

ENGLAND AND WALES

Patricia Mayhew¹

England and Wales (England hereafter) took part in both the 1989 and 1992 sweeps of the International Crime Survey (ICS). In 1989, Scotland and Northern Ireland also participated, but did not join the 1992 sweep².

Composition of the 1992 sample

Details of the sample are shown in Table 1, based on data weighted to maximise the representativeness of the sample in terms of household size, age, gender and regional distribution. Most respondents described their area as being "middle status"; 11% placed themselves in a "higher status" area - lower than the proportions in the Netherlands, Belgium, Canada and Sweden. Only those in Italy (28%) were more likely to describe their area as lower status than those in England (11%).

The conduct of the 1992 survey in England

Field work was conducted by the same survey company as was involved in 1989 (Burke Marketing Research Limited) though with a different management team. Interviews took place mainly between January and the end of February 1992. All interviews were conducted by computed-assisted telephone interviewing (telephone ownership in England in 1992 is estimated to be 88%)³. The sample was designed to be nationally representative of those aged 16 or more.

The standard 1992 ICS questionnaire was used, with two small deviations. One was the addition of some extra phrases to reassure respondents preceding the questions on crime prevention precautions. The other was the offer of a letter from the Home Office verifying the credentials of the survey (see below). The interviewing language was English, with no translation for ethnic minorities. Interviewers were briefed by the national co-ordinator (Patricia Mayhew), who also attended some interviewing sessions.

Field work in 1989 indicated that English respondents were wary of being telephoned to answer questions about crime, and were particularly suspicious of being asked what security precautions they take. An unusually large number of respondents had called the Home Office to verify the credentials of the survey. To

-
- 1 Senior Principal Research Officer, Research and Planning Unit, Home Office, London, United Kingdom.
 2. On 1989 results, risks in Scotland were broadly similar to those in England for most crimes, though risks of assaults with force were rather higher, and women in Scotland appeared to face a higher risk of sexual assaults. Risks in Northern Ireland were generally much lower than on the mainland, and indeed than in most other countries. This is no doubt because Northern Ireland is not a highly urbanised country, and - religious strife apart - social communities are likely to be closely knit.
 3. A listing of known numbers was used as the sampling frame, with the last digit replaced by a randomly generated number - in effect giving a "random digit dialling" procedure, which would cover unlisted numbers.

try and avoid this problem, respondents in 1992 were offered - both at the beginning and end of the interview - the chance of receiving a letter from the Home Office. An appreciable number of respondents took up this offer, many of whom still telephoned the Home Office as well. In all, about 75 respondents telephoned, a proportion of these also phoning their local police station⁴.

Response rates

The acceptability of telephone interviews seems to be a matter of national temperament, and it is fairly well-established that achieving high response rates in England is difficult. The ICS response rate in 1989 England was 42.5% - rather lower than in other countries with the exception of West Germany, Spain, Belgium, the USA and Scotland.

Guidelines laid down by the British Market Research Society specify that unwilling respondents should not be re-telephoned by other interviewers, or at other times. This severely restricted the use of recall procedures which were adopted in other countries to improve response. This, and a possible decline in national tolerance for telephone interviews, is reflected in a still poor response rate in the 1992 survey of 38.4% - the lowest figure among the participating countries.

The effect of low response on victimisation estimates in the 1992 English survey is difficult to assess, particularly in relation to other countries where response was higher. Previous analysis of the 1989 survey results failed to show any definite pattern whereby countries with low response had higher victimisation rates - which would be predicted on the argument that those "with something to say" were more likely to agree to an interview. Moreover, with the exception of England, response rates were higher in the countries which participated in the 1989 and 1992 surveys, and this was accompanied by an increase in overall prevalence rates - albeit not as marked as in England⁵. Analysis below indicates that levels of victimisation in England in 1991 according to the ICS are much in line with those from the national victimisation survey - the British Crime Survey - which measured crime in the same year. On the face of it, this suggests that estimates from the former (1989) survey were under-estimated relative to those from the 1992 survey. Nonetheless, taking account of sampling error, the slight lowering of the response rate in England does not entirely rule out the possibility either that, relative to 1989, victims were slightly over-represented among respondents in the 1992 survey.

The final valid sample in 1992 was 2,001, out of an issued sample of 9,340, and 5,208 valid contacts.

Victimisation rates

Rates of victimisation can be expressed in various ways. The rates presented here are personal prevalence rates: ie. the percentage of those aged 16 or more

4. Although Chief Officers of Police in all police forces in England had been informed before the start of field work that interviewing was to take place, it was probably inevitable that the message had not filtered down to the local stations, where officers were often confused by the survey and themselves phoned the contact number.

5. See Part 1 by Jan van Dijk and Pat Mayhew.

who experienced a specific form of crime once or more⁶. Prevalence rates are not sensitive to differential proneness to multiple victimisation, but rather reflect how many of the population are afflicted by crime at all, either individually or as a member of a household.

The ICS allows estimates for both the calendar year preceding the survey, and for the last five years. Findings about the last year will be most accurate, because less serious incidents which took place some time ago tend to be forgotten. This memory loss explains in part the fact that victimisation rates over five years are much less than five times as high as the calendar year rate: for England, five year rates are on average about three times higher.

Victimisation over the past five years

The percentage of respondents who said they had been victimised once or more, by different types of crimes over the last five years is shown in Table 2, together with sampling error at the 5% significance level.

According to the 1992 survey, the most likely offences to have been experienced over the last five years were car vandalism and thefts from cars, with more than a quarter of owners having fallen victim. Having a burglar in the house was reported by one in ten respondents; and having a burglar try to get into the house by roughly the same proportion. About one in eight people had experienced a theft of some of their personal property, or an assault/threat over the last five years.

Victimisation in 1991

Table 3 shows the percentage of respondents who reported being a victim of different types of crime in 1991. Slightly more than one in ten car owners had experienced some criminal damage to their car; and one in ten a theft from their car. More than one in twenty bicycle owners (5.7%) had their bicycle stolen. Burglars had entered the home of three in a hundred respondents; and a similar figure applied for attempted burglaries.

Trends since 1988

On five-year risks, the 1992 survey indicates an increase for all categories of crime which were covered in the two surveys. The biggest increases were for:

- theft of motorcycle (though numbers are small)
- sexual incidents
- assaults and threats
- thefts from cars
- theft of bicycles

⁶. Incidence rates - a common alternative - express the number of individual crimes experienced by the sample as a whole, counting *all* incidents against victims. Incidence rates allow a calculation of the overall number of crimes committed in a country (derived by multiplying incidence rates estimates for the survey population to the total population). However, with the present sample size this would be hazardous.

- attempted burglary

For comparable crime, the proportion of respondents who had been a victim of one or more of the survey crimes over the past five years has increased from 46% according to the 1989 survey to 61% according to the 1992 one. However, these figures are not firm indicators of five-year risks. This is partly because respondents are unlikely to cope well with the task of remembering events over a long period. Also, some inevitable memory distortion, whereby events are "pulled forward" in time, may undermine the trend data if there are changes in crime levels over the respective five-year recall periods. The later years of the five-year period asked about in the 1989 survey were characterised by lower levels of increase in recorded crime, whereas the later years covered by the 1992 survey saw much higher increases in crimes known to the police. Table 4 illustrates the point.

Comparing crime in the calendar years 1988 and 1992, for crime categories for which figures are reasonably reliable, the ICS shows increases on prevalence rates for:

bicycle theft (owners) 104%	robbery 57%
assaults/threats 100%	vandalism (owners) 41%
sexual incidents 75%	theft from cars (owners) 37%
theft of cars (owners) 79%	personal thefts 36%
attempted burglary 71%	

Are these fairly sizeable increases borne out by other evidence? Two sources can be drawn on:

- the number of notifiable offences recorded by the police; and
- estimates from the national victimisation survey - the British Crime Survey - which was conducted in 1988 (measuring crime in 1987), and in 1992 (measuring crime in 1991).

A comparison with offences recorded by the police

ICS incidence rates would actually be a better basis for comparison with offences recorded by the police (since they provide a more complete measure of the number of incidents which occurred). However, the increase in ICS prevalence rates between 1988 and 1992 is suggestive enough, though it should be stressed that the ICS figures are subject to sampling and response error, and changes in police figures over the period could reflect either changes in recording practices, and/or an increase in the readiness of victims to report crime.

This said, both sources indicate an appreciable increase in crime between 1988 and 1991, in particular for bicycle theft (which increased by 95% according to police figures and by 104% according to the ICS), and theft of cars (59% and 79% respectively). The trend in violent crime is most out of line - though the respective categories do not match particularly well, and the ICS measure may reflect an unknown degree of response error.

A comparison with the British Crime Survey

Comparison with a contemporaneous English crime survey is better, though in practice differences in survey techniques and the precise nature of the questions asked jeopardise straightforward comparisons. Field work for the last sweep of the British Crime Survey (BCS) was conducted at the same time as the 1992 ICS, though the previous measure of crime from the BCS related to 1987 rather than 1988, as in the case of the ICS⁷. The BCS interviewed in excess of 10,000 adults, by personal interview.

Table 5 presents some comparisons between the change in BCS prevalence risks between 1987-1992, and that from the first and second sweeps of the ICS. Only offence categories - or combinations - which match fairly closely are compared, though the matching is not precise even so.

Actual risks of being a victim are very similar according to the two surveys, with the exception of robbery (for which the BCS may have "tighter" classification procedures). By and large, however, the ICS shows a steeper increase in risks since 1988. There are competing explanations for this. One is that the 1992 BCS has undercounted crime relative to the count in 1987; the other is that the 1988 ICS did so relative to the 1992 ICS. The latter is more likely.

In any event, though, an increase in risks is evident from both surveys. As with recorded crime, the biggest discrepancy is for "violence". Possibly, the 1992 ICS saw a lowering of the "threshold" here, with a broader range of offences being reported in interview. Consistent with this is that the percentage of violent incidents reported was lower according to the 1992 survey than the 1989 one (see below).

Reporting to the police

Thefts of cars and motorcycles, and burglaries with entry were most likely to be reported by victims. The lowest reporting rates were for sexual incidents, car vandalism, and assaults/threats (Table 6). These results are in line with 1988 results, and are not dissimilar in other countries. In terms of the relative frequency with which victims in different countries bring in the police, the 1992 ICS results confirm earlier results that victims in England are among the more ready to report crime.

The proportion of incidents said to have been notified to the police is higher on ICS figures than according to the latest BCS. (For instance, 73% of ICS thefts from cars were reported as against 53% in the BCS.) This may well be because respondents in the ICS, in being asked about the "last incident" they reported, mentioned more memorable events - more memorable perhaps because they were reported to the police. The difference in reporting percentages is also inconsistent with the BCS eliciting a wider range of incidents on account, for instance, of its more extensive "screener" questions.

Reasons for not reporting

⁷. Recorded crime figures between 1987 and 1988 were relatively similar, with the steep increase in recorded crime beginning in 1989.

For many offences, the major reasons for not reporting incidents were that they were not considered serious enough, or victims felt that the police could do little about the matter. Fear of reprisal was rarely mentioned, though a few assault victims cited this. Fear or dislike of the police was also rarely given as a reason for not reporting. Table 7 shows details; attention is drawn to the small number of unreported offences in some crime categories.

Seriousness of crime

A question introduced in the 1992 ICS was how serious victims thought "their" offence had been. Table 8 shows that burglaries with entry, and theft of vehicles were regarded most seriously, in the former case no doubt because of intrusion of privacy, and in the latter probably because of the high potential financial loss involved. Robbery was also generally assessed as serious.

The 1992 ICS results merit further analysis of how victims in different countries differ as regards how seriously they viewed what happened to them. Preliminary inspection indicates a general consensus across country as to what offences were most serious, but with those in Italy, New Zealand, Australia and Belgium tending to rank offences more seriously, and those in the Netherlands and Sweden least seriously.

Victim support

Those who had reported one or more offences to the police over the last five years were asked which type of offence they had last reported and whether they had received support to cope with the effects of the crime. The type of help forthcoming will obviously vary with the particular crime experienced - with less serious offences eliciting less support than those which would be regarded, by friends and others, as being potentially more upsetting. In England, reflecting the overall profile of victimisation, the last offence most likely to have been drawn to the attention of the police was: car vandalism (24% of "last" offences reported), and theft from a car (20%). About one in ten reporters had last reported a burglary with entry, a theft of personal property and an assault/threat.

Some 45% of victims said they had received help from family and friends. The police had given help to 28%, with other groups or agencies infrequently mentioned - eg, social welfare agencies (2%), religious organisations (2%), and voluntary organisations (1%).

Although only a small proportion (2.3%) received help from a specialised victim support agency, the figure was rather higher than for those in the other seven 1992 countries to whom the question was put. "Victim Support" in the UK has been one of the most rapidly expanding voluntary sectors, and the ICS result bears some small testimony to their work. Asked whether they thought the services of a victim support agency would have been useful, 25% of victims said it would have been, with higher figures for women, the elderly and those with below average income. Among particular types of victim, the figure was higher too.

Attitudes towards the police

Two questions tap attitudes to the police: the first assessing opinion about how good a job the police do in the local area; the second the performance of the police after victims have reported an offence to them. Levels of satisfaction with the police according to both questions were high, with two-thirds saying the police did a good job locally, and seven out of ten victims being satisfied with the police response when they reported a crime. There seems to be a small downward shift in satisfaction with the general performance of the police locally since 1988 (Table 9).

Over a quarter (26%) of respondents in England said they saw the police pass by in their street on foot or in a car at least once a day; 21% said it was at least once a week. Even so, nearly six out of ten (57%) respondents wanted more police presence; slightly more than a third (37%) thought policing levels at present were sufficient.

Fear of crime

Results for England from the 1992 ICS indicate some degree of wariness about crime (Table 10). Nearly half of respondents (45%) felt they were very likely or likely to experience a burglary in the next year, a higher figure than in the 1988 survey (35%). Just over a quarter avoided particular areas after dark that they thought risky (25% in 1989), and a third felt a bit or very unsafe walking alone in their area at night. In line with most analyses of fear of crime, wariness was highest among women and city dwellers.

Crime prevention

The level of protection against crime claimed by those in England is shown in Table 11. The fact, as said, that many respondents appeared anxious about being asked about their security habits may have meant that some people exaggerated their protection "just in case" the interviewer was phoning for other purposes. Certainly, the level of burglar alarm ownership is higher than indicated by other sources.

Attitudes towards punishment

Respondents were asked about the sentence they would give to "a man of 21 years old who if found guilty for the second time, having stolen a colour television". In 1992, slightly more people opted for a community service order (40%) than for imprisonment (Table 12). This was a slight increase on the figure from the 1989 survey, although the evidence is still that support for imprisonment is stronger in England (and other "anglophone" countries) than elsewhere.

Just over a third of those who opted for imprisonment favoured a period "inside" of two years or more - or some 14% all told of those who made a firm judgement about their preferred sentence (Table 13)

Conclusions and summary

England and Wales was one of eight countries to participate in both the 1989 and 1992 sweeps of the ICS. Whereas in other countries response rates in 1992 were higher as a result of refined survey procedures, restrictions set by the professional body of survey companies on re-contracting refusers meant that the 1992 response rate in England was no better than in 1989. The effect of this on victimisation risks in England relative to the counts in other countries is difficult to assess, though there is no firm evidence that response rates are a critical factor. Sampling error on estimates from a relatively small sample, possible differences in interviewer performance between sweeps, and other unknown sources of response bias may be potentially more important than response rates in assessing results.

Interviewing people about crime on the telephone appears to be difficult in England, with many people reluctant to answer questions, and to accept that the exercise is genuine.

The most likely offences to have been experienced by victims in England were criminal damage to a car, theft from a car, a burglary (or attempt), a theft of some item of personal property, or an assault or threat.

On the evidence of the second ICS, respondents faced higher risks in 1991 than in 1988. This was particularly so for bicycle thefts, assault/threats, sexual incidents, thefts from cars, and attempted burglary. This picture is generally consistent with an increase in offences recorded by the police, and with an increase in risks as measured by the British Crime Survey. However, the increase in violence (assaults/threats and sexual incidents) between 1988 and 1991 according to the ICS is more pronounced than that from the other two indicators. These offences are among the most difficult to measure in surveys, and there is reason to be suspect about whether "like is being compared with like". The 1991 counts may be more reliable than those for 1988.

Levels of reporting to the police vary in England (as elsewhere) according to the seriousness of what happened, but compared to other countries victims are highly likely to bring in the police. Most do so when they have a car, motorcycle or bicycle stolen, or when they experience a burglary.

Thefts of vehicles and burglary were considered the more serious of the incidents which respondents reported to interviewers.

Most people were satisfied with the job the police did in their local areas, and among those who reported a crime, satisfied with the police response. Between a third and a quarter were less than happy. Nearly six out of ten respondents wanted to see more police on a regular basis in their area.

There is wariness about crime in England. Nearly half of respondents felt they were likely or very likely to be burgled in the next year, and a third overall felt unsafe in their local area after dark. Over two-thirds of people claimed to have installed special door locks against intruders, and to have asked someone to watch their home when they were away.

Opinion was fairly divided as to the most appropriate sentence for a 21-year old recidivist burglar, but most opted for community service or a sentence of imprisonment. Imprisonment gained more support than in Europe generally.

TABLES

Table 1: Composition of the 1992 ICS England and Wales sample

Male			51%
Female			49%
Age	Male	Female	Total
16-34	34%	35%	35%
35-54	32%	32%	32%
54+	34%	32%	33%
Status of residential area			
Higher status			11%
Middle status			76%

Lower status			11%
--------------	--	--	-----

Table 2: Percentage of respondents victimised over the last five years¹

% victim once or more, last five years (1992 ICS)	
Theft of car	9.8 +/- 1.3
Theft from car	22.7 +/- 1.8
Car vandalism	26.8 +/- 1.9
Theft of motorcycle	1.9 +/- 0.6
Theft of bicycle	7.6 +/- 1.2
(Owners) ²	
Theft of car	11.5 +/- 1.5
Theft from car	26.6 +/- 2.1
Car vandalism	31.4 +/- 2.2
Theft of motorcycle	16.2 +/- 4.7
Theft of bicycle	14.2 +/- 2.1
Burglary with entry	10.9 +/- 1.4
Attempted burglary	9.1 +/- 1.3
Garage/shed break-in	8.6 +/- 1.2
Robbery	2.6 +/- 0.7
Personal theft	12.0 +/- 1.4
Sexual incidents ³	5.9 +/- 1.4
Assaults/theats	11.7 +/- 1.4
Crimes comparable with 1989 ICS ⁴	60.6 +/- 2.2

1. Prevalence rates are shown with the range in which they are likely to lie taking sampling error into account at the 5% significance level, assuming a simple random sample.
2. Total respondents: 2,001; car owners: 1,711; motorcycle owners: 233; bicycle owners: 1,073; women: 1,024.
3. Sexual incidents based on women only.
4. Excluding garage/shed break-ins and consumer fraud, which were not covered in the 1989 survey.

Table 3: Percentage of respondents victimised in 1991¹

% victim once or more in 1991 (1992 ICS)	
Theft of car	3.7 +/- 0.8
Theft from car	8.6 +/- 1.2
Car vandalism	10.6 +/- 1.3
Theft of motorcycle	0.4 +/- 0.3
Theft of bicycle	3.0 +/- 0.7
(Owners) ²	
Theft of car	4.3 +/- 1.0
Theft from car	10.0 +/- 1.4
Car vandalism	12.4 +/- 1.6
Theft of motorcycle	3.2 +/- 2.3
Theft of bicycle	5.7 +/- 1.4
Burglary with entry	3.0 +/- 0.7
Attempted burglary	2.9 +/- 0.7
Garage/shed break-ins	3.5 +/- 0.8
Robbery	1.1 +/- 0.5
Personal theft	4.2 +/- 0.9
Sexual incidents ³	2.1 +/- 0.9
Assaults/threats	3.8 +/- 0.8
Consumer fraud	6.7 +/- 1.1
Crimes comparable with 1989 ICS ⁴	30.2 +/- 2.0

1. Prevalence rates are shown with the range in which they are likely to lie taking sampling error into account at the 5% significance level, assuming a simple random sample.

2. Total respondents: 2,001; car owners: 1,711; motorcycle owners: 233; bicycle owners: 1,073; women: 1,024.
3. Sexual incidents based on women only.
4. Excluding garage/shed break-ins and consumer fraud, which were not covered in the 1989 survey.

Table 4: Five-year recall periods 1989 and 1992 ICS, and % change in recorded crime

1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992
ICS-1	ICS-1	ICS-1	ICS-1	ICS-1			
			ICS-2	ICS-2	ICS-2	ICS-2	ICS-2
% change in recorded crime							
+3	+7	+1	-5	+4	+17	+16	+11 ¹

1. First six months of 1992 compared with first six months of 1991.

Table 5: Comparison between British Crime Survey and ICS prevalence risks¹

	% adults victim once or more, 1991 BCS	% increase 1987-1991 BCS	% adults victim once or more, 1991 ICS	% increase 1988-1991 ICS
Car damage ²	10.0%	15%	10.6%	56%
All car crime ^{3,5}	19.9%	17%	19.0%	61%
Burglary ⁴	5.1%	11%	5.3%	51%
Bicycle theft ⁵	5.6%	37%	5.7%	104%
Robbery	0.4%	33%	1.1%	57%
Violence ⁶	5.6%	12%	5.2%	79%

- For "household crimes" (the first four in the list), BCS figures have been weighted on an adult base rather than is usual BCS practice on a household base. This replicates ICS weighting more closely.
- BCS figures include attempted thefts of/from cars where the evidence of the attempt was likely to be damage. The ICS is likely to have picked these up under "vandalism". Both rates based on owners.
- Car crime: theft of cars; theft from cars; car vandalism (ICS). Car vandalism and attempts (BCS).
- Burglary with entry, and attempts.
- Based on owners.
- Sexual incidents; robbery; assaults/threats.

Table 6: Percentage of crime reported to the police, 1988 and 1992 (ICS)¹

	1988 ICS %	1992 ICS %	N (1992)
Theft of car	100	94	196
Theft from car	73	73	454
Car vandalism	33	37	537
Theft of motorcycle	100	94	38
Theft of bicycle	70	75	153
Burglary with entry	88	96	219
Attempted burglary ²		54	182
Robbery	71	51	52
Personal theft	56	51	241
Sexual incidents (women only)	8	16	60
Assaults/threats	47	41	235

1. Based on the last crime of a particular type experienced over the past five years.
2. Reporting for attempted burglaries was not covered in the 1989 survey.

Table 7: Reasons for not reporting¹

	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	15	61	61	55	27	49	32	38	38	31
Solved it myself	32	2	3	7		3	5	11	16	16
Inappropriate for police	16	13	17	11		14	14	12	23	16
Other authorities			3	7	8	4	9	18	6	8
My family solved it			1	2		1	4	2	4	3
No insurance			1							
Police could do nothing		24	23	22	40	28	19	25	8	16
Police won't do anything		9	9	27	10	9	19	7	7	15
Fear/dislike police		<1					5		4	4
Didn't dare		1	1							7
Other reasons	46	3	4	1	15	6	9	7	8	7
Don't know			1		3					2
N	10	112	330	34	28	77	23	118	51	135

1. 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 8: Crime seriousness¹

	Very serious %	Fairly serious %	Not very serious %	N
Theft of car	44	32	23	196
Theft from car	17	31	53	454
Car vandalism	13	22	65	537
Theft of motorcycle	39	42	20	38
Bicycle theft	19	39	42	153
Burglary/entry	66	24	10	219
Attempted burglary	30	33	38	182
Robbery	40	40	20	52
Personal theft	26	34	40	241
Sex incidents	35	35	30	60
Assaults/threats	39	29	33	235

1. Based on the last crime of a particular type experienced over the past five years.

Table 9: Attitudes to the police

	1988 ICS	1992 ICS
Police do a good job in local area ¹	69.6%	65.9%
Respondents satisfied with police response ²	70.8%	71.8%

1. "Don't know" answers included.
2. Based on last incident reported over last five years.

Table 10: Concern about crime: England (1992 ICS)

	%
Feel burglary very likely in next year	10
Feel burglary likely in next year	35
Avoid certain areas after dark	27
Feel a bit unsafe walking alone after dark	20
Feel very unsafe walking alone after dark	13

Table 11: Crime prevention measures¹

	%
Installed burglar alarm	22
Installed special door locks	68
Installed special window/door grills	27
Maintain watchdog	31
Refused to reply	2
Have a high fence	38
Have caretaker (or security guard)	2
Other	1
None of these	10
Ask somebody to watch home when away	69
Neighbour watches anyway	11
Own firearms	4
N	2,001

1. Percentages based on total sample of respondents - multiple answers possible.

Table 12: Sentence preferred for 21 year old recidivist burglar

Sentence	1989 ICS	1992 ICS
	%	%
Fine	11	9
Prison	38	37
Community service	38	40
Suspended sentence	5	7
Any other sentence	3	3
Don't know	5	4
N	2,006	2,001

Table 13: Length of prison sentence preferred for 21 year old recidivist burglar (those opting for imprisonment)¹

	%		%
1 month or less	4	3 years	7
2 - 6 months	21	4 years	<1
6 months - 1 year	17	5 years	7
1 year	16	6 years or more	3
2 years	18	Don't know	6

1. Based on n = 747.

Table 14: Comparison between offences recorded by the police and ICS measure (prevalence rates): 1988-1991

	Number of offences recorded by the police	1989/1991 ICS: prevalence rates
	% increase 1998-1991	
Vandalism ¹	38%	41%
Burglary ²	42%	51%
Bicycle theft ³	95%	104%
Theft of cars ^{3,4}	59%	79%
Theft from cars	47%	37%
Robbery	44%	57%
Assaults ⁵	20%	100%
Not really comparable/ too unstable		
Burglary/entry		43%
Attempted burglary		71%
Sexual incidents		75%

1. Recorded offences: all criminal damage. ICS: criminal damage to cars and vans only. Based on owners.

2. Recorded offences: burglary in dwelling. All ICS burglaries (with entry and attempts).

3. ICS: Bicycle and vehicle owners.

4. All vehicles including commercial vehicles, and including attempts.

5. Recorded offences: woundings. ICS: assaults/threats.

