



Idaho Crime Victimization



Survey 2001

***Idaho State Police
Statistical Analysis Center***

Idaho Crime Victimization Survey 2001

Principal Investigators:

Mary K. Sthor, Ph.D.
Department of Criminal Justice Administration
Boise State University

Salvador P. Vazquez
Idaho Statistical Analysis Center
Idaho State Police

Other Manuscript Analysts/Authors/Contributors to the Idaho Crime Victimization Survey 2001:

David Green
Idaho Coalition Against Sexual
and Domestic Violence

Shellee Smith-Daniels
Planning, Grants and Research
Idaho State Police

Janeena Wing
Idaho Statistical Analysis Center
Idaho State Police

Larinda Valdon
Idaho Statistical Analysis Center
Idaho State Police

Robin Elson
Bureau of Criminal Identification
Idaho State Police

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

J. D. Wulhorst
Social Science Research Unit
University of Idaho

William Musser, Captain
Meridian Police Department

Barbara Foltz
Social Science Research Unit
University of Idaho

Editors:

Meredith Pond
Planning, Grants and Research
Idaho State Police

Roberta Silva
Planning, Grants and Research
Idaho State Police

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Victimization Literature	2
Methodology	4
Survey Findings and Analysis	5
Crime Rates and Demographic Generalities	8
Per Capita Victimization	9
Property Crime	12
Larceny and Theft Crime Characteristics	12
Motor Vehicles	15
Vandalism	19
Burglary	21
Violent Crime	24
Robbery	24
Assault	24
Murder	27
Sexual Assault and Rape	27
Child Abuse	31
Domestic Violence	35
Sexual Harassment in the Workplace	41
Hate Crimes	46
Perceptions of Crime, Safety in Idaho	49
Perceptions of Police Services in Idaho	50
Summary	51
References	52

Idaho Crime Victimization Survey 2001

Introduction

The fourth Idaho Crime Victimization Survey (ICVS) was conducted in March and April 2001. This survey was administered to 2,317 Idaho households as a means of enhancing our knowledge and understanding of crime and victimization in Idaho, as well as to provide information that will assist in evaluating the effectiveness of criminal justice and health services programs operated in Idaho by members of the Idaho Research and Analysis Consortium (IRAC).

The survey instrument was designed to elicit information using standard questions regarding property and violent crimes, and was generally modeled after the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS). The ICVS departed from the national model to some extent through the inclusion of questions regarding domestic violence, child abuse, sexual harassment in the workplace, hate crime, perceptions of crime and neighborhood safety, and police services.

The respondents were asked crime questions in reference to the twelve months immediately preceding the date of the survey. Only those respondents who were 18 years or older were included in the survey. The findings for this report are presented as crime rates per every 1,000 households and whenever appropriate, findings were based on relative populations and presented in the form of per capita victimization rates and/or rates per every 1,000 persons. Also, the data used in this report is based solely on the victims' perceptions of the crime.

Under sponsorship and guidance from 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 or indirect financial contributions were made by the Idaho Statistical Analysis Center and S.T.O.P. Violence Against Women Program, housed within ISP, the Idaho Coalition Against Sexual and Domestic Violence, and Boise State University.

This report provides a review of the most pertinent literature on victimization and presents findings, analyses and comparisons to the NCVS.

Victimization Literature¹

In Idaho most of our general knowledge about crime comes from police reports compiled by each agency. The Idaho State Police (ISP) and the Federal Bureau of Investigation under the Uniform Crime Reporting program collects and analyzes these data (Elson 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 even more 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, the researchers on 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, from the second and third administrations of the survey the researchers found that approximately 44% of property crimes and 50% of violent crimes were not reported to the police (Stohr et al. 2000; 2001).

As a means of addressing the low levels of crime reporting, researchers and policy makers have turned to the use of victimization surveys. If the survey sample is representative of the population, then it is likely that victimization reports will more 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 (NCVS), in 1973 (Zawitz et al. 1993). The impetus for this survey was the need to garner 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 2000 NCVS, approximately 50,000 households were contacted and over 100,000 people ages 12 or older were interviewed (Bureau of Justice Statistics 2002).

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 small population state like Idaho does not allow for the extrapolation of its findings to the state-wide population. Moreover, the NCVS data are reported by region, and Idaho is collapsed into the Western region that 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 Idaho, and may serve to unnecessarily inflame or misdirect public concern over violent stranger crime. When in fact most crime, and rural crime particularly, is committed by people known to the victim and is property in nature (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, 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 discernable characteristics. For instance, crime tends 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 residence, although that is less true for rural than for urban residents, and that reporting of property crime is lower when the monetary value of items is small.

The NCVS, NVAWS and state victimization studies indicate that crime victimization is greatly influenced by gender, race, age, income, location and life circumstances. Younger minority males are more likely to be victims of most crimes, and to be victimized by acquaintances or strangers rather than by intimates. Conversely, women are significantly less likely to be victims of street level violent crime than are men, but when they are victims, 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, with the possible exception 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.

Methodology

The Idaho Research and Analysis Consortium, the Idaho State Police and Boise State University conducted the 2001 telephone survey to measure rates of crime and victimization in the State of Idaho. The University of Idaho's Social Service Research Unit (SSRU) administered the survey. The telephone survey instrument was revised over the fall and winter 2000/2001 for the 2001 survey administration. The survey instrument was then pretested from March 7th to March 14th by the SSRU.

A random selection of 4,250 households in Idaho was obtained from Survey Sampling, Inc. The total sample was divided into seven equal segments of approximately 600 households, each representing a potential respondent. For seven consecutive weeks mailings were distributed. The first cohort of 600 was started on February 28th. A postcard was sent to each household to inform residents that they would be contacted to participate in a telephone interview.

Interviewers were trained on instructions in the basics of proper telephone interviewing, confidentiality of responses, telephone call record keeping, and background information concerning the study, during a training session on March 6th. Interviewers used the computer-assisted telephone-interviewing (CATI) program to collect data. Responses to survey questions were entered directly into the CATI program, although information identifying individual respondents was not included in the database. Records of call attempts and the names of those interviewed were separated on the computer file from question responses. All telephone calls were recorded on call logs and verified with telephone bills. Interviewers were monitored during each calling session by a supervisor.

Interviews for this project began March 6th and continued until May 3rd 2001. Calls were made primarily between 4:00 and 8:00 P.M. Mountain Standard Time (MST). Households not reached during this time were then called from 8:00 am to 4 P.M.. Respondents were called a maximum of 10 times at various periods during the days, evenings and weekends. Households not reached after 10 attempts were then placed in a group that was called two or three weeks later for additional follow-up attempts.

Of the 4,250 selected households, 1,028 were taken out of the sample. Of these, 451 were ineligible because of: disconnected telephone numbers with no new listing or wrong addresses with no forwarding address. The other 577 ineligibles included those respondents who were not residents of Idaho, were too ill to participate (43), deceased, part time residents or not able to speak English or Spanish (11). All incorrect and disconnected telephone numbers were checked

with the directory assistance operator for new listings. New listings were then called using the procedure mentioned above. Of the remaining 3,222 households contacted, a total of 2,317 completed the interviews. The difference of 905 respondent households is explained by the fact that another 492 households were not reached after repeated attempts within the allotted time frame and there were 413 residents who declined to participate in the study. Therefore, we achieved a very respectable response rate of 72% and a cooperation rate of 87%.

Survey Findings and Analysis

As indicated in Table 1, the survey respondents tended to be female (57.8%), white (97.1%) and non-Hispanic (95%). They tended to be middle-aged (mean age of 49.2 [keeping in mind that we only interviewed those Idahoans who were 18 or older]), with most (96%) having earned at least a high school diploma or a GED and a significant number (28%) having at least a Bachelors degree. Slightly more than 60% of the respondents resided in the more urban counties of the state and most worked in services related fields (68.4%).

The findings regarding household characteristics (see Table 2) indicate that fewer than half of the respondent households had children (42.7%) and that a slight majority of these kids were male (51.4%). Most of the dwellings for households were in houses or apartments (92.4%) and most owned or were buying their house (88.6%). The median range for income for the households was \$40,000 to \$50,000 and many of the respondents themselves were long time Idaho residents (median of 27 years in Idaho, but with a standard deviation of 21). These descriptors of the households and the respondents tend to mirror the findings of the 2000 Victimization Survey.

The respondents noted that almost two-thirds of the households had firearms and that there were 2.89 firearms per household (see Table 3). This latter finding is virtually the same as last year's in that the respondents then reported there were an average of 2.9 guns in households. The typical firearm owned this year, like last, was a rifle, owned by 44.3% of the households.

As with respondent household and individual characteristics and gun ownership, alcohol and drug use by the respondents over the last year was very similar to the year before. As indicated by the findings contained in Table 4, slightly less than half of the respondents drink alcohol (46.1%) and about 85% of those people drink one to two drinks per week or less. A tiny percentage of the respondents admitted to the use of recreational drugs (1.1%), indicating that the drug they used was marijuana and about 60.8% of users smoked at least two times per week or more often..

Table 1. Respondent Characteristics

Survey Respondents	Sample ^a		Idaho Demographics	
	n	Percent	Total	Percent
Gender				
Male	976	42.1	648,660	50.1
Female	1,338	57.8	645,293	49.9
Race				
White	2,230	97.1	1,177,304	91
American Indian, Aleut, Eskimo	16	0.7	17,645	1.4
Black	11	0.5	5,456	0.4
Asian, Pacific	10	0.4	13,197	1
Other	29	1.3	54,742	4.2
Ethnicity				
Hispanic	102	5	101,690	7.9
Other/Don't Know	1,956	95	1,166,654	91.9
Age				
N	2,286			
Mean	49.2		33.2	
Standard Deviation	16.47			
Median	48			
Range	18-95		18+	71.5
Educational Level				
Less than High	90	3.9	120,361	15.3
High School or GED	732	31.8	224,322	28.5
Some College	666	28.9	215,204	27.3
Associates Degree	167	7.2	57,003	7.2
Bachelors Degree	433	18.8	116,901	14.8
Masters Degree	171	7.4	5,371 ^b	6.8
Doctorate Degree	43	1.9	---	
Living Area				
Urban ^c	1,437	62	805,136	62
Rural	880	38	488,817	38
Occupation				
Agriculture and	87	3.8	34,503	5.8
Law Enforcement	15	0.7	---	
Manufacturing	245	10.7	78,625	13.1
Medical Profession	83	3.6	29,598	4.9
Mental Health	15	0.7	---	
Retail Sales	95	4.2	75,477	12.6
Teaching Profession	139	6.1	40,768	6.8
Transportation Field	43	1.9	85,061	14.2
Services ^d	1,562	68.4	93,467	15.6

^a Persons under 18 were excluded as respondents. ^b Represents all those with degrees higher than bachelors. ^c 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. ^d Professional services, public employee, volunteer, retired, unemployed, disabled, homemaker, mom, realtor, craftsmen, secretary, receptionist, bank teller, bookkeeper, entertainer, cook, baker, daycare provider, care giver, student, and self employed. Percentages will not always add to 100 because of rounding.

Table 2. Household Characteristics

	Survey Households		Idaho Demographics ^a	
	n	Percent	n	Percent
Children in Household				
No	1,324	57.3	287,687	61.2
Yes	983	42.7	181,967	38.7
Male	1,122	51.4		
Female	1,062	48.6		
Residence Type				
House/Apartment	2,134	92.4		
Mobile Home	13	0.6		
Non-transient Hotel	157	6.8		
Other	5	0.2		
Own or Rent				
Own/buying house	2,040	88.6	339,960	72.4
Rent	220	9.5	129,685	27.6
Other	43	1.8		
Household Income				
N	1,865			
Median Range	\$40,000-		\$37,572	
Years Respondent Lived in Idaho				
N	2,306			
Mean	30			
Median	27			
Standard Deviation	21			
Range	1-92			

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

Table 3. Firearms Ownership

Firearms Ownership	n	Percent
Own a Firearm		
N = 2,239		
Yes	1411	63
No	816	36.4
Unsure	12	0.5
Number of Firearms		
N = 6,715		
Mean	2.89	
Median	1	
Standard Deviation	5.27	
Own any of these types of firearms		
Rifles	2,973	44.3
Shotguns	1,852	27.6
Handguns	1,724	25.7
Other	166	2.5

Percentages will not always add to 100 because of rounding.

Table 4. Household Respondent Alcohol and D

Alcohol and Drug Use	n	Percent
Whether the Respondent Drinks Alcohol		
N= 2470		
Yes	1,055	46.1
No	1,232	53.9
How Often Does the Respondent Drink		
1-2 drinks per year	158	15.2
1-2 drinks per month	367	35.3
1-2 drinks per week	376	36.2
1-2 drinks per day	127	12.2
More than 2 per day	11	1.5
Whether the Respondent Uses Drugs		
Yes	26	1.1
Marijuana	24	
No	2,271	98.9
How Often Does the Respondent Use Drugs		
1-2 times per year	3	1.3
1-2 times per month	6	26.1
1-2 times per week	7	30.4
1-2 times per day	5	21.7
More than 2 times per day	2	8.7

Percentages will not always add to 100 because of rounding.

As reported in Table 5, the selection of respondent households in our sample was generally representative of the percentage of households in counties across Idaho. Among the larger counties, Ada, Bingham, Bonneville and Twin Falls were slightly oversampled, but Bannock, Canyon and Kootenai were mildly undersampled. The smaller counties also experienced relatively small amounts of under or oversampling, but these errors were neither large nor systematic.

Table 5. Survey Response by County

County	Survey Households		County Population	
	n	Percent	N	Percent
Ada	578	24.9	300,904	23.3
Adams	9	0.4	3,476	0.3
Bannock	122	5.3	75,565	5.8
Bear Lake	13	0.6	6,411	0.5
Benewah	18	0.8	9,171	0.7
Bingham	79	3.4	41,735	3.2
Blaine	11	0.5	18,991	1.5
Boise	16	0.7	6,670	0.5
Bonner	49	2.1	36,835	2.8
Bonneville	166	7.2	82,522	6.4
Boundary	16	0.7	9,871	0.8
Butte	3	0.1	2,899	0.2
Camas	2	0.1	991	0.1
Canyon	229	9.9	131,441	10.2
Caribou	17	0.7	7,304	0.6
Cassia	33	1.4	21,416	1.7
Clark	4	0.2	1,022	0.1
Clearwater	17	0.7	8,930	0.7
Custer	10	0.4	4,342	0.3
Elmore	45	1.9	29,130	2.3
Franklin	25	1.1	11,329	0.9
Fremont	17	0.7	11,819	0.9
Gem	38	1.6	15,181	1.2
Gooding	33	1.4	14,155	1.1
Idaho	24	1	15,511	1.2
Jefferson	40	1.7	19,155	1.5
Jerome	39	1.7	18,342	1.4
Kootenai	131	5.7	108,685	8.4
Latah	84	3.6	34,935	2.7
Lemhi	7	0.3	7,806	0.6
Lewis	4	0.2	3,747	0.3
Lincoln	9	0.4	4,044	0.3
Madison	45	1.9	27,467	2.1
Minidoka	31	1.3	20,174	1.6
Nez Perce	89	3.8	37,410	2.9
Oneida	11	0.5	4,125	0.3
Owyhee	14	0.6	10,644	0.8
Payette	37	1.6	20,578	1.6
Power	9	0.4	7,538	0.6
Shoshone	20	0.9	13,771	1.1
Teton	10	0.4	5,999	0.5
Twin Falls	132	5.7	64,284	5
Valley	8	0.3	7,651	0.6
Washington	23	1	9,977	0.8
Total	2317	100	1,293,953	100

County population and household data provided by Idaho Department of Commerce

Crime Rates and Demographic Generalities

Table 6 contains the rates for property and violent crimes, sexual assault and rape, murder, child abuse, domestic violence and sexual and gender harassment in the workplace in Idaho for 1999, 2000 and 2001. The percent change in these crime rates from 2000 to 2001 would indicate that property crime is down slightly overall (by 4.9%), although larcenies and thefts did increase (9.0%) and the rate for burglaries did not change. The rates for robberies, physical and nonsexual assaults, murder and domestic violence were also down somewhat over that one-year period. The rate for sexual and gender harassment remained somewhat level with the previous year.

The rate for sexual assault and rape rose by 17.9%. However, as the numbers reported for these crimes are always fairly low, even small increases in raw numbers, yield large percentage increases from year to year. This is why rarer, but more heinous crimes, are best studied over a period of time to better determine patterns and trends in their increases and decreases.

The NCVS data indicate that nationally both property and violent crime continued their downward spiral from 1999 to 2000 (the latest years for which data is currently available – BJS 2002). Property crime nationally declined another 10% and violent crimes declined 15%. Moreover, according to the Federal Bureau of Investigation's Uniform Crime Reports "[t]he crime index rate fell for the 9th straight year in 2000, declining 3.3% from 1999, 18.9% from 1996 and 30.1% from 1991" (BJS 2002: 2).

These national data are mirrored in part at the state level NIBRS, or police reports of incidents, data for 2001 that is featured in the Crime in Idaho document, which indicates that violent crime continued to decline overall from 2000 by 2.3% (Elson 2002). However, there was a slight increase of .1% in property crime incidents reported by the police during that same time period.

These aggregate changes in Idaho crimes reported to the police tend to reflect the most numerous offenses in their categories and therefore mask larger increases and decreases in rarer crimes. For instance, there was an 87.5% increase in murder from 2000 to 2001 – this figure was based on the addition of 14 murders statewide. Whereas there was a decrease in reported incest cases of 63.6%, although this drop was based on only 15 total cases for both years. Or there was a 300% increase in bribery police reports, but this was explained by the addition of only 3 cases from the one reported in 2000. Greater attention to these changes in specific crimes will be attended to in the rest of this document.

Per Capita Victimization

As indicated in Table 7, survey respondents experienced victimization at different rates for different type of crimes. The most likely victim of crime against property was 1.3 times more often male than female, mostly under age 55 with annual household income below \$40,000. Property crime was 1.4 times higher for households located in the urban areas than it was for rural areas.

Violent crime affected 1.1 times more males than females, most victims were between ages 18 to 34. About 22% of violent crime affected households with annual income under \$10,000 and 32.7% of violent crime also affected individuals which annual households income was over \$75,000. Apparently, violent crime least affects people whose annual household income ranged between \$30,000 to \$75,000. Persons living in urban areas were 1.1 times more susceptible to become victims of violent crime than people from rural areas of the state.

Domestic violence victimization, females were 2.3 times more susceptible to experience incidents of domestic violence than were males. The majority of victims tended to be between ages 18 to 34. The likelihood of becoming a victim of domestic violence decreases inversely to age increases. Approximately 50% of all incidents of domestic violence occurred to people whose annual household income was between \$10,000 to \$30,000. Urban and rural areas of the state experienced approximately the same likelihood for domestic violence victimization.

Child Abuse, female children under age 13 were more susceptible to this type of victimization than male children. From all children under age 13, children under age seven experienced 50% of total physical abuse and/or neglect. Most physical abuse or neglect occurred in households whose annual income was less than \$40,000. Children in urban areas were 1.7 times more likely to experience physical abuse and/or neglect than children living in rural areas.

Sexual harassment in the workplace, females experienced approximately 75% of this type of victimization. Coincidentally, about 75% of victims were between ages 18 to 34 and living in the most urban areas of the state. Per capita victimization rates were greater for the lower and upper income categories. Individuals whose household income was within the \$30,000 to \$50,000 reported the least victimization.

Hate Crime, males reported 1.4 times more hate crime than females. Persons between 18 to 24 experienced the highest rates of this type of victimization. By income, individuals with annual

Table 6. Idaho Crime Victimization Rates

Type of Crime/Offense	Rates per 1,000 households or persons age 18 or older			
	1999	2000	2001	% Change
Property Crimes				
Pocket Picking	14.0	15.3	19.4	26.8%
Theft from outside	67.1	61.5	64.3	4.6%
Total Larcenies and Thefts	81.1	76.8	83.7	9.0%
Theft from inside vehicle	95.1	64.8	67.8	4.6%
Theft of vehicle parts	59.8	41.4	35.4	-14.5%
Theft of vehicle	14.0	10.0	10.8	8.0%
Total Motor Vehicle Thefts	168.9	116.1	113.9	-1.9%
Total Vandalism	121.0	104.9	82.9	-21.0%
Break into property	70.0	44.2	40.1	-9.3%
Break into steal	(36.4)	(37.8)	(30.2)	-20.1%
Break into hotel/motel	12.1	4.0	6.9	72.5%
Break into steal hotel/motel		4.8	6	25.0%
Total Burglary	82.1	53.0	53.1	0.2%
Property Crime Totals	453.1	350.8	333.6	-4.9%
Violent Crimes				
Total robbery	3.7	3.2	2.6	-18.8%
Physical assault	53.2	53.8	41	-23.8%
Verbal confrontations	97.6	71.3	72.9	2.2%
Total Non-sexual Assault	154.5	128.3	116.5	-9.2%
Sexual assault	7.5	9.7	9.5	-2.1%
Rape and attempted rape	0.9	2.0	4.3	115.0%
Total Sexual Assault and Rape	8.4	11.7	13.8	17.9%
Threat	10.2	10.3	10.4	1.0%
Attempt	3.7	5.2	2.2	-57.7%
Murder	1.9	0.0	0.9	-
Total Murder	15.8	15.5	13.5	-12.9%
Child Abuse (children 12 and under)				
Exposed to sexually explicit materials through the internet	-	-	11.7	-
Exposed to sexually explicit materials through T.V.	-	-	40.1	-
Exposure to sexual materials or acts	-	-	5.6	-
Neglect	-	-	11.6	-
Physical harm	-	-	12.1	-
Inappropriate touching of sexual areas	-	-	3.5	-
Any sexually offensive behavior	-	-	3.5	-
Total Child Abuse	-	-	88.1	-
Total Child Abuse Excluding Media Exposure	-	-	30.7	-
Total Child Abuse Excluding Media Exposure and in Households with Children	-	-	65.1	-
Domestic Violence				
Physical abuse	1.9	4.4	3.9	-11.4%
Sexual abuse	0.0	2.0	1.3	-35.0%
Emotional abuse	24.2	25.7	17.7	-31.1%
Stalked/harassed	5.6	10.9	3.5	-67.9%
Total Domestic Violence	31.7	43.0	26.4	-38.6%
Sexual/Gender Harassment				
Total Sexual/Gender Harassment	174.0	149.4	151.4	1.3%
Total Sexual/Gender Harassment in Households where Respondent Worked Outside the Home	233.5	226.6	230.1	1.5%
Hate Crime				
Vulnerability		91.5	91.5	0.0%
Actual		-	5.7	-

Percentages will not always add to 100 because of rounding.

household income under \$40,000 experienced 2.2 times more hate crime than those whose household income was higher than \$40,000. Individuals living in urban areas experienced the same per capita hate victimization as those from rural areas.

Table 7. Per Capita Crime Rates by Demographic Characteristics

Victim Characteristics	Property Crime		Violent Crime*		Domestic Violence		Child Abuse**		Sexual Harassment		Hate Crime	
	Rate	%	Rate	%	Rate	%	Rate	%	Rate	%	Rate	%
Gender												
Male	0.263	59	0.017	52	0.077	30	0.046	44	0.080	25	0.013	58
Female	0.182	41	0.015	48	0.175	70	0.058	56	0.243	75	0.010	42
Age***												
0-3												31
4-6												22
7-9												23
10-12												23
18-20	0.478	22	0.167	36					0.333	24	0.022	22
21-24	0.409	19	0.088	19	0.231	26			0.400	28	0.023	23
25-34	0.291	14	0.033	7	0.246	28			0.310	22	0.012	12
35-44	0.250	12	0.011	2	0.200	22			0.156	11	0.012	13
45-54	0.260	12	0.059	13	0.139	16			0.121	9	0.017	17
55-64	0.204	10	0.010	2	0.078	9			0.062	4	0.009	9
65-74	0.136	6	0.054	12					0.024	2	0.004	4
75+	0.105	5	0.038	8								
Rural vs. Urban												
Urban	0.283	65	0.058	53	0.154	49	0.063	63	0.216	74	0.011	50
Rural	0.156	35	0.051	47	0.159	51	0.037	37	0.077	26	0.011	50
Income												
< \$10,000	0.155	12	0.068	17	0.192	16	0.075	20	0.293	23	0.019	27
\$10,000-\$19,999	0.152	12	0.081	20	0.306	25	0.061	16	0.141	11	0.010	14
\$20,000-\$29,999	0.194	15	0.075	19	0.296	25	0.068	18	0.209	17	0.011	15
\$30,000-\$39,999	0.156	12	0.028	7	0.088	7	0.064	17	0.124	10	0.009	13
\$40,000-\$49,999	0.222	17	0.048	12	0.170	14	0.013	3	0.076	6	0.000	0
\$50,000-\$74,999	0.173	14	0.050	12	0.115	10	0.075	20	0.230	18	0.013	18
\$75,000-\$100,000	0.224	18	0.052	13	0.038	3	0.020	5	0.194	15	0.009	13

*Violent crime does not include verbal confrontations. **Child Abuse by gender, for children under age 13, accounts for physically abused or neglected children. ***Child abuse by age reflects percent of neglect/physical abuse raw data within age groups.

Property Crime

Larceny and Theft Crime Characteristics

Tables 8 through 8d provide a snapshot of the most commonly committed types of street crime in many communities.² Police reports of larceny/theft incidents in Idaho for 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000 and 2001 indicate that there has been a steady decrease, with the exception of 2000, in this crime over the last five years (Elson 2002). The ICVS data presented in Table 8 does indicate a 8.9% rate increase in total larceny/theft, from 76.8 in 2000 to 83.7 in 2001. These larceny theft rates still are much less than the national average of 129, as reported by the NCVS (Rennison, 2002).

The majority of these crimes (55.6%) were reported to the police (see Table 8a). The most common reason given for not reporting a pickpocket was that the “police would do nothing” or that there was “nothing to report.” Those who didn’t report the theft from outside noted that the “matter was too trivial” or that there was “nothing to report.”

As indicated by the data presented in Table 8b, almost two-thirds of these crimes occurred in urban areas (63.1%) and virtually all (97.1%) in the respondents’ current town. As the seven most populous counties hold 62% of the state’s population, it would appear that they are actually experiencing slightly less larceny/theft per capita than the more rural counties in the state.

Victims of larceny/theft crimes tended to be respondents who were male, white, non-Hispanics with a mean age in the late thirties (see Table 8c). The respondents, or the adults answering the phone who fit the study criteria, probably claimed themselves as victims for the whole household who were victimized by “theft outside.” The data also indicates that females and Hispanics were also represented in the victimization category.

Larceny and theft offenders (when identified) tended to be in their twenties, male, white and non-Hispanic (see Table 8d). Most of the offenders were known to the respondent as neighbors, friends, family members or in some other way. But the respondents didn’t usually know if the offender was high at the time of the offense. About 30% of the pickpocket offenders were female, about 10% for both crimes were nonwhites and Hispanics were identified as about 23% of the “pickpocket” and 15% of the “theft outside” offenders.

² A cautionary note is necessary when reviewing the data in these and other tables in the report. The comparisons between the NCVS findings and the 1997, 1999, 2000 and 2001 Idaho surveys are useful in providing us with a rough estimate of how we compare. However, the questions were not asked in the same manner for these four surveys - although the property and violent crime questions are the same for the 1999, 2000 and 2001 surveys - thus some of the comparisons are only approximate.

Table 8. Property Crimes: Larcenies and Thefts

Crime Type	Attempt & Actual	Rate x 1,000 Households				
		2001	2000	1999	1997 ^a	NCVS ^b
n=2,317						
Pocket Picking	45	19.4	15.3	14.0	16.7	
Theft From Outside Home	149	64.3	61.5	67.1	4.9	
Total Larceny/Theft Crimes	194	83.7	76.8	81.1	21.6	129

^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 exact 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 2001," by Rennison, September 2002.

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

Crime Characteristics	Pocket Picking		Theft Outside	
	n	Percent	n	Percent
County				
Urban ^a	34	75.6	94	63.1
Rural	11	24.4	55	36.9
Current Town				
Yes	31	70.5	136	97.1
No	13	29.5	4	2.8

^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 8a. Property Crimes: Larcenies and Theft Reporting

Type of Crime	Reported to Police		Not Reporting ^a	
	n	Percent	n	Percent
Pocket Picking				
N=45 responses ^b				
YES	25	55.6		
NO	20	44.4		
Police Would Do Nothing			7	28.0
Nothing to Report			5	20.0
Fear of Retaliation			4	16.0
Nothing Could Be Done			4	16.0
Matter too Trivial			2	8.0
Took Care Of It Myself			2	8.0
Offender Was Family Member			1	4.0
Theft from Outside of Home				
N=141 responses				
YES	56	39.8		
NO	85	60.2		
Matter Too Trivial			31	55.0
Nothing to Report			21	3.0
Took Care of it Myself			5	5.0
Police Would Do Nothing			4	7.0
Offender Was an Acquaintance			3	7.0
Inconvenient			2	2.0
Other Reason Not Reported			4	2.0

^a Respondents were allowed to indicate why the crime was not reported and then the interviewer was asked to select from 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 Victim Characteristics

Victim Characteristics	Pocket Picking		Theft Outside	
	n	Percent	n	Percent
Number of Victims	57		207	
Respondent Victim				
Yes	28	63.6	110	90.9
No	16	36.4	30	9.1
Victim Gender				
Male	27	49.1	112	52.1
Female	28	50.9	103	47.9
Victim Race				
White	53	100	188	95.9
African American			1	0.5
American Indian,			3	1.5
Other			4	2
Victim Ethnicity:				
Hispanic			16	14.5
Non-Hispanic	35	100	94	85.5
Victim Age*				
n	43		137	
Mean	35		39.6	
Standard Deviation	18.4		19	

*Only the first and most numerous victims ages identified by the respondent are reported here.

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

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

Offender Characteristics	Pocket Picking		Theft Outside	
	n	Percent	n	Percent
Number of Offenders	28		112	
Recognize Offenders				
Yes	17	39.5	24	17.0
No	26	60.5	117	83.0
Offender Gender				
Male	19	70.4	45	91.8
Female	8	29.4	4	8.2
Offender Age				
n	11		20	
Mean	29.7		27.5	
Standard Deviation	14.6		28.8	
Race				
White	17	89.5	34	85.0
African American	1	5.2	0	
American Indian, Aleut, Asian, Pacific Islander	1	5.2	1	2.5
Other	0		5	12.5
Ethnicity				
Hispanic	3	23.1	6	15.0
Non-Hispanic	10	76.9	34	85.0
Relationship to Victim:				
Family Member	2	11.8	3	12.5
Neighbor	2	11.8	8	33.3
Friend	5	29.4	2	8.3
Stranger	8	47.1	10	41.7
Other			1	4.2
Offender Use of Alcohol				
Alcohol Only			1	4.2
Drugs Only			1	4.2
Both	3	16.6	1	4.2
Unknown	7	38.9	6	25.0
None	8	44.5	15	62.5

Percentages will not always add to 100 because of rounding.

Motor Vehicles

As indicated by the data presented in Table 9, total motor vehicle crimes have steadily declined over the last few years. Motor vehicle theft in particular (rate of 10.8) was similar but slightly higher than the national average rate of 9.2 (Rennison, 2002). However, police reports indicate that the number of incidents related to auto theft in Idaho is on the rise after a five-year low in 1999.

According to the ICVS data reported in Table 9a, most of the thefts of a vehicle and thefts from inside a vehicle in 2001 were reported to the police. When these crimes were not reported the respondent indicated that the “matter was too trivial,” there was “nothing to report”, or “the police would do nothing”, among other reasons. Most of the “theft of vehicle parts” crimes were not reported to the police, and about 70% of these respondents remarked that the “matter was too trivial” to bother.

Most of the motor vehicle crimes were committed in urban counties (82.2%) and in the current town of the reporting household (88.5%) (see Table 9b). For most of these crimes the victim did not recognize the offender, but reported that those that could be visually identified tended to be male, in their late teens to late twenties, white and a stranger (see Table 9c-9d). Although when the respondent could identify the offender they were neighbors, family members or friends. For the most part the respondent didn't know if the offender was on drugs or had been drinking at the time of the offense, but for the “theft inside a vehicle” crime, the respondents thought they were on one or the other, or both, about 30% of the time.

About 60 to 90% of the time the respondents identified themselves as the victim of the crime (see Table 9c). Victims tended to be males, though not overwhelmingly and with the exception of the “theft of vehicle” crime where women constituted a majority, white, non Hispanics in their mid-thirties to forties.

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 9. Property Crimes: Motor Vehicle

Crime Type	Attempt/ Actual	Rates per 1,000 households				
		2001	2000	1999	1997 ^a	NCVS ^b
n=2,317						
Theft From Inside Vehicle	157	67.8	64.8	95.1	103.5	
Theft of Vehicle Parts	82	35.4	41.4	59.8	69.6	
Theft of Vehicle	25	10.8	10.0	14.0	23.2	9.2
Total Motor Vehicle Thefts	264	113.9	116.1	168.9	196.3	

^aThe 1997, 1999 and 2000 rates are taken from the final reports for the statewide victimization survey studies for those years (Crank et al 1997; Stohr et al. 1999; Stohr et al. 2000). For methodological reasons, the exact same questions were not asked each year. Therefore, comparison of these rates between years must be viewed with some caution. Also note that the sample size for the four years of the administration differed each year (it was 1682 in 1997, 1072 in 1999, 2489 in 2000 and 2317 in 2001). ^bNCVS stands for the National Crime Victimization Survey. These specific data are taken from the Bureau of Justice Statistics NCVS publication "Criminal Victimization Survey 2001" by Rennison, September 2002.

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=139 responses				
YES	79	56.8		
NO	60	44.4		
Matter too trivial			21	33.3
Nothing to report			13	20.6
Inconvenient			6	9.5
Police would do nothing			5	7.9
Own fault			4	6.3
Other			14	22.2
Theft of Vehicle Parts				
n=68 responses				
YES	29	42.6		
NO	39	57.4		
Matter too trivial			24	47.1
Police would do nothing			4	7.8
Nothing to report			3	5.9
Inconvenient			6	11.8
Other			14	27.5
Theft of Vehicle				
n=20 responses				
YES	13	65.0		
NO	7	35.0		
Nothing to report			2	40.0
Police would do nothing			1	20.0
Reported to supervisor			1	20.0
Took care of it myself			1	20.0

^aThe 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. The respondents were allowed to provide with more than one answer.

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	129	82.2	62	75.6	20	80.0
Rural	28	17.8	20	24.4	5	20.0
Current Town						
Yes	115	88.5	53	92.9	17	89.5
No	15	11.5	4	7.1	2	10.5

^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.

Table 9c. 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	188		98		34	
Respondent Victim						
Yes	108	76.1	57	60.2	17	89.5
No	34	23.9	12	39.8	2	10.5
Gender						
Male	98	51.3	50	60.2	11	45.8
Female	93	48.7	33	39.8	13	54.2
Age						
N	184		74		32	
Mean	34.5		41.3		40.6	
Race						
White	171	94.5	76	98.7	31	100.0
African American	4	2.2				
American Indian	1	0.5				
Asian/Pacific Islander	2	1.1	1	1.3		
Multi-Racial	3	1.7				
Ethnicity						
Hispanic	7	6.3	3	5.9		
Non-Hispanic	104	93.7	48	94.1	14	100.0

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

Table 9d. 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	68		21		20	
Did Victim Recognize Offender?						
Yes	24	15.1	6	8.7	9	45.0
No	135	84.9	63	91.3	11	55.0
Gender						
Male	42	91.3	16	94.1	14	87.5
Female	4	8.7	1	5.9	2	12.5
Age						
n	41		13		13	
Mean	18.2		25.5		29.6	
Race						
White	39	90.7	14	100.0		
African American	4	9.3				
Relationship to Victim						
Family					4	40.0
Neighbor	3	12.5	2	28.6		
Friend	4	16.7			3	30.0
Stranger	15	62.5	4	57.1	2	20.0
Other	2	8.3	1	14.3	1	10.0
Offender Use of Alcohol or Drugs:						
Alcohol	4	17.4				
Drugs	2	8.7			1	50.0
Both	1	4.3				
None	4	17.4	4	57.1	1	50.0
Don't Know	12	52.2	3	42.9		

Percentages will not always add to 100 because of rounding.

Vandalism

It would appear that the amount of vandalism has declined when 2001 is compared to 1999 and 2000, though the rate for 2001 is still higher than it was in 1997 (see Table 10). This decrease in vandalism generally coincides with police reports. Over the five-year period from 1997 to 2001, the number of police reports of vandalism decreased by over 2000 incidents, though there was a slight increase in 2000 (Elson 2002).

A slight majority of the ICVS vandalism crimes were reported (52.7%) to the police. Of those who didn't report the crime to the police, about 40% of the respondents indicated that the "matter was too trivial" or there was "not enough to report" (see Table 10a). Others responded that the "police would do nothing" or "that nothing could be done" or "that there was nothing to report" among other reasons given.

Vandalism tended to occur in urban areas in the same town of the responding household (see Table 10b). The victims of vandalism were about half male and half female, white and with a mean age of 40 (see Table 10c). About 88% of the time the respondent claimed to be the victim, but may have been declaring this for the whole household.

About three-fourths of the time the offender was not recognized by the respondent, but when he or she was, tended to be male, white, non-Hispanic, with a mean age of about 21 (see Table 10d). About one-fourth of the time the offender was a stranger, but when they had a relationship with household members they were neighbors, family members, friends or others.

Table 10. Property Crimes: Vandalism

Crime Type	Attempt/ Actual	Rates per 1,000 households			
		2001	2000	1999	1997 ^a
n=2,317					
Damaged or Destroyed Property	192	82.9	104.9	121.0	72.5

^aThe 1997, 1999 and 2000 rates are taken from the final reports for the statewide victimization survey studies for those years (Crank et al. 1997; Stohr et al. 1999; Stohr et al. 2000). For methodological reasons, the exact same questions were not asked each year. Therefore, comparison of these rates between years must be viewed with some caution. Also note that the sample size for the four years of the administration differed each year (it was 1682 in 1997, 1072 in 1999, 2489 in 2000 and 2317 in 2001).

Table 10a. Property Crimes: Vandalism Reporting

Type of Crime	Reported to Police		Reason for Not Reporting ^a	
	n	Percent	n	Percent
Vandalism^a				
N=169 responses				
YES	89	52.7		
NO	80	47.3		
Too Trivial, Not Enough to Report			29	39.2
Police Would Do Nothing			10	13.5
Nothing To Report			8	10.8
Took Care of it Myself			7	9.5
Reported to Employer or Others			5	6.8
Had Relationship To Offender			4	5.4
Involved Children			3	4.1
Inconvenient			2	2.7
Fear of Retaliation			1	1.4
Other Reason			5	6.8

^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 10c. Property Crimes: Vandalism Victim Characteristics

Victim Characteristics	Vandalism	
	n	Percent
Number of Victims	277	
Respondent Victim		
Yes	148	88.6
No	19	11.4
Gender		
Male	128	49
Female	133	51
Age		
n	247	
Mean	40	
Race		
White	248	96.1
African American	2	0.7
American Indian	3	1.1
Asian/Pacific Islander	5	1.9

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	141	73.4
Rural	51	26.6
Current Town		
Yes	141	94.6
No	8	5.4

^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 10d. Property Crimes: Vandalism Offender Characteristics

Offender Characteristics	Vandalism	
	n	Percent
Number of Offenders	105	
Recognize Offenders		
Yes	44	26.2
No	124	73.8
Gender		
Male	69	83.1
Female	14	16.9
Age		
n	80	
Mean	21.5	
Race		
White	83	98.8
African American	1	1.2
Ethnicity		
Hispanic Origin	7	16.3
Other/ Don't Know	36	83.7
Relationship to Victim:		
Neighbor	17	40.5
Stranger	11	26.2
Family	5	11.9
Friend	4	9.5
Other	5	11.9
Offender Use of Alcohol or Drugs		
Alcohol	9	20
Drugs	2	4.4
Both	2	4.4
None	16	35.6
Don't Know	16	35.6

Percentages will not always add to 100 because of rounding.

Burglary

The burglary rate has for the most part declined from the 1999 to the 2001 administration of the ICVS (see Table 11). However, burglary rates for the two most recent survey years remained similar at 53.1 in 2001 and 53 in 2000. For the last five years, police reports indicate an overall declining trend in burglary incidents (Elson 2002). Data from the NCVS 2001 shows that breaking into steal property rate was 28.7 (Rennison), almost five percent below Idaho's rate of 30.2.

About three-fourths of the "break into property" and "break into steal" crimes were reported to the police, although the obverse was true of the other burglary related crimes (see Table 11a). The most numerous reasons for not reporting the crime to the police for all burglary offenses was that the "matter was too trivial," it was "reported to others," the "police would do nothing," there was a "relationship with the offender" or "nothing could be done."

As indicated in Table 11c, victims of burglary tended to be males about half of the time, were white, but with significant representation by minority group members, non Hispanic and in their late thirties.

Most of these crimes were committed in urban areas and the "break into steal and break into property" crimes were usually done in the current town of the responding household (see Table 11b). About 70% of the offenders were not recognized, but when they were they were usually male and in their mid twenties (see Table 11d). More often than not, it was unknown to the respondent whether or not that the offender was on drugs or drinking at the time of the offense, but about 30% of the time they thought they were.

Table 11. Property Crimes: Burglary 2000

Crime Type	Attempt/ Completed	Rates per 1,000 households				
		2001	2000	1999	1997 ^a	NCVS ^b
n=2,317						
Break Into Property	93	40.1	44.2	70.0	63.6	
Break Into Steal Property^c	70	30.2	37.8	36.4	35.7	28.7
Break Into Hotel/Motel	16	6.1	4.0	12.1	4.8	
Break Into Steal: Hotel/Motel	14	6	4.8			
Total Burglary	123	53.1	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 exact 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 2001," by Rennison, 2002. <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/pub>. ^c "Break Into Steal" is a subset of the "Break Into Property" category, but it was asked separately. Therefore Steal Property is not included in the total for burglary.

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=94 responses				
YES	72	76.6		
NO	22	23.4		
Matter Too Trivial			5	22.7
Police Would Do Nothing			5	22.7
Had Relationship To Offender			4	18.2
Nothing to Report			4	18.2
Inconvenient			1	4.5
Took Care Of It Myself			1	4.5
Fear of Retaliation			1	4.5
Other Reason Not Reported			1	4.5
Break into Hotel/Motel				
n=12 responses				
YES	3	25.0		
NO	9	75.0		
Break into Steal: Hotel/Motel				
n=12 responses				
YES	4	33.3		
NO	8	66.7		
Both Break into Hotel/Motel and Break into Steal: Hotel/Motel				
Reported To Others			6	42.9
Nothing Could Be Done			4	28.6
Nothing to Report			1	7.1
Inconvenient			1	7.1
Other Reason			2	14.3

^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 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	63	67.7	18	60
Rural	30	32.3	12	40
Current Town				
Yes	83	94.3	6	26.1
No	5	5.7	17	73.9

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

Percentages will not always add to 100 because of rounding.

Table 11c. Property Crimes: Burglary Victim Characteristics

Victim Characteristics	Break into Property	
	n	Percent
Number of Victims	180	
Respondent Victim		
Yes	81	84.4
No	15	15.6
Gender		
Male	82	50.9
Female	79	49.1
Age		
n	148	
Mean	38.9	
Race		
White	58	80.6
African American	2	2.8
American Indian	3	4.2
Multi-Race	9	12.5
Ethnicity		
Hispanic Origin	4	5.4
Other/ Don't Know	70	94.5

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 Offender Characteristics

Offender Characteristics	Break into property	
	n	Percent
Number of Offenders	76	
Recognize Offenders		
Yes	29	30.2
No	67	69.8
Gender		
Male	52	85.2
Female	9	14.8
Age		
n	44	
Mean	24.9	
Race:		
White	21	91.3
Other	2	8.7
Ethnicity		
Hispanic	1	7.7
Non-Hispanic	12	92.3
Relationship to Victim:		
Family	5	31.3
Friend	8	50.0
Stranger	3	18.7
Offender Use of Alcohol or Drugs:		
Alcohol	3	10.0
Drugs	1	3.3
Both	5	16.7
None	8	26.7
Unknown	13	43.3

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.

Violent Crime

Robbery

There were 6 robbery incidents identified by respondent households in the 2001 survey (see Table 12). The resulting rate is substantially lower than those reported in any of the survey administrations. The four-year data indicate that Idahoan's experiences continue to fall within a fairly narrow range of slightly more than a one-point rate difference. Crime in Idaho trend data indicates that police reports of robbery increased from 2000 to 2001 by 11.3%, but this increase follows two years of decline in reported robberies (Elson 2002). Robbery rate in Idaho (2.6) was seven percent lower than the national average (2.8) as reported by the NCVS (Rennison, 2002).

Table 12. Violent Crimes: Robbery

Crime Type	Threat/ Completed	Rates per 1,000 households				
		2001	2000	1999	1997 ^a	NCVS ^b
Robbery (n=2,317)	6	2.6	3.2	3.7	3.0	2.8

^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 exact 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>.

Assault

The data presented in Table 13 indicate that for three of the four types of physical assault the rates decreased from 2000. For instance, for the "assault with physical force" category the rate for 2001 (25.0) fell to just above the rate for 1999 (22.4) and is well below that for 1997 (38.6) and 2000 (36.2). Verbal confrontations were slightly up from 2000 to 2001, but overall the assault rate for 2001 (113.9) was less than it was for 2000 (137.8) and the other survey years.

The Idaho State Police (ISP) incident five-year trend data indicates that aggravated and simple assaults reported mild fluctuations, remaining at approximate the same levels for any of the past five years. When calculating the rate per every 1,000 persons, this ISP trend data indicates continuous rate decline. The NCVS crime rate of assault with weapon (3.6) was lower than that from the ICVS (4.3). The national rates for assault with weapon reported 14.3% decrease from the prior year, while Idaho rates for the similar type of crime decreased by 2.2% in the same period.

Total crime rate for assault using physical force was almost two times higher for Idaho than it was for the nation as reported by the NCVS. Nevertheless, rates of assault using physical force in Idaho as well as in the nation, reported rate decreases.

As happened with the 2000 data, slightly less than half of the assaults were reported to the police (48.6%) (see Table 13a). The most common reasons given for not reporting were that the “matter was too trivial,” “it was reported to employers or others” or there was “nothing to report.”

The victims of these offenses were a little bit older (mean of 32.9) than the offenders and almost as likely to be female (46.1%) as male (53.9%) (see Table 13c). Most of these victims were white (97.5%) and non-Hispanic (92.0%).

Most of the assaults occurred in urban areas of the state (65.9%) and almost all happened in the current town of the household respondent (86.0%) (see Table 13b). In fact, it appears that almost 89% of the offenders were seen or recognized by the respondents, from which 36% were strangers (see Table 13d). Over half of the offenders were neighbors, family members or friends of the victimized household.

Of the known assault offenders, most were relatively young (mean of 27 years), white (89.8%), non-Hispanic (76.4%), males (84.2%). The respondent believed that over 40% of these offenders were drinking, on drugs, or both, at the time of the offense.

Table 13. Violent Crimes: Nonsexual Assault

Crime Type	Attempt/ Completed	Rates per 1,000 households				
		2001	2000	1999	1997 ^a	NCVS ^b
n=2,317						
Assault With a Gun ^c	14	6.0	8.0	10.3	4.2	
Assault With Other Weapon ^d	10	4.3	4.4	7.5	8.9	3.6
Assault With a Thrown Object	13	5.6	5.2	13.1	19.6	
Assault With Physical Force ^e	58	25.0	36.2	22.4	38.6	
Total Physical Assault^f	95	41.0	53.8	53.2	71.3	21.2
Verbal Confrontations^g	169	72.9	71.3	97.6	63.6	
Assault Other ^h			12.9	23.4	73.1	
Total Assault	264	113.9	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 exact 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 2001,” by Rennison, July 2002. <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 (21.2) 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.”

Table 13a. Violent Crimes: Reporting Nonsexual Assault

Type of Crime	Reported to Police		Reason for Not Reporting	
	n	Percent	n	Percent
All Types of Nonsexual Assault				
YES	103	48.6%		
NO	109	51.4%		
Matter Too Trivial			36	37.1
Reported To Employer Or Others			15	15.5
Nothing To Report			10	10.3
Fear of Retaliation			9	9.3
Relationship With Offender			6	6.2
Took Care Of It Myself			5	5.2
Nothing Could Be Done			4	4.1
Involved Children			1	1.0
Police Would Do Nothing			1	1.0
Other Reason Not Reported			10	10.3

Percentages will not always add to 100 because of rounding.

Table 13c. Violent Crimes: Nonsexual Assault Victim Characteristics

Victim Characteristics	Nonsexual Assault	
	n	Percent
Number of Victims	320	
Respondent Victim		
Yes	133	62.4
No	80	37.6
Gender		
Male	172	53.9
Female	147	46.1
Age		
N	273	
Mean	32.9	
Race		
White	271	97.5
Black/African American	3	1.1
American Indian	4	1.4
Other Race	14	5.0
Ethnicity		
Hispanic	13	8.0
Non-Hispanic	162	92.0

Percentages will not always add to 100 because of rounding.

Table 13b. Violent Crimes: Nonsexual Assault Crime Characteristics

Crime Characteristics	Violent Crime	
	n	Percent
County		
Urban ^a	197	65.9
Rural	102	34.1
Current Town		
Yes	184	86.0
No	30	14.0

^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 13d. Violent Crimes: Nonsexual Assault Offender Characteristics

Offender Characteristics	Nonsexual	
	n	Percent
Number of Offenders	285	
Recognize Offenders		
Yes	191	88.8
No	24	11.2
Offender Was...		
Stranger	68	35.8
Neighbor	32	16.8
Family Member	28	14.7
Friend	21	11.1
Other	41	21.6
Gender		
Male	230	84.2
Female	43	15.8
Age		
N	235	
Mean	27.4	
Race		
White	228	89.8
Black/African-American	3	1.2
Asian/Pacific Islander	7	2.8
American Indian	8	3.1
Other race	8	3.1
Ethnicity		
Hispanic	30	23.6
Non-Hispanic	127	76.4
Offender Drinking/On Drugs		
Drinking	34	14.6
Drugs	18	16.7
Both	21	10.9
Unknown	57	35.4
None	62	21.4

Percentages will not always add to 100 because of rounding.

Murder

The ICVS rate for murder related crimes in 2001 (13.5) was two points less than it was for either 2000 or 1999. As the amount of murder threatened was virtually the same across the three years for which we have data, the real difference came in the rate of attempted murder in the survey years, a figure that decreased from 2000, and even 1999, to 2001.

As the NCVS doesn't include murder related data our perspective is given context only by the police reports of such crimes in Idaho. In contrast to the ICVS data, the ISP reported data on murder indicates that there was a significant increase in murder by 87.5% and in negligent manslaughter by 150.0% from 2000 to 2001 (Elson 2002). However, as murder is a particularly rare crime, large percentage increases or decreases from year to year are not that unusual or instructive. For instance, the five year trend data on police reports of murder in Idaho indicate that the number of murders (37) was highest in those years in 1997 and second highest in 1998 at 36. The number of murders then decreased in both 1999 and 2000, reaching their lowest level in five years at 16 and then jumping up to 30 in 2001. What we can conclude from this analysis of these police reports is that the jump in actual murders in Idaho is not outside the range that we might expect given our historical data. Moreover, the ICVS rates for actual murder that we report in Table 14 would bear out this observation that the rate of murder in Idaho has remained virtually unchanged for the last few years.

Table 14. Violent Crimes: Murder^a

Crime Type	Threat/ Actual	Rates per 1,000 households			
		2001	2000	1999	1997 ^b
Threat	24	10.4	10.3	10.2	
Attempt ^c	5	2.2	5.2	3.7	
Murder	2	0.9	0	1.9	2.4
Total Murder Related Crime	31	13.5	15.5	15.8	

^aThe 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 The 1997, 1999 and 2000 rates are taken from the final reports for the statewide victimization survey studies for those years (Crank et al. 1997; Stohr et al. 1999; Stohr et al. 2000). For methodological reasons, the exact same questions were not asked each year. Therefore, comparison of these rates between years must be viewed with some caution. Also note that the sample size for the four years of the administration differed each year (it was 1682 in 1997, 1072 in 1999, 2489 in 2000 and 2317 in 2001). ^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.

Sexual Assault and Rape

As with the crime of murder, sexual assaults and rapes are relatively rare and heinous crimes that tend to be somewhat volatile from year to year. It should also be said that reporting of sexual assaults and rapes to the police has always been problematic and that it is likely that reports to

victimization survey researchers is not always accurate either. Our assumption, based on past research in the area, is that sexual assaults and rape will be underreported in all data. Having said this, we would note that using the same questions in the last three years to elicit reports of sexual assaults and rape we have found considerable stable annual rates for both 2000 and 2001. Although, the amount of attempted rape would appear to have increased 29.5% for the same period (see Table 15).

The NCVS data for sexual assault and rape indicate that the national victimization rates were significantly lower than the corresponding ICVS rates (Rennison, 2002).

The police reports of rape and sexual assaults in Idaho contained in the Crime in Idaho document also indicate some disturbing information regarding rape (Elson 2002). The five-year trend data for police reports of "forcible sex offenses" has revealed a somewhat steady increase in this crime from 1997 to 2001. Other than a slight decline in 1998, the amount of such reports to the police has increased to a high of 1,591 in 2001. The police reports of "forcible rape" are similar in that the overall picture is of increases in this crime since 1997, though there was a decline in 2000 and the 2001 amount at 424 is almost exactly the same as the 1999 amount at 425. "Forcible Fondling" has also appreciably increased from 1997 to 2001, though the amount in 2000 at 1,129 was actually higher than 2001 at 1,101. Police reports in Idaho are more limited regarding trend data for "forcible sodomy" and "sexual assault with an object," but we do know that from 2000 to 2001 the former increased and the latter decreased.

As is typical for sexual victimization, the reporting of such crimes is low (see Table 15a). Only 22.9% of the victims reported this crime to the police. The most common reasons given for non-reporting were that the "abuse could get worse," it "was my fault," "abuse wasn't that bad," or it "was a private matter." Over three quarters of these crimes were committed in urban areas (76.3%) and most of them (51.5%) occurred in a home (see Table 15b).

Victims of these crimes were overwhelmingly white (97.8%) and about 41% required counseling or medical attention because of the crime (see Table 15c). Because of a misinterpretation in the delivery of the survey, we don't have data on the gender of the victim for 2001. We do know that in 2000, 80% of the victims in the ICVS data were female (Stohr et al. 2001).

It was rare that the offender in these crimes was a stranger (4.5%), rather he or she was likely to be a family member, neighbor or friend (see Table 15d). Over 95% of the time the offender was male and over 97% of the time he or she was white. Most of the time the victim either did not know or did not think that the offender was on drugs or alcohol at the time of the offense.

Table 15. Violent Crimes: Sexual Assault and Rape

Crime Type	Total 2001	Rates per 1,000 households			Rates per 1,000 Persons	
		2001	2000	1999	ICVS adjusted to NCVS ^a	NCVS ^b
n=2,317						
Sexual Assault	22	9.5	9.7	7.5	3.5	1.1
Attempted Rape	6	2.59	2.0	0.9	0.96	0.6
Rape	4	1.73			0.64	0.4
Total Attempted and Rape	10	4.3	2	0.9	1.6	1
Total Sexual Assault and Rape	32	13.8	11.7	8.4	5.13	2.1

^a ICVS adjusted by population using the average household size of 2.69 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 2001," by Rennison 2002. <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/pub>.

Table 15a. Sexual Assault and Rape Reporting

Type of Crime	Reported to Police		Reason for Not Reporting	
	n	Percent	n	Percent
Sexual Assault and Rape				
YES	11	22.9		
NO	37	77.1		
Abuse Could Get Worse			4	21.1
Abuse Was My Fault			4	21.1
Abuse Wasn't That Bad			3	15.8
Private Matter			2	10.5
Other Reasons			6	31.6

Table 15b. Sexual Assault and Rape Crime
Characteristics

Crime Characteristics	Violent Crime	
	(n)	Percent
County		
Urban ^a	58	76.3
Rural	18	23.7
Location of Incident		
Someone's Home	13	39.4
Home	4	12.1
School	3	9.1
In Car	2	6.1
Retail Store	2	6.1
Work/Job	2	6.1
Bar	2	6.1
Neighborhood	1	3.0
Dance Club	1	3.0
Downtown	1	3.0
BSU	1	3.0
Parking Lot	1	3.0
Current Town		
Yes	37	80.4
No	9	19.6
If NO, State Where It Did Happen?		
Idaho	9	81.8
Utah	2	18.2

^aUrban 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.

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

Victim Characteristics	Sexual Assault	
	n	Percent
Respondent Victim		
Yes	21	45.7
No	25	54.3
Required Counseling or Medical Attention		
Yes	19	41.3
No	27	58.7
Victim Race		
White	45	97.8
Other race	1	2.2

^a Including unwanted touching.Table 15d. Violent Crimes: Sexual Assault^a and Rape Offender Characteristics

Offender Characteristics	Sexual Assault	
	n	Percent
Number of Offenders	48	
Recognize Offenders		
Yes	41	89.1
No	5	10.9
Offender was...?		
Family Member	9	40.9
Neighbor	2	27.3
Friend	18	20.5
Stranger	12	4.5
Other	3	6.8
If Offender Was Family Member		
Ex-Husband	5	50.0
Not Sure Relation	1	10.0
Mother	1	10.0
Father	1	10.0
Grandpa	1	10.0
Step-son	1	10.0
Offender Gender		
Male	42	95.5
Female	2	4.5
Offender Age		
n	43	
Mean	31.5	
Offender Race		
White	42	97.7
Other race	1	2.3
Offender Drinking/On Drugs		
Drinking	8	19.5
Drugs	3	7.3
Both	5	12.2
Unknown	11	26.8
None	14	34.1

^a Including unwanted touching.

Child Abuse

The ICVS 2001 collected child abuse data for children age 12 and under. The respondents indicated that 27.5 of every 1,000 households with children experienced neglect and 21.4 experienced physical abuse while inappropriate touching of sexually sensitive areas and sexually offensive behavior directed to children 12 and under was reported to affect 16.2 of every 1,000 households with children. Other types of child victimization include exposure to sexually explicit material through television, internet and printed materials. Exposure to sexually explicit materials through television affected 94.6 children of every 1,000 households with children or 40.1 children for every 1,000 households with or without children.

The respondents reported that the neglected children were abused an average of 8.6 times and that this abuse occurred an average of 5.1 times before the police were called (see Table 16a). The respondents indicated that over 60% of the neglect of children under 12 was reported to the police, usually by parents or other family members. When it was reported the outcomes varied: 30% of the times the Department of Health and Welfare was contacted; 17% of the time the abuser was removed temporarily; 8.7% of the time the abuser was arrested or the police did nothing, and; one occasion (4%) the police did not respond.

The victims of neglect and physical and sexual abuse were on average 6 to 7 years old (the upper range of this question covered up to age 12), with some victims being only months old (see Table 16b). Victims of neglect were similarly likely to be male (51.2%) as female (48.8%), whereas victims of physical abuse were more likely to be female (75.0%) than male (25.0%) (though these figures are based on only 5 cases). The survey sample for victims of sexual related abuse was insufficient, inferences about these victims cannot be made.

The offender characteristics were known for 42 of the physical abuse and neglect cases and for only some of three sexual abuse cases (see Table 16c). Physical abuse and neglect offenders tended to be in their late 20s (mean of 29.9), but ranged in age from 5 to 52, were predominately white (91.9%), non-Hispanic (89.7%) and about as likely to be female (57.1%) as male (42.9%). Offenders also tended to be family members (72.2%), though some were neighbors and only one was a stranger. About 70% of the time the respondents didn't know if, or didn't think that the offender was on drugs or alcohol at the time of the offense.

Based on the very limited number of sexual abuse cases (3) where we have complete offender information, offenders tended to be white and non-Hispanic. Three offenders were male and one female. Two were family members and one was a stranger.

Table 16. Child Abuse Rates per 1,000 Households.

Offense Type	Under Age 12		
	n	With Children in Household	All Households
n=2317 All households n=983 (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?"	27	27.5	11.6
b) "...hit, push, kick, grab or shake them, or otherwise physically harm them?"	21	21.4	12.1
c) "... Inappropriate touching of sexually sensitive areas, such as breasts, buttocks or genital areas directed at children?"	8	8.1	3.5
d) "... any sexually offensive behavior directed at your children, ages 12 and under, such as exposure of breasts, bottocks or genital areas?"	8	8.1	3.5
Total sexual abuse of children	16	16.2	7.0
e) "...children age 12 and under, exposed to sexually explicit materials through the internet?"	27	27.5	11.7
f) "...children age 12 and under, exposed to sexually explicit materials through television?"	93	94.6	40.1
g) "...exposed to any other sexually explicit materials or sexual acts through printed materials?"	13	13.2	5.6
Total Child Abuse (excluding internet and TV exposure to sexually explicit materials)	64	65.1	30.7

Note: Surveys 1999 and 2000 collected child abuse data for children under age 18, while the 2001 survey data reported child abuse for children age 12 and under.

Table 16a. Child Abuse: Offense and Reporting Characteristics

Reporting Characteristics	Child Abuse					
	Neglect		Physical		Sexual Touching	
	n	Percent	n	Percent	n	Percent
Number of Children Under Age 12	58		5		4	
How Many Times						
n	502		47		7	
Mean	8.6		9.4		1.8	
Times Abused Before Reported						
N (13 responses)	112					
Mean	5.1					
Reported to the Police?						
Yes	22	61.1				
No	14	38.9				
Unsure						
Why Not Reported to the Police?						
Family would split	1	8.3				
Discouraged by family	1	8.3				
Discouraged by others	5	41.7				
Other	5	41.7				
Who Called Police?						
Parent	7	43.8				
Child	2	12.5				
Family member	3	18.8				
Neighbor	1	6.3				
Friend	2	12.5				
School	1	6.3				
What Happened When Reported?						
Police did nothing	2	8.7	1	25		
Police did not respond	1	4.3				
Abuser arrested	2	8.7	1	25	1	25
Abuser removed temporarily	4	17.4			1	25
Health and Welfare contacted	7	30.4	1	25	1	25
Other	7	30.4	1	25	1	25

Blanks indicate insufficient or no data.

Table 16b. Child Abuse: Victim Characteristics

Victim Characteristics	Child Abuse					
	Neglect		Physical		Sexual Touching	
	n	Percent	n	Percent	n	Percent
Victim Age						
n	56		4		4	
Mean	6.3		7.0		6.8	
Range	1-12		1-11		2-12	
Victim Gender						
Male	22	51.2	1	25.0	1	50.0
Female	21	48.8	4	75.0	1	50.0

Blanks indicate insufficient or no data.

Table 16c. Child Abuse: Offender Characteristics

Offender Characteristics	Physical Abuse/ Neglect		Sexual Abuse	
	n	Percent	n	Percent
Same Offender Each Time				
Yes	32	84.2		
No	6	15.8		
Gender				
Male	21	42.9	7	58.3
Female	28	57.1	5	41.7
Age				
n	42			
Mean	29.9			
Range	5-52			
Race				
White	34	91.9		
African American	1	2.7		
American Indian	2	5.4		
Ethnicity				
Hispanic	3	10.3		
Non-Hispanic	26	89.7		
Offender Relationship to the Victim/Respondent				
Family Member	13	72.2	2	66.7
Neighbor	2	11.1		
Stranger	1	5.6		33.3
Other	2	11.1	1	
Offender Using Alcohol or Drugs				
Alcohol	3	8.3		
Drugs	2	5.6		
Both	5	13.9	1	33.3
Unknown	16	44.4	1	33.3
None	10	27.8	1	33.3

Domestic Violence

The figures presented in the domestic violence tables (see Tables 17-17f) provide some sense of the extent of violence that occurs between married couples or 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 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.”

ICVS survey data for 2001 indicates that for all categories of domestic violence queried – physical, sexual, emotional and stalking – there were decreases in rates from 2000 to 2001 (see Table 17). However, this was after there were increases in rates for all those same categories from 1999 to 2000. Because of the volatility of these rates, and with only three years worth of data, it would be impossible to identify any trends at this juncture. We would note that the same ambiguity is reflected in police reports of domestic violence, which for Idaho indicate that “intimate partner violence” was up by 2.8% from 2000 to 2001, but that “violence against children” and “family violence” were down in those same years by 4.2% and 3.2%, respectively (Elson 2002).

Our data indicates that victims of domestic violence in Idaho were much more likely to report the offense in 2001 (40.3%) than they had been in either 1999 (11.1%) or 2000 (17.0%) (see Table 17a). The victims noted that abuse happened an average of 7.2 times last year and that it occurred about 6 times (mean 5.9) before the police were called. In all cases where we have data for 2001, a family member, usually a parent, called the police. When the police weren’t called the victim indicated that it was because the abuse was a private matter, there was some other reason than those offered by the interviewer, the police wouldn’t do anything or the abuse would get worse.

The victims indicated that when the police responded different avenues were pursued. In descending order of response magnitude, the victims indicated that the police did one or more of the following: calmed down the parties (33.3%); did nothing (18.2%); arrested the abuser (12.1%); removed the abuser (9.1%); arrested the victim (9.1%); referred the victim to other services (3.0%) or did something else (15.2%). Of the 25 victims who rated the police services when they responded, 56% thought the service was good to very good, 16% were neutral in their rating and 28% ranked it as poor to very poor.

Domestic violence in Idaho, tends to occur proportionally among urban and rural counties. Table 17b describes urban and rural respondents, not the actual effect of domestic victimization. The actual likelihood of victimization for people living in urban/rural is stated in Table 7 where a person living in a rural county would experience as much victimization as the one living in the more urban areas.

Victim response to the abuse tended to include separation or divorce from the offender (34.2%), seeking private (21.9%) or clerical (5.5%) counseling or medical attention (15.1%), obtaining a protection order (11.0%) or taking some other action (see Table 17c). These responses by victims are much more proactive than in years past when about 54% in 2000 and 38% in 1999 took no action. Such responses are consistent with the report by 72.6% of the victims that they no longer reside with the abuser, which represents an increase of about 20 to 30% over 2000 and 1999.

About 70% of abusers received no counseling. About 61% of the victims were aware of domestic violence or sexual assault counseling in their area, but this represents a decrease from years past. Although about the same percentage of victims in 2001 (12.2%) took advantage of that assistance as in 1999 (11.2%) and more did than in 2000 (8.4%). In 2001 the victims who received assistance rated it as good or very good about 57% of the time, as neutral 28.6% of the time and as poor 14.3% of the time.

Victims of this offense in the 2001 survey year had an average age in the late thirties, with a range in age from 21 to 64 (see Table 17d). They were white (94.9%) and usually female (69.5%). Based on the state racial composition, Native Americans experienced extremely high rates of domestic violence while Hispanics were affected in proportion to their ratio of the population. Those victims who had experienced domestic violence in their lifetime had similar characteristics in that they were middle aged (mean 45.0) with an age range that spans adulthood (18-95), white (97.4%), non-Hispanic (93.3%) and female (70.7%) (see Table 17f).

Domestic violence offenders tended to be in their mid-forties, with a range in age from 21 to 80 (see Table 17e). They were usually white (89.2%), male (74.4%) and were using alcohol or drugs over 40% of the time.

Table 17. Domestic Violence

Offense Type	Total	Domestic Violence Rates per 1,000 persons		
		2001	2000	1999
n = 2,317				
In the past 12 months has your spouse or significant other...				
a) ...abused you physically by hitting, pushing, shoving or choking?	9	3.9	4.4	1.9
b) ...abused you sexually through forced or unwanted sex?	3	1.3	2.0	0.0
c) ...abused you emotionally, examples would include name - calling or belittling treatment?	41	17.7	25.7	24.2
d) In the past 12 months have you been followed, harassed, or stalked by a former spouse or significant other?	8	3.5	10.9	5.6
e) During your lifetime, have you ever been the victim of domestic violence?	390	168.3		
Total Domestic Violence	61	26.4	43.0	31.7

Table 17a. Domestic Violence : Incidence and Reporting Characteristics

Incidence and Reporting Characteristics	2001		2000		1999	
	n	Percent	n	Percent	n	Percent
Report Offense to Police						
Yes	27	40.3	6	8.5	1	3.7
Yes some			6	8.5	2	7.4
No	40	59.7	59	83.1	24	88.9
What Happened When Officer Responded						
Police calmed down the parties	11	33.3				
Police did nothing	6	18.2				
Abuser was arrested	4	12.1				
Abuser was removed	3	9.1				
Victim arrested	3	9.1				
Victim referred to services	1	3.0				
Other	5	15.2				
Rate Police Services						
1 Very poor	2	8	2	15.4	1	33.3
2 Poor	5	20				
3 Neutral	4	16	4	30.8	1	33.3
4 Good	9	36	3	23.1	1	33.3
5 Very good	5	20	4	30.8		
Total Number of Times Abuse Happen						
n	81		291			
Mean	7.17		3.6			
Number Times Abuse Happened Before Police Were Called						
Mean	5.87		2.9		3	
Who Called the Police?						
Parent	19	86.4				
Child	1	4.5				
Other family member	2	9.1				
Neighbor			2	15.4		
Respondent			9	69.2	2	50.0
Other Person			2	15.4	2	50.0
Why Not Reported to Police						
Private matter	17	48.6	7	11.1	7	24.1
Other reason	11	31.4	22	34.9	9	31.0
Police wouldn't do anything	6	17.1	5	7.9	1	3.4
Abuse would get worse	1	2.9	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

Percentages will not always add to 100 because of rounding.

Table 17b. Domestic Violence: Offense Characteristics Domestic Violence

Crime Characteristics	2001 Domestic Violence		2000 Domestic Violence		1999 Domestic Violence	
	n	Percent	n	Percent	n	Percent
County						
Urban ^a	41	67.2	63	75.9	22	64.7
Rural	20	32.8	20	24.1	12	35.3
Marital Status						
Married	18	30.0	51	61.4		
Living W/Significant Other	4	6.7	7	8.4		
Single, Never Married	6	10.0	2	2.4		
Separated	14	23.3	5	6		
Divorced	18	30.0	18	21.7		
Children Present During Abuse						
Yes	32	52.5	22	28.2	10	34.5
No	29	47.5	56	71.8	13	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 comprises 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 17c. Domestic Violence: Response to Abuse, Current Status and Programming

Response and Programming	2001		2000		1999	
	n	Percent	n	Percent	n	Percent
Response to Abuse						
Sought Medical Attention	11	15.1	1	1.3	1	3.4
Sought Private Counseling	16	21.9	15	19.2	3	10.3
Sought Clergy Counseling	4	5.5	1	1.3		
Obtained Protection Order	8	11.0	1	1.3	1	3.4
Went to a Shelter	2	2.7	0		1	3.4
Separated or Divorced	25	34.2	6	7.7	5	17.2
No Action Taken	0	0.0	42	53.8	11	37.9
Other Action Taken	7	9.6	12	15.4	7	24.1
If Protection Order						
Civil protection order?	7	70.0	-	-		
Abuser violated order?	2	20.0	-	-		
Did you report the violation?	1	10.0	-	-		
Currently Residing With Abuser			0			
Yes	17	27.4	41	50.6	17	60.7
No	45	72.6	40	49.4	11	39.3
Abuser Received Counseling						
Yes	17	27.4	22	28.2	8	27.6
No	45	72.5	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	35	61.4	59	72.8	18	75.0
No	22	38.6	22	27.2	6	25.0
Have you received help from a program that assists or provides shelter to victims in Idaho?						
Yes	6	12.2	7	8.4	2	11.1
No	43	87.8	76	91.6	16	88.9
Rate Victim Programs						
1 Very Poor	1	14.3	4	10.0	1	50.0
3 Neutral	2	28.6	6	15.0		
4 Good			5	12.5		
5 Very good	4	57.1	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 17d. Domestic Violence: Victim Characteristics

Victim Characteristics	Domestic Violence	
	n	Percent
Victim Age		
n	63	
Mean	37.9	
Range	21-64	
Victim Race/Ethnicity		
White	56	94.9
American Indian	3	5.1
Ethnicity		
Hispanic	4	7.4
Non-Hispanic	50	92.6
Gender*		
Male		30.5
Female		69.5

*Gender percentages based on relative sample and population proportions.

Table 17e. Domestic Violence: Offender Characteristics*

Offender Characteristics	Domestic Violence	
	n	Percent
Gender		
Male	58	74.4
Female	20	25.6
Age		
n	73	
Mean	43.8	
Range	21-80	
Race		
White	66	89.2
African-American	2	2.7
American Indian	2	2.7
Asian/Pacific Islander	1	1.4
Other	3	4.0
Offender Using Alcohol or Drugs		
Alcohol	23	29.3
Drugs	1	1.3
Both	8	10.4
Unknown	39	50.6
None	6	7.8

*From ICVS2000.

Table 17f. Lifetime Domestic Violence: Victim Characteristics

Victim Characteristics	Domestic Violence	
	n	Percent
Victim Age		
n	387	
Mean	45.0	
Range	18-95	
Victim Race/Ethnicity		
White	372	97.4
African American	1	0.3
American Indian	4	1.0
Asian/Pacific Islander	1	0.3
Other	4	1.0
Hispanic Origin		
Yes	11	3.2
No	320	93.3
Don't Know	12	3.5
Victim Gender		
Male		29.3
Female		70.7

*Gender percentages based on relative sample and population proportions.

Sexual 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 the home, and then asked if they or a member of their household had been the victim of gender or sexual harassment in the last 12 months. As indicated by the data presented in Table 18, 97 or a rate of 63.6 “outside the home” working respondents had experienced such harassment in the 2001 survey year. This rate is very close to that for 2000 (62.1), but is far less than 1999 (79.9).

Among the working respondents, five of the nine categories of harassment increased from 2000 to 2001. There were slight decreases in the least offensive, but still bothersome, forms of harassment such as displays of sexually explicit materials, unwelcome questions about dating and sexual behavior, putdown jokes about one gender or another and among the most intrusive and aggressive forms of harassment such as unwelcome touching or being forced to engage in an unwelcome sex act (no cases reported for 2001). Many of these decreases had also occurred in 2000, when compared to the 1999 data. There were, however, a few increases in rates when the 2001 data is compared to 2000. For instance, there was an increase in the reported rate of unwelcome obscene jokes told and language used in the workplace. There was also an increase, based on four cases, in the rate of one of the most egregious forms of harassment, quid pro quo harassment, or being asked to exchange sexual favors to keep or advance in a job. But this rate of 2.6 for 2001 is virtually the same as that for 1999 (2.5) and is based on four cases and the fact that there were no such cases in 2000.

Overall, the total rate of sexual and gender harassment for 2001 is slightly higher than 2000, but lower than for 1999. In any case, a rate of 230.1 per 1000 working people is quite high as it means that approximately two out of every nine employed Idahoans experienced some form of sexual or gender harassment in the survey year 2001.

Most of this harassment occurred in urban counties (83.5%) and was experienced by full time (78.4%), permanent (94.8%) employees (see Table 18a). Over 90% of the harassment occurred

in services, manufacturing or retail sales workplaces. In almost 40% of those workplaces the employees were mostly males. About 46% of the victims in 2001 filed a complaint, which is almost double the percent that filed in 2000. The victims also reported that in 80% of the cases action was taken in response to the complaint. Thirteen percent of the victims filed a lawsuit and 87% took some other action in response to the harassment. About 18% of the victims reported that they suffered either mentally or physically and 4.3% reported that they lost or quit their job as a result of the harassment.

For those who didn't report the harassment, 43.8% reported that it was because they thought the matter was too trivial or small to bother, but 25% feared retaliation, 12.5% thought that nothing could be done, 8.3% feared the system wouldn't take it seriously, 6.3% didn't want to involve others and 4.2% didn't want to report it because of their relationship with the offender.

The offender characteristics reported in Table 18c indicates that over 85% were male, with a mean age in the late 30s and a range of 17-80 years. They tend to be white (97.6%), non-Hispanic (95.0%) and are likely to be a co-worker (42.3%) or a supervisor/owner/boss (38.7%) in relation to the victim. In over 86% of the cases the victim did not believe that the offender was using drugs or alcohol at the time of the offense.

Victims of sexual harassment, as reported in Table 18b, were mostly female on a ratio of three to one male, average age in the mid-thirties (36.1) with an age range of 19 to 66. By race 95% of the victims were white and about 94% of the time they were non-Hispanic.

Table 18. Sexual Harassment in the Workplace

Offense Type	n	Rates per 1,000 Households			Rates per 1,000 Working People		
		2001	2000	1999	2001	2000	1999
Respondent Working Outside Home					1526	1642	801
Total Households Contacted		2317	2489	1076			
Last Twelve Months Employment Ratio (%)					65.9	66.0	74.4
“In the past 12 months have you experienced any sexual or gender offensive behavior in the workplace?”							
Yes	97 ^a	41.9	41	59.5	63.6	62.1	79.9
“...were you told unwelcome obscene jokes by someone at the workplace?”	68	29.3	24.9	34.4	44.6	37.8	46.2
“...were you subjected to unwelcome obscene language by someone in the workplace?”	61	26.3	23.3	---	40	35.3	---
“...were you exposed to a display of offensive sexually explicit materials while on the job?”	13	5.6	6.8	9.3	8.5	10.4	12.5
“...were you asked unwelcome questions about dating and/or sexual behavior by someone on the job?”	25	10.8	12.5	17.7	16.4	18.9	23.7
“...did someone at the workplace tell stories or jokes that tend to ‘put down’ women or men?”	61	26.3	28.9	40	40	43.8	53.7
“...were you asked to exchange sexual favors to keep a job, advance in a job or to gain other job related benefits?”	4	1.7	0	1.9	2.6	0	2.5
“...were you subjected to unwelcome touching such as hugs, arms around the shoulder, kissing, etc., by someone at your workplace?”	14	6	9.2	9.3	9.2	14	12.5
“...were you subjected to unwelcome touching in sexually sensitive places (e.g. breasts, buttocks or genital areas) while on the job?”	8	3.5	2.4	1.9	5.2	3.7	2.5
“...were you forced either physically or emotionally to engage in an unwelcome sex act with someone at your workplace?”	0	0	0.4	0	0	0.6	0
Total Harassment	254 ^b	151.4	149.4	174	230.1	226.6	233.5

^a These numbers and percentages represent the types of harassment experienced by the 97 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 97 persons who experienced sexual or gender harassment in the workplace last year.

Table 18a. Sexual Harassment: Workplace and Harassment Characteristics

Sample Respondents	2001		2000
	n	Percent	Percent
County			
Urban ^a	212	83.5	
Rural	42	16.5	
Employment Status			
Full	76	78.4	84.3
Part-time	21	21.6	13.7
Permanent or Temporary?			
Permanent	91	94.8	90.1
Temporary	5	5.2	9.9
Occupation Categories When Harassed			
Services	36	37.5	
Manufacturing	31	32.3	
Retail Sales	20	20.8	
Medical Profession	5	5.2	
Mental Health	2	2.1	
Teaching Profession	1	1.0	
Transportation Field	1	1.0	
Agriculture and Forestry	0	0	
Law enforcement	0	0	
Gender of Most Staff in Workplace			
Mostly Males	38	39.2	31.7
Mostly Females	22	22.7	23.8
Equal Numbers	37	38.1	44.6
Complaint Filed			
Yes	55	46.2	24.0
No	64	53.8	76.0
Any Action Taken on Complaint?			
Yes	40	80.0	
No	10	20.0	
Did You Suffer Mentally or Physically?			
Yes	21	18.4	
No	93	81.6	
Did You Lose or Quit Your Job?			
Yes	5	4.3	
No	112	95.7	
As Result of Incident, Did You?			
File a lawsuit	3	13.0	
Other	20	87.0	
Why Wasn't Harassment Reported?			
Too trivial or small to bother	21	43.8	26.0
Fear of retaliation	12	25.0	6.0
Nothing could be done	6	12.5	8.0
System wouldn't take it seriously	4	8.3	6.0
Didn't want to involve others	3	6.3	8.0
Relationship with the offender	2	4.2	4.0
Quit job			1.9
Didn't know how to report it			4.0
Other reason			16.0
Handled it myself			20.0

^aUrban 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.

Table 18b. Sexual Harassment: Victim Characteristics

Victim Characteristics	2001		2000
	n	Percent	Percent
Number of Victims	251		
Victim Gender			
Male	59	23.6	27.5
Female	191	76.4	72.5
Victim Age			
Mean		36.1	38.2
Range		19-66	18-64
Victim Race/Ethnicity			
White	236	94.8	
African American	3	1.2	
Other	10	4.0	
Ethnicity			
Hispanic	13	6.2	
Non-Hispanic	196	93.8	

Table 18c. Sexual Harassment: Offender Characteristics

Offender Characteristics	2001		2000
	n	Percent	Percent
Number of Offenders	273		
Offender Gender			
Male	250	85.3	89.2
Female	43	14.7	10.8
Age			
Mean		37.8	38.5
Range		17-80	18-78
Race			
White	245	97.6	
African American	2	0.8	
Asian, Pacific Islander	1	0.4	
Other	3	1.2	
Ethnicity			
Hispanic	5	5.0	
Non-Hispanic	95	95.0	
Relationship to Offender			
Equal Co-Worker	47	42.3	58.8
Supervisor/Owner/Boss	43	38.7	22.7
Subordinate/Victim's Employee	12	10.8	5.2
Client	9	8.1	4.1
Other Relationship			7.2
Sales Rep.			2.1
Offender Using Alcohol or Drugs			
Alcohol	3	2.48	
Drugs	4	3.31	
Both	0	0.00	
Unknown	9	7.44	
None	105	86.78	

Hate Crimes

About one percent of our sample of Idahoans experienced some form of a hate crime in the last 12 months and 5.7% reported that they had been a victim at some time in their life (see Table 19). In response to the questions “Why do you think you were a victim of a hate crime?” in the last 12 months, over 23% indicated that it was because of race and another 3.8% thought it was related to their ethnicity. Two respondents thought it was their religion that made them a target and one respondent each thought their gender, sexual orientation, physical or mental characteristics were responsible. The type of victimization they experienced was primarily harassment/intimidation, a verbal threat and vandalism. Not surprisingly then, those 212 respondents who felt vulnerable to a hate crime; race, religion, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, age and being physically challenged were mentioned as explanations for this perception.

A similar breakdown in explanations appeared for those who felt they had been in a victim in their lifetime, with some reordering in terms of the place of gender and sexual orientation. That is, the respondents indicated in descending order that race, religion, gender, sexual orientation, ethnicity, being physically challenged and some other reasons explained their lifetime hate victimization. The type of victimization they experienced was primarily harassment/intimidation, verbal threats and vandalism.

As indicated by Table 19a, the victims of hate crime were slightly more likely to be male (58%) than female, had a mean age in the mid-forties (mean of 44.2) with an age range of 18-76. Most of them described themselves as white (96.7%) and non-Hispanic (92.3%).

Table 19. Hate Crimes: Vulnerability, Victimization and Explanations

Crime Characteristics	n	Percent	Rate per 1,000 persons	
			2001	2000
“Have you been the victim of a hate crime during the last 12 months?”	26	1.1	11.2	
“Why do you think you were a victim of a hate crime?”				
Race	6	23.1		
Religion	2	7.7		
Ethnicity	1	3.8		
Gender	1	3.8		
Sexual Orientation	1	3.8		
Physically Challenged	1	3.8		
Mentally Challenged	1	3.8		
Other	13	50.0		
“What was the nature of the hate crime?”				
Harassment/Intimidation	10	38.5		
Verbal Threat	5	19.2		
Vandalism	2	7.7		
Stalking	1	3.8		
Theft	1	3.8		
Other	7	26.9		
“Do you feel you are vulnerable to a hate crime?”				
Yes	212	9.2	91.5	91.5
“What is the primary reason you feel vulnerable to a hate crime?”				
Race	47	23.0		
Religion	22	10.8		
Ethnicity	20	9.8		
Gender	11	5.4		
Sexual Orientation	11	5.4		
Age	6	2.9		
Physically Challenged	3	1.5		
Other	84	41.2		
“Have you ever been a victim of a hate crime?”				
Yes	131	5.7	56.5	53.4
“Why do you think you were a victim of a hate crime?”				
Race	33	32.0		
Religion	12	11.7		
Gender	10	9.7		
Sexual Orientation	7	6.8		
Ethnicity	4	3.9		
Physically Challenged	1	1.0		
Other	36	35.0		
“What was the nature of this hate crime?”				
Harassment/Intimidation	35	33.3		
Verbal Threat	14	13.3		
Vandalism	16	15.2		
Physical Assault	8	7.6		
Theft	7	6.7		
Battery	4	3.8		
Stalking	1	1.0		
Sexual Assault	1	1.0		
Rape	1	1.0		
Other	18	17.1		

Table 19a. Hate Crimes: Victim Characteristics

Victim Characteristics	Hate Crime	
	n	Percent
Gender^a		
Female		42.0
Male		58.0
Age		
Mean	44.23	
Range	18-76	
Race and Ethnicity		
White	117	96.7
Black	2	1.7
American Indian	1	0.8
Other	1	0.8
Hispanic Origin		
Hispanic	7	6.7
Non Hispanic	96	92.3
Don't Know	1	1.0
Education		
Elementary	4	3.3
High School	26	21.5
Associate	12	9.9
Some College	35	28.9
Undergraduate Degree	28	23.1
Masters	11	9.1
Doctoral	5	4.1

^a Gender percentage based on relative populations.
Percentages will not always add to 100 because of rounding.

Perceptions of Crime, Safety in Idaho

Of the three survey years, the percent of respondents who reported that crime has increased in their neighborhood is lowest at 20.4% for 2001 (see Table 20). Similarly, there was a decrease from 2000 to 2001 in the percentage of respondents who thought that crime had increased in Idaho.

About the same percentage of respondents said they would recognize or know most or all of their neighbors in both 2000 and 2001 (70%). Relatively, about 87% of respondents in both 2000 and 2001 felt “very safe” walking in their neighborhood during the day and about 47% felt that way about a stroll at night. In contrast, only about 24% felt “very safe” on Idaho’s highways. Comparable, the overall sense of safety, ranging from “somewhat safe” to “very safe” was 96.5% during the day hours, 82.1% during night hours and 81% while on the road.

Table 20. Perceptions of Crime and Safety in Idaho

Perception of Crime and Safety	2001		2000		1999	
	n	Percent	n	Percent	n	Percent
Crime in Idaho						
Increased	1293	55.9	1406	68.0	562	57.8
Decreased	115	5.0	144	7.0	65	6.7
Stayed the same	473	20.5	517	25.0	346	35.6
Unsure	431	18.6				
Crime in my area						
Increased	471	20.4	508	21.8	423	41.6
Decreased	132	5.7	169	7.3	74	7.3
Stayed the same	1534	66.3	1651	70.9	521	51.1
Unsure	177	7.6				
Neighbors Known						
None of them	45	1.9	41	1.7		
Some of them	651	28.1	758	30.5		
Most of them	986	42.6	1026	41.3		
All of them	633	27.3	658	26.5		
Day						
How safe do you feel?						
Very Safe	2017	85.3	2162	87.1		
Somewhat Safe	264	11.2	294	11.9		
Neither	57	2.4	5	0.2		
Somewhat Unsafe	22	0.9	13	0.5		
Very Unsafe	4	0.2	7	0.3		
Night						
How safe do you feel?						
Very Safe	1062	46.4	1196	48.7		
Somewhat Safe	817	35.7	839	34.1		
Neither	57	2.5	53	2.2		
Somewhat Unsafe	244	10.7	247	10.0		
Very Unsafe	111	4.8	123	5.0		
Highway						
How safe do you feel?						
Very Safe	558	24.4	644	26.2		
Somewhat Safe	1295	56.6	1359	55.3		
Neither	88	3.8	67	2.7		
Somewhat Unsafe	274	12.0	296	12.1		
Very Unsafe	75	3.3	90	3.7		

Percentages will not always add to 100 because of rounding.

Perceptions of Police Services in Idaho

Most Idahoans believe that police services have stayed about the same in the last three survey years. In both 2000 and 2001, about 1000 of our respondents had some form of contact with the police within a year of the survey, usually the city police or the county sheriff's offices. Of those who had contact, about 74% were either very satisfied or satisfied with the way the officer performed his or her job (Table 21).

Table 21. Perception of Police Services in Idaho

Perception of Police Services	2001		2000		1999	
	n	Percent	n	Percent	n	Percent
Police Services						
Gotten Better	437	19.0	580	26	239	24.1
Stayed the same	1449	62.8	1424	63.9	651	65.8
Gotten Worse	204	8.8	226	10.1	100	10.1
Unsure	216	9.4				
"In the past year have you had direct contact with the police?"						
Yes	995	43	973	39.1		
No	1322	57	1514	60.9		
"What type of law enforcement was your most recent contact with?"						
City Police	580	58.2	582	59.9		
County Sheriff	308	30.9	256	26.3		
State Police	55	5.5	56	5.8		
Other	48	4.8	70	7.2		
Unkown	6	0.6	8	0.8		
"How satisfied were you with the way the law enforcement officer performed his or her job during this contact?"						
Very satisfied	438	44.2				
Satisfied	293	29.6				
Neutral	62	6.3				
Dissatisfied	71	7.2				
Very dissatisfied	126	12.7				

Percentages will not always add to 100 because of rounding.

Summary

Crime rates in Idaho are generally lower than crime rates reported nationally, with the exception of sexual assault and rape that were higher than the national indicators for the survey year 2001. Within Idaho, both the ICVS and police incident reports indicate patterns of decline in most types of crime victimization.

- Property crime rates decreased 4.9% from survey 2000 to survey 2001. Motor vehicle theft and burglary remained at approximately the same level. Vandalism declined 21% while larceny and theft increased 9%.
- Threats and attempt to murder were 57% lower than that reported in 2000. Violent crime; robbery and physical assault decreased significantly from 2000 to 2001. However, crime related to sexual assault and rape in 2001 was twice as high as it was in 2000.
- Crime rates for incidents of domestic violence decreased 38% from 2000 to 2001; stalking and harassment were down 67%, sexual abuse down 35%, emotional abuse down 31%, and 11% decrease for incidents of physical abuse.
- Child abuse of children age 12 and under including physical abuse, neglect, inappropriate touching of sexual areas and sexually offensive behavior, affected approximately 36.3 children of every 1,000. Total child abuse in households with children and excluding media exposure affected 65 children of every 1,000.
- Sexual harassment in the workplace remained mostly unchanged from prior survey at rates affecting approximately 230 of every 1,000 working people.
- Hate crime rates remained unchanged; 92 of every 1,000 people felt vulnerable to hate crime while 11 of every 1,000 reported actual hate victimization.
- People continue feeling safe while walking in their neighborhoods and surrounding areas during the day, night and while driving on Idaho's highways.
- Perceptions of police services provided by police agencies remained mostly unchanged for the last three years; 82% of people perceived police services have remained the same or have gotten better over the last 12 months. About 74% of people who had contact with the police during the same time expressed higher levels of satisfaction with the way in which law enforcement officers performed their job during such contact.

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 Redesign 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.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics (2002) "Crime and Victim Statistics." www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/ U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- 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.
- Elson, R. (1999) *Crime in Idaho – 1998*. Department of Law Enforcement, Bureau of Criminal Identification, Uniform Crime Reporting Unit. Meridian, Idaho: Uniform Crime Reporting Unit.

- Elson, R. (2000) *Crime in Idaho – 1999*. Department of Law Enforcement, Bureau of Criminal Identification, Uniform Crime Reporting Unit. Meridian, Idaho: Uniform Crime Reporting Unit.
- Elson, R. (2001) *Crime in Idaho – 2000*. Idaho State Police, Bureau of Criminal Identification, Uniform Crime Reporting Unit. Meridian, Idaho: Uniform Crime Reporting Unit.
- 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.
- 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, Elson, 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.