


## Strong Support for Adults Who Use Opioids to be Sent to Treatment and Not Criminally Charged

There has been significant public debate in recent months about the decriminalization of substance abuse in the commonwealth, specifically opioid abuse. Overall, public support is strong for offering treatment for heroin users (61%) and prescription drug abusers (72%) rather than arresting them and processing them criminally. While respondents strongly support the idea of treatment versus arrest, there were significant differences among those who identified themselves as Democrat, Republican and Independent. For those who favored treatment among heroin users, 38 percent identified themselves as Democrat, 18 percent Republican and 38 percent Independent as compared to 35 percent of Democrats, 24 percent of Republicans and 35 percent of Independents who favor treatment for prescription medication abuse. There were also significant racial differences among those favoring arrest versus treatment for both heroin use and prescription medication abuse. Lastly, significant gender differences exist among those who favored arrest versus treatment for heroin use.

### Differences Exist Among Those Who Respondents Believe Should be Most Responsible



### for Combating Opioid Use or Abuse


Though the public indicates support for treatment for both heroin and prescription medication abuse, who should be responsible for combating the abuse varies. Specifically, 30 percent of Virginians believe that individual users should be most responsible for combating heroin use as compared to other groups such as local law enforcement (17%), friends or family (15%), local government (10%), and state government (9%). As for combating prescription medication abuse, slightly less than half (44%) believe that the doctors who prescribe painkillers should be most responsible for combating the issue in

comparison to that of individual users (25%), family or friends (9%), local law enforcement (5%), and state governments (5%).

These relationships remained relatively strong even after considering political affiliation. Thirty-five percent of Democrats, 30 percent of Republicans and 27 percent of Independents strongly believed that individual users should be responsible for combating heroin use. Almost twice the number of Democrats, Republicans and Independents believe the doctors who prescribe prescription painkillers should be most responsible for combating prescription medication abuse (49%, 43% and 42%, respectively). It appears that in the view of respondents, while heroin and prescription painkillers are pharmacologically similar, because of the historical stigma related to heroin it is viewed differently than other prescription pain medications that are considered to have legal and medicinal value.

### **Strong Support for Non-violent Offenders with Mental Illness to Participate in Community-based Treatment Programs**

Similar to substance abuse, mental illness is another issue facing the criminal justice system, specifically regarding treatment versus criminalization. When asked about an alternative to incarceration for non-violent offenders with mental illness, a majority of Virginians (88%) agree that non-violent offenders with mental illness should be required to participate in community-based treatment programs instead of be incarcerated. Levels of support remained high among respondents from all political parties including Democrats (92%), Republicans (81%) and Independents (92%).



### **Strong Majorities Believe that Judges and Juries Should Have Discretion over Sentencing Decisions in the Justice System.**

Other components of the criminal justice system are also of important policy debate. Specifically, the role of decision making in the courts and corrections system are of considerable interest in the commonwealth. Overall, Virginians believe judges and juries should have discretion over sentencing decisions in the justice system. There are few differences among the public, however. For example, among those living in the South Central region, over half of respondents report that that judges should have sentencing privileges, and less than 40 percent believe juries should have the most influence.

We see a similar pattern for those in the 45-64 age range. These residents also feel judges should have primary sentencing discretion. However, among the very young (18-24), a reverse pattern is apparent. That is, fewer young Virginians believe judges should have the most influence; rather, they are more supportive of jury sentencing policy.

Education also appears consequential in shaping public perceptions. Among those with “some college” attainment, greater support is expressed for a system of justice that prioritizes jury sentencing. However, those with a college degree or higher education express contrary opinions; less support exists for jury sentencing among this group.


Income is another factor that affects views among the public. Here, Virginians who report a lower income believe juries should have primary sentencing power. Those with incomes above \$100,000 share a different perception, with higher-income residents believing judges should have greater influence in sentencing.

The least support for sentencing discretion among the public was apparent for the General Assembly. Only 12 percent of the public believes legislators should have the greatest discretion in sentencing criminal defendants. This pattern is fairly consistent across categories. The most support for granting the General Assembly primary sentencing power exists for those residing in Tidewater (16%), women (13%), residents 65 and older (10%), those with some college experience (14%), Virginians earning less than \$50,000 (13%), minorities (13%), those with criminal justice employment or family working in the system (17%), parents of minors (13%) and adults (13%), and among Democrats (18%).


### **The Majority of Virginians Do Not Support Convicted Felons Being Eligible for Nonconsecutive Day/Weekend Jail Time.**

Court systems and local and regional jails in the commonwealth are constantly addressing issues of resource allocation. The utilization of nonconsecutive day/weekend time for inmates is one such tool that can be employed to address these issues. Previously and in this current session, the General Assembly is looking to expand the utilization of the nonconsecutive day/weekend time for inmates to include convicted felons. A majority (57%) of respondents do not support the inclusion of felons into the eligible pool of inmates who could serve nonconsecutive day/weekend time. The strongest opposition to expanding this law is in the South Central region of Virginia, while the strongest support in favor of it is in the Western region of Virginia.

*Inclusion of Convicted Felons in Nonconsecutive Day/Weekend Jail Sentencing.*



*Support & Opposition for Statutory Expansion by Community Type.*




## Virginians are Satisfied with Police Performance in the Community

Citizen satisfaction with police service is a top priority in maintaining order and safety. Officers depend on citizens to report criminal activity and cooperate with requests; however, extensive media coverage of police shootings and citizen protests suggests people are largely dissatisfied with police. Counter to media portrayals, 84 percent of Virginia residents agreed they are satisfied with how local police solve problems and handle calls for service. Individual characteristics played a significant role in views, though the majority within each demographic group still reported satisfaction with police. The largest differences were by age, income and political affiliation. Of those 35 and older, 86 percent were satisfied compared to 76 percent of citizens aged 18 to 34. In addition, 89 percent of those in the highest income category (\$100,000 or higher) were satisfied compared to 80 percent of those in the lowest category (\$50,000 or less). Republicans were more likely to report satisfaction (93%) compared to Democrats (79%) or Independents (84%).


### CITIZEN SATISFACTION WITH LOCAL POLICE

DO YOU STRONGLY AGREE, SOMEWHAT AGREE, SOMEWHAT DISAGREE, OR STRONGLY DISAGREE THAT I AM SATISFIED WITH HOW LAW ENFORCEMENT IN MY LOCAL COMMUNITY SOLVE PROBLEMS AND HANDLE THOSE WHO CALL THEM FOR HELP?



Responses to core police performance questions, such as fair and equal treatment and police use of force, were also positive. A majority of Virginians agreed that police treat people in their community fairly (78%), do a good job of handling race relations (75%), and use an appropriate amount of force when dealing with suspects (73%).

### Views of Police Practice



Though responses were generally favorable, findings suggest it may be useful for police agencies to reach the quarter of residents who disagreed with survey statements. Family income, race and political affiliation were associated with the largest differences in views of police practice.


- Virginians who earned less than \$50,000 were less likely to agree that police treat people fairly (75% vs. 85%), do a good job handling race relations (80% vs. 72%), and use an appropriate amount of force (76% vs. 79%) compared to those who earned \$100,000 or more.
- Similarly, 73 percent of minority residents believed police treat people fairly compared to 83 percent of whites. Significantly, only 63 percent of minority residents said police do a good job of handling race relations, while 83 percent of whites agreed. Race also influenced perception of use of force: 66 percent of minorities and 78 percent of whites said police use appropriate force.
  - Notably, only 66 percent of respondents in the South Central region agreed police handle race relations well compared to 75 percent to 81 percent of those from other regions.
- Democrats were much less likely to agree with each statement compared to Republicans while Independents fell in the middle. Seventy percent of Democrats said residents receive fair treatment (R = 91%, I = 78%); 65 percent agreed police handle race relations well (R = 88%, I = 77%); and 65 percent said police use appropriate force (R = 81%, I = 77%).

A recent development in police practice is the use of body cameras to record police-citizen encounters. Body camera recordings provide more information to evaluate police encounters, which have traditionally been relatively difficult to supervise. Given that many Virginia police agencies are now adopting body cameras, it is encouraging to find that an overwhelming majority of Virginians (94%) supported police use of body cameras. Support for body cameras was largely consistent across demographic groups.

### **Majorities Are Fearful of U.S. Hate-Based Terrorist Attacks in Virginia; Concern for Public Safety Agencies' Ability to Protect Residents from Such Attacks**

Terrorism events seem to happen frequently both domestically and internationally. These occurrences have adversely impacted public perception and fear. Almost three-quarters (72%) of respondents indicated they are very concerned or concerned about attacks in Virginia conducted by U.S.-based hate groups (*Hate Attacks*). Approximately 65 percent were concerned about terrorist attacks in Virginia conducted by U.S.-based religious extremist groups (*Religious Attacks*). Similarly, 58 percent of respondents are concerned about U.S.-based militia groups committing terrorist attacks in Virginia (*Militia Attacks*). Just over 67 percent of respondents are either very or somewhat concerned about terrorist attacks in Virginia being carried out by Islamic Extremists (*Islamic Attacks*). The highest degree of concern is with lone wolf terrorist attacks in Virginia, as 73 percent of respondents are either very or somewhat concerned (*Lone Wolf Attacks*).

Approximately 71 percent of respondents felt very concerned (33%) or somewhat concerned (38%) about local police being unable to protect their community from terrorist attacks (*Police Protection*). Findings demonstrate significant fear and concern of terrorist attacks in Virginia, particularly attacks conducted by U.S.-based hate groups, lone wolf perpetrators and Islamic extremists. Results also suggest concern by the public regarding the capacity of public safety agencies to protect residents from terrorist attacks.



Several demographic variables emerged as predictors of concern regarding terrorist attacks. Respondents who were college educated were significantly more likely to fear attacks; younger respondents expressed more concern than older respondents; white and Hispanic participants described significantly higher levels of concern than African-Americans; and respondents with the highest annual incomes expressed significantly more concern for attacks than those earning less. Geographic region was a statistically significant predictor of concern of terrorist attacks—respondents in Northern Virginia expressed the greatest fear while those in the Tidewater region had the least concern.

## Methodology

The Public Policy Poll 2017 Survey, sponsored by Virginia Commonwealth University (VCU), obtained telephone interviews with a representative sample of 1,000 adults living in Virginia. Interviews were conducted via landline ( $n_{LL}=500$ ) and cell phone ( $n_C=500$ ; including 261 without a landline phone). The survey was conducted by Princeton Survey Research Associates International (PSRAI). The interviews were administered in English by Princeton Data Source from December 1 to 20, 2016. Statistical results are weighted to correct known demographic discrepancies. The margin of sampling error for the complete set of weighted data is  $\pm 4.1$  percentage points.

Details on the design, execution and analysis of the survey are discussed below.

### DESIGN AND DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES

#### Sample Design

The state was stratified into five regions; Northwest, Northern Virginia, West, South Central, and Tidewater (see [Appendix A](#) for county breakdown by region). Separate samples were drawn for each region in order to reach regional quotas. A combination of landline and cellular random digit dial (RDD) samples was used to represent all adults who have access to either a landline or cellular telephone. The samples were provided by Survey Sampling International, LLC (SSI) according to PSRAI specifications.

Within strata, numbers for the landline sample were drawn with equal probabilities from active blocks (area code + exchange + two-digit block number) that contained three or more residential directory listings. The cellular sample was not list-assisted, but was drawn through a systematic sampling from dedicated wireless 100-blocks and shared service 100-blocks with no directory-listed landline numbers.

#### Contact Procedures

Interviews were conducted from December 1 to 20, 2016. As many as seven attempts were made to contact every sampled telephone number. Sample was released for interviewing in replicates, which are representative subsamples of the larger sample. Using replicates to control the release of sample ensures that complete call procedures are followed for the entire sample. Calls were staggered over times of day and days of the week to maximize the chance of making contact with potential



respondents. Interviewing was spread as evenly as possible across the days in field. When necessary, each telephone number was called at least one time during the day in an attempt to complete an interview.

For the landline sample, interviewers asked to speak with the youngest adult male or female currently at home based on a random rotation. If no male/female was available, interviewers asked to speak with the youngest adult of the other gender. This systematic respondent selection technique has been shown to produce samples that closely mirror the population in terms of age and gender when combined with cellular phone interviewing. Prior to dialing, the landline sample was scrubbed of numbers that have been ported to wireless service by comparing the sample file to the most recently available Intermodal Ported Telephone Number Identification Service database. For the cellular sample, interviews were conducted with the person who answered the phone. Interviewers verified that the person was an adult and in a safe place before administering the survey. Both landline and cellular respondents verified they were a resident of Virginia.

## **WEIGHTING AND ANALYSIS**

Weighting is generally used in survey analysis to compensate for sample designs and patterns of non-response that might bias results. The sample was weighted to match the adult population parameters for each region. A three-stage weighting procedure was used to weight these dual-frame samples.

The first stage of weighting corrected for different probabilities of selection associated with the number of adults in each household and each respondent's telephone usage patterns.<sup>1</sup> This weighting also adjusts for the overlapping landline and cell sample frames and the relative sizes of each frame and each sample.

---

<sup>1</sup> i.e., whether respondents have only a landline telephone, only a cell phone, or both kinds of telephone.

The first-stage weight for the  $i^{\text{th}}$  case within a stratum can be expressed as:

$$WT_i = \left[ \left( \frac{S_{LL}}{F_{LL}} \times \frac{1}{AD_i} \times LL_i \right) + \left( \frac{S_{CP}}{F_{CP}} \times CP_i \right) - \left( \frac{S_{LL}}{F_{LL}} \times \frac{1}{AD_i} \times LL_i \times \frac{S_{CP}}{F_{CP}} \times CP_i \right) \right]^{-1}$$

Where  $S_{LL}$  = the size of the landline sample

$F_{LL}$  = the size of the landline sample frame

$S_{CP}$  = the size of the cell sample

$F_{CP}$  = the size of the cell sample frame

$AD_i$  = Number of adults in household  $i$

$LL_i=1$  if respondent has a landline phone, otherwise  $LL=0$ .

$CP_i=1$  if respondent has a cell phone, otherwise  $CP=0$ .

The second stage of weighting balances sample demographics to population parameters within each region. The sample is balanced to match population parameters for sex, age, education, race, Hispanic origin, and telephone usage. The basic weighting parameters came from the U.S. Census Bureau's 2010-2014 American Community Survey data. The telephone usage parameters came from an analysis of recent dual-frame interviewing conducted in Virginia counties by PSRAI.<sup>2</sup>

Weighting was accomplished using SPSSINC RAKE, an SPSS extension module that simultaneously balances the distributions of all variables using the GENLOG procedure. Weights were trimmed to prevent individual interviews from having too much influence on the final results. The use of these weights in statistical analysis ensures that the demographic characteristics of the sample closely approximate the demographic characteristics of the population. Tables 1 through 5 compare weighted and unweighted sample distributions to each region's population parameters. The third and final stage of weighting adjusted regional population totals so that the entire dataset would be representative of the state as a whole.

---

<sup>2</sup> Data was from PSRAI Omnibus survey conducted January 2014 through December 2016.

**Table 1: Sample Demographics Northwest (Region 1)**

---

	<u>Parameter</u>	<u>Unweighted</u>	<u>Weighted</u>
<u>Gender</u>			
Male	48.4	52.8	48.5
Female	51.6	47.2	51.5
<u>Age</u>			
18-24	14.0	5.0	13.2
25-34	15.5	11.1	15.6
35-44	16.0	8.0	15.8
45-64	35.3	43.2	35.9
65+	19.2	32.7	19.5
<u>Education</u>			
HS Grad or less	45.7	34.7	46.1
Some College/Assoc			
Degree	28.3	22.1	27.5
College Graduate	26.0	43.2	26.4
<u>Race/Ethnicity</u>			
White/not Hispanic	80.2	85.9	80.6
Black/not Hispanic	9.4	8.0	9.5
Hispanic/Other	10.4	6.0	9.9
<u>Individual Phone Use</u>			
LLO	8.0	7.0	8.0
Dual	51.3	67.3	51.9
CPO	40.7	25.6	40.1

---

**Table 2: Sample Demographics Northern Virginia (Region 2)**

	<u>Parameter</u>	<u>Unweighted</u>	<u>Weighted</u>	
<u>Gender</u>				
	Male	49.0	50.3	49.4
	Female	51.0	49.7	50.6
<u>Age</u>				
	18-24	10.8	11.7	11.4
	25-34	21.5	5.6	18.5
	35-44	20.8	16.8	21.9
	45-64	34.6	47.7	35.3
	65+	12.3	18.3	12.9
<u>Education</u>				
	HS Grad or less	25.1	14.7	23.5
	Some College/Assoc Degree	23.4	20.3	22.7
	College Graduate	51.5	65.0	53.8
<u>Race/Ethnicity</u>				
	White/not Hispanic	54.7	71.6	55.7
	Black/not Hispanic	11.8	9.6	12.4
	Hispanic	16.4	10.7	15.3
	Other, not Hispanic	17.1	8.1	16.5
<u>Individual Phone Use</u>				
	LLO	4.1	4.1	4.3
	Dual	51.1	74.1	53.6
	CPO	44.9	21.8	42.1

**Table 3: Sample Demographics West (Region 3)**

	<u>Parameter</u>	<u>Unweighted</u>	<u>Weighted</u>	
<u>Gender</u>				
	Male	48.4	41.6	48.2
	Female	51.6	58.4	51.8
<u>Age</u>				
	18-24	13.8	6.4	14.2
	25-34	14.0	5.0	12.4
	35-44	15.1	10.4	15.1
	45-64	35.3	43.6	36.2
	65+	21.8	34.7	22.2
<u>Education</u>				
	HS Grad or less	48.2	37.1	47.8
	Some College/Assoc			
	Degree	32.6	31.2	32.5
	College Graduate	19.2	31.7	19.7
<u>Race/Ethnicity</u>				
	White/not Hispanic	82.9	90.6	83.1
	Black/not Hispanic	11.5	5.4	11.2
	Hispanic/Other	5.6	4.0	5.7
<u>Individual Phone Use</u>				
	LLO	13.7	8.4	13.9
	Dual	44.7	60.9	45.8
	CPO	41.6	30.7	40.2

**Table 4: Sample Demographics South Central (Region 4)**

---

	<u>Parameter</u>	<u>Unweighted</u>	<u>Weighted</u>	
<u>Gender</u>				
	Male	48.1	44.6	47.3
	Female	51.9	55.4	52.7
<u>Age</u>				
	18-24	12.8	9.9	12.9
	25-34	17.1	10.9	16.9
	35-44	16.8	9.4	16.2
	45-64	35.8	41.6	36.3
	65+	17.5	28.2	17.8
<u>Education</u>				
	HS Grad or less	42.1	21.3	40.2
	Some College/Assoc			
	Degree	29.7	31.2	30.5
	College Graduate	28.2	47.5	29.3
<u>Race/Ethnicity</u>				
	White/not Hispanic	58.1	71.3	59.1
	Black/not Hispanic	31.3	20.3	31.3
	Hispanic/Other	10.6	8.4	9.6
<u>Individual Phone Use</u>				
	LLO	7.9	4.5	7.1
	Dual	52.7	65.8	53.0
	CPO	39.4	29.7	39.9

---

**Table 5: Sample Demographics Tidewater (Region 5)**

	<u>Parameter</u>	<u>Unweighted</u>	<u>Weighted</u>	
<u>Gender</u>				
	Male	48.7	45.0	46.7
	Female	51.3	55.0	53.3
<u>Age</u>				
	18-24	14.8	8.5	15.1
	25-34	18.7	7.5	16.2
	35-44	15.8	7.0	14.7
	45-64	33.8	43.0	36.0
	65+	16.9	34.0	18.0
<u>Education</u>				
	HS Grad or less	38.3	25.0	35.3
	Some College/Assoc Degree	36.3	36.0	37.9
	College Graduate	25.4	39.0	26.8
<u>Race/Ethnicity</u>				
	White/not Hispanic	56.8	61.0	56.3
	Black/not Hispanic	30.6	28.0	30.4
	Hispanic	5.8	5.0	6.2
	Other /not Hispanic	6.8	6.0	7.1
<u>Individual Phone Use</u>				
	LLO	7.9	5.0	5.8
	Dual	50.4	72.5	53.4
	CPO	41.7	22.5	40.8

## Effects of Sample Design on Statistical Inference

Post-data collection statistical adjustments require analysis procedures that reflect departures from simple random sampling. PSRAI calculates the effects of these design features so that an appropriate adjustment can be incorporated into tests of statistical significance when using these data. The so-called "design effect" or *deff* represents the loss in statistical efficiency that results from systematic non-response.

PSRAI calculates the composite design effect for a sample of size  $n$ , with each case having a weight,  $w_i$  as:

$$deff = \frac{n \sum_{i=1}^n w_i^2}{\left( \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \right)^2} \quad \text{formula 1}$$

In a wide range of situations, the adjusted *standard error* of a statistic should be calculated by multiplying the usual formula by the square root of the design effect ( $\sqrt{deff}$ ). Thus, the formula for computing the 95% confidence interval around a percentage is:

$$\hat{p} \pm \left( \sqrt{deff} \times 1.96 \sqrt{\frac{\hat{p}(1-\hat{p})}{n}} \right) \quad \text{formula 2}$$

where  $\hat{p}$  is the sample estimate and  $n$  is the unweighted number of sample cases in the group being considered.

The survey's *margin of error* is the largest 95% confidence interval for any estimated proportion based on the total sample— the one around 50%. For example, the margin of error for the entire sample is  $\pm 4.1$  percentage points. This means that in 95 out every 100 samples drawn using the same



methodology, estimated proportions based on the entire sample will be no more than 4.1 percentage points away from their true values in the population. It is important to remember that sampling fluctuations are only one possible source of error in a survey estimate. Other sources, such as respondent selection bias, questionnaire wording and reporting inaccuracy, may contribute additional error of greater or lesser magnitude.

Table 6 shows the design effects and margins of error for each region.

**Table 6: Design Effects and Margins of Error**

<u>Region</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>Design Effect</u>	<u>Margin of Error</u>
Northwest (1)	199	1.50	± 8.5 percentage points
Northern VA (2)	197	1.72	± 9.2 percentage points
West (3)	202	1.52	± 8.5 percentage points
South Central (4)	202	1.50	± 8.4 percentage points
Tidewater (5)	200	1.53	± 8.6 percentage points
Total Sample	1000	1.74	± 4.1 percentage points

## RESPONSE RATE

Table 7 shows the response rates for each region by sample type. Tables 8 through 12 show the individual dispositions of all sampled telephone numbers ever dialed from the original telephone number samples. The response rate estimates the fraction of all eligible sample that was ultimately interviewed. Response rates are computed according to American Association for Public Opinion Research standards.<sup>3</sup> Table 13 shows the total disposition for the all sampled telephone numbers.

**Table 7: Response Rates**

<u>Landline</u>	<u>Cell</u>
-----------------	-------------

<sup>3</sup> American Association for Public Opinion Research. 2016. Standard Definitions: Final Dispositions of Case Codes and Outcome Rates for Surveys. 9th edition. AAPOR.

Northwest (1)	16.0%	15.7%
Northern VA (2)	11.6%	15.5%
West (3)	14.5%	16.1%
South Central (4)	8.4%	14.7%
Tidewater (5)	13.6%	14.3%
Total	12.2%	15.3%

Table 8. Sample Disposition Northwest Region 1

<u>Landline</u>	<u>Cell</u>	
114	18	Non-residential/Business (4.500)
77	----	Ported numbers identified before dialing (4.420)
0	----	Cell in landline frame (4.420)
191	18	OF = Out of Frame
1,594	388	Not working (4.300)
82	0	Computer/fax/modem (4.200)
1,676	388	NWC = Not working/computer
159	28	NA/Busy all attempts (3.120, 3.130)
0	240	VM not set up/caller out of range (3.100)
5	1	On DNC list - not dialed (3.90)
164	269	UHUO <sub>NC</sub> = Non-contact, unknown if household/unknown other
237	314	Voice mail (3.140)
4	0	Other non-contact (deaf/disabled/deceased) (3.211)
241	314	UO <sub>NC</sub> = Non-contact, unknown eligibility
290	308	Refusals (3.211)
11	20	Callbacks (3.211)
301	328	UO <sub>R</sub> = Refusal, unknown if eligible
4	23	O = Other (language) (3.211)
----	37	Child's cell phone (4.700)
19	30	Screen-out Not a resident in VA (4.700)
19	67	SO = Screen out
18	9	R = Refusal, known eligible (breakoffs and qualified CBs) (2.100)
100	99	I = Completed interviews (1.0)
2,714	1,515	T = Total numbers sampled
26.8%	67.4%	$e1 = (I+R+SO+O+UO_R+UO_{NC}) / (I+R+SO+O+UO_R+UO_{NC}+OF+NWC)$ - Est. frame eligibility of non-contacts
86.1%	61.7%	$e2 = (I+R) / (I+R+SO)$ - Est. screening eligibility of unscreened contacts
60.8%	51.5%	$CON = [I + R + (e2*[O + UO_R])] / [I + R + (e2*[O + UO_R + UO_{NC}]) + (e1*e2*UHUO_{NC})]$
26.3%	30.5%	$COOP = I / [I + R + (e2*[O + UO_R])]$
<b>16.0%</b>	<b>15.7%</b>	<b><math>AAPOR\ RR3 = I / [I + R + [e2*(UO_R + UO_{NC} + O)] + [e1*e2*UHUO_{NC}]] = CON*COOP</math></b>

**Table 9. Sample Disposition Northern VA Region 2**

<u>Landline</u>	<u>Cell</u>	
208	42	Non-residential/Business (4.500)
41	----	Ported numbers identified before dialing (4.420)
2	----	Cell in landline frame (4.420)
251	42	OF = Out of Frame
2,398	234	Not working (4.300)
129	0	Computer/fax/modem (4.200)
2,527	234	NWC = Not working/computer
313	20	NA/Busy all attempts (3.120, 3.130)
0	419	VM not set up/caller out of range (3.100)
3	2	On DNC list - not dialed (3.90)
316	441	UHU <sub>NC</sub> = Non-contact, unknown if household/unknown other
357	308	Voice mail (3.140)
1	2	Other non-contact (deaf/disabled/deceased) (3.211)
358	310	UO <sub>NC</sub> = Non-contact, unknown eligibility
376	378	Refusals (3.211)
16	47	Callbacks (3.211)
392	425	UO <sub>R</sub> = Refusal, unknown if eligible
21	79	O = Other (language) (3.211)
----	57	Child's cell phone (4.700)
19	85	Screen-out Not a resident in VA (4.700)
19	142	SO = Screen out
19	17	R = Refusal, known eligible (breakoffs and qualified CBs) (2.100)
98	99	I = Completed interviews (1.0)
4,001	1,789	T = Total numbers sampled
24.6%	79.5%	$e1 = (I+R+SO+O+UO_R+UO_{NC})/(I+R+SO+O+UO_R+UO_{NC}+OF+NWC)$ - Est. frame eligibility of non-contacts
86.0%	45.0%	$e2 = (I+R)/(I+R+SO)$ - Est. screening eligibility of unscreened contacts
55.7%	53.6%	$CON = [I + R + (e2*[O + UO_R])]/[I + R + (e2*[O + UO_R + UO_{NC}]) + (e1*e2*UHU_{NC})]$
20.7%	28.9%	$COOP = I/[I + R + (e2*[O + UO_R])]$
<b>11.6%</b>	<b>15.5%</b>	<b>AAPOR RR3 = <math>I/[I+R+(e2*(UO_R+UO_{NC}+O))+(e1*e2*UHU_{NC})]</math> = CON*COOP</b>

**Table 10. Sample Disposition West Region 3**

<u>Landline</u>	<u>e</u>	<u>Cell</u>	
124	11		Non-residential/Business (4.500)
72	----		Ported numbers identified before dialing (4.420)
0	----		Cell in landline frame (4.420)
196	11		OF = Out of Frame
2,144	413		Not working (4.300)
64	0		Computer/fax/modem (4.200)
2,208	413		NWC = Not working/computer
163	20		NA/Busy all attempts (3.120, 3.130)
0	251		VM not set up/caller out of range (3.100)
2	2		On DNC list - not dialed (3.90)
165	273		UHUO <sub>NC</sub> = Non-contact, unknown if household/unknown other
234	234		Voice mail (3.140)
3	2		Other non-contact (deaf/disabled/deceased) (3.211)
237	236		UO <sub>NC</sub> = Non-contact, unknown eligibility
332	260		Refusals (3.211)
18	32		Callbacks (3.211)
350	292		UO <sub>R</sub> = Refusal, unknown if eligible
0	7		O = Other (language) (3.211)
----	32		Child's cell phone (4.700)
12	15		Screen-out Not a resident in VA (4.700)
12	47		SO = Screen out
30	17		R = Refusal, known eligible (breakoffs and qualified CBs) (2.100)
102	100		I = Completed interviews (1.0)
3,300	1,396		T = Total numbers sampled
23.3%	62.2%		$e1 = (I+R+SO+O+UO_R+UO_{NC}) / (I+R+SO+O+UO_R+UO_{NC}+OF+NWC)$ - Est. frame eligibility of non-contacts
91.7%	71.3%		$e2 = (I+R) / (I+R+SO)$ - Est. screening eligibility of unscreened contacts
64.2%	53.3%		$CON = [I + R + (e2*[O + UO_R])] / [I + R + (e2*[O + UO_R + UO_{NC}]) + (e1*e2*UHUO_{NC})]$
22.5%	30.3%		$COOP = I / [I + R + (e2*[O + UO_R])]$
<b>14.5%</b>	<b>16.1%</b>		<b>AAPOR RR3 = <math>I / [I+R+(e2*(UO_R+UO_{NC}+O)) + [e1*e2*UHUO_{NC}]] = CON*COOP</math></b>

**Table 11. Sample Disposition South Central Region 4**

<u>Landline</u>	<u>e</u>	<u>Cell</u>	
233	20		Non-residential/Business (4.500)
79	----		Ported numbers identified before dialing (4.420)
1	----		Cell in landline frame (4.420)
313	20		OF = Out of Frame
3,324	214		Not working (4.300)
151	0		Computer/fax/modem (4.200)
3,475	214		NWC = Not working/computer
350	14		NA/Busy all attempts (3.120, 3.130)
0	328		VM not set up/caller out of range (3.100)
9	0		On DNC list - not dialed (3.90)
359	342		UHUO <sub>NC</sub> = Non-contact, unknown if household/unknown other
599	252		Voice mail (3.140)
3	0		Other non-contact (deaf/disabled/deceased) (3.211)
602	252		UO <sub>NC</sub> = Non-contact, unknown eligibility
471	334		Refusals (3.211)
28	40		Callbacks (3.211)
499	374		UO <sub>R</sub> = Refusal, unknown if eligible
3	15		O = Other (language) (3.211)
----	40		Child's cell phone (4.700)
18	27		Screen-out Not a resident in VA (4.700)
18	67		SO = Screen out
30	16		R = Refusal, known eligible (breakoffs and qualified CBs) (2.100)
99	103		I = Completed interviews (1.0)
5,398	1,403		T = Total numbers sampled
24.8%	77.9%		$e1 = (I+R+SO+O+UO_R+UO_{NC}) / (I+R+SO+O+UO_R+UO_{NC}+OF+NWC)$ - Est. frame eligibility of non-contacts
87.8%	64.0%		$e2 = (I+R) / (I+R+SO)$ - Est. screening eligibility of unscreened contacts
48.4%	52.6%		$CON = [I + R + (e2*[O + UO_R])] / [I + R + (e2*[O + UO_R + UO_{NC}]) + (e1*e2*UHUO_{NC})]$
17.4%	28.0%		$COOP = I / [I + R + (e2*[O + UO_R])]$
<b>8.4%</b>	<b>14.7%</b>		<b>AAPOR RR3 = <math>I / [I + R + [e2*(UO_R + UO_{NC} + O)] + [e1*e2*UHUO_{NC}]] = CON * COOP</math></b>

**Table 12. Sample Disposition Tidewater Region 5**

<u>Landline</u>	<u>Cell</u>	
216	24	Non-residential/Business (4.500)
47	----	Ported numbers identified before dialing (4.420)
1	----	Cell in landline frame (4.420)
264	24	OF = Out of Frame
2,363	250	Not working (4.300)
88	0	Computer/fax/modem (4.200)
2,451	250	NWC = Not working/computer
256	13	NA/Busy all attempts (3.120, 3.130)
0	420	VM not set up/caller out of range (3.100)
8	1	On DNC list - not dialed (3.90)
264	434	UHUO <sub>NC</sub> = Non-contact, unknown if household/unknown other
307	291	Voice mail (3.140)
6	0	Other non-contact (deaf/disabled/deceased) (3.211)
313	291	UO <sub>NC</sub> = Non-contact, unknown eligibility
344	340	Refusals (3.211)
21	44	Callbacks (3.211)
365	384	UO <sub>R</sub> = Refusal, unknown if eligible
3	10	O = Other (language) (3.211)
----	54	Child's cell phone (4.700)
23	34	Screen-out Not a resident in VA (4.700)
23	88	SO = Screen out
18	17	R = Refusal, known eligible (breakoffs and qualified CBs) (2.100)
101	99	I = Completed interviews (1.0)
3,802	1,597	T = Total numbers sampled
23.3%	76.4%	$e1 = (I+R+SO+O+UO_R+UO_{NC})/(I+R+SO+O+UO_R+UO_{NC}+OF+NWC)$ - Est. frame eligibility of non-contacts
83.8%	56.9%	$e2 = (I+R)/(I+R+SO)$ - Est. screening eligibility of unscreened contacts
57.7%	49.0%	$CON = [I + R + (e2*[O + UO_R])]/[I + R + (e2*[O + UO_R + UO_{NC}]) + (e1*e2*UHUO_{NC})]$
23.6%	29.1%	$COOP = I/[I + R + (e2*[O + UO_R])]$
<b>13.6%</b>	<b>14.3%</b>	<b>AAPOR RR3 = <math>I/[I+R+(e2*(UO_R+UO_{NC}+O))+(e1*e2*UHUO_{NC})]</math> = CON*COOP</b>

**Table 13. Sample Disposition Total VA**

<u>Landline</u>	<u>Cell</u>	
895	115	Non-residential/Business (4.500)
316	----	Ported numbers identified before dialing (4.420)
4	----	Cell in landline frame (4.420)
1,215	115	OF = Out of Frame
11,823	1,499	Not working (4.300)
514	0	Computer/fax/modem (4.200)
12,337	1,499	NWC = Not working/computer
1,241	95	NA/Busy all attempts (3.120, 3.130)
0	1,658	VM not set up/caller out of range (3.100)
27	6	On DNC list - not dialed (3.90)
1,268	1,759	UHU <sub>NC</sub> = Non-contact, unknown if household/unknown other
1,734	1,399	Voice mail (3.140)
17	4	Other non-contact (deaf/disabled/deceased) (3.211)
1,751	1,403	UO <sub>NC</sub> = Non-contact, unknown eligibility
1,810	1,618	Refusals (3.211)
94	183	Callbacks (3.211)
1,904	1,801	UO <sub>R</sub> = Refusal, unknown if eligible
31	134	O = Other (language) (3.211)
----	220	Child's cell phone (4.700)
91	191	Screen-out Not a resident in VA (4.700)
91	411	SO = Screen out
118	78	R = Refusal, known eligible (breakoffs and qualified CBs) (2.100)
500	500	I = Completed interviews (1.0)
19,215	7,700	T = Total numbers sampled
24.5%	72.8%	$e1 = (I+R+SO+O+UO_R+UO_{NC})/(I+R+SO+O+UO_R+UO_{NC}+OF+NWC)$ - Est. frame eligibility of non-contacts
87.2%	58.4%	$e2 = (I+R)/(I+R+SO)$ - Est. screening eligibility of unscreened contacts
56.2%	52.1%	$CON = [I + R + (e2*[O + UO_R])]/[I + R + (e2*[O + UO_R + UO_{NC}]) + (e1*e2*UHU_{NC})]$
21.7%	29.3%	$COOP = I/[I + R + (e2*[O + UO_R])]$
<b>12.2%</b>	<b>15.3%</b>	<b>AAPOR RR3 = <math>I/[I+R+(e2*(UO_R+UO_{NC}+O))+(e1*e2*UHU_{NC})] = CON*COOP</math></b>



## Appendix A

### **Northwest (Region 1)**

Albemarle County  
Augusta County  
Bath County  
Buena Vista city  
Caroline County  
Charlottesville city  
Clarke County  
Culpeper County  
Fauquier County  
Fluvanna County  
Frederick County  
Greene County  
Harrisonburg city  
Highland County  
King George County  
Lexington city  
Louisa County  
Madison County  
Nelson County  
Orange County  
Page County  
Rappahannock County  
Rockbridge County  
Rockingham County  
Shenandoah County  
Spotsylvania County  
Staunton city  
Warren County  
Waynesboro city  
Winchester city

### **Northern VA (Region 2)**

Alexandria city  
Arlington County  
Fairfax city

Fairfax County  
Falls Church city  
Fredericksburg city  
Loudoun County  
Manassas city  
Manassas Park city  
Prince William County  
Stafford County

### **West (Region 3)**

Alleghany County  
Amherst County  
Appomattox County  
Bedford city  
Bedford County  
Bland County  
Botetourt County  
Bristol city  
Buchanan County  
Campbell County  
Carroll County  
Covington city  
Craig County  
Danville city  
Dickenson County  
Floyd County  
Franklin County  
Galax city  
Giles County  
Grayson County  
Henry County  
Lee County  
Lynchburg city  
Martinsville city  
Montgomery County  
Norton city  
Patrick County

Pittsylvania County  
Pulaski County  
Radford city  
Roanoke city  
Roanoke County  
Russell County  
Salem city  
Scott County  
Smyth County  
Tazewell County  
Washington County  
Wise County  
Wythe County

### **South Central (Region 4)**

Amelia County  
Brunswick County  
Buckingham County  
Charles City County  
Charlotte County  
Chesterfield County  
Colonial Heights city  
Cumberland County  
Dinwiddie County  
Emporia city  
Goochland County  
Greensville County  
Halifax County  
Hanover County  
Henrico County  
Hopewell city  
Lunenburg County  
Mecklenburg County  
New Kent County  
Nottoway County  
Petersburg city

Powhatan County  
Prince Edward County  
Prince George County  
Richmond city  
Surry County  
Sussex County

### **Tidewater (Region 5)**

Accomack County  
Chesapeake city  
Essex County  
Franklin city  
Gloucester County  
Hampton city  
Isle of Wight County  
James City County  
King and Queen County  
King William County  
Lancaster County  
Mathews County  
Middlesex County  
Newport News city  
Norfolk city  
Northampton County  
Northumberland County  
Poquoson city  
Portsmouth city  
Richmond County  
Southampton County  
Suffolk city  
Virginia Beach city  
Westmoreland County  
Williamsburg city  
York County

**Appendix B: Cross Tabulations by Questions**

		Q1a. In general, should adults who use heroin be criminally charged and arrested, or should they be sent for treatment and not criminally charged?			
		Arrested and charged	Sent to treatment and not charged	DK/Refused	Number of Cases
All adults		34%	61%	5%	1000
VA Region	Northwest	37%	59%	4%	199
	Northern VA	33%	64%	3%	197
	West	39%	54%	7%	202
	South Central	30%	66%	4%	202
	Tidewater	34%	61%	5%	200
Gender	Men	36%	58%	6%	468
	Women	32%	64%	4%	532
Race	White	38%	56%	5%	727
	Minority	23%	75%	2%	239

Party Identification	Democrat	19%	76%	5%	306
	Republican	57%	40%	3%	281
	Independent	27%	68%	5%	342

Table: Q1b

		Q1b. In general, should adults who abuse prescription medicines be criminally charged and arrested, or should they be sent for treatment and not criminally charged?			
		Arrested and charged	Sent to treatment and not charged	DK/Refused	Number of Cases
All adults		22%	72%	6%	1000
VA Region	Northwest	24%	70%	6%	199
	Northern VA	19%	77%	4%	197
	West	27%	66%	7%	202
	South Central	19%	74%	7%	202
	Tidewater	22%	73%	5%	200
Gender	Men	25%	69%	6%	468
	Women	20%	75%	5%	532

Race	White	25%	70%	5%	727
	Minority	18%	72%	5%	239
Party Identification	Democrat	12%	83%	5%	306
	Republican	36%	61%	3%	281
	Independent	21%	73%	6%	342

Table: Q2a

		Q2a. Which of the following groups do you feel should be MOST responsible for combating heroin use in Virginia?							
		Individual users	Family or friends of the users	Local gov't	State gov't	Local police	Other	DK/Refused	Number of Cases
All adults		30%	15%	10%	9%	17%	11%	8%	1000
VA Region	Northwest	24%	15%	13%	10%	19%	11%	9%	199
	Northern VA	29%	17%	12%	5%	17%	14%	6%	197
	West	31%	14%	6%	9%	20%	9%	11%	202
	South Central	34%	14%	10%	12%	12%	10%	8%	202
	Tidewater	30%	15%	10%	9%	17%	11%	8%	200

Gender	Men	28%	16%	12%	10%	17%	11%	6%	468
	Women	33%	14%	9%	9%	16%	10%	9%	532
Race	White	29%	15%	10%	9%	18%	11%	8%	727
	Minority	33%	15%	12%	12%	13%	9%	7%	239
Party Identification	Democrat	35%	11%	12%	11%	11%	12%	8%	306
	Republican	30%	15%	8%	8%	24%	9%	6%	281
	Independent	27%	19%	12%	10%	14%	11%	7%	342

Table: Q2b

		Q2b. Which of the following groups do you feel should be MOST responsible for combating prescription drug abuse use in Virginia?								
		Individual users	Family or friends of the users	Local gov't	State gov't	Drs who prescribe	Local police	Other	DK/Refused	Number of Cases
All adults		26%	10%	3%	5%	44%	5%	4%	3%	1000
VA Region	Northwest	19%	12%	4%	5%	49%	4%	3%	4%	199
	Northern VA	22%	14%	4%	1%	43%	7%	6%	3%	197
	West	26%	8%	2%	5%	45%	7%	1%	6%	202
	South Central	33%	8%	3%	7%	39%	3%	3%	4%	202

	Tidewater	28%	6%	4%	5%	46%	5%	5%	1%	200
Gender	Men	25%	13%	4%	6%	38%	7%	4%	3%	468
	Women	26%	7%	3%	4%	49%	4%	4%	3%	532
Race	White	26%	10%	3%	5%	44%	5%	3%	4%	727
	Minority	24%	8%	5%	5%	43%	6%	5%	4%	239
Party Identification	Democrat	23%	5%	4%	6%	49%	4%	5%	4%	306
	Republican	27%	11%	2%	4%	43%	8%	2%	3%	281
	Independent	25%	12%	4%	5%	42%	5%	4%	3%	342

Table: Q3

		Q3. Please tell me how much you agree or disagree: Instead of being sentenced to jail or prison for committing a crime, non-violent offenders with mental illness should be required to participate in community-based programs.					
		Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	DK/Refused	Number of Cases
All adults		53%	35%	6%	4%	2%	1000
VA Region	Northwest	45%	35%	9%	8%	3%	199
	Northern VA	51%	40%	4%	4%	1%	197

	West	59%	31%	4%	4%	2%	202
	South Central	53%	37%	5%	3%	2%	202
	Tidewater	57%	31%	7%	2%	3%	200
Gender	Men	45%	40%	7%	5%	3%	468
	Women	61%	30%	4%	4%	1%	322
Race	White	52%	37%	5%	4%	2%	727
	Minority	60%	27%	6%	4%	3%	239
Party Identification	Democrat	65%	27%	4%	2%	2%	306
	Republican	44%	37%	9%	8%	2%	281
	Independent	52%	40%	3%	3%	2%	342

Table: Q5a

		Q5a. Do you strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree that people in my local community receive fair treatment from law enforcement?					
		Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	DK/Refused	Number of Cases
All adults		43%	35%	8%	8%	6%	1000
VA Region	Northwest	45%	36%	10%	6%	4%	135
	Northern VA	45%	35%	6%	8%	6%	299
	West	50%	33%	6%	10%	1%	171
	South Central	36%	35%	8%	13%	8%	171
	Tidewater	42%	35%	11%	6%	8%	223
Gender	Men	50%	30%	7%	9%	5%	482
	Women	37%	39%	9%	9%	7%	519
Age	18-24	35%	42%	11%	10%	2%	133
	25-34	40%	31%	12%	13%	4%	163
	35-44	45%	33%	9%	2%	11%	173
	45-64	44%	35%	6%	10%	5%	348
	65 and older	49%	34%	6%	5%	6%	171
Education	H.S. or less	44%	34%	4%	13%	5%	360
	Some college	40%	34%	13%	9%	4%	297
	College grad or more	47%	36%	8%	2%	7%	337
Family Income	Under \$50,000	40%	35%	7%	15%	3%	377
	50K to under \$100,000	42%	41%	10%	4%	3%	270
	\$100,000 or more	50%	35%	4%	3%	8%	226
Race	White	50%	33%	7%	6%	5%	613
	Minority	34%	39%	9%	13%	6%	355



Party Identification	Democrat	30%	40%	10%	14%	6%	330
	Republican	61%	30%	2%	3%	3%	262
	Independent	44%	34%	10%	8%	5%	326
Criminal justice employee?	Yes	52%	25%	7%	13%	3%	60
	No	43%	35%	8%	8%	6%	936

Table: Q5d

		Q5d. Do you strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree that I am satisfied with how law enforcement in my local community solve problems and handle those who call them for help?					
		Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	DK/Refused	Number of Cases
All adults		49%	35%	6%	7%	4%	1000
VA Region	Northwest	55%	31%	7%	6%	2%	136
	Northern VA	44%	37%	4%	5%	10%	298
	West	47%	33%	8%	12%	0%	171
	South Central	50%	36%	4%	9%	2%	171
	Tidewater	52%	33%	9%	5%	2%	224
Gender	Men	49%	34%	5%	8%	4%	481
	Women	49%	35%	7%	6%	4%	520
Age	18-24	43%	39%	11%	8%	0%	133
	25-34	40%	33%	7%	15%	6%	162
	35-44	54%	34%	3%	4%	6%	173
	45-64	48%	36%	7%	7%	2%	348
	65 and older	57%	33%	2%	2%	5%	171
Education	H.S. or less	51%	29%	7%	9%	5%	360
	Some college	46%	38%	7%	7%	2%	297
	College grad or more	50%	38%	4%	5%	4%	337
	Under \$50,000	45%	35%	6%	11%	2%	378

Family Income	50K to under \$100,000	50%	36%	7%	4%	3%	270
	\$100,000 or more	52%	37%	4%	3%	5%	227
Race	White	54%	33%	6%	5%	2%	613
	Minority	42%	38%	6%	10%	5%	355
Party Identification	Democrat	36%	43%	7%	8%	6%	330
	Republican	62%	31%	3%	3%	1%	261
	Independent	51%	33%	6%	8%	1%	327
Criminal justice employee?	Yes	65%	17%	5%	10%	3%	60
	No	48%	36%	6%	7%	4%	937

Table: Q5e

		Q5e. Do you strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree that police in my local community do a good job handling race relations?					
		Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	DK/Refused	Number of Cases
All adults		42%	33%	8%	8%	9%	1000
VA Region	Northwest	46%	35%	6%	6%	7%	137
	Northern VA	37%	38%	5%	9%	12%	298
	West	54%	24%	9%	7%	6%	172
	South Central	38%	28%	14%	12%	9%	172
	Tidewater	40%	35%	9%	7%	8%	223
Gender	Men	44%	32%	8%	9%	7%	481
	Women	40%	34%	9%	7%	11%	519

Age	18-24	41%	30%	16%	8%	6%	131
	25-34	37%	35%	11%	15%	3%	163
	35-44	38%	35%	5%	5%	18%	172
	45-64	42%	34%	9%	7%	8%	348
	65 and older	51%	29%	3%	8%	9%	172
Education	H.S. or less	44%	28%	7%	14%	8%	360
	Some college	38%	36%	15%	4%	7%	298
	College grad or more	44%	35%	5%	6%	11%	337
Family Income	Under \$50,000	38%	34%	12%	12%	5%	377
	50K to under \$100,000	45%	34%	7%	6%	9%	271
	\$100,000 or more	45%	35%	7%	3%	11%	226
Race	White	50%	33%	6%	4%	7%	614
	Minority	31%	32%	11%	16%	10%	355
Party Identification	Democrat	30%	35%	12%	15%	9%	329
	Republican	55%	33%	2%	3%	8%	262
	Independent	44%	33%	10%	6%	7%	326
Criminal justice employee?	Yes	45%	30%	0%	20%	5%	60
	No	42%	33%	9%	8%	9%	936

Table: Q5f

		Q5f. Do you strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree that police in my local community use an appropriate amount of force when dealing with suspects?
--	--	--

		Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	DK/Refused	Number of Cases
All adults		40%	33%	8%	10%	10%	1000
VA Region	Northwest	37%	32%	8%	12%	12%	136
	Northern VA	40%	31%	9%	8%	11%	297
	West	42%	35%	6%	12%	6%	173
	South Central	40%	31%	6%	11%	12%	171
	Tidewater	39%	38%	9%	7%	8%	224
Gender	Men	42%	33%	7%	10%	8%	482
	Women	37%	34%	9%	9%	12%	520
Age	18-24	43%	32%	6%	10%	9%	132
	25-34	39%	31%	14%	14%	3%	163
	35-44	35%	35%	8%	6%	17%	174
	45-64	40%	35%	7%	11%	7%	347
	65 and older	41%	32%	6%	8%	14%	171
Education	H.S. or less	42%	27%	7%	16%	8%	360
	Some college	34%	42%	9%	7%	8%	297
	College grad or more	42%	31%	8%	6%	13%	337
Family Income	Under \$50,000	35%	41%	9%	9%	6%	377
	50K to under \$100,000	35%	34%	12%	9%	10%	270
	\$100,000 or more	53%	26%	4%	4%	13%	226
Race	White	46%	32%	6%	7%	10%	614
	Minority	31%	35%	11%	14%	9%	355
Party Identification	Democrat	26%	39%	10%	13%	12%	329
	Republican	55%	26%	6%	6%	7%	262
	Independent	42%	35%	6%	9%	9%	326
Criminal justice employee?	Yes	52%	20%	2%	12%	15%	60
	No	39%	34%	8%	10%	9%	937

Table: Q5g

		Q5g. Do you strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree that it is a good idea for police in my local community to wear body cameras?					
		Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	DK/Refused	Number of Cases
All adults		75%	19%	3%	3%	1%	1000
VA Region	Northwest	69%	24%	4%	2%	1%	137
	Northern VA	71%	22%	2%	4%	1%	298
	West	77%	16%	3%	2%	2%	172
	South Central	76%	18%	4%	1%	1%	171
	Tidewater	80%	15%	2%	2%	0%	224
Gender	Men	72%	20%	3%	4%	1%	482
	Women	77%	19%	3%	1%	1%	519
Age	18-24	67%	27%	1%	5%	0%	131
	25-34	75%	19%	1%	4%	1%	162
	35-44	80%	16%	2%	1%	0%	173
	45-64	76%	18%	3%	2%	1%	347
	65 and older	73%	17%	6%	2%	2%	171
Education	H.S. or less	76%	18%	2%	3%	1%	359
	Some college	79%	16%	3%	2%	1%	297
	College grad or more	71%	22%	3%	3%	1%	336
Family Income	Under \$50,000	81%	14%	2%	3%	1%	376
	50K to under \$100,000	73%	23%	2%	2%	0%	270

	\$100,000 or more	69%	23%	4%	3%	1%	228
Race	White	70%	23%	3%	3%	1%	613
	Minority	84%	13%	1%	1%	1%	355
Party Identification	Democrat	78%	15%	4%	2%	0%	329
	Republican	72%	21%	3%	4%	1%	262
	Independent	75%	20%	3%	3%	1%	326
Criminal justice employee?	Yes	69%	25%	3%	3%	0%	61
	No	75%	19%	3%	3%	1%	935

Table 6. Which of the following should have the most influence over sentencing decisions in Virginia?

		Q.6. Which of the following should have the most influence over sentencing decisions in Virginia?				
		Judges	Juries	General Assembly	Dk/Refused	Number of Cases
All Adults		42.1%	42.5%	12.2%	3.2%	4,137
VA Region						
	Northwest	40.2%	47.2%	7.8%	4.8%	562
	Northern VA	43.1%	45.0%	11.4%	0.5%	1,233
	West	40.2%	43.9%	11.5%	4.4%	711
	South Central	45.4%	38.6%	12.4%	3.5%	707
	Tidewater	40.7%	38.3%	16.1%	4.9%	924
Gender						
	Men	42.9%	43.2%	11.2%	2.8%	1,989
	Women	41.3%	41.9%	13.1%	3.7%	2,148
Age						
	18-24	34.2%	51.5%	13.2%	1.1%	546
	25-34	42.7%	42.0%	13.2%	2.1%	672
	35-44	42.6%	45.8%	9.9%	1.7%	716
	45-64	44.6%	38.4%	13.0%	4.0%	1,440
	65 and older	43.2%	41.2%	9.5%	6.1%	708
Education						
	H.S. or less	44.3%	40.5%	12.3%	2.9%	1,489
	Some college	32.1%	48.6%	13.7%	5.6%	1,229

		Q.6. Which of the following should have the most influence over sentencing decisions in Virginia?				
		Judges	Juries	General Assembly	Dk/Refused	Number of Cases
	College grad or more	48.8%	38.8%	10.8%	1.6%	1,393
Family Income						
	Under \$50,000	33.3%	50.2%	13.0%	3.5%	1,559
	\$50K- under \$100,000	46.3%	42.2%	9.0%	2.5%	1,116
	\$100,000 or more	49.5%	35.5%	12.2%	2.9%	938
Race						
	White	43.5%	41.3%	12.0%	3.2%	2,538
	Minority	40.8%	43.8%	12.6%	2.8%	1,469
Party Identification						
	Democrat	39.2%	40.4%	17.4%	3.0%	1,362
	Republican	42.4%	45.0%	10.8%	1.8%	1,082
	Independent	45.6%	41.7%	9.8%	3.0%	1,349
Criminal Justice Employment						
	Yes	47.0%	34.9%	17.3%	0.8%	249
	No	41.9%	42.9%	11.9%	3.4%	3,873