



Idaho

Crime Victimization Survey

Principal Investigators:
Mary K. Stohr, Ph.D.
Department of Criminal Justice Administration
Boise State University

Salvador P. Vázquez
Statistical Analysis Center Director
Idaho State Police

2000

Idaho Crime Victimization

Survey – 2000

Other Manuscript Analysts/Authors:

Craig Prescott – Department of Criminal Justice Administration – Boise State University
David Green – Idaho Coalition Against Sexual and Domestic Violence

Additional Authors and Contributors to the Idaho Crime Victimization Survey:

Idaho State Police – Planning, Grants and Research – Shellee Smith Daniels, Grants/Contracts Officer

Idaho Coalition Against Sexual and Domestic Violence – Sue Fellen, Executive Director

Idaho State Police – Robin Elson – Bureau of Criminal Identification

Idaho Department of Health and Welfare –
Ginger Floerchinger-Franks, Dr. P.H. – Injury Prevention Program
James Aydelotte – Vital Statistics

Meridian Police Department – Captain William Musser

Idaho Department of Labor – Robert Uhlenkott

University of Idaho –
J.D. Wulfhorst – SSRU Director
Barbara Foltz – Social Science Research Unit

Idaho State Police – Planning, Grants and Research – Steve Raschke, Bureau Chief, Editor

Contact Information

Salvador P. Vázquez
Idaho Statistical Analysis Center
Idaho State Police
P.O. Box 700
Meridian, ID 83680-0700
Email: pgr@isp.state.id.us
Phone: (208) 884-7040

This project was supported by grant numbers: (97-MU-MU-K016) Bureau of Justice Statistics, (98STOP99) Office of Justice Programs, Idaho Department of Health and Welfare - Preventive Health and Health Services (1999-B1-ID-PRVS-04), the Idaho Coalition Against Sexual and Domestic Violence and Boise State University. Points of view in this document are those of the author(s), and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of Idaho Research and Analysis Consortium (IRAC) member agencies. 100 copies of this publication were printed by the Idaho State Police in June 2001. Costs associated with this publication are available in accordance with section 60-202, Idaho Code.

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
General Findings from Victimization Literature	2
Methodology	4
Survey Findings and Analysis	5
Crime Rates and Demographic Generalities	8
Property Crimes	12
Larceny and Theft Crime Characteristics	12
Motor Vehicles	15
Vandalism	17
Burglary	19
Driving Under the Influence and Resulting Motor Vehicle Collisions	21
Violent Crimes	21
Robbery	21
Assault	22
Sexual Assault and Rape	25
Murder	27
Crime Among Intimates	28
Child Abuse	28
Domestic Violence	31
Sexual/Gender Harassment in the Workplace	34
Hate Crimes	37
Perceptions of Crime and Police Services	39
Conclusions	40
References	42

Table of Figures

Table 1	Survey Respondent Characteristic.....	6
Table 2	Survey Household Characteristics	6
Table 3	Firearms Ownership	7
Table 4	Household Respondent Alcohol and Drug Use.....	7
Table 5	Survey Response by County	8
Table 6	Idaho Crime Victimization Rates	11
Table 7	Per Capita Crime Rates	12
Table 8-8d	Property Crimes: Larcenies and Thefts	13-14
Table 9-9d	Property Crimes: Motor Vehicles	15-17
Table 10-10d	Property Crimes: Vandalism	17-18
Table 11-11d	Property Crimes: Burglary	19-20
Table 12	Driving Under the Influence and Accidents	21
Table 13	Violent Crimes: Robbery	21
Table 14-14d	Violent Crimes: Non-sexual Assault	22-24
Table 15-15d	Violent Crimes: Sexual Assault and Rape	25-27
Table 16	Violent Crimes: Murder	27
Table 17-17c	Child Abuse	28
Table 18-18e	Domestic Violence	31-34
Table 19-19c	Sexual Harassment	35-37
Table 20-20a	Hate Crimes	38
Table 21	Perceptions of Crime and Safety in Idaho	39
Table 22	Perceptions of Police Services	40

Idaho Crime Victimization Survey - 2000

Introduction

In March and April 2000 the third crime victimization survey was administered to 2,489 Idaho households. The Idaho Crime Victimization Survey (ICVS) was designed and implemented as a means of enhancing the knowledge and understanding of crime victimization in Idaho, as well as to provide information that will assist in evaluating the effectiveness of criminal justice and health services programs operated or managed by members of the Idaho Research and Analysis Consortium (IRAC).

The 2000 survey built and improved upon the crime victimization surveys administered in 1997 and 1999 (Crank, Stohr, Bissey, Jones, Musser and Badger 1997; Stohr and Crank 1996; Stohr, Uhlenkott, Hayter, Meyer, Smith Daniels, ISP Bureau of Criminal Investigation, Floerchinger-Franks, Aydelotte, Fellen, Green, Musser, Burns, Peay, Schnabel and Heady 1999). All three surveys contained standard questions regarding property and violent crimes, including sexual assault, which were modeled on the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS). The 1999 survey also featured special sections on child sexual and physical abuse, domestic violence, sexual and gender harassment, as well as on perceptions of crime and police services. The 2000 survey included additional questions related to hate crime and neighborhood safety and refined questions in the area of sexual assault, sexual harassment in the workplace, child sexual abuse, domestic violence and police services.

The Idaho Research and Analysis Consortium, a collaborative research group of staff from a number of stakeholder agencies, developed the newer or rewritten questions for the 1999 and 2000 surveys. Question content was reflective of the need to supplement system and citizen knowledge about the prevalence of crime, as well as characteristics of crime, victims, and offenders. These evaluation efforts provide decision makers with the ability to make informed policy decisions regarding the criminal justice system or the commonweal of our communities.

Under the sponsorship and guidance of the Idaho State Police (ISP), this survey was financially and intellectually supported by the IRAC, several additional state and local agencies, nonprofit entities, and two state universities. Direct and indirect financial contributions were made by the Idaho Statistical Analysis Center and S.T.O.P. Violence Against Women Evaluation Program housed within ISP, the Idaho Department of Health and Welfare – Preventive Health and Health Services, the Idaho Coalition Against Sexual and Domestic Violence, and Boise State University.

This reports provides a review of some of the pertinent literature on victimization and presents findings and analyses drawn from 2000 Idaho Crime Victimization Survey (ICVS) data. It is our hope that the continued

administration of this or a similar victimization survey will allow our state to better understand the extent and nature of crime in Idaho.

General Findings from Victimization Literature¹

In Idaho most of our general knowledge about crime comes from police reports compiled by each agency, as well as from media stories concerning these reports. The Idaho State Police and the Federal Bureau of Investigation collect and analyze these data under the auspices of the Uniform Crime Reporting and National Incident Based Reporting Programs (ISP Bureau of Criminal Investigation 1999, 2000). These reported crime figures are very useful in providing a sense of the extent of crime and the impact law enforcement activity has in response to it.

Difficulties arise from the knowledge that many people in the United States and in Idaho do not report crime to the police for a variety of reasons (Crank et al. 1997; Menard 1987; Messner 1984; Steffensmeier 1983). About one half of violent crimes and almost four fifths of property crimes are not reported to the police (Zawitz, Klaus, Bachman, Bastian, DeBerry, Rand and Taylor 1993). The reporting drops exponentially when the offender is likely to be well known and/or the offense is viewed as personal or intimate, which tends to be true in cases of sexual assault, child abuse and domestic violence (Bachman 1994). Predictably, researchers engaged in the first Idaho Crime Victimization Survey found that 61% of property crimes, 69% of violent crimes and 62% of sexual assaults were not reported to the police (Crank et al. 1997). Similarly, during the second iteration of this survey the researchers found that approximately 40% of property crimes, 52% of violent crimes and 83% of sexual assaults and rape were not reported to the police (Stohr et al. 1999).

As a means of addressing the low levels of crime reporting, researchers and policy makers have turned to the use of victimization surveys. A representative sample of the population is likely to reveal victimization reports that closely mirror the extent of crime in a demographically similar community.

The Bureau of Justice Statistics first administered the National Crime Survey, later renamed the National Crime Victimization Survey, in 1973 (Zawitz et al. 1993). The impetus for this survey was the need to create a more complete picture of crime victimization in the nation, and the need to collect better information about victims and their experiences. As noted by The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice (1967:38), the study of victims was "[o]ne of the most neglected subjects in the study of crime." For the 1999 NCVS, approximately 43,000 households were contacted and over 77,000 people ages 12 or older were interviewed (Rennison 2000).

¹ Some of this literature was originally collected and described by Boise State University students Michelle Bissey, William Musser, Ryan Badger and by Drs. Stohr and Crank as they worked on the first Idaho victimization report titled "Crime in the Lives of Idahoans." Their assistance and efforts are much appreciated.

Unfortunately, despite the size of the NCVS, the number of victim households contacted in a sparsely populated state like Idaho does not allow for the accurate extrapolation of its findings to the statewide population. Moreover, regionalized NCVS data reporting includes Idaho in its western region; this data set tends to be dominated by more urbanized, and typically more crime prone states such as California. This urban focus can distort the public perception of crime in rural regions more indicative of a state like Idaho, and may serve to unnecessarily inflame or misdirect public concern over violent stranger crime. Most crime, and rural crime particularly, is committed by people known to the victim and is the property category (Rennison 2000; Roebuck 1985; Smith and Huff 1982; Weisheit, Falcone and Wells 1994).

In an effort to develop a more precise picture of crime in their states, researchers in New Mexico, Virginia, Florida, Oregon and Minnesota have engaged in victimization studies (Craven 1988; LaFree 1990; Lewis, Storkamp, Mickolich, Weber, Zumach, Powell and McKenney-Maki 1994; Shoemaker and Bryant 1988). The findings emanating from these studies and from in-depth analysis of NCVS data (Bachman 1992b, 1994; Dodge 1985; Maltz and Zawitz 1998; Perkins and Klaus 1996; Rand 1998; Sampson 1986), from the National Family Violence Surveys (NFVS – Straus 1979, 1994; Straus and Gelles 1986) and from the National Violence Against Women Survey (NVAWS —Tjaden and Thoennes 1999) indicate that crime victimization has discernible characteristics. For instance, crime rates tend to be highest in urban areas and lowest in rural areas, with suburbs usually in the middle of crime prone districts. We also know that crime tends to occur in the town of victim residence, although this appears to be less true for rural than for urban residents. These studies also indicate that the reporting of property crime is lower when the monetary value of items is small.

The NCVS, NVAWS and the several state victimization studies indicate that crime victimization is greatly influenced by gender, race, age, income, location, and life circumstances. In the commission of most crimes, younger minority males are less likely to be victimized by intimates than by acquaintances or strangers. Women are significantly less likely to be victims of street level violent crime than are men, but when victimization does occur they are just as likely to be victimized by intimates as by acquaintances or strangers. Women and children are also targeted for crimes (e.g. rape and sexual assault) that adult men rarely experience outside of a correctional environment. Typically, poor and urban residents are more likely to be victims of violent crime and most property crimes. A possible exception exists in the case of family violence, which tends to be distributed more evenly across income brackets. The findings from the Idaho survey will allow us to identify similarities and differences in victimization characteristics and how they compare between Idaho and the rest of the country.

² Shellee Smith Daniels from the Idaho State Police assembled the consortium by coordinating meetings, financial resources, instrument development, revisions, administration, analysis and write-up. Other IRAC members who developed the survey, refined it and/or analyzed it included: Sue Fellen and David Green from the Idaho Coalition Against Sexual and Domestic Violence, Ginger Floerchinger-Franks and James Aydelotte from the Department of Health and Welfare, Captain William Musser from the Meridian Police Department, Robin Elson from Idaho State Police, Bureau of Criminal Investigation, Bob Uhlenkott from the Idaho Department of Labor and Mary K. Stohr and Craig Prescott from Boise State University. Barbara Schnabel and her staff from the Social Science Research Unit at The University of Idaho administered the survey, ensured that it fit the CATI format, performed a portion of the preliminary analysis, and wrote the methods section of this report.

Methodology

Cooperative Development of the Survey

Beginning in the Fall of 1999, representatives of a consortium of interested stakeholder agencies, the IRAC, were re-assembled by the Idaho State Police (previously the Idaho Department of Law Enforcement) to discuss the refinement and administration of a third Idaho Victimization survey². Additional meetings continued through the beginning date of survey administration in March of 2000.

The survey was pre-tested in February 2000 by the University of Idaho, Social Science Research Unit. The survey instrument was revised based on the pre-test results. The IRAC group met several more times in the Summer and Fall of 1999 to evaluate and direct the findings and analysis.

Sample Selection and Survey Administration

A simple random sample of 4000 households in Idaho was drawn by Survey Sampling of Connecticut. Starting on February 15, a postcard advising selected state residents that they would be asked to participate in a telephone interview was mailed to the first sample of 500 households. During each subsequent week another 500 postcards were mailed to the next sample of households until all 4000 postcards had been sent.

Interviewers at the University of Idaho Social Science Research Unit were given background information concerning the study and they were provided with instruction in the basics of proper telephone interviewing, confidentiality of responses and telephone call record keeping in a training session on March 1. Interviewers were also instructed in the use of the Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI) program. Responses to survey questions were entered directly in the CATI program. Demographic information identifying individual respondents is maintained at the University of Idaho, Social Science Research Unit for confidentiality purposes. Records of call attempts and interviews were kept on paper copies separate from responses to questions. All telephone calls were recorded on call logs and were verified with telephone bills. Interviewers were monitored during each calling session to assure consistency of survey administration.

Interviewing of selected households began March 2 and continued until April 29. Calls were made primarily during the late afternoon or evening hours of 4:00 P.M. to 8:00 P.M.. Households not reached in the evening were called during the day from 8:00 A.M. to 4:00 P.M.. If necessary, a minimum of five call attempts were made to each household on different days and at different times during the day or evening. Five call attempts without successful contact caused households to be placed in a suspended category for a two to three week period of time. Following this period calls were again initiated.

Of the 4,000 selected households, 703 were removed from the sample. Of these 703, there were 237 disconnected telephone numbers with no new listing and wrong addresses with no forwarding address, 95 were not residents of Idaho, and 131 were otherwise unavailable to be interviewed. In 22 households the selected person was deceased, 4 did not speak English or Spanish, and 214 were wrong telephone numbers (i.e., those that did not reach the selected household and had no new telephone listing). All incorrect and disconnected telephone numbers were cross checked with the directory assistance operator for new listings.

Of the remaining 3,297 households, 2,489 completed telephone interviews for a response rate of 75.5%. There were 528 residents who declined to participate. However, another 280 households were not reached after repeated call attempts within the time frame of March 1 and April 29, for a cooperation rate of 83%. These figures represent an increase over the response rate of 69% from the 1999 survey and a cooperation rate in 1999 of 79%. This sample represents the statewide views or opinions of adult residents within +/-1.96 margin of error and 95% confidence level.

As was the case in the 2000 survey, the selected Idaho residents were asked if they or other members of their household had been the victim of specific property crimes, a motor vehicle collision involving a driver under the influence of alcohol or drugs, violent crimes, whether they had experienced or felt vulnerable to a hate crime, sexual harassment in the workplace, sexual assault, child sexual or physical abuse, and/or domestic violence within the past twelve months. If the respondent and/or member(s) of their household had been a victim of crime, respondents were asked a series of questions regarding each incident. If relevant, respondents were asked whether force or threats were used against them or any other household member; what property was stolen, damaged or destroyed; whether the crime was reported to the police; where the crime occurred; and the associated cost to replace the property or cover medical expenses. Respondents were also asked whether they or another member of their household knew or would recognize the offender(s); the offender(s)' gender(s) and age(s); and whether the offender(s) was/were under the influence of alcohol or drugs. When there were single or multiple victims, information was requested concerning victim race/ethnicity(ies), gender(s) and age(s).

Respondents were asked if they were aware of, or had used, any victim/witness, domestic violence or sexual assault service programs in their area. Those who had used the programs were asked to rate them on a scale from 1 to 10. Finally, respondents were asked for demographic information about themselves and their household, including current residence, household income, individual educational level achieved, as well as their satisfaction with police services, perceptions of safety in their neighborhood, firearm ownership, individual race/ethnicity, age, their usage of alcohol or drugs and their gender.

Survey Findings and Analysis

Survey Respondent, Household Characteristics and County Sampling

As indicated in Table 1, the survey respondents tended to be female (59.1%), overwhelmingly white (95.6%),

fairly well educated (only 6.3% had less than a high school diploma or GED, while 29.2% had at least a bachelor's degree), and tended to be middle-aged (mean age – 49.8 [keeping in mind that we only interviewed those Idahoans who were 18 or older]). Most of our respondents were married (71.9%), and the occupations of the respondents varied from white collar/professional (37.0%) to unemployed/student/other (4.5%).

In addition, the findings regarding respondent households, as reported in Table 2, would indicate most

Table 1. Survey Respondent Characteristics

Survey Respondent	Survey Respondents ^a		Idaho Demographics	
	(n)	Percent	Total	Percent
Gender				
Male	(1017)	40.9	624,504	49.9
Female	(1472)	59.1	627,196	50.1
Race/Ethnicity				
White	(2287)	95.6	1,126,913	89.9
Hispanic	(56)	2.3	93,028	7.4
African American/Black	(4)	0.2	4,863	0.4
Asian/Pacific Islander	(14)	0.6	13,940	1.1
American Indian/Alaskan	(25)	1.0	12,956	1.0
Multi-Racial	(7)	0.3		
Educational Level				
Less than High School	(156)	6.3		
High School or GED	(647)	26.2		
Trade School or Some College	(731)	29.6		
Associate Degree	(203)	8.2		
Bachelors Degree	(491)	19.9		
Masters Degree	(184)	7.4		
Doctorate Degree	(48)	1.9		
Age				
N	(2458)		1,251,700	
Mean		49.8		
Standard Deviation		16.2		
Median		48	33.5	
Range		18-93		
Marital Status				
Married	(1784)	71.9		
Divorced/Widowed	(421)	17.0		
Single, Never Married	(183)	7.4		
Living With Partner	(77)	3.1		
Separated/Other	(17)	0.7		
Occupation				
White Collar/Professional	(915)	37.0		
Retired	(524)	21.2		
Blue Collar	(336)	13.6		
Homemaker	(269)	10.9		
Executive	(158)	6.4		
Business Owner/Farmer	(159)	6.4		
Unemployed/Student/etc.	(110)	4.5		

^a Persons under 18 were excluded as respondents. Percentages will not always add to 100 because of rounding.

Table 2. Survey Household Characteristics

Household Characteristics	Survey Households	
	(n)	Percent
Children in Household		
No	(1,382)	55.8
Yes	(1,095)	44.2
Male	(1,234)	49.7
Female	(1,251)	50.3
Households		
Total Idaho Households ^a	469,643	
Residence Type		
House	(2,171)	87.5
Mobile Home	(150)	6.0
Apartment, Townhouse	(149)	6.0
Other	(11)	0.4
Own or Rent		
Own/buying house	(2,168)	87.4
Rent	(246)	9.9
Live with relatives	(49)	2.0
Live with friends	(2)	0.1
Other	(16)	0.6
Household Income		
N	2,040	
Median Range	\$40,000-\$49,999	
Years Respondent Lived in Idaho		
N	1,917	
Mean	30.2	
Std dev	20.3	
Median	27	

^a Provided by Idaho Department of Commerce. Percentages will not always add to 100 because of rounding.

households had no children (55.8%). Household income was in the middle range (\$40,000-\$49,999).

Of the 1,095 respondent households with children, slightly over half of the children were female (50.3%) and slightly less than half were male (49.7%). For most of the respondents, a house was the common residence (87.5%), which most either owned or were buying (87.4%). Many of the respondents were long time Idaho residents (mean years lived in Idaho = 30.2), although the distribution ranging from 0-99 years would indicate that there was a greater variation in length of residency than the mean would lead one to expect.

In Tables 3 and 4 we report the household firearm ownership figures and the respondent use of alcohol or drugs. As indicated by these tables, most households had at least one firearm (66.8%) and many had several (mean number of firearms for households was 2.9). Slightly more than half of the respondents indicated that they do not drink alcohol (50.4%) and of those that do, about half (48.9%) reported that they drink 1-2 drinks per month or less, while 47.4% reported 1-2 drinks per week or more. Usage of drugs was admitted to by about 1% of the respondents. Frequency of usage of drugs by these 22 people varied, with six reporting that they were daily users.

The responses displayed in Table 5 would demonstrate that the more populous counties, e.g. - Ada, Bannock, Bonneville, Canyon, Kootenai and Twin Falls, were generally sampled in proportion to their size. This also appeared to be the case with less populous counties, although a tendency to slightly oversample the larger counties and to slightly undersample smaller counties was exhibited.

Our survey respondents and their households, when compared to Idahoans in general, tended to have more education and income. The respondents were more predominately women and people of retirement age than one might expect given Idaho demographics (see Tables 1 and 2). These findings might be explained in part by the fact that a telephone survey tends to exclude poorer people, and daytime surveys tend to engage more female than male respondents. Also, the exclusion of those under 18 as respondents tended to increase the average age to a level higher than the norm.

Moreover, we slightly undersampled African Americans, Asian/Pacific Islanders, and American Indian/Alaskan Natives in this study, particularly undersampling the number of Hispanics. Explanations for undersampling minority groups might include factors not within our control, such as language barriers, accessibility to a telephone, sampling errors, purpose and extent of the survey, and a host of additional social and economic factors and conditions.

Table 3. Firearms Ownership

Firearms Ownership	(n)	Percent
Own a Firearm		
N = 2432		
Yes	(1624)	66.8
No	(808)	33.2
Number of Firearms		
N = 6178		
Mean		2.9
Std dev		4.6
Median		2
Own any of these types of firearms		
N=2924		
Handguns	(806)	27.6
Shotguns	(883)	30.2
Rifles	(1212)	41.4
Other	(23)	0.8

Percentages will not always add to 100 because of rounding.

Table 4. Household Respondent Alcohol and Drug Use

Alcohol and Drug Use	(n)	Percent
Whether the Respondent Drinks Alcohol		
N= 2470		
Yes	(1,225)	49.6
No	(1,245)	50.4
How Often Does the Respondent Drink		
1-2 drinks per year	(216)	17.9
1-2 drinks per month	(375)	31
1-2 drinks per week	(399)	33
1-2 drinks per day	(156)	12.9
More than 2 per day	(18)	1.5
Other	(44)	3.6
Whether the Respondent Uses Drugs		
Yes	(22)	0.9
No	(2,447)	99.1
How Often Does the Respondent Use Drugs		
1-2 times per year	(3)	13.6
1-2 times per month	(3)	13.6
1-2 times per week	(8)	36.4
1-2 times per day	(4)	18.2
More than 2 times per day	(2)	9.1
Other	(2)	9.1

Percentages will not always add to 100 because of rounding.

Crime Rates and Demographic Generalities

Property and violent crime in Idaho, for the most part, decreased when comparing 1999 survey data to those gleaned in 2000 (Table 6). Larcenies and thefts, motor vehicle thefts, vandalism and burglary experienced sharp declines in rates during this period. There was a 21.5% decline in the property crime rate between 1999 and 2000. However, it is important to note that a comparison of property crime rates in 1997 and 1999 reflected an **increase** comparable to the **decrease** for survey year 2000 (the ICVS rate in 1997 for total property crimes was 403.4). Given this fluctuation in property crime totals among the three years, it would be difficult to use these data to predict any long term trends.

Much like the property crime rate decrease, the ICVS data indicates a decline (15.4%) in the total number of auto collisions while Driving Under the Influence (DUI) and Violent Crime rates between 1999 and 2000. However, when comparing both years, there were slight increases in the rate of DUI-related auto collisions (18.9%) and more substantial increases for Sexual Assault and Rape (39.3%). DUI, Sexual Assault and Rapes are based on relatively small numbers and are therefore more susceptible to rate fluctuations when comparison is made among relatively few data sets.

Table 5. Survey Response by County

County	Survey Households		County Population		County Households	
	(n)	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Ada	(703)	28.2	283,402	22.6	112,537	24.0
Adams	(5)	0.2	3,787	0.3	1,502	0.3
Bannock	(150)	6.0	74,881	6.0	26,990	5.7
Bear Lake	(10)	0.4	6,561	0.5	2,197	0.5
Benewah	(17)	0.7	9,066	0.7	3,631	0.8
Bingham	(86)	3.5	42,127	3.4	13,296	2.8
Blaine	(6)	0.2	17,326	1.4	7,227	1.5
Boise	(11)	0.4	5,311	0.4	2,123	0.5
Bonner	(45)	1.8	36,071	2.9	14,530	3.1
Bonneville	(216)	8.7	81,536	6.5	28,136	6.0
Boundary	(11)	0.4	9,977	0.8	3,498	0.7
Butte	(4)	0.2	3,012	0.2	1,055	0.2
Camas	(1)	0.0	865	0.1	330	0.1
Canyon	(255)	10.2	124,442	9.9	45,489	9.7
Caribou	(13)	0.5	7,273	0.6	2,513	0.5
Cassia	(33)	1.3	21,573	1.7	7,145	1.5
Clark	(2)	0.1	913	0.1	351	0.1
Clearwater	(14)	0.6	9,359	0.7	3,654	0.8
Custer	(8)	0.3	4,089	0.3	1,558	0.3
Elmore	(42)	1.7	25,627	2.0	9,196	2.0
Franklin	(24)	1.0	11,350	0.9	3,634	0.8
Fremont	(19)	0.8	11,890	0.9	3,887	0.8
Gem	(34)	1.4	15,145	1.2	5,988	1.3
Gooding	(30)	1.2	13,743	1.1	5,366	1.1
Idaho	(28)	1.1	15,030	1.2	5,952	1.3
Jefferson	(41)	1.6	19,949	1.6	5,836	1.2
Jerome	(39)	1.6	18,110	1.4	6,731	1.4
Kootenai	(126)	5.1	104,807	8.4	43,017	9.2
Latah	(51)	2.0	32,509	2.6	12,278	2.6
Lemhi	(16)	0.6	7,978	0.6	3,380	0.7
Lewis	(6)	0.2	3,943	0.3	1,641	0.3
Lincoln	(5)	0.2	3,839	0.3	1,412	0.3
Madison	(44)	1.8	24,806	2.0	5,763	1.2
Minidoka	(29)	1.2	20,284	1.6	6,869	1.5
Nez Perce	(104)	4.2	36,913	2.9	15,474	3.3
Oneida	(9)	0.4	4,062	0.3	1,400	0.3
Owyhee	(9)	0.4	10,406	0.8	3,722	0.8
Payette	(41)	1.6	8,404	1.7	7,962	1.7
Power	(22)	0.9	20,846	0.7	2,899	0.6
Shoshone	(11)	0.4	13,654	1.1	5,962	1.3
Teton	(11)	0.4	5,708	0.5	1,991	0.4
Twin Falls	(127)	5.1	62,970	5.0	24,092	5.1
Valley	(13)	0.5	7,858	0.6	3,280	0.7
Washington	(18)	0.7	10,298	0.8	0.8	0.9
TOTAL	2489		1,251,700		469,643	

County population and number of households provided by Idaho Department of Commerce.

The rate for total child abuse in households with children (when the exposure to sexually explicit materials via the media is excluded) remained somewhat stable from 1999 to 2000, with about a 5.6% increase in this rate. Similarly, there were relative increases in

reports of Domestic Violence for households where the respondent lived with a spouse or significant other (19.8%). In those cases when the respondent worked outside the home, total sexual and gender harassment in the workplace decreased by 3.0% from 1999.

Using a statewide survey methodology to calculate crimes between intimates is fraught with complications and difficulties. It is imperative that we view minor increases and decreases in these crime rates as indicating some degree of reliability in the methodological approach undertaken during the survey administration.

Historically, respondents are not always likely to report domestic violence or child abuse to a stranger over the telephone; however, these related questions must be included in the survey instrument to assess the impact of such crimes. We clearly understand that it is likely that these crimes would be underreported to the interviewers and/or that the questions would offend and disturb some respondents. Additionally, we expected that some respondents might also have been the offender in these crimes and/or that some respondents did not feel comfortable or safe responding to our questions. Given these concerns, we also knew there was not an simple mechanism to measure how much child abuse, domestic violence and sexual harassment takes place in our communities. Police, hospital and shelter reports, although important and likely to provide more "hard" data, are skewed toward more extreme or special cases of child abuse and/or domestic violence, and do not often account for multiple victimizations of one person. Victims report a crime by an intimate to the police, or take their child or themselves to a hospital or shelter only when they foresee few other alternatives (Bachman 1993; Bachman and Coker 1995; Bachman and Saltzman 1995; Finkelhor, Hotaling, Lewis and Smith 1990; Smith 1982; Tjaden and Thoennes 1998). Likewise, workers rarely complain about sexual or gender harassment in any formal sense. Therefore, most organizational reports on the subject do not reflect actual victimizations (Erdreich 1995; Stohr, Mays, Beck and Kelley 1998).

The addition of intimate partner crimes, child abuse and sexual harassment to the survey instrument should provide a broader perspective of the type of abuse that occurs in families and the workplace. Because of the sensitive nature of these questions, it can be expected that more serious offenses committed by intimates are consistently underreported. On the other hand, we believe these data may be capturing a broader spectrum of child abuse, domestic violence and sexual harassment than is typically known. For instance, the rates for "exposure to sexual materials via the internet or TV" (child abuse), "emotional abuse" (domestic violence) and "jokes that 'put-down' women or men" (sexual/gender harassment) were the most frequently reported types of offenses in these categories. Unfortunately, they are also probably not the most serious or life threatening within the categories in terms of physical, mental or financial harm.

As the data reported in Table 7 indicate, male respondents (56.9%) experienced more property crime than females (43.1%) on a per capita basis. This finding parallels NCVS data which consistently demonstrate that males are more likely to be victimized in property and violent crimes, with the exception of sexual assault and rape. In fact, our data suggests that more males (60.7%) than females (39.3%) were victimized by violent crimes.

In contrast to crimes against property and violent crimes, domestic violence victimizations were higher for females (65.8%) than for males (34.2%); as well, females (68.8%) suffered higher rates of sexual harassment in the workplace than males (31.2%).

The ICVS data on age is consistent with the NCVS data in that victimizations were concentrated in the younger age brackets and then sharply decline as age increases. A person under age 25 was more likely to be the victim of a property crime, violent crime, or crime of domestic violence than was an individual over the age of 25. Sexual harassment in the workplace was evenly distributed across age brackets, within the age groups 18 to 54 (see Table 7).

The ICVS data reflect a greater likelihood of victimization in an urban area than in rural areas. Urban settings experienced more property crime, violent crime, and domestic violence than rural counties. However, this finding does not hold true for sexual harassment in the workplace, which appears to be widely distributed across counties.

Household income had a different effect on the percentage of respondents reporting victimizations. Property crime was distributed across income brackets with slightly higher rates of victimization for households with income between \$75,000 and \$100,000. Violent crime showed higher rates for the lower side of the income scale, but households with income above \$100,000 also experienced high rates of violent crime. The lowest rates for this type of crime were found for the households with an income range between \$40,000 to \$75,000; by contrast, the highest per capita rates per capita for domestic violence were found in the income group of under \$10,000. Sexual harassment in the workplace was evenly distributed across income categories, with the exception of respondents whose household income was above \$100,000; these households experienced the lowest victimization rates in this category.

Victims of child abuse (physical/neglect) were more likely to be young males (53.8%) than females (46.2%). More than 50% of the victims of physical abuse/neglect were under age 10. The income range for households reporting child abuse was between \$10,000 to \$100,000. No incidents of child abuse were reported for households whose income was under \$10,000 or more than \$100,000.

Overall, rural counties experienced lower rates of crime when compared to urban counties, with the exception of child abuse crimes. Rural counties experienced slightly more (51%) per capita child abuse than urban counties (49%).

Table 6. Idaho Crime Victimization Rates

Type of Crime or Offense	Rates per 1,000 Households or Persons Age 18 or Older		
	2000	1999	% Change
Property Crimes			
Pocket Picking	15.3	14.0	9.3%
Theft from outside	61.5	67.1	-8.3%
Other thefts	39.8	44.8	-11.2%
Total Larcenies and Thefts	116.6	125.9	-7.4%
Theft from inside vehicle	64.8	95.1	-31.9%
Theft of vehicle parts	41.4	59.8	-30.8%
Theft of vehicle	10.0	14.0	-28.6%
Total Motor Vehicle Thefts	116.1	168.9	-31.3%
Total Vandalism			
Break into property	44.2	70.0	-36.9%
Break into steal	(37.8)	(36.4)	3.8%
Break into hotel/motel	4.0	12.1	-66.9%
Break into steal hotel/motel ^a	4.8		
Total Burglary	53.0	82.1	-35.4%
Property Crime Totals	390.7	497.9	-21.5%
Driving Under the Influence Auto Collisions			
Alcohol	4.4	4.6	-4.3%
Drugs	0.8		
Other influence	3.6	2.8	28.6%
Total DUI	8.8	7.4	18.9%
Violent Crimes			
Total robbery	3.2	3.7	-13.5%
Physical assault	53.8	53.2	1.1%
Verbal confrontations	71.3	97.6	-26.9%
Other assault	12.9	23.4	-44.9%
Total Non-sexual Assault	137.8	173.8	-20.7%
Sexual assault	9.7	7.5	29.3%
Rape and attempted rape	2.0	0.9	122.2%
Total Sexual Assault and Rape	11.7	8.4	39.3%
Threat	10.3	10.2	1.0%
Attempt	5.2	3.7	40.5%
Murder	0.0	1.9	-100.0%
Total Murder	15.5	15.8	-1.9%
DUI collisions and Violent Crime Totals	177.0	209.1	-15.4%
Child Abuse			
Exposed to sexually explicit materials through the internet ^a	35.8		
Exposed to sexually explicit materials through T.V.a.	92.6		
Exposure to sexual materials or acts	36.6	17.7	106.8%
Neglect	8.1	6.5	24.6%
Physical harm	12.1	8.4	44.0%
Sexually offensive behavior	6.0	3.7	62.2%
Other sexual abuse	2.8	1.9	47.4%
Total Child Abuse	194.0		
Total Child Abuse Excluding Media Exposure	29.0	20.5	41.5%
Total Child Abuse Excluding Media Exposure and in Households with Children	48.5	45.9	5.7%
Domestic Violence			
Physical abuse	4.4	1.9	131.6%
Sexual abuse	2.0	0.0	
Emotional abuse	25.7	24.2	6.2%
Stalked/harassed	10.9	5.6	94.6%
Total Domestic Violence	43.0	31.7	35.6%
Total Domestic Violence in Households With Spouses or Significant Others	55.7	46.5	19.8%
Sexual/Gender Harassment in the Workplace			
Total Sexual/Gender Harassment	149.4	174.0	-14.1%
Total Sexual/Gender Harassment in Households where Respondent Worked Outside the Home	226.6	233.5	-3.0%

^a Only in ICVS 2000.
Percentages will not always add to 100 because of rounding.

Table 7. Per Capita Crime Rates.

Victim Characteristics	Per Capita Victim Rates and Percentages Within Groups									
	Property Crime		Violent Crime*		Domestic Violence		Child Abuse**		Sexual Harassment	
	Rate	%	Rate	%	Rate	%	Rate	%	Rate	%
Gender										
Male	0.349	56.9%	0.038	60.7%	0.036	34.2%	0.019	53.8%	0.101	31.2%
Female	0.265	43.1%	0.024	39.3%	0.070	65.8%	0.016	46.2%	0.222	68.8%
Age***										
<5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	21.0%	-	-
5-9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	34.0%	-	-
10-14	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	28.0%	-	-
15-17	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17.0%	-	-
18-20	0.516	19.1%	0.129	37.8%	0.167	30.3%	-	-	0.160	14.8%
21-24	0.568	21.1%	0.068	19.8%	0.118	21.4%	-	-	0.290	26.9%
25-34	0.305	11.3%	0.056	16.6%	0.077	14.0%	-	-	0.298	27.6%
35-44	0.346	12.9%	0.038	11.0%	0.073	13.3%	-	-	0.181	16.8%
45-54	0.358	13.3%	0.039	11.4%	0.055	10.0%	-	-	0.111	10.3%
55-64	0.216	8.0%	0.005	1.5%	0.038	6.8%	-	-	0.039	3.6%
65-74	0.228	8.4%	0.006	1.9%	0.023	4.2%	-	-	0.000	0.0%
75+	0.159	5.9%	0.000	0.0%	0.000	0.0%	-	-	0.000	0.0%
Rural v. Urban										
Urban	0.524	78.0%	0.055	81.0%	0.063	59.9%	0.033	49.0%	0.165	50.2%
Rural	0.144	22.0%	0.013	19.0%	0.042	40.1%	0.035	51.0%	0.164	49.8%
Income										
< \$10,000	0.377	14.6%	0.072	21.9%	0.400	49.8%	0.000	0.0%	0.160	12.7%
\$10,000-\$20,000	0.284	11.1%	0.028	8.6%	0.090	11.2%	0.010	1.1%	0.144	11.5%
\$20,000-\$30,000	0.309	12.0%	0.029	8.7%	0.094	11.7%	0.009	1.0%	0.217	17.2%
\$30,000-\$40,000	0.331	12.9%	0.057	17.1%	0.056	6.9%	0.011	1.3%	0.193	15.4%
\$40,000-\$50,000	0.241	9.4%	0.019	5.7%	0.066	8.2%	0.022	2.4%	0.167	13.3%
\$50,000-\$75,000	0.329	12.8%	0.017	5.1%	0.036	4.5%	0.017	1.9%	0.150	11.9%
\$75,000-\$100,000	0.395	15.3%	0.041	12.4%	0.039	4.8%	0.010	1.1%	0.180	14.3%
> \$100,000	0.306	11.9%	0.067	20.3%	0.023	2.9%	0.000	0.0%	0.045	3.6%

* Violent crime does not include verbal confrontations.

** Child Abuse by gender includes physically abused or neglected children.

*** Child abuse by age reflects raw data percentages of physically abused or neglected children by age group.

Property Crimes

Larceny and Theft Crime Characteristics

Tables 8 through 8d provide a snapshot of the most commonly committed types of street crime in many communities.¹ Police reports of larceny/theft incidents in Idaho for 1998 and 1999 indicate that larceny/theft offenses decreased from 1998 to 1999 by 13.6% (ISP Bureau of Criminal Investigation 2000).² Moreover, Idaho State Police five year trend data reveals a steady, albeit not dramatic or consistent, decrease in larceny/thefts from 1995 to 1999. Given these findings and the change in question content for the victimization survey, it is not

¹ A cautionary note is necessary when reviewing the data in these and other tables in this report. The comparisons between the NCVS findings and the 1997,1999 and 2000 Idaho surveys are useful in providing us with a rough estimate of how we compare. However, the same questions were not asked in the same manner for these three surveys; thus' the comparisons are only approximate.

² The ISP data presented in this document are, unless otherwise indicated, based on numbers of actual crime reports and are not proportionate to population or rates.

appropriate to draw any conclusions about increases or decreases over the three year survey period. We would note, however, that the data presented in Table 8 does indicate that the total amount of larceny/theft in Idaho for 2000 (rate of 116.6) is less than the Idaho rate for 1999 (125.9) and much less than the 1999 rate per the NCVS data (153.9) (Rennison 2000).

Table 8a contains questions regarding reporting crime to the police and the reasons people did not report. Most of the victims of these crimes did not report the offense to the police, with the exception of pocket picking. In these cases slightly more than half of the crimes were reported. Most of the time these crimes were not reported "because the matter was too trivial", "nothing could be done", or "for some other reason".

People experienced larceny and theft in their current towns of residence in an average of 79.6% of cases (see Table 8b). About 68.7% of these crimes occurred in the seven most populous urban counties and the replacement cost for the stolen items, on average, was \$644.21.

Data presented in Tables 8c and 8d indicate that the vast majority of larceny and theft offenders were males, typically in their teens to mid-twenties. Most of the offenders, if seen, were known or recognized by the victim; in fact, a few were family members. Moreover, those that were seen, according to the victim's perception, were generally not drinking or using drugs. Offenders among the three offense types were primarily white (80.4%) and Hispanic (16.4%), with a smaller multi-racial percentage.

The victims of larceny and theft tended to be in their early to late 30s. However, the range in ages was from early childhood to advanced old age. The victims were more likely to be males, although the number of female victims in these categories is rather large relative to their property victim status, particularly when compared to the national data (Rennison 2000). Victims also tended to be overwhelmingly white (average 95.5%) in proportion to their share of the general population. All other races/ethnicities experienced minimum larceny and theft victimization.

Table 8. Property Crimes: Larcenies and Thefts

Crime Type	Actual	Attempt	Both	Total 2000	Rates per 1,000 households			
					2000	1999	1997 ^a	NCVS ^b
Pocket Picking^c (N=2489) (Occ=58)	28	10	0	38	15.3	14	16.1	
Theft From Outside Home (N=2487) (Occ=223)	140	11	2	153	61.5	67.1	4.9	
Other Thefts (N=2487) (Occ=156)	82	17	0	99	39.8	44.8	45.2 ^d	
Total Larceny/Theft Crimes (N=2489)	250	38	2	290	116.6	125.9	66.2	153.9

^a These figures are taken from the final report of the first statewide victimization survey (Crank, Stohr, Bissey, Jones, Musser and Badger 1997). For methodological reasons, the same questions were not asked the second year of the survey administration. Therefore, comparison of these rates between years must be viewed with some caution. Also note that the sample size for the three years of the administration differed each year (it was 1682 in 1997, 1072 in 1999 and 2489 in 2000).

^b NCVS stands for the National Crime Victimization Survey. These specific data are taken from the Bureau of Justice Statistics NCVS website "Criminal Victimization 1999," by Rennison, August 2000. <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/pub>.

^c These figures for the 1999 survey do not include 4 crimes that involved some combination of the use of a gun or knife (1), throwing something (1), physical force (3) or verbal confrontations (1). Such crimes that employ the use of force when stealing are more typically known as robberies, rather than thefts. In the 1997 and 2000 surveys robbery was a distinct category.

^d This number represents the sample victimization reports of fuel stolen from vehicles for the 1997 survey.

Table 8a. Property Crimes: Larcenies and Theft Reporting

Type of Crime	Reported to Police		Reason for Not Reporting ^a	
	(n)	Percent	(n)	Percent
Pocket Picking				
N=38 responses ^b				
YES	(19)	50.0		
NO	(19)	50.0		
Matter Too Trivial			(5)	26.0
Relationship With Offender			(1)	5.0
Didn't Want to Involve Police			(1)	5.0
Nothing Could Be Done			(4)	21.0
Reported To School			(2)	10.0
Took Care Of It Myself			(1)	5.0
Other Reason Not Reported			(5)	26.0
Theft from Outside				
N=140 responses				
YES	(51)	36.4		
NO	(89)	63.6		
Matter Too Trivial			(48)	55.0
Relationship With Offender			(3)	3.0
Didn't Want to Involve Police			(4)	5.0
System Would Not Take Seriously			(6)	7.0
Nothing Could be Done			(6)	7.0
Report To Employer Or Others			(2)	2.0
Took Care Of It Myself			(2)	2.0
Not Sure of Theft			(5)	6.0
Other Reason Not Reported			(11)	13.0
Other Thefts				
N=91 responses				
YES	(39)	40.6		
NO	(57)	59.4		
Matter Too Trivial			(24)	42.0
Relationship With Offender			(2)	4.0
Didn't Want to Involve Police			(3)	5.0
System Would Not Take Seriously			(1)	1.0
Nothing Could Be Done			(14)	24.0
Reported To School			(2)	4.0
Reported To Employer Or Others			(5)	8.0
Took Care Of It Myself			(2)	4.0
Not Sure Of Theft			(2)	4.0
Other Reason Not Reported			(2)	4.0

^a Respondents were allowed to indicate why the crime was not reported and then the interviewer provided several options.

^b The numbers do not necessarily add up to the number of households indicating a crime had occurred, as some respondents chose not to indicate whether they reported the crime to the police or not.

Table 8c. Property Crimes: Larcenies and Theft Offender Characteristics

Offender Characteristics	Pocket Picking		Theft Outside		Other Thefts	
	(n)	Percent	(n)	Percent	(n)	Percent
Number of Offenders	44		51		93 ^a	
Recognize Offenders						
Yes	(12)	80.0	(16)	61.5	(22)	78.6
No	(2)	20.0	(10)	38.5	(6)	21.4
Offender Gender						
Male	(22)	78.6	(42)	87.5	(72)	86.7
Female	(6)	21.4	(6)	12.5	(11)	13.3
Offender Age						
N	15		32		29	
Mean	23.6		16.6		24.7	
Offender Using Alcohol or Drugs						
Alcohol	(1)	5.9	(1)	3.6		
Drugs	(2)	11.8	(3)	10.7	(3)	10.0
Both	(2)	11.8	(4)	14.3	(1)	3.3
None	(7)	41.2	(12)	42.8	(16)	53.3
Don't Know	(5)	11.8	(8)	28.6	(10)	33.3
Offender Race/Ethnicity						
White	(16)	76.2	(31)	73.8	(31)	91.2
African American						
Hispanic	(5)	23.8	(7)	16.7	(3)	8.8
Asian						
Multi-Racial			(4)	9.5		
Offender Family						
Yes	(2)	11.8	(1)	3.6	(1)	3.4
No	(15)	88.2	(27)	96.4	(28)	96.6

^a This number includes one respondent who reported that there were 50 offenders.

Percentages will not always add to 100 because of rounding.

Table 8b. Property Crimes: Larcenies and Theft Crime Characteristics

Crime Characteristics	Pocket Picking		Theft Outside		Other Thefts	
	(n)	Percent	(n)	Percent	(n)	Percent
County						
Urban ^a	(28)	68.7	(106)	69.3	(60)	61.8
Rural	(10)	31.3	(47)	30.7	(37)	38.2
Current Town						
Yes	(26)	68.4	(136)	96.4	(71)	73.9
No	(12)	31.6	(5)	3.5	(25)	26.1
Cost to Replace						
N		29		129		72
Mean		687.07		514.36		859.61
Standard Deviation		1,554.96		1,701.01		3,577.31
Median		225.00		100.00		100.00

^a Urban counties included the seven most densely populated counties in the state (Ada, Bannock, Bingham, Bonneville, Canyon, Kootenai, and Twin Falls), which comprise approximately 62% of the Idaho population. All other (37) counties in Idaho were classified as rural.

Percentages will not always add to 100 because of rounding.

Table 8d. Property Crimes: Larcenies and Theft Victim Characteristics

Victim Characteristics	Pocket Picking		Theft Outside		Other Thefts	
	(n)	Percent	(n)	Percent	(n)	Percent
Number of Victims	85		241		183	
Respondent Victim						
Yes	(24)	63.2	(102)	72.0	(66)	68.0
No	(14)	36.9	(39)	23.0	(31)	32.0
Victim Gender						
Male	(46)	66.0	(106)	55.0	(73)	53.0
Female	(23)	33.0	(85)	45.0	(63)	46.0
Victim Race/Ethnicity						
White	(63)	98.4	(201)	92.6	(127)	95.5
African American			(1)	0.5		
Hispanic	(1)	1.6	(11)	5.1	(5)	3.8
Asian						
American Indian			(3)	1.3	(1)	0.8
Multi-Racial			(1)	0.5		
Victim Age						
N	62		196		115	
Mean	32.2		38.6		39.9	

Percentages will not always add to 100 because of rounding.

Motor Vehicles

The data presented in Table 9 would indicate that motor vehicle theft in Idaho during 2000 (rate of 10.0) is identical to the NCVS rate of 10.0 (Rennison 2000). It appears that motor vehicle related crimes may have stabilized and/or decreased when comparing the 2000 findings with the findings from 1997 and 1999 surveys. This decrease in motor vehicle thefts is further supported by the police incident reports compiled by the Idaho State Police (ISP Bureau of Criminal Investigation 1999). Their figures for 1998 and 1999 indicate a 14.9% decrease. Furthermore, their five-year trend data for 1995 to 1999 demonstrates that the number of police reports for motor vehicle thefts have experienced an overall decrease.

During 2000 more citizens did report motor vehicle crimes to the police (an average of 49.1% of incidents across the three crime categories were reported - see Table 9a). Reasons for failing to report either theft from inside the vehicle or theft of vehicle parts indicated that either the matter was considered to be too trivial or that the victim felt that nothing could be done. For those who experienced the theft of vehicles, the most common reason given for not reporting was the relationship that they had with the offender.

To an even greater degree than larceny/ theft, motor vehicle crimes tended to occur in the respondent's own town (see Table 9b). The incidence of these crimes was also much

Table 9. Property Crimes: Motor Vehicle

Type of crime	Actual	Attempt	Both	Total 2000	Rates per 1,000 households			
					2000	1999	1997 ^a	NCVS ^b
Theft From Inside Vehicle (N=2484)	122	35	4	161	64.8	95.1	103.5	
Theft of Vehicle Parts (N=2484)	82	21	0	103	41.4	59.8	69.6	
Theft of Vehicle (N=2485)	18	7	0	25	10.0	14.0	23.2	10.0
Total Motor Vehicle Thefts (N=2489)	222	63	4	289	116.1	168.9	196.3	

^a These figures are taken from the final report of the first statewide victimization survey (Crank, Stohr, Bissey, Jones, Musser and Badger 1997). For methodological reasons the same questions were not asked the second year of the survey administration. Therefore, comparison of these rates between years must be viewed with some caution. Also note that the sample size for the three years of the survey administration differed each year (it was 1682 in 1997, 1076 in 1999 and 2489 in 2000).

^b NCVS stands for the National Crime Victimization Survey. These specific data are taken from the Bureau of Justice Statistics NCVS website "Criminal Victimization 1999," by Rennison, 2000. <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/pub>.

Table 9a. Property Crimes: Motor Vehicle Crime Reporting

Type of Crime	Reported to Police		Reason for Not Reporting ^a	
	(n)	Percent	(n)	Percent
Theft from Inside Vehicle				
N=158 responses				
YES	(84)	53.5		
NO	(73)	46.5		
Matter too trivial			(42)	58.0
Relationship with offender			(3)	4.0
Didn't want to involve the police			(2)	3.0
Victim embarrassed			(1)	1.0
Nothing could be done			(12)	16.0
Took care of it myself			(1)	1.0
Not sure of theft			(3)	4.0
Other reason not reported			(9)	12.0
Theft of Vehicle Parts				
N=99 responses				
YES	(38)	46.3		
NO	(59)	53.7		
Matter too trivial			(37)	63.0
Didn't want to involve the police			(3)	5.0
System would not take seriously			(4)	7.0
Nothing could be done			(10)	17.0
Not sure of theft			(2)	3.0
Other reason not reported			(3)	5.0
Theft of Vehicle				
N=21 responses				
YES	(10)	47.6		
NO	(11)	52.4		
Fear of retaliation			(1)	11.0
Relationship with offender			(4)	44.0
Didn't want to involve the police			(2)	22.0
Nothing could be done			(1)	11.0
Other Reason Not Reported			(1)	11.0

^a The numbers do not necessarily add up to the number of respondent households who didn't report as some respondents chose not to indicate why they didn't report. Percentages will not always add to 100 because of rounding.

higher in urban areas than in rural portions of Idaho. The replacement cost for losses incurred as a result of these crimes was, on average, several hundred to several thousand dollars.

Motor vehicle crime offenders were overwhelmingly male, young (averaging from the late-teens to the mid-twenties), and white (though there was almost equal involvement by Hispanics in the theft of vehicle parts crimes), and some were recognized by the victim (see Table 9c). Respondents indicated that in the majority of cases they were unsure whether the offender was under the influence of drugs or alcohol; however, when the offender was considered to be under the influence, drugs were felt to be used more often than alcohol.

Motor vehicle theft victims were mostly male, usually white and on average, were in their mid-thirties to early forties (see Table 9d). In 70 to 80% of these cases the respondents indicated that they personally were the victims of these crimes.

Poor or vague recollection of non-respondent victimization in the entire household likely explains the consistency throughout the survey of high rates of victimization occurring against the survey respondents. When extrapolating total victimization within the state of Idaho, more accurate figures can be obtained by utilizing the respondent data, rather than household data, due to the greater accuracy of recollection.

Table 9b. Property Crimes: Motor Vehicle Crime Characteristics

Crime Characteristics	Theft from Inside Vehicle		Theft Vehicle Parts		Theft of Vehicle	
	(n)	Percent	(n)	Percent	(n)	Percent
County						
Urban ^a	(116)	73.9	(78)	75.7	(19)	76
Rural	(45)	26.1	(25)	24.3	(6)	24
Current Town						
Yes	(137)	86.7	(86)	87.7	(20)	90.9
No	(21)	13.3	(12)	12.3	(2)	9.1
Cost to Replace						
N	139		77		11	
Mean	\$447.90		\$140.10		\$6,009.09	
Standard Deviation	914		272.04		11,854.74	

^a Urban counties included the seven most densely populated counties in the state (Ada, Bannock, Bingham, Bonneville, Canyon, Kootenai, and Twin Falls), which comprise approximately 62% of the Idaho population. All other (37) counties in Idaho were classified as rural. Percentages will not always add to 100 because of rounding.

Table 9c. Property Crimes: Motor Vehicle Crime Offender Characteristics

Offender Characteristics	Theft Inside		Theft Vehicle Parts		Theft of Vehicle	
	(n)	Percent	(n)	Percent	(n)	Percent
Number of Offenders	50		52		19	
Recognize Offenders						
Yes	(10)	55.5	(9)	56.3	(8)	88.9
No	(8)	44.5	(7)	43.7	(1)	11.1
Offender Gender						
Male	(31)	88.6	(33)	94.3	(14)	93.3
Female	(4)	11.4	(2)	5.7	(1)	6.7
Offender Age						
N	34		21		14	
Mean	18.4		25.4		23.6	
Offender Race/Ethnicity						
White	(28)	87.5	(16)	55.2	(10)	71.4
African American						
Hispanic	(4)	12.5	(13)	44.8	(3)	21.4
Asian						
Multi-Racial					(1)	7.2
Offender Using Alcohol or Drugs						
Alcohol	(1)	4.2	(1)	5.5	(2)	16.7
Drugs	(4)	19.0	(1)	5.5	(1)	8.3
Both	(2)	9.5	(3)	15	(1)	8.3
None	(4)	19.0	(7)	36.8	(6)	50.0
Don't Know	(10)	47.6	(7)	36.8	(2)	16.7
Offender Family						
Yes	(2)	9.5	(0)	0	(5)	38.4
No	(19)	90.5	(19)	100	(7)	53.8

Percentages will not always add to 100 because of rounding.

Table 9d. Property Crimes: Motor Vehicle Crime Victim Characteristics

Victim Characteristics	Theft Inside		Theft Vehicle Parts		Theft of Vehicle	
	(n)	Percent	(n)	Percent	(n)	Percent
Number of Victims	227		132		46	
Respondent Victim						
Yes	(107)	68.6	(78)	79.6	(18)	81.8
No	(49)	31.4	(20)	20.4	(4)	18.2
Victim Gender						
Male	(94)	56.3	(45)	58.4	(17)	43.6
Female	(73)	43.7	(32)	41.6	(22)	56.4
Victim Race/Ethnicity						
White	(208)	95.4	(106)	90.6	(34)	97.1
African American			(2)	1.7		
Hispanic	(6)	2.7	(2)	1.7	(1)	2.9
Asian			(1)	0.9		
American Indian	(3)	1.4	(5)	4.3		
Multi-Racial	(1)	0.5	(1)	0.9		
Victim Age						
N	199		117		27	
Mean	36.1		43.6		39.7	

The percentages will not always add to 100 because of rounding.

Vandalism

Rate comparisons among 1997, 1999 and 2000 Idaho survey data indicate that vandalism has risen and fallen steeply during the last few years (see Table 10). As indicated by the findings presented in Table 10a, about half (52.8%) of the respondents stated that the vandalism was not reported. Of those respondents not reporting, the five most common explanations given (listed in descending order) were: 1. The matter was too trivial (this reason accounted for 59.3% of the non-reporting), 2. Nothing could be done, 3. There was another reason for not reporting other than the ones we provided, 4. The system would not take it (the crime) seriously, and 5. Because of the relationship between the victim and offender.

Table 10. Property Crimes: Vandalism

Crime Type	Actual	Attempt	Both	Total 2000	Rates per 1,000 households			
					2000	1999	1997 ^a	NCVS ^b
Damaged or Destroyed Property (N=2488)	243	18	0	261	104.9	121.0	72.5	

^a These figures are taken from the final report of the first statewide victimization survey (Crank, Stohr, Bissey, Jones, Musser and Badger 1997). For methodological reasons the same questions were not asked the second year of the survey administration. Therefore, comparison of these rates between years must be viewed with some caution. Also note that the sample size for the three years of the survey administration differed each year (it was 1682 in 1997, 1076 in 1999 and 2489 in 2000).

^b NCVS did not report victimization levels for this crime.

Despite these factors, the damage to property was extensive for some of these households. The cost to replace property (for those who estimated a cost) was over \$700 (see Table 10b). Most of these crimes (over 92.4%) occurred in the town of current residence for the responding household and the majority were committed in the seven most populated counties (76.6%).

Vandalism offenders tended to be male (86.1%), white, in their mid-twenties, and were known or recognized by a member of the victim household most of the time (see Table 10c). Although some of the offenders were reported to be under the influence of drugs or alcohol, the majority of these offenders were not considered to be under the influence. Their victims were primarily white (95.1%), in their mid to late twenties, were slightly more likely to be male (52.1%), and often included the respondent to the survey (see Table 10d).

Table 10a. Property Crimes: Vandalism Reporting

Type of Crime	Reported to Police		Not Reporting ^a	
	(n)	Percent	(n)	Percent
Vandalism				
N=158 responses				
YES	(84)	47.2		
NO	(73)	52.8		
Fear of retaliation			(2)	1.5
Too trivial, not enough to report			(76)	59.3
Relationship with offender			(6)	4.6
Didn't want to involve the police			(3)	2.3
System would not take seriously			(8)	6.2
Nothing could be done			(18)	14.1
Reported to employer or others			(2)	1.5
Took care of it myself			(2)	1.5
Not sure of theft			(2)	1.5
Other reason not reported			(9)	7.1

^a The numbers do not necessarily add up to the number of respondent households who didn't report as some respondents chose not to indicate why they didn't report.
Percentages will not always add to 100 because of rounding.

Table 10b. Property Crimes: Vandalism Crime Characteristics

Crime Characteristics	Vandalism	
	(n)	Percent
County		
Urban ^a	(199)	76.8
Rural	(60)	23.2
Current Town		
Yes	(231)	92.4
No	(19)	7.6
Cost to Replace		
N	204	
Mean	\$730.75	
Standard Deviation	2364.83	
Median	\$113.00	

^a Urban counties included the seven most densely populated counties in the state (Ada, Bannock, Bingham, Bonneville, Canyon, Kootenai, and Twin Falls), which comprise approximately 62% of the Idaho population. All other (37) counties in Idaho were classified as rural.
Percentages will not always add to 100 because of rounding.

Table 10c. Property Crimes: Vandalism Offender Characteristics

Offender Characteristics	Vandalism	
	(n)	Percent
Number of Offenders	169	
Recognize Offenders		
Yes	(46)	80.7
No	(11)	19.2
Offender Gender		
Male	(118)	86.1
Female	(19)	13.9
Offender Age		
N	98	
Mean	22	
Offender Race/Ethnicity		
White	(106)	84.1
African American		
Hispanic	(20)	15.9
Asian		
Multi-Racial		
Offender Using Alcohol or Drugs		
Alcohol	(9)	13.4
Drugs	(11)	16.4
Both	(1)	1.4
None	(34)	50.7
Don't Know	(12)	17.9
Offender Family		
Yes	(5)	7.5
No	(62)	92.5

Percentages will not always add to 100 because of rounding.

Table 10d. Property Crimes: Vandalism Victim Characteristics

Victim Characteristics	Vandalism	
	(n)	Percent
Number of Victims	522	
Respondent Victim		
Yes	(218)	86.8
No	(33)	13.2
Victim Gender		
Male	(210)	52.1
Female	(193)	47.9
Victim Race/Ethnicity		
White	(390)	95.1
African American	(3)	0.7
Hispanic	(8)	2
Asian	(2)	0.5
American Indian	(7)	1.7
Victim Age		
N	339	
Mean	39.8	

Percentages will not always add to 100 because of rounding.

Burglary

As indicated in Table 11, the three burglary categories are comparable among 1997, 1999 and 2000 survey years. For the category comparable to NCVS "Burglary" or the "Break Into Steal: Property" offense, the rate for 1997, 1999 and 2000 survey data and the NCVS rate for 1999 are very stable ranging from 34.1 for the NCVS for 1999 to 37.8 for the 2000 Idaho data (Rennison 2000).

Table 11. Property Crimes: Burglary

Crime Type	Actual	Attempt	Both	Total 2000	Rates per 1,000 households			
					2000	1999	1997 ^a	NCVS ^b
Break Into Property (N=2488)	76	32	2	110	44.2	70.0	63.6	
Break Into Steal: Property^f (N=2487)	81	12	1	94	37.8	36.4	35.7	34.1
Break Into Hotel/Motel (N=2484)	5	4	1	10	4.0	12.1	4.8	
Break Into Steal: Hotel/Motel (N=2484)	11	1	0	12	4.8			
Total Burglary (N=2489)	92	37	3	132	53.0	82.1	68.4	

^a These figures are taken from the final report of the first statewide victimization survey (Crank, Stohr, Bissey, Jones, Musser and Badger 1997). For methodological reasons the same questions were not asked the second year of the survey administration.
^b NCVS stands for the National Crime Victimization Survey. These specific data are taken from the Bureau of Justice Statistics NCVS website "Criminal Victimization 1999," by Rennison, 2000. <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/pub>.
^c For the 1997, 1999 and 2000 data the rate for "Break Into Steal" is a follow-up to the "Break Into Property" category.

Table 11a. Property Crimes: Burglary Crime Reporting

Type of Crime	Reported to Police		Reason for Not Reporting ^a	
	(n)	Percent	(n)	Percent
Break into Property and Break into Steal				
N=147 responses				
YES	(87)	59.2		
NO	(60)	40.8		
Matter Too Trivial			(22)	38.6
Relationship With Offender			(5)	8.8
Didn't Want To Involve Police			(2)	3.5
Would Not Take Seriously			(4)	7.0
Nothing Could Be Done			(11)	19.3
Took Care Of It Myself			(1)	1.8
Not Sure It Was Stolen/ Broken Into			(3)	5.3
Other Reason Not Reported			(9)	15.8
Break into Hotel/Motel				
N=9 responses				
YES	(6)	66.7		
NO	(3)	33.3		
Break into Steal: Hotel/Motel				
N=10 responses				
YES	(4)	40.0		
NO	(6)	60.0		
Both Break into Hotel/Motel and Break into Steal: Hotel/Motel				
Matter Too Trivial			(4)	44.4
Would Not Take Seriously			(1)	11.1
Nothing Could Be Done			(1)	11.1
Reported To Others			(2)	22.2
Took Care If It Myself			(1)	11.1

^a The numbers do not necessarily add up to the number of respondent households who didn't report as some respondents chose not to indicate why they didn't report.
 Percentages will not always add to 100 because of rounding.

When the 2000 rates are compared to those for 1997 and 1999 it would appear that the amount of "Total Burglary" offenses experienced an overall decrease in the latest survey year, although there were slight rate increases in the "Break Into Steal" category for both the 1999 and 2000 data years compared to the 1997 data.

Similarly, police reports on burglary/breaking and entering compiled by the Idaho State Police, Bureau of Criminal Investigation indicate a 10.2% decrease in reports of this offense from 1998 to 1999 (ISP Bureau of Criminal Investigation 2000). The ISP five-year trend data also indicates that there has been a steady, if uneven, decrease in this crime from 1995 to 1999.

Data presented on Table 11a indicate that most people reported burglary offenses to the police. For instance, 59.6% of the "Break Into Property" and "Break Into Steal" crimes were reported to the police. However, those who did not report usually cited one of two reasons for not doing so: "the matter was too trivial" or "nothing could be done"

These crimes tended to be committed in the urban counties more than 70% of the time, despite the fact that the seven counties classified as urban constituted only 62% of the statewide population (see Table 11b). The vast majority of the “Break Into Property” and the “Break Into Steal” crimes (93.9%) were committed in the respondent’s current town of residence. Understandably, the vast majority (77.8%) of the much smaller number of “Break Into Hotel/Motel” and the “Break Into Steal in Hotel/Motel” crimes were not committed in the respondent’s current town.

Burglary offenses were monetarily costly for the victims, averaging over \$2,000 to replace items stolen or destroyed (see Table 11b).

Most of the burglary offenders for which we have data were male (83.4%) and tended to be in their mid twenties (average 24.8 years of age) (see Table 11c). There were, however, more women offenders proportionately involved in these crimes than in the other property crime offenses, except for pocket picking offenses where offending women accounted for 21.4%. Few of the respondents indicated that the offender was drinking or using drugs at the time the offense was committed. More respondents indicated that they didn’t know if an intoxicant was used (22.4%) or that there was no intoxicant (39.7%) used by the offender.

The respondent was the primary victim in burglary crimes in 79% of the cases (see Table 11d). The victims of these burglaries were primarily white (92.7%), and were almost evenly divided between males and females, with an average age of over 41.9.

Table 11b. Property Crimes: Burglary Crime Characteristics

Crime Characteristics	Break Into Property/Steal		Break Into Property/Steal Hotel/Motel	
	(n)	Percent	(n)	Percent
County				
Urban ^a	(107)	72.3	(5)	83.3
Rural	(41)	27.7	(1)	16.7
			(7) (out of state)	
Current Town				
Yes	(139)	93.9	(2)	22.2
No	(9)	6.1	(7)	77.8
Home/Hotel/Motel During Crime				
Yes	(57)	43.2	(2)	22.2
No	(75)	56.8	(7)	77.8
Cost to Replace				
N	108		7	
Mean	\$2,677.25		\$600.00	
Standard Deviation	10960.34		754.98	
Median	\$300.00		\$300.00	

^a Urban counties included the seven most densely populated counties in the state (Ada, Bannock, Bingham, Bonneville, Canyon, Kootenai, and Twin Falls), which comprise approximately 62% of the Idaho population. All other (37) counties were classified as rural.
^b Not all respondents indicated the cost associated with the thefts. Percentages will not always add to 100 because of rounding.

Table 11c. Property Crimes: Burglary Offender Characteristics

Offender Characteristics	Break into property	
	(n)	Percent
Number of Offender	112	
Recognize Offenders		
Yes	(34)	80.7
No	(15)	19.2
Offender Gender		
Male	(74)	86.1
Female	(15)	13.9
Offender Age		
N	65	
Mean	25	
Offender Using Alcohol or Drugs		
Alcohol	(3)	5.2
Drugs	(4)	6.9
Both	(15)	25.9
None	(23)	39.7
Don't Know	(13)	22.4

Note: The figures for the other burglary offenses were too small and/or incomplete and so were not reported here. Percentages will not always add to 100 because of rounding.

Table 11d. Property Crimes: Burglary Victim Characteristics

Victim Characteristics	Break into Property	
	(n)	Percent
Number of Victims	379	
Respondent Victim		
Yes	(117)	79.1
No	(31)	20.9
Victim Gender		
Male	(153)	50.3
Female	(151)	49.7
Victim Race/Ethnicity		
White	(228)	92.7
African American	(2)	0.8
Hispanic	(7)	2.8
Asian	(3)	1.2
American Indian	(3)	1.2
Multi-Racial	(3)	1.2
Victim Age		
N	228	
Mean	41.9	

Note: The figures for the other burglary offenses were too small and/or incomplete and so were not reported here. Percentages will not always add to 100 because of rounding.

Driving Under the Influence and Resulting Motor Vehicle Collisions

As indicated in Table 12, respondents reported that there were 11 alcohol related and 11 other substance influenced motor vehicle collisions. These figures rendered the combined rate of 8.8 collisions per 1,000 households for driving under the influence types of offenses. General Auto collisions not associated with driving under the influence represented 89.6% (189) of the total number of collisions. Therefore, 10 out of every 117 households were involved in an auto collision and only 1 of those 10 accidents involved alcohol or drugs.

Table 12. Driving Under the Influence and Accidents

Influence Type	Total 2000	Rates per 1,000 households	
		2000	1999
Alcohol	(11)	4.4	4.6
Drugs	(2)	0.8	
Other Influence	(9)	3.6	2.8
No Intoxicant	(189)	80.0	63.3
No Auto Collision	(2274)		

Note: DUI questions were not asked in the 1997 victimization survey administration, nor are they asked for the NCVS. Questions specific to drug use were not asked in the 1997 or 1999 survey administrations.

Violent Crimes

Robbery

There were 8 robbery incidents identified by respondent households in the 2000 survey (see Table 13). The resulting rate of robbery (3.2) was slightly lower than the 1999 rate (3.7) and slightly higher than the 1997 rate (3.0) for Idaho. These rates remain lower than the NCVS rate of 3.6 (Rennison 2000). The three year data indicate that Idahoan's experiences continue to fall within a fairly narrow range of less than one point rate difference; this range encompasses the rate for the NCVS.

Table 13. Violent Crimes: Robbery

Crime Type	Threat	Attack	Both	Total 2000	Rates per 1,000 households			
					2000	1999	1997 ^a	NCVS ^b
Robbery (N=2482)	1	5	2	8	3.2	3.7	3.0	4.0 ^c

^a These figures are taken from the final report of the first statewide victimization survey (Crank, Stohr, Bissey, Jones, Musser and Badger 1997). For methodological reasons the same questions were not asked for each year of the survey administration. Therefore, comparison of these rates between years must be viewed with some caution. Also note that the sample size for the three years of the survey administration differed each year (it was 1682 in 1997, 1076 in 1999 and 2489 in 2000).

^b NCVS stands for the National Crime Victimization Survey. These specific data are taken from the Bureau of Justice Statistics NCVS website "Criminal Victimization 1999," by Rennison, July 2000." <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/pub>.

^c This rate represents both completed and attempted robberies.

These figures are further substantiated by similar trend data compiled by Uniform Crime Reporting (ISP Bureau of Criminal Investigation 1999). The five year trend data on police reports indicate that the number of reports of robbery was down by 10.7% for the 1998 to 1999 period, and were down overall by about the same amount (12.3%) from 1995 to 1999 (ISP Bureau of Criminal Investigation 1999). The pattern for reported robbery data is one of slight peaks and valleys over the last five years, and is similar to the increases and decreases reflected in the victimization data collected for the state from 1997, 1999 and 2000.

Assault

The data presented in Table 14 indicate that some types of assault in Idaho present a more serious crime problem than one would expect given the national average. When comparable rates were available, it appears the ICVS rate for assault with a weapon was slightly lower than the 1999 NCVS rate (Rennison 2000). Although the ICVS rate for total physical assault was consistently higher than the NCVS rate for 1998 and 1999 (Rennison 1999; 2000 – 1998 data not shown here). When the three years of ICVS physical assault data are compared, the rates decrease for the crimes of “assault with a gun,” “assault with a weapon,” and “assault with a thrown object”. In general, there is a clear trend toward decreases in physical assault when the three years of Idaho data are compared (down 24.5% from 1997 to 2000). This trend toward a decreasing rate is also apparent when one compares the “total assault” rate for 2000 with the 1999 and 1997 rates (down 33.8% from 1997 to 2000 — see Table 14).

Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) police report data indicates that aggravated assaults¹ decreased from 1998 to 1999 by 12.8% (ISP Bureau of Criminal Investigation 2000). Moreover, the five year trend data indicates a 22.1% decrease in police reports for this crime from 1995 to 1999. Similarly, the 1999 data on police reports for simple assault² and for intimidation also indicate that these crimes are down by 6.4% and 2%, respectively, from 1998. The five year ISP trend data indicates that there has been a decrease of 3.4% for simple assault and 5.1% for intimidation. Overall, these decreases in assaults over five years, as reflected by police reports in Idaho, mirror the decreases in the rates of assault for three years of ICVS data.

Slightly less than half of the assaults were reported to the police (48.4%). The most common reasons given for

Table 14. Violent Crimes: Non-sexual Assault

Crime Type	Actual	Attempt	Both	Total 2000	Rates per 1,000 households			
					2000	1999	1997 ^a	NCVS ^b
Assault With a Gun^c (N=2488)	5	14	1	20	8.0	10.3	4.2	
Assault With a Weapon^d (N=2487)	5	5	1	11	4.4	7.5	8.9	4.7
Assault With a Thrown Object (N=2487)	1	10	2	13	5.2	13.1	19.6	
Assault With Physical Force^e (N=2488) (Occ=13)	60	14	16	90	36.2	22.4	38.6	
Total Physical Assault (N=2489)	71	43	20	134	53.8	53.2	71.3	27.4 ^f
Verbal Confrontations^g (N=2483)	60	100	17	177	71.3	97.6	63.6	
Assault Other^h (N=2487)	11	19	2	32	12.9	23.4	73.1	
Total Assault (N=2489)	142	162	39	343	137.8	173.8	208.0	

^a These figures are taken from the final report of the first statewide victimization survey (Crank, Stohr, Bissey, Jones, Musser and Badger 1997). For methodological reasons the same questions were not asked the second year of the survey administration. Therefore, comparison of these rates between years must be viewed with some caution. Also note that the sample size for the three years of the survey administration differed each year (it was 1682 in 1997, 1076 in 1999 and 2489 in 2000).

^b NCVS stands for the National Crime Victimization Survey. These specific data are taken from the Bureau of Justice Statistics NCVS website “Criminal Victimization 1999,” by Rennison, July 2000. <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/pub>.

^c This rate represents the responses to the query about assault “with any weapon, for instance, a gun or knife.”

^d This rate represents the responses to the query about assault “threatened with a weapon.”

^e This rate represents the responses to the query about assault with “any grabbing, punching, choking.”

^f Most of this rate (20.8) represents simple assault.

^g This rate represents the responses to the question “Did anyone threaten to beat you or a household member up or threaten you with a knife, gun, or some other weapon, not including telephone threats?”

^h This rate represents the responses to the query about assault including “any attack or threat or use of force by anyone at all.”

not reporting were that the “matter was too trivial” or that they (police) “would not take the offense seriously,” “didn’t want police involvement,” or that there was some “other reason” for not reporting (see Table 14a).

The overwhelming majority of these crimes occurred in the household’s current town of residence (87.0%), which was usually in an urban area (73.0%), and the cost of these crimes was \$839.00 on average (see Table 14b).

Table 14b. Violent Crimes: Non-sexual Assault Crime Characteristics

Crime Characteristics	Violent Crime	
	(n)	Percent
County		
Urban ^a	(265)	73.0
Rural	(108)	27.3
Current Town		
Yes	(287)	87.8
No	(40)	12.2
Cost^b		
N	21	
Mean	\$839.00	

^a Urban counties included the seven most densely populated counties in the state (Ada, Bannock, Bingham, Bonneville, Canyon, Kootenai and Twin Falls), which comprise approximately 62% of the Idaho population. All other (37) counties in Idaho were classified as rural.

^b Not all respondents indicated that there was a cost associated with these assaults.

Percentages will not always add to 100 because of rounding.

(54.8%) and was most likely male (53.6%), typically white (91.4%) and on average was 30.4 years old. Comparatively, the victim, on average was 3.6 years older than the offender (see Table 14d).

An aggravated assault is defined as “An unlawful attack by one person upon another wherein the offender uses a weapon or displays it in a threatening manner, or the victim suffers obvious severe or aggravated bodily injury involving apparent broken bones, loss of teeth, possible internal injury, severe laceration, or loss of consciousness” (ISP Bureau of Criminal Investigation 2000: 24).

A simple assault is defined as “An unlawful physical attack by one person upon another where neither the offender displays a weapon, nor the victim suffers obvious severe or aggravated bodily injury involving apparent broken bones, loss of teeth, possible internal injury, severe laceration, or loss of consciousness” (ISP Bureau of Criminal Investigation 2000: 37).

Table 14a. Violent Crimes: Reporting Non-sexual Assault

Type of Crime	Reported to Police		Reason for Not Reporting	
	(n)	Percent	(n)	Percent
Assaults				
N=322 responses				
YES	(156)	48.4		
NO	(166)	51.6		
Fear of Retaliation			(7)	4.2
Matter Too Trivial			(76)	45.5
Relationship With Offender			(7)	4.2
Didn’t Want Police Involvement			(17)	10.2
Would Not Take Seriously			(3)	1.8
Reported To School			(20)	12.0
Nothing Could Be Done			(5)	3.0
Reported To Employer Or Others			(6)	3.6
Took Care Of It Myself			(8)	4.8
Won’t Happen Again			(2)	1.2
Victim Embarrassed			(1)	0.6
Other Reason Not Reported			(15)	9.0

Percentages will not always add to 100 because of rounding.

As the data presented in Table 14c indicates, most offenders were recognizable to the victim (84.5%), though they were not family members. The offenders were predominately male (75.5%), in their late twenties (mean =26.8), were white (81.1%), with a large percentage of Hispanic offenders (12.7%) in comparison to the Hispanic population (7.4%). A significant percentage of offenders had been drinking or were under the influence of some drug or intoxicant (34.3%) at the time of the offense.

In contrast, the victim of assault tended to be the respondent (54.8%) and was most likely male (53.6%), typically white (91.4%) and on average was 30.4 years old. Comparatively, the victim, on average was 3.6 years older than the offender (see Table 14d).

Table 14c. Violent Crimes: Non-sexual Assault
Offender Characteristics

Offender Characteristics	Non-sexual Assault	
	(n)	Percent
Number of Offenders	311	
Recognize Offenders		
Yes	(279)	84.5
No	(51)	15.5
Offender Gender		
Male	(235)	75.5
Female	(72)	24.5
Offender Age		
N	318	
Mean	26.8	
Offender Race/Ethnicity		
White	(326)	81.1
Black/African-American	(3)	0.7
Asian/Pacific Islander	(3)	0.7
American Indian	(7)	1.7
Multi-Racial	(12)	12.0
Hispanic (any race)	(51)	12.7
Offender Hispanic Origin		
Non-Hispanic	(256)	73.8
Hispanic	(91)	26.2
Offender A Family Member		
Yes, Some	(5)	
Yes, All	(30)	
No	(188)	
Offender Drinking/On Drugs		
Drinking	(39)	15.2
Drugs	(12)	4.7
Both	(25)	9.7
Unknown Intoxicant	(12)	4.7
No Intoxicant	(111)	43.2
Don't Know	(58)	22.6

Percentages will not always add to 100 because of rounding.

The crime of intimidation is defined as "To unlawfully place another person in reasonable fear of bodily harm through the use of threatening words and/or other conduct, but without displaying a weapon or subjecting the victim to actual physical attack" (ISP Bureau of Criminal Investigation 2000: 38).

Table 14d. Violent Crimes: Non-sexual Assault
Victim Characteristics

Victim Characteristics	Non-sexual Assault	
	(n)	Percent
Number of Victims	379	
Respondent Victim		
Yes	(182)	54.8
No	(150)	45.2
Victim Gender		
Male	(143)	53.6
Female	(124)	46.4
Victim Age		
N	399	
Mean	30.4	
Victim Race/Ethnicity		
White	(416)	91.4
Black/African American	(2)	0.4
Hispanic (any Race)	(15)	3.2
Asian/Pacific Islander	(6)	1.3
American Indian	(12)	2.6
Multi-Racial	(4)	0.9
Victim Hispanic Origin		
Non Hispanic	(374)	94.4
Hispanic	(22)	5.6

Percentages will not always add to 100 because of rounding.

Sexual Assault and Rape

As indicated in Table 15, the rate of sexual assault and rape appears much higher in Idaho than the average rate for the nation when compared to rates per 1,000 households. In the calculation procedures these rates include more incidents than the NCVS; therefore, an adjustment to Table 15 was made to establish a means of comparing of the ICVS data to the NCVS data. In combination, Idaho experienced 29.4% fewer incidents of rape and sexual assault than the nation when analyzed at rates per 1,000 persons. These data, particularly for sexual assault and rape types of offenses, must be viewed with extreme caution and prudence because of the sensitive nature of this topic.

The ICVS overall rate for rape and sexual assault at household level has remained stable within a narrow range of two rate points (see Table 15). This finding reinforces the relative reliability and validity of the survey instrument.

Table 15. Violent Crimes: Sexual Assault and Rape

Crime Type	Threat	Attack	Both	Total 2000	Rates per 1,000 households		Rates per 1,000 Persons	
					2000	1999	ICVS adjusted to NCVS ^a	NCVS ^b
Sexual Assault (N=2471)	6	18	13	24 ^c	9.7	7.5	0.9	0.8
Rape and Attempted Rape (N=2464)	2	NA	3	5	2.0	0.9	0.3	0.9
Total Rape/Sexual Assault (N=2471)	8	18	16	29 ^d	11.7 ^g	8.4	1.2	1.7
Lifetime Total Rape, Sexual Abuse or Assault^e (N=2464)	456			456	184.5			

^a ICVS adjusted by population to comparable to NCVS by using 2.67 persons per household and completed (Actual) victimizations only.

^b NCVS stands for the National Crime Victimization Survey. These specific data are taken from the Bureau of Justice Statistics NCVS website "Criminal Victimization 1999," by Rennison 2000. <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/pub>.

^c As the attempt offenses are a subset of the threat offenses, this figure reflects the addition of the threat and actual categories. The NCVS sexual assault rate includes only completed sexual assaults, whereas the Idaho rates for 1999 and 2000 also include attempted and threatened sexual assault.

^d This number includes the actual rapes and sexual assaults, the threatened sexual assaults and the attempted rapes, not the attempted sexual assaults as they were a subset of the threatened sexual assaults.

^e The exact question asked was as follows: "Please forgive the personal nature of this question, but in your lifetime have you or a household member EVER been raped, sexually abused or assaulted?"

The lifetime total for rape, sexual abuse and assault question was first asked in the 2000 survey administration. Therefore, there is no basis for comparison for the rate of 184.5 victimizations per 1,000 households provided in the National Violence Against Women (NVAW) study. NVAW does, however, provide some context for this finding (Tjaden and Thoennes 1998). In that national telephone survey of 16,000 men and women from 1995 to 1996, about 18% of women and 3% of men had experienced an attempted or completed rape as a child or as an adult (unfortunately, the researchers did not ask about sexual assault). This 18% figure for lifetime victimization via rape/attempted rape in the NVAW study is identical to the 18% figure for Idaho respondents, although our data does include sexual assault offenses. Unfortunately, this is a broad question involving any member of the household, and does not allow for one-to-one comparison with NVAW rates.

Women are most likely to disclose this type of victimization; the ICVS tool interviewed 77.6% female respondents and 22.3% male respondents. These percentages do not reflect that 22.3% of men experienced rape in their lifetime, as previously stated; however, in each interview the respondent acted as proxy for all members in the household.

Idaho citizens (particularly women) are just as likely to experience sexual victimization as other citizens across the country. The five year trend data on Idaho police reports indicate that forcible rape reporting has increased steadily from 1995 to 1999 (recall that these figures do not account for population changes) and increased by 11.5% between 1998 and 1999 (ISP Bureau of Criminal Investigation 2000). Some of the increased reporting may be attributed to an increased awareness, improved police practices, or a general willingness of victims to report. UCR and NCVS data all indicate that this is one of the few crimes that defy the general trend of decreases in serious crime. The best available data indicate that sexual assaults and rape offenses continue to increase in Idaho and across the nation.

As is typical for sexual victimization, the reporting of such crimes is low (see Table 15a). Forty percent of the victims did not report this offense to the police.

The majority of the sexual assaults and rapes occurred in the current town of the household (60.0% — see Table 15b). The respondents indicated that there were only a few who sought or felt they needed medical care, but the cost of this crime was high (at an average of \$2,400) for the two respondents who attached a cost to the nine times the five respondents described occurrence of the offense.

As indicated in Table 15c, sexual assault and rape offenders were predominately male (91.7%), adult (mean age of 20.4), white (80.0%) or Hispanic (20%), and were recognizable to a member of the victim's household (71.4%). Of the five respondents who had information on the offender, three thought that the offender had been drinking at the time of the offense. Victims of sexual assault or rape crimes tended to be female (80.0%), white (100%) and young (mean age of 22.2) (see Table 15d).

Table 15a. Violent Crimes: Sexual Assault and Rape Reporting

Type of Crime	Reported to Police	
	(n)	Percent
Sexual Assault and Rape^a		
YES	(3)	60.0
NO	(2)	40.0

^a In the 2000 survey administration the question on reporting was asked as a follow-up to the question on the number of times the rape or sexual assault occurred or was attempted. Unfortunately, this format excluded those who were threatened with sexual assault and elicited 2 no answers. Number of responses were not adequate for statistically significant findings.

Table 15b. Violent Crimes: Sexual Assault and Rape Crime Characteristics

Crime Characteristics	Violent Crime	
	(n)	Percent
Current Town		
Yes	(3)	87.8
No	(2)	12.2
Number Received Medical Assistance	(2)	
Cost		
N	2	
Mean	\$2,400.00	

Table 15c. Violent Crimes: Sexual Assault^a and Rape Offender Characteristics

Offender Characteristics	Sexual Assault	
	(n)	Percent
Number of Offenders	12	
Recognize Offenders		
Yes	(5)	71.4
No	(2)	28.6
Offender Gender		
Male	(11)	91.7
Female	(1)	8.3
Offender Age		
N	5	
Mean	20.4	
Standard Deviation	2.5	
Offender Race/Ethnicity		
White	(4)	80.0
Hispanic	(1)	20.0
Offender Drinking/On Drugs		
Drinking	(3)	60.0
Drugs		
Both		
Unknown Intoxicant		
No Intoxicant	(1)	20.0
Don't Know	(1)	20.0

^a Including unwanted touching.

Table 15d. Violent Crimes: Sexual Assault^a and Rape Victim Characteristics

Victim Characteristics	Sexual Assault	
	(n)	Percent
Number of Victims	5	
Respondent Victim		
Yes	(3)	50.0
No	(3)	50.0
Unsure	(1)	
Victim Gender		
Male	(1)	20.0
Female	(4)	80.0
Victim Age		
N	5	
Mean	22.2	
Standard Deviation	10.3	
Victim Race/Ethnicity		
White	(5)	100.0

^a Including unwanted touching.

Murder

Murder is not only one of the most heinous violent crimes, but it is also one of the most rare. The rate of murder per 1,000 households from the 2000 survey is nonexistent and for the 1999 and 1997 surveys it is also rather small at 1.9 and 2.4, respectively (see Table 16). When one considers that there were only 26 murders reported in Idaho during 1999 which represents a rate of .022 per 1000 people not (ISP Bureau of Criminal Investigation 2000), it is reasonable that a survey of 2,489 Idaho citizens may not disclose any victims of this type of crime. We can also compare data from 1998 to 1999 and clearly state that reported murders were also down by 27.8% (ISP Bureau of Criminal Investigation 2000). This decrease is further reinforced by the Idaho UCR five year trend data that indicates a 45% reduction in reported murders since 1995.

The 2000 rate for threatened and attempted murders indicates a substantial increase from the 1999 rates. Although the rate for total murder related crime in the 2000 survey was down from the 1999 rate (see Table 16).

Table 16. Violent Crimes: Murder^a

Crime Type	Actual	Rates per 1,000 households		
		2000	1999	1997 ^b
Threat (N=2432)	25	10.3	10.2	
Attempt^c (N=2489)	13	5.2	3.7	
Murder (N=2489)	0	0	1.9	2.4
Total Murder Related Crime (N=2489)	38	15.5	15.8	

^a The NCVS doesn't include data on persons murdered in the United States. The Uniform Crime Reports for 1997 would indicate that 6.8 murders occurred per 100,000 inhabitants of the U.S.

^b These figures are taken from the final report of the first statewide victimization survey (Crank, Stohr, Bissey, Jones, Musser and Badger 1997). For methodological reasons the same questions were not asked the second year of the survey administration. Therefore, comparison of these rates between years must be viewed with some caution. Also note that the sample size for the three years of the survey administration differed each year (it was 1682 in 1997, 1076 in 1999 and 2489 in 2000).

^c Both the attempt and the actual murder offense were only asked of those respondents who indicated that a household member had been threatened with murder.

Crime Among Intimates

Child Abuse

Respondents with children residing in the household were asked “In the past year did anyone, including neighbors, friends, baby sitters, relatives, household members, or any others, subject any children in the household to the following behaviors...?”. There were 487 incidents reported among the subcategories of neglect (20), physical harm (30), touching and sexually offensive behavior (15), other sexual abuse (7), sexually explicit materials or acts (96), and exposure to sexually offensive behavior on the internet (89) and TV (230) (see Table 17). Clearly, exposure to sexual materials constituted the greatest number of offenses and for some of these respondents, X or R rated materials (including movies) available on TV or the Internet, fit the respondent’s definition of abuse.

If “exposure to sexual materials” category is extracted from the reported incidents, the number and rate of offenses for crimes against children would still appear rather high at 48.5 per 1,000 households. One factor to take into consideration is the fact that the majority of children abused or neglected experienced multiple incidents of abuse and several different types of abuse. The total number of children victimized was 37, representing a rate of 24.9 of 1,000 for households or 14.9 for all households in general.

Further analysis suggests that these rates are somewhat inflated when households figures are used. Calculating victimization rates based on total children covered by the survey (2,485) provides a rate of 14.9 per every 1,000 Idaho children that are sexually abused/neglected.

Table 17. Child Abuse

Offense Type	Total	2000 Rates per 1,000 households		1999 Rates per 1,000 households	
		With Children in Household	All Households	With Children in Household	All Households
n=2484 All households n=1485 (with children in the home)					
“In the past year did anyone, including neighbors, friends, baby sitters, relatives, household members, or any others, subject any children in the household to the following behaviors...”					
a) “...neglect to meet their needs for food, drink, shelter, safety, supervision, or a clean environment for a period of several hours or more?” (n=1482)	20	13.5	8.1	14.6	6.5
b) “...hit, push, kick, grab or shake them, or otherwise physically harm them?” (n=1481)	30	20.3	12.1	18.8	8.4
c) “...any touching and/or sexually offensive behavior directed toward children in the household?” (n=1482)	15	10.1	6.0	8.3	3.7
d) “...have any of the children in the household been subjected to any other type of sexual abuse?” (n=1476)	7	4.7	2.8	4.2	1.9
e) “...children exposed to sexually explicit materials or acts (n=1439)	96	66.7	36.6	40.1	17.7
f) “...children exposed to sexually explicit materials through the internet?”(asked in 2000 only) (n=1429)	89	62.3	35.8		
g) “...children exposed to sexually explicit materials through television?”(asked in 2000 only) (n=1398)	230	164.5	92.6		
Total Child Abuse (n=1485)	487	342.1	194.1		
Total Child Abuse (excluding internet and TV exposure to sexually explicit materials) (n=1485)	72	48.5	29.0	45.9	20.5

Given the difficulty of securing child abuse data due to sensitivity and other issues, it is worth noting that the rates are comparable with the 1999 ICVS. In the case of neglect, physical abuse, touching or sexually offensive behavior and other sexual abuse, the rate for 1999 is within two points of the rate for 2000.

The 37 children subjected to the abuse suffered 156 instances of physical abuse or neglect and 57 instances of sexual abuse (see Table 17a). In the case of sexual abuse, most of the time the abuse was reported to the police, although this wasn't as true for physical abuse and neglect. The reasons given for not reporting included the abuse being considered too small or not serious, that it had been reported at school, and for a number of other reasons. According to the respondent, the people who tended to report the abuse were either the respondent or another family member. The respondent also indicated that at times the police did nothing when the offense was reported, that the abuser was arrested in three cases involving sexual abuse or that something else happened.

Failure to report such crimes, of course, is quite common. Finkelhor and his colleagues (1990) found in their analysis of data taken from a national telephone survey done in 1985, that a history of childhood sexual abuse was disclosed by 27% of the women and 16% of the men. Furthermore, 33% of those women and 42% of those men never told anyone about their sexual victimization, let alone the police. Of course, the stigma associated with abuse, particularly sexual abuse committed by a family member, is a burden that victims or offenders may be unlikely to reveal to anyone, let alone an interviewer over the phone. We expect underreporting of abuse to the police or to our interviewers, especially when the abuse is of sexual nature. It is the norm among respondent households and that the reports of abuse revealed in these data may only represent the tip of the iceberg in terms of the prevalence of child abuse in our survey sample in any given year.

As indicated in Table 17b, the child abuse offenders tended to be young (mid-twenties), but with ages ranging from the very young (age 6) to middle age (50), white, and male (though quite a few physical abuse and neglect offenders were female).

Table 17a. Child Abuse: Offense and Reporting Characteristics

Type of Offense	Physical Abuse/Neglect		Sexual Abuse	
	(n)	Percent	(n)	Percent
Number of Children Abused/Neglected	37		18	
How Many Times Physically Abused / Neglected			How Many Times Sexually Abused	
N	156		57	
Mean	4.2		3.1	
Times Abused Before Reported				
N (13 responses)	27		50 (9 responses)	
Mean	2.1		5.5	
Reported to the Police?				
Yes	(16)	43.2	(14)	66.7
No	(20)	54.1	(7)	33.3
Unsure	(1)	2.7		
Why Not Reported to the Police?				
Fear that	(1)	5.5		
Worried about what others would think	(1)	5.5	(1)	16.7
Reported to the school	(4)	22.2	(3)	50.0
Discouraged by family	(1)	5.5		
Too small/not serious	(7)	38.9	(1)	16.7
Other reason	(4)	22.2	(2)	33.3
Who Called Police?				
Respondent	(6)	40.0	(3)	21.4
Child			(1)	7.1
Other Family Member	(4)	26.7	(6)	42.8
Friend	(1)	6.7		
School	(2)	13.3		
Other	(2)	13.3	(4)	28.6
What Happened When Reported?				
Police did nothing	(5)	38.5	(3)	21.4
Police did not respond	(1)	7.7		
Abuser arrested			(3)	21.4
Abuser removed temporarily	(2)	15.4	(1)	7.1
Other	(5)	38.5	(7)	50.0

Table 17b. Child Abuse: Offender Characteristics

Offender Characteristics	Physical Abuse/ Neglect		Sexual Abuse	
	(n)	Percent	(n)	Percent
Same Offender Each Time				
Yes	(31)	91.2	(15)	83.3
No	(3)	8.8	(3)	16.7
Offender Age				
N	26		13	
Mean	28		25.5	
Standard Deviation	13.7		13.2	
Range	6-50		5-45	
Offender Race/Ethnicity				
White	(21)	80.8	(13)	86.7
Asian/Pacific Island	(1)	3.8	(1)	6.7
American Indian	(2)	7.7		
Hispanic	(2)	7.7	(1)	6.7
Offender Gender				
Male	(31)	60.8	(17)	85.0
Female	(20)	39.2	(3)	15.0
Offender Relationship to the Victim/Respondent				
Mother	(4)	14.3		
Father	(4)	14.3	(3)	23.1
Stepfather	(1)	3.6		
Son	(1)	3.6		
Stepson	(1)	3.6		
Cousin			(1)	7.7
Stranger	(1)	3.6	(1)	7.7
Neighbor	(2)	7.1	(2)	15.4
Acquaintance	(8)	28.6	(3)	23.1
Friend	(3)	10.7	(2)	15.4
Other	(3)	10.7	(1)	7.7
Offender Using Alcohol or Drugs				
Alcohol	(1)	3.4		
Drugs	(1)	3.4		
Both	(1)	3.4		
Unknown Intoxicant			(1)	7.7
None	(24)	82.8	(9)	69.2
Don't Know	(2)	6.9	(3)	23.1

When the offense was physical abuse or neglect there were a greater number of offenders within the family unit than when the offense was sexual in nature. Again, we suspect there would be more underreporting of sexual offenses committed by family members. Most of the offenders were not reported to be using drugs or alcohol at the time of the offense.

Their victims tended to be male when the offense was physical abuse or neglect, and female when the offense was sexual abuse (see Table 17c). The average age of the child victim was quite young, at mean age of approximately nine years for both types of offenses, with an age range of 1 to 18 for physical abuse and neglect and 4 to 16 for sexual abuse. Male children (54.7%) were subjects of more physical abuse/neglect than females (45.3). Female children (62.5%) experienced more sexual abuse victimization than males (37.5%).

Table 17c. Child Abuse: Victim Characteristics

Victim Characteristics	Physical Abuse/ Neglect		Sexual Abuse	
	(n)	Percent	(n)	Percent
Victim Age				
N	53		21	
Mean	8.9		9.5	
Range	1-18		4-16	
Victim Gender				
Male	(29)	54.7	(9)	37.5
Female	(24)	45.3	(15)	62.5

Domestic Violence

The figures presented in the domestic violence tables (see Tables 18 – 18e) provide some sense of the extent of violence that occurs between married couples and those living together. In the National Violence Against Women Survey, Tjaden and Thoennes (1998:2) found that “Women experience significantly more partner violence than men: 25 percent of surveyed women, compared with 8 percent of surveyed men, said they were raped and/or physically assaulted by a current or former spouse, cohabiting partner, or date in their lifetime; 1.5 percent of surveyed women and 0.9 percent of surveyed men said they were raped and/or physically assaulted by such a perpetrator in the previous 12 months”.

Survey data indicates that 2.4% of surveyed men were victims of domestic violence during the last 12 months; similarly, 4.0% of surveyed women disclosed domestic violence victimization during the same period. With the exception of emotional abuse (whose rate remained somewhat stable), the rate of domestic violence increased in Idaho from 1999 to 2000 (see Table 18). As this is only the second year that we have asked domestic violence questions in the survey, we are reticent to draw any conclusions about patterns or trends.

There were 107 types of incidents of domestic violence perpetrated on 83 victims identified by our survey respondents (see Table 18e). Victims were asked to identify the number of times domestic violence occurred in the last year; 291 incidents were reported by 81 respondents (mean of 3.6 incidents per those households).

Table 18. Domestic Violence

Offense Type	Total	2000 Domestic Violence Rates		1999 Domestic Violence Rates	
		per 1,000 persons married or living together	per 1,000 households	per 1,000 persons married or living together	per 1,000 households
N		1921	2489	731	1076
In the past 12 months has your spouse or significant other...					
a) ...abused you physically by hitting, pushing, shoving or choking?	11	5.7	4.4	2.7	1.9
b) ...abused you sexually through forced or unwanted sex?	5	2.6	2.0	0.0	0.0
c) ...abused you emotionally, examples would include name - calling or belittling treatment?	64	33.5	25.7	35.6	24.2
d) In the past 12 months have you been followed, harassed, or stalked by a former spouse or significant other?	27	14.1	10.9	8.2	5.6
Total Domestic Violence	107	55.9	43.0	46.5	31.7

Notably, two of those respondents indicated that the abuse had occurred in their household 100 times in the last year. Two additional respondents indicated that they had been abused 300 or 365 times in the last year. These 4 respondents were not considered in the analysis, since they can greatly distort the averages. However, if included, the number of domestic violence incidents would be 1,196 for 85 respondents, for an average of 14.1 incidents per victim.

As indicated in Table 18a, most of the domestic violence was not reported to the police, primarily because the victim reported: “the abuse was not that bad,” “there was some other reason (for not reporting),” or “it was a private matter.” A few respondents to this question also noted that they didn’t report because: “the police wouldn’t do anything,” “the abuse would get worse,” or “the abuse was my fault.”

Respondents were asked what type of action was taken by police when the abuse was reported: “the police did nothing,” “the police calmed down the

Table 18b. Domestic Violence: Offense Characteristics

Crime Characteristics	2000 Domestic Violence		1999 Domestic Violence	
	(n)	Percent	(n)	Percent
County				
Urban ^a	(63)	75.9	(22)	64.7
Rural	(20)	24.1	(12)	35.3
Marital Status				
N= 83				
Married	(51)	61.4		
Living W/Significant Other	(7)	8.4		
Single, Never Married	(2)	2.4		
Separated	(5)	6		
Divorced	(18)	21.7		
Children Present During Abuse				
Yes	(22)	28.2	(10)	34.5
No	(56)	71.8	(19)	65.5

^a Urban counties included the seven most densely populated counties in the state (Ada, Bannock, Bingham, Bonneville, Canyon, Kootenai and Twin Falls), which comprise approximately 62% of the Idaho population. All other (37) counties in Idaho were classified as rural.
Percentages will not always sum to 100 because of rounding.

Table 18a. Domestic Violence : Incidence and Reporting Characteristics

Incidence and Reporting	2000 Domestic Violence		1999 Domestic Violence	
	(n)	Percent	(n)	Percent
Report Offense to Police				
Yes all	(6)	8.5	(1)	3.7
Yes some	(6)	8.5	(2)	7.4
No	(59)	83.1	(24)	88.9
What Happened When Officer Responded				
Police did nothing	(3)	23.1		
Police calmed down parties	(2)	15.4		
Abuser was arrested	(1)	7.7		
Abuser received warning	(1)	7.7		
Abuser received restraining order	(1)	7.7		
Victim lied to police about abuse	(1)	7.7		
Victim given advice	(1)	7.7		
Incident recorded	(1)	7.7		
Other result of reporting	(2)	15.4		
Rate Police Services				
1 Poor	(2)	15.4	(1)	33.3
2 Below Average				
3 Average	(4)	30.8	(1)	33.3
4 Above Average	(3)	23.1	(1)	33.3
5 Excellent	(4)	30.8		
Total number of times abuse happen^a				
N=81				
Mean		3.6		
Number Times Abuse Happened				
Before Police Were Called (8 responses)		23		9
Mean		2.9		3.0
Who Called the Police?				
Child				
Family Member				
Neighbor	(2)	15.4		
Respondent	(9)	69.2	(2)	50.0
Other Person	(2)	15.4	(2)	50.0
Why Not Reported to Police				
Abuse would get worse	(2)	3.2	(1)	3.4
Abuse not that bad	(26)	41.3	(10)	34.5
Abuse my fault	(1)	1.6	(1)	3.4
Police wouldn't do anything	(5)	7.9	(1)	3.4
Private matter	(7)	11.1	(7)	24.1
Other reason	(22)	34.9	(9)	31.0

parties,” or there was some other result of the reporting. Of the 13 respondents who rated the police services provided, 7 gave them a good to excellent score, while 4 gave them a neutral and 2 gave them a poor score (see Table 18a).

The incidence of domestic violence in rural and urban areas was different. Urban households experienced slightly more victimization than rural counties. This finding fits within the conventional criminality, which is

more likely to be proportionally higher in urban areas. In 28% of instances of domestic violence children were present at the time the abuse occurred (see Table 18b).

In the majority of instances of domestic violence, no action was taken ((53.8%) by the household regarding the abuse (although 19.2% did seek private counseling and about 7% of the couples separated or divorced). The abuser was still residing in the household (50.6%) and the abuser received no counseling (57.7%) (see Table 18c). Interestingly enough, most of the survey respondents are aware of domestic violence or sexual assault service programs in their area (72.8%), although only 8.4% of victims of domestic violence received help from such a program during the last 12 months. Of those who have at some point received such assistance, 62.5% rated the program as "very supportive."

Domestic Violence offenders were identified as typically middle aged (mean=43.8), overwhelmingly white (89.2%), usually male (74.4%) and often under the influence of alcohol or other drugs at the time of the offense (41.6%). (see Table 18d). Although these might be the normative characteristics of an offender, we should point out that the age of offenders ranged from young adult (21) to elderly (80), and that women were identified as offenders by fully 25.6% of the households.

The victims of domestic violence were generally middle aged (mean 41.8), between 19 and 74 years old, and white (91.3%). Native American women experienced high levels of domestic violence victimization in proportion to incidence in the population. Victims were predominantly females (71.1%), although males (28.9%) also experienced this type of abuse.

Table 18c. Domestic Violence: Response to Abuse, Current Status and Programming

Response and Programming	2000 Domestic Violence		1999 Domestic Violence	
	(n)	Percent	(n)	Percent
Response to Abuse				
Sought Medical Attention	(1)	1.3	(1)	3.4
Sought Private Counseling	(15)	19.2	(3)	10.3
Sought Clergy Counseling	(1)	1.3		
Obtained Protection Order	(1)	1.3	(1)	3.4
Went to a Shelter			(1)	3.4
Separated or Divorced	(6)	7.7	(5)	17.2
No Action Taken	(42)	53.8	(11)	37.9
Other Action Taken	(12)	15.4	(7)	24.1
Currently Residing With Abuser				
Yes	(41)	50.6	(17)	60.7
No	(40)	49.4	(11)	39.3
Abuser Received Counseling				
Yes	(22)	28.2	(8)	27.6
No	(45)	57.7	(19)	65.5
Unsure	(11)	14.1	(2)	6.9
Are you aware of any Domestic Violence or Sexual Assault Programs in your area?^a				
Yes	(59)	72.8	(18)	75.0
No	(22)	27.2	(6)	25.0
Have you received help from a program that assists or provides shelter to victims in Idaho?				
Yes	(7)	8.4	(2)	11.1
No	(76)	91.6	(16)	88.9
Rate Victim Programs				
1 - Poor	(4)	10.0	(1)	50.0
2				
3	(6)	15.0		
4	(5)	12.5		
5 - Very Supportive	(25)	62.5	(1)	50.0

^a In 1999 this question was worded differently: "Are you aware of Victim/Witness, Domestic Violence Programs, or Sexual Assault Programs in your area that you could contact or where you could go when you need help or services as a victim of a crime?"

Percentages will not always add to 100 because of rounding.

Table 18d. Domestic Violence: Offender Characteristics

Offender Characteristics	Domestic Violence	
	(n)	Percent
Offender Age		
N	73	
Mean	43.8	
Standard Deviation	13.4	
Range	21-80	
Offender Race/Ethnicity		
White	(66)	89.2
African-American	(2)	2.7
Asian/Pacific Islander	(1)	1.4
American Indian	(2)	2.7
Multi-Racial	(1)	1.4
Hispanic	(2)	2.7
Offender Gender		
Male	(58)	74.4
Female	(20)	25.6
Offender Using Alcohol or Drugs		
Alcohol	(23)	29.3
Drugs	(1)	1.3
Both	(8)	10.4
None	(39)	50.6
Does Not Know	(6)	7.8

Percentages will not always add to 100 because of rounding.

Table 18e. Domestic Violence: Victim Characteristics

Victim Characteristics	Domestic Violence	
	(n)	Percent
Victim Age		
N=83		
Mean	41.8	
Range	19-74	
Victim Race/Ethnicity		
White	(73)	91.3
American Indian	(3)	3.8
Multi-Racial	(2)	2.5
Asian/Pacific Islander	(2)	2.5
Hispanic		
Victim Gender		
Male	(24)	28.9
Female	(59)	71.1

Sexual/Gender Harassment in the Workplace

Assessment of sexual harassment among a statewide working population is unusual in a study of this type. Typically, sexual and gender harassment studies are conducted among samples of specialized workplaces such as the military, business, public service workers and among workers in specific professions (Cayer and Schafer 1981; Crites and Hepperle 1988; Erdreich et al. 1995; Ford and McLaughlin 1989; Martin 1989; Maypole 1986; Morash and Haarr 1995; Newell, Rosenfeld and Culbertson 1995; Rosell, Miller and Barber 1995; Stohr et al. 1998).

ICVS respondents were screened based on whether they worked outside of the home, and then asked if they or a member of their household had been the victim of gender or sexual harassment. 102 respondents indicated that they had been the victim of gender or sexual harassment (see Table 19).

Of the 1,642 household respondents who indicated they worked outside of the home, 102 or a rate of 62.1 per 1,000 households experienced some form of gender or sexual harassment in the last year. Most of the harassment

Table 19. Sexual Harassment in the Workplace

Offense Type	(n)	Percent	2000 Sexual Harassment Rates		1999 Sexual Harassment Rates	
			per 1,000 persons	per 1,000 households	per 1,000 persons	per 1,000 households
N						
Respondent Working Outside Home			1642		801	
Total Households contacted				2489		1076
"In the past 12 months have you experienced any sexual or gender offensive behavior in the workplace?"						
Yes	102 ^a		62.1	41.0	79.9	59.5
"...were you told unwelcome obscene jokes by someone at the workplace?"						
	(62)	22.9	37.8	24.9	46.2	34.4
"...were you subjected to unwelcome obscene language by someone in the workplace?"						
	(58)	21.5	35.3	23.3		
"...were you exposed to a display of offensive sexually explicit materials while on the job?"						
	(17)	6.3	10.4	6.8	12.5	9.3
"...were you asked unwelcome questions about dating and/or sexual behavior by someone on the job?"						
	(31)	11.5	18.9	12.5	23.7	17.7
"...did someone at the workplace tell stories or jokes that tend to 'put down' women or men?"						
	(72)	26.7	43.8	28.9	53.7	40.0
"...were you asked to exchange sexual favors to keep a job, advance in a job or to gain other job related benefits?"						
	(0)				2.5	1.9
"...were you subjected to unwelcome touching such as hugs, arms around the shoulder, kissing, etc., by someone at your workplace?"						
	(23)	8.5	14.0	9.2	12.5	9.3
"...were you subjected to unwelcome touching in sexually sensitive places (e.g. breasts, buttocks or genital areas) while on the job?"						
	(6)	2.2	3.7	2.4	2.5	1.9
"...were you forced either physically or emotionally to engage in an unwelcome sex act with someone at your workplace?"						
	(1)	0.4	0.6	0.4	0	0
Total Harassment	270 ^b		226.6	149.4	233.5	174.0
How Many Times	2503 ^c					

^a These numbers and percentages represent the types of harassment experienced by the 102 respondents who indicated they had been victimized by some form of sexual or gender harassment in the last year.

^b This number represents the total types of harassment that were experienced by those 102 persons who experienced sexual or gender harassment in the workplace last year.

^c This was the total number of occurrences of harassment reported by 81 of the respondents (20 respondents answered did not know and one gave no answer), six of whom indicated that the harassment occurred over 100 times last year.

was of the verbal or visual type (88.9%) and some of this was directed at the gender of the victim, rather than having a "sexual" context *per se*. For instance, 26.7% of the harassment experienced was "jokes that put down women or men," and 22.9% was "unwelcome obscene jokes." Victims were also subjected to "unwelcome questions about dating" (11.5%) and "offensive sexually explicit materials" (6.3%).

When comparing the 1999 and 2000 data, there were decreases in almost all of the less serious forms of harassment. Unfortunately, this trend was reversed when the more egregious, but much more rare, behaviors such as "unwelcome touching such as hugs, arms around the shoulder, kissing, etc.," "unwelcome touching in sexually sensitive places..." and "forced either physically or emotionally to engage in an unwelcome sex act" were reported.

Since behaviors and crimes that are exhibited less frequently in a population are more likely to be discernible in larger sampling sizes, we expect that increasing our sample size by roughly 150% from the 1999 survey may have affected these rates.

Twenty-three respondents (8.5%) indicated that the harassment involved “unwelcome touching,” while another 2.2% noted that they had been subjected to “unwelcome touching in sensitive places”. No respondents to this year’s survey reported that they were required to “exchange sexual favors” to retain their job or to gain job benefits. One respondent did report that he/she was “forced either physically or emotionally to engage in an unwelcome sex act” with someone at their workplace (rate of 0.4 per every 1,000 working people).

Incredibly, 270 types of gender or sexual harassment were identified by the victim/respondents (see Table 19). At least 2,503 instances of sexual or gender harassment were identified or the unwelcome harassment occurred at least 1524.4 times per thousand working person households. These figures indicate that it is likely that a sizable number of Idaho households are experiencing multiple types of this kind of harassment.

In Table 19a, most of victims were employed full time (84.3%), in permanent jobs (90.1%) in white collar (42.0%), blue collar (25.0%) or professional level (23.0%) jobs in workplaces. There were equal numbers of males and females on the staff (44.6%), but with slightly more males (31.7%) than females (23.8%).

The vast majority of these victims of gender or sexual harassment did not file a formal complaint (76.0%), nor was the harassment reported to anyone (64.9%). Respondents not filing a formal complaint stated that the matter as “too trivial or small” (26.0%) or that they “handled it” themselves (20.0%) (see Table 19a). In a few instances, the victim didn’t report the behavior because they “didn’t want to involve others” (8.0%), they felt “nothing could be done” (8.0%), or there was “fear of retaliation” (6.0%), among other reasons.

Offenders were more likely to be male (89.2%), with a mean age of 38.5 and a range across the adult spectrum (18-78), white (93.3%) and Hispanic (6.7%), and are most likely to be an equal co-worker (58.8%) or a supervisor (22.7%) (see Table 19b). Victims of these offenses were more likely to be female (72.5%), mean age 38.2 with range from 18 to 64 years and are overwhelmingly white (96.9%) (see Table 19c).

Table 19a. Sexual Harassment: Workplace and Harassment Characteristics

Workplace and Harassment Characteristics	Sexual Harassment	
	(n)	Percent
Employment Status		
Full	(86)	84.3
Part-time	(14)	13.7
Permanent or Temporary?		
Permanent	(91)	90.1
Temporary	(10)	9.9
Occupation when harassed		
Professional	(23)	23.0
Blue Collar	(25)	25.0
White Collar	(42)	42.0
Executive	(7)	7.0
Student	(1)	1.0
Military	(2)	2.0
Gender of Most Staff in Workplace		
Mostly Males	(32)	31.7
Mostly Females	(24)	23.8
Equal Numbers	(45)	44.6
Formal Complaint Filed		
Yes	(24)	24.0
No	(76)	76.0
Harassment Reported		
Yes	(14)	18.4
No	(50)	65.8
Nothing to report	(12)	15.8
Why Wasn't Harassment Reported?		
Fear of retaliation	(3)	6.0
Too trivial or small a matter	(13)	26.0
Relationship with the offender	(2)	4.0
Didn't want to involve others	(4)	8.0
System wouldn't take it seriously	(3)	6.0
Nothing could be done	(4)	8.0
Didn't know how to report it	(2)	4.0
Quit job	(1)	1.9
Handled it myself	(10)	20.0
Other reason	(8)	16.0

Table 19b. Sexual Harassment: Offender Characteristics

Offender Characteristics	Sexual Harassment	
	(n)	Percent
Number of Offenders^a	199	
Offender Gender		
Male	(182)	89.2
Female	(22)	10.8
Offender Age		
Mean	38.5	
Range	18-78	
Offender Race/Ethnicity		
White	(111)	93.3
Hispanic	(8)	6.7
Relationship to Offender		
Supervisor/Owner/Boss	(22)	22.7
Equal Co-Worker	(57)	58.8
Subordinate/		
Victim's Employee	(5)	5.2
Client Harassed	(4)	4.1
Buyer	(2)	2.1
Other Relationship	(7)	7.2

^a One victim indicated that there were 50 offenders and they were all male.

Table 19c. Sexual Harassment: Victim Characteristics

Victim Characteristics	Sexual Harassment	
	(n)	Percent
Number of Victims	102	
Victim Age		
Mean	38.2	
Range	18-64	
Victim Gender		
Male	(28)	27.5
Female	(74)	72.5
Victim Race/Ethnicity		
White	(95)	96.9
Hispanic	(1)	1.0
Asian/Pacific Islander	(1)	1.0
Multi-racial	(1)	1.0

^a Excluding four respondents who indicated abuse occurred from 100 to 360 times during the year.

Percentages will not always add to 100 because of rounding.

Hate Crimes

The 2000 ICVS represents the first time respondents were asked about hate crimes. Survey questions included those related to the perception of Idahoans regarding their vulnerability to hate crimes, why respondents thought they would be victimized by a hate crime, and whether they had been a hate crime victim in the past.

As indicated in Table 20, 227 or 9.2% of the sample respondents felt that they were vulnerable to a hate crime. Reasons for vulnerability included, 1. Race (22.1%), 2. Religion (17.3%), 3. Job/Occupation (9.6%), 4. Ethnicity (6.3%), 5. Political Opinions (4.8%), 6. Gender & Age (3.4%), and 7. Sexual orientation (2.9%).

About 5% of our respondents felt that they had been an actual victim of a hate crime at some point in their lives. As many as 49 people or 38.6% chose race as the reason for their hate crime victimization, followed by religion (14.1%), job/occupation (11.0%), personal relations (9.5%) gender (4.7%) and ethnicity (3.9%) among other reasons.

The typical victim of hate crime is in the age range of 18-88, with an average age of 45.3 years. As previously mentioned, race was the main factor causing people to fear hate crimes. Within the bounds of race and ethnicity, the majority of people who experienced hate crimes were white (84.3%), although the victimization rate is low

compared to its share of population. All other races reported a higher level of victimization relative to total population. Particularly, Hispanics (9.5%) and Native Americans (5.5%) reported high rates of hate crimes. In 1999, Hispanics represented 7.4% of the population and the survey sample accounted for only 2.3% of them. The same applies to Native Americans, who represent 1.0% of the population and experienced over 5% of total hate crime victimization.

Table 20. Hate Crimes: Vulnerability, Victimization and Explanations

Crime Characteristics	(n)	Percent	Rate per 1,000 persons
"Do you feel that you are vulnerable to a hate crime?"			
(n=2481)			
Yes	(227)	9.2	91.5
No	(2229)	89.8	
Unsure	(25)	1.0	
"Why do you feel that you are vulnerable to a hate crime?"			
(n=208)			
Race	(46)	22.1	
Ethnicity	(13)	6.3	
Gender	(7)	3.4	
Sexual Orientation	(6)	2.9	
Religion	(36)	17.3	
Age	(7)	3.4	
Job/Occupation	(20)	9.6	
Political Opinions	(10)	4.8	
Combination of factors	(6)	2.9	
Other*	(57)	27.4	
"Do you feel you have ever been the victim of a hate crime?"			
(n=2472)			
Yes	(132)	5.3	53.4
No	(2340)	94.7	
"Were you the victim of a hate crime primarily because of your..."			
(n=127)			
Race	(49)	38.6	
Ethnicity	(5)	3.9	
Gender	(6)	4.7	
Religion	(18)	14.1	
Age	(1)	0.8	
Political Opinions	(2)	1.6	
Family/Spouse	(5)	3.9	
Personal Relations	(12)	9.5	
Job/Occupations	(14)	11.0	
Other*	(15)	11.8	

* Other is the combination of several independent reasons. Percentages will not always add to 100 because of rounding.

Table 20a. Hate Crimes: Victim Characteristics

Victim Characteristics	Hate Crime	
	(n)	Percent
Gender*		
Male		57.1
Female		42.9
Age		
Mean	45.3	
Range	18-88	
Race and Ethnicity		
White/Caucasian	(107)	84.3
Asian/Pacific Islander	(2)	1.6
American Indian	(7)	5.5
Multi- Racial	(1)	0.8
Hispanic (any race)	(5)	7.9
Hispanic Origin		
Non Hispanic	(105)	90.5
Hispanic	(10)	9.5
Education		
Less than High School	(4)	3.0
High School	(23)	17.4
Trade School	(51)	38.6
Associate Degree	(13)	9.8
Bachelor Degree	(22)	16.7
Master's Degree	(15)	11.4
Doctorate Degree	(3)	2.3
Other	(1)	0.8

* Gender percentages based on relative population.

Percentages will not always add to 100 because of rounding

Perceptions of Crime and Police Services

Over two-thirds of the respondents to our survey (68.0%) indicated that they believed crime had increased in Idaho during the last year (see Table 21). This perception increased from 1999, when approximately one-half (52.3%) of respondents thought crime had increased. Another 32.2% thought it had stayed the same.

Crime is a difficult thing to measure because many people do not report crime to the police or anyone else. We do know the preeminent measure of national crime rates, the National Crime Victimization Survey, indicates that crime has decreased nationally over the course of the last several years (Rennison 2000). In addition, Idaho statewide police incident reports collected and aggregated by the Idaho State Police also indicate that crime, as per police reports, has for the most part consistently decreased in Idaho over the last five years (ISP Bureau of Criminal Investigation 2000).

Interestingly enough, when these perceptions of crime in the state are compared with perceptions of crime in the respondent's immediate area, there is a disjunction in perception. Only about 22% of the respondents felt that crime was increasing in the immediate area around their home, and about 78% indicated that it had stayed the same or decreased in the last year.

Certainly these perceptions of crime are reflected in the fact that most respondents (67.8%) knew or were acquainted with their neighbors (see Table 21). 87% of respondents felt safe walking alone during the day and 48.7% felt safe walking alone at night in their neighborhoods. Moreover, 81.5% felt safe or somewhat safe on Idaho highways.

Table 21. Perceptions of Crime and Safety in Idaho

Perceptions of Crime and Safety	2000		1999	
	(n)	Percent	(n)	Percent
Crime in Idaho				
Increased	(1406)	68.0	(562)	57.8
Decreased	(144)	7.0	(65)	6.7
Stayed the same	(517)	25.0	(346)	35.6
Crime in my area				
Increased	(508)	21.8	(423)	41.6
Decreased	(169)	7.3	(74)	7.3
Stayed the same	(1651)	70.9	(521)	51.1
Neighbors Known				
None of them	(41)	1.7		
Some of them	(758)	30.5		
Most of them	(1026)	41.3		
All of them	(658)	26.5		
DAY				
How safe do you feel				
Very Safe	(2162)	87.1		
Somewhat Safe	(294)	11.9		
Neither	(5)	0.2		
Somewhat Unsafe	(13)	0.5		
Very Unsafe	(7)	0.3		
NIGHT				
How safe do you feel				
Very Safe	(1196)	48.7		
Somewhat Safe	(839)	34.1		
Neither	(53)	2.2		
Somewhat Unsafe	(247)	10.0		
Very Unsafe	(123)	5.0		
HIGHWAY				
How safe do you feel				
Very Safe	(644)	26.2		
Somewhat Safe	(1359)	55.3		
Neither	(67)	2.7		
Somewhat Unsafe	(296)	12.1		
Very Unsafe	(90)	3.7		

Finally, most respondents (about 90%) providing information during administration of the last two surveys indicated that police services had either gotten better in the last year or had stayed the same (see Table 22).

Only about 10% of the respondents in both survey years were in agreement with the statement that police services in their communities had gotten worse. This perception of improved services is reinforced by the finding that about 61% of the respondents were very satisfied with the police and another 22% were somewhat satisfied. Forty percent (40%) of these same respondents had contact with a police officer for some reason. Those respondents (82.1%) who had no contact with police were somewhat to very satisfied with police services. City officers represented 59% of the contacts, while county deputies represented 26.4% of contacts.

Table 22. Perceptions of Police Services in Idaho

Perceptions of Police Services	2000		1999	
	(n)	Percent	(n)	Percent
Police Services				
Gotten Better	(580)	26.0	(239)	24.1
Stayed the same	(1424)	63.9	(651)	65.8
Gotten Worse	(226)	10.1	(100)	10.1
Satisfaction with the police				
Very Satisfied	(579)	60.9		
Somewhat Satisfied	(205)	21.5		
Neutral	(25)	2.6		
Somewhat Dissatisfied	(54)	5.7		
Very Dissatisfied	(92)	9.6		
Contact With the Police				
Yes	(973)	39.1		
No	(1514)	60.9		
Types of Agency Contact				
City Police	(582)	59.8		
County Sheriff	(256)	26.4		
State Police	(56)	5.8		
Other	(70)	7.2		
Unknown	(8)	0.8		

Percentages will not always add to 100 because of rounding.

Conclusions

Findings from this third administration of the Idaho Crime Victimization Survey provide us with a sense of the number and types of criminality experienced by Idahoans. Generally speaking (and given the methodological caveat that the questions vary from the first to the third survey and between the ICVS and the NCVS), it would appear that the amount of typical crime victimization has not increased at all, or substantially, between 1997 and 1999 in Idaho and is lower than the rates reported nationally. These twin findings are not unexpected given the findings reported by the NCVS and the Uniform Crime Report (ISP Bureau of Criminal Investigation 1999; 2000; Rennison 1999; 2000). In both the national (NCVS) and the Idaho (ISP) data sets, a pattern of decline in most crime victimization or offending is quite clear (Kurki 1999). Moreover, in the NCVS data the large urbanized cities – none of which really exist in Idaho – tend to experience more crime than smaller cities and less congested areas of the country.

Our own analysis of ICVS data would indicate that most typical index property and violent offenses are disproportionately concentrated in the seven more urbanized counties of Idaho.

We also found that the rates of reported child abuse and domestic violence increased from survey 1999 to 2000, except for sexual/gender harassment in the workplace that reflected a 3% rate decrease from 1999 to 2000.

Our initial collection of hate crime data should also give Idahoans pause in considering the impact of hate crimes in the state. **A significant number of Idahoans feel vulnerable to a hate crime.** Even though our sample underrepresents Hispanics and tends to overrepresent the middle class and older Idahoans, about 10% of households have at least one respondent who has the perception that they are “vulnerable” to a hate crime because of race (22.1%), religion (17.3%), or for some other reason. Of those who had experienced a hate crime in their lifetime, 43% of them thought it was their race or ethnicity that was the root cause for the offense to be committed. Clearly, this area of research bears further investigation to enable policymakers and citizens to better understand the nature of the problem, and to work toward reducing these types of offenses.

In future iterations of this survey we hope to continue to explore the nature and depth of crime in Idaho. We also plan to improve upon and expand the analysis so that our understanding and response to crime among Idahoans might be most effectively enhanced.

Conclusions:

- Property Crimes: Decreased over 1999 and tend to be focused in the most populated counties.
- Violent Crimes: Threaten or attempted murder is up – all other stays the same.
- Sexual Assault and Rape: Increased over 1999.
- Child Abuse: Abuse happens an average of 2.1 times before reported. Boys are physically abused and neglect while girls are sexually assaulted. Abuser is usually someone known to the victim.
- Domestic Violence: Increase in victimization, Native American Women are victimized at higher rates, males reported higher rates of domestic violence victimization than national average. Number of victims accessing shelters or other services is VERY low.
- Sexual/Gender Harassment in the workplace: Generally NOT reported.
- Hate Crimes: Race and ethnicities are main reasons for hate victimization. Males are victimized at higher rates than females.
- Idahoans feel safe.
- Police Services: Continually improve.

References

- Bachman, R. (1994) *Violence Against Women: A National Crime Victimization Survey Report*. U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- _____(1993) "Predicting the Reporting of Rape Victimization." *Criminal Justice and Behavior*. 20(3): 254-270.
- _____(1992) "Crime in Nonmetropolitan America: A National Accounting of Trends, Incidence Rates, and Idiosyncratic Vulnerabilities." *Rural Sociology*.57(4): 546-560.
- Bachman, R. and A. L. Coker (1995) "Police Involvement in Domestic Violence: The Interactive Effects of Victim Injury, Offender's History of Violence, and Race." *Violence and Victims*. 10(2): 91-106.
- Bachman, R. and L.E. Saltzman (1995) "Violence Against Women: Estimates from the Redesigned Survey." *Bureau of Justice Statistics: Special Report*. U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Cayer, N. J. and R.C. Schafer (1981) "Affirmative Action and Municipal Employees." *Social Science Quarterly*. 61: 487-494.
- Crank, J. P., Stohr, M. K., Bissey, M., Jones, L., Musser, B. and R. Badger (1997) *Crime in the Lives of Idahoans*. Final Report for the Idaho State Board of Education Grant. Boise, Idaho: Department of Criminal Justice Education.
- Craven, D. (1988) *Profiling Crime Victims: Victimization Trends and Victim Characteristics in Oregon From 1977 to 1985*. Salem, OR: Department of Justice.
- Crites, L.L. and W.L. Hepperle (Eds.) (1988) *Women, the Courts, and Equality*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Dodge, R.W. (1985) *Locating City, Suburban, and Rural Crime*. U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Erdreich, B.L., Slavet, B. S., & Amador, A. C. (1995) *Sexual Harassment in the Federal Workplace*. Washington, DC: U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board, Government Printing Office.
- Finkelhor, D., Hotaling, G., Lewis, I. A. and C. Smith (1990) "Sexual Abuse in a National Survey of Adult Men and Women: Prevalence, Characteristics, and Risk Factors." *Child Abuse and Neglect*. 14: 19-28.
- Ford, R.C. and F. McLaughlin (1989) "Sexual Harassment at Work: What is the Problem." *Akron Business and Economic Review*. 19: 305-319.
- Greenfield, L. A., Rand, M. R., Craven, D., Klaus, P. A., Perkins, C.A., Ringel, C., Warchol, G., Maston, C. and J. A. Fox (1998) *Violence by Intimates: Analysis of Data on Crimes by Current or Former Spouses, Boyfriends, and Girlfriends*. U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics. Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office.
- ISP Bureau of Criminal Investigation, R. (1999) *Crime in Idaho – 1998*. Department of Law Enforcement, Bureau of Criminal Identification, Uniform Crime Reporting Unit. Meridian, Idaho: Uniform Crime Reporting Unit.
- ISP Bureau of Criminal Investigation, R. (2000) *Crime in Idaho – 1999*. Idaho State Police, Bureau of Criminal Identification, Uniform Crime Reporting Unit. Meridian, Idaho: Uniform Crime Reporting Unit.

- Kurki, L. (1999) "U.S. Crime Rates Keep Falling." *Overcrowded Times*. 10(1): 1,6-10.
- LaFree, G. (1990) *Crime in the Lives of New Mexicans*. Unpublished Document.
- Lewis, R., Storkamp, D., Mickolich, Weber, Zumach, C., Powell, D. and M. and A. McKenney-Maki (1994) *Troubling Perceptions: 1993 Minnesota Crime Survey*. Minneapolis, MN: Minnesota Planning.
- Maltz, M. D. and M. W. Zawitz (1998) "Displaying Violent Crime Trends Using Estimates From the National Crime Victimization Survey." *Bureau of Justice Statistics – Technical Report*. blackstone.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/pub/dvctuex.htm.
- Martin, S. (1989) "Women On the Move?: A Report On the Status of Women in Policing." *Women and Criminal Justice*. 1(1): 21-40.
- Maypole, D. (1986) "Sexual Harassment of Social Workers at Work: Injustice Within?" *Social Work*. 31(1): 29-34.
- Media Monitor (1999) "Crime Slips to Number Three Spot in Television News Coverage in 1998." *Overcrowded Times*. 10(2): 4.
- Menard, S. (1987) "Short-term Trends in Crime and Delinquency: A Comparison of UCR, NCS, and Self-Report Data." *Justice Quarterly*. 4: 464.
- Messner, S. (1984) "The 'Dark Figure' and Composite Indicators of Crime: Some Empirical Explanations of Alternative Data Sources." *Journal of Criminal Justice*. 12: 435-444.
- Morash, M and R. N. Haarr (1995) "Gender, Workplace Problems, and Stress in Policing." *Justice Quarterly*. 12(1): 113-140.
- Newell, C. E., Rosenfeld, P., and A. L. Culbertson (1995) "Sexual Harassment Experiences and Equal Opportunity Perceptions of Navy Women." *Sex Roles*. 32(3/4): 159-168.
- Perkins, C. and P. Klaus (1996) *A National Crime Victim Survey: Criminal Victimization 1994*. U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice (1967) *The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Rand, M. (1998) "Criminal Victimization 1997 – Changes 1996-1997 With Trends 1993-97." *Bureau of Justice Statistics: National Crime Victimization Survey*. U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Rennison, C. M. (1999) "Criminal Victimization 1998 – Changes 1997-98 with Trends 1993-98." *Bureau of Justice Statistics: National Crime Victimization Survey*. U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Rennison, C. M. (2000) "Criminal Victimization 1999 – Changes 1998-99 with Trends 1993-99." *Bureau of Justice Statistics: National Crime Victimization Survey*. U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Rosell, E., Miller, K. and K. Barber (1995) "Firefighting Women and Sexual Harassment." *Public Personnel Management*. 24(3): 339-350.
- Sampson, R. J. (1986) "The Effects of Urbanization and Neighborhood Characteristics on Criminal Victimization." In Robert Figlio, Simon Hakim, and George Rengert (eds.), *Metropolitan Crime Patterns*, pp. 3-25. Monsey, NY: Criminal Justice Press.

- Shoemaker, D. J. and C. D. Bryant (1988) *Crime in Virginia*. An Unpublished Survey Conducted by the Department of Sociology and the Agricultural Experiment Station at Virginia Tech.
- Smith, B. L. and C. R. Huff (1982) "Crime in the Country: The Vulnerability and Victimization of Rural Citizens." *Journal of Criminal Justice*. 10(3): 271-82.
- Smith, M. D. and E. S. Kuchta (1993) "Trends in Violent Crime against Women, 1973-89." *Social Science Quarterly*. 74(1): 28-45.
- Steffensmeier, D. (1983) "Flawed Arrest 'Rates' and Overlooked Reliability Problems in UCR Arrest Statistics: A Comment on Wilson's 'The Masculinity of Violent Crime' – Some Second Thoughts." *The Journal of Criminal Justice*. 11: 167-71.
- Stohr, M. K. and J. Crank (1996) *Crime in the Lives of Idahoans*. Grant proposal to the Idaho State Board of Education.
- Stohr, M. K., Mays, G. L., Beck, A. C. and T. Kelley (1998) "Sexual Harassment in Women's Jails." *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*. 14(2): 135-155.
- Stohr, M.K., Uhlenkott, Robert, Hayter, John, Meyer, Misty, Smith-Daniels, Shellee, ISP Bureau of Criminal Investigation, Robin, Floerchinger-Franks, Ginger, Aydelotte, James, Fellen, Sue, Green, David, Musser, Bill, Burns, Dawn, Peay, John, Schnabel, Barbara and Celia Heady (2000) *Idaho Crime Victimization Survey – 1999 Final Report*. Boise, Idaho: Idaho Department of Law Enforcement.
- Straus, M. A. (1994) "State-to-State Differences in Social Inequality and Social Bonds in Relation to Assaults on Wives in the United States." *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*. 25(1): pp. 7-24.
- _____ (1979) "Measuring Intrafamily Conflict and Violence: The Conflict Tactics (CT) Scales." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 41(1): 75-88.
- Straus, M. A. and R. J. Gelles (1986) "Societal Change and Change in Family Violence From 1975 to 1985 As Revealed by Two National Surveys." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 48: 465-479.
- Tjaden, P. and N. Thoennes (1999) "Prevalence and Incidence of Violence Against Women: Findings From the National Violence Against Women Survey." *The Criminologist*. 24(3): 1,4,12,14.
- _____ (1998) "Prevalence and Incidence of Violence Against Women: Findings From the National Violence Against Women Survey." *National Institute of Justice and Centers for Disease Control and Prevention: Research in Brief*. U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Weisheit, R. A., Falcone, D. N. and Wells, L. E. (1994) *Rural Crime and Rural Policing*. Research in Action Brief, National Institute of Justice. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Zawitz, M. W., Klaus, P. A., Bachman, R. Bastian, L. D., DeBerry, M. M., Rand, M. R. and B. M. Taylor (1993) *Highlights From 20 Years of Surveying Crime Victims: The National Crime Victimization Survey, 1973-92*. U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.