

# Consultation response: Redesign of the Crime Survey for England and Wales

Centre for Crime and Justice  
Office for National Statistics

7 November 2022



# Contents

<b>Contents</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Contact information</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Executive summary</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Background</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Summary of responses</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Methodological redesign</b>	<b>9</b>
Attitudes towards a longitudinal panel design	9
Attitudes towards multi-modal data collection and the online survey instrument from 2024	12
Screeener questions from April 2024	16
Coding review April 2024	18
<b>Domestic abuse, sexual victimisation, stalking and abuse during childhood</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>OChildren’s Crime Survey for England and Wales (CCSEW)</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>CSEW content</b>	<b>26</b>
Module 5: Perceptions of crime	27
Module 7: Victimisation module	28

Module 8: Fraud victimisation module	30
Module 9: Performance of the criminal justice system	31
Module 10: Mobile phone crime	33
Module 11: Follow-up module A – Experiences of the police	34
Module 12: Crime prevention and security module B- Household	36
Module 13: Crime prevention and security module C: Vehicle crime	37
Module 14: Crime prevention and security module D: Personal and online	38
Module 15: Anti-social behaviour	39
Module 16: Demographics	41
Self-completion module 17: Drug use and drinking	42
Module 18: Self-completion module: Gangs and personal security	44
New areas of research	44
<b>Annex A – List of organisations who provided a consultation response</b>	<b>48</b>

# Contact information

**Enquiries to [crimestatistics@ons.gov.uk](mailto:crimestatistics@ons.gov.uk)**

## **Accessibility**

This consultation response can be provided in alternative formats upon request.

## **Quality assurance**

This consultation has been carried out in accordance with the [government's consultation principles](#).

If you have any complaints about the way this consultation has been conducted, please email [ons.consultations@ons.gov.uk](mailto:ons.consultations@ons.gov.uk).

# Executive summary

Since its introduction in 1981, the Crime Survey for England and Wales (CSEW) has produced annual estimates of crime and is widely regarded as the most reliable source of information about trends in crime. The core content of the CSEW has remained broadly consistent over time to maintain data comparability with previous years. Other sections have, however, been adapted and new topics have been introduced to reflect the changing crime landscape and data requirements of users.

The coronavirus pandemic resulted in significant changes to household survey operations, with all surveys looking for alternative ways to continue delivering against the core needs of users. The CSEW was not immune to this, with the pandemic highlighting a need to make it more resilient to future shocks and long-term changes in the way people are interacting with surveys. There has been an increasing user demand not only for the

CSEW to reflect the changing nature of crime, but to produce more detailed crime estimates, which would necessitate an increase in CSEW sample sizes.

To elicit views from users on how we can achieve these aims we ran a consultation that proposed methodological changes alongside the review of existing elements of the CSEW.

We proposed:

- transition to a longitudinal panel design, which will involve respondents being re-interviewed annually, over several waves
- introduction of a multi-modal survey including face-to-face and telephone interviews and following further development, an online survey.
- review of the CSEW offence classification system
- design improvements to the Children's Crime Survey for England and Wales (CCSEW)

### **Longitudinal panel design**

- We found strong support for the introduction of a longitudinal panel design, with some caveats.
- Benefits of the approach focused particularly on the improved reliability of main estimates and increased granularity of data.
- Key concerns raised by respondents included data comparability, sample representativeness and the need to minimise attrition.
- Further research will be necessary to engage hard-to-reach and other minority groups.

### **Multi-modal CSEW**

Respondents were also supportive of moving towards a multi-modal survey instrument and expressed potential to improve data quality and sample representativeness. However, there were concerns raised about mode effects, data comparability, capturing complex crimes, confidentiality and safeguarding.

We found strong support for the improvement of screener questions as a part of the implementation of the multimodal CSEW. Opportunities and risks raised included:

- the impact on both data quality and comparability.
- increased data quality was valued over the effect on data comparability.
- increased accuracy of crime estimates was a key benefit resulting from improved screener questions.

## Review of CSEW offence classification

- Respondents welcomed the harmonisation of the CSEW offence classification system with Home Office Counting Rules (HOCR).
- Concern was expressed in relation to data comparability.
- The removal of questions on non-domestic stalking within the domestic abuse, sexual victimisation and stalking module of the CSEW, were a main concern.

In some instances, additional data requirements were identified for adults who have experienced abuse in childhood, common themes included perpetrator demographics, the nature of victimisation and reporting of abuse.

Based on users' positive responses to the proposed methodological changes, we will continue implementation of the longitudinal panel design incorporating a multi-modal approach. Wave 1 of the CSEW commenced in October 2021, continuing with in-home, face-to-face interviews, enabling us to maintain consistent estimates with previous years. Wave 2 commenced in October 2022 with the introduction of telephone interviews, and we are currently conducting research into the development of an online survey capability to support further collection of data from wave 2 onwards.

We will conduct further research to ensure sample representativeness and to minimise attrition including the design of an optimal weighting scheme. Data from wave 2 onwards will over time, enable us to produce more granular estimates with increased precision. We will monitor the survey instruments including changes to questions and crime coding and evaluate data quality before integrating data across waves.

## Children's Crime Survey for England and Wales

- Support for the methodological changes of the CSEW were echoed in the Children's Crime Survey for England and Wales (CCSEW).
- The move to a longitudinal panel design was recognised as enabling the analysis of trends in child victimisation  
the ability to identify characteristics that determine risk of experiencing crime and the increased granularity of data from a larger sample size
- The move to a prevalence only measure of victimisation in the CCSEW received strong opposition

While we are considering users' responses to proposals for the CCSEW, we are currently developing an online self-completion module for the CCSEW with the aim of improving response rates and are aiming to have this operational by April 2024. Given the challenges associated with the collection of victimisation data online, estimates will require robust

evaluation. We will continue to engage with stakeholders to understand data requirements, particularly with regard to a prevalence only measure of victimisation.

### Content of the CSEW

Generally, the existing content of the CSEW modules were deemed to be of value to respondents and should be retained. Our findings include:

- some questions and outputs are used more widely than others
- all modules of the survey provide some benefit to respondents
- no large-scale changes will be made to the survey instrument

The consultation provided the opportunity for respondents to highlight new subject areas for inclusion in the survey. New topic areas that were suggested, included hate crimes, online harms, the victim-offender overlap, modern slavery, terrorism and vulnerability to radicalisation. Further in-depth questions for existing modules were suggested including gangs and personal security, VAWG and sexual assault and the reintroduction of the restorative justice module.

The range of additional topics suggested provides challenges given the limited space available on the CSEW. While we are in the early stages of implementing our panel design, for now, we are deferring making any decisions about the inclusion of these topics in the survey as it currently stands. The opportunity to include new topics will largely arise from successful development of an online collection instrument, for which we have started a programme of research.

In future, we will need to assess the relative costs and benefits of including the topics suggested, the appropriateness of their inclusion in a crime survey, and an assessment of resulting data quality and whether it can meet users' needs. We will revisit responses to this consultation in due course and will seek opportunities to engage with stakeholders in more detail as our new design progresses.

We wish to thank all users for their cooperation in taking part in the consultation, and the time taken to complete the form. We endeavour to produce a new transformed CSEW that will better meet user requirements in the future and will continue to provide the most reliable evidence of crimes committed against the general household population in England and Wales.

# Background

The Office for National Statistics (ONS) has conducted a consultation on the planned re-design of the Crime Survey for England and Wales (CSEW). The aim of the consultation was to ensure that the CSEW continues to reflect the evolving needs of policy makers, citizens and data users. We have engaged with CSEW data users to better understand their thoughts on two central elements of the survey: the methodological re-design of the CSEW, and the current survey content.

## Our proposal

Since its inception, the CSEW has been a cross-sectional victimisation survey providing statistics on crime and people's perceptions of crime and the criminal justice system. Following a period of transformation, we are proposing to develop the survey in a way that will meet the future needs of its policy makers, citizens, and data users. This includes improving the accuracy and precision of the survey's estimates in the most cost-effective manner, whilst retaining data quality. The proposal took, as its base, a range of key user requirements, culminating in a design which aims to:

- double the number of interviews on which estimates are based; thereby improving the precision of its sub-national estimates, specifically those at the regional and police force area levels.
- transition from a cross-sectional survey to a longitudinal survey in which respondents are interviewed annually over several years.
- supplement face-to-face interviewing with a multimodal approach that will include telephone interviews and following further development, an online survey.

The public consultation which took place over the summer of 2022 focused on both the proposed changes in methodology and sample design, paired with reviewing the questionnaire content. Taking the views of the widest possible range of data users, we hope to ensure that the CSEW continues to capture the most relevant crimes committed against the general household population while allowing for new avenues of analysis to be explored, particularly in relation to the proposed longitudinal panel design.

It is our opinion that the longitudinal panel design is the most cost-effective way of increasing the number of interviews on which estimates are based, by re-interviewing respondents at multiple waves, 12 months apart.



Benefits of a longitudinal sample design also include improving the precision of estimates of change over time. In any one year a significant proportion of the sample will have been interviewed in previous years, thereby improving the estimates of change over time. Longitudinal datasets will be produced and analysed for the first time. This will allow for greater understanding of important criminological concepts such as repeat victimisation and will enable a better understanding of victim journeys through the criminal justice system.

Alongside consideration of the proposed set of methodological changes, we consulted on the content of the CSEW survey instrument itself, to ensure we achieve the maximum benefit from the survey and that it remains fit for purpose. It is important to understand how CSEW data are used in the wider public space, for example where it feeds into policy areas, to ensure its relevance. It is also important for the survey to move and adapt according to social change and to better identify and understand new and emerging crime types.

## Summary of responses

The consultation ran for 12 weeks, from Thursday 26 May to Sunday 21 August 2022. An information dissemination event was held to promote the consultation.

A total of 58 responses were submitted, 48 via the consultation website and 10 via email. Just over a third (36%) of responses were from government departments, including local government and public bodies. The charity sector made up 24% of responses, and 21% of responses were from police bodies and institutions. The remainder came from academia (14%) and others (5%).

Responses represented individuals or organisations. There were 42 responses on behalf of an organisation, 13 responses on behalf of an individual and three responses on behalf of informal groups, such as community groups. A list of organisations that responded to the consultation can be found in Annex A.

The consultation was split into two sections, the methodological redesign of the CSEW and the CSEW content. Each section and the questions within it were optional and respondents were only required to complete sections relevant to their work or that of their organisation.

## Methodological redesign

As outlined above, the first part of the consultation focused on the methodological redesign of the CSEW. Details were provided on the changes being introduced to the survey design including a longitudinal panel approach, multi-modal data collection including an online survey at wave 2 onwards, changes to screener questions and the Offence Classification System (coding review).

### Attitudes towards a longitudinal panel design

**Question: What are your thoughts on the move to a longitudinal panel design with waves for the CSEW?**

**(42 responses)**

Most respondents (76%<sup>1</sup>) were positive about the introduction of a longitudinal panel design. The benefits of the approach identified by respondents (in priority order) were:

- improved reliability and granularity (36%) – reliability of main estimates will improve and there will be increased granularity of data based on a larger number of interviews
- trends and patterns (31%) – the ability to identify trends and patterns in victimisation and perceptions over time; particularly, a better understanding of repeat victimisation
- new insights (19%) – into the nature of specific crimes including the inter-relationship of different crime types
- cost-effectiveness (7%) – new design will maximise achieved sample sizes and the range of topics collected
- resilience (2%) – increased resilience of the CSEW to societal change

**Question: Are you concerned about potential changes in data output resulting from a move to a longitudinal panel design with waves for the CSEW?**

**(38 responses)**

In relation to the effects of a longitudinal panel approach on data output, 74% of respondents expressed at least one concern about data outputs that could arise from the

---

<sup>1</sup> 32/42 respondents provided a positive response where the advantages of the approach outweighed the disadvantages. 10/42 were mixed, where the positive and negative aspects were more balanced.

change in methodology. Of those who reported concerns, the main issues (in priority order) were:

- data comparability (26%) – the need to maintain stability in core questions across waves and continuing an uninterrupted time series
- sample representativeness (11%) – risk of respondent attrition between survey waves and introduction of bias in the panel composition, for example hard to reach, vulnerable or minority groups
- attrition (11%) – issues of respondent fatigue; response rates from wave 2 onwards; differential rates of attrition across geographical areas; and attrition of hard-to-reach, vulnerable and minority groups
- panel conditioning effects (8%) – the impact of asking repeat questions over a number of years and respondents being influenced by ongoing engagement with the survey, for example, seeking out more information on crime topics

### **Our response to questions covered under attitudes towards a longitudinal panel design section**

We welcome the high level of support for the introduction of a longitudinal panel design, and we appreciate that there are some important concerns and a degree of uncertainty related to the proposed approach.

#### **Data comparability**

There are several opportunities associated with the introduction of the longitudinal panel design, particularly as the first wave retains the same survey methodology as has always been used on the CSEW<sup>2</sup>. We have options to continue producing and publishing outputs in the same manner as previously, while gradually phasing in the integration of data across waves into our statistical outputs. This will not only retain comparability for as long as necessary, in addition, comparisons with wave 1 data will serve as a basis for assessing the quality of data collected from wave 2 onwards.

#### **Sample representativeness**

Concerns raised over sample representativeness at wave 2+ are understandable and we will continuously evaluate this as the programme of work evolves. One aspect mentioned frequently by users is the ‘attrition between waves’, particularly for hard-to-reach groups. Whilst attrition will be a problem there are several ways in which response rates can be

---

<sup>2</sup> A face-to-face interview in people’s homes, with a sole adult respondent, selected at random from a household sampled from the Postal Address file (PaF).

maximised, either by offering incentives or making better use of advance materials sent to the respondent between the wave cycles. For hard-to-reach groups it may be the case that specially designed materials are used to ensure such respondents are retained in the sample. These issues will be explored as the survey continues to evolve and we will be working closely with the future survey contractor to ensure such issues are minimised.

### **Attrition**

No matter how much we try, we will never reach a 100% survey response rate between waves, and some level of attrition will always exist. One method of dealing with attrition is via the weighting scheme. We will employ survey methodologists to devise the best possible weights to compensate for the levels of attrition. Unlike non-response at wave 1 where the differences in the characteristics of non-responders compared with responders to the survey are not known, the characteristics of responders and non-responders are known at wave 2+. Attrition weighting can therefore be a powerful tool in combating non-response and survey methodologists will be assigned the task of designing optimal attrition weights to compensate.

### **Panel conditioning effects**

Panel conditioning is notoriously hard to measure, and we share users' concern over the effect it may have on estimates. Interviews will be maintained at 12 month intervals, and we are hopeful that leaving this distance between waves will help minimise such effects. As part of our ongoing analysis, we will consider these effects and how we may best quantify them.

### **Other issues**

There were several issues raised by respondents which have not been covered in the paragraphs above. These include:

- the possibility of parallel running. We will consider parallel running to better understand the panel design. This will likely occur later, once the potential move to online surveying is better understood and any changes in relation to the survey instrument (particularly changes to the screener questions and coding of crime) are due to take place
- rotation of modules across waves. The primary aim of the wave design is to increase the number of interviews on which the main estimates of crime are produced. In the short-term, we will need to limit wave 2+ questions to only collect data about crimes in the previous 12 months using the screener section

of the questionnaire and a large part of the victim form content. Once we have established core data collections from wave 2+, the survey may be able to increase in length to include additional topics, either through the introduction of supplementary online modules, or rotating the inclusion of topics across waves. This is similar to the way in which the TCSEW evolved during the pandemic. The introduction of further topics in future waves has not yet been decided and will depend, to a large extent, on the success of the current wave 2 survey instrument and the time this takes respondents to complete.

## Attitudes towards multi-modal data collection and the online survey instrument from 2024

The transition of the CSEW from a purely face-to-face survey to a multi-modal design, will involve maintaining a face-to-face, in-home interview at wave 1, with subsequent telephone interviews at wave 2+. Development of an online survey instrument is ongoing, and a trial period is anticipated from 2024.

Responses in relation to the questions on the multi-modal data collection method and the online survey instrument from 2024 have been combined for analysis because similar themes were identified across these areas.

**Questions: What are your thoughts on the proposed move to a multi-modal survey instrument? Are you concerned about the potential changes in data output resulting from the move to a multi-modal CSEW?  
(37 responses)**

Of the 37 responses, 43% (16) were positive about the move to a multi-modal survey instrument. The main benefits identified by respondents were (in priority order):

- improvements to data quality and sample representativeness – alternative options to complete the survey via telephone or online may increase overall participation
- effective use of resources – mode alternatives that are cheaper than face-to-face interviewing will maximise sample data collected from funds available
- improving resilience of the survey instrument – a multi-modal collection makes the CSEW more resilient to the possibility of future pandemics or interruptions to face to face interviewing

Of the 37 responses, 46% (17) had mixed feelings about the move to a multi-modal survey instrument. Respondents saw the same benefits to the multi-modal design as those with positive feelings, however had some concerns including, in priority order:

- mode effects – difficult to quantify and incorporate into statistical weighting when outputs are produced from data that has been integrated across different waves and modes
- comparability to previous CSEW waves – for example impact to question changes that may be necessary to create a multi-modal survey instrument
- capturing complex crimes – difficulty replicating the role that face-to-face interviewers have in navigating the respondents through questions and ensuring quality of data collection
- confidentiality and safeguarding – whether current protocols for self-completion questions can be effectively implemented for telephone and online collection
- data outputs and publications – emphasising the need to fully communicate to users the implications that multi-modal data collection will have on the quality of outputs and publications
- accessibility – alternative modes will only support survey respondents that have access to phone and internet, which may exclude certain groups

Of the 37 responses, 11% (four) had negative feelings about the move to a multi-modal survey instrument. As with other respondents who expressed mixed feelings, the main concerns identified were modal effects and accessibility.

### **Question: How would you use the data?**

#### **(37 responses)**

Respondents provided a range of ways in which they would use the data. The main uses identified were:

- longitudinal analysis and exploring trends (43%) – examples include relationship between crime and well-being, escalation of domestic violence and hate crime victimisation
- briefings, policy making and publications (35%) – examples include monitoring crime rates, strategic reviews, and providing evidence base for policy makers, ministers and MPs, as well as policy evaluation
- comparison with other data sets (24%) – largely using CSEW data as a national baseline to compare with local survey and police data
- analysis of perceptions of crime (22%) – comparing with local data collections, or referencing in briefings, policy documentation or other publications

- prevalence and incidence rates (11%) – primarily for local comparisons, briefings and publications

**Question: Are there any areas of transformation that you are concerned about?  
(22 responses)**

In total, 59% of those who responded to the question (13 responses) reported having concerns about transformation. The main concerns reflect those identified in previous questions (in priority order):

- comparability to previous waves
- data quality
- accessibility
- sample representativeness and attrition
- data outputs and publications
- mode effects

**Question: Are there any actions you would wish ONS to undertake as part of the research programme?  
(17 responses)**

Most responses to the question (14 responses, 82%) identified at least one action that they wish the ONS to undertake as part of the research programme. In priority order, these were:

- robust programme of testing for new survey instruments – detailed qualitative research involving victims of crime, respondent engagement strategies, optimising online survey functionality across electronic devices, ensuring all respondent groups can take part
- data accessibility and guidance – ensuring source data has thorough description detail, guidance is given to users to interpret data, and consideration for new ways of presenting data
- consulting with experts – particularly those with experience in longitudinal panel design

Other responses included finding ways to ensure new and emerging crime types are captured in the survey, particularly for digital and cyber crime. The review of weighting methods to address sampling concerns and mode effects; and consideration of the removal of the cap on the number of incidents reported, were additional suggestions.

## **Our response to questions covered under attitudes towards a multi-modal data collection method and the online survey instrument from 2024**

We welcome the positive response in relation to the expansion of the survey to include telephone and online survey operation, and the recognised potential to improve data quality, especially at lower geographical levels.

As mentioned in our response to concerns regarding the panel design, we will be implementing strategies to maximise response rates from all population sub-groups and across waves. To address concerns about any residual mode effects that persist after data collection, we will use the expertise of survey methodologists to devise optimum weighting strategies to compensate for and eliminate potential biases in statistical outputs.

Our aim is to retain the consistency of question wording across modes as much as possible. While there may be slight differences in the exact wording or ordering of questions depending on the mode of collection, these will only be enacted to ensure equivalence in respondents' understanding of the questions and to ensure quality of data capture. We will continue to undertake comparability research between modes to confirm that this is the case, building on work we have already undertaken between the CSEW and TSCEW data collected during the pandemic.

We appreciate that for certain topics collected in the CSEW (including more complex crimes), the facilitating role of face-to-face interviewing has been important to ensure quality of data collection. Wave 1 interviewing will retain face-to-face interviewing to ensure this continues, however subsequent waves in the short term will be restricted to telephone interviewing. This will continue to be the case until we have developed our online survey infrastructure to support broader collection of data from the panel design.

Telephone interviewing necessitates shorter interview durations with respondents, and we will need to prioritise collection of data that supports the production of main crime estimates. We are therefore focusing our attention on the collection of data from the screener and victimisation modules. We do not envisage using telephone interviewing in future to collect data on crimes of a complex or sensitive nature. However, successful development of our current programme of research to introduce online screener and victimisation modules will provide opportunity for broader collection of CSEW topics in subsequent waves, including self-completion modules for sensitive crime topics. Users are right to point out that safeguarding protocols will need to be revised in this context and we



will seek the advice of the National Statistician's Data Ethics Advisory Committee (NSDEC).

We will also consider users' suggestion to undertake parallel running of new survey modes to evaluate quality before full implementation. This would likely occur at a later stage of the transformation project, once the potential scope for online surveying is better understood and the infrastructure is mature enough to support large scale testing. It is our hope that a mixed mode approach will increase the accessibility and willingness of respondents to take part in the survey, and this is something we will evaluate across respondent groups as we continue to collect data from each wave of collection. As suggested by our users, we will also consult with experts on all aspects of methodological development of the survey.

## Screener questions from April 2024

Screener questions are used in the CSEW to identify whether the respondent has been a victim of a potential criminal incident in the previous 12 months. A review of screener questions is necessary to enable the survey to operate in a multi-modal fashion which includes online data collection.

**Question: Would you prefer screener questions to remain the same to maintain comparability, or would you want to see screener questions improved in the ways outlined in the document?**

**(28 responses)**

Of the 28 responses, 79% (22) were supportive of improving the screener questions from April 2024. Of the remaining six respondents, four were undecided about potential changes and two did not want improvements to the screener questions.

The main themes across all responses were data quality and comparability of data. Those in favour of improvements to screener questions valued data quality (more accurate crime estimates) over the comparability of data over time.

Respondents noted that long term trends have already been disrupted with the move to the TCSEW due to the coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic, so now is a good opportunity to make additional changes and protect the time series in the future.

Respondents who were undecided acknowledged the importance of maintaining both data quality and comparability. They felt they needed more information about the rationale

behind the proposed changes to screener questions and await publication of findings from the first phase of research commissioned by ONS. There were also suggestions to trial the revised screener module as part of a parallel run before implementation.

Respondents who did not want to see improvements to the screener questions valued comparability, including comparability to other surveys, over data quality.

### **Our response to questions covered under screener questions from April 2024**

The concept of moving the crime survey online (either as a push to a web survey, or as we propose, as part of a multi-modal survey) was initiated prior to this consultation and is in line with the broader ONS survey enablement strategy to expand social survey collections online. Initial work<sup>3</sup> investigating whether the survey instrument could operate as an online survey was initiated as far back as 2017. As part of that review, it became apparent that the questionnaire, which had changed little in 20 years, could be improved, particularly in relation to collecting information on attempted crimes. We have, as a result, proposed reviewing current screener questions for implementation at the same time as the introduction of the online survey and coding review, which is currently planned for 2024. This review will take into consideration the comparability issues raised through the consultation and the recommendations from Kantar's report on the development of an online version of the CSEW.

We propose to evaluate new screener questions as part of the implementation of the multi-modal survey instrument. Unlike other changes delivered via the transformation programme of work, changes to questions and the coding of crimes cannot be evaluated without some form of parallel run. In addition, comparability with the past will be affected as changes will be implemented across all waves of the survey, including wave 1.

It is understandable that respondents were concerned with this element of the transformation and said that they would want to be kept informed of developments as the work goes forward, possibly having the opportunity to comment on the work before its implementation.

---

<sup>3</sup> [Re-design of Crime Survey for England and Wales \(CSEW\) Core questions for Online Collection - Office for National Statistics](#)

## Coding review April 2024

The CSEW offence classification system aims to record offences identified by respondents in alignment with police recorded crime. Revisions to Home Office Counting Rules (HOCR) over the years have resulted in some divergence in offence classifications on CSEW that no longer align with police recorded crime practices.

### **Question: Do you have any comments or concerns about the proposed review of the CSEW Offence Classification System? (24 responses)**

There was a mixed response to the proposed review of the CSEW Offence Classification System. Just over half (13 responses, 54%) reported having no concerns and welcomed the harmonisation to the Home Office Counting Rules (HOCR) to increase comparability between the CSEW and police recorded crime.

However, 11 respondents (46%) reported having concerns about the proposed review of the CSEW Offence Classification System, with one respondent saying that aligning to police recorded crime should not be a priority. The main concerns were:

- comparability to previous waves – concerns that revisions to the coding system will affect CSEW time series data
- collecting and interpreting data – concerns about whether new questions would need to be added to the survey to implement the new coding system and whether the new coding system will make data difficult to interpret, particularly for interested members of the public.

### **Question: Are there any actions you would wish ONS to undertake as part of the coding review? (18 responses)**

The majority of responses (78%, 14 responses) to this question identified actions that respondents wish the ONS to undertake as part of the coding review. These included:

- reviewing codes relating to specific crime types – particular emphasis on domestic abuse, sexual violence, computer misuse and fraud, harassment and terrorism
- recording secondary codes and groupings – a coding structure that nests multiple offences within the same incident or series of incidents, and offence groupings, for example VAWG, to identify crimes related to research interests

- providing documentation – how new offence codes relate to old ones, access to legacy coding rules
- reviewing prioritisation rules – recoding specific crimes that are underreported using current rules
- crime harm severity weightings – compatibility with ONS crime severity scores and Cambridge harm index
- police officers coding CSEW data – reintroduction of police officer input into coding some CSEW victimisations

### **Our response to questions under coding review April 2024**

The CSEW offence classification system is designed to record comparable offences captured by the survey as closely as possible to the way in which these offences would be recorded by the police, based on the Home Office Counting Rules (HOCR). However, it is not possible, or even desirable, to completely mirror the HOCR in all cases. Differences in the approach to capturing incidents of crime mean that in some cases the HOCR may not be applicable to certain incidents recorded by the CSEW. The coding review proposes, where appropriate, to realign the survey's offence coding with the HOCR.

This will ensure that changes to the counting rules that have not been enacted in the CSEW coding can be reflected in the survey. This is particularly important to account for the introduction of new crime types and additional offence recording flags and secondary offences that have been added to the HOCR.

We will conduct analysis to assess the impact of any changes in the offence priority order. Any changes to go ahead following this analysis will be implemented alongside changes made to the screener questions.

We do not have plan to expect police officers to code CSEW offences. Instead, we will continue to engage with the Home Office and the National Crime Registrar (NCR) to seek advice on complex cases and understand the impact of any changes to HOCR for the CSEW.

We do not have plans at present to adopt the crime severity score onto the offence coding but will keep this under review throughout the transformation of the survey.

The current offence coding manual can be found in volume two of the [2020/21 Telephone-operated Crime Survey for England and Wales \(TCSEW\) technical report](#).

# Domestic abuse, sexual victimisation, stalking and abuse during childhood

The Domestic abuse, sexual victimisation and stalking self-completion module has been included in the CSEW since 2005. It includes questions on experiences of a range of different behaviours which are used to derive prevalence rates. Other self-completion modules which are rotated in the CSEW, include questions on partner abuse, the nature of sexual assault and abuse during childhood.

The consultation provided information about the redevelopment of questions on domestic abuse in order to increase accuracy of data. Responses in this section focused on questions relating to non-domestic stalking, including how this data is currently used and thoughts about the potential temporary removal of this sub-set of questions.

The abuse during childhood module was introduced in 2016 and is rotated into the self-completion module every three years. Since implementation, this module has been adapted and further improvements are planned. This question in the consultation therefore focuses on the data that respondents would find of most use.

## **Question: Do you foresee any problems with removing the questions on non-domestic stalking for the next few years?**

**(29 responses)**

Respondents were opposed to the removal of the questions on non-domestic stalking for the next few years, with 65% raising issues. Common concerns with the proposed removal were:

- availability of VAWG data (77%) – an incomplete picture about the range of stalking offences, their prevalence and associated risk factors
- evidence gap (31%) – impact on quality of information needed to reduce stalking offences and result in less funding for support services
- escalation (32%) – risk of undermining the severity of non-domestic stalking and its known escalation to more severe crimes

## **Question: Do you find data and outputs from the questions on non-domestic stalking (i.e., stalking not carried out by a partner, ex-partner or family member) useful?**

**(29 responses)**

The data and outputs from the questions on non-domestic stalking were found useful by 59% of respondents.

**Question: How do you use the data and outputs from these questions? For example, do you use these data or outputs for decision making or as evidence in any reports.**

**(25 responses)**

Respondents use the data and outputs from the questions on non-domestic stalking in a variety of ways. These were (in priority order):

- evidence for informing policy, support services and funding (76%) – prevention programmes, support services and awareness campaigns, funding applications and the government's 2021 Tackling VAWG strategy
- analysis and trends (28%) – understanding low conviction rates, cost of stalking crimes, local and national comparisons, and comparing to data from other sources, including charity domestic abuse helplines
- training programmes (24%) – stalker awareness and improving police force understanding of stalking behaviours

**Question: Excluding questions regarding the prevalence of abuse, what other data would be useful to collect from adults who have experienced abuse in childhood? If your response is specific to an experience of a particular type of abuse, please mention this in your answer.**

**(27 responses)**

Respondents identified a range of other data that they would like to see collected from adults who have experienced abuse in childhood, with some specific to a particular type of abuse. The common themes were (in priority order):

- perpetrator demographics (59%) – relationship to victim, age and gender
- nature of the abuse (48%) – age that abuse started, type of abuse, frequency, use of coercion and force, the environment that abuse occurred in, witnesses
- reporting of abuse (33%) – whether abuse was reported, who it was reported to, reasons for not reporting, and how effectively police and child protection agencies acted on reporting
- treatment and support services (26%) – whether tailored support services were used, and health services accessed as a result of abuse

- outcomes in adulthood (15%) – impact on mental health, youth offending, economic prospects, and other impacts transitioning from childhood to adulthood
- risk factors (11%) – identifying characteristics of people vulnerable to child abuse

Other abuse types that were mentioned more generally by respondents included: exposure to indecent sexual imagery, teenage intimate relationship abuse and disentangling neglect and abuse. Another common theme across responses was on terminology and enabling respondents to identify which experiences in childhood would be considered abuse.

Finally, a minority of respondents suggested including more free text follow-up questions for respondents to provide more context to their responses. However, respondents also recognised the need for balance between collecting detailed information and intrusiveness.

### **Our response to questions covered under domestic abuse, sexual victimisation, stalking and abuse during childhood**

Over the last 18 months we have undertaken work to redevelop the questions on domestic abuse on the survey. In order to include the newly developed survey questions, we need more space on the survey and proposed removing the questions on non-domestic stalking in the short-term. We recognise the importance of the data currently collected on stalking to many of our users and the responses have helped us to understand the user needs and future requirements for data collection. In spring 2023, we will publish the new domestic abuse questions, our evaluation plan and an update on the impact for other questions such as non-domestic stalking.

We also recognise the importance of collecting a range of data from adults who have experienced abuse in childhood. We are currently working with our methodology team and stakeholders to redevelop this self-completion module to capture as much required data as possible, whilst prioritising all user needs across the survey space available. Currently this includes re-developing questions to collect more detailed data on high priority requirements for different types of abuse experienced before the age of 18, including emotional, physical and sexual abuse and exposure to domestic violence. We are also developing a question to measure different types of neglect. We are cognitively testing our proposed questions with adults who have experienced abuse during childhood and are incorporating their interview feedback into our question development.

For sexual abuse experienced during childhood we are working on re-developing questions to capture perpetrator relationship to the victim, age and gender as well as reporting of sexual abuse experienced during childhood. We are also considering terminology throughout by engaging with stakeholders and adults who have experienced abuse during childhood.

## Children's Crime Survey for England and Wales (CCSEW)

The Children's Crime Survey for England and Wales (CCSEW) surveys children aged 10 to 15. It has traditionally sub-sampled children from households where an interview has been completed with an individual aged 16+ (for the CSEW). However, a redesign of the CCSEW is necessary to respond to data collection challenges since the pandemic and ensure sustainability for the future. Data collection on the CCSEW was paused between March 2020 and April 2022, during which time it was not possible to produce estimates for 10 to 15 year olds. There continues to be some uncertainty around the estimates we will be able to produce from the survey due to ongoing challenges with response rates since the survey returned in April this year. Re-designing the CCSEW to an online first approach, represents the most efficient way of continuing to produce estimates from the survey and provides resilience to future societal change.

### **Question: What are your thoughts on the CCSEW potentially moving to a longitudinal panel design in the future?**

#### **(26 responses)**

Generally, respondents expressed positive thoughts towards the CCSEW potentially moving to a longitudinal panel design in the future. Of the 26 respondents that answered this question, 15 responded (58%) positively with the main benefits identified as:

- increased ability to analyse trends for example re-victimisation and the identification of characteristics that make children more or less likely to become a victim
- increased sample size will enable further breakdowns and sub-analysis of the data

There were seven respondents (27%) with mixed sentiments towards the move to a panel design methodology, and four respondents with negative views. Points of particular concern included:



- consideration for retaining children in the sample across several waves, who move home, particularly those in foster care
- whether children in care homes are included in the sample
- what will happen to children who 'age out' of the survey

**Question: What would be the impact to you/your organisation of moving to measuring prevalence and incidence to only measuring the prevalence of crime-related victimisation?**

**(19 responses)**

The majority of respondents (15 responses, 79%) showed a preference for keeping the incidence measure in the CCSEW. However, little detail was given on the impact of only measuring prevalence on respondents and their organisations. Isolated examples include:

- separate data sources would need to be sought to supplement CSEW data if incidence was dropped
- dropping incidence measures would fail to meet information needs across the third sector
- costs of crimes against children would likely be underestimated

Other themes in the responses were:

- victimisation - incidence helps understand repeat victimisation, changes in victimisation, the nature of repeat offending and identify groups of children who may be victimised more often
- reliability - removing incidence may impact reliability of prevalence estimates
- service planning - incidence data is important for service planning and delivery

Prevalence was of greater importance to four respondents (21%) and removal of incidence data would have minimal impact on them.

**Question: What, if any, are the limitations of crime measures in their current form and what impact does this have on your work or ability to inform policy?**

**(16 responses)**

At least one limitation of crime measures in their current form were identified by 13 respondents (81%). Most responses focused on gaps in the data, including:

- sexual abuse and sibling sexual abuse
- modern slavery
- child exploitation, including grooming

- children witnessing domestic abuse
- factors that increase a child's risk of being a victim of crime

Insights regarding the impact of these limitations were limited but included problems securing funding for support services.

Other comments included requests for more granular data, including breakdowns by protected characteristics and smaller geographies. Respondents reported that this would enable them to better understand how crimes are affecting different groups (for example breakdowns by gender would help with VAWG) and would enable the comparison of local and national trends. There was also the suggestion of broadening the age range of children from which CCSEW data was collected, up to and including 17 year olds to meet reporting requirements against UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

### **Our response to questions covered under the CCSEW**

We are encouraged that user interest for a longitudinal panel design extends to collecting data from the CCSEW. Response rates from children sampled from households taking part in the CSEW have notably fallen in recent years, making it difficult to collect sufficient data to produce regular and timely outputs to meet users' needs. We are now seeking opportunities to redesign the survey to address low response, and longitudinal data collection is something we can potentially offer to increase the number of interviews with children.

Our engagement with stakeholders continues to highlight the usefulness of the self-completion modules collected from the CCSEW. We believe that transitioning these modules, currently facilitated by face-to-face interviewing, into an online module would be an important first step in redesigning the children's survey. This change would allow for greater sample increases and flexible options for inviting children to take part in the panel design. We have started a programme of research that considers options for collecting children's survey data online, starting with the online self-completion modules, before further consideration of modules that will collect prevalence data on child victimisation. We will review the suggestions in this consultation regarding the ongoing need for incidence measures from the children's survey. Requirements for both prevalence and incidence measures will form a significant part of our programme of work developing an online screener and victimisation module. This work is expected to take place over a longer timescale.

Since the challenges of measuring victimisation among children are even greater for online data collection, we anticipate that we will need to review the estimates we produce from an online CCSEW. We will continue to engage with stakeholders to get a better understanding of their requirements for data on the victimisation of children. We will also be undertaking research to explore how we can continue to meet data users' needs while maintaining the quality of estimates produced through an online CCSEW.

We plan to launch a small-scale online field test in January 2023 to explore how children and their parents engage with an online CCSEW. The findings from this test will inform subsequent research and development, with the aim of having the first online CCSEW module operational by April 2024. We plan to publish a research update on this work in Summer 2023.

We recognise there is a data gap on children's experience of abuse and exploitation. Our feasibility study to determine whether a national survey could provide an effective source of data on the current scale and nature of child abuse remains ongoing. We published a [progress update](#) in April 2022. The next steps involve the development of an appropriate safeguarding process and questionnaire. We published a [tender](#) for this element of the work in September.

## CSEW content

The Crime Survey for England and Wales (CSEW) collects a large amount of information. On average, the survey takes 50 minutes to complete and can be considerably longer for respondents with multiple victimisation experiences. We consulted users on the content of the survey to understand the relative value of questions asked, to help us determine which of those should be retained in the survey. We also invited people to propose new content for the survey, while asserting the limited scope to increase the overall length of the current face to face survey.

### **Our overall response to adapting content in the CSEW**

It was clear from the full set of consultation responses that all sections of the existing survey were still of value to users. We are therefore proposing to retain all the existing modules in the face-to-face survey that will continue to be collected from participants at wave 1.

We acknowledge that there are numerous topics that users would like to expand on or introduce into the survey collection and we summarise these in more detail in the following sections below. Our current assessment is that many of these can be considered as part of our future plans for collecting data longitudinally within the panel design. One of the major benefits of developing the multi-modal approach will be establishing online capability that can support self-completion modules for both sensitive and non-sensitive topics. Having received information from users about topics that are important to them, we will aim to develop a panel design that can accommodate flexible rotation and introduction of additional survey content, with a particular focus on what can be achieved with cost-effective online data collection.

## Module 5: Perceptions of crime

The Perceptions of crime module asks about respondents' day-to-day behaviour to help us to understand how people's behaviour influences their experiences of crime. It also asks about how safe respondents feel, how worried they are about specific types of crime, and the impact crime has on their quality of life. It asks questions about perceptions of crime in the country as a whole and in respondents' specific area.

### **Question: Do you use data or outputs based on questions from the Perceptions of crime module?**

**(30 responses)**

Of the 30 responses to this question, 80% said they use data or outputs based on questions from the Perceptions of crime module.

### **Question: How do you use the data or outputs based on questions from the Perceptions of crime module? For example, do you use these data or outputs for decision making or as evidence in any reports.**

**(23 responses)**

This module was highlighted as being valuable and unique source of data on perceptions of crime and is important for the work of respondents. Data from this module was used to (in priority order):

- Inform users' work (74%) – community safety decision making, public messaging, and problem oriented policing operations
- Analyse data (57%) – benchmarking against local survey data, examining trends over time, assessing impact of high-profile media crime coverage

- Understand variations across demographic groups (30%) – racial and gender disparities in perceptions of crime, as well as geographic variation

**Question: Are there any changes you would like to see made to the module?**  
(20 responses)

Of the 20 responses, 60% would like to see changes made to the perceptions module.

**Question: Please provide additional information on the changes you would like to see made to this module. For example, do you have any suggestions for additional questions in this module.**  
(14 responses)

Changes users would like to see to the perception of crime module relate to the following themes (listed in priority order):

- Increased detail in fear of crime questions (50%) – safety walking alone, use of public transport, distinguishing between violent and non-violent crimes, perceived likelihood of victimisation and adapting behaviours
- Demographics (43%) – factors relating to age, sex, geographic location and interaction with socio-economic environment
- Improved respondent awareness (29%) – improved information about the types of crimes respondents should be considering when completing this module, for example those taking place in the home
- Questionnaire development and design (22%) – extending the ‘going out questions’, harmonisation with other data sources, and availability of PFA level outputs
- Harmonisation (14%) - ensuring data aligns with other data sources to enable comparisons

## Module 7: Victimisation module

The Victimisation module asks about the nature and circumstances of crime, what the victim was doing at the time of the incident, who the offender was and their motives. It asks about the use of force or violence, items that were stolen, damage to the property, and the cost of crime. The respondent is also asked about their contact with police.

**Question: Do you use data or outputs based on questions from the victimisation module?**

**(30 responses)**

Of the 30 responses, 70% of respondents use data or outputs based on questions from the Victimisation module.

**Question: How do you use the data or outputs based on questions from the Victimisation module? For example, do you use these data or outputs for decision making or as evidence in any reports.**

**(19 responses)**

Respondents identified three main uses of the data and outputs based on the victimisation module. These were (in priority order):

- evidence and publications (37%) – evidence to support policies tackling alcohol related violence, measuring the economic and social costs of crime and reporting against UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)
- analysis and research (37%) – using data for detailed analysis, for example nature of violent crime, victim injury, exploring relationships between offender and victim, and geographic patterns in victimisation
- intervention and teaching programmes (16%) – use in university degree course modules, highlighting risk factors to support interventions (e.g., domestic abuse, gang and drug violence)

**Question: Are there any changes you would like to see made to the module?**

**(18 responses)**

Most respondents (67%) would like to see changes to the victimisation module.

**Question: If you answered ‘Yes’ please provide additional information on the changes you would like to see made to this module. For example, do you have any suggestions for additional questions in this module.**

**(11 responses)**

A variety of suggestions were made by respondents which broadly focused on providing more detail on the respondent’s area of interest. The main themes were (in priority order):

- nature of victimisation – various requests, including additional data about location of the incident, contact between victim and offender after the incident, introducing alcohol related questions on the short form

- contact with police and support services – more detail about support that was sought, what was received, the extent of help offered
- greater data disaggregation and frequency – requested by local authority, protected characteristics, and more frequent data on the nature of sexual assault
- long term outcomes – behavioural changes in victims after the incident
- costs of crime – costs of damaged and stolen items and whether they were recovered, duration of injuries sustained by victim, impact on victim's work hours and productivity

## Module 8: Fraud victimisation module

The Fraud victimisation module includes questions about respondents' experiences of fraud and computer misuse, including details about the perpetrators, attempted thefts, what was stolen and victim's costs, and contact with Action Fraud or the police.

**Question: Do you use data or outputs based on questions from the Fraud victimisation module?**  
(27 responses)

Of the 27 responses to this question, 63% answered yes.

**Question: How do you use the data or outputs based on questions from the Fraud victimisation module? For example, do you use these data or outputs for decision making or as evidence in any reports.**  
(16 responses)

There were mixed responses on the use of the fraud victimisation module. The key themes identified (in priority order) were:

- trends and analysis (38%) – links between organised crime and fraud, understanding increases, impact on victim's finances and wellbeing
- decision making and reporting (31%) – policy decisions, police resource allocation, performance monitoring and statutory reviews
- protection of high-risk groups (25%) – identification of groups vulnerable to fraud offences and appropriate prevention strategies

**Question: Are there any changes you would like to see made to the module?**  
(16 responses)

Most (63%) respondents stated that they would like to see changes to this module.

**Question: If you answered ‘Yes’ please provide additional information on the changes you would like to see made to this module. For example, do you have any suggestions for additional questions in this module.**

**(12 responses)**

Suggested changes included:

- reporting and support services (42%) – more detailed information on the reporting of fraud offences and support services used would be useful
- emerging crime types (42%) – cryptocurrency, virtual assets, hacking with extortion and ransomware were all suggested topic areas
- impact of fraud (25%) – more detailed information on the impact of fraud offences would be useful
- data disaggregation (25%) – more granular fraud offence classifications and types of computer misuse, and alignment with NFIB and Action Fraud categories
- question wording clarifications (17%) – improving use of technical terminologies (e.g., “social engineering tricks”, “clone websites”), distinguishing between local and cloud-based environments

## Module 9: Performance of the criminal justice system

The Performance of the Criminal Justice System module asks about the effectiveness of the criminal justice system, including the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS), the courts, prisons, the probation service, Police and Crime Commissioners (PCCs), the National Crime Agency and the Code of Practice for Victims of Crime. Respondents are asked about how each of these organisations is performing across the country as a whole and about how the police are performing in their area.

**Question: Do you use data or outputs based on questions from the Performance of the criminal justice system module?**

**(30 responses)**

Of the 30 responses, 63% said they use data or outputs based on questions from the Performance of the criminal justice system module.



**Question: How do you use the data or outputs based on questions from the Performance of the criminal justice system module? For example, do you use these data or outputs for decision making or as evidence in any reports.**  
**(18 responses)**

Data from the Performance of the criminal justice system (CJS) module is used in the following ways (in priority order):

- analysis and comparison across crime types (50%) – proportion of crimes taken to trial, treatment of offenders and victims, barriers to CJS, experiences of victims meeting offenders. A lot of analysis is focused on domestic abuse, rape, sexual assault and stalking offences
- informing policy and practice (39%) – strategic documents and evidence in briefings, informing policing practices, supporting victims of crime
- use in publications and reports (22%) – includes Race Disparity Unit Ethnicity facts and figures website, Inclusive Britain report, and the perceptions of policing and justice from Northern Ireland where the CSEW is used as comparator data

**Question: Are there any changes you would like to see made to the module?**  
**(20 responses)**

The majority of respondents (70%) would like to see changes made to the Performance of the criminal justice system module.

**Question: If you answered ‘Yes’, please provide additional information on the changes you would like to see made to the module. For example, do you have any suggestions for additional questions in this module.**  
**(14 responses)**

Respondents identified that the following changes they would like to see to the Performance of the criminal justice system module were:

- perceptions of the police, CPS and courts (43%) – ability to differentiate respondent’s perceptions of different institutions, availability of PFA level analysis, more detailed demographic breakdowns (age, sex, ethnicity and migration status). Also measuring the influence of media on perceptions
- victims code and restorative justice (21%) – improving introductory information at the start of module, updating questions in line with the Victims Bill, reinstatement of restorative justice questions

- interaction with the CJS (21%) – developments suggested for this module include questions for witnesses to a crime, confidence in the CPS and beliefs that court sentences will match severity of crimes
- support services (14%) – questions on support services for children, awareness of police and crime commissioner’s responsibilities for providing support for victims

## Module 10: Mobile phone crime

The Mobile phone crime module asks about respondents’ possession of email, landline, and mobile phones as well as their experiences of mobile phone theft. It also asks about any actions they took to protect themselves from mobile phone theft such as registering their phone on an asset register.

**Question: Do you use data or outputs based on questions from the Mobile phone crime module?**  
**(21 responses)**

Of the 21 responses, 29% indicated that they use data or outputs based on questions from the Mobile phone crime module.

**Question: How do you use the data or outputs based on questions from the mobile phone crime module? For example, do you use these data or outputs for decision making or as evidence in any reports.**  
**(Six responses)**

Only three respondents reported currently using the mobile phone crime module data for the purposes of reporting, informing policy and practice and for training programs. One respondent noted they hope to use the data in the future, however questions in their current form are not suitable for their research which focuses on controlling behaviour by partners including controlling access to mobile phones. Two respondents reported that they do not currently use the module for any regular reporting.

**Question: Are there any changes you would like to see made to the module?**  
**(10 responses)**

Half of respondents (5) said that they would like to see changes to the mobile phone crime module.

**Question: If you answered ‘Yes’ please provide additional information on the changes you would like to see made to this module. For example, do you have any suggestions for additional questions in this module.  
(Five responses)**

Suggestions for new questions were provided by three respondents were on:

- mobile number theft – emerging crime types involving phone hacking and porting to other networks
- coercive behaviour – the extent to which respondents are victims of controlling behaviours of partners accessing mobile phones
- location – geographic information including the types of environment in which mobile phone thefts occur

## **Module 11: Follow-up module A – Experiences of the police**

The Experiences of the police module asks about respondents’ various types of contact with the police or police community support officers (PCSOs). It checks whether respondents are, or live with someone, who is a serving police officer or whether they volunteer with the police. The module requests respondents’ views about their local police, experiences of contacting the police by 999 or 101, including the reasons and satisfaction with the contact, experiences of being stopped by the police while driving and on foot and about any complaints against the police.

**Question: Do you use data or outputs based on questions from the Experiences of the police module?  
(25 responses)**

The Experiences of the police module are used by 52% of respondents who responded to this question.

**Question: How do you use the data or outputs based on questions from the Experiences of the police module? For example, do you use these data or outputs for decision making or as evidence in any reports.  
(12 responses)**

The most common use of the experiences of the police module (seven responses) was analysis. Respondents use the data for analysis on the following themes: awareness of the

police; stop and search; experiences of the police at police force level; perceptions and trust in the police and criminal justice system by demographic (including ethnicity and migration status); barriers to accessing CJS and factors affecting confidence in police; and comparing to local survey and police data.

Another common use (five responses) was reporting and performance monitoring. Data is used for evidencing the effectiveness of the police; in reporting confidence and satisfaction levels; internal organisational briefings and benchmarking of performance.

**Question: Are there any changes you would like to see made to the module?  
(16 responses)**

Respondents (56%) would like to see changes made to the module.

**Question: If you answered 'Yes' please provide additional information on the changes you would like to see made to this module. For example, do you have any suggestions for additional questions in this module.  
(10 responses)**

A common theme across responses is for changes to the existing module content. Suggestions included (in priority order):

- contact with the police – collecting additional data about ways people come into contact with police, engagement with young people and victims of VAWG
- stop and search – differentiating between stop and search while driving and PACE stop and search practices
- local police and counter terrorism police – some respondents felt questions should distinguish between different types of police personnel (neighbourhood police, response officers, counter terrorism)
- non-police support services – collecting data about use of alternative non-police services
- frequency of reporting - requests for data to be collected and released more often and providing more breakdowns at lower geographies

## Module 12: Crime prevention and security module B- Household

The Crime prevention and security: household module asks about security measures fitted to respondents' homes to investigate the relationship between home security and crime levels in their area. Some of the measures asked about include burglar alarms, deadlocks, chains, window locks, CCTV and the use of timer or sensor activated lights inside and outside of the home. Questions also ask about how security conscious the respondent is and the reasons for installing security measures or being more conscious of home security.

**Question: Do you use data or outputs based on questions from the Crime prevention and security: household module?**  
**(22 responses)**

Data and outputs based on the questions from the crime prevention and security household module are used by 32% of respondents.

**Question: How do you use the data or outputs based on questions from the Crime prevention and security: household module? For example, do you use these data or outputs for decision making or as evidence in any reports.**  
**(Nine responses)**

Responses to this question mainly focused on victimisation (four responses), including likelihood of victimisation and what role security and prevention options play in preventing victimisation. Another key use of the data was recommendations (three responses), for example providing recommendations on home security measures to local community, providing information on burglary hotspot areas and informing internal and external briefings.

Data is not currently used for any specific regular reporting by two respondents, although one indicated it could be of use in the future.

**Question: Are there any changes you would like to see made to the module?**  
**(10 responses)**

Of the 10 responses, 30% of respondents would like to see changes to the module.

**Question: If you answered ‘Yes’ please provide additional information on the changes you would like to see made to this module. For example, do you have any suggestions for additional questions in this module.**

**(Three responses)**

Minimal responses were given to this question, with main themes including:

- expanding interviewer observations – checking for security devices to match or replace the self-report questions, include observations surrounding the area, not just conditions of the house
- reviewing the list of security measures – due to changing practices, particularly the rise of video doorbells
- socio-economic factors – information about links between security precautions, house tenure and income

## **Module 13: Crime prevention and security module C:**

### **Vehicle crime**

The Crime prevention: vehicle crime module asks respondents about vehicle crime and security. The questions cover how many vehicles (excluding motorcycles) are owned in the household and the security features and high value items contained in those vehicles.

**Question: Do you use data or outputs based on questions from the Crime prevention and security: vehicle crime module?**

**(21 respondents)**

Of the responses, 24% reported using data or outputs from the vehicle crime module.

**Question: How do you use the data or outputs based on questions from the vehicle crime module? For example, do you use these data or outputs for decision making or as evidence in any reports.**

**(Five responses)**

There were relatively few responses to this module. Responses showed that the data from this module is used to:

- monitor vehicle crime trends (40%) – certain types of vehicles and hotspots
- inform users on vehicle crime (40%) – information to support policing strategies
- analyse vehicle crime (20%) – monitoring changes over time

**Question: Are there any changes you would like to see made to the module?  
(Nine responses)**

Just over half of respondents (56%) said there were changes that they would like to see made to the module.

**Question: If you answered 'Yes' please provide additional information on the changes you would like to see made to this module. For example, do you have any suggestions for additional questions in this module.  
(Five responses)**

The changes identified by respondents (in priority order) were:

- focusing on more specific aspects of vehicle crime – more nuanced questions required
- capturing new trends in vehicle crime – new questions needed to capture the changing nature of vehicle crime that has evolved since the module was developed (for example keyless car theft and e-scooters)

## **Module 14: Crime prevention and security module D: Personal and online**

The crime prevention and security personal and online module asks respondents about things they do to help reduce their chances of becoming a victim of crime while outside the home, and whether their attitudes about personal safety have changed over the last 12 months. This module also covers the measures participants take to stay safe online.

**Question: Do you use data or outputs based on questions from the Crime prevention and security: personal and online module?  
(22 responses)**

Of the 22 respondents that answered the question, 45% used data/ outputs from this module to inform policy and practice.

**Question: How do you use the data or outputs based on questions from the Crime prevention and security: personal and online module? For example, do you use these data or outputs for decision making or as evidence in any reports.**

**(11 responses)**

Of the 11 responses, data was identified as being used in the following ways, to:

- inform policy and practice – briefings and publications, develop training modules to keep people safe online, producing general advice and awareness initiatives
- for analysis – comparing to other data including local survey data on perceptions of safety
- enable resource allocation – to offer support for victims of these crime types

**Question: Are there any changes you would like to see made to the module?**

**(12 responses)**

Most respondents (67%) would like to see changes made to the module.

**Question: If you answered ‘Yes’ please provide additional information on the changes you would like to see made to this module. For example, do you have any suggestions for additional questions in this module.**

**(Eight responses)**

Additional questions requested on the following topic areas were about.

- fraud and online security – number of attempted frauds in the past year, updated online security questions and covering wider online harms e.g., vulnerability to radicalisation
- safety attitudes towards safety among women and girls in specific scenarios, such as travelling alone or at night
- weapons – information on carrying a knife or weapon for protection
- media – influence of media on online behaviours

## **Module 15: Anti-social behaviour**

The Anti-social behaviour (ASB) module asks about respondents’ perceptions of ASB in their local area and their personal experiences of ASB.

**Question: Do you use data or outputs based on questions from the Anti-social behaviour module?**



**(25 responses)**

Most respondents (72%) said they use data or outputs from the ASB module.

**Question: How do you use the data or outputs based on questions from the Anti-social behaviour module. For example, do you use these data or outputs for decision making or as evidence in any reports.**

**(18 responses)**

This module was an important source of data on ASB, particularly with government organisations. The main themes highlighted by the 18 respondents on the ASB module were:

- data comparability and analysis (56%) - using data or outputs for analysis and comparability, specifically comparing their own organisations data to the CSEW
- informing policy and practice (28%) – police practice, evidence packs for decision making on ASB, lobbying for legislation
- perceptions (22%) – gaining a deeper understanding of ASB, understanding public attitudes, localised beliefs about discriminatory harassment

**Question: Are there any changes you would like to see made to the module?**

**(14 responses)**

Half of respondents (50%) would like to see changes made to the ASB module.

**Question: If you answered ‘Yes’ please provide additional information on the changes you would like to see made to this module. For example, do you have any suggestions for additional questions in this module.**

**(Seven responses)**

Changes to this module suggested by respondents were.

- question specifics – more detail on respondents’ experiences of ASB, reasons for non-reporting of ASB experienced or witnessed
- frequency – improved measures of how often ASB is experienced (for example, daily, weekly, monthly), rather than just 12 months
- case reviews – whether victims of persistent ASB were exercising use of the Community Trigger, an ASB intervention, to request case reviews

## Module 16: Demographics

The Demographics module asks about respondents themselves. It asks about respondents' general health and any health conditions or illnesses they may have, what they do for work, their identity (ethnicity, nationality and religion), education, housing and income.

**Question: Do you use data or outputs based on questions from the Demographics module?**

**(28 responses)**

Most respondents (79%) said they use data or outputs based on the demographics module.

**Question: How do you use the data or outputs based on questions from the demographics module? For example, do you use these data or outputs for decision making or as evidence in any reports.**

**(21 responses)**

The most common use of the demographics module was for data analysis (18 responses). This included comparing the CSEW data to other data sources, how crimes affect different groups of people and identifying groups at an increased risk of being a victim of crime.

Other uses included:

- informing decisions, policies, and programmes
- using demographic information as a control measure in analysis
- linking to analysis of domestic abuse questions
- protected characteristics within the demographic variables were particularly valuable to some respondents

**Question: Are there any changes you would like to see made to the module?**

**(21 responses)**

Of the 21 responses, 76% said they would like to see changes made to this module.

**Question: If you answered 'Yes' please provide additional information on the changes you would like to see made to this module. For example, do you have any suggestions for additional questions in this module.**

**(17 responses)**

Respondents predominantly requested more questions on emerging demographics which are of increasing interest and importance, including:

- gender – capturing natal sex alongside self-identified gender
- veterans – identification of veterans or members of the armed forces
- disability status – questions to align with the social model of disability, alongside the Equalities Act
- migratory status – need to understand migrant victimisation, currently country of birth is the only demographic available
- mental health – more questions generally on health and mental health
- learning difficulties – important to understand prevalence of victimisation among people with learning disabilities
- sexuality – moving questions on sexuality to this module would be preferred
- ethnicity – further subcategories requested, including harmonisation with 2021 Census
- age – more granular age breakdowns for people aged 60+, whose perceptions and experiences of crime will differ across different age groups
- financial security – income and source of income, emergency access to assets
- social demographics – parental occupation of respondent at age 14
- changing circumstances – collecting data about changes in household composition, relationship status, income, and change of address over the course of the panel participation

Respondents suggested improving the surveys demographic representation by considering boosting the sample to secure adequate numbers from minority groups taking into factors such as ethnicity, sexual identity and sexual orientation.

## Self-completion module 17: Drug use and drinking

The self-completion module for Drug use and drinking asks respondents about any use of a variety of recreational and non-prescribed drugs. Further questions cover psychoactive substances, driving under the influence of drugs and/or alcohol, and other alcohol-related questions.

**Question: Do you use data or outputs based on questions from the drug use and drinking self-completion module?  
(24 responses)**

Over half of respondents (54%) answered yes to using data or outputs based on questions from the drug use and drinking self-completion module.

**Question: How do you use the data or outputs based on questions from the Drug use and drinking self-completion module? For example, do you use these data or outputs for decision making or as evidence in any reports.**

**(16 responses)**

The most common use of the Drug use and drinking module were (in priority order):

- analysis and trends – undertaken at national level to monitor changes in prevalence, detailed analysis of alcohol related violence and drink and drug driving
- publications – reports of road safety, public information materials and press releases
- policy and strategy – informing local priorities, ministerial briefings, annual assessments, supporting the government's 10-year drug strategy

**Question: Are there any changes you would like to see made to the module?**

**(16 responses)**

Half of respondents (50%) would like to see changes to this module.

**Question: If you answered 'Yes' please provide additional information on the changes you would like to see made to this module. For example, do you have any suggestions for additional questions in this module.**

**(10 responses)**

Respondents would like to see to this module include content on:

- drink driving – more questions on circumstances of incidents, motivations and whether the respondent was travelling as a passenger
- drug use – adding in new substances, poly drug use, attitudes and motivations, context and location of drug use and prescription drug use

Other content requested includes use of seatbelts, the frequency of the nightlife questions and the link to violent crime. There were also requests for this module to report more granular data and for neighbourhood estimates to be reported.

## Module 18: Self-completion module: Gangs and personal security

The Gangs and personal security self-completion module asks about respondents' awareness of street gangs, defined as groups of young people who hang around together and have a specific area or territory; have a name, a colour or something else to identify the group; possibly have rules or a leader; who may commit crimes together. It also asks questions about carrying a knife for personal protection.

**Question: Do you find data or outputs based on questions from the Gangs and personal security module useful?**  
**(20 responses)**

The majority of respondents (60%) stated that they found data or outputs based on questions from the Gangs and personal security module useful.

**Our response to questions covered under self-completion module: Gangs and personal security**

Through the consultation, respondents identified their willingness to be involved in the redevelopment of questions on gangs and personal security. We will be engaging with users separately to understand their requirements for improving this data. It is anticipated that re-developed questions will be included in the CSEW from April 2023.

## New areas of research

In the final section of the consultation, respondents were given the opportunity to suggest new topics of interest that they would like to see included in the CSEW and make any other comments about the consultation.

**Question: Are there any new topics of interest that could be collected using the survey instrument? If so, please leave details about the new research area and aims of the questions below.**  
**(23 responses)**

A variety of topics were suggested in this question. The most popular topic suggestions included:

- hate crimes – disabled people's experience of hate crimes

- online harms – non-crime online hate incidents, development of online abuse risk calculator and online harm severity index, measures of online sexual abuse
- victim-offender overlap – data collected from respondents about their offending behaviour and how it relates to their own victimisation experiences
- gangs and personal security – motivations for gang membership, perceptions, improved clarity of definitions, more granular geographic and demographic breakdowns

A summary of topic suggestions and comments can be found in table 1 below.

*Table 1: Further new topic suggestions and comments*

<b>Changes to topics</b>	<b>New topics</b>	<b>Other</b>
Sexual assault	Modern slavery	Data linkage
VAWG	Terrorism and vulnerability to radicalisation	Household surveys
Re-introduce restorative justice	Major incidents	Long term impacts of crime
Cost of crime	Business owners	EQ-5Ds
	Package theft	Ecometric approaches
	Economic crime	Qualitative follow-up
	Victims' code	
	Public transport	
	Bereavement by homicide	

**Question: Do you have any other comments about this consultation?  
(17 responses)**

Responses to this question were also varied. The main themes were:

- requests for different geographical breakdowns. This was a common theme in responses throughout the consultation, expressed in users' consideration for the proposed methodological design and suggested content changes.
- engaging with people with protected characteristics. These views were also captured thoroughly in people's responses to specific modules in the consultation.

**Our response to questions covered under new areas of research**

We welcome the suggestions for new topics and changes to existing topics in the CSEW and we will carefully consider each one. For now, we are deferring making any decisions about the inclusion of these topics while we are in the early stages of implementing the new panel design. In future, we aim to have increased flexibility for collecting new content from online survey modules. We will revisit these suggestions with stakeholders in due course, assessing the benefits and appropriateness of collecting such topics from a crime survey, and the quality of data that can be collected to meet users' needs.

We will always need to be mindful of the limitations surrounding the length of the survey. One way to solve this would be to include new modules on a rotational basis. The American National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) uses module rotation, therefore the ONS will review how the NCVS implemented this and discuss with them.

Some specific enquiries made by respondents in the consultation are listed below with our responses.

**What plans are there for improved harmonisation between devolved administrations?**

The ONS meets regularly with colleagues at the Northern Ireland Statistics and Research Agency (NISRA) and the Scottish Government who run their own crime surveys. Throughout and following the pandemic, each devolved administration changed how they obtained crime survey data. This is primarily due to the different conditions and environments in which the surveys have found themselves during this period. The transformation of the CSEW is being monitored carefully by the devolved administrations, and if successful, it may influence the future direction of the other surveys. We will continue to meet regularly and discuss harmonisation issues between the CSEW and equivalent surveys.

**Will the CSEW continue to strive to gather feedback from communities like new migrant groups, young people and minorities?**

Yes. As part of the redesign of the CSEW we will be looking at all survey materials, especially those sent in advance of the survey or its subsequent waves to try and elicit the best possible response rates for all communities, including migrant groups, young people and minorities.

**How can group residences be included in the sample for both the adults and children's surveys?**

We are currently exploring ways in which group residences including care homes, homeless people and student halls of residence can be included in crime statistics. This includes reviewing the availability of appropriate sample frames, and alternative measures of crime which may be available for these communities.

**Can respondents provide feedback on the sexual assault questions?**

We plan to begin redevelopment work of the sexual assault questions next year. The first phase of this will be to contact stakeholders to collect feedback on the current questions and areas for improvement.

**Will the outcomes from this consultation impact on the CCSEW?**

We will of course take into consideration the views of users from the consultation. For example, the consultation has highlighted the ongoing need for incidence measures from the CCSEW. Therefore, feasibility of both prevalence and incidence measures will form a significant part of investigation in our programme of work developing an online screener and victimisation module for the CCSEW.

**Will there be any ability to analyse free text responses?**

CSEW data must be handled sensitively, given the nature of the topic and the potential for disclosure. Free text responses on the survey must be dealt with particularly carefully. There are no current plans for free text responses to be made generally available for analysis either within the Secure Research Service (SRS) or elsewhere.



## Annex A – List of organisations who provided a consultation response

Department of Justice Northern Ireland, Analytical Services Group  
Bedfordshire Police  
Cabinet Office Equality Hub  
Centre of Expertise on Child Sexual Abuse  
City of London Police, National Lead Force Operations, National Fraud Intelligence Bureau  
City, University of London  
Cardiff University, Crime and Security Research Institute  
Department for Education  
Department for Transport  
Equality and Human Rights Commission  
Fernwood Parish Council  
Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire and Rescue Services  
Home Office  
Liverpool John Moores University  
London Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime<sup>4</sup>.  
Mankind UK and 1in6.uk  
Middle Tennessee State University  
Ministry of Justice  
National Association for People Abused in Childhood  
National Crime Agency, Child Sexual Abuse Threat Leadership  
Norfolk and Suffolk Constabulary, Strategic, Business and Operational Services Dept  
Northamptonshire Police  
Nottingham City Council  
Nottingham Crime and Drugs Partnership  
National Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children  
Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for Derbyshire  
Older People's Commissioner for Wales  
Office for National Statistics, Sustainable Development Goals Team  
Paladin National Stalking Advocacy Service

---

<sup>4</sup> Please note this response is from the Evidence and Insight Unit at MOPAC and so is focused on survey methodology and content, largely from a technical perspective. It is not written on behalf of the Deputy Mayor/Mayor. The views of London's Victims' Commissioners team were sought and are reflected in parts of this response.

Parliamentary Advisory Council for Transport  
Portsmouth City Council  
Protection Against Stalking  
Restorative Justice Council  
Safer Neighbourhood Board Havering  
Splitz Support Service  
StopWatch  
Suzy Lamplugh Trust  
The Children's Society  
The Institute of Alcohol Studies  
The National Police Chiefs' Council  
The Police Foundation  
The Swedish National Council for Crime Prevention  
Victim Support  
Department for Health and Social Care, Violence and Abuse Policy team  
Violence Research Group  
Violence, Health and Society Consortium  
Welsh Government  
West Yorkshire Combined Authority, Policing & Crime Team



© Crown copyright 2019

This publication is licensed under the terms of the Open Government Licence v3.0 except where otherwise stated. To view this licence, visit [nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3](http://nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3) or write to the Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU, or email: [psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk).

Where we have identified any third-party copyright information you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

Where we have identified any third-party copyright information you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.