

W

C

# Criminal Victimisation in Seventeen Industrialised Countries

## 187

### Onderzoek en beleid

De reeks Onderzoek en beleid omvat de rapporten van door het Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek- en Documentatiecentrum van het ministerie van Justitie verricht onderzoek. Opname in de reeks betekent niet noodzakelijk de inhoud van de rapporten het goedkeuren van de minister van Justitie weergeeft.

Key findings from the 2000  
International Crime Victims  
Survey

**John van Kesteren**  
**Pat Mayhew**  
**Paul Nieuwbeerta**

NSCR

Justitie



Wetenschappelijk  
Onderzoek- en  
Documentatiecentrum

## Preface

The International Crime Victims Survey (ICVS) began development in 1987 to further international comparative research. The first survey in 1989 was restricted to fifteen industrialised countries and the cities of Surabaya (Indonesia) and Warsaw (Poland). With the second round of the ICVS, in 1992, its scope expanded through the involvement of UNICRI (the United Nations Interregional Criminal Justice Research Institute), which has developed the survey into a global project covering all continents.

The ICVS has two main features. First, it is a formidable instrument for monitoring crime and perceptions of crime and criminal justice across the world in a standardised way, independently of information from official sources. The results of the ICVS have in many instances provided balance to what has sometimes been ideologically slanted national discourse on crime and criminal justice. The unique value of the ICVS is reflected in the growing interest that key international organisations take in it – for instance the World Health Organisation, the World Bank, the European Commission and the World Society of Victimology. From its first charting of crime in industrialised countries, it moved into Eastern Europe countries in transition from centrally guided to free market economies. Here, it provided crucial research-based information on changes in crime and perceptions of it in a transitional period. In several countries, including Poland, ICVS participation evolved into fully-fledged national crime surveys. The ICVS has had a similar influence in Africa, Asia and Latin America – and its potential here is likely to grow more.

The second main feature of the ICVS is that it provides a wealth of data for researchers interested in the patterns, contours and effects of victimisation in both the developed countries and the rest of the world – which had previously gained less attention. The ICVS has unquestionably both deepened and broadened the empirical of victimology.

This is the first of a number of reports on the 2000 ICVS. A report will follow from UNICRI focussing on Central and Eastern European countries and how they compare with Western Europe. After this, UNICRI will report on Southern Africa.

### **The ICVS Working Group**

The Working Group has changed composition somewhat over time as the survey has developed. Jan van Dijk was the key member of the original ICVS Working Group and

has been closely involved in all three previous sweeps of the survey. He also led the work on getting the latest, 2000 ICVS, off the ground. With his appointment as head of the United Nations' Centre for International Crime Prevention in Vienna, he continued his support for the 2000 ICVS in an advisory role.

We are pleased that NSCR (Netherlands Institute for the Study of Criminality and Law Enforcement) in Leiden recently joined the Working Group. NSCR was willing to take responsibility for the co-ordination of the surveys in 2000 in industrialised countries, and the current management of the complete ICVS database. We hope their involvement will ensure continuity of the ICVS project.

The ICVS Working Group

## Acknowledgements

Many different organisations and individuals have played a part in the ICVS. Thanks are due first to the Dutch Ministry of Justice for funding the overall organisation of the ICVS and data management. Fieldwork in each of the seventeen countries in the 2000 ICVS has been financed by their Criminal Justice ministries or research institutes. We are grateful to them.

The surveys were overseen by national co-ordinators who prepared translations of the English-based questionnaire and carried the burden of work in getting the survey into the field and supervising progress. Their support was invaluable. We are also much indebted to Interview-NSS, the overall contractor for the majority of the ICVS 2000 surveys, as they were in 1989, 1992 and 1996. The research team consisted of Peter Willems, Marco Sodderland, Ambika Lucassen and Nefta Helderop. They did a great deal of work rigorously checking questionnaires and preparing the computer-programmed version of these. They also supervised the performance of sub-contracted local firms, and oversaw data preparation and the production of technical reports. The expertise and experience of Interview-NSS as regards the ICVS has played crucial role in its success.

Our thanks also extend to the numerous the interviewers involved in the 2000 sweep, and to all the respondents – nearly 40,000 – who agreed to take part.

A large number of colleagues from many countries have helped in developing the ICVS over the years. Special thanks are due to Anna Alvazzi del Frate from UNICRI. Her work on the methodology of the face-to-face surveys outside the industrialised world has been invaluable. Furthermore, her enthusiasm for the ICVS project as a whole has been inspiring.

We are also thankful to Gerben Bruinsma, Marita Kok, Marianne Sampiemon, Huub Simons and Antonia Verweij who played a valuable part in preparing this report.

The authors

## About the authors

John van Kesteren was researcher at the Department of Criminal Law and Criminology, at Leiden University, the Netherlands, when this report was prepared. He is now a research officer at UNICRI (United Nations Interregional Crime and Justice Research Institute), Turino, Italy.

Pat Mayhew heads the Patterns of Crime section in the Crime and Criminal Justice Unit of the Research, Development and Statistics Directorate of the Home Office, London, United Kingdom.

Paul Nieuwebeerta is senior researcher at the NSCR (Netherlands Institute for the Study of Criminality and Law Enforcement), Leiden, the Netherlands.

# Summary

The International Crime Victimization Survey (ICVS) is the most far-reaching programme of fully standardised sample surveys looking at householders' experience of crime in different countries. The first ICVS took place in 1989, the second in 1992, the third in 1996 and the fourth in 2000. Surveys have been carried out in 24 industrialised countries since 1989, and in 46 cities in developing countries and countries in transition. This report deals with seventeen industrialised countries which took part in the 2000 ICVS.

The reason for setting up the ICVS was the inadequacy of other measures of crime across country. Figures of offences recorded by the police are problematic due to differences in the way the police define, record and count crime. And since victims report most crimes the police know about, police figures can differ simply because of differences in reporting behaviour. It is also difficult to make comparisons of independently organised crime surveys, as these differ in design and coverage. For the countries covered in this report, interviews were mainly conducted by telephone (with samples selected through variants of random digit dialling). The overall response rate in the 17 countries was 64%. Samples were usually of 2,000 people, which mean there is a fairly wide sampling error on the ICVS estimates. The surveys cannot, then, give precise estimates of crime in different countries. But they are a unique source of information and give good comparative information.

Each participating country paid for its own fieldwork. The Dutch Ministry of Justice also provided financial assistance for overheads. Technical aspects of the surveys in many countries were co-ordinated by a Dutch company, Interview-NSS, who sub-contracted fieldwork to local survey companies. The NSCR and Leiden University managed survey results.

The results in this report relate mainly to respondents' experience of crime in 1999, the year prior to the 2000 survey. Those interviewed were asked about crimes they had experienced, whether or not reported to the police. The main results follow.

## Overall victimisation

- The ICVS allows an overall measure of victimisation which is the percentage of people victimised once or more in the previous year by *any* of the eleven crimes covered by the survey. This prevalence measure is a simple but robust indicator of overall proneness to crime. The countries fall into three bands.
  - Above 24% (victim of any crime in 1999): Australia, England and Wales, the Netherlands and Sweden

- 20%-24%: Canada, Scotland, Denmark, Poland, Belgium, France, and USA
- Under 20%: Finland, Catalonia (Spain), Switzerland, Portugal, Japan and Northern Ireland.
- For countries in previous sweeps of the ICVS, the present results generally mirror previous ones as regards relative rankings.
- In terms of the *number* of crimes experienced per 100 people (an incidence rate), the picture is slightly different. The USA fares relatively worse on incidence rates than on prevalence rates. In contrast, the position of Denmark and Canada slip down somewhat. Incidence rates are highest in England and Wales, Australia and the Netherlands.

#### **Car-related crime**

- The risk of having a car stolen was highest in England and Wales (2.6% of owners had a theft), Australia (2.1%), and France (1.9%). Japan, Switzerland, Catalonia, the USA, Finland, and the Netherlands show risks of 0.5% or less.
- Those in Poland, Japan, Belgium and the Netherlands were least likely to get their cars back – indicating proportionately more professional theft. Recovery rates were above 80% in Sweden, Australia, and the USA – indicating more thefts for ‘joyriding’. In the eleven countries with surveys in 1996 and 2000, there is little change in the proportion of stolen cars recovered, but it is now lower than it was in 1992, probably indicating a general move towards more professional theft since then.
- Having something stolen *from* a car (e.g., luggage, radios, car mirrors etc.) was more common. Highest risks were in Poland (9% of owners had one or more theft), England and Wales (8%), Australia (7%) and the USA (7%). Risks were lowest in Denmark, Finland, the Netherlands, Switzerland and Japan: 4% or less were victimised.
- Car vandalism was most common in Scotland (12% of owners had their car damaged), Poland, England and Wales, the Netherlands and Australia (about 10%-11%). Risks were low in Northern Ireland, Japan, Denmark and Switzerland (less than 5%). Countries with higher rates of car vandalism generally had higher rates of thefts from cars, but the association between vandalism and thefts of cars was weaker.

#### **Motorcycle theft**

- Highest risks of motorcycle and moped theft were in Denmark and England and Wales (4% of owners were victimised). Although Japan has low risks for most crimes, thefts of motorcycles was comparatively high (3%).

### **Bicycle theft**

- For bicycle theft, the highest risks were in Japan, Sweden, the Netherlands and Denmark (about 8% of owners had a bicycle taken).
- The 2000 ICVS results suggest – as in previous years – that bicycle theft is highest in countries where there are most bicycles owned: ie, a plentiful supply of targets encourages rather than dampens theft demand. Also, where bicycle theft is common, stealing cars occurs less often – though the relationship is rather less strong than in earlier ICVS sweeps.

### **Burglary**

- The proportion of households who had a completed or attempted burglary was highest in Australia (7%), England and Wales (5%), Canada, Denmark and Belgium (all 4%).
- The pattern of relative risk is reasonably similar whether the focus is on burglary with entry or attempts. Where burglars are successful in gaining entry, they are also more active in trying to do so.
- Nonetheless, the proportion of burglaries that involved attempts varied somewhat by country. More attempts at entry failed in Finland, France, Belgium, Scotland, the Netherlands, England and Wales, Switzerland and the USA (all had above 50% attempts). With the exception of Finland, the ICVS evidence suggests that homes in these countries are better protected by security devices. This may explain why burglars more often fail to gain entry.

### **Theft of personal property**

- Thefts of personal property will be heterogeneous in nature, but the highest risks were in Australia, Sweden, and Poland (about 5%-6% of people were victimised).
- In roughly a third of thefts, the victim was carrying what was stolen – termed ‘pickpocketing’. Risks of pickpocketing were most common in Poland (4%). Risks were also comparatively high in Belgium, the Netherlands, Denmark, Catalonia, and England and Wales (about 2%). As previous sweeps have found, risks were lowest outside Europe: in Japan, Canada, and the USA.

### **Contact crime**

- An overall measure of contact crime was taken as robbery, assaults with force, and sexual assaults (against women only). The highest risks were in Australia, England and Wales, Canada, Scotland and Finland: over 3% were victims. This

was more than double the level in USA, Belgium, Catalonia, Portugal, and Japan (all under 2%). In Japan the risk of contact crime was especially low (0.4%).

### **Robbery**

- Robbery was comparatively uncommon in all countries. Risks were highest in 1999 in Poland (1.8%), England and Wales, and Australia (both 1.2%). By far the lowest risks were in Japan and Northern Ireland (0.1%).
- On average, just over a third of victims of robbery said the offender(s) carried a weapon of some sort – in most cases a knife. There was a higher than average use of weapons in the USA, Catalonia, Scotland, and Portugal. Although not very statistically robust, the data indicate that guns were used relatively more often in Catalonia and the USA.

### **Sexual incidents**

- Two types of sexual incidents were measured: offensive sexual behaviour and sexual assault (i.e. incidents described as rape, attempted rape or indecent assaults). For all countries combined, just over one per cent of women reported offensive sexual behaviour. The level was half that for sexual assaults.
- Women in Sweden, Finland, Australia and England and Wales were most at risk of sexual assault. Women in Japan, Northern Ireland, Poland and Portugal were least at risk. Many of the differences in sexual assault risks across country were small. Generally, the relative level of sexual assault in different countries accorded with relative levels of offensive sexual behaviour – though there were a few differences.
- Women know the offender(s) in about half of the all sexual incidents: in a third they were known by name, and in about a sixth by sight. (More assaults involved offenders known by name than did incidents of offensive sexual behaviour.) Most sexual incidents involved only one offender. Weapons were very rarely involved.

### **Assaults and threats**

- Taking all countries together, 3.5% were victims once or more of assaults or threats in 1999. Risks were highest in Australia, Scotland, England and Wales (about 6%) and Canada (5%). Risks were lowest in Japan, Portugal, (under 1%) and Catalonia (1.5%).
- Offenders were known in about half the incidents overall. Men were less likely to know offenders than women. Weapons (especially knives) were said to have been used (if only as a threat) in just under a quarter of incidents.

### Country profiles of crime

- Taking all countries together, car vandalism forms a full quarter of crimes experienced by ICVS respondents. Car vandalism – together with thefts of and from cars – means that over 40% of ICVS crimes involve cars.
- Contact crimes comprise about a quarter of the crimes measured, most of them assault and threats. Motorcycle and bicycle theft, burglaries, and thefts of personal property each contributed just over 10% overall. The largest difference between countries was with regard to the bicycle theft 'share', reflecting varying ownership rates.
- The make-up of crime differs across country. Catalonia and Portugal stand out against the norm in having a crime problem dominated by incidents involving cars: rather more than 60% of all the crimes counted. Japan was also unusual in that 40% of the crime counted by the ICVS involved thefts of two-wheelers. The distinctive feature of Finland was the unusually high share of all crime that sexual incidents accounted for (over a quarter).

### Crime seriousness

- Victims were asked to assess the seriousness of what happened. Mean seriousness scores were computed for different offence types. Car thefts where the car was not recovered were viewed most seriously. Next most serious were sexual assaults, then car thefts even if the car was recovered, and robbery involving a weapon. Assaults with force were scored much on a par with burglaries with entry. The least serious crimes were car vandalism, theft from cars, and bicycle theft. Results in previous ICVS sweeps were similar.
- Overall mean score did not differ much by country. This suggests that people in different countries have similar attitudinal thresholds about the seriousness of different crimes. It also suggests people do not differ very greatly in the *types* of incidents they tell interviewers about. The *ranking* of offences in seriousness terms were also very similar, again indicating a high degree of consensus about the import of conventional crimes.
- We corrected the victimisation rates for crime seriousness to see how countries fared on a crime count taking seriousness into account. It did not greatly alter the 'burden of crime' picture from other measures. Australia, England and Wales, the Netherlands and Sweden still remain most pressured by crime. However, Denmark and Canada fall back in the relative order when seriousness is taken into account, while the USA and Northern Ireland go higher up the list.

### Trends in crime

- Generally speaking, the ICVS suggests that crime rose between 1988 and 1991, stabilised or fell in 1995, then fell back more in 1999. This is the dominant pattern in many individual countries.
- The picture in North America differs from that in Europe. Crime levels are lower than in 1988. In the three European countries with four ICVS measures (England and Wales, Finland, and the Netherlands), crime levels are still higher than in 1988. Compared to 1991, risks also fell more in North America than in five of the seven European countries showing falls.
- Since 1995, there has been more consistent falls in property crime. Changes in violent crime are variable.

### Differences in risks of crime

- Risks for different social groups were examined using multivariate analysis. All 17 countries were taken together.
- Those in the *largest conurbations* (of populations over 100,000) were most at risk. Net of other effects, risks were 60% higher in the most urban areas compared to the least urbanised ones. The biggest differentials were for sexual incidents and thefts of and from cars ('car thefts').
- Households with *higher incomes* were more at risk than poorer ones – by a third. The biggest differential was for car thefts. The difference for burglary was lowest (higher income households were about 10% more at risk). The analysis here is focused on *individual* risks rather than area ones. In poorer neighbourhoods, households *in general* might have higher risk, but more affluent households nonetheless emerge as the most vulnerable. They may offer more 'criminal rewards'.
- *Younger respondents* were more at risk than older ones. Risks of all ICVS crimes were well over double than for those aged 55 or more.
- *Those who went out more* frequently were rather more vulnerable – by about 20%.
- Those who were *unmarried* were also more at risk, net of other effects. Risks of contact crime were double than those for people in permanent relationships.
- For robbery and assaults and threats *men* were about 20% more at risk than women were.

### Reporting to the police

- Nearly all cars and motorcycles stolen were reported, as were burglaries with entry. About two-thirds of thefts from cars and bicycle thefts were reported, but

on average only nearly half of attempted burglaries and robberies were. Reporting rates for other crime types were lower.

- We took six crime types to look at differences in reporting levels. The highest reporting rates were in Denmark and Sweden, Northern Ireland, the Netherlands (60% or just under). Reporting was also relatively common in Belgium, England and Wales, Switzerland, France and Scotland (above 50%). Crimes were least often reported in Portugal, Japan, Catalonia, and Poland (less than 40%).
- The most common reason for *not* reporting in all countries was that the incident was 'not serious enough' or there was 'no loss'. (Five crimes were considered.) The idea that the police could do nothing about what happened also featured fairly frequently. Few victims mentioned fear or dislike of the police as a reason for reporting, though it was more common in relation to contact crime.
- Victims were also asked why they *did* report. Victims of sexual incidents and assaults and threats were most concerned to stop what happened being repeated. For burglaries with entry and thefts from cars, more than a third reported because they wanted help in getting property back, and a third did so for insurance reasons. Four in ten victims referred to the civic obligation to notify the police.

#### **Victim support**

- The majority of victims were satisfied with how the police responded to their crime report. Highest levels of satisfaction were in Denmark, Catalonia and Switzerland. The police response was considered least good in Portugal, Poland, France and Japan.
- The main reason for being unhappy with the police response was that they 'they did not do enough': half complained about this. About a third felt that the police 'were not interested'.
- Some victims were asked whether they got help from a specialised victim support agency. Support was more often given to victims of contact crimes (10% were offered help) than to victims of burglary (5%). Victims in the UK were offered most support. There were also comparatively high level of support in the Netherlands, Canada, Sweden, the USA, and Denmark. Least support seems to have been available to victims in Portugal, Japan, Finland, France and Poland.
- In most countries, around one in three burglary victims who had not been given help would have welcomed some. Four in ten victims of contact crime felt this too.

### **Police performance**

- People were asked to say whether or not the police did a good job in controlling crime in their area, and whether the police were helpful. Police performance was most favourably judged in the USA and Canada. Satisfaction levels were also comparatively high in Scotland and Australia. The poorest judgements were from this in Portugal, Poland the Netherlands, Japan and Catalonia.
- In most countries, police performance was judged less favourably after 1988. But compared to the 1996 ICVS, police performance was rated more highly in 2000 in all but one (Sweden) of 11 countries with measures for both years.

### **Anxiety about burglary**

- On average, nearly a third of people felt they were likely or very likely to be burgled in the coming year. Those in Portugal (58%), Belgium, and France (about 45%) were most pessimistic. There was least concern in the Scandinavian countries, the USA, and the Netherlands (under 20% thought a burglary was likely).
- Concern about burglary rose between the 1989 and 1992 ICVS, and has since fallen – although a few countries are exceptions. Falling perceptions of the likelihood of burglary broadly match trends in ICVS burglary levels.

### **Safety on the streets**

- When asked how safe they feel walking alone in their area after dark, on average just under a quarter felt very or a bit unsafe. Those in Catalonia, Australia and Poland were most anxious (about a third felt a bit or very unsafe). Next highest levels were in Portugal and England and Wales. Feelings of vulnerability were lowest in the USA and Sweden, although there were several other countries with only marginally higher figures.
- Whereas anxiety about burglary to some extent matches national risks, feelings about street safety are not consistently related to levels of 'street trouble'. The lack of much relationship between anxiety and risks of street crime has been evident in previous ICVS results. It may mean that fear of street crime is determined by specific 'cultural' pressures.

### **Safety at home**

- A new question in the 2000 ICVS asked about safety at home. A much smaller proportion felt unsafe at home (6% overall felt a bit or very unsafe). Those in Poland felt most insecure (15%), followed by Portugal, Japan and Belgium.

### Home security

- Summary measures of home security were taken as the proportion of homes with burglar alarms and special door locks. The highest alarm ownership was in England and Wales, Australia, Scotland, the USA, Canada, and Belgium. Generally, countries with highest alarm ownership also had more homes with special door locks
- The use of preventive measures is increasing in most countries.

### Attitudes to punishment

- People were asked about the most appropriate sentence for a recidivist burglar aged 21. A community service order was seen the most appropriate sentence overall: 41% recommended it. But there was a wide spread of opinion. It was the first choice in half of the 16 countries considered, with support strongest in France, Catalonia (two-thirds recommending it), Belgium, Poland and Portugal (over half). Fewer than 30% opted for a community sentence in the UK, and fewer still in Japan and the USA.
- Imprisonment was recommended by 34% of respondents overall, and was the first choice in eight countries. Support for imprisonment in 2000 was strongest in the USA, the UK, and Japan (all with about half or more choosing it). Those in Catalonia and France were least in favour of imprisonment.
- The 2000 ICVS shows a general hardening of attitudes towards punishment, with increasing proportions supporting imprisonment. The most marked changes have been in Canada, England and Wales, Scotland, the Netherlands, and Sweden.



# Introduction

## 1.1 Background to the International Crime Victims Survey

The International Crime Victims Survey (ICVS) is now the most far-reaching programme of fully standardised surveys looking at householders' experience of crime in different countries. This chapter starts by looking at the rationale for the ICVS, and how it has developed. It then explains the methodology of the surveys conducted in 2000 in the 17 industrialised countries with which this report deals. Along the way here, it assesses the technical limitations of the survey, arguing that these need to be set against the value of the information the ICVS has provided.

The ICVS was set up to serve three main aims – and they remain as pertinent now as when the project started.

- *To provide an alternative to police information on levels of crime.* Offences recorded by the police are problematic for comparing crime in different countries. First, victims report the vast majority of incidents the police know about, and any difference in the propensity of victims to report undermines comparisons of the amount of crime counted by the police in different countries. Secondly, there may well be differences in the amount of reported crime which is actually recorded by the police in different countries. Thirdly, official police statistics vary because of differences in legal definitions, recording practices and rules for classifying and counting offences. These limitations are well-established (see, e.g., Council of Europe (1999) for a recent illustration).
- *To harness crime survey methodology for comparative purposes.* Over the past 20 years a number of countries have developed 'crime' or 'victim' surveys to assess national or local crime problems. They ask representative samples of the general public about selected offences they have experienced recently, whether or not they reported what happened to the police. For the offences they cover, then, they provide a 'truer' picture of how many people are affected by crime than the more filtered count from police statistics. For comparative purposes, though, these independently organised surveys are of limited use. The number of countries with appropriate surveys is limited, and comparisons are difficult anyway because of differences in survey design and administration, the types of victimisation measured, how exactly victimisation is asked about, and many other factors. A crucial feature of the ICVS is the use of a fully *standardised* questionnaire, as well as carefully controlled data management and analysis procedures.

Moreover, as the intention was to repeat the ICVS over time, it promised additional information in trends in crime in different countries.

- *To extend information on who is most affected by crime.* By collecting social and demographic information on respondents who take part, the ICVS also aimed to assess how crime risks vary for different groups, in terms of age, income levels and so on. Police statistics, generally speaking, provide little in the way of documenting the characteristics of victims. Moreover, with its cross-national perspective, the ICVS allows us to see how far the determinants and consequences of victimisation are the same in different jurisdictions, or whether country differences are evident.

## 1.2 The ICVS to date

The ICVS has been organised by an International Working Group of criminologists with expertise in victim survey methodology. The group was set up in 1987.<sup>1</sup> Additional national co-ordinators in each country have been responsible for the conduct of fieldwork, and where necessary for ensuring a sound translation of the questionnaire. (A list of national co-ordinators is in Appendix 1, paragraph 1.) In the main, each industrialised country has met its own survey costs, with much of the administrative overheads borne by the Dutch Ministry of Justice. The technical management of most of the surveys in industrialised countries has been carried out by InterView-NSS, a Dutch survey company. They sub-contracted fieldwork to survey companies in the participating countries, maintaining responsibility for the questionnaire, sample selection and interview procedures. The data from the surveys have been integrated and processed by researchers at Leiden University.

There have now been four main rounds of the ICVS in industrialised countries. Table 1 shows which countries have participated.

- *The 1989 sweep.* The first round of the ICVS took place in 1989, giving a measure of crime in 1988 (since respondents are principally asked about their experiences in the year preceding the interview). It covered 15 industrialised countries. These were mainly in Western Europe, but also covered Japan, Australia,

1 The Working Group has changed somewhat over time. The initial Group comprised Jan van Dijk (overall coordinator) of the Dutch Ministry of Justice, Pat Mayhew (of the British Home Office), and Martin Killias (University of Lausanne). Since the second sweep, there were two additional members: Ugljesa Zvekic and Anna Alvazzi del Frate, both of the United Nations Interregional Criminal Justice Research Institute (UNICRI) in Rome. For the fourth (2000) sweep of the ICVS, Gerben Bruinsma and Paul Nieuwebeerta of the Netherlands Institute for the Study of Criminality and Law Enforcement (NSCR) in Leiden joined the Working Group. John van Kesteren of the Leiden University has been in effect a 'de facto' member of the Working Group for some time, having had responsibility for managing the ICVS data.

Table 1 National ICVS surveys in industrialised countries

	1989	1992	1996	2000
Australia	•	•		•
Austria			•	
Belgium	•	•		•
Canada	•	•	•	•
Catalonia (Spain)				•
Denmark				•
England & Wales	•	•	•	•
Finland	•	•	•	•
France	•		•	•
Germany (West)	•			
Italy		•		
Japan <sup>1</sup>	•	•		•
Netherlands	•	•	•	•
New Zealand		•		
Northern Ireland	•		•	•
Norway	•			
Poland <sup>2</sup>		•	•	•
Portugal				•
Scotland	•		•	•
Spain	•			
Sweden		•	•	•
Switzerland	•		•	•
USA	•	•	•	•

1 Not all data are available for Japan.

2 Results for Poland were not reported in the report of the third ICVS in industrialised countries.

the USA and Canada. Key findings from the first sweep are reported in Van Dijk et al., 1990.

- *The 1992 sweep.* The second survey was in 1992 (measuring victimisation in 1991). Thirteen industrialised countries took part, including Czechoslovakia (see Van Dijk and Mayhew, 1992). At the same time, UNICRI (United Nations Interregional Criminal Justice Research Institute) in Rome started ICVS-compatible face-to-face surveys in non-industrialised countries. (For the most part, these surveys were at city level because elsewhere sampling frames were often inadequate, fieldwork was more difficult, and some of the victimisation questions (e.g., relating to car crime) less relevant.) UNICRI was keen to sensitise local governments to the dimensions and extent of crime in their urban areas,

especially as police data on crime was often poor.<sup>2</sup> (Key results are in Alvazzi del Frate et al., 1993, and Zvekic and Alvazzi del Frati, 1995.)

- *The 1996 sweep.* The third survey in industrialised countries was in 1996 (measuring victimisation in 1995). Twelve countries took part, eleven of them having taken part at least once before (see Mayhew and Van Dijk, 1997).<sup>3</sup> In tandem, city surveys in other parts of the world expanded further (see, e.g., Alvazzi del Frate, 1998, Hatalak et al., 1998, and Zvekic, 1998).
- *The 2000 sweep.* The fourth round of surveys in industrialised countries was in 2000 (measuring victimisation in 1999). Seventeen countries took part, fourteen of them having taken part at least once before. Alongside, there was further development of city surveys in non-industrialised countries. Table 2 in Appendix 1 shows the countries in which city surveys have been carried out to date outside industrialised countries.

At the time of writing, then, the ICVS had been conducted over a period of 12 years in 24 industrialised countries, with more than one sweep in many of them. Over a slightly shorter time span, there have also been surveys in 46 cities elsewhere around the world. All told, there have been about 140 singular surveys of the ICVS around the world. These have involved interviews with over 200,000 respondents, of which 110,000 were interviewed in industrialised countries.

Outside the management of the Working Group, the ICVS questionnaire has also been used in several other countries. We estimate that about 10 to 15 countries have done 'ICVS-type' surveys over the years where the ICVS questionnaire was used – albeit with possible changes in sampling procedures, survey administration, and precise wording of the questions.<sup>4</sup>

### 1.3 The content of the ICVS

The ICVS is similar to most crime surveys of householders with respect to the crime it covers. It is confined to counting crimes against clearly identifiable individuals, excluding children. (Crime surveys cannot easily cover organisational victims, or victimless crimes such as drug abuse.) For the crimes it covers, the ICVS asks about incidents that by and large accord with legal definitions of offences. In essence, it accepts respondents' accounts of what happened – or at least the accounts they are prepared to give to interviewers. In this respect, it applies a broader definition of

2 Surveys in developing countries and East and Central Europe were mostly funded by the Dutch government, the UK Home Office, and the United Nations on an ad-hoc bases.

3 Malta also had a national surveys in 1996, although no results were presented in the main 1996 survey report (Mayhew and Van Dijk, 1997).

4 Some items of the ICVS questionnaire have also been included in the Eurobarometer in 1996, at the request of the European Commission's Secretary General (INRA, 1996).

crime than the police – who, if incidents are reported to them, are likely to filter out those which may not be felt to merit the attention of the criminal justice system, or meet legal or organisational demands for reasonable evidence.

Respondents are asked about eleven main forms of victimisation. Household crimes (such as burglary) are those which can be seen as affecting the household at large, and respondents report on all incidents known to them. For personal crimes, they report on what happened to them personally. Respondents are asked first about their experience of crime over the last five years. Those who mention an incident of any particular type are asked when it occurred: in the current year (2000), in the last year (in this case 1999), or before that. Those who reported incidents in 1999 were asked how many times it had occurred. All those who said they had been victimised over the five-year period were asked a number of follow-up questions about what happened – whether the police were notified for instance. These questions were posed in relation to the ‘last incident’ if there had been more than one victimisation of a particular type. A few other crime-related questions are also included, asked of all respondents. They cover for instance, concern about crime, attitudes to the police, and what respondents would recommend as a sentence for a recidivist burglar. An overview of the main topics covered in the 2000 ICVS is in Table 2. Because of the longitudinal aspect of the ICVS, changes to the questionnaire have been a minimum. The most important change to the questionnaire for industrialised countries are:

- In 2000, an additional ‘screener’ question was added for assaults and threats. Respondents who, at the first screener question, said they had not been victimised were asked again if they have been attacked or threatened by someone they know. Since these incidents can be identified, it is possible to compare data from 2000 to previous sweeps.
- A question about consumer fraud was added in 1992 to broaden the base of crimes counted.
- Respondents were asked about their experiences of ‘street level’ corruption in the 1996 and 2000 sweeps. This was mainly to set the experience of those in industrialised countries alongside countries elsewhere, where corruption at street level is a greater problem. (For consumer fraud and corruption, respondents were simply asked about their experiences in the last year; they were not asked how often it occurred.)

A summary of the ICVS questionnaires and any changes between them is given in Appendix 3. This also shows the 2000 questionnaire in full. The English versions of the 1989, 1992, 1996 and 2000 questionnaires are available on the internet:

<http://www.icvs.nscr.nl>.

Table 2 Overview of questions asked in the ICVS

Victimisation in last 5 years	When (last year)	How often (last year)	Where	Reported to the police?	Details of report <sup>a</sup>	Reported to others?	Victim support	Seriousness	Additional crime specific questions
<i>Household crimes</i>									
Theft of car	•	•	•	•				•	.b
Theft from car	•	•	•	•	•			•	
Car vandalism	•	•	•	•				•	
Motorcycle / moped theft	•	•	•	•				•	
Bicycle theft	•	•	•	•				•	
Burglary	•		•	•	•		•	•	.c
Attempted burglary	•		•	•				•	
<i>Personal crimes</i>									
Robbery	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	.d
Theft of personal property	•	•	•	•				•	.e
Sexual incidents	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	.f
Assaults / threats + second screener	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	.f
<p>a Details of reports to the police are: why did you report; why did you not report; were you satisfied with the way the police dealt with the matter; why were you not satisfied.</p> <p>b Was the car recovered</p> <p>c Was something stolen; value of property stolen; was something damaged; value of damage</p> <p>d Was anything stolen; number of offenders; whether offender known; whether weapons used; what weapon.</p> <p>e Whether pickpocketing</p> <p>f What happened; was it considered a crime; number of offenders; whether offenders known; who was offender; was weapon used; what weapon</p>									
<i>Other offences</i>									
Consumer fraud	Last year (no 5 year data)			Type of fraud	Reported to police, other reports				
Corruption	Last year (no 5 year data)			Who was corrupt	Reported to police, other reports				
<i>Items on police, prevention and protection</i>					<i>Attitudes towards crime</i>				
Do police do a good job in local area					Perceived likelihood of being burgled				
Are the police helpful					Feelings of safety outside after dark				
Recommended sentence for burglar, and length of prison detention					Feelings of safety at home after dark				
Firearm ownership, type of firearm and reason for ownership					Causes of juvenile crime				
Security measures against burglary									
<i>Personal and household information</i>									
Age	Income level								
Gender	Satisfaction with income								
Household size	Marital status								
Town size	Social (going out) behaviour								
Type of house									
Vehicle ownership									
Occupation									
Years of formal education									

**Table 3** Overview of methodology of the 2000 ICVS in industrialised countries

	Sample size	Response rate	Method*	International co-ordination
Australia	2,005	58	CATI	NSCR – Leiden Univ
Belgium	2,402	56	CATI	Interview-NSS
Canada	2,078	57	CATI	Interview-NSS
Catalonia (Spain)	2,909	73	Telephone	NSCR – Leiden Univ
Denmark	3,007	66	CATI	Interview-NSS
England & Wales	1,947	57	CATI	Interview-NSS
Finland	1,783	77	CATI	NSCR – Leiden Univ
France	1,000	45	CATI	Interview-NSS
Japan	2,211	74	Face-to-face	NSCR – Leiden Univ
Netherlands	2,001	58	CATI	Interview-NSS
Northern Ireland	1,565	81	Face-to-face	Interview-NSS
Poland	5,276	78	Face-to face	NSCR – Leiden Univ
Portugal	2,000	56	CATI	Interview-NSS
Scotland	2,040	58	CATI	Interview-NSS
Sweden	2,000	66	CATI	Interview-NSS
Switzerland	4,234	65	CATI	NSCR – Leiden Univ
USA	1,000	60	CATI	Interview-NSS

\* CATI is Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing.

#### 1.4 The methodology of the ICVS 2000 in industrialised countries

##### *Fieldwork*

Fieldwork for the ICVS 2000 in eleven of the industrialised countries was organised by Interview-NSS, who sub-contracted interviewing work to survey organisations in each country albeit maintaining standardisation of the questionnaire and procedures. Fieldwork in the other six countries was organised by the national co-ordinators working closely with the University of Leiden to ensure standardisation. After fieldwork was completed, data from all surveys were checked by the University of Leiden, and merged into a single database.

Table 3 summarises how the 2000 ICVS was organised. It also shows sample sizes, the response rate, and mode of interview (there are further details below). Appendix 1 gives details of the national co-ordinators, and the agencies that provided funding.

##### *Sampling procedure*

In each country, a regionally well spread, random sample of households was taken. (In the case of countries using telephone interviews, this was by means of variants

of random dialling to landlines.) Within each household, one randomly selected respondent aged 16 or more was questioned.<sup>5</sup>

#### *Sample sizes*

To keep costs in check and encourage as full participation as possible, samples in all sweeps of the ICVS have been relatively modest by the standards of most national crime surveys. In the 17 surveys in industrialised countries in 2000, most had samples of 2,000 (see Table 3), although there were larger ones in Poland, Switzerland and Denmark, and smaller ones in the USA and France. The decision to accept relatively modest samples was carefully made. It was considered unrealistic to assume sufficient countries would participate if costs were too high (especially as some countries had their own national victimisation surveys). The value of the ICVS rests on the breadth of countries participating; this would have been considerably reduced if costs had been higher.

Modest sample sizes produce relatively large sampling error, but for straightforward comparisons of national risks, samples of 1,000 or more suffice to judge broad variations in levels of crime across country. (There is further discussion of statistical significance in Chapter 2.) Modest samples, however, restrict the scope for analysing issues about which a small proportion of the sample provides information.

#### *Mode of interview*

Most surveys in the 2000 ICVS were done by telephone. Interviewers used computers from which they read the questions and recorded answers – a procedure known as computer assisted telephone interviewing (CATI).<sup>6</sup> Telephone interviewing, and the CATI variant of it, has been increasingly used in victimisation surveys – for example, in Canada, the Netherlands, Switzerland, the USA, and England and Wales. For the ICVS, CATI was accepted as a sound technique for countries where telephone penetration is high. Cost is a major consideration. As important, though, is that CATI allows much tighter standardisation of questionnaire administration (see Killias, 1993).

In three countries, interviews were done face-to-face. In Poland and Northern Ireland, low telephone penetration was the reason for this. Face-to-face interviewing in Japan was chosen as the language is very visually oriented, and response cards offering choices of answer are particularly appropriate (Hamai, 2000).

5 Respondents were generally selected by the Troldahl-Carter method. No substitution of the selected respondent was allowed.

6 Up to five attempts on different times of the day were made to reach respondents. Those who made a 'soft refusal' were called back after about two weeks. Interviewers judged whether refusals were 'soft' or 'hard'.

One issue, for countries using telephone interviewing, is whether there is bias because non-telephone owners are omitted. At the time of the 2000 sweep, telephone penetration in the countries taking part was high. It was slightly lower in some countries at the time of the first ICVS. This allowed the possibility of bias both as regards counting victimisation and measuring attitudes over time. It is impossible to say for definite whether this was the case, but levels of telephone ownership in the 1989 ICVS did not relate to the experience of different crimes in any consistent way (Van Dijk et al., 1990). It is also the case that the characteristics of non-telephone owners (most of which will be related to income) may be more akin to those of respondents with whom it is harder to achieve a personal interview (cf. Aye Maung, 1995).

Another methodological issue is whether telephone interviews produce different results from face-to-face (personal) interviews. Methodological work has generally shown little difference in responses to telephone and face-to-face interviews (see Leeuw and Zouwen (1988) for a review of 28 studies). With respect to crime victimisation, Smith (1989) has argued that telephone interviews provide a higher degree of confidentiality and minimise interviewer effects for sensitive topics. The more general consensus is that the two modes produce similar results, as long as the same standards of fieldwork are applied.<sup>7</sup>

#### *Response rates*

Where telephone interviewing was used in the 2000 ICVS, the response rate was on average 66%. The lowest response was in France (45%), and the highest in Finland (77%). In the three countries where face-to-face interviews were done, responses rates were 81% (Northern Ireland), 78% (Poland), and 74% (Japan). Overall, the 2000 ICVS had a reasonably high response rate of 64%.<sup>8</sup> Response rates in all four sweeps of the ICVS are in Table 1 in Appendix 1.

A methodological issue, then, is how far respondents who are successfully interviewed differ from those who refuse to co-operate, or who cannot be reached. A related issue is to what extent cross-national variability in response levels upsets comparability. The issues are not straightforward. First, good (or poor) response may simply reflect survey company performance, saying little about the nature of those who are (or not) interviewed in terms of crime risks. Second, response rates may also reflect the willingness of those in different countries to be interviewed by

7 Tests in the context of the ICVS have produced mixed results about the 'productivity' of telephone versus personal interviews, but they have not provided any overriding strong evidence that victimisation counts are affected by interview mode. It cannot entirely be discounted, however, that some differences in results across country reflect differences in the acceptability of being questioned by phone.

8 This is much higher than the average response rate for the first sweep in 1989 and similar to the response rates in 1992 and 1996. Furthermore, the differences between countries in response rates are somewhat smaller.

phone (or face-to-face). Again this may be of little relevance in terms of the characteristics of those who are or who are not interviewed.

Third, though, there is the possibility that when response is low, bias is introduced. The effect could be in two opposing ways depending on whether low response is due to high non-contact rates, or high refusals rates.

- Where low response is due to high rates of *non-contact*, people are omitted who may be more liable to victimisation because they are residentially more unstable, or simply away from home more. Victims therefore could be *under-represented*, with the effect that victimisation risks in countries where non-contact is high is understated. The ICVS does not, however, allow a good test of contact rates and measured victimisation, since the meaning of non-contact with random digit dialling is diverse. Studies outside the victimisation field, though, indicate that non-contacts to telephone surveys register higher on 'negative' social indicators such as ill-health (e.g., Groves and Lyberg, 1988). Sparks et al.'s (1977) London crime survey, too, found that those who had reported crimes to the police were more difficult to locate for interview than those who did not report a crime.
- Surveys with low response rates due to high rates of *refusals*, on the other hand, may simply pick up people 'with more to say' (refusers having 'less to say'). On this view, victims would be *over-represented*, with the effect that victimisation risks in countries where refusal rates are higher are overestimated relative to those where response is better. A challenge to this comes from a test made in the context of the 1996 British Crime Survey. In this, people who said they did not want to be interviewed were pressed by interviewers to give some very short answers about the extent of their victimisation over the last year. (Most agreed to do so.) Comparing their 'crude' victimisation rates with those of respondents who agreed to be interviewed showed no consistent difference (Lynn, 1997).

As a test with the ICVS, leaving aside the distinction between refusals and non-contact, overall response rates in 54 sweeps were correlated with overall victimisation rates. There was a very slight tendency for risks to be lower in surveys with higher response rates, but the result was statistically insignificant ( $r=-0.19$ ; ns). It cannot be ruled out, though, that response effects work differently in different countries (such that a low response rate in one country influences the victimisation count in a way that does not occur in another). But the burden of the ICVS evidence is that countries with low response levels have neither inflated or deflated counts of victimisation relative to other countries.

### *Weighting*

Results in this report are based on data which have been weighted to make the samples as representative as possible of national populations aged 16 or more in

terms of gender, regional population distribution, age, and household composition. The weighting procedures in the 2000 ICVS are the same as in previous sweeps. Details are in Appendix 1.

#### *Response error*

Crime surveys are prone to various response errors. For one, certain groups (e.g., the better educated) seem more adept at remembering and articulating incidents of victimisation. Second, and more important, respondents may forget to report less serious incidents, or they may 'telescope in' the more serious incidents which happened outside the period they are asked about – although in the ICVS, this telescoping effect should be reduced by asking about experience over the past five years. Third, some people may fail to realise an incident is relevant, or may be reticent to talk about some incidents, for instance sexual incidents, or those involving people they know. On balance, the ICVS will undercount crime for these reasons. It will certainly only measure crimes that respondents are prepared to reveal to interviewers.

There is no way of knowing whether response errors are constant across country. The tendency to forget more trivial incidents of crime may be relatively universal, as may 'forward telescoping' of more salient incidents. Some types of differential 'response productivity' may also be constant, at least within the industrialised world. However, whether respondents differ across countries in preparedness to talk to interviewers about victimisation is possibly more questionable. Cultural sensitivity may apply most to some forms of assaults, and to sexual incidents (Travis et al., 1995; Koss, 1996). It may also be that respondents in different countries have different cultural thresholds for defining certain behaviours as crime (cf. Bruinsma et al., 1992). For industrialised countries, one might optimistically contend that common cultural and legal backgrounds, and the globalisation of markets and mass media information, result in fairly universal definitions about most conventional crimes (e.g., Gottfredson and Hirschi, 1990). Certainly, the ICVS shows that victims in industrialised countries hold strikingly similar views about the relative seriousness of different offence types about which they are asked (see Van Dijk and Van Kesteren (1996), and the analysis in Chapter 2).

### **1.5 Outline of the report**

This report presents an overview of the key findings of the 2000 ICVS in the 17 industrialised countries that took part. Reference is made to results from earlier sweeps, if available and where appropriate. Results from other industrialised countries not participating in the 2000 ICVS are generally omitted in discussion, but they are included in the tables in Appendix 4.

Chapter 2 presents rates of victimisation for the main offence categories, and for all offences together (the overall rate of victimisation). There is some discussion of how the general profile of crime in different countries differs, taking account of varying rates of victimisation for different offences. An assessment is also made of how the seriousness of victimisation differs, using victims' own ratings of seriousness. The chapter ends with trends over time in those countries that have participated before.

Chapter 3 looks at how victimisation varies for different groups – e.g., those in larger conurbations as against smaller ones, and for younger respondents as against older ones. The picture is presented for all countries combined.

Chapter 4 looks at reporting to the police: how reporting levels vary for different offences; how reporting varies between countries; why offences were generally not reported; and why they were. Satisfaction with the police response when a crime was reported is also considered, as is whether victims got help from a specialised Victim Support agency, and if they did not, whether they would have liked help. Mention is also made of general attitudes to the police.

Chapter 5 deals with concern about crime. It looks at differing perceptions of the likelihood of being burgled, and at feelings of safety on the streets and at home. It also presents some findings about the precautions people take against crime, and about how those in different countries vary in the sentence they recommend for a 21 year old recidivist burglar.

Chapter 6 concludes with a discussion of the key findings.

## Victimisation rates

### 2.1 Introduction

Risks of victimisation can be expressed in two main ways. *Prevalence rates* are the percentage of those aged 16 or more who experienced a specific crime once or more. *Incidence rates* express the number of crimes experienced by each 100 people in the sample. These count all incidents against victims who may have experienced more than one incident. Use is made of both 'last year' (1999) incidence and prevalence rates in this chapter, but the latter are mainly chosen to compare levels of victimisation. Although prevalence rates do not reflect the number of times people are victimised, they are a simple and valid measure of the distribution of crime across national populations.

The ICVS allows prevalence rate estimates for both the calendar year preceding the survey, and for the last five years. Incidence rates can only be calculated for 'last year' incidents (see Chapter 1). Findings about the last year (1999 in the case of the 2000 ICVS) will be most accurate, because less serious incidents which took place some time ago tend to be forgotten.<sup>9</sup>

This chapter focuses on:

- Prevalence risks for the eleven main types of victimisation measured by the ICVS. (Full details of prevalence and incidence risks for 1999 are in Tables 1 to 6 in Appendix 4. Also shown are risks in the industrialised countries that have taken part in earlier sweeps of the ICVS.)
- Results from a limited number of questions about consumer fraud and corruption.
- A measure of overall risk in 1999 (based on the eleven key ICVS crimes).
- Country profiles of victimisation, seeing how different types of offences contribute to the overall picture of victimisation in different countries.
- The seriousness of crimes as perceived by their victims, and whether the picture of risk differs when seriousness is taken into account.
- An assessment of trends in crime as measured by the ICVS since the first survey in 1988.

<sup>9</sup> Memory loss explains the fact that five year victimisation rates are only three and a half times higher than calendar year rates.

A broad distinction can be drawn between property and contact crime. All of the former, with the exception of 'theft of personal property', are what were described in Chapter 1 as 'household crimes' (i.e., respondents were asked about the experience of the household as a whole). For some crimes, sub-divisions are possible by drawing on questions about the nature of what happened. Details are below.

#### **Property crime**

Theft of cars  
 Theft from cars  
 Vandalism to cars  
 Motorcycle theft  
 Bicycle theft  
 Burglary with entry  
 Attempted burglary  
 Theft of personal property

#### **Contact crime**

Robbery  
 Sexual incidents  
 – Sexual assaults  
 – Offensive sexual behaviour  
 Assaults and threats  
 – Assaults with force  
 – Threats


The relatively small sample sizes in the ICVS mean that it is often a matter of statistical chance which country, among those with high levels, emerges with the highest rate on any particular type of crime. However, it is almost always the case that countries with the highest rates of victimisation have rates that are statistically significantly higher than countries with the lowest rates. As a broad indication of which countries have relatively high or low rates of victimisation, then, the graphs which follow provide a sound enough guide. In some charts, error bars are shown to reflect the fact that samples of the population are taken. The error bars are set at the 10% confidence level. In other words, they show the range of risk within which there is a 90% chance that the true level of victimisation lies. (Further details of sampling error are in Appendix 2.)

### **2.2 Car-related crime**

The ICVS questions here relate to cars, vans and trucks (called 'cars' for simplicity hereafter). The relevant crimes are (i) theft of a car, (ii) theft from or out of a car, and (iii) vandalism to cars. Risks are best considered for those who said they owned cars since although ownership levels in the seventeen countries were high, there was some variation.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>10</sup> Ownership was highest in Australia (93%), the USA (90%), Canada (88%), and France (88%). It was lowest in Poland (61%), Scotland (76%) and Portugal (77%). The picture of risks on a full population base is very similar to owner risks – e.g., the Spearman correlation is 0.97 ( $p < 0.05$ ;  $n = 17$ ) for thefts of cars. Details of population-based prevalence risks are in Appendix 4, Table 1; population incidence risks are in Appendix 4, Table 2; and owner-based risks are in Appendix 4, Table 3.

Figure 1 Theft of cars



### *Theft of cars*

Risks for car owners were highest in England and Wales, where 2.6% had a car stolen in 1999. Risks are next highest in Australia (2.1%) and France (1.9%). Those facing lowest risks were in Japan (0.1%), Switzerland (0.4%), Catalonia, the USA, Finland, and the Netherlands (all 0.5%). Details are in Figure 1. Relatively few victims had a car stolen more than once, so the picture for incidence risks is very similar.<sup>11</sup> Cars are usually thought to be stolen for two main reasons: either for 'joyriding' (when the car is usually recovered), or for extended personal use, resale or stripping (e.g., Clarke, 1991, Fijnaut, et al., 1998). On average, seven in ten stolen cars were eventually recovered. Recovery rates were highest in Sweden (97%), Denmark (96%), Portugal (88%), Australia (85%) and the USA (80%), indicating more thefts for 'joyriding', or higher penetration perhaps of tracking devices. Those in Poland (47%), Japan (61%), Belgium (65%) and the Netherlands (65%) were least likely to get their

11 The Spearman correlation was 0.98 ( $p < 0.05$ ;  $n = 16$ ).

cars back. These patterns are very consistent over time for countries in previous ICVS sweeps.

There was little change in the proportion of stolen cars recovered between 1996 and 2000 for 11 countries with two measures. But in the European countries taking part in earlier sweeps, the proportion recovered is now lower than it was in 1992 and 1989.<sup>12</sup> The drop is consistent with a trend towards more 'professional' theft that was suggested in the 1996 ICVS – albeit not one that has seemingly continued further. The demand for second-hand or stolen cars in Eastern Europe since the opening of borders may have increased professional thefts in the first half of the 1990s. Certainly other ICVS results indicate that generally few victims of car theft in countries in Eastern Europe get their cars back (e.g., Zvekic, 1996). And, here, Poland is a good example of this. It may be that better police and border patrol activities have stemmed these somewhat since 1996 (Fijnaut, 1998).

#### *Thefts from cars*

Respondents were also asked about thefts from a car, van or truck. These covered items left in the vehicle (such as coats), equipment from within it (such as audio equipment and mobile telephones), and parts taken off it (such as wing mirrors and badges).


Having something stolen from or out of a car was much more common than having the car itself stolen. Those most at risk were in Poland (9% of owners had a theft from their car), England and Wales (8%), Australia (7%), and the USA (7%). The lowest risks were in Denmark, Finland, the Netherlands, Switzerland and Japan: 4% or less were victimised.

The pattern of relative risks of thefts of and from cars across the different countries is not too dissimilar, although there are some differences. For instance, while car owners in Northern Ireland fare slightly worse than average in risks of thefts of their cars, thefts from cars are lower than average. In France, too, risks of thefts of cars are comparatively high, but thefts from cars only just above the average. In contrast, risks for owners in the USA of having their car taken are relatively very low, but thefts from their cars are quite high. There is a similar picture in Catalonia. Figure 2 shows risks of thefts from car, contrasting them with risks of thefts of cars.

The pattern of where thefts took place is broadly similar to thefts of cars. On average, over half of victims (54%) said the theft from their car took place at or near home – slightly less home-based than thefts of cars (60%). This will reflect the fact that cars will be parked there longest. About one in five thefts happened elsewhere

12 This is so even excluding Poland where there has been a marked drop in recovery rates since 1989. For instance, in five European countries in the 1992 and 2000 ICVS the proportion of cars recovered fell from 78% to 68%; or from 78% to 73% without Poland. For six European countries in the 1989 and 2000 sweeps, the proportion of cars recovered fell from 74% to 69%.

Figure 2 Thefts from and of cars



Countries are sorted by 'theft from cars'.

in the city or town where people lived. Two per cent of incidents of both types took place abroad. Drawing on previous ICVS results here too (as numbers are small), the proportion of those with cars stolen abroad was higher in Belgium, Finland, and the Netherlands. Travel patterns might be a factor here.

#### *Vandalism to cars*

The highest car vandalism levels were in Scotland, Poland, England and Wales, the Netherlands, and Australia: in each, 10% or more owners had some damage to their cars in 1999. Levels were 5% or less in Northern Ireland, Japan, Denmark, Switzerland and Finland. In general, car vandalism occurs about half as often again as thefts from cars.

The relative ranking of countries with respect to vandalism and thefts from cars is relatively similar: countries with higher levels of thefts from car also tend to have

higher levels of car vandalism.<sup>13</sup> There are a few exceptions however. Owners in Scotland and the Netherlands are relatively much more prone to car vandalism, with risks about twice as those for thefts from cars. In contrast, owners in the USA, Canada, and the Nordic countries (Finland, Sweden and Denmark) fare better comparatively speaking with regard to car vandalism than thefts from cars, with risk levels for each broadly similar.

The relationship between levels of car vandalism and theft *of* cars is less strong and is only just statistically significant.<sup>14</sup> Scotland, the Netherlands and Catalonia had a worse record on vandalism than on thefts of cars, whereas the Nordic countries, Canada and Northern Ireland did better relative to risks of thefts of cars.

Where the vandalism took place shows an almost identical pattern as for theft of a car and theft from a car.

### 2.3 Motorcycle theft

There were very different levels of motorcycle ownership in the seventeen countries. Highest levels were in Japan (33% had a motorised two-wheeler), Sweden, Switzerland, Catalonia, the Netherlands, France, and Portugal (all about 20% or slightly more). Reflecting the generally small proportion of owners, theft rates for owners are substantially higher than population rates (see Tables 1 and 3 in Appendix 4). The highest risks for motorcycle owners were in Denmark, England and Wales: 4% of owners had a motorcycle stolen. Although Japan has generally low victimisation levels for most crime, thefts of motorcycles were comparatively high (3%).

In 11 of the 17 countries, risks for motorcycle were greater than the risk of a car being stolen for car owners. (In Sweden, risks were very similar). Generally, motorcycle thefts were most common where motorcycles were more frequently owned.<sup>15</sup> In other words, a more plentiful supply of targets appears to encourage rather than dampen theft 'demand'. One reason for this may be simply that more offenders are able to ride motorcycles. However, reflecting the small numbers here, the relationship between ownership and risk was not exact. Risks were higher in England and Wales, Scotland and Denmark relative to ownership levels. Switzerland had fewer thefts than ownership levels might predict.

13 The Spearman correlation is 0.68 ( $p < 0.10$ ;  $n = 17$ ).

14 The Spearman correlation between car vandalism and thefts of cars is 0.44 ( $p < 0.10$ ;  $n = 17$ ).

15 The Spearman correlation between levels of motorcycle ownership and population victimisation rates was 0.66 ( $p < 0.05$ ;  $n = 17$ ).

## 2.4 Bicycle theft

There was a similar relationship between levels of bicycle ownership and levels of bicycle theft. The highest theft risks were in Japan, Sweden, the Netherlands and Denmark. In each, about 8% of owners had a bicycle taken, and each had much higher than average ownership levels. The lowest risks were in Catalonia, Portugal and Northern Ireland, France and Australia: 3% of owners or fewer were victimised.

For all countries, bicycle owners were more likely to have a bicycle stolen (average risk 4.7%) than a car owner was to have a car stolen (average risks 1.2%). The same held for motorcycle theft (average risk 1.9%), although the difference in risks for bicycle owners and motorcycles owners was narrower in England and Wales, Portugal and the USA.


Previous analysis of ICVS results has shown a strong inverse relationship between rates of car theft and rates of bicycle theft, even when multivariate analysis has taken into account the level of urbanisation, GDP, and levels of other crime for instance (Van Dijk, 1991; Mayhew, 1991). Thus, in countries where bicycle ownership is high and bicycle theft common, stealing cars occurs less often. In the 2000 ICVS, the results were in the same direction, but slightly less strong. Of the eight countries with the highest bicycle ownership levels, seven of them were among the eight countries with highest bicycle theft rates, and five had the lowest car theft rates.

Since bicycles and motorcycles are generally used for short distances, it is no surprise that they are most often stolen from close to home (two-thirds were). About a quarter were stolen elsewhere than where people lived (with the highest figures in the Netherlands, Denmark and Japan where cycling is a common means of travel). In total, 9% of thefts took place at work, elsewhere in the country, or abroad.

## 2.5 Burglary

There was a fairly broad range in the proportion of households in 1999 that experienced one or more burglary (whether with entry, or an attempt). The highest risks were in Australia (6.6%) and England and Wales (5.2%). The lowest rates were in Catalonia, Japan, and Finland (see Figure 3). Relative positions in terms of incidents per 100 households were very similar, although the USA fared slightly worse when burglary was measured in terms of incidence, as has been found before in the ICVS. In contrast, Northern Ireland and Denmark fell back on incidence risks relative to prevalence ones.

Figure 3 Burglary and attempts




The pattern of relative risk across country is reasonably similar whether the focus is on burglary with entry or attempts.<sup>16</sup> The main difference is that, compared to their position with respect of burglary with entry, Finland, France, Scotland, and the USA fared relatively rather worse for attempts (Figure 4). In contrast, compared with the levels of attempts, the level of burglary with entry was relatively higher in Denmark, Sweden and Poland.

Nonetheless, the proportion of burglaries that involved attempts varied somewhat by country. The figures were highest in Finland (72%), France, Belgium, Scotland, the Netherlands, Switzerland, England and Wales, and the USA (all above 50%). (With the exception of Switzerland, this is similar to the results from the 1996 sweep for those countries which took part then.) In contrast, most burglars in Sweden,

16 That is, countries with a higher rate of burglary with entry also tend to have a higher rate of attempted burglaries. (The Spearman correlation was 0.69 ( $p < 0.10$ ;  $n = 17$ .)

Figure 4 Burglary with entry and attempted burglary



Countries are sorted by 'burglary with entry'.

**Denmark, Catalonia and Northern Ireland got into houses: only about a third or fewer burglaries involved attempts.**

Where there are proportionately more attempted burglaries, this might suggest that householders are better protected by security devices, so that burglars more often fail to gain entry. In the past, the ICVS results have lent some support to this.<sup>17</sup> The same pattern broadly holds in the current sweep, although the relationship was weaker due in particular to Finland, which had the highest percentage of attempted burglaries, but one of the lowest levels of security. Another outlier was Australia.

<sup>17</sup> This draws on questions which ask householders about the precautions they take against burglary (see Chapter 5). A measure of 'high' security is based on those who said they had one or more of: a burglar alarm or special door locks.

Here, the level of security was relatively high, but more burglars got into homes than would be predicted.<sup>18</sup>

## 2.6 Theft of personal property

The residual category of property crime in the ICVS is theft of personal property (such as a purse, wallet, clothing, sports or work equipment). Most of these crimes are perceived less seriously. Most thefts of personal property involved no contact between victim and offender. But in roughly a third of cases on average, the victim said they were carrying what was stolen. For present purposes, these are called cases of 'pickpocketing'.<sup>19</sup>

National rates of thefts of personal property are somewhat difficult to interpret because they are likely to be heterogeneous in nature. Taken as a whole, those in Australia (6.5%), Sweden (5.8%) and Poland (5.3%) experienced most thefts. Levels were lowest in Japan (0.5%), Portugal (1.9%), and Northern Ireland (2.2%). The picture on the basis of incidence rates was very similar.

### *Pickpocketing*

Pickpocketing was most common in Poland (4.0% were victimised once or more), echoing previous ICVS results. Rates were also relatively high in Belgium (2.1%), the Netherlands (1.9%), Denmark and Catalonia (both 1.8%), and England and Wales (1.7%). In line with previous results, rates were lowest outside Europe (i.e., in Japan, Canada, the USA), although Australia had near average levels, and within Europe, risks were particularly low in Northern Ireland.

## 2.7 Contact crimes


The three contact crimes in the ICVS are robbery, sexual incidents, and assaults and threats. Sexual incidents divide into sexual assault and what victims described as offensive sexual behaviour. Assaults and threats can be separated into assaults with forces and threats only.

We take first a summary measure of aggressive contact crime: robbery, sexual assaults and assaults with force (Figure 5). There is then some discussion of the

18 Taking 20 individual countries since the 1992 sweep to maximise range, the proportion of attempted burglaries was 53% in the seven countries with appreciably higher security levels, but 43% in the other countries. The Spearman correlation between the proportion of attempts and the security measure was 0.57 ( $p < 0.10$ ;  $n = 19$ , Finland excluded). The security measure here is the percentage of homes with a burglar alarm or special door locks. Incidence rates are taken to measure the proportion of attempted burglaries.

19 Information on pickpocketing was not available for Switzerland. Details of how pickpocketing rates are calculated are in Table 6, in Appendix 4.

Figure 5 Selected contact crime (robbery, sexual assault and assault with force)



three full contact crimes in turn, since the pattern of national risks differs somewhat for each. It should be borne in mind that risks are relatively low for each type of contact crime. Firm conclusions about relative vulnerability are therefore hard to draw.

The highest rates of aggressive contact crime were for those in Australia (4.1% were victimised once or more). The next highest risks were in England and Wales, Canada and Scotland (around 3.5%). There were very low risks in Japan, Portugal, and Catalonia (1.5% or less).

#### *Robbery*

The risk of robbery was comparatively low in all countries. On the face of it, risks were highest in 1999 in Poland (1.8%), Australia (1.2%), England and Wales (1.2%), Portugal (1.1%) and France (1.1%) – levels which will be statistically indistinguishable. By far the lowest risks were in Japan and Northern Ireland (0.1%).

There was some similarity in the picture of risks of robbery and pickpocketing, which may reflect fairly similar offending patterns. However, Finland, Denmark, the Netherlands and Belgium ranked rather higher on pickpocketing than they did with regard to robbery. In contrast, robbery risks were higher relative to pickpocketing in Portugal, Australia and Canada.<sup>20</sup>

#### *The details of robbery*

Approaching half of robberies and pickpocketing happen in the city or town whether victims live, with a fifth happening nearer to home. Of robbery incidents specifically, 9% happened abroad, with the highest figures for those from Switzerland, Denmark, Sweden and Japan.

About six in ten victims said that more than one offender was involved – similar to previous sweeps. According to the 2000 ICVS, multiple offenders were most common in Belgium, Northern Ireland, Poland and Scotland, although the small number of robberies involved calls for considerable caution.<sup>21</sup>

Robbery victims were asked whether the offender(s) carried a weapon of some sort. On average, in just over a third of victims said they did – similar to the 1996 ICVS. Weapons were actually used in about four in ten incidents where a weapon was present, again as in the 1996 sweep. The small numerical base makes it difficult to draw out differences between countries. But on the face of it, those in the USA, France, Catalonia, Scotland, Portugal and Canada were most likely to say a weapon was carried. In most cases, a knife had been carried (the average was one in two weapon incidents). Robbery offenders carried a gun in a fifth of incidents on average. The use of guns was most common in Catalonia and the USA.

#### *Sexual incidents*

The question put to female respondents was:

‘First, a rather personal question. People sometimes grab, touch or assault others for sexual reasons in a really offensive way. This can happen either at home, or elsewhere, for instance in a pub, the street, at school, on public transport, in cinemas, on the beach, or at one’s workplace. Over the past five years, has anyone done this to you? Please take your time to think about this.’

Measuring sexual incidents is extremely difficult in victimisation surveys, since perceptions as to what is unacceptable sexual behaviour may differ across country, as well as readiness to report incidents to an interviewer on the phone. The ICVS 2000 measures, then, need a light touch.

20 The correlation between robbery and pickpocketing was  $r=0.45$  ( $p<0.10$ ;  $n=16$ ).

21 The same pattern was not evident for instance for Belgium in 1992, and Scotland in 1996.

### *Sexual assaults*

Sexual assaults (i.e., incidents described as rape, attempted rape or indecent assaults) were less common than offensive sexual behaviour. For all countries combined, just over one per cent of women (1.3%) reported offensive sexual behaviour, but only 0.6% reported sexual assaults.

About one in a hundred women in Sweden, Finland, Australia and England and Wales reported assaults, and differences between them are statistically negligible. Women in Japan, Northern Ireland, Poland and Portugal were least at risk, though again, the differences in risk are statistically weak compared to other countries at the middle level.

### *Offensive sexual behaviour*

More women in Australia, Finland, the Netherlands, and Denmark (over 2%) reported offensive sexual behaviour than elsewhere. (Risks of sexual assault in these countries were also comparatively high, with the exception of Denmark.) There were low risks in Poland, France, Portugal, Catalonia and Northern Ireland. Again, the position with regard to sexual assaults was similar, except that rankings for sexual assaults were higher in France and Northern Ireland.

Looking at what women said about the 'last incident' that had occurred, and taking all countries together since numbers are small, offenders were known in about half of the incidents described as both offensive behaviour and sexual assault. (In a third they were known by name, and in about a sixth by sight.) In sexual assaults, partners, ex-partners, boyfriends, relative or friends were involved in one in five incidents of assault, but in a smaller proportion of incidents involving offensive behaviour – about one in ten. These results are very similar to those from the 1996 ICVS.

Most sexual incidents involved only one offender. Weapons were very rarely involved in sexual assaults.

### *Assaults and threats*

The question asked of respondents to identify assaults and threats was:

'Apart from the incidents just covered, have you over the past five years been personally attacked or threatened by someone in a way that really frightened you, either at home or elsewhere, such as in a pub, in the street, at school, on public transport, on the beach, or at your workplace?'

Overall, 3.5% of respondents indicated that they have been a victim of an assault with force or a threat of force. (Details by country are in Appendix 4, Tables 1, 2 and 6.) There were higher than average rates in Australia, Scotland, England and Wales (about 6%), and Canada (5%).

The 2000 questionnaire included an additional screening question which prompted that assaults and threats could have involved a partner, family member or a close

friend. Although the initial question does *not exclude* such incidents, the additional item did lead to more responses. For a fair comparison with the earlier sweeps, these additional responses have been excluded from assaults and threats, and from the discussion of overall victimisation. The additional responses are included though in details of incidents discussed below. On average the extra prompting lead to 0.8% more victims in 1999 (overall, 4.4% were victimised). It was somewhat higher in the Netherlands and Australia, but less in Japan, France and the USA. As with sexual incidents, differences in definitional thresholds cannot be ruled out in explaining the pattern of ICVS results. However, this should not be overstated. When asked to assess the seriousness of what had happened, there is fair consistency across country in how seriously incidents are viewed (see Table 8 in Appendix 4, and later discussion in this chapter).

#### *Assaults with force*

For the sub-set of incidents which are described as amounting to more than a threat of force, risks were highest in Scotland and England and Wales (about 3% reported having been victimised once or more). Following closely behind were Australia, Canada, Finland and Northern Ireland. Risks were lowest in Japan, Portugal and Catalonia (0.5% or less).

Looking at what was said about the 'last incident', and again taking all countries together, offenders were known in about half the incidents of both assaults and threats. Men, though, were less likely to know the offender(s) (about four in ten knew them) than women (about six in ten).

Taking assaults and threats together again, for all countries combined, weapons were said to have been used (if only as a threat) in just under a quarter of incidents. The figure was higher with male victims than females. In more than 40% of incidents in which a weapon was used, victims mentioned a knife, and in nearly 10% a gun.

Just over a third of assaults and threats and sexual incidents happened at or near home, with the proportions somewhat higher for the assaults and threats than for the sexual incidents. 16% of incidents happened at work, the most reported in the Netherlands and Sweden.

## **2.8 Consumer fraud**

The ICVS asked about consumer fraud for the first time in the 1992 sweep in industrialised countries. People were asked whether someone – when selling something to them, or delivering a service – cheated them in terms of quantity or quality of the goods or services. Although the question does not exclude serious incidents of fraud, most of the incidents reported probably amounted to cheating.

On average, 7.5% of respondents said they experienced some type of consumer fraud in 1999. Poland, Denmark, the USA, Finland, and Sweden had relatively high rates, i.e. about 10% of more were victimised. Levels of fraud were low in Japan, Northern Ireland, the Netherlands, France, and Scotland (less than 5%). For countries in previous sweeps, results were largely similar.<sup>22</sup>

Many victims (about 45% overall) did not specify where the fraud had taken place, but just over a third mentioned shops, and about one in ten mentioned building or construction work. Few incidents were reported to the police, but other agencies were notified about rather more incidents. Details by country are given in Table 5 in Appendix 4.

## 2.9 Corruption

The 1996 ICVS, introduced a question on corruption, chiefly to set the experience of those in industrialised countries alongside countries elsewhere in the world. People were asked:

‘In some countries, there is a problem of corruption among government or public officials. During 1999, has any government official, for instance a customs officer, a police officer or inspector in your country asked you, or expected you to pay a bribe for his or her services?’

Whereas on average nearly one in five people in the developing world reported incidents involving corruption, and about one in eight in Eastern European countries (Zvekic, 1998), corruption was very uncommon in the industrialised countries. In 13 of the 16 countries, less than 0.5% reported any incident, with the figures only marginally higher in France and Portugal (just over 1%). As had been the case in the 1996 sweep, those in Poland stood out (5%), with government officials and police officers being cited most often.<sup>23</sup> Details for all countries are in Table 4 in Appendix 4.


## 2.10 Overall risks

We offer two measures of the overall impact of crime in the seventeen countries. The first is the percentage of people victimised once or more in the past year by any of the eleven crimes covered – a prevalence risk. The second is the number of crimes of

<sup>22</sup> There was no information for Switzerland in 2000. In the previous survey, there was average experience of consumer fraud.

<sup>23</sup> There was no information for Switzerland in 2000. In the previous survey, very few indeed (0.2%) reported any incident of corruption.

Figure 6 Overall victimisation



Countries are sorted by prevalence rates.

\* Incidence rates for Switzerland are estimated.

all types per 100 respondents – an incidence risk. They are complementary measures of risk, and are presented in Figure 6.<sup>24</sup>

The six countries with the highest overall prevalence victimisation rates are Australia (30% of people were victimised once or more), England and Wales (26%), the Netherlands (25%) and Sweden (25%), Canada (24%) and Scotland (23%). They have significantly higher overall victimisation rates (in a statistical sense at the 10% probability level) than the average of all ICVS countries. Northern Ireland, Japan,

<sup>24</sup> Prevalence risks for the eleven crimes are in Table 1 in Appendix 4. Incidence risks for ten crimes are in Table 2, Appendix 4. Ten crimes are shown here as incidence rates for attempted burglary are not available for 1988. Incidence risks for Switzerland for 2000 are estimated on the basis of the relationship between prevalence and incidence risks in previous sweeps.

Portugal, Switzerland and Catalonia had risks on the prevalence measure significantly lower than the average. And Northern Ireland, Japan and Portugal report significantly lower prevalence rates than any other country.

The picture on the basis of the number of crimes experienced (incidence risks) is somewhat different. Most notably, the USA fares relatively worse on incidence risks (in sixth position) than on prevalence risks (eleventh position). In contrast, Denmark and Canada fare rather better on incidence risks – although the change in positions is not as marked as with the USA. Incidence risks are highest in England and Wales, and Australia. Both have 58 incidents per 100, with risks that are statistically higher than all other countries except the Netherlands (51) with the next highest incidence risks.

On the face of it, the two measures indicate that where incidence is high relative to prevalence, there is more concentration of crime among those who are victimised. In Switzerland, Japan, Northern Ireland, Catalonia, Portugal, Finland, and Denmark, the gap between prevalence and incidence risks is narrowest, suggesting a more even spread of crime. In England and Wales, Australia, the Netherlands, Sweden and the USA, the gap is widest, suggesting that when people are victims they are more prone to repeated victimisation. A more geographical concentration of crime may be a factor.

### 2.11 Country profiles of crime

The ‘make-up’ or profile of crime in different countries will reflect the pattern of victimisation risk and the frequency of one type of victimisation relative to another. It does not say much about relative levels of victimisation, but it is a useful way of showing how the burden of crime in quantitative terms differs across country. Table 4 shows the main patterns. (The analysis is done on incidence rates, with the total number of crimes set to 100%.) Switzerland is omitted.<sup>25</sup> A fuller breakdown of all offence types, and for other sweeps is in Table 7 in Appendix 4. We start with an overview for all 16 countries combined, and then consider the features of the make-up of crime in individual countries.

#### *The general profile*

The main features of the average profile of crime are that:

- Contact crime comprises about a quarter of all crimes, with assaults and threats making up about two-thirds of these (or 15% of all crime). Robbery forms a very small proportion of contact crime, and this applies to all countries.

25 No incidence rates were available for 2000 to assess its country profile.

**Table 4** The profile of crime in different countries: (percentage of all offences: total = 100%): 2000 ICVS<sup>1</sup>

	Thefts from and of cars	Car vandalism	Motorcycle and bicycle theft	Burglary with entry and attempts	All contact crime <sup>2</sup>	Theft of personal property
Australia	18	20	4	15	29	14
Belgium	14	23	15	17	19	13
Canada	20	15	10	13	27	15
Catalonia (Spain)	25	38	4	7	14	12
Denmark	14	13	26	13	21	12
England & Wales	19	23	6	12	30	10
Finland	11	16	19	6	36	13
France	23	31	6	8	24	9
Japan	8	26	40	13	11	2
Netherlands	12	26	21	10	19	12
Northern Ireland	20	25	10	11	22	11
Poland	21	23	10	10	20	16
Portugal	29	33	4	13	14	8
Scotland	16	30	6	9	28	12
Sweden	19	14	21	7	24	16
USA	20	22	7	15	20	16
Average	18	24	13	11	22	12

1 Based on incidence rates. Percentages add to 100%.

2 Based on robbery, sexual incidents, and assaults and threats.

- Car vandalism also makes up nearly a quarter of the incidents experienced overall.
- Theft of and from cars together comprise rather less a fifth of all crimes (18%), with thefts from cars having by far the larger share (15%).
- The largest difference between countries is with regard to theft of bicycles, which reflects varying ownership rates.

The overall profile of crime according to the 2000 ICVS is very similar to that from previous ICVS sweeps, when countries taking part in each are compared.

#### *Australia*

Compared to the overall picture, crime in Australia comprises proportionately more contact crime and burglary. Compared to elsewhere, thefts of motorcycles and bicycle ('two-wheelers') are a relatively insignificant problem. This profile is similar to the 1992 survey, although there were proportionately more assaults and threats in the 1992 survey, but less car damage.

*Belgium*

Burglary in Belgium was proportionately more important in its crime make-up than elsewhere. Car-related thefts were relatively rather less significant, as was contact crime. In other respects, Belgium fits the average victimisation pattern reasonably well. Compared to 1992, car-related thefts have become a rather smaller problem, but at the expense of a greater share for contact crime.

*Canada*

Compared to the average picture, the crime profile in Canada is weighted rather more towards contact crime and thefts of personal property, and rather less towards car vandalism. The profile in the 1996 ICVS was fairly similar.

*Catalonia (Spain)*

The make-up of crime in Catalonia does not mirror the overall picture. There was proportionately much more car-related theft and car vandalism (over 60% percent of all crimes). Theft of two-wheelers formed a smaller than average proportion of all crimes, although Catalonia was unusual in having similar rates for both motorcycle and bicycle thefts, whereas elsewhere bicycle thefts predominate. Burglary and contact crime also formed a much smaller proportion of crime than elsewhere.

*Denmark*

The profile of crime in Denmark is reasonably average, although bicycle theft takes a larger than average share (about a quarter of all crimes), while offences involving cars are a relatively small problem compared to elsewhere, especially car vandalism.

*England and Wales*

The crime make-up in England and Wales is again fairly average. The main differences are that thefts of two-wheelers have a smaller share of all crime, while contact crime has a rather larger one. Since the 1996 sweep, the proportion of car-related thefts has gone down, while the proportion of contact crime has increased.

*Finland*

Finland is unusual in that over a third of all crimes are contact crimes, with the proportion of sexual incidents particularly high. There are also proportionally more thefts of two-wheelers. In contrast, burglary comprises only 6% of all crime in Finland, about half the average proportion. Car related crimes are also less dominant. The profile of crime in Finland in 1996 was almost identical.

*France*

All forms of car crime are relatively more common in France than the average profile. As against this, thefts of two-wheelers, burglary, and thefts of personal

property comprise a smaller proportion of all crimes than they tend to elsewhere. Since 1996, car vandalism has featured even more in the make-up of crime in France, and thefts of two-wheelers bicycle even less. Assaults and threats now also comprise rather more of all crime than in the 1996 sweep.

#### *Japan*

The make-up of crime in Japan is singular. Four in ten crimes were thefts of bicycles or motorcycles (overwhelmingly the former). Some other forms of crime were relatively average in terms of their share, but car-related thefts, thefts of personal property, and assaults and threats were comparatively insignificant. (The notion that any cultural 'response effect' contributes to the low figures for assaults and threats runs somewhat counter to the fact that the proportion of sexual incidents was near average.)

#### *The Netherlands*

The picture in the Netherlands is not dissimilar to Denmark. Bicycle theft accounts for about a fifth of all crimes, while the proportion of thefts of and from cars is relatively low. Other crimes are similar to the general profile. The make-up of crime in the 1996 and 2000 sweeps was very similar.

#### *Northern Ireland*

Northern Ireland's crime profile very much fits the overall average. (Car-related thefts have a very slightly higher share and thefts of two-wheelers slightly less.) Compared to the 1996 sweep, there was proportionately more car vandalism in 2000, bringing the figures more in line with the average. Theft of two-wheelers have also increased in share, again nearer to the average.

#### *Poland*

Again, the make-up of crime in Poland is reasonably average. (There is a slightly higher proportion of car-related thefts, and thefts of personal property.) Compared to the 1996 sweep, there was proportionately more car vandalism in 2000, and even more so than in 1992. Car-related thefts have also increased relative to 1996, alongside a fall in the proportionate share for contact crime.

#### *Portugal*

The profile of crime in Portugal was similar to that in Catalonia in many respects, and thus unusual. Over 60% of all offences involved cars, while thefts of two-wheelers were very low relatively in terms of share. However, the proportion of burglaries of all crime was nearer to the average in Portugal than Catalonia, while personal thefts were proportionately lower than in Catalonia.

### *Scotland*

Compared to most other countries, car vandalism accounts for a larger part of all crime in Scotland. The same applies to assaults and threats. Thefts of two-wheelers were proportionately unimportant compared to many other countries. There was a fair degree of similarity with England and Wales in the make-up of crime in Scotland. However, England and Wales was only average in relation to car vandalism, unlike Scotland. And car-related thefts and burglary were a bit more dominant in England and Wales than in Scotland in terms of the share of all crime.

In 1996, car-related thefts in Scotland were above average in terms of proportionate share, whereas in 2000 they are below average. In contrast, contact crime (particularly assaults and threats) comprise a larger share of all crime in 2000 compared to other countries, whereas in 1996 the opposite was true.

### *Sweden*

Like Finland, thefts of two-wheelers made up a much bigger share of overall crime (21%) than in many other countries – although the differences was even greater in 1996 (26%). Car vandalism featured less in the profile of crime in Sweden than elsewhere (again similar to Finland). The same was true of burglary. Contact crime was only slightly above (24% of all crimes) the average level (22%). In this respect Sweden differed from Finland where contact crime was a full 26% of all crime in Finland.

As regards changes over time, there were proportionately fewer thefts of two-wheelers in Sweden in the 2000 sweep than in 1996, relative to other countries. The share that car-related thefts made was nearer the average in 2000, whereas it had been lower than average in 1996.

### *USA*

Burglaries and thefts of personal property feature rather more in the make-up of crime in the USA than in other countries. Thefts of two-wheelers, in contrast, take a smaller share of crime. Otherwise, deviations from the average are not pronounced. Since 1996, thefts of personal property and car vandalism both increased in their share of all offences. This goes in tandem with a smaller share for assaults and threats.

### *An overview*

In sum, these country profiles may be of most interest to the countries concerned as a guide to where their dominant crime problems lie in quantitative terms. But some points are worth highlighting of more general interest. In doing so, we anticipate some of the findings in the following section on the seriousness of crime.

— On average, car vandalism forms a full quarter of the crimes experienced by ICVS respondents in industrialised countries. And the figure was higher in Catalonia,

Portugal, France and Scotland. As will be seen in the next section, though, these incidents are not usually regarded as very serious.

- Assaults and threats are not an insignificant part of the crime profiles overall: as said, they comprised 15% of the incidents mentioned. Assaults with force were regarded more seriously than threats. But threats that respondents brought into the survey count were considered on average more seriously than thefts from cars or pickpocketing.
- Catalonia and Portugal stand out against the norm in having a crime problem dominated by incidents involving cars: rather more than 60% of all the crimes counted. Japan was also unusual in that 40% of the crime counted by the ICVS involved thefts of two-wheelers. The distinctive feature of Finland was the unusually high share of all crime that sexual incidents accounted for (over a quarter).

Changes in the profile of crime in particular countries over the ICVS sweeps give a pointer to local agencies as to how the nature of crime is changing. It does not, though, necessarily point to where the biggest changes in *risk* have occurred. For instance, car-related thefts in Poland are now a more dominant feature of its 2000 crime profile than in the 1996 sweep, although there is no evidence of an actual increase in risks. This is because the balance of relative levels of victimisation has changed.

### 2.12 Seriousness of crime

In assessing the burden of crime, overall victimisation rates take no account of the nature of what happened. This means that serious crimes such as robbery are given the same weight in counting victimisation experience as more minor ones (such as bicycle theft) – even though, as shown, some countries have proportionately more minor crimes than others do. This section draws on a question, introduced in the 1992 ICVS, which asks victims to assess the seriousness of what happened. The question asked was: ‘Taking everything into account, how serious was the incident for you (or your household). Was it very serious, fairly serious or not very serious.’

The question on seriousness is used below in three ways:

- *Overall seriousness ranking*: to look at which ICVS crimes were typically felt to be the most serious, and the most minor.
- *Differences in seriousness ratings across countries*: to see whether people in different countries generally view the seriousness of different offences in a similar way.
- *A seriousness index*: to create an index of overall victimisation that takes account of both the profile of crime in different countries and how seriously it is rated.

Table 5 Seriousness of crimes according to victims in 17 countries: 2000 ICVS

	Very serious %	Fairly serious %	Not very serious %
Car theft: not recovered	57	31	11
Sexual assaults	54	30	16
Car theft: recovered	46	38	17
Robbery with weapon	45	34	21
Assault	41	34	25
Burglary with entry	40	34	25
Theft of motorcycle or moped	34	40	26
Robbery without weapon	32	38	30
Other theft of personal property	27	41	32
Threats	27	37	36
Offensive sexual behaviour	21	30	49
Attempted burglary	20	31	49
Pickpocketing	20	35	45
Bicycle theft	15	37	48
Theft from car	14	34	52
Car vandalism	13	31	56

Crimes are sorted by 'very serious'.

#### *Overall seriousness ranking*

Table 5 shows what proportion of ICVS crimes were considered very, fairly and not very serious, taking all 17 countries as a whole. Certain crimes are sub-divided (for instance thefts of cars are divided according to whether or not the car was recovered).

Car thefts where the owner did not get the car back were regarded most seriously (57% of incidents were felt to be very serious). Next most serious were sexual assaults (54%), and then car thefts even if the car was recovered (46%). The seriousness accorded to car theft is likely to reflect the sheer inconvenience of having a car taken, as well as the generally large monetary value of the loss, even though there may be compensation from insurance.

Robbery involving weapon use (45% of incidents were considered very serious) was rated on virtually the same level as thefts of recovered cars (although taking very and fairly seriously together, car thefts were considered more serious). Assaults with force (41%) were much on a par with burglaries in which someone entered the home. The least serious crimes were car vandalism (only 13% were considered very

serious), theft from cars (14%) and bicycle theft (15%). These results are similar to previous ICVS findings.

*Differences in seriousness ratings across countries*

The next issue is whether seriousness ratings for different types of offence vary across country in a way that might suggest different tolerance or attitudinal thresholds to different crimes. To analyse current results, each incident mentioned by victims in different countries was scored for seriousness. (The scores were based on a three-point scale with 'very serious' scored as 3, 'fairly serious' as 2 and 'not very serious' as 1.) The best overall measure of whether seriousness ratings for different types of offences differ across country is to look at the average scores for the 11 ICVS crimes taken together. In computing this average, each of the eleven types of crime was given equal weight so that differences between countries are not affected by variations in victimisation rates. (Full results are in Table 8 in Appendix 4.)

The mean scores for the 11 crimes did not differ very greatly by country. Ten of the seventeen countries had mean scores falling within 10% of the overall average. The general similarity of mean scores suggest that people in different countries have similar attitudinal thresholds as to the seriousness of different crimes. It also suggests that people do not differ very greatly in the *types* of incidents they are prepared to tell interviewers about.

The relatively small variations in seriousness ratings in the 2000 ICVS centred on there being comparatively high mean scores in Northern Ireland (2.2), Catalonia, Japan, England and Wales, and Poland (all 2.1). Lowest scores were found in Denmark (1.6), and Finland (1.7). These differences could reflect possible differences in the nature of crime experienced (which are not particularly well measured in the ICVS) – or some degree of variation in attitudes to crime. They could also be due to differences in connotation of the word 'serious'.

Another issue is whether the *relative* ranking of the seriousness of different crimes differs across country. The 2000 ICVS results (see Table 8 in Appendix 4) show that people in different countries judged the relative seriousness of different crimes with a fair degree of consistency, again suggesting a wide consensus about the import of conventional crime. This is in line with previous analyses on the 1992 survey (Van Dijk and Van Kesteren, 1996) and the 1996 one (Mayhew and Van Dijk, 1997). For 2000, the main results are:<sup>26</sup>

- Car theft was considered by victims as the most serious offence in half of the 16 countries (i.e., the mean scores were highest), and the second or third most serious in all the rest except Denmark.

<sup>26</sup> Motorcycle thefts are excluded from these comparisons because of particularly small numbers of victims.

- Burglary with entry was rated most seriously in four countries, and second most serious in a further six.
- Robbery was considered the most serious offence in four countries and second most serious in another four.
- In virtually all countries, car vandalism was rated as least serious, after which thefts from cars, and then bicycle theft had the lowest mean seriousness scores.

*An index of crime in relation to the seriousness*


Finally, we turn to the question of whether the picture of the overall 'burden of crime' shown earlier in Figure 6 on the basis of prevalence and incidence rates changes when the seriousness of crimes as judged by victims is taken into account. The approach taken was to calculate an overall incidence rate for each country taking into account the seriousness of each component crime as judged by local victims.<sup>27, 28</sup> The results are in Figure 7, where countries are ranked by the number of 'very serious' crimes per 100 inhabitants.

How do the corrections for crime seriousness alter the 'burden of crime' picture? Most countries remain in more or less the same rank order position as in relation to overall incidence or prevalence risks. Thus, these still stand as reasonable indicators. Comparing overall prevalence risks with risks adjusted for crime seriousness, Australia, England and Wales, the Netherlands and Sweden still remain most pressured by crime. However, Denmark and Canada fall back in the relative order of countries when seriousness is taken into account. In contrast, the USA goes a fair degree higher in the list. The picture is generally similar, too, when unadjusted *incidence* risks are compared with a crime count taking seriousness into account. The USA still moves up, but less so than with the comparison with prevalence rates since it already fared worse on unadjusted incidence rates. Northern Ireland also fares rather worse when seriousness is taken into account.

27 This approach is different from that in the 1996 ICVS analysis, when overall incidence rates were weighted according to seriousness of each component crime as judged the average for the 14 countries in the 1996 analysis. The current approach allows for differences in seriousness perceptions between countries. Since these were modest, however, the general thrust of the 2000 ICVS results is similar to that from 1996.

28 Thus, for instance the 9.4 bicycle thefts per 100 inhabitants in Sweden break down into a rate of 1.6 thefts considered 'very serious' (17% of 9.4), a rate of 3.7 'fairly serious' thefts (39% of 9.4), and a rate of 4.1 'not very serious' thefts (44% of 9.4). The 2.3 burglaries per 100 inhabitants break down into a rate of 1.11 'very serious' (49% of 2.3), 0.68 'fairly serious' (30% of 2.3) and 0.46 'not very serious' (20% of 2.3). The same procedure is applied to all other crimes, and these are then added to produce an overall incidence rate divided into three seriousness levels. In Sweden, the result was a rate 12.4 'very serious' crimes per 100 inhabitants, a rate of 17.6 'fairly serious' crimes, and a rate of 16.4 'not very serious' crimes. This total is the same as the 46.4 crimes per 100 reported on earlier in the chapter.

Figure 7 Incidence rates for 16 crimes by seriousness



Countries are sorted by number of very serious crimes.

### 2.13 Trends in crime

Countries that have taken part in the ICVS more than once have usually done so to align themselves with others in the ongoing sweep rather than to provide any solid indicator of trends over time – for which sample sizes are small. What the ICVS shows in terms of trends nonetheless bears inspection.

Table 6 shows results, based on incidence rates which provide the most complete measure of all crimes experienced. Attempted burglary has been excluded as there was no measure in 1989. Offensive sexual behaviour and threats are also omitted. This is because (i) they are more likely to be susceptible to changes over time in the propensity to report to interviewers; and (ii) they were omitted in trend analysis done on the basis of the 1996 ICVS sweep. Trends in individual crime will be insufficiently reliable, but some mention is made of trend differences for property crime (all thefts and car vandalism) and violent crime (robbery, sexual assault and assault with force). The risk levels mentioned are for the year prior to the survey.

Table 6 Trends in crime

	1988	1991	1995	1999
Australia	46.3	49.5	.	↓ 44.0
Belgium	27.5	27.7	.	29.7
Canada	41.7	44.8	↓ 38.0	33.9*↓
England & Wales	27.1	↑ 47.7	49.5	46.1
Finland <sup>1</sup>	20.7	↑ 28.5	25.5	24.1*↓
France	29.4		↑ 38.9	↓ 29.7
Netherlands	41.3	↑ 49.7	51.0	↓ 42.3
Northern Ireland	21.1	.	23.1	20.7
Poland	.	37.1	36.3	36.3
Scotland	27.2		↑ 38.4	35.3*↑
Sweden	.	31.2	↑ 38.1	39.4
Switzerland <sup>2</sup>	21.3		↑ 36.3	↓ 18.4
USA <sup>3</sup>	51.0	45.5	39.5*↓	34.2*↓
7 countries	36.5	41.9		
7 countries		40.6	39.7	
11 countries			37.7	32.7

1 Finland estimate used for theft from car (2000).

2 Estimates used for crimes against property (2000).

3 Estimates used for all 10 offences (1992).

↑ and ↓ indicate that the difference compared to the *previous survey* is statistically significant (t-test;  $p < 0.10$ )

↑ indicates an increase over the previous sweep; ↓ denotes a decrease.

\* indicates, where appropriate, that the difference with one survey in between is statistically significant (t-test,  $p < 0.10$ ).

**We start with some broad conclusions, and then provide more detail. The broad conclusions are:**

- Generally speaking, the ICVS suggests that crime rose between 1988 and 1991, stabilised or fell in 1995, then fell back more in 1999. This is the dominant pattern in many individual countries.
- The picture in North America differs from that in Europe. The USA has shown consistent drops in crime since 1988. Canada had a modest increase in 1991, but lower figures in 1995 as well as in 1999, leaving overall crime levels lower than in 1988. In the three European countries with four ICVS measures (England and Wales, Finland and the Netherlands), crime levels are still higher than in 1988, despite a fall in risks in 1999. Compared with 1991, risks fell more in North America than in five of the seven European countries showing falls.
- Trends in property crime and violence differ somewhat. Overall, both increased between 1988 and 1991. Between 1991 and 1995, there are indications that

violent crime rose marginally more than property crime in four out of seven countries, though elsewhere there was little proportionate difference. Since 1995, there been a much more consistent fall in property crime. Changes in violence are variable.

*Trends between 1988-1991*

For the seven countries that can be compared here, there was an average increase from 37 incidents per 100 people in 1988 to 42 in 1991. (The increase was more marked excluding the USA.) Five of the seven countries experienced higher crime levels: England and Wales (with the highest increase), the Netherlands, Finland, Australia, and Canada. (The first three increases were statistically significant.) Crime in Belgium showed no change, and it fell in the USA (ns).

*Trends between 1991-1995*

There are again comparisons possible for seven countries. On average, crime stabilised at around 40 incidents per 100 inhabitants, but this conceals some differences. In the USA and Canada, as said, risks fell over this period, and there was a less marked fall in Finland. In Sweden, there was a statistically significantly *increase* (of 26%) in incidence rates. In the other countries, shifts were not marked, or statistically robust.

France, Scotland, Switzerland and Northern Ireland did not participate in the 1992 survey but did so in 1989. In the first three countries there were significantly higher victimisation rates in 1995 than in 1988, with the increase in Switzerland largest. Risks in Northern Ireland also rose, but the change was not statistically robust.

*Trends between 1995-1999*

Eleven countries can be compared here. On average, risks fell from 38 incidents per 100 in 1995 to 33 in 1999. There were falls in most countries. Exceptions were Sweden and Poland, where there was little change. The most statistically robust falls were in France, the Netherlands and Switzerland.

*Variations in property crime and violence*

Between 1988 and 1991, there were no very evident or consistent differences as regards trends in property crime and violence. Between 1991 and 1995, there are indications that violent crimes rose marginally more than property crime in four out of seven countries that can be compared, while elsewhere there was little proportionate difference. Of the four countries that can be compared with 1989, all showed bigger increases in violence than property crime.

Between 1995 and 1999, nine of the eleven countries with available comparisons registered a decrease in property crimes (albeit some of them small), while in two (Poland and Sweden) there was little change. For violent crime, risks rose in five

countries and fell in six – though many of the changes were relatively modest. Taking all available countries together, there was little difference in violence risks over the four years.

The concluding chapter returns to trends in crime, and looks also at the picture from police statistics.



## Individual risk factors

### 3.1 Introduction

So far in this report we have focused on *average* levels of victimization in particular countries, looking at how these compare with other countries, and over time. However, a wealth of victimological literature suggests that, *within* countries, some people will be more at risk than others. This chapter examines these differences in risk. It uses information collected in the ICVS about the respondent's personal characteristics (such as age and marital status), the income level of the household, and the size of the locality in which it is placed.

The variables used are regularly included in victimological risk analysis. Larger independent surveys with more risk-related variables allow more refined analysis of course. Nonetheless, the ICVS measures are among the key ones usually brought into play within the dominant, and closely related, theoretical perspectives on risk – which centre on lifestyle; routine activities; and opportunity structures (see, e.g., Felson, 1998; Van Dijk, 1994; Wittebrood and Nieuwbeerta, 2000). Between them, they highlight the following factors as heightening risks:

- *Where people live.* Those in more urban localities are assumed to live nearer to high offending populations. Also the daily routines of urban dwellers may leave targets less 'socially well guarded' and bring people into contact with each other in relatively anonymous settings. Urbanisation, too, may undermine social cohesiveness. The ICVS measure taken here is simply size of locality.
- *A risky lifestyle* – or more frequent self-exposure to criminal opportunities. This is measured here by an ICVS question on how often the respondent usually goes out in the evening.<sup>29</sup>
- *Target attractiveness* – either of the individual and/or their belongings. This is measured here by household income.
- *Weak guardianship.* This assumes that risks are increased when many activities take place outside the home and when people are, for instance, frequently in the company of strangers. The analysis below employs marital status as a proxy measure of this (with those who are married assumed to be likely to stay at home more). The frequency of going out in the evening is also relevant, which is itself likely to be related to age.

<sup>29</sup> Other measures sometimes used for instance are the frequency of visiting pubs and clubs, or using public transport regularly.

Differences in risk are examined below in relation to various types of victimisation. These are divided into two main groups. The first is *property crime*: thefts of and from cars (labelled 'car thefts' for convenience); burglary; and so-called 'petty crimes' (car vandalism, bicycle theft, and thefts of personal property. The second group is *contact crime*: (robbery together with assaults and threats; and sexual incidents (asked of women only)). It should be borne in mind that within the property crime group, all offences with the exception of thefts from personal property are 'household crimes' about which the respondent answers on behalf of the household at large. Consequently, *individual* respondent characteristics, such as age and evening lifestyle, do not necessarily describe very well the dominant household type. (For instance a young, socially active respondent can be living with 'stay at home' middle-aged parents.)

### 3.2 The effects of individual risk factors on victimisation

Three analyses are presented below. The first (Table 7) shows straightforward prevalence risks of victimisation in terms of the available ICVS measures.<sup>30</sup> The second analysis (Table 8) presents a summary measure of the effects on risks of each *individual* risk factor (e.g., gender or age). The summary measure is expressed as an 'odds-ratio', which is explained more below. The third analysis (Table 9) takes account of the fact that some risk characteristics are themselves related to others (for instance, unmarried people are likely to be younger and to have a more socially active lifestyle). This final analysis, therefore, looks at the *independent* effect of any particular risk characteristic, net of its overlap with related characteristics. Table 7 shows that there were higher risks of victimisation, compared to the average, for:

- Those in the *largest conurbations* (of populations over 100,000). Differences were most pronounced in relation to car thefts and sexual incidents. For all ICVS crimes, those in the most urban areas have approaching double the risk of victimisation as those in the least urban areas.
- Households with *higher incomes*. The differences were most marked for car thefts, petty crime, and sexual incidents. This result on the face of it might seem at odds with conventional criminological wisdom that more socially deprived areas face higher risks of crime. The explanation is likely to be that the current analysis is a 'micro' rather than a 'macro' one (see, e.g., Ellingworth et al., 1997). In other words, it is looking at *individual* risks rather than *area* ones. In poorer neighbourhoods, households in general might have higher risk, but within (and

30 Each country is given equal weight in the analyses in this Chapter. This is to avoid countries with larger samples unduly influencing results.

**Table 7 Differences in risks of victimisation in 1999: 2000 ICVS (16 countries combined)<sup>1</sup>**

	Crimes against property			All property crimes	Contact crimes		All contact crimes	Any crime
	Car thefts <sup>2</sup> (owners)	Burglary and attempts	'Petty crimes' <sup>3</sup>		Robbery, assaults & threats	Sexual incidents (women)		
	% victimised	once or more	in 1999					
Average risk	6.3	3.3	12.8	18.3	4.1	1.7	4.7	21.4
Town size								
<10,000	4.7	2.7	9.6	14.2	2.9	0.9	3.3	16.4
10-100,000	6.0	3.2	13.5	18.8	4.6	1.9	5.2	22.4
>100,000	8.8	4.2	15.6	22.6	4.9	2.6	5.7	26.2
Income <sup>4</sup>								
Lower	4.7	3.1	10.0	14.3	3.6	1.4	4.2	17.4
Higher	7.2	3.5	14.7	21.1	4.4	2.0	5.1	24.3
Age								
55+	3.6	3.0	7.5	11.6	2.0	0.2	2.1	13.1
25-54	6.5	3.2	13.8	19.7	4.2	1.7	4.7	22.9
16-24	10.2	4.2	19.0	26.0	7.4	4.8	9.2	32.0
Going out <sup>5</sup>								
Not often	5.1	2.9	10.4	15.1	3.0	1.0	3.4	17.5
Often	7.5	3.8	15.1	21.4	5.2	2.6	6.0	25.3
Married								
Yes	5.3	2.8	11.5	16.6	2.7	0.9	3.0	18.7
No	8.1	4.2	14.7	20.8	6.1	2.9	7.2	25.5
Education <sup>6</sup>								
Lower	5.1	2.9	10.2	14.6	3.3	1.1	3.6	17.2
Higher	7.0	3.6	14.5	20.8	4.6	2.2	5.4	24.4
Gender								
Female	5.9	3.4	12.3	17.6	3.6	1.7	4.9	20.9
Male	6.7	3.3	13.2	18.9	4.5	na	4.5	21.9

1 Victimization percentages are computed after listwise deletion of cases. This means that if any information on a risk factor was missing (e.g. the respondent answered 'don't know', refused to answer, or the questions were not asked), the case was omitted from analysis. Average victimization risks may therefore differ somewhat from those mentioned elsewhere in this report. Switzerland is omitted completely.

2 Car thefts are thefts of and from cars. Motorcycle thefts are included in 'all crimes'.

3 'Petty crimes' covers car vandalism, bicycle theft, and thefts of personal property.

4 Those on 'lower' incomes have an income less than average in each country. Those on 'higher' incomes earn more than average.

5 The 'going out' variable is based on answers to a question about how many times people usually go out in the evening. Those counted as 'often' indicated to go out at least once a week or more. Those counted as 'not often' go out less frequently.

6 Those with 'lower' education are in the lower half of the educational distribution. Those with 'higher' education are in the upper half of the distribution.

outside them) more affluent households could be the most vulnerable (probably because they offer a greater abundance of 'criminal rewards').

- *Younger respondents* – particularly in relation to the two contact crimes, and car thefts.
- *Those who went out more frequently*. The differences here were most pronounced for contact crimes.
- Those who were *unmarried*, particularly again with respect to contact crime.
- Those with a *higher educational status*, particularly for sexual incidents. It cannot be ruled out that there is some 'response effect' in operation here, such that the more literate and numerate perform better at the task of remembering victimisation. More likely, though – and later results endorse this – is that higher educational status is itself related to other things, such as being younger and less home-bound.
- *Males*. For property crime, the differences were relatively slight, and this will reflect sampling procedure whereby either a man or woman could answer on behalf of the household. For robbery, the male: female difference was larger.

Table 8 presents 'odds-ratio' for any one particular risk variable, such as size of locality. An odds-ratio is (a) the odds of someone in a certain group (e.g., in the largest conurbation) being victimised as against them not being victimised, divided by (b) the odds for someone in the 'base' (or reference) group. In all cases, the base group has been taken as those at lowest risk. (In the case of size of locality, for instance, this is those in areas with less than 10,000 population.) The higher the odds-ratio, the stronger the effect of the particular risk factor on victimisation. The calculation of the odds-ratios is straightforward. Table 7 shows, for instance, that 5.2% of those who go out more frequently were victims of robbery and assaults and threats once or more in 1999. The risk for the less socially active is 3.0%. The odds-ratio – or the 'relative risks' for the socially active as against the rest – is computed as  $[5.2 / (100 - 5.2)] / [3.0 / (100 - 3.0)]$ : 1.77. Thus, the risk of robbery and assaults and threats is 1.77 times (or nearly 80%) higher for those who go out once a week or more as against those who go out less often.

By far the biggest differences in Table 8 emerge for sexual incidents, where the youngest women (aged 16-24) are 25 times more at risk than women aged 55 or older. Being younger also has a strong effect on risks of robbery and assaults and threats, and car thefts. Those who are not married face higher risks than those who are married – for instance by a factor of 2.3 for robbery and assaults and threats, and for women by a factor of 3.3 for sexual incidents.

**Table 8 Uncontrolled effects of risk factors (odds-ratios) on victimisation in 1999: 2000 ICVS (16 countries combined)<sup>1</sup>**

	Crimes against property			Contact crimes			Any crime
	Car thefts <sup>2</sup> (owners) % victimised	Burglary and attempts once or more	'Petty crimes' <sup>3</sup> in 1999	All property crimes	Robbery, assaults & threats	Sexual incidents (women)	
<b>Town size</b> (Base = <10,000)							
10-100,000	1.29	1.19	1.47	1.40	1.61	2.13	1.61
>100,000	1.96	1.58	1.74	1.76	1.73	2.94	1.77
<b>Income<sup>4</sup></b> (Base = Low)							
High	1.57	1.13	1.55	1.60	1.23	1.44	1.23
<b>Age</b> (Base = 55+)							
25-54	1.86	1.07	1.97	1.87	2.15	8.63	2.30
16-24	3.04	1.42	2.89	2.68	3.92	25.16	4.72
<b>Going out<sup>5</sup></b> (Base = Not often)							
Often	1.51	1.32	1.53	1.53	1.77	2.64	1.81
<b>Married</b> (Base = Married)							
Not married	1.57	1.52	1.33	1.32	2.34	3.29	2.51
<b>Education<sup>6</sup></b> (Base = Low)							
High	1.40	1.25	1.49	1.54	1.41	2.02	1.53
<b>Gender</b> (Base = Female)							
Male <sup>7</sup>	1.15	0.97	1.08	1.09	1.26	-	-

1 The odds-ratios are based on prevalence risks in 1999 (% victimised once or more). 'Uncontrolled' means that each category (e.g., town size) is considered independently of any association with another category.

2 Car thefts are thefts of and from cars. Motorcycle thefts are included in 'all crimes'.

3 'Petty crimes' covers car vandalism, bicycle theft, and thefts of personal property.

4 Those on 'lower' incomes have an income less than average in each country. Those on 'higher' incomes earn more than average.

5 The 'going out' variable is based on answers to a question about how many times people usually go out in the evening. Those counted as 'often' indicated to go out at least once a week or more. Those counted as 'not often' go out less frequently.

6 Those with 'lower' education are in the lower half of the educational distribution. Those with 'higher' education are in the upper half of the distribution.

7 Comparing men and women on all contact crime is somewhat inappropriate since men were not asked about sexual incidents. The odds-ratio for men was 0.91.

### 3.3 Multivariate analyses

Multivariate analysis allows more sensitive measurement of which *particular* characteristics are important in determining vulnerability to crime. This is because, as said, it takes account of the overlap between different characteristics. Table 9 presents odds-ratios for individual risk factors, controlling for any overlap with others.

The main features of Table 9 are as follows:

- As one would expect, odds-ratios for particular variables are usually smaller than when they are considered in tandem with other variables than when they are not (i.e., as in Table 8). Nonetheless, most risk factors examined have odds-ratios larger than one in relation to most victimisation types. This indicates that each has some independent effects on risks. One main exception was that gender was relatively unimportant in relation to property crime, contrary to the earlier analyses.
- Two of the biggest changes in the profile of risks (when overlaps with other risk factors are taken into account) are in relation to the *frequency of going out* and *educational status*. A more socially active lifestyle still heightened risks, but much less so. This either suggests that 'lifestyle' *per se* is less important than basic social characteristics (such as being young, and an urban dweller). Or more probably, it indicates that cursory measures of lifestyle used in the ICVS and other victimisation surveys do not do justice to the nuances of exposure to risky situations. Having a *higher educational status* also seemed less important after other risk variables were controlled for. This is likely to reflect the fact, for instance, that younger people now have more educational qualifications.
- Net of other effects, *urbanisation* continued to be an influential risk factor. Risks of property crime, for instance, were 60% higher in the most urban areas compared to the least urbanised ones. The biggest reduction in the 'urbanisation effect', when other things were taken into account, was in relation to contact crime. This is likely to be because the highest risk victims according to Table 7 (e.g., young single people) more often live in the most urbanised areas.
- *Income* also continued to be of importance, although for sexual incidents it was less so when other risk dimensions were controlled for. This might well be because higher-income women more often live in more urbanised areas.
- *Being younger* also remained important. But it was rather less so having taken account of other variables (e.g., that the young go out more).
- *Being married* also still heightened risks, but again less so than when other things related to being married were taken into account. The differential in risks of sexual incidents for unmarried women, for instance, was much weaker after other factors were accounted for (e.g., simply being younger).

**Table 9** Controlled effects of risk factors (odds-ratios) on victimisation in 1999: 2000 ICVS (16 countries combined)<sup>1</sup>

	Crimes against property			Contact crimes			Any crime
	Car thefts <sup>2</sup> (owners) % victimised	Burglary and attempts once or more	'Petty crimes' <sup>3</sup> in 1999	All property crimes	Robbery, assaults & threats	Sexual incidents (women)	
<b>Town size</b> (Base = <10.000)							
10-100.000	1.26	1.14	1.39	1.33	1.48	1.96	1.53
>100.000	1.81	1.43	1.58	1.60	1.47	2.51	1.57
<b>Income<sup>4</sup></b> (Base = Low)							
High	1.42	1.11	1.33	1.39	1.16	1.17	1.14
<b>Age</b> (Base = 55+)							
25-54	1.66	1.00	1.73	1.61	1.92	8.05	2.15
16-24	2.34	1.04	2.27	2.04	2.51	15.48	3.05
<b>Going out<sup>5</sup></b> (Base = Not often)							
Often	1.18	1.17	1.21	1.22	1.25	1.45	1.28
<b>Married</b> (Base = Married)							
Not married	1.27	1.47	1.15	1.18	1.99	2.40	2.00
<b>Education<sup>6</sup></b> (Base = Low)							
High	1.02	1.10	1.07	1.11	1.01	0.96	1.04
<b>Gender</b> (Base = Female)							
Male <sup>7</sup>	1.10	0.96	1.01	1.02	1.19	-	-

1 The odds-ratios are based on prevalence risks in 1999 (% victimised once or more). 'Controlled' means that each category (e.g., town size) is considered controlling for associations with all other categories.

2 Car thefts are thefts of and from cars. Motorcycle thefts are included in 'all crimes'.

3 'Petty crimes' covers car vandalism, bicycle theft, and thefts of personal property.

4 Those on 'lower' incomes have an income less than average in each country. Those on 'higher' incomes earn more than average.

5 The 'going out' variable is based on answers to a question about how many times people usually go out in the evening. Those counted as 'often' indicated to go out at least once a week or more. Those counted as 'not often' go out less frequently.

6 Those with 'lower' education are in the lower half of the educational distribution. Those with 'higher' education are in the upper half of the distribution.

7 Comparing men and women on all contact crime is somewhat inappropriate since men were not asked about sexual incidents. The odds-ratio for men was 0.85.

We do not present here any analysis of whether the picture of differential risk is the same in each of the individual countries in the ICVS. Suffice it to say that the results were *broadly* similar across country, indicating that the contours of victimisation risk are relatively stable. Future reports on the 2000 ICVS will explore differences more specifically.

## Reporting crime and the police

### 4.1 Introduction

This section concentrates mainly on the issue of reporting victimisation to the police. It considers how reporting rates vary across offence types, and across country. The reasons for *not* reporting are then considered: how these differ for different types of victimisation, and whether those in different countries react differently in their decisions not to report. After this, we look at reasons *for* reporting to the police – again in relation to different offence types, and in relation to country differences. The chapter then moves onto what victims who reported felt about the police response: how many were satisfied with it, and if they were not, why not. After this, there is some analysis of how many victims said they received help from a specialised victim support agency, and if they did not, whether they felt such help would have been useful. Finally, we consider how people in general – both victims and non-victims – feel about the performance of the police in their local area, and about how helpful in general they feel the police are.


### 4.2 Reporting to the police

The frequency with which victims (or relatives and friends on their behalf) report offences to the police is strongly related to the type of offence involved. Figure 8 shows average reporting rates in all 17 countries in the 2000 ICVS.<sup>31</sup> Details are also shown of the highest and lowest reporting rates in the 17 countries. For instance, the proportion of burglaries with entry reported ranged from 59% in Portugal to 92% in Belgium, with an average value for all 17 countries of 77%.

There are differences in reporting rates for different types of offences. In most countries, almost all cars and motorcycles stolen were reported, as well as most burglaries with entry. About two-thirds of thefts from cars were reported, and rather more than half of bicycle thefts and robberies. Only about a third of all assaults and threats were drawn to the attention of the police, although the figure was higher for assaults with force (45%) than for threats (29%). Sexual incidents mentioned to interviewers were least frequently reported (on average 15% were). Where sexual

31 The figures refer to the last incident reported to the police over the previous five years. Reporting rates for corruption and consumer fraud are not given since victimisation rates were insufficiently high (see Chapter 2). Details of the few incidents reported to the police and other authorities are given in Appendix 4, Tables 4 and 5.

**Figure 8 Percentage of offences reported to the police (highest, lowest and average values): 17 countries**




Crimes are sorted by average percentage.

assault was mentioned, though, 28% of incidents were reported; where simply offensive behaviour was involved, only 10% were drawn to police attention.

There was more variation in reporting rates for some crimes than others. One of the largest apparent differences is in relation to motorcycle theft, although this is likely to reflect the small number of victims involved. Relatively large differences across countries are also evident for sexual assaults (with a very low reporting rate in Finland and a very high one in Scotland), and for assaults with force (with a low reporting rate in Japan, but high ones in the Netherlands and Northern Ireland). The small numerical base again, though, needs to be borne in mind.

In considering relative propensities to report crime in different countries, the overall proportion of *all* offences reported is not a sound measure. This is because, as seen,

**Figure 9** Percentage of offences reported to the police: overall figure for six types of offences



reporting levels vary by offence type, so overall reporting levels will be influenced by the make-up of crime in each country. Figure 9 offers a compromise by showing reporting levels for six offences for which levels of reporting are most variable and/or experience of victimisation is comparatively high.<sup>32</sup> The offences are thefts from cars, car vandalism, bicycle theft, burglary with entry, attempted burglary and thefts of personal property. (The reporting rates relate to the last incident reported over the previous five years.) A full breakdown of reporting rates, including results from previous ICVS sweeps is given in Table 9 in Appendix 4.

In the 17 countries as a whole, exactly half of the six crimes were reported to the police. The highest reporting rates (around 60%) were in Denmark, Sweden, North-

<sup>32</sup> Omitted are car and motorcycle thefts (which are usually reported and are relatively uncommon), and robbery (for which numbers per country are small). Also, omitted are sexual incidents and assaults/threats. Here, the proportion reported will be influenced by, respectively, the ratio of sexual assaults to offensive sexual behaviour, and assaults to threats.

Table 10 Percentage of offences reported to the police<sup>1, 2</sup>

	1989	1992	1996	2000
Australia	49	↓ 43		↑ 47
Belgium	51	↑ 68		↓ 56
Canada	51	51	50	47
England & Wales	56	58	55	55
Finland	50	↓ 44	↑ 50	46
France	53		48	52
Netherlands	54	57	55	58
Northern Ireland	39		↑ 50	↑ 59
Poland		32	32	↑ 38
Scotland	64		↓ 56	↓ 52
Sweden		58	56	59
Switzerland	62		↓ 54	53
USA	55		53	50

1 Based on theft from cars; car vandalism; bicycle theft; burglary with entry; attempted burglary; and theft of personal property. Based on last incident reported over the previous five years.

2 Countries that participated less than three times are omitted.

↑ and ↓ indicate that the difference compared to the previous survey is statistically significant (t-test;  $p < 0.10$ ).

↑ indicates an increase over the previous sweep; ↓ denotes a decrease.

ern Ireland and the Netherlands. The lowest were in Portugal, Japan, Catalonia and Poland, where only about a third or more of crimes were reported. The figures for Portugal and Catalonia are consistent with the low reporting rates for the South European countries – Spain and Italy – from earlier surveys.

#### *Trends in reporting over time*

Thirteen countries have participated in at least three rounds in the ICVS. Reporting rates over time for the six crimes taken are shown in Table 10. There are two things of note:

- First, there is no evidence that reporting rates have changed much over the years in most of the countries. The average reporting rates for the six crimes has been within a narrow range of 51% to 53% for the countries taking part at least three times.
- Secondly, *relative* levels of reporting are very broadly consistent over the sweeps, and where there are changes they are not always statistically robust. The most marked change in position is in relation to Northern Ireland. The level of reporting in 2000 was comparatively high, whereas in 1996 it had been comparatively low. One explanation for this may be the change in the profile of crime, with a larger proportion of the total count of crime comprising burglaries with entry

and thefts from cars, which have higher reporting levels than some other offences. Reporting has also increased in Poland, but there is no evident change in the profile of crime that explains this. In Scotland, reporting has gone down since 1989, and this is consistent with there being proportionately fewer crimes in 2000 with higher reporting rates (e.g., burglary with entry). There is a similar fall in reporting in Switzerland, and here again changes in the profile of crime may be more an issue than a change in the propensity to report. Reporting rates in Belgium have also fluctuated somewhat, but there is less change in the profile of crime to explain this.<sup>33</sup>

### 4.3 Reasons for not reporting to the police

Victims who did not report were asked why not in relation to five crimes – burglary with entry, thefts from cars, robbery, sexual incidents, and assaults and threats. (The last three are termed ‘contact crimes’). More than one reason could be given. Those who *did* report were also asked to say why they had done so, and this is discussed later.

Table 11 shows reasons for not reporting the five crimes for all 17 countries together. That the incident was ‘not serious enough’ was by far the most important reason for not bringing in the police. About four in ten non-reporters mentioned this, and even more when thefts from cars went unreported. A quarter of victims felt it was inappropriate to call the police, or said they or the family solved it. The idea that the police could do nothing was mentioned fairly frequently (e.g., by one in five victims of thefts of cars who did not report). Few victims mentioned fear or dislike of the police as a reason for not reporting, although it was slightly more often mentioned in relation to contact crime. Fear of reprisals was also infrequently mentioned, though it was rather more often mentioned in relation to contact crime than the two property crimes.

Some response categories are fairly close in meaning. For instance, an incident considered as ‘inappropriate for the police’ might be one that the victim felt was not worth troubling the police about, or in which someone known to the victim was involved. There is also some ambiguity in some of the reasons for not reporting. For instance, ‘the police could do nothing’ might mean that the harm, loss or damage cannot be rectified; that there was insufficient proof of what happened; or that it seems impossible that an offender could be apprehended.

33 There was an unusually high proportion of victims in Belgium in the 2000 ICVS compared to 1992 who did not report to the police because they felt they could not or would not do anything about. On the face of it, this may signify lower confidence in the police, although general attitudes to police performance in Belgium actually improved between the 1992 and 2000 sweeps.

**Table 11 Reasons for not reporting to the police: all countries (percentages)<sup>1</sup>**

	Theft from car <sup>2</sup>	Burglary with entry	Robbery	Sexual incidents	Assault & threats	All five crimes
Not serious / no loss	53	34	39	38	34	42
Solved it ourselves / inappropriate for the police <sup>3</sup>	14	26	21	31	29	24
Police could do nothing	19	13	16	13	13	14
Police wouldn't do anything	16	10	12	7	10	11
Fear of reprisals	<1	2	7	8	7	5
Fear / dislike of the police	1	3	4	4	4	3
Reported to other authorities	1	2	2	4	4	3
No insurance	3	1	1	<1	<1	1
Other / don't know	18	25	23	24	23	22

1 Multiple responses were allowed, so percentages may add to more than 100%. Based on last incident over the previous five years.

2 Reasons for not reporting thefts from cars was not asked in Switzerland.

3 'Solved it myself', 'My family solved it' and 'Not appropriate for the police' are taken together.

There was a clear pattern in which, as one would expect, crimes that were rated as serious by victims were reported most often (72% were). Of incidents judged to be 'somewhat serious', 56% were reported. Of those judged 'not very serious', a much lower 37% were drawn attention to the police.

Assessments of seriousness made most difference to reporting levels for threats and sexual incidents: very few incidents were reported which were considered not very serious. For burglaries, thefts of cars, motorcycles or bicycles, seriousness judgements certainly made a difference, but to a lesser degree. This is probably because other factors also exerted an influence (such as wanting property back, or needing to make an insurance claim).

Reasons for not reporting differed somewhat across country. This will in part reflect the relative weight of different crimes among the five types considered. Table 12 shows details of why respondents said crimes were not brought to the attention of the police. (Tables 10, 11 and 12 in Appendix 4 show results in more detail for all five crimes.)

A technical issue needs mentioning first in relation to Table 12. This is that the number of answers respondents gave in Belgium was greatly in excess of that in other countries; the same applied to Poland, although to a lesser extent. (Survey

**Table 12** Reasons for not reporting to the police, five crimes: by country (percentages)<sup>1</sup>

	Not serious / no loss	Solved it ourselves / inappropriate for the police <sup>3</sup>	Police could do nothing	Police wouldn't do anything	Fear of reprisals	Fear / dislike of the police	Reported to other authorities	No insurance	Other / don't know
Australia	47	14	9	6	<1	<1	4	<1	34
Belgium	52	45	42	35	4	4	6	4	18
Canada	41	22	6	5	2	2	3	1	36
Catalonia (Spain)	51	12	10	17	<1	<1	2	2	16
Denmark	42	31	9	6	1	1	2	1	24
England & Wales	34	21	12	11	3	3	3	1	28
Finland	55	23	7	6	<1	<1	4	1	13
France	39	24	8	10	1	1	<1	1	19
Japan	48	22	18	8	3	3	6	<1	30
Netherlands	32	21	9	9	<1	<1	1	<1	34
Northern Ireland	37	24	17	8	8	8	4	<1	10
Poland	46	24	39	31	7	7	2	3	6
Portugal	41	23	13	10	2	2	1	<1	12
Scotland	37	18	6	7	3	3	3	<1	34
Sweden	34	33	11	11	2	2	1	2	17
Switzerland <sup>2</sup>	36	22	9	4	2	2	<1	<1	13
USA	27	24	17	9	6	6	6	<1	24
All countries	42	24	14	11	3	3	3	1	22

1 Multiple responses were allowed, so percentages may add to more than 100%. Based on last incident over the previous five years.

2 Reasons for not reporting thefts from cars was not asked in Switzerland.

3 'Solved it myself', 'My family solved it' and 'Not appropriate' are taken together.

company practice is likely to explain this.) Results from these two countries, then, need to be interpreted with this in mind.<sup>34</sup>

That the matter was inappropriate for the police or solved privately was far the most frequently mentioned in Belgium. It was also mentioned relatively frequently in Sweden (as was the case in the 1992 ICVS) and Denmark. This was also true in

34 In Belgium, there were about 2.3 reasons coded per respondent for not reporting the five crimes, and 1.7 in Poland. The average for the other countries was 1.1.

relation to contact crimes in Northern Ireland and Poland. The feeling that the police could or would not be able to help was most often cited in Belgium and Poland (though note the technical issue mentioned above). Those in Catalonia, Japan, the USA and Northern Ireland were also slightly more likely to mention the police response. Fear and dislike of the police was most often mentioned (though even then not often) by those in Northern Ireland, Poland and in the USA (in relation to contact crime only).

#### 4.4 Reasons for reporting to the police

The 1996 ICVS introduced the question why victims *did* report. Table 13 shows first the results from the 2000 ICVS for all countries combined for the five crimes the question was asked about. (Multiple responses were allowed.)

The reasons why sexual incidents and assaults/threats were reported differed somewhat from those for other offences. Victims here were especially concerned to stop what happened being repeated. More also wanted help. For the two property offences and robbery, more than a third were reported because assistance was sought in recovering property. When a burglary or theft from a car was involved, about a third were reported for insurance reasons. About four in ten victims overall referred to the obligation to notify the police, either because they felt a crime such as theirs should be reported, or because what happened had been serious. Retributive motives – the hope that offenders would be caught and punished – weighed with nearly as many victims, though this was less evident when thefts from cars were involved. Results from the 1996 ICVS were fairly similar when the comparison is restricted to the countries in each sweep.

The patterns across country are broadly in line with the overall picture. Tables 13, 14 and 15 in Appendix 4 show results for the five crimes together, for burglary with entry, thefts from cars, and for contact crime. However, close comparisons are difficult for three reasons. First, there will be some variation because of the small number of incidents involved in some cases. Second, the 'mix' of offences reported in different countries will make a difference. (For instance, wanting an offender caught and punished was more an issue with burglary than with thefts from cars, while wanting to stop an incident happening again was more common a reason for reporting for sexual incidents than other contact crimes.) Thirdly, as was the case with reasons for *not* reporting, simply more responses were given in Belgium, Poland and (in this case) Japan.<sup>35</sup> For these countries, then, high values on any particular reason for reporting may well simply reflect this technical difference.

35 In Belgium, there were about 4 reasons coded per respondent for reporting the five crimes, 3 in Poland, and 2.3 in Japan. The average for the other countries was 1.6.

Table 13 Reasons for reporting to the police: all countries (percentages)<sup>1</sup>

	Theft from car <sup>2</sup>	Burglary with entry	Robbery	Sexual incidents	Assault & threats	All five crimes
Should be reported / serious	38	44	38	25	35	39
Retribution	27	38	40	43	39	35
To recover property	41	35	38		3	30
To stop it	21	27	26	53	39	28
Insurance reasons	36	33	12		4	27
To get help	7	12	15	26	23	12
Compensation	7	8	7	9	7	7
Other / don't know	11	13	17	21	15	12

1 Multiple responses were allowed, so percentages may add to more than 100%.

2 Reasons for reporting for theft from car was not asked in Switzerland.

#### 4.5 Victim's satisfaction with the police response

If they had reported to the police, victims were asked whether they were satisfied with the police response.<sup>36</sup> Figure 10 shows the results for the two property crimes, and for the three contact crimes taken together. (Further details are in Appendix 4, Table 16, which also shows results from the 1996 sweep.


Overall, there is not much difference between how victims felt when they reported property crimes as against contact crime. For both, about six in ten felt satisfied. But looking at countries individually, the police were rated lower in their handling of contact crime in more countries (eight) than they were for property crime (five); there was little difference in the rest.

Those in Denmark (81%), Switzerland (77%) and Catalonia (75%) were most satisfied after reporting burglaries and thefts from cars, although figures in several other countries were not far behind. Victims of contact crime in Denmark and Switzerland, however, were relatively less satisfied when reporting contact crime. Those in Sweden ranked higher in their assessment of how the police handled contact crimes reported than they did property crimes. The police response was considered least good in Portugal, Poland, France, and Japan (particularly for contact crime).

Levels of satisfaction with the police after reporting were lower when crimes were rated as serious (59% were satisfied) than when they were judged 'somewhat serious' (67%), or 'not very serious' (72%). On the face of it, this might suggest that the police do a poorer job when 'serious' crimes are reported. More likely, probably, is that vic-

36 This question was asked for the same five crimes as questions about reporting to the police: burglary with entry, thefts from cars, robbery, sexual incidents, and assault and threats.

Figure 10 Percentage satisfied with police response after reporting



Countries are sorted by 'theft from car and burglary with entry'.

\* 'Contact crime': robbery, sexual incidents and assaults and threats.

tims have higher expectation of the police when they report crime incidents which they judge to be more serious.

#### *Trends over time in satisfaction with the police response*

For the 11 countries in the 1996 sweep of the ICVS, the picture was generally similar with respect to *relative* levels of satisfaction with the police on reporting. Those in Poland and France, for instance, ranked comparatively low in assessments of police performance in 1996, as they did in 2000; those in Finland ranked police performance relatively highly in both years. The main changes were confined to three countries. In England and Wales, victims who reported were rather less happy with the police response in 2000 than in 1996. In Switzerland and Northern Ireland, in contrast, satisfaction with the police response was higher in 2000 than in 1996.

**Table 14** Reasons for dissatisfaction with the police after reporting: all countries (percentages)<sup>1</sup>

	Theft from car <sup>2</sup>	Burglary with entry	Robbery	Sexual incidents	Assault & threats	All five crimes
Did not do enough	41	49	50	49	51	47
Were not interested	36	33	35	34	31	34
Did not find offender	27	22	21	22	13	22
Did not recover goods	26	22	13		3	18
Gave no information	14	17	8	20	12	15
Impolite	13	15	16	17	22	15
Were slow to arrive	9	16	7	11	15	11
Other / don't know	18	19	20	23	19	21

1 Multiple responses were allowed, so percentages may add to more than 100%.

2 Reasons for dissatisfaction when reporting thefts from car was not asked in Switzerland.

#### *Reasons for dissatisfaction with the police*

Those respondents who indicated that they were not satisfied with the way the police handled the matter were asked why not. (Multiple responses were again allowed). Results for all five crimes for the 17 countries combined are in Table 14.

Overall, the main reason for dissatisfaction was that the police 'did not do enough'. This held across all five crimes, and was the complaint of about half those who answered. The second cause for dissatisfaction was that the 'police were not interested' - mentioned by about a third. For four of the five crimes, the next most common complaint overall was that no offender had been caught. The exception was assaults and threats, where impoliteness on the part of the police was more often mentioned. An explanation for this might be that the police think that some assault incidents involve a degree of victim responsibility. For theft from cars and burglary with entry, around a quarter were dissatisfied because the police did not recover any stolen goods. Victims were most dissatisfied with lack of feedback information from the police when they reported sexual incidents. The relative importance of different reasons for dissatisfaction in the current ICVS sweep was the same as in the 1996 survey.

Results for individual countries are in Table 17, Appendix 4. One needs to bear in mind, though, the small numerical base since answers are based only on those who (a) were victim of one of the five crimes; (b) reported to the police; and (c) were not satisfied. Also, as was the case with reasons for reporting, more responses were given in Belgium, Poland and Japan. Thus, high values on any particular reason why victims were dissatisfied will reflect this.

That the police did not do enough was the most common complaint everywhere except Catalonia, England and Wales and Finland – where as many were unhappy that the police were not sufficiently interested. Those in Portugal were particularly dissatisfied with the effort the police put in. Dissatisfaction with the amount of information the police gave was particularly high in Northern Ireland and the USA, while rather more victims in Catalonia and Sweden mentioned police impoliteness. There was some indication that in Sweden and Northern Ireland, more victims felt that the police were slow to arrive. Some but not all of these findings were also evident in the 1996 ICVS, where comparisons across sweeps can be made.

#### 4.6 Victim support

Some victims who had reported to the police were also asked whether they had received support from a specialised victim support agency. The victims covered were those who has experienced four crimes: burglary with entry, robbery, sexual incidents, and assaults and threats. Because of the small numerical base, the last three are taken together below as ‘contact crime’. Those who had not received any help were asked whether they would have appreciated help in getting information, or practical or emotional support. Results are in Table 15, with further details in Tables 18 and 19 in Appendix 4.

##### *Victims offered support*

Overall, support is more frequently offered to victims of contact crimes (10% were offered help, as against 5% of burglary victims). Victims in the UK – where the victim support movement is strong – were most often offered help, with relatively little difference between victims of burglary and contact crime. For the four crimes together, a full 21% of victims were supported in Northern Ireland, 18% in England and Wales and 12% in Scotland. Elsewhere, there were comparatively high levels of support for victims in the Netherlands (13%), Canada (12%), Sweden (12%), the USA (9%) and Denmark (8%). Least support seems to have been available in Portugal, Japan, Finland, France, and Poland.

Comparing figures from the 2000 ICVS with those from countries in the previous sweep, there was little change that was statistically robust in the proportion of victims contacted by support agencies after they reported to the police. More victims in Northern Ireland, though, seemed supported on 2000 (21%) than in 1996 (11%). The *relative* amount of support offered in different countries was much the same in the two sweeps of the survey.

##### *Victims wanting support*

On the question of whether victims *wanted* help, about one in three burglary victims overall felt it would have been useful, with the proportion rather higher for

**Table 15** Percentage of victims who received, or would have appreciated receiving help from a specialised agency: 2000 ICVS<sup>1</sup>

	Received help <sup>2</sup>		Help would have been useful <sup>3</sup>	
	Burglary with entry	Contact crime <sup>4</sup>	Burglary with entry	Contact crime <sup>4</sup>
Australia	3	7	21	33
Belgium	3	7	22	34
Canada	3	22	30	31
Catalonia (Spain)	7	3	49	59
Denmark	1	19	26	40
England & Wales	16	20	29	36
Finland	-	2	35	35
France	-	3	14	24
Japan	-	-	39	48
Netherlands	9	16	13	23
Northern Ireland	18	23	41	45
Poland	na	4	na	51
Portugal	-	-	52	48
Scotland	12	12	36	35
Sweden	5	16	29	29
USA	5	12	33	38
All countries <sup>5</sup>	5	10	31	41

1 Results for Switzerland are not available; nor are results for burglary in Poland.

2 Asked of victims who reported to the police.

3 Asked of victims who reported to the police but did not receive victim support.


4 Based on robbery, sexual incidents, and assaults and threats.

5 Poland omitted from the average for all countries.

contact crime (four out of ten). Most need was expressed by those in Catalonia, Poland, Portugal, Japan, and Northern Ireland (despite the relatively high level of support already given).

Comparing figures from the current and previous ICVS for countries in both, there was generally little change in the amount of help wanted. There was rather less demand in Sweden, England and Wales, and France, but changes in the nature of incidents reported could explain this. For countries in the current and previous sweep, the *relative* amount of help needed was similar. For example, there was the highest level of demand in Poland and Northern Ireland in both sweeps.

**Figure 11** Percentage thinking the police (a) do a good job in controlling crime in their area, and (b) are helpful



Countries are sorted by 'police are helpful'.

\* 'Police helpful' based on those fully and tending to agree the police are helpful.

#### 4.7 General attitudes to the police

All respondents were asked to give a judgement on the overall performance of the police. The question asked was:

'Taking everything into account, how good a job do you think the police do in your area in controlling crime. Do you think they do a very good job, a fairly good job, a poor job or a very poor job?'

In the 2000 ICVS, there was also a new question:

'And what about the helpfulness of the police. How far do you agree that the police do everything they can to help people and be of service? Do you fully agree, tend to agree, tend to disagree or totally disagree?'

Figure 11 shows results from the two questions (More detailed results are in Tables 20, 21 and 22 in Appendix 4.)

Generally, in those countries where people feel the police do a good job, the police are also considered helpful, and *vice versa*.<sup>37</sup> The most satisfied were in the USA and Canada, where nearly nine out of ten thought both the police performed well, and were helpful. (There were also high levels of satisfaction in the USA and Canada in the 1996 ICVS.) Police performance was also rated relatively highly in Scotland (77%), as it was in 1996, and in Australia (76%). The helpfulness of the police was also rated highly in Finland and Sweden. The poorest judgements of police performance were in Portugal, Poland, the Netherlands, Japan and Catalonia. (Figures for Poland and the Netherlands in 1996 showed the same picture). The police were considered relatively unhelpful in these countries too, though not especially so in Portugal.

#### *Trends over time in attitudes to the police*

Several countries have taken part in at least three sweeps of the ICVS. Table 16 shows results.

Four things are of note.

- First, the rank order position of countries participating in two or more sweeps is very stable. Countries with relatively high figures in one sweep tend to have relatively high figures in other sweeps, and *vice versa*. For instance, in the four countries with measures of attitudes to police performance in all four sweeps of the ICVS, the rank order positions were identical.
- Secondly, there was a general shift downwards in assessments of police performance after 1989, bearing in mind that some of the changes are not particularly statistically robust. For instance, all but one (Finland) of the six countries with measures for 1989 and 1992 had lower figures in 1992. And of nine countries with measures for 1989 and 1996, six had lower figures in 1996 and one (Northern Ireland) had the same.
- Thirdly, police performance was rated more highly in 2000 than in 1996 in all but one of the 11 countries with measures for both years. (The exception was Sweden, where there was little change.) There is good reason, though, to be cautious about this result. This is because – to improve sensitivity of measurement – respondents in the 2000 ICVS were offered four alternatives to judge police performance: that the police did a *very good* job; a *fairly good* job; a *fairly poor* job, and a *very poor* job. In previous sweeps, these were truncated into two: that the police did a *good* job, or a *poor* job. The consistent upward trend in assessments

37 The Spearson correlation between the two measures is 0.82 ( $p < 0.05$ ;  $n = 17$ ).

Table 16 Percentage thinking the police do a good job in controlling crime in their area

	1989	1992	1996	2000 <sup>1</sup>
Australia	73	72		↑ 76
Belgium	53	↓ 48		↑ 64
Canada	89	↓ 82	80	↑ 87
England & Wales	70	↓ 66	68	↑ 72
Finland <sup>2</sup>	64	66	68	70
France	62		↓ 56	↑ 65
Netherlands	58	↓ 50	↓ 45	↑ 52
Northern Ireland	63		63	↑ 67
Poland		38	↓ 27	↑ 46
Scotland	71		69	↑ 77
Sweden		58	62	61
Switzerland	50		↑ 55	↑ 67
USA	81		↓ 77	↑ 89

1 For 2000, the categories 'very good job' and 'fairly good job' are taken together.

2 The differences in Finland between the consecutive years is not statistically significant, but the four-year upward trend is (test for linear association,  $p < 0.07$ ).

↑ and ↓ indicate that the difference compared to the previous survey is statistically significant (t-test;  $p < 0.10$ ).

↑ indicates an increase over the previous sweep; ↓ denotes a decrease.

of police performance in 2000 suggests that this coding change is probably more at issue than any 'real' change in attitudes to the police.

- Bearing in mind the probable 'technical inflation' of the 2000 results, there have been some notable changes in attitudes to the police over time. The most prominent improvements between 1992 and 2000, for instance, were in Poland, Finland, Switzerland, the USA and Belgium. There was a different pattern in the Netherlands however. Satisfaction with the police dropped after 1989, and although it improved in 2000, the percentage feeling the police do a good job is still lower than in 1989.

## Attitudes to crime

The ICVS includes some questions on people's anxiety about crime, and the precautions they take. It also asks about attitudes to sentencing someone who has committed burglary. This chapter deals with these. In considering them, some attention is paid to how the various attitudes relate to national levels of victimisation, and to individual victimisation experience.

### 5.1 The likelihood of burglary

The ICVS provides a measure of concern about burglary through a question which asks respondents how likely they think it is that they will be burgled in the coming year. Figure 12 shows the percentage of people who rated the chance of burglary as 'very likely' or 'likely'. (Table 23 in Appendix 4 gives details across the survey sweeps.) Those in Portugal (58%), Belgium, and France (about 45%) were most pessimistic. There was least concern in the Scandinavian countries (under 20%), the USA, and the Netherlands.<sup>38</sup>

#### *Relationship with national burglary risks and victimisation experience*


What of the relationship between people's concern about burglary and actual burglary risks at country and individual level? The ICVS has previously found that perceptions of the likelihood of burglary at national level are strongly related to national ICVS *risks* of burglary: i.e., countries where the highest proportion feel vulnerable to burglary in the coming year are those where risks are highest. In the 2000 sweep, the relationship was less strong when national burglary risks were compared with the proportion thinking those burglary was likely or fairly likely. This was mainly because there was comparatively higher levels of concern in Catalonia, France, Japan, and Portugal than the rankings on actual burglary levels. The relationship, however, was much stronger on the basis of those thinking burglary very likely.<sup>39</sup>

Whether there is undue wariness in countries where perceptions of risk are highest is not straightforward however. First, it is difficult to translate what people mean by

38 Taking those who thought burglary was 'very likely' gives a fairly similar picture. However, on this more restricted measure, concern in France was not quite as high relatively speaking, while in contrast those in the USA and the Netherlands ranked higher than on the broader-based measure. The same was true in Scotland (as was the case in 1996).

39 The Spearman correlation was 0.73 ( $p < 0.05$ ;  $n = 16$ , based on incidence risks for burglary with entry and attempts).

Figure 12 Perception of the risk of burglary in the coming year



'very likely' or 'likely' into a quantified risk. For instance, the ICVS indicates that 3.6% of householders in the Netherlands in 1999 had a burglar get in, or try to get in their home, representing annual average odds for the 'typical' household of 1 in 28. But whether this equates with an assessment of 'very likely' or 'fairly likely' is simply unknown. Moreover, the proportion thinking that there is a fair chance they will be burgled is an overall national figure. There is no reliable way of assessing risks simply for the most anxious. The ICVS identifies a number of factors that influence risks (see Chapter 3), but it cannot accurately predict the likelihood of burglary for *particular* individuals whose residential and social circumstances might heighten vulnerability, or reduce it.

At the individual level, the 2000 ICVS results are in line with a considerable body of evidence from victim surveys conducted locally in different countries that personal experience of victimisation raises anxiety (see e.g. Killias and Clerici, 2000). Thus, taking all countries together, 27% of those who had *not* been burgled in the past five years said they thought they were likely to be burgled in the coming year. But this

**Table 17** Perceptions of the risk of burglary: percentage thinking burglary very likely or likely in the next year<sup>1</sup>

	1989	1992	1996	2000
Australia	44	↑ 47		36
Belgium	28	↑ 31		↑ 45
Canada	33	33	30	29 ↓ *
England & Wales	35	↑ 45	↓ 41	↓ 33
Finland	9	↑ 14	↓ 11	↑ 13
France	36		↑ 53	↓ 44
Netherlands	28	28	27	19
Northern Ireland	23		↑ 29	↓ 26
Poland		40	↓ 24	26 ↓ *
Scotland	30		↓ 28	↓ 23
Sweden		34	↓ 16	16
Switzerland	46		↓ 29	27
USA	31		↓ 23	↓ 16

<sup>1</sup> Countries that participated less than three times are omitted.

↑ and ↓ indicate that the difference compared to the previous survey is statistically significant (t-test; p<0.10).

↑ indicates an increase over the previous sweep; ↓ denotes a decrease.

\* indicates, where appropriate, that the difference with the 1992 survey is statistically significant (t-test, p<0.10).

rose to 47% for those who had been burgled once in 1999, and to a full 62% for those who had been burgled more than once. These results are shown at the end of this chapter in Table 20. (This also shows other relationships between victimisation experience and the various attitudes to crime considered in the chapter.) Table 28 in Appendix 4 also shows results for individual countries. The effect of burglary victimisation on concern about burglary is evident in each country (although results for France are a bit less clear-cut).

#### *Trends over time*

Table 17 shows results on feelings about the likelihood of burglary for countries that have participated in the ICVS at least three times. The ranking of countries is reasonably stable over the years. For example, those in France and England and Wales have been consistently more worried about the likelihood of burglary, as have those in Canada and Australia. Finland in contrast has shown relatively consistent low levels of worry, as has the USA at least in 1996 and 2000.

Concern about burglary has changed over time – essentially rising in general between 1989 and 1992, then falling. An exception is Belgium where there has been a statistically significant increase in concern, moving Belgium from a relatively aver-

age position to a high one in 2000. Another is Finland, where the trend has not been consistent, but where concern remains relatively low nonetheless.

Relating ICVS trends in national burglary levels to trends in worry about burglary shows a few inconsistencies at the level of individual countries, and sampling error could explain this to a degree. But the general tenor of results is that perceptions of the likelihood of burglary broadly match trends in ICVS burglary levels. Thus, for instance, there was a drop in concern about burglary between 1996 and 2000 in nine of the eleven countries with two relevant measures (with concern staying the same in Sweden and rising in Finland). In the nine countries in which concern fell, the actual likelihood of burglary also fell. Moreover, in the countries in which there was the strongest fall in concern since 1989, actual levels of burglary also fell more than on average.

## 5.2 Feelings of safety on the streets

Since 1992, the ICVS has asked the question below, often used in other crime surveys, to measure vulnerability to street crime:

'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?'


This question has typically been shown to paint a different picture of 'fear of crime' to that from questions which, for instance, ask about perceptions of risk. Typically, women and the elderly emerge as most fearful on this 'street safety' question. This may be because for some people the prospect of being out after dark evokes anxiety about a greater range of mishaps (e.g., accidents as well as crime). The question is also hypothetical for those who are rarely alone outside after dark – although interviewers were instructed to ask 'how safe *would you* feel ...' in such circumstances. For cross-country comparisons, though, exactly what the 'street safety' question measures is secondary insofar as it is likely to be similarly interpreted.

On average, just under a quarter felt very or a bit unsafe. Details are in Figure 13, which also shows results from a new question on safety at home – discussed below.

Those in Catalonia, Australia and Poland were most anxious about being out alone at night: about a third felt very unsafe or a bit unsafe. The next most fearful were those in Portugal, and England and Wales. By contrast, feelings of vulnerability on the streets at night were lowest in the USA, and Sweden, although there were several other countries with only marginally higher figures.<sup>40</sup>

40 The position as regards those who said they felt 'very unsafe' is reasonably similar. The main differences are that those in Catalonia, Portugal and Japan were relatively less fearful on this measure, while those in Switzerland and France were more so.

Figure 13 Concern about being out alone and at home after dark



Countries are sorted by 'unsafe outside'.

\* Results on safety at home are not available for Switzerland.

#### *Relationship with national risks and victimisation experience*

As has been the case in previous sweeps of the ICVS, this measure of street safety is not consistently related to levels of contact crime (robbery, sexual incidents, and assaults and threats).<sup>41</sup> In Catalonia and Portugal, for instance, risks are low, but fear of street is much higher than in Canada and Sweden, say, where actual national risks of contact crime are greater. One implication of the lack of much relationship between anxiety and risks is that fear of street crime may be influenced by specific 'cultural' pressures, such as media presentations of violent crime.

41 The Spearman correlation between the current measure of contact crime (prevalence risks) and the proportion feeling a bit or very unsafe on the streets is low ( $r=-0.31$ ; ns;  $n=17$ ).

**Table 18** Percentage feeling a bit or very unsafe alone after dark in their area<sup>1</sup>

	1992	1996	2000
Australia	31		↑ 34
Belgium	20		21
Canada	20	↑ 26	↓ 16 ↓ *
England & Wales	33	32	↓ 27
Finland	17	17	18
France		20	22
Netherlands	22	20	↓ 18
Northern Ireland		22	23
Poland	43	↓ 34	34 ↓ *
Scotland		26	↓ 20
Sweden	14	↓ 11	↑ 15
Switzerland		17	↑ 22
USA		25	↓ 15

<sup>1</sup> Countries that participated at least once before. This question was introduced in the 1992 survey.

↑ and ↓ indicate that the difference compared to the previous survey is statistically significant (t-test;  $p < 0.10$ ).

↑ indicates an increase over the previous sweep; ↓ denotes a decrease.

\* Indicates, where appropriate, that the difference with the 1992 survey is statistically significant (t-test,  $p < 0.10$ ).

At the individual level, there is some evidence of increased anxiety about street safety among victims of violence, but the relationship is much less strong than is the case with burglary discussed above. One reasons for this may be that while women and the elderly register most concern about street safety (Skogan, 1993), it is younger people and males who most often fall victim (see Chapter 3). Details are in Table 20, where the measure of contact crime is robbery, sexual incidents and assaults and threats.

#### *Trends over times*

There are several countries for which trends can be examined since 1992 (Table 18). The ranking of countries is relatively stable over the years.<sup>42</sup> Those in Poland, England and Wales and Australia consistently show the highest levels of unease, whereas those in Sweden and Finland show the least. The most pronounced changes between 1996 and 2000 have been in Canada, the USA and Scotland, where residents have become less fearful than they were previously compared to other countries. In contrast, Switzerland has moved from a low position to a relatively high one.

<sup>42</sup> The Spearman correlation between levels of fear in 1992 and 1996 was 0.94 ( $p < 0.05$ ;  $n = 6$ ). Between 1992 and 2000 it was 0.81 ( $p < 0.05$ ;  $n = 8$ ). It was weakest between 1996 and 2000 (0.43 ( $p = 0.19$ );  $n = 11$ ).

Overall, there has been a small fall in concern about street safety based on a comparison for six countries in three sweeps, and for 11 countries in the two most recent ones.<sup>43</sup> Since 1992, unease has fallen most in Poland, England and Wales, and albeit rather less so in Canada and the Netherlands. Since 1996, unease has fallen in the USA and Scotland, although it has risen in Switzerland.

There is little justification for relating these changes at country level to ICVS risks in contact crime since, as said, feelings of street safety do not relate well to measured risks. Moreover, the ICVS measure of contact crime over time is not especially robust due to low victimisation levels, and possible changes in the propensity of respondents to tell interviews about interpersonal crime. This said, there is some evidence that falls in feelings of insecurity have tracked falls in contact crime in Canada, Poland and the USA. In England and Wales, the Netherlands and Scotland, however, falls in fear have not been matched by falls in risks.

### 5.3 Safety at home

The 2000 ICVS introduced a new question about feelings of safety at home alone after dark; it was asked in all countries except Switzerland. The question was:

‘How safe do you feel when you are at home alone after dark? Do you feel very safe, fairly safe, a bit unsafe or very unsafe?’

A much smaller proportion of people feels unsafe at home after dark (6%) than they do on the streets (23%) – see Figure 13. Those in Poland felt most insecure at home (15% felt a bit or very unsafe), followed by Portugal, Japan, Australia and Belgium (9% to 10%).

At country level, there was a fairly close correspondence between feeling unsafe at home and on the streets.<sup>44</sup> The main differences were that those in Belgium were rather more afraid at home relative to other countries than was the case on the streets. In contrast, in Catalonia and Scotland, unease on the streets was higher compared to other countries than was unease at home.

#### *Relationship with national risks and victimisation experience*

There is perhaps some question as to what types of victimisation the safety at home question is measuring. Some people may be thinking of a burglar intruding. Others possibly have in mind domestic incidents, when a partner comes home late and the worse for wear. In any event, there was no statistically significant association at country level between national burglary risks and feelings of safety at home. The

43 The average proportion of those feeling very or a bit unsafe in the six countries in all three sweeps was 25% in 1992, 23% in 1996 and 21% in 2000. The average for the 11 countries in 1996 was 23%, falling to 21% in 2000.

44 The Spearman correlation is 0.84 ( $p < 0.05$ ;  $n = 15$ ).

ICVS does not allow a robust enough measure of domestic violence at country level to test this.

At individual level, though, the proportion feeling unsafe at home was higher among victims of burglary than among non-victims – albeit the differential was less strong than with experience of burglary and perceiving burglary to be likely in the near future. For instance, 7% of non-victims felt unsafe at home after dark, but this rose to 13% for those who had been burgled once in 1999, and to 19% for the few who had been burgled more than once (see Table 20). There was also some increase in unease at home according to experience of contact crime.

#### 5.4 Security precautions

Since the 1992 ICVS, there has been a fairly consistent set of questions on measures taken against household property crime, in particular burglary. In all, eight home security issues were asked about in the 2000 ICVS (full details are in Table 26 in Appendix 4).

For some items, residential differences may play a bigger part than deliberate precautionary behaviour. For instance, very few householders in Denmark, Sweden, Japan and Poland said they had a ‘high fence’, whereas about a third in England and Wales and Australia did so. Having a caretaker or security guard on the premises was also more common in Belgium, Canada, Finland, and France (about 10% mentioned them), but was much less common in many other countries. Special grilles on doors and windows were also asked about, but this too may reflect ‘architectural culture’. Grilles were uncommon for instance in Poland, Japan, and the Scandinavian countries, whereas they were said to be very common in Australia, England and Wales, and Scotland.


For this reason, we focus here on two items to assess the 2000 ICVS results: whether a burglar alarm was installed, and whether special (high-grade) door locks had been installed. The figures given are often high (see Table 26 in Appendix 4). It cannot be ruled out that some people claimed they had the security measures on account of residual mistrust about the credentials of the survey, or at least wariness about admitting to unknown interviewers that their homes were vulnerable.

Figure 14 shows that a full 34% of householders in England and Wales claimed they had a burglar alarm.<sup>45</sup> There were also above average levels of alarm ownership in Australia, Scotland, the USA, Canada and Belgium. Alarm ownership was very low in Poland, Japan, and Finland.

Approaching half (44%) of householders on average said they had special door locks. In general, householders in countries with the comparatively high alarm ownership

45 This is a higher figure than the 26% in the 2000 British Crime Survey (Kershaw et al., 2000).

Figure 14 Percentage of homes with burglar alarms and special door locks



Countries are sorted by 'burglar alarms':

also ranked comparatively high on special door locks. However, the Netherlands in particular was out of line. It had the highest proportion having special door locks, but a below average figure for alarms.

#### *Relationship with national risks and victimisation experience*

As has been the case in previous ICVS sweeps, levels of precaution at national level were positively related to national burglary risks:<sup>46</sup> i.e., those in countries facing higher risks were generally more likely to have alarms and special locks. The main differences were that Denmark and Poland came fairly low in terms of precautions taken, although burglary risks were comparatively high. In contrast,

46 The Spearman correlation was 0.64 ( $p < 0.10$ ;  $n = 16$ ).

those in Northern Ireland and Scotland were comparatively well-protected relative to their position on burglary risks.

To look at current levels of household protection in terms of victimisation experience would be misleading, because victims are likely to improve their protection directly as a response to having been burgled. Rather, one needs to take account of what level of security was in place at the time of a burglary. A set of questions in the 1996 ICVS (not repeated in 2000) addressed this in relation to burglar alarms.<sup>47</sup> For those with alarms installed at the time of the offence, 1.1% had a burglar enter the house, as against 1.8% of those without alarms – a statistically robust difference. For attempted burglaries, the picture was different. The level of risk for those with alarms at the time of an attempt was higher (2.1%) than for those without alarms (1.8%). This was taken to suggest that homes with alarms were likely to be more attractive targets, and thus targeted more often on that account. However, the figures also show that entry is more often thwarted. For those with an alarm at the time of the offence, entry was achieved in 35% of incidents, whereas for those without alarms the figures was higher, at 50% (Mayhew and Van Dijk, 1997). A similar relationship between countries with the highest security levels having a higher proportion of attempted burglaries was reported in Chapter 2.

#### *Trends over time*

There is reasonable stability in the figures over ICVS sweeps as regards relative levels of protection in different countries. But it is clear that security has increased in most. For instance, in six countries in the last three ICVS sweeps, average alarm ownership increase from 8% in 1992, to 11% in 1996, and to 14% in 2000. There have been particularly steep increases since 1992 in England and Wales, Australia, Canada and Belgium. The proportion of homes with special door locks has also generally increased since 1992, particularly in Belgium, Finland, Canada, and the Netherlands.

### **5.5 Attitudes to punishment**

The ICVS asked respondents what sentence they considered most appropriate for a recidivist burglar – a man aged 21 who is found guilty of burglary for the second time, having stolen a colour television. Table 19 shows the percentage opting for different sanctions. (Table 27 in Appendix 4 also shows results for other sweeps). A community service order was seen as the most appropriate sentence in the 16 countries overall providing results in the 2000 ICVS: 41% of respondents recom-

47 The questions allowed those who had a burglary at a previous address to be identified. These were deleted from analysis since it was not known whether an alarm was installed at those premises. A further simplification was to restrict analysis to those who had one burglary or attempt only, since to ascertain an 'alarm condition' for each victimisation would have been complex.

Table 19 Sentence preference for a young recidivist burglar (percentages): 2000 ICVS<sup>1</sup>

	Fine	Prison	Community service	Suspended sentence	Other sentence	Don't know	Average length of imprisonment (months) <sup>2</sup>
	%	%	%	%	%	%	
USA	9	56	20	1	8	6	31
Northern Ireland	8	54	30	4	2	3	21
Scotland	11	52	24	5	4	4	21
Japan	17	51	19		1	13	38
England & Wales	7	51	28	5	4	5	24
Canada	9	45	32	4	7	3	23
Netherlands	11	37	30	10	5	6	19
Australia	8	36	46	3	3	4	27
Sweden	11	31	47	4	3	4	11
Portugal	9	26	54	1	6	4	23
Belgium	11	21	57	5	3	3	17
Poland	10	21	55	6	4	5	31
Denmark	9	20	50	13	4	4	7
Finland	15	19	46	16	2	2	8
France	8	12	69	5	2	5	14
Catalonia (Spain)	15	7	65	1	3	9	23
Average	11	34	41	6	4	5	34

1 Countries are ranked based on the percentage in favour of 'sending to prison'

2 Asked if prison sentence was recommended.

mended it.<sup>48</sup> It was the first choice of sentence in half of the countries, with particularly strong support in France (69% opting for it), Catalonia (65%) Belgium, Poland and Portugal (over 50%). There was, however, a fairly wide divergence of opinion: a community sentence was seen as most appropriate by only about 20% in Japan and the USA, and by under 30% in the UK.<sup>49</sup>

Imprisonment was recommended by 34% of respondents overall, and was the first choice in eight countries. There was again a wide divergence across countries. Support was highest in the USA, where 56% opted for it. Over 50% also favoured imprisonment in the UK, and Japan. Those in Catalonia (7%) and France (12%) were least in favour of imprisonment.

The length of sentence recommended did not track preference for having *some* prison sentence particularly well. Although those in the USA were both keenest on

48 There was no information for Switzerland. In 1996, the Swiss gave strong support to a community service order (61% opted for it), and weak support for imprisonment (9%).

49 The percentage opting for a community service order in Finland increased markedly after 1989, when they were introduced in Finland, suggesting that formal sentencing change can increase support for alternatives to imprisonment. Support has fallen back somewhat since 1992, although it is still higher than in 1989.

imprisonment and opted for the longest sentence (an average of 2.5 years), elsewhere there were divergences. For instance, those in Poland were not particularly supportive of imprisonment comparatively speaking, but those who favoured it recommended relatively long sentences. In Catalonia, too, the small proportion that favoured imprisonment also favoured long sentences. In the Scandinavian countries, on the other hand, those who favoured imprisonment tended to opt for a relatively short time in prison.

*Relationship with national burglary risks and victimisation experience*

ICVS results to date have shown that popular support for imprisonment is generally stronger in countries with higher risks of burglary. This was not evident from the 2000 ICVS results, although it remains so on the basis of 'meta' analysis in which the full range of industrialised countries in all sweeps is included (n=52). In 2000, the countries most out of line were Japan and Northern Ireland. Here, there was more support for imprisonment than national burglary levels would suggest. The same applied to Scotland, though to a lesser extent.<sup>50</sup>

As regards personal experience of burglary, there was a modest increase in support for imprisonment among those who had been a victim of burglary over the past five years (Table 20). Previous ICVS analysis has shown the same result, although in multivariate analysis being in an 'anglophone' country was of more import, as was a lower standard of education (Kuhn, 1993; Mayhew and Van Dijk, 1997).

*Trends over time*

For countries for which sentencing preferences can be examined over time, there is much consistency in opinion. For instance, of the ten countries with measures for both 1989 and 2000, rank order positions on support for imprisonment were near identical – with 'anglophone' countries most supportive (the USA, the UK, Australia and Canada). Comparing results for 1992 and 2000 (possible for eight countries), the picture is much the same, although those in Poland are relatively less in favour of imprisonment than they were, and those in the Netherlands more so. Country positions in 1996 and 2000 were generally similar (ten countries).

Community service shows slightly more shift over time. For instance, those in the Netherlands in 2000 were less in favour of a community sentence than they were in 1989. In contrast, there was more support in Belgium and Finland in 2000 than in 1989. Between the 1996 and 2000 ICVS sweeps, though, there was little change. Leaving aside changes in *relative* levels of support for different sentencing options, the 2000 ICVS show a general hardening of attitudes towards punishment. For instance, average support for imprisonment increased from 35% favouring it in

50 In contrast, given relative rankings on national burglary risks, the proportion favouring imprisonment was relatively low in Belgium, Australia, and Denmark.

Table 20 Reactions to crime, by victimisation experience: 2000 ICVS, all countries<sup>1</sup>

	Perceiving burglary as likely <sup>2</sup>	Feeling unsafe outside after dark <sup>3</sup>	Feeling unsafe at home after dark <sup>3</sup>	In favour of prison sentence for burglar
	%	%	%	%
<i>Victim of burglary</i>				
Non-victims <sup>4</sup>	27*	23*	7*	31*
Victims 2-5 years ago	44+	32+	12+	34
Victims once in 1999	47•	34•	13•	35
Victims more than once, 1999	62	40	19	37
<i>Victim of contact crime</i>				
Non-victims <sup>4</sup>	28*	23*	7*	31*
Victims 2-5 years ago	35	32+	10+	33
Victims once in 1999	36	31•	11	36
Victims more than once, 1999	36	38	13	36

1 For Switzerland only data on feeling unsafe outside was available. Other columns are based on 16 countries.

2 'Very likely' and 'fairly likely'.

3 'Very unsafe' and 'a bit unsafe'.

4 Not been victimised in the last five years.

\* Indicates that differences between any victim and non-victims are statistically significant.

+ Indicates that differences between victims 2-5 years ago and victims last year are statistically significant.

• Indicates that differences between single and multiple victims last year are statistically significant ( $\chi^2$  tests,  $p < 0.10$ ,  $df=1$ ).

1989, to 42% in 1996, and to 45% in 2000. (This is on the basis of seven countries in each sweep). Between 1996 and 2000, support for imprisonment increased from 34% to 38% (ten countries). The most marked switch since 1989 has been in Canada, England and Wales, Scotland, and the Netherlands. Support for imprisonment has also increased in Sweden since 1992.

Increase in support for imprisonment goes alongside a general decline in support for community sentences. For instance, community sentences were preferred by 36% in 1989 on average, down to 33% in 1996, and to 30% in 2000 (seven countries in each sweep). Between 1996 and 2000, support for a community service order fell from 41% to 38% (ten countries).



## Conclusions

This report has presented the main findings of the 2000 International Crime Victims Survey (ICVS) in 17 industrialised countries: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Catalonia (Spain), Denmark, England & Wales, Finland, France, Japan, the Netherlands, Northern Ireland, Poland, Portugal, Scotland, Sweden, Switzerland and the USA. This is the fourth sweep of the ICVS in industrialised countries. Fourteen countries reported on here have taken part at least once before. Catalonia (Spain), Portugal and Denmark were countries fresh to the 2000 ICVS. The standardised nature of the ICVS makes it a unique calibrator of crime in different countries. Standardisation involves the use of the same questionnaire, similar methods of sampling, and co-ordination of data management and analysis.

There was a summary of main findings at the beginning of this report. This chapter expands on a few particular ones: (i) the nature and level of victimisation in the industrialised countries covered here; (ii) trends in victimisation; (iii) reporting to the police; and (iv) services to victims. It finishes by considering (v) results from industrialised countries alongside those in developing countries and countries in transition; (vi) the status of the ICVS in the context of other approaches to international comparisons; and (vii) developments for the future.

### 6.1 Victimization in industrialised countries

#### *Country positions*

Chapter 2 put emphasis on what are conventionally called 'league tables'. Although points about the reliability of the ICVS, discussed fully in Chapter 1, need to be borne in mind here, we make only modest apology for this. Criminologists tend to want comparative research to take forward theories about crime, and those involved with the ICVS are counted among them. But the public, and local criminal justice administrators (the main funders of the ICVS) have a simpler agenda: to assess their own performance on crime in comparison with others.

One notable finding of the ICVS is the general consistency in country positions across sweeps for those countries that have participated more than once. The main patterns are:

- Countries that have consistently ranked high relative to others are Australia, the Netherlands, and England and Wales – although the England and Wales position in the first (1989) ICVS was more favourable.
- Countries that have consistently ranked lowest are Japan, Northern Ireland and Finland. Switzerland has also had a low ranking, though less so in 1995.

- Only Canada and the USA have changed position markedly. They had comparatively high crime rates in 1989, but falls in victimisation mean that they now have lower rates, comparatively speaking.

The general consistency of country positions over sweeps adds to the credibility of the ICVS, despite relatively small sample sizes (usually 2,000 in each country).

#### *The make-up of crime*

An important feature of the ICVS is that it shows the contours of 'normal' victimisation against households. This has implications for preventive policies, especially those concerned more with alleviating the commonplace nuisance of crime than with reducing the number of 'headline' offences that more often appears in police statistics because of higher reporting and recording levels. Thus, Chapter 2 showed for instance that:

- Taking all countries together, car vandalism forms a full quarter of crimes experienced by ICVS respondents – and more in Catalonia, Portugal, France and Scotland. In truth, incidents are not regarded as particularly serious, though victims will still want them not to have happened. They are relatively infrequently brought to police attention (overall, only four incidents in ten were).
- Policies focused on preventing car crime as a whole will make a substantial impact on the burden of ordinary victimisation on householders. Car vandalism, theft from cars, and thefts of cars (the most frequently reported) comprise over 40% of ICVS crimes measured, and much more in Catalonia and Portugal.
- Bicycle theft is generally not well reported to the police, but it comprises a significant part of the crime problem in countries with high bicycle ownership. Those concerned with crime policy in Japan, Denmark and the Netherlands in particular should accept the challenge of reducing this particularly common type of theft.
- Contact crime – robbery, sexual incidents and assault and threats – comprise about a quarter of the crimes measured. Most of them are assaults and threats. These offences will feature much less in the police count of crime, despite the fact that their victims regard even threats moderately seriously.

#### *Poland*

To date, Poland has been mainly included within Central and Eastern Europe 'countries in transition' in analysis of ICVS results. It was covered as one of the 17 industrialised countries here as results were available, it is economically advanced, and it has adopted the ICVS questionnaire and methodology at national level. Its inclusion has added breadth. Results for Poland worth singling out are:

- Victimization rates are relatively high, particularly for car-related crime, thefts of personal property (including pickpocketing), and robbery.

- Recovery of stolen cars was the lowest observed, with fewer than half of victims getting their car back – a different pattern from the dominant one.
- Since 1992, overall risks have stayed much the same, whereas there have generally been falls elsewhere.
- The level of reporting to the police is still relatively very low, despite an increase in reporting since 1992. Among those who did report, satisfaction with the police response was poor, and both victims and non-victims assessed overall police performance less favourably than in most other countries (albeit attitudes have become more favourable since 1996).
- Concern about street safety was very high relatively speaking – though again with some improvement since 1992. And those in Poland had by far the most disquiet about safety at home after dark.
- Levels of home security were low compared to other countries, although risks of burglary were no more than average.
- Poland was the only country where corruption was mentioned with any frequency (by one in twenty).

Some other points about ICVS findings for industrialised countries in general compared to countries in transition and developing countries are returned to later.

## 6.2 Trends in crime victimization


The ICVS has been carried out more than once in the majority of the seventeen industrialised countries considered here. Countries have re-entered the survey to align with others in the ongoing sweep rather than to provide any solid indicator of trends over time. ICVS information on trends nonetheless merits inspection.

The main points from Chapter 2 were that:

- Generally speaking, the ICVS suggests that crime rose between 1988 and 1991, stabilised or fell in 1995, then fell back more in 1999. This is the dominant pattern in many individual countries.
- The picture in North America differs from that in Europe. Crime levels are lower than in 1988. In the three European countries with four ICVS measures (England and Wales, Finland, and the Netherlands), crime levels are still higher than in 1988. Compared to 1991, risks also fell more in North America than in five of the seven European countries showing falls.
- Since 1995, there has been more consistent falls in property crime. Changes in contact crime are variable.

We return to trends here by looking at the picture of crime recorded by the police as well as the ICVS. The per capita rate of *all* offences recorded by the police is taken. The constituents of this rate will vary by country, but for considering trends this is not important as long as the constituent parts have not changed over time, and

Figure 15 Police and survey trends, five countries: 1988-1999 (index 1988=100)



changes in recording practices can be accounted for. Thirteen countries are considered who have taken part in the ICVS at least three times.

For this analysis, we use ICVS incidence risks since they are a more complete measure of all crimes experienced. They cover crimes covered by all four sweeps, excluding threats (from within the assaults and threats category) and offensive sexual behaviour (from within the sexual incidents category). This is because (i) these are unlikely to be counted as 'crimes' by the police, and (ii) they are more likely to be susceptible to changes in the propensity to report to interviewers over time. This has involved some estimation.<sup>51</sup>

We look first at the five countries that have taken part in all four sweeps. We then turn to four other countries that have measures for 1988, 1995 and 1999. (As explained, ICVS risk levels are for the year prior to the survey.) Finally, mention is made of countries with an ICVS measure for 1999 and other variants of previous years.

51 The ICVS does not allow for precise 'last year' incidence risks of sexual assaults (ie, sexual incidents less offensive sexual behaviour) or assaults with force, (ie, assaults, less threats). Results on the ratio of the prevalence levels for (i) sexual assaults to all sexual incidents, and (ii) assaults with force to all assaults and threats were applied to incidence level risk for the two categories taken as a whole. Some additional estimation has also been applied for the USA in 1992 for which incidence level data were not available. Estimates for seven crimes in Switzerland in 2000 were also made.

*Five countries: 1988, 1991, 1995, and 1999*

Figure 15 presents changes in crime between 1989 and 1999 in England and Wales, Finland, Netherlands, Canada, and the USA according to both police figures and the ICVS. Both police and survey figures are indexed at 100 for 1988 to ease comparisons.

There is some symmetry in the trends since 1988 in the five countries. On both measures, crime levels rose between *1988 and 1991*, the USA being an exception on surveys figures, and the Netherlands on police figures. The steepest rise was in England and Wales, according to both measures.

Between *1991 and 1995*, police figures fell in all countries except the Netherlands, where they were stable. The fall in Finland too was fairly marginal. On ICVS figures, risks in the USA, Canada and Finland fell, and they stabilised somewhat in England and Wales and the Netherlands.

Between *1995 and 1999*, police figures fell in all countries, except the Netherlands where they remained the same. The ICVS indicates falls in all countries. (Figures for England and Wales for 1999 have been adjusted to take account of an inflationary effect of changes to police 'counting rules' introduced in 1998.)


One would not necessarily expect exact correspondence between the two sets of figures.

- For one, the ICVS profile of offences is rather different from that in police figures, with the ICVS including a greater proportion of less serious and less often reported offences.
- Secondly, the rather less marked swings in police figures may reflect a greater number of recorded violent crimes. In the 13 countries considered in this section, violence has increased over the 1990s in all except Canada and the USA.<sup>52</sup> This may signify a 'real' increase, although it may also reflect the fact that the police in many countries are *recording* more violence (especially related-party incidents). Police figures for the Netherlands, for instance, show a drop of more than 20% in burglary since 1995, whereas violent crime has risen by a third.
- Thirdly, the less marked swings in police figures may also reflect some degree of change in reporting behaviour by victims.<sup>53</sup>

52 Violence here is a combination of figures for violence against the person, sexual offences and robbery, taken together. They have been largely on statistics compiled by Barclay and Tavares (2001).

53 For instance, the ICVS showed a drop in reporting to the police between 1991 and 1995 in the Netherlands, which is consistent with the much flatter trend in police figures – ie, the police may have fewer crimes known to them to record. Reporting levels have also fallen in England and Wales since 1991 (in line with British Crime Survey results).

Figure 16 Police and survey trends, four countries: 1988-1999 (index 1988=100)



*Four countries: 1988, 1995 and 1999*

There are three ICVS measures for Switzerland, Scotland, France, and Northern Ireland – for 1988, 1995 and 1999. Figure 16 shows the trends, with figures for 1988 again indexed at 100. Because of missing information, it is not possible of course to judge whether there were higher crimes levels in 1991 (as was shown in Figure 15 for the other five countries), with the 1995 levels representing a fall from that date. Nonetheless, a notable feature of Figure 16 is the falls in survey-measured risks since 1995, and the falls in police measures in Scotland and France.

Northern Ireland and Switzerland merit comment. The increase in police figures in *Northern Ireland* between 1995 and 1999 are out of line with other countries. However, police recording changes may be an issue. Adjustments were made to account for changes to police ‘counting rules’ introduced in 1998 (as in England and Wales). It is not possible, though, to take as full account of all the inflationary effect of these changes as in England and Wales – so some are likely to remain. The larger increase in recorded crime between 1988 and 1995 than in the ICVS is consistent with a rise in reporting to the police. Reporting continued to increase between 1995 and 1999, and this may be another factor in the rise in police figures in 1999.

*Switzerland* shows a very high ICVS count in 1995, and a much lower one in 1999. This was mainly due to a sharp drop in motorcycle and bicycle thefts – common in Switzerland. The pattern is not reflected in the police figures. However, crime recording is not standardised throughout the country and for parts of Switzerland

only reflect cleared cases. Killias et al. (2000) show police data for theft of personal property, bicycle theft and burglary also show higher crime rates for 1995, although not as extreme as in the ICVS.

One factor behind the rise in victimisation in Switzerland in the mid-1990s may have been the high prevalence of drug-related crime. Since then, a new drug policy (making methadone and heroin available to perhaps three-quarters of heroin users) has been shown in local studies to have considerably cut offending among addicts. Moreover, Switzerland experienced gangs operating from Eastern Europe during the mid 1990s, though these have now declined due probably to changing conditions in Eastern retail markets.

Trends for other countries are commented upon next.

#### *Australia and Belgium: 1988, 1991 and 1999*

According to the ICVS, risks increased in *Australia* in 1991 in line with most other countries) and then fell back in 1999 (by about 10% on 1991) – again consistent with the dominant picture. Police figures also increased between 1988 and 1991, but unlike many countries elsewhere have further increased since. Increased reporting levels according to the ICVS are at least consistent with this.

In *Belgium*, ICVS risks were much the same in 1991 as in 1988, but they then rose fairly modestly (by 7%) in 1991. Substantial changes to the collection of police figures in Belgium in the mid-1990s make comparisons over time difficult.

#### *Poland and Sweden: 1991, 1995 and 1999*

ICVS risks in *Poland* have remained much the same since 1991 (the fractional fall not being statistically robust). Recorded crime in Poland has risen substantially since 1991, although better police administrative systems cannot be ruled out.

*Sweden* is singular in ICVS terms in having had a fairly sharp increase in crime between 1991 and 1995, and a continuing – though much shallower – one since. (Risks are 26% higher in 1999 than in 1991 on the current measure.) Police figures are more in line with the picture from other countries, with levels lower in 1995 than in 1991, albeit no further decrease in 1999.

In sum, then, there is not an *entirely* neat picture as regards trends in crime in these 13 industrialised countries, either as regards ICVS measures themselves, or their correspondence with crimes recorded by the police. Nonetheless, the broad picture is striking. Both ICVS and police figures suggest that overall levels of crime seem to have peaked in many countries in the early 1990s, and fallen since then. Because of volatility in ICVS measures of violent crime due to small numbers, no attempt has been made to differentiate trends in violence as opposed to property crime – though certainly the picture for property crime alone is more consistently downward. Police figures for violence, as said, have increased over the 1990s in all except Canada and the USA – although some recording ‘inflation’ may an issue here. Figures for

domestic burglary have fallen since 1993, for instance, in all 13 countries except Switzerland and Australia. Thefts of motor vehicles have fallen in six out of eleven countries for which there are figures.

It is clearly difficult to explain these widespread falls coming as they do after fairly universal upswings in property crime during the 1970s and 1980s. There is little insight as yet (indeed few criminologists have so far even acknowledged the differing pattern – though see Killias and Aebi, 2000). The drop in crime in America, which has been sharper and started earlier than in Europe, has attracted more scrutiny, but no real consensus. Blumstein and Wollman (2000) provide elegant explanations for the drop in violence in the USA since the early 1990s – focussing for instance on gun control efforts, the decline of crack cocaine, increasing imprisonment rates, and economic buoyancy. But their analysis lacks any international dimension – even for instance reference to the fact that violence trends in Canada have been favourable (though not as favourable) against a rather different backcloth. Moreover, the drop in violence is not set within the context of the longer-term fall in property crime in the USA, which would demand consideration of a rather different set of explanatory variables.

There is no parsimonious explanation of the broader trends considered above, but some of the factors worth considering are mentioned briefly (and in some cases speculatively) below:

- *Demographics factors.* There has been a general ‘ageing’ of populations in Western Europe and North American with a drop in the number of young men in the most crime-prone age groups. The general consensus is that demographic effects play only a part in influencing crime trends, but some part nonetheless.
- *Improved security.* The ICVS has shown clear evidence that the penetration of household security measures has increased, particularly since the 1992 survey. This may be very pertinent to the fairly consistent and marked drops in burglary in police figures mentioned above. Similar improvements in security measures and precautionary behaviour taken against other forms of crime (e.g., bicycle theft) would be consistent with falling risks as most crimes recorded by the police and registered by the ICVS involve property. Householder’s behaviour is of course not the only issue. There has been more attention to ‘designing out’ crime from physical environments, both by social landlords and others (e.g., car manufacturers). A challenge to this argument is that one would have expected security to have increased as much before 1991 as after it, given the increasing crime levels of the late 1980s. It may be, though, that there has been a ‘step change’ sufficiently large to make an impact.
- *Police performance.* Police performance in many countries could have improved substantially recently – although again this might have to be a ‘step change’

since many current policing strategies were also evident in the 1980s, when crime trends were less favourable. Different countries are likely to have employed different techniques, but to the extent that they share a common base of more targeted and pro-active policing, and better technological solutions such as CCTV and forensic science for instance, a contribution from policing cannot be ruled out.

- *Sanctions.* That harsher criminal justice policies underlie the international experience seems hard to sustain. Thus, while some US commentators have held the floor in seeing the US record as due to a substantial increase in imprisonment rates, Europe provides a counter to this since there have been marked variations in imprisonment trends not particularly consistent with the idea that heavier sanctions underlie the reduction in property crime (Aebi et al., 1999). Imprisonment apart, Killias and Aebi (2000) compute a European average for changes in the probability of conviction for offenders known to the police between 1990 and 1996. This shows that the likelihood of conviction has fallen for most offences in most countries (Killias and Aebi, 2000). This again offers little support for the idea that reducing crime levels have come about because of criminal justice system activities.
- *Economic effects.* The current favourable economic climate in North America and Western Europe, with low levels of unemployment and relatively high economic growth may also have depressed levels of property crime, by reducing the need for the proceeds of crime (cf. Field, 1990). It might also be that the tradable value of some stolen goods has declined because of a fall in the price in real terms of items such as TVs, videos and in-car entertainment systems.
- *Drugs.* The use of illegal drugs in the general population is slowly increasing in Europe (EMCDDA, 2000), although this largely involves growing recreational use of cannabis. Bennett's research with arrestees in the UK suggests that cannabis use is associated with a slight inflation in criminal involvement, but the relationship is fairly weak and might be confounded by other factors. Rather, the rise in use of cannabis alongside the drop in property crime would support the notion that regular cannabis use blunts the attractions of offending. This is a 'long shot' but not entirely without empirical support (Johnson et al., 2000). The link between use of hard drugs and offending is much more clearly attested. One issue here, then, is whether the falling street price of hard drugs has dampened criminal demand, as less money needs to be raised to sustain a drug habit.
- *Culture change.* Finally, and most speculatively of all, it is conceivable that intricate cultural and social change is at work. It is tall order to document this, but not preposterous to wonder whether change is operating in some way to 'civilise' at least at the margins those who in the past would have offended, or whether crime is simply becoming a less fashionable pursuit for high-risk age groups.

### 6.3 Reporting to the police

#### *Non-reporting*

Across the 17 industrialised countries overall, only half of the offences that ICVS victims experienced were reported to the police. The proportion reported was highest for stolen vehicles, and nearly eight out of ten burglaries with entry were made known to the police. About two-thirds of thefts from cars and bicycle thefts were reported, but on average only nearly half of attempted burglaries and robberies were. About four in ten incidents of theft of personal property, car vandalism and attempted burglary were reported, and about three in ten incidents of threats and sexual assaults.

There is, then, a substantial 'dark figure' of crime not captured in police statistics simply because many offences are not drawn to police attention at all. The varying reporting rates *across* offence types means, of course, that the picture of crime drawn by police statistics will differ from the picture of 'crime on the ground'. Results in Chapter 3 showed that offences regarded more seriously by their victims were more often reported. The police picture, then, will better reflect these, although not completely by any means since more than a quarter of offences rated most seriously were *not* reported.

#### *Variations in reporting*

The 'dark figure' of unreported crime in different countries will differ given variations in reporting levels in the industrialised countries. On the basis of six crime types taken to look at differences, reporting rates varied fairly considerably.<sup>54</sup> About 60% of incidents were reported in Denmark and Sweden, Northern Ireland, and the Netherlands, about 50% in Belgium, England and Wales, Switzerland, France and Scotland, but less than 40% in Portugal, Japan, Catalonia, and Poland. To some extent this might be due to differences in the types of crimes experienced in the countries. But it may also reflect other factors to do with confidence in the police and public perceptions of how far they are likely to help. High reporting rates improve effective crime prevention and control since the chances of arresting offenders and obtaining a conviction largely depend on information supplied by victims.

54 The six crime types were: thefts from cars, car vandalism, bicycle theft, burglary with entry, attempted burglary, and thefts of personal property. These were chosen as reporting rates were variable, and/or experience of victimisation was comparatively high.

## 6.4 Servicing victims

### *The police*

A feature of criminal justice policy in many countries over the past two decades has been increasing recognition of the interests, rights and needs of victims. One consequence of this has been that many police agencies have tried to improve their response when victims report crime. There is good sense in this as for the vast majority of victims the police is the single most important agency representing the criminal justice system, and indeed the only one with which most victims will they have contact. Another development has been the growth of specialised support agencies.

In many countries, about seven in ten victims were satisfied with the police response when they reported property crime, although the figure was somewhat lower when contact crime was involved. This may be because, having been at the scene, victims felt more involvement. It could also be, though, that reporting property crime has often rather more to do with insurance considerations than with expectations that the police would or could be able to do much.

But there was disparity in satisfaction levels. Highest levels were in Denmark, Catalonia and Switzerland, with figures in several other countries not far behind. Satisfaction was lowest in Portugal, Poland, France and Japan. Different cultural expectations of the police may be one factor here, but a more obvious one is real differences in the demeanour and efficiency of the police.

Another finding of note was that victims who reported crimes they rated most seriously said the police response was less good than victims reporting less serious crimes. Van Dijk (2000b) has also shown that repeat victims are also more dissatisfied. It seems unlikely that the police actually do a poorer job when 'serious' or repeat crimes are reported. More likely is that victims have higher expectations of how the police should have reacted. Nonetheless, there are lessons for the police here in understanding which types of crime are most seriously regarded: namely, car thefts, sexual and other assaults, robberies with weapons, and burglary with entry. In general there was relatively little change in satisfaction levels between the 1996 and 2000 ICVS sweeps. This may mean either that there has been no improvement. Or, more probably, it could indicate that the police have to 'run to stand still' to cope with increasing expectations from service users. The main complaint, as in previous ICVS sweeps, was that the police 'did not do enough', and 'were not interested'. The message is clear for police agencies everywhere.

### *Victim support*

There has been an undoubted growth in specialised services to victims since the early 1980s, and previous sweeps of the ICVS have indicated an increasing proportion of victims receiving help. This round of the survey did not show further

evidence of this (Northern Ireland was an exception), although ICVS estimates are somewhat too fragile to mount a strong case that there is stagnation in victim support.

As before, support was more often given to victims of contact crimes (10% were offered help across the 17 countries overall) than to victims of burglary (5%). And as before again, victims in the UK seemed best provided for – although there was also comparatively good support for victims in the Netherlands, Canada, Sweden, the USA, and Denmark. Services to those in Portugal, Japan, Finland, France and Poland lagged most behind.

Many more than actually received help said they would have welcomed it (around one in three burglary victims, and four in ten victims of contact crime). Most need was expressed by those in Catalonia, Poland, Portugal, Japan, and Northern Ireland (despite the relatively high level of help actually given). In many countries the gap between provision and expressed need was greater for burglary than contact crime: exceptions were the UK and Catalonia, where more burglary victims were helped than average.

### 6.5 Comparisons with countries in transition and developing countries

There is no attempt here to provide anything like a full account of ICVS results to date regarding patterns and levels of victimisation from a global perspective (sources for this are Alvazzi del Frate et al., 2000; Van Dijk, 2000a and 2000b; Van Dijk and Kangaspunta, 2000; and Zvekic, 1998 and 2000.) Rather, we simply give a flavour of how the present results from industrialised countries sit in broader context. The comparisons draw on results for industrialised and other countries prior to the 2000 ICVS sweep.

A broader ICVS perspective is important since most theories of crime and people's responses to it have been generated from crime dynamics in the industrialised world. Countries in transition and developing countries have in the nature of things added rather little because of lack of reliable information. The various disparities between industrialised countries and the rest of the world are also important in strengthening the case for criminal justice assistance to countries with poorer resources.

Thus, ICVS results for world global regions have shown for instance that:<sup>55</sup>

55 These analyses have typically taken the world 'regions' of: Western Europe, the New World (the USA, Canada, Australia and New Zealand); Central and Eastern Europe, Latin America, and Africa. Results from counting within these regions have usually been combined. All countries are usually given equal statistical weight. To enable comparisons between national and city surveys, the former are restricted to respondents living in localities of 100,000 or more inhabitants.

- The highest victimisation risks across a range of offences were generally in Latin American and (sub Saharan) Africa. Risks in countries in transition were higher than in the industrialised countries, but there was some variation within them. Risks in Asia were lowest of all.
- Thus, the ICVS overturns much traditional literature on ‘crime and modernisation’ – based on police counts – which posits that property crime is higher in developed countries because of greater volume and value of material goods, which itself generates property crime (e.g., Shelley, 1981). This idea clearly needs revisiting. The burden of ICVS results is that less developed countries have lower rates of property crime because of less police efficient recording systems, and less frequent reporting by victims (see below).
- The gender difference in risks of interpersonal assaultive crime is much wider in less developed countries where women are substantially more at risk than men – especially in Latin American, Africa and Asia. A number of analyses have related ICVS findings here to measures of gender inequality and economic hardship among young men.
- Repeat victimisation, which has attracted much criminological and policy interest in developed countries recently, is common worldwide. It is particularly pronounced in Latin America and Africa (van Dijk, 2000b).
- While not a significant problem in industrialised countries, as seen, street level corruption (attempts at bribery by public officials) is highest in Latin America and Asia, with countries in transition on a par with Africa.<sup>56</sup>
- Victims in industrialised countries are more likely to report to the police. Reporting levels are generally lowest of all in Latin American countries (Argentina being an exception), followed by Asia, Central and Eastern Europe, and then Africa. The greatest disparity in reporting levels between the developed countries and the rest is with regard to property crime. Lack of insurance – and the need to report to the police to facilitate claims – may be one issue here.
- Differences in reporting levels underscore the point that police figures on crime levels in developing countries and countries in transition seriously underestimate real levels of crime. The ‘dark figure’ of property crime would seem to be especially large.
- Satisfaction with the police after reporting crime was considerably lower outside the industrialised world. One reason for this may be that with lower insurance levels, the police bear more of the brunt of victims’ frustration about financial losses. General assessments of police performance were also considerably lower

<sup>56</sup> Additional questions were added to the 2000 ICVS questionnaire for countries in transition and developing countries. These focus on who was told about the attempts at corruption, why victims did not report, and whether those who did were satisfied. There was also more specificity about the type of official involved, and whether corruption levels have changed compared to ten years ago.

outside the industrialised world. There was the least confidence in the police in Latin America and countries in transition.

- Compared to developed countries, expressed need for specialised victim support was extremely high in Asia and Africa. It was also higher in countries in transition and Latin America. While some victims of property crime in less affluent countries may see support as an avenue of financial redress, the fact that the pattern is similar for contact crime suggests other underlying deficiencies in the responses of the police and other agencies.

## 6.6 The current status of the ICVS

The ICVS is by now an established criminological data source, covering 24 industrialised countries, and another 46 cities in Eastern and Central Europe and developing countries. Certainly, many of the surveys have been small in scale, and have been done at varying times since 1989. Nor has complete standardisation been achieved in all surveys – particularly those in less developed countries where the potential value of new information has led local sponsors to substitute their own victim survey agenda at the expense of strict ICVS consistency. Nonetheless, the breadth of ICVS coverage is striking.

The value of the ICVS is reflected in growing interest from key international agencies. ICVS results, for instance, have featured in the *European Sourcebook of Crime and Criminal Justice Statistics*, sponsored by the Council of Europe (Council of Europe, 1999). They have also featured in HEUNI's ambitious attempt to construct a multi-source picture of crime in different countries drawing on the ICVS, the United Nations World Crime Survey, and a number of other data sources (see Newman, 1999; Kangaspunta et al., 1998).<sup>57</sup> The World Health Organisation's *Global Atlas of Violence* has also drawn on ICVS results (WHO, 1999). ICVS information on levels of street corruption has been linked to (and found to be highly correlated with) other data from Transparency International and the International Institute for Management Development, which collects information on improper business practices.

Both the Council of Europe and HEUNI initiatives try to document the extent of *non-standardisation* in administrative crime statistics – through, for instance, explaining in detail how offences are defined, and how offence coverage differs. This does much to highlight the hazards of comparing police *levels* of crime in different countries – hazards that apply across a broad range of offences, even those (such as burglary) that might seem relatively unproblematic. It also helps more informed comparisons

57 HEUNI is the European Institute for Crime Prevention and Control affiliated with the United Nations. The World Crime Survey information used was that from the Fifth United Nations Survey on Crime Trends and Operations of Criminal Justice Systems 1990-1994.

of *trends* over time using police statistics insofar as changes in offence definitions, counting practices etc are pointed out.

International comparisons of police statistics may in the future, then, be better explained to researchers and others, and thus less liable to mislead. The ICVS survey-based approach will nonetheless continue to be vital as an alternative comparative measure since (i) consistency will be maintained in measuring victimisation; (ii) it covers both unreported and unrecorded offences; and (iii) offers pointers as to change in levels of reporting by victims, which will of course have a bearing on how much crime the police have available to them to record. The ICVS will also remain the best survey-based approach to international comparisons since there is no evidence that independently organised national victimization surveys are being brought more into line: indeed, if anything the opposite is true.

### 6.7 The future

#### *Country coverage*

The ICVS in industrialised countries has now settled into a 4-year cycle. The next target, then, is for a repeat in 2004. If the ICVS continues to be energetically sustained, it will for one provide good coverage of the European Union. To date, all but three of the fifteen member states have participated in the ICVS at national level, albeit some not recently. And of the thirteen Central and Eastern European countries waiting to join, there have been ICVS sweeps in eleven: eight at city level, and three at national level.<sup>58</sup>

One issue for the future is what countries should be included in the industrialised group. The issue of 'grouping' of countries might be formalised by adopting major world aggregates from international organisations. (According to the United Nations, for example, 'industrialised' countries include all European, North American and CIS countries, plus Australia, Japan and New Zealand (a total of 47 countries). Another approach might be the adoption of the developmental perspective, using the UNDP classification that ranks countries as high, medium and low on the Human Development Index.

More globally, while the ICVS has taken reasonably firm hold in industrialised countries, there is more progress to be made in developing countries that account for such a sizeable proportion of the world's population. This is a particular challenge for the future since survey methodology is poorly developed, and local funding is scarce.

58 Of the current member states, Greece, Luxembourg and Ireland have not been in the ICVS. Of the countries waiting to join, there has been no coverage of Cyprus, Turkey or Luxembourg. The three countries with national surveys are the Czech Republic, Estonia and Slovenia.

### *Links with other comparative information*

In the same way that other databases of international information on crime have drawn on the ICVS, so too should the ICVS be fully cognisant of other data sources. It would be useful for the main ICVS database to have as many related crime indices as possible included. Some analyses of ICVS results have already drawn on 'external' social and economic indicators, such as GDP, and women's employment rates. These could be usefully expanded. (The proportion of one-parent families might be one interesting measure. Police per capita and likelihood of conviction might be others – the latter, though, much more problematic than the former.)

There are plans in hand for a comparative International Violence Against Women Survey (IVAWS) drawing on the administrative and data management lessons of the ICVS, as well as the content of 'bespoke' surveys of victimisation of women recently developed for instance in Canada, Australia, and the USA. The IVAWS, to be co-ordinated by HEUNI, UNICRI and Statistics Canada, will clearly be an important counterpoint to the ICVS as regards the level and nature of assaultive crime that women experience.

### *The ICVS content*

Maintaining consistency of measurement in the ICVS is a significant constraint on changing the questionnaire. Another is the need to keep the length of interviews within reasonable bounds, both to prevent increases in fieldwork costs, and to maintain response rates. This said, there is probably some scope for considering whether all questions are 'earning their keep', and if they are not, what might be better substitutes.

Probably the most problematic area of measurement in the ICVS concerns assaults and sexual victimisation – though in truth this applies to most other national and local surveys. One change was made in the 2000 ICVS by adding an additional screener question involving assaults involving people well known to the victim. How far additional improvements could be made would need careful consideration. A markedly different approach to screening for assaultive offences might indeed produce more valid estimates. The cost would be the loss of trend information and comparisons with past ICVS surveys for countries entering for the first time. The IVAWS initiative might be a better route to reliable international comparisons – at least as regards the experiences of women.

Better measures for 'lifestyle' are another candidate. One criminologically attractive – but very high risk – addition would be to ask respondents' about their own offending, given its link to higher victimisation levels (e.g., Mayhew and Elliott, 1990). Respondents' alcohol consumption would be useful in the light of its strength in predicting victimisation risks in other independent surveys (see, e.g., Mirrlees Black et al., 1998; Wittebrood and Nieuwbeerta, 2000). Regularity and type of journeys made on public transport might be another contender. The main

constraint as regards expanding lifestyle questions is the difficulty of doing justice, with limited questionnaire space, to the nuances of lifestyle or 'routine activities' that might impact on risk.

#### *Methodological tests*

Chapter 1 rehearsed the evidence as regards possible biases in ICVS results due to varying response rates, and different modes of interview (i.e., telephone as against face-to-face interviews). While it did not indicate a great deal of room for concern, there is nonetheless scope for further tests of mode and response effects. One possibility might be to assess non-response levels among different groups – for instance by linking non-responding telephone numbers to post (or zip) codes and thereafter to the socio-economic indicators that can be attached to these. It would also be helpful to do more by way of qualitative research to see whether particular ICVS questions are subject to different cultural interpretations.

#### *Forthcoming reports*

Further reports will emerge from the 2000 ICVS. For one, the Dutch Ministry of Justice and countries who took part in the 2000 ICVS are sponsoring the Netherlands Institute for the Study of Criminality and Law Enforcement (NSCR) to hold a workshop in June 2001. Researchers from a number of countries have been invited to present their analyses of the data, which have been made available to them. Publications are likely to merge from the best of these.

UNICRI intends to update results from Central and Eastern Europe cities, comparing them with the respondents in urban area in Western Europe. Another report will focus on results from the latest surveys held in Asia, South America, and Africa. (The University of South Africa has been active in promoting surveys in eight countries in southern Africa.) In due course, too, all the latest ICVS results are likely to be brought together again to look afresh at victimisation and responses to it from a global perspective.



## References

- Aebi, M., G. Barclay, J. Jorg-Martin, M. Killias**  
*European Sourcebook of Crime and Criminal Justice Statistics: key findings*  
Strasbourg, Council of Europe, 1999
- Alvazzi del Frate, A.**  
*Victims of Crime in the Developing World*  
Rome, UNICRI, 1998  
UNICRI publication, no. 57
- Alvazzi del Frate, A.**  
Victims of crime in the developing world.  
In: A. Alvazzi del Frate, O. Hatalak, U. Zvekic (Eds.), *Surveying Crime: a global perspective*  
Rome, Istituto Nazionale di Statistica (ISTAT), 2000
- Alvazzi del Frate, A., U. Zvekic, J.J.M. van Dijk**  
*Understanding Crime: experiences of crime and crime control*  
Rome, UNICRI, 1993  
UNICRI publication, no. 49
- Aye Maung, N.**  
Survey design and interpretation of the British Crime Survey. In: M. Walker (Ed.), *Interpreting Crime Statistics*  
Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1995
- Barclay, G., C. Tavares**  
*International comparisons of criminal justice statistics 1999*  
London, Home Office, 2001  
Home Office Statistical Bulletin
- Bennett, T.**  
*Drugs and Crime: the results of the second developmental stage the NEW-ADAM programme*  
London, Home Office, 2000  
Home Office Research Study, no. 205
- Blumstein, A., J. Wollman**  
*The Crime Drop in America*  
Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2000
- Bruinsma, G, H.G. van de Bunt, J.P.S. Fiselier**  
Quelques réflexions théoriques et méthodologiques à propos d'une recherche internationale comparée de victimation  
*Deviance et Société*, vol. 16, no. 1, 1992, pp. 49-68
- Clarke, R.V.**  
*Preventing Vehicle Theft: a policy oriented review of the literature*  
Edinburgh, Scottish Office, 1991  
Central Research Unit Paper
- Council of Europe**  
*European Source book of Crime and Criminal Justice Statistics*  
Strasbourg, Council of Europe, 1999  
PC-S-ST (99) 8 REV
- Ellingworth, D., T. Hope, D. Osborn, A. Trickett, K. Pease**  
Prior victimisation and crime risk  
*International Journal of Risk, Security and Crime Prevention*, vol. 2, 1997, pp. 201-214
- European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction (EMCDDA)**  
*2000 Annual Report of the State of the Drugs Problem in the European Union*  
Luxembourg, Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, 2000

**Felson, M.**

*Crime and Everyday Life*  
 Thousand Oaks, California, Pine Forge Press, 1998 (2nd edition)

**Field, S.**

*Trends in Crime and their Interpretation: a study of recorded crime in Post-war England and Wales*  
 London, HMSO, 1990

Home Office Research Study, no. 119

**Fijnaut, C., F. Bovenkerk, G. Bruinsma, H.G. van de Bunt**

*Organized Crime in the Netherlands. Study prepared for the Dutch Parliamentary Inquiry Committee on Criminal Investigation Methods*

The Hague, Kluwer Law International, (1998)

**Gottfredson, M., T. Hirschi**

*A General Theory of Crime*  
 Stanford, Stanford University Press, 1990

**Groves, R.M., P. Biemer, L. Lyberg,****W.L. Nicholls, J. Wakesburg**

*Telephone Survey Methodology*

New York, John Wiley, 1988

**Hamai, K., M. Ando, T. Yokochi,****R. Tatsuya, K. Okada**

*The First Victimization Survey of the Ministry of Justice in Collaboration with ICVS*

Tokyo, Research and Training Institute of the Ministry of Justice, 2000

Research Department Report, no. 10

**Hatalak, O., A. Alvazzi del Frate,****U. Zvekic (Eds.)**

*The International Crime Victim Survey in Countries in Transition: National Reports*

Rome, UNICRI, 1998

UNICRI publication, no. 62

**INRA (Europe)**

Les Européens et la sécurité publique

*Eurobaromètre*, vol. 44, no. 3

Brussels, International Research

Associates, 1996

**Johnson, B., A. Golub, E. Dunlap**

The rise and decline of hard drugs, drug markets and violence in inner-city New York. In: A. Blumstein and J. Wollman

(Eds.), *The Crime Drop in America*

Cambridge, Cambridge University Press,

2000

**Kangaspunta, K., M. Joutsen, N. Ollus**

*Crime and Criminal Justice in Europe and North America, 1990-1994*

Helsinki, HEUNI, 1998

HEUNI publication, no. 32

**Kershaw, C., T. Budd, G. Kinshott,****J. Mattinson, P. Mayhew, A. Myhill**

*The 2000 British Crime Survey, England and Wales*

London, Home Office, 2000

Statistical Bulletin no. 18/00

**Killias, M.**

How to optimize the use of CATI in victimisation surveys. In: W. Bilsky et al.

(Eds.), *Fear of Crime and Criminal*

*Victimisation*

Stuttgart, Enke, 1993, pp. 201-209

**Killias, M., M. Aebi**

Crime Trends in Europe from 1990 to

1996: how Europe illustrates the limits of the American experience

*European Journal on Criminal Policy and*

*Research*, 8, 2000, pp. 43-63

**Killias, M., C. Clerici**

Different measures of vulnerability in

their relation to different dimensions of fear of crime

*British Journal of Criminology*, vol. 40,

no. 3, 2000, pp. 437-450

- Killias, M., P. Lamon, C. Clerici, T. Berruex**  
*Tendances de la criminalité en Suisse de 1984 à 2000*  
 Lausanne, IPSC-UNIL, 2000
- Killias, M., J. Rabasa**  
 Does heroin prescription reduce crime? Results from the evaluation of the Swiss Heroin Prescription project  
*Studies in Crime and Crime prevention*, 7/1, 1998, pp. 127-133
- Koss, M.P.**  
 The measurement of rape victimisation in crime surveys  
*Criminal Justice and Behaviour*, vol. 23, no. 1, 1996, pp. 55-69
- Kuhn, A.**  
 Attitudes towards punishment. In: A. Alvazzi del Frate, U. Zvekic, J.J.M. van Dijk (Eds.), *Understanding Crime: experiences of crime and crime control*  
 Rome, UNICRI, 1993  
 UNICRI publication, no. 49
- Lambsdorff, J. Graf**  
 Transparency international corruption index. In: A. Alvazzi del Frate, G. Pasqua (Eds.), *Responding to the Challenges of Corruption*  
 Rome, UNICRI, 2000  
 UNICRI publication, no. 63
- Liukkonen, M.**  
*Motor Vehicle Theft in Europe*  
 Helsinki, HEUNI, 1995  
 HEUNI paper, no. 9
- Lynn, P.**  
*Collecting data about non-respondents to the British Crime Survey*  
 London, Home Office Research, Development and Statistics Directorate (unpublished), 1997
- Mayhew, P.**  
 Opportunity and vehicle crime. In: D.M. Gottfredson, R.V. Clarke (Eds.), *Policy and Theory in Criminal Justice*  
 Aldershot, Avebury, 1990
- Mayhew, P., D.P. Elliott**  
 Self-reported offending, victimization, and the British Crime Survey  
*Victims and Violence*, 5, 1990, pp. 83-96
- Mayhew, P., J.J.M. van Dijk**  
*Criminal Victimization in Eleven Industrialised Countries; key findings from the 1996 International Crime Victims Survey*  
 The Hague, Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek- en Documentatiecentrum, Ministry of Justice, 1997  
 Onderzoek en beleid, no. 162
- Mirrlees-Black, C., T. Budd, S. Patridge, P. Mayhew**  
*The 1998 British Crime Survey*  
 London, Home Office, 1998  
 Statistical Bulletin 21/98
- Newman, G. (Ed.)**  
*Global report on Crime and Justice. United Nations Centre for International Crime Prevention*  
 Oxford and New York, Oxford University Press, 1999
- Shelley, L.**  
*Crime and Modernisation: the impact of industrialisation and urbanisation on crime*  
 Carbondale (Il.), Southern Illinois University Press, 1981
- Skogan, W.G.**  
 Reactions to crime in cross-national perspective. In: A. Alvazzi del Frate, U. Zvekic, J.J.M. van Dijk (Eds.), *Understanding Crime: experiences of crime and crime control*  
 Rome, UNICRI, 1993  
 UNICRI publication, no. 49

**Smith, M.D.**

Women abuse: the case for surveys by telephone

*Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, vol. 4, 1989, pp. 308-324

**Sparks, R.F., H. Genn, D.J. Dodd**

*Surveying Victims*

London, John Wiley, 1977

**Travis, G., S. Egger, B. O'Toole**

The international crime surveys: some methodological concerns

*Current Issues in Criminal Justice*, vol. 6, 1995, pp. 346-361

**Van Dijk, J.J.M.**

On the uses of local, national and international crime surveys. In: G. Kaiser, H. Kury, H.J. Albrecht (Eds.), *Victims and Criminal Justice: Victimological Research: stocktaking and prospects*

Freiburg, Max-Planck-Institut, 1991

**Van Dijk, J.J.M.**

Understanding crime rates: on the interactions between the rational choices of victims and offenders

*British Journal of Criminology*, vol. 34, no. 2, 1994, pp. 105-121

**Van Dijk, J.J.M.**

Criminal Victimisation: a global perspective. In: A. Alvazzi del Frate, O. Hatalak, U. Zvekic (Eds.), *Surveying Crime: a global perspective*

Rome, Istituto Nazionale di Statistica (ISTAT), 2000a

**Van Dijk, J.J.M.**

Implications of the International Crime Victims Survey for a victim perspective.

In: A. Crawford, J. Goody (Eds.), *Integrating a Victim Perspective within Criminal Justice*

Aldershot, Ashgate Dartmouth, 2000b

**Van Dijk, J.J.M., K. Kangaspunta**

*Piecing together the cross-national crime puzzle*

Washington (DC), National Institute of Justice, 2000

National Institute of Justice Journal, January 2000

**Van Dijk, J.J.M., P. Mayhew**

*Criminal Victimization in the Industrialized World; key findings of the 1989 and 1992 International Crime Surveys*

The Hague, Ministry of Justice, Department of Crime Prevention, 1992

**Van Dijk, J.J.M., J. van Kesteren**

The prevalence and perceived seriousness of victimization by crime: some results of the International Crime Survey

*European Journal of Crime, Criminal Law and Criminal Justice*, vol. 4, no. 1, 1996, pp. 48-70

**Van Dijk, J.J.M., P. Mayhew, M. Killias**

*Experiences of Crime across the World: key findings from the 1989 International Crime Survey*

Deventer, Kluwer Law and Taxation, 1990

**Wittebrood, K., P. Nieuwbeerta**

Criminal victimization during one's life course: the effects of previous victimization and patterns of routine activities

*Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, vol. 37, 2000, pp. 91-122

**World Health Organisation**

*Global Atlas on Violence and Health*

Kobe (Japan), World Health Organization Centre for Health Development, 1999

**Zvekic, U.**

The International Crime Victim Survey; issues of comparative advantages and disadvantages

*International Criminal Justice Review*, vol. 6, 1996, pp. 1-21

**Zvekic, U.**

*Criminal victimisation in countries in transition*

Rome, UNICRI, 1998

UNICRI publication, no. 61

**Zvekic, U.**

Overview of countries in transition. In:

A. Alvazzi del Frate, O. Hatalak, U. Zvekic (Eds.), *Surveying Crime: a global perspective*

Rome, Istituto Nazionale di Statistica

(ISTAT), 2000

**Zvekic, U., A. Alvazzi del Frate**

*Criminal Victimization in the Developing World*

Rome, UNICRI, 1995

UNICRI publication, no. 55



## Appendix 1

### Technical details of the ICVS

- T.1 Response rates
  - T.2 City surveys: 1989, 1992, 1996 and 2000
- 
- 1 Summary of organisation and methodology
  - 2 Weighting procedures

Table 1 Response rates<sup>1</sup>

	1989		1992		1996		2000	
	Eligibles <sup>2</sup>	Completed %	Eligibles	Completed %	Eligibles	Completed %	Eligibles	Completed %
Austria	4,425	2,012	3,489	2,006	1,983	1,507	3,468	2,005
Australia	5,535	2,060	3,366	1,485			4,326	2,402
Belgium	4,793	2,074	3,321	2,152	2,873	2,134	3,655	2,078
Canada							4,000	2,909
Catalonia (Spain)							4,552	3,007
Denmark	4,717	2,006	5,208	2,001	3,697	2,171	3,422	1,947
England & Wales	1,474	1,025	1,879	1,620	4,509	3,899	2,310	1,783
Finland	2,918	1,502			1,651	1,003	2,208	1,000
France	17,479	5,274						
Germany (West)								
Italy			3,321	2,024				
Japan <sup>3</sup>	3,014	2,411	3,015	2,382			3,000	2,211
Netherlands	3,067	2,000	3,012	2,000	3,206	2,008	3,459	2,001
New Zealand			3,154	2,048				
Northern Ireland <sup>4</sup>	—	2,000			1,247	1,042	1,930	1,565
Norway	1,425	1,009						
Portugal							3,569	2,000
Scotland	4,856	2,007			3,496	2,194	3,546	2,040
Spain	2,616	862						
Poland <sup>5</sup>			2,118	2,033	3,695	3,483	6,741	5,276
Sweden			2,227	1,707	1,328	1,000	3,008	2,000
Switzerland	1,464	1,000			1,794	1,000	6,494	4,234
USA	5,429	1,996	2,973	1,501	2,506	1,003	1,656	1,000

1 Response rates are based on completed interviews divided by eligible contacts. Those not interviewed include refusals, those with language or hearing difficulties, respondent not available, no eligible respondent, and invalid interviews.

2 'Eligible contacts' are the gross sample less 'non-relevant' contacts (ie, number busy, no answer and disconnected business number).

3 The number of eligible interviews in Japan 2000 includes non-contacts and is therefore an underestimate compared to the others.

4 As the Northern Ireland sample in 1989 was a quota sample of respondents interviewed face-to-face, response rates are not available.

5 The number of eligible interviews in Poland (1992) is from a given response rates of +95% and the number interviewed.

**Table 2 City surveys: 1989, 1992, 1996 and 2000**

Europe		1989	1992	1996/97	2000/01	
Tirana	Albania			R	•	
Minsk	Belarus			•	•	
Sofia	Bulgaria			•	•	
Barcelona	Catalonia (Spain)			<i>N</i>	<i>N</i>	
Zagreb	Croatia			•	•	
Prague	Czech Republic		[ <i>M</i> ]	M+R	•	[as part of Czechoslovakia]
Tallinn	Estonia		R	M+R	•	
Tbilisi	Georgia		M	M+R	•	
Budapest	Hungary			•	•	
Bishkek	Kyrgyzstan			M+R		
Riga	Latvia			(M+R) (M)		(1995) (1998)
Vilnius	Lithuania			M+R	•	
	Malta			(•)		(National survey)
Skopje	Macedonia			•	na	
Warsaw	Poland	•	<i>N</i>	<i>N</i>	na	
Bucharest	Romania			R	•	
Moscow	Russia		•	•	•	
Bratislava	Slovak Republic		[ <i>M</i> ]	•		[as part of Czechoslovakia]
Ljubljana	Slovenia		•	R	•	
Kiev	Ukraine			•	•	
Belgrade	Yugoslavia			•	na	
Asia		1989	1992	1996/97	2000/01	
Beijing	China		•			
Bombay	India		•	R		
Jakarta	Indonesia	( <i>S</i> )	M+R	M+R		(Surabaya)
Seoul	Korea				na	
Ulaan Baatar	Mongolia			R	•	
Manila	The Philippines		•	R	na	
Pt Moresby	Papua New Guinea		M+R na			

Table 2 (continued)

Africa		1989	1992	1996/97	2000/01	
Gaborone	Botswana			•	na	(1998)
Cairo	Egypt		•			
Maseru	Lesotho				•	
Windhoek	Namibia				•	
Lagos	Nigeria			(•)		
Johannesburg	South Africa		•	•	•	
Mbabane	Swaziland				•	
Dar es Salaam	Tanzania		•			
Tunis	Tunisia		•			
Kampala	Uganda		•	R	na	
Lusaka	Zambia				•	
Harare	Zimbabwe			•		
Latin America		1989	1992	1996/97	2000/01	
Buenos Aires	Argentina		•	•	•	
Rio de Janeiro	Brazil		•	•		
La Paz	Bolivia			•		
Bogotá	Colombia			•	na	
San Jose	Costa Rica		R	R		
Mexico	Mexico				na	
Citysuncion						
Panama	Panama				•	
Asunción	Paraguay			•		

R small rural sample included

M multiple cities

N from a national survey

na no dataset available at the time of printing

## 1 Summary of organisation and methodology for the 2000 surveys in the industrialised countries

International co-ordination in the industrialised countries:

Peter Willems, Interview-NSS, Amsterdam (11 countries)

John van Kesteren, NSCR & Leiden University (6 countries)

*financier*: Ministry of Justice, the Hague

### *Australia*

*national co-ordinator*: Carlos Carcach, Australian Institute of Criminology, Canberra

*financier*: Commonwealth Attorney General's Department, Canberra

*fieldwork*: Roy Morgan Research Pty. Ltd.

*sampling method*: random digit dialling, 'last birthday' for selection of household member

*interview method*: CATI

### *Belgium*

*national co-ordinator*: Freddy Gazan, Ministry of Justice, Brussels

*financier*: Ministry of Justice, Brussels

*fieldwork*: NID/Interview-NSS

*sampling method*: random digit dialling, tholdahl carter for selection of household member

*interview method*: CATI

### *Canada*

*national co-ordinator*: Kwing Hung, Department of Justice, Ottawa

*financier*: Department of Justice, Research and statistics department, Ottawa

*fieldwork*: Canadian Facts / Interview-NSS

*sampling method*: random digit dialling, tholdahl carter for selection of household member

*interview method*: CATI

### *Catalonia (Spain)*

*national co-ordinator*: Eulalia Luque Reina, Centre of legal Studies. Justice Department Autonomous Government of Catalonia

*financier*: Autonomous Government of Catalonia

*fieldwork*: Centre of Legal Studies of Justice Department

*sampling method*: random sample from the telephone registry, does not account for households with non-registered telephone numbers

*interview method*: telephone interviewing, but not computer assisted

*Denmark*

*national co-ordinator:* Flemming Balvig, University of Copenhagen  
*financier:* Ministry of Justice  
*fieldwork:* Vilstrup Research / Interview-NSS  
*sampling method:* random digit dialling, 'last birthday' for selection of household member  
*interview method:* CATI

*England and Wales*

*national co-ordinator:* Pat Mayhew, Home Office, London  
*financier:* Home Office, London  
*fieldwork:* BMRB/Interview-NSS  
*sampling method:* random digit dialling, 'last birthday' for selection of household member  
*interview method:* CATI

*Finland*

*national co-ordinator:* Kauko Aromaa, National Research Institute of Legal Policy, Helsinki  
*financier:* National Research Institute of Legal Policy & Statistics Finland, Helsinki  
*fieldwork:* Statistics Finland, Helsinki  
*sampling method:* random sample of individuals age 15 and older was taken from the population registry. For the ICVS, respondents 16 years and older are selected  
*interview method:* CATI

*France*

*national co-ordinator:* Frédéric Ocquteau, Institut des Hautes Études de la Sécurité Intérieure, Paris  
*financier:* Institut des Hautes Études de la Sécurité Intérieure, Paris  
*fieldwork:* Efficience 3 / Interview-NSS  
*sampling method:* random digit dialling, throidahl carter for selection of household member  
*interview method:* CATI

*Japan*

*national co-ordinator:* Koichi Hamai, Ministry of Justice, Tokyo  
*financier:* Ministry of Justice, Tokyo

*sampling method:* two stage sampling; A sample of 209 cities/villages, stratified by town size was taken. Within these cities/villages a random sample of individuals from the population registry

*interview method:* face to face

*Netherlands*

*national co-ordinator:* John van Kesteren, Leiden University

*financier:* Ministry of Justice, the Hague

*fieldwork:* Interview-NSS

*sampling method:* random digit dialling, tholdahl carter for selection of household member

*interview method:* CATI

*Northern Ireland*

*national co-ordinator:* Debbie Donnelly, Northern Ireland Office, Belfast

*financier:* Northern Ireland Office, Belfast

*fieldwork:* UMS/Interview-NSS

*sampling method:* random sample of households based on electoral register, tholdahl carter for selection of household member

*interview method:* CAPI (Computer Assisted Personal Interviewing)

*Poland*

*national co-ordinator:* Andrzej Siemaszko, Institute of Justice, Ministry of Justice, Warsaw

*financier:* Institute of Justice, Ministry of Justice, Warsaw

*fieldwork:* CBOS, Warsaw

*sampling method:* Sampling of households, stratified by region and town size within the regions. Respondents were selected by the 'next birthday' criterion

*interview method:* face to face

*Portugal*

*national co-ordinator:* Antonio Carlos Duarte Fonseca, Ministry of Justice, Lisbon

*financier:* Ministry of Justice, Lisbon

*fieldwork:* Ipsos/Interview-NSS

*sampling method:* random digit dialling, tholdahl carter for selection of household member

*interview method:* CATI

*Scotland*

*national co-ordinator:* Fiona Fraser, Scottish Executive Justice Department, Edinburgh  
*financier:* Scottish Executive Justice Department, Edinburgh  
*fieldwork:* BMRB/Interview-NSS  
*sampling method:* random digit dialling, 'last birthday' for selection of household member  
*interview method:* CATI

*Sweden*

*national co-ordinator:* Jan Ahlberg, National Council for Crime Prevention, Stockholm  
*financier:* National Council for Crime Prevention, Stockholm  
*fieldwork:* TEMO/Interview-NSS  
*sampling method:* random digit dialling, throdahl carter for selection of household member  
*interview method:* CATI

*Switzerland*

*national co-ordinator:* Martin Killias, University of Lausanne  
*financier:* Offices of Police, Justice & Statistics + several local police departments  
*fieldwork:* M.I.S. Trend SA, Lausanne  
*sampling method:* sample of households from telephone directory, stratified by city / canton. There was an oversampling of the large cities, these additional cases are downweighted to ensure representative figures for the whole of Switzerland  
*interview method:* CATI  
*questionnaire:* the Swiss questionnaire was different. All items on victimisation however and some of the follow-up items were taken from the basic ICVS questionnaire. Only these corresponding items are used in this report

*USA*

*national co-ordinator:* Carol Kalish, United States Department of Justice, Washington  
*financier:* United States Department of Justice, Washington  
*fieldwork:* Walker Info / Interview-NSS  
*sampling method:* random digit dialling, throdahl carter for selection of household member  
*interview method:* CATI

## 2 Weighting procedures

### *The need for weighting*

In each randomly selected household only one randomly selected respondent aged 16 or over was interviewed. No substitution of the selected respondent with another household member was allowed. This procedure guarantees a high quality sample and eliminates the disadvantage of quota sampling that the most co-operative respondent in a household is interviewed.

People in households of different sizes have different probabilities of being chosen for the interview, and a weighting procedure is needed to correct this to generate a representative sample of 'persons'. For instance, in a household comprising five people of 16 years or older, the chance of any one of them being interviewed is only one in five. In such large households, the responses of the selected interviewee need to be upweighted. Otherwise, respondents from small households are over-represented. Weighting of the results is done to give the number of people in households of different sizes the proper weight of their proportion in the population.

Apart from the household to person translation, which is made by weighting, corrections have also been applied to make the samples as representative as possible in terms of gender, age and regional distribution.

### *Methodology*

For each country, the most recent statistics on how many of the population were in households of different sizes were used as reference. Additional input for the weighting procedure concerned population size, gender, age and regional population distribution. No appropriate international statistics were available on other criteria such as household income, urbanisation, professional activities, tenure etc to enable them to be used in weighting. Some of these variables, though, would be desirable for this purpose. In most countries, appropriate statistics concerning how the population of those 16 years or older ('adults') were distributed within households were either unavailable or inadequate. Thus, these statistics were derived from the present study itself.

First, on the basis of the available statistics on how many of the population were in households of different sizes, the samples were weighted, taking into account also region and gender. This was done in an iterative weighting procedure in which individual weights for individual respondents were computed to achieve weighted results with marginal totals on gender and region corresponding to population distributions.

In the survey itself, the composition of the households was determined by asking each respondent how many persons the household as a whole consisted of, and also how many were 16 years or older.

Using the weighted results on household size, compared to the distribution of household size in the population showed no significant deviation. Therefore we used the weighted distribution of number of adults from the sample as an estimate for the population. This

resulted in *household weights* that were computed based on gender, household size and regional distribution.

The *individual weights* were computed using the same iterative procedure, but apart from gender and regional distribution, also age and number of adults in the household served as criteria.

A different weighting procedure was applied for Japan, Catalonia (Spain) and Poland. Since these samples were stratified by region, no weighting on region was necessary. First, an initial individual weight was computed (ie, the number of people aged 16 or over in the household, divided by the average number of persons of this age in the sample). This accounts for the larger chance that people from smaller households have of being selected. (This was not done for Japan, since this was a sample of individuals.) Based on this initial weight, a two-way table by age and gender was computed. The initial weight, multiplied by the ratio of what the percentage should be (according to census data) and what was found in the sample, was applied as individual weight. The household weight was computed by dividing the individual weight by the number of persons 16 or older in the household, multiplied by the average number of persons of this age. The distribution over the strata using weighted data was checked against the unweighted data; no obvious deviations were found.

## Appendix 2

### Statistical significance

A sample-based estimate is more or less close to the 'unknown' population value being measured. The size of the deviation  $d$  depends on:

- sample size ( $n$ )
- percentage observed in the sample ( $p$ )
- level of confidence chosen ( $z$ )

In this report we will use a level of confidence of 90%. The nomogram on the next page gives the confidence levels for observed percentages and sample sizes.

For instance, in a survey of 1,000 respondents, 20% said 'yes' to a certain question.

The entry in the table on the next page, at row  $n = 1,000$  and with column percentage of 20, shows  $\delta$  to be 2.1%. This implies that there is a nine in ten chance that the true population value lies between 17.9% and 22.1% ( $20 \pm 2.1$ , at a confidence level of 90%). Hence, that there is a five percent probability that the real value is larger than 22.1% and five percent probability that it is smaller than 17.9%. In another example, say 2% of the sample of 2,000 people had been a victim of a particular crime in the last year. There would be a 90% chance that the true level of victimisation lies between 2.5% and 1.5% ( $2 \pm 0.5$ ).

When there is an average victimisation rate for all countries of 5%, for instance, then a value from an individual survey with a sample of 2,000 of more than 0.8% higher or lower than the average will be statistically significant at the 90% level. Where the overall victimisation rate is 2% say, deviations of 0.5% would be significant. (Thus, in absolute size, the standard error is smaller the less frequently a crime occurs, but proportionately it is much larger.) When the sample is 1,000 (of women only for example), deviations from an overall average of 5% of more than 1.1% will be significant, and with an average of 2%, deviations of 0.7% will be.

The formula which is used for calculating  $d$  at a confidence level of 90% is:

$$\delta = 1.65 \times \sqrt{p \frac{(100-p)}{n}}$$

When a research population is finite, the deviation  $d$  is smaller because the formula is multiplied by:

$$\frac{N-n}{N-1}$$

in which  $N$  is the population size.

## Nomogram for a level of confidence of 90%

Sample size	Percentage observed										
	2 98	5 95	10 90	15 85	20 80	25 75	30 70	35 65	40 60	45 55	50 50
25	4.6	7.2	9.9	11.8	13.2	15.2	15.1	15.7	16.1	16.4	16.5
50	3.3	5.1	7.0	8.3	9.3	10.7	10.7	11.1	11.4	11.6	11.6
100	2.3	3.6	4.9	5.9	6.6	7.6	7.5	7.9	8.1	8.2	8.2
200	1.6	2.5	3.5	4.2	4.7	5.4	5.3	5.6	5.7	5.8	5.8
300	1.3	2.1	2.9	3.4	3.8	4.4	4.4	4.5	4.7	4.7	4.8
400	1.2	1.8	2.5	2.9	3.3	3.8	3.8	3.9	4.0	4.1	4.1
500	1.0	1.6	2.2	2.6	2.9	3.4	3.4	3.5	3.6	3.7	3.7
600	0.9	1.5	2.0	2.4	2.7	3.1	3.1	3.2	3.3	3.3	3.4
700	0.9	1.4	1.9	2.2	2.5	2.9	2.9	3.0	3.0	3.1	3.1
800	0.8	1.3	1.7	2.1	2.3	2.7	2.7	2.8	2.9	2.9	2.9
900	0.8	1.2	1.6	2.0	2.2	2.5	2.5	2.6	2.7	2.7	2.7
1,000	0.7	1.1	1.6	1.9	2.1	2.4	2.4	2.5	2.5	2.6	2.6
1,200	0.7	1.0	1.4	1.7	1.9	2.2	2.2	2.3	2.3	2.4	2.4
1,400	0.6	1.0	1.3	1.6	1.8	2.0	2.0	2.1	2.2	2.2	2.2
1,600	0.6	0.9	1.2	1.5	1.6	1.9	1.9	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.1
1,800	0.5	0.8	1.2	1.4	1.6	1.8	1.8	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9
2,000	0.5	0.8	1.1	1.3	1.5	1.7	1.7	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.8
3,000	0.4	0.7	0.9	1.1	1.2	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.5	1.5	1.5
4,000	0.4	0.6	0.8	0.9	1.0	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.3	1.3	1.3
6,000	0.3	0.5	0.6	0.8	0.8	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.1	1.1
8,000	0.3	0.4	0.6	0.7	0.7	0.8	0.8	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9
10,000	0.2	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8
20,000	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6
30,000	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5
40,000	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4

## Appendix 3

# Overview of the 2000 ICVS questionnaire

### 1 Summary of CATI versions of the questionnaire

The items are grouped by theme, rather than by the order in which they appear in the questionnaire. The question numbers indicate the order in which the questions are asked. The basic English versions of the questionnaires are available on the internet: <http://www.icvs.nscr.nl>

#### CATI questionnaire

	Question number in basic version				
	1989	1992	1996	2000	
<b>SCREENER QUESTIONS</b>					
Cars owned last five years	1a	32	20	20	Question text changed in 1996
Number of cars most of time	1a1	33	21	21	
Garage ownership		41			
Parking arrangements		42			
Motorcycles etc owned last five years	1b	34	25	25	
Number of motorcycles most of time	1b1	35	26	26	
Bicycle owned last five years	1c	36	30	30	
Number of bicycles most of time	1c1	37	31	31	
<b>CAR THEFT</b>					
Victim last five years	2	44	35	35	
When last five years	13a	81	100	100	
How often if last year	13b	82	101	101	
Where occurred	13c	83	102	102	
Reported to police	13e	86	104	104	
Why not reported	13f	87			
How serious		88	105	105	
Car recovered or not	13d	84	103	103	
When recovered		85			
<b>THEFT FROM CAR</b>					
Victim last five years	3	45	40	40	
When last five years	14a	91	110	110	
How often if last year	14b	92	111	111	
Where occurred	14c	93	112	112	Categories added over years

## Question number in basic version

	1989	1992	1996	2000	
Reported to police	14e	94	113	113	
Why reported			114	114	
Why not reported	14f	95	117	117	
Satisfied with way police dealt			115	115	
Why dissatisfied			116	116	
Reported to other authorities			118		
How serious		96	119	119	
Value of damage	14d				
CAR VANDALISM					
Victim last five years	4	46	45	45	
When last five years	15a	101	130	130	
How often if last year	15b	102	131	131	
Where occurred	15c	103	132	132	Categories added over years
Reported to police	15e	106	133	133	
Why not reported	15f	107			
How serious		108	134	134	
Value of property stolen	15d				
THEFT OF MOTORCYCLE/MOPED					
Victim last five years	5	50	50	50	
When last five years	16a	111	140	140	
How often if last year	16b	112	141	141	
Where occurred	16c	113	142	142	
Reported to police	16e	116	143	143	
Why not reported	16f	117			
How serious		118	144	144	
Motorcycle/moped recovered or not	16d				
THEFT OF BICYCLE					
Victim last five years	6	51	55	55	
When last five years	17a	121	150	150	
How often if last year	17b	122	151	151	
Where occurred	17c	123	152	152	Categories added over years
Reported to police	17e	126	153	153	
Why not reported	17f	127			
How serious		128	154	154	
Bicycle recovered or not	17d				

## Question number in basic version

	1989	1992	1996	2000	
<b>BURGLARY</b>					
Victim last five years	7	60	60	60	
When last five years	18a	131	160	160	
How often if last year	18b	132	161	161	
Reported to police	18e	137	166	166	
Why reported			167	167	
Why not reported	18f	138	170	170	
Satisfied with way police dealt			168	168	
Why dissatisfied			169	169	
Reported to other authorities			171		
Contact with specialised agency			173	173	
Specialised agency useful			174	174	
How serious		139	172	172	
Anything stolen	18c	133	162	162	
Value of property stolen	18c1	134	163	163	Instruction changed in 1996
Anything damaged	18d	135	164	164	
Value of damage	18d1	136	165	165	Instruction changed in 1996
<b>ATTEMPT AT BURGLARY</b>					
Victim last five years	8	61	65	65	
When last five years	19a	141	180	180	
How often if last year		142	181	181	
Reported to police		146	182	182	
Why not reported		147			
How serious		148	183	183	
<b>THEFT FROM GARAGES/SHEDS/LOCKUPS</b>					
Victim last five years		62			
When last five years		151			
How often if last year		152			
Reported to police		156			
Why not reported		157			
How serious		158			
<b>ROBBERY</b>					
Victim last five years	9	64	70	70	
When last five years	20a	161	190	190	
How often if last year	20b	162	191	191	
Where occurred	20c	163	192	192	Categories added over years

## Question number in basic version

	1989	1992	1996	2000	
Reported to police	20f	169	199	199	
Why reported			200	200	
Why not reported	20g	170	203	203	
Satisfied with way police dealt			201	201	
Why dissatisfied			202	202	
Reported to other authorities			204	204	
Contact with specialised agency			206	206	
Specialised agency useful			207	207	
How serious		171	205	205	
Anything stolen	20e	168	198	198	
Value of damage	200				
Number of offenders		164	193	193	
Whether offender(s) known		165	194	194	Question changed since 1996
Did offender(s) have weapon	20d	166	195	195	
Type of weapon	20d1	167	196	196	
Long gun or hand gun			196a		
Was weapon used		197	197		
<b>THEFT OF PERSONAL PROPERTY</b>					
Victim last five years	10	65	75	75	
When last five years	21a	181	210	210	
How often if last year	21b	182	211	211	
Where occurred	21c	183	212	212	Categories added over years
Reported to police	21f	186	214	214	
Why not reported	21g	187			
How serious		188	215	215	
Was it pickpocketing	21d	184	213	213	
Value of property stolen	21e				
<b>SEXUAL OFFENCES</b>					
Victim last five years	11	67	80	80	Also asked of men in Australia and Canada 2000
When last five years	22a	191	220	220	
How often if last year	22b	192	221	221	
Where occurred		193	222	222	
Reported to police	22f	206	232	232	
Why reported			233	233	
Why not reported	22g	207	236	236	Code omitted in 1992
Satisfied with way police dealt			234	234	

## Question number in basic version

	1989	1992	1996	2000	
Why dissatisfied			235	235	
Reported to other authorities			237	237	
Contact with specialised agency			238	238	
Specialised agency useful			239	239	
How serious		198	230	230	
Regarded as a crime		200	231	231	
Number of offenders		194	223	223	
Whether offender(s) known	22c	195	224	224	Question changed since 1996
Relationship with offender	22d	196	225	225	Categories added over years
How incident described	22e	199	229	229	
Did offender(s) have weapon			226	226	
Type of weapon			227	227	
Was weapon used			228	228	
More serious incident before			240		
What happened then			241		
ASSAULTS AND THREATS					
Victim last five years	12	68	85	85	Instruction changed since 1996
Victim last five years domestic screener				85a	
When last five years	23a	211	250		
When last five years year incl. domestic				250	
How often if last year	23b	212	251		
How often if last year incl. domestic				251	
Where occurred		213	252	252	Categories added over years
Reported to police	23i	222	262	262	
Why reported			263	263	
Why not reported	23j	223	266	266	
Satisfied with way police dealt			264	264	
Why dissatisfied			265	265	
Reported to other authorities			267	267	
Contact with specialised agency			270	270	
Specialised agency useful			271	271	
How serious		224	268	268	
Regarded as a crime			269	269	
Number of offenders		214	253	253	
Whether offender(s) known	23c	215	254	254	Question text changed 1996

## Question number in basic version

	1989	1992	1996	2000		
Relationship with offender	23d	216	255	255	Categories added over years	
How incident described	23e	217	256	256		
Did offender(s) have weapon		218	257	257		
Type of weapon			258	258		
Was weapon used			259	259		
Whether shot / hit	23f	219				
Injury suffered	23g	220	260	260		
Saw doctor	23h	221	261	261		
CONSUMER FRAUD						
Victim last year		245	280	280		
Type of fraud		246	281	281		
Reported to police		247	282	282		
Reported to other authorities			283	283		
CORRUPTION						
Victim last year			290	290		
Type of corruption			291	291		
Reported to police			292	292		
Reported to other authorities			293	293		
LAST CRIME OVER LAST FIVE YEARS						
What was the last crime		231				
Reported to police	28a	240				
Satisfied with way police dealt	28b	241				
Why dissatisfied	28e	242				
Support from relatives/friends		232				
Support from police		233				
Support from social welfare organisations		234				
Support from religious organisations		235				
Support from voluntary organisation		236				
Support from specialised agency		237				
Support from others		238				
Contact with specialised agency	27a					
Specialised agency useful	27b	239				
POLICE/PREVENTION/PROTECTION						
Police do good job	29a	252	310	310	Four categories 2000	
Police are helpful				311		
Frequency of police patrol		253	311			
Whether patrol sufficient		254				

## Question number in basic version

	1989	1992	1996	2000	
Recommended sentence for burglar	30a	260	320	320	Categories added over years
Length of prison sentence	30b	261	321	321	
Protection measures in the home	33	264	332	332	
Burglary more than once			333		Categories changed over years
Alarm installed - burglary			334		
Attempted burglary more than once			335		
Alarm installed - attempted burglary			336		
Gun owner (including air rifle)			341	341	
Gun ownership	37a	268			
Type of gun owned	37a		342	342	Categories added over years
Reason for owning gun			343	343	Categories added over years
OPINIONS AND ATTITUDES					
Solidarity of neighbourhood		248			Categories changed over years
Feel safe alone after dark		249	300	300	
Feel safe at home alone after dark				301	
Whether avoid certain places	24	250	301		
Whether go accompanied	25				
Likelihood of burglary	26	251	302	302	
Tell neighbours when away	36	267	340		
Going out in the evening	39	274	344	344	
Family gatherings		275			
Opinion about youth crime				340	
DEMOGRAPHIC DATA					
Gender	0e	31	16	16	Codes changed in 1996
Year of birth	43	262	330	330	
Household size	0a	4	5	5	
Persons over 16	0b	5	6	6	
Males over 16		6	7	7	
Town size	44	287	312	312	
Type of accommodation	31	263	331	331	
Home owned / rented	34	265			
Rented from whom		266			
Occupational position	(41a)	277	350	350	
Part/full time job	41b	278			
Age completed education	40	279			

## Question number in basic version

	1989	1992	1996	2000
Number of years of formal education			351	351
Income above or below average	42a	281	352	352
Income lower than bottom 25%	42b	282	353	353
Income higher than upper 25%	42b	283	354	354
Satisfaction with income		284	355	355
Area description		286		
Marital status		285	356	356
Gender of interviewer	45	300	400	400

## 2 2000 International Crime Victims Survey (CATI version)

Q1 Good morning/ afternoon/ evening. I am an interviewer of the Survey Company .... We are conducting an important survey for the ..... about the problem of crime. Information obtained from the study will assist law enforcement agencies to better prevent crime in the future.

The survey is part of a major research project, which is being carried out in many different countries. May I ask you some questions for the survey? The interview won't take much of your time. Your answers will, of course, be treated confidentially and anonymously. <<INT. IF RESPONDENT IS SUSPICIOUS OR DOUBTFUL:>> If you want to check whether this survey is done in co-operation with .... or if you would like more information, I can give you the phone-number of someone at <<INT. IF RESPONDENT ASKS FOR THAT NUMBER:>> May I call you back in 30 minutes/ tomorrow?

- respondent is willing to co-operate
- respondent asks for telephone number and wants to make appointment
- respondent can be called back
- respondent refuses co-operation (SOFT refusal)
- respondent refuses co-operation (HARD refusal)

*If answer is equal to code 4 or 5 then end of questionnaire*

*If answer is equal to code 2 or code 3 then make a call-back*

*Else continue with question 5*

Q5 In order to determine which person I must interview, I would like to know how many people there are in your household, including yourself.

- 1 1
- 2 2
- 3 3

- 4 4
- 5 5
- 6 6 or more

*If answer is equal to code 1 continue with question 16.*

*Else continue with question 6*

Q6 How many people (persons) aged 16 or over are there in your household, including yourself?

- 1 1
- 2 2
- 3 3
- 4 4 or more

Q7 And how many of them are males aged over 16?

- 1 1
- 2 2
- 3 3
- 4 4 or more
- 5 0 (zero)

<<APPLY TROLDAHL-CARTER SELECTION HERE>>

Q10 According to my instructions, I have to interview the <<\*\*\* PERSON>> in your household. Can you please ask him/her whether he/she is willing to come to the phone? <<INT: IF PERSON NOT AVAILABLE:>> Can you tell me at what time I have the best chance of getting him/her on the phone?

Q15 <<INT: QUESTIONS TO MEMBER OF HOUSEHOLD SELECTED BY COMPUTER IF OTHER THAN FIRST CONTACT.>>

Good morning/afternoon/evening. I am an interviewer of the Survey Company.....

<<THIS INTRODUCTION CAN BE CHANGED SLIGHTLY TO SUIT NATIONAL NEEDS>> The survey is part of an international project, which is being done in many European and non-European countries. May I ask you some questions for the survey? The interview won't take much of your time. Your answers will, of course, be treated confidentially and anonymously. <<INT. IF RESPONDENT IS SUSPICIOUS OR DOUBTFUL:>> If you want to check whether this survey is done in co-operation with .... or if you would like more information, I can give you the phone-number of someone at ..... <<INT. IF RESPONDENT ASKS FOR THAT NUMBER:>> May I call you back in 30 minutes/tomorrow?

- respondent is willing to co-operate
- respondent asks for telephone number and wants to make appointment
- respondent can be called back

- respondent refuses co-operation (SOFT refusal)
- respondent refuses co-operation (HARD refusal)

*If answer is equal to code 4 or 5 then end of questionnaire*

*If answer is equal to code 2 or code 3 then make a call-back*

*Else continue with question 16.*

Q16 <<INT: NOTE DOWN THE SEX OF RESPONDENT WITHOUT ASKING>>

- 1 male
- 2 female

*VEHICLE OWNERSHIP*

Q20 I shall start with some questions about crimes involving cars, and so I first need to ask you about car ownership. Over the past five years, which is since 1995, has anyone in your household had a car, van or truck for private use?

- 1 yes
- 2 no

*If answer is equal to code 2 continue with question 25. Else continue with question 21.*

Q21 How many vehicles has your household had use of for most of the time?

- 1 one
- 2 two
- 3 three
- 4 four
- 5 five or more

Q25 Has anyone in your household owned a moped, scooter, motorcycle (or mofa\*) over the past five years?

<<INT: \* ONLY IF RELEVANT IN YOUR COUNTRY>>

- 1 yes
- 2 no

*If answer is equal to code 2 continue with question 30. Else continue with question 26.*

Q26 And how many has your household had use of for most of the time?

- 1 one
- 2 two
- 3 three
- 4 four
- 5 five or more

- Q30 Has anyone in your household owned a bicycle over the past five years.  
<<INCLUDE CHILDREN'S BICYCLES>>
- 1 yes
  - 2 no
- If answer is equal to code 2 continue with question 32. Else continue with question 31.*

- Q31 And how many bicycles has your household had use of for most of the time?
- 1 one
  - 2 two
  - 3 three
  - 4 four
  - 5 five or more

*FIVE YEAR VICTIMISATION SCREENER QUESTIONS*

- Q32 I now want to ask you about crimes you or your household may have experienced during the past five years, which is since 1995. It is sometimes difficult to remember such incidents so I will read the questions slowly and I would like you to think care fully about them.  
*If question 20 is not equal to code 1 continue with question 50.*

*Theft of cars screener*

*If question 20 not equal to 1 continue with question 50*

- Q35 Over the past five years have you or other members of your household had any of their cars/vans/trucks stolen? Please take your time to think about it.
- 1 yes
  - 2 no
  - 9 don't know

*Theft from cars screener*

- Q40 Apart from this, over the past five years have you or have members of your household been the victim of a theft of a car radio, or something else which was left in your car, or theft of a part of the car, such as a car mirror or wheel?  
<<INT: VANDALISM MUST NOT BE REPORTED HERE, BUT UNDER THE NEXT QUESTION; IF THE CAR ITSELF WAS STOLEN AS WELL, THIS SHOULD HAVE BEEN REPORTED BEFORE. OTHER THEFTS FROM THE CAR WHEN IT WAS TAKEN MUST NOT BE REPORTED HERE>>
- 1 yes

- 2 no
- 9 don't know

*Vandalism to cars screener*

- Q45 Apart from thefts, have parts of any of the cars/vans/trucks belonging to your household been deliberately damaged (vandalised) over the past five years?
- <<INT: IF PERSON THINKS IT DELIBERATE, IT WILL COUNT. TRAFFIC ACCIDENTS SHOULD NOT BE REPORTED>>
- 1 yes
  - 2 no
  - 9 don't know

*Theft of motorcycle screener*

*If question 25 is not equal to code 1 continue with question 55*

- Q50 Over the past five years have you or other members of your household had any of their mopeds/scooters/motorcycles/mofa's)\* stolen?
- <<INT: \* ONLY IF RELEVANT IN COUNTRY>>
- 1 yes
  - 2 no
  - 9 don't know

*Theft of bicycle screener*

*If question 30 is not equal to code 1 continue with question 60*

- Q55 Over the past five years have you or other members of your household had any of their bicycles stolen?
- <<INT. INCLUDE CHILDREN'S BICYCLE>>
- 1 yes
  - 2 no
  - 9 don't know

*Burglary screener*

- Q60 Over the past five years, did anyone actually get into your home/residence without permission, and steal or try to steal something? I am not including here thefts from garages, sheds or lock-ups.
- <<INT. INCLUDE CELLARS, DO NOT COUNT BURGLARIES IN SECOND HOUSES>>

- 1 yes
- 2 no
- 9 don't know

*Attempted burglary screener*

- Q65 Apart from this, over the past five years, do you have any evidence that someone tried to get into your home/residence unsuccessfully. For example, damage to locks, doors or windows or scratches around the lock?
- 1 yes
  - 2 no
  - 9 don't know

- Q66 Next I want 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 must not be mentioned now.

*Robbery screener*

- Q70 Over the past five years has anyone stolen something from you by using force or threatening you, or did anybody try to steal something from you by using force or threatening force.
- <<INT. PICKPOCKETING MUST BE REPORTED UNDER THE NEXT QUESTION>>
- 1 yes
  - 2 no
  - 9 don't know

*Theft of personal property screener*

- Q75 <<INT. READ SLOWLY>>
- Apart from theft involving force there are many other types of theft of personal property, such as pickpocketing or theft of a purse, wallet, clothing, jewellery, sports equipment, This can happen at one's work, at school, in a pub, on public transport, on the beach, or in the street. Over the past five years have you personally been the victim of any of these thefts?
- 1 yes
  - 2 no
  - 9 don't know

Q76 I would now like to ask you some questions about crimes of violence of which you personally may have been the victim.

*If question 16 is equal to code 1 continue with question 85*

*Else continue with question 80*

*Sexual victimisation screener*

Q80 First, a rather personal question. People sometimes grab, touch or assault others for sexual reasons in a really offensive way. This can happen either at home, or elsewhere, for instance in a pub, the street, at school, on public transport, in cinemas, on the beach, or at one's workplace. Over the past five years has anyone done this to you? Please take your time to think about it.

<<INT: INCLUDE DOMESTIC SEXUAL ASSAULTS>>

- 1 yes
- 2 no
- 9 don't know

*Assault/threats screener*

Q85 Apart from the incidents just covered, have you over the past five years been personally attacked or threatened by someone in a way that really frightened you, either at home or elsewhere, such as in a pub, in the street, at school, on public transport, on the beach, or at your workplace?

<<INT: INCLUDE SEXUAL VIOLENCE AGAINST MEN, IF MENTIONED, INT. INCLUDE DOMESTIC ASSAULTS>>

- 1 yes
- 2 no
- 9 don't know

*If question 85 is equal to code 1 continue with question 86, Else continue with question 85a*

Q85a Take your time to consider. An incident of this sort might also have involved your partner, family member or a close friend. So apart from incidents already covered, have you in the past five years been personally attacked or threatened by someone you know in a way that really frightened you?

- 1 yes
- 2 no
- 9 don't know
- 10 refusal

*If no crimes mentioned continue with question 280, Else continue with question 86*

## THEFT OF CAR – DETAILS

Q86 Could I now go back to ask you about the crimes you said had happened to you or your household.

*If question 35 is not equal to code 1 continue with question 110*

*Else continue with question 100*

Q100 First of all, you mentioned the theft of a car. When did this happen? Was this ...

<<INT. READ OUT>>

<<INT. IF RESPONDENT HAS BEEN VICTIM AT LEAST ONE TIME IN 1999: TYPE IN [LAST YEAR]>>

- 1 this year
- 2 last year, in 1999
- 3 before then
- 9 <<don't know/can't remember>>

*If answer is equal to code 2 continue with question 101, Else continue with question 102.*

Q101 How often did it happen in 1999?

- 1 once
- 2 twice
- 3 three times
- 4 four times
- 5 five times or more
- 9 don't know

Q102 (The last time) did this theft happen at your own home/residence, near your own home/residence, elsewhere in your city or local area, at work, elsewhere in [COUNTRY], or did it happen abroad?

<<INT. IF VICTIM MORE THAN ONCE OVER PAST FIVE YEARS, ASK ABOUT THE LAST TIME THIS HAPPENED>>

<<INT. INCLUDE INCIDENTS THAT TOOK PLACE IN GARAGES, DRIVES ETC AS CODE 1>>

- 1 at your own home/residence
- 2 near your own home/residence
- 3 elsewhere in city or local area
- 4 at work
- 5 elsewhere in [COUNTRY]
- 6 abroad
- 9 don't know

- Q103 (The last time this happened) was the car/van ever recovered?
- 1 yes
  - 2 no
  - 9 don't know
- Q104 (The last time this happened) did you or anyone else report the incident to the police?
- 1 yes
  - 2 no
  - 9 don't know
- Q105 Taking everything into account, how serious was the incident for you or your household. Was it very serious, fairly serious, or not very serious?
- 1 very serious
  - 2 fairly serious
  - 3 not very serious

*THEFT FROM CARS - DETAILS*

*If question 40 is not equal to code 1 continue with question 130*

- Q110 The theft FROM your car that you mentioned, when did this happen? Was it ...
- <<INT. READ OUT>>
- <<INT. IF RESPONDENT HAS BEEN VICTIM AT LEAST ONE TIME IN 1999: TYPE IN [LAST YEAR]>>
- 1 this year
  - 2 last year, in 1999
  - 3 before then
  - 9 <<don't know/can't remember>>

*If answer is equal to code 2 continue with question 111, Else continue with question 112*

- Q111 How often did it happen in 1999?
- 1 once
  - 2 twice
  - 3 three times
  - 4 four times
  - 5 five times or more
  - 9 don't know

Q112 (The last time) did this theft happen at your own home/residence, near your own home/residence, elsewhere in your city or local area, at work, elsewhere in [COUNTRY], or did it happen abroad?

<<INT. IF VICTIM MORE THAN ONCE OVER PAST FIVE YEARS, ASK ABOUT THE LAST TIME THIS HAPPENED>>

<<INT. INCLUDE INCIDENTS THAT TOOK PLACE IN GARAGES, DRIVES ETC AS CODE 1>>

- 1 at your own home/residence
- 2 near your own home/residence
- 3 elsewhere in city or local area
- 4 at work
- 5 elsewhere in [COUNTRY]
- 6 abroad
- 9 don't know

Q113 (The last time this happened) did you or anyone else report that incident to the police?

- 1 yes
- 2 no
- 9 don't know

*If answer is equal to code 1 continue with question 114*

*If answer is equal to code 2 continue with question 117*

*Else continue with question 119*

Q114 Why did you report it?

<<INT. IF RESPONDENT DID NOT REPORT, ASK ABOUT REASONS WHY OTHER PERSON REPORTED>>

<<MULTIPLE RESPONSE>>

- 1 to recover property
- 2 for insurance reasons
- 3 crimes should be reported/ serious event
- 4 wanted offender to be caught/ punished
- 5 to stop it happening again
- 6 to get help
- 7 to get compensation from the offender
- 8 other reason

Q115 On the whole, were you satisfied with the way the police dealt with the matter?

- 1 yes (satisfied)
- 2 no (not satisfied)
- 9 don't know

*If answer is equal to code 1 or code 9 continue with question 119*

*If answer equal to code 2 continue with question 116.*

Q116 For what reasons were you dissatisfied? You can give more than one reason.

<<INT. MULTIPLE ANSWERS ALLOWED>>

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. don't know

*Continue with question 119*

Q117 Why didn't you report it? <<INT. IF NO CLEAR ANSWER:>> Can you tell me a little more?

<<INT. MULTIPLE ANSWERS ALLOWED>>

- 1 not serious enough/no loss/kid's stuff
- 2 solved it myself/perpetrator known to me
- 3 inappropriate for police/police not necessary
- 4 reported to other authorities instead
- 5 my family resolved it
- 6 no insurance
- 7 police could do nothing/lack of proof
- 8 police won't do anything about it
- 9 fear/dislike of the police/no involvement wanted with police
- 10 didn't dare (for fear of reprisal)
- 11 other reasons
- 12 don't know

Q119 Taking every thing into account, how serious was the incident for you and your household. Was it very serious, fairly serious, or not very serious?

- 1 very serious
- 2 fairly serious
- 3 not very serious

## CAR VANDALISM – DETAILS

*If question 45 is not equal to code 1 continue with question 140. Else continue with question 130.*

Q130 The damage you mentioned that was done to your vehicle, when did this happen?

Was it ...

<<INT. READ OUT>>

<<INT. IF RESPONDENT HAS BEEN A VICTIM AT LEAST ONE TIME IN 1999, TYPE IN [LAST YEAR]>>

- 1 this year
- 2 last year, in 1999
- 3 before then
- 9 <<don't know/can't remember>>

*If answer is equal to code 2 continue with question 131, Else continue with question 132*

Q131 How often did it happen in 1999?

- 1 once
- 2 twice
- 3 three times
- 4 four times
- 5 five times or more
- 9 don't know

Q132 (The last time) did this damage happen at your own home/residence, near your own home/residence, elsewhere in your city or local area, at work, elsewhere in [COUNTRY], or did it happen abroad?

<<INT. IF VICTIM MORE THAN ONCE OVER PAST FIVE YEARS, ASK ABOUT THE LAST TIME THIS HAPPENED>>

<<INT. INCLUDE INCIDENTS THAT TOOK PLACE IN GARAGES, DRIVES ETC AS CODE 1>>

- 1 at your own home/residence
- 2 near your own home/residence
- 3 elsewhere in city or local area
- 4 at work
- 5 elsewhere in [COUNTRY]
- 6 abroad
- 9 don't know

- Q133 (The last time this happened) did you or anyone else report it to the police?
- 1 yes
  - 2 no
  - 9 <<don't know>>

- Q134 Taking every thing into account, how serious was the incident for you and your household. Was it very serious, fairly serious, or not very serious?
- 1 very serious
  - 2 fairly serious
  - 3 not very serious

*THEFT OF MOTORCYCLES – DETAILS*

*If question 50 is not equal to code 1 continue with question 150*

- Q140 The theft of your moped/scooter/motorcycle/[\*mofa] that you mentioned, when did this happen? Was it...
- <<INT. READ OUT>>
- <<INT. IF RESPONDENT HAS BEEN A VICTIM AT LEAST ONE TIME IN 1999, TYPE IN [LAST YEAR]>>
- 1 this year
  - 2 last year, in 1999
  - 3 before then
  - 9 <<don't know/can't remember>>

*If answer is equal to code 2 continue with question 141. Else continue with question 142*

- Q141 How often did it happen in 1999?
- 1 once
  - 2 twice
  - 3 three times
  - 4 four times
  - 5 five times or more
  - 9 don't know

- Q142 (The last time) did this theft happen at your own home/residence, near your own home/residence, elsewhere in your city or local area, at work, elsewhere in [COUNTRY], or did it happen abroad?
- <<INT. IF VICTIM MORE THAN ONCE OVER PAST FIVE YEARS, ASK ABOUT THE LAST TIME THIS HAPPENED>>
- <<INT. INCLUDE INCIDENTS THAT TOOK PLACE IN GARAGES, DRIVES ETC AS CODE 1>>

- 1 at your own home/residence
- 2 near your own home/residence
- 3 elsewhere in city or local area
- 4 at work
- 5 elsewhere in [COUNTRY]
- 6 abroad
- 9 don't know

Q143 (The last time this happened) did you or anyone else report it to the police?

- 1 yes
- 2 no
- 9 don't know

Q144 Taking every thing into account, how serious was the incident for you and your household. Was it very serious, fairly serious, or not very serious?

- 1 very serious
- 2 fairly serious
- 3 not very serious

*BICYCLE THEFT – DETAILS*

*If question 55 not equal to code 1 than continue with question 160*

Q150 The bicycle theft you mentioned, when did this happen? Was it ....

<<INT. READ OUT>>

<<INT. IF RESPONDENT HAS BEEN A VICTIM AT LEAST ONE TIME IN 1999, TYPE [LAST YEAR]>>

- 1 this year
- 2 last year, in 1999
- 3 before then
- 9 <<don't know/can't remember>>

*If answer is equal to code 2 continue with question 151. Else continue with question 152*

Q151 How often did it happen in 1999?

- 1 once
- 2 twice
- 3 three times
- 4 four times
- 5 five times or more
- 9 don't know

- Q152 (The last time) did this theft happen at your own home/residence, near your own home/residence, elsewhere in your city or local area, at work, elsewhere in [COUNTRY], or did it happen abroad?
- <<INT. IF VICTIM MORE THAN ONCE OVER PAST FIVE YEARS, ASK ABOUT THE LAST TIME THIS HAPPENED>>
- <<INT. INCLUDE INCIDENTS THAT TOOK PLACE IN GARAGES, DRIVES ETC AS CODE 1>>
- 1 at your own home/residence
  - 2 near your own home/residence
  - 3 elsewhere in city or local area
  - 4 at work
  - 5 elsewhere in [COUNTRY]
  - 6 abroad
  - 9 don't know

- Q153 (The last time this happened) did you or anyone else report it to the police?
- 1 yes
  - 2 no
  - 9 don't know

- Q154 Taking every thing into account, how serious was the incident for you and your household. Was it very serious, fairly serious, or not very serious?
- 1 very serious
  - 2 fairly serious
  - 3 not very serious

*BURGLARY / HOUSEBREAKING – DETAILS*

*If question 60 is not equal to code 1 continue with question 180  
Else continue with question 160*

- Q160 You said that someone got into your home/residence without permission and stole or tried to steal something in the last five years. When did this happen? Was it .....
- <<INT. READ OUT>>
- <<INT. IF RESPONDENT HAS BEEN VICTIM AT LEAST ONE TIME IN 1999; TYPE LAST YEAR (1999)>>
- 1 this year
  - 2 last year, in 1999
  - 3 before then
  - 9 <<don't know/can't remember>>
- If answer is equal to code 2 continue with question 161, Else continue with question 162*

Q161 How often did it happen in 1999?

- 1 once
- 2 twice
- 3 three times
- 4 four times
- 5 five times or more
- 9 don't know

Q162 (The last time this happened) was anything actually stolen?

<<INT. IF VICTIM MORE THAN ONCE OVER PAST FIVE YEARS, ASK ABOUT THE LAST TIME THIS HAPPENED>>

- 1 yes
- 2 no
- 9 don't know

*If answer is equal to code 2 continue with question 164*

*Else continue with question 163.*

Q163 What do you estimate roughly was the value of the property stolen?

<<INT. WRITE IN COST, EVEN IF ONLY A ROUGH ESTIMATE>> Validation check for abnormal amounts

<<INT. IF RESPONDENT UNCLEAR, ASK FOR REPLACEMENT VALUE OR REPAIR COSTS>>

Q164 Was there any damage done?

- 1 yes
- 2 no
- 9 don't know

*If answer equal to code 1 continue with question 165*

*Else continue with question 166*

Q165 What do you estimate roughly was the value of the property damaged?

<<INT. WRITE IN COST, EVEN IF ONLY A ROUGH ESTIMATE>>Validation check for abnormal amounts

<<INT. IF RESPONDENT UNCLEAR, ASK FOR REPLACEMENT VALUE OR REPAIR COSTS>>

Q166 Did you or anyone else report the last burglary/housebreaking to the police?

- 1 yes
- 2 no
- 9 don't know

*If answer is equal to code 1 continue with question 167*

*If answer is equal to code 2 continue with question 170*

*Else continue with question 172.*

Q167 Why did you report it?

<<IF RESPONDENT DID NOT REPORT, ASK ABOUT REASONS WHY OTHER PERSON REPORTED>>

<<MULTIPLE RESPONSE>>

- 1 to recover property
- 2 for insurance reasons
- 3 crimes should be reported/ serious event
- 4 wanted offender to be caught/ punished
- 5 to stop it happening again
- 6 to get help
- 7 to get compensation from the offender
- 8 other reasons

Q168 On the whole, were you satisfied with the way the police dealt with the matter?

- 1 yes (satisfied)
- 2 no (not satisfied)
- 9 don't know

*If answer is equal to code 2 continue with question 169, Else question 172*

Q169 For what reasons were you dissatisfied? You can give more than one reason.

<<INT. MULTIPLE ANSWERS ALLOWED>>

- 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 don't know

*Continue with question 172*

Q170 Why didn't you report it? <<INT. IF NO CLEAR ANSWER:>> Can you tell me a little more?

<<INT. MULTIPLE ANSWERS ALLOWED>>

- 1 not serious enough/no loss/kid's stuff
- 2 solved it myself/perpetrator known to me
- 3 inappropriate for police/police not necessary
- 4 reported to other authorities instead
- 5 My family resolved it
- 6 no insurance

- 7 police could do nothing/lack of proof
- 8 police won't do anything about it
- 9 fear/dislike of the police/no involvement wanted with police
- 10 didn't dare (for fear of reprisal)
- 11 other reasons
- 12 don't know

Q172 Taking every thing into account, how serious was the incident for you and your household. Was it very serious, fairly serious, or not very serious?

- 1 very serious
- 2 fairly serious
- 3 not very serious

*If code 1 at question 166 continue with question 173. Else continue with question 180.*

Q173 In some countries, agencies have been set up to help victims of crime by giving information, or practical or emotional support. Did you or anyone else in your household have any contact with such a specialised agency after this incident?

- 1 yes
- 2 no
- 9 don't know

*If answer is equal to code 2 continue with question 174, Else continue with question 180*

Q174 Do you feel 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?

- 1 no, not useful
- 2 yes, useful
- 9 don't know

#### *ATTEMPTED BURGLARY / HOUSEBREAKING – DETAILS*

*If question 65 is not equal to code 1 continue with question 190*

*Else continue with question 180*

Q180 You mentioned an incident when someone tried to get into your home/residence but didn't succeed. When did this happen? Was it ...

<<INT. READ OUT>>

<<INT. IF RESPONDENT HAS BEEN VICTIM AT LEAST ONE TIME IN 1999: TYPE IN 2) LAST YEAR (1999)>>

- 1 this year
- 2 last year, in 1999
- 3 before then
- 9 <<don't know/can't remember>>

*If answer is equal to code 2 continue with question 181 Else continue with question 182*

Q181 How often did it happen in 1999?

- 1 once
- 2 twice
- 3 three times
- 4 four times
- 5 five times or more
- 9 don't know

Q182 (The last time this happened) did you or anyone else report the attempted burglary/housebreaking to the police?

<<INT. IF VICTIM MORE THAN ONCE OVER PAST FIVE YEARS, ASK ABOUT THE LAST TIME THIS HAPPENED>>

- 1 yes
- 2 no
- 9 don't know

Q183 Taking everything into account, how serious was the incident for you or your household. Was it very serious, fairly serious, or not very serious?

- 1 very serious
- 2 fairly serious
- 3 not very serious

#### *ROBBERY – DETAILS*

*If question 70 is not equal to code 1 continue with question 210*

*Else continue with question 190*

Q190 You mentioned an incident when someone stole something from you or tried to steal something from you using force or threatening to use force. When did this happen? Was it ...

<<INT. READ OUT>>

<<INT. IF RESPONDENT HAS BEEN VICTIM AT LEAST ONE TIME IN 1999: TYPE IN 2) LAST YEAR (1999)>>

- 1 this year

- 2 last year, in 1999
- 3 before then
- 9 <<don't know/can't remember>>

*If answer is equal to code 2 continue with question 191. Else continue with question 192.*

Q191 How often did it happen in 1999?

- 1 once
- 2 twice
- 3 three times
- 4 four times
- 5 five times or more
- 9 don't know

Q192 (The last time) did this theft with force happen at your own home/residence, near your own home/residence, elsewhere in your city or local area, at work, elsewhere in [COUNTRY], or did it happen abroad?

<<INT. IF VICTIM MORE THAN ONCE OVER PAST FIVE YEARS, ASK ABOUT THE LAST TIME THIS HAPPENED>>

<<INT. INCLUDE INCIDENTS THAT TOOK PLACE IN GARAGES, DRIVES ETC AS CODE 1>>

- 1 at your own home/residence
- 2 near your own home/residence
- 3 elsewhere in city or local area
- 4 at work
- 5 elsewhere in [COUNTRY]
- 6 abroad
- 9 don't know

Q193 How many people were involved in committing the offence?

- 1 one
- 2 two
- 3 three or more
- 9 don't know

Q194 (About the last incident) did you know the offender(s) by name or by sight at the time of the offence?

<<INT: IF MORE THAN ONE OFFENDER, COUNT AS KNOWN IF AT LEAST ONE KNOWN>>

- 1 did not know offender(s)
- 2 (at least one) known by sight
- 3 (at least one) known by name
- 4 did not see offender

Q195 Did (any of) the offender(s) have a knife, a gun, another weapon or something used as a weapon?

- 1 yes
- 2 no
- 9 don't know

*If answer is equal to code 1 continue with question 196. Else continue with question 198.*

Q196 What was it?

- 1 knife
- 2 gun
- 3 other weapon/stick
- 4 something used as a weapon
- 9 don't know

*If answer is equal to code 2 continue with question 196a , Else continue with question 197*

Q196a Was it a handgun or a long gun?

<<INT. LONG GUNS INCLUDE SHOTGUNS, RIFLES OR MACHINEGUNS>>

- 1 handgun
- 2 long gun (rifle, machinegun)
- 9 don't know

Q197 Was the weapon actually used?

<<INT. COUNT WEAPON AS USED:-

KNIFE/OTHER WEAPON/STICK: THREATENED WITH IT, OR VICTIM IN PHYSICAL CONTACT WITH THE WEAPON

GUN: THREATENED WITH IT OR BULLET FIRED>>

- 1 yes
- 2 no
- 9 don't know

Q198 Did the offender actually steal something from you?

- 1 yes
- 2 no
- 9 don't know

Q199 (The last time this happened) did you or anyone else report the robbery to the police?

- 1 yes
- 2 no

9 don't know

*If answer is equal to code 1 continue with question 200*

*If answer is equal to code 2 continue with question 203. Else continue with question 205*

Q200 Why did you report it?

<<INT. IF RESPONDENT DID NOT REPORT, ASK ABOUT REASONS WHY OTHER PERSON REPORTED : MULTIPLE RESPONSE>>

- 1 to recover property
- 2 for insurance reasons
- 3 crimes should be reported/ serious event
- 4 wanted offender to be caught/ punished
- 5 to stop it happening again
- 6 to get help
- 7 to get compensation from the offender
- 8 other reason

Q201 On the whole, were you satisfied with the way the police dealt with the matter?

- 1 yes, satisfied
- 2 no, not satisfied
- 9 don't know

*If answer is equal to code 1 or to code 9 continue with question 205. Else continue with question 202*

Q202 For what reasons were you dissatisfied? You can give more than one reason.

<<INT. MULTIPLE RESPONSE>>

- 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 don't know

*Continue with question 205*

Q203 Why didn't you report it? <<INT. IF NO CLEAR ANSWER:>> Can you tell me a little more?

<<INT. MULTIPLE ANSWERS ALLOWED>>

- 1 not serious enough/no loss/kid's stuff

- 2 solved it myself/perpetrator known to me
- 3 inappropriate for police/police not necessary
- 4 reported to other authorities instead
- 5 My family resolved it
- 6 no insurance
- 7 police could do nothing/lack of proof
- 8 police won't do anything about it
- 9 fear/dislike of the police/no involvement wanted with police
- 10 didn't dare (for fear of reprisal)
- 11 other reasons
- 12 don't know

Q204 Can I just check then, did you or someone else report it to someone else in authority who would deal with it?

- 1 yes
- 2 no
- 9 don't know

Q205 Taking every thing into account, how serious was the incident for you. Was it very serious, fairly serious, or not very serious?

- 1 very serious
- 2 fairly serious
- 3 not very serious

*If code 1 at question 199 continue with question 206*

*Else continue with question 210*

Q206 In some countries, agencies have been set up to help victims of crime by giving information, or practical or emotional support. Did you or anyone else in your household have any contact with such a specialised agency after this incident?

- 1 yes
- 2 no
- 9 don't know

*If answer is equal to code 2 continue with question 207 ,Else continue with question 210.*

Q207 Do you feel the services of a specialised agency to help victims of crime would have been useful for you after this incident?

- 1 no, not useful
- 2 yes, useful
- 9 don't know

*THEFT OF PERSONAL PROPERTY – DETAILS*

*If question 75 is not equal to code 1 continue with question 220*

*Else continue with question 210*

Q210 The theft of personal property that you mentioned, when did this happen, was it ...  
<<INT. IF RESPONDENT HAS BEEN A VICTIM AT LEAST ONE TIME IN 1999 : TYPE ON 2)  
LAST YEAR (1999)>>

- 1 this year
- 2 last year, in 1999
- 3 before then
- 9 <<don't know/can't remember>>

*If answer is equal to code 2 continue with question 211. Else continue with question 212*

Q211 How often did it happen in 1999?

- 1 once
- 2 twice
- 3 three times
- 4 four times
- 5 five times or more
- 9 don't know

Q212 (The last time) did this theft happen at your own home/residence, near your own home/residence, elsewhere in your city or local area, at work, elsewhere in [COUNTRY], or did it happen abroad?

<<INT. IF VICTIM MORE THAN ONCE OVER PAST FIVE YEARS, ASK ABOUT THE LAST TIME THIS HAPPENED>>

<<INT. INCLUDE INCIDENTS THAT TOOK PLACE IN GARAGES, DRIVES ETC AS CODE 1>>

- 1 at your own home/residence
- 2 near your own home/residence
- 3 elsewhere in city or local area
- 4 at work
- 5 elsewhere in [COUNTRY]
- 6 abroad
- 9 don't know

Q213 (The last time this happened) were you holding or carrying what was stolen (was it a case of pickpocketing?)

- 1 yes

- 2 no
- 9 <<don't know>>

Q214 (The last time) did you or anyone else report that incident to the police?

- 1 yes
- 2 no
- 9 don't know

Q215 Taking everything into account, how serious was the incident for you. Was it very serious, fairly serious, or not very serious?

- 1 very serious
- 2 fairly serious
- 3 not very serious

*SEXUAL INCIDENTS – DETAILS*

*If question 80 is not equal to code 1 continue with question 250*

Q220 You mentioned that you had been a victim of a sexual offence. Could I ask you about this. When did this happen? Was it ...

<<IN. READ OUT>>

<<INT. IF RESPONDENT HAS BEEN VICTIM AT LEAST ONE TIME IN 1999: TYPE IN 2) LAST YEAR (1999)>>

- 1 this year
- 2 last year, in 1999
- 3 before then
- 9 <<don't know/can't remember>>

*If answer is equal to code 2 continue with question 221. Else continue with question 222*

Q221 How often did it happen in 1999?

- 1 once
- 2 twice
- 3 three times
- 4 four times
- 5 five times or more
- 9 don't know

- Q222 (The last time) did this incident happen at your own home/residence, near your own home/residence, elsewhere in your city or local area, at work, elsewhere in [COUNTRY], or did it happen abroad?  
<<INT: IF VICTIM MORE THAN ONCE OVER PAST FIVE YEARS, ASK ABOUT THE LAST TIME THIS HAPPENED>>
- 1 at your own home/residence
  - 2 near your own home/residence
  - 3 elsewhere in city or local area
  - 4 at work
  - 5 elsewhere in [COUNTRY]
  - 6 abroad
  - 9 don't know
- Q223 How many people were involved in committing the offence?
- 1 one
  - 2 two
  - 3 three
  - 9 don't know
- Q224 (About the last incident) did you know the offender(s) by name or by sight at the time of the offence?  
<<INT. IF MORE THAN ONE OFFENDER, COUNT AS KNOWN IF AT LEAST ONE KNOWN>>  
<<IF KNOWN BY SIGHT AND KNOWN BY NAME: RECORD KNOWN BY NAME>>
- 1 did not know offender
  - 2 (at least one) known by sight
  - 3 (at least one) known by name
  - 4 did not see offender
- If answer is equal to code 3 continue with question 225. Else continue with question 226*
- Q225 Were any of them your spouse, ex-spouse, partner, ex-partner, boyfriend, ex-boyfriend, a relative or a close friend, or was it someone you work with?  
<<INT. MEANS RELATIONSHIP AT TIME OF THE OFFENCES>>  
<<IF UNCLEAR, PROBE WHETHER EX-SPOUSE, EX-PARTNER, EX-BOYFRIEND AT TIME OF THE OFFENCE>>  
<<MULTIPLE ANSWERS ALLOWED>>
- 1 spouse, partner, (at the time)
  - 2 ex-spouse, ex-partner, (at the time)
  - 3 boyfriend (at the time)
  - 4 ex-boyfriend (at the time)
  - 5 relative

- 6 close friend
- 7 someone she works/worked with
- 8 none of these
- 9 refuses to say

Q226 Did (any of) the offender(s) have a knife, a gun, another weapon or something used as a weapon?

- 1 yes
- 2 no
- 9 don't know

*If answer is equal to code 1 continue with question 227*

*Else continue with question 229*

Q227 What was it?

- 1 knife
- 2 gun
- 3 other weapon/stick
- 4 something used as a weapon
- 9 don't know

Q228 Was the weapon actually used?

<<INT. COUNT WEAPON AS USED:

KNIFE/OTHER WEAPON/STICK: THREATENED WITH IT, OR VICTIM IN PHYSICAL CONTACT WITH THE WEAPON - GUN: THREATENED WITH IT OR BULLET FIRED>>

- 1 yes
- 2 no
- 9 don't know

Q229 Would you describe the incident as a rape (forced intercourse), an attempted rape, an indecent assault or as just behaviour which you found offensive?

- 1 a rape
- 2 an attempted rape
- 3 indecent assault
- 4 offensive behaviour
- 9 don't know

Q230 Taking everything into account, how serious was the incident for you? Was it very serious, fairly serious, or not very serious. <<INT. IN CASE OF A VERY SERIOUS INCIDENT (EG, A RAPE), START WITH:>> The following question is asked for every sexual incident that people mention ...

- 1 very serious

- 2 fairly serious
- 3 not very serious

Q231 Do you regard the incident as a crime?

- 1 yes
- 2 no
- 9 don't know

Q232 Did you or anyone else report that incident to the police?

- 1 yes
- 2 no
- 9 don't know

*If answer is equal to code 1 continue with question 233.*

*If answer is equal to code 2 continue with question 236. Else continue with question 240*

Q233 Why did you report it?

<<IF RESPONDENT DID NOT REPORT, ASK ABOUT REASONS WHY OTHER PERSON REPORTED>>

<<MULTIPLE RESPONSE>>

- 1
- 2
- 3 crimes should be reported/serious event
- 4 wanted offender to be caught/punished
- 5 to stop it happening again
- 6 to get help
- 7 to get compensation from the offender
- 8 other reason

Q234 On the whole, were you satisfied with the way the police dealt with the matter?

- 1 yes (satisfied)
- 2 no (not satisfied)
- 9 don't know

*If answer is equal to code 1 or to code 9 continue with 238. Else continue with question 235*

Q235 For what reasons were you dissatisfied? You can give more than one reason.

<<MULTIPLE RESPONSE>>

- 1 didn't do enough
- 2 were not interested
- 3 didn't find or apprehend the offender

- 4 didn't keep me properly informed
- 5 didn't treat me correctly/were impolite
- 6 were slow to arrive
- 7 other reasons
- 8 don't know

*Continue with question 238*

Q236 Why didn't you report it? <<INT. IF NO CLEAR ANSWER:>> Can you tell me a little more?

<<MULTIPLE RESPONSE>>

- 1 not serious enough/no loss/kid's stuff
- 2 solved it myself/perpetrator known to me
- 3 inappropriate for police/police not necessary
- 4 reported to other authorities instead
- 5 my family resolved it
- 6
- 7 police could do nothing/lack of proof
- 8 police won't do anything about it
- 9 fear/dislike of the police/no involvement wanted with police
- 10 didn't dare (for fear of reprisal)
- 11 other reasons
- 12 don't know

Q237 Can I just check then, did you or someone else report it to someone else in authority who would deal with it?

- 1 yes
- 2 no
- 9 don't know

*Continue with question 240*

Q238 In some countries, agencies have been set up to help victims of crime by giving information, or practical or emotional support. Did you or anyone else in your household have any contact with such a specialised agency after this incident?

- 1 yes
- 2 no
- 9 don't know

*If answer is equal to code 2 continue with question 239*

*Else continue with question 240*

Q239 Do you feel the services of a SPECIALISED agency to help victims of crime would have been useful for you after this incident?

- 1 no, not useful
- 2 yes, useful
- 9 don't know

*ASSAULTS AND THREATS – DETAILS*

*If (question 85 OR question 85a not equal to code 1) continue with question 280*

Q250 The attack or threat that you mentioned, when did this happen? Was it ...

<<INT. READ OUT>>

<<INT. IF RESPONDENT HAS BEEN VICTIM AT LEAST ONE TIME IN 1999: TYPE IN 2) LAST YEAR (1999)>>

- 1 this year
- 2 last year, in 1999
- 3 before then
- 9 <<don't know/can't remember>>

*If answer is equal to code 2 continue with question 251. Else continue with question 252*

Q251 How often did it happen in 1999?

- 1 once
- 2 twice
- 3 three times
- 4 four times
- 5 five times or more
- 9 don't know

Q252 (The last time) did this incident happen at your own home/residence, near your own home/residence, elsewhere in your city or local area, at work, elsewhere in [COUNTRY], or did it happen abroad?

<<INT. IF VICTIM MORE THAN ONCE OVER PAST FIVE YEARS, ASK ABOUT THE LAST TIME THIS HAPPENED>>

- 1 at your own home/residence
- 2 near your own home/residence
- 3 elsewhere in city or local area
- 4 at work
- 5 elsewhere in [COUNTRY]
- 6 abroad
- 9 don't know

Q253 How many people were involved in committing the offence?

- 1 one
- 2 two
- 3 three or more people
- 9 don't know

Q254 (About the last incident) did you know the offender(s) by name or by sight at the time of the offence?

<<INT. IF MORE THAN ONE OFFENDER, COUNT IF KNOWN IF AT LEAST ONE KNOWN>>

<<IF KNOWN BY SIGHT AND KNOWN BY NAME: RECORD KNOWN BY NAME>>

- 1 did not know offender
- 2 (at least one) known by sight
- 3 (at least one) known by name
- 4 did not see offender

*If answer is equal to code 3 continue with question 255. Else continue with question 256*

Q255 Were any of them your spouse, ex-spouse, partner, ex-partner, boyfriend, ex-boyfriend, a relative or a close friend, or someone you work with?

<<INT. MULTIPLE ANSWERS ALLOWED>>

<<INT. MEANS RELATIONSHIP AT TIME OF THE OFFENCES>>

<<IF UNCLEAR, PROBE WHETHER EX-SPOUSE, EX-PARTNER, EX-BOYFRIEND AT TIME OF THE OFFENCE>>

- 1 spouse, partner, (at the time)
- 2 ex-spouse, ex-partner, (at the time)
- 3 boyfriend (at the time)
- 4 ex-boyfriend (at the time)
- 5 relative
- 6 close friend
- 7 someone he/she works/worked with
- 8 none of these
- 9 refuses to say

Q256 Can you tell me what happened, were you just threatened, or was force actually used?

- 1 just threatened
- 2 force used
- 9 don't know

*If answer is equal to code 1 or code 2 continue with question 257*

*Else continue with question 262*

Q257 Did (any of) the offender(s) have a knife, a gun, another weapon or something used as a weapon?

- 1 yes
- 2 no
- 9 don't know

*If answer is equal to code 1 continue with question 258*

*Else continue with question 260*

Q258 What was it?

- 1 knife
- 2 gun
- 3 other weapon/stick
- 4 something used as a weapon
- 9 don't know

Q259 Was the weapon actually used?

<<INT. COUNT WEAPON AS USED

KNIFE/OTHER WEAPON/STICK: THREATENED WITH IT, OR VICTIM IN PHYSICAL CONTACT WITH THE WEAPON -GUN: THREATENED WITH IT OR BULLET FIRED>>

- 1 yes
- 2 no

Q260 Did you suffer an injury as a result?

- 1 yes
- 2 no

*If answer is equal to code 2 continue with question 262. Else continue with question 261*

Q261 Did you see a doctor or any other medical person as a result?

- 1 yes
- 2 no

Q262 Did you or anyone else report that last incident to the police?

- 1 yes
- 2 no
- 9 don't know

*If answer is equal to code 1 continue with question 263*

*If answer is equal to code 2 continue with question 266*

*Else continue with question 268*

Q263 Why did you report it?

<<MULTIPLE RESPONSE>>

<<INT. IF RESPONDENT DID NOT REPORT, ASK ABOUT REASONS WHY OTHER PERSON REPORTED>>

- 1 to recover property
- 2 for insurance reasons
- 3 crimes should be reported/ serious event
- 4 wanted offender to be caught/ punished
- 5 to stop it happening again
- 6 to get help
- 7 to get compensation from the offender
- 8 other reason

Q264 On the whole, were you satisfied with the way the police dealt with the matter?

- 1 yes (satisfied)
- 2 no (not satisfied)
- 9 don't know

*If answer equal to code 2 continue with question 265. Else continue with question 268.*

Q265 For what reasons were you dissatisfied? You can give more than one reason.

<<INT. MULTIPLE ANSWERS ALLOWED>>

- 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 don't know

Q266 Why didn't you report it? <<INT. IF NO CLEAR ANSWER:>> Can you tell me a little more?

<<INT. MULTIPLE ANSWERS ALLOWED>>

- 1 not serious enough/no loss/kid's stuff
- 2 solved it myself/perpetrator known to me
- 3 inappropriate for police/police not necessary
- 4 reported to other authorities instead
- 5 my family resolved it
- 6 no insurance

- 7 police could do nothing/lack of proof
- 8 police won't do anything about it
- 9 fear/dislike of the police/no involvement wanted with police
- 10 didn't dare (for fear of reprisal)
- 11 other reasons
- 12 don't know

Q267 Can I just check then, did you or someone else report it to someone else in authority who would deal with it?

- 1 yes
- 2 no
- 9 don't know

Q268 Taking every thing into account, how serious was the incident for you. Was it very serious, fairly serious, or not very serious?

- 1 very serious
- 2 fairly serious
- 3 not very serious

Q269 Do you regard the incident as a crime?

- 1 yes
- 2 no
- 9 don't know

*If answer is equal to code 1 at question 262 continue with question 270. Else continue with question 280*

Q270 In some countries, agencies have been set up to help victims of crime by giving information, or practical or emotional support. Did you or anyone else in your household have any contact with such a specialised agency after this incident?

- 1 yes
- 2 no

*If answer is equal to code 2 continue with question 271. Else continue with 280*

Q271 Do you feel the services of a specialised agency to help victims of crime would have been useful for you after this incident?

- 1 no, not useful
- 2 yes useful
- 9 don't know

*CONSUMER FRAUD*

Q280 Now changing the subject a little, last year, in 1999 were you the victim of a consumer fraud. In other words, has someone - when selling something to you, or delivering a service - cheated you in terms of quantity or quality of the goods or services?

- 1 yes
- 2 no
- 9 don't know

*If answer is equal to code 1 continue with question 281. Else continue with question 290*

Q281 (The last time this happened) how did this fraud take place? Was it to do with .....  
<<INT. IF MORE THAN ONCE IN 1999, ASK ABOUT LAST TIME IN THE YEAR>>  
<<INT. READ OUT>>

- construction, building or repair work
- work done by a garage
- a hotel, restaurant or pub
- a shop of some sort
- or something else
- don't know

Q282 (The last time this happened) did you or anyone else report this consumer fraud to the police?

- 1 yes, to the police
- 2 no
- 9 <<don't know>>

*If answer is equal to code 2 continue with question 283  
Else continue with question 290*

Q283 Did you or someone else report it to any public or private agency?

- 1 yes
- 2 no
- 9 don't know

*CORRUPTION*

Q290 In some countries, there is a problem of corruption among government or public officials. During 1999, has any government official, for instance a customs officer, a police officer or inspector in your country asked you, or expected you to pay a bribe for his or her services?

- 1 yes
- 2 no
- 9 refusal

*If answer is equal to code 1 continue with question 291*

*Else continue with question 300*

Q291 (The last time this happened) what type of official was involved. Was it a government official, a customs officer, a police officer, or some sort of inspector?

<<INT. IF MORE THAN ONCE IN 1999, ASK ABOUT THE LAST TIME>>

- 1 government official
- 2 customs officers
- 3 police officer
- 4 inspector
- 5 other
- 6 refuses to say

Q292 (The last time) did you or anyone else report this problem of corruption to the police?

- 1 yes
- 2 no
- 9 don't know

*If answer is equal to code 2 continue with question 293. Else continue with question 300*

Q293 Did you or anyone else report it to any public or private agency?

- 1 yes
- 2 no
- 9 don't know

*CONCERN ABOUT CRIME*

Q300 Now I would like to ask some questions about your area and about your opinion of crime in your area. 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? <<INT. IF RESPONDENT SAYS "NEVER GOES OUT", STRESS:>> How would you feel ...

- 1 very safe
- 2 fairly safe
- 3 bit unsafe
- 4 very unsafe
- 5 <<cannot walk>>

Q301 How safe do you feel when you are at home alone after dark? Do you feel very safe, fairly safe, a bit unsafe or very unsafe

- 1 very safe
- 2 fairly safe
- 3 bit unsafe
- 4 very unsafe

Q302 What would you say are the chances that over the next twelve months someone will try to break into your home? Do you think this is very likely, likely or not likely?

- 1 very likely
- 2 likely
- 3 not likely
- 9 don't know

*POLICING QUESTIONS*

Q310 Taking everything into account, how good do you think the police in your area are at controlling crime? Do you think they do a very good job, a fairly good job, a fairly poor job or a very poor job?

- 1 a very good job
- 2 a fairly good job
- 3 a fairly poor job
- 4 a very poor job
- 9 don't know

Q311 And what about the helpfulness of the police. How far do you agree that the police do everything they can to help people and be of service? Do you fully agree, tend to agree, tend to disagree or totally disagree?

- 1 fully agree
- 2 tend to agree
- 3 tend to disagree
- 4 totally disagree
- 9 don't know

Q312 About how many people live in your village, town or city?

<<INT. SEE PAPER LIST FOR GUIDANCE>>

- 1 less than 10,000 inhabitants
- 2 10,001 - 50,000
- 3 50,001 - 100,000
- 4 100,001 - 500,000
- 5 500,001 - 1,000,000
- 6 1,000,001 or more inhabitants
- 9 don't know

*SENTENCING*

Q320 People have different ideas about the sentences, which should be given to offenders. Take for instance the case of a man of 21 years old who is found guilty of burglary/housebreaking for the second time. This time he has taken a colour TV. Which of the following sentences do you consider the most appropriate for such a case?

<<INT. READ OUT, REPEAT IF NECESSARY>>

- 1 fine
- 2 prison
- 3 community service
- 4 suspended sentence
- 5 any other sentence
- 9 <<don't know>>

*If answer is equal to code 2 continue with question 321. Else continue with question 330*

Q321 For how long do you think he should go to prison?

<<"6-12 MONTHS" MEANS: MORE THAN 6 BUT LESS THAN 12 MONTHS>>

- 1 1 month or less
- 2 2 - 6 months
- 3 6 months - 12 months
- 4 1 year
- 5 2 years
- 6 3 years
- 7 4 years
- 8 5 years
- 9 6 - 10 years
- 10 11 - 15 years
- 11 16 - 20 years
- 12 21 - 25 years

- 13 more than 25 years
- 14 life sentence
- 15 don't know

*PERSONAL AND HOUSEHOLD INFORMATION*

Q330 To analyse the results of this survey, we want to look at different types of household. To help us can you give me a little information about yourself and your household? First, could you tell me the year in which you were born?  
<<INT. RECORD YEAR 19..>>

Q331 Is the place you are living in now a flat/apartment/maisonette, a terraced home or a detached or semi-detached house?

- 1 flat/apartment/maisonette
- 2 a terraced house/row house
- 3 detached/semi-detached house
- 4 institution (hospital, house for the elderly)
- 5 other

*If answer is equal to code 4 continue with 341. Else continue with 332*

*Household security measures*

Q332 In order to help us understand why some homes are more at risk of crime than others, could I ask you a few questions about the security of your home/residence? Is your own home/residence protected by the following:...

<<INT. ASSURE RESPONDENT. THAT THESE DATA WILL BE TREATED CONFIDENTIALLY AND ANONYMOUSLY>>

<<INT. READ OUT>>

<<INT. MULTIPLE RESPONSES ALLOWED>>

- 1 a burglar alarm
- 2 special door locks
- 3 special window/door grilles
- 4 a dog that would detect a burglar
- 5 a high fence
- 6 a caretaker or security guard
- 7 a formal neighbourhood watch scheme
- 8 friendly arrangements with neighbours to watch each other houses
- 9 <<not protected by any of these>>
- 10 <<respondent refuses to answer>>

Q340 There s much concern about crime committed by young people. What do you think would be the most effective way of reducing crime by young people? You can give up to three ways if you wish

<<INT. CODE UP TO THREE ANSWERS>>

- 1 better discipline by parents / better parenting / family upbringing to give better respect for the law
- 2 more discipline in school / better education
- 3 reducing poverty / increasing employment levels
- 4 better policing / more police
- 5 increasing sentences for crime / making sentences tougher
- 6 other answers
- 9 don't know

*Gun ownership*

Q341 Do you or anyone else in your household own a handgun, shotgun, rifle, or air rifle?

- 1 yes
- 2 no
- 8 refuses to say
- 9 don't know

*If answer is equal to code 1 continue with question 342*

*Else continue with question 344*

Q342 Could you tell me which sort of gun or guns you own?

<<INT. CODE ALL GUNS IF MORE THAN ONE MENTIONED>>

<<INT. MUTLIPLE RESPONSES ALLOWED>>

- 1 handgun
- 2 shotgun
- 3 rifle
- 4 air rifle
- 5 other gun
- 6 refuses to say
- 9 don't know

Q343 For what reason do you own the gun (guns)?

<<INT. MULTIPLE RESPONSE ALLOWED>>

- 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 <<specify>>
- 8 refuses to answer

Q344 How often do you personally go out in the evening for recreational purposes, for instance to go to a pub, restaurant, cinema or to see friends? Is this almost every day, at least once a week, at least one a month or less?

- 1 almost every day
- 2 at least once a week
- 3 at least once a month
- 4 less often
- 5 never
- 9 don't know

Q350 How would you describe your occupational position. Are you working, keeping house, going to school or college? Or are you retired or disabled, or unemployed but looking for work?

- 1 working
- 2 looking for work (unemployed)
- 3 keeping home (homemaker)
- 4 retired, disabled
- 5 going to school/college (student)
- 6 other

*If answer is equal to code 5 continue with question 352. Else continue with question 351*

Q351 How many years of formal school and any higher education did you have?

<<INT. RECORD NUMBER OF YEARS>>

<<INT. COUNT PRIMARY SCHOOL, SECONDARY SCHOOL, COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY COURSES>>

Q352 Could you please tell me whether your household's combined monthly income after deductions for tax etc, is below or above [median income - xxx]?

<<INT. TAKE INTO ACCOUNT THE NET INCOME. IE, THE AMOUNT PEOPLE GET IN THEIR PAY CHEQUE>>

- 1 below xxx
- 2 above xxx
- 9 don't know/refuses to say

*If answer is equal to code 1 continue with question 353*

*If answer is equal to code 2 continue with question 354*

*Else continue with question 355*

Q353 Is it higher or lower than [bottom 25% limit - yyy] a month?

- 1 higher than yyy
- 2 lower than yyy
- 9 don't know

*Continue with question 355*

Q354 Is it higher or lower than [upper 25% limit - zzz] a month?

- 1 higher than zzz
- 2 lower than zzz
- 9 don't know

Q355 How do you feel about the level of your household income. Are you satisfied with it, fairly satisfied, dissatisfied, or very dissatisfied?

- 1 satisfied
- 2 fairly satisfied
- 3 dissatisfied
- 4 very dissatisfied

Q356 What is your marital status?

- 1 single (not married)
- 2 married
- 3 living together as a couple (but not married)
- 4 divorced/separated
- 5 widowed
- 6 refuses to say

Q400 Thank you very much indeed for your co-operation in this survey. We realise that we have been asking you some difficult questions. So if you like I can give you a (free) telephone number to ring to check that we are a reputable survey research company and that we have carried out the survey at the request of ....

<<INT. NOTE DOWN YOUR SEX>>

- 1 male
- 2 female



## Appendix 4

### Additional tables

Table 1 Victimization in the year preceding the survey: percentage victimised once or more (prevalence rates)

	11 crimes <sup>1</sup>	Car theft	Theft from car	Car vandalism	Motor-cycle theft	Bicycle theft	Burglary	Attempted burglary	Robbery	Personal theft <sup>2</sup>	Sexual incidents <sup>3</sup>	Assaults & threats
Australia	1989	26.1	2.3	6.9	8.8	0.3	1.9	4.4	3.8	0.9	5.0	7.3
	1992	28.6	3.1	6.6	9.5	0.3	2.1	3.7	3.8	1.3	6.5	4.7
	2000	30.0	1.9	6.8	9.2	0.1	2.0	3.9	3.3	1.2	6.5	6.4
Austria	1996	18.8	0.1	1.6	6.7	0.0	3.3	0.9	0.5	0.2	5.0	3.8
Belgium	1989	17.7	0.8	2.7	6.6	0.4	2.7	2.3	2.3	1.0	4.0	1.3
	1992	19.3	1.0	3.9	6.1	1.1	2.8	2.1	1.6	1.0	3.1	1.4
	2000	21.4	0.7	3.6	6.1	0.3	3.5	2.0	2.8	1.0	4.1	1.1
Canada	1989	28.1	0.8	7.2	9.8	0.4	3.4	3.0	2.7	1.1	5.5	4.0
	1992	28.4	1.3	7.3	8.5	0.2	3.7	3.4	2.7	1.2	5.5	3.8
	1996	25.2	1.5	6.2	6.2	0.1	3.3	3.4	2.8	1.2	5.7	4.0
Catalonia (Spain)	2000	23.8	1.4	5.4	5.5	0.1	3.5	2.3	2.3	0.9	4.7	2.1
	2000	19.0	0.4	5.3	7.7	0.6	0.4	1.3	0.6	0.9	3.0	0.8
	2000	23.0	1.1	3.4	3.8	0.7	6.7	3.1	1.5	0.7	4.1	2.5
England & Wales	1989	19.4	1.8	5.6	6.8	0.1	1.0	2.1	1.7	0.7	3.1	1.1
	1992	30.2	3.7	8.6	10.6	0.4	3.0	3.0	2.9	1.1	4.2	2.1
	1996	30.9	2.5	8.1	10.4	0.2	3.5	3.0	3.4	1.4	5.0	2.0
Finland	2000	26.4	2.1	6.4	8.8	0.4	2.4	2.8	2.8	1.2	4.6	2.7
	1989	15.9	0.4	2.7	4.0	0.0	3.1	0.6	0.4	0.7	4.3	0.5
	1992	21.2	0.7	2.9	5.6	0.3	5.0	0.6	0.6	1.0	3.4	3.7
France	1996	18.9	0.4	2.9	4.3	0.2	5.1	0.6	0.7	0.5	3.2	2.5
	2000	19.1	0.4	2.9	3.7	0.1	4.9	0.3	1.0	0.6	3.3	3.7
	1989	19.4	2.4	6.0	6.4	0.6	1.4	2.4	2.3	0.4	3.6	1.1
Germany (West)	1996	25.3	1.6	7.2	8.3	0.8	2.8	2.3	2.2	1.0	4.0	0.9
	2000	21.4	1.7	5.5	8.2	0.3	1.8	1.0	1.3	1.1	3.0	1.1
	1989	21.9	0.4	4.7	8.7	0.2	3.3	1.3	1.8	0.8	4.0	2.8
Italy	1992	24.6	2.7	7.0	7.6	1.5	2.3	2.4	1.7	1.3	3.6	1.7
	1989	8.5	0.2	0.7	2.5	0.2	3.5	0.7	0.2	na	0.2	1.0
	2000	15.2	0.1	1.6	4.4	1.0	6.6	1.1	0.8	0.1	0.5	1.2
Japan <sup>4</sup>	1992	na	1.1	2.3	na	3.2	9.6	1.1	na	na	1.3	1.8
	1989	26.8	0.3	5.2	8.2	0.4	7.5	2.4	2.6	0.8	4.4	2.6
	2000	31.3	0.5	6.8	9.6	1.0	10.0	2.0	3.0	1.0	4.6	2.2
Netherlands	1996	31.5	0.4	5.4	9.9	0.7	9.5	2.6	3.3	0.6	6.8	3.6
	2000	25.2	0.4	3.9	8.9	0.6	7.0	1.9	2.7	0.8	4.7	3.0

New Zealand	1992	29.4	2.7	6.9	7.9	0.3	4.4	4.3	3.6	0.7	5.3	2.7	5.7
Northern Ireland	1989	14.9	1.6	4.0	4.4	0.1	1.6	1.1	0.9	0.5	2.2	1.9	1.8
	1996	16.8	1.6	3.1	6.7	0.0	1.2	1.5	1.1	0.5	2.5	1.2	1.7
	2000	15.0	1.2	2.7	4.5	0.0	1.4	1.7	0.9	0.1	2.2	0.6	3.0
	1989	16.4	1.1	2.8	4.6	0.3	2.8	0.7	0.4	0.5	3.2	2.2	3.0
Poland	1992	27.0	0.7	5.3	4.7	1.0	4.2	2.1	2.3	1.7	8.1	3.6	4.2
	1996	22.9	0.9	5.7	5.4	0.3	3.2	2.0	1.8	1.8	5.6	1.5	3.7
	2000	22.7	1.0	5.5	7.0	0.1	3.6	2.0	1.3	1.8	5.3	0.5	2.8
	2000	15.5	0.9	4.9	6.3	0.3	0.8	1.4	1.2	1.1	1.9	0.6	0.9
Scotland	1989	18.6	0.8	5.4	6.5	0.3	1.0	2.0	2.1	0.5	2.6	1.2	1.8
	1996	25.6	1.7	6.6	9.8	0.1	1.9	1.5	2.4	0.8	4.5	1.3	4.2
	2000	23.2	0.7	4.2	9.0	0.1	2.0	1.5	1.9	0.7	4.6	1.1	6.1
	1989	24.8	1.4	9.6	6.6	0.8	1.1	1.6	2.1	3.1	5.2	2.3	3.1
Sweden	1992	21.5	1.7	3.9	4.5	0.6	7.0	1.4	0.8	0.3	4.2	0.9	2.7
	1996	24.0	1.2	4.9	4.6	0.5	8.8	1.3	1.1	0.5	4.6	2.9	4.5
	2000	24.7	1.3	5.3	4.6	0.4	7.2	1.7	0.7	0.9	5.8	2.6	3.8
	1989	15.6	0.0	1.9	4.1	1.2	3.2	1.0	0.2	0.5	4.5	1.7	1.2
Switzerland	1996	26.7	0.1	3.0	7.1	1.4	7.0	1.3	1.1	0.9	5.7	4.6	3.1
	2000	18.2	0.3	1.7	3.9	0.2	4.7	1.1	1.8	0.7	4.4	2.1	2.4
	1989	28.9	2.1	9.2	8.9	0.1	3.0	3.8	5.4	1.9	4.5	4.5	5.4
USA	1992	26.1	2.6	7.0	8.0	0.4	2.9	3.1	3.9	1.5	5.3	2.3	4.7
	1996	24.2	1.9	7.5	6.7	0.2	3.3	2.6	3.0	1.3	3.9	2.5	5.7
	2000	21.1	0.5	6.4	7.2	0.3	2.1	1.8	2.7	0.6	4.9	1.5	3.4
	1989	20.2	1.1	5.0	6.5	0.4	2.7	2.0	1.9	0.9	3.5	2.4	2.8
All countries <sup>5</sup>	1992	22.1	1.8	5.4	6.4	1.0	5.1	2.3	2.1	0.9	4.3	2.4	3.3
	1996	24.2	1.2	5.2	7.2	0.4	4.4	1.9	2.0	0.9	4.7	2.4	3.9
	2000	21.3	1.0	4.6	6.6	0.3	3.2	1.8	1.8	0.8	3.9	1.7	3.5
	1989	21.1	0.5	6.4	7.2	0.3	2.1	1.8	2.7	0.6	4.9	1.5	3.4

1 Based on eleven crimes standard across sweeps.

2 Theft of personal property.

3 Asked of women only, but asked of men in Australia and Canada in 2000, omitted in this table.

4 Some results for Japan are not available.

5 Averages are based on all countries taking part in each sweep. As countries included vary across sweeps, comparisons should be made cautiously.

Table 2 Victimization in the year preceding the survey: number of offences per 100 inhabitants (incidence rates)

		10 crimes <sup>1</sup>	Car theft	Theft from car	Car vandalism	Motor-cycle theft	Bicycle theft	Burglary	Attempted burglary	Robbery	Personal thefts <sup>2</sup>	Sexual incidents <sup>3</sup>	Assaults & threats
Australia	1989	59.2	3.0	9.1	11.9	0.3	2.3	5.9	4.7	1.1	6.3	18.9	9.7
	1992	56.1	3.5	8.5	13.8	0.3	2.3	5.2	4.0	1.4	9.0	7.6	8.1
	2000	54.3	2.0	9.0	11.6	0.1	2.2	4.8	3.7	1.5	8.0	7.5	11.2
Austria	1996	31.4	0.1	1.9	9.5	0.0	4.3	1.0	0.5	0.2	5.7	9.5	3.7
Belgium	1989	30.0	1.1	3.4	8.8	0.4	3.6	2.8	2.2	1.3	4.3	2.3	3.0
	1992	29.8	1.1	4.9	7.8	1.5	3.6	2.6	3.7	1.4	4.0	1.4	2.5
	2000	33.3	0.9	4.1	8.4	0.3	5.2	2.4	3.6	1.4	4.8	2.1	4.6
Canada	1989	47.9	0.9	9.1	11.5	0.4	4.0	3.6	3.6	1.5	6.9	6.9	6.5
	1992	51.3	1.4	9.9	10.9	0.2	5.3	4.2	3.6	1.6	6.9	7.1	7.3
	1996	44.1	1.6	7.9	7.8	0.1	4.0	4.0	3.6	1.8	7.3	4.8	7.1
	2000	40.4	1.4	6.9	6.3	0.1	4.2	2.9	2.7	1.2	6.3	3.8	8.5
Catalonia (Spain)	2000	28.9	0.4	6.9	11.2	0.8	0.5	1.3	0.7	1.0	3.6	0.8	2.4
Denmark	2000	35.1	1.2	4.1	4.6	1.0	8.7	3.3	1.6	0.8	4.4	4.6	4.7
England & Wales	1989	28.7	2.0	6.5	8.7	0.1	1.3	2.2	3.6	0.7	4.0	1.2	2.4
	1992	51.9	3.9	11.4	15.7	0.4	3.9	3.2	4.4	1.4	5.0	2.9	5.5
	1996	56.5	2.7	11.3	16.1	0.2	4.2	3.4	3.8	1.7	5.5	3.1	9.7
	2000	54.5	2.4	8.5	13.2	0.5	3.2	3.4	3.8	2.0	5.7	6.1	12.4
Finland	1989	22.2	0.4	3.3	4.6	0.0	3.8	0.6	0.6	0.7	5.0	0.5	3.4
	1992	34.1	0.9	3.5	6.8	0.3	5.8	0.6	0.6	1.4	3.9	8.7	6.4
	1996	30.4	0.5	3.5	4.9	0.2	6.4	0.8	0.8	0.8	3.6	4.7	7.4
France	2000	28.6	0.4	3.2	5.0	0.1	5.8	0.5	1.3	0.7	3.9	8.4	6.1
	1989	31.6	2.4	7.5	7.7	0.8	1.4	3.3	2.2	0.6	4.2	1.8	2.9
	1996	42.9	1.8	9.3	11.4	1.0	3.7	2.9	1.9	1.3	4.8	1.7	5.7
Germany (West)	2000	33.9	2.0	6.2	11.0	0.3	1.9	1.0	1.9	1.8	3.1	1.3	6.0
	1989	37.6	0.5	5.5	12.4	0.2	3.8	1.4	0.2	1.1	5.0	5.5	4.7
	1992	37.8	2.9	8.3	10.8	1.7	2.6	2.6	1.8	1.6	4.2	3.8	1.1
Japan <sup>4</sup>	1989	13.9	0.4	0.8	3.5	0.2	4.3	0.9	0.2	0.0	1.7	2.3	0.9
	1992	na											
Netherlands	2000	21.0	0.1	1.7	5.8	1.0	7.9	1.7	1.2	0.1	0.5	3.1	0.6
	1989	46.8	0.3	6.9	10.9	0.4	10.4	2.6	3.6	1.2	5.2	5.0	6.3
	1992	55.2	0.6	9.4	13.5	1.1	14.1	2.4	4.1	1.1	4.9	4.1	6.1
	1996	58.5	0.4	7.0	13.5	1.1	13.0	3.3	4.1	0.8	9.0	6.0	7.3
2000	48.1	0.4	5.7	13.2	0.7	10.2	2.3	3.0	1.5	6.0	5.7	5.3	

New Zealand	1992	54.4	3.2	9.3	10.2	0.3	5.1	5.5	4.5	1.2	7.4	5.0	9.7
Northern Ireland	1989	24.2	2.0	4.7	6.2	0.1	1.8	1.3	.	0.5	2.9	3.8	2.7
	1996	26.1	1.6	3.5	8.6	0.0	1.3	1.8	1.4	0.7	3.0	3.8	3.8
	2000	22.6	1.5	3.3	6.0	0.0	2.4	1.7	0.9	0.1	2.6	1.4	4.3
Norway	1989	27.6	1.1	4.1	6.3	0.6	2.8	0.9	.	0.8	3.2	3.7	5.9
Poland	1992	42.9	0.7	5.8	6.3	1.0	4.7	2.8	3.0	2.2	9.3	6.6	6.8
	1996	41.4	0.9	7.8	7.7	0.3	3.5	2.6	2.8	2.6	7.4	2.3	7.4
	2000	39.7	1.1	7.5	9.7	0.2	4.1	2.5	1.8	2.5	6.4	0.5	5.4
Portugal	2000	25.8	1.0	6.9	9.0	0.3	0.8	1.8	1.7	1.3	2.1	1.2	2.0
Scotland	1989	29.3	0.8	7.8	8.8	0.4	1.3	2.3	.	0.6	2.8	2.3	3.1
	1996	42.9	2.0	8.9	13.6	0.1	2.1	1.6	2.9	1.0	5.5	1.5	7.3
	2000	41.1	0.9	5.8	13.0	0.2	2.3	1.5	2.2	0.9	5.0	2.1	10.3
Spain	1989	48.8	1.9	14.0	9.6	0.9	1.2	2.1	.	4.4	6.5	3.5	6.2
Sweden	1992	34.7	1.8	4.4	5.6	0.8	8.5	1.5	0.8	0.7	5.4	2.0	5.0
	1996	44.2	1.5	6.0	6.3	0.6	11.4	1.5	1.2	0.5	5.8	6.0	7.6
	2000	45.6	1.4	7.1	6.7	0.4	9.4	2.3	0.9	1.5	7.2	6.0	6.5
Switzerland	1989	23.0	0.0	2.2	5.0	1.6	3.9	1.1	.	0.5	5.7	3.0	1.6
	1996	42.6	0.1	3.3	9.3	1.9	9.9	1.6	1.3	0.9	6.8	9.6	4.1
	2000	.	.	.	.	.	.	1.2	2.0	1.1	.	3.5	3.9
USA <sup>4</sup>	1989	61.4	2.9	12.4	12.2	0.1	3.8	5.6	.	2.8	6.1	10.4	10.1
	1992	na	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
	1996	46.8	2.0	9.5	8.8	0.2	3.8	3.9	4.4	1.6	4.6	4.9	10.0
All countries <sup>5</sup>	2000	39.5	0.6	8.1	9.2	0.3	2.7	3.3	3.3	0.6	6.7	2.8	6.5
	1989	35.5	1.3	6.5	8.6	0.4	3.3	2.4	.	1.2	4.7	4.7	4.6
	1992	34.5	2.0	7.5	10.1	0.8	5.6	3.1	2.8	1.4	6.0	4.9	5.8
1996	1996	42.3	1.3	6.7	9.8	0.5	5.6	2.4	2.5	1.2	5.7	4.8	6.8
	2000	35.2	1.0	5.6	8.2	0.4	4.2	2.3	2.2	1.2	4.5	3.6	5.9

1 Based on ten crimes standard across sweeps.

2 Theft of personal property.

3 Asked of women only, but asked of men in Australia and Canada in 2000, omitted in this table.

4 Some results for Japan and the USA are not available.

5 Averages are based on all countries taking part in each sweep. As countries included vary across sweeps, comparisons should be made cautiously.

Table 3 Victimization in the year preceding the survey (prevalence and incidence rates for vehicle owners)

		Percentage victimised at least once					Number of incidents per 100 owners				
		Car theft	Theft from car	Car vandalism	Motor-cycle theft	Bicycle theft	Car theft	Theft from car	Car vandalism	Motor-cycle theft	Bicycle theft
Australia	1989	2.6	7.8	9.9	2.7	4.0	3.3	10.2	13.5	3.6	4.9
	1992	3.4	7.0	10.1	2.1	3.3	3.8	9.1	14.8	2.1	3.6
	2000	2.1	7.3	9.8	0.4	3.1	2.2	9.6	12.5	0.9	3.4
Austria	1996	0.2	1.9	7.9	0.0	3.8	0.2	2.3	11.2	0.0	5.0
Belgium	1989	1.0	3.3	8.0	3.0	4.6	1.4	4.2	10.8	3.7	6.1
	1992	1.2	4.4	7.0	6.8	4.0	1.2	5.6	8.9	9.1	5.2
	2000	0.8	4.1	7.1	1.8	4.6	1.0	4.8	9.7	1.8	6.9
Canada	1989	0.9	8.1	11.0	3.5	5.4	1.0	10.2	12.9	3.5	6.3
	1992	1.4	8.2	9.6	1.7	5.3	1.6	11.1	12.3	2.0	7.6
	1996	1.7	6.9	7.0	0.8	4.7	1.8	8.9	8.7	0.8	5.6
2000	1.6	6.1	6.3	1.0	4.9	1.6	7.8	7.2	1.0	5.8	
Catalonia (Spain)	2000	0.5	6.4	9.2	2.8	1.1	0.5	8.2	13.5	3.6	1.2
Denmark	2000	1.4	4.4	4.8	4.3	7.5	1.5	5.2	6.0	6.1	9.7
England & Wales	1989	2.4	7.3	8.8	0.9	2.8	2.5	8.5	11.3	0.9	3.6
	1992	4.3	10.0	12.4	3.2	5.7	4.6	13.3	18.4	3.2	7.3
	1996	3.0	9.7	12.5	2.3	6.0	3.3	13.7	19.4	2.3	7.2
2000	2.6	8.0	11.0	4.2	4.4	3.0	10.5	16.5	5.7	5.9	
Finland	1989	0.5	3.5	5.2	0.0	3.5	0.5	4.3	6.0	0.0	4.3
	1992	0.8	3.6	6.8	1.4	5.5	1.1	4.3	8.2	1.4	6.4
	1996	0.6	3.7	5.3	1.2	5.6	0.6	4.4	6.1	1.2	7.0
2000	0.5	3.5	4.5	0.8	5.3	0.5	3.9	na	0.8	6.3	
France	1989	2.8	7.1	7.6	3.7	2.4	2.8	8.9	9.1	4.6	2.6
	1996	1.8	8.3	9.5	4.2	4.4	2.1	10.8	13.1	5.2	5.7
	2000	1.9	6.2	9.4	1.5	2.6	2.2	7.1	12.5	1.5	2.7
Germany (West)	1989	0.5	5.8	10.8	1.8	4.4	0.6	6.9	15.4	2.1	4.9
Italy	1992	3.0	7.9	8.6	4.2	3.4	3.3	9.4	12.3	4.6	3.8
Japan <sup>1</sup>	1989	0.3	0.8	3.1	0.7	4.9	0.5	1.0	4.3	0.7	6.1
	1992	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
	2000	0.1	1.8	5.1	3.1	8.2	0.1	2.0	6.7	3.1	9.8

Netherlands	1989	0.4	6.8	10.6	3.3	8.3	0.4	8.9	14.1	3.3	11.4
	1992	0.7	8.4	11.8	5.0	10.8	0.7	11.7	16.7	5.4	15.3
	1996	0.4	6.6	12.0	3.2	10.2	0.4	8.5	16.4	5.0	14.0
	2000	0.5	4.8	10.9	2.7	7.6	0.5	6.9	16.1	3.0	11.0
New Zealand	1992	2.8	7.3	8.4	1.1	6.4	3.3	9.7	10.7	1.1	7.6
	1989	2.2	5.5	6.1	3.3	3.5	2.7	6.4	8.6	3.3	4.0
Northern Ireland	1996	1.9	3.8	8.3	0.0	2.1	1.9	4.3	10.6	0.0	2.2
	2000	1.5	3.3	5.4	0.0	2.4	1.8	3.9	7.2	0.0	4.1
	1989	1.3	3.5	5.7	3.5	3.8	1.3	5.2	7.8	5.7	3.8
Poland	1992	1.4	10.5	9.5	3.4	5.4	1.4	11.6	12.5	3.6	5.9
	1996	1.5	10.1	9.6	1.6	4.3	1.7	13.9	13.7	1.6	4.6
	2000	1.7	9.0	11.4	0.9	4.7	1.8	12.3	15.8	1.7	5.3
Portugal	2000	1.2	6.4	8.2	1.4	1.8	1.3	9.0	11.8	1.4	1.8
	1989	1.2	7.7	9.3	7.2	3.3	1.2	11.2	12.8	9.3	4.3
Scotland	1996	2.1	8.5	12.5	1.3	3.5	2.6	11.4	17.4	1.3	3.9
	2000	1.0	5.6	11.8	2.1	3.9	1.2	7.7	17.1	4.0	4.5
	1989	2.1	14.4	9.9	3.9	2.9	2.8	21.2	14.6	4.4	3.3
Sweden	1992	2.0	4.7	5.4	3.5	7.7	2.2	5.2	6.7	5.0	9.4
	1996	1.5	6.0	5.7	2.3	9.7	1.8	7.4	7.6	3.1	12.5
	2000	1.6	6.6	5.8	1.6	7.8	1.8	9.0	8.5	1.6	10.2
Switzerland	1989	0.0	2.4	5.2	4.7	4.7	0.0	2.8	6.4	6.6	5.7
	1996	0.1	3.7	8.7	4.3	9.0	0.1	4.0	11.3	5.8	12.7
	2000	0.4	2.1	4.8	1.0	6.4	na	.	.	.	.
USA <sup>1</sup>	1989	2.2	9.7	9.3	0.9	4.6	3.0	13.0	12.8	0.9	5.8
	1992	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
	1996	2.1	8.2	7.3	1.0	5.1	2.2	10.4	9.6	1.0	5.9
	2000	0.5	7.1	8.0	2.7	3.5	0.6	9.0	10.2	2.7	4.4
All countries <sup>2</sup>	1989	1.4	6.2	8.1	2.7	4.5	1.6	8.1	10.7	3.3	5.5
	1992	2.0	6.4	7.8	2.8	4.7	2.2	7.9	10.5	3.2	5.7
	1996	1.4	6.4	8.9	1.9	5.7	1.6	8.3	12.1	2.3	7.2
	2000	1.2	5.5	7.8	1.9	4.7	1.4	7.3	10.7	2.4	5.8

1 Some results for Japan and USA are not available.

2 Averages are based on all countries taking part in each sweep. As countries included vary across sweeps, comparisons should be made cautiously.



Scotland	1996	0.3	6	2	2	1	1	2	2
	2000	0.0							
Sweden	1996	0.2	2	1	1	1	1		
	2000	0.1	2	1					
Switzerland	1996	0.2	2	1					
	2000	na							
USA	1996	0.3	3	3					
	2000	0.2	2	1					
All countries <sup>4</sup>	1996	0.8	227	61	29	31	32	71	11
	2000	0.7	367	30	26	6	143	157	15

1 The question asked was: 'In some countries, there is a problem of corruption among government or public officials. During – last year – has any government official, for instance a customs officer, a police officer or inspector in your country asked you, or expected you, to pay a bribe for his service?' This item was introduced in the 1996 surveys, although it was asked in Poland in 1992.

2 Because of the small numbers, number of responses are given instead of percentages.

3 Asked if not reported to the police.

4 Averages and numbers for all countries are based on countries taking part in each sweep. As countries included vary across sweeps, comparisons should be made cautiously.

Table 5 Experience of consumer fraud in the year preceding the survey: 1992, 1996 and 2000 ICVS1, 2

		% victimised		Where fraud took place										Reported to	
			N	Construction or repair work	Car garage hotel	Pub restaurant	A shop	Other	Do not know	Police	Other authority <sup>3</sup>				
Australia	1992	8.4	168	15	5	2	38	2	39	2	2	19			
	2000	8.8	177	17	6	3	19	3	53	3	12	26			
Austria	1996	10.5	158	15	3	2	59	2	20	2	5	17			
	1992	9.0	128	13	2	5	40	39	2	2	7	5			
Belgium	2000	6.4	160	14	6	4	29	46	1	1	6	21			
	1992	8.1	175	10	3	4	24	59	5	17	5	17			
Canada	1996	6.9	148	16	6	1	19	58	1	1	7	28			
	2000	7.5	156	8	9	1	13	69	1	1	13	20			
Catalonia (Spain)	2000	8.7	253	11	7	9	35	38	8	13	8	13			
	2000	11.5	345	11	8	1	57	20	2	11	2	11			
Denmark	1992	6.7	134	18	4	3	26	47	2	21	7	21			
	1996	5.4	118	15	6		14	66	12	36	12	36			
England & Wales	2000	6.0	117	20	10		20	50	10	37	10	37			
	1996	14.5	554	6	8	3	72	11	1	7	1	7			
Finland	2000	10.0	182	9	7	2	66	16	1	1	1	1			
	1996	9.8	98	13	13	5	38	29	1	15	7	15			
France	2000	4.4	44	8	13	2	32	42	3	9	14	9			
	1992	10.6	214	5	4	4	61	24	2	2	2	2			
Japan	2000	2.3	51	4		6	34	56	2	13	2	13			
	1992	4.9	97	19	3	5	27	45	1	9	10	9			
Netherlands	1996	5.9	118	16	4	2	22	56	7	26	7	26			
	2000	4.4	87	19	5		21	53	1	30	17	30			
New Zealand	1992	7.4	152	18	17	1	27	38	4	18	4	18			
	1996	4.4	46	18	4	4	22	52	5	59	5	59			
Northern Ireland	2000	3.8	58	21	1	7	37	34	7	39	7	39			

Poland	1992	11.6	227	5	6	2	63	24	51	3
	1996	14.2	492	6	3	6	69	15	1	6
	2000	12.8	677	4	2	1	76	16	2	2
Portugal	2000	7.0	139	3	1	10	32	51	2	14
	1996	6.4	140	20	7	3	22	47	1	46
Scotland	2000	4.9	101	16	2	6	21	55	1	26
	1992	3.7	63	18	5	1	55	21	2	10
Sweden	1996	7.7	77	5	7	2	60	26	2	15
	2000	9.4	188	8	9	5	52	27	2	7
	1996	9.9	99	6	19	11	30	33	3	8
Switzerland	2000	na	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	1996	9.6	97	10	12	2	7	69	13	35
USA	2000	11.4	114	8	4	3	14	71	8	27
	1992	7.8	1,359	13	5	3	40	37	10	11
All countries <sup>4</sup>	1996	8.6	2,285	13	8	3	35	41	6	26
	2000	7.7	2,963	11	5	4	34	45	7	19

1 The question asked was: 'In the last year, in 199\*, were you the victim of a consumer fraud. In other words, has someone - when selling you something, or delivering you a service- cheated you in terms of quantity of quality or price of the goods or services? This item was introduced in the 1992 ICVS.'

2 Because of small numbers, number of responses are given instead of percentages.

3 Asked if not reported to the police.

4 Averages and numbers for all countries are based on countries taking part in each sweep. As countries included vary across sweeps, comparisons should be made cautiously.

Table 6 Details on sub-crimes: pickpocketing, sexual assaults and assaults with force

		Theft of personal property		Sexual incidents (women only)		Assaults and threats	
		Pick-pocketing <sup>1</sup>	Other theft	Sexual assaults <sup>2</sup>	Offensive sexual Behaviour	Assaults with force <sup>3</sup>	Threats
Australia	1989	0.8	4.1	1.4	5.9	2.3	2.8
	1992	1.0	5.5	1.2	2.3	2.3	2.5
	2000	1.2	5.3	1.0	3.0	2.4	4.0
Austria	1996	2.8	2.3	1.2	2.6	0.8	1.2
Belgium	1989	1.7	2.3	0.5	0.7	0.7	1.4
	1992	1.3	1.8	0.9	0.5	0.4	1.4
	2000	2.1	2.1	0.3	0.7	1.2	2.0
Canada	1989	0.8	4.7	1.2	2.8	1.7	2.2
	1992	0.6	4.8	1.6	2.2	1.8	3.0
	1996	0.8	4.9	0.9	1.7	1.4	2.6
	2000	0.7	4.0	0.8	1.3	2.3	3.0
Catalonia (Spain)	2000	1.8	1.3	0.3	0.5	0.5	1.0
Denmark	2000	1.8	2.2	0.4	2.1	1.4	2.2
England & Wales	1989	1.3	1.8	0.3	0.8	0.9	1.0
	1992	1.3	2.8	0.7	1.4	1.6	2.2
	1996	1.7	3.3	0.4	1.6	2.3	3.5
Finland	1989	1.9	2.4	0.3	0.3	1.7	1.2
	1992	1.7	1.7	1.5	2.3	2.4	2.0
	1996	1.5	1.7	1.0	1.5	2.1	1.9
France	1989	1.5	1.8	1.1	2.6	2.1	2.0
	1989	1.8	1.8	0.4	0.7	0.9	1.1
	1996	1.9	2.1	0.4	0.5	1.4	2.5
Germany (West)	1989	1.3	1.7	0.7	0.4	1.4	2.9
	1989	1.6	2.4	1.1	1.7	1.3	1.8
	1992	2.3	1.3	0.6	1.1	0.2	0.6
Japan	2000	0.1	0.4	0.1	1.1	0.1	0.3
Netherlands	1989	1.5	3.0	0.6	2.0	1.4	2.0
	1992	1.8	2.9	0.7	1.5	1.3	2.7
	1996	2.7	4.1	0.8	2.8	1.1	2.9
	2000	1.9	2.8	0.8	2.2	1.0	2.4
New Zealand	1992	0.7	4.6	1.3	1.4	2.4	3.3
Northern Ireland	1989	0.8	1.4	0.3	1.5	0.8	1.0
	1996	0.5	2.0	0.5	0.7	0.9	0.8
	2000	0.4	1.9	0.1	0.5	2.1	0.9
Norway	1989	0.8	2.3	0.3	1.9	1.1	1.8

Table 6 (continued)

		Theft of personal property		Sexual incidents (women only)		Assaults and threats	
		Pick-pocketing <sup>1</sup>	Other theft	Sexual assaults <sup>2</sup>	Offensive sexual Behaviour	Assaults with force <sup>3</sup>	Threats
Poland	1992	6.7	1.4	1.5	2.0	1.7	2.4
	1996	4.0	1.6	0.6	0.8	1.5	2.2
	2000	4.0	1.3	0.2	0.2	1.1	1.7
Portugal	2000	1.2	0.7	0.2	0.4	0.4	0.6
Scotland	1989	1.0	1.6	0.6	0.6	0.9	0.9
	1996	1.2	3.3	0.2	1.0	1.9	2.3
	2000	1.4	3.2	0.3	0.7	3.0	3.1
Spain	1989	2.8	2.4	0.6	1.7	1.0	2.1
Sweden	1992	1.0	3.2	0.5	0.4	1.0	1.7
	1996	0.9	3.6	1.5	1.5	1.6	2.8
	2000	1.2	4.6	1.1	1.5	1.2	2.7
Switzerland	1989	1.8	2.7	0.6	1.1	0.6	0.6
	1996	2.0	3.7	1.2	3.4	1.1	2.0
	2000	.	.	0.6	1.5	1.0	1.4
USA	1989	1.1	3.4	1.4	3.1	1.7	3.7
	1992	1.4	3.9	0.6	1.8	2.1	2.6
	1996	0.9	3.0	1.2	1.3	2.1	3.6
	2000	0.8	4.1	0.4	1.1	1.2	2.3
All countries <sup>4</sup>	1989	1.4	2.6	0.7	1.8	1.2	1.7
	1992	1.8	3.1	1.0	1.5	1.6	2.2
	1996	1.7	3.0	0.8	1.6	1.5	2.4
	2000	1.4	2.4	0.6	1.3	1.5	2.1

1 All victims of theft of personal property over the last 5 years were asked whether they were holding or carrying what was stolen (i.e., was it a case of pickpocketing). The percentage of pickpocketing incidents is applied to last years' victimisation levels for theft of personal property to obtain an estimate of pickpocketing in the last year.

2 All victims of sexual incidents over the last 5 years were asked whether they would describe what happened as a: rape (forced intercourse); an attempted rape; an indecent assault; or as just behaviour which they found offensive. The first three responses are categorised as sexual assaults. The percentage of assaults is applied to the last year victimisation rates for all sexual incidents to obtain an estimate of sexual assault victimisation. For example, in Australia in 1989, 19% of the sexual incidents over the last 5 years were assaults. The 'last year' victimisation level for sexual incidents was 7.3% (see Table 1 of Appendix 4). Thus, the estimate for sexual assaults last year is 1.4% (19% of 7.3%). The figures apply to women only. Although the questions on sexual incidents were also asked of men in Canada and Australia in the 2000 ICVS, these cases are omitted from this table.

3 All victims of assaults and threats over the last 5 years were asked whether they were simply threatened, or whether force was used. Cases where force was used were categorised as assaults. To obtain an estimate of assaults in the last year, the same procedure was adopted as described above for sexual assaults.

4 Averages for all countries are based on the countries taking part in each sweep. As countries included vary across sweeps, comparisons should be made cautiously.

Table 7 Profile of offences (1992, 1996 and 2000 surveys): percentage of all incidents

		Number of incidents	Car theft %	Theft from car %	Car vandalism %	Bicycle / motor-cycle theft %	Burglary and attempts %	Robbery %	Personal theft %	Sexual offences %	Assaults and threats %
Australia	1992	1,220	6	14	23	4	16	2	15	6	13
	2000	1,157	4	15	20	4	15	2	14	7	19
Austria	1996	481	0	6	30	13	5	1	18	15	12
Belgium	1992	476	3	15	24	16	15	3	12	2	8
	2000	925	2	11	23	15	16	4	13	3	12
Canada	1992	1,183	3	18	20	10	14	3	13	7	13
	1996	1,018	3	17	16	9	16	4	15	5	15
	2000	881	3	16	15	10	13	3	15	5	20
Catalonia (Spain)	2000	860	1	23	38	4	7	4	12	3	8
Denmark	2000	1,101	3	11	13	26	13	2	12	6	13
England & Wales	1992	1,110	7	20	28	8	12	2	9	3	10
	1996	1,323	5	19	26	7	13	3	9	3	16
	2000	1,136	4	15	23	6	12	3	10	5	21
Finland <sup>1</sup>	1992	573	3	10	20	18	3	4	11	13	18
	1996	1,197	1	11	16	21	5	3	12	8	24
	2000	560	1	10	16	19	6	2	12	14	19
France	1996	451	4	21	25	10	11	3	11	2	13
	2000	358	5	17	31	6	8	5	9	2	17
Italy	1992	802	7	21	27	11	11	4	11	5	3
Japan	2000	490	1	8	26	40	13	0	2	7	3
Netherlands	1992	1,177	1	16	23	26	10	2	8	4	10
	1996	1,257	1	11	22	22	12	1	14	5	12
	2000	1,022	1	11	26	21	10	3	12	6	10

New Zealand	1992	1,205	5	16	17	9	17	2	13	4	17
Northern Ireland	1996	286	6	13	31	5	12	3	11	7	14
	2000	355	6	14	25	10	11	0	11	3	18
Poland	1992	933	2	13	14	12	13	5	20	7	15
	1996	1,541	2	18	17	9	12	6	17	3	17
	2000	2,193	3	18	23	10	10	6	15	1	13
Portugal	2000	549	3	25	33	4	13	5	8	2	7
Scotland	1996	1,005	4	20	30	5	10	2	12	2	16
	2000	890	2	13	30	6	9	2	11	2	24
Sweden	1992	607	5	12	16	26	7	2	15	3	14
	1996	455	3	13	14	26	6	1	13	7	17
	2000	930	3	15	14	21	7	3	16	7	14
Switzerland <sup>2</sup>	1996	439	0	7	21	27	6	2	15	11	9
	2000	na	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
USA	1996	514	4	19	17	8	16	3	9	5	20
	2000	429	1	19	22	7	15	1	16	3	15
All countries <sup>3</sup>	1992	9,737	4	16	22	14	12	3	12	5	12
	1996	9,527	3	15	22	12	11	3	13	6	16
	2000	13,691	3	14	23	16	12	3	11	4	15

1 Estimate used for theft from car.

2 Not all data from Switzerland is available.

3 Averages for all countries are based on the countries taking part in each sweep. As countries included vary across sweeps, comparisons should be made cautiously.

Table 8 Average crime seriousness (1992, 1996 and 2000 ICVS): mean scores

	11 crimes <sup>1</sup>	Car theft	Burglary	Robbery	Motor-cycle theft	Assault & threat	Sexual offences	Personal theft	Attempted burglary	Bicycle theft	Theft from car	Car vandalism
Australia	1992	2.06	2.4	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.1	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.7	1.5
	2000	2.06	2.4	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.1	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.7	1.5
	1996	1.84	2.1	2.2	1.8	1.9	1.8	1.7	1.5	1.8	1.6	1.5
Belgium	1992	1.98	2.2	2.3	2.1	2.0	2.1	2.0	1.9	1.8	1.8	1.7
	2000	1.86	2.4	2.2	2.1	1.8	1.9	1.8	1.6	1.7	1.5	1.5
Canada	1992	2.02	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.1	2.2	1.8	1.9	1.8	1.6	1.6
	1996	2.04	2.4	2.3	2.1	2.2	2.1	1.8	2.0	1.9	1.7	1.6
	2000	1.86	2.4	2.2	1.3	2.1	2.1	1.7	1.8	1.7	1.6	1.5
Catalonia (Spain)	2000	2.10	2.4	2.3	2.2	2.2	2.2	1.9	2.0	2.0	1.8	1.8
	2000	1.64	1.7	2.0	1.5	1.9	1.9	1.5	1.5	1.3	1.3	1.4
England & Wales	1992	1.99	2.2	2.2	2.2	2.1	2.0	1.9	1.9	1.8	1.6	1.5
	1996	2.05	2.5	2.4	2.5	2.1	2.1	1.9	1.8	1.8	1.6	1.4
	2000	2.08	2.3	2.4	2.2	2.1	2.3	2.0	2.0	1.8	1.6	1.5
Finland	1992	2.09	2.5	2.3	2.3	2.1	1.9	2.0	2.2	1.9	1.7	1.8
	1996	1.79	2.2	1.9	2.1	1.8	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.6	1.5	1.4
	2000	1.69	1.8	2.1	1.9	1.8	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.4	1.3	1.3
France	1996	1.88	2.2	2.0	2.1	2.0	2.1	1.8	1.7	1.7	1.5	1.5
	2000	1.95	2.4	2.1	2.0	2.1	2.1	1.8	1.9	1.7	1.6	1.6
Italy	1992	2.23	2.5	2.4	2.3	2.4	2.4	2.1	2.1	1.8	1.9	1.9
	2000	2.08	2.4	2.1	2.1	2.2	2.0	2.3	2.1	1.8	1.9	1.7
Netherlands	1992	1.92	2.3	2.2	2.2	2.1	1.9	1.8	1.7	1.7	1.5	1.4
	1996	1.92	2.2	2.2	2.2	2.0	2.0	1.9	1.6	1.7	1.5	1.4
	2000	1.85	2.2	2.1	1.9	2.0	2.0	1.8	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.6
New Zealand	1992	2.08	2.4	2.3	2.1	2.2	2.2	1.9	1.9	2.0	1.8	1.6
	1996	2.14	2.7	2.5	2.0	2.3	2.4	2.0	1.9	1.8	1.6	1.6
Northern Ireland	2000	2.24	2.6	2.7	3.0	2.5	2.0	1.9	1.9	1.8	1.8	1.8

Poland	1992	1.95	2.3	2.2	2.1	2.2	1.8	2.1	2.1	1.6	1.8	1.7	1.6
	1996	1.97	2.9	1.9	1.9	2.5	2.0	1.9	1.9	1.6	1.9	1.6	1.6
	2000	2.06	2.8	2.2	2.1	2.6	2.0	2.0	2.0	1.7	2.0	1.7	1.6
Portugal	2000	1.98	2.3	2.4	2.0	1.9	2.3	2.2	2.0	1.9	1.6	1.7	1.6
	1996	1.86	2.3	2.3	2.1	1.5	2.1	2.1	1.7	1.8	1.7	1.4	1.4
Scotland	2000	1.96	2.2	2.4	2.4	1.9	2.0	2.2	1.9	1.9	1.6	1.6	1.5
	1992	1.84	2.1	1.9	2.3	2.1	2.0	2.1	1.7	1.6	1.6	1.5	1.4
Sweden	1996	1.95	2.1	2.1	2.6	2.2	1.9	1.8	1.8	1.9	1.7	1.6	1.6
	2000	1.99	2.4	2.3	2.4	2.1	2.0	2.0	1.9	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7
	1996	1.76	2.3	1.8	1.9	1.8	1.9	1.9	1.6	1.5	1.6	1.6	1.5
Switzerland <sup>2</sup>	2000	n.a.		1.7	1.7		1.7	1.5		1.3			
	1996	2.09	2.5	2.3	2.4	2.2	2.3	2.1	2.0	2.1	1.7	1.7	1.7
USA	2000	2.00	2.4	2.3	2.5	1.8	2.3	2.1	1.8	2.0	1.7	1.7	1.6
	1992	2.02	2.3	2.3	2.2	2.2	2.1	2.1	1.9	1.9	1.8	1.7	1.6
All countries <sup>3</sup>	1996	1.94	2.4	2.2	2.2	2.1	2.0	2.0	1.8	1.8	1.7	1.6	1.5
	2000	1.95	2.2	2.2	2.1	2.0	2.1	2.0	1.7	1.8	1.6	1.5	1.5

1 The figures shown are average seriousness scores based on incident's scored as 3 for 'very serious', 2 for 'serious', and 1 for 'not very serious'. Based on judgement about the last incident over the past five years. Each crime carries equal weight in computing the average seriousness for 11 crimes.

2 Some data for Switzerland not available.

3 Averages for all countries are based on the countries taking part in each sweep. As countries included vary across sweeps, comparisons should be made cautiously.

Table 9 Percentage of crimes reported to the police

	10 crimes <sup>1</sup>	Car theft	Theft from car	Car vandalism	Motor-cycle theft	Bicycle theft	Burglary	Attempted burglary	Robbery	Personal theft	Sexual incidents	Assaults & threats
Australia	1989	91	55	25	92	70	84		52	45	8	36
	1992	92	54	27	94	76	88	47	53	39	12	39
	2000	92	53	36	70	63	81	41	60	38	15	43
Austria	1996	100	79	33	100	70	79	30	60	52	7	22
Belgium	1989	85	65	37	94	70	78		41	50	15	36
	1992	68	77	45	90	77	88	57	55	60	20	45
	2000	53	97	39	91	70	92	49	47	56	11	30
	1989	49	89	48	100	70	83		57	38	11	38
Canada	1992	51	92	50	72	65	82	44	48	36	13	36
	1996	50	88	47	85	56	85	47	50	32	17	40
	2000	48	99	47	34	50	80	46	41	28	19	35
	2000	41	91	22	82	39	71	31	57	54	13	27
Catalonia (Spain)	2000	56	75	43	76	67	88	25	73	51	12	30
Denmark	1989	59	96	32	86	76	90		68	59	11	43
England & Wales	1992	59	94	37	94	75	96	54	50	51	16	41
	1996	54	67	39	97	79	93	52	55	48	20	38
	2000	53	89	43	94	69	90	62	59	49	14	41
	1989	42	65	42	100	63	62		30	38	7	18
Finland	1992	41	100	36	85	55	74	21	28	37	12	25
	1996	43	na	47	88	52	71	34	39	43	7	27
	2000	41	96	51	100	54	71	22	67	37	1	26
	1989	61	96	47	82	55	84		49	53	15	37
France	1996	49	61	47	81	47	78	44	57	40	30	30
	2000	49	91	49	78	35	73	37	32	51	26	34
	1989	48	89	44	93	72	79		50	38	11	21
Germany (West)	1992	40	95	15	77	29	65	21	42	43	5	24
Italy	2000	39	61	21	70	36	60	35	31	39	11	21
Japan <sup>2</sup>	1989	53	92	36	95	73	94		54	48	13	39
Netherlands	1992	57	90	39	94	67	90	52	59	53	12	43

(Netherlands continued)	1996	53	90	72	43	88	64	85	49	70	57	14	42
	2000	58	94	77	49	90	66	91	60	63	50	17	42
New Zealand	1992	60	97	64	36	89	87	89	48	49	50	12	42
Northern Ireland	1989	46	96	55	36	89	57	85		59	26	8	51
	1996	55	94	60	40	100	69	86	50	93	40	43	58
	2000	60	95	61	44	100	64	86	40	73	30	22	55
	1989	43	75	58	37	83	45	78		36	31	5	29
Poland	1992	32	93	53	30	89	47	49	20	31	20	8	25
	1996	34	93	45	33	79	45	54	25	37	20	12	31
	2000	40	92	47	28	69	50	62	30	40	26	18	32
Portugal	2000	36	76	41	23	57	32	59	26	40	34	16	33
Scotland	1989	62	92	78	50	81	77	93		49	51	29	44
	1996	54	97	73	41	77	76	96	59	38	48	25	44
	2000	50	89	69	47	100	78	91	49	68	58	23	41
Spain	1989	33	82	32	22	55	24	44		29	43	5	27
Sweden	1992	59	97	70	51	85	67	66	31	81	50	20	29
	1996	54	90	75	63	88	59	71	43	81	56	12	28
	2000	57	98	76	57	85	61	71	37	71	47	12	36
	1989	59	89	72	47	88	84	80		39	42	21	26
Switzerland	1996	52	98	85	31	87	75	88	43	24	37	16	32
	2000	52	87	71	43	80	74	88	45	50	45	10	33
	1989	52	97	60	56	87	63	80		58	41	18	42
USA <sup>3</sup>	1992	na											
	1996	58	90	66	51	88	47	68	52	66	36	28	45
	2000	52	95	61	48	71	54	71	45	69	31	15	53
	1989	50	88	64	40	88	64	80		48	43	13	35
All countries <sup>4</sup>	1992	51	94	62	37	87	64	79	39	50	44	13	35
	1996	50	87	69	42	87	64	82	45	54	43	19	36
	2000	49	91	62	41	79	56	78	40	55	42	15	36
	1989	49	91	62	41	79	56	78	40	55	42	15	36

1 Based on 10 crimes standard across all sweeps (the question was not asked for attempted burglary in 1989). For the 10 crimes, based on victims last year, last incident that occurred. Figures on reporting for individual crimes are based on the last incident over the previous five years.

2 Information for Japan was not collected in 1992; that from the 1989 sweep is not comparable with other countries.

3 Results for the USA (1992) are not available.

4 Averages are based on all countries taking part in each sweep. As countries included vary across sweeps, comparisons should be made cautiously.

Table 10 Reasons for not reporting crimes to the police, based on five crimes: 2000 ICVS 1, 2

	N	Not serious enough	Solved ourselves	Inappropriate for police	Other authorities	My family solved it	No insurance	Police could do nothing	Police wouldn't do anything	Fear/dislike of police	Fear of reprisals	Other reasons	Don't know
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Australia	603	47	9	4	4	1		8	6		3	32	2
Belgium	392	52	25	29	6	9	4	42	35	4	9	17	2
Canada	527	41	14	6	3	3	1	6	5	2	4	31	5
Catalonia (Spain)	447	51	7	5	2	1	2	10	17		2	13	3
Denmark	404	42	20	12	2	1	1	9	6	1	8	19	6
England & Wales	412	34	10	11	3	2	1	12	11	3	4	24	4
Finland	335	56	17	5	4	1	1	7	6		3	13	
France	203	39	16	8		1	1	8	10	1	5	16	2
Japan	157	48	11	7	6	5		18	8	3	3	27	2
Netherlands	323	32	12	10	1	1		9	9		2	30	4
Northern Ireland	132	37	8	16	4	2		17	8	8	9	9	1
Poland	859	46	10	15	2	1	3	39	31	7	8	5	1
Portugal	348	41	10	10	1	2		13	10	2	3	11	1
Scotland	328	37	10	6	3	1		6	7	3	4	31	3
Sweden	357	34	14	18	1	4	2	11	11	2	3	16	2
Switzerland <sup>3</sup>	553	42	14	12		1		11	5	3	5	10	5
USA	185	27	10	12	6	3		17	9	6	2	21	4
All countries	6,560	42	13	11	3	2	1	14	11	3	5	19	3

1 The five crimes are: theft from cars, burglary with entry, robbery, sexual incidents and assaults & threats. Based on last incident not reported over the previous five years.

2 Multiple answers were allowed, so percentages may add up to more than 100%.

3 Figures for Switzerland are based on four crimes (thefts from car are omitted).

Table 11 Reasons for not reporting to the police for burglary with entry and thefts from cars: 2000 ICVS1

	N	Not serious enough	Solved ourselves	Inappropriate for police	Other authorities	My family solved it	No insurance	Police could do nothing	Police wouldn't do anything	Fear/dislike of police	Fear of reprisals	Other reasons	Don't know
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Australia	225	62	2	4			1	14	9	1		21	4
Belgium	105	50	10	22	1	7	10	50	37	1	3	20	2
Canada	189	50	9	5	2	3	1	9	8			23	5
Catalonia (Spain)	295	58	3	3	2	1	3	9	17		1	11	3
Denmark	94	52	5	15	1	2	3	1	4	1	2	16	8
England & Wales	129	52	7	14	1	4	2	18	16	1	1	17	2
Finland	58	61	4	3	3		7	13	15			10	
France	79	46	4	6			2	12	13		3	18	4
Japan	89	55	9	5	4	5	0	12	8	2	0	23	3
Netherlands	80	36	3	14			11	11	18			26	5
Northern Ireland	56	59	4	8				22	9	5	1	9	
Poland	464	39	7	11	1	1	5	45	37	4	2	7	1
Portugal	205	47	10	12	1	2		11	11		1	7	1
Scotland	101	55	5	11		3		7	12	1		21	1
Sweden	106	39	4	20	1	5	7	14	11			19	
Switzerland <sup>2</sup>	74	45	8	15		1	1	15	5	1		8	6
USA	79	32	7	9		3	1	28	8			16	7
All countries	2,427	49	6	10	1	2	3	18	14	1	1	16	3

1 Multiple answers were allowed, so percentages may add up to more than 100%. Based on last incident not reported over the previous five years.

2 Figures for Switzerland are based on burglary with entry only.

Table 12 Reasons for not reporting to the police for robbery, sexual incidents, and assaults and threats: 2000 ICVS<sup>1</sup>

	N	Not serious enough	Solved ourselves	Inappropriate for police	Other authorities	My family solved it	No insurance	Police could do nothing	Police wouldn't do anything	Fear/dislike of police	Fear of reprisals	Other reasons	Don't know
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Australia	378	39	13	4	6	2		5	4		4	38	1
Belgium	287	53	31	32	8	10	2	39	34	5	12	15	1
Canada	338	36	17	7	4	3		4	3	3	6	36	5
Catalonia (Spain)	152	38	14	8	2	1		11	17	1	5	16	3
Denmark	310	38	24	11	2			9	7	1	10	20	5
England & Wales	283	26	11	10	4	2		9	9	4	6	27	4
Finland	278	55	20	6	4	2		6	4		4	14	
France	125	34	24	9		1		6	8	1	7	15	1
Japan	67	39	15	10	9	6		25	9	4	7	33	1
Netherlands	243	31	14	8	2	1		8	6		3	31	4
Northern Ireland	75	21	12	22	7	4		14	7	10	15	9	1
Poland	395	54	15	19	3	2		31	25	10	14	3	1
Portugal	143	31	11	7	1	4		15	8	4	7	17	
Scotland	227	30	13	4	4	1	1	6	5	4	6	35	4
Sweden	251	32	18	18	1	3		10	11	3	5	14	2
Switzerland	479	41	14	12		1		10	5	3	6	10	5
USA	107	24	12	14	10	4		9	9	10	4	24	1
All countries	4,133	36	16	12	4	3	0	13	10	4	7	21	2

<sup>1</sup> Multiple answers were allowed, so percentages may add up to more than 100%. Based on last incident not reported over the previous five years.

Table 13 Reasons for reporting to the police, based on five crimes: 2000 ICVS 1, 2

	N	To recover property %	Insurance reasons %	Should be / serious %	Retribution %	To stop it %	To get help %	Compen- sation %	Other reasons %	Don't know %
Australia	701	28	12	24	11	19	8		22	6
Belgium	575	44	44	79	71	72	36	39	11	1
Canada	545	20	19	36	17	11	10	1	36	
Catalonia (Spain)	405	47	29	39	17	19	7	1	3	
Denmark	621	27	47	30	24	17	10	10	13	
England & Wales	681	21	24	39	23	19	9	2	22	1
Finland	226	22	25	22	32	14	11	3	3	
France	221	28	43	12	32	21	8	2	9	
Japan	118	31	2	58	64	55	12	5	5	
Netherlands	562	19	33	24	33	12	5	3	12	
Northern Ireland	242	27	16	36	40	35	15	4	8	
Poland	727	54	17	64	66	55	30	18	3	
Portugal	254	51	11	49	27	14	5	2	2	
Scotland	480	20	17	36	26	20	8	3	20	3
Sweden	472	27	52	37	35	21	8	3	8	
Switzerland <sup>3</sup>	544	18	35	21	25	23	7	9	3	2
USA	250	25	20	41	33	35	15	7	14	
All countries	7,452	30	27	39	35	28	12	7	12	2

1 The five crimes are: theft from car, burglary with entry, robbery, sexual incidents and assaults & threats. Based on last incident reported over the previous five years.

2 Multiple answers were allowed, so percentages may add up to more than 100%.

3 Figures for Switzerland are based on four crimes (thefts from car are omitted).

Table 14 Reasons for reporting to the police for burglary with entry and thefts from cars: 2000 ICVS<sup>1</sup>

	N	To recover property %	Insurance reasons %	Should be / serious %	Retribution %	To stop it %	To get help %	Compen- sation %	Other reasons %	Don't know %
Australia	454	40	17	27	13	18	0	1	14	5
Belgium	446	52	51	80	72	71	35	43	9	1
Canada	380	27	27	38	15	6	5	1	31	
Catalonia (Spain)	297	49	35	39	13	16	6	1	3	
Denmark	467	33	59	28	19	13	6	7	10	
England & Wales	487	26	33	42	22	14	7	3	19	2
Finland	130	30	41	20	23	6	4	4	2	
France	160	31	55	11	25	12	7	2	8	
Japan	99	34	3	61	66	56	6	5	6	
Netherlands	394	23	43	25	25	10	4	2	12	
Northern Ireland	153	37	25	36	35	31	8		7	
Poland	519	68	21	68	66	49	25	20	3	
Portugal	182	56	14	53	28	11	2	1	2	
Scotland	309	30	26	36	22	14	6	2	16	4
Sweden	331	33	70	37	28	13	6	3	6	
Switzerland 3	319	24	52	19	25	17	5	9	3	2
USA	146	38	31	44	29	27	9	11	12	
All countries	5,272	37	36	39	31	23	8	7	10	3

1 The two crimes are: theft from car and burglary with entry. Based on last incident reported over the previous five years.

2 Multiple answers were allowed, so percentages may add up to more than 100%.

3 Figures for Switzerland based on burglary with entry only.

Table 15 Reasons for reporting to the police, for robbery, sexual incidents and assaults and threats: 2000 ICVS<sup>1, 2</sup>

	N	To recover property %	Insurance reasons %	Should be / serious %	Retribution %	To stop it %	To get help %	Compen- sation %	Other reasons %	Don't know %
Australia	245	6	3	17	8	22	23	0	36	7
Belgium	129	15	19	76	68	75	41	23	17	
Canada	165	4	2	33	21	20	21	1	48	
Catalonia (Spain)	108	41	14	39	30	26	10	2	5	
Denmark	153	8	9	36	38	29	24	17	19	
England & Wales	194	8	2	30	27	31	13	1	32	
Finland	96	11	2	23	46	25	21	2	5	
France	61	20	10	17	50	45	9	4	10	
Japan	15	16	0	52	69	69	57	6		
Netherlands	168	9	8	24	52	18	6	5	10	
Northern Ireland	89	10	1	37	47	42	27	10	10	
Poland	208	19	6	54	68	70	44	13	3	
Portugal	73	36	2	40	24	21	10	3	3	
Scotland	171	4	1	35	34	30	12	4	28	
Sweden	140	13	10	38	49	40	13	2	12	
Switzerland	225	9	10	23	27	31	9	11	2	2
USA	103	7	4	37	40	45	24	2	16	
All countries	2306	16	8	40	46	43	23	8	16	7

1 The three crimes are: robbery, sexual incidents and assaults & threats. Based on last incident reported over the previous five years.

2 Multiple answers were allowed, so percentages may add up to more than 100%.

**Table 16 Percentage satisfied with police response on reporting: 1996 and 2000 ICVS<sup>1, 2</sup>**

		Theft from car	Burglary with entry	Robbery	Assault & threats	All five crimes <sup>1</sup>
Australia	2000	70	75	58	69	71
Austria	1996	59	46	[49]	49	53
Belgium	2000	58	69	42	67	62
Canada	1996	72	77	62	70	73
	2000	71	71	63	74	71
Catalonia (Spain)	2000	81	61	77	71	75
Denmark	2000	74	87	77	56	77
England & Wales	1996	73	75	69	67	72
	2000	63	76	57	60	66
Finland	1996	78	74	63	81	77
	2000	72	77	80	73	74
France	1996	56	62	44	59	56
	2000	40	52	[65]	57	47
Japan	2000	37	57	[32]	[26]	45
Netherlands	1996	72	79	72	58	71
	2000	71	74	73	61	70
Northern Ireland	1996	61	64	[47]	56	60
	2000	75	64	[90]	64	69
Poland	1996	33	34	28	40	34
	2000	35	40	41	47	39
Portugal	2000	33	27	38	27	31
Scotland	1996	77	74	76	70	75
	2000	69	80	67	74	73
Sweden	1996	74	75	[71]	72	74
	2000	71	69	79	73	71
Switzerland	1996	72	61	[48]	49	64
	2000	na	75	47	70	70
USA	1996	65	69	49	73	67
	2000	65	74	49	68	65
All countries <sup>3</sup>	1996	66	66	56	62	65
	2000	58	66	59	61	63

1 Sexual incidents are omitted because of very low number of cases (less than 20 per country). They are included in the total for five crimes. For all countries together there were 148 reports to the police for sexual incidents; 58% of victims were satisfied.

2 Figures in square brackets are based on less than 20 reported offences.

3 Averages are based on all countries taking part in each sweep. As countries included vary across sweeps, comparisons should be made cautiously.

Table 17 Reasons for dissatisfaction with the police after reporting (percentages): 2000 ICVS 1, 2

	N	Did not do enough	Were not interested	Did not find offender	Did not recover goods	Gave no information	Impolite	Were slow to arrive	Other	Don't know
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Australia	164	30	17	14	1	8	10	13	37	2
Belgium	195	70	51	47	35	52	16	23	23	
Canada	144	49	27	16	12	7	19	6	47	1
Catalonia (Spain)	82	36	38	18	20	5	21	3	6	
Denmark	128	56	37	13	4	9	19	9	21	1
England & Wales	208	37	41	14	9	8	4	8	37	1
Finland	54	43	44	22	13		10	9	15	
France	98	37	28	12	23	7	18	10	13	
Japan	47	44	21	47	29	32	32	7	21	
Netherlands	143	34	14	8	9	12	13	9	29	1
Northern Ireland	67	47	38	16	15	22	14	17	8	
Poland	392	59	31	64	51	18	15	19	10	
Portugal	164	62	31	31	25	9	4	5	6	
Scotland	122	45	32	12	14	17	17	7	35	
Sweden	108	53	37	15	13	9	20	27	10	
Switzerland 3	125	56	43	8	7	7	9	9	13	1
USA	79	38	43	17	20	24	15	10	19	1
All countries	2,154	48	36	22	17	15	14	11	20	<1

1 Based on theft from cars, burglary with entry, robbery, sexual incidents and assaults & threats. Based on last incident over the previous five years.

2 Multiple responses were allowed, so percentages add up to more than 100%.

3 Reasons for dissatisfaction when reporting thefts from car was not asked in Switzerland.

**Table 18 Percentage of victims who received help from a specialised agency: 1996 and 2000 ICVS<sup>1</sup>**

		Burglary with entry		Robbery		Sexual incidents		Assaults and threats	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Australia	2000	236	3	45	8	19	22	181	5
Austria	1996	31	6	10	0	6	0	20	16
Belgium	2000	214	3	35	1	8	16	86	9
Canada	1996	184	3	36	16	18	31	109	11
	2000	157	3	26	10	17	55	123	19
Catalonia (Spain)	2000	64	7	73	2	5	6	29	5
Denmark	2000	251	1	49	21	16	30	94	16
England & Wales	1996	237	21	37	19	13	36	107	15
	2000	220	16	44	23	8	35	141	18
Finland	1996	75	4	70	8	145	6	383	6
	2000	28	0	48	2	83	1	243	3
France	1996	78	0	23	0	5	21	35	12
	2000	49	0	13	10	4	0	93	2
Japan	2000	53	0	5	0	4	0	10	0
Netherlands	1996	168	6	35	7	12	48	90	13
	2000	164	9	44	21	15	45	141	11
Northern Ireland	1996	46	11	14	8	7	0	42	14
	2000	73	18	12	6	4	46	74	24
Poland <sup>2</sup>	1996	184	4	135	4	68	0	275	3
	2000	na	na	195	6	45	5	359	3
Portugal	2000	69	0	41	1	5	0	55	0
Scotland	1996	165	11	25	16	12	28	112	5
	2000	114	12	30	10	8	21	133	12
Sweden	1996	33	1	15	24	4	19	32	20
	2000	77	5	33	23	9	22	98	14
Switzerland <sup>2</sup>	1996	52	5	6	47	8	7	23	0
	2000	na							
USA	1996	69	0	24	27	12	20	74	14
	2000	52	5	20	9	6	52	77	9
All countries	1996	1,363	8	447	10	326	11	1,390	9
	2000	1,821	5	712	10	256	22	1,936	9

1 Based on those who reported to the police. N is the number of crimes about which the question was asked. Based on last incident over the previous five years.

2 Results for burglary with entry for Poland are not available for 2000. Results for Switzerland are not available for 2000.

**Table 19** Percentage of victims who would have appreciated receiving help from a specialised agency: 1996 and 2000 ICVS<sup>1</sup>

		Burglary with entry		Robbery		Sexual incidents		Assaults and threats	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Australia	2000	230	21	41	38	15	43	171	31
Austria	1996	29	35	10	37	6	23	17	48
Belgium	2000	209	22	35	41	6	47	78	30
Canada	1996	178	21	31	46	12	72	97	44
	2000	153	30	23	35	8	43	99	30
Catalonia (Spain)	2000	59	49	71	61	5	73	28	53
Denmark	2000	248	26	39	49	11	57	78	33
England & Wales	1996	185	40	30	36	8	23	91	44
	2000	183	29	34	28	5	100	116	35
Finland	1996	72	45	64	36	136	33	359	36
	2000	28	35	47	30	80	36	236	37
France	1996	78	33	23	14	4	0	30	24
	2000	49	14	12	29	4	29	91	23
Japan	2000	53	39	5	18	4	61	10	58
Netherlands	1996	158	17	33	23	6	100	78	26
	2000	150	13	35	22	8	15	125	24
Northern Ireland	1996	41	33	13	47	7	69	36	49
	2000	60	41	11	51	2	0	56	45
Poland <sup>2</sup>	1996	180	48	129	58	68	46	269	54
	2000	na	na	183	51	43	49	350	50
Portugal	2000	69	52	40	38	5	100	55	52
Scotland	1996	147	36	21	38	8	31	106	33
	2000	100	36	27	19	7	85	117	36
Sweden	1996	32	41	11	26	3	32	25	54
	2000	74	29	25	30	7	19	85	30
Switzerland <sup>2</sup>	1996	50	24	3	19	8	55	23	44
	2000							15	81
USA	1996	69	43	18	31	10	63	63	34
	2000	48	33	19	20	3	100	70	40
All countries	1996	1,256	35	399	42	290	43	1,269	43
	2000	1,711	31	647	35	214	54	1,766	38

1 Based on those who reported to the police and did not receive any help. N is the number of crimes about which they question was asked. Based on last incident over the previous five years.

2 Results for burglary with entry for Poland are not available for 2000. Results for Switzerland are not available for 2000.

**Table 20** Percentage thinking the police do a good job in controlling crime in their area<sup>1</sup>

		Yes	No	Don't know
Australia	1989	73	13	14
	1992	72	13	14
	2000	76	13	11
Austria	1996	76	13	11
Belgium	1989	53	22	24
	1992	47	25	27
	2000	64	26	10
Canada	1989	89	11	
	1992	82	12	6
	1996	80	10	10
	2000	87	7	5
Catalonia (Spain)	2000	53	27	20
Denmark	2000	71	11	18
England & Wales	1989	70	16	14
	1992	66	21	13
	1996	68	20	12
	2000	72	17	11
Finland	1989	64	18	18
	1992	53	23	24
	1996	55	24	22
	2000	70	22	8
France	1989	62	21	18
	1996	56	18	27
	2000	65	16	19
Germany (West)	1989	67	24	9
Italy	1992	50	40	10
Japan <sup>2</sup>	1989	59	36	6
	1992	na		
	2000	54	30	17
Netherlands	1989	58	20	22
	1992	50	24	27
	1996	45	26	29
	2000	52	23	26
New Zealand	1992	79	10	11
Northern Ireland	1989	63	21	16
	1996	63	20	17
	2000	67	21	11
Norway	1989	70	13	17
Poland	1992	37	63	
	1996	27	43	30
	2000	46	51	4

Table 20 (continued)

		Yes	No	Don't know
Portugal	2000	45	47	7
Scotland	1989	71	16	13
	1996	69	21	9
	2000	77	16	6
Spain	1989	53	29	18
Sweden	1992	58	20	22
	1996	61	14	25
	2000	61	22	17
Switzerland	1989	50	11	39
	1996	55	21	24
	2000	67	14	18
USA <sup>2</sup>	1989	80	17	2
	1992	na		
	1996	77	18	6
	2000	89	7	4
All countries <sup>3</sup>	1989	66	19	15
	1992	60	24	16
	1996	58	22	20
	2000	66	22	12

1 'Yes' are those who said 'very good' and 'good' job.

2 Results not available for Japan and the USA (1992).

3 Averages are based on all countries taking part in each sweep. As countries included vary across sweeps, comparisons should be made cautiously.

**Table 21** Percentage thinking the police do a good job in controlling crime in their areas; 2000 ICVS

	How good a job do you think the police in your area?				
	Very good job	Fairly good job	Fairly poor job	Very poor job	Don't know
Australia	18	58	10	3	11
Belgium	7	57	19	7	10
Canada	30	58	6	1	5
Catalonia (Spain)	18	59	11	5	6
Denmark	14	39	19	7	20
England & Wales	25	46	9	2	18
Finland	15	57	12	5	11
France	15	55	19	3	8
Japan	10	54	12	5	19
Netherlands	6	48	25	5	17
Northern Ireland	5	46	18	5	26
Poland	16	52	12	9	11
Portugal	2	44	42	9	4
Scotland	5	40	35	13	7
Sweden	13	48	17	5	17
Switzerland	19	48	11	4	18
USA	40	49	5	2	4
All countries	15	50	17	5	12

Table 22 Percentage thinking that the police are helpful; 2000 ICVS

	How good a job do you think the police in your area?				
	Very good job	Fairly good job	Fairly poor job	Very poor job	Don't know
Australia	25	55	12	2	5
Belgium	15	49	22	5	8
Canada	37	51	7	1	4
Catalonia (Spain)	26	51	13	4	6
Denmark	31	33	10	5	21
England & Wales	40	37	6	2	15
Finland	24	50	13	5	8
France	38	47	12	2	1
Japan	24	49	14	7	7
Netherlands	10	49	16	4	21
Northern Ireland	8	35	22	5	29
Poland	26	46	10	7	11
Portugal	5	47	36	10	2
Scotland	13	52	22	8	6
Sweden	40	44	7		9
Switzerland	20	46	18	6	10
USA	37	51	6	2	4
All countries	25	47	15	4	10

Table 23 Perception of the risk of burglary in the coming year (percentages)

		Very likely	Likely	Not very likely	Don't know
Australia	1989	11	32	50	6
	1992	13	34	46	7
	2000	9	28	57	7
Austria	1996	1	12	82	5
Belgium	1989	5	23	56	15
	1992	2	20	44	25
	2000	10	35	48	6
Canada	1989	5	28	67	
	1992	6	28	63	4
	1996	5	25	64	6
	2000	5	25	66	5
Catalonia (Spain)	2000	1	31	61	13
Denmark	2000	3	17	75	5
England & Wales	1989	7	28	55	9
	1992	10	35	47	8
	1996	10	32	52	7
	2000	6	27	58	9
Finland	1989	<1	8	85	7
	1992	1	13	79	7
	1996	1	10	86	3
	2000	1	13	84	2
France	1989	5	30	54	10
	1996	6	47	38	9
	2000	3	42	43	12
Germany (West)	1989	5	50	45	<1
Italy	1992	4	34	46	15
Japan <sup>1</sup>	1989	2	23	74	1
	1992	na			
	2000	3	42	43	12
Netherlands	1989	5	23	58	13
	1992	5	23	55	16
	1996	5	22	57	17
	2000	3	15	62	19
New Zealand	1992	113	41	42	5
Northern Ireland	1989	3	20	66	11
	1996	5	24	65	6
	2000	3	23	62	12
Norway	1989	2	19	68	11

Table 23 (continued)

		Very likely	Likely	Not very likely	Don't know
Poland	1992	6	34	60	
	1996	3	21	61	14
	2000	3	22	60	15
Portugal	2000	4	54	42	
Scotland	1989	5	25	59	11
	1996	3	23	67	6
	2000	4	19	71	7
Spain	1989	6	36	41	17
Sweden	1992	3	31	61	5
	1996	1	14	78	7
	2000	1	15	79	6
Switzerland	1989	2	44	49	5
	1996	3	26	66	5
	2000	4	23	64	9
USA <sup>1</sup>	1989	7	25	67	2
	1992	na			
	1996	4	19	71	6
	2000	3	13	78	5
All countries <sup>2</sup>	1989	5	28	60	8
	1992	6	30	54	9
	1996	4	23	65	9
	2000	4	27	60	9

1 Data from Japan (1992) and USA (1992) are not available.

2 Averages are based on all countries taking part in each sweep. As countries included vary across sweeps, comparisons should be made cautiously.

**Table 24** Feelings of safety when walking alone after dark in the area (percentages), and mean score: 1992, 1996 and 2000 ICVS<sup>1</sup>

		Very safe	Fairly safe	Bit unsafe	Very unsafe	Unknown	Never go out in evening	Mean
Australia	1992	28	41	17	14	<1		2.17
	2000	24	40	21	14	2		2.25
Austria	1996	45	33	16	4	2		1.84
Belgium	1992	38	42	14	5	<1		1.87
	2000	38	39	14	7	1		1.89
Canada	1992	41	37	13	7	2		1.91
	1996	34	39	17	8	1		2.02
	2000	42	40	11	5	<1	1	1.78
Catalonia (Spain)	2000	25	40	29	6	<1	<1	2.17
Denmark	2000	54	27	13	5	<1	1	1.67
England & Wales	1992	25	42	20	13	<1		2.21
	1996	20	45	22	11	2		2.30
	2000	25	45	18	8	2	2	2.10
Finland	1992	48	35	13	4	<1		1.75
	1996	44	38	14	3	1		1.78
	2000	44	37	15	3	1		1.77
France	1996	37	43	14	7	<1		1.90
	2000	44	33	14	8	<1	1	1.85
Italy	1992	28	37	22	14	<1		2.21
Japan	2000	13	65	20	3	<1		2.12
Netherlands	1992	38	40	14	7	<1		1.91
	1996	40	39	13	7	<1		1.88
	2000	40	41	13	5	<1	<1	1.83
New Zealand	1992	24	38	22	17	<1		2.31
Northern Ireland	1996	39	39	15	7	<1		1.91
	2000	31	45	15	7	<1	1	1.99
Poland	1992	17	39	33	10	<1		2.36
	1996	17	47	27	7	3		2.25
	2000	13	51	26	8	2	<1	2.29
Portugal	2000	21	51	21	6	<1	<1	2.12
Scotland	1996	24	48	18	8	2		2.18
	2000	31	46	14	6	1	2	1.94

Table 24 (continued)

		Very safe	Fairly safe	Bit unsafe	Very unsafe	Unknown	Never go out in evening	Mean
Sweden	1992	48	38	9	4	<1		1.70
	1996	53	34	9	2	2		1.67
	2000	50	35	11	3	1	<1	1.68
Switzerland	1996	45	36	13	4	2		1.83
	2000	45	32	12	10	<1	<1	1.87
USA	1996	40	35	15	10	<1		1.95
	2000	46	36	10	4	3	1	1.72
All countries <sup>2</sup>	1992	34	39	18	10	<1		2.04
	1996	37	39	16	7	1		1.96
	2000	34	41	16	6	1	1	1.94

1 The mean scores are based on a four-point scale (very safe=1, very unsafe=4), (unknown and never go out in the evening are omitted).

2 Averages are based on all countries taking part in each sweep. As countries included vary across sweeps, comparisons should be made cautiously.



**Table 25** Feelings of safety when at home alone after dark, and mean score: 2000 ICVS<sup>1</sup>

	Very safe	Fairly safe	Bit unsafe	Very unsafe	Don't know	Mean
Australia	52	38	8	2	<1	2.11
Belgium	57	34	7	2	1	1.53
Canada	66	30	3	1	<1	1.39
Catalonia (Spain)	60	33	5	1	<1	1.47
Denmark	84	13	2	<1		1.19
England & Wales	59	34	5	1	1	1.48
Finland	78	19	3	<1	<1	1.26
France	63	31	5	2		1.45
Japan	25	66	8	1	<1	1.85
Netherlands	72	24	4	1		1.33
Northern Ireland	58	36	5	1		1.49
Poland	28	56	13	2	1	1.89
Portugal	39	51	8	2		1.73
Scotland	64	32	3	<1	<1	1.39
Sweden	73	22	4	<1	<1	1.31
Switzerland	na					
USA	71	24	3	1	1	1.34
All countries	60	34	5	1	0	1.47

1 The mean scores are based on a four point scale (very safe=1, very unsafe=4, unknown is omitted)

Table 26 Measures taken against burglary (percentages): 1992, 1996 and 2000 ICVS

		Burglar alarm	Special door locks	Window grilles	Watch dog	High fence	Caretaker/security guard	Watch scheme <sup>1</sup>	Refused
Australia	1992	14	60	33	40	25	3	na	2
	2000	26	67	43	44	31	4	4	4
Austria	1996	6	37	12	15	7	1	2	4
	1992	12	25	4	16	4	2	na	8
Belgium	2000	21	50	15	27	22	10	19	4
	1992	13	42	25	25	14	9	na	8
Canada	1996	20	52	21	30	20	10	34	8
	2000	23	53	20	31	20	10	29	2
	2000	9	38	14	10	6	1	1	4
Denmark	2000	7	21	3	19	3	1	14	1
England & Wales	1992	22	68	27	30	38	2	na	2
	1996	27	68	27	28	43	3	48	3
	2000	34	69	30	23	36	4	41	4
	1992	1	20	1	12	3	11	na	1
Finland <sup>2</sup>	1996	2	na	na	5	14	4	na	na
	2000	4	37	9	17	6	11	4	
	1996	15	34	14	24	15	11	43	3
France	2000	13	40	18	25	19	12	7	4
	2000	3	10	5	17	2	4		
Italy	1992	13	36	11	12	4	5	na	1
Netherlands	1992	8	59	15	15	9	4	na	1
	1996	10	68	11	17	13	8	8	2
	2000	11	70	14	15	14	6	11	2
New Zealand	1992	10	43	13	32	23	1	na	1
Northern Ireland	1996	11	35	12	25	16	0	2	1
	2000	16	40	20	25	19	1	1	1

Poland	1992	1	16	4	48	12	1	na	na
	1996	1	15	3	37	4	<1	11	<1
	2000	2	17	2	26	4	1	2	3
Portugal	2000	8	36	9	9	3	1	1	1
	1996	25	62	21	25	31	2	28	2
Scotland	2000	26	65	27	24	23	2	30	2
	1992	5	44	5	4	1	4	na	1
Sweden	1996	7	38	7	13	2	1	6	1
	2000	10	43	7	16	2	2	3	2
	1996	5	29	11	16	1	5	4	2
Switzerland <sup>3</sup>	2000	na							
USA <sup>3</sup>	1992	na							
	1996	21	58	21	39	15	7	38	5
	2000	24	53	21	36	16	7	29	10
	1992	10	41	14	23	13	4	na	2
All countries <sup>4</sup>	1996	13	41	13	23	15	4	19	3
	2000	15	44	16	23	14	5	12	3

1 The question about formal neighbourhood watch schemes was not asked in 1992.

2 Some data for Finland (1996) are not available.

3 Data for Switzerland (2000) and USA (1992) are not available.

4 Averages are based on all countries taking part in each sweep. As countries included vary across sweeps, comparisons should be made cautiously.

Table 27 Sentence preferences for a young recidivist burglar (percentages)

		Sentence preferences						Length of imprisonment <sup>1</sup>	
		Fine %	Prison %	Community service %	Suspended sentence %	Other sentence %	Don't know %	Months	SD <sup>2</sup>
Australia	1989	8.5	35.6	45.7	2.9	3.4	3.8	17	27
	1992	7.7	34.0	48.0	4.0	3.7	2.7	17	25
	2000	8.3	37.4	35.2	10.5	3.6	5.0	15	30
Austria	1996	13.8	9.8	62.4	8.0	2.0	3.9	10	18
Belgium	1989	13.2	25.5	37.7	10.2	4.7	8.7	24	59
	1992	12.0	18.7	55.2	3.8	3.3	7.0	19	42
	2000	11.4	20.5	56.7	4.9	3.3	3.1	17	41
Canada	1989	10.6	32.4	39.3	10.3	5.1	2.3	14	24
	1992	9.6	38.9	30.3	9.8	6.9	4.5	15	26
	1996	7.8	43.3	29.8	8.4	7.3	3.5	-	-
	2000	9.4	44.6	32.3	3.5	7.0	3.2	23	38
Catalonia (Spain)	2000	15.4	6.9	65.3	0.9	2.5	8.9	23	54
Denmark	2000	9.1	19.5	49.7	13.4	4.0	4.3	7	17
England & Wales	1989	11.4	38.2	37.5	4.8	3.0	5.2	20	35
	1992	8.9	37.3	40.2	6.5	3.2	3.9	22	33
	1996	8.1	49.0	29.1	5.8	4.9	3.1	24	35
	2000	6.9	51.0	28.4	5.0	4.0	4.6	24	38
Finland	1989	18.9	15.0	36.7	21.6	4.6	3.1	15	35
	1992	13.1	13.9	55.2	11.1	3.1	3.6	11	24
	1996	14.7	17.5	48.8	13.4	3.5	2.1	10	23
	2000	15.0	18.8	46.4	15.7	2.3	1.7	8	11
France	1989	10.3	12.8	53.1	14.3	3.0	6.5	11	39
	1996	9.1	10.7	68.3	5.5	1.8	4.4	9	18
	2000	7.5	11.9	68.5	5.1	2.4	4.5	14	35
Germany (West)	1989	8.8	13.0	60.0	12.3	1.8	4.0	11	23
Italy	1992	9.6	22.4	46.5	3.6	5.4	12.5	30	62
Japan	2000	16.9	51.0	18.9	0.7	0.0	12.6	20	38

Netherlands	1989	9.2	25.6	45.9	6.5	7.0	5.7	13	22
	1992	9.4	25.9	47.6	7.9	4.4	4.8	15	32
	1996	9.4	31.2	41.8	9.2	3.9	4.6	19	43
	2000	10.9	37.4	30.3	10.2	4.7	6.4	19	38
New Zealand	1992	9.6	25.6	50.6	3.3	7.0	3.9	17	35
	1989	9.0	45.4	30.2	7.9	1.6	6.1	23	38
Northern Ireland	1996	14.7	48.7	28.2	3.8	1.6	3.0	18	20
	2000	7.7	53.9	29.5	4.3	1.9	2.7	21	23
	1989	23.0	13.8	47.0	5.3	3.5	7.5	10	15
Norway	1992	13.5	31.1	47.8	5.2	2.3		35	45
	1996	10.2	16.5	58.7	6.7	3.4	4.4	25	26
Poland	2000	10.3	21.1	54.8	5.7	3.6	4.6	31	44
	2000	9.4	25.7	54.2	0.9	6.1	3.7	23	24
Portugal	1989	14.4	39.0	33.5	3.6	3.2	6.3	19	41
	1996	12.8	48.4	27.1	4.5	3.8	3.3	19	31
	2000	10.9	52.3	24.3	4.7	4.0	3.7	21	35
	2000	23.1	26.6	24.4	1.0	7.9	17.0	36	79
Spain	1989	14.1	26.2	47.4	5.2	3.3	3.7	12	29
	1996	12.7	22.1	50.4	6.1	3.8	5.0	18	53
	2000	11.2	30.7	47.3	4.2	2.8	3.8	11	29
	2000	11.6	8.6	56.7	12.0	5.9	5.3	6	12
Switzerland	1989	10.2	9.4	61.0	12.8	3.5	3.2	6	5
	1996	8.2	52.7	29.6	2.0	4.9	2.7	38	55
USA	1996	8.0	56.2	23.0	1.2	7.4	4.2	36	57
	2000	9.4	55.9	19.6	1.1	7.8	6.3	31	48
	2000	12.9	27.4	41.2	8.2	4.3	6.0	18	36
All countries <sup>3</sup>	1989	10.8	27.4	46.9	6.0	4.3	4.7	19	35
	1996	11.0	30.2	44.1	7.1	3.9	3.7	18	30
	2000	10.6	33.7	41.3	5.7	3.7	5.0	19	34
	2000	10.6	33.7	41.3	5.7	3.7	5.0	19	34

1 Asked if a prison sentence was recommended.

2 Standard deviations are based on average months in prison.

3 Averages are based on all countries taking part in each sweep. As countries included vary across sweeps, comparisons should be made cautiously.

**Table 28 Reactions to crime, by victimisation experience: 2000 ICVS**

	% Perceiving a burglary as likely <sup>1</sup>				% Feeling unsafe walking alone after dark <sup>2</sup>			
	<b>Victim of burglary</b>				<b>Victim of violence</b>			
	Not in last 5 years	2-5 years ago	Once in 1999	More than once, 1999	Not in last 5 years	2-5 years ago	Once in 1999	More than once 1999
Australia	37	47	49	68	33	42	35	35
Belgium	46	69	65	59	21	30	21	18
Canada	28	48	49	71	15	26	16	20
Catalonia (Spain)	35	43	62	80	34	47	35	46
Denmark	20	34	36	57	16	28	17	17
England & Wales	34	41	52	82	25	37	26	29
Finland	13	24	29	54	18	25	18	25
France	50	57	35	58	19	33	21	42
Japan	37	71	64	89	22	43	22	70
Netherlands	21	46	45	49	17	28	18	28
Northern Ireland	27	57	75	64	21	48	22	30
Poland	28	53	48	75	33	47	34	45
Portugal	56	77	82	75	25	47	27	55
Scotland	22	40	57	75	19	26	20	30
Sweden	15	39	34	14	14	19	14	28
Switzerland	25	39	41	80	22	24	22	28
USA	15	26	37	82	14	19	15	16
All countries	30	48	51	66	22	34	23	33

1 'Very likely' and 'fairly likely':

2 'Very unsafe' or 'a bit unsafe':

Table 28 (continued)

	% Feeling unsafe alone at home after dark <sup>2</sup>				% In favour of imprisonment for burglar			
	<b>Victim of burglary</b>				<b>Victim of burglary</b>			
	Not in last 5 years	2-5 years ago	Once in 1999	More than once, 1999	Not in last 5 years	2-5 years ago	Once in 1999	More than once, 1999
Australia	8	10	22	28	38	33	43	36
Belgium	8	16	15	13	21	22	16	16
Canada	4	10	10	20	44	43	50	57
Catalonia (Spain)	6	10	10	10	7	8		
Denmark	3	6	1	24	19	21	27	15
England & Wales	5	13	8	24	50	52	56	69
Finland	3	12		24	19	17	26	38
France	6	4	20		12	16	13	28
Japan	8	23	26	27	50	68	55	58
Netherlands	4	3	8	17	38	34	40	32
Northern Ireland	6	15	14		54	66	46	64
Poland	14	28	27	18	21	17	22	23
Portugal	9	22	21	34	26	20	34	34
Scotland	3	3	12	30	53	54	42	43
Sweden	4	4	3	13	30	36	42	33
USA	4	7	20	15	56	52	74	57
All countries	6	12	15	21	34	35	39	40

1 'Very likely' and 'fairly likely'.

2 'Very unsafe' or 'a bit unsafe'.



### Selected list of publications on the ICVS

**Alvazzi del Frate, A.**

*Victims of Crime in the Developing World*

Rome, UNICRI, 1998

UNICRI publication, no. 57

**Alvazzi del Frate, A.,**

**U. Zvekic, J.J.M. van Dijk (Eds.)**

*Understanding Crime: experiences of crime and crime control*

Rome, UNICRI, 1993

UNICRI publication, no. 49

**Block, R.**

Measuring victimisation risk: the effects of methodology, sampling, and fielding'

In: A. Alvazzi del Frate, U. Zvekic,

J.J.M. van Dijk (Eds.), *Understanding*

*Crime: experiences of crime and crime control*

Rome, UNICRI, 1993, pp. 163-174

UNICRI publication, no. 49

**Hatalak O., A. Alvazzi del Frate,**

**U. Zvekic (Eds.)**

*The International Crime Victim Survey in Countries in Transition: National Reports*

Rome, UNICRI, 1998

UNICRI publication, no. 62

**Hatalak O., A. Alvazzi del Frate,**

**U. Zvekic (Eds.)**

*Surveying Crime: A Global Approach*

Rome, ISTAT/UNICRI, 2000

**Kury, H. M. Würger**

The influence of the type of data collection method on the results of the victim surveys. In: A. Alvazzi del Frate, U. Zvekic, J.J.M. van Dijk (Eds.),

*Understanding Crime: experiences of*

*crime and crime control*

Rome, UNICRI, 1993, pp. 137-152

UNICRI publication, no. 49

**Kury, H. F.J. Obergefell, M.Wunger**

The regional distribution of crime: results from different countries

*Studies on Crime and Crime Prevention,*

vol. 5, no. 1, 1996, pp. 5-29

**Mayhew, P.**

Research issues in relation to the International Crime Survey. In: A. Alvazzi del Frate, U. Zvekic, J.J.M. Van Dijk (Eds.), *Understanding Crime: experiences of crime and crime control*

Rome, UNICRI, 1993

UNICRI publication, no. 49

**Mayhew, P.**

*The 1996 International Crime Victimisation Survey: a UK perspective*

London, Home Office, 1997

Research Findings, no. 57

**Mayhew, P., J.J.M. van Dijk**

*Criminal Victimisation in Eleven Industrialised Countries: key findings from the 1996 International Crime Victims Survey*

The Hague, Ministry of Justice, Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek- en Documentatiecentrum, 1997

Onderzoek en beleid, no. 162

**Skogan, W.G.**

Reactions to crime in cross-national perspective'. In: A. Alvazzi del Frate, U. Zvekic, J.J.M. van Dijk (Eds.),

*Understanding Crime: experiences of*

*crime and crime control*

Rome, UNICRI, 1993

UNICRI publication, no. 49

**Takasugi, Fumiko**

The present and future of Japan's crime: from a structural analysis of victimization rates. In: G. Kaiser, H. Kury, H.-J. Albrecht (Eds.), *Victims and Criminal Justice: Victimological Research: stocktaking and prospects*

Freiburg, Max-Planck-Institut, 1991,

pp. 469-510

**Van Dijk, J.J.M.**

On the uses of local, national and international crime surveys. In: G. Kaiser, G., Kury, H. and Albrecht, H.J. (Eds.), *Victims and Criminal Justice: Victimological Research: stocktaking and prospects*

Freiburg, Max-Planck-Institut, 1991

**Van Dijk, J.J.M.**

Understanding crime rates: On the interactions between the rational choices of victims and offenders

*British Journal of Criminology*, vol. 34, no. 2, 1994, pp. 105-121

**Van Dijk, J.J.M.**

Opportunities for Crime: a test of the rational/interactionist model. Paper presented on *Symposium in Economics and Crime*, Strasbourg, Council of Europe, 1995

**Van Dijk, J.J.M., P. Mayhew**

*Criminal Victimization in the Industrialized World: key findings of the 1989 and 1992 International Crime Surveys*

The Hague, Ministry of Justice,

Department of Crime Prevention, 1992

**Van Dijk, J.J.M., J. Van Kesteren**

Criminal victimization in European cities: some results of the International Crime Victims Survey

*European Journal on Criminal Policy and Research*, vol. 4, no. 1, 1996, pp. 9-21

**Van Dijk, J.J.M., J. van Kesteren**

The prevalence and perceived seriousness of victimizations by crime: Some results of the International Crime Survey

*European Journal of Crime, Criminal Law and Criminal Justice*, vol. 4, no. 1, 1996, pp. 48-70

**Van Dijk, J.J.M., P. Mayhew, M. Killias**

*Experiences of Crime across the World: key findings from the 1989 International Crime Survey*

Deventer, Kluwer Law and Taxation, 1990

**Zvekic, U.**

*Criminal Victimization in Countries in Transition*

Rome: UNICRI, 1998

UNICRI publication, no. 61

**Zvekic, U., A. Alvazzi del Frate**

Victimisation in the developing world: an overview. In: A. Alvazzi del Frate, U. Zvekic, J.J.M. Van Dijk (Eds.), *Understanding Crime: experiences of crime and crime control*

Rome, UNICRI, 1993, pp. 51-86

UNICRI publication, no. 49

**Zvekic, U., A. Alvazzi del Frate, (Eds.)**

*Criminal Victimization in the Developing World*

Rome, UNICRI, 1995

UNICRI publication, no. 55