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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

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 around 12,000 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 fourth full year of the survey, with interviews conducted between April 2012 and March 2013.

This executive summary presents a selection of key survey results. These and a range of additional Main Findings are presented at the start of each of the Chapters 2 to 8.

Main Findings

Estimates, risk and characteristics of crime (Chapters 2 and 3)

- There were 815,000 crimes as measured by the SCJS in 2012/13, including:
  - Approximately 579,000 property crimes (71% of crime) involving theft or damage to personal or household property (including vehicles);
  - Approximately 236,000 violent crimes of assault or robbery (29% of crime).
- The number of crimes has fallen by 22% since 2008-09, from 1,045,000 crimes in 2008-09 to 815,000 crimes in 2012-13. This change is statistically significant.
- Breaking down the proportions of property crime and violent crime further:
  - 27% of crime in 2012/13 was vandalism; 21% was other household theft (including bicycle theft); 13% was personal theft (excluding robbery); 6% were all motor vehicle theft related incidents and 4% was housebreaking;
  - 28% of crime in 2012/13 was assault (including 25% minor assault (including attempted assault) and 2% serious assault) and 1% was robbery.
The 2012/13 survey estimates that around one in six (16.9%) adults aged 16 or over was the victim of at least one crime.

- 14.8% of adults were estimated to have been a victim of property crime;
- 3.1% of adults had been a victim of violent crime.

The risk of being a victim of a crime has fallen from 20.4% in 2008/09 to 16.9% in 2012/13. This change is statistically significant. The risk of crime is lower in Scotland than in England and Wales where the victimisation rate was 18.7% in 2012/13.

The risk of being a victim of any crime was higher for those adults living in the 15% most deprived areas of Scotland: 21% compared with 16% for those living in the rest of Scotland.

The impact and perceptions of crime (Chapter 4)

- Injuries were sustained by victims in almost three-fifths (58%) of violent crime, of which three-fifths (60%) sustained minor bruising or a black eye and a third (33%) received scratches.
- In 70% of crime, victims said they thought what happened was a crime.
- In 57% of crime, victims said the offender should have been prosecuted in court, compared to 39% of crime where victims said that the offender should not have been prosecuted in court.

Reporting crime and support for victims (Chapter 5)

- Just under two-fifths (39%) of crimes were reported to the police in 2012/13, around the same level seen in recent years.
- Two-thirds of victims of crime (66%) were satisfied with the way the police handled the matter.

Public perceptions of crime (Chapter 6)

- Just over three-quarters (76%) of adults perceived the crime rate in their local area to have stayed the same or reduced in the past two years, whilst one-fifth (20%) thought it had increased.
- Almost three-quarters (72%) of adults said they felt very or fairly safe walking alone in their neighbourhood after dark, an increase of six percentage points from 66% in 2008/09 (a real statistically significant change).
- Adults were more likely to think that they were likely to experience crime than they actually were; for example, 6 times as many adults thought that they were likely to have their home broken into than actually did have their home broken into (7% compared with the actual risk of housebreaking of 1.2%).
The public and the police (Chapter 7)

- 73% 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** (68%); **Solve crimes** (64%); **Respond quickly to appropriate calls and information** (66%); **Catch criminals** (61%); and, **Prevent crime** (56%).
- The changes in respondents’ confidence levels between the 2008-09 and 2012-13 surveys are positive and statistically significant across all six of these statements on aspects of confidence in the police.
- Most adults (86%) agreed that local police would treat them with respect if they had a reason to contact them, whilst two-thirds (66%) agreed that the local police can be relied upon to be there when needed.
- Over half (56%) of respondents reported that the police patrolled their area regularly, with just over one-fifth (21%) being aware of the police patrolling on foot.

The Scottish criminal justice system (Chapter 8)

- Most adults said they did not know a lot about the criminal justice system (61%) and another 15% said they knew nothing at all.
- The changes in respondents’ confidence levels between the 2008-09 and 2012-13 surveys are positive and statistically significant, across all of the six comparable statements on aspects of their confidence in the justice system:
  - Makes sure everyone has access to the legal system if they need it (up from 70% in 2008/09 to 76% in 2012/13)
  - Makes sure the system doesn't treat you differently depending on where you live in Scotland (up from 54% in 2008/09 to 64% in 2012/13)
  - Is effective at bringing people who commit crime to justice (up from 53% in 2008/09 to 57% in 2012/13)
  - Deals with cases promptly and efficiently (up from 35% in 2008/09 to 43% in 2012/13)
  - Provides victims of crime with the services and support they need (up from 38% in 2008/09 to 52% in 2012/13)
  - Provides witnesses with the services and support they need (up from 43% in 2008/09 to 55% in 2012/13)
- Two-thirds of adults (66%) either strongly or slightly agreed that community sentencing is an effective way of dealing with less serious crime.
Almost one in four (23%) adults had experienced at least one of the civil law problems asked about in the last three years.
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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 12,000 face-to-face interviews with adults (aged 16 or over) living in private households in Scotland.

The main aims of the SCJS are to:

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

This report presents the results for the fourth full year of the survey, with interviews conducted between April 2012 and March 2013. As set out in the executive summary the results of this survey provide evidence to inform national outcomes and justice outcomes.

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.

1.1 Survey background

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).

Box 1.1: Past Scottish crime and victimisation surveys

- 1982, 1988: British Crime Survey (BCS) included coverage of central and

1 Related publications can be found at http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/Statistics/Browse/Crime-Justice/crime-and-justice-survey/publications

2 For further explanation of terminology used in this report with regard to crimes refer to Annex 3 and methodological issues in Annex 4.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Survey Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>First independent Scottish Crime Survey (SCS) launched, based on BCS and covering the whole of Scotland (c. 5,000 interviews).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996, 2000, 2003</td>
<td>Further sweeps of the SCS (c. 5,000 interviews).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004, 2006</td>
<td>Scottish Crime and Victimisation Survey (SCVS) (c. 27,000 interviews in 2004, c. 5,000 interviews in 2006).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/09, 2009/10, 2010/11</td>
<td>Scottish Crime and Justice Survey (SCJS) (c. 16,000 interviews 2008/09 and 2009/10, c. 13,000 interviews in 2010/11).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1.2 Methodology

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 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 2012/13 SCJS remains broadly similar to the 2008/09 to 2010/11 survey designs.

- **Survey frequency**: A survey rationalisation project, alongside other major Scottish Government cross-sectional population surveys led to the SCJS moving to a biennial design following completion of the SCJS 2010/11 – no survey ran in 2011/12.

- **Sample**: the sample was designed to be representative of all private residential households across Scotland (with the exception of some of the smaller islands). A systematic random selection of private residential addresses across Scotland was produced from the Royal Mail Postal Address File (PAF) and allocated in batches to interviewers. Interviewers called at each address and then selected one adult (aged 16 or over) at random from the household members for interview.

- **Questionnaire**: the questionnaire consists of a modular design completed by the interviewer (section A 2.1) and a Computer Assisted Self Interviewing (CASI) self-completion section covering sensitive crimes (sexual victimisation, stalking and harassment and partner abuse, and illicit drug use).

- **Fieldwork**: interviews were conducted on a rolling basis between 1st April 2012 and 31st March 2013, with roughly an equal number of interviews conducted in each month.
Interviews: 12,045 face-to-face interviews were conducted in respondents' homes by professional interviewers using Computer Assisted Personal Interviewing (CAPI) machines. Interviews lasted an average of 40 minutes, though there was considerable variation in interview length depending on the respondent’s reported experience.

Time period covered: 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 (April 2011 to February 2013) so is not directly comparable with any calendar year.

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 67.7%.

Further information about the design and methodology is contained in Annex 2 and in the accompanying Technical Report.

1.3 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 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. 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.

1.3.1 Exclusions

Crime and victimisation surveys do have limitations and the SCJS is no exception. The SCJS does not aim to provide an absolute count of all crime and has notable exclusions.

---

3 Further detail of the coverage of the SCJS is provided in Annexes 2 and 3 of this report and in the accompanying Technical Report.
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 all SCJS crime statistics.

1.3.2 Respondent contact and recall

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.

1.3.3 Sample error

The SCJS results, like the results of other sample-based surveys, are also subject to sampling error. To indicate the extent of this error, 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.

Surveys produce estimates for variables for different populations, and significance testing determines the likelihood that real differences exist when comparing to previous survey estimates.
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 has been assessed using standard statistical tests to examine 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.

In spite of these limitations the results of this survey provide the best available indicator of rates of adult victimisation in Scotland.

1.4 Comparing estimates of crime

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

Where comparisons are made in this report, most are with the three surveys since 2008/09 (the 2008/09, 2009/10 and 2010/11 surveys). These surveys have similar sample sizes and design. Scottish crime surveys prior to 2008/09 had substantially different sampling to the three most recent surveys (as outlined in section 1.1) which should be kept in mind when comparing data over time. Where statistical significance of change in survey results is considered in this report, this has been done at 95% significance level.

In contrast to previous surveys, the SCJS from 2008/09 to 2010/11 used continuous year-round fieldwork with a rolling reference period. This 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. As noted in section 1.1, the SCJS moved to a biennial design following completion of the SCJS 2010/11.

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.

---

4 The sample size was 16,003 in 2008/09; 16,036 in 2009/10 and 13,010 in 2010/11. Additional stratification at Local Authority level in 2009/10 increased the disproportion within the design. Fieldwork in 2010/11 took place over 10 months compared with the 12 month period to undertake the surveys in 2008/09 and 2009/10. The Technical Report provides further information on the differences between the surveys.
The design of the SCJS is very similar to the Crime Survey for England and Wales (CSEW, formerly the British Crime Survey (BCS)) which covers England and Wales only and which introduced continuous interviewing and a rolling reference period from 2000/01.

1.5 The structure of the report

The report is split into seven chapters, each looking at a different justice topic. The report includes data for the majority of questions contained in the survey questionnaire and presents simple one-to-one relationships between survey variables. The report is supported by six annexes providing further crime type data, survey method and survey comparison information. The report does not include in-depth, multivariate statistical analysis that would explore the more complex underlying relationships within the data.

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 2012/13 and results from the CSEW. 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 offenders 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 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 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. It also includes issues around harassment and discrimination and whether people feel worried.

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 is 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, which includes a summary of the questionnaire used, the survey sampling approach and information on fieldwork outcomes. It also includes information on the weighting applied to the data.

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.

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 CSEW.

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 will be published in three separate reports.

1.6 Conventions used in figures and tables

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 6.2: Perceptions of how crime rates have changed nationally and locally over the past two years

2. SCJS 2012/13

3. Base: Adults (12,050); adults who have lived in the local area for two years or more (10,640)

4. Variable name: QS2AREAS and QS2AREA

**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 alongside 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.

In tables and figures providing analysis, these are rounded using base 10 (to the nearest multiple of 10) for disclosure control purposes. However, unrounded numbers are provided in data tables released alongside this report.

**Percentages**

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

Percentages presented in tables and figures where they refer to the percentage of respondents, households or crimes that have the attribute being discussed may not sum to 100 per cent. Respondents have the option to refuse answering any question they did not wish to answer and the majority of questions have a ‘don’t know’ option. Percentages for these response categories are generally not shown in tables and figures.

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.

Also, percentages quoted in the report may represent variables that allow respondents to choose multiple responses. These percentages will not sum to 100 per cent with the other percentages presented. They represent the percentage of the variable population that select a certain response category.

**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.

**Survey Data**
Detailed tables containing all the results from the survey questionnaire are provided alongside this report on the SCJS website:


The raw survey data files and survey documentation will be available soon after publication of this report in SPSS data file format from the UK Data Service. http://ukdataservice.ac.uk/ (http://discover.ukdataservice.ac.uk/series/?sn=2000046)
2 THE EXTENT OF CRIME IN SCOTLAND

2.1 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 in Scotland and the proportion of different types of crime within that. This chapter also examines the risk of becoming a victim of crime (prevalence or victimisation rate).

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)\(^6\);
- Police recorded crime statistics, examining crime reported to the police;
- Crime Survey for England and Wales (CSEW) data collected to period ending June 2013 covering England and Wales, allowing comparisons of the incidence rates of different types 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 estimate totals and proportions among the adult population resident in private households in Scotland. The figures reported below are rounded to the nearest 1,000 crimes.

Main Findings

Estimates of crime

- There were 815,000 crimes as measured by the SCJS in 2012/13, including:
  - Approximately 579,000 property crimes involving theft or damage to personal or household property (including vehicles);
  - Approximately 236,000 violent crimes of assault or robbery.
- The number of crimes has fallen by 22% since 2008-09, from 1,045,000 crimes in 2008-09 to 815,000 crimes in 2012-13. This change is statistically significant.

\(^6\) 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 subsequent surveys with previous Scottish crime surveys. Previous Scottish crime survey reports are available on the Scottish Government website: [http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/Statistics/Browse/Crime-Justice/crime-and-justice-survey/publications](http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/Statistics/Browse/Crime-Justice/crime-and-justice-survey/publications)
Proportion of SCJS crime in aggregated crime groups

- Property crime accounted for 71% of all crime, with violent crime accounting for the other 29%.

- Breaking down the proportions of property crime and violent crime further:
  - 27% of crime in 2012/13 was vandalism; 21% was other household theft (including bicycle theft); 13% per cent was personal theft (excluding robbery); 6% were all motor vehicle theft related incidents and 4% was housebreaking;
  - 28% of crime in 2012/13 was assault (including 25% minor assault (including attempted assault) and 2% serious assault) and 1% was robbery.

The risk of crime

- The risk of being a victim of a crime has fallen from 20.4% in 2008/09 to 16.9% in 2012/13. This change is statistically significant.

- The 2012/13 survey estimates that around one in six (16.9%) adults aged 16 or over was the victim of at least one crime.
  - 14.8% of adults were estimated to have been a victim of property crime;
  - 3.1% of adults had been a victim of violent crime.

- The risk of crime is lower in Scotland (16.9%) than in England and Wales where the victimisation rate was 18.7% in 2012/13.

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.

Box 2.1: Aggregated crime groupings used in this report

In this report, overall crime measured by the survey has been split into two distinct groups, property crime and violent crime, as presented in Figure A3.2. As well as being associated with differing levels of risk, crimes within these two groups exhibit different characteristics and victims experience and perceive them differently (Chapters 3 and 4).

Property crime includes the following distinct 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 (includes serious assault, attempted assault, minor assault with no/negligible and minor injury);
- Robbery.

Individual offence codes are allocated to each Victim Form as part of the offence coding process (as explained in Annex 3) – for example “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 and acquisitive crime are comparable with police recorded crime; these and other crimes are examined in Annex 5.

The SPSS data files which will be made available from the UK Data Service 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.

## 2.2 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 of the total adult population resident in private households in Scotland. The figures reported below are rounded to the nearest 1,000 crimes.

The SCJS 2012/13 estimates that there were approximately 815,000 crimes against adults resident in private households in Scotland. Of these, 71% (579,000) were property crimes involving theft or damage to personal or household property (including vehicles). Around three-in-ten of these (29% or 236,000) were violent crimes of assault or robbery.

As the estimates originate from a sample survey, they are subject to sampling error. To supplement the estimates, a range of values were calculated, known as the confidence interval, which is likely to include the ‘true’ value for the number of crimes 95 times out of 100 (were the survey to be repeated multiple times).
These calculations show the actual number of crimes based on the SCJS 2012/13 to be in the range of 762,000 to 867,000. Within this the number of property crimes is estimated to be between 542,000 and 615,000, and the number of violent crimes between 196,000 and 275,000.

2.2.1 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 2012/13 in aggregated crime groups (see Box 2.1 for further information).

**Property crime**, which accounts for 71% of SCJS 2012-13 crime, is made up of five crime sub-groups, including incidents of vandalism (27% of all SCJS 2012-13 crime), other household theft (including bicycle theft) (21% of all SCJS 2012-13 crime) and personal theft (excluding robbery) (13%).

**Violent crime** accounted for 29% of all SCJS 2012-13 crimes. Violent crime is split into two aggregated groups: assault and robbery.

- Assault was largest aggregated group overall, covering serious assaults, minor assault with no/negligible and minor injury and attempted assault, accounting for 28% of SCJS 2012-13 crime; within this group:
  - serious assaults accounted for 2%
  - minor assault with no/negligible and minor injury for 23%; and
  - attempted assault for 3% of SCJS 2012-13 crime.
- Robbery incidents accounted for 1% of all SCJS crime.
2.3 Comparing crime over time

Data from previous surveys are presented in the following sections alongside the 2012/13 data. Care needs to be taken with the comparison of estimates from the 2008/09 to 2012/13 surveys with those from previous Scottish crime surveys.

The series includes a break in the survey methodology from 2008/09 onwards, moving to a rolling reference period, increased sample size and continuous fieldwork, until a move to a biennial design following the 2010/11 sweep (as outlined in section 1.1), which has helped to reduce confidence intervals around survey results in surveys since 2008/09.

2.3.1 Trends in numbers of crimes overall crimes

Figure 2.2 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 from the 2006 surveys onwards to indicate the reliability of the estimates shown.

---

7 Incidence variables (listed based on Figure 2.1 clockwise from top) are in the Respondent File SPSS: INCPROPERTY, INCVAND, INCOTHERHOUSETHEFTCYCLE, INCALLMVTHEFT, INCHOUSEBREAK, INCPERSTHEFT, INCVIOLENT, INCASSAULT, INCROB.
The smaller confidence intervals from 2008/09 onwards are due to the larger sample size in these surveys which produces an estimate that is statistically more reliable than previous estimates. Where statistical significance of change in survey results are considered in this report they are based on surveys since 2008-09.

No clear trend could be detected for changes to the numbers of crimes as a whole measured by the various Scottish crime surveys conducted prior to 2008-09.

**Figure 2.2: Total number of crimes over time**

*SCJS 1992/93 to 2012/13*

Base: SCS 1993 (5,030); 1996 (5,050); 2000 (5,060); 2003 (5,040); SCVS 2004 (3,030); 2006 (5,000); SCJS 2008/09 (16,000); 2009/10 (16,040); 2010/11 (13,010); 2012/13 (12,050)

SCJS Variable name: INCSURVEYCRIME

Note: There was a break in survey methodology from 2008/09, moving to a rolling reference period, increased sample size and continuous fieldwork until a move to a biennial design for 2012/13.

**2.3.2 Statistical significance of changes in key survey results**

Table 2.1 (and Table 2.2) shows a decrease in the number of overall crimes since 2008-09. The estimated number of crimes in 2012/13 (815,000) has fallen by 22% (230,000) since 2008/09 (a real statistically significant change), and by 7% (60,000) since 2010/11 (not a real statistically significant change).
Table 2.1: Estimates of numbers of all SCJS crime
SCJS 2008/09 to 2012/13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>All SCJS crime</th>
<th>Lower estimate</th>
<th>Upper estimate</th>
<th>Confidence interval</th>
<th>Base</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>1,045,000</td>
<td>974,000</td>
<td>1,116,000</td>
<td>71,000</td>
<td>16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>945,000</td>
<td>879,000</td>
<td>1,012,000</td>
<td>66,000</td>
<td>16,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td>874,000</td>
<td>813,000</td>
<td>935,000</td>
<td>61,000</td>
<td>13,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td>815,000</td>
<td>762,000</td>
<td>867,000</td>
<td>52,000</td>
<td>12,050</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All SCJS crime
Variable name: INCSURVEYCRIME

Note: The unrounded estimates are provided in the accompanying Excel document to provide comparable estimates to previous publications.

It should be noted more generally that while analysis of results between adjacent survey sweeps may not identify statistically significant changes in results, analysis of trends over the longer term can sometimes smooth out shorter term (and often not statistically significant) variation and enables an assessment to be made of the longer term trends.

In summary, as shown in Table 2.2, the latest key headline crime trends reported in SCJS 2012-13 are that 'all crime', 'property crime' and 'violent crime' show real reductions from 2008/09. However, there is only a statistically significant (real) change in property crime when compared to 2010/11. All crime and violent crime are showing no real statistically significant changes in their estimated values.

Table 2.2: % change in estimates of numbers of all SCJS crime, by crime group
SCJS 2008/09 to 2012/13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALL SCJS CRIME</td>
<td>1,045,000</td>
<td>945,000</td>
<td>874,000</td>
<td>815,000</td>
<td>-22%</td>
<td>-7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPERTY CRIME</td>
<td>728,000</td>
<td>679,000</td>
<td>654,000</td>
<td>579,000</td>
<td>-21%</td>
<td>-12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>303,000</td>
<td>275,000</td>
<td>219,000</td>
<td>-37%</td>
<td>-20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All motor vehicle theft related incidents</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>64,000</td>
<td>58,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>-29%</td>
<td>-14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housebreaking</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>29,000</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other h'hold theft (inc. bicycles)</td>
<td>173,000</td>
<td>153,000</td>
<td>169,000</td>
<td>169,000</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal theft (excl. robbery)</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>124,000</td>
<td>106,000</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIOLENT CRIME</td>
<td>317,000</td>
<td>266,000</td>
<td>220,000</td>
<td>236,000</td>
<td>-25%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>297,000</td>
<td>247,000</td>
<td>208,000</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>-24%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>-42%</td>
<td>-6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Changes which are statistically significant real changes at the 95% level are shown in bold and italics
2. It should be noted that some of the equivalent estimates for subgroups of crime, particularly for violent crime, are based on small sample sizes (close to 300 respondents in both 2010/11 and 2012/13 for violent
crime overall) which makes the overall incidence data susceptible to volatile changes following slight changes in underlying violent crime reported by the respondents between sweeps of the survey. In addition, small proportions of records which include larger amounts of multiple incidents of violent crimes can contribute considerably to variation between survey sweeps. For example, the average number of incidents of violent crime (for those that did experience violent crime increased from 3 incidents to 3.3 incidents between 2010-11 and 2012-13).

2.3.4 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: Number of crimes (grouped) over time**
**SCJS 1992/93 to 2012/13**

In summary, trends have varied by crime group, for example, vandalism has returned to the levels experienced in the 1990s after increasing and decreasing.

---

8 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.
during the 2000s. Motor vehicle theft related incidents and housebreaking have decreased steadily since the early 1990s. Housebreaking is on an upward trend since 2008/09, but remains notably lower than in the 1990s.

### 2.4 Police recorded crime statistics

In this section the estimates of crime as measured by the SCJS 2012/13 are examined in the context of police recorded crime from 2012/13.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Box 2.2: Police recorded crime and comparisons with SCJS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When comparing crime estimates from the SCJS and crime recorded by the police the following differences should be kept in mind:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <strong>Reference periods</strong> for police recorded crime (2012/13) and the SCJS (2012/13): SCJS 2012/13 estimates are based on interviews carried out between 01 April 2012 and 31 March 2013 and incidents experienced by respondents in the 12 months before their interview. The centre-point of the period for reporting crime is March 2012 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 2012 (about 6 months behind the 2012/13 recorded crime figures reported here). The police recorded crime statistics relate to crime recorded by the police in the financial year 2012/13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <strong>Reporting rates</strong> 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, 2009/10, 2010/11 and 2012/13 this adjustment was not carried out, which is consistent with practice on the CSEW, and due the lack of an available source that was up-to-date and nationally representative (Annex 5).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The statistical bulletin for police recorded crime in Scotland for 2012/13 is available from the Scottish Government website[^9].

A subset of all SCJS crime can be compared with police recorded crime statistics. This comparable subset includes vandalism, acquisitive crime and violent crime[^10].

[^9]: [http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2013/06/9697](http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2013/06/9697)
Almost two-thirds (65%) of crime was classed as comparable with police recorded crime statistics (comparable crime).

Further information on the contents of the overall recorded crime groups of crime is available here - http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2013/06/9697/8. While data comparability is further explained in Annex 5.

2.4.1 Comparisons with police recorded crime statistics 2012/13

The SCJS 2012/13 estimated that there were 527,000 crimes in the comparable subset (see Annex 5.1). In 2012/13, the police recorded 145,000 crimes and offences in the comparable subset of crime.

Figure 2.5: Comparison between comparable SCJS and police recorded crime

**SCJS 2012/13; Police recorded crime 2012/13**

![Figure 2.5](image-url)

**Base:** Comparable subsets of crime; SCJS 2012/13 (1,450 incidents); Police recorded crime statistics 2012/13 (144,662 incidents)

**Variable name:** Incidence variables

Figure 2.5 presents the proportion of comparable crime recorded by the police in 2012/13 and comparable crime estimated by the SCJS in 2012/13, broken down by vandalism, acquisitive crime and violent crime as defined by the SCJS.

---

10 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.

11 Definitions for the groups of crimes used in this report can be found in Annex 3. Incidence variables (listed based on figure top to bottom) are: INCVAND, INCACQUIS, INCVIOLENT.
The breakdown between these three categories of comparable crime are consistent between SCJS and recorded crime data collections, suggesting that the two sources are likely to be identifying crimes consistently across these groups.

### 2.4.2 Reporting comparable crime

Not all crime is reported to the police. SCJS 2012/13 estimates that 44% of comparable crime was reported to the police. This is similar to the 44% equivalent reporting rate for comparable crime estimated for England and Wales in 2012/13. Reporting rates for SCJS comparable crime varied by crime type, e.g. 36% of vandalism, 55% of acquisitive crime and 48% of violent crime.

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

### 2.4.3 Comparison of total number of crimes in Scotland and England and Wales

Changes to the SCJS with regard to the reference period mean it is very similar to the method used in the CSEW which measures crime in England and Wales. The CSEW 2012/13 provides useful context for the SCJS 2012/13 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.

Approximate incidence rates (the number of crimes as measured by the CSEW 2012/13 and the SCJS 2012/13 per 10,000 adults or households) were compared for the various crime groups (Figure 2.6).

---

12 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.

13 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.


15 Further information on the method and design of the survey is provided in Annex 2.

16 Annex 6 provides further information on the differences in offence coding between CSEW and SCJS.

17 Crime in England & Wales, year ending March 2013 - Appendix Tables - Table A2 (CSEW numbers rounded to nearest 10) http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/publications/re-reference-tables.html?edition=tcm%3A77-314526

An incidence rate of, for example, 517 for assault does not mean that 517 adults per 10,000 will necessarily be the victim of assault, rather that there will be 517 separate incidents of assault experienced within the 10,000 as a whole (i.e. some...
The comparison showed that among groups of property crime:

- As shown in Figure 2.6, the incidence rates for all motor vehicle theft related incidents, housebreaking, other household theft and personal theft were lower in Scotland than in England and Wales;

- The incidence rate for vandalism and violence was higher in Scotland than in England and Wales.

**Figure 2.6: Comparison of incidence rates in Scotland with England and Wales**

SCJS 2012/13, CSEW 2012/13 (incidence rate per 10,000 households / adults)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime Category</th>
<th>Scotland</th>
<th>England and Wales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All motor vehicle theft related incidents</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housebreaking</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other h'hold theft (inc. bicycles)</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal theft (excl. robbery)</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>543</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: SCJS 2012/13 (12,050); CSEW 2012/13 (34,880).

Variable name: Incidence variables

2.5 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.

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).

18 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, INOTHERHOUSETHEFTCYCLE, INCPERSTHEFT, INCASSAULT, INCROB. Incident rates are calculated using the number of households or adults according to the type of crime (see Annex 3).
The SCJS is used specifically to monitor one of the national indicators in Scotland Performs\textsuperscript{19}:

\begin{quote}
‘reduce crime victimisation rates’.
\end{quote}

It is defined as the percentage of adults aged 16 or over in private households who have been the victim of one or more crimes as measured by the SCJS. The SCJS 2008/09 was the baseline for the national indicator and changes in the data since then are explored below in section 2.5.2.

2.5.1 *Overall risk of being a victim of crime*

The SCJS estimates that 16.9\% of adults aged 16 or over were the victims of at least one crime as measured by the SCJS in 2012/13. Confidence interval calculations show the actual risk of victimisation to be in the range of 16.1\% to 17.7\%.

The equivalent rate for crime victimisation in England and Wales was 18.7\%\textsuperscript{20} in 2012-13.

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

2.5.2 *Risk of being a victim of crime: 2012/13 compared with 2008/09 and 2010/11*

The SCJS 2008/09 was the baseline year for the Scotland Performs national indicator relating to crime victimisation rates.

Comparing the 2012/13 estimate with the 2008/09 estimate, the risk of being a victim of a crime has fallen from 20.4\% in 2008/09 to 16.9\% in 2012/13. This is a statistically significant real change of 3.5 percentage points from the baseline year (Annex 4).

However the fall in the risk of being a victim of crime in the latest two surveys, from 17.8\% in 2010-11 to 16.9\% in 2012-13, is not a statistically significant real change.

2.5.3 *Risk of being a victim of different crimes (grouped)*

As measured by the SCJS in 2012/13 there was a 16.9\% risk of an adult being a victim of one or more crimes of any type. Figure 2.7 shows the victimisation rate for the broad categories of property and violent crime and for the different crime groups which make up those larger categories.

\textsuperscript{19} http://www.scotland.gov.uk/About/scotPerforms

\textsuperscript{20} Table A3: CSEW trends in percentages of households/adults who were victims once or more (prevalence risks) from 1981 to 2012/13 http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/publications/re-reference-tables.html?edition=tcm%3A77-314526
There was a 14.8% risk to an adult of being a victim of property crime. Within the broad group of property crime, vandalism was the most commonly experienced crime with 6.3% of households experiencing it in the last year while housebreaking was the least common crime being experienced by 1.2% of households.

There was a 3.1% risk of being a victim of violent crime. Within that category, 2.9% of Scottish adults had been the victim of an assault and 0.2% of adults had been the victim of robbery.

2.5.4 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 general fraud in the victim form as there are a number of issues with measuring this particular type of crime (discussed in the following section) and therefore fraud is not included in any of the SCJS crime statistics.

There are a number of difficulties in measuring card and identity fraud:

---

21 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, PREVASAULT, PREVROB.
• 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 2012/13 estimated that 4% of adults had experienced card fraud in the 12 months prior to interview. Around 1% of adults had been a victim of identity theft, where someone had pretended to be them or used their personal details fraudulently.
3 THE RISK AND CHARACTERISTICS OF CRIME

3.1 Introduction

As reported in Chapter 2, the Scottish Crime and Justice Survey (SCJS) 2012/13 estimated that approximately 815,000 crimes occurred in Scotland and that 16.9% of adults were victims of crime. Property crime accounted for 71% of all crime and violent crime for 29%.

This chapter examines the nature and characteristics of crime and covers the varying risk of being a victim of crime. This includes when and where crime happened and the characteristics of offenders. It concludes with looking at violent crimes and the use of weapons and the role of alcohol and drugs.

Main Findings

Varying risk of crime

- In 2012/13, 16.9% of adults in Scotland were estimated to have been victims of a crime within the scope of the survey.
- Those aged 16-24 were most likely to fall victim of crime (24%), compared with other age groups.
- The risk of being a victim of any crime was higher for those adults living in the 15% most deprived areas of Scotland: 21% compared with 16% for those living in the rest of Scotland.

Repeat victimisation (victim of same type of crime more than once in the last year)

- 4% of adults were repeat victims of property crime and 1% of adults were repeat victims of violent crime.

Characteristics of crime

- 45% of all crime happened immediately outside the home, which is related to property crime making up the majority of crimes.
- Almost one in three violent crimes (29%) happened between 9 pm and 3 am on a weekend.

Characteristics of offenders (as perceived by victims)

- Males (73%) were more likely than females to be offenders (14%), with around one-in-ten (11%) where there were groups of both male and female offenders.
- 70% of offenders were thought to be aged between 16 and 39, while
school age children were more likely to commit property crime than violent crime (29% and 12% respectively).

*Weapons used in crime*

- Victims reported that the offender had something they used or threatened to use as a weapon in 17% of all crime (where the victim saw or had any contact with the offender).

*Alcohol or drug related violent crime*

- In 59% of violent crime the victim said the offender was under the influence of alcohol, and under the influence of drugs in 29% of violent crimes.

### 3.2 Varying risk of crime

Just under one-in-six of adults aged 16 and over (16.9%) were victims of at least one crime covered by the survey. As was seen in Chapter 2, 14.8% were the victim of property crime and 3.1% were the victim of violent crime. This rate is also described as the risk of being a victim of crime, and 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.

**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
3.2.1 Varying risk of crime amongst adults

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 any crime was slightly higher for males than for females: 18% of males had been the victim of at least one crime compared with 16% of females. The risk of being a victim of property crime was almost the same for males (15%) and females (14%) whilst males had a higher risk of being a victim of violent crime compared with females (4% cent and 2% respectively).

The risk of being a victim of any crime decreased with age. Just under a quarter (24%) of 16-24 year olds were at risk of being a victim of crime compared with around one-in-ten (9%) of those aged 60 or older. The risk of being a victim of property crime was similar for 16-24 year olds (18%) and 25-44 year olds (19%). The risk decreased with age thereafter so that 8% of those aged 60 or over were at risk of being a victim of property crime. Similarly, the risk of being a victim of violent crime decreased with age, from 8% for 16-24 year olds compared with less than 0.5% of those aged 60 or over.
Males aged 16-24 had the highest risk of being a victim of any crime (27%), compared to females aged 16-24 (20%). For violent crime, 16-24 year old males were at the highest risk (11%) and a little over twice as likely to be victim of violent crime compared to males 25-44 (5%) and females 16-24 (5%).

### 3.2.2 Varying risk of crime by area characteristics

This section explores how the risk of being a victim of crime in Scotland varied by area deprivation. 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 that the risk of being a victim of any crime was higher for those adults living in the 15% most deprived areas of Scotland: 21% compared with 16% for those living in the rest of Scotland.

---

As measured by the 2012 Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation (SIMD):

http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/Statistics/SIMD
Similarly, the risk of property crime was higher for adults living in the 15% most deprived areas (18%) compared with those living in the rest of Scotland (14%). The risk of violent crime for adults living in the 15% most deprived areas was higher (5%) than for those in the rest of Scotland (3%).

### 3.3 Repeat victimisation

Individuals who have been the victim 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.

The SCJS 2012/13 estimated that 4% of adults were repeat victims of property crime and 1% of adults were repeat victims of violent crime.
Figure 3.2: Repeat victims as percentage of all victims within each crime group

*SCJS 2012/13*

Base: Households / adults who were victims in each crime group

Variable name: Repeat victim variables

Figure 3.2 shows that just under three-in-ten (29%) of victims of property crime were repeat victims, including, for vandalism where 28% of victims of vandalism were repeat victims. The percentage of repeat victims among victims of other types of property crime were lower, for example 8% of victims of personal theft (excluding robbery) were repeat victims.

Around a third (32%) of all incidents of violent crime were experienced by repeat victims of violent crime, as measured by the SCJS in 2012/13. On average repeat victims experienced three violent crimes in the 12 months prior to interview.

---

23 Base: Property crime 1,610; Vandalism 710; All motor vehicle theft related incidents 200; Housebreaking 120; Other household theft (including bicycle theft) 590; Personal theft (excluding robbery) 220; Violent crime 310.

24 Repeat victim variables are in the Respondent File SPSS: REPPROPERTY, REPALLVAND, REPALLMVTHEFT, REPHOUSEBREAK, REPOTHERHOUSETHETF_CYCLE, REPERSTHEFT, 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.

25 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).
3.4 Characteristics of crime

Information on where, and when, crimes happened as well as the characteristics of offenders and the use of weapons are provided in the following sections.

3.4.1 Where crime happened

Respondents were asked where the crime happened. Property crime makes up the majority of crime measured by the SCJS. Reflecting this, the main place where crime took place was immediately outside the home (45% of all crime 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 12% of crime occurred in the home and 1% inside a garage, whilst 15% of crime happened in or near the victim’s place of work (Table 3.2).

Table 3.2: Where crime happened

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCJS 2012/13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base: Victims of crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable name: QWH1, QWH3, QWH5 and QWH7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of SCJS crimes</th>
<th>Property crime</th>
<th>Violent crime</th>
<th>All SCJS crime</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outside home</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In/Near respondent/victim's place of work</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inside own home</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In/Around a pub/bar/club</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In/Around a shop/supermarket/shopping</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At the home of a friend or relative</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While travelling or near transport facilitie:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inside garage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some other place</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Base</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,950</strong></td>
<td><strong>340</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,290</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over three-fifths of all property crime took place immediately outside the home (61%). In contrast, violent crime more commonly happened in a number of other locations; in or near the respondent’s place of work (32%), inside or directly outside the victims’ home (20%), in or around a shop, supermarket, shopping centre or precinct (12%), and or around a pub, bar or club (12%).

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; of those that responded and could remember (as shown in Table 3.3) 53% of crime happened on a weekday in comparison to 38% that happened on a weekend.
Table 3.3: When crime happened
SCJS 2012/13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of SCJS crimes</th>
<th>Property crime</th>
<th>Violent crime</th>
<th>All SCJS crime</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weekday any time</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekday morning (6am - noon)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekday afternoon (noon - 6pm)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekday evening (6pm - midnight)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekday night (midnight - 6am)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weekend any time</strong></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekend morning (6am - noon)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekend afternoon (noon - 6pm)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekend evening (6pm - midnight)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekend night (midnight - 6am)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Base</strong></td>
<td>1,950</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>2,290</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: Victims of crime
Variable name: QWEE, QTIM and QTIM2

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.

54% of property crime took place on a weekday and 33%, took place at the weekend, while 49% of violent crime took place at the weekend mostly between 6 pm and 6 am (41%).

Victims of violent crime were asked for more detail about when the incident happened. This additional information indicated that almost one in three violent crimes (29%) happened between around 9 pm and 3 am on a weekend.

3.4.3 Characteristics of offenders

Victims were asked whether they had any contact with the offender or offenders and whether they felt able to say anything about them. The victim was able to say something about the offender in 47% of crime overall. The victim was able to say something about the offender in 26% of property crimes compared with 96% of violent crimes.

Table 3.4 shows the age and gender characteristics of offenders - where the victim was able to say something about the offender. Offenders were more likely to be male (73%) than female (14%) (with another 11% where there was a groups of both male and female offenders). Males were more likely to be the offender in both property and violent crime.

70% of offenders were thought to be aged between 16 and 39, while school age children were more likely to commit property crime than violent crime (29% and 12% respectively).
Table 3.4: Characteristics of offenders
SCJS 2012/13

Percentage of SCJS crimes where respondent was able to say anything about the offender(s) | Property crime | Violent crime | All SCJS crime
--- | --- | --- | ---
Gender
Male | 67 | 77 | 73
Female | 14 | 15 | 14
Person/People of both sexes | 17 | 7 | 11
Age
School age | 29 | 12 | 19
16-24 | 30 | 38 | 35
25-39 | 31 | 38 | 35
40 or over | 13 | 16 | 15
Base | 470 | 330 | 800

Base: Crimes where respondent was able to say anything about the offender(s)
Variable name: QSX and QAGE

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

- The offender was known well by the victim in around 14% of all crime.
- The offender was known well by the victim in around 55% of crime where they knew or had seen the offender before.

- The offender was well known to the victim in around 34% of all violent crime.
- The offender was well known to the victim in around 65% of violent crime where they knew or had seen the offender before.

- The offender was well known to the victim in around 7% of all property crime.
- The offender was well known to the victim in around 42% of property crime where they knew or had seen the offender before.

In addition, where victims **knew the offender well** they were asked about their **relationship with the offender**.

It should be noted that information on the victim’s relationship with the offender(s) is based on small numbers and differing base sizes for different questions, so survey estimates should be treated with caution.

For example, in 16% of crimes where the victim knew the offender well, the offender was a client or member of public contacted through work, in 13% a friend or acquaintance, and in 10% the current husband, wife or partner. However, this means, for example, that victims said only around 2% of all SCJS crime was committed by a client or member of public contacted through work.
3.4.4 Weapons used in crime

Victims reported that the offender had something they used or threatened to use as a weapon in around 6% of all crime.

Where the victim saw or heard what was going on, the offender was reported to have had a weapon in 17% of all crime (23% of violent crime).

In 84% of crime where victims reported that the offender had a weapon, the offender used or threatened to use the weapon (91% of violent crime where victims reported that the offender had a weapon).

Where victims reported that the offender had a weapon, a knife was the most common used weapon (39%) followed by a stick/ club/ hitting implement (24%). Victims reported the offender had a knife in 41% of violent crime in 2012/13, where the victim said the offender had a weapon. However, it should be noted that these estimates are based on small sample sizes and that no information was able to be presented on property crime.
Table 3.5: Use of weapons in crime  
SCJS 2012/13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of SCJS crimes</th>
<th>Property crime</th>
<th>Violent crime</th>
<th>All SCJS crime</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Offender had a weapon</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offender did not have a weapon</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not known/no contact with the offender</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>710</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Offender used or threatened to use the weapon  
* 91 84

Type of weapon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of weapon</th>
<th>Property crime</th>
<th>Violent crime</th>
<th>All SCJS crime</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knife</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottle</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stick/ club/ hitting implement</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stones/ bricks</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screwdriver/ stabbing implement</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any gun (includes pistol, rifle, shotgun, airgun)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All crime where the offender(s) used or threatened to use the weapon

Variable name: QWEA1, QWEA2 and QWEW

3.4.5 Alcohol or drug related violent crime

Respondents were asked whether they thought the offender was under the influence of alcohol or drugs at the time of the offence. The estimate may not accurately reflect the proportion of violent crimes involving alcohol or drugs because it is reliant on the victim’s perception of the state of the offender.

From the 343 victims reporting violent crimes, in 59% of violent crime the victim said the offender was under the influence of alcohol and victims also reported that the offender was under the influence of drugs in 29% of violent crimes.
4 THE IMPACT AND PERCEPTIONS OF CRIME

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents results which describe the impact of crime on victims, their perception of the crime itself and the outcome for the offender.

The chapter describes the emotions victims felt, the injuries sustained by victims in violent crime and the financial impact of property crime. It also looks at victims’ perceptions including whether they thought an incident was a crime or not and their views on the offender going to court and what type of sentence or other treatment they should have received.

Main Findings

Monetary impacts of property crime

- In over half of property crime (51%) when property was damaged, victims valued damaged items at £1,300 or less - around a third (32%) did not know the value of the damaged items.

Injuries sustained

- Injuries were sustained by victims in almost three-fifths (58%) of violent crime, of which three-fifths (60%) sustained minor bruising or a black eye and a third (33%) received scratches.

Whether what happened was a crime or not

- In 70% of crime, victims said they thought what happened was a crime.

What should have happened to offender(s)

- In 39% of incidents, victims said that the offender should not have been prosecuted in court compared to 57% of incidents where victims said that the offender should have been prosecuted in court.

- In incidents where victims said that the offender should not have been prosecuted in court, victims most often said that the offender should have apologised for what they had done (22%) or been given some kind of warning (22%).

4.2 Impact of crime

This section explores the monetary impacts of property crime, injuries sustained in violent crime and the emotions felt by victims after the crime happened.
4.2.1 Monetary impacts of property crime

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.

Responses show that in over half (51%) of property crime when property was damaged, victims valued damaged items at £1,300 or less. Around a third (32%) did not know the value of the damaged items.

In 78% of property crimes when property was stolen, victims valued stolen items at £1,300 or less whilst around two-fifths (39%) of victims valued the items at £150 or less.

Figure 4.1: Value of damaged/stolen items

Property crime where something was damaged / stolen (damaged 1,000; stolen 1,050)
Variable name: QSVA and QDVA (property crime columns)

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 41% of property crimes where items were damaged or stolen. Claims were made in 22% of property crimes where damaged or stolen goods were insured.

4.2.2 Injuries sustained in 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 (including 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.

Injuries were sustained in 58% of violent crime. In three-fifths of violent crimes where the victim suffered an injury, they sustained minor bruising or a black eye (60%), a third received scratches or minor cuts (33%) and in just over a quarter the victim received severe bruising (26%) (Figure 4.2); respondents were given the option to provide multiple responses to this question.

**Figure 4.2: Injuries sustained in violent crime**

*SCJS 2012/13*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Injuries Sustained</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minor bruising or black eye</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scratches, minor cuts</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe bruising</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe cuts, gashes, tears, punctures to skin</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head injury</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broken, cracked, fractured bones</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broken nose</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broken / chipped / lost teeth</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe concussion or lost of consciousness</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal injuries</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dislocation of joints</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Base: Violent crime where victim was physically injured (200)*  
*Variable name: QINW*

### 4.2.3 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, property crime and violent crime.

Across all SCJS crimes, the most common emotions experienced by the victims were annoyance (53%) and anger (52%). Other than annoyance and anger, victims of violent crime were more likely to experience other strong negative emotions than victims of property crime: for example, shock (38% against 16%), fear (22% against 6%), loss of confidence (13% against 4%), anxiety (13% against 5%) and depression (9% against 3%).
Victims of violent crime were also more likely to report that they experienced no emotional reaction after an incident (9%) than victims of property crime (3%).

**Table 4.1: Emotional responses to crime**

*SCJS 2012/13*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of SCJS crimes</th>
<th>Property crime</th>
<th>Violent crime</th>
<th>All SCJS crime</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annoyed</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shock</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lost confidence / felt vulnerable</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crying / tearful</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxious / had panic attacks</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty sleeping</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depressed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Base</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,950</strong></td>
<td><strong>340</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,290</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4.3 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 action, if any, should have been taken against the offender.

**4.3.1 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 asked victims explicitly whether they thought what happened to them was a crime, wrong but not a crime, or just something that happens (Figure 4.3).

In 70% of crime victims said they thought what happened was a crime, 16% of crime victims described the incident as wrong but not a crime and 14% of crime victims said the incident was just something that happened.

Victims of violent crime were more likely than victims of property crime to think that the incident was not a crime, respectively 39% and 26%.
4.3.2 What should have happened to the offender

Victims were asked whether they thought the offender should have been prosecuted in court or not. All victims were asked this regardless of whether the police had come to know about the crime or identified the offender and regardless of whether the victim believed what happened to be a crime.

In 39% of all incidents, victims said that the offender should not have been prosecuted in court, although this varied by type of crime, for example 38% of victims of property crimes and 43% of victims of violent crimes.

Those who did not think the offender should have been prosecuted in court, were asked the reasons for this. As shown in Table 4.2, the most common reasons given for all crime were that the incident was too trivial (36%), it would be a waste of time or money (19%), that the offenders were too young or were children (15%) and that the courts are inappropriate for the offence (15%).
The reasons for why the victim felt the offender should not have been prosecuted varied by type of incident; for example, in 44% 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, while 19% of victims of violent crime gave this response.

Victims of violent crime who did not think that the offender(s) should have been prosecuted in court were more likely than victims of property crime to say that this was because the incident was too trivial, while 19% of victims of violent crime gave this response.

4.3.3 Alternatives to prosecution for offender – victims’ opinions

In crime where victims said that the offender should not have been prosecuted in court, respondents were asked what should have happened as an alternative to prosecution (Table 4.3). Victims most often said that the offender should have apologised for what they had done (22%), been given some kind of warning (22%) or been made to pay the victim compensation (14%).

In 9% of such crime victims said that nothing should have happened to the offender.
The alternatives suggested for offenders varied between property crime and violent crime. For example, victims of property crime were more likely to say the offender should have been made to pay them compensation (21%) with none saying so for violent crime. Similarly, just over a fifth of violent crime victims (22%) said nothing should have happened to the offender compared to 4% of property crime victims, while victims of violent crimes were more likely to say the offender should be given help to stop offending (16%) than victims of property crimes (7%).

### 4.3.4 Prosecution of offender – victims’ opinions

57% of all crime victims said the offender should have been prosecuted in court. Victims said the offender should have gone to court in 59% of property incidents compared with 53% of violent incidents.

Those victims who thought the offender should have been prosecuted in court were asked whether the offender should have been given a prison sentence or another kind of sentence (Figure 4.4).
Figure 4.4: Whether offender should have been given a prison sentence or another sentence
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Base: All crime where victim thinks the offender should have been prosecuted in court (All SCJS crime 1,390; Property crime 1,190; Violent crime 200)

Variable name: 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)

In a quarter (25%) of crime where the victim thought that the offender should have been prosecuted, the victim thought the offender should have been given a prison sentence. Victims said the offender should have been sentenced to prison in 37% of such violent crime and in 20% of such property crime.

In 71% of crime where the victim thought that the offender should have been prosecuted, the victim said that the offender should have been given another kind of sentence. Victims said the offender should have been given a sentence other than a prison sentence in 77% of such property crime and in 57% of such violent crime.

4.3.5 Alternatives to prison for offender – victims’ opinions

Those victims who thought the offender should have been prosecuted in court and given an alternative sentence to prison were asked what sentence the court should have given the offender (Table 4.4). Chapter 8.3 contains additional information on respondents’ attitudes to prisons and community sentencing.
Table 4.4: Alternative to prison for offender – victims’ opinions
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of SCJS crimes where respondent thinks the offender(s) should have been prosecuted or given</th>
<th>Property crime</th>
<th>Violent crime</th>
<th>All SCJS crime</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community service order</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation order</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A fine</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An order when offender is made to address</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A warning</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be electronically tagged at home</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of these</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Base</strong></td>
<td><strong>930</strong></td>
<td><strong>110</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,040</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: Crime where victim thought offender should have been prosecuted in court and given an alternative to a prison sentence
Variable name: QNPS

Around one-quarter of victims of all crime types thought that undertaking a community service order (28%), compensation order (26%) or a fine (23%) were appropriate. The alternatives differed between victims of violent crime and property crime. Compensation orders (32%) were the most popular alternative for victims of property crime, and community service orders (35%) were the most popular alternative sentence for victims of violent crime. Only 4% of victims of violent crime thought a compensation order was a suitable sentencing alternative.
5 REPORTING CRIME AND SUPPORT FOR VICTIMS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter explores the advice and support available to victims of crime, including practical support from a range of organisations. The chapter also provides detail on whether crimes were reported to the police, examining reasons for not reporting and perceptions of how well the police handled the incident.

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.

Main Findings

Reporting crime to the police

- Just under two-fifths (39%) of crimes were reported to the police in 2012/13, the same reporting rate as in 2010/11.
- Almost half (48%) of violent crimes were reported to the police compared with 35% of property crime - housebreaking (64%) was the most likely to be reported.
- Nearly one-in-ten violent crimes (9%) went unreported to the police because the victim "dealt with the matter themselves" and 14% of violent crimes were unreported because the incident was considered a personal or family matter.
- Two-thirds of victims of crime (66%) were satisfied with the way the police handled the matter (compared to 59% in 2010/11).

Information or assistance about the investigation

- In 47% of all reported crimes, victims received information or assistance about the investigation from at least one source (e.g. police liaison officers, Victim Support Scotland, etc).

5.2 Reporting crime to the police

As Figure 5.1 shows, 39% of crimes were reported to the police in 2012/13, the same rate as in 2010/11.26

---

26 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 5.1: Percentage of survey incidents by crime type reported to the police
SCJS 2012/13

Base: All SCJS crime (2,290); Property crime (1,950); Vandalism (760); All motor vehicle theft (200); Housebreaking (130); Other household theft (inc. bicycle theft) (640); Personal theft (excl. robbery) (220); Violent crime (340)

Variable name: QPOL and incidence variables

Almost half (48%) of violent crimes were reported to the police compared with 35% of property crimes. The crime most likely to be reported was housebreaking (64%) whilst other household theft (including bicycle theft) was the crime least likely to be reported (25%).

5.2.1 What factors affect reporting?

Reporting crime to the police can be a requirement to allow an insurance claim to be made. This may explain why the reporting rate for crime where damaged or stolen property was insured was higher than where it was not insured (48% of crime where property was insured was reported compared with 29% of crime where property was not insured).

Where property was insured, the reporting rate for crime was higher where an insurance claim was made than for when no claim was made (92% compared with 35%).

---

27 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, INCPERSTHEFT, INCVIOLENT.
The reporting rate also appeared to be related to how the incident was perceived by the victim (Figure 5.2). The reporting rate for crime where the victim said they thought what had happened was a crime was 48%. 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 (18% and 19% respectively).

**Figure 5.2: Effect of perception of crime on reporting – percentage of SCJS crime reported to the police, by perceptions of the crime**

*SCJS 2012/13*

---

**Base:** All SCJS crime (3,000); All SCJS crime considered to be a crime (2,050); What happened was wrong but not a crime (520); What happened was just something that happens (400)  
**Variable name:** QPOL

### 5.2.2 Why crime was not reported

The police did not come to know about 60% (489,000) of SCJS incidents. If a crime was not reported to the police, victims were asked the reasons for this, i.e. multiple responses were possible from each respondent (Table 5.1). The most common reason for crime not being reported to the police was that the victim felt the police could have done nothing (37%). The second most common reason was that the incident was seen as too trivial and not worth reporting by the victim (36%), while 2% of victims did not report the incident because of a previous bad experience of the police or courts. It should be noted that for each incident several different reasons could have been taken.

In nine per cent of 489,000 incidents that were not known to the police, the matter was dealt with privately. In 59% of these incidents where the victim dealt with the matter themselves, the people involved were spoken to directly.
Nearly one quarter of violent crimes (23%) went unreported because the victim “dealt with the matter themselves” and 14% of violent crimes were unreported because the incident was considered a personal or family matter. This is in contrast to property crime where each of these reasons account for 5% of crime non-reporting. Victims were more likely to not report property crime because they viewed it too trivial, than were to not report violent crime for this reason (43% and 17% respectively).

Table 5.1: Most common reasons crime was not reported

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of SCJS crimes</th>
<th>Unreported property crime</th>
<th>Unreported violent crime</th>
<th>All unreported crime</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police could not have done anything about it</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incident was too trivial, not worth reporting</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police would not have been interested</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victims dealt with the matter themselves</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incident was considered a personal or family matter</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inconvenient / too much bother to report</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime was reported to other authorities or organisations</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of reprisals by offenders</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There was no loss or damage</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous bad experience of the police or courts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dislike / fear of the police</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Base: Unreported crime
Variable name: QPON*

5.2.3 Why crime was reported

Where the crime was reported to the police, victims were asked why it was reported (Table 5.2). The most common reason for reporting crime to the police was because the victim said that “all crime should be reported, right thing to do/ duty /automatic” (49%). This was also the case for reporting property crime (52%) and violent crime (42%). Compared with property crime, higher proportions of violent crime were reported to the police because the victim wanted to avoid repetition of crime for themself or someone else, and because the crime was serious or upsetting.

---

28 All other reasons were mentioned in one per cent or fewer incidents and are not shown in Table 5.1.
Table 5.2: Most common reasons crime was reported
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of SCJS crimes where the police were told by respondent / person in household / other person</th>
<th>Reported property crime</th>
<th>Reported violent crime</th>
<th>All reported crime</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All crimes should be reported / right thing to do / duty / automatic</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the hope that offenders would be caught / punished</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoped to avoid repetition of crime to someone else</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoped to avoid repetition of crime to oneself</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The crime was serious or upsetting</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needed a crime number for purposes of insurance claim</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the hope that property would be recovered</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To satisfy other authorities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needed assistance (e.g. to get home)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police witnessed the crime</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone else reported the crime</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: Crimes where the police were told by respondent / person in household / other person
Variable name: QPKR

5.2.4 Satisfaction with the police response

61% of victims said overall the police dealt with case fairly while 17% disagreed (and 9% neither agreed or disagreed and a further 9% said not applicable as they had no dealings with the police). Further to that, 81% of the victims agreed the police gave them an opportunity to fully explain what happened, while 6% disagreed. 49% of victims agreed that the police gave them an opportunity to express their view about how the case should be handled, while 20% disagreed. 71% of victims agreed that the police dealt with them in fairly, while 14% disagreed.

Victims were asked overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied they were with the way the police handled this matter, and in 66% of reported crime, victims were satisfied with the way the police handled the matter.

Victims of crime were more likely to be satisfied with the police response where they had face-to-face contact with the police. As shown in (Figure 5.3), in 70% of reported crime where the victim had face-to-face contact with the police, victims said they were satisfied with how the police handled the matter compared with 53% of reported crime where the victim did not have this contact.
5.3 Information or assistance about the investigation

Where the crime was reported to the police the SCJS 2012/13 also asked victims about the information or assistance received by them related to the investigation of the crime or, where applicable, the resulting case.

5.3.1 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 47% of all reported crimes, victims received information or assistance about the investigation from at least one source (Table 5.3). In a quarter of crimes (25%) no information or assistance was received and in 22% of crimes the case was not investigated.
Table 5.3: Whether information or assistance was received about the investigation (or case)  
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of SCJS crimes</th>
<th>Reported property crime</th>
<th>Reported violent crime</th>
<th>All reported crime</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any organisation</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Support Scotland / Witness Service</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurator Fiscal’s Office</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not receive any information</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The case was not investigated</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: Victims of crime  
Variable name: QINF  

For reported crime where information or assistance about the investigation was received, this was most commonly from the police (42%). In only a small proportion of reported crimes was information or assistance was received from Victim Support Scotland/Witness Service or the Procurator Fiscal’s Office (7% and 4% respectively), although this improved to 10% and 9% respectively for violent crimes.

Figure 5.4 shows the types of information or assistance provided by any police source (either a police liaison officer or other police sources). Where information or assistance about the investigation was received from the police, this was most often about the police investigation (56%), updates on whether the offender had been caught (23%), keeping victims informed about the case (20%), updates on the progress of the case (20%) and whether the offender had been charged (15%).
Figure 5.4: Information or assistance for victims about the investigation (or case) provided by the police
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Base: All SCJS crime where information or assistance received from the police (440)
Variable name: QINTY
6 PUBLIC PERCEPTIONS OF CRIME

6.1 Introduction

One of the key indicators in the Scottish Government’s national performance framework, ‘Scotland Performs’\(^{29}\) 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 and perceptions of the likelihood of being a victim of crimes. The chapter then 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. Finally it considers issues around harassment and discrimination and whether people feel worried.

Main Findings

Perceptions of crime

- Just over three-quarters (76%) of adults perceived the crime rate in their local area to have stayed the same or reduced in the past two years, whilst one-fifth (20%) thought it had increased.

- Almost three-quarters (72%) of adults said they felt very or fairly safe walking alone in their neighbourhood after dark, an increase of six percentage points from 66% in 2008/09 (a real statistically significant change).

Public anxiety about crime

- Over half (52%) of adults were worried that someone would use their credit / bank details to obtain money, goods or services, while 43% were worried about having their identity stolen.

Perceived versus actual risk of crime

\(^{29}\) Scottish Government website: [http://www.scotland.gov.uk/About/scotPerforms](http://www.scotland.gov.uk/About/scotPerforms)
Adults were more likely to think that they were likely to experience crime than they actually were; for example, 6 times as many adults thought that they were likely to have their home broken into than actually did have their home broken into (7% compared with the actual risk of housebreaking of 1.2%).

Harassment and discrimination

- 10% of adults said they had been insulted, pestered or intimidated in any way.
- Of those who had experienced some form of harassment in the last 12 months, 8% felt they were harassed because of their ethnic origin or race, whilst 5% felt it was because of their age or because of their gender or gender identity (or someone’s perception of that aspect).

6.2 Perceptions of crime

Scotland Performs measures and reports on the progress of government in Scotland in creating a more successful country. The SCJS is used to monitor the following national indicator:

‘Improve people’s perceptions about the crime rate in their area.’

This national indicator is measured by the percentage of adults who believe that crime has stayed the same or reduced in the past 2 years in their local area.30

6.2.1 Perceptions of changing local crime levels

The SCJS 2012/13 estimated that three quarters of adults (76%) 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 and on the 73% found in 2010-11. One in five adults (20%) thought that the crime rate in their area had increased over the last two years compared with 32% in 2006.

Examining changes between 2006, the baseline year for the national performance indicator, and 2012/13 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 (6% compared to 13% in 2006), and an increase in the percentage of adults who perceive that the level of crime had remained about the same (65% compared to 57% in 2006). This trend is a continuation of one that began to emerge in the 2003 and 2006 surveys31 (Figure 6.1) although it should be noted that the sample size was lower in the earlier surveys, for example around 4,400 in 2003.

---

30 The local area was defined as the area within 15 minutes walk of the respondent’s home.

31 Scottish Crime Survey
Figure 6.1: Perceptions of how crime rates have changed in respondents’ local area over the past two years

*Scottish crime surveys*

Table 6.1 shows the differences in perceptions of the crime rate in the local area between different groups of adults. Those who had been victims of crime were more negative in their views, with 30% saying there was a lot or a little more crime in their area (compared to 17% for those who had not been victims of crime).
Table 6.1: Public perceptions of crime in local area by various characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCJS 2012/13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of adults who had lived in local area for two years or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is ‘about the same’ or ‘less’ crime in this area than two years ago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is ‘a lot’ or ‘a little’ more crime in this area than two years ago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All</th>
<th>76</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>10,640</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-24</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-59</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 or over</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-24</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-59</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 or over</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim of crime</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living in rest of Scotland</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9,110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: Adults who have lived in the local area for two years or more
Variable name: QS2AREA

6.2.2 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. While 44% of respondents perceived that the crime rate in Scotland had increased, only 20% perceived that there had been any increase in their local area.

Correspondingly, 36% of adults perceived that that the crime rate in Scotland overall had stayed the same compared with 65% of adults who perceived that that the crime rate in their local area had stayed the same.
6.2.3 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 over two-fifths of adults believing them to be very or fairly common (44% and 41% respectively, each a decrease of four percentage points compared to 2010/11).
Figure 6.3: Perceptions of how common specific crimes are in local area
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![Bar chart showing perceptions of how common specific crimes are](image)

**Base:** Adults answering module A (3,020)

**Variable name:** QACO

### 6.2.4 Acting on perceptions

Figure 6.4 lists the type of behaviours that respondents said they had done or had in place in the last year to try to reduce the risk that they would become the victim of a crime. The most common behaviour was for people to be more careful about concealing valuables to make them less visible around their person, in their car or at home (27%).

Around a quarter of adults said they had either not left their home empty, or left a light on or on a timer (26%) or avoided certain areas or types of places (23%). A very small proportion said they either carried a personal alarm (2%) or carried a weapon or some means of defence (1%).
Figure 6.4: What adults have done or had in place in the last year to try to reduce the risk of being a victim of crime
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Base: Adults (3,020)
Variable name: QDONE

6.2.5 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 (Table 6.2). Across Scotland, the majority of adults (72%) said that they felt safe (very safe 38%; fairly safe 34%) while 27% of adults said they felt unsafe walking alone in their local area after dark (very unsafe 10%; a bit unsafe 17%). Females were more likely than males to report feeling unsafe (38% of females compared with 15% males).

In addition, the 72% of adults estimated to have felt safe walking alone after dark in 2012/13 represents an increase of six percentage points from 66% in 2008/09 (a real statistically significant change) and an increase of four percentage points from 68% in 2010/11 (also a real statistically significant change).
Table 6.2: Safety when walking alone after dark by age within gender
SCJS 2012/13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of adults</th>
<th>Very safe</th>
<th>Fairly safe</th>
<th>A bit unsafe</th>
<th>Very unsafe</th>
<th>Base</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-24</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-59</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 or over</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-59</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 or over</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2,470</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: Adults
Variable name: QSFARK

Adults were also asked how safe they felt in their home alone after dark (Table 6.3).

The majority said that they felt safe (95%), with 5% reporting feeling unsafe. Looking at differences by groups of adults, females were more likely to express feeling unsafe at home alone after dark than males (8% compared with 3% of males). The youngest females were most likely to report feeling unsafe at home alone after dark: 13% of females aged 16-24 with little difference between the older age groups.
Table 6.3: Safety when home alone after dark by age within gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very safe</th>
<th>Fairly safe</th>
<th>A bit unsafe</th>
<th>Very unsafe</th>
<th>Base</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>All</strong></td>
<td>73</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td>81</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-24</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-59</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 or over</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-24</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-59</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 or over</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,470</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: Adults
Variable name: QSFNIGH

6.3 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.

6.3.1 Worry about specific types of crime

Respondents were first asked how worried they were that a range of crimes might happen to them. Respondents were asked how worried they were about the crime happening not how worried they would be if the crime happened.

Figure 6.5 shows that over half of adults (52%) were worried that someone would use their credit / bank details to obtain money, goods or services whilst over two-fifths of adults (43%) were worried about having their identity stolen.

---

32 Respondents were asked how worried they were about the crime happening not how worried they would be if the crime happened.
6.3.2 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 6.6 fraudulent use of credit or bank details (14%), damage to vehicles (10%) and identity theft (9%) were the crimes that adults most commonly thought were likely to happen to them in the next 12 months. Over half (57%) of adults did not think it was likely that they would experience any of the listed crimes in the next 12 months.
3.64 Trends in public perceptions of crime

Three measures of public concern about crime in the SCJS 2012/13 have also been included in past surveys, allowing analysis of the following trends:

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

As discussed in Chapter 1, there was a shift in the public's perception of the crime rate in the local area. Between the 2006 and 2012/13 surveys, an increasing proportion of adults thought that the crime rate in their area had remained at 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.
6.4.1 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.

**Figure 6.7: Percentage of adults who believe particular crimes are ‘very’ or ‘fairly common’ in their local area**

*Scottish crime surveys*

Base: SCS 1993 (2,520); 1996 (2,510); 2000 (2,540); 2003 (2,530); SCVS 2006 (2,510); SCJS 2008/09 (4,030); 2009/10 (4,000); 2010/11 (3,220); 2012/13 (3,020)

Variable name: QACO

Note: There was a break in the survey methodology from 2008/09, moving to a rolling reference period, increased sample size and continuous fieldwork until a move to a biennial design for 2012/13 Note: ‘Deliberate damage to property/vehicles’ was split in 2012/13 to consider separately ‘Deliberate damage to cars or other vehicles’ and ‘Deliberate damage to peoples home by vandals’

In 2012/13 adults perceived most of these particular crimes to be less common in their local area than in the past. Figure 6.7 shows trends since the 1993 and 1996 surveys, including four crimes which were first asked about in 2006 (anti-social 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 2012/13 estimated that around one in five adults thought that these crimes were common (both 20%).
Since the last survey in 2010/11, the perception of how common each of the crime types are have either remained stable or decreased. The biggest change was a decrease in the perceived commonness of people having their car or vehicles stolen (from 14% in 2010/11 to 8% in 2012/13).

6.4.2 Worry about crimes happening over time

In addition to being asked for their perceptions of how common crimes were respondents were also asked how worried they were that specific crimes would happen to them. Similar to perceptions of how common crimes are, there has been a broadly steady decrease in the proportion of adults worrying that most crimes might happen to them (Figure 6.8).

Since 2000, the largest decrease was for women worrying about being sexually assaulted (a 20 percentage point decrease since 2000 from 41% to 21% in 2012/13).

Large decreases were also shown for adults worrying about having their home damaged by vandals (a 16 percentage point decrease since 2000 from 37% to 21% in 2012/13) and adults worrying about having their home broken into (a 13 percentage point decrease since 2000 from 45% to 32% in 2012/13).

Figure 6.8: Percentage of respondents ‘very’ or ‘fairly worried’ about particular crimes
Scottish crime surveys
Furthermore adults were asked if they worry about crimes to the extent it prevented them from doing things they would otherwise do. 60% of adults said they did not worry to that extent, while just under 30% worried a little and 10% worried quite a lot or great deal.

6.5 Perceived and actual risk of crimes

Adults’ perceptions of how likely they are to be the victims of some types of crime can be compared with their actual risk, as measured by the prevalence of crime, calculated from the victimisation rates derived from this survey.

In most cases the perceived risk was around two or three times higher than the actual risk (prevalence) on average across the population (Figure 6.9). For example, 10% 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 4.1%.

For some crimes the difference between perceived and actual risk was much larger, for example:

- Adults were 20 times more likely to think that they were likely to be mugged or robbed in the street than they actually were (4% compared with the actual risk of robbery of 0.2%);
- 20 times as many adults thought they were likely to have a motor vehicle stolen than were actually likely to experience this (4% compared with the actual risk of theft of a motor vehicle of 0.2%);
- 6 times as many adults thought that they were likely to have their home broken into than actually did have their home broken into (7% compared with the actual risk of housebreaking of 1.2%).

---

33 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 6.9: Perceived risk versus actual risk of being victim of a crime

Base: Adults (12,050)
Variable name: QHAPP and prevalence variables

The risk of being a victim of card or identity fraud was identified through a separate section from the victim form. Comparing results of the actual risk with the perceived risk it can be seen that over three times as many adults thought that they were likely to become a victim of card fraud than were actually likely to experience this fraud (14% thought this likely to happen compared with the actual risk of 4.5%). Twenty times as many adults thought they were likely to become a victim of identity fraud than were likely to experience this (9% thought this likely to happen compared with the actual risk of 0.5%).

6.6 Harassment and discrimination

A series of questions on harassment were asked of the respondents about any incidents in which they may have been insulted, pestered or intimidated in any way. This was clarified as being undertaken by anybody who is not a member of their household, either in person or by some other means (such as in writing or through electronic communications).

10% of adults said they had been harassed in some way (Table 6.4). There was a marked relationship with age – the proportion of adults saying they had been

---

34 Prevalence variables (listed based on Figure 1.10 top to bottom) are in the Respondent File SPSS: PREVMOTOVVAND, PREVHOUSEBREAK, PREVASSAULT, PREVROB, PREVPROPVAND, PREVTHEFTFROMMV, PREVTHEFTOFMV

35 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.
harassed in the previous 12 months decreasing from 16% for those aged 16-24 down to 3% for those aged 60 and over. Of those who had been harassed, the vast majority (81%) of adults said this was through verbal abuse directed towards them, whilst around a third (34%) said it included threats of violence.

Table 6.4: Whether had been insulted, pestered or intimidated in any way by anybody who is not a member of the household in the last 12 months

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adults</th>
<th>16-24</th>
<th>25-44</th>
<th>45-59</th>
<th>60+</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes (in person or by some other means)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal abuse</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threats of physical violence</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Something being thrown</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being pushed</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being obstructed</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other forms of physical violence</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism to their property</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being stalked by someone</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All adults
Variable name: QAINSUL and QHWHAT2

Of those who had experienced some form of harassment in the last 12 months, around three-quarters (76%) were unable to say if this was due to any particular reason (as shown in Table 6.5), 8% felt it was because of their ethnic origin or race, whilst 5% felt it was because of their age or because of their gender or gender identity. This latter issue was particularly more pronounced amongst females, where 9% said they were harassed because of their gender.

Table 6.5: What incidents of insults, pestering or intimidation may have been motivated by

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adults who had been insulted, pestered or intimidated in last 12 months</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>16-24</th>
<th>25-44</th>
<th>45-59</th>
<th>60+</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic origin / Race</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sectarianism</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender / Gender identity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability / Condition</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual orientation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of those above</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: Adults who had been insulted, pestered or intimidated in last 12 months
Variable name: QHDISCRIM2

A very small proportion of adults were actually worried about personally being insulted, pestered or intimidated for any reason, with 3% saying they were worried
for ethnicity/race or sectarianism reasons (Table 6.6). This level of worry appears to decrease with age across most of the categories, in particular amongst those being worried about being harassed for sectarianism reasons (from 5% for those aged 16-24, down to 1% for those aged 60 and over).

Table 6.6: Proportion worried about being insulted, pestered or intimidated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCJS 2012/13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adults very or fairly worried</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic origin / Race</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sectarianism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender / Gender identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability / Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Base:** All adults

**Variable name:** QHWORR
7 THE PUBLIC AND THE POLICE

7.1 Introduction

Chapter 5 provided information on victims and the police in the context of reporting crimes and the support given specifically to victims. This chapter explores, perceptions of the level of police presence in local areas, confidence in the police in relation to specific aspects of policing and attitudes to local policing irrespective of whether they have been a victim of crime.

Main Findings

Confidence in the police

- 73% 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 (68%);
  - Solve crimes (64%);
  - Respond quickly to appropriate calls and information (66%);
  - Catch criminals (61%); and,
  - prevent crime (56%).
- The changes in respondents' confidence levels between the 2008-09 and 2012-13 surveys are positive and statistically significant across all six of these statements on aspects of confidence in the police.

Attitudes to the police in the local area

- Most adults (86%) agreed that local police would treat them with respect if they had a reason to contact them, whilst two-thirds (66%) agreed that the local police can be relied upon to be there when needed.

Police presence in the local area

- Over half (56%) of respondents reported that the police patrolled their area regularly, with just over one-fifth (21%) being aware of the police patrolling on foot.
- Over half (55%) of adults living in the 15% most deprived areas said they thought the police presence was not enough in their local area, compared with 45% of those living in the rest of Scotland.
7.2 Confidence in the police

The survey measured public perceptions of confidence in the ability of police in local areas on specific aspects of their work. This focus reflects one of the aims of the Police and Fire Reform (Scotland) Act 2012, and will provide pre-reform baseline results to support future assessment of the change, which saw the eight legacy Scottish police forces reform to create the Police Service of Scotland, on 1 April 2013.\textsuperscript{36}

Respondents, regardless of whether they had ever been in contact with the police, were asked for their overall opinion on how the police were performing in their local area; 61% thought the police were doing a good or excellent job in their area, while 29% thought they were doing a fair job and 8% thought the police were doing a poor or very poor job in their area.

Respondents were asked how confident they were in the ability of the police in their local area to undertake specific aspects of police work. This is a change from previous years where the focus was on the “local police force’s” ability.

**Figure 7.1: Confidence in police in the local areas ability to undertake specific aspects of work**

*SCJS 2012/13*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Very / fairly Confident</th>
<th>Not very / not at all confident</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investigate incidents after they occur</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deal with incidents as they occur</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respond quickly to appropriate calls and information from the public</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solve crimes</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catch criminals</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevent crime</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Base: Adults (12,050)*

*Variable name: QPOLCONF*

When considering confidence in the police in local areas ability to do specific elements of their job (Figure 7.1), a greater percentage of adults had confidence

\textsuperscript{36} \url{http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/Justice/public-safety/Police/ConsultationFuturePolicin}
than did not have confidence in all of the six aspects. In particular, just under three quarters (73%) of adults said they were very or fairly confident in their ability to investigate incidents after they occur, while 56% were confident that police in their local area could prevent crime.

Compared with the previous survey year (2010/11), there was a small increase in the public’s confidence in the police in the local area across all aspects (Table 7.1), however it should be noted that changes in the proportions confident in local police catching criminals and solving crimes is not statistically significant. The change in respondents’ confidence in the other four statements (between 2012-13 and 2010-11) is statistically significant.

While analysis of results between adjacent survey sweeps may not identify statistically significant changes in results, analysis of trends over the longer term can sometimes smooth out shorter term (and often not statistically significant) variation and enables an assessment to be made of the longer term trends. In this case, the changes in respondents confidence levels between the 2008-09 and 2012-13 surveys are positive and statistically significant, across all six statements on aspects of their confidence in the police.

Table 7.1: Changes in confidence in local police force’s ability to undertake specific aspects of work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of adults (Very/Fairly confident)</th>
<th>2008/09</th>
<th>2009/10</th>
<th>2010/11</th>
<th>2012/13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investigate incidents after they occur</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deal with incidents as they occur</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respond quickly to appropriate calls and information from the public</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solve crimes</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catch criminals</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevent crime</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>16,040</td>
<td>13,010</td>
<td>12,050</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.3 Attitudes to the police in the local area

To explore attitudes to the police, respondents were asked whether they agreed or disagreed with a series of statements about 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.\(^{37}\)

Figure 7.2 shows that most adults (86%) agreed that local police would treat them with respect if they had reason to contact them, whilst around two-thirds agreed that

---

\(^{37}\) 470 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. This is an increase from the previous sweep as the question is now asked of the full sample.
the local police can be relied upon to be there when needed (66%). 44% adults disagreed that community relations with the police in the local area were poor.

**Figure 7.2: Level of agreement with statements about the police in the local area**

**Base: All respondents who are not in the police and no police officer in household (11,520)**

**Variable name: POLOP**

For most of these statements, the percentage of respondents saying that they neither agreed nor disagreed, or that they did not know, were relatively high. For example, 24% neither agreed nor disagreed that they were not dealing with the things that mattered in the local community and 11% said they did not know whether they did or not, which may suggest that respondents did not have enough knowledge to provide an informed opinion on this aspect of local policing.

There were differences in attitudes to the local police between those living in the 15% most deprived areas and those living in the rest of Scotland for some statements, with those living in more deprived areas providing less positive responses overall (Figure 7.3)\(^{38}\) For example, 36% 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 51% of those living elsewhere.

In addition, higher proportions of those in the 15% most deprived areas agreed that that community relations were poor with the police in their local area (37% compared with 19% of those living in the rest of Scotland), and that the local police

---

\(^{38}\) As measured by the 2012 Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation (SIMD):

[http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/Statistics/SiMD](http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/Statistics/SiMD)
were not dealing with the things that mattered to people in their community (33% compared with 23% of those in the rest of Scotland).

Figure 7.3: Agreement with statements about the police in the local area by area deprivation
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>15% most deprived</th>
<th>Rest of Scotland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police in this area would treat you with respect if you had contact with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>them for any reason</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police in this area can be relied on to be there when you need them</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The police in this area treat everyone fairly regardless of who they are</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The police in this area listen to the concerns of local people</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community relations with the police in this local area are poor</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, people have a lot of confidence in the police in this area</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police in this area are not dealing with the things that matter to people in this community</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of adults who are not in the police and no police officer in household (Strongly/Tend to agree)

Base: All respondents who are not in the police and no police officer in household (11,520)
Variable name: POLOP

7.4 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.

7.4.1 Awareness of local police patrolling local areas

Respondents were asked whether, as far as they knew, police patrolled their local area regularly (Table 7.). Over half (56%) reported that the police did patrol their area regularly. When this was broken down by mode of patrolling, just less than half (48%) said they were aware of police patrolling by car and just over one-fifth (21%) said they were aware of police patrolling on foot. 37% of respondents said the police did not patrol their local area regularly, while 7% did not know whether the police patrolled their local area regularly or not.

Of those who were aware of police patrolling their local area on foot or by bicycle, a high proportion had seen them doing this in the last four weeks (83%). This included
12% who had seen this happening daily, 22% every couple of days and 21% once a week.

### Table 7.2: Awareness of local police patrolling practices
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of adults not in the police and not married to or living with a police officer</th>
<th>15% most deprived</th>
<th>Rest of Scotland</th>
<th>Scotland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On foot</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By bicycle</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By car</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Base:** All respondents not in the police and not married to or living with a police officer

**Variables:** POLPATR

Note: SIMD 2012 classification

Awareness of police patrolling the local area was higher among those living in the 15% most deprived areas of Scotland (66%) than among those living in the rest of Scotland (54%). This result was consistent regardless of whether awareness was of police patrolling by car, on foot or by bicycle. For example, 56% of those living in the 15% most deprived areas were aware of police patrolling by car compared with 47% of those living in the rest of Scotland.

### 7.4.2 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 (Table 7.). There was a roughly equal split between those that thought it was about right (49%) and those that thought it was not enough (46%), with around 1% saying the police presence was too much.
Table 7.3: Perception of police presence in local area
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception of adults not in the police and not married to or living with a police officer</th>
<th>15% most deprived</th>
<th>Rest of Scotland</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Scotland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not enough</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About right</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too much</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>1,710</td>
<td>9,810</td>
<td>9,010</td>
<td>2,510</td>
<td>11,520</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All respondents not in the police and not married to or living with a police officer
Variables: POLPRES
Note: SIMD 2012 classification; Urban Rural 2011-12 classification

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. Over half (55%) of adults living in the 15% most deprived areas said they thought the police presence was not enough in their local area, compared with 45% of those living in the rest of Scotland, while 49% of those living in urban areas thought there was not enough police presence in their local area, compared to 37% of those living in rural areas.

7.4.3 Importance of a community police officer in the local area

Respondents were also asked how important it was to them that there are local police officers who knows and patrols their local area. Over nine-in-ten (92%) said it was important to them (65% said it was very important; 27% said it was fairly important), while 7% said it was not important.
8 SCOTTISH JUSTICE SYSTEM AND ORGANISATIONS

8.1 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.

In particular, the chapter focuses on confidence in the criminal justice system and attitudes to community sentencing. Expanding to the wider justice system, it ends by investigating experiences of civil law problems as well as where people may have sought information, advice or other help.

Main Findings

The Scottish criminal justice system

- Most adults said they did not know a lot about the criminal justice system. Around three-fifths of adults (61%) said they did not know very much about the criminal justice system and 15% said they knew nothing at all.

- Just 3% said they knew a lot about the criminal justice system and 21% said they knew a fair amount.

- 74% of respondents thought that the criminal justice system treats those accused of crime as innocent until proven guilty.

- The changes in respondents’ confidence levels between the 2008-09 and 2012-13 surveys are positive and statistically significant, across all of the six comparable statements on aspects of their confidence in the justice system:
  - Makes sure everyone has access to the legal system if they need it (up from 70% in 2008/09 to 76% in 2012/13)
  - Makes sure the system doesn't treat you differently depending on where you live in Scotland (up from 54% in 2008/09 to 64% in 2012/13)
  - Is effective at bringing people who commit crime to justice (up from 53% in 2008/09 to 57% in 2012/13)
  - Deals with cases promptly and efficiently (up from 35% in 2008/09 to 43% in 2012/13)
- Provides victims of crime with the services and support they need (up from 38% in 2008/09 to 52% in 2012/13)
- Provides witnesses with the services and support they need (up from 43% in 2008/09 to 55% in 2012/13)

**Community sentencing**

- Two-thirds of adults (66%) either strongly or slightly agreed that community sentencing is an effective way of dealing with less serious crime.
- Three-fifths (60%) of respondents felt that community sentences do not discourage people from offending, although 48% agreed that learning new skills during community sentences stops low level offenders from committing more crimes.

**Civil law**

- Almost one in four (23%) adults had experienced at least one of the civil law problems asked about in the last three years.
- Fourteen per cent of adults had experienced problems with home, family or living arrangements and just 8% had experienced problems with money, finance or things they had paid for.

### 8.2 The Scottish criminal justice system

The survey collects 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.

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, and then carrying out that sentence.

#### 8.2.1 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.

Overall, most adults said they did not know a lot about the criminal justice system: just 3% said they knew a lot and 21% said they knew a fair amount. Around three-fifths of adults (61%) said they did not know very much and 15% said they knew nothing at all.
8.2.2 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 12 key areas (Figure 8.1).

Around three quarters of adults were either very or fairly confident that the system allows all those accused of crimes to get a fair trial (77%) or makes sure everyone has access to the criminal justice system if they need it (76%) or thought that it treats those accused of crime as innocent until proven guilty (74%). Under three-fifths of adults (57%) thought it was effective in bringing people who commit crime to justice whilst around a third (32%) were confident that it gives punishments that fit the crime.
Victims and non-victims tended to have fairly similar views, although victims were marginally less confident than non-victims across a range of these statements.

Differences in the results between 2010/11 and 2012/13 are shown in Table 8.1. While 12 statements were posed to respondents in 2012/13, Table 8.1 reports only on the 6 statements also posed to respondents in previous surveys (also, see Table 8.1, note 1 regarding changes in the statements on victims and witnesses).

Compared with the previous survey year, in 2012-13 there was a small increase in the public’s confidence in the justice system across all aspects presented in Table 8.1, however it should be noted that changes in the proportions confident that the justice system brings people who commit crime to justice and that the justice system deals with cases promptly and efficiently is not statistically significant. The change in respondents’ confidence in the other four statements (between 2012-13 and 2010-11) is statistically significant.

It should be noted that while analysis of results between adjacent survey sweeps may not identify statistically significant changes in results, analysis in trends over the longer term can sometimes smooth out shorter term (and often not statistically significant) variation and enables an assessment to be made of the longer term trends. In this case, the changes in respondents’ confidence levels between the
2008-09 and 2012-13 surveys are positive and statistically significant, across all of the six statements on aspects of their confidence in the justice system, for which it is possible to compare (see Table 8.1, note 1).

Table 8.1: Confidence with different aspects of delivery of justice system – comparison over time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Makes sure everyone has access to the legal system if they need it</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes sure the system doesn't treat you differently depending on where you live in Scotland</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is effective at bringing people who commit crime to justice</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deals with cases promptly and efficiently</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides victims of crime with the services and support they need</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides witnesses with the services and support they need</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variable name: QDCONF

Note 1 – the statements on victims and witnesses were updated in 2012-13. In previous surveys they read ‘Provides a good standard of service for victims of crime?’ and ‘Provides a good standard of service for witnesses?’

8.2.3 Contact with courts

Just under one-in-five adults (18%) had attended court or had contact with the courts in the last three years. Of those, around a quarter (24%) was due to having been called for jury service but not subsequently selected – 16% was actually for jury service as part of the jury.
Table 8.2: Proportion of adults had had contact with courts in last 3 years and in what capacity
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of adults who had contact with courts in last 3 years</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While doing jury service called but not selected</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a witness in a criminal case</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While doing jury service as part of jury</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As an accused in a criminal case</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For other work or professional reasons (e.g. police or social workers)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To support someone else attending court</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a victim in a criminal case</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a pursuer in a civil case</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a defender in a civil case</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a witness in a civil case</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting a fines office or other public counter</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a member of the legal profession</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a spectator or tourist</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No 82 79 85

Base: All adults (12,050); All adults who had contact with courts in the last 3 years (1,990)

Variables: QCRT; QCRTHOW

8.3 Prisons and sentences

Respondents were asked whether they agreed or disagreed with a series of attitudinal statements about the effectiveness of prisons in Scotland for punishing, rehabilitating, deterring people and protecting the public from crime community sentences (Table 8.2).

Forty-three per cent of adults are confident prisons are effective at punishing offenders once convicted of a crime, while over half (53%) of adults are not confident. One quarter (25%) of adults are confident prisons are effective at rehabilitating offenders who have been convicted of crime, while 68% are not confident. Over one quarter (28%) of adults are confident prisons are effective at deterring people from offending, while 68% are not confident. Over two thirds (68%) of adults are confident prisons are effective at protecting the public from crime, while 29% are not confident.
Table 8.3 Public perception of prison effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of adults</th>
<th>Very confident</th>
<th>Fairly confident</th>
<th>Not very confident</th>
<th>Not at all confident</th>
<th>Refused</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prisons are effective at punishing offenders who have been convicted of a crime</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prisons are effective at rehabilitating offenders who have been convicted of a crime</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prisons are effective at deterring people from offending</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prisons are effective at protecting the public from crime</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Base: Adults (3,010)*

*Variable name: QPRIS_01, QPRIS_02, QPRIS_03, QPRIS_04*

**8.3.1 Community Payback Orders**

Respondents were asked about community payback orders, a new type of community sentence designed to punish offenders in a way that pays the community while making offenders address and change their behaviour. 30% of adults had heard of community payback orders before undertaking this survey, while 18% of adults were aware that community payback orders were being used in their local area to punish offenders. The most common ways respondents came to know about community pay orders was by word of mouth (36%), newspaper and websites (22%) and witnessing work being carried out (20%).

Respondents were asked whether they agreed or disagreed with a series of attitudinal statements about community sentences (Figure 8.2). Two-thirds of adults (66%) either strongly or slightly agreed that community sentencing is an effective way of dealing with less serious crime. Whilst 60% felt that community sentences do not discourage people from offending, almost half (48%) agreed that learning new skills during community sentences stops low level offenders from committing more crimes.
Community sentencing is an effective way of dealing with low level non-violent crime
Community sentences do not discourage people from offending
Low level offenders who complete their community sentences have paid back their community for the harm caused
Community sentences do not punish low level offences
Learning new skills during community sentences stops low level offenders from committing more crimes

Base: Adults (12,050)
Variable name: QDISATT

8.3.2 Sentences

18% of the adult population had been previously convicted of a crime (including motor vehicle offences), with men around three times more likely to have been convicted than women.

Of the adults that have been previously convicted the most common sentence experienced was a fine or financial penalty (71%) followed by penalty points (66%), while 7% of convicted adults received a community sentence and 5% received a custodial sentence.

8.4 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)\(^{39}\) 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 set out in Scotland Performs\(^{40}\). More specifically, helping to resolve people’s civil problems will help take forward the recommendation from the tackling poverty framework, Achieving our Potential\(^{41}\) 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\(^{42}\).

Respondents were asked if, over the previous three years, they had experienced any of 16 named problems or disputes. They were then asked whether they attempted to solve them, if they used help or advice in that process and if so from whom. 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 and the extent of unsolved civil law problems.

Further analysis of the answers to civil law questions will be published as part of a separate publication in due course.

**8.4.1 Experience of civil law problems**

Respondents were asked about their experiences of problems in different areas 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 one in four (23%) adults had experienced at least one of the civil law problems asked about in the last three years. Figure 8.3 shows that 14% of adults had experienced problems with home, family or living arrangements and 8% had experienced problems with money, finance or things they had paid for.

---

39 '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).

40 Scottish Government website: [http://www.scotland.gov.uk/About/scotPerforms/outcomes](http://www.scotland.gov.uk/About/scotPerforms/outcomes)


Table 8.4 shows the individual problems adults had experienced. The most common single problem was with neighbours, which 9% had experienced, whilst 3% of adults had either experienced problems with faulty goods or services money or debt problems.

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). Less than half (46%) had solved the problem whilst just over a third (34%) were still trying to solve the problem. Around one-in-ten had tried to solve the problem but had to give up (9%) or were not planning to do anything to solve the problem (8%).
Table 8.4: Experience of civil law problems
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of adults</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any civil law problem</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any problems with home or family living arrangements</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems to do with neighbours</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems to do with child contact, residence or maintenance</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems to do with housing</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems to do with the behaviour of a partner, ex-partner or other person who is harassing you</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other problems to do with divorce or separation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems to do with the education of your children</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration problems</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any problems with your health and well-being</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems with injury because of an accident</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems to do with medical negligence</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems with issues surrounding mental health difficulties</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any problems with money, finances or anything paid for</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems to do with money and debt, for example being owed</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit problems</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems with faulty goods or services</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any problems with someone treating you unfairly</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems with discrimination</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems with unfair treatment by the police</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems to do with employment, other than finding work</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: Adults (6,020)
Variable name: CVJUS1-4

8.4.2 Support and help

Of those who had experienced a problem, a series of follow-up questions were asked on whether they sought information, advice or other help from Citizens Advice Bureau (or similar advice organisation) or from a solicitor or lawyer to try and solve the problem. This was in relation to the most important, or only, problem identified.

Under one-in-five had contacted, or planned to contact, either a Citizens Advice Bureau (or similar advice organisation) (18%) or a solicitor or lawyer (17%). Of those who had not either contacted or planned to contact a Citizens Advice Bureau (or similar advice organisation), around a third (34%) felt able to deal with the problem without their help and just under three-in-ten (28%) didn’t think they could
do anything to help anyway. Fourteen per cent did not know that they deal the sort of problem experienced.

Similar patterns were seen for those who had not either contacted or planned to contact a solicitor or lawyer: 30% felt able to deal with the problem without their help and 19% didn’t think they could do anything to help. Additional information was asked about solicitors or lawyers which showed that 17% of adults didn’t think the problem was serious enough and 16% were worried about the cost or didn’t want to pay the cost.

Table 8.5: Percentage of adults who sought or were planning to seek information, advice or other help

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of adults who identified the most important civil law problem</th>
<th>Citizens Advice Bureau or similar advice organisation</th>
<th>A solicitor or lawyer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didn’t think that the problem was serious enough</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worried about the cost / didn’t want to pay</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felt able to deal with the problem without their help</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haven’t got round to it yet</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didn’t know how to find one</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didn’t know they dealt with this sort of problem</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There wasn’t one I could easily get to</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heard they weren’t very good locally</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embarrassed / nervous / anxious about talking about the problem</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didn’t know how to describe the problem</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didn’t think they could do anything to help</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>1,350</td>
<td>1,350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: Adults who identified the most important civil law problem

Variable names: CVJUSSK; CVJUSCAB; CVJUSLAW
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 (e.g. to Table A 1.5) 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 (which will be available from the UK Data Service), variable names which correspond to the crime groups displayed in the data tables are provided in Annex 3.

**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. Just under two-thirds (65%) of crime was

---

43 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, 2008/09 and 2010/11 reports but differs from the definition used in previous reports.

44 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
classed as comparable with police recorded crime statistics (Section 2.4). Further details about police recorded crime statistics are included in Annex 5.

Notes

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

2. For Table A 1.3 and Table A 1.4 (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. This is used in the following tables to reflect the change from 2008-09 onwards, to reporting on high-level property and violent crime groups, rather than household and personal crimes, which were reported on in 2005-06 and earlier years.

---

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).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated 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>814,636</td>
<td>762,342</td>
<td>866,928</td>
<td>52,293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROPERTY CRIME</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>578,698</td>
<td>542,113</td>
<td>615,283</td>
<td>36,585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor vehicle vandalism</td>
<td>219,009</td>
<td>198,923</td>
<td>239,095</td>
<td>20,086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property vandalism</td>
<td>128,639</td>
<td>114,666</td>
<td>142,612</td>
<td>13,973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All motor vehicle theft related incidents</td>
<td>49,669</td>
<td>41,395</td>
<td>57,943</td>
<td>8,274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft of a motor vehicle</td>
<td>3,986</td>
<td>2,159</td>
<td>5,812</td>
<td>1,826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft from a motor vehicle</td>
<td>39,972</td>
<td>32,365</td>
<td>47,580</td>
<td>7,608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempted theft of / from motor vehicle</td>
<td>5,711</td>
<td>3,045</td>
<td>8,377</td>
<td>2,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housebreaking</td>
<td>34,745</td>
<td>27,661</td>
<td>41,830</td>
<td>7,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other household thefts inc. bicycle theft</td>
<td>168,887</td>
<td>152,293</td>
<td>185,461</td>
<td>16,594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other household theft</td>
<td>135,103</td>
<td>120,029</td>
<td>150,177</td>
<td>15,074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle theft</td>
<td>33,784</td>
<td>27,097</td>
<td>40,471</td>
<td>6,687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal theft excluding robbery</td>
<td>106,388</td>
<td>88,828</td>
<td>123,948</td>
<td>17,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft from the person</td>
<td>26,331</td>
<td>18,292</td>
<td>34,370</td>
<td>8,039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other personal theft</td>
<td>80,057</td>
<td>64,581</td>
<td>95,533</td>
<td>15,476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VIOLENT CRIME</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>235,937</td>
<td>196,399</td>
<td>275,476</td>
<td>39,539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious assault</td>
<td>224,587</td>
<td>185,471</td>
<td>263,703</td>
<td>39,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>11,350</td>
<td>6,073</td>
<td>16,626</td>
<td>5,277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMPARABLE CRIME</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>219,009</td>
<td>198,923</td>
<td>239,095</td>
<td>20,086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisitive crime</td>
<td>72,515</td>
<td>62,551</td>
<td>82,480</td>
<td>9,964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent crime</td>
<td>235,937</td>
<td>196,399</td>
<td>275,476</td>
<td>39,539</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table A 1.2: Estimates of the extent of crime in Scotland by year

**Scottish crime surveys**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<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>1,055,466</td>
<td>967,852</td>
<td>839,538</td>
<td>1,093,725</td>
<td>1,004,327</td>
<td>1,044,809</td>
<td>945,419</td>
<td>874,142</td>
<td>814,636</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>PROPERTY CRIME</strong></th>
<th>n/a</th>
<th>n/a</th>
<th>n/a</th>
<th>n/a</th>
<th>n/a</th>
<th>n/a</th>
<th>728,219</th>
<th>679,301</th>
<th>654,007</th>
<th>578,698</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vandalism</strong></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>
<td>275,387</td>
<td>219,009</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>
<td>145,873</td>
<td>128,639</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>
<td>129,514</td>
<td>90,370</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>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</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>
<td>4,017</td>
<td>3,986</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>46,822</td>
<td>47,278</td>
<td>39,972</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>
<td>6,520</td>
<td>5,711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housebreaking</strong></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>
<td>28,144</td>
<td>34,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other household thefts inc. bicycle theft</strong></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>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</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>142,108</td>
<td>126,592</td>
<td>140,521</td>
<td>135,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle theft</td>
<td>25,961</td>
<td>25,164</td>
<td>17,836</td>
<td>28,909</td>
<td>2,148</td>
<td>21,590</td>
<td>30,749</td>
<td>26,502</td>
<td>28,590</td>
<td>33,784</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>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</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>
<td>31,236</td>
<td>26,331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other personal theft</td>
<td>111,265</td>
<td>111,196</td>
<td>93,695</td>
<td>104,559</td>
<td>123,785</td>
<td>125,328</td>
<td>89,898</td>
<td>101,105</td>
<td>92,315</td>
<td>80,057</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>VIOLENT CRIME</strong></th>
<th>167,792</th>
<th>158,924</th>
<th>210,742</th>
<th>239,891</th>
<th>228,394</th>
<th>272,847</th>
<th>316,590</th>
<th>266,119</th>
<th>220,136</th>
<th>235,937</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assault</strong></td>
<td>155,004</td>
<td>141,618</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>
<td>208,109</td>
<td>224,587</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>19,809</td>
<td>16,240</td>
<td>18,070</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>
<td>12,027</td>
<td>11,350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>COMPARABLE CRIME</strong></th>
<th>n/a</th>
<th>n/a</th>
<th>n/a</th>
<th>n/a</th>
<th>n/a</th>
<th>n/a</th>
<th>n/a</th>
<th>n/a</th>
<th>n/a</th>
<th>n/a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>
<td>275,387</td>
<td>219,009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisitive crime</td>
<td>226,919</td>
<td>148,657</td>
<td>141,522</td>
<td>135,963</td>
<td>97,748</td>
<td>77,058</td>
<td>63,657</td>
<td>61,322</td>
<td>60,751</td>
<td>72,515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent crime</td>
<td>167,792</td>
<td>158,924</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>
<td>220,136</td>
<td>235,937</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Base (All)**         | 5,030 | 5,050 | 5,060 | 5,040 | 5,030 | 5,050 | 5,040 | 5,000 | 5,000 | 12,050 |
Table A.3: Rates of crime in Scotland, per 10,000 households / individuals
SCJS 2012/13 (Base: 12,050)

<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>2,783</td>
<td>2,604</td>
<td>2,962</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROPERTY CRIME</strong></td>
<td>1,977</td>
<td>1,852</td>
<td>2,102</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>1,010</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor vehicle vandalism</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property vandalism</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All motor vehicle theft related incidents</strong></td>
<td>210</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft of a motor vehicle</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft from a motor vehicle</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempted theft of / from motor vehicle</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housebreaking</strong></td>
<td>147</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other household thefts inc. bicycle theft</strong></td>
<td>713</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other household theft</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle theft</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal theft excluding robbery</strong></td>
<td>245</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft from the person</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other personal theft</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VIOLENT CRIME</strong></td>
<td>543</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious assault</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMPARABLE CRIME</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>1,010</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisitive crime</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent crime</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table A 1.4: Rates of crime in Scotland, per 10,000 households / individuals by year

**Scottish crime surveys**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<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>n/a</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>3,048</td>
<td>2,763</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>
<td></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>
<td>1,168</td>
<td>925</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>
<td>619</td>
<td>543</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>
<td>549</td>
<td>382</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>n/a</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>210</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>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</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>
<td>201</td>
<td>169</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>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</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>
<td>119</td>
<td>147</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>n/a</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>717</td>
<td>713</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>
<td>596</td>
<td>571</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>
<td>121</td>
<td>143</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>258</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>245</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>
<td>73</td>
<td>61</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>
<td>214</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VIOLENT CRIME</strong></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>
<td>511</td>
<td>543</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>
<td>483</td>
<td>517</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>
<td>38</td>
<td>42</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>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMPARABLE CRIME</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>
<td>1,168</td>
<td>925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisitive crime</td>
<td>1,113</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>306</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>
<td>511</td>
<td>543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Base (All)</strong></td>
<td>5,030</td>
<td>5,050</td>
<td>5,060</td>
<td>5,040</td>
<td>3,030</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>16,040</td>
<td>13,010</td>
<td>12,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALL SCJS CRIME</strong></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>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPERTY CRIME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor vehicle vandalism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property vandalism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All motor vehicle theft related incidents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft of a motor vehicle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft from a motor vehicle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempted theft of / from motor vehicle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other household thefts inc. bicycle theft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other household theft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle theft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal theft excluding robbery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft from the person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other personal theft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIOLENT CRIME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.9</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>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base (All)</td>
<td>5,030</td>
<td>5,050</td>
<td>5,060</td>
<td>5,040</td>
<td>3,030</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>16,040</td>
<td>13,010</td>
<td>12,050</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A 1.6: Prevalence of crime by demographic variables  
*SCJS: 2012/13*

<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>ALL SCJS CRIME</strong></td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-24</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-59</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 or over</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-24</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-59</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 or over</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deprivation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15% most deprived</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of Scotland</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Base: 12,050*

*Variable name: Prevalence variables*
**Table A 1.7: Percentage of crime reported to the police by year**

*Scottish crime surveys*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<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>52</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</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>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</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>
<td>40</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor vehicle vandalism</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>36</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>30</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>33</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>51</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>44</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>
<td>92</td>
<td>94</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>
<td>29</td>
<td>38</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>
<td>20</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housebreaking</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>
<td>62</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>n/a</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26</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>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle theft</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</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>28</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>37</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>
<td>34</td>
<td>46</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>
<td>29</td>
<td>34</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>
<td>51</td>
<td>48</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>
<td>52</td>
<td>48</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>
<td>31</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparable crime</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>
<td>46</td>
<td>44</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>
<td>40</td>
<td>36</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>
<td>51</td>
<td>55</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>
<td>51</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Base (All)** 5,030 5,050 5,060 5,040 3,030 5,000 16,000 16,040 13,010 12,050

Variable name: Prevalence variables and QPOL

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.*
Table A 1.8: Perceptions of how crime rates have changed in respondents’ local area over the past two years

SCJS 2012/13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of adults who had lived in local area for 2 years or more</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>ALL SCJS CRIME</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-24</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-59</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 or over</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-24</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-59</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 or over</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim of crime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-victim</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deprivation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15% most deprived</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of Scotland</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: 12,050

Variable name: QS2AREA

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 A 1.9: Percentage of respondents worried about particular crimes by year

Scottish crime surveys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable name: QWORR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Your car / other vehicle will be damaged by vandals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your home will be broken into</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You will be mugged / robbed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You will be physically assaulted / attacked in the street / other public place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Things will be stolen from your car / other vehicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your home will be damaged by vandals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your car / other vehicle will be stolen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You will be sexually assaulted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You will be involved / caught up in violence between groups of individuals / gangs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You will have your identity stolen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone will use your credit / bank details to obtain money, goods or services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<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</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>
<td>41</td>
<td>21</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>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</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>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</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>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Things will be stolen from your car / other vehicle</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>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</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>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your car / other vehicle will be stolen</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>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You will be sexually assaulted</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>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</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>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</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>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</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>51</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base (All) | 5,030 | 5,050 | 5,060 | 5,040 | 3,030 | 5,000 | 16,000 | 16,040 | 13,010 | 12,050 |

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 A 1.10: Percentage of respondents confidence about aspects of the Scottish Criminal Justice System  
**SCJS 2012/13**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage 'very' or 'fairly confident'</th>
<th>Is effective in bringing people who commit crimes to justice</th>
<th>Deals with cases promptly and efficiently</th>
<th>Everyone has access to the legal system if they need it</th>
<th>The system isn’t different depending on where you live</th>
<th>Provides a good standard of service for victims</th>
<th>Provides a good standard of service for ALL SCJS CRIME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALL SCJS CRIME</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-24</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-59</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 or over</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-24</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-59</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 or over</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim of crime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-victim</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>55</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>51</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of Scotland</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCJS contact ever</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of SCJS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A lot / fair amount</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very much / at all</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Base: 12,050
Variable name: QDCONF

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 A 1.11: Percentage of respondents confidence in various aspects of their local police force's ability

**SCJS 2012/13**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage ‘very’ or ‘fairly confident’</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>ALL SCJS CRIME</strong></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-24</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-59</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 or over</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-24</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-59</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 or over</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>60</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>Victim</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-victim</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>63</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>52</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of Scotland</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Base: 12,050**

**Variable name: QPOLCONF**

**Question wording:** “How confident are you in your local police force’s ability to …” Answer options: ‘Very confident’, ‘Fairly confident’, ‘Not very confident’, ‘Not at all confident’.
Table A 1.12: Attitudes to community sentences
SCJS 2012/13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Community sentencing is an effective way of dealing with low level non-violent crime</th>
<th>Community sentences do not discourage people from offending</th>
<th>Learning new skills during community sentencing stops more criminals committing more crimes</th>
<th>Community sentences do not punish low level offenders enough</th>
<th>Low level offenders who complete their community sentences have paid back to their community for the harm caused</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage ‘strongly’ or ‘slightly agree’</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALL SCJS CRIME</strong></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td>68</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-24</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-59</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 or over</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-24</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-59</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 or over</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Victim of crime</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-victim</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deprivation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15% most deprived</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of Scotland</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: 12,050
Variable name: QDISATT

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 SCJS 2012/13 Technical Report. This section presents a brief overview of the questionnaire, survey sampling, fieldwork and response rate.

A2.1 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 incidents a respondent may have experienced during the reference period (the 12 months prior to interview). 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 to do so.

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\(^{45}\).

Treated as a single questionnaire the SCJS 2012/13 had a total of 10 distinct sections which flowed in the following order:

**Main questionnaire** (12,050 respondents)

- Section 1: Perceptions of crime
- Section 2: Victim form screener

**Victim form** (Section 3) (completed by 2,320 respondents). Repeated up to five times, triggered by information collected in the victim form screener section)

- Incident dates
- Incident details
- Experience of criminal justice system organisations and related issues (emotions, victim’s use of force / drugs / alcohol, police contact, information and assistance, and attitudes towards offender prosecution and sentencing)

\(^{45}\) http://www.scotland.gov.uk/SCJS
Incident summary

Full sample module (Section 4) (12,050 respondents)

- Justice system (including the system overall, confidence in the Police and questions about the courts system);
- Police (visibility, attitudes towards and police contact)
- Convicted of a crime

Quarter-sample modules (Section 5) (c. 3,000 respondents each module)

Module A
- Local community (previously in the full sample module)
- Perceptions of crime

Module B
- Sentencing (including community sentencing – previously in the full sample module – prisons and Community Payback Orders)

Module C and D
- Civil law

Main questionnaire continued (12,050 respondents)

- Section 6: Demographics (household composition / details, tenure and accommodation type, marital status, work status and employment details, qualifications, health status and caring, identity and household income).

Self-completion questionnaire (completed by 10,240 respondents)\[^{46}\]

- Section 7: Risk factors (home unoccupied, going out, alcohol)
- Section 8: Illicit drug use
- Section 9: Stalking and harassment and partner abuse
- Section 10: Sexual victimisation

Respondents were given the option of refusing to complete any question they did not wish to answer.

\[^{46}\] Respondents were given the option to refuse the self-completion questionnaire so not all 12,050 respondents to the main survey completed it. The findings from the self-completion section of the survey will be reported in a series of separate reports.
Where relevant, and especially for the victim form, question wording remained consistent with previous surveys in order to aid comparability.

Details of the questionnaire changes to the 2012/13 survey questionnaire can be found in the accompanying Technical Report.

**A2.2 Sampling**

The sample for the SCJS 2012/13 was designed by the Scottish Government. The sample design was coordinated with the sample designs for the Scottish Health Survey (SHeS) and the Scottish Household Survey (SHS) as part of a survey efficiency project and to allow the samples of the three surveys to be pooled for further analysis.\(^{47}\)

The SCJS sample was designed prior to the details of the Police and Fire Reform (Scotland) Act 2012\(^{48}\) being announced. Therefore, the sample is designed to allow reporting at Police Force Area level. The requirements of the design for the 2012/13 SCJS were to provide an annual sample size of 12,086 for Scotland with a minimum effective sample size of 750 for each police force area.

**A2.2.1 Sample selection**

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 Royal Mail’s small user Postcode Address File (PAF) was used as the sample frame for the address selection. The PAF is currently by far the most comprehensive and reliable sample frame available in the UK for surveys of this kind. The sample design was implemented using systematic random sampling to select the addresses from the sample frame. Within strata the addresses were ordered by urban-rural classification, SIMD rank and postcode.

The sample was also designed to achieve the equivalent of a simple random sample of 750 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.

A change to design was made for SCJS 2012/13 which saw the survey move to a single stage unclustered sample design. The SCJS 2010/11 used a partially

---

\(^{47}\) Further information on the sample designs and the methodology uses is available here: [http://scotland.gov.uk/Topics/Statistics/About/SurveyDesigns201215](http://scotland.gov.uk/Topics/Statistics/About/SurveyDesigns201215)

\(^{48}\) The act came into force on 1 April 2013 and brought together the eight police forces, the Scottish Police Services Authority and the Scottish Crime and Drug Enforcement Agency into a single Police Service of Scotland. For more information: [http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/Justice/public-safety/Police/ConsultationFuturePolicin](http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/Justice/public-safety/Police/ConsultationFuturePolicin)
clustered design where clustering only occurred in the more sparsely populated areas of rural Scotland\textsuperscript{49}.

Interviews were conducted across the whole of Scotland, excluding only some of the smallest inhabited islands (detailed in the Technical Report\textsuperscript{50}).

\textbf{A2.2.2 Selecting households}

At each sampled address, the interviewer was firstly 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 which had been split into two flats). In this case, a random selection of which address to interview at was made using an algorithm in the Computer Assisted Personal Interviewing (CAPI) script to generate a random number.

\textbf{A2.2.3 Selecting individuals within households}

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 under any circumstances.

Fieldwork assignments by area across Scotland were spread out across the 12 month fieldwork period, with a target to conduct equal numbers of interviews across each of the 12 months. 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.

\textbf{A2.3 Fieldwork}

Fieldwork began on 1st April 2012 and finished on the 31st of March 2013, with the 12,045 interviews being spread equally across each of the 12 months fieldwork period (c.1,000 interviews per month).

Interviews were conducted face-to-face in the respondents’ homes and administered by specially trained professional interviewers employed by the independent research agency TNS BMRB 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 the interviewers visit.

\textsuperscript{49} See SCJS 2010/11 Main Findings for further information: http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2011/10/28142346

\textsuperscript{50} See the publications section of the SCJS website: http://www.scotland.gov.uk/SCJS
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 67.7%. This was a slight increase on the response rate of 67.2% from the 2010/11 survey. For all selected addresses, 7.2% were found to be ineligible (or ‘deadwood’ at which it was not possible to gain an interview) for the survey, a decrease of 0.1% from the previous survey. Table A2.1 provides a full breakdown for all issued addresses.

The addresses of unknown eligibility have been allocated as eligible and ineligible proportional to the levels of eligibility for the remainder of the sample. This approach provides a conservative estimate of the response rate as it estimates a high proportion of eligible cases amongst the unknown eligibility addresses.
Table A2.1: Fieldwork outcomes and response rate  
SCJS 2012/13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fieldwork Outcome</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Percentage issued</th>
<th>Percentage eligible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responding</td>
<td>12,048</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>67.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office refusal</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sampling unit information refused</td>
<td>1,886</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refusal at introduction/ before interview</td>
<td>1,427</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broken appointment - no re-contact</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total refused</td>
<td>4,146</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-contact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No contact with anyone at the address</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact made at address, but not with target respondent</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total non-contact</td>
<td>776</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other non-response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ill at home during field period</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Away or in hospital throughout field period</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physically or mentally unable/incompetent</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language barrier</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lost interview</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other non-response (not covered by categories above)</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total other non-response</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown eligibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not attempted</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inaccessible</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to locate address</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total unknown eligibility</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated eligible addresses in set of unknown eligibility addresses</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total eligible addresses</td>
<td>17,796</td>
<td>92.8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not eligible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not yet built / under construction</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolished/derelict</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant/empty</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-residential</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address occupied but not resident household</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communal establishment / institution</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other ineligible</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated ineligible addresses in set of unknown eligibility addresses</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total not eligible</td>
<td>1,385</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All issued addresses</td>
<td>19,181</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 3  SCJS measures of 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' 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 or not.

In common with other crime surveys, the SCJS caps the number of victim forms a respondent is asked. In the case of the SCJS, this cap is set at up to five incidents or types of incident, even if they had experienced more than this number. 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 of interview length 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 the SCJS coding manual which contained precise definitions of each offence code.

The purpose of the offence classification was to identify a single offence code for each victim form. Offence codes are split into two groups:

- **In-scope codes**: those which are used in the calculation of victimisation rates (prevalence and incidence) and therefore those used in this report;

- **Out-of-scope codes**: these can be further split into two categories, neither of which are included in the published survey statistics contained in this report;
  - **Sexual offence or threat codes**;
  - **Non-valid codes**: codes assigned to incidents which 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.
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 the same questions on very similar incidents) as well as aiding respondent recall. Details of the most recent incident were taken to represent other incidents in the series (up to a maximum of five) when calculating crime estimates and analysing victimisation data. This practice is also followed by the CSEW 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 British Crime Survey (BCS, now the Crime Survey for England and Wales CSEW) 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 CSEW 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 and be assigned an in-scope offence code.
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 2012, the survey statistics would include incidents which the respondent had experienced between 1st September 2011 and the 31st August 2012\(^{51}\). 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 A 3.1 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 2012 were asked about incidents which occurred in the reference period 1st October 2011 to 30th September 2012. The total reference period for interviews conducted from April 2012 through to the end of March 2013 is therefore a 23 month period from April 2011 through to February 2013. This is illustrated in Figure A 3.1 below.

March 2012 is the only month to be included in the reference period for all 12,045 respondents and the crimes collected centre around these months.

\(^{51}\) However, for the sake of simplicity during the interview (and despite the fact that these incidents are not included in the analysis), 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 2012) would also be recorded by the interviewer. Whilst the are recorded in the data files, these incidents do not form part of the survey estimates of crime.
In 2002, the BCS/CSEW similarly moved from a fixed reference period to a rolling reference period. 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 incidents 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 Crimes measured by the survey
A3.6.1 Offence codes
The offence coding manual for SCJS 2012/13 contained 66 offence codes. Of those 66, 12 were out-of-scope codes relating to sexual offences or threats, and so are not included in the analysis contained in this report. Twenty one of the 66 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). The remaining 33 in-scope offence codes are combined into a number of groups of types of crime which are reported in this report.
**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.\(^{52}\)

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, as these are classified as out-of-scope codes, 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 will be published in a separate report.\(^{53}\)

**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 in-scope offence codes**

The list of the 33 SCJS in-scope offence codes (crimes) which were included in the incidence and prevalence estimates in this report is shown in Table A 3.1. The table also shows the crime groups used in the report into which each offence code is grouped.

---

\(^{52}\) Further details can be found in Chapter 1 of this report and in the accompanying Technical Report

\(^{53}\) Additional reports on the publications section of the survey website:

### Table A 3.1: Offence codes included in the estimates of crime by crime group used in this report

**SCJS 2012/13**

<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>Assault</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></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>Robbery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Attempted robbery</td>
<td></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>Personal theft (excluding robbery)</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>73</td>
<td>Other attempted 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 (including bicycle theft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Theft from a meter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Housebreaking: non-connected domestic garage / outhouse – nothing taken</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

54 Housebreaking and attempted housebreaking in a dwelling includes connected domestic garages outhouses and sheds.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Crime group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Theft from car / van</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Theft of motorbike, motor scooter or moped</td>
<td>All motor vehicle theft related incidents</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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Vandalism to a motor vehicle</td>
<td>Vandalism</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>

**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 provided 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:
  - Assault;
  - Robbery.
If other household members had experienced personal crimes then this was not recorded in the survey.

This important distinction between personal and household crimes affects how the survey statistics were calculated.

**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 data supplied by National Records of Scotland (NRS); Estimates of Households and Dwellings in Scotland, 2011 (2,368,150 households) and Mid-2011 Population Estimates Scotland (4,341,500 adults)\(^{55}\). It should be noted that mid-2012 population estimates were published by NRS in August 2013 though these were too late to be used in the calculation of weights (Annex 4) for the Scottish Household Survey and Scottish Health Survey. As such, the SCJS has used mid-2011 estimates for consistency with these other surveys.

**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 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.

The incidence rate has also been calculated for key crime groups. This is calculated as the gross number of incidents multiplied by the product of 10,000 divided by the population (households or adults aged 16+ depending whether the crime group contains household or personal crimes) to give an incidence rate per 10,000. 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 CSEW. 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.\(^{56}\)

---

\(^{55}\) Data rounded to the nearest 50 and available from the NRS website: [http://www.gro-scotland.gov.uk/statistics/theme/index.html](http://www.gro-scotland.gov.uk/statistics/theme/index.html)

\(^{56}\) The incidence figures for the crime groups ‘all SCJS crime’, ‘property crime’ and ‘comparable crime’ are produced by summing the component incidence figures
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 CSEW 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).

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.

Crime groups

For the purpose of reporting, ‘all SCJS crime’ (overall crime) has been broken down into various groups of crimes (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 the characteristics of the crimes, and victims’ experience and perception of them. These two principal groups can also be further broken down into seven groups shown in Figure A 3.2 below. Some further sub-groups are also shown for vandalism and assault. The groups shown in Figure A 3.2 and used in this report (including the Annex 1 tables) are described in more detail below.

**Figure A 3.2: Crime groups used in the report**

![Crime groups diagram](image)

**A3.8.1 Crime group descriptions**

The descriptions of the crime groups used in this report follow the basic order of Figure A 3.2 and the Annex 1 tables. Descriptions for comparable crime and acquisitive crime are also included.
Variable names are included in square brackets after the heading for each crime group.\(^{57}\)

**All SCJS crime** [variable surveycrime]

All SCJS crime includes all property crime and all violent crime, but excludes threats and sexual offences.

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.\(^{58}\) 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.\(^{59}\)

**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.

**Motor vehicle vandalism** [variable motovvand]

This crime group includes any intentional and malicious damage to a motor 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

\(^{57}\) Variables in the SPSS data files will be prefaced by inc for incidence variables and prev for prevalence variables.

\(^{58}\) The figures for incidence for all SCJS crime are produced by summing the incidence figures for property and violent crime.

\(^{59}\) The figures for incidence for property crime are produced by summing the incidence figures for these component crime groups.
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 previous reports but differs from the definition used prior to the 2003 report.  

---

60 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.

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.

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. 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.
A4.1 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.

A4.2 Confidence intervals

A4.2.1 – Change in sample structure and revision to design factors presented in the 2008-09, 2009-10 and 2010-11 SCJS reports

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).

In the 2010-11, 2009-10 and 2008-09 SCJS analysis, the samples were stratified, clustered and weighted. Accurate complex standard errors and confidence intervals were calculated using SAS Surveymeans module. The calculation of the survey
design factor (a measure of the survey efficiency) was based upon the clustering and stratification but did not take account of survey weighting.

In 2012-13, the SCJS sample design was altered to be stratified and weighted, but not clustered. Accurate complex standard errors and confidence intervals were calculated using SAS Surveymeans module. The calculation of the survey design factor (a measure of survey efficiency) was based upon stratification and survey weighting. To take account of the survey weighting, the standard error for an equivalent simple random sample was approximated by calculating the standard error on the unweighted sample (which although not a true simple random sample, provides a practical approximation to such, given the more complex design of the actual survey sample).

To confirm, the exclusion of weighting from the 2010-11, 2009-10 and 2008-09 calculations means that the design factors presented in the survey reports for these years were underestimated, we estimate by a factor of around 1.3. The 2010-11, 2009-10 and 2008-09 SCJS reports estimated that most design factors that were calculated have values of less than 1.2 and suggested that the use of 1.2 would provide conservative estimates of confidence intervals for most estimates from the survey.

In summary, while the confidence intervals and complex standard errors reported in previous surveys are true, when calculating confidence intervals around results not contained in the report itself, an improved estimate of the generic design factor to be applied to standard errors results from these earlier survey years is around 1.5.

A4.2.2 – All SCJS crime

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 individual 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 was 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 individual crimes to all household members (converting adults into households).

The variances are calculated in the same way as for the standard household or individual 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 individual 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.

**A4.2.3 – 2012-13 survey design factors**

If confidence intervals are not provided in the report for a variable of interest, 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 1.3. This suggests that the use of 1.3 would provide a reasonable and often conservative estimate of the design factor for most estimates from the survey.

**A4.2.4 – summary of confidence intervals around key survey results**

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 approximated 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)
SCJS 2012/13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime rates per 10,000</th>
<th>Best estimate</th>
<th>Confidence interval</th>
<th>SRS standard error</th>
<th>Complex standard error</th>
<th>Design factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALL SCJS CRIME</td>
<td>2,783</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPERTY CRIME</td>
<td>1,977</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor vehicle vandalism</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property vandalism</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All motor vehicle theft related incl.</strong></td>
<td><strong>210</strong></td>
<td><strong>35</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.15</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft of a motor vehicle</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft from a motor vehicle</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempted theft of / from motor veh</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housebreaking</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other household thefts inc. bicycl</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other household theft</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle theft</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal theft excluding robbery</strong></td>
<td><strong>245</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.38</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft from the person</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other personal theft</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIOLENT CRIME</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious assault</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPARABLE CRIME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisitive crime</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent crime</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A4.2 Weighting

A4.2.1 Weighting method

For the 2012/13 SCJS data the weighting was undertaken by the Scottish Government rather than the survey contractor (as had previously been the case), but the methodology applied was largely consistent with that from previous sweeps of the survey. The procedures for the implementation of the weighting methodology were developed by the Scottish Government working with the Methodology Advisory Service at the Office for National Statistics.

Weighting survey data is required to correct for unequal probabilities of selection and variations in response rates from different groups. The weighting procedures for the SCJS used calibration weighting to correct for non-response bias. Calibration weighting derives weights such that the weighted survey totals match known population totals (e.g. age and gender totals within a specific geographic area). To undertake the calibration weighting the ReGenesees Package for R statistical software was used and within this to execute the calibration rim weighting was specified.

The following units of analysis required weights:

- Household main section
- Individual main section
- Household self-completion
- Individual self-completion

Separate weights were required for the self-completion section since not all respondents to the main section completed the self-completion section. The weighting procedures for the self-completion weights were identical to those used for the main section.

Further details of the weighting are provided in the Technical Report.
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. Police recorded crime is a measure of those crimes reported to the police 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. Just under two-thirds (65%) of all SCJS crime as measured by the SCJS 2012/13 falls into categories that can be compared with crimes recorded by the police (see Chapter 2).

It is possible to make comparisons between the SCJS and police recorded crime statistics for three crime groups (Figure A 5.1):

- 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).

To enable consistent comparisons to be made, SCJS violent crimes have been compared to a set of recorded crimes comprising a range of Group 1 non-sexual crimes of violence and Group 6 common assault offences. Information on crime groups in Annex 3 provides further information about these groups.

All SCJS crime estimates are based on interviews conducted between the 1st of April 2012 and the 31st of March 2013. 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 Annex 3). The rolling reference period used in the SCJS means that the data collected centres around March 2012.

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 National Records for Scotland (NRS) mid-2011 population estimates of households and adults (see Annex 3).
Figure A 5.1: Comparable crime groups
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A5.2 Police recorded crime statistics

Police recorded crime statistics used in this report relate to crimes committed in the financial year between April 2012 and March 2013. The figures presented in this volume were published in June 2013\textsuperscript{61}.

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 CSEW.

\textsuperscript{61} The statistical bulletin for police recorded crime in Scotland for 2012/13 is available from the Scottish Government website: \url{http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2013/06/9697}
The coding of crimes differs between the SCJS and the Crime Survey for England and Wales (CSEW – formerly 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 CSEW 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 CSEW estimates).

The SCJS also differs from the CSEW 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 CSEW 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 CSEW.

The definition of burglary in England and Wales as measured by the CSEW 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.62

   Burglary measured by the CSEW 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 CSEW 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 classified as 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.

---

62 If a theft occurred in this instance, it would be included in the other household theft crime group.
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