

MMECC Project

Using International Victim Surveys to Estimate Victim Losses from Crime

1. Introduction

A key component of cost of crime estimates is a measure of the direct losses to victims from crime. Given the well-documented limitations of recorded crime data, crime victimisation surveys are the preferred source of data on these losses. This section shows how to use victimisation surveys to generate data for cost of crime estimation. The focus of this paper is on the scope for using data from international victim surveys for this purpose. A parallel paper reviews the (rather greater) scope for doing such analysis using data from detailed national victim surveys (with more respondents asked many more questions) such as the British Crime Survey.

Coverage of surveys

Surveys may be conducted at various levels and in different ways. Crime is a significant political issue in many countries. Since surveys are normally funded by taxpayers, their geographical coverage will often be driven by political geography and by the structure of responsibilities within the Criminal Justice System. Where responsibilities are decentralised to local communities or even police force areas a result can be many small and unrepresentative local surveys which cannot be used for purposes of estimating national costs of crime, unless the questions and methodology are well co-ordinated.

National crime victim surveys are conducted regularly in some countries. Where such surveys are conducted (for example in the UK where separate surveys are conducted for Scotland, Northern Ireland and England & Wales) the data can be of great value for crime cost estimation purposes. But many EU member states do not conduct regular large-scale national surveys of this kind. Some of these countries do contribute to a wider internationally-sponsored effort but, as we show, these surveys are of very limited value for estimating key cost of crime components.

ICVS surveys

International Crime Victims Surveys, conducted under the auspices of the UNICRI organisation, are available for a wide range of countries. The surveys are conducted occasionally rather than annually and the sample size (usually around 2,000 households) is on the low side. Despite these limitations they do ensure a minimum amount of information is being produced for the countries covered, and this does support international comparisons of various kinds. The ICVS covers around 37k respondents spread over 18 countries, with an average of 2,000 respondents per country: see Table 1.1 below. The UK data are split into three, one set each for England & Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland. Other European countries/areas covered are: Netherlands, Switzerland, Belgium, France, Finland, Sweden, Portugal, Denmark, Catalonia and Poland. A number of non-European countries are included namely: USA, Canada and Australia.

Table 1.1 Countries Covered by EUICVS 2000

Count		Total household respondents
COUNTRY	england & wales	1947
	scotland	2055
	northern ireland	1511
	netherlands	2000
	switzerland	4234
	belgie	2501
	france	1000
	finland	1782
	sweden	2001
	portugal	2000
	denmark	3007
	catalonia	2909
	usa	1000
	canada	2078
	australia	2005
	poland	5276
Total		37306

The offences covered are: theft of cars, theft from cars, theft of motorcycles, theft of bicycles, burglary/housebreaking, attempted burglary/housebreaking, robbery, theft of personal property, sexual victimisation, and assaults/threats.

There are 682 variables in the SPSS version of the data. A copy of the questionnaire is available from the EUICS site:

http://www.europeansafetyobservatory.eu/files/EUICS_qmasterEN.pdf

The data are quite limited from a cost of crime perspective. Sample size is quite low, so incidence rates cannot be estimated very reliably. The questionnaire is much less detailed than national surveys like the British Crime Survey. There is little to enable quantification of key cost components such as: victim loss from physical or emotional sources, lost output (e.g. days off work); and value of property lost or damaged in motor vehicle offences.

The things which it is possible to do are as follows:

- Identify which respondents have been victims of each offence in the past 5 years: the best source is the variable [offence type]LAST YEAR since it distinguishes those who have been a victim in the past 5 years; further it allows the victim group to be split into three: those who have been a victim in the current (incomplete) year, those who were a victim the previous year and those who had been victimised at some other time during the previous 5 years.
- Calculate the mean value of property stolen (and the mean value of property damaged) in domestic burglaries during the past five years
- Identify which respondents reported incidents (and if not why not)
- Whether a stolen car was recovered
- How serious the incident was for the victim and their household
- What weapons if any were used in robberies, sexual assaults and assaults or threats
- Whether injuries resulted from assaults (but not robberies or sexual assaults)
- Identify very crudely (by quartiles or halves) where households are located in the distribution of income.

2. Methodology

2.1 Estimating incidence and prevalence

For many offence types, including some quite serious crimes like sexual offences and violence against the person, reporting rates may be low and unpredictable. Surveys are often the best means of making reliable estimates of the proportion of the

population experiencing offences. In section 3 we show how to collect from ICVS the data needed to estimate incidence rates.

2.2 Estimating losses per incident

The costs victims incur from crime depend not only on the proportion of households experiencing a particular type of offence but also on the loss per incident. In section 4 we show how ICVS may, in some instances, be used to collect data on the distribution of losses across a sample of victims.

2.3 Using the findings for cost estimation purposes

The remaining sections of the paper show how to take these pieces of information from ICVS to construct some of the components of victim costs of crime. The methodology is illustrated by reference to Northern Ireland.

3. Incidence rates for various offence types from EU ICS

We look first at the estimation of incidence rates. The focus is on identifying the proportion of households who have been the victim of such an offence in the current year, the past year or the past 5 years. The preferred measure is taken by dividing the number of households who were victims in the ‘last year’ by the total number of households surveyed. In some cases this measure does not capture well a measure of the risk of becoming a victim. Non car-owning households are not at risk of having a car stolen. Such households would be excluded from a theft risk calculation. But for purposes of estimating incidence we are interested in the fraction of all households becoming victims.

The tables in Annex 2 below document findings for a range of offences.

4. Estimating Costs of Crime per Offence

The estimates of loss per offence are based on responses for all instances where households report losses from offences in the past five years. The basic procedure is to use EU ICS data to compute for each country the mean value of property damaged and the mean value of property stolen. The results are summarised in Tables 4.1 and 4.2.

Table 4.1 Mean value of damage to property in domestic burglaries Report

burglar:-VALUE OF DAMAGED PROPERTY

COUNTRY	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
england & wales	559.09	110	832.471
Scotland	444.32	45	641.031
northern ireland	243.85	47	508.453
netherlands	1605.06	101	5994.663
Belgie	28934.77	149	63443.108
France	4021.91	18	8592.393
Finland	5522.25	10	7249.070
Sweden	3693.35	42	5946.976
Portugal	5334.09	43	11775.582
Denmark	4009.19	117	6380.421
catalonia	102071.49	47	487169.332
usa	553.61	29	1037.423
canada	688.12	100	1410.713
australia	346.51	131	554.227
poland	165559.59	118	371256.631
Total	27035.03	1107	166368.333

Table 4.2 Mean value of property stolen in burglaries Report

burglar:-VALUE OF STOLEN PROPERTY

COUNTRY	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
england & wales	1603.21	156	2744.354
scotland	1498.10	79	2140.285
northern ireland	1382.23	71	3104.791
netherlands	724426.68	121	8047176.578
belgie	287198.66	176	2038585.598
france	16317.14	41	31685.610
finland	8862.68	23	14016.375
sweden	16130.07	85	27203.370
portugal	8078.67	98	17049.596
denmark	22934.24	232	34755.740
catalonia	284923.21	95	629844.105
usa	5742.05	50	18728.562
canada	4219.42	153	10337.003
australia	7697.32	225	68289.043
poland	113018.46	196	311837.979
Total	110507.11	1799	2190204.358

Care is needed because the number of burglaries involving damage to property is smaller than the number involving items being stolen. The mean loss per incident for

those surveyed is adjusted by taking a weighted average of the damage loss and the property loss: Table 4.3. This spreads the damage costs across all incidents where property loss occurred.

Table 4.3 Estimate of mean value of property damaged and stolen in domestic burglaries: UK

	mean value of damage	Incidents involving damage	mean value of property stolen	Incidents involving stolen items	Total mean loss	Mean loss per incident
	a	b	c	d	e=a+c	f=(ab+cd)/d
	£	No.	£	No.	£	£
england & wales	559	110	1,603	156	2,162	1,997
scotland	444	45	1,498	79	1,942	1,751
northern ireland	244	47	1,382	71	1,626	1,544

5. Estimating Aggregate Victim Costs of Crime

Assuming the Survey is nationally representative then the findings about victimisation can be aggregated to make estimates for the whole country. We use Northern Ireland to illustrate the method. The number of households in the Survey (Northern Ireland, 2000) is 1,511. The number of households in the country at that time¹ (Northern Ireland, 2000) was 623,000. Everything is thus to be scaled up by the multiple:

Multiply incidence and cost figures by: $623,000/1,511 = 412.31$

In fact it may be appropriate to scale up further to take account of subsequent growth in the number of households. The number was 648,000 by 2002, although we don't have a more recent figure.

¹ <http://www.detini.gov.uk/cgi-bin/downdoc?id=25>

Inflation

Any value estimates need to take account of inflation. The UK All Items Retail Prices Index (CHAW) stood at 170.3 in 2000². By 2007 it had risen to 206.6, so values are multiplied by 206.6/170.3 to convert from 2000 prices to 2007 prices. This assumes implicitly that when asked about property loss respondents have expressed losses in terms of prices prevailing at the time of the survey even though the loss was experienced up to five years previously³.

Proportion of households victimised

The best estimate of the proportion of households victimised annually is known from the 'last year' data to be 18/1511 = 1.19%. The corresponding proportions for other offence types are as follows⁴:

Car theft	1.19%
Theft from car	2.71%
Damage to car	4.50%
Burglary	1.65%
Personal theft	2.25%

In the spreadsheet model below these incidence rates are used to estimate the number of households victimised across the whole country. As is evident from our analysis of the ICVS data on the losses per incident, many of the data required to complete the estimation process are missing.

² The source of the data used is:

<http://www.statistics.gov.uk/StatBase/tsdataset.asp?vlnk=7172&More=N&All=Y>. This is not the only index that might be used but it is a familiar one.

³ The reason is that it is convenient to base value estimates on all incidents over the previous years rather than the last year offences only since it gives a larger sample and thus a better idea of the shape of the distribution of losses.

⁴ Offence types involving fewer than 5 victims have been excluded.

Table 5.1 Victim costs of crime, Northern Ireland

Annual estimate based on ICVS data for 2000					
	household victims last year'	victims in country (Est.)	loss per incident (Survey) £	aggregate loss (Survey) £	aggregate loss (inflation- adjusted) £
Assault	46	18,966			
Sexual offences	5	2,062			
Car theft	18	7,422			
Theft from car	41	16,905			
Damage to car	68	28,037			
Burglary	25	10,308	1,761.5	£18,157,017	£22,027,244
Robbery	1	412			
Personal theft	34	14,019			
households					
	NI, 2000:	623,000			
	ICVS:	1,511			
inflation					
	RPI 2000:	170.30			
	RPI 2007:	206.60			
recorded crime: Northern Ireland (new counting rules)	(thousands)	year 99/00	year 05/06		
	VAP	21.4	31.0		
	Sexual offences	1.3	1.7		
	Burglary	16.1	12.8		
	Robbery	1.4	1.7		
	Theft	37.0	29.5		
	Fraud and forgery	7.9	5.1		
	Criminal damage	31.2	34.8		
	Drug offences	1.7	2.9		
	Other	1.1	3.7		
	Total	119.1	123.2		

Use of Parallel Findings

In the absence of alternative data sources from the same country the next possibility to explore is using victim loss estimates from a neighbouring or similar country. Home

Office data for the cost of offences in 2003-04 based on England and Wales (E&W) would likely be a reasonable estimate for offences in Northern Ireland (NI).

Per capita income is slightly lower in NI than in E&W and this might well be reflected in the value of lost output or the value of property stolen or damaged. One option, therefore, would be to reduce the victim cost estimates in proportion to this variation. More generally it would be possible to 'scale' the Dubourg et al (2005) estimates according to a country's per capita income level. This is a rather crude procedure because it makes many assumptions such as the profile of murder victims being comparable in relation to characteristics such as age and labour market status.

If we are to use the Dubourg et al (2005) findings then it is important to recall that our purpose here is to estimate the costs to victims. We exclude here the costs of anticipation and the costs of the Criminal Justice System response. These other components are dealt with elsewhere in the model.

The table below uses the same template as the one above, but contains the Dubourg et al estimates and the corresponding calculations for application to Northern Ireland. One other addition is that of homicides. The normal presumption is that virtually all offences of this type are reported, so that the recorded offences are a good guide to the losses that have occurred.

Cost of crime estimates for Northern Ireland based on ICVS data 2000

	household victims	victims in country	loss per incident	aggregate loss	aggregate loss (inflation- adjusted)	loss per incident (Dubourg et al)	aggregate loss (Dubourg et al)
	last year'	(Est.)	(Survey)	(Survey)			
Assault	46	18,966				1,057	20,047,324
Sexual offences	5	2,062				27,184	56,041,138
Car theft	18	7,422				847	6,286,074
Theft from car	41	16,905				286	4,834,744
Damage to car	68	28,037				478	13,401,715
Burglary	25	10,308	1,761.5	£18,157,017	£22,027,244	1,721	17,739,626
Robbery	1	412				4,161	1,715,621
Personal theft	34	14,019				300	4,205,559
							<u>124,271,801</u>
Homicides		48				1,311,490	62,951,520

number of households**inflation**

in country:	NI, 2000	623,000		RPI 2000	170.30
in survey:	ICVS	1,511		RPI 2007	206.60

	year 99/00	year 05/06
recorded crime		
VAP	21.4	31.0
Sexual offences	1.3	1.7
Burglary	16.1	12.8
Robbery	1.4	1.7
Theft	37.0	29.5
Fraud and forgery	7.9	5.1
Criminal damage	31.2	34.8
Drug offences	1.7	2.9
Other	1.1	3.7
Total	119.1	123.2

Sources of data

Recorded crime data for 05-06 from: http://www.psnipolice.uk/1_recorded_crime.pdf

Homicides estimated from homicide rate of 28 per million inhabitants and population of 1.710300 million inhabitants in June 04

Loss per incident estimates derived from Dubourg et al (2005): (all in £)

	Impact on victims	property stolen	property damaged	property recovered	Lost output	Total loss
Assault	788				269	1,057
Sexual offences	22,754				4,430	27,184
Car theft	800				47	847
Theft from car	266				20	286
Damage to car	472				6	478
Burglary	646	846	187	-22	64	1,721
Robbery	3,048	109	12	-19	1,011	4,161
Personal theft	118	175	17	-13	3	300
Homicide	860,380				451,110	1,311,490

The net result is a set of estimates that rely on two principal sources. The incidence rates are taken from ICVS (except for the number of homicides which is taken from

recorded crime data) and the loss estimates (with the exception of burglary) are derived from Dubourg et al (2005).

This procedure is generalisable provided that one is happy to make adjustments to the loss per incident estimates based on the ratio of per capita income in a country to that of the UK in 2004.

6. Conclusions

Previous sections have demonstrated how to derive estimates of incidence rates from ICVS data and how it may be possible to derive some components of the value of losses victims experience per offence. It is clear, however, from the spreadsheet model example that this approach typically leaves many gaps in victim loss estimates. Various strategies can be developed to try to fill some of these gaps.

The more general implication is that although ICVS data are very useful for making estimates of incidence and prevalence rates of offences they are of limited use for estimating the value of victim losses. The coverage in ICVS is limited effectively to estimates for domestic burglary.

National surveys, such as the British Crime Survey, offer more complete coverage of such issues. Northern Ireland has itself conducted such surveys (the latest in 2006-07) but the raw data have not thus far been made available for external analysis. For countries where such surveys are not conducted (or data are not released) the options are:

- to consider commissioning one (or to consider releasing the data),
- to seek data from other less direct sources or
- to use values from other countries as proxies until something better can be done.

Annex 1 Extracting and Accessing ICVS data

1. Go to the data section of the ICVS web site (<http://www.unicri.it/wwd/analysis/icvs/data.php>)
2. Download the zipped SPSS data file for the 2000 National Surveys. Unzip the file to extract the data file which is in .por format.
3. At the time of writing (Feb. 2008) the latest data available in 'raw' form from the web site refer to the 2000 round of the survey, making them rather out of date. Variables measured in currency terms may need to be adjusted for changes in the currency in use (for states switching to the Euro since 2000) and/or for inflation. Inflation adjustments can be made using price index data for the relevant country.
4. This data file covers many countries. To explore the data for a particular country create a new datafile that contains only data from the country of interest. Select the Data item from the menu then Select Cases. Select your country by specifying the appropriate condition on variable i005. For Northern Ireland this would mean setting i005=10300. Towards the bottom of the Select Cases box indicate that you wish to save these data in a new file.
5. This newly created file is easier to use than the one you downloaded. Give it a name that indicates clearly which country the data cover.
6. The ICVS questionnaire contains quite a lot of questions that are of interest from a cost of crime perspective, but responses are not recorded against all of them. You can establish this quickly by running Descriptive Statistics to review the contents of the variables of interest. See list of variables below.
7. In the case of variables such as the value of property stolen in burglaries where data have been collected, generate key properties of the variable, such as its mean, minimum, maximum, median and mode. You may also be interested in things like the skewness of the distribution of its values.
8. It is useful to record also the number of households reporting themselves to be victim of each offence type. You will typically have a choice between incidents 'this year', 'last year' or 'prior'. The simplest of these is 'last year'. Unlike 'this year' it covers a full twelve month interval so can be used to derive an annual incidence or prevalence rate. The 'prior' one refers to some other time in the previous five years. Recollection over this interval is probably less reliable, so does not form a solid basis for estimating an average annual incidence rate.
9. Suggested method is to run Frequencies for each variable in the first list below to get incidence estimates. Then run Frequencies (or Compare Means as appropriate) to examine the proportion of cases where items are recovered (or losses have been estimated).

Annex 1 (cont.) Listing of key variables in ICVS

Variables for estimating proportion of households victimised:

c01a100	cartheft:LAST YEAR
c02a100	th fr car:LAST YEAR
c03a100	cardam:LAST YEAR
c04a100	motortheft:LAST YEAR
c05a100	bicyctheft:LAST YEAR
c06a100	burglar:LAST YEAR
c09a100	robbery:LAST YEAR
c10a100	pers theft:LAST YEAR
c11a100	sexoff:LAST YEAR
c12a100	assault:LAST YEAR
c13a100	fraud:LAST YEAR
c14a100	corrupt:LAST YEAR
sa2a100	carjack:LAST YEAR

Variables for cost of crime estimates:

c01c101	cartheft:RECOVERED
c02c202	th fr car:-VALUE OF STOLEN PROPERTY
c02b900	th fr car:SERIOUS
c03c302	cardam:-VALUE OF DAMAGED PROPERTY
c04c101	motortheft:RECOVERED
c05c101	bicyctheft:RECOVERED
c06c202	burglar:-VALUE OF STOLEN PROPERTY
c06c302	burglar:-VALUE OF DAMAGED PROPERTY
c09c202	robbery:-VALUE OF STOLEN PROPERTY
c10c202	pers theft:-VALUE OF STOLEN PROPERTY
c11b900	sexoff:SERIOUS
c12b900	assault:SERIOUS
c12e032	assault:-INJURY
c12e033	assault:-SEE DOCTOR
sa1c202	stock: VALUE
sa2c201	carjack:ACTUALLY STOLEN
sa2e032	carjack: INJURY
sa2e033	carjack: -SEE DOCTOR

SPSS Syntax for generating data required

The following lines of syntax generate a listing of the raw data (as listed above) needed from ICVS for the spreadsheet model. This assumes you have selected from ICVS the cases relevant to the country and year you are analyzing.

```
FREQUENCIES
  VARIABLES=c01a100 c02a100 c03a100 c04a100 c05a100 c06a100 c09a100 c10a100
  c11a100 c12a100 c13a100 c14a100 sa2a100
  /ORDER= ANALYSIS .
DESCRIPTIVES
```

```
VARIABLES=c01c101 c02c202 c02b900 c03c302 c04c101 c05c101 c06c202 c06c302  
c09c202 c10c202 c11b900 c12b900 c12e032 c12e033 sa1c202 sa2c201 sa2e032  
sa2e033  
/STATISTICS=MEAN STDDEV MIN MAX .
```

More specialist exploration

To explore the link between victimisation and household characteristics such as ethnic composition and household income look through the dataset to make a judgment about whether it is likely to be worthwhile spending time on further analysis. With low numbers of victims, and/or where the classification of households allows of much variation, the scope may be very limited. But it's worth looking, particularly if there are distributional concerns to be explored.

Annex 2 Estimating incidence rates

2.1 Victims of Burglary

Count

		burglar:LAST YEAR					Total
		no victim	this year	last year	before that	do not know	
COUNTRY	england & wales	1727	8	55	155	3	1948
	scotland	1941	6	30	75	3	2055
	northern ireland	1426	4	25	56	0	1511
	netherlands	1820	7	39	133	1	2000
	switzerland	4004	8	46	175	0	4233
	belgie	2269	25	51	156	1	2502
	france	934	1	10	48	7	1000
	finland	1755	0	6	21	0	1782
	sweden	1892	1	34	74	0	2001
	portugal	1883	15	27	74	0	1999
	denmark	2722	6	93	185	1	3007
	catalonia	2789	5	37	74	3	2908
	usa	924	2	18	52	3	999
	canada	1882	8	49	137	2	2078
	australia	1715	28	77	179	5	2004
	poland	4999	22	105	149	1	5276
Total		34682	146	702	1743	30	37303

2.2 Car theft [theft of cars]

Count

		cartheft:LAST YEAR					Total	
		no owner	no victim	this year	last year	before that		do not know
COUNTRY	england & wales	384	1395	4	40	117	6	1946
	scotland	493	1470	1	15	73	3	2055
	northern ireland	255	1147	10	18	79	1	1510
	netherlands	359	1581	9	9	38	4	2000
	switzerland	834	3321	9	13	48	9	4234
	belgie	322	2083	8	17	71	1	2502
	france	125	811	2	17	41	3	999
	finland	325	1409	4	8	36	0	1782
	sweden	419	1479	5	26	71	1	2001
	portugal	469	1476	5	18	31	1	2000
	denmark	666	2179	1	32	126	2	3006
	catalonia	484	2356	1	13	55	1	2910
	usa	97	865	0	5	33	0	1000
	canada	256	1703	4	28	86	1	2078
	australia	132	1708	10	38	110	6	2004
	poland	2057	3063	6	55	93	1	5275
Total		7677	28046	79	352	1108	40	37302

2.3 Theft from cars

COUNTRY * th fr car:LAST YEAR Crosstabulation

Count		th fr car:LAST YEAR					Total	
		no owner	no victim	this year	last year	before that		do not know
COUNTRY	england & wales	384	1159	17	125	261	2	1948
	scotland	493	1264	9	87	201	1	2055
	northern ireland	255	1124	9	41	81	1	1511
	netherlands	359	1344	13	79	198	7	2000
	switzerland	834	3073	20	70	233	4	4234
	belgie	322	1852	26	90	209	1	2500
	france	125	701	8	55	110	2	1001
	finland	325	1297	18	51	91	0	1782
	sweden	419	1247	8	105	221	0	2000
	portugal	469	1257	39	98	137	0	2000
	denmark	666	2052	13	103	171	2	3007
	catalonia	484	1922	38	154	305	6	2909
	Usa	97	748	9	64	79	2	999
	canada	256	1439	14	111	256	1	2077
	australia	132	1464	37	137	227	7	2004
	poland	2057	2482	71	288	372	5	5275
Total		7677	24425	349	1658	3152	41	37302

2.4 motor theft [motorbikes]

COUNTRY * motortheft:LAST YEAR Crosstabulation

Count		motortheft:LAST YEAR					Total	
		no owner	no victim	this year	last year	before that		do not know
COUNTRY	england & wales	1777	149	0	7	14	0	1947
	scotland	1937	114	0	3	2	0	2056
	northern ireland	1422	87	0	0	3	0	1512
	netherlands	1563	379	4	12	38	4	2000
	switzerland	3256	915	7	10	41	5	4234
	belgie	2070	392	6	8	24	1	2501
	france	791	178	0	3	28	0	1000
	finland	1523	251	0	2	6	0	1782
	sweden	1535	432	1	8	25	0	2001
	portugal	1633	351	0	5	11	0	2000
	denmark	2533	421	0	21	32	0	3007
	catalonia	2251	593	3	19	44	0	2910
	usa	879	116	0	3	1	0	999
	canada	1879	190	0	2	7	0	2078
	australia	1761	227	0	1	14	1	2004
	poland	4720	529	4	5	17	0	5275
Total		31530	5324	25	109	307	11	37306

2.5 Attempted burglaries

COUNTRY * attempt:LAST YEAR Crosstabulation

Count

		attempt:LAST YEAR					Total
		no victim	this year	last year	before that	do not know	
COUNTRY	england & wales	1767	11	55	108	6	1947
	scotland	1928	8	39	74	6	2055
	northern ireland	1459	3	13	29	7	1511
	netherlands	1785	11	54	141	11	2002
	switzerland	3937	39	74	170	13	4233
	belgie	2246	31	69	151	4	2501
	france	952	0	13	30	5	1000
	finland	1736	3	17	26	0	1782
	sweden	1937	6	14	42	1	2000
	portugal	1923	7	25	44	1	2000
	denmark	2864	4	44	90	4	3006
	catalonia	2830	5	19	55	0	2909
	usa	934	6	27	29	4	1000
	canada	1922	7	49	97	3	2078
	australia	1766	33	65	133	8	2005
	poland	5086	15	69	101	4	5275
Total		35072	189	646	1320	77	37304

2.6 Robbery

COUNTRY * robbery:LAST YEAR Crosstabulation

Count

		robbery:LAST YEAR					Total
		no victim	this year	last year	before that	do not know	
COUNTRY	england & wales	1873	6	22	46	1	1948
	scotland	2011	1	14	30	0	2056
	northern ireland	1495	3	1	12	0	1511
	netherlands	1929	6	17	42	6	2000
	switzerland	4124	4	32	71	4	4235
	belgie	2426	15	26	34	0	2501
	france	959	4	11	27	0	1001
	finland	1735	2	11	34	0	1782
	sweden	1955	1	19	25	1	2001
	portugal	1898	15	22	63	2	2000
	denmark	2940	6	20	40	1	3007
	catalonia	2772	9	26	101	0	2908
	usa	970	5	6	16	2	999
	canada	2014	5	19	39	1	2078
	australia	1930	14	24	32	5	2005
	poland	5073	19	96	85	3	5276
Total		36104	115	366	697	26	37308

2.7 Personal theft

COUNTRY * pers theft:LAST YEAR Crosstabulation

Count

		pers theft:LAST YEAR					Total
		no victim	this year	last year	before that	do not know	
COUNTRY	england & wales	1673	13	91	169	2	1948
	scotland	1798	13	94	147	3	2055
	northern ireland	1414	15	34	48	1	1512
	netherlands	1698	16	94	182	10	2000
	switzerland	3472	71	187	475	29	4234
	belgie	2120	46	104	226	5	2501
	france	893	8	30	62	6	999
	finland	1606	17	59	99	0	1781
	sweden	1708	9	116	167	1	2001
	portugal	1867	12	38	81	2	2000
	denmark	2604	29	123	239	12	3007
	catalonia	2622	21	88	175	4	2910
	usa	868	11	49	70	2	1000
	canada	1761	31	97	188	1	2078
	australia	1646	51	130	174	4	2005
	poland	4541	44	280	404	5	5274
Total		32291	407	1614	2906	87	37305

2.8 Sexual assaults

COUNTRY * sexoff:LAST YEAR Crosstabulation

Count

		sexoff:LAST YEAR					Total
		no victim	this year	last year	before that	do not know	
COUNTRY	england & wales	937	6	27	25	4	999
	scotland	1013	2	11	23	0	1049
	northern ireland	762	2	5	10	0	779
	netherlands	928	9	31	48	4	1020
	switzerland	2008	16	46	88	15	2173
	belgie	1212	19	13	34	0	1278
	france	496	0	6	10	0	512
	finland	841	12	34	36	0	923
	sweden	938	8	26	41	1	1014
	portugal	1003	6	7	19	1	1036
	denmark	1431	12	38	43	0	1524
	catalonia	1477	3	12	8	0	1500
	usa	488	8	8	19	3	526
	canada	1967	18	30	61	2	2078
	australia	1860	35	48	59	4	2006
	poland	2708	8	13	22	3	2754
Total		20069	164	355	546	37	21171

2.9 Assaults/threats

COUNTRY * assault:LAST YEAR Crosstabulation

Count		assault:LAST YEAR					10	Total
		no victim	this year	last year	before that	do not know		
COUNTRY	england & wales	1654	16	118	153	5	0	1946
	scotland	1767	21	125	141	1	0	2055
	northern ireland	1398	18	46	47	3	0	1512
	netherlands	1799	33	68	95	5	0	2000
	switzerland	3877	52	102	188	15	0	4234
	belgie	2256	47	79	113	6	0	2501
	france	880	10	42	65	3	0	1000
	finland	1574	20	74	114	0	0	1782
	sweden	1769	16	76	138	1	0	2000
	portugal	1919	17	19	44	2	0	2001
	denmark	2736	9	108	150	4	0	3007
	catalonia	2752	9	42	60	0	0	2863
	usa	872	11	34	78	5	0	1000
	canada	1782	22	110	163	1	0	2078
	australia	1625	79	128	170	3	1	2006
	poland	4898	69	148	158	4	0	5277
Total		33558	449	1319	1877	58	1	37262

2.10 Fraud

COUNTRY * fraud:LAST YEAR Crosstabulation

Count		fraud:LAST YEAR			Total
		yes	no	do not know	
COUNTRY	england & wales	117	1827	4	1948
	scotland	101	1948	6	2055
	northern ireland	58	1451	2	1511
	netherlands	87	1892	21	2000
	belgie	160	2333	8	2501
	france	44	952	3	999
	finland	182	1599	1	1782
	sweden	188	1789	24	2001
	portugal	139	1837	24	2000
	denmark	345	2637	25	3007
	catalonia	253	2640	16	2909
	usa	114	874	13	1001
	canada	156	1894	28	2078
	australia	177	1802	26	2005
	poland	677	4519	80	5276
Total		2798	29994	281	33073

2.11 Corruption

COUNTRY * corrupt:LAST YEAR Crosstabulation

Count

		corrupt:LAST YEAR				Total
		yes	no	do not know	8	
COUNTRY	england & wales	1	1946	0	0	1947
	scotland	0	2055	0	0	2055
	northern ireland	2	1509	0	0	1511
	netherlands	8	1990	2	0	2000
	belgie	9	2491	2	0	2502
	france	13	985	2	0	1000
	finland	3	1777	1	1	1782
	sweden	2	1999	0	0	2001
	portugal	27	1971	2	0	2000
	denmark	8	2996	2	0	3006
	catalonia	7	2901	1	0	2909
	usa	2	997	1	0	1000
	canada	8	2067	3	0	2078
	australia	7	1997	1	0	2005
	poland	269	4928	79	0	5276
Total		366	32609	96	1	33072

Annex 3 Application to Northern Ireland

Latest Survey findings from year: 2000

Country covered: Northern Ireland

Households interviewed: 1,511

1. Car theft

Households suffering loss:	
Non car owners:	255
Owners & victims:	
This year (incomplete)	10
Last year	18
Prior (other time in last 5 yrs)	79
	107
Owners not victimised in last 5 years:	1,147

Incidence rate ('last year') = $18/1511 = 1.19\%$

No value question. Recovery rate (from c02c202): $83/109 = 76\%$

2. Theft from car

Households suffering loss:	
Non car owners:	255
Owners & victims:	
This year (incomplete)	9
Last year	41
Prior (other time in last 5 yrs)	81
	131
Owners not victimised in last 5 years:	1,124

No responses recorded to value question (c02c202).

Incident rate ('last year'): = $41/1511 = 2.71\%$

Of the 131 victims 34 regarded the event as 'very serious', 34 as 'fairly Serious' and 63 as 'not very serious'.

3. Damage to car

Households suffering loss:	
Non car owners:	255
Owners & victims:	
This year (incomplete)	27
Last year	68
Prior (other time in last 5 yrs)	142
	237
Owners not victimised in last 5 years:	1,020

No responses recorded to value question (c03c302)

Incidence rate ('last year'): = $68/1511 = 4.50\%$

Of the 236 victims 51 regarded the event as 'very serious', 97 as 'fairly Serious' and 88 as 'not very serious'.

4. Theft of motorcycle (motortheft)

Households suffering loss:

Non motorcycle owners:	1,422
Owners & victims:	
This year (incomplete)	0
Last year	0
Prior (other time in last 5 yrs)	3
	3
Owners not victimised in last 5 years:	1,020

No information on vehicle recovery. Ignore this category: numbers too small.

5. Bicycle theft

Households suffering loss:

Non cycle owners:	622
Owners & victims:	
This year (incomplete)	4
Last year	22
Prior (other time in last 5 yrs)	52
	78
Owners not victimised in last 5 years:	809

No information on cycle recovery.

Incidence rate ('last year') = $22/1511 = 1.46\%$

6. Burglary

Households burgled:

This year:	4
Last year:	25
Previously:	56
Not victims:	1,426

Households suffering property loss: 71

Households suffering property damage: 45

Value of property loss**Mean value of property stolen: £1,591****Median value of property stolen: £400****Value of property damage****Mean value of property damaged: £269****Median value of property damaged: £100**

Incidence rate ('last year') = $25/1511 = 1.65$

7,8 attempts to break in and garage-related offences ignored

9. Robbery

Households suffering loss:	
This year (incomplete)	3
Last year	1
Prior (other time in last 5 yrs)	12
Not victims	1,495

Value of property stolen (c09c202) not recorded

Number of incidents too low to compute incidence rate

10. Personal theft

Households suffering loss:	
This year (incomplete)	15
Last year	34
Prior (other time in last 5 yrs)	48
Not victims	1,414

Value of property stolen (c10c202) not recorded

Incidence rate ('last year') = $34/1511 = 2.25\%$

11. Sexual offences

Households victimised:	
This year (incomplete)	2
Last year	5
Prior (other time in last 5 yrs)	10
Not victims	762
Information missing	733

Respondent's rating of seriousness: of the 17 offences 7 were rated as 'very serious', 4 as 'fairly serious' and 6 as 'not very serious'

Incidence rate ('last year') = $5/1511 = 0.33\%$ (but only 779/1511 responses to this question)

12. Assault

Households victimised:	
This year (incomplete)	18
Last year	46
Prior (other time in last 5 yrs)	47
Not victims	1,398
Information missing	3

Respondent's rating of seriousness: of 134 offences rated, 80 were described as 'very serious', 47 as 'fairly serious' and 7 as 'not very serious'.

No data collected on length of time off work or in hospital

Incidence rate ('last year'): = $46/1511 = 3.04\%$

13. Fraud Missing from dataset, although frequency counts are available for the missing variables. 58 households were victims of fraud last year. Of

these, 12 related to 'construction or repair works', 21 to 'shops' and 20 to 'other'.

14. **Corruption** This category is also missing from the dataset, but again frequency counts are available. Only 2 households report being victims.
15. **Stock (agricultural) theft** No data
16. **Carjacking** No data