

Table 1.3 Violent deaths in states with the highest versus lowest gun ownership levels (BRFSS 2004); Mortality Data WISQARS 1999–2007

	High-gun states ^a	Low-gun states ^b	Ratio
Aggregate population of adults, 2001–2007	356 million	358 million	1.0
Proportion of households with firearms	50%	15%	3.3
Percentage of adult population reporting depression, past 12 months (NSDUH 2008–2009)	3.7%	3.7%	1.0
Percentage of adult population reporting suicidal ideation, past 12 months (NSDUH 2008–2009)	6.6%	6.5%	1.0
Number of nonlethal violent crimes in 2010 (UCR 2010)	165,739	148,287	1.1
Suicide			
Women			
Firearm suicide	4,148	563	7.4
Non-firearm suicide	4,633	4,575	1.0
Total suicide	8,781	5,138	1.7
Men			
Firearm suicide	26,314	7,163	3.7
Non-firearm suicide	11,592	12,377	0.9
Total suicide	37,906	19,540	1.9
Men ages 15–29			
Firearm suicide	5,803	1,308	4.4
Non-firearm suicide	3,192	2,671	1.2
Total suicide	8,995	3,979	2.2
5–14 year olds			
Firearm suicide	166	15	11.1
Non-firearm suicide	225	154	1.5
Total suicide	391	169	2.3
Adults 65+ years old			
Firearm suicide	6,374	1,714	3.7
Non-firearm suicide	1,182	2,270	0.5
Total suicide	7,556	3,984	1.9
Homicide			
Men			
Firearm homicide	13,755	7,799	1.8
Non-firearm homicide	5,031	3,963	1.3
Total homicide	18,786	11,762	1.6
Women			
Firearm homicide	3,165	998	3.2
Non-firearm homicide	2,855	2,132	1.3
Total homicide	6,020	3,130	1.9

Table 1.3 (Continued)

	High-gun states ^a	Low-gun states ^b	Ratio
5–14 year olds			
Firearm homicide	259	100	2.6
Non-firearm homicide	212	169	1.3
Total homicide	471	269	1.8
Men 15–29			
Firearm homicide	6,971	4,900	1.4
Non-firearm homicide	1,187	1,334	0.9
Total homicide	8,158	6,234	1.3
Adults 65+ years old			
Firearm homicide	620	139	4.5
Non-firearm homicide	794	534	1.5
Total homicide	1,414	673	2.1
Unintentional firearm deaths	109	677	6.2

Note: All data are from 1999–2007 because cell counts were suppressed beginning in 2008; terrorism-related homicides are not counted.

^aLouisiana, Utah, Oklahoma, Iowa, Tennessee, Kentucky, Alabama, Mississippi, Idaho, North Dakota, West Virginia, Arkansas, Alaska, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming

^bHawaii, New Jersey, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York

Table 1.1 Homicide, suicide, and unintentional gun deaths among 5–14 year olds: The United States versus 25 other high-income populous countries (early 2003)

	Mortality rate ratio
<hr/>	
Homicides	
Gun homicides	13.2
Non-gun homicides	1.7
Total	3.4
Suicides	
Gun suicides	7.8
Non-gun suicides	1.3
Total	1.7
Unintentional firearm deaths	10.3

Source: Richardson and Hemenway 2011

Table 1.2 NVDRS 2005–2010

	Firearm			Non-firearm		
	<i>N</i>	Occurred in a house/apt	Occurred at victim's residence	<i>N</i>	Occurred in a house/apt	Occurred at victim's residence
Homicides by age group						
0–4 yrs	81	75%	67%	1,025	90%	77%
5–14 yrs	257	72%	51%	205	78%	67%
15–24 yrs	5,679	37%	16%	1,385	47%	27%
25–34 yrs	4,906	44%	24%	1,479	56%	39%
35–64 yrs	5,003	56%	41%	3,716	62%	50%
65+ yrs	470	74%	69%	719	79%	76%
Suicides by age group						
0–4 yrs	—			—		
5–14 yrs	105	97%	88%	301	91%	88%
15–24 yrs	3,332	75%	64%	3,769	69%	65%
25–34 yrs	4,034	76%	67%	4,743	70%	65%
35–64 yrs	15,634	78%	74%	16,568	72%	70%
65+ yrs	6,019	89%	88%	2,168	80%	83%

Note: Unknowns for age (0.7%), house/apt (1.4%), home (3.6%) were set aside.

Table 2.1 Effects of the Brady Act on homicide and suicide changes from pre- to post-Brady period in treatment relative to control states
(Standard-error estimates in parentheses)

	Victims aged 21 and older	Victims aged 55 and older
Homicide (rate per 100,000)	-0.36 (0.64)	-0.09 (0.27)
Gun homicide rate	-0.14 (0.52)	0.05 (0.10)
Non-gun homicide rate	-0.22 (0.15)	-0.14 (0.20)
% homicides committed with gun	1.1 (1.0)	3.3 (2.4)
Suicide (rate per 100,000)	-0.12 (0.27)	-0.54 (0.37)
Gun suicide rate	-0.21 (0.19)	-0.92** (0.25)
Non-gun suicide rate	0.09 (0.13)	0.38* (0.20)
% suicides committed with gun	-0.3 (0.5)	-2.2** (0.9)

Source: Cook and Ludwig (2003). The original results reported in Ludwig and Cook (2000) were based on a data set with several minor errors which we subsequently corrected.

Note: The pre-Brady period is defined as 1990 to 1993 and post-Brady period as 1994 to 1997. Regressions are calculated by estimating equation (2) in text using state population as weights to adjust for heteroskedasticity.

**Statistically different from zero at the 5% p-value

*Statistically different from zero at the 10% p-value

Table 1. Prevalence of gun-disqualifying mental health and criminal records in sample of people with serious mental illness

Type of gun-disqualifying record	N	Percent
Involuntary civil commitment	1,086	(4.7%)
Incompetent to stand trial	464	(2.0%)
Not guilty by reason of insanity	29	(0.1%)
Conservatorship	152	(0.7%)
Any mental health disqualification	1,634	(7.0%)
Criminal disqualification	8,129	(34.9%)
Any criminal or mental health disqualification	9,246	(39.7%)
Both criminal and mental health disqualification	512	(2.2%)
Not disqualified	14,046	(60.3%)

Table 2. Unadjusted frequencies of violent crime by gun-disqualifying mental health status and NICS policy exposure (person-month level of analysis)

	N person- months	Number of violent crime months	Percent of person- months with violent crime	Estimated annualized percent of group with violent crime
FULL SAMPLE ¹				
Gun-disqualifying mental health record and NICS policy exposure				
Legally disqualified, before NICS reporting began	44,345	289	0.65	7.8
Legally disqualified, after NICS reporting began	51,254	278	0.54	6.5
Not legally disqualified, before NICS reporting began	1,314,007	7,066	0.54	6.5
Not legally disqualified, after NICS reporting began	778,678	3,776	0.48	5.8
<i>Total</i>	<i>2,188,284</i>	<i>11,409</i>	<i>0.52</i>	<i>6.3</i>
NOT-CRIMINALLY-DISQUALIFIED SUBSAMPLE ²				
Gun-disqualifying mental health record and NICS policy exposure				
Legally disqualified, before NICS reporting began	34,842	194	0.56	6.7
Legally disqualified, after NICS reporting began	35,248	93	0.26	3.2
Not legally disqualified, before NICS reporting began	1,128,574	5,552	0.49	5.9
Not legally disqualified, after NICS reporting began	537,325	1,753	0.33	3.9
<i>Total</i>	<i>1,735,989</i>	<i>7,592</i>	<i>0.44</i>	<i>5.2</i>

¹ Includes all person-months with community tenure; months spent hospitalized or incarcerated were removed from analysis.

² N=452,292 person-month observations were removed for the subsample analysis due to a gun-disqualifying criminal history.

Table 3. Adjusted odds ratios for monthly violent crime associated with legal restrictions on firearms access for people with serious mental illness in Connecticut from 2002-2009, before and after initiation of state policy of reporting gun-disqualifying mental health records to the National Instant Check System

	Adjusted Odds Ratio	95% Confidence Interval	Statistical Significance
Gun-disqualifying criminal record			
No criminal disqualification [reference category]	[1.00]		
Criminal disqualification	1.60	(1.52 - 1.68)	***
Gun-disqualifying mental health record and NICS policy exposure			
Legally disqualified, before NICS reporting began [reference category]	[1.00]		
Legally disqualified, after NICS reporting began	0.92	(0.76 - 1.13)	ns
Not legally disqualified, before NICS reporting began	0.76	(0.65 - 0.88)	***
Not legally disqualified, after NICS reporting began	0.78	(0.67 - 0.91)	***
Primary psychiatric diagnosis			
Major depression [reference category]	[1.00]		
Schizophrenia	0.90	(0.84 - 0.96)	***
Bipolar disorder	1.13	(1.07 - 1.20)	**

Substance abuse

No co-occurring alcohol or illicit drug use disorder [reference category]	[1.00]	
Any co-occurring alcohol or illicit drug use disorder	2.93	(2.57 - 3.34) ***

Demographic characteristics

Age in years	0.98	(0.97 - 0.98) ***
Sex		
Female [reference category]	[1.00]	
Male	2.00	(1.90 - 2.14) ***
Race/ethnicity		
Non-hispanic white [reference category]	[1.00]	
Black	1.77	(1.67 - 1.88) ***
Hispanic	1.20	(1.11 - 1.26) ***
Other race/ethnicity	0.41	(0.29 - 0.58) ***

Analytic model specifications: General estimating equations (GEE) logistic regression for repeated measures with a lagged dependent variable, controlling for time and adjusting for non-independence of intra-person observations.

N=2,187,732 person-months observations

Statistical significance: ns - not significant; ***p<0.001;

Table 4. Adjusted odds ratios for first violent crime associated with legal restrictions on firearms access for people with serious mental illness in Connecticut from 2002-2009, before and after initiation of state policy of reporting gun-disqualifying mental health records to the National Instant Check System: SUBSAMPLE WITH NO PRE-EXISTING FELONY CONVICTION OR OTHER GUN DISQUALIFYING CRIMINAL RECORD

	Adjusted Odds Ratio	95% Confidence Interval	Statistical Significance
Gun-disqualifying mental health record and NICS policy exposure			
Legally disqualified, before NICS reporting began [reference category]	[1.00]		
Legally disqualified, after NICS reporting began	0.69	(0.57 - 0.82)	***
Not legally disqualified, before NICS reporting began	0.65	(0.54 - 0.79)	**
Not legally disqualified, after NICS reporting began	0.62	(0.46 - 0.83)	***
Primary psychiatric diagnosis			
Major depression [reference category]	[1.00]		
Schizophrenia	0.80	(0.74 - 0.86)	***
Bipolar disorder	1.05	(0.98 - 1.13)	ns
Substance abuse			
No co-occurring alcohol or illicit drug use disorder [reference category]	[1.00]		
Any co-occurring alcohol or illicit drug use disorder	3.08	(2.68 - 3.54)	***

Demographic characteristics

Age in years	0.98	(0.97 - 0.98) ***
Sex		
Female [reference category]	[1.00]	
Male	2.18	(2.04 - 2.34) ***
Race/ethnicity		
Non-hispanic white [reference category]	[1.00]	
Black	1.89	(1.76 - 2.03) ***
Hispanic	1.30	(1.21 - 1.41) ***
Other race/ethnicity	1.26	(0.24 - 0.54) ***

Analytic model specifications: General estimating equations (GEE) logistic regression for repeated measures with a lagged dependent variable, controlling for time and adjusting for non-independence of intra-person observations.

N=1,735,437 person-months observations

Statistical significance: ns - not significant; ** p<0.01; ***p<0.001;

Table 6.1 Incidence of and relative risk for new criminal activity, by type of offense, among authorized purchasers of handguns in California

Type and number of prior conviction(s)	Nature of new offense			
Study group	Any offense <i>n</i> (%)	Nonviolent firearm offense <i>n</i> (%)	Violent offense <i>n</i> (%)	Violent Crime Index offense <i>n</i> (%)
Prior misdemeanor conviction (<i>n</i> =2,735)	1379 (50.4)	361 (13.2)	682 (24.9)	421 (15.4)
No prior criminal history (<i>n</i> =2,442)	239 (9.8)	50 (2.0)	108 (4.4)	60 (2.5)
Males ^a	RR (95% CI)	RR (95% CI)	RR (95% CI)	RR (95% CI)
Any conviction(s)				
1	5.9 (5.1–6.9)	5.0 (3.6–7.0)	5.0 (4.0–6.2)	5.1 (3.8–6.9)
≥2	8.4 (7.2–9.8)	7.7 (5.6–10.5)	7.3 (5.9–9.1)	7.6 (5.7–10.2)
Conviction(s), none involving firearms or violence				
1	5.9 (5.0–6.9)	4.8 (3.4–6.7)	4.8 (3.8–6.0)	5.0 (3.7–6.8)
≥2	7.8 (6.7–9.2)	6.5 (4.7–9.1)	6.8 (5.4–8.6)	6.4 (4.7–8.7)
Conviction(s) involving firearms, but none involving violence				
1	6.4 (4.9–8.2)	7.7 (4.8–12.3)	4.4 (3.0–6.6)	5.2 (3.1–8.5)
≥2	10.9 (6.0–20.0)	14.7 (5.8–36.9)	13.0 (6.3–26.7)	12.4 (5.0–31.0)
Conviction(s) involving violence				
1	9.3 (7.7–11.3)	8.7 (6.0–12.6)	8.9 (6.8–11.6)	9.4 (6.6–13.3)
≥2	11.3 (8.3–15.3)	11.7 (6.8–20.0)	10.4 (6.9–15.8)	15.1 (9.4–24.3)

Source: Wintemute GJ, Drake CM, Beaumont JJ, Wright MA, Parham CA. Prior Misdemeanor Convictions as a Risk Factor for Later Violent and Firearm-Related Criminal Activity among Authorized Purchasers of Handguns. *JAMA* 1998;280:2083–2087.

RR=relative risk; CI=confidence interval

^aComparison is to subjects with no prior criminal history. Results are adjusted for age and time elapsed since handgun purchase.

Table 6.2 Risk of arrest and new prohibition among legal purchasers of handguns in California^a

Characteristic	Arrest for any crime	Conviction for prohibiting offense	Conviction for violent Crime Index crime ^b
Misdemeanor conviction(s)	HR (95% CI)	HR (95% CI)	HR (95% CI)
No criminal history	Referent	Referent	Referent
1	5.6 (4.5–6.9)	4.2 (2.5–6.8)	4.9 (2.2–11.1)
2	9.0 (6.7–12.2)	10.4 (5.7–18.8)	9.2 (3.1–26.8)
≥3	11.4 (8.3–15.7)	13.6 (7.2–25.6)	11.0 (3.4–35.6)
Sex			
Male	1.0 (0.7–1.3)	0.6 (0.3–1.1)	0.9 (0.3–3.1)
Female	Referent	Referent	Referent
Age, yr			
21–24	4.9 (3.7–6.4)	6.1 (3.5–10.8)	7.7 (2.8–20.9)
25–34	2.4 (1.9–3.1)	2.4 (1.4–4.1)	2.6 (1.0–6.9)
35–49	Referent	Referent	Referent

Adapted from Wright MA, Wintemute GJ. Felonious or Violent Criminal Activity That Prohibits Gun Ownership among Prior Purchasers of Handguns: Incidence and Risk Factors. *J Trauma* 2010;69:948–955.

HR=hazard ratio; CI=confidence interval.

^aAdjusted for all variables in the table.

^bMurder, forcible rape, robbery, aggravated assault.

Table 6.3 Alcohol use and alcohol-related risk behaviors among firearm owners by presence or absence of specific firearms-related behavior^a

Characteristic or behavior	Any alcohol OR (95% CI)	≥5 Drinks/ occasion OR (95% CI)	Drink and drive OR (95% CI)	≥60 Drinks/ month OR (95% CI)
Exposure to firearms				
Firearm owner	1.3 (1.2–1.5)	1.3 (1.2–1.5)	1.8 (1.3–2.4)	1.5 (1.1–1.8)
Household	1.2 (1.1–1.3)	1.0 (0.9–1.3)	1.3 (0.8–1.9)	1.3 (0.8–2.0)
No firearms	Referent	Referent	Referent	Referent
Loaded unlocked firearm at home				
Firearm owner, 'yes'	1.4 (1.2–1.7)	1.8 (1.5–2.3)	3.5 (2.3–5.4)	2.3 (1.6–3.3)
Firearm owner, 'no'	1.3 (1.2–1.4)	1.2 (1.1–1.4)	1.5 (1.9–2.0)	1.3 (1.0–1.7)
No firearms	Referent	Referent	Referent	Referent
Drive/ride in vehicle with loaded firearm				
Firearm owner, 'yes'	1.5 (1.3–1.9)	1.7 (1.4–2.2)	3.0 (1.9–4.7)	2.2 (1.4–3.3)
Firearm owner, 'no'	1.3 (1.2–1.4)	1.2 (1.1–1.4)	1.6 (1.2–2.2)	1.3 (1.0–1.7)
No firearms	Referent	Referent	Referent	Referent
Carry firearm for protection against people				
Firearm owner, 'yes'	1.3 (0.9–1.8)	1.5 (1.0–2.1)	2.1 (1.0–4.6)	1.6 (0.8–3.1)
Firearm owner, 'no'	1.3 (1.2–1.5)	1.3 (1.1–1.5)	1.7 (1.3–2.3)	1.4 (1.1–1.8)
No firearms	Referent	Referent	Referent	Referent

Source: Wintemute GJ. Association between firearm ownership, firearm-related risk and risk reduction behaviors and alcohol-related risk behaviors. *Injury Prevention* 2011;17(6):422–427.

OR=odds ratio; CI=confidence interval

^aAdjusted for state of residence, age, sex, and race.

Table 6.4 Incidence and relative hazard of first arrest for new crimes among violent misdemeanants who applied to purchase handguns

Characteristic	Subjects, <i>n</i>	Firearm-related and/or violent crime		Non-firearm, nonviolent crime	
		Persons arrested <i>n</i> (%)	RH (95% CI)	Persons arrested <i>n</i> (%)	RH (95% CI)
All subjects	1654	360 (21.8)		366 (22.1)	
Purchase status					
Denied	927	186 (20.1)	Referent	211 (22.8)	Referent
Approved	727	174 (23.9)	1.2 (1.0–1.5)	155 (21.3)	0.9 (0.8–1.1)
Sex					
Female	65	11 (16.9)	Referent	15 (23.1)	Referent
Male	1589	349 (22.0)	1.3 (0.7–2.5)	351 (22.1)	0.9 (0.6–1.6)
Age, yr					
21–24	377	108 (28.6)	Referent	117 (31.0)	Referent
25–29	719	152 (21.1)	0.7 (0.6–0.9)	152 (21.1)	0.7 (0.5–0.8)
30–34	558	100 (17.9)	0.6 (0.4–0.8)	97 (17.4)	0.5 (0.4–0.7)
Prior convictions					
Any crime					
1	815	144 (17.7)	Referent	126 (15.5)	Referent
2	429	90 (21.0)	1.2 (0.9–1.6)	104 (24.2)	1.7 (1.3–2.1)
3	200	57 (28.5)	1.7 (1.3–2.3)	58 (29.0)	2.0 (1.5–2.8)
≥4	198	63 (31.8)	2.0 (1.5–2.7)	73 (36.9)	2.8 (2.1–3.7)
Firearm-related and/or violent crime					
1	1217	230 (18.9)	Referent	241 (19.8)	Referent
2	302	86 (28.5)	1.6 (1.3–2.1)	81 (26.8)	1.4 (1.1–1.8)
≥3	115	37 (32.2)	1.8 (1.3–2.6)	36 (31.3)	1.7 (1.2–2.5)

Source: Wintemute GJ, Wright MA, Drake CM, Beaumont JJ. Subsequent Criminal Activity among Violent Misdemeanants Who Seek to Purchase Handguns. *JAMA* 2001;285(8):1019–1026.

RH=relative hazard; CI=confidence interval

Table 6.5 Risk of arrest for new crimes for handgun purchasers compared with denied persons among violent misdemeanants who applied to purchase handguns^a

Characteristic	Firearm-related and/or violent crime	Non-firearm, nonviolent crime
	RH (95% CI)	RH (95% CI)
Age, yr		
21–24	1.4 (0.9–2.0)	1.0 (0.7–1.5)
25–29	1.1 (0.8–1.5)	0.9 (0.7–1.3)
30–34	1.6 (1.1–2.5)	1.0 (0.6–1.5)
Prior convictions		
Any crime		
1	1.3 (0.9–1.8)	1.0 (0.7–1.4)
2	1.2 (0.8–1.8)	0.9 (0.6–1.3)
3	1.1 (0.7–1.9)	1.3 (0.8–2.3)
≥4	1.8 (1.1–3.1)	0.9 (0.6–1.5)
Firearm-related and/or violent crime		
1	1.4 (1.1–1.8)	1.0 (0.7–1.3)
2	1.3 (0.8–2.0)	1.1 (0.7–1.8)
≥3	0.9 (0.5–1.8)	0.8 (0.4–1.7)

Source: Wintemute GJ, Wright MA, Drake CM, Beaumont JJ. Subsequent Criminal Activity among Violent Misdemeanants Who Seek to Purchase Handguns, Risk Factors and Effectiveness of Denying Handgun Purchase. *JAMA* 2001;285:1019–1026.

RH=relative hazard; CI=confidence interval

^aThe comparison is to persons whose handgun purchases were denied. Adjusted for sex and all variables in the table.

Table 6.6 Support overall and among firearm owners for denial of firearm purchases by persons convicted of specific misdemeanor offenses

Offense	Overall %	Firearm owners %
Public display of a firearm in a threatening manner	95	91
Possession of equipment for illegal drug use	92	89
Domestic violence	89	80
Assault and battery without a lethal weapon or serious injury	85	75
Drunk and disorderly conduct	74	73
Carrying a concealed weapon without a permit	83	70
Driving under the influence of alcohol	71	59

Source: Teret SP, Webster DW, Vernick JS, et al. Support for new policies to regulate firearms. *N Engl J Med.* 1998;339:813–818.

Table 7.1 State regulation of private-party firearm sales

State	Handgun sales		Long gun sales	
	All sales	Gun shows only	All sales	Gun shows only
California	•		•	
Colorado		•		•
Connecticut	•			•
Hawaii	•		•	
Illinois	•		•	
Iowa	•			
Maryland	•			
Massachusetts	•		•	
Michigan	•			
Missouri	•			
Nebraska	•			
New Jersey	•		•	
New York	•			•
North Carolina	•			
Oregon		•		•
Pennsylvania	•			
Rhode Island	•		•	

Source: From *Survey of state procedures related to firearm sales, 2005*. Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2006. NCJ 214645.

Note: In the remaining 33 states, private-party firearm sales are not regulated.

Table 8.1 Percentage of Missouri Crime Guns with Short Time Intervals between Retail Sale and Recovery by Police for Years 2002–2011

Year	Up to 3 months (%)	3–12 months (%)	1–2 years (%)
2002	2.9	5.2	5.2
2003	3.2	5.3	6.1
2004	2.1	5.6	5.7
2005	3.3	5.1	6.6
2006	3.2	7.5	7.2
2007	4.5	7.9	7.1
2008	9.4	12.6	6.7
2009	8.1	15.0	12.7
2010	7.6	13.7	13.0
2011	8.5	14.3	12.7

Table 8.2 Estimates of association between state gun laws and crime gun exports

	IRR	Robust SE	<i>p</i> value
State gun laws			
Discretionary purchase permits	0.24	0.10	.001
Purchase permits with fingerprinting	0.55	0.15	.02
Nondiscretionary permits	0.75	0.15	.15
Strong dealer regulation ^a	1.45	0.30	.07
Penalty for failure to conduct background checks	0.76	0.12	.07
Penalty for straw purchasers	1.46	0.30	.07
Junk guns banned	0.68	0.13	.04
Private sales regulated	0.71	0.11	.03
Firearm theft/loss reported	0.70	0.10	.02
One gun per month	0.81	0.26	.51
Covariates			
Household gun ownership	6.05	4.20	.009
Border population in states with strong gun laws ^b	1.00	1.82E-08	.50
Border population in states with medium gun laws ^c	1.00	2.57E-08	.14
Migration out of state	0.99	5.04E-07	.50
Borders Canada	0.68	0.065	<.001
Borders Mexico	0.84	0.19	.43

Note: IRR = incidence rate ratio. Model also includes state population offset term.

^aStates were considered to have strong dealer regulation if they require licensing of gun dealers, allow inspection of dealer records, and penalize dealers who falsify records.

^bStates were considered to have strong gun laws if they have a discretionary permit-to-purchase law.

^cStates were considered to have medium gun laws if they regulate private sales, require licensing of gun dealers, and allow inspections of dealer records.

Table 12.1 Features test of the federal assault weapons ban

Weapon category	Military-style features (2 or more qualified a firearm as an assault weapon)
Semi-automatic pistols accepting detachable magazines	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) ammunition magazine that attaches outside the pistol grip 2) threaded barrel capable of accepting a barrel extender, flash hider, forward handgrip, or silencer 3) heat shroud attached to or encircling the barrel 4) weight of more than 50 ounces unloaded 5) semiautomatic version of a fully automatic weapon
Semi-automatic rifles accepting detachable magazines	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) folding or telescoping stock 2) pistol grip that protrudes beneath the firing action 3) bayonet mount 4) flash hider or a threaded barrel designed to accommodate one 5) grenade launcher
Semi-automatic shotguns	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) folding or telescoping stock 2) pistol grip that protrudes beneath the firing action 3) fixed magazine capacity over 5 rounds 4) ability to accept a detachable ammunition magazine

Table 12.2 Assault weapons as a percentage of guns recovered by police

City	Pre-ban	Post-ban	% change
Baltimore, MD	1.88% (1992–1993)	1.25% (1995–2000)	–34%
Boston, MA	2.16% (1991–1993)	0.6% (2000–2002)	–72%
Miami, FL	2.53% (1990–1993)	1.71% (1995–2000)	–32%
St. Louis, MO	1.33% (1992–1993)	0.91% (1995–2003)	–32%
Anchorage, AK	3.57% (1987–1993)	2.13% (1995–2000)	–40%
Milwaukee, WI	5.91% (1991–1993)	4.91% (1995–1998)	–17%

Note: Figures for Baltimore, Boston, Miami, and St. Louis are based on all recovered guns. Figures for Anchorage and Milwaukee are based on, respectively, guns tested for evidence and guns recovered in murder cases. Changes in Baltimore, Boston, Miami, and St. Louis were statistically significant at $p < .05$. See Koper (2004) for further details about the data and analyses.

Table 12.3 Guns with large-capacity magazines as a percentage of guns recovered by police (selected years)

City	Pre-ban	Late 1990s	Early 2000s
Baltimore, MD	14.0% (1993)	15.5% (1998)	15.7% (2003)
Anchorage, AK	26.2% (1992–1993)	30.0% (1999–2000)	19.2% (2001–2002)
Milwaukee, WI	22.4% (1993)	36.4% (1998)	N/A
Louisville, KY	N/A	20.9 (1996)	19.0% (2000)

Note: Figures for Baltimore and Milwaukee are based on, respectively, guns associated with violent crimes and with murders. Figures for Anchorage and Louisville are based on guns submitted for evidentiary testing. The Anchorage figures are based on handguns only. See Koper (2004) for further details about the data and analyses.

Table 15.1 National Firearms Agreement (1996) Australia**Ban on automatic and semi-automatic long arms—and buyback**

- Ban on import, sale, resale, transfer, ownership, possession, manufacture and use

Nationwide registration of all firearms

- Integration of licensing and registration systems across the country

License applicants must prove ‘genuine reason’ for every firearm they wish to possess

- Personal protection is not a genuine reason; applicants for Category B, C, D and H must also prove ‘genuine need’

Uniform basic licence requirements

- Age 18, prove genuine reason, be a ‘fit and proper person’, pass an adequate safety test, waiting period at least 28 days
- Photo licence showing the holder’s address, the category of firearm, issued for a maximum of five years.
- Conditions include storage requirements, inspection by police, licence withdrawal/seizure of guns in certain circumstances.
- Categories of licenses and firearms:
 - Category A: air rifles; rimfire rifles (excluding self-loading); single and double barrel shotguns
 - Category B: muzzle-loading firearms; single shot, double barrel and repeating centrefire rifles; break action shotgun/rifle combinations
 - Category C (prohibited except for certain occupational purposes, later expanded to include some clay target shooters): semi-automatic rimfire rifles with max 10-round magazine; semi-automatic shotguns with max 5-round magazine; pump action shotguns with max 5-round magazine.
 - Category D (prohibited except for official purposes): semi-automatic centrefire rifles; semi-automatic shotguns; pump action shotguns with a capacity over 5 rounds; semi-automatic rimfire rifles with capacity over 10 rounds.
 - Category H: all handguns, including air pistols.

Safety training as a prerequisite for licensing

- An accredited course required for first-time licence; a specialized course for persons employed in the security industry.

Grounds for licence refusal / cancellation and seizure of firearms, including:

- General reasons: not of good character, conviction for violence in past five years, contravene firearm law, unsafe storage, no longer genuine reason, not notifying change of address, licence obtained by deception, not in the public interest.
- Specific reasons: applicant/licence holder has had a restraining order or serious assault conviction in past 5 years.
- Mental or physical fitness: reliable evidence of a condition that would make the applicant unsuitable to possess a gun.

Permit to acquire

- Separate permits required for the acquisition of every firearm, with a waiting period of at least 28 days.

Table 15.1 (Continued)

Uniform standard for the security and storage of firearms

- Guns must be kept locked, ammunition stored separately; failure to store firearms safely is an offense.
- Specific storage requirements for different categories of firearms.
- Rules for safekeeping of firearms when temporarily away from the usual place of storage.

Recording of sales

- No private or backyard sales: all sales must be conducted by or through licensed firearm dealers.
- Dealers must ensure purchaser is licensed, and provide details of each purchase and sale to firearms registry.
- Ammunition sold only for those guns for which the purchaser is licensed; limits on the quantity that can be purchased.

No mail order sales

- Mail order only allowed from licensed gun dealer to licensed gun dealer.
 - Advertising guns may only be conducted by or through a licensed gun dealer.
 - The movement of Category C, D and H firearms must be in accordance with prescribed safety requirements.
-

Table 19.1 Percentage of people who favor gun policies, overall and by gun ownership

Item	Overall (N = 2,703)	Non-gun owners ^a (n = 913)	Non-gun owner, gun in household (n = 843)	Gun owners (n = 947)	NRA members (n = 169)
Assault weapon and ammunition policies					
Banning the sale of military-style, semi-automatic assault weapons that are capable of shooting more than 10 rounds of ammunition without reloading?	69.0	77.4	67.7**	45.7***	14.9***
Banning the sale of large-capacity ammunition clips or magazines that allow some guns to shoot more than 10 bullets before reloading?	68.4	75.5	69.2*	47.8***	19.2***
Banning the sale of large-capacity ammunition clips or magazines that allow some guns to shoot more than 20 bullets before reloading?	68.8	75.6	69.9	49.4***	19.9***
Banning the possession of military-style, semi-automatic assault weapons that are capable of shooting more than 10 rounds of ammunition without reloading if the government is required to pay gun owners the fair market value of their weapons?	56.0	63.3	52.6**	36.9***	17.0***
Banning the possession of large-capacity ammunition clips or magazines that allow some guns to shoot more than 10 bullets before reloading if the government is required to pay gun owners the fair market value of their ammunition clips?	55.0	61.9	51.6**	37.0***	22.9***

Prohibited person policies					
Prohibiting a person convicted of two or more crimes involving alcohol or drugs within a three-year period from having a gun for 10 years?	74.8	76.1	74.8	70.5*	64.2
Prohibiting a person convicted of violating a domestic violence restraining order from having a gun for 10 years?	80.8	82.9	79.1	75.6**	61.5**
Prohibiting a person convicted of a serious crime as a juvenile from having a gun for 10 years?	83.1	84.4	81.3	80.0	70.0
Prohibiting a person under the age of 21 from having a handgun?	69.5	76.4	63.6***	52.3***	42.3***
Prohibiting a person on the terror watch list from having a gun?	86.0	87.5	85.6	82.2*	75.5
Prohibiting people who have been convicted of each of these crimes from having a gun for 10 years:					
Public display of a gun in a threatening manner excluding self-defense	71.1	69.8	78.7**	71.3	58.5
Domestic violence	73.7	72.4	80.4**	73.7	61.4
Assault and battery that does not result in serious injury or involve a lethal weapon	53.0	54.6	53.4	48.5*	33.1
Drunk and disorderly conduct	37.5	39.7	36.6	32.1*	29.1*
Carrying a concealed gun without a permit	57.8	60.3	61.3	49.0***	43.3**
Indecent exposure	25.9	28.1	23.7	21.2*	27.1*
Background check policies					
Requiring a background check system for all gun sales to make sure a purchaser is not legally prohibited from having a gun?	88.8	89.9	91.5	84.3**	73.7*

(Continued)

Table 19.1 (Continued)

Item	Overall (<i>N</i> = 2,703)	Non-gun owners ^a (<i>n</i> = 913)	Non-gun owner, gun in household (<i>n</i> = 843)	Gun owners (<i>n</i> = 947)	NRA members (<i>n</i> = 169)
Increasing federal funding to states to improve reporting of people prohibited by law from having a gun to the background check system?	66.4	67.8	65.5	63.4	60.9
Allowing law enforcement up to five business days, if needed, to complete a background check for gun buyers? ^b	76.3	79.8	79.2	67.0***	47.1***
Policies affecting gun dealers					
Allowing the U.S. Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives to temporarily take away a gun dealer's license if an audit reveals record-keeping violations and the dealer cannot account for 20 or more of the guns?	84.6	86.4	84.1	78.9**	64.0**
Allowing cities to sue licensed gun dealers when there is strong evidence that the gun dealer's careless sales practices allowed many criminals to obtain guns?	73.2	77.0	72.2	62.9***	43.5***
Allowing the information about which gun dealers sell the most guns used in crimes to be available to the police and the public so that those gun dealers can be prioritized for greater oversight?	68.8	74.1	64.3**	56.5***	41.2***
Requiring a mandatory minimum sentence of two years in prison for a person convicted of knowingly selling a gun to someone who cannot legally have one?	76.0	77.7	76.3	70.7**	69.8**

Other gun policies

Requiring a person to obtain a license from a local law enforcement agency before buying a gun to verify their identity and ensure that they are not legally prohibited from having a gun?	77.3	83.5	76.4**	59.4***	37.6***
Providing government funding for research to develop and test “smart guns” designed to fire only when held by the owner of the gun or other authorized user?	44.2	47.4	43.4	35.3***	23.0***
Requiring by law that people lock up the guns in their home when not in use to prevent handling by children or teenagers without adult supervision?	67.2	75.3	62.6***	44.4***	32.2***

Note: We asked respondents whether they favored or opposed each policy using a 5-point Likert scale (strongly favor, somewhat favor, neither favor nor oppose, somewhat oppose, strongly oppose). We coded strongly favor and somewhat favor responses as being in support of a given policy.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

^aResponses among non-gun owners with a gun in their household, gun owners, and NRA members were compared with responses among non-gun owners (no gun in household) using chi-square tests.

^bQuestion informed respondents that under current federal law, most background checks for gun buyers are completed in just a few minutes. But if law enforcement needs additional time to determine if a gun buyer is not legally allowed to have a gun, they may only take up to a maximum of three business days to complete the check.

Table 19.2 Percentage who favor gun policies affecting persons with mental illness, overall and by gun ownership

Item	Overall (<i>N</i> = 2,703)	Non-gun owners ^a (<i>n</i> = 913)	Non-gun owner, gun in household (<i>n</i> = 843)	Gun owners (<i>n</i> = 947)	NRA members (<i>n</i> = 169)
Background check policies					
Requiring states to report a person to the background check system who is prohibited from buying a gun due either to involuntary commitment to a hospital for psychiatric treatment or to being declared mentally incompetent by a court of law?	85.4	85.3	86.5	85.6	80.7
Requiring health care providers to report people who threaten to harm themselves or others to the background check system to prevent them from having a gun for six months?	74.5	75.4	76.1	72.0	66.0
Requiring the military to report a person who has been rejected from service due to mental illness or drug or alcohol abuse to the background check system to prevent them from having a gun?	78.9	79.6	79.7	76.2	67.5

Other gun policies					
Allowing police officers to search for and remove guns from a person, without a warrant, if they believe the person is dangerous due to a mental illness, emotional instability, or a tendency to be violent?	52.5	55.3	53.4	43.6***	31.1**
Allowing people who have lost the right to have a gun due to mental illness to have that right restored if they are determined not to be dangerous?	31.6	31.6	28.9	34.0	41.6
Government spending					
Increasing government spending on mental health screening and treatment as a strategy to reduce gun violence?	60.4	61.8	60.6	55.1*	57.2
Increasing government spending on drug and alcohol abuse screening and treatment as a strategy to reduce gun violence?	43.5	46.6	44.2	35.0***	36.6***

Note: We asked respondents whether they favored or opposed each policy using a 5-point Likert scale (strongly favor, somewhat favor, neither favor nor oppose, somewhat oppose, strongly oppose). We coded strongly favor and somewhat favor responses as being in support of a given policy.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

^aResponses among non-gun owners with a gun in their household, gun owners, and NRA members were compared with responses among non-gun owners (no gun in household) using chi-square tests.

Table 19.3 Percentage who favor gun policies by political party affiliation

Item	Democrats ^a (<i>n</i> = 788)	Independents (<i>n</i> = 1,121)	Republicans (<i>n</i> = 794)
Assault weapon and ammunition policies			
Banning the sale of military-style, semi-automatic assault weapons that are capable of shooting more than 10 rounds of ammunition without reloading?	86.6	63.9***	51.6***
Banning the sale of large-capacity ammunition clips or magazines that allow some guns to shoot more than 10 bullets before reloading?	83.2	65.6***	51.0***
Banning the sale of large-capacity ammunition clips or magazines that allow some guns to shoot more than 20 bullets before reloading?	82.8	66.7***	51.9***
Banning the possession of military-style, semi-automatic assault weapons that are capable of shooting more than 10 rounds of ammunition without reloading if the government is required to pay gun owners the fair market value of their weapons?	72.1	51.3***	40.2***
Banning the possession of large capacity ammunition clips or magazines that allow some guns to shoot more than 10 bullets before reloading if the government is required to pay gun owners the fair market value of their ammunition clips?	68.6	52.4***	38.9***
Prohibited person policies			
Prohibiting a person convicted of two or more crimes involving alcohol or drugs within a three-year period from having a gun for 10 years?	79.4	72.2*	75.2*
Prohibiting a person convicted of violating a domestic violence restraining order from having a gun for 10 years?	85.1	79.2*	77.3*
Prohibiting a person convicted of a serious crime as a juvenile from having a gun for 10 years?	88.5	79.2**	82.0*
Prohibiting a person under the age of 21 from having a handgun?	83.6	66.1***	54.5***
Prohibiting a person on the terror watch list from having a gun?	88.3	84.0	86.3

Prohibiting people who have been convicted of each of these crimes from having a gun for 10 years:			
Public display of a gun in a threatening manner excluding self-defense	70.7	71.1	71.7
Domestic violence	76.1	73.5	70.2
Assault and battery that does not result in serious injury or involve a lethal weapon	58.2	50.4*	49.9*
Drunk and disorderly conduct	42.3	33.7*	37.4
Carrying a concealed gun without a permit	64.2	56.8*	50.0***
Indecent exposure	28.4	24.7	24.4
Background check policies			
Requiring a background check system for all gun sales to make sure a purchaser is not legally prohibited from having a gun?	92.1	87.5	86.3*
Increasing federal funding to states to improve reporting of people prohibited by law from having a gun to the background check system?	76.2	64.0***	56.1***
Allowing law enforcement up to five business days, if needed, to complete a background check for gun buyers? ^b	87.3	70.8***	71.1***
Policies affecting gun dealers			
Allowing the U.S. Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives to temporarily take away a gun dealer's license if an audit reveals record-keeping violations and the dealer cannot account for 20 or more of the guns?	88.5	83.3	80.9*
Allowing cities to sue licensed gun dealers when there is strong evidence that the gun dealer's careless sales practices allowed many criminals to obtain guns?	82.2	69.5***	66.5***
Allowing the information about which gun dealers sell the most guns used in crimes to be available to the police and the public so that those gun dealers can be prioritized for greater oversight?	79.5	65.3***	58.8***
Requiring a mandatory minimum sentence of two years in prison for a person convicted of knowingly selling a gun to someone who cannot legally have a gun?	81.1	73.4*	73.0*

(Continued)

Table 19.3 (Continued)

Item	Democrats ^a (<i>n</i> = 788)	Independents (<i>n</i> = 1,121)	Republicans (<i>n</i> = 794)
Other gun policies			
Requiring people to obtain a license from a local law enforcement agency before buying a gun to verify their identity and ensure that they are not legally prohibited from having a gun?	87.8	73.5***	68.7***
Providing government funding for research to develop and test “smart guns” designed to fire only when held by the owner of the gun or other authorized user?	51.4	43.8*	34.1***
Requiring by law that people lock up the guns in their home when not in use to prevent handling by children or teenagers without adult supervision?	80.8	65.3***	49.5***

Note: We asked respondents whether they favored or opposed each policy using a 5-point Likert scale (strongly favor, somewhat favor, neither favor nor oppose, somewhat oppose, strongly oppose). We coded strongly favor and somewhat favor responses as being in support of a given policy. *N* = 2,703.

p* < .05, *p* < .01, ****p* < .001

^aResponses among Independents and Republicans were compared with responses among Democrats using chi-square tests.

^bQuestion informed respondents that under current federal law, most background checks for gun buyers are completed in just a few minutes. But if law enforcement needs additional time to determine if a gun buyer is not legally allowed to have a gun, they may only take up to a maximum of three business days to complete the check.

Table 19.4 Percentage who favor gun policies affecting persons with mental illness, by political party affiliation

Item	Democrats ^a (n = 788)	Independents (n = 1,121)	Republicans (n = 794)
Background check policies			
Requiring states to report a person to the background check system who is prohibited from buying a gun due either to involuntary commitment to a hospital for psychiatric treatment or to being declared mentally incompetent by a court of law?	87.1	84.5	84.5
Requiring health care providers to report people who threaten to harm themselves or others to the background check system to prevent them from having a gun for six months?	80.0	71.3**	72.1*
Requiring the military to report a person who has been rejected from service due to mental illness or drug or alcohol abuse to the background check system to prevent them from having a gun?	84.7	74.9**	77.5*
Other gun policies			
Allowing police officers to search for and remove guns from a person, without a warrant, if they believe the person is dangerous due to a mental illness, emotional instability, or a tendency to be violent?	60.7	47.9***	48.5**
Allowing people who have lost the right to have a gun due to mental illness to have that right restored if they are determined not to be dangerous?	31.1	30.7	33.8
Government spending			
Increasing government spending on mental health screening and treatment as a strategy to reduce gun violence?	71.1	57.2***	50.0***
Increasing government spending on drug and alcohol abuse screening and treatment as a strategy to reduce gun violence?	53.4	41.1**	32.7***

Note: We asked respondents whether they favored or opposed each policy using a 5-point Likert scale (strongly favor, somewhat favor, neither favor nor oppose, somewhat oppose, strongly oppose). We coded strongly favor and somewhat favor responses as being in support of a given policy.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

^aResponses among Independents and Republicans were compared with responses among Democrats using chi-square tests.