



European Crime Prevention Network

European Crime Prevention Monitor

2012/2

Public opinion and policy on crime prevention in Europe

EUCPN Secretariat, December 2012, Brussels



With financial support from the Prevention of and Fight against Crime Programme of the European Union

European Commission – Directorate-General Home Affairs

Public opinion and policy on crime prevention in Europe

Abstract

The first report in the *European Crime Prevention Monitor series* gave an overview of general European developments in crime and crime statistics, based on international cross-country statistics, surveys and reports (EUCPN, 2012a). Four different data sources were highlighted, with focus on recorded crime rates, victimisation data, self-reported delinquency measures and qualitative data.

In this second monitor report the focus is put on people's perceptions and attitudes on the one hand, and on priorities in crime prevention policies across Europe on the other hand. What does the general public think about the police: their relationship with the communities, their effectiveness in preventing crime, their fairness with which they wield their authoritative power, their integrity,...? What do Europeans think of the effectiveness of policies on the different levels (national vs. European)? What do they believe to be the challenges to the security in the prevention and fight against crime? These are some questions approached in this report. The information and data used to answer these questions come from the *Trust in the Police & Courts* Module of the European Social Survey and from the Eurobarometer surveys conducted by the European Commission.

Besides these existing survey data, the EUCPN Secretariat collected some additional data from the EUCPN members on the priorities in the crime prevention policies in their countries. More specifically, questions were asked about the country's top three priorities in crime prevention policy/strategy and compared to the country's three most prominent crime problems based on crime statistics. Also, it was examined whether or not the top three priorities in the country's crime prevention policy were based on statistical or recorded data, or – if not – what other basis was used to pick these priorities. And finally, some questions were added about any remarkable or new developments in the Member States over the past five years.

Citation

EUCPN (2012). *European Crime Prevention Monitor 2012/2: Public opinion and policy on crime prevention in Europe*. Brussels: European Crime Prevention Network.

Legal notice

The contents of this publication do not necessarily reflect the official opinions of any EU Member State or any agency or institution of the European Union or European Communities.

Authors

Dr. Noël Klima, Coordinator EUCPN Secretariat
Belinda Wijckmans, Research Officer EUCPN Secretariat

EUCPN Secretariat
Waterloolaan / Bd. de Waterloo 76 1000 Brussels, Belgium
Phone: +32 2 557 33 30 Fax: +32 2 557 35 23
eucpn@ibz.eu – www.eucpn.org

Table of contents

- 1. Introduction 4**
- 2. European Social Survey: perceptions and attitudes towards the police 5**
 - 2.1. Trust and legitimacy..... 5**
 - 2.1.1. General perception of police work and contact with the police..... 6
 - Police doing a good/bad job 6*
 - Police initiated contact with citizens 7*
 - 2.1.2. Trust in the police 8
 - Success of the police in preventing crimes 9*
 - Police making fair and impartial decisions and treating everybody equally10*
 - 2.1.3. Perceived legitimacy of the police.....11
 - General support of police actions by citizens12*
- 3. Eurobarometer: citizens’ opinion on crime (prevention) policies in Europe 14**
 - 3.1.1. Introduction14
 - 3.1.2. Effectiveness of EU level policy on the prevention and fight against crime .15
 - 3.1.3. A secure Europe.....16
- 4. EUCPN survey: Priorities in crime prevention policies across Europe..... 18**
 - 4.1. Overview of the results 19**
 - 4.2. Main priorities in crime prevention policy 19**
 - 4.3. Most prominent crime problems 19**
 - 4.4. New developments and their cause(s) 20**
- 5. Conclusions..... 20**
- References 23**
- Annex 1: Questionnaire 25**
- Annex 2: Detailed overview response per question 27**
- Annex 3: Summary characteristics of the data used 32**

1. Introduction

It is generally agreed upon that it is difficult to make clear recommendations for or comparisons of crime (prevention) policies based on crime statistics, i.e. recorded levels of crime by the police. On the European level for example such data have restricted comparability due to a variety of definitions, differences in legal systems and recording methods in the Member States.

Besides the obvious shortcomings of these recorded data and the various efforts to overcome some of these limitations – due to the increasing emphasis on evidence-based policy – policy-making does not happen in a societal vacuum (Hamilton & Harvey, 2005). Statistics, the availability of resources, but also public opinion and support, form the relevant – if not *the* – criteria for the creation, the change and the implementation of policy measures. One of the challenges in any democracy, therefore, is to find a broad based consensus to tackle the problems and new (crime) developments societies are confronted with. As mentioned in the report by the European Commission on the Measurement of Economic Performance and Social Progress (Stiglitz, et al. 2009: 177): “[...] *citizens’ voices can provide a corrective to public policy, ensure the accountability of governments and public institutions, reveal what people need and value, and call attention to significant human deprivations both in emergency situations and over the long term.*” At the same time, this means that the general public needs to believe that not only they are actually heard or ‘consulted’, but also that the existing institutions – the police, justice, administration, etc. – will guarantee their (constitutional) rights and treat them with respect and according to the law (Stiglitz, et al. 2009).

More recently, attention has been given to the legitimacy of criminal justice policy through public trust (Hough & Sato, 2011; Jackson et al., 2011). The basic idea is that if people trust the system and the agencies acting within it, like e.g. the police, and if they accept these agencies’ legitimate right to exercise authority, they will obey the law and cooperate with the system because they believe it is normatively right to do so (Hough & Sato, 2011; Tyler, 2011). This also formed the basis of the Euro-Justis¹ (Hough & Sato, 2011; Jackson et al., 2011b; Jokinen et al., 2009) and Fiducia² projects, arguing that crime policies should not rely on short-term repressive strategies, but rather on longer-term inclusionary strategies which are aimed at demonstrating that the institutions of justice are fair and just. In the end, this would be a far more efficient way of keeping social order than coercing compliance with the law (Hough & Sato, 2011).

In the first part of this second monitor report we will zoom in on people’s perceptions and attitudes towards public institutions and legal authorities. We will focus particularly on the police because this fits into the broader theme we worked on during the Cyprus Presidency, i.e. prevention of crime through community policing (EUCPN, 2012b; Verhage & Ponsaers, 2012). What does the general public think about the police: their relationship with the communities, their effectiveness in preventing crime, their fairness with which they wield their authoritative power, their integrity,...? The information and data used to answer these questions come from the Trust in the Police & Courts Module of the European Social Survey (European Social Survey 2010; 2011; 2012).

In the second part of this paper, the focus will shift towards crime (prevention) policies. The results from the European Commission’s Eurobarometer (Flash Eurobarometer 155,

¹ <http://www.eurojustis.eu/index-2.html>

² <http://www.fiduciaproject.eu/>

2004; Special Eurobarometer 371, 2011) will be presented, highlighting European residents' views on the effectiveness of policies on the prevention and fight against crime and on the main challenges to security both at EU level and within individual Member States.

In the third and final part, we collected some information from our own Network Members on the priorities in crime prevention policies/strategies in their country and on which basis these priorities are chosen. Next to the results of the European Social Survey on public opinion, looking at the priorities from a policy point of view might offer some interesting insights too.

As mentioned in the first European Crime prevention monitor report (EUCPN, 2012a) the main aim of these reports is not to carry out our own original research, but rather to bring together and summarize data, figures and research on topics which might be of interest for our target groups, i.e. local, national and European practitioners and policy makers, in a manner which is consistent with their needs.

2. European Social Survey: perceptions and attitudes towards the police

The European Social Survey (ESS) is an academically-driven biennial large-scale survey covering over 30 countries to date. ESS is funded jointly by the European Commission, the European Science Foundation and academic funding bodies in each participating country. Its three aims are, firstly – to monitor and interpret changing public attitudes and values within Europe and to investigate how they interact with Europe's changing institutions, secondly – to advance and consolidate improved methods of cross-national survey measurement in Europe and beyond, and thirdly – to develop a series of European social indicators, including attitudinal indicators. The first round was conducted in 2002/2003, the fifth in 2010/2011. The fifth round of the ESS contains 45 questions on 'Trust in Justice'. 28 countries participated in this round at the end of 2010, of which 22 EU Member States. Topline results related to *Trust in Justice* for all participating countries are summarized in a brief report which can be found on the ESS website (Jackson et al., 2011a)³.

In this monitor report we will only focus on the results for trust in and legitimacy of the police⁴ in the 21 participating EU Member States of which data were available in December 2012. Austria participated in the survey but no data were available (yet). The five remaining Member States – Romania, Latvia, Luxemburg, Malta and Italy – were not included in this round of the survey.

2.1. Trust and legitimacy

The ESS module on 'Trust in Justice' refers to the social concepts of trust and legitimacy. According to Jackson et al. (2011b) both concepts underline the moral and practical link between the citizen and the criminal justice system and are therefore indispensable for an effective crime policy in the Member States of the European Union. The ESS module is

³ <http://www.europeansocialsurvey.org/download.pdf>

⁴ Data on the trust in and legitimacy of criminal courts are not included in this monitor report.

based on social indicators that refer mainly to these two concepts. Trust is defined as "the belief that the police and courts have the right intentions and are competent to do what citizens trust them to do" (Jackson et al., 2011b: 273). Legitimacy refers to both the citizen and the criminal justice institutions and their interrelationship influenced by (i) expressed consent to power (people's felt obligation to obey) (ii) normative justifiability of power via shared values and (iii) legality of action via institutional commitment to the rule of law (Jackson et al., 2011a: 7; Jackson et al., 2011b: 273). Criminal justice institutions are usually considered legitimate when there are "certain minimum standards with regard to fairness, efficiency and honesty" (Jackson et al., 2011b: 273). In the survey the local, social and cultural contexts are also taken into consideration.

2.1.1. General perception of police work and contact with the police

Police doing a good/bad job

In the survey respondents across the EU Member States were asked whether or not they believed in general the police is doing a good job⁵. The results are shown in figure 1 below⁶.




Figure 1: Police doing a good or bad job
 Source: European Social Survey Round 5 – own calculations⁷

⁵ Question D7: Taking into account all the things the police are expected to do, would you say they are doing a good job or a bad job?
⁶ For all results shown in the figures based on ESS data the design weight has been applied. For general total 'EU Member States' percentages quoted in the text, the population size weight has additionally be applied. These weights do not adjust for non-response in the sample. For more information on the weights, see: <http://ess.nsd.uib.no/ess/doc/weighting.pdf>
⁷ Using ESS Online Analysis package – Nesstar (www.europeansocialsurvey.org)

In general, more than 65 per cent of the people in EU Member State countries consider the police to be doing a good or a very good job, about a fourth believes they are doing neither a good nor a bad job, and less than 10 per cent of EU Member State citizens indicate that the police is doing a bad or a very bad job (not shown in figure). Nevertheless, the differences between countries are quite substantial, with the police work being generally well-evaluated in the Northern-European Member States and less so in (some) Eastern and Southern European countries.

The largest proportions of people who believe the police is doing a good or a very good job can be found in Finland (85,6%), Denmark (79,7%), Germany (78,9%) and Sweden (76,9%), whereas the smallest proportions are observed in Lithuania (33,3%), Greece (36,4%), Hungary (40,6%) and the Czech Republic (45,3%).

Looking at the data, it can be observed that in Greece more than one fifth of the people who participated in the survey indicated that the police is doing a very bad job, which is the largest proportion compared to the other EU Member States. They are followed closely by Lithuania (19%), and then by Bulgaria (14%), the Czech Republic (13%) and Hungary (12%).

Police initiated contact with citizens

Respondents were asked whether the police had approached, stopped or contacted them for any reason in the two years prior to the interview⁸. Overall, 36 per cent of EU Member State citizens indicated they had an encounter with the police in the last two years, but there is a considerable variation in the proportion of people across EU countries experiencing a police-initiated contact. The rates vary from around 50 per cent in Finland and Sweden to only around 16 per cent in Bulgaria and 24 per cent in Portugal (not shown in figure). As already mentioned in the ESS Topline results booklet (Jackson et al., 2011a: 4), the interpretation of these results needs to be done carefully. One has to be aware of the fact that the role and tasks of the police can differ quite significantly among Member States, and that higher rates of contact in e.g. Finland or Sweden could also indicate a much broader range of tasks and responsibilities given to the police, e.g. in crime prevention activities⁹.

Besides whether or not the respondent had experienced a police-initiated contact, those who had were also asked to indicate their degree of satisfaction with the way they were treated¹⁰. The results are shown in figure 2.

Of the respondents who had been approached, stopped or contacted by the police people in the Nordic countries, like Sweden, Finland, Estonia and Denmark, but also in Belgium and Ireland seemed to be most satisfied with the way they were treated. In contrast, more than one third of French and Hungarian respondents who had had an encounter with the police indicated to be (very) dissatisfied with the way they were treated.

⁸ Question D8: In the past 2 years, did the police in [country] approach you, stop you or make contact with you for any reason?

⁹ E.g. the role of the police in Community (oriented) Policing (CoP) – see: EUCPN (2012b).

¹⁰ Question D9: How dissatisfied or satisfied were you with the way the police treated you the last time this happened?




Figure 2: Police-initiated contact by country and degree of satisfaction
 Source: European Social Survey Round 5 – own calculations¹¹

It is important to note that having been in contact with the police is seemingly unrelated to the degree of satisfaction. Countries like Finland, Sweden and Belgium show high levels of contact and high degrees of satisfaction, whereas for example the Netherlands or Spain show a high level of contact with a lower degree of satisfaction. Also with the general perception of the police doing a good or a bad job, there seems no obvious correlation with the level of contact. Again Finnish people also generally agree that the police is doing a (very) good job, whereas Belgians for example have a high level of contact and a high degree of satisfaction, but generally agree a bit less that the police is doing a (very) good job.

2.1.2. Trust in the police

The authors of the ESS Topline results booklet (Jackson et al., 2011a: 5) define trust in the police as: (i) trust in their competence to e.g. catch or deter offenders or to respond quickly to emergencies, (ii) trust in the fact that they wield their power fairly, and (iii) trust in the fact that they treat all groups in society equally.

¹¹ Using ESS Online Analysis package – Nesstar (www.europeansocialsurvey.org)

Success of the police in preventing crimes

People were asked to rate how successful they think the police are in preventing crime in their country¹². The results are shown in figure 2. In general, people do not seem to be very optimistic about the police’s capacity to prevent crime. On a scale from 1 to 10 people across European Member States on average give a 5, and looking at the figure below it can be observed that there is not much variation between the countries. Spain scores highest with an average of 6 and Greece the lowest with an average score of 4,6.




Figure 3: Perceived success of the police in preventing crimes
 Source: European Social Survey Round 5 – own calculations¹³

Similar results have been found on people’s perceptions of the speed of police response to a call reporting a violent crime near their home (not shown in figure)¹⁴. As mentioned in the ESS Topline results booklet (Jackson et al., 2011a: 7) the averages range between 5 and 6. Noticeably, respondents who had been a victim of crime recently tend to regard the police as less effective compared to non-victims.

¹² Question D12: Based on what you have heard or your own experience how successful do you think the police are at preventing crimes in [country] where violence is used or threatened?
¹³ Using ESS Online Analysis package – Nesstar (www.europeansocialsurvey.org)
¹⁴ Question D14: If a violent crime were to occur near to where you live and the police were called, how slowly or quickly do you think they would arrive at the scene?

Police making fair and impartial decisions and treating everybody equally

With respect to the perceived fairness of the decision making by the police the responses vary widely across the EU Member States¹⁵. Figure 4 shows the proportion of people in each Member State who believe that often or very often the police makes a fair, impartial decision in the cases they deal with.

Finland (91%), Denmark (90%) and Spain (86%) have the largest proportions of people with a (very) positive view on the fairness of their decisions, whereas in Lithuania and Slovakia people tend to be a bit more negative with only just over half of the respondents sharing this positive viewpoint.




Figure 4: Police making fair and impartial decisions
Source: European Social Survey Round 5 – own calculations¹⁶

Figure 5 shows the responses to the question whether or not the respondents think the police are treating rich and poor equally, or if one of these groups is treated worse than the other¹⁷. The Member States with the highest proportions of people trusting the police with regard to an equal treatment of rich and poor people are The Netherlands (76%), Denmark (74%) and Finland (70%). The countries with the least confidence that this is the case are Greece (22%), Lithuania and Slovakia (both 31%). At the same time, the results show clearly that in these countries with less trust in the equal treatment by the police, more people think that this is to the disadvantage of the poor people. In Greece for example, 77% of the respondents believe that poor people are treated worse.

¹⁵ Question D16: About how often would you say that the police make fair, impartial decisions in the cases they deal with?

¹⁶ Using ESS Online Analysis package – Nesstar (www.europeansocialsurvey.org)

¹⁷ Question D10: When victims report crimes, do you think the police treat rich people worse, poor people worse, or are rich and poor treated equally?

Jackson et al. (2001a: 5-6) also looked at the financial situation of the respondents themselves and found that those who indicated to have difficulties living on their present income are more likely to report that poor people are treated worse than rich people, especially in those countries who actually scored relatively well on this indicator, like e.g. the Netherlands, Denmark and Finland. In other words: although people in these countries generally believe that the police are treating rich and poor people equally, those respondents with financial difficulties are more likely to believe that poor people are treated worse.




Figure 5: Police treating rich and poor people equally or not
 Source: European Social Survey Round 5 – own calculations¹⁸

2.1.3. Perceived legitimacy of the police

As mentioned before and defined by Jackson et al. (2011a: 7), legitimacy of the police is composed of three dimensions: (i) people’s felt obligation to obey the police (ii) people’s moral alignment with the police, and (iii) people’s perceptions of the legality of the police. In the round 5 questionnaire of the ESS respondents on the one hand had to indicate on a 5-point scale whether or not they agreed with the statement that the police generally have the same sense of right and wrong as they did themselves. On the other hand, they rated from 0 to 10 whether they felt it their duty to do what the police tells them to do even if they don’t understand or agree with the reasons. Jackson et al. (2011a: 9) plot the correlations of the national averages of these two measures as an indication of the degree of legitimacy of the police in each country. In figure 6 these results are replicated but only for the 21 European Member States for which the data were available.

¹⁸ Using ESS Online Analysis package – Nesstar (www.europeansocialsurvey.org)




Figure 6: Consent to police authority and perceptions of shared moral values
 Source: European Social Survey Round 5 – own calculations¹⁹

The results in Figure 6 show that there is a positive correlation between the two statements: Member States in which a larger proportion of its people agree with the statement that the police share the same sense of right and wrong with themselves also tend to have a larger proportion of respondents who feel a stronger duty to follow police orders.

Again, the Northern European Member States (Finland, Denmark, Sweden) score the highest on both measures, but also the Netherlands and Germany combine a relatively high levels of moral alignment with still relatively high levels of a sense of duty. Countries like Slovenia, Bulgaria, France, Slovakia and Greece on the other hand score the lowest on both measures.

Respondents in the Czech Republic, Hungary and Cyprus do not follow the same trend and show a relatively low level of moral alignment with the police but relatively higher levels of felt duty to follow police directives, whereas Lithuania for example shows a relatively large proportion (more than 60%) of people agreeing that the police is sharing the same moral values but only 39% of the respondents feeling obliged to do what the police say.

General support of police actions by citizens

Closely related to the perceived legitimacy of the police, in this final paragraph on the perceptions and attitudes towards the police we look at the general support given to the

¹⁹ Using ESS Online Analysis package – Nesstar (www.europeansocialsurvey.org)

police. Respondents were asked how much they agreed with the statement that they generally support how the police usually act²⁰.

Overall, about two thirds of the people across European Member States (strongly) agree with this statement (not shown in figure). Looking at the details of the results in figure 7, it can be observed again that the Northern European countries show the highest levels of support to the police. More than 90 per cent of the Finnish respondents indicate that they (strongly) agree with the statement! Closely followed by Denmark (83%), but also Germany (81%) and the United Kingdom (79%). Also at the lower end again the same 'pattern' can be observed with Greece, the Czech Republic and Lithuania generally showing less support. Finally, Greece, France and Bulgaria have the highest proportions of people (strongly) disagreeing with the statement.




Figure 7: General support how the police act
 Source: European Social Survey Round 5 – own calculations²¹

²⁰ Question D23: Using this card, please say to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about the police in [country]: 'I generally support how the police usually act.'

²¹ Using ESS Online Analysis package – Nesstar (www.europeansocialsurvey.org)

3. Eurobarometer: citizens' opinion on crime (prevention) policies in Europe

3.1.1. Introduction

Some phenomena of crime such as youth crime and urban crime are certainly a matter for national, regional and/or local authorities whereas other forms of more organised crime, transnational crime, cyber crime, etc. are much wider phenomena making these global and/or European priorities. Hence, it can be useful and sometimes necessary to prevent and tackle certain crime types at the European level in addition to the national levels. General crime prevention at the EU level focuses on supporting authorities at the various levels within the Member State in their action against all types of crime. One of the actors doing this is the European Crime Prevention Network. The network's objective is *inter alia* to feed EU priorities, develop and exchange good and promising practices and support various European, national and local initiatives.

Rather than people's perceptions on the trustworthiness and legitimacy of the police, in this second part of the monitor report the focus is put on what people think about the effectiveness of policies on the prevention and fight against crime. Also, attention is given to what the public opinion is regarding the main challenges to security, both at EU level and within individual Member States. For this overview the results of various Eurobarometer surveys and reports are being summarised in the next few paragraphs.

Since 1973, the European Commission has been monitoring the evolution of public opinion in the Member States by means of the Eurobarometer surveys²². As mentioned on the website²³, several types of these surveys are conducted on various topics and themes:

- The Standard Eurobarometer addresses major topics concerning European citizenship – e.g. enlargement of European Union, social situation, health, culture, information technology, environment, the Euro, defence, etc. – and consists of approximately 1000 face-to-face interviews per country. Reports are published twice a year.
- Special Eurobarometer reports are based on in-depth thematic studies carried out for various services of the European Commission or for other EU Institutions and integrated in Standard Eurobarometer's polling waves.
- Flash Eurobarometers are ad hoc thematic telephone interviews conducted at the request of any service of the European Commission. Flash surveys enable the Commission to obtain results relatively quickly and to focus on specific target groups, as and when required.
- The qualitative studies investigate in-depth the motivations, the feelings, the reactions of selected social groups towards a given subject or concept, by listening and analysing their way of expressing themselves in discussion groups or with non-directive interviews.

²² http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/index_en.htm

²³ http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/description_en.htm

Crime and Security issues have been approached in several Eurobarometer surveys such as those on Justice and Home Affairs²⁴, The role of the European Union in fighting against organised crime²⁵, Cyber Security²⁶, Discrimination in the EU²⁷, Awareness of Home Affairs²⁸, Internal Security²⁹, etc.

3.1.2. Effectiveness of EU level policy on the prevention and fight against crime

In the Flash Eurobarometer 155 (2004: 12) the citizens’ views on the effectiveness of European level policies on the prevention and fight against crime in 15 European Member States are examined. The results of the survey show the overall support from EU citizens for policy-making on crime prevention at the European level. More concretely, the report states that “71% of EU citizens believe that policy-making on the prevention and fight against crime would be more effective if it were decided on jointly at the European Union level rather than at the level of individual Member States. Of those, 40% are certain of this”.




Figure 8: Crime prevention policy more effective at the EU level – citizens’ perceptions
 Source: Calculations based on the figure (percentages valid) in the Flash Eurobarometer 155, p.13
 *Percentages “Yes, certainly” and “Yes, probably” as opposed to “No, certainly/probably not”

²⁴ Flash Eurobarometer 155 (2004) http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/flash/fl155_executive.pdf
²⁵ Special Eurobarometer 264 (2006) http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs_264_en.pdf
²⁶ Special Eurobarometer 390 (2012) http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs_390_en.pdf
²⁷ Special Eurobarometer 393 (2012) http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs_393_en.pdf
²⁸ Special Eurobarometer 380 (2012) http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs_380_en.pdf
²⁹ Special Eurobarometer 371 (2011) http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs_371_en.pdf

The results of the individual Member States are shown in figure 8 above. Overall, in Spain, France, Portugal and Germany the largest proportions of people can be found who consider that a EU level policy on crime prevention would be more effective than decision-making on the level of individual Member State. Over 80 per cent of the respondents in each of the countries just mentioned consider this 'certainly or probably' the case. The UK, Sweden and Denmark on the other hand, have the lowest proportions of people supporting this statement in general, and with less certainty as well.

Furthermore, the Flash Eurobarometer 155 (2004) also examines the response according to some socio-demographic background factors, like sex, age, age at the moment of leaving school and the living environment. In short: according to this report (2004: 14) men, older respondents, the lower educated and people living in big cities seem more convinced ('with certainty') that EU-level policy-making on the prevention of and fight against crime would be more effective than individual national policies (not shown in figure 8).

3.1.3. A secure Europe

According to the 2010 document 'EU Internal Security Strategy in Action: Five steps towards a more secure Europe' (European Commission 673 Final, 2010: 4)³⁰ the key challenges to the security of the European Union, which according to the European Commission call for a joint approach by the Member States and the various European actors and institutions, are:

- Serious and organised crime: e.g. trafficking in human beings, trafficking of drugs and firearms, money laundering, illegal shipment and dumping of waste in- and outside Europe; but also burglary, car theft, the trade of counterfeit and dangerous goods and itinerant gangs connected to global criminal networks.
- Terrorism
- Cybercrime
- Border security: e.g. smuggling
- Management of natural and man-made disasters

The Special Eurobarometer 371 (2011) survey on Internal Security compares the public opinion of European citizens with the priorities in the Internal Security Strategy report mentioned above. First, respondents were asked in two open questions what they believe to be the most important challenges to the security of both their own country and of the European Union. They were allowed to identify up to three challenges for each question. The results are shown in figure 9.

As can be observed in the results below, the top four challenges to the national security corresponds with the top four challenges to the European security, although in case of the latter two (poverty and organised crime) the ranking order is reversed. Corruption is considered a challenge to the security on both levels but ranks slightly higher on the national level, whereas illegal immigration ranks higher as a European challenge.

³⁰ <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2010:0673:FIN:EN:PDF>

The four main challenges identified by the European citizens are:

- The economic and financial crises: more than a third of the respondents mention these as a challenge to the security on the national and the European level. Summarised from the Special Eurobarometer 371 (2011: 11-22), on the national level especially Irish (61%), Spanish (57%), Greek (56%), Cypriot (54%) and Hungarian (52%) citizens consider the economic and financial crises as important challenges to the security in their own country. Also to the EU security as a whole, these crises are seen as the most important challenges by the citizens of these countries, with Greek respondents considering these as the top challenge to the EU security (59%).




Figure 9: Europeans' opinion on the most important challenges to the national and European security. Source: Copied from the Special Eurobarometer 371, p.10 & p.18

- Terrorism: this is the second most mentioned challenge. One in four respondents identify terrorism as an important challenge to their own national security, and even over a third mention it as a challenge to the EU security. Citizens living in Denmark (55% resp. 53%) and the UK (47% resp. 41%) consider it important challenges both to their own national security and to the EU's as a whole. Spanish (38%) and German (34%) respondents are also quite likely to mention terrorism as an important challenge to their own country's security, but a little less likely compared to other countries to consider it as a safety issue for the EU as a whole. On the other hand, in Bulgaria and the Czech Republic for example terrorism is hardly considered a national threat (4% resp. 14%) but it is highly considered as a challenge to the security of EU citizens (around 40% in both countries).
- Poverty: almost a quarter of the respondents mention poverty as one of the main challenges to the security in their country, and just under a fifth mentions it as an EU security challenge as well. Especially countries in Eastern Europe and the Baltic states mention poverty, Northern European countries are least likely to mention it both as a national or a EU challenge.

- Organised crime: more than one in five of the European citizens consider organised crime as a challenge to the national and the European security. Ireland (45%), the Czech Republic and Austria (both 39%) have the largest proportions of people identifying it as an important national security challenge. Respondents living in Austria (44%) and Ireland (42%) mention it as a challenge to EU security as well.

Of the five priorities or key challenges to the internal EU security set out in the Internal Security Strategy in Action report – terrorism, organised crime, cybercrime, security of EU borders and natural/man-made disasters – terrorism and organised crime are also mentioned spontaneously by the European citizens as important challenges. The other three – although mentioned – seem to be considered a lot less important at first sight.

As can be noted in the tables in the Special Eurobarometer 371 (2011: 12 & 21), there is a lot of variation between the countries but overall only around 10 per cent or less of the European citizens regard these as security challenges either to their own country or to the EU as a whole. However, when faced with the question to rate the importance of each of these key challenges³¹ at least 80 per cent of the respondents consider each of the five challenges very or fairly important. And again, terrorism and organised crime are considered to be (very) important by most Europeans.

Finally, most respondents believe that these challenges will increase over the next three years, or will at least remain unchanged. Out of these five challenges, cybercrime is considered most likely to increase in the next three years, according to 63 per cent of the European citizens. Only a small minority of the respondents believe that each of these challenges to the EU security will decrease over the next few years.

Further details on the differences between countries and across demographic groups, and on the public opinion about whether or not the Member States and the EU are doing enough to tackle the five challenges to internal security can be read in the Special Eurobarometer 371 (2011).

4. EUCPN survey: Priorities in crime prevention policies across Europe

Following the EUCPN's Multiannual Strategy one of the Network's goals is "*to disseminate qualitative knowledge on crime prevention.*" By collecting and disseminating multidisciplinary information on statistics, surveys and other reports, the Network will be able to base its own decisions on facts and figures, and to contribute to a more general knowledge base. Besides the survey results on the public opinion from European citizens, looking at the priorities from a policy point of view might offer some interesting insights too. Therefore, in order to get an overview of the priorities in crime prevention policies/strategies in each Member State, we asked our Network Members to complete a short questionnaire (cfr. Annex 1).

³¹ QC3. In your opinion, how important or not important are currently the following challenges to the internal security of the EU?

4.1. Overview of the results

In total 15 of the 27 Member States responded to the request to complete the questionnaire. The responses to the questions are summarized in the following paragraphs. The more detailed responses of each individual Member State are added in Annex 2.

4.2. Main priorities in crime prevention policy

The first question asked each country's top three priorities in crime prevention policy/strategy. Obviously, each country has its own strategy and approach regarding crime prevention. Whereas some countries pay specific attention to certain crime types in their prevention strategy, others – like e.g. the Czech Republic, Denmark and the UK – have a broad and general preventative discourse on the national level, with more room to focus on local crime prevention priorities.

Overall, the crime types which are considered most in the various prevention policies are:

1. Property crimes (i.e. burglaries, theft)
2. Crimes against the person (i.e. violence, domestic violence)
3. Juvenile delinquency
4. Drug use
5. Violent crime

Not all of the responding countries base their priorities solely on statistical data (see e.g. the Finnish response on the importance of values), but most of the times crime figures and data are taken into account. The data which are mainly relied upon are police records, but also European, national and/or local (victims) survey data are being used.

4.3. Most prominent crime problems

The Member States were asked what their three most prominent crime problems are, based on their country's crime statistics. The most common answers were:

1. Property crimes (i.e. burglaries, theft)
2. Crimes against the person (i.e. violence, domestic violence)
3. Drug use
4. Economic crime (i.e. money laundering, forgery, fraud)
5. Other

Immediately one can see that there is a huge correspondence between this list and the previous one on policy priorities. Three out of the five most prominent crime problems

are listed as priorities. This is not very surprising as most countries indicate that they base their priorities on some sort of crime statistics, primarily police records.

Looking at the results in more detail, it is obvious that overall, property crime seems to be the most prominent crime problem by far, across all countries. Of the 15 Member States who participated, 12 mentioned a property-related crime (i.e. burglary and/or theft) in their top three. Next are crimes against the person and problems with drug use.

Remarkable is the occurrence of economic related crimes, which is mentioned a few times as a frequent crime problem but which is not included as a separate crime prevention policy priority. Conversely, juvenile delinquency is an important priority for a lot of countries but is less mentioned in the top three of crime problems based on crime statistics. Obviously, with juvenile delinquency the focus lies on the type of offender, not on the crime. Therefore, it can be related to several types of crime, like e.g. violence, drug offences, property crimes.

4.4. New developments and their cause(s)

In the last two questions the Member States were asked if there were any remarkable new developments in the past five years, and what the cause(s) of these could be.

One of the first noticeable developments is the emergence of cybercrime or e-crime, which seems to become more and more of a concern. The easy access to new digital technologies and the internet are being identified as lying at the basis of some new forms of crime, like e.g. phishing and skimming, but also in facilitating more common types of crime.

Another remarkable finding is that although in general, crime trends seemed to have been declining over the past few years, some countries – like e.g. Cyprus, Denmark, Ireland and Luxemburg – mention an increase in the number of burglaries and property related crimes. Suggestions have been made that this upward trend can be linked to the current broader economic situation and the financial crisis.

5. Conclusions

This second monitor report was largely divided into three parts. Firstly, the focus was put on European citizens' perceptions and attitudes towards trust in and the legitimacy of the police. Secondly, we looked at what people think about the effectiveness of policies on the prevention and fight against crime. Also, the public opinions regarding the main challenges to security, both at EU level and within individual Member States were examined. In the final part, the priorities in crime prevention policies across Europe were listed and described. The information and data used in this report come from the *Trust in the Police & Courts* Module of the European Social Survey (2011) and from the Eurobarometer surveys conducted twice a year by the European Commission. Additionally, the EUCPN Secretariat collected data on the national crime prevention policies, prominent crime problems and new developments in crime issues from the EUCPN members.

One of the findings of the fifth round of the European Social Survey is that there is quite some variation across EU Member States regarding the perceived trust in and the legitimacy of the police. However, some general patterns can be observed, e.g. citizens living in the Northern European countries seem to be most trusting in the police compared to some Eastern and Southern European Member States. North-European citizens generally think more that the police is doing a good job, they have more contact with their police, they are generally more satisfied with the way the police treats them and they have the most positive views on the way the police are wielding their power. Also, the legitimacy of the police seems to be more recognised by people living in the Nordic Member States: they have a larger proportion of respondents agreeing with the statement that the police share the same sense of right and wrong as themselves and these countries also tend to have a larger proportion of respondents who feel a stronger duty to follow police orders.

As Jackson et al. (2011a, 2011b) suggest, the results of the ESS indicate that social values or indicators, like public trust and institutional legitimacy, should perhaps be given more weight in the debate on crime (prevention) policies. If people indeed are more ready to comply with the law when they trust the criminal justice system and when they regard it as legitimate, then crime strategies should not focus solely on deterrence but also – and perhaps more – on these normative factors.

Looking at the citizens' views on the effectiveness of European level policies on the prevention and fight against crime, it can be observed that – although people generally tend to agree that policy-making on the prevention and fight against crime at the European Union level would be more effective than at the level of individual Member States – respondents living in the Northern European countries have the lowest proportions of people agreeing with this compared to the other Member States, whereas people in Spain and Portugal for example seem to agree more. To a certain extent, it seems that the countries where the levels of perceived trust and legitimacy in their own 'institutions' are high such as the Nordic countries (Finland, Denmark and Sweden), the United Kingdom and Ireland, are also those countries where less people believe in the effectiveness of joint decision-making at the European level. Another tendency can be observed in Germany, where a relatively high level of trust and legitimacy in their own 'institutions' goes along with a high belief in the effectiveness of EU level decision making.

From the Eurobarometer findings it occurs that in terms of the perceived challenges to the national and European security, the economic and financial crises are the most mentioned challenges to the security at both national and European level. Terrorism is the second most mentioned, and poverty and organised crime complete the top four as challenges to the security in the respondents' own country, as well as to the EU security.

The data also show that at least eight out of ten respondents agree that the five challenges set out in the Internal Security Strategy in Action – terrorism, organised crime, cybercrime, security of EU borders and natural/man-made disasters – are all (fairly or very) important challenges to the internal security of the EU. Again, of these five, terrorism and organised crime are the two challenges considered to be (very) important by most Europeans.

At first sight, there seemed not much correspondence between the crime prevention priorities mentioned by the EUCPN policy makers and the (perceived) challenges to the

national and EU security mentioned in part 3 of this report. For example, terrorism was mentioned as the second most important challenge to the security in the EU as well as in several Member States, but is nowhere to be seen in the individual country's prevention strategies (nor in the statistics). Obviously, in most countries terrorism is dealt with by other agencies such as intelligence services, military services or specialized units who collect their own data different from the regular police statistics. Also, the other challenges mentioned in the EU report, such as poverty, boarder security and man-made or natural disasters cannot simply be explained by a single criminal activity and are usually exceeding the scope of a national criminal statistics report. Therefore, a comparison between countries is very difficult to make. The same counts for data on organised crime which are often not part of the traditional crime statistics. This (partly) explains the gap which seemingly exists between the broad, transnational and EU priorities and (future) strategies and issues which worry the individual Member States on a daily basis.

According to the Eurobarometer cybercrime is seen a one of the challenges most likely to increase over the next three years, and looking at what policy makers identify as recent developments – e.g. the emergence of cybercrime and issues possibly related to the economic and financial crises – this gap between the EU and the national priorities might in fact not be as wide. These findings also underline the necessity of the installation of a European Cybercrime Centre (EC3) at Europol³² in January 2013 as a European focal point in the fight against cybercrime.

Although the three datasets used in this second European Crime Prevention Monitor report cannot be compared directly, the results can complement each other, advising local and national policy makers in their decision-making (see overview in annex 3). As a final conclusion, this report showed that (i) the perception of citizens concerning trust and legitimacy of authorities might be something which needs to be taken into account in crime (prevention) strategies, (ii) there is a range of common perceptions on challenges to the security and its reasons on the national and the EU level, and (iii) the most prevalent crime problems according to the statistics are not always implemented in the national crime prevention strategy.

³² <https://www.europol.europa.eu/node/1899>

References

- EUCPN (2012a). *European Crime Prevention Monitor 2012/1 – European cross country crime statistics, surveys and reports*. Brussels: European Crime Prevention Network. <http://www.eucpn.org/research/reviews.asp>, 34p.
- EUCPN (2012b). *Community (oriented) policing in Europe: Concepts, theory and practice*. EUCPN Toolbox series No. 2. Brussels: European Crime Prevention Network.
- European Commission 673 Final (2010). *The EU Internal Security Strategy in Action: Five steps towards a more secure Europe*. Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council. (22.11.2010) Brussels. <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2010:0673:FIN:EN:PDF>
- European Social Survey (2012). *ESS-5 2010 Documentation Report. Edition 2.0*. Bergen: European Social Survey Data Archive, Norwegian Social Science Data Services. <http://ess.nsd.uib.no/ess/round5/>
- European Social Survey (2011). *Round 5 Module on Trust in the Police & Courts – Final Question Design Template*. London: Centre for Comparative Social Surveys, City University London. http://www.europeansocialsurvey.org/index.php?option=com_docman&task=cat_view&gid=145&Itemid=80
- European Social Survey (2010). *Data file edition 2.0. Round 5, Data Norwegian Social Science Data Services, Norway – Data Archive and distributor of ESS data*. <http://ess.nsd.uib.no/ess/round5/download.html>
- Flash Eurobarometer 155 (2004). *Justice and Home Affairs*. Taylor, Nelson, Sofres – EOS Gallup Europe, Brussel: European Commission. http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/flash/fl155_executive.pdf, 11p.
- Hamilton, C. and R. Harvey (2005). *The role of statistics and public opinion in the implementation of international juvenile justice standards*. HEUNI Paper No. 21. Helsinki: European Institute for Crime Prevention and Control, affiliated with the United Nations (HEUNI), <http://www.heuni.fi/Etusivu/Publications/HEUNIpapers/1201509903501>, 37p.
- Hough, M., and M. Sato (2011). *Trust in justice: why it is important for criminal policy, and how it can be measured: final report of the Euro-Justis project*. Helsinki: European Institute for Crime Prevention and Control, affiliated with the United Nations (HEUNI), <http://www.heuni.fi/Etusivu/Publications/HEUNIreports/1302673429954>, 107p.
- Jackson, J., M. Hough, B. Bradford, T. Pooler, K. Hohl, and J. Kuha (2011a). *Trust in Justice: Topline Results from Round 5 of the European Social Survey*, ESS Topline Results Series 1, Brussels: European Commission. http://www.europeansocialsurvey.org/index.php?option=com_docman&task=cat_view&gid=82&Itemid=80
- Jackson, J., B. Bradford, M. Hough, J. Kuha, S. Stares, S. Widdop, R. Fitzgerald, M. Yordanova, and T. Galev (2011b). Developing European indicators of trust in justice. *European Journal of Criminology*, 8(4), p. 267 – 285.

- Jokinen, A., E. Ruuskanen, M. Yordanova, D. Markov, and M. Ilcheva (2009). *JUSTIS Project Working Papers Review of Need: Indicators of Public Confidence in Criminal Justice for Policy Assessment*. Helsinki: European Institute for Crime Prevention and Control, affiliated with the United Nations (HEUNI), <http://www.heuni.fi/Oikeapalsta/Search/1247667362492>, 240p.
- Special Eurobarometer 393 (2012). *Discrimination in the EU in 2012*. Wave EB77.4 – TNS Opinion & Social, Brussels: European Commission. http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs_393_en.pdf, 238p.
- Special Eurobarometer 390 (2012). *Cyber Security*. Wave EB77.2 – TNS Opinion & Social, Brussels: European Commission. http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs_390_en.pdf, 121p.
- Special Eurobarometer 380 (2012). *Awareness of Home Affairs*. Wave EB76.4 – TNS Opinion & Social, Brussels: European Commission. http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs_380_en.pdf, 118p.
- Special Eurobarometer 371 (2011). *Internal Security*. Wave EB75.4 – TNS Opinion & Social, Brussels: European Commission. http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs_371_en.pdf, 136p.
- Special Eurobarometer 264 (2006). *The role of the European Union in fighting against organised crime*. Wave 65.4 – TNS Opinion & Social, Brussels: European Commission. http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs_264_en.pdf, 63p.
- Stiglitz, J. E., A. Sen, and J-P. Fitoussi (2009). *Report by the Commission on the Measurement of Economic Performance and Social Progress*. http://www.stiglitz-sen-fitoussi.fr/documents/rapport_anglais.pdf, 292p.
- Tyler, T. R. (2011). Trust and legitimacy: Policing in the USA and Europe. *European Journal of Criminology*, 8(4), p. 254 – 266.
- Verhage & Ponsaers (2012). Community policing as a police strategy: effects and future outlook. In: EUCPN Secretariat (eds.), *EUCPN Thematic Paper Series, no. 3*, Brussels: European Crime Prevention Network. <http://www.eucpn.org/research/reviews.asp>

Annex 1: Questionnaire

EUCPN's European Crime Prevention Monitor 2 – 2012/12

Questionnaire

Introduction

Following the EUCPN's Multiannual Strategy one of the Network's goals is to 'to disseminate qualitative knowledge on crime prevention.' By collecting and disseminating multidisciplinary information on statistics, surveys and other reports, the Network will be able to base its own decisions on facts and figures and to contribute to a more general knowledge base. In order to achieve this, it is of utmost importance to collect comparable data from **all 27 Member States**. Therefore, may we kindly urge you to complete this very short questionnaire and send it back to us **before October 19th**? We understand that your time is precious and limited, so we have opted to ask just a few questions. It will only take a few minutes for you to answer them and they will provide us with a rich and important source of information.

Thank you very much in advance for your cooperation!

Questions

Country:	
-----------------	--

1. Considering your country's national crime prevention <u>policy/strategy</u>, what are the <u>3 main priorities</u>?
1.
2.
3.

2. Are these priorities based on statistical facts and/or figures, e.g. National or European Statistics, police records, surveys, etc.? YES - NO
2.1. If yes, which statistical facts/figures? What year were they collected? By whom were they collected/analysed? Please, describe in as much detail as possible.

2.2. If not, on what basis were these priorities picked? Please, describe in as much detail as possible.

3. Considering your country's crime statistics, what are the 3 most prominent crime problems?

1.

2.

3.

4. Were there any remarkable or new developments in your country over the past 5 years? YES - NO

4.1. If yes, which one(s)?

4.2. What is/are the cause(s) of the new development(s)?

Annex 2: Detailed overview response per question

Country	3 CP policy priorities	Based on statistical data? If yes, which data?	3 most prominent crime problems	Any new developments past 5 years? If yes,	Cause
AT	For the upcoming year the 3 main priorities are 1. Cyber Crime 2. Child Protection 3. Addiction	Yes, internal statistics from the last years	In the year 2011 it was 1. Theft 2. Burglary 3. Vandalism	In the last years a greater use of the internet and IT-Technology for criminal activities could be observed in Austria	The exact cause is unknown to me. Maybe the technical development, maybe the ordinariness and the ease of use of IT-technologies and the internet or maybe something completely different.
BE	For the moment, we have only a validated national police plan. The national policy on integral security (including crime prevention) on governmental level still needs to be finalized. This means that for the moment we only can indicate the priorities for the police. Based on this police plan with 10 priorities on crime phenomena, the local prevention plans and the draft policy plan on integral security, we could carefully point the following categories of priority (in random order) for crime prevention: 1. Burglary and theft 2. Violence: in public spaces and domestic violence 3. Nuisance	Yes, these priorities are based on statistical facts of the police on federal and local level, completed with questionnaires of partners, citizens, ...	1. Theft and extortion 2. Damage of property 3. Crime against physical integrity	The past 5 years, there is more attention for among others: 1) Radicalisation and honour related violence 2) Cybercrime 3) Camera surveillance and other new technologies 4) Itinerant groups 5) Administrative approach	Globalization & modernization Current financial situation
CY	1. Property Crime (Burglaries & Thefts) 2. Drugs 3. Illegal Immigration	Yes, serious and Minor crime statistics are collected / analyzed by the Police Analysis & Statistics Office. The statistics are analysed every month, six months and on a yearly basis. Last year, statistics were produced for 2011. Data is collected both from various police reports / forms as well as from an automated entry system run at Local Police Stations and CID offices. Statistics are based on the number of cases reported to the Police and the number of persons involved. However, the above three priorities mentioned in Question 1, do not rely only on police statistics, but also on threat assessments on specific types of crime, their future threats and the social impact they have on society.	1. Property Crime (Burglaries & Thefts) 2. Drugs 3. Economic Crime (Forgery etc)	The most significant developments in Cyprus, regarding criminality are the financial crisis and the subsequent rise in property crime. Due to the evolving nature of certain crimes and the new forms of crime committed with the use of electronic means, the Cyprus Police set up various specialised Offices / Units, such as the Cyber Crime Office, the Analysis & Statistics Office. To complement this effort, special training programmes on these new forms of crime, are now delivered in the Cyprus Police Academy.	We estimate that the rise in property crime can be partly attributed to the financial crisis, observed in Cyprus. Regarding crimes committed with the use of electronic means, it is clear that the increasing use of the Internet has generated these new forms of crime.
CZ	1. Reduced risk of crime and incidence of crime on the municipal and regional level, including reduction of risk factors which may trigger violations of law and order; The main priorities are: - elimination of individual causes of social exclusion - the establishment and cultivation of co-operation between the public administration, local authorities and NGOs - monitoring and regular assessment 2. Integration of efficient prevention in the everyday policing activities of the Police of the CR, especially on the local level; The main priorities are: - set clear achievable goals - set transparent monitoring process - clear budget lines to ensure implementation 3. Launching of an efficient and permanent system of collection, analysis, dissemination, and exchange of crime prevention related information among all stakeholders The main priorities are: - commission external and independent evaluations - set transparent monitoring process - clear budget lines to ensure implementation	Yes, analyses are performed on administrative data and own data, external as well as internal. • Analyses performed by the Ministry of the Interior to map the risk locations and to help create guidelines for the selection of towns and municipalities at risk to be included in the local crime prevention activities, • Analyses performed by regions to help point out sites and locations at high risk. Such analyses are subsequently used as background material to help evaluate local level crime prevention projects submitted by towns and municipalities for subsidies. Regions find them useful in the process of drafting the regional crime prevention programmes, • Analyses performed by the self-governing bodies with the objective to provide a detailed picture of the local problems which are proposed for solution under the umbrella of the local crime prevention programmes, • Analyses performed by the Police of the CR on the level of local Police stations, county headquarters, and regional directorates. The analysis are a part of the regional analyses and serve as background material for the Police own prevention activities, • Analyses performed to evaluate the effectiveness of	1. Illegal access to information systems and other cyber related crimes 2. Public corruption and serious economic crime including money laundering and other related crimes 3. Extremism and all other forms of discrimination and intolerance	Yes, crime trends correspond to new developments or shifts in the following fields: - social exclusion (extremism, poverty related crimes...) - new digital technologies (crime – stalking, phishing, skimming...) - aging of population (domestic violence and finance related crime connected to seniors)	Yes, crime trends correspond to new developments or shifts in the following fields: - social exclusion (extremism, poverty related crimes...) - new digital technologies (crime – stalking, phishing, skimming...) - aging of population (domestic violence and finance related crime connected to seniors)

Country	3 CP policy priorities	Based on statistical data? If yes, which data?	3 most prominent crime problems (stats)	Any new developments past 5 years? If yes, which?	Cause
DK	<p>1. Reduce the number of the most prolific offending youth</p> <p>2. Maintain the results of the broad initiatives aimed at the broad population</p> <p>3. Bring down the number repeat victimizations</p> <p>4. Maintain the high sense of safety that people feel</p> <p>We have answered according to our strategy here at the Council, because there is no overall national strategy, including for instance ministries etc. There is no focus on specific types of crime. It is more in the line of developments we wish to influence, like the decline in youth crime, decline in crime and limit the influx and influence of organized crime.</p>	<p>Yes, to a wide extent on the self report study done by prof. Flemming Balvig, since 1989 with 5 year intervals. Balvig conducts the study amongst 8th graders who are 14 years old, and has for instance documented that as a whole youth has become more and more law abiding, but there is a small and stable group, who continues to commit serious crimes more than a few times. This study is the basis for the first priority and partly for the second.</p> <p>The second part of the argument for the second priority is the national victim survey, which documents a decline in violence. Thus youth crime has gone down and violence has gone down. The same victim survey documents that there is a considerable increased risk of being victimized again, if you are victimized once. This goes for violence as well as burglary. The reasons for the first may be of a more social nature while the reasons for repeat victimization of burglary may have something to do with the fact that burglars know that there is 'something to be had' when entering a specific house.</p>	<p>1. Burglary</p> <p>2. Organized crime</p> <p>3. /</p>	<p>1) the drop in the amount of violence is significant and remarkable</p> <p>2) the fact that the majority of young people are now completely law abiding is also remarkable</p> <p>3) the large increase in burglary was unfortunately also remarkable</p>	<p>1. society as a whole shows signs of renouncing violence increasingly. The proclivity to report continues to rise, which indicates that what was in the past viewed as merely 'physical incidents' and just 'something that happens' is now increasingly seen as a criminal act that merits reporting to the police. (Prof. Balvigs interpretation).</p> <p>2. Balvig speaks of 'disciplining for the future' meaning that young people today are much more aware of walking the straight line and maintaining a clean record in order to be able to achieve the things they want in life – a job for instance. Of course the above mentioned development also plays a role here. And lastly I want to mention that the fact that society has become so affluent has eliminated the need for the majority of young people to steal. They simply have everything they need already. Whether this stays the same during and after the current crisis, will be interesting to follow.</p> <p>3. Finally, Dave Sorensen has studied possible reasons for the increase in residential burglary. He studied a number of reasons for possible effect on the burglary rate and found that more than one had the potential to explain small parts of the increase, but that none could explain it altogether. The factors with the most explanatory power were identified to be:</p> <p>a) the reform of the Danish police in 2007. The reform was a very extensive one, rearranging the organization and meaning many changes for many people. New areas of expertise, and new work locations meant a drop in the effectiveness of the police for a period of time.</p> <p>b) Influx of crime tourism is the most likely external cause to have made the burglary rates go up.</p> <p>But also the following factors influenced the development:</p> <p>c) increasing professionalism – evidenced in the increasing amount of expensive designer furniture being stolen</p> <p>d) increase in repeat victimization in the same households</p> <p>e) an increase in the average number of charged crimes per offender.</p> <p>Additionally, increases in the size of the young adult population and in the use of cocaine and amphetamines, plus the financial crisis, are thought to have provided fertile grounds for property crime to flourish.</p>
ES	<p>1. Crimes of which passive subject are people - crimes make against people.</p> <p>2. Crimes against patrimony.</p> <p>3. Minor offence of injuries and minor offence of larceny.</p>	<p>Yes, in Spain the proper Authority to gather and make public statistical facts on crimes is the Ministry of Interior. It is possible to consult the information in the Website 'Ministry of Interior's Statistical Annual': http://www.interior.gob.es/file/57/57566/57566.pdf</p>	<p>The publicized crime statistics do not make differences amongst different crimes</p>	<p>The publicized crime statistics do not make differences over the past 5 years. Nevertheless, it is publicized the crimes statistics on the last twelve years in the Website: overall, the trend shows a fall in the crime rates.</p>	
FI	<p>1 local crime prevention</p> <p>2 prevention of violence</p> <p>3 prevention of youngsters and children's exclusion</p> <p>4 improving the status of victims</p>	<p>Yes and no.</p> <p>Prevention of violence is based on relatively high violence numbers in criminal statistics in Finland, others are just important values to Finnish society.</p> <p>National research of legal policy, they also have site in English.</p> <p>Statistics of Finland, they also have site in English.</p>	<p>1. property crimes</p> <p>2. crimes against life and health</p> <p>3. drug offenses</p>	<p>The number of total crimes has stayed quite stable in the past years.</p> <p>Small minority is that the number of hit and run crimes committed by the foreigners has varied during the past years</p>	<p>The total number of criminality has been stable, due to the stable structure of society and authorities work.</p> <p>Hit and run crimes are the result of free movement of people by the Schengen agreement. And in Finland there are plenty of crime opportunities, because of poor protection and copious opportunities.</p>

Country	3 CP policy priorities	Based on statistical data? If yes, which data?	3 most prominent crime problems (stats)	Any new developments past 5 years? If yes, which?	Cause
IE	<p>The three main priorities as reflected in the Strategy Statement 2011-2014 of the Department of Justice and Equality and annual policing plans of An Garda Síochána (Ireland's police force) are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To protect the State and its people against terrorism in all its forms 2. To combat crime, including organised crime and white collar crime 3. To enhance safety in our communities and on our roads <p>The policing priorities are set out in An Garda Síochána Policing Plan 2012. The Plan lists 6 crime types which are not accorded any relative priority.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Tackle property crime 2. Tackle crimes against the person 3. Divert young people from crime 4. Tackle organised crime 5. Tackle e-crime 6. Tackle white collar crime in all its forms 	<p>Not directly. Statistical facts form part of the overall consideration in the determination of priorities. The Minister determines these matters as priorities for An Garda Síochána (National Police Force) based on, among other things, consideration of crime trends and statistics and Government policy and priorities, as set out in the Programme for Government.</p> <p>The Policing Plan is informed by an analysis of crime statistics.</p>	<p>The following three broad crime categories feature prominently in discussion and analysis of Ireland's recent crime statistics.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Organised Crime including gangland killings and drug offences 2. Crimes against the person and public order offences including assault, sexual offences, threats and alcohol related offences 3. Property crime including burglary, robbery and theft related offences 	<p>The latest police recorded crime statistics released by the Central Statistics Office show a decrease in 11 of the 14 crime groups for which figures are given, compared with the previous 12 months.</p> <p>In particular, crimes against the person have decreased, including murder (- 8%), as well as assault and related offences (- 9.7%). Public order and damage to property offences have also decreased (- 13.1% and -10.8% respectively), as have drug offences (- 4.9%) and weapons and explosives offences (- 15.1%).</p> <p>The position with respect to some property offences remains a concern, however. While robbery and theft offences have decreased (by 4.7% and 1.1% respectively), burglary has increased by 10.3% and fraud offences by 8%.</p>	<p>It is suggested by public commentators that the increase in burglaries and property crimes can be linked to broader economic issues.</p>
LT	<p>First three priorities, defined in the National Crime prevention and Control Programme are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Violent crime prevention and control; 2. Property crimes prevention and control; 3. Prevention and control of crimes committed in public places. <p>This Programme is very wide (and quite old – from 1997), so every three years we form a implementation plan, which also defines priorities out of all mentioned in the Programme. Priority for the 2013-2015 are: the development of the crime control and prevention system (training of specialists, individual juvenile prevention based on research, strengthening of the preventive measures for the protection of the property of the population).</p>	<p>Yes, to the Lithuanian departmental register of criminal offenses, half of all of the recorded criminal offenses are thefts and other property crimes. Juveniles suspected of committing 9.3 percent of all investigated criminal offenses. All the data is collected in the Mol system by The IT and Communications Department under the Ministry of the Interior (http://www.ird.lt/viewpage.php?page_id=55) and every year analyzed in the Mol and Police department under the Mol. Smaller priorities (as which trainings should be provided, which measures of individual prevention should be picked up) depend on the institutions who are directly responsible for the implementation. Also every year Mol is conducting face to face interview and is drafting a survey "Lithuanian attitudes towards the police, the feeling of safety perception and assessment of the state of public safety" on which results the priorities are made too. (http://www.vrm.lt/go.php/lt/Sociologiniai-tyrimai/248/1 - Lt only)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Thefts (1007,7 per 100 000 citizens) 2. Fraud (168,5) 3. Burglary (124,2) 	<p>Not in the field of crime prevention policy</p>	
LU	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Burglaries 2. Violence against persons 3. Drugs abuse and crime related to it 	<p>Yes, the Grand-Ducal Police issues every year a criminal statistics report on national level. The figures were collected in February 2012 to refer to the year 2011. Total of criminal acts registered : 35.702</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Burglaries (3.579 = 10% of the criminal acts registered in 2011) 2. Violence against persons (3.134 = 8.8 %) 3. Drug related crimes (2.941 = 8.2%) 	<p>Burglaries have risen by 48% from 2010 to 2011.</p>	<p>This phenomenon can partly be explained by an important series of burglaries at the end of 2011, mostly committed by 1 or 2 criminal groups. They were specialised in breaking in local complexes like the municipal office or elementary schools. On the other hand, there was a spectacular rise of burglaries in private housings (+ 60%).</p>
MT	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Theft 2. Fraud 3. Crimes on the elderly 	<p>Yes, statistics from the Police (such statistics are not analysed). Each month the police issue a statistical report showing the trends in crime and where it is happening and on whom. Obviously we will target those victims most prone to crime.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Theft from vehicle 2. Pick Pocketing 3. Theft from residence 	<p>Lately we have a rise in pick pocketing.</p>	<p>The main cause of such rise in pick pocketing is attributed to the fact that a lot of ROMA persons having Romanian passports live in Malta and frequent places where large masses of people gather. Systematically they pick pocket persons in bars and other places of entertainment.</p>

Country	3 CP policy priorities	Based on statistical data? If yes, which data?	3 most prominent crime problems (stats)	Any new developments past 5 years? If yes, which?	Cause
NL	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Armed robberies 2. Crime against businesses 3. Youth crime 	<p>Yes.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Police records, monthly, per business sector, per police region 2. Bi-annually by means of victim survey 3. Research demonstrates that 75% of youth criminality derives from youth groups or group dynamic processes. Since 2009 once a year data of the police, prosecution office and municipalities is gathered to make a national and regional picture of the amount of youth groups. Youth groups are distinguished in two groups: criminal groups and groups causing nuisance (see attachment). 	<p>National crime statistics and National Safety Monitor available from www.cbs.nl</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. theft 2. Damaging / destruction 3. Traffic related crime 		
PL	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. to combat juvenile delinquency 2. to reduce the number of fatal road accidents 3. to prevent domestic violence 	<p>Yes, these priorities are mainly based on statistical data from police records as well as reports of the National Programme to Prevent Domestic Violence (collected by the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy), report on the Safety in Poland (collected by the Ministry of Interior). Those reports are prepared each year. We also take into consideration European statistics especially when it comes to the fatal road accidents.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. juvenile delinquency 2. domestic violence 3. fatal road accidents 	<p>One significant development in Poland was a delegalization and penalization process of so called "Boosters" (in Polish 'dopalacze'). After deaths of few young people who consumed legally accessible synthetic substances which gave similar effect as synthetic drugs and had similar chemical structure, the Ministry of Health issued to the Parliament an Act forbidding its selling. Shops and other places where such 'boosters' were sold were closed down by sanitary institutions and the Police. This had an important social effect as parents and young people used to perceive these substances as safe because they were legal. After the penalization and with thanks to many debates, campaigns and crime prevention programmes the public is constantly informed that those substances have similar effects as drugs and may be equally addictive.</p>	
RO	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prevention of crime against private and public property 2. Prevention of juvenile delinquency and victimization of minors 3. - 	<p>Yes, the national crime prevention priorities mentioned above have been decided upon by the managing team of the Romanian National Police Inspectorate based on police records collected every year monthly and quarterly by the Criminal Record specialized unit. Facts and figures are collected via a national database set up for various crimes and the recordings are analysed by the managing team every year in order to set the priorities for the year to come.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. thefts / burglaries 2. robbery 3. juvenile delinquency and victimization of minors 	No	

Country	3 CP policy priorities	Based on statistical data? If yes, which data?	3 most prominent crime problems (stats)	Any new developments past 5 years? If yes, which?	Cause
UK	<p>The UK policing landscape has changed under the current Government, with power shifting from Central Government to local communities. From November 15th 2012 locally elected Police and Crime Commissioners will set local crime reduction policies based on local crime priorities. The aim is to give the public a stronger voice on policing and crime.</p> <p>Local decisions will be informed by crime maps which are available online and give the public access to detailed monthly data about crime and anti-social behaviour in their area, as well as justice outcomes for England and Wales.</p> <p>The Government will respond to national threats through the National Crime Agency (NCA) which will deal with complex and organised crimes when it is established by the end of 2013. The Government's national priorities include metal theft which affected the UK's security and infrastructure and needed legislation to deal with it.</p> <p>The Government also has a role in addressing some of the key drivers of crime, for example by developing strategies to tackle illicit and harmful drug use and alcohol abuse.</p>	<p>Yes, we have two key measures of crime: the Crime Survey in England and Wales (CSEW), which surveys around 45,000 adults; and Police Recorded Crime (PRC), which measures crimes reported to the police. The CSEW is conducted by the Office for National Statistics (ONS) and consists of face-to-face interviews with over 45,000 adults aged 16 or over resident in households in England and Wales who are asked about their experiences of a range of crimes in the 12 months prior to interview. For the crime types and population it covers, the CSEW provides a better reflection of the true extent of household and personal crime than police recorded statistics because the survey includes crimes that are not reported to or recorded by the police. It is also a better indicator of long-term trends than police recorded crime because it is unaffected by changes in reporting over time or in police recording practices and has retained the same methodology for the main count of crime since the survey began in 1981.</p> <p>Generally speaking, the CSEW should be used to assess overall levels and trends in crime. However, sampling error makes it less effective when looking at very small numbers of crimes, either for rare crime types such as robbery, or when looking at very small geographical areas. For this reason PRC is the better source for crime pattern analysis at a very local level, subject to the limitation of being unable to show the full extent of crime in an area due to under-reporting. PRC also provides a good measure of well-reported crimes, in particular homicide.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Other theft offences 2. Violence against the person offences 3. Burglary offences 	<p>The latest crime statistics show that crime has fallen by 6% across both measures (Police Recorded Crime and the Crime Survey in England and Wales). This is the first statistically significant fall in the CSEW for 3 years. These figures indicate that the public have the lowest chance of being a victim of crime since the CSEW began in 1981.</p> <p>Crime Survey for England and Wales ↓ Overall CSEW crime down 6% the first statistically significant fall for 3 years following a largely flat trend</p> <p>Statistically significant falls in CSEW crime: ↓ Vandalism down 10% ↓ Vehicle-related theft down 8% ↓ All Household crime down 7% ↓ Household acquisitive crime down 5%</p> <p>Police recorded crime ↓ Total recorded crime down 6% from 4.1 million to 3.9 million</p> <p>Falls across nearly all crime types: ↓ Criminal damage down 12% ↓ Knife crime down 9% (for selected violent and sexual offences) ↓ Offences against vehicles down 8% ↓ Robbery down 7% ↓ Violence against the person down 6% ↓ Domestic burglary down 6% ↓ Sexual offences down 5% ↓ Drug offences down 4% ↓ Fraud and forgery down 3% ↓ Other theft offences down 2% ↓ Firearms offences (excluding air weapons) down 18% (provisional) ↓ Homicides down 14% (provisional)</p>	

Annex 3: Summary characteristics of the data used

	European Social Survey (ESS)	Eurobarometer	EUCPN survey
Institution conducting the study	Academics and national coordinators and survey Institutes	European Commission	European Crime Prevention Network (EUCPN)
Funding organisation	The central coordination and design has been funded through the European Commission's Fifth and Sixth Framework Programmes and the European Science Foundation. The national scientific funding bodies cover the costs of fieldwork in each country.	European Commission	European Crime Prevention Network Member States; European Commission
Main Focus	<p>Mapping long-term attitudinal and behavioural changes in Europe's social, political and moral climate</p> <p>Core module of 12 topics repeated each round:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Trust in institutions - National, ethnic, religious identity - Political engagement - Well-being, health and security - Socio-political values - Demographic composition - Moral and social values - Education and occupation - Social capital - Financial circumstances - Social exclusion - Household circumstances <p>Rotating modules changed each round:</p> <p>Round 1: Immigration and asylum, citizen involvement and democracy</p> <p>Round 2: Family, work and well-being, economic morality, health and care seeking</p>	Surveys and studies on public opinions and trends on a wide variety of issues relating to the EU	Overview of the priorities in crime prevention policies/strategies in each Member State

	Round 3: Personal and social well-being, perceptions of the life course Round 4: Experiences and expressions of Ageism, welfare attitudes in a changing Europe Round 5: Trust in Justice, work, family and well-being Round 6: Personal and social well-being, understanding and evaluating democracy		
Methodology	Quantitative	Quantitative	Qualitative
Crime (Prevention) topics measured	Perception of European citizens on trust and legitimacy of police and criminal courts in their countries	Justice and Home Affairs, The role of the European Union in the fight against organised crime, cyber security, discrimination in the EU, awareness of Home Affairs, internal security	Main priorities in crime prevention policy in the EU Member States. Most prominent crime problems in the EU Member States New developments in crime (prevention) and their cause(s)
Timing	Round1: June 2001 – Sept. 2003 Round 2: Feb. 2003 – Sept. 2005 Round 3: Dec. 2004 – Sept. 2007 Round 4: Dec. 2006 – Sept. 2009 Round 5: Nov. 2008 – Oct. 2011 Round 6: March 2011 – Oct. 2013	Since 1973 twice a year and various ad-hoc surveys	2012
Geographical coverage	31 countries (27 EU Member States included)	34 countries or territories (27 EU Member States included)	15 EU Member States
Sample	EU eligible residential populations aged 15+; Minimum 1,500, (or 800 for countries with less than two million inhabitants) 39.000 interviews in Round 5 (Trust in Justice)	Approx. 1000 interviews per country	15 questionnaires
Frequency	2 year cycle	Standard and Special Eurobarometer: twice a year Flash Eurobarometer and Qualitative studies: ad-hoc	Ad hoc when required
Key publications	A list of relevant publications can be downloaded from http://ess.nsd.uib.no/bibliography	All Eurobarometer publications can be downloaded from http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinio	All European Crime Prevention Monitors can be downloaded from: www.eucpn.org

	<p>/complete.html</p> <p>Specifically on justice issues:</p> <p>Jackson, J., M. Hough, B. Bradford, T. Pooler, K. Hohl, and J. Kuha (2011). <i>Trust in Justice: Topline Results from Round 5 of the European Social Survey</i>, ESS Topline Results Series 1, Brussels: European Commission. http://www.europeansocialsurvey.org/index.php?option=com_docman&task=cat_view&gid=82&Itemid=80</p>	<p>n/index_en.htm</p> <p>Specifically on crime issues:</p> <p>Flash Eurobarometer 155 (2004). <i>Justice and Home Affairs</i>. Taylor, Nelson, Sofres – EOS Gallup Europe, Brussel: European Commission. http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/flash/fl155_executive.pdf</p> <p>Special Eurobarometer 393 (2012). <i>Discrimination in the EU in 2012</i>. Wave EB77.4 – TNS Opinion & Social, Brussel: European Commission. http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs_393_en.pdf</p> <p>Special Eurobarometer 390 (2012). <i>Cyber Security</i>. Wave EB77.2 – TNS Opinion & Social, Brussel: European Commission. http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs_390_en.pdf</p> <p>Special Eurobarometer 380 (2012). <i>Awareness of Home Affairs</i>. Wave EB76.4 – TNS Opinion & Social, Brussel: European Commission. http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs_380_en.pdf</p> <p>Special Eurobarometer 371 (2011). <i>Internal Security</i>. Wave EB75.4 – TNS Opinion & Social, Brussel: European Commission. http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs_371_en.pdf</p>	<p>EUCPN (2012). <i>European Crime Prevention Monitor 2012/2: Public opinion and policy on crime prevention in Europe</i>. Brussels: European Crime Prevention Network. http://www.eucpn.org/research/reviews.asp</p>
--	---	--	---

		<p>Special Eurobarometer 264 (2006). <i>The role of the European Union in fighting against organised crime</i>. Wave 65.4 – TNS Opinion & Social, Brussel: European Commission. http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs_264_en.pdf</p>	
Website	http://www.europeansocialsurvey.org	http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/index_en.htm	http://www.eucpn.org/