

The Downtown Review

Volume 6 | Issue 1


Article 4

December 2019

Comparing the Violent Crime Trends in Select States to the National Trends to Determine Differences Between Crimes, States, and Regions

Alexandra N. Kremer
Cleveland State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://engagedscholarship.csuohio.edu/tdr>

 Part of the [Arts and Humanities Commons](#), [Criminal Law Commons](#), and the [Social and Behavioral Sciences Commons](#)

[How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!](#)

Recommended Citation

Kremer, Alexandra N.. "Comparing the Violent Crime Trends in Select States to the National Trends to Determine Differences Between Crimes, States, and Regions." *The Downtown Review*. Vol. 6. Iss. 1 (2019)

Available at: <https://engagedscholarship.csuohio.edu/tdr/vol6/iss1/4>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Scholarship at EngagedScholarship@CSU. It has been accepted for inclusion in The Downtown Review by an authorized editor of EngagedScholarship@CSU. For more information, please contact library.es@csuohio.edu.

Violent crime rates follow trends that are observed on a national level and released annually to the public. In the last quarter of a century, violent crime trends have been on the decline according to both the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) and Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) (Gramlich, 2018). While the data does show a substantial decline, there have been some increases in certain years. According to the Pew Research Center, “there are large geographic variations in crime rates”, noting that certain states and cities had crime rates that were significantly larger or smaller than others, even contrary to what one would assume (Gramlich, 2018). This paper strives to examine the differences in crime trends between various states and their difference to national trends, as well as look at the differences between the subsets of violent crime. To do this, the crime rates of California and Nevada in the West, Tennessee and Florida in the South, Ohio and Illinois in the Midwest, and New York and Maine in the Northeast will be evaluated using data from the Uniform Crime Report (UCR) from 2000 through 2014. This data factors in murder and nonnegligent manslaughter, rape, robbery, and aggravated assault.

Violent Crime

The first step in studying trends in violent crime is understanding what violent crime is. Violent crimes are studied to make policy changes that can reduce the incidence of violent crimes, increase understanding regarding the risk of both offending and victimization, and to provide education to the public about violent crimes.

What are Violent Crimes?

Violent crime includes crimes such as homicide, robbery, assault, and rape. The FBI’s Uniform Crime Reporting Program defines violent crimes as “offenses which involve force or threat of force” (“Violent Crime,” n.d.). These crimes are studied by different groups depending on the perspective they have of violent behavior. The criminological perspective looks at the making of laws, breaking of laws, and the reaction from society on the violation of laws; this perspective is much more theory-driven. The criminal justice perspective is more applied and practical and looks at the function of law enforcement, courts, and corrections. The newest perspective is the public health perspective. This looks at violence as a health issue and looks at prevention using policy, education, and psychological interventions and limiting recidivism. All these perspectives look for ways to understand violence, and work to mitigate the occurrence of violent crimes against persons and to protect society.

Measuring Violent Crime

Violence is difficult to measure for several reasons. There are privacy laws, it cannot be observed easily, and it is sometimes not reported. Also, often when data is collected, it is collected for other purposes and cannot be easily recycled for other research. However, measures do exist to help with measuring violence. Experiments are one example of a measure used (such as the ones used for understanding learning theory) and experiments concerning interventions (such as the one conducted in Minneapolis concerning mandatory arrest for domestic violence). Another measure is surveys, including victimization surveys, such as the national crime victimization survey (NCVS), and self-report surveys. Further measures include participant observation and law enforcement data.

Experiments

Experimentation typically involves the comparison of two or more groups and should utilize random assignment. Social learning theory was tested through the Bobo Doll Experiment (Bandura, Ross, & Ross, 1961). This experiment tested whether the exposure to violence increased violent behavior through the testing of young boys and girls. It was found that children who observed the aggressive model, which showed violence, were more likely to imitate aggressive behavior. This showed the idea that exposure to violence could increase the occurrence of violent behavior. Another experiment conducted concerned the rates of recidivism of domestic violence offenders. The experiment randomly assigned subjects to arrest, counseling, or removal, and it found evidence to support mandatory arrest laws in reducing recidivism (Sherman & Berk, 1984). This did also show mixed findings in other cities, however, depending on the offender situation.

Surveys

Survey data can come from a few sources, with the main ones being victimization surveys and self-report. The main victimization survey is the national crime victimization survey (NCVS), which is a joint effort by the Bureau of Justice Statistics and the U.S. Census Bureau. This is done on an annual basis in an interview format and is used to obtain more information regarding the victim and the relationship they have with the offender, as well as the characteristics of the offense itself and whether the victim reported. There are several limitations to the NCVS, including failure to report, low accuracy, exclusion of certain demographics, and the lack of data on homicide. Self-report surveys, on the other hand, are used to find out more about the offender of the

crime, though the data can be hard to obtain due to the nature of the survey. These surveys can help us to understand crime correlates.

Participant Observation

Participant observation is typically used for studying groups. In this, researchers gain access to the group they wish to study, and they observe them from the inside. This can be done by either stating up front that they are a researcher, or by keeping it secret. Remaining discreet has advantages of avoiding the influence of the researcher's presence on the group's behavior, but this can also be dangerous. Participant observation is a very qualitative approach, and there is a risk to the loss of objectivity.

Law Enforcement Data

Law enforcement data typically comes from the national level versus the local level because of ease of access for researchers. This data includes that collected by the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS), the Center for Disease Control (CDC), the U.S. Census Bureau, the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), and more. Another data source is the national incident-based reporting system (NIBRS). The FBI produces the annual Uniform Crime Report (UCR), which divides crimes into two parts. Part one offenses are crimes against persons and include data on the most serious violent crimes in our society, including criminal homicide, rape, robbery, and aggravated assault. Part two consists of crimes against property. There are 3 main forms that are submitted in the UCR. The first deals with crimes known to the police and the information they have. Not all jurisdictions report, so the numbers and statistics from this form are estimates. The second form provides demographics on arrested offenders. The third form is the supplementary homicide report (SHR), which is meant to provide information regarding murder and non-negligent manslaughter. The SHR provides detailed information on a national scale and consists of high quality data, but there is some lack of submission, missing information, and questions about the coding of circumstances.

Trends

Crime trends are compiled and distributed annually by NIBRS, the FBI in the UCR, and BJS. Due to differences in populations between states, crime trends are examined through the lens of crime rates. Crime rates are determined using several components, including the amount of crime, the population of the location in question, and a constant (Chapter Two: Measuring Violent Crime, 1997). To

calculate the crime rate, divide the amount of crime by the population and multiply by the constant (Chapter Two: Measuring Violent Crime, 1997). By transferring numbers into rates, the amount of crime between states can be compared more accurately because crime rates control for the difference in population.

National Violent Crime Rate

The national crime rate is calculated with the number of offenses in both part one and part two of the UCR and uses the aforementioned formula to find the rate per 100,000. The crime rate is more heavily influenced by property crimes (part two offenses) than crimes against persons (part one offenses). Table 1 displays the national violent crime trend in the U.S. from 2000 to 2014 from UCR data.

Table 1.

Year	Population	Violent Crime Total	Violent Crime Rate
2000	281,421,906	1,425,486	506.5
2001	285,317,559	1,439,480	504.5
2002	287,973,924	1,423,677	494.4
2003	290,788,976	1,383,676	475.8
2004	293,656,842	1,360,088	463.2
2005	296,507,061	1,390,745	469.0
2006	299,398,484	1,435,123	479.3
2007	301,621,157	1,422,970	471.8
2008	304,059,724	1,394,461	458.6
2009	307,006,550	1,325,896	431.9
2010	309,330,219	1,251,248	404.5
2011	311,587,816	1,206,031	387.1
2012	313,873,685	1,217,067	387.8
2013	316,497,531	1,199,684	379.1
2014	318,857,056	1,197,987	375.7
Average			445.95

(U.S. Department of Justice & Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2017).

Table 2.

Year	Murder and Nonnegligent Manslaughter	Legacy Rape	Revised Rape*	Robbery	Aggravated Assault
2000	15,586 (5.5)	90,178 (32.0)		408,016 (145.0)	911,706 (324.0)
2001	16,037 (5.6)	90,863 (31.8)		423,557 (148.5)	909,023 (318.6)
2002	16,229 (5.6)	95,235 (33.1)		420,806 (146.1)	891,407 (309.5)
2003	16,528 (5.7)	93,883 (32.3)		414,235 (142.5)	859,030 (295.4)
2004	16,148 (5.5)	95,089 (32.4)		401,470 (136.7)	847,381 (288.6)
2005	16,740 (5.6)	94,347 (31.8)		417,438 (140.8)	862,220 (290.8)
2006	17,309 (5.8)	94,472 (31.6)		449,246 (150.0)	874,096 (292.0)
2007	17,128 (5.7)	92,160 (30.6)		447,324 (148.3)	866,358 (287.2)
2008	16,465 (5.4)	90,750 (29.8)		443,563 (145.9)	843,683 (277.5)
2009	15,399 (5.0)	89,241 (29.1)		408,742 (133.1)	812,514 (264.7)
2010	14,722 (4.8)	85,593 (27.7)		369,089 (119.3)	781,844 (252.8)
2011	14,661 (4.7)	84,175 (27.0)		354,772 (113.9)	752,423 (241.5)
2012	14,866 (4.7)	85,141 (27.1)		355,051 (113.1)	762,009 (242.8)
2013	14,319 (4.5)	82,109 (25.9)	113,695 (35.9)	345,095 (109.0)	726,575 (229.6)
2014	14, (4.5)	84,041 (26.4)	116,645 (36.6)	325,802 (102.2)	741,291 (232.5)
Averages	5.24	29.91	36.25	132.96	256.50

(U.S. Department of Justice & Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2017).

Here, 2000 had the highest violent crime rate at 506.5 per 100,000, and 2014 was the lowest at 375.7 per 100,000. The trend shows a gradual decrease in the crime rate between 2000 and 2014, with little fluctuation. Table 2 displays the national crime trend broken down by specific violent crime, in which the actual number is presented with the calculated rate in parentheses beside it.

Table 2 shows that revised rape is the only violent crime that has an increasing trend; however, because this only has two years of data, it could also be seen to have remained relatively stable and cannot truly be considered a trend yet. In the period of 2000–2014, murder and nonnegligent manslaughter rates remained stable, with slight increases until about 2009 when they began to decline. Legacy rape followed a similar suit. Robbery followed a steady decline over the time span, with an uptick in 2006–2008. Finally, aggravated assault showed the same decline and uptick as robbery, but also includes a rise in 2014. This shows that the national trend of overall violent crime and the trend by specific crime on the national scale is relatively the same, with a few exceptions of the onset of decline and the slope of the linear nature of the trend.

The Regions of the United States

* In 2013 the definition of rape was changed from “the carnal knowledge of a female forcibly and against her will” to “penetration, no matter how slight of the vagina or anus with any body part or object, or oral penetration by a sex organ of another person, without the consent of the victim” (U.S. Department of Justice & Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2013).

The FBI divides the United States into four different regions, including the West, South, Midwest, and Northeast. The West contains about 22.8% of the population, the Northeast about 18.8%, the Midwest about 22.6%, and the South about 35.8% (CIUS 2002 Section II, 2002).

Northeast

The Northeast region of the United States consists of approximately 20% of the population and consists of 9 states. Among these are New York and Maine. Table 3 displays the overall violent crime rate of New York, while Table 4 breaks these rates down by subsets of violent crimes.

Table 3.

Year	Population	Violent Crime Total	Violent Crime Rate
2000	18,976,457	105,111	553.9
2001	19,084,350	98,022	513.6
2002	19,134,293	95,030	496.6
2003	19,212,425	89,486	465.8
2004	19,280,727	84,914	440.4
2005	19,315,721	85,839	444.0
2006	19,306,183	84,016	435.2
2007	19,297,729	79,962	414.4
2008	19,490,297	77,546	397.9
2009	19,541,453	75,110	384.4
2010	19,395,206	76,492	394.4
2011	19,501,616	77,463	397.2
2012	19,576,125	79,535	406.3
2013	19,695,680	77,563	393.8
2014	19,746,227	75,398	381.8
Average			434.65

(U.S. Department of Justice & Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2017)

Table 4.

Year	Murder and Nonnegligent Manslaughter	Legacy Rape	Revised Rape	Robbery	Aggravated Assault
2000	952 (5.0)	3,530 (18.6)		40,539 (213.6)	60,090 (316.7)
2001	960 (5.0)	3,546 (18.6)		36,555 (191.5)	56,961 (298.5)
2002	909 (4.8)	3,885 (20.3)		36,653 (191.6)	53,583 (280.0)
2003	934 (4.9)	3,775 (19.6)		35,790 (186.3)	48,987 (255.0)

2004	889 (4.6)	3,608 (18.7)		35,506 (173.8)	46,911 (243.3)
2005	874 (4.5)	3,636 (18.8)		35,179 (182.1)	46,150 (238.9)
2006	922 (4.8)	3,168 (16.4)		34,459 (178.5)	45,467 (235.5)
2007	805 (4.2)	2,928 (15.2)		31,085 (161.1)	45,144 (233.9)
2008	836 (4.3)	2,798 (14.4)		31,787 (163.1)	42,125 (216.1)
2009	781 (4.0)	2,582 (13.2)		28,141 (144.0)	43,606 (223.1)
2010	868 (4.5)	2,797 (14.4)		28,630 (147.6)	44,197 (227.9)
2011	769 (3.9)	2,751 (14.1)		28,405 (145.7)	45,538 (233.5)
2012	683 (3.5)	2,837 (14.5)		28,633 (146.3)	47,382 (242.0)
2013	644 (3.3)	2,575 (13.1)	3,548 (18.0)	27,241 (138.3)	46,130 (234.2)
2014	617 (3.1)	3,918 (19.8)	5,433 (27.5)	24,045 (121.8)	45,303 (229.4)
Averages	4.29	16.65	22.75	165.67	246.60

(U.S. Department of Justice & Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2017)

Table 3 shows that New York has a similar violent crime rate and trend to the national ones. New York starts with a higher rate in 2000, but by about 2002, the rates are closer to equal and following a similar declining trend to the lowest rate in 2014. In Table 4, New York’s murder and nonnegligent manslaughter rates sees a gradual decline, whereas the national trend, in Table 2, is more stable with a less noticeable slope. Also seen in this table, New York’s legacy rape rate is nearly half of what the national rate is, and it appears to decline, even out, and then increase again with a spike in 2014, while the national trend is a slight decrease with a small peak in 2014. A similar observation can be made for revised rape in 2013, where New York is about half the national, while in 2014, both have an increase. However, New York has a much higher rate increase in 2014 than the national trend. New York’s robbery rate is consistently higher than that of the nation but follows a similar trend. Finally, in aggravated assaults, New York is lower than the national rate until about 2012 when they become about even with each other.

Table 5 displays the overall violent crime rate and the violent crime rate by specific crime for Maine in 2000–2014.

Table 5.

Year	Population	Violent Crime Total	Violent Crime Rate
2000	1,274,923	1,397	109.6
2001	1,284,470	1,435	111.7
2002	1,294,894	1,396	107.8
2003	1,309,205	1,422	108.6
2004	1,314,985	1,364	103.7
2005	1,318,220	1,483	112.0
2006	1,321,574	1,533	116.0

2007	1,317,207	1,565	118.8
2008	1,316,456	1,572	119.4
2009	1,318,301	1,580	119.9
2010	1,327,379	1,621	122.1
2011	1,328,544	1,638	123.3
2012	1,328,501	1,626	122.4
2013	1,328,702	1,761	132.5
2014	1,330,089	1,700	127.8
Average			117.04

(U.S. Department of Justice & Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2017)

Table 5 illustrates that Maine’s overall violent crime rate is significantly lower than the national crime rate in all years from 2000–2014. However, unlike the national rate, the violent crime rate in Maine has been increasing since about 2004 following the original decrease. Maine has shown an increase of approximately 18 violent crimes per 100,000, while the national rate has decreased approximately 131 violent crimes per 100,000. Table 6 breaks violent crime down into its specific subsets to examine the rates of each.

Table 6.

Year	Murder and Nonnegligent Manslaughter	Legacy Rape	Revised Rape	Robbery	Aggravated Assault
2000	15 (1.2)	320 (25.1)		247 (19.4)	815 (63.9)
2001	19 (1.5)	326 (25.4)		264 (20.6)	826 (64.3)
2002	14 (1.1)	377 (29.1)		270 (20.9)	735 (56.8)
2003	16 (1.2)	354 (27.0)		289 (22.1)	763 (58.3)
2004	18 (1.4)	315 (24.0)		289 (22.0)	742 (56.4)
2005	19 (1.4)	326 (24.7)		323 (24.5)	815 (61.8)
2006	23 (1.7)	341 (25.8)		383 (29.0)	786 (59.5)
2007	20 (1.5)	392 (29.8)		349 (26.5)	804 (61.0)
2008	31 (2.4)	379 (28.8)		333 (25.3)	829 (63.0)
2009	26 (2.0)	375 (28.4)		399 (30.3)	780 (59.2)
2010	24 (1.8)	389 (29.3)		412 (31.0)	796 (60.0)
2011	26 (2.0)	394 (29.7)		370 (27.9)	848 (63.8)
2012	26 (2.0)	372 (28.0)		420 (31.6)	808 (60.8)
2013	24 (1.8)	366 (27.5)	495 (37.3)	335 (25.2)	907 (68.3)
2014	21 (1.6)	360 (27.1)	485 (36.5)	304 (22.9)	890 (66.9)
Averages	1.64	27.31	36.90	25.28	61.60

(U.S. Department of Justice & Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2017)

Table 6, once again, displays a significantly lower rate for the crimes of murder and nonnegligent manslaughter, robbery, and aggravated assault than the national rates. However, the rates for legacy rape and revised rape are comparable to the national rates. Furthermore, Maine appears to follow an inverse trend from

the national in the crimes of legacy rape, revised rape, robbery, and aggravated assault. Legacy rape fluctuated throughout the time span slightly and had begun to fall again around 2012, while the national trend declined rather steadily with a very slight increase in 2014. Maine’s revised rape decreased in 2014 from 2013. Looking at robbery, both Maine and the national had increases around 2006, though Maine’s increase lasted a few years longer, before both decreasing again, with the national having a steep decline. Finally, in aggravated assault, the national trend showed a steady decline, while Maine fluctuated and ended slightly higher in 2014 than in 2000.

The Midwest

The Midwest contains approximately another 20% of the U.S. population and consists of 12 states, including Ohio and Illinois, which are examined here. Table 7 depicts Ohio’s overall violent crime trend, while Table 8 displays the subsets of violent crime.

Table 7.

Year	Population	Violent Crime Total	Violent Crime Rate
2000	11,353,140	37,935	334.1
2001	11,389,785	40,023	351.4
2002	11,408,699	40,128	351.7
2003	11,437,680	38,185	333.9
2004	11,450,143	38,787	338.7
2005	11,470,685	40,162	350.0
2006	11,478,006	41,491	361.5
2007	11,466,917	40,759	355.4
2008	11,485,910	40,436	352.0
2009	11,542,645	38,305	331.9
2010	11,537,968	36,306	314.7
2011	11,541,007	35,218	305.2
2012	11,553,031	34,827	301.5
2013	11,572,005	33,722	291.4
2014	11,594,163	33,030	284.9
Average			330.55

(U.S. Department of Justice & Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2017)

The Ohio overall violent crime rate is lower than the national rate, not as significantly as Maine, but still approximately 200 violent crimes per 100,000 lower. Ohio follows a trend of increasing and decreasing, with peaks in the years

2001, 2002, and 2005–2008, while the national trend has a steadier decline with fewer peaks. Peaks for the national trend are seen in 2005–2007.

Table 8.

Year	Murder and Nonnegligent Manslaughter	Legacy Rape	Revised Rape	Robbery	Aggravated Assault
2000	418 (3.7)	4,271 (37.6)		15,610 (137.5)	17,636 (155.3)
2001	452 (4.0)	4,466 (39.2)		17,199 (151.0)	17,906 (157.2)
2002	526 (4.6)	4,809 (42.2)		17,871 (156.6)	16,922 (148.3)
2003	526 (4.6)	4,660 (40.7)		16,895 (147.7)	16,104 (140.8)
2004	506 (4.4)	4,744 (41.4)		17,429 (152.2)	16,108 (140.7)
2005	590 (5.1)	4,671 (40.7)		18,673 (162.8)	16,228 (141.5)
2006	560 (4.9)	4,770 (41.6)		19,418 (169.2)	16,743 (145.9)
2007	529 (4.6)	4,661 (40.6)		18,351 (160.0)	17,218 (150.2)
2008	547 (4.8)	4,531 (39.4)		18,706 (162.9)	16,652 (145.0)
2009	527 (4.6)	4,119 (35.7)		17,670 (153.1)	15,989 (138.5)
2010	479 (4.2)	3,730 (32.3)		16,486 (142.9)	15,611 (135.3)
2011	500 (4.3)	3,679 (31.9)		15,991 (138.6)	15,048 (130.4)
2012	478 (4.1)	3,813 (33.0)		15,396 (133.3)	15,140 (131.0)
2013	478 (4.1)	3,594 (31.1)	4,391 (37.9)	14,483 (125.2)	14,370 (124.2)
2014	464 (4.0)	4,097 (35.3)	5,042 (43.5)	12,753 (110.0)	14,771 (127.4)
Averages	4.40	37.51	40.70	146.87	140.78

(U.S. Department of Justice & Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2017)

Ohio has a slightly lower murder and nonnegligent manslaughter and aggravated assault rate than the national, while having a slightly higher legacy and revised rape rates and comparable robbery rates. The trend for murder follows the same as the national trend with an increase until about 2006 then a steady decrease to 2014. The legacy rape trend of Ohio increases until about 2008, while the national trend has a relatively continuous decrease in its trend. Also, Ohio's revised rape increases more significantly. Robbery, similarly to murder and legacy rape, begins with an increase, lasting until about 2006/2007, before decreasing. Finally, the aggravated assault trend has a relatively steady decline with a few peaks. It appears that the crimes in Ohio follow the same trends as the national, though they start slightly later and may have higher or lower rates than the national trends for violent crimes.

Table 9 and Table 10 similarly break down the overall violent crime rate and subsets of violent crime for Illinois.

Table 9.

Year	Population	Violent Crime Total	Violent Crime Rate
2000	12,419,293	81,196	653.8
2001	12,520,227	79,270	633.1
2002	12,586,447	75,759	601.9
2003	12,649,087	70,376	556.4
2004	12,712,016	69,365	545.7

2005	12,765,427	70,496	552.0
2006	12,831,970	69,498	541.6
2007	12,852,548	68,528	533.2
2008	12,901,563	67,780	525.4
2009	12,910,409	64,185	497.2
2010	12,841,980	57,132	444.9
2011	12,859,752	54,523	424.0
2012	12,868,192	53,556	416.2
2013	12,890,552	51,956	403.1
2014	12,880,580	47,663	370.0
Average			477.23

(U.S. Department of Justice & Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2017)

Illinois has a higher overall violent crime rate than the national rates but follows a similar decreasing trend. The rate remains higher until 2014 where it falls below the national.

Table 10.

Year	Murder and Nonnegligent Manslaughter	Legacy Rape	Revised Rape	Robbery	Aggravated Assault
2000	898 (7.2)	3,926 (31.6)		25,641 (206.5)	50,731 (408.5)
2001	982 (7.8)	4,010 (32.0)		24,931 (199.1)	49,347 (394.1)
2002	961 (7.6)	4,370 (34.7)		25,314 (201.1)	45,114 (358.4)
2003	895 (7.1)	4,189 (33.1)		23,786 (188.0)	41,506 (328.1)
2004	780 (6.1)	4,220 (33.2)		22,582 (177.6)	41,783 (328.7)
2005	770 (6.0)	4,313 (33.8)		23,255 (182.2)	42,158 (330.3)
2006	780 (6.1)	4,078 (31.8)		23,782 (185.3)	40,858 (318.4)
2007	752 (5.9)	4,103 (31.9)		23,100 (179.7)	40,573 (315.7)
2008	790 (6.1)	4,118 (31.9)		24,054 (186.4)	38,818 (300.9)
2009	773 (6.0)	3,901 (30.2)		22,923 (177.6)	36,588 (283.4)
2010	704 (5.5)	3,066 (23.9)		20,386 (158.7)	32,976 (256.8)
2011	781 (6.1)	3,030 (23.6)		20,217 (157.2)	30,495 (237.1)
2012	770 (6.0)	3,581 (27.8)		19,480 (151.4)	29,725 (231.0)
2013	722 (5.6)	3,895 (30.2)	5,340 (41.4)	17,733 (137.6)	28,161 (218.5)
2014	685 (5.3)	3,081 (23.9)	4,159 (32.3)	15,299 (118.8)	27,520 (213.7)
Averages	6.29	30.24	36.85	173.81	301.57

(U.S. Department of Justice & Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2017)

Illinois has higher murder and nonnegligent manslaughter, robbery, and aggravated assault rates than the national rates, with comparable legacy rape rates. When comparing the crime trends, Illinois’s legacy rape, robbery, and aggravated assaults follow a similar trend to the national. The trend for murder and nonnegligent manslaughter is a steeper decrease than that of the national, which is close to being stable. Finally, Illinois has a reverse trend from the national for revised rape, starting in 2013 higher than the national rate and falling lower than the national rate in 2014.

The Midwest rates and trends are relatively comparable to those of the nation. Though Ohio has several lower rates and Illinois has several higher rates.

The South

The Southern region of the United States consists of about 40% of the population and 16 states, thus the largest region of the United States. Table 11 and Table 12 display the overall crime rate and the rates for particular violent crimes, respectively, for Tennessee.

Table 11.

Year	Population	Violent Crime Total	Violent Crime Rate
2000	5,689,283	40,233	707.2
2001	5,749,398	42,776	744.0
2002	5,789,796	41,562	717.8
2003	5,845,208	40,409	691.3
2004	5,893,298	41,113	697.6
2005	5,955,745	45,104	757.0
2006	6,038,803	46,043	762.5
2007	6,156,719	46,482	755.0
2008	6,214,888	44,913	722.7
2009	6,286,254	41,933	666.0
2010	6,357,436	38,909	612.0
2011	6,399,787	38,895	607.8
2012	6,454,914	41,213	638.5
2013	6,497,269	38,063	585.8
2014	6,549,352	39,848	608.4
Average			684.91

(U.S. Department of Justice & Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2017)

Tennessee's violent crime rate is significantly higher than that of the national rate, with about 200 more violent crimes per 100,000 people in 2000, and about 230 more per 100,000 in 2014. Tennessee's violent crime rate decreases until about 2005, where it is relatively steady before beginning to decline again in 2008, followed by several fluctuations.

Table 12.

Year	Murder and Nonnegligent Manslaughter	Legacy Rape	Revised Rape	Robbery	Aggravated Assault
2000	410 (7.2)	2,186 (38.4)		9,465 (166.4)	28,172 (495.2)
2001	423 (7.4)	2,196 (38.2)		10,219 (177.7)	29,938 (520.7)
2002	420 (7.3)	2,290 (39.6)		9,413 (162.6)	29,439 (508.5)
2003	396 (6.8)	2,129 (36.4)		9,413 (161.0)	28,471 (487.1)
2004	357 (6.1)	2,282 (38.7)		8,863 (150.4)	29,611 (502.5)
2005	431 (7.2)	2,194 (36.8)		10,009 (168.1)	32,470 (545.2)
2006	419 (6.9)	2,194 (36.3)		11,143 (184.5)	32,287 (534.7)
2007	405 (6.6)	2,201 (35.7)		11,033 (179.2)	32,843 (533.4)
2008	412 (6.6)	2,078 (33.4)		10,804 (173.8)	31,619 (508.8)
2009	468 (7.4)	2,019 (32.1)		9,653 (153.3)	29,793 (473.2)
2010	359 (5.6)	2,173 (34.2)		8,361 (131.5)	28,016 (440.7)
2011	380 (5.9)	2,095 (32.7)		8,082 (126.3)	28,338 (442.8)
2012	400 (6.2)	2,047 (31.7)		8,151 (126.3)	30,615 (474.3)
2013	335 (5.2)	1,904 (29.3)	2,500 (38.5)	7,333 (112.9)	27,895 (429.3)
2014	371 (5.7)	1,861 (28.4)	2,531 (38.6)	7,265 (110.9)	29,681 (453.2)
Averages	6.54	34.79	38.55	152.33	489.97

(U.S. Department of Justice & Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2017)

Tennessee has a higher murder and nonnegligent manslaughter and aggravated assault rate, with slightly higher rates in in all types of violent crime. However, while the rates are generally higher, the trends all seem to be about the same as the national trends.

Table 13 and Table 14 display the same information for the state of Florida as is displayed in the tables above for their respective states. In Table 13, it is seen that Florida has a significantly higher violent crime rate than the national, with about 300 more violent crimes per 100,000 people in 2000 and about 165 per 100,000 in 2014. The Florida crime trend also decreases over the time period and follows similar peaks and valleys as the national trend.

Table 13.

Year	Population	Violent Crime Total	Violent Crime Rate
2000	15,92,378	129,777	812.0
2001	16,373,330	130,713	798.3
2002	16,691,701	128,721	771.2
2003	16,999,181	124,280	731.1
2004	17,385,430	123,754	711.8
2005	17,768,191	125,957	709.0
2006	18,089,888	129,602	716.4
2007	18,251,243	131,878	722.6
2008	18,328,340	126,256	688.9
2009	18,537,969	113,541	612.5
2010	18,838,613	101,969	541.3

2011	19,082,262	98,198	514.6
2012	19,320,749	94,087	487.0
2013	19,600,311	91,993	469.3
2014	19,893,297	107,521	540.5
Average			580.03

(U.S. Department of Justice & Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2017)

Table 14.

Year	Murder and Nonnegligent Manslaughter	Legacy Rape	Revised Rape	Robbery	Aggravated Assault
2000	903 (5.6)	7,057 (44.2)		31,809 (199.0)	90,008 (563.2)
2001	874 (5.3)	6,641 (40.6)		32,867 (200.7)	90,331 (551.7)
2002	911 (5.5)	6,753 (40.5)		32,581 (195.2)	88,476 (530.1)
2003	924 (5.4)	6,727 (39.6)		31,523 (185.4)	85,106 (500.6)
2004	946 (5.4)	6,612 (38.0)		29,997 (172.5)	86,199 (495.8)
2005	883 (5.0)	6,592 (37.1)		30,141 (169.6)	88,341 (497.2)
2006	1,129 (6.2)	6,475 (35.8)		34,147 (188.8)	87,851 (485.6)
2007	1,202 (6.6)	6,149 (33.7)		38,155 (209.1)	86,372 (473.2)
2008	1,168 (6.4)	5,972 (32.6)		36,268 (197.9)	82,848 (452.0)
2009	1,017 (5.5)	5,501 (29.7)		30,911 (166.7)	76,112 (410.6)
2010	987 (5.2)	5,373 (28.5)		26,086 (138.5)	69,523 (369.0)
2011	984 (5.2)	5,273 (27.6)		25,622 (134.3)	66,319 (347.5)
2012	1,009 (5.2)	5,260 (27.2)		23,889 (123.6)	63,929 (330.9)
2013	972 (5.0)	4,765 (24.3)	6,767 (34.5)	23,200 (118.4)	61,054 (311.5)
2014	1,149 (5.8)	6,051 (30.4)	8,563 (43.0)	24,914 (125.2)	72,895 (366.4)
Averages	5.55	33.99	38.75	168.33	445.69

(U.S. Department of Justice & Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2017)

Table 14 depicts that Florida follows a similar crime trend as the national in all types with some differences in where upticks may be located. In 2014, every type of crime exhibited an increase in some degree from the year before. Florida has higher crime rates in all except murder and nonnegligent manslaughter, where they are closer to equal, and lower even, until about 2006, where Florida saw an increase that continued until 2008 before steadily decreasing until 2013 with another peak in 2014. Revised rape in Florida also had a more prominent increase in 2014 than the national rate.

The West

The West consists of approximately 13 states and 20% of the population. Of these states Table 15 and Table 16 display the data for Nevada, while Table 17 and Table 18 display the data of California.

Table 15.

Year	Population	Violent Crime Total	Violent Crime Rate
2000	1,998,257	10,474	524.2
2001	2,097,722	12,359	589.2
2002	2,167,455	13,856	639.3
2003	2,242,207	13,813	616.0
2004	2,332,898	14,379	616.4
2005	2,412,301	14,654	608.0
2006	2,495,529	18,687	748.8
2007	2,565,382	19,365	754.9
2008	2,600,167	18,973	729.7
2009	2,643,085	18,639	705.2
2010	2,704,283	17,929	663.0
2011	2,720,028	15,452	568.1
2012	2,754,354	16,763	608.6
2013	2,791,494	16,888	605.0
2014	2,839,099	18,045	635.6
Average			640.80

(U.S. Department of Justice & Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2017)

Table 15 illustrates that Nevada has an overall violent crime rate that follows the opposite trend from the national decreasing trend. However, while Nevada does show an increase overall, it does appear to reach a peak around 2007 before following a steady decrease and increasing again in 2014.

Table 16.

Year	Murder and Nonnegligent Manslaughter	Legacy Rape	Revised Rape	Robbery	Aggravated Assault
2000	129 (6.5)	860 (43.0)		4,543 (227.3)	4,942 (247.3)
2001	180 (8.6)	883 (42.1)		4,932 (235.1)	6,364 (303.4)
2002	181 (8.4)	928 (42.8)		5,118 (236.1)	7,629 (352.0)
2003	197 (8.8)	871 (38.8)		5,225 (233.0)	7,520 (335.4)
2004	172 (7.4)	954 (40.9)		4,905 (210.3)	8,348 (357.8)
2005	206 (8.5)	1,016 (42.1)		4,702 (194.9)	8,730 (361.9)
2006	226 (9.1)	1,092 (43.8)		7,038 (282.0)	10,331 (414.0)
2007	193 (7.5)	1,096 (42.7)		6,938 (270.4)	11,138 (434.2)
2008	165 (6.3)	1,106 (42.5)		6,486 (249.4)	11,216 (431.4)
2009	156 (5.9)	1,024 (38.7)		6,028 (228.1)	11,413 (432.5)
2010	158 (5.8)	965 (35.7)		5,298 (195.9)	11,508 (425.5)
2011	139 (5.1)	913 (33.6)		4,308 (158.4)	10,092 (371.0)
2012	124 (4.5)	931 (33.8)		4,918 (178.6)	10,790 (391.7)
2013	163 (5.8)	1,090 (39.0)	1,482 (53.1)	5,183 (185.7)	10,060 (360.4)
2014	170 (6.0)	995 (35.0)	1,357 (47.8)	5,954 (209.7)	10,564 (372.1)
Average	6.95	39.63	50.45	219.66	372.71

(U.S. Department of Justice & Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2017)

Nevada has a higher rate than that of the nation in all types of violent crime, spare aggravated assault in 2000 to 2001. In murder and nonnegligent manslaughter, the rate increases until about 2006/2007 before beginning to decrease, hitting a low in 2012 before rising again. Legacy rape stays relatively stable until 2008 when it begins to decrease. Revised rape starts much higher than the national rate, and stays higher, but follows the opposite trend as it decreases in 2014. Robbery follows a similar fluctuating trend to the national trend. Finally, aggravated assault in Nevada follows a trend of steady increase until it peaks around 2007 and begins to decrease again, remaining higher in 2014 than it was in 2000.

Table 17.

Year	Population	Violent Crime Total	Violent Crime Rate
2000	33,871,648	210,513	621.6
2001	34,600,463	212,867	615.2
2002	35,001,986	208,388	595.4
2003	35,462,712	205,551	579.6
2004	35,842,038	189,175	527.8
2005	36,154,147	190,178	526.0
2006	36,457,549	194,483	533.5
2007	36,553,215	191,561	524.1
2008	36,756,666	185,329	504.2
2009	36,961,664	174,934	473.3
2010	37,338,198	164,133	439.6
2011	37,683,933	154,943	411.2
2012	37,999,878	160,944	423.5
2013	38,431,393	154,739	402.6
2014	38,802,500	153,709	396.1
Average			471.58

(U.S. Department of Justice & Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2017)

Table 17 shows that California has a significantly higher violent crime rate than the national until they are about even in 2008. The overall violent crime trend is similar, though California's starts much steeper than that of the nation before becoming more similar and gradual between 2008 and 2014. California, while growing closer to the national crime rate, still remains higher throughout the time period.

Table 18.

Year	Murder and Nonnegligent Manslaughter	Legacy Rape	Revised Rape	Robbery	Aggravated Assault
2000	2,079 (6.1)	9,785 (28.9)		60,249 (177.9)	138,418 (408.7)
2001	2,206 (6.4)	9,960 (28.8)		64,614 (186.7)	136,087 (393.3)
2002	2,395 (6.8)	10,198 (29.1)		64,968 (185.6)	130,827 (373.8)
2003	2,407 (6.8)	9,994 (28.2)		63,770 (179.8)	129,380 (364.8)
2004	2,392 (6.7)	9,615 (26.8)		61,768 (172.3)	115,400 (322.0)
2005	2,503 (6.9)	9,392 (26.0)		63,622 (176.0)	114,661 (317.1)
2006	2,486 (6.8)	9,235 (25.3)		71,142 (195.1)	111,620 (306.2)
2007	2,262 (6.2)	9,046 (24.7)		70,706 (193.4)	109,547 (299.7)
2008	2,142 (5.8)	8,903 (24.2)		69,388 (188.8)	104,896 (285.4)
2009	1,972 (5.3)	8,713 (23.6)		64,093 (173.4)	100,156 (271.0)
2010	1,809 (4.8)	8,331 (22.3)		58,116 (155.6)	95,877 (256.8)
2011	1,792 (4.8)	7,665 (20.3)		54,291 (144.1)	91,195 (242.0)
2012	1,884 (5.0)	7,837 (20.6)		56,521 (148.7)	94,702 (249.2)
2013	1,746 (4.5)	7,464 (19.4)	10,324 (26.9)	53,640 (139.6)	89,029 (231.7)
2014	1,699 (4.4)	8,398 (21.6)	11,527 (29.7)	48,680 (125.5)	91,803 (236.6)
Averages	5.82	24.65	28.30	170.17	303.89

(U.S. Department of Justice & Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2017)

California exhibits similar rates across all types of violent crime, with slight differences in either direction. Murder and nonnegligent manslaughter is slightly higher in 2000 through 2010, at which point the national rate and California’s rates are equal and remain about equal. In legacy rape, California rates are slightly lower than those of the nation and follow a similar decreasing trend; the same is true of revised rape. California’s robbery rates are higher than the national rates for the duration of the time period and increase between 2000 and about 2006 before following the decreasing trend of the nation. Finally, California has higher aggravated assault rates than the nation until they even out around 2010 and stay close to each other for the remainder, following a similar trend of overall decrease over the period of 2000 to 2014.

Conclusions

Overall Rates and Trends Comparison

Of the states examined above, most of them follow a similar overall trend in violent crime from 2000 to 2014. However, Nevada and Maine follow different trends. Nevada displays a trend of increase until about 2007 followed by a slow decrease that left the rates in 2014 still significantly higher than the rates in 2000. Maine follows an inverse trend from the national decrease as it has seen an increase in violent crime since about 2004.

Regarding the overall rate of violent crime, only New York displayed similar rates to those of the nation. Two states had lower overall violent crime rates: Ohio and Maine. The remaining states, California, Nevada, Florida,

Tennessee, and Illinois all had higher overall violent crime rates than the national rates.

When looking at the averages presented in the tables, the national average rate of overall violent crime in the time period is 445.95. Five states have a higher average rate overall than this: Tennessee (684.91), Nevada (640.80), Florida (580.03), Illinois (477.23), and California (471.58). Three states have a lower average rate overall: New York (434.65), Ohio (330.55), and Maine (117.04). Both states examined from the West and the South have higher average overall rates, while both states in the Northeast have lower average overall rates, and the Midwest states are split.

Specific Rates and Trends Comparison

Murder and Nonnegligent Manslaughter

Murder and Nonnegligent manslaughter is “the willful (nonnegligent) killing of one human being by another” (U.S. Department of Justice & Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2010). The trend for murder and nonnegligent manslaughter was relatively stable at the national level with a slight decrease over time. This was also true in Ohio, Maine, and Tennessee. However, New York, Illinois, and California had a steeper, more noticeable decrease in their trends, and Florida and Nevada actually had an increase before beginning to decrease, with Nevada increasing again after hitting a low point in 2012.

Florida and New York demonstrated similar murder and nonnegligent manslaughter rates to the nation, while Maine and Ohio’s rates were lower. The remaining four states, Illinois, Tennessee, Nevada, and California, all had higher murder and nonnegligent manslaughter rates between 2000 and 2014 than the national rates during this time.

Based upon the tables provided, the national average rate of murder and nonnegligent manslaughter is 5.24 for 2000 through 2014. Of the eight states examined, five have higher averages: Nevada (6.95), Tennessee (6.54), Illinois (6.29), California (5.82), and Florida (5.55), and three had lower averages: Ohio (4.40), New York (4.29), and Maine (1.64). Once again, both of the states in the West and the South have higher rates, and both of the states in the Northeast have lower rates, while the Midwest is divided.

Legacy and Revised Rape

In 2013 rape was redefined by the FBI from “the carnal knowledge of a female forcibly and against her will” to “penetration, no matter how slight, of the vagina or anus with any body part or object, or oral penetration by a sex organ of

another person, without the consent of the victim” (U.S. Department of Justice & Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2013). The national trend for legacy rape was a decrease, while revised rape increased. Four states from those selected followed a similar trend in legacy rape, while New York, Maine, Ohio, and Nevada did not. In revised rape, Maine, Illinois, and Nevada had a different trend, while the remaining five states were similar.

Illinois demonstrated similar rates to the nation for legacy rape, while Maine displayed similar rates for both legacy and revised rape. Several states exhibited lower rates than the national rates for both legacy and revised rape, including New York and California for both, and Illinois for revised rape in 2014. However, there were also several states that were higher in both. Ohio, Tennessee, Florida, and Nevada displayed higher rates of both legacy and revised rape than the national rates from 2000 to 2014, and Illinois had higher rates of revised rape in 2013.

If one examines the averages presented in the tables for legacy rape, five states have higher averages than the national (29.91), and three have lower averages. The five that are higher include: Nevada (39.63), Ohio (37.51), Tennessee (34.79), Florida (33.99), and Illinois (30.24). The three that have lower averages include: Maine (27.31), California (24.65), and New York (16.65). Legacy rape demonstrates a change from what was seen in murder and nonnegligent manslaughter and the overall violent crime. Here, both Midwest states are higher, along with both states from the South, while the West is divided, and the Northeast remains lower, though with Maine closer to the national average, and New York presenting a significantly lower average.

In the case of revised rape, the states with higher and lower rates shift. Here, six of the states have higher average rates, including: Nevada (50.45), Ohio (40.70), Florida (38.75), Tennessee (38.55), Maine (36.90), and Illinois (36.85). California (28.3) and New York (22.75) have lower averages than the national (36.25). In revised rape, both states from the Midwest and the South have higher averages, while the Northeast and the West are divided.

Robbery

Robbery is defined as “taking or attempting to take anything of value from the care, custody, or control of a person or persons by force or threat of force or violence and/or by putting the victim in fear” (U.S. Department of Justice & Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2010). Similar to the other types of violent crime, the national trend shows a decrease in robbery from 2000 to 2014. Three of the states examined above do not follow this trend, including Maine, Ohio, and California. California does show a decline but increased beforehand.

The majority of the states mentioned above demonstrated higher robbery rates than the national rates. These include, New York, Illinois, Tennessee, Florida, Nevada, and California. Maine and Ohio had lower and similar rates respectively.

In fact, only one state, Maine (25.28), has a lower average robbery rate than the national average (132.96). The remaining states, Nevada (219.66), Illinois (173.81), California (170.17), Florida (168.33), New York (165.67), Tennessee (152.33), and Ohio (146.87), all have higher average robbery rates. Here, both states from three of the four regions of the United States demonstrate higher averages than the national average robbery rate.

Aggravated Assault

The FBI defines aggravated assault as “an unlawful attack by one person upon another for the purpose of inflicting severe or aggravates bodily injury...usually accompanied by the use of a weapon or by other means likely to produce death or great bodily harm” (U.S. Department of Justice & Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2010). In this specific type of violent crime, Maine shows an inverse trend to the national, displaying an increase of aggravated assaults per 100,000 people between 2000 and 2014. Nevada increases until 2007 before following the national decline.

None of the states examined above have similar rates of aggravated assault to the national rates. New York, Maine, and Ohio all demonstrate lower rates of aggravated assault than the national rates, even with Maine’s inverse trend. Illinois, Tennessee, Florida, Nevada, and California all are higher than the national rates for aggravated assault.

Aggravated assault has a similar distribution of averages to the overall violent crime averages and the murder and nonnegligent manslaughter averages. Tennessee (489.97), Florida (445.69), Nevada (372.71), California (303.89), and Illinois (301.57) all have higher average aggravated assault rates than the national average (256.50), while New York (246.60), Ohio (140.78), and Maine (61.60) have lower average rates. Here, both states examined from the West and the South display higher average rates, while the Northeast states both show lower average rates, and the Midwest is split.

Explanations

Some explanations presented for the differences in crime patterns include: urban areas having more higher crime rates than suburban areas, rural areas having higher crime rates than suburban, and regional differences which state that the south has higher violent crime rates than the other regions.

Violent crime victimization rates are higher in urban areas over suburban and rural areas (Duhart, 2000). The data discussed above, would support this as, for the most part, the states that had higher average rates are more urban than rural, as seen in Table 19. However, this does not explain the differences between the states that have similar percentages of urban population and rural population, such as New York and Illinois, where Illinois was consistently higher, and New York was consistently lower than the national.

Table 19.

State	% Rural Population	% Urban Population
New York	12.13%	87.87%
Maine	61.34%	38.66%
Ohio	22.08%	77.92%
Illinois	11.51%	88.49%
Tennessee	33.61%	66.39%
Florida	8.84%	91.16%
Nevada	5.80%	94.20%
California	5.05%	94.95%

(U.S. Census Bureau, 2010)

If urbanity leads to greater instances of violent crime, then California should, in this case, have the highest rate of violent crime and Maine should have the lowest. However, when examining the average overall rates, Tennessee has the highest average rate, with California falling closer to the national average, and Maine has the lowest average rate overall. /research suggests that urban areas experience more violent crime victimization, but Table 19 displays that even with higher rural population, such as Tennessee, a state may present high violent crime rates.

Another explanation for patterns of violent crime by region is the argument for a culture of honor in the South that leads to a higher incidence of violent crime. The South has a history of violence and has a culture that has violence as a “normal” and important part (Nisbett, 1993). Violence is used in the South to protect one’s honor and to defend reputations (Nisbett, 1993). The data presented above defends this, as the two states examined from the South, Tennessee and Florida, have a consistently higher average than the nation in overall violent crime and all subsets.

Further explanations for the differences in the rates of violent crime include the arguments of the effects of weather on crime. One theory, routing activities theory, posits that human behavior is rhythmic and follows certain daily patterns that adapt to the environment, such as weather, thus suggesting that changes in weather can change the availability of victims (Cohn, 1990). Research posits that warmer weather breeds more crime and aggressive behavior. Previous

experiments have found that heat can create a curvilinear relationship that suggests that after a certain point heat can actually reduce aggression, while a different experiment found that heat does increase aggression without the curvilinear relationship (Cohn, 1990). The data examined here would support this, as the states in the West and South are consistently above the national average across all types of violent crime, spare California in the case of legacy rape. Further, the Northeast states are generally cooler, and, according to the data presented above, have consistently lower averages than the nation, spare New York in robbery.

A fourth explanation for differences in crime ties to the tourism of the area. Research suggests that tourists are at greater risk of being victimized by crime, at least in part because most tourists follow a pattern of where they visit and what they do in a tourist location, which makes them easier targets (Lisowska, 2017). The data presented supports this, in the cases of Tennessee, Nevada, California, and Illinois, however; states like New York have high tourism, but New York has been consistently lower in the rates of violent crime.

Further arguments look at the demographics between regions, such as racial breakdown (Table 20), poverty (Table 21), median income (Table 21), unemployment rates (Table 22), and homeownership vs. nomadic rates (Table 21).

Table 20.

	New York	Maine	Ohio	Illinois	Tennessee	Florida	Nevada	California
White	55.8%	93.6%	79.7%	61.8%	74.2%	55.1%	50.5%	37.8%
Black	14.4%	1.04%	12.1%	14.1%	16.7%	15.5%	8.18%	5.6%
Hispanic	18.8%	1.52%	3.54%	16.9%	5.05%	24.5%	28.1%	38.8%
Asian	8.38%	0.98%	1.99%	5.21%	1.61%	2.64%	7.9%	14%
Two +	1.8%	2.16%	N/A	1.73%	1.93%	1.76%	3.61%	2.83%

(DATA USA, 2015), (DATA USA, 2015), (DATA USA, 2015), (DATA USA, 2015), (DATA USA, 2015), (DATA USA, 2015), (DATA USA, 2015), (DATA USA, 2015), (DATA USA, 2015)

Table 21.

	New York	Maine	Ohio	Illinois	Tennessee	Florida	Nevada	California
Income	\$60,850	\$51,494	\$51,075	\$59,588	\$44,361	\$49,426	\$52,431	\$64,500
Poverty	15.4%	13.4%	14.8%	13.6%	16.7%	15.7%	14.7%	15.3%

Homeownership	53.1%	71%	65.4%	65.3%	65.8%	63.8%	54%	53.6%
---------------	-------	-----	-------	-------	-------	-------	-----	-------

(DATA USA, 2015), (DATA USA, 2015), (DATA USA, 2015), (DATA USA, 2015), (DATA USA, 2015), (DATA USA, 2015), (DATA USA, 2015), (DATA USA, 2015), (DATA USA, 2015)

Table 22.

	New York	Maine	Ohio	Illinois	Tennessee	Florida	Nevada	California
Unemployment	4.6%	3.3%	5.0%	4.9%	3.7%	4.1%	5.0%	4.8%

(United States Department of Labor; Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2018), (United States Department of Labor; Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2017), (United States Department of Labor; Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2018), (United States Department of Labor; Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2018), (United States Department of Labor; Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2018), (United States Department of Labor; Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2018), (United States Department of Labor; Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2018), (United States Department of Labor; Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2018), (United States Department of Labor; Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2018)

Many believe that minorities have a higher instance of committing violent crime, or crime in general, which would lead to the states with more minority groups having higher crime rates. According to Table 20, states with around 50/50 do tend to have higher average crime rates (California, Florida, Nevada, and Illinois), apart from New York which has more diversity but lower crime. It is also argued that higher poverty rates will increase crime, and this is seen in Table 21, in that California, Florida, and Tennessee have higher average crime rates and higher poverty rates, but again, New York has a higher poverty rate and lower average crime rate. Also, Maine and Illinois have almost equal poverty rates, but Maine has a lower average rate in almost all types of violent crime, while Illinois is higher in all types. Homeownership, instead of nomadic life, is also thought to be a mitigating factor in crime, and Table 21 shows that California and Nevada have these low rates, but so does New York. Similar rates of homeownership are seen in Ohio, Illinois, Tennessee, and Florida, even though these four have different average rates of violent crime. Thus, suggesting that homeownership may not be a good predictor compared to other demographics. Finally, Table 22 looks at unemployment rates, which are suggested to contribute to criminal activity. However, Tennessee, a state with among the highest averages of violent crime, has an unemployment rate that is comparable to that of Maine, which has low averages of violent crime.

These tables illustrate that demographics are not necessarily reliable predictors on their own, though there are connections to be found between racial groups/minorities, and poverty rates.

Implications

By studying and understanding the data presented here, it is possible to begin looking at patterns and trends. Observing the differences by region and looking into why these differences exist allow for policy-makers to examine what does and does not work in certain areas to attempt to decrease, and possibly

prevent violent crime. For example, knowing that the South has high averages across the board and the Northeast has low averages, policy-makers can look at the differences between the two regions to understand why there are such differences. Also, knowing if a certain region follows the general trend of the nation or not, allows for the predicting of crime from year to year. Finally, knowing if certain crimes have higher rates than others in a state or region, allows for law enforcement to examine the differences between crimes, and possibly recognize if a strategy they are using is not appropriate or well designed for the specific crime. For example, California has higher averages than the national average in all violent crimes except rape, while Maine has lower averages in all except rape, knowing this could allow for law enforcement and policy-makers from the two states to collaborate and discuss what difference exist between the two to remedy this (i.e. does California have a way to address rape better than Maine? Can Maine help California lower violent crime rates through the exchange of information on what works for them?) If this information was shared between states, it is possible that together they could find the best ways to handle all forms of violent crime, and thus diminish its prevalence even more and perhaps even begin preventing it from happening in the first place. Knowing the patterns and trends of violent crime across the nation could lead to a greater understanding of the problem and collaboration of solving it across every state.

References

- Chapter Two: Measuring Violent Crime. (1997). In *Trends and Social Distributions* (pp. 12-36). Perseus Books, LLC.
- CIUS 2002 Section II. (2002). *Crime Index Offenses Reported*. FBI.
- Cohn, E. G. (1990). Weather and Crime. *British Journal of Criminology*, 51-64.
- DATA USA. (2015). Retrieved from Ohio: <https://datausa.io/profile/geo/ohio/#top>
- DATA USA. (2015). Retrieved from Illinois: <https://datausa.io/profile/geo/illinois/>
- DATA USA. (2015). Retrieved from New York: <https://datausa.io/profile/geo/new-york/>
- DATA USA. (2015). Retrieved from Maine: <https://datausa.io/profile/geo/maine/>
- DATA USA. (2015). Retrieved from Tennessee: <https://datausa.io/profile/geo/tennessee/>
- DATA USA. (2015). Retrieved from Florida: <https://datausa.io/profile/geo/florida/>
- DATA USA. (2015). Retrieved from California: <https://datausa.io/profile/geo/california/>
- DATA USA. (2015). Retrieved from Nevada: <https://datausa.io/profile/geo/nevada/>
- Duhart, D. T. (2000). Urban, Suburban, and Rural Victimization, 1993-98. *Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report*, 1-12.
- Gramlich, J. (2018, January 30). *5 Facts about crime in the U.S.* Retrieved from Pew Research Center: <http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2018/01/30/5-facts-about-crime-in-the-u-s/>
- Lisowska, A. (2017). Crime in Tourism Destinations: Research Review. *Tourism*, 31-39.
- Nisbett, R. E. (1993). Violence and U.S. Regional Crime. *American Psychologist*, 441-449.
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2010). *2010 Census of Population*. Retrieved from <http://www.census.gov/geo/www/ua/2010urbanruralclass.html>
- U.S. Department of Justice & Federal Bureau of Investigation. (2010). *Aggravated Assault*. Retrieved from FBI: UCR: <https://criminal.findlaw.com/criminal-charges/robbery-overview.html>
- U.S. Department of Justice & Federal Bureau of Investigation. (2010). *Murder*. Retrieved from FBI: UCR: <https://ucr.fbi.gov/crime-in-the-u.s/2010/crime-in-the-u.s.-2010/violent-crime/murdermain>
- U.S. Department of Justice & Federal Bureau of Investigation. (2010). *Robbery*. Retrieved from FBI: UCR: <https://ucr.fbi.gov/crime-in-the-u.s/2010/crime-in-the-u.s.-2010/violent-crime/robberymain>
- U.S. Department of Justice & Federal Bureau of Investigation. (2013). *Rape*. Retrieved from FBI: UCR: <https://ucr.fbi.gov/crime-in-the-u.s/2013/crime-in-the-u.s.-2013/violent-crime/rape>

- U.S. Department of Justice, & Federal Bureau of Investigation. (2017). *Uniform Crime Report*. Department of Justice. Retrieved from <https://www.ucrdatatool.gov/Search/Crime/State/RunCrimeStatebyState.cfm>
- United States Department of Labor; Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2017, November 2). *New England and State Unemployment- September 2017*. Retrieved from New England Information Office: https://www.bls.gov/regions/new-england/news-release/unemployment_newengland.htm
- United States Department of Labor; Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2018, April 12). *Alternative Measures of Labor Underutilization, California- 2017*. Retrieved from Western Information Office: https://www.bls.gov/regions/west/news-release/laborunderutilization_california.htm
- United States Department of Labor; Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2018, March 27). *Alternative Measures of Labor Underutilization, Florida- 2017*. Retrieved from Southeast Information Office: https://www.bls.gov/regions/southeast/news-release/laborunderutilization_florida.htm
- United States Department of Labor; Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2018, March 15). *Alternative Measures of Labor Underutilization, Illinois- 2017*. Retrieved from Midwest Information Office: https://www.bls.gov/regions/midwest/news-release/laborunderutilization_illinois.htm
- United States Department of Labor; Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2018, April 13). *Alternative Measures of Labor Underutilization, Nevada- 2017*. Retrieved from Western Information Office: https://www.bls.gov/regions/west/news-release/laborunderutilization_nevada.htm
- United States Department of Labor; Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2018, April 12). *Alternative Measures of Labor Underutilization, New York- 2017*. Retrieved from New York-New Jersey Information Office: https://www.bls.gov/regions/new-york-new-jersey/news-release/laborunderutilization_newyork.htm
- United States Department of Labor; Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2018, March 16). *Alternative Measures of Labor Underutilization, Ohio- 2017*. Retrieved from Midwest Information Office: https://www.bls.gov/regions/midwest/news-release/laborunderutilization_ohio.htm
- United States Department of Labor; Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2018, March 28). *Alternative Measures of Labor Underutilization, Tennessee- 2017*. Retrieved from Southeast Information Office:

https://www.bls.gov/regions/southeast/news-release/laborunderutilization_tennessee.htm