

BELGIUM

Tony Peters and Jacques Van Kerckvoorde¹

Introduction

This report presents the preliminary results of the Belgian component of the second International Crime Survey, which was carried out upon the initiative of Jan van Dijk (Ministry of Justice of the Netherlands), Patricia Mayhew (Home Office, United Kingdom) and Martin Killias (University of Lausanne, Switzerland).

A number of comments on the Belgian part of the first survey are published in a separate book². This report is limited to the second survey which was carried out in Belgium in early 1992.

The sample

Due to financial constraints, the survey had to be modest in cost terms and resulted in a gross nationwide sample of 4,909 telephone subscribers being called, which represented a reduction of 47.8% compared to the 1989 survey. Fortunately, on this occasion there was a smaller proportion of non-relevant contacts (33% instead of 41.2%). Also, the percentage of relevant but unsuccessful contacts (such as refusals and prematurely terminated contacts) dropped from 62.6% in 1989 to 54.9% in 1992 (Table 1).

In our comments on the results of the first International Crime Survey, we deplored the extremely low response rate. Compared to the very low percentage in 1989 (37.2%) a considerable increase of successful contacts were made in 1992, increasing to 45.1%. In the northern, Dutch-speaking part of the country the response rate was 46.6% against 41.9% in the French-speaking southern part. This increase in the rate may be the result of the introduction, in 1992, of a two-stage field work procedure, whereby all those respondents who, during the first stage, had refused to co-operate or ended the interview prematurely, as well as all "no answers", "busy calls" and "respondents not available", were called again three weeks later. Despite this new method, however, the response rate still proved to be far too low. Furthermore, the size of the group of respondents (N=1,485) was rather modest, and therefore insufficient to meet the requirements for a statistical elaboration with which to obtain a further differentiation.

Data collection technique

Interviewing was carried out using the computer assisted telephone interviewing (CATI) technique. Field work was sub-contracted by Inter/View BV, a Dutch

¹ Professors, Department of Criminal Law and Criminology, Catholic University of Leuven, Leuven, Belgium.

² Kellens, G., T. Peters and J. Van Kerckvoorde (forthcoming) A Belgian commentary on the International Crime Survey.

company appointed for the survey, to the interviewing company Marketing Unit. The interviewers all received (in groups) an oral briefing on the background and purposes of the survey, and in some cases these were also attended by a country representative (i.e. researcher). Before the interviewing commenced, the interviewers and their supervisor went through the entire questionnaire on a screen. Problems and difficulties were discussed and each interviewer received a written set of instructions on the use of the questionnaire. The first two interviews were also attended by the supervisor and subsequently evaluated.

Any problems, questions and comments were reported to the survey company supervisor and, whenever necessary, to the country representatives.

The field work started on 4 February 1992 and data collection was terminated on 5 May 1992. The questionnaire was administered in Dutch (58% of the completed interviews) and in French (42%), which reflects almost exactly the importance of each language group.

Some of the contacted people were suspicious of the research itself, others were worried about questions concerning their lifestyle (going out) and the possession of a burglar alarm. Some of them contacted a university representative before being interviewed, in order to gain reassurance about the *bona fide* of the survey. Unfortunately, some months before the interviewing began, newspaper articles and radio and television broadcasts had warned the public against the activities of an alleged *mala fide* marketing company, which interviewed people about their lifestyle with the corrupt aim of identifying the best moment for a successful burglary.

Data collection

The interviewing phase coincided with a period of mass media alarm over a crime wave resulting from the publication of some police statistics released at the end of January 1992. Furthermore, a case that received wide coverage by the media on the disappearance of two girls and their suspected sexual abuse and murder, provoked extreme sensitivity towards criminality as well as animated discussion on social reaction towards crime. At the end of 1991, national elections resulted in a marked loss of votes for the traditional political parties. This was interpreted as a sign of distrust and loosened ties between the population and its political leaders. Some of the results (e.g. attitude towards the police, fear of crime, attitudes towards punishment) may have been negatively influenced by these events and developments.

The least we can say is that interviewing for the second victim survey was carried out in a period characterised by sharp growing concern over the increase of crime and its control by an allegedly inadequate crime prevention policy and criminal justice system.

The prevalence of victimisation

The following paragraphs present a number of preliminary findings for the Belgian component of the International Crime Survey. It is important to note that for data elaboration purposes the results were weighted for the following variables: age and gender of the respondents, family size and regional distribution.

Victimisation rates in 1987-1991

First of all, the respondents were asked if they had been a victim of one of the crimes listed in the questionnaire, at least once during the last five years (between 1987 and 1991). This was not the case in 51.6% of the interviews. Of those who had experienced a victimisation, more than half (i.e. 55.4%) had been victimised once, whereas for 26.2% it had happened twice. Table 2 presents the different findings according to the type of crime.

As usual in this type of survey, car vandalism and ordinary types of theft (theft of bicycle, theft from car and personal theft) rank top on the list. When the analysis of crimes of theft is limited to the group of "owners only", the high percentage of theft of motorcycles is evident.

Crimes involving direct contact between the offender and victim (such as assault, robbery and most of the sexual offences), or which often entail an emotional shock (burglary), register relatively low scores. Comments and reservations concerning results in victim surveys related to sexual offences and to crime committed within the family are expressed elsewhere in the report³.

Victimisation in 1991

Table 2 also includes a separate column for all 1991 reported crimes. The total number of respondents remains the same as for the five-year (1987-1991) period (N=1,485). Although the percentages are of course lower, no fundamental changes were registered in ranking.

The number of cases of consumer fraud is an exception because the measurement of that type of victimisation is limited to one year (1991). Almost 9% of the respondents reported being a victim of this type of crime, which immediately brought it to the top of the victimisation list.

Compared with the European 1988 averages the 1991 figures generally place Belgium in a middle-range position for all crimes, with the exception of theft of motorcycle, which is well above average.

Given the limited number of moments of measurement, the rather small samples and the differences in weighting factors, it was not feasible to look for a pattern and therefore it will suffice to say that percentages remained more or less stable. Lower scores were clearly found for burglary, attempted burglary and personal theft whereas scores were higher for theft of car, theft from car and theft of motorcycle.

The increasing numbers of car theft correspond completely with figures provided by police data which are especially valid for this type of crime. On the other hand, the increase in the number of robberies registered by police statistics was by no means confirmed by the International Crime Survey.

The reporting of victimisation

³ Kellens et al., A Belgian..., op. cit.

Taking into account the different types of victimisation, respondents were asked whether they reported the last incident to the police. Table 3 shows the percentage of reported cases in decreasing order.

As usual the percentage of cases that are reported to the police varies greatly according to the type of victimisation. In general reporting to the police is strongly dependent on the seriousness of the incident. Theft of valuable goods and incidents that produce a strong emotional impact, such as burglary with entry, show a high reporting rate.

The lower percentage of reports of robbery requires further analysis since direct contact between offender and victim, as well as the possible implication of violence, would lead one to expect a much higher percentage. The reporting rate for violent and sexual offences is again very low. One reason for this may be the rather trivial nature of some of the incidents; another may be related to the direct relationship (partner, colleague, friend, member of the family) between the victim and the offender. This will be discussed in greater detail in a subsequent paragraph.

Reasons for not reporting

Table 4 shows that a rather high number of the victims of sexual offences did not judge the incident as being serious enough to be reported to the police. They very often felt that this type of incident was not the kind of problem to be dealt with by the police. In several cases other authorities or services were contacted, although it was not possible, in interview, to identify such authorities or services (which might include the family doctor or other medical services).

Great care must, of course, be taken in analysing reported crimes since the clusters of replies concerning reasons for not reporting are often too small to enable for a comparison of the percentages. In fact, some 400 reasons for not reporting to the police were provided (multiple answers were possible).

46.5% of the respondents referred to the limited seriousness of the incident as the reason for not reporting; 16.3% referred to the inability of the police to be able to do anything and in 7.8% of the cases it was stated that the police would not even want to do anything. In 6.5% of the cases the victim did not report the incident because it was felt inappropriate for police intervention.

Car vandalism in particular had a high non-reporting score that was related to the limited seriousness of the incident, whereas in the case of personal theft 18.5% of the reasons for not reporting referred to the inappropriateness of the case for police intervention.

Especially in cases of theft of bicycles, non-reporting was related to the fact that the police is considered unable (25.2%) or unwilling (18.1%) to act. Those incidents with a low non-reporting rate, such as car or motorcycle theft, were too limited to allow for further quantitative analysis.

The general attitude of respondents towards the police will be discussed later in the report.

Crime seriousness

Table 5 provides an overview of the respondents' evaluation of the seriousness of the last victimisation. In more than one-third of the cases (38%) the victim did not

consider the incident serious enough to be reported, whereas one out of four (26.6%) victims judged it to be very serious.

In cases of car vandalism the incident was often considered as not serious. This confirms the above-mentioned reasons for the higher non-reporting rates for such incidents. As may be expected, bicycle theft was also judged as not serious.

Victims of burglaries were particularly upset about the incident, and in fact 54.9% of them classified it as very serious. The classification of "very serious" is used twice as often for this offence than for the other incidents in general. Both sexual offences and theft of car are also frequently described as very serious, but especially in the cases of sexual offences, the total number of incidents is too low to allow for the use of percentages.

Contrary to expectations based on Table 3, theft of motorcycle does not belong to the group of incidents described as "very serious". Most of the victims (60.1%) of this type of crime (taking into account that the total number of victims was only 36) described it as fairly serious.

Victim support

718 of the 1,485 respondents mentioned that they had been victimised at least once within the last five years. This group of victims were asked whether they had received any help and/or support during the last experience of victimisation. Before analysing the replies it is important to recall some of the figures which explain the relativity of the question concerning help and/or support received by the victim.

Victimisation concerned 18.9% of cases of car damage or vandalism, 17.2% of cases of theft from car and 15.0% of cases of theft of personal property without force.

It is obvious, from the figures in Table 6, that only half of the victims received some form of support from a third person. This does not seem to present a problem in cases of less serious criminal incidents. Any help or support that was received came mainly from a member of the family, friends and/or neighbours: in fact this category was mentioned by 28.9% of the victims. The police were mentioned as a form of support by one out of five victims. Other possible help/supportive agencies were rarely mentioned, and social welfare institutions appear to be almost completely absent in this area.

In Table 7 a further differentiation of the information is provided according to the following variables: gender, age, family income, level of education, number of inhabitants of the village or city and ownership or not of the home.

In too many cases no information was provided about the family income, and therefore this variable was omitted from the analysis. The differentiation according to the number of inhabitants of the area of residence has only been partially used.

As was already mentioned in the comments on the former International Crime Survey, there remains the problem of placing the inhabitants of Brussels into the right category, given the fact that the larger Brussels metropolitan area with some 1,000,000 inhabitants contains 19 independent communities of very different sizes and with wide variations in the numbers of inhabitants⁴. Only responses from

⁴ Kellens et al., A Belgian..., op. cit.

communities with less than 10,000 inhabitants were not affected by this complicating factor. As long as the non-response rate did not differ too much between the different categories in relation to numbers of inhabitants, this variable can be partially used.

The analysis based on those variables which allow for useful and acceptable differentiations show that receiving help/support was especially mentioned by women, by respondents with a lower level of income and by people aged 55 years or more, whereas the opposite was true for people with a higher level of education and for men.

Women received help/support mostly from a third person in their own milieu whereas people over 55 relied mainly on the police.

Although youngsters tended to refer to help/support agencies rather than to the police, the latter were still only mentioned on a few occasions and almost never by the other social groups.

Referring to their last victimisation, a majority of the respondents (60.9%) answered that they did not need help/support from a victim assistance organisation, 9% of them expressed no opinion, and 30.1% answered that they would have welcomed assistance. This is almost 10% less than the 40% of the former International Crime Survey.

However, these figures are significant given the low number of victims who actually received some form of assistance. Unfortunately it is not clear from the interview what type of assistance the victims were thinking about, nor was an explanation requested for the absence of much assistance in the past.

Gender, age and the other above-mentioned variables do not differentiate percentages. Only for men is the percentage (27.5%) of those who think that assistance would have been helpful a bit lower.

Attitudes towards the police

A major piece of information in victim surveys is the reporting rate of victimisation to the police. The average figure for this survey was 61.6%, although it was somewhat higher for: people over 55 years of age (73.4%); people with a secondary school level of education (66.5%), owners of homes (65.6%) and the lower income group (65.6%).

Lower reporting rates can clearly be found among victims who rent their home (50.1%), live in rural areas (smaller towns and villages) (53.9%) and belong to the younger age groups (54.3%).

The reasons for lower reporting rates in rural areas require further analysis. Although the absence of a permanent police service during the night and at weekends could be a possible explanation, other explanations must nevertheless also be taken into consideration. People in rural areas might tend to receive greater assistance from family, friends and/or neighbours.

When asked to express their degree of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the way they were treated by the police when reporting the crime, 57.7% of the victims claimed to be satisfied, 31.4% were dissatisfied and 10.9% did not express an opinion. The over 55 age group (69.9%) and, to a lesser extent, female victims (61%) expressed greater satisfaction, whereas victims who rent their residence tended to express greater dissatisfaction (36%).

What do such findings reveal? In general it can be said that, according to the former International Victim Survey⁵, the degree of victims' dissatisfaction with the police when reporting a crime is relatively high in Belgium. That this is confirmed in a second consecutive survey could be taken as an incentive to concentrate on this subject in future research and pilot projects. Although this problem has been discussed from a victimological point of view⁶, few initiatives have been taken to date to improve the contacts between police services and victims of crime.

The main reasons for dissatisfaction were almost identical to those expressed during the former International Crime Survey (see Table 8), i.e. that the police "didn't do enough" (41.9%) and that the police "was not interested" (39.6%). A less frequent complaint was that police "didn't recover the property" (18.5%) and that the police "didn't find or apprehend the offender" (15.8%).

In general, 54.8% of the respondents were satisfied with the presence of the police in the areas in which they live. Nevertheless, 30.1% thought that the presence of the police in their neighbourhood was unsatisfactory, and only 0.7% thought the police should be less present.

People living in smaller towns and villages and with a lower level of education were relatively more satisfied with the presence of the police.

In general, 47.5% of the respondents thought that the police do a good job in controlling crime, 25.3% thought that they are not doing a good job and 27.2% did not express an opinion.

The percentage of people who expressed favourable views on the quality of police work was above average among people with lower incomes (54.3%), with a lower level of education and who lived in rural areas.

Dissatisfaction was especially expressed by people with higher incomes (31.3%), by men (28.7%), youngsters (28.3%) and people with a higher level of education (28.2%). Women in particular did not express an opinion (30.6%).

Fear of crime and related topics

Respondents were asked whether they felt safe when walking alone in their area after dark. Table 9 presents the four possible replies according to different variables.

80.4% of the respondents felt very (38.1%) or fairly (42.3%) safe, whereas 14.4% felt a bit and 5.2% very unsafe. Men in particular (87.9%) felt safe or very safe whereas women felt a bit (18.8%) or very unsafe (8.1%).

Relatively more people aged over 55 felt unsafe (22.5%). Although questions were formulated in a somewhat different way, it is possible to refer to the results of

⁵ van Dijk, J.J.M., P. Mayhew and M. Killias (1990) Experiences of crime across the world: key findings of the 1989 International Crime Survey, p. 188, Kluwer, Deventer.

⁶ Peters, T. (1991) "The relation between the police, the victim and victim assistance: problems and recommendations" in Viano, E. (ed.) Victims' rights and legal reforms, pp. 269-277, Onati; Christiansen, S. and W. Meyvis (1990) "Slachtofferzorg, een politiezorg? Verkenning en omschrijving van een politietaak" *Panopticon* 2:96-124.

a local victim survey in the city of Gent, where women and senior citizens expressed an above average fear of leaving the house after dark⁷.

6.5% of the respondents declared that they never left the house after dark. This figure was much higher among people over 55 (13.3%), among women (10.9%), among the lower educated (9.3%), and the lower income group (8.8%). In particular, men, young, middle-aged and higher educated people do go out.

20.3% of the respondents said that they avoided certain areas or people when going out after dark for safety reasons. This figure was especially high among women (25.8%) and among people who rented their residence (23.8%).

1.9% of the respondents estimated the likelihood of their house being burgled within the next 12 months as being very high, whereas 29.5% thought that there was a real chance of someone trying to break into their house. Put together these two figures total 31.4%. This percentage is higher among middle-aged people (37.1%), respondents aged 55 or more (48.2%) and respondents with a lower level of education. On the contrary, 46.1% estimated the risk of a burglary as being rather low.

A local victim survey in some areas of the city of Gent showed comparable results. 20% and 25% of the respondents from two working class neighbourhoods, estimated the risk of a burglary as fairly and very likely. The same type of evaluation was made by 29% of the respondents coming from middle class neighbourhoods and by 56% of respondents living in residential areas⁸.

It is clear that the risk of burglary is overestimated. Although in the recent International Crime Survey one out of three respondents estimated the likelihood of a burglary within a year as (very) probable, only one out of fifty (2.1% burglary with entry) actually experienced such an incident during the last year.

Although relatively few respondents thought they lived in a neighbourhood where people usually help one another, 47.6% of them thought that people in general tend to help each other; while 35.5% thought that the opposite is true and that people tend to go their own way. One out of seven did not have a clear opinion on the matter. People aged 55 or over tended to express more optimistic views in this respect (54.5%), whereas young respondents (40%) and people living in rented homes (44.7%) expressed a more typically negative view.

Crime prevention

Table 10 shows the crime prevention measures used by respondents to protect their homes. Multiple answers were possible. First of all the more permanent protection or crime prevention measures were listed: 7.5% of the respondents refused to answer this question. Secondly, the respondents were asked whether they requested someone to look after their house when going away for a couple of days. A final point of interest concerning protection is related to the possession of a gun or firearm.

⁷ Hebberecht, P., H. Hofman, K. Philippeth, P. en Colle, B. m.m.v. Caudron, P. De Decker and K. De Duytsche (1992) "Buurt en criminaliteit" *De politie en de veiligheid van de burger*, No. 14, p. 260, Vanden Broele, Brugge.

⁸ Hebberecht et al., Buurt..., op. cit.

Quite a few houses (48.7%) were not protected by one of the listed crime prevention measures. At most the usual lock devices were used. This is an extraordinary finding given the high estimation of the risks of a burglary.

The absence of special measures is high among the lower educated categories (54.7%), young people (54.6%) and among respondents who rent their residence (54%). 25.1% of the respondents had installed special door locks, 15.5% owned a guard dog, while 12.3% had installed a burglar alarm.

Among respondents who left the house empty for a short period, 42.7% asked someone to keep an eye on the house. In 22% of the cases the respondents confirmed that neighbours watched the house anyway. 78.4% of the respondents did not own a gun, 1.2% did not know and 4.8% refused to answer the question. The remaining 15.6% owned at least one weapon⁹.

Attitudes towards punishment

When asked about the most appropriate sentence for a 21 year old man who was found guilty of burglary for a second time and who had stolen a colour television set, the respondents tended to provide rather tolerant replies.

12% of them preferred a fine to a sentence, 18.7% thought that a prison sentence should be imposed, but a clear majority (55.2%) thought that the best solution would be a community service order.

The general pattern did not differ very much from the results of the former International Crime Survey. Nevertheless, a more tolerant approach can be deduced from the changes in numbers of respondents who expressed the preference for a community service order (55.2% compared to 37.7% in 1988). A prison sentence was indicated by 25.5% of the respondents in 1988 compared to 18.7% in the recent survey.

Prison sentences seem more popular among young people (23.7%) whereas middle-aged people have a much more negative attitude towards the use of imprisonment (13.8%) and are particularly in favour of a community service (62.2%).

From a glance at the relationship between income and the level of education and attitudes towards punishment, favourable attitudes towards community service can be noted, especially among higher income groups (60.3%) and higher educated respondents (63.7%).

These figures correspond very closely to the results of comparable research. Even in research where the measurement of attitudes is restricted to interviewing real victims of crime, a combination of community service and restitution, or restitution alone, was considered by the respondents as the most appropriate sentence¹⁰.

However, it was found in the same research that especially victims of violent crimes (55%) and victims of burglary (63%) were in favour of a more punitive

⁹ The higher percentage shown in Table 10 is due to the fact that some respondents claimed to own more than one type of firearm.

¹⁰ Sessar, K. (1990) "Tertiary victimization. A case of the politically abused crime victims" in Galaway, B. and J. Hudson (eds.) *Criminal justice, restitution and reconciliation*, pp. 37-45.

response. In such cases the victim was very much concerned with the fact that something has to be done to stop the criminal.

In such cases, the victims were much more concerned with the way the criminal justice system (police, prosecutor and court) handles the case. Indifference and the casual way with which the latter carry out their work caused greater frustration among the victims.

Some concluding remarks

As far as the technical and methodological aspects of the second International Crime Survey are concerned, a striking similarity appears between the results of this and the former survey.

The type of survey, the questions posed and the data collection technique did not change. Although the sample was greatly reduced, this was compensated by the higher number of relevant contacts (response rate). Unfortunately, the totals were often too limited to allow for a further differentiation of the total population.

The comments on the International Crime Survey concerning the too narrow concept of criminality adopted, the representativeness of the sample, and the interviewing instrument used, remain valid since no major changes have been introduced in the research concept.

With respect to victimisation figures, it is important to note that the survey does not confirm the increase in street robbery which has been registered by national police statistics during the past three years.

As for the seriousness of crime, it should be stressed that the findings, according to which 45.9% of the victims of burglary with entry consider it to be "very serious", coincide with research carried out in Belgium¹¹.

In particular, although analysis shows that shock, anger, anxiety and fear are usually only immediate psychological reactions to crime, the fact that it can also produce real traumatic, long-lasting effects on some victims highlights the need for a more qualitative type of research into the effects of such deep rooted victimisation experiences. This type of research has been carried out recently and further applications into a pilot action project are now under way¹².

TABLES

Table 1: Response information

¹¹ Goethals, J. and T. Peters (1991) "Victims of violence. A descriptive analysis of street crime and burglary in Belgium" in Kaiser, G., H. Kury and H.J. Albrecht (eds.) *Victims and criminal justice*, pp. 611-653, Max Planck Institut, Freiburg i Br.

¹² Aertsen, I. and K. Vander Zande (1991) *Slachtoffers van geweld en geestelijke gezondheidszorg*, (Eindrapport april), p. 179, (promotoren Goethals, J., F. Hutsebaut and T. Peters), K.U., Leuven.

	1992			1989
	North f	South f	Total f	Total f
A Gross sample	2,586	2,323	4,909	9,407
B Non relevant contacts	773	845	1,618	3,872
C Relevant contacts	1,813	1,478	3,291	5,535
<u>D Not interviewed: refusal/terminated</u>	398	478	876	2,802
E Not interviewed: other	549	381	930	665
F Completed	866	619	1,485	2,068
	%	%	%	%
Non relevant contacts (B/A)	29.9	36.4	33.0	41.2
Relevant, but refusal/terminated (D/C)	22.0	32.3	26.6	50.6
Relevant, but other reasons/terminated (E/C)	30.3	25.8	28.3	12.0
Response rate final valid sample/relevant contacts	46.6	41.9	45.1	37.2

Table 2: Prevalence victimisation rates (for one and five years)*

Total sample of respondents	Respondents	1987-1991		1991	
		No. of persons victimised	% respondents victimised	No. persons victimised	% respondents victimised
Theft of car	1,485	55	3.7	16	1.1
Theft from car	1,485	186	12.7	17	3.8
Car vandalism	1,485	263	17.7	91	6.1
Theft of motorcycle	1,485	36	2.4	17	1.1
Theft of bicycle	1,485	194	13.1	41	2.8
Burglary with entry	1,485	98	6.6	31	2.1
Attempted burglary	1,485	82	5.5	24	1.6
Robbery	1,485	47	3.2	14	0.9
Personal theft	1,485	162	10.9	46	3.1
Assault/threat	1,485	64	4.3	26	1.8
Consumer fraud	1,485	**	**	128	8.6
Sexual incidents (women only)	759	23	3.1	11	1.4
(Owners only)					
Theft of car	1,308	55	4.2	16	1.2
Theft from car	1,308	186	14.2	57	4.4
Car vandalism	1,308	263	20.1	91	7.0
Theft of motorcycle	251	36	14.4	17	6.8
Theft of bicycle	1,024	194	19.0	41	4.0

* Prevalence - percentage of respondents who have been victims of a specific form of crime once or more.

** Questions limited to 1991.

Table 3: Reported crimes (percentage of respondents who reported last incident during five year period)

	% reported	No. of respondents that have been victimised
Theft of car	91.4	55
Theft of motorcycle	89.8	194
Burglary with entry	88.1	98
Theft of bicycle	76.7	36
Theft from car	76.5	186
Personal theft	60.1	162
Attempted burglary	57.5	82
Robbery	55.0	47
Car vandalism	45.4	263
Assault/threat	45.0	64
Sexual incidents	20.1	23

Table 4: Reasons for not reporting*

	Theft of car %	Theft from car %	Car vandalism %	Theft of motorcycle %	Theft of bicycle %	Burglary with entry %	Robbery %	Personal theft %	Sexual incidents %	Assault/threat %	Total %
Not serious enough	18.6	48.1	59.1	49.9	38.9	29.0	51.8	44.8	50.9	44.2	46.5
Solved it myself	7.5	2.8	2.8	31.2	4.2	16.2	17.9	8.2	12.6	6.9	5.5
Inappropriate for police	21.1	6.1	3.4		10.4		2.0	18.5	18.1	9.5	6.5
Other authorities		1.4	1.1					0.7	8.0	4.3	1.0
My family solved it			3.1		3.5						1.5
No insurance			1.4		2.3			1.8			1.0
Police could do nothing	10.8	4.9	17.9	23.1	25.2	34.5	14.3	12.2		19.7	16.3
Police won't do anything		14.4	8.5	18.9	18.1		5.2	4.8		3.0	7.8
Fear/dislike police										1.4	0.3
Didn't dare											
Other reasons	32.0	24.0	8.4		9.8	20.3	10.7	12.7	10.4	11.1	11.1
Don't know	9.5	7.3	3.8		0.8			2.9			2.5
N =	5	39	154	5	49	12	19	67	19	33	
	100.0	108.9	109.6	123.1	113.2	100.0	102.0	106.7	100.0	100.0	100

* Multiple answers possible - percentages calculated on victims who said they had not reported the last incident of each type of crime to the police.

Table 5: Crime seriousness*

	Theft of car %	Theft from car %	Car vandalism %	Theft of motorcycle %	Theft of bicycle %	Burglary with entry %	Robbery %	Personal theft %	Sexual incidents %	Assault/threat %
Very serious	41.6	18.1	19.2	24.6	19.4	54.9	29.8	27.7	43.9	37.7
Fairly serious	40.4	43.4	29.3	60.1	37.2	23.6	28.7	40.5	23.7	28.5
Not serious	18.0	38.5	51.5	15.3	43.2	21.5	41.7	31.9	32.4	33.8
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
N	55	186	263	36	194	98	47	162	23	64

* Percentage based on victims of specific crimes.

Table 6: Means of support to cope with latest crime experienced

	%
Relatives, friends, neighbours	28.9
Police	21.1
Social welfare agencies	0.5
Religious organisations	0.6
Voluntary organisations	0.2
Specialised agency to help crime victims	0.4
Any other person or agency	1.5
N	718

Table 7: Means of support in dealing with latest crime experienced (percentages, according to several variables)

Support from	Gender		Age			Education completed at			House rental		Town size
	Male	Female	16-34	35-54	55+	<15 yrs	16-19 yrs	>20 yrs	Owned	Rented	<10,000 inh.
Relatives, friends, neighbours	24.2	34.5	30.7	28.6	25.8	35.8	31.5	23.5	29.6	28.3	24.2
Police	18.3	24.5	16.4	20.1	31.8	23.5	24.4	17.1	21.9	19.6	16.3
Social welfare agencies	0.2	0.9	1.2	0	0	0	0.4	1.1	0.5	0.6	0
Religious organisations	0.5	0.6	0.6	0.9	0	0	0.4	1.1	0.8	0.0	0.6
Voluntary organisations	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.7
Specialised agencies	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.5	0.5	0.3	0.0
Others	1.4	1.5	2.5	0.7	0.6	1.7	1.5	1.5	1.3	2.2	1.3
N	390	328	317	238	162	141	296	252	529	179	178

Table 8: Reasons for dissatisfaction with the way the police dealt with the incident

	f	%
Did not do enough	58	41.9
Were not interested	55	39.6
Did not find or apprehend the offender	22	15.8
Did not recover my property	26	18.5
Did not keep me properly informed	9	6.7
Did not treat me correctly	18	13.0
Were slow to arrive	7	5.2
Other reason	14	9.9

N victims dissatisfied: 139

N reasons for dissatisfaction: 209

Table 9: Degree of feeling safe when walking alone in area after dark

	All		Gender		Age			Education completed at			House	
	f	%	Male	Female	16-34	35-54	55+	<15 yrs	16-19 yrs	>20 yrs	Owned	Rented
			f	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Very safe	565	38.1	48.8	27.8	38.5	40.8	34.9	36.7	35.6	42.0	39.6	34.1
Fairly safe	628	42.3	39.1	45.3	43.8	40.1	42.7	41.7	44.6	39.4	41.7	43.1
Bit unsafe	214	14.4	14.4	18.8	14.5	13.4	15.3	16.2	14.3	14.4	14.1	15.6
Very unsafe	78	5.2	5.2	8.1	3.1	5.6	7.2	5.4	5.4	4.3	4.7	7.2
N	1,485		726	759	533	472	480	356	606	441	1,122	344

%		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Mean		1.87	1.66	2.07	1.82	1.84	1.95	1.90	1.90	1.81	1.84	1.96

Table 10: Crime prevention measures*

	%
Installed burglar alarm	12.3
Installed door locks	25.1
Installed window/door grills	4.0
Maintain watchdogs	15.5
High fence	4.5
House has a caretaker	2.1
None of these	48.7
Ask somebody to watch home	42.7
Neighbours watch anyway	22.0
Possession of firearms	18.7
Refused to reply	7.5

* Percentage based on total sample of respondents - multiple answers possible.

Table 11: Attitudes towards punishment (percentages on total sample and according to several variables)

Appropriate sentence	Total	Age			Income			Education		
		16-34	35-54	55+	below average	above average	unknown	< 15 yrs	16-19 yrs	> 20 yrs
Fine	12	13.3	9.3	13.3	14.9	11.1	10.3	14.9	11.2	9.7
Prison	18.7	23.7	13.8	18.0	19.5	18.5	18.1	20.8	21.2	15.2
Community service	55.2	52.8	62.2	50.9	48.3	60.3	53.0	44.3	56.9	63.7
Suspended sentence	3.8	4.4	3.5	3.6	5.3	2.9	4.1	6.5	2.9	2.3
Other sentence	3.3	2.4	3.6	3.9	3.8	2.7	3.6	2.7	2.6	3.4
"Don't know"	7	3.5	7.5	10.4	8.1	4.6	10.9	10.8	5.2	5.7
N	1,485	533	472	480	439	724	322	356	606	441