



**2006 Crime
Victimization Study**
*A Survey of Utah
Residents*

Christine Mitchell, Ph.D.
Benjamin Peterson, M.A.
Utah Commission on Criminal and Juvenile Justice

Table of Contents

Background.....	3
Introduction.....	4
<i>Summary of Findings</i>	5
Crime Perceptions.....	8
<i>Most Utahns Felt Safe in Their Communities</i>	9
<i>Utahns Were More Concerned about Property Crime than Personal Safety</i>	11
<i>Past Victimization Impacted Concerns about Future Victimization</i>	12
<i>Victims and Non-Victims Believed Crime Would Rise in Future Years</i>	13
<i>Drugs Viewed as More Serious Problem Than Gangs But Concern about Gangs Growing</i>	14
<i>Utahns Felt Local Law Enforcement Performed Well</i>	15
<i>Drugs and Family Issues Perceived as Causing Crime in Utah</i>	16
<i>Most Utahns Got Crime Information from Newspapers and Television</i>	16
<i>Most Utahns Believed Rehabilitation Programs Could Be Effective in Reducing Re-Offending</i>	17
<i>More Than Half of the Respondents Supported Tax Increases to Build Prisons</i>	17
<i>Almost One-Third Were Aware of Utah's Victim Notification Service</i>	18
Incidence of Crime.....	19
<i>Property Crimes</i>	19
<i>Person Crimes</i>	23
<i>Sexual Crimes</i>	27
Focus on Identity Theft.....	29
<i>Victims Equally Likely to Discover Identity Theft through Charges or Bank Contacts</i>	30
<i>Perpetrators Gained Access to Accounts or Information through a Variety of Means</i>	31
<i>Two-thirds Victimized by Strangers</i>	31
<i>Identity Theft Caused Financial Losses, Credit Problems, and Loss of Time</i>	31
The Impact of Crime.....	34
<i>Impact of Crime on Victims</i>	34
<i>Demographic Characteristics Influenced the Experience of Crime Victimization</i>	35
<i>Many Victims Believed That the Offender Was Motivated by Their Personal Characteristics</i>	37
<i>Reporting Crime to the Police Held Steady</i>	38
<i>Utahns Proactive in Protecting Themselves from Crime</i>	39
Methodology and Demographic Characteristics.....	42
<i>Demographic Characteristics</i>	42
<i>Crime Data</i>	44
2006 Crime Victimization Survey Questions and Responses.....	45

Background

The mission of the Utah Commission on Criminal and Juvenile Justice (CCJJ) is to promote broad philosophical agreement about the objectives of the criminal and juvenile justice system in the state; to provide a mechanism for coordinating the functions of various branches and levels of government concerned with criminal and juvenile justice; and to coordinate statewide efforts to reduce crime and victimization in Utah. To accomplish these goals, the Commission includes a diverse membership representing a wide range of organizations playing a role in justice issues in Utah. The CCJJ Research and Data Unit conducts and coordinates research on pertinent criminal justice issues and serves as the Statistical Analysis Center for the state of Utah.

The CCJJ Research and Data Unit conducts and coordinates research on criminal justice issues and serves as the Statistical Analysis Center for the state of Utah. The authors of the 2006 Crime Victimization Survey are Christine Mitchell, Director of Research, and Benjamin Peterson, Research Consultant.

Funding for this project and report was provided by grant 2007-BJ-CX-K001 awarded by the Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice. The opinions, findings, and conclusions expressed in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Justice.

Introduction

One of the statutory duties of the Commission on Criminal and Juvenile Justice (CCJJ) is to “study, evaluate, and report on the status of crime in the state and on the effectiveness of criminal justice policies, procedures, and programs that are directed toward the reduction of crime in the state.” Utah has an effective system of crime data collection in which local law enforcement agencies provide statistics to the state on the number and type of crimes that the public reports to them. There are limitations inherent in this type of system as an estimate of the actual prevalence of crime. The only crimes which can be counted in such a system are those which are reported to the police and which are then included in the reports from law enforcement to the state. Crimes which go unreported (which for some types of crimes may be as high as two-thirds) will not be included in reported crime statistics.

Reporting crime to the police is a personal decision. There are many reasons that a citizen might not chose to report a crime to the authorities, spanning a range from a well-justified fear for his or her life to a reluctance to go through the bother of reporting. Crime victimization surveys such as the one reported here have been used in an effort to bridge the gap between actual crime and reported crimes.

CCJJ conducted its fourth Utah Crime Victimization Survey during 2007, covering crimes which occurred during 2006. A sample of 1,199 Utahns participated in this survey aimed at assessing fear of crime, perceptions of risk, causes of crime, victimization during the prior year, and lifetime levels of victimization. Also included is a special section on identity theft which is new to this survey.

Summary of Findings

Perceptions of Crime

- Crime, education, and the cost of living were reported as the top three concerns, in that order, of survey respondents.
- Despite crime being the number one concern of the survey respondents, 85.7% reported feeling safe in their communities.
- Victims of crime in 2006 were more likely to report feeling unsafe in their communities when compared with non-victims—3.9% of victims said they felt unsafe versus 1.6% of non-victims.
- Almost 80% of respondents answered that they were never or almost never prevented from doing things by the fear of crime. Individuals who had been victims during the past year were more likely to report limiting their activities due to fear of crime.
- When asked to predict whether they would be victims of crime in the coming year, respondents were more likely to think that they would become victims of property crimes, rather than violent or sex crimes. Not surprisingly, those who had been victims in 2006 were almost twice as likely to believe they would be victims in the coming year.
- Almost half of the respondents (49.0%) believed that crime in their communities has increased over the past three years, and 59.1% believed it will continue to rise over the next three years.
- Many respondents (42.6%) felt that illegal drugs were a problem in their neighborhoods. Victims of crime were much more likely to report that drugs were a problem—50.8% of victims compared to 33.0% of non-victims.
- Gangs were less often reported as a problem than drugs (18.8%). Respondents who were victimized during the last year, however, reported concerns about gangs at a rate more than twice as high as non-victims (25.9% victims vs. 10.6% non-victims).
- More than three-quarters of the respondents (77.7%) rated the performance of their local law enforcement as good or very good. However, victims had a less positive view of law enforcement.
- Illegal drugs were chosen as a cause of Utah's crime problem by almost all of the respondents (90.8%). The vast majority also blamed lack of parental discipline (88.4%), the breakdown of family life (83.2%), gangs (81.8%), and moral decay (80.3%).
- Three-quarters (75.1%) of respondents said that they believed that rehabilitation programs could be effective in reducing offender recidivism. 82.6% said that a combination of punishment and treatment should be used in dealing with criminal offenders, rather than either one by itself.

Experience with Crime

- Of all Utahns surveyed, 53.6% reported being the victim in 2006 of at least one of the types of crime included in this study. Previous surveys did not include stalking and identity theft in their calculation of victimization rates, however, these were included this year.

- Survey respondents were asked if they had ever been a victim of the crimes included in the study at any other time in their lives. More than 90% (90.8%) of respondents had been a victim of at least one crime or attempted crime during their lifetimes.
- **Theft or attempted theft of a motor vehicle** was reported by 6.6% of the respondents for 2006. This represents a slight increase over the 2004 survey rate. 81.1% of the victims reported at least one crime to the police.
- **Theft of items from automobiles** was more common, with 18.1% responding that this had occurred in 2006, similar to the 16.2% from the 2004 survey. 68.9% reported at least one crime to the police.
- 20.3% of the respondents said that they had been victims of the most common of the property offenses, **vandalism**. This rate was very similar to that found in previous victimization surveys. Over half of the victims (58.5%) reported at least one crime to the police.
- Almost 10% (9.2%) of the respondents said that they were victims of a **burglary** in 2006 which was an increase from the rate found in the 2004 survey. Most victims (64.2%) reported at least one burglary to the police.
- **Robbery** occurred for only 1.3% of the respondents. A similarly low rate was found in the 2004 survey. Surprisingly, only 53.8% of the victims reported to the police.
- **Assault with a weapon** was even less common, with a rate of less than one percent (0.4%). All the incidents, however, were reported to the police.
- **Assault without a weapon** was reported by 3.1% of the respondents, a slight decrease from the 2004 rate. Less than half of these victims went to the police (51.4%) possibly because the victims knew their attackers in 83.8% of the cases. Almost a third of the respondents (32.3%) said that an assault of this type had occurred at another time in their lives (excluding 2006).
- **Domestic abuse** decreased slightly to a rate of 2.8% in 2006. Almost half of the victims reported at least one crime to the police (48.3%) which represents a substantial increase from the 27.6% reported in 2004. The majority of these victims were assaulted more than once (61.3%) during the year.
- Almost one-fifth (19.6%) of the respondents said that they had experienced some form of **stalking** during 2006.
- Some type of **sexual assault** occurred in 2.4% of the cases which is an increase over the 1.5% found in the 2004 survey. Of these, 76.9% did not report to the police. Almost 80% (79.3%) of perpetrators were known to the victim and a substantial proportion of these were family members (20.7%).
- A very small percentage (0.7%) said that they had been **raped** in 2006 which is very similar to the rate reported in 2004. More than half of the victims were raped more than once. Only 25% of the victims reported the crime to the police. Over 80% of those who did not report the crimes said it was because the offender was a friend or family member. 14.8% of the respondents said that they had been a victim of rape at some other time during their lifetimes.

Identity Theft

- Questions about **identity theft** were asked for the first time in the 2006 survey. 14.0% of the respondents said that they had been victims in 2006 of identity theft with an additional 19.9% reporting lifetime victimization.
- The most common type of identity theft was someone using an individual's credit card without permission, which was reported by 9.6% of the survey respondents.
- Misuse of other types of accounts (such as checking) was reported by 5.8%. Almost 4% (3.9%) said that someone used their personal information to obtain services and another 5% (4.9%) said that someone used their personal information to open new accounts, get loans, or commit some crime.
- Identity theft was less likely than other property crimes to be reported to the police (53.6%). Almost all those who did not report said that they dealt with the incident in another way without involving the police (95.5%).
- About half the victims (45.8%) discovered the theft through missing money in accounts or fraudulent credit card charges. Contacts by a bank, credit bureau, collection agency, or a business about late bills revealed the theft for 52.4% of the victims.
- Just over one-fourth of the victims did not know how the perpetrator gained access to their information or accounts (26.2%). A computer scam or "phishing" was the method in 14.3% of cases and the theft of a wallet or purse in 13.7%.
 - Only a small percentage of the victims knew the perpetrator of the crime (19.6%).
 - Ongoing problems were reported by 10.7% of the identity theft victims. Less than half suffered a financial loss as a result of the theft (41.1%) and 55.4% said that they have had no problems resulting from the incident.

Impact of Victimization

- Overall, victims rate the impact crime has had on their lives as minimal, with 73.6% reporting very little or some impact.
- The most impact was felt by victims of sex crimes, followed by victims of person crimes, with the least impact reported by victims of property crimes.
- Women were more than twice times as likely as men to report a major impact from crime victimization. 16.5% of women compared to 6.2% of men said they suffered quite a lot of impact.
- About half of the respondents said that they kept a gun in their homes (50.6%), though only a small percentage of those individuals (12.1%) kept a gun solely for protection. About a third of the gun owners said that they kept it for sporting purposes alone (35.8%) and another 45.5% reported that they kept a gun for both sporting and protection purposes.
- The large majority of respondents said that they had taken a variety of precautions to feel more protected from crime such as installing security lights or burglar alarms. 80.7% of the survey respondents said that they had taken at least one protective measure.

Crime Perceptions

Citizens' perceptions of personal and community safety were similar to those found in the 2002 and 2004 surveys. As with respondents from the earlier surveys, Utahns in 2006 reported feeling safe in their communities, although most also believed that crime was at least sometimes a problem. Crime was picked most often by respondents as one of the top three issues facing their communities. Respondents were almost evenly split between believing that crime had increased over the past three years and believing that it had remained fairly constant, in spite of the fact that, during the past three years, crime rates in Utah have actually decreased.

CCJJ administered the fourth Crime Victimization Survey during 2007. The survey asked residents of Utah about their perceptions of crime and safety in their community, as well as their experience with crime during 2006. Of the 1,199 Utahns responding to the survey, 509 (42.5%) reported being a victim of one of the traditional types of crimes included in the survey. This rate of traditionally defined victimization for 2006 looks very similar to the 41.3% reported for 2004. However, the 2006 survey added two new types of crimes, identity theft and stalking. When victims of these crimes are included in the victimization rate, 643 (53.6%) of the respondents reported being a victim. The rest of the analysis in this report includes victims of stalking and identity theft in the victim group.

Looking at general crime categories, 43.5% of the respondents reported a property crime (including identity theft),

24.8% a violent crime (including stalking), and 2.7% (only 32 respondents) a sex crime (See Figure 1). It is important to remember that some individuals were victims of more than one type of crime during the year. When adjusted to eliminate identity theft and stalking, these rates appear comparable to those found in 2004.

Respondents were asked which problem areas in society were of most concern to them from a list. These responses (shown in Figure 2) are very similar

Figure 1

Rate of victimization reported by 2006 survey respondents





Figure 2
What Problem Areas Concern You the Most?



to those from 2004. Crime, education, and cost of living were the top three problem areas mentioned by respondents in both 2004 and 2006. Traffic and taxes ranked fourth and fifth in both surveys. New to this survey were the environment and population growth, which were of greater concern than unemployment, war, and terrorism. Unemployment, which was the top concern in the 2002 survey, was low on the list in 2004 and 2006.

Most Utahns Felt Safe in their Communities

Overall, survey respondents reported always or almost always feeling safe in their communities (See Table 1). 85.7% of the respondents reported feeling safe, which is slightly lower than the rate in 2004. Very few respondents reported either never or almost never feeling safe (2.8%).

Table 1
How safe do you feel in your community?

	Always or Almost Always Safe	Sometimes Safe	Never or Almost Never Safe
2006	85.7%	11.4%	2.8%
2004	87.5%	10.5%	2.1%
2002	86.2%	12.0%	1.8%
2000	83.6%	14.6%	1.8%
Male	89.0%	8.8%	2.2%
Female	83.9%	12.9%	3.2%
Urban	84.7%	11.9%	3.3%
Rural	88.7%	10.8%	0.5%
Non-Victim	93.5%	4.9%	1.6%
Victim	78.9%	17.2%	3.9%
Victim Property Crime	78.1%	17.7%	4.2%
Victim Violent Crime	77.0%	16.6%	6.4%
Victim Sex Crime	75.0%	15.6%	9.4%

Men were slightly more likely to feel safe, although this difference was not significant. Rural residents were also slightly more likely to report feeling safe, although this difference also was not significant.

Not surprisingly, those who had been victims of crime during 2006 were much less likely to report that they felt safe than those who were not victims. Of those reporting victimization during 2006, only 79.0% said that they always or almost always felt safe in their communities compared to 93.5% of

those who were not victimized during the year.

Victims were categorized by the type of crime that they experienced—property crime, violent crime, or sex crime. Among those who were victimized, those who were victims of a sex crime were least likely to feel safe and most likely to report that they never or almost never felt safe.

Table 2
How often does fear of crime prevent you from doing things you would like to do?

	Never or Almost Never	Sometimes	Always or Almost Always
2006	79.4%	18.3%	2.3%
2004	82.3%	16.0%	1.7%
2002	78.4%	19.8%	1.8%
2000	69.5%	27.5%	3.0%
Male	85.1%	12.7%	2.2%
Female	76.4%	21.3%	2.3%
Urban	78.5%	19.0%	2.4%
Rural	84.1%	14.4%	1.5%
Non-Victim	84.8%	13.9%	1.3%
Victim	74.7%	22.0%	3.3%
Victim Property Crime	73.5%	23.3%	3.3%
Victim Violent Crime	71.1%	23.8%	5.1%
Victim Sex Crime	65.6%	31.3%	3.1%

Almost 80% of the respondents said that fear of crime never or almost never prevented them from doing things they would like to do (See Table 2). Men reported that fear of crime interfered with their activities less than women. While urban respondents reported more frequent interference than rural residents, this difference was not significant.

Individuals who had been victims during the past year were more likely to report limiting their activities because of fear of crime. One-quarter of those who had been victims said that they sometimes, almost always, or always found that fear of crime prevented them from doing things they wanted to do, compared to 15.2% of non-victims. Victims of sex crimes again were most likely to say that fear of crime limited their activities, although this was a very small group of respondents.

While most respondents reported feeling safe in their communities, almost half (44.1%) said that there is

an area within a mile of their home where they would be afraid to walk or jog alone at night. This has not changed from the 2004 survey. Of female respondents, 56.4% reported such an area within a mile of their homes, while only 23.2% of men gave this response. Urban respondents were more likely than rural ones to report that there was an area near their

homes where they would be afraid to go at night (47.3% for urban vs. 34.5% for rural).

Respondents who had been victims during the last year were more likely to say that there was an area within a mile of their home where they would be afraid to walk or jog at night (52.1% of victims vs. 36.6% of non-victims).

Survey respondents have consistently reported that crime is one of their top concerns. In the current survey, crime was most often selected as one of respondents' top three concerns (81.1% of the respondents). Almost three-quarters (73.0%) said that crime was sometimes or always a problem in their communities. On the other hand, the vast majority reported feeling safe in their communities (85.7%) and that fear of crimes never or almost never prevented them from doing things (79.4%). Interestingly, Utahns were aware of crime and concerned about its impact on their communities without feeling at risk themselves.

Table 3

When you leave your home, how often do you think about it being broken into or vandalized?

	Never or Almost Never		Sometimes	Always or Almost Always
	Never	Sometimes		
2006	58.5%	29.2%	12.3%	
2004	55.7%	33.1%	11.2%	
2002	50.6%	37.7%	11.7%	
2000	48.1%	38.8%	13.1%	
Male	56.9%	32.1%	11.0%	
Female	59.3%	27.7%	13.0%	
Urban	56.0%	30.2%	13.7%	
Rural	68.4%	25.5%	6.1%	
Non-Victim	69.5%	24.7%	5.8%	
Victim	48.9%	33.1%	18.0%	
Victim Property Crime	45.4%	35.2%	19.4%	
Victim Violent Crime	51.0%	25.3%	23.6%	
Victim Sex Crime	40.6%	31.3%	28.1%	

Utahns Were More Concerned about Being a Victim of Burglary than of Assault

Survey respondents were asked how often they thought about their homes being burglarized while they were away (See Table 3). 41.5% of the respondents said that they at least sometimes thought about their homes being broken into or vandalized when they are away. They were also asked how often they thought about being robbed or physically assaulted when

they were away from home. A smaller number (31.3%) reported that they at least sometimes thought about a physical assault when away from home (See Table 4).

Fear of one's home being broken into has reduced over the time period covered by the four surveys. The percentage of respondents who never or

almost never thought about this has increased by more than 10% since the 2000 survey. However, those answering that the always or almost always thought about being personally assaulted has increased by almost 9% since the 2000 survey.

No gender differences were found in fear of burglary. However, women were significantly more likely to

report a concern about physical violence. One-third of women compared to one-quarter of men said that they were sometimes, almost always, or always concerned about being robbed or physically assaulted.

Rural respondents were significantly less concerned that their homes would be broken into than urban ones. While the difference was not significant, rural residents also tended to view the risk of physical assault as lower than the urban respondents

Table 4

When you leave home, how often do you think about being robbed or physically assaulted?

	Never or Almost Never		Sometimes	Always or Almost Always
	Never	Sometimes		
2006	68.7%	22.1%	9.2%	
2004	68.6%	24.7%	6.7%	
2002	79.7%	18.4%	1.8%	
2000	77.9%	20.3%	2.4%	
Male	74.2%	17.3%	8.5%	
Female	65.9%	24.6%	9.5%	
Urban	66.8%	23.4%	9.8%	
Rural	77.0%	17.3%	5.6%	
Non-Victim	79.8%	16.4%	3.8%	
Victim	59.1%	27.1%	13.8%	
Victim Property Crime	57.5%	27.4%	15.1%	
Victim Violent Crime	56.6%	28.3%	15.1%	
Victim Sex Crime	59.4%	25.0%	15.6%	

Almost 50% of those who were victimized during the last year said that they at least sometimes thought about their homes being broken into when they were away, compared to approximately 30% of non-victims. Victims were also much more likely to report that they sometimes, almost always, or always thought about being physically assaulted when they left home (40.9% of victims vs. 20.2% of non-victims). The type of victimization seemed to impact thoughts about burglary—those who had been victims of property crimes and sex crimes were more concerned about their homes being broken into.

Respondents were also asked if they thought they were likely to become victims of certain specific types of crime in the coming year (See Table 5 and Figure 3). Half of the respondents (49.7%) reported that they thought they would be the victim of at least one of these types of crime in the coming year. Men and women were equally likely to predict that they would become crime victims. Only 40.3% of rural respondents thought they would be victimized in the next year, compared to 51.7% of urban respondents. The largest differences in predicting that they would be victims were seen in those who had been victims in the previous year. 63.0% of those who had been a victim last year expected to be a victim again next year, compared to 34.4% of those who had not been victims in the last year.

Respondents were most concerned about theft (32.9%) and least

Table 5
Select any of the following you believe are likely to happen to you in the next 12 months:

	2000	2002	2004	2006
Theft of Valuable Item	33.8%	30.9%	32.6%	32.9%
Motor Vehicle Theft	24.2%	21.8%	30.9%	29.5%
Burglary	26.5%	25.3%	21.8%	22.0%
Threatening with Bodily Attack	13.5%	9.6%	16.6%	19.5%
Taking by Force or Threat	9.4%	6.9%	14.1%	16.9%
Beating or Attacking with Weapon	6.5%	5.2%	10.3%	13.4%
Rape	3.9%	3.1%	4.8%	5.2%
Domestic Violence	2.2%	1.8%	2.2%	2.2%

concerned about domestic violence (2.2%). In general, respondents were more likely to expect to become a victim of property crime (44.1%) rather than violent crime (26.9%, see Figure 3).

While the percentages are similar to those found in the 2004 survey, 2006 respondents were more likely to report thinking they would be victims of the crimes of threatening with bodily attack, taking by force or threat, and beating or attacking with a weapon.

Past Victimization Impacted Concerns about Future Victimization

There were clear differences in the views of past victims and non-victims on their likelihood of becoming a victim in the next 12 months. When asked if the respondents sometimes or always feared

Figure 3
Select any the the following you believe are likely to happen to you in the next 12 months





Figure 4
Respondents reporting sometimes or often being concerned about violent and property crime victimization



that someone would burglarize or vandalize their homes, someone would attack or assault them, or someone would otherwise violently victimize them, in all instances, those who reported some victimization in the prior year were more likely to have these concerns (See Figure 4).

An interesting phenomenon is that crime victimization appears to create general, not specific, fear of crime among respondents victimized in the past year. For example, victims of property crime were more fearful than non-victims of becoming a future victim of property crime, but they were also more fearful of becoming a victim of a violent crime. Similarly, victims of violent crimes in the past year were more likely to fear future violent victimization than non-victims but they were also more likely to fear future property crimes such as burglary or vandalism.

Victims and Non-Victims Believed Crime Would Rise in Future Years

Utah's reported crime rate has consistently decreased since its most recent peak in 1995. Utah's index crime rate in 2006 was 3,741 per 100,000, reflecting a 8.7% decrease over 2005. Both violent and property crime rates have steadily decreased during the last 10 years. Violent and property crime rates are at lower levels than any time in the previous 30 years.

However, survey respondents have a different perspective on crime. When asked if they believed that crime had increased or decreased during the past three years, almost half (49.1%) of those who answered this question believed that crime had somewhat or greatly increased (See Table 6). Only 6.7% thought that crime had

decreased, in spite of the well-publicized reductions in crime rates. These figures are very similar to those from the previous surveys.

Two possible explanations for the discrepancy between respondents' opinions on crime prevalence and the official statistics can be given. First, the official crime statistics are based on crimes reported to the police. Unreported crimes are, by definition, not included in reported crime statistics. Perhaps the rate of unreported crimes is increasing, and respondents are experiencing an increased rate of crime in spite of the decreases in reported crimes. Evidence from the current study does not support an increase in victimization or a decrease in reporting crimes to the police. Second, respondents' beliefs about crime may simply be inaccurate. Media reports of numerous sensational crimes may create a feeling that crime is growing when, in fact, it is not.

Women were more likely than men to believe that crime had increased as opposed to stayed the same or decreased during the last three years (52.2% vs. 43.1% for men). No differences were found in urban and rural respondents on this question. Victims were also more likely to believe that crime had increased during the past three years (56.3% victims vs. 40.2% non-victims).

Table 6

Over the past/next three years, do you believe crime in your community has/will:

Past Three Years	Greatly or Somewhat Decreased	Stayed the Same	Greatly or Somewhat Increased
2006	6.7%	44.3%	49.0%
2004	6.5%	44.0%	49.5%
2002	9.9%	48.5%	41.6%
2000	11.1%	42.3%	46.7%
Male	8.6%	48.2%	43.1%
Female	5.6%	42.1%	52.2%
Urban	7.0%	44.6%	48.5%
Rural	4.7%	42.6%	52.6%
Non-Victim	6.4%	53.4%	40.2%
Victim	6.9%	36.8%	56.3%
Victim Property Crime	7.1%	34.0%	58.9%
Victim Violent Crime	8.0%	36.7%	55.4%
Victim Sex Crime	12.5%	25.0%	62.5%
Next Three Years	Greatly or Somewhat Decrease	Stay the Same	Greatly or Somewhat Increase
2006	5.9%	35.0%	59.1%
2004	5.7%	35.9%	58.4%
2002	7.7%	36.6%	55.7%
2000	9.0%	30.7%	60.3%
Male	6.3%	38.7%	55.0%
Female	5.8%	33.0%	61.2%
Urban	6.3%	35.2%	58.6%
Rural	4.2%	31.4%	64.4%
Non-Victim	5.6%	44.0%	50.4%
Victim	6.2%	27.3%	66.5%
Victim Property Crime	6.5%	25.3%	68.2%
Victim Violent Crime	5.8%	26.7%	67.5%
Victim Sex Crime	12.5%	25.0%	62.5%

Respondents were also asked if they thought crime would increase, decrease, or stay the same in the next three years. Almost 60% of respondents (59.1%) predicted that crime would increase in the next three years (See Table 6). Only 5.9% thought that crime would decrease. Women were slightly more likely than men to believe that crime would increase in the next three years (61.2% vs. 55.0% for men), although this difference did not reach statistical significance. Rural residents were also more likely to predict an increase in crime, but this difference was also not significant.

Victims were much more likely than non-victims to believe that crime would increase in the coming three years with only about half of non-victims predicting an increase compared to almost two-thirds of victims (50.4% vs. 66.5%).

Drugs Viewed as More Serious Problem Than Gangs But Concern about Gangs Growing

Twice as many respondents said that illegal drugs, rather than gangs, were a problem in their neighborhood. 42.6% said that they thought illegal drugs were a problem in their neighborhoods compared to 18.8% who said that gangs were a problem (See Tables 7 and 8). The percent of respondents who thought that drugs were a problem in their neighborhoods was slightly higher than in 2004 and substantially higher than 2002. Concern about gangs has

grown even more than concern about drugs over the time period of the surveys. In the 2004 survey, 14.8% reported that gangs were a problem compared to 18.8% in the 2006 survey.

Concern about illegal drugs did not differ for men and women. Rural respondents were less likely to say that drugs were a problem but this difference did not reach statistical significance. Individuals who had been victimized during the past year, however, were much more likely to report that drugs were a problem

Table 7
Do you feel illegal drugs are a problem in your neighborhood?

	Yes	No
2006	42.6%	57.4%
2004	41.5%	58.5%
2002	36.4%	63.6%
2000	39.9%	60.1%
Male	41.5%	58.5%
Female	43.1%	56.9%
Urban	41.8%	58.2%
Rural	48.1%	51.9%
Non-Victim	33.0%	67.0%
Victim	50.8%	49.2%

in their neighborhoods (50.8% of victims vs. 33.0% of non-victims).

Gangs were not a greater concern for women than men, however, urban respondents were twice as likely as rural residents to report that gangs posed a problem in their neighborhoods. Respondents who were victimized during the last year reported problems with gangs in their neighborhoods at a rate more than twice as high as respondents who were not victimized in the previous year (25.9% for victims vs. 10.6% for non-victims)

Utahns Felt Local Law Enforcement Performed Well

More than three-quarters (77.7%) of survey respondents rated the performance of their local law enforcement as good or very good (See Table 9). This is very similar to the results of the 2004 (78.1%) survey and higher than 2002 (71.6%) and 2000 (66.8%). Very few respondents (3.4%) rated law enforcement in their community as bad or very bad.

Table 9
How would you rate the job law enforcement is doing in your community?

	Very Good or Good	Acceptable	Very Bad or Bad
2006	77.7%	18.9%	3.4%
2004	78.1%	18.6%	3.3%
2002	71.6%	23.8%	4.6%
2000	66.8%	27.9%	5.3%
Male	70.6%	24.2%	5.2%
Female	81.3%	16.2%	2.5%
Urban	78.2%	18.5%	3.4%
Rural	77.1%	19.3%	3.6%
Non-Victim	83.3%	15.2%	1.5%
Victim	72.8%	22.2%	5.1%
Victim Property Crime	72.7%	21.9%	5.5%
Victim Violent Crime	70.2%	24.3%	5.5%
Victim Sex Crime	56.3%	31.3%	12.5%

Table 8
Do you feel gangs are a problem in your neighborhood?


	Yes	No
2006	18.8%	81.2%
2004	14.8%	85.2%
2002	13.8%	86.2%
2000	17.5%	82.5%
Male	19.3%	80.7%
Female	18.6%	81.4%
Urban	20.5%	79.5%
Rural	10.3%	89.6%
Non-Victim	10.6%	89.4%
Victim	25.9%	74.1%

While the overwhelming majority of respondents saw police as performing well or very well, men were less likely than women to rate police behavior positively. No differences were found in urban and rural respondents.

Victimization appears to affect an individual's attitude toward the police. While almost three-fourths of respondents who were victims of crime in the last year gave the police a good or very good rating, they were less likely to give a positive rating than respondents who were not victims (72.8% for victims vs. 83.3% for non-victims). Victims of sex offenses (only 32 respondents) gave the least positive rating.

Figure 5

Which of the following do you think are responsible for our crime problem?



Drugs and Family Issues Perceived as Causing Crime in Utah

Survey respondents were asked to indicate whether or not they felt certain factors were responsible for crime problems in Utah (See Figure 5). They almost universally blamed illegal drugs (90.8%), lack of parental discipline (88.4%), and the breakdown of family life (83.2%) for crime problems. Similar results were found in the 2004 survey with almost 90% of respondents choosing substance abuse and lack of parental discipline as causal factors in crime. The breakdown of family life was selected by 84.3% of the 2004 respondents.

More than 75% also felt that gangs (81.8%), moral decay (80.3%), domestic violence (79.0%), alcohol (77.1%), and lack of education (75.1%) contributed to crime problems in Utah. More than two-thirds selected violence in the media (71.8%) and population

increase (69.5%) as crime causes. Only one option, the availability of guns was chosen by less than 50% of the respondents (43.5%).

Most Utahns Got Crime Information from Newspapers and Television


As found in prior victimization surveys, most respondents reported they got local crime information from the newspapers (78.4%) or from television news (78.3%). Few respondents reported getting their crime information from the police

(26.4%) or newsletters (23.4%). The 2006 survey added a new source of information, the internet, for the first time. 44.8% of the respondents said that they got crime information from the internet (See Figure 6).

Urban respondents were significantly more likely to say that they got information from television (81.7% vs. 62.8%) and radio (61.0% vs. 50.5%). On the other hand, rural respondents more often said that they got crime information from the local newspaper (84.2% vs. 77.3%) and from the police (35.2% vs. 24.6%). Use of the internet was the same for rural and urban respondents.

Figure 6

Where do you get information about crime?



About half of the survey respondents, 51.9%, said that the news media report Utah's crime situation as it really is. 28.1% thought that the local media make crime problems seem worse than they really are, while 12.5% said that the local media make the problems seem better than they really are. 2004 respondents gave the media a better rating for accuracy than the current survey group. 57.0% in 2004 thought the media painted an accurate picture, with 24.7% saying they make it look worse and 9.9% saying they make it look better.


Male respondents were somewhat more likely than female respondents to believe the media makes the crime situation look worse than it really is, 32.4% versus 25.9%. Victims were almost twice as likely as non-victims to say that the media makes the crime situation look better than it really is (17.0% for victims vs. 9.3% for non-victims). Interestingly, victims were also more likely to say that the media makes crime look worse than it really is (32.3% for victims vs. 28.0% for non-victims).

Most Utahns Believed Rehabilitative Programs Could Be Effective in Reducing Re-Offending

When asked if they believed that treatment could be effective in reducing offender recidivism, 75.1% of the respondents said that they believed it could. Only 17.0% said that they didn't believe that treatment could reduce recidivism. Similarly, when asked whether rehabilitation or punishment was most important in handling offenders in Utah, 82.6% said

Figure 7

Victim attitudes toward punishment and rehabilitation



that both were important elements. Less than 10% said that rehabilitation (9.1%) or punishment (7.0%) alone were most important. These results are similar to those found in the 2004 survey.

Men were twice as likely as women to answer that punishment was the most important element in handling criminal offenders (10.3% vs. 5.4%), even though men regarded treatment as effective as often as women. No differences were found in the answers given by urban and rural respondents.

Victims had a different view than non-victims on this question. Victims were twice as likely as non-victims to feel that punishment was the correct approach to dealing with offenders (9.3% for victims vs. 4.6% for non-victims, see Figure 7). Both victims and non-victims, however, overwhelmingly believed that treatment and rehabilitative programs could be effective with offenders (81.3% for victims vs. 86.5% for non-victims).

More than Half of the Respondents Supported Tax Increases to Build Prisons

54.5% of the respondents said that they would support a tax increase to provide funding for additional prison space to incarcerate more offenders. While women were slightly more likely to

answer yes to this question (55.8% for women vs. 51.8% for men), the difference was not significant. No differences were found for urban and rural respondents. Contrary to expectations, victims were no more likely than non-victims to support tax increases to fund prison expansion.

Almost One-Third Were Aware of Utah's Victim Notification Service

Almost one-third (31.8%) of respondents said that they were aware that the State of Utah offers a victim

notification service, VINE, that will call or email a victim when an offender is released from prison or jail. However, less than 5% of those who were aware of the service had ever signed up for the VINE service (4.2%). Those who had been victims in the last year reported a slightly higher rate of signing up for VINE (6.1%).

The Incidence of Crime

More than half (53.6%) of all survey respondents reported being a victim of at least one of the 14 types of crimes included in this survey. This figure includes two new categories — identity theft and stalking—which were not included in previous surveys. Excluding these two crimes gives a victimization rate of 42.5% which is very similar to the 41.3% rate reported for the 2004 victimization survey. Survey respondents were also asked if they had ever been a victim of the crimes included in the study at any other time in their lives. More than 90% (90.8%) of respondents said they had been a victim of at least one crime or attempted crime during their lifetimes.

Just over one-quarter (26.6%) of the respondents reported that they had been victims of two or more of the 14 types of crimes during the year.

Survey respondents were asked if they had personally experienced certain types of crime in 2006. If they answered affirmatively, they were then asked a series of follow-up questions regarding the specific circumstances of the crime. An additional question regarding lifetime incidence (outside of 2006) was also asked for each type of crime (with the exception of stalking questions). The crimes are divided into three categories: property crimes, person crimes, and sexual crimes.

In addition to the traditional index crimes, the report spotlights two “emerging” issues in crime victimization: identity theft and stalking. Identity theft is described, along with victimization data, following the property crime section. Stalking data are analyzed following the person crime

section (this issue was also spotlighted in the 2004 report, allowing comparison of data across the two surveys).

Property Crimes

Property crimes involve loss or damage to an

Table 10
Crime Victimization: 2000 through 2006

	2000	2002	2004	2006
Property Crime				
Motor Vehicle Theft	5.5%	5.5%	5.4%	6.6%
Auto Burglary	13.3%	11.8%	16.2%	18.1%
Vandalism	22.9%	18.6%	19.6%	20.3%
Burglary	5.6%	6.4%	6.6%	9.2%
Identity Theft				14.1%
Other Property Crime	8.6%	8.6%	7.4%	5.7%
Person Crime				
Robbery	0.8%	0.9%	1.1%	1.3%
Assault with Weapon	0.7%	0.7%	0.8%	0.4%
Assault without Weapon	3.5%	2.5%	3.7%	3.1%
Domestic Violence	3.3%	2.5%	3.1%	2.8%
Threat of Violence	7.2%	5.7%	7.1%	5.1%
Stalking				19.6%
Sexual Crime				
Rape	0.7%	1.0%	0.6%	0.7%
Sexual Assault	2.1%	1.5%	1.5%	2.4%

individual's possessions, without direct contact with the perpetrator. In this survey, we asked respondents about theft involving a motor vehicle or the contents of a motor vehicle, intentional damage of one's property (vandalism), and break-in and theft from one's home or other residential property (burglary). Additionally, for the first time in this survey, we asked several questions about an emerging property crime, theft of one's identity.

Property crimes were the most prevalent, with 38.5% of respondents reporting being the victim of at least one of the traditional indexes of property crime. When identity theft victimization was included, this percentage jumped to 43.5%.

Men and women had very similar rates of property crime victimization (44.1% of women, 42.3% of men). Overall property crime rates were not related to income or minority status. It does appear, however, that, in 2006, respondents living in urban locations (40.2%) were more likely to be victimized by property crimes than those living in rural locations (33.2%), and this difference remained when adding in identity theft (45.7% vs. 38.3%). When lifetime incidence of property crimes in general is considered, there is no longer a significant difference by location (86.0% urban vs. 83.2% rural). Additionally, reported lifetime incidence of property crime victimization also differed by sex, minority status, household income, and age (though the latter is to be expected due to the confounding influence of time). In general, males (89.3%) were more likely to report being victimized by a property crime at some point in their lives, compared to females (83.6%); non-minorities (86.3%) reported a higher lifetime incidence than minorities (76.1%); and household incomes above \$60,000 (90.1%) and between \$20,000-

60,000 (84.9%) reported greater incidence than those with household incomes below \$20,000 (72.9%). We now turn to each of the specific categories. Table 11 shows the percentage of the sample which reported each type of property crime.

Theft or attempted theft of a motor vehicle, including a car, truck, motorcycle, or snowmobile (motor vehicle theft) occurred for 6.6% of the respondents, up from 5.4% in 2004. A much greater percentage of respondents had experienced a vehicle theft at some other time during their lifetime (30.9%), which was also up from the 2004 survey (when it was 26.9%). Almost 20% of the victims reported more than one incident.

Additionally, there was a stronger likelihood for motor vehicle thefts to occur in urban areas than in rural areas – of the 75 reported incidents, 71 (94.7%) were by respondents residing in urban areas—this translated into a rate of 7.5% in urban areas, compared to 2.0% in rural areas. The lifetime incidence also differed by location, with 31.9% of respondents living in urban areas experiencing a motor vehicle theft, compared to 24.1% in rural areas. Additionally, males were more likely to report having a motor vehicle stolen than females, both in 2006 (9.1% vs. 5.2%) and over the course of their lives (34.6% vs. 28.9%). Minorities (13.0%) reported a higher rate of 2006 victimization than non-minorities (5.8%), though the lifetime incidence did not differ between these groups. There were no differences according to age or income level.

Table 11
Property Crime Victimization: 2000 through 2006

	2000	2002	2004	2006
Motor Vehicle Theft	5.5%	5.5%	5.4%	6.6%
Auto Burglary	13.3%	11.8%	16.2%	18.1%
Vandalism	22.9%	18.6%	19.6%	20.3%
Burglary	5.6%	6.4%	6.6%	9.2%
Identity Theft				14.1%
Other Property Crime	8.6%	8.6%	7.4%	5.7%

The rate of reporting motor vehicle theft to the police has increased substantially over the time period covered by the Utah victimization survey. Of those who said they were victims of a theft or attempted theft of a motor vehicle, 81.1% reported at least one incident to the police. This continues the upward trend in reporting of this particular crime over the past several surveys (63.5% report rate in 2002, 77.4% in 2004).

In cases where the crime was not reported to the police, half of those respondents either dealt with the crime in another way or felt that it was only a minor offense, while other common reasons for not reporting included believing that the police could not do anything to help (44.4%), or feeling that the crime was due in part to the individual's own carelessness (44.4%).

Theft of items from automobiles (auto burglary)

was substantially more common than stealing the vehicle itself, with 18.1% of respondents reporting that they were victimized in this manner during 2006, along with 52.9% reporting such victimization at some other point in their lives. The previous survey saw a substantial jump in the incidence of auto burglary between 2002 and 2004 (11.8% in 2002 to 16.2% in 2004), and the data from this survey apparently demonstrate a continuation of the rise in this particular type of property crime.

Again, reports of auto burglary victimization in 2006 were disproportionately more likely to come from urban residents (19.7%) than rural residents (12.8%), but the discrepancy was somewhat mitigated in lifetime incidence (54.0% vs. 48.2%). Older respondents aged 41 and over (16.3%) were significantly less likely to report such victimization in 2006, compared to those aged 25 and under (22.4%)

and 26 to 40 (22.0%). There were no significant differences in 2006 victimization according to gender, minority status, or income, though lifetime incidence did differ for minorities (57.5% vs. 46.4% for non-minorities) and those with the highest total household income (61.3% vs. 52.5% for \$20,000-60,000 and 35.6% for under \$20,000). Almost 35% of the 216 (36.8%) victims of this crime reported having their cars burglarized more than once.

31% of the victims of auto burglary chose not to report any of these thefts to the authorities. This rate was virtually identical to that found in the 2004 survey (31.1%). Most commonly, those who chose not to report the incident thought it was too minor of an offense (66.7%), the police would not be able to help (53.8%), the incident was dealt with in another way (44.9%), or that the victimization was due to their own carelessness (42.3%).

As in previous surveys, more respondents were victims of **vandalism** in 2006 than any other type of property offense (20.3%), and more than half (51.8%) had been victims at some other point in their lives. Additionally, 39.3% experienced two or more acts of vandalism during 2006, which is also consistent with past surveys.

Those living in urban and rural areas of the state experienced vandalism at similar rates. Also, similar rates of victimization were reported by sex, age, minority status, and income. Over their lives, however, males (56.7%) were more likely to have property vandalized than females (49.1%), and non-minorities (52.6%) reported a similar lifetime discrepancy compared to minorities (40.6%). As with other property crimes, there appeared to be a progression of lifetime victimization from the highest level of income down to the lowest (59.5% over

\$60,000, 51.7% \$20,000-60,000, 31.6% under \$20,000).

The large increase in reporting acts of vandalism to the authorities that was found in the 2004 survey appears to have been mostly sustained in 2006, with 58.5% of victims reporting one or more vandalism events to the police in the current survey (60.1% in 2004). Of the victims who did not report, 68% said this was because the crime was too minor, and not worth reporting. Other victims reported dealing with the crime in a different way (62.3%) or did not feel that the police would be able to do anything about the crime (60.7%).

Survey respondents were asked if anyone had **broken into, or attempted to break into their homes, or some other building on their property (burglary)**. In the first three victimization surveys conducted with Utah residents, the rate of home burglary had been relatively stable at around six percent. In the current survey, however, there was a slight jump in the incidence of this crime, with 9.2% of respondents reporting being the victim of a home burglary or attempted home burglary in 2006. The lifetime incidence of reported home burglary also increased to 40.1% in the 2006 sample, up from 34.8% in 2004. As with the other property crimes, a high percentage of respondents (36.8%) reported having their home burglarized more than once in 2006.

There were no significant differences between urban and rural residents in the rate of this crime in 2006. Those at the lowest levels of household income were most likely to report experiencing a home burglary (20.6%), compared to moderate (9.9%) and highest (7.1%) levels, which reverses the trends obtained with other property crimes (though this discrepancy

goes away for lifetime incidence of this crime). No differences were found by age, gender, or minority status.

A majority of the victims of home burglary reported the crime to the police (64.2%), though this is down somewhat from the reporting rate for this offense in the 2004 survey (74.4%). Once again, as with other property crimes, those who did not report the burglary most often claimed that it was simply a minor offense (51.2%), they did not feel the police would be able to help (51.2%), or they took care of the matter in an alternative way (39.0%).

In the 2006 survey, we also added some new questions (borrowed from the latest National Crime Victimization Survey) about the emerging issue of **identity theft**. Respondents were asked about whether or not they experienced four different types of situations related to identity theft or fraud, and 14% reported being a victim of at least one of these types in 2006. Please refer to the special section "Focus on Identity Theft" (page 29) for more information on this emerging issue and the data from this survey.

Overall, property crime victims are the most likely type of victims to seek law enforcement assistance for the crimes committed against them – for all "traditional" property crimes, the rate of reporting to the police was 64.2% (not including identity theft victims). The rate of reporting for identity theft victims was somewhat lower, at only 47.7%. Even though the majority of property crimes are brought to the attention of the police, this still means that over one-third are never reported. Most commonly, victims did not report because they dealt with the incident in another way, they did not believe the crime was significant enough to report, or they felt that the police would not be able to help them.

Table 12
Person Crime Victimization: 2000 through 2006

	2000	2002	2004	2006
Robbery	0.8%	0.9%	1.1%	1.3%
Assault with Weapon	0.7%	0.7%	0.8%	0.4%
Assault without Weapon	3.5%	2.5%	3.7%	3.1%
Domestic Violence	3.3%	2.5%	3.1%	2.8%
Threat of Violence	7.2%	5.7%	7.1%	5.1%
Stalking				19.6%

Continuing the trend from previous surveys, property crime remains the most common form of criminal victimization occurring for residents of Utah. Most of the time, however, these crimes do not receive the same attention as more “high-profile” violent crimes. Even so, property crimes have a wide-ranging impact on the populace, and victims of these types of crimes will often feel more susceptible to other types of crime as well (see previous section).

Person Crimes


Person crimes involve direct contact with the victim, with injury and/or the threat of violence. In this survey, this included the categories of robbery, threat of violence, assault (with or without a weapon), and domestic violence. While such violent (non-sexual) crimes are less prevalent than property crimes, they generally have more impact on the victim. In 2006, 8.8% of respondents reported being the victim of at least one of these traditional indices of person crime. Reports of stalking were more prevalent, and including this form of victimization increases the prevalence to 24.8%.

The victimization rates for violent person crimes did not differ according to the location of the respondents’ residence—an equal amount of violent crimes were experienced in urban and rural areas (both in 2006 and in lifetime incidence). While there were no gender differences in 2006

violent victimization, males are generally more likely to be the victims of violent crimes at some point in their lives (62.3% vs. 45.1% for females). Younger respondents, under 25 years old (25.0%) were much more likely to be victimized by person crime in 2006 than those 26 to 40 (10.5%) or 41 and over (6.6%).

Victimization by a person crime in 2006 also differed significantly by minority status and income level. Minorities (20.7%) were more likely to be victimized than non-minorities (7.7%), and this moved to 38.0% for minorities and 23.5% for non-minorities when stalking was included in the rates. This difference was mitigated somewhat in lifetime incidence (55.4% vs. 50.6%). Finally, those at the lowest levels of household income (16.8%) were the most likely to be victimized by a violent person crime in general, compared to those at the middle level (8.7%) and the highest level (7.3%) of income (with stalking included, the rates were 41.1%, 25.5%, and 20.3% respectively). This discrepancy remained for lifetime incidence, though it was not as sharp (60.7%, 53.2%, and 50.2% respectively). We will now turn to a description of each of these categories separately (See Table 12 for the summary of victimization rates).

Figure 8
Demographic Characteristics of 2006 Person Crime Victims



When asked if **someone took, or attempted to take, something directly from respondents using force (robbery)**, 1.3% responded affirmatively. This rate is essentially unchanged from the 2004 survey, when 1.1% reported being the victims of robbery. When lifetime incidence of this type of victimization is taken into consideration, 11.8% reported experiencing robbery at some other point in their lives (up from 9.7% in the last survey). One difference with the previous survey was that a majority of victims (9, or 60%) reported being robbed by a stranger.

While the absolute number of reported robberies was very low (15 out of 1199), it appears that there was a trend for females (1.7%, or 13 of the total) to be more likely to experience robbery than males (0.5%, or 2 of the total). Other trends placed the rate for the youngest respondents (5.3%), minorities (3.3%) and low income respondents (4.7%) somewhat higher than other respondents (though, again, it is difficult to make definitive statements about these differences due to small overall numbers). Although the 2006 rate appears to be greater for females, lifetime incidence of robbery was significantly higher for males (16.1%) than for females (9.6%). No differences were found between urban and rural areas.

Only 53.8% of these victims stated that they reported the crime to the police, which is down from 71.4% in 2004. The reasons for not reporting were more varied than many of the above property crimes, but the two most common responses, voiced by a majority of non-reporting victims, were that they felt it was either a minor offense or that the police could not do anything to help (both 57.1%). Other common reasons included being afraid of the offender, dealing

with the incident in another way, or not wanting to get the police involved (all 42.9%).

5.1% of respondents reported that someone **threatened to hit, attack, or beat** them. This is down somewhat from the 2004 survey, when 7.1% reported such victimization. A little over thirty percent (31.1%) of the reported incidents involved a stranger, though the vast majority involved someone known to the victim. Additionally, over sixty percent (61.4%) reported being threatened more than once in 2006. The lifetime incidence of threats of violence for this sample was 34.2%.

This rate did not vary significantly by gender or location, though there was a trend toward a higher rate of threatened violence in rural (7.1%) vs. urban (4.7%) areas. Younger respondents under 25 years of age (10.5%) were most likely to be threatened in 2006, followed by those 26 to 40 years old (6.9%) and those over 40 years of age (3.9%). There were no overall gender differences in the victimization rate for this offense (only a slight trend toward males), but important differences did emerge when examining the rates by identity of the offender. While males were more likely to be threatened by a stranger (50.0% vs. 17.1% for females), females were more likely to be threatened by a family member (42.9% vs. 11.5% for males) and by other well-known individuals who were not family (42.9% vs. 19.2% for males). Over the course of their lives, males were significantly more likely to experience threats of violence (46.3% vs. 28.0% for females). Minorities (9.8%) also reported being threatened more than non-minorities (4.6%) in 2006. There were no differences according to household income.

Threats of violence continued to be a low-reporting offense, with 58.6% not reporting such incidents to

the police. While the non-report rate was down somewhat from 2004 (63.8%), the majority of victims were still not reporting these threats. The main reasons offered by those who did not report an incident were that the incident was dealt with in another way (73.2%), the respondent felt it was only a minor offense (53.7%), or they did not want to get the police involved (51.2%). A large percentage also reported that they did not report because the offender was a family member or close friend (46.3%).

Respondents were also asked if they had been **hit, attacked, or beaten without a weapon (assault)**, and 3.1% (37 out of 1199) reported that they experienced such victimization. Of these, 52.9% reported multiple victimizations, and 83.8% knew their attacker in some way (only 16.2% were stranger attacks). Most of these assaults (73%) were perpetrated by adults. The lifetime incidence increased to 32.3%.

The non-weapon assault rates did not differ by location, and there were no significant gender differences (though males did report a slightly higher rate of victimization, 4.2% vs. 2.6%). Respondents under 25 years of age were more likely to be assaulted in 2006 (9.2% vs. 3.9% for the 26-40 group and 2.2% for the over 40 group). Minorities (6.5%) also tended to be assaulted in this manner more than non-minorities (2.8%), but the rates did not differ significantly by income level. Over their lives, males were much more likely to experience assault with hands, fists, or feet at some point than females (39.7% vs. 28.5%).

Only a slight majority of victims (51.4%) reported such incidents to the police, which is a small decrease from 2004 (52.9%). Given that the vast majority of victims knew the perpetrator in some way,

it is not surprising that most also reported dealing with the incident in another way other than involving the police (83.3%). Many also cited this relationship with the offender (close friend or family member) as the reason why they did not report the incident (61.1%).

Only 5 respondents (0.4%) reported that they had been **injured by someone using a weapon (assault)** in 2006, the least common type of victimization in this survey. A higher percentage did, however, report being assaulted with a weapon at some point in their lives (9.3%). Four out of the 5 reported incidents occurred in urban areas, 3 out of the 5 were perpetrated by family members or close acquaintances, 3 out of the 5 victims were males, and 3 out of the 5 victims were minorities—such low absolute numbers of incidents do not allow any conclusions to be drawn. In terms of lifetime incidence of assault with a weapon, however, males (14.7% vs. 6.5% for females), minorities (18.0% vs. 8.5% for non-minorities), and respondents at the lowest income levels (17.1% vs. 10.2% for middle and 8.7% for upper) were more likely to experience such crimes. Additionally, all 5 victims of assault with a weapon reported the incident to the proper authorities.

Respondents were also asked if they had been victims of **domestic abuse**, or assault by a family member or significant other, and 2.8% (33 out of 1199) reported that they had experienced this crime in 2006. Over their lifetimes, 21% of respondents had been domestically abused—an increase of over five percent from the lifetime incidence reported in the 2004 survey (15.6%). The majority of these domestic assaults (84.4%) were committed by adults. The vast majority of victims in 2006 (61.3%) were assaulted on more than one occasion.

The rates did not differ significantly by location of residence. Respondents 25 years of age or younger experienced a disproportionate amount of domestic assault, with 11.8% of this group reporting such incidents in 2006 (compared to 2.0% for those 26 to 40 and 2.2% for 41 and over). As in previous surveys, while there were no significant gender differences in domestic assault victimization within this year of analysis (3.1% for females, 2.2% for males), the lifetime reported incidence for this crime did show females (24.3%) are more likely to experience domestic assault than males (14.7%). Domestic assault was more likely to be experienced by minority respondents (8.8% vs. 2.2% for non-minorities) in 2006, though lifetime rates were equal for both groups. Low-income respondents also reported a greater incidence of domestic violence victimization, both in 2006 only (8.4% vs. 2.1% for both middle and higher income respondents) and over the course of their lives (33.7% vs. 21.8% for middle and 19.5% for higher income respondents).

On a more positive note, while the reporting rate for this type of victimization was still quite low (48.3%), it does represent an increase of over twenty percent from what previous surveys have consistently found (27.6% in 2004, 25.5% in 2002). Domestic abuse victims often find it difficult to report such incidents because of the nature of the relationship with the offender, and this was indeed the most cited reason for not bringing it to the attention of the police (84.2%). Victims also commonly said that they dealt with the incident in another way (78.9%), that they did not want to get the police involved (52.6%), or that they did not think the police could do anything to help (52.6%). Also, almost half (47.4%) felt it was a subjectively minor offense.

Table 13

Did you feel threatened by another person as a result of any of the following behaviors?

	2004	2006
Unsolicited phone calls	11.6%	10.8%
Unsolicited letters/written correspondence	4.3%	4.3%
Communicating against your will (other)	5.8%	5.7%
Following/spying	6.9%	7.3%
Standing outside home/work	6.4%	5.6%
Continually showing up where you are	3.3%	3.8%
Leaving unwanted items	2.3%	1.9%

The 2004 survey began asking questions for the first time about **stalking** victimization, and provided a spotlight description of this emerging issue in victimization. In this survey, we once again asked these questions, allowing some comparison over time (see Table 13). In 2006, 19.2% of the respondents reported experiencing at least one of the types of stalking behaviors, which is a slight decrease from the 20.4% who reported such threats in 2004. Once again, the most common way that victims were harassed by stalkers was through the use of unsolicited phone calls (10.8%). Unsolicited and unwanted communication, including letters or written correspondence (4.3%) or other forms of communication (5.7%), were less common. Other common stalking behaviors that were experienced by these victims actually involved the physical presence of the perpetrator, including following or spying on the respondent (7.3%) and standing outside their home, school, or workplace (5.6%). There were no differences between urban and rural locations for this type of victimization overall or for any of the specific behaviors.

As in the previous survey, females were more likely than males to experience stalking in general (20.8% vs. 16.1%). The behaviors that most accounted for this difference were unsolicited phone calls (12.8% vs. 8.3%), standing outside of one's home or place of work (7.0% vs. 2.9%), and continually showing up at places where the respondent was (4.8% vs. 1.7%).

For person crimes overall, many of the same trends found in previous surveys continued. A disturbingly high percentage of violent crime victims reported being attacked by people they knew, whether it was a family member, close friend, or casual acquaintance. This is a likely explanation for the low percentage of these crimes that are reported to the police. Additionally, despite the common misconception, violent person crime did not appear to be restricted to the urban areas. In most cases, there were once again no differences found between urban and rural areas in these types of victimization (similar to prior surveys). Finally, with some exceptions, males, minorities, and those with low household incomes were the most likely to be victimized by violent person crimes

Sexual Crimes

At least one sex crime was reported by 2.7% of the survey respondents. Women were more likely than men to be the victim of a sex crime, although the rates for both genders were low (3.4% of women, 1.2% of men). Sex crime rates were not related to minority status or urban versus rural residence. However, lower income individuals were more likely to report sex crime victimization (3.6% for under \$60,000 vs. 1.2% for \$60,000 or more). The youngest respondents, ages 25 or less, were also more likely to be victims of sex crimes—9.0% for those 25 and under, 2.3% for 26 to 40 year olds, and 2.2% for those 41 and over. Table 14 shows the rate of rape and sexual assault reported by respondents.

Table 14
Sex Crime Victimization: 2000 through 2006

	2000	2002	2004	2006
Rape	0.7%	1.0%	0.6%	0.7%
Sexual Assault	2.1%	1.5%	1.5%	2.4%

Forced unwanted sexual activity, such as touching, grabbing, kissing, fondling, etc. (sexual assault) was reported by 2.4% (29 of 1199) of respondents in 2006, up slightly from the 1.5% reported in 2004. An additional 24.7% reported lifetime experience of this crime (this number was 20.2% in the 2004 survey). Three-quarters of the 2006 crimes were committed by adults, with 17.9% committed by juveniles (2 reported the assault was committed by both an adult and a juvenile). Six of the 29 reported assaults (20.7%) were committed by strangers—otherwise, the offender was known to the victim in some way. 61.5% of the victims reported more than one incident.

Of the 29 respondents experiencing sexual assault victimization, 25 were female—the victimization rate for females (3.2%) differed significantly from that of males (1.0%). This difference is even greater when looking at lifetime incidence, with females (33.1%) experiencing a much higher likelihood of being sexually assaulted at some point in their lives than males (9.1%). While there are no differences according to minority status, a disproportionate number of sexual assaults appeared to be experienced by younger and lower-income respondents. 9.2% of those 25 years and under experienced a sexual assault in 2006, compared to 1.6% aged 26 to 40 and 2.1% aged 41 and over. In 2006, 7.5% of those whose household income was less than \$20,000 were sexually assaulted, compared to 2.3% of those with incomes between \$20,000 and \$60,000 and 1.0% of those with incomes over \$60,000 (lifetime rates were 38.4%, 25.0%, and 25.2% respectively). There were no differences between urban and rural areas in sexual assault victimization.

Unfortunately, most of these sexual assaults went unreported. An alarming 76.9% of respondents did not report at least one of the incidents they experienced. This is a large increase from the 66.7% non-report rate in the 2004 survey, and is closer to the 79.3% in the 2002 survey. Of those not reporting the crime to the police, 68.4% said the incident was handled in a different way, 57.9% did not want to get the police involved, and 52.6% did not feel the police would be able to help. Additionally, 47.4% said they did not report the crime explicitly because the offender was a friend or family member, while 36.8% indicated fear of the offender as a reason.

In 2006, 0.7% (8 of 1199) of all respondents experienced a **rape**, defined as forced sexual intercourse (or attempted forced sexual intercourse). Over their lifetimes, 14.8% of respondents said they had been raped at some point, with females (20.5%) much more likely than males (3.9%) to experience this type of victimization during their lives. Similar trends in lifetime victimization as those mentioned above for low-income respondents were also found for rape (27.9% for low income, 16.4% for middle, and 12.8% for high). Lifetime incidence of rape was

actually higher for respondents from rural areas (19.5%) than for those from urban areas (14.1%). No differences in lifetime incidence were found by minority status. The number of victims was too small to determine any significant differences between genders, areas, or other characteristics with regard to victimization in 2006.

More than half of the victims were raped more than once, and only one of the eight incidents involved a stranger as the perpetrator. Only two of the eight victims (25%) reported any of the incidents to the police. The reasons were varied, but most respondents indicated this was because the offender was a close friend or family member (83.3%) and that they did not feel the police could do anything to help (83.3%). On top of this, fear of the offender not only played a role in two-thirds of the non-reported rapes, but the same number also felt the crime was due to their own carelessness.

It should be noted that the survey pool consisted entirely of Utah citizens aged 18 and over. Thus, sex crimes against children are not described by this survey.

Focus on Identity Theft

Identity theft is a growing concern for the residents of Utah. The 2006 victim survey added a set of new questions about the prevalence and impact of identity theft. 168 of the respondents (14.0%) reported that they had been victims of some type of identity theft in 2006. When asked if they had ever been a victim of identity theft at any previous time in their lives, an additional 239, or 19.9% answered that they had at some other time been a victim of identity theft. Overall, 33.9% of the respondents reported that they had been victims of identity theft during their lifetime. Credit card theft was the most common form of identity theft.

The 2006 victim survey added a series of questions about identity theft and its impact on the citizens of Utah, borrowed from the 2004 National Crime Victimization Survey. 14.0% of the respondents said they had been victims of some type of identity theft during 2006. This rate is much higher than the 6.2% annual rate estimated by the 2004 National survey even though the same survey questions were used. While Utah may simply have a higher rate of identity theft than the national average, it is also possible that the prevalence of this crime has increased substantially between 2004 and 2006.

Definition of Identity Theft in Utah Statutes
A person is guilty of identity fraud when that person:

- a. obtains personal identifying information of another person whether that person is alive or deceased; and
- b. knowingly or intentionally uses, or attempts to use, that information with fraudulent intent, including to obtain, or attempt to obtain, credit, goods, services, any other thing of value, or medical information.

Table 15

During 2006, did you discover that someone used or attempted to use:

Existing credit cards without permission	9.6%
Existing accounts other than credit cards without permission	5.8%
Personal information to obtain services, such as cell phones, utilities	3.9%
Personal information to obtain new credit cards or loans, run up debts, open other new accounts, or otherwise commit theft, fraud, or some other crime	4.9%

As in the National study, the most common type of identity theft was misuse of credit cards (See Table 15) with 9.6% of the total respondents indicating that someone used or attempted to use their existing credit cards without their permission. Additionally, 5.8% said that someone used or attempted to use their existing accounts other than credit cards (e.g., checking) without permission; 3.9% said that someone used or attempted to use their personal information to obtain services, such as cell phones, telephones, or utilities; and 4.9% said that someone used or attempted to use personal information without permission to obtain new credit cards or loans, run up debts, open other new accounts, or otherwise commit theft, fraud, or some other crime. About half the respondents who said they were victims of identity theft (45.0%) reported experiencing two or more of these types of identity theft.

Lifetime incidence of identity theft victimization was 33.9% which is only 2.4 times higher than the 2006 rate. 41.3% of all identity theft reported by the survey respondents occurred during 2006. This may be due to the fact that identity theft is a relatively new crime. 22.7% reported lifetime misuse of existing credit cards; 15.0% lifetime misuse of other existing accounts; 8.6% lifetime misuse of personal information to obtain services; and 9.9% lifetime misuse of personal information to obtain credit or commit fraud.

The 2004 National survey found that higher income and urban respondents were more likely to report identity theft. The present study found no differences in identity theft rates by income or urban/rural residence. No differences were found for gender or minority status. Lifetime incidence of identity theft, however, was related to income. Almost one quarter (24.5%) of individuals reporting an income over \$60,000 a year were victims of identity theft at some time compared to 16.6% of those making between \$20,000 and \$60,000 and 17.8% of those making less than \$20,000.

Those who reported an episode of identity theft were asked how many times they were victimized. About half reported only one event (56.6%), although one responded that he or she experienced 50 identity theft events. The average number of events was 2.36.

Less than half of the identity theft victims reported one or more crimes to the police (47.7%) and less than half of the total identity theft incidents (46.2%) were actually reported to the

police. When one or more crimes were not reported, the vast majority of the respondents said that they dealt with the incident in another way, without involving the police (83.5%). The next most common reason was that the respondent did not think that the police could do anything to help (40.0%). Other common reasons were that the incident was too minor to report (20.0%); the incident was due to the victim's own carelessness (21.2%); or that the perpetrator was a family member or friend (18.8%). The least common reasons were that the victim didn't want to get involved with the police (10.6%); he or she didn't want anyone to know about the incident (5.9%); he or she felt sorry for the offender (5.9%); or he or she was afraid of the offender (2.4%).

Victims Equally Likely to Discover Identity Theft through Charges or Bank, Credit Bureau Contacts

Respondents were asked how they discovered the identity theft. (See Table 16.) They were allowed to chose as many answers as applied to their situation. The most common way that a victim in this survey discovered their identity theft was through missing money in an account or charges placed on an account. 45.8% of those who answered this question found out through missing money or fraudulent charges. This was also the most common way of

Table 16
How did you discover this identity theft?

Money missing from account or charged place on an account	45.8%
Contacted by a credit bureau, collection agency, credit card company, or other business about late or unpaid bills	26.2%
Contacted by a bank	26.2%
Noticed that a credit card, check book, etc., was missing, and contacted bank or credit card company	17.3%
Other	16.1%
Block placed on a credit card or other account	14.9%
Noticed an error on a credit report	14.3%
Denied credit or a loan	7.1%
Notified by a law enforcement agency	4.8%
Driver's license suspended	1.8%
Arrested on a warrant	0.6%

discovering identity theft in the 2004 National survey.

The next most common ways of discovering the theft were through a contact from a credit bureau, collection agency, credit card company, or other business about late or unpaid bills or a contact from a bank (26.2% for each, 52.4% combined). 17.3% said that they discovered the theft by noticing that a credit card, check book, etc., was missing. A similar percentage had a block placed on a credit card or other account (14.9%) or noticed an error on a credit report (14.3%). 7.1% were denied credit and 4.8% were notified by law enforcement. The least common means of discovering the theft were a suspension of a driver's license (1.8%) and one individual (0.6%) was arrested as a result of the identity theft.

information when paying a bill was the method in 10.7% of the identity thefts. Mail theft or dumpster diving was used in 8.9% of the cases; a car break-in in 8.3%; a telephone scam in 5.4%, and a home break-in in 4.2%.

"Other" was selected in 21.4% of the cases. In reviewing the open-ended responses to "other" for common themes, a few additional categories were identified: 9 (5.4% of the identity theft cases) said that a family member or friend got access to personal information and used it; 7 (4.2%) lost a credit card or had it stolen; and 4 (2.4%) were victimized through their employment or business contacts. Two individuals said that their disabilities contributed to the theft.

Table 17
How did they obtain access to your accounts or personal information?

Don't know	26.2%
Other	21.4%
Computer scam or "phishing"	14.3%
Theft of wallet or purse	13.7%
Data base hacking or loss of data by a business or government	11.9%
Credit card information was skimmed when paying a bill	10.7%
Mail theft or dumpster diving	8.9%
Car break in	8.3%
Telephone scam	5.4%
Home break in	4.2%

Perpetrators Gained Access to Accounts or Information through a Variety of Means

Respondents were asked how the perpetrators obtained access to their accounts or their personal information (See Table 17). Just over one-quarter (26.2%) said that they didn't know how it was done. A computer scam or "phishing" was the method in 14.3% of the cases, and theft of wallet or purse in 13.7% of the cases. Inappropriate access to information through data base hacking or loss of data by a business or government was the means in 11.9% of identity thefts. Skimming credit card

Two-Thirds Victimized by Strangers

Identity theft victims were asked about their relationship to the perpetrator. Identity theft was most likely to be committed by a stranger. Almost two-thirds of the identity theft victims (66.1%) reported that the perpetrator was a


stranger. An additional 13.7% said they did not know who committed the crime. Family members were responsible in 12.5% of the cases, while friends and acquaintances committed the crime in 7.1% of the identity thefts.

Identity Theft Caused Financial Losses, Credit Problems, and Loss of Time

One of the large concerns in identity theft is the difficulty of stopping the crime and in recovering from its impacts. Respondents were first asked if the misuse of their accounts and identity had stopped.

Figure 8

Amount of Theft and Amount of Final Loss in Identity Theft



Respondents replied that it had stopped in the vast majority of the cases (89.3%). However, when the identity theft consisted of using personal information to obtain new credit cards, etc., the misuse was slightly more likely to be continuing—15.7% of those reporting this type of identity theft reported on-going problems compared to 7.3% for other categories of identity theft.

Identity theft victims were also asked if the incident was still causing problems for them, such as requiring them to clean up their credit reports. 18.5% of the victims were still experiencing problems from the crime. Those who were victims of credit card theft were least likely to be experiencing continuing problems.

Finally, they were asked how much time it had taken to clear up problems caused by the identity theft.

One-fourth (25.0%) said that it took less than a day; 29.2% said less than a month; and 42.3% said it took more than a month. For those cases that took more than one month, 26.8% reported that fixing the problems took between one and six months; 6.5% between six and 12 months; and 7.1% more than a year.

One question of interest in evaluating

the impact of identity theft is the amount of financial loss incurred by the victim (See Figure 8).

Respondents were asked two questions about the financial impact of the crime. The first question assessed the total amount of money obtained through the identity theft.

14.3% said that no financial benefit was obtained by the offender(s). Of

the rest, 17.3% reported \$1 to \$100; 23.8% between \$101 and \$500; 11.3% \$501 to \$1000; 20.2% between \$1001 and \$5000; and 9.1% over \$5000.

Several respondents reported substantial thefts. One individual estimated a theft of \$100,000 and another of \$230,000. The median amount of the value of the theft was \$400.

Identity theft victims were also asked the overall dollar loss to them from this incident. 58.9% said they did not end up losing any money. 9.5% said they lost \$1 to \$100; 12.5% between \$101 and \$500; 6.0% \$501 to \$1000; 6.0% between \$1001 and \$5000; and 5.4% over \$5000. The highest loss was \$100,000. The median loss was \$0.

Identity theft victims were also asked about other impacts of the crime (See Table 18). More than half (55.4%) of the respondents said that they had no

Table 18
As a result of this crime, have you?

Been contacted by a debt collector or creditor	22.0%
Received a negative credit rating	16.7%
Had to pay higher interest rates on credit cards or loans	16.7%
Had banking problems	14.9%
Had problems with credit card accounts	14.3%
Been turned down for a loan	10.1%
Been turned down for insurance or had to pay higher rates	4.8%
Been the subject of a criminal investigation, warrant, or conviction	4.8%
Been the subject of a civil suit or judgment	4.2%
Had phone or utilities cut off and/or denied new service	3.0%
Been turned down for a job	0.6%
Had other problems	11.3%
Had no problems	55.4%

problems resulting from the identity theft. The most common problem from this list was being contacted by a debt collector or creditor (22.0%). 16.7% of respondents said they received a negative credit rating and the same percentage (16.7%) had to pay

higher interest rates on credit cards or loans. Banking problems were reported by 14.9% of respondents; 14.3% had problems with credit card accounts; and 10.1% were turned down for a loan.

The Impact of Crime

Respondents were asked a number of questions designed to evaluate the impact of crime on their lives. Most victims said that the crime had little impact on their lives. But, these impact ratings were importantly qualified by the nature of the crime experienced. As in previous surveys, the impact of victimization appeared to increase in a step-wise fashion as the type of crime moved from property-related to violent/person-related to sex-related. For the “emerging” victimization issues, about one-third of victims of stalking reported a substantial impact, while almost 40% of identity theft victims also reported a substantial impact.

Impact of Crime on Victims

Respondents were asked how much impact crimes occurring in 2006 had on their lives. Only responses from those who answered affirmatively to one of the crime questions included in the survey were considered for this question. Generally speaking, victims rated the impact of crime on their lives as minimal (See Table 19). Of the victims of some form of crime in 2006 who provided impact ratings, approximately three-quarters said that they suffered either very little impact (45.8%) or some impact (27.8%) on their lives. About one-quarter suffered either a lot (13.4%) or quite a lot (12.9%) of impact on their lives.

But, these impact ratings were importantly qualified by the nature of the crime experienced. As in previous surveys, the impact of victimization appeared to increase in a step-wise fashion as the type of crime moved from property-related (25.9% reporting “a lot” or “quite a lot”) to violent/person-related (37.8%) to sex-related (44.4%). For the “emerging” victimization issues, 33.6% of

victims of stalking reported a substantial impact, while 38.6% of identity theft victims reported a substantial impact.

The impact of crime victimization also differed significantly according to the gender of the respondent. Women were more than twice as likely as men to feel a lot or quite a lot of impact (32.3% of women vs. 15.2% of men). This is a trend that has been supported consistently in prior surveys as well. In contrast, the area of the state in which the victim lived did not appear to play a role in the impact of the crime. Surprisingly, given that the youngest respondents appear to experience the highest rates

Table 19
If you were a victim in 2006, how much impact did the event have on your life?

	Very little	Some	A lot	Quite a lot
Total	45.8%	27.8%	13.4%	12.9%
Male	55.9%	29.0%	9.0%	6.2%
Female	40.4%	27.2%	15.8%	16.5%
Urban	45.6%	27.9%	14.0%	12.5%
Rural	45.2%	29.0%	11.3%	14.5%
Property Crime	44.8%	28.5%	13.5%	13.3%
Violent Crime	37.5%	30.5%	16.0%	16.0%
Sex Crime	25.9%	29.6%	14.8%	29.6%

of crime, they tend to rate the impact of their victimization as relatively low (15.2% report a substantial impact). Rather, those aged 41 and over report the most impact from victimization in 2006 (28.9%). Minority victims also appeared to be more impacted by victimization, with 39% indicating that it had a substantial impact on their lives compared to 25% of non-minorities. Victimization impact did not appear to differ by income or urban versus rural location of the respondent.

As in previous surveys, a large percentage of victims, 85.6%, indicated that they were not informed by an officer of crime victim services or programs. This is an increase from the already high percentage (79.8%) who reported this in the last survey. No differences were found in this question by victim characteristics.

On the other hand, all survey respondents were asked whether or not they knew where to find these types of services if they were needed, and 74.7% responded affirmatively. When examining this number more closely, however, it appears that non-victims in 2006 felt they knew where they would go if they were to need help more than those who actually experienced victimization (77.9% vs. 72.0%). Victims of sex offenses were the least likely to report that they knew where to find services in their communities (65.6%). Thus, in spite of (or because of) the experience of victimization, victims were significantly less sure of where to find victim assistance services. This could be due to a variety of factors. First, it could be a function of the lack of information that they said was provided through the process—though, within this, it is also possible that the low rate of reporting on most crimes affected this number as well. It could also reflect the possibility that non-victims had an inflated perception of their knowledge,

due to the fact that they had not been forced to utilize it. Finally, there could be other important characteristics that differentiate victims and non-victims that help to explain this gap in knowledge.

In addition, men were more likely than women to say that they knew where to find victims' services (78.3% for men vs. 72.8% for women). Also, rural respondents were more likely to report they knew where to find help (83.5% for rural vs. 72.9% for urban).

Demographic Characteristics Influenced the Experience of Crime Victimization

While crime was experienced by residents of Utah (over their lives and in 2006 in particular) regardless of their demographic and background characteristics, some of these factors were related to increased incidence of crime in general, and to certain types of crime in particular. In the earlier sections outlining the different types of crime by category, information was provided about how each of the crimes (and the categories) differed by age, sex, minority status, and household income, as well as residential location (urban or rural). We provide a brief summary of this information here, pointing out the overall trends (2006 and lifetime), as well as the trends for each of the three crime categories.

Age is one factor that tends to influence the likelihood of being victimized by crime (See Table 20). Overall victims of crime in 2006 were younger on average (48.3 years) than non-victims (52.9 years). Including the emerging issues of identity theft and stalking, the rate of 2006 victimization decreased as age increased, with 61.8% of those 25 and under, 59.5% of those 26 to 40, and 51.4% of those 41 and over reporting a victimization (50.0%, 48.0%, and

Table 20
Age and Victimization in 2006

	18-25 yrs.	26-40 yrs.	41 yrs. or more
All Victims	61.8%	59.5%	51.4%
Traditional Victims	50.0%	48.0%	39.7%
Person Victims Including Stalking	38.2%	25.5%	23.3%
Person Victims Excluding Stalking	25.0%	10.5%	6.6%
Sex Victims	10.5%	1.6%	2.3%

39.7% when just considering traditional crimes). This was especially true for person crimes (38.2%/25.5%/23.3% with stalking included, 25.0%/10.5%/6.6% for traditional only) and sex crimes (10.5%/1.6%/2.3%). The rates are more balanced for property crimes.

Gender was another factor that influenced victimization, though it generally depended on the type of crime being examined. In terms of general victimization, there were no significant differences in 2006 victimization rates between males and females, regardless of whether overall victimization (including emerging issues) was included or strictly traditional victimization compared. In fact, the only overall category that shows significant differences is sex crimes with 3.4% of females and 1.2% of males reporting this type of victimization in 2006 (see above for sex differences across the specific crimes in this survey). In terms of general lifetime victimization, males (93.7%) were more likely to report being victimized at some point in their lives than females (89.3%)—this trend also held for property crimes (89.3% vs. 83.6%) and person crimes (62.3% vs. 45.1%), but for sex crimes, this pattern reversed (10.5% men vs. 35.8% women).

Whether the respondent was a member of a **minority** group or not also plays a role in victimization rates (See Table 21). Minorities were slightly more likely to be victimized by crime in general in 2006, whether that included emerging issues (63.0% vs. 53.2% for non-

minorities) or only included traditional crimes (51.1% vs. 41.5%). As there were no differences for property crime or sex crime victimization rates, this overall difference in 2006 appeared to be carried by the discrepancy in the rate of person crime

victimization. Minorities (38.0% with stalking, 20.7% without) were significantly more likely to be victimized by person crimes than non-minorities (23.5%, 7.7%). In terms of lifetime victimization rates, non-minorities actually reported a higher likelihood of being victimized in general over the course of their lives (91.5%) than minorities (82.6%). This was mostly due to the high rate of property crime victimization reported by non-minorities (86.3% vs. 76.1% for minorities). One factor that may influence this is that the minority sample was significantly younger than the non-minority sample (45.7 vs. 51.2).

Socioeconomic status (assessed through total household **income** in 2006) was also a factor in crime victimization (See Table 22). While not significant, a trend appeared such that those with the lowest income (less than \$20,000) were most likely to experience crime in general in 2006 (62.6% overall, 52.3% traditional only), followed by those who made between \$20,000 and \$60,000 (56.1%, 43.1%), and those who made more than \$60,000 (51.9%, 41.0%). This was especially true for violent person crimes (41.1% for the lowest vs. 20.3% for the highest when including stalking, 16.8% vs. 7.3% for traditional only) and sex crimes (8.4% for the lowest vs. 1.2% for the highest).

Table 21
Racial and Ethnic Minorities and Victimization in 2006

	Minority	Non-Minority
All Victims	63.0%	53.2%
Traditional Victims	51.1%	41.5%
Person Victims Including Stalking	38.0%	23.5%
Person Victims Excluding Stalking	20.7%	7.7%

Table 22
Income and Victimization in 2006

	Under \$20,000	\$20,000- \$60,000	\$60,000 or More
All Victims	62.6%	56.1%	51.9%
Traditional Victims	52.3%	43.1%	41.0%
Person Victim Including Stalking	41.1%	25.5%	20.3%
Person Victims Excluding Stalking	16.8%	8.7%	7.3%
Sex Victims	8.4%	2.5%	1.2%

Surprisingly, these trends tended to reverse for lifetime victimization, as those with the highest household income (93.2%) reported a significantly higher rate of victimization over the course of their lives than those with the lowest incomes (86.0%). This overall difference in favor of those at the highest household income levels was explained by the higher incidence of lifetime property crime victimization (90.1% for the highest income group vs. 72.9% for the lowest), while those at the lowest levels of household income still experienced the highest rates of lifetime person crime (60.7% vs. 50.2% for the highest) and sex crime (43.0% vs. 26.9%) victimization.

Finally, another factor that is often assumed to influence the rates of crime victimization is the residential location of the person, with most people believing that urban residents experience more crime than rural residents. In this survey, we found no significant differences in overall crime victimization in 2006 between urban and rural residents, as well as no difference in general lifetime rates of victimization. The only contrast that approached significance by residential location was the incidence of property crime victimization in 2006, with urban residents (45.7% including identity theft, 40.2% without) experiencing higher rates of this type of crime than rural residents (38.3%, 33.2%).

Many Victims Believed the Offender Was Motivated by their Personal Characteristics

More than half of those who were victimized in 2006 believed that the offenses committed against them were provoked by their personal characteristics. As Table 23 below shows, the most frequently cited motivating characteristic reported by victims was age (11.6%). A relatively large percent also felt that their sex (10.0%) was a factor in the perpetrator's motivation to victimize them. In general, perceptions of motivation due to one's personal characteristics increased across the board for 2006 victims compared to 2004 victims' perceptions. The order of perceived impact of the various characteristics that were identified, however, remained mostly the same. One exception is that sexual orientation bias in victimization moved ahead of religion as a perceived motivating factor in 2006 (though the prevalence of each remains low).

Looking at perceived motivations by type of crime, victims of property crime were least likely to feel that the offender was motivated by their personal characteristics. As with the general trends, age (13.4%) and sex (10.2%) were the most commonly cited perceived motivations. Victims of person

Table 23
Do you believe the offender was motivated by any of the following?

	2004	2006
Offender not motivated by bias	40.6%	43.3%
Other reason	21.6%	13.3%
Sex	12.1%	10.0%
Age	9.3%	11.6%
Mental disability	5.7%	7.4%
Physical condition	4.4%	7.4%
National origin	3.3%	4.6%
Race	2.9%	4.3%
Religion	2.9%	3.4%
Sexual orientation	2.4%	4.0%
Sensory disability	1.2%	1.8%

crimes were most likely to feel the offender was motivated by their personal characteristics (over 60%), with the most common reasons being mental disability (20%), age (19%), sex (19%), and physical condition or disability (16.2%). The number of sex crime victims was very low, but these individuals were most likely to cite their sex (25%) and mental or physical condition (18.8%) as motivating characteristics. For the emerging issues in victimization, a large percentage of stalking victims believed the offender was motivated by their characteristics (18.7% cited age, while 18.3% cited sex), while victims of identity theft were much less likely to believe that any of their characteristics motivated the crime (age was the most cited, at 14.9%).

Not surprisingly, a victim's demographic background influenced how likely they were to feel that the offender was motivated by their personal characteristics. In terms of age, the youngest respondents (14.9%) and the oldest respondents (13.1%) were more likely to feel the offender was motivated by their age than those in the middle group (7.1%). Females (13.9%) were also more likely to feel their victimization was due to their sex than males (2.3%) were. Finally, minority victims were much more likely to cite their race (20.7%) and national origin (17.2%) as motivating factors than non-minority victims (2.7% and 3.4% respectively).

Reporting Crime to the Police Held Steady

Crime reporting rates were generally similar to the rates from the 2004 survey, with rates for some types of

crime increasing and rates for other types decreasing. As reported in the 2004 survey, it is difficult to confidently compare rates from surveys prior to 2004, as the administration format was changed last time. It does appear, however, that reporting rates for motor vehicle theft, domestic assault, and other assaults and threats of violence have all increased in this survey. The largest increase appears to be for domestic assaults, where the reporting rate jumped from 27.6% in 2004 to 48.3% in 2006—this is especially surprising, given the sensitivity of the crime and the relationship to the offender involved. On the other hand, reporting decreased for home burglary, robbery, rape, and other property crimes. For rape, though there are a very small number of incidents within any of the survey years (which can produce volatility in rates), reporting appears to have returned to similar levels prior to 2004 after a significant increase in that survey.

Table 24 provides the trends in the reporting rates across the four surveys that have been conducted. It is important to note that rates have been generally reported at the level of the victim—in other words, these numbers (in red) reflect the percentage of

Table 24
Percent of Victims Reporting Crime to Police: 2000-2006

	2000	2002	2004	2006 Victim	2006 Incident
PROPERTY CRIME				64.2%	55.2%
Motor Vehicle Theft	60.2%	64.4%	77.4%	81.1%	76.8%
Auto Burglary	54.2%	54.5%	68.9%	69.1%	64.6%
Vandalism	35.3%	40.2%	60.1%	58.5%	45.3%
Burglary	49.2%	58.1%	74.4%	64.2%	60.2%
PERSON CRIME				48.2%	35.0%
Robbery	50.0%	53.8%	71.4%	53.8%	65.9%
Assault With Weapon	60.0%	45.5%	57.1%	100.0%	100.0%
Assault Without Weapon	38.5%	43.4%	47.1%	51.4%	32.3%
Domestic Assault	24.7%	25.5%	27.6%	48.3%	44.2%
Threat of Violence	23.6%	28.2%	36.2%	41.4%	23.6%
SEXUAL CRIME				28.6%	5.0%
Rape	20.0%	21.4%	54.5%	25.0%	8.7%
Sexual Assault	2.2%	20.7%	33.3%	30.0%	4.5%

victims who reported at least one incident to the police, regardless of the number of times they were victimized. In this table, we also provide the reporting rate at the incident level for 2006—in other words, these numbers (in blue) reflect the percentage of total incidents experienced by victims that were ultimately reported to the police. For example, in some cases, a person was victimized more than once by the same type of crime in 2006, and may have only reported one of these to the police. In this case, the person is recorded as a report for the rate in red, but only one of their multiple incidents is reported for the rate in blue.

For the most part, victims provided reasons for not reporting that commonly centered around dealing with the incident in an alternative way, believing the incident was relatively minor, and believing that the police would not be able to do anything to help them. This was relatively consistent across types of crimes, though person crime and sex crime victims were more likely to know the offender well (family or close friend), and to cite this as a reason for not reporting.

Utahns Were Proactive In Protecting Themselves

All survey respondents were asked about measures they had taken to protect themselves from crime. The numbers below reflect actions that the respondents had taken in general, not necessarily in 2006 only. In general, 81% of respondents reported taking at least one of the precautionary measures we asked about.

Table 25 highlights each of these measures and the percentage of 2006 respondents who reported taking each of these compared to the 2004 survey respondents. While the number of respondents reporting taking no action increased in 2006 (19%

from 13.1%), those who did take action tended to be somewhat more proactive in certain areas, especially when it came to protecting their property with burglar alarms (23.7%) or security stickers (22.4%), or in taking a self-defense course for themselves (20.5%). As in 2004, the most common action taken to feel safer from crime was to purchase and install extra or more secure door locks (51.4%). Interestingly, there was a fair increase in the number of respondents who indicated they have bought a gun to protect themselves from crime, up to 13.1% from 9.2% in 2004.

As might be expected, a smaller number of respondents who had been violently victimized (in 2006) reported taking no extra precautions, 12.1% versus 21.3% of those who had not been violently victimized. A similar, though not as large, difference was found with victims of property crime (in 2006). Fifteen percent (15.3%) of all property crime victims did not take any extra steps to feel safe, compared to 21.9% of non-victims of property crime. For victims of both types of crime, the differences with non-victims were found across all potential measures.

Looking at gender differences, men were significantly less likely than women to report taking any action to

Table 25
Which of the following have you done to your residence to make you feel safer from crime?


	2004	2006
Extra/more secure door locks	53.9%	51.4%
Security lights	38.6%	40.4%
Extra/more secure window locks	35.4%	35.6%
Neighborhood watch	34.2%	32.1%
Purchased dog	24.1%	25.9%
Burglar alarms	20.1%	17.8%
Display security sticker	18.9%	22.4%
Self-defense course	18.7%	23.7%
Carry object for defense	18.2%	20.5%
Pepper spray	13.4%	13.7%
Purchased gun	13.1%	19.0%
No action	9.2%	13.1%

protect themselves from crime (75.2% vs. 84.0%). Women were more likely to report that they took a self-defense course, installed extra or more secure door and window locks, participated in a Neighborhood Watch program, purchased a dog, and purchased pepper spray. Men, on the other hand, were more likely to report purchasing a gun to protect themselves.

Youngest respondents were also significantly less likely than oldest respondents to report taking extra safety precautions, with 27.6% of those 25 and under reporting taking no action compared to only 17.7% of those 41 and over. This difference was mostly explained by large discrepancies in home and neighborhood protections measures, including door and window locks, burglar alarms, security lights, displaying a security company sticker, and participating in Neighborhood Watch. There were no significant general differences in the likelihood of taking extra measures to feel safe by minority status or household income, though non-minorities were more likely to install extra door locks and security lights. On the other hand, minorities were more likely to purchase pepper spray. Those at the highest levels of household income were more likely to take the more expensive measures to protect their homes (i.e., burglar alarms, security lights, displaying security company sticker), but not the more accessible measures (no differences for door and window locks).

Residential location was another factor that influenced the likelihood of taking extra safety precautions, as urban dwellers (82.1%) were much more likely to indicate that they have taken extra steps than rural dwellers (74.5%). While urban

Figure 9
Survey respondents taking some sort of action to feel more safe from crime



residents were more likely to take every category of measures assessed, the only ones that showed a significantly large difference were installing a burglar alarm and security lights, displaying a security company sticker, and participating in a Neighborhood Watch program.

Focusing on guns in particular, just over half of the respondents (50.6%) reported keeping a gun in their home—up from 41.6% of the 2004 respondents who reported this (See Table 26). Of those who have a gun in their home, 12.1% indicated that it was solely for protection purposes, 35.8% said that it was solely for sporting purposes, and almost half (45.5%) indicated that it served both of these purposes. Males (61.1% vs. 45.0% for females), non-minorities (52.7% vs. 28.1% of minorities), and older respondents (53.2% vs. 45.6% for 26 to 40 year olds and 43.4% for those 25 and under) were significantly more likely to keep a gun in their home, while lowest income respondents were significantly less likely (26.2% vs. 50.1 for middle and 57.1% for high). Rural residents were also much more likely to report keeping a gun in their home (62.1% vs. 48.7% for urban residents), though urban residents were more likely to keep it for protection only while rural

Table 26

Do you keep a gun in your home?

	Yes	No
Gender		
Male	61.1%	38.9%
Female	45.0%	55.0%
Minority Status		
Non-minority	52.7%	47.3%
Minority	28.1%	71.9%
Age		
Under 25 Years	43.4%	56.6%
26 to 40 Years	45.6%	54.4%
41 Years and Over	52.7%	47.3%
Income		
Under \$20,000	26.2%	73.8%
\$20,000 to \$60,000	50.1%	49.9%
\$60,000 or More	57.1%	42.9%
Location		
Urban	48.7%	51.3%
Rural	62.1%	37.9%

residents were more likely to keep it for sporting only (similar rates cited both reasons).

A small percentage of respondents (7.0%) reported carrying a gun outside their home for protection in 2006. This number is up slightly from the 5.6% who reported doing this in 2004. A much larger percentage of males (12.3% vs. 4.3% of females) and individuals in the highest category of household income (9.9% vs. 5.2% for the middle income category and 5.6% for the lower income category) indicated taking this step, though this did not differ by residential location, age, or minority status.

Methodology and Demographic Characteristics

In 2007, the Utah Commission on Criminal and Juvenile Justice conducted its fourth Crime Victimization Survey of Utah residents. The current study and the one conducted in 2004 used randomly generated telephone calls to contact a sample of Utah residents. The 1,199 survey respondents were from 25 of the 29 counties in the state. The four counties which were not included accounted for less than one-half of one percent of Utah's population (0.3%) in 2006. Survey participants were more likely to be female, white, with more than a high school education, and from an urban county.

Commission staff reviewed and made minor revisions to the survey instrument used in the prior surveys. The largest change was the addition of a series of questions on identity theft which had not been included in previous surveys. Modifications were made to reflect current circumstances in Utah while trying to keep the questions essentially the same to allow year-to-year comparisons.

The survey was administered through a contract with a private firm that specializes in telephone surveys. Random digit dialing techniques were used to contact potential participants. Telephone calls were made until 1,199 responses were obtained.

Demographic Characteristics

Of the 1,199 respondents included in the final survey sample, almost two-thirds (65.7%) were women. The average age of the sample was 50.0 years. 14.3% of respondents were under 30 years of age and 13.5% were over 70.

7.8% of the survey respondents were members of a racial or ethnic minority. 95.0% were white, 0.8%

were black, 1.3% were Native American, 0.8% were Asian, 0.3% were Pacific Islander, and 1.8% were bi- or multi-racial. 3.7% of the sample reported Hispanic ethnicity.

72.5% of the sample members were married, 10.7% were single, 8.6% divorced, 7.7% widowed, and 0.6% separated.

When asked about their family income, 18.3% reported that they made less than \$30,000 a year, 31.1% said they made between \$30,000 and \$60,000 a year, 20.1% reported \$60,000 to \$90,000 a year, and 15.2% \$90,000 or more a year.

Less than 1% reported an 8th grade or less educational level. 3.5% reported 9th to 12th grade but no diploma; 14.9% high school degree or GED; 21.2% some post-high school education, but no certificate or degree; 10.5% technical-vocational school certificate or degree; 10.8% associate degree; 22.8% baccalaureate degree; and 15.0% graduate degree.

Asked about their employment, 38.3% said they were

employed full-time; 13.2% were employed part-time; 1.9% were students; 14.4% were homemakers; 6.0% were unemployed; and 24.8% were retired.

83.0% of the respondents were from urban areas and 17.0% were from rural areas of the state. Urban residents were defined by their county of residence. Counties with at least one town of more than 45,000 residents were classified as urban. Six of the 29 counties in Utah were defined as urban—Cache, Davis, Salt Lake, Utah, Weber, and Washington.

Respondents' zip codes were from 25 of the 29 counties in the state. The four counties not represented in the study, Daggett, Piute, Rich, and Wayne, had very small populations and include less than half of 1% of the state population (0.3%) according to U.S. Census Bureau 2006 population estimates.

The sample respondents generally had lived in Utah for many years. Slightly more than three-fourths of the respondents (75.4%) reported living in Utah 18 years or more. Only 5.4% lived in Utah less than 3 years; 4.5% between 3 and 5 years; 5.3% 6 to 9 years; and 9.5% 10 to 17 years.

Socio-Economic Description of Survey Participants

This table briefly outlines characteristics of participants as reported from survey responses

AGE	
18 to 20	1.5%
21 to 25	4.8%
26 to 30	8.0%
31 to 35	9.1%
36 to 40	8.4%
41 to 45	8.3%
46 to 50	10.2%
51 to 55	9.6%
56 to 60	10.3%
61 to 65	8.2%
66 to 70	7.7%
71 to 75	4.8%
76 to 80	3.7%
Over 80	3.6%
GENDER	
Female	65.7%
Male	34.3%
RACE	
White	95.1%
Black	0.8%
Native American	1.3%
Asian	0.8%
Pacific/Islander	0.3%
Bi/Multiracial	1.8%
ETHNICITY	
Hispanic	3.8%
Non-Hispanic	96.2%
MARITAL STATUS	
Married	72.5%
Single	10.7%
Divorced	8.6%
Widowed	7.7%
Separated	0.6%
YEARLY INCOME	
Less than \$10,000	3.2%
\$10,000 to \$19,999	5.8%
\$20,000 to \$29,999	9.2%
\$30,000 to \$39,999	10.2%
\$40,000 to \$49,999	11.0%
\$50,000 to \$59,999	9.9%
\$60,000 to \$69,999	8.1%
\$70,000 to \$79,999	7.3%
\$80,000 to \$89,999	4.8%
\$90,000 to \$99,999	3.3%
More than \$100,000	11.9%

EDUCATIONAL LEVEL	
8 th Grade or Less	0.8%
9 th to 12 th with No Diploma	3.5%
Diploma or GED	14.9%
Some Post High School	21.2%
Technical/Vocational	10.5%
Associate Degree	10.8%
Baccalaureate Degree	22.8%
Graduate Degree	15.0%

EMPLOYMENT STATUS	
Employed Full-Time	38.3%
Employed Part-Time	13.2%
Student	1.9%
Homemaker	14.4%
Unemployed	6.0%
Retired	24.8%

GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION	
Urban	83.0%
Rural	17.0%

RESIDENCE IN UTAH	
Less than 3 Years	5.4%
3 to 5 Years	4.5%
6 to 9 Years	5.3%
10 to 17 Years	9.5%
18 Years or More	75.4%

LIVING AT CURRENT LOCATION	
Less than 3 Years	26.4%
3 to 5 Years	15.6%
6 to 9 Years	13.4%
10 to 17 Years	16.5%
18 Years or More	28.0%

HOUSING TYPE	
Apartment	6.0%
Condo/Townhouse	5.5%
Duplex	1.8%
Mobile Home	2.7%
Single Family Dwelling	84.0%

HOME OWNERSHIP	
Own	83.4%
Rent	14.9%
Other	1.7%

INDIVIDUALS IN HOUSEHOLD	
1	12.4%
2 to 3	47.8%
4 to 5	28.1%
6 to 7	9.2%
8 or More	2.6%

Most respondents said they lived in single family homes (84.0%) and 83.4% said that they owned their residence. Only 12.4% of respondents lived alone, with almost half living in a 2 to 3 person household.

Crime Data

Most of the individuals interviewed for this study reported feeling safe in their communities. These feelings are supported by official crime figures which indicate that crime has decreased over the last two decades and that the crime rate in Utah is lower than the National average. Despite the evidence of low and reducing crime rates, the respondents, as in previous surveys, regarded crime as the top concern for the state and believed that crime had increased and would continue to increase. To understand these conflicting pieces of information, the methods and instruments used to collect crime data must be considered.

The Federal Government uses two principal methods to collect crime data. The first is the Federal Bureau of Investigation's (FBI) Uniform Crime Reporting program (UCR). This program, which has been in existence for almost 80 years, collects information on eight major crime types that are reported to local law enforcement authorities. These crimes are homicide, forcible rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny-theft, motor vehicle theft, and arson. This information is used to calculate crime rates and track changes in them over time.

There are two obvious limitations for these data. First, they rely entirely on reported crime which represents only a subset of crimes. And second, UCR data focus only on the crimes listed above. As

the results from the present survey show, adding stalking and identity theft to victimization rates greatly increased these rates. Without these two crime categories, the overall victimization rate for the survey was 42.5%. With them, it increased to 53.6%, a substantial change.

In order to gather more complete information about crime, the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) developed the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS). The survey has been conducted annually since 1973 and collects more detailed and complete information on crime than the UCR program. The results of these surveys suggest that approximately two out of every three crimes go unreported to law enforcement.

Utah's Victimization Survey is patterned after the National program. One weakness of the NCVS is that it collects too few responses to allow for state-by-state analyses. In 2001, the Utah Commission on Criminal and Juvenile Justice developed and administered Utah's first crime victim survey to gather crime data to supplement Utah's UCR numbers. The Utah victim survey, in combination with UCR data, allow us to make better estimates of the impact of crime on Utah's communities.

2006 Crime Survey

“We are conducting a statewide crime victimization survey funded by the Utah State Commission on Criminal and Juvenile Justice which is part of the Governor’s Office. The survey will only take a just a few minutes of your time. Is there someone 18 years of age or older that would be willing to participate? This interview is voluntary and has been approved by the Utah Justice Commission. My supervisor may monitor this interview to check my work. However, all the information you provide will be kept confidential. Your participation is completely voluntary, but very important to the study. No names will be associated with any of the answers. A statement of information practices is available on our website or by standard mail upon request. If I come to any question you prefer not to answer, just let me know and I’ll skip over it. You can confirm the authenticity of the study by calling the Utah Justice Commission at 801-538-1031.”

The following shows the questions used in the surveys and the total responses. In the body of the report, we adjusted percentages to eliminate responses such as “don’t know” or a refusal. We also adjusted a few questions to eliminate answers which were illogical such as a response to a question about the impact of 2006 crime victimization on your life from respondents who had not answered affirmatively to any of the 2006 crime victimization questions. The data presented here show the total percentages including the “don’t know’ and missing responses and so may not match the adjusted percentages from the report.

1. Which of the following problem areas in Utah worry you the most?

	2004	2006		
Crime	77.8%	81.1%	Environment	58.8%
Education	78.0%	74.7%	Population growth	46.0% 49.1%
Cost of living	69.4%	70.7%	Unemployment	63.8% 48.6%
Traffic	65.4%	67.2%	War	40.8% 43.4%
Taxes	64.7%	65.6%	Terrorism	26.5% 26.1%

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

	2000	2002	2004	2006
Never a problem	2.7%	2.4%	4.2%	3.8%
Almost never a problem	23.2%	25.1%	24.5%	23.0%
Sometimes a problem	60.7%	60.3%	57.7%	57.5%
Almost always a problem	9.3%	7.9%	7.8%	9.3%
Always a problem	4.2%	4.4%	5.3%	5.8%
Don't know			0.5%	0.7%

3. How safe do you feel in the community where you live?

	2000	2002	2004	2006
Always safe	14.6%	15.1%	25.5%	23.8%
Almost always safe	69.0%	71.1%	62.0%	61.8%
Sometimes safe	14.6%	12.0%	10.5%	11.4%
Almost never safe	1.5%	1.5%	1.6%	2.2%
Never safe	0.4%	0.3%	0.5%	0.7%
Don't know				0.2%

4. How often does fear of crime prevent you from doing things you would like to do?

	2000	2002	2004	2006
Never	30.5%	27.3%	50.9%	47.6%
Almost never	39.0%	41.2%	31.3%	31.3%
Sometimes	27.5%	19.8%	18.0%	18.2%
Almost always	2.4%	1.4%	1.1%	1.5%
Always	0.5%	0.4%	0.6%	0.8%
Don't know				0.6%

5. When you leave home, how often do you think about being robbed or physically assaulted?

	2000	2002	2004	2006
Never	23.2%	26.1%	34.4%	34.1%
Almost never	40.7%	42.6%	34.0%	34.5%
Sometimes	29.2%	26.4%	24.7%	22.1%
Almost always	5.1%	3.9%	4.0%	5.0%
Always	1.8%	1.1%	2.6%	4.2%
Don't know				0.2%

6. Is there any area within a mile of your home where you would be afraid to walk or jog alone at night?

	2000	2002	2004	2006
No	45.4%	48.6%	53.7%	54.1%
Yes	54.6%	51.4%	44.6%	44.1%
Don't know			1.7%	1.8%

7. When you leave home, how often do you think about it being broken into or vandalism while you're away?

	2000	2002	2004	2006
Never	12.5%	13.4%	20.3%	18.9%
Almost never	35.6%	37.3%	35.3%	39.4%
Sometimes	38.8%	37.7%	33.1%	29.1%
Almost always	9.7%	9.4%	6.7%	6.7%
Always	3.4%	2.3%	4.5%	5.6%
Don't know				0.3%

8. How often do you worry that criminals will hurt your loved ones?

	2000	2002	2004	2006
Never	8.8%	10.9%	13.3%	13.7%
Almost never	32.5%	36.4%	32.3%	34.8%
Sometimes	47.3%	43.7%	42.0%	37.5%
Almost always	7.9%	7.0%	7.0%	8.3%
Always	3.6%	2.0%	5.0%	5.5%
Don't know			0.5%	0.3%

9. When you're in your home, how often do you feel afraid of being attacked or assaulted?

	2000	2002	2004	2006
Never	29.8%	31.3%	43.1%	45.3%
Almost never	47.5%	43.7%	42.0%	37.5%
Sometimes	20.3%	18.4%	14.7%	14.1%
Almost always	1.7%	1.6%	1.2%	1.7%
Always	0.7%	0.2%	0.7%	1.2%
Don't know			0.2%	0.3%

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

	2000	2002	2004	2006
Never	17.8%	21.7%	28.5%	29.2%
Almost never	50.0%	50.9%	46.1%	45.6%
Sometimes	28.8%	25.1%	22.4%	22.1%
Almost always	2.3%	1.8%	1.7%	1.8%
Always	1.1%	0.6%	1.1%	1.1%
Don't know			0.2%	0.2%

11. Select any of the following you believe are likely to happen to you during the next 12 months?

	2000	2002	2004	2006
Steal valuable items	33.8%	30.9%	32.6%	32.9%
Burglary	26.5%	25.3%	21.8%	22.0%
Motor vehicle theft	24.2%	21.8%	30.9%	29.5%
Threatening with fist, feet	13.5%	9.6%	16.6%	19.5%
Taking by force or threat	9.4%	6.9%	14.1%	16.9%
Attacking with weapon	6.5%	5.2%	10.3%	13.4%
Rape	3.9%	3.1%	4.8%	5.2%
Domestic violence	2.2%	1.8%	2.2%	2.2%

12. During 2006, did you have contact with your local police for any of the following reasons?

	2000	2002	2004	2006
Casual conversation	39.9%	41.4%	53.0%	57.1%
Traffic violation/accident	23.3%	20.4%	20.4%	19.6%
Officer responded to call	18.4%	19.1%	29.7%	33.5%
Reported crime to police	17.7%	18.3%	25.3%	26.9%
Asked police for information	15.0%	13.2%	28.5%	28.5%
Participated in activity	9.5%	11.1%	25.8%	27.3%
Questioned by police	9.8%	8.3%	18.0%	18.8%
Participated in survey	0.8%	1.1%	4.2%	4.3%

13. How would you rate the job law enforcement is doing in your community?

	2000	2002	2004	2006
Very good	21.2%	24.9%	34.8%	34.5%
Good	45.6%	46.7%	43.4%	41.9%
Acceptable	27.9%	23.8%	18.3%	18.6%
Bad	4.3%	3.7%	2.3%	1.8%
Very bad	1.1%	0.9%	1.0%	1.5%
Don't know			1.3%	1.6%

14. Do you feel that illegal drugs are a problem in your neighborhood?

	2000	2002	2004	2006
No	60.1%	63.6%	54.7%	55.1%
Yes	39.9%	36.4%	38.9%	40.9%
Don't know			6.4%	4.1%

15. Do you feel that gangs are a problem in your neighborhood?

	2000	2002	2004	2006
No	82.5%	86.2%	82.8%	79.9%
Yes	17.5%	13.8%	14.4%	18.5%
Don't know			2.8%	1.6%

16. Over the past three years, do you believe that crime in your community has:

	2000	2002	2004	2006
Greatly decreased	2.6%	2.0%	1.1%	1.3%
Somewhat decreased	8.4%	7.9%	5.1%	5.0%
Stayed the same	42.3%	48.5%	41.7%	42.1%
Somewhat increased	40.0%	37.8%	41.0%	38.2%
Greatly increased	6.6%	3.8%	5.9%	8.4%
Don't know			5.3%	4.9%

17. Over the next three years, do you believe that crime in your community will:

	2000	2002	2004	2006
Greatly decrease	1.8%	1.6%	0.9%	1.3%
Somewhat decrease	7.2%	6.1%	4.7%	4.5%
Stay the same	30.7%	36.6%	34.7%	33.9%
Somewhat increase	51.5%	49.7%	49.5%	48.1%
Greatly increase	8.8%	6.0%	7.0%	9.2%
Don't know			3.2%	3.1%

18. Which of the following do you believe are responsible for our crime problems?

	2004	2006
Illegal drugs	89.7%	90.8%
Lack of parental discipline	89.4%	88.4%
Breakdown of family life	84.3%	83.2%
Domestic violence	82.2%	79.0%
Moral decay	81.4%	80.3%
Alcohol	79.1%	77.1%
Gangs	77.5%	81.8%
TV/movies/video game violence	72.5%	71.8%
Population increase	62.8%	69.5%
Too much leisure time	52.3%	50.2%
Availability of guns	52.1%	43.5%
Criminal justice system too easy	49.2%	53.9%
The economy or poverty	48.9%	61.4%
Lack of education		75.1%
Other	5.2%	10.3%

19. Which best describes where you get information about crime in your community?

	2004	2006
Television	77.8%	78.3%
Local newspapers	78.3%	78.4%
Radio	58.3%	59.5%
Relatives/friends	64.4%	61.7%
Groups/organizations	34.3%	34.1%
Newsletters	22.6%	23.4%
Internet		44.8%

20. Local news media make Utah's crime problems seem _____ than they really are.

	2000	2002	2004	2006
Better than	11.6%	10.4%	9.9%	12.5%
Worse than	21.8%	21.3%	24.7%	28.1%
Same as	41.2%	43.4%	57.0%	52.0%
Don't know	25.5%	24.9%	8.4%	7.4%

21. Which of the following is most important when handling criminal offenders in Utah?

	2000	2002	2004	2006
Rehabilitation/treatment			8.9%	9.1%
Punishment			7.7%	7.0%
Both rehabilitation/punishment			81.3%	82.7%
Don't know			2.1%	1.3%

22. Do you believe treatment and other forms of rehabilitation can be effective in keeping criminal offenders from committing crimes in the future?

	2000	2002	2004	2006
Yes			77.0%	75.1%
No			14.7%	17.0%
Don't know			8.3%	7.9%

23. Would you support a tax increase for the building of additional prison space to incarcerate offenders in Utah?

	2000	2002	2004	2006
Yes			50.4%	54.5%
No			41.3%	38.9%
Don't know			8.3%	6.7%

24. In 2006, did anyone steal or attempt to steal a motor vehicle such as your car, truck, motorcycle, snowmobile, etc.?

	2000	2002	2004	2006
Yes	5.5%	5.5%	5.4%	6.6%

How many times did this occur?

Minimum				1
Maximum				5
Median				1

How many of these incidents did you report to the police?

Reported	60.2%	64.4%	77.2%	81.1%
Not reported	39.8%	35.6%	22.6%	18.9%

Reason for not reporting to police (if not reported)

Dealt with in another way	50.0%
Minor offense	50.0%
Police couldn't help	44.4%
Due to own carelessness	44.4%
Didn't want police involved	27.8%
Offender friend/family member	11.1%
Afraid of offender	5.6%
Felt sorry for offender	0.0%

During your entire lifetime, has anyone stolen, or attempted to steal, a motor vehicle such as your car, truck, motorcycle, snowmobile, etc.?

Yes	26.9%	30.9%
-----	-------	-------

25. In 2006, did anyone steal items that belonged to you from inside any of your vehicles, such as money, purse, wallet, day planner, stereo, TV, VCR, vehicle parts, recordings, etc.?

	2000	2002	2004	2006
Yes	13.3%	11.8%	16.2%	18.1%

How many times did this occur?

Minimum				1
Maximum				15
Median				1

How many of these incidents did you report to the police?

Reported	54.2%	54.5%	68.9%	68.9%
Not reported	45.8%	45.5%	31.1%	31.1%

Reason for not reporting to police (if not reported)

Minor offense	66.7%
Police couldn't help	53.8%
Dealt with in another way	44.9%
Due to own carelessness	42.3%
Didn't want police involved	15.4%
Offender friend/family member	11.5%
Afraid of offender	5.1%
Felt sorry for offender	1.3%

During your entire lifetime, has anyone stolen, or attempted to steal, a motor vehicle such as your car, truck, motorcycle, snowmobile, etc.?

Yes	46.9%	52.9%
-----	-------	-------

26. In 2006, was any of your property damaged or vandalized, but not stolen?

	2000	2002	2004	2006
Yes	22.9%	18.6%	19.6%	20.3%

How many times did this occur?

Minimum				1
Maximum				30
Median				1

How many of these incidents did you report to the police?

Reported	35.3%	40.2%	60.1%	58.5%
Not reported	64.7%	59.8%	39.9%	41.5%

Reason for not reporting to police (if not reported)

Minor offense	68.0%
Dealt with in another way	62.3%
Police couldn't help	60.7%
Didn't want police involved	16.4%
Due to own carelessness	12.3%
Offender friend/family member	9.8%
Afraid of offender	6.6%
Felt sorry for offender	4.9%

During your entire lifetime, has any of your property been damaged or vandalized, but not stolen?

Yes	49.2%	51.8%
-----	-------	-------

27. In 2006, did anyone break into, or try to break into, your home or some other building on your property?

	2000	2002	2004	2006
Yes	5.6%	6.4%	6.6%	9.2%

How many times did this occur?

Minimum	1
Maximum	20
Median	1

How many of these incidents did you report to the police?

Reported	49.2%	56.1%	74.4%	64.2%
Not reported	50.8%	41.9%	25.6%	35.8%

Reason for not reporting to police (if not reported)

Minor offense	51.2%
Police couldn't help	51.2%
Dealt with in another way	39.0%
Offender friend/family member	26.8%
Didn't want police involved	22.0%
Due to own carelessness	14.6%
Felt sorry for offender	9.8%
Afraid of offender	2.4%

During your entire lifetime, has anyone broken into, or tried to break into, your home or some other building on your property?

Yes	34.8%	40.1%
-----	-------	-------

28. In 2006, did anyone take, or attempt to take, something directly from you by using force, such as a stick-up, mugging, or threat?

	2000	2002	2004	2006
Yes	0.8%	0.9%	1.1%	1.3%

How many times did this occur?

Minimum	1
Maximum	6
Median	1

How many of these incidents did you report to the police?

Reported	50.0%	53.8%	71.4%	53.8%
Not reported	50.0%	46.2%	28.6%	46.2%

Reason for not reporting to police (if not reported)

Minor offense	57.1%
Police couldn't help	57.1%
Dealt with in another way	42.9%
Didn't want police involved	42.9%
Afraid of offender	42.9%
Felt sorry for offender	28.6%
Due to own carelessness	28.6%
Offender friend/family member	14.3%

Offense done by:

Person well known to you	11.1%	30.0%	32.3%	20.0%
A stranger	66.7%	20.0%	32.3%	60.0%
A family member	5.6%	5.0%	16.1%	13.3%
A casual acquaintance	22.2%	20.0%	16.1%	26.7%
I did not see anyone	5.6%	20.0%	3.2%	6.7%

To your knowledge, was the assailant:

Juvenile (under 18)	17.4%	20.0%
Adult (age 18 or older)	56.5%	53.3%
Both	21.7%	26.7%
Don't know	4.3%	0.0%

During your entire lifetime, has anyone taken, or attempted to take, something directly from you by using force, such as a stick-up, mugging, or threat?

Yes	9.7%	11.8%
-----	------	-------

29. In 2006, was anything else stolen from you (other than the incidents already mentioned)?

	2000	2002	2004	2006
Yes	8.6%	8.6%	7.4%	5.7%

How many times did this occur?

Minimum	1
Maximum	8
Median	1

How many of these incidents did you report to the police?

Reported	27.4%	33.0%	56.9%	53.8%
Not reported	72.6%	67.0%	43.1%	46.2%

Reason for not reporting to police (if not reported)

Police couldn't help	59.0%
Dealt with in another way	56.4%
Minor offense	43.6%
Due to own carelessness	33.3%
Offender friend/family member	28.2%
Didn't want police involved	23.1%
Felt sorry for offender	10.3%
Afraid of offender	7.7%

During your entire lifetime, was anything else stolen from you (other than the incidents already mentioned)?

Yes	35.7%	38.8%
-----	-------	-------

30. In 2006, did anyone injure you with a club, knife, gun or other weapon other than hands, fists or feet?

	2000	2002	2004	2006
Yes	0.7%	0.7%	0.8%	0.4%

How many times did this occur?

Minimum	1
Maximum	5
Mean	2

How many of these incidents did you report to the police?

Reported	60.0%	45.5%	57.1%	100.0%
Not reported	40.0%	54.5%	42.9%	0.0%

Reason for not reporting to police (if not reported)

Dealt with in another way	33.3%
Police couldn't help	20.0%
Felt sorry for offender	13.3%
Minor offense	13.3%
Offender friend/family member	13.3%
Didn't want police involved	6.7%
Afraid of offender	6.7%
Due to own carelessness	0.0%

Offense done by:

A family member	6.7%	6.7%	41.2%	40.0%
A stranger	53.3%	40.0%	29.4%	40.0%
Person well known to you	33.3%	13.3%	17.6%	20.0%
A casual acquaintance	20.0%	26.7%	5.9%	20.0%
I did not see anyone	0.0%	0.0%	5.9%	0.0%

To your knowledge, was the assailant:

Juvenile (under 18)	31.3%	20.0%
Adult (age 18 or older)	62.5%	20.0%
Both	6.3%	40.0%
Don't know	0.0%	20.0%

During your entire lifetime, has anyone injured you with a club, knife, gun or other weapon other than hand fists or feet?

Yes	9.3%	9.3%
-----	------	------

31. In 2006, did your spouse, significant other, partner or other family member injure you with an object or weapon, or hit, slap, push or kick you?

	2000	2002	2004	2006
Yes	3.3%	2.5%	3.1%	2.8%

How many times did this occur?

Minimum	1
Maximum	8
Median	2

How many of these incidents did you report to the police?

Reported	24.7%	25.5%	27.6%	48.3%
Not reported	75.3%	74.5%	72.4%	51.7%

Reason for not reporting to police (if not reported)

Offender friend/family member	84.2%
Dealt with in another way	78.9%
Police couldn't help	52.6%
Didn't want police involved	52.6%
Minor offense	47.4%
Afraid of offender	26.3%
Felt sorry for offender	21.1%
Due to own carelessness	15.8%

To your knowledge, was the assailant:

Juvenile (under 18)	6.6%	12.1%
Adult (age 18 or older)	86.9%	81.8%
Both	6.6%	3.0%
Don't know	0.0%	3.0%

During your entire lifetime, has your spouse, significant other, partner or other family member injured you with an object or weapon, or hit, slapped, pushed or kicked you?

Yes	15.6%	21.0%
-----	-------	-------

32. In 2006, did anyone hit, attack or beat you by using their hands, fists, or feet (This does not include incidents involving a club, knife, gun or other weapon)?

	2000	2002	2004	2006
Yes	3.5%	25.5%	3.7%	3.1%

How many times did this occur?

Minimum	1
Maximum	7
Median	2

How many of these incidents did you report to the police?

Reported	38.5%	43.4%	47.1%	51.4%
Not reported	61.5%	56.6%	52.9%	48.6%

Reason for not reporting to police (if not reported)

Dealt with in another way				83.3%
Offender friend/family member				61.1%
Minor offense				38.9%
Didn't want police involved				38.9%
Felt sorry for offender				33.3%
Police couldn't help				27.8%
Afraid of offender				22.2%
Due to own carelessness				11.1%

Offense done by:

A family member	29.5%	29.6%	43.5%	48.6%
A stranger	28.2%	25.9%	15.2%	16.2%
Person well known to you	33.3%	27.8%	25.0%	37.8%
A casual acquaintance	12.8%	24.1%	13.0%	27.0%
I did not see anyone	0.0%	1.9%	3.3%	0.0%

To your knowledge, was the assailant:

Juvenile (under 18)			13.9%	13.5%
Adult (age 18 or older)			75.0%	73.0%
Both			8.3%	13.5%
Don't know			2.8%	0.0%

During your entire lifetime, has anyone hit, attacked or beat you by using their hands, fists, or feet (This does not include incidents involving a club, knife, gun, or other weapon)?

Yes			28.1%	32.3%
-----	--	--	-------	-------

33. In 2006, did anyone threaten – with or without a weapon – to hit, attack or beat you?

	2000	2002	2004	2006
Yes	7.2%	5.7%	7.1%	5.1%

How many times did this occur?

Minimum				1
Maximum				30
Mean				2

How many of these incidents did you report to the police?

Reported	23.6%	28.2%	36.2%	41.4%
Not reported	76.4%	71.8%	63.8%	58.6%

Reason for not reporting to police (if not reported)

Dealt with in another way					73.2%
Minor offense					53.7%
Didn't want police involved					51.2%
Police couldn't help					48.8%
Offender friend/family member					46.3%
Felt sorry for offender					29.3%
Afraid of offender					26.8%
Due to own carelessness					12.2%

Offense done by:

A family member	19.3%	13.2%	20.7%	29.5%
A stranger	36.0%	32.2%	30.2%	31.0%
Person well known to you	26.1%	30.6%	27.8%	32.8%
A casual acquaintance	23.6%	25.6%	20.7%	36.1%
I did not see anyone	1.9%	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%

To your knowledge, was the assailant:

Juvenile (under 18)			18.3%	13.1%
Adult (age 18 or older)			69.7%	77.1%
Both			11.3%	9.8%
Don't know			0.7%	0.0%

During your entire lifetime, has anyone threatened – with or without – to hit, attack or beat you?

Yes			31.6%	34.2%
-----	--	--	-------	-------

34. In 2006, did anyone force you, or attempt to force you, to have sexual intercourse with them?

	2000	2002	2004	2006
Yes	0.7%	1.0%	0.6%	0.7%

How many times did this occur?

Minimum				1
Maximum				8
Median				1

How many of these incidents did you report to the police?

Reported	20.0%	21.4%	54.5%	25.0%
Not reported	80.0%	78.6%	45.5%	75.0%

Reason for not reporting to police (if not reported)

Offender friend/family member				83.3%
Police couldn't help				83.3%
Didn't want police involved				66.7%
Afraid of offender				66.7%
Due to own carelessness				66.7%
Dealt with in another way				50.0%
Felt sorry for offender				0.0%
Minor offense				0.0%

Offense done by:

A family member	13.3%	10.0%	35.7%	37.5%
A stranger	33.3%	5.0%	21.4%	12.5%
Person well known to you	53.3%	35.0%	28.6%	37.5%
A casual acquaintance	33.3%	30.0%	14.3%	25.0%
I did not see anyone	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	12.5%

To your knowledge, was the assailant:

Juvenile (under 18)		41.7%	12.5%
Adult (age 18 or older)		58.3%	75.0%
Both		0.0%	12.5%
Don't know		0.0%	0.0%

Was this done by:

Threatening you	53.3%	35.0%	75.0%	37.5%
Physically hurting you	26.7%	15.0%	66.7%	75.0%
Holding you down	60.0%	50.0%	58.0%	75.0%

During your entire lifetime, has anyone forced you, or attempted to force you, to have sexual intercourse with them?

Yes		11.9%	14.7%
-----	--	-------	-------

35. In 2006, did anyone force you, or attempt to force you, into any unwanted sexual activity such as touching, grabbing, kissing, fondling, etc.?

	2000	2002	2004	2006
Yes	2.1%	1.5%	1.5%	2.4%

How many times did this occur?

Minimum				1
Maximum				9
Mean				2

How many of these incidents did you report to the police?

Reported	2.2%	20.7%	33.3%	23.1%
Not reported	97.8%	79.3%	66.7%	76.9%

Reason for not reporting to police (if not reported)

Dealt with in another way		68.4%
Didn't want police involved		57.9%
Police couldn't help		52.6%
Offender friend/family member		47.4%
Due to own carelessness		36.8%
Afraid of offender		36.8%
Minor offense		31.6%
Felt sorry for offender		5.3%

Offense done by:

A family member	6.5%	9.7%	22.2%	20.7%
A stranger	6.5%	6.5%	11.1%	20.7%
Person well known to you	45.7%	41.9%	33.3%	55.2%
A casual acquaintance	43.5%	41.9%	33.3%	27.6%
I did not see anyone	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

To your knowledge, was the assailant:

Juvenile (under 18)		17.2%	17.9%
Adult (age 18 or older)		79.3%	75.0%
Both		3.4%	7.2%
Don't know		0.0%	0.0%

During your entire lifetime, has anyone forced you, or attempted to force you, into any unwanted sexual activity such as touching, grabbing, kissing, fondling, etc.?

Yes		20.2%	24.6%
-----	--	-------	-------

36. Please respond yes or no if, during 2006, you felt threatened by another person as a result of any of the following behaviors.

	2000	2002	2004	2006
Phone calls			11.6%	10.8%
Following or spying			6.9%	7.3%
Standing outside			6.4%	5.6%
Showing up places			3.3%	3.8%
Other communication			5.8%	5.7%
Sending letters			4.3%	4.3%
Leaving unwanted items			2.3%	1.9%

37. During 2006, did you discover that someone used or attempted to use your:

	2006
Existing credit cards without your permission	9.6%
Existing accounts (e.g., checking) without your permission	5.8%
Personal information to obtain services	3.9%
Personal information to obtain new credit cards, accounts	4.9%
None of these	84.9%
Don't know	0.4%

How many times did this occur?

Minimum		1
Maximum		50
Mean		2.36

Did the episodes of identity theft occur separately or at the same time?

Separately		34.5%
Same time		51.2%
Don't know		14.3%

How many of these incidents did you report to the police?

Reported	46.4%
Not reported	53.6%

Reason for not reporting to police (if not reported)

Dealt with in another way	83.5%
Police couldn't help	40.0%
Due to own carelessness	21.2%
Minor offense	20.0%
Offender friend/family member	18.8%
Didn't want police involved	10.6%
Didn't want anyone to find out	5.9%
Felt sorry for offender	5.9%
Afraid of offender	2.4%

During your entire lifetime, has someone used or attempted to use your:

	2006
Existing credit cards without your permission	13.1%
Existing accounts (e.g., checking) without your permission	9.3%
Personal information to obtain services	4.7%
Personal information to obtain new credit cards, accounts	5.0%
None of these	67.0%
Don't know	1.7%

Which best describes the most recent incident of identity theft in 2006?

	2006
Existing credit cards without your permission	44.1%
Existing accounts (e.g., checking) without your permission	23.8%
Personal information to obtain services	10.1%
Personal information to obtain new credit cards, accounts	22.0%

How did you discover this identity theft?

Block placed on a credit card or other account	14.9%
Money missing from account/charges placed on account	45.8%
Contacted by credit card company, etc., about late bill	26.2%
Contacted by bank	26.2%
Noticed that credit card, check, etc., missing	17.3%
Notified by law enforcement	4.8%
Arrested on a warrant	0.6%
Driver's license suspended	1.8%
Denied credit or loan	7.1%
Noticed an error on credit report	14.3%
Other	16.1%

How did they obtain access to your accounts or personal information?

Theft of wallet or purse	13.7%
Home break in	4.2%
Car break in	8.3%
Mail theft or dumpster diving	8.9%
Computer scam or phishing	14.3%
Telephone scam	5.4%
Data base containing your information was hacked	11.9%
Credit card information was skimmed when paying bill	10.7%
Other	21.4%
Don't know	26.2%

What was the total dollar amount of the credit, loans, cash, services, and anything else the person obtained by misusing your identity?

Minimum	\$0
Maximum	\$230,00
Median	\$400

What was the final dollar cost to you of this identity theft?

Minimum	\$0
Maximum	\$100,00
Median	\$0

Offense done by:

A family member	12.5%
A stranger	66.1%
A friend	2.4%
An acquaintance	4.8%
Don't know	13.7%

Has the misuse of your accounts and identity stopped?

Yes	89.3%
No	8.3%
Don't know	2.4%

Is the incident still causing problems for you? For example, are you still spending time clearing up credit accounts or your credit report?

Yes	18.5%
No	79.8%
Don't know	1.8%

How much time did it take to resolve all the problems associated with this incident?

Less than one day	25.0%
Less than one month	29.2%
More than one month	42.3%
Don't know	3.6%

How many hours?

Minimum	0
Maximum	24
Median	2

How many days?

Minimum	0
Maximum	33
Median	7

How many months?

Minimum	0
Maximum	36
Median	4

As a result of this identity theft, have you...

Been turned down for a loan	10.1%
Had banking problems	14.9%
Received a negative credit rating	16.7%
Had phone or utilities cut off or been denied service	3.0%
Had to pay higher interest rates on credit cards/loans	16.7%
Been denied for insurance or had to pay higher rates	4.8%
Been turned down for a job	0.6%
Been contacted by a debt collector or creditor	22.0%
Been the subject of a civil suit or judgment	4.2%
Been the subject of criminal investigation, conviction	4.8%
Had other problems	11.3%
Had no problems	55.4%

38. If you were a victim of a crime in 2006, how much of an impact did the event(s) have on your life? (All respondents who answered this question are included in these percentages.)

	2000	2002	2004	2006
Very little	40.0%	41.5%	54.6%	52.7%
Some	36.6%	34.1%	25.0%	22.1%
A lot	15.8%	16.2%	11.0%	12.4%
Quite a lot	7.6%	8.2%	9.4%	12.8%

39. If you were the victim of a crime in 2006, did an officer inform you about crime victim services or programs? (All respondents who answered this question are included in these percentages.)

	2000	2002	2004	2006
Yes	11.3%	10.4%	20.2%	11.5%
No	88.7%	89.6%	79.8%	88.5%

40. Please respond yes or no if you were the victim of a crime during 2006 and you believe the offender was motivated by any of the following characteristics. (All respondents who answered this question are included in these percentages.)

	2000	2002	2004	2006
Does not apply	45.0%	49.9%	40.6%	
Gender	8.8%	6.4%	12.1%	9.8%
Age	21.8%	18.6%	9.3%	11.1%
Mental disability	6.5%	8.1%	5.7%	6.4%
Physical condition/disability	2.4%	2.1%	4.4%	7.2%
National origin	3.4%	2.1%	3.3%	4.5%
Race	3.9%	3.8%	2.9%	4.4%
Religion	1.9%	1.7%	2.9%	3.5%
Sexual orientation	3.2%	1.9%	2.4%	3.9%
Sensory disability	0.0%	0.5%	1.2%	2.3%
Other	28.0%	26.7%	21.6%	17.3%
Not motivated by bias				64.2%

41. Do you know where in your community or neighborhood to go when you need help or services as a victim of crime?

	2000	2002	2004	2006
Yes	68.5%	68.8%	79.9%	73.9%
No	31.5%	31.2%	20.1%	25.0%
Don't know				1.1%

42. Do you keep gun(s) in your home?

	2000	2002	2004	2006
Yes			41.6%	48.9%
No			58.4%	47.8%
Don't know				3.3%

43. Which one of the following reasons best describes why you have a gun in your home:

	2000	2002	2004	2006
For protection			8.4%	12.0%
For sporting purposes			42.7%	35.3%
For protection or sporting purposes			42.8%	44.9%
For other reasons			6.0%	6.5%
Don't know				1.4%

44. In 2006, did you ever carry a gun outside your home for protection?

	2000	2002	2004	2006
Yes	5.9%	5.6%	5.6%	6.9%
No	94.1%	94.4%	94.4%	91.8%
Don't know				1.3%

45. Please respond yes or no if you have taken any of the following steps to feel safer from crime?

	2000	2002	2004	2006
More secure door locks	36.8%	38.9%	53.9%	51.4%
Security lights	25.8%	28.2%	38.6%	40.9%
More window locks	17.7%	18.3%	35.4%	36.1%
Neighborhood watch	14.6%	15.9%	34.2%	32.5%
Purchased dog	17.5%	18.2%	24.1%	26.2%
Burglar alarms	10.9%	11.7%	18.7%	24.0%
Displayed security sticker	11.7%	11.7%	18.9%	22.6%
Self-defense course	6.1%	5.8%	18.2%	20.8%
Carried object for defense	8.5%	8.3%	20.1%	18.1%
Pepper spray	7.6%	6.2%	13.4%	13.9%
Purchased gun	7.1%	7.1%	9.2%	13.3%
Taken no action	28.6%	28.0%	13.1%	19.3%