

## GEORGIA

**Merab Pachulia<sup>1</sup>**

The International Victimization Survey in Georgia was financed by the Georgian Social Research Center and, in part, by the Georgian Census Committee.

The field work was carried out between 27 April and 30 May 1992. Data entry in mainframe computers and the transferring procedure (into personal computers) was completed on 25 August.

### **Particular problems encountered**

Some financial problems were encountered during the study. As mentioned above, the project was financed by two organisations but political instability in Georgia led to a postponement of the field work and of the project in general. Also, during this period, both Georgia and the ex-Soviet Union territory underwent some economic changes, which mainly took the form of inflation.

The questions related to income were a bit weak; the minimum income was not officially defined.

### **The Georgian Social Research Center**

The Georgian Social Research Center (GSRC), an independent, unaffiliated organisation, was founded in July 1990 by the Georgian Sociological Association (GSA), with the aim of designing and conducting independent surveys, opinion polls, market researches, and so on.

Since its foundation, the GSRC has carried out several surveys throughout Georgia using the method of face-to-face interviews, and several smaller scale studies: telephone surveys in Tbilisi, regional studies and some qualitative research.

Although the GSRC is a commercial organisation, its management is interested in the development of sociology in Georgia. It regularly organises lectures and seminars for students of the Department of Sociology at the University of Tbilisi, and provides some students with GSRC scholarships.

A full service is available for complete professional design, data collection, analysis and interpretation. For confidential reasons no part of a study is contracted out.

The GSRC has contacts with colleagues in Russia, the Baltic Republics, Armenia, the United Kingdom, the USA and Germany.

### **Interviewers' specifications**

#### *Background and experience of interviewers*

---

<sup>1</sup> Georgian Social Research Center, Tbilisi, Georgia.

The field work was conducted by 78 interviewers; most of these were drawn from the Department of Sociology (29) and Psychology (12), and the Faculty of Journalistic Literature (18). The remainder were members of the Georgian Census Committee's permanent interviewers network. Most of the interviewers were female.

In order to improve their qualifications, the GSRC prepared an Interviewers' Training Project whereby the interviewers were trained by GSRC experts. The training programme consisted of the following stages:

- 1) statement of a problem;
- 2) demonstration of the problem by acting out standard situations (role games);
- 3) discussion;
- 4) brief description of the problem involved and ways of solving it;
- 5) re-acting of standard situations;
- 6) examination and fixing of given information;
- 7) final summary of how to solve a given problem.

After the training course, each interviewer had to pass a test.

## **Sampling**

In order to carry out this survey, the experts from the Georgian Social Research Center (GSRC) designed a nationwide, representative, multi-stage probability sample. Taking into account the politically unstable climate and other factors which might negatively affect the response rate, 1,832 respondents were selected for interviewing. All the interviews were face-to-face.

### *Sampling stages*

During the first stage of sampling Georgia was divided, according to geographical and administrative features, into seven primary sampling units (PSUs). Each unit included several regions and each region encompassed between 7 and 17 zones.

The following is a list of the primary sampling units:

- 1) Abkhazia - North-West Georgia;
- 2) Kolkheti - includes parts of West Georgia;
- 3) Adjara - South-West Georgia;
- 4) Kartl-Khakheti - Central and East Georgia;
- 5) Mtskheta-Mtianeti - South Georgia;
- 6) Kvemo kartli;
- 7) Tbilisi and Rustavi - this unit includes Tbilisi, the capital of Georgia (divided into 10 zones) and Rustavi. Both were considered as independent regions.

Samachablo (former Osetia) was excluded from the sample frame because of the political instability in this region. Despite this exclusion, statistically almost 95% of the inhabitants of Georgia were covered by the sample.

During the second stage of sampling a set number of regions were chosen for each PSU (all regions were given their own weight).

During the third stage of sampling individuals and household addresses were randomly selected from the passport bureaus and, finally, individuals from each family.

<b>Non-response rates for the individual survey for UNICRI</b>	
Original sample	1,832
Completed cases	1,396
Refusals	114
Respondent was not reached at home after third recall	195
Language problem	32
Wrong address	34
Other	61

#### General response rate for this survey

$$* = \frac{b}{a} = 0.762$$

#### Refusal rate

$$\frac{1}{b} = 0.081$$

Note: Abkhazia and Kolkheti had the highest non-response rates; this was due to political tension in the regions.

Gender	1989 population data (official data)	1992 sample
Male	46%	42.9%
Female	54%	57.1%

#### The pilot study

The pilot study was conducted by GSRC interviewers. The interviewing was carried out in two languages, Georgian and Russian, since about 30% of the population in the Republic of Georgia is not of Georgian nationality. During this stage of the study 9 interviewers were used. Interviewing lasted two days and data were entered into SPSS PC.

Seventy-five copies of the questionnaire were printed for the pilot study, in both Georgian and Russian languages. The respondents were interviewed in Tbilisi and

Akhalkalaki (East Georgia, with a predominantly non-Georgian population). As expected, there was a general unwillingness to respond to questions concerning sexual incidents. After the pilot study, the wordings of some questions were changed in both languages.

In general, the majority of the questions were well accepted and received some interest, probably due to the delicate nature of the problem.

## Additional information

The fact that Russia and Georgia have adopted the same economic, political and military system for decades was the main reason why some results from both the Russian and Georgian surveys are almost the same.

Car theft is one of the most widespread forms of crime and this could be explained by several factors. This type of crime is not too difficult to accomplish; in such a chaotic political, social and economic situation there is almost no chance of being caught and, of course, it is very profitable. Car owners consider the seizure of cars by political organisations and for political reasons as car theft. During the last two or three years numerous armed groups with different political affiliations have appeared in all parts of Georgia. At the same time, it is very difficult to prevent car thefts and theft from a car. Co-operation and co-ordination is almost inexistent between the Georgian police and the crime prevention institutions of its neighbouring republics (i.e. Armenia, Azarbaijan, etc.). Whereas car theft is more widespread in Georgia than in Russia, car vandalism is more common in Russia than it is in Georgia. It is easier to steal a whole car than parts of it.

The number of bicycles and motorcycles used in Georgia is very low, due to its geographical characteristics and also because this form of transport is not part of the national culture.

Respondents understand burglary as armed burglary of apartments. The burglars themselves try to find the owners at home in order to find out where they keep the money and jewelry. They even intimidate their victims.

Four amnesties during the last two years have resulted in many criminals being released from prison.

Widespread car theft and apartment burglary explains the loss of interest by criminals in robbery or personal theft.

The inclusion of sexual incidents among the questions resulted in a remarkably low response rate. This was the first survey in Georgia to include questions of this type and the respondents therefore found it quite unusual to answer them.

The increase of the professional level of crime and the growth of organised crime is much lower in Georgia than in Russia.

Consumer fraud is quite usual since it is perceived as a normal reward for some services. This is also the case with bribe takers in some government offices.

The respondents believed that it was useless reporting most forms of crime to the police since the latter were unable to do anything against the political forces involved in crime. This is mainly correct in the case of car theft. Alongside the official solutions for some types of crime there exists the traditional institution of "crime resolution" by some important personality who has an influence over local criminals but is also respected by the population.

Compared to Moscow, robbery, sexual abuse and other "contact crimes" are considered to be more serious than other crimes.

The use of house alarms and other security equipment is not widespread among the Georgian population because this type of defence is unreliable, due to problems with the electricity supply, telephones that do not always function, etc. In the countryside neighbours often know one another quite well and therefore it is more common for people to ask someone to keep an eye on the house in Georgia than in Moscow.

The possession of weapons by armed political groups is normal and is also widespread among the population. Although it is illegal to carry a gun, the police are sometimes unable to prevent this.

### Attitudes towards the police

Almost seven out of ten victims who reported a crime to the police were unsatisfied with the way they dealt with the report. The population in general feel that the police are unable to do anything against armed gangs.

78.6% of the population was dissatisfied with the work of the police in the local regions.

It must be mentioned at this point that people do not trust the police and try to defend themselves with guns and other weapons, especially in the countryside.

Given the political climate in some regions the police are completely unable to control the situation.

## TABLES

**Table 1: Prevalence victimisation rates (5 years)\***

	Victimisation rate (%)
Theft of car	7.0
Theft from car	13.7
Car vandalism	5.9
Theft of motorcycle	0.3
Theft of bicycle	1.6
(Owners)	
Theft of car	14.4
Theft from car	28.0
Car vandalism	12.2
Theft of motorcycle	5.5
Theft of bicycle	8.0
Burglary with entry	10.2
Attempted burglary	7.7
Robbery	5.6
Personal theft	13.9
Sexual incidents	2.9
Assault/threat	4.6

\* 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	2.7
Theft from car	4.9
Car vandalism	1.9
Theft of motorcycle	
Theft of bicycle	0.3
(Owners)	
Theft of car	5.6
Theft from car	10.1
Car vandalism	3.8
Theft of motorcycle	
Theft of bicycle	1.4
Burglary with entry	2.5
Attempted burglary	2.0
Robbery	1.6
Personal theft	3.5
Sexual incidents	
Assault/threat	0.5
Consumer fraud	65.1
Corruption	20.7

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

**Table 3: Reported crimes**

	%
Theft of car	57.1
Theft from car	22.0
Car vandalism	24.1
Theft of motorcycle	50.0
Theft of bicycle	9.1
Burglary with entry	50.7
Attempted burglary	35.5
Robbery	21.8
Personal theft	5.7
Sexual incidents	21.7
Assault/threat	4.7

**Table 4: 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	59.2	20.9	32.5	50.0	4.5	51.4	33.3	15.5	31.2	31.2
Fairly serious	21.4	42.9	33.7		22.7	26.0	25.6	30.4	35.9	35.9
Not serious	3.1	16.7	10.8	25.0	40.9	11.3	1.2	24.2	21.7	10.9

\* Percentage based on victims of specific crimes.