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Conventions used in the Figures and Tables

The following conventions are used in the figures and tables for this report, including the Annexes.

**Figures and tables**

Each figure or table has a title (1), the data source (survey year etc.) (2), a base definition and the unweighted base figures (3). The SPSS data file variable name is also included (4).  

For example:

1. **Figure 5.6: Most common reasons crime was reported**
2. SCJS 2009/10
3. All SCJS crime where the police were told by respondent / person in household / other person (base: 1,217)
4. Variable name: QPKR

**Unweighted base**

All SCJS percentages and rates presented in the figures and tables are based on weighted data (see Annex 4 for further details). However, figures and tables show the unweighted base above the figure / table which represents the number of respondents / households interviewed in the specified group or the numbers of crimes that the analysis is based on.

**Percentages**

Row or column percentages may not add to 100 per cent due to rounding.

Most figures / tables present cell percentages where the figures refer to the percentage of respondents / households / crimes that have the attribute being discussed. The complementary percentage to add to 100 per cent may not be shown. Respondents could refuse to answer any question they did not wish to answer. The majority of questions also had a ‘don’t know’ option. Percentages are generally not shown for these response categories.

A percentage may be quoted in the report text for a single category that is identifiable in the figures / tables only by summing two or more component percentages. In order to avoid rounding errors, the percentage has been recalculated for the single combined category and therefore may differ by one percentage point from the sum of the percentages derived from the figures / tables.

Percentages in the tables and figures in the main body of the report (excluding the Annex 1 tables) are displayed to zero decimal places. The exceptions are where the percentage is less than one per cent or where

---

1 The SPSS variable name is also often the question name.
results are presented reporting national indicators. Percentages are then displayed to one decimal place.

**Table abbreviations**

‘ - ’ indicates that no respondents gave an answer in the category

‘0’ indicates less than 0.5% (this does not apply when percentages are presented to one decimal point).

‘n/a’ indicates that the SCJS question was not applicable or not asked in that particular year.

‘ * ’ indicates that data are not reported because the unweighted base is less than 50.
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Executive Summary

Introduction

The Scottish Crime and Justice Survey (SCJS) is a large-scale continuous survey measuring people’s experience and perceptions of crime in Scotland, based on 16,000 face-to-face interviews conducted annually with adults (aged 16 or over) living in private households in Scotland.

Background to the survey

Crime and victimisation surveys have been carried out in Scotland since the early 1980s. The current survey was launched in April 2008 as the Scottish Crime and Justice Survey (SCJS) and represents a major shift in design and methodology from previous surveys, principally involving a large increase in sample size and a move to continuous interviewing using a rolling reference period for the victimisation module. As a result, care should be taken if comparing the results from the SCJS with sweeps from previous Scottish crime surveys. The increase in sample size enhances the statistical reliability of the estimates produced by the survey.

Purpose and limitations of the SCJS

The SCJS 2009/10 provides a complementary measure of crime compared with police recorded crime statistics. The survey provides information on the criminal justice system and on adults’ experience of civil law problems and their perceptions and experience of crime. It also provides estimates of progress for two of the 45 national indicators in the Scottish Government’s National performance framework.

At the same time, the SCJS does not aim to provide an absolute count of crime and has notable exclusions. As with any survey, the results can only represent the experience of the adults in the sample who take part and the results, like the results of other sample-based surveys, are subject to sampling error. In spite of these limitations the results of the SCJS 2009/10 provide the best available indicator of rates of adult victimisation in Scotland.

This report

This report presents the initial findings from the SCJS 2009/10. It includes estimates for the majority of questions contained in the survey questionnaire and some simple one-to-one relationships between survey variables. The report does not include in-depth, multivariate statistical analysis that would explore the more complex underlying relationships within the data.

The extent of crime in Scotland

Estimates of crime

One of the main purposes of the SCJS 2009/10 is to provide an estimate of the extent of crime among the adult population living in private households in Scotland.
Scotland. There were 945,000 crimes as measured by the SCJS in 2009/10. This included approximately 679,000 property crimes (72% of all SCJS crime) involving theft or damage to personal or household property (including vehicles) and approximately 266,000 were violent crimes of assault or robbery (28% of all SCJS crime).

Proportion of SCJS crime in aggregated crime groups

32% of crime measured by the SCJS in 2009/10 was vandalism; 16% was other household theft (including bicycle theft); 14% was personal theft (excluding robbery); seven per cent was all motor vehicle theft related incidents and three per cent was housebreaking.

26% of crime measured by the SCJS in 2009/10 was assault (including two per cent which was serious assault) and two per cent was robbery.

The risk of crime

Around one in five (19.3%) adults aged 16 or over was the victim of at least one crime as measured by the SCJS. 17% of adults (88% of all victims) were estimated to have been a victim of property crime and four per cent of adults (19% of all victims) had been a victim of violent crime.

Trends in numbers of crimes; 2008/09 and 2009/10

A comparison of estimates from 2008/09 and 2009/10 suggests that crime has decreased by just under 10%, with a fall from 1,045,000 crimes in 2008/09 to 945,000 crimes in 2009/10.

The risk of being a victim of a crime fell from 20.4% in 2008/09 to 19.3% in 2009/10.

Comparison with England and Wales

The risk of being a victim of crime in England and Wales, estimated from the BCS 2009/10, was 21.5% compared with 19.3% in Scotland.

Comparison of the proportion of crime made up by the different crime groups in Scotland and in England and Wales showed that 72% of crime as measured by the SCJS in 2009/10 in Scotland was property crime compared with 78% of crime identified by the BCS in 2009/10 in England and Wales. 28% of crime as measured by the SCJS in 2009/10 was violent crime compared with 22% of crime measured by the BCS in England and Wales in the same period.

The risk and characteristics of crime

Varying risk of crime – individual level

Males and females had an equal risk of being a victim of property crime (both 17%) whereas males had a higher risk of being a victim of violent crime compared with females (five per cent and two per cent respectively).
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16-24 year old males had the highest risk of being a victim of violent crime (15%) compared with all other combined age / gender groups.

Varying risk of crime – area level

The risk of property crime was higher for adults living in the 15% most deprived areas (22%) compared with those living in the rest of Scotland (16%). There was a six per cent risk of violent crime for adults living in the 15% most deprived areas compared with a three per cent risk for adults living in the rest of Scotland.

Repeat Victimisation

The SCJS 2009/10 estimated that six per cent of adults (or 34% of victims of property crime) were repeat victims of property crime, that is they had been the victim of more than one property crime in the previous 12 months, and one per cent of adults (or 34% of victims of violent crime) were repeat victims of violent crime.

Characteristics of crime

Three in five property crimes (60%) took place immediately outside the home. One in ten or fewer property crimes took place in any other single location. In contrast, violent crime happened in a number of locations for example in or near the victim’s place of work (19%); in or around a pub, bar or club (18%); inside the victims’ home (12%); immediately outside the home (11%).

Characteristics of offenders

Offender(s) were male in 68% of property crime compared with 82% of violent crime where the victim could provide details. Offenders included both males and females in 19% of property crime compared with six per cent of violent crime where the victim could provide details.

In 42% of property crime where the victim could provide details, the offender(s) was aged 16-24 and in 46% of such violent crime, the offender(s) was that age. In 37% of property crime where the victim was able to provide details, the offender(s) was of school age compared with 13% of such violent crime where the offender(s) was that age.

Victims who knew or had seen the offender(s) were more likely to know the offender(s) well in violent crime (56%) than in property crime (35%). In 31% of property crime where the victim knew the offender(s) well the offender(s) was a neighbour; in 23% a friend and in 14% young people from the local area. In 20% of violent crime where the victim knew the offender(s) well, the offender(s) was a client or member of the public contacted through work; in 19% a friend or acquaintance; in 17% the current husband, wife or partner and in 11% the former husband, wife or partner of the victim.
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Weapons used in crime

Victims reported that the offender(s) had something they used or threatened to use as a weapon in 30% of violent crime and seven per cent of property crime where victims saw or had any contact with the offender(s).

Alcohol or drug related violent crime

Victims perceived the offender(s) to have been under the influence of alcohol in 62% of violent crime and of drugs in 26% of violent crime.

Impact and perceptions of crime

Monetary impacts – property crime

In 54% of property crime when property was damaged, victims valued damaged items at £300 or less. In 32%, they said they did not know the value of the damaged items. In 83% of property crime when property was stolen victims valued stolen items at £300 or less; in 42%, they valued them at £50 or less.

Injuries sustained

Injures were sustained in more than half (56%) of violent crime.

Whether what happened was a crime or not

When asked about their perceptions of the crime, in 66% of crime victims said they thought what happened was a crime; in 18% of crime, victims described it as wrong but not a crime and in 16% of crime victims said it was just something that happened.

Property crime (72%) was more likely to be described as a crime by victims compared with violent crime (51%). Violent crime (27%) was more likely to be described by victims as ‘just something that happens’ compared with property crime (12%).

What should have happened to offender(s)

In 41% of crime, victims said that the offender(s) should not have been prosecuted in court. Victims said the offender(s) should not have been prosecuted in court in 37% of property crime compared with 50% of violent crime.

In 56% of crime, victims said the offender(s) should have been prosecuted in court. Victims said the offender(s) should have been prosecuted in court in 60% of property crime compared with 47% of violent crime.

In 24% of crime where the victim thought that the offender(s) should be prosecuted, the victim thought the offender(s) should have been given a
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prison sentence and in 72%, the victim said that the offender(s) should have been given some other kind of sentence;

- Victims said the offender(s) should have been sentenced to prison in 41% of such violent crime and in 19% of such property crime;

- Victims said the offender(s) should have been given a sentence other than a prison sentence in 77% of such property crime and in 57% of such violent crime.

Reporting crime and support for victims

Advice and support for victims

Regardless of whether the crime was reported to the police, for the majority of crime (90%), victims said they or another household member did not need or want any support or advice.

The percentage of victims who actually received advice and support was lower than the percentage who said they would have liked to receive support and advice. Victims received advice and support in six per cent of crime and they would have liked to receive advice and support in nine per cent of crime.

The difference was greater for violent crime than property crime. Advice and support was received in nine per cent of violent crime and five per cent of property crime. Victims would have liked advice and support for 17% of violent crime and six per cent of property crime.

Compared with 2008/09 both the proportion of crime where victims received advice and support and the proportion of crime where victims would have liked advice and support decreased. Victims in eight percent of crime received advice and support in 2008/09 compared with victims in six per cent of crime in 2009/10. Victims in 13% of crime would have liked advice and support in 2008/09 compared with victims in nine per cent of crime in 2009/10.

Reporting crime to the police

Approaching two in five (37%) of all SCJS crimes were reported to the police in 2009/10 which is similar to the 38% measured in 2008/09. The comparable figure for England and Wales was 40%.

In 57% of reported crime, victims were satisfied with the way the police handled the matter while in 26% of reported crime they were dissatisfied. In almost half (49%) of crime, where the victim reported dissatisfaction with the way the police handled reported crime, this was because the police did not follow up, respond or there was no action taken.

Information or assistance about the investigation

In three in ten reported crimes (30%) victims received information or assistance about the investigation (or case) from at least one source. In 78% of reported crime where information or assistance was received from the
police, victims reported satisfaction with that information or assistance. In 41% of reported crime where victims had received at least one type of information or assistance, they would have liked to receive at least one additional type of information or assistance.

In around a third of reported crimes (31%) victims did not receive any information or assistance about the investigation (or case). In 61% of reported crime where victims had not received information or assistance, they would have liked to receive at least one type of information or assistance.

**Public perceptions of crime**

**Perceptions of crime**

The SCJS is used specifically to monitor one of the national indicators in Scotland Performs: ‘increase positive public perception of the general crime rate in the local area’. This national indicator is measured by the percentage of adults who perceive that the amount of crime in their local area has either decreased or stayed the same in the last two years.

The SCJS 2009/10 estimated that 71% of adults perceived the crime rate in their local area to have stayed the same or reduced in the past two years. This is a statistically significant increase in the national indicator measure compared with the baseline of 65% in 2006. There was a two percentage point increase in the national indicator between 2008/09 and 2009/10.

As well as being asked about perceived changes to the crime rate in their local area, respondents were also asked about how they thought the crime rate had changed in the last two years in Scotland overall. Adults were twice as likely to believe that the crime rate had increased in Scotland as a whole as they were to believe that it had increased in the local area (52% versus 25%).

**Public anxiety about crime**

To understand public anxiety about crime respondents were asked how much they worried about a range of crimes happening to them, and whether they thought they would be a victim of a range of crimes in the next year.

Adults were most worried about someone using their credit / bank details to obtain money, goods or services (57%) and having their identity stolen (50%). Fraudulent use of credit or bank details (17%), damage to vehicles (13%) and identity theft (12%) were the crimes that adults most commonly thought were likely to happen to them in the next 12 months. Half (49%) of all adults did not think it was likely that they would experience any of the crimes asked about in the next 12 months.

**Trends in public perceptions of crime**

The percentage of adults who believed that particular crimes were common in the local area has generally decreased from the first crime surveys in the early
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1990s. The percentage of adults worrying that particular crimes might happen to them has also generally decreased over time.

Comparing data from 2009/10 with the previous survey in 2008/09, there was a slight increase in the perception of how common most crimes were in the local area, with the largest increase being for drug dealing / drug abuse (from 45% to 48%) and street mugging or robbery (from 10% to 13%).

**Perceived versus actual risk**

The risk of being a victim of crime perceived by adults was generally much higher than the actual risk of being a victim. In most cases the perceived risk of being a victim of specific crimes was around twice the actual risk on average across the population. However, for having a motor vehicle stolen, being mugged or robbed in the street or having one’s home broken into, the perceived risk was much higher than the actual risk (25, 20 and nine times higher, respectively).

**The public and the police**

**Confidence in the police**

Respondents were asked how confident they were in their local police force’s ability to undertake specific aspects of their work, principally related to preventing, investigating and detecting crime.

More than three in five adults (68%) said they were very or fairly confident in their local police force’s ability to investigate incidents after they occur.

Fewer adults, though still a majority, said they were confident about their local police force’s ability to deal with incidents as they occur (61%); solve crimes (60%); respond quickly to appropriate calls and information (58%) and catch criminals (57%).

Just under half of adults (48%) were very or fairly confident in their local police force’s ability to prevent crime, the lowest confidence expressed in any aspect of the local police force’s performance.

Compared with the previous survey year (2008/09), there was a small but significant increase in adults’ confidence in all aspects of local police performance.

**Attitudes to the police in the local area**

More than eight in ten adults (83%) agreed that the local police would treat them with respect if they had reason to contact them while almost six in ten agreed that the police treat everyone in the area fairly and that the local police can be relied upon to be there when needed (58% each).

48% agreed the police listened to the concerns of local people and 43% agreed that people have a lot of confidence in the local police.
Around three in ten agreed that local police were not dealing with the things that matter to the community (31%) and that community relations with the police in the local area were poor (28%).

Attitudes of those living in the 15% most deprived areas were more negative to aspects of service provided by the police in the local area than were the attitudes of those living in the rest of Scotland.

**Police presence in the local area**

56% of adults said the overall police presence in their local area was not enough, 38% said it was about right and one per cent said the police presence was too much. 65% of respondents living in the 15% most deprived areas said they thought the police presence was not enough in their local area, compared with 55% of those living in the rest of Scotland.

**Being stopped by the police**

Respondents were asked whether they had ever been stopped and asked questions by the police in Scotland. Almost four in ten (39%) said they had.

Of those stopped by the police ever, 28% had been stopped while they were in a car; 15% when on foot; and one per cent each when riding a bicycle or a motorcycle.

More than a quarter of those who had ever been stopped (26%) said they had been stopped and asked questions by the police in the last year.

The main reason they had been stopped in a car in the last year was for a routine check such as checking a tax disc (23% of those stopped in that time). The main reason they had been stopped on foot or on a bicycle in the last year was because the police were just making general enquiries or asking for information (22% of those stopped in that time).

**Scottish justice systems and organisations**

**The Scottish criminal justice system**

Most adults said they did not know very much (64%) and another 18% did not know anything at all about the criminal justice system.

Respondents, regardless of the level of contact they have had with the criminal justice system, were asked how confident they were that the system delivered in six key areas.

- 71% of adults were either very or fairly confident that the system makes sure everyone has access to the criminal justice system if they need it;
- 55% were very or fairly confident that the system doesn’t treat you differently depending on where you live in Scotland;
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- 53% were very or fairly confident that the system is effective in bringing people who commit crimes to justice;
- 45% were very or fairly confident that the system provides a good standard of service for witnesses;
- 41% were very or fairly confident that the system provides a good standard of service for victims of crime;
- 38% were very or fairly confident that the system deals with cases promptly and efficiently.

The percentage of adults saying they had confidence in the different aspects of delivery of the criminal justice system increased by up to three percentage points for five out of six aspects between 2008/09 and 2009/10. The exception was in the percentage of adults who were very or fairly confident in the system’s ability to bring people who commit crimes to justice, which was unchanged (53% in each year).

Community sentencing

The extent to which respondents agreed or disagreed with a series of attitudinal statements about the use of community sentences for offenders was investigated:

- 85% agreed (strongly or slightly) that community sentencing is a good idea for minor crimes;
- 66% agreed that drug users need treatment not prison;
- 64% agreed that community sentences do not punish criminals enough;
- 64% agreed that community sentences are a soft option;
- 50% agreed that learning new skills during community sentences stops criminals from committing more crimes;
- 49% agreed that electronic tagging of criminals is a good alternative to prison.

There was little change since 2008/09 in these attitudes. The main exception was in the percentage of adults agreeing that electronic tagging of criminals is a good alternative to prison, which increased by three percentage points since 2008/09 (46% 2008/09; 49% 2009/10).

Civil Law

Respondents were asked about their experiences of civil law problems in the three years prior to interview. 28% of adults had experienced at least one civil law problem in the last three years.
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Specifically, 16% of adults had experienced a civil law problem related to home, family or living arrangements; 12% had experienced problems associated with money, finance or things they had paid for; six per cent had been treated unfairly in some respect; five per cent had experienced health or well-being problems.

The most common individual civil law problem was with neighbours, which 11% had experienced followed by problems with faulty goods or services (six per cent).
1 Introduction

The Scottish Crime and Justice Survey (SCJS) is a large-scale continuous survey measuring adults’ experience and perceptions of crime in Scotland. The survey is based on, annually, 16,000 face-to-face interviews with adults (aged 16 or over) living in private households in Scotland.

The main aims of the SCJS are to:

- Provide a valid and reliable measure of adults’ experience of crime, including services provided to victims of crime;
- Examine trends in the number and nature of crimes in Scotland over time;
- Examine the varying risk of crime for different groups of adults in the population;
- Collect information about adults’ experiences of, and attitudes to, a range of crime and justice related issues.

This report presents the results for the second full year of the survey, with interviews conducted between April 2009 and March 2010. The report from the first year of the survey (2008/09) was published in October 2009.²

Throughout the report, the term ‘crime’ is used to refer to any in-scope incident recorded by the survey, occurring during the interview reference period and in Scotland, in which the respondent or their household as a whole was the victim.³

1.1 Survey background and methodology

Crime and victimisation surveys have been carried out in Scotland since the early 1980s. The geographical coverage, sample size, method and fieldwork and reference periods have varied across previous crime surveys (Box 1.1).

---


³ For further explanation of terminology used in this report with regard to crimes refer to Annex 1.
The SCJS was launched in April 2008, and represented a major departure from the design, methodology and sample size of previous surveys. The main changes introduced with the SCJS were an increase in the sample size (to 16,000 adults from around 5,000 in most previous surveys) and a move to continuous fieldwork throughout the financial year using a rolling reference period for the victimisation module. The increase in sample size enhances the statistical reliability of the estimates produced by the survey.

The design of the 2009/10 SCJS remains the same as the 2008/09 survey (with the exception of a change to the sample design resulting in the redistribution of interviews within Police Force Areas – Annex 2):

- **Sample**: a systematic random selection of private residential addresses across Scotland was produced and allocated in batches to interviewers. Interviewers called at addresses and obtained information on all household members and then selected at random one adult (aged 16 or over) for interview at each address. The sample was designed to be representative of all private residential households across Scotland (with the exception of some of the smaller islands) over the 12 month fieldwork period;

- **Interviews**: 16,036 interviews were conducted in respondents’ homes by professional interviewers using Computer Assisted Personal Interviewing (CAPI) machines;

- **Questionnaire**: the questionnaire consists of a modular design, including a victimisation module, demographic section, four quarter-sample modules on varying topics (section A2.2) and a Computer Assisted Self Interviewing (CASI) self-completion section covering sensitive crimes (sexual victimisation, partner abuse and illicit drug use). Interviews lasted an average of 40 minutes, though there was considerable variation in interview length, in particular where respondents reported experiencing one or more incident of victimisation;

**Box 1.1: Past Scottish crime and victimisation surveys**

- **1982, 1988**: British Crime Survey (BCS) included coverage of central and southern Scotland only.

- **1993**: First independent Scottish Crime Survey (SCS) launched, based on BCS and covering the whole of Scotland.

- **1996, 2000, 2003**: Further sweeps of the SCS.


- **2008/09**: Scottish Crime and Justice Survey (SCJS)
• **Fieldwork**: all interviews were conducted between 1\textsuperscript{st} April 2009 and 31\textsuperscript{st} March 2010, with roughly an equal number of interviews conducted in each month;

• **Time period covered**: interviews were conducted on a rolling basis over the course of a year and respondents were asked about incidents experienced in the 12 months prior to the month of interview (the reference period). The time period covered by the data included in this report extends over 23 months (as interviews were conducted across 12 months) so is not directly comparable with any calendar year (Annex 2);

• **Weighting**: the results obtained were weighted to correct for the unequal probability of selection for interview caused by the sample design and for differences in the level of response among groups of individuals.

The survey response rate was 70%.

Further information about the design and methodology is contained in Annex 2 and in the accompanying Technical Report.\(^4\)

### 1.2 Purpose and limitations of the SCJS

One of the main functions of crime and victimisation surveys is that they provide a complementary measure of crime compared with police recorded crime statistics (Chapter 2). Counts of police recorded crime are limited in that, for or a variety of reasons, not all incidents of victimisation are reported to, or recorded by, the police. In addition, police recorded crime statistics are affected by changes in policing policy and police recording practice.

By asking adults about their experiences including incidents that are not reported to or not recorded by the police, crime surveys can overcome some of the limitations to police recorded crime statistics and provide a more complete picture of victimisation rates.\(^5\) In doing this, the SCJS focuses attention on the victims of crime and provides data on which groups are most at risk of certain crimes. Additionally, the survey provides information on the criminal justice system and on adults’ experience of problems and disputes that can be settled in court.

---


\(^5\) Further detail of the coverage of the SCJS is provided in Annexes 2 and 3 of this report and in the accompanying Technical Report.
However, crime and victimisation surveys are not without their limitations and the SCJS is no exception. The SCJS does not aim to provide an absolute count of all crime and has notable exclusions.

It is a survey of adults living in private residential households and therefore does not provide information on crimes against adults living in other circumstances (for example those living in institutions, such as prisons or hospitals, or other communal accommodation, such as military bases and student accommodation). Those living in some of the smallest inhabited islands in Scotland are excluded for practical reasons (see the accompanying Technical Report for details).

It excludes persons under the age of 16 and crimes against businesses (for example, shoplifting). Other crimes outside the survey’s coverage include those that are ‘victimless’, such as speeding, or where a victim cannot be interviewed, such as homicide. Whilst details of threats are collected in the survey, they are not included in the crime statistics as it is hard to establish whether or not an offence has been committed. Sexual offences are also not explicitly collected in the victimisation module, but are collected in the self-completion section and reported separately; thus they are not included in the all SCJS crime statistics.

As with any survey, the results can only represent the experience of the adults in the sample who take part; if the experiences of those who cannot be contacted, or who refuse to take part, are different from those who are interviewed, and this cannot be corrected by weighting, then the survey will not reflect the experiences of the adults of Scotland as a whole. Measures are taken to ensure the representativeness of the sample as far as possible. For example, interviewers must make a minimum of 8 calls at an address on different days of the week and at different times of the day to attempt to obtain contact at a selected address.

There may also be errors in the recall of participants as to when certain incidents took place, resulting in some crimes being wrongly included in, or excluded from, the reference period. Again, a number of steps in the design of the questionnaire are taken to ensure, as far as possible, that this does not happen, for example repeating key date questions in more detail.

It is also possible that public perceptions of crime and victimisation may change over time, and result in changes in how adults consider incidents from survey to survey.

The SCJS results, like the results of other sample-based surveys, are also subject to sampling error. To indicate the extent of this error, the confidence intervals for the key statistics presented in this report are provided in Annex 4. These confidence intervals are bands within which the ‘true’ value lies (i.e. that value which would be obtained if a census of the entire population was undertaken). These confidence intervals are calculated to the 95% level, meaning that we would expect the survey data to lie within this range 95 times if the survey were to be repeated 100 times, each with a different randomly selected sample of adults.
In spite of these limitations the results of this survey provide the best available indicator of rates of adult victimisation in Scotland.

### 1.3 Comparing estimates of crime

Care needs to be taken with the comparison of estimates between one survey and another.

Most of the comparisons made in this report are between the 2008/09 and 2009/10 surveys. The 2008/09 and 2009/10 surveys have similar sample sizes and design, although additional stratification at Local Authority level in 2009/10 increased the disproportion within the design. Scottish crime surveys prior to 2008/09 had substantially different sampling to the 2008/09 and 2009/10 surveys (section 1.1) which needs to be kept in mind when comparing data over time.

In contrast to previous surveys, the SCJS uses continuous year-round fieldwork with a rolling reference period. This change from 2008/09 onwards represents a fundamental change in the methodology of crime and victimisation surveys in Scotland and cannot be discounted fully as a possible explanation of change when looking at data from surveys prior to the SCJS.

The smaller sample size of surveys between 1993 and 2006 means that the confidence intervals associated with the data are larger than those associated with the SCJS. As a result for the SCJS, estimates of crime, especially those that are less common, for example robbery, are more statistically reliable than the estimates produced by previous surveys.

Many features of the SCJS have not altered from previous surveys. The fundamental structure of the questionnaire and wording of key questions has not changed. In particular, questions used to screen for being a victim of crime and those used in assigning offence codes remain unchanged.

The design of the SCJS is very similar to the British Crime Survey (BCS) which covers England and Wales only and which introduced continuous interviewing and a rolling reference period from 2000/2001.

### 1.4 The structure of the report

This report presents the initial findings from the SCJS 2009/10. It includes data for the majority of questions contained in the survey questionnaire and some simple one-to-one relationships between survey variables. The report does not include in-depth, multivariate statistical analysis that would explore the more complex underlying relationships within the data.

The structure is as follows:

**Chapter 2** examines the extent and distribution of crime, estimating how many crimes were committed and proportions of different types of crime within
that. The extent of crime identified in the SCJS is contextualised using three sets of complementary data: time-series data from previous surveys, police recorded crime statistics in 2009/10 and results from the BCS. The limitations of the comparisons are also presented. The chapter ends by examining the risk (prevalence) of being a victim of crime in total and of various crime groups. The risk of being a victim of card and identity fraud is also briefly examined.

Chapter 3 explores the risk and characteristics of crime in more detail. It starts by identifying the unequal risk of being a victim of crime among different groups of adults and the risk of being a repeat victim. Characteristics of crimes and offender(s) are investigated. The use of weapons in crime is identified and the extent of alcohol and drug use in violent crime is explored.

Chapter 4 explores the impact and perceptions of crime. In this chapter the impact of crime on victims, including monetary impacts of property crime and injuries sustained in violent crime is identified. The victims’ perspective of the crime itself and their opinion of potential outcomes for the offender(s) are also investigated.

Chapter 5 focuses on reporting crime and support for victims, first looking at the advice and support available to victims from a range of organisations. It provides more detail about the rate and process of reporting crime to the police. Information and assistance provided to victims, where crimes are investigated and where they result in a court case, is also covered.

Chapter 6 provides information on adults’ perceptions of crime, investigating the extent to which they perceive crime as a problem and are anxious about becoming a victim of crime. It examines how public perception of crime has changed over time and the extent of the gap between perceived likelihood of being a victim and actual risk of victimisation.

Chapter 7 explores the public’s confidence in the police in relation to specific aspects of policing and attitudes to aspects of the service provided by police in the local area. Perceptions of the level of police presence in local areas and attitudes to being stopped and questioned by the police are also reported.

Chapter 8 presents information about aspects of the justice system. Initially it focuses on awareness and perceptions of the criminal justice system and component organisations. It then explores knowledge and perceptions of sentencing. Adults’ experience of a range of civil law problems is also examined in this chapter.

Annex 1 presents the detailed tabulations of the key crime data discussed in the report, including incidence and prevalence statistics. Annex 2 provides detail of the method used in the survey. Annex 3 explains how information on crimes was collected and processed as well as detail on how crimes are grouped and how they link together. Annex 4 includes information on sampling error and the confidence intervals and design effects for key survey estimates, as well as information on the weighting applied to data. Annex 5 provides a note on comparing survey estimates of crime with police recorded
crime statistics. **Annex 6** includes information on comparing crime estimated by the SCJS with the BCS.

The Annexes to this report are complemented and expanded on by the accompanying Technical Report.°

Data from the self-completion section of the survey questionnaire, covering sexual victimisation, partner abuse and illicit drug use are published in three separate reports.°

Data files and survey documentation are available from the UK Data Archive.°

---


° These reports are available from December 2010 (sexual victimisation and partner abuse) and January 2011 (illicit drug use) on the ‘publications’ section of the survey website: http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/Statistics/Browse/Crime-Justice/Publications/publications.

° UK Data Archive website: http://www.data-archive.ac.uk/.
2 The Extent of Crime in Scotland

2.1 Summary

Estimates of crime

One of the main purposes of the SCJS 2009/10 is to provide an estimate of the extent of crime among the adult population living in private households in Scotland. There were 945,000 crimes as measured by the SCJS in 2009/10, including:

- Approximately 679,000 property crimes (72% of all SCJS crime) involving theft or damage to personal or household property (including vehicles);
- Approximately 266,000 violent crimes of assault or robbery (28% of all SCJS crime).

Proportion of SCJS crime in aggregated crime groups

Breaking down the proportions of property crime and violent crime further:

- 32% of crime measured by the SCJS in 2009/10 was vandalism; 16% was other household theft (including bicycle theft); 14% per cent was personal theft (excluding robbery); seven per cent were all motor vehicle theft related incidents and three per cent was housebreaking;
- 26% of crime measured by the SCJS in 2009/10 was assault (including two per cent which was serious assault) and two per cent was robbery.

The risk of crime

The SCJS 2009/10 estimates that around one in five (19.3%) adults aged 16 or over was the victim of at least one crime as measured by the SCJS.

- 17% of adults (88% of all victims) were estimated to have been a victim of property crime;
- Four per cent of adults (19% of all victims) had been a victim of violent crime.

Comparing the 2009/10 estimate with the 2008/09 estimate (the baseline year for the Scotland Performs national indicator relating to crime victimisation rates):

- The risk of being a victim of a crime which was measured by the SCJS had fallen from 20.4% in 2008/09 to 19.3% in 2009/10.

The equivalent rate for crime victimisation in England and Wales, estimated by the BCS 2009/10, was 21.5%.
Trends in numbers of crimes; 2008/09 and 2009/10

A comparison of estimates from 2008/09 and 2009/10 suggests that crime has decreased by just under 10%, with a fall from 1,045,000 crimes in 2008/09 to 945,000 crimes in 2009/10.

Comparison with England and Wales

Comparison of the proportion of crime made up by the different crime groups in Scotland and in England and Wales showed:

- 72% of crime as measured by the SCJS in 2009/10 in Scotland was property crime compared with 78% of crime identified by the BCS in 2009/10 in England and Wales;
- 28% of crime as measured by the SCJS in 2009/10 was violent crime compared with 22% of crime measured by the BCS in England and Wales in the same period.

2.2 Introduction

An important objective of the SCJS is to measure the extent of crime in Scotland. This chapter provides an overview of the total number of crimes (incidence) identified by the survey (grossed to an estimate among the total population) and the proportion of different types of crime within that.

Interpretation of survey results is aided by contextual information. In this chapter, three sets of comparative data are used to provide context for the SCJS estimates:

- Previous Scottish crime survey data (although limited conclusions can be drawn from surveys prior to the first wave of the SCJS in 2008/09);\(^9\)
- Police recorded crime statistics, examining crime reported to the police;
- British Crime Survey (BCS) data collected in 2009/10 covering England and Wales, allowing comparisons of the incidence rates of different types of crime (Osborne, 2010).

Finally, this chapter examines the risk of becoming a victim of crime (prevalence or victimisation rate).

\(^9\) Chapter 1 provides further details of the changes made to the SCJS and discusses the reasons caution should be used when comparing the results from the SCJS 2008/09 and 2009/10 with previous Scottish crime surveys. Previous Scottish crime survey reports are available on the Scottish Government website: [http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/Research/by-topic/crime-and-justice/crime-and-justice-survey/publications](http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/Research/by-topic/crime-and-justice/crime-and-justice-survey/publications).
The estimate of the total number of crimes is broken down into various groups. The principal groups are property crime and violent crime. Box 2.1 below provides further information on the crime groups used in this report.\footnote{Wherever crime groups are shown in the figures included in this report they are colour-coded consistently to aid recognition.}

**Box 2.1: Aggregated crime groupings used in this report**

In this report, overall crime measured by the survey has been split into two exclusive groups, property crime and violent crime. As well as being associated with differing levels of risk (section 2.7.3), crimes experienced in these two groups exhibit different characteristics and victims experience and perceive them differently (Chapters 3 and 4).

**Property crime** includes the following exclusive groups:

- Vandalism (including motor vehicle and property vandalism)
- All motor vehicle theft related incidents (including theft and attempted theft of and from a motor vehicle)
- Housebreaking (termed burglary in England and Wales)
- Other household thefts (including bicycle theft)
- Personal theft (excluding robbery)

**Violent crime** includes:

- Assault;
- Robbery.

Individual offence codes are allocated to each Victim Form as part of the offence coding process (Annex 3) – for example “\textit{Vandalism to a motor vehicle}”. These offence codes can be grouped in a variety of other ways from those shown above. For example, for comparisons with police recorded crime, the group ‘acquisitive’ crime which includes housebreaking, theft of a motor vehicle and bicycle theft is used.

Vandalism, acquisitive crime and violent crime are comparable with police recorded crime, and these are examined in section 2.5.

The SPSS datafiles available from the UK Data Archive contain variables for the groups used in the report as well as a variety of other groupings and the offence code allocated to each incident.

Annex 3 provides further detail of the breakdown of crime groups used in this report.
2.3 Estimates of crime

The SCJS provides an estimate of the number of crimes (or incidence) occurring within Scotland. The numbers from the survey are then weighted and grossed to an estimate among the total adult population resident in private households in Scotland. The figures reported below are rounded to the nearest 1,000 crimes.

The SCJS 2009/10 estimates that there were approximately 945,000 crimes against adults resident in private households in Scotland. Of those crimes, the SCJS estimates that:

- Approximately 679,000 were property crimes involving theft or damage to personal or household property (including vehicles);
- Approximately 266,000 were violent crimes of assault or robbery.

As the estimates originate from a sample survey, they are subject to survey error. To supplement the estimates, a range of values was calculated, known as the confidence interval, which is likely to include the ‘true’ value for the number of crimes 95 times out of 100 if the survey were to be repeated.

These calculations show the actual number of crimes based on the 2009/10 SCJS to be in the range of 879,000 to 1,012,000. Within this the number of property crimes is estimated to be between 634,000 and 725,000 and the number of violent crimes between 227,000 and 305,000.\(^{11}\)

2.3.1 Percentage of SCJS crime in aggregated crime groups

Figure 2.1 provides an additional breakdown of the overall estimate, showing the proportion of crime measured by the SCJS in 2009/10 in aggregated crime groups (Box 2.1).

72% of crime was property crime. Breaking this down further:

- Around one in three (32%) crimes were incidents of vandalism (17% was vandalism to vehicles and 15% was vandalism to property);
- Seven per cent was all motor vehicle theft related incidents (including attempted and actual thefts of and from a motor vehicle);
- Three per cent of crime was housebreaking and 16% was other household theft (including bicycle theft);
- Personal theft (excluding robbery) accounted for 14% of crime.

\(^{11}\) Annex 1 provides confidence intervals for the incidence of all SCJS crime and other crime groups.
Violent crime in the SCJS 2009/10 included actual and attempted serious assault, minor assault and robbery. 28% of crime was violent, broken down as follows:

- Assault accounted for 26% of crime (two per cent was serious assault and 24% was minor assault);
- The remaining two per cent of all SCJS crime was robbery.

**Figure 2.1: % of SCJS crime in each crime group**

**Definitions for the groups of crimes used in this report can be found in Annex 3.**

**Incidence variables (listed based on Figure 2.1 clockwise from top) are in the Respondent File SPSS: incproperty incvand, incallmvtheft, inchousebreak, incotherhousetheftcycle, incperstheft, incviolent, incassault, incrob.**
2.4 Comparing crime over time

Data from previous surveys, including the 2008/09 SCJS, are presented in the following sections alongside the SCJS 2009/10 data. Care needs to be taken with the comparison of estimates from the SCJS 2008/09 and 2009/10 with those from previous Scottish crime surveys due to the change to the methodology in 2008/09 and the wider confidence intervals associated with estimates from previous surveys (Chapter 1).

2.4.1 Trends in numbers of crimes; 2008/09 and 2009/10

A comparison of estimates from 2008/09 and 2009/10 suggests that crime has decreased by just under 10%,\(^{14}\) with a fall from 1,045,000 crimes in 2008/09 to 945,000 crimes in 2009/10 (Table 2.1). This is a statistically significant change which means there is a 95% certainty that the change did not occur by chance (Annex 4).

Table 2.1: 2008/09 and 2009/10 estimates of numbers of all SCJS crime
Base: 2008/09 (16,003); 2009/10 (16,036).
Variable name: incallsurveycrime.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey year:</th>
<th>All SCJS crime estimate</th>
<th>Lower estimate</th>
<th>Upper estimate</th>
<th>Confidence interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>1,044,809</td>
<td>973,849</td>
<td>1,115,769</td>
<td>70,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>945,419</td>
<td>879,307</td>
<td>1,011,531</td>
<td>66,112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This decrease was not uniform across all groups of crime. Figure 2.2 shows the change in crime as a percentage change from the 2008/09 survey:

- Property crime decreased by seven per cent. Within this crime group, numbers of vandalism, other household theft (including bicycle theft) and all motor vehicle theft-related incidents had reduced, with the greatest decrease being for vandalism (a 14% reduction in numbers compared to 2008/09). Housebreaking and personal theft (excluding robbery) increased by 13% and 19% respectively;
- Violent crime decreased by 16%. Within this crime group, assault and robbery decreased by 17% and four per cent respectively.

\(^{14}\) The SCJS does not cover all types of crime – see Annex 3 for further details.
Figure 2.2: % change in crime groups; 2009/10 compared with 2008/09 SCJS 2008/09, 2009/10. 
Base: All SCJS crime 2008/09 (3,794); 2009/10 (3,326). 
SCJS Variable name: incidence variables.15

2.4.2 Trends in numbers of crimes since the early 1990s
Figure 2.3 shows the total number of crimes as estimated by crime surveys conducted in Scotland since 1993. Confidence intervals which show the range within which the true estimate is likely to lie are included for the 2006, 2008/09 and 2009/10 surveys to indicate the reliability of the estimates shown.16 The smaller confidence intervals in 2008/09 and 2009/10 for the SCJS are due to the larger sample size in these surveys which produces an estimate that is statistically more reliable than previous estimates. The shifts in the estimates between previous surveys prior to the 2008/09 survey is within the range of values likely to include the ‘true’ number of crimes and so could have occurred by chance. As a result, no clear trend could be detected for changes to the numbers of crimes as a whole measured by the various Scottish crime surveys conducted since 1993.

15 Definitions for the groups of crimes used in this report can be found in Annex 3. Incidence variables (listed based on Figure 2.2 top to bottom) are in the Respondent File SPSS: incproperty, incvand, incallmvtheft, inchousebreak, incotherhousetheftcycle, incperstheft, incviolent, incassault, incrob.

16 Confidence intervals for the total number of crimes have not been calculated for estimates produced before the 2006 survey. Those shown are based on a 95% level of confidence (see Annex 4 for further details).
Figure 2.3: Total number of crimes over time
Scottish crime survey estimates.
Base: SCS 1993 (5,030); 1996 (5,045); 2000 (5,059); 2003 (5,041); SCVS 2004 (3,034); 2006 (4,988); SCJS 2008/09 (16,003); 2009/10 (16,036).17
Variable name: incsurveycrime.

Note: The dashed line indicates a break in the survey methodology, moving to a rolling reference period, increased sample size and continuous fieldwork (section 1.1).

2.4.3 Number of crimes (grouped) over time
Figure 2.4 breaks down the overall number of crimes into groups and provides estimates for them from the crime surveys conducted in Scotland since 1993. The small sample size of surveys prior to 2008/09 and the associated wide confidence intervals prevent detailed examination of trends, though some patterns do emerge for some crime groups.

Figure 2.4 suggests among groups of property crime:

- An apparent rise in vandalism since the early 1990s to date, with some fluctuation between years;18
- An apparent decrease in all motor vehicle theft related incidents and housebreaking;

17 The year of the surveys refer to the fieldwork period. However, the data in the chart is displayed based on the survey reference periods.

18 Changes are described as apparent as confidence intervals were not available for all previous surveys.
• Personal theft (excluding robbery) appears to have stayed at a broadly similar level over the whole period;

• There is no clear trend apparent for other household theft (including bicycle theft).

Among groups of **violent crime**:

• There is an apparent rise in assault since the early 1990s to date (although the level has fallen between the 2008/09 and 2009/10 surveys);

• Robbery appears to have stayed at stable, low, levels over the whole period.

**Figure 2.4: Number of crimes (grouped) over time**

Scottish crime survey estimates.

Base: SCS 1993 (5,030); 1996 (5,045); 2000 (5,059); 2003 (5,041); SCVS 2004 (3,034); 2006 (4,988); SCJS 2008/09 (16,003); 2009/10 (16,036).  

Variable name: incidence variables.  

Note: The dashed line indicates a break in the survey methodology, moving to a rolling reference period, increased sample size and continuous fieldwork (section 1.1).

---

19 The year of the surveys refer to the fieldwork period. However, the data in the chart is displayed based on the survey reference periods.

20 Definitions for the groups of crimes used in this report can be found in Annex 3. Incidence variables are in the Respondent File SPSS: incvand, incallmvtheft, inchousebreak, incotherhousetheftcycle, incperstheft, incassault, incrob.
2.5 Police recorded crime statistics

In this section the estimates of crime as measured by the SCJS 2009/10 are examined in the context of police recorded crime from 2009/10.

Box 2.2: Police recorded crime and comparisons with SCJS

When comparing crime estimates from the SCJS and crime recorded by the police (section 2.5.1) the following differences need to be kept in mind:

- **Reference periods** for police recorded crime (2009/10) and the SCJS (2009/10): SCJS 2009/10 estimates are based on interviews carried out between 01 April 2009 and 31 March 2010 and incidents experienced by respondents in the 12 months before their interview. The centre-point of the period for reporting crime is March 2009 which is the only month to be included in all respondents’ reference periods. Averaging over the moving reference period of the SCJS generates estimates that are most closely comparable with police recorded crime figures for the 12 months to the end of September 2009 (about 6 months behind the 2009/10 recorded crime figures reported here). The police recorded crime statistics relate to crime recorded by the police in the financial year 2009/10;

- **Reporting rates and how crimes against business and people aged 15 or younger are reported**: A set of crimes from police recorded crime were selected which best match the categories in the SCJS comparable subset. The count for the comparable police recorded crime includes crimes committed against businesses and under 16 year olds, both of which were excluded from SCJS measures of crime. Previously, the comparable police recorded crime was adjusted to remove the estimated number of crimes committed against businesses and against victims under 16 years olds using work carried out by Strathclyde Police in 2002. In the SCJS 2008/09 and 2009/10 this adjustment was not carried out, which is consistent with practice on the BCS, and due the lack of an available source that was up-to-date and nationally representative (Annex 1);

- **Police recording practice**. Details of the Scottish Police Recording Standard are available from the policies section of the Association of Chief Police Officers Scotland (ACPOS) website: http://www.acpos.police.uk/Policies.html.

A subset of all SCJS crime can be compared with police recorded crime statistics. This comparable subset includes vandalism, acquisitive crime and violent crime.\textsuperscript{21} 67% of crime was classed as comparable with police recorded crime statistics (comparable crime).

### 2.5.1 Comparisons with police recorded crime statistics 2009/10

The SCJS 2009/10 estimated that there were 630,000 crimes in the comparable subset. In 2009/10, the police recorded 195,701 crimes in the comparable subset of crime (section 2.5).

Figure 2.5 shows a comparison of the proportion of comparable crime recorded by the police in 2009/10 and comparable crime estimated by the SCJS in 2009/10, broken down by vandalism, acquisitive crime and violent crime as defined by the SCJS.\textsuperscript{22}

It shows that:

- 46% of comparable crime recorded by the police was vandalism and a further 13% was acquisitive crime compared with 48% and 10% respectively for comparable crime estimated by the SCJS;
- 41% of comparable crime recorded by the police was violent crime compared with violent crime being 42% of comparable crime estimated by the SCJS.

\begin{itemize}
  \item[21] Annex 3 and Annex 5 provide a breakdown of all the crime groups used in this report including comparable crime. Acquisitive crime includes housebreaking, theft of a vehicle and theft of a bicycle.
  \item[22] The definition of violence differs between the SCJS and police recorded crime. Minor assault is not included in the recorded crime category of ‘non-sexual crimes of violence’ but is counted in miscellaneous offences. In the SCJS, minor assault is included in the estimates of violent crime.
\end{itemize}
2.5.2 Reporting comparable crime

Not all crime is reported to the police. The SCJS 2009/10 estimated that 40% of comparable crime (37% of all SCJS crime) was reported to the police. This was similar to the reporting rate estimated by the BCS in 2009/10 (43% of comparable crime; 40% of all BCS crime) (Osborne, 2010). Within crime measured by the SCJS in 2009/10, the proportion of comparable crime reported to the police varied by type and included:

- 39% of vandalism;
- 57% of acquisitive crime;
- 38% of violent crime.

Reporting incidents to the police is explored in more detail in Chapter 5.

---

23 Definitions for the groups of crimes used in this report can be found in Annex 3. Incidence variables (listed based on Figure 2.5 top to bottom) are in the Respondent File SPSS: incvand, incacquis, incviolent.

24 Crime reported to the police covers all crime the police came to know about, including incidents reported by the respondent or someone else, and incidents where the police were there at the time of the incident or found out in some other way.


2.6 **Comparison of total number of crimes in Scotland and England and Wales**

Changes to the SCJS with regard to the reference period and the continuous fieldwork mean it is now very similar to the method used in the BCS which measures crime in England and Wales.\(^{25}\) The BCS 2009/10 provides useful context for the SCJS 2009/10 results, although care needs to be taken when comparing crime estimates between the two sources as the coding of a small number of offences differs between the surveys, primarily reflecting the differing legal systems.\(^{26}\)

The *incidence rates* (the number of crimes as measured by the BCS 2009/10 and the SCJS 2009/10 per 10,000 adults or households) were compared for the various crime groups (Figure 2.6).\(^{27}\)

The comparison showed that among groups of *property crime*:  

- The incidence rates for all motor vehicle theft related incidents and housebreaking were lower in Scotland than in England and Wales;
- The incidence rates for other household theft (including bicycle theft) and personal theft (excluding robbery) were similar in Scotland and in England and Wales;
- The incidence rate for vandalism was higher in Scotland than in England and Wales.

The comparison among groups of *violent crime* showed that:  

- The incidence rate for robbery was similar in Scotland and in England and Wales;
- The incidence rate for assault was higher in Scotland than in England and Wales.\(^{28}\)

---

\(^{25}\) Further information on the method and design of the survey is provided in Annex 2.

\(^{26}\) Annex 6 provides further information on the differences in offence coding between BCS and SCJS.

\(^{27}\) An incidence rate of, for example, 578 for assault does not mean that 578 adults per 10,000 will necessarily be the victim of assault, rather that there will be 578 separate *incidents* of assault experienced within the 10,000 as a whole (i.e. some adults may experience more than one incident of assault). Incidence rates are calculated using households or adults according to the type of crime (see Annex 3).

\(^{28}\) The SCJS differs from the BCS in that the SCJS prioritises coding assault over crimes such as damage or theft when both crime types occur in a single incident. Further details are presented in Annex 6.
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Figure 2.6: Comparison of incidence rates in Scotland with England and Wales

SCJS 2009/10, BCS 2009/10 (incidence rate per 10,000 households / adults).
Base: SCJS 2009/10 (16,036); BCS 2009/10 (44,638).
Variable name: incidence variables.\textsuperscript{29}

Comparison of the proportion of crime made up by the different crime groups in Scotland and in England and Wales showed 72% of crime was property crime compared with 78% of crime in England and Wales (Osborne, 2010). Within that:

- 32% of crime in Scotland was vandalism compared with 25% in England and Wales;
- Seven per cent of crime in Scotland was motor vehicle theft related incidents compared with 13% in England and Wales;
- Three per cent of crime in Scotland was housebreaking, compared with seven per cent in England and Wales;\textsuperscript{30}

\textsuperscript{29} Definitions for the groups of crimes used in this report can be found in Annex 3. Incidence variables are in the Respondent File SPSS: incvand, incallmvtheft, inchousebreak, incotherhousetheftcycle, incperstheft, incassault, incrob. Incident rates are calculated using the number of households or adults according to the type of crime (see Annex 3).

\textsuperscript{30} Housebreaking in Scotland was compared with burglary in England and Wales. The definition of burglary in England and Wales as measured by the BCS and the definition of housebreaking in Scotland as measured by the SCJS differ in two ways; the offender’s mode of entry and the intention of the offender. Further details are presented in Annex 6.
• 16% of crime in Scotland was other household theft (including bicycle theft) and 14% was personal theft. In England and Wales 33% were other thefts, which incorporated these two categories.

28% of crime in Scotland was violent crime. This compares with 22% of crime measured by the BCS in England and Wales being violent crime (Osborne, 2010).

2.7 The risk of crime
As well as estimating the number of crimes, the SCJS measures the percentage of households or adults who were victims of crime in the 12 months before interview. This identifies the overall risk of being a victim of crime and is known as the crime victimisation rate or prevalence.

The SCJS is used specifically to monitor one of the national indicators in Scotland Performs:

‘reduce overall crime victimisation rates by two percentage points by 2011’ which contributes to the achievement of the outcome ‘we live our lives safe from crime, disorder and danger’.

It is defined as the percentage of adults aged 16 or over in private households who have been the victim of a crime as measured by the SCJS. The SCJS 2008/09 was the baseline for the national indicator and changes in the data for the 2008/09 and 2009/10 surveys are explored in section 2.7.2.

2.7.1 Overall risk of being a victim of crime
The SCJS estimates that around one in five (19.3%) adults aged 16 or over was the victim of at least one crime as measured by the SCJS in 2009/10. Confidence interval calculations show the actual risk of victimisation to be in the range of 18.3% to 20.2%. 32

The equivalent rate for crime victimisation in England and Wales, estimated from the BCS 2009/10, was 21.5% (Osborne, 2010).

Within the overall victimisation rate, different types of crime have different risks associated with them. The risk of being a victim of property crime or a victim of violent crime is presented below:

• 17% of adults were estimated to have been a victim of property crime;
  o Almost nine in 10 (88%) of all victims were the victim of property crime;


32 Annex 1 provides estimates for the range of values (known as the confidence interval) for the rate of victimisation for all SCJS crime and the groupings of crimes used in this report.
• The SCJS 2009/10 estimated that four per cent of adults had been a victim of violent crime;
  o One in five (19%) of all victims were the victim of violent crime.

Further detail about the nature and impact of victimisation is provided in chapters 3 and 4.

2.7.2 Risk of being a victim of crime: 2009/10 compared with 2008/09

The SCJS 2008/09 was the baseline year for the Scotland Performs national indicator relating to crime victimisation rates. Comparing the 2009/10 estimate with the 2008/09 estimate:

• The risk of being a victim of a crime which was measured by the SCJS had fallen from 20.4% to 19.3%.

This is a statistically significant change which means that there is a 95% certainty that the change did not occur by chance (Annex 4).

2.7.3 Risk of being a victim of different crimes (grouped)

As measured by the SCJS in 2009/10 there was a one in five (19.3%) risk of an adult being a victim of one or more crimes of any type. This section examines the risk in more detail, breaking it down between property crime and violent crime and for different types of crime within those groups (Figure 2.7).

There was a 17% risk to an adult of being a victim of property crime. Within the broad group of property crime, there was:

• An eight per cent risk to a household of being a victim of vandalism;
• A two per cent risk to a household of being a victim of a motor vehicle theft related incident;
• A less than one per cent (0.9%) risk to a household of being a victim of housebreaking;

33 Table A1.5 in Annex 1 shows the data for the risk of crime for various crime groups from the 1993 Scottish Crime Survey to the 2009/10 SCJS.

34 Property crime includes a mixture of crimes committed against households and against adults. Prevalence (or risk of being a victim) of property crime was calculated in this report as a percentage of adults experiencing at least one property crime. If prevalence had been calculated as a percentage of households experiencing at least one property crime, this would have given a prevalence of 15.9%. The risk to sub-groups within property crime are calculated as a percentage of households or adults according to whether they include only crimes committed against households or only crimes committed against adults. Where the crime group includes a mixture of crimes committed against households and against adults this is calculated as the percentage of adults.
• A five per cent risk to a household of being a victim of other household theft (including bicycle theft);

• A three per cent risk to an adult of being a victim of personal theft (excluding robbery).

There was a four per cent risk of being a victim of violent crime and within the violent crime group there was:

• A three per cent risk to an adult of being a victim of assault;

• A 0.3% risk to an adult of being a victim of robbery.

**Figure 2.7: Risk of being a victim of different crimes (grouped)**

SCJS 2009/10.

Base: Households / adults (16,036).

Variable name: prevalence variables.\(^{35}\)

--

**2.7.4 Risk of card and identity fraud**

This section looks at card and identity fraud, which there has been growing concern about in recent years. The SCJS does not ask specific questions on fraud in the victim form as there are a number of issues with measuring this problem (discussed in the following section) and therefore fraud is not included in any of the SCJS crime statistics.

---

\(^{35}\) Definitions for the groups of crimes used in this report can be found in Annex 3. Prevalence variables are in the Respondent File SPSS: prevproperty, prevvand, prevallmvtheft, prevhousebreak, prevotherhousetheftcycle, prevperstheft, prevviolent, prevassault, prevrob.
There are a number of difficulties in measuring card and identity fraud:

- Where a card is not physically stolen, adults may be unaware that a fraud involving their personal or financial details has taken place;
- Adults whose details are used fraudulently may not suffer loss or harm and may not consider themselves to be the victim of a crime;
- Where a card or personal documents are physically stolen, details may be given by adults in the victim form, though this may not be the case in other kinds of identity fraud.

However, there is currently no consistent measure for this type of fraud and there are difficulties with using survey data or police statistics to assess how much of this type of fraud there is (Box 2.3 and Murphy and Eder, 2010).

**Box 2.3: Card and identity fraud**

Currently there is no comprehensive measure of card and identity fraud. The Home Office (Murphy and Eder, 2010) considers data from the UK Cards Association as a good source of information on the rate of plastic card fraud within the UK. However, UKCA data is not available separately for Scotland and does not include details about other types of identity fraud not involving plastic cards.

Based on BCS definitions (Hoare and Wood, 2007), card and identity fraud measured in the SCJS (but not included in the crime statistics) includes:

- Credit or bank cards being stolen and subsequently used to obtain money, good or services;
- Credit or bank card details being used to obtain money, goods or services;
- Personal details being obtained and used to open bank accounts or get credit cards, loans, state benefits or official documents such as national insurance numbers, drivers licenses, birth certificates and passports.

The SCJS 2009/10 estimated that:

- 4.3% of adults had experienced card fraud in the 12 months prior to interview;
- 0.6% of adults had been a victim of identity theft, where someone had pretended to be them or used their personal details fraudulently.

For card fraud, there were more instances of cards themselves being used without permission (2.9%) than of card details being used (1.5%).
As well as measuring the extent of fraud, questions were also asked about the extent adults worried about card and identity fraud happening to them and the likelihood they believed it would happen, in the context of other types of crime. Section 6.6 provides further discussion about this in comparison to the actual risk reported here.
3 The Risk and Characteristics of Crime

3.1 Summary

Varying risk of crime – individual level

Simple relationships of age and gender to victimisation were examined in the SCJS 2009/10. Considering gender:

- Males and females had an equal risk of being a victim of property crime (17%); Males had a higher risk of being a victim of violent crime compared with females (five per cent and two per cent respectively).

Differences by age included:

- 29% of males aged 16-24 were at risk of being a victim of SCJS crime. The risk to females of the same age of being a victim was 24%;
- 16-24 year old males had the highest risk of being a victim of violent crime (15%) compared with all other combined age / gender groups.

Varying risk of crime – area level

Examining simple relationships of area deprivation to victimisation the SCJS 2009/10 identified:

- The risk of property crime was higher for adults living in the 15% most deprived areas (22%) compared with those living in the rest of Scotland (16%);
- There was a six per cent risk of violent crime for adults living in the 15% most deprived areas compared with a three per cent risk for adults living in the rest of Scotland.

Repeat Victimisation

The SCJS 2009/10 estimated that:

- Six per cent of adults (or 34% of victims of property crime) were repeat victims of property crime;
- One per cent of adults (or 34% of victims of violent crime) were repeat victims of violent crime.

Characteristics of crime

The main place, by far, where property crime took place was immediately outside the home:

- Three in five property crimes (60%) took place immediately outside the home. One in ten or fewer property crimes took place in any other single location.
In contrast, violent crime happened in a number of locations including:

- In or near the victim’s place of work (19%);
- In or around a pub, bar or club (18%);
- Inside the victims’ home (12%);
- Immediately outside the home (11%).

**Characteristics of offenders**

Characteristics of offenders included:

- The offender(s) was male in 68% of property crime compared with 82% of violent crime where the victim could provide details. Offenders included both males and females in 19% of property crime compared with six per cent of violent crime where the victim could provide details;

- In 42% of property crime where the victim could provide details, the offender(s) was aged 16-24 and in 46% of such violent crime, the offender(s) was that age. In 37% of property crime where the victim was able to provide details, the offender(s) was of school age compared with 13% of such violent crime where the offender(s) was that age.

Victims who knew or had seen the offender(s) were more likely to know the offender(s) well in violent crime (56%) than in property crime (35%).

- In 31% of property crime where the victim knew the offender(s) well the offender(s) was a neighbour; in 23% a friend and in 14% young people from the local area;

- In 20% of violent crime where the victim knew the offender(s) well, the offender(s) was a client or member of the public contacted through work; in 19% a friend or acquaintance; in 17% the current husband, wife or partner and in 11% the former husband, wife or partner of the victim.

**Weapons used in crime**

Victims reported that the offender(s) had something they used or threatened to use as a weapon in 30% of violent crime and seven per cent of property crime where victims saw or had any contact with the offender(s).

**Alcohol or drug related violent crime**

Victims perceived the offender(s) to have been under the influence of alcohol in 62% of violent crime and of drugs in 26% of violent crime.
3.2 Introduction
As reported in Chapter 2, the Scottish Crime and Justice Survey (SCJS) 2009/10 estimated that approximately 945,000 crimes occurred in Scotland and 19% of adults were victims of crime. Property crime accounted for 72% and violent crime for 28% of crime.

This chapter examines the nature and characteristics of crime and covers:

- The varying risk of being a victim of crime overall, as well as separately for property crime and violent crime;
- Features of all SCJS crime, property crime and violent crime, including when and where they happened, the characteristics of offenders and, for violent crime, the use of weapons and the role of alcohol and drugs.

3.3 Varying risk of crime
Of the 19% of adults aged 16 or over who were victims of at least one crime covered by the survey, 17% were a victim of property crime and four per cent were a victim of violent crime (Chapter 2). This is also described as the risk of being a victim of crime, which is an indication of the average risk across the population. In reality the level of risk is specific to individual adults according to their particular personal, household and area characteristics. The next two sections discuss this varying risk in more detail and explore particular individual and area characteristics that are associated with an adults’ risk of being a victim of crime.

Box 3.1: The varying risk of victimisation

Other crime surveys have demonstrated that risk varies among adults with differing personal, household and lifestyle characteristics. Particular features that increase risk have been identified through modelling BCS and other crime survey data. Features identified include personal characteristics, such as age and gender, and household attributes, such as a household’s size, composition and type of accommodation. Lifestyle factors that are associated with differential risk include relative affluence and routine activities such as the proportion of time spent in or out of the home (Kershaw and Tseloni, 2005).

Area characteristics also influence the risk of crime. More property and violent crime have consistently been found in areas with higher levels of deprivation (Johnson et al., 2005). Urban areas, where areas of higher deprivation tend to be, have higher crime rates. As a result, there is a higher than average risk of victimisation to adults living in urban areas compared with those living in rural locations.

Analysis of BCS and other crime survey data has shown that, in low crime areas, the risk is more evenly distributed. In areas of high crime, it is concentrated in a relatively small number of households. This means that, in high crime areas, the risk to an individual household is relatively low, but those that are victims more often suffer repeated victimisation (Kershaw and Tseloni, 2005).
3.3.1 Varying risk of crime – individual level
This section explores how the risk of being a victim of crime varies among adults in Scotland. It examines the varying risk of being a victim of crime overall, as well as separately for property crime and violent crime.

The analysis only presents simple one-to-one relationships of age, gender and age by gender rather than more complex statistical relationships such as those described in Box 3.1 that might be identified through modelling. Table 3.1 shows:

- The risk of being a victim of crime as measured by the SCJS 2009/10 was higher for males than for females (20% males; 18% females);
  - Males and females had an equal risk of being a victim of property crime (17%);
  - Males had a higher risk of being a victim of violent crime compared with females (five per cent and two per cent respectively);
- The risk of being a victim of SCJS crime decreased with increasing age. 26% of 16-24 year olds were at risk of being a victim of SCJS crime compared with nine percent of those aged 60 or older;
  - The risk of being a victim of property crime was similar for 16-24 year olds (20%) and 25-44 year olds (22%). The risk decreased with age thereafter so that nine per cent of those aged 60 or over were at risk of being a victim of property crime;
  - The risk of being a victim of violent crime decreased with age. The risk of being a victim of violent crime was 10% for 16-24 year olds compared with one per cent of those aged 60 or over.

When age and gender were combined:

- 29% of males aged 16-24 were at risk of being a victim of SCJS crime. The risk to females of the same age of being a victim was 24%;
  - For all other ages, the risk of SCJS crime was similar for males and females within each age group;
- The risk of being a victim of property crime was similar for males and females within each age group;
- The effects of age and gender combined meant that 16-24 year old males had the highest risk of being a victim of violent crime (15%) compared with all other combined age / gender groups.
### Table 3.1: Varying risk of crime – proportion of adults who were victims of crime by age and gender

SCJS 2009/10.
Base: Adults (16,036).
Variable name: *prevsurveycrime, prevproperty* and *prevviolent*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics of victims:</th>
<th>All SCJS crime %</th>
<th>Victim of: Property crime %</th>
<th>Violent crime %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GENDER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-59</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 or over</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGE WITHIN GENDER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male 16-24</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male 25-44</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male 45-59</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male 60 or over</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female 16-24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female 25-44</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female 45-59</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female 60 or over</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALL</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.3.2 Varying risk of crime – area level

This section explores how the risk of being a victim of crime in Scotland varied by area deprivation.\(^{36}\) The analysis only presents simple one-to-one relationships rather than more complex statistical relationships such as those described in Box 3.1 that might be identified through modelling. Figure 3.1 shows:

- The risk of being a victim of SCJS crime for an adult living in the 15% most deprived areas of Scotland was 25% compared with an 18% risk to an adult living in the rest of Scotland;
  - The risk of property crime was higher for adults living in the 15% most deprived areas (22%) compared with those living in the rest of Scotland (16%);

---

\(^{36}\) As measured by the 2009 Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation (SIMD): http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/Statistics/SIMD.
There was a six per cent risk of violent crime for adults living in the 15% most deprived areas compared with a three per cent risk for adults living in the rest of Scotland.

**Figure 3.1: Varying risk of crime - proportion of adults who were victims of crime by area deprivation**

SCJS 2009/10.

Base: Adults (16,036); adults in 15% most deprived areas (2,027); adults in rest of Scotland (14,009).

Variable name: *prevsurveycrime, prevproperty and prevviolent*.

3.3.3 Repeat victimisation

The SCJS 2009/10 estimated that six per cent of adults were repeat victims of property crime and one per cent of adults were repeat victims of violent crime.

**Box 3.2: Repeat victimisation**

Crime surveys have shown that the majority of victims will have been the victim of only one crime in a 12 month period. Among victims, crime is further concentrated in particular people and households (Farrell & Pease, 2007; Planty & Strom, 2007).

In common with the BCS, victims of the same type of crime more than once in the last year are defined as repeat victims. The repeat victimisation rate accounts for differences between estimates of crimes (incidence) and victims (prevalence). If every victim was the victim of only one crime in the previous 12 months, estimates of the number of crimes and the number of victims would be the same.
Analysis showed that:

- 34% of victims of property crime were repeat victims;
  - A large proportion of property crime is vandalism. 31% of victims of vandalism were repeat victims;
  - The percentage of repeat victims among victims of other types of property crime were lower, for example 15% of victims of personal theft (excluding robbery) were repeat victims;
- 34% of victims of violent crime were repeat victims.

**Figure 3.2: Repeat victims as % of all victims within each crime group**

SCJS 2009/10.
Base: Households / adults who were victims in each crime group. Base: property crime 2,285; vandalism 1,198; all motor vehicle theft related incidents 307; housebreaking 120; other household theft (including bicycle theft) 725; personal theft (excluding robbery) 289; violent crime 446.

Variable name: repeat victim variables.

---

37 Base: property crime 2,285; vandalism 1,198; all motor vehicle theft related incidents 307; housebreaking 120; other household theft (including bicycle theft) 725; personal theft (excluding robbery) 289; violent crime 446.

38 Repeat victim variables are in the Respondent File SPSS: repproperty; repallvand, repallmvtheft, rephousebreak, repotherhousetheftcycle, repperstheft, repviolent. Weighting variables used are WGTGHHD for all crime groups except property crime (as it is a mixture of household and personal crime), personal theft (excluding robbery) and violent crime, where WGTGINDIV is used.
62% of all incidents of violent crime were experienced by repeat victims of violent crime, as measured by the SCJS in 2009/10. On average repeat victims experienced three violent crimes in the 12 months prior to interview.39

3.4 Characteristics of crime

3.4.1 Where crime happened
Respondents were asked where the crime happened. Nearly half of crime measured by the SCJS 2009/10 (46%) happened immediately outside the home. This category includes incidents which took place on the street outside the home, on driveways, doorsteps, balconies and in the garden. An additional 11% of crime occurred in the home and one per cent inside a garage. 10% of crime happened in or near the victim’s place of work (Table 3.2).

Property crime makes up the majority of crime measured by the SCJS in 2009/10. Reflecting this, the main place where property crime took place was immediately outside the home:

- Three in five property crimes (60%) took place immediately outside the home compared with 11% of violent crime;
  - Within property crime, vandalism (80%), other property theft (including bicycle theft) (70%) and motor vehicle theft related incidents (67%) most often happened immediately outside the home;
  - Only four per cent of personal theft (excluding robbery) took place immediately outside the home;
- One in ten or fewer property crimes took place in any other single location other than immediately outside the home.

In contrast, violent crime happened in a number of locations:

- Just under one in five (19%) violent crimes happened in or near the respondent’s place of work;
- A similar percentage (18%) happened in or around a pub, bar or club;
- Around one in eight violent crimes took place inside the victims’ home (12%) or immediately outside the home (11%). Six per cent of violent crime occurred at the home of a friend or relative;
- One in ten (10%) violent crimes happened in or around a shop, supermarket, shopping centre or precinct.

---

39 The average number of crimes per repeat victim was calculated using only the first five incidents in series victimisations, which means this average number may underestimate the actual average among repeat victims (Annex 3).
Table 3.2: Where crime happened
SCJS 2009/10.
Base: All SCJS crime (3,326); property crime (2,833); violent crime (493).
Variable name: QWH, QWH3, QWH5 and QWH7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>All SCJS crime %</th>
<th>Victim of: Property crime %</th>
<th>Violent crime %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outside home</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some other place</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inside own home</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In / near respondent / victim's place of work</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In / around a pub / bar / club / working men's club</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In / around a shop / supermarket / shopping centre / precinct</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At the home of a friend or relative</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While travelling or near transport facilities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inside garage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4.2 When crime happened
Respondents were asked whether the crime happened during the week or at the weekend, and at what time of day it happened. Table 3.3 provides more detail of when crime measured by the SCJS 2009/10 took place:

- Almost half of all crime (48%) took place on a weekday and a little less, 43%, took place at the weekend;
  - Half of all property crime (51%) took place on a weekday and 38%, took place at the weekend;
  - In contrast, over half of all violent crime (54%) took place at the weekend and 42% took place during the week.

Looking in detail at the times crime happened on weekdays:

- The majority of crime taking place on a weekday happened during the afternoon (15%) or during the evening (13%). Eight per cent happened between midnight and 6 a.m. and five per cent took place between 6 a.m. and midday;
  - The majority of both property crime and violent crime which happened on a weekday took place between midday and midnight;
10% of weekday property crime took place between midnight and 6 a.m. compared with five per cent of violent crime.

At the weekend:

- More crimes happened in the evening (16%) or during the night (16%) than during the morning (one per cent) or afternoon (five per cent);
  - 24% of violent crime happened between 6 p.m. and midnight compared with 13% of property crime;
  - 20% of violent crime happened between midnight and 6 a.m. at the weekend compared with 14% of property crime.

Table 3.3: When crime happened

SCJS 2009/10.
Base: All SCJS crime (3,326); property crime (2,833); violent crime (493).
Variable name: QWEE, QTIM and QTIM2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time:</th>
<th>All SCJS crime %</th>
<th>Victim of Property crime %</th>
<th>Violent crime %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WEEKDAY ANY TIME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekday morning (6am - noon)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekday afternoon (noon - 6pm)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekday evening (6pm - midnight)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekday night (midnight - 6am)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEEKEND ANY TIME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekend morning (6am - noon)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekend afternoon (noon - 6pm)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekend evening (6pm - midnight)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekend night (midnight - 6am)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Percentages for each crime for weekdays and weekends, as well as for times within weekday and weekend, do not add up to 100% as some respondents were unable to say when the crime had happened.

Given the interest in violence related to ‘drinking culture’, victims of violent crime were also asked more detail about when the incident happened. This additional information indicated that around one in three violent crimes (33%) happened between around 9 p.m. and 3 a.m. on a weekend.
3.4.3 Characteristics of offenders

The victim was able to say something about the offender(s) in 48% of crime overall. The victim was able to say something about the offender(s) in fewer than three in ten (29%) property crimes compared with over nine in ten (97%) violent crimes.

As Table 3.4 shows, characteristics of offenders included:

- Males (76%) were more likely than females (11%) or groups of both males and females (12%) to be offenders in crime where the victim was able to say something about the offender(s);
  - Offender(s) were male in 68% of property crime compared with 82% of violent crime where the victim could provide details;
  - In 19% of property crime where the victim could provide details, the offenders were both males and females, compared with in six per cent of violent crime;
- For crime where the victim was able to say something about the offender(s), the most commonly reported age group of the offender(s) were adults aged 16-24 (44%), 29% were aged 25-39, 23% were of school age and 10% were aged 40 or older;
  - In 42% of property crime where the victim could provide details the offender(s) was aged 16-24 and in 46% of violent crime, the offender(s) was that age;
  - In 37% of property crime where the victim was able to provide details, the offender(s) was of school age compared with 13% of violent crime where the offender(s) was that age;
    - The higher percentage of property crime where the victim could provide details and offender(s) was of school age appears to reflect the influence of vandalism (53%) and particularly of property vandalism (58%) within property crime overall;
  - In over one in three (34%) violent crimes where the victim was able to say something about the offender(s), the offender(s) was aged 25-39, compared with 21% of property crime where the offender(s) was that age.
Table 3.4: Characteristics of offenders
SCJS 2009/10.
Base: Crimes where respondent was able to say anything about the offender(s) (all SCJS crime 1,205; property crime 734; violent crime 471).
Variable name: QWSE, Q1SX, QMAGE and Q1AGE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics of offender(s):</th>
<th>All SCJS crime</th>
<th>Victim of: Property crime</th>
<th>Violent crime</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GENDER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both male &amp; female</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School age</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-24</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-39</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 or over</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents were asked whether they knew or had seen the offender(s) before and, if so, how they knew them.

In almost two in five (36%) SCJS crimes in 2009/10 where they knew or had seen the offender(s) before, the victim knew the offender(s) by sight and in nearly one in five (19%) they knew them just to speak to casually.

The offender(s) was known well by the victim in 47% of crime where they knew or had seen the offender(s) before.

- Victims who knew or had seen the offender(s) were more likely to know the offender(s) well in violent crime (56%) than in property crime (35%).

Table 3.5 shows the relationship between the victim and the offender(s) in crimes where the victim knew the offender(s) well:

- In 20% of crime where the victim knew the offender(s) well, the offender(s) was a friend / acquaintance;
- In 15% where the victim knew the offender(s) well, the offender(s) was a client or a member of the public contacted through work;
- In 14%, the offender(s) was a neighbour and in another eight per cent, the offender(s) were young people from the local area;
- In 13% of crime where the victim knew the offender(s) well, the offender(s) was the current husband, wife or partner of the victim and in another nine per cent the offender(s) was the former husband, wife or partner.
For property crime where the victim knew the offender(s) well:

- The offender(s) was a neighbour in 31% of such property crime;
- The offender(s) was a friend in 23% of such property crime;
- The offenders were young people from the local area in 14% of such property crime.

For violent crime where the victim knew the offender(s) well:

- In 20% of violent crime where the victim knew the offender(s) well, the offender(s) was a client or member of the public contacted through work;
- In 19% of such violent crime, the offender(s) was a friend / acquaintance;
- In 17% of such violent crime, the offender(s) was the current husband, wife or partner and in 11%, the former husband, wife or partner of the victim.

Table 3.5: Relationship with offender(s)
SCJS 2009/10.
Base: Crimes where respondent knew the offender(s) well (all SCJS crime 328; property crime 152; violent crime 176).
Variable name: QWRE and Q1RE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>All SCJS crime</th>
<th>Victim of: Property crime</th>
<th>Violent crime</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friend / acquaintance</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client / member of public contacted through work</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbour</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband / wife / partner</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former husband / wife / partner</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young people from local area</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other relative</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former boyfriend / girlfriend</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other household member</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Son / daughter (in law)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current boyfriend / girlfriend</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleague / workmate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.4.4 Weapons used in crime

In 21% of all crime measured by the SCJS in 2009/10, where the victim saw or had any contact with the offender(s), victims reported that the offender(s) had something they used or threatened to use as a weapon. The offender(s) was reported to have had a weapon in 30% of violent crime and seven percent of property crime where victims saw or had any contact with the offender(s).

Figure 3.3: % of crime in which offender(s) had a weapon
SCJS 2009/10.

Base: Crime where respondent or someone else saw or heard what was going on or had contact with the offender(s) (all SCJS crime 1,066; property crime 579; violent crime 487).

Variable name: QWEA.

Where victims reported that the offender(s) had something they used or threatened to use as a weapon a knife was the most common weapon, used in three per cent of crime measured in the SCJS 2009/10.

- Victims reported the offender(s) had a knife in 42% of violent crime where the offender(s) had a weapon;
- In 22% of violent crime where the offender(s) had a weapon, the victim reported they had a bottle;
- In 16% of violent crime where the offender(s) had a weapon the victim reported the weapon was a stick / club, hitting implement;
- In one per cent of violent crime where the offender(s) had a weapon, the victim reported the offender(s) had a gun.
3.5 Alcohol or drug related violent crime

Respondents were asked whether they thought the offender(s) was under the influence of alcohol or drugs at the time of the offence. For crime involving force or violence or threats of force or violence, they were also asked if they themselves had any alcohol or drugs immediately before the incident took place. The estimates may not reflect fully the proportion of violent crimes involving alcohol or drugs for two reasons:

- Respondents may not be aware that the offender(s) was under the influence of alcohol or drugs. Alternatively, respondents may presume that the offender(s) was under the influence of either when they were not;
- Respondents may be reluctant to admit to an interviewer that they were under the influence of alcohol or that they had taken drugs.

Box 3.3: Alcohol and violence

According to the World Health Organisation, alcohol and violence are linked in a number of ways. Both alcohol use and interpersonal violence affect communities, public service provision (including health and justice services), and the safety and health of individuals. There is a strong association between alcohol consumption and an individual's risk of becoming a perpetrator or victim of violence. It is in this context that links between alcohol and drugs and violent crime are reported in this section.

Figure 3.4 shows:

- In 62% of violent crime measured by the SCJS 2009/10, the victim said the offender(s) was under the influence of alcohol. This was a higher proportion than found in the BCS in England and Wales in 2009/10 where the victim reported that the offender(s) was under the influence of alcohol in 50% of violent crime;
- Victims reported that the offender(s) was under the influence of drugs in just over one in four (26%) violent crimes. Once again this was higher than the equivalent figure from the BCS for England and Wales for the same period (20% of violent crime);
- In three in ten (30%) violent crimes, the victim said that they had consumed alcohol immediately before the incident;
- Victims said they had taken drugs immediately before the incident in one per cent of violent crime.

---

Figure 3.4: Alcohol or drug related violent crime
SCJS 2009/10.
Violent crime (base: 493).
Variable name: QWAL, Q1AL, QWDR, Q1DR and QBODR.
4 The Impact and Perceptions of Crime

4.1 Summary
In this chapter the impact of crime on victims and their perspective of the crime itself and the outcome for the offender(s) is investigated.

Monetary impacts – property crime
In property crime:

- In 54% of property crime when property was damaged, victims valued damaged items at £300 or less. In 32%, they said they did not know the value of the damaged items;

- In 83% of property crime when property was stolen victims valued stolen items at £300 or less; in 42%, they valued them at £50 or less.

Injuries sustained
Injuries were sustained in more than half (56%) of violent crime.

Whether what happened was a crime or not
When asked about their perceptions of the crime, in 66% of crime victims said they thought what happened was a crime; in 16% of crime, victims described it as wrong but not a crime and in 16% of crime victims said it was just something that happened.

- Property crime (72%) was more likely to be described as a crime by victims compared with violent crime (51%);

- Violent crime (27%) was more likely to be described by victims as ‘just something that happens’ compared with property crime (12%).

What should have happened to offender(s)
In 41% of crime, victims said that the offender(s) should not have been prosecuted in court:

- Victims said the offender(s) should not have been prosecuted in court in 37% of property crime compared with 50% of violent crime.

In 56% of crime, victims said the offender(s) should have been prosecuted in court.

- Victims said the offender(s) should have been prosecuted in court in 60% of property crime compared with 47% of violent crime.

In 24% of crime where the victim thought that the offender(s) should have been prosecuted, the victim thought the offender(s) should have been given a prison sentence and in 72%, the victim said that the offender(s) should have been given another kind of sentence;
4.2 Introduction
This chapter continues to examine aspects of crime, looking at crime as a whole and breaking it down between property crime and violent crime which exhibit different characteristics. The impact of crime on victims and their perspectives on the crime itself and the outcome for the offender(s) is also investigated. The chapter describes:

- The emotions victims felt, the injuries sustained by victims in violent crime and the financial impact of property crime;

- Victims' perceptions including: whether they thought an incident was a crime or not; and their views on the offender(s) going to court and what type of sentence or other treatment they should have received.

4.3 Impact of crime
Initially this section examines the emotional impacts which victims experienced after the crime happened. The chapter then highlights specific aspects of the impacts of violent crime and property crime. First, information about the financial impact of property crime, including the value of property stolen and details about insurance status is provided. Then injuries sustained in violent crime are described.

4.3.1 Monetary impacts - property crime
As well as emotional and physical impacts, victims of crime can suffer financial loss through property being stolen or damaged. Respondents who were victims of property crime were asked the approximate value of damaged or stolen items. The range of values given was wide, reflecting the diverse property crime included under this heading, for example from stolen vehicles to property damaged in minor incidents of vandalism.

Figure 4.1 shows:

- In over half of property crime (54%) when property was damaged, victims valued damaged items at £300 or less. Around one-third (32%) said they did not know the value of the damaged items;

- In over four in five (83%) property crimes when property was stolen, victims valued stolen items at £300 or less; more than two in five (42%) valued them at £50 or less.

41 In the SCJS in 2009/10, 31 violent crimes were identified where property was damaged and 21 where property was stolen. Owing to the low unweighted base sizes these are not reported here.
Figure 4.1: Value of damaged / stolen items
SCJS 2009/10.
Base: Property crime where something was damaged / stolen (damaged 1,629; stolen 1,324).
Variable name: QSVA and QDVA.

The extent to which the financial loss was recouped depends on whether the property was covered by insurance and if it was covered, whether an insurance claim was made.

- Items were covered by insurance in just less than half (47%) of property crimes where items were damaged or stolen;
- Claims were made in around one in five (19%) of property crimes where damaged or stolen goods were insured.

4.3.2 Injuries sustained - violent crime
As described in Chapter 2, violent crime included attempted assault, serious assault, minor assault and robbery. The degree of violence varied considerably between the different types of crime as did the level of injury sustained. Serious assault, by definition, involved serious injury. At the other end of the scale some incidents of minor assault resulted in no injury and included incidents of attempted assault and threats where the offender(s) had a weapon. Robbery could result in serious, minor or no injury but involved the threat of force.

42 See Annex 3 for further details of how serious assault is defined.
Injuries were sustained in more than half (56%) of violent crime (Figure 4.2). These included:

- In more than six in ten (63%) violent crimes where the victim suffered an injury, they sustained minor bruising or a black eye;
- In more than three in ten (31%) violent crimes where the victim was injured, they received scratches or minor cuts;
- In more than two in ten (21%) violent crimes where the victim was injured, the victim received severe bruising;
- In one in ten (10%) violent crimes where the victim was injured, they sustained severe cuts, gashes, tears or punctures to the skin;
- Other injuries such as head injuries, broken bones or internal injuries were sustained by victims in seven per cent or fewer violent crimes where the victim was injured.

**Figure 4.2: Injuries sustained in violent crime where the victim was physically injured**

SCJS 2009/10.
Base: Violent crime where victim was physically injured (247).
Variable name: QINW.
4.3.3 Emotions felt

Victims were asked what, if any, emotions they felt after the crime happened. Table 4.1 shows emotions felt by victims in all SCJS crime and specifically of property crime and violent crime:

- Victims experienced anger and annoyance in the same percentage of SCJS crimes (53% each);
  - Victims experienced anger (56%) and annoyance (57%) in around six in ten property crimes;
  - In almost one half (47%) of violent crimes, victims experienced anger and in just over four in ten (43%) violent crimes, victims were annoyed following the incident;
- In 17% of crimes, victims said they experienced shock. A range of other emotions were reported; each one being experienced by victims in less than one in ten crimes;
  - In 27% of violent crime victims experienced shock compared with 13% of property crime;
  - All other emotions were experienced by victims in five per cent or fewer property crimes and in 16% or fewer violent crimes;
- In nine per cent of violent crime, victims said that they experienced no emotional reaction after an incident compared with victims in three per cent of property crime.

Table 4.1: Emotional responses to crime
SCJS 2009/10.
Base: All SCJS crime (3,326); property crime (2,833); violent crime (493).
Variable name: QEMO.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotions:</th>
<th>All SCJS crime %</th>
<th>Victim of Property crime %</th>
<th>Violent crime %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annoyed</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shock</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lost confidence / felt vulnerable</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crying / tearful</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxious / had panic attacks</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depressed</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty sleeping</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4 Perceptions of crime
This section examines whether the victim considered what happened to them to be a crime or not. It then explores victims’ opinions of what should have happened to the offender(s), including prosecution, being sent to prison and alternatives to both of these.

4.4.1 Whether what happened was a crime
It is possible that victims did not consider the incident they experienced to be a crime. Whether they did or not may have depended on the nature of the incident itself and their own perceptions of the incident. The SCJS explored victims’ views on whether they thought what happened to them was a crime, wrong but not a crime, or just something that happens (Figure 4.3).

- In 66% of crime measured by the SCJS, victims said they thought what happened was a crime;
  - Property crime (72%) was more likely to be described as a crime by victims compared with violent crime (51%);
- In around one in six (16%) SCJS crimes, victims described it as wrong but not a crime;
  - In 15% of property crime, and in 19% of violent crime, victims said the incident was wrong but not a crime;
- In around one in six (16%) SCJS crimes, victims said the incident was just something that happened;
  - Violent crime (27%) was more likely to be described by victims as ‘just something that happens’ compared with property crime (12%).
4.4.2 What should have happened to offender(s)

Regardless of whether the police had come to know about the crime or identified the offender(s) and regardless of whether the victim believed what happened to be a crime, victims were asked whether they thought the offender(s) should have been prosecuted in court or not:

- In over two in five (41%) crimes measured by the SCJS in 2009/10, victims said that the offender(s) should not have been prosecuted in court, while three per cent did not know whether the offender(s) should have been prosecuted or not.
  - In 37% of property crime compared with 50% of violent crime victims said the offender(s) should not have been prosecuted in court;
  - In a further three per cent of property crime and four per cent of violent crime, victims did not know whether they should have been prosecuted or not.

Those who did not think the offender(s) should have been prosecuted in court, were subsequently asked the reason for this. As Table 4.2 shows, the most common reasons given for all SCJS crime were:

- The incident was too trivial (35%);
- It would be a waste of time or money (18%);
- The offenders were too young or were children (14%);
• The incident was a personal / private matter (12%);
• Courts are inappropriate for this offence (11%);
• It was a common event / just something that happens (11%).

Reasons varied by type of crime:

• In 41% of property crime, victims who did not think that the offender(s) should have been prosecuted in court said that this was because the incident was too trivial. In 22% of violent crime, victims gave the same reason;

• Victims in violent crime who did not think that the offender(s) should have been prosecuted in court were most likely to say that this was because the incident was personal, private or dealt with by the victim (victims gave this reason in 23% of violent crime compared with seven per cent of property crime) or that the incident was a common event / just something that happens (also reported in 23% of violent crime compared with five per cent of property crime).

Table 4.2: Reasons why offender(s) should not have been prosecuted in court
SCJS 2009/10.
Base: Crime where victim did not think the offender(s) should have been prosecuted (all SCJS crime 1,237; property crime 1,019; violent crime 218).
Variable name: QNCO.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons :</th>
<th>All SCJS crime</th>
<th>Victim of: Property crime</th>
<th>Violent crime</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incident too trivial</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would be a waste of time / money</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offenders were children / too young</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal/private/dealt with ourselves</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courts are inappropriate for this offence</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common event / just something that happens</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No evidence / proof</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There was no loss / damage / harm</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offender was not responsible for their actions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courts are ineffective</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partly respondent's / friend's / colleague's fault</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4.3 Alternatives to prosecution for offender(s) – victims’ opinions

In crime where victims said that the offender(s) should not have been prosecuted in court, or they did not know whether or not they should have been prosecuted in court, respondents were asked what should have happened as an alternative to prosecution (Table 4.3). They most often said that the offender(s) should have:

- Been given some kind of warning (23%);
- Apologised for what they had done (21%);
- Been made to pay the victim compensation (11%);
- Done something to help the victim or the community (11%).

In 14% of such crime victims said that nothing should have happened to the offender(s).

The alternatives suggested varied by property crime and violent crime (Table 4.3).

Table 4.3: Alternatives to prosecution for offender(s) – victims’ opinions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCJS 2009/10</th>
<th>Base: Crime where victim did not think the offender(s) should have been prosecuted / did not know whether they should have been or not (all SCJS crime 1,345; property crime 1,108; violent crime 237).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variable name: QNCA.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives to prosecution:</td>
<td>All SCJS crime %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been given some kind of warning</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apologised for what they had done</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay the victim compensation</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help the victim or the community</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Given help to stop offending</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been given a fine</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Something else</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing should have happened to them</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.4 Prosecution of offender(s) – victims’ opinions

In over half (56%) of crime measured by the SCJS in 2009/10 victims said the offender(s) should have been prosecuted in court.

- Victims said the offender(s) should have gone to court in 60% of property crime compared with 47% of violent crime.
Those victims who thought the offender(s) \textit{should} have been prosecuted in court were asked whether the offender(s) should have been given a prison sentence or another kind of sentence (Figure 4.4).

- In 24\% of crime where the victim thought that the offender(s) \textit{should} have been prosecuted, the victim thought the offender(s) should have been given a prison sentence;
  - Victims said the offender(s) should have been sentenced to prison in 41\% of such violent crime and in 19\% of such property crime;
- In 72\% of crime where the victim thought that the offender(s) \textit{should} have been prosecuted, the victim said that the offender(s) should have been given another kind of sentence;
  - Victims said the offender(s) should have been given a sentence other than a prison sentence in 77\% of such property crime and in 57\% of such violent crime.

**Figure 4.4: Whether offender(s) should have been given a prison sentence or another sentence**

SCJS 2009/10.
Base: All crime where victim thinks the offender(s) should have been prosecuted in court (all SCJS crime 1,976; property crime 1,721; violent crime 255).
Variable name: \textit{QSEN}.

Note: Combined percentages for prison and other sentences do not add up to 100\% as some respondents expressed no opinion on which type of sentence should have been given to the offender(s).
4.4.5 Alternatives to prison for offender(s) – victims’ opinions

Those victims who thought the offender(s) should have been prosecuted in court and given an alternative sentence to prison were asked what sentence the court should have given the offender(s) (Table 4.4).

- In 28% of crime where victims thought the offender(s) should have been prosecuted and given an alternative sentence, victims said the offender(s) should have been given a compensation order where they had to pay for any loss or damage caused to property as a result of the crime;
  - Victims said the offender(s) should have been given a compensation order in 33% of such property crime compared with seven per cent of such violent crime;
- In 25% of crime where victims thought the offender(s) should have been prosecuted and given an alternative sentence, victims said the offender(s) should have been given a fine;
  - Victims said the offender(s) should have been given a fine in 23% of such property crime compared with 31% of such violent crime;
- In 25% of crime where victims thought the offender(s) should have been prosecuted and given an alternative sentence, victims said the offender(s) should have been given a community service order where the offender(s) had to carry out unpaid work in the community under supervision;
  - Victims said the offender(s) should have been given a community service order in 25% of such property crime and 26% of such violent crime.

Table 4.4: Alternative to prison for offender(s) – victims’ opinions

SCJS 2009/10.
Base: Crime where victim thought offender(s) should have been prosecuted in court and given an alternative to a prison sentence (all SCJS crime 1,496; property crime 1,348; violent crime 148).
Variable name: QNPS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative sentence:</th>
<th>All SCJS crime %</th>
<th>Victim of: Property crime %</th>
<th>Violent crime %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compensation (offender pays for loss)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A fine</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community service order (unpaid work)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A warning</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be electronically tagged at home</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A probation order</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of these</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5 Reporting Crime and Support for Victims

5.1 Summary

Advice and support for victims

Aspects of support and advice provision in relation to the crime were examined by the SCJS 2009/10.

Regardless of whether the crime was reported to the police, for the majority of crime (90%), victims said they or another household member did not need or want any support or advice.

Victims in six per cent of crime received advice and support. Victims would have liked to receive advice and support in nine per cent of crime.

- Advice and support was received in nine per cent of violent crime and five per cent of property crime;
- Victims would have liked advice and support for 17% of violent crime and six per cent of property crime.

In total there was at least one unmet support need in eight per cent of crime measured in the SCJS in 2009/10, including in 14% of violent crime and in six per cent of property crime.

Compared with 2008/09, both the proportion of crime where victims received advice and support and the proportion of crime where victims would have liked advice and support have decreased.

- Victims in eight percent of crime received advice and support in 2008/09 compared with victims in six per cent of crime in 2009/10;
- Victims in 13% of crime would have liked advice and support in 2008/09 compared with victims in nine per cent of crime in 2009/10.

Reporting crime to the police

Approaching two in five (37%) of all SCJS crime were reported to the police which is a similar rate as measured in 2008/09 (38%). The reporting rate estimated in the BCS 2009/10 for England and Wales was 40%.

In 57% of reported crime, victims were satisfied with the way the police handled the matter while in 26% of reported crime they were dissatisfied:

- In almost half (49%) of crime, where the victim reported dissatisfaction with the way the police handled reported crime, this was because the police did not follow up, respond or there was no action taken.
Information or assistance about the investigation

In three in ten reported crimes (30%) victims received information or assistance about the investigation (or case) from at least one source:

- In 78% of reported crime where information or assistance was received from the police, victims reported satisfaction with that information or assistance;
- In 41% of reported crime where victims had received at least one type of information or assistance, they would have liked to receive at least one additional type of information or assistance.

In around a third of reported crimes (31%) victims did not receive any information or assistance about the investigation (or case):

- In 61% of reported crime where victims had not received information or assistance, they would have liked to receive at least one type of information or assistance.

Contact with the Procurator Fiscal

Victims had contact with the Procurator Fiscal in 17% of crime where the police identified the perpetrator.

5.2 Introduction

The first section of this chapter explores the advice and support available to victims of crime, including emotional and practical support from a range of organisations. Preferences for advice and support are compared with experience of advice and support received.

The next section provides more detail on the rate and process of reporting crime to the police, including examining reasons for not reporting and perceptions of how well the police handled the incident. The rate of reporting crime to the police is one of the indicators for the Scottish Policing Performance Framework.\(^\text{43}\)

The chapter then moves on to look at information or assistance provided about the investigation and, where appropriate, the case. Finally it looks at experience of the Procurator Fiscal service from the perspective of being a victim.

This chapter is based on information collected as part of the victim form. These are incident based, so adults or households who suffered more than one type of crime may be represented more than once.

### 5.3 Advice and support for victims

Regardless of whether the crime had been reported to the police, the Scottish Crime and Justice survey (SCJS) asked victims which types of support or advice they would have liked to receive to help with the consequences of the crime.\(^{44}\)

They were also asked about the support and advice actually received from a range of organisations including the police, Victim Support Scotland (VSS), the Witness Service, Citizen’s Advice Scotland, Women’s Aid, Rape Crisis and Samaritans. Comparison of these two measures indicates where victims’ needs were being met and where there were potential gaps in support.

#### 5.3.1 Advice and support victims would have liked to receive

For the majority of crime measured by the SCJS in 2009/10 (90%), victims said they did not need or want any support or advice (Figure 5.1). For slightly less than one in ten crimes (nine per cent), victims said they would have liked to receive advice and support. The percentage of crime where victims would have liked to receive advice and support was higher for violent crime (17%) than for property crime (six per cent).

Compared with 2008/2009, there has been a decrease in the proportion of crimes in which victims said they would have liked advice or support. The 2008/09 survey reported that in 13% of crime, victims would have liked support compared with victims in nine per cent of crime in 2009/10.

\(^{44}\) While the results discussed in this section are about advice and support provided from any organisation, not just the police, they are an important mechanism for referring victims to organisations and services which provide advice and support. As will be seen in section 5.4, 37% of crime was reported to the police as measured in 2009/10.
Figure 5.1: Changes in whether victims would have liked to receive support and advice or not over time
Variable name: QSUWL.

Types of advice and support victims would have liked to receive, mentioned in two per cent of crime each:

- Reporting the crime;
- Counselling;
- Other emotional support.

Other types of advice and support, mentioned in one per cent of crime each:

- Help securing their house;
- Repairing damage to the house / property;
- Help to find alternative accommodation;
- Medical advice / information;
- Advice / information on other organisations to contact for support.
5.3.2 Advice and support received
Victims received advice and support to help deal with the consequences of the crime in six per cent of crime measured by the SCJS in 2009/10. In 2008/2009 the figure was slightly higher at eight per cent.

This compares with nine per cent of crime where victims, regardless of whether the crime was reported to the police or not, would have liked to have received advice and support (section 5.3.1).

Advice and support was received in nine per cent of violent crime and five per cent of property crime. Advice and support to help deal with the crime came from a range of organisations, including police liaison officers (three per cent of all SCJS crime) and Victim Support Scotland (one per cent of all SCJS crime).

Support was received from other organisations including Women’s Aid, the Witness Service, the local council, a housing association or their workplace in one per cent or less of crime each. Although victims were asked about Citizen’s Advice Scotland, the Samaritans or Rape Crisis, none mentioned having received help from these organisations in relation to dealing with the consequences of a crime.

5.3.3 Unmet support needs
The percentage of unmet support needs was calculated by comparing each individual type of support according to whether the victim would have liked to receive it and whether the victim did receive it for each crime. Each crime for which the victim would have liked to receive a particular type of support that they did not receive was defined as having an unmet support need.

In total there was at least one unmet support need in eight per cent of crime measured in the SCJS in 2009/10, the same percentage as measured in 2008/09. There was a higher level of unmet support need among victims in violent crime than in property crime:

- In 14% of violent crime the victim stated that they would have liked to receive at least one form of help and advice which they did not receive;
- In six per cent of property crime the victim stated that they would have liked to receive at least one form of help and advice which they did not receive.

---

45 Sexual victimisation was not recorded specifically in the SCJS 2009/10 victim form. The SCJS collected information about sexual victimisation in the self-completion section of the questionnaire. The results obtained are published in a separate volume.
5.3.4 Satisfaction with support provided

For crime where advice and support was received by victims, they were asked how satisfied they were with the help provided by each organisation that assisted. Two sources of support, police liaison officers and Victim Support Scotland, had sufficient response in the survey to allow comparisons between them.\(^{46}\) Figure 5.2 shows that, in the majority of crime, victims provided with support and advice from these two sources were satisfied:

- In 72% of crime where support and advice was provided by police liaison officers, victims reported satisfaction and in 10% they reported dissatisfaction;
- In 67% of crime where support and advice was provided by Victim Support Scotland (VSS), victims reported satisfaction and in one per cent they reported dissatisfaction.

**Figure 5.2: Satisfaction with support received**
SCJS 2009/10.
Base: All SCJS crime where respondent / other household member received support / advice from police liaison officer (69); Victim Support Scotland (50). Variable name: QSUSAT.

\(^{46}\) The unweighted base size for police liaison officers was 69 and for Victim Support Scotland was 50. This means the estimates shown are subject to large confidence intervals and should be used with caution.
5.4 Reporting crime to the Police

As Figure 5.3 shows, approaching two in five (37%) crimes measured by the SCJS 2009/10 were reported to the police, a similar rate as in 2008/09 (38%). This is referred to as the reporting rate. The reporting rate for England and Wales in the British Crime Survey (BCS) 2009/10 was 40% (Osborne, 2010).

Reporting rates were similar for violent crime (38%) and property crime (36%). The rate varied among different groups of property crime:

- The crime most likely to be reported was housebreaking (64%);
- The reporting rate for all motor vehicle theft related incidents (45%) was also above average;
- The reporting rate for vandalism, at 39%, was close to the average;
- Crime groups least likely to be reported were other household theft (including bicycle theft) (32%) and personal theft (excluding robbery) (26%).

---

47 Crime reported to the police covers all crime the police came to know about, including incidents reported by the respondent or someone else, and incidents where the police were there at the time of the incident or found out in some other way.
Figure 5.3: % of survey incidents within crime type reported to the police SCJS 2009/10.
Base: All SCJS crime (3,326); property crime (2,833); vandalism (1,322); other household theft (inc. bicycle theft) (765); all motor vehicle theft (322); housebreaking (121); personal theft (excl. robbery) (303); violent crime (493).
Variable name: QPOL and incidence variables.\textsuperscript{48}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure53.png}
\caption{Percentage of SCJS crime reported to the police by crime type.}
\end{figure}

5.4.1 What factors affect reporting?

The previous section showed how some types of crime were more likely to be reported than others. This section looks at two factors that affect the rate of reporting incidents to the police: insurance coverage and perceptions of the incident.

Reporting crime to the police can be a requirement to allow an insurance claim to be made. Not surprisingly, the reporting rate for crime where damaged or stolen property was insured was higher (44\%) than where it was not insured (33\%).

Among crime where property was insured, the reporting rate for crime where an insurance claim was made was higher (85\%) compared with the reporting rate for crime when property was covered by insurance but a claim was not made (34\%).

\textsuperscript{48} Definitions for the groups of crimes used in this report can be found in Annex 3. Incidence variables are in the Respondent File SPSS: incsurveycrime, incproperty, incvand, incallmvtheft, inchousebreak, incotherhousetheftcycle, incpersteft, incviolent.
The reporting rate also appeared to be related to how the incident was perceived by the victim (Figure 5.4). The reporting rate for crime where the victim said they thought what had happened was a crime was 47%. This was higher than the reporting rates for crime where the victim said it was wrong but not a crime or just something that happens (19% and 13% respectively).

Figure 5.4: Effect of perception of crime on reporting – % of SCJS crime reported to the police by perceptions of the crime
SCJS 2009/10.
Base: All SCJS crime (3,326); all SCJS crime considered to be a crime (2,319); what happened was wrong but not a crime (523); what happened was just something that happens (452).
Variable name: QPOL.

5.4.2 Why crime was not reported
If a crime was not reported to the police, victims were asked the reason(s) for this (Figure 5.5). In around four in ten (39%) unreported crimes, victims said that the crime was not reported to the police because the incident was too trivial and not worth reporting.

Virtuems also said that they did not report the crime because the police could not have done anything about it (28%) or would not have bothered or been interested (14%). For 12% of crime not reported to the police the reason given was that the victims dealt with the matter themselves. In seven per cent of unreported crime, victims considered what happened to be a private, personal or family matter and in six per cent, victims said that it was too much trouble to report the crime.

Chapter 4 provides information on the percentages of victims who thought what happened to them was a crime, wrong, but not a crime, or just something that happens.
Figure 5.5: Most common reasons crime was not reported

SCJS 2009/10
Base: All SCJS crime where the police did not come to know about the matter (2,008).
Variable name: QPON.

The reasons given for not reporting a crime to the police varied by type of crime:

- Compared with violent crime, the reason given by victims for not reporting property crime was more likely to be that:
  - The incident was too trivial or not worth reporting (46% of unreported property crime compared with 20% of unreported violent crime);
  - The police could have done nothing about it (33% of unreported property crime compared with 18% of unreported violent crime);

- Compared with property crime, the reason given by victims for not reporting violent crime was more likely to be that:
  - They dealt with the matter themselves (25% unreported violent crime compared with eight per cent of unreported property crime);

---

50 All other reasons were mentioned in four per cent or fewer incidents and are not shown in Figure 5.5.
o It was considered a private, personal or family matter (13% of unreported violent crime compared with four per cent of unreported property crime);

o The crime was reported to other authorities / organisations (10% unreported violent crime compared with two per cent of unreported property crime).

5.4.3 Why crime was reported
Where the crime was reported to the police victims were asked why it was reported (Figure 5.6).

• In just under half (46%) of reported crime, the reason given was because all crime should be reported, it was the right thing to do, it was their duty or it was automatic;

• In around one in four (24%) of reported crime, it was reported in the hope that the offender(s) would be caught or punished;

• In 15% of reported crime, it was reported because a crime number was needed for insurance purposes, and in 12% it was reported in the hope that property could be recovered;

• Crime was also reported to avoid a similar incident happening again, either to the victim or to someone else (17% and 15% of reported crime respectively);

• 16% of crime was reported because it was a serious, major or upsetting crime.
Figure 5.6: Most common reasons crime was reported 51
SCJS 2009/10.
Base: All SCJS crime where the police were told by respondent / person in household / other person (1,217).
Variable name: QPKR.

As with non-reporting, the reasons given by victims for reporting crime to the police varied by type of crime:

- 51% of property crime was reported because all crime should be reported, it was the right thing to do, it was their duty or it was automatic compared with 33% of reported violent crime;
- 20% of property crime was reported because a crime number was needed for the purposes of making an insurance claim and 15% of property crime was reported in the hope that the property would be recovered;
- The percentage of violent crime reported to the police because the incident was serious, major or upsetting (32%) was higher than the percentage of property crime reported for this reason (11%).

51 All other reasons were mentioned in five per cent or fewer reported crimes and are not shown in Figure 5.6.
### 5.4.4 Satisfaction with the police response

In 57% of reported crime, victims were satisfied with the way the police handled the matter (Figure 5.7). In 26% of reported crime, victims were dissatisfied. There was no change in satisfaction since 2008/09. The level of dissatisfaction with the way the police handled the matter was 28% in 2008/09 (compared with 26% in 2009/10).

Victims of crime were more likely to report they were satisfied with the police response in crimes where they had face-to-face contact with the police. In 61% of reported crime where the victim had face-to-face contact with the police, victims said they were very or fairly satisfied with how the police handled the matter compared with 48% of reported crime where the victim did not have this contact. Levels of dissatisfaction were the same regardless of whether the victim had face-to-face contact with the police or not.

**Figure 5.7: Satisfaction with police handling of the matter**
SCJS 2009/10.
Base: All SCJS crime where the police came to know about the matter (1,301); reported crime where the victim had face-to-face contact with the police (857); reported crime where the victim had no face-to-face contact with the police (432).
Variable name: QPSA.

Satisfaction with the police handling of reported crime was similar between reported property crime and reported violent crime:

- In 57% of reported property crime, victims were satisfied;
- In 56% of reported violent crime, victims were satisfied.
Satisfaction with the police handling of reported property crime was higher in 2009/10 than in the previous year (57% 2009/10; 53% 2008/09). In contrast, satisfaction with the police handling of reported violent crime was lower in 2009/10 than in the previous year (56% 2009/10; 64% 2008/09).

5.4.5 Reasons for dissatisfaction
In 49% of crime where the victim reported dissatisfaction with the way the police handled the incident, they said this was because the police did not follow up, respond to their call or there was no action taken (Figure 5.8). In around three in ten cases of dissatisfaction with police handling of reported crime, victims said they were dissatisfied because no-one was apprehended or punished or the problem was unresolved (31%), or because the police were unhelpful (30%). In one in five cases dissatisfaction arose because the police took too long to respond or because they were incompetent or inefficient (20% each).

Figure 5.8: Most common reasons for dissatisfaction with the way the police handled the matter\(^{52}\)
SCJS 2009/10.
Base: All SCJS crime where dissatisfaction reported with police handling of the matter (348).
Variable name: QPSA2N.

\(^{52}\) All other reasons were mentioned in three per cent or fewer reported crimes and are not shown in Figure 5.8.
Chapter 5 – Reporting Crime and Support for Victims

5.5 Information or assistance about the investigation
Section 5.3 explored the types of advice and support available to victims of crime, focusing on emotional support and practical advice. Where the crime was reported to the police the SCJS 2009/10 also asked victims about the information or assistance received by them related to the investigation of the crime or, where applicable, the resulting case.

5.5.1 Types and sources of information or assistance
There are a number of different sources of information or assistance available for victims of crime as an investigation proceeds, including police liaison officers, other police sources and Victim Support Scotland including the Witness Service.

In three out of ten crimes, victims either received information or assistance about the investigation (or case) from at least one source (30%), or did not receive any information or assistance at all (31%) or reported that the case was not investigated (31%) (Figure 5.9).

Figure 5.9: Whether information or assistance was received about the investigation (or case)
SCJS 2009/10.
Base: All SCJS crime where police came to know about the matter (1,301).
Variable name: QINF.

Information or assistance about the investigation and, where appropriate, the case was more likely to have been received for reported violent crime (35%), than for reported property crime (28%).

For most reported crime where information or assistance about the investigation (or case) was received, this was from the police (27%), including a police liaison officer and other police sources (seven per cent and 21% respectively). In three per cent of reported crime, information or assistance was provided by Victim Support Scotland or the Witness Service and in two per cent it was provided by other organisations.
Figure 5.10 shows the types of information or assistance provided by any police source, by a police liaison officer and by other police. As Figure 5.10 shows, for reported crime where information or assistance about the investigation (or case) was provided by the police, this was most often about their investigation (46%), updates on the progress of the case (26%), keeping victims informed about the case (21%) and catching or charging the offender(s) (16% and 15% respectively).

**Figure 5.10: Information or assistance for victims about the investigation (or case) provided by the police**

SCJS 2009/10.

Base: All SCJS crime where information or assistance received from the police, any (376); police liaison officers (93); police, other (298).

Variable name: QINTY.

5.5.2 Satisfaction with information or assistance about the investigation (or case) from the police

Where information or assistance about the investigation of a crime was received from the police, victims were asked how satisfied or dissatisfied they were with it. In around three in four (78%) reported crimes where information or assistance about the investigation was received, victims were satisfied with it. In around one in eight (12%), victims reported dissatisfaction with the information or assistance the police provided (Figure 5.11).

There was no statistically significant difference in satisfaction between crimes where information or assistance was received from police liaison officers or from another police source.
Figure 5.11: Satisfaction with information or assistance about the investigation
SCJS 2009/10
Base: All SCJS crime where information or assistance was received from the police, any (376); police liaison officers (93); police, other (298).
Variable name: QINSAT.

Those victims expressing dissatisfaction with information or assistance about the investigation (or case) received from the police were asked why this was.

The most common reason given was that not enough information or assistance was provided. Other reasons included the person providing the information or assistance being unapproachable; the information or assistance was not what was needed; the information or assistance was not provided at the right time or was too slow and the information or assistance was difficult to understand or not clear enough.

Due to the low level of dissatisfaction expressed, the low base size prevents more detailed analysis.

5.5.3 Information or assistance about the investigation the victim would have liked to receive

For crime where the victim received information or assistance from at least one organisation, victims were asked to identify what other information or assistance they would have liked. The same question was also asked if no information or assistance was received about the investigation (or the case).

The main types of information or assistance victims would have liked to receive about the investigation are shown in Figure 5.12. These are shown for crime where the victim received information or assistance from at least one organisation and for crime where the victim received no information or assistance.
In one in five reported crimes (20%), victims who had not received any information or assistance about the investigation or case did not want any. In almost two in five (37%) reported crimes, victims who had received some information or assistance did not want any additional information or assistance.

The results suggest that information or assistance about the investigation was not provided for all crimes when it was required. In 61% of reported crime where victims had not received information or assistance, they would have liked to have received at least one type of information or assistance. Victims would have liked to have received at least one additional type of information or assistance in 41% of reported crime where victims had received at least one type of information or assistance.

For each type of information or assistance, as expected, interest was higher among the victims who had not received any information or assistance about the investigation (or case), but would have liked to, than for those victims who received some information or assistance and would have liked to receive additional information or assistance. Looking at the information or assistance needs in detail, Figure 5.12 shows that victims would have liked to receive information or assistance about:

- Catching the offender(s) (25% of crime where the victim received no information or assistance and 15% of crime where the victim received some information or assistance);
- Information or assistance about progress of the case (23% of crime where the victim received no information or assistance and 11% of crime where the victim received some information or assistance);
- Being kept informed about the case (20% of crime where the victim received no information or assistance and 11% of crime where the victim received some information or assistance);
- Charging the offender(s) (15% of crime where the victim received no information or assistance and 11% of crime where the victim received some information or assistance);
- The police investigation (24% of crime where the victim received no information or assistance and five per cent of crime where the victim received some information or assistance).
Figure 5.12: Most common (additional) types of information or assistance about the investigation the victim would have liked to have received 53
SCJS 2009/10.
Base: All SCJS crime where information or assistance received from at least one organisation (412); all SCJS crime where information or assistance not received from any organisation (490).
Variable name: \textit{QINNR} and \textit{QINWL}.

5.6 Contact with the Procurator Fiscal 54
The final section of this chapter looks at experience of the Procurator Fiscal.

In crime where the police identified the perpetrator, victims were asked whether they had contact with the Procurator Fiscal in connection with the case. The victim had contact with the Procurator Fiscal in around one in six (17%) such crimes (Figure 5.13).

In just under three in ten violent crimes (28%) where the police found out who committed it, someone in the household had contact with the Procurator Fiscal compared with less than one in ten (four per cent) property crimes of this kind.

53 All other reasons were mentioned in fewer than 10% of crime in either group and are not shown in Figure 5.12.

54 The Crown Office and Procurator Fiscal service (COPFS) is one organisation in the Scottish criminal justice system but victims were only asked about their experience of ‘Procurator Fiscal’ in 2009/10.
Figure 5.13: Whether victim had contact with the Procurator Fiscal service in connection with the crime
SCJS 2009/10.
Base: All SCJS crime where the police found out who committed the crime (445); property crime (274); violent crime (171).
Variable name: QOPFNEW.

For SCJS crime where there was contact with the Procurator Fiscal, victims were asked the level of satisfaction with various aspects of that contact. Victim satisfaction was highest with the helpfulness of the staff and how the case was dealt with overall. Satisfaction was lowest for the extent to which they were kept informed about the case and how quickly the case was dealt with. The small base size (51) prevents more detailed analysis of these results.

This section has provided information about experience of the Procurator Fiscal among victims of crime. Further details about knowledge and experience of the Procurator Fiscal among adults as a whole is contained in Chapter 8.
6 Public Perceptions of Crime

6.1 Summary

Perceptions of crime

The SCJS is used specifically to monitor one of the national indicators in Scotland Performs: *Increase positive public perception of the general crime rate in the local area.*

This national indicator is measured by the percentage of adults who perceive that the amount of crime in their local area has either decreased or stayed the same in the last two years.

- The SCJS 2009/10 estimated that 71% of adults perceived the crime rate in their local area to have stayed the same or reduced in the past two years. This is a statistically significant increase in the national indicator measure compared with the baseline of 65% in 2006;

- There was a two percentage point increase in the national indicator between 2008/09 and 2009/10.

As well as being asked about perceived changes to the crime rate in their local area, respondents were also asked about how they thought the crime rate had changed in the last two years in Scotland overall.

- Adults were more than twice as likely to believe that the crime rate had increased in Scotland as a whole than they were to believe that it had increased in the local area (52% and 25% respectively).

Crimes perceived to be most common in the local area were:

- Drug dealing / drug abuse (with 48% of adults believing it to be very or fairly common);

- Anti-social behaviour, (with 47% of adults believing it to be very or fairly common).

Public anxiety about crime

To understand public anxiety about crime respondents were asked how much they worried about a range of crimes happening to them, and how likely it was that those crimes might happen to them in the next year.

- Adults were most worried about someone using their credit / bank details to obtain money, goods or services (57%) and having their identity stolen (50%);

---

The local area was defined as the area within 15 minutes walk of the respondent’s home.
• Fraudulent use of credit or bank details (17%), damage to vehicles (13%) and identity theft (12%) were the crimes that adults most commonly thought were likely to happen to them in the next 12 months;

• Half (49%) of all adults did not think it was likely that they would experience any of the listed crimes in the next 12 months.

**Trends in public perceptions of crime**

• The percentage of adults who believed that particular crimes were common in the local area has generally decreased from the first crime surveys of the early 1990s. The percentage of adults worrying that particular crimes might happen to them has also generally decreased over time;

• Comparing data from 2009/10 with the previous survey in 2008/09, there was a slight increase in the perception of how common most crimes were in the local area, with the largest increase being for drug dealing / drug abuse (from 45% to 48%) and street mugging or robbery (from 10% to 13%).

**Perceived versus actual risk**

Comparing perceptions of the risk of being a victim of specific crimes to the actual risk:

• In most cases the perceived risk was around twice the actual risk (prevalence) on average across the population;

• However, for having a motor vehicle stolen, being mugged or robbed in the street or having one’s home broken into, the perceived risk was much higher than the actual risk (25, 20 and nine times higher, respectively).

**6.2 Introduction**

Public attitudes towards crime, and in particular fear of crime (Box 6.1), have been explored extensively through the use of crime surveys.

One of the key indicators in the Scottish Government’s national performance framework, ‘Scotland Performs’, is the public’s perception of the general crime rate in the local area. Understanding the links between perceptions of crime and community safety is important to policy makers in Scotland. As a result, various questions exploring perceptions of crime were included in the SCJS and the results are presented in this chapter.

The first section of this chapter explores adults’ perceptions of crime; how much of a problem they believe it to be in Scotland as a whole, whether they

---

perceive crime rates in their local area to be changing, and finally how common they believe specific crimes were in their local area. The sources that inform opinions on the frequency of crime in the local area and whether adults have taken any action as a result of these opinions are also explored.

The chapter then moves on to investigate anxiety about crime, specifically:

- Feelings of safety after dark;
- Worry about various types of crime;
- Perceptions of the likelihood of being a victim of crimes.

It then looks at the changes in perceptions of crime over time. Finally it examines perceptions of the likelihood of an adult becoming the victim a particular crime over the next 12 months versus the actual risk of them being a victim.

**Box 6.1: Fear of crime**

Levi (2007) suggests that the concept of fear of crime tends to be used as an umbrella term for a range of concerns about crime and its consequences, which is independent of actual crime rates. ‘Fear of crime’ itself has been shown to be complex and difficult to measure. Ditton and Farrell (2007) describe confusion between fear, worry and anxiety, and between a general concern about crime and a more specific fear of victimisation. They highlight how direct questions on fear of crime can generate socially desirable answers with the respondent wishing either to appear less or more fearful than they actually are.

Despite the challenges of definition and measurement, Hough et al. (2007) describe how fear of crime can be linked to confidence in the justice system, and so remains of interest to policy-makers.

### 6.3 Perceptions of crime

The SCJS is used specifically to monitor one of the national indicators in Scotland Performs:57

*Increase positive public perception of the general crime rate in the local area.*

This national indicator is measured by the percentage of adults who perceive that the amount of crime in their local area has either decreased or stayed the same in the last two years.58

---


58 The local area was defined as the area within 15 minutes walk of the respondent’s home.
6.3.1 Perceptions of changing local crime levels

The SCJS 2009/10 estimated that 71% of adults perceived the crime rate in their local area to have stayed the same or reduced in the past two years. This is a statistically significant increase in the national indicator measure compared with the baseline of 65% in 2006. One in four adults (25%) thought that the crime rate in their area had increased over the last two years compared with 32% in 2006.

There was a two percentage point increase in the national indicator between 2008/09 and 2009/10.

Examining changes between 2006, the baseline year for the national performance indicator, and 2009/10 in more detail, there has been a decrease in the percentage of adults who perceive that there was a lot more crime in the local area, and an increase in the percentage of adults who perceive that the level of crime had remained about the same:

- Eight per cent of adults thought there was a lot more crime in the local area, compared with 13% in 2006;
- 61% of adults thought that the crime rate in the local area had remained constant compared with 57% of adults in 2006.

This trend is a continuation of one that started in the 2003 SCS (Figure 6.1).

It should be noted that many factors influence adults’ perceptions of the crime rate in the local area (for example personal experience, experiences of friends and family, media etc) and they do not necessarily reflect true rates of crime.
Figure 6.1: Perceptions of how crime rates have changed in respondents’ local area over the past two years

Scottish crime surveys.
Base: Adults who had lived in local area for two years or more, SCS 2000 (4,512); 2003 (4,443); SCVS 2006 (4,433); SCJS 2008/09 (14,214); 2009/10 (14,381).
Variable name: QS2AREA.

Note: The dashed line indicates a break in the survey methodology, moving to a rolling reference period, increased sample size and continuous fieldwork (section 1.1).
Table 6.1 shows the differences in perceptions of the crime rate in the local area between different groups of adults:

**Table 6.1: Public perceptions of crime in local area by various characteristics, 2009/10**

SCJS 2009/10.

Base: Adults who have lived in the local area for two years or more (14,381).

Variable name: QS2AREA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>There is ‘about the same’ or ‘less’ crime in this area than two years ago</th>
<th>There is ‘a lot’ or ‘a little’ more crime in this area than two years ago</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MALE (TOTAL)</strong></td>
<td>73.9</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-24</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>73.4</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-59</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 or over</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEMALE (TOTAL)</strong></td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-24</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-59</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 or over</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VICTIM OF CRIME</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>73.4</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEPRIVATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living in 15% most deprived areas</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living in rest of Scotland</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALL</strong></td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.3.2 Perceptions of changing national crime levels

As well as being asked about changes to the perceived crime rate in their local area, respondents were also asked about how they thought the crime rate had changed in the last two years in Scotland overall.

Figure 6.2 compares opinions of how the national crime rate had changed in the last two years with those on how the local crime rate had changed in the same period, showing a large discrepancy between opinions based on local experience versus those obtained in other ways:

---

59 As measured by the 2009 Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation (SIMD): http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/Statistics/SIMD.
• Adults were more than twice as likely to believe that the crime rate had increased in Scotland as a whole than they were to believe that it had increased in the local area (52% and 25% respectively);

• Correspondingly, adults were much less likely to believe that the crime rate in Scotland overall had stayed the same than that in the local area (36% and 61% respectively).

Figure 6.2: Perceptions of how crime rates have changed nationally and locally over the past two years
SCJS 2009/10.
Base: Adults (16,036); adults who have lived in the local area for two years or more (14,381).
Variable name: QS2AREAS and QS2AREA

6.3.3 Perceptions of particular types of crime
As well as being asked how the local crime rate had changed, respondents were asked how common specific crimes were in their local area (Figure 6.3). Those crimes perceived to be most common in the local area were drug dealing / drug abuse and anti-social behaviour, with almost half of adults believing them to be very or fairly common (48% and 47% respectively).

Other crimes were perceived to be less common. For example just over one-third (35%) of adults believed deliberate damage to vehicles or property was common in their local area.
Young adults aged 16-24 years old were more likely to believe both anti-social behaviour and drug dealing / drug abuse to be common in their local area (61% and 56% respectively) than older adults aged 60 years or over (33% and 39% respectively).

Those who viewed a crime as common in their local area were asked where they got this impression from. Figure 6.4 presents the results of this question for the two crimes perceived to be most common in the local area.

- Seven out of ten (71%) adults who viewed anti-social behaviour as common in their local area said that they got this impression because they had witnessed such behaviour;

- In contrast, a little under two thirds (66%) of adults who viewed drug dealing / drug abuse as common in their local area, said that they got this impression from other people talking about it;

- Four in ten (40%) adults who viewed drug dealing / drug abuse as common in their local area and over three in ten (33%) adults who viewed anti-social behaviour as common in their local area said that they got this impression from the local media.
Figure 6.4: Where adults have got impressions that anti-social behaviour and drug dealing / drug abuse are common in their local area
SCJS 2009/10
Base: Adults answering module A who think people behaving in an anti-social manner in public is common in their local area (1,533); drug dealing / drug abuse is common in their local area (1,626).
Variable name: QACM1.

6.3.4 Acting on perceptions
Respondents were asked if they had changed anything or done anything differently in their everyday life because of the types of problems listed in Figure 6.3.

As Figure 6.5 shows, only a small minority (16%) had taken action, with the most common action being to be more careful about shutting and locking car or property doors and windows (mentioned by 38% of those taking any action). Over a third (35%) of adults taking action now avoided certain areas and under a third (31%) had stopped going out at night or started accompanying others when doing so.
6.3.5 Safety after dark

The question ‘how safe do you feel walking alone in your local area after dark’ is commonly used to measure public anxiety about crime. Across Scotland, the majority of adults (67%) said that they felt safe (very 32%; fairly 35%) while 12% of adults said they felt very unsafe walking alone in their local area after dark and 21% said that they felt a bit unsafe (Table 6.2).

Table 6.2: Safety when walking alone after dark by gender within age
SCJS 2009/10.
Base : Males (7,061); females (8,975).
Variable name: QFSDARK.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adult:</th>
<th>Very safe</th>
<th>Fairly safe</th>
<th>A bit unsafe</th>
<th>Very unsafe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MALE (TOTAL)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-24</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-59</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 or over</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE (TOTAL)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-59</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 or over</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Females were more likely than males to report feeling unsafe (44% of females compared with 19% males), as were the oldest adults (42% of those aged 60 or older, compared with 30% of 45-59 year olds, for example).

Adults were also asked how safe they felt in their home alone after dark (Table 6.3). The majority said that they felt safe (94%), with less than one in ten reporting feeling unsafe (six per cent).

Table 6.3: Safety at home alone after dark by gender within age
SCJS 2009/10.
Base: Males (7,061); females (8,975).
Variable name: QFSNIGH.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adults:</th>
<th>Very safe</th>
<th>Fairly safe</th>
<th>A bit unsafe</th>
<th>Very unsafe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MALE (TOTAL)</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-24</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-59</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 or over</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE (TOTAL)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-24</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-59</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 or over</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Looking at differences by groups of adults:

- Females were more likely to express feeling unsafe at home alone after dark than males (eight per cent compared with three per cent of males);

- The youngest females were most likely to report feeling unsafe at home alone after dark; 13% of females aged 16-24 compared with eight per cent of females overall.

### 6.4 Public anxiety about crime

To understand public anxiety about crime respondents were asked how much they worried about a range of crimes happening to them, and how likely it was that those crimes might happen to them in the next year.
6.4.1 Worry about specific types of crime
Respondents were first asked how worried they were that a range of crimes might happen to them.\(^6\)

Figure 6.6 shows the percentage of adults who were very or fairly worried about these crimes:

- 57% of adults worried that someone would use their credit / bank details to obtain money, goods or services;
- 50% of adults worried about having their identity stolen;
- More than four in ten adults worried about having their car or other vehicle damaged by vandals (42%);
- A quarter (25%) of adults worried about their home being damaged by vandals.

Figure 6.6: Worry that specific types of crime might happen
SCJS 2009/10.
Base: Adults (16,036); adults in households with regular use of a motor vehicle (11,791).
Variable name: QWORR.

Respondents were asked how worried they were about the crime happening not how worried they would be if the crime happened.

\(^6\) Respondents were asked how worried they were about the crime happening not how worried they would be if the crime happened.
For both identity theft and theft of credit or bank details, adults aged 45-59 were most likely to report that they were worried about it happening compared with any other age group:

- 61% of adults aged 45-59 were worried about having their identity stolen (compared with 50% of all adults);
- 65% of adults aged 45-59 were worried that someone would use their credit or bank details to obtain money, goods or services (compared with 57% of all adults).

Adults with regular use of a vehicle in the household who lived in the 15% most deprived areas of Scotland were most likely to worry about having their car or other vehicle damaged by vandals (56% compared with 40% of those living in the rest of Scotland).

### 6.4.2 Perceived likelihood of being a victim of specific types of crime

To assess adults’ perceptions of their personal risk of being a victim, the survey also asked respondents which, if any, crimes they thought they were likely to experience in the next year.

As shown in Figure 6.7 fraudulent use of credit or bank details (17%), damage to vehicles (13%) and identity theft (12%) were the crimes that adults most commonly thought were likely to happen to them in the next 12 months. Fewer than one in ten thought they were likely to experience any of the other types of crime listed, and only two per cent thought they were likely to be sexually assaulted in the next year.

Half (49%) of adults did not think it was likely that they would experience any of the listed crimes in the next 12 months.
Figure 6.7: Crimes adults think are likely to happen to them in next 12 months  
SCJS 2009/10.  
Base: Adults (16,036).  
Variable name: QHAPP.

Those who felt that they were likely to experience fraudulent use of credit or bank details and identity theft were more often those in the middle age groups (20% of those aged 25-59 thought someone would use their credit or bank details, while 15% thought they were likely to have their identity stolen).

The oldest adults said they were likely to experience none of the listed crimes more often than other ages (57% of those aged 60 or older, compared with 44% of 25-44 year olds, for example).
6.5 Trends in public perceptions of crime

Three measures of public concern about crime in the SCJS 2009/10 have also been included in past surveys, allowing analysis of the following trends:

1. How the perceived crime rate in the local area had changed;
2. Perceptions of how common specific crimes were in the local area;
3. Worry about being the victim of specific crimes.

As discussed in section 6.3.1, there was a shift in the public’s perception of the crime rate in the local area. Between the 2003 and 2008/09 surveys, an increasing proportion of adults thought that the crime rate in their area had remained about the same level while fewer adults thought that there was more crime in the local area.

The following two sections examine trends over time for perception of how common crimes are and worry about crimes happening.

6.5.1 Perception of how common crimes are over time

Comparing the percentage of adults who believe that particular crimes were common in the local area with previous crime surveys in Scotland shows there is a general downward trend over time. In 2009/10 fewer adults perceived most of these particular crimes to be common in their local area than have done so in the past. Figure 6.8 shows trends since the 1993 and 1996 surveys, including four crimes which were first asked about in 2006 (antisocial behaviour, drug dealing / drug abuse, physical assault motivated by skin-colour, ethnicity or religion and sexual assault).

Since 1996, the largest decreases have been for perceptions of how common having things stolen from vehicles and homes being broken into were. In 1996, around two in five adults thought these crimes were common (42% and 39% respectively) while the SCJS 2009/10 estimated that around one in five adults thought that these crimes were common (21% and 19% respectively).

However, since the last survey in 2008/09, with the exception of vehicle theft, for all crimes there has been a slight increase in the perception of how common they were in the local area, with the largest increase being for drug dealing / drug abuse (from 45% to 48%) and street mugging or robbery (from 10% to 13%).

---

61 ‘People carrying knives’ was added to this question in the 2008/09 survey and so no trend data is available for this option.
Figure 6.8: % of adults who believe particular crimes are ‘very’ or ‘fairly common’ in their local area (1993 to 2009/10)
Scottish crime surveys.
Base: SCS 1993 (2,517); 1996 (2,511); 2000 (2,542); 2003; (2,530); SCVS 2006; (2,512); SCJS 2008/09; (4,027); 2009/10; (3,995).
Variable name: QACO.

Note: The dashed line indicates a break in the survey methodology, moving to a rolling reference period, increased sample size and continuous fieldwork (section 1.1).
6.5.2 Worry about crimes happening over time

Similar to perceptions of how common crimes were, there has been a decrease in the proportion of adults worrying that particular crimes might happen to them since 1993 (Figure 6.9).

In the last decade since 2000, the largest decreases were for:

- Women worrying about being sexually assaulted (a 15 percentage point decrease since 2000 from 41% to 26% in 2009/10);
- Adults worrying about having their home damaged by vandals (a 12 percentage point decrease since 2000 from 37% to 25% in 2009/10);
- Adults worrying about having their home broken into (an 11 percentage point decrease since 2000 from 45% to 34% in 2009/10).

Although there has been a general decrease in worry about crimes since 2000, a higher proportion of adults appeared to be worried about having their car or vehicle damaged (a five percentage point increase from 37% to 42% in 2009/10).

Figure 6.9: % of adults ‘very’ or ‘fairly worried’ about particular crimes (1993 to 2009/10)
Scottish crime surveys
Base: Adults; SCS 1993 (5,030); 1996 (5,045); 2000 (5,059); 2003 (5,041); SCVS 2006 (4,988); SCJS 2008/09 (16,003); 2009/10 (16,036).
Variable name: QWORR.

Note: The dashed line indicates a break in the survey methodology, moving to a rolling reference period, increased sample size and continuous fieldwork (section 1.1).
6.6 Perceived and actual risk of crimes

Adults’ perceptions of how likely they are to be the victims of some types of crime (section 6.4.2) can be compared with their actual risk (Chapter 2).

In most cases the perceived risk was around two or three times higher than the actual risk (prevalence) on average across the population (Figure 6.10). For example, 13% of adults thought it was likely that their vehicle would be damaged by vandals in the next 12 months, whereas the actual risk of their vehicle being damaged in this way was five per cent.

For three crimes the difference between perceived and actual risk was much larger:

- 25 times as many adults thought they were likely to have a motor vehicle stolen than were actually likely to experience this (five per cent compared with the actual risk of theft of a motor vehicle of 0.2%);

- Adults were 20 times more likely to think that they were likely to be mugged or robbed in the street than they actually were (six per cent compared with the actual risk of robbery of 0.3%);

- Nine times as many adults thought that they were likely to have their home broken into than actually did have their home broken into (eight per cent compared with the actual risk of housebreaking of 0.9%).

---

62 It should be noted that the perceived risk of being a victim of housebreaking is based on the respondent’s personal view, though the actual risk shown is the percentage risk (prevalence) of housebreaking happening to a household.
Figure 6.10: Perceived risk (% saying likely to happen) versus actual risk (% who were victims of each type of crime in past 12 months)
SCJS 2009/10.
Base: Adults (16,036).
Variable name: QHAPP and prevalence variables.\(^{63}\)

The risk of being a victim of card or identity fraud was identified through a separate section from the victim form (section 2.7.4).\(^{64}\) Comparing results of the actual risk with the perceived risk:

- Nearly four times as many adults thought that they were likely to become a victim of card fraud than were actually likely to experience this fraud (17% thought this likely to happen compared with the actual risk of 4.3%);
- 20 times as many adults thought they were likely to become a victim of identity fraud than were likely to experience this (12% thought this likely to happen compared with the actual risk of 0.6%).

\(^{63}\) Prevalence variables (listed based on Figure 6.10 top to bottom) are in the Respondent File SPSS: prevmotovvand, prevhousebreak, prevassault, prevrob, prevpropvand, prevtheftfrommv, prevtheftofmv.

\(^{64}\) As discussed in Chapter 2, actual prevalence (risk) may have been underestimated because the incident did not result in loss to the individual experiencing it or due to lack of awareness of the crime.
7 The Public and the Police

7.1 Summary
This chapter explores adults’ confidence in the police and attitudes towards the service provided by police in the local area. Perceptions of the level of police presence in local areas and attitudes to being stopped and questioned by the police are also reported.

Confidence in the police

Respondents were asked how confident they were in their local police force’s ability to undertake specific aspects of their work, principally related to preventing, investigating and detecting crime:

- More than three in five adults (68%) said they were very or fairly confident in their local police force’s ability to investigate incidents after they occur;
- Fewer adults, though still a majority, said they were confident about their local police force’s ability to:
  - Deal with incidents as they occur (61%);
  - Solve crimes (60%);
  - Respond quickly to appropriate calls and information (58%);
  - Catch criminals (57%);
- Just under half of adults (48%) were very or fairly confident in their local police force’s ability to prevent crime, the lowest confidence expressed in any aspect of the local police force’s performance.

Compared with the previous survey year (2008/09), there was a small but significant increase in adults’ confidence in all aspects of local police performance.

Attitudes to the police in the local area

When respondents were asked to consider aspects of the service provided by the police in their local area:

- More than eight in ten (83%) agreed that the local police would treat them with respect if they had reason to contact them while almost six in ten agreed that the police treat everyone in the area fairly and that the local police can be relied upon to be there when needed (58% each);
- Between four and five in ten agreed the police listened to the concerns of local people (48%), and that people have a lot of confidence in the local police (43%);
Around three in ten agreed that local police were not dealing with the things that matter to the community (31%) and that community relations with the police in the local area were poor (28%).

Attitudes of those living in the 15% most deprived areas were more negative about aspects of service provided by the police in the local area than those living in the rest of Scotland.

### Police presence in the local area

Respondents were asked whether, as far as they knew, local police patrolled their local area regularly.

- 52% said that, as far as they knew, the police did patrol their area regularly, 39% said, as far as they knew, the police did not patrol their local area regularly and nine per cent did not know whether the police patrolled their local area regularly or not;
  - Awareness of police patrolling the local area was higher among those living in the 15% most deprived areas of Scotland (60%) than among those living in the rest of Scotland (50%);
- 56% of adults said the overall police presence in their local area was not enough, 38% said it was about right and one per cent said the police presence was too much;
  - 65% of adults living in the 15% most deprived areas said they thought the police presence was not enough in their local area, compared with 55% of those living in the rest of Scotland.

### Being stopped by the police

Respondents were asked whether they had ever been stopped and asked questions by the police in Scotland. Almost four in ten (39%) said they had.

- 28% of adults had been stopped while they were in a car; 15% when on foot; and one per cent each when riding a bicycle or a motorcycle;
- More than a quarter of those who had ever been stopped (26%) said they had been stopped and asked questions by the police in the last year;
- The main reason for being stopped in a car in the last year was for a routine check such as checking a tax disc (23% of those stopped in that time);
- The main reason for being stopped on foot or on a bicycle in the last year was because the police were just making general enquiries or asking for information (22% of those stopped in that time).
7.2 Introduction
Chapter 5 provided information on victims and the police in the context of reporting crimes and the support given specifically to victims. In this chapter, the wider relationship of the police with the general public is examined. This chapter explores the public’s confidence in the police in relation to specific aspects of policing and attitudes to aspects of the service provided by police in the local area. Perceptions of the level of police presence in local areas and attitudes to being stopped and questioned by the police are also reported.

Box 7.1: Assessing police performance
It has become accepted by policy makers, among others, that any complete assessment of police performance has to go beyond their ability to prevent and solve crime to include their relationship with the public as a service provider (Hough and Roberts, 2007).

Jackson et al. (2009) suggest that confidence in the police is central to the effective operation of the criminal justice system. This confidence encourages the public to report crime and act as witnesses or jurors, but also, importantly, it determines preparedness to comply with the law (i.e. it is more likely that people will help, or call on the help of, the police). As a result, confidence measures have become central to performance indicators, forming one part of the Service Response element of the Scottish Policing Performance Framework: (http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Resource/Doc/1101/0047863.pdf).

At the same time, public opinion does not necessarily measure the effectiveness of policing on the ground, and public opinion surveys consistently show a mismatch between public perception and the reality of crime and justice trends (Skogan, 2007).

Contact with the police also helps shape attitudes towards policing. Again, as Jackson et al. (2009) point out, fair treatment results in satisfaction which translates to an increased propensity to support the police and obey the law, thus legitimising the criminal justice system. On the other hand negative experiences can lead to a perception that the police are unfair and reduce propensity for co-operation. Evidence suggests that little credit is given for professionalism and that bad experiences have a greater impact on overall ratings of police performance than experiences which are good (Skogan, 2007).

7.3 Confidence in the police
The Scottish Crime and Justice Survey (SCJS) 2009/10 measured public perceptions of confidence in the local police on specific aspects of their work. To do this, respondents, regardless of whether they had ever been in contact with the police or not, were asked how confident they were in their local police force’s ability to undertake specific aspects of police work. These aspects of police work principally related to preventing, investigating and detecting crime as well as responding to calls or information from the public.
When considering confidence in the local police force’s ability to do specific elements of their job, a greater percentage of adults had confidence than did not have confidence in five out of six aspects:

- More than three in five adults (68%) said they were very or fairly confident in their local police force’s ability to investigate incidents after they occur;
- Slightly fewer adults said they were very or fairly confident about their local police force’s ability to:
  - Deal with incidents as they occur (61%);
  - Solve crimes (60%);
  - Respond quickly to appropriate calls and information (58%);
  - Catch criminals (57%).

Under half of adults (48%) were very or fairly confident in their local police force’s ability to prevent crime, the lowest level of confidence expressed in any aspect of the local police force’s performance. Opinion was more divided about this than any other aspect, with a similar percentage of negative and positive opinions being expressed (48% confident and 46% not confident).

**Figure 7.1: Confidence in local police force’s ability to undertake specific aspects of their work**

SCJS 2009/10.
Base: Adults (16,036).
Variable name: QPOLCONF.
Compared with the previous survey year (2008/09), there was a small but significant increase in the public’s confidence in the local police across all aspects.

- The largest increases, of four percentage points, were in the proportion of adults who were confident in the ability of the police to respond quickly to appropriate calls and information from the public (58% were confident in 2009/10 compared with 54% in 2008/09) and to investigate incidents after they occur (68% in 2009/10 compared with 64% in 2008/09);

- There was an increase of three percentage points in the proportion of adults who were confident in the police’s ability to deal with incidents as they occur (61% were confident in 2009/10 compared with 58% in 2008/09) and to solve crimes (60% in 2009/10 compared with 57% in 2008/09);

- There was an increase of two percentage points in the proportion of adults who were confident in the police’s ability to catch criminals (57% were confident in 2009/10 compared with 55% in 2008/09) and to prevent crime (48% in 2009/10 compared with 46% in 2008/09).

Figure 7.2: Changes in confidence in local police force’s ability to undertake specific aspects of their work (% very / fairly confident) SCJS 2008/09, 2009/10. Base: Adults 2008/09 (16,003); 2009/10 (16,036). Variable name: QPOLCONF.
7.4 **Attitudes to the police in the local area**

To explore attitudes to the police, respondents were asked the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with a series of statements related to the service provided by the police in their local area. Respondents who were serving police officers, or where a member of their household was a serving police officer, were not asked these questions.\(^{65}\)

- More than eight in ten (83%) agreed that local police would treat them with respect if they had reason to contact them and seven per cent disagreed;

- Almost six in ten (58%) agreed that the police treat everyone in the area fairly and 15% disagreed;

- The same percentage (58%) agreed that the local police can be relied upon to be there when needed, while over a quarter (26%) disagreed;

- Almost five in ten (48%) agreed the police listened to the concerns of local people, while 15% disagreed;

- Over four in ten (43%) agreed that people have a lot of confidence in the local police and 26% disagreed;

- Over three in ten (31%) agreed that local police were not dealing with the things that matter to the community and a slightly larger percentage (34%) disagreed;

- Almost three in ten (28%) agreed that community relations with the police in the local area were poor and almost four in ten (38%) disagreed.

For virtually all of the statements, a relatively high percentage said either that they neither agreed nor disagreed with the statement or that they did not know. For example 19% neither agreed nor disagreed that the police listen to concerns of local people and 18% said they did not know whether they did or not, suggesting they may not have enough knowledge to provide an informed opinion on the police in the local area.

---

\(^{65}\) 121 (three per cent) respondents answering Module B said they were in the police, or they were married to or lived with a serving police officer and were not asked the remaining questions covering attitudes to police in the local area; police presence in the local area and being stopped and asked questions by the police.
**Figure 7.3: Level of agreement with statements about the police in the local area**
SCJS 2009/10.
Base: All respondents answering module B who are not in the police and no police officer in household (3,889).
Variable name: POLOP.

There were significant differences in attitudes to the local police between those living in the 15% most deprived areas and those living in the rest of Scotland, with the former group being more negative in their attitudes. Of note:

- 27% of those living in the 15% most deprived areas agreed that overall people have a lot of confidence in the police in their area compared with 46% of those living in the rest of Scotland;

- 42% of those in the 15% most deprived areas agreed that the local police were not dealing with the things that mattered to people in their community compared with 28% of those in the rest of Scotland;

- 44% of adults living in the 15% most deprived areas agreed that community relations were poor with the police in their local area compared with 25% of those living in the rest of Scotland.

---

66 As measured by the 2009 Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation (SIMD): http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/Statistics/SIMD.
**Figure 7.4: Agreement with statements about the police in the local area by area deprivation (% strongly / tend to agree)**

SCJS 2009/10.

Base: All respondents answering module B who are not in the police and no police officer in household (3,889).

Variable name: POLOP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Rest of Scotland</th>
<th>15% most deprived</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police in this area would treat you with respect if you had contact with them for any reason</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The police in this area treat everyone fairly regardless of who they are</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police in this area can be relied on to be there when you need them</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The police in this area listen to the concerns of local people</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, people have a lot of confidence in the police in this area</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police in this area are not dealing with the things that matter to people in this community</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community relations with the police in this local area are poor</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**7.5 Police presence in the local area**

A series of questions were asked about police presence in the local area. This included awareness of police presence, views on the level of police presence, and the importance of having a community police officer in the local area. Respondents who were serving police officers, or where a member of their household was a serving police officer, were not asked these questions.

**7.5.1 Awareness of local police patrolling local areas**

Respondents were asked whether, as far as they knew, local police patrolled their local area regularly.

- Over half (52%) reported that, as far as they knew, the police did patrol their area regularly. When this was broken down by mode of patrolling:
  - 43% said they were aware of police patrolling by car;
  - 19% said they were aware of police patrolling on foot;
  - Nine per cent said they were aware of police patrolling by bicycle;
Almost four in ten (39%) said, as far as they knew, the police did not patrol their local area regularly;

Nearly one in ten (nine per cent) did not know whether the police patrolled their local area regularly or not.

Eight in ten (80%) of those who were aware of police patrolling their local area on foot or by bicycle had seen them doing this in the last four weeks including:

- 12% who had seen this happening daily;
- 19% every couple of days;
- 18% once a week;
- 16% at least twice in the last four weeks;
- 14% once in the last four weeks.

Awareness of police patrolling the local area was higher among those living in the 15% most deprived areas of Scotland (60%) than among those living in the rest of Scotland (50%). This result was consistent regardless of whether awareness was of police patrolling by car, on foot or by bicycle.

- 48% of those living in the 15% most deprived areas were aware of police patrolling by car compared with 42% of those living in the rest of Scotland;
- 27% of those living in the 15% most deprived areas were aware of police patrolling on foot, compared with 17% of those living in the rest of Scotland;
- 15% of those living in the 15% most deprived areas were aware of police patrolling by bicycle compared with eight per cent of those living in the rest of Scotland.

7.5.2 Opinions of the level of police presence in the local area
Respondents were asked whether overall they thought that the police presence in their local area was not enough, about right or too much.

- A majority (56%) said they thought it was not enough;
- Almost four in ten (38%) thought it was about right;
- One per cent said they thought the police presence was too much.
There were differences in opinions about the level of police presence between those living in the 15% most deprived areas of Scotland and those living in the rest of Scotland.

- 65% of adults living in the 15% most deprived areas said they thought the police presence was not enough in their local area, compared with 55% of those living in the rest of Scotland;
- 29% of those living in the 15% most deprived areas thought the police presence was about right compared with 40% of adults living in the rest of Scotland;
- Two per cent of respondents living in the 15% most deprived areas thought the police presence was too much compared with one per cent of those living in the rest of Scotland.

7.5.3 Importance of a community police officer in the local area
Respondents were also asked how important it was to them that there was a community police officer who knows and patrols their local area. Almost nine in ten (89%) said it was important to them (66% said it was very important; 23% said it was fairly important), while nine per cent said it was not important.

Those living in the 15% most deprived areas of Scotland were equally likely to say it was important that there was a community police officer in their local area as those living in the rest of Scotland (91% and 89% respectively).

7.6 Being stopped by the police
A series of questions were asked about being stopped by the police in Scotland. Once again, respondents who were serving police officers, or where a member of their household was a serving police officer, were not asked these questions.

7.6.1 Being stopped and asked questions by the police
Respondents were asked whether they had ever been stopped and asked questions by the police in Scotland. Almost four in ten adults (39%) said they had. 28% of adults had been stopped while they were in a car; 15% when on foot; and one per cent each when riding a bicycle or a motorcycle.

More than a quarter of those who had ever been stopped (26%) said they had been stopped and asked questions by the police in the last year. The majority stopped in the last year had been stopped once in that time (65%), while 20% had been stopped twice.67

67 Where respondents had been stopped more than once, they were asked about the last time this had happened in the follow-up questions reported below.
Table 7.1 below shows the percentage of adults who had been stopped by the police *ever* and *in the last year*, by a range of demographic characteristics.

**Table 7.1: Been stopped and asked questions by police *ever* / *in the last year* by various characteristics**

SCJS 2009/10.

Base: All adults answering module B who are not in the police and no police officer in household (3,889).

Variable name: *PSTOP* and *PSTOPYR*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ever been stopped by police &amp; asked questions</th>
<th>Been stopped &amp; asked questions by police <em>in the last year</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MALE (TOTAL)</strong></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-24</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-59</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 or over</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEMALE (TOTAL)</strong></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-59</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 or over</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VICTIM OF CRIME</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-victim</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEPRIVATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15% most deprived</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of Scotland</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALL</strong></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of those adults who had been stopped and questioned by the police *in the last year*:

- Over half (56%) had been stopped and asked questions while in a car;
- 42% had been stopped and asked questions when they were on foot;
- Two per cent had been stopped and asked questions when on a bicycle;
- No-one reported being stopped on a motorcycle *in the last year*.

Almost half (48%) of those stopped and asked questions by the police said they were not worried or did not mind being stopped. Over a quarter (26%) said they were annoyed, 17% were angry and 14% were embarrassed about being stopped and asked questions.
7.6.2 Reasons for being stopped by the police

The police gave a reason why they had been stopped in 84% of cases where an adult was stopped and asked questions.

The main reasons given by the police to those who had been stopped in a car in the last year included:68

- 23% said it was for a routine check (e.g. checking tax disc);
- 11% said it was for speeding.

For those stopped on foot or on a bicycle in the last year, the main reasons given included:69

- 22% said the police were just making general enquiries or asking for information;
- 15% said the police were asking whether the respondent had witnessed something;
- 12% said the police told them they were acting suspiciously.

Over three quarters (77%) of those given a reason for being stopped said they thought it was the real reason while 19% thought they were stopped for a different reason. Of those who said they did believe the reason given by the police or who did not know whether they did or not, 83% said this was a good enough reason for stopping them.

7.6.3 Being searched by the police

Almost one in ten (nine per cent) of those stopped in a car in the last year said the police actually searched them or someone else in the vehicle or the vehicle itself. 23% of those stopped on foot or on a bicycle said the police actually searched them or someone with them or looked into any bags or cases.

7.6.4 Opinions about the police conduct

Those who had been stopped and asked questions in the last year by the police were asked various questions about the police conduct including: overall satisfaction; the interest the police showed in what the respondent said; how politely they dealt with the respondent; and how fairly they treated them.

68 Other reasons were given by 10% or fewer respondents and are not reported here.

69 Other reasons were given by 11% or fewer respondents and are not reported here. The low unweighted base size for respondents being stopped when on foot or on a bicycle (90) means the estimates might vary from the ‘real’ percentages by a relatively large amount and should be used with caution.
• 72% were satisfied overall with the way the police handled the matter and 28% were dissatisfied;

• 63% said the police showed as much interest as they thought they should in what the respondent had to say and 35% said they showed less interest than they thought they should;

• 84% said the police were polite in dealing with them and 16% said they were impolite;

• 78% said the police treated them fairly and 21% said they treated them unfairly.

When asked whether the incident changed their view of the police or not, 76% said the incident had not changed their view of the police at all, nine per cent said they viewed them more favourably and 15% said they viewed them less favourably as a result.
8 Scottish Justice Systems and Organisations

8.1 Summary

The Scottish criminal justice system

Most adults said they did not know very much (64%) and another 18% did not know anything at all about the criminal justice system.

Respondents, regardless of the level of contact they have had with the criminal justice system, were asked how confident they were that the system delivered in six key areas:

• 71% of adults were either very or fairly confident that the system makes sure everyone has access to the criminal justice system if they need it;

• 55% were very or fairly confident that the system doesn’t treat you differently depending on where you live in Scotland;

• 53% were very or fairly confident that the system is effective in bringing people who commit crimes to justice;

• 45% were very or fairly confident that the system provides a good standard of service for witnesses;

• 41% were very or fairly confident that the system provides a good standard of service for victims of crime;

• 38% were very or fairly confident that the system deals with cases promptly and efficiently.

The percentage of adults saying they had confidence in the different aspects of the delivery of the criminal justice system increased by up to three percentage points for five out of six aspects between 2008/09 and 2009/10. The exception was in the percentage of adults who were very or fairly confident in the system’s ability to bring people who commit crimes to justice, which was unchanged (53% in each year).

Community sentencing

The extent to which respondents agreed or disagreed with a series of attitudinal statements about the use of community sentences for offenders was investigated:

• 85% agreed (strongly or slightly) that community sentencing is a good idea for minor crimes;

• 66% agreed that drug users need treatment not prison;

• 64% agreed that community sentences do not punish criminals enough;
• 64% agreed that community sentences are a soft option;
• 50% agreed that learning new skills during community sentences stops criminals from committing more crimes;
• 49% agreed that electronic tagging of criminals is a good alternative to prison.

There was little change since 2008/09 in these attitudes. The main exception was in the percentage of adults agreeing that electronic tagging of criminals is a good alternative to prison, which increased by three percentage points since 2008/09 (46% in 2008/09; 49% in 2009/10).

Civil law

Respondents were asked about their experiences of problems in different realms of their life in the three years prior to interview. 28% of adults had experienced at least one civil law problem in the last three years. Specifically:

• 16% of adults had experienced problems with home, family or living arrangements;
• 12% had experienced problems with money, finance or things they had paid for;
• Six per cent had been treated unfairly in some respect;
• Five per cent had experienced health or well-being problems.

The most common civil law problem was with neighbours, which 11% had experienced, followed by problems with faulty goods or services (six per cent).

8.2 Introduction

The focus of this chapter is on the justice system in Scotland, both criminal and civil.

It starts by exploring knowledge of and attitudes towards the criminal justice system in Scotland. The previous chapter discussed confidence in the criminal justice system in the specific context of the police. The theme is continued in this chapter, widening it out to the criminal justice system as a whole.

The chapter then focuses on a specific aspect of the criminal justice system, attitudes to community sentencing. Expanding to the wider justice system, it ends by investigating experiences of civil law problems.
8.3 The Scottish criminal justice system
The survey asked about the following elements of the criminal justice system:

- The police;
- The Crown Office;
- Procurator Fiscal;\(^{70}\)
- The Scottish Court Service;
- The judiciary;
- The Scottish Prison Service;
- Criminal justice social work.

The survey collected information on knowledge of the criminal justice system and contact with the different organisations involved. Respondents were also asked how confident they were in the criminal justice system as a whole.

8.3.1 Perceived knowledge of the criminal justice system
Respondents were asked how much they knew about the work of the Scottish criminal justice system in general. The Scottish criminal justice system was described to them as:

*The shared name for all the organisations in Scotland that deal with finding offenders and arresting them, then taking them through the court system and deciding what sentence they are given if they are found guilty.*

Overall, most adults said they did not know a lot about the criminal justice system:

- Just two per cent said they knew a lot;
- 16% said they knew a fair amount;
- 64% said they did not know very much;
- 18% said they knew nothing at all.

---

\(^{70}\) The Crown Office and Procurator Fiscal service (COPFS) is a single organisation in the Scottish criminal justice system but respondents were asked about the Crown Office and the Procurator Fiscal separately in questions on awareness and contact with criminal justice organisations. This should be borne in mind when interpreting the results provided in this chapter.
8.3.2 Awareness of organisations

Respondents were asked which organisations in the criminal justice system they had heard of. At least nine out of ten adults had heard of the following organisations: the police (99%), the Scottish Prison Service (93%), the Procurator Fiscal (91%) and the Judiciary (90%). Just under half (47%) had heard of criminal justice social work (Figure 8.1).

Figure 8.1: Proportion of adults who had heard of criminal justice system organisations

SCJS 2009/10.
BASE: Adults (16,036).
Variable name: QDHEAR.

Victimisation had little impact on awareness of criminal justice service organisations. Similar proportions of victims and non-victims had heard of all of the organisations except for criminal justice social work; a higher proportion of victims were aware of this organisation than non-victims (51% and 46% respectively).
8.3.3 Contact with organisations (ever)
Respondents were asked if they had ever been in contact with any of the organisations that they reported having heard of (including for professional reasons).

Figure 8.2 shows that:

- The criminal justice service organisation most adults had had contact with was the police (69%);
- Around one in five had been in contact with the Procurator Fiscal (22%) or Scottish Court Service (23%);
- A slightly lower proportion had been in contact with the judiciary (18%);
- Fewer reported having contact with the Scottish Prison Service (nine per cent), the Crown Office (eight per cent) or criminal justice social work (seven per cent);
- A quarter (25%) of adults had never had contact with any organisation in the criminal justice system.

**Figure 8.2: Proportion of adults who have ever had contact with criminal justice organisations**
SCJS 2009/10.
Base: Adults who have heard of at least one criminal justice organisation (15,994).
Variable name: QDCONT.
Figure 8.3 shows the different likelihood of contact with each of the criminal justice organisations between victims and non-victims. Those who had been victims of crime were more likely than non-victims to have had contact with each of the organisations. Over one in ten (11%) victims and almost three in ten (28%) non-victims had never had contact with any of the organisations.

Figure 8.3: Proportion of adults who have ever had contact with criminal justice organisations by victim status
SCJS 2009/10.
Base: Adults who have heard of at least one criminal justice organisation (non-victims 13,433; victims 2,561).
Variable name: QDCONT.

8.3.4 Prompted awareness of the role of the Procurator Fiscal

In section 8.3.2 it was reported that, when prompted, 91% of adults had heard of the Procurator Fiscal. Knowledge of the service was then probed more fully.

Respondents were asked to indicate what they thought the role of the Procurator Fiscal was, choosing from a list of three possible answers: the

---

71 The Crown Office and Procurator Fiscal service (COPFS) is a single organisation in the Scottish criminal justice system but respondents were asked about the Crown Office and the Procurator Fiscal separately. The role of COPFS is the investigation and prosecution of crime; the investigation of sudden or suspicious deaths and complaints against the police. When asked about knowledge of roles, respondents were only asked about the Procurator Fiscal and only the first of these roles was included in the description presented. This should be borne in mind when interpreting the results in this section, though the effects cannot be assessed using the data collected.
investigation and prosecution of crime; deciding on sentences for those found guilty of a crime; or representing victims of crime in court. The first of these descriptions is the actual role of the Procurator Fiscal.

• Overall, 59% correctly identified that the role of the Procurator Fiscal was the investigation and prosecution of crime;

• 17% thought that the Procurator Fiscal decided on sentences for those found guilty of crime;

• Nine per cent thought that the Procurator Fiscal represented the victims of crime in court;

• 14% of adults answered ‘don’t know’ to this question.

8.3.5 Extent of knowledge about the Procurator Fiscal’s work
Regardless of whether they correctly identified the role, respondents were then told that the role of the Procurator Fiscal was the investigation and prosecution of crime. They were then asked how much they knew about the work of the organisation.

Most adults did not know a lot about the Procurator Fiscal’s work (81% said they did not know very much or did not know anything at all):

• Just two per cent said they knew a lot about the Procurator Fiscal;

• 16% said they knew a fair amount;

• 59% said they did not know very much;

• 23% said they did not know anything at all.

The proportion who said they knew nothing at all (23%) about the Procurator Fiscal’s work was higher than the proportion who said they knew nothing about the criminal justice system as a whole (18%) (section 8.3.1).

8.3.6 Experience of the Procurator Fiscal
21% of adults had both heard of the Procurator Fiscal and been in contact with them ever. Those respondents were asked about the nature of that contact.

The most common reasons adults had been in contact with the Procurator Fiscal were:

• In some professional capacity (32%);

• As a witness, other than the victim (29%);

• As the accused / defendant (24%);

• As a victim (11%).
Other reasons included:

- As a relative of a victim (eight per cent);
- On jury service / as a juror (four per cent);
- As a relative of the accused / defendant (five per cent);
- Due to the death of a family member / friend (two per cent).

8.3.7 Satisfaction with the Procurator Fiscal

Those who had contact with the Procurator Fiscal were asked if they were satisfied with that contact:

- 32% of adults who had been in contact with the Procurator Fiscal were very satisfied with their contact;
- 31% were quite satisfied;
- 15% were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied;
- Nine per cent were quite dissatisfied;
- 11% were very dissatisfied.

Satisfaction overall dropped slightly between 2008/09 (66%) and 2009/10 (63%).

8.3.8 Confidence in the criminal justice system

The survey looked at confidence in the criminal justice system as a whole through various statements about the perceived performance of the system.

**Box 8.1: Trust in justice**

The trust that people have in ‘justice’ is critical to the effective operation of any criminal justice system. Trust in the idea of justice encourages victims and witnesses to report incidents to the police, to give evidence in court and to support the jury system. There is considerable support for the view that confidence in the criminal justice system has an important role in reinforcing acceptance and observance of the law. There is also a body of academic thought suggesting that people obey laws because of an underlying trust in the judicial process (for example, Roberts, & Hough, 2005; Tilly, 2005; Sunshine & Tyler, 2003; Beetham, 1991; Lind & Tyler, 1988).
Respondents, regardless of the level of contact they had with the criminal justice system, were asked how confident they were that the system delivered in six key areas shown in Figure 8.4:

- 71% of adults were either very or fairly confident that the system makes sure everyone has access to the criminal justice system if they need it;
- 55% were very or fairly confident that the system doesn’t treat you differently depending on where you live in Scotland;
- 53% were very or fairly confident that the system is effective in bringing people who commit crimes to justice;
- 45% were very or fairly confident that the system provides a good standard of service for witnesses;
- 41% were very or fairly confident that the system provides a good standard of service for victims of crime;
- 38% were very or fairly confident that the system deals with cases promptly and efficiently.

Victims and non-victims tended to have similar views with the exception of confidence that the system is effective in bringing people who commit crimes to justice (victims 46%; non-victims 54%).

Figure 8.4: Confidence with different aspects of delivery of the criminal justice system among all respondents and by victim status (% very or fairly confident)
SCJS 2009/10.
Base: Adults (16,036); non-victims (13,469); victims (2,567).
Variable name: QDCONF.
Differences in the results between 2008/09 and 2009/10 are shown in Figure 8.5. The percentage of adults saying they had confidence in the different aspects of delivery of the criminal justice system increased by up to three percentage points for five out of the six aspects. The exception was in the percentage of adults who were very or fairly confident in the system’s ability to bring people who commit crimes to justice, which was unchanged. The largest increases were:

- 41% of adults were confident that the system provides a good standard of service for victims of crime in 2009/10 compared with 38% in 2008/09;
- 38% of adults were confident that the system deals with cases promptly and efficiently in 2009/10 compared with 35% in 2008/09.

Figure 8.5: Confidence with different aspects of delivery of the criminal justice system – comparison over time (% very or fairly confident)
Base: Adults 2008/09 (16,003); 2009/10 (16,036).
Variable name: QDCONF.
8.4 **Community sentencing**
The survey collected data on awareness, perceptions and attitudes towards community sentences. The main areas explored in the survey were:

- Awareness of different types of community sentences;
- Perceptions of the effectiveness of community sentences in reducing the likelihood of offending or re-offending;
- Perceptions of the appropriateness of community sentences as an alternative to prison.

8.4.1 **Knowledge of community sentencing**
Respondents were asked, without prompting, if they could think of any ways that are currently used to deal with adults who are found guilty of a crime, other than fines or a prison sentence. They were then asked to choose which sentence they had heard of from a list (excluding fines or a prison sentence). Figure 8.6 shows the percentage of adults who were aware of different sentences (unprompted and all mentions). Without prompting:

- Four out of five adults mentioned community service (80%);
- 29% mentioned electronic tagging;
- Almost a quarter mentioned probation (24%);
- 16% mentioned a deferred sentence;
- 10% mentioned a compensation order.

Drug Treatment and Testing Orders (DTTO) and Supervised Attendance Orders (SAO) were least commonly mentioned without prompting (just eight per cent and six per cent respectively mentioned these).

Combining unprompted and prompted mentions, the majority of adults had heard of:

- Community service orders (96%);
- Electronic tagging (94%);
- Probation (92%);
- Deferred sentences (78%).

DTTOs (50%), compensation orders (43%) and SAOs (35%) were the least well known community sentences.
8.4.2 Perceptions of the effectiveness of community sentences

Respondents who were aware of at least one community sentence were asked which community sentence they thought would make it less likely that an offender would commit a crime in the future (Figure 8.7). Percentages saying each community sentence would make it less likely that a person would commit a crime in the future were:

- Electronic tagging (33%);
- Community service (25%);
- DTTO (14%);
- Probation (13%);
- Compensation order (10%);
- Deferred sentence (nine per cent);
- SAO (seven per cent).
**Figure 8.7**: % of adults who think that each community sentence would make it less likely that the person would commit a crime in the future SCJS 2009/10.
Base: Adults aware of at least one community sentence (15,703).
Variable name: *QDISRED*.

### 8.4.3 Attitudes to community sentences

The extent to which respondents agreed or disagreed with a series of attitudinal statements about community sentences was also explored (Figure 8.8). A high proportion agreed with community sentencing in some circumstances or agreed with the principles behind some types of community sentencing but there was also a high proportion who agreed that community sentences were a soft option and did not punish criminals enough:

- 85% agreed (strongly or slightly) that community sentencing is a good idea for minor crimes;
- 66% agreed that drug users need treatment not prison;
- 64% agreed that community sentences do not punish criminals enough;
- 64% agreed that community sentences are a soft option;
- 50% agreed that learning new skills during community sentences stops criminals from committing more crimes;
- 49% agreed that electronic tagging of criminals is a good alternative to prison.
Figure 8.8: Attitudes to community sentences (% agree strongly or agree slightly)
SCJS 2009/10.
Base: Adults (16,036).
Variable name: QDISATT.

Attitudes had changed little on most statements between 2008/09 and 2009/10. The main exception was in the percentage agreeing that electronic tagging of criminals is a good alternative to prison where there was an increase of three percentage points between the two years (46% 2008/09; 49% 2009/10)

8.5 Civil law

The survey included questions on the experience of civil law problems by adults in Scotland and their response to these problems. Respondents were asked about civil problems which may raise a legal issue or which, if not resolved earlier, could ultimately result in legal proceedings, for example, welfare rights, debt, housing, employment, divorce or separation and consumer issues.

These types of problems are referred to as the problems of everyday life (Pleasance et al., 2004)\textsuperscript{72} and have been found in other jurisdictions to be intrinsically linked to other injustices (Kemp et al., 2007); social justice and criminal justice issues. The resolution of these problems is a key issue for the Scottish Government when making progress towards the National Outcomes

\textsuperscript{72} 'The problems to which the principles of civil law apply today are not abstract legal problems. They are not problems familiar only to lawyers, or discussed only in tribunals and civil courts. They are for the most part the problems of everyday life – the problems people face as constituents of a broad civil society (Pleasance et al., 2004).
set out in Scotland Performs. More specifically, helping to resolve people’s civil problems will help take forward the recommendation from the tackling poverty framework, Achieving our Potential to better integrate and so improve advice and support for people at risk of poverty and the recommendation from the report of the Debt Action Forum to take longer term action to better integrate services to meet people’s needs.

Respondents were asked if, over the previous three years, they had experienced any of 13 named problems or disputes. They were then asked the importance to them of solving these problems, whether they attempted to solve them, if they used help or advice in that process and if so from whom. Respondents were further asked whether or not they were satisfied with the outcome. The findings from this section of the survey therefore provide an indication of the prevalence as a whole and of individual civil law problems across Scotland, the types of help and advice that people experiencing these problems use and the extent of unsolved civil law problems.

### 8.5.1 Experience of civil law problems
Respondents were asked about their experiences of problems in different realms of their life in the three years prior to interview. The problems examined were grouped into four different areas:

- Home, family or living arrangements;
- Money, finance or anything paid for;
- Unfair treatment;
- Health and well-being.

Almost three in ten (28%) adults had experienced at least one of the civil law problems asked about in the last three years. Figure 8.9 shows the prevalence of different types of problems:

- 16% of adults had experienced problems with home, family or living arrangements;
- 12% had experienced problems with money, finance or things they had paid for;
- Six per cent had been treated unfairly in some respect;
- Five per cent had experienced health or well-being problems.

---


Figure 8.9: Experience of any civil law problems
SCJS 2009/10.
Base: Adults answering module C (3,984).
Variable name: CVJUS1-4.

Figure 8.10 shows the individual problems adults had experienced:

- The most common single problem was with neighbours, which 11% had experienced;
- Six percent of adults had experienced problems with faulty goods or services;
- Five percent of adults had experienced money or debt problems.

The prevalence as a whole, and of individual civil law problems in Scotland, was found to be similar to the 2008/09 results.
Figure 8.10: Types of civil law problem experienced
SCJS 2009/10.
Base: Adults answering module C (3,984).
Variable name: CVJUS1-4.

8.5.2 The importance of resolving civil law problems
Those who had experienced a civil law problem were asked how important it was that the problem was solved. Figure 8.11 shows the proportion of those experiencing each problem who said it was very important or quite important to have the problem resolved.76

- Problems which nearly all respondents said were either very or quite important to resolve were mental health problems (100%), relationship problems (97%), benefit problems (98%), housing or homelessness (99%), employment problems (96%) and money or debt problems (97%);

- The majority of those experiencing problems with faulty goods or services and problems with neighbours said that the problem was very important to resolve (65% and 58% respectively) and around an additional three in ten said the problem was quite important to resolve (29% and 28% respectively).

The most commonly experienced of the civil law problems (problems with neighbours, 11%, and problems with faulty goods or services, six per cent) were the ones which the lowest proportions of adults said it was very important to resolve (65% and 58% respectively).

76 Figure 8.11 is ordered on the percentage saying it was very important that the civil law problem they experienced was resolved.
Figure 8.11: The importance of resolving civil law problems (% saying very important or quite important)
SCJS 2009/10.
Base: Adults answering module C having experienced a problem (bases ranging from 102 for mental health difficulties to 413 for problems with neighbours). Variable name: CVJUSIMP.

Those who had experienced a problem were asked what the current situation was with their problem (the question was asked only in relation to the problem they perceived as most important if they had more than one).

- 49% had solved the problem;
- 37% were still trying to solve the problem;
- Seven per cent had tried to solve the problem but had given up;
- Six per cent were not planning to do anything to solve the problem.

When the problem had been solved, most were satisfied with the results; 50% said they were very satisfied and 32% said they were fairly satisfied. Five per cent were quite dissatisfied and four per cent very dissatisfied with the outcome. As satisfaction was only asked of those who had solved the problem, it is not possible to assess the level of satisfaction or dissatisfaction of the other groups shown above with the outcome.

---

77 Civil law problems experienced in the last three years by fewer than 100 respondents are not reported here. These include problems with an injury due to an accident (80); medical negligence (64); discrimination (61); unfair treatment by the police (60); immigration (12).
Where adults had solved the problem or tried to, 61% had done so with help or advice from others while 39% said they had done so without any help or advice. As Figure 8.12 shows, those who had solved the problem (or tried to) with help or advice from others had received it from a range of sources the most prominent of which were:

- Friends or family (34%);
- Local authority (23%);
- A solicitor (20%);
- Citizen’s Advice Bureau (18%).

Figure 8.12: Main sources providing help or advice to solve / try to solve only / most important problem

SCJS 2009/10.

Base: Adults answering module C who have solved / tried to solve only / most important problem with help from others (597).

Variable name: CVJUSORG.

---

78 11% in total had received help from a range of other sources which are not shown here.
Those who had solved the problem (or tried to) without help or advice from others were asked why this was. Around half (49%) said that they did not need any help or advice. Other reasons given by adults for not using help or advice to solve or try to solve the problem included:

- It was not worth the bother / hassle (14%);
- They did not know where to go or who to ask for help or advice (11%);
  - Seven per cent of males said they did not know where to go for help or advice compared with 15% of females;
- The problem was over and done with quickly (10%).
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Annex 1  Data Tables

The following data tables provide data for some of the key measures of the survey, including trend data for past crime surveys in Scotland. Notes on how to read and interpret these tables follow.

Tables displaying different groupings of crime (A1.1 to A1.5 and A1.7) have the following structure where each crime group represents a subset of the crime group above (see Annex 3 for more information on the groupings of crime displayed in this report):

**ALL SCJS CRIME** includes all crimes measured by the survey except threats and sexual offences (Annex 3).

- **PROPERTY CRIME** comprises the following exclusive groups:
  - Vandalism
  - All motor vehicle theft related incidents
  - Housebreaking
  - Other household thefts (including bicycle theft)
  - Personal theft (excluding robbery)

- **VIOLENT CRIME** comprises the following exclusive groups:
  - Assault
  - Robbery

Further subgroups are also shown – for example vandalism is further broken down into motor vehicle vandalism and property vandalism.

For analysts using the SPSS data files (available from the UK Data Archive), variable names which correspond to the crime groups displayed in the data tables are provided in Annex 3.

---

79 In 2003 the definition of housebreaking was changed to mirror more accurately the Scottish police recorded crime definition of domestic housebreaking by including housebreakings to non-dwellings (such as sheds, garages and outhouses) which are directly connected to the dwelling. As a result, the definition of housebreaking used in this report is the same as the definition used in the 2003, 2006 and 2008/09 reports but differs from the definition used in previous reports.
COMPARABLE CRIME is a subset of all SCJS crime that can be compared with police recorded crime statistics. This comparable subset comprises vandalism, acquisitive crime and violent crime. 67% of crime was classed as comparable with police recorded crime statistics (Section 2.5). Further details about police recorded crime statistics are included in Annex 5.

VEHICLE CRIME (OWNERS) is based on all those who have said that they or someone in their household has owned or had regular use of a motor vehicle (motorcycle, scooter, moped, car, van or other motor vehicle) or a bicycle respectively in the 12 months prior to the month of interview (variables MOTORCYC, CAR and OWNBIK2).

Notes:

1. For tables A1.1 and A1.3 upper and lower estimates are based on 95% confidence intervals.

2. For tables A1.3 and A1.4 (crime rates) for the following crime groups, rates are quoted per 10,000 adults: all SCJS crime, property crime, personal theft (excluding robbery), theft from the person, other personal theft, violent crime, assault, serious assault, and robbery. For all other crime groups rates are quoted per 10,000 households.

3. n/a denotes where data is unavailable.

4. The dates in the header columns for surveys up to 2005/06 for tables A1.2, A1.4, A1.5 and A1.7 represent the coverage of the reference period for each of the surveys and not the survey fieldwork period (for example, the 2006 Scottish Crime and Victimization Survey fieldwork period was from June to December 2006, but the reference period covered April 2005 to March 2006). The table base text represents the fieldwork year.

80 Readers will therefore note that the same data for vandalism and violent crime is displayed twice in these tables, once under the ‘all SCJS crime’ heading and again under the ‘comparable crime’ heading. Acquisitive crime includes housebreaking, theft of a motor vehicle and bicycle theft and is a separate crime group used only in this report with reference to police recorded crime (Annex 3).
### Annex 1 – Data Tables

**Table A1.1: Estimates of the extent of victimisation in Scotland, 2009/10**

SCJS 2009/10 (base: 16,036).

Variable name: incidence variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total numbers of crimes</th>
<th>Best estimate</th>
<th>Lower estimate</th>
<th>Upper estimate</th>
<th>Confidence interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALL SCJS CRIME</strong></td>
<td>945,419</td>
<td>879,307</td>
<td>1,011,531</td>
<td>66,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROPERTY CRIME</strong></td>
<td>679,301</td>
<td>633,883</td>
<td>724,719</td>
<td>45,418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>303,010</td>
<td>277,430</td>
<td>328,589</td>
<td>25,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor vehicle vandalism</td>
<td>160,615</td>
<td>145,933</td>
<td>175,298</td>
<td>14,683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property vandalism</td>
<td>142,394</td>
<td>124,541</td>
<td>160,247</td>
<td>17,853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All motor vehicle theft related incidents</strong></td>
<td>64,231</td>
<td>55,145</td>
<td>73,318</td>
<td>9,087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft of a motor vehicle</td>
<td>5,967</td>
<td>3,527</td>
<td>8,408</td>
<td>2,441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft from a motor vehicle</td>
<td>48,622</td>
<td>41,381</td>
<td>55,864</td>
<td>7,242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempted theft of / from motor vehicle</td>
<td>9,642</td>
<td>5,812</td>
<td>13,472</td>
<td>3,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housebreaking</td>
<td>28,853</td>
<td>21,842</td>
<td>35,864</td>
<td>7,011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other household thefts inc. bicycle theft</td>
<td>153,094</td>
<td>137,890</td>
<td>168,298</td>
<td>15,204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other household theft</td>
<td>126,592</td>
<td>111,430</td>
<td>141,754</td>
<td>15,162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle theft</td>
<td>26,502</td>
<td>21,639</td>
<td>31,365</td>
<td>4,863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal theft excluding robbery</strong></td>
<td>130,113</td>
<td>110,157</td>
<td>150,068</td>
<td>19,956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft from the person</td>
<td>29,007</td>
<td>20,817</td>
<td>37,198</td>
<td>8,191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other personal theft</td>
<td>101,105</td>
<td>81,956</td>
<td>120,254</td>
<td>19,149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VIOLENT CRIME</strong></td>
<td>266,119</td>
<td>227,155</td>
<td>305,082</td>
<td>38,964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>247,244</td>
<td>212,349</td>
<td>282,139</td>
<td>34,895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious assault</td>
<td>19,809</td>
<td>13,287</td>
<td>26,332</td>
<td>6,523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>18,875</td>
<td>6,266</td>
<td>31,484</td>
<td>12,609</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMPARABLE CRIME**

| Vandalism               | 303,010       | 277,430        | 328,589        | 25,580              |
| Acquisitive crime       | 61,322        | 52,295         | 70,349         | 9,027               |
| Violent crime           | 266,119       | 227,155        | 305,082        | 38,964              |

**VEHICLE CRIME (OWNERS)**

| Theft of a motor vehicle | 5,967 | 3,521 | 8,413 | 2,446 |
| Theft from a motor vehicle | 48,622 | 41,183 | 56,061 | 7,439 |
| Attempted theft of / from a motor vehicle | 9,642 | 5,759 | 13,525 | 3,883 |
| Bicycle theft            | 22,399 | 18,029 | 26,768 | 4,370 |
Table A1.2: Estimates of the extent of victimisation in Scotland, 1992 to 2009/10 ¹
Base: SCS 1993 (5,030); 1996 (5,045); 2000 (5,059); 2003 (5,041); SCVS 2004 (3,034); 2006 (4,988); SCJS 08/09 (16,003); 09/10 (16,036).
Variable name: incidence variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALL SCJS CRIME</td>
<td>1,055,466</td>
<td>967,852</td>
<td>839,538</td>
<td>1,093,725</td>
<td>940,380</td>
<td>1,004,327</td>
<td>1,044,809</td>
<td>945,419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROPERTY CRIME</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>211,635</td>
<td>234,308</td>
<td>215,048</td>
<td>363,135</td>
<td>301,257</td>
<td>268,662</td>
<td>350,376</td>
<td>303,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor vehicle vandalism</td>
<td>118,994</td>
<td>118,588</td>
<td>119,335</td>
<td>181,062</td>
<td>176,683</td>
<td>167,246</td>
<td>182,860</td>
<td>160,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property vandalism</td>
<td>92,641</td>
<td>115,720</td>
<td>95,713</td>
<td>182,070</td>
<td>124,574</td>
<td>101,417</td>
<td>167,516</td>
<td>142,394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All m. vehicle theft related incidents</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>69,709</td>
<td>64,231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft of a motor vehicle</td>
<td>36,382</td>
<td>22,693</td>
<td>17,865</td>
<td>19,921</td>
<td>13,794</td>
<td>10,382</td>
<td>7,424</td>
<td>5,967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft from a motor vehicle</td>
<td>150,489</td>
<td>135,918</td>
<td>70,511</td>
<td>89,398</td>
<td>70,881</td>
<td>69,541</td>
<td>53,645</td>
<td>48,622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempted theft of / from motor vehicle</td>
<td>55,481</td>
<td>60,436</td>
<td>20,252</td>
<td>27,548</td>
<td>16,014</td>
<td>13,452</td>
<td>8,641</td>
<td>9,642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housebreaking</td>
<td>164,536</td>
<td>100,800</td>
<td>105,820</td>
<td>87,133</td>
<td>63,806</td>
<td>45,086</td>
<td>25,485</td>
<td>28,853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other h’hold thefts inc. bicycle theft</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>172,856</td>
<td>153,094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other household theft</td>
<td>111,451</td>
<td>100,881</td>
<td>60,253</td>
<td>109,426</td>
<td>97,160</td>
<td>151,331</td>
<td>126,592</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle theft</td>
<td>25,961</td>
<td>60,436</td>
<td>17,836</td>
<td>28,909</td>
<td>21,590</td>
<td>14,889</td>
<td>8,641</td>
<td>9,642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal theft excluding robbery</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>109,793</td>
<td>130,113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft from the person</td>
<td>20,433</td>
<td>16,733</td>
<td>19,516</td>
<td>13,026</td>
<td>5,142</td>
<td>26,108</td>
<td>19,895</td>
<td>29,007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other personal theft</td>
<td>111,265</td>
<td>111,196</td>
<td>93,699</td>
<td>104,559</td>
<td>123,785</td>
<td>125,328</td>
<td>89,898</td>
<td>101,105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIOLENT CRIME</td>
<td>167,792</td>
<td>159,924</td>
<td>210,742</td>
<td>239,891</td>
<td>228,394</td>
<td>272,847</td>
<td>316,590</td>
<td>266,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>155,004</td>
<td>141,616</td>
<td>188,360</td>
<td>220,487</td>
<td>215,533</td>
<td>253,287</td>
<td>296,893</td>
<td>247,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious assault</td>
<td>75,956</td>
<td>38,973</td>
<td>33,127</td>
<td>46,010</td>
<td>21,671</td>
<td>14,889</td>
<td>25,709</td>
<td>19,807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>12,788</td>
<td>17,308</td>
<td>22,382</td>
<td>19,404</td>
<td>12,861</td>
<td>19,560</td>
<td>19,697</td>
<td>18,875</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMPARABLE CRIME**

| Vandalism               | 211,635 | 234,308 | 215,048 | 363,135 | 301,257  | 268,662  | 350,376  | 303,010 |
| Acquisitive crime       | 226,919 | 148,657 | 141,522 | 135,963 | 97,748   | 77,058   | 63,657   | 61,322  |
| Violent crime           | 167,792 | 159,924 | 210,742 | 239,891 | 228,394  | 272,847 | 316,590  | 266,119 |

**VEHICLE CRIME (OWNERS)**

| Theft of a motor vehicle | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | 7,424    | 5,967   |
| Theft from a motor vehicle | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | 53,279   | 48,622  |
| Attempted theft of / from a motor vehicle | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | 8,478    | 9,642   |
| Bicycle theft            | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | 25,546   | 22,399  |

¹. The dates in the header columns in this table up to 2005/06 represent the coverage of the reference period for each of the surveys and not the survey fieldwork period.
Table A1.3: Rates of victimisation in Scotland, per 10,000 households / individuals, 2009/10  
SCJS 2009/10 (base: 16,036).  
Variable name: incidence variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime rates per 10,000 households / individuals</th>
<th>Best estimate</th>
<th>Lower estimate</th>
<th>Upper estimate</th>
<th>Confidence interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALL SCJS CRIME</strong></td>
<td>3,268</td>
<td>3,045</td>
<td>3,491</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROPERTY CRIME</strong></td>
<td>2,646</td>
<td>2,493</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor vehicle vandalism</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All motor vehicle theft related incidents</strong></td>
<td>274</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft of a motor vehicle</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft from a motor vehicle</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempted theft of / from motor vehicle</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housebreaking</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other household thefts inc. bicycle theft</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other household theft</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle theft</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal theft excluding robbery</strong></td>
<td>304</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft from the person</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other personal theft</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VIOLENT CRIME</strong></td>
<td>622</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious assault</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMPARABLE CRIME</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>1,292</td>
<td>1,183</td>
<td>1,402</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisitive crime</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent crime</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VEHICLE CRIME (OWNERS)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft of a motor vehicle</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft from a motor vehicle</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempted theft of / from a motor vehicle</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle theft</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A1.4: Rates of victimisation in Scotland, per 10,000 households / individuals, 1992 to 2009/10 ¹

Base: SCS 1993 (5,030); 1996 (5,059); 2000 (5,041); 2003 (5,041); SCVS 2004 (3,034); 2006 (4,988); SCJS 08/09 (16,003); 09/10 (16,036).
Variable name: incidence variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALL SCJS CRIME</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>3,655</td>
<td>3,268</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPERTY CRIME</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2,911</td>
<td>2,646</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>1,038</td>
<td>1,105</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>1,656</td>
<td>1,374</td>
<td>1,175</td>
<td>1,503</td>
<td>1,292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor vehicle vandalism</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>731</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property vandalism</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>831</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All motor vehicle theft related incidents</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>274</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft of a motor vehicle</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft from a motor vehicle</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempted theft of / from motor vehicle</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housebreaking</td>
<td>807</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other household thefts inc. bicycle theft</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>653</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other household theft</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle theft</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal theft excluding robbery</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>304</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft from the person</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other personal theft</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIOLENT CRIME</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious assault</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| COMPARABLE CRIME                               |      |      |      |      |         |         |         |         |
| Vandalism                                      | 1,038| 1,105| 984 | 1,656| 1,374   | 1,175   | 1,503   | 1,292   |
| Acquisitive crime                              | 1,113| 701  | 648 | 620  | 446     | 337     | 273     | 262     |
| Violent crime                                  | 411 | 388 | 513 | 599 | 570     | 651     | 744     | 622     |

| VEHICLE CRIME (OWNERS)                         |      |      |      |      |         |         |         |         |
| Theft of a motor vehicle                       | 280 | 177 | 125 | 136 | 94      | 63      | 47      | 37      |
| Theft from a motor vehicle                     | 1,168| 1,037| 527 | 609  | 481     | 425     | 337     | 302     |
| Attempted theft of / from a motor vehicle      | 430 | 444 | 198 | 188  | 109     | 82      | 54      | 60      |
| Bicycle theft                                  | 343 | 326 | 208 | 369  | 257     | 225     | 294     | 248     |

¹. The dates in the header columns in this table up to 2005/06 represent the coverage of the reference period for each of the surveys and not the survey fieldwork period.
Table A1.5: Prevalence of victimisation, 1992 to 2009/10

Base: SCS 1993 (5,030); 1996 (5,045); 2000 (5,059); 2003 (5,041); SCVS 2004 (3,034); 2006 (4,988); SCJS 08/09 (16,003); 09/10 (16,036).
Variable name: prevalence variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALL SCJS CRIME</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPERTY CRIME</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor vehicle vandalism</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property vandalism</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All motor vehicle theft related incidents</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft of a motor vehicle</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft from a motor vehicle</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempted theft of / from motor vehicle</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housebreaking</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other household thefts inc. bicycle theft</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other household theft</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle theft</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal theft excluding robbery</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft from the person</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other personal theft</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIOLENT CRIME</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VEHICLE CRIME (OWNERS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theft of a motor vehicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft from a motor vehicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempted theft of / from a motor vehicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle theft</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The dates in the header columns in this table up to 2005/06 represent the coverage of the reference period for each of the surveys and not the survey fieldwork period.
Table A1.6: Prevalence of crime by demographic variables, 2009/10
SCJS 2009/10 (base: 16,036).
Variable name: prevalence variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentages</th>
<th>All SCJS crime</th>
<th>Property crime</th>
<th>Violent crime</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MALE (TOTAL)</strong></td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-24</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-59</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 or over</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **FEMALE (TOTAL)**| 18.2           | 17.0           | 2.3           |
| 16-24             | 23.8           | 21.8           | 5.0           |
| 25-44             | 24.8           | 22.8           | 3.6           |
| 45-59             | 18.4           | 17.6           | 1.2           |
| 60 or over        | 8.6            | 8.3            | 0.4           |

| **DEPRIVATION**   |                |                |               |
| 15% most deprived | 25.2           | 21.7           | 6.2           |
| Rest of Scotland  | 18.3           | 16.2           | 3.1           |

| **ALL**           | 19.3           | 17.0           | 3.6           |
**Table A1.7: % of crime reported to the police,\(^1\) 1992 to 2009/10\(^2\)**

Base: SCS 1993 (5,030); 1996 (5,045); 2000 (5,059); 2003 (5,041); SCVS 2004 (3,034); 2006 (4,988); SCJS 08/09 (16,003); 09/10 (16,036).

Variable name: prevalence variables and QPOL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALL SCJS CRIME</strong></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property crime</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor vehicle vandalism</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property vandalism</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All motor vehicle theft related incidents</strong></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft of a motor vehicle</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft from a motor vehicle</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempted theft of / from motor vehicle</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housebreaking</strong></td>
<td>77</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other household thefts inc. bicycle theft</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other household theft</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle theft</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal theft excluding robbery</strong></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft from the person</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other personal theft</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VIOLENT CRIME</strong></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMPARABLE CRIME</strong></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisitive crime</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent crime</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Crime reported to the police covers all crime the police came to know about, including incidents reported by the respondent or someone else, and incidents where the police were there at the time of the incident or found out in some other way.

2. The dates in the header columns in this table up to 2005/06 represent the coverage of the reference period for each of the surveys and not the survey fieldwork period.
Table A1.8: Perceptions of how crime rates have changed in respondents’ local area over the past two years, 2009/10
SCJS 2009/10. Base: adults who had lived in local area for 2 years or more (14,381).
Variable name: QS2AREA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentages</th>
<th>There is ‘about the same’ or ‘a little / lot less’ crime than two years ago</th>
<th>There is ‘a lot / little more’ crime than two years ago</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MALE (TOTAL)</strong></td>
<td>73.9</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-24</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>73.4</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-59</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 or over</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEMALE (TOTAL)</strong></td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-24</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-59</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 or over</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VICTIM OF CRIME</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>73.4</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEPRIVATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15% most deprived</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of Scotland</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALL</strong></td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Question wording: “How much would you say the crime rate in your local area has changed since two years ago? Would you say there is more, less or about the same? Options: ‘A lot more crime’, ‘A little more’, ‘About the same’, ‘A little less’, ‘A lot less’.
### Table A1.9: % of respondents either ‘very’ or ‘fairly worried’ about particular crimes, 1993 to 2009/10

Base: SCS 1993 (5,030); 1996 (5,045); 2000 (5,059); 2003 (5,041); SCVS 2004 (3,034); 2006 (4,988); SCJS 08/09 (16,003); 09/10 (16,036).

Variable name: QWORR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Your car / other vehicle will be damaged by vandals ²</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your home will be broken into</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You will be mugged / robbed</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You will be physically assaulted / attacked in the street / other public place</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Things will be stolen from your car / other vehicle ²</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your home will be damaged by vandals</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your car / other vehicle will be stolen ²</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You will be sexually assaulted ³</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You will be involved / caught up in violence between groups of individuals / gangs</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You will have your identity stolen</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone will use your credit / bank details to obtain money, goods or services</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Question wording: “I am now going to read out a list of crimes and ask how worried you are about each one. Could you tell me how worried you are that …” Answer options: ‘Very worried’, ‘Fairly worried’, ‘Not very worried’, ‘Not at all worried’.

2. In 2008/09 and 2009/10 ‘Your car / other vehicle will be damaged by vandals’, ‘Your car / other vehicle will be stolen’ and ‘Things will be stolen from your car / other vehicle’ are shown for respondents with (access to) a car or other vehicle, based on respondents whose households had access to a motor vehicle at time of interview (variable names NUMMOT and NUMCAR) rather than at any time in the 12 months prior to the month of interview (variable names MOTORCYC and CAR) which ‘vehicle owners’ in other Annex 1 tables are based on.

3. Results for worry about being sexually assaulted only included responses from women in previous Scottish crime surveys and these figures are not shown in this table. From SCJS 2008/09 onwards the data includes men and women.
Table A1.10: % of respondents ‘very’ or ‘fairly confident’ about aspects of the Scottish Criminal Justice System, 2009/10

SCJS 2009/10 (base: 16,036).
Variable name: QDCONF.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentages</th>
<th>Is effective in bringing people who commit crimes to justice</th>
<th>Deals with cases promptly and efficiently</th>
<th>Makes sure everyone has access to the legal system if they need it</th>
<th>Makes sure the system isn’t different depending on where you live</th>
<th>Provides a good standard of service for victims of crime</th>
<th>Provides a good standard of service for witnesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MALE (TOTAL)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-24</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-59</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 or over</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE (TOTAL)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-24</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-59</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 or over</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VICTIM OF CRIME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPRIVATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15% most deprived</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of Scotland</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCJS CONTACT: EVER 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNOWLEDGE OF SCJS 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A lot / fair amount</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very much / at all</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes for Table A1.10:

1. Question: “How confident are you that the Scottish Criminal Justice System as a whole …?” Answer options: ’Very confident’, ’Fairly confident’, ’Not very confident’, ’Not at all confident’.

2. ‘SCJS contact: ever’ is based on respondents who have (answer yes) or have not (answer no) personally ever been in contact with any of the following: Police, Crown Office (part of the prosecution service), Procurator Fiscal (PF), Scottish Court Service, the Judiciary (Judges, Magistrates, and Justices of the Peace), the Scottish Prison Service or Criminal Justice Social Work (variable name: QDCONT).

3. ‘Knowledge of SCJS’ is based on respondents’ answer to the question “How much do you know about the work of the Scottish Criminal Justice System in general” (variable name: QDKGEN) which is preceded by the following description read out by the interviewer; “I am now going to ask you some questions about the Scottish Criminal Justice System in general. This is the shared name for all the organisations in Scotland that deal with finding offenders and arresting them, then taking them through the court system and deciding what sentence they are given if they are found guilty.”
### Table A1.11: % of respondents either ‘very’ or ‘fairly confident’ in various aspects of their local police force’s ability, 2009/10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Prevent crime</th>
<th>Respond quickly to appropriate calls &amp; info from the public</th>
<th>Deal with incidents as they occur</th>
<th>Investigate incidents after they occur</th>
<th>Solve crimes</th>
<th>Catch criminals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MALE (TOTAL)</strong></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-24</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-59</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 or over</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEMALE (TOTAL)</strong></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-24</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-59</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 or over</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VICTIM OF CRIME</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEPRIVATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15% most deprived</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of Scotland</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALL</strong></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


SCJS 2009/10 (base: 16,036) 
Variable name: QPOLCONF
Table A1.12: Awareness of types of sentences (% total spontaneous and prompted awareness), 2009/10

SCJS 2009/10 (base: 16,036). Variable name: QDISKNWA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentages</th>
<th>Community service order</th>
<th>Compensation order</th>
<th>Deferred sentence</th>
<th>Electronic tagging</th>
<th>Probation</th>
<th>Drug Treatment &amp; Test Order</th>
<th>Supervised Attendance Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MALE (TOTAL)</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-24</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-59</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 or over</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE (TOTAL)</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-24</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-59</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 or over</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VICTIM OF CRIME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPRIVATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15% most deprived</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of Scotland</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRISON: EVER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Question wording: “When a judge or a sheriff finds someone guilty in Scotland they can give them one of several types of sentences – for example, they can give someone a fine or they can send them to prison. Apart from these two options, can you think of any other ways that are currently used to deal with adults who are found guilty of a crime?” Answer spontaneous. Prompted question wording: “And which of these other ways of dealing with people who have been found guilty of a crime have you heard of before now?” Answer options as above.

2. ‘Prison: ever’ is based on respondents who have (answer yes) or have not (answer no) personally been on remand or served a sentence in Scotland in a young offenders’ institution, a prison or in the community (variable name QDBEENP).
Table A1.13: Attitudes to community sentences (% ‘strongly’ or ‘slightly agree’), 2009/10

SCJS 2009/10 (base: 16,036)
Variable name: QDISATT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentages</th>
<th>Electronic tagging of criminals is a good alternative to prison</th>
<th>Drug users need treatment not prison</th>
<th>Community sentencing is a good idea for minor crimes</th>
<th>Learning new skills during community sentences stops criminals committing more crimes</th>
<th>Community sentences do not punish criminals enough</th>
<th>Community sentences are a soft option</th>
<th>Criminals who complete their community sentences have paid back their community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MALE (TOTAL)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-24</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-59</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 or over</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE (TOTAL)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-24</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-59</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 or over</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VICTIM OF CRIME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPRIVATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15% most deprived</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of Scotland</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRISON: EVER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes for Table A1.13:

1. Question wording: “The ways of dealing with people who have been found guilty of committing a crime that we have just been talking about are called community sentences. I would now like to read you some statements that other people have made about community sentencing in general. Please tell me how much you agree or disagree with each statement. How much do you agree or disagree that …” Answer options: ‘Agree strongly’, ‘Agree slightly’, ‘Neither agree or disagree’, ‘Disagree slightly’, ‘Disagree strongly’.

2. ‘Prison: ever’ is based on respondents who have (answer yes) or have not (answer no) personally been on remand or served a sentence in Scotland in a Young Offenders’ institution, a prison or in the community (variable name: QDBEENP).
Annex 2  Methodology

Full details of the design and methodology for the survey can be found in the accompanying Technical Report. This section presents a brief overview of the survey sampling, questionnaire, fieldwork and response rate.

A2.1 Sampling

The SCJS used a random probability sample method and was designed to be representative of the population of households in Scotland and adults aged 16 or over living in those households.

The sample was drawn from the small users' Postcode Address File (PAF) which was expanded using the multiple occupancy indicator (MOI). PAF is currently by far the most comprehensive and reliable sample frame available in the UK for surveys of this kind.

The sample was also designed to achieve the equivalent of a simple random sample of 1,000 interviews in each police force area (PFA) in Scotland. A disproportional sample design by PFA was necessary to meet this stipulation, as PFAs with smaller populations required samples larger than their population proportions. As analysis was also required by criminal justice authority area (CJAA), these were combined with PFAs to produce 11 mutually exclusive areas which were used to stratify the sample.

The 2009/10 survey, in contrast to the 2008/09 survey, was further stratified at the Local Authority level, which lead to a re-distribution of interviews within PFA. This had the affect of increasing the disproportional sampling between PFAs and creating disproportionate sampling within PFA.

As well as stratifying by PFA / CJAA / LA, sample selection differed between urban and rural areas as defined by the Scottish Government’s urban / rural classification.\(^{81}\) In a departure from previous Scottish crime surveys, the sample was largely unclustered – clustering only occurred in the more sparsely populated areas of rural Scotland. In rural areas, Data Zones were selected as primary sampling units with probability proportional to population size and the sample was clustered within those areas. In urban areas the sample was systematically selected within PFA with a fixed interval giving an un-clustered sample.

At each sampled address, the interviewer was required to establish that the address was eligible (ineligible addresses included vacant properties, second homes, non-residential addresses and establishments where people live in group residences, e.g. care homes or halls of residence). On very rare occasions an interviewer found the address they had been provided with consisted, in fact, of more than one address (for example a house split into two flats). In this case, a random selection of which address to interview at...

\(^{81}\) Details of the 2007-2008 Scottish Government Urban Rural Classification used in this survey can be found at http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Resource/Doc/233802/0063988.pdf.
was made using an algorithm in the Computer Assisted Personal Interviewing (CAPI) script to generate a random number.

Only one adult was interviewed in each household. As the majority of households contained more than one adult (aged 16 or more), details of all eligible adults were collected by the interviewer before the CAPI script randomly selected one adult for interview. The random selection of the adult to be interviewed was used to avoid any bias in selection, and once a selection was made, no substitutions were permitted.

Fieldwork assignments by area across Scotland were spread out across the 12 month fieldwork period, with a target to conduct equal numbers of interviews each month throughout the year. This avoided particular concentrations of interviews in a given area within a short period of time, or a concentration of interviews within a particular period of time.

Interviews were conducted across the whole of Scotland, excluding only some of the smallest inhabited islands (detailed in the Technical Report).

A2.2 Questionnaire
The SCJS basic questionnaire structure consists of three elements:

- The main questionnaire consisting of a set of core modules asked of the whole sample, including demographics; and a set of quarter-sample modules, containing questions on a variety of topics;
- A victim form questionnaire which collects details about the separate incidents a respondent may have experienced during the reference period. This victim form can be repeated up to five times. The number of victim forms completed depended on the number and nature of incidents respondents experienced;
- A self-completion questionnaire covering sensitive issues. All respondents were asked to complete a self-completion questionnaire, but had the option to refuse this due to the sensitive nature of the questions.

A detailed description of the questionnaire can be found in the Technical Report and a copy of the full questionnaire is available from the Scottish Government survey website or the UK Data Archive.82

The questionnaire consisted, in order, of the following questionnaires / sections / modules:

Main questionnaire
- General views on crime and social issues
- Victim form screener

---

Victim form (repeated up to five times, based on information collected in the victim form screener section)
  - Incident details
  - Perception of the offender and the incident
  - Support and advice received
  - Experience of criminal justice system organisations

Full sample module
  - Community sentencing
  - Local community
  - Criminal justice system

Quarter-sample modules
  Module A
    - Fear of crime
  Module B
    - Police
    - Road safety cameras
  Module C
    - Fraud (card and identity)
    - Civil law
  Module D
    - Crime scenarios
    - Procurator Fiscal

Main questionnaire continued
  - Demographics

Self-completion questionnaire
  - Illicit drug use
  - Partner abuse
  - Sexual victimisation

Respondents were given the option of refusing to complete any question they did not wish to answer.

Questionnaire development was carried out prior to fieldwork in order to ensure that questions relevant to emerging policy issues were included. A process of cognitive testing ensured that questions were tested before being added to the survey. More detail on this process can be found in the Technical Report. However, where relevant, and especially for the victim form, question wording remained consistent with previous surveys in order to aid comparability.
A2.3 Fieldwork
Fieldwork began on 1st April 2009 and finished on the 31st of March 2010, with approximately 1,333 interviews being conducted each calendar month.

Interviews were conducted face-to-face in the respondents’ homes and administered by specially trained professional interviewers using Computer Assisted Personal Interviewing (CAPI). Prior to calling at addresses interviewers posted a letter from the Scottish Government which included further information about the survey as well as answering a selection of frequently asked questions in order to prepare households for their call.

The majority of respondents to the self-completion section completed it using Computer Assisted Self-Interviewing (CASI), entering their answers directly on to the interviewer’s tablet PC themselves. This ensured greater confidentiality when answering sensitive questions or those on illicit behaviour.

A2.4 Response rate
The overall response rate (after adjusting to exclude ineligible addresses where interviews could not have been obtained) was 69.7%. Under one in ten (8.9%) issued addresses were found to be ineligible or ‘deadwood’ at which it was not possible to gain an interview. Table A2.1 provides a full breakdown for all issued addresses.
### Table A2.1: Response rate for SCJS 2009/10

SCJS 2009/10.

Base: issued sample (25,256).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome / summary</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>% issued</th>
<th>% valid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total sample issued</td>
<td>25,256</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addresses not traced / inaccessible</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not built / does not exist</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derelict / demolished</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empty / vacant</td>
<td>878</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second home / not main residence</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business / industrial</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution / communal establishment</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other deadwood</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total ineligible addresses</strong></td>
<td>2,254</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total eligible addresses</td>
<td>23,002</td>
<td>91.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No contact with anyone in household</td>
<td>1,132</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No contact with selected respondent</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No contact with responsible adult (age &lt;18)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total non contact</strong></td>
<td>1,243</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office refusal</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused all information</td>
<td>2,085</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal refusal</td>
<td>1,387</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proxy refusal</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental permission refused (age &lt;18)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total refusal</strong></td>
<td>4,254</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broken appointment</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporarily ill / incapacitated</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physically or mentally unable</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Away / in hospital</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate English</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other unsuccessful</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total other unsuccessful</strong></td>
<td>1,469</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total unproductive</td>
<td>6,966</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieved interviews</td>
<td>16,036</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>69.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 3  SCJS Crime

This annex presents an overview of how information about crime is collected in the survey, what crimes are recorded, what crimes are included in the analysis contained in this report and how these are grouped. More detailed information is available in the Technical Report.

A3.1 How the information was collected
Respondents were asked about their experiences of up to 17 broad types of crimes in the 12-month ‘reference period’ (section A3.5) in the victim form screener section of the questionnaire. For example, “In that time, did anyone get into your home without permission and cause damage”. Up to five incidents or types of incidents identified in the screener section were then followed up in detail in the victim form section of the questionnaire after establishing more accurately when the incident/s occurred and if the incidents were part of a series.

In common with other crime surveys, the SCJS only asked respondents to provide details of up to five incidents or types of incidents, even if they had experienced more. Incidents were prioritised according to the type of offence, with those offences which are less common prioritised over more common ones (and within this order, the most recent incident first). The number of victim forms was capped in this way to reduce the burden on respondents.

A3.2 Offence coding
Once the interview data was returned to the office, all victim forms were reviewed by specially trained coders in order to determine whether what was reported in the interview represented a crime or not and what offence code should be assigned to the incident. Coders used a coding manual which contained precise definitions of each offence code. A copy of this manual can be found in the Technical Report.

The purpose of the offence classification was to identify a single offence code for each victim form. Offence codes are split into three groups:

- In-scope codes (those which are used in the calculation of victimisation rates or prevalence and incidence and therefore those used in this report);
- Out-of-scope codes (codes relating to sexual offence or threats which are not included in the survey crime statistics);
- Non-valid codes (codes assigned where incidents happened outside of Scotland, outside the reference period, were duplicate incidents or where not enough information was collected to make an accurate classification of the incident/s).

Prior to the 1993 Scottish crime survey, offence coding instructions were consistent with previous British Crime Surveys (BCS). In 2003 the definition of housebreaking was changed to mirror more accurately the Scottish police
recorded crime definition of domestic housebreaking by including housebreakings to non-dwellings (such as sheds, garages and outhouses) which are directly connected to the dwelling. The definition of housebreaking used in this report is the same as the definition used in the 2003, 2006 and 2008/09 reports but differs from the definition used in previous reports.

For the 2009/10 SCJS the code ‘petty assault’ was split into ‘minor assault with injury’ and ‘minor assault with no / negligible injury’ (however, this latter change does not affect the comparability of any of the crime groups used in this report).

Further details of the offence coding process including the quality assurance procedures followed are included in the accompanying Technical Report.

A3.3 Series of crimes
Most incidents that were reported in the survey were one-off, single occurrences. However, in a minority of cases respondents were victimised in the same manner more than once. In these cases, respondents were asked whether they considered these incidents to be a ‘series’; that is where the incidents involved:

“the same thing, done under the same circumstances and probably by the same people”.

Where incidents were determined to be part of a series, the total number of incidents in the series was recorded, but only one victim form was completed. The details collected in this victim form were those of the most recent incident. This avoided a greater level of respondent burden as respondents did not have to repeatedly answer questions on very similar incidents as well as aiding respondent recall. Details of the incident were taken to represent other incidents in the series (up to a maximum of five – see section A3.3.1) when calculating crime estimates and analysing victimisation data. This practice is also followed by the BCS and other crime surveys such as the Northern Ireland Crime Survey (NICS) and the National Crime and Victimisation Survey (NCVS) in the USA.

A3.3.1 Capping series of crimes
Where there were more than five incidents in a series, only the first five were included in the estimates of crime. This restriction has been applied since the BCS began in 1982 and the equivalent Scottish crime survey began in 1993. This capping was applied to ensure that survey estimates were not affected by a very small number of respondents who reported an extremely high number of incidents. This improves the ability to compare trends in survey data over time, especially among rarer crimes where numbers of crimes can be highly variable between survey years. Capping of this kind is consistent with other surveys of crime and other similar types of survey.

Prevalence rates are not affected by this capping procedure (see Bolling et al., 2008 for information on the measurement of series data in the BCS), though it has been shown to underestimate the incidence of crime, in
particular of violent crime, in other surveys (Farrell & Pease, 2007; Planty & Strom, 2007). The Technical Report also provides further discussion of this issue.

A3.4 Valid incidents

The SCJS only collected information about incidents which happened in Scotland. For incidents happening on-line then information was collected only if the respondent was living in Scotland at the time of the incident. The BCS and the NICS collect information on crimes occurring in England and Wales and Northern Ireland respectively.

In addition, valid incidents had to have occurred in the reference period, the 12 months prior to the month of interview (section A3.5) and be assigned an in-scope offence code (section A3.2).

A3.5 Survey reference period

Respondents to the SCJS were asked about their experience of crime within a defined period of time known as the ‘reference period’. The estimates of incidence and prevalence in this report are based only on incidents which happened in the 12 calendar months prior to the month of interview. For example, in an interview conducted on the 15th of September 2009, the survey statistics would include incidents which the respondent had experienced between 1st September 2008 and the 31st August 2009. The reference period therefore covered an equal length of time (12 calendar months) for each respondent, irrespective of when they were interviewed during the 12 month fieldwork period. This example is highlighted in Figure A3.1 below.

Due to continuous interviewing across the 12 month fieldwork period, the reference period ‘rolled’ forward for each consecutive fieldwork month. Compared to the example above, respondents interviewed on 15th October 2009 were asked about incidents which occurred in the reference period 1st October 2008 to 30th September 2009. The total reference period for interviews conducted from April 2009 through to the end of March 2010 is therefore a 23 month period from April 2008 through to February 2010. This is illustrated in Figure A3.1 below.

March 2009 is the only month to be included in the reference period for all 16,036 respondents and the crimes collected centre around this month.

______________________________

83 However, despite the fact that these incidents are not included in the analysis, for the sake of simplicity during the interview, respondents were also asked about incidents which happened in the period of time between the start of the reference period and the date of interview (the wording of the victim form screener questions follow the format “Since the first of <month of start of reference period>, ...”). In the example above, details of incidents which occurred in the month of interview (i.e. the 15 days of September 2009) would also be recorded by the interviewer. These incidents do not form part of the survey estimates of crime.
In 2002, the BCS similarly moved from a fixed reference period with a sample size of 20,000 to a rolling reference period with a sample size of 40,000. The initial findings of an assessment of the impact of the change in methodology on estimates of crime concluded that ‘the new methodology is not giving rise to crime estimates any greater than those achieved under the old methodology. Indeed, for some categories the change in methodology appears to generate lower estimates (Kershaw et al., 2001).

**A3.5.1 Series incidents and the reference period**

Where respondents had experienced series incidents, if the most recent incident in the series occurred in the month of interview (that is outside of the reference period), the number of incidents in the series (capped at five) was reduced by the number of incidents occurring in the month of interview.

**A3.6 Crime measured by the survey**

**A3.6.1 Offence codes**

The offence coding manual for SCJS 2009/10 contained 64 offence codes. Of those 64, 13 were out-of-scope codes relating to sexual offences or threats, and so are not included in the analysis contained in this report (section A3.6.2 and A3.6.3). 18 of the 64 offence codes were non-valid codes (for classifying incidents, that happened outside of Scotland, outside the reference period, were duplicate incidents or where not enough information was collected to make an accurate classification of the incident/s).
A3.6.2 A note on crime types not covered
The SCJS does not aim to provide data about all types of crime and has notable exclusions.\textsuperscript{84}

The SCJS did collect information on threats and, where reported in the victim form, on sexual offences, and coders assigned offence codes to these incidents in the normal way. However, the analysis contained in this report, including the estimates of crimes, do not include these crimes for the reasons outlined below.

A3.6.3 Sexual offences
Very small numbers of sexual offences were recorded in the victim form in past Scottish crime surveys. It is accepted that victims are reluctant to disclose information on these sensitive crimes in a face-to-face interview. Any survey estimates for sexual offences produced from the victim form in past surveys were based on such small numbers that they were not sufficiently reliable to report.

Recognising the unreliability of face-to-face interviewing in collecting information about sexual victimisation, the SCJS estimates of crime did not include data on any sexual offences. Instead a separate self-completion section was developed for the SCJS. Data from the sexual victimisation section of the self-completion questionnaire is published in a separate report.\textsuperscript{85}

A3.6.4 Threats
Following established practice in previous crime surveys in Scotland, threats, although assigned an offence code, were not included in the estimates of crime due to the difficulty of establishing whether or not a crime actually occurred (Anderson and Leitch, 1996).

A3.6.5 List of offence codes
The list of the 33 SCJS offence codes (crimes) which were included in the incidence and prevalence estimates in this report is shown in table A3.1. The table also shows the crime groups used in the report into which each offence code is grouped.

\textsuperscript{84} Further details can be found in Chapter 1 of this report and in the accompanying Technical Report.

\textsuperscript{85} The reports on sexual victimisation will be published in December and will be available on the publications section of the survey website:
### Table A3.1: Offence codes included in the estimates of crime by crime group used in the report
SCJS 2009/10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Crime group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Serious assault</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Minor assault with injury</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Minor assault with no / negligible injury</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Serious assault and fire raising</td>
<td>Assault</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Serious assault and housebreaking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Attempted assault</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>Personal theft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Attempted robbery</td>
<td>(excluding robbery)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Snatch theft from the person</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Other theft from the person</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Attempted theft from the person</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Other theft</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Housebreaking in a dwelling (nothing taken)</td>
<td>Housebreaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Housebreaking in a dwelling (something taken)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Attempted housebreaking in a dwelling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Attempted housebreaking to non-connected domestic garage / outhouse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Theft in a dwelling</td>
<td>Other household theft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Theft from a meter</td>
<td>(including bicycle theft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Housebreaking: non-connected domestic garage / outhouse – nothing taken</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Housebreaking: non-connected domestic garage / outhouse – something taken</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Theft of pedal cycle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Theft from outside dwelling (excluding theft of milk bottles)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Theft of car / van</td>
<td>All motor vehicle theft related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Theft from car / van</td>
<td>incidents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Theft of motorbike, motor scooter or moped</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Theft from motorbike, motor scooter or moped</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Attempted theft of / from car / van</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Attempted theft of / from motorcycle, motor scooter or moped</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Fire raising</td>
<td>Vandalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Vandalism to a motor vehicle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Vandalism to the home</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Other vandalism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

86 Housebreaking and attempted housebreaking in a dwelling includes connected domestic garages, outhouses and sheds.
A3.6.6 Household and individual crimes

All of the 33 offence codes which are assigned in the SCJS relate either to:

- Crimes against the individual respondent (such as assault);
- Crimes experienced by the respondent’s household (such as housebreaking).

With regard to crimes against individuals (personal crimes), respondents were asked only to provide information about incidents in which they themselves were the victim. Of the crime groups used in this report, this includes:

- Personal theft (excluding robbery);
  - Violent crime, including:
    o Assault;
    o Robbery.

If other household members had experienced personal crimes then this was not recorded in the survey.

Of the groups used in this report, crimes where the household was considered to be the victim include:

- Vandalism;
- All motor vehicle crime related incidents;
- Housebreaking;
- Other household theft (including bicycle theft).

This important distinction between personal and household crimes affects how the survey statistics were calculated (section A3.7).

A3.7 Incidence, prevalence and repeat victimisation

The SCJS produces two key measures of crime: incidence (the numbers of crimes) and prevalence (the risk of being a victim of crime or the victimisation rate). It also provides data on repeat victimisation.

Incidence and prevalence statistics were estimated for Scotland using mid-2009 population estimates for the household and adult populations supplied by General Register Office for Scotland (GROS): 2,344,450 households and 4,281,650 adults.87

A3.7.1 Incidence and incidence rate

Incidence is defined as:

“The number of crimes experienced per household or adult.”

To calculate incidence, the number of crimes experienced by respondents or their household (section A3.6.6) was aggregated together for each offence code, based on up to five separate victim forms, and on the number of incidents in a ‘series’ (capped at five) recorded in those victim forms (section A3.5.1).

The incidence rate has also been calculated for key crime groups. This is calculated as the gross number of incidents divided by 10,000 to give an incidence rate per 10,000 households (for household crimes) or per 10,000 adults (for personal crimes). The incidence rate enables comparison between areas with differing populations. It is used in the report to compare results obtained from the SCJS and from the BCS 2009/10.

Incidence and incidence rates were estimated using incidence weights which include a grossing factor based on population estimates for the household and adult populations depending on whether the crime was classified as a household or individual crime.

A3.7.2 Prevalence

Prevalence is defined as:

“The proportion of the population who were victims of an offence once or more in the specified period.”

Prevalence takes account of whether a household or person was a victim of a specific crime once or more in the reference period, not the number of times they were victimised. These figures were based on information from the victim form which was used to designate respondents and/or their households as victims, or non-victims. The percentage of households or individuals in the population that were victimised provides the prevalence. This equates to the risk of being a victim of crime and is also referred to as the rate of victimisation.

Prevalence was estimated using population estimates for the household and adult populations depending on whether the crime was classified as a household or individual crime.

Where crimes are grouped together in a way that includes both household and personal crime, prevalence was calculated using the population estimates for adults. This follows the practice adopted by the BCS and includes:

- Property crime;
- Comparable crime;
- All SCJS crime (crime overall).
Since the SCJS also collects demographic information, prevalence has been calculated for different subgroups to investigate the varying risk among adults with different personal and area characteristics (Chapter 3). Estimates of prevalence among motor vehicle- and bicycle-owners have also been calculated for relevant crimes (Annex 1). Risk among those groups is higher than for the population in general, of course, as the household population includes those which do not have access to motor vehicles or bicycles.

A3.7.3 Repeat Victimisation

A household or adult is classed as a repeat victim if they are the victim of the same crime more than once in the 12 month reference period. If all victims had only been the victim of one crime in the reference period incidence and prevalence would be the same. Repeat victimisation accounts for differences between incidence and prevalence. Higher levels of repeat victimisation mean there is a relatively lower prevalence compared with incidence.

Repeat victimisation is calculated as a percentage of household or adult victims according to the crime group. Where both household and personal crimes are grouped together, repeat victimisation is calculated as a percentage of the population of adult victims.

A3.8 Crime groups

For the purpose of reporting, all SCJS crime (overall crime) has been broken down into various groups (Box 2.1 in Chapter 2). The two principal crime groups are property crime and violent crime as the level of risk associated with these groups of crimes differs, along with their characteristics, and victims’ experience and perception of them. These two principal groups can also be further broken down into seven groups shown in Figure A3.2 below. Some further sub-groups are also shown for vandalism and assault. The groups shown in Figure A3.2 and used in this report (including the Annex 1 tables) are described in more detail below.
Figure A3.2: Crime groups used in the report

- **ALL INCIDENTS**
  - **ALL CRIME**
    - Non-valid incidents
    - Sexual Offences
    - Threats
  - **ALL SCJS CRIME**
    - **PROPERTY CRIME**
      - Vandalism
        - Motor vehicle vandalism
        - Property vandalism
        - All motor vehicle theft related incidents
      - Housebreaking
      - Other household theft (including bicycle theft)
      - Personal theft (excluding robbery)
    - **VIOLENT CRIME**
      - Assault
        - Serious assault
        - Minor assault
      - Robbery
A3.8.1 Crime group descriptions
The descriptions of the crime groups used in this report follow the basic order of Figure A3.2 and the Annex 1 tables. Descriptions for comparable crime and acquisitive crime are also included (section A3.8.2).

Variable names are included in square brackets after the heading for each crime group.\textsuperscript{88}

All SCJS crime [variable surveycrime]
All SCJS crime includes all property crime and all violent crime, but excludes threats and sexual offences (section A3.6).

All SCJS crime is used throughout the report and all of the other crime groups used in the report are sub-groups of all SCJS crime. Estimates of overall incidence and prevalence of crime in Scotland are calculated using all SCJS crime. As all SCJS crime includes both household and personal crimes, prevalence and repeat victimisation are calculated based on the adult population.

Property crime [variable property]
This crime grouping includes vandalism; all motor vehicle theft related incidents; housebreaking; other household theft (including bicycle theft); and personal theft (excluding robbery).

Property crime is one of the main crime groups used in this report (together with violent crime). As property crime includes both household and personal crimes, prevalence and repeat victimisation are calculated based on the adult population.

Vandalism [variable vand]
Vandalism involves intentional and malicious damage to property (including houses and vehicles). In the Criminal Justice (Scotland) Act 1980, vandalism became a separate offence defined as wilful or reckless destruction or damage to property belonging to another. Cases which involve only nuisance without actual damage (for example, letting down car tyres) are not included. Where criminal damage occurs in combination with housebreaking, robbery or violent offences it is these latter crimes that take precedence.

Vandalism is a subgroup of property crime.

\textsuperscript{88} Variables in the SPSS data files will be prefaced by inc for incidence variables and prev for prevalence variables.
Motor vehicle vandalism [variable motovvand]

This crime group includes any intentional and malicious damage to a vehicle such as scratching a coin down the side of a car, or denting a car roof. It does not, however, include causing deliberate damage to a car by fire. These incidents are recorded as fire-raising and therefore included in vandalism to other property. The SCJS only covers vandalism against vehicles belonging to private households; that is, cars, vans, motorcycles, scooters and mopeds which are either owned or regularly used by anyone in the household. Lorries, heavy vans, tractors, trailers and towed caravans were generally excluded from the coverage of the SCJS as these are usually the property of an employer and not for personal use.

Motor vehicle vandalism is a subgroup of vandalism.

Property vandalism [variable propvand]

Vandalism to the home and other property involves intentional or malicious damage to doors, windows, fences, plants and shrubs for example. Vandalism to other property also includes arson where there is any deliberate damage to property belonging to the respondent or their household (including vehicles) caused by fire, regardless of the type of property involved.

Property vandalism is a subgroup of vandalism.

All motor vehicle theft related incidents [variable allmvtheft]

The SCJS covers three main categories of vehicle theft: 'theft of motor vehicles' referring to the theft or unauthorised taking of a vehicle, where the vehicle is driven away illegally (whether or not it is recovered); 'theft from motor vehicles' which includes the theft of vehicle parts, accessories or contents; and 'attempted thefts of or from motor vehicles', where there is clear evidence that an attempt was made to steal the vehicle or something from it (e.g. damage to locks). If parts or contents of the motor vehicle are stolen in addition to the vehicle being moved, the incident is classified as theft of a motor vehicle. Included in this category are cars, vans, motorcycles, scooters and mopeds which are either owned or regularly used by anyone in the household. Lorries, heavy vans, tractors, trailers and towed caravans were generally excluded from the coverage of the SCJS as these are usually the property of an employer and not for personal use.

All motor vehicle theft related incidents are a subgroup of property crime.

Housebreaking [variable housebreak]

In Scottish law, the term 'burglary' has no meaning although in popular usage it has come to mean breaking into a home in order to steal the contents. Scottish law refers to this as 'theft by housebreaking'.

Respondents who reported that someone had broken into their home with the intention of committing theft (whether the intention was carried out or not) were classified as victims of housebreaking. Entry must have been by forcing a door or via a non-standard entrance. Thus, entry through unlocked doors or by using false pretences, or if the offender had a key, were not housebreaking
(they would fall into ‘other household theft’). The definition of housebreaking used in this report is the same as the definition used in the 2003, 2006 and 2008/09 reports but differs from the definition used prior to that. The definition was changed in 2003 to mirror more accurately the Scottish police recorded crime definition of domestic housebreaking by including housebreakings to non-dwellings (such as sheds, garages and out-houses) which are directly connected to the dwelling.

Housebreaking is a subgroup of property crime.

**Other household theft (including bicycle theft)** [variable `otherhousetheftcycle`]

This crime group includes actual and attempted thefts from domestic garages, outhouses and sheds that are *not* directly linked to the dwelling. The term also includes thefts from gas and electricity prepayment meters and thefts from outside the dwelling (excluding thefts of milk bottles etc. from the doorstep). 'Thefts in a dwelling' are also included in this group; these are thefts committed inside a home by somebody who did not force their way into the home, and who entered through a normal entrance (examples include guests at parties, workmen with legitimate access, people who got in using false pretences, or if the respondent left a door open or unlocked). Theft of a bicycle is also included.

Other household theft (including bicycle theft) is a subgroup of property crime.

**Personal theft (excluding robbery)** [variable `perstheft`]

This group of crime includes actual and attempted ‘snatch theft’, ‘theft from the person’ where the victim’s property is stolen directly from the person of the victim but without physical force or threat of force and ‘other personal theft’ which refers to theft of personal property outside the home where there was no direct contact between the offender and the victim.

Personal theft is a subgroup of property crime.

**Violent crime** [variable `violent`]

The coverage of violent crime consists of actual and attempted minor assault, serious assault and robbery. Sexual offences are not included (section A3.6.3).

Violent crime is one of the main crime groups used in this report (together with property crime).
**Assault [variable assault]**

In the SCJS, the term assault refers to two categories:

- Serious assaults, comprising incidents of assault which led to an overnight stay in hospital as an in-patient or which resulted in specific injuries regardless of whether or not the victim stayed in hospital overnight;

- Minor assaults, which are actual or attempted assaults resulting in no or negligible injury.

Assault is a subgroup of violent crime.

**Serious assault [variable serassault]**

An assault is classified as serious if the victim sustained an injury resulting in an overnight stay in hospital as an in-patient or any of the following injuries whether or not they was detained in hospital: fractures, internal injuries, severe concussion, loss of consciousness, lacerations requiring sutures which may lead to impairment or disfigurement or any other injury which may lead to impairment or disfigurement.

Serious assault is a subgroup of assault.

**Robbery [variable rob]**

This term refers to actual or attempted theft of personal property or cash directly from the person, accompanied by force or the threat of force. Robbery should be distinguished from other thefts from the person which involve speed or stealth.

Robbery is a subgroup of violent crime.

**A3.8.2 Comparable crime group descriptions**

**Comparable crime [variable comparcrime]**

Only certain categories of crime covered by the SCJS are directly comparable with police recorded crime statistics (Annex 5). These categories are collectively referred to as comparable crime. Comparable crime can be broken down into the following three crime groups:

- Acquisitive crime: comprising housebreaking, theft of a motor vehicle and bicycle theft;

- Vandalism: including both vehicle and property vandalism;

- Violent crime: comprising assault and robbery.
Section A3.8.1 provides definitions of vandalism and violent crime. Acquisitive crime is defined below.

Comparable crime is used in Chapter 2 when comparing SCJS data to police recorded crime statistics and in the crime tables (Annex 1). For further details of the comparison between police recorded crime and SCJS crime, see Annex 5.

**Acquisitive crime** [variable *acquis*]

Acquisitive crime consists of three crime groups / offence codes: housebreaking, theft of a motor vehicle and bicycle theft. Housebreaking is defined in section A3.8.1 and theft of a motor vehicle is part of the all motor vehicle theft related incidents crime group (section A3.8.1). Bicycle theft is defined as theft of a bicycle from outside a dwelling. Almost all bicycles were stolen in this way. Bicycle thefts which take place inside the home by someone who is not trespassing at the time are counted as theft in a dwelling (a subgroup of other household theft including bicycle theft); and thefts of bicycles from inside the home by a trespasser are counted as housebreaking.
Annex 4  Confidence Intervals, Statistical Significance and Weighting

A4.1 Confidence intervals and statistical significance

SCJS estimates are based on a representative sample of the population of Scotland aged 16 or over living in private households. A sample, as used in the SCJS, is a small-scale representation of the population from which it is drawn.

Any sample survey may produce estimates that differ from the values that would have been obtained if the whole population had been interviewed. The magnitude of these differences is related to the size and variability of the estimate, and the design of the survey, including sample size.

It is however possible to calculate the range of values between which the population figures are estimated to lie; known as the confidence interval (also referred to as margin of error). At the 95 per cent confidence level, when assessing the results of a single survey it is assumed that there is a one in 20 chance that the true population value will fall outside the 95 per cent confidence interval range calculated for the survey estimate. Similarly, over many repeats of a survey under the same conditions, one would expect that the confidence interval would contain the true population value 95 times out of 100.

Because of sampling variation, changes in reported estimates between survey years or between population subgroups may occur by chance. In other words, the change may simply be due to which respondents were randomly selected for interview.

Whether this is likely to be the case can be assessed using standard statistical tests. These tests indicate whether differences are likely to be due to chance or represent a real difference. In general, only differences that are statistically significant at the five per cent level (and are therefore likely to be real as opposed to occurring by chance) are described as differences within this report.

Confidence intervals around SCJS estimates are based on sampling variation calculations which reflect the stratified and, in some areas, clustered design of the survey, and also the weighting applied. They are often referred to as complex standard errors (CSEs). The values for these were calculated using the SAS Surveymeans module (http://www.sas.com).

Statistical significance for change in SCJS estimates for all SCJS crime cannot be calculated in the same way as for other SCJS estimates. This is because there is an extra stage of sampling used in the personal crime rate (selecting the adult respondent for interview) compared with the household crime rate (where the respondent represents the whole household). Technically these are estimates from two different, though obviously highly related, surveys. The Office for National Statistics (ONS) methodology group
has provided an approximation method to use to overcome this problem. This method is also used by the BCS.

The approach involves producing population-weighted variances associated with two approximated estimates for overall crime. The first approximation is derived by apportioning household crime equally among adults within the household (in other words, converting households into adults). The second apportions personal crimes to all household members (converting adults into households).

The variances are calculated in the same way as for the standard household or personal crime rates (i.e. taking into account the complex sample design and weighting). An average is then taken of the two estimates of the population-weighted variances. The resulting approximated variance is then used in the calculation of confidence intervals for the estimate of all SCJS crime. It is then used in the calculation of the sampling error around changes in estimates of all SCJS crime. This enables the determination of whether such differences are statistically significant.

This method incorporates the effect of any covariance between household and personal crime. By taking an average of the two approximations, it also counteracts any possible effect on the estimates of differing response rates by household size.

If confidence intervals are not provided, then an approximation may be used. The standard error should be calculated assuming a simple random sample and the value multiplied by an appropriate design factor to provide the confidence interval. Design factors will differ for different types of crime and characteristics. Examination of the data indicates that most design factors that have been calculated have values of less than 1.2. This suggests that the use of 1.2 would provide conservative estimates of confidence intervals for most estimates from the survey.

Table A4.1 shows the following for the key crime groups:

- The estimates for incidence rates per 10,000 adults / households;
- The 95% confidence intervals;
- The simple random sample (SRS) standard error;
- The complex, or SCJS sample, standard error;
- The design factor.
Table A4.1: Rates, confidence intervals, standard errors and design factors for key crime groups (incidence rate per 10,000), 2009/10 SCJS 2009/10.
Base: Adults (16,036).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime rates per 10,000</th>
<th>Best est.</th>
<th>Conf. int.</th>
<th>SRS Stand. Err.</th>
<th>SCJS Stand. Err.</th>
<th>Design Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALL SCJS CRIME</td>
<td>3,268</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPERTY CRIME</td>
<td>2,646</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>1,292</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor vehicle vandalism</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property vandalism</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All mv theft related incidents</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft of a motor vehicle</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft from a motor vehicle</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempted theft of / from mv</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housebreaking</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other h’hold thefts inc. cycle</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other household theft</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle theft</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal theft excl. robbery</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft from the person</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other personal theft</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIOLENT CRIME</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious assault</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMPARABLE CRIME

| Vandalism              | 1,292     | 219        | 50              | 56               | 1.11          |
| Acquisitive            | 262       | 77         | 19              | 20               | 1.04          |
| Violent crime          | 622       | 182        | 46              | 46               | 1.02          |
A4.2 Weighting

A4.2.1 Weighting method

Weighting was required to correct for:

- Unequal probabilities of selection, correcting for sampling bias (design weights);
- Disproportional area sampling, correcting for sampling bias (calibration weighting);
- Differential response by different sub-groups, correcting for non-response error (calibration weighting).

A two-stage approach to weighting was used for the SCJS. The first stage calculated a set of design weights that corrected for the unequal probabilities of selection firstly due to any inaccuracy in the Postcode Address File (PAF) multiple occupancy indicator (MOI) and secondly, for the individual level weights, due to selection of the individual, using the adult household size.

These design weights were used as pre-weights, or initial weights, applied to the data before the calibration weighting. Correction for disproportional sampling by police force area (PFA) and criminal justice authority area (CJAA) was achieved within the calibration weighting.

Weighting to correct for non-response error used characteristics that have been shown to be related to the levels and types of crime experienced by individuals.

The rims used in the calibration weighting for households were: \(^{89}\)

- Urban / rural within local authority (LA);
- Household type within PFA / CJAA;
- Age of head of household within PFA / CJAA.

A single age by gender by PFA / CJAA rim was used in the calibration weighting for individuals.

---

\(^{89}\) The calibration weighting procedure used for SCJS, is known as ‘rim weighting’. The factors used in the rim weighting are known as rims.
A4.2.2 Weights and expansion factors

The SCJS, like the BCS, technically consisted of two highly related, but separate surveys (section A4.1). At different points in the survey the adult being interviewed provided information on behalf of themselves as an individual and at other points on behalf of the household as a whole.

As a result two weights were needed for each case (respondent); a household weight and an individual weight. These were applied according to whether an estimate was for a household variable (such as household accommodation type) or an individual variable (such as respondent opinion of the change in crime in the local area).

In this report, the results from the survey are presented in terms of the total population of households or adults in Scotland. An expansion factor was included in the weights to gross-up the sample data and express the results as population values. This produced two gross weights which are applied to the relevant questions when reporting the data.

The household or individual weight calculated for a respondent also applied to any victim form linked to that respondent, according to whether the details provided were categorised as a household or an individual crime (section A3.6.6).

Most victim forms covered only one occasion. A small number of victim forms provided information about the latest in a series (where the same thing was carried out by the same people on different occasions – see Annex 3). A second expansion factor was combined with the household or individual weight to allow estimates of incidence to include up to five of the crimes in the series that happened in the reference period (Annex 3). This produced a separate ‘incident weight’ for each valid victim form. This weight was applied when reporting incident details (for example, who the offender was) so that data from series incidents were represented in the correct proportion of incidents overall.

Further details of the weighting are provided in the Technical Report.
Annex 5 Comparing SCJS and Police Recorded Crime Statistics

A5.1 Comparable crime

The SCJS provides estimates of the level of crime in Scotland. It includes crimes that are not reported to or recorded by the police, but is limited to crimes against adults resident in households, and also does not cover all crime types (Chapter 1). Police recorded crime is a measure of those crimes reported to the police (estimated by the SCJS to be 40% of comparable crime) and recorded by them as a crime or offence.

In order to compare the estimates of crime from the SCJS and police recorded crime statistics, a comparable subset of crime was created for a set of crimes that are covered by both measures. 67% of all SCJS crime as measured by the SCJS 2009/10 falls into categories that can be compared with crimes recorded by the police.

It is possible to make comparisons between the SCJS and police recorded crime statistics for three crime groups (Figure A5.1):

- Vandalism (including motor vehicle vandalism and property vandalism);
- Acquisitive crime (including bicycle theft, housebreaking and theft of motor vehicles);
- Violent crime (including assault and robbery).

Section A3.8.2 provides further information about these groups.

All SCJS crime estimates are based on interviews conducted between the 1\textsuperscript{st} of April 2009 and the 31\textsuperscript{st} of March 2010. Interviews were conducted continuously through this fieldwork period. Respondents were asked about crimes they experienced in the 12 months prior to the interview (the reference period – see section A3.5). The rolling reference period used in the SCJS means that the data collected centres around March 2009.

To enable comparison, estimates of the total number of comparable crimes in Scotland were obtained by grossing up the number of crimes identified in the SCJS using the General Register Office for Scotland (GROS) mid-2009 population estimates of households and adults (section A3.7).
Figure A5.1: Comparable crime groups

- **ALL INCIDENTS**
  - Non-valid incidents

- **ALL CRIME**
  - Sexual Offences
  - Threats

- **ALL SCJS CRIME**

- **COMPARABLE CRIME**

  - **VANDALISM**
    - Motor vehicle vandalism
    - Property vandalism

  - **ACQUISITIVE**
    - Bicycle theft
    - Housebreaking
    - Theft of motor vehicle

  - **VIOLENCE**
    - Assault
      - Serious assault
      - Minor assault
    - Robbery
    - Theft from motor vehicle
    - Personal theft (excl. robbery)
    - Other household thefts
A5.2 Police recorded crime statistics
Police recorded crime statistics used in this report relate to crimes committed in the financial year between April 2009 and March 2010. The figures presented in this volume were published on 07 September 2010.90

Various adjustments were made to the recorded crime categories by Scottish Government statisticians to maximise comparability with the SCJS. In previous crime surveys in Scotland the police recorded crime statistics were adjusted further to remove crimes against victims aged 15 or younger and crimes against businesses. However, for the SCJS the adjustments have not been made for the following reasons:

- This further adjustment came from a Strathclyde police survey from 2002 which was before the change to recorded crime practices brought about by the Scottish Recorded Crime Standard so it may not be valid any longer;
- In addition, the adjustment may still be appropriate but given that the data from the SCJS can now be provided at police force area (PFA) level it is not appropriate to use Strathclyde’s adjustment across all forces. Information to undertake this adjustment using local police force sources did not exist at the time of publication.

The decision not to adjust police recorded crime statistics is consistent with established practice on the BCS.

Annex 6 Comparing SCJS and BCS Crime Estimates

The coding of crimes differs between the SCJS and the British Crime Survey (BCS) which reflects the different criminal justice systems in which they operate. These differences should be borne in mind when comparisons are made between SCJS and BCS estimates in this report. One general difference is that the SCJS includes crimes where the offender is mentally ill or a police officer (these crimes are excluded in the BCS estimates).

The SCJS also differs from the BCS in that it prioritises assault over other crimes when coding offences. For example, if an incident includes both vandalism and assault, the assault component will be assumed to be more serious unless it is clear that the damage to property was the most serious aspect of the incident. This is not the case with the BCS where vandalism has priority over assault. In addition, the intent of the offender to cause harm is not taken into consideration in the SCJS and the offence code given relies only on the injuries that the victim received. The intention of the offender is taken into consideration when assigning offence codes for assaults in the BCS.

The definition of burglary in England and Wales as measured by the BCS and the definition of housebreaking in Scotland as measured by the SCJS differ in two ways:

1. **The mode of entry;**

   In Scotland, housebreaking occurs when the offender has physically broken into the home by forced entry or come in the home through a non-standard entry point such as a window. Even if the offender pushed past someone to gain entry to the home, this would not be coded as housebreaking in Scotland.91

   Burglary measured by the BCS in England and Wales does not necessarily involve forced entry; a burglar can walk in through an open door, or gain access by deception.

2. **The intention of the offender;**

   Burglary from a dwelling in England and Wales as measured by the BCS includes any unauthorised entry into the respondent’s dwelling, no matter what incident occurs once the offender is inside. If the offender does not have the right to enter a home, but does so, this will be burglary.

   In Scotland, the SCJS records the incident as housebreaking only if there is evidence of either theft from inside the home or an intention to steal in the case of attempted break-ins.

---

91 If a theft occurred in this instance, it would be included in the other household theft crime group.
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