



OPHI WORKING PAPER NO. 01

Safety and Security

A proposal for internationally comparable indicators of violence

Rachael Diprose *

May 2007

Abstract

Violence impedes human freedom to live safely and securely and can sustain poverty traps in many communities. One of the challenges for academics, policy makers, and practitioners working broadly in programmes aimed at poverty alleviation, including violence prevention, is the lack of reliable and comparable data on the incidence and nature of violence. This paper proposes a household survey module for a multidimensional poverty questionnaire which can be used to complement the available data on the incidence of violence against property and the person, as well as perceptions of security and safety. Violence and poverty are inextricably linked, although the direction of causality is contested if not circular. The module uses standardised definitions which are clear and can be translated cross-culturally and a clear disaggregation of different types of interpersonal violence (not including self-harm) which bridges the crime–conflict nexus.

Keywords: poverty, violence, survey methods, freedoms

JEL classification: C8, I3, J12

Copyright © Oxford Poverty & Human Development Initiative 2009

* University of Oxford; rachael.diprose@sant.ox.ac.uk

This study has been prepared within the OPHI theme on The Missing Dimensions of Poverty Data.

OPHI gratefully acknowledges support for its research and activities from the Government of Canada through the International Development Research Centre (IDRC) and the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), the Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID), and the United Kingdom Department for International Development (DFID).

ISSN 2040-8188

ISBN 978-1-907194-01-6

Acknowledgements

I am grateful for the comments and inputs of Alex Butchart, Sabina Alkire, Afsan Bhadelia, Emma Samman, Maria Ana Lugo, Diego Zavaleta, Proochista Ariana, Anna Hiltunen, Luca Mancini, Frances Stewart, Andrew Mack and other participants at the OPHI workshop on Missing Dimensions of Poverty Data. Without their support, this paper would not have been possible. This research was conducted in conjunction with the Oxford Poverty and Human Development Initiative (OPHI) and The Centre for Research on Inequality, Human Security, and Ethnicity (CRISE), University of Oxford.

A modified version of this paper was published in the December 2007 issue of *Oxford Development Studies*, vol 35, no. 4.

The Oxford Poverty and Human Development Initiative (OPHI) is a research centre within the Oxford Department of International Development, Queen Elizabeth House, at the University of Oxford. Led by Sabina Alkire, OPHI aspires to build and advance a more systematic methodological and economic framework for reducing multidimensional poverty, grounded in people's experiences and values.

This publication is copyright, however it may be reproduced without fee for teaching or non-profit purposes, but not for resale. Formal permission is required for all such uses, and will normally be granted immediately. For copying in any other circumstances, or for re-use in other publications, or for translation or adaptation, prior written permission must be obtained from OPHI and may be subject to a fee.

Oxford Poverty & Human Development Initiative (OPHI)
Oxford Department of International Development
Queen Elizabeth House (QEH), University of Oxford
3 Mansfield Road, Oxford OX1 3TB, UK
Tel. +44 (0)1865 271915 Fax +44 (0)1865 281801
ophi@qeh.ox.ac.uk <http://ophi.qeh.ox.ac.uk/>

The views expressed in this publication are those of the author(s). Publication does not imply endorsement by OPHI or the University of Oxford, nor by the sponsors, of any of the views expressed.

Table of Contents

Introduction	2
Violence: safety and security as a dimension of poverty	6
What is violence?	6
Types of violence: bridging conflict and crime analyses	8
Why consider this dimension? Violence and its impacts	9
Correlations between poverty, conflict and crime-related violence	12
Data collection: what are available and what are the issues?	12
Data on violence and threats to security in the form of crime	13
Data on conflict and related forms of violence	14
Why use household surveys?	15
Indicators	18
Part 1: Indicators of incidents of threats to physical safety and security:	
against property	21
Sub-forms of property related crime and violence	25
Questions asked for five-sub forms of property related crime and violence	26
Part 2: Indicators of incidents of threats to physical safety and security:	
against person	28
Sub-forms of person related crime and violence	32
Questions asked for five-sub forms of person related crime and violence	33
Part 3: Perceptions of safety and violence	34
Domestic violence	36
The quick module	37
What kinds of indicators can this data produce?	41
Conclusion	42
Bibliography	43
Appendix 1 – Summary of questionnaires, indicators, and recommendations	47
Appendix 2 – Indicators of violence, physical safety, and security:	
comprehensive module	50
Appendix 3 – Questions on physical safety and security from internationally comparable surveys	53

List of Tables

1: Indicators of incidents of threats to physical safety and security: against property	23
2: Indicators of incidents of threats to physical safety and security: against person	29
3: Perceptions of safety and violence	35
4: Domestic violence: recommended to add to health modules	38
5: Quick module on physical safety and security	39

Introduction

People are no longer surprised when someone kills his brother

— Naryn, Kyrgyz Republic, *Voices of the Poor* (2000)

Our public safety is ourselves. We work and hide indoors... and of dangers at school... I am afraid that they might kill my son for something as irrelevant as a snack

— From a women's group, Sacadura Cabral, Brazil, *Voices of the Poor* (2000)

Lost assets, lost agricultural implements, lack of capital to invest in agriculture, and a lack of day-to-day financial liquidity" led to impoverishment. In addition, many of the men suffered injuries which affected their capacity to work

— Group of Tamils in Velur, Sri Lanka, *Voices of the Poor* (2000)

injuries and violence are ranked amongst the leading causes of death and disability... particularly true in the case of the low-income and middle income countries where injuries and violence are growing in significance...

— WHO (2004b: 1)

We, Heads of State and Government...reaffirm that our common fundamental values, including freedom, equality, solidarity, tolerance, respect for all human rights, respect for nature and shared responsibility, are essential to international relations...We reaffirm our commitment to eradicate poverty and promote sustained economic growth, sustainable development and global prosperity for all...We strongly reiterate our determination to ensure the timely and full realization of the...Millennium Development Goals. We underline the need for urgent action on all sides, including more ambitious national development strategies and efforts backed by increased international support.

— 2005 World Summit Outcome, United Nations, 16 September 2005

One of the greatest impediments to human security in the post-Cold War era is not inter-state wars resulting in mass destruction fought by the armed forces of nation states, but violence, perpetrated by individuals, groups, and state actors within the internal borders of nations (Hegre et al. 2001). Violence, resulting from everyday crime, large-scale communal conflicts and insurgencies, or through state repression can and does undo the development gains achieved in education, health, employment, capital generation and infrastructure provision. Violence is a public health problem, a human rights problem, a community problem, and a problem for the state and the international community. It impedes human freedom to live safely and securely and can sustain poverty traps in many communities. However, violence is not always an inevitable part of human interaction. Many multiethnic, multi-religious, and poor peoples manage human interaction and channel conflict and the propensity for violence in peaceful ways.¹

One of the problems for academics, policy makers, and practitioners working broadly in programmes aimed at poverty alleviation, specifically at violence prevention, humanitarian responses to man-made crises, and longer-term strategies to overcome structural inadequacies, is the availability of reliable data on the incidence, form, frequency, context, perceptions, and avenues of redress for the occurrence of violence. In particular, there is an absence of comparable data across country borders as well as sociocultural and historical contexts. Experts working on poverty reduction and violence prevention, for institutions such as the World Health

¹ Fearon and Laitin (1996) have estimated that between 1960 and 1979, of all the potential conflicts in Africa (defined as occurring where different ethnic groups live side by side), only 0.01% turned violent.

Organisation (2005), the Human Security Centre (2005), the Inter American Institute of Human Rights (Perez-Valero 2002: 9, cf. *Le Monde* July 1992), and the agencies of the United Nations such as the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC resolution 2003/26) and the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime have argued that there is an absence of reliable and comparable data collected at regular intervals over time which can adequately inform their policy and programme design, as well as programme monitoring and evaluation.

The World Report on Violence and Health (WHO 2002: 10-11) states that self-inflicted, interpersonal or collective violence kills more than 1.6 million people every year with an overall age-adjusted rate of 28.8 per 100 000 population. An estimated 5.06 million people die each year as a result of injury (both accidental and intentional) (WHO 2004a: 1). According to data from high-income countries² alone, for every person killed from injury, approximately 30 times as many people are hospitalised from injury, and 300 times as many are treated in hospital emergency rooms and then released.³ Self-inflicted injuries are estimated to be the fourth leading cause of death and the sixth leading cause of ill-health and disability within the 15-44 age group (WHO 1999). The vast majority of these deaths occurred in low- to middle-income countries with less than 10% of all violence-related deaths occurring in high-income countries. Nearly half of these 1.6 million violence-related deaths were suicides, almost one-third were homicides and about one-fifth were war-related. These figures, while horrifying, are vulnerable to gross underreportage due to poor data availability, but do give some indication as to the seriousness of the problem, particularly in developing countries. To provide some context, tuberculosis kills 1.7 million people a year (UN 2006: 15), the number of AIDS-related deaths increased in 2005 to 2.8 million across the world, despite greater access to antiretroviral treatment and improved care in some regions (UN 2006: 14), and 10.5 million children died before their fifth birthday in 2004 – mostly from preventable causes (UN 2006: 10). These figures do not include injury rates, which in many cases sustain poverty traps.

According to United Nations Statistics, ‘in 1990, more than 1.2 billion people – 28 per cent of the developing world’s population – lived in extreme poverty. By 2002, the proportion decreased to 19 per cent’ (UN 2006: 4). The laudable Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) aim to target poverty, and in particular address the special needs of the least developed countries, landlocked countries and small island developing states; to achieve a significant improvement in the lives of at least 100 million slum-dwellers by 2020; to halve, between 1990 and 2015, the proportion of people who suffer from hunger; and to halve, between 1990 and 2015, the proportion of people whose income is less than \$1 a day. However, it is precisely the people suffering from poverty who are most vulnerable to the devastating impacts of violence which can undermine the achievements made in reaching these goals. Indeed the Millennium Declaration which gave rise to the MDGs committed to responding to violence alongside poverty.⁴

More comprehensive data are essential for gauging the true situation of peoples in both sub-national and national contexts. They are also essential for those working to reduce poverty, including levels of violence and violence prevention. Furthermore, such data are useful for monitoring the indirect impacts of development strategies and poverty reduction, and other forces which impact on the population, which can have different effects on the various types of violence, exacerbating one kind while reducing another. How can broad institutions,

² Included here are the Netherlands, Sweden, and the United States of America

³ WHO 2004b: 1; cf. *Injury Pyramid*. Geneva, World Health Organisation, 2001 (http://www.who.int/violence_injury_prevention/injury/pyramid/injpyr/en, accessed 11 June 2003)

⁴ United Nations 2000

programmes, and responses be designed to help mitigate violence when it is poorly understood, particularly in terms of the patterns of how, where, why, and when it occurs, or by whom it is generally perpetrated on more than a case-by-case basis?

This paper proposes a survey module which can be incorporated into multidimensional poverty survey questionnaires so that data on violence is collected in conjunction with data on other aspects of poverty, such as health, income and employment, education, vulnerability and risk, shame and humiliation, eudemonia and well being. All these dimensions are inextricably linked. Violence is a health problem in that it causes injury and death. Moreover, violence and lack of security and safety reduce access to income-generating activities, employment opportunities, job security and safe passage to work. In conflict situations, both the private sector and public services are seriously weakened; education, public health facilities, and public infrastructure are sometimes destroyed; people are more vulnerable to disease; and their overall sense of eudemonia may decrease. The shame and humiliation of being poor, injured, disfigured or disabled and from a marginalised group in conflict situations sustain the sense of impoverishment amongst the poor. Disability may impact on income-generating activities and consumption. It is therefore important that poverty be measured multi-dimensionally including the security aspect, so that data are available to formulate comprehensive, mutually-reinforcing policies and programmes across all dimensions.

The aim of this paper is to propose a shortlist of indicators to measure the frequency and types of violence and some of its impacts as well as perceptions of threat, which can be used in the large household surveys conducted by nation states, as well as international development agencies including the World Bank, the agencies of the United Nations, and others who conduct surveys in multi-country and multi-locality contexts.⁵ There are vast differences between states, as well as the peoples within states, and the issues around which violence occurs. Accordingly, the phenomenon of intra-state violence may vary both between country contexts, and within the states themselves. The indicators presented in this paper (and the questions which underpin them) seek to provide some kind of comparable data. The module advocated in this paper is not exhaustive, as exhaustive survey modules are surveys within themselves and should be implemented as such. Some data are simply not comparable or require such exhaustive and in-depth questioning that they are not included here.⁶

Data, albeit not usually used for comparative purposes, can be comparable if questions are designed at the onset to accommodate the messiness of the different structural and social contexts in which the questions are asked. One way of accommodating such messiness is to have a core of categorical answers available for the questions being asked, with additions being made if specifically needed in a country or sub-national context.⁷ Thinking about cross-country contexts and the likelihood of sub-national variation in the phenomenon of violence at the onset is essential for making indicators comparable, asking questions which are valid for a variety of contexts, and allowing options for answers to closed-ended questions that can accommodate the bulk of answers across a variety of contexts. Even so, large cross-country surveys such as the

⁵ This paper is concerned primarily with data which can be collected in household surveys rather than through creating databases of incidents based on other kinds of secondary data such as newspaper reports, archives of police and judiciary records, and through other monitoring initiatives.

⁶ There are no questions, for example, on psychological violence or self-harm as this would extend the module so significantly that it would be impossible to include in multi-dimensional survey on poverty. There are also no questions included on violence against the child as UNICEF has already created internationally comparable surveys gauging threats to the child.

⁷ This has been recommended by WHO 2004b

Living Standards Measurement Survey (LSMS) do not have one true prototype to be implemented in all contexts (the Ghana LSMS is the closest to a prototype existing for the LSMS).⁸ The aim of this paper is to shortlist a series of indicators for violence which are more than just a skeletal framework to be modified so substantially that all essence of comparability is lost, but rather which can be implemented as is or with only slight alteration, remaining sensitive to both the nature of questions on violence which are difficult to ask as well as the context in which they are asked.

A further, but important consideration is that given the sensitive nature of the questions under investigation, the training of enumerators in administering sensitive questions and the implementation of this module is key to the quality of data that will eventually be obtained. In many environments, societies and cultures, there may be cultural or institutional disincentives including dangers to reporting the experience of violence, or people may just not want to discuss such a sensitive topic with strangers. Some have concerns that such questions should not or cannot be asked in a survey module at all, but should be investigated only using qualitative techniques suitable to sensitive topics. However, it is argued here that it is possible to collect data on violence using survey techniques, and furthermore given the dearth of internationally comparable data on people suffering from the impacts of violence, survey techniques may be the only way of collecting data to complement and verify other available sources.⁹

The paper also advocates the creation of a module to measure security and physical safety which incorporates threats to human security both from violent crime (individual and collective) aspects of human security and from conflict (usually collective or state-society). Often, surveys concentrate on one or the other aspect of physical safety and security, as does the academic literature examining the relationships between security and violence. This paper argues that the measurement of both crime-related violence and conflict-related violence is essential for gauging the level of poverty which includes rights to physical safety and security. It is important to highlight at the outset that crime is not always violent; moreover, sometimes crime is a form of conflict. However, conflict is not always considered to be a crime and is not always violent. For the most part, the survey seeks to measure the incidence of violent crime and violent conflict. The exception is questions on theft which other research has demonstrated to be important to security and safety for most people, in particular the poor.

The data proposed for collection in this paper cover three important areas:

- 1) the incidence and frequency of both general crime (theft and violent crime) and more conflict-related violence against both property
- 2) the incidence and frequency of both general crime (theft and violent crime) and more conflict-related violence against person;
- 3) perceptions of threat(s) to security and safety, both now and in the future.

Within these realms there are questions which seek to gauge injuries and deaths resulting from such violence, the victims and perpetrators of violence and the location where incidents take place, as well as avenues for recourse from incidents of violence and satisfaction with these.

⁸ World Bank, Living Standards Measurement Survey (www.worldbank.org/LSMS/, accessed 15 April 2007).

⁹ There are many instruments available that provide extensive instructions and advice on how to implement surveys on violence, such as those provided by WHO 2004b. Limited space in this paper prevents discussing the implementation of this survey module, however, of all the poverty dimensions under consideration, implementation concerns are of utmost importance here.

Domestic violence is another very serious component of violence and insecurity. However, the paper proposes that detailed questions on domestic violence which gauge both the incidence of domestic violence and perceptions of its severity become a core component of health survey instruments rather than this module. However, there are efforts in this module to ascertain whether incidents of violence occur in the home.

Section 2 of this paper examines violence as a dimension of poverty. Section 2 also examines the available data being collected on crime and conflict which is internationally comparable. Section 3 examines what data sources are available for indicators of crime and conflict. Section 4 outlines the indicators proposed for inclusion on a survey module on violence, security and safety.

Violence: safety and security as a dimension of poverty

What is violence?

There are many ways of defining violence,¹⁰ which is a long-researched and complex phenomenon found across the world. The World Health Organisation defines violence (2004b) as ‘the intentional use of physical force or power, threatened or actual, against oneself, another person, or against a group or community, that either results in or has a high likelihood of resulting in injury, death, psychological harm, maldevelopment or deprivation’. This paper draws on the WHO definition, although the indicators necessarily only capture a part of it.

As this definition implies, violence may be physical, resulting in harm to person or property, or psychological, resulting in and from fear and oppression. Violence can be collective,¹¹ where the perpetrators are a group or mob; or individual where one person is responsible for inflicting harm on a person or property; or it can be perpetrated by state actors acting in either official or unofficial capacities. Violence may be sexual, forcing people to commit acts of a sexual nature against their will, or it may be symbolic, including the desecration of cultural and religious symbols inciting group reprisals.¹² Violence may be defined by the realm in which the act takes place (inter-personal, communal, state-society), or the way the violence is inflicted (property destruction, intentional injuries, crime, kidnapping), or by how the violence is inflicted (gunshot, stabbing, burning, bombing, rape, incest, and so on). Violence may be subject to cultural relativism where different cultures define acts as violent or not depending on local value systems, customs and social organisation.¹³

Often, the way data are collected on physical safety and security depends on how the institution or analyst defines violence or a problem associated with violence. At the broadest level, data on threats to physical safety and security in the form of violence can be disaggregated between

¹⁰This paper will limit the use of the term violence to not include threat. Threat will be defined as ‘threat of violence’.

¹¹ Tilly (2003: 3) provides a heuristic definition for understanding collective violence as incidents which ‘have common episodic social interaction that:

- ‘Immediately inflicts physical damage on persons and/or objects (“damage” includes forcible seizure of persons or objects over restraint or resistance);
- Involves at least two perpetrators of damage; and
- Results at least in part from coordination among persons who perform the damaging acts.’

¹² Das et al. 2000; James 1997; Daniel 1994

¹³ Ibid.

violent crime (infringements on the state laws against person or property, perpetrated by individuals or small groups of individuals which could be identified with adequate information usually with motive) and conflict (also infringements on state laws, but usually perpetrated on a group basis which may be triggered by infringements on group or moral codes or motivated by political and other factors). When the justice system of individual states functions effectively, the incidence of both types of violence may be captured and recorded in police and court records. However, in many states in transition this is not the case, particularly in conflict situations where the state may cease to function or the justice sector may be weak.

A report on forms of insecurity and crime in Latin America identifies violence in the realms of crime, ethnic violence and racial intolerance, political violence in repressive democracies, drug-related narco-traffic, violence against children, domestic and gender violence, kidnappings, death threats, and violence perpetrated by police squads, and violence between indigents (Perez-Valero 2002). The *World Report on Violence and Health* (WHO 2002), reports on youth violence, child abuse and neglect by parents, violence by intimate partners, abuse of the elderly, sexual violence, self-directed violence, and collective violence. These are just two examples of the multitude of ways in which violence can be viewed, with categorical typologies often overlapping, including with respect to perpetrators, victims, root causes, politics, crime, and so on.

Indicators of violent conflict include injuries/deaths and destruction of property or goods. These indicators are also crimes in themselves, but in conflict contexts, the group nature of violence makes it is unlikely that the perpetrators may be identified, captured, and/or prosecuted, leaving a serious gap in reporting of violence. Furthermore, the way in which people are targeted can vary between crime and conflict. In conflict situations, the targeting of victims may be indiscriminate, based on some broader identity. The victims of crimes, in contrast, may be (but are not always) based on personal relationships and grievances among particular individuals, as in the case of many homicides and assaults, but this can also occur in conflict situations. Previous research has shown that forms of conflict tend to be related and that small disputes act as triggers for bigger conflicts (Esman and Herring 2001), with early triggers sometimes occurring in the form of everyday crime. Yet the appropriate policy responses for each form of threat to human security may be very different.

Often the two areas overlap in reports on human security and safety but the two aspects are rarely both included in the same instrument of data collection. Given that the aim of this paper is to look at designing a module of a household survey which can measure incidents of violence and threats to human safety and security as a dimension of poverty, then both aspects, violent crime and violent conflict, need to be included in the survey module. Yet, while the data collected should cover incidents of both violent crime and broader conflicts, it should be detailed enough in each respect for disaggregation by the broad identity groupings of victims and perpetrators, the location and form of the incidents, and responses by the state and society to such incidents so that policy responses can be designed to combat the two broader realms.

Some definitions of violence, including the WHO definition above, include the threat of harm, not just the actual act. Wherever possible, this paper advocates the use of international definitions of the terms associated with violence, but separates out the threat of violence from actual acts. The threat of violence is as an important aspect of security and safety; however, threats can be real and perceived, incorporating many other psychological elements. The *Human Security Report* argues that fear seems to bear little relation to objective risks (Human Security Centre 2005: 47). Thus for the purposes of the measurement, these two aspects of violence, the actual acts and perception of threats, will be measured separately. They can be combined to create indicators which meet the WHO definition of aspects of violence.

Types of violence: bridging conflict and crime analyses

In order to bridge the conflict-crime nexus, this paper uses a typology of violence which pertains to both violent conflict and crime occurring between people. The WHO (2004b: 4) identification of four types of intentional or deliberate violence resulting in injury or death is useful in considering how to design the survey module:

- Interpersonal violence¹⁴ (e.g. assault,¹⁵ homicide, intimate partner violence, sexual violence¹⁶)
- Self-directed violence¹⁷ or self-harm¹⁸ (deliberate overdose on drugs and alcohol, self-mutilation, self-immolation, suicide)
- Legal intervention¹⁹ (action by police or other law enforcement personnel)
- War, civil insurrection²⁰ and disturbances (e.g. demonstrations and riots)

This module aims to capture data on the incidence of violence and other threats to safety and security (predominantly theft) between people with the exclusion of self-harm. It is important to highlight at the outset that these are major omissions, given that suicides account for such a large proportion of violence. However, this module seeks to bridge violent crime and conflict conceptually through the lens of interpersonal occurrences of either form of violence. Questions on self-harm would necessarily involve a different style of questioning and categorisation, overall leaving the module unwieldy and difficult to implement as a part of a larger survey on poverty. Thus, self-harm is not included in the module.

The bridging typology underpinning the module allows for data to be collected on violent crime, violence in conflict contexts, the household and that perpetrated by the state (although this is not asked about directly). While the module can adequately capture data on the incidence of crime, it cannot adequately capture full information on the incidence of conflict where there are large numbers of perpetrators. However, it can adequately capture data on injuries and deaths associated with both crime and conflict.

¹⁴ Interpersonal violence: physical violence between people including situations, in which a person hits, slaps, pushes, kicks or otherwise strikes another person, e.g. fights between friends or family members. Interpersonal violence includes child abuse and neglect, youth violence, violence against women, sexual violence, and elderly abuse and neglect.

¹⁵ Physical assault: behaviours that threaten, attempt, or actually inflict physical harm.

¹⁶ Sexual violence/sexual assault: any sexual act, attempt to obtain a sexual act – including unwanted sexual comments or advances, or acts to traffic a person for sexual exploitation - directed against a person's sexuality using coercion, by any person regardless of their relationship to the victim, in any setting, including but not limited to home and work.

¹⁷ Self-directed violence: self-directed violence is divided into suicidal behaviour and self abuse. Suicidal behaviour includes suicidal thoughts, attempted suicides – also called 'parasuicide' or 'deliberate self-injury' in some countries – and completed suicides. Self-abuse, in contrast, includes to acts such as self-mutilation.

¹⁸ Self-harm: deliberate overdose of drugs and alcohol, self-mutilation, self-immolation and suicide.

¹⁹ Legal intervention: any act of law enforcement by a person acting in an official capacity (e.g. execution of a search warrant or arrest, execution of a legal sentence such as corporal punishment).

²⁰ Civil insurrection: The act or an instance of open revolt against civil authority or a constituted government.

Why consider this dimension? Violence and its impacts

One of the surprises of the comprehensive *Voices of the Poor* Study (Narayan et al. 2000: 7) based on 78 Participatory Poverty Assessments (PPA) across 47 countries, was the prominence of concerns for physical safety and security among the poor. The study finds that poverty is multidimensional, where

Poverty never results from the lack of one thing but from many interlocking factors that cluster in poor people's experiences and definitions of poverty. (Narayan et al. 2000: 32)

Violence and a lack of physical safety and security are among the dimensions of poverty not adequately addressed in most poverty measures which focus on income levels, or access to education and health facilities. The following excerpt from the *Voices of the Poor* Study highlights the importance given to this issue by the poor from around the world. It shows that problems differ across countries and that, for comparability, indicators used have to be flexible enough to accommodate the many dimensions that threats to physical safety through violence can take:

Poor women express fear of increased crime, both in public and at home. In Ukraine, women and old people say they no longer leave their homes after dark, and 'worry when their children return late from school or work' (Ukraine 1996). In Moldova, women are afraid to work the night shift because of fear of assaults (Moldova 1997). In South Africa, case studies document 'rapes of teenage girls, unfilled claims of child support by mothers due to fears of being beaten by the fathers, and even the crippling of a woman following a drunken argument among the couple' (South Africa 1998). The South Africa PPA also describes gang-related and political violence. Women report feeling vulnerable to physical attacks and sexual assaults when they are out collecting firewood. In India and in Pakistan, women spoke about the dangers of sexual assault and harassment by forest officials and others when collecting firewood, (1993). In Pakistan, absence of latrines forces women to use the bush before dawn and after dusk exposing them to snake bites, sexual harassment and attacks (Pakistan 1993). In Bangladesh (1996), provision of toilets and bathing places were high priority among adolescent girls and women because of fear of harassment and inconvenience (Narayan et al. 2000: 41-42).

Similarly, in a four-district intensive study on *Perceptions of the Poor* (Pal 2001) conducted in Sri Lanka, ending civil conflict was amongst the five key poverty challenges highlighted by the study. Again the poor in this study perceive poverty to be multidimensional and speak of how they are poor as well as why they are poor, describing the threats of armed conflict and acts of violence they encounter everyday. For example, the overwhelming cause of poverty in the Trincomalee district was perceived to be the armed conflict. The conflict has disrupted or destroyed their livelihoods and increased the lack of security and mobility. Out of a total of some 83,829 families in the district, 40,437 had been displaced during the armed conflict during the 1990s, while over 30,960 houses, comprising one third of homes in the district, were damaged or destroyed (Pal 2001: 15). Physical safety and security were not just a concern in the district most affected by violence, but an everyday threat to citizens in the study in all four districts. See for example the following excerpt from Moneragala District (Pal 2001: 65)

When an 18-year old girl was walking back from school, a drunken man raped her on the way. She had to be hospitalized. So our parents stopped us from going to school

after we became big [reached puberty]. The man belonged to a rich family. Although the girl's family went to the police they didn't take any action against the man.

Jayawathi Menike, farmer, Moneragala district

A lack of physical safety and security are a part of the general state of deprivation of these people and thus a part of their poverty. Violence is not the outcome of poverty but rather the reason for poverty according to this study. Thus it should be included in measures of poverty.

As stated previously, the *World Report on Violence and Health* (WHO 2002: 10-11) states that self-inflicted, interpersonal and collective violence kills more than 1.6 million people every year. However, there are considerable regional differences in rates of violent death:

In the African Region and the Region of the Americas, homicide rates are nearly three times greater than suicide rates. However, in the European and South-East Asia Regions, suicide rates are more than double homicide rates (19.1 per 100,000 as against 8.4 per 100,000 for the European Region, and 12.0 per 100,000 as against 5.8 per 100,000 for the South-East Asia Region), and in the Western Pacific Region, suicide rates are nearly six times greater than homicide rates (20.8 per 100,000 as against 3.4 per 100,000) (WHO 2002: 10).

The report argues that these statistics are just the tip of the iceberg, with the majority of violent acts being committed behind closed doors and going largely unreported. It also demonstrates how the different forms of violence feed on each other. People who were subjected to child abuse or violence from an intimate partner are much more likely to commit acts of self harm. Collective violence fractures normal social bonds and often leads to sexual violence and heightened violence in young people. Almost every form of violence predisposes victims and perpetrators to another.

Civil wars are estimated to have killed 5 million people in the 1990s,²¹ Conflicts also force populations to migrate suddenly as internally displaced persons and as refugees. 'War and internal conflicts in the 1990s forced 50 million people to flee their homes.'²² Displacement affects people's health and livelihoods, and may disrupt children's families and education. According to the *Human Security Report* (HSR) (HSC 2005: 1), civil wars, genocides, and international crises have all declined sharply in the past dozen years, and international wars together with military coups have been in steady decline for a much longer time period, particularly since the end of the cold war. The HSR finds that wars have fewer victims today, with battle-related deaths amounting to nearly 700,000 in 1950, compared to 20,000 in 2002, with sub-Saharan Africa becoming the world's most violent region today (HSC 2005: 4-5).²³ While the number of wars is decreasing, some 60 wars are still being fought around the world with deadly consequences (HSC 2005: 9). However, the HSR indicates that there has been a huge increase in refugees and displaced persons over time since the major wars of the 1950s, 1960s and 1970s (HSC 2005: 5). The HSR also highlights that while the costs of war may be obvious, in the form of battle-deaths, displacement, flattened cities, destroyed infrastructure and

²¹ UNDP 2000: 36

²² UNDP 1999: 36

²³ This figure draws on Lacin and Gleditsch 2005. It includes civilian and combatant deaths, but not deaths in conflict areas that arise from crime, disease, or one-sided violence (security forces firing on unarmed protesters, genocides).

so on, less obvious are the high numbers of indirect costs and ‘excess’ deaths such as those which would not have occurred had there not been excess fighting (HSC 2005: 7) including disease and malnutrition. Disease and malnutrition, this paper argues, can be captured in health modules of household surveys and correlated with the findings of modules on security and safety if these modules are also included in the survey instrument. However, such data needs to be treated cautiously as a first step, as panel data sets would need to be created to determine to what extent the disease and malnutrition is a direct result of conflict, and to what extent this would have resulted if the conflict had not happened at all.

Both violence and civil wars come at great economic and financial costs. According to Gleditsch et al. (1994) from PRIO in Oslo, in 1994 for example, at the peak of several conflicts, the world spent:

about 1,000,000 million USD annually on armaments.²⁴ This is almost 5% of the total global output, and represents about one-sixth of total public spending. Arms expenditure exceeds world spending on public education by 10% and health spending by 25%. Global arms spending is 20 times higher than foreign aid and more than 2,000 times higher than what is spent on international peacekeeping.²⁵

In 2001, for example, the poorest 41 countries had increased their armed forces by 80% since 1985 and the poorest five countries had nearly tripled their armed forces (300%). In contrast the OECD nations’ armed forces had decreased by 25%.²⁶

The WHO report, *The Economic Dimensions of Interpersonal²⁷ Violence* (WHO, 2004a), finds that estimates of the cost of violence in the United States of America reach 3.3% of the gross domestic product, while in England and Wales, the total costs from violence – including homicide, wounding and sexual assault – amount to an estimated \$40.2 billion annually. The report also highlights that interpersonal violence disproportionately affects low- and middle-income countries. The economic effects are also likely to be more severe in poorer countries. However, as this report shows, there is a scarcity of studies of the economic effects of this violence in low- and middle-income countries. However, evidence indicates that in low- and middle-income countries, it is probable that society absorbs much of the costs of violence through direct public expenditures and negative effects on investment and economic growth. Importantly, there are inadequate data on the costs of treating the consequences of interpersonal violence, be it crime or conflict-related. The modules presented in this paper are a first step to measuring the incidence of violence, but do not seek to measure the direct and indirect costs of conflict. However, such data, when collected over time, can be used to correlate with other measures of changing public expenditure and impacts of violence on investment and economic growth.

²⁴ Estimates for total arms spending vary considerably because of official secrecy, misleading accounting procedures, and varying exchange rate. For Sivard (1986) reports a world total of USD 858,635 million, while USACDA (1989) uses the figure USD 983,800 million. In 1990, the SIPRI (1990) Yearbook stopped providing a figure for world military expenditure, mainly because it was too difficult to provide reliable estimates for such major arms spenders as China and the Soviet Union. However the press release of the 1990 edition of the Yearbook gives an estimate for 1989 ‘of the order of USD 950,000 million’. USACDA (1994) reports a peak figure of USD 1,215,000 million (in 1991 dollars) for 1987, declining to 1,038,000 in 1991.

²⁵ Gleditsch et al. 1994

²⁶ UNDP 2001: 207, table 19

²⁷ Interpersonal violence is defined in this WHO report as violence between family members and intimate partners and violence between acquaintances and strangers that is not intended to further the aims of any formally defined group or cause.

Correlations between poverty, conflict and crime-related violence

Violence against the property and person in the form of crime, vigilantism, communal conflicts, insurgencies, civil wars, and intra-state wars is interlinked with poverty and underdevelopment, although it is generally agreed that the causality goes both ways. Major civil wars are associated with markedly worse performance in economic growth, food production per capita and human indicators, such as infant mortality rates, school enrolment, and so on. For example, Stewart and Fitzgerald found that conflict is a major source of poverty and underdevelopment (Stewart and Fitzgerald 2001: 3), given that low incomes lead to conditions that are conducive to violence. Elbadawi (1999) also finds that civil wars and poverty are inextricably linked. Civil wars directly affect poverty by destroying physical, human and social capital, resulting in a disruption of productivity, heightened unemployment, social displacement and increased physical insecurity. Collier and Hoeffler (1998) identify the economic impacts of war on growth and poverty by identifying three main impacts of civil war: (1) a disruption to capital or transaction intensive activities (roads, production, and financial services, for example); (2) a diversion of expenditure and resources from economic to war efforts; and (3) a reduction of domestic savings through consumption and capital flight.

Meanwhile, numerous investigations have shown that low incomes lead to conditions which are conducive to violence. Famine and severe impoverishment have very often been associated with military activities and violent encounters. Wars and the associated insecurities tend to disrupt normal economic and social activities, undermine democracies and public discussions, and frustrate the development of a well-functioning market economy (Drèze and Sen 1989). Yet, Easterly (1999, 2001, 2002) also established that income poverty alone does not necessarily engender conflict. However, when combined with high income and asset inequality, particularly along ethnic or communal lines, poverty can lead to violent conflict.

Thus, the evidence of numerous studies demonstrates a two-way relationship between poverty and conflict, and that it is likely to be worse in low-income countries. Thus it is important to measure the magnitude of violence along with other aspects of poverty, not only because it is an important part of poverty, but also because it may worsen other aspects of poverty and vice versa.

Data collection: what are available and what are the issues?

There is consensus in many fields that given the nature of violence and the location (national or sub-national) of violent incidents, the internationally comparable data on conflict, physical safety, and security are inadequate.²⁸ There are a variety of ways of collecting data on violence, threats to physical safety, and conflict, which include but are not limited to household surveys. For example data on mortality and injuries can be and are collected from hospitals and police records, but do not encompass those incidents which may be treated outside hospitals or not treated at all, such as rape, intimate partner violence, genital mutilation and other problems of physical safety which may result in social shame and humiliation; incidents of violence in communal conflicts that go unreported; injuries treated outside the formal health sector; and so on. Similar kinds of data may be missing or underreported by administrators of the justice sector such as the police (particularly if there are political or merit reasons not to do so) and the courts

²⁸ WHO 2004b; HSR 2005; European Crime and Safety Survey (EU ICS) in Van Dijk et al. 2005; Mack 2002; UNICEF 2006

(where cases of injury and even death do not reach the courts), due to human error, inadequate training in reporting and file keeping, and other related reasons.

The WHO report (2005: 6) on *Milestones of a Global Campaign for Violence Prevention* argues that an 'ongoing supply of national and local-level information about the causes and about the consequences of violence is essential to building a comprehensive understanding of the problem and for designing, developing, and monitoring effective solutions'. In a different report (WHO 2004b: 1) WHO argues that 'injuries and violence are ranked amongst the leading causes of death and disability...particularly true in the case of the low-income and middle income countries where injuries and violence are growing in significance, largely as a consequence of the epidemiologic, demographic and socioeconomic transitions that have characterised the development of these countries in recent decades.'²⁹ Thus, it is important to include both injuries and deaths in indicators of security and safety to truly gauge the size and nature of the problem which may be disguised by only including indicators of deaths in survey instruments.

Data on violence and threats to security in the form of crime

The Division of Policy Analysis and Public Affairs of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) has implemented a series of surveys over time on Crime Trends and Operations of Criminal Justice Systems. The ninth survey covers the period 2003-04 and requests that permanent missions of the UN fill in a questionnaire which summarises the statistics of national justice providers, such as the police and the courts, on crimes, using international standardised definitions (UNODC 2005). Such information is useful in collating statistics on crime, violence, and prosecution in a format which is standardised across nations. However, this survey relies on the statistics provided by national government offices which is vulnerable to underreporting, missing many of the incidents of violence as has been outlined above.

The implementation of International Crime Victim Surveys (ICVS), supported by the Ministry of Justice in the Netherlands, The Home Office in the United Kingdom, the Department of Justice in Canada, the United Nations Office of Drugs and Crime (UNODC) and the European Commission, is useful as it seeks to supplement the data made available by national governments from police and prosecution records. It is also useful as it provides a standardised tool of data collection in terms of definitions, methodology, and reference periods on 11 types of crime.³⁰ There is also an African version of the ICVS implemented in 13 African nations conducted in collaboration with the United Nations African Institute for the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders (UNAFRI). The survey asks about where the crimes took place, if they were reported to the police, satisfaction with the police response, reasons for dissatisfaction, the seriousness of the incident for the household, and if it was not reported, why it was not reported. It also asks questions on the weapons used in robberies, the number of people involved in sexual offences and their relationship with the offender, as well as whether weapons were used and whether the person classifies the incident as a crime. However, it does not seek to

²⁹ WHO compiles the data supplied by countries on homicides, suicides and war each year. This in a sense combines data on violent conflict and crime. It receives such information from over 80 countries (85 for 2001). However, what is consistently missing is data on African countries on the causes of death, as well as that from the Asian and Middle Eastern regions. Household surveys would help fill such reporting gaps and overcome some of the underreporting issues.

³⁰ Data is collected on ownership of cars, theft of cars, theft from cars, car vandalism; ownership of motorcycles, theft of motorcycles; ownership and theft of bicycles; burglary, attempted burglary; robbery; personal theft involving force; sexual offences (includes touch and rape all in one); assaults and threats.

measure how far conflict-related violence is group based, or ask questions about rural crime and conflict (with the exception of a few questions in the African ICVS).

Data on conflict and related forms of violence

The Human Security Report (HSC 2005: 2) identifies the inadequacy of available comparable year-on-year data on global security as a significant barrier to research and policy design. There are no 'official' data sets on armed conflicts, genocide and core human rights abuse, nor are easily comparable measures of criminality made available from state-based institutions. Furthermore, the UN does not have any comparable data on armed conflicts to help it formulate and evaluate its security policies. The HSR highlights that governments may not be willing to divulge the incidence of violence and violent conflict within their own borders. It also argues that while violent crime is a threat to human security, attempts to track global and regional trends in criminal violence are hampered by a lack of data, underreporting and underrecording, conflicting definitions and so on (HSC 2005: 8). Identifying types of violence is important for policy prescriptions; for example a study in Sierra Leone found that displaced women were twice as likely to be raped as those who remained in their homes. The Human Security Centre (HSC) at the University of British Columbia has reviewed and compiled its report based on data from research institutions around the world as well as commissioning a major opinion poll on popular attitudes to security in 11 countries, and a new dataset by the Uppsala University Conflict Data Program. There are a variety of data sources on violence, conflict, wars, insurgencies, political terror, and so on identified by the HSC. Each has both benefits and limitations.

For example, the Political Terror Scale (PTS) at the University of North Carolina records the global and regional trend data on human rights abuse in the developing world using a composite indicator that captures core human rights abuses such as torture, extra-judicial executions, and 'disappearances' backed by death squads. However, the central focus of the PTS is state repression, although the identity of the perpetrators of the violence is not always clear and hence the indicator sometimes captures violence not perpetrated by the state.

The Uppsala University's Conflict Data Program and the International Peace Research Centre in Oslo (PRIO) track the armed conflict trends in the post-Second World War period, in what is known as the Correlates of War project. Their definition of armed conflict, however, does not include conflicts between non-state actors, such as the communal conflicts in Indonesia, Nigeria, and many other parts of the world. Thus the HSC commissioned Uppsala to collect this data including smaller conflicts as well as genocides and massacres for 2002-03 with the threshold being at least 25 battle-related deaths in each calendar year (HSC 2005: 21). However, this work relies on newspaper reports and reports from agencies such as the UN and civil society organisations, again leaving it vulnerable to underreporting on frequency of incidents, as well as involving very stringent rules on how to count battle deaths. The HSR (HSC 2005) argues that given the huge variation in the numbers of deaths reported in such sources and the conservative estimates which they use in their database, this database while useful, is susceptible to underreporting of battle deaths, particularly in the database on armed conflicts involving the state (the threshold is 1,000 in a calendar year, thus countries such as Northern Ireland miss the threshold). Injuries are not recorded at all.

As part of its efforts to promote disaster prevention and mitigation as an integral part of development activities, the World Bank's Disaster Management Facility (DMF), under the umbrella of the ProVention Consortium, undertook a study of the quality and accuracy of disaster data (Tschoegl et al. 2006). The three databases reviewed also include data on violence and conflict. These were NatCat maintained by Munich Reinsurance Company (Munich); Sigma

maintained by Swiss Reinsurance Company (Zürich) and EM-DAT maintained by the Centre for Research on the Epidemiology of Disasters (CRED, Université Catholique de Louvain, Brussels). There were significant differences in the incidents recorded in the databases, however they fell over time. Records that date from the 1980s had greater discrepancies than those from the 1990s, with press sources being the least reliable, and standardised definitions being a key issue for redress amongst the databases if results from these databases are to be compared.

Why use household surveys?

The discussion above looks at just some of the major internationally comparable data sources which specifically focus on crime and conflict, although other survey instruments discussed below may include one or two questions on these topics. With the exception of the ICVS, most of the datasets are created using secondary sources and are vulnerable to varying definitions, underreporting, political agendas of the institutions providing the information and so on. This paper proposes using a household survey to complement the available data. There are several reasons why household surveys are a useful way of obtaining data on injuries,³¹ deaths, and violence. These include:

- To provide data on injuries or deaths if no other data sources exist in a particular nation;
- Household surveys can be used to supplement and cross-check administrative data on conflict and crime, and discrepancies between data can be examined;³²
- Certain empirical hypotheses on the causal interconnections between poverty and violence (criminal and civil) as well as violence prevention, can be tested using such data more accurately than is possible using aggregate datasets;
- Multidimensional poverty measures can identify which economically and socially poor groups are also the victims of significant violence;
- Multidimensional poverty measures can track the dynamics of change – for example what sequences or kinds of development investments stabilise high crime or post-conflict situations and which accelerate the violence.
- Limited attention has previously been paid to injuries as a public health problem due to a lack of reliable and valid information on injuries which makes the size of the problem visible to policy makers;
- The surveys would provide baseline data on injuries, death, and violence together with socioeconomic baseline data in countries where no population data exists. Deaths, injuries and property destruction can then be mapped according to demographic sub-populations, place, type and nature of injury, all of which are

³¹ WHO uses the following definitions relating to injury. Injury: physical damage that results when a human body is suddenly or briefly subjected to intolerable levels of energy. It can be a bodily lesion resulting from acute exposure to energy (thermal, chemical, kinetic) in amounts that exceed the threshold of physical tolerance, or it can be an impairment of function resulting from a lack of one or more vital elements (oxygen, warmth), as in drowning, strangulation or freezing. Injury death: death as a result of an injury event. Injury event: an incident leading to an injury. Intentional injury: injuries that are purposefully inflicted, either by the victims themselves (i.e. suicide and suicide attempts) or by other persons (i.e. homicide, assault, rape, child abuse).

³² WHO 2004b, 2005; HSC 2005; Van Dijk et al. 2005

important features required for designing policy and programmes to redress or prevent future occurrences;

- Household surveys capture the incidence of violence where it does not reach hospitals or other state agencies which may report the incident, particularly where cases are treated outside the formal health sector, or where people are too embarrassed to report incidents;
- They allow for the simultaneous comparison of physical security and safety as well as poverty between different geographic regions, or countries; and
- They can provide estimates of the burden of poor security and safety in terms of direct financial costs, disability and mortality.

However, household surveys which attempt to capture real incidents of violence, trends in the incidence of violence over time, perceptions of security and safety and other related information can be logistically difficult to implement particularly in conflict regions or high violence regions, and validity may be reduced if the respondent is not convinced of confidentiality. The validity of results of household surveys may be undermined by recall bias, and may be prone to selection bias, sampling errors (but they are selected precisely because the sampling framework is at least ostensibly robust), and non-response bias in areas where the displaced have relocated or where homes are heavily protected in high income areas. Household surveys may use non-standardised terms across countries, limiting the comparability of results, which is why this paper proposes a standardised module. While many of these problems can be overcome by better design (careful attention to sampling, limiting non-response, and constructing questions which limit recall bias and use of internationally comparable definitions), better trained interviewers (in conducting surveys on sensitive topics such as violence) and better implementation (through resource provision, planning and supervision), they can also be resource intensive and thus may only be carried out periodically. This paper addresses many of these issues, particularly the need to generate internationally comparable data.

There are many household surveys which, albeit not explicitly aimed at measuring violence per se, have questions pertaining to certain aspects of violence, be it violent crime, theft and property destruction, conflict and its sociodemographic features, intra-household violence, violence perpetrated by the state or individuals, satisfaction with problem-solving avenues and state agencies and so on. The following sections review a series of surveys which in some form or other ask questions related to measuring violence (either conflict based, or crime based) and perceptions of threat, its causes, consequences, changes over time, options for remedies and satisfaction with these. This list is not exhaustive, but covers most of the major international instruments looking in some way at measuring violence, perceptions and conflict. This section does not include questions related to measuring the costs of violence, as such questions are outside the scope of a short module.

The surveys reviewed here are (See Appendix 1 for more details):

- The Living Standards Measurement Survey – the World Bank (covering themes of sociodemographic data, education, health, service provision, governance, values and meanings, and other modules) (World Bank, 1980-Present).
- The International Crime Victims Surveys – UNODC/UNICRI (covering themes of 11 types of crime including theft, robbery, assault, threat, perceptions of safety, changes in crime over time, reporting and satisfaction of outcomes – usually conducted by telephone but a face-to-face questionnaire is analysed here) (UNODC/UNICRI, 1989-Present).

- European Crime and Safety Survey/ EU International Crime Survey – EU (Applies the ICVS) – implemented by Gallup Europe on crimes against clearly identifiable individuals, excluding children, which uses phone interviews rather than face-to-face (UNODC/UNICRI, 1989-Present).
- The Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys (MICS, UNICEF)– the module on attitudes to domestic violence (UNICEF, 1995-Present).
- The Demographic and Health Surveys – on incidents of domestic violence against women (USAID, 1985-Present).
- The Afrobarometer (covering themes of democracy, governance, livelihoods, macro-economics and markets, social capital, conflict and crime, participation and national identity) (IDASA-CDD-Michigan State University (MSU), 2000-Present).
- The Latinobarometer (covering themes of the economy and international trade; trade and integration agreements; democracy; politics and institutions; social policies and wealth distribution; civic culture, social capital and participation; environment; gender and discrimination; and current themes) (Latinobarómetro, 1995-2004).
- The Asianbarometer Survey (covering themes of economic evaluations; trust in institutions; social capital political participation; electoral mobilisation; psychological involvement and partisanship; traditionalism; democratic legitimacy and preference for democracy; efficacy, citizen empowerment, system responsiveness; democratic versus authoritarian values; cleavages; belief in procedural norms for democracy. Wave 2 also covered human security, globalisation, the meaning of democracy, important problems to be addressed, quality of governance, international relations, as well as satisfaction with government and democracy) (National Taiwan University (NTU) and Institute of Political Science of Academia Sinica, 2000-Present).
- The Eurobarometer (covering the same themes as the surveys above) (Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR), 1974-Present).
- The Ipsos-Reid poll implemented for the Human Security Centre and the Human Security Report on people's fears and experiences of political and criminal violence in 11 countries (Ipsos-Public Affairs).
- The Centre for Research on Inequality, Human Security, and Ethnicity (CRISE), University of Oxford survey on Perceptions of Identity (Multi-country study on conflict and perceptions of identity, collective action, stereotypes, attitudes towards the use of violence, inequalities; the Indonesian survey has questions on incidence of conflict and disputes).
- The World Bank Questionnaire on Social Capital (with sections on group difference, identity groupings and problems generated, whether these problems lead to violence, and perceptions of safety) (Grootaert et al. 2004).
- The International Labor Organisation (ILO) People's Security Surveys (PSS) which combine 100 questions on different forms of security and insecurity, including all of the types of violence discussed below in one module, as well as questions on perceptions of safety and security.
- World Health Organisation (WHO) World Health Survey which has household and individual survey instruments (sections on individual survey instrument includes sibling death, causes, type of injury and location of incident; victimisation of violent crimes, and perceptions of safety walking alone after dark and in the home). This comprehensive

health survey incorporates multidimensional aspects of health and poverty including income, employment, identity, perception, service provision, cost of healthcare, depression, disease, etc. all of which can be mapped against the responses to the questions on violence.

Many of these instruments include measures of violence or are focused on violence directly. However, they either do not adequately cover both conflict- and crime-related violence, and the surveys are not structured in a way that the incidence of both crime- and conflict-related violence can be correlated with other aspects of poverty as a part of a multi-dimensional poverty measure

Indicators

The comprehensive survey module on physical safety and security discussed below has been divided into three parts so that questions are asked in a logical, sequential order, maximising the amount of data which can be captured in approximately 10-15 minutes. For those respondents who have not experienced actual incidents of violence against property or person, this module will take less than five minutes. For those who have experienced many different forms of threats to their human security, the module will take approximately 15 minutes. The module should be added to pre-existing survey modules which aim to capture internationally comparable data on aspects of poverty: in particular income, education, health, social capital, well-being, livelihoods, nutrition, migration and refugee status, and so on. The findings from this module can be used to run correlations with other poverty data to investigate connections across dimensions, as well as making it possible to create a multidimensional measure of poverty. The three parts of the module are:

- Part 1: Indicators of incidents of threats to physical safety and security: against property
- Part 2: Indicators of incidents of threats to physical safety and security: against person
- Part 3: Perceptions of safety and threats of violence

A fourth part on domestic violence is adapted from the questions already being asked in the DHS surveys. It is advisable that questions on domestic violence become core rather than optional modules on health surveys where health survey enumerators already spend significant time building trust with respondents and ensuring the interview is confidential from other household members.

Overall, using six key questions and a series of sub-questions the module aims to capture indicators of physical safety and security that are comparable across countries, in both urban and rural contexts. Given the vast variety of threats to security and safety across the world, where in some countries property crime is of great concern such as in parts of Western and Eastern Europe (Alvazzi del Frate and Van Kesteren 2004), and in others civil war poses the greatest threat to human security, for example in parts of West Africa such as the recent conflicts in the Ivory Coast, this module aims to incorporate indicators of violent incidents associated with both crime and group-based conflict. Also included are indicators of perceptions of security and safety to complement the data on actual incidents. The section on property-related incidents is asked first because, albeit a sensitive issue, it is the least sensitive of all sections of the module. The section on overall perceptions of conflict and crime in the region is asked at the end of the module to minimise the risk of the respondent ending the session prematurely. As far as possible, questions have been included which have already been tested in a cross-cultural context.

When the module is considered in its entirety, it aims to capture data on:

- **Selected types of property-related crime in the past five years:** number of incidents, number of people injured (losing one day or more of actual activities) in the most recent incident, the perpetrators (with safeguards against short-circuiting the survey implementation through asking people to name particular household members or state agencies), reporting the crime (to both state and non-state actors) and satisfaction with how the incident was resolved (to gauge how society manages such incidents).
- **Selected types of violence against the person:** number of incidents, number of deaths, number of people injured (losing one day or more of actual activities) in the most recent incident, the location of the incident (gauging individual, institutional involvement in the violence, and locations for targeting prevention programmes), the perpetrators (with safeguards against short-circuiting the survey implementation through asking people to name particular household members or state agencies), crime reporting (to both state and non-state actors) and satisfaction with how the incident was resolved (to gauge how society manages such incidents).
- **Perceptions of safety from violence and security:** perception of likelihood of being a victim of violent crime or conflict in the next year, and perception of greatest threat to human security in terms of crime, conflict and other issues).
- **Incidents of domestic violence (added to health surveys):** incidents of different intensities of violence against women taking place within the household (by other members of the household), attitudes towards whether the act should be punished and by whom, reporting of the problem, and satisfaction with how the problem was dealt with.

This paper also recommends that the module developed for measuring security and safety should be accompanied by questions on age, gender, religion, ethnicity, language group, migration status, IDP and refugee status, rural-urban status, economic status, education, and occupation. These are all important variables for disaggregating data to understand perceptions of risks to safety and threat of violence, perceptions of the proximate causes of violence, groups most vulnerable to actual incidents of violence, and geographic regions where violence is most prevalent.

The work of many theorists on conflict and violence have identified the link between identity, groups, and conflict, particularly as conflicts shift from interstate wars to internal conflicts within the boundaries of nation states. Authors such as Brubaker and Laitin (1998), Horowitz (2000), Tilly (2003), Stewart (2000), and the work of the researchers at the Centre for Research on Inequality, Human Security and Ethnicity (CRISE) at the University of Oxford, to name just a few, all examine the links between both ascriptive identity groups (such as ethno-religious, linguistic and other culturally defined groups) and prescriptive identity groups (other groups drawn around political and other identity group boundaries). As Brubaker and Laitin (1998: 427) put it,

That political violence can be ethnic is well established, indeed too well established; how it is ethnic remains obscure. The most fundamental questions – for example, how the adjective ‘ethnic’ modifies the noun ‘violence’ – remain unclear and largely unexamined.

Eriksen (1993) and many other identity theorists argue that an individual can take on a particular identity or multiple identities and that loyalties to one identity may surpass another. Della Porta

and Diani (1999) argue that identity formation is essential for understanding collective action. As Anderson (1991) and others have reasoned, identity formulation and transformation are contingent on demographic, political, economic, cultural, policy, and legislative environments at multiple levels and grievances towards changes in these environments.³³ Identity loyalties can shape the form that individual and group behaviour takes, and whether this results in violence.

As a result, to understand violent conflict and crime, and the associated threats to human security within a poverty framework, it is important to understand which groups of people are most vulnerable to violence, as well as the identity group basis of perceptions of threats to physical safety and security. This consequently requires data to be included in the survey on identity as outlined above.

Such demographic information in turn can help shape policies and programmes in poverty alleviation and violence prevention. Most of these aspects will be captured in surveys on poverty overall. However, IDP and refugee status, religion, ethnicity and language group are often not included in poverty surveys, and given the importance of these aspects to understanding targeted crime and conflict-related violence, it is recommended that questions on identity be included in the demographic section of the survey wherever it does not threaten the possibility of implementing the survey in a particular country.

This paper argues that all questions be directed at ‘you or a member of your household’ when trying to measure the frequency of violence, as this stops double reporting on ‘friends or family’ from respondents in the same community. The definition of a household used for this module includes people who are living in the house and eat regularly from the same pot.

Given that this module on physical safety and security is intended to gauge poverty levels in different countries around the world, and many of the world’s poorest countries have limited infrastructure, including phones, interviews must be conducted face to face rather than using CATI (Computed Assisted Telephone Interviews) technology which has been used in many of the surveys conducted in Europe mentioned above. Furthermore, given the sensitive nature of the topic, face-to-face interviews allow field teams to explain the purpose of the questionnaires, assure interviewees of confidentiality, and allay any fears or concerns they may have. The household surveys being targeted in this paper are all face-to-face.

WHO (2004a: 28) and UNIDRC (Alvazzi del Frate and Van Kesteren 2004) recommend using internationally recognised, standard definitions and codes for classifying data. Wherever possible, these have been used in this module, although threat and actual acts of violence have been disaggregated in the questions used for the indicators. However, the questions are designed in such a way that these can be re-aggregated as necessary to meet internationally recognised definitions. Furthermore, it recommends conducting surveys at the local rather than national level, as this is where many of the violent phenomena take place. For comparative purposes, this paper recommends that as a first step the survey module be conducted nationally, while later studies can be conducted more intensively in selected sites which emerge as of special interest from the first wave of data analysis.

In other survey modules, particularly health modules which aim to capture some data on violence, senior females in the household are the primary interviewees as they are more likely to remember the injuries incurred by other household members (WHO 2004b: 30). However, this

³³ On this, see also the work of Wolf (1964, 1999), who has shown how structures and power relations shape cultures.

paper recommends interviewing both men and women as they will have different knowledge of different kinds of violence.³⁴ However, Part 3 on domestic violence against women should only be asked to women as a part of a broader module on health, where enumerators have special skills in asking sensitive questions, and where there is assurance that other members of the household are not present during the conduct of the interview, potentially compromising the validity of results.

The questions on frequency of both property- and person-related crime and violence are asked for a period of five years. This is a reasonable and resource-efficient interval within which to conduct this survey module. Most of the surveys such as the LSMS, the Barometer surveys and some questions on the ICVS and EU-ICS ask the question for the past year. However, in the ICVS and the EU-ICS most of the questions are asked for the past five years. Ideally, this module would include both, but space does not allow for this luxury. Thus, the five-year marker is more useful, given that it is relevant to threats to security and safety for both crime and conflict. While crime may be a more frequently occurring social phenomenon across the world, conflict occurs less frequently. However, the impacts of conflict on both the community and social tensions can be more wide-reaching and devastating than smaller incidents of crime (with the exception of course of places where homicide and assault are a large-scale problem). Asking about the frequency of incidents in the past year would miss the incidents arising in many conflict situations. This data in turn could not be tested against the answers to the questions on perceptions of security and safety, where in conflict situations, incidents in the past five years could inform their feelings of security and safety in the present day, which would not be captured if the indicators on frequency of incidents only pertained to the previous year.

In the following pages, there is discussion of each part of the module, the considerations involved in including, excluding, or modifying questions from pre-existing surveys, as well as adding questions which have not been asked in international surveys before. There is also some discussion of where the results of previous surveys using these questions have been analysed previously, and some of the factors for consideration when implementing the survey to ensure the validity of results.

Part 1: Indicators of incidents of threats to physical safety and security: against property

Part 1 (see below) of the survey module aims to capture the frequency of incidents of property-based crime in both urban and rural settings, involving or not involving assault. Property-based crime has been included as an indicator of security and safety for two main reasons. First, theft, regardless of whether assault occurs, can be debilitating for the poor and contribute to their feeling of insecurity and lack of safety. For example, crime surrounding burglary was considered to be a fairly serious to a very serious offence by 88% of all respondents in the African ICVS (Naudé et al. 2006: 9).

Second, in conflict situations property damage and looting are a common form of violence which marks instability. During conflict situations, property damage is often an indicator of escalating violence, where mobs burn down villages, places of worship, and public infrastructure of particular identity groups as much as they engage in armed or unarmed clashes. For example, in the Poso District in Central Sulawesi, where a conflict broke out between Muslim and Christian groups between 1998 and 2001, approximately 2,000 people were killed within a four

³⁴ However, space should be made in the questionnaire to determine if the person interviewed is the person who has suffered from violence in the past, or they are representing another member of the household.

sub-district radius. However, approximately 20,000 houses were burned down or damaged across the four sub-districts and 6,401 buildings were damaged (6,254 houses, 58 places of worship, 30 schools, 41 government offices, one market, and 17 other buildings) (BPS Sulawesi Tengah 2004). Amongst the five communal conflicts taking place across Indonesia at the time, the estimated number of deaths was lowest in Poso (Varshney et al. 2004),³⁵ however, property damage was the more common form of violence taking place in this district. Of these five communal conflicts, only in Poso do tensions continue to simmer, indicating the importance of considering both human-physical and property violence as indicators of safety and security in conflict situations.

Alvazzi del Frate and Van Kesteren (2004: 1) in their analysis of the results of the 2000 International Crime Victim Survey (ICVS), argue that victimisation experiences are more likely to occur in urban areas. However, the kinds of questions asked in the ICVS are common to urban forms of crime, with the exception of those questions asked in the African ICVS. The ICVS conducted in 13 African nations also added questions on theft of livestock, more common to rural than urban areas (Naudé et al. 2006: 8). Consequently, this proposed module also attempts to capture forms of rural crime which have been identified in qualitative and survey work conducted by many development institutions including the *Voices of the Poor* Study (2000) and the Local Conflict and Development Programmes in Indonesia (Diprose 2004; Barron et al. 2006) conducted by the World Bank, as well as the Access to Justice work conducted by UNDP (Diprose et al. 2005; UNDP 2007) in Indonesia and Cambodia.

Table 1 shows Part 1 of the survey module. In implementation perspective, all questions should be read out in entirety. However, following the screening questions (i and ii, where ii helps to screen out double reporting), the complete list of answer options for Question 1 (iii–ix) do not always need to be read out in entirety to respondents, particularly for Questions v and vi and viii, as respondents will often naturally answer the question and enumerators can then select the appropriate categorical answer to fill in the box (assuming that they have been given training in the strict definitions of each categories). Furthermore, based on past implementation experience, throughout this module, there are always answer options of ‘don’t know’ and ‘refused to answer’ given the sensitive nature of the topic. However, as far as possible, with good implementation these should be used sparingly. Following the presentation of these questions, there is a discussion of the logic behind the design of Part 1 based on previous research and internationally comparable surveys which have been implemented.

³⁵ Varshney et al. 2004

Table 1: Indicators of incidents of threats to physical safety and security: against property

1. In the past 5 years, have you or any members of your household been the victim of or experienced the following?	i)	ii) Was this the same incident as you have told us about previously? If yes, which one? [Do not ask for 1A]	ii) If yes, how many times in the last 5 years did this happen to you or another member of your household?	iii) Did any-one die in any of these incidents?	iv) If yes, how many people?	v) The last time it happened where did it occur?	vi) The last time this happened, can you tell me who the perpetrator was or give me a broad description of whether they were an individual, a group, people you knew or strangers?	vii) In the last (most recent) incident that occurred, aside from those who were killed, was anyone injured (could not continue their normal activities for more than one day)?	viii) Did you report it, and if so who to?	ix) If you reported this incident, how satisfied were you with the way they dealt with this problem?
	0. No 1. Yes 88. N/A 99. Don't know	No Yes, A Yes, B Yes, C Yes, D Yes, E	1. Once 2. Twice 3. Three times 4. More than three times (LSMS Malawi)	0. No 1. Yes 99. Don't know		1. Home (around home) 2. On street near own home 3. In a public area near a government office/building 4. At school 5. At work 6. On a street/highway not near own home 7. Residential institution 8. Sports and athletic area 9. Industrial or construction site 10. Farm (excluding home) 11. Commercial area (shop, store, hotel, bar, office) 12. Countryside	1. HH member 2. Other relative 3. Neighbour who you know 4. Close friend of you or the family 5. Person you know by sight only 6. Group of people who you know by sight only 7. Individual stranger 8. Group of	0. No 1. Yes 99. Don't know	0. No 1. Yes to the police 2. Yes, to the military 3. Government official (includes village heads, LGA, state and other, but not police or military) 4. Yes, to informal authorities (traditional leaders, religious leaders, elders, chiefs) 5. Yes, to another household member 6. Yes to the neighbours 7. Yes, to health officials 8. Yes to civil society organisations (including women's organisations) 9. Yes to a gang 10. Yes to the media 11. Yes, to a political party	1. Very satisfied 2. Somewhat satisfied 3. Somewhat dissatisfied 4. Very dissatisfied 99. Don't know 88. N/A (For those who did not report it) (Barometer surveys)

						13. Nursing home 14. Place of worship 15. Other (specify) 88. Refuses to answer 99. Don't know	strangers 99. Did not see offender/don't know 77. Refused to answer		88. Refuses to answer 99. Don't know (Adapted from Barometers / ICVS)	
A. Someone actually got into your house, flat, or dwelling, without permission and stole or tried to steal something? (ICVS)										
B. Someone took something from you or a member of your household (on your person), by using force, or threatening you? Or did anyone try to do so? (Adapted from ICVS)										
C. Someone stole something you own (not stored in the dwelling) such as vehicles, parts or contents of vehicles, motorbikes, mopeds, scooters, machinery, pumps, bicycles, store property and so on? (Combined from ICVS)										
D. Animals or crops were stolen from you or a member of your household? (LSMS Malawi)										
E. Someone deliberately destroyed or damaged your home, shop, or any other property that you or a member of your household owns? (additional question)										

Sub-forms of property-related crime and violence

From the multitude of types of property-related crime and violence, there are five sub-types of property-related crime and violence which are examined in questions in the module proposed in this paper. These questions can be asked across rural and urban contexts and include both conflict- and crime-related threats to human security.

The first type pertains to burglary in the home, using a clear description of what is meant by burglary – without actually using the term burglary, which may have different interpretations across languages and contexts – to facilitate comparability. The description here is ‘someone tried to get into your house, flat or dwelling without permission and stole or tried to steal something’. Alvazzi del Frate and Van Kesteren (2004: 7) in their analysis of ICVS results for Europe in 2000, find there is a correlation between attempted and completed burglaries (0.68, $n=25$, $p<0.10$) and, on average in over eighty percent of burglaries something was actually stolen. Thus, for the sake of expediency, only actual burglaries are asked about here.

The second question pertains to robbery, a more serious threat to personal safety given that the person is threatened or harmed during the crime. Again the question is clearly formed so that the term robbery is not included but the act of robbery (theft with violence) can be ascertained in a variety of languages and cultural contexts. Alvazzi del Frate and Van Kesteren (2004: 10) find that in Western Europe, robbery is perceived to be the most serious form of crime, comparable to car theft in Eastern Europe. The three questions included in the survey, and discussed above, albeit slightly modified, have been tested in the ICVS and other surveys. Thus this paper argues that it is common to ask questions about burglary and robbery as indicators of security and safety.

The next question combines a series of questions asked separately in the ICVS about the theft of property, including vehicles from outside the home. It has been combined for the sake of efficacy and extra categories have been included to accommodate more likely types of theft in rural contexts. In rural contexts, this is just as likely to be machinery, such as water pumps or bicycles, as it is cars or motorbikes in urban contexts. On the one hand, by combining these aspects, it is difficult to measure the value of the property theft given the large difference in value between the cost of cars and bicycles. Ideally, this question would be divided into a series of questions that could be asked, disaggregating the different types of theft. The ICVS already does this adequately, although the ICVS is more relevant to urban contexts. On the other hand, this module is trying to gauge security and safety in combination with a number of other modules measuring poverty, and thus the module must be as concise as possible. The intrinsic value of a bicycle may be much greater to a poor rural farmer in Bangladesh as their only means of transport compared to an urban car-owner with potential access to other forms of transport. For example, in the ICVS conducted in 13 African nations, 42% of respondents considered the theft of a bicycle to be a very serious crime (Naudé et al. 2006: 11). Theft of either form of property can be just as debilitating and perceived to be of equal seriousness to either party depending on their context.

Theft can also trigger vigilante retribution, leading to spiralling threats to security and safety, as in the case of some parts of rural Indonesia such as in Lampung and Madura provinces. For example:

...The story's like this, before the killing happened, there were many 'sanyo' (water pumps) that went missing so that the community went on alert. They waited indeed for the thief and when he was discovered they immediately shouted 'thief!' and the residents

immediately gathered and chased the thief. The burglar was asked to give himself up but he didn't want to, racing instead to the top of a bamboo tree. In the end the bamboo was burnt and the thief fell and died, before being butchered...

Male focus group discussion participant, Madura island, Indonesia, 7 April 2003
(Diprose 2004: 9)

Thus, this question is used to measure the frequency of property theft from outside the home as an indicator of security, rather than as a proxy for measuring the cost of different types of theft which other surveys already measure.

A fourth question has been included from the LSMS security and safety module implemented in Malawi, on theft of animals and crops, with the theft of livestock also being used in the African ICVS. In rural areas, this is a common problem, where theft of livestock can incite more violence and conflict between neighbours, villages, and even result in vigilante mob killings similar to the example outlined above. The final question has been added to gauge the frequency of property destruction which can be considered a form of crime, but as was outlined in the example of Poso above, is a common form violence associated with conflict situations.

Questions asked for five-sub forms of property-related crime and violence

For each of the sub-types of property-related violence and crime, following the screening question on whether the type of incident has occurred or not, a further four questions are asked when incidents have occurred. These questions cover frequency of the incident, the identity of the perpetrator (in broad terms), reporting of the incident, and satisfaction with the response to reporting of the incident. Data on these aspects is important for planning public policy responses to the problem.

Frequency of incident, frequency of injuries, and number of people injured

The frequency of incidents is asked as one, two, three or more than three times to avoid problems of recall beyond a few incidents. The information obtained can then be used to create both incidence and prevalence rates, as used by the ICVS. From this survey module the incidence rate which can be measured is the number of incidents per 100 respondents in the five years preceding the survey. The prevalence rate is the percentage of respondents who were victimised at least once across all types of crime and violence in the five years preceding the survey. With proper sampling and implementation of the survey, these indicators can be scaled up to estimate incidence rates per 100,000 head of population as is commonly reported in the crime rates and international reports on crime rates, violence and so on.

Identity of the perpetrator

Following the lead of previously implemented surveys involving internationally comparable data on conflict, crime and violence, ascertaining the identity of the perpetrator helps policymakers to determine how to design their violence-prevention programmes. While the ICVS work across the world has highlighted that in sexual incidents, people are more likely to know the perpetrator than not, this may not be the case in robberies or in conflict situations. While there is evidence that most contact crimes against a person are likely to involve individual perpetrators with the exception of robbery (Alvazzi del Frate and Van Kesteren 2004; Naudé et al. 2006), violence in conflict situations is usually conducted by groups, which explains the focus of much of the academic work outlined above on group identities.

Thus the questions in this module have combined the options from CRISE surveys, ICVS, and the barometer surveys to create a list of potential perpetrators which involve individuals and groups. In order not to prematurely end the interview, particularly in interviews where other household members are likely to be present, if the perpetrator was a member of the household we do not ask which member of the household it was (as asked in some surveys). However, collecting this information can gauge the frequency of domestic violence without asking about domestic violence directly. Furthermore, we do not ask if the perpetrator was a member of a state institution, in order to reduce the likelihood that the survey will be banned from being implemented in particular countries. While not ideal, this can be accommodated by the ‘other’ option and the option on ‘person who you know by sight only’.

Reporting the incident and satisfaction with action taken

‘Imagine when we send these thieves to the police, we end up being disappointed to see them back the same day’.

— Malawi

Understanding the frequency and of incidents and who the perpetrators are, is only half the battle in obtaining data for poverty alleviation in the form of violence-prevention programmes. Reporting and resolving the incidents is the next crucial step to increasing security and safety for the poor. Alvazzi del Frate and Van Kesteren (2004: 1) emphasise that the delicate relationship between citizens and the police is indicative of the gap between theory and practice in crime-reporting patterns, and suggest the identification of specific roles for other actors in crime prevention outside the state agencies of law enforcement and the criminal justice system. Perez-Valero (2002: 8) argues that the impunity of law-enforcement officers as perpetrators of violence is one of the internal causes of crime and violence in Latin America. Furthermore, crime and violence are associated with a lack of institutional infrastructure including state justice providers, as social mechanisms which exist in traditional societies are absent from newer, urban areas (Perez-Valero 2002: 9). In many areas, predominantly those which are rural, people do not report their problems to the police, let alone seek prosecution when they do. More often they report problems of violence and crime to local religious, ethnic, and traditional leaders who attempt to resolve them informally (UNDP 2005; 2007). In some instances, local armed gangs are brought in to help ‘solve the problem’. In conflict situations it may be the military or higher level government officials.

Thus, this module seeks to find out whether or not people have either informal or formal avenues of redress, and how satisfied they are with these. The list of options has been created based on the different options used in the Barometer Surveys, the ICVS, and the CRISE survey implemented in Indonesia. It includes both informal leaders and state institutions, as well as health officials, civil society organisations, and even local gangs. The police and military have been listed as separate institutions given that in conflict situations the role of these institutions is often very different, where separating the state from the conflict can be difficult. The findings from these questions can then be correlated with the types of crimes and the perpetrators to ascertain where formal and informal systems are functioning, and where, in the eyes of respondents and particularly the poor, these systems are not working or are even detrimental to their feelings of safety and security.

For example Alvazzi del Frate and Van Kesteren (2004: 16) find that property crime tends to be more frequently reported in Western and Central-Eastern Europe, but overall less than half the number of occurring incidents are reported at all in Western Europe and only one third in Central-Eastern Europe (with only one third of these again being satisfied with the performance

of the police). Similar findings on low report rates to police were also found in the survey of 13 African nations.

Part 2: Indicators of incidents of threats to physical safety and security: against person

Part 2 of the module examines threats to physical safety and security against the person. There are six sub-categories used to gauge such incidents which by their very nature involve violence against the person. These include assault without a weapon, assault involving weapons, shootings, injuries involving explosive devices, kidnappings, and sexual assault (not including offensive behaviour). Ideally, there would also be a question on drug-related incidents, however, despite being a significant problem in many parts of the world and in particular Latin America (Perez-Valero 2002) and the Caribbean (UNODC and World Bank 2007), these are not commonly asked in household surveys and require a battery of questions which cannot be asked in such a short module.

For reasons of efficacy, the use of weapons is already incorporated in the questions. It is important to ask about the use of weapons as this is an indicator of the seriousness of an incident and the potential for injury and death. For example, weapons were more frequently present in robberies and assaults compared to other forms of contact crimes in Europe (Alvazzi del Frate and Van Kesteren 2004: 12). In Africa, in 50% of robberies, offenders were armed and in one third of cases weapons were actually used. In 75% of cases of sexual incidents in Zambia weapons were used (Naudé et al. 2006). These findings have important implications for the likelihood of violence and for policy towards arms possession.

Below is a discussion of the logic behind each of the six forms of violence against the person. Again, following the screening question not all of the answer options for ii–xii need to be read out in entirety as respondents will often naturally answer the question and enumerators can then select the appropriate categorical answer to fill in the box.

Table 2: Indicators of incidents of threats to physical safety and security: against person

<p>2. Apart from the previous incidents, in the past five years, have you or any members of you household been the victim of or experienced the following?</p>	<p>i) 0. No 1. Yes 99. Don't know</p>	<p>ii) Was this the same incident as you have told us about previously? If yes, which one? No Yes, 1A Yes, 1B Yes, 1C Yes, 1D Yes, 1E Yes, 2A Yes, 2B Yes, 2C Yes, 2D Yes, 2E Yes, 2F Yes, 2G</p>	<p>iii) If yes, how many times in the last five years did this happen to you or another member of your HH? 1. Once 2. Twice 3. Three times 4. More than three times (LSMS Malawi)</p>	<p>iv) Did anyone die in any of these incidents? ? 0. No 1. Yes 99. Don't know iv) If yes, how many people?</p>	<p>v) If anyone died in any of these incidents, what was their age and gender (choose most recent 2)? 1. Female aged 10 years or younger? 2. Male aged 10 years or younger? 3. Female aged between 11–18 years old 4. Male aged between 11–18 years old 5. Female aged between 19–30 years old 6. Male aged between 19–30 years old? 7. Female aged over 30?</p>	<p>vi) In the last (most recent) incident that occurred, aside from those who were killed, was anyone injured (could not continue their normal activities for more than one day)? 0. No 1. Yes 99. Don't know vii) If yes, how many people were injured in the most recent</p>	<p>viii) If anyone was injured in the most recent incident what was their age and gender (if more than one person choose the most severely injured)? 1. Female aged 10 years or younger? 2. Male aged 10 years or younger? 3. Female aged between 11–18 years old 4. Male aged between 11–18 years old 5. Female aged between 19–30 years old 6. Male aged</p>	<p>ix) The last time this happened, where did this happen (if more than one incident choose the most recent death, or if no deaths occurred, the most recent injury)? 1. Home 2. On street near own home 3. In a public area near a government office/building 4. At school 5. At work 6. On a street/highway not near own home 7. Residential institution 8. Sports / athletic area 9. Industrial or construction site 10. Farm (excluding home)</p>	<p>x) The last time this happened was the perpetrator (s) an individual HH member, another relative, a neighbour who you know, a close friend of you or the family, a person/group of people you only know by sight, someone else (specify), a stranger/group of strangers, or you don't know/didn't see the offender? 1. HH member 2. their relative 3. Neighbour who you know 4. Close friend of you or the family 5. Person you know by sight only 6. Group of people</p>	<p>xi) Who did you report this to (if more than one person/institution, choose the one person/institution which was most important to you)? 0. No 1. Yes to the police 2. Yes, to the military 3. Government official (includes village heads, LGA, state and other, but not police or military) 4. Yes, to informal authorities (traditional leaders, religious leaders, elders, chiefs) 5. Yes, to another HH member 6. Yes to the neighbours 7. Yes, to health officials</p>	<p>xii) If you reported this incident, how satisfied were you with the way they dealt with this problem? 1. Very satisfied 2. Somewhat satisfied 3. Somewhat dissatisfied 4. Very dissatisfied 99) Don't know 88. N/A (for those who did not report it or refuse to answer, or don't know)</p>
---	---	--	---	--	--	--	--	---	--	---	--

						8. Male aged over 30? 99. Don't know 88. N/A 77. Refuses to say	incident? (adapted from WHO guidelines)		between 19–30 years old? 7. Female aged over 30? 8. Male aged over 30? 99. Don't know 88. N/A 77. Refuses to say	11. Commercial area (shop, store, hotel, bar, office) 12. Countryside 13. Nursing home 14. Place of worship 15. Other (specify) 99. Unknown (ICVS/WHO)	who you know by sight only 7. Individual stranger 8. Group of strangers 99 Did not see offender/don't know 77. Refused to answer (ICVS and WHO)	8. Yes to civil society organisations (including women's organisations) 9. Yes to a gang 10. Yes to the media 11. Yes, to a political party 88. Refuses to answer 99. Don't know		
	i)		ii)	iii)	iv)	v) Victim 1	v) Victim 2	vi)	vii)	viii)	ix)	x)	xi)	xii)
A. You or a member of your HH were assaulted (hit, slapped, shoved, punched, pushed, or kicked) without any weapon either inside or outside the home? (WHO)														
B. You or a member of your HH were assaulted (beaten, stabbed, burnt, throttled, or otherwise attacked) with a weapon (e.g. bottle, glass, knife, club, hot liquid, rope) not including being shot by a gun or firearm? (WHO)														
C. Someone shot you or a member of your HH with a firearm or gun? (WHO)														
D. You, or a member of your HH, were kidnapped (taken and held against your will)? (additional)														

E. You, or a member of your HH, were injured by a bomb, Molotov cocktail, landmine or other explosive device? (additional)														
F. I know this is a difficult question for you, so please take a moment to think about it. Have you or a member of your HH experienced a sex act against your will involving either vaginal, oral or anal penetration, or attempts to do so? (WHO)														

Sub-forms of person related crime and violence

Assault and battery Similar to the questions on property related crime and violence, the three questions on different forms of assault and battery are worded in a simple fashion with bracketed examples to explain what each form of violence means. For example, there is a question which asks whether 'you, or a member of your household, were assaulted (hit, slapped, shoved, punched, pushed or kicked)'. The three questions involve different combinations of the use of weapons in the assault. Firearms and guns have been singled out, as identifying the use of firearms has very specific policy implications for firearms legislation, as well as involving a much higher likelihood of serious injury or death. For example the joint UNODC and World Bank report on crime and violence in the Caribbean found that:

The CARICOM Regional Task Force on Crime and Security recently commissioned a report on the proliferation of small arms and light weapons (SALW) in the Caribbean (CARICOM, 2002). The resulting report identified three levels of SALW proliferation in the region: countries with *established* high levels and patterns of armed crime (Jamaica), countries with *emerging* high levels of armed and organized criminality (Guyana, Trinidad and Tobago), and countries with *indications of increased use* and availability of small arms (Antigua and Barbuda, Barbados, Dominica, Grenada, St. Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, St. Vincent and the Grenadines).

UNODC and World Bank (2007: ix)

Conflict-related human-physical violence Two additional questions in the module are on kidnappings and incidents involving explosive devices. These are two further forms of violence common to conflict situations, as is evidenced by communal conflicts in countries such as Nigeria and Indonesia, landmines in warfare in the Middle East and in the past in Cambodia, and more recently bombing by insurgents in conflicts in parts of Latin America and the Middle East.

Sexual assault The final question, albeit sensitive and difficult to ask, is on sexual assault. There is a risk that the interviewee will end the interview prematurely due to the sensitive nature of questions on sexual violence and violence in the household. There are also cross-cultural differences in the interpretations in the meaning of terms associated with sexual violence as was found in the implementation of the ICVS survey across the world (Alvazzi del Frate 1998: 37). In particular, given that there are a wide range of events incorporated in definitions of sexual assault (such as rape and indecent assault), asking about sexual assault in a cross-cultural context can lead to overreporting or underreporting in different contexts depending on how terminology is incorporated. Thus it is imperative that substantial training is given to enumerators on how to ask such sensitive questions, that time is available for trust and reassurance to be built up between enumerator and interviewee, and that the separate concepts involved in defining sexual assault, crime, and incidents not be included in the same question.

Alvazzi del Frate (1998) as well as Naudé et al. (2006) found that when the question was asked to include indecent or offensive behaviour as well as rape, attempted rape, and indecent assaults, the results were not valid given the different cultural interpretations of the question. Also there is a greater likelihood of reporting victimisation by a stranger than someone in the household (Naudé et al. 2006:47). However, sexual violence is a widespread problem occurring in both conflict- and crime-based contexts, and consequently should not be left out. WHO³⁶ proposes a specific question

³⁶ Personal correspondence with WHO representative, 18 May 2007

which reduces the likelihood of cross-cultural misinterpretation which asks specifically about vaginal, anal, or oral penetration against one's will.

For each type of incident the same logic has been used to gauge perpetrators, reporting and satisfaction with action to resolve the problem. However, there are four additional questions pertaining to these incidents.

Questions asked for five-sub forms of person-related crime and violence

Death and injuries The first two questions relate to the number of deaths and injuries pertaining to the incident, modified from surveys such as the ICVS and the LSMS module on security and safety conducted in Malawi. The primary aim of this survey module, as has been discussed from the beginning of this paper, is to supplement pre-existing data on the incidence of violence, and threats both real and perceived to security and safety. In order to do this we need to know overall incidence rates for a particular type of violence/crime, whether the incidents involve deaths or injuries to victims. To reiterate, WHO finds that from high-income countries alone, for every person killed from injury, approximately 30 times as many people are hospitalised from injury, and 300 times as many are treated in hospital emergency rooms and then released (2004a: 1). Thus, it is important to include both injuries and deaths in indicators of security and safety, to truly gauge the size and nature of the problem which may be disguised by only including indicators of deaths in survey instruments. The questions have been framed in the module in order to ascertain this.

Injuries are only ascertained for the most recent event, to avoid problems of recall. The WHO (2004a: 25-28) recommends that in order to provide adequate data for policy and programming purposes, any survey attempting to measure the frequency of violent injuries (both fatal and non-fatal) should include questions which measure: place, activity, mechanism, intent, nature, use of alcohol; relationship between perpetrator and victim, object used to injure the victim, feeling of safety, and weapon carrying.³⁷ For the sake of expediency, the questions in this module do not include questions on violent accidents, the type of weapon, or the use of alcohol. The rest are incorporated into the questions on both property and human-physical crime and violence (although number of deaths is only asked for the types of human-physical-based crime and violence), where physical harm is the intent of the act. The survey is also limited in that it does not collect data on the extent and nature of injuries or the cost of sustaining such injuries for the victim and society at large. The threshold used for ascertaining if an injury has impacted the life of the victim is the loss of one or more days of normal activities as recommended by the WHO guidelines on conducting surveys on injuries and violence.

Unlike measuring the number of injuries, the likelihood of recall of the number of violent deaths in the household over five years is much higher, so this is not restricted to the most recent incident but is asked for all incidents against the person in the previous five years. Some authors argue that it is difficult to separate violent from other non-violent deaths in places such as the Democratic Republic of Congo (Roberts, 2000: 1), where deaths from malnutrition, disease and famine are closely related to the conflict, with 1.7 million excess deaths being attributed to the violence. However, the module

³⁷ It also recommends asking questions on control of temper; history of childhood violence; disability and loss of income and other costs incurred from injury and death; thoughts and plans for committing suicide and number of attempts; medical care and treatment of injury. However, these aspects are not included in the indicators below, primarily due to the fact that these are detailed questions requiring a much larger module for a survey (or a survey exclusively aiming to capture these aspects). For those injuries resulting in death, WHO also recommends attaining information on the age of the victim at the time of death, where the person died, and the time of death. Again these are not included.

in this survey should be conducted in conjunction with other modules on health and disease/illness-related deaths, so that the two can be disaggregated.

Age and gender of victims The third sub-question is on the age and gender of victims. This is restricted to up to the two most recent victims who died and up to two of the most recent victims who were injured to allow for efficient implementation. During the various workshops held to review this module, participants flagged just how important it was to know at least the gender and age of victims in order to be able to understand the nature of violence in areas where it is prevalent in terms of which persons are most vulnerable to this aspect of poverty. This will inform the types of interventions designed and the kinds of services provided as well as the allocation of funding for violence-prevention services.

Location of incident The fourth additional question is the location of the incident, which, unlike the questions pertaining to property, is not incorporated into the type of incident itself. The location of incidents has been included in the survey modules as it is an important indicator of where the poor are at greatest risk, and this information is needed to design programmes for violence prevention and to increase security and safety. For example, from the African ICVS, we know that most motorcycle theft occurs at or near the victims home (100% of cases in Botswana, Namibia, and Zambia), whereas 63% of car thefts occurred at or near the respondents home. There is great variation between countries on the location of violence. This is also the case for sexual violence, where there was great variation in the African ICVS as to whether the incident took place near the person's home or not (Naudé et al. 2006).

Furthermore, it is in this question that we can indirectly measure whether the violence is perpetrated by people in the home, or people associated with institutions such as those in nursing homes, or other state-based institutions without asking the question directly and compromising the likelihood that the survey can be implemented at all. The Multi-cluster Surveys (MICS) already recognise the institutional nature of violence by asking about violence against the elderly in institutional care (UNICEF 2006).

Part 3: Perceptions of safety and violence

Almost all of the surveys either explicitly dealing with violence, or addressing it in a few questions, have a question which asks about feelings of safety and security. Both the ICVS and LSMS ask about how safe people feel after dark and in the home. The Ipsos-Reid survey questions implemented for the HSR ask about the likelihood of victimisation. Questions on weapon-carrying can be an indication of perceived threat as in the WHO guidelines. However, there are arguments to suggest that answers to questions about feelings of safety, security, and fear may be time specific (James 1997), and related to psychological mindset and factors other than real threats to security and safety.

However, perceptions cannot be ignored as indicators of poverty and insecurity. The *Human Security Report* (HSC 2005: 47) argues that human security is about perceptions as well as realities, because perceived threats can trigger interstate wars, violent civil conflict, political oppression and genocide. Governments can sometimes play on people's fears and exaggerate or fabricate threats to provide political justification for war or repression. Media can influence popular perceptions. The HSR also argues (HSC 2005: 47) that bottom-up perspectives are notably absent from human security research and policy agendas; that determining the views of at-risk populations is also necessary to assess the scale and nature of the insecurities they face; and that the most repressive regimes maintain control by creating a climate of fear but seldom resort to actual violence. In its own poll, it found that neither war nor terrorism were the greatest source of fear amongst the 6,000 polled, but rather

criminal violence (HSC 2005: 51). This relates to the views of Horowitz (2000), who sees ethnicity ‘as reconfigured social memory of the past’ and ‘fears for the future’ as important in defining relationships between ethnic groups, with group fear being a key aspect of conflict.

Table 3: Perceptions of safety and violence

<p>3. In the next twelve months, what is the likelihood that you will become a victim of one of the forms of violence mentioned above? (HSR-Ipsos-Reid)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Very likely 2. Somewhat likely 3. Somewhat unlikely 4. Very unlikely 	i)	<p>ii) Is it more likely to be:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Against person 2. Against property 3. Both 4. None 	ii)
<p>4. Compared to five years ago, has the level of violence in the neighbourhood where you live increased, decreased or stayed the same? (adapted from CRISE surveys)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Increased a lot 2. Increased a little 3. Stayed about the same 4. Decreased a little 5. Decreased a lot 			
<p>5. How safe do you feel walking down the street after dark in the area where you live? (Social Capital, WHO)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Very safe 2. Moderately safe 3. Neither safe nor unsafe 4. Moderately unsafe 5. Very unsafe 			
<p>6. There are many different potential threats and dangers to people’s personal security in today’s world. Thinking of all the threats that you might face in your life, which two (ranked) is of the most concern to you now? (HSR-Ipsos-Reid)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Criminal violence 2. Inter-communal violence 3. Armed warfare/conflict 4. Terrorism 5. Death, or incapacitation from natural disasters, health, or economic problems 6. Other 7. None 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. (Most important) 2. (Second most important) 		

Furthermore, the actual incidence of violence may not be the only indicator of future violence. Richards (cf. Banerjee 2001) argues that non-violence can be a way of waging war, and that violent wars and peace should not be considered as sharp categorisations but rather as a continuum (Richards 2005). Some conflicts have non-violent outcomes but they are by no means peaceful, as they can be fraught with communal tension and oppression, having the potential to escalate into violence. The HSR also found that past experience is rarely in line with their expectations of future violence (HSC 2005: 52). Thus, it is important to ask about perceptions and fears of victimisation as well as real rates.

Given these arguments, four questions are included on perceptions in Part 4 of this module (see Table 3). This is the first time that conflict is asked about directly, and thus it has been placed at the end of the module in case the respondent prematurely ends the interview. The first and final questions have been adapted from the questions asked for the HSR to reflect both crime and conflict and other threats, and to distinguish between different types of conflict. Further disaggregation can be made between victimisation involving property, person or both. The first and final questions seek to gauge what problem is considered most serious in the region where the survey is being implemented in order to provide some context to victimisation rates established from the previous questions, as well as perceptions of the relative seriousness of different types of problems. The second question looks at perceptions of changes over time which is useful for retroactive data collection when there is no baseline survey. The third question gauges people's perception of safety at night as a proxy for current perceptions of safety in the location where people live.

Domestic violence

In the past, almost each and every woman was treated unbecomingly such as being verbally abused, beaten up and left abandoned by her husband, while at the moment beating was rare.... The very rude treatment of husbands against their wives in the old days was likely due to the fact that many of them were jobless, idle and resorted to drinking, gambling and womanizing.

— Malang, Indonesia, *Voices of the Poor* study, Narayan et al. 2000

Almost every study which includes modules on domestic violence indicates that while possible, it is difficult to ask such sensitive questions in all cultural contexts. This is similar to the question on sexual assault outlined above (García-Moreno et al. 2005: xii). The results of the study on sexual assault outlined above indicate that violence by a male intimate partner (also called 'domestic violence') is widespread in all of the countries included in the study. However, there was a great deal of variation from country to country, and from setting to setting. This indicates that this form of violence is not inevitable.

According to the WHO multi-country study on women's health and domestic violence the proportion of ever-partnered women who had ever suffered physical violence by a male intimate partner ranged from 13% in a Japanese city to 61% in a Peruvian province, with most sites falling between 23% and 49%. The prevalence of severe physical violence (a woman being hit with a fist, kicked, dragged, choked, burnt on purpose, threatened with a weapon, or having a weapon used against her) ranged from 4% in a Japanese city to 49% in a Peruvian province. The vast majority of women physically abused by partners experienced acts of violence more than once. The *Voices of the Poor* study conducted by the World Bank found domestic violence to be a significant problem for women:

Women often felt reluctant to talk about some issues such as violence against women inside and outside the home and family planning except in smaller more intimate groups.
—Bangladesh 1996 – Narayan et al. 2000: 22

Furthermore, Perez-Valero (2002: 11) argues that gender stereotypes which reinforce the notion of the right of husbands to control and sometimes beat their wives constitute a key cause of violence in Latin America.

Two surveys targeting women have special modules on domestic violence which are asked to women only by specially trained enumerators. The MICS conducted by UNICEF asks about attitudes to domestic violence and finds a high correlation between attitudes and incidents (UNICEF 2006). The Demographic and Health Survey (DHS) has an extensive module which also asks questions on both the incidence of domestic violence and attitudes towards it. However, in both surveys these are optional modules not asked in all countries. These surveys are a first step, and this paper argues that, given the evidence of a variety of experts working on human security, violence and safety, domestic violence modules should become a standard and if possible a compulsory module of MICS and DHS surveys. Given the limited space in this module, this paper recommends using a modified version of the DHS survey with some extra sub-questions and that it be incorporated as a core-module of surveys already dealing with this issue such as the DHS and MICS. Ideally similar questions on violence against children and the elderly in the home would also be asked. Part 2 of the survey module proposed in this paper can capture some basic data on the incidence of domestic violence by cross-tabulating types of violence against the person with either the perpetrator or location (in the home). This is adequate for determining correlations with other types of victimisation and poverty data. More extensive questions on domestic violence should be saved for the survey instruments that undertake more extensive data collection on health issues.

This paper advocates the use of a modified version of the DHS module on domestic violence which has a range of severity of domestic violence questions which can be easily translated across different cultural contexts, without actually using the term ‘domestic violence’. The DHS survey also asks about the frequency of violence. The extra questions added to the module on reporting and satisfaction with the action taken follow the same reasoning for including these questions in the survey module discussed above. Given the nature of domestic violence and the fact that in some countries it is legislated as a crime, and in others it is not, this paper recommends that the module also incorporate questions on whether the respondent thinks the incident should be punished and by whom. This helps gauge the cultural attitudes towards the violence independent of state legislation, as well as the realm in which people think the problem should be dealt with (assuming they do) which is important for policy makers. (See Table 4.)

The Quick Module

Below, in Table 5, a shortened version of the survey is presented to be implemented in under five minutes. Each type of violence can potentially proxy for other types. However, if this survey module is implemented on a worldwide scale it will not capture some of the types of violence relevant to different contexts such as kidnapping. It does not include the questions on sexual violence, the age and gender of victims, the satisfaction with reporting. It only has one question on perceptions.

Table 4: Domestic violence: recommended to add to health modules

<p>Has any member of you household ever done any of the following things to you?</p> <p>(Adapted from DHS)</p>	<p>i) 0) No 1) Yes 99) Don't know</p>	<p>ii) How often did this happen during the last 12 months: often, only sometimes, or not at all?</p> <p>1. Often 2. Only sometimes 3. Not at all</p>	<p>iii) Do you think such acts should be punished?</p> <p>0) No 1) Yes 99) Don't know</p> <p>(additional question)</p>	<p>iv) If yes, by whom should the person be punished (if more than one, choose the one which was most important to you)?</p> <p>A. Police B. Military C. Religious leader/ Traditional leaders /elders /chiefs/ village heads D. Government officials E. NGO/CSO F. Local armed gangs G. Media H. Political party I. Doctor, health official J. Other household member K. Other (specify) L. Don't know (additional question)</p>	<p>v) In the most recent incident, who did you report this to (if more than one person/ institution, choose the one which was most important to you)?</p> <p>1) Police 2) Military 3) Religious leader/ Traditional leaders /elders /chiefs/ village heads 4) Government officials 5) NGO/CSO 6) Local armed gangs 7) Media 8) Political party 9) Doctor, health official 10) Other household member 11) Other (specify) 12) Did not report it 99) Don't know (additional question adapted from Barometers/ICVS)</p>	<p>vi) If you reported this incident, how satisfied were you with the way they dealt with this problem?</p> <p>1) Very satisfied 2) Somewhat satisfied 3) Somewhat dissatisfied 4) Very dissatisfied 99) Don't know 88) N/A (for those who did not report it) (additional question from ICVS)</p>
A) Push you, shake you, or throw something at you?						
B) Slap you?						
C) Twist your arm or pull your hair?						
D) Punch you with his fist or something that could hurt you?						
E) Kick you, drag you, or beat you up?						
F) Try to choke you or burn you on purpose?						
G) Threaten to attack you with a knife, gun, or any other weapon?						
H) Physically force you to have intercourse with him even when you don't want to?						
I) Force you to perform any sexual acts you did not want to?						

Table 5: Quick module on physical safety and security

<p>1. In the past 5 years, have you or any members of your household been the victim of or experienced the following?</p>	<p>i) 0. No 1. Yes 99. Don't know</p>	<p>ii) Was this the same incident as you have told us about previously? If yes, which one? 1. No 2. Yes, 1A 3. Yes, 1B 4. Yes, 1C 5. Yes, 1D 6. Yes, 1E 7. Yes, 2A 8. Yes, 2B 9. Yes, 2C 10. Yes, 2D 11. Yes, 2E 12. Yes, 2F 13. Yes, 2G</p>	<p>ii) If yes=> how many times in the last five years did this happen to you or another member of your household? 1. Once 2. Twice 3. Three times 4. More than three times</p>	<p>iii) Did anyone die in any of these incidents? 0. No 1. Yes 99. Don't know</p>	<p>iv) If yes, how many people?</p>	<p>v) The last time it happened where did it occur? 1. Home (around home) 2. On street near own home 3. In a public area near a government office/building 4. At school 5. At work 6. On a Street/ highway not near own home 7. Residential institution 8. Sports and athletic area 9. Industrial or construction site 10. Farm (excluding home) 11. Commercial area (shop, store, hotel, bar, office) 12. Countryside 13. Nursing home 14. Place of worship 15. Other (specify) 88. Refuses to answer 99. Don't know</p>	<p>vi) The last time this happened, can you tell me who was the perpetrator or give me a broad description of whether they were an individual, a group, people you knew or strangers? 1. HH member 2. Other relative 3. Neighbour who you know 4. Close friend of you or the family 5. Person you know by sight only 6. Group of people who you know by sight only 7. Individual stranger 8. Group of strangers 99. Did not see offender/don't know 77. Refused to answer</p>	<p>vii) In the last (most recent) incident that occurred, aside from those who were killed, was anyone injured (could not continue their normal activities for more than one day)? 0. No 1. Yes 99. Don't know</p>	<p>viii) If yes, how many people were injured in the most recent incident?</p>	<p>ix) Did you report it, and if so who to? 0. No 1. Yes to the police 2. Yes, to the military 3. Government official (includes village heads, LGA, state and other, but not police or military) 4. Yes, to informal authorities (traditional leaders, religious leaders, elders, chiefs) 5. Yes, to another household member 6. Yes to the neighbours 7. Yes, to health officials 8. Yes to civil society organisations (including women's organisations) 9. Yes to a gang 10. Yes to the media 11. Yes, to a political party 88. Refuses to answer 99. Don't know</p>
--	--	---	--	--	--	--	--	---	---	--

Part 1 – Property	i)	ii)	iii)	iv)	v)	vi)	vii)	viii)	ix)
A. Someone got into your house, flat, or dwelling, without permission and stole or tried to steal something?									
B. Someone stole something you own (not stored in the dwelling) such as vehicles, parts or contents of vehicles, motorbikes, mopeds, scooters, machinery, pumps, bicycles, store property, livestock, and so on? (not stored in the dwelling)									
C. Someone deliberately destroyed or damaged your home, shop, or any other property that you or a member of your household owns?									

Part 2 – Person									
D. You or a member of your household were hit, slapped, shoved, punched, pushed, or kicked without any weapon either inside or outside the home?									
E. You or a member of your household were beaten, stabbed, burnt, throttled, or otherwise attacked with a weapon (eg. Bottle, glass, knife, club, hot liquid, rope) not including being shot by a gun or firearm?									
F. Someone shot you or a member of your household with a firearm or gun?									
G. You or a member of your household was injured by an explosive device such as a bomb, Molotov cocktail, landmine or something similar?									

2. In the next twelve months, what is the likelihood that you will become a victim of one of the forms of violence mentioned above? (HSR-Ipsos-Reid)	i)		ii) Is it more likely to be:	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Very likely 2. Somewhat likely 3. Somewhat unlikely 4. Very unlikely 			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Against person 2. Against property 3. Both 4. None 	

What kinds of indicators can this data produce?

With careful sampling and survey implementation, below are just some of the indicators of security and safety that can be produced from the data obtained from the longer survey module presented above, in combination with the other modules of poverty measurement. These include the incidence of violence, risk and vulnerability to violence, reporting and response to violence, perceptions and attitudes towards violence, and the impacts of violence if measured in combination with other dimensions of poverty. This list is not exhaustive but provides an indication of potential indicators.

Frequency of violence and threats to security

- Rates of different types of theft per 100,000 head of population;
- Rates of robbery per 100,000 head of population;
- Rates of homicide, assault, and battery per 100,000 head of population;
- Rates of different forms of rape and attempted rape per 100,000 head of population;
- Rates of property destruction per 100,000 head of population;
- Rates of kidnapping, gunshot crimes, and bomb injuries and deaths per 100,000 head of population;
- Rates of gunshot injuries and deaths per 100,000 head of population;
- Rates of domestic violence against women (with varying intensities of acts perpetrated), if incorporated into health survey instruments.

Risk and vulnerability

- Risk of certain types of violence vis-à-vis experience of victimisation in other types of violence
- Geographic risk rates (risk of people living in different geographic location to different types of violence);
- Risk of injury/death per type of violence (injury/death as percentage of frequency of type);
- Victim profiles by age, gender, location, and type of perpetrator;
- Perpetrator profiles (percentage of type of perpetrator per type of violence);
- Correlations between: gender and vulnerability to different types of violence; ethnic, religious, and other identities and vulnerability to different types of violence; injury and likelihood of death; different types of violence and likelihood of injury;
- Risk of experiencing different types of violence based on type of employment, level of consumption, level of education, etc.

Reporting and response

- Percentage of population reporting violent incidents to informal or formal institutions (per type, including domestic violence);
- Reporting gap (frequency of reporting as a proportion of frequency of incident);
- Percentage of population satisfied with informal institutions' role in addressing violence;
- Percentage of population satisfied with state agencies' role in addressing violence;
- Perceived appropriate policy realm for responding to different types of violence.

Perceptions and attitudes

- Attitudes of women towards punishment of domestic violence (proportions of intensity of domestic violence experience against attitude towards punishment, including most appropriate domain for punishment);
- Perception of likelihood of future victimisation (of property violence or human-physical violence);
- Perception of the importance of different types of violence together with other forms of shock.

Impacts (as measured with other dimensions of poverty)

- Impact of different types of violence on level of shame and humiliation;
- Impact of different types of violence on consumption, over time;
- Impact of different types of violence on continued education;
- Impact of different types of violence on perception of likelihood of future violence;
- Impact of different types of violence on access to health care and cost of health care;
- Correlations between social capital and types of responses to violence;
- Impact of violence on eudemonia;
- Impact of violent contexts on job security.

Conclusion

Vulnerability to violence, insecurity and poor safety is an important dimension of poverty. However, there are inadequate data which are comparable across contexts and oftentimes in specific contexts to properly inform poverty-alleviation and violence-prevention programmes.

This module, while respecting the difficulties of realistic time and space limitations faced by governments and agencies implementing multi-topic individual or household surveys, can provide data which can be correlated with other measures of the different dimensions of poverty such as income, education, health, eudemonia, shame and humiliation, informal employment, and empowerment indicators. The kinds of research questions the data will be able to answer include:

- Questions on safety and security from property-related crime/violence and human physical violence over a five-year period including the number of incidents, number of people injured, the perpetrators, reporting the incident and satisfaction with the action taken, the number of deaths related to violence against the person and the location of the incident;
- Perceptions of safety from violence and security: perception of likelihood of being a victim of violent crime or conflict in the next year (either property- or person-related), perception of greatest threat to human security in terms of crime, conflict and other issues.
- Hypothesis-testing, and other analyses of the interconnections between any other dimensions of poverty and the aspects of safety and security measured here, either across groups and sub-groups, or over time, or internationally; and
- Recommendations for health modules on how to measure incidents of domestic violence of different intensities of violence against women taking place within the household, attitudes towards whether the act should be punished and by whom, reporting of the problem, and satisfaction with how the problem was dealt with.

With this information, ideally programmes and policy across a variety of contexts will be better informed allowing for better targeting and ultimately one form of poverty alleviation. Numerous indicators of security and safety could be generated from these data, in combination with the other modules typically found in household surveys. These include: the incidence of the different types of violence (normally calculated per 100,000 individuals); the risk and vulnerability of different groups to violence depending on their identity, age, gender and location; victims and perpetrator profiles disaggregated by type of violence; rates of reporting violence; perceptions and attitudes towards violence; and the relationship between violence and other dimensions of poverty. This information should serve to inform policy to alleviate poverty generally and bolster human safety and security in particular.

Bibliography

- Alvazzi del Frate, A. 1998. 'Victims of Crime in the Developing World', No. 57, Rome: UNICRI.
- Alvazzi del Frate, A. and Van Kesteren, J. N. 2004. *Criminal Victimisation in Urban Europe. Key findings of the 2000 International Crime Victims Survey*. Turin: UNICRI.
- Anderson, B. 1991. *Imagined Communities* (rev. edn) London: Verso.
- Badan Pusat Statistik (BPS) 2004. *Dampak Konflik Horizontal di Kabupaten Poso*. BPS: Sulawesi Tengah.
- Banerjee, M. 2001. *The Pathan Unarmed*. Oxford: James Curry.
- Barron, P., Diprose, R. and Woolcock, M. 2006. 'Local Conflict and Community Development in Indonesia: Assessing the Impact of the Kecamatan Development Program (KDP) on Local Conflict and Conflict Management Capacity', *CPR Working Paper*, Washington DC: World Bank.
- Bates, R. H. 2000. *Prosperity and Violence: The Political Economy of Development*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co.
- Brubaker, R. and Laitin, D. D. 1998. 'Ethnic and Nationalist Violence', *Annual Review of Sociology*, 24: 423-52.
- Collier, P. and Hoeffler, A. 1998. 'On the Economic Causes of Civil War', *Oxford Economic Papers*, 50: 563-73.
- Collier, P. and Hoeffler, A. 2001. 'Greed and Grievance in Civil War', *World Bank Policy Research Working Paper 2355*, Washington DC: World Bank.
- Daniel, E. V. 1994. 'The Individual in Terror', in T. J. Csordas (ed.) *Embodiment and Experience*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Das, V., Kleinman, A., Ramphele, M. and Reynolds, P. (eds) 2000. *Violence and Subjectivity*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- de Waal, A. 1989. *Famines That Kill*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- della Porta, D. and Diani, M. 1999. *Social Movements: An Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Diprose, R. 2004. *Conflict Pathways in Indonesia: Conflict, Violence, and Development Programs in East Java*. Jakarta: World Bank Office.
- Diprose, R. 2007. 'Physical Safety and Security: A Proposal for Internationally Comparable Indicators of Violence', *Oxford Development Studies*, 35 (4): 431-58.
- Diprose, R., Deeks, P. and Invong, S. 2005. *Dispute Resolution and Commune Councils in Cambodia: A Study of Conflict and Best Practices for Peace*. Cambodia: The Asia Foundation.
- Drèze, J. and Sen, A. 1989. *Hunger and Public Action*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Drèze, J. and Sen, A. 2002. *India: Development and Participation*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Easterly, W. 1999. 'Life During Growth', *Journal of Economic Growth*, 4 (3): 239-75.

- Easterly, W. 2001. 'Can Institutions Resolve Ethnic Conflict?', *Economic Development and Cultural Change* 49 (4): 687-706.
- Easterly, W. 2002. 'Polarized Peoples', in *The Elusive Quest for Growth: Economists' Adventures and Misadventures in the Tropics*. Cambridge MA: MIT Press.
- Elbadawi, I. 1999. 'Civil Wars and Poverty: The Role of External Interventions, Political Rights and Economic Growth'. Paper given at the World Bank Development Economic Research Group Conference on 'Civil Conflicts, Crime, and Violence', Washington DC, July.
- Eriksen, T. H. 1993. *Ethnicity and Nationalism: Anthropological Perspectives*. London: Pluto Press.
- Esman, M. and Herring, R. J. (eds) 2001. *Carrots, Sticks, and Ethnic Conflict: Rethinking Development Assistance*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Fearon, J. D. and Laitin, D. D. 1996. 'Explaining Interethnic Cooperation', *American Political Science Review*, 90 (4): 715-35.
- García-Moreno, C., Jansen, H. A. F. M., Ellsberg, M., Heise, L. and Watts, C. 2005. *WHO Multi-country Study on Women's Health and Domestic Violence against Women*. Geneva: World Health Organisation.
- Gleditsch, N. P., Cappelen, A. and Bjerkholt, O. 1994. *The Wages of Peace: Disarmament in a Small Industrialized Economy*. Oslo: Sage Publications for PRIO.
- Grootaert, C., Narayan, D., Jones, V. N. and Woolcock, M. 2004. *Measuring Social Capital: An Integrated Questionnaire*. Washington DC: World Bank.
- Gurr, T. R. 1993. *Minorities at Risk: A Global View of Ethnopolitical Conflicts*. Washington DC: Institute of Peace Press.
- Gurr, T. R. 2000a. 'Ethnic Warfare on the Wane', *Foreign Affairs*, 79 (3): 52-64.
- Gurr, T. R. 2000b. *People versus States: Minorities at Risk in the New Century*. Washington DC: Institute of Peace Press.
- Gurr, T. R., Marshall, M. G. and Khosla, D. 2000. *Peace and Conflict 2001: A Global Survey of Armed Conflicts, Self-Determination Movements, and Democracy*. College Park MD: Center for International Development and Conflict Management, University of Maryland.
- Hegre, H., Elingsen, T., Gates, S. and Gleditsch, N. P. 2001. 'Towards a Democratic Civil Peace? Democracy, Political Change, and Civil War, 1816-1992', *American Political Science Review*, 95 (1): 3-41.
- Homer-Dixon, T. 1994. 'Environmental Scarcities and Violent Conflict: Evidence from Cases', *International Security*, 19 (1): 5-40.
- Horowitz, D. L. 2000. *Ethnic Groups in Conflict*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Human Security Centre 2005. *Human Security Report 2005: War and Peace in the 21st Century*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press for the University of British Columbia.
- IDASA-CDD-Michigan State University MSU. 2000-Present. *Afrobarometer Surveys* <http://www.afrobarometer.org/index.html>, accessed 17 April 2007.
- Igwara, O. 2001. 'Dominance and Difference: Rival Visions of Ethnicity in Nigeria', *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 24 (1): 86-103.
- Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research ICPSR. 1974-Present. *Eurobarometer Surveys* http://www.gesis.org/en/data_service/eurobarometer/, accessed 11 April, 2007.
- ILO Centre for Population Studies 2006. *Mozambique's People's Security Surveys PSS Mozambique*. Italy, May, <http://www.ilo.org/public/english/protection/ses/activity/survey.htm>, accessed on 30 July 2007.
- Ipsos-Public Affairs (n.d.) *Ipsos Reid Poll* Human Security Centre.
- James, W. 1997. 'The Names of Fear: Memory, History, and the Ethnography of Feeling Among Uduk Refugees', *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, 3 (1): 115-131.
- Keen, D. 1998. *The Economic Functions of Violence in Civil Wars*. Oxford: Oxford University Press for the International Institute for Strategic Studies.

- Lacina, B. and Gleditsch, N. P. 2005. 'Monitoring Trends in Global Combat: A New Dataset on Battle Deaths 2005', *European Journal of Population*, 21 (2-3): 145-166.
- Latinobarómetro, C. 1995-2004. *Latinobarometer Questionnaires Master Version, English*. <http://www.latinobarometro.org>, accessed 16 April 2007.
- Mack, A. 2002. 'Civil War: Academic Research and the Policy Community', *Journal of Peace Research*, 395: 515-25.
- Mancini, L. 2005. 'Horizontal Inequality and Communal Violence: Evidence from Indonesian Districts', *CRISE Working Paper 22*, Oxford: Queen Elizabeth House, University of Oxford.
- Nafziger, E. W. and Auvinen, J. 2002. 'Economic Development, Inequality, War and State Violence', *World Development*, 30 (2): 153-163.
- Narayan, D., Chambers, R., Shah, M. K. and Petesch, P. 2000. *Voice of the Poor: Crying Out for Change*. New York: Oxford University Press for the World Bank.
- National Taiwan University (NTU) and Institute of Political Science of Academia Sinica. 2000-Present. *Asian Barometer Surveys* <http://www.asianbarometer.org/>, accessed 13 April 2007.
- Naudé, C. M. B., Prinsloo, J. H. and Ladikos, A. 2006. *Experiences of crime in Thirteen African Countries: Results from the International Crime Victim Survey*. Turin, UNODC-UNICRI.
- Pal, M. S. 2001. *Perceptions of the Poor: Poverty Consultations in Four Districts in Sri Lanka*. Manila: Asian Development Bank.
- Perez-Valero, T. 2002. *A Latin American Perspective on Crime and Insecurity in the Continent*. New York: Commission on Human Security.
- Press Trust of India PTI. 2007. 'Poverty Not a Cause of Violence: Amartya Sen', *The Hindu* Durban.
- Richards, P. (ed.) 2005. *No Peace No War: An Anthropology of Contemporary Armed Conflicts*. Oxford: James Currey.
- Roberts, L. 2000. *Mortality in Eastern DRC: Results from Five Mortality Surveys*. Bukavu/New York: International Rescue Committee.
- Sen, A. 1981. *Poverty and Famines: An Essay on Entitlement and Deprivation*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Sen, A. K. 2001. 'Global Inequality and Persistent Conflicts', paper given at Nobel Peace Prize Symposium, Oslo.
- Sen, A. K. 2006. *Identity and Violence: The Illusion of Destiny*, H. L. Gates (ed.). New York: W. W. Norton & Co.
- SIPRI 1990. *SIPRI Yearbook 1990: World Armament and Disarmament*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sivard, R. 1986. *World Military and Social Expenditures* 11th edn. Washington DC: World Priorities.
- Stewart, F. 2000. 'Crisis Prevention: Tackling Horizontal Inequalities', *Oxford Development Studies*, 28 (3): 245-62.
- Stewart, F. 2002. 'Horizontal Inequalities: A Neglected Dimension of Development', *QEH Working Paper Series 81*, Oxford: Queen Elizabeth House, University of Oxford.
- Stewart, F., Brown, G. and Mancini, L. 2005. 'Why Horizontal Inequalities Matter: Some Implications for Measurement', *CRISE Working Paper 19*, Oxford: Queen Elizabeth House, University of Oxford.
- Stewart, F. and Fitzgerald, V. 2001. *War and Underdevelopment: The Economic and Social Consequences of Conflict*, F. Stewart (ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tilly, C. 2003. *The Politics of Collective Violence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tschoegl, L., Below, R. and Guha-Sapir, D. 2006. *An Analytical Review of Selected Data Sets on Natural Disasters and Impacts*. Brussels: Centre for Research on the Epidemiology of Disasters CRED.
- UN 2006. *The Millennium Development Goals Report*. New York, United Nations.
- UNDP 1999, 2000, 2001. *Human Development Report*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- UNDP 2005. *Pathways to Justice: Access to Justice with a Focus on Poor, Women and Indigenous Peoples*. Phnom Penh: UNDP Cambodia and the Ministry of Justice.
- UNDP 2007. *Access to Justice for All? An Assessment of Access to Justice in Five Provinces of Indonesia*. New York: UNDP.
- UNICEF 1995-Present. *Multi-Cluster Surveys MICS*. www.childinfo.org/mics/, accessed 12 April 2007.
- UNICEF 2006. *Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey Manual 2005: Monitoring the Situation of Women and Children*. New York: UNICEF.
- United Nations 2000. 'United Nations Millennium Declaration', in *United Nations General Assembly 55/2*: <http://www.un.org/millennium/declaration/ares552e.htm>, accessed April 9 2007.
- UNODC 2005. *Questionnaire for the Ninth United Nations Survey on Crime Trends and Operations of Criminal Justice Systems, covering the period 2003-2004*. New York: UNODC.
- UNODC and World Bank 2007. *Crime, Violence, and Development: Trends, Costs, and Policy Options in the Caribbean*, No. 37820. New York and Washington DC: UNODC and World Bank.
- UNODC/UNICRI 1989-Present. 'International Crime Victims Surveys', www.unicri.it/wvd/analysis/icvs/, accessed 15 April 2007.
- USAID 1985-Present. *Demographic and Health Surveys DHS*. <http://www.measuredhs.com/>, accessed 10 April 2007.
- Uvin, P. 1998. *Aiding Violence: The Development Enterprise in Rwanda*. West Hartford CT: Kumarian Press.
- Uvin, P. 2002. 'The Development/Peacebuilding Nexus: A Typology and History of Changing Paradigms', *Journal of Peacebuilding and Development*, 1 (1): 5-24.
- Van Dijk, J. J. M., Manchin, R., Van Kesteren, J., Nevala, S. and Hideg, G. 2005. *The Burden of Crime in the EU, A Comparative Analysis of the European Survey of Crime and Safety (EU ICS) 2005*. Brussels: EU ICS.
- Varshney, A., Panggabean, R. and Tadjoeuddin, M. Z. 2004. 'Patterns of Collective Violence in Indonesia 1990-2003', *Working Paper 04/03*, Jakarta: UNSFIR.
- WHO 1999. *Injury: A Leading Cause of the Global Burden of Disease*. Geneva: World Health Organisation.
- WHO 2002. *World Report on Violence and Health*, E. G. Krug et al. (eds). Geneva: WHO.
- WHO 2004a. *The Economic Dimensions of Interpersonal Violence*. Geneva: World Health Organisation.
- WHO 2004b. *Guidelines for Conducting Community Surveys on Injuries and Violence*, D. Sethi et al. (eds) Geneva: World Health Organisation.
- WHO 2005. *Milestones of a Global Campaign for Violence Prevention 2005: Changing the Face of Violence Prevention*. Geneva: World Health Organisation.
- WHO 2007. *World Health Survey 2002*. Geneva: World Health Organisation, <http://www.who.int/healthinfo/survey/instruments/en/index.html> accessed on 30 July 2007.
- Wolf, E. 1964. *Anthropology*. Englewood Cliffs NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Wolf, E. 1999. *Envisioning Power: Ideologies of Dominance and Crisis*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Woodroffe, J. and Ellis-Jones, M. 2000. *States of Unrest: Resistance to IMF Policies in Poor Countries*. London: World Development Movement.
- World Bank 1980-Present. *Living Standards Measurement Survey* <http://www.worldbank.org/lsms/>, accessed 7 April 2007.

Appendix 1 – Summary of Questionnaires, Indicators, and Recommendations

Survey Instruments	What indicator(s) of violence, safety and security appear on the survey?	Recommendations of accommodating these questions in the module	How many countries has it been used in?	Access to the data?	Website or data source file
LSMS Core	In Health Module: on injuries incurred (asked together with illness)	Not recommended as not specific enough, and questions are already asked in general health module	Most countries where LSMS has been conducted	Yes	www.worldbank.org/LSMS/
LSMS Module on Security and Safety	Questions on crime, rural crime, perceptions of safety and security	A selection of questions have been included in the module, particularly to do with theft of livestock and crops common to rural areas	Full module = 1, Malawi. Some questions on impact of conflict in selected questions in LSMS Bosnia-Herzegovina	Yes	www.worldbank.org/LSMS/
MICS	Questions on attitudes towards domestic violence, female genital mutilation, child discipline.	Not recommended for this module as already asked in an international survey with adequate training in sensitive interview techniques for women. Prefer DHS module question on actual incidence of domestic violence against women.	67 countries across the world	Yes, by request	www.childinfo.org/mics/
Afrobarometer	Country's most important problem; crime in the past year including theft, assault, and arrest for you or member of family. Confidence/trust in authorities, who do you go to for problem solving.	We recommend the questions on crime and change be modified to the household and made more comprehensive. This question should be asked in terms of real incidents and general trends. We recommend using the similar question on most important problems from the HSR. For questions of how problems are solved, we recommend this is restricted to violent crimes only, and ask about satisfaction with performance	During Round 1, from July 1999 through June 2001, Afrobarometer surveys were conducted in 12 countries. Round 2 surveys were conducted from May 2002 through October 2003 in 15 countries. Round 3 surveys were conducted in 18 countries from March 2005 through February 2006. Additional time series data have also been collected in five countries.	Yes	http://www.afrobarometer.org/
Latinobarometer	Assaulted, attacked or victim of crime in family. Perceptions of changes in crime levels in last 12 months. Country's most important problem. Confidence/trust in authorities, who do you go to for problem solving. Law abidingness of citizens	We recommend the questions on crime and change be modified to the household and made more comprehensive. This question should be asked in terms of real incidents and general trends. We recommend using the similar question on most important problems from the HSR. For questions of how problems are solved, we recommend this is restricted to violent crimes only, ask about satisfaction with performance. Don't ask question on law abidingness of citizens.	18 Countries in Latin America in 2004. 8 Countries in Latin America in 1995. Bolivia, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Ecuador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, Uruguay, Argentina, Brazil, Venezuela, Columbia, Chile, Paraguay	No, must pay for data or analyse in limited form online	http://www.latinobarometro.org/index
Asianbarometer	Only on specific question on crime similar to latinobarometer	We recommend this question, in modified form.	12 East Asian political systems (Japan, Mongolia, South Korea, Taiwan, Hong Kong, China, the Philippines, Thailand, Vietnam, Cambodia, Singapore, and Indonesia), and 5 South Asian countries (India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka, and Nepal). One survey in Mainland China, Hong Kong, Japan, India, Bangladesh, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Nepal, Singapore, Indonesia. Two rounds of surveys in Taiwan, South Korea, the Philippines, Thailand, and Mongolia.	Yes, by application to organisation, or online analysis	http://www.asianbarometer.org
Eurobarometer	Only on specific question on crime similar to latinobarometer	We recommend this question, in modified form.	30 countries or territories: the 25 Member States, the two acceding countries (Bulgaria and Romania), the two candidate countries (Croatia and Turkey) and the Turkish Cypriot Community.	Reports only	http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/
International Crime and Victimization surveys (ICVS)	Asks detailed questions on the number of times people in household have: ownership of cars, theft of cars, theft from cars, car vandalism; ownership of motorcycles, theft of motorcycles; ownership and theft of bicycles;	Consider all of these dimensions of indicators of crime and accommodate in one-two questions with sub sections only	The International Crime Victim Survey (ICVS). Since 1989, through the four 'sweeps' of the ICVS, standardised victimisation surveys have been carried out in more than	Yes, 2000	www.unicri.it/wwd/analysis/civs/

Survey Instruments	What indicator(s) of violence, safety and security appear on the survey?	Recommendations of accommodating these questions in the module	How many countries has it been used in?	Access to the data?	Website or data source file
	burglary, attempted burglary; robbery; personal theft involving force; sexual offences (includes touch and rape all in one); assaults and threats. Asks about where this happened; was it reported to police; satisfaction with police response; reasons for dissatisfaction; seriousness of the incidence for the household; why not reported. For victims of robbery: weapons used. For victims of sexual offences: no of people involved, relationship with offender, weapons used, how the person classifies the crime, if they regard it as a crime. For victims of assaults/ threats: no of people involved, relationship with offender, weapons used, just threatened or force used, injury, medical help sought, regard it as a crime. Includes module on consumer crime. Then questions on comparisons over time of crime prevention, perceptions of safety, police's performance, sentences for offenders, how to reduce crime amongst young people, ownership of weapons, why owned. In general, questions are asked for period of the last 5 years		70 countries across the world. Mainly conducted in European and industrialised nations and urban areas.		
European Crime and Safety Survey	Based on the ICVS outlined above	Same recommendations as the ICVS	Implemented by Gallup Europe in Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, and the UK	No, by request	www.gallup-europe.be/euics/
African ICVS	Based on the ICVS outlined above, with added questions on livestock theft and car hijacking	Same recommendations as the ICVS, also include question on livestock theft	Botswana (twice); Egypt, Lesotho, Mozambique, Namibia, Nigeria, South Africa (four times), Swaziland, Tanzania, Tunisia, Uganda, Zambia, and Zimbabwe	No, by request	www.unodc.org/pdf/Africa www.unicri.it/wwd/analysis/icvs/
WHO Guidelines for conducting surveys on injuries and violence WHO surveys on violence	Injuries, deaths, according to internationally recognised classifications for describing and coding injuries. Core modules: optional modules	Not recommended to ask questions on unintentional injuries such as accidents, road traffic unintentional deaths. Also no questions on self-harm due to space limitations in module. Minimise questions on cost of impact due to space limitations in module. Recommends use of closed answer questions with categories extended to accommodate particular idiosyncrasies of each country/locality. Recommends conducting community surveys at local rather than national level	N/A	No, for subscribers only	http://www.who.int/violence_injury_prevention/publications/violence
WHO, Multi-country study on women's health and domestic violence	Types of intimate partner violence, prevalence of physical and sexual abuse by perpetrators other than partners aged 15 years and over, prevalence of sexual abuse before age 15.	Has been accommodated in other questions included in the module	11 countries: Bangladesh, Brazil, Ethiopia, Japan, Namibia, New Zealand, Peru, Samoa, Serbia and Montenegro, Thailand, and the Republic of Tanzania		http://www.who.int/violence_injury_prevention/publications/violence
HSR-Ipsos Reid	Fears and experiences of criminal and political violence	Some questions on perceptions of victimisation possibilities in the future, as well as what are the major problems facing the country.	11 countries: Brazil, Canada, France, India, Japan, Russia, South Africa, Thailand, Turkey, the UK and the US	No	
Demographic and Health Survey (DHS)	Module on domestic violence (attitudes, incidents, relationship with perpetrator).	Recommend use of questions on incidents of violence against women in the home to be asked to women only in conjunction with health modules	World-wide. Most countries	Yes	
World Bank Survey on Social Capital	Group difference and problems, perception of frequency of violence, changes over time, feeling of safety, victimisation – assault and burglary	Question on victimisation already incorporated from ICVS. Don't recommend questions on how safe people feel walking on street after dark or feeling of safety in the home as may be related to psychological state rather than safety		No	

Survey Instruments	What indicator(s) of violence, safety and security appear on the survey?	Recommendations of accommodating these questions in the module	How many countries has it been used in?	Access to the data?	Website or data source file
CRISE, University of Oxford, Perceptions Survey	Perceptions of identity, identity markers (political, ethno-religious, other), group membership, group interaction and networks, group mobilisation and action, mediators, trust in leaders, and attitudes towards violence. Indonesia version also included questions on involvement of individuals in violent and non-violent disputes, avenues for recourse and satisfaction with these	Questions on reporting and satisfaction from Indonesia version are incorporated in the module	Indonesia, Malaysia, Guatemala, Peru, Bolivia, Nigeria, Ghana, Ivory Coast	By request	www.crise.ox.ac.uk
ILO People's Security Survey	People's perceptions of insecurity and security ; sources of socioeconomic insecurity for different social and demographic groups; actual knowledge with regard to policies; perceptions with regard to policies relating to socioeconomic security; coping mechanisms. Types of violence and crime include: Theft, Drug trafficking, traffic of arms, authority assault, noise pollution, illegal business, prostitution, corrupt servants, corrupt police, sexual assault, selling of stolen goods, burglary, domestic violence	Violence in the workplace is already considered in the other dimensions which will complement this survey module. Other types of violence due not use internationally comparable definitions, however this module shows that insecurity includes both theft, violence against person, sexual assault, and domestic violence and perceptions of safety and security which are all included in the one survey instrument. Questions are asked for households and neighbourhoods. Findings indicate that reporting of sexual violence and domestic violence were higher when asking about the neighbourhood than when asked for the household level.	Argentina, Bangladesh, Brazil, Chile, China, Ethiopia, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Hungary, Mozambique, Namibia, Pakistan, Russia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Tanzania, Ukraine	Report only	http://www.ilo.org/public/english/protection/ses/activity/survey.htm
World Health Survey	Household and individual survey instruments. The individual survey instrument includes questions on sibling death, causes, type of injury which includes weapon used and location of incident. It has separate questions on victimisation of violent crimes, and perceptions of safety walking alone after dark and in the home. This comprehensive health survey incorporates multi-dimensional aspects of health and poverty including income, employment, identity, perception, service provision, cost of healthcare, depression, disease, etc all of which can be mapped against the responses to the questions on violence.	The questions on perceptions have been included in the survey module presented in this paper. The parts of the questions on incident have already been better incorporated into other questions.	70 countries	Yes	http://www.who.int/healthinfo/survey/instruments/en/index.html

Appendix 2 – Indicators of violence, physical safety, and security: comprehensive module

<p>1. In the past 5 years, have you or any members of you HH been the victim of or experienced the following?</p>	<p>i) 0. No 1. Yes 88. N/A 99. Don't know (N/A is used for people that don't own the category of property mentioned, i.e. crops and animals)</p>	<p>ii) Was this the same incident you told us about previously? If yes, which one? [Do not ask for 1A] 0. No 1. Yes, A 2. Yes, B 3. Yes, C 4. Yes, D 5. Yes, E</p>	<p>ii) If yes, how many times in the last five years did this happen to you or another member of your HH? 1. Once 2. Twice 3. Three times 4. More than three times</p>	<p>iii) Did anyone die in any of these incidents? 0. No 1. Yes 99. Don't know</p>	<p>iv) If yes, how many people?</p>	<p>v) The last time it happened where did it occur? 1. Home (around home) 2. On street near own home 3. In a public area near a government office/building 4. At school 5. At work 6. On a Street/ highway not near own home 7. Residential institution 8. Sports and athletic area 9. Industrial or construction site 10. Farm (excluding home) 11. Commercial area (shop, store, hotel, bar, office) 12. Countryside 13. Nursing home 14. Place of worship 15. Other (specify) 88. Refuses to answer 99. Don't know</p>	<p>vi) The last time this happened, can you tell me who was the perpetrator or give me a broad description of whether they were an individual, a group, people you knew or strangers? 1. HH member 2. Other relative 3. Neighbour who you know 4. Close friend of you or the family 5. Person you know by sight only 6. Group of people who you know by sight only 7. Individual stranger 8. Group of strangers 99. Did not see offender/don't know 77. Refused to answer</p>	<p>vii) In the last (most recent) incident that occurred, aside from those who were killed, was anyone injured (could not continue their normal activities for more than one day)? 0. No 1. Yes 99. Don't know</p>	<p>viii) Did you report it, and if so who to? 0. No 1. Yes to the police 2. Yes, to the military 3. Government official (includes village heads, LGA, state and other, but not police or military) 4. Yes, to informal authorities (traditional leaders, religious leaders, elders, chiefs) 5. Yes, to another household member 6. Yes to the neighbours 7. Yes, to health officials 8. Yes to civil society organisations (including women's organisations) 9. Yes to a gang 10. Yes to the media 11. Yes, to a political party 88. Refuses to answer 99. Don't know</p>	<p>ix) If you reported this incident, how satisfied were you with the way they dealt with this problem? 1. Very satisfied 2. Somewhat satisfied 3. Somewhat dissatisfied 4. Very dissatisfied 99. Don't know 88. N/A (For those who did not report it)</p>
<p>A. Someone actually got into your house, flat, or dwelling, without permission and stole or tried to steal something? (ICVS)</p>										
<p>B. Someone took something from you or a member of your household (on your person), by using force, or threatening you? Or did anyone try to do so? (Adapted from ICVS)</p>										
<p>C. Someone stole something you own (not stored in the dwelling) such as vehicles, parts or contents of vehicles, motorbikes, mopeds, scooters, machinery, pumps, bicycles, store property and so on? (Combined from ICVS)</p>										
<p>D. Animals or crops were stolen from you or a member of your household? (LSMS Malawi)</p>										
<p>E. Someone deliberately destroyed or damaged your home, shop, or any other property that you or a member of your household owns? (additional question)</p>										

<p>2. Apart from the previous incidents, in the past five years, have you or any members of your household been the victim of or experienced the following?</p>	<p>i) 0. No 1. Yes 99. Don't know</p>	<p>ii) Was this the same incident you told us about previously? If yes, which one? 0. No 1. Yes, 1A 2. Yes, 1B 3. Yes, 1C 4. Yes, 1D 5. Yes, 1E 6. Yes, 2A 7. Yes, 2B 8. Yes, 2C 9. Yes, 2D 10. Yes, 2E 11. Yes, 2F 12. Yes, 2G</p>	<p>iii) If yes, how many times in the last five years did this happen to you or another member of your HH? 1. Once 2. Twice 3. Three times 4. More than three times (LSMS Malawi)</p>	<p>iv) Did anyone die in any of these incidents? 0. No 1. Yes 99. Don't know iv) If yes, how many people?</p>	<p>v) If anyone died in any of these incidents, what was their age and gender (choose most recent 2): 1. Female aged 10 years or younger? 2. Male aged 10 years or younger? 3. Female aged between 11–18 years old 4. Male aged between 11-18 years old 5. Female aged between 19–30 years old 6. Male aged between 19-30 years old? 7. Female aged over 30? 8. Male aged over 30? 99. Don't know 88. Not applicable 77. Refuses to say</p>	<p>vi) In the last (most recent) incident that occurred, aside from those who were killed, was anyone injured (could not continue their normal activities for more than one day)? 0. No 1. Yes 99. Don't know vii) If yes, how many people were injured in the most recent incident?</p>	<p>viii) If anyone was injured in the most recent incident what was their age and gender (if more than one person choose the most severely injured)? 1. Female aged 10 years or younger? 2. Male aged 10 years or younger? 3. Female aged between 11–18 years old 4. Male aged between 11-18 years old 5. Female aged between 19–30 years old 6. Male aged between 19-30 years old? 7. Female aged over 30? 8. Male aged over 30? 99. Don't know 88. N/A 77. Refuses to say</p>	<p>ix) The last time this happened, where did this happen (if more than one incident choose the most recent death, or if no deaths occurred, the most recent injury)? 1. Home 2. On street near own home 3. In a public area near a government office/building 4. At school 5. At work 6. On a street/ highway not near own home 7. Residential institution 8. Sports and athletic area 9. Industrial or construction site 10. Farm (excluding home) 11. Commercial area (shop, store, hotel, bar, office) 12. Countryside 13. Nursing home 14. Place of worship 15. Other (specify) 99. Unknown</p>	<p>x) The last time this happened was the perpetrator (s) an individual household member, another relative, a neighbour who you know, a close friend of you or the family, a person/group of people you only know by sight, someone else (specify), a stranger/group of strangers, or you don't know/didn't see the offender? 1. HH member 2. Other relative 3. Neighbour who you know 4. Close friend of you or the family 5. Person you know by sight only 6. Group of people who you know by sight only 7. Individual stranger 8. Group of strangers 99. Did not see offender/don't know 77. Refused to answer</p>	<p>xi) Who did you report this to (if more than one person/institution, choose the one person/institution which was most important to you)? 0. No 1. Yes to the police 2. Yes, to the military 3. Government official (includes village heads, LGA, state and other, but not police or military) 4. Yes, to informal authorities (traditional leaders, religious leaders, elders, chiefs) 5. Yes, to another household member 6. Yes to the neighbours 7. Yes, to health officials 8. Yes to civil society organisations (including women's organisations) 9. Yes to a gang 10. Yes to the media 11. Yes, to a political party 88. Refuses to answer 99. Don't know</p>	<p>xii) If you reported this incident, how satisfied were you with the way they dealt with this problem? 1. Very satisfied 2. Somewhat satisfied 3. Somewhat dissatisfied 4. Very dissatisfied 99) Don't know 88. N/A (for those who did not report it or refuse to answer, or don't know)</p>	
<p>A. You or a member of your household were assaulted (hit, slapped, shoved, punched, pushed, or kicked) without any weapon either inside or outside the home?</p>	<p>i)</p>		<p>ii)</p>	<p>iii) iv)</p>	<p>v) Victim 1</p>	<p>v) Victim 2</p>	<p>vi) vii)</p>	<p>viii)</p>	<p>ix)</p>	<p>x)</p>	<p>xi)</p>	<p>xii)</p>
<p>B. You or a member of your household were assaulted (beaten, stabbed, burnt, throttled, or otherwise attacked) with a weapon (eg. Bottle, glass, knife, club, hot liquid, rope) not including being shot by a gun or firearm?</p>												
<p>C. Someone shot you or a member of your household with a firearm or gun?</p>												
<p>D. You or a member of your household were kidnapped (taken and held against your will)?</p>												
<p>E. You or a member of your household was injured by a bomb, Molotov cocktail, landmine or other explosive device? (additional)</p>												
<p>F. I know this is a difficult question for you, so please take a moment to think about it. Have you or a member of your household experienced a sex act against your will involving either vaginal, oral or anal penetration, or attempts to do so?</p>												

<p>3. In the next twelve months, what is the likelihood that you will become a victim of one of the forms of violence mentioned above?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Very likely 2. Somewhat likely 3. Somewhat unlikely 4. Very unlikely 	<p>i)</p>	<p>ii) Is it more likely to be:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Against person 2. Against property 3. Both 4. None 	<p>ii)</p>
<p>4. Compared to five years ago, has the level of violence in the neighbourhood where you live increased, decreased or stayed the same?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Increased a lot 2. Increased a little 3. Stayed about the same 4. Decreased a little 5. Decreased a lot 			
<p>5. How safe do you feel walking down the street after dark in the area where you live?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Very safe 2. Moderately safe 3. Neither safe nor unsafe 4. Moderately unsafe 5. Very unsafe 			
<p>6. There are many different potential threats and dangers to people's personal security in today's world. Thinking of all the threats that you might face in your life, which two (ranked) is of the most concern to you now?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Criminal violence 2. Inter-communal violence 3. Armed warfare/conflict 4. Terrorism 5. Death, or incapacitation from natural disasters, health, or economic problems 6. Other 7. None 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. (Most important) 2. (Second most important) 		

Appendix 3 – Questions on physical safety and security from internationally comparable surveys

Question/Indicator: Incidents of injury and death	Measures	Questionnaire
<p>During the past two weeks, have you suffered from an illness or injury? Yes/No</p> <p>What was the illness or injury? Lists illnesses and burn, fracture, wound, poisoning, other (specify)</p> <p>Asks on action taken to treat illness only.</p>	Illness, injury and type	LSMS core
<p>In the past year, were you personally attacked, physically beaten, or threatened with violence by someone? Yes/ No</p>	Actual incidence of violence, threat and injury together	LSMS module, Malawi
<p>In the past year, did anyone enter your dwelling to steal, try to steal something, or commit another crime? Yes/No</p>	Actual incidence of theft based crime	LSMS module, Malawi
<p>How many times did it happen? Once, twice, three times, more than three times</p>	Actual frequency of theft based crime	LSMS module, Malawi
<p>In the past year were any animals/crops stolen from you? Yes/No (Types of animals then asked)</p>	Actual frequency of theft based crime	LSMS module, Malawi
<p>In the past year, were you personally a victim of petty theft such as pick-pocketing, theft of purse, watch, wallet, clothing, or jewellery? Yes/No</p>	Actual frequency of theft based crime	LSMS module, Malawi
<p>Did anyone in the household die? Yes/No</p> <p>If yes, did they die of old age, an illness, or some other cause? What was the cause of their death</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Traffic accident 2. Other accident or injury 3. Childbirth or complications 4. Murder 5. Suicide 6. Witchcraft/sorcery 7. Other specify 	Death and cause of death	LSMS Malawi integrated household questionnaire
<p>Are you eligible to receive funds from the civil victims of war programme?</p>	Proxy for number of victims	LSMS in Bosnia-Herzegovina
<p>Have you, or someone in your family, been assaulted, attacked, or been the victim of a crime in the last 12 months?</p> <p>Have you or someone in your family been aware of an act of corruption in the last 12 months?</p> <p>Do you know if any of your friends or someone in your family has consumed drugs in the last 12 months?</p> <p>Have you known somebody who has bought or sold any drugs in the last 12 months? Yes, No answers</p>	Actual incidents	Latinobarometer questionnaire 2005

<p>Over the past year, how often, if ever, have you or anyone in your family: [Read out options]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Feared crime in your own home? B. Had something stolen from your house C. Been physically attacked? D. Arrested for any offence other than traffic violations <p>Answer options: never, just once or twice, several times, many times, always, don't know</p>	Rough estimate of actual incidents	Afrobarometer questionnaire 2005, round 3 Nigeria
<p>Over the past 5 years, have you or any other members of your household (this was about 15 questions asked separately each time in the survey, combined here):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Had any of our household had any of their cars/vans/trucks stolen B. Been the victim of a car radio theft, or something else which was left in the car, or theft of a part of the car such as a mirror or a wheel? C. Parts of cars/vans/trucks belonging to your household been deliberately damaged? D. Had any of their mopeds/scooters/motorcycles stolen? E. Had any of their bicycles stolen? F. Did anyone try to get into your house or flat without permission and steal or try to steal something? G. Did anyone actually get into your house or flat without permission and steal or try to steal something? H. Has anyone taken something from you, by using force, or threatening you? Or did anyone try to do so? I. Apart from theft involving force, other types of thefts of personal property (e.g. pickpocketing, theft of purse, jewellery, clothes) J. Perhaps sometimes grab, touch or assault others for sexual reasons in a really offensive way? K. Apart from the incidents just covered have you over the past five years been personally attacked or threatened by someone that really frightened you either at home or elsewhere, such as in a pub, in the street, at school, on public transport, on the beach or at your workplace? <p>Yes/No/Don't know. This year, last year, before then, don't know/can't remember.</p>	Actual incidents	ICVS
<p>For select offences: What actually happened? Were you threatened or was force used?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Just threatened 2. Force used 3. Don't know 	Threat or force	ICVS
<p>For select offences: Did you suffer an injury as a result?</p> <p>Yes, No, Don't know</p>	Actual injuries	ICVS

Did you see a doctor or a healer as a result? Yes\No		
Did any of the offender(s) have a knife, a gun, another weapon, or something used as a weapon? Answer options: Yes, No, Don't know, then list kind	Type of violence	ICVS
In the past 12 months, have you been frightened for the safety of yourself or your family because of the anger or threats of another person or persons? If yes, specify by whom. 1. Intimate partner 2. Parent 3. Child, sibling or other relative (e.g. brother, cousin, sister) 4. Friend or acquaintance 5. Unrelated caregiver 6. Stranger 7. Official or legal authority (e.g. police officer, soldier) 8. No one (not been frightened for safety) 77. Refused 98. Other (specify) 99. Unknown	Real threats	Guidelines for conducting household surveys on injuries and violence WHO
Which of the following was the most important in causing your injury? A. Shot with a firearm or gun B. Beaten, stabbed, burnt, throttled, or otherwise attacked with a weapon (e.g. Bottle, glass, knife, club, hot liquid, rope) C. Hit, slapped, shoved, punched, pushed, or kicked (without any weapon) D. Refused E. Other (specify) F. Unknown	Action resulting in injuries	Guidelines for conducting household surveys on injuries and violence WHO
In the past five years have YOU personally been attacked or threatened by someone, or by a group of people in a way that was violent? Yes, No, Don't know Asked again for others in household (not including yourself)	Actual incidents of violence against the person	HSR-Ipsos Reid
Have you or members of your family been involved in disputes (either big ones in the community, or small ones in the village or hamlet)? Yes, No, Don't know	Involvement in disputes	CRISE, University of Oxford, Indonesia survey
Have you, or members of your family been involved in big conflicts in the community? Yes, No, Don't know	Involvement in conflicts	CRISE, University of Oxford, Indonesia survey

<p>If you or your family have been involved in a dispute or conflict, did violence occur such as property destruction, physical contact, injuries and so on? Yes, No, Don't know</p>	<p>Involvement in disputes resulting in violence</p>	<p>CRISE, University of Oxford, Indonesia survey</p>
<p>In the past 12 months, have you or anyone in the household been a victim of a violent crime such as an assault or mugging? How many times</p>	<p>Frequency of actual incidents of assaults and muggings</p>	<p>World Bank Survey on Social Capital</p>
<p>In the past 12 months has your house been burglarised or vandalised? How many times</p>	<p>Frequency of actual incidents of burglary and vandalism</p>	<p>World Bank Survey on Social Capital</p>
<p>In the past year, have you or anyone in your household been the victim of a violent crime, such as assault or mugging? Yes/No</p>	<p>Frequency of incident of violent crime</p>	<p>World Health Organisation World Health Survey</p>
<p>For each sibling death: Was the death associated with injury? (Yes/No). If yes, was it due to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Accident 2. Suicide 3. Murder 4. War 5. Natural disaster <p>What was the mechanism or cause of injury?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Motor vehicle 2. Pedestrian-vehicle crash 3. Motorcycle 4. Pedal cycle 5. Fall 6. Gunshot, firearm related 7. Landmine / bomblast 8. Stab / cut / pierce 9. Fire / burn 10. Poisoning 11. Near drowning / drowning / submersion 12. Other mechanism / cause of injury <p>Where did the injury occur?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Home 2. School 3. Street/highway 4. Parking lot 5. Trade and service areas (shop, bank, etc.) 6. Farm 7. River/lake/stream/ocean 8. Industrial/construction area 9. Other public building 10. Other <p>Specify others</p>	<p>Frequency of incidents of death for each sibling in household</p>	<p>World Health Organisation World Health Survey</p>

Question/Indicator: Perpetrators, victims, and location of violence	Measures	Questionnaire
<p>Was the individual (perpetrator) a household member, a relative, a neighbour, or a stranger?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. HH member 2. Other relative 3. Neighbour 4. Stranger 	Perpetrator of incident	ICVS
<p>Where did each of the incidents take place? (See indicator 1 above)</p> <p>Answer options: at home, near own home, at the workplace, elsewhere in the city or local area, elsewhere in the country, abroad, don't know.</p>	Location of incident	ICVS
<p>Did you know the offender by name or by sight?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Did not know offender(s) 2. Known by sight only 3. Know by name 4. Did not see offender 	Identity of perpetrator	ICVS
<p>For select offences (assault, threat, sexual assault): Were any of them your spouse, ex-spouse, partner, ex-partner, boyfriend, ex-boyfriend, a relative or a close friend, or was it someone you work with?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Spouse, partner, (at the time) 2. Ex-spouse, ex-partner, (at the time) 3. Boyfriend (at the time) 4. Ex-boyfriend (at the time) 5. Relative 6. Close friend 7. Someone they work with 8. None of these 9. Refuses to say 	Identity of perpetrator	ICVS
<p>What was the injured person (or you) doing when you were injured?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Paid work (including travel to and from work) 2. Unpaid work (including travel to and from work) 3. Education 4. Sports 5. Leisure/play 6. Vital activity (i.e. sleeping, eating, washing) 7. Travelling 8. Unspecified activities (hanging around, doing nothing) 98. Other (specify) 99. Unknown 	Location of incident	Guidelines for conducting household surveys on injuries and violence WHO
<p>Where was the injured person (or you) when the injury occurred?</p>	Location of incident	Guidelines for conducting household surveys on injuries and violence WHO
<p>Please indicate the relationship between or persons, who hurt the injured person (or you).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Intimate partner 2. Parent 3. Child, sibling, or other relative (e.g. brother, cousin, sister) 	Relationship between victim and perpetrator	Guidelines for conducting household surveys on injuries and

<p>4. Friend or acquaintance 5. Unrelated caregiver 6. Stranger 7. Official or legal authorities 77. Refused 98. Other (specify) 99. Unknown</p>		violence WHO
--	--	--------------

Question/ Indicator: Perceptions of threat and safety	Measures	Questionnaire
In your opinion, which would you consider to be the country's most important problem?	Perceptions of problems	Latinobarometer, 2005 questionnaire
<p>In your opinion, what are the most important problems facing this country that government should address?</p> <p>(Do not read out answers, code from responses, accept up to three answers asking which are the three most important if they offer more than three, rank the three answers as 1, 2, and 3).</p> <p>Options of codes include: Economics (management of the economy, wages, unemployment, poverty, rates and taxes, loans and credit), Food/agriculture (farming, agriculture, food shortage/famine, drought, land), Infrastructure (transportation, communications, roads), Government services (education, housing, electricity, water supply, orphans/ street children/ homeless children, services (other)), Health (health, AIDS, sickness/ disease), Governance (crime and security, corruption, political violence, political instability/ political divisions/ ethnic tensions, discrimination/ inequality, gender issues/ women's rights, democracy/ political rights, war (international), civil war), nothing/ no problems, don't know, other.</p>	Perceptions of problems	Afrobarometer questionnaire 2005, round 3 Nigeria
<p>Taking everything into account, how serious was the incident for you or your household? (see indicator 1 above)</p> <p>Answer options: very serious, somewhat serious, not very serious</p>	Perception of seriousness of crime	ICVS
<p>How safe do you feel walking alone in your area after dark? Do you feel very safe, fairly safe, a bit unsafe, or very unsafe?(if respondent says never goes out, stress 'how safe would you feel')</p> <p>1. Very safe 2. Fairly safe 3. Bit unsafe 4. Very unsafe</p>	Perception of safety after dark	ICVS, WHO World Health Survey
<p>How safe do you feel when you are home alone after dark?</p> <p>Do you feel very safe, fairly safe, a bit unsafe or very unsafe?</p> <p>1. Very safe 2. Fairly safe 3. Bit unsafe 4. Very unsafe</p>	Perception of safety at night in the home	ICVS, World Health Survey
<p>How safe do you feel against criminals in your own house?</p> <p>Very safe, fairly safe, unsafe?</p>	Perception of safety at night in the home	LSMS Malawi

When walking alone in your neighbourhood or village during the day, how safe do you feel against criminals? Very safe, fairly safe, unsafe?	Perception of safety at night in the village	LSMS Malawi
When walking alone in your neighbourhood or village at night, how safe do you feel against criminals? Very safe, fairly safe, unsafe?	Perception of safety at night in the village	LSMS Malawi
If fairly safe or unsafe, what are the threats? 1. Armed robbers 2. Burglars 3. Other criminals 4. Other	Types of threats	LSMS Malawi
Have you carried a loaded firearm on your person outside the home in the last 30 days? 1. No 2. Yes, for protection 3. Yes, for work 4. Yes, for sport (e.g. hunting target practice) 77. Refused 99. Unknown	Weapon carrying as a perception of threat	Guidelines for conducting household surveys on injuries and violence WHO
There are many different potential threats and dangers to people's personal security in today's world. Thinking of all the threats that you might face in your life, which ONE is of the most concern to you now? 1. Criminal violence 2. Terrorism 3. Health and economic threats 4. Accidents/natural disasters 5. War 6. Other	Perception of greatest threat to human security	HSR-Ipsos Reid
In the next twelve months, what is the likelihood that you will become a victim of violence? 1. Very likely 2. Somewhat likely 3. Somewhat unlikely 4. Very unlikely	Perception of future victimisation	HSR-Ipsos Reid
Of all the issues presently confronting your country, which ONE do you feel should receive the greatest attention from your countries leaders? 1. Economic issues 2. Social issues 3. War 4. Crime 5. Terrorism 6. Other specify	Perception of state role in solving problems	HSR-Ipsos Reid
Sometimes people decide to use violent means to address their political grievances and achieve their political objectives. We would like to know your opinion about the use of violence in the political sphere. Could you please indicate whether you agree or disagree with the following statements? 1. Violence should never be used	Attitudes towards the use of violence	CRISE, University of Oxford

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Sometimes violence is necessary to improve the political situation 3. Violence has improved the situation of the country in the past 4. Violence only provokes more violence 5. Sometimes violence is the only way to be heard 		
<p>If a dispute occurs between groups (communal) in your region, does violence usually occur?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Always occurs 2. Often occurs 3. Sometimes occurs 4. Rarely occurs 5. Never occurs 6. Don't know 	Perception of frequency of violence	CRISE, University of Oxford
<p>If a dispute occurs between individuals in your region, does violence usually occur?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Always occurs 2. Often occurs 3. Sometimes occurs 4. Rarely occurs 5. Never occurs 6. Don't know 	Perception of frequency of violence	CRISE, University of Oxford
<p>In general, how safe from crime and violence do you feel when you are alone at home</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Very safe 2. Moderately safe 3. Neither safe nor unsafe 4. Moderately unsafe 5. Very unsafe 	Perception of safety	World Bank Survey on Social Capital
<p>How safe do you feel walking down the street after dark?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. Very safe 7. Moderately safe 8. Neither safe nor unsafe 9. Moderately unsafe 10. Very unsafe 	Perception of safety	World Bank Survey on Social Capital
<p>In your opinion, is this village/neighbourhood generally peaceful or marked by violence?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Very peaceful 2. Moderately peaceful 3. Neither peaceful or violent 4. Moderately violent 5. Very violent 	Perception of peace and violence	World Bank Survey on Social Capital

Question/Indicator: Sexual violence, gender based violence	Measures	Questionnaire
<p>For ICVS questions on sexual assault it is combined with other crimes above. Then asked: Were any of them your spouse, ex-spouse, partner, ex-partner, boyfriend, ex-boyfriend, a relative or a close friend, or was it someone you work with?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Spouse, partner, (at the time) 2. Ex-spouse, ex-partner, (at the time) 3. boyfriend (at the time) 4. Ex-boyfriend (at the time) 5. Relative 6. Close friend 7. Someone they work with 8. None of these 9. Refuses to say 	Perpetrators of sexual assault	ICVS
<p>Would you describe the incident as a rape (forced intercourse, an attempted rape, an indecent assault, or just behaviour which you found offensive)?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A rape 2. An attempted rape 3. Indecent assault 4. Offensive behaviour 5. Don't know 	Definitions of sexual crimes	ICVS
<p>(Does/did) your (last) husband/partner ever do any of the following things to you:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> A. Push you, shake you, or throw something at you? B. Slap you? C. Twist your arm or pull your hair? D. Punch you with his fist or something that could hurt you? E. Kick you, drag you, or beat you up? F. Try to choke you or burn you on purpose? G. Threaten to attack you with a knife, gun, or any other weapon? H. Physically force you to have intercourse with him even when you don't want to? I. Force you to perform any sexual acts you did not want to <p>How often did this happen during the last 12 months: often, only sometimes, or not at all?</p>	Incidents of violence against women in the home of varying severity	DHS
<p>Sometimes a husband is annoyed or angered by things that his wife does. In your opinion, is a husband justified in hitting or beating his wife in the following situations: (Yes/No/Don't know)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> A. If she goes out without telling him? B. If she neglects the children? C. If she argues with him? D. If she refuses sex with him? E. If she burns the food? 	Attitudes towards violence against women in the home	MICS

Question/Indicator: Avenues for redress and satisfaction with these	Measures	Questionnaire
<p>Please tell me how much you agree or disagree with the following statements. Do you strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree or strongly disagree?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. The judicial system punishes the guilty no matter who they are B. In my country, justice arrives late, but it arrives C. The privatisation of state companies has been beneficial to the country D. You can generally trust the people who run our government to do what is right E. Private enterprise is indispensable for the development of the country 	Perception of justice	Latinobarometer, 2005 questionnaire
<p>Please look at this card and tell me how much confidence you have in each of the following groups/ institutions. Would you say you have a lot, some, a little or no confidence?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. The church B. Armed Forces C. Unions D. Judiciary E. Local council F. Police 	Confidence in problem solving institutions	Latinobarometer, 2005 questionnaire
<p>In the past three years, have you never, sometimes, or often done the following, for you or your family, in order to solve problems that affect you in your neighbourhood with the authorities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Contacted local government B. Contacted officials at higher level C. Contacted elected legislative representatives at any level D. Contacted political parties or other political organisations E. Contacted non-government/civil society organisations (farmer's associations, trade unions, interest groups, etc.) F. Contacted media G. Other 	Reporting problems	Latinobarometer, 2005 questionnaire
<p>Do you think that the (nationals) are very, quite, a little or not at all...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Law-abiding B. Demanding of their rights C. Conscious of their obligations and duties D. Receive equal treatment in front of the law 	Action to solve problems	Latinobarometer, 2005 questionnaire
<p>During the past year, how often have you contacted any of the following persons about some important problems or to give them your views?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. A Local Government Councillor B. A Member of the National Assembly C. An official of a Government Ministry D. A Political Party Official E. A Religious Leader F. A Traditional Ruler G. Some other influential person (prompt if necessary: you know, someone with more power or money than you who can speak on your behalf) 	Reporting problems	Afrobarometer questionnaire 2005, round 3 Nigeria

Answer options: Never, only once, a few times, often, don't know		
<p>Think of the last time you contacted any of the above leaders. Was the main reason to:</p> <p>A. Tell them about your own personal problems? B. Tell them about a community or public problem? C. Give them your view on some political issue? D. Something else. E. Not applicable (did not contact any leader) F. Don't know</p> <p>Circle appropriate answer</p>	Reasons for reporting problems	Afrobarometer questionnaire 2005, round 3 Nigeria
<p>How much trust do you have in each of the following, or haven't you heard enough about them to say?</p> <p>A. The President B. The National Assembly C. The Independent National Electoral Commission (INEC) D. Your elected Local Government Councillor E. The Ruling Party F. Opposition Political Parties G. The Military H. The Police I. The Courts of Law J. Government Broadcasting Service K. Independent Broadcasting Services L. Government Newspapers M. Independent Newspapers N. Independent Corrupt Practices Commission O. Economic and Financial Crimes Commission P. National Drug and Law Enforcement Agency</p> <p>Answer options: not at all, just a little, somewhat, a lot, don't know, haven't heard enough.</p>	Trust in leaders and institutions	Afrobarometer questionnaire 2005, round 3 Nigeria
<p>How well or badly would you say the current government is handling the following matters, or haven't you heard enough to say?</p> <p>E. Reducing Crime</p> <p>Answer options: Very badly, fairly badly, fairly well, very well, don't know, haven't heard enough.</p>	Government handling of problems	Afrobarometer questionnaire 2005, round 3 Nigeria
<p>How likely do you think it would be that the authorities could enforce the law if:</p> <p>A. A top government official committed a serious crime? B. A person like you committed a serious crime</p> <p>Answer options: Very likely, likely, not very likely, not at all likely, don't know.</p>	Law enforcement	Afrobarometer questionnaire 2005, round 3 Nigeria
<p>There are also a variety of questions which include crime in the sub-set of questions such as</p> <p>What you would do if:</p> <p>1. The police wrongly arrested someone from your family (don't worry things will be resolved given enough time, lodge a complaint through the proper channels and procedures, use connections with influential people, offer tip or bribe, join in</p>	Asking for assistance from police	Afrobarometer questionnaire 2005, round 3 Nigeria

<p>public protest, other, nothing because nothing can be done, don't know).</p> <p>2. Based on your experience how easy or difficult is it to obtain the following services? Or do you never try and get these services from government?</p> <p>C. Help from the police when you need it (very easy, easy, difficult, very difficult, never try, don't know)</p>		
<p>The last time, did you or anyone else report the incident to the police? (See indicator 1 above)</p> <p>Answer options: Yes, No, Don't know</p>	<p>Reporting to police</p>	<p>ICVS</p>
<p>On the whole, were you satisfied with the way the police dealt with your (their) report? (See indicator 1 above)</p> <p>Answer options: yes satisfied, no dissatisfied, don't know.</p>	<p>Satisfaction with police performance</p>	<p>ICVS</p>
<p>For what reason were you dissatisfied? You can give more than one reason</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Didn't do enough 2. Were not interested 3. Didn't find or apprehend the offender 4. Didn't recover my property (goods) 5. Didn't keep me properly informed 6. Didn't treat me correctly/were impolite 7. Were slow to arrive 8. Other reasons (PLEASE SPECIFY) <p>.....</p>	<p>Reasons for dissatisfaction with police performance</p>	<p>ICVS</p>
<p>Why did you or no one else report it? (Multiple answers allowed)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Not serious enough/no loss/kid's stuff 2. Solved it myself/perpetrator known to me 3. Inappropriate for police/police not necessary 4. Reported to other public or private agencies 5. My family solved it 6. No insurance 7. Police could do nothing/lack of proof 8. Police won't do anything about it 9. Fear/dislike of the police/no involvement 10. wanted with police 11. Didn't dare (for fear of reprisal) 12. Other reasons (SPECIFY) <p>.....</p> <p>13. Don't know</p>	<p>Reason for not-reporting a crime</p>	<p>ICVS</p>
<p>Taking everything into account, how good do you think the police in your area is in controlling crime? Do you think they do a very good job, a fairly good job, a fairly poor job or a very poor job?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Very good job 2. Fairly good job 3. Fairly poor job 4. Very poor job 	<p>Performance of police</p>	<p>ICVS</p>

<p>Do you or someone else in your household own a handgun, shotgun, rifle or air rifle?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes 2. No <p>Could you tell me which sort of gun or guns you own?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Handgun 2. Shotgun 3. Rifle 4. Air rifle 5. Other rifle 6. Don't know 7. Refused to say <p>47b. For what reason do you own the gun (guns)?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. For hunting 2. Target shooting (sports) 3. As part of a collection (collector's item) 4. For crime prevention/protection 5. In armed forces or the police 6. Because it has always been in our family/home 7. Refused to answer 	Weapons ownership	ICVS
Did you report any of these offences to the police? Yes/No	Reporting to police	LSMS Malawi
On the whole were you satisfied with the way the police dealt with the matter (s)? Yes/No	Satisfaction with police performance	LSMS Malawi
<p>Why did you fail to report this incident to the police?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Crime was not serious 2. Police too far 3. Police corrupt 4. Reporting would cause trouble 5. Neighbourhood issue, didn't want the police involved 6. Other please specify 	Reasons for not reporting crime to police	LSMS Malawi
<p>What steps have you taken to protect yourself from crime in the past year?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Establishing community policing 2. Neighbourhood watch 3. Employed watchmen 4. Acquired guard dogs 5. Improved house security (bars, walls, fence) 6. Changed location 7. Traditional remedies 8. Other specify 9. Nothing 	Steps taken to protect against crime	LSMS module, Malawi
I am now going to read out a list of facilities and services in your local area. For each one please tell me whether you consider your local services to be excellent, very good, fair, or poor. Police services is included	Perception of performance of police	LSMS module on values and opinions
IF for example, your or your family is involved in a <u>dispute</u> , who do you approach to seek assistance to resolve the dispute? [Use the codes for	Reporting disputes	CRISE, University of

<p>the person/party from the code list.] If violence occurs: A. B. If violence has not yet occurred C. D.</p>		<p>Oxford, Indonesia Survey</p>
<p>74. How about if there is a large dispute between community groups, who does the community usually approach to seek assistance to resolve the dispute? [Use the codes for the person/party from the code list.] If violence occurs: A. B. If violence has not yet occurred C. D.</p>	<p>Who the community approaches to resolve disputes</p>	<p>CRISE, University of Oxford, Indonesia Survey</p>

Question/Indicator: Mobility in violent contexts	Measures	Questionnaire
<p>In which municipality did you live just before the war? List</p>	<p>Previous place of abode</p>	<p>LSMS Living in Bosnia-Herzegovina</p>
<p>What was the reason you moved to your current place? A. War B. Property occupied C. Security D. No adequate living conditions E. Family reasons F. Job G. Other reasons H. Returnee I. Property destroyed in the war</p>	<p>Reason for migration</p>	<p>LSMS Living in Bosnia-Herzegovina</p>
<p>Which one of the listed statuses describes best your current status in your current place? A. Permanent residence with no moving during the war B. Permanent resident – displaced person – returnee C. Permanent resident – refugee – returnee D. Temporary resident – displaced person E. Temporary resident – refugee – displaced person F. Temporary resident – refugee G. Temporary resident – other</p>	<p>Status of migrant</p>	<p>LSMS Living in Bosnia-Herzegovina</p>

Question/ Indicator: Changes over time	Measures	Questionnaire
Do you think crime has increased a lot or a little, or has decreased a lot or a little or has remained the same in the last 12 months? Crime was part of a list of problems and the temporal reference was the last 12 months, consistence with the time series	Changes in General levels of crime in past year	Latinobarometer questionnaire 2005
In the past year, would you say that crime increased, decreased, or remained the same compared to the previous year? Increased, decreased, remained the same.	Changes in general levels of crime in past year	LSMS Malawi
Compared to five years ago, have conditions in your community for the following become: (much worse, worse, about the same, better, much better, not applicable)? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Police services 2. Robbery 3. Witchcraft or accusations of witchcraft 4. Level of trust in the community And other non violence related ones	Changes in violence and service provision in past five years	LSMS Malawi
Compared to five years ago, is the (following) much lower, lower, about the same, higher, much higher? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Number of deaths in young or middle aged men 2. Number of deaths in young or middle aged women And others not related to violence	Changes in numbers of deaths in last five years	LSMS Malawi
Compared to five years ago, has the level of violence in the village/neighbourhood increased, decreased or stayed the same? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. Increased a lot 7. Increased a little 8. Stayed about the same 9. Decreased a little 10. Decreased a lot 	Perceptions of changes in violence over the past five years	World Bank Survey on Social Capital