

PROJECT FINAL REPORT

Grant Agreement number: 217311

Project acronym: Euro-Justis

Project title: Scientific Indicators of Confidence in Justice: Tools for Policy Assessment

Funding Scheme: SP1 – COOPERATION SSH7

Period covered: March 2008 from June 2011 to

**Name of the scientific representative of the project's co-ordinator, Professor Mike Hough,
Institute for Criminal Policy Research (ICPR), Birkbeck, University of London**

Tel: +44 [0]7825 071761

E-mail: m.hough@bbk.ac.uk

Project website address: <http://www.eurojustis.eu/>

Table of contents

Final publishable summary report.....	3
Executive summary.....	3
Description of project context and objectives.....	4
Description of the main results	7
Review of need.....	7
Conceptualisation.....	8
Development of indicators	10
Contextual data	10
Piloting of the Euro-Justis indicators	13
Potential impact and dissemination activities	16
Contact details.....	26
Use and dissemination of foreground	27
List of scientific (peer reviewed) publications.....	27
List of dissemination activities	29
Report on societal implications.....	35

Final publishable summary report

Executive summary



Euro-Justis - Scientific Indicators of Confidence in Justice: Tools for Policy Assessment (duration: 1/3/2008-31/6/2011) was a Specific Targeted Research Project funded under the Socio-Economic Sciences and Humanities Programme of the 7th Framework Programme for Research of the European Union, Thematic Priority 6 – Socio-economic and scientific indicators.

The Euro-Justis project is grounded in ‘procedural justice theory’. It assumes that if the justice system treats people fairly and respectfully, this builds public trust and public commitment to the rule of law. The attraction of the procedural justice perspective is that it resolves the tension that is often thought to exist between effective crime control and the respecting of people’s rights. It shows that fair, respectful and legal behaviour on the part of justice officials is not only ethically desirable, but is an essential precondition for effective justice.

The Euro-Justis project has developed a standardised approach to measuring confidence in criminal justice and public feelings of security. The project has designed and tested a suite of survey questions in four countries – Bulgaria, France, Italy, and Lithuania - which can also be used by any member states that want to measure trust in justice¹. In addition, a sub-group of the Euro-Justis team has taken a core sub-set of these questions and developed them into a Trust in Justice module in the fifth European Social Survey, conducted in 2010. This covered 28 countries, and will allow the team to identify the factors that shape trust in justice and affect the perceived legitimacy of the police and courts in different parts of Europe. Analysis will start in the autumn of 2011. With the inclusion of the project's justice module, the ESS will constitute a unique resource for monitoring public trust and perceptions of institutional legitimacy across Europe.

Description of project context and objectives

Euro-Justis was a project designed to provide EU institutions and Member States with new evidence-based indicators for the assessment of public confidence in criminal justice. Effective criminal justice policies are essential for the economic and social well-being of European citizens and for the establishment of a European knowledge-based society.

Most Member States assess the success of their crime policies by reference to levels of crime – whether measured by police statistics, by national surveys of victimization or by the International Crime Victimization Survey (ICVS and EUICS). It is important to do so, but it is equally important to assess whether citizens trust their institutions of justice, and whether they *feel* secure, regardless of actual levels of crime. Few Member States would take issue with this. However, if Governments and the EU lack proper indicators about confidence and insecurity, their criminal policies are likely to be skewed towards short-term crime control strategies, at the expense of ensuring that the justice system commands legitimacy and that citizens feel safe and secure. Further, without scientific evidence on the trajectory of confidence and insecurity over time, Governments will be unable to measure the impact of such policy.

This project intended to make a contribution to state-level policies on crime and criminal justice; EU policy on Justice, Freedom and Security; EU policy on social inclusion and the work of the Social Protection Committee; and Human Right and Protection of the Vulnerable (both victims and offenders). The project aimed to achieve these objectives by creating and testing social indicators to measure trust in justice. Social indicators are an increasing part of European Union policy development and assessment, particularly in poverty and social inclusion. Combining national information with transnational objectives agreed by EU heads of state and government, indicators provide valid measurements of different dimensions of human well-being. What constitutes human well-being is of course a normative and political question, but once consensus is reached, these statistics allow policy-makers to define a problem, assess possible solutions, and evaluate interventions.

¹ For example, Charles University in Prague has fielded the questionnaire in the Czech Republic.

If Member States are to achieve balanced and effective crime policies, they need to pay closer attention to issues of confidence, legitimacy and insecurity. They need to make use of indicators in order to develop and evaluate policy. Such indicators are vital for (a) better formulation of the problems of confidence and legitimacy and (b) more effective monitoring of changes in public attitudes in response to policy innovation. The indicators can be used to inform careful and long-term policies to restore legitimacy, instead of short-term and ‘electioneering’ strategies that exploit public anxiety about crime for political gain.

The central idea being tested by the project is that if people trust the police and the courts, they will regard them as a form of legitimate authority; they will then defer to this authority, obey the law and cooperate with the justice system. Institutions build legitimacy through public trust; and to earn trust, justice officials must treat citizens respectfully and observe their rights. If they are successful in earning public trust, the end result will be a system of justice that is both humane and effective. If, on the other hand, the police and other justice officials lose public trust, this will breed public cynicism about the rule of law and encourage law-breaking.

Procedural justice theory (associated in particular with the work of Tom Tyler in the United States) has been explored primarily in English-speaking cultures and has not yet been sufficiently tested in the varied cultural settings of continental Europe. Euro-Justis aims to fill this knowledge gap, suggesting that building the legitimacy of formal authorities may be a powerful mechanism for securing normative compliance with the law. On the basis of pilot surveys conducted in Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, France, Italy and Lithuania, the researchers have developed an extensive suite of survey questions asking about people’s attitudes toward the police, the courts, fear of crime and attitudes to punishment.

Euro-Justis aimed to create a set of questions that map onto the relevant conceptual domains of confidence and legitimacy, and for these measures to be fielded and validated. The project aimed to collect contextual data that allow policy makers to make sense of the indicators and appreciate nationally-specific issues. With such indicators, the project intended to support the development of more inclusionary criminal justice

policies designed to secure commitment to the rule of law and thus compliance with the law.

The project also aimed to equip Member States and EU institutions both with a set of concepts about confidence in justice and with a tool-kit of indicators for assessing confidence. We did not expect every Member State immediately to adopt the full toolkit of indicators that we devise – though we hoped that several will adopt some of the indicators. We hope, however, that more of them will adopt the underpinning principles. In other words, for some countries the toolkit will serve as an illustration of a particular approach to policy assessment, and for others it will be of immediate practical value in assessing policies for improving confidence in justice.

Description of the main results

Review of need

The project began by exploring the need for European-wide social indicators of public trust in justice for policy assessment. It also examined the state of current tools, which involved a cross-national review of Member States' and European initiatives for the assessment of a) the level of public trust in justice and b) the surrounding social, legal and criminological factors that help a profound understanding of public confidence. In summary, the project reviewed the policy-need for such indicators, assessed the social scientific literature on confidence in justice, and catalogued existing indicators that have been used at national and supra-national levels.

In reviewing the importance of public trust as a tool for policy assessment, we examined the perceived need amongst scientists, criminal justice managers and government officials for a set of indicators built around these concepts by conducting a series of interviews and surveys. A questionnaire was developed and was translated into each project members' language. In-depth interviews were also conducted by the project partners based in the respective countries. The interviews and questionnaire showed that such indicators are not available in most Member States and that policy makers will welcome such measures to inform domestic policies on crime.

The project also identified current indicators of public trust in justice that exist nationally as well as supra-nationally. For example, we assessed the measurement of confidence in justice in domestic initiatives such as the use of the British and Scottish Crime Surveys in the UK, and the Dutch and Belgian National Police Monitors. It investigated whether national indicators are robust and statistically validated and will assess whether they can be transposed to other countries. As for supra-national indicators, international initiatives such as the International Crime and Victimization Survey and the European Social Survey (ESS) were identified. It investigated why, although social indicators are an increasing part of EU policy development, Europe still lacks high-quality comparative data and indicators on confidence and insecurity. The

above tasks were analysed and presented in a publication which is explained in the dissemination section (“Potential impact and dissemination activities”).

The Euro-Justis project also conducted a systematic literature review of the key European and North American research on trust in justice. This task continued until the end of the project and the complete bibliography is available from the project website www.eurojustis.eu (under “Documents – Work Package 2”).

Conceptualisation

The Euro-Justis project made a theoretical contribution to the understanding of trust in justice in order to guide the development of new and improved social indicators of public confidence.

Criminology has given insufficient attention to questions about why people comply with the law, and too much attention to questions about why people break the law. The imbalance is important, because questions about reasons for law-breaking tend – not inevitably but because of the political climate in which policy is developed – to yield answers framed within the boundaries of the simple crime control model described above, finding solutions to crime control that are designed to secure instrumental compliance. Questions about compliance, by contrast, yield answers that recognise the interplay between formal and informal systems of social control, and in particular the normative dimensions in people’s orientation to the law. Normative compliance with the law occurs when people feel a moral or ethical obligation or commitment to do so. Theories of normative compliance, called ‘compliance theories’ here, posit a range of mechanisms by which people acquire – or lose – norms of acceptable behaviour.

One of the strands of compliance theory is procedural justice theory, which was central to the Euro-Justis project, and is especially useful in making sense of issues around trust in the police, beliefs about police legitimacy and public compliance and cooperation with the law. Legitimacy is a central concept here. There are two uses of the term. Political philosophers often talk of political systems as achieving legitimacy when they meet various agreed objective criteria, to do with acceptance of democratic norms and observance of human rights. Assessments of this sort also involve subjective

judgements, of course, about the nature of the ‘good or just society.’ But there is a separate set of questions about the ability of a criminal justice system to command legitimacy in the eyes of the public - whether the policed see the police as legitimate. These questions are open and empirical, and require examination of public attitudes, values, behaviours and beliefs.

Perceived legitimacy exists when the policed regard the authorities as having earned an entitlement to command, creating in themselves an obligation to obey the police. If people willingly offer their obedience to systems of authority that command legitimacy, questions about the ‘drivers’ of legitimacy become of central policy importance. Procedural justice theories propose that perceived legitimacy flows from public trust in institutions; and that public trust is at least in part a function of the quality of treatment that the public receive from justice officials. Thus if the police treat people fairly and respectfully, and if this treatment is aligned with public perceptions of morality, they will be regarded as having legitimate authority, and will be better able to command compliance and cooperation.

Procedural justice theorists argue that strategies of instrumental compliance are relatively costly and ineffective. The argument is that motive-based, voluntary self-regulation based on perceptions of the legitimacy of the law is more effective, more economical and more durable over time. According to the procedural justice perspective people are willing to accept decisions and outcomes that they do not regard as being in their personal best interests – provided that they consider justice institutions and officials to be wielding legitimate authority. This points to the possibility of creating a system of social control which is based upon the willing consent and cooperation of citizens, rather than upon the threat of punishment. If such a vision is to be even partly achieved, it will be important to nudge political and public debate towards a greater appreciation of the normative dimension in regulating behaviour. For liberally minded reformers a particular attraction of procedural justice theories are that they promise to resolve the tension that is often thought to exist between effective crime control and the respecting of people’s rights. They point to the conclusion that fair, respectful and legal behaviour on the part of justice officials is not only ethically desirable, but is a prerequisite for effective justice.

Development of indicators

The project developed survey questions for use at both national and supranational level in social scientific surveys and which can be employed as indicators of public confidence in the criminal justice system. The development task involved translating concepts described in the previous section into specific survey questions.

Questions were developed and tested using the technique of 'cognitive interviewing'. Cognitive interviewing (or cognitive question testing) is a technique to assess the quality, range and scope of survey measures. It allowed us to explore the survey response process: how respondents comprehend a question; employ strategies to retrieve relevant information from memory; and follow decision processes when giving an answer. Respondents were asked to detail their thought processes as they answer each survey question, either while they were actually engaged in this task (concurrent think-aloud probes) or after they had finished (retrospective think-aloud probes).

In the light of the feedback from cognitive interviews, questions were revised and finalised. The questionnaire was then translated and is available in ten languages: English, Bulgarian, German, Greek, Italian, Lithuanian, Portuguese, Russian, Spanish, and Turkish. They are all available from the Euro-Justis website (under "Documents – Work Package 4).

Contextual data

In addition to survey based indicators described in the previous section, the project also collected country-based contextual data in order to highlight local specificities in interpreting survey-based attitudinal indicators. The value of the contextual data increased when the Euro-Justis suite of survey questions was adopted by the 2010 European Social Survey (ESS). In analysis of the ESS, key contextual variables will be incorporated into multi-level structural equation models predicting trust in justice, perceptions of legitimacy and compliance and cooperation with the law. As there will be a maximum of 32 countries in the ESS analysis, the number of contextual variables that can be included in any model is necessarily limited. In the description of the eight baskets of indicators below, we have suggested which variables are likely to be the key ones included in the analysis.

The project developed eight baskets of contextual indicators, and are all available in an excel file from the Euro-Justis website (under “Documents – Work Package 5).

1) Demographic data

Key variables here are population numbers and trends, age mix, degree of urbanization and homogeneity of nationality. All of these are likely to correlate to some degree with trust in justice, but countries that are young, and are highly urbanized are likely to be less trusting than others.

2) Socio-economic data

Key variables here GDP per capita, unemployment rates and measures of income inequality, such as the Gini coefficient. There are strong theoretical grounds for expecting high levels of unemployment and high levels of income inequality to be negatively correlated with trust in justice – and with other indicators of institutional trust. Expenditure on the criminal justice system has been collected, and this may prove important.

3) Objective efficiency of justice

We have collected an extensive battery of variables, some relating to the structure of the criminal justice system, but most reflecting levels of financial investment in, and professionalization of, the system. Two composite measures covering investment and professionalization will be constructed for the ESS analysis.

4) Crime levels and penalties

The main indicators here are statistics of crimes recorded by the police. Comparison of police statistics is notoriously risky, as reporting and recording practices vary widely across jurisdiction. The data are probably sufficiently robust to permit construction of a five-point scale (very high crime/high crime/average/low crime/very low crime) – but such a scale would need to be validated where possible against other data sources such as the European Crime and Safety Survey (EU ICS). Unfortunately, as yet this includes too few countries (18) to serve as a primary data source for contextual variables. A second set of indicators relates to prison population size. Of course this cannot be used as an indicator of crime levels, but

when combined with indicators of crime rates will provide measures of system punitivity. Previous research indicates that heavy use of imprisonment is associated with public distrust in justice.

- 5) Institutional structures and legal reform
Variables relating to the criminal justice system include violations of Article 6 of the European Convention on Human Rights (as an indicator of the right to a fair trial), speed of case disposal, judicial structure, professionalization of justice and availability of legal aid. Variables relating to political governance include the World Bank 'Rule of law' indices, Liphart's typology of democracies and measures of welfare expenditure. The percentage of national expenditure on welfare and a typology derived from Liphart are likely to figure in ESS analysis. Previous research suggests that 'corporatist' democracies with high investment in welfare generate high levels of political trust – and trust in justice.
- 6) Legitimacy
Only two usable variables have been collected here: findings of violations of the ECHR and Transparency International's Corruption Perception Index. However, both variables are likely to be significant correlates of trust in justice.
- 7) Crime as a cultural and political issue
We had planned to collect data on the structure of mass media, and public consumption of mass media, but only limited comparative data were available. However, the ESS itself has a suite of questions on media consumption, so the need to assemble country level data became less pressing. However, media coverage of crime as an issue is clearly a central issue in understanding public trust in justice and public attitudes to crime and punishment. It is clear that some form of primary analysis of the quality of media crime coverage is needed, and this is planned as part of our programme of analysis of the ESS.
- 8) Confidence and concerns in areas other than justice
Indices of public trust in politicians, of social trust (trust in other people) and economic confidence are clearly likely to be important in analysis of trust in justice. Our plans for this basket were revised when it was clear that there would be a

module on trust in justice in the ESS. A number of such indices will be available at individual (respondent) level – rather than at country level – because the ESS includes questions on political and social trust and on economic confidence, and it is obvious better to use individual-level variables where possible. Depending on the outcome of this analysis it may be useful to include country-level indices from the World Values Survey (using either the 2005-07 sweep or the 20011-12 sweep). For the present, however, it was decided that it made no sense to create country level indices from this data source.

Piloting of the Euro-Justis indicators

The questionnaire was fielded in four countries – Bulgaria, France, Italy, and Lithuania (and an associate member of the project, Charles University, also fielded the questionnaire in the Czech Republic) . The fielding was conducted by a subcontractor survey company in each country. Micro-data (SPSS file) are available on the Euro-Justis website (under “Documents – Work Package 6) for secondary analysis. It was intended that the data will provide guidance to policy makers on how to assess policies aimed at improving public confidence in justice.

Analyses on national-probability samples of three European countries - Bulgaria, Italy and Lithuania – provided the following findings:

- Our indicators of trust and legitimacy are more robust for the police than for the courts, appearing to measure constructs that were clearly predicted by the conceptual framework within which we developed the measures.
- Although our indicators of trust and legitimacy relating to the courts perform less well against conventional measurement criteria, we have proposed ways in which they can and should be used.
- Spidergrams provide an accessible and balanced graphical representation of a multi-dimensional portfolio of indicators that are conceptually and methodological consistent.
- The police and criminal courts command greater public trust and legitimacy in Italy than in Bulgaria and Lithuania.
- Corruption is a particular problem in the Bulgarian and Lithuanian justice systems.

- In all three countries, moral alignment with the criminal courts is low, relative to findings from similar surveys elsewhere. (This is the belief that the courts protect the interests of ordinary people and pass sentences that are in line with public sentiments.)

A more detailed report of the findings above is available from the Euro-Justis website (under “Documents – Work Package 6” titled “D6.2 Assessing survey based indicators through statistical analysis”).

CNRS, the French Euro-Justis partner, used a slightly different questionnaire to enable detailed exploration of the experience and of ethnic minorities than could be done in the other pilot surveys. The French pilot survey differs from those carried out in Bulgaria, Italy and Lithuania for its focus on ethnic minorities. In France, there has been increasing tension between the police and ethnic minority youths in disadvantaged neighbourhoods. The widely reported riots which took place in 2005 - the largest in Europe since the WWII – is a clear example of this tension. Thus, the main objective of the French pilot was to explore differences between ethnic groups in attitudes towards the police, and to examine factors that can explain any differences in trust in the police.

Descriptive analyses demonstrated differences in the level of trust towards the police, with ethnic minorities having less trust in the police. However, multivariate analysis showed that ethnicity in fact was not a significant predictor of distrust in the police when other factors were taken into account, such as procedural justice considerations. Those who regarded the police as procedurally fair – for example perceive police officers to treat people in a respectful manner, explain their actions, and reach fair decisions – were more likely to trust the police than others. Similarly, those who considered the police to be discriminatory against ethnicity were more likely to distrust the police. Police fairness was also important not only through individual’s direct experience with the police but their vicarious experience: witnessing the police treating a stranger, neighbour, or a family member in a disrespectful or unfair manner was a significant predictor of distrust in the police. As for socio-demographic factors, only one variable – holding a low socio-economic occupation (in comparison to having a high socio-economic occupation) – explained distrust in the police.

Detailed findings from the French survey are available from a separate publication which is described in the next section (“Potential impact and dissemination activities”.)

Ethics screening

The project was subject to the ethics screening process at the original coordinating institution, King’s College London, and considered to represent very low risk. Consortium members were required to ensure that any research that they undertook was compliant with local requirement for ethical scrutiny.

Potential impact and dissemination activities

Potential Impact on policy

Our analysis derived from interviews with practitioners including policy makers, judges and other criminal justice official, shows that few member states currently place the sort of emphasis on trust in justice that we regard as necessary. If policy in member states attends more closely to issues of public trust in the criminal justice system, this should result in systems that are both more just – in the broadest sense – and more effective in tackling crime. If member states are to achieve balanced and effective crime policies, they need to pay closer attention to issues of trust and legitimacy. If they ignore these factors, their criminal policies risk becoming skewed towards short-term crime control strategies at the expense of ensuring that the justice system commands legitimacy and that citizens feel safe and secure. Measures of trust in justice and the legitimacy of legal authorities can be used to inform careful and long-term policies to foster public compliance instead of short-term and 'electioneering' strategies that exploit public feelings for political gain.

It is also important to measure trust in justice through an integrated and European approach, since so many areas of European policy are now strictly interdependent. The process of European integration brings about the need for comparative information on social development. Additional to any benefits related to integration, however, there are obvious benefits for domestic policy assessment if Member States are able to benchmark their own performance against their neighbours' and the European norm, using properly validated comparable measures.

Our analysis of the demonstration surveys in Bulgaria, France, Italy and Lithuania should extend understanding of the relationships between trust in justice, legitimacy, compliance and cooperation – and the ways in which these relationships vary across country and culture. In addition, analysis of the 5th European Social Survey will enable us to unravel these issues more effectively. These data will allow us to develop and test social indicators of trust in justice for 28 rather than four European countries surveyed in our demonstration surveys. The project is confident that Euro-Justis has developed robust measures of trust and legitimacy for the police, and viable measures for the courts, to be applied to policy. Lastly, our trust in justice indicators have been, or will

be, fielded outside of Europe in a further four countries: Chile, Japan, South Africa and the United States.

Main dissemination activities

Euro-Justis has organised three international conferences – in Bulgaria, Italy and the UK. The first international JUSTIS conference was hosted by the Center for the Study of Democracy in Sofia, Bulgaria on 24-25 March 2009. The conference gathered representatives of the partner institutions, as well as members of the Euro-Justis External Expert Group and other prominent criminologists. Invitees to the conference included the Vera Institute of Justice (<http://www.vera.org/>) from the United States, as they are involved in a related project which aims to build trust in justice from a human rights perspective, and leading academics and policy officials in the field. The presentations are available at the project website: www.eurojustis.eu.



The Center for the Study of Democracy organised a public discussion event on 24 March on Indicators of Public Confidence in Justice at the Bulgarian National Institute of Justice. Speakers included the Bulgarian Minister of Justice Ms. Miglena Tacheva, Director of the National Institute of Justice Dr. Pencho Penev, the Deputy Prosecutor General of Bulgaria Mr. Hristo Manchev, Director of the CSD Law Program

Dr. Maria Yordanova, Prof. Mike Hough, and Prof. Julian Roberts. Other participants and the audience were also encouraged to participate in the discussion.

The second international Euro-Justis conference was hosted by the University of Parma in Parma, Italy on 6-7 May 2010. Invitees to the conference included EU officers, External Expert Group members, members of other FP6 and FP7 projects, and prominent criminologists and specialists in the field of trust in justice. All in all, more than 50 people attended the conference.

The conference consisted of five sessions, starting with global perspectives on trust and legitimacy followed by presentations on the progress of the Euro-Justis project. In the first session of the second day, Euro-Justis was discussed in a broader European context, and the last session of the conference dealt with building links with other European research projects on crime and deviance.

SESSION 1: Global perspectives on trust and legitimacy: This session was chaired by Mike Hough from the Institute for Criminal Policy Research, King's College London who welcomed everyone to Parma. The first presentation was by Manuela Alfe who gave an overview of FP7 Socio-economic Sciences and Humanities research on crime. Afterwards, Tom Tyler from New York University, US spoke about trust and legitimacy in the USA and Europe. Tyler's ideas about procedural justice are of fundamental importance to the Euro-Justis project, and he expressed his interest in the eventual results of the project. Jonathan Jackson from London School of Economics presented emerging findings on trust in the UK, and the last presentation of session 1 was given by Philippe Robert from Centre de Recherches Sociologiques sur le Droit et les Institutions Pénales (CESDIP), France. He spoke about the French tradition of survey research. Time was allowed for discussion at the end of the session.

SESSION 2: EURO-JUSTIS 2010 - Progress Report: The second session was chaired by Julian Roberts from the University of Oxford, UK. The session began with an introduction by Mike Hough after which Roberto Piscopo, President of the Tribunale

di Parma, gave his greetings. Presentations followed by Camilla Priede from the University of Sheffield on how to improve Euro-Justis indicators using cognitive interviewing, and by Mike Hough and Jonathan Jackson on trust in justice and the European Social Survey. The last presentation of the first conference day was by Stefano Maffei from the University of Parma. He talked about the collection of country-based contextual data to be used when analyzing the Euro-Justis data.

SESSION 3: EXTERNAL EXPERT GROUP MEETING: The External Expert Group (EEG) had a closed meeting where experts validated the project's work in progress.

SESSION 4: EURO-JUSTIS in the broader European context: The first session of the second day of the conference was chaired by Alberto Cadoppi from the University of Parma and Mike Hough. The day started with an introduction by Mike Hough, after which Ugo Angeloni from the Italian Ministry of Interior gave his greetings. Presentations were given on trust, punitivity and imprisonment by Tapio Lappi-Seppälä from the National Research Institute of Legal Policy, Finland, and on the Stockholm Programme and cross-national trust in justice by Geert Vervaeke from the European Network of Councils of Judiciary. François Paychère from the European Commission for the Efficiency of Justice talked about his institution's work, and the session was finished by greetings from Gennaro Gallo from the Italian State Police.

SESSION 5: Building links with European Research on Crime and Deviance: The last session of the conference was chaired by Manuela Alfe from the European Commission and Stefano Maffei from the University of Parma. Four different EU funded projects on crime and deviance were presented by Renée Zauberman from CESDIP, France, Thordis Ingadottir from Reykjavik University, Iceland and by Angelos Giannakopoulos from the University of Konstanz, Germany. Finally, closing remarks were made by Stefano Maffei.



The third and final international Euro-Justis conference (Euro-Justis International Conference - Trust, Consent and the Rule of Law) was hosted by ICPR in London, UK on 13 May 2011. The purpose of the conference was to present the work carried out in the project and to have invitees present their work related to issues of trust in justice and legitimacy of the criminal justice system. Invitees to the conference were mainly policy-makers, practitioners, NGOs, ‘think-tanks’ and researchers, including academic criminologists, and post-graduate students. All in all, more than 130 people from over 10 countries attended the conference. The conference was very well received by the participants.



Opening and morning session

Professor Mike Hough from ICPR and Dr Manuela Alfé from the European Commission welcomed the participants to the conference on behalf of the organizers and project team. The opening speech was given by Lord Ken Macdonald QC who was Director of Public Prosecutions in England and Wales between 2003 and 2008. In his speech, Lord Macdonald emphasized the importance of due process, fair trials and transparency in the criminal justice process as whole, and especially in relation to the prosecution of terrorists.

Next, Professor Hough presented on the topic of trust, consent and the rule of law and introduced the Euro-Justis project and its outcomes. Then, Professor Wesley Skogan from the Northwestern University, USA, discussed the impact of citizens' encounters with police. Drawing on a range of survey findings, he demonstrated that in relation to people's trust in the police, the impact of negative encounter is bigger than the impact of a positive encounter and therefore stressed the importance of good and fair treatment in policing. Next, Professor Tom Tyler from New York University discussed whether policing of terrorism should be guided by narrow instrumental

concerns, or broader considerations about procedural fairness and the building of legitimacy. He argued that the latter is the better way to motivate people in ethnic minority communities to report suspicious activity and cooperate with the police. This was also demonstrated by survey data on Muslims in America and US. Finally, Professor Sophie Body-Gendrot from Sorbonne-Paris IV University, Paris, commented on the presentations of the previous speakers in a way that stressed the scope for different orientations to of policing in different cultures and countries.

Afternoon session

The afternoon session began with Dr Jon Jackson from London School of Economics who discussed the issue of legitimacy and procedural justice in diverse settings using examples and survey data from England and Wales, London, and South Africa. Then Professor Ben Bowling from King's College London presented on the idea of "good enough" policing focusing specifically on the power of the UK police to stop and search people in public places and the negative experience people have on this. Finally, the floor was given Ms Sara Thornton who is the Chief Constable of Thames Valley Police. Ms Thornton commented the conference presentations from the point of view of a senior police practitioner, for whom fair treatment in policing was a central preoccupation.

After the presentations, the floor was opened to questions from the participants and all the presenters were available for discussion and comments. A lively discussion touched many of the themes and issues covered during the conference. Most of the presentations given during the London conference are available on the Euro-Justis website at: <http://www.eurojustis.eu/conferences.php>.



The project has produced two publications in book format. The first publication was titled “JUSTIS Project Working Papers – Review of Need: Indicators of Public Confidence in Criminal Justice for Policy Assessment” edited and published by the Finnish partner HEUNI in September 2009. The publication is available in electronic format from our project website (www.eurojustis.eu).

This publication has three parts. The first part covers the review of importance of public confidence as a tool for policy assessment in the countries participating in Euro-Justis. The review was carried out by interviewing experts such as scientists, criminal justice managers and government officials from all countries represented in the project. The second contains reviews on literature and current indicators of confidence in justice and fear of crime. Each partner participating in Euro-Justis prepared a review on their own country, and these are published here as such. The content and scope of these reviews vary, and therefore they should be considered as working papers. The third part of the publication is a review on current indicators of public confidence on a supra-national level. This part assesses the measurement of confidence in justice in international initiatives such as the International Crime Victimization Survey and the European Social Survey.

The second publication was titled “Trust in justice: why it is important for criminal policy, and how it can be measured: Final report of the Euro-Justis project” published by HEUNI in June 2011. The publication is available in electronic format from our project website (www.eurojustis.eu).

The publication does three things. First, it sets out a conceptual framework – or a set of ideas – about ‘trust-based justice’, arguing that building trust in justice ought to be a central priority for governments across Europe. It explains why we believe it is important to use indicators of public trust in justice as a barometer for testing the state of criminal justice systems across Europe. Secondly, the publication proposes practical ways in which member states can and should measure public trust in justice. It summarises the concepts that are important to measure, and presents the way that we think measurement is best done. Thirdly, it sets out some of the findings from the piloting process, presenting preliminary results from Bulgaria, France, Italy and Lithuania – to give a flavour of how to make use of indicators in order to inform careful and long-term criminal policies.

A collection of articles by project members and experts were published in the special edition of the peer-reviewed academic journal, the *European Journal of Criminology*. (Special Issue: Trust in Justice, edited by Mike Hough, Elina Ruuskanen, and Anniina Jokinen), published in July 2011 (vol. 8). The edition included the following articles:

Hough, M., Ruuskanen, E., & Jokinen, A. “Trust in justice and the procedural justice perspective: Editors’ introduction”

Tyler, T. “Trust and legitimacy: Policing in the USA and Europe”

Jackson, J, Bradford, B., Hough, M., Kuha, J., Stares, S., Widdop, S., Fitzgerald, R., Yordanova, M., & Galev, T. “Developing European indicators of trust in justice”

Parmentier, S., & Vervaeke, G. “In criminal justice we trust? A decade of public opinion research in Belgium”

Lappi-Seppälä, T. “Explaining imprisonment in Europe”

Boda, Z., & Szabó, G. “The media and attitudes towards crime and the justice system: A qualitative approach”

Contact details

Project website: www.eurojustis.eu

Note: Euro-Justis website will remain active for at least three years after the project's completion on 30 June 2011.

Project partners: (see also <http://www.eurojustis.eu/partners.html>)

Coordinator: Institute for Criminal Policy Research, Birkbeck College London (ICPR) – London, UK

Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique – France

Center for the Study of Democracy – Bulgaria

European Institute for Crime Prevention and Control – Finland

Institute for Political Sciences – Hungary

London School of Economics and Political Sciences – UK

Center for Crime Prevention - Lithuania

University of Parma – Italy

University of Sheffield – UK

Use and dissemination of foreground

List of scientific (peer reviewed) publications

Note: The following publications are all **publicly** accessible and listed in order of **importance**.

- Jackson, J., Bradford, B., Hough, M., Kuha, J., Stares, S. R., Widdop, S., Fitzgerald, R., Yordanova, M. and Galev, T. (2011). 'Developing European Indicators of Trust in Justice', **European Journal of Criminology**, Vol 8, No 4, pp. 267-285.
- Boda, Z., & Szabó, G. "The media and attitudes towards crime and the justice system: A qualitative approach", **European Journal of Criminology**, Vol 8, No 4, pp. 329-342.
- Hough, M., Jackson, J., Bradford, B. Myhill, A, and Quinton, P. (2010) 'Procedural Justice, Trust, and Institutional Legitimacy', **Policing**, Vol 4, No 3. Pp. 203-210.
- Hough, M. (2012 in press) 'Researching trust in the police and trust in justice: A UK perspective', **Policing and Society**.
- Hough, M., Ruuskanen, E, and Jokinen, A. (2011) 'Editors' introduction: special issue on procedural justice', **European Journal of Criminology**, Vol 8, No 4, pp. 249-253.
- Bradford, Ben and Jackson, Jonathan (2011) Pourquoi les Britanniques ont confiance en leur police. <http://www.eurojustis.eu/fotoweb/47.pdf>
- Jackson, Jonathan and Tyler, Tom R. and Bradford, Ben and Taylor, Dominic and Shiner, Mike (2010) Legitimacy and procedural justice in prisons. **Prison service journal**, (191). pp. 4-10.
- Gerber, Monica M. and Hirtenlehner, Helmut and Jackson, Jonathan (2010) Insecurities about crime in Germany, Austria and Switzerland: a review of research findings. **European journal of criminology**, 7 (2). pp. 141-157.
- Jackson, Jonathan and Bradford, Ben (2010) What is trust and confidence in the police? **Policing: a journal of policy and practice**, 4 (3). pp. 241-248.
- Jackson, Jonathan and Bradford, Ben (2009) Crime, policing and social order: on the expressive nature of public confidence in policing. **British journal of sociology**, 60 (3). pp. 493-521.
- Bradford, Ben and Jackson, Jonathan and Stanko, Elizabeth (2009) Contact and confidence: revisiting the impact of public encounters with the police. **Policing and society**, 19 (1). pp. 20-46.
- Jackson, Jonathan and Bradford, Ben and Hohl, Katrin and Farrall, Stephen (2009) Does the fear of crime erode public confidence in policing? **Policing: a journal of policy and practice**, 3 (1). pp. 100-111.

Camilla Priede & Stephen Farrall (2011): Comparing results from different styles of cognitive interviewing: 'verbal probing' vs. 'thinking aloud'. **International Journal of Social Research Methodology**, Vol 14 (4), pp. 271-287

List of dissemination activities

The list includes the following information: 1) Type of activities, main leader, title, date, place, type of audience, size of audience (if known) and countries addressed. It excludes presentations at the three Euro-Justis international conferences described above.

- 1) Conference, Stephen Farrall (USFD), Measuring Confidence in the Police: Lessons from Research into Survey Question Design, November 2008, Plenary Speaker, ESRC Confidence in the Police Seminar, Newcastle University, Academic audience, UK. (60 people)
- 2) Conference, Mike Hough (ICPR), Social Research and Sociology: The Case of Criminology, December 2008, Social Research Association Annual Conference, Academic Conference, UK. (150 people)
- 3) Conference, Jon Jackson (LSE), New Directions in Research on Public Confidence in Policing: Trust, Legitimacy and Consent, December 2008, Scottish Institute for Policing Research Seminar Series, Academic audience, UK.
- 4) Conference, Mike Hough (ICPR), Public Confidence: The Last Ten years and Current Experience, January 2009, City Forum, Policy audience, UK. (100 people)
- 5) Conference, Mike Hough (ICPR), Sentencing and Attitudes to Punishment in Britain, April 2009, Ryukoko University, Kyoto, Academic audience, Japan. (25 people)
- 6) Conference, Jon Jackson (LSE), Punitive sentiment and the legitimacy of legal authorities, April 2009, Royal Statistical Society, Academic audience, UK.
- 7) Conference, Jon Jackson (LSE), Trust in justice and the legitimacy of the criminal justice system, April 2009, Distinguished Speaker Lecture Series, Sydney Law School, University of Sydney, Academic audience, Australia.
- 8) Conference, Mike Hough (ICPR), The Criminological Enterprise: Maximising Impact, May 2009, British Society of Criminology, Academic audience, UK.
- 9) Conference, Mike Hough (ICPR), Confidence in Criminal Justice and Policing, June 2009, British Society of Criminology, Cardiff, Academic audience, UK.
- 10) Conference, Mike Hough (ICPR), The JUSTIS Project: Trust in Criminal Justice and Policing, June 2009, Stockholm Criminology Symposium, Stockholm, Academic audience, Sweden.
- 11) Conference, Stephen Farrall & Camilla Priede (USFD), Measuring Confidence in the Criminal Justice System Across Europe: Lessons from Research into Survey Question Design, June 2009, Stockholm Criminology Symposium, Stockholm, Academic audience, Sweden.
- 12) Conference, Mike Hough (ICPR), Confidence in Criminal Justice and Policing, June 2009, City University, Academic audience, UK. (50 people)

- 13) Conference, Mike Hough (ICPR) & Jon Jackson (LSE), The JUSTIS Project: Trust in Criminal Justice and Policing, June 2009, University of Leeds, Academic audience, UK. (30 people)
- 14) Conference, Mike Hough (ICPR), Public Trust in Policing, June 2009, University of Oxford, Academic audience, UK.
- 15) Conference, Stephen Farrall & Camilla Priede (USFD), Designing, Refining and Testing Survey Questions Across Europe: One Battery of Questions to Measure Confidence in Criminal Justice in Many Languages, September 2009, European Society of Criminology, Ljubljana, Academic audience, Slovenia.
- 16) Conference, Mike Hough (ICPR), Legitimacy, Trust in Justice and Penal Populism: ‘What is Criminology?’, October 2009, University of Oxford, Academic audience, UK. (70 people)
- 17) Conference, Mike Hough (ICPR), Trust in Justice: A Case Study, November 2009, British Academy, Academic audience, UK.
- 18) Conference, Mike Hough (ICPR), Investing in Criminological Research, March 2010, British Academy, Academic audience, UK.
- 19) Conference, Mike Hough (ICPR), Stop & Search and Trust in Justice: Where now for Stop & Search?, March 2010, King’s College London, Policy/practitioner audience, UK. (100 people)
- 20) Conference, Mike Hough (ICPR), Working with Offenders: Trust Legitimacy and Respect, May 2010, MORI, Civil Society audience and policy, UK.
- 21) Conference, Mike Hough (ICPR) Euro-JUSTIS and the European Social Survey, May 2010, Royal Statistical Society, Belfast, Policy/academic audience, UK.
- 22) Conference, Mike Hough (ICPR), Crime Forecasting, June 2010, City Forum, Policy audience, UK.
- 23) Conference, Mike Hough (ICPR), Euro-JUSTIS and the European Social Survey, July 2010, Statisticians’ Conference, Policy audience, UK. (50 people)
- 24) Conference, Mike Hough (ICPR), Compliance and the Problem of Authority, October 2010, Crime, Disorder and Policing, University of Edinburgh, Academic audience, UK.
- 25) Mike Hough (ICPR), Public Trust in Justice, Institutional Legitimacy and Compliance with the Law, November 2010, All Souls College, University of Oxford, Academic audience, UK.
- 26) Presentation, Mike Hough (ICPR), Confidence in the Criminal Justice System: Examining the PSA2/24 Measures, October 2008, Office for Criminal Justice Reform, Policy audience, UK.
- 27) Presentation, Mike Hough (ICPR), The EU JUSTIS Project (Justice Indicators), November 2008, Luxembourg, Policy and civil society audience.
- 28) Presentation, Mike Hough (ICPR), Police Legitimacy and Trust in Justice: The EU JUSTIS, November 2008, SIPR/BSC/Strathclyde Police Conference, Policy audience, UK.

- 29) Presentation, Mike Hough (ICPR), Procedural Justice, December 2008, Home Office/Ministry of Justice/British Society of Criminology Conference, Policy audience, UK.
- 30) Presentation, Mike Hough (ICPR), Procedural Justice and JUSTIS, April 2009, Ministry of Justice, Policy audience, UK.
- 31) Presentation, Jon Jackson (LSE), Trust and confidence in the police: A British perspective, April 2009, Research Seminar, New South Wales Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research, Policy audience, Australia.
- 32) Presentation, Mike Hough (ICPR), Why pursue Confidence is Justice?, September 2009, Association of Chief Police Officers, Excellence in Policing Conference, Policy audience, UK.
- 33) Presentation, Jon, Jackson (LSE) & Mike Hough (ICPR) Drivers of Public Confidence in Policing, September 2009, Association of Chief Police Officers, Excellence in Policing Conference, Policy audience, UK.
- 34) Presentation, Mike Hough (ICPR), Under the Influence, October 2009, Policy Exchange Fringe Meeting: Manchester Tory Conference, Policy audience, UK.
- 35) Presentation, Mike Hough (ICPR), Euro-JUSTIS and the European Social Survey, November 2009, European Network of Councils for the Judiciary, Policy audience, Poland. (40 people)
- 36) Presentation, Mike Hough (ICPR), Penal Politics, Populism and trust in Justice, November 2009, Howard League for Penal Reform, Policy and civil society audience, UK.
- 37) Presentation, Mike Hough (ICPR), Public Trust, Public Engagement, Oxford, July 2010, Sentencing Council, Policy audience, UK. (30 people)
- 38) Presentation, Mike Hough (ICPR) Public Trust, Public Engagement, October 2010, British Academy, Policy audience, UK.
- 39) Presentation, Mike Hough (ICPR), Euro-JUSTIS and the European Social Survey, October 2010, DG-JLS, Policy audience, (Luxembourg)
- 40) Presentation, Mike Hough (ICPR), Euro-JUSTIS and the European Social Survey, February 2010, The Hague, European Network of Councils for the Judiciary, Policy audience, the Netherlands.
- 41) Presentation, Rokas Uscila (NPLC), Scientific Indicators of Trusts in Justice. Review of need in Lithuania, M.Romeris university, March 2009, Academic audience, Lithuania.
- 42) Presentation, Alfredas Kiškis (NPLC), Trust in Criminal Justice system. What to measure?, M.Romeris University, May 2009, Academic audience, Lithuania.
- 43) Conference, Jon Jackson (LSE), Public Trust and Police Legitimacy: Concepts and data from the British (and European) Contexts, October 2010, XXIII Conference of the Baltic Criminologists, Academic and policy audience, Lithuania.

- 44) Conference, Mike Hough (ICPR), Trust in Justice – The Euro-JUSTIS Project, October 2010, XXIII Conference of the Baltic Criminologists, Academic and policy audience, Lithuania. (100 people)
- 45) Conference, Evaldas Visockas(NPLC), Trust in Criminal Justice System in Lithuania, October 2010, XXIII Conference of the Baltic Criminologists, Academic and policy audience, Lithuania. (100 people)
- 46) Conference, Evaldas Visockas(NPLC), Measuring Trust in Police, January 2009, Police Department under the Ministry of Interior Affairs accounting conference “Evaluation of Police work results for 2008”, Vilnius, Policy audience, Lithuania.
- 47) Presentation, Alfredas Kiškis (NPLC), Review of need: State-of-the-art indicators of public confidence in justice for policy assessment, February 2009, Ministry of Interior Affairs, Committee for implementing National crime prevention and control programme, Vilnius, Policy audience, Lithuania.
- 48) Presentation, Evaldas Visockas (NPLC), Trust in Justice. Why is it important?, February 2009, Ministry of Interior Affairs, Committee for implementing National crime prevention and control programme, Vilnius, Policy audience, Lithuania.
- 49) Conference, Alfredas Kiškis (NPLC), Public Trust in Justice: Benefits and it’s Drivers, June 2010, Public security initiatives. Will we use existing potential?, Vilnius city municipality, Vilnius, Policy audience, Lithuania.
- 50) Conference, Evaldas Visockas (NPLC), Society and Criminal Justice Institutions in Crime Prevention Policy, June 2010, Public security initiatives. Will we use existing potential?, Vilnius city municipality, Vilnius, Policy audience, Lithuania.
- 51) Presentation Evaldas Visockas (NPLC), Measuring Police Work Effectiveness. Importance of Public Trust Indicators, January 2011, Police Department under the Ministry of Interior Affairs, accounting conference Evaluation of Police work results for 2010, Vilnius, Policy audience, Lithuania.
- 52) Presentation, Kauko Aromaa, Anniina Jokinen and Elina Ruuskanen (HEUNI), Euro-Justis project, quarterly meeting of the National Council for Crime Prevention on February 2011, Academic and policy audience, Finland.
- 53) Lecture, Stefano Maffei–E. Vaccari (UNIPR), “Dati contestuali e nuovi indicatori per la misurazione della fiducia nella giustizia” – Seminar to PhD. Students of the Faculty of Law, University of Parma, March 2011, Academic audience, Italy.
- 54) Lecture, Stefano Maffei, (UNIPR) “Introducing EUROJUSTIS: New Indicators of Confidence in Justice , European Public Law Organization – Seminar in the context of the IV edition of the

- “Advanced Seminar in Current Developments in European Law”, University of Parma, June 2010, Academic audience, Italy.
- 55) Lecture, Stefano Maffei (UNIPR), “Introducing EUROJUSTIS: New Indicators of Confidence in Justice”, European Public Law Organization (meeting with Board of directors and experts in public law), Legrena, April 2010, Academic audience, Greece.
- 56) Conference, Stefano Maffei (UNIPR) “EUROJUSTIS: nuovi indicatori di fiducia nella giustizia” – Convegno Studiosi del diritto comparato, Roma, November 2009, Academic audience, Italy.
- 57) Presentation, Stefano Maffei & E. Vaccari (UNIPR), “I nuovi indicatori EUROJUSTIS per misurare la soddisfazione dei cittadini nella giustizia civile e penale” (Seminar for 35 lawyers and trainees), Università degli Studi di Modena e Reggio Emilia, Modena, March 2011, Practitioner audience, Italy.
- 58) Presentation, Stefano Maffei & E. Vaccari (UNIPR), “I nuovi indicatori EUROJUSTIS per misurare la soddisfazione dei cittadini nella giustizia civile e penale” (Seminar for 40 lawyers), Università degli Studi di Milano Bicocca, Milan, March 2011, Practitioner audience, Italy.
- 59) Presentation, Stefano Maffei & E. Vaccari (UNIPR), “Gli indicatori EUROJUSTIS” (Seminar for 50 notaries) Consiglio nazionale del Notariato (Italian Council for notaries), Roma, February 2011, Policy audience, Italy.
- 60) Presentation, Cristina Pavarani (UNIPR), “EUROJUSTIS: New indicators of confidence and trust in Justice” (meeting with 30 Italian lawyers based in London), London, December 2010, Practitioner audience, UK.
- 61) Presentation, Stefano Maffei (UNIPR), “EUROJUSTIS: New indicators of confidence and trust in Justice” (meeting with GGi Geneva Group International – an association of over 400 European lawyers), Limassol, November 2009, Practitioner audience, Cyprus
- 62) Presentation, Stefano Maffei, “I nuovi indicatori EUROJUSTIS per misurare la soddisfazione dei cittadini nella giustizia civile e penale” (Seminar for 40 newly appointed judges), Consiglio Superiore della Magistratura (Italian Council for the Judiciary), Rome, October 2009, Practitioner audience, Italy.
- 63) Presentation, Stefano Maffei (UNIPR), “I nuovi indicatori EUROJUSTIS per misurare la soddisfazione dei cittadini nella giustizia civile e penale” (Seminar at the Ministry of Interior), Ministero dell’ Interno, Rome, October 2009, Policy audience, Italy.
- 64) Organiser of conference, CNRS – together with Science Po “Public Security: Discourses and Practices”, April 2011, Policy and academic audience, 30 participants, France.
- 65) Workshop, Boda Zsolt (IPS) ‘Governing by Trust: Sincerity as a Procedural Fairness Norm’, European Consortium for Political Research, Joint Session of Workshops, April 2011, University of St. Gallen, St. Gallen, Academic audience, Switzerland.

- 66) Organiser of panel at conference, Boda Zsolt (IPS), EU-s projektek a PTI-ben (Projects of IPS funded by EU Framework Programmes), A büntető-igazságszolgáltatási rendszerbe vetett bizalom indikátorai (Indicators of trust in criminal justice), November 2011, Centre for Social Science of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Budapest, Academic audience, Hungary.
- 67) Presentation, Szabó Gabriella (IPS), A média szerepe a büntető igazságszolgáltatásba vetett bizalom kialakulásának (The role of media in shaping people's attitudes towards criminal justice), EU-s projektek a PTI-ben (Projects of IPS funded by EU Framework Programmes), November 2010, Centre for Social Science of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Budapest, Academic audience, Hungary.
- 68) Conference, Boda Zsolt (IPS), Legitimációs és bizalmi deficit a magyar politikai rendszerben (Legitimacy deficit and the lack of confidence in the Hungarian political system), A rendszerváltás húsz éve (The 20 year after the collapse of communist regime), October 2009, Centre for Social Science of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Budapest, Academic audience, Hungary.

Report on societal implications

A General Information *(completed automatically when Grant Agreement number is entered.*

Grant Agreement Number:

217311

Title of Project:

Euro-Justis - Scientific Indicators of Confidence in Justice: Tools
Policy Assessment

Name and Title of Coordinator:

Professor Mike Hough

B Ethics

1. Did your project undergo an Ethics Review (and/or Screening)?

- If Yes: have you described the progress of compliance with the relevant Ethics Review/Screening Requirements in the frame of the periodic/final project reports?

0Yes

Special Reminder: the progress of compliance with the Ethics Review/Screening Requirements should be described in the Period/Final Project Reports under the Section 3.2.2 'Work Progress and Achievements'

2. Please indicate whether your project involved any of the following issues (tick box) :

RESEARCH ON HUMANS

- | | |
|---|----|
| • Did the project involve children? | NO |
| • Did the project involve patients? | NO |
| • Did the project involve persons not able to give consent? | NO |
| • Did the project involve adult healthy volunteers? | NO |
| • Did the project involve Human genetic material? | NO |
| • Did the project involve Human biological samples? | NO |
| • Did the project involve Human data collection? | NO |

RESEARCH ON HUMAN EMBRYO/FOETUS

- | | |
|---|----|
| • Did the project involve Human Embryos? | NO |
| • Did the project involve Human Foetal Tissue / Cells? | NO |
| • Did the project involve Human Embryonic Stem Cells (hESCs)? | NO |
| • Did the project on human Embryonic Stem Cells involve cells in culture? | NO |
| • Did the project on human Embryonic Stem Cells involve the derivation of cells from Embryos? | NO |

PRIVACY

- | | |
|---|-----|
| • Did the project involve processing of genetic information or personal data (eg. health, sexual lifestyle, ethnicity, political opinion, religious or philosophical conviction)? | YES |
| • Did the project involve tracking the location or observation of people? | NO |

RESEARCH ON ANIMALS

- | | |
|---|----|
| • Did the project involve research on animals? | NO |
| • Were those animals transgenic small laboratory animals? | NO |
| • Were those animals transgenic farm animals? | NO |
| • Were those animals cloned farm animals? | NO |
| • Were those animals non-human primates? | NO |

RESEARCH INVOLVING DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

- | | |
|---|----|
| • Did the project involve the use of local resources (genetic, animal, plant etc)? | NO |
| • Was the project of benefit to local community (capacity building, access to healthcare, education etc)? | NO |

DUAL USE

- | | |
|---|----|
| • Research having direct military use | NO |
| • Research having the potential for terrorist abuse | NO |

C Workforce Statistics

3. Workforce statistics for the project: Please indicate in the table below the number of people who worked on the project (on a headcount basis).

Type of Position	Number of Women	Number of Men
Scientific Coordinator	0	1
Work package leaders	1	7
Experienced researchers (i.e. PhD holders)	5	12
PhD Students	1	1
Other	1	
4. How many additional researchers (in companies and universities) were recruited specifically for this project?		16
Of which, indicate the number of men:		6

D Gender Aspects		
5. Did you carry out specific Gender Equality Actions under the project?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes No
6. Which of the following actions did you carry out and how effective were they?		
	Not at all effective	Very effective
<input type="checkbox"/> Design and implement an equal opportunity policy	○ ○ ○ ○ ○	○ ○ ○ ○ ○
<input type="checkbox"/> Set targets to achieve a gender balance in the workforce	○ ○ ○ ○ ○	○ ○ ○ ○ ○
<input type="checkbox"/> Organise conferences and workshops on gender	○ ○ ○ ○ ○	○ ○ ○ ○ ○
<input type="checkbox"/> Actions to improve work-life balance	○ ○ ○ ○ ○	○ ○ ○ ○ ○
<input type="checkbox"/> Other: <input style="width: 50%;" type="text"/>		
7. Was there a gender dimension associated with the research content – i.e. wherever people were the focus of the research as, for example, consumers, users, patients or in trials, was the issue of gender considered and addressed?		
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes- please specify <input style="width: 150px;" type="text"/>		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No		
E Synergies with Science Education		
8. Did your project involve working with students and/or school pupils (e.g. open days, participation in science festivals and events, prizes/competitions or joint projects)?		
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes- please specify <input style="width: 150px;" type="text"/>		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No		
9. Did the project generate any science education material (e.g. kits, websites, explanatory booklets, DVDs)?		
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes- please specify <input style="width: 150px;" type="text"/>		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No		
F Interdisciplinarity		
10. Which disciplines (see list below) are involved in your project?		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Main discipline: 5.4		
<input type="checkbox"/> Associated discipline <input style="width: 30px;" type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Associated discipline	
G Engaging with Civil society and policy makers		
11a Did your project engage with societal actors beyond the research community? (if 'No', go to Question 14)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes No
11b If yes, did you engage with citizens (citizens' panels / juries) or organised civil society (NGOs, patients' groups etc.)?		
<input type="checkbox"/> No		
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes- in determining what research should be performed		
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes - in implementing the research		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, in communicating /disseminating / using the results of the project		

11c In doing so, did your project involve actors whose role is mainly to organise the dialogue with citizens and organised civil society (e.g. professional mediator; communication company, science museums)?	✓	Yes No			
12. Did you engage with government / public bodies or policy makers (including international organisations)					
<input type="radio"/> No <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes- in framing the research agenda <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes - in implementing the research agenda <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes, in communicating /disseminating / using the results of the project					
13a Will the project generate outputs (expertise or scientific advice) which could be used by policy makers? <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes – as a primary objective (please indicate areas below- multiple answers possible) <input type="radio"/> Yes – as a secondary objective (please indicate areas below - multiple answer possible) <input type="radio"/> No					
13b If Yes, in which fields?					
Agriculture Audiovisual and Media Budget Competition Consumers Culture Customs Development Economic and Monetary Affairs Education, Training, Youth Employment and Social Affairs		Energy Enlargement Enterprise Environment External Relations External Trade Fisheries and Maritime Affairs Food Safety Foreign and Security Policy Fraud Humanitarian aid		Human rights Information Society Institutional affairs Internal Market Justice, freedom and security Public Health Regional Policy Research and Innovation Space Taxation Transport	✓

13c If Yes, at which level? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="radio"/> Local / regional levels <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="radio"/> National level <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="radio"/> European level <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="radio"/> International level		
H Use and dissemination		
14. How many Articles were published/accepted for publication in peer-reviewed journals?	13	
To how many of these is open access provided?		
How many of these are published in open access journals?	13 – at least access to abstracts	
How many of these are published in open repositories?	0	
To how many of these is open access not provided?		
Please check all applicable reasons for not providing open access:		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> publisher's licensing agreement would not permit publishing in a repository <input type="checkbox"/> no suitable repository available <input type="checkbox"/> no suitable open access journal available <input type="checkbox"/> no funds available to publish in an open access journal <input type="checkbox"/> lack of time and resources <input type="checkbox"/> lack of information on open access <input type="checkbox"/> other ² :	Where partial access only is available	
15. How many new patent applications ('priority filings') have been made? <i>("Technologically unique": multiple applications for the same invention in different jurisdictions should be counted as just one application of grant).</i>	None	
16. Indicate how many of the following Intellectual Property Rights were applied for (give number in each box).	Trademark	0
	Registered design	0
	Other	0
17. How many spin-off companies were created / are planned as a direct result of the project?	None	
<i>Indicate the approximate number of additional jobs in these companies:</i>		
18. Please indicate whether your project has a potential impact on employment, in comparison with the situation before your project:		
<input type="checkbox"/> Increase in employment, or <input type="checkbox"/> Safeguard employment, or <input type="checkbox"/> Decrease in employment, <input type="checkbox"/> Difficult to estimate / not possible to quantify	<input type="checkbox"/> In small & medium-sized enterprises <input type="checkbox"/> In large companies <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None of the above / not relevant to the project	

² For instance: classification for security project.

<p>19. For your project partnership please estimate the employment effect resulting directly from your participation in Full Time Equivalent (FTE = one person working fulltime for a year) jobs:</p> <p>Difficult to estimate / not possible to quantify</p>	<p><i>Indicate figure:</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> ✓</p>		
<p>I Media and Communication to the general public</p>			
<p>20. As part of the project, were any of the beneficiaries professionals in communication or media relations?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>			
<p>21. As part of the project, have any beneficiaries received professional media / communication training / advice to improve communication with the general public?</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>			
<p>22 Which of the following have been used to communicate information about your project to the general public, or have resulted from your project?</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top;"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Press Release <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Media briefing <input type="checkbox"/> TV coverage / report <input type="checkbox"/> Radio coverage / report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Brochures /posters / flyers <input type="checkbox"/> DVD /Film /Multimedia </td> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top;"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Coverage in specialist press <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Coverage in general (non-specialist) press <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Coverage in national press <input type="checkbox"/> Coverage in international press <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Website for the general public / internet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Event targeting general public (festival, conference, exhibition, science café) </td> </tr> </table>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Press Release <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Media briefing <input type="checkbox"/> TV coverage / report <input type="checkbox"/> Radio coverage / report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Brochures /posters / flyers <input type="checkbox"/> DVD /Film /Multimedia	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Coverage in specialist press <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Coverage in general (non-specialist) press <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Coverage in national press <input type="checkbox"/> Coverage in international press <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Website for the general public / internet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Event targeting general public (festival, conference, exhibition, science café)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Press Release <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Media briefing <input type="checkbox"/> TV coverage / report <input type="checkbox"/> Radio coverage / report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Brochures /posters / flyers <input type="checkbox"/> DVD /Film /Multimedia	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Coverage in specialist press <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Coverage in general (non-specialist) press <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Coverage in national press <input type="checkbox"/> Coverage in international press <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Website for the general public / internet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Event targeting general public (festival, conference, exhibition, science café)		
<p>23 In which languages are the information products for the general public produced?</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top;"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Language of the coordinator <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other language(s) (Partner institution countries) </td> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top;"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> English </td> </tr> </table>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Language of the coordinator <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other language(s) (Partner institution countries)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> English
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Language of the coordinator <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other language(s) (Partner institution countries)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> English		

Question F-10: Classification of Scientific Disciplines according to the Frascati Manual 2002 (Proposed Standard Practice for Surveys on Research and Experimental Development, OECD 2002):

FIELDS OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

1. NATURAL SCIENCES

- 1.1 Mathematics and computer sciences [mathematics and other allied fields: computer sciences and other allied subjects (software development only; hardware development should be classified in the engineering fields)]
- 1.2 Physical sciences (astronomy and space sciences, physics and other allied subjects)
- 1.3 Chemical sciences (chemistry, other allied subjects)
- 1.4 Earth and related environmental sciences (geology, geophysics, mineralogy, physical geography and other geosciences, meteorology and other atmospheric sciences including climatic research, oceanography, vulcanology, palaeoecology, other allied sciences)
- 1.5 Biological sciences (biology, botany, bacteriology, microbiology, zoology, entomology, genetics, biochemistry, biophysics, other allied sciences, excluding clinical and veterinary sciences)

2 ENGINEERING AND TECHNOLOGY

- 2.1 Civil engineering (architecture engineering, building science and engineering, construction engineering, municipal and structural engineering and other allied subjects)
 - 2.2 Electrical engineering, electronics [electrical engineering, electronics, communication engineering and systems, computer engineering (hardware only) and other allied subjects]
 - 2.3. Other engineering sciences (such as chemical, aeronautical and space, mechanical, metallurgical and materials engineering, and their specialised subdivisions; forest products; applied sciences such as geodesy, industrial chemistry, etc.; the science and technology of food production; specialised technologies of interdisciplinary fields, e.g. systems analysis, metallurgy, mining, textile technology and other applied subjects)
3. MEDICAL SCIENCES
- 3.1 Basic medicine (anatomy, cytology, physiology, genetics, pharmacy, pharmacology, toxicology, immunology and immunohaematology, clinical chemistry, clinical microbiology, pathology)
 - 3.2 Clinical medicine (anaesthesiology, paediatrics, obstetrics and gynaecology, internal medicine, surgery, dentistry, neurology, psychiatry, radiology, therapeutics, otorhinolaryngology, ophthalmology)
 - 3.3 Health sciences (public health services, social medicine, hygiene, nursing, epidemiology)
4. AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES
- 4.1 Agriculture, forestry, fisheries and allied sciences (agronomy, animal husbandry, fisheries, forestry, horticulture, other allied subjects)
 - 4.2 Veterinary medicine
5. SOCIAL SCIENCES
- 5.1 Psychology
 - 5.2 Economics
 - 5.3 Educational sciences (education and training and other allied subjects)
 - 5.4 Other social sciences [anthropology (social and cultural) and ethnology, demography, geography (human, economic and social), town and country planning, management, law, linguistics, political sciences, sociology, organisation and methods, miscellaneous social sciences and interdisciplinary, methodological and historical S1T activities relating to subjects in this group. Physical anthropology, physical geography and psychophysiology should normally be classified with the natural sciences].
6. HUMANITIES
- 6.1 History (history, prehistory and history, together with auxiliary historical disciplines such as archaeology, numismatics, palaeography, genealogy, etc.)
 - 6.2 Languages and literature (ancient and modern)
 - 6.3 Other humanities [philosophy (including the history of science and technology) arts, history of art, art criticism, painting, sculpture, musicology, dramatic art excluding artistic "research" of any kind, religion, theology, other fields and subjects pertaining to the humanities, methodological, historical and other S1T activities relating to the subjects in this group]