

Working Paper No.9
30 January 2006

ENGLISH ONLY

**STATISTICAL COMMISSION and
UN ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR
EUROPE**

**CONFERENCE OF EUROPEAN
STATISTICIANS**

**UNITED NATIONS OFFICE ON
DRUGS AND CRIME**

Joint UNECE-UNODC Meeting on Crime Statistics
Vienna, 25-27 January 2006

Session 2 – Invited paper

**ADDRESSING TELESCOPING AND NON-RESPONSE
Results from the questionnaire on Victim Surveys
on telescoping, non response and methodological challenges***

Submitted by ISTAT, Italy

1. Introduction

1. Many countries perform different surveys, some at regional level, others at national level. That could look as a richness of approaches and information but also it causes problems in identifying and evaluating communalities and corresponding effectiveness.

2. The need and corresponding difficulty to reach a common point of view and strategy is clear also from a first glance at the inventory's data whose analysis look not easy nor trivial. Different methodological skills were involved, different terminologies were used, different skills in working using another language were undertaken. As a consequence when we deal about some topics it could be useful and recommended to provide also our own definition about those, otherwise misrepresentations and misunderstanding are likely to occur.

3. The above problems were found when analysing both reference period data, telescoping effect data, and performance process data, that is non response.

* Analysis by Maria Giuseppina Muratore and Isabella Corazziari

I think that coordinating and organising means first of all better defining what looks trivial and shared, while my own inventory's analysis experience says it is not.

2. Reference period and telescoping effect

2a. Reference period

4. The first analysis phase was to recode some answers, to make them more understandable and comparable.

5. Most used reference period to report crimes is "1 year" or "12 month before interview" (more or less 89% of surveys), the following are also indicated by higher frequency: "5 years", "lifetime", "last 6 months" and "3 years before the interview". In many case both 5 year and 1 year before the interview are considered, as it will be stressed when dealing strategies to reduce the telescoping effect (21 surveys out of 26 using 5 year reference period also ask for events occurred 1 year before the interview). Italy considers 3 year reference period instead of 5, but in this phase it was joined with surveys using 5 year ref.period for brevity.

6. It is important to notice that when the reference period is 1 year, many surveys indicate the calendar year as a fixed reference period, while some surveys, using a moving reference period, underline to consider the first month of the last 12 months period before the interview, as a reference to collect events. That first month becomes an anchor to delimitate the reference period, which will shift according to the survey length.

7. Other surveys, specifically panel surveys, link the reference period to the previous interview which can occur every 9 to 15 months, with a moving estimates period of about 11 months on average (Switzerland) or about every 6 months for NCVS- USA.

8. When considering lifetime periods we concern also reference periods defined as "from 16 or 18 years old" which clearly are used when collecting physical and/or sexual violence events.

Table 1. Type of reference period used.

| Reference period | N | % |
|-----------------------------|----|------|
| Six Months | 7 | 9,0 |
| One year /12 months | 62 | 79,5 |
| Three years | 2 | 2,6 |
| Five years | 26 | 33,3 |
| Life time (or > 16/18years) | 18 | 23,1 |
| Other | 2 | 2,6 |

9. When considering the type of surveys collecting data about victimisation in term of dedicated surveys or multipurpose surveys with an included module about victimisation and/or crimes (55,6% are victimisation survey; 33,3% are multipurpose surveys with the inclusion of a module on victimisation; 12,3% are violence against women surveys; 7,4% are other types), victimisation surveys most frequently consider 5 years, 6 months and/or 1 year as reference periods. Except for very few cases, surveys collecting events for last 5 years also collect events for the last 12 months period. In those cases estimates are published referring to the 12 months reference period.

10. Multipurpose surveys adopt most frequently 1 year and 6 months as the reference periods for collecting crime events. Violence surveys usually refer to lifetime or a long period starting when respondent was 16 or 18 years old (77,8% of all the violence against women surveys). Victimization surveys use lifetime period only to collect sexual violence events, with the only exception of the International Crime in Business Survey – Lithuania.

Table2. Type of reference period used by survey's type

| Reference period | N | % |
|---------------------------------------|----------|----------|
| Six Months | | |
| Crime | 4 | 57,1 |
| Module | 2 | 28,6 |
| Violence | 1 | 14,3 |
| Total six months | 7 | 100,0 |
| One year /12 months | | |
| Crime | 34 | 54,8 |
| Module | 19 | 30,6 |
| Violence | 9 | 14,5 |
| Total one year | 62 | 100,0 |
| Five years | | |
| Crime | 21 | 80,8 |
| Module | 3 | 11,5 |
| Violence | 2 | 7,7 |
| Total five years | 26 | 100,0 |
| Life time (or > 16/18years) | | |
| Crime | 2 | 11,1 |
| Module | 2 | 11,1 |
| Violence | 14 | 77,8 |
| Total life time | 18 | 100,0 |

2b. Different reference periods for the same survey

11. Many surveys use different reference periods for selected crimes (33 cases out of 78, that is 42% of the processed surveys). Changes involve mostly 12 months (14 cases) and lifetime (9 cases); 5 years (5 cases), 6 months and 3 years (both for only one survey) are also involved. Crimes needing different reference period are mostly sexual crimes and physical violence (17 cases that is 21,8% of all the processed surveys). The first are often collected referring to lifetime, some surveys have few questions collecting events occurred before 16 years age; many other surveys consider events after 16 or 18 years age. Only one survey collect domestic violence occurred in the last 5 years of respondent life.

12. The only 2 crimes with 1 year reference period, which are not physical and/or sexual crimes, are corruption crime and consumers' fraud, both collected by the Lithuania victimization survey; the other crimes in the same survey refer to past 5 years reference period.

2c. About the telescoping effect

13. When analysing Inventory's data, some recoding was needed. For example some surveys did not report any strategies to reduce the telescoping effect, while reading the whole corresponding Inventory it was clear that they use the reducing reference period (5 cases); other surveys indicated the funnelling questions among strategies, while reading elsewhere their inventory it was clear that they actually use the reducing reference period (5 cases). Furthermore recoding the "specify" field of other items, 7 cases were recoded, most of all as using the reporting of the event date.

14. After the above adjustments a variegated picture appears. First of all, 41% of surveys declare not to use any measure to reduce telescoping against the 59% that do it. In details 3,8% of surveys did not answer to the question while 37,2% answered in a negative way. When considering surveys trying to reduce telescoping effect and recall problems, most of them declared to reduce the reference period (52,2%) and to collect the event data (43,5%); 15,2% of surveys use the funnel questions and 6,5% the panel data technique. Finally 15,2% declared to use other strategies.

Table 3. Special measures taken to reduce the telescoping effect

| | N | % on surveys (78) | % on measures' respondents (46) |
|---|----|-------------------|---------------------------------|
| Reporting of the event date | 20 | 25,6 | 43,5 |
| Use of funnel questions | 7 | 9,0 | 15,2 |
| Reducing of the reference period | 24 | 30,8 | 52,2 |
| Use of panel data | 3 | 3,8 | 6,5 |
| Other | 7 | 9,0 | 15,2 |
| No specific measures were taken | 29 | 37,2 | |
| Missing | 3 | 3,8 | |
| No specific measures were taken + missing | 32 | 41,0 | |

15. 41,3% of surveys that address the telescoping problem use more than one strategies. The number of different strategies undertaken varies from 1 to 3 and the medium number of solutions used is 1,41.

Reporting the event date

16. 20 surveys use the report of the event date strategy and some of them use it to check and to make data imputation a posteriori.

3 out of those 20 surveys consider a reference period of 6 months, while 16 surveys have the year or twelve months; 8 out of the last surveys use the reducing reference period strategy too (1 and 5 years or 1 and 3, as Italy does). 2 surveys have also the lifetime as reference period and only one the five year.

The reporting event data is used by crime survey in 65% of cases, by multipurpose survey with a victimisation module included (30%) and only in 1 case by violence against women survey.

Table 4. About the reporting of the event date, by reference period and type of survey

| Reference period | N | % |
|-------------------------|-----------|--------------|
| Six months | 3 | 15,0 |
| 1 year/12 months | 16 | 80,0 |
| 5 years | 1 | 5,0 |
| Total | 20 | 100,0 |
| Type of survey | | |
| Victimization module | 13 | 65,0 |
| Victimization survey | 6 | 30,0 |
| Violence survey | 1 | 5,0 |
| Total | 20 | 100,0 |

Use of Funnel questions

17. Only 7 surveys use the funnel questions to address telescoping effect. They are above all multipurpose surveys with a victimization module, but also violence surveys and there is only a case of victimization survey.

The most used reference period is one year (4 surveys, 2 of which with the reducing period strategy too), the combination of lifetime period and one year (2 surveys) and 6 months (1).

Table 5. About the use of funnel questions, by reference period and type of survey

| Reference period | N |
|-------------------------|----------|
| 6 months | 1 |
| 1 year | 4 |
| lifetime and 1 year | 2 |
| Type of survey | |
| Victimization module | 4 |
| Victimization survey | 1 |
| Violence survey | 2 |
| Total | 7 |

Reducing of the reference period

18. The most used strategy is the reducing of the reference period. This is very used by victimization surveys and only partially by the other survey types. Looking at the different periods used to reduce the lack of memory the 1 and 5 years is the most used technique, but also others are used, as the six months in combination with the year or the lifetime, the 1 and 3 years.

Table 6. About the reducing of the reference period, by reference period and type of survey

| Reference period | N | % |
|---|-----------|--------------|
| 6 months (mixed with one year or 5 years or lifetime) | 5 | 20,8 |
| 1-5 years | 16 | 66,7 |
| Others | 3 | 12,5 |
| Total | 24 | 100,0 |
| Type of survey | | |
| Victimization surveys | 18 | 75,0 |
| Violence surveys | 2 | 8,3 |
| Victimization module | 4 | 16,7 |
| Total | 24 | 100,0 |

19. When considering the joint use of two reference periods, 1 and 5 years is the most frequently used combination.

The analysis of crime estimates for the two jointly used reference period, usually suggest that crime distribution by year is not always uniform. This is true also when considering 3 year as reference period that is a relatively small overall period. Italian studies highlighted it for crimes collected referring both to last 3 years and then for last 1 year before the interview. Some crimes do not distribute uniformly (for example robbery in Italy according to the citizen's victimisation survey in 2002: 447 in the last 3 years and 210 in the last year before the interview, data in thousand, that is to say half of the declared robberies in the last 3 years occurred in the most recent year; threat is 1274 in last 3 years and 509 in the more recent year of the 3; other crimes as bag-snatching, pick-pocketing, car theft do not show such an effect). One consideration we can do is that lack of memory differently affects different crimes.

20. Using the combination of two reference period produce a reduction in error estimates, as demonstrated in an italian experiment on a multipurpose survey: the 2002 sample was divided in two part, an experiment group and the control group of 12,000 households each. The experiment group considered the joint use of reference period in which the use of reduced period from 3 to 1 years caused the burglary decreasing from 3,1% (when directly asking to refer to the last year before the survey) to 2,6% (average year crime estimates based on data referred to 3 years and the last 12 months).

We recommend to use estimates referred to the most recent period, avoiding to publish estimates referring to years affected by the telescoping effect.

The use of panel data

21. Panel surveys can clearly use the previous interview as the anchor date and this strategy look actually the most interesting. Considering small intervals as 6 months (11 months for the Swiss panel) they succeed in reproducing quite well the real situation. Furthermore when considering last 6 months the risk of lack of memory for less severe crimes is lesser than surveys referring to 1 year as crime reference period.

22. To reduce errors in estimates and to enhance the above strategy to address memory recall, usually the first wave of interviews is not published. In literature strategies to correct the first wave are proposed as to gain also these data after proper telescoping effect corrections are made (usually such strategies decrease the first wave estimates on the basis of subsequent waves results).

23. Panel surveys are performed only in 3 cases, maybe because they do cost very much. Among these, 2 are victimisation surveys and 1 is a multipurpose survey with an included victimisation module.

Table 7. Survey that use panel data

| | | |
|-------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| HUNGARY | Hungarian Crime (Victim) Survey | 6 months, 1 year, lifetime |
| USA | National Crime Victimization Survey | 6 months |
| SWITZERLAND | Swiss Household Panel (SHP) | 11 months |

24. The Hungarian survey collecting events for the last 6 months also collect events for the last 1 year before the interview, and lifetime.

Other strategies

25. The other strategies are using of other kind of data, anchoring the recall to some specific period, improving the interviewers training, using of the calendar events when asking about the date or proposing to remember the season, the dresses worn or things happened in interviewees' life, i.e. dear dates, as anniversary, birthday.

26. There are 7 surveys that gave those indications, 2 of which are victimization surveys, 2 victimization modules and 3 violence surveys. Their reference period is the lifetime period (2 cases), the combination of 5 and 1 years (2 cases), the combination of lifetime and 1 year; one survey uses the 5 years reference period and one the last year.

The indicated strategies are usually used jointly with others, most frequently the reporting of the event date.

No measures taken and missing

27. Most of surveys declaring no use of reducing telescoping effects measures are module surveys. The module is a very important tool, sometimes the only source of informations about victimisation, but ad hoc surveys are most accurate and reliable.

28. Many violence against women surveys declared no use strategies to reduce the telescoping effects, as their main aims are the knowledge and discovery of violence prevalence among women, instead of yearly or six-monthly estimates of incidence of crimes.

Table 8. About surveys do not use measure to reduce telescoping effect, by reference period and type of survey

| Reference period | N | % |
|-------------------------|-----------|--------------|
| Six months | 1 | 3,4 |
| One year | 19 | 65,5 |
| 2 years | 2 | 6,9 |
| 3 years | 1 | 3,4 |
| Lifetime and 1 year | 4 | 13,8 |
| Lifetime | 1 | 3,4 |
| Lifetime, 5 and 1 years | 1 | 3,4 |
| Type of survey | N | % |
| Victimization module | 13 | 44,8 |
| Victimization surveys | 9 | 31,0 |
| Violence surveys | 7 | 24,1 |
| Total | 29 | 100,0 |

Table 9. Survey with missing value to strategies to reduce telescoping

| | |
|-------------|-------------------------|
| BULGARIA | Crime Victims Survey |
| SWITZERLAND | Swiss Health Survey |
| SWITZERLAND | Household Budget Survey |

Conclusion on telescoping effect

29. In conclusion to reduce the telescoping effect a synergy of strategies looks better. In fact among surveys adopting at least one of the above strategy the 40% do adopt more than 1. Often the reporting of the event date is considered, eventually corrected in a second moment, other

surveys use the funnelling questions. Others prefer to improve interviewers training or to define with interviewee the lifetime calendar event, eventually helping memory by referring to dear date or different seasons.

30. A synergy of strategies could be a warrantee: in fact at one hand we find the success in reducing the telescoping effect through reducing the reference period for example in the Italian case; on the other hand ad hoc trials made on some victimisation surveys show that one strategy is not enough.

31. In fact when introducing in Italy (2002 victimization survey) new questions on the date, month, season and year of the last event occurrence, many errors arose in the collected data despite of the use of the reducing period strategy (3 year and 12 months)¹. Some examples: asking the date of the last event in the incident report section on the last event (theoretically happened in 2001-2002), we found some “surprises” thanks to the combination of the date of occurrence and the date of interviews and thanks to the useful *mechanism of dear date*: for instance 23 events of burglary (collected as they had happened in 2001-2002) had happened before 1999, 48 during the 1999 and 96 in 2000. So the implementation of corrections was done and many bias were eliminated, as shown in table 10.

Table 10. Imputation of correction on some crimes

| Crime | % of error | change on weighed estimates | |
|---------------------------|------------|-----------------------------|--------|
| | | (.000) | (.000) |
| Pickpocket | 10,5% | 858 | 764 |
| Bag-snatching | 10,2% | 276 | 245 |
| Robbery | 9,9% | 237 | 201 |
| Household burglary | 19,0% | 1018 | 803 |
| Car theft | 7,8% | 1110 | 1016 |
| Van theft | 12,8% | 70 | 61 |
| Theft of parts of vehicle | 19,3% | 1621 | 1276 |
| Assault | 6,0% | 263 | 240 |

Source: Istat, Citizen's Safety survey, 2002

32. The above example underlines the importance of using a combination of strategies as reducing the reference period, reporting the event date, training on interviewers and funnel questions.

Finally, expensive but very good strategy is the panel data structure.

3. Non responses and strategies to reduce them

33. Some problems regarding non response rate:

- overall non homogeneous in defining and calculating the rate. Main problems:
 - many include not-contacts, many not include them;

¹ The recall period were the 12 months previous the interview, a mobile period between 2001-2002 years. Example of questions “in the last 3 years, has anybody?” (if yes) “Did it happen in the last 12 months, that is from September 2001?”

- some include untraceables (not presents for the survey periods), some others do not;
 - some include language or comprehension/understanding problems some others do not (languages problem can be a specificity of the country)
 - when considering crime or victimization module inside a more general survey:
 - some consider a not response rate specific for those who actually answered the overall survey, some other provide the overall not-response rate (Italy for AVQ)
 - when considering an **individual sample** it's possible assume that:
 - **phone** interview: select an individual and then look for his/her phone number (not contacts if the number is missing). Then the person is called: if **the respondent** accept the interview it is a response, if the respondent refuse it is a non-response
 - **face to face**: select a dwelling: if who opens the door accept the interview it is a response, if who opens the door refuse it is a non-response
 - **mail**: easier, simply mails not come back
34. Some examples of doubts for individual samples:
- *Australia National Survey of Community Satisfaction with Policing* CATI considers substitution, so what about the rate? Is it a global rate: household +individual inside the household?
 - *BULGARIA Crime Victims Survey* (face to face/individual sample): if who opens the door refuses the interview, do they try to interview another person in the house?
35. Maybe there was a sort of misunderstanding about samples of households and/or sample of individuals when an individual inside the household is selected.

- Some examples of doubts when considering a households samples:
- Australia for the followings *General Social Survey; 2002 National Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Social Survey*: does it considers also the refusals of who opens the door or only of selected persons in the household? Regarding *Crime and Safety Survey* (all persons in the family) is the household rate referred to who opens the door (24%), and the individual one obtained as the household rate + individual refusals inside the household (25%)?

What are we actually comparing?

36. Given the above considerations, and having made some adjustments of rates according to the adding information most of you have sent to ISTAT, we have the following not response rates calculated as a global not response rate (both household or individual) excluding not-contacts, including language or understanding problems, in few cases also the problem of untraceable individuals are included.

37. Many factors may affect interviews quality. Considering non response among them, we can see that differences in rates can be attributed to different causes: the advance letter, the survey method chosen, the attention to quality of who made the survey and corresponding experience in facing refusals. Analysing data, lesser refusal rates more often correspond to Statistical Office and Ministry. Refusal rate is somewhat linked to survey method, face to face usually have less refusal rate then telephone ones, even if there are some exception for some face to face surveys that have high refusal rate. The advance letter is a good tool to stimulate survey participation too.

Table 11. Percentage of non response rates in class

| Class of non response rate | N | % |
|--------------------------------|----|-------|
| less or equal 10% | 2 | 5,0% |
| 10% < rate <= 20% | 14 | 35,0% |
| 20% < rate <= 30% | 10 | 25,0% |
| 30% < rate <= 50% | 10 | 25,0% |
| > 50% rate | 4 | 10% |
| Total | 40 | 100,0 |

Table 12. Surveys with a global not response rate less or equal 10%

| Countries | Survey method |
|--------------------------------------|---------------|
| AUSTRALIA General Social Survey | face to face |
| ROMANIA Living Condition Survey | face to face |
| Total of surveys | 2 |

38. Both of the above surveys are multipurpose surveys with the inclusion of a module on victimization. In both cases the surveys are performed by national statistical institute and respondents were informed in advance of the survey.

Table 13. Surveys with a global not response rate 10% < rate <= 20%

| countries | Survey method |
|---|---------------|
| AUSTRALIA 2002 National Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Social Survey | face+self |
| BULGARIA International Crime Victims Survey | face to face |
| BULGARIA Crime Victims Survey | face to face |
| CANADA General Social Survey on Victimization | cati |
| DENMARK Victimization Survey 2005-2006 | cati |
| FINLAND Finnish national safety survey (not contacts included) | face+cati |
| GERMANY Victims of crime in Bochum: 1975 - 1986 - 1998. A long term comparative study of a large German City | face+cati |
| IRELAND Quarterly National Household Survey – Crime and Victimization | face to face |
| ISRAEL Victimization survey 2001, Households | cati |
| ISRAEL Victimization survey 2001, Individuals | cati |
| ITALY Multipurpose Survey - Citizen's safety survey | cati |
| ITALY Multipurpose Survey - Everyday Life Aspects | face+mail |
| SWEDEN Living Condition Survey (ULF) | face to face |
| SWITZERLAND Swiss Household Panel (SHP) | cati |
| USA National Crime Victimization Survey | face+cati |
| Total of surveys | |
| Cati | 6 |
| face to face | 3 |
| face+cati | 3 |
| face+mail | 1 |
| face+self | 1 |

39. 9 surveys are victimisation surveys, all the others are multipurpose with an included module on victimisation. Also in this case there is a clear indication that informing in advance the respondents have the effect of reducing not response: most of the above surveys used the tool, while Australian and the 2 Bulgarian surveys did not use it.

Table 14. Surveys with a global not response rate 20% < rate <= 30%

| Countries | | Survey method |
|-------------------------|---|---------------|
| AUSTRALIA | Crime and Safety Survey | mail |
| FINLAND | Faith, hope, battering (not contacts included) | mail |
| GERMANY | Experiences of Victimization and Attitudes to inner security in Germany | face+self |
| GERMANY | Insecurities in European Cities. Crime-Related Fear Within the Context of New | face to face |
| NETHERLANDS | Anxieties and Community-Based Crime Prevention | |
| S | National Security Monitor (no official English title available yet) | face+cati |
| NEW ZEALAND | New Zealand National Survey of Crime Victims | face+self |
| NORWAY | Survey of level of living, victimization and fear of crime (SSB) | face+cati |
| POLAND | International Crime Victim Survey | face to face |
| SLOVENIA | Crime Victim Survey | cati |
| SWITZERLAND | Swiss victimisation survey - Crime Victim Survey | cati |
| Total of surveys | face to face | 2 |
| | Cati | 2 |
| | face+cati | 2 |
| | face+self | 2 |
| | Mail | 2 |

40. More than half of the above surveys are victimization surveys (7 out of 10) as indicated also by the survey name; again the majority of surveys did inform the respondents in advance (Finland and Swiss did not provide information about that).

Table 15. Surveys with a global not response rate 30% < rate <= 50%

| countries | | Survey method |
|-------------------------|---|---------------|
| AUSTRALIA | National Survey of Community Satisfaction with Policing | cati |
| BELGIUM | Safety Monitor | cati |
| CANADA | Violence Against Women Survey | cati |
| CANADA | International Crime Victimization Survey (ICVS) | cati |
| NETHERLANDS | Permanent Survey on Living Conditions - Justice and Security module | face to face |
| NEW ZEALAND | 5th International Crime Victims' Survey 2004 | cati |
| NORWAY | The hidden violence? | mail |
| SPAIN | Violence Against Women Macro-Survey | face+cati |
| SWITZERLAND | SILC Statistics on income and living conditions | cati |
| SWITZERLAND - icvs | Swiss victimisation survey – icvs | cati |
| Total of surveys | Cati | 7 |
| | face+cati | 1 |
| | face to face | 1 |
| | Mail | 1 |

41. 4 surveys are victimization surveys, 3 survey are multipurpose with included module in victimization and 3 are violence against women survey. Only Netherlands and Swiss SILC informed in advance respondents.

Table 16. Surveys with a global not response rate >50% rate

| countries | | Survey method |
|-------------------------|--|---------------|
| AUSTRALIA | International Crime Victimization Survey | cati |
| AUSTRALIA | International Violence Against Women Survey (IVAWS) – Australian component | cati |
| HUNGARY | Victims and Opinions (not contacts included) | face to face |
| TURKEY | International Crime Victim Survey | other mixed |
| Total of surveys | cati | 2 |
| | Face to face | 1 |
| | Other mixed | 1 |

42. Only Australian International Crime Victimization Survey inform respondents in advance. With the exception of International Violence against women survey, the other are all victimisation surveys.

43. When considering a non response rate over 50% for a *face to face* survey (ex Hungary; Spain .etc) we could think it is due to the “individual sample” methodology with a main not-response reason as “not at home” (and a maximum of 3 times revisit), also if substitution is considered in case of refusal or untraceables. That is to say: interview can be lost for too many appointments.

44. While when considering face to face surveys with a sample of households, usually the household module can be answered by different members (so less appointments are needed). Furthermore if there are empty individual modules, the corresponding not response rate is not usually calculated, so the overall not-response rate looks lesser. Some countries provided both household and individual not-response rate, in some cases the last was quite high.

3a. Why the refusals?

45. Many things can be made to ameliorate quality survey, one of them is to be aware of the disaffection reason, who we are missing. Only knowing non respondents, in fact, it’s possible to study right solutions.

46. The main causes of non responses are non contacts and refusals. The most show a solicitude for refusals and the main refusals reasons pointed out are: interview topic, shortage of time, disagreement for participation in interviews, distrust to survey's purposes, doubts in keeping anonymity, absence of interest, family reason, language comprehension and many others.

47. Compared with refusals, other reasons for not reaching household and individual seem absolutely irrelevant, even if often the main reasons for an household non response are empty house, no reachable, no eligible, finished attempts.

3b. Strategies to improve response rate

48. To evaluate the effectiveness of the undertaken measure to prevent and or to address non responses, a regression analysis of the non response rates was performed considering as independent variables (that is to say as possible causes and explanations of the observed rates), the recoded undertaken measures and/or strategies to obtain low non response rates. Strategies described in a qualitative mode were recoded mainly as *presence or absence* dichotomous variables.

49. Observed rates can be considered the results of counting the event “non response”, distributed as a binomial variable, on the total of 100 trials in subgroups defined by the mixed strategies as reported and adopted by each surveys.

50. Given the adopted sample procedures, observations which give rise to the observed non response rates are considered independent (we do not consider here the household cluster effect as we process global non response rates, that is to say households non response rates or individual rates for individuals’ samples) so a logistic regression model can be applied. The output are regression coefficients which enable us to evaluate the odds of having a high non response rate for a particular type of strategy with respect to the absence of that strategy, controlling for all the other considered strategies. A measure of the statistical significance of these estimates is also provided which enable us to evaluate how confident we are that the emerged association is not due only to random.

51. Not all the above surveys provided information about strategies to address non response and in model are not considered survey whose non response rate includes not-contacts. As a result only 24 surveys were analysed by logistic analysis and the corresponding coded variables/strategies were:

method (*as coded in the above tables*); training programs for interviewers (*yes or no*); repeated contacts (*yes or not and how many if more than 2*); personal visits (*yes or no*); letter about the survey (*before the survey; in case of first refuse*); monitoring process - supervising interviewers(*yes or no*); extension of the random sample (*yes or no*); check recall (*yes or no*); information phone number/source for helping information provided (*yes or no*); senior interviewers or strategies to reconvert refusal (*yes or no*); sample units substitution (household and/or individual) (*yes or no*); female interviewers (*yes or no*); other organisational measures (*yes or no*); new strategies (*yes or no*); reminder (*yes or no*); Combinations of mode of data collection (*yes or no*); strategies part of the ICVS methodology (*yes or no*).

52. Some of the considered variables were set to 0 by the program as resulting a linear combinations of others explanatory variables.

Controlling by method, the main strategies that reduce non response are training programs for interviewers, the choose of female interviewers and personal visits. All of those strategies are pre survey.

53. Other strategies as the possibility of repeated contacts, controlling/monitoring interviewers, the choose of senior interviewers to face non response, substitution of sample units are related to higher non response rate, maybe because they all are post strategies, that is to say they are adopted when a first non response has happened.

Table 17. Odds ratio estimates of strategies to face non response

| Odds estimates | | | | |
|----------------------|-----------------------------|----------|----------------------------|--------|
| Effect | modality | estimate | 95% Wald confidence limits | |
| Metodo | cati vs face to face | 1.945 | 1.241 | 3.047 |
| Metodo | face+auto vs face to face | 0.811 | 0.479 | 1.372 |
| Metodo | face+cati vs face to face | 0.915 | 0.568 | 1.474 |
| Metodo | other mixed vs face to face | 9.872 | 3.180 | 30.641 |
| Metodo | postale vs face to face | 1.434 | 0.706 | 2.913 |
| training_programs | No vs Yes | 8.516 | 3.215 | 22.555 |
| repeated_contacts | No vs Yes | 0.547 | 0.362 | 0.827 |
| personal_visit | No vs Yes | 1.967 | 0.712 | 5.432 |
| Letter | No vs Yes | 1.751 | 0.717 | 4.279 |
| monitoring_process__ | No vs Yes | 0.132 | 0.029 | 0.606 |

| | | | | |
|----------------------|-----------|-------|-------|-------|
| extension_of_the_ran | No vs Yes | 0.659 | 0.326 | 1.333 |
| senior_interviewers_ | No vs Yes | 0.188 | 0.051 | 0.697 |
| sample_units_substit | No vs Yes | 0.202 | 0.089 | 0.456 |
| female_interviewers | No vs Yes | 8.653 | 1.998 | 37.46 |
| other | No vs Yes | 0.070 | 0.016 | 0.317 |
| reminder | No vs Yes | 0.554 | 0.238 | 1.289 |
| part_of_the_ICVS_met | No vs Yes | 0.865 | 0.519 | 1.440 |

3c. Regarding collecting non respondent basic information

54. As regarding collecting non respondent basic information by a short questionnaire, less than $\frac{3}{4}$ of the surveys do not collect them, while 27.6% collect them.

5 Surveys that collect basic information on non response have rates in 10-20% (see table 18, Bulgaria, Italy and USA), 5 surveys in 20-30% (table 18 Australia - Crime and Safety Survey, France, Germany, Poland, Slovenia, 4 surveys in 30-50% (table 18, Belgium, New Zealand, Spain, Switzerland-SILC), and 2 surveys have rates higher than 50% (table 18, Australia - International Crime Victimization Survey, Hungary). Half of these surveys are cati and the other face to face or face+cati. In Slovenia a non response analysis is performed for non-contacted households. So trying to gather information about non response is a strategy used that is not connected with the rates observed in the above surveys.

55. Two surveys didn't produce a own questionnaire information, but use non respondents information collected by others for other survey topic or available in administrative sources.

Table 18. Collecting basic information on the non respondents

| Yes basic information on the non-respondents collected by a short questionnaire | | |
|---|--|---------------------|
| Country | Survey name (English) | |
| AUSTRALIA | Crime and Safety Survey | <u>Mail</u> |
| | International Crime Victimization Survey | <u>Cati</u> |
| BELGIUM | Safety Monitor | <u>Cati</u> |
| BULGARIA | Crime Victims Survey | <u>Face to face</u> |
| | International Crime Victims Survey | <u>Face to face</u> |
| CZECH REPUBLIC | International Crime Victim Survey in Prague in 2000 | <u>Cati</u> |
| FRANCE | National French survey on violence against women | <u>Cati</u> |
| GERMANY | Insecurities in European Cities. Crime-Related Fear Within the Context of New Anxieties and Community-Based Crime Prevention | <u>Face to face</u> |
| HUNGARY | Hungarian Crime (Victim) Survey | <u>Face+cati</u> |
| ITALY | Women Safety Survey | <u>Cati</u> |
| | Multipurpose Survey - Citizen's safety survey | <u>Cati</u> |
| NEW ZEALAND | 5th International Crime Victims' Survey 2004 | <u>Cati</u> |
| POLAND | International Crime Victim Survey | <u>Face to face</u> |
| SLOVENIA | Crime Victim Survey | <u>Cati</u> |
| SPAIN | Violence Against Women Macro-Survey | <u>Face+cati</u> |
| SWITZERLAND | Household Budget Survey | <u>Cati+mail</u> |
| | SILC Statistics on income and living conditions | <u>Cati</u> |
| | Swiss Health Survey | <u>Face+mail</u> |
| | Swiss Household Panel (SHP) (2004-2005) | <u>Cati</u> |
| USA | National Crime Victimization Survey | <u>Face+cati</u> |
| Total | 20 | 27.63% |

3d.The respondent substitution

56. A way to deal with non-response is substituting the respondent when not all the person of the household have to be interviewed. 76 surveys provided information about substituting. Missing data are from the following surveys:

| | |
|----------------|---|
| CZECH REPUBLIC | Victimization and the feeling of security of citizens |
| NETHERLANDS | International Crime Victims Survey (ICVS) |
| | Police Population Monitor |

57. At a first look most of the surveys (67,5%) do not substitute the non-respondent both in case of refuse than of not contact. 21 surveys (27,3%) substitute in both cases, 2 surveys only for refuse and 2 other surveys only for not contact.

58. Surveys based on sample of households where all persons are interviewed clearly do not substitute persons in case of non response (9 surveys, 11.8% of overall 76 surveys). Most of surveys that substitute both in case of non response than of not contact have a sample of households where only 1 person is selected mainly random or by birthday method (11 out of 21); 6 surveys out of the 21 selecting in both cases, are based on a sample of individuals (see the table **SUBTOTALS** for details).

59. When considering the first case (1 selected person in household and substitution allowed in both case of refuse and not contact) most of the surveys are cati (7 out of 11), 3 are face to face and 1 is a mixed mode data collection method. Surveys with a sample of individuals that considers substitution both in case of refuse than of not contact are mostly face to face (4 out of 6); 1 is face+cati; 1 is cati.

60. 4 surveys allowing substitution in both refuse and not-contact case did not indicate the type of sample (if individuals or households, see table below) and 2 of them (Italy and Hungary) where planned or on field surveys when collecting Inventory's informations. As regards Italian "Women Safety Survey" a sample of households with a 16-70 years old random selected woman is actually used.

Table 19. Survey that select a new respondent if a respondent refuse and/or can not be contacted

| select a new respondent if a respondent refuses | | |
|--|--|----------------------|
| Country | Survey name (English) | |
| AUSTRALIA | International Violence Against Women Survey (IVAWS) – Australian component | |
| ESTONIA | ICVS Estonia 2004 | |
| Total | | 2 2.6% |
| Both surveys select 1 person in the sampled household | | |
| | | |
| select a new respondent if a respondent cannot be contacted | | |
| Country | Survey name (English) | |
| GERMANY | Victims of crime in Bochum: 1975 - 1986 - 1998. A long term comparative study of a large German City | |
| LITHUANIA | International Crime in Business Survey | |
| Total | | 2 2.6% |
| German survey have an individuals sample, while Lithuania did not declare the type of sample | | |
| | | |
| select a new respondent in both cases: if a respondent refuses or cannot be | | |

| contacted | | |
|---|--|------------------|
| Country | Survey name (English) | |
| AUSTRALIA | National Survey of Community Satisfaction with Policing | |
| BELGIUM | Safety Monitor | |
| BULGARIA | Crime Victims Survey | |
| | International Crime Victims Survey | |
| CZECH REPUBLIC | International Crime Victim Survey in Prague in 2000 | |
| | Victimization of citizens of The Czech Republic by some types of criminality in the year 2004 | |
| DENMARK | Violence Against Women Survey | |
| FRANCE | National French survey on violence against women | |
| GERMANY | Insecurities in European Cities. Crime-Related Fear Within the Context of New Anxieties and Community-Based Crime Prevention | |
| | Victim Survey 1997 (Germany) | |
| HUNGARY | Hungarian Crime (Victim) Survey | |
| | Victims and Opinions | |
| ITALY | Women Safety Survey | |
| | Multipurpose Survey - Citizen's safety survey | |
| POLAND | International Crime Victim Survey | |
| PORTUGAL | Victimisation survey – 1994 | |
| SPAIN | Violence Against Women Macro-Survey | |
| SWITZERLAND | Swiss victimisation survey (2004 and 2005) | |
| | Violence against women | |
| TURKEY | International Crime Victim Survey | |
| Total | | 21 27.3% |
| SUBTOTALS of select a new respondent in both cases: if a respondent refuses or cannot be contacted: BY SAMPLE TYPE | | |
| Data collection: | Sample: 1 selected person in household | |
| Cati | | 7 |
| Face to face | | 3 |
| Mixed | | 1 |
| Total | | 11 |
| Out of 11: 7 are CATI; 3 are face to face (Germany; Poland; Portugal) and 1 (Turkey) is other mixed mode | | |
| Data collection: | Sample: Individuals | |
| Cati | | 1 |
| Face to face | | 4 |
| Face+cati | | 1 |
| Total | | 6 |
| Data collection: | Sample: Missing | |
| Cati | | 2 |
| Face to face | | 1 |
| Face+cati | | 1 |
| Total | | 4 |
| do not select a new respondent if a respondent refuses or cannot be contacted | | |
| Total | | 52- 67,5% |

3e. The missing follow up

61. To approach missing data 13 surveys performed a sort of follow up to gather missing information.

Different techniques are used to join the more data completeness and they differ if the problems are missing on items non-response or refusals.

62. About items non-response, interviews are supervised and controlled and in case of problems or missing, interviewers are contacted again and the households are called back in order to complete the information or to control them. Usually the follow-up is organized by phone, but sometimes also by mail or with a direct contact.

63. Some surveys have planned this phase, asking several times (for instance Australia had 6 call back). Other have organized mail follow-ups and telephone ones. About refusal, some institute work on the refusal conversion activity. Sometimes they are organized by phone, in other circumstances expert interviewers visit households.

3f. Conclusions on quality and non response

64. Looking at the inventory data, emerge the richness, the complexity, the variability of different experiences, but it's not easy to evaluate quality in a multifaceted world that seems without language. Addressing quality, means first of all to define what quality is. Common definitions are necessary, as common tools to monitor it. Different instruments can be used and can fit differently according to the context, but we have to identify a common background also in methodology, a starting point.

65. Analysing non response rate was an hard experience. The difficulty was to find a common lead, a common language and also in this case our mother tongues differ. Perhaps we need to start in defining a common vocabulary.

66. Furthermore, to assess quality, it's not sufficient to look at the refusal rate (also non contacts rates are often disregarded), quality is achieved from different points, thanks to an effort that involve several steps of data production. It's important to look at the sample size too, as well as, at the same time, to the planned territorial level estimates. This is an attention that have to be considered designing a survey and data consistency can be at risk when these criteria are not contemporary present. This is the case for instance of ICVS in Canada and New Zealand that have a very high non response rate, a small sample (2.000 individuals) and estimates planned at first regional level.

4. The survey average length

67. The range of interviews average length is very wide: it varies from a minimum of 1 minute to a maximum of 60 minutes. Obviously it depends from many factors, but first of all the number of individuals interviewed in a households and the number of questions asked to interviewees. This is not easy to determine, also because in typical victimization survey the length differs according to paths followed, that is the victimisation events experienced. We could assume that victimisation module are less complete and with less questions of dedicated surveys on victimization.

Table 20. Average time to complete survey

| class average time to complete survey | N | % |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|----------------|
| <=15 | 16 | 25,81% |
| 15-30 | 19 | 30,65% |
| 30-45 | 16 | 25,81% |
| >45 | 11 | 17,74% |
| totale | 62 | 100,00% |

68. The most frequent class of average time is 15-30 minutes, followed by less than 15 minutes and 30-45 minutes with the same frequency. Only the 17,7% of surveys last more than 45 minutes. The 22,2% of surveys do not indicate any average length.

69. Survey with a very short average length (≤ 15 minutes) are for the 75% victimization module: the module of some of them last very few minutes. The second class of average length, 15-30 minutes, is characteristic of victimization surveys (78,9% of surveys lasting 15-30 minutes). Increasing the length of the interview the presence of module surveys decrease, but they do not disappear completely. The 50% of surveys lasting 30-45 minutes are crime surveys, the 25% are multipurpose with an included module on victimisation surveys and violence against women surveys. 63,6% of surveys lasting more than 45 minutes on average are victimization surveys, 27,3% are violence against women surveys and only 1 case is a module survey.

70. An other important issue is the technique used to collect data. Some interviews last more due to the particular methodology: for example face to face and self-administered questionnaires. At the same time a telephone interview have not to be too much long, because of tiredness, boredom and respondent burden that can influence the data quality. We have to consider that some interviews can be very long: for example a woman victim of violence can find herself in a good climate of confidence and speak deeply of its experience, but this is not the normality.

71. Considering the class less then 15 minutes the data are very surprising: there are a similar percentages of both cati and face to face interviews, but it has to consider that often the victimization modules are face to face and take less time. Most of Cati surveys last 15-30 minutes, but a no unimportant percentage last more than 30 minutes. Face to face interviews are longer on average, 41% takes 30-45 minutes.

72. Considering the other survey methods and their combination, as it can be seen in table 12, we have very few cases. Self-administered questionnaires are longer. Usually combining different strategies takes more time, with the exception of mixed mode involving cati interviews (15-30 minutes).

Table 21. Class average time to complete the survey, by survey method

| Survey method | cati | | face to face | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|---------|--------------|---------|
| | N | % | N | % |
| class average time to complete survey | | | | |
| ≤ 15 | 5 | 27,78% | 8 | 36,36% |
| 15-30 | 12 | 66,67% | 2 | 9,09% |
| 30-45 | 3 | 16,67% | 9 | 40,91% |
| >45 | 1 | 5,56% | 3 | 13,64% |
| totale | 18 | 100,00% | 22 | 100,00% |
| (missing) | 4 | 16,0 | 7 | 24,1 |
| Total | 25 | | 29 | |

| metodo di survey | Postal questionnaire |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------|
| class average time to complete survey | N |
| ≤ 15 | 1 |
| >45 | 1 |
| (missing) | 2 |
| Total | 4 |

| metodo di survey | Face to face + cati |
|------------------|---------------------|
|------------------|---------------------|

| | |
|--|----------|
| class average time to complete survey | N |
| <=15 | 1 |
| 15-30 | 4 |
| >45 | 2 |
| (missing) | 1 |
| Totale complessivo | 8 |

| | |
|--|---|
| metodo di survey | Face to face+ Self-administered questionnaires |
| Class average time to complete survey | N |
| <15 | 1 |
| >45 | 4 |
| Total | 5 |

| | |
|--|---|
| metodo di survey | Face to face +postal questionnaire |
| Class average time to complete survey | N |
| 30-45 | 1 |
| Total | 1 |

| | |
|--|------------------------------------|
| metodo di survey | Cati + postal questionnaire |
| Class average time to complete survey | N |
| 15-30 | 1 |
| Total | 1 |

| | |
|--|--------------------|
| metodo di survey | other mixed |
| class average time to complete survey | N |
| <=15 | 1 |
| 15-30 | 1 |
| Total | 2 |

| | |
|--|---|
| metodo di survey | Self-administered questionnaires |
| class average time to complete survey | N |
| 30-45 | 1 |
| >45 | 1 |
| Total | 2 |

5. Major methodological challenges met during the design of the survey

73. When asked to point out the main difficulties met during the design of the survey (some solved, some not), many institutions focused their attention to the questionnaire construction (25,6%), the sensitivity and specificity of the topic (24,4%), the definition, design, size of the sample (16,7%) and secondary the methodology and non responses (together 15,4%), the relationship with interviewees, the dissemination. Inside these main issue, many distinctions can be made. Regarding the **questionnaire construction** most attention was given to face memory effects and about wording. Telescoping effect was underlined above all by Poland, Italy, Portugal, Netherlands, France. Also the sections sequence and the questionnaire length are pointed out.

74. About the **topic specificity** the following problems are underlined: the difficult of sexual events definition as well as the definition and classification of crimes, the risk to underestimate the phenomena due to disclosure problems and sensitiveness issue. Definition/inclusion of violent events in the questionnaire and/or the disclosure problem are addressed by Finland, France, Norway, Ireland, Italy, Australia, Portugal.

75. The problems regarding the **sample** strategy involves different aspects. The attention is on the possibility to reach small and sparse populations, migrants, people not easy to interview. The trouble is that many of these sub-populations, usually not present in statistics, are often more at risk to experience victimization and abuse. The other important problem, linked to telephonic method, is the coverage. Now there is a wide trend in increasing of mobile phones and a contemporary decreasing in the landline possession. The coverage problems are underlined by Canada, Belgio, Australia, Italy, Netherlands and Germany.

76. Other sample problems regard the representativeness quality and the high standard error, generally very high for rare events, as crimes are. The worrying about it is linked with the sample size and sample design used by different institutions.

77. **Non response** is another important topic, refusals in particular are one of the biggest problem faced by Australia, Finland, Germany, New Zealand, Switzerland, Netherlands. Other notes regarding methodology show limits of international survey versus national, due to cultural thresholds of what is considered a crime, in terms of disclosure rates, and in terms of response rates.

78. About **dissemination**, problems regard the presentation of the results, above all the presentation to media (Australia, France), the construction of meaningful indicators, how to compare different victimization rates coming up from several surveys and the comparison to registered crime (Netherlands).

79. Finally, regarding **interviewees** the attention focus on interviewers - interviewees' relationship, on the possibility to plan training with a sensitivity component, to have skillful interviewers, pay attention on maintaining privacy and maintaining safety of interviewers and respondents (Australia - Personal Safety Survey).

80. A part some particularity, no differences emerge between surveys according to the survey type. Only a major difficulty for module victimization in going in depth, ask about violence, to cope with the topic sensitivity. The problems is the respondent burden, the different issue mainly focused (Ireland - Quarterly National Household Survey – Crime and Victimization).

Table 22. Methodological challenges met during the design of the survey

| Major methodological challenges met during the design of the survey | N | % |
|---|-----------|-------------|
| regarding questionnaire construction | | |
| Wording | 4 | |
| memory effect | 7 | |
| sequence | 2 | |
| balance between maintaining the same and new questions | 1 | |
| combining sexual assault questions with the main survey form | 1 | |
| methods to construct and validate the questionnaire | 1 | |
| easier questionnaire for interviewers | 1 | |
| Length | 3 | |
| total | 20 | 25,6 |
| regarding sample | | |
| high standard error | 2 | |
| coverage especially for telephone technique | 4 | |
| migrants, dispersed, small population | 4 | |
| representative | 2 | |
| inclusion of minors in sample | 1 | |
| Total | 13 | 16,7 |
| regarding the topic specificity | | |
| sensitivity | 2 | |
| definition of fear of crime | 2 | |
| definition of crime/crime classification | 3 | |
| definition of violent events | 5 | |
| multivictimization | 1 | |
| event' series | 1 | |
| language and cultural differences | 1 | |
| estimating the amount of property crimes | 1 | |
| underestimation | 3 | |
| Total | 19 | 24,4 |
| regarding the dissemination | | |
| presentation of results (how to map crime), media | 1 | |
| differences in victimization rates | 1 | |
| comparison to registered crime | 1 | |
| construction of meaningful indicators | 2 | |
| counting crime, dissemination | 1 | |
| Total | 6 | 7,7 |
| regarding interviewees | | |
| sensitivity component in training | 2 | |
| skilful interviewers | 1 | |
| maintaining privacy | 2 | |
| maintaining safety of interviewers and respondents | 1 | |
| interviewers - interviewees' relationship | 1 | |
| total | 7 | 9,0 |
| regarding the technique and the methodology | | |
| change in methodology to reduce cost | 1 | |
| experiment in cati | 1 | |
| limits of international survey versus national (cultural thresholds of what is considered a crime, in terms of disclosure rates, and in | 2 | |

| | | |
|-------------------------------|-----------|--------------|
| terms of response rates) | | |
| total | 4 | 5,1 |
| regarding non response | | |
| high percentage of refuse | 7 | |
| non sample error | 1 | |
| total | 8 | 10,3 |
| many of them | 1 | 1,3 |
| total | 78 | 100,0 |

6. Major problems in the design of the survey

81. What about major problems that still be solved? Fortunately the answers present less variability than the above ones, even if part of the troubles considered in the previous paragraph are not completely solved. However, the 12,1% of surveys (4 cases) declare there are no problems and a higher missing percentage is present.

82. Looking at the answers, also in this case, the same macro issues were created. The highest frequencies are for **sample** problems and **topic sensitivity** (both 27,3%). About the first, the difficulties regard above all coverage and the quality of the sample to represent the actual criminality variability and rare events.

83. The possibility to give right estimates it's a big problem. Very often, also with a huge sample size (for instance 60.000 households) the estimates have an enormous standard error and too large confidence interval. This means that a big attention must be paid to sample size, his allocation and design. An other problem strictly linked to estimates is coverage. This is both a general problem and a specific one. From the general point of view, it concerns the quality of sample units selection list. There can be problems of target population in terms of reaching particular group of people live in remote, unreachable areas, that are out of statistics and often are also more at risk (we can think to lower class group, as well as to abused women, as well as to migrants and homeless).

84. On the contrary, the more specific problem regards only telephonic surveys. The recent increasing of mobile diffusion (in Italy for instance has increased from about 2% in 1997 to about 15% in 2003) will be a wide problem, also because people unreachable through the landline may have different behaviour from victimization point of view. Possible solutions could be to use mobile lists, if existing, or the mixed mode collection data, with the consequently incoming problems of changes' methodology.

85. However, a preliminary study Istat carried out recently on Multipurpose Survey on Everyday Aspect of Life, using variables on coverage (landline possession versus only mobile and no telephone at all) and on victimization (victims of pick-pocketing and bag-snatching) shows that the difference in estimates is still not so important.

86. About the **sensitivity topic**, surveys put the attention on the possibility to broader the range of crime covered, in particular consumer fraud, e-theft, sexual incidents. Others report the difficulty regarding series events data collection and the disclosure. The problem to collect data on sexual events in a victimization module is particularly experienced.

87. Secondary the attention is on memory effect, balance between introducing new questions and maintaining old questions at the aim of having an history series of results.

Table 23. Problems in the design of the survey

| Major problems in the design of the survey | N | % |
|--|-----------|--------------|
| regarding questionnaire construction | | |
| memory effect | 2 | |
| balance between maintaining the old and introducing new questions | 2 | |
| Total | 4 | 12,1 |
| regarding sample | | |
| Sampling methods | 1 | |
| clustering effect (within the household) | 1 | |
| Coverage | 5 | |
| rare events, representativeness | 1 | |
| Variability | 1 | |
| Total | 9 | 27,3 |
| regarding the topic specificity | | |
| broader range of data: collecting consumer fraud, e-theft, sexual incident | 3 | |
| police reporting | 1 | |
| Disclosure | 2 | |
| series incidents | 2 | |
| more crime disaggregating | 1 | |
| Total | 9 | 27,3 |
| regarding the dissemination | | |
| different rates | 1 | |
| comparison with registered crime | 1 | |
| Total | 2 | 6,1 |
| regarding interviewees | | |
| interviewers - interviewees' relationship | 1 | |
| Total | 1 | 3,0 |
| regarding the technique and methodology | | |
| mail survey mode do not allow to ask all important questions | 1 | |
| interviewers bias | 1 | |
| module surveys: inhibition to ask sexual incident and respondent burden | 1 | |
| Total | 3 | 9,1 |
| no problems | 4 | 12,1 |
| many | 1 | 3,0 |
| Total | 33 | 100,0 |
