

## **SP1 - COOPERATION**

### **SSH7**

#### **GRANT AGREEMENT NR 217311**

## **SCIENTIFIC INDICATORS OF CONFIDENCE IN JUSTICE: TOOLS FOR POLICY ASSESSMENT**

<b><u>Work Package 6:</u></b>	<b>Assessment of policies: piloting of the EURO- JUSTIS indicators of public confidence</b>
<b><u>Task 6.1:</u></b>	<b>Conducting the survey</b>
<b><u>Deliverable 6.1:</u></b>	<b>Report on the fielding of surveys</b>

Version:	1	Date	June 28, 2011
Type: Public	Report		
Confidentiality:	Public		
Responsible Partner:	LSE		
Editor:	ICPR		
Contributors:	ICPR		

## CONTENT LIST

<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b> .....	3
<b>1. Italy</b> .....	4
1.1. Technical Report.....	4
1.2. Fielding Report.....	5
<b>2. Bulgaria</b> .....	7
2.1. Technical Report.....	7
2.1. Fielding Report.....	11
<b>3. Lithuania</b> .....	16
3.1. Technical Report.....	16
3.2. Fielding Report.....	16
<b>4. France</b> .....	20
4.1. Technical Report.....	20
4.2. Fielding Report.....	23

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The research project EURO-JUSTIS (Scientific Indicators of Confidence in JUSTIS: Tools for Policy Assessment), which is funded primarily by the European Commission from the 7<sup>th</sup> Framework Programme for Research, is designed to provide EU institutions and Member States with new indicators for assessing public confidence in justice.

WP6 aims to pilot a balanced portfolio of social indicators of public confidence in justice. There are four main objectives: first, to field the survey questions that were conceptualised in WP3 and operationalised in WP4; second, to interpret results and integrate them with the contextual data described under WP5; third, to develop an overall indicator that balances valid and reliable measures of the constituent components, and fourth to provide guidance to policy makers on how to assess policies aimed at improving public confidence. Particular care will be given to ensure that the approach in combining the various streams of data is science-based, theory- and concept-led, but at the same time policy-driven (i.e. amenable to use by policy makers for assessment and evaluation).

This deliverable consists of reports on the fielding of the survey questions that capture attitudinal indicators of public confidence in certain representative areas of Europe; namely Bulgaria, Lithuania, Italy, and France. Calls for tenders was issued by KCL (now ICPR) and three subcontractors were selected to carry out the surveys in each country.

## **1. Italy**

### **1.1. Technical Report**

The survey in Italy was conducted by GfK Austria (Ungargasse 37, Vienna, 1030, Austria) costing €27,500 + VAT. The fieldwork was carried out between 29 October and 19 November, 2010 using CAPI (Computer Aided Personal Interviews). The total number of interviewers involved in the survey was 111, and on average, each interviewer carried out approximately five interviews. Interviewers were properly instructed through telephone briefing sessions and were informed about the objective of the survey. They were instructed on the questionnaire flow and specific issues regarding each question.

The sampling comprised of individuals aged 16 years old and over, using a quota sample, applying the following quotas:

- Regions and City Sizes (interlocked)
- Gender and Age (interlocked)
- Level of education
- Occupation

The sampling points were selected randomly. The total number of sampling points involved in the Survey was 111. The resulting sample was as follows:

- Sample: 522
- The response rate was 28%
  - Contacts: 1833
  - Completed interviews: 522
  - Refusals: 357
  - Screen out: 954

## 1.2. *Fielding Report*

As part of quality control, 5% of completed questions were checked and 20% of the interviewers were asked to provide feedback regarding their fieldwork. Below are the comments received by the interviewers.

The interviewers felt that there was a high level of interest among the respondents. The majority of respondents considered that the subject was relevant in the context of Italian society and appreciated the opportunity to state their opinion on the matter. The Elderly were more cooperative in taking part in the survey than younger people.

Respondents thought that most of the questions were clear and the language was appropriate for the most part of the sample. The interviewers did not have difficulties in carrying out the survey, with the exception of a few participants with low levels of education because of the type of language used. In particular, the sections that respondents found most interesting were: section B – Neighbourhood perceptions, relational concerns and fear of crime and section C - Trust in justice and the legitimacy of legal authorities.

Many respondents, however, found the survey long and at times repetitive. According to the interviewers, the only section that produced objections and criticism among respondents was SECTION D - Self-control, moral norms and instrumental incentives, because it dealt with personal/private subjects.

Comments to specific questions (please see [www.eurojustis.eu/](http://www.eurojustis.eu/) under WP4 for the survey questions):

- Questions from **B35 to B43**: some respondents found it difficult to empathize with the characters in the scenarios because they are far from

their own experiences. However, other respondents felt they were useful because they made the questions easier to understand. Interviewers also reported that they had to repeat the scenarios because they were long. A small number of respondents commented that the scenarios only refer to poor areas/neighbourhoods, and considered that these scenarios were not very comprehensive or realistic enough because crimes are also committed in rich neighbourhoods.

- **B19-B20:** some respondents felt fearful and concerned when thinking of possible experiences they had in the past or possible experiences that could occur to them in the future.
- **C16:** some respondents felt they were too personal.
- **C72-C73-C74:** the majority of respondents felt that the questions were quite offensive.
- **D1-D5:** some respondents were uncomfortable answering these questions. Some even felt that many people are unlikely to answer affirmatively to these questions.
- **F7-F9:** many respondents found these questions to be too personal and were not happy to disclose their economic status and political ideas.

## **2. Bulgaria**

### **2.1. Technical Report**

The survey in Bulgaria was conducted by Vistosha Research (Alexander Zhendov Street, 1113 Sofia) at a cost of €11,900 + VAT. The fieldwork was carried out in October, 2010. Using face-to-face interviews, the total number completed was 1,008 (response rate 63%), with one interview discarded during the control stage due to insufficient quality. 94 interviewers took part in the survey with each conducting on average 11 interviews. The interviewers, or their supervisors, were thoroughly instructed prior to the fieldwork.

The sampling method was two stage random route cluster sampling. The sample covered the whole population of Bulgaria aged 18 and over. A random nationwide sample of 126 clusters was generated with 8 interviews per cluster. The first stage of our sampling procedure is based on the list of electoral sections from the last Parliamentary elections – July 2009. The total number of electoral sections is 11 632. Electoral sections cover the whole territory of the country and respectively provide access to the whole Bulgarian population. Vitosha Research disposes of the complete list of electoral sections, which includes: number, territorial location and number of voters. Selection of electoral sections included in the sample is based on the following procedure (systematic random selection):

1. Within the list of electoral sections a cumulative measure of size column, based on the number of voters in each electoral section is computed;
2. The total number of voters in all sections is divided by the number of sections to be included in the sample (the proposed number for the present survey is 126). The product of the division is the so called "selection interval" (SI);
3. A random start (RS) within the range between 1 and SI is chosen;
4. Following the cumulative column in the table, the first electoral section included is the one which contains the RS. The second section is the one which contains RS+SI, the third - RS+2SI, etc.

The number of clusters (electoral sections) chosen at the first stage of the sampling procedure will be  $N=126$ . Following the above procedure ensures:

1. That the clusters are chosen with probability proportional to the size of the sections.
2. That the sample is proportionally distributed over the territory of the country and includes all types of locations (cities, towns, and villages).
3. That it is representative of the whole population of the country.

The second stage of the selection process involves selecting the respondents themselves. Exactly 8 people from each cluster are to be interviewed, according to the requirements for random selection of respondents, thus making  $N = 1008$  face-to-face interviews (126 clusters x 8 respondents). Applying this method provides equal chance of every Bulgarian citizen aged 18 and over being interviewed and ensures representativeness of the survey. In each of the selected clusters, one address is drawn at random, which is an exact address (so called *starting point* in the populated area/region/settlement). The first step is to stand on the street at the starting address facing towards the end of the street. Walking on the right hand side of the street every third door is chosen. Only dwelling units are used.. At every address, up to three revisits must be made to attempt to achieve an interview with the chosen respondent, until the interviewer succeeds in interviewing 8 people.

The criteria for choosing each respondent are detailed below:

- the member of the family, who is at least 18 years old, and had the most recent birthday (this will secure that each member has an equal chance of being included in the survey);
- a permanent resident of the household contacted;
- the only household member interviewed.

Settlements with less than 100 voters were not included in the sample.

Urban/rural settlements are determined by sample design.

The sample composed in the above-described way will have the following properties:

1. The sample is representative of the Bulgarian population aged 18 and over and covers the whole territory of the country.
5. The sample is designed to reproduce the basic socio-demographic parameters of the population aged 18+ as of the data from the last Parliamentary elections – July 2009.
6. The parameter estimates (distributions for each variable in the survey) will depend on the size of the sample and the level of intra-class correlation (the level of similarity of respondent answers to the different questions within a given cluster).
7. Given the planned sample size ( $N = 1008$ ) and the average estimate for the intra-class correlation of  $B=0.05$ , the expected maximum stochastic errors for the different estimates of variable distributions are as follows:

**Estimated Stochastic Error (Sample size  $N = 1008$  and 95% confidence level)**

Relative Share (%)	Maximal Relative Stochastic Error	Maximal Stochastic Error	Confidence Intervals	
			Low	High
5	26	1.3	3.7	6.3
10	18.0	1,8	8,2	11,8
15	14.7	2.2	12.8	17.2
20	12.5	2.5	17.5	22.5
25	10.8	2.7	22.3	27.7
30	9.3	2.8	27.2	32.8
40	7.5	3.0	37.0	43.0
50	6.2	3.1	46.9	53.1

The distribution of interviews for the 28 regions in Bulgaria was as follows:

Region	Count	Percent	Region	Count	Percent
Blagoevgrad	40	4	Pleven	39	3.9
Bourgas	56	5.6	Plovdiv	88	8.7
Varna	64	6.4	Razgrad	24	2.4
Veliko Turnovo	32	3.2	Rousse	32	3.2
Vidin	16	1.6	Silistra	16	1.6
Vratsa	24	2.4	Sliven	32	3.2
Gabrovo	24	2.4	Smolyan	16	1.6
Dobrich	24	2.4	Sofia - city	144	14.3
Kurdjali	32	3.2	Sofia - region	32	3.2
Kyustendil	24	2.4	Stara Zagora	48	4.8
Lovech	16	1.6	Turgovishte	16	1.6
Montana	24	2.4	Haskovo	40	4
Pazardjik	40	4	Shumen	24	2.4
Pernik	16	1.6	Yambol	24	2.4

The survey was conducted using the national interviewer net of Vitosha Research (VR). The net consists of 27 regional teams each with a team head experienced in fieldwork. The interviewers have undergone the necessary training and have considerable experience. In order to solve specific problems, interviewers were instructed to contact the head of the regional team or the staff members of VR, Sofia.

The briefing session included an overview of survey methodology, specific features of the questionnaire and of specific questions, sampling methodology and specific fieldwork requirements. It also included a reconstruction of a fieldwork situation. The interviewers were supplied with

written instructions and show-cards and were instructed to record the necessary information for all inaccessible respondents and refusals.

Over 10% of the respondents in the study were contacted via phone in order to check the work of the interviewers. Some of the respondents were selected randomly; others were selected during the inspection of the questionnaires when there was any doubt about the quality of the work. One interview was discarded because of low data quality.

All questionnaires were subjected to a logic check before data entry. The logic check was carried out by the VR staff and included:

- Fulfillment of all questionnaire instructions;
- Logical correspondence between answers of different questions;
- Control for accuracy in the cases where there is objective information (e.g. questions on size of the city/village, administrative region, number of the cluster).

## **2.1. Fielding Report**

As a whole the interviewers reported that there were no serious problems with the questionnaire and most of the respondents understood most of the questions.. The main problems are listed below:

The interviewers report that the respondents found the questionnaire very long, laborious and quite boring. The main reason for this, according to some interviewers, is the relatively high register of the language used for the questions – i.e. the questions sound too academic or too elevated to the

general public. Many respondents do not have the general knowledge about law that is required to understand some of the questions. The interviewers, however, were able to understand all the questions.

The questions were a bit repetitive and some respondents had the feeling that they are being asked the same thing over and over again. The interviewers also complained about the large number of show-cards which they felt interrupted the dynamics of the interview.

By far the most problematic part of the questionnaire was section D "self-control". Questions D1-D3 and D5 elicited very strong reactions from many respondents as despite answering "no" to question D1, they were still asked to imagine that they had stolen something. The common response was "I would never do such a thing!" and a strong refusal to answer (which however was not provided as a possible option in the questionnaire and the interviewers had problems deciding how to indicate such answer). The overall attitude of some respondents changed after D1-D5 and they became more hostile and uncooperative.

Overall, females demonstrated stronger reactions than males to the problematic D1-D5 part of the survey which was reflected quantitatively as more answers of "I don't know" to these questions by females.

The questionnaire was, overall, a bit difficult for less educated people as well as some of the Roma respondents.

Generally, people living in villages were more open to the interviewers, responded more friendly to the questions and were more cooperative. The

subjective feeling of some interviewers is that people living in villages are less concerned about crime, although house burglary is quite common in the villages in some parts of the country which often causes tension between Roma and Bulgarian people.

Comments to specific questions (please see [www.eurojustis.eu/](http://www.eurojustis.eu/) under WP4 for the survey questions):

### **Block A: A1-A10**

- It seemed strange to the interviewers/respondents that questions A1 and A4 asked only about the workdays from Monday to Friday while some respondents tend to read/watch TV only during the weekend. A2, A3, A5 assume that the respondents read papers/magazines or watch TV which is not the case for some people (there is no answer "I don't watch TV/I don't read papers whatsoever")

### **Block B**

- B1-B11 were quite clear, the questions were short and straightforward, there are no comments about these questions.
- B12-B34 these questions elicited some of the remarks about "too academic in style" that are summarized above as a general comment.
- B35-B43 this group of questions was the second most often noted problem with the questionnaire. According to the interviewers, the stories and explanations were too long and. The respondents either found the long explanation unnecessary because the answer seemed obvious to them from the beginning, or had problems focusing their attention on the story from the questionnaire – some of them spontaneously recalled similar stories they had had or had heard about and interrupted the interview with their own story. Some of the

interviewers and possible respondents found the stories a bit naïve in the context of the Bulgarian reality. It was noted that some of the respondents do not know the difference between a robbery and a burglary and confuse the two.

**Block C:** This group of questions was overall quite hard for the respondents. It was noted by an interviewer that when people answered questions about “the police” they most often meant the traffic police in particular as, most often people have experience with the traffic police.

- C25 – wording of the answers makes them longer and a bit incomprehensible. (see notes on translation issues below)
- C41 – respondents had problems answering this question because most of them didn’t have “personal experience” with the criminal courts and it was not clear to them how they should answer the question in that case. The same remark was made for a similar question about the police (C8).
- C64 and C66 elicited many spontaneous answers such as “Suspended prison sentence” in combination with the length of the sentence, although both questions had filters and did not allow length estimation for any other option than “prison sentence”.

**Block D:** This group of questions was already commented as the most problematic one for the reasons explained above.

**Block E:** No particular comments about these questions apart from the general remark about the academic/far-fetched style of some questions. After block D most respondents were tired from the overall length of the interview and a bit hostile because of the D2, D3, D5 questions which were interpreted as suggestions that the respondents were criminals.

**Block F:** No particular comments about these questions apart from F5 “how

many years of education have you completed” – Bulgarian people always have problems responding adequately to this type of question, not only in this study. The “household income” is another question that is notoriously disliked by the respondents. This problem is faced in all surveys that ask such a question. The use of showcards with letters pointed out has not reassured the respondents about the anonymity of their data.

### Translation issues

The translation of the questionnaire was discussed with the coordinator of the ESS team in Bulgaria – Ms. Lilia Dimova, and most of the questions use similar wording with minor changes as compared to the ESS pilot questionnaire (ESS Round 5). Only a few questions differ vastly from the ESS wording due to following reasons:

- C1-C3 and respectively C4-C6 & C72 - C74 – questions posed problems during the ESS pilot and it was decided to use the EUROJUSTIS pilot survey to test similar questions but with different wording. ESS wording is closer to “everyday” language, while in the EUROJUSTIS pilot the questions were kept as close to the original wording as possible. The EUROJUSTIS pilot did not register specific problems with these questions but we have to note the difference in the methodology for collecting data during the pilot survey, and the fact that the ESS comprehensive methodology is able to register minor issues that could be not registered in our survey.
- C24 & C25– The Bulgarian translation of the ESS question uses “когато жертви на престъпление **дават показание**” (when victims **give testimony** to) to translate “when victims **report** crimes”, which has more normative meaning of formal procedure of testifying. In the EUROJUSTIS question, we use “когато жертви на престъпление **съобщават** за него” (“when victims report ...”, where “report” is in the sense of “inform” or “notify” the police), which has a broader and

informal meaning of contacting policy to report something. After a discussion with the ESS coordinator, we consider the EUROJUSTIS wording as closer to the original English wording.

- C25 and respectively C52 – ESS uses a changed version of the original wording of the answers, which could be translated as “The police treat Bulgarians worse” (in original: “People from the same race or ethnic group as most [country] people treated worse”), while EUROJUSTIS used wording, closer to the original one. The ESS version proved to be more comprehensible and clear for respondents.

### **3. Lithuania**

#### **3.1. Technical Report**

The survey in Lithuania was conducted by Vilmorus (Gedimino ave. 1-15, Vilnius, Lithuania) costing €16,300 + VAT. The fieldwork was carried out between 15 October and 27 November, 2010 using face-to-face interviews. The sample consisted of 1021 respondents, comprised of Lithuanian inhabitants aged 16 and over. Multi-stage random sampling was used to produce a probability sample, covering 18 towns and 54 villages (Vilnius, Kaunas, Klaipeda, Siauliai, Panevezys, Marijampole; Alytus, Sakiai, Telsiai, Mazeikiai, Pakruojis, Akmene, Silute, Kedainiai, Utena, Taurage, Kupiskis, Rokiskis, Svencionys, Ukmerge, Moletai and Raseiniai districts.)

#### **3.2. Fielding Report**

The following points were raised by respondents:

- The Questionnaire was quite interesting but too long.
- All questions were understandable.

- Too many questions with showcards.
- Not very clear criteria for using showcards. These were used in one case and not used in similar questions with the same quantity of options. For example questions C1-C3 with cards, questions C8-C15 without cards.
- Some questions were not applicable to Lithuania: the group of questions concerning different treatment by race – there is a very small percentage of the population comprised of different racial groups in Lithuania.

Comments to specific questions (please see [www.eurojustis.eu/](http://www.eurojustis.eu/) under WP4 for the survey questions):

#### *Block A*

- Not all respondents read newspapers, or watch TV. Is it reasonable to ask them what they are reading/watching? Proceeding from this question to another in these cases was missing: from A1 to A4 and from A4 to A6.
- Question A1 asks only about newspapers: "...how much of your time is spent reading the newspapers?" and A2 as a continuing question is not only about newspapers but about magazines also: "...Please list which newspapers or magazines you read..."
- The format of question A2 includes almost only newspapers in the answer options when the question is about newspapers and magazines. It would have been more appropriate to add newspapers which are published not daily or weekly but with other periodicity. For example, many people not living in big cities in Lithuania read local newspapers published twice a week. In addition, options such as "Internet newspapers" was missing.

*Block B*

- In questions B3 and B8, many respondents found it difficult to define how many times they felt worried about having their home broken into. Most respondents found it easier to define as “sometimes”, “rarely”, “often”.
- Some phrases used in questions seemed odd for some respondents – for example question B41 states “...she routinely locks her door when she leaves, since she believes this is the sensible thing to do...” Most of the Lithuanian population think that you must lock the door every time you leave if don’t want to be robbed.
- B12 Precaution against crime “Avoid using public transport” – can be understood in two ways: 1) usage of personal means of transport or taxi; 2) walking on foot. These two options have quite different and contrary implications on answers. Quite often respondents in Lithuania meant “walking on foot” and commented that they feel more secure in public transport than walking on the street.

*Block C*

- C7 question: “Taking into account all the things the police are expected to do, would you say they are doing a good job or a bad job?” Despite there being no such option, there were many responses which stated “quality of police work suffers because of lack of finance”.
- Respondents reacted sensitively to questions D2 and D5. These questions made assumptions that the respondent had stolen something. Sometimes respondents felt insulted even if the question was a hypothetical scenario.
- Questions C64 and C66 seemed very similar to respondents: C64)

“Which one of the following sentences do you think he should receive?”  
C66) “Which of the following sentences do you think he would receive from the courts in [country]?” Attempts were made to keep the translation as close to the original questions in this survey but with the benefit of hindsight, it would have been better to change the wording of question C64 to: “Which sentence you would chose for this person?”

#### *Block D*

- Again, respondents reacted sensitively to questions D2 and D5, because these questions made assumptions that the respondent has stolen something.

## **4. France**

### **4.1. Technical Report**

#### 1. SURVEY METHOD

A telephone survey was conducted for those 18 years and older living in metropolitan France.

1,503 individuals were surveyed

Mean length of the questionnaire : 25 minutes

Date : 24th of February to the 18th of March

The sample was divided into two sub-samples :

1/ A whole France subsample

2/ A subsample restricted to the département of Seine-Saint-Denis

According to the quota method, the survey was conducted so that each sub-sample will be representative according to the following variables :

- gender
- Age in four categories (15-24, 25-44, 45-59, 60 +)
- Socio-professional categories in 3 categories (higher, lower, economically inactive)
- Region (9 zones)
- City size (5 categories)
- The number of persons in the household
- Educational attainment
- 

The samples were weighted so that each sample effectively represents the targeted population:

## 2. PHONE CONTACTS

Refusal rates were higher in Seine-Saint-Denis. The more urban character of the Seine-Saint-Denis subsample largely explains the greater number of refusals. Furthermore, the département of Seine-Saint-Denis includes a greater number of foreigners (22% versus 6% for France as a whole), who tend to be more reluctant to participate because of language difficulties.

**Table 1. Phone contacts**

	FRANCE		SEINE-SAINT-DENIS	
	Number	%	Number	%
Total available addresses	15 000	100	15 000	
Success	751	7	752	6
Contacted	1852	17	690	6
Failure	8063	75	10512	87
Refusal to answer	3742	35	4924	<b>41</b>
Wrong address	2127	20	2472	21

## 3. DURATION

Mean length = 25 minutes

Max: 53 minutes

Min: 5 min

72% of the interviews lasted between 20 and 28 minutes.

Younger people and students were quicker at answering the questionnaire.

## 4. QUOTAS

The following table shows that the quota sample worked well, despite the difficulties concerning the level of diploma. Special attention has been paid to this quota variable so as to reach the objectives. The maximal difference to the objective for the specific category of a given quota variable is 0.1%.

Table 2. Quota : objectives and results for each subsample

		France					SSD				
		OBJ.		RES.		OBJ.		RES.			
		Nb	%	Nb	%	Diff.	Nb	%	Nb	%	Diff.
		750	100%	751	100%	1	750	100%	752	100%	2
GENDER	Male	357	48%	347	46%	-10	361	48%	363	48%	2
	Female	393	52%	404	54%	11	389	52%	389	52%	0
AGE	18-29	147	20%	134	18%	-13	181	24%	172	23%	-9
	30-44	202	27%	226	30%	24	229	31%	231	31%	2
	45-59	195	26%	187	25%	-8	194	26%	197	26%	3
	60+	206	27%	204	27%	-2	146	19%	152	20%	6
DIPLOMA	No diploma	136	18%	122	16%	-14	207	28%	183	24%	-24
	< Bac	304	41%	298	40%	-6	251	33%	255	34%	4
	> Bac	274	37%	299	40%	25	251	33%	279	37%	28
	Student	36	5%	32	4%	-4	41	5%	35	5%	-6
REGION	Paris	139	19%	162	22%	23					
	Paris region West	71	9%	75	10%	4					
	Paris region East	60	8%	62	8%	2					
	North	48	6%	49	7%	1					
	West	101	13%	97	13%	-4					
	East	65	9%	58	8%	-7					
	South-West	84	11%	75	10%	-9					
	South-East	90	12%	91	12%	1					
	Mediterranean	92	12%	82	11%	-10					
CITY SIZE	rural town	189	25%	192	26%	3					
	< 20 000 inh.	127	17%	117	16%	-10					
	20 to 200 000	98	13%	96	13%	-2					
	> 200 000 inh.	213	28%	195	26%	-18					
	Paris agglom.	123	16%	151	20%	28					
SOCIO-PROF.	SP ++	175	23%	169	23%	-6	173	23%	185	25%	12
	SP --	273	36%	277	37%	4	314	42%	305	41%	-9
	Econ. inactive	302	40%	305	41%	3	263	35%	262	35%	-1
PERSONS / HOUSEHO.	1	249	33%	212	28%	-37	232	31%	206	27%	-26
	2	247	33%	269	36%	22	202	27%	211	28%	9
	3	111	15%	115	15%	4	124	17%	128	17%	4
	4+	143	19%	155	21%	12	192	26%	207	28%	15

## 4.2. *Fielding Report*

The French survey focused on ethnicity, so the French questionnaire is not the exact equivalent of the pilot surveys carried out in the countries discussed above. We paid special attention, in translating and sometimes adapting the questions for the French public. For example, we used simple words available to the French public at large, but also referred to themes or issues which appear to be salient in the French context.

Given the interest indifferences between ethnic groups, the questionnaire focussed on attitudes and experience of the agency with which people have most experience and contact – the police. Attitudes and experience were covered in more depth than in the other pilot surveys. The items on attitudes to the courts were largely dropped, although the question on penalties for burglary was retained.

The survey company outlined that the interviewees were interested in the theme of the survey and answering questions enthusiastically; and that no question was problematic.