

CAIRO (EGYPT)

Ahmed El-Magdoub¹

The sample

In 1992 Cairo's population totalled 8 million inhabitants compared to 6,068,695 in 1986 (according to the last census), and the number of families amounted to 1,350,821 distributed among 21 districts. It was, therefore, very difficult to choose 1,000 households as a representative sample. Until a very short time ago "in the fiftieth of this century" it was possible to depend upon class differentiation between the districts to obtain a sample of the three classes: upper, middle and lower. Yet the social and economic changes which have taken place in Egypt, especially in the seventies and eighties, have clearly influenced the class character of these districts.

The emigration of a great number of Egyptians to petroleum-producing Arab countries to earn very high wages - Egypt's open-door economic policy - in addition to a housing crisis, have led to social mobility, at least as far as housing is concerned. As a result of this, many lower class people moved first to middle and then to upper class areas or directly to upper class districts without having reached the necessary standards of the higher class, such as level of education and traditions. What happened was that they just chose to live in the upper status areas, or in areas which were once advanced areas before becoming dependent on the new affluent inhabitants.

Consequently, these areas lost much of their prestige and declined to middle, or even lower class standards. At the same time, many of the members of the upper class, having lost everything, including their distinguished economic position, to the new class of "Rich people of open door and petroleum", were obliged to live in middle and lower class areas.

The housing crisis led to the loss of freedom to choose not only a dwelling place, but also its social standard. In order to face life requirements, many families in the upper class bracket were obliged to let their furnished houses for very high rents, and move to lower class areas.

Although three districts in Cairo were chosen, each one representing one of the three classes, due to their extension, difference, and the changes which took place as a result of the afore-mentioned considerations, it was very difficult to classify an area as belonging to a specific class. It is not unusual to find within a region, one or more streets that are "very highly developed" and one or more which are underdeveloped. The external appearance of a district or individual is not sufficient evidence of class belonging. Therefore, it was hard to ensure that the sample represented the class of all the inhabitants, and this was particularly so in the case of those members of the middle class who border on the limits of the upper or lower classes.

¹ Chief, Criminal Policy Department, The National Center for Social and Criminological Research, Cairo, Egypt.

In order to have a complete sample that included the three economic levels, three sections of Cairo City were chosen, each one representing one of the three levels: Misr el Gadida (higher class), Misr el Qadima (middle class) and Boulac (lower class).

For the purpose of distributing the sample (1,000 households) among the three mentioned sections, a comparison was made between the number of families in each section and the total number of families in the three sections; the percentage distribution was as follows: Misr el Gadida district - 24.9%; Misr el Qadima district - 33.7%; and Boulac district - 42.2%.

When the interviews had been completed, the distribution had changed to read: 30% higher level, 52% middle level, and 18% lower level.

Data collection

All interviews were conducted using the face-to-face technique. The interviewers were free to choose the households in which to apply the questionnaires and any member of the household over 16 years of age could act as respondent (random sample). Twenty interviewers (of which 10 male and 10 female) received specific training once a week during the months of February and March 1992.

Some particular problems were encountered, one of which was the United Nations Security Council's Resolution against Libya, which aroused the fury of Egyptian public opinion and led to disapproval with the United Nations or any related project. This resulted in a refusal on the part of the people to dialogue with the interviewers because the word "United Nations" appeared in the title of the questionnaire.

This situation did not improve very much even when the cover page was removed, since well-educated persons soon detected references to the United Nations in the text, particularly in the section which presented the interviewer. For this reason, the interviewers were compelled to take a new sample on more than one occasion.

Field work started in March 1992 and lasted for three months. An average interview lasted approximately 25-35 minutes, depending mainly on the seriousness of the victimisation experience reported. The questionnaire was administered in Arabic.

Response rate and re-contacting

Given the people's attitude towards the United Nations, the response rate was 60%; the remaining 40% refused to co-operate with the interviewers. Re-contacting involved 5% of the interviewees who were substituted after a second refusal, thus partially modifying the sample.

TABLES

Table 1: Prevalence victimisation rates (5 years)*

| | Victimisation rate (%) |
|---------------------|------------------------|
| Theft of car | 3.9 |
| Theft from car | 16.3 |
| Car vandalism | 7.6 |
| Theft of motorcycle | 1.7 |
| Theft of bicycle | 4.8 |
| | |
| (Owners) | |
| Theft of car | 35.5 |
| Theft from car | 45.9 |
| Car vandalism | 21.4 |
| Theft of motorcycle | 17.2 |
| Theft of bicycle | 17.8 |
| | |
| Burglary with entry | 12.8 |
| Attempted burglary | 11.9 |
| Robbery | 6.8 |
| Personal theft | 34.0 |
| Sexual incidents | 45.5 |
| Assault/threat | 7.8 |

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

Table 2: Prevalence victimisation rates (1 year)*

| | Victimisation rate (%) |
|---------------------|------------------------|
| Theft of car | 1.2 |
| Theft from car | 4.8 |
| Car vandalism | 2.4 |
| Theft of motorcycle | 0.5 |
| Theft of bicycle | 1.0 |
| | |
| (Owners) | |
| Theft of car | 3.4 |
| Theft from car | 13.5 |
| Car vandalism | 6.8 |
| Theft of motorcycle | 5.1 |
| Theft of bicycle | 3.7 |
| | |
| Burglary with entry | 3.0 |
| Attempted burglary | 3.8 |
| Robbery | 2.2 |
| Personal theft | 9.6 |
| Sexual incidents | 10.1 |
| Assault/threat | 2.6 |
| Consumer fraud | 48.3 |

| | |
|------------|------|
| Corruption | 31.9 |
|------------|------|

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

Table 3: Reported crimes

| | % |
|---------------------|------|
| Theft of car | 69.2 |
| Theft from car | 47.9 |
| Car vandalism | 26.3 |
| Theft of motorcycle | 58.8 |
| Theft of bicycle | 22.9 |
| | |
| Burglary with entry | 13.3 |
| Attempted burglary | 22.7 |
| Robbery | 33.8 |
| Personal theft | 21.2 |
| Sexual incidents | 2.5 |
| Assault/threat | 16.7 |

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 % |
|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|-----------|------------------|--------------------|------------------|
| Not serious enough | | 34.0 | 29.4 | 27.3 | 28.9 | 21.3 | 25.5 | 30.5 | 19.9 | 20.5 |
| Solved it myself | | 8.5 | 10.3 | 18.2 | 15.6 | 13.3 | 18.2 | 5.9 | 18.7 | 24.4 |
| Inappropriate for police | | 13.2 | 8.8 | | 11.1 | 12.0 | 7.3 | 5.9 | 15.7 | 9.0 |
| Other authorities | | | | | | 1.3 | | 2.2 | 0.4 | |
| My family solved it | | 6.6 | 4.4 | 9.1 | 2.2 | 9.3 | | 2.2 | | 6.4 |
| No insurance | | 2.8 | 8.8 | 9.1 | 2.2 | 4.0 | | 0.3 | | |
| Police could do nothing | 30.0 | 19.8 | 14.7 | 27.3 | 31.1 | 21.3 | 21.8 | 30.2 | 17.7 | 17.9 |
| Police won't do anything | | 8.5 | 14.7 | | 8.9 | 9.3 | 21.8 | 15.3 | 16.5 | 11.5 |
| Fear/dislike police | | | | | | | | 0.7 | 0.7 | 1.3 |
| Didn't dare | | | | 9.1 | | 3.6 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 6.4 |
| Other reasons | 30.0 | 2.8 | 5.9 | | | 6.7 | 1.8 | 6.5 | 9.0 | 1.3 |
| Don't know | 10.0 | 3.8 | 2.9 | | | | | 0.3 | 0.7 | 1.3 |

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

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 | 59.0 | 30.7 | 34.2 | 41.2 | 29.2 | 59.4 | 66.2 | 3.0 | 60.6 | 56.4 |
| Fairly serious | 23.1 | 42.3 | 39.5 | 58.8 | 47.9 | 28.1 | 25.0 | 4.0 | 28.8 | 32.1 |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|------|------|------|--|------|------|-----|------|------|------|
| Not serious | 17.9 | 27.0 | 26.3 | | 22.9 | 12.5 | 8.8 | 19.4 | 10.6 | 11.5 |
|-------------|------|------|------|--|------|------|-----|------|------|------|

* Percentage based on victims of specific crimes.

Table 6: Crime prevention measures*

| | % |
|-----------------------------------|------|
| Installed burglar alarm | 3.7 |
| Installed door locks | 59.6 |
| Installed window/door grills | 15.8 |
| Maintain watchdogs | 3.4 |
| High fence | 3.3 |
| House has a caretaker | 14.3 |
| None of these | |
| Others | |
| Ask somebody to watch home | 38.1 |
| Neighbours watch anyway | 24.7 |
| Possession of firearms | 9.1 |
| House is insured against burglary | 3.1 |

* Percentages based on total sample of respondents.

