

Trükiks antud tekst (võimalikud muudatused kujunduses)
Puudub: Preface

Andri Ahven & Lauri Tabur
Kauko Aromaa

Victims of Crime in Estonia 1993-2000

Research Report

Ministry of Internal Affairs, Estonia
National Research Institute of Legal Policy, Finland
Research Communications 51
Tallinn – Helsinki 2001

MINISTRY OF INTERNAL AFFAIRS, ESTONIA
RESEARCH REPORT
NATIONAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE OF LEGAL POLICY, FINLAND
RESEARCH COMMUNICATIONS 51

Siseministeerium. Uringuaruanne
Oikeuspoliittinen tutkimuslaitos. Tutkimustiedonantoja
Rättspolitiska forskningsinstitutet. Forskingsmeddelanden

Andri Ahven & Lauri Tabur
Kauko Aromaa

VICTIMS OF CRIME IN ESTONIA 1993-2000

Tallinn – Helsinki 2001

ISBN 9985-78-179-1; 951-704-260-4

ISSN 1235-9254

© Siseministeerium 2001

EVG Print, Tallinn

Tagakülg

ISBN 9985-78-179-1; 951-704-260-4
ISSN 1235-9254

CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Victimisation prevalence	
<i>Estonia in comparison with other countries</i>	
Victimisation to violence	
<i>Urbanisation and regional differences</i>	
<i>Sexual incidents</i>	
Victimisation to property crimes	
<i>Robbery, personal theft (incl. pickpocketing)</i>	
<i>Car theft, theft from car and car vandalism</i>	
<i>Burglary, attempted burglary</i>	
<i>Bicycle theft</i>	
<i>Theft from summer cottage, garden house, allotment, and theft from garage, shed etc</i>	
<i>Reporting to the police</i>	
<i>Reasons for not reporting to the police</i>	
Satisfaction with the police response	
Professional level of the Estonian police	
<i>Personal experiences with the police</i>	
Concern for violence	
Property crime risk assessment	
<i>Victimisation prevention precautions</i>	
Attitudes towards punishment	
Consumer fraud	
Corruption	
References	
APPENDIX	
EESTIKEELNE KOKKUVÕTE / ESTONIAN SUMMARY	

VICTIMS OF CRIME IN ESTONIA 1993-2000

This is a report on the Estonian 1993, 1995 and 2000 applications of the 1992-2000 International Crime Victimization Survey (ICVS).

The data were collected by EMOR Ltd by conducting personal interviews in Estonian and Russian languages with 1000 (1993), 1173 (1995) and 1700 (2000) individuals living in Estonia, at ages from 16 to 74, in February and May 1993, in February 1995, and in May-June 2000. The May-June 2000 survey was financed by Estonian Ministry of Internal Affairs. The survey report was compiled in cooperation with the Finnish National Research Institute of Legal Policy. The publication of this report was sponsored by UNICRI (The United Nations Interregional Crime and Justice Research Institute).

Introduction

After regaining independence in 1991, crime has been regarded as one of the most acute problems in Estonian society in the 1990s. The number of police-recorded crimes has substantially increased since the late 1980s, with the level of 2000 being the highest in the whole post-war period. The homicide rate peak level since the late 1940s reached in 1994, and it is considered very high in an international comparison as well. In the late 1990s, the homicide rate decreased again by approximately 50 %.

All these developments, paralleled by persistent media attention devoted to serious violent crimes, have created favourable conditions for widespread fear of crime. It is often assumed by general public that crime situation is deteriorating continuously, and that the probability to become victimised by violent crime in Estonia is much higher than in Western European countries.

In this period of rapid change, it is important to obtain independent information on the situation in order to supplement the picture provided by police statistics on recorded crimes. The police statistics are substantially influenced by the reporting behaviour of crime victims and general public changes in legislation and actual registration practice, police priorities and resources (especially in case of so-called victimless crimes – drug offences, economic crimes, violations of public order, etc.). Consequently, official statistics may not adequately reflect changes in the volume and structure of crime. For the same reason, it is not possible to make valid international comparisons of the volume of crime on the basis of official crime statistics (except, albeit with some reservations, in case of homicides).

One way of tackling the measurement and description problem is to introduce independent and complementary measures of the state of crime. The International Crime Victimization Survey (ICVS) is one of such instruments. Of course, it is not the only way, and it is

understood to cover only a specific aspect of "crime": a limited catalogue of crimes as experienced by individual persons. Interviewing a representative sample of adult (16-74 years old) population approximates these.

The first sweep of the ICVS for Estonia was made in February 1993 (Aromaa & Ahven, 1993). According to this survey, the Estonian overall prevalence of victimisation was then on the same level as in Western European countries with the highest prevalence, e.g. the Netherlands (van Dijk, 1994). The second survey was carried out in February 1995 (Aromaa & Ahven, 1995). In general, the results of this survey were in accordance with the first one.

In early 2000, a new sweep of the ICVS was organised in many European countries. In Estonia, the survey was carried out in May-June, using principally the same questionnaire as in 1993 and in 1995, with minor changes.

Victimisation prevalence

In order to estimate the overall victimisation rates (all crimes) and major types of victimisation, the survey covered victimisation to violent and property offences that were experienced by individual persons or their households in course of last five years and in 1999. The percentage of people victimised in 1999 was used as the main indicator to characterise the rates of crime (victimisation).

Earlier experiences from victimisation surveys have shown that respondents have difficulties to remember all incidents that have occurred over last five-year period.

In 1999, the prevalence of thefts from cars was the highest among all crimes included in the survey: 9.2 % of the respondents were victimised by this type of offence (including all respondents; the percentage of car owners victimised by this offence type was 14.7 %) – see Table 1 and Figure 1. Besides thefts from cars, the victimisation rates were also high in the following cases: theft from summer cottage, garden house or allotment (7.3 % of all respondents and 17.0 % of property owners)¹, assault/threat (6.4 % of respondents), car vandalism (5.9 % of all respondents and 9.3 % of car owners).

- These results are in accordance with other sociological surveys, although it is not possible to make accurate comparisons of victimisation rates due to differences in survey methodology and wording of questions.
- Saar Poll surveys in 1997 and 1999 contained a question on victimisation to violence and property offences. A respondent was asked whether he/she or members of his/her household have been victimised to one/several property or violent crimes over past twelve months. In November 1997, the percentage of victimised respondents was 18 %; in October 1999, the same percentage was 23 (approximately 1000 respondents; Saar Poll 1999).

¹ This question was not included in the 1995 survey. It was added to the Estonian questionnaire upon experiences from the 1993 survey which indicated that this was felt to be a particular problem in Estonia, where the ownership of summer cottages, garden lots and the like has been very common.

Table 1 Percentage victimised by different type of events in course of past year (% of the population at least 16 years old)¹

	Estonia			Lithuania ²	Finland ³	Europe ⁴
	1993	1995	2000	1997	2000	1996
Theft of car	0.7	1.6	0.9	0.6	0.4	1.2
- car owners only	1.5	2.7	1.5
Theft from car	7.3	7.0	9.2	6.0	2.8	5.0
- car owners only	15.6	11.5	14.7
Car vandalism	3.1	5.2	5.9	4.2	3.7	8.0
- car owners only	6.6	8.6	9.3
Theft of motorcycle	0.8	0.2	x	0.2	0.1	..
- motorcycle owners only	5.7	1.3	x
Theft of bicycle	6.3	4.7	4.1	4.1	4.9	4.8
- bicycle owners only	9.6	7.0	6.1
Domestic burglary with entry	5.7	4.2	3.7	4.4	0.3	1.8
Attempt of domestic burglary	3.2	3.9	3.1	3.1	0.9	1.9
Theft from summer cottage, garden house, allotment	x	x	7.3	x	x	x
- property owners only	x	x	17.0	x	x	x
Theft from garage, shed etc.⁵	7.9	7.0	4.5	x	x	x
- property owners only	5.8	x	x	x
Robbery	2.9	3.4	2.9	1.8	0.6	0.7
Personal theft	8.0	5.5	5.5	7.6	3.7	4.8
- pickpocketing	2.7	2.7	3.6	..	1.1	..
Sexual incident⁶	2.5	1.3	3.6	4.0	3.7	2.5
- rape and attempted rape	1.0	0.7	0.7
- sexual harassment ⁷	1.4	0.7	2.8
Assault/threat	4.8	5.5	6.4	2.7	4.3	3.7
- threat	2.6	3.8	4.0	..	1.9	..
- with force	2.2	1.7	2.3	..	2.4	..
Respondents (N)	1000	1173	1700	1000	1815	x

x - not applicable; .. - no data available

¹ Estonia and Lithuania: ages 16-74 years; Finland: ages 15-74 years. The rounding of subtotals may cause differences in total numbers for sexual incidents and assault/threat.

² International Crime Victim Survey in Lithuania 1997. Final Report.

³ Aromaa & Heiskanen (2000).

⁴ The 1996 figures reflect information on the following European countries: England and Wales, Scotland, Northern Ireland, France, Switzerland, the Netherlands, Sweden, Austria. The rates for these countries refer to the population at least 16 years old (Mayhew & van Dijk, 1997). The questions on sexual violence and harassment were presented to the female respondents only. Sexual violence included rape, attempted rape, and sexually offensive physical violence. Sexual harassment referred to other sexually offensive physical contacts.


⁵ *Theft from summer cottage, garden house, allotment* was a new question in the 2000 survey. This event type may contain some cases that in 1995 were classified as *theft from garage, shed etc.* Therefore, it is not certain if the level of victimisation to thefts from garages, sheds etc. has actually decreased or not in comparison with 1995.

⁶ The validity (comparability) of the question on sexual incidents is limited because of possible differences in interpretation and relatively small number of such incidents.

⁷ Indecent assault and sexually offensive behaviour.

According to the survey carried out by the Estonian Institute of Economic Research, 25 % of respondents, their family members or their households were victimised by some type of crime in 1999 (EKI-test, 1999). The prevalence of victimisation has remained on the same level since 1995 when that kind of surveys were first initiated.

Figure 1 Percentage victimised by different type of events in course of past year (% of the population 16-74 years old), Estonia 1995 and 2000



The prevalence of victimisation to the majority of offence types covered in interviews in 2000 was quite similar in the 1995 survey. In both surveys, thefts from cars were the most common type of crime. The percentage victimised by this offence type has increased from 7.0 % to 9.2 % (this difference is within the limits of the 95 % confidence interval), reflecting at least partly the large increase in car ownership between 1995 and 2000.

In many cases, there is relatively high likelihood to be victimised again by the same type of crime during one-year period. This appears especially in cases of theft from summer cottage, garden house, or allotment. In 1999, 52 % of victims had been victimised to this type of event at least twice. The same indicator for assault/threat was 32 %, for theft from garage, shed etc. 29 %, for robbery and car vandalism 22 % (Table 2).

Table 2 Frequency of victimisation by different type of events in course of past year (% of respondents, who were victimised by this type of offence), Estonia 2000

	Victimised during 1999 ¹					Total at least twice	Victims (N) ²
	1x	2x	3x	4x	5x or more		
Theft of car	100	0	0	0	0	0	16
Theft from car	73	20	5	1	0	26	157
Car vandalism	78	10	12	0	0	22	100
Theft of bicycle	91	9	0	0	0	9	70
Domestic burglary with entry	83	10	3	0	5	17	63
Attempt of domestic burglary	81	9	8	0	0	17	53
Theft from summer cottage, garden house, allotment	45	28	7	4	13	52	124
Theft from garage, shed etc.	70	13	9	0	7	29	76
Robbery	78	16	4	0	2	22	49
Personal theft	84	9	1	1	2	13	94
Sexual incident	85	9	0	0	3	12	33
Assault/threat	68	18	9	5	1	32	108

Estonia in comparison with other countries

Similar surveys were carried out in several European countries in early 2000, but there are no data on these available yet (except Finland). International comparisons are therefore based on previous surveys, carried out in 1995-1997.

For some property crimes (robbery, burglary, theft from car), the Estonian victimisation rates are relatively high in comparison with Western European countries, especially with Finland. Regarding the total rate of threats and assaults, the Estonian rates also exceed the Western European average. However, for assaults with physical force, the differences are smaller and not significant in comparison with Finland what is an interesting fact.

The differences between Estonia and Lithuania are not as large. The latest conclusion was confirmed by the Living Conditions Survey, carried out in all Baltic countries in October-November 1999 (Aasland & Tyldum, 2000). According to this survey, in course of last 12 months the percentage of 18-74 years old population who had experienced violence-caused bruises or injuries, serious threats, robberies or thefts (car theft, theft from car, or theft from household) - was 18 % in Estonia, and 15 % both in Latvia and Lithuania. Among capital cities, victimisation to such crimes was on the highest level in Tallinn (24 % of respondents during last 12 months), followed by Lithuanian capital Vilnius (21 %) and Latvian capital Riga (19 %).

Compared with police statistics on recorded crime of recent years, the Living Conditions Survey indicates remarkably smaller differences in crime rates among the Baltic States. This is in line with findings from the 1996 ICVS in the Baltic countries (Aromaa, 1998). In

¹ "Don't know" is not shown in the table. Row totals may differ from 100 % due to rounding.

² Absolute number of respondents victimised at least once by this type of offence during 1999.

1999, the number of police-recorded crimes per 100 000 of the population was 357 in Estonia, 180 in Latvia, and 208 in Lithuania. The main reasons for such differences are clearly not variations in the actual crime level, but differences in legal definitions of offences, statistical recording methods, and reporting behaviour (see above).

Victimisation to violence

The number of homicides in Estonia has been one of the few reliable indicators of violence in the official statistics for last decades. The homicide rate has increased rapidly since the late 1980s and reached its highest level in 1994. After this, the homicide rate has declined substantially, the 1999 rate being only one-half of the 1994 rate.

A large part of homicides (more than 50 %), usually in connection with alcohol consumption, were committed against members of offender's own household or other acquaintances. According to a detailed homicide study, the proportion of encounters between criminals was approximately 15 %, and the proportion of robberies was approximately 15-20 % of all events in mid-1990s (Lehti, 1997).

The ICVS contained a question about suffering assaults or serious threats in course of last five years and during 1999. The measure is thus actually dealing with two separate matters, where the threat component is likely to be influenced by subjective factors related to individual respondents to a higher degree than the more strictly defined component of assault where physical force actually being used. These subjective, definitional and perception-related factors may vary across countries and cultures, between different parts of the population, as well as over time in manner that may influence the survey outcome to a significant degree. In recent times, for instance, it has been observed that media coverage of topics such as "crime" or "violence" has increased, with the possible consequence that the general public has developed an increased tendency to define everyday events in such terms. Also, this development may have affected the respondents to the effect that they recall (potentially) violent incidents better than previously (when these phenomena were less covered by media).

According to the 2000 survey, 6.4 % of all respondents (7.3 % of men and 5.5 % of women) were victimised by assault or threat in 1999. Victimised to assaults with force were 2.3 % of all respondents (3.4 % of men and 1.2 % of women) – Tables 3 and 4. The prevalence of violent victimisation has slightly grown from 1994 to 1999 (due to increased victimisation of women), but changes are not statistically significant. Comparing with one-year rates the five-year rates indicate higher absolute number of victims, consolidating thereby more statistical stability to the figure (del Frate et al., 1993). At the same time it is obvious that respondents remember recent events better than those that occurred long time ago: the five-year rate has been only 2-3 higher than the one-year rate.

Violence victimisation has repeatedly and in many countries been shown to be strongly related to age, with young people having the highest prevalence rates. Allowing for some chance variations, this is true also in the Estonian case. Violence victimisation is highest among people less than 25 years of age. In 1999, 13 % of all respondents at ages from 16 to 24 were victimised by assault/threat (average rate was 6 %). The probability to be victimised is the highest among young men.

Table 3 Percentage of men and women victimised to violent events: assaults and threats

	During	During	During	In past five years ¹		
	1992	1994	1999	1988-1992	1990-1994	1995-1999
Average	4.8	5.5	6.4	10.3	10.7	15.8
Men	7.0	7.7	7.3	14.2	14.6	16.9
Women	2.8	3.5	5.5	6.8	6.9	14.7

Table 4 Percentage of men and women victimised to violent events: assaults *with force* only

	During	During	During	In past five years ²		
	1992	1994	1999	1988-1992	1990-1994	1995-1999
Average	2.2	1.7	2.3	4.6	4.1	6.2
Men	3.6	2.8	3.4	6.8	6.4	8.3
Women	0.9	0.7	1.2	2.8	1.5	4.5

Changes in victimisation rates to assaults with force resemble those found for the overall measure for threats and assaults. However, the changes in case of concrete physical violence are relatively smaller than those found for the former measure. The five-year prevalence in 2000 increased relatively more for women than for men. This is in line with the finding for sexual incidents, and may be interpreted in the similar manner. This change may – at least partly – also reflect a real change in victimisation of women in particular. Should this be so, further in-depth research into the matter will be called for.

Table 5 shows the overall rates of threats and assaults, controlling for age. The increases noted above seem to be concentrated on ages 15-34. More detailed analysis with larger samples would be required for further comments regarding this change. In this context, we may just suggest, without hard evidence, that the core group of the increase is women in this age category, subjected to sexual harassment, domestic violence, and workplace violence. As a statistical category, such incidents belong mostly to fear-inducing threats rather than concrete physical violence.

¹ The interview year (i.e. Jan-Feb 1993/1995 and Jan-June 2000) included; the most recent (1995-2000) five-year rate may be biased – i.e. too high - because of the exceptional timing of the fieldwork.

² The interview year (i.e. Jan-Feb 1993/1995 and Jan-June 2000) included.

Table 5 Victimisation to violence (assaults and threats), by age (%)

Age	During 1992	During 1994	During 1999	In past five years ¹		
				1988-1992	1990-1994	1995-1999
15-24	9	11	13	23	22	27
25-34	4	6	5	13	13	18
35-44	8	4	8	10	10	18
45-54	4	5	6	7	9	12
55-64	1	5	2	6	8	8
65-74	1	3	3	4	5	6

Controlling for ethnicity of the respondents, a difference between Estonians and non-Estonians already found in previous surveys is repeated. In 1999, 5.1 % of Estonians and 8.6 % of non-Estonians were victimised to violent events (assaults or threats).

The prevalence of violent victimisation has been relatively stable during the second half of the 1990s. This conclusion is also supported by the Living Conditions Surveys of 1994 and 1999. According to these surveys, the overall rate of violence victimisation in 1999 was a little lower than in 1994. In 1994, 5.4 % of all respondents were victimised to violence with force, in 1999 the corresponding rate was 4.7 % (Table 6). However, victimisation to violence has increased among women and decreased among men. Thus, the recent trend regarding the victimisation of women is repeated also in this survey.

The prevalence of threats remained on the same level (5.4 % of respondents), but the rate of men victimised by this type of offence has decreased, and the respective rate of women has increased. Again, the finding corresponds with the outcome of the Estonia 2000 survey on the part of women. It should be borne in mind that the differences concerning men were not statistically significant in the Estonia 2000 survey. The results of the Living Conditions Surveys may be regarded as relatively reliable due to the large sample group sizes (N=4,435 in 1994; N=4,726 in 1999).

The wording, the age of respondents, and the reference period applied were not identical in the living condition surveys and victimisation surveys. For this reason, the comparability of surveys may not be the best. Nevertheless, the proportions of victimised respondents in similar types of crime were quite similar.

¹ The interview year (i.e. Jan-Feb 1993/1995 and Jan-June 2000) included.

Table 6 Living Conditions Surveys: percentage victimised by different type of events in course of past 12 months (% of the population 18-74 years old), 1994 and 1999¹

	Male		Female		Total	
	1994	1999	1994	1999	1994	1999
Violence	8.2	6.3	2.8	3.4	5.4	4.7
- violence which led to visible bruises or injuries to the body	3.7	3.4	1.2	1.5	2.4	2.4
- violence which did not lead to visible bruises or injuries to the body	4.5	2.9	1.6	1.9	3.0	2.4
Threats which were so serious that you became frightened	7.0	5.5	3.9	5.3	5.4	5.4

In the Estonia 2000 survey, the respondents who were victimised to assaults or threats over last 5 years were asked to describe this event. The results were as follows (268 events, percentage of the total):

- 40 % of assaults/threats were committed using physical force;
- 43 % of assaults/threats took place near victim's home;
- 53 % of assaults/threats were committed by at least two offenders;
- 33 % of assaults/threats were committed by offender(s) who or of whom at least one was acquainted to victim;
- 11 % of assaults/threats were committed using a weapon (in two cases out of three, the weapon was used for threatening only);
- 25 % of victims of assaults/threats (64 % victims of assault with force) suffered injuries;
- 44 % of injured victims went to a doctor for medical assistance.


Women were more often than men victimised near their home (52 % vs. 35 % of all events). Also, women were more often attacked by a single offender (58 % vs. 28 % of events).

Urbanisation and regional differences

According to the Estonia 2000 survey, the prevalence of victimisation to violence is the highest in large cities: 9.2 % of respondents in Tallinn and 7.8 % in other large towns were victimised by assaults or threats in 1999 (Figure 2). The same indicator ranged from 3.9 to 4.8 % in other towns and rural areas.

¹ Surveys were carried out in October-November 1994 (N=4,435) and 1999 (N=4,726). Sources: Sillaste & Purga, 1995; Elutingimuste ..., 2000.

Figure 2 Victimisation to violence (assaults and threats) in course of past year, by urbanisation (% of the population 16-74 years old), 2000¹



According to previous sweeps of the ICVS, victimisation to violence has been the highest in the eastern part of Estonia (Ida-Virumaa county and Lääne-Virumaa county were regarded as one region). This result is repeated in the Estonia 2000 survey. In eastern Estonia, 9.6% of respondents were victimised to violence (assaults/threats) in 1999. In Tallinn, otherwise in the high-crime area, the same indicator was 9.2 %, and in other regions between 2.5 and 4.2 %.

Regional differences in violence are related to a certain extent to differences in the ethnic composition of the population. According to police statistics, the violence criminality of non-Estonian (mainly Russian) population has been higher than the same of the Estonian population during several decades. This tendency also appears in the homicide survey (Lehti, 1997).

Sexual incidents

Victimisation to sexual incidents is considered as special cases. This event type was asked only from women. It included forcible rape, attempted forcible rape, and other sexually offensive behaviour. Earlier analysis has suggested that this event type is being rather sensitive to cultural and/or semantic factors (Aromaa & Kinnunen, 1995; Aromaa, 1993; see also results reported in Zvekic & Alvazzi del Frate, 1995). The validity (comparability) of this survey question may not be among the best – besides interpretations problems the number of incidents is rather small, preventing more detailed analysis of the data.

Women were asked whether they have been victimised by this type of offence in course of last five years. If the answer was yes, a follow-up question about the most recent sexual incident was asked: was it sexual violence (rape, attempted rape), indecent assault or sexually offensive behaviour? In Table 1, indecent assault and sexually offensive behaviour is regarded as one unified term “sexual incident”.

¹ “Large towns”: Tartu, Narva, Kohtla-Järve, Pärnu; “other towns”: county centres and other towns; “rural areas”: townships and small villages (there are no essential differences between small towns and townships, e.g., some townships are larger than small towns).

In the Estonia 2000 survey, women who were victimised to sexual offences over last 5 years were asked to describe their last incident. The results were as follows (86 events, percentage of the total):

- 55 % of victims stated that the sexual incident was serious or very serious;
- 51 % of victims considered it as a crime;
- 75 % of sexual incidents were committed by a single man;
- 17% of sexual incidents were committed by offender(s) who or at least one of whom was an acquaintance of victim.

In 1994, 1.3 % of all women (8 out of 598) were victimised to sexual incidents; in 1999, the corresponding figure was 3.6 % (33 out of 906). Considering the small amount of victims in 1994 it is not possible to make valid conclusions, for instance with regard to the characteristics of relevant events.

For interpretation purposes, it may be relevant that from 1994 to 1999, the increase was concentrated on sexual harassment only (0.7 % and 2.8 %, respectively), whereas the proportion of women victimised to rape or attempted rape remained the same (0.7 % and 0.7 %, respectively). If these figures reflect actual trends, they may be explained by an increased awareness of women concerning their rights (in recent years, sexual harassment has received more media coverage than earlier).

Victimisation to property crimes

The Estonia 2000 survey covered victimisation to property offences that were experienced by individual persons or their households in course of last five years and in 1999.

Robbery, personal theft (incl. pickpocketing)

The difference between robberies and personal theft is not always very clearly defined. We assume that respondents interpreted robberies as offences committed using threat or real force, as they also were described in the questionnaire. Personal thefts (incl. pickpocketing) would then be offences that remained usually hidden at the moment they were committed, without resorting to threat or violence (in 1999, 60 % of personal thefts were pickpocketing).

According to the Estonia 2000 survey, 4 % of men and 2 % of women were victimised to robbery in 1999. In the case of personal theft, 4 % of men and 7 % of women were victimised in 1999.


In 1999, about 2 % of Estonians and 5 % of non-Estonians were victimised to robbery. These differences are obviously related to the fact that the majority non-Estonians are living in large towns where the crimes rate is higher than in small towns and rural areas. There were no substantial differences between different ethnic groups in cases of personal theft.

In the Estonia 2000 survey, the respondents who were victimised to robberies over last 5 years were asked to describe the event. The results were as follows (268 events, percentage of the total):

- 60 % of robberies resulted in a loss of victim's property;
- 38 % of robberies took place near victim's home;
- 70 % of robberies were committed by at least two offenders;
- 22 % of robberies were committed by offender(s) who or at least one of whom was acquainted to victim;
- 28 % of robberies were committed using weapons (36 % knives, 17 % firearms);
- 65 % of personal thefts were committed in the community where victims lived but not near his/her home.

The probability to be victimised to robbery is the highest in Tallinn, followed by other large towns. The prevalence of victimisation to robberies in Tallinn was a little higher in 1999 than in 1994, but this change remains within the confidence interval.

Figure 3 Victimisation to robbery and personal theft in course of past year, by urbanisation (% of the population 16-74 years old), 2000




Car theft, theft from car and car vandalism

In the ICVS, car theft also comprises the unauthorised use of car. According to the Estonia 2000 survey, the number of car thefts in 1999 was lower than in 1994, but due to the small number of respondents, firm conclusions about trends in car thefts can hardly be made. Of all respondents who had car stolen in course of last five years, 56 % stated that their car was recovered. This recovery rate is not very high (and clearly lower than, for instance, in Finland) perhaps indicating a difference in the structure of car thefts, with professional thefts playing more significant role. Cars stolen to be exported, rebuilt for domestic markets, or stripped - all would be not recovered normally.

The prevalence of victimisation to theft from car is the highest in Tallinn, approximately twice as high as the rate in all other towns and rural areas. Theft from car is the most common type of crime in Tallinn. In Tallinn, 15 % of all respondents were victimised to theft from car in 1999 (25 % of car owners/users). The prevalence of victimisation to car vandalism is also the highest in Tallinn.

Figure 4 Victimisation to car theft, theft from car and car vandalism in course of past year, by urbanisation (% of victimised car owners/users), 2000



In Tallinn, victimisation to theft from car and car vandalism have increased a little in comparison with 1994. The probability to become victimised has, however, not increased for car owners/users due to the increase in their absolute number during the same period. In reality victims may sometimes have difficulties to know which specific car crime they are being actually victimised to. An incident of car vandalism may actually be an unsuccessful car theft, or a break-in. A car theft, again, may effectively be a case of theft from car, where the car was only first moved to more appropriate place.


Burglary, attempted burglary

Victimisation to burglaries and attempted burglaries was more common in Tallinn than elsewhere, both in 1994 and in 1999 (Figure 5). The prevalence of victimisation to burglaries and attempted burglaries in Tallinn was slightly lower in 1999 than in 1994, but this change remains within the confidence interval.

The average damage caused by the latest burglary (total value of stolen property only, possible damage caused by break-in was not accounted for) was approximately 8,600 EEKs. The average value of stolen property in Tallinn was substantially higher (13,200 EEKs) than in other towns and rural areas (2,900-7,600 EEKs without clear correlation with urbanisation). There is no clear correlation between income per capita and the rate of victimisation to burglaries and attempted burglaries.

The average total value of stolen property was between 7,400-8,200 EEKs in lower income groups (income per capita less than 3,000 EEKs per month), but it increased substantially in higher income groups (the average damage was 12,400 EEKs).


Figure 5 Victimisation to burglaries and attempted burglaries in course of past year, by urbanisation (% of the population 16-74 years old), 2000



Bicycle theft

The probability to be victimised to bicycle theft is the highest in Tallinn, followed by other large towns (Figure 6). In 1999, 5.2 % of all respondents (8.9 % of bicycle owners) were victimised to this crime. Victimisation to bicycle theft in Tallinn has increased a little in comparison with 1994. However, the probability to become victimised has not increased for bicycle owners due to the increase in their absolute number during the same period. 69 % of bicycle thefts took place near victim's home.

Figure 6 Victimisation to bicycle theft, by urbanisation (% of victimised bicycle owners), 2000



Theft from summer cottage, garden house, allotment, and theft from garage, shed etc.

There are no essential differences by urbanisation (type of settlement of respondents) regarding victimisation to thefts from summer cottages, garden houses and allotments, except for rural areas (Table 7). This is logical because summer cottages and garden houses are usually located elsewhere than respondent's area of residence, outside of towns. The relatively low victimisation rate in rural areas may be partially explained by the fact that the respondents in rural areas have less separate summer cottages, and their answers reflect more

often victimisation to thefts from allotments or gardens than from summer cottages. At the same time, allotments are often located near owner's home, under better visual surveillance. Thefts from garage, shed etc. are more common in Tallinn and other large towns than elsewhere.

Table 7 Victimization to some kinds of theft in course of past year, by urbanisation (% of the population 16-74 years old), 2000

	Tallinn	Large towns	Other towns	Rural areas
Theft from summer cottage, garden house, allotment	7.2	9.0	8.8	6.4
- property owners only	18.3	24.6	21.1	9.7
Theft from garage, shed etc.	6.0	6.6	3.0	2.2

Reporting to the police

Reporting crime experiences to the police may be seen as an indicator of the public's relationship to crime and the police. Information on police reports is useful also because it has helped to clarify the background of ostensible discrepancies between crime statistics of the police and results of victimisation surveys.


A large part of crimes is not reported to the police. According to the 1995 survey, 34.8 % of the most recent incidents were reported to the police; in the Estonia 2000 survey, the figure was 35.7 % (in 2000, theft from summer cottage etc. were not included, with these offence types the same indicator was 34.6 %). The change 1995-2000 is not statistically significant.

Reporting the victimisation incidents to the police was much more usual in cases of property crimes than in cases of violence, both in Estonia as well as in other European countries. In general, reporting of property crimes is in connection with the value of stolen property: bigger losses are reported more often than smaller ones. Reporting person crimes have been observed to be connected with the degree of injury caused, but also with the relationship between victim and perpetrator.

In the 1995 and 2000 surveys, car thefts were reported more often than any other types of incidents (in both surveys, 86 % were reported to the police), followed by domestic burglary with entry (56 % in 1995, 62 % in 2000; the change is not statistically significant). Victimization to violence (assault/threat, sexual incident) is less actively reported to the police: only 10 % of sexual incidents and 25 % of assaults/threats were reported to the police according to the 2000 survey.

According to the public opinion survey performed by Saar Poll in 1997, a large part of respondents felt that it was important to report crimes to the police: 75 % of respondents (regardless of actual crime experiences) expressed their opinion that crime victims should inform the police (Saar Poll, 1999).

Figure 7 Reporting to the police (% of crimes). The most recent victimisation incident in past five-year period, 1995 and 2000



Reasons for not reporting to the police

The reason for not reporting incidents to the police was asked for the most recent victimisation in every event category. Earlier reports have often concluded that the most common reasons have to do either with the perceived triviality of incident, or with the assumption that it would be useless to refer the case to the police.

The victims who did not report the most recent incident to the police most often gave the explanation that "police won't do anything about it" (45 % of victims who did not report). Also, this explanation received approximately the same degree of support (an exact comparison was difficult) in 1995.

The explanation "police won't do anything about it" dominated in cases of bicycle theft and theft from car. Between 1995 and 2000, this explanation has become more popular with regard to most types of crime, although changes are statistically not significant. If this reflects a real tendency in the general public, police might be well advised to attempt to change this perception.

Table 8 Reasons for not reporting the most recent event to the police (% of victims who did not report their most recent event to the police), 1995 and 2000¹

Reason for not reporting	Not reported to the police (%)	
	1995	2000
Police won't do anything about it	40.7	45.0
Inappropriate for police/police not necessary	17.0	25.5
Police could do nothing/lack of proof	27.2	22.4
Not serious enough/no loss/kid's stuff	16.3	21.1
No insurance	5.4	9.4
I solved it on my own/perpetrator is known to me	7.4	8.8
My family solved it	6.2	6.6
Didn't dare (for fear of reprisal)	1.9	3.3
Fear/dislike of the police/no involvement wanted with police	3.6	3.2
Reported to other public or private agencies	1.9	1.6
Other reasons	4.1	6.6
Don't know	0.7	0.6

Satisfaction with the police response

The victims were asked what they thought about the police performance when they reported a victimisation incident to the police last time. The question was "Were you satisfied with the way the police dealt with your report?" The possible answers were "very satisfied", "generally satisfied", "not satisfied enough", "not satisfied at all", and "don't know".

The percentages of those not satisfied are shown in Table 9. Victims were very often dissatisfied with the way the police dealt with their report. Particularly thefts were usually not dealt with in satisfactory manner. Dissatisfaction with the police response was the lowest for incidents of violence and for robberies. However, even for these, the rate of dissatisfaction was high, at the level of 50 %. Dissatisfaction with the police response was the highest among victims who had suffered domestic burglary with entry or whose bicycle had been stolen, reaching the level of 78-79 %.

Main reasons causing dissatisfaction were given as the following: the police "didn't recover my property (goods)", "didn't find or apprehend the offender", "were not interested", "didn't do enough".

¹ Several answers were allowed. An exact comparison between 1995 and 2000 is not possible, because the 2000 questionnaire contained a new question about theft from summer cottage, etc., that increased the proportion of answers "inappropriate for police/police not necessary" (this type of offence is usually regarded as less serious).

Table 9 Percentage of people not satisfied with the way the police dealt with their case in the most recent incident reported to the police by type of offence (% of all answers), 1993, 1995 and 2000. Possible answers to the question “Were you satisfied with the way the police dealt with your report?”, were “not satisfied enough” and “not satisfied at all”


	1993	1995	2000
Domestic burglary with entry	88	72	79
Theft of bicycle	67	89	78
Theft from garage, shed, etc.	85	60	75
Attempt of domestic burglary	50	83	69
Theft of car	40	75	68
Personal theft	75	78	68
Theft from car	67	80	67
Car vandalism	50	50	59
Theft from summer cottage, garden house, allotment	x	x	59
Robbery	25	50	57
Assault/threat	50	57	52
Sexual incident	50	0	22

Professional level of the Estonian police

The Estonian version of the ICVS questionnaire presented also a general question on respondent's assessment on the professional skills of the Estonian police: "Are the Estonian police up to professional level?" This question has not been used in the other surveys of the ICVS. In the Estonian application, the outcome was quite interesting.

The percentage of critical respondents was very high in 1993. After this, the evaluation of the police professional level has constantly improved: in 1993, only 17 % of all respondents thought the police were up to professional level; in 2000, the same indicator was already 51 %. In 2000, 53 % of Estonians assessed the police professional level to be up to requirements; for respondents representing other nationalities/ethnicity, this percentage was a little lower – 46 %. In comparison to 1995, the opinion improvement is more significant among Estonians than among non-Estonians.

Figure 8 Assessment of the professional level of Estonian police (% of the population at least 16 years old), 1993, 1995 and 2000. Possible answers to the question “Are the Estonian police up to professional level according to your opinion?”, were “completely”, “generally”, “generally not”, “not at all” and “don't know”



Personal experiences with the police


A large part of population does not have contacts with the police very often: according to the survey from the beginning of 2000, 28 % of Estonian population (ages 15-74) had been in contact with the police or had personal experiences observing the work of the police in course of last six months (Eesti elanike kokkupuuted politseiga, 2000).

The majority of the contacts/observations were related to traffic violations or being suspected of such a violation; a relatively large part of these respondents consisted of men under age 34. For 21 % of those who had personal contact with the police, the last contact was related either to suffering or witnessing crime.

Concern for violence


The respondents were asked whether they felt safe in their residential area after dark. According to the Estonia 2000 survey, the concern for violence when going out after dark has slightly decreased in comparison with the 1995 survey. The differences are, however, statistically not significant.

Figure 9 Assessment of safety in the living area after dark (% of the population 16-74 years old), 1993, 1995 and 2000. The statement of the question was following: “How safe do you feel walking alone in your living area after dark? Do you feel very safe, fairly safe, a bit unsafe, or very unsafe?”



Concern for violence has been consistently higher among women (also other surveys have arrived at a similar pattern). In the Estonia 2000 survey, 72 % of men and 48 % of women feel very safe or fairly safe in their residential area after dark. 28 % of men and 52 % of women feel a bit unsafe or very unsafe.


Figure 10 Assessment of safety in the area of residence after dark, by sex (% of men/women 16-74 years old), 1993, 1995 and 2000. The statement of the question was following: “How safe do you feel walking alone in your living area after dark? Do you feel very safe, fairly safe, a bit unsafe, or very unsafe?”



Concern for violence was on the lowest level among young people. The older the respondent was, the higher was concern for violence; this was found both for men and women.

Concern for violence is the highest in Tallinn and in other large towns, and the lowest in rural areas. In Tallinn, 59 % of respondents do not feel safe in their own residential area after dark.

Figure 11 Assessment of safety in the living area after dark, by urbanisation (% of population 16-74 years old), 2000. The statement of the question was following: “How safe do you feel walking alone in your living area after dark? Do you feel very safe, fairly safe, a bit unsafe, or very unsafe?”



Property crime risk assessment

The proportion of those thinking burglary to be likely or very likely to happen in next year was remarkably higher in 2000 than in 1995 (44 % vs. 28 %; statistically significant difference). Technically, this result came about through the decrease of the proportion of respondents who had no opinion on this matter.

Table 10 Assessed risk of burglary to respondent’s home in course of next year (% of the population 16-74 years old), 1993, 1995 and 2000

	1993	1995	2000
Likely or very likely (total)	34	28	44
- likely	27	24	36
- very likely	7	4	8
Not likely	28	41	41
Don’t know	38	31	15

The perceived likelihood of house burglaries declines systematically as we move towards lower degrees of urbanisation. In the Estonia 2000 survey, the percentage considering it to be likely or very likely that their home will be burglarised in course of next year: Tallinn – 63 %, large towns – 59 %, other towns – 33 %, rural areas – 23 %. An interpretation has been given in earlier reports that actual burglary victimisation does influence the perceived future burglary risk. In cross-sectional measurements as the one at hand, such assumption can be tested only indirectly: indeed, burglary risk in rural areas is usually being lower than in highly urbanised locations.

Victimisation prevention precautions

The survey questionnaire listed a number of simple precautions taken to avoid victimisation to burglary. Since 1995, the use of special locks has increased mostly, from 17 % in 1995 to 23 % in 2000 (statistically significant change) – Table 13. The use of special grills to protect doors or windows has also significantly increased (from 2.6 % in 1995 to 5.1 % in 2000). The relative change here is actually big, but as these measures are not very common, their practical significance continues to be relatively low. The popularity of other precautions has changed less, or not at all.

It is important to notice that the increasing use of special locks and grills is restricted to Tallinn only. Here, the 2000 survey found that as many as 46 % of respondents were using special locks, and 14 % had installed door or window grills.

Table 11 Percentage using various precautions in order to avoid victimisation to burglary¹

	1993	1995	2000
A			
Burglar alarm	3.0	2.8	3.8
Special locks	10.1	17.2	22.8
Grills	0.9	2.6	5.1
Dog	19.2	23.8	23.8
High fence	0.9	1.6	1.9
Guard, caretaker	0.1	0.3	0.3
Refuses to answer	2.1	0.9	2.0
No protection	65.8	58.6	53.2
B			
Ask neighbors to watch my home	27.2	32.7	28.5
Neighbors watch anyway	16.2	12.9	19.5
Firearms	7.4	8.3	7.4
<i>of which: guns for protection</i>	4.8	4.3	3.3
Insurance	22.7	12.4	12.4

Again, the proportion of those who use none of the protection measures listed has decreased between 1995 and 2000 in Tallinn only, mainly due to the increase in use of special locks. In other regions, 50-70 % of respondents had not taken any special precautions. In rural areas, 40 % of respondents have dogs, but other precautions are used more rarely.

¹ Multiple answers allowed.

Table 12 Percentage *not* using any of the listed precautions (table 13, part A), by region (urbanisation), 1993, 1995 and 2000


Region	1993	1995	2000
Tallinn	64	53	35
Large towns	77	63	63
Other towns	..	68	66
Rural areas	..	56	55
Total	66.9	58.6	53.2

Attitudes towards punishment

Respondents' attitudes towards crime and punishment were measured by the following question: "People have different ideas about the sentences that should be given to offenders. Take for instance a case of 21 years old man who was found guilty of burglary for the second time. This time, he has stolen a colour TV. Which of the following sentences do you consider to be the most appropriate in this case: a fine, imprisonment, community service, suspended sentence, or any other?" Those who supported the imprisonment were further asked for how long time the offender should serve in prison.

Respondents of the Estonia 2000 survey were clearly more favourable towards community service¹ than respondents of the 1995 survey (from 35 % in 1995 to 51 % in 2000) – Figure 13. Declining support of prison sentences (from 40 % in 1995 to 23 % in 2000) reflected the increased popularity of community service). Both in 1995 and in 2000, women more often supported lenient punishments than men.

Figure 12 Attitudes towards punishment: appropriate punishment to recidivist burglar (% of population 16-74 years old), 1995 and 2000



¹ Community service is legally not implemented in Estonia (except in some cases concerning juvenile delinquents). The question was included in the ICVS questionnaire, aimed at measuring attitudes towards appropriate punishment, regardless of real sentencing practice.

As compared with European average in 1992 (26.6 %), Estonians were already in 2000 less often (23.4 %) in favour of a prison sentence (in 1995, 40 % of Estonians supported such a sentence). Results of the ICVS 2000 for other European countries are not available yet; 19 % of Finnish respondents in the 2000 survey supported imprisonment in this case.

Table 13 Recommended length of prison sentence (% of respondents supporting prison sentence for repeat burglar; N = 398)

	%
1 month or less	2
2-6 months	13
More than 6 months and less than 1 year	14
1 year	27
2 years	18
3-4 years	12
5 years or more	12

There were practically no differences in recommended length of prison sentence between men and women.

The percentage of those in favour of a prison sentence in Estonia is not substantially higher than in Finland any more. Yet, Estonians continue to give more support to longer sentences than Finns do (regarding the case described). For example, 45 % of Finns who supported imprisonment recommended a sentence length of 2-6 months (in Estonia, 13 %).

Consumer fraud

Besides violence and property crimes, the Estonian survey focused also on victimisation to consumer frauds. The answers reflected primarily respondents' personal subjective impressions.

According to the surveys, the percentage of respondents stating that they had been cheated in course of last year when buying a product or a service has increased significantly from 1993 (26 %) and 1995 (31 %) to 2000 (39 %). About 90 % of such respondents said that the most recent incident of this kind took place when buying something from a shop or booth.

The details of frauds that came up were not followed up sufficiently enough to adequately assess whether these incidents referred rather to consumer discontent than proper frauds. It can be possible that an increased awareness of consumers' rights, requirements presented to shops, etc. has influenced answers.

Corruption

In the ICVS, corruption was given quite narrow definition: it was restricted to personal experience with public officials asking for bribes. The question was "Has any of the state officials asked money from you or hinted that your problem could be solved on certain conditions in course of past year?"

In the Estonia 2000 survey, the official demanding a bribe was a police officer most often. Although the percentage of respondents who had experiences with such police officers has increased in comparison with the 1995 data, it is being not clear whether there have been actual changes (there are no essential differences in comparison with 1993: 1.6 % in 1993, 2.2 % in 2000).

Table 14 What duty assignment was the person holding who demanded a bribe in course of past year, 1993, 1995 and 2000 (N)¹

	1993 (N=1000)	1995 (N=1173)	2000 (N=1700)
Employee of ministry or governmental agency	5	4	8
Employee of city council or parish administration	5	6	12
Customs officer, revenue officer	11	11	8
Police officer	16	8	37
Employee of some other state institution	14	15	29
Other	4	6	5
% of all respondents who were asked for a bribe	4.6	3.6	5.2
Total number of respondents who were asked for a bribe	45	42	89

In the survey, there were no additional questions about the circumstances of demanding the bribe, therefore it was difficult to analyse the reasons of possible changes. It is, however, likely that the overwhelming majority of incidents where police officers demanded bribes has been related to traffic violations. If the increase in number of contacts with corrupted police officers reflects reality, it may be at least partially explained by the increased number of car drivers and the volume of traffic during the same period. At the same time, the number of any kind of contacts with the traffic police per driver has may be even decreased (this is, however, not possible to confirm without sufficient information about the intensity and practices of traffic control, etc.). It is worth of noting that in the Finnish 2000 survey none of the respondents (N=1800) had experienced demands for bribes from police or customs officers in course of past year.

¹ The question included local government officials. NB! Notice the different number of respondents in each survey year.

REFERENCES

- Aasland, Aadne & Tyldum, Guri (2000). Better or Worse? Living Conditions Developments in Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania 1994-1999. Oslo: Fafo-report 334.
- Alvazzi del Frate, Anna & Ugljesa Zvekic & Jan J.M. van Dijk (eds.) (1993). Understanding Crime Experiences and Crime Control: Acts of the International Conference. Rome, November 18-20, 1992. Unicri Publication No. 49, s. 519-529. Rome: Unicri — Ministry of Justice, the Netherlands — Ministry of the Interior, Italy.
- Aromaa, Kauko (1998). The International (Crime) Victimization Survey in Finland, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania 1995-1997. In Aromaa, K (ed.), The Baltic Region. Insights in crime and crime control. Scandinavian Studies in Criminology Vol. 15. Oslo: Scandinavian Research Council for Criminology/Pax Forlag A/S, p. 82-103.
- Aromaa, Kauko (1993). Finland. In Anna Alvazzi del Frate — Ugljesa Zvekic — Jan J.M. van Dijk (eds.): Understanding Crime Experiences and Crime Control: Acts of the International Conference. Rome, November 18-20, 1992. Unicri Publication No. 49, s. 519-529. Rome: Unicri — Ministry of Justice, the Netherlands — Ministry of the Interior, Italy.
- Aromaa, Kauko & Ahven, Andri (1995). Victims of crime in a time of change: Estonia 1993 and 1995. Helsinki: National Research Institute of Legal Policy, Research Communications 19.
- Aromaa, Kauko & Heiskanen, Markku (2000). Crime risks in Finland 2000. Finnish results of the 2000 sweep of the International Crime Victims Survey. Helsinki: National Research Institute of Legal Policy, Research Communications 50.
- Aromaa, Kauko & Kinnunen, Aarne (1995). Rikoksen uhrit Suomessa ja Norjassa. Vuoden 1989 kansainvälisen uhritutkimuksen tuloksia. (The victims of crime in Finland and Norway. Results from the 1989 International Crime Victimization Survey.) Helsinki: Publication 127 of the National Research Institute of Legal Policy.
- Eesti elanike kokkupuuted politseiga (2000). Aruanne. Tallinn: AS Emor [Tellija Politseiamet.]
- EKI-test (1994-1999). Tallinn: Eesti Konjunkturiinstituut.
- Elutingimuste uuring Eestis 1999. aastal (2000). Põhiandmed. NORBALT II. Tartu.
- International Crime Victim Survey in Lithuania 1997. Final Report. Vilnius: The Institute of Law.
- Lehti, Martti (1997). Viron henkirikollisuus 1990-luvulla. Helsinki: Oikeuspoliittisen tutkimus-laitoksen julkaisuja 148.
- Mayhew, Pat & van Dijk, Jan J.M. (1997). Criminal Victimization in Eleven Industrialised Countries. Key findings from the 1996 International Crime Victims Survey. WODC: Onderzoek en beleid 162.
- Saar Poll (1999). Avaliku arvamuse uuring "Riik ja rahvas" 21.10 - 01.11. [kuritegevus]. <http://www.riigikogu.ee/osakonnad/msi/uurimused>.
- Sillaste, Juhan & Purga, Ülle (1995). Elutingimused Eestis 1994. aasta lõpul. Vihik 4, Tervis ja turvatunne. Tallinn.
- Zvekic, Ugljesa & Anna Alvazzi del Frate (eds.) (1995). Criminal Victimization in the Developing World. UNICRI Publication No. 55. Rome: United Nations Interregional Crime

and Justice Research Institute.

APPENDIX

Confidence intervals

Sampling studies involve the possibility of sampling error as well as of measurement errors that are caused by the interview questions or the interview situation. The size of the sampling error may be estimated by means of calculating confidence intervals. Confidence intervals denote the limits within which the corresponding value in the total population is situated with a high probability. In the present table, the probability is 95 %.

Halves of the 95 % confidence intervals (percentage):

Sample size	1 and 99	2 and 98	3 and 97	4 and 96	5 and 95	10 and 90	15 and 85	20 and 80	30 and 70	40 and 60	50
50	2.8	3.9	4.8	5.5	6.1	8.4	10.0	11.2	12.8	13.7	14.0
100	2.0	2.8	3.4	3.9	4.3	5.9	7.0	7.9	9.0	9.7	9.8
200	1.4	1.9	2.4	2.7	3.0	4.2	5.0	5.6	6.4	6.8	6.9
300	1.1	1.6	1.9	2.2	2.5	3.4	4.0	4.5	5.2	5.6	5.7
400	1.0	1.4	1.7	1.9	2.1	2.9	3.5	3.9	4.5	4.8	4.9
500	0.9	1.2	1.5	1.7	1.9	2.6	3.1	3.5	4.0	4.3	4.4
600	0.8	1.1	1.4	1.6	1.7	2.4	2.9	3.2	3.7	3.9	4.0
700	0.7	1.0	1.3	1.5	1.6	2.2	2.6	3.0	3.4	3.6	3.7
800	0.7	1.0	1.2	1.4	1.5	2.1	2.5	2.8	3.2	3.4	3.5
900	0.7	0.9	1.1	1.3	1.4	2.0	2.3	2.6	3.0	3.2	3.3
1000	0.6	0.9	1.1	1.2	1.4	1.9	2.2	2.5	2.8	3.0	3.1
1250	0.6	0.8	0.9	1.1	1.2	1.7	2.0	2.2	2.5	2.7	2.8
1500	0.5	0.7	0.9	1.0	1.1	1.5	1.8	2.0	2.3	2.5	2.5
1700	0.5	0.7	0.8	0.9	1.0	1.4	1.7	1.9	2.2	2.3	2.4

The lower limit of the confidence interval is found by subtracting the indicated half of the interval from the figure calculated from the sample; for the upper limit, this half must be added to the figure derived from the sample.

Example: 18,5 % of the total sample had had their bicycle stolen in the course of the last five years. The result is with a 95 % probability between 16,6 and 19,4 % ($18,5 \pm 1,9$, if $n=1700$). For many types of crime, the victimisation rates are rather low, in particular in a one-year perspective. Then, the confidence intervals of the results are large in comparison to the estimated rates.

The confidence intervals have been calculated from the standard deviation formula of the binomial distribution as follows:

$$L_p = p \pm 1,96 * \sqrt{\pi * (1 - \pi) / (v - 1)}, \text{ where}$$

p = the percentage calculated from the sample

n = sample size

1,96= the coefficient for the 95 % confidence interval

EESTIKEELNE KOKKUVÕTE / ESTONIAN SUMMARY

Siseministeriumi tellimisel viis AS Emor 2000. aasta mais-juunis Eesti elanikkonna seas läbi küsitluse "Ohvriuring 2000". Küsitlus oli osa 2000. aastal enamikus Euroopa riikides läbiviidud rahvusvahelisest kuriteoohvrite uuringust, milles kasutati ühtset ankeeti ja küsitlusmetoodikat.

Uuringu käigus intervjueriti 1700 inimest vanuses 16-74 aastat üle Eesti. Eesmärgiks oli selgitada, milliste kuritegude ohvriks vastajad olid viimase viie aasta jooksul langenud. Uuring võimaldab hinnata muutusi kuritegevuse tasemes ajavahemikus 1994-1999 ning perspektiivis võrrelda Eesti olukorda teiste riikidega. Eelmised niisugused uuringud viidi Eestis läbi 1993. ja 1995. aastal; nende käigus küsitleti vastavalt 1000 ja 1173 inimest.

Uuring hõlmas kuritegusid, mis olid suunatud üksikisikute või nende vara ja majapidamise vastu. Levinumate vara- ja isikuvastaste kuritegude kohta küsiti, kas küsitletav on niisuguseid kuritegusid 1999. aastal ja viimase viie aasta jooksul isiklikult kogunud. Toimunud kuriteo kohta küsiti, millised olid selle toimepanemise asjaolud ning kas juhtunust politseile teatati (mitme kuriteo puhul võidi küsida ainult viimase kohta); kuidas oli kannatanu rahul juhtumi lahendamisega politsei poolt. Kuriteost mitteteatamisel küsiti mitteteatamise motiive. Lisaks esitati küsimusi turvatunde, turvameetmete, karistustesse suhtumise jm kohta. Majapidamist puudutavate (varavastaste) kuritegude puhul arvestati analüüsil kogu peret (majapidamist) iseloomustavaid näitajaid.

Uuringu tulemuste esitamisel on põhiliseks kuritegevuse taset iseloomustavaks näitajaks võetud 1999. aastal ohvriks langenud inimeste osatähtsus kõigist küsitletuist. Muutuste hindamiseks on 1999. aastat iseloomustavaid andmeid võrreldud 1994. aastat kajastavate andmetega (1995. aasta uuringu tulemuste põhjal).

Uuringuaruanne valmis koostöös Soome Õiguspoliitika Instituudiga. Uuringuaruande trükkimist toetas rahaliselt ÜRO Kriminaalpreventsiooni Instituut (UNICRI).

Kuritegude ohvriks langemise ulatus

Enamlevinud kuriteoliikide taseme hindamiseks küsiti, missuguste etteantud loetelus toodud vägivalla- või varavastaste kuritegude ohvriks oli vastaja või tema majapidamine langenud viimase viie aasta jooksul, sh eraldi 1999. aastal.

1999. aastal oli kõige enam varguseid autost: 9,2% kõigist küsitletuist oli langenud vähemalt ühe niisuguse kuriteo ohvriks (autoomanikest või autokasutajatest langes niisuguse kuriteo ohvriks 14,7%). Järgnesid vargus suvilast, maakodust või aiamaalt (7,3% kõigist küsitletuist; 17,0% niisuguse vara valdajaist) ning auto väline kahjustamine ehk autovandalism (5,9% kõigist küsitletuist; 9,3% autoomanikest/-kasutajatest).

Isiklike esemete varguse (sh taskuvarguse) ohvriks langes 5,5%, garaazist vm abihoonetest toime pandud varguse ohvriks 4,5%, jalgrattavarguse ohvriks 4,1%, vägivallaga ähvardamise ohvriks 4,0%, korterivarguse ohvriks 3,7% ja korterivarguse katse ohvriks 3,1% küsitletuist.

Vähem esineb otsest füüsilist vägivalda: röövimise ohvriks langes 2,9% ja kallaletungi ohvriks 2,2% küsitlenuist.

Sotsioloogiliste uuringute andmetel ei ole olulisi muutusi kuritegevuse tasemes ja liigilises struktuuris ajavahemikus 1994-1999 toimunud¹.

Mitmete kuriteoliikide puhul on küllalt suur tõenäosus langeda samaliigilise kuriteo ohvriks korduvalt aasta jooksul. 1999. aastal langes suvilast, maakodust või aiamaalt toime pandud varguse ohvriks kaks või enam korda 52% niisuguste kuritegude läbi kannatanutest; sealjuures 13% viis korda või enam. Vägivallaähvarduse või kallaletungi ohvriks langes korduvalt aasta jooksul 32%, garaazist vm abihoonest toime pandud varguse ohvriks 29%, röövimise ja autovandalismi ohvriks 22% niisuguste kuritegude läbi kannatanutest; teiste kuriteoliikide puhul esines korduvat ohvrikslangemist harvemini.

Eesti võrdluses teiste riikidega

Võrreldes Lääne-Euroopa riikidega, on Eesti kuritegevuse tase kõrgem varavastaste kuritegude osas (röövimine, korterivargus, vargus autost); vahe on veelgi suurem võrreldes Soomega².

Vägivallaähvarduste ja kallaletungide puhul ületab Eesti tase samuti Lääne-Euroopa keskmist, kuid vahed on väiksemad. Võrdluses Soomega ei ole kallaletungide osas olulisi erinevusi (Soomes on vägivalla tase mõnevõrra kõrgem kui enamikus Lääne-Euroopa riikides).

Võrreldes Läti ja Leeduga, on elutingimuste uuringu andmetel³ kuritegevuse tase Eestis küll kõrgem, kuid erinevalt ametlikust kriminaalstatistikast ei ole riikidevahelised erinevused suured⁴.

Vägivallaähvardused ja kallaletungid

Ohvriuringu andmetel langes 1999. aastal vägivallaga ähvardamise ohvriks 4,0% küsitletuist ning kallaletungi ohvriks 2,2% küsitletuist (sh 3,4% meestest ja 1,2% naistest). Vägivallaähvarduste ja kallaletungide ohvriks (kokku) langes 1999. aastal eestlastest 5,1% ja mitteestlastest 8,6%.

33% vägivallajuhtudest (ähvardus + kallaletung) oli ründaja või vähemalt üks mitmest ründajast kannatanule tuttav nime või välimuse poolest.

¹ Niisugust järeldust lubavad teha lisaks Ohvriuring 2000 tulemustele ka Sotsiaalministeeriumi, Statistikaameti ja Tartu Ülikooli poolt 1994. ja 1999. aastal läbi viidud elutingimuste uuringud ning Eesti Konjunktuuriinstituudi küsitlused (EKI-test) aastatel 1994-1999.

² Aromaa, Kauko & Heiskanen, Markku (2000). Suomalaisten rikosriskit 2000. Kansainvälinen rikosuhritutkimuksen Suomea koskevia tuloksia. Helsinki: Oikeuspoliittisen tutkimuslaitoksen tutkimustiedonantoja 49.

³ Elutingimuste uuring Balti riikides 1999. aastal. Vt: Aasland, Aadne & Tyldum, Guri (2000). Better or Worse? Living Conditions Developments in Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania 1994-1999. Oslo: Fafo-report 334.

⁴ Sama uuringu andmetel teatatakse Eestis kuritegudest politseile aktiivsemalt kui Lätis ja Leedus. Peamisteks Balti riikide vaheliste erinevuste põhjusteks ametliku kriminaalstatistika puhul on erinevused seadusandluses ja politsei poolt kuritegude registreerimise praktikas; samuti kuritegudest politseile teatamises – mitte suurtes erinevustes kuritegevuse tegelikus tasemes. Ühtse meetodika alusel läbi viidud küsitluste tulemused sobivad riikidevaheliseks võrdluseks reeglina paremini kui ametlik kriminaalstatistika.

Vägivalla üldine tase on 1990te teisel poolel püsinud suhteliselt stabiilsena – seda nii ohvriuuringu kui elutingimuste uuringu andmetel. Mõningane kasv ilmneb naiste ohvrikslangemises; meeste osas on märgatav väike langus.

Röövimised ja isiklike esemete vargused

1999. aastal langes röövimise ohvriks 2,9% küsitletuist. Isiklike esemete varguse ohvriks langes 5,5% küsitletuist (sh taskuvarguse ohvriks 3,6% küsitletuist).

Röövimise ohvriks langes 4% meestest ja 2% naistest. Isiklike esemete varguse puhul oli olukord vastupidine: niisuguse kuriteo ohvriks langes 4% meestest ja 7% naistest.

Röövimiste ja isiklike esemete varguste piir pole väga selge. Võib eeldada, et röövimiste puhul on reeglina kasutatud vägivalda või sellega ähvardamist. Isiklike esemete varguste puhul on kuritegu toimumise hetkel reeglina jäänud varjatuks (1999. aastal oli 60% juhtudest tegu taskuvargusega).

Kuritegevuse tase asulatüüpide järgi

Küsitlusandmed kinnitavad politseistatistikast ilmnevat asjaolu, et enamiku kuriteoliikide puhul on kuritegevuse tase kõrgeim Tallinnas ja madalaim maal.

Ohvriuuringu kohaselt on vägivaldajuhtumeid (kallaletunge ja vägivaldaähvardusi) kõige enam Tallinnas ja suurtes linnades: 1999. aastal langes kallaletungi või vägivaldaähvarduse ohvriks Tallinnas 9%; suurtes linnades¹ 8% küsitletuist; muudes linnades ja maa-asulates jäi antud näitaja 4...5% vahemikku.

Röövimise ja isiklike esemete varguse (varjatud, vägivaldala kuriteod) ohvriks langemise tõenäosuses on selgelt suurim Tallinnas, järgnevad teised suured linnad.

Korterivarguseid (varguseid kodust) ja korterivarguse katseid on kõige enam Tallinnas (sama oli olukord 1994. aastal). Viimase korterivargusega tekitatud keskmine rahaline kahju (varastatud esemete väärtus) oli 2000. aasta ohvriuuringu järgi Eestis tervikuna 8600 krooni. Keskmine tekitatud kahju oli oluliselt suurem Tallinnas (13200 kr) kui teistes linnades ja maa-asulates.

Autovarguste suhteliselt väikese arvu tõttu ei saa teha kindlaid järeldusi tendentside ja autovarguste levikupildi kohta.

Vargus autost on kõige sagedasem Tallinnas, ületades muude linnade ja maa-asulate taset ligikaudu 2 korda. 1999. aastal langes Tallinnas autost toime pandud varguse ohvriks 15% kõigist küsitletuist (25% autoomanikest või -kasutajatest); see ongi kõige sagedamini esinev kuriteoliik Tallinnas. Ka autovandalism on Tallinnas rohkem levinud kui mujal.

1994. aastaga võrreldes on autodest toime pandud varguste ja autovandalismi läbi kannatanute arv Tallinnas küll kasvanud, kuid ligikaudu samas tempos on suurenenud ka

¹ Suured linnad: Tartu, Narva, Kohtla-Järve, Pärnu.

autoomanike ja -kasutajate arv – seega ei ole Tallinnas autoomanike või -kasutajate jaoks niisuguste kuritegude tõenäosus siiski arvestatavalt kasvanud.

Jalgrattavarguse ohvriks langeti 1999. aastal kõige sagedamini Tallinnas: 5% kõigist küsitletuist (9% jalgrattaomanikest). Tallinnas on võrreldes 1994. aastaga märgatav väike kasv, kuid samal ajal on kasvanud ka jalgrattaomanike arv – seega ei ole jalgrattaomanike jaoks risk oluliselt suurenenud.

Suvilast, maakodust või aiamaalt toime pandud varguste puhul ei ilmnenud suuri erinevusi kannatanute osakaalus erineva suurusega linnade elanike seas. Kannatanuid oli 7...9% kõigist küsitletuist (18...25% niisuguse vara omanikest). Maapiirkondades märkis niisuguseid vargusi 6% kõigist küsitletuist (10% niisuguse vara omanikest).

Varguseid garaazidest, varjualustest ja kuuridest esineb rohkem Tallinnas jt suurtes linnades (6...7% kõigist küsitletuist); vähem teistes linnades (3%) ja maal (2%).

Kuritegudest politseile teatamine

Valdavast osast kuritegudest politseile ei teatata. 1995. aasta ohvriuringu järgi teatati viimasest kuriteost politseile 34,8% juhtudest; 2000. aasta ohvriuringu järgi 35,7% juhtudest¹.

Kannatanute poolt kuriteost politseile teatamise aktiivsus on nii ohvriuringute kui ka elutingimuste uuringute järgi viimase viie aasta jooksul veidi tõusnud.

Varavastaste kuritegude puhul sõltub sündmusest politseile teatamine üldjuhul tekitatud kahjust: mida suurem on kahju, seda suurema tõenäosusega kuriteost teatatakse. Ohvriuringu järgi teatati kõige aktiivsemalt autovargustest (86%) ja korterivargustest (62%). Suhteliselt vähe teatatakse kallaletungidest ja vägivallaähvardustest (kokku ligikaudu 25%).

Viimasest kuriteost politseile mitteteatamise põhjuste hulgas (võis vastata mitu vastusevarianti) on esikohal arvamus, et “politsei poleks niikuinii asja heaks midagi teinud” (45%); teiseks domineerivaks motiiviks on juhtumi või kahju ebaolulisus. Antud juhul kajastavad vastused kannatanute arvamusi, mitte tegelikke kogemusi politseiga kokkupuutest.

Üldine hinnang politseile

Hinnang politsei professionaalsele tasemele on järjekindlalt paranenud: 1993. aastal hindas seda “täiesti” või “üldiselt” nõuetele vastavaks vaid 17% küsitletuist; 2000. aastal juba 51%.

¹ Võrreldavad andmed; 2000.a. puhul on jäetud välja vargused suvilast jm, mida ei küsitud 1995.a. Erinevate küsitluste puhul olenevad kuritegudest teatamise näitajad eeskätt küsimustikus loetletud kuriteoliikidest. Suurema arvu kergemate kuriteoliikide näitamisel vastusevariantide seas (nt vargused suvilatest, garaazidest jms) “väheneb” ka kuritegudest teatamise protsent tervikuna, kuna niisugustest kuritegudest teatatakse vähem; lisaks võib olla erinevusi arvutusmetoodikas.

2000. aastal hindas politsei professionaalset taset nõuetele vastavaks 53% eestlastest ja 46% muust rahvusest küsitletuist. Hinnang politsei tasemele on viimastel aastatel kiiremini paranenud eestlaste hulgas.

Turvatunne ja turvameetmete kasutamine

Meeste turvatunne on märgatavalt suurem kui naistel: 2000. aasta ohvriuuringus märkis 72% meestest, et tunneb end täiesti või üsna julgelt oma elurajoonis pimedas üksi liikudes; naiste puhul oli vastav näitaja 48%. Kõige turvalisemalt tunnevad ennast noored; turvatunne väheneb vanuse suurenemisega nii meeste kui naiste puhul. Võrreldes 1995. aastaga on küsitluste andmetel turvatunne veidi suurenenud (erinevused ei ole siiski statistiliselt olulised).

Elutingimuste uuringu järgi väljendas 1999. aastal kartust langeda tänaval kuritegeliku ründe ohvriks 55% naistest ja 38% meestest (1994. aastal 63% naistest ja 49% meestest).

2000. aasta ohvriuuringus pidas 44% küsitletuist tõenäoliseks, et nende korterisse järgmise aasta jooksul sisse murtakse (1995. aastal 28%; statistiliselt oluline kasv).

Elanike poolt spetsiaalsete turvalukkude ja mõnede muude meetmete kasutamine murdvarguste tõkestamiseks on viimase viie aasta jooksul oluliselt lisandunud Tallinnas, kuid mitte mujal. Tallinnas oli 2000. aastal korteriuksel turvalukk 46% küsitletuist (1995. aastal 29%).

Suhtumine karistustesse

2000. aasta ohvriuuring näitas, et inimeste suhtumine karistamisse on muutunud pehmemeks. Vastused küsimusele "*Missugune oleks õige karistus teistkordses murdvarguses süüdi tunnistatud 21-aastasele mehele, kes varastas teleri*" näitasid, et võrreldes 1995. aastaga on oluliselt vähenenud vanglakaristuse pooldajate osakaal ning kasvanud ühiskondliku tööteenistuse¹ pooldajate osakaal.

Väärrib märkimist, et küsitluse andmetel on Eestis vanglakaristuse pooldajaid juba vähem (23%) kui oli Lääne-Euroopa riikides keskmiselt 1992. aastal (27%; uuemad võrdlusandmed puuduvad).

¹ Niisugune karistusvorm seni Eestis puudub, v.a analoogilised mõjutusvahendid alaealiste puhul. Tegu on rahvusvahelisest ankeedist pärit küsimusega, millega uuritakse inimeste hoiakuid, olenemata nende realiseeritavusest igas riigis.

Vanglakaristuse pooldajad pakkusid kirjeldatud juhtumi puhul kõige sagedamini sobiva karistusaja pikkuseks üks aasta (% küsitletuist; N = 398):

1 kuu või vähem	-	2,0
2-6 kuud	-	13,3
Üle 6 kuu, kuid alla 1 aasta	-	13,8
1 aasta	-	27,4
2 aastat	-	17,8
3-4 aastat	-	11,6
5 aastat või rohkem	-	11,6

Lühikokkuvõte

1. Küsitluste andmetel ei ole ajavahemikus 1994-1999 olulisi muutusi kuritegevuse tasemes ja liigilises struktuuris toimunud.
2. 1999. aastal kannatas kõige rohkem inimesi autodest toime pandud varguste läbi: ligi 15% autoomanikest või -kasutajatest (Tallinnas 25%). Kannatanute arvult järgnesid vargus suvilast või aiamaalt ning vandalism auto kallal.
3. Vägivallaga ähvardamise ohvriks langes 4,0%, korterivarguste ohvriks 3,7% küsitletuist. Röövimise ohvriks langes 2,9% ja kallaletungi ohvriks 2,2% küsitletuist.
4. Mõnede kuriteoliikide puhul on suur tõenäosus langeda korduvalt aasta jooksul samaliigilise kuriteo ohvriks (eriti varguste puhul suvilast või aiamaalt).
5. Võrreldes Lääne-Euroopa riikidega, on Eesti kuritegevuse tase küllalt kõrge mõnede varavastaste kuritegude osas (röövimine, korterivargus, vargus autost). Vägivallaähvarduste ja kallaletungide puhul on erinevused väiksemad. Elutingimuste uuringu andmetel on kuritegevuse tase Eestis küll kõrgem kui Lätis ja Leedus, kuid riikidevahelised erinevused ei ole suured.
6. Küsitlusandmetel on enamiku kuriteoliikide puhul on kuritegevuse tase kõrgeim Tallinnas ja madalaim maal. Tallinnas on levinuim kuriteoliik vargus autost.
7. Politseile teatati ohvriuuringu järgi 35,7% juhtudest (erinevate uuringute puhul oleneb näitaja eeskätt sellest, milliste kuriteoliikide kohta küsitakse). Kõige aktiivsemalt teatati autovargustest (86%) ja korterivargustest (62%). Suhteliselt vähe teatatakse kallaletungidest ja vägivallaähvardustest (kokku ligikaudu 25%).
8. Hinnang politsei professionaalsele tasemele on järjekindlalt paranenud: 1993. aastal hindas seda nõuetele vastavaks vaid 17% küsitletuist; 2000. aastal juba 51%.
9. Turvatunne tänavatel on veidi kasvanud, kuid korterivargust kardetakse märgatavalt enam kui viie aasta eest.
10. Turvalukkude kasutamine on oluliselt lisandunud Tallinnas, kuid praktiliselt üldse mitte teistes linnades ja maal.