

State of South Dakota

Office of the  
Attorney General

Division of  
Criminal Investigation



**South Dakota  
Serious Crime Survey  
1985**

102294

**STATISTICAL ANALYSIS CENTER**

SOUTH DAKOTA SERIOUS CRIME SURVEY  
1985

Doneen B. Hollingsworth  
Gary R. Leonardson, Ph.D.  
Donald E. Gromer  
Marissa E. Schatz

South Dakota Statistical Analysis Center  
Division of Criminal Investigation  
Office of the Attorney General  
Rol Kebach Criminal Justice Training Center  
Pierre, South Dakota 57501  
(605) 773-3331

June 1986

This project was supported by Grant # 83-BJ-CX-k433, awarded by the Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice. Points of view or opinions stated in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position of the United States Department of Justice.

**U.S. Department of Justice  
National Institute of Justice**

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

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been granted by

Public Domain/Bureau of Justice  
Statistics/US Dept. of Justice

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction ..... iii

Methodology ..... 1

Results ..... 4

Victim Profile ..... 41

Appendix A  
    Comment Section ..... 53

Appendix B  
    Summary of Sample Composition ..... 67

Appendix C  
    Comparison of Results Between 1985 and 1976 Surveys 71

Appendix D  
    Discriminant Analysis of Victims/Nonvictims ..... 75

Appendix E  
    Rural Residents versus Urban Residents ..... 77

Appendix F  
    Survey Instrument ..... 81

Selected Bibliography ..... 97

**NCJRS**  
**AUG 25 1988**  
**ACQUISITIONS**

Introduction:

This report is a summary analysis of data gathered from the 1985 South Dakota Serious Crime Survey. The data were obtained via a questionnaire booklet mailed to 3,970 state residents over the age of 17. The survey was conducted by the Statistical Analysis Center (SAC) of the Division of Criminal Investigation.

The 1985 project was the first of its kind sponsored by the Office of the Attorney General. It was conducted during November and December of 1985 and asked respondents about any crime experiences they had in the previous 12 months. The purpose of the survey was threefold: (1) to estimate how many South Dakota citizens are victims of crime, including crime not reported to the police; (2) to analyze and appreciate the experiences of victims with the criminal justice system; and (3) to estimate the level of public support for certain criminal justice programs.

The survey gathered information not otherwise available on the occurrence of crime in South Dakota. Victimization surveys of this type have become increasingly popular in other states. It has long been recognized that a large portion of crimes committed in our society are NOT reported to law enforcement authorities. Victimization surveys can provide a valuable supplement to officially reported crime statistics because victimization data includes incidents not reported to the police. The National Crime Survey, conducted annually by the Bureau of Justice Statistics, produces victimization data for the nation as a whole. However, no data specifically pertaining to South Dakota is available from this source.

Interest in the victims of crime has increased markedly in recent years. The growth of a body of "victimology" literature and the emergence of numerous grassroots victim's rights organizations reflect the public's continuing frustration about crime and the criminal justice system's treatment of victims. A common perception among the public is that the criminal justice system cares only about the defendant and his or her rights, and the victim - viewed by the general citizenry as the truly injured party - is neglected in the process.

Knowledge can be a powerful tool for the changes needed to make victims more active participants in the decisions of the justice process. Many state officials, legislators, and policymakers are working to instill a more sensitive, balanced approach to the treatment of victims in South Dakota. It is hoped that research of this type will help in the development of a balanced justice system.

## Methodology:

Valid and reliable survey research is dependent upon several factors, including a representative SAMPLE, from which inferences can be made about the entire population under study. The state's drivers' license file is considered to be the most representative list of South Dakotans. This list includes names and addresses. There are approximately 610,000 names on the drivers' license files. The files include both active and inactive drivers, and those who possess the cards for identification purposes only. The State (I.P.S.) computer staff used this huge file to generate a representative sample of South Dakotans, aged 18 and over. A systematic random sample procedure was used.

A sample of 3,970 names was drawn. A large sample size was necessary to insure that a significant number of crime victims would be contacted. Criminal victimization, especially of the more serious type, is relatively rare.

A mail survey was chosen over other possible methods of obtaining information from citizens. There is evidence to support the contention that a mail survey provides the respondent more privacy than a telephone or face-to-face interview. Victimization details are often considered private. A mail survey gives the respondent a feeling of anonymity and confidentiality. Another advantage of mail surveys is that the questionnaire can be filled out at the respondent's convenience and therefore he/she does not feel so intruded upon. A successful mail survey is usually dependent upon good follow-up procedures, however.

It should be noted that the accuracy of a victim survey, is of course, dependent on the accuracy of citizens' responses. Individuals may sometimes forget about an incident, inaccurately indicate when it occurred, or choose not to indicate the fact that they were victimized.

In mid-November of 1985, 3,970 surveys were mailed to South Dakota citizens whose names had been drawn at random from the drivers' license files. A cover letter from Attorney General Meierhenry was included, along with a set of instructions and definitions of the specific crimes under consideration.

Persistent follow-up procedures were used to ensure a high rate of return. Two weeks after the initial mailing, postcard "reminders" were sent to all those people who had not yet responded. In the fourth week, a second questionnaire booklet and cover letter were mailed, stressing the importance of citizen participation in the survey. Another postcard "reminder" followed two weeks after that.

The initial sample size was 3,970 people. Of this total, 505 either were deceased or moved without leaving a forwarding address. This left an "effective sample size" of 3,465 (3,970 subtract 505). Out of the 3,465 who received a questionnaire, 2,858 or 82.5% returned the crime survey. A few (182) of the returned forms were either incomplete or were received after the cut-off date of January 1, 1986. Therefore, there were 2,676 questionnaires used in the analysis, representing an "effective response rate" of 77.2% (i.e., 2,676 of 3,465).

#### Sample Response Rates

|                           |                            |                             |
|---------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Original<br>Sample Size   | *<br>Moved/Deceased        | Effective<br>Sample Size    |
| 3,970                     | 505                        | 3,465                       |
| Incomplete<br>Information | Returned<br>After Deadline | Total Unusable<br>Responses |
| 91                        | 91                         | 182                         |
| Non-Responses             | Effective Responses        |                             |
| 607                       | 2,676                      |                             |
| Total Response Rate       | Effective Response Rate    |                             |
| 82.5%                     | 77.2%                      |                             |

The return rate (82.5%) was a very high rate of return for a mail-out survey. This high rate of return strengthens the generalizability of the findings of this study. The high response rate can be attributed in part to the survey's subject matter. Crime is a topic of much interest and concern to the general public. Also, South Dakota citizens have been known to be very cooperative in past survey research projects.

With the high rate of return and the many similarities between the sample characteristics and those of the entire state population, it appears that survey results can be quite accurately generalized to the population as a whole.

Crimes Surveyed:

A set of definitions for the eight crimes examined was included with the survey booklet. The respondents were asked to carefully read them to distinguish among the different types of crime before completing the questionnaire. The eight crimes and their definitions are as follows:

1. THEFT: The unlawful taking of property or money without the actual or threatened use of force.
2. BURGLARY: Unlawful entry of a RESIDENCE or BUSINESS with or without force with the intent to commit a crime. (Usually the taking of property.)
3. ROBBERY: Theft of property or cash directly FROM A PERSON by force or threat of force, with or without a weapon.
4. MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT: Theft or unauthorized use of a motor vehicle. (Car, truck, motorcycle, tractor, snowmobile or airplane.)
5. VANDALISM: Intentional or reckless destruction or defacement of property without consent of the owner.
6. ASSAULT WITH WEAPON: \* Attack with a dangerous or deadly weapon resulting in any physical injury.
7. ASSAULT WITH BODY: \* Attack without a weapon, using only fists, feet, or other bodily part, resulting in any physical injury.
8. SEXUAL ASSAULT: Sexual activity against your will through the actual or threatened use of force.

\* For purposes of some further discussion, Assault with Body and Assault with Weapon will be combined as Assault.

## Results:

These seven crimes can be grouped into two broader categories (Personal and Property Crimes) which will be used throughout this report. Robbery, Assault, and Sexual Assault are known as VIOLENT or PERSONAL crimes. Violent crimes involve the element of personal confrontation between the victim and offender, and because of their nature, are generally considered to be more serious than the property crimes.

Theft, Burglary, Motor Vehicle Theft, and Vandalism are all considered PROPERTY crimes. While these offenses generally do not involve personal danger to the victim, the value of property lost in these crimes is often many times greater than in violent crimes. Throughout this report the term "property crime" will be used synonymously with the terms household crime and non-violent crime.

The first question on the survey asked about crime victimization during the previous 12 months. Eighteen percent (N=481) of those surveyed indicated that they were the victim of at least one of the eight crimes specified: theft, burglary, robbery, motor vehicle theft, vandalism, assault with a weapon, assault with body, and sexual assault.

Further analysis by specific crime resulted in the following:


| Crime               | # of Victims | Percent of Total |
|---------------------|--------------|------------------|
| Theft               | 234          | 33.7%            |
| Vandalism           | 228          | 32.8%            |
| Burglary            | 107          | 15.4%            |
| Assault             | 83           | 12.0%            |
| Motor Vehicle Theft | 23           | 3.3%             |
| Sexual Assault      | 13           | 1.9%             |
| Robbery             | 6            | .9%              |
| Total               | 694          | 100.0%           |

The property crimes of theft, vandalism, and burglary ranked first, second, and third respectively in the percentage of the total. These three accounted for 81.9% of the crime total. Motor vehicle theft was the other crime against property, which brings the total property crime percentage to 85.2%.

Violent crime was 14.8% of the total crime committed. Assault was the most common crime against a person accounting for 12% of the total. Sexual assault followed at 1.9% and robbery was the least common of all crimes at .9%.  
(See Figure 1)

Figure 1

# TYPES OF CRIMES OVERALL



As previously mentioned, 481 of the 2,676 survey respondents indicated they had been the victim of at least one of the specific crimes. Further analysis by type of crime established that 212 (44.1%) of the victims had been victimized by more than one crime. As it is broken out even further, it is shown that these multiple victims suffered an inordinate number of violations against themselves and/or their property.

As shown in the following table, people were the victims of the same crime on an average of 1.3 to 1.9 times, and many were victimized by more than one different crime.

|                        | Number of<br>Victims | Victim-<br>izations | Average Number<br>of Victimitations<br>per Number of<br>Victims |
|------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|---|
| Theft                  | 234                  | 446                 | 1.9   |
| Vandalism              | 228                  | 366                 | 1.6   |
| Burglary               | 107                  | 141                 | 1.3   |
| Assault                | 83                   | 149                 | 1.8   |
| Motor Vehicle<br>Theft | 23                   | 34                  | 1.5   |
| Sexual Assault         | 13                   | 19                  | 1.5   |
| Robbery                | 6                    | 9                   | 1.5   |
| Total                  | 694                  | 1,164               |   |

There were 694 victims of each crime

There were 1,164 occurrences of all eight crimes

A average of 2.4 crimes were committed against each victim during the 12-month period.

1,164 criminal acts were committed against the 481 victims and their property in our sample. The 481 victims had an average of 2.4 crime occurrences committed against them during the past twelve months. Over one-half (55.9%) of the victims indicated they had only been victimized one time; 86 (17.9%) were victimized twice; 58 (12.1%) had been victimized five or more times; and 15 victims (3.1%) were victimized 10 or more times in the last twelve months.

Questions 2 through 19 were designed to be filled out only by those who had indicated in Question 1 that they were a crime victim. Further information was elicited for only the most recent crime in the case of multiple victimizations. The results were first analyzed for all the victims combined and them separated for violent and non-violent victims.



The majority of crimes, as measured by the survey, were not reported to the police in 1985. Violent crimes were not reported as often as were non-violent crimes. Motor vehicle theft and burglary were the crimes most frequently reported to law enforcement authorities. Assault and sexual assault were reported least often. The outcome of cases was more likely to be known for violent crimes than for non-violent crimes. (See Figures 2 and 3).

| Disposition of Case | Overall Victims | Non-Violent Victims | Violent Victims |
|---------------------|-----------------|---------------------|-----------------|
| Not Reported        | 51.9%           | 49.7%               | 59.8%           |
| Dismissed           | 19.5%           | 19.4%               | 20.7%           |
| Plea Bargain        | 1.7%            | 1.3%                | 3.7%            |
| Prosecuted          | 1.5%            | 1.9%                | -0-             |
| Active              | 9.0%            | 9.0%                | 9.8%            |
| Don't Know Outcome  | 16.3%           | 18.6%               | 6.1%            |

South Dakotans do report crimes to law enforcement authorities more often than citizens across the country. Slightly less than half of the crimes committed against South Dakotans in our sample were reported to police. Since first measured in 1973, the National Crime Survey has consistently found that only a third of all crimes in the United States are reported to the police. Thefts resulting in large losses and serious violent crimes are most likely to be reported to the police.

Figure 2

# CURRENT DISPOSITION OF THE MOST RECENT CRIME





Figure 3

# DISPOSITION OF CASE VIOLENT VS. NON-VIOLENT



The most frequent reason given by South Dakota victims for not reporting all crimes was that they felt that it was useless to report the crime because nothing could or would be done about it. There was a significantly different response pattern between property crime victims and violent crime victims as to why the most recent crime committed against them was not reported. The property crime victims were much more likely to believe that reporting was useless or that the crime was not important enough to report than were violent crime victims.

Almost one-third of the victims of violent crime claimed they did not report the crime because they felt it was a private or personal matter. Fear of retaliation and/or investigation was also much more prevailing for violent crime victims than for property crime victims. This fear of retaliation was cited by 40% of the victims of sexual assault as the one most important reason for not reporting the incident. (See Figures 4 and 5)

| Reason For Not Reporting Crime | Overall Victims | Non-violent Victims | Violent Victims |
|--------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------|-----------------|
| Afraid of Retaliation          | 4.7%            | 2.6%                | 12.7%           |
| Afraid of Investigation        | .8%             | 0                   | 3.6%            |
| Private Matter                 | 11.9%           | 7.3%                | 29.1%           |
| Useless                        | 49.8%           | 56.8%               | 29.1%           |
| Not Important                  | 25.7%           | 27.6%               | 14.6%           |
| Too much time wasted           | 1.6%            | 1.6%                | 1.8%            |
| Too busy to report             | .4%             | .5%                 | 0               |

Figure 4

# REASONS FOR NOT REPORTING CRIME





Figure 5

## REASONS FOR NOT REPORTING CRIME VIOLENT VS. NON-VIOLENT




The majority of violent crimes did not involve the use of a weapon, other than bodily threats or fists. Fists, feet, or other body parts were used as weapons in half of these violent crimes. Bodily threats were used against the victims in 28.6% of the cases. Other weapons such as guns, knives, clubs, etc. were used in relatively few crimes. Figure 6 illustrates the type of weapon used in the commission of violent crimes.

| Weapon            | Percent of Cases   |
|-------------------|--------------------|
| Bodily Threats    | 28.6%              |
| Fists, Feet, etc. | 50.0%              |
| Gun               | 4.8%               |
| Knife             | 7.1%               |
| Club, Stick, etc. | 1.2%               |
| Other             | Remainder of Cases |

Figure 6

## WEAPONS USED IN VIOLENT CRIMES




Seven possible emotional problems were listed and the victims were asked to check all those they had as a result of the most recent crime. The problems listed were Fear, Anxiety, Nervousness, Anger, Shame, Sleeplessness, and Self-Blame. Violent crime victims were much more likely to suffer these emotional problems than were victims of non-violent crimes. Each of the emotional problems were found to be reported by a higher percentage of violent crime victims than by property crime victims. All of the percentages between the non-violent and violent groups were statistically significant (See Figure 7).

| Type of Emotional Problem | Overall Victims | Non-violent Victims | Violent Victims |
|---------------------------|-----------------|---------------------|-----------------|
| Fear                      | 9.6%            | 5.7%                | 28.6%           |
| Anxiety                   | 11.3%           | 9.3%                | 20.2%           |
| Nervousness               | 9.6%            | 4.7%                | 33.3%           |
| Anger                     | 47.6%           | 45.3%               | 61.9%           |
| Shame                     | 1.3%            | 0                   | 7.1%            |
| Sleeplessness             | 7.3%            | 4.2%                | 22.6%           |
| Self-Blame                | 7.3%            | 5.4%                | 16.7%           |

It is interesting to note that the emotional problems reported by violent crime victims were experienced to an even greater degree by the victims of sexual assault. Almost three-fourths (71.4%) of the sexual assault victims indicated they had been Afraid since they were victimized. More than half of them also experienced Nervousness and Anger. Over 40 percent suffered from Anxiety and Shame about the incident.

Figure 7

## EXTENT OF EMOTIONAL PROBLEMS VIOLENT VS. NON-VIOLENT




A related question asked the victims to rank their extent of emotional suffering on a scale of 1 to 7. The higher the score the more severe the emotional suffering. Victims of violent crime perceived that they suffered more emotionally than did victims of non-violent crimes (See Figure 8).

| Victim Group | Mean Score | Standard Deviation |
|--------------|------------|--------------------|
| Non-violent  | 2.41       | 1.67               |
| Violent      | 3.58       | 2.17               |

Figure 8

## EXTENT OF EMOTIONAL SUFFERING

VIOLENT VS. NON-VIOLENT



In accordance with the definitions of violent and non-violent crime, only the victims of violent crime could be physically injured as a result. The majority (61.8%) of violent crime victims stated that they were not physically injured as the result of the most recent assault, robbery, or sexual assault; whereas 27.6% of the violent crime victims required first aid following the crime, 6.6% needed medical attention in a doctor's office or hospital, and 4% were hospitalized for more than 24 hours as a result of the crime.

It may seem surprising that the majority of the violent crime victims were not physically injured. However, the types of crimes portrayed by the media involve serious injuries and become newsworthy because they are so unusual. The more frequently occurring crimes affect larger numbers of people, but often have less serious direct physical consequences.

The National Crime Survey reports that approximately 30% of all robbery and assault victims sustained some sort of physical injury. The relationship of the victim to the offender influences the likelihood of injury. Across the country, violent crimes involving strangers were less likely to result in injury to the victim than crimes involving nonstrangers.

Question 9 dealt with the approximate cost of medical and psychological services required as a result of the crime. Thirteen of the victims indicated they did not seek any medical or psychological help because it was too expensive. The cost of these services for those victims who did receive help ranged from \$15 to \$3,600. The median cost was \$191.

| Cost of Services | Frequency | Percentage |
|------------------|-----------|------------|
| Less than \$50   | 5         | 27.8%      |
| \$50 to \$199    | 4         | 22.2%      |
| \$200 to \$499   | 5         | 27.8%      |
| \$500 +          | 4         | 22.2%      |


Nationally, one out of ten violent crime victims incurred medical expenses.

The victims were asked to estimate the total replacement, repair, or cash loss for their property stolen or damaged by burglary, theft, vandalism, or robbery. Figure 9 illustrates the percentage of victims and the amount of their losses. The most common loss category was \$50 to \$249. The smallest percentage of victims had losses of \$1,000 or more; however, 28 people fell into this category.

The fact that economic loss was low, however, does not mean that the impact on the victim was insignificant. For example, a burglary of one's home may have caused only minor financial loss, but it may have a major effect on the victim's feelings of safety and security within the home.

Figure 9

### AMOUNT OF LOSSES AS A RESULT OF CRIME




The next question asked if the victim's insurance covered any of the losses or expenses due to the most recent crime. As shown in Figure 10, the majority of victims (52.5%) were not covered for their loss and 23.9% did not have any insurance. The amount of coverage for those who did receive a claim is illustrated in the pie chart.

The amount of time lost as a result of the crime due to injury, reporting time, court processing, inconvenience, etc., was also discussed. The majority of victims (74.6%) indicated that no time was lost as a result of the crime; however, violent crime victims were likely to have lost more time than were non-violent victims.

| Time Lost    | Non-Violent Victims | Violent Victims |
|--------------|---------------------|-----------------|
| None         | 74.0%               | 75.0%           |
| One-half day | 17.3%               | 11.5%           |
| One day      | 5.3%                | 2.6%            |
| Two days     | 1.6%                | 1.3%            |
| 3-4 days     | .9%                 | 5.1%            |
| 5-7 days     | .9%                 | 3.8%            |

Figure 10

### INSURANCE COVERAGE EXPENSE/LOSS DUE TO CRIME




Question 11 asked if the offender(s) was caught in the most recent crime. Most offenders were not reported caught in all cases (See Figure 11). However, offenders were more likely to be reported caught for violent crimes than for non-violent crimes, in spite of the fact that violent crimes were not reported as often.

| Offender Status      | Overall Victims | Non-Violent Victims | Violent Victims |
|----------------------|-----------------|---------------------|-----------------|
| All were caught      | 13.1%           | 10.9%               | 22.1%           |
| Some were caught     | 1.9%            | 2.1%                | 1.3%            |
| Offenders not caught | 70.9%           | 72.1%               | 66.2%           |
| Don't Know           | 14.0%           | 14.9%               | 10.4%           |

Figure 11

### OFFENDERS CAUGHT IN THE MOST RECENT CRIME





The next question dealt with the relationship between the victim and offender. The victims were asked how well they knew their offender(s). Figure 12 illustrates the relationship for all victims and Figure 13 looks at this for violent and non-violent victims.

A Bureau of Justice Statistics report found that when people worry about crime, they worry most about being injured by strangers. The fear of crime, in general, is the fear of a random, unprovoked attack by a stranger. This study and many others have found, however, that much crime is committed by and against people who know each other well. It is widely believed that a large proportion of crimes committed by relatives and close acquaintances are not reported to the police and are under-reported. For that reason, the number of crimes committed by nonstrangers may be somewhat understated, and the proportion of crimes committed by strangers may be somewhat overstated.

The victims of violent crimes were much more likely to know the offender(s) than were victims of non-violent crimes. Of course, it is the nature of violent crime that its victims have personal contact with the offender. Many victims of property crime never see the offender.

|                       | Overall<br>Victims | Non-Violent<br>Victims | Violent<br>Victims |
|-----------------------|--------------------|------------------------|--------------------|
| Stranger/Know Nothing | 58.3%              | 65.1%                  | 32.8%              |
| Had seen before       | 12.3%              | 12.6%                  | 10.5%              |
| An acquaintance       | 12.3%              | 11.5%                  | 15.8%              |
| Knew well             | 11.7%              | 8.2%                   | 25.0%              |
| Relative              | 5.4%               | 2.6%                   | 15.8%              |

A strong majority (85.8%) of the victims of sexual assault had at least seen their attacker prior to the criminal incident. Almost three-fourths of the assault victims had also at least seen the offender before the attack: 23.8% of those assault victims indicated that they knew the offender well; another 16.7% were related to the offender. It should be noted that there was only a small number (13) of sexual assault victims; therefore, results are tentative.

Figure 12

# OFFENDER/VICTIM RELATIONSHIP





Figure 13

# OFFENDER/VICTIM RELATIONSHIP VIOLENT VS. NON-VIOLENT




The majority of all crimes (52.3%) occurred at the home of the victim. Non-violent crimes were more likely to occur at the victim's home than were violent crimes. Over half of all property crimes happened at the victim's home and another 14% happened at or near the victim's place of work. Forty percent of all violent crimes occurred at the home of the victim; 18.8% were in or near a bar or lounge; and 13.8% happened in a residential area. Figure 14 and the following table illustrate the different locations and the percentage of victims at those locations.

| Location of Crime   | Overall Crime | Non-Violent Crime | Violent Crime |
|---------------------|---------------|-------------------|---------------|
| At my home          | 52.3%         | 55.1%             | 40.0%         |
| Another home        | 1.8%          | 1.4%              | 3.8%          |
| Residential area    | 6.8%          | 5.3%              | 13.8%         |
| Outside city limits | 5.2%          | 5.1%              | 5.0%          |
| In or near bar      | 7.0%          | 4.5%              | 18.8%         |
| Downtown area       | 7.0%          | 7.3%              | 5.0%          |
| Place of work       | 12.2%         | 14.0%             | 2.5%          |
| Other               | 7.9%          | 5.9%              | 11.3%         |

In contrast to South Dakota findings, the National Crime Survey has found that the streets were the most common site for personal crimes of violence. One would expect South Dakota to have less street crime than the nation as a whole because of our generally rural environment. However, the South Dakota survey and the National Crime Survey both show that sexual assaults were most likely to occur at the home of the victim. Almost one-third of the assaults in South Dakota also occurred at the victim's home, but the next likely place for assaults was in a bar or lounge.

Figure 14

### LOCATION OF CRIME VIOLENT VS. NON-VIOLENT



Questions 16 through 19 each made a statement and asked the victims to circle the answer which best represented their response to the situation described. The possible answers were strongly agree, agree, indifferent, disagree, and strongly disagree.

Question 16 stated "After my experience as a crime victim in South Dakota, I would be willing to report any crimes committed against me in the future." Significantly more non-violent victims agreed with this statement than did the violent victims.

- 77.5% of all the victims agreed with the statement.
- 79.8% of non-violent crime victims claimed they would report crimes committed against them in the future.
- 66.7% of violent crime victims claimed they would report crimes against them in the future.

Question 17 said, "If I became a crime victim again in the future, I would go through the entire court process if necessary to prosecute the offender(s)." Once again, the non-violent victims were much more likely to agree than the violent victims.

- 73.8% of all the victims agreed with the statement.
- 78% of non-violent crime victims claimed they would go through the entire court process, if necessary, to prosecute future offenders.
- 55% of violent crime victims claimed they would go through the entire court process, if necessary, to prosecute future offenders.

Question 18 stated "I feel that I lost more than I gained through prosecution." The violent and non-violent victims answered this question similarly.

- 22.8% of all the victims agreed with this statement. The majority of victims (50.3%) felt indifferent toward the statement.
- 26.6% of non-violent crime victims felt they lost more than they gained.
- 27.7% of violent crime victims felt they lost more than they gained.

Question 19 said "If my county had had a victim/witness assistant available whom I could have contacted for information about the criminal justice system and for assistance, I feel I would have been aided significantly." In this instance, the violent crime victims were much more likely to have agreed with the statement.

- 46.9% of all the victims agreed with the statement.
- 42.5% of the non-violent crime victims felt they would have been greatly aided by a victim/witness assistant.
- 62.7% of the violent crime victims felt they would have been greatly aided by a victim/witness assistant.

The next section of the questionnaire was designed to be filled out by all the survey participants, whether they were a victim or not, and dealt with the respondents' perceptions of crime and the criminal justice system. The responses were generally looked at from three perspectives:

(1) the answers of all the survey participants; (2) the responses of crime victims compared to non-victims; and (3) the violent crime victims contrasted with the non-violent crime victims.

Question 20 asked the respondents if they felt that crime in their community had increased, decreased, or stayed about the same within the past year. Almost two-thirds of the citizens (65.4%) believed that crime had stayed about the same in their community, while 29.2% of the respondents felt that crime had increased and only 5.4% of those participating believed that crime had actually decreased.

Victims of crime were much more likely to believe that crime had increased in their community than were the non-victims. There was very little difference between violent and non-violent victims in their perception of the change in crime within their community during the last year.

| <u>Group</u> | <u>Increased</u> | <u>Decreased</u> | <u>Same</u> |
|--------------|------------------|------------------|-------------|
| Overall      | 29.2%            | 5.4%             | 65.4%       |
| Victim       | 46.1%            | 4.7%             | 49.3%       |
| Non-Victim   | 25.5%            | 5.6%             | 68.9%       |
| Violent      | 46.4%            | 4.8%             | 48.8%       |
| Non-Violent  | 46.5%            | 4.7%             | 48.8%       |

South Dakota citizens felt somewhat more positive about crime rates in their community than did a national sample of citizens. A 1983 Gallup Poll showed that 37% of Americans thought there was more crime in their area compared to a year ago, while 17% believed there was less crime, 36% felt crime had stayed the same, and 10% had no opinion.

Question 21 asked the citizens if they believed they were likely to be the victim of a crime during the next year. An overwhelming majority (85.2%) of the respondents said No, they did not feel they would be a crime victim. Some (14.8%) of the survey participants felt they were likely to be a victim of a crime within the next year.

Victims of crime were much more likely than non-victims to believe that they would be victimized in the course of the next year. When the victims were separated by category of crime, it was found that victims of violent crimes were more likely to feel that they would be a victim of a crime during the next year than were victims of non-violent crimes.

| Group       | Likely to be Victim | Not Likely to be Victim |
|-------------|---------------------|-------------------------|
| Overall     | 14.8%               | 85.2%                   |
| Victim      | 40.5%               | 59.5%                   |
| Non-Victim  | 9.3%                | 90.7%                   |
| Violent     | 53.1%               | 46.9%                   |
| Non-Violent | 38.1%               | 61.9%                   |

It is interesting to compare the South Dakota responses to national responses to a similar question concerning the likelihood of being a crime victim. Overall, 14.8% of the South Dakota survey respondents felt they were likely to be a crime victim in the next year. An ABC News Poll, conducted in 1982, found that 32% of the American public felt they were likely to be a crime victim. The difference between South Dakota and the ABC Poll may be partially attributed to the different wording of the question. The national survey asked the respondents to rate their chances of "someday" being a violent crime victim.

Those who answered yes to Question 21 (N=384) were asked to specify which crime they were concerned about becoming a victim of. Property crime victimization was a concern to 89% of those responding. Theft was mentioned most often - 43.1% of the participants felt they were likely to be a victim of theft, while 24.8% were concerned about vandalism and 20.4% felt they would be burglarized. Eleven percent of those responding were fearful of being the victim of a violent crime, with assault being the most common violent crime listed. There were no significant differences between the victims and non-victims or the violent and non-violent victims with regard to the types of crime they believed they would be the victim of during the next year.

The next question asked "Do you feel safe in your home at night?" Overall, 94.8% of the respondents replied that they did feel safe at night in their homes. Only 5.2% of South Dakotans reported they did not feel safe in their homes at night. Non-victims of crime were more likely to feel safe than were the victims. Among the victims, the violent crime victims were less likely to feel safe than the non-violent crime victims.

| Group       | Felt Safe | Did Not Feel Safe |
|-------------|-----------|-------------------|
| Overall     | 94.8%     | 5.2%              |
| Victim      | 89.9%     | 10.1%             |
| Non-Victim  | 95.8%     | 4.2%              |
| Violent     | 75.9%     | 24.1%             |
| Non-Violent | 92.9%     | 7.1%              |

South Dakotans feel much safer in their homes at night than do the American people in general. A 1983 Gallup Poll found that 16% of Americans did NOT feel safe in their home at night, compared to 5% of South Dakotans feeling that way. This Gallup Poll finding has remained fairly constant since 1975.

Questions 23 and 24 asked the respondents to list two crimes which most concerned them in their community and state, respectively. The following tables present the frequencies and percentages for each of the crimes which were listed.

### CRIMES MOST CONCERNED ABOUT IN COMMUNITY

| Crime            | # of Responses | Percent of Total |
|------------------|----------------|------------------|
| Vandalism        | 1,051          | 21.8%            |
| Theft            | 1,027          | 21.3%            |
| Burglary         | 815            | 16.9%            |
| Sexual Assault   | 619            | 12.8%            |
| Assault          | 308            | 6.4%             |
| Robbery          | 298            | 6.2%             |
| Drugs            | 204            | 4.2%             |
| DWI              | 167            | 3.5%             |
| Murder           | 97             | 2.0%             |
| Child Abuse      | 87             | 1.8%             |
| Vehicle Theft    | 82             | 1.7%             |
| Kidnapping       | 31             | 0.6%             |
| Speeding/Traffic | 24             | 0.5%             |
| Poaching, etc.   | 9              | 0.2%             |
| Arson            | 7              | 0.1%             |
| Total            | 4,826          | 100.0%           |

### CRIMES MOST CONCERNED ABOUT IN THE STATE

| Crimes              | # of Responses | Percent of Total |
|---------------------|----------------|------------------|
| Sexual Assault      | 1,098          | 23.2%            |
| Assault             | 730            | 15.4%            |
| Robbery             | 563            | 11.9%            |
| Burglary            | 453            | 9.6%             |
| Theft               | 448            | 9.4%             |
| Murder              | 367            | 7.7%             |
| Vandalism           | 312            | 6.6%             |
| Drugs               | 267            | 5.6%             |
| DWI                 | 238            | 5.0%             |
| Child Abuse         | 128            | 2.7%             |
| Motor Vehicle Theft | 74             | 1.6%             |
| Kidnapping          | 50             | 1.0%             |
| Speeding/Traffic    | 5              | 0.1%             |
| Arson               | 5              | 0.1%             |
| Total               | 4,740          | 99.9%            |

It is interesting to note the differences between the crimes of most concern to respondents for their community and for the state. The top three crimes of concern in the community were property crimes, but the top three crimes in the state were violent crimes. Apparently, the respondents were more worried about property loss or damage than violent crimes occurring in their own neighborhood. They believed the more serious, violent crimes were likely to occur in other parts of the state.

Sexual assault led both lists as the violent crime of most concern. The respondents saw sexual assault as especially worrisome at the state level.

A slight majority (55.1%) of the respondents indicated they would pay additional tax dollars to reduce the threat of crime in South Dakota. There were no significant differences between the victims and non-victims or the violent and non-violent crime victims. All the groups seemed to be somewhat in favor of the proposition.

Almost two-thirds of the American public indicated we were spending "too little" to halt the rising crime rate in the country, as reported in a national poll conducted in 1982 by the Roper Public Opinion Research Center. In fact, more people in that poll felt we were spending too little on halting the rising crime rate than on any other selected problem in the country. Since the first Roper Poll in 1973, about two-thirds of the American public have consistently thought that too little is being spent to reduce crime.

There may be some explanation for the discrepancy between the South Dakota and the national findings. First, crime is more prevalent in other, more populated areas of the country than in South Dakota. Therefore, the American public may be more apt to think that additional money should be spent to reduce crime. Second, the questions were worded slightly different in the two surveys. The national poll asked the respondents if "we're spending too much, too little, or about the right amount on halting the rising crime rate?" The subject of taxes was inferred, but not directly mentioned. The South Dakota survey directly asked the respondents if they would pay additional tax dollars to reduce the threat of crime in the state. If the national poll had specifically asked about increasing taxes to reduce crime, perhaps the public would not have been as supportive.



Question 26 asked the respondents to rate the present effectiveness of South Dakota Courts, Law Enforcement, and Corrections as compared to five years ago (1980).

| THE COURTS  |        |       |       |          |
|-------------|--------|-------|-------|----------|
| Group       | Better | Same  | Worse | Not Sure |
| Overall     | 10.6%  | 43.2% | 26.6% | 19.5%    |
| Victim      | 9.0%   | 41.9% | 29.0% | 20.1%    |
| Non-Victim  | 11.0%  | 43.5% | 26.1% | 19.4%    |
| Violent     | 11.0%  | 41.5% | 29.3% | 18.2%    |
| Non-Violent | 8.7%   | 42.4% | 28.7% | 20.2%    |

None of the groups were greatly impressed with the current effectiveness of the courts, as compared to five years ago. There were no significant differences between any of the groups in regard to their response by categories.

| LAW ENFORCEMENT |        |       |       |          |
|-----------------|--------|-------|-------|----------|
| Group           | Better | Same  | Worse | Not Sure |
| Overall         | 31.7%  | 44.3% | 12.1% | 11.9%    |
| Victim          | 24.8%  | 42.8% | 19.0% | 13.4%    |
| Non-Victim      | 33.3%  | 44.6% | 10.6% | 11.5%    |
| Violent         | 29.3%  | 37.8% | 25.6% | 7.3%     |
| Non-Violent     | 23.6%  | 44.0% | 17.7% | 14.7%    |

Overall, law enforcement rated significantly better than courts or corrections did in the state. All of the above groups had somewhat favorable impressions of the current effectiveness of law enforcement as compared to five years ago. However, non-victim responses were more favorable toward law enforcement than were victim responses. Violent crime victims also had a significantly different response pattern than did victims of non-violent crimes.

It is interesting to examine the results of a national poll concerning public attitudes toward the job performance of Local, State, and Federal law enforcement officials. The respondents were more positive about the job done by local law enforcement than by state and federal police. Most (62%) of the national respondents rated their local law enforcement officials positively; 56% gave state law enforcement officials a positive rating; and 47% rated law enforcement at the federal level as positive. It should be noted that most people would be more aware of police activity at the local level than at the state or federal levels.


| CORRECTIONS Group | Better | Same  | Worse | Not Sure |
|-------------------|--------|-------|-------|----------|
| Overall           | 12.1%  | 34.4% | 27.6% | 25.9%    |
| Victim            | 12.4%  | 30.4% | 32.7% | 24.5%    |
| Non-Victim        | 12.0%  | 35.2% | 26.5% | 26.3%    |
| Violent           | 13.8%  | 26.3% | 35.0% | 24.9%    |
| Non-Violent       | 12.4%  | 30.9% | 32.3% | 24.4%    |

None of the groups were greatly impressed with the current effectiveness of corrections as compared to five years ago. There were no significant differences between the two groups (victims/non-victims and violent/non-violent) in regards to overall response by categories.

Figure 15 portrays the results for each criminal justice institution for the total respondents.

Figure 15

### EFFECTIVENESS OF C.J. SYSTEM COURTS, LAW ENFORCEMENT, CORRECTIONS



Question 27 asked the respondents to check three things which they felt would most reduce crime in South Dakota. Seven methods of possible crime reduction were listed, along with an "other" category which allowed the respondents to specify their own choice. The following table presents the methods and their corresponding frequencies and percentages.

RANK OF THINGS WHICH WOULD MOST REDUCE CRIME IN SOUTH DAKOTA

|                            | Number of Responses By | Percent of Total |
|----------------------------|------------------------|------------------|
| Longer Jail Sentence       | 1,618                  | 21.3%            |
| Mandatory Jail Sentence    | 1,488                  | 19.6%            |
| Neighborhood Watch Program | 1,473                  | 19.4%            |
| More Undercover Police     | 813                    | 10.7%            |
| Secret Witness Program     | 775                    | 10.2%            |
| Increase # of Police       | 514                    | 6.7%             |
| Other                      | 463                    | 6.1%             |
| Handgun Registration       | 457                    | 6.0%             |
| Total                      | 7,601                  | 100.0%           |

The most popular method mentioned for reducing crime in the state was longer confinement for convicted criminals. Sixty percent of the respondents indicated longer confinement would be an effective means of crime reduction. Over half of all those responding also listed mandatory jail sentencing and a neighborhood watch program as helpful in lessening crime. The least popular method for reducing crime was handgun registration.


Question 29 asked the respondents' opinions regarding mandatory sentencing, such that a person convicted of a crime would automatically receive that sentence. Overall, 60.3% of the total respondents were in favor of mandatory sentencing. There was no statistical difference between the victims and non-victims or the violent and non-violent victims concerning a previously agreed upon penalty or sentence.

Questions 30 through 34 each made a statement and asked the participants to circle the answer which best represented their level of agreement with each specific statement. The answers included strongly agree, agree, indifferent, disagree, and strongly disagree. There were no significant differences in the responses of the victims and non-victims or the violent and non-violent crime victims, therefore only the overall results will be used when discussing these five questions.

Question 30 stated, "Victims of violent crimes should be compensated or reimbursed for their loss or injury." The respondents were very much in favor of reimbursing the violent crime victims: 86% agreed, 7.4% were indifferent, and 6.6% disagreed (See Figure 16).

Figure 16


## VICTIMIZATION COMPENSATION



Question 31 carried the compensation issue one step further: "The reimbursement of victims of violent crimes should come from State funds." Although the respondents were in favor of victim reimbursement, they were generally opposed to State funds paying for that reimbursement: 53.1% of the respondents were opposed to the concept, 16.7% were indifferent, and 30.2% agreed with using state money for this purpose (See Figure 17).

Figure 17

## REIMBURSEMENT FROM STATE FUNDS



South Dakota law does provide for victim reimbursement by the offender. §23A-28-1 through §23A-28-12 describe the procedures through which the victim may be reimbursed by the violator for monetary damages as a result of the criminal activity. §23A-28-2 states, "If the sentencing court orders suspended imposition of sentence, suspended sentence, or probation, the court shall require as a condition that the defendant, in cooperation with the court service officer assigned to him, must promptly prepare a plan of restitution, including the name and address of each victim, a specific amount of restitution to each victim, and a schedule of restitution payments." The court considers many factors before approving the plan of restitution including the defendant's age, employment circumstances, family and financial details, etc. No restitution may be ordered against a defendant who is not, or who is not expected to be, financially capable of fulfilling the obligations.


Compliance with the plan of restitution becomes a condition of the defendant's probation or suspension. Failure of the defendant to obey the court's plan of restitution constitutes a violation of the condition of parole. In practice, enforcement of the restitution order is often difficult to effect.

It should be noted that the restitution proceedings described in Chapter 23A-28 do not limit or impair the rights of victims to sue and recover damages from the defendant in a civil action. Also, unlike several other states in the nation, South Dakota does not provide State funds for the compensation of the victims of crime.

Question 32 said, "State funds should be appropriated to encourage counties to hire a special assistant to help victims and witnesses during the court process." Almost three-fourths of the respondents (71.6%) were in favor of using state funds to encourage counties to hire these special victim/witness assistants, while 15.1% of the participants were indifferent and 13.3% were opposed to the proposal (See Figure 18).

Figure 18

### VICTIM/WITNESS ASSISTANT



Legislation was recently passed in the 1986 Legislative Session establishing guidelines for this victim/witness assistant. The law basically enables South Dakota counties to hire these special assistants who will work with the state's attorney and sheriff of the particular county. The duties of the victim/witness assistant prescribed by §22-1-2, §22-2-10, and §22-1-11 include:

- 1) Advise the victim about the legal proceedings in which the victim will be involved;
- 2) Advise the victim when he will be required to appear at any proceeding and if the proceeding is continued or postponed;
- 3) Assist the state's attorney and the victim to determine the amount of monetary damages suffered by the victim and advise the victim about restitution;
- 4) Advise, if the victim is sixteen years old or less and the victim of certain crimes, the victim and one of the victim's immediate family that the preliminary hearing or disposition testimony of the victim may be videotaped pursuant to §23A-12-9.
- 5) Advise the victim or one of the victim's immediate family if the defendant is released from custody and the defendant is released from custody and the defendant's bail conditions.

At this writing, four counties in South Dakota have a victim/witness assistant to aid the victims of crime through the legal process. Minnehaha County has had an assistant since early 1984 and their program has been a model for other counties to follow. Brown, Davison, and Lawrence counties have recently named victim/witness assistants. The assistant in Davison County is presently a volunteer working out of the Sheriff's Office.

It is expected that many other counties in South Dakota will follow the lead of these four counties by hiring special victim assistants in the future. Because of financial constraints, several smaller counties may hire one assistant to help crime victims in a group of counties.

Question 33 stated, "The victims of violent crime should be notified when the convict is eligible for parole." An overwhelming majority (89%) of the respondents agreed that victims should know when the offender would be going before the Board of Pardons and Paroles, while only 5% disagreed with this proposal and 6% were indifferent (See Figure 19).

Question 34 asked for the respondent's level of agreement with the following statement: "The victims of violent crimes have the right to be heard at the convict's parole hearing." Many (85.6%) of those responding agreed that the violent crime victim should be allowed to provide his/her input at the offender's parole hearing, while a few (6.6%) were opposed to the concept and 7.8% were indifferent. (See Figure 20)

The issues of notification of victims regarding the offender's parole eligibility and the victim input at the parole hearing were also raised in the 1986 Legislative Session. The proposed legislation was passed and signed and can be found in SDCL §24-15-8.1, SDCL §24-15-8.2, SDCL 24-15-8.3, and SDCL §24-15-3. These new laws provide for the notification of the victims when the inmate will be eligible for consideration for parole. "The notice shall provide the inmate's parole consideration eligibility date, the parole hearing date, and it shall advise the victim that he may be present at the hearing and may state his opinion regarding the possible parole of the inmate." It will be interesting to see what effect, if any, the victim's attendance and input at the parole hearing will have on the release date of the inmate.

Figure 19

## PAROLE ELIGIBILITY NOTIFICATION OF VICTIM





Figure 20

## PAROLE HEARING VICTIM INPUT AT HEARING





## VICTIM PROFILE

The remaining questions on the survey were demographic in nature and were designed to obtain a profile of the respondents. From these questions, victim characteristics were established. The respondent demographics were also used to compare the sample characteristics with those of the general population, as measured by 1980 Census data for South Dakota.

Overall, the South Dakota crime victims were more likely to be young, male, single, fairly well educated, and to have lived in a larger community for a relatively short time. This South Dakota victim profile compares favorably with a national crime victim profile developed over the years by the National Crime Survey, which is conducted annually by the Bureau of Justice Statistics. The National Crime Survey has found that victimization rates for personal crimes of violence were relatively higher for males, younger persons, blacks, the poor, and single persons (those separated or divorced, as well as those never married.)

Throughout the last decade, the National Crime Survey has also found certain kinds of households have remained more vulnerable to crime than others. These are black households, households with high incomes, and households in central cities of metropolitan areas. Nationwide during 1984, 29% of all black households, 30% of all households with incomes of \$25,000 or more, and 31% of all households in central cities were touched by crime.

### Sex:

Overall, a higher proportion of the State's males than females were likely to be victims of crimes. However, when type of crime is examined, females were more likely to be the victims of violent crime in South Dakota. This finding is in sharp contrast to the National Crime Survey data, which reports overall violent crime rates were approximately two times higher for males than for females across the country.

- 20.4% of surveyed males were victims.
- 15.7% of surveyed females were victims.
  
- 45.2% of the violent crime victim respondents were male.
- 54.8% of the violent crime victim respondents were female.

An almost equal percentage of males and females in South Dakota were assault victims: 49% of assault victims were male and 51% were female. The National Crime Survey has found that women are more vulnerable than men to assault by acquaintances and relatives. South Dakota robbery victims were more often male than female. Sexual assaults happened much more often to females, however, since all but one of the sexual assault victims in the South Dakota survey were female.

Age:

In South Dakota, younger people (ages 18-29) were more likely to be victims of crime than were older people (60 and over). The National Crime Survey has also examined the different age groups in the population and determined the young were the most likely to be victims of violent crime. Other surveys have also shown that older citizens are generally less likely to be victimized, though they are more likely to alter their lifestyles due to a fear of crime. The elderly's greater fear of crime may cause them to restrict their lives in ways that reduce their chances of being victimized.

| Age Group   | *Overall Rate | Violent Rate | Non-Violent Rate |
|-------------|---------------|--------------|------------------|
| 18-19       | 22.2%         | 25.0%        | 75.0%            |
| 20-29       | 25.7%         | 28.6%        | 71.4%            |
| 30-39       | 18.1%         | 14.7%        | 85.3%            |
| 40-49       | 18.4%         | 12.0%        | 88.0%            |
| 50-59       | 16.2%         | 8.5%         | 91.5%            |
| 60-69       | 11.6%         | 7.3%         | 92.7%            |
| 70 and over | 7.6%          | 5.3%         | 94.7%            |

\*Overall Victimization Rate = 18%

A similar pattern is seen for all crime in that the victimization rate decreases as age increases. The degree of change is most noticeable for the violent crime victims, however (See Figure 21).

The most striking single category was the 20 to 29 age group. This particular category accounted for more than half (57.1%) of all the violent crimes and 62.2% of the South Dakota assault victims. Almost three-fourths (71.4%) of the sexual assault victims were also in their twenties, and 30.8% of all property crime victims also were of the same age group.


Race:

Based on our sample, it appears that Native Americans were more likely to be crime victims than were Caucasians. (The Native American findings should be interpreted somewhat cautiously because their response rate was low.) It also appears that Native Americans were more likely to be the victims of violent crime than were whites. Indians suffered a disproportionate number of motor vehicle thefts as compared to whites in South Dakota, as 27.3% of all motor vehicle theft victims were Native Americans.

Figure 21

# VICTIM AGE RATE

## VICTIMIZATION BY AGE



Marital Status:

There was a significant relationship between victimization rate and marital status. For both males and females, married persons were less likely to be victims of any type of crime than were the never married or separated/divorced. This was seen even more clearly for the violent crime victims as compared to the non-violent crime victims. All of the sexual assault victims listed themselves as single, separated, or divorced. Sixty percent of assault victims were in these same marital categories, however, 35.6% of all assault victims were married.

Two-thirds of all assaults on divorced and separated women measured by the National Crime Survey were committed by acquaintances and relatives. Additionally, in almost three-fourths of spouse-on-spouse assaults, the victim was divorced or separated at the time of the incident.

| Marital Status     | *Overall Rate | Violent Rate | Non-Violent Rate |
|--------------------|---------------|--------------|------------------|
| Single             | 23.8%         | 32.1%        | 67.9%            |
| Married            | 15.9%         | 9.5%         | 90.5%            |
| Divorced/separated | 31.6%         | 44.2%        | 55.8%            |
| Widowed            | 7.9%          | 27.3%        | 72.7%            |

\*Overall Victimization Rate = 18%

Education:

The crime victims overall tended to have more years of education than the non-victims in our sample. Violent crime victims, however, had statistically significant fewer years of education than did the non-violent crime victims.

| Group               | Average Years of Education |
|---------------------|----------------------------|
| Victim              | 13.3 years                 |
| Non-Victims         | 12.7 years                 |
| Violent Victims     | 12.9 years                 |
| Non-Violent Victims | 13.4 years                 |



Income:

Income level was found to be somewhat related to the victim rate. Those with higher and lower incomes had the highest rates of victimization. As shown in the following table, a different pattern emerges when type of crime is looked at. Violent crime victims were more likely to have lower incomes while non-violent victims were more likely to have higher incomes (See Figure 22).

| Income        | *Overall Rate | **Violent Rate | **Non-Violent Rate |
|---------------|---------------|----------------|--------------------|
| 0-7,499       | 21.8%         | 24.5%          | 75.5%              |
| 7,500-9,999   | 16.6%         | 40.0%          | 60.0%              |
| 10,000-14,999 | 17.0%         | 25.7%          | 74.3%              |
| 15,000-19,999 | 16.8%         | 20.3%          | 79.7%              |
| 20,000-24,999 | 16.8%         | 19.7%          | 80.3%              |
| 25,000-34,999 | 16.3%         | 5.6%           | 94.4%              |
| 35,000 plus   | 20.1%         | 10.4%          | 89.6%              |

\*Overall Victimization Rate = 18%

\*\*Percent of victims who were in either violent or non-violent category - totals to 100%

The National Crime Survey reported a direct relationship between family income and the likelihood of violent victimization: the lower the income, the greater the victimization.


Forty-four percent of the thefts in South Dakota during 1985 occurred in households with annual incomes of \$25,000 and over. Burglary was most common in those households with yearly incomes greater than \$35,000. Vandalism also was committed more frequently against those households in the highest income category.

Motor vehicle theft was the only crime studied which occurred with the most frequency to those families in the lowest income bracket: 27.3% of all motor vehicle thefts happened to households reporting an income of less than \$7,500 per year. Assaults were most commonly committed against victims whose family income ranged from \$10,000 to \$14,999 annually.

Figure 22

# VICTIM INCOME RATE

## VICTIMIZATION BY INCOME



Community Size:

The size of community was related to victimization. Sparsely populated areas tended to have a lower rate than did more populated areas (See Figure 23). The National Crime Survey has also found that rural residents are less often crime victims than are people living in cities. The size of community did not make any significant difference in whether the crime was violent or non-violent however.

Size of Community      Victimization Rate

|                 |       |
|-----------------|-------|
| Farm/ranch      | 11.2% |
| Less than 500   | 13.3% |
| 500-999         | 16.8% |
| 1,000-2,499     | 17.4% |
| 2,500-4,999     | 21.0% |
| 5,000-9,999     | 16.0% |
| 10,000-19,999   | 20.9% |
| 20,000 and over | 22.5% |

Overall Victimization Rate = 18%

Mobility:

The questionnaire asked respondents to indicate the length of time they had lived in South Dakota and how long they had lived in their present community. The length of time lived in South Dakota was not related to victimization. However, the length of time lived in the present community was related to victimization rates overall. That is, the rate of criminal victimization decreased as the number of years spent in the community increased. The relationship did not continue when the type of crime was examined.

Time in Present Community      Victimization Rate


|                         |       |
|-------------------------|-------|
| Less than one year      | 24.1% |
| One to two years        | 31.3% |
| Three to five years     | 22.2% |
| Six to ten years        | 17.1% |
| Eleven to fifteen years | 13.1% |
| Sixteen or more years   | 15.6% |

Overall Victimization Rate = 18%

Figure 23

# VICTIM COMMUNITY SIZE

## RATE OF VICTIMIZATION BY POPULATION





APPENDIX A

The respondents were given several opportunities to comment further on various sections of the survey instrument. The majority of the survey participants did write additional observations on their questionnaires. The large number of comments elicited by those responding is a further indication of the amount of interest shown in crime and criminal justice issues by South Dakotans.

All of the comments were recorded and a representative selection has been included on the following pages. The chosen comments have been separated into their respective topical areas. All of the written observations would have been included in this document if space had permitted. They were all very interesting and have contributed significantly to the overall results of the project.



WHEN ASKED FOR PERSONAL EXPERIENCES AND COMMENTS, SOME VICTIMS SAID:

"Especially in the case of sexual abuse of children, we must give 'stiffer' punishments. My father-in-law was recently convicted of sexually abusing a grandchild. There was a lot of plea bargaining done, he was sent to the Pen for 2 weeks and then to the Human Services Center for 2-3 weeks. He received no treatment at HSC because they had no information on him. His parole is broken constantly because he's been given permission to leave the county; leave the state; grandchildren stay overnight in his home; and he hasn't been to therapy for 11 months! The clear message he's been given by our legal system is 'What you did really isn't that bad.' Our judges need to become enlightened to this problem!!"

"Although I was not a direct victim of any of these crimes, my daughter who is 13 was grabbed by a masked intruder in our home and the next morning my mother-in-law was severely beaten in our place of business and the business was robbed. My mother-in-law was hospitalized for 4 weeks and has still not recovered but is home. I finally feel safe at home at night but for a long time I did not. I still make sure all doors are locked, even during the day."

"During this past year, I have had mixed emotions about the criminal justice system. Three hours before receiving this, I had a call from my husband saying a trailer parked next to his business was stolen last night. He's had property stolen at least 4 times in the past year. A friend was killed by a drunk driver. My daughter was the victim of a sexual assault and was treated well by the police. The victim's assistant was a great help."

"In my assault, I did nothing to provoke the attack. I was simply in the wrong place at the wrong time. The State's Attorney told me he kind of liked the defendant. He allowed him to plea bargain. The defendant would plead guilty to a lesser charge, but when we were in court, he pled 'not guilty.' The judge gave him the minimum penalty. The defendant continued to threaten me whenever he saw me downtown - threatened me with death. I was told several times I was as good as dead. You will have to tell me how the justice system could have been improved. I don't feel there was a working justice system!"

"I know of a party that was a victim. The juvenile was caught but got off. He was told to make payments, to pay back what was stolen. It was never followed up on and done. This should not be. Also, a party had things stolen from their farm. It was reported but no one ever came to investigate."

WHEN ASKED FOR PERSONAL EXPERIENCES AND COMMENTS, SOME VICTIMS SAID:

"We do know that our present justice system isn't working or we wouldn't have to turn our colleges into prisons. Criminals often get a slap on the wrist and the victim often gets the shaft."

"Our losses from three break-ins were over \$15,000 including the arson on September 15, 1985. To our knowledge, nothing has been done at this time to apprehend those involved. The law enforcement officers are good at taking pictures, fingerprints and sending evidence to Pierre but everything stops there. As far as law enforcement for this end of the county, we have none! One cop between two towns who works part-time is not enough."

"Your survey considers only the victim of crimes but there is another kind of victim during all of this too. It is the victim of knowing and loving the one who is charged with the crime. My husband and I are two of those victims. The hurt and pain are very real and deep even after two and one half years. The crime and court proceedings were in another state so the expenses were great too. During the trial, I was so ashamed of my fellow human being as they were like wild animals after a wounded animal. Both lawyers tried to see if they could out perform the other in their acting abilities."

"I did this survey from a woman's view point. Living on the reservation is probably somewhat different than a city. We are seeing more alcoholism, vandalism, child abuse and family abuse, also robbery to support a drinking or drug habit. Also the court system, to me, is very lax. I'm sure tax dollars are adequate. Once you catch the thief or criminal, make the sentence fit the crime."

"I feel South Dakota is a good place to live and raise my family. I feel safe here and I hope I always will. As a born citizen of this state, I appreciate the concern of your department."

"I am writing in response to the recent crime survey questionnaire I received today. I recently had a \$200 bicycle stolen from our basement. My son had only had the bike 2 weeks before this happened and we are still very upset over it. I reported it to the police and have not heard anything from them since, so am not happy with the situation as it is. Your survey came at an appropriate time."

"We live in a good community. Our home is never locked - day or night."

WOULD YOU PAY ADDITIONAL TAX DOLLARS TO REDUCE THE THREAT OF CRIME IN SOUTH DAKOTA?

"No, I think the tax rate in South Dakota is sufficient for adequate protection."

"No, because we're from a small community and these crimes are in larger cities. Our small town would never use those tax monies."

"Yes, if I was assured of protection and conviction."

"No, tax dollars won't reduce the threat of crime, only improve the capture of criminals."

"Yes, if it could be proven that more money could reduce crime, but I doubt that's possible."

"No, I think we pay enough already. They just need to do a little better job enforcing the law when crime occurs."

"Yes, if there was some way of knowing it would help I'd pay additional tax dollars."

"Yes, if it would be documented that the extra money made a difference."

"Yes, if it was used in a productive way."

"Yes, if it really went for that and did some good. It is worth a try!!"

"No, we are mostly on a fixed income. Additional tax would be hard."

"No, I would like to see tax dollars switched from some other programs to this."

"No, tax bar owners, etc. who highly contribute to the problem of drunks; fines from convicted drug users."

"Yes, if used for educational programs."



DO YOU FEEL THAT EACH CRIME SHOULD HAVE A PREVIOUSLY AGREED UPON PENALTY OR SENTENCE, SO THAT A PERSON CONVICTED OF A CRIME WOULD AUTOMATICALLY RECEIVE THAT SENTENCE?

"Yes, possibly a minimum sentence then decide if greater sentence is needed."

"No, each crime, even if the act is the same, is different."

"Yes, it might make a difference to the people committing crimes on whether to do it or not if they know the punishment."

"No, a judge should consider the person and all factors in each case."

"Yes, the guilty should not have a short sentence just because they could afford a smart lawyer."

"No, crimes and solutions are too complex. Each crime is so different with each individual."

"No, that's why we pay judges."

"Yes, previously agreed upon minimum penalty with additional time for seriousness of crime or degree of violence."

"Yes, but this isn't a cut and dried question. After a minimum punishment requirement, it should be up to the judge's discretion for the individual case."

"No, I believe each crime should be treated and punished in line with the severity of harm to the victim."



WHAT DO YOU FEEL WOULD BE MOST EFFECTIVE IN REDUCING CRIME IN SOUTH DAKOTA?

"Less plea bargaining and longer sentencing with no early parole. Death sentence for murder and/or manslaughter."

"Don't spend the taxpayers money on murderers. Use the electric chair or hanging. Don't give them a place to live the rest of their life."

"Less plea bargaining"

"Stricter and stronger enforced sentencing"

"More police visibility"

"More severe penalties"

"Control drugs and alcoholism."

"Less privileges, no music, TV, cigarettes, limited food and sleep for offenders"

"Improve economy."

"Additional and improved detective activity"

"We need much more citizen concern to stop crime."

"Less plea bargaining, minimum sentences and early paroles"

"Perpetrator working in social programs or other court appointed sentencing in addition to their sentence."

"Higher salaries and more intensive training for police"

"More severe punishment, not going to jail to play volleyball, etc."

"Crime prevention programs in school"

"Keep the criminals behind bars"

"Programs helpful to victims"

"Community service in place of incarceration when appropriate"

"More effective handling of criminals so they aren't let go on technicalities."

"Prosecute drug peddlers and close down liquor stores that sell to minors."

WHAT DO YOU FEEL WOULD BE MOST EFFECTIVE IN REDUCING CRIME IN SOUTH DAKOTA?

"Get the police out of the patrol cars and on the street again."

"More severe penalties for persons driving when under the influence of alcohol and drugs and for habitual criminals."

"Swift capital punishment for capital crimes--murder, rape, etc. Allow convicted murderers one appeal, if conviction is upheld, carry out the death sentence within the week. The system of punishment in this country is too lax."

"More police and youth related activities"

"More citizen Crime Awareness Programs"

"I believe that a 48-hour jail sentence for everyone convicted of DWI would reduce crime with no exceptions."

"Not a longer jail term but professional help for the repeat offender."

"Tougher sentences for child molesters and rape offenders."

"Less legal loopholes for criminals, our undercover agents can find criminals but the courts find it hard to get a conviction because a lawyer can always find a legal loophole to get their client off - guilty or not!"

"Programs to educate the public in what to look for in crimes, how not to be victimized, what to expect in the court system, and the responsibility to become involved if witnessing or victimized by crime."

HOW DO YOU FEEL THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM IN SOUTH DAKOTA  
COULD BE IMPROVED TO HELP VICTIMS OF CRIME?

"Longer prison terms for violent crimes"

"Crime victims shouldn't be made to feel like they are the ones on trial, for instance like rape."

"Worry over rights and feelings of victims at least as much if not more than those of the accused. As it is, many crimes go unreported because victims feel they are automatically thought to be guilty of causing a crime rather than being an innocent victim."

"Our criminal justice system does nothing to compensate the victim or help them through the crime."

"Give more severe sentences or penalties according to the crime committed. Hold the criminal longer before a parole board allows their sentence to be shortened. Sentence criminal of committing murder to a death sentence instead of life in prison."

"The courts should take a more sociological look at the crime and the victim."

"Keep justice in mind, don't adhere to the letter of the law and technicalities."

"I feel our criminal justice system is far too lenient with the criminal. Our present system protects the criminal. We are so concerned about 'citizen rights.' What about the citizen rights of the victim? Let's get tough with the criminal."

"Make the criminal pay or repay damage done to the victim."

"Anything done to help the victims would be an improvement."

"The laws be changed so police are backed up on arrests."

"I feel that the laws are laws for the criminals not for the victims. I also am sick of the injustice of people not being able to protect and defend themselves, their property, or their families. The laws are vague and not understandable for common people and are miserably smeared by the courts and lawyers."

"Take swift action to help these victims and to prosecute the offender."

"Make judges more aware of victim's plight."

HOW DO YOU FEEL THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM IN SOUTH DAKOTA COULD BE IMPROVED TO HELP VICTIMS OF CRIME?

"The criminal should make restitution, where at all feasible, to the people he/she has wronged."

"When the criminal is convicted, make sure he serves his entire time."

"Don't be so lenient in murder cases and parole - especially in violent or pre-meditated crime. It does not give peace of mind to families of crime victims to know a parole can release the perpetrator."

"Make parole harder for repeat criminals, crack down on repeat minor offenders but only violent offenders get prison, less plea bargaining, more vocational training for prisoners. Have a victim reimbursement program where the offenders do work (like work study for students) and pays at least half of the damage. This could be done as part of a vocational training program. If not enough jobs can be found, have them do make-work jobs, i.e. picking up trash along side the roads, digging wells, etc."

"Train the existing law enforcement personnel to help and be supportive of victims."

"You'll never convince people crime doesn't pay if they can plea bargain their way out of punishment. The law protects criminals to the detriment of the society."

"By penalizing the criminal for the reimbursement of loss or injury to the victim"

"Make sure the one who committed the crime is punished."

"Many times a criminal is given early parole or charges are automatically dismissed, for example, in return for testimonies without the victim's consent or knowledge. I feel a victim should have as many rights as the person who committed the crime. Instead the victim reports a crime and has to stand by to see what happens with very little control of the outcome."

"Those victims of crimes need to be better informed of the South Dakota criminal justice system. This awareness could be just what South Dakota needs to decrease crime."

"By giving more rights to the victim and to stop treating the victim as the one who is in the wrong, especially a rape victim. It appears to me that the criminal has all the rights and court appointed attorneys and appeals on his side while the victim has nothing."

HOW DO YOU FEEL THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM IN SOUTH DAKOTA  
COULD BE IMPROVED TO HELP VICTIMS OF CRIME?

"I think the taxpayers' money should be used to prevent crime. If the victim is to be reimbursed, it should be done through the person committing the crime."

"A heavy fine should be imposed against the perpetrator and used to help victims and families."

"Start putting offenders behind bars so they don't have the chance to become repeaters."

"I believe the criminal is more protected than the victim."

"The victim is a victim more than once: as a crime victim, at the trial he/she is often treated as the accused, and by often being accused of inviting the crime. Treat victims with understanding, compassion and belief. Provide support resources."

"By giving a few rights to the victims instead of always turning the criminals loose on some small technicality. Seems the only one with any rights are the criminals and they really rule the world!!"

"Victims should be totally informed at all stages of the prosecution proceedings."

"The victim has been compensated greatly, but not wholly, when the criminal is caught and made to pay for the crime he committed. If the system was just committed to the defense of the victim, instead of the criminal, it would help alot."

"More community participation in prevention, such as neighborhood watch programs, more community voluntary participation in victim assistance and encouragement type programs, and more voluntary help in criminal rehabilitation programs."

"I think that where it's possible to materially compensate victims, that it should be done. Possibly through restitution programs or even profit making operations where the majority of the profits (gained by convicts) be given to victims. Part of the profit could also be used to pay holding costs for prisoners."

"Time and effort should be spent vigorously pursuing 'rights' of victims in the same way that defendants' rights have been fought for and won. Crime does not have its impact on society lessened by a system that concerns itself only with punishing the criminal. A compassionate society should seek to lessen the impact of crime at the point of greatest impact: the life and welfare of the victim."

HOW DO YOU FEEL THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM IN SOUTH DAKOTA COULD BE IMPROVED TO HELP VICTIMS OF CRIME?

"Strict and severe punishment for all criminals so the number of victims is reduced. There is no excuse for second or third time offenders."

"I think some of the crimes could be eliminated if the people who committed them were given sentences enough so they couldn't turn right around to do it again. Let the criminal know he can't kill someone and get away with it. The only way to help victims is to make sure the criminal pays for his crime and is locked away from society."

"Put offenders in prison and make the Pen less like a Holiday Inn and more like a jail should be."

"I feel very strongly about victims' rights starting with children who are abused and molested. I feel there are many aspects that need to be improved upon that should apply to all crimes and victims. My primary concern would be to educate law enforcement officers, attorneys, and judges as to some of the additional trauma they are causing victims!"

"Make sure victims are given the same rights as the accused. Provide assistance to victims to help them understand the procedures by use of special assistants. The accused has the right to be assisted by a lawyer and the victim also needs assistance."

"The system should respond faster and serve harsher sentences. It does no good to give a sentence and then reduce it in the same breath."

"Offenders should be required to make restitution by returning, repairing, replacing or paying for property involved. Victims of assault (whether with a weapon, bodily, or sexual) should have medical care, legal advice and moral support. Cost to be paid by the offender."

"If I were a victim of a crime, just knowing that the person at fault is being justly punished would help."

"I would like to see younger and first time non-violent offenders housed in area jails where contact with the family could be continued. It would be best if these were located near a state trade school. Springfield could still have the job of housing and training for the more difficult cases. I am strongly opposed to compensating victims of crime except when the court may see fit from actual resources of the offender."

HOW DO YOU FEEL THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM IN SOUTH DAKOTA  
COULD BE IMPROVED TO HELP VICTIMS OF CRIME?

"We should offer special services for the victims. We should help reduce the anxiety of the victims by offering programs that deal both with the victim's emotional state and also with his/her knowledge of the justice system."

"The nature of the crime and its effect on the victims should be considered at the time of sentencing not at the time of parole eligibility. Parole should be dependent upon the criminal's rehabilitation, not his crimes. Make the sentences appropriate."

"If violent criminals weren't released we wouldn't have this problem, would we?"

"Although there are many very important people in our law enforcement system, there are far too many who are unqualified for the job. If there is any need for more money to be spent, it is in training and keeping a more professional force, especially on the local level. We need stricter standards for our police and troopers."

"I feel a special assistant to help the victims of crime would be an improvement."

"It's about time we do something to help the victim!"

"Victims should become more involved with the entire trial, sentencing, and parole process."

"Why give a sentence of 10 years and then turn them loose in two or three years?"

"Instead of using funds to make prisons comfortable, the money should be used to help the victims."

"It's tough to see people get out of prison after only a short stay. I can imagine the victim feels violated in this type of case because the victim has done a lot of work to see that justice is upheld. This is indirectly a message that their victimization was not very important."



**APPENDIX B**

## SUMMARY OF SAMPLE COMPOSITION

Comparisons between characteristics of survey respondents and characteristics of residents of South Dakota as reported by the 1980 Census data:

Some of the sample characteristics of the South Dakota Serious Crime Survey were compared with population factors of estimates collected in conjunction with the 1980 Census. The sample values were quite similar to the population values in nearly all of the comparisons.

### Response rates for sample and population rates of 1980 Census for 10 LARGEST CITIES in South Dakota.

The percents of population between the two comparison groups are very similar. The higher percent of respondents in Sioux Falls and Rapid City was likely due to: 1) people in larger cities are more concerned about crime and usually have higher crime rates; therefore, they are more likely to be interested in and return questionnaires about crime; 2) there may have been a shift in population from rural areas to larger populated areas; therefore, there may be a higher proportion of people living in Sioux Falls and Rapid City at the present time than there was in 1980. An attempt was made to include some of the nearby unorganized areas with the cities, since the city percents were determined by zip code designation and many nearby, unorganized and/or rural areas have the same zip code as the adjacent cities.

| % of Respondents<br>By Zip Code |       | *1980 Census Percent |
|---------------------------------|-------|----------------------|
| Brookings                       | 2.1%  | 2.2%                 |
| Vermillion                      | 1.1%  | 1.5%                 |
| Yankton                         | 2.0%  | 1.7%                 |
| Sioux Falls                     | 15.0% | 12.4%                |
| Watertown                       | 2.8%  | 2.3%                 |
| Mitchell                        | 1.8%  | 2.1%                 |
| Huron                           | 2.2%  | 1.9%                 |
| Aberdeen                        | 4.2%  | 4.0%                 |
| Pierre                          | 1.9%  | 1.7%                 |
| Rapid City                      | 9.1%  | 7.4%                 |

\*Includes some nearby unorganized areas

Distribution of sample and 1980 Census population rates by SEX for those ages 18 and over.

The comparative figures are almost identical for the two groups.

| Sex     | % of Respondents | 1980 Census Percent |
|---------|------------------|---------------------|
| Males   | 48.6%            | 48.7%               |
| Females | 51.4%            | 51.3%               |

Distribution of sample and 1980 Census population rates by RACE for those ages 18 and over.

These rates are quite similar, although there were somewhat more whites and fewer Native Americans in the sample than was reported in the 1980 Census.

| Race            | % of Respondents | 1980 Census Percent |
|-----------------|------------------|---------------------|
| Native American | 3.0%             | 4.8%                |
| Asian           | .4%              | .3%                 |
| Black           | .2%              | .3%                 |
| White           | 96.1%            | 94.5%               |
| Other           | .4%              | .2%                 |

Distribution of sample and 1980 Census population rates by YEARS OF EDUCATION.

The sample respondents' educational levels were similar to, although somewhat higher than, the educational levels reported in the 1980 census.

| Years of Education | % of Respondents | 1980 Census Percent |
|--------------------|------------------|---------------------|
| 0-4 years          | .3%              | 1.5%                |
| 5-8 years          | 9.4%             | 20.5%               |
| 9-11 years         | 6.5%             | 10.0%               |
| 12 years           | 36.3%            | 36.3%               |
| 13-15 years        | 27.3%            | 17.7%               |
| 16 years and over  | 19.9%            | 14.0%               |

Distribution of sample and 1980 Census population rates by AGE.

The comparative values were very similar for the age groups. The percent difference (9.3% to 13.1%) between the two groups of those ages 70 and over was likely due to the fact that some people of the over 70 age group would not have a driver's license and, therefore, would not have a chance of being in the sample pool.

| Age Group   | % of Respondents | 1980 Census Percent |
|-------------|------------------|---------------------|
| 20-29       | 24.8%            | 25.4%               |
| 30-39       | 20.3%            | 16.7%               |
| 40-49       | 15.0%            | 12.9%               |
| 50-59       | 14.1%            | 13.9%               |
| 60-69       | 13.8%            | 12.1%               |
| 70 and over | 9.3%             | 13.1%               |

Distribution of sample and 1980 Census population rates by NUMBER IN HOUSEHOLD.

The 1980 Census used housing units as the basic sampling unit; whereas the basic sampling unit of the survey was individuals. This may account for the differences in the percent of one person households. In the 1980 census, the people were surveyed by housing units and asked how many lived in the household. With the survey, the person could have lived alone but said they were part of another unit (e.g., their family household). The poor farm-related economy of the survey area could have forced some people living alone to return to their family homes or to consolidate in other living arrangements, during recent years.

| Number in Household | % of Respondents | 1980 Census Percent |
|---------------------|------------------|---------------------|
| 1 person            | 11.2%            | 23.3%               |
| 2 persons           | 34.8%            | 32.0%               |
| 3 persons           | 19.1%            | 16.1%               |
| 4 persons           | 19.2%            | 14.8%               |
| 5 persons           | 9.0%             | 8.1%                |
| 6 or more persons   | 6.6%             | 5.8%                |

Distribution of sample and 1980 Census population rates by MARITAL STATUS.

The 1980 Census figures are based on those 19 and older and the survey figures are tabulated for those 18 and over. Results from each of the surveys were very similar with regard to percent by marital status category.

| Marital Status | Percent of Respondents | 1980 Census Percent | Census 18 & Over Only |
|----------------|------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. Single      | 18.0%                  | 20.4%               | 19.7%                 |
| 2. Married     | 71.3%                  | 65.5%               | 66.1%                 |
| 3. Separated   | .8%                    | .9%                 | .9%                   |
| 4. Divorced    | 4.5%                   | 4.6%                | 4.6%                  |
| 5. Widowed     | 5.4%                   | 8.6%                | 8.7%                  |

Distribution of sample and 1980 Census population rates by RURAL OR URBAN for those ages 18 and over.

The comparative values are quite similar. Since there likely has been a slight shift in the population from rural to urban in the last 6 years, the values in categories for the survey respondents are likely to be closer to the current rural/urban split than are the values presented below.

| Community Size        | % of Respondents | 1980 Census Percent |
|-----------------------|------------------|---------------------|
| Urban (2500 and over) | 46.7%            | 48.1%               |
| Rural (under 2500)    | 53.3%            | 51.9%               |

APPENDIX C

## Comparison of Results Between 1985 and 1976 Crime Surveys

A study of crime rate and attitudes about crime was conducted in 1976 by the Criminal Justice Studies Program at the University of South Dakota. Some of the results of the 1976 study can be compared with the findings of this present survey and are presented below.

Return rates. The return rates for each of the studies was very good. Other surveys conducted in the State have also found people in South Dakota to be responsive and cooperative.

1976 survey return rate was 78.3%  
1985 survey return rate was 82.5%

Overall State crime rate. The overall crime rate was reported to be somewhat lower in 1985 than it was reported in the 1976 survey. This decline is consistent with the national rates which have also decreased somewhat during the same time period. In each case, the South Dakota crime rate was lower than the national crime rate.

1976 survey reported crime rate\* was 19.4%  
1985 survey reported crime rate\* was 18.0%

\* Crime rate was defined by the percent of respondents who were victims of crime during the past year (i.e., for the 1985 survey, 481 of the 2676 respondents said they were victims of crime.)

Crime rate by categories. The 1985 crime rate was lower than the 1976 rates in each of the seven crime categories mentioned below with the exception of motor vehicle theft which had the same reported value for each time period.

|                     | 1985 | 1976 |
|---------------------|------|------|
| Theft               | 8.7  | 14.7 |
| Vandalism           | 8.5  | 10.0 |
| Burglary            | 4.0  | 6.2  |
| Assault             | 3.1  | 5.4  |
| Motor vehicle theft | .9   | .9   |
| Sexual assault      | .5   | 1.0  |
| Robbery             | .2   | .9   |

Note: An individual could have been a victim of more than one crime. The rate reported above was based on the percent of respondents who reported being victimized for each category.

Total Crime Rate. The total crime rate was also reported to be lower in 1985 than it was in 1976. The total crime rate was determined by considering the total number of different crimes committed against individuals.

1976 survey total crime rate\* was 39.1.

1985 survey total crime rate\* was 25.9.

\* The 1985 total crime rate was determined by dividing the number of crimes committed (694) by the number of respondents (2676).

Note: Keep in mind that an individual could have been a victim of more than one crime.

Some Demographic Characteristic of Victims of Crime Versus Non-victims of Crime. A comparison of some demographic and attitude factors was made between the 1976 and 1985 studies, as present below:

- a. Sex: In both surveys males were more likely to be victims of crime than were females.
- b. Age: It was found in both surveys that younger people were more likely to be victims of crime than were older people. That is, as age increased there was a decreasing likelihood of victimization.
- c. Education: The 1976 study found that the education level of victims was somewhat less than that of non-victims. However, in the 1985 study victims had more years of education than did non-victims.
- d. Income: In the 1976 survey, it was reported that victims had a somewhat lower income level than did non-victims. The 1985 study did not find any statistical difference between the income level of victims and non-victims.

Attitudes about Crime .

- a. Safe at Home at Night: Those surveyed during each time periods felt quite safe at home during the night.

The 1976 survey reported that 93.0% of respondents felt safe at home at night.

The 1985 survey reported that 94.8% of respondents felt safe at home at night.

- b. Has Crime Increased? Those surveyed in 1976 were much more likely to feel that crime had increased than were participants of the 1985 survey. The wording of the questions may account for some of the discrepancy in the two percents. The 1976 group was asked to respond for the last two years, and the 1985 group was asked to respond for the last year.

In the 1976 survey, 52.0% of respondents felt that crime had increased in their community during the lasttwoyears.

In the 1985 survey, 29.2% of respondents felt that crime had increased in their community during the lastyear.

- c. Previously Agreed upon Penalty: Both groups were somewhat in favor of convicted people receiving a previously agreed upon penalty or sentence. Those responding to the 1985 survey were more in favor of the proposition than were those participating in the 1976 survey.

In the 1976 survey, about 53.0% of respondents were in favor a previously agreed upon penalty or sentence.

In the 1985 survey, 60.3% of respondents were in favor of a previously agreed upon penalty or sentence.

d. Compensation for Violent Crimes: Both the 1976 and 1985 groups were in favor of reimbursing violent crime victims. The 1985 respondents were much more in favor of the proposition than were the 1976 survey respondents.

In the 1976 survey, 70.0% of the respondents were in favor of reimbursing violent crime victims.

In the 1985 survey, 86.0% of the respondents were in favor of reimbursing violent crime victims.

## SOUTH DAKOTA SERIOUS CRIME SURVEY - 1985

### DISCRIMINANT ANALYSIS OF VICTIMS/NON-VICTIMS

Thirty-three demographic and attitudinal factors were examined to see if they were able to distinguish crime victims from non-victims. The statistical technique used for this procedure was multiple linear regression (discriminant analysis). Question #1, which asked if the person had been a victim of crime, was used as the dependent variable with scoring being 1 for "yes" and 2 for "no". The independent variables or predictor variables were questions 20 through 45 on the South Dakota Serious Crime Survey of 1985 with the exceptions of questions 28 and 35. Question 28 was covered by the responses in question 27 and question 35 was an open-ended question. Some of the questions were converted into dichotomous numbering system so that the analysis could be conducted.

Only about 13% of the variance of the variable victim/non-victim was accounted for by the predictor variables. This was not a large percent of the variance, but it was statistically significant ( $F = 43.08$ ,  $p = .0001$ ).

The variables found to be the best seven variables in predicting victims or non-victims were (in order of importance):

1. If a person felt that he/she would be a victim of crime during the next year (Q21)
2. Belief concerning victims of violent crimes and whether victims should be compensated and reimbursed (Q30)
3. Population of community in which individual lives
4. Age of respondent
5. Length of time person had lived in the community
6. Sex of individual
7. Marital status of person

## DISCRIMINANT ANALYSIS RESULTS

| Predictor Variables | B Value | Sum of Squares | F Value | p Value |
|---------------------|---------|----------------|---------|---------|
| Q21                 | .30     | 24.24          | 192.38  | .0001   |
| Q30                 | -.04    | 1.87           | 14.81   | .0001   |
| Population          | -.01    | 1.44           | 11.42   | .001    |
| Age                 | .02     | 1.43           | 11.32   | .0001   |
| Time in Community   | .01     | .71            | 5.63    | .02     |
| Sex                 | .03     | .56            | 4.42    | .04     |
| Marital Status      | .04     | .52            | 4.10    | .04     |

Question 21 (Do you believe that you are likely to be the victim of a crime during the next year?) was by far the "best" variable in distinguishing victims from non-victims. Victims of crime during the past year were much more likely to believe that they would be victims of crime in the future than were non-victims of crime.

Question 30 (Victims of violent crimes should be compensated or reimbursed for their loss of injury) was another one of the seven variables found to be useful in predicting victims/non-victims of crime. Victims of crime were more likely to agree with Question 30 than were non-victims of crime. Another distinguishing characteristic between victims and non-victims was sex of the respondents. Males were more likely to be victims of crime than were females. Age was also found to contribute to the prediction of victims/non-victims. Older people were less likely to be victims of crime than were younger people. Marital status was also selected as a significant predictor variable. Married and widowed respondents were less likely to be victims of crime than were single, divorced, and separated people. The population of community of residence was found to contribute additional predictive power. Those residing in larger communities were more likely to be victims of crime than were residents of less populated areas. The final variable having predictive power was length of time lived in current place of residence. Those with longer time at current place of residence were less likely to be victims of crime than were those who were more recent residents at their present location.

Crime appears to impact all segments of society. Even though some variables were useful in distinguishing victims from non-victims, the differences were not really that large or profound in most cases.

APPENDIX D

RURAL RESIDENTS VERSUS URBAN RESIDENTS  
SUMMARY OF RESULTS

For the purposes of this section of the paper rural refers to those who live in communities of less than 2,500 and urban indicates those who live in cities of 2,500 or more.

Victimization Rate: Rural people reported significantly less crime committed against them than did urban people. This is not surprising, since lower crime rates in rural areas have been reported consistently at the national level.

13.9% of rural people were victims of crimes during the past 12 months.

21.4% of urban people were victims of crimes during the past 12 months.

Types of Crimes: There were no significant differences between the two groups with regards to types of crimes committed against them.

Type of Crime  
Rank Order-Rural

Type of Crime  
Rank Order-Urban

1. Theft
2. Vandalism
3. Burglary
4. Assault with Body
5. Motor Vehicle Theft
6. Assault with Weapon
7. Sexual Assault
8. Robbery

1. Theft
2. Vandalism
3. Burglary
4. Assault with Body
5. Motor Vehicle Theft
6. Assault with Weapon
7. Sexual Assault
8. Robbery

Perception of Crime: Urban people were much more likely to believe that crime has increased in their community than were rural people. Urban people have higher crime rates and often read, see and hear of crime in their city through the media or other sources. Therefore, it is likely that urban people would perceive (or know) that crime has increased.

21.3% of rural people believed that crime has increased.  
35.7% of urban people believed that crime has increased.

7.4% of rural people believed that crime has decreased.  
3.8% of urban people believed that crime has decreased.

71.3% of rural people believed that crime has remained the same.  
60.5% of urban people believed that crime has remained the same.

Likelihood of Victimization: There was no statistical difference between the two groups concerning the likelihood of being a victim of crime during the next year. Respondents from each group were not likely to believe that they would be victimized by crime during the next year. While the rates are low, there are still a number of people who are concerned about being victimized.

13.3% of rural people believed they will be a victim of crime.

16.0% of urban people believed they will be a victim of crime.

86.7% of rural people believed they will not be a victim of crime.

84.0% of urban people believed they will not be a victim of crime.

Safe at Night: Both groups felt quite safe in their homes at night. A vast majority of all respondents felt safe at night. This must be considered to be a positive aspect of the quality of life in South Dakota. Some out-of-state urban areas are well known for high crime rates and the accompanying fear and terror it brings into the lives of the people who live there.

94.8% of rural people felt safe at home at night.

94.7% of urban people felt safe at home at night.

5.2% of rural people did not feel safe at home at night.

5.3% of urban people did not feel safe at home at night.

Crimes of Concern in Community: Listed below are crimes in communities which concerned rural and urban people the most. The two lists below are about the same, indicating that rural and urban people are not very different in regards to the crimes in their communities which concern them. Rural people were (somewhat) more concerned about property crimes than were urban respondents; and urban people were (somewhat) more concerned about crimes against people than were rural respondents.

| Crimes of Concern Rank Order-Rural | Percent Mentioning Crime | Crimes of Concern Rank Order-Urban | Percent Mentioning Crime |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Theft                           | 54.9%                    | 1. Vandalism                       | 46.7%                    |
| 2. Vandalism                       | 53.1%                    | 2. Theft                           | 38.0%                    |
| 3. Burglary                        | 29.8%                    | 3. Burglary                        | 35.5%                    |
| 4. Sex. Assault                    | 12.4%                    | 4. Sex. Assault                    | 27.1%                    |
| 5. Drugs                           | 11.4%                    | 5. Drugs                           | 11.4%                    |
| 6. Robbery                         | 8.4%                     | 6. Robbery                         | 10.6%                    |

Crimes of Concern in State: Listed below are crimes in the State which concerned rural people and urban people the most. The two lists below are very similar, indicating common beliefs between the two groups with regard to crimes in the state that concerned them the most. There is a striking difference between the rankings and percentages of crimes in communities and crimes in the State. Both rural and urban people were more concerned about personal (sexual assault, assault with body, and robbery) crimes in the state than they were concerned about personal crimes in the community. The people seemed to use their concerns of crime in the State to indicate violent crimes which they most feared.

| Crimes of Concern Rank Order-Rural | Percent Mentioning Crime | Crimes of Concern Rank Order-Urban | Percent Mentioning Crime |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Sex. Assault                    | 46.4%                    | 1. Sex. Assault                    | 46.2%                    |
| 2. Robbery                         | 24.4%                    | 2. Robbery                         | 23.3%                    |
| 3. Theft                           | 21.5%                    | 3. Burglary                        | 20.0%                    |
| 4. Burglary                        | 18.1%                    | 4. Assault w/body                  | 18.6%                    |
| 5. Assault w/body                  | 15.8%                    | 5. Theft                           | 16.8%                    |
| 6. Murder                          | 14.4%                    | 6. Murder                          | 16.1%                    |
| 7. Vandalism                       | 13.6%                    | 7. Assault w/weapon                | 13.5%                    |
| 8. Assault w/weapon                | 13.4%                    | 8. Vandalism                       | 13.0%                    |
| 9. Drugs                           | 13.1%                    | 9. DWI                             | 11.4%                    |
| 10. DWI                            | 8.3%                     | 10. Drugs                          | 9.6%                     |

Additional Taxes: There was a statistically significant difference between the two groups on willingness to pay additional tax dollars to reduce the threat of crime in South Dakota. Urban people were more in favor of the proposition than were rural people. This was likely because of a greater concern about crime in the urban communities, and/or higher crime rates in urban areas, and/or more coverage of crime by the media, and/or more informal information (i.e., friends, neighbors, etc., talking about crime) available on crime in urban areas.

50.4% of rural people would be willing to pay additional tax dollars.  
 59.0% of urban people would be willing to pay additional tax dollars.



APPENDIX E



OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL

STATE CAPITOL  
Pierre, South Dakota 57501-5090  
Phone (605) 773-3215

MARK V. MEIERHENRY  
ATTORNEY GENERAL

November 15, 1985

Dear Citizen:

The State of South Dakota is conducting a Serious Crime Survey and your name was randomly selected from the driver's license files. To assist the South Dakota Statistical Analysis Center and other agencies of the criminal justice system in understanding serious crime, I would appreciate having you share your experiences with crime and your views on criminal justice in South Dakota. Even if you were not a victim of crime, we would like you to respond to the appropriate questions in the booklet.

The purpose of the survey is threefold: to estimate how many South Dakota citizens are victims of crime, including crimes not reported to the police; to appreciate the experiences of victims with the criminal justice system in South Dakota; and to estimate the level of public support for certain criminal justice programs. The results will be used in making future criminal justice decisions.

While we needed your name to contact you, only your booklet number and your responses will be recorded. YOUR NAME WILL NOT BE RECORDED and your responses will be handled in a confidential manner. Our prime concern is the experience of 4,000 South Dakota residents who are being asked to cooperate in our effort to fight crime.

Please return the completed booklet promptly. A self-addressed, stamped envelope is included. Your help is greatly appreciated. If you have any questions or comments or would like more information on the results of the survey, contact the South Dakota Statistical Analysis Center at the above address or write your comments on the questionnaire.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "M. Meierhenry".

Mark V. Meierhenry  
Attorney General





OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL

STATE CAPITOL  
Pierre, South Dakota 57501-5090  
Phone (605) 773-3215

MARK V. MEIERHENRY  
ATTORNEY GENERAL

December 13, 1985


Dear Citizen:

About one month ago we sent you a survey booklet asking about your experiences as a victim of crime and about your opinions on some criminal justice issues. According to our records, we have not yet received your completed booklet.

We need your response to help give us an accurate picture of crime trends in South Dakota. Since you are one of only 4,000 South Dakota residents being asked to participate in our survey, your cooperation is very important. Will you please take a few minutes to complete the survey booklet and return it in the post-paid envelope provided? Your name will not be recorded and your responses will be anonymous.

If you have already done so, we thank you for your contribution to this important survey.

Sincerely,

  
Mark V. Meierhenry  
Attorney General



## INSTRUCTIONS

Please read and familiarize yourself with the following definitions. It is important that you distinguish among the different types of crime before completing the questionnaire.

Pay particular attention to the distinction between theft, burglary, and robbery.

After becoming familiar with these definitions, go on to the instructions inside the booklet. KEEP THIS PAGE ALONGSIDE THE QUESTIONNAIRE TO AID YOU IN ANSWERING THE QUESTIONS.

- A. THEFT: The unlawful taking of property or money without the actual or threatened use of force
- B. BURGLARY: Unlawful entry of a RESIDENCE or BUSINESS with or without force with the intent to commit a crime. (Usually the taking of property)
- C. ROBBERY: Theft of property or cash directly FROM A PERSON by force or threat of force, with or without a weapon.
- D. MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT: Theft or unauthorized use of a motor vehicle. (Car, truck, motorcycle, tractor, snowmobile, or airplane.)
- E. VANDALISM: Intentional or reckless destruction or defacement of property without consent of the owner.
- F. ASSAULT WITH BODY: Attack with a dangerous or deadly weapon resulting in any physical injury.
- G. ASSAULT WITH BODY: Attack without a weapon, using only fists, arms, feet, or other bodily part, resulting in any physical injury.
- H. SEXUAL ASSAULT: Sexual activity against your will through the actual or threatened use of force.



1. Were you a victim of any of the following crimes (A-H) listed below during the past 12 month period?

----- YES If YES, check each crime you were a victim of and indicate the number of times the crime was committed against you during the last 12 months.

----- NO If NO, please go to Question 20 on page 5.

A. THEFT--property or valuables taken without your permission but not by force or unlawful entry.

YES ----- NO ----- NUMBER OF TIMES -----

B. BURGLARY--property or money taken by someone who entered your home, apartment, or garage without your permission.

YES ----- NO ----- NUMBER OF TIMES -----

C. ROBBERY--property or valuables taken directly from you under actual or threatened force.

YES ----- NO ----- NUMBER OF TIMES -----

D. MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT--someone stole your car, truck, motorcycle, tractor, snowmobile, boat, or airplane.

YES ----- NO ----- NUMBER OF TIMES -----

E. VANDALISM--someone intentionally or recklessly damaged or destroyed property belonging to you.

YES ----- NO ----- NUMBER OF TIMES -----

F. ASSAULT WITH A WEAPON--someone beat or attacked you with a knife, gun, club, or other weapon.

YES ----- NO ----- NUMBER OF TIMES -----

G. ASSAULT WITH BODY--someone hit or struck you with their fists, feet, or other part(s) of their body.

YES ----- NO ----- NUMBER OF TIMES -----

H. SEXUAL ASSAULT--someone forced you or attempted to force you to engage in sexual activity against your will.

YES ----- NO ----- NUMBER OF TIMES -----

2. If you answered YES to any of the previous crimes, please indicate which crime was the most recent?  
-----

3. What is the current disposition of the most recent crime which was committed against you?
- 1. The case was not reported to the police
  - 2. The case was reported but dismissed
  - 3. The case was prosecuted, but the offender(s) was allowed to plea bargain to a lesser charge
  - 4. The case was prosecuted before a judge or jury trial
  - 5. The case is currently active
  - 6. I do not know the outcome of the case
4. If the most recent crime against you was NOT reported, please indicate the ONE most important reason you had for not reporting it.
- 1. Afraid of retaliation
  - 2. Afraid of investigation
  - 3. Private or personal matter
  - 4. Felt it was useless to report because nothing could/would be done about it
  - 5. Felt the crime was not important enough to report
  - 6. Felt too much time would be required of me if I reported the crime--loss of work, etc.
  - 7. Did not get around to it because I was busy with other matters
  - 8. Other (please describe) -----

Questions 5 - 15 are to be answered in relation to the most recent crime committed against you during the last 12 months. Those who were not a victim of crime during this period are to go to Question 20 on page 5.

**PHYSICAL INJURY**

5. Please check the appropriate category below:
- 1. I was not physically injured as a result of the most recent crime
  - 2. I required first aid following the crime, but no hospitalization
  - 3. I required medical attention in a doctor's office or hospital following the crime, but no overnight hospitalization
  - 4. I required hospitalization for more than 24 hours as a result of the crime



12. How well did you know the offender(s) in the most recent crime?  
If more than one offender, describe the most well-known.

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. I don't recall anything about the offender
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. A total stranger (never saw before)
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. Had seen before
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. An acquaintance
- \_\_\_\_\_ 5. Knew well
- \_\_\_\_\_ 6. Relative

PROPERTY/CASH LOSS

13. What is your estimate of the total replacement, repair, or cash loss for your property stolen or damaged by burglary, theft, vandalism, or robbery?

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. Question does not apply; I had no losses from this crime
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. \$1 to \$19
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. \$20 to \$49
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. \$50 to \$99
- \_\_\_\_\_ 5. \$100 to \$249
- \_\_\_\_\_ 6. \$250 to \$495
- \_\_\_\_\_ 7. \$500 to \$999
- \_\_\_\_\_ 8. \$1,000 to \$4,999
- \_\_\_\_\_ 9. \$5,000 or more

INSURANCE COVERAGE

14. Did insurance cover any of your losses or expenses due to this crime?

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. Question doesn't apply; I had no losses from this crime
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. Question doesn't apply; I had no insurance
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. Yes, insurance covered all losses and expenses
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. Insurance covered over half but not all losses and expenses
- \_\_\_\_\_ 5. Insurance covered less than half but some losses and expense
- \_\_\_\_\_ 6. Insurance covered none of the losses and expenses

LOCATION OF CRIME

15. Where did the most recent crime against you occur? Check the single most accurate description.

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. At home
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. In someone else's home
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. In a residential area
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. Outside city or town limits
- \_\_\_\_\_ 5. In or near a bar or lounge
- \_\_\_\_\_ 6. In downtown area
- \_\_\_\_\_ 7. In or near my hotel/motel room
- \_\_\_\_\_ 8. At or near my place of work
- \_\_\_\_\_ 9. Other (please describe) \_\_\_\_\_

For Questions 16 through 19, please circle the answer which best represents your response to the situation described.

16. After my experience as a crime victim in South Dakota, I would be willing to report any crimes committed against me in the future.

Strongly Agree            Agree            Indifferent            Disagree            Strongly Disagree

17. If I became a crime victim again in the future, I would go through the entire court process if necessary to prosecute the offender(s).

Strongly Agree            Agree            Indifferent            Disagree            Strongly Disagree

18. I feel that I lost more than I gained through prosecution.

Strongly Agree            Agree            Indifferent            Disagree            Strongly Disagree

19. If my county had had a victim/witness assistant available whom I could have contacted for information about the criminal justice system and for assistance, I feel I would have been aided significantly.

Strongly Agree            Agree            Indifferent            Disagree            Strongly Disagree

PERCEPTION OF CRIME AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE

20. Within the past year, do you think that crime in your community has increased, decreased, or stayed about the same?

- 1. Crime has increased in my community
- 2. Crime has decreased in my community
- 3. Crime has stayed about the same in my community

21. Do you believe that you are likely to be the victim of a crime during the next year?

- 1. Yes            Which crime? -----
- 2. No

22. Do you feel safe in your home at night?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No

23. Which two crimes in your community most concern you?

- 1. -----
- 2. -----

24. Which two crimes in the state concern you the most?

1. \_\_\_\_\_

2. \_\_\_\_\_

25. Would you pay additional tax dollars to reduce the threat of crime in South Dakota?

\_\_\_\_\_ 1. Yes

\_\_\_\_\_ 2. No

26. Compared to five years ago (1980), how effective do you feel the following South Dakota institutions are now?

|                                    | Better | The Same | Worse | Not Sure |
|------------------------------------|--------|----------|-------|----------|
| The Courts                         | _____  | _____    | _____ | _____    |
| Law Enforcement                    | _____  | _____    | _____ | _____    |
| Corrections<br>(prison and parole) | _____  | _____    | _____ | _____    |

27. Check three things which you feel would most reduce crime in South Dakota.

\_\_\_\_\_ 1. Increase the number of police

\_\_\_\_\_ 2. A secret witness program

\_\_\_\_\_ 3. Longer confinement for convicted criminals

\_\_\_\_\_ 4. Neighborhood watch program

\_\_\_\_\_ 5. More undercover police activity

\_\_\_\_\_ 6. Mandatory jail sentencing

\_\_\_\_\_ 7. Handgun registration

\_\_\_\_\_ 8. Other, specify \_\_\_\_\_

28. Which of the above do you feel would be the most effective in reducing crime?

\_\_\_\_\_

29. Do you feel that each crime should have a previously agreed upon penalty or sentence, so that a person convicted of a crime would automatically receive that sentence?

\_\_\_\_\_ 1. Yes

\_\_\_\_\_ 2. No

For questions 30 through 34, please circle the answer which best represents your response to the situation described.

30. Victims of violent crimes should be compensated or reimbursed for their loss or injury.

Strongly Agree      Agree      Indifferent      Disagree      Strongly Disagree

31. The reimbursement of victims of violent crimes should come from State funds.

Strongly Agree      Agree      Indifferent      Disagree      Strongly Disagree

32. State funds should be appropriated to encourage counties to hire a special assistant to help victims and witnesses during the court process.

Strongly Agree      Agree      Indifferent      Disagree      Strongly Disagree

33. The victims of violent crime should be notified when the convict is eligible for parole.

Strongly Agree      Agree      Indifferent      Disagree      Strongly Disagree

34. The victims of violent crimes have the right to be heard at the convict's parole hearing.

Strongly Agree      Agree      Indifferent      Disagree      Strongly Disagree

35. How do you feel the criminal justice system in South Dakota could be improved to help victims of crime?

-----  
-----



42. Which of the following categories represents your family's total yearly income?

- |                               |                               |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| ----- 1. \$4,999 or less      | ----- 6. \$20,000 to \$24,999 |
| ----- 2. \$5,000 to \$7,499   | ----- 7. \$25,000 to \$34,999 |
| ----- 3. \$7,500 to \$9,999   | ----- 8. \$35,000 to \$49,999 |
| ----- 4. \$10,000 to \$14,999 | ----- 9. \$50,000 or more     |
| ----- 5. \$15,000 to \$19,999 |                               |

43. What is the size of your community?

- |                                   |                           |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|
| ----- 1. Rural--farm or ranch     | ----- 5. 2,500 to 4,999   |
| ----- 2. Less than 500 population | ----- 6. 5,000 to 9,999   |
| ----- 3. 500 to 999               | ----- 7. 10,000 to 19,999 |
| ----- 4. 1,000 to 2,499           | ----- 8. 20,000 and over  |

44. How long have you lived in South Dakota?

- |                              |                                  |
|------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| ----- 1. Less than one year  | ----- 4. Six to ten years        |
| ----- 2. One to two years    | ----- 5. Eleven to fifteen years |
| ----- 3. Three to five years | ----- 6. Sixteen or more years   |

45. How long have you lived in your present community?

- |                              |                                  |
|------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| ----- 1. Less than one year  | ----- 4. Six to ten years        |
| ----- 2. One to two years    | ----- 5. Eleven to fifteen years |
| ----- 3. Three to five years | ----- 6. Sixteen or more years   |

46. What is the ZIP CODE of your mailing address? \_\_\_\_\_

Please place your completed questionnaire in the enclosed self-addressed, stamped envelope and return to the Office of the Attorney General within two weeks.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION!



APPENDIX F

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY:

Bureau of Justice Statistics Bulletin, "Violent Crime by Strangers". Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, NCJ-80829, April 1982.

Bureau of Justice Statistics Bulletin, "New State Laws and the System's Response - Victim and Witness Assistance". Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, NCJ-87934, May 1983.

Bureau of Justice Statistics Bulletin, "The Severity of Crime". Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, NCJ-92326, January 1984.

Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report, "The Economic Cost of Crime to Victims". Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, NCJ-93658, May 1984.

Bureau of Justice Statistics Bulletin, "Households Touched by Crime, 1983". Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, NCJ-93658, May 1984.

Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report, "The Risk of Violent Crime". Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, NCJ-97119, May 1985.

Bureau of Justice Statistics Bulletin, "Households Touched by Crime, 1984". Department of Justice Statistics, NCJ-97689, June 1985.

Bureau of Justice Statistics Technical Report, "Response to Screening Questions in the National Crime Survey". Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, NCJ-97624, June 1985.

Bureau of Justice Statistics Bulletin, "Criminal Victimization, 1984". Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, NCJ-98904, October 1985.

Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report, "Locating City, Suburban, and Rural Crimes". Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, NCJ-99535, December 1985.

Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report, "Reporting Crime to the Police". Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, NCJ-99432, December 1985.

Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report, "The Use of Weapons in Committing Crimes". Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, NCJ-99643, January 1986.

Crime in South Dakota 1984. Statistical Analysis Center, Division of Criminal Investigation, Office of the Attorney General, Pierre, South Dakota, 1985.

Crime in the United States, 1984. Uniform Crime Reports of the United States, Federal Bureau of Investigation, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, D.C., 1985.

Crime Victimization in South Dakota, 1976. Criminal Justice Studies Program, University of South Dakota, Vermillion, South Dakota, 1978.

Forst, Brian E. and Jolene C. Herson, The Criminal Justice Response to Victim Harm. National Institute of Justice, U.S. Department of Justice, June 1985.

Friedman, Kenneth, Helen Bischoff, Robert Davis, and Andrea Person, Victims and Helpers: Reactions to Crime. National Institute of Justice, Grant # 79-NIAX0059.

Garofalo, James, Local Victim Surveys: A Review of the Issues. Department of Justice, Law Enforcement Administration, National Criminal Justice Information and Statistics Service, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1977.

General Population Characteristics, South Dakota, 1980 Census of Population, U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, PC80-1-B43, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., issued July 1983.

General Social and Economic Characteristics, South Dakota, 1980 Census of Population, U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, PC80-1-C43, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., issued July 1983.

Kelly, Deborah P., "Victims' Perceptions of Criminal Justice". Pepperdine Law Review, Volume 11:15, 1984, pp. 15-20.

McGarrell, Edmund F. and Timothy J. Flanagan, eds., Sourcebook of Criminal Justice Statistics-1984. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, NCJ-96382.

President's Task Force on Victims of Crime, Final Report. Washington, D.C., December 1982.

Oregon Serious Crime Survey-1985 Update. Department of Justice, Crime Analysis Center, Salem, Oregon, 1986.

Public Attitude and the Criminal Justice Survey-1976. Montana Board of Crime Control, Helena, Montana, 1977.

Public Opinion/Victimization Survey, 1982. Montana Board of Crime Control, Helena, Montana, 1983.

Report on Crime and Criminal Justice in Colorado and Denver, 1985. Colorado Department of Public Safety, Division of Criminal Justice, Denver, Colorado, 1986.

SAS User's Guide: Basics. 1982 Edition, SAS Institute, Inc., Cary, North Carolina.

SAS User's Guide: Statistics. 1982 Edition, SAS Institute, Inc., Cary, North Carolina.

Schaeffer, Richard L., William Mendenhall, and Lyman Ott, Elementary Survey Sampling. Duxbury Press, North /scituate, Massachusetts, 1979.

Welch, Susan and John C. Comer, Quantitative Methods for Public Administration. The Dorsey Press, Homewood, Illinois, 1983.

Wolfgang, Marvin E., Robert M. Figlio, Paul E. Tracy, and Simon I. Singer, The National Survey of Crime Severity. U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, NCJ-96017, June 1985.

Woodard, Paul L. and John R. Anderson, Victim Witness Legislation: An Overview. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, NCJ-94365.