978 and June 30, 1979? Yes No
4. If yes to "3", how many? _____
5. Did your business experience an attempted burglary during that same time period? Yes No
6. If yes to "5," how many? _____
7. What was the dollar loss due to loss of merchandise or similar goods due to the burglary? \$ _____
8. What was the dollar loss due to damage committed during the burglary to the building or other fixtures? \$ _____
9. Do you have a burglary alarm system? Yes No
10. Did you report the attempts or completed burglary to the police? Yes No
11. If yes, how many were reported? _____ Attempts _____ Completes
12. If any burglaries were not reported to police, why? (Check SINGLE most important reason.)
1. Nothing can be done - lack of proof
 2. Did not think it important enough
 3. Police would not want to be bothered
 4. Did not want to take the time - too inconvenient
 5. Private or personal matter - did not want to report the person
 6. Do not want to get involved
 7. Afraid of reprisal
 8. Reported to someone else
 9. Other (specify) _____

III. ROBBERY: Robbery is committed when a person uses or threatens the use of force to steal from you, i.e., gun, knife, club, or fists.

13. Was your business the victim of a robbery between July 1, 1978 and June 30, 1979? Yes No If yes, how many? _____
14. How many robberies were reported to the police? _____
15. Did you have an attempted robbery during that same time period? Yes No If yes, how many? _____
16. How many attempted robberies were reported to the police? _____
17. What was the dollar loss due to robbery(ies)? \$ _____
18. Was anyone injured during the robbery or attempt? Yes No
19. If any robbery or attempted robbery was not reported to the police, why? (Check SINGLE most important reason.)
1. Nothing can be done - lack of proof
 2. Did not think it important enough
 3. Police would not want to be bothered
 4. Did not want to take the time - too inconvenient
 5. Private or personal matter - did not want to report the person
 6. Do not want to get involved
 7. Afraid of reprisal
 8. Reported to someone else
 9. Other (specify) _____

IV. WORTHLESS CHECKS

20. Does your business accept checks? Yes No
21. Did your business accept any NSF, account closed, forged, altered, or any other type of check that a bank refused to pay between July 1, 1978 and June 30, 1979? Yes No
22. If yes, how many? _____
23. If yes, what was your dollar loss for that period? \$ _____
24. What is the estimated percent of your gross sales that this dollar loss represents? _____% (Report to nearest whole percentage, for example: 5.7% = 6%)
25. How much of this loss was recovered? \$ _____
26. Were these unrecovered checks reported to the police? Yes No
27. If not all checks were reported, approximately what percent were reported? _____%
28. Do you attempt to collect "bad checks" yourself or have a private agency do it?
 Self Private agency
 Both Self and Private agency Neither

29. If you did not report any of these checks to the police, why not? (Check SINGLE most important reason.)

- 1. Nothing can be done - lack of proof
- 2. Did not think it important enough
- 3. Police would not want to be bothered
- 4. Did not want to take the time - too inconvenient
- 5. Private or personal matter - did not want to report the person
- 6. Do not want to get involved
- 7. Afraid of reprisal
- 8. Reported to someone else
- 9. Other (specify) _____

V. CREDIT CARDS

30. Does your business accept credit cards? Yes No

31. Did your business accept a credit card in payment for goods or services that was not accepted by the issuing company between July 1, 1978 and June 30, 1979? Yes No

32. If yes, what was the reason(s) for refusal? _____

33. If yes, how many refusals? _____

34. If yes, what was the dollar loss to your business? \$ _____

35. If yes, what was the estimated percent of your gross sales this dollar loss represented? _____% (Report to nearest whole percentage, for example: 5.7% = 6%)

36. Were these losses reported to the police? Yes No

37. If not all were reported, approximately what percent were reported? _____%

38. If none were reported, why? (Check SINGLE most important reason.)

- 1. Nothing can be done - lack of proof
- 2. Did not think it important enough
- 3. Police would not want to be bothered
- 4. Did not want to take the time - too inconvenient
- 5. Private or personal matter - did not want to report the person
- 6. Do not want to get involved
- 7. Afraid of reprisal
- 8. Reported to someone else
- 9. Other (specify) _____

VI. SHOPLIFTING

39. Is your business subject to shoplifters? Yes No

40. Did your business experience losses due to shoplifters between July 1, 1978 and June 30, 1979? Yes No

41. If yes, how many incidents would you estimate occurred? _____

42. If yes, what is your estimated dollar loss from shoplifters? \$ _____

43. If yes, what percent of your gross sales do you feel the dollar loss represents? _____% (Report to nearest whole percentage, for example: 5.7% = 6%)

44. How many shoplifters have you:

Detained	_____
Reported to police	_____
Arrested	_____
Ignored	_____

45. Does your business have a formal shoplifting policy? Yes No

46. If yes, do all your employees know and follow the policy? Yes No

47. If arrests are not being made, why not? (Check SINGLE most important reason.)

- 1. Fear of civil suit
- 2. Nothing can be done - lack of proof
- 3. Did not think it important enough
- 4. Police would not want to be bothered
- 5. Did not want to take the time - too inconvenient
- 6. Private or personal matter - did not want to report the person
- 7. Do not want to get involved
- 8. Afraid of reprisal
- 9. Reported to someone else
- 10. Other (specify) _____

VII. EMPLOYEE THEFTS

48. How many persons do you employ? _____

49. Do you feel that your business has been the victim of thefts by your employees between July 1, 1978 and June 30, 1979? Yes No

50. If yes, how many incidents of theft occurred? _____

51. If yes, how many of your employees were involved? _____

52. If yes, what do you feel the dollar loss was to your business? \$ _____

53. If yes, what percent of your gross sales do you estimate this dollar loss represents? _____% (Report to nearest whole percentage, for example: 5.7% = 6%)

54. Did you take any action against these employees? Yes No

55. If yes, what type of action was taken against these employees?

Indicate Number of Employees below:

- _____ Discharged
- _____ Transferred to another area
- _____ Reported to police
- _____ Arrested
- _____ Other (specify) _____

56. If theft was discovered and not reported to the police, why was it not reported? (Check SINGLE most important reason.)

- ___ 1. Fear of civil suit
- ___ 2. Nothing can be done - lack of proof
- ___ 3. Did not think it important enough
- ___ 4. Police would not want to be bothered
- ___ 5. Did not want to take the time - too inconvenient
- ___ 6. Private or personal matter - did not want to report the person
- ___ 7. Do not want to get involved
- ___ 8. Afraid of reprisal
- ___ 9. Reported to someone else
- ___ 10. Other (specify) _____

E-4

VII. VANDALISM

57. Did your business suffer a dollar loss between July 1, 1978 and June 30, 1979 because of an act of vandalism directed against your place of business, your vehicles, or any other property owned or controlled by your business? ___ Yes ___ No

58. If yes, what was the dollar loss? \$ _____

59. If yes, how many incidents occurred? _____

60. If yes, how many incidents were reported? _____

61. If you answered no to above question, why was the incident(s) not reported to the police? (Check SINGLE most important reason.)

- ___ 1. Nothing can be done - lack of proof
- ___ 2. Did not think it important enough
- ___ 3. Police would not want to be bothered
- ___ 4. Did not want to take the time - too inconvenient
- ___ 5. Private or personal matter - did not want to report the person
- ___ 6. Do not want to get involved
- ___ 7. Afraid of reprisal
- ___ 8. Reported to someone else
- ___ 9. Other (specify) _____

VIII. MISCELLANEOUS CRIME

62. Were you the victim of any other crimes not listed previously, during the period from July 1, 1978 to June 30, 1979? ___ Yes ___ No

63. If yes, list type and number(s) of miscellaneous crime(s) below:

Type of Crime	Number of Crimes
_____	_____
_____	_____

64. Were any of the crimes listed in Item 63 reported to the police? ___ Yes ___ No

65. If yes, list type of crime(s) and number(s) reported to the police below:

Type of Crime Reported	Number of Crimes Reported
_____	_____
_____	_____

66. Are you aware that the Roseburg Police Department has a crime prevention program? ___ Yes ___ No

67. Have you or a member of your business been contacted by or received information about Roseburg's crime prevention program through any of the following sources? (Check all that apply)

- ___ 1. Radio/T.V./Newspaper articles
- ___ 2. Public or organizational meetings
- ___ 3. Word of mouth
- ___ 4. Crime prevention block meetings
- ___ 5. Personal contact with Roseburg's crime prevention officer
- ___ 6. Other source; list _____

68. What type(s) of changes have been made to your business' security within the past five years? (Check all that apply)

- ___ 1. No improvements were made
- ___ 2. Improved external lighting
- ___ 3. Improved internal lighting
- ___ 4. Improved door locks
- ___ 5. Improved window or skylight security (e.g., installed metal grates, removed window displays blocking visibility from outside, installed window locks or improved window latches, etc.)
- ___ 6. Installed or improved fence or walls
- ___ 7. Installed a new alarm system
- ___ 8. Improved an existing alarm system

- 9. Made changes to discourage shoplifting (e.g., installed mirrors or cameras, publicized a "get-tough" anti-shoplifting policy, etc.)
- 10. Established a check cashing/credit card policy
- 11. Improved an existing check cashing/credit card policy
- 12. Made changes designed to discourage employee theft
- 13. Made use of guard dog(s)
- 14. Hired full or part-time security guard(s) (either uniformed or plain clothes)
- 15. Other security improvements, please describe: _____

69. Were any of the improvements listed in Question 68 a result of BEING THE VICTIM OF CRIME(S)?

- 1. Yes--I was a victim and I made improvements. What type(s) of improvement was made? Place the number(s) corresponding to the type(s) of improvement from Question 68 here: _____
- 2. Yes--I was a victim but I made no improvements.
- 3. No--I was not a victim, but I made improvements. What type(s) of improvement was made? Place the number(s) corresponding to the type(s) of improvement from Question 68 here: _____
- 4. No--I was not a victim and I made no improvements.

70. Were any of the improvements listed in Question 68 a result of INFORMATION GAINED THROUGH ROSEBURG'S CRIME PREVENTION PROGRAM?

- 1. Yes--I have knowledge gained through Roseburg's crime prevention program and I made improvements. What type(s) of improvement was made? Place the number(s) corresponding to the type(s) of improvement from Question 68 here: _____
- 2. Yes--I have knowledge gained through Roseburg's crime prevention program but I made no improvements.
- 3. No--I have no knowledge gained through Roseburg's crime prevention program but I made improvements. What type(s) of improvement was made? Place the number(s) corresponding to the type(s) of improvement from Question 68 here: _____
- 4. No--I have no knowledge gained through Roseburg's crime prevention program and I made no improvements.

Thank you for filling out this questionnaire. Please place it in the return envelope and drop it in the mail.

END