

Final report on the study on crime victimisation

Contract: 11002-2008.002-2008.711

**Jan van Dijk
Pat Mayhew
John van Kesteren
Marcelo Aebi
Antonia Linde**

Tilburg, August 2010

Publisher: INTERVICT/PrismaPrint Tilburg
ISBN 978-94-6167-014-4

INTERVICT
Tilburg University
P.O. Box 90153
5000 LE Tilburg
Netherlands

Phone: +31 13 4663526
Fax: +31 13 4663546
E-mail: intervict@uvt.nl
Website: www.tilburguniversity.nl/intervict

Visiting address:
Montesquieu Building
Warandelaan 2
5037 AB Tilburg
Netherlands

INTERVICT is affiliated with Tilburg University

This research was commissioned by Eurostat.

Contents

	Page
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	i
1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 THE POLICY OBJECTIVES OF AN EU SURVEY OF VICTIMISATION	1
1.2 THE INVENTORY OF SURVEY DATA ON VICTIMISATION	4
1.3 MODES OF INTERVIEW	4
2 KEY RESULTS OF THE 17-COUNTRY PILOTS	6
2.1 INTRODUCTION	6
2.2 MAIN IMPRESSIONS ABOUT THE QUESTIONNAIRE	6
General recommendations about the questionnaire in the light of the pilots	8
2.3 SECTION A: PERSONAL AND HOUSEHOLD INFORMATION	8
Recommendations about personal and household information in the light of the pilots	8
2.4 SECTION B: FEELING OF SAFETY AND WORRIES ABOUT CRIME	9
Recommendations about feelings of safety and worry about crime	9
2.5 SECTION C: VICTIMISATION SCREENERS	9
Recommendations about victimisation screeners	10
2.6 SECTION D: VICTIM FORM ABOUT VICTIMISATION DETAILS	10
Recommendations about victimisation details	10
2.7 SECTION E: 'NON-CONVENTIONAL' CRIMES, INCLUDING E-CRIMES	11
Recommendations about 'non-conventional' crimes	11
2.8 SECTION F: OTHER SAFETY ISSUES	11
Recommendations about other safety issues	11
2.9 SECTION G: SEXUAL AND VIOLENT CRIMES	11
Recommendations about sexual and violent crimes	12
2.10 APPLIED METHODOLOGIES	12
2.11 ASSESSMENT OF COSTS	14
2.12 THE COUNTRIES' OVERALL EVALUATION OF THE PILOTS	15
3 THE ICVS-2 PILOT SURVEYS	18
3.1 THE FIRST ICVS-2 PILOTS	18
3.2 THE SECOND ICVS-2 PILOTS	21
4 GENERAL ISSUES ABOUT SURVEY ADMINISTRATION	23
4.1 INTRODUCTION	23
4.2 MODE OF DATA COLLECTION	23
Recommendations on mode of data collection	27
4.3 LENGTH OF INTERVIEW	27
Recommendation on length of the questionnaire	27
4.4 FREESTANDING VERSUS MULTIPURPOSE VICTIMISATION SURVEYS	28
Recommendation on whether the survey should be freestanding	28
4.5 SELECTION OF RESPONDENTS	29
Recommendation on respondent selection	31
4.6 RECALL PERIOD AND TIMING OF FIELDWORK	31
Recommendation on the recall period and timing of fieldwork	32
4.7 SAMPLE SIZE	32
Recommendation on sample size	34

4.8	TRANSLATION.....	34
	Recommendations on translation.....	35
4.9	TRAINING OF INTERVIEWERS, CONFIDENTIALITY AND ETHICS.....	36
	Recommendations on training of interviewers, confidentiality and ethics.....	39
4.10	TIME LIMIT FOR DATA TRANSMISSION.....	40
	Recommendations on data transmission.....	40
5	THE REVISED QUESTIONNAIRE.....	41
	Recommendations on a revised questionnaire.....	45

REFERENCES	46
ANNEX A MATRIX OF INFORMATION ON THE PILOT SURVEYS.....	47
ANNEX B PROPOSED QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE SASU.....	59
ANNEX C EXPANDED QUESTIONS ON VIOLENCE FOR THE SASU.....	104
ANNEX D A review of victimisation surveys in Europe from 1970 to 2010.....	D-3

Tables

Table 1	Costs of surveys in different modes.....	15
Table 2	Summary of response rates in the first NICIS pilot.....	20
Table A.1	Interview modes, sample size, response rates, and duration.....	48
Table A.2	Sampling domain, sampling method, and respondent range.....	49
Table A.3	Executing and supervising agency, interviewer experience, gender and training.....	50
Table A.4	Modes of contact, re-contact and replacement, and incentives.....	51
Table A.5	Questionnaires changes, completion of Section G, and other comparisons.....	52
Table A.6	Saliency and overall evaluation.....	53
Table A.7	Main criticisms and comments.....	55

Figures

Figure A	NICIS-I Pilot design for CAWI and PAPI modes.....	18
Figure B	Alternative options for questions about violence.....	42

Glossary

CAPI	Computer Assisted Personal Interviewing
CASI	Computer Assisted Self Interviewing
CATI	Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing
CAWI	Computer Assisted Web-based Interviewing
EC	European Commission
EU	European Union
EU-SPS	European Union Security Survey
FRA	Fundamental Rights Agency
HEUNI	The European Institute for Crime Prevention and Control, affiliated with the United Nations
ICBS	International Crime Business Survey
ICCS	International Commercial Crime Survey
ICVS	International Crime Victimization Survey
NICIS	Netherlands's Institute for Urban Research and Practice
PAPI	Paper and Pencil Interviewing
SASU	EU Security Survey
UNECE	United Nations Economic Commission for Europe
UNODC	United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Sample surveys of the general public about their experience of common crime – so-called victimisation surveys - are now well established. In covering crimes that are both reported and not reported to the police, victimisation surveys provide a more complete measure of people's ordinary experience of crime than administrative statistics. Victimisation surveys have been carried in various countries across the world, but having been done in different ways, they are as problematic for comparative purposes as statistics of police recorded crime. The International Crime Victimization Survey (ICVS) has adopted a standardised approach in surveys carried out in a large number of countries over the last two decades. The fifth round of this comparative survey, conducted in 2004/2005, was co-funded by the European Commission. Nonetheless, the need stands for an up-to-date survey tailored to the legal and social realities of the EU and its distinct policy interests.

Such a survey was proposed under the European Commission's Action Plan on the *Hague Programme (2004-2009)*, updated in the *Stockholm Action Plan (2010-2014)*, in which the European Commission agrees to develop a comparative victimisation survey to provide data on crime as a supplement to statistics of police recorded crime. Execution of the task has been put in the hands of Eurostat. Proposals for the planned survey were submitted for discussion in the DG JLS *Expert Group on the Policy Needs of Crime and Criminal Justice Statistics*, the Eurostat *Working Group on Crime and Criminal Justice Statistics* and the *Task Force on Victimization Surveys*. HEUNI was contracted to assist in the design a draft questionnaire. In 2009, the Universities of Tilburg (the Netherlands) and Lausanne (Switzerland) were contracted by Eurostat to:

- (a) make an inventory of victimisation surveys that have been conducted in Europe;
- (b) evaluate pilot tests in 17 member states of the draft questionnaire for an EU-wide survey; and
- (c) in the light of (b) and other professional experience, to review the methodological options for a survey in all member states to take place in 2013. The planned survey is now named the *EU Security Survey (or the EU Safety Survey (SASU) or EU-SASU)*.

Alongside this, work was in hand in the United Nations on a *Manual on Victimization Surveys*. This recommends the regular conduct of victimisation surveys as a tool for the planning, monitoring and evaluation of national and local crime prevention and control policies (United Nations, 2010). Within the context of the European Union, a standardised victimisation survey would allow member states with widely divergent criminal laws and criminal justice practices to compare their experiences. This would be in relation to comparative levels of selected crimes (including different forms of violent crime), as well as fear of crime and aspects of policing. In addition, such an EU survey would provide benchmark data on the performance of the police and other agencies *vis à vis* victims of crime as regulated in the Framework Decision of 2002 (and the future Directive on Crime Victims Rights). If repeated over time, the EU survey could provide invaluable information on trends in crime in the member states.

The inventory

The inventory of victimisation surveys conducted in Europe was carried out by the University of Lausanne. It showed that surveys at the national level have been conducted in many of the member states. All member states (except Cyprus) have also taken part once or more in the standardised International Crime Victims Survey (ICVS). In some countries, where national surveys have been repeated many times, they have over the years developed into the most authoritative source of information on trends in common crime and crime-related issues. A revised version of the ICVS was piloted in 2010, with co-funding from the European Commission, in some member states.

The inventory - entitled *Review of the current situation in respect of the collection of survey data on victimisation* - is available as a separate document to this report,

The 17-country pilots evaluation

With funding from the European Commission, a draft questionnaire for an EU victimisation survey, drafted with the assistance of HEUNI, was pilot tested by the statistical authorities in 17 member states in 2009. The main impressions from the pilots were:

- Countries seem to have been reasonably successful in translating the questionnaire and in carrying out a pilot survey with their chosen mode(s).
- There was general consensus that the content of the questionnaire was of considerable interest to respondents.
- In some countries, however, questions on sexual victimisation and other violence (particularly in a domestic setting) as formulated in the initial draft questionnaire were deemed too sensitive for inclusion, in particular for the older respondents, and made the interview too long.

There is a full discussion of the results from the pilots in Chapter 2. What follows here is a synthesis of (a) information on what happened in the pilots; (b) recommendations in the *UN Manual on Victimisation Surveys*; (c) our own professional survey experience; and (d) an emerging consensus in the consultative groups set up by Eurostat mentioned above. From all these, we make recommendations on the methodological options for the SASU regarding key aspects.

Modes of data collection

As shown in Chapter 2, many interview modes were used in the pilots. A majority of countries used CATI. CAPI was also frequently tested. Both modes worked well except that Section G of the existing questionnaire (on sexual and violent victimisation) posed problems in all interview modes.

It is difficult to estimate precisely from the pilots how much response rates varied by interview mode. However, CAPI or PAPI generally achieved higher response than CATI, although CATI responses were reasonably respectable, by and large.

In addition to what happened in the pilots, the following points are important:

- Postal questionnaires are cheaper than both CATI and CAPI, but despite what seems an encouraging pilot in Germany, they seem a high-risk option. CAWI interviews will also be cheap, but how far the SASU should accommodate CAWI interviews needs further testing. The results of the ongoing ICVS-2 pilot (discussed in Chapter 3) are of importance therefore. PAPI interviews will be more expensive than CATI or CAPI.
- In terms of standardisation and data quality, PAPI is inferior to CAPI and CATI, which may be much on a par. Data quality (validity and reliability) in CAWI has yet to be assessed. Response rates are also a problem in CAWI (although agreed panels might be a solution for this).
- Both CATI and CAWI impose limits on questionnaire length if reasonable response rates are to be maintained – no more than 20-24 minutes on average. CAPI and PAPI might allow longer interviews, but costs would rise further.
- Experience in Belgium, Finland and the Netherlands suggests that the use of CAWI in mixed mode interviewing produces higher rates of victimisation and requires reweighting to produce comparable results.

Recommendations: Although full standardisation does not seem feasible at this stage we recommend that the SASU should use the same interview mode as far as possible. CATI seems to best option in cost terms. There was broad – but not total – consensus about this. Some countries may not feel in a position to mount CATI interviews now, but by 2013 the situation may have changed.

Sampling and selection of respondents

There was not a great deal of variation in how samples were selected in the pilots, although a few countries accepted volunteers, and not all samples were of the national population. The pilots were not consistent in the age range of those interviewed either with regard to the lower age limit, and whether there was a cap on elderly respondents. In the majority of pilot surveys, one person per household was interviewed.

The following points are important in considering the SASU:

- For CATI, we recognise that increasing reliance on mobile phones is a problem in many countries which will need to be solved. There is also a potential problem of legal restrictions on random digit dialling. The seriousness of this should be ascertained.
- Experience shows that respondents of 16 years or older are able to answer questions about both household and personal crimes. This justifies the use of a representative sample of persons who are asked about both types of crimes. The sample could be taken either from a national registry of persons, or from a random sample of households from which one member aged 16 or more is randomly selected.

Recommendations: We think that the age range of respondents in the SASU needs to be standardised. We feel those aged 16 or more should be interviewed, but not those younger. We feel there is no strong case for imposing an upper age limit.

We would recommend interviewing only one person in the household about both household and personal crimes. Costs would increase if there were potentially different respondents for household and personal crimes, and response rates might well suffer.

Whether the 'next birthday' or a Kish grid method is used can probably be left to individual countries, taking account of the method they are most used to.

We would not recommend any substitution of the selected respondent, as it will introduce sample bias. Nor do we feel that 'proxy' interviewing should be allowed.

Sample size

The sample sizes in the pilots were modest, with most samples comprising 400 to 700 respondents. It is accepted that the samples in the SASU will need to be substantially larger. This said:

- The choice of sample sizes per country will depend on available resources, and the choice of modes of data collection.
- Sample size will also depend on the margins of error in the key indicators deemed acceptable from a policy perspective at a confidence level of 95%.
- One-year prevalence rates of overall victimisation should be the key indicator required from the SASU. Other key indicators will be one-year victimisation rates by individual crime types.
- The minimum numbers of victimisation incidents about which follow up information can be collected (such as reporting to the police and satisfaction with the police) should also be taken into consideration.

Recommendations: On the basis of costs estimates made by the pilot countries for the various modes, and their likely choice of modes, available resources would allow for sample sizes between 6,000 and 8,000 per member state. Such sample sizes would seem to warrant the production of indicators with acceptable margins of error for the purpose of making reliable comparisons between countries of levels of key crimes and related policy issues, and in trends in crime across countries (if the SASU is periodically repeated with similarly sized samples).

The interview (recall) period and timing of fieldwork

The questionnaire used in the pilots had differing 'recall periods', which was a source of some confusion.

The recall period needs to (a) allow less serious incidents to be remembered; (b) prevent more serious incidents being 'telescoped in'; and (c) provide enough incidents for victims

to describe. An initial 5-year recall period is the best compromise for (b) and (c), with additional information on incidents in the last year. Victimization over a one-year period would be the main measure of comparative risks, although 'last incidents' over the previous five years would be used to collect information on the nature of victimization and experiences with the police.

Recommendations: The proven practice of asking about five-year and 12-month experiences should be retained. Differing recall periods should be avoided across the questionnaire

If the 'last calendar year' is used as the reference period, this would entail fieldwork taking place very early in 2013. As this does not seem feasible in many countries, the next best option is for fieldwork to take place at roughly the same time later in 2013 in all countries. Respondents would be asked about incidents which happened within 12 months of the date of the interview.

Interviewer training, confidentiality and ethics

Strict standards on training, confidentiality and ethics were not laid down in the pilots because of the nature of the exercise. The situation for the SASU, however, would obviously be different. This is especially so in view of the nature of questions about victimization by crime, including that of a sexual or violent nature. Questions about safety measures and gun ownership also require attention in training.

Recommendations: Professionally trained and experienced interviewers should be used in the 2013 SASU. They also need to be specifically trained about the nature of the survey.

All elements of standard training should be maintained as regards conducting interviews efficiently, accurately, and with due regard to the respondent. But elements of training will need to be focussed on the SASU specifically – particularly with regard to questions on sexual victimization and other violence and the conditions under which questions are asked about this.

A training video might be well worth considering – to save countries effort, and to ensure consistent training. Active training for the SASU might also be useful including role-playings, simulations, and group discussions.

Agencies should adhere to strict procedures as regards the security of data, especially micro data traceable to individual respondents. Interviewers should also abide by strict rules for maintaining the confidentiality of information given to them

Interviewers need to be able to access support for themselves in the event of stressful interviews. A debriefing exercise would be useful after a set number of interviews have been completed.

Respondents must not feel overly pressurised into agreeing to an interview, should be treated respectfully and have every confidence that the information they give will be anonymous and confidential. Procedures should be in place so that respondents can be referred onto a support agency if this seems appropriate.

Time limit for data transmission

Recommendations: Results from the SASU need to be timely for optimal policy impact. However, further consideration needs to be given to how long countries should be given to produce 'top line' final results, taking into account the need for these to be based on fully validated data and consistent analysis processes.

The revised questionnaire

After the pilots, a revised version of the questionnaire was designed in consultation with the *Expert Group on the Policy Needs of Crime and Criminal Justice Statistics*, and with the *Working Group on Crime Statistics* and the *Task Force on Victimisation*. In the new questionnaire, the questions on violence in Section G of the piloted questionnaire have been curtailed, as have the questions on feelings of safety and security measures.

Further reductions were made in other parts of the questionnaire in accordance with the outcome of a structured consultation with the *Expert Group* on policy priorities. Screeners on less serious types of crime such as vandalism and threats were deleted. The current questionnaire is estimated to take a little over 20 minutes of interview time on average. At the request of the *Task Force*, two sets of the screener questions on violence have been designed, one consisting of four questions and one of six (with extra screening questions on violence by partners or ex-partners).

We do not feel it is feasible to prepare a 'mode neutral' questionnaire. What CAPI and CATI can cope with will be hard to deliver in a paper questionnaire. A paper version of the questionnaire will need special attention.

Recommendation: It would seem advisable to carry out a further round of pilot tests with the revised questionnaire, including the alternative approaches to the screeners (and follow-up questions) on violent victimisation.

Further tests should also address possible effects of the use of different modes of data collection on victimisation rates and the need for possibly reweighting results.

Given that the SASU questionnaire has been drafted in English, careful attention should be given to the translation of key concepts, preferably with back translation, particularly of the screener questions.

1 INTRODUCTION

In December 2008, the University of Tilburg in collaboration with the University of Lausanne was contracted by Eurostat to investigate the development of a victimisation survey for member states.¹ The universities formed a consortium to carry out the work. This comprised Prof Jan Van Dijk, Prof Marcelo Aebi, John van Kesteren, and Antonia Linde. From September 2009 onwards Pat Mayhew joined the consortium.

In the course of the project, several interim reports were submitted to Eurostat which were discussed at meetings of the Eurostat *Working Group on Crime and Criminal Justice Statistics*, the *Task Force on Victimisation Surveys*, and the DG JLS *Expert Group on the Policy Needs of Crime and Criminal Justice Statistics*.

This final report addresses the tasks we were asked to do. These were:

- i. To assess the current situation with respect to the collection of survey data on victimisation in Europe. The inventory is available as a separate document to this report. It is entitled *Review of the current situation in respect of the collection of survey data on victimization*. A summary of main conclusions is given in Section 1.2 below.
- ii. To report on the results of pilot surveys in 17 countries undertaken to develop a victimisation module for member states, using a questionnaire developed by the *Task Force* with the assistance of HEUNI.^{2, 3} The key results are discussed in Chapter 2.
- iii. To produce a questionnaire suitable for a victimisation survey in the European Union, drawing on experience with the initial questionnaire. The questionnaire is discussed in Chapter 5. A full version is presented in Annex B.
- iv. To provide an overall review of the options for a final victimisation study in the European Union. This is discussed in Chapter 4.

Before dealing with the tasks we were set, it is worth reviewing briefly the purposes of victimisation surveys, and how these relate to the policy objectives of a European victimisation survey.

1.1 THE POLICY OBJECTIVES OF AN EU SURVEY OF VICTIMISATION

The origin of an EU-wide survey was the *Hague Programme (2004-2009)*, updated in the *Stockholm Action Plan (2010-2014)*. In this, the Council of Ministers requested the European Commission to develop a set of comparative crime statistics for member states. In the framework of the subsequent *Action Plan*, preparatory work was done to

1 Contract number -11002.2008.002-2008.711

2 Grant 38400.2005.002-2006.052.

3 A formal report was delivered in December 2009, although it omitted results from some countries which started fieldwork later than others. These are now incorporated, together with comments that arose during and after a meeting of the *Working Group* in February 2010, and during and after a meeting of the *Task Force* in April 2010.

design a comparative victimisation survey that could supplement police figures of recorded crime (Aromaa *et al.*, 2007).

The strengths of crime victimisation surveys

Crime victimisation surveys were initially launched to measure the 'true volume of crime' - i.e., including crimes not reported to the police, and reported crimes which may not be recorded by the police. With time, however, it became clear that although surveys can reveal crimes unrecorded by the police, estimating the 'true volume of crime' still remained difficult with survey techniques (see Lynch, 2008 for a full discussion). Instead, the value of victimisation surveys became to be seen as twofold. First, they had an intrinsic capacity to bring into focus the extent of crime problems that affect and trouble ordinary citizens most often – which was of obvious policy use. Secondly, if surveys were conducted at regular intervals with the same methodology, they had the capacity to estimate changes in levels of crime over time; the same went for trend measurement of fear of crime and confidence in (components of) the criminal justice system.

In countries where crime trend data from surveys has been available, they have often shown a different picture from police figures (Lynch & Addington, 2007; Van Dijk, 2009). Analyses have demonstrated that when recorded crime has increased (or decreased), it could be largely driven by changes in reporting patterns, and / or changes in police recording. Independent measures of crime trends from victimisation surveys, therefore, came into their own.

Both media exposure and the policy impact of victimisation surveys have been most pronounced in countries where surveys have been conducted annually or bi-annually for some time. For example, in the UK and the Netherlands, the national surveys have produced trend data on crime for over twenty years, and they are now generally recognised as the most authoritative source on trends in volume crime (see Hough & Maxfield, 2007). Such repeated surveys have had considerable impact on policy making - for example by focussing attention on the high costs of less serious volume crime (e.g., thefts from vehicles, household burglary, and minor street violence). Surveys in Italy, France and the UK, for example, have also drawn attention to the problems of violent crime between intimates.

Victimisation surveys as a way of measuring crime in different countries

If the same questionnaire and methodology is used, crime surveys can also produce estimates of crime levels which are comparable across countries, as the *Stockholm Action Plan* envisaged (see Mayhew & van Dijk, forthcoming). Crime problems can be defined in colloquial language that reflects the perceptions of ordinary people, regardless of how offences are technically defined in national criminal codes. Moreover, repeated standardised surveys can produce change estimates which are comparable across countries. Results can be used to benchmark the impact of crime control policies on trends in crime, crime reporting by victims, and police recording. This has pertinence for the EU.

Why an EU crime victimisation survey is needed

As member states have different criminal codes and systems of policing and criminal justice, the notion of 'Uniform Crime Statistics' for Europe seems unlikely in the near future. Current police figures across Europe are problematic.⁴ Some of the difference between them are due to criminal codes (e.g., as regards minor thefts); others are due to different recording rules (e.g. concerning serial victimisation). Further difficulties in comparing police statistics arise because of differences in rates of reporting to the police. These tend to be lower, for instance, in new member states - perhaps because of less confidence in the capacity of the police to investigate crime reports (Van Dijk *et al.*, 2007).

One implication of these empirical observations is that improved performance of police forces and justice institutions in new member states will result in increases in recorded crimes – independent of the actual volume of crime. Thus, a programme of repeated victimisation surveys seems important not least to prevent erroneous conclusions about trends in crime in the new member states of the Union.

New member states aside, a key strength of a repeated EU victimisation survey would be its capacity to produce estimates of change in 'volume crime' affecting ordinary households across all jurisdictions. Such a programme would allow member states to benchmark their national crime trends against those of selected other member states, and to determine whether national policies are effective in relative terms. A programme of European surveys would also allow European institutions to allocate funds for crime prevention and control according to reliable, comparative information on trends in overall volume crime, fear of crime, and trust in the institutions (*cf.* the UN *Manual on Victimisation Surveys*).

Monitoring police performance and victim services

The EU has become more involved in the harmonisation of policies and practices in several areas of security and justice. Specifically, the European Council adopted in 2002 a *Framework Decision on the Position of the Victim in Criminal Procedure* which will now be upgraded into a Directive. This legally binding instrument introduces obligations on member states as to how victims reporting crimes to the police are treated, including the provision of specialised support for victims of crime.

From this perspective, an important secondary objective of an EU survey is the collection of comparable data on how far police forces are complying with European standards for police performance regarding victims. Of special interest in an EU survey would be questions on the impact of crimes on victims, level of reporting to the police, victims' satisfaction with their treatment by the police, their reasons for dissatisfaction, and the provision and demand for specialised victim support services. Given the policy usefulness of this information, it can be noted that sample sizes per country should be set with a view to identifying sufficient numbers of victims who have reported crimes to the police last year (or in recent years).

⁴ For instance, the *European Sourcebook* shows that per capita rates of police recorded crimes in new member states are less than a quarter of the rates in countries like Sweden and Finland.

1.2 THE INVENTORY OF SURVEY DATA ON VICTIMISATION

The report by Prof. Marcelo Aebi and Antonia Linde was a far-reaching review of large number of victimisation surveys, updating information collected by UNECE/UNODC. It reviews the evolution of surveys in the EU, and presents the situation in mid 2009 with respect to surveys that have been, or are being done in the 27 member states. The review covers national surveys, academic/research studies, pilot exercises, and international surveys.⁵

The review shows that:

- There has been a considerable number of victimisation surveys carried out.
- Some surveys have been on an ad-hoc basis; some are conducted on a regular footing. Outside the context of the ICVS, twelve countries and one region (Catalonia) have conducted periodic surveys. A further eleven countries have conducted periodic surveys.
- Coverage of victimisation is sometimes included in multipurpose surveys.
- Many surveys are national, but some are at local level.
- Sample sizes have differed, as has mode of administration. Response rates have varied.
- The main European and international surveys identified were the ICVS, the EU-ICS, the ICBS / ICCS, Eurobarometer, ICVS-2, and FRA's EU-Midis European Union Minorities and Discrimination Survey (EU-Midis).

1.3 MODES OF INTERVIEW

The interview modes used in the surveys covered in the inventory differed considerably, although 19 of the 27 member states had used Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI) as a mode of interviewing in at least one survey, and twelve countries had used face-to-face interviewing. This Chapter ends by briefly considering interview mode as it features large in any discussion on an EU-wide victimisation survey.

The mode of interviewing in victimisation surveys has changed somewhat over time. Face-to-face interviewing was the 'gold standard' in the early days, partly because of higher response rates, and partly because of incomplete telephone penetration. Telephone interviewing is now more common because it is cheaper, and according to tests does not pose problems even with respect to sensitive questions. (Indeed, tests for the Canadian *Violence against Women Survey* showed CATI to be the best option, perhaps because there is more distance between interviewer and respondent (Smith, 1989)). Telephone interviews are now usually done through CATI, whereby the questionnaire is programmed into a computer which the interviewer uses to enter responses. In developed countries where face-to-face interviews are still done, the

⁵ It takes into account the documentation of existing surveys by the UNECE/UNODC Task Force, the study conducted for Eurostat by HEUNI in 2007, and the publications produced by the CRIMPREV Network.

interviewer now generally uses a laptop into which the questionnaire is again programmed – a procedure called Computer Assisted Personal Interviewing CAPI. A few countries still use non-computer aided methods - so-called Paper-and Pencil Interviewing (PAPI). These carry extra data-processing costs and the risk of errors.

A by-product of CAPI is the potential to allow respondents to use the computer themselves to answer questions of a sensitive nature – a technique known as Computer Assisted Self Interviewing (CASI). CASI imposes some limits on the complexity of questions that can be asked, but has nonetheless proved valuable, particularly in increasing the level of sexual and domestic violence revealed.

Mail surveys have generally decreased in popularity over time. Their chief benefit is that there are relatively cheap. There are three main disadvantages however. First, they rarely achieve high response rates, and there are questions about the representativeness of those who do respond. The second problem - particularly pertinent in a victimisation survey - is that respondents have to cope with a complicated set of routings, depending on their victimisation status. Thirdly, respondents often ignore instructions or make mistakes in answering questions in the way they are asked to.

With increasing internet use, Computer Assisted Web Interviewing (CAWI) clearly provides a window of opportunity for surveys in the future, particularly in terms of cost. To date, CAWI has not been much used in victimisation surveys, although we return to some tests later.

2 KEY RESULTS OF THE 17-COUNTRY PILOTS

2.1 INTRODUCTION

At the invitation of Eurostat, statistical agencies in 17 member states agreed to mount pilot surveys to test a questionnaire measuring victimisation experience that was developed by the *Task Force* with the assistance of HEUNI. Most of the surveys were carried out in 2009, although a few were later in the field than others. Results from all pilots have been incorporated here.⁶ The fieldwork for twelve of the pilot surveys was done by the national statistics office. Four pilot surveys were done by polling companies. The majority worked with permanent and experienced staff. Slovenia and Cyprus recruited students from social sciences. Sample sizes ranged from 169 and 200 (Latvia and Slovak Republic) to over 5,000 (Finland). Most pilots used sample sizes of between 400 and 700 respondents.

The agencies contracted by Eurostat were asked to report on (a) the translation of the English questionnaire; (b) their approach to the field survey, including a cognitive testing of the questionnaire; and (c) their experiences with the survey in the field. The country reports were analysed by our consortium. The reports varied significantly in length and the detail provided, but by and large they seemed to meet the formal requirements.⁷

Our analysis of the country reports on the pilot surveys started by focussing on type of information provided. This resulted in the design of a matrix with 23 key categories of information that seemed of importance. Our team then checked whether information on the 23 categories was available. This was not the case in all reports. We also noted some inconsistencies in some of the reports. To address inconsistencies and missing information, we sent messages electronically to contact persons on 18th November 2009, inviting responses by 1st December 2009. We asked for the additional information we needed (for instance, on response rates according to mode of interview). We also asked all contact persons to provide us with an estimate of the cost of a dedicated survey lasting 20 minutes per interview on average with a net sample size of 4,000 respondents. Most countries reported in due time. The additional information they sent is incorporated into this report. The results on costings are discussed in Section 2.11.

Country information on the 23 information categories is summarised in Tables A.1 to A7 in Annex A.

2.2 MAIN IMPRESSIONS ABOUT THE QUESTIONNAIRE

There was general consensus that the content of the questionnaire was of considerable interest to respondents. In some countries, questions on sexual and non-sexual violence in a domestic setting as formulated in the piloted questionnaire were deemed too sensitive for inclusion, in particular for the older respondents. By and large, interviewers in all countries faced no other major difficulties in administering the questionnaire.

6 An interim report on the results of the pilots was discussed at the meeting of the *Working Group* in February 2010. Some participants at that meeting sent in written comments afterwards. Both the *Working Group* discussion, as well as subsequent comments have been reflected as appropriate.

7 Not a great deal was said about translation, although certain comments were made about translating specific terms when the questionnaire was reviewed by countries section by section.

That said, the pilot experience indicated that there were a number of areas that were judged problematic and/or requiring more work. The main criticisms of the questionnaire were as follows:

- Virtually all countries felt the questionnaire was too long and in parts too detailed. This was most often noted in relation to questions on violence and security perceptions, and in relation to the follow-up questions concerning the victimisations that respondents reported.
- Many countries reported difficulties with the fact that respondents were asked about their various experiences of victimisation with different time frames. (For most crimes, the questionnaire applied a five-year reference period, with a follow-up question about 'the last year'. Other items asked about experiences in the last 12 months; yet others ask about experiences since the age of 15. Nine of the country reports mentioned specifically that 'recall periods' needed to be standardised.
- Some questions were felt to overlap and / or repeat each other, both within and across sections.⁸
- Eight of the country reports mentioned that the phrasing of some questions seemed awkward or poorly formulated (in the sense that they were difficult to understand). In some cases the interviewers improvised in rephrasing the questions into more 'common' language to improve fluency.
- It was not always clear to the interviewer which of the text was a question to be put to the respondent, and which was an instruction or comment to the interviewer.
- It was also felt that it was not always clear whether the response categories were to be read out. Some countries also remarked that the list of response categories to choose from was too long. Some countries suggested that the questions where this applied needed to be simplified, or broken down into sub-questions.
- Several countries felt that response categories need to be consistently completed with 'Don't know' and 'Refusal' options that are not to be read out to the respondent. (Some countries recommended the use of showcards to help the respondents, although of course this is only an option in face-to-face interviewing.)
- Several countries felt that the questionnaire would be improved if its different sections had a short introduction so that the respondent could anticipate what was coming.
- A final general observation on the questionnaire from some countries was that it was not clear enough which member of the household was to be interviewed and how the concepts of household or family were defined.

⁸ A majority of the reports mentioned that there was overlap between Section D (details about victimisation) and Section G (violence and sexual crimes). Repetition an overlap was also observed within Section G.

General recommendations about the questionnaire in the light of the pilots

Based on the assessments made by 17 pilot countries, we recommend the following concerning the questionnaire:⁹

- The questionnaire needed to be shortened and restructured so that there was less overlap and repetition.
- The phrasing of some questions and their response categories needed to be simplified.
- Time frames as regards victimisation experience needed to be more consistent.
- For all questions, the response categories should be included in the question when they were to be read out.

The response categories needed to be completed with “Don’t know” options and “Refusal” when appropriate.

- Precise instructions are needed as to who is the ‘eligible respondent’ from within the household.

2.3 SECTION A: PERSONAL AND HOUSEHOLD INFORMATION

A number of the pilot surveys were conducted using a set of questions relating to personal and household information that were country specific. These were generally sets of questions that national agencies had in general use. For international comparisons, however, it is preferable to use a standardised set of questions. In this case, these should be questions adopted by Eurostat. A handful of countries endorsed this specifically.

The personal and household information that is collected falls into two types. The first is information necessary to conduct the interview and to evaluate the quality of the sampling. The second type of question is included to analyse relationships between victimisation and other characteristics. Quite a number of the reports mentioned that some of the second set of questions was regarded by some respondents as sensitive or a breach of privacy. To avoid refusals, the second group of questions would be better moved towards the end of the questionnaire.¹⁰

Recommendations about personal and household information in the light of the pilots

Based on the views of the pilot countries, we recommend the following in relation to personal and household information.

⁹ More detailed information on each of the sections is, as said, available on request. Also, all country reports on which this report is based are available on the CIRCA website.

¹⁰ Four of the country reports explicitly mentioned this.

Personal and household information needs to be standardised and it seems advisable to adopt the standardised set of questions from the European Module on Core Social Variables.

Information that is not required to conduct the interview and/or to evaluate the quality of the sample needs to be moved to the end of the questionnaire.

2.4 SECTION B: FEELING OF SAFETY AND WORRIES ABOUT CRIME

There were 16 questions on feeling of safety and worries about crime. This was judged to be rather excessive, and some countries recommended a significant shortening of Section B.

There were few other comments about Section B, but what was mainly mentioned was that the response categories were inconsistent - the number of responses to choose from varied, and some response categories ran from positive to negative, while others were the other way round. Respondents indicated that they found this confusing. A number of the questions also overlapped, and there did not seem to be a logical structure.

Recommendations about feelings of safety and worry about crime

Based on the views of the pilot countries, we recommended that:

Section B could be much shorter. There seems to be a need to assess first the primary topics of interest, and then to select questions thereafter.

There should be consistency in how the questions are phrased and in how response categories are ordered.

2.5 SECTION C: VICTIMISATION SCREENERS

Section C had a set of screening questions asking about a number of crimes. (Sexual and violent crimes - other than robbery - were excluded because they were placed in a separate Section G). If respondents replied affirmatively, they were then immediately asked four follow-up questions about when the crime occurred and how often. More detailed questions about the circumstances of what happened were asked in Section D of the questionnaire.

This approach differs somewhat from what is common in victimisation surveys. In these, there is a 'short screener' approach where respondents are first screened for all types of victimisation and only those answering affirmatively are asked at a later point for details of what happened. This approach aims to avoid the proven phenomenon that respondents who have been subject to victimisation in relation to several types of crime do not report other victimisations in order to avoid follow-up questions (a so-called 'ceiling effect').

Questions about vehicle theft were preceded by questions on ownership or availability of vehicles in the household. Cognitive testing showed that 'having private use of a car', for instance, was unclear, as was the time at which the 'number of cars' should be measured. In 'live conditions', however, respondents did not seem to have the same problems.

Some country reports questioned whether the list of crimes is complete. (For example, it was noted that respondents were asked about attempted burglary, but not about attempts in relation to other types of crime; thefts of motorcycles were asked about, but not thefts *from* a motorcycle).¹¹ A suggestion from Poland was that it would be preferable to ask about more crimes with fewer details.

There were also a few suggestions for including non-physical violence such as threats, 'insults' and 'mobbing'. There was also a bid made for covering victimisation while on vacation or abroad. Finally, one report made the case for a question about victimisation by 'any other crime' (and, if yes, what crime).

Recommendations about victimisation screeners

It seems to us advisable in relation to Section C to opt for the usual 'short screener' approach. Importantly, this would also mean moving the questions on 'when' and 'how often' to Section D of the questionnaire.

Consideration might be given to including questions on other forms of victimisation (e.g., threats and vandalism). However, time constraints should be seriously considered.

2.6 SECTION D: VICTIM FORM ABOUT VICTIMISATION DETAILS

Section D contained a standardised block of questions asking about the victimisation experience. Many pilot reports mentioned that Section D was too detailed. They noted that not all questions were applicable to each type of crime. They also noted that for some crimes, questions were repeated.¹² Sweden made the point in a written comment that the decision on the number and type of follow-up questions on the detail of victimisation incidents was best made when final sample sizes were agreed, and the likely number of victims known.

Recommendations about victimisation details

Taking account of the views of the pilot countries, we recommended for Section D that:

Instead of a universal Section D, it would be better to devise sets of questions that are more specific to each type of crime, although maintaining some consistency in coverage if this is appropriate. This means creating sub-sections within Section D for each type of crime. This would make it possible to decide for each type of crime what details are relevant (and to avoid asking, for example, the value of the stolen property in case of bicycle theft).

There needs to be careful consideration of which details of the victimisation incident are sought and which are not. Questions should only be considered for inclusion if they are (a) interesting for international comparison; and (b) likely to yield a sufficient number of responses to ensure reasonable reliability margins.

¹¹ Countries in southern Europe felt that 'theft of a bicycle' could be omitted, but 'car-jacking' included.

¹² Poland argued that many of the details are relatively constant over time and need not be included in each round of what hopefully will be a regular survey.

2.7 SECTION E: 'NON-CONVENTIONAL' CRIMES, INCLUDING E-CRIMES

Section E covered consumer fraud (goods / services); bribery; phishing; identity fraud; and computer-related offences. We have labelled these here as 'non-conventional' crimes. The country reports noted that questions on non-conventional crimes were sometimes confusing. Some technical terms were used (like phishing) which were not understood by respondents and some of the crimes overlapped. In many cases, the number of victims was very small.

Recommendations about 'non-conventional' crimes

Taking account of the views of the pilot countries, our recommendations are that:

Some questions on e-crime need to be retained. This is, for one, because some respondents will expect this from a survey on 'crime'. (If excluded, some respondents might also report them under other categories of theft.) In addition, the interrelations between victimisation by e-crime and common acquisitive and violent crimes seem interesting.

However, we feel that a victimisation survey module for use in EU member states should not seek to measure a broad range of specific e-crimes. One reason for this is that the nature of e-crimes is constantly changing. Also, this topic is covered in other Eurostat surveys. In sum, Section E needs to be revisited and curtailed.

2.8 SECTION F: OTHER SAFETY ISSUES

Section F dealt with crime prevention measures, as well as with gun ownership. Questions on preventive measures were regarded by some respondents with suspicion (e.g., whether they had a burglar alarm). Opinions about the crime prevention activities of the police were seen as lacking. One report mentioned that ownership of guns for defensive purposes is a 'criminal offence' and should not be included in a victimisation survey.

Recommendations about other safety issues

We would recommend that the number of questions on crime prevention measures is reduced, but that there are further questions on perceptions of police performance for all respondents.

2.9 SECTION G: SEXUAL AND VIOLENT CRIMES

In our view, the most important problem emerging from the country pilots relates to the Section G. This was developed to provide fuller and more detailed information on sexual crimes and violence by partners, acquaintances and strangers, compared to a general victimisation survey. Under the fieldwork conditions of the pilots, Section G proved to be problematic in several respects, and several countries chose to alter its administration.¹³

¹³ Fourteen of the pilots included Section G for the whole sample, although Spain and Finland reorganised this part of the questionnaire. In five of the pilots, Section G was presented in CASI mode with help from the interviewer if needed. In Denmark, Section G used CAWI. Finland reported that respondents had difficulties with CASI for Section G and preferred being interviewed orally.

The main problems with Section G were:

- First, the section was disproportionately long. (On average, it consumed one-third of the time that the surveys took to complete.) The length of Section G posed a particular problem for pilots using the Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI). A number of pilots decided to use this part of the questionnaire only in case of face-to-face interviewing, not when CATI was used.
- Secondly, in many countries, Section G proved very sensitive for some respondents (and to a degree for interviewers). This caused a comparatively high level of Section G refusals. Section G also provoked a number of complaints from respondents (even if they may have agreed to answer the questions). A number of country reports suggested that domestic violence should be dealt with in a dedicated survey rather than a general survey on victimisation by crime.
- Thirdly, the follow-up questions on sexual and other violent victimisation had low responses as many respondents did not feel qualified to answer.
- Finally, the format of the questions in Section G was felt to be repetitive, and in many respects confusing.¹⁴ Respondents were asked for 'life-time' experiences (albeit from age 15). This was considered by many of the older respondents to be difficult.

Recommendations about sexual and violent crimes

As the majority view seems to be that Section G be shortened considerably, if not left out altogether, our recommendations are as follows:

Section G should be dropped as it is currently formulated. Instead, there should be broad screeners for sexual and violent victimisation, which should go in Section C, with follow-up questions in Section D.

For the sexual and violent victimisation screeners, we recommend a five-year reference period, with a follow-up question to establish incidents that happened in the last year.

Additional screeners or prompters could be included to help respondents focus on domestic violence and other violence by acquaintances.

The follow-up questions should be reduced significantly. Only questions that give sufficient number of responses given the sample size should be included.

2.10 APPLIED METHODOLOGIES

The questionnaire to be used in the pilots was standardised, and a primary goal of the surveys was to test the questionnaire in the field using different interview modes. However, no requirements were imposed concerning the mode of interviewing, and only Finland mounted a direct, experimental test of different interviewing modes. Nor were any

¹⁴ Analysis of responses in the German pilot suggested that respondents were replying about the same incidents to different questions on different types of domestic violence.

requirements laid down as regards sampling design or the organisation of fieldwork. As a result, the applied methodologies show considerable variation.

This section deals with the response rates achieved in the pilots, the mode of interviewing used, and the age range of respondents. Some other issues from the pilot surveys – for instance to do with sampling frames, respondent choice about mode of interviewing, interviewer training in the pilots - are taken up in Chapter 4.

Mode of interview

In the pilots, most countries used CATI, CAPI, PAPI or a combination of these. In 13 countries, interviews were conducted totally or partly with CATI. In six countries, all or some interviews were conducted with PAPI. In five countries, all or some interviews were conducted with CAPI. For Section G, self-completion PAPI was sometimes used, and CASI in two of the pilots. In Germany, the main pilot was a postal survey. Finland and Denmark also used CAWI.

Finland

Finland carried out a multi-mode survey which deserves attention. First, a random sample from the population registry was taken. Each respondent was then assigned to one of three survey modes: (i) CAPI; (ii) CATI, or (iii) CAWI. The CAWI sample had the lowest response rate, but a significantly higher victimisation rate, a point returned to in Chapter 4.

Response rates

It is difficult to conclude much about whether response rates varied markedly according to mode. There were differences in procedures for contacting and re-contacting respondents for one. There was also variability in response rates among countries using the same mode.

In the nine countries using CATI, response rates were 40% or higher in Austria, Denmark, Finland¹⁵ Italy, Latvia, Slovakia and Sweden. Lower rates were achieved in Catalonia (10%), and Poland (22%). Compared to response rates in other victimisation surveys, including the ICVS-2 pilots, these rates are comparatively high, with the exception of Catalonia.¹⁶

Pilot studies carried out with CAPI or PAPI reported fairly high response rates: Catalonia (41%), Cyprus (89%) and Latvia (67%). The Czech Republic reported a combined response rate of 69% for a mixed mode pilot. Germany achieved a fairly high response rate of 49% with its postal survey, distributed to a panel of households agreeing to participate in surveys, with an incentive.¹⁷

15 In Finland, the response rate was 75% when households without telephone were deducted from the gross sample. The response rate was 62% if they were included.

16 Twelve of the pilots used an advance letter to sampled households; two did not. One survey with an 'intent selection' sample provided no information about the survey beforehand. An advance letter in Catalonia was only sent to respondents on a population register outside Barcelona. The use of advance letters is shown in Table A.4 in Annex A.

17 Austria, who used CATI and CAPI, also gave a €25 incentive to every respondent who participated.

By and large, the response rates of the pilots were encouraging. Hard refusals were observed in only a limited number of cases. Lithuania and Spain noted a relatively high number of refusals to Section G. Finland reported a relatively low response rate for Computer Assisted Web-based Interviewing (CAWI) - 24%.

Re-contacting

For assessing response rates, it is important to know how many attempts were made to reach a respondent. Different strategies were applied in the pilot surveys (see Table A.4 in Annex A). For surveys using CATI it is relatively easy to schedule new attempts; six to eight attempts was normal. For the face-to-face interviews, the number of attempts to re-contact selected respondents was between two and six. In the majority of the face-to-face surveys, non-reachable respondents were replaced by other household members.¹⁸

Random contacting or random sampling

All in all, the pilots where the sample was drawn from the population registry, after which the respondent was contacted, were more successful with regard to response rates than samples where the contact method was random (as is the case with random digit dialling for CATI, and a random walk for face to face interviewing).

Age limits

The pilots did not show consistency in the age range of those interviewed. Seven pilots interviewed only respondents aged 18 years or older. One pilot interviewed those aged 13 years or older; Italy started at age 14. Six pilots had a minimum age of 15 or 16. Spain worked with a minimum age of 18 for Section G. Seven pilots had no upper age restriction, but in six no-one was interviewed above the age of 64 or 75. Sweden set the limit at 79. For a few countries the age restrictions were not documented. Section G had upper and lower age limit in most pilots (Spain for instance worked with a minimum age of 18); some countries also proposed age limits for Section G.

2.11 ASSESSMENT OF COSTS

An additional piece of information we asked for from the participating countries was an estimate of the cost of a survey using different modes, with interviews lasting a maximum of 20 minutes with a net sample of 4,000 respondents. Most countries responded with estimates at 2009 prices. For countries that did not respond or participate in the pilot projects, we made estimates based on what a 'similar' country in the same region estimated.

The prices per completed interview and the prices for a survey with N=4,000 are in Table 1 below. The estimates given by the Czech Republic and Hungary seem to be on the low side. The cost for face-to-face interviewing in some countries in the north-west of Europe (and Austria) is based on the estimate provided by Sweden only. The cost of face-to-face interviewing could be up to €50 per interview higher than mentioned here. The result is that an interview by telephone will cost between €25 - €50 in the European Union on average and for face-to-face interviewing between €65 and €75 per completed interview on average.

¹⁸ Four reports did not mention the re-contacting and replacement protocols.

Table 1 Estimated cost of EU survey in different modes

Estimated cost of EU survey: per interview and sample of N=4,000 (italics are estimates)

	CAPI	CATI	CAPI	CATI
	<i>€ Price per interview</i>		<i>€ Price for N=4,000 sample</i>	
Austria	<i>100</i>	<i>40</i>	<i>400,000</i>	<i>160,000</i>
Cyprus	<i>45</i>	<i>20</i>	<i>180,000</i>	<i>80,000</i>
Czech	<i>7.5</i>	<i>7.5</i>	<i>30,000</i>	<i>30,000</i>
Denmark	<i>100</i>	<i>40</i>	<i>400,000</i>	<i>160,000</i>
Finland*	<i>150</i>	<i>85</i>	<i>600,000</i>	<i>340,000</i>
Germany	<i>100</i>	<i>40</i>	<i>400,000</i>	<i>160,000</i>
Hungary	<i>8</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>32,000</i>	<i>32,000</i>
Italy	<i>70</i>	<i>25</i>	<i>280,000</i>	<i>100,000</i>
Latvia	<i>27</i>	<i>18</i>	<i>108,000</i>	<i>72,000</i>
Lithuania	<i>22</i>	<i>14</i>	<i>88,000</i>	<i>56,000</i>
Poland	<i>62</i>	<i>20</i>	<i>248,000</i>	<i>80,000</i>
Portugal	<i>80</i>	<i>16</i>	<i>320,000</i>	<i>64,000</i>
Slovak Rep	<i>50</i>	<i>25</i>	<i>200,000</i>	<i>100,000</i>
Slovenia	<i>50</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>200,000</i>	<i>24,000</i>
Spain	<i>80</i>	<i>16</i>	<i>320,000</i>	<i>64,000</i>
Sweden	<i>100</i>	<i>40</i>	<i>400,000</i>	<i>160,000</i>
Ireland	<i>100</i>	<i>40</i>	<i>400,000</i>	<i>160,000</i>
UK	<i>100</i>	<i>40</i>	<i>400,000</i>	<i>160,000</i>
Netherlands	<i>100</i>	<i>40</i>	<i>400,000</i>	<i>160,000</i>
Belgium	<i>100</i>	<i>40</i>	<i>400,000</i>	<i>160,000</i>
Luxembourg	<i>100</i>	<i>40</i>	<i>400,000</i>	<i>160,000</i>
France	<i>100</i>	<i>40</i>	<i>400,000</i>	<i>160,000</i>
Bulgaria	<i>50</i>	<i>20</i>	<i>200,000</i>	<i>80,000</i>
Romania	<i>50</i>	<i>20</i>	<i>200,000</i>	<i>80,000</i>
Estonia	<i>24.5</i>	<i>16</i>	<i>98,000</i>	<i>64,000</i>
Greece	<i>50</i>	<i>20</i>	<i>200,000</i>	<i>80,000</i>
Malta	<i>40</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>160,000</i>	<i>60,000</i>
Average cost	67	26		
Total for 27 surveys with N=4000			7,464,000	3,006,000

* Finland. Based on current questionnaire. If final questionnaire is shorter, price will be lower.

2.12 THE COUNTRIES' OVERALL EVALUATION OF THE PILOTS

We draw together here the countries overall evaluation of their pilot survey. It discusses what they felt about the salience of the survey, whether they felt that implementing an EU victimisation survey would be feasible in their country (and under what conditions), and

what they felt was most likely to impede the successful execution of an EU survey programme. In summary, the main conclusions we draw are that:

- a) Most countries felt that an EU survey programme on crime would be valuable and seen as salient.
- b) Most countries who expressed a view also felt that a survey in their country would be feasible - although several countries had strong reservations about the questionnaire.
- c) There was broad consensus that the tested questionnaire was too long. Section G on sexual and violent victimisation was a major concern.
- d) It seems unlikely that a fully standardised survey, as regards interview mode, could be mounted in all EU member states. This point is discussed more fully in Chapter 4.

Value and salience

More than half of the country reports that addressed the value of the survey were very positive about its focus and coverage. Cyprus was especially enthusiastic about the survey, never having done one of their own before. Some reports suggested that a similar survey ought to be conducted on school premises (covering the theme of violence in schools).

Three reports did not mention how respondents responded to the survey itself, the subject matter, or the questions. The remainder of the reports were mainly neutral rather than negative – and where countries were neutral, this stemmed more from difficulties with the current instrument rather than the survey itself.

Some reports sounded a negative note in terms of both interviewers and respondents getting annoyed by repetitive aspects of the questionnaire, and by its length. One report (from Slovakia) was especially negative, particularly on the Section G: “Many respondents were significantly disgusted and disappointed”. The Hungarian report mentioned that some of the ‘crimes’ were not really crimes in a formal sense and thus the survey was dealing in part with trivial incidents of no concern to respondents. This comment should probably be interpreted in its specific national context since Hungary is one of the countries where minor thefts are regarded as administrative misdemeanours rather than criminal offences.

Feasibility

Nine reports did not express an explicit position on the issue of overall feasibility. For the rest, they considered a survey in their country would be feasible (and well-received) but only if the questionnaire was improved. Some countries also felt feasibility would depend on interview mode – which is taken up in Chapter 4.

While problems were identified with some aspects of the pilot surveys, then, it is nonetheless the case that most countries seem to have been reasonably successful in carrying them out. This in itself testifies to the feasibility of a comparative survey in the

EU regions. The ICVS, of course, has also demonstrated the feasibility of a survey-based comparative approach.

Questionnaire

Section 2.2 above dealt in detail with the tested questionnaire which was seen as problematic in terms of length, the approach taken to the measurement of sexual and violence victimisation, and some other issues which have been discussed (such as overlap, and inconsistent reference periods). Our proposals for a revised questionnaire are taken up in Chapter 5.

Endnote: sustainability

Chapter 1 laid out two of the main merits of an EU-wide victimisation surveys. The first was being able to provide comparative information on levels of crime affecting ordinary people in different EU countries as an alternative to problematic comparisons based on police figures. The second was the possibility of assessing survey-based trends in crime if standardised surveys are repeated over time.

Mounting an EU survey programme in 2013 as announced in the *Stockholm Action Plan* will be expensive and time-consuming. Financial and human resources will be more readily justified if repeated surveys are mounted at regular intervals to provide information on trends in crime over time, as well as on changes in reporting behaviour and perceptions of police performance. This is of special importance in new member states insofar as improved performance of police forces and justice institutions may lead to artefactual increases in recorded crimes. Moreover, repeated surveys will help serve the purpose of monitoring whether services to victims are improving.

One implication of conducting repeated surveys is that costs should be sustainable – ie, choices made about the first round of survey should take into account the continuing costs of further rounds. In this respect, methodological decisions (about interviewing mode and questionnaire length for instance) should be informed by sustainability considerations. At first blush, this suggests that CATI should be the ‘preferred’ mode of interviewing to maximise cost advantages, although it is acknowledged that the increasing problem of mobile phone ownership will need to be tackled. In the coming years, CAWI - at least in some European countries, and subject to the caveats above - might become a viable alternative option, bringing a further cost advantage.

3 THE ICVS-2 PILOT SURVEYS

3.1 THE FIRST ICVS-2 PILOTS

In 2008, a Dutch agency, NICIS, commissioned pilot surveys in four countries (Canada, Germany, Sweden and the UK) at the request of the International Government Research Directors (IGRD).^{19, 20} Using a questionnaire largely based on the fifth ICVS, the pilots aimed to:

1. Compare response rates using three modes:²¹ CATI, CAWI and self-completion PAPI (by means of postal questionnaire).
2. Establish if the questionnaire would be suitable for use with CAWI and PAPI.

CATI samples were taken in each of the four countries. Interviewing stopped when there was an achieved sample of approximately 200 respondents. Recruitment for CAWI and PAPI was as shown in Figure A. Respondents were offered the choice to fill in the questionnaire online or by pen and paper. Both Groups 1 and 2 received an introductory letter, but a critical difference was that Group 1 was given a printed PAPI questionnaire, whereas Group 2 was invited to ask for a printed questionnaire. It was assumed that there would be higher completion of the printed questionnaire received by Group 1, at the cost of a lower on-line (web) completion rate. Groups 1 and 2 were both divided again in two; one half of each Group received only one reminder letter; the other half received two reminders

Figure A NICIS-I Pilot design for CAWI and PAPI modes

CAWI / PAPI / samples from address register			
GROUP 1		GROUP 2	
Invitation letter with link to website		Invitation letter with link to website	
Asked to complete on-line or by printed questionnaire		Asked to complete on-line or by printed questionnaire	
Printed questionnaire included (prepaid)		Respondents invited to ask for a printed questionnaire	
Reminder after two weeks		Reminder after two weeks	
Group 1A	Group 1B	Group 2A	Group 2B
No further reminder	2 nd reminder	No further reminder	2 nd reminder

Comparison of response rates with different modes

19 NICIS, a research institute specialising in urban problems, currently oversees the execution of the annual Dutch Victimization Survey (Veiligheidsmonitor).

20 It was financed by the UK, the Netherlands and Canada.

21 Face-to-face interviews were not included in the pilot due to their high costs relative to the other methodologies.

The NCIS report gives information on response rates, although it is somewhat difficult to interpret these. The main reason is that the nature of the 'gross' samples are unclear. For instance, the CATI samples were achieved by random digit dialling, but it is not known how many of the 'gross sample' numbers were valid. Another difficulty in interpreting the response rates for the CATI interviews is that the number of call backs is not specified. Similarly, the CAWI and PAPI samples were drawn from address registers, but it is again not known how many of the addresses were currently valid. These points should be born in mind in interpreting what follows. Table 2 gives details of the response rates achieved according to mode.

CATI

The response rates in CATI were modest comparing the gross samples with the achieved number of respondents. The highest CATI response in the four countries was 17% in Sweden; the lowest response was 3% in Canada. The straight average for CATI in the four countries was 9%.²²

CAWI with PAPI questionnaire included

As expected, the response to the CAWI questionnaire was lower when a PAPI version was included. The highest response was (again) in Sweden (7%) where there is a high internet penetration. In Germany and the UK the response was 2-3%. The straight average for this CAWI mode in the four countries was 4%.

CAWI with PAPI questionnaire answer card only

Rather more responded in CAWI mode when no PAPI questionnaire was available. Response was highest (yet again) at 16% in Sweden, but only 3% in Germany (similar to the other CAWI option above). The straight average response rate was 8%.

²² This averages the percentage response rate in each country, disregarding the gross sample size.

Table 2 Summary of response rates in the first NICIS pilot

	Canada	Germany	Sweden	UK	Total ¹³
CATI					
Gross sample	7,696	1,914	1,214	3,871	14,695
Response N	206	223	205	200	834
Response %	2.7%	11.7%	16.9%	5.2%	9.1%
Group 1 PAPI questionnaire included (CAWI responses)					
Gross sample	5	1,502	750	600	7,852
Response N (CAWI)	224	31	53	15	323
Response % (CAWI)	4.5%	2.1%	7.1%	2.5%	4.0%
Group 2 PAPI answer card only (CAWI responses)					
Gross sample	5	1,498	750	600	7,848
Response N (CAWI)	402	44	119	33	598
Response % (CAWI)	8.0%	2.9%	15.9%	5.5%	8.1%
Group 1 PAPI questionnaire included (PAPI responses)					
Response N (PAPI)	856	227	188	117	1,388
Response % (PAPI)	17.1%	15.1%	25.1%	19.5%	19.2%
Group 2 PAPI answer card only (PAPI responses)					
Response N (PAPI)	100	3	16	10	129
Response % (PAPI)	2.0%	0.2%	2.1%	1.7%	1.5%

PAPI questionnaire included

When a PAPI questionnaire was offered, it produced more responses than from CAWI. In Sweden, 25% of respondents completed the PAPI questionnaire, with the lowest figure (17%) in Canada. The straight average for when a PAPI questionnaire was made available was 19%.

There was some evidence that including a PAPI questionnaire resulted in respondents switching from CAWI.

PAPI questionnaire – answer card

As would be expected, few respondents used the answer card to send for and complete a PAPI questionnaire. In three of the four countries, about 2% did so, but only 0.2% in Germany. The straight average was 1.5%.

Response by age

The age profile of respondents in the three different modes differed somewhat according to figures given by NICIS for Sweden and Germany. In Sweden, those aged 55 or over comprised a large proportion (just over 40%) of those in the CATI and PAPI samples. Older people were even more heavily represented in the PAPI sample in Germany. Younger respondents aged 16-34 were best represented in the CAWI mode in Sweden, comprising a third of those who answered. The same picture did not emerge in Germany however.

Reminders

Sending out two reminders did not affect responses a great deal. There was some evidence that the second reminder annoyed some potential respondents.

The questionnaire

There were no difficulties with the questionnaire used in the first NICIS pilot as regards CAWI, and CATI. However, the PAPI questionnaire did less well. A particular problem was that multiple answers were given in questions where only one answer was required.

The main lessons from the first NICIS pilot are threefold:

- First, response rates were disappointing in all three modes - CATI, CAWI and PAPI. As said, though, the response rates reported by NICIS could be misleadingly low as some technical details about gross samples are missing. Also, the CAWI / PAPI tests were carried out over the Christmas 2008 / New Year 2009 period, which may have reduced response somewhat.
- Secondly, the best response was through PAPI when a questionnaire was enclosed - ranging from 15% to 25%. However, the PAPI questionnaire posed some problems for respondents, and although the NICIS report suggests that these might be remedied with clearer instructions, in our view there is some doubt as to how far this would solve the problem.
- Thirdly, the CAWI response was better when only a PAPI answer card was offered, ranging from 16% in Sweden but well under 10% elsewhere. Whether these response rates could be improved is a matter of some importance. Increasing internet penetration and the use of incentives may improve CAWI response rates. NICIS also felt that using an Internet panel might be a useful way forward. Finland's experience in the current Eurostat-funded pilots, too, was promising. Of those offered the CAWI mode, 24% responded after two reminders.

3.2 THE SECOND ICVS-2 PILOTS

With co-funding from the European Commission,²³ NICIS have mounted another pilot, drawing on the lessons of first pilot, although as yet no results are available. Six countries are taking part: the four who participated in the first pilot, as well as Denmark and the Netherlands.

Using the same questionnaire as in the first NICIS pilot, with some adjustments, the countries are to provide a net sample per country of 4,000.²⁴ Of these, 2,000 were to be achieved using CATI, and 2,000 using CAWI. For the CAWI sample, 1,000 respondents were to be recruited from 'a register of personal data and addresses'. (Suppliers were not discouraged from using incentives to improve response.) The remaining 1,000 CAWI responses were to be found using a panel, although little instruction was given in the

23 Under Grant 11002.2008.002-2008.711.

24 Tenderers were asked to support their estimate of what gross sample was needed to achieve 4,000 interviews on the basis of a response rate of 40%-50%, which was said to have been achieved in previous sweeps of the ICVS.

tender as to what types of panels were appropriate. (In this respect, this sample resembles the German pilot which used an agreed panel to receive a postal questionnaire.)

4 GENERAL ISSUES ABOUT SURVEY ADMINISTRATION

4.1 INTRODUCTION

Chapter 2 reviewed a number of lessons learned from the pilots in 17 member states which tested a questionnaire measuring victimisation that was developed by the *Task Force* with the assistance of HEUNI. It covered how well (or not well) the questionnaire performed and the countries' overall impressions about the survey and its salience to respondents. Chapter 2 also summarised the various ways in which the pilots were carried out.

This chapter consolidates the discussion as to the best way forward for administering the *EU Security Survey (SASU)*. It draws on:

- a. the experiences of the countries taking part in the current pilots;
- b. recommendations in the UN *Manual on Victimisation Surveys*;
- c. our own professional survey experience; and
- d. comments made during and after the *Working Group* meeting in February 2010, and the *Task Force* meetings in April 2010 and June 2010.

A number of the survey administration issues discussed in this chapter have informed the development of a revised questionnaire. This is discussed in Chapter 5.

4.2 MODE OF DATA COLLECTION

Costs, standardisation and quality

The first issue we address is mode of data collection for the SASU in 2013. As will be seen, the pilot countries had different views on this, but issues of cost, data quality and – ideally standardisation – are important. There are a few accepted principles:

- Postal questionnaire are cheaper than both CATI and CAPI, although these now have little support.
- However, CAWI might be cheaper still than CATI.
- PAPI will be more expensive than CAPI (because of extra data processing costs).
- In terms of standardisation and data quality, CATI and CAPI may be much on a par, and better than PAPI, and – possibly - CAWI.
- Of the two main modes used in the pilots, CATI is cheaper than CAPI (or PAPI). On the basis of prices provided by the pilot countries, for interviews with 4,000 respondents lasting a maximum of 20 minutes, our best estimate is that a completed CATI interview in the EU will cost on average between €25 - €50, and a CAPI interview between €65 and €75. Taking mid-points, this means that CAPI interviews approach twice the price of CATI ones. The differential might be

somewhat reduced if in the future proportionately more calls are made to mobile phones – but the differential will still be marked.

- Surveys using CAPI or PAPI generally achieved higher response than CATI surveys (and this was broadly the case in the pilots). Levels of response in CATI surveys, however, can be respectable (and again this was the case in the pilots).
- CATI, though, faces challenges in the future.
 - In some countries (France for example) there does not exist a good sampling frame of fixed numbers as many households decide not to be registered.
 - Increasing reliance on mobile phones (particularly among the young) poses a problem for random sampling of telephone numbers. This will need to be tackled in surveys using CATI through inclusion of mobile users in the sampling design.
 - There is a potential problem of legal restrictions on random digit dialling. We are not aware of the restrictions that currently exist, or how far legislation is in hand in Member States that might affect fieldwork in 2013. Current and proposed restrictions, however, need to be investigated. Asking Member State survey agencies would be the most efficient way forward.

Ideally, the SASU should be conducted using the same mode of interviewing (or the same proportionate mix of different modes). CATI seems the best option on grounds of cost. We asked countries specifically about the feasibility of using CATI, and their preferred interview mode. The results were:

- Three countries said CATI was not at the moment feasible because of low household telephone coverage: Hungary, the Slovak Republic and Cyprus.²⁵ A few other countries also had some reservations about CATI, mainly because of increasing mobile phone ownership.
- In the north and west of Europe, CATI or CAWI were preferred modes on cost grounds. Germany was an exception here, preferring a postal PAPI survey. France (although they did not conduct a pilot survey) preferred a CAPI mode. The German and French views reflected current practices in their country.
- Estonia, Finland and Denmark favoured a mixed mode approach whereby respondents could choose between CAWI and some other modes.

There was, in sum, lack of agreement among the countries as to feasible and optimal modes of interviewing. It is difficult to escape the conclusion, then, that full standardisation of an EU survey programme as regards mode of interviewing may not be achievable. Requirements for interview mode will probably need to allow some flexibility. Nonetheless, we do not consider this to present an overriding argument against an EU survey programme. In several countries, as well as in the ICVS, CATI and face-to-face

25 Cyprus felt that only CAPI would be feasible, although in a later communication they indicated that they may consider CATI. The Slovak Republic mentioned PAPI as a possibility, although Hungary had argued that the questionnaire was not fit for PAPI.

interviewing have in the past been combined. A possible solution might be to opt for a mixed mode approach including allowing respondents a choice between modes of interviewing. Countries in southern and Eastern Europe might conduct most interviews face-to-face, perhaps with some over the phone. Elsewhere, most interviews could be carried out with CATI, to capitalise on the cost advantages. The value of CAWI needs to be considered carefully – a point returned to.

Respondent choice

Respondent choice is an issue worth mentioning, although it should not in our view be overriding - since preferences might vary across country, as well as over time. This said, two countries investigated how respondents preferred to be interviewed, although it should be born in mind that they were answering in relation to the questionnaire that was being tested:

- In Finland, respondents had difficulty in answering Section G with CASI. They appeared to prefer being interviewed orally.
- In Finland, also, when respondents who had voluntarily participated in the survey were asked at the end of the interview what their preferred method of interview would have been, they generally favoured the mode in which they had just been interviewed. This was particularly so for those using CAWI. All in all, CAWI was the most popular mode when all respondents were counted together, followed by CATI.²⁶
- In Portugal, where respondents were allowed to change between CAPI and CATI if they wanted to, there was a preference for CAPI over CATI among many respondents.²⁷ This is somewhat at odds with the Finnish results, and may signify cultural differences.

Outside the context of the pilots, the Netherlands have reported encouraging results in relation to tests for the national government surveys by the Central Bureau of Statistics using a sequential mixed mode approach. Respondents contacted by mail are invited to fill in the questionnaire by CAWI or by mail. Those who do not answer are subsequently approached with a request to participate in CATI mode. Possible non-responders can also be visited at home for a CAPI interview.

Questionnaire implications

One important consideration in choosing the mode of interviewing is the maximum duration of the interview (see Section 4.3 below). Another consideration is that it is Eurostat practise to have one 'model' questionnaire that is adapted for different interview modes. (We assume that the model questionnaire would be for CAPI/CATI use.) The adaptation is likely to be problematic. Germany, for instance, is committed to a postal questionnaire for the SASU. This will pose problems for the format of the questionnaire,

26 Results showed that 39% said they would have preferred CAWI, 36% a telephone interview, and only 6% a face-to-face interview.

27 The sample was split into three subsamples, each to receive a previously defined interview method. If the respondent did not agree to the defined mode, the interviewer could change to the mode that the respondent preferred.

given complex routings in particular. A questionnaire for countries using interviewers who are working from a printed questionnaire (rather than computers) will also need work. Trained interviewers may cope better with routings than respondents, although there are still likely to be some problems. As Germany says, conversion of a CATI or CAPI questionnaire to an interviewer-completed or self-completed questionnaire would involve time- and cost-intensive work, as well as adjustments with regard to content.

Computer Assisted Web Interviewing

The situation with regard to having CAWI as an interview mode option is difficult to assess at this stage. Extensive testing would be needed before it could be recommended as the sole or partial interview mode. The response rate in Finland's current pilot with CAWI was 24%, but the CAWI response rates in from the first round of the ICVS-II pilots orchestrated by NICIS were considerably poorer.

This said, extensive pilot testing with CAWI for national surveys in the Netherlands as one stage in a sequential mixed mode model has, as mentioned, shown encouraging results. In relation to the pilots, too, Finland, Estonia and Denmark have indicated they favoured a mixed mode approach whereby respondents could choose between CAWI and some other modes.²⁸ This position seems to be shared by the countries participating in the ICVS-2 pilots, organised by NICIS; for the second round of pilots it was decided that CATI and CAWI should be used, with CAPI or PAPI excluded as options.

At this stage, though, the methodological challenges of CAWI cannot be denied. There is possible bias due to differential access to the internet, and a degree of respondent self-selection (with or without incentives). Response rates may also be low. In the medium to long term, however, ways round these problems may be found, particularly by using representative panels that polling companies are increasingly likely to offer. As said, further piloting would be needed to resolve the methodological feasibility of CAWI for the measurement of victimisation.

The possibility of a CAWI mode effect also needs to be considered. In the Finnish pilot which used CAWI, response was low, but victimisation levels high. Also, a very large (190,000 sample) victimisation survey in the Netherlands which used CAWI as one interview mode indicated that victimisation levels were higher among those using CAWI than other modes. This led to the need for a weight to be constructed to take account of the CAWI mode effect. Experience in Belgium and Finland also suggests that the use of CAWI in mixed mode interviewing requires reweighting to produce comparable results.

The higher victimisation levels in CAWI interview could be for two reasons. First, there might have been introduced a bias in the respondents by the non-response, with those participating, differing in terms of victimisation experiences. If this is the case, better response rates would remedy the problem. Secondly, there might be a real 'method effect' such that web-based interviewing somehow leads to higher victimisation

28 Another possibility is a dynamic strategy, whereby the most cost-effective method (CAWI) would be offered first, then – if there is no response - a contact by phone offering the next most cost effective method (CATI), or a paper questionnaire, or – as a last option - a visit by an interviewer for CAPI.

responses, possibly because respondents do not feel controlled by an interviewer. Obviously, this is an important issue that requires careful consideration and further pilot testing.

Recommendations on mode of data collection

As agreed in the *Task Force* meetings, it will be up to each country to decide on the mode(s) of data collection to be used, although a technical document will be developed including some recommendations.

Our own recommendations are:

- If national sampling frames (of fixed and mobile phones) allow for coverage of a substantial proportion of persons/households, the SASU should use CATI as the preferred option, with mobile phones included. While some countries may not feel in a position to mount CATI interviews, by 2013 the situation may have changed. Otherwise, CAPI should be the preferred option
- Member States should be asked about the current legal restrictions on random digit dialling and whether future legislation is planned.
- How far the SASU should accommodate CAWI interviews, possibly as part of a sequential mixed mode (or with the use of panels), needs further consideration and testing. The results of the ongoing NICIS pilot can hopefully provide guidance on the feasibility of the CAWI option.
- Some attention needs to be given for the format of the questionnaire used by interviewers not using computers.
- When results are presented it will be essential that full details are given by each country as to the mode of interview used

4.3 LENGTH OF INTERVIEW

Most of the pilot country reports mentioned that the interviews were too long on average and unacceptably long for some respondents, especially victims of violent crimes. If CATI is the preferred interview mode, this has implications for the length of the interview. With CATI, interviews cannot last much longer than 20 minutes because of the increasing risks of refusals. CAPI (or PAPI) might allow for a longer interview, but costs would rise even more in comparison with a 20 minute CATI interview. Experience with CAWI is limited so far, but the view in the Finnish report is that CAWI interviews should also be no longer than 20 minutes. We have taken this into account in devising the revised questionnaire discussed in Chapter 5.

Recommendation on length of the questionnaire

We recommend that the SASU interview should not take much longer than 20 minutes in CATI mode. This will minimise refusals and will contain costs. Interviews in CAWI mode should take about the same time. CAPI interviews would be likely to take a little longer (because of greater interpersonal interaction and tuition in CASI, if used). But a slightly longer interview time with CAPI would be acceptable.

4.4 FREESTANDING VERSUS MULTIPURPOSE VICTIMISATION SURVEYS

The majority of victimisation surveys are freestanding – i.e., they only address victimisation and crime-related issues. Some victimisation modules, however, are set in other surveys, with victimisation being just one of other topics. The Aebi & Linde review, for instance, identified some victimisation surveys that were part of multipurpose surveys. In the 17-country pilots, one country administered the victimisation survey as part of another survey.

Here are some advantages of add-on victimisation surveys.

- The cost of the victimisation questions is to a degree absorbed by the other survey costs (for instance, sampling design and some of the fieldwork costs, such as collection of socio-demographic information).
- The answers on victimisation might sometimes be able to be analysed in relation to topics which have some intellectual similarity – social deprivation, for instance, or experience of accidents or perceived quality of life.
- The victimisation component can sometimes help the conduct of the rest of the survey, since it can provide a perhaps welcome change of topic.
- When the main survey is financially well-established, it may be more likely that a victimisation module takes periodically place.

As against this, freestanding victimisation surveys have advantages too – possibly more advantages than disadvantages.

- There is a clear limit on the number of questions that can be posed in a survey without unduly burdening the respondent. This means that victimisation questions might have to be curtailed in the interests of covering other topics.
- There could be difficulties in switching topics within the same survey.
- There might be ‘context effects’ such that one topic in multi-topic survey might influence the answers to another topic. In relation to victimisation, for instance, respondents may feel that they will be ‘blamed’ if they answer affirmatively to victimisation questions in the light of previous answers they might have given about their behaviour patterns.
- The analysis and presentation of results on victimisation can proceed without being constrained by the analysis and presentation of other results. This will often mean that the victimisation survey is more of a ‘whole product’.

Recommendation on whether the survey should be freestanding

<p>On balance, we would recommend that the SASU should be mounted as freestanding surveys in member states. However, we appreciate that some countries may have overriding reasons for inserting the victimisation module in a multipurpose survey. If this is the case, the SASU module needs to be kept fully intact.</p>

4.5 SELECTION OF RESPONDENTS

The SASU should aim for a nationally representative sample of those living in private households.²⁹ These are best drawn from a register of population or households – or in the case of CATI, from some method of contacting a random selection of households or individuals *via* telephone numbers. By and large, interviewing people who have volunteered to take part in surveys – so-called ‘intent selection’ interviewing – risks possible bias.

In the majority of the pilots, the sampling frame was the total population of the country. In some cases, the samples were stratified. One survey worked with a rotating panel and three had an ‘intent selection’ sample, including the postal survey in Germany.³⁰

Victimisation surveys typically collect information on experiences of two types of crime: (i) crimes affecting the household as a whole (burglaries, vandalism to the house, theft of family-owned vehicles); and (ii) crimes affecting individuals (e.g., ‘contact crimes’ and thefts of personal property).³¹ This raises issues about how many respondents are interviewed, and what is an appropriate age range.

One respondent or two?

There is an argument for separate questionnaire to deal with household and personal crimes. For the household crimes, the respondent might be the best qualified household member (one of the adults); for personal crimes, the most appropriate choice is a randomly selected household member. Germany used this approach, and continues to propose it, although there were some problems.³² Although not participating in the pilot studies, France also suggested in a written comment that questions on household crime could best be put to ‘the best qualified’ person.

While a two-respondent approach might provide better information, it poses additional fieldwork cost. It also risks reducing response rates, since two potentially different people need to be contacted and agree to be interviewed. This carries extra weight in CATI surveys since after the initial contact by phone has been made with the household, contact must subsequently be made with the most qualified member for the interview about household crimes, and then with another respondent for the interview about

29 In the pilots, the sample in six countries taken from one or more specific regions in the country. In Lithuania, residents who spoke only Russian were excluded.

30 One country worked with a ‘random walk’ sampling strategy for the face-to-face version of the survey. Catalonia used random dialling sampling for the city of Barcelona, and a sample from the population registry for the population outside the city. Italy used a random sample from the telephone (landlines) registry.

31 An issue of weighting arises from this. In the case of the ICVS, prevalence victimisation rates for both household and personal crimes have all been calculated using weights for a sample of persons (aged 16 or more). However, weights based on household samples are also available, and can be used for more accurate estimate of victimisation rates for household crimes.

32 In the German pilot, questionnaires were mailed to a pre-arranged panel of willing respondents. Primary respondents were asked to fill in a questionnaire on household crimes and to pass on another questionnaire on personal crime to a selected member of the household. However, a considerable proportion of the primary respondents continued filling in the second questionnaire on personal crimes as well, although they did not qualify for this.

personal crimes. There is also the issue of comparability of results, which may be compromised if some countries use one respondent per household, and some countries use two respondents.

Age limits

As Chapter 2 discussed, the pilots did not show consistency in the age range of those interviewed. However, most pilots interviewed household members from age 16 without an upper age limit; several countries imposed age limits for Section G.

It is known that victimisation rates are relatively high for teenagers. This would argue for the lowest possible age limit – age 15 or even lower. However, there are two main reasons for not lowering the age limit below 16:

- General survey experience shows that some parents do not want their young children to be interviewed without their involvement. This was also mentioned in some pilot reports. An interview with a young person which is supervised by a parent could jeopardise the veracity of answers about personal crimes. (Many young teenagers may not wish their parents or carers to know about troubles they might have encountered when they were in school or out at in the evening or weekend.)
- As mentioned, another problem is that young household members may not be sufficiently able to provide good enough details about household victimisations. They may not, for instance, have taken much notice of vandalism to the garden or to thefts from cars belonging to other members of the household, especially if the theft took place away from home.

In our view, the age range needs to be standardised in the SASU. Age sixteen seems a workable option as the lower age limit, and there was fair consensus on this at the *Task Force* meeting in April 2010. The experience of several national surveys and the ICVS shows that respondents aged 16 years or older are able to answer questions about both household and personal crimes. We appreciate that younger respondents (say those aged 16 to 20 years) may face some difficulties in answering some of the questions of household crimes, but these young respondents will form a relatively small proportion of the overall sample.

There seems no strong reason to retain an upper age limit. In fact, the victimisation of the elderly seems important to consider – even if only to show that risks are generally low.

The sample could be taken either from a national registry of persons, or from a random sample of households from which one member aged 16 or more is randomly selected. Whether the 'next birthday' or a Kish grid method is used can probably be left to individual countries, taking account of the method they are most used to.

Substitution

When there is household member available who is willing to be interviewed, even though they are not the selected respondent, it is tempting to make a substitution in the interests of achieving a productive visit. However, substitution introduces significant bias in

undercounting to those less likely to be available at home (e.g. young males), compromising the random selected sample. We would not advise substitution.

Proxy interviewing

The situation sometimes arises when a household member offers themselves as a 'proxy' respondent – i.e., answering on behalf of the selected respondent (whose experiences are believed to be known by the proxy). We would not advise allowing proxy interviewing, especially as it would mean answering questions about possible personal victimisation. At the most extreme, the proxy interviewee may actually be a perpetrator of an offence against the selected respondent; rather more likely is that the proxy interviewee may not be aware of all the victimisation experiences of the selected respondent. Moreover, collecting attitudinal information from a proxy interviewee who is meant to reflect the attitudes of the selected respondent is clearly problematic.

Recommendation on respondent selection

We recommend that the SASU should pursue the proven approach of drawing a personal sample, either from a registry of persons, or through the subsequent selection of an eligible individual from a household sample.

We recommend that the selected respondent should be interviewed about both household crimes and personal crimes – although we appreciate that some countries might want more latitude on this.

We recommend that the age range of respondents in the SASU is standardised. Starting interviews at age sixteen seems a workable option (and there is general consensus about this). There seems no strong reason to retain an upper age limit.

The randomly selected personal respondent should be interviewed, with no substitution.

Interviews with someone acting as a proxy for the elected respondent should not be allowed, in our view.

4.6 RECALL PERIOD AND TIMING OF FIELDWORK

Victimisation surveys aim to estimate victimisation over a limited time – or 'recall' - period. There is a balance to be made about recall period over which experiences are likely to be reliably remembered, and generating enough victimisation incidents to report upon. Methodological work shows, on the one hand, that many less serious incidents are soon forgotten, which argues for a short recall period. On the other hand, it has been proved in experiments that serious incidents – which people will want to talk about - tend to be pulled forward in time - so-called 'forward telescoping' (see Skogan, 1989).

The piloted questionnaire had a variety of recall periods, which caused some confusion. In our revised SASU questionnaire, the victimisation screeners focus on victimisation experience over the past five years, honing down onto the last 12 months for one-year victimisation rates (see Chapter 5 and Annex B).

There are three options for ascertaining 12-month victimisation.

- a. The first option is to conduct fieldwork early in the calendar year and to ask about the previous year (discounting incidents in the fieldwork year in the calculation of

one-year rates). This option has the advantage of victimisations in a specific calendar year being counted - 2012 in the case of the SASU. It may also produce more reliable one-year rates, as it is easier to remember whether an event took place in the last calendar year, than whether an incident took place 11 months or 13 months ago. A third factor is that it has the advantage of bringing forward the publication date of the first results

- b. The second option is to take a calendar year time frame, asking about 'this' year' (say 2013) and 'last year' (2012). While this might provide a relatively easy memory prompt, it could mean that the count for the calendar year prior to the interview year (2012) would be deflated because of memory loss and 'forward telescoping' (into 2013).
- c. The third option is to conduct fieldwork when it is convenient for survey companies and to ask about the 12 months prior to the date of the interview. This 12-month period would span 2012 and 2013. For incidents in 2012, it would be necessary to ask whether they occurred before or after the 12-month 'anniversary' of the date of the interview. Thus, for instance, if someone was interviewed on 1 November 2013, but was victimised in June 2012, that incident would be outside the 12-month period,

At the *Task Force* meeting in April 2010, it emerged that many countries would have difficulty mounting the SASU early in 2013.³³ For this reason, we feel that option c. above should be adopted.

Recommendation on the recall period and timing of fieldwork

The proven practice of asking about five-year and *12-month* experiences should be retained. Differing recall periods should be avoided across the questionnaire.

We recommend that, ideally, data collection should be carried out at the same time in all countries. However, given the difficulties of this, and the fact that more countries appear able only to mount the SASU in the second semester of 2013 (rather than the first), we recommend that as many countries as possible should conduct fieldwork in the second semester of 2013, and that the questionnaire should elicit victimisation experience in the past 12 months, spanning 2012 and 2013.

4.7 SAMPLE SIZE

Sample sizes in victimisation surveys are a function of four main factors: available funds, mode of interview, length of interview, and the precision of the estimates required. (By sample size here we mean the size of the achieved sample, rather than the gross sample. In a comparative setting, achieved samples will reflect response rates, which may vary across country and cannot be accurately predicted.)

Available funds

The first factor pertinent to sample size is the money available. In the case of the 2013

33 Poland and France felt that the survey should be conducted in the first semester of 2013; most other countries (Czech Republic, Germany, Spain, Latvia, Romania) preferred the second semester; for Estonia either was possible

SASU, this is the money available to fund 27 countries of different sizes, and with different survey capabilities.

Mode of interview

The second factor pertinent to sample size is mode of interview. As discussed, there are fairly substantial differences in the cost of surveys using different modes. Other things being equal, postal questionnaires will give the largest sample for a given price, even taking into account the cost of incentives and low response rates. After that, a CATI survey will be cheaper than a CAPI survey; after that, a CAPI survey will be cheaper than a PAPI survey.

Length of interview

A further factor which is relevant to sample size is the length of the interview. Especially when personal visits are made, fewer longer interviews can be achieved for a given cost than shorter ones. While shorter interviews will help to achieve larger samples, the case for them, in our view, is more importantly determined by the fact that shorter interviews will improve response rates.

Precision of estimates

The third factor relevant to sample size is the precision of the estimates required. In general, the larger the sample, the greater the accuracy of the estimate and the smaller the confidence limits.³⁴ However, the precision of estimates is not proportionate to sample size, such that a survey with a sample of 4,000 (say) is not twice as accurate as one with a sample of 2,000. The precision of estimates also depends to a degree on sample design (with multi-stage, stratified samples having larger variance than simple random samples). For attitudinal and perceptual questions, smaller samples are needed than for estimates of victimisation; most or all respondents provide answers and there are generally average scores on point scales rather than (low) percentage values on dichotomous variables for given answers.

In the ICVS, the relatively modest samples of (usually) 2,000 respondents per country were adequate for differentiating between countries in terms of the overall prevalence rate of 'any victimisation'. This size sample was also adequate to estimated differences between countries for the more common individual types of victimisation, such as theft from cars and burglary. For less common crimes, however, the sample size was stretched, with the degree of sampling error meaning that few firm conclusions could be drawn about the precise rankings of individual countries. This was also true for information on the experiences of victims as regards of reporting individual crimes to the police, or levels of satisfaction with treatment by the police after reporting.

Eurostat has already suggested some requirements for the precision of victimisation estimates, at the 95% confidence level. These, however, have not been finalised; Eurostat's suggestions are, at the time of writing, out for consultation among the member states.

34 Confidence intervals help judge the statistical reliability of comparisons made. Overlapping confidence intervals indicate that a difference in estimates between two countries is not statistically significant – i.e., the difference could have arisen by chance.

It should be noted that it is more demanding to get higher precision for estimates of victimisation over one year than for victimisation over five years (for which victimisation levels will be higher of course). However, the initial five-year reference period we recommend for the SASU is to increase the reliability of one-year victimisation (by reducing ‘forward telescoping’). Five-year victimisation rates should not themselves be seen as a key indicator, principally because they will undercount ‘real’ levels of victimisation over five years because of memory loss.

Apart from the precision of the estimates of victimisation rates, sample size is also pertinent to how many incidents one uncovers of victimisation of different types (burglary, say). The nature of different kinds of victimisation in different countries is of some importance for comparative purposes (for instance, the percentage of incidents which are reported to the police). The largest samples that can be afforded, therefore, are preferable.

Larger samples are also necessary if victimisation levels among subgroups of the population are seen as important – for instance, differences between men and women, between different age groups, or between different parts of the country. In our view, the expectations of what can be achieved in the SASU as regards differences for subgroups should be kept modest.

On the basis of costs estimates made by the pilot countries for various interviewing modes, and their likely choice of modes, available resources seem to allow for sample sizes of between 6,000 and 8,000 per member state. Such sample sizes should allow indicators with acceptable margins of error for the purpose of making reliable comparisons of levels of key crimes and related policy issues in different countries. Trends in crime across countries would also be comparable if the SASU is periodically repeated with similarly sized samples.

Recommendation on sample size

In our view, the SASU needs to provide – most fundamentally - estimates for the 27 member states which can be reliably compared in terms of:

- (i) Overall one-year victimisation rates ideally for both (a) prevalence rates (the number of country inhabitants victimised once or more, and (b) incidence rates (the number of victimisations per 100 inhabitants).
- (ii) One-year prevalence levels of individual victimisation types – for instance, burglary, or robbery.

Present indications are that the sample sizes affordable in the SASU (6,000 to 8,000) will meet these requirements.

Future rounds of the SASU will need sufficient sample sizes to allow comparisons of key indicators over time.

4.8 TRANSLATION

The assumption is that national statistical offices will be responsible for ensuring that an English language questionnaire is translated into host languages to reflect as precisely as possible what the questions are meant to address. To this end, there is a case for the questionnaire to be accompanied by document that explains the intended meaning of the

questions - a proposal that some of the pilot countries put forward. Whereas English is a relative 'simple' language, other languages have, amongst other things, distinctions between formal and informal phrasing, and between male and female words. There is also a different order of words in sentence construction.

The question may arise as to whether questionnaire should be translated for minority groups who do not speak the host language. While not doing so could mean excluding them, it will be up to individual countries to judge the seriousness of these exclusions. Additional translation will, of course, incur extra financial cost, and as well possibly as additional fieldwork costs in hiring multilingual interviewers, for instance.

In making the main translation, it would be advisable for more than one person to be involved. Ideally, there should be 'back translation' – i.e., the translation of the original English-language questionnaire - into Latvian, say - should be translated back again into English by an independent Latvian and competent English speaker. The new English version ought to be carefully checked against the original version.

Particularly sensitive is the task of translating the concepts and terms of the screener questions, and at a minimum we would recommend 'back translation' of these. Some other concepts and terms are especially likely to not cross linguistic boundaries very easily. In devising the new questionnaire, some examples are:

- 'Stranger' (in some countries it is nearer to 'immigrant').
- 'Vans' (as a target of theft) – 'trucks' and 'pick-ups' are terms more often used in some countries.
- 'Robbery' (often synonymous with 'burglary').
- 'Bribery' – too serious in some countries for the type of low level bribery the question is meant to capture. More appropriate terms to use could be 'backhanders', un petit cadeau, pot-de-vin, smeergeld (Dutch), and 'illegal commission' (Southern Europe).

Recommendations on translation

Careful attention should be given to the translation of key concepts, preferably with back translation, particularly of the screener questions.

4.9 TRAINING OF INTERVIEWERS, CONFIDENTIALITY AND ETHICS

Training

In the pilots, interviewers received specific training for ten of the pilot surveys.³⁵ For the full-blown SASU in 2013, we are unclear how far field forces will differ from those used for the pilot surveys, and the degree of routine 'in-house' training that will be provided.

We feel that only professionally trained and experienced interviewers should be used in the 2013 SASU. They also need to be specifically trained about the survey. Using interviewers with previous experience of other victimisation surveys would be useful.³⁶

Much of what should be routine initial and refresher training will apply to the SASU. At a minimum, this should include procedures with regard, for instance, to:

- Encouraging respondents to take part, without being overly forceful. This is the process of ensuring 'informed consent'.
- Being able – in CATI and CAPI interviews – to 'manipulate' keyboards accurately, without causing delay in questionnaire administration.
- Following questionnaire instructions accurately and quickly, without making up their own rules.
- Being able to query beforehand any interviewer instructions about which interviewers are unsure.
- Steering respondents through the questionnaire in a patient way (especially when respondents challenge 'why is that question being asked').
- Thanking respondents – in a genuine tone – for taking part.

In relation to the SASU, elements of training that will need to be focussed on include:

- How to select eligible respondents from within a correctly understood household unit.
- Allaying fears about the confidentiality of responses.
- Appreciating the need for questions about sexual incident and assaults / threats to be answered in a 'private' conversation with the interviewer, thus ensuring that the

35 Duration varied. Some countries used video-recording, and discussion. Others limited training to written instructions and background information. One country trained on methodology only

36 In the pilots, nine countries worked with experienced interviewer, generally employed by the Statistics Office. (Sweden worked with an experienced team that also did the national victimisation survey.) Slovenia and Cyprus recruited students from social sciences. Three countries did not report on their interviewers and one said they used a team of interviewers with and without experience. Nine surveys were done mixed gender interviewers, although the majority was female. Four surveys were done by all female teams. Five reports did not specify the gender of interviewers.

respondent is in a position to answer questions without hindrance or heightened risk. This will ensure more honest answers. It will also forestall possible domestic trouble. In face-to-face surveys, it is easier, to protect, the respondent's privacy by ensuring that the interview is conducted away from other household members. In telephone interviews, it is much more difficult to gauge the 'real life' conditions under which a respondent is answering questions. This should be fully addressed in training. The need for rescheduling an interview if conditions are not right should be stressed, applying to both face-to-face and telephone interviews.

As the SASU is centrally concerned with victimisation experience, it will also be important for interviewers to need to know about the usual contours of this. Some key training items would be that:

- Most people will engage well with the subject of crime and victimisation.
- The SASU is not meant to cover every crime a respondent might have experienced.
- Victimisation is not randomly distributed: some respondents will be victimised several times. This will make for some long interviews, whereas most will be fairly short.
- It is vitally important to make sure that events are located accurately in time, particularly as regards the 'last 12 months'.
- Incidents which might appear to more than one screener question should only be reported once.
- The screeners questions are designed specifically simply to elicit 'yes' or 'no' answers, with other parts of the questionnaire used for collecting details about what happened.
- Respondents are to report only on their own experience of personal crime.
- Very serious events are unlikely to be reported in interview often, although they could arise.
- Less serious victimisations can soon be forgotten, but are relevant to the survey and need prompting for using the exact question wording.

It is unreasonable at this point to be too prescriptive about how exactly training is delivered. This will depend on resources and existing programmes of initial and refresher training. However, active training for the SASU might be useful including role-playings, simulations, and group discussions. It would also be advisable to arrange group discussions after the first days of fieldwork to exchange experiences.

We feel that it would be useful to develop a consistent training package for interviewers working on the SASU. This might efficiently be delivered through a video or DVD, although the number of different language versions needed would have to be considered.

Confidentiality and ethics

There are ethical considerations for the agencies responsible for the SASU, for interviewers, and for respondents. Many of the ethical considerations concern confidentiality.

Agencies

Agencies should adhere to procedures to ensure tight security procedures for the electronic storage of survey data. This is especially so as regards access to, and sharing of files in which there are micro data that can be traced to individuals. (For instance, agencies should issue all interviewers with a unique password for the data collection devices they are issued with.)

For now, we assume that survey agencies responsible for the SASU are aware of the tight procedures needed to ensure the security of data, and that interviewers are made clearly aware of their own responsibilities.

Interviewers

The survey companies involved in the SASU should, we believe, have standard procedures for ensuring ethical conduct on the part of interviewers in relation to the conduct of fieldwork, disclosure of information, etc. But two issues we feel are of particular note for the SASU are that:

- Interviewers should not disclose information pertaining to respondents, and should be made aware of the consequences of doing so.
- Interviewers should adhere closely to the instructions they are given as to assuring respondents that their answers will be anonymous and treated confidentially.

Interviewers may have to deal with some difficult interviews, which might be stressful for them. Stressful interviews will not necessarily be confined to those in which sexual and other violent incidents are described by respondents; serious burglaries can also cause trauma. Agencies should take responsibility for setting procedures in place to support interviewers. For instance:

- There could be formal 'debriefing' session with interviewers after they have completed, say, 100 interviews.
- Management support should be available to deal with especially difficult 'one-off' interviews, with interviewers being clear as how to access this support.

Respondents

Interviewers (and those in charge of them) have a responsibility towards respondents. Survey companies will have their own ethics standards for how interviewers treat respondents. We assume these will be strictly enforced in relation to the SASU. Some of the procedures which are particularly important for the SASU are that:

- Respondents should not feel pressurised into taking part in the survey, but feel that have given 'informed consent'. In practice, this can be difficult given the thin dividing line between interviewer behaviour which is needed to maintain response rates, and accepting refusals.
- Respondents should be treated respectfully (however 'awkward' they might be).
- To help respondents access further support and advice, interviewers should be given at least one contact telephone number to provide to respondents who seem to require some support. Countries will need to choose from the most appropriate agencies.

As an endnote, there might be a case for considering whether respondents, at the end of the interview, should be offered the opportunity of receiving a summary of results from the SASU. This is a way of acknowledging their contribution, and thanking them for it. It may also improve a participant's future response to requests to be surveyed. However, the logistics of following through this idea are not insignificant so further consideration would be needed.

Recommendations on training of interviewers, confidentiality and ethics

Professionally trained and experienced interviewers should be used in the 2013 SASU. They also need to be specifically trained about the nature of the survey.

All elements of standard training should be maintained as regards conducting interviews efficiently, accurately, and with due regard to the respondent. But elements of training will need to focus on the SASU specifically – particularly with regard to questions on sexual and other violence victimisation and the conditions under which questions are asked about this.

A training video might be well worth considering – to save countries effort, and to ensure consistent training. Active training for the SASU might also be useful including role-playings, simulations, and group discussions.

Agencies should adhere to strict procedures as regards the security of data, especially micro data traceable to individual respondents. Interviewers should also abide by strict rules for maintaining the confidentiality of information given to them

Interviewers need to be able to access support in the event of stressful interviews. A debriefing exercise would be useful after a set number of interviews have been completed.

Respondents must not feel overly pressurised into agreeing to an interview, should be treated respectfully and have every confidence that the information they give will be anonymous and confidential. Procedures should be in place so that respondents can be referred onto a support agency if this seems appropriate.

To help respondents to access further support and advice, interviewers should be given at least one contact telephone number to give to respondents who may require some support.

4.10 TIME LIMIT FOR DATA TRANSMISSION

We see the time limit for data transmission as pertinent to when results from the SASU are available. It is important that results from a high budget Eurostat survey are timely. If not, they risk seeming out-of-date. For information on security issues, and attitudes to the police, for instance, timeliness is obviously important. This argues for the narrowest possible time gap between data collection and the publication of results.³⁷ At the same time (and speaking from experience of the ICVS), it is in our view essential that no results should be published until:

- there is full confidence on the part of Eurostat that any differences in survey methodology are not undermining the comparability of results;
- it is certain that analysis procedures for estimating key indicators have been applied in a fully standardised way; and
- all countries have been given adequate opportunity to assess the comparative results, and provide feedback on (possible) reasons for them.

DG JLS have requested that top line results are available for publication by the end of 2014. With interviewing likely to be in the second semester of 2013, this poses a demanding schedule. Publication of top line results only will not, in our view, make matters much easier, since it will be essential that all data is fully verified and checked, and that analysis procedures in all countries have been the same and are robust.

As said, if CAWI is used as an interview mode, it may be that a weighting factor needs to be applied. Settling upon an appropriate weight (which might differ by country) could be a time-consuming process. This needs to be factored into the time limit for data transmission. Consideration will also need to be given as regards the technical work needed to construct appropriate weights.

Recommendations on data transmission

Results from the SASU need to be timely for optimal policy impact. However, further consideration needs to be given to how long countries should be given to 'top line' final results, taking into account the need for these to be based on fully validated data and consistent analysis processes.

37 Eurostat indicate that for other Eurostat social surveys, data availability is as follows:
LFS data are available 12 weeks after the end of data collection;
ICT survey: data from the second quarter of year N are available on 5 October of the same year;
EU-SILC: data of year N-1 are available in December N/January N+1.

5 THE REVISED QUESTIONNAIRE

Part of the task of evaluating the results of the pilot surveys in the 17 member states was to recommend changes to the questionnaire used in the pilots. To reiterate, the main problems with that questionnaire were:

- its overall length and the detailed nature of some questions;
- the sensitivity of questions in Section G on sexual victimisation and assaults and threats (particularly in a domestic setting);
- the varying recall periods, which caused some confusion;
- some overlapping in the questions, within and between sections;
- some infelicities in phrasing of questions, and inconsistencies in response categories.

Work began on a revised questionnaire in late 2009. An outline of the initial proposal was presented at the *Working Group* meeting in February 2010. In the light of comments, some revisions were made and slightly modified questionnaire was discussed at the *Task Force* meeting in April 2010. After further comments at and after this meeting, another revision was made, which was discussed at the *Task Force* meeting in June 2010. The current version reflects discussions at the June 2010 meeting as well some of the comments from a written consultation of *Task Force* members after the June 2010 meeting. In devising and revising the questionnaire, consideration also was given to the views of the DG JLS *Expert Group on the Policy Needs of Crime and Criminal Justice Statistics*, who were consulted about what they felt the questionnaire should cover from a policy perspective.

The proposed questionnaire is set out in Annex B. However, at the request of the *Task Force* in June 2010, we have prepared two sets of the screener questions for measuring sexual victimisation and assaults / threats ('violence' hereon). The one in the full questionnaire in Annex B consists of four screener questions. The second option consists of six screener questions to differentiate violence by partners or ex-partners (see Figure B below). The second option is shown in Annex C. (The questions in Annex C are restricted only to those which are relevant to the measurement of violence).

Figure B Alternative options for questions about violence

Proposed questionnaire (see Annex B)		Alternative questionnaire (see Annex C)	
Screeners (Section C)		Screeners (Section C)	
<i>Sexual incidents involving</i>	1. People not known 2. People known	<i>Sexual incidents involving</i>	1. People not known 2. Partners & ex-partners 3. Other people known
<i>Assaults & threats by:</i>	3. People not known 4. People known	<i>Assaults & threats by:</i>	4. People not known 5. Partners & ex-partners 6. Other people known
Follow-up questions of victims (Section D)	People not known People known (partners & ex-partners identified in questions on the offender)	Follow-up questions of victims (Section D)	People not known Partners and ex-partners Other people known

As well as taking into account the views of the *Working Group*, the *Task Force*, and the *Expert Group*, we adhered to three main guiding principles in drafting the new questionnaire.

- i. The first principle was to try and find solutions to the problems that arose in relation to the piloted questionnaire.
- ii. The second principle were guided by was to aim for a questionnaire lasting in the region of 20 minutes on average to administer in CATI.³⁸ The changes made that will have saved most time are in relation to Section G of the piloted questionnaire, and the questions on feelings of safety and security measures. In the light of the consultation with the *Expert Group* on policy priorities, we deleted screeners (and follow-up questions) on vandalism and threats which we had at various times proposed.

The current questionnaire in Annex B seems to fit the time requirements of CAPI, CATI and CAWI. For PAPI, considerable thought needs to be given to the layout of the questionnaire. The alternative version of the questionnaire (see Annex C) would take slightly longer than 20 minutes.

- iii. The third principle we adhered to was adopt as simple phrasing as possible to help with the translation into languages that are more complex than English. As discussed in Section 4.8 in Chapter 4, however, translation of the English-version questionnaire will need careful attention, particularly the screener questions.

38 Timing was judged by estimates of how long each 'ask-all' question would take, and how long filtered questions would take, taking into account the likely number of respondents.

The recall period

The period over which respondents are asked to recall victimisation incidents – the ‘recall period’ - is important. The piloted questionnaire had a variety of recall periods. This caused some confusion, although many questions asked about ‘the last five years’ and then focussed on the current and previous calendar year.

As Section 4.6 in Chapter 4 explained, there are different options for a ‘one-year’ victimisation estimate. In our revised questionnaire we have opted for the third option that we set out. In this, the victimisation screeners focus first on victimisation experience over the past five years. Then, respondents who reply affirmatively are later asked whether the incident happened in the last 12 months before the date they were interviewed.

Possible further modifications

Although the length of the revised questionnaire in Annex B is moderate and acceptable, the question still remains as to whether there is room for further cuts. These, for instance, would allow for the extra time that the violence questions in Annex C would take.

Bearing in mind that there is relatively little ‘flesh on the bone’ to be pruned further, possible candidates are:

- a. One of the four ‘worry’ questions in Section A – primary questions which are asked of everyone.
- b. Burglary to a second home – which requires one primary question and an additional short Victim Form for those victimised.
- c. The value of property stolen and damaged in burglary – which may be quite a time-consuming question.
- d. Whether victims who reported to the police received any information about what happened – asked in the longer Victim Forms for burglary, robbery, and violence.
- e. Whether the offender was under the influence of alcohol and / or drugs – asked in relation to robbery and violence.
- f. Whether the offence might have happened because of the victim’s ethnic or immigrant status, religion or belief, disability, age, or sexual orientation. This is asked in relation to violence.
- g. Who was involved in card abuse.
- h. Whether victims who did not report violence to the police had contact with Victim Support.
- i. Avoidance behaviour at night – a primary question in Section E.

Shortening the questionnaire would, of course, cut overall fieldwork costs with the same sample size. Shorter interviews with given fieldwork costs would allow larger sample

sizes. A shorter questionnaire would also free space for additional modules, perhaps on a rotating basis, on other issues in future surveys.

Another option for reducing interview length is not to ask *all* questions on attitudes and opinions to each respondent. For example:

- There are four topics in Section A of the questionnaire, which deals with worried about crime. Computer assisted interviewing makes it possible to ask every respondent only about one of these five topics, which would be randomly generated. With a main sample of 8,000 respondents, each topic on worries would be answered by 1,600 respondents. This is sufficient to compute an average per country with a reasonably narrow reliability interval. This would shorten the interview by about one minute. A less drastic option would be to ask about two out of five topics randomly, although for the respondent the choice may appear somewhat odd.
- There are three topics regarding attitudes to law enforcement. Asking each respondent about one of the three at random will save 20-30 seconds per interview.
- The personal and household information in the last part of the questionnaire might not have to be asked of all respondents to study the relation between socio-demographics and victimisation risk. However, this needs further consideration. It is also unclear whether Eurostat requires the core variables to be collected for every respondent.
- A more radical option would be to use the full questionnaire with a sample of 2,000 per country. This sample could be used for cross-sectional analyses on victimisation, demographics and attitudinal data. In addition, an extended sample could be interviewed asking only questions on victimisation experience, victimisation details (for those victimised), and social demographic information. The time required for this questionnaire would be reduced by approximately 30%. This option allows a larger sample to be interviewed for a given budget. It would improve the accuracy of estimates of victimisation rates, levels of reporting to the police, satisfaction with police on reporting, etc. A larger sample might also provide the option of drawing sufficiently large subsamples in the capital cities of all Member States to allow the calculation of city victimisation rates as well as national rates.

The questionnaire for different modes

We do not feel it is feasible to prepare a 'mode neutral' questionnaire. The version of the questionnaire we have prepared is suitable for CATI and CAPI. Further consideration would need to be given to its adaptation for CAWI.

What CAPI and CATI can cope with will be hard to deliver in a paper questionnaire whether administered by interviewers without computers, or self-completed by respondents on paper. As mentioned in Section 4.2 of Chapter 2, interviewers and respondents have to cope with a complicated set of routings, depending on victimisation

status, and there are plentiful not completing the questionnaire in they what that is wanted. A paper version of the questionnaire will need very special attention.

Recommendations on a revised questionnaire

Recommendation: It would seem advisable to carry out a further round of pilot tests with the revised questionnaire, including the alternative approaches to the screeners (and follow-up questions) on violent victimisation.

Further tests should also address possible effects of the use of different modes of data collection including CAWI on victimisation rates and the need for reweighting results.

Given that the SASU questionnaire has been drafted in English, careful attention should be given to the translation of key concepts, preferably with back translation, particularly of the screener questions.

REFERENCES

- Aromaa, K. Heiskanen, M. Laaksonen, S. & Viuko M.** (2007). *Final Report on Crime and Victimization Survey*. Helsinki: HEUNI.
- Hough, M. & Maxfield, M.** (Eds.) (2007). *Surveying Crime in the XXI Century: Proceedings of a conference marking the 25th anniversary of the British Crime Survey*. New York: Criminal Justice Press.
- Lynch, J.P. & Addington, L.A.** (2007). *Understanding Crime Statistics; Revisiting the Divergence of the NCVS and UCR*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Mayhew, P. & van Dijk, J.** (2012) 'Assessing crime through international victimisation surveys'. In Gadd, D., Karstedt, S., & Messner, S.F. (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Criminological Research Methods*. London, UK: SAGE.
- Smith, M. D.** (1989) 'Woman abuse: the case for surveys by telephone'. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 4, 308-324.
- Skogan, W. G.** (1986) Methodological issues in the study of victimisation I, E. Fattah (Ed.), *From Crime Policy to Victim Policy*. London: Macmillan.
- United Nations** (2010). *Manual on Victimization Surveys*. Report ECE/CES/4. Vienna: UN Office on Drugs and Crime, UN Economic Commission for Europe.
- Van Dijk, J.J.M** (2009). *Approximating the Truth about Crime; comparing crime data based on general population surveys with police figures of recorded crimes*. www.crimeprev.eu.
- Van Dijk, J.J.M., Manchin, R., Van Kesteren, J. & Hideg, G.** (2007). *The burden of crime in the EU, key findings of the EU /International Crime Victim Survey 2005*. Turin: UNICRI, Brussels: Gallup/Europe.

ANNEX A MATRIX OF INFORMATION ON THE PILOT SURVEYS

This Annex summarises information from country reports with regard to the 23 information categories we considered important.

- Table A.1 covers: interview mode, sample size, response rates and interview duration.
- Table A.2 covers: sampling domain, sampling method, and respondent age range.
- Table A.3 covers: executing and supervising agency, interviewer experience, gender and training.
- Table A.4 covers modes of contact, re-contact and replacement, and incentives.
- Table A.5 covers Questionnaires changes, completion of Section G, and other comparisons.
- Table A.6 covers: salience and overall evaluation
- Table A.7 covers: Main criticisms and comments

All country reports on which this report is based are available on the CIRCA website. The contents of the reports were also pulled together into a series of separate documents. The first lays out general comments on the pilots from the final and interim country reports. The others synthesise the main comments in the reports about the seven sections (A to G) of the questionnaire. These documents (which are largely unedited) are available on request.

We also have available in electronic form the frequencies for all questions in the questionnaire from most of the pilot surveys, although in some surveys, sample sizes were too small to allow the calculation of frequency tables per question. This information can be used to assess whether individual questions give sufficient numbers of answers to justify inclusion given the sample size that will eventually be chosen for the final study.

Table A.1 Interview modes, sample size, response rates, and duration

	Interview modes	Sample size (net)	Response rates	Duration (minutes)
Austria	CATI / CAPI	511 / 485	41.7% 32.3%	28.5 (max 2 h)
Catalonia	CATI / CAPI + PAPI	707 / 472	21% / 70%	18 / 21
Cyprus	CAPI A few CASI and PAPI for Sec. G	639 101	89% 86%	40
Czech Rep	Face-to-face and by telephone (both modes computer assisted) and from paper.	691	69% (average for all methods)	34 30
Denmark³⁹	CATI with CAWI for Section G CAWI (all parts)	Total response 649 (305)	60% (28%) 28% for CAWI. 60% total result	Unknown
Finland	CAPI CAWI CAWI	757 3078 3993	50% 24% 62% ⁴⁰	28 23 23
Germany	PAPSI (victimisation screeners) CAWI (victim forms) CAPI (victim forms) PAPSI(victim forms)	1,306 42 29 121	52% 65% 32% 89%	Unknown
Hungary	PAPI ⁴¹	646	59	Unknown
Italy	CATI	503	48%	33
Latvia	CAPI and PAPI (Sec. G) / CATI	103 / 66	67% / 71%	22 / 20
Lithuania	CAPI Section G PAPI	244 198	81% (but only 66% completed whole questionnaire)	1.07 for complete interview (discarding uncompleted)
Poland	CATI CAPI (had a longer questionnaire)	500 100	22.1% na (random route)	26.2 40.7
Portugal	Nearly 1/3 (of the sample) CATI: 1/3 CAPI + CATI (G section); 1/3 CAPI + CASI (Section G) but respondent could ask for other method then initial assigned to	515	60% (total)	33.2
Slovak Rep	PAPI	200	na	92 mins Longest 140
Slovenia	CATI / CAPI	1084 / 916	52% / 38%	19 / na
Spain	Mainly CAPI (but some CATI) Section G was done with PAPI	659 (5)	53% (18% for CATI) 18% refused Section G	28 minutes (plus 9 minutes for the Section G)
Sweden	CATI	538	49%	18 / 25 ⁴²

39 Denmark: Statistics Denmark recontacted 54 out of 68 respondents who answered Sections A-F by phone and Section G through the Web. They said that they would have been willing to answer the full questionnaire by phone.

40 Finland: the response rate was 75% when households without telephone were deducted from the gross sample. The response rate was 62% if they were included.

41 Hungary: Section G filled out later by respondent without interviewer, unless respondent needed help.

42 Sweden: 18 mins without Section G; 25 mins when short Section G included.

Table A.2 Sampling domain, sampling method, and respondent range

	Sampling domain	Sampling method	Age from	Age till
Austria	National	Central Register of Registration and Telephone Directory ⁴³	18	No limit
Catalonia	CATI – Catalonia as a whole CAPI – Barcelona metrop. area	Random. Stratified by region Random, stratified by Census area	Unknown	Unknown
Cyprus	2 urban areas	Sampling frame: Population Register and households from the Electricity Authority. 2-stage random sample, stratified	18	74
Czech Rep	Part of Travel Movement Survey	Random sample of respondents from the Travel Movement Survey	Unknown	Unknown
Denmark	Population Registry	Random sample	16	75
Finland	Permanent Finnish speaking citizens	Population Register: stratified sample	15	74
Germany	Four states Head of households for household crimes Random household members for individual crimes	Panel of the German Micro Census (stratified by type of household)	16	No limit
Hungary	CATI in Budapest only	Random, stratified by region, sex and age / landlines	18	No limit
Italy	National population with landline telephone connection	Random, stratified by main geographical area and municipality	14 18 Section G	No limit 74 Section G
Latvia	5 cities / towns, 4 rural municipalities, and one rural territory	Random from Population Registry, stratified by region	18	74
Lithuania	Šiauliai and Panevėžys counties	Stratified by county (150 each) random from Population Registry	15	No limit
Poland	CAPI: random walk CATI: Telephone database	CAPI: ⁴⁴ random walk with stated starting points CATI: proportional stratified sample.	18	Unknown
Portugal	3 geographical regions: Lisbon, Oporto, and Algarve.	From Housing Registry. Kish method for selecting HH member. Stratified by region	18	74
Slovak Rep	Households, but mostly head of the household	'Intent selection'	18	No limit
Slovenia	Population Register of two cities (Ljubljana and Moribor)	Simple random sample stratified by age and geographical area	15	No limit
Spain	National 2007 Population Register	3-stage stratified sample	15 Section G 18	74
Sweden	National	Random, stratified by county and age	16	79

43 Austria: weighted according to 2007 average population living in private households (sex, age, and federal province).

44 Poland: Stratified by town size and 16 voivodships.

Table A.3 Executing and supervising agency, interviewer experience, gender and training

	Executing agency	Supervising agency	Interviewer experience	Gender	Training
Austria	Statistics Austria		Experienced; 150 for CAPI and 100 for CATI	Both	Unknown
Catalonia	IDESCAT and polling company		Unknown	Both	Yes
Cyprus	CYSTAT		Mixed	12 female 1 male	Yes
Czech Rep	Czech Statistical Office		Experienced interviewers	Unknown	In methodology, not specific in subject
Denmark	Statistics Denmark's Survey Division		Experienced	Unknown	Unknown
Finland	Statistics Finland	University of Helsinki, HEUNI	Experienced	19 female 10 males	By letter
Germany	Federal Statistical Office		n.a. (postal) experienced staff for CATI and CAPI parts	Both	Written field manual
Hungary	Hungarian Central Statistical Office		Experienced	Unknown	2 hours
Italy	Survey company selected by Istat	ISTAT	More experienced meant to be selected	Female only	Yes, but not in dealing with refusals
Latvia	National Statistical Bureau		Experienced	Both	Yes
Lithuania	Staff of regional statistics offices		Yes	Female	Yes
Poland	TNS OBOP	Institute of Justice	Mixed	CATI: 27 - 3/4 fem. CAPI: 26, 58% -fem.	Yes
Portugal	Statistics Portugal	National Working Group, comprising Min. of Justice, Min of Internal Affairs, and Victim Support	Mixed	80% female	Yes
Slovak Rep	Central Office of Statistics and Regional Offices		Yes	59% female	Unknown
Slovenia	Central Office		CATI: 12 students CAPI: 13 of which 4 students	CATI and CAPI: all female	4 hours
Spain	Contractor		Unknown	Female	Yes, 2 days
Sweden	Statistics Sweden		Yes	Unknown	Team that worked on national crime survey

Table A.4 Modes of contact, re-contact and replacement, and incentives

	Contact method	Re-contacting and replacement	Incentives
Austria	Letter	Unknown	€25 voucher
Catalonia	Advance letter	CATI – 6 call-backs CAPI – 3 attempts (well defined procedure for validation of respondent and then replacement with new address).	No
Cyprus	Advance letter (2 weeks prior)	No replacement if respondent not able or not available or when respondent spoke neither Greek nor English. Replacement only when selected respondent lived abroad, either for studies or work (was de-facto no member of ...)	No
Czech Rep	Letter	Unknown	Unknown
Denmark	Letter	When R did not fill out the web-based questionnaire, R was approached by phone. Not stated how many attempts, assume several.	Unknown
Finland	Letter	In CAWI 2nd letter to all, and reminder by SMS (50% of non-respondents after 2nd letter)	No
Germany	Screeners: letter Victim forms: letter	Screening: 1 recontacting only in one state (initial sample was big enough for a 60% drop out); replacement only, when selected person has died or moved abroad 2. Victim Forms: PAPSI: 1 recontacting by telephone CATI + CAPI: up to five attempts; replacement only, when selected person has died, moved abroad or because of incorrect offences	Screeners: 25-30 euro Victim forms: 15-30 euro
Hungary	Letter	Replacement by other household member if selected respondent not available, interviewer had up to three attempts to re-contact	No
Italy	Letter	7-attempts (different weekdays and time of day). Replacement within household after 4 attempts with primary respondent	No
Latvia	Letter	3 attempts at contact. After that another household member	No
Lithuania	Letter	3 attempts Replacement from by new address	No
Poland	No letter	CAPI: 2 attempts CATI: 8 attempts	No
Portugal	Letter	No replacement, but initial sample was oversized to meet required sample size	No
Slovak Rep	No , 'intended to comply'	'Intended to comply'	No
Slovenia	Letter	Special letters for follow-up procedures used	Unknown
Spain	Letter	6 call-backs	No
Sweden	Letter (1 week before	Same as for National Crime Survey	No

Table A.5 Questionnaires changes, completion of Section G, and other comparisons

	Questionnaire changes	Completed Sec. G	Comparisons with	
			Other surveys	Admin. sources
Austria	No	Yes	EU ICS (2004/5)	Yes, reporting to the police
Catalonia	No	Only CAPI; not CATI	No	Unknown
Cyprus	Only details	Yes	Not applicable	Not applicable
Czech Rep	Unknown	Yes, but in separate mode. 22 out of 27 answered details on victimisation	2007 survey, but results not comparable.	Yes, but not comparable
Denmark	No	CAWI only	Danish Victimisation Survey	Unknown
Finland	Section D omitted from CATI and CAWI; some improvement in question design	Yes	Finnish national victimisation surveys and ICVS	Police statistics
Germany	Questionnaire split into version for household crimes (to be filled out by a qualified household member) and a version for individual victimisation (to be filled out by random household member)	Yes, but rearranged	EU ICS (2004) Regional surveys	Police statistics
Hungary	Questionnaire was restructured to fit PAPI method	Yes	Nothing comparable	Not comparable
Italy	Some during translation, some during programming	Yes	National VS and Nat. VAWS (both ISTAT projects)	No
Latvia	No	Yes, many problems	No	No
Lithuania	Modifications made after cognitive testing	Yes	No	na
Poland	Some questions on household moved to end of questionnaire	CAPI, yes. CATI selected questions only (20 respondents)	Yes, but samples make comparisons difficult	No
Portugal	Modifications made	Yes, but different sequence of questions	No	No
Slovak Rep	Modifications made, see report on translation and testing	Yes	No	No
Slovenia	Unknown	Yes	No	Unknown
Spain	Unknown	Yes, but re-arranged	No	No
Sweden	No	Yes, but 25% refused	Swedish Crime Survey	Unknown

Table A.6 Saliency and overall evaluation

	Saliency	Overall evaluation
Austria	Positive, but the questionnaire is very demanding and the crimes are not the most serious ones.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is needed (and should be elaborated) is some tool that allows for differentiation between 'serious' or 'real' crime <i>versus</i> other disturbances.
Catalonia	Normal or good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ OK
Cyprus	Very positive. Another theme that could be covered is that of psychological violence. Similar survey could be conducted in schools, covering school violence.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very positive • Preference for CAPI (most appropriate for Cyprus)
Czech Rep	No judgement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The questionnaire was too long and complicated with enormous number of questions which burden respondents. • There were unpopular questions about property and income. • The long 5-year recall period was too inclusive.
Denmark	Overall, the interviewers found the survey very relevant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The questionnaire needs to be improved quite a lot
Finland	Positive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The questionnaire was too long, specially for CATI but also for the two other modes. • Phrasing of questions not optimal • Section G troublesome – long and invasive. • Section D very repetitive and too detailed.
Germany	Feasible, but needs work	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Methodology of the survey and wording, length and structure of the questionnaire need to be improved • Improved version can produce valid findings broadening knowledge for policy beyond official statistics • Can allow international comparison but full standardization will be difficult to attain
Hungary	Incentive might increase patience. Some crimes are not 'crimes'; respondents are not motivated to answer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questionnaire not suitable for PAPI. • Need for an 'other crimes' category. • No match between survey crime definitions and criminal code.
Italy	Respondents seemed interested.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Survey had good results. • Questionnaire is feasible. • Standardised methodology for data collection may not be possible
Latvia	Respondents very positive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both CATI and CAPI have advantages and disadvantages
Lithuania	19% dropped out during Section G; as a result 66% completed whole questionnaire	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unacceptable length and complexity of the questionnaire • Supplementary documents (explanations of the contents) are needed

Table A.6 (cont.) Salience and overall evaluation

	Salience	Overall evaluation
Poland	Very many refusals because of tedious and repetitive nature of the questions - especially Section G.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questionnaire must be improved a lot
Portugal	OK. Most respondents completed the interview	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are some problems to overcome with regard to sampling, interview mode and questionnaire.
Slovak Rep	Respondents got annoyed by repetition and length of the questionnaire	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It could be done in PAPI
Slovenia	The interview and other aspects of the survey like computer programming and data analysis are very demanding because of the length and complicated structure. It is a heavy burden	
Spain	The respondents considered the gathering of this type of information very appropriate.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Positive, but the questionnaire needs work
Sweden	Very positive, but response rates were lower than for the National survey, and questionnaire needs work	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many of the questions need to be reformulated • Many of the questions Section G are of a highly sensitive nature and are unsuited to a survey of this kind • Not sufficiently well developed for pilot testing

Table A.7 Main criticisms and comments

	Main criticisms and comments
Austria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Obviously the questionnaire is a demanding instrument, both for the respondents, and also for the interviewers. It is extremely time-consuming. • Many trivial crimes (or not even crimes). • There is doubt about the validity of the domestic violence items.
Catalonia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questionnaire needs to be rationalised and simplified. • It is a general survey with little attention to specific victim groups (children, gender based crime, on vacation etc). • Very serious violent crime is not in the questionnaire, but may fall out of the scope of this project
Cyprus	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many complaints about length. • Sensitivity and personal nature of questions is a problem. • Changes are needed regarding length and structure. • Target should be those aged 18+. • Introductions are needed for each section. • Section G should preferably be in CASI or PAPI mode • It should be stand-alone survey.
Czech Rep	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For future purposes, a more effective and appropriate approach would be to append several questions with reference to victims of one or two crime types over a period of one year to another social questionnaire. Furthermore, to obtain objective and comparable data, the sample size of respondents must be such that we can then weight the data according to the selected population.
Denmark	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data was linked to registered database that has information on respondent and household (age, gender, marital status, place of residence, citizenship, country of origin, household composition). Therefore, there was no need to ask these questions in the survey • Phrasing of questions clumsy. Too much repetition of questions. • Questionnaire is too long; respondents get disinterested.
Finland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The basic questionnaire should have been finalised in more detail before field testing, especially different versions for different modes
Germany	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A victim survey (within the system of official statistics) can lead to reliable and valid results. • The tested questionnaire requires modification, specifically with regard to wording of the questions. • Survey needs to be conducted on a regular basis. • Preferably there should be a uniform survey method, but this does not seem feasible. • The questionnaire must accommodate different types of interview methods; current instrument is not equipped for PAPSII. • Questionnaire must be shortened • Sample must be large enough. • Fieldwork possible in second half of 2013. • Translations are needed for non German-speaking population.
Hungary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self-completion of Section G was not a success. • In general, the respondents' opinion was that the questionnaire was too long, and too detailed. It was the most difficult and the longest questionnaire conducted in the last few years. • Many 'crimes' are not crimes. Repetition was tedious. Questionnaire needs an 'other crimes' category.

Table A.7 (cont.) Main criticisms and comments

	Main criticisms and comments
Italy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sensitive issues (income, protective measures) should be moved to the end. May be find different way of obtaining income. • Screening crimes in Section C were too long; need to apply a shorter list. • Better to use standardised time frames - preferably a 12-month reference period. • Streamline victim forms, in line with the type of crime reported. • Consumer fraud, bribery and computer crimes/security suffer from definitional problems. Bribery as defined in pilot questionnaire is too sensitive in the Italian context. • Section G: the introductions to this and to specific parts of the section are problematic or even redundant. Separate screeners for different types of offenders can be cut down. Sexual harassment is less relevant.
Latvia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The structure of the questionnaire seems to be rather complicated. Should be rearranged with no overlap. • Time frames are not consistent and are too long for some crimes. • Section G was problematic; too personal.
Lithuania	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Structure should clearer, simpler and shorter. • Violence should be shorter and clearer. • These should be clear description of concepts and definitions; too much confusion. • Household and person information should be harmonised with European model. • Crimes should be classified after details are asked. • Fewer response categories are needed. • CAPI is most appropriate for this survey. • Reference period should be the calendar year
Poland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too long – more than 300 questions. • Respondents became annoyed by the duration of interview (max 90 min. - many crimes, many details. • Wrong structure • Repetition of questions / issues • Too many questions about households • Too many questions about feeling safe • Broad panel of crimes including sexual and violent offences • Only basic crime details. • Few questions about households. • No questions about life time experience. • Survey should be repeated every 2 to 3 years.
Portugal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questionnaire needs deep revision: needs to be shorter and simpler. • Response categories need to be looked at. • Reference periods are not logical. • Follow-up questions are not logical. • Psychological violence is missing. • Satisfaction with justice system is missing.

Table A.7 (cont.) Main criticisms and comments

	Main criticisms and comments
Slovenia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too extensive - parts not applicable to Slovenia • Title of the project should have a positive connotation. • Avoid mentioning the police. • Personal and household information is problematic. • Young respondents have problems answering household information, and parents refuse on behalf of young respondents.
Spain	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The questionnaire is workable, despite its length. The average duration of the interviews is less than 30 minutes. • The Section G (Violence) subsections of the questionnaire used in the field test were rearranged with respect to the original version approved by the Task Force. • The rearrangement of Section G is based on the questions regarding violence experienced by the respondent, from the earliest to the most recent event. Firstly, the questions referred to violence experienced from a stranger, and concluded with partner violence. • It may be advisable to simplify the reference periods in the questionnaire, using only a short term (for example, the last five years) and a long term reference period (for example, the last fifteen years). • We believe that it may be useful to include, in each subsection of Section G, a question on when did the violent events take place and how old was the respondent at the time. • In the field test conducted in Spain, the target population was family units with people aged 15 to 74, inclusive, except for the questions in Section G (Violence), which were formulated to people aged over 18. • Given that older people had serious difficulties in responding to the self-completion questions in Section G, it may be advisable to lower the age limit from 74 to 70 years. • The test revealed that CAPI interviewing is the most appropriate. The length of the questionnaire and nature of the survey argue against the use of CATI. • We believe that from a Spanish perspective, a title such as “Survey on Safety and Crime” would be more understandable and more readily accepted by the public. This would encourage participation. • The test has also underscored the importance of a correct and accurate translation into the national language, duly substantiated by a cognitive test. • At this stage, given the length of the questionnaire, the wide range of issues addressed, and the duration of the interviews, we would advise against including this survey as a module of a broader European survey. We believe that it should be a standalone project.
Sweden	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Much lower non-response among the older respondents, (which raises doubts about representativeness of sample). • The questionnaire is very long and it may be worth scrutinising it in some detail, asking whether all of the information collected is really necessary.

ANNEX B PROPOSED QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE SASU

Ø. INTERVIEWER INTRODUCTION	
Ø1	<p>Intro1</p> <p>I am an interviewer from We are conducting a survey about crime and public safety at the request of the European Union (alternatively: of the Ministry of Justice / Interior).</p> <p>May I ask you a few questions? This interview won't take much of your time. Your answers will, of course, be treated confidentially and anonymously.</p>
Ø2	<p>Intro2</p> <p><< INT: IF RESPONDENT IS SUSPICIOUS OR DOUBTFUL >></p> <p>If you want to check whether this survey is done for the European Union / [Ministry], or if you would like more information, I can give you the phone-number of someone at the [Ministry].</p>
Ø3	<p>Intro3</p> <p><< INT: IF RESPONDENT ASKS FOR THAT NUMBER >></p> <p>His/her telephone is</p>
Ø4	<p>Household composition</p> <p>In order to determine which person in your household I should interview, I would like to know about the composition of your household. Including yourself, how many people are there in the household?</p> <p><< INT: REFERS TO CURRENT HOUSEHOLD. A HOUSEHOLD COMPRISES PEOPLE WHO REGULARLY EAT TOGETHER >></p> <p>Total number of persons in household _____</p> <p>Number of persons aged less than or equal to 4</p> <p>Number of persons aged from 5 to 13</p> <p>Number of persons aged from 14 to 15</p> <p>Number of persons aged from 16 to 24 of which, number of students</p> <p>Number of persons aged from 25 to 64</p> <p>Number of persons aged more than or equal to 65</p>
Ø5	<p>Respondent selection</p> <p>Could I now interview the person in your household aged 16 or over whose birthday is next?</p> <p><< INT: IF SAME PERSON, GO TO QUESTION SECTION A. IF DIFFERENT PERSON, GO TO QUESTION Ø6 >></p>
Ø6	<p>Appointment book</p> <p><< INT: IF NOT AVAILABLE >></p> <p>Can you tell me at what time and at which telephone number I have the best chance of contacting him / her?</p> <p>Note date, time, number _____</p> <p><< INT: IF SELECTED RESPONDENT IS DIFFERENT FROM THE FIRST PERSON CONTACTED IN THE HOUSEHOLD >></p>
Ø7	<p>Intro4</p> <p>I am an interviewer from We are conducting a survey about crime and public safety the request of the European Union (alternatively: of the Ministry of Justice / Interior).</p> <p>May I ask you a few questions? This interview won't take much of your time. Your answers will, of course, be treated confidentially and anonymously.</p>

A. FEELING SAFE AND WORRIES ABOUT CRIME	
A1	<p>How safe do you feel alone at night</p> <p>I would now like to ask some questions about crime in your area.</p> <p>How safe do you feel walking alone in your area after dark? Do you feel very safe, fairly safe, a bit unsafe, or very unsafe?</p> <p><< INT: IF RESPONDENTS SAYS 'NEVER GOES OUT', STRESS >></p> <p>How safe <u>would you feel?</u></p> <p>1 Very safe</p> <p>2 Fairly safe</p> <p>3 A bit unsafe</p> <p>4 Very unsafe</p> <p>5 [DK]</p>
A2	<p>Worried about contact crime</p> <p>How worried are you about a family member or you yourself being physically attacked by people you do not know? Are you not worried at all, a bit worried, quite worried or very worried?</p> <p>1 Not worried at all</p> <p>2 A bit worried</p> <p>3 Quite worried</p> <p>4 Very worried</p> <p>5 [DK]</p>
A3	<p>Worried about terrorism</p> <p>How worried are you about being victim of a terrorist attack in your country? Are you not worried at all, a bit worried, quite worried or very worried?</p> <p>1 Not worried at all</p> <p>2 A bit worried</p> <p>3 Quite worried</p> <p>4 Very worried</p> <p>5 [DK]</p>
A4	<p>Likelihood of burglary</p> <p>What would you say are the chances that over the next twelve months someone will try to break into your home to steal something? Do you think this is not at all likely, not very likely, fairly likely, or very likely?</p> <p>1 Not at all likely</p> <p>2 Not very likely</p> <p>3 Fairly likely</p> <p>4 Very likely</p> <p>5 [DK]</p>
B. QUESTIONS ABOUT VEHICLE OWNERSHIP, SECOND HOME OWNERSHIP AND USE OF 'CARDS' AND ONLINE BANKING	
	<p>I will be asking you some questions about crimes that you or other household members might have experienced. Before that, though, I need to ask you about some things that might have been targeted by offenders.</p>
B1	<p>Use of car / van / pick-up truck</p> <p>First, in the last five years, has anyone in your household had a car, van or pick-</p>

	<p>up truck for personal use?</p> <p><< INT: INCLUDE LEASED CARS AND COMPANY CARS AVAILABLE FOR PERSONAL USE >></p> <p><< INT: HOUSEHOLD MEANS <u>CURRENT</u> HOUSEHOLD MEMBERS >></p> <p><< HOUSEHOLD MEMBERS ARE PEOPLE WHO LIVE IN THE SAME HOUSE AND REGULARLY EAT TOGETHER >></p> <p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember]</p>
B2	<p>Use of motorcycle</p> <p>In the last five years, has anyone in your household had a moped, scooter or motorcycle?</p> <p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember]</p>
B3	<p>Use of bicycle</p> <p>In the last five years, has anyone in your household had a bicycle?</p> <p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember]</p>
B4	<p>Second home ownership</p> <p>In the last five years, did your household have a second home?</p> <p><< INT: INCLUDE A HOME AVAILABLE FOR USE BY THE HOUSEHOLD, EVEN IF IT IS LET OUT OCCASIONALLY >></p> <p><< INT: DO NOT INCLUDE HOMES WHICH ARE PERMANENTLY LET OUT >></p> <p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember]</p>
B5	<p>Ownership of bank and credit cards, and use of on-line banking</p> <p>In the last five years, have you personally used a credit card, cash card, or bank card, or done your banking on-line?</p> <p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember]</p>
C VICTIMISATION SCREENERS	
<p><i>Note that all the screener questions refer to the experience of country citizens wherever the offence might have occurred – rather than to offences in the country in which they live. Whether the incident took place abroad is dealt with in the follow-up questions.</i></p>	
VICTIMISATION SCREENERS FOR VEHICLE-RELATED CRIMES	
<p>I would now like to ask some questions about crimes that you or other members of your household may have experienced.</p> <p><i>IF B1 = 1, ASK C1. IF B1 = 2 OR 3, GO TO C3</i></p>	
C1	<p>Car theft victimisation screener</p> <p>In the last five years have you or anyone else in your household had a car, van or pick-up truck stolen or driven away without permission?</p> <p><< INT: DO NOT INCLUDE A CAR BEING TAKEN BY A FAMILY MEMBER WITHOUT PERMISSION, UNLESS THE OWNER CONSIDERS THIS THEFT >></p>

	<p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember]</p>
C2	<p><i>IF B1 = 1, ASK C2. IF B1 = 2 OR 3, GO TO C3</i></p> <p>Theft from car victimisation screener</p> <p>(Apart from this) In the last five years have you or anyone else in your household had anything stolen from a car, van or pick-up truck? This includes parts of the vehicle, personal possessions in the car, or other things.</p> <p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember]</p>
C3	<p><i>IF B2 = 1, ASK C3. IF B2 = 2 OR 3, GO TO C4</i></p> <p>Motorcycle theft victimisation screener</p> <p>In the last five years, did you or anyone else in your household have a motorcycle, scooter or moped stolen or driven away without permission?</p> <p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember]</p>
C4	<p><i>IF B3 = 1, ASK C4. IF B3 = 2 OR 3, GO TO C5</i></p> <p>Bicycle theft victimisation screener</p> <p>In the last five years have you or anyone else in your household had a bicycle stolen?</p> <p><< INT: INCLUDE CHILDREN'S BICYCLES IF THEY ARE TWO-WHEELERS >></p> <p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember]</p>
VICTIMISATION SCREENERS FOR HOUSEHOLD-RELATED CRIMES	
C5	<p>Burglary victimisation screener</p> <p>Over the past five years, did anyone actually get into your main home without permission and steal or try to steal something? I am not including here thefts from the garden, garage, shed or lock-up or from a second home.</p> <p><< INT: INCLUDE CELLARS THAT ARE PART OF THE HOME. >></p> <p><< INT: INCLUDE STATIC MOBILE HOMES / CARAVANS >></p> <p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember]</p>
C6	<p><i>IF B4 = 1, ASK C6. IF B4 = 2 OR 3, GO TO C7</i></p> <p>Burglaries in second homes</p> <p>Over the past five years, did anyone actually get into your second home / house without permission, and steal or try to steal something? I am not including here thefts from the garden, garage, shed or lock-up.</p> <p><< INT: INCLUDE CELLARS. THAT ARE PART OF THE HOME>></p> <p><< INT: INCLUDE STATIC MOBILE HOMES / CARAVANS >></p> <p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember]</p>

VICTIMISATION SCREENERS FOR PERSONAL CRIMES

Next I would like to ask you some questions about what may have happened to you personally. Things that you have mentioned already or which happened to other members of your household should not be mentioned here.

Please include anything that happened to you in the last five years. These incidents could have taken place in the street, for instance, in a pub, in a park, on public transport, at work, or at home.

C7 Robbery victimisation screener

In the last five years, has anyone stolen, or tried to steal something from you by using force or threatening you with force?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 3 [DK / cannot remember]

C8 Personal theft victimisation screener

Excluding thefts by using force or threat, there are many other types of theft of personal property, such as pick-pocketing or theft of a purse, wallet, clothing, jewellery, mobile phone, and mp3 player, or sports equipment.

In the last five years have you personally been victim of any of these incidents?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 3 [DK / cannot remember]

VICTIMISATION SCREENERS FOR 'NON-CONVENTIONAL' CRIMES

C9 Consumer fraud victimisation screener

Now changing the subject, in the last five years, were you yourself the victim of a consumer fraud. In other words, have you been cheated in terms of the quantity, quality or pricing of the goods being sold or services delivered? This could also have happened when you bought something over the Internet.

<< INT: INCLUDE CELLARS. THAT ARE PART OF THE HOME >>

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 3 [DK / cannot remember]

IF B5 = 1, ASK C10. IF B5 = 2 OR 3, GO TO C11

C10 Card / on-line banking abuse victimisation screener

In the last five years, has information from your credit card, cash card, debit card, bank card or on-line bank account been used without permission, to steal from you, or to defraud you?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 3 [DK / cannot remember]

C11 Bribery victimisation screener

In some countries, there is a problem of bribery in the public or private sector. In the last five years, has anyone such as a police officer, other government official (for example an inspector or a customs officer), a doctor, or teacher asked you, or expected you to pay a bribe [or backhander] for his or her services?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 3 [DK / cannot remember]

VICTIMISATION SCREENERS FOR VIOLENT CRIMES

I asked before whether anyone had stolen, or tried to steal something from you by using force or threatening you with force. Apart from this, I would like to ask you about other incidents when someone has used force against you, or threatened to do so. These incidents could have taken place in the street, for instance, in a pub, in a park, on public transport, at work, or at home.

I will start with offences of a sexual nature. I am only interested in incidents which might have happened to you personally.

Remember that your answers will, of course, be treated confidentially and anonymously.

C12 Sexual offences – people not known

People sometimes touch or grab someone in a really offensive way for sexual reasons, or force or attempt to force them into an unwanted sexual act. I want to know whether this has happened to you. This might have involved someone you knew, or someone you did not know at the time. First, I would like to know whether, in the past five years, anyone you did not know at the time has done any of these things to you?

<< INT: IF RESPONDENT IS HESITANT OR NERVOUS, TRY TO FIND OUT IF THE PRESENCE OF OTHERS IS A PROBLEM. IF SO, CONSIDER OPTION OF RESCHEDULING THE INTERVIEW >>

<< INT: PEOPLE KNOWN JUST BY SIGHT SHOULD BE COUNTED AS PEOPLE NOT KNOWN >>

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 3 [DK / cannot remember]
- 4 [Refusal / don't wish to answer]

C13 Sexual offences – others known

Secondly, has anyone you know done this to you in the past five years? This could have been a partner, ex-partner, boyfriend / girlfriend, ex-boyfriend / girlfriend, a date, or someone else you knew well, such as a family member, friend, neighbour, or colleague. Please take your time to think about it.

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 3 [DK, cannot remember]
- 4 [Refusal / don't wish to answer]

<< INT: AGAIN, IF RESPONDENT IS HESITANT OR NERVOUS, TRY TO FIND OUT IF THE PRESENCE OF OTHERS IS A PROBLEM. IF SO, CONSIDER OPTION OF RESCHEDULING THE INTERVIEW >>

Now I am going to ask about other incidents of a non-sexual nature when someone has used force against you, or threatened to do so. Again this might have involved someone you knew, or someone you did not know at the time.

Remember that your answers will, of course, be treated confidentially and anonymously.

C14 Assaults / threats – people not known

First, in the past five years, has anyone you did not know at the time threatened to hurt you, or actually slapped you, hit you, kicked you, thrown something at you, or attacked or threatened you with a weapon in a way that really frightened you?

<< INT: IF RESPONDENT IS HESITANT OR NERVOUS, TRY TO FIND OUT IF THE PRESENCE OF OTHERS IS A PROBLEM. IF SO, CONSIDER OPTION OF RESCHEDULING THE INTERVIEW >>

<< INT: PEOPLE KNOWN JUST BY SIGHT SHOULD BE COUNTED AS PEOPLE NOT KNOWN >>

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 3 [DK / cannot remember]
- 4 [Refusal / don't wish to answer]

C15 Assaults / threats – others known

Secondly, has anyone you know done this to you in the past five years? This could have been a partner, ex-partner, boyfriend / girlfriend, ex-boyfriend / girlfriend, a date, or someone else you knew well, such as a family member, friend, neighbour, or colleague.

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 3 [DK, cannot remember]
- 4 [Refusal, don't wish to answer]

D. VICTIMISATION DETAILS	
SECTION D QUESTIONS RELATE TO CRIMES THE RESPONDENT HAS BEEN VICTIM OF IN THE LAST FIVE YEARS. THE QUESTIONS RELATE TO THE LAST INCIDENT THAT HAPPENED, IF THEY HAVE BEEN VICTIMISED MORE THAN ONCE	
D1 THEFT OF A CAR / VAN / PICK-UP TRUCK	
IF C1 = 1, ASK D1.1, ELSE GO TO D2.1 You have been a victim of one or more crimes in the last five years. I will now ask you a few details about these incidents.	
D1.1	When (MR) You mentioned the theft of a car (van / pick-up truck). I want to know when this happened. Was it within the last 12 months – i.e., since [12 months before date of interview]. Or was it before this? << INT: IF RESPONDENT HAS BEEN VICTIM MORE THAN ONCE, CODE ALL TIME PERIODS THAT APPLY >> << INT: PROBE AS FAR AS POSSIBLE WHETHER CODE 1 OR 2 APPLIES >> 1 Last 12 months 2 Before that 3 [DK / cannot remember]
	<i>IF D1.1 = 1, ASK D1.1a. ELSE GO TO D1.2</i> D1.1a How often in last 12 months How often did it happen in the last 12 months? 1 Once 2 Twice 3 Three times 4 Four times 5 Five times or more 6 [DK / cannot remember]
D1.2	<i>Where did it happen</i> (The last time) where did this theft happen? Was it in or around your home, in your neighbourhood or town, somewhere elsewhere in [country], or did it happen abroad? << INT: IF VICTIM MORE THAN ONCE OVER THE PAST FIVE YEARS, ASK ABOUT THE LAST TIME THIS HAPPENED >> 1 In or around own home (main or secondary residence) 2 In neighbourhood or town 3 Elsewhere in [country] 4 Abroad 5 [DK / cannot remember]
D1.3	Was vehicle returned (The last time this happened) Did you get the vehicle back? 1 Yes 2 No 3 [DK / cannot remember]
D1.4	Incident reported to the police (The last time this happened) did you or anyone else report the incident to the

<p>police?</p> <p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember]</p>
<p><i>IF D1.4 = 1, ASK D.1.4a</i></p> <p>D1.4a Satisfied with police response</p> <p>Overall, how satisfied were you with the way the police handled the matter? Were you very satisfied, fairly satisfied, neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, a bit dissatisfied or very dissatisfied?</p> <p>1 Very satisfied</p> <p>2 Fairly satisfied</p> <p>3 Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</p> <p>4 A bit dissatisfied</p> <p>5 Very dissatisfied</p> <p>6 [DK / cannot remember]</p> <p><i>END OF SECTION – GO TO D2.1</i></p>
<p>D2 THEFT FROM A CAR / VAN / PICK-UP TRUCK</p>
<p><i>IF C2 = 1, ASK D2.1, ELSE GO TO D3.1</i></p> <p>D2.1 When (MR)</p> <p>You mentioned the theft from a car (van / pick-up truck). I want to know when this happened. Was it within the last 12 months – i.e., since [12 months before date of interview]. Or was it before this?</p> <p><< INT: IF RESPONDENT HAS BEEN VICTIM MORE THAN ONCE, CODE ALL TIME PERIODS THAT APPLY >></p> <p>1 Last 12 months</p> <p>2 Before that</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember]</p>
<p><i>IF D2.1 = 1, ASK D2.1b. ELSE GO TO D2.2</i></p> <p>D2.1b How often in last 12 months</p> <p>How often did it happen in the last 12 months?</p> <p>1 Once</p> <p>2 Twice</p> <p>3 Three times</p> <p>4 Four times</p> <p>5 Five times or more</p> <p>6 [DK / cannot remember]</p>
<p>D2.2 <i>Where did it happen</i></p> <p>(The last time) where did this theft happen? Was it in or around your home, in your neighbourhood or town, somewhere elsewhere in [country], or did it happen abroad?</p> <p>-<< INT: IF VICTIM MORE THAN ONCE OVER THE PAST FIVE YEARS, ASK ABOUT THE LAST TIME THIS HAPPENED >></p> <p>1 In or around own home (main or secondary residence)</p> <p>2 In neighbourhood or town</p> <p>3 Elsewhere in [country]</p> <p>4 Abroad</p> <p>5 [DK / cannot remember]</p>
<p>D2.3 Incident reported to the police</p>

<p>(The last time this happened) did you or anyone else report the incident to the police?</p> <p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember]</p>
<p><i>IF D2.3 = 1, ASK D2.3a</i></p> <p>D2.3a Satisfaction with police response</p> <p>Overall, how satisfied were you with the way the police handled the matter? Were you very satisfied, fairly satisfied, neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, a bit dissatisfied or very dissatisfied?</p> <p>1 Very satisfied</p> <p>2 Fairly satisfied</p> <p>3 Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</p> <p>4 A bit dissatisfied</p> <p>5 Very dissatisfied</p> <p>6 [DK / cannot remember]</p> <p><i>END OF SECTION – GO TO D3.1</i></p>
<p>D3 MOTORCYCLE / MOPED THEFT</p>
<p><i>IF C3 = 1, ASK D3.1. ELSE GO TO D4.1</i></p> <p>D3.1 When (MR)</p> <p>You mentioned theft of a motorcycle or moped. I want to know when this happened. Was it within the last 12 months – i.e., since [12 months before date of interview]. Or was it before this?</p> <p><< INT: IF RESPONDENT HAS BEEN VICTIM MORE THAN ONCE, CODE ALL TIME PERIODS THAT APPLY >></p> <p>1 Last 12 months</p> <p>2 Before that</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember]</p>
<p><i>IF D3.1 = 1, ASK D3.1a. ELSE GO TO D3.2</i></p> <p>D3.1a How often in last 12 months</p> <p>How often did it happen in the last 12 months?</p> <p>1 Once</p> <p>2 Twice</p> <p>3 Three times</p> <p>4 Four times</p> <p>5 Five times or more</p> <p>6 [DK / cannot remember]</p>
<p>D3.2 Where did it happen</p> <p>(The last time) where did this theft happen? Was it in or around your home, in your neighbourhood or town, somewhere elsewhere in [country], or did it happen abroad?</p> <p><< INT: IF VICTIM MORE THAN ONCE OVER THE PAST FIVE YEARS, ASK ABOUT THE LAST TIME THIS HAPPENED >></p> <p>1 In or around own home (main or secondary residence)</p> <p>2 In neighbourhood or town</p> <p>3 Elsewhere in [country]</p> <p>4 Abroad</p> <p>5 [DK / cannot remember]</p>

<p>D3.3 Incident reported to the police (The last time this happened) did you or anyone else report the incident to the police?</p> <p>1 Yes 2 No 3 [DK / cannot remember]</p>
<p><i>IF D3.3 = 1, ASK D3.3a</i></p> <p>D3.3a Satisfaction with police response Overall, how satisfied were you with the way the police handled the matter? Were you very satisfied, fairly satisfied, neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, a bit dissatisfied or very dissatisfied?</p> <p>1 Very satisfied 2 Fairly satisfied 3 Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied 4 A bit dissatisfied 5 Very dissatisfied 6 [DK / cannot remember]</p> <p><i>END OF SECTION – GO TO D4.1</i></p>
<p>D4 BICYCLE THEFT</p>
<p><i>IF C4 = 1, ASK D4.1. ELSE GO TO D5.1</i></p> <p>D4.1 When (MR) You mentioned theft of a bicycle I want to know when this happened. Was it within the last 12 months – i.e., since [12 months before date of interview]. Or was it before this?</p> <p><< INT: IF RESPONDENT HAS BEEN VICTIM MORE THAN ONCE, CODE ALL TIME PERIODS THAT APPLY >></p> <p>1 Last 12 months 2 Before that 3 [DK / cannot remember]</p>
<p><i>IF D4.1 = 1, ASK D4.1a. ELSE GO TO D4.2</i></p> <p>D4.1a How often in last 12 months How often did it happen in the last 12 months?</p> <p>1 Once 2 Twice 3 Three times 4 Four times 5 Five times or more 6 [DK / cannot remember]</p>
<p>D4.2 Where did it happen (The last time) where did this theft happen? Was it in or around your home, in your neighbourhood or town, somewhere elsewhere in [country], or did it happen abroad?</p> <p><< INT: IF VICTIM MORE THAN ONCE OVER THE PAST FIVE YEARS, ASK ABOUT THE LAST TIME THIS HAPPENED >></p> <p>1 In or around own home (main or secondary residence) 2 In neighbourhood or town 3 Elsewhere in [country] 4 Abroad</p>

5	[DK / cannot remember]
D4.3	<p>Incident reported to the police</p> <p>(The last time this happened) did you or anyone else report the incident to the police?</p> <p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember]</p>
D4.3a	<p><i>IF D4.3 = 1, ASK D4.3a</i></p> <p>Satisfaction with police response</p> <p>Overall, how satisfied were you with the way the police handled the matter? Were you very satisfied, fairly satisfied, neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, a bit dissatisfied or very dissatisfied?</p> <p>1 Very satisfied</p> <p>2 Fairly satisfied</p> <p>3 Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</p> <p>4 A bit dissatisfied</p> <p>5 Very dissatisfied</p> <p>6 [DK / cannot remember]</p> <p><i>END OF SECTION – GO TO D5.1</i></p>
D5 BURGLARY – MAIN HOME	
D5.1	<p><i>IF C5 = 1, ASK D5.1, ELSE GO TO D6.1</i></p> <p>When (MR)</p> <p>You mentioned a burglary in your main home. I want to know when this happened. Was it within the last 12 months – i.e., since [12 months before date of interview]. Or was it before this?</p> <p><< INT: IF RESPONDENT HAS BEEN VICTIM MORE THAN ONCE, CODE ALL TIME PERIODS THAT APPLY >></p> <p>1 Last 12 months</p> <p>2 Before that</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember]</p>
D5.1a	<p><i>IF D5.1 = 1, ASK D5.1a. ELSE GO TO D5.2</i></p> <p>How often in last 12 months</p> <p>How often did it happen in the last 12 months?</p> <p>1 Once</p> <p>2 Twice</p> <p>3 Three times</p> <p>4 Four times</p> <p>5 Five times or more</p> <p>6 [DK / cannot remember]</p>
D5.2	<p>Value of property stolen or damaged</p> <p>(The last time) what do you estimate roughly was the value of any property stolen or damaged?</p> <p><< INT: IF VICTIM MORE THAN ONCE OVER THE PAST FIVE YEARS, ASK ABOUT THE LAST TIME THIS HAPPENED >></p> <p><< INT: IF RESPONDENTS ASKS, ASK FOR REPLACEMENT VALUE. TRY AND OBTAIN AT LEAST A ROUGH ESTIMATE >></p> <p>1 [Nothing stolen or damaged]</p> <p>2 _____ value in € (or local currency)</p>

3 [DK / cannot remember]
<p>D5.2a Burglary insurance</p> <p>Was any of the property which was stolen or damaged covered by insurance?</p> <p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember]</p>
<p>D5.3 Incident reported to the police</p> <p>(The last time this happened) did you or anyone else report the incident to the police?</p> <p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember]</p> <p><i>IF D5.3 = 1,, GO TO D5.3b</i></p> <p><i>IF D5.3 = 3, GO TO D5.5</i></p>
<p><i>IF D5.3 = 2, ASK D5.3a</i></p> <p>D5.3a Why police were not informed (MR)</p> <p>Why not?</p> <p><< INT: MULTIPLE RESPONSES ARE POSSIBLE. DO NOT READ OUT RESPONSE CATEGORIES BELOW, BUT CODE ANSWERS IN THE MOST APPROPRIATE CATEGORY >></p> <p>1 Not serious enough / no loss / kid's stuff</p> <p>2 Inappropriate for police / police not necessary</p> <p>3 Police could do nothing / lack of proof</p> <p>4 Police won't do anything about it</p> <p>5 Fear / dislike of the police / didn't want involvement with police</p> <p>6 Reported to other authorities instead</p> <p>7 Solved it myself / my family resolved it / perpetrator known to me</p> <p>8 No insurance</p> <p>9 Fear of reprisals</p> <p>10 Inconvenient / police too far away / too much trouble</p> <p>11 Other reasons</p> <p>12 Don't know</p> <p><i>GO TO D5.5</i></p>
<p><i>IF D5.3 = 1, ASK D5.3b</i></p> <p>D5.3b Satisfaction with police response</p> <p>Overall, how satisfied were you with the way the police handled the matter? Were you very satisfied, fairly satisfied, neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, a bit dissatisfied or very dissatisfied?</p> <p>1 Very satisfied</p> <p>2 Fairly satisfied</p> <p>3 Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</p> <p>4 A bit dissatisfied</p> <p>5 Very dissatisfied</p> <p>6 [DK / cannot remember]</p>
<p><i>IF D5.3b = 4 OR 5, ASK D5.3c</i></p> <p>D5.3c Why not satisfied (MR)</p> <p>For what reasons were you dissatisfied? You can give more than one reason.</p>

<p><< INT: MULTIPLE RESPONSES ARE POSSIBLE. DO NOT READ OUT RESPONSE CATEGORIES BELOW, BUT CODE ANSWERS IN THE MOST APPROPRIATE CATEGORY >></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Didn't do enough 2 Were not interested 3 Didn't find or apprehend the offender 4 Didn't recover my property (goods) 5 Didn't keep me properly informed 6 Didn't treat me correctly / were impolite 7 Were slow to arrive 8 Other reasons 9 DK (spontaneous)
<p><i>IF D5.3 = 1, ASK D5.4</i></p> <p>D5.4 Receive any information about what happened</p> <p>Did you receive any information from the police about what happened in your case - for instance, did they say they had caught someone, or that they were not in a position to take things further?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Yes 2 No 3 [DK / cannot remember]
<p>D5.5 Contact victim support</p> <p>In some countries, agencies have been set up to help victims of crime by giving information, practical or emotional support. Did you or anyone else in your household have any contact with a specialised victim support agency after this incident?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Yes 2 No 3 [DK / cannot remember]
<p><i>IF D5.5 = 1, ASK D5.5a</i></p> <p><i>IF D5.5 = 2 OR 3, GO TO D5.5b</i></p> <p>D5.5a What type of contact (MR)</p> <p>What type of contact did you have? Was it a letter, a phone call, or did you personally meet with the victim support agency?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Letter 2 Phone call 3 Met with victim support agency 4 [DK / cannot remember]
<p><i>IF D5.5 = 2 or 3, ASK D5.5b</i></p> <p>D5.5b Support useful</p> <p>Do you think that the services of a specialised agency to help victims of crime would have been useful for you or anyone else in your household after this incident?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Yes 2 No 3 [DK / cannot remember]
<p>D5.6 Emotional impact</p> <p>To what extent is the incident still on your mind? Do you never think about it, sometimes think about it, think about it quite often, or does it dominate your</p>

<p>life?</p> <p>1 Never</p> <p>2 Sometimes think about it</p> <p>3 Think about it quite often</p> <p>4 Dominates my life</p> <p>5 [DK / refuses to say]</p> <p><i>END OF SECTION – GO TO D6.1</i></p>
<p>D6 BURGLARY – SECOND HOME</p>
<p><i>IF C6 = 1, ASK D6.1, ELSE GO TO D7.1</i></p> <p>D6.1 When (MR)</p> <p>You mentioned a burglary in your second home. I want to know when this happened. Was it within the last 12 months – i.e., since [12 months before date of interview]. Or was it before this?</p> <p><< INT: IF RESPONDENT HAS BEEN VICTIM MORE THAN ONCE, CODE ALL TIME PERIODS THAT APPLY >></p> <p>1 Last 12 months</p> <p>2 Before that</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember]</p>
<p><i>IF D6.1 = 1, ASK D6.1a. ELSE GO TO D6.2</i></p> <p>D6.1a How often in last 12 months</p> <p>How often did it happen in the last 12 months?</p> <p>1 Once</p> <p>2 Twice</p> <p>3 Three times</p> <p>4 Four times</p> <p>5 Five times or more</p> <p>6 [DK / cannot remember]</p>
<p>D6.2 Whether second home abroad</p> <p>[The last time] was the burglary at a second home in this country, or in another country?</p> <p><< INT: IF VICTIM MORE THAN ONCE OVER THE PAST FIVE YEARS, ASK ABOUT THE LAST TIME THIS HAPPENED >></p> <p>1 This country</p> <p>2 Another country</p>
<p>D6.3 Incident reported to the police</p> <p>(The last time this happened) did you or anyone else report the incident to the police?</p> <p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember]</p>
<p><i>IF D6.3 = 1, ASK D.6.3a</i></p> <p>D6.3a Satisfied with police response</p> <p>Overall, how satisfied were you with the way the police handled the matter? Were you very satisfied, fairly satisfied, neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, a bit dissatisfied or very dissatisfied?</p> <p>1 Very satisfied</p> <p>2 Fairly satisfied</p> <p>3 Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</p>

<p>4 A bit dissatisfied</p> <p>5 Very dissatisfied</p> <p>6 [DK / cannot remember]</p> <p><i>END OF SECTION – GO TO D7.1</i></p>
<p>D7 ROBBERY</p>
<p><i>IF C7 = 1, ASK D7.1, ELSE GO TO D8.1</i></p> <p>D7.1 When (MR)</p> <p>You mentioned that someone had stolen, or tried to steal, something from you by using force or threatening you with force. I want to know when this happened. Was it within the last 12 months – i.e., since [12 months before date of interview]. Or was it before this?</p> <p><< INT: IF RESPONDENT HAS BEEN VICTIM MORE THAN ONCE, CODE ALL TIME PERIODS THAT APPLY >></p> <p>1 Last 12 months</p> <p>2 Before that</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember]</p>
<p><i>IF D7.1 = 1. ASK D7.1a. ELSE GO TO D7.2</i></p> <p>D7.1a How often in last 12 months</p> <p>How often did it happen in the last 12 months?</p> <p>1 Once</p> <p>2 Twice</p> <p>3 Three times</p> <p>4 Four times</p> <p>5 Five times or more</p> <p>6 [DK / cannot remember]</p>
<p>D7.2 Where did it happen</p> <p>(The last time) where did this incident happen? Was it in or around your home, in your neighbourhood or town, somewhere elsewhere in [country], or did it happen abroad?</p> <p><< INT: IF VICTIM MORE THAN ONCE OVER THE PAST FIVE YEARS, ASK ABOUT THE LAST TIME THIS HAPPENED >></p> <p>1 In or around own home (main or secondary residence)</p> <p>2 In neighbourhood or town</p> <p>3 Elsewhere in [country]</p> <p>4 Abroad</p> <p>5 [DK / cannot remember]</p>
<p>D7.3 Something stolen</p> <p>Was anything actually stolen?</p> <p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember]</p>
<p>D7.4 Weapon used</p> <p>Did any of the offenders have a weapon or something they used or threatened to use as a weapon?</p> <p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember]</p>

<p><i>IF D7.4 = 1, ask D7.4a</i></p> <p>D7.4a Kind of weapon</p> <p>What did he / she / they use as a weapon? Was it a gun of some sort, a knife, or something else? <<</p> <p>INT: DO NOT READ OUT. IF MORE THAN ONE WEAPON, MARK THE HIGHEST ON THE LIST >></p> <p>1 Gun (of some sort)</p> <p>2 Knife</p> <p>3 Something else</p> <p>4 [DK / cannot remember]</p>
<p>D7.5 Injury</p> <p>Were you bruised, scratched, cut or injured in any way?</p> <p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember]</p>
<p><i>IF D7.5 = 1, ASK D7.5a</i></p> <p>D7.5a Treatment for injury</p> <p>Did you visit a doctor, health centre or hospital because of the incident?</p> <p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember]</p>
<p>D7.6 Emotional impact</p> <p>To what extent is the incident still on your mind? Do you never think about it, sometimes think about it, think about it quite often, or does it dominate your life?</p> <p>1 Never</p> <p>2 Sometimes think about it</p> <p>3 Think about it quite often</p> <p>4 Dominates my life</p> <p>5 [DK / refuses to say]</p>
<p>D7.7 Alcohol</p> <p>At the time the incident happened, did you think the offender was under the influence of alcohol and / or drugs?</p> <p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember]</p>
<p>D7.8 Incident reported to the police</p> <p>(The last time this happened) did you or anyone else report the incident to the police?</p> <p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember]</p> <p><i>IF D7.8 = 1, GO TO D7.8b</i></p> <p><i>IF D7.8 = 3, GO TO D7.10</i></p>
<p><i>IF D7.8 = 2, ASK D7.8a</i></p> <p>D7.8a Why police were not informed (MR)</p> <p>Why not?</p>

<< INT: MULTIPLE RESPONSES ARE POSSIBLE. DO NOT READ OUT RESPONSE CATEGORIES BELOW, BUT CODE ANSWERS IN THE MOST APPROPRIATE CATEGORY >>

- 1 Not serious enough / no loss / kid's stuff
- 2 Inappropriate for police / police not necessary
- 3 Police could do nothing / lack of proof
- 4 Police won't do anything about it
- 5 Fear / dislike of the police / didn't want involvement with police
- 6 Reported to other authorities instead
- 7 Solved it myself / my family resolved it / perpetrator known to me
- 8 No insurance
- 9 Fear of reprisals
- 10 Inconvenient / police too far away / too much trouble
- 11 Other reasons
- 12 Don't know

GO TO D7.10

IF D7.8 = 1, ASK D7.8b

D7.8b Satisfaction with police response

Overall, how satisfied were you with the way the police handled the matter? Were you very satisfied, fairly satisfied, neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, a bit dissatisfied or very dissatisfied?

- 1 Very satisfied
- 2 Fairly satisfied
- 3 Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
- 4 A bit dissatisfied
- 5 Very dissatisfied
- 6 [DK / cannot remember]

IF D7.8b = 4 OR 5, ASK D7.8c

D7.8c Why not satisfied (MR8)

For what reasons were you dissatisfied? You can give more than one reason.

<< INT: MULTIPLE RESPONSES ARE POSSIBLE. DO NOT READ OUT RESPONSE CATEGORIES BELOW, BUT CODE ANSWERS IN THE MOST APPROPRIATE CATEGORY >>

- 1 Didn't do enough
- 2 Were not interested
- 3 Didn't find or apprehend the offender
- 4 Didn't recover my property (goods)
- 5 Didn't keep me properly informed
- 6 Didn't treat me correctly / were impolite
- 7 Were slow to arrive
- 8 Other reasons
- 9 DK (spontaneous)

IF D7.8 = 1, ASK D7.9

D7.9 Receive any information about what happened

Did you receive any information from the police about what happened in your case - for instance, did they say they had caught someone, or that they were not in a position to take things further?

<p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember]</p>
<p>D7.10 Contact victim support</p> <p>In some countries, agencies have been set up to help victims of crime by giving information, practical or emotional support. Did you have any contact with a specialised victim support agency after this incident?</p> <p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember]</p>
<p><i>IF D7.10 = 1, ASK D7.10a</i></p> <p>D7.10a What type of contact (MR)</p> <p>What type of contact did you have? Was it a letter, a phone call, or did you personally meet with the victim support agency?</p> <p>1 Letter</p> <p>2 Phone call</p> <p>3 Met with victim support agency</p> <p>4 [DK / cannot remember]</p>
<p>D7.10b Support useful</p> <p>Do you think that the services of a specialised agency to help victims of crime would have been useful for you after this incident?</p> <p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember]</p> <p><i>END OF SECTION – GO TO D8.1</i></p>
<p>D8 THEFT OF PERSONAL PROPERTY</p>
<p><i>IF C8 = 1, ASK D8.1, ELSE GO TO D9.1</i></p> <p>D8.1 When (MR)</p> <p>You mentioned theft of personal property in which there was no force or threat of force. I want to know when this happened. Was it within the last 12 months – i.e., since [12 months before date of interview]. Or was it before this?</p> <p><< INT: IF RESPONDENT HAS BEEN VICTIM MORE THAN ONCE, CODE ALL TIME PERIODS THAT APPLY >></p> <p>1 Last 12 months</p> <p>2 Before that</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember]</p>
<p><i>IF D8.1 = 1, ASK D8.1a.</i></p> <p>D8.1a How often in last 12 months</p> <p>How often did it happen in the last 12 months?</p> <p>1 Once</p> <p>2 Twice</p> <p>3 Three times</p> <p>4 Four times</p> <p>5 Five times or more</p> <p>6 [DK / cannot remember]</p>
<p>D8.2 Where did it happen</p> <p>(The last time) where did this theft happen? Was it in or around your home, in</p>

<p>your neighbourhood or town, somewhere elsewhere in [country], or did it happen abroad?</p> <p><< INT: IF VICTIM MORE THAN ONCE OVER THE PAST FIVE YEARS, ASK ABOUT THE LAST TIME THIS HAPPENED >></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 In or around own home (main or secondary residence) 2 In neighbourhood or town 3 Elsewhere in [country] 4 Abroad 5 [DK / cannot remember]
<p>D8.3 Holding / carrying what was stolen</p> <p>(The last time this happened) were you holding or carrying what was stolen (e.g., was it a case of pickpocketing?)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Yes 2 No 3 [DK / cannot remember]
<p>D8.4 Incident reported to the police</p> <p>(The last time this happened) did you or anyone else report the incident to the police?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Yes 2 No 3 [DK / cannot remember]
<p><i>IF D8.4 = 1, GO TO D8.4a</i></p> <p>D8.4a Satisfaction with police response</p> <p>Overall, how satisfied were you with the way the police handled the matter? Were you very satisfied, fairly satisfied, neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, a bit dissatisfied or very dissatisfied?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Very satisfied 2 Fairly satisfied 3 Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied 4 A bit dissatisfied 5 Very dissatisfied 6 [DK / cannot remember] <p><i>END OF SECTION – GO TO D9.1</i></p>
<p>D9 CONSUMER FRAUD</p>
<p><i>IF C9 = 1, ASK D9.1, ELSE GO TO D10.1</i></p> <p>D9.1 When (MR)</p> <p>You mentioned being a victim of consumer fraud. I want to know when this happened. Was it within the last 12 months – i.e., since [12 months before date of interview]. Or was it before this?</p> <p><< INT: IF RESPONDENT HAS BEEN VICTIM MORE THAN ONCE, CODE ALL TIME PERIODS THAT APPLY >></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Last 12 months 2 Before that 3 [DK / cannot remember]
<p><i>IF D9.1 = 1, ASK D9.1a. ELSE GO TO D9.2</i></p> <p>D9.1a How often in last 12 months</p> <p>How often did it happen in the last 12 months?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Once

<p>2 Twice</p> <p>3 Three times</p> <p>4 Four times</p> <p>5 Five times or more</p> <p>6 [DK / cannot remember]</p>
<p>D9.2 Where happened – home or abroad</p> <p>[The last time] did the incident happen to you in this country, or in another country?</p> <p><< INT: IF VICTIM MORE THAN ONCE OVER THE PAST FIVE YEARS, ASK ABOUT THE LAST TIME THIS HAPPENED >></p> <p><< INT: IF THE FRAUD INVOLVED THE INTERNET, CODE THE COUNTRY WHERE THE RESPONDENT MADE THE INTERNET CONNECTION >></p> <p>1 This country</p> <p>2 Another country</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember]</p>
<p>D9.3 Involved buying goods or services</p> <p>Last time it happened, was it when buying goods or paying for a service?</p> <p>1 Buying goods</p> <p>2 A service</p> <p>3 Both</p> <p>4 [DK / cannot remember]</p>
<p>D9.4 Involved the Internet</p> <p>Was it an order using the internet or e-mail?</p> <p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember]</p>
<p>D9.5 Incident reported to police or an authority</p> <p>Did you or anyone else report the incident to the police, a consumer authority, or to both?</p> <p>1 Police</p> <p>2 Consumer authority</p> <p>3 Both</p> <p>4 No</p> <p>5 [DK / cannot remember]</p>
<p><i>IF D9.5 = 1 or 3, ASK D9.5a</i></p> <p>D9.5a Satisfaction with response</p> <p>Overall, how satisfied were you with the way the <u>police</u> dealt with the matter? Were you very satisfied, fairly satisfied, neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, a bit dissatisfied or very dissatisfied?</p> <p><< INT: THIS IS ABOUT SATISFACTION WITH THE POLICE ONLY >></p> <p>1 Very satisfied</p> <p>2 Fairly satisfied</p> <p>3 Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</p> <p>4 A bit dissatisfied</p> <p>5 Very dissatisfied</p> <p>6 [DK / cannot remember]</p> <p><i>END OF SECTION – GO TO D10.1</i></p>

D10 CARD / ON-LINE FRAUD
<p><i>IF C10 = 1, ASK D10.1, ELSE GO TO D11.1</i></p> <p>D10.1 When (MR)</p> <p>You mentioned that someone had used your credit card, cash card, debit card, bank card or on-line bank account to steal from you, or to defraud you. When did this happen? I want to know when this happened. Was it within the last 12 months – i.e., since [12 months before date of interview]. Or was it before this?</p> <p><< INT: IF RESPONDENT HAS BEEN VICTIM MORE THAN ONCE, CODE ALL TIME PERIODS THAT APPLY >></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Last 12 months 2 Before that 3 [DK / cannot remember]
<p><i>IF D10.1 = 1, ASK D10.1a. ELSE GO TO D10.2</i></p> <p>D10.1a How often in last 12 months</p> <p>How often did it happen in the last 12 months?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Once 2 Twice 3 Three times 4 Four times 5 Five times or more 6 [DK / cannot remember]
<p>D10.2 Where happened – home or abroad</p> <p>[The last time] did the incident happen to you in this country, or in another country?</p> <p><< INT: IF VICTIM MORE THAN ONCE OVER THE PAST FIVE YEARS, ASK ABOUT THE LAST TIME THIS HAPPENED >></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4 This country 5 Another country 6 [DK / cannot remember]
<p>D10.3 Card or on-line fraud</p> <p>The last time it happened, was one of your cards used (for example, a credit card, debit card, or cash card)? Or was the theft done by on-line banking?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Card used 2 On-line banking 3 [DK / cannot remember]
<p>D10.4 Find out who was involved</p> <p>Did you ever find out who was involved?</p> <p><< INT: IF YES, BUT ANSWER NOT SPONTANEOUS, ASK WHO IT WAS >></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Yes, family member or someone else well known to me 2 Yes, but someone not known to me 3 No 4 [DK / cannot remember]
<p>D10.5 Incident reported to police or an authority</p> <p>Did you or anyone else report the incident to the police, to a bank or some other financial institution, or to both?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Police 2 Bank / financial institution

3	Both
4	No
5	[DK / cannot remember]
<p><i>IF D10.5 = 1 or 3,</i></p> <p>D10.5a Satisfaction with <u>police</u> response</p> <p>Overall, how satisfied were you with the way the police dealt with the matter? Were you very satisfied, fairly satisfied, neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, a bit dissatisfied or very dissatisfied?</p> <p><< INT: THIS IS ABOUT SATISFACTION WITH THE POLICE ONLY >></p> <p>1 Very satisfied</p> <p>2 Fairly satisfied</p> <p>3 Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</p> <p>4 A bit dissatisfied</p> <p>5 Very dissatisfied</p> <p>6 [DK / cannot remember]</p> <p><i>END OF SECTION – GO TO D11.1</i></p>	
D11 BRIBERY	
<p><i>IF C11 = 1, ASK D11.1, ELSE GO TO D12.1</i></p> <p>D11.1 When (MR)</p> <p>You mentioned being forced or expected to pay a bribe [backhander]. When did this happen? I want to know when this happened. Was it within the last 12 months – i.e., since [12 months before date of interview]. Or was it before this?</p> <p><< INT: IF RESPONDENT HAS BEEN VICTIM MORE THAN ONCE, CODE ALL TIME PERIODS THAT APPLY >></p> <p>1 Last 12 months</p> <p>2 Before that</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember]</p>	
<p><i>IF D11.1 = 1, ASK D11.1a. ELSE GO TO D11.2</i></p> <p>D11.1a How often in last 12 months</p> <p>How often did it happen in the last 12 months?</p> <p>1 Once</p> <p>2 Twice</p> <p>3 Three times</p> <p>4 Four times</p> <p>5 Five times or more</p> <p>6 [DK / cannot remember]</p>	
<p>D11.2 Where happened – home or abroad</p> <p>[The last time] did the incident happen to you in this country, or in another country?</p> <p><< INT: IF VICTIM MORE THAN ONCE OVER THE PAST FIVE YEARS, ASK ABOUT THE LAST TIME THIS HAPPENED >></p> <p>1 This country</p> <p>2 Another country</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember]</p>	
<p>D11.3 What type of official was involved</p> <p>(The last time this happened) what type of official was involved? Was it a police officer, an inspector, a customs officer, some other government official, someone involved in the law, a teacher, or doctor? Or was it someone else?</p>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Police officer 2 Inspector (health, construction, food quality, sanitary control or licensing agency) 3 Customs officer 4 Some other government official 5 Someone involved in the law (judge, prosecutor, court official etc) 6 Teacher / professor / other school staff) 7 Doctor (or other medical personnel) 8 Someone else 9 [DK / cannot remember]
<p>D11.4 Reported to police or an authority</p> <p>Did you or anyone else report the incident to the police, to some other authority, or to both?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Police 2 Other authority 3 Both 4 No 5 [DK / cannot remember]
<p><i>IF D11.4 = 1 or 3, ASK D11.4a</i></p> <p>D11.4a Satisfaction with response</p> <p>Overall, how satisfied were you with the way the police dealt with the matter? Were you very satisfied, fairly satisfied, neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, a bit dissatisfied or very dissatisfied?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Very satisfied 2 Fairly satisfied 3 Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied 4 A bit dissatisfied 5 Very dissatisfied 6 [DK / cannot remember] <p><i>END OF SECTION – GO TO D12.1</i></p>
<p>D12 SEXUAL OFFENCES – PEOPLE NOT KNOWN</p>
<p><i>IF C12 = 1, ASK D12.1, ELSE GO TO D13.1</i></p> <p>D12.1 When (MR)</p> <p>You mentioned that you had been victim of a sexual offence by someone you did not know. Remember that your answers will, of course, be treated confidentially and anonymously.</p> <p>I want to know when this happened. Was it within the last 12 months – i.e., since [12 months before date of interview]. Or was it before this?</p> <p><< INT: IF RESPONDENT HAS BEEN VICTIM MORE THAN ONCE, CODE ALL TIME PERIODS THAT APPLY >></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Last 12 months 2 Before that 3 [DK / cannot remember]
<p><i>IF D12.1 = 1, ASK D12.1a. ELSE GO TO D12.2</i></p> <p>D12.1a How often in last 12 months</p> <p>How often did it happen in the last 12 months?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Once 2 Twice

<p>3 Three times</p> <p>4 Four times</p> <p>5 Five times or more</p> <p>6 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]</p>
<p>D12.2 Where did it happen</p> <p>(The last time) where did this incident happen? Was it in or around your home, in your neighbourhood or town, somewhere elsewhere in [country], or did it happen abroad?</p> <p><< INT: IF VICTIM MORE THAN ONCE OVER THE PAST FIVE YEARS, ASK ABOUT THE LAST TIME THIS HAPPENED >></p> <p>1 In or around own home (main or secondary residence)</p> <p>2 In neighbourhood or town</p> <p>3 Elsewhere in [country]</p> <p>4 Abroad</p> <p>5 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]</p>
<p>D12.3 Description of incident</p> <p>Would you describe the incident as (1) a rape or attempted rape, (2) an indecent assault, or (3) behaviour which you found offensive? Please simply give me the number that is applicable.</p> <p>1 A rape or attempted rape</p> <p>2 Indecent assault</p> <p>3 Offensive behaviour</p> <p>4 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]</p> <p><i>IF D12.3 = 3 OR 4, GO TO D12.6</i></p>
<p><i>IF D12.3 = 1 OR 2, ASK D12.4.</i></p> <p>D12.4 Weapon used</p> <p>Did any of the offenders have a weapon or something they used or threatened to use as a weapon?</p> <p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]</p>
<p><i>IF D12.4 = 1, ask D12.4a. ELSE GO TO D12.5.</i></p> <p>D12.4a Kind of weapon</p> <p>What did he / she / they use as a weapon? Was it a gun of some sort, a knife, a something else?</p> <p><< IF SEVERAL WEAPONS, MARK THE HIGHEST ON THE LIST >></p> <p>1 Gun (of some sort)</p> <p>2 Knife</p> <p>3 Something else</p> <p>4 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]</p>
<p>D12.5 Injury</p> <p>Were you bruised, scratched, cut or injured in any way?</p> <p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]</p>
<p><i>IF D12.5 = 1, ASK D12.5A. ELSE GO TO D12.6</i></p> <p>D12.5a Treatment for injury</p>

<p>Did you visit a doctor, health centre or hospital because of the incident?</p> <p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]</p>
<p>D12.6 Emotional impact</p> <p>To what extent is the incident still on your mind? Do you never think about it, sometimes think about it, think about it quite often, or does it dominate your life.</p> <p>1 Never</p> <p>2 Sometimes think about it</p> <p>3 Think about it quite often</p> <p>4 Dominates my life</p> <p>5 [DK / refuses to say]</p>
<p>D12.7 Alcohol</p> <p>At the time the incident happened, did you think the offender was under the influence of alcohol and / or drugs?</p> <p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember]</p>
<p>D12.8 Whether due to discrimination (MR)</p> <p>Do you believe this crime happened because of, or partly because of your ethnic or immigrant status, religion or belief, disability, age, or sexual orientation?</p> <p><< IF ONLY A 'YES' ANSWER, ASK WHAT THE RESPONDENT BELIEVED WAS THE REASON >></p> <p>1 Ethnic or immigrant status</p> <p>2 Religion or belief</p> <p>3 Disability</p> <p>4 Age</p> <p>5 Sexual orientation</p> <p>6 Not due to any of these</p> <p>7 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]</p>
<p>D12.9 Incident reported to the police</p> <p>(The last time this happened) did you or anyone else report the incident to the police?</p> <p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]</p> <p><i>IF D12.9 = 1, GO TO D12.9b</i></p> <p><i>IF D12.9 = 3, GO TO D12.11</i></p>
<p><i>IF D12.9 = 2, ASK D12.9a,</i></p> <p>D12.9a Why police were not informed (MR)</p> <p>Why not?</p> <p><< INT: MULTIPLE RESPONSES ARE POSSIBLE. DO NOT READ OUT RESPONSE CATEGORIES BELOW, BUT CODE ANSWERS IN THE MOST APPROPRIATE CATEGORY >></p> <p>1 Not serious enough / no loss / kid's stuff</p> <p>2 Inappropriate for police / police not necessary</p>

<p>3 Police could do nothing / lack of proof</p> <p>4 Police won't do anything about it</p> <p>5 Fear / dislike of the police / didn't want involvement with police</p> <p>6 Reported to other authorities instead</p> <p>7 Solved it myself / my family resolved it / perpetrator known to me</p> <p>8 No insurance</p> <p>9 Fear of reprisals</p> <p>10 Inconvenient / police too far away / too much trouble</p> <p>11 Other reasons</p> <p>12 [DK / cannot remember]</p> <p><i>GO TO D12.11</i></p>
<p><i>IF D12.9 = 1, ASK D12.9b</i></p> <p>D12.9b Satisfaction with police response</p> <p>Overall, how satisfied were you with the way the police handled the matter? Were you very satisfied, fairly satisfied, neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, a bit dissatisfied or very dissatisfied?</p> <p>1 Very satisfied</p> <p>2 Fairly satisfied</p> <p>3 Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</p> <p>4 A bit dissatisfied</p> <p>5 Very dissatisfied</p> <p>6 [DK / cannot remember]</p>
<p><i>IF D12.9b = 4 OR 5, ASK D12.9c</i></p> <p>D12.9c Why not satisfied (MR)</p> <p>For what reasons were you dissatisfied? You can give more than one reason.</p> <p><< INT: MULTIPLE RESPONSES ARE POSSIBLE. DO NOT READ OUT RESPONSE CATEGORIES BELOW, BUT CODE ANSWERS IN THE MOST APPROPRIATE CATEGORY >></p> <p>1 Didn't do enough</p> <p>2 Were not interested</p> <p>3 Didn't find or apprehend the offender</p> <p>4 Didn't recover my property (goods)</p> <p>5 Didn't keep me properly informed</p> <p>6 Didn't treat me correctly / were impolite</p> <p>7 Were slow to arrive</p> <p>8 Other reasons</p> <p>9 DK (spontaneous)</p>
<p><i>IF D12.9 = 1, ASK D12.10</i></p> <p>D12.10 Receive any information about what happened</p> <p>Did you receive any information from the police about what happened in your case - for instance, did they say they had caught someone, or that they were not in a position to take things further?</p> <p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]</p>
<p>D12.11 Contact victim support</p> <p>In some countries, agencies have been set up to help victims of crime by giving</p>

<p>information, practical or emotional support. Did you have any contact with a specialised victim support agency after this incident?</p> <p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p> <p>3 DK / cannot remember / / refuses to say]</p>
<p><i>IF D12.11 = 1, ASK D12.11a.</i></p> <p>D12.11a What type of contact (MR)</p> <p>What type of contact did you have? Was it a letter, a phone call, or did you personally meet with the victim support agency?</p> <p>1 Letter</p> <p>2 Phone call</p> <p>3 Met with victim support agency</p> <p>4 [DK / cannot remember]</p>
<p><i>IF D12.11 = 2 OR 3, ASK D12.11b</i></p> <p>D12.11b Support useful</p> <p>Do you think that the services of a specialised agency to help victims of crime would have been useful for you after this incident?</p> <p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>END OF SECTION – GO TO D13.1</i></p>
<p>D13 SEXUAL OFFENCES – OTHER PEOPLE KNOWN</p>
<p><i>IF C13 = 1, ASK D13.1, ELSE GO TO D14.1</i></p> <p>D13.1 When (MR)</p> <p>You mentioned that you had been victim of a sexual offence by someone you knew. Remember that your answers will, of course, be treated confidentially and anonymously.</p> <p>I want to know when this happened. Was it within the last 12 months – i.e., since [12 months before date of interview]. Or was it before this?</p> <p><< INT: IF RESPONDENT HAS BEEN VICTIM MORE THAN ONCE, CODE ALL TIME PERIODS THAT APPLY >></p> <p>1 Last 12 months</p> <p>2 Before that</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember]</p>
<p><i>IF D13.1 = 1, ASK D13.1a. ELSE GO TO D13.2</i></p> <p>D13.1a How often in last 12 months</p> <p>How often did it happen in the last 12 months?</p> <p>1 Once</p> <p>2 Twice</p> <p>3 Three times</p> <p>4 Four times</p> <p>5 Five times or more</p> <p>6 [DK / cannot remember/ refuses to say]</p>
<p>D13.2 Where did it happen</p> <p>(The last time) where did this sexual offence happen? Was it in or around your home, in your neighbourhood or town, somewhere elsewhere in [country], or did it happen abroad?</p> <p><< INT: IF VICTIM MORE THAN ONCE OVER THE PAST FIVE YEARS, ASK</p>

<p>ABOUT THE LAST TIME THIS HAPPENED >></p> <p>1 In or around own home (main or secondary residence)</p> <p>2 In neighbourhood or town</p> <p>3 Elsewhere in [country]</p> <p>4 Abroad</p> <p>5 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]</p>	
<p>D13.3 Description of incident</p> <p>Would you describe the incident as (1) a rape or attempted rape, (2) an indecent assault, or (3) behaviour which you found offensive? Please simply give me the number that is applicable.</p> <p>1 A rape and attempted rape</p> <p>2 Indecent assault</p> <p>3 Offensive behaviour</p> <p>4 [DK / refuses to say]</p> <p><i>IF D13.3 = 3 OR 4, GO TO D13.6</i></p>	
<p><i>IF D13.3 = 1 OR 2, ASK D13.4</i></p> <p>D13.4 Weapon used</p> <p>Did any of the offenders have a weapon or something they used or threatened to use as a weapon?</p> <p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]</p>	
<p><i>IF D13.4 = 1, ask D13.4a</i></p> <p>D13.4a Kind of weapon</p> <p>What did he /she /they use as a weapon? Was it a gun of some sort, a knife, or something else?</p> <p><< INT: IF SEVERAL WEAPONS, MARK THE HIGHEST ON THE LIST >></p> <p>1 Gun (of some sort)</p> <p>2 Knife</p> <p>3 Something else</p> <p>4 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]</p>	
<p>D13.5 Injury</p> <p>Were you bruised, scratched, cut or injured in any way?</p> <p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]</p>	
<p><i>IF D13.5 = 1, ASK D13.5a</i></p> <p>D13.5a Treatment for injury</p> <p>Did you visit a doctor, health centre or hospital because of the incident?</p> <p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]</p>	
<p>D13.6 Emotional impact</p> <p>To what extent is the incident still on your mind? Do you never think about it, sometimes think about it, think about it quite often, or does it dominate your life.</p> <p>1 Never</p>	

<p>2 Sometimes think about it</p> <p>3 Think about it quite often</p> <p>4 Dominates my life</p> <p>5 [DK / refuses to say]</p>
<p>D13.7 Was the offender a partner or someone else known</p> <p>At the time of the incident, was the offender your spouse, partner or boyfriend / girlfriend, or your ex-spouse, ex-partner, ex-boyfriend / girlfriend? Or was it someone else you knew?</p> <p><< INT: MEANS RELATIONSHIP AT TIME OF THE OFFENCES >></p> <p>1 Spouse or partner (at the time)</p> <p>2 Ex-spouse or ex-partner (at the time)</p> <p>3 Boyfriend / girlfriend (at the time)</p> <p>4 Ex-boyfriend / ex-girlfriend (at the time)</p> <p>5 Someone else known</p> <p>6 Refuses to say (spontaneous)</p>
<p><i>IF D13.7 = 5, ASK D13.7a</i></p> <p>D13.7a Who was the offender if not partner</p> <p>Can you tell me who the offender was? Was it a date, a relative, a neighbour, a friend, a colleague, a customer or client, or someone else?</p> <p>1 Date</p> <p>2 Relative</p> <p>3 Neighbour</p> <p>4 Friend</p> <p>5 Colleague</p> <p>6 Customer / client</p> <p>7 Someone else</p> <p>8 Refuses to say (spontaneous)</p> <p>9 [DK]</p>
<p>D13.8 Alcohol</p> <p>At the time the incident happened, did you think the offender was under the influence of alcohol and / or drugs?</p> <p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember]</p>
<p>D13.9 Whether due to discrimination (MR)</p> <p>Do you believe this crime happened because of, or partly because of your ethnic or immigrant status, religion or belief, disability, age, or sexual orientation?</p> <p><< IF ONLY A 'YES' ANSWER, ASK WHAT THE RESPONDENT BELIEVED WAS THE REASON >></p> <p>1 Ethnic or immigrant status</p> <p>2 Religion or belief</p> <p>3 Disability</p> <p>4 Age</p> <p>5 Sexual orientation</p> <p>6 Not due to any of these</p> <p>7 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]</p>

D13.10 Incident reported to the police
(The last time this happened) did you or anyone else report the incident to the police?
1 Yes
2 No
3 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]
IF D13.10 = 1, GO TO D13.10b
IF D13.10 = 3, GO TO D13.12

IF D13.10 = 2, ASK D13.10a
D13.10a Why police were not informed (MR)
Why not?
<< INT: MULTIPLE RESPONSES ARE POSSIBLE. DO NOT READ OUT RESPONSE CATEGORIES BELOW, BUT CODE ANSWERS IN THE MOST APPROPRIATE CATEGORY >>
1 Not serious enough / no loss / kid's stuff
2 Inappropriate for police / police not necessary
3 Police could do nothing / lack of proof
4 Police won't do anything about it
5 Fear / dislike of the police / didn't want involvement with police
6 Reported to other authorities instead
7 Solved it myself / my family resolved it / perpetrator known to me
8 No insurance
9 Fear of reprisals
10 Inconvenient / police too far away / too much trouble
11 Other reasons
12 Don't know
GO TO D13.12

IF D13.10 = 1, ASK D13.10b
D13.10b Satisfaction with police response
Overall, how satisfied were you with the way the police handled the matter? Were you very satisfied, fairly satisfied, neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, a bit dissatisfied or very dissatisfied?
1 Very satisfied
2 Fairly satisfied
3 Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
4 A bit dissatisfied
5 Very dissatisfied
6 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]

IF D13.10b = 4 OR 5, ASK D13.10c
D13.10c Why not satisfied (MR)
For what reasons were you dissatisfied? You can give more than one reason.
<< INT: MULTIPLE RESPONSES ARE POSSIBLE. DO NOT READ OUT RESPONSE CATEGORIES BELOW, BUT CODE ANSWERS IN THE MOST APPROPRIATE CATEGORY >>
1 Didn't do enough
2 Were not interested
3 Didn't find or apprehend the offender

4	Didn't recover my property (goods)
5	Didn't keep me properly informed
6	Didn't treat me correctly / were impolite
7	Were slow to arrive
8	Other reasons
9	DK (spontaneous)
<i>IF D13.10 = 1, ASK D13.11</i>	
D13.11 Receive any information about what happened	
Did you receive any information from the police about what happened in your case - for instance, did they say they had caught someone, or that they were not in a position to take things further?	
1	Yes
2	No
3	[DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]
D13.12	Contact victim support
In some countries, agencies have been set up to help victims of crime by giving information, practical or emotional support. Did you have any contact with a specialised victim support agency after this incident?	
1	Yes
2	No
3	DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]
<i>IF D13.12 = 1 ASK D13.12b</i>	
D13.12a What type of contact (MR)	
What type of contact did you have? Was it a letter, a phone call, or did you personally meet with the victim support agency?	
1	Letter
2	Phone call
3	Met with victim support agency
4	[DK / cannot remember]
<i>IF D13.12 = 2 or 3, ASK D13.12b</i>	
D13.12b Support useful	
Do you think that the services of a specialised agency to help victims of crime would have been useful for you after this incident?	
1	Yes
2	No
3	[DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]
<i>END OF SECTION – GO TO D14.1</i>	
D14 ASSAULTS / THREATS – PEOPLE NOT KNOWN	
<i>IF C14 = 1, ASK D14.1, ELSE GO TO D15.1</i>	
D14.1 When (MR)	
You mentioned you have been assaulted or threatened by someone you did not know. Remember that your answers will, of course, be treated confidentially and anonymously.	
I want to know when this happened. Was it within the last 12 months – i.e., since [12 months before date of interview]. Or was it before this?	
<< INT: IF RESPONDENT HAS BEEN VICTIM MORE THAN ONCE, CODE ALL TIME PERIODS THAT APPLY >>	
1	Last 12 months

2	Before that
3	[DK / cannot remember]
<i>IF D14.1 = 1, ASK D14.1a. ELSE GO TO D14.2</i>	
D14.1a How often in last 12 months	
How often did it happen in the last 12 months?	
1	Once
2	Twice
3	Three times
4	Four times
5	Five times or more
6	[DK / cannot remember/ refuses to say]
D14.2 Where did it happen	
(The last time) where did this sexual offence happen? Was it in or around your home, in your neighbourhood or town, somewhere elsewhere in [country], or did it happen abroad?	
<< INT: IF VICTIM MORE THAN ONCE OVER THE PAST FIVE YEARS, ASK ABOUT THE LAST TIME THIS HAPPENED >>	
1	In or around own home (main or secondary residence)
2	In neighbourhood or town
3	Elsewhere in [country]
4	Abroad
5	[DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]
D14.3 Force used or threat	
(The last time), can you tell me what happened? Were you just threatened, or was force used?	
1	Just threatened
2	Force used
3	[DK / refuses to say]
D14.4 Weapon used	
Did any of the offenders have a weapon or something they used or threatened to use as a weapon?	
1	Yes
2	No
3	[DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]
<i>IF D14.4 = 1, ask D14.4a</i>	
D14.4a Kind of weapon	
What did he /she /they use as a weapon? Was it a gun of some sort, a knife, or something else?	
<< INT: IF SEVERAL WEAPONS, MARK THE HIGHEST ON THE LIST >>	
1	Gun (of some sort)
2	Knife
3	Something else
4	[DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]
<i>IF D14.3 = 2 OR 3, ASK D14.5. IF D14.3 = 1, GO TO D14.6</i>	
D14.5 Injury	
Were you bruised, scratched, cut or injured in any way?	
1	Yes

2	No
3	[DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]
<i>IF D14.5 = 1, ASK D14.5a</i>	
D14.5a	Treatment for injury
Did you visit a doctor, health centre or hospital because of the incident?	
1	Yes
2	No
3	[DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]
D14.6 Emotional impact	
To what extent is the incident still on your mind? Do you never think about it, sometimes think about it, think about it quite often, or does it dominate your life.	
1	Never
2	Sometimes think about it
3	Think about it quite often
4	Dominates my life
5	[DK / refuses to say]
D14.7 Alcohol	
At the time the incident happened, did you think the offender was under the influence of alcohol and / or drugs?	
1	Yes
2	No
3	[DK / cannot remember]
D14.8 Whether due to discrimination (MR)	
Do you believe this crime happened because of, or partly because of your ethnic or immigrant status, religion or belief, disability, age, or sexual orientation?	
<< IF ONLY A 'YES' ANSWER, ASK WHAT THE RESPONDENT BELIEVED WAS THE REASON >>	
1	Ethnic or immigrant status
2	Religion or belief
3	Disability
4	Age
5	Sexual orientation
6	Not due to any of these
7	[DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]
D14.9 Incident reported to the police	
(The last time this happened) did you or anyone else report the incident to the police?	
1	Yes
2	No
3	[DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]
<i>IF D14.9 = 1, GO TO D14.9b</i>	
<i>IF D14.9 = 3, GO TO D14.11</i>	
<i>IF D14.9 = 2, ASK D14.9a</i>	
D14.9a	Why police were not informed (MR)
Why not?	

<< INT: MULTIPLE RESPONSES ARE POSSIBLE. DO NOT READ OUT RESPONSE CATEGORIES BELOW, BUT CODE ANSWERS IN THE MOST APPROPRIATE CATEGORY >>

- 1 Not serious enough / no loss / kid's stuff
- 2 Inappropriate for police / police not necessary
- 3 Police could do nothing / lack of proof
- 4 Police won't do anything about it
- 5 Fear / dislike of the police / didn't want involvement with police
- 6 Reported to other authorities instead
- 7 Solved it myself / my family resolved it / perpetrator known to me
- 8 No insurance
- 9 Fear of reprisals
- 10 Inconvenient / police too far away / too much trouble
- 11 Other reasons
- 12 Don't know

GO TO D14.11

IF D14.9 = 1, ASK D14.9b

D14.9b Satisfaction with police response

Overall, how satisfied were you with the way the police handled the matter? Were you very satisfied, fairly satisfied, neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, a bit dissatisfied or very dissatisfied?

- 1 Very satisfied
- 2 Fairly satisfied
- 3 Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
- 4 A bit dissatisfied
- 5 Very dissatisfied
- 6 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]

IF D14.9b = 4 OR 5, ASK D14.9c

D14.9c Why not satisfied (MR)

For what reasons were you dissatisfied? You can give more than one reason.

<< INT: MULTIPLE RESPONSES ARE POSSIBLE. DO NOT READ OUT RESPONSE CATEGORIES BELOW, BUT CODE ANSWERS IN THE MOST APPROPRIATE CATEGORY >>

- 1 Didn't do enough
- 2 Were not interested
- 3 Didn't find or apprehend the offender
- 4 Didn't recover my property (goods)
- 5 Didn't keep me properly informed
- 6 Didn't treat me correctly / were impolite
- 7 Were slow to arrive
- 8 Other reasons
- 9 DK (spontaneous)

IF D14.9 = 1, ASK D14.10

D14.10 Receive any information about what happened

Did you receive any information from the police about what happened in your case - for instance, did they say they had caught someone, or that they were not in a position to take things further?

1	Yes
2	No
3	[DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]
D14.11	<p>Contact victim support</p> <p>In some countries, agencies have been set up to help victims of crime by giving information, practical or emotional support. Did you have any contact with a specialised victim support agency after this incident?</p> <p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p> <p>3 DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]</p>
	<p><i>IF D14.11 = 1 ASK D14.11a</i></p> <p>D14.11a What type of contact (MR)</p> <p>What type of contact did you have? Was it a letter, a phone call, or did you personally meet with the victim support agency?</p> <p>1 Letter</p> <p>2 Phone call</p> <p>3 Met with victim support agency</p> <p>4 [DK / cannot remember]</p>
	<p><i>IF D14.11 = 2 or 3, ASK D14.11b</i></p> <p>D14.11b Support useful</p> <p>Do you think that the services of a specialised agency to help victims of crime would have been useful for you after this incident?</p> <p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]</p> <p><i>END OF SECTION – GO TO D15.1</i></p>
D15 ASSAULTS / THREATS – OTHER PEOPLE KNOWN	
	<p><i>IF C15 = 1, ASK D15.1, ELSE GO TO SECTION E, QUESTION E.1</i></p> <p>D15.1 When (MR)</p> <p>You mentioned you have been assaulted or threatened by someone you knew. Remember that your answers will, of course, be treated confidentially and anonymously.</p> <p>I want to know when this happened. Was it within the last 12 months – i.e., since [12 months before date of interview]. Or was it before this?</p> <p><< INT: IF RESPONDENT HAS BEEN VICTIM MORE THAN ONCE, CODE ALL TIME PERIODS THAT APPLY >></p> <p>1 Last 12 months</p> <p>2 Before that</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember]</p>
	<p><i>IF D15.1 = 1, ASK D15.1s. ELSE GO TO D15.2</i></p> <p>D15.1a How often in last 12 months</p> <p>How often did it happen in the last 12 months?</p> <p>1 Once</p> <p>2 Twice</p> <p>3 Three times</p> <p>4 Four times</p> <p>5 Five times or more</p>

6	[DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]
D15.2	<p>Where did it happen</p> <p>(The last time) where did this incident happen? Was it in or around your home, in your neighbourhood or town, somewhere elsewhere in [country], or did it happen abroad?</p> <p><< INT: IF VICTIM MORE THAN ONCE OVER THE PAST FIVE YEARS, ASK ABOUT THE LAST TIME THIS HAPPENED >></p> <p>1 In or around own home (main or secondary residence)</p> <p>2 In neighbourhood or town</p> <p>3 Elsewhere in [country]</p> <p>4 Abroad</p> <p>5 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]</p>
D15.3	<p>Force used or threat</p> <p>(The last time), can you tell me what happened? Were you just threatened, or was force used?</p> <p>1 Just threatened</p> <p>2 Force used</p> <p>3 [DK / refuses to say]</p>
D15.4	<p>Weapon used</p> <p>Did any of the offenders have a weapon or something they used or threatened to use as a weapon?</p> <p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]</p>
	<p><i>IF D15.4 = 1, ASK D15.4a</i></p> <p>D15.4a Kind of weapon</p> <p>What did he / she / they use as a weapon? Was it a gun of some sort, a knife, or something else?</p> <p><< INT: DO NOT READ OUT. IF MORE THAN ONE WEAPON, MARK THE HIGHEST ON THE LIST >></p> <p>1 Gun (of some sort)</p> <p>2 Knife</p> <p>3 Something else</p> <p>4 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]</p>
	<p><i>IF D15.3 = 2 OR 3, ASK D15.5. IF D15.3 = 1, GO TO D15.6</i></p> <p>D15.5 Injury</p> <p>Were you bruised, scratched, cut or injured in any way?</p> <p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]</p>
	<p><i>IF D15.5 = 1, ASK D15.5a</i></p> <p>D15.5a Treatment for injury</p> <p>Did you visit a doctor, health centre or hospital because of the incident?</p> <p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]</p>

<p>D15.6 Emotional impact</p> <p>To what extent is the incident still on your mind? Do you never think about it, sometimes think about it, think about it quite often, or does it dominate your life.</p> <p>1 Never</p> <p>2 Sometimes think about it</p> <p>3 Think about it quite often</p> <p>4 Dominates my life</p> <p>5 [DK / refuses to say]</p>
<p>D15.7 Was the offender a partner or someone else known</p> <p>At the time of the incident, was the offender your spouse, partner or boyfriend / girlfriend, your ex-spouse, ex-partner, ex- boyfriend / girlfriend? Or was it someone else you knew?</p> <p><< INT: MEANS RELATIONSHIP AT TIME OF THE OFFENCES >></p> <p>1 Spouse or partner (at the time)</p> <p>2 Ex-spouse or ex-partner (at the time)</p> <p>3 Boyfriend / girlfriend (at the time)</p> <p>4 Ex-boyfriend / ex-girlfriend (at the time)</p> <p>5 Someone else known</p> <p>6 Refuses to say (spontaneous)</p>
<p><i>IF D15.7 = 5, ASK D15.7a</i></p> <p>D15.7a Who was the offender if not partner</p> <p>Can you tell me who the offender was? Was it a date, a relative, a neighbour, a friend, a colleague, a customer or client, or someone else?</p> <p>1 Date</p> <p>2 Relative</p> <p>3 Neighbour</p> <p>4 Friend</p> <p>5 Colleague</p> <p>6 Customer / client</p> <p>7 Someone else</p> <p>8 Refuses to say (spontaneous)</p> <p>9 [DK]</p>
<p>D15.8 Alcohol</p> <p>At the time the incident happened, did you think the offender was under the influence of alcohol and / or drugs?</p> <p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember]</p>
<p>D15.9 Whether due to discrimination (MR)</p> <p>Do you believe this crime happened because of, or partly because of your ethnic or immigrant status, religion or belief, disability, age, or sexual orientation?</p> <p><< IF ONLY A 'YES' ANSWER, ASK WHAT THE RESPONDENT BELIEVED WAS THE REASON >></p> <p>1 Ethnic or immigrant status</p> <p>2 Religion or belief</p>

3	Disability
4	Age
5	Sexual orientation
6	Not due to any of these
7	[DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]
<p>D15.10 Incident reported to the police</p> <p>(The last time this happened) did you or anyone else report the incident to the police?</p> <p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]</p> <p><i>IF D15.10 = 1, GO TO D15.10b</i></p> <p><i>IF D15.10 = 3, GO TO D15.12</i></p>	
<p><i>IF D15.10 = 2, ASK D15.10a</i></p> <p>D15.10a Why police were not informed (MR)</p> <p>Why not?</p> <p><< INT: MULTIPLE RESPONSES ARE POSSIBLE. DO NOT READ OUT RESPONSE CATEGORIES BELOW, BUT CODE ANSWERS IN THE MOST APPROPRIATE CATEGORY >></p> <p>1 Not serious enough / no loss / kid's stuff</p> <p>2 Inappropriate for police / police not necessary</p> <p>3 Police could do nothing / lack of proof</p> <p>4 Police won't do anything about it</p> <p>5 Fear / dislike of the police / didn't want involvement with police</p> <p>6 Reported to other authorities instead</p> <p>7 Solved it myself / my family resolved it / perpetrator known to me</p> <p>8 No insurance</p> <p>9 Fear of reprisals</p> <p>10 Inconvenient / police too far away / too much trouble</p> <p>11 Other reasons</p> <p>12 Don't know</p> <p><i>GO TO D15.12</i></p>	
<p><i>IF D15.10 = 1, ASK D15.10b</i></p> <p>D15.10b Satisfaction with police response</p> <p>Overall, how satisfied were you with the way the police handled the matter? Were you very satisfied, fairly satisfied, neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, a bit dissatisfied or very dissatisfied?</p> <p>1 Very satisfied</p> <p>2 Fairly satisfied</p> <p>3 Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</p> <p>4 A bit dissatisfied</p> <p>5 Very dissatisfied</p> <p>6 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]</p>	
<p><i>IF D15.10b = 4 OR 5, ASK D15.10c</i></p> <p>D15.10c Why not satisfied (MR)</p> <p>For what reasons were you dissatisfied? You can give more than one reason.</p> <p><< INT: MULTIPLE RESPONSES ARE POSSIBLE. DO NOT READ OUT</p>	

<p>RESPONSE CATEGORIES BELOW, BUT CODE ANSWERS IN THE MOST APPROPRIATE CATEGORY >></p> <p>1 Didn't do enough</p> <p>2 Were not interested</p> <p>3 Didn't find or apprehend the offender</p> <p>4 Didn't recover my property (goods)</p> <p>5 Didn't keep me properly informed</p> <p>6 Didn't treat me correctly / were impolite</p> <p>7 Were slow to arrive</p> <p>8 Other reasons</p> <p>9 DK (spontaneous)</p>	
<p><i>IF D15.10 = 1, ASK D15.11</i></p> <p>D15.11 Receive any information about what happened</p> <p>Did you receive any information from the police about what happened in your case - for instance, did they say they had caught someone, or that they were not in a position to take things further?</p> <p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]</p>	
<p>D15.12 Contact victim support</p> <p>In some countries, agencies have been set up to help victims of crime by giving information, practical or emotional support. Did you have any contact with a specialised victim support agency after this incident?</p> <p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]</p>	
<p><i>IF D15.12 = 1 D15.12a</i></p> <p>D15.12a What type of contact (MR)</p> <p>What type of contact did you have? Was it a letter, a phone call, or did you personally meet with the victim support agency?</p> <p>1 Letter</p> <p>2 Phone call</p> <p>3 Met with victim support agency</p> <p>4 [DK / cannot remember]</p>	
<p><i>IF D15.12 = 2 OR 3, ASK D15.12b</i></p> <p>D15.12b Support useful</p> <p>Do you think that the services of a specialised agency to help victims of crime would have been useful for you after this incident?</p> <p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]</p> <p><i>END OF SECTION – GO TO SECTION E, QUESTION E.1</i></p>	

E. ATTITUDES TO LAW ENFORCEMENT AND SECURITY PRECAUTIONS

There may need to be some appropriate 'text fill' at the beginning of Section E according to what earlier parts of the questionnaire have been completed. For instance, those who have had no victimisations will differ from those who might have answered questions about several incidents.

E1 Exposure to drugs problems
Over the last 12 months, how often were you personally in contact with drug-related problems in the area where you live? For example seeing people dealing in drugs, taking or using drugs in public spaces, or finding syringes left by drug addicts? Was this often, from time to time, rarely or never?

- 1 Often
- 2 From time to time
- 3 Rarely
- 4 Never
- 5 [DK]

E2 Burglar alarm ownership
Now a few questions on security precautions. First, is your home protected by a burglar alarm?
<< NOT FIRE ALARM >>
<< THIS IN RELATION TO THE PRIMARY RESIDENCE >>

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 3 [DK]

E3 Special door
Do you have special doors locks in your home?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 3 [DK]

E4 Avoidance behaviour at night
Next, please try and remember the last time you went out after dark in your area for whatever reason. Did you stay away from certain streets or places, for reasons of safety, or avoid certain people?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 3 [DK cannot remember]
- 4 Never go out

E5 Gun ownership
Do you or anyone else in your household own a handgun, shot gun, rifle, or air rifle?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 3 Refuses to say
- 4 [DK]

IF E5 = 1, ASK E5a, ELSE GO TO E6

E5a Reason for owning gun (MR)
For what reason do you own the gun (guns)?
<< INT: MULTIPLE RESPONSE ALLOWED >>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 For hunting 2 Target shooting (sports) 3 As part of a collection (collector's item) 4 For crime prevention / protection 5 In armed forces or the police 6 Because it has always been in our family / home 7 Other answers 8 Refuses to answer 9 [DK]
E6	<p>Police performance</p> <p>Taking into account all the things the police in your area are expected to do, would you say they are doing a very good job, a good job, a bad job or a very bad job?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Very good job 2 Good job 3 Neither good nor bad job 4 Bad job 5 Very bad job 5 [DK/ no opinion]
E7	<p>Courts performance</p> <p>Taking into account all the things the courts in your country are expected to do, would you say they are doing a very good job, a good job, a bad job or a very bad job?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Very good job 2 Good job 3 Neither good nor bad job 4 Bad job 5 Very bad job 5 [DK/ no opinion]
E8	<p>Punitiveness (regarding a burglar)</p> <p>People have different ideas about the sentences, which should be given to offenders. Take for instance the case of a 21-year old man who is found guilty of breaking into someone's home for the second time. This time he has taken a TV. Which of the following sentences do you consider the most appropriate for such a case? Do you prefer a fine, a prison sentence, a community service, a suspended prison sentence, or any other sentence?</p> <p><< REPEAT RESPONSE OPTIONS IF NECESSARY >></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Fine 2 Prison 3 Community service 4 Suspended prison sentence 5 Any other sentence 6 [DK / no opinion]

F. ADDITIONAL PERSONAL AND HOUSEHOLD INFORMATION	
<i>All the following questions are Eurostat core variables.</i>	
F1	<p>Urbanisation</p> <p><< TO BE OBTAINED FROM EXTERNAL DATA / SAMPLING FRAME WHERE POSSIBLE >></p> <p>1 Densely populated area</p> <p>2 Intermediate populated area</p> <p>3 Thinly populated area</p> <p>4 [DK]</p>
F2	<p>NUTS2 Geographical region</p> <p><< TO BE OBTAINED FROM EXTERNAL DATA / SAMPLING FRAME WHERE POSSIBLE >></p> <p><i>Include a procedure to establish the NUTS code (nuts2 level) without asking the respondent</i></p>
F3	<p>Respondent sex</p> <p><i>INTERVIEWER CAN FILL IN WITHOUT ASKING</i></p> <p>1 Male</p> <p>2 Female</p> <p>3 [DK]</p>
F4	<p>Age</p> <p>I would like to end by asking you some questions about yourself and your household. First, could you tell me in what year were you born?</p> <p>Age _____ [999= DK]</p>
F5	<p>Country of birth</p> <p>In which country were you born?</p> <p>Country _____ [999= DK]</p> <p><i>FOR CODING, SEE ISO COUNTRY CLASSIFICATION 2 DIGITS</i></p>
F5a	<p>Country of birth of mother</p> <p>In which country was your mother born?</p> <p>Country _____ [999= DK]</p> <p><i>FOR CODING, SEE ISO COUNTRY CLASSIFICATION 2 DIGITS</i></p>
F5b	<p>Country of birth</p> <p>In which country was your father born?</p> <p>Country _____ [999= DK]</p> <p><i>FOR CODING, SEE ISO COUNTRY CLASSIFICATION 2 DIGITS</i></p>
F6	<p>Country of citizenship</p> <p>What country (or countries) are you currently a citizen of?</p> <p>_____</p>
F6	<p>Marital status</p> <p>Which is your current legal marital status?</p> <p>1 Unmarried (i.e. never married)</p> <p>2 Married (including registered partnership)</p> <p>3 Widowed and not remarried (including widowed from registered partnership)</p> <p>4 Divorced and not remarried (including legally separated and dissolved registered partnership).</p>

F7	<p>Employment status</p> <p>Are you at the moment carrying out a job or profession, are you unemployed, are you still at school or a student, are you retired or stopped working, are you disabled, in compulsory military or community service, or fulfilling domestic tasks?</p> <p><< INT: UNPAID WORK FOR FAMILY BUSINESS, APRENTICESHIP & TRAINEESHIP COUNTS AS JOB >></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Carries out a job or profession, including unpaid work for a family business or holding, including an apprenticeship or paid traineeship, etc. 2 Unemployed 3 Pupil, student, further training, unpaid work experience 4 In retirement or early retirement or has given up business 5 Permanently disabled 6 In compulsory military or community service 7 Fulfilling domestic tasks 8 Other inactive person
	<p><i>IF F7 = 1, ASK F7a AND FURTHER</i></p>
F7a	<p>Full or part-time work</p> <p>Do you work full-time or part-time</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Full-time 2 Part-time
F7b	<p>Labour status in employment (self-employed or employed)</p> <p>Are you self-employed or an employee?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Self-employed 2 An employee
F7c	<p>Self-employment status</p> <p>Do you have employees?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Yes 2 No
F7d	<p>Employee status</p> <p>Do you have a permanent job or a contract of unlimited duration? Or do you have a temporary job, or a contract of limited duration?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Permanent job or unlimited contract 2 Temporary job or limited contact
F7e	<p>Occupation in employment</p> <p>Can you tell me what your job is?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">ISCO-08 coded at 2 digit level, 36 position</p>
F7f	<p>Economic sector in employment</p> <p style="text-align: right;">NACE Rev.2 coded at 2 digit level</p>
F8	<p>Educational level</p> <p>Which of the following education levels have you completed:</p> <p>[NOTE: THIS QUESTION HAS TO BE WRITTEN IN EACH COUNTRY TO CORRESPOND THE NATIONAL EDUCATION SYSTEMS]</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 0 No formal education or below ISCED1 1 ISCED 1 - primary education 2 ISCED 2 - lower secondary education 3 ISCED 3 - upper secondary education

	4	ISCED 4 - post secondary education but not tertiary
	5	ISCED 5 - tertiary education, first stage
	6	ISCED 6 - tertiary education, second stage
F9	Household income level	
	<p>If you add up the income from work and the income from social benefits for all the members of your household, can you tell me what is your households' total <u>net income</u> per month? If you don't know the exact number, give me an estimate.</p>	
	<p><< ADD UP INCOME FROM LABOUR, SOCIAL BENEFITS OR ANY OTHER REGULAR INCOME >></p>	
	<p>Amount in national currency _____ (9= DK)</p>	
	<p>That is the end of this survey. Thank you very much for your co-operation. It is greatly appreciated.</p>	

ANNEX C EXPANDED QUESTIONS ON VIOLENCE FOR THE SASU

VICTIMISATION SCREENERS - EXPANDED	
C12	<p>I asked before whether anyone had stolen, or tried to steal something from you by using force or threatening you with force. Apart from this, I would like to ask you about other incidents when someone has used force against you, or threatened to do so. These incidents could have taken place in the street, for instance, in a pub, in a park, on public transport, at work, or at home.</p> <p>I will start with offences of a sexual nature. I am only interested in incidents which might have happened to you personally.</p> <p>Remember that your answers will, of course, be treated confidentially and anonymously.</p> <p>Sexual offences – people not known</p> <p>People sometimes touch or grab someone in a really offensive way for sexual reasons, or force or attempt to force them into an unwanted sexual act. I want to know whether this has happened to you. This might have involved someone you knew, or someone you did not know at the time. First, I would like to know whether, in the past five years, anyone <u>you did not know at the time</u> has done any of these things to you?</p> <p><< INT: IF RESPONDENT IS HESITANT OR NERVOUS, TRY TO FIND OUT IF THE PRESENCE OF OTHERS IS A PROBLEM. IF SO, CONSIDER THE OPTION OF RESCHEDULING THE INTERVIEW >></p> <p><< INT: PEOPLE KNOWN JUST BY SIGHT SHOULD BE COUNTED AS PEOPLE NOT KNOWN >></p> <p>1 Yes 2 No 3 [DK / cannot remember] 4 [Refusal / don't wish to answer]</p>
C13	<p>Sexual offences – partners / ex-partners</p> <p>Secondly, has a partner or any ex-partner or boyfriend / girlfriend or ex-boyfriend / girlfriend done any of these things to you in the past five years?</p> <p>1 Yes 2 No 3 [DK, cannot remember] 4 [Refusal / don't wish to answer]</p> <p><< INT: AGAIN, IF RESPONDENT IS HESITANT OR NERVOUS, TRY TO FIND OUT IF THE PRESENCE OF OTHERS IS A PROBLEM. IF SO, CONSIDER OPTION OF RESCHEDULING THE INTERVIEW >></p>
C14	<p>Sexual offences – other people known</p> <p>Finally, has anyone else you know such as a date, a neighbour, friend, colleague or family member done any of these things to you in the past five years?</p> <p>1 Yes 2 No 3 [DK, cannot remember] 4 [Refusal / don't wish to answer]</p> <p><< INT: AGAIN, IF RESPONDENT IS HESITANT OR NERVOUS, TRY TO FIND OUT IF THE PRESENCE OF OTHERS IS A PROBLEM. IF SO, CONSIDER THE OPTION OF RESCHEDULING THE INTERVIEW >></p>
Now I am going to ask about other incidents of a non-sexual nature when	

someone has used force against you, or threatened to do so. Again this might have involved someone you knew, or someone you did not know at the time. Remember that your answers will, of course, be treated confidentially and anonymously.

C15 Assaults / threats – people not known

First, in the past five years, has anyone you did not know at the time threatened to hurt you, or actually slapped you, hit you, kicked you, thrown something at you, or attacked or threatened you with a weapon in a way that really frightened you?

<< INT: IF RESPONDENT IS HESITANT OR NERVOUS, TRY TO FIND OUT IF THE PRESENCE OF OTHERS IS A PROBLEM. IF SO, CONSIDER THE OPTION OF RESCHEDULING THE INTERVIEW >>

<< INT: PEOPLE KNOWN JUST BY SIGHT SHOULD BE COUNTED AS PEOPLE NOT KNOWN >>

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 3 [DK / cannot remember]
- 4 [Refusal / don't wish to answer]

C16 Assaults / threats – partners / ex partners

Secondly, has a partner or any ex-partner or boyfriend / girlfriend or ex-boyfriend / girlfriend done any of these things to you u in the past five years?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 3 [DK, cannot remember]
- 4 [Refusal, don't wish to answer]

C17 Assaults / threats – other people known

Finally, has anyone else you know such as a date, a neighbour, friend, colleague or family member done any of these things to you in the past five years?

<< INT: AGAIN, IF RESPONDENT IS HESITANT OR NERVOUS, TRY TO FIND OUT IF THE PRESENCE OF OTHERS IS A PROBLEM. IF SO, CONSIDER THE OPTION OF RESCHEDULING THE INTERVIEW >>

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 3 [DK / cannot remember]
- 4 [Refusal, don't wish to answer]

VICTIMISATION DETAILS - EXPANDED

D12 SEXUAL OFFENCES – PEOPLE NOT KNOWN

IF C12 = 1, ASK D12.1, ELSE GO TO D13.1

D12.1 When (MR)

You mentioned that you had been victim of a sexual offence by someone you did not know. Remember that your answers will, of course, be treated confidentially and anonymously.

I want to know when this happened. Was it within the last 12 months – i.e., since [12 months before date of interview]. Or was it before this?

<< INT: IF RESPONDENT HAS BEEN VICTIM MORE THAN ONCE, CODE ALL TIME PERIODS THAT APPLY >>

- 1 Last 12 months

	<p>2 Before that</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember]</p>
	<p><i>IF D12.1 = 1, ASK D12.1a. ELSE GO TO D12.2</i></p> <p>D12.1a How often in last 12 months</p> <p>How often did it happen in the last 12 months?</p> <p>1 Once</p> <p>2 Twice</p> <p>3 Three times</p> <p>4 Four times</p> <p>5 Five times or more</p> <p>6 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]</p>
	<p>D12.2 Where did it happen</p> <p>(The last time) where did this incident happen? Was it in or around your home, in your neighbourhood or town, somewhere elsewhere in [country], or did it happen abroad?</p> <p><< INT: IF VICTIM MORE THAN ONCE OVER THE PAST FIVE YEARS, ASK ABOUT THE LAST TIME THIS HAPPENED >></p> <p>1 In or around own home (main or secondary residence)</p> <p>2 In neighbourhood or town</p> <p>3 Elsewhere in [country]</p> <p>4 Abroad</p> <p>5 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]</p>
	<p>D12.3 Description of incident</p> <p>Would you describe the incident as (1) a rape or attempted rape, (2) an indecent assault, or (3) behaviour which you found offensive? Please simply give me the number that is applicable.</p> <p>1 A rape or attempted rape</p> <p>2 Indecent assault</p> <p>3 Offensive behaviour</p> <p>4 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]</p> <p><i>IF D12.3 = 3 OR 4, GO TO D12.6</i></p>
	<p><i>IF D12.3 = 1 OR 2, ASK D12.4.</i></p> <p>D12.4 Weapon used</p> <p>Did any of the offenders have a weapon or something they used or threatened to use as a weapon?</p> <p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]</p>
	<p><i>IF D12.4 = 1, ask D12.4a. ELSE GO TO D12.5.</i></p> <p>D12.4a Kind of weapon</p> <p>What did he / she / they use as a weapon? Was it a gun of some sort, a knife, a something else?</p> <p><< IF SEVERAL WEAPONS, MARK THE HIGHEST ON THE LIST >></p> <p>1 Gun (of some sort)</p> <p>2 Knife</p> <p>3 Something else</p> <p>4 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]</p>

<p>D12.5 Injury</p> <p>Were you bruised, scratched, cut or injured in any way?</p> <p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]</p>
<p><i>IF D12.5 = 1, ASK D12.5A. ELSE GO TO D12.6</i></p> <p>D12.5a Treatment for injury</p> <p>Did you visit a doctor, health centre or hospital because of the incident?</p> <p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]</p>
<p>D12.6 Emotional impact</p> <p>To what extent is the incident still on your mind? Do you never think about it, sometimes think about it, think about it quite often, or does it dominate your life.</p> <p>1 Never</p> <p>2 Sometimes think about it</p> <p>3 Think about it quite often</p> <p>4 Dominates my life</p> <p>5 [DK / refuses to say]</p>
<p>D12.7 Alcohol</p> <p>At the time the incident happened, did you think the offender was under the influence of alcohol and / or drugs?</p> <p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember]</p>
<p>D12.8 Whether due to discrimination (MR)</p> <p>Do you believe this crime happened because of, or partly because of your ethnic or immigrant status, religion or belief, disability, age, or sexual orientation?</p> <p><< IF ONLY A 'YES' ANSWER, ASK WHAT THE RESPONDENT BELIEVED WAS THE REASON >></p> <p>1 Ethnic or immigrant status</p> <p>2 Religion or belief</p> <p>3 Disability</p> <p>4 Age</p> <p>5 Sexual orientation</p> <p>6 Not due to any of these</p> <p>7 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]</p>
<p>D12.9 Incident reported to the police</p> <p>(The last time this happened) did you or anyone else report the incident to the police?</p> <p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]</p> <p><i>IF D12.9 = 1, GO TO D12.9b</i></p> <p><i>IF D12.9 = 3, GO TO D12.11</i></p>

<p><i>IF D12.9 = 2, ASK D12.9a,</i></p> <p>D12.9a Why police were not informed (MR)</p> <p>Why not?</p> <p><< INT: MULTIPLE RESPONSES ARE POSSIBLE. DO NOT READ OUT RESPONSE CATEGORIES BELOW, BUT CODE ANSWERS IN THE MOST APPROPRIATE CATEGORY >></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Not serious enough / no loss / kid's stuff 2 Inappropriate for police / police not necessary 3 Police could do nothing / lack of proof 4 Police won't do anything about it 5 Fear / dislike of the police / didn't want involvement with police 6 Reported to other authorities instead 7 Solved it myself / my family resolved it / perpetrator known to me 8 No insurance 9 Fear of reprisals 10 Inconvenient / police too far away / too much trouble 11 Other reasons 12 [DK / cannot remember] <p><i>GO TO D12.11</i></p>
<p><i>IF D12.9 = 1, ASK D12.9b</i></p> <p>D12.9b Satisfaction with police response</p> <p>Overall, how satisfied were you with the way the police handled the matter? Were you very satisfied, fairly satisfied, neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, a bit dissatisfied or very dissatisfied?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Very satisfied 2 Fairly satisfied 3 Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied 4 A bit dissatisfied 5 Very dissatisfied 6 [DK / cannot remember]
<p><i>IF D12.9b = 4 OR 5, ASK D12.9c</i></p> <p>D12.9c Why not satisfied (MR)</p> <p>For what reasons were you dissatisfied? You can give more than one reason.</p> <p><< INT: MULTIPLE RESPONSES ARE POSSIBLE. DO NOT READ OUT RESPONSE CATEGORIES BELOW, BUT CODE ANSWERS IN THE MOST APPROPRIATE CATEGORY >></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Didn't do enough 2 Were not interested 3 Didn't find or apprehend the offender 4 Didn't recover my property (goods) 5 Didn't keep me properly informed 6 Didn't treat me correctly / were impolite 7 Were slow to arrive 8 Other reasons 9 DK (spontaneous)
<p><i>IF D12.9 = 1, ASK D12.10</i></p> <p>D12.10 Receive any information about what happened</p>

<p>Did you receive any information from the police about what happened in your case - for instance, did they say they had caught someone, or that they were not in a position to take things further?</p> <p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]</p>	
D12.11	<p>Contact victim support</p> <p>In some countries, agencies have been set up to help victims of crime by giving information, practical or emotional support. Did you have any contact with a specialised victim support agency after this incident?</p> <p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p> <p>3 DK / cannot remember / / refuses to say]</p>
<p><i>IF D12.11 = 1, ASK D12.11a.</i></p>	
D12.11a	<p>What type of contact (MR)</p> <p>What type of contact did you have? Was it a letter, a phone call, or did you personally meet with the victim support agency?</p> <p>1 Letter</p> <p>2 Phone call</p> <p>3 Met with victim support agency</p> <p>4 [DK / cannot remember]</p>
<p><i>IF D12.11 = 2 OR 3, ASK D12.11b</i></p>	
D12.11b	<p>Support useful</p> <p>Do you think that the services of a specialised agency to help victims of crime would have been useful for you after this incident?</p> <p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>END OF SECTION – GO TO D13.1</i></p>
<p>D13 SEXUAL OFFENCES – PARTNERS</p>	
<p><i>IF C13 = 1, ASK D13.1, ELSE GO TO D14.1</i></p>	
D13.1	<p>When (MR)</p> <p>You mentioned that you had been victim of a sexual offence by a partner or ex-partner. Remember that your answers will, of course, be treated confidentially and anonymously.</p> <p>I want to know when this happened. Was it within the last 12 months – i.e., since [12 months before date of interview]. Or was it before this?</p> <p><< INT: IF RESPONDENT HAS BEEN VICTIM MORE THAN ONCE, CODE ALL TIME PERIODS THAT APPLY >></p> <p>1 Last 12 months</p> <p>2 Before that</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember]</p>
<p><i>IF D13.1 = 1, ASK D13.1a. ELSE GO TO D13.2</i></p>	
D13.1a	<p>How often in last 12 months</p> <p>How often did it happen in the last 12 months?</p> <p>1 Once</p> <p>2 Twice</p> <p>3 Three times</p>

4	Four times
5	Five times or more
6	[DK / cannot remember/ refuses to say]
<p>D13.2 Where did it happen</p> <p>(The last time) where did this sexual offence happen? Was it in or around your home, in your neighbourhood or town, somewhere elsewhere in [country], or did it happen abroad?</p> <p><< INT: IF VICTIM MORE THAN ONCE OVER THE PAST FIVE YEARS, ASK ABOUT THE LAST TIME THIS HAPPENED >></p> <p>1 In or around own home (main or secondary residence)</p> <p>2 In neighbourhood or town</p> <p>3 Elsewhere in [country]</p> <p>4 Abroad</p> <p>5 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]</p>	
<p>D13.3 Description of incident</p> <p>Would you describe the incident as (1) a rape or attempted rape, (2) an indecent assault, or (3) behaviour which you found offensive? Please simply give me the number that is applicable.</p> <p>1 A rape and attempted rape</p> <p>2 Indecent assault</p> <p>3 Offensive behaviour</p> <p>4 [DK / refuses to say]</p> <p><i>IF D13.3 = 3 OR 4, GO TO D13.6</i></p>	
<p><i>IF D13.3 = 1 OR 2, ASK D13.4</i></p> <p>D13.4 Weapon used</p> <p>Did any of the offenders have a weapon or something they used or threatened to use as a weapon?</p> <p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]</p>	
<p><i>IF D13.4 = 1, ask D13.4a</i></p> <p>D13.4a Kind of weapon</p> <p>What did he /she /they use as a weapon? Was it a gun of some sort, a knife, or something else?</p> <p><< INT: IF SEVERAL WEAPONS, MARK THE HIGHEST ON THE LIST >></p> <p>1 Gun (of some sort)</p> <p>2 Knife</p> <p>3 Something else</p> <p>4 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]</p>	
<p>D13.5 Injury</p> <p>Were you bruised, scratched, cut or injured in any way?</p> <p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]</p>	
<p><i>IF D13.5 = 1, ASK D13.5a</i></p> <p>D13.5a Treatment for injury</p> <p>Did you visit a doctor, health centre or hospital because of the incident?</p>	

<p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]</p>
<p>D13.6 Emotional impact</p> <p>To what extent is the incident still on your mind? Do you never think about it, sometimes think about it, think about it quite often, or does it dominate your life.</p> <p>1 Never</p> <p>2 Sometimes think about it</p> <p>3 Think about it quite often</p> <p>4 Dominates my life</p> <p>5 [DK / refuses to say]</p>
<p>D13.7 Who was the offender in partner incidents</p> <p>At the time of the incident, was the offender your spouse, partner or boyfriend / girlfriend, or your ex-spouse, ex-partner, ex-boyfriend / girlfriend?</p> <p><< INT: MEANS RELATIONSHIP AT TIME OF THE OFFENCES >></p> <p>1 Spouse or partner (at the time)</p> <p>2 Ex-spouse or ex-partner (at the time)</p> <p>3 Boyfriend / girlfriend (at the time)</p> <p>4 Ex-boyfriend / ex-girlfriend (at the time)</p> <p>5 Refuses to say (spontaneous)</p>
<p>D13.8 Alcohol</p> <p>At the time the incident happened, did you think the offender was under the influence of alcohol and / or drugs?</p> <p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember]</p>
<p>D13.9 Whether due to discrimination (MR)</p> <p>Do you believe this crime happened because of, or partly because of your ethnic or immigrant status, religion or belief, disability, age, or sexual orientation?</p> <p><< IF ONLY A 'YES' ANSWER, ASK WHAT THE RESPONDENT BELIEVED WAS THE REASON >></p> <p>1 Ethnic or immigrant status</p> <p>2 Religion or belief</p> <p>3 Disability</p> <p>4 Age</p> <p>5 Sexual orientation</p> <p>6 Not due to any of these</p> <p>7 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]</p>
<p>D13.10 Incident reported to the police</p> <p>(The last time this happened) did you or anyone else report the incident to the police?</p> <p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]</p> <p><i>IF D13.10 = 1, GO TO D13.10b</i></p>

IF D13.10 = 3, GO TO D13.12

IF D13.10 = 2, ASK D13.10a

D13.10a Why police were not informed (MR)

Why not?

<< INT: MULTIPLE RESPONSES ARE POSSIBLE. DO NOT READ OUT RESPONSE CATEGORIES BELOW, BUT CODE ANSWERS IN THE MOST APPROPRIATE CATEGORY >>

- 1 Not serious enough / no loss / kid's stuff
- 2 Inappropriate for police / police not necessary
- 3 Police could do nothing / lack of proof
- 4 Police won't do anything about it
- 5 Fear / dislike of the police / didn't want involvement with police
- 6 Reported to other authorities instead
- 7 Solved it myself / my family resolved it / perpetrator known to me
- 8 No insurance
- 9 Fear of reprisals
- 10 Inconvenient / police too far away / too much trouble
- 11 Other reasons
- 12 Don't know

GO TO D13.12

IF D13.10 = 1, ASK D13.10b

D13.10b Satisfaction with police response

Overall, how satisfied were you with the way the police handled the matter? Were you very satisfied, fairly satisfied, neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, a bit dissatisfied or very dissatisfied?

- 1 Very satisfied
- 2 Fairly satisfied
- 3 Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
- 4 A bit dissatisfied
- 5 Very dissatisfied
- 6 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]

IF D13.10b = 4 OR 5, ASK D13.10c

D13.10c Why not satisfied (MR)

For what reasons were you dissatisfied? You can give more than one reason.

<< INT: MULTIPLE RESPONSES ARE POSSIBLE. DO NOT READ OUT RESPONSE CATEGORIES BELOW, BUT CODE ANSWERS IN THE MOST APPROPRIATE CATEGORY >>

- 1 Didn't do enough
- 2 Were not interested
- 3 Didn't find or apprehend the offender
- 4 Didn't recover my property (goods)
- 5 Didn't keep me properly informed
- 6 Didn't treat me correctly / were impolite
- 7 Were slow to arrive
- 8 Other reasons
- 9 DK (spontaneous)

<i>IF D13.10 = 1, ASK D13.11</i>	
D13.11	<p>Receive any information about what happened</p> <p>Did you receive any information from the police about what happened in your case - for instance, did they say they had caught someone, or that they were not in a position to take things further?</p> <p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]</p>
<i>IF D13.12 = 1 ASK D13.12b</i>	
D13.12	<p>Contact victim support</p> <p>In some countries, agencies have been set up to help victims of crime by giving information, practical or emotional support. Did you have any contact with a specialised victim support agency after this incident?</p> <p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]</p>
<i>IF D13.12 = 2 or 3, ASK D13.12b</i>	
D13.12a	<p>What type of contact (MR)</p> <p>What type of contact did you have? Was it a letter, a phone call, or did you personally meet with the victim support agency?</p> <p>1 Letter</p> <p>2 Phone call</p> <p>3 Met with victim support agency</p> <p>4 [DK / cannot remember]</p>
<i>IF D13.12 = 2 or 3, ASK D13.12b</i>	
D13.12b	<p>Support useful</p> <p>Do you think that the services of a specialised agency to help victims of crime would have been useful for you after this incident?</p> <p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]</p> <p><i>END OF SECTION – GO TO D14.1</i></p>
D14 SEXUAL OFFENCES – OTHER PEOPLE KNOWN	
<i>IF C14 = 1, ASK D14.1, ELSE GO TO D15.1</i>	
D14.1	<p>When (MR)</p> <p>You mentioned that you had been victim of a sexual offence by someone else you knew. Remember that your answers will, of course, be treated confidentially and anonymously.</p> <p>I want to know when this happened. Was it within the last 12 months – i.e., since [12 months before date of interview]. Or was it before this?</p> <p><< INT: IF RESPONDENT HAS BEEN VICTIM MORE THAN ONCE, CODE ALL TIME PERIODS THAT APPLY >></p> <p>1 Last 12 months</p> <p>2 Before that</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember]</p>
<i>IF D14.1 = 1, ASK D14.1a. ELSE GO TO D14.2</i>	
D14.1a	<p>How often in last 12 months</p> <p>How often did it happen in the last 12 months?</p> <p>1 Once</p>

<p>2 Twice</p> <p>3 Three times</p> <p>4 Four times</p> <p>5 Five times or more</p> <p>6 [DK / cannot remember/ refuses to say]</p>
<p>D14.2 Where did it happen</p> <p>(The last time) where did this sexual offence happen? Was it in or around your home, in your neighbourhood or town, somewhere elsewhere in [country], or did it happen abroad?</p> <p><< INT: IF VICTIM MORE THAN ONCE OVER THE PAST FIVE YEARS, ASK ABOUT THE LAST TIME THIS HAPPENED >></p> <p>1 In or around own home (main or secondary residence)</p> <p>2 In neighbourhood or town</p> <p>3 Elsewhere in [country]</p> <p>4 Abroad</p> <p>5 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]</p>
<p>D14.3 Description of incident</p> <p>Would you describe the incident as (1) a rape or attempted rape, (2) an indecent assault, or (3) behaviour which you found offensive? Please simply give me the number that is applicable.</p> <p>1 A rape and attempted rape</p> <p>2 Indecent assault</p> <p>3 Offensive behaviour</p> <p>4 [DK / refuses to say]</p> <p><i>IF D14.3 = 3 OR 4, GO TO D14.6</i></p>
<p><i>IF D14.3 = 1 OR 2, ASK D14.4</i></p> <p>D14.4 Weapon used</p> <p>Did any of the offenders have a weapon or something they used or threatened to use as a weapon?</p> <p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]</p>
<p><i>IF D14.4 = 1, ask D14.4a</i></p> <p>D14.4a Kind of weapon</p> <p>What did he /she /they use as a weapon? Was it a gun of some sort, a knife, or something else?</p> <p><< INT: IF SEVERAL WEAPONS, MARK THE HIGHEST ON THE LIST >></p> <p>1 Gun (of some sort)</p> <p>2 Knife</p> <p>3 Something else</p> <p>4 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]</p>
<p>D14.5 Injury</p> <p>Were you bruised, scratched, cut or injured in any way?</p> <p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]</p>
<p><i>IF D14.5 = 1, ASK D14.5a</i></p>

<p>D14.5a Treatment for injury</p> <p>Did you visit a doctor, health centre or hospital because of the incident?</p> <p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]</p>
<p>D14.6 Emotional impact</p> <p>To what extent is the incident still on your mind? Do you never think about it, sometimes think about it, think about it quite often, or does it dominate your life.</p> <p>1 Never</p> <p>2 Sometimes think about it</p> <p>3 Think about it quite often</p> <p>4 Dominates my life</p> <p>5 [DK / refuses to say]</p>
<p>D14.7 Who was the offender in incidents by people known</p> <p>Can you tell me who the offender was? Was it a date, a relative, a neighbour, a friend, a colleague, a customer or client, or someone else?</p> <p>1 Date</p> <p>2 Relative</p> <p>3 Neighbour</p> <p>4 Friend</p> <p>5 Colleague</p> <p>6 Customer / client</p> <p>7 Someone else</p> <p>8 Refuses to say (spontaneous) / DK</p>
<p>D14.8 Alcohol</p> <p>At the time the incident happened, did you think the offender was under the influence of alcohol and / or drugs?</p> <p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember]</p>
<p>D14.9 Whether due to discrimination (MR)</p> <p>Do you believe this crime happened because of, or partly because of your ethnic or immigrant status, religion or belief, disability, age, or sexual orientation?</p> <p><< IF ONLY A 'YES' ANSWER, ASK WHAT THE RESPONDENT BELIEVED WAS THE REASON >></p> <p>1 Ethnic or immigrant status</p> <p>2 Religion or belief</p> <p>3 Disability</p> <p>4 Age</p> <p>5 Sexual orientation</p> <p>6 Not due to any of these</p> <p>7 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]</p>
<p>D14.10 Incident reported to the police</p> <p>(The last time this happened) did you or anyone else report the incident to the police?</p>

<p>1 Yes 2 No 3 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say] <i>IF D14.10 = 1, GO TO D14.10b</i> <i>IF D14.10 = 3, GO TO D14.12</i></p>
<p><i>IF D14.10 = 2, ASK D14.10a</i> D14.10a Why police were not informed (MR) Why not? << INT: MULTIPLE RESPONSES ARE POSSIBLE. DO NOT READ OUT RESPONSE CATEGORIES BELOW, BUT CODE ANSWERS IN THE MOST APPROPRIATE CATEGORY >> 1 Not serious enough / no loss / kid's stuff 2 Inappropriate for police / police not necessary 3 Police could do nothing / lack of proof 4 Police won't do anything about it 5 Fear / dislike of the police / didn't want involvement with police 6 Reported to other authorities instead 7 Solved it myself / my family resolved it / perpetrator known to me 8 No insurance 9 Fear of reprisals 10 Inconvenient / police too far away / too much trouble 11 Other reasons 12 Don't know <p style="text-align: right;"><i>GO TO D14.12</i></p></p>
<p><i>IF D14.10 = 1, ASK D14.10b</i> D14.10b Satisfaction with police response Overall, how satisfied were you with the way the police handled the matter? Were you very satisfied, fairly satisfied, neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, a bit dissatisfied or very dissatisfied? 1 Very satisfied 2 Fairly satisfied 3 Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied 4 A bit dissatisfied 5 Very dissatisfied 6 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]</p>
<p><i>IF D14.10b = 4 OR 5, ASK D14.10c</i> D14.10c Why not satisfied (MR) For what reasons were you dissatisfied? You can give more than one reason. << INT: MULTIPLE RESPONSES ARE POSSIBLE. DO NOT READ OUT RESPONSE CATEGORIES BELOW, BUT CODE ANSWERS IN THE MOST APPROPRIATE CATEGORY >> 1 Didn't do enough 2 Were not interested 3 Didn't find or apprehend the offender 4 Didn't recover my property (goods) 5 Didn't keep me properly informed 6 Didn't treat me correctly / were impolite</p>

7	Were slow to arrive
8	Other reasons
9	DK (spontaneous)
<i>IF D14.10 = 1, ASK D14.11</i>	
D14.11	<p>Receive any information about what happened</p> <p>Did you receive any information from the police about what happened in your case - for instance, did they say they had caught someone, or that they were not in a position to take things further?</p> <p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]</p>
D14.12	<p>Contact victim support</p> <p>In some countries, agencies have been set up to help victims of crime by giving information, practical or emotional support. Did you have any contact with a specialised victim support agency after this incident?</p> <p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p> <p>3 DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]</p>
<i>IF D14.12 = 1 ASK D14.12a</i>	
D14.12a	<p>What type of contact (MR)</p> <p>What type of contact did you have? Was it a letter, a phone call, or did you personally meet with the victim support agency?</p> <p>1 Letter</p> <p>2 Phone call</p> <p>3 Met with victim support agency</p> <p>4 [DK / cannot remember]</p>
<i>IF D14.12 = 2 or 3, ASK D14.12b</i>	
D14.12b	<p>Support useful</p> <p>Do you think that the services of a specialised agency to help victims of crime would have been useful for you after this incident?</p> <p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]</p> <p><i>END OF SECTION – GO TO D15.1</i></p>
D15 ASSAULTS / THREATS – PEOPLE NOT KNOWN	
<i>IF C15 = 1, ASK D15.1, ELSE GO TO D16.1</i>	
D15.1	<p>When (MR)</p> <p>You mentioned you have been assaulted or threatened by someone you did not know. Remember that your answers will, of course, be treated confidentially and anonymously.</p> <p>I want to know when this happened. Was it within the last 12 months – i.e., since [12 months before date of interview]. Or was it before this?</p> <p><< INT: IF RESPONDENT HAS BEEN VICTIM MORE THAN ONCE, CODE ALL TIME PERIODS THAT APPLY >></p> <p>1 Last 12 months</p> <p>2 Before that</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember]</p>
<i>IF D15.1 = 1, ASK D15.1s. ELSE GO TO D15.2</i>	

D15.1a	How often in last 12 months How often did it happen in the last 12 months? 1 Once 2 Twice 3 Three times 4 Four times 5 Five times or more 6 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]
D15.2	Where did it happen (The last time) where did this incident happen? Was it in or around your home, in your neighbourhood or town, somewhere elsewhere in [country], or did it happen abroad? << INT: IF VICTIM MORE THAN ONCE OVER THE PAST FIVE YEARS, ASK ABOUT THE LAST TIME THIS HAPPENED >> 1 In or around own home (main or secondary residence) 2 In neighbourhood or town 3 Elsewhere in [country] 4 Abroad 5 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]
D15.3	Force used or threat (The last time), can you tell me what happened? Were you just threatened, or was force used? 1 Just threatened 2 Force used 3 [DK / refuses to say]
D15.4	Weapon used Did any of the offenders have a weapon or something they used or threatened to use as a weapon? 1 Yes 2 No 3 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]
	<i>IF D15.4 = 1, ASK D15.4a</i>
D15.4a	Kind of weapon What did he / she / they use as a weapon? Was it a gun of some sort, a knife, or something else? << INT: DO NOT READ OUT. IF MORE THAN ONE WEAPON, MARK THE HIGHEST ON THE LIST >> 1 Gun (of some sort) 2 Knife 3 Something else 4 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]
	<i>IF D15.3 = 2 OR 3, ASK D15.5. IF D15.3 = 1, GO TO D15.6</i>
D15.5	Injury Were you bruised, scratched, cut or injured in any way? 1 Yes 2 No 3 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]

<i>IF D15.5 = 1, ASK D15.5a</i>	
D15.5a	Treatment for injury Did you visit a doctor, health centre or hospital because of the incident? 1 Yes 2 No 3 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]
D15.6	Emotional impact To what extent is the incident still on your mind? Do you never think about it, sometimes think about it, think about it quite often, or does it dominate your life. 1 Never 2 Sometimes think about it 3 Think about it quite often 4 Dominates my life 5 [DK / refuses to say]
D15.7	Alcohol At the time the incident happened, did you think the offender was under the influence of alcohol and / or drugs? 1 Yes 2 No 3 [DK / cannot remember]
D15.8	Whether due to discrimination (MR) Do you believe this crime happened because of, or partly because of your ethnic or immigrant status, religion or belief, disability, age, or sexual orientation? << IF ONLY A 'YES' ANSWER, ASK WHAT THE RESPONDENT BELIEVED WAS THE REASON >> 1 Ethnic or immigrant status 2 Religion or belief 3 Disability 4 Age 5 Sexual orientation 6 Not due to any of these 7 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]

D15.9	Incident reported to the police (The last time this happened) did you or anyone else report the incident to the police? 1 Yes 2 No 3 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say] <i>IF D15.9 = 1, GO TO D15.9b</i> <i>IF D15.9 = 3, GO TO D15.11</i>
D15.9a	<i>IF D15.9 = 2, ASK D15.9a</i> Why police were not informed (MR) Why not? << INT: MULTIPLE RESPONSES ARE POSSIBLE. DO NOT READ OUT

RESPONSE CATEGORIES BELOW, BUT CODE ANSWERS IN THE MOST APPROPRIATE CATEGORY >>

- 1 Not serious enough / no loss / kid's stuff
- 2 Inappropriate for police / police not necessary
- 3 Police could do nothing / lack of proof
- 4 Police won't do anything about it
- 5 Fear / dislike of the police / didn't want involvement with police
- 6 Reported to other authorities instead
- 7 Solved it myself / my family resolved it / perpetrator known to me
- 8 No insurance
- 9 Fear of reprisals
- 10 Inconvenient / police too far away / too much trouble
- 11 Other reasons
- 12 Don't know

GO TO D15.11

IF D15.9 = 1, ASK D15.9b

D15.9b Satisfaction with police response

Overall, how satisfied were you with the way the police handled the matter? Were you very satisfied, fairly satisfied, neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, a bit dissatisfied or very dissatisfied?

- 1 Very satisfied
- 2 Fairly satisfied
- 3 Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
- 4 A bit dissatisfied
- 5 Very dissatisfied
- 6 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]

IF D15.9b = 4 OR 5, ASK D15.9c

D15.9c Why not satisfied (MR)

For what reasons were you dissatisfied? You can give more than one reason.

<< INT: MULTIPLE RESPONSES ARE POSSIBLE. DO NOT READ OUT RESPONSE CATEGORIES BELOW, BUT CODE ANSWERS IN THE MOST APPROPRIATE CATEGORY >>

- 1 Didn't do enough
- 2 Were not interested
- 3 Didn't find or apprehend the offender
- 4 Didn't recover my property (goods)
- 5 Didn't keep me properly informed
- 6 Didn't treat me correctly / were impolite
- 7 Were slow to arrive
- 8 Other reasons
- 9 DK (spontaneous)

IF D15.9 = 1, ASK D15.10

D15.10 Receive any information about what happened

Did you receive any information from the police about what happened in your case - for instance, did they say they had caught someone, or that they were not in a position to take things further?

- 1 Yes

2	No
3	[DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]
D15.11	Contact victim support In some countries, agencies have been set up to help victims of crime by giving information, practical or emotional support. Did you have any contact with a specialised victim support agency after this incident? 1 Yes 2 No 3 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]
<i>IF D15.11 = 1 D15.11a</i>	
D15.11a	What type of contact (MR) What type of contact did you have? Was it a letter, a phone call, or did you personally meet with the victim support agency? 1 Letter 2 Phone call 3 Met with victim support agency 4 [DK / cannot remember]
<i>IF D15.11 = 2 OR 3, ASK D15.11b</i>	
D15.11b	Support useful Do you think that the services of a specialised agency to help victims of crime would have been useful for you after this incident? 1 Yes 2 No 3 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say] <i>END OF SECTION – GO TO D16.1</i>
D16 ASSAULTS / THREATS – PARTNERS	
<i>IF C16 = 1, ASK D16.1, ELSE GO TO D17.1</i>	
D16.1	When (MR) You mentioned you have been assaulted or threatened by a partner / ex-partner. Remember that your answers will, of course, be treated confidentially and anonymously. I want to know when this happened. Was it within the last 12 months – i.e., since [12 months before date of interview]. Or was it before this? << INT: IF RESPONDENT HAS BEEN VICTIM MORE THAN ONCE, CODE ALL TIME PERIODS THAT APPLY >> 1 Last 12 months 2 Before that 3 [DK / cannot remember]
<i>IF D16.1 = 1, ASK D16.1b.</i>	
D16.1a	How often in last 12 months How often did it happen in the last 12 months? 1 Once 2 Twice 3 Three times 4 Four times 5 Five times or more 6 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]

<p>D16.2 Where did it happen</p> <p>(The last time) where did this incident happen? Was it in or around your home, in your neighbourhood or town, somewhere elsewhere in [country], or did it happen abroad?</p> <p><< INT: IF VICTIM MORE THAN ONCE OVER THE PAST FIVE YEARS, ASK ABOUT THE LAST TIME THIS HAPPENED >></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 In or around own home (main or secondary residence) 2 In neighbourhood or town 3 Elsewhere in [country] 4 Abroad 5 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]
<p>D16.3 Force used or threat</p> <p>(The last time), can you tell me what happened? Were you just threatened, or was force used?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Just threatened 2 Force used 3 [DK / refuses to say]
<p>D16.4 Weapon used</p> <p>Did any of the offenders have a weapon or something they used or threatened to use as a weapon?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Yes 2 No 3 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]
<p><i>IF D16.4 = 1, ASK D16.4a</i></p> <p>D16.4a Kind of weapon</p> <p>What did he / she / they use as a weapon? Was it a gun of some sort, a knife, or something else?</p> <p><< INT: IF SEVERAL WEAPONS, MARK THE HIGHEST ON THE LIST >></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Gun (of some sort) 2 Knife 3 Something else 4 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]
<p><i>IF D16.3 = 2 OR 3, ASK D16.5. IF D16.3 = 1, GO TO D16.6</i></p> <p>D16.5 Injury</p> <p>Were you bruised, scratched, cut or injured in any way?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Yes 2 No 3 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]
<p><i>IF D16.5 = 1, ASK D16.5a</i></p> <p>D16.5a Treatment for injury</p> <p>Did you visit a doctor, health centre or hospital because of the incident?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Yes 2 No 3 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]
<p>D16.6 Emotional impact</p> <p>To what extent is the incident still on your mind? Do you never think about it, sometimes think about it, think about it quite often, or does it dominate your</p>

<p>life.</p> <p>1 Never</p> <p>2 Sometimes think about it</p> <p>3 Think about it quite often</p> <p>4 Dominates my life</p> <p>5 [DK / refuses to say]</p>
<p>D16.7 Who was the offender in partner incidents</p> <p>At the time of the incident, was the offender your spouse, partner or boyfriend / girlfriend, your ex-spouse, ex-partner, ex-boyfriend / girlfriend?</p> <p><< INT: MEANS RELATIONSHIP AT TIME OF THE OFFENCES >></p> <p>1 Spouse or partner (at the time)</p> <p>2 Ex-spouse or ex-partner (at the time)</p> <p>3 Boyfriend / girlfriend (at the time)</p> <p>4 Ex-boyfriend / ex-girlfriend (at the time)</p> <p>5 Refuses to say (spontaneous)</p>
<p>D16.8 Alcohol</p> <p>At the time the incident happened, did you think the offender was under the influence of alcohol and / or drugs?</p> <p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember]</p>
<p>D16.9 Whether due to discrimination (MR)</p> <p>Do you believe this crime happened because of, or partly because of your ethnic or immigrant status, religion or belief, disability, age, or sexual orientation?</p> <p><< IF ONLY A 'YES' ANSWER, ASK WHAT THE RESPONDENT BELIEVED WAS THE REASON >></p> <p>1 Ethnic or immigrant status</p> <p>2 Religion or belief</p> <p>3 Disability</p> <p>4 Age</p> <p>5 Sexual orientation</p> <p>6 Not due to any of these</p> <p>7 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]</p>
<p>D16.10 Incident reported to the police</p> <p>(The last time this happened) did you or anyone else report the incident to the police?</p> <p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]</p> <p><i>IF D16.10 = 1, GO TO D16.10b</i></p> <p><i>IF D16.10 = 3, GO TO D16.12</i></p>
<p><i>IF D16.10 = 2, ASK D16.10a</i></p> <p>D16.10a Why police were not informed (MR)</p> <p>Why not?</p> <p><< INT: MULTIPLE RESPONSES ARE POSSIBLE. DO NOT READ OUT RESPONSE CATEGORIES BELOW, BUT CODE ANSWERS IN THE MOST APPROPRIATE CATEGORY >></p>

- 1 Not serious enough / no loss / kid's stuff
- 2 Inappropriate for police / police not necessary
- 3 Police could do nothing / lack of proof
- 4 Police won't do anything about it
- 5 Fear / dislike of the police / didn't want involvement with police
- 6 Reported to other authorities instead
- 7 Solved it myself / perpetrator known to me
- 8 My family resolved it
- 9 No insurance
- 10 Fear of reprisals
- 11 Inconvenient / police too far away / too much trouble
- 12 Other reasons
- 13 Don't know

GO TO D16.12

IF D16.10 = 1, ASK D16.10b

D16.10b Satisfaction with police response

Overall, how satisfied were you with the way the police handled the matter? Were you very satisfied, fairly satisfied, neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, a bit dissatisfied or very dissatisfied?

- 1 Very satisfied
- 2 Fairly satisfied
- 3 Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
- 4 A bit dissatisfied
- 5 Very dissatisfied
- 6 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]

IF D16.10b = 4 OR 5, ASK D16.10c

D16.10c Why not satisfied (MR)

For what reasons were you dissatisfied? You can give more than one reason.

<< INT: MULTIPLE RESPONSES ARE POSSIBLE. DO NOT READ OUT RESPONSE CATEGORIES BELOW, BUT CODE ANSWERS IN THE MOST APPROPRIATE CATEGORY >>

- 1 Didn't do enough
- 2 Were not interested
- 3 Didn't find or apprehend the offender
- 4 Didn't recover my property (goods)
- 5 Didn't keep me properly informed
- 6 Didn't treat me correctly / were impolite
- 7 Were slow to arrive
- 8 Other reasons
- 9 DK (spontaneous)

IF D16.10 = 1, ASK D16.11

D16.11 Receive any information about what happened

Did you receive any information from the police about what happened in your case - for instance, did they say they had caught someone, or that they were not in a position to take things further?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No

	3 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]
D16.12	Contact victim support In some countries, agencies have been set up to help victims of crime by giving information, practical or emotional support. Did you have any contact with a specialised victim support agency after this incident? 1 Yes 2 No 3 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]
D16.12a	What type of contact (MR) What type of contact did you have? Was it a letter, a phone call, or did you personally meet with the victim support agency? 1 Letter 2 Phone call 3 Met with victim support agency 4 [DK / cannot remember]
	<i>IF D16.12 =2 OR 3, ASK D16.12b</i>
D16.12b	Support useful Do you think that the services of a specialised agency to help victims of crime would have been useful for you after this incident? 1 Yes 2 No 3 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say] <i>END OF SECTION – GO TO D17.1</i>
	<i>IF C17 = 1, ASK D17.1, ELSE GO TO SECTION E, QUESTION E.1</i>
D17.1	When (MR) You mentioned you have been assaulted or threatened by someone you knew. Remember that your answers will, of course, be treated confidentially and anonymously. I want to know when this happened. Was it within the last 12 months – i.e., since [12 months before date of interview]. Or was it before this? << INT: IF RESPONDENT HAS BEEN VICTIM MORE THAN ONCE, CODE ALL TIME PERIODS THAT APPLY >> 1 Last 12 months 2 Before that 3 [DK / cannot remember]
	<i>IF D17.1 = 1, ASK D17.1b.</i>
D17.1a	How often in last 12 months How often did it happen in the last 12 months? 1 Once 2 Twice 3 Three times 4 Four times 5 Five times or more 6 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]
D17.2	Where did it happen (The last time) where did this incident happen? Was it in or around your home, in your neighbourhood or town, somewhere elsewhere in [country], or did it

<p>happen abroad?</p> <p><< INT: IF VICTIM MORE THAN ONCE OVER THE PAST FIVE YEARS, ASK ABOUT THE LAST TIME THIS HAPPENED >></p> <p>1 In or around own home (main or secondary residence)</p> <p>2 In neighbourhood or town</p> <p>3 Elsewhere in [country]</p> <p>4 Abroad</p> <p>5 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]</p>
<p>D17.3 Force used or threat</p> <p>(The last time), can you tell me what happened? Were you just threatened, or was force used?</p> <p>1 Just threatened</p> <p>2 Force used</p> <p>3 [DK / refuses to say]</p>
<p>D17.4 Weapon used</p> <p>Did any of the offenders have a weapon or something they used or threatened to use as a weapon?</p> <p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]</p>
<p><i>IF D17.4 = 1, ASK D17.4a</i></p> <p>D17.4a Kind of weapon</p> <p>What did he / she / they use as a weapon? Was it a gun of some sort, a knife, or something else?</p> <p><< INT: IF SEVERAL WEAPONS, MARK THE HIGHEST ON THE LIST >></p> <p>1 Gun (of some sort)</p> <p>2 Knife</p> <p>3 Something else</p> <p>4 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]</p>
<p><i>IF D17.3 = 2 OR 3, ASK D17.5. IF D17.3 = 1, GO TO D17.6</i></p> <p>D17.5 Injury</p> <p>Were you bruised, scratched, cut or injured in any way?</p> <p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]</p>
<p><i>IF D17.5 = 1, ASK D17.5a</i></p> <p>D17.5a Treatment for injury</p> <p>Did you visit a doctor, health centre or hospital because of the incident?</p> <p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]</p>
<p>D17.6 Emotional impact</p> <p>To what extent is the incident still on your mind? Do you never think about it, sometimes think about it, think about it quite often, or does it dominate your life.</p> <p>1 Never</p> <p>2 Sometimes think about it</p>

<p>3 Think about it quite often</p> <p>4 Dominates my life</p> <p>5 [DK / refuses to say]</p>
<p>D17.7 Who was the offender in incidents by people known</p> <p>Can you tell me who the offender was? Was it a date, a relative, a neighbour, a friend, a colleague, or someone else?</p> <p>1 Date</p> <p>2 Relative</p> <p>3 Neighbour</p> <p>4 Friend</p> <p>5 Colleague</p> <p>6 Customer / client</p> <p>7 Someone else</p> <p>8 Refuses to say (spontaneous) / DK</p>
<p>D17.8 Alcohol</p> <p>At the time the incident happened, did you think the offender was under the influence of alcohol and / or drugs?</p> <p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember]</p>
<p>D17.9 Whether due to discrimination (MR)</p> <p>Do you believe this crime happened because of, or partly because of your ethnic or immigrant status, religion or belief, disability, age, or sexual orientation?</p> <p><< IF ONLY A 'YES' ANSWER, ASK WHAT THE RESPONDENT BELIEVED WAS THE REASON >></p> <p>1 Ethnic or immigrant status</p> <p>2 Religion or belief</p> <p>3 Disability</p> <p>4 Age</p> <p>5 Sexual orientation</p> <p>6 Not due to any of these</p> <p>7 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]</p>
<p>D17.10 Incident reported to the police</p> <p>(The last time this happened) did you or anyone else report the incident to the police?</p> <p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]</p> <p><i>IF D17.10 = 1, GO TO D17.10b</i></p> <p><i>IF D17.10 = 3, GO TO D17.12</i></p>
<p><i>F D17.10 = 2, ASK D17.10a</i></p> <p>D17.10a Why police were not informed (MR)</p> <p>Why not?</p> <p><< INT: MULTIPLE RESPONSES ARE POSSIBLE. DO NOT READ OUT RESPONSE CATEGORIES BELOW, BUT CODE ANSWERS IN THE MOST APPROPRIATE CATEGORY >></p>

- 1 Not serious enough / no loss / kid's stuff
 - 2 Inappropriate for police / police not necessary
 - 3 Police could do nothing / lack of proof
 - 4 Police won't do anything about it
 - 5 Fear / dislike of the police / didn't want involvement with police
 - 6 Reported to other authorities instead
 - 7 Solved it myself / perpetrator known to me
 - 8 My family resolved it
 - 9 No insurance
 - 10 Fear of reprisals
 - 11 Inconvenient / police too far away / too much trouble
 - 12 Other reasons
 - 13 Don't know
- GO TO D17.12

IF D17.10 = 1, ASK D17.10b

D17.10b Satisfaction with police response

Overall, how satisfied were you with the way the police handled the matter? Were you very satisfied, fairly satisfied, neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, a bit dissatisfied or very dissatisfied?

- 1 Very satisfied
- 2 Fairly satisfied
- 3 Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
- 4 A bit dissatisfied
- 5 Very dissatisfied
- 6 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]

IF D17.10b = 4 OR 5, ASK D17.10c

D17.10c Why not satisfied (MR)

For what reasons were you dissatisfied? You can give more than one reason.

<< INT: MULTIPLE RESPONSES ARE POSSIBLE. DO NOT READ OUT RESPONSE CATEGORIES BELOW, BUT CODE ANSWERS IN THE MOST APPROPRIATE CATEGORY >>

- 1 Didn't do enough
- 2 Were not interested
- 3 Didn't find or apprehend the offender
- 4 Didn't recover my property (goods)
- 5 Didn't keep me properly informed
- 6 Didn't treat me correctly / were impolite
- 7 Were slow to arrive
- 8 Other reasons
- 9 DK (spontaneous)

IF D17.10 = 1, ASK D17.11

D17.11 Receive any information about what happened

Did you receive any information from the police about what happened in your case - for instance, did they say they had caught someone, or that they were not in a position to take things further?

- 1 Yes

2	No
3	[DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]
D17.12	<p>Contact victim support</p> <p>In some countries, agencies have been set up to help victims of crime by giving information, practical or emotional support. Did you have any contact with a specialised victim support agency after this incident?</p> <p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]</p>
D17.12a	<p>What type of contact (MR)</p> <p>What type of contact did you have? Was it a letter, a phone call, or did you personally meet with the victim support agency?</p> <p>1 Letter</p> <p>2 Phone call</p> <p>3 Met with victim support agency</p> <p>4 [DK / cannot remember]</p>
	<p><i>IF D17.12 =2 OR 3, ASK D17.12b</i></p> <p>D17.12b Support useful</p> <p>Do you think that the services of a specialised agency to help victims of crime would have been useful for you after this incident?</p> <p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p> <p>3 [DK / cannot remember / refuses to say]</p> <p>END OF SECTION – GO TO SECTION E, QUESTION E.1</p>

ANNEX D - A review of victimisation surveys in Europe from 1970 to 2010

Marcelo F. Aebi & Antonia Linde
University of Lausanne, Switzerland*

Table of contents

Introduction	5
Methodology and terminology	5
Main European and international surveys on victimisation.....	7
ICVS	7
EU ICS	8
Eurobarometer	9
Pilot study on the EU victimisation survey module	10
ICVS-2: Pilot studies.....	11
ICBS / ICCS	12
IVAWS.....	13
EU-MIDIS European Union Minorities and Discrimination Survey.....	14
The pilot: FRA's Pilot Victim Survey on Ethnic Minorities and Immigrants	14
The survey: EU-MIDIS European Union Minorities and Discrimination Survey	15
Surveys on victimisation in the 27EU Members States.....	17
Austria (Österreich).....	17
Belgium (Belgique/België).....	18
Bulgaria (България [Bălgarija]).....	19
Cyprus (Κύπρος/Kıbrıs [Kýpros])	22
Czech Republic (Česká republika).....	22
Denmark (Danmark).....	24
Estonia (Eesti).....	25
Finland (Suomi/Finland).....	26
France (France)	28
Germany (Deutschland).....	30
Greece (Ελλάδα [Elláda]).....	36
Hungary (Magyarország)	36
Ireland (Eire/Ireland)	37
Italy (Italia)	38
Latvia (Latvija).....	40
Lithuania (Lietuva).....	40
Luxembourg (Luxembourg).....	41
Malta (Malta)	42
Netherlands (Nederland).....	42
Poland (Polska).....	44
Portugal (Portugal).....	45
Romania (România).....	46

*This paper is a revised and updated version of a report presented to Eurostat in June 2009 (Aebi & Linde, 2009). The authors would like to thank helpful comments and information provided by Jan van Dijk, John van Kesteren, Andri Ahven, Kauko Aromaa, Jacqueline Azzopardi, Markku Heiskanen, Fritz Huls, Georgeta Istrate, Andreas Kapardis, Klára Kerezsi, Milada Martinková, Maria Giuseppina Muratore, Louis de Schorlemer, Paul Smit, Wolfgang Stangl, Alexander Stoyanov, Cynthia Tavares, Geoffrey Thomas, Christina Zafaronitou, and Renée Zauberman.

Slovakia (Slovensko).....	47
Slovenia (Slovenija)	47
Spain (España)	48
National Level.....	48
Catalonia (Catalunya).....	50
Sweden (Sverige).....	51
Switzerland	52
United Kingdom.....	53
England and Wales	54
Northern Ireland	56
Scotland	56
Summary of the situation in Europe	58
Conclusion	67
References	69

INTRODUCTION

The goal of this review is to present the historical evolution and the current situation in respect of the collection of survey data on victimisation, at the European Union (EU) level and individually in each one of the 27 EU Member States from 1970 to 2010. The review includes national surveys, academic/research studies, pilot exercises, and international surveys. Whenever possible, the following information is provided for each survey: year in which the survey was conducted, frequency of the survey, type of survey (victimisation, multipurpose, etc.), questionnaire used (ICVS or ad hoc questionnaire), type of sample (national, city, etc.), size of the sample, response rate, methodology (face to face, CATI, CAPI, CAWI, CASI, PAPI, etc.), institution that financed the survey, and institution that conducted the survey. A chapter on victimisation surveys in Switzerland has also been included.

After a chapter on methodology and terminology, the review includes a short description of the main European and International Surveys mentioned frequently throughout the text (ICVS, EU ICS, Eurobarometer, Pilot study on the EU victimisation survey module, Pilot studies of the ICVS-2, ICBS/ICCS, IVAWS, FRA's Pilot Victim Survey on Ethnic Minorities and Immigrants, and EU-MIDIS European Union Minorities and Discrimination Survey). The following 28 chapters present in detail the surveys conducted in each EU Member State and Switzerland. A synoptic table of the main surveys conducted in each EU country is provided at the end of the review.

METHODOLOGY AND TERMINOLOGY

To carry out this review, we followed three strategies. First, we took into account previous reviews, particularly the database developed by a working group of the UNECE/UNODC (2004-2006), a report submitted by HEUNI to Eurostat in 2007 (Aromaa, Heiskanen, Laaksonen & Viuhko, 2007), and the publications produced in the framework of the CRIMPREV program (Zauberman, 2009). Second, we conducted a comprehensive review of the existing scientific literature, official publications and reports, both through library networks and through the internet. Third, we took personal contact with colleagues and experts in the field of victimisation.

These strategies enabled us to build up a general bibliography and 27 specific bibliographies, one for each of the countries included in the review. The latter are mentioned in each of the relevant chapters. The general bibliography includes publications on the methodology and results of the main European and international surveys and has been used in different chapters of our review⁴⁵.

In order to avoid reiterations in the presentation of the different surveys, we applied the following conventions:

- (a) when the type of sample is not specified (e.g. urban sample), the sample is a national random sample

45 Alvazzi del Frate (1998, 2004a, 2004b), Alvazzi del Frate & van Kesteren (2002, 2004), Alvazzi del Frate, Zvekc & van Dijk (1993), Aromaa (2004), Aromaa & Heiskanen (2008), Aromaa, Heiskanen, Laaksonen & Viuhko (2007), De Schorlemer (2009), European Commission (1996, 2000, 2002), Eurostat (2009), FRA (2009), Goodey (2008), Johnson, Ollus & Nevala (2007, 2008), Mayhew & Van Dijk (1997), Nevala (2005), Smit (2009), Tavares (2009), Thomas (2007, 2009), UNECE-UNODC (2004-2006), Van Dijk (2009), Van Dijk & Langerak (2009), Van Dijk & Mayhew (1992), Van Dijk, Mayhew & Killias (1990), Van Dijk, Manchin, Van Kesteren & Hideg, G. (2007), Van Dijk & Steinmetz (1980), Van Dijk & Terlouw (1996), Van Dijk & Toornvliet (1996), Van Dijk, van Kesteren & Smit (2007), Van Kesteren (2003, 2009), Van Kesteren, Mayhew & Nieuwbeerta (2000), Zauberman (2008a, 2008b), Zvekc & Alvazzi del Frate (1995).

- (b) when the type of survey is not specified (e.g. multipurpose survey) the survey is a victimisation survey.
- (c) As a rule, the year of the survey corresponds to the one in which data were collected and not to the year used as a reference in the questionnaire, which usually is the previous one. For example, a 2010 survey usually covers the lifetime prevalence of victimisation experiences (which corresponds to the question: “Have you ever been the victim of...”) and the prevalence for the year 2009 (if the answer to the previous question is yes, when did that experience take place: this year [2010] last year [2009], or earlier?).
- (d) Sample size refers to the number of completed interviews (final sample). Whenever possible, we have indicated also the response rate. With these two elements it is possible to calculate the size of the gross sample (e.g. a sample size of 1,000 and a response rate of 50% means that the gross sample was 2000). When the final sample was not available, we have clearly indicated that we were mentioning the *gross sample*.

The following abbreviations have been used throughout the text:

Institutions:

- DG JLS: *Directorate-General for Justice, Freedom and Security of the European Commission*.
- EU: *European Union*.
- FRA: *European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights*.
- HEUNI: *European Institute for Crime Prevention and Control, affiliated with the United Nations*.
- Nicis Institute for Urban Research and Practice.
- UNECE: *United Nations Economic Commission for Europe*.
- UNICRI: *United Nations Interregional Crime and Justice Research Institute*.
- UNODC: *United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime*.
- WODC: *Research and Documentation Centre of the Dutch Ministry of Justice (Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek- en Documentatiecentrum)*

Surveys:

- BCS: *British Crime Survey*.
- EU ICS: *EU International Crime Survey*.
- EU-MIDIS: *European Union Minorities and Discrimination Survey*.
- ICBS: *International Crime against Businesses Survey*.
- ICCS: *International Crime Commercial Survey*.
- ICVS: *International Crime Victim Survey*.
- INSEC: *Insecurities in European Cities*.

Methods of sampling and interviewing:

- CAPI: *Computer Assisted Personal Interviewing*.
- CASI: *Computer Assisted Self-Interviewing*.
- CATI: *Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing*.
- CAWI: *Computer Assisted Web Interviewing*.
- FE : *Focused Enumeration*.
- FtoF: *Face to face Interviewing*.
- PAPI: *Pencil and Paper Interviewing*.
- PAPSI: *Pencil and Paper Self-Interviewing*
- RDD: *Random Digit Dialing*.
- RW: Random Walk = RR : Random Route.

MAIN EUROPEAN AND INTERNATIONAL SURVEYS ON VICTIMISATION

In the following chapters we have compiled a few comprehensive descriptions of the main European and international surveys mentioned in this review.

ICVS⁴⁶

The International Crime Victim Survey (ICVS) project was initiated in 1987⁴⁷. The main objective of the project was to seek advancement in international comparative criminological research, beyond the constraints of officially recorded crime data. The goal was to provide information on victimisation experiences, fear of crime, and attitudes towards the criminal justice system through a standard questionnaire, which would produce results allowing international comparisons. In order to reach that goal, all methodological aspects were standardised as much as possible.

The first round of the ICVS was conducted in 14 countries in 1989 by the Ministry of Justice of The Netherlands in cooperation with the Home Office of the United Kingdom and the University of Lausanne, Switzerland (Van Dijk, Mayhew, Killias, 1990). The interviews were conducted using CATI. The same year, pilot studies were conducted also in Indonesia (Jakarta) and Poland (Warsaw).

UNICRI became involved in the ICVS in 1991 with the aim of providing a wider geographical coverage to the project in order to include countries where telephone interviewing was not possible because the telephone penetration rates were low. A specific face to face methodology was developed for this purpose. Pilot studies were carried out to test the comparability of results obtained with the two different methods.

The second sweep of the ICVS took place in 1992 with a total of 33 participating countries, of which 20 used face to face interviews. The third sweep was performed in 1996 in 48 countries, of which 36 used face to face interviews. The fourth sweep was conducted in 2000 with, again, a total of 48 participating countries, of which 30 used face to face interviews. In 2004-5 took place the fifth sweep with 30 participating countries and including 33 capitals or main cities. As it is explained in the next chapter, in 18 countries, including the first 15 EU Member States, the survey was co-financed by the European Commission's Directorate General for Research and Technology Development and organised by a consortium lead by Gallup Europe. Until 2009, over 140 surveys have been conducted in 78 countries, of which 37 used national representative samples.

The first sweeps of the ICVS used samples of approximately 1,000 households, selecting individuals aged 16 or older. In 2004-5 the samples were usually of 2,000. These samples are relatively small by the standards of most national crime surveys; but they allow keeping the costs within reasonable limits. Comparative analyses can be safely conducted on the main variables, while caution should be the rule when looking at issues about which a small proportion of the sample provided information. Most countries using the CATI method draw national samples. The face to face method was used in countries

46 Sources: Alvazzi del Frate (2004b), van Dijk, van Kesteren & Smit (2007a).

47 The project was initiated by criminologists Martin Killias, Pat Mayhew and Jan van Dijk. The latter was also the main leader of the International Crime Businesses Survey (ICBS / ICCS), conducted for the first time in 1994. During the decade of 1990, UNICRI played a key role in the development of both surveys mainly through the work of Anna Alvazzi del Frate. The latter was also a member of the group of experts that, coordinated by HEUNI, launched in 1997 the International Violence Against Women Survey (IVAWS).

where the telephone penetration rate was lower than 70%. In such cases, surveys were frequently conducted in urban areas, usually the capital city. In general, it can be said that industrialised countries, including all Western European countries used the CATI method, while face to face interviews were used by several Central and Eastern European countries, as well as in the capitals of countries of the Americas, Africa, and Asia.

The standard questionnaire has been translated in the languages of all participating countries. That questionnaire went through different modifications throughout the years, but the fundamental questions –especially the questions on victimisation experiences– remained almost identical in order to assure the continuity of the time series. The 2004-5 version (conducted, as explained below, under the name EU ICS in some countries) includes information on 15 offences. The types of offences included cover the bulk of *common crimes* such as theft, burglary, robbery and assault. Through a set of special questions the survey also collected information on nonconventional crimes such as petty corruption (bribe-seeking by public officials) and consumer fraud.

The time reference normally used in ICVS data analysis is the calendar year preceding the survey. On average, the response rate to the ICVS has been 60%. However, this percentage varied widely across time and from country to country. In particular, countries that used face to face interviews –generally in Central and Eastern Europe– managed sometimes to interview more than 90% of the households contacted, although this percentages have diminished to around 70% in 2004-5. On the other hand, in countries where the CATI method was used –generally in Western Europe–, response rates could vary between 30% and 80% in the 1990s, but went down to a range of 40%-60% in 2004-5.

EU ICS⁴⁸

The European Crime and Safety Survey (EU ICS, which corresponds to the abbreviation of EU International Crime Survey) was part of the fifth sweep of the ICVS. For the execution of the EU ICS in the member countries of the European Union a consortium was set up, led by Gallup Europe, in Brussels, and including UNICRI in Turin, Italy, the Max Planck Institute for Foreign and International Criminal Law in Freiburg, Germany, CEPS/INSTEAD in Luxembourg and GeoX in Hungary. The consortium received a grant from the European Commission, DG Research, to carry out the EU ICS survey in 2005 among the 15 first Member States of the EU, and committed itself to include at least three of the newly acceded members (Estonia, Hungary, and Poland).

Most EU ICS interviews were carried out with CATI methodology; the exceptions were Estonia and Poland, where the interviews were conducted face to face in the respondent's home. In Finland, a sub-sample was interviewed via mobile phones. The average duration of the telephone interview was 23.2 minutes. Twelve of the countries were surveyed using an Internet-based CATI server that made the questionnaire available in many languages from a single location.

48 Source: van Dijk, Manchin, van Kesteren and Hideg (2005).

Eurobarometer⁴⁹

The Eurobarometer (EB) are a series of surveys regularly performed on behalf of the European Commission in EU Member States and, currently, in some European countries that do not belong to the EU or that are candidates to join the Union. The standard EB (there are, or there have been, other ones, such as the Flash EB, the Special EB, the EB qualitative, the Central and Eastern EB, and the Candidate Countries EB) was established in 1973 and is conducted twice yearly. In this article we will focus on the Standard EB 44.3 of 1996, which was the first one to include questions on fear of crime, as well as on the Standard EB 54.1 (Autumn 2000) and EB 58.1 (Autumn 2002) that also included questions related to victimisation.

The EB covers the population aged 15 and over, resident in each of the Member States, and uses a multi-stage random probability sample. The method consists in drawing a number of sampling points, proportional to population size and density and stratified by type of area (metropolitan, urban and rural). In each of the selected sampling points a starting address is drawn randomly. Further addresses are selected at every Nth address by standard random walk method. In each household, the respondent is selected randomly. All interviews are conducted face to face in the respondents' homes and in their national language. Data are weighted for gender, age and region. EU averages are calculated on the basis of Eurostat population figures. The usual sample size of the Eurobarometer is 1,000 in each country, with the exception of Germany (2,000 respondents, of whom 1,000 from the Western states and 1,000 from the Eastern states), the United Kingdom (1,300, of whom 1,000 from Great Britain and 300 from Northern Ireland) and Luxembourg (600). The small size of the sample is explained by the budget available and may have introduced bias that could lead to slightly inflated victimisation rates.

The Standard EB 44.3 (1996) included questions on the perception of the effectiveness of certain measures of crime prevention (alarm, reinforced doors, neighbourhood watch, policing), and the work of the police, individuals and organizations in prevention efforts. It also asked about the perception of the causes of juvenile delinquency (poverty, unemployment) and measures to reduce it (more discipline at homes and schools, tougher sentences, better education, prevention programs). The questionnaire included questions on the perception of organized crime, trying to establish if people felt that crime had infiltrated the civil society, the economy, and the local and national government. All these questions differ from those regularly included in the ICVS and were also included in the Standard Eurobarometer standard 58.1 in 2002. Furthermore, the Standard Eurobarometers 44.3 (1996), 54.1 (2000) and 58.1 (2002) included a question about feeling safe while walking alone at night in the district of residence, and a question on contacts with drug-related problems in the neighbourhood. Finally, the Standard Eurobarometer 58.1 (2002) included questions on the perception of the risk of being victim of theft and robbery (making a distinction between theft, theft or robbery of mobile phones and theft or robbery of other personal items), burglary, and assaults or threats of assault.

In 1999, as part of the EB 51.0, a Special Eurobarometer entitled *Europeans and their Views on Domestic Violence against Women* was carried out. This opinion poll was conducted at the request of the European Commission, Directorate-General

49 Source: van Dijk & Toornvliet (1996).

Communication, and was managed and organised by that Directorate-General Public Opinion Analysis Unit. For the Standard Eurobarometer 51.0, a total of 16,179 persons aged 15 and over, residents in the 15 EU Member States, were interviewed. The basic sampling design applied in all Member States was a multistage random sample. In each EU country, a number of sampling points was drawn with probability proportional to population size (for a total coverage of the country) and to population density. All interviews were face to face in people's home and in the appropriate national language (European Commission, 1999). In 2010, this Special Eurobarometer was repeated, as part of the EB 73.2, under the name of *Domestic Violence against Women* (n°344). It covered resident in each of the 27 Member States aged 15 and over with a total of 26,800 interviews. The same sampling procedure was applied. All interviews were conducted face to face in the appropriate national language and CAPI was used in those countries where this technique was available (European Commission, 2010).

Pilot study on the EU victimisation survey module⁵⁰

On 7th August 2006, the European Commission published the Commission Communication to the European Parliament, the Council and the European Economic and Social Committee on *Developing a comprehensive and coherent EU strategy to measure crime and criminal justice: An EU Action Plan 2006-2010*. One of the most important activities identified in the Action Plan is the development of a common survey module on victimisation. The purpose of such a module is to ensure that information on crime victimisation could be collected in the Member States according to an agreed methodology and that the statistics would therefore be comparable.

In this context, Eurostat commissioned HEUNI for the development of a first draft of the module, which was then approved by the Working Group (Task Force) on victimisation surveys of Eurostat in June 2007. The module is based on victimisation surveys conducted both at the national and the international level, and takes into account the victimisation surveys database and the first version of the Manual on victimisation surveys developed by the United Nations Office for Drugs and Crime (UNODC) and the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE).

Then the European Commission (Framework Programme of DG JLS) and Eurostat made available to Member States the necessary funds to conduct a pilot study of that module on victimisation. Sixteen countries and the Autonomous Community of Catalonia carried out the study through their Statistics institutes, between 2008 and 2010. The first part of the study consisted in translating the questionnaire and producing a report on major problems of translation; the second part consisted in applying the questionnaire to a selected sample in each country. The goal of the pilot study was to assess the viability of the module and to make recommendations for its implementation in line with the EU Action Plan. The evaluation of the pilot studies was commissioned by Eurostat to the Universities of Tilburg (Netherlands) and Lausanne (Switzerland) in December 2008 and was completed in June 2010.

Before conducting the fieldwork, participating countries were encouraged to carry out cognitive testing of the translated survey module using survey laboratory facilities where available. Each EU Member State was invited to make proposals for carrying out suitable testing procedures in a personal interview environment using a sample drawn from the

⁵⁰ Source: Eurostat (2009).

national population. The method of drawing the sample could be chosen by the Member State. Individuals may be selected, or households (all members of the household or only selected members). It was however important to ensure a roughly equal balance of men and women, and an adequate representation of young persons (aged under 25). The average sample size in each Member State was expected to be about a thousand individuals, depending on the costs involved.

Interviews could be conducted either face to face, using laptop computers (CAPI), or by telephone (CATI). It was recommended to use both methods for different sub-sets of the sample, in order to make it possible to assess the advantages and disadvantages of each mode for this type of survey module. Sections of the questionnaire on sensitive subjects such as sexual offences could be handled through self-completion on computer or in writing (PAPI or CAPI).

ICVS-2: Pilot studies⁵¹

Promoted by the International Governmental Research Directors, (IGRD), at the end of 2008 and the beginning of 2009, a pilot study using a short version of the ICVS questionnaire (called the ICVS-2 questionnaire) was conducted in Sweden, Germany, Canada, and United Kingdom. This pilot study was designed to learn what the contribution of CAWI and PAPI in terms of response might be and whether they have an exclusive range or overlap each other. The pilot measured the response rates obtained through variations in method, using both online and printed questionnaires. In addition, a similar survey was conducted through the means of CATI for comparison reasons. Face to face interviews were not included in the pilot due to their high costs relative to the other methodologies.

The main goal of the pilot was to have an in-depth analysis of the (none) response of the different methods and approaches used to conduct the survey. The secondary objective was to establish if the questionnaire ICVS-2 would be suitable for use with CAWI and PAPI.

The CATI sample was drawn by random digit dialling (RDD) of telephone numbers. Within a household, there was a random selection of a household member aged over 16 based on the first upcoming birthday. This process continued until the agreed amount of completed interviews (n=200) was reached.

In the CAWI and PAPI modes, the sample was drawn from an address register. To examine the overlap of the two methods, two random subgroups were created from the initial sample. Each group received an invitation letter containing a link to the website where respondents could fill in the survey. In this motivational letter respondents were asked to participate in the survey either online or by filling in a printed copy of the questionnaire. In the first group a printed copy of the questionnaire was included with the invitation letter. Respondents could fill it in and return it in an prepaid postage addressed envelope that was enclosed. In the second group respondents could request a printed questionnaire by sending back an enclosed answer card. They would then have a copy of the printed questionnaire sent to them which they could fill in and return with an enclosed addressed envelope. It was assumed that including the questionnaire with the invitation letter would lead to higher return rates of the printed copies, but that this would

⁵¹ Sources: van Dijk (T.) & Langerak (2009).

affect the number of people that completed the interview online in a negative way. In both groups respondents who had not replied received a reminder two weeks after they had received the initial invitation letter. To measure the effects of a reminder, both groups were again divided into two subgroups: one group in which respondents received only one reminder and one in which respondents received a second reminder sent one week after the first.

Using the same questionnaire, a second ICVS-2 pilot was conducted in 2010. This second pilot was funded by the European Commission and the fieldwork was conducted by Nicis. Six countries took part in it: Sweden, Germany, Canada, United Kingdom, Denmark and the Netherlands. The net samples included 4,000 respondents per country. Of these, 2,000 were interviewed using CATI, and 2,000 using CAWI. This second pilot is sometimes wrongly called the ICVS 2010.

ICBS / ICCS⁵²

The first International Commercial Crime Survey (ICCS) was carried out in eight European countries (Czech Republic, France, Germany, Hungary, Italy, the Netherlands, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom) and Australia in 1994. It was based on a standardised questionnaire for businesses victimisation. Between 1995 and 1999, surveys with the same methodology were also replicated in St. Petersburg (Russia), Latvia and Lithuania to address the issue of the security of foreign businesses. The same questionnaire was used in 1995 in Andalusia, in 1997 in Estonia and 1998 in South Africa. A national survey using a very similar questionnaire was also conducted in Australia, followed by a national survey on the retail sector in 1999. Two surveys were carried out in south-western Finland in 1994–1995, mostly based on the same questionnaire.

The ICCS questionnaire mostly focused on experiences of victimisation, information on perceptions, and attitudes to several aspects of everyday business. Questions dealt with experiences of crime, safety in the area, pollution issues, security devices and costs involved, attitudes towards the police, and private policing. In the late 1990s, the ICCS questionnaire was modified to include more items on corruption. At the same time, the ICVS questionnaire was also revised to allow an expanded section on corruption. This revision was conducted by UNICRI, that developed a standard questionnaire based on the 1994 ICCS questionnaire, which was revised and finalised in co-operation with the National Institute of Justice, USA, and the Gallup Organisation, Hungary. Some sections were particularly analysed with a view to using them (a) for comparisons with other surveys on corruption, (b) as a complement to the ICVS, and (c) as a part of the assessment component of the Global Programme Against Corruption (GPAC) of the United Nations. The survey was renamed as International Crime Business Survey (ICBS) and was launched in 2000 –parallel to the ICVS– in the capitals of nine central eastern European countries under the supervision of UNICRI. The countries involved were Albania (Tirana), Belarus (Minsk), Bulgaria (Sofia), Croatia (Zagreb), Hungary (Budapest), Lithuania (Vilnius), Romania (Bucharest), Russia (Moscow) and Ukraine (Kiev). The questionnaire was translated into the languages of all participating countries.

The national co-ordinators appointed for the ICVS (leading criminologists or research institutions) in each participating country were also requested to monitor the progress of

⁵² Sources: Alvazzi del Frate (2004), van Kesteren (2003).

the ICBS. The role of the national coordinators included ensuring the correctness of the translation/localisation of the questionnaires, monitoring of the sampling procedure and participation in the training of the interviewers. Funding was provided by the Ministries of Justice and Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands and the Ministry of Justice of Hungary. In order to provide for the highest comparability of the results, the fieldwork was contracted to a major international survey company, Gallup, which used its branches and associates in each participating country. Survey teams received standard training and guidelines for the project, along the lines of training provided for the ICVS. Because of the elevated costs involved, it was decided to limit the surveys to capital cities in each participating country. To ensure a representative sample of companies of different sizes and different business sectors, a total of 4,500 companies' managers were interviewed (500 in each city). The majority of countries used face to face interviews and obtained response rates of around 65%.

IVAWS⁵³

The International Violence Against Women Survey (IVAWS) is an international and comparative survey on violence perpetrated by men against women. The IVAWS project was initiated in 1997 when HEUNI, together with a number of international experts in the field, started developing a comparative and standardised survey tool for measuring violence against women worldwide. The project was co-ordinated by HEUNI with inputs from UNODC, UNICRI, and Statistics Canada. The IVAWS combines the methodology and contacts developed for ICVS with the methodology developed for national violence against women surveys by Statistics Canada.

Pilot studies started in early November 2001, with Canada carrying out a 100 respondent survey. Other countries carried out pilot studies during 2002, including Argentina, Costa Rica, Denmark, Italy, Kazakhstan, Poland, Australia, Indonesia, Philippines, Serbia, Switzerland, and Ukraine. On the basis of these experiences, the final questionnaire was established in December 2002. It has already been translated into Chinese, Czech, Danish, French, German, Greek, Italian, Polish, Portuguese, and Spanish.

The questionnaire can be roughly divided into three parts: experienced violence, consequences of violence, and background information. The victimisation screeners are composed of twelve questions, each category beginning with a question on lifetime victimisation, and followed by a more detailed breakdown of prevalence and incidence by perpetrator. The most recent incidents of partner violence and non-partner violence are then explored in closer detail with separate sections dedicated for both types. Case details include things such as possible injuries, need of medical care, reporting (or not reporting) to the police, and the respondent's views on how her voice was heard. The survey methodology package includes, besides the questionnaire and a pre-programmed data capture programme, a Manual with detailed guidelines on how to implement the survey.

In Europe, the IVAWS was conducted in Denmark (2003), Greece (2003), Italy (2006), Poland (2004), and Switzerland (2004). In Denmark, Italy and Switzerland, interviews were conducted over the telephone; the remaining countries interviewed respondents face to face. Decisions about interviewing methods were based on practical

53 Sources: Johnson, Ollus & Nevala (2008), Nevala (2005).

considerations such as cost, telephone coverage and logistics, and were left to the discretion of coordinators in each country.

EU-MIDIS European Union Minorities and Discrimination Survey

In June 2006, the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA) started a project that led to the development of the European Union Minorities and Discrimination Survey (EU-MIDIS), conducted in 2010, which was preceded by a pilot survey conducted in 2008. Both surveys are described in the following chapters.

The pilot: FRA's Pilot Victim Survey on Ethnic Minorities and Immigrants⁵⁴

In June 2006 the FRA launched a pilot victim survey in six EU Member States under the heading Ethnic Minorities and Immigrants' Experiences of Criminal Victimisation and Policing (also known as a FRA's Pilot Victim Survey on Ethnic Minorities and Immigrants). The Member States involved were Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Italy, Romania and Slovakia. The pilot was set out to test different sampling frames and the application of the survey questionnaire on selected immigrant and ethnic minority groups in each Member State. The primary objective of the pilot exercise was to establish whether a survey of this kind could be successfully extended to cover the EU27. The fieldwork for the survey research was undertaken towards the end of 2006 and the beginning of 2007, with the results of the exercise submitted for internal scrutiny by the Agency in May 2007.

For the purpose of the pilot research the following groups were selected for interviewing in the Member States (the sample size is indicated between brackets)

- Austria: Turkish, ex-Yugoslavians (N=700)
- Belgium: Turkish, North Africans, Italians (N=499)
- Bulgaria: Roma, Turkish (N=900)
- Italy: Albanian, North African, Romanian (N=603)
- Romania: Roma, Hungarian (N=600)
- Slovakia: Roma, Hungarian (N=605)

The pilot survey tested two main sampling frames in the six Member States: random digit dialling (RDD) with focused enumeration, and random route cluster sampling. The RDD technique with focused enumeration consist in selecting telephone numbers randomly, but retaining from the sample only those households where it can be verified that there is at least one resident from the selected ethnic groups. The random route cluster sampling consists in selecting an address inside a cluster (in this case a geographical area) and follow a random itinerary from this point (random route, also known as random walk). In every Member State all interviews were conducted face to face with an interviewer filling out the questionnaire.

The main questionnaire was developed by a group of experts involved in the development of the ICVS and the Eurobarometer questionnaire. The ICVS was extremely useful to the FRA as it provided a majority population control group with which to compare the results of the FRA survey on immigrants and ethnic minorities. It was also useful as it offered an established questionnaire that was adapted for the pilot questionnaire to incorporate new questions needed for a survey on minorities; for example questions on experiences of police stop and search, and whether there was any

⁵⁴ Source: Goodey (2008).

indication that experiences of victimisation were racially or ethnically motivated, such as the use of racist or religiously offensive language.

The survey: EU-MIDIS European Union Minorities and Discrimination Survey⁵⁵

Following the success of the pilot survey exercise in six Member States, a full-scale survey was conducted in the 27 European Union Member States in 2008 under the name EU-MIDIS European Union Minorities and Discrimination Survey. The EU-MIDIS survey was conducted, from May to November 2008, asking samples of immigrant, ethnic minorities and national minorities groups in each Member State about their experiences of discrimination and victimisation.

The survey sampled persons (male and female) aged 16 and older who: (a) Self-identify themselves as belonging to one of the immigrant, ethnic minority or national minority groups selected for sampling in each Member State, (b) Are resident in the Member State being surveyed, (c) Have been resident in the Member State for at least one year, (d) Have sufficient command of (one of the) the national language(s) of the Member State being surveyed to lead a simple conversation with the interviewer. In each household that contained persons from the designated target groups, up to three eligible persons were invited to take part in the survey.

The target sample size per vulnerable group was 500, with 13 countries having 2 target groups, 11 countries having 1 group and 3 countries having 3 groups for surveying. In 10 countries an additional sample of a minimum of 500 majority persons (from the same areas where minority respondents lived) were also interviewed, to provide reference information for police stop-and-search practices. In total 5068 interviews were achieved with respondents from the majority population.

Sampling for the EU-MIDIS survey was based on a dual strategy: to cover major cities, including capitals, where immigrant groups for surveying are located, and to adopt an “on-location” approach for Member States where relevant minorities are primarily non-urban, or there are no real distinct urban centres (e.g. in the smallest Member States). EU-MIDIS adopted four distinct sampling approaches: (a) City/Metropolitan: random route sampling (RR) with focused enumeration (FE); (b) Registry-based address sample; (c) Nationwide random route with FE (d) Network sampling (NS). Only one primary sampling approach was used within a Member State.

The highest response rates were achieved in the following type (a)/(b)/(c) groups: Asians in Cyprus (89%); Romanians in Italy (69%); Brazilians in Portugal (67%); Roma in Slovakia (61%); North Africans in Italy (61%); Albanians in Italy (60%); Roma in the Czech Republic (58%). On the other hand, the lowest rates (below 20%) were recorded in the following type (a)/(b)/(c) groups: Somalis in Finland (17%); South American immigrants in Spain (17%); Bosnians in Slovenia (18%). The best response rates were recorded in type (c) samples (58%), when nationwide random route sampling was used in areas with a high density of mostly indigenous (predominantly Roma) minorities (in Bulgaria and in Poland fieldwork facilitators – e.g. community leaders, other trusted persons – were also used in order to gain access to potential participant groups). There was no significant difference on average in response rates between national registries based (type b) urban samples (31%) and focused enumeration-assisted random route

⁵⁵ Source: FRA (2009).

urban samples (38%). Samples obtained in interviewer-generated situations produced the second highest response rate overall – type (d): 54%.

SURVEYS ON VICTIMISATION IN THE 27 EU MEMBERS STATES

In this section we present surveys on victimisation conducted in each of the 27 European Union Member States.

AUSTRIA (ÖSTERREICH)⁵⁶

Austria participated in the ICVS in 1996 and 2005 (EU ICS). Interviews were carried out using CATI methodology. The national representative samples were composed by 1,507 and 2,004 households and the response rates were 76% and 46% respectively.

The country also participated in the Eurobarometers of Public Safety 44.3 (1996), 54.1 (2000), 58.1 (2002), and in the Special Eurobarometers on Domestic Violence Against Women 51.0 (1999) and 344 (2010) with samples of about 1,000 individuals interviewed face to face.

The Austrian Safety Board conducts annually since 2006 the Security Barometer (*Sicherheitsbarometer*). The data collection takes place every spring and is conducted through telephone interviews by the OGM market research institute. This survey asks a representative sample of the population about (crime related) fears and especially about the fear of domestic burglary. Further questions deal with specific places in terms of crime (neighbourhood, urban area) and specific offences the respondents or someone amongst their acquaintanceship have experienced.

Austria also conducted the pilot study on the EU victimisation survey module in 2009. A total of 2,725 interviews have been conducted; 1,225 interviews using CAPI methodology and 1,500 using CATI methodology. The fieldwork was conducted by the Institute for Law and Criminal Sociology (*Institut für Rechts- und Kriminalsoziologie*) on behalf of Statistics Austria.

At the local scale, the Vienna Department of Urban Planning organised in 2003 the Survey Living in Vienna (*Leben in Wien 2003*) that included a set of questions related to crime and victimisation, and also on the respondents' evaluation of security in their surrounding, and in the city of Vienna in general. The sample included 8,300 individuals living in Vienna and aged over 14. The survey was conducted through a CATI random sampling procedure.

In 2002/03, Austria participated in the INSEC (Insecurities in European Cities)⁵⁷ study with a sample 1,079 interviews representative of two Viennese urban areas. The main focus of research was on the whole range of urban disorders and insecurities late modern urban societies, and on the effects of globalisation on urban residents' perception of insecurity, both on a local and regional level. The questionnaire included items on experiences of crime, risk assessment and victimisation.

In 2005, the survey Burglary Prevention in Private Households in Vienna was conducted with a representative sample of 1,000 Viennese households interviewed with CATI methodology. The survey included questions on victimisation experiences and fear of crime, considering namely domestic burglary. The survey was carried out by IFES.

⁵⁶ Main source: Stangl (2009).

⁵⁷ See the description of the INSEC study in the chapter on Germany.

On behalf of the Bureau of Women's Affairs of the city of Vienna, the IFES also conducted in 1998 a Survey on women's living conditions, opinions and satisfaction named *Womens' Barometer (Frauenbarometer)*. The survey was based on a representative sample of the city of Vienna composed by 2,300 women. It included a set of questions that were similar or identical to those used in the Living in Vienna survey.

Austria participated in 2007 in the FRA's Pilot Victim Survey on Ethnic Minorities and Immigrants with a sample of 700 individuals with Turkish and ex-Yugoslavian origins. The interviews were conducted face to face with an interviewer filling out the questionnaire. In 2008, this country participated in the full-scale EU-MIDIS with a sample of 534 individuals with Turkish origins and 593 individuals with ex-Yugoslavian origins. The sample covered the city of Vienna, and the response rate was 85%.

BELGIUM (BELGIQUE/BELGIË)⁵⁸

Belgium participated four times in the ICVS, in 1989, 1992, 2000 and 2005 (EU ICS). The country used national representative samples of 2,060, 1,485, 2,402 and 2,014 households with responses rates of 37%, 44%, 56% and 55% respectively, and applied CATI methodology.

The country participated in the Eurobarometers of Public Safety 44.3 (1996), 54.1 (2000), 58.1 (2002), and in the Special Eurobarometers on Domestic Violence Against Women 51.0 (1999) and 344 (2010) with samples of about 1,000 individuals interviewed face to face.

Since 1997, Belgium conducts regularly a national victimisation survey called Security Monitor (*Moniteur de Sécurité*). This survey has been conducted in 1997, 1998, 2000, 2002, 2004 and 2006. According to Pauwels and Pleysier (2007) "the Security Monitor is the official national crime and victim survey, conducted [and financed] by the Federal Police, under the authority of the Ministry of the Interior. The Belgian Security Monitor, inspired by the Dutch Police Monitor, is in essence a federal, repeated cross-sectional, victim survey, using Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI). [...] In 1997, the Minister of the Interior ordered a first sweep of the Security Monitor at the federal level, and at the local level, in those communities that had a safety-contract (*veiligheids- en samenlevingscontract*) with the federal government or were 'pilot police zones'. The second sweep, conducted in 1998, introduced a postal survey as a possible, and cheaper, alternative to the telephone mode, in approximately 70 communities. After a thorough evaluation, it was decided not to offer the postal survey alternative in future sweeps. In order to create more time and budgetary space for further analyses and research, and the implementation of the Security Monitor in local communities, data collection is spread every two years since 1998. [...] The local Monitors are executed in all 73 communities with a safety-contract and in the police zones those communities belong to". The Security Monitor is based on a national, stratified random sample. The sample is selected using multistage probability sampling. The variables used for the stratification are geographical area and degree of urbanisation. In 2004, the survey used a sample of 41,017 (federal and local) households and obtained a response rate of 56% with CATI methodology. In 2006, it used a sample of 43,318 households (Police fédérale belge, 1997-2006).

58 Main source: Kellens, Peters & van Kerckvoorde (1993), Pauwels & Pleysier (2007, 2008).

Also according to Pauwels & Pleysier (2007), "Another important repeated cross-sectional survey is the APS-SCV survey (*Administratie Planning en Statistiek - Sociaal Culturele Veranderingen*) of the Flanders Authority. In contrast to the Security Monitor, the APS-SCV survey's main interest is not crime or victimisation; since 1996, it is an annual 'barometer' of socio-cultural changes among Dutch speaking inhabitants of the Flemish Community or the Brussels Capital Region. The main interest, therefore, is a broad one, dealing with values, attitudes and opinions of the Flemish on a number of relevant topics. There are some other important differences compared to the Security Monitor. The APS-SCV survey is not a federal survey, but concentrates on Flanders only. Furthermore, the data are gathered in face to face surveys (representative sample of 1,500 respondents) with a questionnaire in Dutch only. As the APS-SCV is an annual survey, some of the question blocks rotate; this is the case for the 'fear of crime' item set which was used in the questionnaire of the 1999, 2000, 2002 and 2004 sweep of the survey. Previously, we reported on secondary analyses investigating the temporal invariance assumption of the 'fear of crime' items of the 1999, 2000 and 2002 round".

Belgium participated in 2007 in the FRA's Pilot Victim Survey on Ethnic Minorities and Immigrants with a sample of 499 individuals with Turkish, North African and Italian origins. The interviews were conducted face to face with an interviewer filling out the questionnaire. In 2008, this country participated in the full-scale EU-MIDIS with a sample of 532 individuals with Turkish origins and 500 individuals with North African origins. The sample covered the cities of Brussels and Antwerp, and the response rate was 81%.

BULGARIA (БЪЛГАРИЯ [BĀLGARIJA])⁵⁹

Bulgaria used the ICVS questionnaire in Sofia in 1997 with the support of UNICRI. The ICVS was used with national representative samples in 2002 and 2004. Bulgaria participated in the EU ICS in 2004 with a sample of 1,101 households and obtained a response rate of 83%. The country used face to face interviews at the respondent home with a paper questionnaire. The ICVS questionnaire is currently being used for periodical national victimisation surveys conducted in 2005, 2007, 2008, and 2009. More details are provided in the Table 1.

59 Main source: Bezlov, Gounev, Hristov, Stoyanov, Yordanova & Markov (2006), Stoyanov (2009).

Table 1: Victimization surveys conducted in Bulgaria (Source: Stoyanov, 2009)

Year	Sample size	Institution	Questionnaire
2002	N=1615	CSD and Vitosha Research	ICVS
2004	N=1101	Idem	Idem (EU ICS)
2005	N=1202	Idem	Idem
2007	N=2463	Idem	Idem
2008	N=2499	Idem	Idem
2009	N=2500	Idem	Idem
Sample type random two stage cluster sample, representative of the general population aged 15 or more			
Method Face to face, in home interview, paper and pencil			

According to the Center for the Study of Democracy (2009): “Following the political and economic crisis in late 1996 and early 1997, a Center for the Study of Democracy (CSD) team, participating in UNDP’s Early Warning project, included in its monthly surveys a set of victimisation questions (UNDP, 1998)”.

Bulgaria participated in the Special Eurobarometer on Domestic Violence Against Women 344 (2010) with a sample of about 1,000 individuals interviewed face to face.

In 2004, the country conducted a Survey on non-registered criminality in the Republic of Bulgaria based on a victimisation survey with a sample of 2,619 households, representing 7,180 individuals. The sample was selected using multistage probability sampling. The variable used for the stratification was the degree of urbanisation. The sample was representative at the national level. The response rates were 87% for households and 97.5% for individuals. The survey was based on face to face interviews at the respondent home with a paper questionnaire. The survey used an ad hoc questionnaire. It was placed under the responsibility of the National Statistical Institute, Department of Demographic and Social Statistics.

Bulgaria participated in 2000 in the second round of the ICBS. The survey was conducted by Vitosha Research, under the supervision of UNICRI. . It used a random sample –drawn from the database of the National Statistical Institute– of 532 companies from the city of Sofia, stratified by size and sector. Interviews were conducted face to face. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands provided funding. A second business victimisation survey using the same questionnaire was also conducted by Vitosha Research in Sofia in 2004. In September 2005, a third survey was conducted using the same questionnaire but with a random national sample –representative of the companies in the country– of 308 companies, stratified by size and sector. The survey was financed by the Centre for the Study of Democracy. More information on these surveys is given in the Table 2.

Table 2: Business surveys conducted in Bulgaria

Year	Sample type	Sample size	Institution	Question naire	Method
2000	random sample of companies stratified by size and sector, representative of the companies in Sofia	N=532	CSD and Vitosha Research / Gallup	ICCS	Face to face, paper and pencil
2004	Idem	--	CSD and Vitosha Research	Idem	Idem
2005	random sample of companies stratified by size and sector, representative of the companies in the country	N=308	CSD and Vitosha Research	Idem	Idem

Source: Stoyanov, personal communication

Bulgaria participated in 2007 in the FRA's Pilot Victim Survey on Ethnic Minorities and Immigrants with a sample of 900 individuals with Roma and Turkish origins. The interviews were conducted face to face with an interviewer filling out the questionnaire. In 2008, this country participated in the full-scale EU-MIDIS with a nationwide sample of 500 individuals with Turkish origins and 500 individuals with Roma origins. The response rate was 68%.

CYPRUS (ΚΥΠΡΟΣ/KIBRIS [ΚΎΠΡΟΣ])⁶⁰

Cyprus did not participate in the ICVS, but conducted the pilot study on the EU victimisation survey module in 2009. The pilot exercise was conducted by the Statistical Service of Cyprus (CRISTAT). It was decided to test the survey only in the two urban areas in which the highest incidence of crime is usually reported, according to the Police data, namely those of Lefkosia and Lemesos. Regarding sampling procedure, the 2001 Census of Population Register was used as the sampling frame and this was supplemented by the Register from the Electricity Authority of Cyprus (EAC). A two-stage sampling procedure was used. At the first stage, a sample of 1,000 households was selected from the above sampling frame, using simple random sampling. At the second stage, an individual in the age group 18-74 was randomly selected, using “the person who had the last birthday” method. The sample of 1,000 households was distributed in the two urban areas based on the latest distribution of households in them. The final selection included a gross sample size of 587 households for Lefkosia and 413 households for Lemesos. CAPI methodology was applied for Sections A-F of the questionnaire (with show cards for five questions in section D) and respondents were encouraged to complete by themselves the section on violence (section G) either on the computer or on paper (PAPI). However only 15.8% of the sample chose this option; the rest decided to continue the interview with the CAPI method used for sections A-F.

The country participated in the Special Eurobarometers on Domestic Violence Against Women 344 (2010) with a sample of 505 individuals interviewed face to face.

Cyprus conducted in 2008 the EU-MIDIS with a nationwide sample of 500 individuals with Asian origins. The response rate was 98%.

CZECH REPUBLIC (ČESKÁ REPUBLIKA)⁶¹

The Czech Republic participated as part of Czechoslovakia in the 1992 ICVS. The survey was conducted with a national representative sample of 1,821 households. The response rate was 91%. The sample was selected using multistage probability sampling. The variables used for the stratification were age, gender, socio-professional qualifications, area of residence, regional distribution, and size of the population. Data were collected through face to face interviews conducted in June 1992 in the Czech and Slovak languages. The final sample for the Czech Republic consisted in 1,262 households. The survey was placed under the responsibility of the Institute of Criminology and Social Prevention.

In 1996, the Czech Republic conducted the ICVS with a sample of multiple cities and a small rural sample. Interviews were conducted face to face. The sample was 1469 respondents aged 16 or older. The sample was selected using multistage probability sampling. The survey was placed under the responsibility of the Institute of Criminology and Social Prevention.

Then, the ICVS was conducted in the city of Prague in 2000 with a city representative sample of 1,500 households (respondents aged 16 or older) and using CATI methodology. The sample was selected using multistage probability sampling. The

60 Main source: Kapardis (2009).

61 Main source: Martinková (2009).

survey was placed under the responsibility of the Institute of Criminology and Social Prevention.

The country participated in the Special Eurobarometer on Domestic Violence Against Women 344 (2010) with a sample of 1,022 individuals interviewed face to face.

The Czech Republic also conducted the pilot study on the EU victimisation survey module in 2008/9. The Czech Statistical Office (CZSO) had the responsibility of conducting the pilot study, while the Institute of Criminology and Social Prevention provides scientific expertise. The sample was based on voluntary participation and included 1,000 respondents (total sample was 690 interviews). The response rate was 69.1%. The country used 151 interviewers that were employees of the CZSO performing various fieldworks for the Office. Interviewers also filled an interviewer's questionnaire about their experience. The survey was conducted combining the following methods: (a) Face to face interview with paper and pencil questionnaire (method assessed by 52 interviewers); (b) Face to face interviews assisted with computer (method assessed by 48 interviewers); (c) Phone interview with paper and pencil (method assessed by 54 interviewers); and (d) Phone interview assisted with computer (method assessed by 58 interviewers). Interviewers considered that face to face interview with the respondents (based either on printed questionnaire or assisted with computer) were generally more comfortable than phone interviewing.

In 2004, the country conducted the study *Victimisation of Citizens of the Czech Republic by Some Types of Criminality in the Year 2004*. It was a multipurpose survey that did not use the ICVS questionnaire but included some comparable questions. It was conducted with a sample of 1,052 households selected through multistage probability sampling. The variables used for the stratification were age, sex, education, size of the city, and degree of urbanisation. The sample was representative at the national level. The survey was conducted using face to face interviews at the respondent's home with a paper questionnaire. The survey was placed under the responsibility of the Institute of Criminology and Social Prevention.

Between 2000 and 2003, four victimisation surveys were conducted with the financial support of the Ministry of Interior of the Czech Republic. The first three ones were part of the research project *Continual Research of Victimisation and Feeling of Security of Citizens (2000-2002)*. Researches of this project were conducted by the Department of Sociology of Charles University with representative samples at the national level in the years 2000 (1,386 respondents), 2001 (1,418 respondents), and 2002 (1,259 respondents). The fourth survey financed by the Ministry of Interior of the Czech Republic was the research project *Continual Research of Victimisation and Feeling of Security of Citizens*. This research followed up in some actual aspects the preceding research project. It was conducted by the Department of Sociology of Charles University. The representative sample at the national level was 1,418 individuals aged 16 or older. All these surveys did not use the ICVS questionnaire, but an ad hoc one.

In 2006, the country conducted the survey *Experiences of Czech Republic Citizens with Some Offences*. The survey was based on an adapted version of the ICVS questionnaire. According to Martinková (2008): "The survey was conducted with a group of 3,082 respondents over the age of 15 throughout the Czech Republic. The group of

respondents was obtained by a stratified, multi-layered selection and was representative in the indicators: age, sex, size of the place of residence, education, higher territorial administrative unit (region). The field research was performed by the firm GfK and the data collection was financed by the National Committee for Crime Prevention. Polling was conducted face to face.” The survey was placed under the responsibility of the Institute of Criminology and Social Prevention.

The country participated in 1994 in the first round of the ICBS/ICCS with a national representative sample. Interviews were conducted face to face. The survey was placed under the responsibility of the Dutch Ministry of Justice.

The Czech Republic conducted in 2008 the EU-MIDIS with a nationwide sample of 505 individuals of Roma origins. The response rate was 94%.

DENMARK (DANMARK)

Denmark participated in the ICVS in 2000 and 2005 (EU ICS). Interviews were carried out using CATI methodology. The national representative samples were composed by 3,007 and 1,984 households and the response rates were 66% and 44% respectively.

The country participated in the Eurobarometers of Public Safety 44.3 (1996), 54.1 (2000), 58.1 (2002), and in the Special Eurobarometers on Domestic Violence Against Women 51.0 (1999) and 344 (2010) with samples of about 1,000 individuals interviewed face to face.

Denmark also conducted the pilot study on the EU victimisation survey module in 2009 with a random sample of 1,073 individuals aged 16 to 75. The sample frame was the Population Register, which covers all registered residents in Denmark. 447 interviews were conducted using CATI methodology and 202 using CAWI and CASI methodology. The overall response rate was 64%. The pilot was conducted by Statistics Denmark's Survey Division, Interview services.

In 2010, Denmark took part in the second ICVS-2 pilot study funded by the European Commission and conducted by Nicis, with a sample of 4,000 respondents (2,000 achieved using CATI, and 2,000 using CAWI)

From a historical point of view, it has been pointed out that the first victimisation survey took place in the city of Aarhus, Denmark, in 1730 (Wolf & Hauge, 1975). The city council reacted to the complaints of the citizens by asking six persons to go through all the households of the town asking their inhabitants if they had been victims of burglary during the last 3 or 4 year. At that time, Aarhus had a population of approximately 3,500 persons and according to them there had been 188 burglaries, which implies that around 1% to 2% of the households had been victims of such a crime (Balvig, 1987; Garrido, Stangeland & Redondo, 2001: 696-7).

In the contemporary period, the Nordic countries were also pioneers in conducting victimisation surveys. As Sparks (1981) has mentioned, at the beginning of the 1970s the Scandinavian Research Council for Criminology financed a series of victimisation survey on violent crime and on property crimes in Denmark, Finland, Norway, and Sweden (Aromaa 1971, 1974a, 1974b; Wolf & Hauge 1975; Aromaa & Leppa 1973).

Apart from that, since 2005, Denmark also has an annual victimisation survey. The project started with two national victimisation surveys in 1995 and 1996 placed under the responsibility of the National Police with the University of Copenhagen providing expertise, and Statistics Denmark conducting the interviews by using CATI methodology. The questionnaire was not based on the ICVS questionnaire, but included some comparable questions. In 2005, this victimisation survey was carried out again using the same questionnaire and the same methodology. Since then, it has been conducted every year and will continue to be conducted annually. The sample size is approximately 12,000 individuals for each survey and the response rate is around 65%. National registers are used to select a random and national representative sample. Since 2005, the survey is financed by the National Police, the Crime Preventive Council and the Ministry of Justice. The University of Copenhagen and The Ministry of Justice provides expertise in conducting the analyses and writing the report.

Denmark also participated in the IVAWS in 2003. The Survey was placed under the responsibility of the Ministry of Justice and the report made in cooperation with The University of Copenhagen. 3,552 females were interviewed and the response rate was 55%. The survey was conducted using CATI methodology.

In the fall of 2007, a national survey on dating violence took place in Denmark. It was an internet-based survey (CAWI) based on a random sample of 2,123 Danish residents aged 16-24 (drawn from the Danish register of all registered residents in Denmark). The survey also included qualitative information based on focus group discussions. The response rate was 28%. The Survey was conducted by the National Institute of Public Health, the University of Southern Denmark, and the Ministry of Gender Equality (Schütt et al., 2008)

Denmark conducted in 2008 the EU-MIDIS with a sample of 553 individuals with Turkish origins and 561 individuals with Somali origins. The sample covered the cities of Copenhagen and Odense, and the response rate was 98%.

ESTONIA (EESTI)⁶²

Estonia participated in four sweeps of the ICVS, in 1993, 1995, 2000 and 2004 (EU ICS). Indeed, the ICVS has become a sort of regular national victimisation survey and, in that context, it was conducted again in 2009.

In 1993, for the first ICVS conducted in Estonia, the country used a national representative sample of 1,000 households. In 1995, the national representative sample included 1,173 households and the questionnaire was available in two languages (Estonian and Russian). In 2000, the country used a national representative sample that included an urban subsample (N=502) of the city of Tallinn. In 2004, the EU ICS used a sample of 1,678 households (including a subsample of 482 households in Tallinn) and obtained a response rate of 52%. In 2009, the fieldwork was carried out by the national Statistical Office (previously it was done by private companies). The 2009 survey was based on the ICVS questionnaire but included a few modifications. As a consequence, the comparability of the answers' structure with other ICVS surveys should be rather good but, due to a longer fieldwork period (several months instead of 2-3 weeks) and

62 Main source: Ahven (2008, 2009).

some differences in sampling, the results (including victimisation rates) may not always be fully comparable. The final sample included approximately 4,500 households (the original sample before fieldwork included at least 6,500 households). Samples were drawn from official national registration lists using a multistage probability sampling. They were stratified by geographical area and degree of urbanisation. The methodology is based on face to face interviews in the respondent's home. Since 2000, interviewers use CAPI to register the answers.

The 1993–2004 surveys were placed under the responsibility of the Ministry of the Interior, Internal Security Policy Department. In 2004, it was co-financed by The Ministry of Justice, and the Tartu University provided institutional support by compiling a report on the results. The 2009 survey was carried out by the Statistical Office in cooperation with the Ministry of Justice, Criminal Policy Department.

Estonia also participated in the Special Eurobarometer on Domestic Violence Against Women 344 (2010) with a sample of 1,000 individuals interviewed face to face.

Apart from that, Estonia conducted in 1998 a crime against businesses survey using the same questionnaire as the one used for the first ICBS/ICCS in 1994. In 2007, the Criminal Policy Department of the Ministry of Justice conducted a study on offences committed against enterprises and employees in 2006, which aim was to analyse (1) the forms and extent of crime directed against enterprises (estimations of enterprise managers of the problem); (2) the nature of the offences directed against the employees of undertakings and agencies (personal experience of the employees with offences committed with respect to them, including by the employer, at the workplace). The study contained two different interviews with a different questionnaire for each target group: (1) a telephone interview with the managers of 702 enterprises; (2) a laptop assisted interview at the homes of 526 employees. Information on enterprises was obtained by random choice from the commercial register, taking account of their classification by size (on the basis of the number of employees). The employees to be interviewed were found by a random choice from the database of the Statistical Office. The sample covered the residents of 15–74 of age who were employed most of the time in 2006. The response rate for enterprises was 32.4% (702 interviews out of a sample of 2168) and for employees it was 29.9% (742 interviews –of which 526 for this survey– out of a sample of 2482).

Estonia conducted in 2008 the EU-MIDIS with a sample of 500 individuals with Russian origins. The sample covered the city of Tallinn, and the response rate was 89%.

FINLAND (SUOMI/FINLAND)⁶³

Finland participated in the five sweeps of the ICVS, in 1989, 1992, 1996, 2000 and 2005 (EU ICS). The samples were respectively of 1,025, 1,620, 3,899, 1,783, and 2,500 households with response rates of 70%, 86%, 86%, 77%, and 57%. The surveys were conducted using CATI methodology.

The country participated in the Eurobarometers of Public Safety 44.3 (1996), 54.1 (2000), 58.1 (2002), and in the Special Eurobarometers on Domestic Violence Against Women

63 Main source: Aromaa (2009), Aromaa & Heiskanen (1992), Heiskanen (2009).

51.0 (1999) and 344 (2010) with samples of about 1,000 individuals interviewed face to face.

Finland conducted the pilot study on the EU victimisation survey module in 2009. Three institutions were involved in the piloting: HEUNI, Statistics Finland, the Department of Statistics and Applied Mathematics at the University of Helsinki. The Finnish pilot study included three sub-surveys. Each of these tested a different data collection mode: face to face interviews, CATI and CAWI. The original questionnaire was designed for a face to face interview in which separate show cards were to be used to improve the quality of the data; but the more detailed questions concerning different types of crime were dropped out from the telephone and web surveys. The gross sample size was 750 in the face to face and CATI versions, and 2,000 in the CAWI version. The sampling strategy was the same in all three cases. The target population consisted of permanent residents in Finland living in private households and aged 15 or older. The frame population was divided into strata based on a cross-classification of regions, gender and age bracket, and a stratified random sampling strategy was used.

Historically, the first Finnish victimisation surveys took place in the early 1970s, when the Scandinavian Criminological Research Council funded a series of surveys on victimisation for violent crime and property crime in Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden (see Denmark chapter, with references).

Currently, Finland carries out a periodical victimisation survey called the Finnish National Safety Survey. Victimisations include crimes but also injuries (traffic, work, home, leisure, and sport). The survey has been conducted in 1980, 1988, 1993, 1997, 2003, 2006, and 2009. In 2006, the sample was national and consisted in 8,163 individuals with a response rate of 81%. The sample is selected through simple probability sampling and is representative at the national level. In 2006, the survey was conducted using CATI methodology, together with CAPI for persons without telephone. In 1980, 1988 and 1997, the survey was financed by Statistics Finland. In 2006, the Finnish National Safety Survey was conducted under the responsibility of the National Research Institute of Legal Policy (OPTULA). It was financed by the Ministry of justice, the Ministry of interior, and the Ministry of social affairs and wealth. The Police college of Finland provided institutional support and expertise (Heiskanen, 2006).

Finland participated in 1994 in the first round of the ICBS/ICCS with a regional sample (District of Oulu) and using the CATI method. Moreover, two crime against businesses surveys were carried out in South-Western Finland in 1994-95, using basically the same questionnaire as the one used for the first ICCS in 1994. In 1996 and 1997, the Finnish police organised another crime against businesses survey.

Finland has also carried out two times a survey on violence against women called "Faith, hope, battering". The survey took place in 1997 and 2005. It used a mail questionnaire. In 1997, the sample consisted in 4,955 females and the response rate was 70%. In 2005, the sample consisted in 4,464 females (aged 18-74) and the response rate was 62%. Samples were selected through simple probability sampling and were representative at the national level. The surveys were placed under the responsibility of Statistics Finland, the Ministry of Social Welfare and Health, the Ministry of Justice the National Research

Institute of Legal Policy, the Police college of Finland and HEUNI (Heiskanen & Piispa, 1998, 2008).

Finland conducted in 2008 the EU-MIDIS with a sample of 562 individuals with Russian origins and 484 individuals with Somali origins in the city of Helsinki (metro area). The response rate was 69%.

FRANCE (FRANCE)⁶⁴

France participated in the ICVS, in 1989, 1996, 2000, and 2005 (EU ICS). The country used national representative samples of 1,502, 1,003, 1,000, and 2,016 households with responses rates of 51%, 61%, 45%, and 47% respectively, using CATI methodology. In 2005, the sample included a subsample of 800 households in Paris.

The country participated in the Eurobarometers of Public Safety 44.3 (1996), 54.1 (2000) and in the Special Eurobarometers on Domestic Violence Against Women 51.0 (1999) and 344 (2010) with samples of about 1,000 individuals interviewed face to face.

In 1986, the CESDIP (*Centre de recherches sociologiques pour le droit et les institutions pénales*/Center for Sociological Research in Law and Penal Institutions) conducted the first nationwide victimisation survey, covering the years 1984-5. According to Philippe Robert (2007): “A series of screening questions were initially incorporated into an omnibus survey (11,156 interviewees were chosen from quota samples of the target population). Among the victims thus identified, sub-populations were formed – with specific sampling for each type of victimisation, based on frequency – and 1,138 interviews were conducted. The questionnaire borrowed from similar surveys done in other countries, but also made full use of the results of the qualitative research...”. The survey was based on face to face interviews and used individuals –aged 16 or older– instead of households as counting units. Thus, victimisation rates were calculated for individuals even when the offence concerned a household, (e.g. robbery). The questionnaire was modeled on those used in similar surveys in other countries, but also took into consideration the results of qualitative research.

Between 1996 and 2006, the National Institute of Statistics and Economic Surveys (INSEE) conducted eleven annual surveys on the Living conditions of households that contained a module on victimisation. Interviews were conducted face to face using households as counting units. The questions on victimisation were loosely based on the ones included in the ICVS; however, according to Didier et al. (2009), in the 11 surveys only 6 times the questions were identical to the ones used the year before (1998 and 2000-04). The basic sample was composed by approximately 6'000 households and the samples were *semi-rotating* until 2004. This means that half of the sample interviewed one year was interviewed again the year after. In particular, in 2004, the sample included 6,351 households; in 2005, it included 13,872; and in 2006 it included roughly 13,263. The increase in 2005 is due to the fact that the basic sample of 6,400 households, that included 400 households from disadvantaged urban areas (DUA), was doubled by another one, roughly the same size (7,650 precisely), which included 1,240 households from DUA. With the exception of 2005, the samples were representative at the national level and selected using probability sampling. The variable used for the stratification was the geographical area. In 2006, the response rate was 26% and the face to face

64 Main source: Robert (2008), Robert, Zauberman, Névanen and Didier (2008), Zauberman (2009).

interviews were conducted using the CAPI methodology. The survey was placed under the responsibility of the INSEE. The survey on the living conditions of households disappeared in 2006.

However since 2005, another annual survey started taking place. It is called "Framework of life and security" (*Cadre de vie et sécurité*). The new questionnaire is inspired by the one used in the British Crime Survey (Didier et al. 2009) and, thus, the questions are not strictly comparable to the former ones. The survey is directed by the INSEE and the OND (National Observatory of Delinquency, which is part of the INHES, National Institute of Higher Studies for Domestic Security). It is financed by the INHES, the Interministerial Agency for Urban Affairs and Social Development (DIV) and the OFDT (French Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction). In 2005, a national representative sample of 6,512 households was selected using multistage probability sampling. The variable used for the stratification was the geographical area. The response rate was 30% and surveys were conducted face to face using the CAPI methodology.

Regarding local victimisation surveys, France conducted in 1989 two surveys (financed by the above mentioned DIV) using CATI methodology. One was conducted in Épinay with 1,780 interviews and the other in the Toulouse urban area with 1,576 interviews. In 1999, a pilot survey in Amiens was carried out by the CESDIP with a sample of 1,156 interviews and CATI methodology. The Amiens survey served as the basis for a survey of the Île-de-France region organised by the CESDIP for the Île-de-France Regional Institute for Urban Planning (IAURIF) in 2001. The Île-de-France survey was based on a sample of 10,504 interviewees, and it was replicated in 2003, 2005, 2007 and 2009. The Amiens study also served as the basis for CESDIP telephone surveys conducted in 2005 in five cities that are members of the French Forum for Urban Safety, using samples between 1,000 and 5,000 individuals depending on the area⁶⁵.

France also participated in 1994 in the first round of the ICBS/ICCS with a national representative sample. A random sample was taken from the business population, stratified according to the size and type of business (using a random selection of companies of 1-10 and 11 or more employees in the retail trade). The interviews were conducted through CATI. Response rates were 49% for companies with 1-10 employees and 66% for companies with 11 or more employees. The survey was placed under the responsibility of the Dutch Ministry of Justice.

France also conducted the National French Survey on Violence Against Women in 2000. The sample size was 6,970 females. The national representative sample was selected through multistage probability sampling. The variable used for the stratification was the geographical area. The response rate was 71.3% with CATI methodology. The survey was also placed under the responsibility of the Institute of Demography of Paris 1 University. It was financed by the State Secretariat of Women Rights and Professional Education, Service of Women Rights and Equality.

The country also participated in the European Social Surveys of 2002, 2004 and 2006, with funding for the French participation provided by the Ministry of Research, and scientific expertise provided by the Centre for the studies of French political life (CEVIPOF).

65 For details, see Robert (2007).

France also conducted in 2008 the EU-MIDIS with a sample of 534 individuals with North African origins and 466 individuals with Sub-Saharan African origins. The sample covered the cities of Paris (metro area), Marseille and Lyon, and the response rate was 69%.

GERMANY (DEUTSCHLAND)

Germany participated twice in the ICVS, in 1989 and 2005 (EU ICS). The country used national representative samples of 5,274 and 2,025 households with responses rates of 30% and 43% respectively, and used CATI methodology.

The country participated in the Eurobarometers of Public Safety 44.3 (1996), 54.1 (2000) and 58.1 (2002) with samples of 2,000 interviews conducted face to face, of which 1,000 in the former Eastern State and 1,000 in the former Western State. Germany also participated in the Special Eurobarometers on Domestic Violence Against Women 51.0 (1999) and 344 (2010) with samples of 2,035 and 1,573 individuals respectively, interviewed face to face.

Germany conducted the pilot study on the EU victimisation survey module in 2009 using mainly a postal survey. A total of 1,306 interviews were carried out with PAPSI for the victimisation screeners, followed by CATI, CAPI or PAPSI for the victim forms. The response rate was 49%. The exercise was conducted by the Federal Statistical Office.

The country participated in 2009 in the first pilot of the ICVS-2, conducted by Nicis. Two methodologies were used for the pilot exercise: CATI and a combination of CAWI and PAPI. The sample included 319 households for CAWI and PAPI methodology (82 households for CAWI and 237 households for PAPI) and 223 households for CATI methodology. For CAWI and PAPI, the overall response rate was 10.6%. In particular, the response rates were 2.7% for the CAWI methodology (2.1% when the questionnaire was included and 2.9% when an answer card was included), 7.9% for the PAPI methodology (15.1% when the questionnaire was included and 0.2% when an answer card was included), and 11.7% for CATI methodology. In 2010, Germany also participated in the second ICVS-2 pilot study with a sample of 4,000 households.

According to Obergfell-Fuchs (2008): "The first (published) victim survey in Germany dates 1973, from then until 1990 the frequency of such surveys was quite low with a mean of about 2 surveys within 5 years. But in the early 1990s a steep increase occurred, up to about 5 surveys per year were conducted and since then, the quantity remained on this higher plateau, which is about the quadruple of the numbers of the 1980s." Obergfell-Fuchs (2008) identifies 34 surveys on victimisation and insecurity that are included in Table 3 at the end of this chapter. Most of them "were designed by research institutes to answer special scientific questions, some others, especially those in later years, have been developed in cooperation between local governments and research institutes, their major goal was local policy planning. Until now periodic national or state-wide victimisation surveys are still lacking in Germany. On a local level, some efforts were made to develop such periodic surveys, but either they cover only a more or less narrow period of time or the intervals between the particular inquiries is quite long hence, longitudinal interpretations might be rather flawed."

At the national level, Germany conducted a victimisation survey in 1997-1998, which was part of two multi-thematic surveys. An ad-hoc questionnaire survey was used with a national representative sample of 20,070 and 3,272 households with a response rate of 67%. The sampling procedure was multistage probability sampling. The variable used for the stratification was the geographical area. The sample was representative at first regional level. The survey was placed under the responsibility of the University of Constance, School of Law, and it was financed by the Federal Ministry of Justice.

Another multipurpose survey, called Experiences of Victimization and Attitudes to Inner Security in Germany, was conducted in 2003 using parts of the ICVS questionnaire and face to face interviews at the respondent's home using a paper questionnaire. The sample included 400 households and the response rate 70%. The sampling procedure was simple probability sampling. The sample was representative at the second regional level. This survey was placed under the responsibility of the Max-Planck-Institute and the *XXXBundeskriminalamt*. The Department of Criminology of the University of Freiburg provided expertise.

A multipurpose survey called Insecurities in Europe Cities – Crime related fear within the context of new anxieties and community based crime prevention (INSEC)⁶⁶ was conducted in 2002 in Hamburg. The survey used an ad-hoc questionnaire with a sample of 861 households and obtained a response rate of 24%. The survey used face to face interviews at the respondent's home using a paper questionnaire. The sample was representative of two districts or neighbourhoods in the city of Hamburg, and the sample was drawn by simple probability sampling. The survey was placed under the responsibility of the University of Hamburg, Department of Criminology.

In the city of Bochum, the survey Victims of Crime in Bochum: A Long Term Comparative Study of a Large German City was conducted in 1975, 1986, and 1998. The survey used face to face interviews and, later, CATI methodology. In 1998, the sample size was 1,661 households and the response rate 80%. The sample was drawn by simple probability sampling and was representative of the city of Bochum. The survey was placed under the responsibility of the University of Bochum, Faculty of Law. It was financed by the Volkswagen Foundation (*VW-Stiftung*), and an International Advisory Board provided expertise.

The country participated in 1994 in the first round of the ICBS/ICCS with a national representative sample. A random sample was drawn from the business population, stratified according to the size and type of business (using a random selection of companies of 1-10 and 11 or more employees in the retail trade). The interviews were conducted through CATI. The response rates were 49% for companies of 1-10 employees and 66% for companies with 11 or more employees. The survey was placed under the responsibility of the Dutch Ministry of Justice.

66 The INSEC was a comparative study funded by the European Commission within its 5th Framework Programme (1998-2002) - Key Action: Improving the Socio-Economic Knowledge Base) -, conducted in five European cities (Amsterdam, Budapest, Hamburg, Krakow and Vienna) in 2002-3. The study was designed by a group of international academics. The aim was to study urban disorder and insecurity, as well as the effects of globalization on the perception of the latter, both at the local and regional level. Interviews were conducted face to face using a paper version of the questionnaire. The questionnaire included questions on experiences of victimisation and victimisation risk assessments. It was developed in German and translated into Hungarian, Polish, Flemish and Turkish. The latter version was used to interview Turkish immigrants in Hamburg.

Germany conducted in 2008 the EU-MIDIS with a sample of 503 individuals with Turkish origins and 500 individuals with ex-Yugoslavian origins. The sample covered the cities of Berlin, Frankfurt and Munich. The response rate was 80%.

Table 3: Victimization and Insecurity Surveys in Germany according to the review of Obergfell-Fuchs (2008)

No	Author	Year	Territorial Scope	Focus	Publication
1	Stephan	1973	local: Stuttgart	general	Stephan (1976)
2	Schwind	1973/74	local: Göttingen	general	Schwind et al. (1975)
3	Schwind et al.	1975 – 1986 – 1998	local: Bochum	general	Schwind et al. (2001)
4	Kreuzer et al.	1990	no area specified	university students	Kreuzer et al. (1993)
5	Arnold et al.	1981	regional/ supranational: Baden-Württemberg, Germany – Baranya, Hungary – Texas, USA	general	Teske & Arnold (1991); Arnold & Korinek (1991)
6	Plate et al.	1982	local: Solingen	general	Plate et al. (1985)
7	Sessar, Boers	1984	local: Hamburg	general	Boers (1991); Sessar (1992)
8	Kury	1989	national: 1st ICVS	general	Kury (1991)
9	Aben	1990	local: Lübeck	general	Aben (1992)
10	Kury et al 1990	1991	national: East and West Germany	general	Kury et al. (1992)
11	Boers et al.	1991 – 1993 – 1995	national: East and West Germany	general	Boers et al. (1997)

No	Author	Year	Territorial Scope	Focus	Publication
12	Kury et al.	1991/92 – 1995-96	local/regional: Freiburg – Emmendingen – Löffingen	general	Kury et al. (2000)
13	Kräupl, Ludwig	1991/92 – 1995/96 – 2001/02	local/regional: Jena – Kahla- Suhl	general	Kräupl & Ludwig (1993, 2000); Ludwig & Kräupl (2005)
14	Wetzels et al.	1992	national: East and West Germany	general	Wetzels et al. (1995)
15	Schwind et al.	1993	local: Bochum	students 6–21y	Schwind et al. (1995)
16	Funk et al.	1994	local: Nuremberg	students 12–15y	Funk (1995)
17	Research Group Community Crime Prevention in Baden-Wuerttemberg	1994	local/regional: Calw, Freiburg, Ravensburg, Weingarten	general	Dölling et al. (2003)
18	Research Group Community Crime Prevention Baden-Wuerttemberg	1995	national	general	Forschungsgruppe Kommunale Kriminalprävention Baden-Württemberg (1998)
19	Heinz et al.	1997	national	general	Schnell & Kreuter (2000)
20	Hermann et al.	1997 – 2004	local: Schwetzingen	general	Hermann & Laue (2005)
21	Kury et al.	1998	local: Reutlingen	general	Kury et al. (1999a)
22	Kury et al.	1998	local: Metzingen	general	Kury et al. (1999b)

No	Author	Year	Territorial Scope	Focus	Publication
23	Wetzels et al.	1998	local: Munich, Kiel, Hamburg, Hanover, Wunstorf, Lilienthal, Leipzig, Stuttgart, Schwaebisch-Gmuend	students 15–17y	Wetzels et al. (2001)
24	Hermann, Dölling	1998	local: Freiburg, Heidelberg	general 14–70y	Hermann & Dölling (2001)
25	Oberwittler et al.	1999	local: Freiburg, Cologne	students 13–17y	Oberwittler et al. (2001)
26	Kury et al.	2000	local: Mannheim	general	Posch et al. (2001)
27	Oberwittler et al.	2000	regional: Markgraefler Land	students 13–18y	Oberwittler et al. (2002)
28	Wilmers et al.	2000	local/regional: Hamburg, Hanover, Leipzig, Munich, Friesland	students 15–17y	Wilmers et al. (2002)
29	Sessar et al.	2001	local/supranational: Hamburg, Amsterdam, Budapest, Cracow, Vienna	general	Sessar (2006)
30	Dreher et al.	2003	local: Rottweil	general	Dreher et al. (2005)
31	Müller, Schröttle	2003	national	women	Bundesministerium für Familie, Senioren, Frauen und Jugend (2004)
32	Feltes, Goldberg	2003/04	local: Bochum	students 11–17y	Feltes & Goldberg (2006)
33	Gallup/Europe, Kury et al.	2005	national: ICVS	general	EUICS Report (2005)
34	Pfeiffer et al.	2005	local/regional: Munich, Stuttgart, Schwaebisch-Gmuend, Kassel, Dortmund, Oldenburg, Lehrte, Belm, Wallenhorst, Peine, Soltau-Fallingbostel, Thuringia	students 10–11 y 15–17 y	Baier et al. (2006)

Source: Obergfell-Fuchs (2008).

GREECE (ΕΛΛΑΔΑ [ELLÁDA])⁶⁷

In 1991, a pilot study of the ICVS was conducted in the city of Athens with the financial support of the University of Athens and Panteion University. The sample was composed of 345 households selected randomly from the archives of a public utility company. Interviews were conducted face to face by a team composed of university postgraduate students. The response rate was 77%. Only a summary of the first results of this research has been published (Spinellis et al. 1991).

Greece participated in the 2005 EU ICS with a national representative sample of 2,020 households and a 44% response rate using CATI methodology.

The country participated in the Eurobarometers of Public Safety 44.3 (1996), 54.1 (2000), 58.1 (2002), and in the Special Eurobarometers on Domestic Violence Against Women 51.0 (1999) and 344 (2010) with samples of about 1,000 individuals interviewed face to face.

At the national level, only one victimisation survey was conducted, in 2001. The results are available only in Greek (Karydis, 2004). In the city of Athens, surveys on fear of crime were conducted in 1998 and 2004 by the Panteion University.

Greece participated in the IVAWS survey in 2003. However, the results were not included in the international publication of the findings because the survey was still going on at the moment of the publication.

Greece also conducted in 2008 the EU-MIDIS with a sample of 503 individuals with Albanian origins and 505 individuals with Roma origins. The sample covered the cities of Athens and Thessaloniki, and the response rate was 65%.

HUNGARY (MAGYARORSZÁG)⁶⁸

Hungary participated in the ICVS in 1996 and 2005 (EU ICS) with samples of 756 and 2,103 households and obtained response rates of 80.7% and 53% respectively. Face to face methodology was used in 1996 and CATI in 2005.

The country participated in the Special Eurobarometer on Domestic Violence Against Women 344 (2010) with a sample of 1,040 individuals interviewed face to face.

Hungary also conducted the pilot study on the EU victimisation survey module in 2008/9. The target population was individuals aged 18 and over, living in private households in Budapest and five other counties. The gross sample size was 1,096 individuals and the response rate was 59% using face to face interviews with paper and pencil questionnaires. The response rate was lower in Budapest (39, 2%) than in the other counties. The survey was carried out by the Hungarian Central Statistical Office, using its own most experienced interviewers. The implementation of the survey was coordinated by the Social Services Statistics Department, the operational work was organised by the Regional Directorate Debrecen at the local level in the selected counties and in Budapest.

67 Main source: Zarafonitou (2009).

68 Main source: Kerezsi (2009).

Hungary conducted in 2003 a national survey called Victims and Opinions with a sample of 10,020 households and obtained a response rate of 42.3%. The survey used a probability sample drawn from the register of registered residents in Hungary. The sample was stratified according to the size of the county of residence, age, and gender. It was representative at the national level. The questionnaire was not based on the ICVS questionnaire, but included some comparable questions. The methodology is based on face to face interviews in the respondent's home. The survey was placed under the responsibility of National Institute of Criminology.

In 2002/03, Hungary participated in the INSEC⁶⁹ study with a sample 1,001 interviews, representative of two urban areas of Budapest. The survey was conducted by the National Institute of Criminology.

Hungary participated in 1994 in the first round of the ICBS/ICCS with a city sample from Budapest. Interviews were conducted face to face. The country also participated in the ICBS in 2000, conducted by GALLUP. Funding was provided by UNICRI and the Ministry of Justice of Hungary. The survey was carried out through CATI in the city of Budapest, with a sample size of 517 companies. The sample was drawn from the database of the National Statistical Institute.

This country also conducted in 2008 the EU-MIDIS with a sample of 500 individuals with Roma origins. The sample covered the cities of Budapest and Miskolc, and the response rate was 81%.

IRELAND (EIRE/IRELAND)

Ireland participated in the 2005 EU ICS with a national representative sample of 2,003 households and a 42% response rate using CATI methodology.

The country participated in the Eurobarometers of Public Safety 44.3 (1996), 54.1 (2000), 58.1 (2002), and in the Special Eurobarometers on Domestic Violence Against Women 51.0 (1999) and 344 (2010) with samples of about 1,000 individuals interviewed face to face.

The Irish National Crime Council (2009) points out that a survey called Victims of Recorded Crime in Ireland, which drew on Garda records from November 1994 to October 1995, was conducted in 1996 (Watson, 2000). This survey was commissioned by the Garda Research Unit to the Economic and Social Research Institute (ESRI). Before this, the last large scale survey of Crime and Victimization patterns in Ireland had been carried out in the early 1980s.

Currently, the Central Statistics Office (CSO) examines Crime and Victimization rates in Ireland as part of their Quarterly National Household Surveys (QNHS). These have been conducted in 1998, 2003, 2006 and 2009 (Irish National Crime Council, 2009). Thus, the Quarterly National Household Survey can be considered as a sort of regular national victimisation survey.

⁶⁹ See the description of the INSEC study in the chapter on Germany.

In 2003, the QNHS used a sample of 29,436 households selected through multistage probability sampling. The variables used for the stratification were the geographical area and the degree of urbanisation. Age and gender are also used in the weighting process. The sample was representative at the second regional level. The response rate was 85%, using CAPI methodology. In 2006, 39,000 households were surveyed. This sample was mathematically adjusted to be representative of the population of the Republic of Ireland as a whole (Irish National Crime Council, 2009)

According to the Irish National Crime Council (2009): “In addition to the QNHS, the annual Garda Public Attitudes Survey provides an alternative source of information regarding the 'dark figure' of unreported crime in Ireland.” This survey estimates the percentage of offences recorded to the police and has been conducted annually since 2002.

Ireland also conducted in 2008 the EU-MIDIS with a sample of 609 individuals with Central and Eastern European origins and 503 individuals with Sub-Saharan African origins. The sample covered the Dublin metro area, and the response rate was 41%.

ITALY (ITALIA)⁷⁰

Italy participated two times in the ICVS, in 1992 and 2005 (EU ICS). The country used national representative samples of 2,044 and 2,023 households with response rates of 61% and 54% respectively, and using CATI methodology.

The country participated in the Eurobarometers of Public Safety 44.3 (1996), 54.1 (2000), 58.1 (2002), and in the Special Eurobarometers on Domestic Violence Against Women 51.0 (1999) and 344 (2010) with samples of about 1,000 individuals interviewed face to face.

Italy also conducted the pilot study on the EU victimisation survey module in 2009. A total of 503 interviews were carried out with CATI methodology. The response rate was 48%. A random sampling procedure, stratified by region and place size, was used. The survey was conducted by the Italian National Institute of Statistics (ISTAT).

In 1991, UNICRI carried out an investigation about victimisation with the support of the Ministry of the Interior. It involved a sample of 2,024 people (aged 16 or over) and it has been used mainly for international comparative purposes. In 1994, the Cattaneo Institut conducted together with DOXA a national victimisation survey with a sample of 6,291 individuals older than 15 years (Barbagli, 1995).

Italy conducts the multipurpose survey called The Italian Citizens' Safety Survey (*Sicurezza dei cittadini*) every five years since 1997/98. The second survey was conducted in 2002 and the third one in 2008-2009. In 2002 a national representative sample of 60,000 households was used (with substitution), and the response rate was 64.3% (not considering the out of target phone numbers). The sampling procedure was multistage probability sampling. The variables used for the stratification were geographical area and degree of urbanisation. The sample was representative at the first regional level. The mode of data collection was telephone interviewing (CATI). The

70 Main source: Muratore (2009), Sacchini & Selmini (2007, 2008), Sacchini (2008).

survey was placed under the responsibility of the Central Direction for life conditions and quality of life surveys (DCCV) of ISTAT (Muratore & Tagliacozzo, 2008).

Italy also conducts the national multipurpose survey called Everyday Life Aspects (*Aspetti della vita quotidiana*). This survey is carried out yearly since 1993. Data on bag-snatching and pick-pocketing were collected from 1993 to 2003. Data on social decay were collected from 1999 to 2003. A question on the perception of risk of criminality in the own area is still collected. The sample across the years is 24,000 households (about 60,000 individuals) and the response rates were around 90% in 1993 and 86% in 2003. Surveys used self-administered questionnaires (for instance for social decay and soft-crimes indicators). The method of data collection is PAPI. The sampling procedure is multistage probability sampling. The variables used for the stratification are geographical area and degree of urbanisation. The sample is representative at the regional level and all regions are covered. All members of the selected households are interviewed. The survey is placed under the responsibility of the DCCV of ISTAT.

On a regional level, in 1997, the Italian Citizens' Safety Survey was extended also to the Emilia-Romagna area through an oversampling of 9,000 individuals (added to the already available 2,000 interviews in the Region; thus the total sample is 11,000 interviewed in an area with 4 millions inhabitants) and according to an agreement between the regional government and the ISTAT. In 2002, Emilia Romagna and four other regions (Tuscany, Abruzzo, Campania, Lazio) were oversampled. The total oversampling for the five regions was 30,000 interviews. In the city of Bologna, the oversampling was of 1,000 interviews that, added to those already available by the national research with reference to the city, bring the total number of the individuals interviewed to 1,707. In 2008, an oversampling was carried out in 5 provinces (Bari, Napoli, Reggio Calabria, Palermo, Catania) of the South, requested by the Italian Home Office (*Ministero dell'Interno*).

On a local level, in 1994, the Cattaneo Institute developed a local victimisation survey in the city of Bologna. In this case, the sample was composed by 1,614 individuals. The minimum age was 18, and the interviews were conducted face to face.

The country participated in 1994 in the first round of the ICBS/ICCS. A national representative sample was used. A random sample was drawn from the business population, stratified according to the size and type of business (using a random selection of companies of 1-10 and 11 or more employees in the retail trade). The interviews were conducted through CATI. Response rates vary between 49% for companies with 1-10 employees and 66% for companies with 11 or more employees. The survey was placed under the responsibility of the Dutch Ministry of Justice.

The country also conducted in 2006 a survey on violence against women called the Women Safety Survey (*Sicurezza delle donne*), which has a particular focus on domestic violence. The sample consisted in 25,000 females aged between 16 and 70. The response rate was 67.7% (not considering the out of target phone numbers). The questionnaire was somehow inspired by the IVAWS questionnaire (some questions are comparable) but it also included some different and new questions. The sampling procedure was multistage probability sampling. The variables used for the stratification were the geographical area and the degree of urbanisation. The sample was

representative at the first regional level. The survey was conducted using CATI methodology. It was financed by the Equal Opportunity Department (DPO), and carried out by the DCCV of ISTAT (Muratore, 2004; Muratore & Corazziari, 2008).

Italy participated in 2007 in the FRA's Pilot Victim Survey on Ethnic Minorities and Immigrants with a sample of 603 individuals with Albanian, North African and Romanian origins. In 2008, this country also participated in the full-scale EU-MIDIS with a sample of 500 individuals with Albanian origins and 501 individuals with North African origins and 502 individuals with Romanian origins. The sample covered the cities of Rome, Milan and Bari, and the response rate was 88%. The interviews were conducted face to face.

In 2010, ISTAT conducted a survey on foreign people and their integration and quality of life in Italy. The survey included a module on victimisation suffered in the last 3 years and last 12 months. The survey used a sample of 12,000 foreign residents living in private households.

LATVIA (LATVIJA)

Latvia conducted the ICVS in 1995, 1998 and 2000. In 1995 and 1998 it used multiple cities samples combined with a small rural sample (in 1998 the sample was composed of 1,411 households), and in 2000 it used a national representative sample.

The country participated in the Special Eurobarometer on Domestic Violence Against Women 344 (2010) with a sample of 1,008 individuals interviewed face to face.

Latvia also conducted the pilot study on the EU victimisation survey module in 2009. The exercise was conducted by the Central Statistical Bureau of Latvia (CSB). The questionnaire was tested using both CAPI and CATI with samples of 150 CAPI interviews and 100 CATI interviews. For creating a sample, data from the Latvian Population Register were used. The age group from 18 to 74 years was chosen. Then, one person from the household was selected. The Mathematical Support division of the CSB created the sample. The questionnaire was tested in 5 cities/towns, 5 rural municipalities, and one rural territory. Moreover, in Riga, the suburbs of Latgale, which present the highest crime rate, were selected for the sample.

Latvia also conducted in 2008 the EU-MIDIS with a sample of 500 individuals with Russian origins. The sample covered the cities of Riga and Daugavpils, and the response rate was 86%.

LITHUANIA (LIETUVA)

Lithuania participated three times in the ICVS, in 1996/97, 2000, and 2005. In 1996/97, it used multiple cities samples combined with a small rural sample. The sample size was 1,176 households with a response rate of 53.7%. In 2000, a sample of 1526 household from Vilnius was used. The sample was selected using simple probability sampling and was representative at the city level. The survey was conducted using face to face interviews. It was placed under the responsibility of the Law Institute, Criminological Research Department, and it was financed by UNICRI.

Even if Lithuania participated in the ICVS in 2005, data arrived after the final deadline and therefore the country is not included in the main publications about the survey.

The country also participated in the Special Eurobarometer on Domestic Violence Against Women 344 (2010) with a sample of 1,016 individuals interviewed face to face.

Lithuania also conducted the pilot study on the EU victimisation survey module in 2009. The target population was composed by individuals aged 15 and over and living in private households within the territory of the Republic of Lithuania. The Population Register was used as a sampling frame. The sample size of the field-testing covered 300 persons (150 from Šiauliai county and 150 from Panevėžys county). A stratified sample design was used. There were 12 strata: 2 largest cities, other cities, rural areas and age groups (15–19, 20–39, 40–59, 59+). A simple random sample of persons aged 15 and over, living in private households, was selected from the Residents' Register in each stratum. For sections A-F of the questionnaire, interviews were conducted face to face using laptop computers (CAPI). The section on violence was filled in through self-completion in a paper questionnaire (PAPI).

Lithuania also conducted in 2000 the ICBS with a sample of 525 persons (one for each company) in Vilnius. The sample was selected using simple probability sampling and is representative only at the city (capital) level. No information on response rate is available. The survey was conducted through face to face interviews. It was placed under the responsibility of the Law Institute, Criminological Research Department. It was financed by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands.

Lithuania conducted in 2008 the EU-MIDIS with a sample of 515 individuals with Russian origins. The sample covered the cities of Vilnius and Visaginas, and the response rate was 90%.

LUXEMBOURG (LUXEMBOURG)

Luxembourg participated in the 2005 EU ICS with a national representative sample of 800 households and a 36.9% response rate. The interviews were carried out using CATI methodology.

The country participated in the Eurobarometer of Public Safety 44.3 (1996) with a sample of 600 interviews and in the Eurobarometers 54.1 (2000) and 58.1 (2002) with samples of about 1'000 interviews. The surveys were conducted face to face. Luxembourg also participated in the Special Eurobarometer on Domestic Violence Against Women 51.0 (1999) and 344 with samples of 601 and 505 individuals respectively, interviewed face to face.

The police services of Luxembourg conducted in March 2007 a survey on feelings of insecurity. The survey used CATI methodology. The sample was selected through random digit dialling and it included 1'000 persons aged 12 or more. The sample was stratified according to age, gender, professional activity, nationality and regional area. It was representative at the national level.

Luxembourg also conducted in 2008 the EU-MIDIS with a nationwide sample of 497 individuals with ex-Yugoslavian origins. The response rate was 78%.

MALTA (MALTA)⁷¹

Malta participated in the ICVS in 1997, but the survey remained unpublished and the database is not available. No other general victimisation surveys were carried out in the country.

The country participated in the Special Eurobarometer on Domestic Violence Against Women 344 (2010) with a sample of 500 individuals interviewed face to face.

Malta conducted in 2008 the EU-MIDIS with a sample of 500 individuals with Sub-Saharan African origins. This country was an exception to the methodology of this survey, since it did not use the technique of random route selected clusters to create the sample. This is explained by the special living conditions of the ethnic minority studied. First, the researchers tried to interview people with North African origins in the Mosque, but this strategy only generated a few interviews. Finally, the vast majority of the interviews were conducted with people from Sub-Saharan origin in the common areas of the administrative detention semi-open centers in Malta, as it was not possible to access to closed centers. For this reason, the response rate was not calculated.

NETHERLANDS (NEDERLAND)⁷²

The Netherlands participated in the five sweeps of the ICVS in 1989, 1992, 1996, 2000 and 2005 (EU ICS). The country used national representative sample of 2,000, 2,000, 2,008, 2,001 and 2,010 households with response rates of 65%, 66%, 63%, 58%, and 46 respectively, and CATI methodology. In 2010, the Netherlands participated in the second ICVS-2 pilot study with a sample of 4,000 respondents (2,000 achieved using CATI, and 2,000 using CAWI).

The country participated in the Eurobarometers of Public Safety 44.3 (1996), 54.1 (2000) and 58.1 (2002), and in the Special Eurobarometers on Domestic Violence Against Women 51.0 (1999) and 344 (2010) with samples of about 1,000 individuals interviewed face to face.

National victimisation surveys started in the Netherlands in 1974 under the responsibility of the Research and Documentation Center (WODC) of the Ministry of Justice (Van Dijk, Steinmetz, 1980). These surveys were later adopted by the CBS (Statistics Netherlands) that has been carrying out national victimisation surveys since 1980. These surveys are based on random samples taken from private households; they include questions on victimisation of various forms of crime asked to respondents aged 15 and older. During the period 1980 to 1992, the Crime Victim Survey (ESM) was held first annually and, from 1984 to 1992, biannually. From 1992 onwards, the ESM was succeeded by the Justice and Security Survey (ERV - *Enquête Rechtsbescherming en Veiligheid*). Since 2005, the ERV was replaced by the National Security Monitor (see below).

In 2005, the Netherlands introduced the annual National Security Monitor. The questionnaire integrated elements from the former POLS Justice Module and from the Police Monitor (see below). The 2005 survey was a small-scale (pilot) survey, and from 2006 on it was representative at the level of police regions. In 2005 it used a sample of 5,242 individuals and obtained a response rate of 70%. CATI and CAPI methodology

71 Main source: Azzopardi (2009).

72 Main source: Huls (2009), Pauwels & Pleysier (2007, 2008), Wittebrood (2008).

were applied, and the sampling procedure was multistage probability sampling. The variables used for the stratification were age, gender and geographical area. The survey was placed under the responsibility of Statistics Netherlands, Division of Social and Spatial Statistics (SRS)/Statistical Analysis Heerlen (SAH). It was financed by the Ministry of Justice and the Ministry of the Interior and Kingdom Relations. The survey is conducted in cooperation between the ministries mentioned and Statistics Netherlands. The National Security Monitor was stopped in 2008 and replaced by the Integral Security Monitor. The survey is conducted with the same methodology as the former National Security Monitor. Fieldwork, research and analysis are under the responsibility of Statistics Netherlands (CBS). The police regions and municipalities are allowed to do the same survey with a standard questionnaire but CBS is responsible for the sample.

The Permanent Survey on Living Conditions (POLs - *Permanent Onderzoek Leefsituatie*) including a Justice and Security module was conducted from 1980 to 2005 (from 1980 to 1985 every year, and from 1986 to 1992 every two years). Between 1980 and 1992 different design and questionnaires were used; from 1992 to 1996 it was a separate continuous victim survey. This survey was discontinued in 2005. In 2004, it used a national representative sample of 10,552 individuals and obtained a response rate of 58%, using CAPI methodology. The sampling procedure was multistage probability sampling. The variables used for the stratification were age, gender, geographical area and degree of urbanisation. The sample was representative at the national level. The survey was placed under the responsibility of the Statistics Netherlands.

Also a Police Monitor PMB is conducted in every police region since 1993. Originally, this survey was conducted every second year but, since 2001, it is conducted every year. The Police Monitor uses a very large sample that included 90,000 households in 2003 and 88,000 in the 2008 sweep. It uses telephone interviewing. The Police Monitor is placed under the responsibility of the Ministry of the Interior and Kingdom Relations (BZK) and the Ministry of Justice (B&A Group/Intomart, 2003).

In 2002-3 the Netherlands participated in the INSEC⁷³ study with a sample of 1,000 urban residents in two districts of Amsterdam. The survey was conducted by the Universities of Groningen and Leiden.

The Netherlands participated in 1994 in the first round of the ICBS/ICCS with a national representative sample. A random sample was drawn from the business population, stratified according to the size and type of business. The country used a random selection of companies of 1-10 and 11 or more employees in the retail trade, industry and catering sector. CATI methodology was used. Response rates were 64% and 74% respectively for small and large industrial business, 76% and 72% for the catering sector with 1-10 or 11 and more employees respectively and 79% and 72% respectively for retail trade sector with 1-10 and 11 or more employees. The survey was placed under the responsibility of the Dutch Ministry of Justice.

Since 2004, the Netherlands also conducts annually a Business Crime Monitor survey. In 2004, 2005, 2006, and 2007 it was conducted within the following five sectors of industry in the Netherlands: construction (samples of 5,700, 6,400, 5,800, and 6,700), retail (samples of 8,800, 9,000, 11,800, and 10,700), hospitality (samples of 8,900, 9,500,

73 See the description of the INSEC study in the chapter on Germany.

6,200, and 6,600), transport (samples of 6,500, 3,900, 4,800, and 3,600), and financial and business services (samples of 7,800, 9,300, 9,000, and 10,100).

The country conducted in 1986 the first National Survey on the Prevalence of Wife Abuse in the Netherlands, with a representative sample of 1,016 women aged between 20 and 60 (Romkens, 1997). This survey was repeated in 1996, 1997 (among immigrants only), and 2009.

In 2006, the Netherlands also published the first Monitor Victims of Human Trafficking which included, among his sources, a series of surveys of victims of this type of crime (WODC, 2006).

The Netherlands also conducted in 2008 the EU-MIDIS with a sample of 459 individuals with North African origins, 443 individuals with Turkish origins, and 471 individuals with Surinamese origins. The sample covered the cities of Amsterdam, Rotterdam, The Hague and Utrecht. The response rate was 77%.

POLAND (POLSKA)⁷⁴

Poland participated in the ICVS in 1989, 1992, 1996, 2000 and 2004 (EU ICS). In 1989, the survey was conducted in the city of Warsaw with a sample of 500 households. It was conducted through telephone interviewing. In 1992, 1996, 2000 and 2004 (EU ICS), Poland participated with national representative samples of 2,033, 3,482, 5,276 and 5,013 households, and obtained response rates of 96%, 94%, 78% and 72% respectively. In 2000 and 2004, the surveys used face to face interviews at the respondent home (with a paper questionnaire) and an adapted form of the ICVS questionnaire. Samples were selected using multistage probability sampling. The variables used for the stratification were age, gender, marital status, and geographical area. Surveys were financed by the Ministry of Sciences.

In 2005, another survey was carried out, only in Warsaw, using the ICVS questionnaire. It used a sample of 1,000 households and was conducted through face to face interviews. The response rate was 18%. The survey was financed by the Ministry of Sciences.

Poland participated in the Special Eurobarometer on Domestic Violence Against Women 344 (2010) with a sample of 1,000 individuals interviewed face to face.

Poland also conducted the pilot study on the EU victimisation survey module in 2009 with a sample of 500 interviews carried out with CATI and 100 carried out with CAPI. The response rate was 22.1%. The pilot exercise was conducted by the Institute of Justice of Poland.

In 2002-3 the country participated in the INSEC⁷⁵ study with a sample of 1,088 urban residents in two districts of Krakow. The survey was conducted by the Jagiellonian Universities of Krakow.

The country participated in the IVAWS survey in 2004 with a sample size of 2,009 females and obtained a response rate of 87%. The survey used face to face interviews.

⁷⁴ Main source: Siemaszko (2009).

⁷⁵ See the description of the INSEC study in the chapter on Germany.

The sample was selected using multistage probability sampling. The variables used for the stratification were age, gender, and geographical area. The sample was representative at the national level. The survey was placed under the responsibility of Warsaw University, IPSiR (Institute of Social Prevention and Resocialisation), Chair of Criminology. It was financed by a grant of the Ministry of Science and Informatics of Poland.

Poland also conducted in 2008 the EU-MIDIS with a nationwide sample of 500 individuals with Roman origins. The response rate was 86%.

PORTUGAL (PORTUGAL)

Portugal participated in the ICVS in 2000 and 2004 (EU ICS) with national representative sample of 2,000 and 2,011 households, and obtained response rates of 56% and 43% respectively.

The country participated in the Eurobarometers of Public Safety 44.3 (1996), 54.1 (2000) and 58.1 (2002), and in the Special Eurobarometers on Domestic Violence Against Women 51.0 (1999) and 344 (2010) with samples of about 1,000 individuals interviewed face to face.

Portugal also conducted the pilot study on the EU victimisation survey module in 2009. The sample used was composed of 515 interviews. They were carried out with CATI (1/3 of the sample), CAPI+CATI (1/3 of the sample) and CAPI+CASI (1/3 of the sample). The response rate was 60%.

Portugal also conducted national Victimisation Surveys in 1991, 1992 and 1994. In 1994, a sample of 13,500 households was used. It was selected using multistage probability sampling. The variable used for the stratification was the geographical area and, a posteriori, a second stratification was made by gender and age in each of the geographical areas selected. The sample was representative at the national level. The survey did not use the ICVS questionnaire. Data collection was based on face to face interviews at the respondent's home using an electronic questionnaire (CAPI). The survey was placed under the responsibility of the Legal Policy and Planning Office of the Ministry of Justice, Justice Statistics Department. The National Statistics Institute provided expertise (Recasens i Brunet, 2008).

This country conducted in 2008 the EU-MIDIS with a sample of 505 individuals with Brazilian origins and 510 individuals with Sub-Saharan African origins. The sample covered the cities of Lisbon (metro area) and Setubal, and the response rate was 72%.

ROMANIA (ROMÂNIA)⁷⁶

Romania participated two times in the ICVS, in 1996 and 2000. In 1996 the country combined an urban sample of 1,000 households from the capital city, Bucharest, and a small rural sample of 91 households to reach a total sample of 1091 households. The survey was based on face to face interviews. In 2000, the country used a city sample (Bucharest) of 1'506 households. Interviews were conducted face to face and the response rate was 76.7%. The sample was representative at the city level. The surveys were placed under the responsibility of the Juridical Research Institute of the Romanian Academy, Public Law and Criminology Department.

In 2010, the country participated in the Special Eurobarometer on Domestic Violence Against women 344 with a sample of 1,054 individuals interviewed face to face.

Starting in 2001, the National Institute of Statistics (Institutul Național de Statistică, INS) conducted annually the multipurpose Living Conditions Survey (*Condițiile de viață ale populației din România*, ACOVI). This survey included several questions on victimisation and used national representative samples of approximately 10,000 individuals. The variable used for the sample stratification was the geographical area. Interviews were conducted face to face, at the respondent's home, by filling a paper questionnaire. The last Living Conditions Survey was carried out in 2006, providing data for 2005. This survey has been replaced by the Quality of Life Survey (*Ancheta asupra calității vieții*, ACAV) harmonised with the European Survey Statistics on Income and Living Conditions (EU-SILC) which, according to the regulations, do not include questions on victimisation. INS conducted also, in 2008, the Health Interview Survey (*Ancheta asupra sănătății*, SAN 2008), harmonised with the European Health Interview Survey, which includes questions on the extent of exposure at home or in the living area to crime, violence or vandalism and at the work place to harassment, bullying, discrimination, violence or threat of violence. The next Health Interview Survey will be carried out in 2014.

Romania also conducted in 2000 the ICBS with a sample of 500 persons (one for each company) in Bucharest. The sample was representative only at the city level. Face to face interviews were used. The survey was conducted by GALLUP and funding was provided by the Dutch Ministry of Justice.

Romania participated in 2007 in the FRA's Pilot Victim Survey on Ethnic Minorities and Immigrants with a sample of 600 individuals with Roma and Hungarian origins. Two main sampling frames were tested: Random digit dialling and focused enumeration and Random route cluster sampling. The interviews were conducted face to face with an interviewer filling out the questionnaire. In 2008, this country participated in the full-scale EU-MIDIS with a nationwide sample of 500 individuals with Roma origins. The response rate was 64%.

⁷⁶ Main source: Istrate (2009).

SLOVAKIA (SLOVENSKO)

Slovakia participated as part of Czechoslovakia in the 1992 ICVS. The survey was conducted with a national representative sample of 1,821 households. The response rate was 91%. The sample was selected using multistage probability sampling. The variables used for the stratification were age, gender, socio-professional qualifications, area of residence, regional distribution, and size of the population. Data were collected through face to face interviews conducted in June 1992 in the Czech and Slovak languages. The final sample for Slovakia consisted in 508 households. The survey was placed under the responsibility of the Institute of Sociology and Social Prevention.

In 1997, the country participated in the ICVS with a sample of 1,105 households and obtained a response rate of 75.1%. The survey was conducted using face to face interviews.

The country participated in the Special Eurobarometer on Domestic Violence Against Women 344 (2010) with a sample of 1,032 individuals interviewed face to face.

Slovakia also conducted the pilot study on the EU victimisation survey module in 2008/9. The pilot exercise was conducted by the Statistical Office of the Slovak Republic (SO SR) using face to face interviews with paper and pencil questionnaires (PAPI). It used a purposive selected sample which assured a response rate of 100%. The sample was composed by 200 households (25 for each of the eight regions of the country) represented by one person aged 18 or older. The average duration of the survey was 1 hour and 32 minutes per respondents.

Slovakia participated in 2007 in the FRA's Pilot Victim Survey on Ethnic Minorities and Immigrants with a sample of 605 individuals with Roma and Hungarian origins. The interviews were conducted face to face with an interviewer filling out the questionnaire. In 2008, this country participated in the full-scale EU-MIDIS with a nationwide sample of 500 individuals with Roma origins. The response rate was 89%.

SLOVENIA (SLOVENIJA)

Slovenia conducted the ICVS in 1992, 1996 and 2001 with samples of 1,000, 2053 and 3,885 households respectively. In 1992, the sample was restricted to the capital city, Ljubljana, and combined CATI and CAPI methodology. In 1996, the country combined an urban (Ljubljana) sample of 1,107 households and a rural sample of 946 households, and applied CATI methodology. In 2000, the sample was representative at the national level and CATI methodology was used. The sample was selected using stratified random sampling. The survey was placed under the responsibility of the Statistical Office of Republic of Slovenia (SORS), Social Services Statistics Department.

The country participated in the Special Eurobarometer on Domestic Violence Against Women 344 (2010) with a sample of 1,005 individuals interviewed face to face.

Slovenia also conducted the pilot study on the EU victimisation survey module in 2009. A total of 1,084 interviews were conducted with CATI and 916 with CAPI, and the response rates obtained were 52% and 38% respectively. This pilot exercise was conducted by SORS.

This country also conducted in 2008 the EU-MIDIS with a sample of 473 individuals with Serbian origins and 528 individuals with Bosnian/Muslim origins. The sample covered the cities of Ljubljana and Jesenice, and the response rate was 64%.

SPAIN (ESPAÑA)⁷⁷

In the case of Spain, the distribution of powers between the Central Administration and the Autonomous Communities allow a distinction between victimisation surveys conducted in Catalonia and those conducted at the national level and in other autonomous communities.

National Level

Spain participated in the ICVS in 1989 and 2005 (EU ICS) with samples of 862 and 2,034 households and responses rates of 33% and 40% respectively. In 1989 the survey was conducted using CATI methodology in urban areas, while in rural areas where telephone penetration was too low interviews were taken face to face with some computer assistance. In 2005 it was conducted using CATI methodology. In 1989, in order to save costs, rural areas were selected applying standard national quota sampling instead of other methods of probability sampling. In 2005, the sample was representative at the national level.

Spain participated in the Eurobarometers of Public Safety 44.3 (1996), 54.1 (2000), 58.1 (2002), and in the Special Eurobarometers on Domestic Violence Against Women 51.0 (1999) and 344 (2010) with samples of about 1,000 individuals interviewed face to face.

Spain also conducted the pilot study on the EU victimisation survey module in 2008/9. The pilot survey was conducted by the Cabinet of Interior Security Studies (GESI) and the National Statistical Institute (INE) and the field test was carried out by TNS-Demoscopia under the technical supervision of the INE. It targeted people aged 15-74 (both included), living in family units. Thus, people living alone were excluded from the survey. The geographical scope spanned over ten provinces out of 50. The pilot test sample was designed by the INE. The theoretical sampling size was 1,000 people; 10 for each of the 100 census sections targeted by the study. The households within a section were randomly selected. Once the households had been selected, questions regarding the number of people living in the household were posed, and the respondent was selected using a random number table. The data collection methods chosen were CAPI and CATI. CAPI interviews were conducted in 96 census sections and CATI in 4 sections. The overall response rate was 53.5%

Gondra Bustinza (2008) identifies also eight victimisation surveys conducted by the CIS (*Centro de Investigaciones Sociológicas*), of which six were conducted at the national level (in 1978, 1980, 1991 and 1995), one in Madrid in 1980, and one with a sample of several cities in 1982. Apart from that, there was a study on terrorism and citizens' security conducted also by the CIS in 1987. The Barometer conducted periodically by the CIS cannot be considered as a victimisation survey as it only includes a couple of questions on citizens' concerns among which delinquency is often included.

⁷⁷ Main source: Recasens i Brunet (2008).

Table 4: Victimisation Surveys conducted by the CIS in Spain*

Year	Survey	Sample (N)	Territorial scope	CIS Study Number
1978	Study on criminality (Estudio sobre criminalidad)	1.204	Spain	1149
1978	Study on victimisation (Estudio sobre victimización)	5.706	Spain	1152
1980	Study on victimisation and drugs (Estudio sobre victimización y droga)	5.738	Spain	1206
1980	Study on citizens' insecurity 1 (Estudio sobre inseguridad ciudadana 1)	1.156	Madrid	1251
1982	Study on citizens' insecurity 2 (Estudio sobre inseguridad ciudadana 2)	3.714	Sample of cities	1313
1991	Study on citizens' insecurity 3 (Estudio sobre inseguridad ciudadana 3)	2.490	Spain	1974
1995	(Delinquency, security and police) Delincuencia, seguridad y policía	3.919	Spain	2200
1995	(Request for insecurity and victimisation) Demanda de Inseguridad y Victimización	14.994	Spain	2200

*Table adapted from Gondra Bustinza (2008) with additional information from Raldúa Martín (1996).

Since 1994, the Andalusian Institute of Criminology carried out a series of surveys at the local level in the Autonomous Community of Andalusia (García España, Pérez Jiménez, Benítez Jiménez, 2007, 2008); in 2009, the same institute conducted a national victimisation survey (Díez Ripollés & García España, 2009). All these surveys used the successive versions of the ICVS questionnaire, adapted to the Spanish case. The 2009 national survey was conducted through CATI with a sample of 1,400 households, and obtained a response rate of 28.8%. The sample included people aged 16 or older residing in capitals and municipalities with more than 50,000 inhabitants. The surveys conducted in the Autonomous Community of Andalusia took place in Málaga in 1994 and 2005, in Córdoba, Huelva and Seville in 2006, and in Almería, Cádiz, Granada and Jaén in 2007. A survey conducted in Seville in 2003 remains unpublished. The 1994 Malaga survey used a sample of 1,634 households combining face to face and telephone interviews. The rest of the surveys used CATI methodology and included persons aged 16 or older. The sample of the 2005 Malaga survey consisted in 1,343 interviews. The surveys of 2006 and 2007 used samples of 800 interviews in each city. The response rates were 17.2% (Córdoba), 15.1% (Huelva), 18.3% (Sevilla), 18.5% (Almería), 17.6% (Cádiz), 20% (Granada), and 19% (Jaén).

In 1994, a pilot survey for the first round of the ICBS/ICCS was conducted in the city of Málaga (Stangeland & Guzmán Muñoz, 1996). Another pilot, conducted in Seville, remained unpublished.

As far as school victimisation is concerned, the Attorney of the Spanish People (*Defensor del Pueblo español*) conducted, in cooperation with UNICEF, two surveys on school violence in 1999 and 2005-6. The sample included 3,000 secondary school students attending 300 institutions selected according to the following criteria: urban/rural,

public/private, and proportional distribution according to the Spanish Autonomous Regions (Defensor del Pueblo, 2007).

The country conducted the Violence Against Women Macro-Survey in 1999, 2002 and 2006, with national samples of 20,552, 20,652 and 32,426 females respectively. In 1999, the response rate was 44.1%. Face to face interviews and CATI methodology were used. The sample was selected using multistage probability sampling. The variables used for the stratification were the geographical area and the degree of urbanisation. Oversampling was applied for Autonomous Communities (first regional level) with less population. The sample was representative at first regional and national level. The survey was placed under the responsibility of the Instituto de la Mujer, Secretaría General de Políticas de Igualdad (Instituto de la Mujer, 1999, 2002, 2006; Meil, 2005).

Spain conducted in 2008 the EU-MIDIS with a sample of 514 individuals with North African origins, 504 individuals with South American origins, and 508 individuals with Romanian origins. The sample covered the cities of Madrid and Barcelona, and the response rate was 58%.

Catalonia (Catalunya)⁷⁸

Catalonia participated in the ICVS in 1996 and 2000. In 1996, the data arrived after the final deadline and therefore the region is not included in the main publications about the survey. In 2000, the survey used a sample of 2,909 households and the response rate was 73%. The survey was conducted using telephone interviewing but not CATI methodology. The sampling method was based in random sample from the telephone registry, and therefore does not account for households with non-registered telephone numbers. The survey was financed by the Autonomous Government of Catalonia and was co-ordinated for the Centre of Legal Studies, Ministry of Justice.

Catalonia also conducted the pilot study on the EU victimisation survey module in 2009, with a sample size of 1,179 households, of which 707 were interviewed with CATI and 472 with CAPI. An extra module on violence was included using CASI methodology. The sample was representative of the population of Catalonia. For CATI, a random sample stratified by region, sex and age was used. For CAPI, a two-stage sample, involving the selection of census sections as first stage units (understood as conglomerates) and individuals as the final unit, was used. The face to face interviews were only held in the Barcelona metropolitan area. The sample design was provided by the Ministry of Home Affairs, Institutional Relations and Participation, and the Statistical Institute of Catalonia (IDESCAT). The response rate was 9.6% for CATI and 40.5% for CAPI.

Since 1999 a survey called Survey on Public Security in Catalonia is conducted annually. The sample is representative of the population of Catalonia. In 1999, the survey pilot used a non-representative sample of 5,320 households. In 2000, the first survey used a sample of 12,806 households. In 2001, the sample was composed of 12,617 households (Generalitat de Catalunya, 2002). Moreover, from 1983 to 2001, a victimisation survey called Survey on Public Security in Barcelona was conducted annually in the city of Barcelona. Since 2002, the Survey on Public Security in Barcelona and the Survey on Public Security in Catalonia are conducted together under the name of the latter. In 2002, the survey used a sample of 18,679 households. The survey is conducted using CATI

⁷⁸ Main sources: Recasens i Brunet (2008), Robert (2005).

methodology. The sample is selected using multistage probability sampling. The variables used for the stratification are age, gender, and geographical area. The sample is representative at the first regional level. The survey is placed under the responsibility of the Government of Catalonia (*Generalitat de Catalunya*), Department of Justice and Interior.

SWEDEN (SVERIGE)

Sweden participated in the ICVS in 1992, 1996, 2000, and 2005 (EU ICS). The samples were composed by 1,707, 1,000, 2,000 and 2,012 households and the response rates were 77%, 75%, 66%, and 55% respectively. Samples were selected using simple probability sampling and they were representative at the national level. The surveys were conducted using CATI methodology

The country participated in the Eurobarometers of Public Safety 44.3 (1996), 54.1 (2000), 58.1 (2002), and in the Special Eurobarometers on Domestic Violence Against Women 51.0 (1999) and 344 (2010) with samples of about 1,000 individuals interviewed face to face.

Sweden also conducted the pilot study on the EU victimisation survey module in 2009. The exercise was conducted by the National Council for Crime Prevention in Sweden (BRA), using CATI methodology. The sample was drawn from the Total Population Register maintained by Statistics Sweden, which includes all those permanently resident in Sweden at the time of the sampling (thus, the sample did not exclude persons who lack a landline telephone). The age-range of the sample was 16 to 79 years (both included).

Sweden also participated in 2008-9 in the first pilot of the ICVS-2. Two methodologies were used for the pilot exercise: CATI and a combination of CAWI and PAPI. The country used a total sample of 381 households for CAWI and PAPI methodology (117 households for CAWI and 204 households for PAPI) and 205 households for CATI methodology. For CAWI and PAPI the overall response rate was 25.4%. In particular, the response rates were 11.8% for the CAWI methodology (7.1% when the questionnaire was included and 15.9% when an answer card was included⁷⁹), 13.6% for the PAPI methodology (25.1% when the questionnaire was included and 2.1% when an answer card was included) and 16.9% for CATI methodology. In 2010, the country also participated in the second ICVS-2 pilot study with a sample of 4,000 households.

From a historical point of view, the first Swedish victimisation surveys took place in the early 1970s, when the Scandinavian Criminological Research Council funded a series of surveys on victimisation for violent crime and property crime in Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden (see the chapter on Denmark, with references).

Since 1978, the country conducts annually the multipurpose survey called Living Conditions Survey (ULF), that includes a module on victimisation. In 2005, the sample size consisted in 6000 households and the response rate was 78%. The sample was selected using simple probability sampling and is representative at the national and the first regional level and an *ad-hoc* questionnaire was used. The survey was conducted using face to face interviews at the respondent's home using paper questionnaire. The

⁷⁹ See the description of the ICVS-2 Pilot Study included in the first part of this article.

survey is placed under the responsibility of Statistics Sweden, Department of Population and Welfare Statistics. The Institute of Criminology of Stockholm University, The Swedish National Council for Crime Prevention, and The National Board of Health and Welfare provided expertise.

Since 2006, the country carries out an annual victimisation survey called the Swedish Crime Survey (NTU). It covers population aged 16-79 and includes questions on victimisation, fear of crime and public confidence in the justice system. In 2006, the national representative sample included almost 8,000 individuals, while subsequent waves of data collection have been conducted using twice the sample size, which has resulted in almost 15,000 respondents annually (BRA, 2009). According to BRA (2009): "interviews are conducted by Statistics Sweden (Statistiska Centralbyrån), mainly by telephone. An abridged version of the questionnaire is sent to those who cannot be reached, or who decline to participate by phone. [...] The response rate is relatively high; just over three quarters of the individuals in the sample have participated in the survey." For example, in 2006, the response rate was 78%.

The country carried out between October 1999 and January 2000 a multipurpose survey called Captured Queen: Men's Violence Against Women in "Equal" Sweden. This survey used a sample of 1,000 females and obtained a response rate of 70%. The sample was selected through multistage probability sampling. The variables used for the stratification were age, gender, marital status, geographical area and degree of urbanisation. The sample was representative at the national level. The methodology was based on self-administered questionnaires sent by the post. The survey was placed under the responsibility of the Feminist Studies in Social Sciences, Uppsala University. It was financed by the Crime Victim Compensation and Support Authority. The National Centre for Battered and Raped Women, Statistics Sweden provided expertise.

The country conducted in 2008 the EU-MIDIS with a sample of 494 individuals with Iraqi origins and 506 individuals with Somali origins in the cities of Stockholm and Malmö. The response rate was 17%.

SWITZERLAND⁸⁰

Switzerland participated in the ICVS, in 1989, 1996, 2000, and 2005. Indeed, the country conducted six national victimisation surveys, of which four were placed under the umbrella of the ICVS. These surveys took place in 1984/7, 1989, 1996, 1998, 2000, and 2005. All of them were conducted by the School of Criminal Sciences of the University of Lausanne, and used CATI.

The first national Swiss crime survey was conducted in two phases in 1984 (French-speaking cantons) and in 1987 (German-speaking cantons and the Italian-speaking canton), with a sample of 6,505 respondents (Killias, 1989). That survey was one of the first major victim surveys conducted using CATI and the structure used for the temporal location of the events was later included in the development of what became the International Crime Victim Survey or ICVS (van Dijk, Mayhew and Killias 1990). Since then, Swiss national victimisation surveys have followed the methodology of the ICVS. In 1989 and 1996, Switzerland opted for the a sample of 1,000 randomly selected

80 Main sources: Haymoz, Aebi, Killias & Lamon (2009), Killias (1989), Killias, Haymoz & Lamon (2007).

households; in 2000 and 2005, the samples were of 4,234 and 3,898 households respectively. The 1998 national survey was conducted on a sample of 3,041 respondents following the methodology of the 1996 wave of the ICVS. In the surveys of 1998, 2000, and 2005, certain city areas were overrepresented in order to increase the number of respondents from immigrant communities and allow a more detailed analysis of this group of the population.

The surveys of 1984, 1987, 1998 and 2005 were funded by the Swiss National Science Foundation. The surveys of 1989, 1996 were funded by the Justice Federal Office. The 2000 survey was funded by the Justice Federal Office, the Federal Police Office and the Federal Statistical Office. The seventh Swiss national crime survey will take place in 2011.

The country participated in 1994 in the first round of the ICCS with a national representative sample. A random sample was drawn from the business population, stratified according to the size and type of business. The country used a random selection of companies of 1-10 and 11 or more employees in the retail trade, industry and catering sector. Interviews were conducted through CATI. The survey was conducted by the School of Criminal Sciences of the University of Lausanne.

Switzerland also participated in the IVAWS in 2004. A total of 1,975 women aged 18 or more (but younger than 70), were interviewed (namely 1,351 in German-speaking and 623 French-speaking parts of Switzerland). The computer randomly selected home phone numbers in German-speaking and French-speaking Switzerland. The response rate was 59%. The random sample was selected on the basis of the national telephone company file, and regions and towns/villages were represented according to their population. The survey was conducted by the School of Criminal Sciences of the University of Lausanne (Killias, Simonin & De Puy, 2005).

UNITED KINGDOM⁸¹

In the United Kingdom, the General Household Survey was the first survey that covered victimisation issues. This multipurpose survey, conducted during the 1970s, included some questions about domestic burglaries victimisation (Hough, 2009). Since 1982, the United Kingdom has carried out periodically the British Crime Survey (BCS).

According to Hough and Norris (2008) the first BCS was conducted in 1982 and included data covering England, Wales and Scotland. Fieldwork in Scotland was conducted by the same company as that in England and Wales and used an identical questionnaire – though it covered only the (densely populated) southern part of Scotland. The absolute sample size was smaller in Scotland although the sampling fraction was much larger (5,000 for a population of 5 million as opposed to 10,000 for a population of 50 million). In the 1980s the BCS was conducted three times in England and Wales (in 1982, 1984 and 1988) and twice in Scotland (1982 and 1988). No crime survey data for Northern Ireland was collected in the 1980s, reflecting funding constraints and the priority that security issues attracted at that time. The 1990s saw increasing divergence between the English and Scottish surveys (see the details under the headings England & Wales and Scotland).

81 Main sources: Hough (2009), Hough & Norris (2008), Walker (2008).

The United Kingdom participated in the Eurobarometers of Public Safety 44.3 (1996), 54.1 (2000) and 58.1 (2002) with samples of 1,300 interviews conducted face to face, of which 1,000 in Great Britain (England & Wales and Scotland) and 300 in Northern Ireland. The United Kingdom participated in the Special Eurobarometers on Domestic Violence Against Women 51.0 (1999) and 344 (2010) with samples of 1,356 and 1,322 individuals respectively, interviewed face to face.

The United Kingdom also participated in the first pilot of the ICVS-2. Two methodologies were used for the pilot exercise: CATI and a combination of CAWI and PAPI. The country used a total sample of 175 households for CAWI and PAPI methodology (48 households for CAWI and 127 households for PAPI) and 200 households for CATI methodology. For CAWI and PAPI the overall response rate was 14.6%. In particular, the response rates were 4% for the CAWI methodology (2.5% when the questionnaire was included and 5.5% when an answer card was included), 10.6% for the PAPI methodology (19.5% when the questionnaire was included and 1.7% when an answer card was included) and 5.2% for CATI methodology. In 2010, the United Kingdom participated also in the second ICVS-2 pilot study with a sample of 4,000 households interviewed.

England and Wales

England and Wales participated in the five sweeps of the ICVS, in 1989, 1992, 1996, 2000 and 2005 (EU ICS). The samples were respectively of 2,006, 2,001, 2,171, 1,947, and 1,775 households with response rates of 43%, 38%, 59%, 57%, and 43%. In 2005, the main sample included a subsample for the city of London composed by 874 households.

As mentioned before (see United Kingdom) the British Crime Survey (BCS) started in 1982, but since the 1990s there are important differences between the survey conducted in England and Wales and the survey conducted in Scotland. According to Hough and Norris (2008), in England and Wales the BCS was conducted every other year from 1992 onwards. The BCS had a steadily increasing sample size. The core sample size for the 2000 BCS was around 20,000. Booster samples aimed at providing accurate data about ethnic minorities and young people were also regularly included. The increased sample size also allowed respondents to be split into smaller samples who were asked questions about different topics (victimisation questions are always asked of the full sample). The interview strategy of the BCS was changed in 1994 to one using CAPI and CASI rather than PAPI. The survey is continuous since 2001 (monthly interviews), with samples of 40,000 interviews per year, and applies calibration weighting.

According to HEUNI (2007), in 2004-5 the sample of the BCS was approximately 51,000 persons. "Information was collected on persons living in private households and aged 16 and more. The mode of data collection was CAPI and CASI. The sampling procedure was a multistage probability sample and variables used for the stratification were geographical area, social class of head of household and population density. Oversampling was applied for certain groups of persons/areas like small police force areas, ethnic minority groups and people aged 16-24. The response rate was 75% in 2004. In the case of non-response, no basic information was collected and no new target person was selected, but proxies were allowed in the case of language difficulties. Training of the interviewers, repeated calls and an advance letter containing a token

incentive were applied to reduce non-response. The sample was representative at national level and at first and second regional level.”

In 2001, the BCS included a detailed self-completion questionnaire designed to ascertain the extent and nature of domestic violence, sexual assault and stalking for England and Wales. It also included questions on sexual assault against men, as well as questions allowing a clear distinction between different forms of sexual assault and the overlaps between domestic violence, sexual assault and stalking. A national representative sample of 22,463 women and men aged 16-59 were asked, via a computerised self-completion questionnaire (CASI), whether they had been subject to domestic violence, sexual assault or stalking during their lifetime and during the preceding year. Those who had been subject to such incidents were asked details about their experiences, enabling distinctions to be made between levels and overlaps of the three forms of violence, the identification of risk factors associated with such violence, the impact it had on people's lives, and the manner in which people sought help. Self-completion modules on domestic violence (1996 BCS), sexual victimisation (1998 and 2000 BCS) and stalking (1998 BCS) have also been included in different waves of the BCS.

At the local level, Hough (2009) notes that the first victimisation survey was conducted in the early 1970s, in London, by the Institute of Criminology of Cambridge, and it was funded by the Home Office (Sparks, Genn & Dodd, 1977) . In 1975, another survey was conducted in the city of Sheffield, whose results were published twelve years later (Bottoms, Mawby & Walker, 1987). Subsequently, a survey on crime, victimisation, police and fear of crime was conducted in London (Smith, 1983). Other victimisation surveys, with a methodology inspired by the BCS, were conducted in the county of Nottingham (Farrington & Dowds, 1985), in Merseyside (Kinsey, 1984) and in the London Borough of Islington (Jones, MacLean & Young, 1986). In 2002, the survey conducted by Smith (1983) was replicated, adapting it slightly in order to use with a subsample of the BCS in London (Fitzgerald et al., 2002).

It should be mention that the Youth Lifestyle Survey is a survey on self-reported crime, but includes also questions on victimisation experienced by the people surveyed. So far, this survey has been conducted twice, in 1992-3 and in 1998-9, with subsamples of the BCS corrected to include younger individuals, and using PAPI. The samples were composed by young people aged 14 to 25 and 12 to 30 respectively. Thus, for the 1998-9 survey, 4,848 youths were interviewed and the response rate was 69% (Flood Page et al., 2000).

England and Wales participated in 1994 in the first round of the ICBS/ICCS A total of 7,558 companies were interviewed. A random sample was drawn from the business population, stratified according to the size and type of business (using a random selection of companies of 1-10 and 11 or more employees in the retail trade). CATI methodology was used. Response rate was between 82% for companies with 1-10 employees and 77% for companies with 11 or more employees. The survey was carried out by the Home Office and placed under the responsibility of the Dutch Ministry of Justice. In England and Wales, this survey was renamed as the Commercial Victimisation Survey and was repeated in 2002 with some methodological changes (Shury et al., 2005). In this case, the sample included 6,516 companies surveyed by telephone (CATI), and a qualitative study based on 40 interviews was added. For telephone interviews, the

response rate was 61% and the average length was 20 minute per interview. A third edition of this survey is currently being planned.

In 2008 England conducted in 2008 the EU-MIDIS with a sample of 1,042 individuals with Central and Eastern European origins. The sample covered the city of London, and the response rate was 21%.

Northern Ireland⁸²

Northern Ireland participated four times in the ICVS, in 1989, 1996, 2000 and 2005 (EU ICS). The samples were respectively of 2,000, 1,042, 1,565, and 2,002 households. The response rate for 1989 is not available, but in 1996, 2000, and 2005 the response rates were 84%, 81%, and 41% respectively. The surveys were conducted using CATI methodology.

The country also conducts periodically the Northern Ireland National Crime Survey (NICS). This survey was conducted in 1994/95, 1998, 2001 and 2003/4 with samples of approximately 3,000 households, representative at the national level, and using CAPI and CASI methodology. Since 2005, the survey is continuous –following the model of the BCS in England and Wales– and the sample includes 6,420 households in which one person aged 16 or older is randomly selected and interviewed. The questionnaire of the NICS follows closely the one used for the BCS.

Scotland

Scotland participated four times in the ICVS, in 1989, 1996, 2000 and 2005 (EU ICS) with samples of 2,007, 2,194, 2,040, and 2,010 households, and obtained response rates of 41%, 63%, 58%, and 47% respectively. The surveys were conducted using CATI methodology.

According to the Scottish Government (2009): “Crime surveys have been carried out in Scotland since the early 1980s. In 1982 and 1988, the SCS formed part of the BCS. In 1993, however, the first independent SCS was run in Scotland and was repeated in 1996, 2000 and 2003. The SCS is referred to by the year in which data were collected rather than the year to which the data refer. In June 2004, the Scottish Executive commissioned the Scottish Crime and Victimisation Survey (SCVS), a new survey of victimisation in Scotland. In two distinct ways the SCVS was significantly different from previous sweeps of the SCS that had been undertaken in Scotland since 1993. First, the sample size was increased from 5,000 interviews every three years to an annual sample of 27,000 with continuous interviewing. More importantly, the survey method was changed from a face to face survey to a telephone survey (CATI). These changes were the outcome of a fundamental review of the SCS undertaken in 2003 and the change of data collection method represented the potential for change in the data series established by the SCS. Reflecting this, the Scottish Executive commissioned MORI Scotland and TNS Social to undertake a parallel face to face survey designed as a repeat of the previous waves of the SCS, although with a smaller sample of 3,000 interviews, to provide a measure of victimisation against which the telephone survey could be compared. In addition to the 3,000 full SCS interviews, 2,000 additional short

82 Main source: Northern Ireland Statistics & Research Agency (2009), Statistics and Research Branch of the Northern Ireland Office (2009)

interviews were conducted to bring the total number of adults providing the self-completion data that had been a feature of the previous SCS up to 5,000.”

In April 2008, the Scottish Crime and Justice Survey (SCJS) replaced the SCVS. Interviews for the SCJS began in April 2008 and ran continuously until March 2010. The survey involved interviewing a random sample of adults in 16,000 households across Scotland per year (Scottish Government, 2009).

The SCJS follows the BCS and NICS (see the chapter on Northern Ireland) in moving to a continuous collection methodology, and the questionnaire is similar but not identical to that of the BCS (Hough and Norris, 2008).

SUMMARY OF THE SITUATION IN EUROPE

Table 5 summarises the information presented in this article. It indicates the participation of each country in international and European surveys (ICVS, EU-ICS, ICVS-2 pilot studies, pilot study on the EU victimisation survey module in 2009, Eurobarometer, IVAWS, ICBS / ICCS, and the pilot study and EU-MIDIS survey), national periodical and non-periodical surveys on household and personal victimisation, businesses victimisation, and violence against women. The table also shows the methodology used for data collection, introducing a distinction between CATI and other methodologies.

Table 5 uses the following abbreviations in the heading:

ICVS : International Crime Victims Survey, EU ICS, Pilots ICVS-2

Pilot EU 2009 : Pilot Study on the EU victimisation survey module

EB : Euro-barometer

N.S. periodical : Periodical National Survey

N.S. non-periodical : Other national surveys (non periodical)

ICBS : International Crime Business Survey (ICBS/ ICCS)

N.S. Business National Crime Business Survey

IVAWS : International Violence Against Women Survey

N.S. VAW : National surveys on violence against women

EU : MIDIS : European Union Minorities and Discrimination Survey

CATI : Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing

Other : Other than CATI method of interviewing

Table 5: Summary of Victimization Surveys in Europe.

Country	ICVS	Pilot EU 2009	EB	N. S. Periodical	N. S. Non Periodical	ICBS	N. S. Business	IVAWS	N. S Violence Against Women	EU-MIDIS	CATI	Other
Austria	1996 2005	Yes	1996 1999 2000 2002 2010	No	No	No	No	No	No	Pilot Study (2007) 2008	Yes	CAPI
Belgium	1989 1992 2000 2005	No	1996 1999 2000 2002 2010	Security Monitor: 1997; (biannual since 1998) APS-SCV (annual since 1996) (Flanders)	No	No	No	No	No	Pilot Study (2007) 2008	Yes	
Bulgaria	1997 2002 2004	No	2010	IVCS: 2005 2007 2008 2009	2004	2000	2002 2004 2005	No	No	Pilot Study (2007) 2008	No	PAPI
Cyprus	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	2008	No	CAPI CASI PAPI
Czech Republic	1992 1996 2000	Yes	2010	No	2000 2001 2002 2003 2004 2006	1994	No	No	No	2008	Yes	PAPI

Country	ICVS	Pilot EU 2009	EB	N. S. Periodical	N. S. Non Periodical	ICBS	N. S. Business	IVAWS	N. S. Violence Against Women	EU-MIDIS	CATI	Other
Denmark	2000 2005 Piloto ICVS- 2 2010	Yes	1996 1999 2000 2002 2010	National Victimization Survey. Started in 1996. (Annual since 2005)	2007	No	No	2003	No	2008	Yes	
Estonia	1993 1995 2000 2004 2009	No	2010	ICVS: 1993 1995 2000 2005 2009	No	No	1998	No	No	2008	No	CAPI
Finland	1989 1992 1996 2000 2005	Yes	1996 1999 2000 2002 2010	Finnish National Safety Survey: 1980 1988 1993 1997 2003 2006 2009	No	1994	1996 1997	No	1997 2005	2008	Yes	F to F
France	1989 1996 2000 2005	No	1996 1999 2000 2002 2010	Living Conditions of Households Survey (annual from 1996 to 2006) Framework of Live and Security (annual since 2005)	1986	1994	No	No	2000	2008	Yes	CAPI

Country	ICVS	Pilot EU 2009	EB	N. S. Periodical	N. S. Non Periodical	ICBS	N. S. Business	IVAWS	N. S. Violence Against Women	EU-MIDIS	CATI	Other
Germany	1989 2005 Pilots ICVS- 2 2008-9 2010	Yes	1996 1999 2000 2002 2010	No	1991 1992 1995 1997 2003	1994	No	No	No	2008	Yes	
Greece	1991 2005	No	1996 1999 2000 2002 2010	No	2001	No	No	2003	No	2008	Yes	F to F
Hungary	1996 2005	Yes	2010	No	2004 2006	1994 2000	No	No	No	2008	Yes	F to F
Ireland	2005	No	1996 1999 2000 2002 2010	The Quarterly National Households Survey (1998, 2003, 2006 2009) Garda Public Attitudes Survey (annual since 2002)	1996	No	No	No	No	2008	Yes	F to F

Country	ICVS	Pilot EU 2009	EB	N. S. Periodical	N. S. Non Periodical	ICBS	N. S. Business	IVAWS	N. S. Violence Against Women	EU-MIDIS	CATI	Other
Italy	1992 2005	Yes	1996 1999 2000 2002 2010	The Italian Citizens' Safety Survey (every five years since 1997-98) Everyday Life Aspects (annual from 1993 to 2003)	1991	1994	No	No	2006	Pilot Study (2007) 2008	Yes	PAPI
Latvia	1995 1998 2000	Yes	2010	No	No	No	No	No	No	2008	Yes	CAPI
Lithuania	1996/7 2000 2005	Yes	2010	No	No	2000	No	No	No	2008	No	PAPI CAPI
Luxembourg	2005	No	1996 1999 2000 2002 2010	No	2007	No	No	No	No	2008	Yes	F to F
Malta	1997	No	2010	No	No	No	No	No	No	2008	No	F to F

Country	ICVS	Pilot EU 2009	EB	N. S. Periodical	N. S. Non Periodical	ICBS	N. S. Business	IVAWS	N. S Violence Against Women	EU-MIDIS	CATI	Other
Netherlands	1989 1992 1996 2000 2005 Piloto ICVS 2 2010	No	1996 1999 2000 2002 2010	National Victimization Surveys (periodical from 1974 to 1980) Crime Victim Survey (ESM) (periodical from 1980 to 2005). Permanent Survey on Living Conditions (periodical from 1980 to 2005) National Security Monitor (annual from 2005 to 2008) Integral Security Monitor (annual since 2009) Police Monitor (From 1993 to 2001 every second year. Since 2001 yearly)	No	1994	Annual since 2004	No	1986 1996 1997 2009	2008	Yes	CAPI
Poland	1989 1992 1996 2000 2004	Yes	2010	No	No	No	No	2004	No	2008	No	PAPI

Country	ICVS	Pilot EU 2009	EB	N. S. Periodical	N. S. Non Periodical	ICBS	N. S. Business	IVAWS	N. S. Violence Against Women	EU-MIDIS	CATI	Other
Portugal	2000 2004	Yes	1996 1999 2000 2002 2010	No	1991 1992 1994	No	No	No	No	2008	Yes	CAPI
Romania	1996 2000	No	2010	Living Conditions Survey (2001-2006)	No	2000	No	No	No	Pilot Study (2007) 2008	No	PAPI
Slovakia	1992 1997	Yes	2010	No	No	No	No	No	No	Pilot Study (2007) 2008		F to F
Slovenia	1992 1996 2001	Yes	2010	No	No	No	No	No	No	2008	Yes	CAPI
Spain (National level)	1989 2005	Yes	1996 1999 2000 2002 2010	No	2009	No	No	No	1999 2002 2006	2008	yes	CAPI
Spain (Catalonia)	1996 2000	Yes	See Spain	Survey on Public Security in Catalonia (annual since 1999).	No	No	No	No	See Spain	2008	Yes	CAP

Country	ICVS	Pilot EU 2009	EB	N. S. Periodical	N. S. Non Periodical	ICBS	N. S. Business	IVAWS	N. S Violence Against Women	EU-MIDIS	CATI	Other
Sweden	1992 1996 2000 2005 Pilots ICVS-2 2008-9 2010	Yes	1996 1999 2000 2002 2010	Living Conditions Survey (annual since 1978) Swedish Crime Survey (annual since 2006)	No	No	No	No	1999/ 2000	2008	Yes	CAWI PAPI
United Kingdom	1989 1996 2000 2004 Pilots ICVS-2 2008-9 2010	No	1996 1999 2000 2002 2010	British Crime Survey (periodical from 1982)	No	1994	No	No	No	2008	Yes	CAPI CAWI CASI
United Kingdom: England and Wales	1989 1992 1996 2000 2005	No	See United Kingdom	British Crime Survey (continuous since 2001)	No	1994	No	No	No	2008	Yes	CASI CAPI PAPI CAWI
United Kingdom: Northern	1989 1996 2000	No	See United Kingdom	Northern Ireland's Crime Survey (periodical since 1994)	No	No	No	No	No	2008	Yes	CASI CAPI

Country	ICVS	Pilot EU 2009	EB	N. S. Periodical	N. S. Non Periodical	ICBS	N. S. Business	IVAWS	N. S. Violence Against Women	EU-MIDIS	CATI	Other
Ireland	2005		m									
United Kingdom: Scotland	1989 1996 2000 2005	No	See United Kingdom	Scottish Crime Survey (periodical since 1993)	No		No	No	No	2008	Yes	CAPI CASI