


EU-MIDIS

European Union Minorities
and Discrimination Survey

Main Results Report

European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights

20 09	EU-MIDIS
	European Union Minorities and Discrimination Survey
	English
	

EU-MIDIS

European Union Minorities
and Discrimination Survey

Main Results Report

European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD	6	3.1.3. Discrimination by respondent characteristics	95
KEY FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE SURVEY	8	3.1.4. Crime victimisation	96
1. Introduction	19	3.1.5. Crime victimisation by respondent characteristics	100
1.1. Background – The Agency and its work	19	3.1.6. Corruption	101
1.1.1. EU-MIDIS key objectives	20	3.1.7. Police and border control	102
1.2. Methodology	20	3.1.8. Police stops by respondent characteristics	105
1.2.1. Survey basics	20	3.1.9. Respondent background	108
1.2.2. EU-MIDIS sampling	21	3.2. Central and East Europeans	110
1.2.3. Delivery	28	3.2.1. General opinions on discrimination, and rights awareness	112
1.2.4. Weighting	29	3.2.2. Experience of discrimination	115
1.2.5. Quality control	29	3.2.3. Discrimination by respondent characteristics	121
1.3. Remarks for the reader	30	3.2.4. Crime victimisation	122
1.3.1. Points to consider	30	3.2.5. Crime victimisation by respondent characteristics	127
1.3.2. Glossary	31	3.2.6. Corruption	128
2. Main results	34	3.2.7. Police and border control	128
2.1. Discrimination experiences	34	3.2.8. Police stops by respondent characteristics	131
2.1.1. Overall prevalence rates	35	3.2.9. Respondent background	133
2.1.2. Prevalence of specific discrimination experiences – nine domains	38	3.3. North Africans	134
2.1.3. Multi-domain discrimination experience	47	3.3.1. General opinions on discrimination, and rights awareness	135
2.1.4. Volume of discrimination	48	3.3.2. Experience of discrimination	138
2.1.5. Non-reporting of discrimination	50	3.3.3. Discrimination by respondent characteristics	142
2.2. Specific victimisation experiences	57	3.3.4. Crime victimisation	143
2.2.1. Overall crime prevalence rates	58	3.3.5. Crime victimisation by respondent characteristics	147
2.2.2. Prevalence of specific crimes	59	3.3.6. Corruption	148
2.2.3. Combined prevalence of property- and in-person crimes	64	3.3.7. Police and border control	148
2.2.4. 'Racially' motivated in-person criminal victimisation	65	3.3.8. Police stops	150
2.2.5. In-person crimes in detail	67	3.3.9. Respondent background	153
2.3. Policing	74	3.4. The Roma	154
2.3.1. Trust in the police	75	3.4.1. General opinions on discrimination, and rights awareness	155
2.3.2. Police stops	76	3.4.2. Experience of discrimination	159
3. Results by aggregated immigrant/ethnic groups	80	3.4.3. Discrimination by respondent characteristics	165
3.1. Sub-Saharan Africans	81	3.4.4. Crime victimisation	166
3.1.1. General opinions on discrimination, and rights awareness	83	3.4.5. Crime victimisation by respondent characteristics	170
3.1.2. Experience of discrimination	88		

3.4.6. Corruption	171	3.7.9. Respondent background	240
3.4.7. Police and border control	171		
3.4.8. Police stops by respondent characteristics	174	4. Comparisons with the majority population	242
3.4.9. Respondent background	175	4.1. EU-MIDIS majority sub-sample: policing and borders	242
3.5. Russians	176	4.1.1. Trust in the police	242
3.5.1. General opinions on discrimination, and rights awareness	177	4.1.2. Police stops prevalence	244
3.5.2. Experience of discrimination on the basis of ethnicity	180	4.1.3. Frequency	244
3.5.3. Discrimination by respondent characteristics	184	4.1.4. Type of stops	245
3.5.4. Crime victimisation	185	4.1.5. Police activity during stops	248
3.5.5. Crime victimisation by respondent characteristics	189	4.1.6. Evaluation of police conduct	251
3.5.6. Corruption	190	4.1.7. Immigration, customs or border control	254
3.5.7. Police and border control	190	4.2. Eurobarometer comparisons	255
3.5.8. Police stops by respondent characteristics	193	4.2.1. Considerations when comparing results	255
3.5.9. Respondent background	195	4.2.2. Special Eurobarometer Survey No. 296	257
3.6. Turkish	196	4.2.3. Special Eurobarometer Survey No. 263	260
3.6.1. General opinions on discrimination, and rights awareness	199	4.3. European Crime and Safety Survey Comparisons	263
3.6.2. Experience of discrimination	201	4.3.1. Considerations when comparing results	263
3.6.3. Discrimination by respondent characteristics	206	4.3.2. Theft of personal property	263
3.6.4. Crime victimisation	207	4.3.3. Assaults or threats	265
3.6.5. Crime victimisation by respondent characteristics	212		
3.6.6. Corruption	213	5. Concluding comments	268
3.6.7. Police and border control	213		
3.6.8. Police stops by respondent characteristics	216		
3.6.9. Respondent background	218		
3.7. Former Yugoslavians	220		
3.7.1. General opinions on discrimination, and rights awareness	221		
3.7.2. Experience of discrimination	224		
3.7.3. Discrimination by respondent characteristics	229		
3.7.4. Crime victimisation	230		
3.7.5. Crime victimisation by respondent characteristics	234		
3.7.6. Corruption	236		
3.7.7. Police and border control	236		
3.7.8. Police stops by respondent characteristics	238		

Foreword

This report presents the main results from EU-MIDIS, the FRA's 'European Union Minorities and Discrimination Survey'. The survey interviewed 23,500 people with an ethnic minority or immigrant background across the EU's 27 Member States, and is the largest EU-wide survey of its kind on minorities' experiences of discrimination, racist victimisation, and policing. The data provides evidence that is essential in the development of policies and action to address fundamental rights abuses in these fields.

The number of interviewees in the survey and the survey's EU-wide scope means that the results cannot be overlooked as the experiences of a select few. At the same time, the survey's rigorous sampling approach ensures that the results are representative of the minority groups surveyed in locations throughout the EU – in other words, interviewees were chosen at random and were not selected from a sample of the most discriminated against or the most victimised.

The survey's findings serve to highlight beyond any doubt that discrimination on the basis of ethnicity is a major problem for many minorities in the EU. Of the nine areas of everyday life looked at in the survey, employment emerges as the main domain where minorities experience the greatest levels of what is perceived as discriminatory treatment, both when looking for work and at work. In particular, the data also indicates that the Roma, Sub-Saharan Africans and North Africans face very high levels of discrimination in their everyday lives in comparison

with some of the other large groups covered in the survey, with problems of discrimination and racist victimisation being acute in certain Member States.

As well as mapping the extent of discrimination, the survey's results also provide important evidence of minorities' low levels of rights awareness in the areas of discrimination, including their lack of knowledge about organisations where they can report discrimination. Coupled with this is the survey's finding that the vast majority of people never report experiences of discrimination either at the place where the discrimination occurs or to an organisation that can receive complaints; a finding that underscores the need for improved knowledge of their rights and access to justice for these most vulnerable of groups.

A further significant finding from the survey, which serves to counteract simplistic constructions of minorities as criminal 'threats' to society, is that many minority groups are victims of crime and are particularly vulnerable to racially motivated crime. And, as with under-reporting of discrimination, the survey reveals that rates of reporting to the police are very low among some groups. This finding is coupled with results indicating low levels of faith in the police's ability to effectively respond to crime, as well as an absence of trust in the police among certain groups.

With a view to examining experiences of law enforcement and border control through the lens of non-discrimination, the survey was able to

devote some of its resources to interviewing 5,000 people from the majority population to allow for a comparison of majority and minority experiences of police stops and border control. What the results reveal is a high level of intensive policing activity for certain minorities in certain locations, which often surpasses that of the majority population. These results are particularly important when looked at alongside the survey's findings on non-reporting to the police and lack of trust in the police as a service provider.

In sum, this report can be read as the first baseline comparative EU data on selected ethnic minorities and immigrants' experiences of discrimination, criminal victimisation and policing; including important data on rights awareness in the field of non-discrimination. The results provide an essential reference source for those who are developing policies and taking action to address discrimination and racist victimisation, as they highlight those areas where minorities experience most discrimination and racist victimisation. Importantly, the results conclusively show which groups, amongst those surveyed, experience the highest levels of discrimination and victimisation in the EU. The results also present a starting point that allows Member States to critically examine their own situation relative to other countries where the same group was surveyed – for example, between those seven Member States where the Roma were surveyed – and with respect to existing policies and interventions to address discrimination and victimisation.

The collection of empirical data for the development of policies and action in the field of fundamental rights lies at the heart of the FRA's mandate. This 'bottom up' approach to data collection on the situation of fundamental rights, which directly engages those who are vulnerable to fundamental rights abuses, serves to shed new light on the experiences of ethnic minorities and immigrants in the EU. The results from the survey, which are also being published as a series of 'Data in Focus' reports, and the survey instruments themselves (the questionnaire and the technical report), provide tools to challenge accepted wisdom about the extent and nature of, and appropriate responses to, discrimination and victimisation against minorities in the EU.

It is hoped that the results in this report, together with further reporting from EU-MIDIS, will provide those seeking to address fundamental rights with the necessary evidence and tools needed to do so.



Morten Kjærum
Director

EU-MIDIS

Key findings & recommendations from the survey

EU-MIDIS: The European Union Minorities and Discrimination Survey

- 23,500 people from various ethnic minority and immigrant groups were surveyed across the EU's 27 Member States in 2008.
- EU-MIDIS is the first EU-wide survey to specifically interview a predominantly random sample of immigrant and ethnic minority groups using a standardised questionnaire.
- The survey's main part asked respondents about their experiences of discrimination on the basis of their immigrant or ethnic minority background, their experiences of criminal victimisation (including racially motivated crime), and experiences of policing; the results of which are summarised here.
- The survey also asked respondents about their awareness of their rights and the extent to which they reported experiences of discrimination and victimisation, including reasons for non-reporting.
- The survey also interviewed 5,000 people from the majority population in 10 Member States in order to compare the survey's findings on experiences of police stops and border control. Section 4 in the main results report outlines the findings.
- In this section the results are discussed for the most part at the level of general (aggregate) groups – for example, showing results for all Roma or all Sub-Saharan African interviewees, with some specific Member State examples.

EXPERIENCES OF DISCRIMINATION

Overall experiences of discrimination across nine areas of everyday life

Differences between ethnic groups

On average, across nine areas of everyday life,ⁱ the Roma were discriminated against because of their ethnic background more than other groups that were surveyed in EU-MIDIS; for example, in comparison with Sub-Saharan Africans or North Africans.

Every second Roma respondent said that they were discriminated against on the basis of their ethnicity at least once in the previous 12 months.

The average Roma interviewee ran the risk of being discriminated against 4.6 times over a 12 month period. Looking at the results only for those who had been discriminated against, this average increased to 11 incidents over a 12 month period.

- EU-MIDIS identified the second highest rate of overall discrimination as being against Sub-Saharan Africans – 41% were discriminated against because of their immigrant or ethnic minority background at least once in the last 12 months. This was followed by discrimination against North Africans – 36%. In joint fourth place were Turkish and Central and East European respondents; a quarter were discriminated against in the last 12 months – 23%.
- Respondents with a Russian background and those from the former Yugoslavia experienced the lowest levels of discrimination of all groups surveyed in EU-MIDIS; respectively, 14% and 12% of those surveyed indicated they had experienced discriminatory treatment because of their minority background at least once in the last 12 months.

Differences between Member States

- Looking at a breakdown of the results according to specific groups in Member States, the 'top ten' experiencing the highest levels of discrimination over a 12 month period were, in descending order: Roma in the Czech Republic (64%), Africans in Malta (63%), Roma in Hungary (62%), Roma in Poland (59%), Roma in Greece (55%), Sub-Saharan Africans in Ireland (54%), North Africans in Italy (52%), Somalis in Finland (47%), Somalis in Denmark (46%), and Brazilians in Portugal (44%).
- As an average, each Roma person experienced more incidents of discrimination over a 12 month period than other aggregate groups surveyed – such as Sub-Saharan Africans or Turkish respondents. However, looking at a breakdown of results for specific groups in Member States, the highest average number of discrimination incidents over a 12 month period was experienced by North Africans in Italy: an average of 9.29 incidents for every North African person interviewed in Italy. The next highest number was 6.81 incidents for each Roma person in Poland and 6.69 for each Roma in Hungary.

Using these results

The results from EU-MIDIS could be employed at the Community, national and regional level – particularly in those cities where the survey was conducted (see Table 1.2 in the introduction to the main results report) as evidence to inform policy and action addressing discrimination against some of the most vulnerable groups in society.

At the level of Community legislation in the field of non-discrimination, the results support the need for a critical assessment of implementation of the Racial Equality Directive (2000/43/EC) 'on the ground'.

Such impact assessments should be embedded in future initiatives targeting discrimination against minorities to measure their short, medium and long-term outcomes with regard to the sustained reduction of discrimination in relation to the allocation of resources over a period of time.

Surveys are ideal tools for impact assessments as they allow those particularly targeted by legislation to provide valuable feedback with regard to its effectiveness.

For example, the very high levels of discrimination indicated by the Roma in the survey pose some critical questions about the success to date, the 'cultural appropriateness', and the local implementation of EU and Member State policies and funding aimed at reducing discrimination against the Roma and integrating them fully into society. Initiatives, such as the 'Decade of Roma Inclusion: 2005-2015', could incorporate a critical reading of progress to date in reducing the social exclusion of and discrimination against the Roma based on evidence provided by EU-MIDIS and other available sources.

Discrimination in employment

Discrimination in employment – when looking for work and at work – emerged as the most significant area for discriminatory treatment on the basis of respondents' immigrant or ethnic minority background.

- On average, only 43% of Roma said that they had some kind of paid employment in the last five years; in comparison, as an illustration, 90% of Central and East European respondents said they were in paid employment in the last five years.
- Looking at the occupational status of respondents at the time of the survey interview: on average, 23% of Roma interviewees said they were unemployed and only 28% said they had some kind of paid employment, while almost half were economically inactive – that is, homemakers, retired persons, the disabled or those too young (still in education).
- Looking at a breakdown of the results according to specific groups in Member States: Africans in Malta emerge as having the highest rate of unemployment at the time of the survey interview – with 54% unemployed. The next highest rate of unemployment at the time of the interview was for Roma in Slovakia (36%), followed by Roma in Bulgaria (33%).
- On average, 38% of Roma job seekers indicated that they were discriminated against because of their ethnicity at least once in the last 12 months when looking for work. For other general groups the rate of discrimination when looking for work was: 22% for Sub-Saharan Africans, 20% for North Africans, 12% for Turkish respondents, 11% for

Central and East Europeans, and 8% for Russians and also for former Yugoslavians.

- Looking at a breakdown of the results according to specific groups in Member States, six of the 'top ten' experiencing the highest levels of discrimination when looking for work were Roma; with the highest rate being for Roma in Hungary (47%).
- On average, 19% of Roma said they had been discriminated against at work because of their ethnicity at least once in the last 12 months. For other groups, rates of discrimination at work were: 17% for Sub-Saharan Africans, 16% for North Africans, 13% for Central and East Europeans, 10% for Turkish respondents, and 4% for both former Yugoslavians and Russians.
- The results for specific groups in Member States show that the 'top ten' experiencing the highest levels of discrimination at work were: North Africans in Italy (30%), Roma in Greece (29%), Roma in the Czech Republic (27%), Africans in Malta (27%), Sub-Saharan Africans in Ireland (26%), Roma in Hungary (25%), Brazilians in Portugal (24%), Turkish in Denmark (22%), Roma in Poland (22%), and Romanians in Italy (20%).

Respondents were asked whether they knew about anti-discrimination legislation in employment:

On average, 39% of respondents thought that no legislation exists forbidding discrimination against people on the basis of their ethnicity when applying for a job. A further 23% either didn't know or refused to answer the question, while 39%ⁱⁱ said they were aware of the existence of such legislation.

Using these results

EU-MIDIS presents stark data on the extent of discrimination experienced by different minorities in the field of employment – particularly when looking for work. This evidence can be used for kick-starting targeted responses to address discrimination in access to employment, particularly as paid employment is a key means for enhancing social integration.

Government bodies, public and private employers, and trade unions all have a role to play in recognising, identifying and addressing discrimination in employment. Given the low

numbers in the survey who were aware of anti-discrimination legislation in the area of employment, it is clear that efforts to increase awareness amongst vulnerable minorities need to be strengthened.

Action to address discrimination in employment should be targeted to the particular situation and needs of different minority groups, including recognition of intra-group barriers to employment based on gender, age and educational level.ⁱⁱⁱ Any initiatives addressing discrimination in employment also need to be undertaken with a view to looking at discrimination in educational and vocational training opportunities for minorities.

Greater emphasis needs to be placed on the benefits of a diverse workforce, and this message needs to be communicated to employers and employees through the provision of evidence and the promotion of diversity policies. Herein, lessons can be learned from existing 'good' and 'bad' practices that have addressed equality in employment.

Discrimination in housing

Of the nine areas of discrimination that were surveyed, discrimination in housing – when looking for somewhere to rent or buy – emerged as one of the least problematic.

- The highest discrimination rate among all general groups surveyed was recorded among North Africans and Roma: On average, 11% of both North Africans and Roma were discriminated against when looking for a house or apartment to rent or buy.
- Looking at a breakdown of the results according to specific groups in Member States, North Africans in Italy experienced the highest rate of discrimination in the area of housing.

Housing was one of the three areas where respondents were asked whether they knew about anti-discrimination legislation:

On average, 44% of respondents thought that no legislation exists forbidding discrimination against people on the basis of their ethnicity when renting

or buying a flat. A further 25% either didn't know or refused to answer the question, while 31% said they were aware of the existence of such legislation.

Using these results

Given the existence of EU-wide legislation in the field of non-discrimination that addresses housing, and given the low level of awareness of their rights in this area among minorities, attention should be focused on improving rights awareness in this field so that discrimination can be more effectively tackled where it exists.

Policy makers and practitioners should be encouraged to look at 'what works' in the area of housing to see if lessons can be learned and adapted between Member States, and for use in other service areas where discrimination is more prevalent.

Attention should be paid to monitoring discrimination in relation to different types of housing markets – public or private rented housing, as well as access to the home buyer market.^{iv}

- Breaking down the results according to specific groups in Member States, six of the 'top ten' experiencing the highest levels of discrimination by social services were Roma; but, once again, North Africans in Italy indicated the highest level of discrimination of all specific groups surveyed: with 22% discriminated against in the last 12 months.

Using these results

In Member States and particular localities with large minority populations, healthcare and social service authorities (and practitioners) need to pay particular attention to discrimination (both direct and indirect) affecting patients or users of services from a minority background. Herein a number of avenues could be explored; such as a review of potential barriers to access to services, and an analysis of the specific needs of different minority communities, and vulnerable groups within communities (such as children, women and the elderly).^v

Particular attention should be paid to the needs of and provision for the Roma in the area of healthcare and social services.

Discrimination by healthcare and social services

Discrimination by healthcare personnel emerged as a particular problem for the Roma: 17% indicated they had experienced discrimination in this area in the last 12 months. In comparison, discrimination by healthcare personnel was identified as a problem by less than 10% of the other groups surveyed.

- Looking at a breakdown of the results according to specific groups in Member States, six of the 'top ten' experiencing the highest levels of discrimination in relation to healthcare were Roma. However, North Africans in Italy indicated the highest level of discrimination of all individual groups surveyed – with 24% discriminated against in the last 12 months.

Discrimination by social service personnel showed a similar pattern to discrimination by healthcare personnel: 14% of the Roma indicated they had experienced discrimination in this area in the last 12 months, but less than 10% amongst the other general groups surveyed identified this as a problem.

Discrimination by schools and other educational establishments

Discrimination by school personnel and other educational establishments was experienced by 10% or less of all the general respondent groups surveyed: 10% of the Roma indicated they had experienced discrimination in this area in the last 12 months, followed by 8% of North Africans and 6% of Sub-Saharan Africans surveyed.

- The survey's results show that North Africans in Italy are the most discriminated against group in the area of education, with 21% having experienced discrimination in the last 12 months. The second highest rate of discrimination was indicated by Roma in Poland – 20%.

Using these results

Discrimination in education is particularly damaging as it can serve to hinder progress through the education system, and can have a negative impact on young people's oppor-

tunities in the labour market. To this end, EU policies could address discrimination in education and vocational training as a core issue. The existing legal and policy framework concerning the rights of the child can be used to support any policy initiatives in this direction.

Discrimination experiences at a young age can undermine young immigrant and ethnic minorities' sense of self esteem, and can reinforce negative stereotypes. In recognition of this, addressing the problem of discrimination in schooling, by school personnel and other students, should be a priority for educational establishments, government ministries, and teachers' unions.^{vi}

Independent mechanisms for recording complaints in relation to discrimination on the basis of ethnicity/immigrant background should be established for all schools and other educational institutions. The collection of this data should be undertaken to ensure redress and access to justice for individual complainants, and to promote a system for the collection of robust statistical data on discrimination (based on anonymous aggregate data) that can be used as evidence to identify and respond to problems where they occur.

The same principles of data collection – as outlined above – can be applied to other areas covered in the survey, such as employment and housing.

Discrimination at a café, restaurant, bar or nightclub, and by shops

Discrimination experiences in relation to leisure and retail services were a significant problem for a number of groups surveyed – for example when in or when trying to enter a café, restaurant, bar or nightclub.

- On average, 20% of Roma, 14% of Sub-Saharan Africans, and 13% of North Africans had experienced discrimination when in or trying to enter a café, restaurant, bar or nightclub.
- Looking at a breakdown of the results according to specific groups in Member States: Africans in Malta emerge as the most discriminated against group in this area, with 35% experiencing

discrimination in the last 12 months. The second highest rate of discrimination was jointly indicated by Roma in the Czech Republic and North Africans in Italy (30%).

Discrimination in or when trying to enter a shop was a significant problem for the Roma.

- On average, 20% of Roma identified discrimination when in or trying to enter a shop. In comparison, both 11% of North Africans and Sub-Saharan Africans identified discrimination in this area. In comparison, less than 5% of other groups identified this area as a problem.
- Exploring the results according to specific groups in Member States, the Roma in Poland emerge as the most discriminated against group in relation to shops, with 44% experiencing discrimination in the last 12 months. The second highest rate of discrimination was experienced by Roma in Hungary (31%), followed by North Africans in Italy (27%).

The third area of anti-discrimination legislation that people were asked about in the survey encompassed goods and services – that is, discriminatory treatment on the basis of ethnicity in relation to shops, restaurants, bars or clubs:

On average, 46% of respondents thought that no legislation exists forbidding discrimination against people on the basis of their ethnicity in relation to these services. A further 24% either didn't know or refused to answer the question, while 30% said they were aware of the existence of such legislation.

Using these results

People encounter services, such as shops, on a regular basis, and clearly need to be better informed about their rights to non-discriminatory treatment in these areas.

Leisure and retail services pose problems of discriminatory treatment for a number of minorities, and therefore emerge as areas where further research and closer regulation is required – building on examples of good practice developed in other sectors that have attempted to address discrimination.

Non-discrimination programmes in relation to the area of employment should be extended to encompass customers or clients

of services as part of a joined-up approach to non-discrimination for employers, employees, their clients and customers.

Discrimination when trying to open a bank account or obtain a loan

Discrimination when trying to open a bank account or get a loan from a bank emerged as the least problematic of the nine areas surveyed in EU-MIDIS – however, one explanation for this could be that those minorities who come into contact with banks are probably the least disadvantaged within their communities.

- On average, 7% of Roma, 6% of North Africans, and less than 5% of other general groups that were surveyed identified discrimination in relation to opening a bank account or trying to obtain a loan. However, looking at a breakdown of the results according to specific groups in Member States, North Africans in Italy indicate very high levels of discrimination (23%) in this area when compared with other specific groups.

Using these results

Banks could identify ‘good practices’ in relation to how they respond to potential or existing clients from immigrant or ethnic minority backgrounds, and could look to see how services for these groups can be enhanced further.

Non-reporting of discrimination

On average – across all groups surveyed in EU-MIDIS – 82% of those who were discriminated against in the past 12 months did not report their most recent experience of discrimination either at the place where it occurred or to a competent authority. Non-reporting ranged from 79% amongst the Roma to 88% amongst Central and East Europeans.

- As an illustration: In Portugal non-reporting of discrimination is the norm as 100% of Sub-Saharan Africans and 98% of Brazilians who were discriminated against did not report their latest experience of discrimination. In France reporting levels were higher than in most Member States, but were still relatively low: 29% of North Africans

and 37% of Sub-Saharan Africans reported their latest incident of discrimination.

- The most common reason given by all respondents for not reporting discrimination incidents was the belief that ‘nothing would happen’ as a result of reporting, while the third most common reason for not reporting was lack of knowledge about how to go about reporting.

The survey asked people whether they knew of any organisation that can support people who have been discriminated against (for whatever reason) – only 16% of respondents indicated that they did.

When presented with the name or names of Equality Bodies in their country of residence – 63% of respondents said that they had not heard of any of them: a finding that helps to explain very low rates of reporting discrimination.

Using these results

In line with the requirements of the Racial Equality Directive, those who have been discriminated against on the basis of their race or ethnic origin should be encouraged to report their experiences to a competent authority or office – such as an Equality Body.

A review of the resources available to Equality Bodies, and other complaints authorities or offices, should be undertaken to examine how best to target available resources to encourage reporting and to be able to effectively respond to complaints.

Victims of discrimination need to be made aware of how to go about reporting discrimination, and they need assurance that reporting is an effective means to gain redress.

Vulnerable minorities need to be made aware of their rights and should have the means to access them. The existing situation needs to be assessed by all parties that have a duty to receive and process complaints.

Possibilities for alternatives to traditional justice mechanisms should be explored where it is apparent that existing complaints mechanisms are failing or unable to respond to the situation on the ground as it is experienced by minorities.

EXPERIENCES OF VICTIMISATION

Overall experiences of criminal victimisation across five crime types

The average rate of criminal victimisation for all groups surveyed in EU-MIDIS was 24%.^{vii} In other words – every fourth person from a minority group was a victim of crime at least once in the 12 months preceding the survey.

On average, across the five crime types tested in the survey, the highest levels of overall victimisation in the 12 months preceding the survey were experienced by Sub-Saharan Africans (33%), closely followed by the Roma (32%).

Chapter 4 in the main EU-MIDIS results report allows for a tentative comparison of victimisation rates between the majority population surveyed in the European Crime and Safety Survey and minorities surveyed in EU-MIDIS with respect to (i) theft of personal property and (ii) assault or threat: the results indicate that, on average, minorities are victims of personal theft, and assault or threat more often than the majority population.

- Looking at a breakdown of the results according to specific groups in Member States, those where more than 40% of respondents were victims of crime in the last 12 months included: Roma in Greece (54%), Somalis in Denmark (49%), Somalis in Finland (47%), Roma in the Czech Republic (46%), and Sub-Saharan Africans in Ireland (41%).

Using these results

Often immigrant and ethnic minority groups are stereotyped as criminals, or at least as potential criminals; yet the survey's results illustrate clearly that significant numbers of people from minority backgrounds are also victims of crime in need of assistance, protection and support. Therefore, victim support services should be reviewed in the light of these findings to see whether they are meeting the needs of minority groups.

High levels of criminal victimisation, together with experiences of discrimination, should be recognised for their negative impact on minority populations with respect to social marginalisation and vulnerability.

Property crime

On average, Roma respondents had the highest burglary victimisation rate of all general groups surveyed – with 10% indicating they had been burgled at least once in the last 12 months. For all other general groups surveyed, fewer than 5% had been victims of burglary in the last 12 months.

- The high burglary victimisation rate for the Roma as a group was influenced by the extremely high rate of burglary recorded for Roma in Greece – where 29% of respondents were victimised at least once in the last 12 months. In comparison, the next highest burglary rate was for Roma in the Czech Republic, where 11% indicated they had been a victim.

On average, 10% of Central and East Europeans and North Africans, and 8% of Roma and Sub-Saharan Africans were victims of theft of personal property at least once in the last 12 months. For all other groups the average rate was 4% or less.

- Looking at a breakdown of the results according to specific groups in Member States: Roma in Greece (21%) and North Africans in Italy (19%) reported the highest levels of theft of personal property.

On average, Sub-Saharan Africans had the highest levels of vehicle-related criminal victimisation of all aggregate groups surveyed – with 15% indicating they had been a victim at least once in the previous 12 months.

- Looking at a breakdown of the results according to specific groups in Member States: Roma in Greece (23%) and Somalis in Finland (21%) reported the highest levels of victimisation with respect to vehicle-related crime.

Using these results

The results show that certain minority groups in Member States experience very high levels of specific property related crime – such as Roma victims of burglary in Greece. This indicates that crime prevention efforts need to be targeted at particular groups in relation to their specific victimisation characteristics.

The most socio-economically marginalised minorities are particularly disadvantaged in the aftermath of property crime since they find it difficult to replace what was stolen

and they lack insurance. Therefore existing channels of support and compensation should be reviewed to see if they are meeting these victims' needs.

In-person crime – experiences of assault or threat, and serious harassment

On average, looking only at assault or threat (excluding serious harassment), the Roma (10%), Sub-Saharan Africans (9%) and North Africans (9%) were most likely to have been assaulted or threatened with violence at least once in the previous 12 months.

- Looking at a breakdown of the results according to specific groups in Member States, the 'top ten' experiencing the highest levels of assault or threat are all represented by people coming from these three aggregate groups: Roma, Sub-Saharan Africans and North Africans.
- The highest incidence rates for assault or threat was found for Somali respondents in Finland – where 74 incidents of assault or threat for every 100 interviewees were recorded. This very high rate reflects the fact that many Somalis in Finland were victims of assault or threat on several occasions within a 12 month period. Other high incidence rates for victims of assault and threat were: 44 for every 100 North African interviewees in Italy, 42 for every 100 Roma interviewees in the Czech Republic, 40 for every 100 Roma interviewees in Poland, 40 for every 100 Somali interviewees in Denmark, 33 for every 100 Roma interviewees in Greece, and 29 for every 100 Roma interviewees in Hungary.

On average, nearly every fifth person from the Roma and Sub-Saharan African groups that were surveyed said they had been a victim of serious harassment at least once in the last 12 months (18%).

- Looking at a breakdown of the results according to specific groups in Member States, at least 1 in 4 respondents from the following groups were victims of serious harassment a minimum of once in the last 12 months: Roma in the Czech Republic (31%), Roma in Greece (28%), Somalis in Denmark (27%), Sub-Saharan Africans in Ireland (26%) and Africans in Malta (26%).
- The highest incidence rate for serious harassment was found for Roma respondents in Greece

– where 174 incidents were recorded for every 100 interviewees. The next highest rates were 118 for every 100 Roma interviewees in the Czech Republic, 112 for every 100 Somali interviewees in Denmark, 106 for every 100 Somali interviewees in Finland, and 94 for every 100 Sub-Saharan African interviewees in Ireland.

Using these results

Incidents of assault and threat are experienced by large numbers of minorities, and experiences of serious harassment are very common among many groups surveyed. For those 18 Member States where results from EU-MIDIS could be compared with other victim survey research findings on the majority population, the evidence shows that minorities experience assaults and threats, on average, more frequently than the majority population (see Chapter 4 in the EU-MIDIS main results report).

The extremely high victimisation rates among specific groups that were surveyed – for example, Somali interviewees in Finland in relation to assault or threat – require a detailed follow-up at Member State level to assess the vulnerabilities of specific groups and to target crime prevention measures accordingly.

Manifestations of serious harassment are often considered to be outside the mandate of policing and criminal justice responses to crime, particularly where there is no specific legislation addressing such incidents. However, the survey's results on the pervasiveness of serious harassment for many minority groups, which often includes a perceived racist motivation, indicates that greater attention should be paid to these everyday incidents as they impact on vulnerable minority groups.

In-person crime – experiences of racially motivated assault or threat, and serious harassment

On average, looking at all in-person crimes of assault, threat or serious harassment, and among all respondents surveyed, 18% of Roma respondents and 18% of Sub-Saharan African respondents indicated that they had experienced at least one

'racially motivated' incident in the last 12 months. In comparison, less than 10% of other general groups surveyed indicated that they were victims of racially motivated in-person crime in the last 12 months.

- More than 1 in 4 respondents from the following groups considered that they were a victim of 'racially motivated' in-person crime in the last 12 months: Roma in the Czech Republic (32%), Somalis in Finland (32%), Somalis in Denmark (31%), Africans in Malta (29%), and (equally) 26% of Roma in Greece, Roma in Poland and Sub-Saharan Africans in Ireland.

Looking only at results for those who said they were victims of assault or threat in the last 12 months – a striking 73% of Roma victims and 70% of Sub-Saharan African victims considered that the perpetrators of the last incident they experienced targeted them because of their immigrant or ethnic minority background.

- Most incidents of assault or threat were not committed by members of right-wing extremist groups. The highest rates where victims could identify perpetrators as being members of right-wing extremist groups were: 13% of assaults or threats committed against victims with a Turkish background, 12% of assaults or threat where the victim was Roma, and 8% in the case of victims with a Sub-Saharan African background.

Using these results

Racially motivated crime is a problem for specific groups that were surveyed; in particular, Sub-Saharan Africans and Roma. The results indicate that targeted responses need to be directed at these groups as victims and potential victims of racially motivated crime.^{viii}

At the same time as addressing the needs of victims, efforts need to be directed at perpetrators or potential perpetrators of these crimes. To this end, EU-MIDIS presents valuable data about perpetrators' characteristics in relation to incidents of assault, threat and serious harassment. In the absence of systematic detailed police data that could be used to develop evidence-based responses to these types of crime, EU-MIDIS is a starting point for the collection and analysis of this type of information.

The results present a wealth of information about the nature of racist victimisation, and include the important finding that the majority of racist incidents are not perpetrated by members of right-wing-extremist groups. This result may necessitate a refocusing on 'everyday' incidents of racial victimisation that are committed often by people who are known to victims, as indicated in the survey, rather than the 'stranger danger' that is often presumed to be in the guise of right-wing extremism.

The implementation of Council Framework Decision 2008/913/JHA on combating racism and xenophobia, which established the approximation of law addressing certain forms of racist and xenophobic crime in the EU, can benefit from the survey's results that reveal how minorities experience racist crime, and which also show the significant number who do not report victimisation to the police and their reasons for non-reporting (as outlined below).

Non-reporting of in-person crime

For the different aggregate groups surveyed, between 57% and 74% of incidents of assault or threat were not reported to the police. At the same time, between 60% and 75% of these incidents were regarded by different aggregate respondent groups as 'serious'. For example, 70% of Turkish respondents who were victims of assault or threat considered these incidents to be serious, but only 26% reported them to the police.

For the various groups surveyed, on average between 75% and 90% of incidents of harassment were not reported to the police. However, between 50% and 61% of these incidents were regarded as 'serious' by victims.

- The main reason given by various respondent groups for not reporting in-person victimisation (assault and threat, and serious harassment) was because they were not confident the police would be able to do anything.
- Of those who did report their victimisation to the police, high rates of dissatisfaction with how the police dealt with their complaint were recorded for the Roma, where on average 54% were

dissatisfied in relation to cases of assault or threat, and 55% were dissatisfied in relation to reported cases of serious harassment.

Using these results

The results are evidence that significant numbers of incidents of criminal victimisation and, in particular, racist victimisation never come to the attention of the police. To this end, police and criminal justice statistics on recorded incidents (or cases) only represent the ‘tip of the iceberg’ with respect to the true extent of the problem, and therefore can be more usefully read as indicators of the quality of existing mechanisms for data collection on (racist) crime against minorities.

Lack of data on the extent and nature of criminal (racist) victimisation against minorities serves to hinder efforts to effectively address the problem.

High levels of non-reporting to the police, which are coupled with high levels of lack of confidence in policing, calls for an overview of incentives to encourage reporting by victims and an improvement in the service offered by the police to victims.

Working initiatives between the police, local authorities and civil society organisations should be developed in an effort to encourage reporting of crime and to provide assistance to victims.

POLICING

Experiences of police stops, perceptions of ethnic profiling, and trust in the police

The survey found very high levels of police stops among many minority groups that were interviewed. On average, the proportion of those who were stopped by the police at least once in the 12 months prior to the survey interview was: 33% of all North Africans; 30% of Roma; 27% of Sub-Saharan Africans; 22% of both Central and East European and former Yugoslavian respondents; 21% of Turkish respondents; 20% of Russian respondents.

- Looking at a breakdown of the results according to specific groups in Member States: very high rates were recorded for Sub-Saharan Africans in Ireland (59%) and Roma in Greece (56%).
- The Roma in Greece were by far the most heavily policed group in the survey, with 323 police stops recorded for every 100 Roma interviewees – or just over 3 stops for every interviewee over a 12 month period. This rate was twice as high as the rate recorded among North Africans in Spain and Sub-Saharan Africans in Ireland, who jointly had the second highest stop rate of 160 per 100 interviewees – or just over 1½ stops for every interviewee.

In ten Member States respondents from the majority population were also interviewed to look at differences in rates of police stops between the majority and minority population. In some countries minority respondents were stopped by the police significantly more often than the majority population in a 12 month period (see Chapter 4 in the main results report).

- For example: In Hungary, 15% of majority respondents were stopped in the last 12 months in comparison with 41% of Roma respondents; in Greece, 23% of majority and 56% of Roma respondents were stopped in the last 12 months; in Spain, 12% of majority and 42% of North African respondents were stopped in the last 12 months; in France, 22% of majority and 42% of North African respondents were stopped in the last 12 months.

Among all respondents, the following percentage considered that they were stopped specifically because of their immigrant or ethnic minority background: 19% of North Africans, 15% of Roma, 9% of Sub-Saharan Africans and Central and East Europeans, 5% of Turkish respondents, 1% of Ex-Yugoslavian respondents and 0% of respondents with a Russian background.

- Looking at a breakdown of the results according to specific groups in Member States: very high rates of presumed ethnic profiling (over 20%) were recorded for the Roma in Greece (39%), North Africans in Spain (31%), Sub-Saharan Africans in France (24%), Roma in Hungary (24%), and North Africans in Italy (21%).

When asked whether the police treated them respectfully during a stop, 33% of Roma respondents and 32% of North African respondents indicated that the police’s behaviour towards them, during their last

stop, was fairly or very disrespectful. In comparison, 20% of Sub-Saharan Africans and 18% of Turkish respondents considered the police to be fairly or very disrespectful, while the rates for other groups were 12% or lower.

- Looking at a breakdown of the results according to specific groups in Member States: high rates – 30% or over – of fairly or very disrespectful police treatment were indicated by the Roma in Greece (51%), Roma in Poland (45%), North Africans in Italy (41%), Sub-Saharan Africans in France (36%), North Africans in Belgium and Sub-Saharan Africans in Portugal (both 35%), North Africans in the Netherlands (34%), North Africans in France (32%), and Roma in Hungary (30%).

Using these results

There is very little data on police stops across the EU with the exception of the United Kingdom. EU-MIDIS data presents a valuable insight into this area that should be of use to police forces, non-governmental organisations and community groups that seek to identify and address potential discriminatory police treatment where it exists.^{ix}

Even where perceptions of profiling cannot be proven, the fact that significant numbers of minorities believe that they are victims of profiling is evidence that work needs to be done to improve police relations and interaction with minority communities.

Low levels of trust in the police can be viewed as an indicator of overall levels of trust in the State. If minority communities are to feel fully integrated and respected members of European societies, which should particularly be the case for those who are EU citizens, their trust in the police needs to be shaped by respectful and non-discriminatory treatment.

For a fuller overview of the key results, please refer to Chapter 2 in the EU-MIDIS Main Results Report, along with Chapter 3 in the report that provides a breakdown of the data by general groups, and Chapter 4 which presents a comparison of results between majority and minority populations in Member States.

Endnotes

- i EU-MIDIS asked respondents about discrimination they had experienced, on the basis of their ethnicity/immigrant background, across 9 areas of everyday life: (1) when looking for work; (2) at work; (3) when looking for a house or an apartment to rent or buy; (4) by healthcare personnel; (5) by social service personnel; (6) by school and other education personnel; (7) at a café, restaurant, bar or nightclub; (8) when entering or in a shop; (9) when trying to open a bank account or get a loan from a bank.
- ii Adds up to 101% due to rounding.
- iii The Agency's Annual Report on the situation of fundamental rights in the European Union contains a chapter on 'Racism and discrimination in the employment sector' with respect to the situation of ethnic minority and immigrant groups in the EU: http://fra.europa.eu/fraWebsite/attachments/FRA-AnnualReport09_en.pdf.
- iv The Agency's Annual Report on the situation of fundamental rights in the European Union contains a chapter on 'Racism and discrimination in the area of housing' with respect to the situation of ethnic minority and immigrant groups in the EU: http://fra.europa.eu/fraWebsite/attachments/FRA-AnnualReport09_en.pdf. In addition, the Agency published two reports in October 2009 on 'Housing conditions of Roma and Travellers in the EU': http://fra.europa.eu/fraWebsite/attachments/ROMA-Housing-Comparative-Report_en.pdf, and 'Housing discrimination against Roma in selected EU Member States: an analysis of EU-MIDIS data': http://fra.europa.eu/fraWebsite/attachments/Roma-Housing-Analysis-EU-MIDIS_en.pdf.
- v The Agency's Annual Report on the situation of fundamental rights in the European Union contains a chapter on 'Racism and discrimination in healthcare' with respect to the situation of ethnic minority and immigrant groups in the EU: http://fra.europa.eu/fraWebsite/attachments/FRA-AnnualReport09_en.pdf.
- vi The Agency's Annual Report on the situation of fundamental rights in the European Union contains a chapter on 'Racism and discrimination in the education sector' with respect to the situation of ethnic minority and immigrant groups in the EU: http://fra.europa.eu/fraWebsite/attachments/FRA-AnnualReport09_en.pdf.
- vii EU-MIDIS asked respondents about their experiences of victimisation across 5 crime types: (1) theft of or from a vehicle; (2) burglary or attempted burglary; (3) theft of personal property not involving force or threat; (4) assault or threat; (5) serious harassment.
- viii The Agency's Annual Report on the situation of fundamental rights in the European Union contains a chapter on 'Racist violence and crime' with respect to the situation of ethnic minority and immigrant groups in the EU: http://fra.europa.eu/fraWebsite/attachments/FRA-AnnualReport09_en.pdf.
- ix The FRA's forthcoming Guide on ethnic profiling, together with an EU-MIDIS 'Data in Focus' report on 'law enforcement', which incorporates data on police stops, will be released in 2010.

1. Introduction

This section introduces the survey, its objectives, and the methodology and sampling used. The last part explains the extent to which data from the survey can be compared, and provides some important clarifications regarding the results.

1.1. Background – The Agency and its work

On 1st March 2007 Council Regulation (EC) No 168/2007 came into effect establishing the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA). With this, the FRA became the legal successor to the European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia (EUMC).

The FRA took over the work of the EUMC with a wider mandate to cover fundamental rights within the meaning of Article 6(2) of the Treaty on European Union, including the European Convention on Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and as reflected, in particular, in the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the EU. In paragraph 10 of the preamble establishing the Agency it is stated that *'the work of the Agency should continue to cover the phenomena of racism, xenophobia and anti-Semitism, the protection of rights of persons belonging to minorities, as well as gender equality, as essential elements for the protection of fundamental rights'*.

At the heart of the Agency's work lies the task to collect objective, reliable and comparable information and data on the situation of fundamental rights in the EU, which can be used by the relevant institutions, bodies, offices and agencies of the Community and its Member States, as well as a wide range of other stakeholders working in the field of fundamental rights. The Agency is tasked with doing this by developing methods and standards to improve the comparability, objectivity and reliability of data at EU level, including survey research.

The FRA's annual reports and other research publications, and those of its predecessor the EUMC, have consistently highlighted three concerns:

- First, the continued existence of discriminatory practices and racist crimes against ethnic minorities and immigrants in the EU, as indicated by available evidence collected from governmental and non-governmental sources;
- Second, the lack of comprehensive and comparable EU-wide data on ethnic minorities and

immigrants' experiences of unequal treatment and racist victimisation;

- Third, the need for data collection on minorities' experiences of discrimination and victimisation that can be used to inform evidence-based policies and action to address these fundamental rights abuses.

To this end, this report presents the main findings from the Agency's EU-MIDIS survey, which is the first of its kind in the EU to produce EU-wide data on experiences of discrimination, racist victimisation, and policing, for over 23,500 immigrant and ethnic minority respondents.

The results present valuable findings that highlight problem areas with regard to the discrimination and victimisation experiences of minorities both within and between Member States. The findings can be used to kick-start discussions and policy action at Member State and EU-level about where interventions to address discrimination and victimisation in everyday life need to be targeted most urgently. They also offer evidence for critiquing the apparent limitations of past and on-going interventions to address discrimination and victimisation against minorities, and provide the context against which EC and national legislation, such as the EC 'Race Directive', can be judged with respect to the realities of discrimination and victimisation on the ground.

Essentially, EU-MIDIS provides:

- The first baseline comparative data on selected ethnic minorities and immigrants' experiences of discrimination, criminal victimisation and policing in the EU; including data on their awareness of their rights in the field of non-discrimination.
- A primary reference source for those developing policies and taking action to address racist discrimination and criminal victimisation.
- The tools for further research at national and local level; namely, the survey questionnaire and technical report.

1.1.1. EU-MIDIS key objectives

Within the EU, experiences of discrimination and victimisation against ‘vulnerable’ groups (namely, disadvantaged ethnic minorities and/or immigrants) have not yet been captured in sufficient detail. In response to this, the FRA launched a comprehensive survey, EU-MIDIS, to collect and document the experience of vulnerable communities across all Member States of the European Union. The survey aimed to look at racially or ethnically motivated discrimination as well as experiences of criminal victimisation on the same grounds.

EU-MIDIS had the following primary objectives:

- To collect survey data in EU Member States on discrimination and criminal victimisation as experienced by selected immigrant and other minority groups (such as established national or ethnic minority groups), which can inform the development of evidence-based policies at national and EU level to address differences in these discrimination and victimisation rates as revealed through the survey.
 - To collect data using a standardised quantitative survey instrument that allows for comparison of results:
 - a) between different minority groups within Member States where two or more groups were interviewed.
 - b) between Member States that have similar minority populations.
 - c) according to a range of respondent characteristics such as gender and age.
 - d) between the results generated from this survey and those generated from ‘matched’ questions in other surveys on Member State majority populations.
 - To collect data on selected groups using **probability random sampling methods** that allows for the generalisation of results to the groups being researched in the areas where they were surveyed.
- The report does not offer prescriptive suggestions for policy responses and action in the light of the survey’s findings, but instead offers some general remarks in this regard in the key findings, main results, and in the final section of the report.
 - The ‘Data in Focus’ reports that stem from the survey offer more detailed results on specific themes or groups surveyed, as well as targeted recommendations in consideration of policy.
 - The survey *did not* have as an objective the collection of data that could explain the causes of discriminatory treatment and racist victimisation, as its aim was to document minorities’ *experiences* of discrimination and victimisation.

1.2. Methodology

EU-MIDIS is the first systematic large-scale attempt to address vulnerable immigrant and ethnic minority groups using a standardised survey instrument in all Member States of the EU.

As such, the survey faced a number of methodological challenges, including: lack of recent and reliable statistical information about the size and composition of target populations; difficult access to communities; language problems (to name just a few examples).

A pilot survey was carried out in six Member States in 2007, which identified and tackled a number of these issues in preparation for the full survey. Information about the methodological and sampling approach of the full survey is documented in a comprehensive technical report, where detail about every aspect of the survey is available, from questionnaire translations to fieldwork execution. The methodological summary in this report addresses only the key points presented in the full technical report.

Gallup Europe undertook the fieldwork for EU-MIDIS under the supervision of FRA staff who took part in interviewer training sessions and observed fieldwork in selected Member States.

What the main results report does and does not do:

- The survey results are presented here as descriptive statistics that outline the situation on the ground as reported by survey interviewees.
- The survey’s results are representative only of the groups that were surveyed in the locations where they were surveyed.

1.2.1. Survey basics

EU-MIDIS was a standardised survey-based data collection exercise with selected immigrants, national minorities and/or ethnic minorities. The fieldwork was mostly undertaken in European urban centres or other geographic areas with high concentrations of minority populations.

The design of the EU-MIDIS survey could only be defined in relatively broad terms in the technical specification of the Call for Tender for the survey. The operational design of the survey took its final shape in the light of the pilot survey's results, which tested the questionnaire and different sampling approaches in six Member States, and after detailed discussions with representatives of Gallup Europe and a panel of experts.

Preparatory activities for the study started in January 2008, and the fieldwork was launched in most Member States during May 2008. Due to various challenges, the survey fieldwork stretched until the end of October / beginning of November in some Member States (with a summer break between 22nd of July and 25th of August when fieldwork activities were effectively suspended). Table 1.1 details the actual fieldwork duration in each Member State.

Table 1.1 – EU-MIDIS Fieldwork dates

(all in 2008)	Start	End
Austria	6-May	17-Jul
Belgium	28-Apr	29-Aug
Bulgaria	12-May	17-Jun
Czech Rep.	20-May	6-Jul
Cyprus	10-May	22-Jun
Denmark	19-May	27-Oct
Estonia	12-May	4-Sep
Finland	18-Apr	25-Aug
France	5-May	15-Sep
Germany	10-May	30-Jun
Greece	19-May	10-Jul
Hungary	11-May	20-Jun
Ireland	15-Aug	3-Oct
Italy	14-May	22-Jul
Latvia	16-May	21-Jul
Lithuania	17-May	14-Jul
Luxembourg	28-Apr	6-Sep
Malta	16-May	21-Jul
Netherlands	1-May	5-Nov
Poland	11-May	20-Jun
Portugal	15-May	21-Jul
Romania	17-May	25-Jun
Slovakia	3-May	30-Jun
Slovenia	16-May	30-Sep
Spain	1-May	22-Jul
Sweden	3-May	24-Sep
UK	7-May	13-Sep

1.2.2. EU-MIDIS sampling

1.2.2.1. Geographical coverage

From the outset, EU-MIDIS was planned with a focus on groups in urban/semi-urban areas, in particular within capital cities and one or two key urban centres with high concentrations of immigrant / ethnic minority groups. However, this model could not be applied with the predominantly rural national minorities that were interviewed for the survey in some Member States – namely the Roma. Therefore, EU-MIDIS adopted a dual strategy; first, to cover major cities, including capitals, where vulnerable groups that were selected for interviewing were mostly immigrants, and, second, to adopt an 'at location' approach for Member States where the relevant minorities for surveying were primarily non-urban, or where there were no real distinct urban centres (e.g. in the smallest Member States). The sites selected for the survey were designated by the FRA at the inception stage of planning. Table 1.2 specifies the EU-MIDIS coverage area in each Member State.

Table 1.2 – EU-MIDIS Coverage Area

Austria	Vienna	Latvia	Riga
Belgium	Brussels Antwerp	Lithuania	Daugavpils Vilnius Visaginas
Bulgaria	[nationwide ¹]	Luxembourg	[nationwide]
Czech Rep.	[nationwide]	Malta	[nationwide]
Cyprus	[nationwide]	Netherlands	Amsterdam Rotterdam The Hague Utrecht
Denmark	Copenhagen Odense	Poland	[nationwide]
Germany	Berlin Frankfurt Munich	Portugal	Lisbon metro area Setubal
Greece	Athens Thessaloniki	Romania	[nationwide]
Estonia	Tallinn	Slovakia	[nationwide]
Finland	Helsinki metro area	Slovenia	Ljubljana Jesenice
France	Paris metro area Marseille Lyon	Spain	Madrid Barcelona
Hungary	Budapest Miskolc	Sweden	Stockholm Malmö
Ireland	Dublin metro area	UK	London
Italy	Rome Milan Bari		

¹ Corresponding to the location of relevant target groups.

Note: Results for Cyprus and Malta, for South Americans in Spain, and Brazilians in Portugal are only reported in the main results section. Further results from the full dataset will be released in 2010, which will allow for an analysis of findings concerning these Member States and/or specific groups.

1.2.2.2. Target groups

EU-MIDIS aimed to produce data on the extent and nature of discrimination and criminal victimisation as experienced by groups that are considered vulnerable to these acts on the basis of their immigrant or ethnic minority background. In this regard, the groups for sampling were broadly classed as ‘immigrants’, ‘national minorities’ and ‘ethnic minorities’ to reflect the particular situation in Member States with respect to histories of past and recent immigration, and settlement, and the degree to which certain groups are considered to be vulnerable to victimisation and discrimination.

Note: Groups are referred to simply as ‘Russians’ or ‘Sub-Saharan Africans’, for example, to denote their origin but not their citizenship, which was recorded separately.

The FRA’s selection of groups for sampling was informed by the national annual reports on the situation of racism and xenophobia in each Member State, which have been submitted since 2000 to the Agency and its predecessor, the EUMC, by its **RAXEN network** of national focal points (of which there is one in each Member State). The results of this data collection exercise are published by the Agency in its annual report that looks at the situation of racism and xenophobia in the Member States of the EU.

Given that an upper limit of three groups had to be set for sampling in any Member State – with a minimum sample size of 500 respondents for each group – difficult choices had to be made in those countries with significant and diverse immigrant and ethnic minority populations concerning which groups to select. In this regard the Agency benefited from the information supplied by and the expertise of its RAXEN network.

In sum, the FRA’s selection of groups to take part in the research was based on the following specific considerations (see Table 1.3 for listing of all groups surveyed).

- *Groups which are vulnerable* to or at risk of discriminatory treatment on the basis of their ethnicity or immigrant background, as well as criminal victimisation, including specifically ‘racially’ motivated crime. In this regard, the research did not focus on groups that can be considered as not particularly vulnerable or at risk; for example, British immigrants in Spain or the Swedish minority in Finland.
- *A minimum overall size of the community* sufficient for random sampling purposes, in interaction with identifiable areas where the groups reside at a minimum sufficient density (e.g. 5%).
- When identifying groups, stress was placed on some common *shared characteristics*; namely – their socially, economically and/or politically marginalised status when compared with the majority population.
- With the aim to be able to compare results between Member States, every effort was made to avoid selecting a group that was only represented in one Member State.

In addition to the groups that were selected for interviewing in each Member State, which could be up to three, interviewers were also allowed to interview people of Sub-Saharan African origin who they identified during the survey’s normal random route sampling where they were *not already included in any of the specifically targeted groups for surveying in a Member State*. In other words, where Sub-Saharan Africans were not one of the groups for surveying in a Member State, but when someone with a Sub-Saharan African origin was identified through random sampling in that country, they were asked if they could be interviewed. The decision was taken to do this as it was felt that Sub-Saharan Africans are particularly prone to discrimination and racist victimisation in many Member States, based on reports from the Agency’s RAXEN network, and therefore their experiences should be captured if possible. However, using the survey’s random sampling approach, very few additional Sub-Saharan African respondents were identified in this way. Given the small size of the “other” Sub-Saharan Africans group and its composition (disproportionate representation of some Member States) these observations were excluded from the analysis in this report. However, the full dataset contains information on this “other” Sub-Saharan African group, which can be analysed once the dataset is made public.

Table 1.3 summarises the groups sampled and surveyed in each Member State.

Austria	Turkish former Yugoslavs ²
Belgium	North Africans ³ Turkish
Bulgaria	Roma Turkish
Czech Rep.	Roma
Cyprus	Asians ⁴
Denmark	Turkish Somalis
Germany	Turkish former Yugoslavs
Greece	Albanians Roma
Estonia	Russians
Finland	Russians Somalis
France	North Africans Sub-Saharan Africans ⁵
Hungary	Roma
Ireland	Central and East Europeans ⁶ Sub-Saharan Africans
Italy	Albanians North Africans Romanians
Latvia	Russians
Lithuania	Russians
Luxembourg	former Yugoslavs
Malta	Immigrants from Africa
Netherlands	North Africans Turkish Surinamese
Poland	Roma
Portugal	Brazilians Sub-Saharan Africans
Romania	Roma
Slovakia	Roma
Slovenia	Serbians Bosnians
Spain	North Africans South Americans Romanians
Sweden	Iraqis Somalis
UK	Central and East Europeans

1.2.2.3. Target persons

The survey sampled individuals (male and female) aged 16 years and older who:

- Identified themselves as belonging to one of the immigrant, national minority or ethnic minority groups selected for sampling in each Member State.
- Are usually resident⁷ in one of the sampled cities or areas of the Member State being surveyed.
- Have been resident in the Member States for at least 12 months.
- Have sufficient command of (one of the) the national language(s) of the Member State being surveyed to lead a simple conversation with the interviewer.⁸

In each household that contained individuals from the designated target groups, up to three eligible persons were invited to take part in the survey. Individuals within households were sampled randomly to take part in the survey using a Kish grid (see online survey technical report for full details of the screening approach).

1.2.2.4. Sampling approach

The complex target population and coverage area definition was reflected in a similarly complex sample design, utilising four different approaches (see Table 1.4, which shows the specific type adopted in each Member State).

The general EU-MIDIS sampling approach was based on a combination of two specific methods; *random-route sampling* and *focused enumeration*.

As a default sampling approach, a **standard random-route** (RR) procedure was used to sample households. This method is one of the most likely to capture the whole universe in each city or relevant area sampled. The survey's pilot study showed that random-route sampling produces the best response rates, and provides an easier one-step access to members of the sampled minorities in comparison

2 Those from any of the successor states of the former Yugoslavia.

3 Algeria, Egypt, Libya, Morocco, Sudan, Tunisia, Western Sahara.

4 Various Asian countries, most frequently from Sri Lanka, the Philippines, India, Bangladesh, Pakistan. Please note that this sample was overwhelmingly female (as most of those interviewed were domestic workers).

5 All other African countries, not listed as North African.

6 Any of the 12 new Member States of the EU, apart from Cyprus and Malta, abbreviated as CEE (Central and Eastern Europe).

7 The definition of 'residence' was merely practical, no legal registration was checked.

8 The exception were the countries where the interviewers were able to conduct the interviews in the minority language – see section 1.2.3.2.

with other approaches, such as CATI-screening, which were tested as part of the pilot. All interviews for the survey were carried out face-to-face, with a professional interviewer asking the questions and coding the responses. In the light of the pilot, it was considered that the personal presence of interviewers facilitated a more accurate execution of the focused enumeration procedure (see below), and also allowed for the use of alternative language questionnaires.

For the random route samples in each of the selected primary sampling units (PSUs – concentrated in the high-density and medium-density areas where targeted minorities mostly live), one starting address was drawn at random. That ‘start’ address served as the first address of a cluster. The remainder of the cluster was then selected as every 5th address by standard random-route procedure from the initial address. Cluster sizes were not defined for any sampling point (however, the number of “desired” interviews for each sampling point was provided); usually cluster sizes in medium-density areas were larger than those in high-density areas. Stopping rules were in place to prevent ineffective random-route sampling where the first ten attempts could not identify any eligible minority household (in the main sample and via focused enumeration combined). In those cases where the originally designated starting point proved to be ineffective, two substitute starting addresses were made available; the first in the same sampling area (which might have been a medium or a high-density area) and the second in a high-density area.

To assist random sampling in Type (a) samples (see below), for each PSU a *Google-map based satellite and outline map segments were provided to interviewers* where the designated starting address (designated by a random algorithm) was marked, and interviewers were required to document their sampling activity on the map as well as by completing matching route administration sheets. In this way the geographical sample selection for Type (a) samples was fully centralised and controlled by Gallup Europe.

Focused enumeration (FE) was applied in order to boost the efficacy of the random-route approach. FE relies on interviewers ‘screening’ addresses adjacent to the core issued address, e.g. the one that is identified via the RR procedure. During FE, any contact person at the RR address is asked to “map” the immediate neighbours to find additional households where target minority persons might live. This is a method that keeps a random rule for respondent selection, but through proxy information it provides better access to rare populations. Focused enumeration may cover any of the following dwelling

units: any flats/houses one and two doors to the right and one and two doors to the left of the source RR address, and if in a multi-storey building those *directly* above and *directly* below the flat/household where an interviewer is asking someone to ‘map’ information about their neighbours.

The aim of FE was that interviewers could elicit proxy information from a single address to screen out addresses containing people from the majority population, and also to screen out addresses containing people from minority households/persons that did not belong to the group or groups selected for interviewing in a Member State.

Because the focused enumeration ‘booster sample’ was drawn from all sample PSUs – and because a fixed number of addresses is ‘sampled’ around each core sample address – the sample of addresses issued for screening by focused enumeration aimed to be as representative of the coverage area as the standard random route procedure.

As a general rule, all sampling activities were face to face, and each identified address was visited twice after the initial attempt to establish contact; thus **three attempts were made in total before dropping an address**, with the application of strict rules concerning repeat contacts in order to ensure that a household was approached at different times when they were likely to be home.

1.2.2.5 Sampling methods applied in the various Member States

After reviewing the possibilities in each Member State, EU-MIDIS adopted **four distinct sampling approaches**, with two of them capitalising on random route and focused enumeration, and the other two utilising alternatives to this method. Sampling approaches were uniform within Member States – that is, only one approach was used in each country. The four types were:

TYPE A) CITY/URBAN: random route sampling (RR) with focused enumeration (FE:): the standard sampling method, where the random route PSUs are allocated in the selected cities / urban areas, disproportionately distributed across sections and stratified by density (in cases where reliable density information for each strata could be obtained).

The FRA and Gallup worked together to obtain detailed statistics concerning the concentration

of eligible minority groups by city/urban section (e.g. ward, parish, census unit, or equivalent).

Where statistical information was available, samples were allocated in a way that 80% of the issued PSUs were located in sections with at least 15% combined density of eligible minorities, and 20% in sections with a combined density between 8.0% and 14.99%. In the standard design, sections with a density of 7.99% or less were not sampled.

In several locations obtaining section-level density information proved to be impossible, or the obtained figures were deemed inoperable (e.g. outdated or insufficiently detailed, which was the case in Estonia, Greece, Italy and Slovenia). In these cities PSUs were designated by expert choice (e.g. after consulting with the FRA's RAXEN network, minority organisations, academic experts, and municipal offices), with a view to defining and confirming the allocation of PSUs in high and medium density areas.

TYPE B) REGISTRY-BASED address samples: In most Member States it is not legally possible to obtain samples containing sensitive information such as ethnic background that can identify an individual or household. However in a few cases this was possible, and EU-MIDIS utilised this approach as an ideal method for sampling low-incidence or dispersed ethnic minorities with the assurance that no individual's results could be found through the resulting data analysis. In these countries, a random sample was drawn from a sufficiently accurate population list (national registries or equivalent) and the selected individuals (and their household members) were contacted directly by interviewers.

TYPE C) NATIONWIDE sampling: the method used to cover ethnic minorities that are situated in rural and semi-rural areas, as well as large urban centres, where the random-route PSUs are allocated in territories throughout the country where there is a known high density of the target population (as established either by national statistics or large-scale specific studies).

TYPE D) INTERVIEWER-GENERATED & NETWORK sampling (IG/NS): adopted as a contingency method for the above three truly random sampling approaches. In this scenario, starting from an initial number of contacts, the network of the identified eligible persons was to be

sampled. In many instances this method proved to be unsuitable for the survey, as the individuals recruited for the interview were extremely reluctant to provide their personal networks for subsequent sampling. This approach therefore became predominantly an interviewer-generated sample of relevant minorities at typical places of gathering, with very limited opportunity to follow up respondents' personal networks. However, the approach still used the same screener as the other three sampling approaches to identify appropriate respondents. This sampling method was adopted from the outset in Malta, where interviews took place among the population of so called semi-open detention centres.

As indicated in Table 1.4, **in five Member States the originally selected random-route sampling method had to be replaced with the fall-back network sampling solution due to the extremely low or no efficacy of the originally selected method.** In the UK, Ireland and Sweden the random-route approach did not in effect provide any access to the target groups, while due to the low efficacy of the random-route approach in the Netherlands and Slovenia a certain number of interviews were conducted with the fall-back method (proportions of interviews by sampling method are shown in Table 1.4).

Regardless of the sampling method, the following requirements were set out for EU-MIDIS:

- Replacement of enumerated dwelling units / households was possible, provided that two further visits after the initial contact were carried out, or the unit explicitly refused participation.
- In each enumerated eligible household (with at least one member fulfilling the eligibility criteria) up to three persons could be interviewed, chosen randomly from household members should there be more than three eligible persons (using a Kish grid selection).
- The primary mode of contact was face to face. In order to (re)contact identified minority households, other approaches were also accepted. Interviewers might use the telephone number obtained by the interviewer at a first visit to follow up and schedule/reschedule appointments for a second/third follow-up. Telephoning as a contact method had the benefit of being a flexible approach, and was used as a first contact method in some cases in relation to focused enumeration, where the referrer could provide

Table 1.4 – Sampling approaches by Member States, and distribution of the achieved sample according to sampling method

(RR = conducted at primary random route address, FE = conducted at and address identified with focused enumeration, AS = address sample, IG/NS = interviewer-generated and network sampling)

(TYPE A)	Sampling approach	% RR	% FE	% NS
Austria	RR with FE	57	43	
Belgium	RR with FE	73	27	
Greece	RR with FE	54	46	
Estonia	RR with FE	26	74	
France	RR with FE	96	4	
Hungary	RR with FE	77	23	
Italy	RR with FE	80	20	
Latvia	RR with FE	68	32	
Lithuania	RR with FE	34	66	
Portugal	RR with FE	39	61	
Spain	RR with FE	78	22	
Ireland	RR with FE --> IG/NS	0		100
Sweden	RR with FE --> IG/NS	4		96
UK	RR with FE --> IG/NS	6		94
Netherlands	RR with FE --> IG/NS	41		59
Slovenia	RR with FE --> NS	38	50	12
(TYPE B)				
Denmark	AS	NA		
Germany	AS	NA		
Finland	AS	NA		
Luxembourg	AS			
(TYPE C)				
Czech Rep.	RR with FE	73	27	
Bulgaria	RR with FE	70	30	
Poland	RR with FE	82	18	
Romania	RR with FE	90	10	
Slovakia	RR with FE	37	63	
Cyprus	RR with FE	44	56	
(TYPE D)				
Malta	IG/NS			100

a telephone number for their neighbour (which may have been recorded along with the address), and was also effective in nearly all cases of network sampling.

The FRA has contributed text on sampling 'difficult to survey' or 'rare' populations for the United Nations Manual on Victimization Surveys.⁹

1.2.2.6. Sample size

The target sample size per specific minority group was 500 (with the exception of the UK where the sample size for a single group was 1,000). Table 1.5 shows the net sample size achieved in the various groups.

9 UNODC-UNECE Manual of Victimization Surveys (United Nations Economic Commission for Europe, ECE/CES/2009/12/Add.1).

Table 1.5 – EU-MIDIS Sample sizes

		N=			N=	
Austria	Turkish	534	Latvia	Russians	500	
	former Yugoslavs	593		Lithuania	Russians	515
Belgium	North Africans	500	Luxembourg		former Yugoslavs	497
	Turkish	532		Malta	Immigrants from Africa	500
	[majority] ¹⁰	[527]	Netherlands		North Africans	459
Bulgaria	Roma	500			Turkish	443
	Turkish	500			Surinamese	471
	[majority]	[500]	Poland	Roma	500	
Czech Rep.	Roma	505		Portugal	Brazilians	505
	Cyprus	Asians	500			Sub-Saharan Africans
Denmark	Turkish	553	Romania	Roma	500	
	Somalis	561			[majority]	[500]
Germany	Turkish	503	Slovakia	Roma	500	
	former Yugoslavs	500			[majority]	[500]
	[majority]	[504]	Slovenia	Serbians	473	
Greece	Albanians	503			Bosnians	528
	Roma	505	Spain	North Africans	514	
	[majority]	[506]			South Americans	504
Estonia	Russians	500			Romanians	508
	Finland	Russians		562		[majority]
	Somalis	484	Sweden	Iraqis	494	
France	North Africans	534			Somalis	506
	Sub-Saharan Africans	466	UK	Central and		
	[majority]	[503]			East Europeans	1042
Hungary	Roma	500		“Other” Sub-Saharan		
	[majority]	[508]		Africans	146	
Ireland	Central and		TOTAL MINORITY:		23,565	
	East Europeans	609				
	Sub-Saharan Africans	503	TOTAL MAJORITY:		5,068	
Italy	Albanians	500	GRAND TOTAL:		28,633	
	North Africans	501				
	Romanians	502				
	[majority]	[502]				

1.2.2.7. Majority sub-survey

In addition to sampling selected immigrant and ethnic minority groups in the 27 Member States of the EU, it was decided that a sub-survey on the majority population should be conducted in some Member States to compare results between majority and minority populations living in the same areas concerning the survey's questions on experiences of police stops and customs/border control. In addition, majority population respondents were asked some questions about their background characteristics.


The FRA identified 10 countries (Belgium, Bulgaria, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Romania,

Slovakia and Spain) where a geographically 'matched' sample of the majority population was interviewed, with a sample size of N=500 in each country. The total number of majority interviews achieved was 5,068.

In most of the countries respondents from the majority population were recruited along the random routes that produced the minority sample, i.e. a randomly selected member from households where only majority people lived was invited to participate by answering a very short questionnaire. No more than one interview was completed per household and respondent selection was carried out following the 'last birthday' method.

¹⁰ See section 1.2.2.7.

When, upon completion of the EU-MIDIS minority segment, the corresponding majority sub-sample did not reach the desired 500 cases, additional telephone interviews were conducted to complement those collected face-to-face, using a random sample of directory-listed telephone numbers from the same streets where minority interviews were completed (CATI interviews). In Germany, due to the list-based sampling method, all majority interviews were carried out in the framework of a telephone follow-up survey. Figure 1.1 details the sampling method and interviewing mode for majority interviews in the 10 selected countries.



1.2.3. Delivery

EU-MIDIS interviews were carried out face-to-face, predominantly in respondents’ homes (unless otherwise requested by sampled respondents).

1.2.3.1. The questionnaire

The EU-MIDIS questionnaire was developed in-house by the FRA, and with the input of experts working in the field of international survey research (including work on minority populations). Where possible, the survey’s structure and questions were taken from reputable international surveys, such as the Eurobarometer or International Crime Victimization Survey (ICVS), in order to capitalise on the comparability of results between the majority population interviewed in these surveys and

EU-MIDIS findings on minority groups. Where questions were taken from existing surveys, the original wording was maintained when the question was inserted into EU-MIDIS to enhance comparability of results.

Questionnaires were paper-and-pencil based in each country. Where appropriate, visual aids were provided (e.g. show cards).

The typical length of the interview was between 25 and 35 minutes, depending on the specific group interviewed. On average the EU-MIDIS *main questionnaire* was 32 minutes long. This came on top of a 5-minute average duration *screening questionnaire*, which was used to identify eligible respondents (see section 1.2.2.3.). The actual length of each interview varied according to the extent of discrimination or criminal victimisation each respondent had to report to the interviewer, as well as factors such as respondents’ talkativeness, language capability, and different interviewing styles. The shortest interview took only 9 minutes, while some interviews were up to 145 minutes duration.

1.2.3.2. Language of delivery

EU-MIDIS questionnaires were predominantly delivered in the national language(s) of the country where the interview took place.

To compensate for some respondents’ potentially inferior knowledge in the national language(s) of the Member State in question, interviewers carried questionnaires in the relevant native language(s) of the groups surveyed as an aid for any respondent who needed it (so interviewees could look up and read problematic questions in their native language).

Individuals who did not speak a national language sufficiently well to hold a simple conversation with the interviewer were not included in the sample.

In some countries interviewers were also recruited who could speak other languages that could be of assistance when interviewing certain minority groups. Overall, 11% of all interviews were carried out in a language other than the national language. This was particularly the case with the Russians interviewed in the Baltic countries and the CEE respondents in Ireland.

The source EU-MIDIS questionnaire was finalised around mid-March in English. Translations were carried out into the local main and proxy languages. Forward and back-translations were made to the following main languages (translations were

distributed to the FRA RAXEN national focal points for a final expert review).

The languages in which the survey was delivered were:

Bulgarian	Czech	Danish
Dutch	English	Estonian
Finnish	French	German
Greek	Hungarian	Italian
Latvian	Lithuanian	Polish
Portuguese	Romanian	Slovak
Slovene	Spanish	Swedish

Translations were also made into the following proxy languages:

Albanian	Arabic	Russian
Serbian	Somali	Turkish

Some of the non-proxy languages were used as proxies elsewhere (e.g. Romanian was the standard delivery language in Romania, and was used as a proxy language in Italy and Spain when interviewing members of the local Romanian migrant communities.)

1.2.4. Weighting

Weighting in EU-MIDIS was used in a limited manner to correct for known selection disparities within specific immigrant and ethnic minority groups in every Member State. Design weights were assigned on the basis of selection probability within the household (corrections were needed if the respondent came from a household with more than three eligible persons) and on the basis of density-based selection probabilities (as described above, EU-MIDIS artificially over-sampled high-density areas, with the sampling then corrected in the design weights). The latter could only be achieved in places where the sample was allocated according to known statistical distributions.

The weighting did not, on the other hand, correct for sampling rate disparities across Member States, specifically because the size of the represented population was not systematically available for the area covered by EU-MIDIS (typical problems were: limited EU-MIDIS coverage within a country;¹¹ available population information was outdated;¹²

statistics were only available for non-nationals and not for those immigrants who had already obtained citizenship or were second generation; and there were several known cases of severe undercounting of a given minority population in a Member State, which was particularly the case in relation to the Roma). Due to the numerous pitfalls and limitations of attempting to weight the data on the basis of the available population data on minorities, EU-MIDIS provides all cross-group averages *without being weighted according to the relative size of the groups*.

For similar reasons (although the lack of information in general and especially in a systematised manner is even more profound) post-stratification weighting on the basis of socio-demographic variables was also not carried out.

1.2.5. Quality control

EU-MIDIS had quality-control procedures in place which place this study, despite its enormous complexity, in the top strata of pan-European social surveys (along with those such as Eurobarometer). Measures included:

- A double translation and back-translation of the survey instrument carried out by Gallup (verified by the FRA's RAXEN national focal points).
- Central and on-location personal briefings were held (by Gallup) for participating national fieldwork providers and extensive in-person training was mandatory for any interviewer involved in the survey execution.
- Detailed written instructions (management, sampling and interviewer manuals) were drafted and provided for all participants involved, and translated into national languages where it was necessary.
- During fieldwork execution a full review of interviews was carried out by local supervisors and at least 10% of the interviews were actually verified with the respondents.
- Representatives from the FRA as well as Gallup visited national partners and attended training and shadowed actual interviews in Member States; the memos and debriefings from such

¹¹ As described in the Sampling section, in many Member States EU-MIDIS was carried out in selected metropolitan areas or cities, statistically not representing the total relevant population in the particular country.

¹² Up-to-date information in the case of EU-MIDIS was a key requirement. In several Member States a large proportion or even the majority of the sampled groups (and those interviewed) arrived only within the past few years. Therefore census information from e.g. 2000 or 2001, even if available, had some limited empirical relevance to the current situation.

visits served as important feedback to help the national institutes improve their fieldwork operations.

- Proper quality-control measures for data entry (e.g. partial double entry) were put in place to ensure the accuracy of data capture.
- An extensive data-editing effort helped to build harmonisation of the national datafiles and the elimination of inconsistencies found in the submitted raw dataset.

1.3. Remarks for the reader

As evident from the brief methodology overview, due to practical and structural reasons EU-MIDIS could not implement a completely uniform design. This last part of the introductory chapter provides a summary of the most important points to consider with respect to the challenges faced by the survey as the first of its kind on minorities.

This section also clarifies some terms and abbreviations that are used in the later analysis.

1.3.1. Points to consider

As with all large-scale cross-national survey research, EU-MIDIS faced a number of challenges. As already mentioned, an expert panel reviewed the project, and, where possible, necessary adjustments were made based on the feedback and recommendations received. However, a number of issues concerning the survey's approach could not be addressed due to challenges that were beyond the control of the Agency and Gallup Europe; such as some Member States' limited or outdated population data.

The following outlines some of the most important points that should be taken into consideration when reading the results:

Limited potential for generalisation within a Member State: given the restricted coverage of the survey in most Member States (urban areas, not covering low-density areas), it is arguable how much the result can be referenced as the opinions of X ethnic minority in Z country. For the sake of clarity, the findings should be read as representative of X minority group (or groups) in Y area. For example, in countries with Type (a) samples, the strict generalisation level is 'X ethnic minority in the medium-to high-density areas of K, L, M cities'.

Comparability across Member States: primarily because of the potentially very different immigrant and socio-economic status of the groups surveyed in the various Member States, and also because of the geographical scope of the samples in the various countries (see section 1.2.2.1), **EU-MIDIS does not provide results on the basis of a Member State 'league table'**. Instead, the results focus on findings by 'aggregate' respondent groups across the EU (such as 'the Roma' or 'North Africans') and by individual minority groups by Member State. In this regard, the findings in the main results part of the report should be compared either between aggregate groups or between specific groups within an aggregate group.

Comparisons of various groups within countries: the results can potentially suffer from similar drawbacks as discussed above (e.g. comparing the experiences of fundamentally different groups). However, comparisons of results within a single country benefit from the application of the same sampling approach, and therefore comparability is enhanced.

Comparability of groups within 'aggregate' groups: this area is of least concern with respect to

The need for a ground-breaking survey:

The FRA's general position is that given that there is currently no government-generated data available on ethnic minorities and immigrants' experiences of discrimination and criminal victimisation in the vast majority of EU Member States, and given that the EU has repeatedly called for such data to be collected and made available in the public domain, the Agency has set out to do the following: to undertake the first EU-wide survey that has attempted to collect data to shed some light on people living in the EU, both citizens and non-citizens, whose experiences of everyday life remain under-researched, and for whom policy recommendations and action could benefit from solid evidence-based knowledge of the situation on the ground.

By providing both the technical report and the questionnaire from the survey, the Agency hopes that Member States are encouraged to see that it is feasible to conduct research on 'difficult to survey' groups, and that the results can serve to inform policy development and action on the ground to combat some of the worst forms of discrimination and criminal victimisation identified in the survey's findings.

questions of comparability. **To this end, the reader is recommended to focus on results between groups within each of the different aggregate groups surveyed.**

Comparability with national general population surveys: there are some limitations with regard to the extent to which the results from surveys of the general majority population, such as Eurobarometer or the ICVS, can be compared with EU-MIDIS findings where the same questions were used. These concerns focus in the main on different sampling approaches and locations for sampling.

1.3.2. Glossary

The report often uses general terms such as 'prevalence rates', 'immigrants', 'North Africans' etc. This section provides definitions and a list of abbreviations used throughout the report.

1.3.2.1. General

Throughout the report we use the general term '**immigrant and ethnic minority groups**' when referring to the general target groups of EU-MIDIS.

For the purpose of the survey the term '**immigrant**' encompasses the following:

- Refers to non-citizens (non-nationals) of Member States, as defined by their nationality, and is also used here to refer to citizens (nationals) who are commonly labelled, and may even label themselves, as a 'foreigner'/'immigrant'.
- A 'foreigner'/'immigrant' can be a recent arrival in a country or even a third generation citizen who may continue to be called or may self-define themselves as, for example, 'Turkish' or 'Somali'.
- The term 'foreigner'/'immigrant' implies that someone resides, either permanently or temporarily, in a Member State. The survey did not include non-resident migrant workers – for example, those who cross Member States' borders on a daily or weekly basis for work, but whose main place of residence continues to be another Member State or country from that in which they work/study. Also, the term 'foreigner'/'immigrant' does not include tourists, but can include resident students on long-term periods of study.
- Refugees and asylum seekers could be included in the research as long as they represent one of the three groups identified for sampling, but they

were not singled out for sampling purposes. The only systematic inclusion of this group took place in Malta, where interviewing was focused around semi-open detention centres.

For the purpose of the survey the term '**ethnic minority**' encompasses the following:

- Refers to both citizens (nationals) of Member States and non-citizens (non-nationals) who consider themselves as having, or are considered by others to have, identifiable group characteristics with respect to, for example, shared language, religion and cultural practices.
- Reference to 'ethnic minorities' is used here as a generic social science term, which includes and goes beyond more narrowly framed legal constructions of 'national minorities'.

For the purposes of this report (while the general definition of 'ethnic minorities' does include immigrant as well as non-immigrant individuals), the term 'minority' also refers to indigenous minorities (e.g. the Turkish minority in Bulgaria and the Roma populations) who are sometimes recognised in law as 'national minorities'.

The term 'immigrants' refers to groups that are not considered as indigenous in the country of current residence (e.g. 'Turkish immigrants to Germany'). The term 'migrants' is sometimes used in place of 'immigrants' to encapsulate a respondent group that is comprised largely of EU citizens (for example in the case of Central and East European citizens residing in the UK and Ireland).

As discussed in the section on the **geographical coverage of the survey**, the survey population in most countries was limited to those living in a few selected cities. Still, in the report we most often refer to the *country* that hosts these cities instead of the specific cities (e.g. we refer to Albanian immigrants in Italy, instead of referring to Albanian immigrants in Rome, Milan and Bari). The illustrations also indicate the countries in their labels, using the abbreviations described below (e.g. Albanians – IT). The reader should be aware that this labelling might be misleading for those who are not familiar with the actual coverage area of the survey, therefore we strongly recommend a careful inspection of the information in section 1.2.2.1 on the coverage area in each Member State.

1.3.2.2. Indices

The report was created with the explicit intention to avoid jargon as much as possible. To this end, only a very limited number of specific indices were created. We offer the following information to readers in this regard:

- **Prevalence rates:** prevalence rates refer to the proportion of persons who reported at least one occurrence of the phenomenon under analysis in the reference period. Such prevalence rates are provided for each specific discrimination and crime type, as well as for police stops. 'Prevalence' is not always spelled out; any 'victimisation rate' or 'discrimination rate' in the text refers to prevalence.

Prevalence rates might be *incidence-specific* (e.g. prevalence rate of assaults or threats) or *general* (e.g. prevalence rate of crime victimisation). In the latter case, prevalence rates show the proportion of persons who experienced at least one occurrence of all phenomena (e.g. all five crimes tested) in the reference period.

Reference periods might be 12 months (e.g. the 12 months that preceded the interview), or five years (preceding the interview). Please note that the report routinely provides illustrations, where the two reference periods are combined. In these charts and tables, the five-year rate is the sum of the percentage given for the past 12 months and that for the 2-5 year period. Similarly, where the 12-month rate is broken down into multiple categories (e.g. those stopped by the police in the 12 months prior to the interview as a result of anticipated profiling and those stopped by the police in the 12 months prior to the interview but *not* as a result of anticipated profiling) the percentages in each category should be added up for the actual 12-month prevalence rate.

- **Incidence rates:** incidence rates provide the *volume* of occurrences of a specific phenomenon over the reference period of the 12 months prior to the interview. Incident rates in this report are expressed as the average number of occurrences within the reference period projected to 100 persons. Incidence rates are meant when the report talks about 'volume' or 'frequency' of particular phenomena.

Incidence¹³ rates are provided for crime victimisation and discrimination. Specific rates indicate the volume of the particular type (e.g. the incidence rate for harassment describes how many harassments were indicated per 100 respondents during the reference period) or the general type (e.g. general crime incidence) which is the sum of the incident rates of each phenomena that the general type includes.

1.3.2.3. General group definitions

Throughout the report **aggregated or general groups** of ethnic minority or immigrant communities are analysed. These aggregated groups were created on the basis of recognised similarities in terms of ethnic/racial background (e.g. the Sub-Saharan African or Roma) or immigrant, socio-economic or cultural backgrounds (e.g. former Yugoslavians or Central and East Europeans). General groups are aggregates of similar communities across Member States. Table 1.6 specifies which specific groups belong to each of these general or aggregated groups.

In some parts of the report the term **specific group** is used. This means a specific individual group that was surveyed in a Member State; such as North Africans in Italy or Somalis in Finland. Results for specific groups are included in the report to illustrate either very high or very low findings that show the extent to which results deviate around the average recorded for aggregate groups.

In a few cases the groups selected for interviewing did not fall under any of the aggregate groups. This is the case of Asians in Cyprus, Brazilians in Portugal, South Americans in Spain and Iraqis in Sweden. The main results section in this report includes some findings for these groups, but the reader will need to wait for the release of the survey's dataset for any further analysis.

¹³ The use of the term incidence, which is described here, is based on the victimological research tradition, while the meaning of incidence in, for example, epidemiology is slightly different. Please see the paragraph 247 of the draft UNODC-UNECE Manual on Victimization Surveys (United Nations Economic Commission for Europe, ECE/CES/2009/12/Add.1) for a discussion on the differences in usage in different disciplines.

Table 1.6 – EU-MIDIS General groups

Sub-Saharan Africans	Sub-Saharan Africans in: France Ireland Portugal Somalis in: Denmark Finland Sweden Africans in Malta Surinamese in the Netherlands*
CEE (Central and East Europeans)	Albanians in: Italy Greece Romanians in: Italy Spain From the 10 East European New Member States (CEE) in: Ireland UK
Former Yugoslavians	former Yugoslavians in: Austria Germany Luxembourg Serbians in Slovenia Bosnians in Slovenia
North Africans	North Africans in: Belgium France Italy the Netherlands Spain
Roma	The Roma in: Bulgaria Czech Republic Greece Hungary Poland Romania Slovakia
Russians	Russians in: Estonia Finland Latvia Lithuania
Turkish	Turkish in: Austria Belgium Bulgaria Denmark Germany Netherlands

1.3.2.4. Abbreviations

As much as possible, this report has avoided the use of abbreviations. EU-MIDIS itself is an acronym for 'European Union Minorities and Discrimination Survey'.

Where necessary, Member States were abbreviated according to the standard ISO country codes, as adopted by the European Union Inter-Institutional Style Guide, as follows:

Belgium	BE
Bulgaria	BG
Czech Republic	CZ
Denmark	DK
Germany	DE
Estonia	EE
Ireland	IE
Greece	EL
Spain	ES
France	FR
Italy	IT
Cyprus	CY
Latvia	LV
Lithuania	LT
Luxembourg	LU
Hungary	HU
Malta	MT
Netherlands	NL
Austria	AT
Poland	PL
Portugal	PT
Romania	RO
Slovenia	SI
Slovakia	SK
Finland	FI
Sweden	SE
United Kingdom	UK

In some cases, especially in Chapter 3 of this report, the names of minority groups were abbreviated as well. Where minorities corresponded with a country-specific nationality, we used the standard ISO abbreviations (e.g. RO for Romanians). In a few cases ethnic-minority group abbreviations were combined with countries where the group was surveyed (e.g. RO in IT, that is, Romanians in Italy).

* Surinamese interviewees were classified as being of Sub-Saharan African origin.

2. Main results

This section highlights key results from the survey; it compares findings for general 'aggregate' groups (such as 'North Africans' or the 'Roma') where they were surveyed in more than one Member State, and also presents some notable findings for specific groups in individual Member States.

An overview of the primary results in the three main areas covered by the survey are presented: (1) discrimination experiences on the basis of respondents' immigrant or ethnic minority background in nine different areas of everyday life; (2) criminal victimisation experiences across five different crime types, including experiences of racially motivated victimisation; and (3) trust in and experiences of law enforcement, including discriminatory ethnic profiling.

2.1. Discrimination experiences

EU-MIDIS measures specific discrimination experiences across nine domains of everyday life. Interviewees were introduced to the theme of discrimination before being asked specific questions about their personal experiences.

The survey used an established method to collect information about discrimination and personal victimisation experiences, which is borrowed from crime victimisation surveys such as the British Crime Survey (BCS) and the International Violence Against Women Survey (IVAWS). During a screening phase, interviewers asked respondents about specific experiences of discrimination on the basis of their immigrant or ethnic minority background (that targeted them personally, and not others, e.g. their family members – with the exception of discrimination by school personnel which could be experienced as a parent) *in the past five years*, and then – if discrimination in this time frame was confirmed – the questionnaire clarified whether or not they could recall a specific incident from the *past 12 months*. If an experience of discrimination in the last 12 months was recalled, further questions asked about the frequency of specific experiences over the past 12 months, and whether or not the last incident in question was officially reported (at the place of discrimination, or anywhere else). Finally, of those who said they had experienced discrimination in any of the nine areas tested and did not report it anywhere, the survey asked for clarification about the reasons for not doing so, with multiple responses recorded by the interviewer.

Specific discrimination experiences were tested in nine domains within the fields of work, and public and private services. The selected domains covered main areas of everyday life with the anticipation that the proportion of those who do not come into

contact with these domains is in most cases relatively low. The domains are as follows (in parenthesis, the short labels used in subsequent analyses and illustrations are included for clarification):

Work

- when looking for paid work out of all those who have been looking for work in the past five years preceding the interview (*when looking for work*)
- at work by people who you work for or work with, out of all those who have been working in the past five years preceding the interview (*at work*)

(Predominantly) public services

- when looking for a house or apartment to rent or buy, by people working in a public housing agency, or by a private landlord or agency (*by housing agency / landlord*)
- by people working in public or private health services, by anyone, such as a receptionist, nurse or doctor (*by healthcare personnel*)
- by people working in public employment or social insurance services; this could be an agency where you have to register for work or which gives you benefits or money (*by social service personnel*)
- by people working in a school or in training; this includes schools, colleges and other further education. This could have happened to you as a student or as a parent (*by school personnel*)

Private services

- when in or trying to enter a café, restaurant, bar or nightclub (*at a bar, restaurant*)
- when in a shop or trying to enter a shop (*at a shop*)

- when trying to open a bank account or get a loan from a bank (*in a bank*)

Based on the nine domains explained above, in the following section *prevalence* and *incidence* rates for discrimination that vulnerable ethnic and immigrant minorities faced in the EU will be discussed.

Prevalence rates show the percentage of respondents who were discriminated against in at least one of the domains investigated (in the preceding 12 months).

Incidence rates incorporate the additional dimension of frequency to prevalence, by giving the average number of incidents per 100 persons.

Those who did not look for a job and those who did not work were removed from the calculation of respective discrimination rates (an analysis of labour participation of the vulnerable minorities is available below, in section “2.1.2.1 Groups in the labour market”), as were those who confirmed that they could not be a subject of discrimination because they did not come into contact with the particular services investigated.¹⁴ Interviewers were instructed to probe each negative answer (i.e. that the respondent was not discriminated against) to ascertain whether or not respondents were in contact with the given service at all.

When interpreting the results it should be remembered that some response rates refer to a *low number of cases* concerning issues that only a fraction of the sample were confronted with; e.g. those who provided reasons for not reporting particular incidents of discrimination were those who: first of all have been in contact with the particular service, faced that specific discrimination in the past five years, were discriminated against in the preceding 12 months as well, and did not report the most recent incident. Obviously, starting from a sample size of 500 per specific group, the number of respondents who were ‘left’ to provide their views on why the discrimination incident against them was not officially reported was in many cases low (especially in specific groups where the discrimination rate was low and the reporting rate was high). The reader will find specific warnings about low case numbers where this was the case, and in some instances the analysis is suppressed or aggregated (with the collapsing of more domains or more groups) in order to enhance the statistical relevance of the findings.

2.1.1. Overall prevalence rates

When discussing prevalence rates, we will primarily focus on **12-month** rates, which is an established reference period for recall in many survey instruments (although some surveys have a longer recall period). While this rate may produce a memory bias effect called “telescoping” (e.g. people have the tendency to bring incidents forward in time to match the timeframe they are asked about, thereby boosting the reported rate compared to the “real” rate), at the same time respondents are more prone to forget less serious incidents when asked about discrimination or victimisation experiences over a longer period of time. In sum, while telescoping may lead to inflated rates, forgetting about incidents influences the rates in the opposite direction, which results in an undercount of incidents.


The selection of this 12 month reference period was also determined by the criterion used for respondent sampling – which required a minimum stay in the country of at least 12 months, prior to the interview, in order to be eligible for sampling. The 12-month rule for eligibility was necessary to ensure that the respondents have been in the country long enough for them to be able to describe their experiences in the Member States, without including incidents which might have taken place elsewhere.

Those who arrived in the country where they were interviewed less than five years ago could only describe incidents from the number of years that they had spent in the country, which in their case was less than five – in contrast, given the respondent eligibility criteria, everybody is able to answer regarding the past 12 months. In an effort to document experiences in a particular Member State and to avoid an overly complex interview questionnaire, the survey only inquired about incidents that took place in the country of interviewing; that is, the current country of residence of respondents. The proportion of those who spent less than five years in the country where they resided at the time of the interview was particularly high among those in Ireland (among CEE respondents: 96%), Africans in Malta (92%), CEE respondents in the UK (70%), Asians in Cyprus (69%), and Romanians in Spanish and Italian urban centres (56% and 54%, respectively). On the other hand, for many established or national minorities that were surveyed length of residence in a Member State was a ‘non issue’ as they had either been born in the country or had lived there for well over five years.

¹⁴ Please note that the EU-MIDIS questionnaire is available online through the Agency’s website (<http://fra.europa.eu/eu-midis>).

Figure 2.1
12-month discrimination prevalence rate (CA2-CI2)

Specific groups, % discriminated against at least once in any of the nine domains tested



EU-MIDIS 2008

Questions CA1-CI1: During the last 5 years, [or since you've been in the country if less than 5 years], have you ever been discriminated against when [DOMAIN] in [COUNTRY] because of your immigrant/minority background? [IF YES] CA2-CI2: Thinking about the last time this happened, when was this: in the last twelve months or before then?

The [DOMAIN]: when looking for paid work | at work by people who you work for or work with | when looking for a house or apartment to rent or buy, by people working in a public housing agency, or by a private landlord or agency | by people working in public or private health services, by anyone, such as a receptionist, nurse or doctor | by people working in public employment or social insurance services; this could be an agency where you have to register for work or which gives you benefits or money | by people working in a school or in training; this includes schools, colleges and other further education. This could have happened to you as a student or as a parent | when in or trying to enter a café, restaurant, bar or nightclub | when in a shop or trying to enter a shop | when trying to open a bank account or get a loan from a bank

Looking at aggregated minority groups (see Figure 2.1), the **12-month prevalence rate of discrimination is the highest among the Roma:**

On average, 47% of all Roma respondents who were interviewed were discriminated against in at least one domain of the nine tested during the course of the 12 months preceding the survey. The second highest average rate of discrimination was for Sub-Saharan African respondents, at 41%.


About one third of North African immigrants in Europe have been discriminated against during the 12 months preceding the survey (36%), and about one in four Turkish and Central and East European immigrants were affected as well (23% in both groups). Results are (relatively) the most favourable among the Russian minority in the Baltic States and Finland (14%), and for the former Yugoslavian community (12%).

When looking at specific groups within Member States, seven of these emerge as particularly affected by discrimination. In line with the general findings at an aggregated group level, looking at the breakdown of results for the individual groups surveyed by Member State (Figure 2.2), four of the 'top five' groups who experience the worst discrimination in general

are Roma (in CZ 64% have been discriminated against, as were 62% in HU, 59% in PL and 55% in Greece). EU-MIDIS detected similarly high (50+ per cent) prevalence rates among African immigrants in Malta (63%), Sub-Saharan Africans in Ireland (54%), and North Africans in Italy (52%). Among the 45 specific groups surveyed, there are 16 where the prevalence rate is at least 33%; in other words, where on average 1 in 3 people in that group consider that they were discriminated against on the basis of their immigrant or ethnic minority background at least once in the last 12 months.

The lowest levels of 12-month prevalence of discrimination were detected among those with a former Yugoslav background in Austria (3% of them indicated that they were discriminated against in the past 12 months), the Russian minority in Lithuania (4%) and Latvia (5%), the Turkish minority in Bulgaria (8%), and the Turkish in Austria (9%). Discrimination affected about one fifth or less of the samples (over a period of 12 months) in seven further instances; for example, Turkish in Belgium (20%), Russians in Estonia (17%), Central and East European immigrants in the UK (11%) and Iraqis in Sweden (10%). It is notable that all former Yugoslavian minority communities have either faced single digit rates of discrimination (in Austria, as discussed above), or belong to a group

Figure 2.2
Discrimination prevalence rates (CA2-C12)
 % discriminated against in the past 12 months
 (9 domains)



EU-MIDIS 2008

Question: as with Figure 2.1

where at most about a fifth of respondents reported that they have been discriminated against in the past 12 months: e.g. those in Germany (21%), in Slovenia

(combining results for Bosnians (16%) and Serbs (10%)), and in Luxembourg (12%).

Although the possibilities for definitive conclusions are limited because of the strong interaction between the two variables, statistical analyses of the results suggests that the country where the interview took place has a somewhat stronger influence on the likelihood of being discriminated against than does the general group the respondent belongs to. For example, when looking at respondents with a Turkish background in the various Member States, the variation in discrimination prevalence rates ranges from 42% in Denmark, 30% in both Germany and the Netherlands, 20% in Belgium, and 9% in Austria. The lowest recorded rate for respondents with a Turkish background is in Bulgaria (8%), which, unlike the other Turkish groups surveyed, represents the experiences of a non-immigrant established minority. However, looking at the other groups surveyed in these same countries, e.g. in Denmark and Austria, it seems that the different rates found might be linked to the country in general, as the other group or groups surveyed in these countries show similarly high (e.g. Somali people in Denmark) or low (people with a former Yugoslav background in Austria) rates in comparison to those with a Turkish background. On the other hand, the rate for the other group surveyed in Bulgaria (the Roma: 26%) is nowhere near the rather favourable results found among the Turkish. Hence, other explanatory factors need to be investigated too with respect to differences within Member States where more than one minority group was interviewed.

Figure 2.2 helps to review the discrimination prevalence rates *within countries* (note that the data presented here are the same as in Figure 2.1), to see how similar or different the experiences of immigrant or ethnic minority groups are where they have been surveyed. Countries are shown in original language alphabetical order, by the number of minority groups covered in each of them. Looking at results for countries where other groups were interviewed besides the Turkish, one can find Member States where there are stark differences in discrimination rates between different groups; striking examples being the difference between discrimination rates in Sweden for Iraqis (10%) and Somalis (33%), and in Ireland between Central and East European respondents (26%) and Sub-Saharan Africans (54%). Therefore, although in some cases there is evidence to suggest that differences in discrimination rates are linked to Member States rather than the groups themselves, this does not hold true in many countries where other factors are at work that might help to

explain very different results between groups within a country; factors such as ‘colour of skin’ being a predictor of heightened discrimination experiences. Future ‘Data in Focus’ reports from the survey will further analyse results to identify any patterns in this regard.

2.1.2. Prevalence of specific discrimination experiences – nine domains

Generally speaking, discrimination is not ‘service-dependent’; in other words, those groups who experience high levels of discrimination in one area of life tend to experience high levels in other areas too. There is, however, slight variation, and certainly the absolute level of discrimination varies greatly across the nine types or domains the survey focussed on. Before discussing in detail discrimination experiences across the nine domains, we will briefly describe the extent to which different groups are present in the labour market in an effort to understand the results concerning discrimination when looking for work or when at work.


2.1.2.1. Groups in the labour market

Interviewees were asked if they have had paid work in the past five years in order to identify those

respondents who could answer questions about their experiences of discrimination in the work place. A similar question was asked with regard to looking for work in the past five years in order to screen for respondents who could be queried on discrimination experiences when looking for work. At the same time, the results from these questions provide an overview of long-term activity in the labour market in addition to the snapshot view with respect to respondents’ employment status (which was collected towards the end of the interview by asking respondents if they were working in a paid job, unemployed or doing something else at the time of the interview).

As shown in Figure 2.3, a large proportion of the respondents in most groups surveyed were in paid employment for at least some time **during the past five years**; the proportion of those who indicated that this was the case was 70% or more in 21 out of the 45 specific groups surveyed. A typical goal of an *immigrant* is to work in their new country and get ahead more easily, farther or quickly than would have been possible in their home country. Therefore it is no wonder, especially in the groups that consist of recent immigrants, that the proportion of those who had been able to find work, at least for some time, is large (the age-composition of these groups also explains the relatively intensive job activity).

Figure 2.3
Ethnic minorities in the labour market (CA0_1 and CB0_1)
Labour market participation, (any time during) the past 5 years, %



Question CA0_1: Can I just check, have you ever looked for paid work during the last 5 years in [COUNTRY] [or since you've been in the country if less than 5 years]?
CB0_1: Did you have paid work at any time during the last 5 years in [COUNTRY], [or since you've been in the country if less than 5 years]?

Looking at the 'top' ten groups in terms of their active workplace history over the last five years, we see that *immigrant* groups dominate among those covered by the survey. At the other end of the scale are the Roma in Romania and Poland, where only about three in ten of those interviewed had been able to find paid work in the past five years. In several other Roma groups as well, the proportion of those who have had paid employment over the past 5 years remained low (EL: 41%, SK: 42%, and BG: 46%). Alongside the Roma, it can also be noted that less than half of the Iraqis in Sweden (44%) had paid jobs in the last five years, with the next lowest employment rate being for Turkish respondents in Austria (50%).

Considering the averages in paid employment by aggregate groups, the rate among the Roma is the lowest in general (43%), while Central and East European migrants were most likely to be in a paid position (90%). High rates of those not in paid work in a group does not mean that its members were unlikely to have looked for a job in the same time period. Half of the Roma (49%), two-thirds of the Sub-Saharan African respondents (66%) as well as North Africans (64%), and 38% of those with a Turkish background did look for a job in the five years preceding the survey. Central and East European migrants – being mostly recent arrivals in the countries where the interviews took place – were those most likely to have looked for paid work during this period (84%). The CEE immigrants in Ireland and

the UK, and also Romanians in Spain and Italy, were groups where members confirmed in large numbers that they have been looking for a job (IE: 95%, UK: 91%, ES: 91% and IT: 83%). Similarly high figures were recorded in only a few other groups, such as African immigrants in Malta (95%), where the time of arrival for many fell within the 5-year period too.


Of those who indicated that they *did not have a job in the last five years* (see Figure 2.4), Roma and Sub-Saharan African respondents were the most likely to state that they were looking for a job but did not find one (30% and 26%, respectively), while 25% of the Roma, 31% of Turkish respondents and 29% of Central and East European migrants indicated they were homemakers – findings which particularly reflect the situation of women. The level of respondents who have not been looking for paid work because they are not yet in or who are already out of the labour market (e.g. because they are retired or permanently disabled) is highest among the Russian (71%) and former Yugoslav (65%) minorities surveyed. Those most likely to have problems with residence permits that are keeping them from jobs are in the CEE group (6%), while Sub-Saharan Africans have the highest numbers of those for whom language difficulties are indicated as the key burden (6%).

Finally, looking at the **occupational status at the time of the interview**, the Roma results are again the most striking (these results differ from

Figure 2.4

Reasons for not having paid work (CB0_2)

% of general groups, past 5 years (category values <= 1% not shown)




EU-MIDIS 2008

Question CB0_2: What was the main reason why you did not have paid work [in the past five years]?

those presented above, as the focus here is on the respondents' *current* employment status instead of activity in the labour market in the past five years, as described earlier). Considering all Roma respondents, 23% were unemployed and only 28% were in paid employment (full or part-time, or self employed). Almost half of those surveyed were economically inactive: 24% were looking after the home and children, and 23% were retired, still in school, permanently disabled or indicated another circumstance for not being involved in the job market (see Figure 2.5). Only the Turkish came close to the Roma group as far as the proportion of inactive persons is concerned (40%): but with most of those who could actively participate in the labour market in fact working (48% of those interviewed). Economic activity rates (that is, either in work or unemployed and available for work) in every other aggregated group were over 60%. At the other extreme, those in the CEE group are the most likely to be economically active, with the overwhelming majority working (80%) or unemployed and available for work (5%), while the rest – 15% – were not on the labour market because they were homemakers, or because of other reasons (e.g. they were still in school, already retired, etc.).

Figure 2.5 provides details of unemployment in the specific respondent groups in each Member State. The group with the highest proportion indicating that they were unemployed was African immigrants in Malta – at 54% (it is Sub-Saharan African respondents in general who were – after the Roma – the second most likely to indicate that they are unemployed: 17% overall). Unemployment rates (at the time of the interview) were also extremely high compared to other groups among the specific Roma groups: 36% in Slovakia, 33% in Bulgaria, 24% in Poland, 23% in Hungary, 20% in Greece and 19% in the Czech Republic. Among Somalis in Finland and Sweden about one in five respondents could not find a job (19%). The same proportion of North African immigrants interviewed in Spain were also unemployed.

Figure 2.5
Rate of unemployment (BG5)
 At the time of the interview,
 specific groups, %




Question BG5: Are you working in a paid job or are you unemployed or doing something else? Using this card, how would you describe your main activity?

Gender and employment

When looking at the results due consideration should be given to differences in employment status according to gender and immigrant/ethnic minority group – see Figure 2.6.

In this regard, respondents were asked about their employment status – that is, whether they were, **at the time of the interview**, in paid employment, taking care of the home or unemployed, or if they were not in the labour market for another reason (e.g. studying full time, or retired). Figure 2.6 expands on the results

Figure 2.6
Employment status by gender at the time of the interview (BG5, %)



EU-MIDIS 2008

Question BG5: Are you working in a paid job or are you unemployed or doing something else? Using this card, how would you describe your main activity?

in Figure 2.5 and shows that there is great variation in the employment rates of various immigrant and ethnic minority groups interviewed in EU-MIDIS on the basis of gender. **The results show how the group of respondents who are ‘homemakers’ or in ‘unpaid work’ is predominantly composed of women: in total 21% of women fall into this category compared to only 1% of men, and in some cases more than half of female respondents have indicated that they take care of the home (71% of Roma women in Romania, 70% of Roma women in Greece and 52% of Turkish women in Austria).**

The fact that on average one in five female respondents stay at home explains why the rate of women in the labour market is as a rule lower than the rate of men, particularly since the share of women and men who are not active in the labour market (because they are studying, retired, etc.) is, on average, equal – 20% of men and 21% of women are non-active. Alongside the example of Austrians in Turkey and Roma in Romania, where many women take care of the home, differences in the share of women and men in employment is

particularly large among North Africans in Italy, where women’s employment rate is only half that of men. The exception to this general rule regarding male/female paid employment is with regard to Asian immigrants in Cyprus, who are predominantly women who are working. Also, among Romanians in Spain slightly more women than men are working, while among South Americans in Spain, CEE migrants in Ireland, and Surinamese in the Netherlands the differences in the employment rates between women and men are small (under five percentage points).

The highest employment rates for both women and men are found among the following groups: CEE respondents in Ireland and the UK, Brazilians in Portugal, Romanians in Italy and, in the case of female respondents, the aforementioned Asian migrants in Cyprus. On the other hand, the groups with the lowest rate of employment for *both* men and women are Roma groups in Romania, Poland and Slovakia, while Roma women in Greece and Roma men in Hungary have particularly low employment rates.

2.1.2.2. Discrimination when looking for work

Note: Discrimination prevalence rates are only given for those who are in contact with a specific service.

In the light of the above overview it does not come as a surprise that on average **38% of Roma job seekers** (those who have been looking for paid work, regardless of if they were working or not) **indicated that they were discriminated against** at least once in the 12 months preceding the survey when they applied for a job (see Figure 2.7). Correspondingly, six out of the ten specific groups where this type of discrimination was most widespread were Roma in the various Member States. According to the judgement of respondents, access to work has been limited for 47% of Roma job-seekers in Hungary, 45% in the Czech Republic, 42% in Greece, 38% in Slovakia, 36% in Poland, and 29% in Bulgaria. This ‘top ten’ list only lacks one Roma group: those from Romania.

More than a fifth of the Sub-Saharan African respondents interviewed by EU-MIDIS stated that they were discriminated against when looking for work (22%), and 20% of job seekers among North African immigrants indicated the same. Among the


specific groups most likely to face discrimination when looking for work are African immigrants in Malta: 42% reported that they faced discrimination when looking for work because of their ethnic/immigrant background. Among North Africans, those in Italy were most likely to be discriminated against (37%). Such discrimination was also very widespread in the case of Asian immigrants in Cyprus (who are not classified into any of the aggregated groups as they represent a ‘one off’ group that was surveyed): 34% among those who were looking for a job indicated that they felt they were discriminated against on the basis of their ethnicity/immigrant background.

2.1.2.3. Discrimination at work


Even at work, the Roma were – even if only nominally – the most likely to feel that they were treated unfairly because of their ethnic background. Of those Roma who said they were active in the labour market, 19% indicated they had been discriminated against in the last 12 months at work. However, Figure 2.8 shows that there is little difference between the Roma and some other aggregated groups: 17% of Sub-Saharan African respondents, and 16% of North Africans provided similar reports as well. 13% of CEE migrant workers and 10% of those with a Turkish background stated that they suffered from unequal treatment at their workplaces that was related to their ethnicity

Figure 2.7
**Prevalence rate of specific discrimination:
 WHEN LOOKING FOR WORK (CA2 and CA0_1)**
 % discriminated against at least once in the past 12 months

Aggregate groups:



Specific groups with highest prevalence rates (top 10):



EU-MIDIS 2008


Question CA0_1: Can I just check, have you ever looked for paid work during the last 5 years in [COUNTRY] [or since you've been in the country if less than 5 years]? [IF YES] CA1: During the last 5 years, [or since you've been in the country if less than 5 years], have you ever been discriminated against when looking for paid work in [COUNTRY] because of your immigrant/minority background? [IF YES] CA2: Thinking about the last time this happened, when was this: in the last twelve months or before then?

or immigrant background. Such discrimination is virtually nonexistent among the former Yugoslavian and Russian minorities in the countries where EU-MIDIS surveyed them (4% in both groups).


Corresponding to the similar prevalence rates for discrimination against the Roma and some other general groups, the ranking of country specific minorities regarding at-work discrimination is not exclusively dominated by Roma groups: among the 'top ten', four belong to this minority: the Roma in Greece (second place: 29%), in the Czech Republic (27%), in Hungary (25%) and in Poland (22%). The most likely to experience at-work discrimination (by employers or colleagues) were North Africans in Italy, 30% of whom reported such treatment in the 12 months preceding the survey. Just as African immigrants in Malta are the most likely to be unemployed, and are the third most likely to report discrimination when trying to secure a job for

Figure 2.8
**Prevalence rate of specific discrimination:
 AT WORK (CB2 and CB0_1)**
 % discriminated against at least once in the past 12 months

Aggregate groups:



Specific groups with highest prevalence rates (top 10):



EU-MIDIS 2008

Question CB0_1: Did you have paid work at any time during the last 5 years in [COUNTRY], [or since you've been in the country if less than 5 years]? [IF YES] CB1: During the last 5 years, (or since you have been in [COUNTRY]), in [COUNTRY], have you ever been discriminated against at work by people who you work for or work with because of your immigrant/minority background? [IF YES] CB2: Thinking about the last time this happened, when was this: in the last twelve months or before then?

themselves, the situation remains much the same when they are working: 27% of them report unfair treatment at their workplace on the basis of their ethnicity/immigrant background. Several other groups of respondents of Sub-Saharan African origin also perceive fairly high rates of discrimination at work; such as 26% of Sub-Saharan Africans in Ireland. In addition, 24% of the Brazilian respondent group in Portugal said they experienced discrimination at work, of whom (in the judgement of the interviewer) 23% were 'Black' persons of Sub-Saharan African origin (note - this group is not analysed as part of the aggregate Sub-Saharan African group).

2.1.2.4. Discrimination by housing agency / landlord

When it comes to housing (Figure 2.9), 12-month discrimination rates are markedly lower than those experienced in the areas of work. On average, 11% of Roma and 11% of North Africans indicated that they

were discriminated against by housing services, an agency or landlord. In Italy, North African respondents reported the highest level of discrimination in housing of all groups surveyed – 1 in 4 having been discriminated against. The fact that all three groups surveyed in Italy appear in very prominent positions in the top ten list of those most discriminated against in the housing market, with Albanian immigrants ranking third (19%) and Romanians fifth (15%), points to a country-specific problem in this domain.


After North Africans and the Roma, both 7% of Sub-Saharan Africans and Central and East Europeans report discrimination experiences related to housing. However, those with a Turkish, Russian and former Yugoslav background all report extremely low levels of discrimination in this domain.

2.1.2.5. Discrimination by healthcare personnel


When looking at average discrimination rates by

aggregate groups, healthcare is once again an area where respondent-perceived discrimination levels are generally low, with one significant exception: the Roma (see Figure 2.10). On average, 17% of the Roma indicated that they felt they were discriminated against by healthcare personnel (medical or other). Six Roma groups appear among the ten country specific groups most discriminated against by healthcare personnel, with those in Greece (23%) and Poland (22%) reporting the highest rates. It is only the Roma minority in Bulgaria that did not make the ‘top ten’ list of groups most discriminated against in relation to healthcare.

However, when we look at the ten specific groups reporting the highest levels of discrimination in this area, North Africans in Italy emerge as the most discriminated against – with 1 in 4 indicating at least one incident in the last 12 months. North Africans as a general group reported a healthcare-specific discrimination prevalence rate of 8%, less than half as high as the Roma, and about the same



Question CC1: Thinking about the last 5 years, (or since you have been in [COUNTRY]), have you ever been discriminated against in [COUNTRY] when looking for a house or apartment to rent or buy, by people working in a public HOUSING agency, or by a private landlord or agency. [IF YES] CC2: Thinking about the last time this happened, when was this: in the last twelve months or before then?



Question CD1: In the last 5 years, (or since you have been in [COUNTRY]), have you ever been discriminated against in [COUNTRY] by people working in PUBLIC or PRIVATE HEALTH services? That could be anyone, such as a receptionist, nurse or doctor. [IF YES] CD2: Thinking about the last time this happened, when was this: in the last twelve months or before then?

proportion as was recorded among Sub-Saharan African respondents (7%). Africans in Malta are the Sub-Saharan African group that felt most often discriminated against by healthcare personnel (17%), after which 14% of Somalis in Finland and 15% of Brazilian immigrants in Portugal (among whom many were also 'black' Africans) were discriminated against as well.

2.1.2.6. Discrimination by social service personnel

Figure 2.11 shows a very similar picture to discrimination in healthcare. Against otherwise generally low discrimination levels, more than one in seven (14%) Roma in the countries where they were surveyed confirmed that they thought they were treated unfairly because of their ethnic background by social service personnel (e.g. an employment agency, or an agency that provides benefits for persons and families).

North Africans in Italy dominate the 'top ten' list again, with 22% having perceived discrimination against them from social services (note that discrimination prevalence rates are provided for those who were in contact with the specific service); but the next five groups in the list are Roma: the Roma in the Czech Republic (21%), Hungary (18%), Poland (18%), Slovakia (15%) and Greece (14%), while those from Bulgaria also appear in the 'top ten' list with 10% indicating unequal treatment. Besides North Africans, Italy has another group that ranks among those most discriminated against by social services personnel (Albanians: 9%). Somali respondents in Denmark (10%) and the Turkish in Germany (10%) were also among those who provided evidence of the most negative experiences.

2.1.2.7. Discrimination by school personnel


10% of the Roma were discriminated against at least once in the year preceding the survey by school personnel, either as students or as parents. This is

Figure 2.11


Prevalence rate of specific discrimination: BY SOCIAL SERVICE PERSONNEL (CE2)

% discriminated against at least once in the past 12 months

Aggregate groups:



Specific groups with highest prevalence rates (top 10):




EU-MIDIS 2008

Figure 2.12


Prevalence rate of specific discrimination: BY SCHOOL PERSONNEL (CF2)

% discriminated against at least once in the past 12 months

Aggregate groups:



Specific groups with highest prevalence rates (top 10):



EU-MIDIS 2008

Question CE1: In the last 5 years, (or since you have been in [COUNTRY]), have you ever been discriminated against in [COUNTRY] by people working in PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT or SOCIAL INSURANCE services? This could be an agency where you have to register for work or which gives you benefits or money. [IF YES] CE2: Thinking about the last time this happened, when was this: in the last twelve months or before then?

Question CF1: Looking at the last 5 years again, (or since you have been in [COUNTRY]), in [COUNTRY], have you ever been discriminated against by people working in a school or in training? This includes schools, colleges and other further education. This could have happened to you as a student or as a parent. [IF YES] CF2: Thinking about the last time this happened, when was this: in the last twelve months or before then?

one of the lowest rates recorded among the Roma, out of the nine domains tested. Discrimination rates were, however, fairly high in Poland (where 20% of the Roma who are in contact with this service reported unequal treatment) and Hungary (17%). In general, 8% of North Africans and 6% of Sub-Saharan African respondents stated that they or their children were discriminated against by school/educational personnel (see Figure 2.12).

Unequal treatment in schools was fairly often confirmed in Italy by those who were in contact with educational institutions: 21% of North Africans (topping the list), 12% of Romanians and 10% of Albanians indicated that they felt they were treated unfairly in schools because of their ethnic or immigrant background. 10% of North Africans in Belgium had the same opinion, and those with a Turkish background in Germany (11%) and Denmark (10%) were also among specific groups that were the most discriminated against in schools.


2.1.2.8. Discrimination at a café, restaurant, bar or nightclub

Turning to predominantly private services (Figure 2.13), discrimination prevalence rates go up, but only for the groups that are most vulnerable to discrimination in general. One in five Roma (20%), 14% of Sub-Saharan African respondents, and 13% of North Africans reported that they were discriminated against in (or when entering) a pub, café, restaurant or a nightclub. Such experiences were much less widespread among the Turkish (6%), CEE (4%), Russian (2%) and former Yugoslav (2%) minorities.

With 35% indicating such treatment, African immigrants in Malta are the most affected by discrimination in cafés, restaurants or bars, but the Roma in the Czech Republic (30%) and North Africans in Italy (30%) are not far behind.

It is notable that all three Somali groups that were surveyed in EU-MIDIS ranked among the ten most disadvantaged groups considering this domain, with the Finnish Somali community being slightly more discriminated against (16%) than those in Sweden or Denmark (13% both). This finding implies that Somalis are particularly vulnerable to discriminatory treatment in these service sectors, and therefore targeted interventions to recognise and respond to discriminatory treatment may be necessary.

Figure 2.13
Prevalence rate of specific discrimination: AT A CAFÉ, RESTAURANT OR BAR (CG2)
 % discriminated against at least once in the past 12 months



EU-MIDIS 2008

Question CG1: In the last 5 years, (or since you have been in [COUNTRY]), have you ever been discriminated against in [COUNTRY] when in or trying to enter a café, restaurant, bar or nightclub. [IF YES] CG2: Thinking about the last time this happened, when was this: in the last twelve months or before then?

2.1.2.9. Discrimination at a shop



While North Africans (11%) and Sub-Saharan African respondents (11%) were somewhat less likely to be discriminated against in shops than they were in bars and restaurants, the discrimination faced by Roma is at the same level for both domains; it affects one fifth of the respective population (see Figure 2.14).

The rate of discrimination in retail outlets (when in or entering a shop) is strikingly high among the Polish Roma: almost half of them (44%) felt they were discriminated against in such a situation in the 12 months prior to the interview. The Hungarian Roma (31%), North Africans in Italy (27%) and the Czech Roma (24%) all recalled high levels of discrimination in this domain. It was only the Bulgarian and the Romanian Roma who are not among the ‘top ten’ of those who faced discrimination in retail outlets. Both immigrant groups surveyed in Portugal, however, were among the specific minorities that were most discriminated against in this domain (Brazilians: 13%, Sub-Saharan Africans: 13%), as were Sub-Saharan

Figure 2.14

**Prevalence rate of specific discrimination:
AT A SHOP (CH2)**

% discriminated against at least once in the past 12 months



Aggregate groups:**Specific groups with highest prevalence rates (top 10):**

EU-MIDIS 2008

Figure 2.15

**Prevalence rate of specific discrimination:
AT A BANK (CI2)**

% discriminated against at least once in the past 12 months

Aggregate groups:**Specific groups with highest prevalence rates (top 10):**

EU-MIDIS 2008

Question CH1: In the last 5 years, (or since you have been in [COUNTRY]), have you ever been discriminated against in [COUNTRY] when in a shop or trying to enter a shop. [IF YES] CH2: Thinking about the last time this happened, when was this: in the last twelve months or before then?

Question CI1: Lastly, during the last 5 years, (or since you have been in [COUNTRY]), have you ever been discriminated against in [COUNTRY] when trying to open a bank account or get a loan from a bank. [IF YES] CI2: Thinking about the last time this happened, when was this: in the last twelve months or before then?

immigrants in Ireland (17%), and the Somali in Finland (15%).

2.1.2.10. Discrimination at a bank

According to the survey's findings across nine domains of everyday life, banks are the least likely to discriminate against their potential clients (see Figure 2.15). One explanation for this overall low rate could be that those who came into contact with a bank were probably the least disadvantaged persons within their groups, whereas many members of minority groups would come into contact with other services, such as shops. At the same time, interaction with a bank is not a regular occurrence for most people when compared with other activities such as visiting a shop.

Even among the Roma, 'only' 7% felt they were discriminated against at a bank (when trying to open a bank account, or when applying for a loan), which is remarkably low considering the nine domains tested. The specific group that emerges as most discriminated against in this domain is

North Africans in Italy (almost one quarter of those who came into contact with banks in this group had the impression that they were discriminated against – other immigrant groups in Italy also ranked relatively high in this regard, if substantially lower than North Africans). More than one in ten clients among Hungarian (14%) and Czech (11%) Roma also confirmed that they felt that banks did not treat them the same way as non-minority customers. Herein, the results are evidence that interventions may be needed to address discrimination in this domain with respect to the situation, as reported by minorities, in specific countries.

2.1.3. Multi-domain discrimination experience

Prevalence of discrimination, while it allows for an excellent overview of the proportion of those who have been targeted by unequal treatment in the recent past, does not capture several important dimensions that are related to the intensity of discrimination experiences. Most prominently, it does

not offer information on the overall frequency of incidents (which is discussed in the next sub-section under “Volume of discrimination”), but it also lacks information regarding the number of various types of discriminations that respondents experienced.

Figure 2.16 clarifies this second aspect by providing information on the average number of distinct domains – of the nine surveyed – in which respondents in each specific group and across aggregate groups experienced discrimination (among those who reported *any* discrimination). As one might expect from the previous analyses, **the Roma report the most types of discrimination: those who were discriminated against mentioned on average 2.5 domains where they could recall an experience of unequal treatment in the year preceding the survey.**


What is more striking is that the number of domains in which North Africans report discrimination is almost as high (2.38). This result can primarily be attributed to the Italian North African minority, who were very likely to be discriminated against (7th most likely of all specific groups surveyed, according to overall prevalence rates – see Figure 2.1), and, even more strikingly, half of them indicated that they faced unequal treatment in about four domains of the nine tested (4.12). The rest of the North African respondent groups’ results range between 1.50 (in

the Netherlands) and 1.90 (in Belgium). Central and East European migrants report discrimination in an average of 2.13 domains, and all other general groups confirmed past-year incidents in less than two domains (see Figure 2.16 above).

Multi-domain discrimination is not only high among North Africans in Italy, the country’s other immigrant groups also tended to suffer incidents in more than one domain (Romanians: 3.53, Albanians: 2.64). Roma groups in Poland (2.79), Hungary (2.65), Slovakia (2.57), the Czech Republic and Greece (2.54 both) are also among those who provided reports of being discriminated against in a relatively large number of domains. On the other hand, among Austrian immigrants the lowest averages of multi-domain discrimination were recorded (Turkish: 1.18, ex-Yugoslavs: 1.24).

2.1.4. Volume of discrimination

The incidence rate of discrimination refers to the number of incidents (all types combined) per 100 persons, and is used to estimate the full volume of discrimination in a specific or aggregated respondent group. As Figure 2.17 shows, **the range of incidence rates is spectacularly wide, even when considering the aggregated groups. The difference between the Roma (455 discrimination experiences per 100 respondents in the past 12 months) and the**



Questions CA1-CI1: During the last 5 years, [or since you’ve been in the country if less than 5 years], have you ever been discriminated against when [DOMAIN] in [COUNTRY] because of your immigrant/minority background? [IF YES] CA2-CI2: Thinking about the last time this happened, when was this: in the last twelve months or before then?

The [DOMAINS]: when looking for paid work |at work by people who you work for or work with | when looking for a house or apartment to rent or buy, by people working in a public housing agency, or by a private landlord or agency | by people working in public or private health services, by anyone, such as a receptionist, nurse or doctor | by people working in public employment or social insurance services; this could be an agency where you have to register for work or which gives you benefits or money | by people working in a school or in training; this includes schools, colleges and other further education. This could have happened to you as a student or as a parent. | when in or trying to enter a café, restaurant, bar or nightclub | when in a shop or trying to enter a shop |when trying to open a bank account or get a loan from a bank

former Yugoslavian minorities (44) is tenfold.

Similar to prevalence, the incidence rates present the population “average”, which means that even within a particular group some individuals may be subject to a much higher incidence of discrimination than others.

These results are particularly informative as they also indicate the average number of discrimination incidents in a year, across the nine domains, that an individual in a specific group or an aggregate group is likely to experience. **For example – North Africans in Italy experience on average 9 incidents of discrimination in a 12 month period and Roma in Poland nearly 7 incidents in a year, while Russians in Lithuania experience on average 0.06 incidents and ex-Yugoslavs in Austria experience on average 0.1 incident a year.** These findings indicate that discrimination on the basis of immigrant or ethnic minority background is a pervasive experience for some specific groups in the country where they live. Yet, for other groups, discrimination on the basis of their ethnicity or immigrant background is a rare event.

discrimination serves to ‘normalise’ these experiences and to undermine a minority group’s place in society.

After North Africans in metropolitan Italy (929), the Roma in Poland (681), Hungary (669), the Czech Republic (580) and Greece (566) are the specific groups with the highest 12-month discrimination incident rates of all groups covered in EU-MIDIS.


Looking at aggregate groups, North Africans and Sub-Saharan African respondents rank second and third with about three discrimination experiences suffered by each respondent during the year that preceded the interview (incidence rates are 320 and 256, respectively). Again, the result for the aggregate North African group is strongly influenced in the negative direction by the very unfavourable reports provided by those in Italy. In comparison, the next highest incident rate among North Africans is around the average for all specific groups surveyed (those in Spain: 207).

In this analysis Sub-Saharan African respondents rank higher, which is based on the average number of incidents experienced (the incidence rate) in a year across all domains (in comparison with the multi-domain discrimination ranking discussed in the previous section). *This indicates that Sub-Saharan Africans were more likely to be exposed to repeat discrimination in fewer domains.* Somalis in Finland face the highest volume of discrimination (403) in this general group, while African immigrants in Malta, who predominantly consist of Sub-Saharan Africans, are close with 353.

The incidents per respondent can also be used to estimate the volume of the cases of discrimination that could potentially be reported to organisations/Equality Bodies – by multiplying the average number of discrimination incidents by the size of the specific group.

The implications of regularised experiences of discrimination are significant for those communities they most affect. Left unchecked, regular

Figure 2.17
12-month discrimination incidence rate (CA3-CI3)
Specific groups, total number of discrimination incidents suffered in the nine domains, per 100 respondents



Questions CA3-CI3: You mentioned that you have been discriminated against because of your immigrant/minority background when [DOMAIN] in [COUNTRY]. How many times in the last 12 months have you experienced this type of discrimination?
The [DOMAINS]: as with Figure 2.16

Incidence rates provide a great illustration at the bottom end of the scale too. Herein, the incidence rate of 6 per 100 respondents in the case of Russians in Lithuania is very tangible proof that discrimination is not a key problem for that particular minority. Other groups with an incidence rate of 50 or below are, besides the aforementioned Russian minority in Lithuania, the following: former Yugoslavians in Austria (11), Russians in Latvia (15), Turkish in Austria (26), Central and East European migrants in the UK (33), Turkish in Bulgaria (42), the two minorities in Slovenia (Serbian: 43, Bosnian: 46), and Iraqis in Sweden (44). However, given that EU-MIDIS was not able to interview all minority groups in Member States, it may be the case that if the survey exercise was repeated for Sub-Saharan Africans in these countries then the findings could be much worse.

2.1.5. Non-reporting of discrimination

Those who indicated that they were discriminated against in the past 12 months were asked the following question (specifically for each incident in the nine domains): *“People might report acts of discrimination to an organisation or an office where complaints can be made, or at the place where it happened. Please try to remember the LAST TIME you were discriminated against at [DOMAIN]. Did you or anyone else report this incident anywhere?”*

Those who *did not* report an incident of discrimination were asked a follow-up question to determine the reasons for non-reporting. This section provides an overall summary of the results in these two regards.

Please note that the question considered reporting to a designated body as well as at the place of the incident and did not separate the two reporting possibilities.¹⁵ Also note that EU-MIDIS did not define what “reporting” is, e.g. the question did not impose any formal requirement in this regard (nevertheless in the text we will sometimes refer to such complaints as “official reports” in order to better distinguish them from respondents’ reports of various experiences to the interviewer during the course of the survey interview).

2.1.5.1. Overall tendency to not report discrimination

In each of the aggregate and specific groups covered by EU-MIDIS, not reporting discrimination

is the norm; with rather few exceptions discrimination incidents remain largely unreported and thus invisible to anti-discrimination agencies/bodies as well as to the places where incidents take place.

Looking at aggregate respondent groups, Central and East European immigrants were least likely to report incidents of discrimination (88% confirmed not reporting them). Other groups are somewhat more likely to report their experiences of unequal treatment, but a very small minority in every group actually report incidents of discrimination (see Figure 2.18).

With respect to reporting levels by specific groups (see Figure 2.19), the most extreme levels of non-reporting were found for minority groups in Portugal, where official reporting of discrimination cases is almost unheard of: virtually nobody in the Sub-Saharan and the Brazilian respondent groups filed a complaint. Non-reporting also remained at or above 95% among South Americans (96%) and Romanians (95%) in Spain, Bosnians in Slovenia (95%), Turkish in Austria and Bulgaria (both 95%), and Russians in Latvia (95%). In a further 13 groups the *non-reporting* rate ranges between 85% and 92%.

On the other hand, at least every fourth incident was reported by eight specific groups in six Member States. A (potentially) more rights-conscious culture (including perhaps the knowledge and the means to complain) was evidenced by a higher number of complaints made about unequal treatment; which was observed especially in France where the reporting rates were 37% in the case of Sub-Saharan Africans and 29% for the North African community. Likewise, both groups in Finland were among those groups most likely to report incidents (Somali: 32%, Russian: 27%), and discrimination incidents were also reported more often than for other groups surveyed by North African respondents in Belgium (34%), the Czech and Polish Roma (34% and 29% respectively), and Somalis in Sweden (26%).

Overall, the survey’s findings present a very bleak picture of high levels of non-reporting of discrimination among all the minority groups interviewed for EU-MIDIS. The repercussions of this are significant; simply put: reports of discrimination are not being registered either at the place where the discrimination occurs or at the offices of bodies


¹⁵ As the pilot testing already hinted at very low rates of reporting in general, which was later confirmed by the main study, the case numbers would have been simply insufficient to analyse the various possible addressees of specific reports or complaints.

Figure 2.18

Overall reporting rate of discrimination incidents suffered (CA4-CI4)

Aggregate groups, % of the cases, average of the nine domains (the most recent incidents), among those who were discriminated against in the past 12 months

■ Not reported (incl. Don't know/Refused)
 □ Reported



EU-MIDIS 2008

Questions CA4-CI4: People might report acts of discrimination to an organisation or an office where complaints can be made, or at the place where it happened. Please try to remember THE LAST TIME you were discriminated against when [DOMAIN – as with Figure 2.16]. Did you or anyone else report this incident anywhere?

or institutions that have a legal mandate to respond to discrimination complaints, such as Equality Bodies that have been established under community law. In this regard, although anti-discrimination laws are now in place throughout the EU that address discrimination on the basis of race and ethnicity, the reality is that the minority groups experiencing discrimination on these grounds are not reporting

these incidents anywhere. There is a mismatch between the 'law in the books' and the 'law in practice'.

One might assume that reporting of incidents depends on exposure to discrimination. The results provide some support for this assumption. If respondents who have been discriminated against in the past 12 months are classified into three groups based on the incidence of discrimination – low incidence, medium incidence and high incidence – the reporting rate increases in step with discrimination incidence. The respondents in the low incidence group who had experienced 1-3 incidents in the past 12 months were the least likely to report incidents (14% reported), while 18% of respondents in the medium incidence group (4-9 incidents in the past 12 months) reported at least one of the cases, and 24% in the high incidence group (10 or more incidents in the past 12 months) filed a report.


Other factors such as respondents' level of education or length of stay in a Member State might also contribute to reporting rates; with the assumption that more educated respondents and those who have been living longer in a Member State are more likely to report discrimination. Examining the data set as a whole, and looking at reporting and non-reporting based on various respondent background characteristics, it appears that the following might only have a marginal impact on the rate at which

Figure 2.19

Overall reporting rate of discrimination incidents suffered (CA4-CI4)

Specific groups, % of the cases, average of the nine domains (the most recent incidents), among those who were discriminated against in the past 12 months

■ Not reported (incl. Don't know/Refused) □ Reported



EU-MIDIS 2008

Question: As with Figure 2.18

respondents report discrimination to organisations: gender, age, household income, employment status, years of education, fluency in the national language, and neighbourhood status relative to other areas in the same cities. On the other hand, length of

residence does appear to have an effect on reporting, as 20-22% of respondents who had lived in the country ten years or more, or who were born there, reported an incident in the past 12 months, while 13-14% of respondents who had been in the country


Figure 2.20

Reporting rates of specific discrimination domains (CA4-C14)


% who reported / did not report the most recent incident in the past 12 months, aggregate groups in descending order of overall discrimination prevalence

■ Not reported (incl. Don't know/ Refused)
 ■ Reported


Roma



Sub-Saharan African



North African



CEE







Figure 2.20 (Continued)

Reporting rates of specific discrimination domains (CA4-CI4)

% who reported / did not report the most recent incident in the past 12 months, aggregate groups in descending order of overall discrimination prevalence

■ Not reported
(incl. Don't know/
Refused)

■ Reported

Turkish**Russian****Ex-Yugoslav**

EU-MIDIS 2008

Question: As with Figure 2.18

for 1-9 years did so. Similarly, respondents who were citizens of the Member State where they were living reported at a higher rate (21%) compared to non-citizens (14%). However, these general findings for *all* respondents might not apply when data is examined at the level of aggregate or specific groups.

2.1.5.2. Service-specific reporting rates

Figure 2.20 indicates that most incidents of discrimination that were reported somewhere were either workplace discrimination or unequal treatment in the education system. School discrimination

cases were most frequently reported, out of all nine domains surveyed, among the Roma (31%), North Africans (21%), Turkish (25%), and Russians (34%). Those from the former Yugoslavia were marginally more likely to report discrimination in a shop (19%) than discrimination in the education system (18%). Officially reported incidents of workplace discrimination were most frequent among the Sub-Saharan African group (22%).¹⁶

Non-reporting of discrimination is a mixture between being group dependent and service dependent: e.g. reporting school-based discrimination was

¹⁶ Please note the total in Figure 2.20 might go beyond 100%, this is due to rounding.

common across all general groups, while (although most instances of discrimination in private services were not reported) almost a quarter of Russians who received unfair treatment in a bank did 'officially' complain about it (24%), and former Yugoslavians are more likely to report incidents in shops than any other type of discrimination they encounter. Figure 2.20 provides a breakdown of specific reporting/non-reporting patterns in each of the aggregated groups, by discrimination domains.

2.1.5.3. Reasons for non-reports

If respondents did not report the last incident of discrimination they experienced in the past 12 months, they were asked to give their reasons for not doing so. Respondents were invited to provide reasons in their own words, and interviewers classified the replies according to a predefined coding scheme, containing the following broader categories:

- Fear of intimidation from perpetrators if reported discrimination
- Concerned about negative consequences/contrary to my interest – such as not receiving 'good service' in future
- Didn't know how to go about reporting discrimination/where to report
- Nothing would happen/change by reporting discrimination
- Too trivial/not worth reporting it – it's normal, 'happens all the time'
- Inconvenience/too much bureaucracy or trouble/no time
- Dealt with the problem themselves/with help from family/friends
- Residence permit problems – so couldn't report
- Not reported because of language difficulties/insecurities
- Other

Multiple answers were accepted: each category that respondents referred to in their reply was marked. In this analysis we provide the totals based on the results in each of the nine domains (see Figure 2.21).

The most common general reasons for not reporting discrimination incidents officially (either at the place of the discrimination or elsewhere, e.g. with designated bodies) are very similar across the board: most victims of discrimination express scepticism that reporting the incident will be of any use as they tend to believe that simply '**nothing would happen**' as a result of reporting. As Figure 2.21 shows, this category was most often recorded among Roma respondents, but it was extremely widespread in every other

general group as well, and qualified as **the most prominent reason to omit official complaints related to discrimination incidents**. The Roma, Russian and ex-Yugoslavian replies showed that the second most widely mentioned barrier to officially reporting discrimination is that respondents '*didn't know how or where to report it*' (52%, 40% and 36%, respectively). North Africans, Turkish respondents, and Central and East European immigrants, on the other hand, indicated that these incidents were almost 'normal' and belonged to the daily routine; thus, they were classified as '*too trivial, not worth reporting*' – this category was the second most frequent in these groups (with respective figures being 42%, 40% and 37%). Another reason, that it is just '*too inconvenient, takes too much time or trouble*' to officially report incidents was given by a range of 19% (among Sub-Saharan Africans) through to 27% (among Russians). Collectively, these results show both a very high level of lack of knowledge about reporting mechanisms and a strong indication of a sense of resignation about the effectiveness of reporting.

The potential that reporting could result in 'secondary victimisation' was also a factor dissuading people from reporting. In this regard, an average of 28% of the aggregate Turkish group, 39% of the Roma, and 34% of those with a former Yugoslavian background were concerned about potential '*negative consequences of reporting*', e.g. that they will be treated even worse if they report unfair treatment or that they will lose access to the service altogether; in the other groups such a concern was less significant (between 18%-23%). Of perhaps more concern is the finding that '*fear of intimidation*' from perpetrators was a widespread barrier to reporting among former Yugoslavians (22%) and the Roma (21%). What these results indicate is that measures need to be in place to encourage reporting and the follow-up of complaints in the context of a safe environment, one which serves to protect victims and to remove the potential for secondary victimisation.

'*Language difficulties*' were a relatively significant barrier for the Russian minority (17%), especially when compared to other aggregate groups where this problem affected discrimination victims in proportions only ranging from 1% to 7%. '*Residence permit problems*' were rarely mentioned as a barrier in officially reporting incidents among all groups surveyed. On average, Central and East European migrants were most likely to mention residence permit problems (7%), but differences can be noted between the responses of CEE migrants in the UK and Ireland, which were generally low, and those of other CEE groups, in particular Albanians in Italy (12%) and

Figure 2.21

Reasons for non-reporting (CA5-CI5)

% of those who did not report the most recent incidents of discrimination in the past 12 months, with their reasons for not reporting (multiple responses possible), aggregate groups in descending order of overall discrimination prevalence






Roma**Sub-Saharan African****North African****CEE**

Figure 2.21 (Continued)

Reasons for non-reporting (CA5-CI5)

% of those who did not report the most recent incidents of discrimination in the past 12 months, with their reasons for not reporting (multiple responses possible), aggregate groups in descending order of overall discrimination prevalence



EU-MIDIS 2008

Question: As with Figure 2.18

Romanians in Spain (10%). The implications of this finding are particularly important with regard to the experiences of CEE respondents who *are* EU citizens.

Finally, a certain proportion of respondents mentioned that they dealt with the problem themselves, e.g. by personally settling the issue with the perpetrator, or inviting family and friends to help out and find a resolution together. This was

most widespread among the Roma (19%), former Yugoslavians (19%), Russians (18%) and the Turkish minority (20%). Whether this indicates a healthy level of 'self reliance' among these communities or if it also points, once again, to a lack of belief in official complaints mechanisms, it is difficult to say. Perhaps this result shows that people gain redress in a variety of ways that lie outside the arena of traditional justice channels.

2.2. Specific victimisation experiences

As EU-MIDIS had crime victimisation as only one of the three key focus areas of the survey, it had to limit the selection of crimes tested to accommodate questions relevant to discrimination, police stops and other important domains as well. The five 'ordinary' crimes selected for the survey were identified on the basis of the anticipated prevalence rates (based on the pilot study, and in order to have a sufficient number of cases for analysis) and their relevance to vulnerable minorities (e.g. assaults or threats has a generally low prevalence, but it is very relevant with regard to uncovering potentially violent racist incidents targeting the various immigrant / ethnic minorities).

Furthermore, EU-MIDIS introduced a new category (serious harassment) which is a borderline criminal activity that is not routinely covered by victimisation studies. Still, due to its profound relevance to the subject matter of this survey, it was tested together with the other crimes.

In addition to the five 'ordinary' crimes surveyed, EU-MIDIS also asked respondents about their experiences of corruption, the analysis of which is reported in Chapter 3 in a series of more detailed findings on aggregate groups.

The interview applied the same methods for exploring specific victimisation incidents as was described in the introductory paragraphs to the previous section that discussed discrimination experiences. For each of the five crimes covered (see below), screening questions clarified whether or not the respondent (1) fell victim to the particular crime in the five years prior to the interview (or in the period since he or she has lived in the country where interviewed, if less than five years) in the Member State where the survey took place, and (2) if they were victimised during the 12 months preceding the interview.

For each crime, the survey clarified if victims perceived any racial or ethnic motives on the part of the perpetrators. For in-person crimes – assault, threat and serious harassment – follow-up questions were asked to clarify how often these incidents had occurred in the last 12 months, and detailed information was sought with regard to the last

incident; such as perpetrator characteristics, and reasons for non-reporting to the police. This follow-up was not extended to property crimes given the evidence from the pilot survey that the rates of 'racist' property crime were likely to be very low and the results to the follow-up questions would therefore be unreliable.

The five specific crimes covered by the survey are (with the actual question text for the first screener question in italics):

PROPERTY CRIMES:

Vehicle crime (results are presented here based on the replies of vehicle owners only):

During the last 5 years in [COUNTRY], was any car, van, truck, motorbike, moped or bicycle¹⁷ – or some other form of transport belonging to you or your household – stolen, or had something stolen from it? [IF NEEDED, CLARIFY: All forms of motorised and non-motorised transport can be included].

Burglary

During the last 5 years, did anyone get into your home without permission and steal or try to steal something? [Does include cellars – Does NOT include garages, sheds, lock-ups or gardens].

Theft of personal property (sometimes referred to as "small or petty theft")

Apart from theft involving force or threat, there are many other types of theft of personal property, such as pick-pocketing or theft of a purse, wallet, clothing, jewellery, or mobile phone. This can happen at work, on public transport, in the street – or anywhere. Over the last five years have you personally been the victim of any of these thefts that did not involve force?

IN-PERSON CRIMES

Assaults or threats

During the last 5 years, have you been personally attacked, that is hit or pushed, or threatened by someone in a way that REALLY frightened you?

¹⁷ Please note that this category collapses various transports, including non-motorised transport. In the case of vulnerable minorities EU-MIDIS considered this approach to counter the effect of affluence-dependent victimisation which is connected, for example, to the ownership of cars.

This could have happened at home or elsewhere, such as in the street, on public transport, at your workplace – or anywhere. Please take your time in answering.

Serious harassment

During the last 5 years, have you been personally harassed by someone or a group in a way that REALLY upset, offended or annoyed you? By 'harassment' we mean unwanted and disturbing behaviour towards you that did not involve actual violence or the threat of violence. This could have happened at home, at work, on the street, on public transport, in a shop, in an office – or anywhere. Please take your time in answering.

As with the nine domains of discrimination, attrition rates in the five crime areas – that is, the 'drop off' between those who were screened to see if they were a victim of crime and those who indicated they were victims – resulted in a loss of eligible subjects as many of those interviewed were not victimised. As crime is a rarer event than discrimination, the analysis in this section of the report (and particularly in Chapter 3 by aggregate groups) is typically based on few cases. Herein, the reader will find specific warnings about extremely low case numbers, where applicable, and in some instances the analysis is suppressed or aggregated (by collapsing more domains or more groups) in order to enhance the statistical relevance of the findings.

As already introduced in the previous section discussing specific discrimination experiences, prevalence and incidence rates of specific and overall crime victimisation will be discussed.

Prevalence rates show the percentage of respondents who were victimised at least once (in at least one of the crimes, when discussing the *overall* rate) in the preceding 12 months.

Incidence rates incorporate the additional dimension of frequency to prevalence, by giving the average number of incidents per 100 persons. Incidence rates are only available for in-person crimes.

2.2.1. Overall crime prevalence rates

When discussing prevalence rates, this section will focus on **12-month rates** (see explanation under section on 'Overall prevalence rates').

Starting with aggregated minority groups, the **12-month prevalence rate of crime victimisation is**

highest among respondents with a Sub-Saharan African background (33% of respondents interviewed fell victim to at least one of the five crimes tested) and among the Roma (32%) (see Figure 2.22). About a quarter of Central and East European (24%) and North Africans (26%) in the EU have been victimised during the 12 months prior to the survey, and about one in five Turkish respondents became a victim too (21%). Results are – similarly to discrimination experiences – relatively the most favourable among the Russian minority in the Baltic States and Finland (17%), and for members of the former Yugoslavian communities (14%).

Looking at the average reported level of criminal victimisation across the five crime types surveyed, with regard to specific groups in the various Member States, **Roma** and **Sub-Saharan African** groups are overrepresented as victims (see Figure 2.22). More than half of the Roma in Greece were victims of crime within the last 12 months, and similar levels can be noted regarding the Somali communities in Denmark (49%) and Finland (47%), as well as among Roma surveyed in the Czech Republic (46%). 41% of Sub-Saharan Africans were victimised in Ireland. Among North Africans, those residing in Italy were most likely to be victims of crime during the past 12 months (36%), and in the same period 35% of the Turkish respondents interviewed in Denmark fell victim to at least one of the five crimes tested.

The lowest levels of 12-month prevalence of crime victimisation were detected among the Turkish community in Bulgaria (7% of them indicated that they were victimised during the past 12 months), the former Yugoslavian communities in Austria and Luxembourg (both 9%) and – rather atypically, considering the average for Sub-Saharans as an aggregate group – Sub-Saharan Africans in Portugal (9%).


Figures 2.22 and 2.23 illustrate in different ways how crime victimisation prevalence rates differ within each country and by groups.

Analysis of the results shows a weak but statistically significant tendency that it is rather the country of residence and not the general group that minorities belong to that better predicts the likelihood of being victimised. In some cases specific groups have very different crime victimisation rates compared to the average of the aggregated group they are part of; for example, Sub-Saharan Africans are a prominent example of this phenomenon with the aforementioned Portuguese case. Another group that is in a much more favourable situation than others in the same aggregated group

Figure 2.22
12-month victimisation prevalence rate (DA2-DE2)
 Specific groups, % victimised at least once in the five crimes tested

Aggregate groups:

Sub-Saharan African	33
Roma	32
North African	26
CEE	24
Turkish	21
Russian	17
Ex-Yugoslav	14



EU-MIDIS 2008

Questions DA1-DE1: During the last 5 years, [or since you've been in the country if less than 5 years], in [COUNTRY] has [TYPE] happened to you? [IF YES] DA2-DE2: Thinking about the last time this happened, when was this: in the last twelve months or before then?

The [TYPES]: was any car, van, truck, motorbike, moped or bicycle – or some other form of transport belonging to you or your household – stolen, or had something stolen from it? [All forms of motorised and non-motorised transport can be included] | Did anyone get into your home without permission and steal or try to steal something? [Does include cellars – Does NOT include garages, sheds lock-ups or gardens] | Have you personally been the victim of any thefts that did not involve force? | Have you been personally attacked, that is hit or pushed, or threatened by someone in a way that REALLY frightened you? | Have you been personally harassed by someone or a group in a way that REALLY upset, offended or annoyed you?

are the Roma in Bulgaria: the 12% 12-month crime victimisation rate for this group is dramatically lower compared to the results for other Roma groups. The fact that the other minority group surveyed in Bulgaria, besides the Roma, is the least likely to be victimised of all (the Turkish, as explained above) confirms that the general crime level in a country (or urban centre) is potentially a key predictor of the crime victimisation rate experienced by minorities (and the majority population) living there. However, one should not forget that the sample in Bulgaria was predominantly rural, which in itself accounts for a large part of the lower victimisation rates reported in the country compared to most groups that were interviewed in metropolitan areas. Still, the Roma in the survey were predominantly interviewed in smaller settlements, with the exception of those in Greece and Hungary (see section “1.2 Methodology” in the Introduction chapter), which does not help to explain relatively high levels of criminal victimisation of Roma respondents in the Czech Republic. In this regard, as stated earlier, the Member State, rather than the group being surveyed, may be a greater predictor of criminal victimisation rates.

2.2.2. Prevalence of specific crimes

Below we discuss victimisation prevalence rates for each of the five crimes tested in the survey.

2.2.2.1. Vehicle crime

Vehicle crimes are, on average, most often experienced by Sub-Saharan Africans as an aggregate group (see Figure 2.24); the 15% prevalence rate for this group is higher than similar rates for other aggregated groups (note: these rates are calculated based on the responses of those who confirmed that they had a vehicle in their possession during the five years prior to the survey). This general group was represented by Somalis in Finland (21%), Somalis in Denmark (18%), and Sub-Saharan Africans in Ireland (17%)¹⁸ in the ‘top ten’ ranking of the most victimised communities.

11% of Central and East European immigrants had their vehicle stolen or had something stolen from it at least once in the 12 months preceding the survey, which puts them in joint second place

18 Here we focus on the groups with the highest prevalence rates.

Figure 2.23
Crime prevalence rates (DA2-DE2)
 % victimised in the past 12 months (5 crimes)

■ Yes
 □ No

Countries with 3 groups

North African – ES	21	79
South American – ES	17	83
Romanian – ES	14	86
North African – IT	36	64
Albanian – IT	22	78
Romanian – IT	22	78
Surinamese – NL	35	65
Turkish – NL	33	67
North African – NL	30	70

Countries with 2 groups

Turkish – AT	12	88
Ex-Yugoslav – AT	9	91
North African – BE	20	80
Turkish – BE	16	84
Roma – BG	12	88
Turkish – BG	7	93
Turkish – DE	23	77
Ex-Yugoslav – DE	21	79
Somali – DK	49	51
Turkish – DK	35	65
Roma – EL	54	46
Albanian – EL	24	76
Somali – FI	47	53
Russian – FI	27	73
Sub-Saharan African – FR	23	77
North African – FR	21	79
Sub-Saharan African – IE	41	59
CEE – IE	28	72
Brazilian – PT	11	89
Sub-Saharan African – PT	9	91
Somali – SE	28	72
Iraqi – SE	15	85
Bosnian – SI	18	82
Serbian – SI	16	84

EU-MIDIS 2008


Question: As with Figure 2.22

Figure 2.24


Prevalence rate of specific crime: VEHICLE CRIME (DA2 and DA4)

% of vehicle owners victimised at least once in the past 12 months

Aggregate groups:



Specific groups with highest prevalence rates (top 10):



EU-MIDIS 2008

Question DA1: During the last 5 years in [COUNTRY], was any car, van, truck, motorbike, moped or bicycle-or some other form of transport belonging to you or your household-stolen, or had something stolen from it? [IF YES] DA2: Thinking about the last time this happened, when was this: in the last twelve months or before then? [IF YES] DA4: Have you or your household owned any of these vehicles in the last 5 years: car, van, truck, motorbike, moped, bicycle?

as the most victimised aggregate group together with North Africans. Interestingly, only one of the specific groups belonging to the Central and East European category is classified among the ten with the highest prevalence of vehicle crime (Central and East Europeans in the UK: 14%); which, given that CEE respondents were interviewed in London, reflects the overall high crime rate experienced in this capital city. North Africans (represented in the top ten by those in the Netherlands: 17%, and Italy: 16%) are similarly affected by vehicle crimes as Central and East European respondents (11%).

Unlike many domains reported in the survey, the Roma are in fourth place among the general groups surveyed, with a 9% 12-month prevalence rate for vehicle crimes. However, one has to look at the experiences of specific groups to see that the Roma in Greece have an extremely high rate of vehicle-related crime (almost a quarter had their vehicle, or something from it, stolen within the year that

preceded the survey: 23%). In comparison, the second most victimised Roma group (those in Hungary) did not make the 'top ten'.


Rates of vehicle related crime among the aggregate Turkish group (9%) are the same as for the Roma, while former Yugoslavians (7%) and Russians (6%) experience the lowest levels of crime victimisation in this category. The less than threefold difference between the least victimised general group (Russians: 6%) and the one with the highest prevalence (Sub-Saharan African: 15%) is the *lowest* considering all crimes tested, indicating a relatively even exposure to this category of crime.

2.2.2.2. Burglary


The extremely high likelihood of the Roma in Greece having their homes burgled (29%) contributed significantly to the high burglary prevalence rate among the Roma as an aggregate group: on average, 10% in the aggregate Roma group reported a burglary in the 12 months preceding the interview (see Figure 2.25). This rate is more than double that of other groups that follow the Roma in the general ranking. Yet alongside the extremely high rate for the Roma in Greece, the next two groups with the highest burglary prevalence rate in the 'top ten' are also Roma; with those in the Czech Republic coming second (11%) and the Hungarian Roma third (9%). The Slovakian (7%), Bulgarian (6%) and Polish (6%) Roma are also among the most victimised groups in this specific crime category.

Given that European Roma are all too often characterised as criminal elements in society, these results illustrate very clearly that they are also victims of crime; particularly in the area of burglary. What may be needed in response to this evidence are targeted interventions to address the vulnerabilities of Roma housing to burglary, which, in turn, should be reflected in programmes focusing on the quality and hence the security status of Roma housing.

In comparison with the Roma, burglary prevalence is 4% among all of the following aggregate groups: Russians and North Africans (of whom none of the specific groups made the 'top ten'), Turkish (with those in the Netherlands appearing among the 'top ten': 7%), and Central and East European migrants (those interviewed in the UK are among the highest ranked specific groups: 6%).



Question DB1: During the last 5 years, did anyone get into your home without permission and steal or try to steal something? [Does include cellars – Does NOT include garages, sheds lock-ups or gardens]. [IF YES] DB2: Thinking about the last time this happened, when was this: in the last twelve months or before then?



Question DC1: Apart from theft involving force or threat, there are many other types of theft of personal property, such as pick-pocketing or theft of a purse, wallet, clothing, jewellery, or mobile phone. Over the last five years have you personally been the victim of any of these thefts that did not involve force? [IF YES] DC2: Thinking about the last time this happened, when was this: in the last twelve months or before then?

2.2.2.3. Theft of personal property

In comparison with the other property crimes tested, prevalence rates for theft of personal property are more similar across the general groups: the difference between the results for the groups ranked between first and fourth is only 2 percentage points (see Figure 2.26). Theft of personal property was particularly low (3%-4%) among Russians, Turkish and former Yugoslavians.

Once again, the Roma in Greece emerge as a group that is particularly vulnerable to criminal victimisation: 21% indicated that something was stolen from them in the course of the 12 months prior to the survey. North Africans in Italy are ranked second (19%), and Central and East Europeans in the UK are the third most likely to be victimised in this category, with a 15% prevalence rate.

It is noteworthy that all three groups surveyed in Italy were in the ‘top ten’ of the most affected

specific immigrant / minority groups. Other relatively frequently victimised groups were: the Roma in the Czech Republic, Sub-Saharan Africans in France, Somalis in Denmark (all 11%), Somalis in Sweden and North Africans in Spain (both 9%).



2.2.2.4. Assaults or threats

On average, the Roma (10%), Sub-Saharan African respondents (9%) and North Africans (9%) were most likely to have been assaulted or threatened at least once in the 12 months preceding the survey (Figure 2.27). Without exception, the ‘top ten’ list of the most affected minorities is made up of specific groups belonging to one of these three broad groups. Five of the highest-ranking groups were Roma (CZ: 15%, PL: 15%, SK: 12%, HU: 11%, RO: 8%), two were Sub-Saharan African (Somalis in Finland: 20%, the same group in Denmark: 15%), two were North Africans (those in Italy: 15% and in Spain: 10%), and one was

Figure 2.27

Prevalence rate of specific crime: ASSAULT OR THREAT (DD2)

% victimised at least once in the past 12 months

Aggregate groups:**Specific groups with highest prevalence rates (top 10):**

EU-MIDIS 2008

Question DD1: During the last 5 years, have you been personally attacked, that is hit or pushed, or threatened by someone in a way that REALLY frightened you? [IF YES] DD2: Thinking about the last time this happened, when was this: in the last twelve months or before then?

Surinamese in the Netherlands (9%), who are of African-Caribbean origin.

Overall, prevalence rates ranged between 3% and 4% for Central and East Europeans, Russians, former Yugoslavians and those with a Turkish background.

In sum – the evidence indicates that violent crime is a particular problem for the three general groups represented in the ‘top ten’, and therefore targeted interventions are needed to address the causes of violent crime victimisation for these groups.



2.2.2.5. Serious harassment

Almost every fifth respondent from the Roma and Sub-Saharan African communities said that they had been harassed at least once in the 12 months prior to the survey (18% both) (see Figure 2.28). The list of the ten most affected specific groups consists predominantly of those belonging to these two broad categories (the exceptions being the Turkish in Denmark and North Africans in Italy).

Figure 2.28

Prevalence rate of specific crime: SERIOUS HARASSMENT (DE2)

% victimised at least once in the past 12 months

Aggregate groups:**Specific groups with highest prevalence rates (top 10):**

EU-MIDIS 2008

Question DE1: During the last 5 years, have you been personally harassed by someone or a group in a way that REALLY upset, offended or annoyed you? [IF YES] DE2: Thinking about the last time this happened, when was this: in the last twelve months or before then?

Those who are most likely to become targets of serious harassment are either Roma (especially those in the Czech Republic: 31%, and Greece: 28%) or Sub-Saharan African persons: Somalis in Denmark: 27%, Sub-Saharan Africans in Ireland: 26%, African immigrants in Malta: 26%, and Somalis in Finland: 25%.

As with assaults and threats, Roma and Sub-Saharan African respondents dominate the picture; with North Africans in Italy appearing at number ten in the ‘top ten’ list of those most affected by serious harassment. What this finding supports is the need for targeted interventions to address how violence and harassment are experienced in these communities, and hence in the locations where these communities were interviewed. Given that violence and harassment are often dominated by (male) ‘youth’, both as victims and offenders, it is particularly important that any responses explore the possible interplay of youth and violent crime/harassment, and address this at the same time as looking for causes of youth disaffection that may lie in unemployment and social exclusion.

Serious harassment was relatively frequent for the Turkish groups and North Africans (with an average prevalence rate of 10%), closely followed by Central and East European immigrants (8%). Russians (6%) and those with a former Yugoslavian background (5%) were the least likely to indicate that they were harassed in the 12 months prior to the interview.

2.2.3. Combined prevalence of property- and in-person crimes

One of the outcomes of the above analyses is the apparent dissimilarity in how groups (aggregate and specific) rank according to the likelihood of crime victimisation in the five crimes tested. Statistical

Table 2.1 – Correlation between likelihood of crime victimisation in the five crimes

	Vehicle crimes	Burglary	Theft	Assault or threat	Serious harassment
Vehicle crimes	1				
Burglary	0.150	1			
Theft	0.082	0.148	1		
Assault or threat	0.119	0.116	0.166	1	
Serious harassment	0.109	0.114	0.166	0.257	1



all significant at 0.01 level (2-tailed)

EU-MIDIS 2008

Figure 2.29



12-month victimisation prevalence rate – Property crimes (DA2-DC2)

Specific groups, % victimised at least once in the three crimes tested (vehicle crime, burglary, theft)



12-month victimisation prevalence rate – In-person crimes (DD2-DE2)

Specific groups, % victimised at least once in the two types tested (assault or threat, serious harassment)



Question: as provided in Figure 2.22

analyses shows that the correlation rates between the various crime experiences (on an individual level) remain generally low, with the exception of assaults or threats, and serious harassment: as shown in Table 2.1, the .257 correlation shows a not extremely strong but tangible association between the two types of incidents of in-person crime (in comparison, correlations between the various *discrimination incidents* were in general twice as high).

Overall, the prevalence of property crimes and in-person crimes are correlated at the .218 level – hinting at marked differences between the groups who are most affected by the two types of crimes.

Inspection of the aggregated prevalence rates for property and in-person crimes (see Figure 2.29) reveals several important inconsistencies regarding the likelihood of becoming a victim of a crime belonging to one of these two types. On the level of general groups, the Roma and Sub-Saharan African respondents were markedly more likely to become victims of an in-person crime (23% in both cases) as opposed to property crimes (18% both). Central and East European immigrants, on the other hand, tended to report higher prevalence of property crimes (17%) compared to in-person crimes (11%).

In the case of some specific groups, this difference is rather extreme. African immigrants in Malta were among those most likely to be victims of in-person crimes (30%), but the prevalence of property crimes is one of the lowest among them (6%, only one percentage point above the absolute minimum the survey found); however, this particular result may reflect the fact that Africans in semi-open detention centres in Malta are materially poor and, therefore, have little to steal. Other specific groups where in-person crimes of assault or threat, and/or harassment, are markedly more frequent than property crimes are, for example, the Polish Roma (with respective rates of victimisation of 28% and 11%), Romanian Roma (15% and 8%), and the Turkish in Germany (16% and 11%).

On the other hand, several specific groups are evidently more affected by property crimes than in-person crimes; such as Central and East European migrants in the UK (24% property and 9% in-person crime prevalence rates), or North Africans in the Netherlands (21% vs. 13%, respectively.)

Figure 2.30 once again provides the prevalence rates for property and in-person crimes in a structure where groups within the same country are easier to compare.

2.2.4. 'Racially' motivated in-person criminal victimisation

This analysis provides a summary of the cases where persons who fell victim to in-person crimes believed that the perpetrators were at least partly motivated by the respondent's specific ethnic (or immigrant) background. Figure 2.31 summarises the proportion of those within each aggregated and specific group who felt they were targeted by such 'racist' in-person crimes (assaults or threats, or serious harassment).

Racist in-person crime was by far most often confirmed by Sub-Saharan African respondents and the Roma, with 18% of all persons interviewed in both groups indicating at least one such incident in the 12 months that preceded the interview. In the other general groups the proportion indicating that they considered themselves as being victims of 'racially' motivated crime, in the last 12 months, remained in the one-digit range: North Africans: 9%, Turkish: 8%, Central and East Europeans: 7%, Russians: 5% and former Yugoslavians: 3%.

Considering the specific groups, there are seven where the proportion of those who fell victim to what they considered to be racially motivated crime was over 25%. About one in four Roma in Greece and Poland, and Sub-Saharan Africans in Ireland, told EU-MIDIS that they were targets of racist crime (26% each). But **the highest ratios were recorded among the Roma in the Czech Republic, the Somali in Finland (32% both), the Somali in Denmark (31%), and African immigrants in Malta (29%).** On the other hand, barely anybody (1%) among former Yugoslavians in Austria and Luxembourg, Russians in Latvia, and Turkish in Bulgaria, confirmed any in-person crime from the past 12 months with a perceived ethnic/racist motivation.

In conclusion – it is clear, as one might expect, that racially motivated crime is overwhelmingly a problem for more visible minorities in the EU, including the Roma. The extent of the problem, as evidenced by EU-MIDIS results, should be of particular concern to policy makers and law enforcement personnel. Given the FRA's established tradition of reporting on trends in racist crime, based on available criminal justice data, these results should be used as evidence to critique the limited extent and public availability of existing official data (from law enforcement and criminal justice sources) on 'racist' crime in most Member States. The paucity of current official data in this area, against the backdrop of significant numbers of incidents reported to the survey, is evidence enough that much needs

Figure 2.30

Property crimes prevalence rate (DA2-DC2)

% victimised in the past 12 months (vehicle crime, burglary, theft)

In-person crimes prevalence rate (DD2-DE2)

% victimised in the past 12 months (assault or threat, serious harassment)

■ Yes □ No

Countries with 3 groups

North African – ES	14	86	14	86
South American – ES	10	90	9	91
Romanian – ES	9	91	8	92
North African – IT	26	74	24	76
Albanian – IT	14	86	12	88
Romanian – IT	16	84	11	89
Surinamese – NL	22	78	20	80
Turkish – NL	24	76	15	85
North African – NL	21	79	13	87

Countries with 2 groups


Turkish – AT	5	95	8	92
Ex-Yugoslav – AT	7	93	3	97
North African – BE	13	87	10	90
Turkish – BE	10	90	8	92
Roma – BG	7	93	5	95
Turkish – BG	5	95	4	96
Turkish – DE	11	89	16	84
Ex-Yugoslav – DE	12	88	11	89
Somali – DK	26	74	36	64
Turkish – DK	24	76	18	82
Roma – EL	43	57	32	68
Albanian – EL	17	83	10	90
Somali – FI	24	76	36	64
Russian – FI	15	85	16	84
Sub-Saharan African – FR	19	81	9	91
North African – FR	12	88	14	86
Sub-Saharan African – IE	22	78	30	70
CEE – IE	17	83	15	85
Brazilian – PT	7	93	4	96
Sub-Saharan African – PT	5	95	4	96
Somali – SE	19	81	14	86
Iraqi – SE	10	90	6	94
Bosnian – SI	11	89	8	92
Serbian – SI	10	90	9	91

Question: as provided in Figure 2.22

Figure 2.31

In-person crime with a perceived racist motive (DD4, DE5)

% of victims of serious harassment or assaults or threats with an anticipated racist / ethnic motive in the past 12 months (in the total population)



EU-MIDIS 2008

Questions DD4-DE5: Do you think that [this incident/any of these incidents] IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS happened partly or completely because of your immigrant/minority background?

to be done to encourage public reporting and law enforcement recording of 'racist' crime.

The next section provides some details regarding the specific circumstances of criminal victimisation (e.g. racially or ethnically offensive language used, perpetrator/s' ethnicity), which is presented separately for the two in-person crimes covered (assault or threat, and serious harassment).

2.2.5. In-person crimes in detail

The questionnaire included a more detailed series of follow-up questions for those who indicated that they were victims of assaults or threats, or serious harassment, in the previous 12 months. This section presents key findings from this investigation, covering the volume or 'extent' of these crimes, and including information on the 'nature' of these incidents; including the circumstances, who the perpetrators were, and reporting behaviour. Due to the low incidence rates in general for in-person crime, detailed information about the nature of these incidents is presented by aggregate groups.

2.2.5.1. Volume

The incidence rate for **assaults or threats** shows the number of incidents per 100 persons, and is used to estimate the 12-month volume of such incidents in a specific or aggregated respondent group. What the survey finds is that assault or threat incidence rates are markedly higher among the Roma (26), Sub-Saharan African respondents (23) and North Africans (21), compared to Central and East European

immigrants, Russians (both 9), Turkish (8) and especially former Yugoslavians (6).

As Figure 2.32 illustrates, the specific groups can be classified into three broad clusters:

- **low to extremely low incidence rates** for assaults or threats – below 10 per 100 persons
- **moderate incidence rates** for assaults or threats – between 10 and 28 incidents per 100 persons
- **high incidence rates** for assaults or threats – at least 29 per 100 persons

The highest incident rates for assaults or threats were found among Somali respondents in Finland (74), with the six other groups belonging to the high-rate segment being – in decreasing order – North Africans in Italy (44), the Roma in the Czech Republic (42), the Roma in Poland (40), Somalis in Denmark (40), the Roma in Greece (33), and the Roma in Hungary (29).

The volume of **serious harassment**, compared to assaults or threats, is systematically higher in almost every group surveyed (exceptions are only the North Africans and Romanians in Italy, the North Africans in Spain, and Russians in Latvia). Reflecting this, a different scale for low, medium and high incidence rates needs to be drawn up – ranging from:

- **low to extremely low incidence rates** for serious harassment – below 20 per 100 persons

- **moderate incidence rates** for serious harassment – between 21 and 55 incidents per 100 persons
- **high incidence rates** for serious harassment – over 56 per 100 persons

As Figure 2.33 illustrates, of all specific groups surveyed, the Roma in Greece indicated the highest number of harassment incidents over the 12 months preceding the interview (174 incidents per 100 respondents). High levels were also reported in the survey by Roma in the Czech Republic (118), Somalis in Denmark (112), and Somalis in Finland (106).

On an aggregate group level, the Roma (69) and Sub-Saharan African respondents (61) were particularly affected by harassment incidents, while such incidents were relatively rare in the former Yugoslavian group (11).

Adding together the incident rates of the two in-person crimes (assault or threat, and serious harassment), one can come to a figure for the overall incident rate of the two crimes concerned. As it is dominated by the significantly higher harassment incident rate, the specific respondent groups most affected are the same as shown in Figure 2.33, namely: Greek Roma (208¹⁹), Somalis in Finland (179), Czech Roma (159), Somalis in Denmark (151),


the Polish Roma (113), and Sub-Saharan Africans in Ireland (109).

Looking at the most favourable results: the combined in-person crime incidence rate remained in the one digit range in Portugal for both groups (Sub-Saharan Africans and Brazilians) and among former Yugoslavian respondents in Austria (with a combined rate of 8 incidents per 100 for all three groups).

2.2.5.2. Crime incident characteristics

Where people indicated they were a victim of assault or threat in the last 12 months they were asked to provide information about the nature (or characteristics) of the last incident. The results are shown in Table 2.2.

As victims of assaults or threats were asked whether something was stolen or if the perpetrator/s attempted to steal something, the results were able to indicate if the incident was in fact a **robbery**. Herein, 38% of victims within the CEE group and 36% of North African victims indicated that something was stolen, or perpetrators at least tried to steal something, during the last incident – indicating that it was in fact a completed or attempted robbery. The proportion of robbery victims was also relatively high among those with a Russian background (27% of all assaults or threats).



Question: DD3. How many times has something like this [assault or threat] happened to you in the last 12 months?

¹⁹ The figures do not always add up exactly to the numbers presented, due to rounding.

Although a significant proportion of victims were ‘only’ threatened with respect to the combined crime of ‘assault or threat’, **among North Africans (65%) and Russians (60%) many incidents involved actual physical violence as well.** In about half of the assaults or threats that targeted Sub-Saharan African respondents (50%), members of the Roma communities or Central and East European immigrants (48% both), offenders applied force. The prevalence of violent assaults – relative to the total population interviewed – peaked among the Roma, Sub-Saharan African respondents (5% both) and North Africans at (6%). What this means is that **one in every 20 people from the total Roma, Sub-Saharan or North African communities surveyed in EU-MIDIS was a victim of in-person ‘assault or threat’ involving force, at least once, in the 12 months prior to the interview.**


While property crimes were very rarely considered to be racially motivated by victims, **in-person crimes (assault or threat, and serious harassment) were very often assumed to have ethnic or racist motivations.** In this regard, 70% of Sub-Saharan African and 73% of Roma victims indicated that they felt that the perpetrators of the (last) incident of in-person crime they experienced were targeting them – at least partly – because of their immigrant or

ethnic minority background. Even in those general groups where victims were least likely to identify a relationship between their immigrant or ethnic background and their experience of victimisation, a significant minority within these groups were of the opinion that becoming a target was not independent of their ethnic or immigrant origin. It was only in the former Yugoslavian community that a marginal majority of victims of assault or threat indicated that they believed they were *not* targeted because of their immigrant/ethnic background (55%). At the other extreme, only 18% of Roma victims were of the opinion that the incident(s) of in-person crime they suffered in the last 12 months had nothing to do with their ethnicity.

The perception of racist motivation was often validated by victims who indicated that racist or religiously offensive language was used by perpetrators. This was most frequent regarding incidents against Sub-Saharan African respondents (60%), the Roma (54%), and victims with a Turkish background (52%).

However, as the data also collected information about the background of perpetrators, where known, including whether they were from the same communities as victims (see Table 2.3), the

Figure 2.33
12-month SERIOUS HARASSMENT incidence rate (DE3)
 Specific groups, total number of victimisation incidents suffered, per 100 respondents



Question: DE3. How many times has something like this [serious harassment] happened to you in the last 12 months?

research was able to show that many incidents of assault or threat are not related to racism in the sense of having a perpetrator/s from the majority population, but are a result of inter-ethnic crime; for example, a third of incidents among the Roma, and about every fifth assault or threat in the former Yugoslavian, North African, Russian and Turkish groups were committed by offenders coming from the same ethnic or immigrant minority background. Still, the vast majority of assaults or threats were intra-ethnic, committed either by majority perpetrators (with the highest rate found in the case of Sub-Saharan Africans: 71%, the Roma: 60%, and Russian immigrants: 59%), or by people from other ethnic groups (most typical for former Yugoslavians: 32%, North Africans: 31%, and Turkish respondents: 31%).

In each group except Russian and Turkish respondents, assaults or threats were primarily committed by multiple perpetrators; especially those that targeted the Roma (70%), Central and East European (66%) and North Africans (67%).

A rather significant number of incidents of assault or threat involved offenders that respondents knew: someone from the neighbourhood, a workmate, customer, or even current or former members of the victims' household (which could indicate domestic violence) (see Table 2.3). In comparison, identifiable

members of right-wing extremist gangs were among the offenders in only 13% of assaults or threats committed against those with a Turkish background, 12% in the case of the Roma, and 8% of the incidents against Sub-Saharan Africans. What these results indicate is that a lot of racist crime is an 'everyday' event involving people victims regularly come into contact with, whereas the involvement of extremist right-wing gangs is a relatively rare occurrence. Therefore, considerations about whom, how and where to target anti-racist crime initiatives at need to be considered in the light of these results as, to date, a number of Member States continue to address their activities at extremist right-wing groups, whilst perhaps neglecting the 'everyday' nature of many incidents.

Notably, 7% of assaults or threats against Russian and Turkish people involved police officers. Police involvement in incidents as perpetrators was also indicated by 4% of North African, Roma and former Yugoslavian victims. These findings are of particular concern, and would indicate that concerted efforts are needed to identify and effectively address incidents where the police are the perpetrators of racist victimisation. Given the very low levels of trust in the police that many minorities reported in EU-MIDIS, these results are a further indication that in some countries and for some groups much

Table 2.2 – Assault or threat, incident details 1

	Sub-Saharan African	CEE	Ex-Yugoslav	North African	Roma	Russian	Turkish
<i>Rate of victimisation (DD1, DD2)</i>	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Not victimised	83	92	93	84	82	92	91
Victimised past 12 months	9	4	3	9	10	4	3
Victimised past 2-5 years	8	4	4	7	8	4	5
<i>Force actually used (DD10)</i>							
Yes (within all assaults or threats)	50	48	43	65	48	60	41
Yes (in the total population)	5	2	1	6	5	2	1
<i>Something stolen (DD5)</i>							
Yes (within all assaults or threats)	14	38	17	36	21	27	14
Yes (in the total population)	1	2	1	3	2	1	0
<i>Attributed racial/ethnic motivation (DD4)</i>							
Yes, including the most recent	70	46	32	46	73	42	60
Yes, but not including the most recent	2	5	4	10	5	1	5
No	21	39	55	39	18	42	30
Don't know/no opinion	6	9	9	5	4	14	6
<i>Racist or religiously offensive language used (DD9)</i>							
Yes	60	23	36	43	54	27	52

Table 2.3 – Assault or threat, incident details 2

ASSAULT OR THREAT	Sub-Saharan African	CEE	Ex-Yugoslav	North African	Roma	Russian	Turkish
<i>Perpetrators (DD8)</i>							
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
From the same ethnic group	12	12	22	22	33	18	17
From another ethnic group	19	27	32	31	12	16	31
From majority	71	57	32	56	60	59	52
<i>Multiple perpetrators (DD6)</i>							
Yes	53	66	55	67	70	46	49
<i>Perpetrators included (DD7)</i>							
Member of your household (incl. former)	5	2	5	5	6	16	6
Someone from your neighbourhood	17	12	23	15	27	11	17
Someone you work with/colleague	4	4	7	6	3	7	6
A customer, client or patient	5	4	7	4	2	10	10
Someone else you know	10	7	12	10	19	15	14
Member of a right-wing/racist gang	8	6	5	6	12	1	13
Police officer	3	1	4	4	4	7	7
Other public official	2	2	2	2	2	1	2
A stranger (someone else you didn't know)	58	66	44	52	52	59	43

EU-MIDIS 2008

work needs to be done in an effort to establish trust between minority communities and the police that are there to serve them.

The characteristics of harassment incidents are rather similar to those of assault or threat; however, these incidents are considered by victims as being more racially motivated (especially by the Roma: 79%, and by Sub-Saharan Africans: 79%). This is reflected in the survey's findings that perpetrators of harassment are more likely to come from the majority population (Table 2.4 shows the general group details).

In cases of serious harassment, perpetrators are likely to be co-workers, someone from the same neighbourhood as victims, and also, in the case of some groups, someone else known to the victim. Generally, those who harass members of vulnerable minorities are less likely to be unknown to them, as compared to those who perpetrate assaults or threats.

Harassments are also slightly more likely to be committed by lone perpetrators among some groups (indicated by the lower proportion of multiple perpetrators in Table 2.4 compared with Table 2.3). In addition, six percent of harassment cases suffered by the Roma and Turkish respondents, and 5% of those that targeted North Africans, involved police officer(s) as perpetrators. Other public officials were involved in 8% of the Roma-reported incidents of serious harassment. Once again, as with assaults or threats, these findings paint a disturbing picture of abuse of

power by law enforcement and other public officials against vulnerable minority groups.

2.2.5.3. Non-reporting

The majority of assaults or threats were not reported to the police, and the non-reporting of serious harassment was even higher (although harassment may typically be regarded by victims as something that cannot be reported) (see Table 2.5). High levels of under-reporting, as well as the uneven reporting rates across aggregate minority groups, clearly illustrates the limitations of criminal justice statistics in being able to accurately reflect the absolute and relative exposure of minorities to racist criminal victimisation (or, for that matter, any criminal victimisation) in the various Member States in the EU. **The results indicate that Turkish interviewees were the least likely to approach the police when victimised, with 74% not reporting incidents of assault or threat to the police.** This is not because the incidents were considered as trivial: according to 70% of victims of assault or threat with a Turkish background, the incidents they suffered were either fairly or very serious. Likewise, **more than two thirds of assaults or threats that targeted Central and East European immigrants (69%), Roma (69%) and Russians (69%) went unreported** (even if respectively 66%, 65% and 60% of the incidents were regarded as very or fairly serious by the victims). In the rest of the groups, the non-reporting rate ranged between 57% (ex-YU) to 62% (among North Africans).

Table 2.4 – Serious harassment, incident details

HARASSMENT	Sub-Saharan African	CEE	Ex-Yugoslav	North African	Roma	Russian	Turkish
<i>Rate of victimisation (DE1, DE2)</i>							
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Not victimised	74	87	89	83	72	89	84
Victimised past 12 months	18	8	5	10	18	6	10
Victimised past 2-5 years	9	5	6	8	10	5	6
<i>Attributed racial/ethnic motivation (DE5)</i>							
Yes, including the most recent	79	64	53	59	79	56	63
Yes, but not including the most recent	4	5	2	4	3	1	3
No	13	26	40	34	13	37	28
Don't know/no opinion	4	4	5	2	4	6	6
<i>Racist or religiously offensive language used (DE9)</i>							
Yes	73	41	51	47	67	32	58
<i>Perpetrators (DE8)</i>							
From the same ethnic group	7	10	12	23	23	15	18
From another ethnic group	17	17	36	29	11	22	26
From majority	80	75	49	55	78	64	63
<i>Multiple perpetrators (DE6)</i>							
Yes	58	55	53	59	67	44	56
<i>Perpetrators included (DE7)</i>							
Member of your household (incl. former)	3	2	1	3	6	11	4
Someone from your neighbourhood	15	11	13	12	29	15	20
Someone you work with/colleague	7	11	10	12	4	7	10
A customer, client or patient	5	4	2	3	1	14	9
Someone else you know	8	5	9	11	20	12	13
Member of a right-wing/racist gang	5	4	9	4	12	2	8
Police officer	2	2	3	5	6	1	6
Other public official	2	3	0	2	8	5	5
A stranger (someone else you didn't know)	64	57	33	54	58	48	53

EU-MIDIS 2008

Not reporting to the police about assaults or threats seems to be the normal response among members of vulnerable minority groups, and is even worse when it comes to incidents of serious harassment. Depending on the group, **75% to 90% of harassment incidents went unreported**; thus, these pervasive incidents, which cumulatively have a negative impact on people's lives, remain invisible to any data collection mechanisms that could serve to inform policy responses. This lower reporting rate is probably not independent from the fact that a relatively lower proportion of these incidents were considered severe by respondents; with rates ranging between 58% and 61% in most groups (respondents from Central and East Europe were most likely to regard the incident as less severe, e.g. only 'pestering' rather than serious harassment; yet within this group as well, half of the harassment cases were considered as very or fairly serious). In sum, the ratio between incidents that

are considered to be 'severe' and those that go on to be reported is about 4:1 across all groups surveyed, which would indicate a mismatch between the severity of harassment incidents and the ability to capture them in any reporting mechanism.

Turkish and Central and East European immigrants were the least likely to report their experiences of serious harassment (90% and 89%, respectively, indicated non-reporting). On the other hand, a quarter of the serious harassment incidents suffered by those with a former Yugoslavian background were brought to the attention of the police.

2.2.5.4. Reasons for non-reporting

If respondents did not inform the police about the last incident of an in-person crime they were the victim of in the past 12 months, the survey asked them about

Table 2.5 – Reporting and seriousness of in-person crime

	Sub-Saharan African	CEE	Ex-Yugoslav	North African	Roma	Russian	Turkish
ASSAULT OR THREAT	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
<i>Seriousness (DD14)</i>							
Very or fairly serious	73	66	75	63	65	60	70
Not very serious	21	30	24	34	31	36	24
<i>Police reports (DD11)</i>							
Yes, reported	40	31	43	38	31	31	26
Not reported	60	69	57	62	69	69	74
SERIOUS HARASSMENT							
<i>Seriousness (DE13)</i>							
Very or fairly serious	60	50	61	58	61	60	60
Not very serious	37	45	33	41	37	38	33
<i>Police reports (DE10)</i>							
Yes, reported	16	11	25	21	16	16	10
Not reported	84	89	75	79	84	84	90

EU-MIDIS 2008

their main reasons for not doing so. Respondents were invited to provide reasons in their own words, and interviewers classified the replies according to a predefined coding scheme, containing the following categories:

- Fear of intimidation from perpetrators if reported incident
- Concerned about negative consequences if reported
- Not confident the police would be able to do anything
- Too trivial/not worth reporting
- Dealt with the problem themselves/with help from family/friends
- Dislike/fear the police/previous bad experience with police
- Reported to other authorities instead
- Residence permit problems – so couldn't report
- Not reported because of language difficulties/insecurities
- Inconvenience/too much bureaucracy or trouble/no time
- Other

Multiple answers were accepted, with each category that the respondents covered in their reply marked by the interviewer. In Table 2.6 reasons for non-reporting have been sorted according to their average prevalence – showing the most common (as an average across groups) responses first.

Considering both in-person crime categories (assault or threat, and serious harassment) and each general

group surveyed, a dominant reason for not reporting was **because victims have no confidence in the police**. Other than in the case of harassments suffered by Central and East European immigrants (which were predominantly regarded as insignificant, and too trivial to report), a major response in each group was that they did not trust that the police could do anything about their case. **The proportion of those not reporting because they lacked confidence in the police ranged between 26% and 75%, depending on the crime and general group – with the Roma having the least confidence in the police.** The potential negative repercussions of reporting is of particular concern for large proportions of Roma victims (and to a somewhat lesser extent Turkish and former Yugoslavians) who indicated they were afraid of further retaliation from the perpetrators – or other negative consequences – if they reported the incident. Among the Roma, an *outright negative attitude towards the police* characterised about one third of victims who opted to not officially report to the police, and was among the key reasons that such incidents were not reported (33% of assault or threat incidents, and 32% of serious harassment incidents).

In the Roma groups a large number of in-person crime victims who did not report their case indicated that they *took care of the issue using private means* (40% for both crimes).

Language difficulties were a relatively significant barrier for the Russian minority (9%), especially when compared to other aggregate groups, where this

problem affected victims in proportions ranging from 1% to 6% (the latter figure was recorded among Sub-Saharan African assault or threat victims – see Table 2.6). *Residence permit problems* were rarely mentioned as a barrier to officially reporting incidents, and was the highest among North Africans and Central and East European immigrants (5%-4%, depending on the crime).

Considering those who brought their case to the attention of the police, most Roma were **dissatisfied with how the police dealt with their complaint** (54% were dissatisfied in the case of assault or threat and 55% in the case of harassment follow-ups). But they were not alone: the few assault or threat victims from the ex-Yugoslavian group – who reported their case – were similarly dissatisfied (54%), while those from the Russian (59%) and Turkish (63%)

communities were even more disgruntled with how the police responded.²⁰ As regards officially reported harassment cases, Sub-Saharan African respondents (53%) were almost as dissatisfied with how the police dealt with them as were the Roma.

2.3. Policing

Police forces are the ‘gatekeepers’ through which victims can report incidents of criminal victimisation. Ideally, they are there to provide a policing service that can protect and respond appropriately to immigrant and ethnic minority groups that are vulnerable to victimisation and, in particular, racist crime. Yet, at the same time, the police tend to pay special attention to certain members of particular immigrant or ethnic minority groups as possible

Table 2.6 – Reasons for non-reporting

ASSAULT OR THREAT	Sub-Saharan African	CEE	Ex-YU	North African	Roma	Russian	Turkish
<i>Reasons for not reporting (DD13)</i>							
No confidence in the police	47	33	55	34	75	41	52
Too trivial/not worth reporting	24	25	41	22	27	24	44
Dealt with the problem themselves	17	15	32	18	40	37	30
Concerned about consequences	12	11	22	7	38	12	31
Inconvenience/too much trouble/time	13	16	16	10	11	18	31
Fear of intimidation from perpetrators	9	6	12	8	35	10	19
Negative attitude to police	7	5	4	9	33	18	24
Language difficulties/insecurities	6	4	2	3	1	9	5
Reported elsewhere	4	2	0	2	1	0	0
Residence permit problems	0	4	2	5	0	0	0
Other reason	15	13	4	12	16	12	10
SERIOUS HARASSMENT	Sub-Saharan African	CEE	Ex-YU	North African	Roma	Russian	Turkish
<i>Reasons for not reporting (DE12)</i>							
No confidence in the police	44	26	50	31	71	37	48
Too trivial/not worth reporting	35	47	49	33	31	39	45
Dealt with the problem themselves	12	13	25	20	40	23	19
Concerned about consequences	10	9	24	13	37	12	21
Inconvenience/too much trouble/time	11	13	23	13	8	14	20
Fear of intimidation from perpetrators	8	6	22	8	33	7	12
Negative attitude to police	4	3	5	6	32	4	13
Language difficulties/insecurities	3	3	1	2	1	9	4
Reported elsewhere	2	2	3	1	3	2	1
Residence permit problems	1	4	1	5	0	0	0
Other reasons	11	9	13	5	7	21	13

EU-MIDIS 2008


²⁰ However the number of the available cases in these latter groups were very low: N=32, 24 and 27 (unweighted) respectively.

offenders, and have been critiqued in some studies for discriminatory and disproportionate numbers of checks, or police stops, against people with an immigrant or ethnic minority background (which will be discussed with evidence from EU-MIDIS in Chapter 4 in this report). **Given that the survey showed that recent victims have low levels of confidence in the police – that is, they simply do not report incidents to the police – the results are a clear indication that there is significant scope for improving police-community relations with regard to many of the immigrant and ethnic minority groups surveyed.**

2.3.1. Trust in the police

Prior to asking about experiences of criminal victimisation and respondents' reporting behaviour, including their reasons for not reporting to the police, the survey asked a general question about trust in the police. The results showed that **the majority of most immigrant and ethnic minority groups reported that they tended to trust the police.** It was only amongst the Roma groups where most respondents claimed they tended *not* to trust the police (50%), while only 30% tended to trust the police. However, the survey showed a marked difference between responses to this abstract question about trust in the police and questions about reporting behaviour. For example: when asked, 51% of respondents in the Russian community (as a general group) indicated that they 'trusted' the police (Figure 2.34); however, only 31% of those who were assaulted or threatened actually turned to the police (see Table 2.5), and 41% of those who did not report their victimisation told interviewers that this was due to their lack of confidence that the police would be able to do anything about the incident (see Table 2.6) (and a not insignificant minority of the Russian assault or

Figure 2.34
Trust in the police (F1)
Aggregate groups



Question F1: Would you say you tend to trust the police in [COUNTRY] or tend not to trust them?

threat victims – 18% – indicated a major reason for not reporting the incident was their strong negative attitude towards the police).


In sum, there seemed to be a difference between the attitudes displayed when the police were viewed from a distance as opposed to real-life situations involving the possibility of actual encounters with the police. However, in some groups, those who reported incidents of crime ended up trusting the police less than those who did not make a report (e.g. Sub-Saharan Africans, Turkish, etc. – see Table 2.7 where the proportions of those *not trusting* the police are shown, dependent on the types of crimes reported). In contrast, for some other groups those who did not

Table 2.7 Lack of trust in police and crime experience

(F1, % of those who do not trust the police according to reporting and non-reporting of victimisation and those experiencing no victimisation)	Sub-Saharan African	CEE	Ex-YU	North African	Roma	Russian	Turkish
ASSAULT OR THREAT	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Reported to police	41	26	32	39	65	51	51
Did not report to police	36	34	46	52	71	42	35
Not a victim	22	18	15	28	47	22	16
HARASSMENT							
Reported to police	43	32	28	38	52	20	40
Did not report to police	30	31	33	33	69	27	25
Not a victim	22	17	15	29	46	22	16

EU-MIDIS 2008

Figure 2.35
Trust in the police (F1)
Specific groups



EU-MIDIS 2008

Question F1: Would you say you tend to trust the police in [COUNTRY] or tend not to trust them?

report victimisation to the police had less trust than those who did report – a prominent example being the Roma.

As one can't tell from the data whether in these cases those who reported an incident had an *a priori* higher trust towards the police, or whether their experience with the police served to enhance their confidence in policing, it is apparent that further research is required to look at the relationship between contact with the police and the perpetuation of or reduction in negative attitudes.

Turning to the actual results for the various specific groups within countries (Figure 2.35), there are five where the absolute majority of respondents indicated that they do not trust the police, each of them being Roma groups (58% in PL, 56% in CZ, 54% in SK, 53% in EL and 51% in HU). Lack of confidence also characterises between one-third and about four in 10 respondents among Sub-Saharan Africans in France (42%), Surinamese in the Netherlands (41%), Romanian Roma (39%), North Africans in the Netherlands (35%), Bulgarian Roma (35%), and North Africans in Italy (33%). In 27 of the 45 groups covered in the survey, however, the absolute majority do tend to trust the police. The highest levels of trust were

seen among Russian immigrants in Finland (85% trust), former Yugoslavians in Austria (80%) and the same group in Luxembourg (79%).

2.3.2. Police stops

12-month rates for police stops (e.g. the proportion of those who were stopped by the police at least once in the 12 months preceding the interview) were highest among Sub-Saharan Africans in Ireland (59% of them were stopped by the police in the above mentioned timeframe – which is almost twice as high as the same result among the CEE group interviewed in that country: 29%). Similarly high levels of police stops were reported by the Roma in Greece (56%)²¹ (see Figure 2.36).

Despite this exceptionally high policing rate among Sub-Saharan Africans in Ireland, the aggregate Sub-Saharan African group was only ranked third amongst the most heavily policed communities: North Africans and the Roma were the most likely of all groups to be stopped by the police, with a respective 33% and 30% 12-month rate of police stops.


The Roma in Greece were by far the most heavily policed group in the year prior to the survey: the

²¹ A matched sample of the Greek majority in the same neighbourhoods where Roma were interviewed had a police stop rate of 23%, in the 12 months prior to the interview, please see Chapter 4 for the police stop result contextualisation in a selection of Member States.

Figure 2.36

Stopped by the police (F3)

Specific groups, % stopped by the police at least once in the past 12 months



EU-MIDIS 2008

Question F3: Thinking about the last time you were stopped in this country, when was this? Was it in the last 12 months or before then?

incident rate of police stops amounted to 323 per 100 respondents (see Figure 2.37) over a period of 12 months. This rate – more than three stops on average for each person in this community – was twice as high as the incident rates recorded among the two groups in joint second place: North Africans in Spain and Sub-Saharan Africans in Ireland (160). The incidence rates exceeded 100 in three other communities: the


Hungarian Roma (138), North Africans (128), and Sub-Saharan Africans in France (117).

The lowest rates were recorded in Austria (former Yugoslavians: 9, Turkish: 10), among Africans in Malta (13), and for immigrant groups in Portugal (Brazilians: 14, Sub-Saharan Africans: 15).

Figure 2.37

12-month volume of police stops (F4)

Specific groups, total number of police stops, per 100 respondents




EU-MIDIS 2008

Question F4: In the last 12 months, how many times have you been stopped by the police in this country?

Figure 2.38

Police profiling (F5)

Specific groups, % stopped the last time on the basis of ethnic background, in the past 12 months (in the total population)



EU-MIDIS 2008

Question F5: Do you think that [the last time you were stopped/any time you were stopped] IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS was because of your immigrant/minority background?

Overall, considering the aggregated groups, the Roma (105) and North Africans (102) had the highest incident rates of police stops over the past 12 months.


Those who were stopped by the police (during the past 12 months) were asked whether or not they felt this was because of their immigrant or ethnic minority background – in other words, whether they considered they were the victim of discriminatory police profiling. Projecting this result on to the total population, a rate of police stops based on discriminatory minority profiling was created (see

Figure 2.38). According to this index, 39% of all Roma in Greece felt they were subjected to police profiling in the last 12 months (i.e. they felt they were subjected to police stops due to their ethnicity), and 31% of North Africans in Spain felt the same. There were 13 further groups where at least one in 10 respondents believed they were singled out by the police because of their ethnic background, including French Sub-Saharan Africans and Hungarian Roma (both 24%).

Figure 2.39

Police conduct during stops – disrespectful (F8)

Specific groups, % of people who said the police was fairly or very disrespectful the last time they were stopped, in the past 12 months



EU-MIDIS 2008

Question F8: Again, thinking about the last time you were stopped, how respectful were the police when dealing with you?

Looking at the aggregate groups, discriminatory attention from the police was seen in the largest proportions for North Africans (19%) and the Roma (15%): one in five to seven members of both groups indicated that the police stopped them during the 12 months preceding the interview as a result of (suspected) discriminatory profiling practices (Figure 2.38).

In comparison, perceptions of discriminatory police profiling practices were virtually non-existent among respondents from the aggregate Russian or former Yugoslavian group. However, former Yugoslavians in Germany were twice as likely to be stopped by the police in comparison with Germans from the majority population living in the same areas (see the specific section on this in Chapter 4, which compares stop rates between the majority and minority populations surveyed in ten Member States). Correspondingly, the bottom four spots in the profiling list were occupied by respondents from the Russian or former Yugoslavian groups. There were practically no reports of Russians in Latvia and Lithuania, and former Yugoslavians in Austria, being stopped by the police in a way that the respondents assumed was due to discriminatory police practices.

In the later sections of the report, more detailed information is provided on police stops (where they took place, what the police did, etc). This section in the main results part concludes with an evaluation of police behaviour, as seen by those who were subject to police stops during the 12 months preceding the survey.

While in most cases police conduct was considered to be, at least, neutral by those who were the subject of such stops, **in several specific groups a large number of respondents considered that the police dealt with them disrespectfully during stops (Figure 2.39)**. More than half of the Roma in Greece had this opinion (51%), and this view was shared by significant numbers of Roma in Poland (45%) as well as North Africans in Italy (41%). On an aggregated level, a third (33%) of the Roma who were stopped by the police considered the police's behaviour to be *fairly* or *very* disrespectful, and 32% of North Africans were of the same opinion. Officers' behaviour was less than neutral in one in five stops that involved Sub-Saharan African subjects.

Where a comparison with representatives of the majority population was available, in those ten Member States where the majority population was interviewed too – with only a few exceptions, the minority population rated the police's behaviour towards them as less respectful in comparison with the rating given by the majority population (see Chapter 4).

Having outlined key results from the survey across the different groups that were interviewed – focusing on experiences of discrimination, criminal victimisation, and police stops – the next section presents results for each aggregate group that was surveyed.

3. Results by aggregated immigrant/ethnic groups

This section offers a comparative perspective of EU-MIDIS results within the general aggregate groups surveyed, providing cross-country analyses for each.

The first analysis on Sub-Saharan Africans raises some considerations in relation to the findings that are relevant to the other groups surveyed, and therefore it is suggested to read this analysis first.

Aggregate or general groups

What do we mean by aggregate or general groups?

The aggregated or general groups in the survey were created on the basis of shared characteristics in terms of ethnic/racial background or in relation to their immigrant, socio-economic or cultural backgrounds.

General groups are aggregates of similar communities across Member States. Table 3.1 specifies which specific groups belong to each of these general or aggregated groups:

Table 3.1 – EU-MIDIS General groups

Sub-Saharan Africans	Sub-Saharan Africans in: France Ireland Portugal Somalis in: Denmark Finland Sweden Africans in Malta Surinamese in the Netherlands
CEE (Central and East Europeans)	Albanians in: Italy Greece Romanians in: Italy Spain From the 10 East European New Member States (CEE) in: Ireland UK
Former Yugoslavians	former Yugoslavians in: Austria Germany Luxembourg Serbians in Slovenia Bosnians in Slovenia
North Africans	North Africans in: Belgium France Italy the Netherlands Spain
Roma	The Roma in Bulgaria Czech Republic Greece Hungary Poland Romania Slovakia
Russians	Russians in Estonia Finland Latvia Lithuania
Turkish	Turkish in: Austria Belgium Bulgaria Denmark Germany Netherlands

3.1. Sub-Saharan Africans

Who was surveyed?

The Sub-Saharan African respondents in the survey comprised diverse groups (see sample box) with different immigrant and ethnic backgrounds, but all of whom could be described as having a generic ethnic background that was essentially 'Black African' rather than North African: for example, Somalis in the Nordic countries (Denmark, Finland and Sweden); Sub-Saharan Africans in Ireland, France and Portugal; African immigrants in Malta who were identified by interviewers as predominantly Sub-Saharan African; and Surinamese people in the Netherlands of Black African-Caribbean origin. It should be noted that while the latter groups are predominantly of 'Black' Sub-Saharan African origin in terms of racial composition (95% of Africans in Malta and 74% of the Surinamese in the Netherlands were classified as such), these groups included some non-Black Africans too (e.g. some North Africans in Malta).

One interesting national sub-group within this aggregate Sub-Saharan group is Somalis, and therefore the reader can look at results separately for Somalis in the three Member States where they were surveyed.

SAMPLE

Member States:

- Denmark (Somali) (N=561)
- Finland (Somali) (N=484)
- Ireland (Sub-Saharan African) (N=503)
- France (Sub-Saharan African) (N=466)
- Malta (African) (N=500)
- The Netherlands (Surinamese) (N=471)
- Portugal (Sub-Saharan African) (N=510)
- Sweden (Somali) (N=506)


Sampling method:

- Random route sampling with FE in high-density urban areas (FR, PT, partly NL);
- Registry-Based Address Sampling (DK, FI)
- Interviewer Generated Sampling (IE, MT, SE, partly NL)


Figure 3.1.1

Mean discrimination rate*
% discriminated against in the past 12 months (9 domains)


Mean victimisation rate*
% victimised in the past 12 months (5 crimes)




% of discrimination incidents that were officially reported**
(mean for all discrimination types)



% of crimes officially reported to the police**
(mean for all crimes)



Police stops (F2, F3, F5, %)



Note: * based on CA2-CI2 / DA2-DE2
** based on CA4-CI4 / DD11, DE10

EU-MIDIS 2008
Somali (Som), Sub-Saharan African (SSA),
African (Afr), Surinamese (Sur)

Questions: CA2-CI2 / DA2-DE2. Thinking about the last time this happened, when was this: in the last twelve months or before then? CA4-CI4: Did you or anyone else report this incident anywhere? DD11, DE10: Did you or anyone else report the incident to the police?

F2: In this country, within the last five years, have you EVER been stopped by the police when you were in a car, on a motorbike or bicycle, on public transport or just on the street? F3: Thinking about the last time you were stopped in this country, when was this? Was it in the last 12 months or before then? F5: Do you think that [the last time you were stopped/any time you were stopped] IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS was because of your immigrant/minority background?

The reader should also note that some survey respondents were identified as Sub-Saharan African by interviewers but their responses are not analysed here as they were part of a group that was not predominantly Sub-Saharan African; for example, among Brazilians in Portugal as many as 23% could be of Black-African origin according to interviewers; therefore, their results are *not* included in the aggregate Sub-Saharan African group analysed here (although the full data set includes results that can be analysed with respect to all Sub-Saharan African interviewees).

Finally, EU-MIDIS interviewed any 'Black' Sub-Saharan person who was encountered during the normal sampling procedure in countries where no predominantly Sub-Saharan Black group was selected for interviewing. In this manner, EU-MIDIS recruited and interviewed 146 "other" Sub-Saharan African persons from various EU Member States. However, this group has not been analysed here because representation of the group is unevenly distributed between Member States, and, in general, the number of cases per Member State is too small to establish any reliable differences. Further analysis of the data will make available results for this group.

Given the diversity among the Sub-Saharan interviewees, it is perhaps more meaningful to compare results between the sub-group of Somali respondents who were interviewed in the three Nordic countries, and to compare results between the other Sub-Saharan African interviewees.

Some key findings on respondents' experiences of discrimination, victimisation and police stops

Figure 3.1.1 summarises some key results from the survey:

In general, African minorities in Malta reported the highest rate of (perceived) experiences of discrimination, on the basis of their immigrant/ minority background, across nine different areas of everyday life in the past 12 months (63%). This was followed by Sub-Saharan African respondents in Ireland (54%) and the Nordic countries (47% in Finland, 46% in Denmark). On the other hand, a lower rate of discrimination was perceived by Sub-Saharan respondents living in France (26%), in Portugal (29%), and Surinamese in the Netherlands (29%). As a reflection of these perceptions, and taking into account those respondents who had experienced discrimination and therefore might adopt avoidance behaviours, every fifth (19%) Sub-Saharan African

respondent confirmed that they avoided certain places (e.g. shops or cafés) where they believed they would receive bad treatment due to their ethnic background.

The percentage of **those reporting discrimination was generally low**, ranging from zero to 37%. Among the respondents, none of the Sub-Saharan Africans in Portugal formally reported that they had been discriminated against, whereas 12% in the Netherlands, 16% of those in Ireland, and 18% of Africans in Malta officially reported incidents of discrimination. A higher proportion of cases were officially reported by Sub-Saharan respondents in France (37%), Finland (32%), Denmark (23%) and Sweden (26%).

In most Member States **a high number of Sub-Saharan African respondents were crime victims**; with the highest rates recorded in the Nordic countries of Denmark (49%) and Finland (47%), followed by Ireland (41%). Sub-Saharan Africans were frequently victims of crime in the Netherlands (35%), Malta (32%), Sweden (28%), and France (23%) (albeit at comparatively lower rates). The rate of victimisation of Sub-Saharan African respondents was lowest in Portugal (9%). With the exception of the Netherlands, where perpetrators of assault and threat tended not to be from the majority population, between 57% and 96% of victims attributed a **racist motivation** to their last experience of assault or threat.

Over a quarter (25%) of those interviewed in this *general* group (all countries considered) informed EU-MIDIS that they tended to avoid certain locations in their area for fear of being harassed, threatened or even attacked. Without the presence of such avoidance behaviour, the rate of victimisation for Sub-Saharan Africans would likely be higher.

The highest rate of those who **reported their victimisation to the police** was found in Sweden; where slightly more than one in three respondents (36%) informed the police about the latest incident. Those second most likely to report victimisation were the Surinamese from the Netherlands (33%), followed by Somalis in Finland (30%), and Sub-Saharan people in Portugal (24%). Reporting rates for the five crimes tested by this survey were the lowest in Denmark, France, Ireland and Malta (16-20%).

Finally, with respect to **police stops**, Sub-Saharan African respondents were by far the most likely to be stopped in Ireland in the 12 months preceding the survey interview: at 59%. This was followed by those living in France (38%) and the Netherlands (34%).

Policing was the lightest in Portugal and Malta, where less than one in 10 respondents were checked by police officers at all in the past 12 months. Perceptions of police profiling was highest in absolute terms (e.g. compared to all respondents) and in relative terms (compared to all stops) amongst Sub-Saharan African interviewees in France (20% perceived profiling and 38% were stopped by the police). In most other countries less than half of those who were stopped felt they were singled out because of their ethnic background.

3.1.1. General opinions on discrimination, and rights awareness

Respondents' opinions about the extent of discrimination on different grounds in their country of residence: including grounds in addition to ethnic or immigrant origin

Before being asked about their personal *experiences* of discrimination, interviewees were asked their opinion on how widespread they believed discrimination to be on *different grounds* in their respective countries of residence: ranging from discrimination on grounds of 'religion or belief' through to 'disability' (see Figure 3.1.2). Comparing the countries, Sub-Saharan African respondents in France, Sweden, Portugal and the Netherlands emerge as the most pessimistic regarding how widespread they consider discrimination to be **on any grounds**; with rates of those considering them widespread reaching or exceeding about a quarter of the respondents for *each type* of discrimination tested. The least negative in this respect were the Sub-Saharan African respondents in Finland and the African respondents in Malta, where only about half of them, at the most, stated that they believe discrimination to be widespread on any of the grounds investigated.

Ethnicity was cited as the primary cause of discrimination by Sub-Saharan African respondents in almost all of the Member States (ranking second to religion only in Denmark, by one percentage point (Somali respondents)). The highest rate of respondents considering that discrimination was widespread on the basis of ethnicity was in France, where roughly nine out of ten Sub-Saharan African respondents had this opinion (87%). Only somewhat less pessimistic in this respect were those in Sweden and Ireland, where about three out of four were convinced that discrimination was widespread based on ethnic background (Figure 3.1.2). The lowest rate was in Finland and Malta, but here still more than half of respondents believed that someone of a different ethnic background was more likely to face discrimination.

In many countries, discrimination based on **religion or belief** was also commonly considered to be widespread. Among the Member States, Sub-Saharan African respondents in Denmark stood out as a large proportion (62%) considered that discrimination on the basis of religion/belief was widespread. In almost all other Member States religion was the second most often cited cause for discrimination (exceptions were Ireland and Portugal), with relatively more affirmative responses prevailing in France (76%) and Sweden (69%). Those least likely to consider discrimination based on religion/belief as widespread were respondents in Malta, Ireland and Portugal (22-28%).

Although discrimination based on **sexual orientation** was not considered as one of the most widespread reasons for discrimination in most countries, half of Sub-Saharan African respondents in France and 46% of Surinamese in the Netherlands believed that this was a cause of discrimination in their respective countries of residence.

Gender was recognised as a cause of discrimination by 43% of Sub-Saharan respondents living in France and about one in three Sub-Saharan African respondents living in Sweden and Portugal. Rates were very similar regarding **disability**, with about half of respondents in France, and one in three in Sweden and 39% in Portugal, considering this as a relatively common cause of discrimination. In Sweden and Portugal, respectively 43% and 41% of Sub-Saharan African respondents identified **age** as a ground for discrimination. Perceptions of discrimination based on age were less likely in France (30%) and Ireland (22%), and garnered the fewest responses in Finland (14%) and Malta (13%).

Opinions on workplace advancement according to ethnicity or religion

There was much less variation in the opinions of Sub-Saharan African respondents with regard to the influence that a non-majority **ethnic background** has on employment opportunities, training, and promotion – **workplace advancement** (see Figure 3.1.3): in most Member States the majority of respondents considered that a different ethnic background makes it more difficult in their country of residence to advance in the workplace. Such an opinion was most widespread among Surinamese in the Netherlands (74%), and Somalis in Denmark (73%) and Sweden (72%). Respondents in Portugal and Malta provided a more 'positive' assessment, with 57% and 45% of them believing that ethnic difference can be a factor for discrimination in the labour market and at work; though it must be noted that the number

Figure 3.1.2
Is discrimination widespread? (A1, %)

Very or fairly widespread Very or fairly rare
Non-existent Can't tell





Figure 3.1.2 (Continued)
Is discrimination widespread? (A1, %)



Question A1: For each of the following types of discrimination, could you please tell me whether, in your opinion, it is very widespread, fairly widespread, fairly rare, or very rare in [COUNTRY]? Discrimination on the basis of ...?

of those without an opinion was the highest in this group as well (17-19%). Therefore it would seem that this seemingly 'positive' response is tempered by a lack of knowledge/opinion on this matter.

Having a **non-majority religion** was generally considered to be a barrier in the workplace by fewer respondents in each country (compared to ethnic background); though still about six out of 10 respondents in the Netherlands, Denmark and Sweden (Figure 3.1.3) thought it to be a drawback. The rate of those who considered that a non-majority religious background was a disadvantage was lowest in Ireland, Malta (one in three respondents in both countries)

and especially in Portugal (14%); but again, the rate of indecisive respondents was also the highest in these three countries (19-23%), which would seem to indicate a lack of knowledge/experience among respondents on which to base their opinion.

Willingness to provide information on ethnicity or religion for a census

Asked about their willingness to provide data on their ethnicity and religion,²² about three out of four respondents in Ireland (74%) and Sweden (72%) had no objection to providing information on their **ethnicity** for a census, and about three out of five in

²² Question A5a: Would you be in favour of or opposed to providing, on an anonymous basis, information about your ethnic origin, as part of a census, if that could help to combat discrimination in [COUNTRY]?

France (61%), Portugal (62%) and the Netherlands (62%) said the same. However, less than half of Somali respondents in Denmark (45%) and Finland (49%) were willing to share such information, and the rate of those explicitly refusing to do so was also the highest among them (44% and 33%, respectively). The rate of those respondents willing to provide information about their **religion**²³ was almost identical to that of the provision of ethnic information (e.g. in Denmark, Malta, Portugal and Sweden), while in some Member States somewhat fewer said that they would give this data; while the rate of those explicitly saying that they would definitely *not* was slightly higher (e.g. in France and Ireland, respectively 16% and 27% would not give information about their religion, which in both cases was three percentage points more than the proportion of respondents explicitly refusing to provide data on their ethnicity in these countries).


Awareness of anti-discrimination bodies

About six out of 10 or more respondents in each country were unable to think of any organisation in their respective country of residence that can offer support or advice to people who have been discriminated against (for whatever reason).²⁴ This finding helps explain the low incidence of formal complaints that were filed, which was a striking result in the survey.


The least well informed were African immigrants in Malta (93% were unable to mention an organisation), Sub-Saharan Africans living in Portugal (88%), Surinamese in the Netherlands (81%) and Somalis in Denmark (80%).

When prompted by the interviewer by being given the name of an Equality Body or the equivalent organisation (or organisations) in their country of residence,²⁵ rates improved somewhat: about half of respondents said that they were *not* familiar with any of the named Equality Bodies or organisations mentioned by the interviewer: 56% in Ireland; 50% in Denmark; 54% in Portugal; and 45% in Sweden. The least informed were those interviewed in Malta (only 11% could recall the name of the organisation – “National Commission for the Promotion of Equality for Men and Women”). On the other hand, one or the other of the two Dutch organisations were familiar to

Figure 3.1.3
Workplace advancement (A4, %) i) with different ethnic background



ii) with different religious background



EU-MIDIS 2008
Somali (Som), Sub-Saharan African (SSA), African (Afr), Surinamese (Sur)

Question A4: Would you say that, with equivalent qualifications or diplomas, the following people would be less likely, as likely, or more likely than others to get a job, be accepted for training or be promoted in [COUNTRY]? A. A person of different ethnic origin than the rest of the population, B. A person who practices a different religion than that of the rest of the country?

almost eight out of 10 Surinamese in the Netherlands; with “Antidiscriminatie bureau of meldpunt” being better known by those interviewed (known by 71%) compared to the Equal Treatment Commission (known by 60%). However, awareness levels of named

23 Question A5b: And how about providing, on an anonymous basis, information about your religion or belief?

24 Question A3: Do you know of any organisation in [COUNTRY] that can offer support or advice to people who have been discriminated against – for whatever reason?

25 Questions B2A-C: Have you ever heard of the [NAME OF EQUALITY BODY1-3]? The following Equality Bodies / organisations were tested: Denmark – “The Complaints Committee for Ethnic Equal Treatment” and “Danish Institute for Human Rights”; Finland – “Ombudsman for Minorities” and “National Discrimination Tribunal”; Ireland: “Equality Authority” and “Equality Tribunal”; France – “High Authority for combating discrimination and for equality”; Malta – “National Commission for the Promotion of Equality for Men and Women”; The Netherlands – “Equal Treatment Commission” and “Antidiscriminatie bureau of meldpunt”; Portugal – “High Commissioner for Immigration and Ethnic Minorities”; Sweden – “Ombudsman against Ethnic Discrimination”.

Equality Bodies in many Member States remained modest at best; with 34% in France and 37% in Finland knowledgeable about organisations that were named by interviewers.

These results are particularly important for Equality Bodies, and other relevant complaints organisations in Member States, as they present clear evidence that some of the groups who are most vulnerable to discrimination are unaware of the existence of such organisations that have a mandate to receive complaints of discrimination. What this means is that minorities, such as Sub-Saharan Africans, who are victims of discrimination are not reporting their experiences to the competent complaints bodies in their Member State.

Awareness of anti-discrimination laws

In several Member States the majority of Sub-Saharan African respondents were not aware that laws exist forbidding discrimination on the basis of ethnicity or 'race'.

As for laws against discrimination **when applying for a job**,²⁶ less than half of respondents living in Ireland (43%), Malta (25%) and Portugal (24%) were aware of a law. But even in France and the Netherlands, where most respondents (respectively 65% and 59%) were aware of such regulations, a very significant number of interviewees could not confirm the existence of such legislation. However, legislation in the field of employment was, on average, known about by most Sub-Saharan African respondents in comparison with the other two areas that were tested (legislation in relation to housing and services).

About half of the respondents in France (53%) and Sweden (50%) assumed that there was a law prohibiting discrimination against ethnic minorities with regard to **renting or buying a flat**.²⁷ Only one in four African respondents in Malta (24%) and in Portugal (23%) knew that equal treatment in housing had a legal basis. In contrast, almost half of respondents in Denmark (46%), and two out of five in the Netherlands, Finland (both 43%) and Ireland (41%) were also aware of laws banning discriminatory treatment in the housing market.

Sub-Saharan respondents in France (56%) were once again the most aware that they were protected by laws outlawing racial discrimination in relation to goods and services – when entering or in a **shop, restaurant or club**.²⁸ Almost as many Sub-Saharan African respondents in Denmark (51%), the Netherlands (48%), and somewhat fewer in Finland (45%) and in Sweden (42%), as well as in Ireland (35%), also knew about the existence of anti-discrimination laws in relation to shops, restaurants and bars. In comparison, only one in ten Africans (13%) believed such laws existed in Malta, and 23% of Sub-Saharan respondents in Portugal indicated that anti-discrimination legislation in this area existed.

In sum, these results indicate that awareness of legislation prohibiting discrimination on the grounds of race/ethnicity is limited amongst most Sub-Saharan groups interviewed. Council Directive 2000/43/EC (the 'Race Directive') implementing the principle of equal treatment between persons irrespective of racial or ethnic origin, which covers the grounds tested above and is required to be transposed into domestic law in EU Member States, is, together with existing Member State legislation, little known by many of the most vulnerable groups it was established to assist.

In addition, when asked whether they knew about the **Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union**,²⁹ about one in three respondents in most Sub-Saharan groups said they had heard of it but were not sure what it was. Levels of awareness were somewhat higher in Portugal and Finland (44% both), while the lowest level of awareness was found in Malta (17%). However, the rate of those who claimed *to know* what the Charter is about only exceeded 10% of respondents in Denmark (11%) and Ireland (16%). Coupled with the survey's findings on low levels of awareness of anti-discrimination legislation and complaints mechanisms, it is clear that vulnerable minorities are distanced from the legal apparatus that has been established with the mandate to assist them.

26 Question B1a: What do you think, is there a law in [COUNTRY] that forbids discrimination against immigrants and ethnic minority people... (a) when applying for a job?

27 Question B1c: What do you think, is there a law in [COUNTRY] that forbids discrimination against immigrants and ethnic minority people... (c) when renting or buying a flat?

28 Question B1b: What do you think, is there a law in [COUNTRY] that forbids discrimination against immigrants and ethnic minority people... (b) when entering or in a shop, restaurant or club?

29 Question B3: Are you familiar with the "Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union"? 1 – Yes and you know what it is, 2 – Yes, you have heard about it, but you are not sure what it is, 3 – No, you have never heard about it.

3.1.2. Experience of discrimination

Respondents' general experiences of discrimination on different grounds


Having measured their *opinion* on the extent of discrimination on different grounds in their country of residence (as outlined in the previous paragraphs), respondents were asked a follow-up question about their general *experiences* of discrimination in the last 12 months under the same cross section of grounds (see explanatory footnote³⁰).

Note for reading figures presented in the report:

In a number of figures and tables in the report, the five-year rate is the sum of the percentage given for the past 12 months and that for the 2-5 year period. Similarly, where the 12-month rate is broken down into multiple categories (e.g. those stopped by the police in the 12 months prior to the interview as a result of profiling, and those stopped by the police in the 12 months prior to the interview *not* as a result of profiling) the percentages in each category should be added up for the actual 12-month prevalence rate. For some questions multiple responses were possible and therefore the reader is advised to look at the question wording as set out in the original questionnaire, which can be downloaded from the FRA's website.

The results show (see Figure 3.1.4) that in most Member States at least one in three respondents in each group indicated that they had experienced discrimination in the last 12 months that included ethnic discrimination, and in some cases as many as half (e.g. FI: 48%) or even two-thirds of them experienced discrimination (e.g. IE: 69%, MT: 66%). These rates are somewhat less than respondents' general *opinion* on the frequency of discrimination on the grounds of ethnic or immigrant origin in their country of residence (as shown in Figure 3.1.2). Yet, given that people's opinions are not only based on their own personal experiences but also those of friends, family, and acquaintances, as well as media reporting, it is not surprising that opinions about how widespread discrimination is are higher than experiences over a limited period of 12 months. Consideration should also be given to the fact that

Figure 3.1.4
General experiences of discrimination on different grounds (A2)
In the past 12 months, %



Question A2: In the past 12 months have you personally felt discriminated against or harassed in [COUNTRY] on the basis of one or more of the following grounds [ethnic or immigrant origin, gender, sexual orientation, age, religion or belief, disability, other reason]?

earlier experiences of discrimination (or victimisation) during one's lifetime will impact on the individual's opinions on discrimination later in life.

The Dutch results illustrate how respondents' opinions and experiences of discrimination in the past 12 months can differ: many Surinamese interviewees had a negative opinion about the presence of discrimination in Dutch society (67% said discrimination based on ethnic or immigrant origin is fairly or very widespread), but they were the least likely of all Sub-Saharan African interviewees to recall a personal example of discriminatory treatment on the basis of ethnicity in the last 12 months (29% could recall such an incident). This finding was replicated for other Sub-Saharan African groups surveyed; that is: respondents were more likely to indicate that discrimination was widespread on ethnic grounds than they were able to recall

³⁰ Before clarifying specific discrimination experiences for the nine types tested in the survey, EU-MIDIS asked a complementary question to clarify respondents' general thoughts or impressions about their recent discrimination history. In order to do so on a comparative basis, EU-MIDIS used a question from a 2008 Eurobarometer survey (EB 296, 2008), which asked about personal memories of discrimination in multiple domains - Question A2, which asked 'In the past 12 months have you personally felt discriminated against or harassed in [COUNTRY] on the basis of one or more of the following grounds? Please tell me all that apply. A - Ethnic or immigrant origin, B - Gender, C - Sexual orientation, D - Age, E - Religion or belief, F - Disability, X - For another reason'. Chapter 4 in this report presents a comparison of results between the majority and minority populations' responses to this question from Eurobarometer and EU-MIDIS.

discriminatory experiences based on their ethnicity from the past 12 months (without prompting them to think about the various types that were tested later in the questionnaire). It was only in Finland (opinion that discrimination on the basis of ethnicity widespread: 51%, felt discriminated against on the basis of ethnicity: 48%) and Ireland (73% and 69%, respectively) where these rates were close. Whereas in Malta, the rate of African immigrants who indicated they were discriminated against in the last 12 months was even higher than the rate of those who believed that discrimination based on ethnicity was widespread in the country (opinion that discrimination on the basis of ethnicity widespread: 52%, felt discriminated against: 66%).

In comparison with discrimination experienced in the last 12 months on the grounds of ethnicity, the ratio of those who felt they were discriminated against *solely* on grounds *not involving* their ethnicity was only between 1% and 11%.


Respondents' experiences of discrimination across nine areas of everyday life on the grounds of ethnic or immigrant origin

Having been asked about their general experiences of discrimination in the last 12 months – on different grounds such as gender, age and ethnicity – respondents were asked a series of questions about their experiences of discrimination solely on the basis of their *immigrant or ethnic minority background* across nine specific areas of everyday life.

First, interviewees were asked to recall discrimination on the basis of their immigrant or ethnic minority background that they might have experienced in each of the nine areas in the last five-years. If they answered 'Yes' to discrimination under any of the nine grounds they were asked about, a follow-up question was asked for each of the nine to determine whether the latest incident had been in the past 12 months, and, if so, detailed follow-up questions were asked about reporting and reasons for not reporting discrimination.

The survey found that overall discrimination rates in the last five years, as an average of the nine

Figure 3.1.5
Personal discrimination experience based on ethnicity (CA1-CI1, CA2-CI2)
Prevalence across 9 domains, %



Questions CA1-CI1: During the last 5 years, [or since you've been in the country if less than 5 years], have you ever been discriminated against when [DOMAIN] in [COUNTRY] because of your immigrant/minority background? CA2-CI2: Thinking about the last time this happened, when was this: in the last twelve months or before then?

areas tested, were high in most Member States (see Figure 3.1.5); with approximately three out of five Sub-Saharan African respondents surveyed (56%) indicating that they had been discriminated against in the last five years. Rates were somewhat lower in Portugal (37%), France (45%), the Netherlands (49%) and Sweden (52%). However, these results could be affected by the fact that some respondents had been living in their Member State for less than five years, and therefore could only report their experiences for the period they had been in the Member State (see section 3.1.9 on respondents' backgrounds); this was particularly important regarding the Maltese results as many respondents had been in the country for less than five years.

When asked whether they could recall any specific incidents of discrimination on the basis of their ethnicity in the *preceding 12 months*,³¹ the results

³¹ Key reference periods are 12 months (e.g. the 12 months that preceded the interview), or five years (preceding the interview). Please note that this section provides some illustrations, where the two reference periods are combined. In these charts and tables, the five-year rate is the sum of the percentage given for the past 12 months and that for the 2-5 year period. Similarly, where the 12-month rate is broken down into multiple categories (e.g. those stopped by the police in the 12 months prior to the interview as a result of anticipated profiling, and those stopped by the police in the 12 months prior to the interview *not* as a result of anticipated profiling – see part 3.1.6 in this section) the percentages in each category should be added up for the actual 12-month prevalence rate. Also, where a category reads 'both' or 'on other grounds as well' this means that the response is either part of a multiple response answer or a combination of responses to different questions (such as police stops and other police contacts), and therefore percentages need to be read cumulatively.

show that on average, across the nine areas tested, three in five African respondents (63%) in Malta could recall such an incident; a proportion higher than in any other Member State. About half of Sub-Saharan African respondents in Ireland (54%), Finland (47%), and Denmark (46%) confirmed episodes of racial discrimination in the past 12 months, while every third or fourth Sub-Saharan African respondent interviewed in Sweden, Portugal, the Netherlands and France (26-33%) recounted discrimination experiences from the previous 12 months.

With respect to the general question on discriminatory treatment in relation to ethnicity, asked at the beginning of the questionnaire interview (as discussed in the previous paragraphs, see Figure 3.1.4), respondent replies in some countries tended to indicate higher discrimination rates compared to the responses to specific questions concerning the nine areas of ethnic/immigrant origin discrimination discussed in this section. This can either mean that some relevant areas of discrimination were not covered by EU-MIDIS in its detailed questions about discrimination across nine areas, or that the general impression of being discriminated against is stronger than the verifiable experiences recalled by respondents for the last 12 months in relation to the nine areas tested. At the same time, as discussed earlier, experiences of discrimination that predate the period asked about in the survey can have a lasting effect on people's feelings of being discriminated against, and so are recalled in response to a general question about discrimination – something that survey researchers call 'telescoping'. As an illustration, in the following countries the rate of discrimination on the basis of ethnic or immigrant background in the general question (reported in Figure 3.1.4) was generally higher than the aggregate result recorded for the nine areas of discrimination tested (Figure 3.1.5): Ireland (69% general question vs. 54% aggregate for nine areas), France (35% vs. 26%), Portugal (36% vs. 29%) and Sweden (39% vs. 33%).

On the other hand, the rates of discrimination between the general question on discrimination in the past 12 months, asked at the beginning of the survey, and the aggregate results for detailed questions on discrimination across nine domains suggests the same discrimination rates in Finland, Malta, and the Netherlands. In Denmark, the average discrimination rate for the nine specific areas even outnumbers that recorded for the general question on discrimination (46% vs. 39%, respectively).

Looking at the specific discrimination experiences across the nine domains (see Figure 3.1.6), **the two most common domains in which respondents in most Member States experienced discrimination in the past 12 months are work related**: when 'looking for work' and 'at work'. Private services (other than banks) were also relatively often perceived as having treated Sub-Saharan African respondents unfairly. Discrimination in a bank, by health care, social services or school personnel was, on the other hand, rare for all Sub-Saharan African groups.

Discrimination was not especially high in **Denmark** in any of the domains tested – compared to some other Member States. The highest rates in Denmark were seen when looking for work (12 months: 18%, 5 years: 35%) and at work (12 months: 16%, 5 years: 26%), and by private services such as cafés/restaurants (12 months: 13%, 5 years: 19%) and shops (12 months: 12%, 5 years: 16%). 12-month rates do not exceed 10% in any other domains, and discrimination by housing agencies/landlords is especially low at 3% (5-year: 7%). However, discrimination by school/education personnel is among the most frequently cited experiences of discrimination if 5-year rates are considered: one in five (22%) of Sub-Saharan African respondents experienced discrimination of this kind in the past 5 years in Denmark.

The rate of incidents of discrimination is somewhat higher in **Finland**. Respondents are most often discriminated against when looking for work and at work (respective 12-month rates are 22% and 18%, 5-year rates are 41% and 27%). About one in five Somalis in Finland in the past 5 years have been discriminated against by housing agencies (22%), healthcare personnel (19%), at a café/bar (23%) or in a shop (21%). Respective 12-month rates for these four domains were between 12-16%.

In **Sweden**, although 12-month rates were not especially high, 5-year rates were quite high in work-related domains; altogether, 41% of Somalis in Sweden were discriminated against when looking for work and 32% at work. About one in four respondents experienced discrimination at a café/bar in the past 5 years. The rates of discrimination in the past 5 years in other domains, however, only barely exceeded 15%, and were under 10% for the 12-month period.

About four in ten Sub-Saharan African respondents were discriminated against when looking for work or at work in the past 5 years in **Ireland**. The 12-month rate for workplace discrimination was among the

highest compared to the other groups, with one in four respondents having experienced this in the past 12 months. About one in four Sub-Saharan African respondents said that they were discriminated against in a shop in the past 5 years, but in other domains 5-year discrimination rates barely exceeded 15%; with the exception of discrimination by a housing agency or a landlord (5-year rate 23%, 12-month rate 12%).

Discrimination in **France** in the past 5 years was relatively frequent only in work-related circumstances (when looking for work: 39%, at work: 22%), and by housing agencies/landlords (25%), while the respective 12-month rates were 18% (looking for work), 10% (at work), and 8% (housing). The discrimination rate at cafés/restaurants was 16% over 5 years (12 months: 8%).

Discrimination in Portugal was relatively rare, and almost nonexistent in some areas. Discrimination in the past 12 months was most frequent for those looking for work (19%) and at work (16%): respective 5-year rates are 32% and 18%. 16-17% experienced discrimination in the past 5 years in a café/restaurant or in a shop, and 14% by school personnel: 12-month rates are 11%, 13% and 8%, respectively. Discrimination against Sub-Saharan African respondents by social service personnel and in banks was virtually nonexistent in Portugal.

The rate of discrimination in the tested domains showed some distinctive differences with regard to **Malta**, which is largely explicable due to the different background of this group in comparison with other Sub-Saharans surveyed (for example, their place of residence (many were living in semi-open detention centres), and length of stay in country (a number were recent arrivals)). About half of the respondents claimed to have been discriminated against when *looking for work* in the past 5 years, and one in three when *at work*. Discrimination at a café/restaurant was also common (39%) in the last five years, and about one in five respondents also mentioned discrimination by healthcare personnel. Twelve-month rates were similar, but in this regard attention should be paid to the fact that 92% of respondents had been living in Malta for 1-4 years only.

Discrimination in **the Netherlands** was relatively low, being barely existent in some domains. Discrimination in the past 12 months was most frequent for those

at work (12 months: 11%, 5 years: 24%), and also in relation to discrimination in a café/restaurant, or in a shop, with rates (respectively) being 11-12% in the past 12 months and 20% and 19% over five-years. Discrimination against Surinamese respondents in housing, by healthcare and social service personnel, and in banks, was very rare or nonexistent in the Netherlands.

Reporting discrimination

In any domain where perceived racial discrimination occurred, practically none of the respondents reported the incidents in **Portugal** (see Figure 3.1.6). In **Malta**, no complaints were filed when respondents felt discriminated against by educational personnel or in relation to housing. **In general, only the Sub-Saharan African respondents in France were likely to file reports of racial discrimination – with close to half of respondents reporting such incidents at least in some specific domains** (especially when treated unfairly by potential employers or at work, or by school personnel). This might indicate that the reporting procedure in France is more transparent with regard to the workplace and educational institutions. At the same time, data on complaints to Equality Bodies, which is one organisation that victims can turn to when they want redress, indicates that France performs relatively well compared with most Member States – in other words, numbers of complaints are relatively high.³² Compared to all the groups surveyed in EU-MIDIS, the French Sub-Saharan Africans included the second-highest percentage of respondents (36%, after Somalis in Sweden with 37%) saying that they knew of an organisation that can support and give advice to people who have been discriminated against.

However, the overall perception that *nothing would change* if discriminatory treatment was reported was quite high even in France (78%) – even though the reporting rate was highest there of all Member States where Sub-Saharan Africans were surveyed (Figure 3.1.6). Similar sentiments about the futility of formally filing a complaint prevailed among roughly three in four respondents interviewed in Portugal and Malta, and among 68% of Sub-Saharan African respondents in Sweden and 52% in Denmark.

32 FRA Annual Report 2009: Chapter 1.1. 'Equality Bodies and complaints under the Racial Equality Directive.'

Figure 3.1.6
Specific discrimination experience based on ethnicity (CA1-CI1, CA2-CI2)

Reporting rate (CA4-CI4)

% who reported the most recent incident in the past 12 months

- In the past 12 months
- In the past 2-5 years
- Not discriminated against

- Not reported (incl. Don't know/ Refused)
- Reported

DK

(Somali)

When looking for work	18	17	66	92	8
At work	16	10	74	73	28
By housing agency/ Landlord	34		93	76	24
By healthcare personnel	6	4	90	85	15
By social service personnel	10	5	84	73	27
By school personnel	9	13	78	80	20
At a café, restaurant or bar	13	6	81	85	15
At a shop	12	4	84	87	13
In a bank	5	3	92	93	7

FI

(Somali)

When looking for work	22	19	59	86	14
At work	18	9	73	61	39
By housing agency/ Landlord	12	10	78	74	26
By healthcare personnel	14	5	81	79	21
By social service personnel	8	4	88	87	13
By school personnel	7	9	85	64	36
At a café, restaurant or bar	16	7	77	92	8
At a shop	15	6	79	89	11
In a bank	4	3	93	74	26

SE

(Somali)

When looking for work	17	24	58	84	16
At work	12	20	69	75	25
By housing agency/ Landlord	6	10	84	72	28
By healthcare personnel	7	5	88	89	11
By social service personnel	9	7	84	79	21
By school personnel	3	6	91	88	13
At a café, restaurant or bar	13	13	74	80	20
At a shop	4	9	87	86	14
In a bank	5	4	91	83	17

IE

(Sub-Saharan African)

When looking for work	19	22	59	91	9
At work	26	11	63	73	27
By housing agency/ Landlord	12	11	77	95	5
By healthcare personnel	6	6	88	88	12
By social service personnel	6	6	88	90	10
By school personnel	9	9	82	89	11
At a café, restaurant or bar	7	5	88	94	6
At a shop	17	6	77	96	4
In a bank	6	8	86	97	3

FR

(Sub-Saharan African)

When looking for work	18	21	61	44	56
At work	10	12	78	48	52
By housing agency/ Landlord	7	17	75	94	6
By healthcare personnel	3	4	93	85	15
By social service personnel	3	4	92	87	13
By school personnel	4	4	92	51	49
At a café, restaurant or bar	8	8	84	82	18
At a shop	5	3	92	96	4
In a bank	2	4	93	87	13

PT

(Sub-Saharan African)

When looking for work	19	13	68	100	0
At work	16	2	82	100	0
By housing agency/ Landlord	2	4	94	100	0
By healthcare personnel	5	4	92	99	1
By social service personnel	2	0	98	100	0
By school personnel	8	6	86	100	0
At a café, restaurant or bar	11	5	84	100	0
At a shop	13	4	83	100	0
In a bank	2	0	98	100	0

Figure 3.1.6 (Continued)


Specific discrimination experience based on ethnicity (CA1-CI1, CA2-CI2)

■ In the past 12 months
 ■ In the past 2-5 years
 □ Not discriminated against

Reporting rate (CA4-CI4)

% who reported the most recent incident in the past 12 months

■ Not reported (incl. Don't know/ Refused)
 □ Reported



Questions CA1-CI1 / CA2-CI2 as with Figure 3.1.5. CA4-CI4: Did you or anyone else report this incident anywhere?

When asked why the latest incident of discrimination was not reported (see Figure 3.1.7), about two out of five respondents in Denmark, Finland, Malta (37% to 39%), and a slightly higher ratio of respondents in Ireland (45%) and France (46%), replied that they *did not know how or where to file a complaint*. Again this serves to highlight the lack of awareness among vulnerable minorities and victims about how to register a complaint, which might reflect lack of public awareness campaigns and/or resources for these campaigns by the responsible complaints bodies.

In almost all the Member States, non-reporting because of *residence permit problems* received the lowest responses – ranging from 0% in Denmark and Finland to 4% in France. *Language difficulties* were also a minor reason for not officially reporting incidences of racial discrimination in most of the Member States, with responses ranging from 0% in Portugal and the Netherlands to 2-4% in France, Ireland, Finland, and Denmark. African respondents in Malta and Sweden cited language difficulties for non-reporting more commonly than did those in the other Member States (18% and 8%, respectively).

Fears of negative consequences was cited by low percentages of Somali respondents in Denmark

(10%) and Finland (11%), but by significantly higher percentages of those interviewed in France (35%) and Malta and Sweden (both 23%). *Fears of being threatened or intimidated by perpetrators* if they reported incidents were cited by 33% in Malta, 13% in France and 12% in Ireland. These results point to a lack of victim protection and may also indicate that many perpetrators are known by their victims – hence a possible need to address ‘acquaintance danger’ rather than ‘stranger danger’ through campaigns and other initiatives.

A higher proportion of Sub-Saharan African respondents in Sweden (28%) and Portugal (41%) indicated that they *dealt with the problem themselves*, which could indicate a high level of self-reliance or support within a community, as well as, potentially, a lack of faith in other avenues for redress. In comparison, only 3% of African respondents in Malta and 10% of Sub-Saharan African respondents in Finland indicated that they dealt with incidents of discrimination themselves.

Figure 3.1.7
Reasons for not reporting discrimination (CA5-C15)
 Based on the last incident, in the past 12 months, in any of 9 domains, %





Figure 3.1.7 (Continued)

Reasons for not reporting discrimination (CA5-C15)

Based on the last incident, in the past 12 months, in any of 9 domains, %



Questions CA5-C15: Why wasn't it [the most recent incident of discrimination] reported?

3.1.3. Discrimination by respondent characteristics

SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE

The discrimination experiences of Sub-Saharan African respondents differed across the various socio-demographic groups. Table 3.1.1 shows that it was particularly men, younger respondents, and the unemployed who reported having been discriminated against during the year prior to the survey.

- **Gender:** Men were more likely to mention a discriminatory incident (44%) than women (37%).
- **Age group:** Younger Sub-Saharan African respondents ran a higher risk of being discriminated against. Respondents between 16 and 24 were particularly apt to suffer discrimination (49%), followed by the 25-39 year-olds (45%). In comparison, only about one-third of respondents aged 40-54 (30%) and 15% of persons aged 55 years and older reported being the victim of a discriminatory incident.
- **Income status:** Discrimination against Sub-Saharan African respondents didn't vary much between the different income groups. However, respondents with an income in the lowest

quartile (47%) were slightly more liable to report a discriminatory incident than those above this threshold (36-38%).

Table 3.1.1 – Discrimination rate (CA2-C12, past 12 months)

General group: Sub-Saharan African

By socio-demographic profile, %

Respondent gender (BG0)	Male	44
	Female	37
Age group (BG1)	16-24 years	49
	25-39 years	45
	40-54 years	35
	55 years or more	15
Household income (quartiles) (BG6)	In the lowest quartile	47
	Between the lowest quartile and the median	38
	Above the median	36
Employment status (BG5)	Employed/self-employed	39
	Homemaker/unpaid work	35
	Unemployed	59
	Non-active	33
Education status (years) (BG7)	5 years or less	37
	6-9 years	41
	10-13 years	43
	14 years or more	43

EU-MIDIS 2008

- **Employment status:** Unemployed respondents were distinctly more likely to report a discriminatory incident (59%), followed by the employed or self-employed (39%). The non-active (e.g. students, pensioners, or others not currently in the job market) were the least likely to have experienced discrimination (33%).
- **Education:** Only minor differences were observed in the discrimination experiences of people with different educational backgrounds; those with less than 5 years of education were the ones less likely to experience discrimination (37%).

RESPONDENT STATUS

A number of ‘respondent-status’ variables were collected in the survey – such as citizenship status and length of stay in the country – which were looked at with respect to their influence on discrimination rates (see Table 3.1.2):

- **Length of stay in the country:** The longer the respondents had stayed in the country, then the less discrimination they experienced (see Table 3.1.2). Indeed, Sub-Saharan African respondents who had stayed up to four years were the ones

most frequently reporting discrimination (51%), followed by those who had stayed between 5-19 years. Sub-Saharan African respondents who had been in the country for 20 years or more or who were born in the country experienced the lowest levels of discrimination (23% and 30% respectively).

- **Neighbourhood status:** Respondents living in areas that were poorer than other parts of the city were less often a victim of discrimination (29%) than those living in areas just as affluent as others (42%) or in mixed parts of the city (41%).

- **Citizenship status:** Half of the non-nationals reported a discriminatory incident (47%), which is markedly higher compared to those respondents who indicated they were citizens of the EU Member State in which they lived (35%).

- **Language proficiency:** Language appeared to have little impact on the rates of discrimination experienced.

3.1.4. Crime victimisation

Much like the Roma, the survey showed that Sub-Saharan African respondents are particularly vulnerable to crime victimisation (see Figure 3.1.8). One in three respondents in Finland (34%), Denmark (31%), Malta (30%) and Ireland (29%) indicated that they were a victim of crime at least once in the last 12 months in at least one of the five crime types tested (burglary, vehicle crime, theft, assault and threat, or harassment: see subsequent footnotes for verbatim question wordings), and *in circumstances that indicated they were targeted on the basis of their ethnicity or immigrant background*. Overall, when combining the results for crimes that the victim considered were ‘racially’ motivated and not ‘racially’ motivated, the 12-month prevalence of the five crimes tested was highest among the Somali groups interviewed in Denmark (49%) and in Finland (47%), and among Sub-Saharan Africans in Ireland (40%). The 12 month victimisation rate, on the other hand, was markedly lower in Portugal (9%) than anywhere else where Sub-Saharan African persons were interviewed. In the other Member States, the 12 month victimisation rate varied between 24% (France) and 35% (the Netherlands).

Table 3.2.2 – Discrimination rate (CA2-CI2, past 12 months)

General group: Sub-Saharan African

By respondent status and neighbourhood, %


Length of stay in COUNTRY (BG8a)	1-4 years	51
	5-9 years	44
	10-19 years	45
	20+ years	23
	Born in COUNTRY	30
Neighbourhood status relative to other areas of the city (PI01)	Poorer	29
	As other areas	42
	Mixed	41
Language proficiency in the national language (PI04)	Fluent, without foreign sounding accent	38
	Fluent, with foreign sounding accent	42
	Less than fluent	44
Citizenship in COUNTRY (BG9)	Citizen	35
	Not a citizen	47

EU-MIDIS 2008

Figure 3.1.8

Personal victimisation experience (DA1-DE1, DA2-DE2, DA3-DC3, DD4, DE5)

Prevalence across 5 crime types, %



Questions DA1-DE1: During the last 5 years in [COUNTRY], has [TYPE] happened to you? [IF YES] DA2-DE2: Thinking about the last time this happened, when was this: in the last twelve months or before then? [IF YES] DA3-DC3, DD4, DE5: Do you think that [this incident/any of these incidents] IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS happened partly or completely because of your immigrant/minority background?

Property crimes

The highest prevalence of **vehicle crimes**³³ was recorded for Somali respondents in the Nordic countries, with a 12-month prevalence of 21% in Finland, 18% in Denmark, and 14% in Sweden. Sub-Saharan Africans in Ireland (17%) and Surinamese in the Netherlands (15%) were also likely targets of vehicle crimes. The rate of vehicle crimes was lowest in Malta (4% in the past 12 months) and in Portugal (6%). Only a small proportion of victims thought that car theft was racially motivated (0% to 6% in all groups in the 12-month period, with the highest rate recorded in Ireland).

Even in this highly victimised group, respondents were rather unlikely to fall victim to **burglary**,³⁴ with

the 12-month rates ranging between 0% in Portugal and 6% in the Netherlands and Sweden. When asked about the most recent burglary they had experienced in the last 12 months, the rate of those that thought they were intentionally targeted because of their ethnicity was 2% at the most (in Ireland and in Finland). However, this result is not surprising given that burglary – unlike assault, threat and harassment – is not an ‘in person’ crime which requires that victim and perpetrator meet.

The highest prevalence rates of **theft of personal property**³⁵ were found in Denmark and in France (11% both). Only 3% of respondents in Portugal and 4% in Malta were victims of this type of crime in the 12 months preceding the interview. In Ireland, about as many felt that they were victims of theft of personal property because of their ethnic background as those who thought that it did not play a role, whereas a racist motive for this type of crime was assumed rarely in the other Sub-Saharan African groups surveyed.

In-person crimes – focusing on racist motivation

EU-MIDIS investigated rates of victimisation in two specific instances of in-person crimes: assaults or threats, and serious harassment (although the latter does not necessarily qualify for an offence in a criminal sense).

If respondents indicated they had experienced in-person crime in the last 12 months they were asked detailed follow-up questions with respect to the last incident for each of the two crime types surveyed (‘assault or threat’, and ‘serious harassment’). These follow-up questions provided detailed information about the nature of incidents, including who the perpetrator or perpetrators were.

As shown in Table 3.1.3, the likelihood of becoming the victim of **assault or threat**³⁶ was particularly high (focusing on 12-month prevalence) in Finland (20%) and Denmark (15%). The lowest 12-month prevalence of assaults and threats was recorded in Portugal (2%).

Respondents from all groups, but one, were very

33 Questions DA1-2: During the [REFERENCE PERIOD] in [COUNTRY], was any car, van, truck, motorbike, moped or bicycle – or some other form of transport belonging to you or your household – stolen, or had something stolen from it? [IF NEEDED, CLARIFY: All forms of motorised and non-motorised transport can be included].

34 Questions DB1-2: During the [REFERENCE PERIOD], did anyone get into your home without permission and steal or try to steal something? [Does include cellars – Does NOT include garages, sheds lock-ups or gardens].

35 Questions DC1-2: Apart from theft involving force or threat, there are many other types of theft of personal property, such as pick-pocketing or theft of a purse, wallet, clothing, jewellery, or mobile phone. This can happen at work, on public transport, in the street – or anywhere. Over the [REFERENCE PERIOD] have you personally been the victim of any of these thefts that did not involve force?

36 Questions DD1-2: During the [REFERENCE PERIOD], have you been personally attacked, that is hit or pushed, or threatened by someone in a way that REALLY frightened you? This could have happened at home or elsewhere, such as in the street, on public transport, at your workplace – or anywhere.

Table 3.1.3 – Assaults or threats, incident details

ASSAULT OR THREAT	DK (Som)	FI (Som)	SE (Som)	IE (SSA)	FR (SSA)	PT (SSA)	MT (Afr)	NL (Sur)
<i>Victimisation rate (based on DD1, DD2)³⁷</i>	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Victimised past 12 months	15	20	6	8	3	2	7	9
Victimised past 2-5 years	11	18	9	7	7	2	2	7
<i>Attributed racial/ethnic motivation (DD4)</i>								
Yes, including the most recent	71	88	58	77	57	96	89	16
Yes, but not including the most recent	1	0	3	11	4	0	3	0
<i>Racist or religiously offensive language used (DD9)</i>								
Yes	49	81	42	80	25	32	77	26
<i>Force actually used (DD10)</i>								
Yes (within all incidents)	56	59	39	43	18	56	57	42
Yes (in the total population)	8	12	2	3	1	1	4	4
<i>Something stolen (DD5)</i>								
Yes (within all incidents)	6	6	29	17	34	8	9	30
Yes (in the total population)	1	1	2	1	1	0	1	3
<i>Perpetrators (DD8)</i>								
From the same ethnic group	12	8	16	7	6	8	0	33
From another ethnic group	14	2	39	20	28	8	0	51
From majority	74	84	45	78	79	88	100	24
<i>Seriousness (DD14)</i>								
Very or fairly serious	72	76	74	73	97	72	63	74
Not very serious	21	21	13	10	3	28	37	26
<i>Not reported to the police (DD11)</i>								
Not reported	71	57	61	64	82	40	51	47
<i>Reasons for not reporting (DD13, top 3 mentions)</i>								
No confidence in the police	58	41	25	49	89	30	44	20
Too trivial/not worth reporting	19	20	38	16	19	40	33	35
Dealt with the problem themselves	7	9	50	43	8	40	0	15

EU-MIDIS 2008, Somali (Som), Sub-Saharan African (SSA), African (Afr), Surinamese (Sur), Sub-Saharan African (other)

likely to perceive a racial motivation for assaults or threats: only a small minority of the Surinamese in the Netherlands assumed racist motivation to be behind their experiences of assault and threat (16%). This figure is – somewhat curiously – less than the proportion of those who confirmed that religiously offensive or racist language was used during these incidents (26%). However, as Table 3.1.3 shows, this particular group reported the least incidents involving majority offenders (24% of all assaults and threats involved ‘white’ Dutch perpetrators), while 33% were committed by ethnic peers and 51% by people belonging to other ethnic minorities. In comparison, in most Member States respondents were assaulted

or threatened by members of the majority population (e.g. all incidents in Malta, 88% in Portugal, and 84% in Finland).

More than three out of four respondents considered these incidents of assault and threat as serious, but less than half in most groups reported these crimes to the police (see Table 3.1.3). Reporting rates were somewhat lower in Denmark, Ireland and France, where about two thirds or more of victims did not report these offenses.

Respondents explained their reasons for not reporting incidents to the police, and interviewers recorded

³⁷ For specific question wordings of the indicators in the tables of this section please refer to the questionnaire, which you can find at: http://fra.europa.eu/fraWebsite/attachments/EU-MIDIS_Questionnaire.pdf.

Table 3.1.4 – Serious harassment, incident details

SERIOUS HARASSMENT	DK (Som)	FI (Som)	SE (Som)	IE (SSA)	FR (SSA)	PT (SSA)	MT (Afr)	NL (Sur)	EU (other)
<i>Victimisation rate (based on DE1, DE2)</i>	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Victimised past 12 months	27	25	12	26	6	3	26	14	16
Victimised past 2-5 years	13	12	10	12	9	2	4	6	9
<i>Attributed racial/ethnic motivation (DE5)</i>									
Yes, including the most recent	89	88	76	78	75	95	87	28	74
Yes, but not including the most recent	1	1	2	6	3	0	12	1	4
<i>Racist or religiously offensive language used (DE9)</i>									
Yes	76	85	76	82	33	29	85	34	48
<i>Perpetrators (DE8)</i>									
From the same ethnic group	3	3	11	3	23	2	2	27	9
From another ethnic group	9	5	34	20	36	2	2	51	35
From majority	93	93	70	81	48	93	97	22	65
<i>Seriousness (DE13)</i>									
Very or fairly serious	60	71	67	84	78	47	29	54	39
Not very serious	37	28	32	15	20	53	68	44	57
<i>Not reported to the police (DE10)</i>									
Not reported	92	82	63	85	81	100	88	78	78
<i>Reasons for not reporting (DE12, top 3 mentions)</i>									
No confidence in the police	57	45	31	42	50	75	38	25	44
Too trivial/not worth reporting	37	25	38	19	26	13	54	42	50
Dealt with the problem themselves	6	6	41	18	58	7	2	14	11

EU-MIDIS 2008, Somali (Som), Sub-Saharan African (SSA), African (Afr), Surinamese (Sur), Sub-Saharan African (other)

as many categories of response as were mentioned. The main reasons given for not reporting assaults or threats were: 'dealt with the problem themselves' (half of respondents in Sweden and two out of five respondents in Ireland and Portugal provided an explanation for not reporting that included this aspect); that the incident was 'too trivial/not worth reporting' (with the highest rates in Sweden and Portugal); and 'no confidence that the police could do anything about the incident' (89% among Sub-Saharan Africans in France and 58% among Somalis in Denmark). This last explanation for not reporting should be of particular concern to the police, as it indicates a lack of faith in the police's ability to deliver a service to victims.

Serious harassments were generally more frequent than assaults or threats; however, in Portugal hardly any respondents were harassed (3% in the past 12 months), and only 6% were in France (see Table 3.1.4). The groups most frequently harassed were the Somali in Denmark (27%) and Finland (25%), Sub-Saharan

Africans in Ireland (26%), and African immigrants in Malta (26%). Prevalence of serious harassment was markedly lower (although still very high if compared to Sub-Saharans in France and Portugal) in the other Member States.

In all Member States, except the Netherlands, at least three quarters of victims attributed a racial motivation to these incidents of harassment, and in the case of almost all groups this is supported by the fact that racially/religiously offensive language was frequently used during these encounters (although relatively few in Portugal and France could confirm this aspect).

In the Netherlands racist motivation for harassment incidents was markedly lower compared to other Member States (28%), and a correspondingly low proportion of victims confirmed the use of specifically racist or religiously offensive language (34%) during these incidents. As with assaults or threats, the perpetrators of harassment against the Surinamese community in the Netherlands are least likely to come

from the majority population (Dutch majority: 22%). Instead, incidents of harassment in the Netherlands are either intra-ethnic (27%), with victim and perpetrator coming from the same ethnic group, or, more typically, inter-ethnic with offenders coming from (another) minority (51%).

Apart from France and – as described – the Netherlands, Sub-Saharan Africans are mostly harassed by people from the national majority population. Perpetrators came almost exclusively from the majority ethnic group in Denmark, Finland, Portugal and Malta. In about one third of the cases recorded in Sweden and France offenders belonged to a different non-majority ethnic group, and in one out of five cases in France perpetrators were from the same ethnic group as victims. (Note, percentages can add up to more than 100 as there can be perpetrators from different backgrounds for one incident).

The majority of serious harassment incidents were considered as severe by victims – see Table 3.1.4 (the most by Sub-Saharans in Ireland, where 84% indicated that the incident was fairly or very serious). Only among Sub-Saharan African respondents in Portugal and Africans in Malta did the majority of victims state that these incidents were not very serious. The reporting rates to the police for these incidents were much lower than in the case of assaults or threats; about four in five victims did not inform the police about these incidents – excepting Sweden, where 37% notified the police about the harassment they suffered.

Reasons given for not reporting were very similar to those in the case of assaults or threats: the most important reason for non-reporting was that victims did not feel or trust that the police could do anything about their case (especially in Portugal, Denmark and France, Table 3.1.4). Reasons for non-reports often included dealing with the problem themselves (mentioned particularly often in Sweden and France, but very rarely in Malta, Denmark, Finland and Portugal). In Malta, the victims' perception that the case was too trivial stopped them from bringing it to the attention of the police.

3.1.5. Crime victimisation by respondent characteristics

SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE

- **Age group:** In line with similar observations for other immigrant groups, younger people were more often victims of crime compared to older

Table 3.1.5 – Victimization rate (DA2-DE2, past 12 months)

General group: Sub-Saharan African
By socio-demographic profile, %

Respondent gender (BG0)	Male	32
	Female	35
Age group (BG1)	16-24 years	41
	25-39 years	34
	40-54 years	32
	55 years or more	18
Household income (quartiles) (BG6)	In the lowest quartile	38
	Between the lowest quartile and the median	36
	Above the median	28
Employment status (BG5)	Employed/self-employed	32
	Homemaker/unpaid work	33
	Unemployed	37
	Non-active	35
Education status (years) (BG7)	5 years or less	25
	6-9 years	31
	10-13 years	36
	14 years or more	36

EU-MIDIS 2008

respondents in the Sub-Saharan African groups surveyed: four out of 10 respondents aged 24 or younger were victimised, while this number gradually diminished for the older age groups.

- **Employment status:** Some differences could be observed in crime victimisation by employment status. The unemployed respondents were most likely to say they had been a victim of crime in the past 12 months (37%), while the percentage victimised in the employed/self-employed group was the lowest.
- **Education:** The likelihood of victimisation increased gradually with the education status of respondents. While 36% of those who attended formal education for 10 years or longer said they were a victim of crime in the last 12 months, 31% of those with 6-9 years of education did so. Only a quarter of Sub-Saharan African respondents having had five years of education or less were victims of a crime during the year prior to the survey.
- **Gender:** Differences in victimisation experiences were less significant between men and women (respectively, 32% and 35%).

- **Income:** Respondents from households with an income above the national median were less likely to say they had been a victim of a crime (28%) than respondents in the lowest income group (38%).

These results indicate that the unemployed and those on the lowest income are more likely to be victimised, which highlights the particular vulnerabilities of Sub-Saharan respondents who are in the most disadvantaged socio-economic positions.

RESPONDENT STATUS

A number of 'respondent-status' variables were collected in the survey – such as citizenship status and length of stay in the country – which can be tested with respect to their influence on crime victimisation rates (see Table 3.1.6). The most important ones with respect to their relationship to crime victimisation rates were the city area that participants from the Sub-Saharan African community were living in, and the length of their stay in their country of residence.

- **Length of stay in the country:** Sub-Saharan African respondents with a medium-term stay in the country of residence had most often been the victim of a crime (5-9 years: 35%, 10-19 years:

Table 3.1.6 – Victimization rate (DA2-DE2, past 12 months)

General group: Sub-Saharan African

By respondent status and neighbourhood, %

Length of stay in COUNTRY (BG8a)	1-4 years	29
	5-9 years	35
	10-19 years	38
	20+ years	25
Neighbourhood status relative to other areas of the city (PI01)	Born in COUNTRY	35
	Poorer	26
	As other areas	33
Language proficiency in the national language (PI04)	Mixed	40
	Fluent, without foreign sounding accent	34
	Fluent, with foreign sounding accent	33
Citizenship in COUNTRY (BG9)	Less than fluent	35
	Citizen	36
	Not a citizen	31

EU-MIDIS 2008

38%). Next to these groups, those who were born in the country were most likely to be victimised. As was observed for other immigrant groups, Sub-Saharan African respondents who were already in a Member State for 20 years or more (e.g. well established and most often not particularly young members of the community) ran the lowest risk of becoming a victim of a crime (25%). Therefore, length of stay in the country and age are factors that together reduce the risk of victimisation.

- **Neighbourhood status:** A quarter of respondents living in a city area that was classified as 'poor' by interviewers had been the victim of a crime (26%), which was a much lower rate than those in mixed (40%) or areas of 'normal' status (33%). This result would seem to contradict the earlier finding, in relation to respondents' socio-demographic characteristics, which showed that the unemployed and those on a low income were more vulnerable to victimisation. However, given that neighbourhood 'status' was based on an interviewer's assessment of neighbourhoods relative to others, it could be suggested that respondents' self-reported income and employment status are a more accurate way of recording the relationship between socio-economic status and victimisation rates.

- **Language proficiency:** This variable had only very minor effects on crime victimisation.

- **Citizenship:** Sub-Saharan African respondents who had the citizenship of their country of residence were more frequently victims of crime during the year prior to the survey (36%) than those with the citizenship of a different country (31%). This result reinforces the point that the victimisation of minorities should not be side-lined as the problems of third country nationals residing in the EU, but should be recognised as a problem impacting on both EU and non-EU citizens.

3.1.6 Corruption

In addition to questions in relation to the five crime types tested, the survey asked a separate specific question about corruption experiences. The results showed that **corruption**³⁸ was virtually nonexistent in all the countries investigated.

³⁸ Questions E1-2: During [REFERENCE PERIOD] did any government official in [COUNTRY], for instance a customs officer, a police officer, a judge or an inspector, ask you or expect you to pay a bribe for his or her services?

In the past five years 0-1% of the respondents in the various Sub-Saharan African groups had been asked or expected to pay a bribe to a public official for his or her services. Six out of the ten cases that took place in the past 12 months among respondents from the eight Sub-Saharan groups were perceived to have taken place because of the respondent's immigrant or ethnic background. The officials mentioned in connection to incidents in the past 12 months were: immigration, customs or border control personnel; police officers; judges, magistrates or prosecutors; other unspecified public officials. None of the incidents of corruption were reported anywhere.

3.1.7. Police and border control


The survey's results indicate that the police are generally trusted by many of the Sub-Saharan African respondents in the survey. In all Nordic Member States (DK, FI, SE), 64% of the Somali respondents stated that they trusted the police. A little fewer than three out of five respondents displayed the same confidence with police authorities in Malta (58%), Portugal (57%) and Ireland (55%). It was only in France and the Netherlands where more Sub-Saharan African respondents indicated that they did *not* trust the police (42% and 41%, respectively) than those who answered that they did trust the police (FR: 30%, NL: 40%; with the remainder of respondents indicating that they neither trusted nor distrusted the police).

Policing stops – including perceptions of profiling

Against generally favourable levels of trust in the police, an extremely high proportion of Sub-Saharan African respondents were stopped for questioning during the last 12 months in Ireland (59%), and police stops were the second most frequent in France (37%) (see Figure 3.1.9). This contrasts with a single digit rate of police stops in Malta (8%) and Portugal (9%). About two in ten Sub-Saharan African respondents were stopped by the police in the year preceding the survey in Sweden (19%) and Denmark (21%), one in four in Finland (26%), and a third in the Netherlands (34%).

Apart from being directly stopped by the police, many Sub-Saharan African respondents in Finland (44%) and Denmark (41%) indicated that, in addition,

Figure 3.1.9
Police contact (F3, F9)
In the past 12 months, %



Question F3: Thinking about the last time you were stopped in this country, when was this? Was it in the last 12 months or before then? F9: Apart from the police stopping you, which I've already asked you about, have you had any contact with the police in this country in the last 12 months? By this I mean you could have reported something to them yourself, or you may have had to register something with them, etc.

they had had some other contact with the police in the past 12 months preceding the interview (e.g. to arrange documentation, to register with them for something etc.) (Figure 3.1.9).

The majority of police stops of Sub-Saharan African respondents in Ireland (93%), Sweden (89%), Finland (75%), the Netherlands (63%), Denmark (65%) and Portugal (60%) occurred when respondents were driving cars or were riding motorbikes (e.g. in motorised transport).³⁹ In Malta and in France, most police stops occurred in the streets - 60% and 48%, respectively.

When asked about the nature of police actions when stopped,⁴⁰ 97% of Sub-Saharan African respondents in Portugal, 94% in France, and 83% of Africans in Malta cited identification and passport checks as the primary occurrence. Questioning by police in the same Member States (all of which


³⁹ Question F6: Thinking about THE LAST TIME you were stopped by the police in this country, were you in a car, on a motorbike or bicycle, on public transport or just on the street?

⁴⁰ Question F7: Thinking about the last time you were stopped, what did the police actually do? 01 – Ask you questions, 02 – Ask for identity papers – ID card passport/residence permit, 03 – Ask for driving licence or vehicle documents, 04 – Search you or your car/vehicle, 05 – Give some advice or warn you about your behaviour (including your driving or vehicle), 06 – Did an alcohol or drug test, 07 – Fine you, 08 – Arrest you/take you to a police station, 09 – Take money or something from you in the form of a bribe, 10 – Other.

Figure 3.1.10

Perception of profiling at police stops (F5)

Those stopped in the past 12 months, %



Question F5: Do you think that [the last time you were stopped/any time you were stopped] IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS was because of your immigrant/minority background? MONTHS happened partly or completely because of your immigrant/minority background?

have marine borders facing the African continent) received responses as high as 87% in Portugal, 61% in France and 60% in Malta; while this practice was also common in Sweden, where 65% of Somali respondents who were stopped mentioned being questioned. In comparison, in Ireland only 26% of Sub-Saharan African respondents were questioned.


Given that 47% per cent of Sub-Saharan African respondents were, on average, citizens of the Member States in which they were living, requests to see passports and identification, together with the use of questioning by the police, can serve to alienate those people who are the subject of such police action.

Car or personal searches were by far most likely to occur in France, attested to by 45% of Sub-Saharan African respondents living there. Many of the police stops, however, seemed to relate to traffic controls, as evidenced by the checking of vehicle papers and driving licenses; as 77% of Sub-Saharan African respondents in Sweden, 76% in Ireland, 59% in Denmark, 57% in Portugal and 52% in Finland confirmed in their responses. A high proportion of

Figure 3.1.11

Evaluation of police conduct during stops (F8)

Last stop, in the past 12 months, %



Question F8: Again, thinking about the last time you were stopped, how respectful were the police when dealing with you?

police stops in Sweden (52%) and Finland (43%) also included drug and alcohol tests. Police stops that culminated in a fine or arrest (e.g. escorting the person to the police station) were highest in the Netherlands (40%, combined, of which 33% were fines). It is noteworthy that none of the Sub-Saharan respondents stopped by the police in Portugal were fined, but 4% were taken to the police station.


The above findings could simply reflect the nature of policing in Member States, but they need to be read alongside **respondents' perceptions that the police stopped them because of their immigrant or ethnic minority background** – that is, because of discriminatory police profiling. Figure 3.1.10 shows that in several Member States many of those stopped tended to believe that the police stopped them (in relation to the last time they were stopped) because of their ethnic background. Perceptions of being stopped by the police because of ethnicity were prevalent in Malta and France (both 53%), Finland (42%), Portugal (40%) and Denmark (37%). Perceived profiling was less frequent in Ireland (8%), the Netherlands (23%) and Sweden (28%).

In addition to being asked whether they thought they were stopped by the police because of their ethnicity, respondents were also asked to evaluate the police's conduct in relation to their last experience of a police stop – that is, whether the police were respectful or disrespectful (see Figure 3.1.11). Sub-Saharan African minorities, with the exception of those in France, had generally favourable evaluations of police conduct during the (last) stop. About two thirds of respondents stopped by the police in Finland, Sweden, Ireland, Malta and the Netherlands (64-66%) regarded police behaviour as very or fairly respectful, while 55% of Somali respondents in Denmark and 48% of Sub-Saharans in Portugal indicated the same. However, only 27% of Sub-Saharan subjects of police stops in France thought the police treated them respectfully, while 36% thought the police treated them disrespectfully (with the remainder indicating that their treatment was neither respectful nor disrespectful). 35% in Portugal, and 27% both in Denmark and Finland, also claimed that police officers were disrespectful towards them during these encounters.

These results point to the fact that the perception of police profiling during stops, together with the 'quality of the stop' – whether people were treated respectfully or disrespectfully – are crucial elements in determining minorities' sense of discriminatory treatment in their encounters with the police. Where people feel they are treated differently because of their ethnicity or immigrant background, and where they feel they are treated with disrespect, the repercussions of this are likely to be negative with regard to police-community relations.

Evaluation of police conduct in other contacts

As shown in Figure 3.1.12, respondents' evaluation of police conduct in different circumstances other than being stopped showed a somewhat more positive picture: with those evaluating the police's conduct as fairly or very respectful ranging between 57% (MT) and 79% (SE). The rate of those who felt that the police were disrespectful in such encounters was the highest in Malta (18%).



Question F10: Thinking about the last time you had contact with the police in this country – that DID NOT involve them stopping you – how respectful were they to you?

Border control

The survey asked respondents a couple of 'screening questions' about whether, in the last 12 months, they had returned to their country of residence from travel abroad when immigration/border/customs personnel were present, and if they had been stopped by them. These results in themselves cannot present a picture of potential discriminatory treatment as they are dependent on factors such as where respondents were travelling back from, the existence or not of Schengen border controls, and whether respondents had an EU passport. However, having determined that respondents had returned to their country of residence and had been stopped by immigration/border/customs personnel, they were asked a follow-up question about whether they considered they were *singled out for stopping on the basis of their immigrant/ethnic background when re-entering their country of residence*⁴¹ – which was used as a rough indicator of potential profiling during these encounters.

41 Question G1: During the last 12 months, have you ever entered [COUNTRY] from a visit abroad when either immigration, customs or border control were present?
 ASK IF RESPONSE TO G1 = Yes – G2. During the last 12 months, were you ever stopped by [COUNTRY NATIONALITY] immigration, customs or border control when coming back into the country?
 ASK IF RESPONSE TO G2 = Yes – G3. Do you think you were singled out for stopping by [COUNTRY NATIONALITY] immigration, customs or border control specifically because of your immigrant/minority background?

Members of some Sub-Saharan African communities seem to travel abroad fairly frequently; respondents in Ireland: (47%), the Netherlands (45%), France (39%), Denmark (36%) and Sweden (36%) did so over the 12 months preceding the interview. The situation is quite different for some other communities; e.g. only 7% of those interviewed in Malta and 8% in Portugal indicated that they had entered their EU country of residence in the last 12 months when either immigration, customs or border control were present; though the low percentage in the case of Malta is explicable given that interviewees were living in semi-open detention centres.

Of those returning to their EU country of residence, about 76% of Sub-Saharan African respondents in Ireland, 63% of Sub-Saharan respondents in France, 46% in Finland, and more than 30% in Portugal, Malta, Sweden and Denmark were stopped by immigration, customs or border control personnel. When 66% of Somali travellers to Finland – who were stopped by border control – thought they were singled out because of their ethnicity by immigration and customs officials, which was the highest rate for Sub-Saharan Africans. Approximately half of the respondents who were stopped in Malta (54%), Sweden (48%) and Denmark (46%) also felt they were singled out at the border because of their immigrant

or ethnic minority background. At the same time none of those who were stopped at the border when re-entering Ireland had the same feeling that they were singled out because of their immigrant/ethnic minority background.

3.1.8. Police stops by respondent characteristics

SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE

Table 3.1.7 outlines experiences of police stops by socio-demographic profile.

- **Gender:** Sub-Saharan African men reported being stopped much more frequently by the police than women during the 12 months prior to the survey (33% men vs. 19% women). Men were also four times more likely than women to assume that the reason why the police had stopped them was due to their ethnic origin: 13% of all male Sub-Saharan African respondents felt they were singled out on the basis of their background, whereas only 3% of women thought so.

Table 3.1.7 – Police stops (F2, F3 and F5)

General group: Sub-Saharan African

Socio-demographic profile By socio-demographic profile, %

		Not stopped	Stopped in past 2-5 years	Stopped in past 12 months, no profiling	Stopped in past 12 months, with profiling
Respondent gender (BG0)	Male	54	13	20	13
	Female	74	8	16	3
Age group (BG1)	16-24 years	63	9	15	13
	25-39 years	63	11	18	8
	40-54 years	61	13	20	6
	55 years or more	76	7	6	11
Household income (quartiles) (BG6)	In the lowest quartile	67	10	16	7
	Between the lowest quartile and the median	53	13	24	9
	Above the median	55	13	21	11
Employment status (BG5)	Employed/self-employed	56	12	22	10
	Homemaker/unpaid work	73	8	16	3
	Unemployed	71	9	12	8
	Non-active	68	9	15	8
Education status (years) (BG7)	5 years or less	85	4	6	5
	6-9 years	72	8	11	9
	10-13 years	61	12	18	9
	14 years or more	47	15	28	10

• **Age group:** A similar proportion of Sub-Saharan African respondents between 16 and 54 years of age said that they had been stopped by the police during the past 12 months (ranging from 28% of the 16-24 year-olds to 26% of the 25-54 year-olds). It was the oldest age groups that stood out in that respect: indeed, only less than one in six (17%) of the Sub-Saharan African respondents aged 55 years or more reported being stopped by the police in the past 12 months.

The 16-24 year-olds were the most likely to say that the police had stopped them in the last 12 months due to their immigrant or ethnic minority background: one in seven (13%) said they had been stopped during that period of time due to profiling, whereas in the other age groups, approximately one in ten or less thought that way.

• **Income status:** Only a quarter of Sub-Saharan African respondents with an income in the lowest quartile said they were stopped by the police in the 12 months that preceded the interview (23%), while this proportion was one third among respondents with a higher income. There were no marked differences on the basis of income between respondents' perceptions that their last experience of a police stop was due to profiling.

• **Employment status:** During a 12-month period, full-time workers (30%), as well as part-time workers and the self-employed (32%), were more frequently stopped by the police than Sub-Saharan African respondents who were homemakers or in unpaid work. This might be explained – in part – as due to the different daily mobility patterns of these groups: that is, the respondents that were the least often stopped – e.g. homemakers and people in unpaid work (19%) – were perhaps those whose daily movements were more restricted. A more likely explanation is probably related to gender, as homemakers and those in unpaid work are predominantly women, and women were far less likely to be stopped than men. The employed, which consist largely of men, were also more likely to consider their treatment by the police to be discriminatory, e.g. that they profiled them on a racial basis.

• **Education:** Highly-educated Sub-Saharan African respondents were far more likely to have been stopped by the police during the past five years than the less-educated: 38% of those who went to school for at least 14 years said they were stopped by the police in the past 12 months, whereas only 11% of those whose formal education lasted 5 years or less had been stopped. However, as a proportion of those

Table 3.1.8 – Police stops (F2, F3 and F5)

General group: Sub-Saharan African

By respondent status and neighbourhood, %

		Not stopped	Stopped in past 2-5 years	Stopped in past 12 months, no profiling	Stopped in past 12 months, with profiling
Length of stay in COUNTRY (BG8a)	1-4 years	82	3	10	6
	5-9 years	58	9	27	6
	10-19 years	61	14	15	9
	20+ years	57	14	18	12
	Born in COUNTRY	47	13	26	14
Neighbourhood status relative to other areas of the city (PI01)	Poorer	64	13	15	8
	As other areas	56	11	24	9
	Mixed	59	12	19	10
Language proficiency in the national language (PI04)	Fluent, without foreign sounding accent	57	13	19	12
	Fluent, with foreign sounding accent	57	12	24	8
	Less than fluent	81	6	7	6
Citizenship in COUNTRY (BG9)	Citizen	56	15	20	10
	Not a citizen	69	7	17	7

stopped, the least educated were more likely to perceive the stop to be the result of police profiling.

RESPONDENT STATUS

Looking at 'respondent-status' variables – such as citizenship status and length of stay in the country – and their relationship to experiences of policing, the following can be noted (see Table 3.1.8):

- **Length of stay in country:** Sub-Saharan African respondents born in the country where they were interviewed were most likely to indicate that the police stopped them (40% confirmed this had taken place in the 12 months that preceded the interview, and more than half of them were checked in the past five years). Both the five-year rate and the 12-month rate for prevalence of police stops was lowest (16%) among those who arrived in the country in the last 1-4 years.
- **Neighbourhood:** The results show that the police stop respondents living in neighbourhoods that are much like other areas (that is, neither poor nor above average in income) more often than they stop those living in neighbourhoods that were identified as 'poor' by interviewers. What this perhaps indicates is that the likelihood of being stopped has less to do with the neighbourhood where respondents live, and more to do with other factors such as their gender and whether they are frequently moving through different areas, and, depending also on the type of transport they use, are therefore more exposed to the risk of being stopped.

- **Language proficiency:** Sub-Saharan African respondents with lower language proficiency were the ones least often stopped by the police – only 13% reported such an incident from the past 12 months (adding together those stopped without profiling and those stopped with perceived profiling). At the same time approximately three in 10 of those who either spoke the language fluently (31%) or fluently with a foreign accent (32%) were stopped in the last 12 months.

Respondents who were stopped during the year prior to the survey and who spoke the language fluently with an accent were less likely to say that this was due to discriminatory behaviour by the police (8%) than those who spoke the language fluently without an accent (12%). Those less than fluent, however the nominal results are the lowest, were relatively most likely to assume profiling (6%).

- **Citizenship** did not have a major effect on the likelihood of police stops. Sub-Saharan African respondents with national citizenship were the most likely to have been stopped during the past 12 months (30%), which is slightly more compared to non-nationals (24%).

3.1.9. Respondent background

Origins

EU-MIDIS surveyed Sub-Saharan African people in seven EU Member States (Denmark, Sweden, Finland, Ireland, Malta, the Netherlands, Portugal and France). 35% of the Surinamese in the Netherlands and 25% of Sub-Saharan Africans in France were (at least) second generation (e.g. born in the country where interviewed), while all other groups consisted almost exclusively of immigrants. Some of these communities are well established over time: 45% of the Surinamese, 40% of Sub-Saharan respondents in France and 26% in Portugal have been living in the country for at least 20 years. In contrast, 92% of the Africans interviewed in Malta arrived less than 5 years ago, and this rate was rather high in Ireland as well (26%). About three in five have citizenship in their respective countries of residence in France (68%) and Sweden (71%), and this is true as well for about three in ten or more in Denmark (54%), Portugal (31%) and Finland (46%). Essentially, without exceptions, all Surinamese were national citizens (98%) in the Netherlands. On the other hand barely any Africans in Ireland (7%) and Malta (3%) have Irish or Maltese citizenship.

Socio-demographic details

With regard to age, the Maltese community is the youngest with 90% of respondents under 40 years old (almost exclusively males – 95%). About a third of Somali respondents in Finland and Surinamese in the Netherlands were 16-24 years old (33% and 31% respectively), and also 27% of Somali respondents in Denmark belonged to this age group. Africans in Malta are the least educated, with 69% of them having completed only up to 9 years of study, followed by Sub-Saharan African respondents in Portugal (57%) and the Somali in Finland (45%). Sub-Saharan Africans in Ireland had the longest years in education, with 67% having completed 14 years of study or more, followed by Surinamese (52%) and Sub-Saharan respondents in France (48%).

68% of those in Portugal, 60% in Ireland, 59% in Sweden and 58% in the Netherlands were in employment. Somewhat fewer than half of respondents in Denmark, Malta and Finland were employed (full-time or part time, or self-employed). Unemployment was extremely high in Malta (54%). However, the particular circumstances of Maltese respondents, who were mainly living in semi-open detention centres, means that, in comparison with other Sub-Saharan interviewees, very few could describe themselves as, for example, 'taking care of the home'. Relatively high rates of unemployment were also recorded in Finland and Sweden (19% each), while the proportion of the non-active population (students, retired persons, other) reached a high of 35% among Somalis in Denmark, followed by 28% of the Surinamese in the Netherlands and a quarter of Sub-Saharan Africans in France and Portugal. 14-16% of respondents in France, Ireland and Finland classified themselves as homemakers.

Cultural background

The first language of Somalis in Denmark, Finland and Sweden, and for one in three respondents in Malta, was Somali. 56% of the respondents in Portugal said that their first language was Portuguese, and one in five respondents in France said that their first language was French. 16% of African respondents in Malta said that their first language was Arabic and the same proportion of respondents mentioned Tigrinya (Ethiopian language) as their first language. Based on the observations of interviewers, almost all respondents in France, Ireland, the Netherlands and Portugal spoke the national language fluently, and the same was true for about two in three respondents in the other countries as well – except for those living in Malta, where only 36% were able to speak the national language fluently.

With regard to religion, Sub-Saharan African respondents living in Ireland (87%), Portugal (73%) and Surinamese in the Netherlands (48%) were predominantly Christians.

All other groups were predominantly Muslim (DK: 99%, FR: 75%, MT: 70%, FI: 99%, SE: 98%). Irrespective of faith, in each group four in five respondents or more confirmed that religion was fairly or very important to them.

Half of the Somalis in Denmark (51%) and 60% in Finland wear traditional/religious clothing, as do about one third of the Sub-Saharan Africans living in Ireland. Only 18% of Swedish Somali respondents and the same proportion of Sub-Saharans in Portugal indicated that they wore traditional or religious clothing, while 26% in France did so. The proportion of women to men wearing traditional or religious clothing was particularly high in Denmark, where 96% of the respondents who said that they wear traditional or religious clothing when out in public were women, and in Sweden (85% women).

Segregation

Based on the accounts of interviewers, 72% of the Somali in Sweden, 44% of the Sub-Saharan respondents in France and 39% of the Surinamese interviewed in the Netherlands lived in a predominantly immigrant neighbourhood. These were usually considered 'poor' according to interviewers' perceptions of areas relative to other areas in the city where interviews were conducted (SE: 69% and FR: 39%, while only 18% in the Netherlands were rated as living in a specifically poor area). The remainder of interviewees lived in neighbourhoods that were described by interviewers as not particularly poor compared to other areas of the city, or in mixed areas (highest: 97% in Ireland, 85% in Finland and 82% in Denmark).

3.2. Central and East Europeans

Who was surveyed?

Migrants from the former Socialist countries of Central and East Europe (from here on referred to as ‘CEE respondents’ or ‘CEE migrants’) have been penetrating the Western European labour markets in ever increasing numbers, and particularly since the accession of new Member States to the EU in 2004 and 2007.

Persons belonging to the CEE group were typically interviewed in capital cities or in other major urban centres. Obviously, this aggregate group is not ethnically homogenous, but it does feature some similar social and demographic characteristics (see section 3.2.9 on respondent background). **The results for this group are best explored by comparing findings between the Polish respondents that were interviewed in Ireland and the UK, the Romanian respondents that were interviewed in Italy and Spain, and the Albanian interviewees in Greece and Italy.**

Note: The majority of CEE migrants (on average, 57%) have been in their host countries for 1-4 years only; therefore, the rates for the past 5 years are usually not discussed within the text due to the low proportion of respondents having spent 5 years in the countries where they were interviewed.


SAMPLE

Member States:
 Greece (Albanian) (N=503)
 Ireland (Polish) (N=609)
 Italy (Albanian N=500), (Romanian N=502)
 Spain (Romanian) (N=508)
 The UK (Polish) (N=1042)


Sampling method:
 Random route sampling with FE in high-density urban areas (EL, IT, ES);
 Interviewer-generated sampling (IE, UK)

Please note:
 In the UK and Ireland the groups that were interviewed included mainly migrants from Poland: 82% of respondents in the UK and 98% of respondents in Ireland were Polish. For the purpose of this report, we will refer to the groups of CEE migrants in the UK and Ireland most often as “Polish in the UK” and “Polish in Ireland”.

Figure 3.2.1



Police stops (F2, F3, F5, %)



Note: * based on CA2-CI2 / DA2-DE2
 ** based on CA4-CI4 / DD11, DE10

EU-MIDIS 2008

Albanian (Ab), Romanian (Ro), Central and East Europe (CEE)

Questions: CA2-CI2 / DA2-DE2. Thinking about the last time this happened, when was this: in the last twelve months or before then? CA4-CI4: Did you or anyone else report this incident anywhere? DD11, DE10: Did you or anyone else report the incident to the police? F2: In this country, within the last five years, have you EVER been stopped by the police when you were in a car, on a motorbike or bicycle, on public transport or just on the street? F3: Thinking about the last time you were stopped in this country, when was this? Was it in the last 12 months or before then? F5: Do you think that [the last time you were stopped/any time you were stopped] IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS was because of your immigrant/minority background?

Some key findings on respondents' experiences of discrimination, victimisation and police stops

Figure 3.2.1 summarises some key results from the survey:

The communities that form the CEE group are affected quite differently by **discrimination and victimisation**.

Except for those in the UK, a quarter or more of Central and East European migrants experienced **discrimination on the grounds of their immigrant or ethnic background** at least once in the past 12 months (considering the nine domains tested). Albanians and Romanians in Italy encountered the most discrimination (37% and 29% respectively). In contrast, one out of ten Polish respondents in the UK could recall a specific incident from the past 12 months that they considered discriminatory on the basis of their immigrant background (11%). In the CEE group as a whole, 11% confirmed that they avoid certain places (e.g. shops or cafés) where they believed they would receive bad treatment due to their immigrant background.

Reporting discrimination is the exception rather than the norm: in each country, at most one fifth of respondents who were discriminated against, in the nine domains investigated, reported it at the place where it occurred or to a competent body. Acts of discrimination suffered by Romanians residing in Spain were the most likely to remain unreported (the reporting rate was only 5%). Although Albanians in Italy experienced the most discrimination of all CEE groups surveyed, they were very unlikely to report incidents of discrimination (9% did so). The CEE migrants, mainly Polish, in Ireland and the UK were the most likely to report incidents of discrimination (the rates were 21% and 17%, respectively).

In the past 12 months Polish respondents living in the UK experienced the lowest level of ethnic discrimination, but they were also the most likely to become victims of crime in the past twelve months (the rate of **victimisation** was 30%). Almost as many of the 'same' group (predominantly Polish) interviewed in Ireland confirmed that they were crime victims (28%), while between one fifth and one quarter of Central and East European migrants interviewed in Greece (24%) and Italy (22%) indicated that at least one of the five crimes tested in EU-MIDIS was committed against them. Romanians in Spain recorded the lowest level of victimisation (14%) among Central and East European migrants. On average for all CEE groups surveyed,

8% considered that they were victims of racially motivated crime in the last 12 months (in relation to all crimes asked about). With respect to in-person crimes of assault or threat, and serious harassment, victims indicated that they considered that **racist motivation** was involved in, respectively, 46% and 64% of incidents.

Overall, crime incidents are more likely to be officially reported than discrimination; however, non-reporting remains very high: on average, only 13% of crimes against Albanians residing in Greece and against Polish in Ireland were brought to the attention of the police. The highest rate of reporting was found in crime cases that involved migrants from Poland/CEE countries living in the UK (25%), as well as among the Romanian and Albanian respondents in major Italian cities (23% and 22%, respectively). The crime reporting rate was modest in the case of Romanians living in Spain (17%).

On average, almost one in five of those interviewed (17%) in the general aggregate CEE group – considering all relevant countries – informed EU-MIDIS that they tended to avoid certain locations in their area for fear of being harassed, threatened or attacked.

Considering the past 12 months, the Albanian community in Greece was the most **heavily policed** among the six groups surveyed, while the Polish living in the UK were the least controlled.

Police profiling was perceived mainly by Albanians in Greece and Italy: 17% and 15%, respectively, were stopped by the police in the last 12 months in such a manner that they believed they were singled out on the grounds of their ethnicity or immigrant background. A similar opinion was given by 11% of those belonging to the Romanian community in Italy.

The Romanian community in Spain and the Polish community living in the UK were less likely to face what they considered to be police profiling (5% in both communities), and were also the communities that faced the fewest police stops. Although in Ireland the proportion of immigrants from CEE countries stopped by the police in the past 12 months was among the highest (29%), only three percent of those stopped felt that they were singled out on the basis of their specific ethnic or immigrant background.

3.2.1. General opinions on discrimination, and rights awareness

Respondents' opinions about the extent of discrimination on different grounds in their country of residence: including grounds in addition to ethnic or immigrant origin

Before being asked about their personal experiences of discrimination, Central and East European interviewees were asked to assess how widespread

they thought discrimination in their host country was based on six different grounds: ethnic or immigrant origin, gender, sexual orientation, age, religion or belief, and disability (see Figure 3.2.2).

In all communities belonging to the CEE group, the primary source of discrimination was identified as 'ethnic/immigrant origin'. Three quarters of Romanians and Albanians in Italy considered that unfair treatment based on ethnicity or immigrant status was very or fairly widespread (77% and 76%, respectively),





Figure 3.2.2 (Continued)

Is discrimination widespread? (A1, %)



Question A1: For each of the following types of discrimination, could you please tell me whether, in your opinion, it is very widespread, fairly widespread, fairly rare, or very rare in [COUNTRY]? Discrimination on the basis of ...?

and half of the Albanians in Greece held a similar opinion (50%). Lower proportions of respondents who felt that discrimination based on ethnicity/immigrant origin was widespread were recorded for Central and East European migrants in Spain (43%), the UK (35%), and Ireland (25%).

Discrimination based on sexual orientation was considered to be the second most widespread form of discrimination by approximately two fifths of Albanians in Greece and Italy, and amongst Romanians in Italy (with proportions between 41-45%).

Disability was considered the least widespread ground for discrimination in five of the six groups surveyed; with the exception being Albanians in Italy who ranked it as the second least important ground.


It is noteworthy that about seven out of 10 respondents in Ireland claimed that, in their opinion, discrimination on the basis of anything but ethnicity was non-existent in the country (71% to 79% depending on the type).

Opinions on workplace advancement according to ethnicity or religion

Figure 3.2.3 shows that among all interviewee groups

of Central and East European migrants, with the exception of the Romanian community in Spain, the dominant opinion was that a non-majority ethnic background is a **barrier to workplace advancement** (e.g. admittance, training opportunities and promotions). The ratios of those who considered a minority background a burden in the labour market went as high as 73% in the case of Albanians in Greece and 70% in the case of Polish in the UK, and as low as 36% in the case of Romanians in Spain. Strikingly, 50% of Romanian respondents in Spain believed that a non-majority ethnic background offered equal opportunities for workplace advancement.

Almost six out of 10 Romanians in Italian major cities perceived that a **non-majority religion** was a barrier to success in the labour market in their host country (59%) (whereas Italy is a Catholic country, the vast majority of Romanians in Italy are Christian-Orthodox). The same opinion is second and third most widespread among the communities of Albanians in Greece and Italy (46% and 44%, respectively) (a significant proportion of Albanians are Muslims). Only 8% of the Polish in Ireland consider that having a different religious background plays a factor in workplace advancement, whereas 38% of Polish in the UK consider that it does. These very different



Question A4: Would you say that, with equivalent qualifications or diplomas, the following people would be less likely, as likely, or more likely than others to get a job, be accepted for training or be promoted in [COUNTRY]? A. A person of different ethnic origin than the rest of the population, B. A person who practices a different religion than that of the rest of the country?^a

results for the two Polish ‘communities’ surveyed are perhaps explicable by the fact that both Poland and Ireland are Catholic countries whereas the UK’s official religion is Anglican – or protestant.

Willingness to provide information on ethnicity or religion for a census

Effective actions to combat discrimination need solid population data on potential targets of discrimination. Given the lack of comprehensive and up-to-date population data in a number of countries,

the number of CEE migrants in different EU Member States is debatable. Although the majority of Central and East European migrants from the six communities analysed in this report were in favour of providing, on an anonymous basis, **information about their ethnic origin**⁴² as well as their **religion**⁴³ or belief **for a census**, approximately three out of 10 were reluctant to give out this information (29% in the case of ethnic origin and 32% in the case of religion). While the Polish in Ireland were the most willing to reveal their ethnicity and religion (96% in both cases), the Polish in the UK were the least likely to be in favour of doing so (42% said “yes” with respect to providing information about their ethnicity for a census and 36% said “yes” with regard to their religion). A pattern similar to that in the UK was seen for the Romanian respondents in Spain, where the dominant opinion was opposition to giving out information about their ethnicity (47% said “no” and 45% said “yes”) or their religion (48% said “no” and 44% said “yes”) for a census.

Whether the very different responses for the UK and Ireland can be attributed to Ireland’s status as a Catholic country – hence respondents might feel more willing to give information about their religion – is debatable. These differences in responses between the similarly ‘matched’ groups that were surveyed in Member States, for example between Polish respondents in Ireland and the UK, demands further investigation to identify explanations for these apparent differences.

Awareness of anti-discrimination bodies

Among CEE respondents, awareness levels about organisations in host countries that can offer support or advice to people who have been discriminated against, for whatever reason, were relatively low.⁴⁴ The least informed were Albanians in Greece and Romanians in Italy (8% and 9%, respectively, were able to think of an organisation), while the most informed were the Polish in Ireland (33%). 11% of Romanians in Spain, 14% of Polish in the UK, and 17% of Albanians in Italy stated they knew of an organisation that they believed could be called upon for help if they encountered discrimination on any grounds.

Besides clarifying spontaneous awareness of any organisation that victims of discrimination can turn

42 Question A5a: Would you be in favour of or opposed to providing, on an anonymous basis, information about your ethnic origin, as part of a census, if that could help to combat discrimination in [COUNTRY]?

43 Question A5b: And how about providing, on an anonymous basis, information about your religion or belief?

44 Question A3: Do you know of any organisation in [COUNTRY] that can offer support or advice to people who have been discriminated against – for whatever reason?

to, the survey asked respondents to indicate whether they had heard of **specific anti-discrimination bodies/authorities** in their host country that were named by interviewers;⁴⁵ the intention being to remind people of organisations which they might not necessarily identify in an open-ended question. When prompted by being given the name of organisations, one third of Albanians in Greece could recall both the “Greek Ombudsman” and the “Work Inspectorate” (34-35%), and 10% knew of the “Equal Treatment Committee”. In contrast, only one out of 10 Romanians and Albanians in Italy, as well as Polish in Ireland, had heard of an Equality Body. The “Office against racial discrimination” was familiar to 11-12% of both CEE groups in Italy; and similarly 12% of Polish respondents in Ireland had heard of the “Equality Tribunal” and 10% of the “Equality Authority”. Two fifths of the Polish in the UK had heard of the “Commission for Equality and Human Rights” (40%), and three out of 10 Romanians in Spain had heard of the “Ombudsman” (29%).

Awareness of anti-discrimination laws

National anti-discrimination laws are relatively unknown, with the majority of CEE respondents of the belief that laws prohibiting discrimination on the grounds of ethnicity or ‘race’ do not exist: on average, depending on the legislative area tested (employment, services and housing), between 46% and 57% of Central and East European migrants were unaware of anti-discrimination legislation in the area of ethnicity or ‘race’. On average, CEE respondents were most aware of laws that forbid discrimination on the basis of ethnicity in relation to the job market⁴⁶ (39%), and least aware of those in the field of commercial services⁴⁷ (26%). Looking at different responses between the six communities included in the CEE group, a pattern emerged: in each of the three anti-discrimination legislation areas tested, the Polish in Ireland, followed by those in the UK, were the most conscious of anti-discrimination

laws – between 52% and 66% in the case of Polish in Ireland and between 32% and 57% of those in the UK were aware of national anti-discrimination laws, depending on the area; in comparison, Romanians in Spain were the least informed about the existence of anti-discrimination legislation (between 7% and 9% were aware of these laws, depending on the area).

On average, two fifths of CEE respondents said they were familiar with the **EU Charter of Fundamental Rights**⁴⁸ (42%); but out of them only 13% indicated that they actually knew what the Charter is about, while another 29% stated that they had only heard about it.

While the Albanians in Italy, along with the Polish in Ireland, had the highest overall familiarity with the Charter (59% in both cases), Albanians living in Greece were the least aware of it (28%). The proportion of those who claimed to be informed about the content of the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights was as high as one fifth among Romanians interviewed in Spain (20%), and as low as 6% among Romanians in Italy. These differences in awareness of anti-discrimination legislation and the Charter of Fundamental Rights need to be explored further by Member State and according to apparent similarities and differences between ‘sub-groups’ (such as the Polish or Romanians) that make up CEE respondents as a whole.

3.2.2. Experience of discrimination

Respondents’ general experiences of discrimination on different grounds

Having measured their *opinion* on the extent of discrimination on different grounds in their country of residence (as outlined in the previous paragraphs), respondents were asked a follow-up question about their *general experiences of discrimination* in the last 12 months under the same cross-section of grounds (see explanatory footnote⁴⁹).

45 Questions B2A-C: Have you ever heard of the [NAME OF EQUALITY BODY1-3]? The following Equality Bodies were tested: Greece – “The Greek Ombudsman”, “Equal Treatment Committee” and “Work Inspectorate”; Italy – “Office against racial discrimination”; Spain: “Ombudsman”; Ireland – “Equality Authority” and “Equality Tribunal”; UK – “Commission for Equality and Human Rights”.

46 Question B1a: What do you think, is there a law in [COUNTRY] that forbids discrimination against immigrants and ethnic minority people... (a) when applying for a job?

47 Question B1b: What do you think, is there a law in [COUNTRY] that forbids discrimination against immigrants and ethnic minority people... (b) when entering or in a shop, restaurant or club?

48 Question B3: Are you familiar with the “Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union”? 1 – Yes and you know what it is, 2 – Yes, you have heard about it, but you are not sure what it is, 3 – No, you have never heard about it.

49 Before clarifying specific discrimination experiences for the nine types tested in the survey, EU-MIDIS asked a complementary question to clarify respondents’ general thoughts or impressions about their recent discrimination history. In order to do so on a comparative basis, EU-MIDIS used a question from a 2008 Eurobarometer survey (EB 296, 2008), which asked about personal memories of discrimination in multiple domains - Question A2, which asked ‘In the past 12 months have you personally felt discriminated against or harassed in [COUNTRY] on the basis of one or more of the following grounds? Please tell me all that apply. A – Ethnic or immigrant origin, B – Gender, C – Sexual orientation, D – Age, E – Religion or belief, F – Disability, X – For another reason’. Chapter 4 in this report presents a comparison of results between the majority and minority populations’ responses to this question from Eurobarometer and EU-MIDIS.


Note for reading figures presented in the report:

In a number of figures and tables in the report, the five-year rate is the sum of the percentage given for the past 12 months and that for the 2-5 year period. Similarly, where the 12-month rate is broken down into multiple categories (e.g. those stopped by the police in the 12 months prior to the interview as a result of profiling, and those stopped by the police in the 12 months prior to the interview *not* as a result of profiling) the percentages in each category should be added up for the actual 12-month prevalence rate. For some questions multiple responses were possible and therefore the reader is advised to look at the question wording as set out in the original questionnaire, which can be downloaded from the FRA's website.

The majority of respondents in each CEE group surveyed stated that in the past 12 months they did *not* feel discriminated against or harassed on a range of different grounds (between 55% and 83%) (see Figure 3.2.4). However, in line with their perception that discrimination on the ground of ethnicity or immigrant origin is widespread in their 'host' country (see previous paragraphs, Figure 3.2.2), Albanians and Romanians in Italy indicated that they had experienced some of the highest levels of discrimination on grounds including ethnicity (40% and 38%, respectively) of all groups surveyed. Polish respondents in Ireland also indicated high levels of having experienced discrimination on grounds including ethnicity in the past 12 months (28%).

These results indicate that those respondent groups who believe that discrimination on the basis of ethnic or immigrant origin is generally widespread in their 'host' country *also* tend to report higher levels of having experienced discrimination on these grounds in the last 12 months. In comparison with discrimination experienced in the last 12 months on the grounds of ethnicity, the ratio of those who felt they were discriminated against *solely* on grounds *not involving* their ethnicity was only between 1% and 6%.

Figure 3.2.4
General experiences of discrimination on different grounds (A2)
In the past 12 months, %



Question A2: In the past 12 months have you personally felt discriminated against or harassed in [COUNTRY] on the basis of one or more of the following grounds [ethnic or immigrant origin, gender, sexual orientation, age, religion or belief, disability, other reason]?


Respondents' experiences of discrimination across nine areas of everyday life on the grounds of ethnic or immigrant origin

Having been asked about their general experiences of discrimination – on different grounds such as gender, age and ethnicity – respondents were asked a series of questions about their experiences of discrimination solely on the basis of their *immigrant or ethnic minority background* across nine areas of everyday life.

Perceptions of having been discriminated against (as discussed in previous paragraphs) were generally confirmed by respondents' detailed memories of discrimination incidents, with an anticipated ethnic motivation, in the previous year. On average, taking into account all the nine domains surveyed in EU-MIDIS, one fifth of CEE respondents experienced discrimination on the basis of their ethnic or immigrant origin in the past 12 months⁵⁰ (23%). As shown in Figure 3.2.5, these experiences were most widespread among Albanians and Romanians in Italy (37% and 29%, respectively) (all areas combined). On

50 Key reference periods are 12 months (e.g. the 12 months that preceded the interview), or five years (preceding the interview). Please note that this section provides some illustrations, where the two reference periods are combined. In these charts and tables, the five-year rate is the sum of the percentage given for the past 12 months and that for the 2-5 year period. Similarly, where the 12-month rate is broken down into multiple categories (e.g. those stopped by the police in the 12 months prior to the interview as a result of anticipated profiling and those stopped by the police in the 12 months prior to the interview *not* as a result of anticipated profiling) the percentages in each category should be added up for the actual 12-month prevalence rate.

Figure 3.2.5
Personal discrimination experience based on ethnicity (CA1-CI1, CA2-CI2)
 Prevalence across 9 domains, %



Questions CA1-CI1: During the last 5 years, [or since you've been in the country if less than 5 years], have you ever been discriminated against when [DOMAIN] in [COUNTRY] because of your immigrant/minority background? CA2-CI2: Thinking about the last time this happened, when was this: in the last twelve months or before then?

the other hand, only one out of 10 Polish respondents in the UK recalled such experiences (11%).

Looking at the average for all six groups of Central and East European migrants, the survey found that the most serious discriminatory treatment over the past 12 months was encountered at work or when looking for work (13% and 11%, respectively), as well as in the area of housing (e.g. when looking for a house or apartment to rent or buy) (7%). Treatment in shops was the least discriminatory (on average, only 3% said they were discriminated against based on their ethnic origin during the past 12 months in shops); however, 11% of respondents said that they avoided certain places such as shops or cafés for fear of being treated badly, which might account for the low level of discriminatory treatment on the basis of ethnicity reported in this domain.

Analysis of the results for the individual communities surveyed highlights some interesting differences (see Figure 3.2.6). For example: **Albanians in Greece** reported relatively moderate discrimination rates with respect to the last 12 months, with 1 in 10 stating that they were discriminated against in a work-related situation (10% when *looking for work* and 10% *at work* – the second lowest ratio in this domain across the six communities), and 6% indicating discrimination when *looking for a house to rent or buy*, or in relation to *social services personnel*. In comparison, **Albanians in Italy** experienced much higher levels of discrimination on

the basis of their ethnicity/immigrant background in the last 12 months. This group was the most likely to recall a discriminatory experience when they were *looking for work* (25%), and also reported the highest discrimination rate of all CEE groups surveyed in the area of *housing* (1yr: 19%). Although discrimination in relation to a bank was not identified as a major problem by any of the groups, in Italy the two CEE groups that were surveyed recorded the highest rates of being discriminated against in this domain of all CEE groups surveyed (9% of Albanians and 8% of Romanians in Italy identified this domain as a problem).

As well as the Albanians in Italy, Romanians in the same country also experienced very high levels of discrimination. One-fifth of the **Romanians surveyed in Italy** had experienced discriminatory incidents in the labour market over the past 12 months (21% when *looking for work*, as well as 20% *at work*). Among the six CEE groups surveyed, Romanians in Italy felt discriminated against at their workplace most often in the past year. In the last 12 months, 15% of respondents from this specific group felt that they were treated unequally in relation to *housing*, 10% with respect to *healthcare personnel* and 8% by *social services*. Among all the Central and East European groups surveyed, Romanians in Italy reported the highest level of discrimination experienced from school personnel (12%). Also, comparing the six CEE groups, discrimination experiences in *shops* were mentioned the most by this specific community (9%).

Following the same pattern as other communities, **Romanians in Spain** mentioned the most discrimination experiences in the *job market* (1yr: 13% when looking for work and 14% at work). In comparison, in the other domains the rates of discriminatory treatment in the last 12 months equalled 2% or less when it came to *social service* or *school personnel*, as well as in *cafés*, and reached 5% in the case of *housing, healthcare* or *the bank sector*.

Considering the nine domains, in the past 12 months the **Polish in Ireland** reported their highest levels of discrimination in relation to being *at work* (1yr: 17%). However, among all Central and East European migrants the respondents from this specific community were the least likely to state that they encountered unfair treatment *when looking for work* during the past 12 months (3% only).

Figure 3.2.6


Specific discrimination experience based on ethnicity (CA1-CI1, CA2-CI2)

Reporting rate (CA4-CI4)

% who reported the most recent incident in the past 12 months

- In the past 12 months
- In the past 2-5 years
- Not discriminated against

- Not reported (incl. Don't know/ Refused)
- Reported



Questions CA1-CI1 / CA2-CI2 as with Figure 3.2.5. CA4-CI4: Did you or anyone else report this incident anywhere?

The overall situation for Polish respondents in the UK was the best of all CEE groups surveyed in EU-MIDIS; they reported generally low rates of discrimination experiences over the past 12 months (between 0% and 6% depending on the area). Only 1% at most of the CEE migrants in the UK recalled incidents of discrimination at a shop, in cafés or in a bank. However, when asked if they avoid certain shops or cafés because of fear of discrimination grounded in ethnicity, it was striking to note that Polish respondents in the UK answered “yes” at a rate of 20%, whereas in the other CEE communities only between 6% and 8% claimed that they tend to avoid places because they think they might be treated badly due to their ethnic background (Albanians in EL: 6%; Polish in Ireland: 7%; Romanians in ES and IT, and Albanians in IT: 8%). Therefore, these avoidance behaviours could explain low levels of reported discrimination among the CEE community in the UK.

Reporting discrimination

Most of the time, incidents of discrimination go unreported – either at the place where they occur or

to a competent complaints authority. On average, CEE respondents are most likely to report discrimination they encounter in the workplace or in schools (13% and 10%, respectively). Looking at results across all CEE groups, the discrimination experiences least reported by respondents are those relating to shops (2%), as well as those in the area of housing, healthcare and when entering a café (a reporting rate of 3% in each field). Looking at country differences, migrants in Ireland and the UK were more likely than others to report discrimination experiences (see Figure 3.2.6). However, it should be noted that in several instances the number of persons indicating that they reported discrimination in Ireland and the UK was very low given that the overall discrimination rates across the nine domains were very low in these countries in the first place. With this caveat in mind, almost a quarter of Polish respondents in Ireland (24%) and 18% of the ‘same’ migrant group in the UK reported their most recent experience of unfair treatment at work, while discrimination experiences when searching for work were reported by 8% of CEE migrants in the UK and in one in ten cases in Ireland.

Figure 3.2.7 (Continued)

Reasons for not reporting discrimination (CA5-C15)

Based on the last incident, in the past 12 months, in any of 9 domains, %





Figure 3.2.7 (Continued)
Reasons for not reporting discrimination (CA5-C15)
 Based on the last incident, in the past 12 months, in any of 9 domains, %



EU-MIDIS 2008

Questions CA5-C15: Why wasn't it [the most recent incident of discrimination] reported?

As shown in Figure 3.2.7, the main reason given by respondents for not reporting incidents of discrimination lies in the belief that “nothing would happen” as a result of reporting (over a third held this view – between 32% of CEE persons in Ireland and 68% in Greece).

Many Central and East European migrants considered discrimination incidents too trivial (e.g. 55% of the Romanians in Italy, 45% of the Polish in the UK) or as too time consuming (e.g. 36% of the Polish in the UK, 25% of the Romanians in Italy) to officially report them.

Another relatively important reason given for non-reporting is the procedural uncertainty about reporting; that is, discrimination **victims do not know where or how to report incidents**; around a third of the Polish in the UK (36%) and Albanians in Italy (30%) gave this reason.

While fear of intimidation is less likely to be a cause for not reporting an incident of discrimination (although 13% of Albanians in Italy and 11% of CEE respondents in the UK offered this as a response), more are concerned with the possible negative consequences of reporting a case of unfair treatment (one third of Albanians in Italy, and one quarter of Albanians in Greece (24%) and Romanians in Spain (23%)).

Those most likely to deal with discrimination problems themselves were the Albanians and Romanians in Italy (19% and 10%, respectively).

Reasons for non-reporting related to residence permit problems were relevant mainly for Albanians in Greece (9%) and in Italy (12%), and for 10% of Romanians in Spain. Less than one out of 10 Central and East European migrants claimed that a language barrier prevented them from making a report (e.g. 8% of the Polish in the UK – the highest among the CEE group).

3.2.3. Discrimination by respondent characteristics

SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE

The distribution of discrimination experiences for Central and East European respondents points to several categories that run a higher discrimination risk in the different socio-demographic groups, although many of the observed differences are not significant (see Table 3.2.1):

- **Gender:** Men report higher rates of discrimination (25%) than women (22%). However, the observed difference is not significant.
- **Age group:** Central and East Europeans that report the highest rates of discrimination are those in the youngest age group: 16-24 years (29%). Among the older age groups, experience of discrimination decreases.
- **Income status:** Discrimination experiences among groups with incomes in the lowest quartile (24%) are slightly higher than for groups with a larger household income.
- **Employment status:** The least discriminated against are those who are employed or self-

employed (21%) and homemakers (22%). Unemployed persons are discriminated against considerably more often (46%).

- **Education:** Only small differences are observed in the discrimination experiences of people with different levels of education.

RESPONDENT STATUS

A number of 'respondent status' variables were collected in the survey – such as citizenship and length of stay in the country – which can be tested with respect to their influence on discrimination rates. With respect to these 'status' variables, several substantial differences emerge between subgroups, as shown in Table 3.2.2:

- **Length of stay in the country:** Central and East European respondents who have stayed in the recipient country for more than 20 years or were born in the country report the lowest rates of discrimination (10-15%). Compared to this group, people who have arrived in the country more recently, especially within 5-9 years, report significantly higher discrimination rates (28%).
- **Citizenship:** Central and East European respondents who are citizens of the Member State where they were surveyed have been discriminated against less often (20%) than those who are not citizens (24%).

Table 3.2.1 – Discrimination rate (CA2-CI2, past 12 months)

General group: Central and East European

By socio-demographic profile, %

Respondent gender (BG0)	Male	25
	Female	22
Age group (BG1)	16-24 years	29
	25-39 years	23
	40-54 years	21
	55 years or more	18
Household income (quartiles) (BG6)	In the lowest quartile	24
	Between the lowest quartile and the median	20
	Above the median	21
Employment status (BG5)	Employed/self-employed	21
	Homemaker/unpaid work	22
	Unemployed	46
	Non-active	33
Education status (years) (BG7)	5 years or less	19
	6-9 years	24
	10-13 years	22
	14 years or more	24

Table 3.2.2 – Discrimination rate (CA2-CI2, past 12 months)

General group: Central and East European

By respondent status and neighbourhood, %

Length of stay in COUNTRY (BG8a)	1-4 years	21
	5-9 years	28
	10-19 years	24
	20+ years	10
Neighbourhood status relative to other areas of the city (PI01)	Born in COUNTRY	15
	Poorer	26
	As other areas	21
	Mixed	25
Language proficiency in the national language (PI04)	Fluent, without foreign sounding accent	28
	Fluent, with foreign sounding accent	26
	Less than fluent	18
Citizenship in COUNTRY (BG9)	Citizen	20
	Not a citizen	24

- **Neighbourhood status:** Those who live in areas with characteristics that are similar to other areas experience less discrimination. Central and East European immigrants who live in poorer neighbourhoods and areas with a mixed status (neither poor nor affluent) are discriminated against more often (26% and 25%, respectively).

- **Language proficiency:** The better a respondent’s knowledge of the national language, the higher the likelihood that he/she will experience discrimination (fluent without accent – 28%, less than fluent – 18%). An explanation for this could be that those who are fluent in the language of their country of residence are better able to detect discriminatory treatment as they can understand the nuances of the language.

3.2.4. Crime victimisation


After Sub-Saharan Africans, Roma and North Africans, those in the CEE group are among the most vulnerable to becoming a victim of crime. Considering the five crimes tested in the survey (theft of and from a vehicle, burglary, other theft, assault or threat, and serious harassment), on average a quarter of Central and East European respondents were victims of crime in the last 12 months (24%), and 8% were targeted by racially motivated crime over the past 12 months.

Analysing the victimisation rate in the past 12 months, Polish respondents in the UK and Ireland emerge as the most victimised (30% and 28%, respectively), while the lowest rate is among Romanians in Spain (14%) (see Figure 3.2.8).

As many as 13% of Albanians and 10% of Romanians in Italy stated that they were targeted by racially motivated crime over the past 12 months. In the other communities, lower proportions of victims thought that their ethnic/immigrant background played a role when victimised in the past 12 months (Polish in Ireland: 9%; Albanians in Greece: 8%; Romanians in Spain: 7%; Polish in the UK: 5%).

Considering the past 12 months, Central and East European migrants were most often victims of **theft of and from vehicles**⁵¹ (including all motorised and non-motorised transport): on average, 11% of CEE vehicle owners were victims of such incidents during the past 12 months. The second most likely crime victimisation type was **theft of personal belongings**

Figure 3.2.8
Personal victimisation experience (DA1-DE1, DA2-DE2, DA3-DC3, DD4, DE5)
Prevalence across 5 crime types, %



Questions DA1-DE1: During the last 5 years in [COUNTRY], has [TYPE] happened to you? [IF YES] DA2-DE2: Thinking about the last time this happened, when was this: in the last twelve months or before then? [IF YES] DA3-DC3, DD4, DE5: Do you think that [this incident/any of these incidents] IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS happened partly or completely because of your immigrant/minority background?

(such as a purse, wallet, jewellery, mobile phone, etc.) – overall, this crime affected 10% of the CEE group over the past 12 months. The third most widespread crime among CEE respondents was serious harassment (1yr: 8%). Looking at the proportion of crimes seen as ethnically/racially motivated: on average, more than two fifths of the in-person crimes (serious harassment and assault or threat) during the past 12 months were believed by respondents to be ethnically motivated (64% and 46%, respectively); whereas the same held true for less than one in 10 other crimes.

Property crimes

In all but two of the communities that form the CEE group, theft of and from **vehicles** (including all motorised and non-motorised transport) was a problem for around one out of 10 vehicle owners over the past 12 months (between 10% in the case of Romanians in Italy and 14% in the case of Polish respondents in the UK). The exceptions were Romanian vehicle owners in Spain and Albanian

51 Questions DA1-2: During the [REFERENCE PERIOD] in [COUNTRY], was any car, van, truck, motorbike, moped or bicycle – or some other form of transport belonging to you or your household – stolen, or had something stolen from it? [IF NEEDED, CLARIFY: All forms of motorised and non-motorised transport can be included].

vehicle owners in Italy who were the least likely to become victims of this type of crime (4% and 6%, respectively). None of the Romanian victims of vehicle-related crime in Italy indicated that they considered the crime to be racially motivated.⁵² In the other CEE communities, the perception of whether these crimes were thought to be motivated by 'racism' varies between 6% in the UK and 16% in Greece. In Spain, this proportion was nominally higher – but the number of cases remained extremely low and therefore no conclusions can be drawn from the results (for example, 3 of the 8 Romanian victims in Spain assumed ethnic motives to be behind vehicle related crimes).

Burglary⁵³ affected between 1% and 6% of Central and East European migrants in the past 12 months. The most likely burglary victims over the past 12 months were the Polish in the UK (6%). Only 1% of Romanians in Spain said that someone got into their home without permission and tried to steal something. The proportion of burglaries thought to be motivated either in whole or in part by 'racism' was very low in the UK (5%). In other countries, the ratios – although they were much higher – were the result of a very low number of cases and therefore cannot be meaningfully analysed (for example, 3 out of 20 cases of burglary among the Polish in Ireland were thought to be motivated by 'racism').

Analysing the data with respect to theft of smaller belongings (e.g. purse, mobile phone, etc.) in the past 12 months, the results show a victimisation rate as high as 15% in the case of Polish respondents in the UK, and 13% among Romanians in Italy.⁵⁴ The Polish in Ireland were the least likely to have had smaller personal items stolen in the past 12 months (6%); however, after the Romanians in Italy, the Polish in Ireland were the second most likely to indicate that they considered a 'racist' motivation to be behind these incidents (14%). Those most likely to have perceived racial motives were the Romanians in Italy (16%).

In-person crimes – focusing on racist motivation

EU-MIDIS investigated rates of victimisation in two specific instances of in-person crimes: assaults or threats, and serious harassment (although the latter does not necessarily qualify for an offence in a criminal sense).

If respondents indicated they had experienced in-person crime in the past 12 months they were asked detailed follow-up questions with respect to the last incident for each of the two crime types surveyed ('assault or threat', and 'serious harassment'). These follow-up questions provided detailed information about the nature of incidents, including who the perpetrator or perpetrators were.

Looking at Table 3.2.3, the likelihood of becoming a victim of an **assault or threat**,⁵⁵ in the past 12 months, was as high as 6% both for Romanians in Italy and Polish respondents in Ireland. The lowest 12-month victimisation rate in relation to this offence was recorded for Romanians in Spain (2%). When asked if something was stolen from them during an assault or threat – in other words whether the incident was a robbery – more than half of Romanians (59%) and over two fifths of Albanians in Italy (47%⁵⁶), as well as 42% of Polish respondents in the UK, stated that the reported assaults or threats were *robberies*. Looking at all assaults and threats that can be classified as robberies, Romanians in Italy emerge as the community most vulnerable to robbery – with 4% of all Romanian interviewees being victims of robbery in the previous 12 months. In addition, 62% of assaults or threats against Romanians in Italy involved actual physical violence, with similarly high rates for the Polish in Ireland (58%) and Romanians in Spain (56%). Assaults or threats in the other communities also tended to go beyond "only" threatening the victim (with 32% of incidents against Albanians in Greece and 45% against Albanians in Italy employing force⁵⁷).

52 N=17 of which none considered the crime to be racially motivated.

53 Questions DB1-2: During the [REFERENCE PERIOD], did anyone get into your home without permission and steal or try to steal something? [Does include cellars – Does NOT include garages, sheds lock-ups or gardens].

54 Questions DC1-2: Apart from theft involving force or threat, there are many other types of theft of personal property, such as pick-pocketing or theft of a purse, wallet, clothing, jewellery, or mobile phone. This can happen at work, on public transport, in the street – or anywhere. Over the [REFERENCE PERIOD] have you personally been the victim of any of these thefts that did not involve force?

55 Questions DD1-2: During the [REFERENCE PERIOD], have you been personally attacked, that is hit or pushed, or threatened by someone in a way that REALLY frightened you? This could have happened at home or elsewhere, such as in the street, on public transport, at your workplace – or anywhere.

56 N=17.

57 Please note that for assaults, several sample sizes were quite low: N=19 in EL (Albanians), N=17 in IT (Albanians) and N=10 in ES (Romanians).

Having in mind the one-year time span, in all communities that form the CEE group, **serious harassments** were more widespread than assaults or threats. The most likely to have experienced serious harassment in the last 12 months were the Polish in Ireland (11%), while those in the UK – next to Romanians in Spain – were the least likely to report an incident of serious harassment over the same period of time (6%).

While ethnic motives were rarely identified in the previously discussed instances of property crimes, people targeted by in-person crimes very often felt that their ethnic (or religious) background played a role in them becoming a victim.

Almost all harassment incidents among Albanians in Italy in the past 12 months were considered to be racially motivated (96%); also, eight out of 10 incidents of serious harassment were thought to have a racial motivation among Albanians in Greece, Romanians in Italy, and Romanians in Spain. The lowest proportions of harassments in the past 12 months that were attributed to racial motivation were recorded in Ireland and the UK (39% and 37%, respectively). Overall, between 28% and 81% of assaults or threats were considered to be racially motivated (the lowest rates were in the UK and the highest in Italy (Albanians)); however, please note that for assault or threat offences, several sample sizes were low: Greece (Albanians): N=19; Spain (Romanians): N=14; Italy (Albanians): N=17).

Most of the assaults or threats were committed mainly by **perpetrators** belonging to non-ethnic groups – in other words, belonging to the majority population; this was the case in seven out of 10 personal incidents experienced by Romanians in major Italian cities (75%), and by the Polish in Ireland, as well as by Albanians in Greece (73%).⁵⁸ This pattern did not hold true in the UK, where more than half (55%) of the most recent assaults or threats suffered by the Polish were attributed to perpetrators from other 'ethnic' groups (that is, neither Polish nor from the majority population). No Polish respondent in Ireland thought that the perpetrators in question were from another 'ethnic' group.

Reflecting the results for assault and threat, perpetrators of serious harassment were most likely to be from the majority population. Practically all Albanians in Greece said this (94%), as well as more

than eight out of 10 Romanians in Spain, Polish in Ireland and Albanians in Italy. Half of the Romanians in Italy stated that those who harassed them were from the majority population (56%), while one quarter declared that the perpetrators were from the same ethnic group (28%). In the UK the situation was more mixed: those who were victims of serious harassment in the past 12 months stated that the perpetrators were as likely not to be from the majority population (inter-ethnic harassment: 49%) as from the majority population (48%), while 13% said that perpetrators of harassment were also Polish (note, percentages can add up to more than 100 as there can be perpetrators from different backgrounds for one incident).

Racist or religiously **offensive language** was most often identified in incidents of assault or threat against Albanians in Greece (52%) and Romanians in Spain (51%). However, given that the number of assaults and threats were relatively low amongst interviewees in these countries, these numbers have to be treated with caution as they represent a few incidents.⁵⁹ In other communities, between 6-20% of victims of assault or threat indicated that specifically racist or religiously offensive language was used by offenders.

Considerable differences were noticed between the six communities that form the CEE group with regard to religiously or racially offensive language used in harassment incidents. While three quarters of Albanians in Greece who were victims of serious harassment over the past 12 months stated that offensive language was used (75%), and nearly seven out of 10 Romanians in Spain (68%) and six out of ten Albanians in Italy (60%) said the same, only 13-18% of the harassment incidents against the Polish in Ireland, as well as against Romanians in Italy, involved offensive language. The proportion that stated that perpetrators used racist or religiously offensive language remains in general below – sometimes well below – the proportion of those who felt that harassment incidents were racially motivated. Notable differences in this regard were observed in the case of Romanians in major Italian cities, where only 18% of harassment victims indicated that specifically racist language was used by offenders, but 82% of incidents were assumed to be racially motivated by victims. The situation is similar in the case of Albanians in Italy – there is a gap of 36 percentage points between those who indicated the use of offensive language and those who perceived ethnic motivation (considering

⁵⁸ Please note that for assaults the number for EL (Albanians)=19.

⁵⁹ EL (Albanians): N=19; ES (Romanians): N=14.

Table 3.2.3 – In-person crimes, main results

	ASSAULT OR THREAT						SERIOUS HARASSMENT					
	EL (Ab)	IT (Ab)	IT (Ro)	ES (Ro)	IE (CEE)	UK (CEE)	EL (Ab)	IT (Ab)	IT (Ro)	ES (Ro)	IE (CEE)	UK (CEE)
<i>Victimisation rate (based on DD1, DD2/DE1, DE2)</i>	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Victimised past 12 months	4	3	6	2	6	5	7	9	7	6	11	6
Victimised past 2-5 years	3	7	4	1	4	3	8	8	8	4	5	3
<i>Attributed racial/ethnic motivation (DD4/DE5)</i>												
Yes, including the most recent	53	81	54	35	47	28	82	96	82	84	39	37
Yes, but not including the most recent	0	6	12	0	0	8	3	2	0	0	4	16
<i>Racist or religiously offensive language used (DD9/DE9)</i>												
Yes	52	6	20	51	17	20	75	60	18	68	13	37
<i>Force actually used (DD10)</i>												
Yes (within all incidents)	32	45	62	56	58	36
Yes (in the total population)	1	2	4	1	4	2
<i>Something stolen (DD5)</i>												
Yes (within all incidents)	32	47	59	14	21	42
Yes (in the total population)	1	2	4	0	1	2
<i>Perpetrators (DD8/DE8)</i>												
From the same ethnic group	10	17	9	14	13	12	2	7	28	7	7	13
From another ethnic group	13	34	22	21	0	55	0	13	9	5	9	49
From majority	73	36	75	58	73	34	94	84	56	88	84	48
<i>Seriousness (DD14/DE13)</i>												
Very or fairly serious	56	70	66	79	55	74	30	66	53	60	41	53
Not very serious	32	17	34	21	42	22	58	25	44	37	56	45
<i>Not reported to the police (DD11/DE10)</i>												
Not reported	68	58	63	79	76	68	98	87	85	86	96	82
<i>Reasons for not reporting (DD13/DE12, top 3 mentions)</i>												
Too trivial/not worth reporting	31	21	10	26	36	24	67	38	30	32	49	55
No confidence in the police	45	21	30	26	42	27	49	23	15	6	36	18
Dealt with the problem themselves	45	11	10	12	7	15	20	30	11	10	9	4

EU-MIDIS 2008, CEE people (CEE), Albanian (Ab), Romanian (Ro)

the most recent incident of serious harassment). Although victims may not have tangible evidence that 'racism' was behind their experiences of serious harassment, the fact that they perceive it to be there indicates that inter-community relations are probably unhealthy between offender and victim groups – so much so that racist motivation is presumed to exist.

As discussed, in-person crimes against CEE respondents are very often committed by members of the majority population. However, only modest numbers of respondents identified the perpetrators as belonging to a **racist gang** in the case of assault

or threat (CEE average: 6%; IT (Ab): 13% – the highest among the six communities of Central and East European migrants⁶⁰; UK-CEE respondents: 8% – second highest). A similar pattern was noticed in cases of serious harassment: 18% of Albanians in Italy mentioned that offenders in their most recent harassment incident were members of a right-wing gang, and 5% of Polish victims of serious harassment in the UK (CEE average: 4%). High ratios of Central and East Europeans reported that more than one perpetrator was involved in their most recent experience of in-person victimisation (serious harassment: 55%, and assault or threat: 66%), whereas

60 N=17.

two fifths of CEE respondents said that harassment incidents were committed by offenders who were alone (40%) and 29% said this about incidents of assault or threat. What this tells us is that in-person victimisation is typically perpetrated by groups, but these are rarely groups that could be defined as belonging to a ‘racist gang’.

In all communities, over half of the victims of assault or threat considered the last incident to be very or fairly *serious* (the lowest such ratio was 55% among Polish in Ireland, while the highest was 79% among Romanians in Spain⁶¹). The majority of Albanians in Greece and Polish in Ireland considered their experiences of harassment to be not very serious (58% and 56%, respectively). In all other communities, more than half of victims of harassment considered the incident in question as serious (between 53% in the UK and 66% among Albanians in Italy).

On average, at least two thirds of the in-person crimes experienced by CEE respondents went unreported to the police – with harassment incidents reported less than assaults or threats (CEE average, assaults or threats: 69% not reported; CEE average, harassment: 89% not reported). One explanation for this, as confirmed by the reasons for not reporting outlined in Table 3.2.3, was that victims of harassment considered their experiences as not very serious and therefore did not think it appropriate to bring them to the attention of the police. In all communities that form the CEE group, at least four out of five did not report incidents of harassment (between 82% and 98%); in fact, almost none of the Polish in Ireland or Albanians in Greece reported these incidents. In relation to assaults or threats, extreme cases of non-reporting were registered in communities where the number of victims was low, and therefore meaningful interpretations of these results are difficult to make.⁶²

Among the CEE group, **the primary reason given for not reporting assaults or threats was a lack of confidence in the police** (33%); the highest proportion who gave this response was found among Albanians in Greece (45%), and the lowest level was seen among the same ethnic group in Italy (21%) – although still very high.⁶³ On average, a quarter of CEE respondents who experienced a personal incident did not report the incident because they considered it trivial (25%) (which was the second most often mentioned reason for not reporting assaults or threats in the CEE group).

Table 3.2.4 – Victimization rate (DA2-DE2, past 12 months)
General group: Central and East European
 By socio-demographic profile, %

Respondent gender (BG0)	Male	25
	Female	24
Age group (BG1)	16-24 years	27
	25-39 years	25
	40-54 years	22
	55 years or more	19
Household income (quartiles) (BG6)	In the lowest quartile	23
	Between the lowest quartile and the median	25
	Above the median	26
Employment status (BG5)	Employed/self-employed	24
	Homemaker/unpaid work	24
	Unemployed	26
	Non-active	24
Education status (years) (BG7)	Up to 5 years	16
	6-9 years	21
	10-13 years	24
	14 years or more	27

EU-MIDIS 2008

In the case of serious harassment, 47% of victims in the CEE group did not report the last incident because they considered it too trivial. A lack of confidence in the police was the second most common reason for not reporting (26%) at the level of the aggregate CEE group. Looking at differences between communities it can be noted that two-thirds of the Albanians in Greece (67%), and half of the Polish in the UK (55%), did not notify the police about the incident because they felt that it was not worth it. Three out of 10 Albanians in Italy who were harassment victims, and who did not report their case, indicated that they took care of the issue privately; those least likely to deal with the problem personally were the Polish in the UK (4%).

On average, 17% of CEE respondents indicated that they avoid certain places or locations for fear of being assaulted, threatened, or harassed because of their ethnic/immigrant background. This rate is as high as 21% among the Polish in both Ireland and the UK, and as low as 11% among Albanians in Greece, as well as among Romanians in Spain.

61 N=14.

62 IT (Albanians) N=17 and ES (Romanians) N=14.

63 However, please note that except in the UK (N=33), the sample sizes for the reasons for not reporting assaults ranged between 9 and 27 cases.

3.2.5. Crime victimisation by respondent characteristics

SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE

In terms of respondents' socio-demographic profile and observable differences in victimisation rates, the following can be noted (see Table 3.2.4):

- **Gender:** The survey found that CEE males are victimised more than women by only one percentage point; whereas one would expect a higher rate for men given that interpersonal crimes that predominantly impact on women (such as 'domestic' crime and sex crimes) were not specifically looked at in the survey.
- **Age group:** Younger people are typically more often victims of crime than older people, which is largely explicable due to specific differences in life style patterns. This pattern is replicated for Central and East European survey respondents: the highest victimisation rates (past 12 months) are reported by respondents in the youngest age group (16-24 years, 27%), and the lowest rates are reported in the oldest age group (55 years and more, 19%).
- **Household income:** Slightly higher victimisation rates are observed for those from higher income households (26%), in comparison with those from lower income households (23%).
- **Employment status:** There are hardly any differences in crime victimisation by employment status. However, the group with the highest victimisation rate is the unemployed (26%).
- **Education:** The group that reported the lowest rate of victimisation was those who had the lowest level of education: Up to 5 years of schooling – 16%. With an increase in years of schooling, reported rates of victimisation increase. The Central and East European respondents running the highest victimisation risk are those with the highest level of education: more than 14 years – 27%.

The finding that both the unemployed and those with the most years of education were more likely to be victims of crime suggests that people from both ends of the socio-demographic scale are vulnerable to victimisation. What needs to be acknowledged when looking to explain these results is that migrants – here in the form of CEE respondents – present a different group (or groups) for analysis in comparison with

the majority population. Herein, more work needs to be undertaken on the victimisation of migrants to identify any particular characteristics in relation to victimisation rates.

RESPONDENT STATUS

Observed differences between victimisation rates according to the 'respondent status' of Central and East European migrants are not substantial, but the following can be noted (see Table 3.2.5).

- **Length of stay in the country:** This seems to have an effect on victimisation experience. The groups that have the lowest reported victimisation rate levels are those who were born in the recipient country (18%) and those who have stayed in the country for more than 20 years (5%). Regarding the latter, the observed low rate of victimisation is most probably linked to other factors, such as age (and the number of respondents in this category is rather small). The other results in terms of victimisation and length of stay are not substantially different (ranging between 23-25% according to the time period).
- **Neighbourhood status and proficiency in the national language:** These do not produce substantial differences in victimisation experiences. Groups that report the highest rates of victimisation are those who live in poorer

Table 3.2.5 – Victimization rate (DA2-DE2, past 12 months)

General group: Central and East European
By respondent status and neighbourhood, %

Length of stay in COUNTRY (BG8a)	1-4 years	25
	5-9 years	24
	10-19 years	23
	20+ years	5
Neighbourhood status relative to other areas of the city (PI01)	Born in COUNTRY	18
	Poorer	26
	As other areas	23
Language proficiency in the national language (PI04)	Mixed	25
	Fluent, without foreign sounding accent	23
	Fluent, with foreign sounding accent	21
Citizenship in COUNTRY (BG9)	Less than fluent	28
	Citizen	29
	Not a citizen	24

EU-MIDIS 2008

neighbourhoods (26%) and those who are less than fluent in the national language (28%).

- **Citizenship** in the recipient country has, surprisingly, a negative effect on victimisation experience. Central and East European immigrants who are citizens of the recipient country report a higher level of victimisation (29%) than those who are not citizens (24%). But the observed difference is not striking.

3.2.6. Corruption

On average, an insignificant proportion of CEE respondents reported that a public official expected them to pay a bribe⁶⁴ over the past 12 months (CEE average: 1%). Looking at differences between communities we saw that the Polish in both Ireland and the UK, as well as Romanians in Spain, **never** felt that they were expected to pay a bribe in the one-year time span. The community most likely to (or at least expected to) pay a bribe to a public official was Albanians in Greece (1yr: 7%).

The number of cases of corruption among public officials in the past 12 months is very low (0 to 7 cases in 5 of the CEE communities and 38 cases in Greece) – thus the results lack statistical solidity. The majority of Albanians in Greece who were expected to pay a bribe by public officials assumed that the incident was linked to their ethnic background (56%); **doctors were mentioned as the most frequent group asking for a bribe by Albanians in Greece (64%)**. Although the low number of cases in relation to these results makes it difficult to generalise, the finding that a number of doctors expected a bribe requires further analysis to uncover the extent of this potential problem.

3.2.7. Police and border control


In general, the police are rather well trusted by Central and East European migrants. Two thirds of Albanians in Greece (66%), Romanians in Italy (66%), and Polish respondents in the UK (68%) indicated that they tend to trust the police, and over a half of Albanians in Italy (55%) and 48% of the Polish in Ireland indicated the same. About a quarter of respondents said they tend *not* to trust the police amongst Albanians in Italy and the Polish in Ireland (24% and 23%, respectively). The level of distrust is lower in the other groups, with the lowest levels among Romanians in Spain (11% likely to distrust the police).

Policing stops – including perceptions of profiling

Figure 3.2.9 shows that Albanians in Greece had the most regular contact with the police; the majority in the last 12 months had some form of contact with them. About one third of them were stopped by the police (31%), and 44% had other contacts as well (adding 18% and 13%). Only 38% among this group said they had no contact with the police. The Polish in Ireland also experienced regular police stops (29%), and almost as many of them contacted the police themselves regarding something unrelated to a stop (28%); thus, half had no contact with the police. Police contact is the least frequent among Central and East European migrants in the UK and Spain, where two thirds (69% and 66%, respectively) had no contact with them.

Looking at those who were stopped: in particular, the Polish in Ireland (89%) and Albanians in Italy (69%) said that the last time they were stopped was in traffic (while driving a car or riding a motorbike); the opposite pattern was found in the case of Romanians in Spain and the Polish in UK (61% and 59%, respectively, were stopped while on foot or while riding a bicycle).⁶⁵

Figure 3.2.9
Police contact (F3, F9)
In the past 12 months, %



Question F3: Thinking about the last time you were stopped in this country, when was this? Was it in the last 12 months or before then? F9: Apart from the police stopping you, which I've already asked you about, have you had any contact with the police in this country in the last 12 months? By this I mean you could have reported something to them yourself, or you may have had to register something with them, etc.


64 Questions E1-2: During [REFERENCE PERIOD] did any government official in [COUNTRY], for instance a customs officer, a police officer, a judge or an inspector, ask you or expect you to pay a bribe for his or her services?

65 Question F6: Thinking about THE LAST TIME you were stopped by the police in this country, were you in a car, on a motorbike or bicycle, on public transport or just on the street?

Figure 3.2.10

Perception of profiling at police stops (F5)

Those stopped in the past 12 months, %



Question F5: Do you think that [the last time you were stopped/any time you were stopped] IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS was because of your immigrant/minority background?^a

Almost half of the Albanians in Greece (43%) and half of Romanians in Italy reported traffic controls.

In three out of the six CEE communities, those who were stopped were more likely to perceive that the police stopped them because of their ethnic background with respect to the most recent stop in the last 12 months (see Figure 3.2.10). Two-thirds of Albanians in Italy (67%) and over a half of those in Greece (55%), and a significant number of Romanians in Italy (45%), felt that the police singled them out because of their ethnicity. A perception of profiling was less widespread among the Polish in the UK (31%) and Romanians in Spain (27%), while it was almost absent among the Polish in Ireland, as only 2% of them felt that the police singled them out on ethnic/immigrant grounds when they were stopped – however, this result might be explained by the large number of CEE respondents in Ireland experiencing traffic stops.

Given that the police would be unable to distinguish a CEE driver from a non-CEE driver in a traffic stop, unless that driver had foreign number plates, it is clear that profiling would not be an issue for the majority of respondents in Ireland who were stopped whilst in a private vehicle. In comparison, assumptions about

discriminatory police profiling are more likely during pedestrian stops and public transport stops as the police could be using indicators such as language when deciding whether to conduct a stop.


The primary activity of the police at these stops was to check documents and ask some questions.⁶⁶ Few of the stops resulted in a fine (7% of police stops among Albanians in Greece, and Polish in the UK and Ireland, and even fewer in other groups). Overall, police stops were most likely to result in serious outcomes for Albanians in Greece and the Polish in the UK, where one out of ten people stopped were escorted to a police station (11% and 10% respectively). Similar proportions among the Polish in the UK (10%) and Albanians in Italy (11%) had themselves or their vehicle searched by the police. Alcohol or drug tests were less frequent (8% among the Polish in Ireland, 7% among Romanians in Spain), while 17% of Polish in the UK who were stopped by the police were given some advice or warning about their behaviour.

The majority of all CEE respondents evaluated police conduct during stops as positive (see Figure 3.2.11). The vast majority of the Polish in Ireland (71%) and two thirds of Romanians in Spain (67%) considered the police that stopped them as very or fairly respectful; 58% of the Polish in the UK, 61% of Albanians in Greece, and half of Albanians and Romanians in Italy held the same view. In addition, between one fifth and one third of respondents regarded the police's behaviour as at least neutral. On the other hand, those most dissatisfied with the way the police treated them were the Romanians in Italy (21% claimed they were fairly or very disrespectful), followed by Albanians in Italy (18%). Very few Romanians in Spain (3%) and Polish in Ireland (4%) gave negative feedback in this respect.


Evaluation of police conduct in other contacts

As outlined above, between one fifth and two fifths of the various groups reported contacts with the police that were other than police stops (20-44%). Figure 3.2.12 shows that most communities displayed higher levels of satisfaction with police conduct in these situations in comparison with police conduct during stops. The only exception to this tendency was among Albanians in Italy who were about equally satisfied in the two situations (other contacts: 48% vs. police stops: 51%). Moreover, almost a quarter of Albanians from Italy claimed that the police were (very or fairly)

⁶⁶ Question F7: Thinking about the last time you were stopped, what did the police actually do? 01 – Ask you questions, 02 – Ask for identity papers – ID card passport/residence permit, 03 – Ask for driving licence or vehicle documents, 04 – Search you or your car/vehicle, 05 – Give some advice or warn you about your behaviour (including your driving or vehicle), 06 – Did an alcohol or drug test, 07 – Fine you, 08 – Arrest you/take you to a police station, 09 – Take money or something from you in the form of a bribe, 10 – Other.



Question F8: Again, thinking about the last time you were stopped, how respectful were the police when dealing with you?



Question F10: Thinking about the last time you had contact with the police in this country – that DID NOT involve them stopping you – how respectful were they to you?

disrespectful to them in the case of encounters other than stops (23%); in contrast, in all other groups only between 2% and 8% of respondents had the same negative opinion in relation to their treatment by the police during contact unrelated to stops.

Border control

The survey asked respondents a couple of ‘screening questions’ about whether, in the last 12 months, they had returned to their country of residence from travel abroad when immigration/border/customs personnel were present, and if they had been stopped by them. These results in themselves cannot present a picture of potential discriminatory treatment as they are dependent on factors such as where respondents were travelling back from, the existence or not of Schengen border controls, and whether respondents had an EU passport. However, having determined that respondents had returned to their country of residence and had been stopped by immigration/border/customs personnel, they were asked a follow-up question about whether they considered they were *singled out for stopping on the basis of their*

immigrant/ethnic background when re-entering their country of residence – which was used as a rough indicator of potential profiling during these encounters.

Central and East European migrants travel abroad quite often: on average, during the past 12 months, 47% of CEE respondents entered their host countries from a visit abroad when either immigration, customs or border control were present; two fifths of those who travelled were stopped by border control when coming back into the country (42%), and three out of 10 assumed that they were singled out for stopping because of their ethnic/immigrant background (31%).⁶⁷

The most likely to be intercepted at border crossings in the past 12 months were Albanians in Greece (83%); of these stops, 48% were assumed to be the result of discriminatory profiling. On the other hand, Polish respondents in the UK reported the lowest proportion of stops that they considered to be based on discriminatory profiling (9% of border stops). Seven out of 10 Romanians in Italian cities stated they

⁶⁷ Question G1: During the last 12 months, have you ever entered [COUNTRY] from a visit abroad when either immigration, customs or border control were present?
 ASK IF RESPONSE TO G1 = Yes – Question G2: During the last 12 months, were you ever stopped by [COUNTRY NATIONALITY] immigration, customs or border control when coming back into the country?
 ASK IF RESPONSE TO G2 = Yes – Question G3: Do you think you were singled out for stopping by [COUNTRY NATIONALITY] immigration, customs or border control specifically because of your immigrant/minority background?

were stopped by border control when coming back from abroad (72%); however, only 18% of these stops were attributed to discriminatory profiling by border control personnel.

3.2.8. Police stops by respondent characteristics

SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC STATUS

Table 3.2.6 outlines experiences of police stops by socio-demographic profile.

- **Gender:** While criminal victimisation experiences for men and women show no substantial differences, police stops of Central and East European people show a clear gender difference. Men are stopped by the police far more often than women. This refers both to police stops in the past five years (46% of men have been stopped by the police vs. 20% of women) and stops in the past 12 months (men: 33%, women: 11%). **Police profiling is also about three times more frequent among men than among women.**
- **Age:** The most frequently stopped group are people aged between 25 and 39. However, it is

interesting to note that older Central and East European respondents (55 years and more) report levels of profiling during police stops (10%) that are similar to other age groups: 10% among 40-54 year olds, and between 8-9% for the other age groups.

- **Income:** Those in the lowest income quartile are stopped least often – 23% have been stopped in the past 5 years; whereas among those in the upper income bracket - 35% have been stopped in the past 5 years, and 10% report a perception of profiling at stops in the past 12 months.
- **Employment status:** 81% of homemakers have *not* been stopped in the past five years at all, which is largely explicable by the fact that the majority of this group are women. In comparison, 66-75% of CEE people in paid employment have *not* been stopped by the police in the past 5 years; which, again, could be partly explained by gender and age.
- **Education:** In terms of education, the most frequently stopped in the last 12 months are Central and East Europeans with 6-9 years of schooling (29%), and the least frequently stopped are those with 5 years or fewer of schooling (12%)

Table 3.2.6 – Police stops (F2, F3 and F5)
General group: Central and East European
By socio-demographic profile, %

		Not stopped	Stopped in past 2-5 years	Stopped in past 12 months, no profiling	Stopped in past 12 months, with profiling
Respondent gender (BG0)	Male	54	12	21	12
	Female	80	9	7	4
Age group (BG1)	16-24 years	70	8	13	9
	25-39 years	65	11	16	8
	40-54 years	68	13	10	10
	55 years and more	72	10	8	10
Household income (quartiles) (BG6)	In the lowest quartile	76	7	11	5
	Between the lowest quartile and the median	63	11	18	8
	Above the median	65	10	15	10
Employment status (BG5)	Employed/self-employed	66	11	15	8
	Homemaker/unpaid work	81	9	7	3
	Unemployed	66	12	11	11
	Non-active	75	7	10	8
Education status (years) (BG7)	5 years or less	80	7	10	2
	6-9 years	53	19	13	16
	10-13 years	68	11	12	9
	14 years and more	71	8	17	5

– however, the number of cases in the latter group is relatively small as few Central and East European respondents have attended school for 5 years or less. Differences in perceptions of police profiling are similar between groups with various years of education.

RESPONDENT STATUS

Looking at ‘respondent status’ variables – such as citizenship and length of stay in the country – and their relationship to experiences of policing, the following can be noted (see Table 3.2.7):

- **Length of stay in the country:** This has a relationship to the likelihood of police stops. Those most frequently stopped in the last 12 months are Central and East Europeans who have had a longer stay (10-19 years) in the country (27%).

Perceptions of police profiling seems to increase with length of stay in a country. The longer Central and East Europeans stay in the recipient country, the more often they think they have been profiled when stopped by the police. In this regard it should be noted that reported profiling rates are, as with perceived discrimination, a combination of police activity and personal perceptions; the length of stay in a country influences perceptions and it is therefore difficult

to say whether reported higher rates of profiling are a result of specifically targeted police activity, if they reflect evolving stereotypes on the part of the police and/or those who are stopped, or if respondents develop a better sense for grasping the more subtle signs of unequal treatment the longer they stay in a country.

- **Neighbourhood:** Living in poor neighbourhoods increases the perception by respondents that they were stopped as a result of profiling in the last 12 months.
- **Language proficiency:** This increases the chances of police stops: 60% of Central and East Europeans who are fluent in the national language have *not* been stopped by the police in the past 5 years, while among those who are less than fluent 72% have not been stopped in the past 5 years.
- **Citizenship:** This does not affect the likelihood of police stops much. However, it has an impact on perceived police profiling: Central and East Europeans who are not citizens of the recipient country report much lower rates of police profiling than those who are citizens (7% vs. 17%). This difference is likely to be a result of perceptions which evolve with the differential status of being a citizen.

Table 3.2.7 – Police stops (F2, F3 and F5)
General group: Central and East European
 By respondent status and neighbourhood, %

		Not stopped	Stopped in past 2-5 years	Stopped in past 12 months, no profiling	Stopped in past 12 months, with profiling
Length of stay in COUNTRY (BG8a)	1-4 years	72	7	15	6
	5-9 years	66	14	13	7
	10-19 years	54	18	13	14
	20+ years	61	14	10	15
	Born in COUNTRY	100	0	0	0
Neighbourhood status relative to other areas of the city (PI01)	Poorer	61	14	12	13
	As other areas	75	8	12	6
	Mixed	61	13	18	8
Language proficiency in the national language (PI04)	Fluent, without foreign sounding accent	60	16	14	10
	Fluent, with foreign sounding accent	67	11	13	9
	Less than fluent	72	9	10	9
Citizenship in COUNTRY (BG9)	Citizen	60	13	10	17
	Not a citizen	68	10	14	7

3.2.9. Respondent background

Origins

EU-MIDIS interviewed six communities of Central and East Europeans: 1) Albanians in Athens and Thessaloniki, Greece; 2) Albanians in Rome, Milan and Bari, Italy; 3) Romanians in Rome, Milan and Bari, Italy; 4) Romanians in Madrid and Barcelona, Spain; 5) CEE migrants (mainly Polish) in London, UK; 6) CEE migrants (mainly Polish) in Dublin, Ireland. Practically all CEE migrants arrived in their host countries as adults (after the age of 16) (93%); almost none of them were born in the country where they were interviewed. On average, the majority of CEE migrants (57%) have been living in their host countries for 1-4 years, a quarter for 5-9 years, and 18% for 10-19 years; only 1% have been living there for more than 20 years. Looking at country differences we saw that this pattern held true with the exception of Greece – where the majority of Albanians have been living there for 10-19 years (70%), and in Italy where the situation is balanced – 34% of Albanian migrants have been living there for 5-9 years, 33% for 10-19 years and 32% for 1-4 years. It is worth mentioning that almost all CEE migrants in Ireland have been living there for only 1-4 years (96%).

Given the diversity within the CEE group – it is advised that comparisons are drawn between ‘matched’ groups; that is, between the Polish respondents, between the Albanian respondents, and between the Romanian respondents.

Socio-demographic details

CEE migrants most often reported schooling with a duration of 10-13 years (CEE average: 45%). While one fifth of the Polish in Ireland stated that they went to school for 10-13 years (20%), this proportion was at least twice as high among Romanians in Spain and Italy (43% and 46%, respectively), the Polish in the UK (56%), and among Albanians in Greece (56%). On average, two out of five CEE migrants reported schooling for 14 years or more (42%).

At the time of the interview, the rate of CEE migrants employed in paid work (self-employed or in full or part time jobs) was, on average, 81%; this rate reaches its maximum among the Polish in the UK (92%). On the other hand, only 59% of the Albanians in Italian major cities claim to have some form of paid employment.

Cultural background

As CEE migrants were not born in the countries where they were interviewed and arrived there as adults, their first language is not the national language of their countries of residence. Overall, more than half of the Central and East European migrants are fluent in the national language. The most likely to be fluent are the Romanians in Spain; however, very few speak the language without an accent. Disregarding Ireland, where 90% of the interviews were carried out by Polish interviewers in Polish, and therefore no information is available on respondents’ assessed level of fluency in English, the lowest rate of language fluency found in CEE migrants was in the UK capital (and therefore one might assume that Polish respondents in Ireland also had similar levels of English language fluency). In terms of religious denomination, the Polish in Ireland do not differ significantly from the majority population, as both Ireland and Poland are Catholic countries; whereas Poles interviewed in the UK are living in an (officially) protestant but highly secular and multicultural capital city. Romanians in both Italy and Spain (98% and 97%, respectively) are Christian. While most Albanians in Greece are Christians (63%), approximately three out of 10 are Muslim. Albanians in Italy also differ significantly from the majority group as only 53% are Christian and 40% are Muslim. These differences in religion between host societies and CEE migrants can help to explain respondents’ experiences and perceptions of being treated less favourably in their host country; particularly where a tolerant culture is not promoted. Only 1% of the CEE migrants indicated that they often wear clothing that is specific to their ethnic/religious group.

Segregation

Spatial segregation, meaning that those surveyed lived – according to the judgment of the interviewer – in areas predominantly populated by their peers, is highest among Albanians in Greece (35%), followed by the Polish in the UK (28%) and Romanians in Spain (21%).

3.3. North Africans

Who was surveyed?

North African interviewees were identified as respondents belonging to any of the following countries; namely: Algeria, Egypt, Libya, Morocco, Sudan, Tunisia or Western Sahara. Interviewers always let respondents self-identify, and recorded information about their country of origin. The survey's full dataset includes this information, which allows for a further breakdown of results according to nationality/citizenship.

In turn, Sub-Saharan Africans were identified as all those respondents of 'Black African' origin who did not come under one of the countries listed as 'North African'.

SAMPLE

Member States:
 Belgium (N=500)
 France (N=534)
 Italy (N=501)
 The Netherlands (N=473)
 Spain (N=514)

Sampling method:
 Random route sampling with FE in high-density urban areas (BE, FR, IT, ES and partly NL);
 Interviewer-generated sampling (partly NL)


Some key findings on respondents' experiences of discrimination, victimisation and police stops

Figure 3.3.1 summarises some key results from the survey.

Discrimination against respondents with a North African background was very different across the five Member States where they were surveyed.

The highest rate of discrimination against North Africans was recorded in Italy: more than half of all North African respondents faced discrimination on the basis of their immigrant or ethnic background in the past 12 months. Discrimination against North Africans in the other countries was lower, with between 25-39% having been discriminated against in one of the 9 domains tested in the past

Figure 3.3.1



Questions CA2-CI2 / DA2-DE2: Thinking about the last time this happened, when was this: in the last twelve months or before then? CA4-CI4: Did you or anyone else report this incident anywhere? DD11, DE10: Did you or anyone else report the incident to the police?

F2: In this country, within the last five years, have you EVER been stopped by the police when you were in a car, on a motorbike or bicycle, on public transport or just on the street? F3: Thinking about the last time you were stopped in this country, when was this? Was it in the last 12 months or before then? F5: Do you think that [the last time you were stopped/any time you were stopped] IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS was because of your immigrant/minority background?

12 months. This places North Africans in the mid-range of discrimination risk in comparison with other aggregate groups.

In the North African group as a whole, 17% confirmed

that they avoided certain places (e.g. shops or cafés) where they believed they would be treated unfairly due to their ethnic/immigrant background. This 'avoidance' behaviour can be expected to lower the rate of discrimination experienced.

Reporting rates of discrimination were also quite different between countries; but, generally, higher rates of discrimination corresponded with lower reporting rates. For example, reporting rates were the lowest in Spain (9%) and Italy (13%) which were the two countries with the highest discrimination rates (39% and 52%, respectively). Scepticism that anything would happen as a result of reporting discrimination was mentioned most frequently in all groups as the main reason for not reporting incidents. **This tendency concerning high discrimination rates and low levels of reporting discrimination was replicated for other groups surveyed in EU-MIDIS; for example, amongst Sub-Saharan Africans. An explanation for this could be that in some countries where discrimination is more widespread people also have a lack of faith in the ability of institutions to address discrimination.**

Crime victimisation rates were the highest in the case of North African respondents in Italy, with one in three of them having fallen victim to one of the crime types tested, followed by respondents in the Netherlands. Rates for all other groups were lower, affecting about one in five respondents. With the exception of France, between 46% and 57% of victims of assault or threat considered that the last incident was motivated by 'racism'.

In turn, about one in five of those interviewed (19%) in the *general aggregate* group – considering all relevant countries – informed EU-MIDIS that they tend to avoid certain locations for fear of being harassed, threatened or assaulted. Again, these avoidance measures can be expected to lower respondents' risk of being victimised, but serve to highlight the extent to which people alter their lifestyles in order to avoid becoming a victim.

Rates of reporting crimes to the police were generally higher among respondents than those reporting incidents of discrimination. These rates were the highest among North African respondents living in Italy (41%), and lowest among those living in France and the Netherlands (20%).

The intensity of **police activity** with regard to North African minorities in the six countries surveyed also showed significant differences. The rate of those who

were stopped by the police was the highest in Spain and France (12-month rate: 42%, 5-year rate: 50-54%), and the Spanish were the most likely to assume a racial/ethnic motivation for police stops.

3.3.1. General opinions on discrimination, and rights awareness

Respondents' opinions about the extent of discrimination on different grounds in their country of residence: including grounds in addition to ethnic or immigrant origin

Respondents were asked to assess how widespread they thought discrimination on different grounds was in their respective countries (see Figure 3.3.2).


In general, North African respondents living in Italy were the most likely to consider discrimination widespread in each of the areas tested (reaching 94% in the case of ethnic/immigrant origin), which was followed by those living in France (where 88% identified discrimination on the basis of ethnic/immigrant origin as widespread). Respondents living in Spain were the most positive in their appraisal of discrimination on different grounds (10-31% of them even considered discrimination nonexistent in the different areas), though still more than half of them considered discrimination widespread based on ethnic/immigrant origin. Although North Africans showed significant differences regarding how widespread they considered discrimination on different grounds to be in their respective countries of residence - overall, discrimination based on ethnic/immigrant background was considered as being most widespread, followed by discrimination based on religion or belief (in the Netherlands the latter was the first, followed by discrimination based on ethnic origin). Rates for other grounds of discrimination were generally much lower; except in France (where more than half of respondents believed discrimination based on disability and sexual orientation to be widespread) and Italy (where more than two thirds of respondents believed that discrimination based on sexual orientation was widespread; a result that requires further research).

Opinions on workplace advancement according to ethnicity or religion

Figure 3.3.3 shows that a non-majority ethnic background is believed to be a barrier to workplace advancement by three out of four respondents in Belgium, Italy and the Netherlands, and by somewhat more than half of respondents in Spain and France.

Figure 3.3.2
Is discrimination widespread? (A1, %)

Very or fairly widespread Very or fairly rare
Non-existent Can't tell




EU-MIDIS 2008


Question A1: For each of the following types of discrimination, could you please tell me whether, in your opinion, it is very widespread, fairly widespread, fairly rare, or very rare in [COUNTRY]? Discrimination on the basis of ...?

A non-majority religious background was generally considered a barrier by slightly fewer respondents than a different ethnic background. Still, two thirds or more of respondents in Belgium, Italy and the Netherlands, and almost half of respondents in France, felt that people with a different religion than that of the majority population were less likely to be successful in the workplace.

Figure 3.3.3
Workplace advancement (A4, %)
i) with different ethnic background



ii) with different religious background



EU-MIDIS 2008

Question A4: Would you say that, with equivalent qualifications or diplomas, the following people would be less likely, as likely, or more likely than others to get a job, be accepted for training or be promoted in [COUNTRY]? A. A person of different ethnic origin than the rest of the population, B. A person who practices a different religion than that of the rest of the country?

Willingness to provide information on ethnicity or religion for a census

When asked if they would provide, on an anonymous basis, information about their **ethnic origin**⁶⁸ or **religion/belief**⁶⁹ for a census, North African respondents in Italy and Belgium were the most likely to have no objection to providing such data (80-81% and 69-70%, respectively). The rate of those refusing to provide such data was highest among North Africans in the Netherlands, where 48-49% said that they would not want to provide such information (the rate of those willing to do so was 49% for both ethnicity and religion).

Awareness of anti-discrimination bodies

About one in four respondents at the most could name an organisation that could offer support or advice to people who have been discriminated against for whatever reason.⁷⁰ Respondents in France were the most likely to know of such organisations (though 68% did not), followed by those living in Belgium (though 79% knew none). However, 84-85% of respondents in the Netherlands and Spain could not name such an organisation. When prompted⁷¹ with the name(s) of such organisations in their respective countries of residence, there was some improvement: just 41% of North Africans in Belgium were not familiar with the Centre for Equal Opportunities and Opposition to Racism, and 52% in the Netherlands did not know the antidiscrimination office ("Antidiscriminatie bureau of meldpunt"). Prompting names of organisations was not much help for respondents in Italy or Spain: 77% did not recognize the name of the organisation given.

Awareness of anti-discrimination laws

With respect to three areas (employment, services, and housing), respondents were asked whether legislation exists prohibiting discrimination on the basis of ethnicity/immigrant origin. Respondents in all countries were most certain about the existence of anti-discrimination laws when applying for a job.⁷² However, levels of awareness were quite different,

68 Question A5a: Would you be in favour of or opposed to providing, on an anonymous basis, information about your ethnic origin, as part of a census, if that could help to combat discrimination in [COUNTRY]?

69 Question A5b: And how about providing, on an anonymous basis, information about your religion or belief?

70 Question A3: Do you know of any organisation in [COUNTRY] that can offer support or advice to people who have been discriminated against – for whatever reason?

71 Questions B2A-C: Have you ever heard of the [NAME OF EQUALITY BODY1-3]?

The following Equality Bodies were tested: Belgium – "Centre for Equal Opportunities and Opposition to Racism"; France – "High Authority for combating discrimination and for equality"; Italy – "Office against racial discrimination (UNAR)"; The Netherlands – "Equal Treatment Commission" and "Antidiscriminatie bureau of meldpunt"; Spain – "Ombudsman".


72 Question B1a: What do you think, is there a law in [COUNTRY] that forbids discrimination against immigrants and ethnic minority people... (a) when applying for a job?

ranging from 66% in France to just 20% in Spain who knew about such laws. Levels of awareness were generally somewhat lower in the case of laws forbidding discrimination when entering or in a shop, restaurant or club⁷³ or when renting/buying a flat,⁷⁴ but were highest in all cases in France (55-57% knew about the existence of these laws) and lowest in Belgium (17% both).

North Africans living in France were most familiar with the **Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union**:⁷⁵ 37% of them had heard of it (although only 6% knew exactly what it was). The levels of awareness were lowest in Spain (17% had heard about it, while 7% knew exactly what it was).


3.3.2. Experience of discrimination

Respondents' general experiences of discrimination on different grounds



Question A2: In the past 12 months have you personally felt discriminated against or harassed in [COUNTRY] on the basis of one or more of the following grounds?

Figure 3.3.5
Personal discrimination experience based on ethnicity (CA1-C11, CA2-C12)
Prevalence across 9 domains, %



Questions CA1-C11: During the last 5 years, [or since you've been in the country if less than 5 years], have you ever been discriminated against when [DOMAIN] in [COUNTRY] because of your immigrant/minority background? CA2-C12: Thinking about the last time this happened, when was this

Having measured their *opinion* on the extent of discrimination on different grounds in their country of residence (as outlined in the previous paragraphs), respondents were asked a follow-up question about their general *experiences* of discrimination in the past 12 months under the same cross-section of grounds (see explanatory footnote⁷⁶).

The results show that for North Africans in EU-MIDIS, their opinion about the extent of discrimination is in excess of experiences that they are able to recall over the past 12 months – which is explicable given that opinions can be based on experiences pre-dating a 12 month reference period, and given that opinions are also shaped by incidents that happen to family, friends and acquaintances. In Belgium, France, the Netherlands and Spain, between 54-88% of respondents thought that discrimination based on ethnic/immigrant origin was widespread, but – as shown in Figure 3.3.4 – discrimination experiences in the last 12 months (based on ethnicity) ranged between 24-66%. North African respondents in Italy had the highest percentage, among all North African groups, indicating that discrimination based on ethnic

73 Question B1b: What do you think, is there a law in [COUNTRY] that forbids discrimination against immigrants and ethnic minority people... (b) when entering or in a shop, restaurant or club?

74 Question B1c: What do you think, is there a law in [COUNTRY] that forbids discrimination against immigrants and ethnic minority people... (c) when renting or buying a flat?

75 Question B3: Are you familiar with the "Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union"? 1 – Yes and you know what it is, 2 – Yes, you have heard about it, but you are not sure what it is, 3 – No, you have never heard about it.

76 Before clarifying specific discrimination experiences for the nine types tested in the survey, EU-MIDIS asked a complementary question to clarify respondents' general thoughts or impressions about their recent discrimination history. In order to do so on a comparative basis, EU-MIDIS used a question from a 2008 Eurobarometer survey (EB 296, 2008), which asked about personal memories of discrimination in multiple domains - Question A2, which asked 'In the past 12 months have you personally felt discriminated against or harassed in [COUNTRY] on the basis of one or more of the following grounds? Please tell me all that apply. A – Ethnic or immigrant origin, B – Gender, C – Sexual orientation, D – Age, E – Religion or belief, F – Disability, X – For another reason'. Chapter 4 in this report presents a comparison of results between the majority and minority populations' responses to this question from Eurobarometer and EU-MIDIS.

or immigrant origin is widespread in their country of residence (94%), and that they themselves had been discriminated against in the past 12 months on these grounds (66%).

Note for reading figures presented in the report:

In a number of figures and tables in the report, the five-year rate is the sum of the percentage given for the past 12 months and that for the 2-5 year period. Similarly, where the 12-month rate is broken down into multiple categories (e.g. those stopped by the police in the 12 months prior to the interview as a result of profiling, and those stopped by the police in the 12 months prior to the interview *not* as a result of profiling) the percentages in each category should be added up for the actual 12-month prevalence rate. For some questions multiple responses were possible and therefore the reader is advised to look at the question wording as set out in the original questionnaire, which can be downloaded from the FRA's website.

In comparison with discrimination experienced in the past 12 months on the grounds of ethnicity, the ratio of those who felt they were discriminated against *solely* on grounds *not involving* their ethnicity was only between 4% and 11%.

Respondents' experiences of discrimination across nine areas of everyday life on the grounds of ethnic or immigrant origin

As shown in Figure 3.3.5: In most countries where North African minorities were surveyed, around half or less than half of respondents had experienced specific incidents of discrimination on the basis of their ethnic/immigrant background in the past 5 years, and about one third of them (or in the case of France, one in four respondents) had experienced this type of discrimination in the past 12 months.⁷⁷ However, more than half of respondents in Italy could recall a specific experience of discrimination on the basis of their ethnic/immigrant background in the past 12 months, and two out of three were able to recall an incident from the past 5 years.

Looking at the domains for which discrimination was tested in the survey (see Figure 3.3.6), discrimination was generally most frequent in work-related circumstances (i.e. when looking for work or at work): an overall rate of 38% of all North African respondents had been discriminated against in the past 5 years when looking for work, and 30% of them when at work.

Although much less frequent, discrimination by housing agencies/landlords (23%), and when in or entering a café/restaurant (21%) were identified by respondents as the next most likely areas of discrimination. Unequal treatment was least common against North African respondents when opening a bank account or getting a loan from a bank (11%).

When asked if they avoid certain places, such as shops or cafes, for fear of being treated badly because of their immigrant/ethnic background, 17% of North African respondents said they employed these precautionary measures, and there was not much difference between respondents from different countries in this respect: the rate of those avoiding certain places was lowest in France (14%) and the highest in Belgium (21%).

Looking at responses by Member States (see Figure 3.3.6):

Belgium is the Member State where discrimination when looking for work is the second highest, after Italy, for both the 12 month (18%) and 5 year rates (34%). About one in ten respondents in Belgium have also been discriminated against at work, by school personnel, at cafés/restaurants or at a shop in the past 12 months. 5-year rates are not especially high in these cases, but still about one in five respondents have been discriminated against at work or by school personnel in the past 5 years, and somewhat fewer (15-16%) have encountered discrimination in a café/restaurant or in a shop. Discrimination in banks was virtually nonexistent in Belgium.

In **Spain** the most common domains in which discrimination occurred for respondents of North African origin were when looking for work (12 months: 15%, 5 years: 33%), at work (12 months: 12%, 5 years: 30%), and by housing agencies/landlords (12 months: 14%, 5 years: 28%). About one in ten


⁷⁷ Key reference periods are 12 months (e.g. the 12 months that preceded the interview), or five years (preceding the interview). Please note that this section provides some illustrations, where the two reference periods are combined. In these charts and tables, the five-year rate is the sum of the percentage given for the past 12 months and that for the 2-5 year period. Similarly, where the 12-month rate is broken down into multiple categories (e.g. those stopped by the police in the 12 months prior to the interview as a result of anticipated profiling and those stopped by the police in the 12 months prior to the interview *not* as a result of anticipated profiling) the percentages in each category should be added up for the actual 12-month prevalence rate.

Figure 3.3.6
Specific discrimination experience based on ethnicity (CA1-CI1, CA2-CI2)

■ In the past 12 months
 ■ In the past 2-5 years
 □ Not discriminated against

Reporting rate (CA4-CI4)
 % who reported the most recent incident in the past 12 months

■ Not reported (incl. Don't know/ Refused)
 □ Reported



EU-MIDIS 2008


Questions CA1-CI1 / CA2-CI2 as with Figure 3.3.5. CA4-CI4: Did you or anyone else report this incident anywhere?

respondents had been discriminated against in cafés/ restaurants in the past 12 months (the 5-year rate is 14%). Discrimination in other domains is quite rare, and hardly exists at all by school personnel and social

service personnel (5-year rates are 5% or less).

Looking at Figure 3.3.6, discrimination when *looking for work* was experienced by three in ten North

Figure 3.3.7
Reasons for not reporting discrimination (CA5-C15)
 Based on the last incident, in the past 12 months, in any of 9 domains, %



Questions CA1-C11 / CA2-C12 as with Figure 3.3.5. CA4-C14: Did you or anyone else report this incident anywhere?

African respondents in **France** in the past 5 years, and two in ten of them had been discriminated against *at work* in the past 5 years (12-month rates were 17% and 15%, respectively). Unequal treatment by housing agencies/landlords and in cafés/restaurants

was encountered by about one in ten respondents in the past 5 years, and the rate of respondents having been discriminated against in these domains in the past 12 months was very low – as in the case of the other domains, the rate did not exceed 7%.

When compared to the other countries where North African minorities were surveyed, discrimination in Italy against this group is very high. More than one third of respondents have been discriminated against in each domain in the past 5 years, and at least one in five in the past 12 months. The rate of respondents discriminated against was highest in work related circumstances: 37% have been discriminated against in the past 12 months when looking for work (63% in the past 5 years) and 30% at work (53% in the past 5 years). Half of the respondents have been discriminated against by housing agencies/landlords in the past 5 years (and one in four in the past 12 months), and nearly one in three respondents in a café/restaurant in the last 12 months (5-year rate: 44%).

In the Netherlands, discrimination in all areas was low. Similar to other countries, North African respondents in the past 5 years were most likely to be discriminated against when looking for work (28%) and at work (23%), and one in five of them were also treated unfairly in a café/restaurant in the last five years. Discrimination from school personnel in the past 5 years was identified by 16% of respondents, and 15% also said they have been discriminated against in shops. In the last 12 months, about one in ten respondents had encountered discrimination in the above mentioned areas, whereas discrimination rates in all other domains (by housing agencies/landlords, by healthcare and social service personnel, and in a bank) were low, and did not exceed 5% in the past 12 months.

Incidents of discrimination are unlikely to be reported by North African respondents in most Member States, and it is not possible to compare country data and draw conclusions based on such low case numbers. However, it is worth noting that **in Italy, despite the relatively high discrimination rate, the reporting of these incidents is almost nonexistent. The reporting rate is highest in Belgium, where in some of the domains almost half of respondents did report incidents of discrimination (i.e. discrimination by healthcare and school personnel).**

As shown in Figure 3.3.7, the leading **reason** given by respondents in all countries **for not reporting** discriminatory incidents in the past 12 months was the belief that nothing would happen by doing so; this was mentioned by two in five respondents in Spain, four in five respondents in France, and about half of respondents in all other countries. Another reason commonly mentioned was the belief that the incident was too trivial and not worth reporting,

which was mentioned by one in three respondents (except in Italy, where more than half of the respondents mentioned this reason). In general, not knowing how to report was a problem for at least one in four respondents; rising to as many as 42% of North African respondents in France, but, exceptionally, only 18% of respondents in Italy. One in four respondents were worried about the consequences of reporting discrimination in Belgium, and two in five were concerned about this in France. Hardly any respondents in any of the countries mentioned residence permit problems or language difficulties as a reason for not reporting incidents of discrimination.

3.3.3. Discrimination by respondent characteristics

SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE

The results for discrimination experiences of North African interviewees showed that certain socio-demographic groups may run a higher discrimination risk (see Table 3.3.1):

- **Gender:** Men reported much higher rates of discrimination (41%) than women (28%).
- **Age group:** North Africans between 16 and 39 years of age were the most likely to have encountered discrimination (41-43%), followed

Table 3.3.1 – Discrimination rate (CA2-CI2, past 12 months)

General group: North African
By socio-demographic profile, %

Respondent gender (BG0)	Male	41
	Female	28
Age group (BG1)	16-24 years	41
	25-39 years	43
	40-54 years	30
	55 years or more	11
Household income (quartiles) (BG6)	In the lowest quartile	41
	Between the lowest quartile and the median	31
	Above the median	34
Employment status (BG5)	Employed/Self-employed	40
	Home maker/unpaid work	19
	Unemployed	44
	Non-active	33
Education status (years) (BG7)	5 years or less	16
	6-9 years	35
	10-13 years	37
	14 years or more	40

by 40-54 year olds (30%). In comparison, only 11% of the 55 year-olds and older were discriminated against in the past 12 months.

- **Income status.** Discrimination experiences are most prevalent among those belonging to the lowest income quartile (41% vs. 31-34% among those over the lowest quartile).
- **Employment status.** In terms of employment status, the least discriminated against were those who stayed at home or who were in unpaid work (19%), which can best be explained by the fact that this group is over-represented by women. The unemployed (44%), and the employed and self-employed (40%), were the most likely to experience discrimination.
- **Education.** No marked differences were observed in the discrimination experiences of people with 6 or more years of schooling; however, those with 5 years of education or less were the least likely to indicate they had been discriminated against in the last 12 months (16%).

RESPONDENT STATUS

A number of 'respondent status' variables were collected in the survey – such as citizenship and length of stay in the country – which can be tested with respect to their influence on discrimination rates. Table 3.3.2 shows that with respect to these 'status'

Table 3.3.2 – Discrimination rate (CA2-CI2, past 12 months)

General group: North African

By respondent status and neighbourhood, %

Length of stay in COUNTRY (BG8a)	1-4 years	50
	5-9 years	44
	10-19 years	37
	20+ years	26
	Born in COUNTRY	32
Neighbourhood status relative to other areas of the city (PI01)	Poorer	26
	As other areas	40
	Mixed	40
Language proficiency in the national language (PI04)	Fluent, without foreign sounding accent	36
	Fluent, with foreign sounding accent	40
	Less than fluent	28
Citizenship in COUNTRY (BG9)	Citizen (only)	30
	Not a citizen	43

EU-MIDIS 2008

variables, several substantial differences emerge between subgroups:

- **Length of stay in the country:** A quarter of North African immigrants who had lived in the country (where they were interviewed) for more than 20 years reported incidents of discrimination in the last 12 months, whereas half of those who had moved to the country between 1 and 4 years ago (50%) reported discrimination. A third of the respondents who were born in the country said they had experienced discrimination in the past 12 months.
- **Citizenship:** North African immigrants who are citizens of the country they live in were less likely to experience discrimination in the past 12 months (30%) compared to 43% who are not citizens.
- **Neighbourhood status:** 26% of the North African immigrants living in poor neighbourhoods were discriminated against. In comparison, discrimination rates in areas with status characteristics similar to other areas in the city and to areas with a 'mixed' status were markedly higher (both 40%) – a possible explanation being that respondents living in more mixed neighbourhoods or those having a similar status to other areas in a city are more likely to be exposed to discrimination in their daily encounters.
- **Language proficiency:** Respondents who spoke the national language with a foreign accent were slightly more likely to report an experience of discrimination than were those who spoke the language without an accent (40% vs. 36%). Respondents who were not fluent in the national language were, nevertheless, the least likely to have encountered discrimination (28%) – one possible explanation of this finding is that a better knowledge of the national language intensifies the contacts of immigrants with the majority population, which in turn increases the likelihood of being discriminated against and/or increases the ability to perceive more subtle forms of discriminatory behaviour.

3.3.4. Crime victimisation

See Figure 3.3.8:

Corresponding to the general patterns of discrimination experiences, becoming a victim of

the five crimes tested (i.e. theft of/from a vehicle, burglary, theft of other personal property, and two instances of in-person crimes: assaults or threats, and serious harassment) in the past 12 months was most likely for North African respondents living in Italy – with two in five of them having been victimised. However, if 5-year rates are considered, more than half of the respondents living in Italy and an equally high proportion of North Africans in the Netherlands were victims of crime. In comparison, one in five respondents in Belgium, Spain and France have been victimised in the past 12 months, and about two in five if 5-year rates are considered.

The rate of all respondents having experienced a crime that was perceived as racially motivated was highest in Italy: 22% of respondents claim to have experienced such crimes in the past 12 months. Rates were much lower in the other countries: 12% in Spain and even fewer (6-9%) respondents in other countries experienced racially motivated crime

in the past 12 months – making only Italy and Spain the countries where more than half of the crimes committed against North African minorities were attributed to racial motivations.


Property crimes

The frequency of **vehicle crimes**⁷⁸ (theft of/from a vehicle) was different in each of the countries. While two in five vehicle owners were victimised in Italy and the Netherlands, only about one in four respondents living in Spain had the same experience, and one in ten North African respondents living in Belgium or France had a vehicle stolen/something stolen from it in the past 5 years. 12 month victimisation rates were about half as high as 5-year rates, with the highest again in Italy and the Netherlands (16% and 17% of vehicle owners victimised, respectively), and lowest in Belgium and France (5-6%).

Due to low case numbers it is hard to draw conclusions regarding the rate of those assuming a racial motivation behind vehicle crimes. However, about one in four respondents in Spain and a third of respondents in Italy attributed racial motivation to these crimes. In other countries, even fewer respondents felt this way (case numbers did not exceed five).

There was not much difference with regard to becoming a victim of **burglary**⁷⁹ in the countries surveyed. The most victimised were North Africans living in the Netherlands (14% in the past 5 years). If 12-month rates are considered, the rate of respondents having been victims of burglary does not exceed 5% in any of the countries. It is again hard to analyse perceived racial motives for these crimes due to the low numbers involved, but about a third of victims believed that they were picked on because of their ethnic or immigrant background in Italy and the Netherlands, and even fewer felt this way in other countries (four respondents was the most).

With regard to **theft of personal belongings**⁸⁰ (e.g. purse, mobile phone, etc.), it was again North Africans living in Italy that indicated they were victimised the most, with about one in three being victimised in the past 5 years (12-month rate: 19%). One in five respondents from all the other countries had



Question DA1-DE1: During the last 5 years in [COUNTRY], has [TYPE] happened to you? [IF YES] DA2-DE2: Thinking about the last time this happened, when was this: in the last twelve months or before then? [IF YES] DA3-DC3, DD4, DE5: Do you think that [this incident/any of these incidents] IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS happened partly or completely because of your immigrant/minority background?

78 Questions DA1-2: During the [REFERENCE PERIOD] in [COUNTRY], was any car, van, truck, motorbike, moped or bicycle – or some other form of transport belonging to you or your household – stolen, or had something stolen from it? [IF NEEDED, CLARIFY: All forms of motorised and non-motorised transport can be included].

79 Questions DB1-2: During the [REFERENCE PERIOD], did anyone get into your home without permission and steal or try to steal something? [Does include cellars – Does NOT include garages, sheds lock-ups or gardens].

80 Questions DC1-2: Apart from theft involving force or threat, there are many other types of theft of personal property, such as pick-pocketing or theft of a purse, wallet, clothing, jewellery, or mobile phone. This can happen at work, on public transport, in the street – or anywhere. Over the [REFERENCE PERIOD] have you personally been the victim of any of these thefts that did not involve force?

some small belongings stolen in the past 5 years (respective 12-month rates are 6-9%). About one in three respondents in Italy and Spain sensed a racial motivation for these crimes, and about one in six respondents also believed this to be the case in France and the Netherlands; although virtually no one in Belgium did.

In-person crimes – focusing on racist motivation

EU-MIDIS investigated rates of victimisation in two specific instances of in-person crimes: assaults or threats, and serious harassment (although the latter does not necessarily qualify for an offence in a criminal sense).

If respondents indicated they had experienced in-person crime in the last 12 months they were asked detailed follow-up questions with respect to the last incident for each of the two crime types surveyed ('assault or threat', and 'serious harassment'). These follow-up questions provided detailed information about the nature of incidents, including who the perpetrator or perpetrators were.

Looking at Table 3.3.3, the likelihood of becoming a victim of assault or threat, or serious harassment, was highest for North Africans in Italy - where 15% were assaulted or threatened and as many harassed in the past 12 months. Otherwise, assault, threat and serious harassment rates in the previous 12 months rarely exceeded 10%, and were as low as 4% in some countries (assaults or threats in Belgium).

With regard to the perceived **racial motivation** of these crimes, North Africans in Italy were the most likely to see such motives – with about three in four of them believing that they were picked on because of their ethnicity in the case of assaults or threats, and one in two in the case of serious harassment in the past 12 months. Those least likely to see racial motivation behind assaults or threats were respondents from France (17%), and in all other countries about half of the victimised respondents also felt that racial motivation played a part. Respondents from almost all countries were either more than or as likely to attribute racist motivation to incidents of serious harassment as for incidents of assault or threat: nearly three in four respondents believed that they had been harassed because of their ethnicity in Italy and Spain, and two in three respondents in France.

The **use of force** during assaults or threats was most common in Spain and Italy (in four in five cases), and force was used against two in five respondents in Belgium and France, and in the nearly half of incidents in the Netherlands. **Robbery** was especially common in Italy, where in about three quarters of incidents of assault or threat **something was stolen**. In the case of some groups, perceived racial motivation was confirmed by the use of **racially/religiously offensive language**: more than half of assaulted or threatened respondents in Belgium, Spain and the Netherlands said that such offensive language was used. However, except in Belgium, the rate at which offensive language was used is the same if not somewhat higher in the case of harassments than for assaults or threats. During both types of incidents, it was North Africans in France who rarely reported the use of such offensive language (one in five respondents or less).

An explanation for this could be due to the **ethnicity of perpetrators**: in France, half or more of the perpetrators in the case of both assault and threat, and serious harassment, were from the *same* ethnic group – the highest rate among all North Africans groups surveyed. In at least half of the cases in other countries, perpetrators were from the majority group (both for assaults, threats, and serious harassment), except for harassments in Belgium where 43% of offenders came from the majority population. Inter-ethnic incidents were, however, also common: about one third or more of respondents (in France one in four) from most countries stated that the perpetrator of the serious harassment was from another ethnic group. The rate of inter-ethnic incidents was the lowest in Spain, where only one in ten victims were assaulted, threatened or harassed by a perpetrator from a different non-majority ethnic group.

Most respondents considered assaults or threats **serious**: at least half of them in all countries said that the incident was serious or very serious. Respondents tended to view their experiences of harassment as slightly less serious, but still at least a half of respondents said that these incidents were serious.

Reporting rates for assaults or threats were not especially high in any of the groups with the exception of Italy – where half of respondents did report these crimes to the police. Two in three respondents from other countries did not report these incidents. Reporting rates for harassment were generally lower in all countries: at least two thirds of respondents did not report these incidents to the police.

Table 3.3.3 – In person crimes, main results

	ASSAULT OR THREAT					SERIOUS HARASSMENT				
	BE	ES	FR	IT	NL	BE	ES	FR	IT	NL
<i>Victimisation rate (based on DD1, DD2/DE1, DE2)</i>	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Victimised past 12 months	4	10	8	15	7	7	6	11	15	9
Victimised past 2-5 years	6	4	9	14	4	8	5	7	12	7
<i>Attributed racial/ethnic motivation (DD4/DE5)</i>										
Yes, including the most recent	57	61	17	48	46	51	73	63	70	30
Yes, but not including the most recent	0	0	1	26	3	4	3	1	9	0
<i>Racist or religiously offensive language used (DD9/DE9)</i>										
Yes	57	60	12	41	54	42	71	20	57	53
<i>Force actually used (DD10)</i>										
Yes (within all incidents)	43	78	42	80	47
Yes (in the total population)	2	8	3	12	3
<i>Something stolen (DD5)</i>										
Yes (within all incidents)	3	17	12	73	24
Yes (in the total population)	0	2	1	11	2
<i>Perpetrators (DD8/DE8)</i>										
From the same ethnic group	31	10	61	5	21	18	11	50	7	28
From another ethnic group	26	13	29	49	22	36	11	24	33	38
From majority	55	72	12	71	54	43	81	26	69	57
<i>Seriousness (DD14/DE13)</i>										
Very or fairly serious	80	60	66	53	79	65	71	54	58	47
Not very serious	15	38	26	47	18	32	27	46	41	53
<i>Not reported to the police (DD11/DE10)</i>										
Not reported	68	63	71	50	78	81	79	88	70	80
<i>Reasons for not reporting (DD13/DE12, top 3 mentions)</i>										
No confidence in the police	45	17	4	24	34	31	20	25	40	48
Too trivial/not worth reporting	28	31	31	48	22	31	34	41	32	12
Dealt with the problem themselves	10	6	49	8	16	22	7	46	6	15

EU-MIDIS 2008, North African

One of the main reasons for not reporting assaults or threats was a lack of confidence in the police. Another common reason for not reporting to the police was the belief that the latest incident, which respondents were asked to recall, was too trivial/not worth reporting. About half of respondents in France claimed that they dealt with the problem themselves. The main reasons for not reporting harassment were quite similar: in most countries at least one in three mentioned a lack of confidence in the police (except in the Netherlands, where this reason was scarcely mentioned), almost half of respondents in the Netherlands and two in five in Italy considered the incident too trivial and not worth reporting, and

about half of respondents in France said that they had dealt with the problem themselves.

When asked if they avoid certain places or locations for fear of being assaulted, threatened or harassed because of their immigrant/minority background, one in four respondents in Belgium and Italy said that they do (25-26%). Respective rates in the other countries were 13-17%. Again, we can suppose that if these avoidance measures were not taken, victimisation rates among these groups might be higher.

3.3.5. Crime victimisation by respondent characteristics

SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE

Table 3.3.4 shows that the groups most likely to have been victimised were: those under 40 years old; those with at least six years of education; the unemployed or non-active; those on lower incomes.

A notable finding, which runs counter to results from existing surveys on the majority population, was that there were no significant differences in victimisation rates based on respondents' gender.

- **Age group.** Victim surveys generally indicate that younger people are more often victims of crime than older people, which is partly a reflection of their life style. This was also observed for North African immigrants: the highest victimisation rates (in past 12 months) were recorded among immigrants in the youngest age groups (up to 24 years – 34%; between 25 and 39 – 30%), while the oldest age group had the lowest victimisation rate (55 and older – 12%).
- **Employment status.** The unemployed and the non-active ran the highest victimisation risk (29-30%), followed by the employed or self-employed (26%). Homemakers and those in unpaid

Table 3.3.4 – Victimization rate (DA2-DE2, past 12 months)

General group: North African

By socio-demographic profile, %

Respondent gender (BG0)	Male	25
	Female	27
Age group (BG1)	16-24 years	34
	25-39 years	30
	40-54 years	17
	55 or more	12
Household income (quartiles) (BG6)	In the lowest quartile	29
	Between the lowest quartile and the median	22
	Above the median	24
Employment status (BG5)	Employed/self-employed	26
	Homemaker/unpaid work	15
	Unemployed	30
Education status (years) (BG7)	Non-active	29
	Up to 5 years	15
	6-9 years	24
	10-13 years	25
	14 years or more	29

work were characterised by lower victimisation rates – which is interesting given that no notable differences in victimisation rates were recorded between men and women.

- **Education.** The more years of education, the more likely respondents were to have been victimised – while 15% of the least educated respondents became a victim of a crime in the past 12 months, this rate increased to 29% among those in the highest educational category. The result might be an effect of age rather than education – as older respondents in general were less highly educated.

RESPONDENT STATUS

A number of 'respondent status' variables were collected in the survey – such as citizenship and length of stay in the country – which can be tested with respect to their influence on crime victimisation rates. The results showed that certain groups – as shown in Table 3.3.5 - were more likely to have experienced some form of victimisation than other groups.

- **Length of stay in the country:** The group with the lowest victimisation rate were those who had lived in a country for more than 20 years (21%). North Africans who moved to a country more recently (i.e. between 1 and 9 years ago) were more likely to have experienced some form of victimisation in the past 12 months (26-27%).

Table 3.3.5 – Victimization rate (DA2-DE2, past 12 months)

General group: North African

By respondent status and neighbourhood, %

Length of stay in COUNTRY (BG8a)	1-4 years	27
	5-9 years	26
	10-19 years	23
	20+ years	21
Neighbourhood status relative to other areas of the city (PI01)	Born in COUNTRY	31
	Poorer	19
	As other areas	30
Language proficiency in the national language (PI04)	Mixed	27
	Fluent, without foreign sounding accent	30
	Fluent, with foreign sounding accent	25
Citizenship in COUNTRY (BG9)	Less than fluent	18
	Citizen (only)	26
	Not a citizen	25

However, it was the second-generation immigrants, those who were born in the country, who were the most likely to have been victimised – note: these immigrants tend to be younger, and as such are characterised by a higher likelihood of victimisation.

- **Neighbourhood status:** Victimization rates were highest in city areas with status characteristics similar to most other areas in the city and areas with a mixed status (30% and 27%, respectively). The corresponding rate was 19% in poorer areas.
- **Language proficiency:** Proficiency in the local language was associated with victimisation experiences; while over a quarter of respondents who spoke the national language fluently encountered some form of victimisation in the past 12 months (25-30%), only 18% of those who did not speak the language fluently had similar experiences.
- **Citizenship:** There are no substantial differences in victimisation experiences with regard to citizenship status; however, those with citizenship of the country of residence (once again, a generally younger group compared to the others) proved to be the most vulnerable to crime victimisation.


3.3.6. Corruption

1-5% of the respondents from various North African groups had been asked or expected to pay a bribe by a public official⁸¹ in the past five years (the highest rate, 5%, was among North Africans in Italy). The majority of incidents of bribery in the past 12 months were presumed by the respondent to be linked to their immigrant or ethnic minority background (in total for the five groups, 16 cases out of 25). Three-quarters of all cases mentioned by the five groups involved a police officer, with other unspecified public officials being the second most likely to be mentioned. Only two out of 25 cases were reported anywhere.

3.3.7. Police and border control

The police are in general more trusted than not by North African respondents, though differences can

Figure 3.3.9
Police contact (F3, F9)
In the past 12 months, %



Question F3: Thinking about the last time you were stopped in this country, when was this? Was it in the last 12 months or before then? F9: Apart from the police stopping you, which I've already asked you about, have you had any contact with the police in this country in the last 12 months? By this I mean you could have reported something to them yourself, or you may have had to register something with them, etc.

be observed between the five survey countries: half of respondents in Belgium, Spain and France said that they trust the police, and two in five respondents also indicated their trust in the police in Italy and the Netherlands. The level of those explicitly trusting the police is the highest in Spain (52%). About a third or fewer respondents said explicitly that they do not trust the police – the highest rates of those who felt this way were in the Netherlands (35%) and Italy (33%). The lowest rate was in Spain (23%).

Police stops – including perceptions of profiling

North African respondents in Spain and France have the most intense contact with the police; about half of them had some form of contact with the police in the past 12 months (see Figure 3.3.9). This is mainly due to the intensity of police stops: about two in five of respondents in these two countries have been stopped by the police (adding only police stops to both stops / other contacts), whereas respective rates for the other countries are one in four.

Most of those who were stopped by the police in France were driving a car or motorbike (73%), and more than half of those stopped in Belgium (54%) and the Netherlands (52%) were also driving a vehicle.⁸²


81 Questions E1-2: During [REFERENCE PERIOD] did any government official in [COUNTRY], for instance a customs officer, a police officer, a judge or an inspector, ask you or expect you to pay a bribe for his or her services?

82 Question F6: Thinking about THE LAST TIME you were stopped by the police in this country, were you in a car, on a motorbike or bicycle, on public transport or just on the street?

Figure 3.3.10

Perception of profiling at police stops (F5)

Those stopped in the past 12 months, %



Question F5: Do you think that [the last time you were stopped/any time you were stopped] IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS was because of your immigrant/minority background?

Respondents in Spain were most likely to be stopped on the street (81%), and this was true for one in three respondents in Belgium, Italy and the Netherlands. One in five North Africans in Italy was stopped on public transport, and one in ten respondents in the Netherlands were stopped while riding a bicycle (a factor that is attributable to high rates of bicycle use in the Netherlands). **Most respondents were stopped once or twice at the most, but one in three respondents in Italy and Spain claim to have been stopped by the police four times or more in the past 12 months, and one in five respondents in Spain said they were stopped more than ten times.**


When stopping respondents, the most common **police actions**⁸³ involved asking questions (40-64% in all groups), or asking for identity papers/residence permits – most often in Italy (90%), Spain (85%) and France (82%). Corresponding with the situation in which they were most often stopped (in a car or on a motorbike), respondents in France (66%) were the most likely to be asked for a driving licence or vehicle documents. About one in three respondents in Belgium and France were personally searched or had their vehicles searched. One in three North African respondents in the Netherlands was fined.

As shown in Figure 3.3.10, respondents in Spain and Italy were the most likely to suspect that they were stopped because of their ethnic background;

Figure 3.3.11

Evaluation of police conduct during stops (F8)

Last stop, in the past 12 months, %



Question F8: Again, thinking about the last time you were stopped, how respectful were the police when dealing with you?

three in four believed that their most recent or a previous police stop in the last 12 months was a result of ethnic profiling, and more than half of respondents stopped in Belgium (55%) considered the same to be true.

The **conduct of the police during police stops** was evaluated quite similarly by most of the North African respondents in the different countries (see Figure 3.3.11). 42-44% in Belgium, Spain, France and the Netherlands felt that police officers were fairly or very respectful towards them during their last experience of a police stop. On average, a third of respondents in these countries thought that the police's conduct was in fact disrespectful – except in Spain, where only one in four respondents felt this way. **Respondents in Italy had a somewhat more negative experience, only one in three of them evaluated the police's conduct as respectful, and 41% of them found it disrespectful.**

Evaluation of police conduct in other contacts

The evaluation of the police in circumstances other than police stops showed a more positive picture: 63-73% of respondents in Belgium, Spain, France and the Netherlands felt that the behaviour of the police was very respectful, and 18% or less had a negative experience (see Figure 3.3.12). In comparison, only

⁸³ Question F7: Thinking about the last time you were stopped, what did the police actually do? 01 – Ask you questions, 02 – Ask for identity papers – ID card/passport/residence permit, 03 – Ask for driving licence or vehicle documents, 04 – Search you or your car/vehicle, 05 – Give some advice or warn you about your behaviour (including your driving or vehicle), 06 – Did an alcohol or drug test, 07 – Fine you, 08 – Arrest you/take you to a police station, 09 – Take money or something from you in the form of a bribe, 10 – Other.



Question F10: Thinking about the last time you had contact with the police in this country – that DID NOT involve them stopping you – how respectful were they to you?

51% of North Africans in Italy regarded the police as respectful, while 23% considered them to be disrespectful.

Border control

The survey asked respondents a couple of ‘screening questions’ about whether, in the last 12 months, they had returned to their country of residence from travel abroad when immigration/border/customs personnel were present, and if they had been stopped by them. These results in themselves cannot present a picture of potential discriminatory treatment as they are dependent on factors such as where respondents were travelling back from, the existence or not of Schengen border controls, and whether respondents had an EU passport. However, having determined that respondents had returned to their country of residence and had been stopped by immigration/border/customs personnel, they were asked a follow-up question about whether they considered they were *singled out for stopping on the basis of their immigrant/ethnic background* when re-entering their country of residence – which was used as a rough indicator of potential profiling during these encounters.

33–45% of North African respondents in Spain, France, Italy and the Netherlands returned from abroad to their respective country of residence in the past 12 months.⁸⁴ Respondents in Belgium (18%) were less likely to travel. When returning to their country of residence, respondents were stopped by immigration, customs or border control to different extents. The most likely to be stopped were North Africans living in Italy (79%) and France (76%), but about a half of respondents living in Belgium were stopped as well. **85% of North Africans living in Italy suspected that they were stopped by border control/immigration personnel because of their ethnic/immigrant background**, whereas 44% of respondents in Spain and one in three respondents in the other countries thought that they were singled out because of their ethnicity. Given that minorities can be moving within the EU’s Schengen borders, and therefore they are not always required to stop and produce ID or a passport when re-entering their country of residence, these figures are an indication that certain groups may be stopped more by border control in certain countries; however, further research is needed regarding the specific circumstances of stops.

3.3.8. Police stops

SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE

Table 3.3.6 outlines experiences of police stops by socio-demographic profile.

- **Gender:** Men were significantly more likely than women to have been stopped by the police; this refers both to police stops in the past five years (41% of men had *not* been stopped by the police vs. 78% of women) and stops in the past 12 months (45% of men vs. 14% of women *were* stopped in this period). Furthermore, men and women had different perceptions with regard to ethnic profiling by the police: men were slightly more likely to think this was the case (25% vs. 20% who felt ethnicity played no role in the stop) – the corresponding proportions for women were 4% vs. 10%.
- **Age group:** North Africans between 16 and 39 years of age were most likely to be stopped by the police: half of them having been stopped in the past five years. In comparison, only about 22% of those aged 55 years or older were

⁸⁴ Question G1: During the last 12 months, have you ever entered [COUNTRY] from a visit abroad when either immigration, customs or border control were present?
 ASK IF RESPONSE TO G1 = Yes – G2. During the last 12 months, were you ever stopped by [COUNTRY NATIONALITY] immigration, customs or border control when coming back into the country?
 ASK IF RESPONSE TO G2 = Yes – G3. Do you think you were singled out for stopping by [COUNTRY NATIONALITY] immigration, customs or border control specifically because of your immigrant/minority background?

Table 3.3.6 – Police stops (F2, F3 and F5)**General group: North Africans**

By socio-demographic profile, %

		Not stopped	Stopped in past 2-5 years	Stopped in past 12 months, no profiling	Stopped in past 12 months, with profiling
Respondent gender (BG0)	Male	41	14	20	25
	Female	78	9	10	4
Age group (BG1)	16-24 years	50	9	18	22
	25-39 years	50	13	18	20
	40-54 years	66	14	13	8
	55 years or more	78	14	2	6
Household income (quartiles) (BG6)	In the lowest quartile	60	14	12	15
	Between the lowest quartile and the median	51	13	20	16
	Above the median	51	12	16	21
Employment status (BG5)	Employed/self-employed	47	15	20	18
	Home maker/unpaid work	85	7	6	3
	Unemployed	48	11	17	25
	Non-active	62	9	12	16
Education status (years) (BG7)	5 years or less	74	14	5	7
	6-9 years	60	13	9	18
	10-13 years	55	12	16	17
	14 years or more	50	11	21	18

EU-MIDIS 2008

stopped by the police at all in the five years preceding the interview.

motivation behind the police's decision to stop them.

- **Income status:** North African immigrants with an income above the lowest quartile were more likely to have been stopped by the police in the past 12 months than were those with incomes in the lowest quartile (36-37% vs. 27%).

RESPONDENT STATUS

Looking at 'respondent status' variables – such as citizenship status and length of stay in the country – and their relationship to experiences of policing, the following can be noted (see Table 3.3.7):

- **Employment status:** While only 15% of those looking after the home or in unpaid work were stopped by the police in the past five years, more than half of the unemployed and those employed or self-employed had been stopped (52% and 53%, respectively) – differences that can largely be attributed to gender. The unemployed were – in relative as well as in absolute terms – the most likely to indicate that they were stopped as a result of ethnic profiling by the police.
- **Education:** North African immigrants with 5 years of schooling or less were the least frequently stopped by the police, while those with at least 14 years of education were the most heavily policed group (considering the 12 month rate the prevalence of police stops were 12% and 39%, respectively). Those with under 10 years spent in education were most likely to attribute a racist

- **Length of stay in a country:** North Africans who immigrated between five and nine years ago and those who were born in a country were the most frequently stopped by the police, but only slightly more.

Groups also differed as to how much they assumed that police stops were connected to their ethnic background: respondents who had been in a country between five and nine years were most likely to answer that they were stopped as a result of police profiling than to say that their ethnicity did not play a role (24% vs. 12%; the corresponding proportions for those born in a country were 18% vs. 22%).

- **Neighbourhood status:** Although the likelihood of police stops did not differ much between

neighbourhoods, North Africans living in poor neighbourhoods more often felt they were subjected to police profiling (20% vs. 16% who did not attribute discriminatory police treatment).

- **Citizenship:** This did not have a marked effect. Citizens and non-citizens were more or less equally likely to have been stopped in the past 12 months. However, non-citizens more often perceived that they were targeted because of their ethnic background.

- **Language proficiency:** More than four out of 10 North Africans who were fluent in the local language said they were stopped by the police in the past five years, compared to nearly a third of those who were less than fluent in the local language (29%). These results indicate that language proficiency might be linked to a specific demography and thus lifestyle (and of course being a second generation migrant), which increases the likelihood of police stops.

Table 3.3.7 – Police stops (F2, F3 and F5)

General group: North Africans

By respondent status and neighbourhood, %

		Not stopped	Stopped in past 2-5 years	Stopped in past 12 months, no profiling	Stopped in past 12 months, with profiling
Length of stay in COUNTRY (BG8a)	1-4 years	63	11	11	15
	5-9 years	51	14	12	24
	10-19 years	53	12	17	18
	20+ years	63	13	14	10
	Born in COUNTRY	50	10	22	18
Neighbourhood status relative to other areas of the city (PI01)	Poorer	52	12	16	20
	As other areas	56	12	16	16
	Mixed	57	12	16	15
Language proficiency in the national language (PI04)	Fluent, without foreign sounding accent	53	10	19	17
	Fluent, with foreign sounding accent	51	14	17	18
	Less than fluent	71	10	6	13
Citizenship in COUNTRY (BG9)	Citizen	56	11	19	14
	Not a citizen	55	13	12	20

EU-MIDIS 2008

3.3.9. Respondent background

Origins

The North African (Maghrebian) minorities in the five EU Member States (Belgium, France, Italy, The Netherlands and Spain) were quite diverse regarding their country of birth and length of stay in their respective countries of residence. A clear distinction can be made based on whether a large proportion of the North African minority was born in the country, or if they were mostly first generation immigrant populations. Examples of the former (born in the country) were Belgium, France and the Netherlands, where two out of five respondents were born in the country. In the other two countries, Italy and Spain, respondents were predominantly more recent immigrants.

Socio-demographic details

With regard to education, the North African minorities in France were the most educated, with only 10% of them having completed less than 10 years of study and 64% having completed 14 or more. In the case of North African minorities in other countries, the rate of undereducated minority respondents was about one in four, and slightly lower for Italy (15% with 9 years or less in school). The rate of those having completed 14 or more years of study was 37-45% in all other countries.

There were substantial differences among North African minorities regarding employment. Two thirds in Spain and Italy were employed (i.e. full-time, part-time, or self-employed), whereas this rate was 55% for those living in France and roughly one third of respondents in all other countries. The rate of those explicitly unemployed was however not so high (10-19%), even in countries where the employment rate was lower. This is due to the high rate of homemakers (4-16%) and/or students (15-27%, except for North Africans in Spain where only 5% were students).

Cultural background

The first language of 14-17% of North African respondents was French in Belgium and France – not surprising considering that almost half of them were born in the country. Otherwise the first language of almost all respondents was Arabic and dialects of Arabic. Most respondents were fluent in the language of their country of residence (70-95%).

The religion of all groups was almost exclusively Islam. Many were without a specific denomination, but about half or more of respondents in Belgium, Italy and the Netherlands were Sunni. Almost all of them considered religion fairly or very important (84-99%). One in three North Africans in Belgium said that they wear religious/traditional clothing, and 41% in the Netherlands said the same; more than 80% of those wearing such apparel in both countries were women. Rates for this in the other countries were significantly lower (15-22%).

Segregation

According to the observations of interviewers, 71% of North Africans in Belgium and 43-46% in France and the Netherlands lived in a predominantly immigrant/minority population neighbourhood. Rates were somewhat lower in Spain (about one in three respondents), and just 15% in Italy. The neighbourhoods of North African respondents in Belgium, Spain and France were considered poorer in relation to other parts of the city in about one in three cases, and rates for this were somewhat lower in the other countries (11-20%).

3.4. The Roma

Who was surveyed?

The survey looked at the experiences of Roma in seven Member States, which, with the exception of Greece, joined the EU between 2004 and 2007. Unlike most of the other groups surveyed in EU-MIDIS, the Roma are an indigenous minority population in the Member States where they were surveyed.

Reflecting where the Roma are mainly located in each Member State, interviews in Greece and Hungary were carried out in urban settings, while interviews in other countries were undertaken as a 'nationwide' sample (including some urban locations). At the same time, the interviewer-generated data on the nature of neighbourhoods where the Roma were interviewed shows that in some countries, such as Bulgaria and Romania, the Roma tended to live in areas that were predominantly Roma. Therefore, it is suggested that the results should be interpreted with the context of the different Roma communities in mind.

At the end of this chapter more information is provided about the background characteristics of the seven Roma groups surveyed.

SAMPLE

Member States:

- Bulgaria (N=500)
- Czech Rep. (N=505)
- Greece (N=505)
- Hungary (N=500)
- Poland (N=500)
- Romania (N=500)
- Slovakia (N=500)


Sampling method:

Random route sampling with FE in high-density urban areas (HU – Budapest and Miskolc, EL – Athens and Thessaloniki); nationwide random route sampling in areas with Roma concentration (BG, CZ, PL, RO, SK)

Some key findings on respondents' experiences of discrimination, victimisation and police stops

Figure 3.4.1 summarises some key results from the survey.

Figure 3.4.1



Question CA2-CI2 / DA2-DE2: Thinking about the last time this happened, when was this: in the last twelve months or before then?
CA4-CI4: Did you or anyone else report this incident anywhere? DD11, DE10: Did you or anyone else report the incident to the police?

F2: In this country, within the last five years, have you EVER been stopped by the police when you were in a car, on a motorbike or bicycle, on public transport or just on the street? F3: Thinking about the last time you were stopped in this country, when was this? Was it in the last 12 months or before then? F5: Do you think that [the last time you were stopped/any time you were stopped] IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS was because of your immigrant/minority background?

A dedicated 'Data in Focus' report on the Roma has been produced from the survey's results, which can be downloaded or ordered in print form from the FRA's website (<http://fra.europa.eu/eu-midis>).

The Roma emerged as the most discriminated against group surveyed by EU-MIDIS.

Roma communities in the various Member States are affected very differently by discrimination and victimisation; however, most of these communities belong to a high-risk group considering all vulnerable minorities investigated in this survey. As a reflection of this, the Roma were the most likely of all groups surveyed to avoid certain locations in their area for fear of being discriminated against (23%), or for fear of being harassed, threatened or attacked (31%).

The majority of the Roma in the Czech Republic (64%), Hungary (62%), Poland (59%) and Greece (55%) felt they were **discriminated against on the basis of their ethnicity** at least once in the past 12 months (considering the nine domains tested). In comparison, about one in four Roma respondents in Bulgaria and Romania could recall a specific incident from the past 12 months which they considered discriminatory.

Non-reporting of discrimination is generally high among the Roma (e.g. incidents do not get reported either at the place where they occur or somewhere else). The highest rate for reporting incidents of discrimination was recorded for the Czech Roma (34%), who also indicated that they experience the highest levels of discrimination of all Roma groups surveyed. In several Member States, on the other hand, respondents were very unlikely to officially report incidents of discrimination, with reporting rates being as low as 8% in Bulgaria and 10% in Greece.

A similar pattern emerges when we look at rates of **criminal victimisation** across the five crime types tested (being a victim of theft of or from a vehicle, burglary, theft of personal property, assault or threat, or serious harassment). About half of those interviewed in the Czech Republic (46%) and Greece (54%) were victims of at least one of these crimes in the last 12 months, while medium-level victimisation rates were recorded in Hungary (34%), Poland (33%) and Slovakia (28%). In line with their low discrimination rates, Bulgarian (12%) and Romanian (19%) Roma were the least likely to indicate that they were victims of crime in the past 12 months. Correspondingly, Bulgarian and Romanian Roma were unlikely to attribute a racist motive to their

experiences of crime, whereas, in consideration of all interviewees, 35% of the Czech Roma and 29% of Polish Roma thought that they were victims of racially motivated crime in the last 12 months (this represents over three-quarters of all crime victims).

Crime incidents were generally more likely to be officially reported than discrimination experiences, but non-reporting remained extremely high: on average, only 12% of crime victims reported to the police in Bulgaria, 11% in Greece, and 15% in Hungary (please note that depending on the circumstances, serious harassment does not necessarily qualify as a criminal offence). The reporting rate for victimisation was highest in Slovakia (31%), followed by Poland (28%), Romania (25%) and the Czech Republic (24%).

The Greek Roma community is the most heavily policed among the seven countries surveyed.

Police profiling is also very widespread in Greece – 38% of all Roma interviewees in Greece were stopped by the police in the last 12 months in a manner that the subjects considered to be discriminatory; that is, they considered that they were stopped because of their ethnic background (this rises to 69% among the Greek Roma who were actually stopped in the last 12 months, see Figure 3.4.10). Considering that Greek and Hungarian Roma were the only two groups interviewed predominantly in urban settings, the fact that Hungarian Roma came second after Greek Roma in the average number of police stops they experienced probably reflects the fact that urban residence itself involves more intensive policing. In comparison, in the other Member States the Roma were interviewed *mostly* in non-urban centres and experienced less intensive policing.

Considering police stops in the past 12 months, Slovakian, Romanian and Bulgarian Roma were least likely to attribute their experiences of police stops to discriminatory police practice – ethnic profiling. These are also the Member States – along with Poland – where such stops are relatively rare, e.g. 80% of the Bulgarian Roma were not stopped by the police in the past 5 years.

3.4.1. General opinions on discrimination, and rights awareness

Respondents' opinions about the extent of discrimination on different grounds in their country of residence: including grounds in addition to ethnic or immigrant origin

Respondents were asked to assess how widespread

Figure 3.4.2
Is discrimination widespread? (A1, %)

Very or fairly widespread Very or fairly rare
Non-existent Can't tell





Figure 3.4.2 (Continued)
Is discrimination widespread? (A1, %)



Question A1: For each of the following types of discrimination, could you please tell me whether, in your opinion, it is very widespread, fairly widespread, fairly rare, or very rare in [COUNTRY]? Discrimination on the basis of...?

they thought discrimination on different grounds was in their respective countries.

Overall, Roma respondents had a rather unfavourable view about how widespread discrimination on a variety of grounds was in their country; with discrimination on the basis of ethnic or immigrant origin being identified as the prime source of unfair treatment by the Roma (see Figure 3.4.2). The opinion that discrimination on the basis of ethnic or immigrant origin is widespread varied from modestly high proportions in some countries (BG: 36%, RO: 41%) to the overwhelming majority of respondents indicating it to be a problem in others (HU: 90%, CZ: 83%, SK: 80%).


Other types of discrimination were considered widespread especially in the Czech Republic, Hungary and Slovakia; in all three Member States age-based discrimination was deemed as the second most widespread. It is also noteworthy that about half of Bulgarian respondents claimed that discrimination on the basis of any other grounds besides ethnic or immigrant origin is non-existent (44-58%, depending on the type).

Religion and belief is considered the least widespread ground for discrimination in five of the seven Member States where Roma were interviewed; the exceptions are Poland, where it ranked second most important, and Bulgaria, where discrimination based on sexual orientation was deemed least important.

Opinions on workplace advancement according to ethnicity or religion

A non-majority ethnic background is widely believed to be a barrier to workplace advancement in each country (see Figure 3.4.3.). Almost nine out of ten Roma in Poland (87%) and Hungary (85%) indicated that someone with a non-majority ethnic background faces particular challenges with regard to workplace advancement (e.g. admittance, training opportunities and promotions), and this opinion was also widespread in the other Member States: SK: 77%, EL: 78%, CZ: 68%, BG: 51%. Even in Romania, where the lowest number of respondents confirmed this, still 38% believed this to be the case.

Polish Roma were also more likely than others to say that a non-majority religion is a barrier to success in the labour market (however, the Polish



Question A4: Would you say that, with equivalent qualifications or diplomas, the following people would be less likely, as likely, or more likely than others to get a job, be accepted for training or be promoted in [COUNTRY]? A. A person of different ethnic origin than the rest of the population, B. A person who practices a different religion than that of the rest of the country?

Roma are unlikely to practice a religion different from the Polish majority). This opinion is second most widespread in Bulgaria, where a significant minority of the Roma are Muslims.

Willingness to provide information on ethnicity or religion for a census

Effective action against discrimination needs reliable information about communities that are vulnerable to discrimination.

Roma communities are generally undercounted in national statistics, which results in incomplete or inaccurate population data about this population on which to base policy responses. However, given the years of discriminatory treatment encountered by Roma in Europe, including periods of systematic oppression, evidence indicates that many Roma are reluctant to be categorised as ‘Roma’, which in part could be explained by the misuse to which ‘ethnic’ data has been put in some countries. Confirming this assumption, in several Member States where Roma were interviewed for EU-MIDIS, a number of interviewees indicated that they are reluctant to provide their **ethnic background**⁸⁵ for a census or similar large scale national data collection exercise, even if such information would be “anonymous” and the results could be used for combating discrimination and designing policies to assist minorities.

Yet, the results indicate that the majority of Roma would be willing to have information about their ‘ethnicity’ collected: In Poland, 87% said “yes” with respect to giving information about their ethnicity, and a mere 4% gave an outright “no”. In most other Member States those who agreed were in the majority too. It was only in Greece where just a minority of respondents said they would provide information on their ethnicity for a census (38%). When asked if they would reveal their **religion**⁸⁶ for a census, the results were essentially the same, e.g. 51% of the Greek Roma indicated that they would refuse such a question, whereas in other groups 50-79% would be willing to disclose their religion.

Awareness of anti-discrimination bodies

When asked whether they knew of any **organisation** in their country that could offer support or advice to people who have been discriminated against, for whatever reason,⁸⁷ Roma respondents were, in the main, unable to identify any organisation; the proportion of those not being able to name an organisation reached 94% in Greece, 89% in Romania, 87% in Bulgaria, 84% in Slovakia, 78% in Poland and Hungary, and 71% in the Czech Republic. Even in the Czech Republic and in Hungary – where Roma were relatively the most informed – only 24% (in CZ) and 22% (in HU) were able to say that they knew such an organisation. Only 6% of those interviewed in Greece

85 Question A5a: Would you be in favour of or opposed to providing, on an anonymous basis, information about your ethnic origin, as part of a census, if that could help to combat discrimination in [COUNTRY]?

86 Question A5b: And how about providing, on an anonymous basis, information about your religion or belief?

87 Question A3: Do you know of any organisation in [COUNTRY] that can offer support or advice to people who have been discriminated against – for whatever reason?

and 8% in Romania could name an organisation that they believed could be called upon for help when someone is facing discrimination (for whatever reason, including discrimination on the basis of ethnicity).

The survey also tested awareness of some of the **specific anti-discrimination authorities or bodies**⁸⁸ in each country by reading the names of these organisations and asking interviewees if they had heard of them. (Any of) the designated authorities where incidents of discrimination could be reported are best known in Poland (where 62% stated that they are aware of at least one of the three authorities) and in the Czech Republic (58%). The authorities that proved to be best known are the *Civil Rights Spokesman* in Poland (59%) and the *Defender of Rights* in the Czech Republic (58%). Hungarian Roma are the third most aware of anti-discrimination public bodies (43% have heard of at least one of the two named organisations, with the *Parliamentary Commissioner for the National and Ethnic Minorities Rights* being the better known: 35%). In the other Member States less than three out of ten Roma stated that they had heard of (any of) the specific named authorities in their country (SK: 29%, EL: 26%, RO: 24%, BG: 19%).

Awareness of anti-discrimination laws

The survey tested respondents' awareness of anti-discrimination laws, with respect to grounds of ethnicity, in three areas: employment, services and housing. **Roma respondents in each country were relatively unaware of anti-discrimination laws:** particularly in Greece, where, for example, only 11% thought that there were laws that forbid discrimination on the basis of someone's ethnic or immigrant background when applying for a job.⁸⁹

About one in four Roma in Bulgaria and Romania were aware of the existence of anti-discrimination legislation on various grounds, with awareness being

in the 28-47% range in Slovakia, Poland and Hungary (depending on the country and different areas covered by such legislation). In sum, respondents are generally more aware of anti-discrimination laws concerning the job market, and less so regarding general services⁹⁰ and housing.⁹¹ The highest awareness of such legislation was detected among the Czech Roma; 57% of them confirm that laws are in place to prevent workplace discrimination (but only 40% are aware of such laws regarding services, and 36% think that discrimination on the basis of someone's ethnic background is forbidden in law when letting or selling a house/apartment).

57% of Roma in the Czech Republic, and a relatively high percentage in Slovakia (42%), said that they had heard of the **EU's Charter of Fundamental Rights**.⁹² Yet even in these Member States, only 10% indicated that they actually knew what the Charter is about. In comparison in Greece, a mere 6% said they had heard of the Charter and 1% claimed that they knew what it is.

In other Member States awareness of the Charter was as follows – PL: 32%, RO: 26%, BG: 23%, HU: 18% – with the proportion claiming to know what the Charter is about being in the range of one third/one fifth of these percentages.

3.4.2. Experience of discrimination

Respondents' general experiences of discrimination on different grounds

Having measured their *opinion* on the extent of discrimination on different grounds in their country of residence (as outlined in the previous paragraphs), respondents were asked a follow-up question about their general *experiences* of discrimination in the last 12 months under the same cross-section of grounds (see explanatory footnote⁹³).

88 Questions B2A-C: Have you ever heard of the [NAME OF EQUALITY BODY1-3]?

The following Equality Bodies were tested: Bulgaria – "Commission for Protection Against Discrimination"; Czech Republic – "Defender of Rights"; Greece – "The Greek Ombudsman", "Equal Treatment Committee" and "Work Inspectorate"; Hungary – "Equal Treatment Authority" and "Parliamentary Commissioner for the National and Ethnic Minorities Rights"; Poland – "Office of the Commissioner for Civil Rights Protection", "Government commissioner for equal status of Women and Men" and "General Commission of Government and Ethnic and National Minorities"; Romania – "National Council for Combating Discrimination"; Slovakia – "Slovak National Centre for Human Rights".

89 Question B1a: What do you think, is there a law in [COUNTRY] that forbids discrimination against immigrants and ethnic minority people... (a) when applying for a job?

90 Question B1b: What do you think, is there a law in [COUNTRY] that forbids discrimination against immigrants and ethnic minority people... (b) when entering or in a shop, restaurant or club?

91 Question B1c: What do you think, is there a law in [COUNTRY] that forbids discrimination against immigrants and ethnic minority people... (c) when renting or buying a flat?

92 Question B3: Are you familiar with the "Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union"? 1 – Yes and you know what it is, 2 – Yes, you have heard about it, but you are not sure what it is, 3 – No, you have never heard about it.

93 Before clarifying specific discrimination experiences for the nine types tested in the survey, EU-MIDIS asked a complementary question to clarify respondents' general thoughts or impressions about their recent discrimination history. In order to do so on a comparative basis, EU-MIDIS used a question from a 2008 Eurobarometer survey (EB 296, 2008), which asked about personal memories of discrimination in multiple domains – Question A2, which asked 'In the past 12 months have you personally felt discriminated against or harassed in [COUNTRY] on the basis of one or more of the following grounds? Please tell me all that apply. A – Ethnic or immigrant origin, B – Gender, C – Sexual orientation, D – Age, E – Religion or belief, F – Disability, X – For another reason'. Chapter 4 in this report presents a comparison of results between the majority and minority populations' responses to this question from Eurobarometer and EU-MIDIS.

Note for reading figures presented in the report:

In a number of figures and tables in the report, the five-year rate is the sum of the percentage given for the past 12 months and that for the 2-5 year period. Similarly, where the 12-month rate is broken down into multiple categories (e.g. those stopped by the police in the 12 months prior to the interview as a result of profiling, and those stopped by the police in the 12 months prior to the interview *not* as a result of profiling) the percentages in each category should be added up for the actual 12-month prevalence rate. For some questions multiple responses were possible and therefore the reader is advised to look at the question wording as set out in the original questionnaire, which can be downloaded from the FRA's website.

Looking at Figure 3.4.4, and returning to the findings outlined earlier in Figure 3.4.2, the results suggest that impressions of discrimination are often reflected in experiences as a large proportion of people in the various Roma communities confirmed that they had been discriminated against (in the past 12 months), and especially on the basis of their ethnicity. Apart from Bulgaria and Romania, the majority of Roma respondents in the survey indicate that they have been discriminated against on a variety of grounds, and primarily on the basis of their ethnicity. The proportion of those who considered they were discriminated against on grounds *not involving* their ethnicity remained between 1% and 6%.


Respondents' experiences of discrimination across nine areas of everyday life on the grounds of ethnic or immigrant origin

As shown in Figure 3.4.5: In most countries where the Roma were surveyed, significant numbers had experienced specific incidents of discrimination on the basis of their ethnicity in the past 5 years and in the past 12 months.

The results indicate that the Czech Roma were the most likely to confirm that they personally had been discriminated against on the basis of their ethnicity: as many as three quarters indicated such an incident in the past 5 years, and 64% during the past 12 months.⁹⁴ On the other hand, 66% of the Roma in Bulgaria and 65% in Romania could *not* recall an incident of discrimination from the past 5 years in the nine domains surveyed.

Looking at the *average for all Member States* where Roma were interviewed, discrimination in the past five years is most widespread when someone is looking for work (only 40% of those in this situation did *not* face discrimination), and around one quarter of respondents said they were treated unfavourably in shops (25%), cafés (26%), and by health services (25%) because they were Roma. On the other hand, 91% of those who were in contact with banks were *not* discriminated against in the past 5 years, and 71% did not experience discrimination at their workplace; however, this last result should be treated with caution as many Roma are not in regular paid employment, which therefore can indicate high levels of discrimination when looking for work. Discrimination rates reported in relation to schools,

Figure 3.4.4
General experiences of discrimination on different grounds (A2)
In the past 12 months, %




EU-MIDIS 2008

Question A2: In the past 12 months have you personally felt discriminated against or harassed in [COUNTRY] on the basis of one or more of the following grounds [ethnic or immigrant origin, gender, sexual orientation, age, religion or belief, disability, other reason]?

94 Key reference periods are 12 months (e.g. the 12 months that preceded the interview), or five years (preceding the interview). Please note that this section provides some illustrations, where the two reference periods are combined. In these charts and tables, the five-year rate is the sum of the percentage given for the past 12 months and that for the 2-5 year period. Similarly, where the 12-month rate is broken down into multiple categories (e.g. those stopped by the police in the 12 months prior to the interview as a result of anticipated profiling and those stopped by the police in the 12 months prior to the interview not as a result of anticipated profiling) the percentages in each category should be added up for the actual 12-month prevalence rate.

Figure 3.4.5
Personal discrimination experience based on ethnicity (CA1-CI1, CA2-CI2)
 Prevalence across 9 domains, %



EU-MIDIS 2008

Questions CA1-CI1: During the last 5 years, [or since you've been in the country if less than 5 years], have you ever been discriminated against when [DOMAIN] in [COUNTRY] because of your immigrant/minority background? CA2-CI2: Thinking about the last time this happened, when was this: in the last twelve months or before then?

social services, and in housing are about 20%; but again, these rates must be considered in the light of the fact that many Roma do not come into contact with particular services – if they did, discrimination rates might be higher still.

When asked if they avoid certain shops or cafés because they think they would be treated badly because of their ethnic background, Roma in Greece were *most likely* (35%) and those in Bulgaria and Romania *least likely* (14% and 11%, respectively) to say they adopt such behaviour, while around one quarter of Roma in the other Member States claimed that they tended to avoid such places (CZ: 28%, HU: 23%, PL: 23%, SK: 27%). The low rate of avoidance behaviour reported for Bulgaria and Romania could in part reflect the fact that members of the interviewed Roma community in these countries tended to live, according to interviewers' assessments, in neighbourhoods that were predominantly Roma, and therefore, it can be argued, they would not come into regular contact with shops and cafés where they would experience discrimination.

Perhaps as a reflection of this relative isolation, **Bulgaria** emerges in the survey as one of the Member States where Roma report the least discrimination overall. Still, two-fifths of those who were *looking for work* in Bulgaria had been discriminated against during the past 5 years (42%) (see Figure 3.4.6); 29%

in the past 12 months (however only 7% of those in work reported discrimination at their current workplace in the past 12 months). Considering the past 12 months, 11% of Bulgarian Roma were discriminated against by *healthcare* personnel and 10% by *social services* personnel. In comparison, rates of discrimination experienced by Bulgarian Roma are lower in relation to *shops, banks* and *housing services*. Also, discrimination in *schools* is very rare. These comparatively low rates of discrimination should be cautiously interpreted as they can also be explained by greater levels of isolation from mainstream society, which, in itself, could be caused by long-term and systemic discrimination.

Relative to some of the other six Member States where the Roma were surveyed, the situation in the Czech Republic is considerably much worse.

According to interviewees in this country, seven out of ten (69%) of those who were *looking for work* felt they were discriminated against during the past 5 years on the basis of their ethnicity (45% during the past 12 months), and four out of ten of those *in work* thought they were discriminated against (27% in the last 12 months). Considering the past 5 years, approximately one third of Roma reported incidents of discrimination that took place in *bars or restaurants* (38%) (in the past 12 months: 30%), and by *social service* personnel (34%) (12 months: 21%). Unequal treatment is least widespread in relation to banks (5 years: 14%).

In **Greece**, Roma are most likely to be discriminated against *when looking for work* (5 years: 57%; 12 months: 42%). In the past 5 years, over a third of Roma in Greece faced unequal treatment *at work* (39%) (12 months: 29%), as well as from *housing services or private landlords* (34%) (12 months: 20%). They also felt discriminated against by *healthcare* workers in relatively large proportions (23% in the past 12 months, and 30% in the past 5 years). The Greek Roma also faced incidents of discrimination in *bars and restaurants* (12 months: 20%, 5 years: 27%).

Looking for work is an area where **Hungarian** Roma (as well as Roma from other Member States) feel discriminated against the most (5 years: 68%; 12 months: 47%). Roma in Hungary are also very likely to recall an incident of discrimination in relation to *school* (either as a student or as a parent): 39% indicated such an incident in the past 5 years (12 months: 17%). Also, those Roma *in work* in Hungary are more likely to be discriminated against than in most other Member States (12 months: 25%, 5 years: 36%). These results, when looked at together with the findings on discrimination in other areas of everyday

Figure 3.4.6
Specific discrimination experience based on ethnicity (CA1-CI1, CA2-CI2)

■ In the past 12 months
 ■ In the past 2-5 years
 □ Not discriminated against

Reporting rate (CA4-CI4)

% who reported the most recent incident in the past 12 months

■ Not reported (incl. Don't know/ Refused)
 □ Reported

BG

When looking for work	29	13	58
At work	7	3	90
By housing agency/ Landlord	0	1	99
By healthcare personnel	11	2	87
By social service personnel	10	3	87
By school personnel	2	2	96
At a café, restaurant or bar	6	3	91
At a shop	1	1	97
In a bank	1	1	98

Not reported	96	4
Reported	95	5
Not reported	100	0
Reported	95	5
Not reported	94	6
Reported	70	30
Not reported	100	0
Reported	100	0
Not reported	100	0

CZ

When looking for work	45	24	31
At work	27	13	60
By housing agency/ Landlord	13	9	77
By healthcare personnel	18	6	76
By social service personnel	21	13	66
By school personnel	11	9	80
At a café, restaurant or bar	30	8	61
At a shop	24	7	70
In a bank	11	3	86

Not reported	81	19
Reported	78	22
Not reported	78	22
Reported	85	15
Not reported	78	22
Reported	67	33
Not reported	88	12
Reported	79	21
Not reported	74	26

EL

When looking for work	42	15	43
At work	29	10	61
By housing agency/ Landlord	20	14	66
By healthcare personnel	23	7	70
By social service personnel	14	4	82
By school personnel	10	5	85
At a café, restaurant or bar	20	7	73
At a shop	18	3	79
In a bank	8	1	91

Not reported	96	4
Reported	95	5
Not reported	91	9
Reported	93	7
Not reported	93	7
Reported	87	13
Not reported	95	5
Reported	100	0
Not reported	88	12

HU

When looking for work	47	21	32
At work	25	11	64
By housing agency/ Landlord	16	13	71
By healthcare personnel	18	7	75
By social service personnel	18	8	73
By school personnel	17	22	60
At a café, restaurant or bar	24	8	68
At a shop	31	8	62
In a bank	14	3	82

Not reported	96	4
Reported	83	17
Not reported	96	4
Reported	79	21
Not reported	96	4
Reported	77	23
Not reported	97	3
Reported	94	6
Not reported	98	2

PL

When looking for work	36	34	30
At work	22	12	66
By housing agency/ Landlord	10	6	84
By healthcare personnel	22	10	68
By social service personnel	18	7	75
By school personnel	20	14	65
At a café, restaurant or bar	26	8	66
At a shop	44	8	48
In a bank	8	3	89

Not reported	89	11
Reported	94	6
Not reported	93	7
Reported	80	20
Not reported	71	29
Reported	54	46
Not reported	94	6
Reported	96	4
Not reported	52	48

RO

When looking for work	19	21	60
At work	12	7	81
By housing agency/ Landlord	3	1	96
By healthcare personnel	11	9	79
By social service personnel	4	2	94
By school personnel	4	6	89
At a café, restaurant or bar	9	4	87
At a shop	8	2	89
In a bank	2	1	97

Not reported	93	7
Reported	40	60
Not reported	81	19
Reported	88	12
Not reported	87	13
Reported	74	26
Not reported	98	2
Reported	90	10
Not reported	81	19


Figure 3.4.6 (Continued)
Specific discrimination experience based on ethnicity (CA1-CI1, CA2-CI2)

■ In the past 12 months
 ■ In the past 2-5 years
 □ Not discriminated against

Reporting rate (CA4-CI4)

% who reported the most recent incident in the past 12 months

■ Not reported (incl. Don't know/ Refused)
 □ Reported



Questions CA1-CI1 / CA2-CI2 as with Figure 3.4.5. CA4-CI4: Did you or anyone else report this incident anywhere?

life, put the Hungarian Roma up amongst those most discriminated against in the seven Member States where Roma were surveyed.

High levels of discrimination were also reported in survey interviews with the Roma in **Poland**. Seven out of 10 Roma in Poland stated they felt discriminated against *when looking for work* over the last 5 years (70%) (12 months: 36%). More than half of the Roma respondents were discriminated against in a *shop* over the past 5 years (5 years: 52%, 12 months: 44%), and around a third of the sample reported discrimination incidents from the past five years by school personnel, at work, in bars or restaurants, and by healthcare personnel.

Two-fifths of Roma in **Romania** in search of work stated that they had experienced unfair treatment due to their ethnicity in the past 5 years (40%) (12 months: 19%). The second area of everyday life that was most often referred to as a source of discriminatory treatment was *healthcare*: 20% said they were discriminated against in this domain in the past five years and 11% in the past 12 months.

Alongside Roma in Hungary, Poland and the Czech Republic, Roma in **Slovakia** indicate that they are often discriminated against *when looking for work*: 65% of those interviewed experienced unequal treatment in the past 5 years and 38% during the past 12 months. On the other hand, discrimination *at the workplace* against those who are already employed is rather low in Slovakia when compared with results for other countries (5 years: 16%, 12 months: 4%). Almost three out of ten respondents felt they were discriminated against in the past five years by *healthcare* and *social services*, and in a *restaurant or bar*.

Reporting discrimination

Roma who are discriminated against are extremely unlikely to report these incidents either at the place where they occur or to a complaints body, with non-reporting reaching extreme highs in Bulgaria (92%) and Greece (90%). In the other Member States, the average proportion of unreported incidents across the nine areas of discrimination surveyed ranges from 66% to 82% (see Figure 3.4.6) (please note that in several instances the number of persons providing answers with respect to non-reporting is very low as a reflection of the rate of discrimination experienced by individuals in the past 12 months). Victims of discrimination in the Czech Republic are most likely to report an incident (34%), and, amongst all Roma groups surveyed, those experiencing discrimination in the area of education (either as a parent or a student) are more likely to report these incidents than other types of discrimination.

When asked why they do not report incidents of discrimination, respondents predominantly expressed their scepticism that “nothing would change” as a result of reporting (e.g. 83% in Bulgaria and 87% in Slovakia) (see Figure 3.4.7).

While fear of intimidation is not a likely cause for not reporting an incident of discrimination (although a significant number offered a response falling into this category in the Czech Republic and Slovakia), many are concerned about the possible negative consequences of bringing a complaint of discrimination (e.g. 52% in the Czech Republic and 58% in Slovakia).

Figure 3.4.7

Reasons for not reporting discrimination (CA5-C15)

Based on the last incident, in the past 12 months, in any of 9 domains, %





Figure 3.4.7 (Continued)

Reasons for not reporting discrimination (CA5-C15)

Based on the last incident, in the past 12 months, in any of 9 domains, %



Questions CA1-C11 / CA2-C12 as with Figure 3.3.5. CA4-C14: Did you or anyone else report this incident anywhere?

Another relatively important reason for non-reporting is the procedural uncertainty; that is, **discrimination victims do not know where or how to report such incidents, especially in Bulgaria (64%), Greece (59%), Poland (53%) and Slovakia (58%)**.

At the same time, in some Member States many of these incidents of discrimination were deemed as fairly trivial everyday occurrences by respondents (BG: 48%, CZ: 57%, SK: 63%).

In comparison with many of the other aggregate groups surveyed who are immigrants in their country of residence, the Roma do not face problems with reporting discrimination that can be related to their residence permit status, as the Roma are national citizens, nor do they report facing language barriers when it comes to reporting discrimination.

3.4.3. Discrimination by respondent characteristics

[Please note that this section does not give a breakdown for the Roma group according to nationality and immigrant status, due to the extremely low rate of non-nationals and immigrants in this general group.]

- **Gender, income and education:** As shown in Table 3.4.1, the characteristics that produce *no* differences in discrimination rates among the Roma are income and education, one of the possible reasons for the lack of difference is the overall low level of differentiation among the Roma according to income and education – in sum, the majority of Roma are both on low incomes and under-educated.

- **Age and employment:** In comparison, age and employment status are factors that do divide

the Roma into specific sub-groups with different experiences of discrimination. The reported rate of discrimination among Roma in the oldest age group (55 years of age and above) is much lower than among younger Roma: around half of respondents under 55 report discrimination. With regard to employment status, the likelihood of experiencing discrimination is highest among Roma who are unemployed (61%).

Table 3.4.1 – Discrimination rate (CA2-C12, past 12 months)


General group: Roma

Socio-demographic profile, %

Respondent gender (BG0)	Male	48
	Female	47
Age group (BG1)	16-24 years	51
	25-39 years	50
	40-54 years	48
	55 years or more	34
Household income (quartiles) (BG6)	In the lowest quartile	46
	Between the lowest quartile and the median	46
	Above the median	44
Employment status (BG5)	Employed/self-employed	47
	Homemaker/unpaid work	42
	Unemployed	61
	Non-active	39
Education status (years) (BG7)	5 years or less	43
	6-9 years	49
	10-13 years	49
	14 years or more	47

EU-MIDIS 2008

3.4.4. Crime victimisation



Question DA1-DE1: During the last 5 years in [COUNTRY], has [TYPE] happened to you? [IF YES] DA2-DE2: Thinking about the last time this happened, when was this: in the last twelve months or before then? [IF YES] DA3-DC3, DD4, DE5: Do you think that [this incident/any of these incidents] IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS happened partly or completely because of your immigrant/minority background?

EU-MIDIS results indicate that Roma and Sub-Saharan African respondents are by far the most vulnerable groups to become victims of crime. Corresponding to general patterns of discrimination experiences, crime victimisation in the last 5 years – in relation to the five crimes tested in the survey (theft of and from a vehicle, burglary, other theft, assault or threat, and serious harassment) – is most prevalent among the Roma in Greece (66%), the Czech Republic (64%) and Poland (59%). **In Greece more than half of those interviewed were victims of crime in the past 12 months (54%),** and a similarly high rate was recorded amongst Roma in the Czech Republic (46%). Looking at results for criminal victimisation over the five year period, about half of those interviewed in Slovakia (50%) and Hungary (53%) were victimised in the past five years, whereas Roma in Bulgaria (19%) and Romania (34%) were the least likely to be victimised by crime in the past five years.

With respect to racially motivated crime:

Considering all persons interviewed, as many as 35% of the Czech Roma, 29% of the Greek and Polish Roma, 21% in Hungary, and 17% in Slovakia stated that they were targeted by racially motivated crime in the past 12 months. In contrast, **in Bulgaria and Romania victims of crime tended not to attribute a racist motivation, but in the other five Member States the majority of those who were crime victims thought that their ethnic background played a role in their victimisation.**

Property crime

Looking at experiences of property crime over the past five years, **theft of and from vehicles**⁹⁵ (including all motorised and non-motorised transport) was not a problem among vehicle owning Roma in Bulgaria (4%) and Romania (9%). On the other hand, 23% of Greek Roma were victims of vehicle-related crime during a 12 month period (5 years: 36%). Vehicle related crime is also relatively widespread in the Czech Republic (12 months: 10%, 5 years: 31%) and Hungary (12 months: 14%, 5 years: 28%). A relatively high 5-year victimisation rate but a lower 12-month victimisation rate was recorded in Poland (24% and 6%, respectively) and in Slovakia (22% and 5%) – a probable explanation being that respondents were less able than elsewhere to recover or replace stolen vehicles, thus a more recent ‘repeat victimisation’ was not possible.

About a quarter or fewer of such crimes in the past 12 months were thought to be motivated by racism: Czech Republic (26%) and Greece (17%). In some Member States this proportion was nominally higher, but the number of cases remained extremely low and hence no meaningful conclusions can be drawn from the results.

The other property crime surveyed, **burglary**,⁹⁶ affected a very high number of Roma in Greece (12 months: 29%, 5 years: 43%); with the Czech Republic reporting the second highest burglary rate (12 months: 11%, 5 years: 19%). Burglary victims were found in essentially equal proportions in Hungary, Poland and Slovakia (12 months: 6-9%, 5 years: 14-15%), while only 9% of respondents in Romania and Bulgaria had their home broken into during the past five years (12 months: 3% and 6%, respectively for the two countries). Racist motivation is infrequently

95 Questions DA1-2: During the [REFERENCE PERIOD] in [COUNTRY], was any car, van, truck, motorbike, moped or bicycle – or some other form of transport belonging to you or your household – stolen, or had something stolen from it? [IF NEEDED, CLARIFY: All forms of motorised and non-motorised transport can be included]

96 Questions DB1-2: During the [REFERENCE PERIOD], did anyone get into your home without permission and steal or try to steal something? [Does include cellars – Does NOT include garages, sheds lock-ups or gardens].

attributed to burglary in comparison with some other crimes; yet about one half of burglaries in the past 12 months were thought to be racially motivated in Poland (53%) and one third in Slovakia (36%). 21-24% of burglary victims in Romania, Hungary and Greece thought that perpetrators singled them out on the basis of their ethnicity, while only 6% in Bulgaria thought this was the case (although 9% could not tell, which was the highest among all Roma communities surveyed).

With regard to **theft**⁹⁷ (other than vehicle related crime and burglary), 29% of Roma in Greece reported that some of their smaller belongings (e.g. purse, mobile phone, etc.) were stolen in the past 5 years, with their 12-month victimisation rate being 21%. This is by far the highest result considering all Roma surveyed for this crime; the 12-month victimisation rate among the Czech Roma (11%, in second place) is almost half of what EU-MIDIS recorded in Greece. In all other Member States the proportion of victims of theft in the last 12 months remains at 8% or under, with the lowest 12-month incidence rates recorded in Bulgaria (2%) and Romania (4%). A possible racist motive was attributed to experiences of theft by Roma in Poland, Greece and the Czech Republic (54%, 27% and 27% of crimes of theft in the past 12 months, respectively). In contrast, in Bulgaria none of the victims of theft indicated that perpetrators stole their belongings because they were Roma.⁹⁸

In-person crimes

EU-MIDIS investigated rates of victimisation for two specific instances of in-person crime: assaults or threats, and serious harassment (although the latter does not necessarily qualify for an offence in a criminal sense) (see Table 3.4.2).

If respondents indicated they had experienced in-person crime in the past 12 months they were asked detailed follow-up questions with respect to the last incident for each of the two crime types surveyed ('assault or threat', and 'serious harassment'). These follow-up questions provided detailed information about the nature of incidents, including who the perpetrator or perpetrators were.

With respect to a five year period, the likelihood of becoming a victim of **assault or threat**⁹⁹ varies greatly across the various Roma communities surveyed – ranging from 3% in Bulgaria to a more than ten-fold ratio in Poland (32%, see Table 3.4.2). In turn, the 12-month rate of victimisation for assault or threat ranges between 2% (Bulgaria) and 15% (Czech Republic and Poland). In Bulgaria, Greece and Hungary about a third of the reported assaults or threats were robberies (32-34% of victims indicated that something was stolen as a result of the incident), while elsewhere this proportion was lower (ranging between 20% in Slovakia and 11% in Romania).

Assaults or threats involving physical violence were most likely in Bulgaria (60% of all incidents), the Czech Republic and Romania (both 55%).

Assaults or threats in the other Member States also often went beyond "only" threatening the victim; for example, in Hungary, where most incidents did not involve physical contact, 37% of victims stated that force was actually used.

Serious harassments are more widespread than assaults or threats; however in some Member States the difference in prevalence rates is minimal (e.g. in Hungary, Romania and Bulgaria). Roma in the Czech Republic were most likely to report an incident of harassment in the past 5 years (48%; 12 months: 31%), and those living in Poland were close to this figure too (41%, 12 months: 21%). On the other hand, only 6% of the Bulgarian Roma reported serious harassment in the past 5 years (12 months: 4%), which is one of the lowest values considering all distinct ethnic communities, besides the Roma, surveyed by EU-MIDIS. The serious harassment rate is also relatively low – compared to most other Roma groups – in Romania (5 years: 16%, 12 months: 10%).

While *ethnic motives* were relatively rarely assumed in relation to property crimes (as previously discussed), **victims of in-person crimes very often considered that their ethnic (or religious) background could have played a role in them becoming a victim.** In high, but varying degrees – depending on the proportion of *peer-group or non-peer group perpetrators* – victims of in-person crimes tended to assume racial motives behind their victimisation: **this is particularly the case in the Czech Republic (where 87% of the most recent cases of assault or threat, and 84% of**

97 Questions DC1-2: Apart from theft involving force or threat, there are many other types of theft of personal property, such as pick-pocketing or theft of a purse, wallet, clothing, jewellery, or mobile phone. This can happen at work, on public transport, in the street – or anywhere. Over the [REFERENCE PERIOD] have you personally been the victim of any of these thefts that did not involve force?

98 N = 10, the analysis with regard to racist motivation should be treated with caution due to the low number of cases.

99 Questions DD1-2: During the [REFERENCE PERIOD], have you been personally attacked, that is hit or pushed, or threatened by someone in a way that REALLY frightened you? This could have happened at home or elsewhere, such as in the street, on public transport, at your workplace – or anywhere.

Table 3.4.2 – In-person crimes, main results 1

	ASSAULT OR THREAT							SERIOUS HARASSMENT						
	BG	CZ	EL	HU	PL	RO	SK	BG	CZ	EL	HU	PL	RO	SK
<i>Victimisation rate (based on DD1, DD2/DE1, DE2)</i>	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Victimised past 12 months	2	15	7	11	15	8	12	4	31	28	16	21	10	14
Victimised past 2-5 years	1	11	3	9	17	5	7	2	17	4	7	20	6	13
<i>Attributed racial/ethnic motivation (DD4/DE5)</i>														
Yes, including the most recent	50	87	69	84	86	31	66	75	84	84	85	86	48	69
Yes, but not including the most recent	10	3	2	4	7	0	9	0	4	2	0	4	0	4
<i>Racist or religiously offensive language used (DD9/DE9)</i>														
Yes	40	53	65	58	78	32	32	26	70	91	64	74	38	36
<i>Force actually used (DD10)</i>														
Yes (within all incidents)	60	55	44	37	48	55	48
Yes (in the total population)	1	8	3	4	7	5	5
<i>Something stolen (DD5)</i>														
Yes (within all incidents)	33	18	34	32	14	11	20
Yes (in the total population)	1	3	2	4	2	1	2
<i>Perpetrators (DD8/DE8)</i>														
From the same ethnic group	37	32	32	45	1	57	44	23	32	6	40	0	56	31
From another ethnic group	0	27	23	7	0	13	6	9	21	20	2	2	2	5
From majority	40	68	39	49	97	25	54	71	79	86	70	98	42	67

EU-MIDIS 2008

serious harassments, were considered to be racially motivated), in Poland (86% for both crimes) and in Hungary (84-85% for both).

Assaults or threats are predominantly committed by majority perpetrators in Poland (97%), the Czech Republic (68%) and in Slovakia (54%). The Roma in Greece, on the other hand, are less likely to attribute ethnic motivation to assaults or threats (69% in the most recent incident), as 32% of the perpetrators are also Roma. Such a pattern is even more evident in Romania, where 57% of assaults or threats against the Roma were committed by Roma perpetrators, and thus only 31% of the incidents were considered to be 'racist'; while in Bulgaria 50% of assaults or threats were felt to be racially motivated – and 37% of perpetrators were Roma. In some other Member States many victims considered even intra-ethnic incidents as racially motivated; for example, in Hungary almost half of incidents of assault or threat were committed by fellow-Roma (45%), yet 84% of victims indicated that these crimes were racially/ethnically motivated. Herein it is suggested that follow-up research is needed to explore how intra-ethnic crime manifests itself between the Roma, and if ethnic differences within the Roma population are identified and seen as a cause of victimisation between different Roma groups.

In comparison with assault or threat, perpetrators of serious harassment are less likely to come from the victim's own ethnic group and are much more likely to be from the majority population. In most Member States at least two thirds of harassment incidents involved majority population offenders (for example: 67% in Slovakia, 86% in Greece and 98% in Poland). This explains the generally higher proportion of racially motivated incidents for harassment, which essentially corresponds to the proportion of cases where majority offenders were involved (victims assume racist reasons ranging from 69% in Slovakia to 75-86% in most Member States). It is only in Romania where most Roma who were victims of harassment indicated that the perpetrators were also Roma (56%).

Victims' judgements of racist motivation – especially in the case of serious harassment – were generally supported by their references to the use of *racially or religiously offensive language* by perpetrators. In general though, the proportion who stated that perpetrators used this type of offensive language remains below – sometimes well below – the proportion of incidents that were assumed to be racially motivated. Significant differences in this regard were observed in Bulgaria; where, for example, only 26% of harassment victims indicated that racist language was used by offenders, while 75% of these

Table 3.4.3 – In-person crimes, main results 2

	ASSAULT OR THREAT							SERIOUS HARASSMENT						
	BG	CZ	EL	HU	PL	RO	SK	BG	CZ	EL	HU	PL	RO	SK
<i>Seriousness (DD14/DE13)</i>														
Very or fairly serious	43	75	72	47	78	37	70	60	59	72	47	75	26	58
Not very serious	57	20	25	53	15	51	29	40	37	28	53	19	65	39
<i>Reported to the police (DD11/DE10)</i>														
Yes	33	35	30	20	31	34	35	0	15	7	11	21	18	33
<i>Reasons for not reporting (DD13/DE12)</i>														
Fear of intimidation	30	51	52	18	23	35	42	0	50	28	18	24	27	54
Concerned about consequences	15	50	41	29	39	24	45	16	44	42	18	42	18	51
No confidence in the police	100	87	70	62	92	52	68	75	72	72	68	81	38	77
Too trivial/not worth reporting	85	42	16	20	17	5	42	28	31	43	14	13	35	50
Dealt with the problem themselves	85	57	27	29	28	14	67	25	45	55	23	25	26	48
Negative attitude to police	15	53	35	19	52	0	23	11	41	36	16	46	0	33
Reported elsewhere	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	21	2	4	2	1	3	0
Residence permit problems	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Language difficulties/insecurities	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	1	0	0
Too much trouble / time	0	25	3	10	4	16	10	20	16	2	6	5	8	5
Other reason	0	39	3	18	10	16	5	11	19	1	10	1	0	4

EU-MIDIS 2008

incidents were assumed to be racially motivated. Differences between assumed racist motivation and the use of racist language were observed in most Member States, especially in the case of assaults or threats. However, victims, based on factors such as past experience and general discriminatory treatment, can still assume racist motivation in the absence of offensive language.

Inter-ethnic assaults or threats and harassment

(that involve some other ethnic minority) were most widely reported by the Roma in the Czech Republic (27% of assaults or threats and 21% of harassments), in Greece (23% and 20%, respectively) and to a lesser extent in Romania (13% of assaults or threats but only 2% of harassments were committed by perpetrators from another ethnic minority).

As discussed, in-person crimes against Roma (especially harassment) are very often committed by the majority population. **Notably in the Czech Republic and Slovakia it is not atypical that these offences are committed by perpetrators identified as belonging to a racist gang (CZ - assault or threat: 25%, and 35% harassment; SK - 15% and 10%, respectively).** In the Czech Republic reports of lone perpetrators of in-person crimes is quite atypical (19% of assaults or threats and 21% of incidents of serious harassment were committed by offenders who were alone), while in Slovakia 31% of those who

committed an assault or threat and 44% of those who harassed the Roma were on their own. Lone perpetrators of in-person crimes were most widely reported by the Roma in Bulgaria (assaults or threats: 43%, harassment: 62%), and least frequently in Poland (10% and 13%, respectively).

In comparison with serious harassment, victims of assaults or threats were only slightly more or as likely to rate the incident as very or fairly *serious* (see Table 3.4.3). In Bulgaria, harassment incidents were generally considered to be serious for the victim (60% stated that harassment was at least fairly serious versus 43% in the case of assaults or threats). However this result is an exception; in the other six Member States assaults or threats are considered at least as serious as harassments.

With respect to reporting in-person crimes to the police, differences can be observed concerning **reporting of assault or threat and serious harassment to the police.** In all Member States, with the exception of Slovakia where reporting for assault or threat and harassment is similar, the Roma are *much less likely to report harassment* to the police. Extremes in reporting patterns can be observed for Bulgaria where none of the harassment incidents were reported (however most victims felt they were at least fairly serious¹⁰⁰), and also in Greece where 72% stated that the last incident they experienced

100 Please once again note the extremely low case number, N=20.

was serious but only 7% reported it to the police. In comparison, harassment is relatively frequently reported in Slovakia (33%), Poland (21%) and in Romania (18%). Non-reporting is somewhat lower in the case of *assaults or threats* (reporting rates range between 20% in Hungary to 35% in Slovakia and the Czech Republic), but in several Member States less than half of the cases which were otherwise rated as serious were eventually reported to the police (e.g. in the Czech Republic, Greece, Hungary and Poland).

The reasons given for not reporting in-person crimes signal a high level of mistrust in the police’s ability to effectively respond to the needs of the Roma community as victims of crime in most Member States:

even in the best case, 52% of victims of assault/threat in Romania told interviewers that they didn’t report incidents because they had no confidence in the police. This proportion reached very high levels in several Member States (PL: 92%, CZ: 87%, EL: 70%; the results for Bulgaria are only indicative due to the small number of cases), and in every country this was the prime reason that victims most often gave for not reporting to the police.

As the Roma reported the highest rates of victimisation out of all the aggregate groups surveyed in EU-MIDIS, Table 3.4.3 is able to report on all the various reasons given for not reporting the most recent victimisation incident. In the Czech Republic and Slovakia large numbers of assault or threat victims who did not report to the police indicated that they took care of the issue themselves (57% and 67%; the results for Bulgaria are only indicative due to the small number of cases). Another reason for not reporting to the police was ‘fear of intimidation from the perpetrators’, which was given by 52% of victims in Greece, 51% in the Czech Republic, and 42% in Slovakia. While in the Czech Republic and Poland, an outright negative attitude towards the police was among the key reasons why such incidents were not reported by victims (53% and 52% of the cases, respectively in each country).

The reasons given for not reporting harassment are very similar to what was found in the case of assaults or threats: it is not the triviality of the case, but the lack of confidence in the police that primarily prevents these cases from being brought to them.

Of note in this regard is the proportion of Roma who indicate that **they avoid certain places or locations** for fear of being assaulted, threatened, or harassed, because of their ethnic background. This amounts to 53% in Poland, 39% in Greece, 36% in Slovakia, 36%

in the Czech Republic, and 27% in Hungary (BG: 8%, RO: 14%). In the absence of these avoidance measures incidents of assault or threat and harassment against the Roma could be much higher.

3.4.5. Crime victimisation by respondent characteristics

[Please note that this section does not give a breakdown for the Roma group according to citizenship and immigrant status, due to the extremely low rate of non-citizens and immigrants in this general group.]

Table 3.4.4 shows that no notable differences in the past 12-month victimisation experiences were observed between male and female Roma.

This in itself is a notable result because it differs from patterns of criminal victimisation recorded in existing crime surveys among the majority population – which indicate that men are more often victims of crime than women. This result in EU-MIDIS is even more startling given that the survey did not specifically explore in detail domestic violence and sexual assault, which are typically crimes that are dominated by female victims (although some of these cases may have been reported by the respondents as assault, threat or serious harassment).

- **Age:** However, with regard to age, victimisation rates reported by the Roma are more in line with

Table 3.4.4 – Victimization rate (DA2-DE2, past 12 months)

General group: Roma

By socio-demographic profile, %

Respondent gender (BG0)	Male	33
	Female	31
Age group (BG1)	16-24 years	37
	25-39 years	35
	40-54years	30
	55 years or more	21
Household income (quartiles) (BG6)	In the lowest quartile	31
	Between the lowest quartile and the median	31
	Above the median	31
Employment status (BG5)	Employed/self-employed	33
	Homemaker/unpaid work	30
	Unemployed	36
	Non-active	29
Education status (years) (BG7)	5 years or less	35
	6-9 years	31
	10-13 years	31
	14 years or more	26

general expectations about this indicator that are based on existing crime data and crime survey research on the majority population. Victimization rates are highest among the younger age groups and lowest among the older age groups. The most vulnerable are people aged up to 24 years, among whom 37% report having been a victim of crime in the past 12 months. The least vulnerable are Roma aged 55 years or more (21%).

- **Income and employment:** This does not influence victimisation risk. However, employment status produces some differences. The most vulnerable group, similar to the results regarding discrimination experiences, are the unemployed (36%).
- **Education:** Higher levels of education decrease the victimisation risk among the Roma. Those who report the lowest rates of victimisation are Roma with 14 years or more of schooling (26%), while Roma with 5 or fewer years of schooling report higher victimisation rates (past 12 months) of 35%.

3.4.6. Corruption

Looking at the past five years, 15% of the Roma community in Greece reported that a public official expected them to pay a bribe,¹⁰¹ with the proportion falling to 9% considering the past 12 months. This makes the Roma community in Greece the most likely to (or at least expected to) pay a bribe to public officials, with Romanian Roma coming second (5 years: 12%, 12 months: 7%). In most other Member States the proportion of the Roma who indicated they were expected to pay a bribe remained at levels which are, at most, half of what the survey found in Greece (considering the five-year time span, HU: 7%, CZ: 7%, SK: 5%, BG: 4%, PL: 3%).

While the number of available cases is very low (9 to 43 cases depending on the country) – thus the results lack statistical solidity – in many cases those who were expected to pay a bribe to public officials assumed that the incident was linked to their Roma background (especially those in Hungary: 72%, the Czech Republic: 67%, Greece: 47%, and Poland: 46%). In three countries (Bulgaria, Poland and Slovakia) policemen were mentioned as the group most frequently asking for a bribe to be paid. The second most frequently mentioned group were healthcare personnel (most often mentioned in Greece and


Romania). In Hungary some type of inspector was most likely to ask for a bribe, while in the Czech Republic those asking for a bribe were other, unspecified, public officials.

3.4.7. Police and border control

The police are in general not trusted by the Roma in Europe: 58% of Roma respondents in Poland, 56% in the Czech Republic, 54% in Slovakia, 53% in Greece, and 51% in Hungary indicated that they tend *not* to trust the police. Even in those Member States where the police received a more favourable response, less than half of interviewees stated that they trusted the police (Romania: 48%, Bulgaria: 43%). Outright confidence in the police is critically low in several Member States, including Poland (13%) and the Czech Republic (16%). 36% trust the police in Greece, and less than three in ten in Hungary and Slovakia (28% both).

Policing stops – including perceptions of profiling

Figure 3.4.9 shows that the Roma in Greece have the most intense contact with the police: the vast majority in the last 12 months experienced *police-initiated* contact (56% – adding together the 34% who were only stopped by the police with the



Question F3: Thinking about the last time you were stopped in this country, when was this? Was it in the last 12 months or before then? F9: Apart from the police stopping you, which I've already asked you about, have you had any contact with the police in this country in the last 12 months? By this I mean you could have reported something to them yourself, or you may have had to register something with them, etc.

101 Questions E1-2: During [REFERENCE PERIOD] did any government official in [COUNTRY], for instance a customs officer, a police officer, a judge or an inspector, ask you or expect you to pay a bribe for his or her services?

22% who were both stopped by and contacted the police themselves for some other reason in the last 12 months); while many initiated contact with the police *themselves* (35% – adding the 13% for whom the only contact with the police in the past 12 months was when they contacted the police themselves and the 22% who were both stopped by and contacted the police themselves for some other reason in the last 12 months). Only 30% among the Roma in Greece said they had no contact with the police. After Roma in Greece, the Hungarian Roma were in ‘second place’, with 41% stopped by the police in the past 12 months; but only a few directly contacted the police themselves (12%). Police contact is rather an exception, on the other hand, in Bulgaria and Poland – where 76% and 72%, respectively, had no contact with the police (which may be explained by the non-urban nature of the sampled communities in both Member States).


Looking at the circumstances of police stops: more than other Roma groups, the Bulgarian (84%) and Greek Roma (88%) were stopped by the police while driving a private vehicle, while the opposite pattern was noted in Hungary where 85% were stopped while on foot, or riding a bike. In the other Member States, about half of the stops were traffic controls.¹⁰²

In several Member States those stopped were more likely than not to perceive that the police stopped them because of their ethnic background (see Figure 3.4.10); for example, 69% of police stops in the past 12 months in Greece were considered to be the result of ethnic profiling.

Assumptions about profiling (e.g. respondents felt they were singled out by the police because of their ethnicity) were widespread in Hungary (57%), Poland (51%) and the Czech Republic (52%). Bulgarian Roma were least likely to assume that the police singled them out on racial/ethnic grounds when they were stopped (11%), while about a quarter of those stopped by the police in Romania and Slovakia had such an opinion (24-29%).

The dominant activity of the police at these stops was to check documents, and ask some questions – however quite a few stops resulted in a fine; namely in Greece (49%), but also in Romania (26%), Poland (24%), the Czech Republic (24%), and Slovakia (19%).¹⁰³

Figure 3.4.10
Perception of profiling at police stops (F5)
Those stopped in the past 12 months, %



Question F5: Do you think that [the last time you were stopped/any time you were stopped] IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS was because of your immigrant/minority background?

Overall, police stops of Roma resulted in the most serious outcomes in Greece: with 34% of those stopped escorted to a police station, and 68% having themselves or their vehicle searched by the police. Having to undertake an alcohol or drug test was also most frequent in Greece (41%), and took place quite often in Slovakia (39%) and in the Czech Republic (30%).


Figure 3.4.11 shows that police **conduct during stops** was evaluated very differently in the various Member States. **Negative evaluations were dominant in Greece (in total 51% considered that the police were fairly or very disrespectful during the latest stop) and in Poland (where 45% provided a similar assessment).** In most Member States the majority of respondents regarded the behaviour of the police as at least neutral. Roma were most satisfied with police conduct in Bulgaria, where in total three quarters stated that they were at least fairly respectful. Also in Romania the level of satisfaction with police conduct during stops was higher than in many countries – with 59% claiming that the police were at least fairly respectful.

102 Question F6: Thinking about THE LAST TIME you were stopped by the police in this country, were you in a car, on a motorbike or bicycle, on public transport or just on the street?

103 Question F7: Thinking about the last time you were stopped, what did the police actually do? 01 – Ask you questions, 02 – Ask for identity papers – ID card passport/residence permit, 03 – Ask for driving licence or vehicle documents, 04 – Search you or your car/vehicle, 05 – Give some advice or warn you about your behaviour (including your driving or vehicle), 06 – Did an alcohol or drug test, 07 – Fine you, 08 – Arrest you/take you to a police station, 09 – Take money or something from you in the form of a bribe, 10 – Other.

Figure 3.4.11
Evaluation of police conduct during stops (F8)

Last stop, in the past 12 months, %



Question F8: Again, thinking about the last time you were stopped, how respectful were the police when dealing with you?

Evaluation of police conduct in other contacts

About 11-36% of the various groups reported contact with the police other than police initiated stops. The evaluation of police conduct did not differ significantly by the nature of the contact – that is, police initiated stops or other police contacts (see Figure 3.4.12).


Once again, the Roma in Greece and Poland were least satisfied with how the police treated them – 35% in Greece and 41% in Poland considered the police to be disrespectful, whereas results were more positive in Bulgaria and Romania (63% in BG and 76% in RO indicated that the police were respectful).

Border control

The survey asked respondents a couple of 'screening questions' about whether, in the last 12 months, they had returned to their country of residence from travel abroad when immigration/border/customs personnel were present, and if they had been stopped by them¹⁰⁴. These results in themselves cannot present a picture of potential discriminatory

Figure 3.4.12
Evaluation of police conduct in other contacts (F10)

Last contact (other than stop), in the past 12 months, %



Question F10: Thinking about the last time you had contact with the police in this country – that DID NOT involve them stopping you – how respectful were they to you?

treatment as they are dependent on factors such as where respondents were travelling back from, the existence or not of Schengen border controls, and whether respondents had an EU passport. However, having determined that respondents had returned to their country of residence and had been stopped by immigration/border/customs personnel, they were asked a follow-up question about whether they considered they were *singled out for stopping on the basis of their immigrant/ethnic background* when re-entering their country of residence – which was used as a rough indicator of potential profiling during these encounters.

The survey indicates that Roma in most Member States predominantly do not travel and encounter border control when returning to their country of residence: those who do range from 5% in the Czech Republic to 14% in Romania. Depending on the country, only between 13 and 48 respondents were stopped when re-entering their country from a visit abroad. Based on the reports of the few who travelled and were stopped at the border, profiling at **border crossings** is most widespread in the Czech Republic (confirmed by 48%, N=19), Poland (44%, N=14), and Slovakia (41%, N=35),

¹⁰⁴ Question G1: During the last 12 months, have you ever entered [COUNTRY] from a visit abroad when either immigration, customs or border control were present?

ASK IF RESPONSE TO G1 = Yes – G2. During the last 12 months, were you ever stopped by [COUNTRY NATIONALITY] immigration, customs or border control when coming back into the country?

ASK IF RESPONSE TO G2 = Yes – G3. Do you think you were singled out for stopping by [COUNTRY NATIONALITY] immigration, customs or border control specifically because of your immigrant/minority background?

whereas only 6% of the Romanian Roma assumed that they were singled out for stopping from other travellers because of their ethnicity.

3.4.8. Police stops by respondent characteristics

[Please note that this section does not give a breakdown for the Roma group according to citizenship and immigrant status, due to the extremely low rate of non-citizens and immigrants in this general group.]

- **Gender:** Respondent reports show that the Roma are stopped by the police fairly frequently, and that **men are stopped at a much higher rate than women** – only 44% of male respondents report *not* having been stopped in the past 5 years by the police (see Table 3.4.5). In the past 12 months, men are, on average, stopped more than twice as often as women. Profiling at police stops is also a more frequent experience for men (19%) than women (9%).
- **Age:** Those most frequently stopped are Roma aged between 16-39 years. Among them, people aged 16-24 are **stopped most often (35% in the past 12 months)**. With the further advance

of age, the frequency of police stops decreases.

Perceptions of being profiled are highest among those aged 16-24 years (19%).

- **Income:** With respect to income, no clear differences can be identified in the rate or experiences of police stops. Among the most affluent, 31% were stopped in the past 12 months compared to 30% in the lowest income group. Again, as explained earlier, this apparent lack of difference between income levels and experiences of police stops is perhaps an indicator that income levels between the Roma do not differ much. It can also be suggested that being 'Roma', regardless of differential income levels, is in itself the basis on which decisions (either conscious or subconscious) to stop people are made.
- **Employment status:** This is also related to police stops. Less 'mobile' segments of the Roma population – that is, those who are potentially at home or inside more - have fewer contacts with the police: 65% of the non-active Roma and 69% of homemakers have not been stopped by the police in the past five years, whereas police stops are more likely among Roma who are more 'mobile' and in employment.

Table 3.4.5 – Police stops (F2, F3 and F5)

General group: The Roma

By socio-demographic profile, %

		Not stopped	Stopped in past 2-5 years	Stopped in past 12 months, no profiling	Stopped in past 12 months, with profiling
Respondent gender (BG0)	Male	44	13	24	19
	Female	71	9	10	9
Age group (BG1)	16-24 years	56	9	16	19
	25-39 years	55	12	20	13
	40-54 years	59	12	15	14
	55 years or more	73	9	10	8
Household income (quartiles) (BG6)	In the lowest quartile	60	11	15	15
	Between the lowest quartile and the median	59	12	18	10
	Above the median	58	11	19	12
Employment status (BG5)	Employed/self-employed	48	14	23	16
	Homemaker/unpaid work	69	9	10	11
	Unemployed	56	10	16	17
	Non-active	65	10	15	10
Education status (years) (BG7)	5 years or less	63	9	11	17
	6-9 years	59	13	17	12
	10-13 years	52	11	23	14
	14 years or more	57	11	21	11

- **Education:** No clear relationship can be identified between police stops and education level. On the whole, those who were stopped most often in the past 12 months are Roma with 10-13 years of education.

With respect to the variables of employment status and education level, and their impact on perceptions of police profiling, the results are inconclusive and do not point to any consistent patterns in how different sub-groups within the Roma population might be

expected to perceive profiling. For example, those with the least years of schooling tend to perceive profiling more than those with more years of education, which may appear to be counterintuitive to some research assumptions that perceptions of discrimination generally increase with educational levels. At the same time, other factors are probably at play here, and therefore the results can only be used as pointers towards potential problem areas in police-Roma relations.

3.4.9. Respondent background

Origins

EU-MIDIS interviewed Roma people in seven EU Member States (Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Greece, Hungary, Poland, Romania and Slovakia). The Roma in these Member States are established minorities, predominantly national citizens and – other than in the Czech Republic – they were also born there (97-100%). The proportion of ‘immigrants’ is by far the highest in the Czech Republic, which reflects the split of Czechoslovakia into two countries (18% of the Roma indicated they were born in the former Czechoslovakia).

Socio-demographic details

The Greek Roma are in the most disadvantaged position in terms of education: only 4% of them reported schooling with a duration of at least ten years, indicating that the majority of respondents completed primary education at most. 35% of the Roma interviewed in Greece were illiterate. This proportion is 11% in Poland, 10% in Romania and 5% in Bulgaria. Even in Member States where Roma illiteracy is not a widespread problem, the proportion of those who continued their education at upper secondary level (e.g. went to school for over 9 years) remains rather low: 23% in Bulgaria, 36% in Hungary and 39% in Slovakia.

At the time of the interview, the rate of Roma employed in paying jobs (self-employed or in full or part time jobs) reaches its maximum in the Czech Republic, with 44%. On the other hand, only 17% in Romania and 18% in Poland claim to have such jobs; with further activity rates as follows: BG: 32%, EL: 35%, HU: 31%, SK: 25%. At the same time the average ages of the samples are not dramatically different from one another in a way that could “naturally” effect activity rates.

Cultural background

The Roma often report very distinct cultural backgrounds. 13% of Romanian and 19% of the Slovakian Roma are “less than fluent” in the national language (most of them are native Hungarian speakers). An accent-free proficiency characterises only a minority in Poland (43%), and is not a standard feature in the Czech Republic (73%), Bulgaria (85%) and Greece (86%). In terms of religious denomination, the Roma generally do not differ significantly from the majority group; however, in Bulgaria a significant minority of the Roma are Muslims (20%). Besides being relatively easily identified based on physical appearance, about one in ten respondents in Slovakia, Greece and Poland indicated that they usually also wear apparel that is specific to their ethnic group; in the other Member States virtually no one considered their clothing specific to their ethnicity.

Segregation

Spatial segregation (that people surveyed lived – according to the judgment of the interviewer – in areas predominantly populated by their peers) is extremely high in Bulgaria (72%), Romania (66%), Slovakia (65%) and Greece (63%). In addition, Roma respondents in Bulgaria and Romania were interviewed predominantly in non-urban settings, which serves to increase the likelihood of their isolation from mainstream society.

3.5. Russians

Who was surveyed?

EU-MIDIS surveyed some of the largest ethnic minority, migrant and national minorities in the EU. In this regard, the Russian community represents a significant proportion of the population in a number of EU Member States – namely: Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, and is also represented in large numbers in Finland.

Unlike some of the other groups surveyed in EU-MIDIS, with the exception of the Roma, many Russian respondents in the Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania are part of a well-established population, either having been born in these countries or having lived there for more than 20 years. In Finland, in comparison, only one Russian in the sample (among the 562 surveyed) was born in the country, while 38% had been living there for nine years or less. These respondent characteristics have implications with respect to the findings from the survey.

At the end of this chapter more information is provided about the background characteristics of the four Russian groups surveyed, including information about their citizenship status. **It should be noted that the use of the term 'Russian' denotes the respondent's background not their citizenship.**

SAMPLE

Member States:

Estonia (N=500)

Latvia (N=500)

Lithuania (N=515)

Finland (N=562)

Sampling method:


Random route sampling with FE in high-density urban areas (EE, LV, LT);

Registry-Based Address Sampling (FI)

Some key findings on respondents' experiences of discrimination, victimisation and police stops

Figure 3.5.1 summarises some key results from the survey.

EU-MIDIS asked respondents about their experiences of discrimination on the basis of their immigrant or ethnic minority background in relation to nine areas of everyday life.



Question CA2-CI2 / DA2-DE2: Thinking about the last time this happened, when was this: in the last twelve months or before then?
 CA4-CI4: Did you or anyone else report this incident anywhere? DD11, DE10: Did you or anyone else report the incident to the police?

F2: In this country, within the last five years, have you EVER been stopped by the police when you were in a car, on a motorbike or bicycle, on public transport or just on the street? F3: Thinking about the last time you were stopped in this country, when was this? Was it in the last 12 months or before then? F5: Do you think that [the last time you were stopped/any time you were stopped] IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS was because of your immigrant/minority background?

As an average of these nine areas, approximately **one quarter of Russians in Finland felt discriminated against in the past 12 months because of their ethnic Russian background (27%); this was the highest proportion among the four Member States surveyed.**

While 17% of Russians in Estonia could recall an incident from the past 12 months that they considered discriminatory on the basis of their ethnicity, only 4-5% of Russians in Lithuania and Latvia could do the same. In the Russian group as a

whole, 10% confirmed that they avoid certain places (e.g. shops or cafés) because they believed they would receive bad treatment due to their ethnic Russian background.

In sum, with respect to discrimination experiences, the results indicate significant differences in rates of discrimination between, on the one hand, Finland and the three Baltic Member States, and, on the other hand, show marked differences in the rates of discrimination reported in Estonia and the other two Baltic States of Latvia and Lithuania.

Along with experiencing the most discrimination based on their ethnicity, Russians in Finland were also most likely to report discrimination: **one quarter of respondents in Finland officially reported their experiences of discrimination either at the place where these incidents occurred or to a complaints office/authority (27%)**. In Lithuania, the rate of reporting was the second highest (18%), but in Latvia and Estonia the rate of reporting was extremely low (5% and 8%, respectively).

As well as experiencing the most discrimination, Russians in Finland were also the most likely to become victims of crime, with one in four being victimised in the last 12 months (27%). Lower rates were recorded in Latvia, Estonia and Lithuania, where one in eight respondents were victimised within the last 12 months (between 12-15%). On average, about one in ten of all Russians interviewed (11%) – in all four countries – informed EU-MIDIS that they tend to avoid certain locations in their area for fear of being harassed, threatened or even attacked. Overall, among all Russian respondents surveyed, only 5% considered that they were victims of racially motivated crime. In comparison, looking specifically at the experiences of Russians in Finland who indicated they were victims, more than half of assaults and threats (57%) and seven out of 10 (72%) incidents of serious harassment were considered by victims to be racially motivated.

To some extent, crime incidents were more likely to be officially reported than discrimination incidents; however, non-reporting remains very high: on average only 11% of the crimes committed against Russians residing in Estonia and 17% of those against Russians in Latvia were brought to the attention of the police. The highest rate of reporting was found amongst Russians in Finland and Lithuania (24% and 23%, respectively).

In line with reporting the highest rates of discrimination and victimisation, the Russian

community in Finland were also the most heavily policed: within the last five years, almost four out of 10 Russians living in Finland were stopped by the police when they were in a car, on a motorbike or bicycle, on public transport or just on the street (39%); considering the past 12 months, the proportion of those stopped by the police was 24%. The comparable rates of police stops over a five-year period were 30% for Russians in Latvia, 24% in Estonia, and 21% in Lithuania; with the one-year rates being 23%, 18% and 14% (respectively for each country). However, and perhaps unsurprisingly given that Russians 'look' like the mainstay of the population in their respective countries of residence (with appearance being one ground for police stops), respondents' perceptions of police profiling during stops was non-existent; only 1% of Russians in Estonia were stopped by the police in the last 12 months in such a way that they felt singled out on the grounds of their ethnic background.

3.5.1. General opinions on discrimination, and rights awareness

Respondents' opinions about the extent of discrimination on different grounds in their country of residence: including grounds in addition to ethnic or immigrant origin


Respondents were asked to assess how widespread they thought discrimination on different grounds was in their respective countries.

Russians in the four Member States were asked to assess the level of discrimination in their countries based on six different grounds: ethnic or immigrant origin, gender, sexual orientation, age, religion or belief, and disability. The results are shown in Figure 3.5.2

Overall, with the exception of Lithuania, discrimination based on ethnicity was seen as the most widespread ground for discrimination of the six asked about: on average, three out of 10 respondents identified this type of discrimination as very or fairly widespread (31%), rising to as many as six out of 10 (59%) in Estonia. In Lithuania, Russians considered discrimination on the basis of ethnicity the fourth most likely cause of unfair treatment (12%); with age considered as the primary source of discrimination.

Age-based discrimination was seen as the second most widespread by approximately one-fifth of the Russians in the four Member States. Across countries the corresponding proportions did not vary much: ranging between 17% in Finland and 23% in Latvia.

Figure 3.5.2
Is discrimination widespread? (A1, %)



EU-MIDIS 2008

Question A1: For each of the following types of discrimination, could you please tell me whether, in your opinion, it is very widespread, fairly widespread, fairly rare, or very rare in [COUNTRY]? Discrimination on the basis of ...?


Unequal treatment grounded in *disability, gender or sexual orientation* were considered very or fairly widespread by moderate proportions of Russians (averages for the aggregate Russian group being: 14%, 10% and 8%, respectively).

Religion was believed to be the least widespread reason for discrimination – on average across the four Member States only 3% of Russians identified this as a problem. The Russians in Finland were more likely than any other Russian group to see this type of discrimination as widespread (6%).

Opinions on workplace advancement according to ethnicity or religion

A non-majority ethnic background is widely believed to be a barrier to workplace advancement: overall, looking at the average for the four Member States, 47% considered that someone with a different ethnicity was “less likely” to get a job, be accepted for training, or promoted. In comparison, having a **different religion** from that of the rest of the country was considered as being less of a hindrance to workplace advancement: with, on average, 80% believing that a person with a different religion was as likely or more likely as others to get a job or be promoted.

However, looking at country-specific data highlights some significant variations between the four communities surveyed, as shown in Figure 3.5.3:



Question A4: Would you say that, with equivalent qualifications or diplomas, the following people would be less likely, as likely, or more likely than others to get a job, be accepted for training or be promoted in [COUNTRY]? A. A person of different ethnic origin than the rest of the population, B. A person who practices a different religion than that of the rest of the country?

The dominant opinion among Russians in Estonia and Finland was that a non-majority ethnic background was a barrier to workplace advancement: 72% and 64%, respectively. On the other hand, 38% of Russians in Latvia, and 14% in Lithuania, held a similar opinion.

Between 70% of Russians in Finland and 91% in Lithuania considered that a different religious background is *not* a barrier to success in the labour market. However, the country that registers the highest proportion of those who believe that a minority religious background impedes workplace advancement is Finland (17%); perhaps unsurprisingly, Russians in Finland differ significantly from the majority population in terms of their religion (see Respondent Background information at the end of this chapter).

Willingness to provide information on ethnicity or religion for a census

Effective action to combat discrimination needs reliable information about the potential and actual targets. A majority of approximately three-quarters of the respondents from the Russian aggregate group would be willing to provide, on an anonymous basis, information about their ethnic origin for a census,¹⁰⁵ as well as about their religion or belief,¹⁰⁶ if that could help to combat discrimination (on average, 79% and 77%, respectively); overall, only 12% were reluctant to reveal their ethnicity or their religion for such a purpose, and 10% were not certain how to respond. Russians in Finland were below the average, as only two thirds were in favour of providing information, anonymously, about their ethnicity (66%) or about their religion (64%) for a census – (the lowest across the four communities). Russian respondents in Latvia were most willing to provide this kind of information (95% in the case of both ethnic origin and religion).

Awareness of anti-discrimination bodies

When asked whether they knew of any **organisation** in their country that could offer support or advice to people who have been discriminated against, for whatever reason,¹⁰⁷ Russians in Estonia and those from Lithuania had the lowest levels of awareness: only 7% and 12%, respectively, knew of an organisation that they believed could be called upon for help if someone encounters any type of

¹⁰⁵ Question A5a: Would you be in favour of or opposed to providing, on an anonymous basis, information about your ethnic origin, as part of a census, if that could help to combat discrimination in [COUNTRY]?

¹⁰⁶ Question A5b: And how about providing, on an anonymous basis, information about your religion or belief?

¹⁰⁷ Question A3: Do you know of any organisation in [COUNTRY] that can offer support or advice to people who have been discriminated against – for whatever reason?

discrimination. In contrast, three out of 10 Russians in Finland were aware of such organisations (31%).

The survey also tested awareness of some of the **specific anti-discrimination authorities or bodies**¹⁰⁸ in each country by reading the names of these organisations and asking interviewees if they had heard of them.¹⁰⁹ A very different picture emerged of knowledge about named organisations in each of the Member States. The highest overall awareness was in Estonia, where approximately two thirds of respondents had heard of the “*Office of the Chancellor of Justice*” (65%). About half of the Russians in Latvia and Lithuania were familiar with the “*Latvian National Human Rights Office*” (50%) and the “*Office of the Equal Opportunities Ombudsman*” (49%). In Finland, 38% of respondents had heard of the “*Ombudsman for Minorities*” (30%), but far fewer were aware of the “*National Discrimination Tribunal*” (19%).

Awareness of anti-discrimination laws

At the aggregate group level, one third of respondents were unable to express an opinion as to whether there were anti-discrimination laws in place in their countries (35-36% depending on the legislative area); the highest proportion of those unable to comment on the existence of any anti-discrimination legislation was recorded in Estonia (56-58% depending on the topic). On average, 45% of Russians in the four Member States were familiar with laws that forbid discrimination on the basis of ethnicity when applying for a job;¹¹⁰ only 19% believed that such legislation did not exist. While approximately one third of Russians believed there were anti-discrimination laws regarding treatment in a shop or restaurant¹¹¹ (36%), as well as when renting or buying a flat¹¹² (37%), about a quarter

believed that these laws did not exist in their respective countries (28% and 27%, respectively). Analysing the differences between countries, we observed that in all three areas tested, the Russians in Finland, followed by those in Lithuania, were the most conscious of laws that forbid unequal treatment. Six out of 10 respondents in Finland (63%) and Lithuania (60%) were familiar with anti-discrimination laws relating to the job market, but only 26% of Russians in Estonia and Latvia had a similar level of awareness. The Russians in Latvia were the least informed about anti-discrimination laws in relation to services and housing (16% in both cases).

The majority of Russians stated that they were familiar with the **EU Charter of Fundamental Rights**¹¹³ (56%), and 14% indicated that they actually knew what the Charter is about. Across Member States, Russians in Lithuania had the highest overall awareness of the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights (63%), as well as the highest knowledge about it – one-fifth of respondents in Lithuania claimed they knew what the Charter was about (21%). Substantially fewer Russians in Estonia were likely to know what the Charter was about (7%).

3.5.2. Experience of discrimination on the basis of ethnicity

Respondents’ general experiences of discrimination on different grounds

Having measured their *opinion* on the extent of discrimination on different grounds in their country of residence (as outlined in the previous paragraphs), respondents were asked a follow-up question about their *general experiences* of discrimination in the last 12 months under the same cross-section of grounds (see explanatory footnote¹¹⁴).

108 Note – in some Member States where other aggregate groups were surveyed other organisations were also named in the absence of Equality Bodies, or alongside named Equality Bodies.

109 Questions B2A-C: Have you ever heard of the [NAME OF EQUALITY BODY1-3]? The following Equality Bodies were tested: Estonia – “Office of the Chancellor of Justice”; Latvia – “Latvian National Human Rights Office”; Lithuania – “Office of the Equal Opportunities Ombudsman”; Finland – “Ombudsman for Minorities” and “National Discrimination Tribunal”.

110 Question B1a: What do you think, is there a law in [COUNTRY] that forbids discrimination against immigrants and ethnic minority people... (a) when applying for a job?

111 Question B1b: What do you think, is there a law in [COUNTRY] that forbids discrimination against immigrants and ethnic minority people... (b) when entering or in a shop, restaurant or club?

112 Question B1c: What do you think, is there a law in [COUNTRY] that forbids discrimination against immigrants and ethnic minority people... (c) when renting or buying a flat?


113 Question B3: Are you familiar with the “Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union”? 1 – Yes and you know what it is, 2 – Yes, you have heard about it, but you are not sure what it is, 3 – No, you have never heard about it.

114 Before clarifying specific discrimination experiences for the nine types tested in the survey, EU-MIDIS asked a complementary question to clarify respondents’ general thoughts or impressions about their recent discrimination history. In order to do so on a comparative basis, EU-MIDIS used a question from a 2008 Eurobarometer survey (EB 296, 2008), which asked about personal memories of discrimination in multiple domains – Question A2, which asked: ‘In the past 12 months have you personally felt discriminated against or harassed in [COUNTRY] on the basis of one or more of the following grounds? Please tell me all that apply. A – Ethnic or immigrant origin, B – Gender, C – Sexual orientation, D – Age, E – Religion or belief, F – Disability, X – For another reason’. Chapter 4 in this report presents a comparison of results between the majority and minority populations’ responses to this question from Eurobarometer and EU-MIDIS.

Note for reading figures presented in the report:

In a number of figures and tables in the report, the five-year rate is the sum of the percentage given for the past 12 months and that for the 2-5 year period. Similarly, where the 12-month rate is broken down into multiple categories (e.g. those stopped by the police in the 12 months prior to the interview as a result of profiling, and those stopped by the police in the 12 months prior to the interview *not* as a result of profiling) the percentages in each category should be added up for the actual 12-month prevalence rate. For some questions multiple responses were possible and therefore the reader is advised to look at the question wording as set out in the original questionnaire, which can be downloaded from the FRA's website.


Figure 3.5.4
General experiences of discrimination on different grounds (A2)
In the past 12 months, %



Question A2: In the past 12 months have you personally felt discriminated against or harassed in [COUNTRY] on the basis of one or more of the following grounds [ethnic or immigrant origin, gender, sexual orientation, age, religion or belief, disability, other reason]?

The majority of respondents in each community from the Russian group stated that in the past 12 months they did not feel discriminated against or harassed on a variety of grounds (between 68% and 89%) (see Figure 3.5.4). However, a significant proportion, about a quarter of Russians in Estonia and Finland, indicated that they had experienced unfair treatment on a basis that included their ethnicity (26% and 24%, respectively). Lithuanians

Figure 3.5.5
Personal discrimination experience based on ethnicity (CA1-CI1, CA2-CI2)
Prevalence across 9 domains, %



Question CA1-CI1: During the last 5 years, [or since you've been in the country if less than 5 years], have you ever been discriminated against when [DOMAIN] in [COUNTRY] because of your immigrant/minority background? CA2-CI2: Thinking about the last time this happened, when was this: in the last twelve months or before then?

were the least likely of the four groups to indicate that they had experienced discrimination on grounds including their ethnicity. Amongst all four groups, the proportion of those who considered they were discriminated against on grounds *not involving* their ethnicity remained between 0% and 9%.

Respondents' experiences of discrimination across nine areas of everyday life on the grounds of ethnic or immigrant origin

Looking at the overall results for the nine areas of discrimination on the basis of ethnicity or immigrant background that were surveyed in EU-MIDIS, and considering either the past 5 years or 12 months,¹¹⁵ personal discrimination experiences grounded in ethnicity were the most widespread among Russians in Finland (5 years: 47% and 12 months: 27%) (see Figure 3.5.5). Approximately

one quarter of Russians in Estonia (27%) experienced incidents of unequal treatment on the basis of their ethnic origin in the past 5 years, and 17% during the past 12 months. On the other hand, lower proportions of respondents were able to recall such experiences in Latvia (5 years: 14% and 12 months: 5%) and Lithuania (5 years: 8% and 12 months: 4%).

Figure 3.5.6 shows that Russians in the four Member States were most likely to experience discrimination grounded in ethnicity over the past 5 years in the area of employment: on average, approximately a quarter of all Russians said they


¹¹⁵ Key reference periods are 12 months (e.g. the 12 months that preceded the interview), or five years (preceding the interview). Please note that this section provides some illustrations, where the two reference periods are combined. In these charts and tables, the five-year rate is the sum of the percentage given for the past 12 months and that for the 2-5 year period. Similarly, where the 12-month rate is broken down into multiple categories (e.g. those stopped by the police in the 12 months prior to the interview as a result of anticipated profiling and those stopped by the police in the 12 months prior to the interview *not* as a result of anticipated profiling) the percentages in each category should be added up for the actual 12-month prevalence rate.

Figure 3.5.6
Specific discrimination experience based on ethnicity (CA1-CI1, CA2-CI2)

■ In the past 12 months
 ■ In the past 2-5 years
 □ Not discriminated against

Reporting rate (CA4-CI4)
 % who reported the most recent incident in the past 12 months

■ Not reported (incl. Don't know/ Refused)
 □ Reported



EU-MIDIS 2008

Questions CA1-CI1 / CA2-CI2 as with Figure 3.5.5. CA4-CI4: Did you or anyone else report this incident anywhere?

had been discriminated against on the basis of their ethnicity *when looking for work* (24%) (12 months: 8%), and one in 10 had a similar experience *at work* (9%) (12 months: 4%). In all other areas surveyed, the average percentage of those who experienced unequal treatment on the basis of their ethnic background in the last 5 years was very low – between 2% and 6%.

Compared to other countries where Russians were surveyed, Estonia had the highest proportion of respondents who experienced discrimination


when looking for work over both the 5-year and 1-year period (39% and 16%, respectively). 13% of Russians in Estonia also felt they were subjected to unequal treatment at their *workplace* and 10% in a *shop* in the past 5 years, with the proportion of Russians in Estonia discriminated against in a shop being the highest among the four Member States. Over the past five years, 5-6% of respondents in Estonia experienced discrimination on the basis of their ethnic background by *healthcare personnel, social service personnel* or in *cafés*.

The overall rate of discrimination on the basis of ethnicity is lower for Russians in Latvia and Lithuania in comparison with the situation in Estonia and Finland.

In Latvia and Lithuania, in eight of the nine domains surveyed, the proportion of those who said they experienced incidents of discrimination on the basis of their Russian background in the past 5 years varied between 0% and 4%. However, 16% of Russians in Lithuania and 14% of those in Latvia faced ethnic discrimination over the past 5-year period when they were *looking for work* (12 months: 4% in LT and 3% in LV).

As stated above, the overall discrimination situation is probably the worst for Russians in Finland. Respondents from this community were the second most likely among the Russian aggregate group (after Russians in Estonia) to encounter ethnic discrimination when they were *looking for work* (5 years: 25% and 12 months: 8%). They were also the most likely to have experienced incidents of unequal treatment *at work* (5 years: 17% and 12 months: 8%). Over the past 5 years, one in ten Russians in Finland (10-13%, depending on the area of discrimination) encountered ethnic discrimination at a *café, restaurant or bar*, in relation to *housing*, or from *healthcare, social service, or school personnel*. Only 5%

Figure 3.5.7
Reasons for not reporting discrimination (CA5-C15)
Based on the last incident, in the past 12 months, in any of 9 domains, %



EU-MIDIS 2008

Questions CA5-C15: Why wasn't it [the most recent incident of discrimination] reported?

faced discrimination on the basis of their ethnicity in relation to *banks* (the highest ratio in the Russian group) and 6% in relation to *shops*.

When asked if they avoid certain places such as shops or cafés for fear of discrimination on the basis of their ethnicity, on average, looking at the aggregate group results, one in 10 Russians confirmed this. However, marked differences emerge when we look at the findings with respect to individual Member States – with 3-4% of Russians in Lithuania and Latvia claiming that they tend to avoid certain places because they might be treated badly on the basis of their ethnicity, whereas one fifth of Russians in Estonia stated the same (20%).

Reporting discrimination

For each area of discrimination covered by EU-MIDIS, respondents were asked to state if they reported the last incident of discrimination (within the past 12 months) either at the place where it occurred or to a complaints authority. On average, respondents were most likely to officially report incidents involving school and social service personnel (34% and 21%, respectively) (see Figure 3.5.6). The incidents least likely to be reported were those relating to discrimination relating to shops (on average, 5%). Although the reporting rates for discrimination in relation to banks were nominally higher, the statistical relevance of these results is limited given that so few incidents of discrimination in this sector occurred (N=22).

A number of differences exist between countries and across discrimination domains with respect to reporting rates for discrimination:¹¹⁶ for example, 3% of Russians in Estonia reported incidents that took place in a shop and 13% did the same in Finland; while discrimination in the areas of healthcare, housing and in cafés was reported to a designated authority or at the place of discrimination by 17%, 16% and 9%, respectively, of respondents in Finland, and 52% of discrimination in relation to schools was reported.

With the exception of Lithuania, the primary reason given by Russians for not reporting incidents of discrimination lies in their belief that nothing would change as a result of doing so (see Figure 3.5.7). This belief was most widespread in Estonia (80%) and Latvia (74%).

Procedural uncertainty – that discrimination victims do not know where or how to report incidents – was

mentioned regularly as a reason for non-reporting (most commonly in Lithuania: 76%). In addition, half of those who had been discriminated against in Lithuania (more than in the other Member States) indicated that incidents were not reported because the process takes too much time and trouble.

After problems with residence permits, fear of intimidation is among the least likely reasons given for not reporting an incident of discrimination (although approximately one out of 10 responses fell into this category in Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania).

3.5.3. Discrimination by respondent characteristics

SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE

The overall rate of discrimination of Russian immigrants is comparatively low when compared with some of the other aggregate groups surveyed, and therefore an analysis of results on the basis of respondents’ socio-demographic background is necessarily limited in consideration of areas of discrimination where very few incidents were reported in the survey.

Table 3.5.1 – Discrimination rate (CA2-CI2, past 12 months)

General group: Russians

By socio-demographic profile, %

Respondent gender (BG0)	Male	11
	Female	15
Age group (BG1)	16-24 years	16
	25-39 years	21
	40-54 years	16
	55 years or more	6
Household income (quartiles) (BG6)	In the lowest quartile	17
	Between the lowest quartile and the median	12
	Above the median	15
Employment status (BG5)	Employed/self-employed	15
	Homemaker/unpaid work	16
	Unemployed	22
	Non-active	9
Education status (years) (BG7)	5 years or less	2
	6-9 years	6
	10-13 years	11
	14 years or more	17

EU-MIDIS 2008

¹¹⁶ Please note that usually, the number of persons per country providing answers in this question is very low – between 0 and 40 cases – depending on the rate of past 12-months discrimination. We mention here only the percentage results where the number of cases was 30 or higher.

- **Gender:** Males report lower perceived ethnic discrimination rates (11%) than women (15%). This division is specific for Russian respondents and has not been identified for any other aggregate groups surveyed in EU-MIDIS.
- **Household income:** Does not produce substantial differences in perceived discrimination. Yet, respondents from poorer households tend to indicate more often discrimination experiences (17%), on average, than respondents from more affluent households (12-15%).
- **Employment status:** Among Russian respondents employment status is one of the most important preconditions for exposure to discriminatory practices. Those least exposed to discrimination are people who are not active in the labour market (9%). Unemployed persons have the highest rate of discrimination (22%).
- **Education:** The level of education of respondents has a significant impact on rates of discrimination. Russians with longer periods of education (10 years and more) have been discriminated against more than twice as often as those with lower levels of education (up to 9 years). A possible reason for this division could be that perceptions of discriminatory treatment are more likely among better educated people, in combination with other factors such as the specific work environments of better educated respondents.

RESPONDENT STATUS

- **Length of stay in a country:** According to the survey's results, length of stay in a country substantially reduces the risk of discrimination for Russians (see Table 3.5.2). Respondents who have stayed in a country for a period from 1 to 4 years reported the highest discrimination rates (36%), while respondents who have been in a country for more than 20 years have been discriminated against much less frequently (8%).
- **Neighbourhood status:** With respect to neighbourhood status, as subjectively classified by interviewers, the likelihood of discrimination is highest for Russians living in poorer neighbourhoods (23%) and lowest for those living in 'mixed' areas (10%).
- **Proficiency in the national language:** This has had a moderate effect on discrimination experiences. Russians who are fluent in the national language and without a foreign-

Table 3.5.2 – Discrimination rate (CA2-CI2, past 12 months)

General group: Russians

By respondent status and neighbourhood, %

Length of stay in COUNTRY (BG8a)	1-4 years	36
	5-9 years	29
	10-19 years	22
	20+ years	8
	Born in COUNTRY	9
Neighbourhood status relative to other areas of the city (PI01)	Poorer	23
	As other areas	13
	Mixed	10
Language proficiency in the national language (PI04)	Fluent, without foreign sounding accent	13
	Fluent, with foreign sounding accent	20
	Less than fluent	20
Citizenship in COUNTRY (BG9)	Citizen	11
	Not a citizen	17

EU-MIDIS 2008

sounding accent have experienced fewer discrimination incidents (13%) than those who are less than fluent, or those who are fluent but with an accent (20%).


- **Citizenship:** National citizenship appears to substantially decrease the discrimination risk. Russians who are citizens of the country in which they were interviewed run the lowest discrimination risk (11%), while those without citizenship are much more likely to report discrimination (17%).

3.5.4. Crime victimisation

According to the evidence submitted by interviewees, Russians are moderately vulnerable to becoming victims of crime when compared with other ethnic/immigrant groups surveyed in EU-MIDIS. Considering all the five crimes tested in the survey (theft of and from a vehicle, burglary, other theft, assault or threat, and serious harassment), approximately one third of Russian respondents were victimised in the past five years (37%) and 17% during the last 12 months. Overall, only 5% of all Russians surveyed were targeted by racially motivated crime.

Considering victimisation both in the last five years and the last 12 months, Russians in Finland were the most likely of all four groups surveyed to have had personal experiences of victimisation (5 years: 59% and 12 months: 27%) (see Figure 3.5.8). They were also the most likely to have been the victim of a crime with

Figure 3.5.8
Personal victimisation experience (DA1-DE1, DA2-DE2, DA3-DC3, DD4, DE5)
 Prevalence across 5 crime types, %



Questions DA1-DE1: During the last 5 years in [COUNTRY], has [TYPE] happened to you? [IF YES] DA2-DE2: Thinking about the last time this happened, when was this: in the last twelve months or before then? [IF YES] DA3-DC3, DD4, DE5: Do you think that [this incident/any of these incidents] IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS happened partly or completely because of your immigrant/minority background?

a perceived ‘racist’ motive during the past 12 months (12%) (note: detailed questions about possible racist motivation were only asked in relation to crimes occurring in the last 12 months). In the other three communities of Russians – those in Latvia, Estonia and Lithuania – most crimes in the past 12 months were not considered by victims as having a ‘racist’ motivation (only 1-3%).

After Russian respondents in Finland, Russians in Latvia reported the second highest rate of criminal victimisation during the past five years (33%), while respondents in Lithuania reported the lowest rates of victimisation among the four Member States (5 years: 23%; 12 months: 12%).

Of the five crimes asked about in EU-MIDIS, respondents were most likely to be victims of **theft of and from vehicles**:¹¹⁷ on average, one fifth of Russians from households which owned some type of motorised or non-motorised vehicle were victims of these crimes over the past 5 years (20%) and 6% had a similar experience in the past 12 months. Considering the five-year time span, the second most often mentioned crimes experienced by Russians were

burglaries and thefts of other belongings (such as a purse, wallet, jewellery, mobile phone, etc.) (for both crimes: 5 years – 12%, and 12 months: 4%). Incidents of serious harassment were mentioned by 11% of Russians in consideration of the five year period, and by 6% in the past 12 months. Overall, respondents from this group were least likely to be victims of *assaults or threats* (5 years: 8% and 12 months: 4%). While property crimes were rarely associated with the victim’s ethnicity, 57% of serious harassments within the Russian group and 44% of assaults or threats in the past 12 months were thought to have racial motivations.

Looking at the specific experiences of victimisation by Member State, the following can be noted:

Property crimes

Theft of and from vehicles (including all motorised and non-motorised transport) was most widespread among Russian vehicle owners in Finland, where one third reported vehicle-related crimes in the past 5 years (36%) and 10% over the past 12 months. In contrast, rates of vehicle-related victimisation were significantly lower (by 27 percentage points) among Russian vehicle owners in Estonia and Lithuania (last 5 years: 9% rate in both countries; 1yr: 3% rate in both countries). This type of crime was very rarely seen as having any connection to the victim’s ethnicity (2% of such crimes in Finland were seen as such).¹¹⁸

There was little variation between countries with regard to **burglary**¹¹⁹ in the last 12 months (between 3% and 5% depending on the country). Considering the past 5 years, burglaries most affected Russians in Finland (15%) and were least common in Lithuania (9%). In four out of 27 cases of burglary in Finland, ethnic motives were perceived; with respective rates being one out of 26 cases in Lithuania and one out of 22 cases in Latvia.

Regarding other types of theft, victimisation rates were highest in Latvia and Estonia: Latvia 5-yr: 15%, 1yr: 6%; Estonia 5-yr: 14%, 1yr: 7%. In comparison, 7% of Russians in Lithuania were victims of these types of **thefts**¹²⁰ over a 5-year time-period (1yr: 2%). No

117 Questions DA1-2: During the [REFERENCE PERIOD] in [COUNTRY], was any car, van, truck, motorbike, moped or bicycle – or some other form of transport belonging to you or your household – stolen, or had something stolen from it? [IF NEEDED, CLARIFY: All forms of motorised and non-motorised transport can be included].

118 Please note that the indicated number of thefts of and from vehicles in the past 12 months in the Russian group was extremely low: Estonia – 8 cases; Latvia – 10 cases; Lithuania – 12 cases and Finland – 47 cases.

119 Questions DB1-2: During the [REFERENCE PERIOD], did anyone get into your home without permission and steal or try to steal something? [Does include cellars – Does NOT include garages, sheds lock-ups or gardens].

120 Questions DC1-2: Apart from theft involving force or threat, there are many other types of theft of personal property, such as pick-pocketing or theft of a purse, wallet, clothing, jewellery, or mobile phone. This can happen at work, on public transport, in the street – or anywhere. Over the [REFERENCE PERIOD] have you personally been the victim of any of these thefts that did not involve force?

ethnic motivation was associated with these crimes in Estonia or Latvia.¹²¹

In-person crimes

EU-MIDIS investigated rates of victimisation in two specific instances of in-person crimes: assaults or threats, and harassment of a serious nature (although the latter does not necessarily qualify as an offence in a criminal sense).

If respondents indicated they had experienced in-person crime in the last 12 months they were asked detailed follow-up questions with respect to the last incident for each of the two crime types surveyed ('assault or threat', and 'serious harassment'). These follow-up questions provided detailed information about the nature of incidents, including who the perpetrator or perpetrators were.

In the case of Russian respondents, the numbers experiencing in-person crime, and particularly assault or threat, was very low. Therefore the data has to be interpreted cautiously with respect to any generalisations that can be made from the results.

Table 3.5.3 shows that within the Russian group as a whole, the probability of becoming a victim of an **assault or threat**¹²² during the past 12 months was quite low, ranging between 2% in Lithuania and 6% in Finland. Considering the five year period, Russians in Finland were also the most likely to be victims of assaults or threats (14%). As in Finland, approximately twice as many Russians in the three other Member States experienced assaults or threats in the longer period of time: Latvia (1yr: 4% and 5yrs: 9%), Lithuania (1yr: 2% and 5yrs: 4%), and Estonia (1yr: 3% and 5yrs: 5%). A very small proportion of the assaults or threats reported by Russians in Finland were *robberies* (3%)¹²³ (that is, something was stolen during the assault or threat). Please note that although the nominal proportion of robberies in the other three Member States is much higher, the statistical relevancy of these findings is limited as the number of assaults or threats in the past 12 months was very small: five out of 17 cases of assault or threat in Latvia were

robberies, 12 out of 16 cases in Lithuania, and 8 out of 15 cases in Estonia.

In all Member States, except Latvia, **serious harassment** was more widespread than assaults or threats. Almost one quarter of Russians in Finland experienced serious harassment in the past 5 years (24% – the highest ratio within the Russian group); respondents from this community were also the most likely to have been harassed in the past 12 months (13%). Taking into account the 5-year span, much lower harassment rates were noted for Estonia (5yrs: 9% and 1yr: 4%) and Lithuania (5yrs: 7% and 1yr: 4%). The most likely to officially report incidents of harassment were Russians in Latvia: however, only 3% were victims of harassment in the last 12 months and only 5% over the past 5 years.

For Russians in Finland, more than half of the assaults or threats (57%) and seven out of 10 serious harassments (72%) in the past 12 months were considered to be 'racially' motivated.

Lower proportions of respondents in the other three Member States believed that their ethnic background played a role in either their experiences of assault or threat, or harassment in the past 12 months.¹²⁴ In-person crimes in Latvia were the least likely to be attributed to ethnic motivations (3 out of 15 cases of harassment and 3 out of 17 assaults or threats).

In Finland and Lithuania, incidents of assault or threat in the past 12 months were primarily committed by **perpetrators** from the majority population: this was the case for 86% of the incidents experienced by Russians in Finland. In contrast, in Latvia most assaults or threats were committed by perpetrators from another ethnic group (6 out of 17 cases), while five out of the 15 assaults or threats recorded in Estonia were intra-ethnic and an additional five were inter-ethnic. Perpetrators of serious harassment were most likely to be from the majority population in Finland (75%), Estonia (13 cases out of 19) and in Lithuania (17 cases out of 30), while in Latvia they were more likely to come from another ethnic group (6 cases out of 15).

In the case of two fifths of the in-person crimes in Finland, **racist or religiously offensive language** was used (assaults or threats: 43% harassments: 46%). Half of the assault or threat incidents in Lithuania involved

121 In Estonia and Latvia the indicated number of small thefts in the past 12 months was 34 and 31, respectively. In Lithuania and Finland, this was 18 and 15, respectively.

122 Questions DD1-2: During the [REFERENCE PERIOD], have you been personally attacked, that is hit or pushed, or threatened by someone in a way that REALLY frightened you? This could have happened at home or elsewhere, such as in the street, on public transport, at your workplace – or anywhere.

123 Number of assaults or threats in the last 12 months in Finland: 35.

124 Please note that the number of in-person crimes (either assaults or harassment) in Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania varied between 15-30 cases.

Table 3.5.3 – In-person crimes, main results

	ASSAULT OR THREAT				SERIOUS HARASSMENT			
	EE	LV	LT	FI	EE	LV	LT	FI
<i>Victimisation rate (based on DD1, DD2/DE1, DE2)</i>	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Victimised past 12 months	3	4	2	6	4	3	4	13
Victimised past 2-5 years	2	5	2	8	5	2	3	11
<i>Attributed racial/ethnic motivation (DD4/DE5)</i>								
Yes, including the most recent	32	14	50	57	60	21	30	71
Yes, but not including the most recent	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	1
<i>Racist or religiously offensive language used (DD9/DE9)</i>								
Yes	0	0	56	43	15	0	24	46
<i>Force actually used (DD10)</i>								
Yes (within all incidents)	82	46	63	57
Yes (in the total population)	2	2	1	4
<i>Something stolen (DD5)</i>								
Yes (within all incidents)	57	27	64	3
Yes (in the total population)	2	1	2	0
<i>Perpetrators (DD8/DE8)</i>								
From the same ethnic group	33	23	12	11	23	32	15	10
From another ethnic group	33	36	5	3	13	40	18	21
From majority	18	30	72	86	64	28	52	75
<i>Seriousness (DD14/DE13)</i>								
Very or fairly serious	47	54	77	63	53	74	49	61
Not very serious	53	34	18	37	47	19	48	36
<i>Not reported to the police (DD11/DE10)</i>								
Not reported	76	77	59	66	100	79	88	81
<i>Reasons for not reporting (DD13/DE12, top 3 mentions)</i>								
No confidence in the police	43	56	70	13	23	47	43	12
Too trivial/not worth reporting	77	25	60	26	62	18	62	24
Dealt with the problem themselves	38	8	10	30	14	65	33	43

EU-MIDIS 2008

racist language (8 cases out of 16). No assaults or threats in Estonia or Latvia were characterised by offensive language; the same held true for harassment incidents in Latvia.

As discussed, in-person crimes against Russians were often committed by perpetrators belonging to the majority population. However, almost no respondents in the Russian group identified the perpetrators as belonging to a *racist gang* in either cases of assault or threat (1 case out of 16 in Lithuania), or harassment (3% of harassment incidents in Finland). Overall, the majority of Russians stated that the perpetrators acted alone in both assault or threat and serious harassment incidents; still, more than two fifths of Russians experienced in-person crime incidents that involved more than one perpetrator (on average, assaults or threats: single perpetrators: 47%; multiple

perpetrators: 46%; harassments: single perpetrators: 53%; multiple perpetrators: 44%).

In all countries, with one exception, the majority of Russians rated the last incident of either assault or threat, or serious harassment, as *very or fairly serious*; for example, six out of 10 victims of in-person crimes in Finland considered those incidents as serious (63% in the case of assaults or threats and 61% in the case of harassment).¹²⁵ The exception was Estonia, where more respondents rated the number of assaults or threats as not very serious (53%) as opposed to very or fairly serious.

With respect to **reporting in-person crimes to the police**, differences can be observed between assault or threat and harassment. In all Member States, Russians were less likely to report incidents of serious

¹²⁵ Please note that the nominal ratios in the other 3 countries are based on small samples between 15 and 30 cases.

harassment to the police. Two thirds of Russians in Finland did not report assaults or threats to the police, while 81% did not in the case of harassment incidents. In Estonia and Latvia three out of four assaults and threats were not reported, and in Estonia no incidents of serious harassment were reported.¹²⁶

For two fifths of respondents from the Russian group **the main reason given for not reporting assault or threat incidents was a lack of confidence that the police would be able to do anything** (on average: 41%). A lack of faith in the police's ability to further the case was most prevalent in Estonia (9 out of 12 non-reported assaults or threats) and Lithuania (6 out of 10 non-reported assaults or threats).¹²⁷

Overall, approximately one third of Russians who were victims of assault or threat and did not report their case to the police indicated that they took care of the issue privately (37%). The least likely to mention this reason were respondents from Finland, while the most likely to have dealt with the problem themselves were the Russians in Lithuania.

The reasons given for not reporting harassment referred primarily to the triviality of the case (39%) and the lack of confidence in the ability of the police to do anything about it once reported (37%); those who said they dealt with the problem themselves were, on average, fewer than was the case regarding assaults or threats (23%).

On average, a quarter of Russians in the four Member States who experienced an in-person crime did not report the incident to the police because they considered it to be trivial (24%). Across the four countries, those who mentioned this reason the least were Russians in Latvia and Lithuania (1 case out of 11 and 1 case out of 10, respectively).

On average, 11% of the Russian group indicated that **they avoid certain places or locations** for fear of being assaulted or threatened, or harassed because of their ethnic background. The variations among countries are striking: the number of those who indicated this was only 3-5% in Lithuania and Latvia, but was as high as 24% in Estonia.

In sum, significant differences can be found in the results between the four Russian groups surveyed. Overall, Russians in Finland emerged as the

group that is particularly vulnerable to criminal victimisation.

3.5.5. Crime victimisation by respondent characteristics

SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE

- **Gender:** With regard to gender, victimisation rates among Russians diverge slightly from the typical characteristics of victimisation seen in surveys on the majority (non minority) population in that males reported *lower* rates of victimisation (16%) than females (18%) (see Table 3.5.4).
- **Age:** The most vulnerable groups are people in the group 25-39 years (23% past 12 months victimisation rate) followed by 16-24 year-olds and 40-54 years-olds (21% past 12 months victimisation rate, both). Reported victimisation rates are lowest in the group aged 55 years and above (9%).
- **Employment status:** The unemployed, followed by those who are taking care of the home or

Table 3.5.4 – Victimization rate (DA2-DE2, past 12 months)

General group: Russians

By socio-demographic profile, %

Respondent gender (BG0)	Male	16
	Female	18
Age group (BG1)	16-24 years	21
	25-39 years	23
	40-54 years	21
	55 years or more	9
Household income (quartiles) (BG6)	In the lowest quartile	19
	Between the lowest quartile and the median	17
	Above the median	15
Employment status (BG5)	Employed/self-employed	17
	Homemaker/unpaid work	27
	Unemployed	35
Education status (years) (BG7)	Non-active	13
	5 years or less	0
	6-9 years	12
	10-13 years	19
	14 years or more	17

EU-MIDIS 2008

¹²⁶ In Estonia the total number of assault and threat cases was 15 and the number of harassment cases 20. In Latvia there were 17 cases of assault and threat.

¹²⁷ Please note that in the Russian group the number of non-reported assaults varied between 11 and 23 depending on the country.

are in unpaid work, have the highest rates of victimisation (35% and 27%, respectively). Those who are employed or not active in the labour market have victimisation rates that are only half as high (17% and 13%).

- **Education:** Higher levels of education increase the victimisation risk for Russians; with rates being highest for people with secondary and university education (10-13 years of schooling: 19%, 14 years and more of schooling: 17%).

RESPONDENT STATUS

A number of 'respondent-status' variables were collected in the survey – such as citizenship status and length of stay in the country – which can be tested with respect to their influence on crime victimisation rates. The results showed that certain groups were more likely to have experienced some form of victimisation (see Table 3.5.5).

- **Length of stay:** The length of stay in the country substantially reduces victimisation risk for Russian respondents. People who have stayed in the country for more than 20 years have reported notably lower rates of victimisation in the past 12 months (12%) than those who have stayed in the country for 1-4 years (31%).

Table 3.5.5 – Victimization rate (DA2-DE2, past 12 months)

General group: Russians

By respondent status and neighbourhood, %

Length of stay in COUNTRY (BG8a)	1-4 years	31
	5-9 years	24
	10-19 years	26
	20+ years	12
	Born in COUNTRY	16
Neighbourhood status relative to other areas of the city (PI01)	Poorer	26
	As other areas	18
	Mixed	11
Language proficiency in the national language (PI04)	Fluent, without foreign sounding accent	17
	Fluent, with foreign sounding accent	26
	Less than fluent	21
Citizenship in COUNTRY (BG9)	Citizen	16
	Not a citizen	19

EU-MIDIS 2008

- **Neighbourhood:** Russian immigrants who live in neighbourhoods with a 'mixed' affluence status (relative to other areas of the city) run the lowest victimisation risk (11%), while those living in poorer areas report substantially higher rates of victimisation in the past 12 months (26%).

- **Language proficiency:** Russian respondents who were evaluated as speaking the national language fluently without a foreign accent had the lowest victimisation rate - 17%; while those who spoke the language with a recognisable accent were more often victimised (26%).

- **Citizenship:** Citizenship status does not produce a clear difference in victimisation rates among Russian respondents. For example, victimisation rates reported by those who declared themselves as not being citizens of the country (19%) do not differ much from victimisation rates reported by Russians who indicated they are citizens of the country (16%).

3.5.6. Corruption

On average, very few Russians reported that a public official expected them to pay a bribe¹²⁸ in the past 12 months (3%); the proportion was twice as high over the five-year period (6%). Russians in Latvia were the most likely to be asked by a government official to pay a bribe (5yrs: 12% and 1yr: 6%). On the other hand, in Finland, only 1% of respondents had encountered this during the past 5 years, and none had encountered it in the past 12 months. In Estonia and Lithuania, 5-6% of Russians had such an experience over a broader (5-year) period.

The number of cases of corruption in the past 12 months is low (up to 32 cases depending on the country) – thus the results lack statistical solidity. Ethnic motivations were attributed to only one case out of the 32 incidents in Latvia, and also to one out of 27 in Lithuania.


3.5.7. Police and border control

A large majority of Russian respondents in Finland *do* trust the police (85%), and only 5% of them tend *not* to trust them. The Russian communities in the other three countries are quite divided in this respect; however, two-fifths of Russians in Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia indicated that they tend to trust the police (LV: 41%, LT: 39% and EE: 37%).

¹²⁸ Questions E1-2: During [REFERENCE PERIOD] did any government official in [COUNTRY], for instance a customs officer, a police officer, a judge or an inspector, ask you or expect you to pay a bribe for his or her services?

Figure 3.5.9
Police contact (F3, F9)

In the past 12 months, %



Question F3: Thinking about the last time you were stopped in this country, when was this? Was it in the last 12 months or before then? F9: Apart from the police stopping you, which I've already asked you about, have you had any contact with the police in this country in the last 12 months? By this I mean you could have reported something to them yourself, or you may have had to register something with them, etc.

Police stops – including perceptions of profiling


Figure 3.5.9 shows that Russians in Finland had the most contact with the police: in the last 12 months, half of them either contacted the police themselves (35%) or were stopped by the police (25%) (one in ten people mentioned both situations). Police contacts were much less frequent in Lithuania and Estonia, where about three quarters of respondents (78% and 74%, respectively) had no contact with the police; two thirds of Russians in Latvia also had little contact with the police (67%). In these three countries, police stops were somewhat more frequent than other respondent initiated contact with the police.

Looking at those stopped by the police; about nine out of ten respondents said that they were stopped while driving (LT: 94%, EE and FI: 92%, LV: 86%). One in ten Russians in Latvia said the police stopped them on the street, while very few mentioned other situations (e.g. when riding a bicycle or a motorbike, or on public transportation).¹²⁹

According to respondents, profiling at police stops is almost non-existent: only 1% of Russians in Latvia and Lithuania, 2% in Finland, and 5% in Estonia felt that the police singled them out because of their ethnicity in the past 12 months (see Figure 3.5.10). Almost all respondents (97-98%, Estonia: 91%) had no sense of

Figure 3.5.10
Perception of profiling at police stops (F5)


Those stopped in the past 12 months, %



Question F5: Do you think that [the last time you were stopped/any time you were stopped] IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS was because of your immigrant/minority background?

Figure 3.5.11
Evaluation of police conduct during stops (F8)

Last stop, in the past 12 months, %



Question F8: Again, thinking about the last time you were stopped, how respectful were the police when dealing with you?

being stopped by the police because of their Russian background. Given that Russians look like the majority population in their countries of residence, this result is hardly surprising.

In three countries, the primary action taken by the police during stops was to check driving licences, vehicle documents (LT: 87%, EE: 83%, LV: 79%) or identity papers (mentioned by between 37% and 48% of respondents in Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia, but only by 9% in Finland), and to ask some questions (EE: 56%, LV: 46% and LT: 38%, again only 6% in Finland).¹³⁰

129 Question F6: Thinking about THE LAST TIME you were stopped by the police in this country, were you in a car, on a motorbike or bicycle, on public transport or just on the street?

130 Question F7: Thinking about the last time you were stopped, what did the police actually do? 01 – Ask you questions, 02 – Ask for identity papers – ID card passport/residence permit, 03 – Ask for driving licence or vehicle documents, 04 – Search you or your car/vehicle, 05 – Give some advice or warn you about your behaviour (including your driving or vehicle), 06 – Did an alcohol or drug test, 07 – Fine you, 08 – Arrest you/take you to a police station, 09 – Take money or something from you in the form of a bribe, 10 – Other.

In Finland, 78% of those who were stopped reported alcohol or drug tests, but these tests were experienced by far fewer people in Estonia (26%) and Latvia (23%). Between 15% (FI) and 22% (LT) of stops resulted in a fine, whereas very few respondents said the police arrested them or escorted them to a police station (EE: 4%, FI: 3%). **One in ten Russians in Lithuania reported that the police took money or something from them in the form of a bribe** (11%, also 6% in LV and 4% in EE).

Russians from Finland and Latvia evaluated **police conduct during stops** very positively: 94% and 85%, respectively, considered the police to be very or fairly respectful (see Figure 3.5.11). Positive evaluations of police conduct were also the norm in Lithuania (69%) and Estonia (53%) – while 24% of Russians in the former country and 41% in the latter regarded the behaviour of the police as neutral. **In general, very few people were dissatisfied with police conduct during stops (1-7%).**

Evaluation of police conduct in other contacts

As seen in Figure 3.5.9, between 10% and 35% of respondents reported contacts with the police other than stops (e.g. contacts when reporting something to the police or when registering something with them). **Once again, the vast majority of**

respondents in all communities said that the police were respectful towards them during other contacts (between 85% and 62%) (see Figure 3.5.12). However, the proportions of people indicating “respectful” conduct by the police were *lower* than recorded with reference to police stops. This was especially true in Latvia (-20 percentage points), and to some extent in Finland (-9) and Lithuania (-7). In Estonia, by contrast, higher numbers were satisfied with the treatment they received during these “other” contacts (70% vs. 53% satisfied with conduct at police stops).

These results are noteworthy as they indicate that police stops may not be the only area where attention towards discriminatory policing needs to be focused.

Border control

The survey asked respondents a couple of ‘screening questions’ about whether, in the last 12 months, they had returned to their country of residence from travel abroad when immigration/border/customs personnel were present, and if they had been stopped by them. These results in themselves cannot present a picture of potential discriminatory treatment as they are dependent on factors such as where respondents were travelling back from, the existence or not of Schengen border controls, and whether respondents had an EU passport. However, having determined that respondents had returned to their country of residence and had been stopped by immigration/ border/customs personnel, they were asked a follow-up question about whether they considered they were *singled out for stopping on the basis of their immigrant/ ethnic background* when re-entering their country of residence – which was used as a rough indicator of potential profiling during these encounters.

Those most likely to travel abroad in the last 12 months were Russian respondents from Finland – two thirds of them entered the country from a visit abroad when either immigration, customs or border control were present (69%).¹³¹ However, they were the least likely to have been stopped when returning to the country (33%); among those who were stopped, 9% felt that they were singled out because of their ethnic background – which was the highest rate among the different Russian groups surveyed of perceived profiling at border crossings.



Question F10: Thinking about the last time you had contact with the police in this country – that DID NOT involve them stopping you – how respectful were they to you?

131 Question G1: During the last 12 months, have you ever entered [COUNTRY] from a visit abroad when either immigration, customs or border control were present? ASK IF RESPONSE TO G1 = Yes – G2. During the last 12 months, were you ever stopped by [COUNTRY NATIONALITY] immigration, customs or border control when coming back into the country? ASK IF RESPONSE TO G2 = Yes – G3. Do you think you were singled out for stopping by [COUNTRY NATIONALITY] immigration, customs or border control specifically because of your immigrant/minority background?

In comparison with Russians in Finland, only about a quarter of Russians in Lithuania returned from abroad when border control was present (23%). However, they were the most likely to be stopped by border control (81%), but none of these stops were considered to be the result of ethnic profiling. In Latvia too, the presence of ethnic profiling at border crossings was not an issue for those returning to their EU country of residence from a visit abroad.

3.5.8. Police stops by respondent characteristics

SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC STATUS

One of the specific characteristics of Russians, in comparison with some other aggregate groups who were surveyed in EU-MIDIS, is that profiling at police stops is very low. Given this low rate, an analysis of stops on the basis of the characteristics of those stopped did not reveal any striking patterns due to the low number of cases involved. In sum, irrespective of gender, age or income – reported profiling rates only vary in the range of 0-1%. Only among the unemployed did reported profiling rates reach 2% (see Table 3.5.6).

- **Gender:** Marked differences between the experiences of men and women can be noted: Women with a Russian background are among those stopped least often of all minority groups surveyed in EU-MIDIS: 80% of them have not been stopped at all in the past 5 years. Men with a Russian background, however, have been stopped relatively frequently: one in every three men was stopped by the police at least once in the past 12 months.
- **Age:** With regard to age, the most intensively policed – in the form of stops – were Russians in the age group 25-39 years (33% have been stopped in the past 12 months). With the advance of age, the frequency of police stops decreases: in the age group 55 years and above 8% report having been stopped in the past 12 months.
- **Income:** An interesting finding for Russian respondents is that there is a clear link between the frequency of police stops and the income status of respondents. The least frequently stopped are people in the lowest income quartile: 84% of this group report that they have not been stopped in the past 5 years. Among the most affluent, 29% of respondents have been

Table 3.5.6 – Police stops (F2, F3 and F5)

General group: Russians

By socio-demographic profile, %

		Not stopped	Stopped in past 2-5 years	Stopped in past 12 months, no profiling	Stopped in past 12 months, with profiling
Respondent gender (BG0)	Male	56	13	30	1
	Female	80	7	13	0
Age group (BG1)	16-24 years	74	10	16	0
	25-39 years	57	11	32	1
	40-54 years	63	10	26	0
	55 years or more	85	6	8	0
Household income (quartiles) (BG6)	In the lowest quartile	84	8	7	0
	Between the lowest quartile and the median	71	11	18	0
	Above the median	61	10	29	0
Employment status (BG5)	Employed/self-employed	62	10	27	0
	Home maker/unpaid work	66	20	14	0
	Unemployed	73	13	12	2
	Non-active	88	5	7	0
Education status (years) (BG7)	5 years or less	94	6	0	0
	6-9 years	86	3	10	1
	10-13 years	71	9	20	0
	14 years or more	68	10	22	0

EU-MIDIS 2008

Table 3.5.7 – Police stops (F2, F3 and F5)**General group: Russians**

By respondent status and neighbourhood, %

		Not stopped	Stopped in past 2-5 years	Stopped in past 12 months, no profiling	Stopped in past 12 months, with profiling
Length of stay in COUNTRY (BG8a)	1-4 years	78	7	15	0
	5-9 years	61	16	22	1
	10-19 years	56	16	28	0
	20+ years	81	8	11	0
	Born in COUNTRY	71	6	22	0
Neighbourhood status relative to other areas of the city (PI01)	Poorer	64	12	24	0
	As other areas	69	10	20	0
	Mixed	77	5	17	1
Language proficiency in the national language (PI04)	Fluent, without foreign sounding accent	70	8	22	0
	Fluent, with foreign sounding accent	62	13	24	0
	Less than fluent	68	12	19	0
Citizenship in COUNTRY (BG9)	Citizen	71	9	20	0
	Not a citizen	71	8	20	0

EU-MIDIS 2008

stopped by the police in the past 12 months – but practically no one in this group reported that police stops were a result of profiling.

- **Employment status:** The most frequently stopped with regard to employment status are those who are employed or self-employed (27% have been stopped in the past 12 months). Non-active persons are least likely to be stopped by the police: 88% of them report that they have not been stopped in the past 5 years.
- **Education:** The higher the level of education, the more likely it is that respondents were stopped by the police. Russians with the highest level of education (14 years and more) have been stopped most frequently in the past 12 months – 22%. Among those with 6-9 years or less of schooling only 11% have been stopped by the police. It would appear that this result needs to be read alongside that for income levels and rates of police stops – as the two indicators, together, would seem to offer a possible explanation regarding apparent wealth (corresponding perhaps to years of education) and police stops.

RESPONDENT STATUS

- **Length of stay:** As shown in Table 3.5.7, this factor does have a clear influence on the likelihood of police stops. Russians that have been stopped least frequently are those who

have been living in the country for the shortest period (1-4 years) and those who have either stayed in the country for more than 20 years or were born in the country. Those most frequently stopped are people who have been in the country for between 10-19 years (28% of this group report having been stopped in the past 12 months).

- **Neighbourhood status:** This does not have a clear influence on frequency of police stops. Those most frequently stopped are Russians living in poorer areas of the cities/urban centres where interviews were conducted (24% in the past 12 months).
- **Language proficiency:** The respondents who speak the national language fluently but with a foreign-sounding accent have been stopped slightly more often in the past 12 months (but the differences with those who do not have an accent or who speak the language less than fluently are small).
- **Citizenship:** Does not have an impact on the frequency of police stops amongst the Russian respondents.

3.5.9. Respondent background

Origins

EU-MIDIS interviewed Russians in four Member States: Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania and Finland. Overall, approximately six out of 10 Russians are citizens of these countries (59%), and 22% in Finland are also citizens of another country. Looking at country data, we see that almost all Russians in Lithuania said that they were Lithuanian citizens only. In Latvia, Finland and Estonia, respondents most often reported not being a national citizen (53-55%). On average, the majority of Russians were born in these Member States (45%) and approximately a quarter have been living there for more than 20 years (28%). However, practically no Russian in Finland was born there, having settled in this country more recently (over half have been living in Finland for 10-19 years (56%), a quarter for 5-9 years (25%), and 13% for 1-4 years). The Russian immigrants were most likely to have arrived in the countries where they live as adults after the age of 16 (43%).

Socio-demographic details

On average, Russians were most likely to report schooling with a duration of 14 years or more (51%). The Russians in Finland are the most educated, with seven out of ten stating that they attended 14 years of school or more (70%).

At the time of the interview, the proportion of Russians employed in paid work (self-employed or in full or part time jobs) was, on average, 60%. This ratio was lowest among Russians in Latvia (49%); in this community, the highest proportion of retired people was also recorded (28%). In all other countries (Estonia, Finland and Lithuania), approximately six out of 10 Russians held paying jobs (61-66%).

Cultural background

In all four Member States, almost all respondents considered Russian as their mother tongue (93-100%). In Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania the majority of interviews were carried out by peer-group interviewers; therefore no information is available in consideration of interviewers' assessment of respondents' level of fluency in the (main) national language. In Finland, all the interviews were carried out in Finnish, and we found that the majority of Russians in this country were fluent – half of them with an accent (57%), and 17% accent-free; still, a quarter were “less than fluent” in the national language.

In terms of religious denominations, the situation for this group needs special attention due to particularities in each country. The vast majority of Russians in Estonia declared themselves Christian Orthodox (92%), indicating that they belong to one of the most widespread religions in the country; however, the majority also said that religion is not important in their life. A similar situation was seen among Russians in Latvia: 81% declared themselves Christian Orthodox. The Russians in Lithuania and Finland differ significantly from the majority group in terms of their religion; the majority of them also stated that religion was important in their life.

Segregation

Spatial segregation, indicating that those surveyed – according to the judgment of the interviewer – lived in areas predominantly populated by their peers, is not extremely widespread; it was most widespread among Russians in Finland (15%), and the least widespread among those in Estonia and Latvia (9% in both).

3.6. Turkish

Who was surveyed?

People with a Turkish background were surveyed in six EU Member States. With the exception of Turkish respondents in Bulgaria who are an indigenous minority, all the other ‘Turkish’ groups in the survey have their origins in immigrant communities.

At the end of this chapter more information is provided about the background characteristics of the six Turkish groups surveyed; for example – information about their citizenship status, which ranged from 13% of respondents in Germany to 84% of respondents in Belgium (while the Bulgarian sample had 100% citizenship as a non-immigrant community). Together with citizenship, factors such as length of stay in the country or whether a respondent was born there all serve to influence how respondents both perceive and experience discrimination, victimisation and contact with the police.

SAMPLE

Member States:

- Austria (N=534)
- Belgium (N=532)
- Bulgaria (N=500)
- Denmark (N=553)
- Germany (N=503)
- The Netherlands (N=438)

Sampling method:


- Random route sampling with FE in high-density urban areas (AT, BE, partly NL);
- Nationwide random route sampling in areas with Turkish concentration (BG); Registry-Based Addresses Sampling (DE, DK);
- Interviewer-generated sampling (partly NL)

Some key findings on respondents’ experiences of discrimination, victimisation and police stops

Figure 3.6.1 summarises some key results from the survey.

EU-MIDIS asked respondents about their experiences of discrimination on the basis of their immigrant or ethnic background in relation to nine areas of everyday life, about their experiences of crime (including racially motivated crime) across five areas, and their experiences of police stops.

Figure 3.6.1



Question CA2-CI2 / DA2-DE2: Thinking about the last time this happened, when was this: in the last twelve months or before then? CA4-CI4: Did you or anyone else report this incident anywhere? DD11, DE10. Did you or anyone else report the incident to the police?

F2: In this country, within the last five years, have you EVER been stopped by the police when you were in a car, on a motorbike or bicycle, on public transport or just on the street? F3: Thinking about the last time you were stopped in this country, when was this? Was it in the last 12 months or before then? F5: Do you think that [the last time you were stopped/any time you were stopped] IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS was because of your immigrant/minority background?

As an average of these nine discrimination areas, nearly one in four of the entire Turkish sample indicated they had been **discriminated** against on the basis of their immigrant or ethnic background in

the preceding 12 months (23%), and one in five had fallen **victim** to at least one of the five crimes asked about in the survey (21%). Of all Turkish respondents surveyed, one in ten considered that racist motivation was a factor in the crimes they experienced in the last 12 months.

Incidents of discrimination most often occurred in relation to work – either at work or when looking for work. The crime experiences most often mentioned by respondents were vehicle crime and serious harassment. Looking at the results for discrimination *and* victimisation, it appears that the younger age groups, the unemployed, and the highly educated are more affected than other groups by these experiences.

Exploring responses between the Turkish communities in the various Member States exposes very different rates of discrimination and victimisation. In Austria and Bulgaria respondents belonged to the 'low risk' segment considering all vulnerable minorities surveyed in EU-MIDIS, with, respectively, 9% and 8% discrimination rates and 12% and 7% victimisation rates. In comparison, in Belgium and Germany respondents were in the 'medium risk' segment, with respective discrimination rates being 20% and 30%, and victimisation rates 16% and 23%. In Denmark and the Netherlands interviewees were in the relatively 'high risk' segment, with, respectively, discrimination rates at 42% and 30%, and victimisation rates at 35% and 33%.

There is also great variation in the results between interviewers' subjective interpretation of the degree of segregation of interviewee communities relative to the majority population, and the potential implications of this with respect to experiences of discrimination. One assumption could be that those living in more segregated communities experience more discrimination, which in itself is reflected in their physical isolation from the majority population. On the other hand, those who are more segregated could be less likely to encounter situations in their everyday life where they could experience discrimination, and/or at the same time they could conceivably 'choose' to live together. For example: Interviewers did *not* describe Turkish neighbourhoods in Denmark as segregated, whereas Bulgarian Turkish neighbourhoods were seen as rather segregated; correspondingly, those with a Turkish background living in Denmark were much more likely to be discriminated against than Turkish Bulgarians. However, interviewees of Turkish origin in the Netherlands reported high levels of discrimination and interviewers perceived high levels

of neighbourhood segregation. Therefore, one cannot conclusively say that discrimination rates directly relate to either low or high levels of neighbourhood segregation.

In the Turkish group as a whole, 12% confirmed that they avoid certain places (e.g. shops or cafés) where they believed they would receive bad treatment due to their different ethnic background, and 16% indicated that they keep away from areas where they think they could become a victim of racist crime.

The non-reporting of discrimination (e.g. cases not being reported either at the place where they occur or to an office or authority that can receive complaints) was high among EU residents of Turkish origin in each of the surveyed countries. In general, **reporting rates for discrimination** were lowest in countries where respondents were least likely to be discriminated against (in Bulgaria and Austria reporting rates were both 5%), and were highest in countries where interviewees indicated they experienced most discrimination (in Denmark (24%) and the Netherlands (22%)). In Germany and Belgium one in six cases of discriminatory treatment were reported to designated offices or elsewhere (both 17%).


In comparison with reporting rates for discrimination, reporting rates for crime do not present such a clear cut pattern. Rates were highest amongst respondents in Belgium and Bulgaria; one in four crimes committed in the preceding 12 months were reported to the police (BE: 27%, BG: 24%) – although victimisation rates in Bulgaria were very low and therefore reporting rates are based on very few incidents. One in five crime victims with a Turkish origin reported such incidents in the Netherlands (21%), while in Austria and Denmark less than one in twenty (AT: 2%, DK: 5%) victims turned to the authorities.

The largest number of police stops was reported by respondents in Denmark, with almost as many reported for the Netherlands too: nearly half of Turkish respondents in these countries were stopped by the police in the preceding 5 years, and about one quarter were stopped in the preceding 12 months (DK: 28%, NL: 27%). High levels were also reported for Germany, Belgium and Bulgaria – where more than one in three residents of Turkish origin were stopped in the preceding five years (DE: 37%, BE: 32%, BG: 32%), and about one in five in the preceding 12 months (DE: 24%, BE: 18%, BG: 22%). In Austria, only one in ten respondents could recall a police stop from the preceding 5 years (12%), and one in twenty cited a case from the preceding 12 months (6%).


Figure 3.6.2
Is discrimination widespread? (A1, %)

Very or fairly widespread Very or fairly rare
Non-existent Can't tell


BE




BG



DK



DE



NL





Figure 3.6.2 (Continued)

Is discrimination widespread? (A1, %)



Question A1: For each of the following types of discrimination, could you please tell me whether, in your opinion, it is very widespread, fairly widespread, fairly rare, or very rare in [COUNTRY]? Discrimination on the basis of ...?

Respondents felt they had been subjected to discriminatory police stops – **ethnic profiling** – most often in Denmark and Germany, and least in Bulgaria and Austria. Approaching one in ten Danish or German respondents with a Turkish background (7%) felt that the last time they were stopped they were singled out because of their ethnicity; while 5% in Belgium, 4% in the Netherlands, and only 1% in Bulgaria and Austria felt the same.

3.6.1. General opinions on discrimination, and rights awareness

Respondents' opinions about the extent of discrimination on different grounds in their country of residence: including grounds in addition to ethnic or immigrant origin

Before being asked about their personal experiences of discrimination, interviewees were asked their opinion about how widespread they believed discrimination to be on different grounds in their respective countries of residence; ranging from discrimination on grounds of 'religion or belief' through to 'disability' (see Figure 3.6.2).

Perceptions about the extent of discrimination on different grounds were quite varied between countries.

Overall, respondents in Belgium and the Netherlands reported the highest levels of perceived discrimination on different grounds, while the lowest levels were reported in Austria and Bulgaria.

Ethnic or immigrant origin was identified in five out of six countries as the most widespread ground for

discrimination, and was closely followed in second place by respondents identifying discrimination on the grounds of **religion or belief**. All other grounds of discrimination were identified as 'widespread' less frequently.

For example: 69% of the Turkish in Belgium, 61% in the Netherlands and 58% in Denmark were of the opinion that discrimination on *ethnic grounds* was very or fairly widespread, and those in Belgium (71%) and the Netherlands (61%) were the most concerned about discrimination on the grounds of *religion or belief*. About half of the Turkish in Germany and Denmark (DE: 48%, DK: 52%), one third in Austria (29%) and one in twenty in Bulgaria (5%) thought that discrimination on the grounds of religion or belief was very or fairly widespread.

In contrast with the other Turkish groups surveyed, respondents in Bulgaria identified all other grounds of discrimination as more widespread than discrimination on the basis of religion or belief. Moreover, in Bulgaria many respondents identified various grounds of discrimination as 'non-existent' – more than in other countries; for example, two respondents in five (40%) said that discrimination on ethnic grounds was non-existent, and three in five (60%) thought the same about discrimination on religious grounds. Respondents in Belgium, Bulgaria and Austria ranked as third discrimination on the grounds of disability, whereas respondents in Germany and the Netherlands thought that discrimination on the grounds of sexual orientation was more common, and those in Denmark felt that gender discrimination was the third most widespread. As a reflection of their own circumstances or in the absence of public

discussion about these themes, which is able to penetrate minority populations, many respondents had difficulties assessing the prevalence of discrimination on the grounds of disability and sexual orientation.

Opinions on workplace advancement according to ethnicity or religion

Respondents were asked to assess how a minority background affects **workplace advancement** (see figure 3.6.3). Those with a Turkish background in the Netherlands, Belgium and Denmark were the most pessimistic in this respect, while those in Austria and Bulgaria were least inclined to see ethnicity as a barrier to workplace advancement.


In The Netherlands four in five respondents (80%) and in Belgium and Denmark two in three respondents (67% and 66%, respectively) thought that a **non-majority ethnic background** was disadvantageous in relation to recruitment, training or promotion. In Germany too, more than half of respondents felt the same (55%). In Austria and Bulgaria only one in three considered ethnic origin to be a hindrance to workplace advancement (AT: 27%, BG: 28%).

Having a **different religious background to that of the majority population** (see figure 3.6.3) was also perceived as a significant factor against workplace advancement by respondents in the Netherlands (68% considered it disadvantageous) and in Belgium (62%). In Denmark and Germany, half of respondents believed this to be a problem (DK: 52%, DE: 50%), while (as with ethnicity) only one in three Austrians and Bulgarians saw having a different religion as a hindrance to workplace advancement (BG: 26%, AT: 27%).


Willingness to provide information on ethnicity or religion for a census

70% of respondents would be willing to provide information about their **ethnicity**¹³² for a census or similar large-scale survey, and 69% would not have any concerns about providing data on their **religious background**.¹³³ At the same time, one out of every five Turkish respondents in the survey would be reluctant to provide this data. The Turkish in the Netherlands proved to be the most reluctant; two in five would refuse to give out data on their ethnicity (42%) or religion (44%). The Turkish in Austria, on the

Figure 3.6.3
Workplace advancement (A4, %)
i) with different ethnic background



ii) with different religious background



EU-MIDIS 2008

Question A4: Would you say that, with equivalent qualifications or diplomas, the following people would be less likely, as likely, or more likely than others to get a job, be accepted for training or be promoted in [COUNTRY]? A. A person of different ethnic origin than the rest of the population, B. A person who practices a different religion than that of the rest of the country?

other hand, were open to data provision: only 2% would be unwilling to provide information on their ethnicity and 1% would prefer not to give data about their religious background.

Awareness of anti-discrimination bodies

Amongst the Turkish respondent group as a whole, five out of six (84%) could not name any organisation providing assistance to persons who have been discriminated against.¹³⁴ The least knowledgeable were Turkish respondents in the Netherlands, where nine out of ten could not think of such an organisation (89%), while those in Germany appeared somewhat better informed as “only” three out of

132 Question A5a: Would you be in favour of or opposed to providing, on an anonymous basis, information about your ethnic origin, as part of a census, if that could help to combat discrimination in [COUNTRY]?

133 Question A5b: And how about providing, on an anonymous basis, information about your religion or belief?

134 Question A3: Do you know of any organisation in [COUNTRY] that can offer support or advice to people who have been discriminated against – for whatever reason?

four (75%) lacked any information about these types of organisations. When specifically prompted¹³⁵ by interviewers by being given the name/s of Equality Bodies/organisations in their countries, in general three out of five respondents did not recognise any of the organisations referred to (59%).

However, contrary to their unprompted response, respondents in Belgium were the most likely to know the *Centre for Equal Opportunities and Opposition to Racism* once they were provided with its name; however, half of them had never heard of the organisation. In Denmark, where two organisations were referred to, respondents showed different levels of awareness depending on the organisation: with 87% having never heard of the Complaints Committee for Ethnic Equal Treatment, whereas nearly half were aware of the *Danish Institute for Human Rights*. As another illustration, the Equal Treatment Commission was known about by 37% of Turkish respondents in the Netherlands.

Awareness of anti-discrimination laws

An important background factor contributing to respondents' attitudes about and perceptions of having experienced discrimination is their knowledge and awareness of relevant legislation, which also reflects the extent to which countries have promoted awareness of existing EU or national legislation.

Turkish respondents in each country were relatively unaware of the existence of laws against discrimination on the basis of ethnicity – especially in Germany and Belgium. With regard to legislation against discrimination in the area of employment: two out of five of all Turkish respondents did not know about any legislation in this area. Those in the Netherlands appeared the best informed: approximately half of the respondents said they thought that a law prohibiting discrimination exists in the areas of employment, housing and services.

The **Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union**¹³⁶ was also relatively unknown by the target group. In general 65% had never heard about the Charter, 25% had heard about it but did not know what it was, and only 7% said that they knew what it was. Respondents in Germany appeared to know most about the Charter; 13% knew what it was, 38% had heard of it but couldn't say what it was about, and 48% had never heard of it. The lowest awareness levels were detected among respondents in Belgium and the Netherlands: three in four had never heard about the Charter, while one in five had heard about it but did not know what it was.

3.6.2. Experience of discrimination

Respondents' general experiences of discrimination on different grounds

Having measured their *opinion* on the extent of discrimination on different grounds in their country of residence (as outlined in the previous paragraphs), respondents were asked a follow-up question about their *general experiences* of discrimination in the last 12 months under the same cross section of grounds (see explanatory footnote¹³⁷).

Looking at the results on experiences of discrimination across different grounds in the last 12 months (see Figure 3.6.4): on average, respondents in Belgium and Germany reported the highest levels of having been discriminated against (BE: 45%, DE: 42%), with high levels also reported for Denmark and the Netherlands (DK: 37%, NL: 38%). Respondents from Austria and Bulgaria gave the lowest reported rates, with 25% and 9%, respectively, indicating that they had been discriminated against on various grounds in the preceding 12 months.

Respondents who indicated they had been discriminated against on grounds including ethnicity also varied greatly between countries: one in three respondents in Belgium, Germany, Denmark and the Netherlands confirmed that they had faced


135 Questions B2A-C: Have you ever heard of the [NAME OF EQUALITY BODY1-3]?

The following Equality Bodies were tested: Austria – “Ombudsman for Equal Treatment” and “National Equality Body”; Belgium – “Centre for Equal Opportunities and Opposition to Racism”; Bulgaria – “Commission for Protection Against Discrimination”; Denmark – “The Complaints Committee for Ethnic Equal Treatment” and “Danish Institute for Human Rights”; Germany – “Federal antidiscrimination authority”, “Federal Government Commissioner for migration, refugees and integration” and “Landesstelle für Gleichbehandlung – gegen Diskriminierung (Berlin)”, “Antidiskriminierungsstelle für Menschen mit Migrationshintergrund (AMIGRA)” (München), “Antidiskriminierungsstelle der Stadt Frankfurt im Amt für Multikulturelle Angelegenheiten (AMKA)” (Frankfurt); The Netherlands – “Equal Treatment Commission” and “Antidiscriminatie bureau of meldpunt”.

136 Question B3: Are you familiar with the “Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union”? 1 – Yes and you know what it is, 2 – Yes, you have heard about it, but you are not sure what it is, 3 – No, you have never heard about it.

137 Before clarifying specific discrimination experiences for the nine types tested in the survey, EU-MIDIS asked a complementary question to clarify respondents' general thoughts or impressions about their recent discrimination history. In order to do so on a comparative basis, EU-MIDIS used a question from a 2008 Eurobarometer survey (EB 296, 2008), which asked about personal memories of discrimination in multiple domains - Question A2, which asked ‘In the past 12 months have you personally felt discriminated against or harassed in [COUNTRY] on the basis of one or more of the following grounds? Please tell me all that apply. A – Ethnic or immigrant origin, B – Gender, C – Sexual orientation, D – Age, E – Religion or belief, F – Disability, X – For another reason’. Chapter 4 in this report presents a comparison of results between the majority and minority populations' responses to this question from Eurobarometer and EU-MIDIS.

Figure 3.6.4
General experiences of discrimination on different grounds (A2)
 In the past 12 months, %



Question A2: In the past 12 months have you personally felt discriminated against or harassed in [COUNTRY] on the basis of one or more of the following grounds [ethnic or immigrant origin, gender, sexual orientation, age, religion or belief, disability, other reason]?

Note for reading figures presented in the report:

In a number of figures and tables in the report, the five-year rate is the sum of the percentage given for the past 12 months and that for the 2-5 year period. Similarly, where the 12-month rate is broken down into multiple categories (e.g. those stopped by the police in the 12 months prior to the interview as a result of profiling, and those stopped by the police in the 12 months prior to the interview *not* as a result of profiling) the percentages in each category should be added up for the actual 12-month prevalence rate. For some questions multiple responses were possible and therefore the reader is advised to look at the question wording as set out in the original questionnaire, which can be downloaded from the FRA's website.

discrimination on grounds including ethnicity (BE: 35%, DE: 33%, DK: 31%, NL: 28%), while this was true for 18% of those in Austria and for only 8% in Bulgaria.

Looking at the proportions of those who indicated that they had been discriminated against *solely on ethnic grounds* in the last 12 months reveals less significant differences between countries – ranging

from 6% to 15% of respondents. About one in six in Belgium and Austria indicated that they had been discriminated against solely on ethnic grounds in the preceding 12 months, while about one in ten in Denmark, Germany and the Netherlands felt this way. Those in Bulgaria reported very low levels of discrimination solely on the basis of ethnicity – only one in twenty.

A notable finding is that when asked about discrimination experiences across a range of grounds, respondents of Turkish origin in Austria indicated that they had experienced discrimination solely on ethnic grounds more than other 'Turkish' groups that were interviewed.

Breaking down results for discrimination on grounds other than ethnic or immigrant origin indicates that the second most common ground amongst all respondents of Turkish origin was identified as religion or belief. Respondents in the Netherlands, Belgium, and Germany were the most likely to have encountered unfair treatment based on religious beliefs in the last 12 months (NL: 24%, BE: 23%, DE: 23%).

Respondents' experiences of discrimination across nine areas of everyday life on the grounds of ethnic or immigrant origin


Having been asked about their general experiences of discrimination – on different grounds such as gender, age and ethnicity – respondents were asked a series of questions about their experiences of discrimination solely on the basis of *their immigrant or ethnic minority background* across nine areas of everyday life.

Looking at the overall results for the nine areas of discrimination surveyed in EU-MIDIS, and considering either the past 5 years or 12 months¹³⁸ (see Figure 3.6.5), personal discrimination experiences grounded in ethnicity were most widespread among those with a Turkish background in Denmark: more than half (54%)

indicated that they had been treated badly due to their ethnicity in the preceding 5 years, and two in five (42%) said that this had happened in the last 12 months. Turkish respondents in Germany and the Netherlands also confirmed high rates of discrimination; nearly half in the Netherlands (47%) and two in five in Germany (41%) indicated that they had been discriminated against in the

¹³⁸ Key reference periods are 12 months (e.g. the 12 months that preceded the interview), or five years (preceding the interview). Please note that this section provides some illustrations, where the two reference periods are combined. In these charts and tables, the five-year rate is the sum of the percentage given for the past 12 months and that for the 2-5 year period. Similarly, where the 12-month rate is broken down into multiple categories (e.g. those stopped by the police in the 12 months prior to the interview as a result of anticipated profiling and those stopped by the police in the 12 months prior to the interview not as a result of anticipated profiling) the percentages in each category should be added up for the actual 12-month prevalence rate.

Figure 3.6.5
Personal discrimination experience based on ethnicity (CA1-CI1, CA2-CI2)
 Prevalence across 9 domains, %



Questions CA1-CI1: During the last 5 years, [or since you've been in the country if less than 5 years], have you ever been discriminated against when [DOMAIN] in [COUNTRY] because of your immigrant/minority background? CA2-CI2: Thinking about the last time this happened, when was this: in the last twelve months or before then?

preceding 5 years, and one in three confirmed incidents in the previous 12 months (DE: 30%, NL: 30%). Respondents in Austria and Bulgaria appeared much less vulnerable to discrimination on the basis of their ethnicity/immigrant background: 26% in Austria and 11% in Bulgaria mentioned incidents of discriminatory treatment that they had experienced in the previous 5 years, and 9% and 8% respectively confirmed that they had encountered similar treatment in the last 12 months.

The proportions of five-year rates compared to 12-month rates suggest that in Denmark and Germany, and to a smaller extent in the Netherlands and in Bulgaria, discriminatory incidents targeting the Turkish were most frequent in the last 12 months, and perhaps therefore – it can be tentatively suggested – rates of discrimination were increasing.

In most of the countries where Turkish communities were interviewed, their general impressions of unequal treatment on the basis of ethnicity (discussed in previous paragraphs) were mirrored by the average rate of discrimination they experienced on the basis of ethnicity with respect to nine areas of everyday life (see Figure 3.6.5).

Looking at the specific discrimination experiences across the nine domains (Figure 3.6.6), the most common domains for discrimination were employment related: when looking for work and when at work.

The Turkish in **Belgium** referred to the labour market as the area where they most often faced discriminatory treatment in the previous 12 months – 10% when looking for a job, and 9% at work; with 5 year discrimination rates rising to 19% and 14% respectively. A smaller number of respondents in Belgium mentioned discrimination in bars or restaurants (6%), and one in twenty encountered unfair treatment at school (4%) or by a landlord or a housing agency (4%) – considering the 12 months preceding the survey. Banks, social services, and healthcare emerged as the least discriminatory domains.

The highest discrimination rates in **Bulgaria** (see once more Figure 3.6.6) for the preceding 5 years were in the area of looking for work (12%), and with regard to social services (6%). 12-month rates for these domains were 7% and 4% respectively. **The lowest rates of discrimination on the basis of ethnicity was recorded among the Turkish in Bulgaria, who for many of the areas asked about could not think of a single incident of discrimination in the last five years.**

In **Denmark** the Turkish were most likely to feel discriminated against at work and when looking for work – with 31% and 26% 5-year rates, and 22% and 17% 12-month rates, respectively. One in ten respondents had been discriminated against by personnel in healthcare, by social or employment services, and in relation to education.

Results showed that Turkish job-seekers in Germany perceived discriminatory treatment on the basis of their ethnicity more often than in the other five Member States where Turkish people were interviewed. Respondents here were far more likely to be discriminated against when looking for work – almost half (47%) confirmed this experience in the preceding 5 years, and one in three (29%) could recall an incident of this sort from the preceding 12 months. 11% experienced unequal treatment (as a parent or as a student) in relation to educational establishments, and 10% faced discrimination from social services.

Turkish respondents in the **Netherlands** reported the greatest number of discrimination experiences in the following domains: at work or when looking for work, in cafés/restaurants/bars, and in relation to schooling. 23% confirmed that they had faced discrimination at work over the preceding 5 years, and 10% mentioned incidents from the preceding 12 months. A large number of cases cited by respondents took place in restaurants or bars; 17% mentioned cases in the preceding 5 years and one in ten confirmed that they


Figure 3.6.6
Specific discrimination experience based on ethnicity (CA1-CI1, CA2-CI2)

■ In the past 12 months
 ■ In the past 2-5 years
 ■ Not discriminated against

Reporting rate (CA4-CI4)

% who reported the most recent incident in the past 12 months

■ Not reported (incl. Don't know/ Refused)
 ■ Reported




Questions CA1-CI1 / CA2-CI2 as with Figure 3.6.5. CA4-CI4: Did you or anyone else report this incident anywhere?

Figure 3.6.7

Reasons for not reporting discrimination (CA5-CI5)

Based on the last incident, in the past 12 months, in any of 9 domains, %



EU-MIDIS 2008

Questions CA5-CI5: Why wasn't it [the most recent incident of discrimination] reported?

had received unequal treatment at such places in the preceding 12 months. Schools and/or colleges were also places of discriminatory treatment, with a 21% five-year discrimination rate and a 9% 12-month rate.

Discrimination rates among the Turkish in Austria were very low. They ran the highest risk of discrimination when looking for a job; but rates in this domain were very low in comparison with the experiences of most other Turkish groups surveyed (5 yr: 16%, 12-month: 4%). Their second highest discrimination rate (although still very low) was with respect to shops; 4% confirmed incidents over the preceding 12 months when either in or trying to enter a shop, and 8% over the preceding 5 years.

Overall – Turkish respondents in Bulgaria reported the lowest levels of discrimination for most of the domains surveyed. Their status as the only indigenous Turkish group surveyed could help to explain their low rates of discrimination. However, this variable alone cannot provide an explanation, and therefore other factors, such as the average age or the employment status of the group in Bulgaria, should be looked at too (see Respondent Background at the end of this chapter).

Reporting discrimination

For each area of discrimination covered by EU-MIDIS, respondents were asked to state if they reported the last incident of discrimination (within the past 12 months) either at the place where it occurred or to a complaints authority (see Figure 3.6.6).

Incidents of discrimination most often go undetected as those suffering such incidents are usually extremely unlikely to report them.

Looking at differences in reporting rates between the countries, Turkish victims of discrimination in the Netherlands, Denmark and Germany were more likely to report an incident, while in Bulgaria and Austria – where the Turkish were the least affected by discrimination – those who were discriminated against tended not to report incidents either at the place where they occurred or to an organisation dealing with complaints.

In each of the countries, discriminatory incidents in relation to schools, work, housing and banks (although this last domain was extremely rare) were the most likely to be reported.

Figure 3.6.7 indicates the various reasons that were given by respondents for not reporting discrimination

that they experienced on the basis of their ethnicity/immigrant background. In general, for all areas of discrimination asked about, the top reasons given for *not* reporting included a lack of belief or trust in the effectiveness of institutions ('nothing would happen'): **respondents of Turkish origin in Bulgaria and Germany expressed the highest levels of scepticism about reporting – with eight in ten of the opinion that “nothing would happen” as a result of reporting (BG: 82%, DE: 81%).**

Victims of discrimination also demonstrated a lack of knowledge about complaint channels ("not sure how to report") – **at least one in three in most countries did not know where to make a complaint, and therefore were unable to report discrimination should they have wanted to.**

Respondents also indicated their fears of negative consequences should they report – for example, in the area of work this could be the fear of losing one's job: **in Germany, Austria, Denmark and Bulgaria, respondents mentioned in the greatest proportions that they were concerned about the negative consequences of reporting discrimination, as one in three did not report for this reason.**

Respondents also referred to the assumed 'triviality' of incidents, which in many ways points to the everyday nature of many of these acts of discrimination. Those in Germany were most likely to mention that they considered the incident too trivial and not worth reporting – half of them were of this opinion. However, many Turkish in the other countries also cited this reason, especially in Austria where this was the most common reason given.

3.6.3. Discrimination by respondent characteristics

SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE

The specific discrimination experiences of Turkish respondents reflect major differences only with respect to *some* socio-demographic characteristics (see Table 3.6.1).

- **Gender:** A difference can be observed between discrimination rates for men (25%) and women (22%).
- **Age group:** The highest level of discrimination is observed among those in the socially most active age groups: 16-24 years (29%) and 25-39 years (26%). The chances of discrimination markedly decrease with age: people in the age

Table 3.6.1 – Discrimination rate (CA2-CI2, past 12 months)

General group: Turkish

By socio-demographic profile, %

Respondent gender (BG0)	Male	25
	Female	22
Age group (BG1)	16-24 years	29
	25-39 years	26
	40-54 years	22
	55 years or more	10
Household income (quartiles) (BG6)	In the lowest quartile	27
	Between the lowest quartile and the median	21
	Above the median	24
Employment status (BG5)	Employed/self-employed	25
	Homemaker/unpaid work	15
	Unemployed	32
	Non-active	22
Education status (years) (BG7)	5 years or less	17
	6-9 years	20
	10-13 years	24
	14 years or more	36

EU-MIDIS 2008

group 55 years and older are the least likely to be discriminated against.

- **Income status:** This is a factor producing differences among respondents. People in the lowest income group (lowest quartile) run higher risks of discrimination (27%) compared to those from the higher household income categories (21-24%).
- **Employment status:** Discrimination is closely linked to employment status. The lowest discrimination rates are observed among homemakers (15%) – who are typically women. The unemployed have twice the rate of discrimination (32%) as that of homemakers.
- **Education:** People with higher levels of education report higher rates of discrimination (36% for Turkish respondents with more than 14 years of schooling) than people with lower levels of education.

RESPONDENT STATUS

With respect to respondent status, the specific subgroups running the **highest risk** of being discriminated against are the Turkish who do not have the citizenship of their country of residence (29%), and those who have stayed in the country for a period of 5-9 years (30%) (see Table 3.6.2).

Table 3.6.2 – Discrimination rate (CA2-CI2, past 12 months)

General group: Turkish

By respondent status and neighbourhood, %

Length of stay in COUNTRY (BG8a)	1-4 years	16
	5-9 years	30
	10-19 years	25
	20+ years	25
Neighbourhood status relative to other areas of the city (PI01)	Born in COUNTRY	21
	Poorer	25
	As other areas	23
Language proficiency in the national language (PI04)	Mixed	23
	Fluent, without foreign sounding accent	25
	Fluent, with foreign sounding accent	22
Citizenship in COUNTRY (BG9)	Less than fluent	22
	Citizen	20
	Not a citizen	29

EU-MIDIS 2008

- **Citizenship and length of stay:** The Turkish who are least likely to be discriminated against are those who are citizens in their country of residence (20%) and those who have stayed in the country for a shorter period of time (1-4 years – 16%).


Aspects of 'respondent status' that do not appear to have any specific relevance in relation to discrimination rates are:

- **Neighbourhood status:** differences between the Turkish living in neighbourhoods that are poorer than other areas of the city and the Turkish living in more affluent areas are not significant;
- **Language proficiency:** the difference in discrimination rates between the lowest and the highest level of language proficiency is only 3%.

3.6.4. Crime victimisation

Looking at rates of victimisation across the five crime types tested in the survey, the results showed a medium level of vulnerability to victimisation among Turkish respondents in comparison with other aggregate groups surveyed in EU-MIDIS. Looking at the results for the aggregate Turkish respondent group as a whole, two in five indicated that they had been victims of crime in the preceding five years (39%), and half as many, one in five, mentioned incidents that they had experienced in the preceding 12 months (21%). The incidents most often mentioned by respondents in each country were thefts of and from vehicles, and serious harassment. Similarly to the attributes

Figure 3.6.8
Personal victimisation experience (DA1-DE1, DA2-DE2, DA3-DC3, DD4, DE5)
 Prevalence across 5 crime types, %



Questions: DA1-DE1. During the last 5 years in [COUNTRY], has [TYPE] happened to you? [IF YES] DA2-DE2: Thinking about the last time this happened, when was this: in the last twelve months or before then? [IF YES] DA3-DC3 DD4, DE5: Do you think that [this incident/any of these incidents] IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS happened partly or completely because of your immigrant/minority background?

of those who demonstrated a higher vulnerability to discrimination, those who were most vulnerable to criminal victimisation were the highly educated, the 16-24 year old age group, the unemployed and the non-active (see Tables 3.6.4. and 3.6.5.).

About one in ten (9%) of those who were victims of crime in the past 12 months assumed that perpetrators were driven by ‘racist’ motivations.

Figure 3.6.8 presents an overview of average victimisation rates for the five crime types tested in EU-MIDIS, with a breakdown of results by Member States according to victimisation rates in the last five years and last 12 months, and with the percentage of victims indicating that they considered their victimisation to be ‘racially’ motivated.

Similarly to the patterns of reported discrimination, respondents in the Netherlands and Denmark were the most likely to be victims of crime of all respondent groups of Turkish origin that were surveyed. Victimisation rates for both the preceding five years and for the shorter 12 month time-span were clearly the highest in these countries: three in five in the

Netherlands (61%) and more than half in Denmark (56%) were victims of crime in the last five years, and one in three (NL: 32% and DK: 35%) were victims in the preceding 12 months. In Belgium and Germany fewer respondents, but still a considerable proportion – two in five (BE: 44%, DE: 40%) – said that they were a victim of at least one of the five crimes tested in EU-MIDIS in the preceding 5 years, while one in six (16%) in Belgium and nearly one in four (23%) in Germany had become victims in the preceding 12 months. The lowest victimisation rates were found in Bulgaria and Austria: only 7% of respondents in Bulgaria and 12% in Austria were victims of crime in the last 12 months.

Victims in Denmark and Germany were far more likely to assume that the crimes committed against them were racially motivated: one in six thought that their experiences were either partially or wholly motivated by ‘racism’ (DK: 15%, DE: 14%). Turkish respondents in Austria, Belgium and the Netherlands were less likely to attribute racial motives to their experiences of victimisation: 7% of respondents in Austria and Belgium, and 6% in the Netherlands stated that the last crime they had experienced – within the timeframe of the preceding 12 months – had been racially motivated.

Property crimes

Considering incidents in the preceding five years, **theft of vehicles and from vehicles**¹³⁹ was mentioned by one out of four Turkish respondents (23%) across all the countries where they were interviewed; for the preceding 12 months, one in ten (9%) could recall such an incident. Vehicle crimes were the most common among respondents in the Netherlands and Denmark; 18% and 19% respectively stated that such a crime had been committed at their expense in the preceding 12 months. On the other hand, those in Austria were the least affected, with only 1% having experienced vehicle related crime in the past 12 months. These types of crime were not, in general, assumed to have racial motivations; however, in Bulgaria, one in three (33%) who were victims of vehicle related crime in the past 12 months felt that their ethnic background was a factor, and 31% of victims in Belgium also felt that this was the case.

In comparison with vehicle related crime, **burglary**¹⁴⁰ levels were significantly lower among the Turkish in each of the countries surveyed; the overall rate

139 Questions DA1-2: During the [REFERENCE PERIOD] in [COUNTRY], was any car, van, truck, motorbike, moped or bicycle – or some other form of transport belonging to you or your household – stolen, or had something stolen from it? [IF NEEDED, CLARIFY: All forms of motorised and non-motorised transport can be included].

140 Questions DB1-2: During the [REFERENCE PERIOD], did anyone get into your home without permission and steal or try to steal something? [Does include cellars – Does NOT include garages, sheds lock-ups or gardens].

was 9% for the preceding five years and 4% for the preceding 12 months. Burglaries appeared the most common in the Netherlands and Belgium, where 19% and 16% of the Turkish (respectively) had their homes broken into in the preceding five years, and 7% and 5% mentioned an incident from the preceding 12 months. On average, one in six of those who were victims of burglary in the past 12 months thought that they were victims of 'racially' motivated crime (15%). Again, the Turkish in Belgium and Germany were the most likely to have assumed 'racist' motives for burglary: one in three in Belgium, and 16% in Germany believed that this was the case.

With respect to **non-violent thefts of personal property**,¹⁴¹ levels of victimisation were low in comparison to rates for other aggregate groups surveyed (see Figure 2.26). One in ten had had their smaller belongings stolen in the preceding five years (11%), and one in twenty mentioned a similar incident in the preceding 12 months. Those most victimised by this type of crime were respondents in the Netherlands, where one in five (19%) had experienced a theft in the past 5 years and 7% could recall an incident from the preceding 12 months. Those in Belgium, Denmark and Germany were also affected in significant proportions; five year rates were 14%, 13%, and 11% respectively, and 12-month rates were at 5% for each of the three countries. About one in seven victims of theft (14%) – considering all the countries – felt that the last incident they could recall was racially motivated. **Respondents in Germany were the most likely to think that something had been stolen from them because of their ethnic/immigrant background; two in five (40%) felt that this was the case. At the same time, in all the other countries it was very rare that victims perceived ethnic motivations behind these crimes.**

In-person crimes – focusing on racist motivation

EU-MIDIS investigated rates of victimisation in two specific instances of in-person crimes: assaults or threats, and harassment of a serious nature (although the latter does not necessarily qualify as an offence in a criminal sense).

On average for the aggregate Turkish respondent group, 9% of interviewees mentioned that they had

suffered an **assault or threat**¹⁴² in the preceding 5 years, and 3% indicated that they had experienced a similar offence in course of the preceding 12 months (see Table 3.6.3). The likelihood of becoming a victim of an assault or threat varies greatly across the various Turkish communities surveyed – ranging from 2% in Bulgaria to 13% in Denmark and the Netherlands, considering the past five years, and between 1% (BG) and 6% (NL and DK) for the preceding 12 months. Respondents in Denmark and the Netherlands, and to a slightly lesser extent in Germany, were more vulnerable to assault and threat than those in the other Member States.

If respondents indicated they had experienced in-person crime in the last 12 months they were asked detailed follow-up questions with respect to the last incident for each of the two crime types surveyed ('assault or threat', and 'serious harassment'). These follow-up questions provided detailed information about the nature of incidents, including who the perpetrator or perpetrators were.

A quarter of assaults and threats that had taken place in Belgium and one in three in the Netherlands in the preceding five years were in fact **robberies** (25% and 30% respectively), and this was the case also for one out of every five assaults or threats in Bulgaria (19%). In comparison, in most of the incidents of assault or threat recorded in other countries nothing was stolen/taken from the victims.

The ethnic composition of perpetrators also differed from country to country: Turkish victims of assault and threat in Denmark were in most cases targeted by perpetrators from the majority (non minority) population – in eight cases out of ten (79%). In comparison, this was true for only one in three assaults or threats experienced by the Turkish in the Netherlands, while in two cases out of five they were targeted by someone from another ethnic group, and for every one assault or threat in five the perpetrator was also someone with a Turkish background. Interestingly, in Bulgaria, where the Turkish are an indigenous minority, no single victim of assault or threat indicated that they had been victimised by someone from the majority population, but one in five (19%) had been targeted by members of another ethnic group and the rest had been assaulted or

¹⁴¹ Questions DC1-2: Apart from theft involving force or threat, there are many other types of theft of personal property, such as pick-pocketing or theft of a purse, wallet, clothing, jewellery, or mobile phone. This can happen at work, on public transport, in the street – or anywhere. Over the [REFERENCE PERIOD] have you personally been the victim of any of these thefts that did not involve force?

¹⁴² Questions DD1-2: During the [REFERENCE PERIOD], have you been personally attacked, that is hit or pushed, or threatened by someone in a way that REALLY frightened you? This could have happened at home or elsewhere, such as in the street, on public transport, at your workplace – or anywhere.

Table 3.6.3 – In-person crimes, main results

In-person crimes, main results	ASSAULT OR THREAT						SERIOUS HARASSMENT					
	BE	BG	DK	DE	NL	AT	BE	BG	DK	DE	NL	AT
<i>Victimisation rate (based on DD1, DD2/DE1, DE2)</i>	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Victimised past 12 months	2	1	6	4	6	2	7	4	17	14	12	6
Victimised past 2-5 years	7	1	8	6	7	3	6	2	8	10	7	5
<i>Attributed racial/ethnic motivation (DD4/DE5)</i>												
Yes, including the most recent	29	19	82	67	41	80	61	22	77	77	27	81
Yes, but not including the most recent	7	0	3	11	4	0	2	0	1	4	3	5
<i>Racist or religiously offensive language used (DD9/DE9)</i>												
Yes	29	25	64	64	44	48	54	10	73	66	31	73
<i>Force actually used (DD10)</i>												
Yes (within all incidents)	46	38	27	50	41	61
Yes (in the total population)	1	0	1	2	3	1
<i>Something stolen (DD5)</i>												
Yes (within all incidents)	25	19	3	11	30	0
Yes (in the total population)	0	0	0	0	2	0
<i>Perpetrators (DD8/DE8)</i>												
From the same ethnic group	17	81	6	11	22	23	14	54	7	17	38	3
From another ethnic group	69	19	15	27	40	29	36	29	14	26	40	25
From majority	47	0	79	53	34	48	45	46	89	66	31	65
<i>Seriousness (DD14/DE13)</i>												
Very or fairly serious	76	56	82	70	66	42	79	68	65	57	64	24
Not very serious	24	44	12	25	30	29	19	32	34	42	29	36
<i>Not reported to the police (DD11/DE10)</i>												
Not reported	31	63	88	80	67	90	81	75	95	93	85	100
<i>Reasons for not reporting (DD13/DE12, top 7 mentions)</i>												
No confidence in the police	46	60	75	79	13	0	34	48	44	76	23	53
Too trivial/not worth reporting	77	0	51	23	50	54	41	61	51	46	58	13
Dealt with the problem themselves	0	100	18	60	25	0	11	55	16	30	9	10
Concerned about consequences	0	30	47	40	13	14	17	41	27	30	5	5
Inconvenience/Too much trouble/No time	54	30	51	38	0	0	7	0	25	36	11	10
Fear of intimidation from perpetrators	0	30	19	38	0	32	6	34	8	30	0	3
Negative attitude to police	23	0	46	21	6	0	17	0	23	17	2	0

EU-MIDIS 2008

threatened by someone sharing their own ethnic background.

'Assaults or threats' in most of the surveyed countries often went beyond "only" threatening the victim. Even in Denmark, where most incidents classified under 'assault or threat' *did not* involve physical contact, one in four (27%) victims stated that force was actually used. Although very few Turkish respondents in Austria were victims of assault or threat, those that were encountered actual violence more often than the other Turkish groups that were interviewed in the survey: three victims out of five confirmed that force had been used during the last assault or threat they had experienced (61%). In comparison, half of the assaults or threats in Germany (50%), in Belgium

(46%) and in the Netherlands (41%) involved actual physical violence. Eight in ten Turkish victims in Belgium and Denmark described these incidents as serious (BE: 76%, DK: 82%), while seven in ten in Germany and the Netherlands felt the same (DE: 70%, NL: 66%). Conversely, although Austrians described assaults or threats as typically violent, they did not consider many of these incidents as especially grave; with only two in five rating the last incident as very or fairly serious.

In Germany and Denmark, victims of assault or threat were the most likely to mention that racist or religiously offensive language had been used during these incidents; more than three in five stated that this had been the case (DK: 64%, DE:

64%). Two out of three in Germany (67%) and two in five victims in the Netherlands (41%) attributed racial motivations to the most recent incident explored in detail in the survey, while those in Belgium and Bulgaria were the least likely to perceive 'racist' intentions (BE: 29%, BG: 19%). Although Austrians were less affected by assaults and threats than any of the other groups – excepting Bulgarians – racist language was very commonly (48%) used during the incidents that were committed against them. Corresponding to these facts, victims in Austria and Denmark were the most likely to assume that they had been targeted due to their ethnic background; eight in ten were convinced that the most recent assault or threat was racially motivated (DK: 82%, AT: 80%) – in the case of Austria, a finding that seems at odds with the low number of respondents identifying incidents as 'serious', and which may require further investigation with respect to perceptions of 'seriousness' among Turkish respondents in Austria.

Serious harassment proved to be more widespread than assault or threat in all of the countries where those of Turkish origin were interviewed. Overall, one in six respondents confirmed that they had been harassed in the preceding five years (16%), and one in ten had suffered harassment in the preceding 12 months (10%). Those of Turkish origin living in Denmark were the most likely to confirm an incident of serious harassment either in the preceding five years (25%) or the previous 12 months (17%). Respondents living in Germany and the Netherlands were close to this figure; 24% and 19% respectively had been harassed in the preceding five years, and 14% and 12% in the preceding 12 months. While in Bulgaria only 6% confirmed a case of serious harassment in the preceding five years, and 4% over the previous 12 months.

Again, respondents in Denmark were in most cases **harassed by people from the majority population**, in nine cases out of ten incidents (89%), and in Germany and Austria this proportion was roughly two out of three (DE: 66%, AT: 65%). The proportion of majority perpetrators in the rest of the countries ranged from 31% to 46%. The Turkish in Belgium tended to perceive these incidents as the gravest, and those in Austria saw them as less serious: 79% of victims in Belgium described the last incident as very or fairly serious, while in Austria only one in four victims of serious harassment described the incident as serious (24%).

However, respondents in Austria, and in Denmark, were the most likely to indicate that perpetrators of serious harassment used racist or religiously

offensive language; three in four harassment victims in both of these countries reported this (DK: 73%, AT: 73%). More than half the number of victims of serious harassment in Belgium (54%) and two thirds in Germany (66%) also confirmed that this happened. Indeed, eight out of ten among those in Austria (81%) and three in four among those in Denmark and Germany (77%) felt that the last incident of serious harassment that they had experienced had been racially motivated; while three in five victims in Belgium perceived ethnic motives (61%) and only one in four in Bulgaria and in the Netherlands had similar suspicions (BG: 22%, NL: 27%).

Similarly to other ethnic and immigrant minorities interviewed in EU-MIDIS, respondents of Turkish origin were more likely to report assaults or threats than incidents of serious harassment to the police; one reason being that harassment does not always qualify as an offence in a criminal sense. **As an average across all Turkish groups surveyed, one in four incidents of assault or threat (26%), from the previous 12 months, was reported to the police, while this applied to only one in ten incidents of serious harassment.** The highest non-reporting of assaults or threats was detected in Austria, where nine out of ten cases were kept private by the victims (90%), and in Denmark, where 88% of victims never reported to the police. Those in Belgium were the most likely to turn to the police if they had been victimised – 69% reported the last incident in the preceding 12 months. None of the incidents of serious harassment were reported to Austrian authorities, and it was also atypical for the Turkish in Germany and Denmark to turn to the police if they had been victims of serious harassment (93% of harassment cases were not reported to the police in Germany, and 95% in Denmark). Serious harassment incidents were more likely to be reported to the police in Bulgaria and Belgium, but still about eight in ten incidents were *not* reported (BG: 75%, NL: 85%).

In general, **the main reasons mentioned by victims for not reporting assaults or threats** was the lack of confidence in the authorities, the triviality of the incidents, concerns about negative consequences should they report, and the fact that they considered it was too much trouble and inconvenience to make an official report (Table 3.6.3.). Many also mentioned that they preferred to resolve the problem themselves, which indicates that the State, in the form of the police, is an avenue of last resort for many communities. This finding is supported by the result that more than half (52%) of the entire Turkish sample did not report to the police because they had no confidence in the police. Of particular note is the fact

that about one in three did not report incidents of assault or threat because they were concerned about the possible negative consequences of doing so (31%), which indicates that **'fear' of retribution is a major factor for non-reporting among the Turkish community and is therefore an issue that needs addressing.**

A third of victims said that they did not report incidents of assault or threat to the police because they dealt with the problem themselves (30%), or thought that it was too much trouble (31%) – perhaps indicating that existing mechanisms for reporting incidents to the police could be improved to encourage reporting.

A great deal of variety in reasons for non-reporting assault or threat can be noted between the groups surveyed in each Member State; for example, victims in Belgium, Austria, Denmark and the Netherlands were quickest to say that they found the incidents 'too trivial' and not worth reporting (BE: 77%, AT: 54%, DK: 51%, NL: 50%), while those in Belgium and Denmark also felt that the inconvenience and trouble that goes with reporting were too much to make it worthwhile, and those in the Netherlands (and Germany) mentioned (as the second most important reason for non-reporting) that they preferred dealing with the problem themselves.

Considering all the Turkish respondents interviewed across Europe, **the reasons given for not reporting harassment were rather similar to those that kept them from reporting assaults or threats:** a lack of confidence in the police, the triviality of the incidents, concerns about negative consequences should they report, the inconvenience of reporting, and preferring to resolve the problem by themselves. Half of victims of serious harassment did not report to the police because they had no confidence in them. Nearly as many, 45%, mentioned that they found the incident 'too trivial' (or everyday in nature), and therefore not worth reporting. About one in five were concerned about the possible negative consequences of reporting (21%) to the police, and an equal proportion decided to deal with the problem on their own (19%).

Those of Turkish origin in Germany identified their lack of faith in the ability of the police to effectively respond to the incident as the first reason given for not reporting (76%), which was also given as the first reason for non reporting by victims in Austria (53%). In all other countries where Turkish respondents were interviewed, the first reason given for not reporting serious harassment was that the incident was seen as 'too trivial', and therefore not worth reporting.

A relatively significant proportion of Turkish interviewees said that they **avoided certain places for fear of being assaulted, threatened or harassed on the basis of their ethnic background** – as an average, one in six (16%) were concerned about this. Those in the Netherlands (20%), Belgium (19%) and Austria (19%) appeared the most worried (the fact that 1 in 5 respondents in Austria avoided certain places for fear of in-person crime could help account for their low victimisation rate). In Germany and Denmark, the proportion of those who chose not to go to certain places in an effort to avoid negative incidents was also significant (DE: 18%, DK: 14%), whereas Turkish respondents in Bulgaria were much less concerned to do this (4%).

3.6.5. Crime victimisation by respondent characteristics

SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE

Looking at the five crime types asked about in EU-MIDIS, victimisation rates (past 12 months) among the Turkish vary substantially across several socio-demographic characteristics, as shown in Table 3.6.4:

- **Age:** with the increase of age the likelihood of victimisation decreases. The highest risk is among the youngest (16-24 years: 27%, 25-39 years 23%), and the lowest risk is observed for people in the oldest age group (55 years or more) – 11%.
- **Income status:** low income increases the likelihood of victimisation. However, also one in five of those from a household with an above average income was a victim crime in the past 12 months.
- **Education status:** victimisation risk increases with more years of education (up to 5 years of schooling: 17%, 14 years and more of schooling: 28%).
- **Employment status:** the groups that run the lowest risk of victimisation are homemakers (16%) – who are typically women. For other occupational groups, substantially higher victimisation rates were reported.

Gender is a characteristic that does not have any substantial influence on victimisation rates: for both men and women the reported victimisation rate in the past 12 months is 21% – again, a finding that differs from research on the majority population, which tends to report higher victimisation rates for men.

Table 3.6.4 – Victimisation rate (DA2-DE2, past 12 months)**General group: Turkish**

By socio-demographic profile, %

Respondent gender (BG0)	Male	21
	Female	21
Age group (BG1)	16-24 years	27
	25-39 years	23
	40-54 years	17
	55 years or more	11
Household income (quartiles) (BG6)	In the lowest quartile	25
	Between the lowest quartile and the median	15
	Above the median	21
Employment status (BG5)	Employed/self-employed	21
	Homemaker/unpaid work	16
	Unemployed	23
	Non-active	23
Education status (years) (BG7)	5 years or less	17
	6-9 years	17
	10-13 years	24
	14 years or more	28

EU-MIDIS 2008

RESPONDENT STATUS

Testing for differences in victimisation rates according to respondent status, some differences were identified between subgroups according to citizenship status, language proficiency, and neighbourhood status (see Table 3.6.5).

- **Citizenship status:** Non-citizens are victimised at a higher rate (24%) than those who are citizens of the Member States where they live (19%).
- **Language proficiency:** Those who are fluent in the language of the Member State where they live but have a foreign sounding accent are less likely to be victimised (18%) than those who are fluent but without a foreign sounding accent (23%).
- **Neighbourhood:** 23% of those living in areas that were considered much the same as other areas of cities where respondents were interviewed (subjective interviewer-based judgement), as opposed to 18% that were classified as living in poorer neighbourhoods, relative to other areas, were victims of crime.

Table 3.6.5 – Victimisation rate (DA2-DE2, past 12 months)**General group: Turkish**

By respondent status and neighbourhood, %

Length of stay in COUNTRY (BG8a)	1-4 years	23
	5-9 years	21
	10-19 years	23
	20+ years	20
Neighbourhood status relative to other areas of the city (PI01)	Born in COUNTRY	20
	Poorer	18
	As other areas	23
Language proficiency in the national language (PI04)	Mixed	20
	Fluent, without foreign sounding accent	23
	Fluent, with foreign sounding accent	18
Citizenship in COUNTRY (BG9)	Less than fluent	20
	Citizen	19
	Not a citizen	24

EU-MIDIS 2008

3.6.6. Corruption

Experience of corruption¹⁴³ in relation to public officials was very rare. Less than 1% – altogether 20 respondents – of the total number of Turkish interviewees in the six Member States mentioned that a public official had asked for or expected a bribe from them in the preceding 12 months. The highest number of these cases was mentioned by those in Bulgaria, where in the past 5 years 3% (N=17) of the sample experienced corruption; in Austria and Belgium only one single case was detected in each country.

In Bulgaria, doctors and nurses, and in a few cases immigration officers, were involved in these incidents; while in Denmark, police officers and inspectors (health, food, sanitary, etc.) were mentioned (two cases each in the past 12 months). Only two cases of corruption were reported anywhere: one in Bulgaria and one in Austria.

3.6.7. Police and border control

According to EU-MIDIS, the police enjoy a reasonable level of trust among Turkish respondents. Three in five (62%) said that they trust the police, one in six (18%) were neutral, and a similar proportion expressed an explicitly negative attitude towards the police (17%). The police in Denmark, Austria and Bulgaria were


¹⁴³ Questions E1-2: During [REFERENCE PERIOD] did any government official in [COUNTRY], for instance a customs officer, a police officer, a judge or an inspector, ask you or expect you to pay a bribe for his or her services?

the most trusted by Turkish respondents; 69% of the Turkish in Denmark and 67% in Austria and in Bulgaria trust the police, and only 3-16% said that they actually distrust them. Those in the Netherlands were by far the least confident in the police; only half of them trusted the police, 15% felt neutral, and one in three (31%) had an outright negative attitude.

Police stops – including perceptions of profiling

Figure 3.6.9 presents rates of police stops, contact with the police other than stops, and those experiencing both police generated stops and other police contact. The findings indicate that the Turkish in Denmark had the most intense contact with the police; nearly half of respondents were either stopped by the police or had some other form of contact with them in the 12 months preceding the survey. On the other hand, police contact seems to be the exception in Austria, where nine in ten (89%) respondents had no contact with them at all in the previous 12 months. Those in Denmark and the Netherlands were the most likely to be stopped by the police (adding together those only experiencing stops with those who experienced both stops and other contact with the police); more than one in four of the Turkish living in these countries had been stopped by the police in a 12 month period (NL: 27% DK: 28%). Those living in Denmark were most likely to contact the police (other than the police stopping them), as were those from Belgium; one in three had some other contact with the police in these countries (DK: 29%, BE: 30%). In comparison, the Turkish minority in Bulgaria were often stopped by the police (23%), but they were much less likely to get into other forms of contact with the police themselves (12%).

Police profiling was perceived most often by respondents in Germany, Belgium and Denmark (see Figure 3.6.10), where between one in four and one in three of respondents felt that the last time they were stopped was because of their ‘ethnic’ background (DE: 30%, BE: 27%, DK: 26%). One in six of the Turkish in the Netherlands and Austria had the same suspicion (NL: 16%, AT: 15% regarding the last stop); while only 4% of Turkish Bulgarians attributed ethnic profiling to their last experience of a police stop.



Question F3: Thinking about the last time you were stopped in this country, when was this? Was it in the last 12 months or before then? F9: Apart from the police stopping you, which I've already asked you about, have you had any contact with the police in this country in the last 12 months? By this I mean you could have reported something to them yourself, or you may have had to register something with them, etc.


These police stops were predominantly traffic controls: 81% of the entire sample was stopped in their cars or while riding a motorbike.¹⁴⁴ However, 24% of the Turkish in Belgium, 19% in Austria, 17% in Germany, and 17% in the Netherlands, were stopped on public transport or on the street – with these latter situations more likely to point to ethnic profiling given that the police are better able to see people than in a traffic related stop, which might support respondents’ assertions in some countries that they were victims of police profiling.

Looking at what happened during the last stop – on average, the police asked questions in half of the cases (51%), although this rose to three cases out of four involving the Turkish in Germany. Also, compared to the 19% average for the whole sample, very many respondents in Germany received verbal advice or a warning from the police as a result of the stop (40%). Among all Turkish respondents who were stopped, 70% were asked to produce vehicle documentation, and 10% had either their vehicle or themselves searched. In Belgium, only half of the Turkish subjects who were stopped were asked to provide vehicle documentation (53%), but 17% had their cars (or themselves) searched by the police.¹⁴⁵

144 Question F6: Thinking about THE LAST TIME you were stopped by the police in this country, were you in a car, on a motorbike or bicycle, on public transport or just on the street?


145 Question F7: Thinking about the last time you were stopped, what did the police actually do? 01 – Ask you questions, 02 – Ask for identity papers – ID card passport/residence permit, 03 – Ask for driving licence or vehicle documents, 04 – Search you or your car/vehicle, 05 – Give some advice or warn you about your behaviour (including your driving or vehicle), 06 – Did an alcohol or drug test, 07 – Fine you, 08 – Arrest you/take you to a police station, 09 – Take money or something from you in the form of a bribe, 10 – Other.

Figure 3.6.10
Perception of profiling at police stops (F5)
 Those stopped in the past 12 months, %



Question F5: Do you think that [the last time you were stopped/any time you were stopped] IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS was because of your immigrant/minority background?

Figure 3.6.11
Evaluation of police conduct during stops (F8)
 Last stop, in the past 12 months, %



Question F8: Again, thinking about the last time you were stopped, how respectful were the police when dealing with you?

In most countries the majority of those who indicated they were stopped by the police in the last 12 months evaluated their treatment by the police (during their last police stop) as 'respectful' (see Figure 3.6.11). Those from Germany were the most likely to give a negative evaluation of the police: one in four felt that the German police were very or fairly disrespectful when dealing with them (25%). One in five in Belgium, Denmark and the Netherlands felt this way too, while an explicitly negative assessment was provided by


only 8% in Bulgaria and 14% in Austria. The Turkish in Austria were most likely to perceive a neutral attitude towards them on the part of the police – 48% said that the police officer/s stopping them were neither respectful, nor disrespectful.

Evaluation of police conduct in other contacts

Evaluations of police conduct were for the most part more favourable when respondents were asked to assess the attitude of the police in other contacts (those that did not involve being stopped by the police). **On average, about three in four respondents assessed police conduct as very or fairly respectful (see Figure 3.6.12); although in Austria only one fourth and in Germany only half of respondents were of this opinion.** This did not however mean that the Turkish in these countries tended to perceive a negative attitude from the police, but there were many giving a neutral evaluation (AT: 49%, DE: 35%). In Austria one in five respondents had difficulties assessing police conduct, which could reflect the fact that the percentage of Turkish respondents who are recent arrivals is higher in Austria (20% of respondents in Austria had arrived 1-9 years ago, while only 10% or less in other countries had arrived in this period) and therefore they might find it difficult to assess police conduct (however, the Turkish in Austria in general had very little contact with the police).

Figure 3.6.12
Evaluation of police conduct in other contacts (F10)

Last contact (other than stop), in the past 12 months, %



Question F10: Thinking about the last time you had contact with the police in this country – that DID NOT involve them stopping you – how respectful were they to you?

Border control

The survey asked respondents a couple of 'screening questions' about whether, in the last 12 months, they had returned to their country of residence from travel abroad when immigration/border/customs personnel were present, and if they had been stopped by them. These results in themselves cannot present a picture of potential discriminatory treatment as they are dependent on factors such as where respondents were travelling back from, the existence or not of Schengen border controls, and whether respondents had an EU passport. However, having determined that respondents had returned to their country of residence and had been stopped by immigration/border/customs personnel, they were asked a follow-up question about whether they considered they were *singled out for stopping on the basis of their immigrant/ethnic background* when re-entering their country of residence – which was used as a rough indicator of potential profiling during these encounters.

Out of the Turkish communities surveyed in EU-MIDIS, those living in Denmark and the Netherlands travelled abroad the most frequently; during the 12 months preceding the survey, 60% and 52% of respondents re-entered their respective EU countries and crossed a border with control personnel present.¹⁴⁶ 42% of those in Germany and 27% in Austria recalled a similar journey, while only one in ten in Bulgaria and Belgium mentioned this for the same period.

Of those re-entering their country of residence when border, immigration or customs personnel were present, those in Bulgaria were the most likely to be stopped – 89%; which most probably can be explained by the specific border control operations characterising the Turkish-Bulgarian border. Turkish respondents living in Germany were also very likely to be stopped by border guards when re-entering Germany; three in four (75%) were stopped while re-entering Germany, which could be explained by the large number not having German citizenship. Half of those living in Belgium, one fourth in Denmark and Austria, and one fifth of those in the Netherlands had similar experiences.

Respondents living in Denmark were the most likely to assume that they were singled out

by border control personnel because of their ethnic background; 44% had this perception. A considerable proportion of respondents in Germany, the Netherlands and Belgium also attributed ethnic profiling to their experiences of being stopped upon returning to their country of residence (DE: 36% NL: 31% BE: 25%). Even if these encounters were not discriminatory in nature, the fact that significant numbers of respondents in some countries felt that they were treated differently at borders, because of their ethnicity, is cause in itself to examine why these negative perceptions of differential treatment exist among minority communities who are resident in EU Member States.

3.6.8. Police stops by respondent characteristics

SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC STATUS

Table 3.6.6 indicates differences in the volume and experiences of stops according to different respondent characteristics:

- **Gender:** Men were stopped by the police (past 5 years) more than twice as often as women. In view of police stops in the past 12 months, the difference between men and women is even greater (men: 32%, women: 11%). In addition, men who were stopped by the police perceive ethnic profiling to be a factor more often than women do.
- **Age:** The groups most often stopped by the police are those between 16-39 years of age. Relatively high rates of police stops are also observed for those aged between 40-54 years. In the age group 55 years and above police stops are less frequent (80% have not been stopped by the police in the past 5 years). Those who were stopped by the police in the last 12 months and most often consider it to be the result of ethnic profiling are the youngest age group (16-24 years)
- **Income:** Income groups create a clear differentiation with respect to the likelihood of police stops: those in the highest income group (household income above the median) had the highest rate of stops in the past 5 years (42%). No

¹⁴⁶ Question G1: During the last 12 months, have you ever entered [COUNTRY] from a visit abroad when either immigration, customs or border control were present?

ASK IF RESPONSE TO G1 = Yes – G2. During the last 12 months, were you ever stopped by [COUNTRY NATIONALITY] immigration, customs or border control when coming back into the country?

ASK IF RESPONSE TO G2 = Yes – G3. Do you think you were singled out for stopping by [COUNTRY NATIONALITY] immigration, customs or border control specifically because of your immigrant/minority background?

Table 3.6.6 – Police stops (F2, F3 and F5)**General group: Turkish**

By socio-demographic profile, %

		Not stopped	Stopped in the past 2-5 years	Stopped in past 12 months, no profiling	Stopped in past 12 months, with profiling
Respondent gender (BG0)	Male	50	18	25	7
	Female	81	9	9	2
Age group (BG1)	16-24 years	63	11	17	8
	25-39 years	63	16	17	4
	40-54 years	67	12	18	3
	55 years or more	80	10	9	1
Household income (quartiles) (BG6)	In the lowest quartile	65	15	15	5
	Between the lowest quartile and the median	68	13	15	4
	Above the median	58	15	23	5
Employment status (BG5)	Employed/self-employed	56	16	22	5
	Home maker/unpaid work	88	6	5	1
	Unemployed	66	15	15	4
	Non-active	71	11	13	4
Education status (years) (BG7)	5 years or less	85	7	7	0
	6-9 years	69	13	14	4
	10-13 years	59	15	21	5
	14 years or more	54	15	24	7

EU-MIDIS 2008

notable differences were found in perceptions of police profiling according to income.

- **Employment status:** Reflecting the results related to income, the most frequently stopped were the employed/self employed (43% in the past 5 years) followed by the unemployed (34%). 4% among the unemployed and 5% among the employed/self-employed attributed the stop to profiling. In comparison, only 12% of homemakers or those in unpaid work were stopped in the last five years and only 1% attributed the stop to profiling – again, a factor related to gender.
- **Education:** People with higher levels of education report having been stopped more frequently than do those with lower levels of education; looking at the last 5 years, 46% of those with 14 years or more of education have been stopped, while 14% of those with 5 years or less of education have been stopped. Perceived profiling rates among these groups show the same relationship: those in the most highly educated group perceive more often that they have been stopped as a result of police profiling. An explanation for this, which could be explored further, is that sensitivity to discriminatory

treatment and the everyday mobility of more highly educated people is greater; this in turn increases the chances of police stops and the likelihood that stops are perceived to be the result of profiling.

RESPONDENT STATUS

- **Length of stay:** Respondents of Turkish origin who had been in the country for more than 10 years and those born in the country were the most frequently stopped by the police (see Table 3.6.7).
- **Language proficiency:** Higher proficiency in the language of the country of residence appears to be slightly related to the increased likelihood of police stops. In addition, profiling is also slightly more often identified by respondents with higher language proficiency. However, these findings are marginal.

Factors that do not produce notable differences at the aggregate group level are citizenship and neighbourhood status; although, as reported previously, differences can be noted when looking at these characteristics and experiences of stops at the level of individual Member States.

Table 3.6.7 – Police stops (F2, F3 and F5)**General group: Turkish**

By respondent status and neighbourhood, %

		Not stopped	Stopped in the past 2-5 years	Stopped in past 12 months, no profiling	Stopped in past 12 months, with profiling
Length of stay in COUNTRY (BG8a)	1-4 years	78	6	11	5
	5-9 years	73	9	14	4
	10-19 years	67	13	16	4
	20+ years	68	14	15	3
	Born in COUNTRY	63	13	19	5
Neighbourhood status relative to other areas of the city (PI01)	Poorer	72	12	13	3
	As other areas	64	13	18	5
	Mixed	66	13	16	4
Language proficiency in the national language (PI04)	Fluent, without foreign sounding accent	61	13	20	6
	Fluent, with foreign sounding accent	66	13	16	4
	Less than fluent	72	13	13	2
Citizenship in COUNTRY (BG9)	Citizen	66	14	17	4
	Not a citizen	67	12	16	5

EU-MIDIS 2008

3.6.9. Respondent background**Origins**

EU-MIDIS interviewed members of Turkish minority groups in six EU Member States. In most of these countries they are immigrant communities, apart from Bulgaria where the Turkish are an indigenous minority and all of them were born in Bulgaria. On average, 42% of Turkish respondents were born in the EU country where they were interviewed – the most second-generation immigrants lived in Belgium, the least in Denmark (36% and 24%, respectively, were born there). One in three respondents had been living in their country of residence for more than 20 years (32%); the most long-established Turkish immigrants could be found in Germany (46%). In Austria there are the most newcomers: nearly one in ten (8%) have been living there for less than 5 years, compared to the 3% average among all Turkish respondents in the six Member States. On average, three out of five were citizens of the countries where they lived (64%); although all Bulgarian Turkish were Bulgarian citizens and one in five had dual citizenship (21%). The largest number of citizens of Turkish origin could be found in Belgium, where 84% had Belgian citizenship, while in Germany only 13% of the Turkish had obtained German citizenship.

Socio-demographic details

The age composition of the Turkish group in Bulgaria was significantly different from the others due to the fact that they are an indigenous minority and, therefore, the age composition is most probably similar to that of the majority population. In Bulgaria one in ten Turkish (12%) were aged between 16 and 24, and the number of older people was significant: one in three (30%) were aged 55 years or more – a factor that may help explain their low levels of discrimination experiences. The Turkish communities in the other EU countries were significantly younger: on average one in four (26%) were young people, between the ages of 16 and 24, and less than one in eight were in the oldest age group (13%). The great majority of EU residents with a Turkish background were aged between 25 and 54 (62%). The Turkish in The Netherlands were most represented in the youngest age group (34% were between 16 and 24).

About one fifth of respondents reported education with a duration of 5 years or less (19%). More than one in six were highly educated – 17% having completed 14 years or more of schooling.

There were more undereducated women than undereducated men: one in four Turkish females (24%) completed 5 years or less of school – or did not go to school at all – while this applied to only half as many males: 12% reported the same duration of schooling. On the other hand, no similarly significant difference was detected between the number of highly educated men and women: 18% of the men and 16% of the women completed 14 years or more of schooling. The most educated were respondents of Turkish origin in the Netherlands, and the least educated were Turkish respondents in Austria and Germany. Among those in the Netherlands, nearly one in three (30%) reported schooling with a duration of 14 years or more, while this proportion was only 5% among those in Austria and Germany. In Austria, one third of the Turkish sample had completed 5 years of full time education or less, or did not go to school at all – a factor that could affect perceptions of discriminatory treatment.

Nearly half of Turkish respondents were actively working (48%) – fulltime/part time or self-employed - and one in six were studying (14%). Men were more likely to work: 61% of male interviewees and 37% of females were working; but women were just as likely to study as men: 13% and 14% respectively. In Bulgaria the same proportion of respondents were working as in the other countries, but significantly fewer were studying (3%).

The most economically active workers were interviewed in Denmark, where three out of five were working (60%); while in Austria less than the average, 43%, were present in the labour market. One in five Turkish immigrants in Germany and the Netherlands were studying (20%), while in Austria slightly fewer than the average were still in education. One in six respondents were homemakers, usually women - one third (29%) of all the interviewed Turkish females stayed at home and took care of the family. This was most common in Austria (51% of female respondents were homemakers), while far fewer women of Turkish origin were homemakers in Denmark (7%). The overall unemployment rate was 11%, but it varied substantially from country to country. The highest levels of unemployment were found in Belgium: nearly one in five (17%) did not have a job, and unemployment was also a problem in Bulgaria (14%) and in the Netherlands (13%). From this point of view, the Turkish were in the most advantageous situation in Austria, where only one in twenty (6%) were unable to find a job at the time of the survey.

Language

Nine in ten respondents considered Turkish as their mother tongue. The greatest number of Turkish respondents who named the language of their host country as their mother tongue was found in Belgium, where 7% identified French as their mother tongue. According to interviewers' assessments: overall, 71% of Turkish respondents spoke the language of their country of residence fluently (41% without any noticeable accent). The Turkish in Belgium demonstrated the highest level of language proficiency - 81% spoke fluent French. Turkish respondents in Austria appeared to have the most problems with the language – only 53% were judged by interviewers as speaking German fluently, although competently enough to be able to answer the interview questions.

Religion

95% of all persons interviewed indicated that they were Muslim. Respondents demonstrated a strong devotion to religion and tradition. 85% said that religion was very or fairly important in their lives; those in Belgium appeared the most devoted (96%) and those in Germany the least (76%). On average, 22% indicated that they wore clothing that was traditional to their culture and/or religion. This was most common in Austria (39%) and least common amongst Bulgarian Turkish (13%). Wearing traditional or religious clothing was predominantly a characteristic of women (94% of the Turkish respondents who indicated they did so were women).

Segregation

According to interviewers' assessments, respondents in Belgium, and Bulgaria, and to a smaller extent in the Netherlands, appeared to be living in more segregated neighbourhoods than interviewees in other countries; while interviewees in Denmark seemed the best integrated based on an assessment of neighbourhood segregation. In Belgium and Bulgaria nearly seven in ten (BE: 70%, BG: 64%) respondents' households were situated within a predominantly immigrant neighbourhood. On the other hand, in Denmark only one in ten were in similar areas (16%) – although this could reflect the registry-based sampling that was applied in Denmark. 35% of the households visited in Belgium and one in four Dutch households (24%) were regarded by interviewers to be in 'poor' areas in relation to other parts of cities where interviews took place, while one in ten households visited in Denmark was located in less well-off areas.

3.7. Former Yugoslavians

Who was surveyed?

In four Member States respondents with a former-Yugoslavian background (ex-Yugoslavian; ex-YU) were interviewed. In Slovenia, which was part of the former Yugoslavia, an equal number of Bosnians and Serbians was interviewed (N=500 for both groups), and the results for these two groups were treated separately in the analysis. In the other three Member States a generic ‘former Yugoslavian’ group was surveyed and the analysis is presented for former Yugoslavians as a whole in these countries. In sum – the analysis is for five different groups (2 from Slovenia and one from each of the other three Member States).

The ‘respondent characteristics’ box at the end of this chapter presents a breakdown of different respondent variables, including citizenship.

SAMPLE

Member States:
 Austria (N=593)
 Germany (N=500)
 Luxembourg (N=497)
 Slovenia (N=1001)


Sampling method:
 Random route sampling with FE in high-density urban areas (AT, SI);
 Registry-Based Addresses Sampling (DE, LU)

Some key findings on respondents’ experiences of discrimination, victimisation and police stops

Figure 3.7.1 summarises some key results from the survey.

EU-MIDIS asked respondents about their experiences of discrimination on the basis of their immigrant or ethnic minority background in relation to nine areas of everyday life, about their experiences of crime (including racially motivated crime) across five areas, and their experiences of police stops.

Experiences of discrimination based on respondents’ immigrant or ethnic minority background differed significantly between the Member States where they were surveyed.



Question CA2-CI2 / DA2-DE2: Thinking about the last time this happened, when was this: in the last twelve months or before then? CA4-CI4: Did you or anyone else report this incident anywhere? DD11, DE10: Did you or anyone else report the incident to the police? F2: In this country, within the last five years, have you EVER been stopped by the police when you were in a car, on a motorbike or bicycle, on public transport or just on the street? F3: Thinking about the last time you were stopped in this country, when was this? Was it in the last 12 months or before then? F5: Do you think that [the last time you were stopped/any time you were stopped] IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS was because of your immigrant/minority background?

In Austria, only 3% of the ex-Yugoslavian group felt discriminated against on the basis of their ethnicity in the past 12 months (considering all the 9 domains tested), whereas 21% (seven times the Austria rate) of the former Yugoslavian community living in Germany recalled unequal treatment based on their minority

background in the same 12 month period. After Germany, the Bosnian community in Slovenia was the second most discriminated against (16%).

Of all aggregate groups looked at in EU-MIDIS, former Yugoslavians were the least likely to avoid certain locations for fear of being discriminated against on the basis of their ethnic background – on average, 6%. At the same time, former Yugoslavians were also the least likely out of all aggregate groups surveyed to avoid certain locations in their area for fear of being a victim of crime on the basis of their ethnicity – on average 9% indicated this.

Former Yugoslavians in Luxembourg were most likely to report discrimination experiences (either at the place where they occur or to an office or authority that can receive complaints): one-fifth of them – 24% – reported their most recent experience of unequal treatment on the basis of their ethnicity, which was the highest reporting rate among all ex-YU groups. While both ex-YU in Germany and Bosnians in Slovenia experienced relatively high levels of discrimination based on their minority background, they acted differently when it came to reporting these incidents: former Yugoslavians in Germany were the second most likely among the ex-YU group to report such experiences (19% of these incidents were reported), whereas only 5% of Bosnians in Slovenia reported experiences of discrimination based on their ethnicity (the lowest rate among all ex-YU groups).

Former Yugoslavians in Germany and Bosnians in Slovenia were also the most likely in the ex-YU group to become victims of any of the five crimes tested in EU-MIDIS in the past 12 months (21% and 18%, respectively).

Among respondents from the former Yugoslavia as a whole, the proportion of crimes reported to the police was significantly higher than the proportion of discrimination incidents that were reported. The greatest difference in reporting rates between crime and discrimination was among former Yugoslavians in Austria: 43% reported incidents of crime to the police, while only 9% reported incidents of discrimination (a difference of 34 percentage points). Crimes committed against Serbs in Slovenia were the least likely to be brought to the attention of the police (18%); however, this reporting rate was still 10 percentage points higher compared to the reporting rate for discrimination (8%).

Former Yugoslavians in Slovenia (both Serbs and Bosnians) were the most likely of all ex-Yugoslavian groups to have been stopped by the police (60% of

Serbs and 59% of Bosnians had been stopped by the police in the last five years, and 31% of Serbs and 34% of Bosnians within the last 12 months). However, only 1-2% of those who were stopped considered it to be the result of discriminatory profiling practices.

Among all former Yugoslavians who were interviewed – perceptions of having been profiled by the police were very low (between 0% in Austria and 3% in Germany). A similar low level of perceived profiling was found for Russian respondents as an aggregate group – whereas visibly different minorities that were interviewed in EU-MIDIS, such as the Roma or Sub-Saharan Africans – were far more likely to say that they had experienced a discriminatory police stop.

3.7.1. General opinions on discrimination, and rights awareness

Respondents' opinions about the extent of discrimination on different grounds in their country of residence: including grounds in addition to ethnic or immigrant origin

Before being asked about their personal experiences of discrimination, interviewees were asked their opinion about how widespread they believed discrimination to be on different grounds in their respective countries of residence; ranging from discrimination on grounds of 'religion or belief' through to 'disability' (see Figure 3.7.2).


Discrimination (in general) was considered more widespread in Slovenia than in the other Member States.

As an average, around one third of ex-Yugoslavians across the four Member States considered discrimination on the basis of **ethnic or immigrant background** and discrimination on the basis of **religion or belief** to be widespread in their countries of residence (36% and 33%, respectively).

Ethnic/immigrant origin was considered to be the primary source of discrimination in all investigated communities but one: 59% of Serbs in Slovenia felt that discrimination based on **sexual orientation** was more widespread than discrimination based on ethnicity (49%). Significant numbers of Bosnians in Slovenia also identified discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation as widespread (therefore these responses might warrant further investigation with respect to attitudes towards sexuality among both the majority and minority populations in Slovenia). Nonetheless, having identified sexuality as the main ground for

Figure 3.7.2
Is discrimination widespread? (A1, %)



Very or fairly widespread Very or fairly rare
Non-existent Can't tell



EU-MIDIS 2008

Question A1: For each of the following types of discrimination, could you please tell me whether, in your opinion, it is very widespread, fairly widespread, fairly rare, or very rare in [COUNTRY]? Discrimination on the basis of ...?

Figure 3.7.3

Workplace advancement (A4, %) i) with different ethnic background**ii) with different religious background**

EU-MIDIS 2008
Ex-Yugoslavian (ex-YU), Serbian (Ser), Bosnian (Bos)

Question A4: Would you say that, with equivalent qualifications or diplomas, the following people would be less likely, as likely, or more likely than others to get a job, be accepted for training or be promoted in [COUNTRY]? A. A person of different ethnic origin than the rest of the population, B. A person who practices a different religion than that of the rest of the country?

discriminatory treatment, Serbs in Slovenia were the second most likely (49%) among all the ex-Yugoslavian groups (after Bosnians in Slovenia – 50%) to believe that unfair treatment based on ethnic origin was very or fairly widespread.

More than four out of 10 Serbs and Bosnians in Slovenia, as well as former Yugoslavians in Germany, said that discrimination on the basis of religion or belief was very or fairly widespread in their countries of residence. In comparison, only 17%-19% of respondents in Austria and Luxembourg held a similar opinion.

Ex-Yugoslavians were least likely to believe that gender and age-based discrimination were widespread in their countries of residence (on average: 13% and 16%, respectively).

Opinions on workplace advancement according to ethnicity or religion

Respondents were asked to assess how a minority background affects **workplace advancement** (see Figure 3.7.3).

In all five communities, having an ethnic origin different from the rest of the population was perceived as a more significant obstacle to workplace advancement (e.g. admittance, training opportunities and promotions) than having a different religious background. In all ex-Yugoslavian communities, with the exception of Austria, about half of respondents (between 47% and 51%) were convinced that a different **ethnic background** is a barrier to workplace advancement. In Austria, the dominant opinion, shared by two thirds of former Yugoslavians living in the country, is that ethnicity does not impede workplace advancement (68%). Ex-Yugoslavians in Austria were also the least likely to believe that a different **religious background** than that of the rest of the country could have a negative impact on workplace advancement (17%). The communities that register the highest proportions of those who believe that their minority religious background will hinder their workplace advancement were Bosnians and Serbs in Slovenia (44% and 41%, respectively).

Willingness to provide information on ethnicity or religion for a census

Differences between the former-Yugoslavian communities with regard to their willingness to provide **information** on an anonymous basis about their **ethnic origin**¹⁴⁷ or their **religion**¹⁴⁸ **for a census**, if that could help to combat discrimination, are quite stark. While many former Yugoslavians in Luxembourg were reluctant to reveal information about both their ethnic or religious background (43% in both cases; although 49% were in favour in both cases), almost all ex-Yugoslavians living in Austria and Germany would be willing to provide such information (90%-93% depending on what sort of information and on the country). One explanation for the lower willingness to provide such information by former Yugoslavians in Luxembourg could be that significant numbers in this community arrived in Luxembourg as refugees from the war in the former Yugoslavia – a war where ethnic and religious affiliation were catalysts for conflict and 'ethnic cleansing'; the respondent characteristics

147 Question A5a: Would you be in favour of or opposed to providing, on an anonymous basis, information about your ethnic origin, as part of a census, if that could help to combat discrimination in [COUNTRY]?

148 Question A5b: And how about providing, on an anonymous basis, information about your religion or belief?

data appears to support this hypothesis, as 72% of respondents in Luxembourg arrived there between 10-19 years ago.

Awareness of anti-discrimination bodies

When asked whether they knew of any **organisation** in their country that could offer support or advice to people who have been discriminated against, for whatever reason,¹⁴⁹ former Yugoslavians were generally unable to identify any such organisation: in all five communities one fifth or fewer of the respondents knew of such an organisation. Familiarity with this type of organisation was lowest among Bosnians in Slovenia (13%) and highest among those in Germany and Luxembourg (20% both).

EU-MIDIS went on to ask respondents if they had heard of specific named organisations in their country of residence.¹⁵⁰ The highest overall awareness was among former Yugoslavians in Germany – 55% of respondents in this group had heard of at least one of the organisations that interviewers named; with each individual named organisation being known by approximately three out of 10 respondents (30%-32%). About a third of both Serbs and Bosnians in Slovenia were familiar with at least one Equality Body (37% and 34%, respectively). The “Office for Equal Opportunities” and the “Advocate of the Principle of Equality” were known by 20%-26% of the Serbs and Bosnians in Slovenia; the least known being the “Council for the implementation of the principle of equal treatment”, which only 9% of both Serbs and Bosnians in Slovenia had heard of it. The lowest level of awareness of a named organisation was found in Luxembourg; only 5% of the former Yugoslavians in this country had heard of the “Permanent Special Commission against Racial Discrimination”; however, given this organisation’s title, which infers a limited mandate, it is perhaps not surprising that many former Yugoslavians would not be aware of this body and/or would not associate their particular equality needs with it.

Awareness of anti-discrimination laws

When asked whether legislation exists to protect people on the basis of their ethnicity in three different areas, respondents were generally more aware of the existence of anti-discrimination legislation in relation to the job market and less aware of legislation relating to housing and services. In all three domains, former Yugoslavians living in Germany were the most informed about the existence of anti-discrimination laws (30%-45% depending on the area). In contrast, former Yugoslavians in Luxembourg were the least likely to know about legislation that forbids discrimination against minorities when applying for a job¹⁵¹ or when renting or buying a flat¹⁵² (30% and 23%, respectively), and Serbians in Slovenia were the least aware of anti-discriminatory legislation in relation to services¹⁵³ (17%).

The level of familiarity with the **EU Charter of Fundamental Rights**¹⁵⁴ varies considerably among the five communities surveyed. Overall awareness of the Charter was highest among Serbians and Bosnians in Slovenia (71% and 69%, respectively); these respondents were also the most likely to say that they actually knew what the Charter was about (15% and 11%, respectively). In comparison, only about a quarter of former Yugoslavians in Luxembourg and Austria were familiar with the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights (25% and 29%, respectively), and fewer said they knew what it was about (4% and 9%, respectively).

3.7.2. Experience of discrimination

Respondents’ general experiences of discrimination on different grounds

Having measured their *opinion* on the extent of discrimination on different grounds in their country of residence (as outlined in the previous paragraphs), respondents were asked a follow-up question about

149 A3. Do you know of any organisation in [COUNTRY] that can offer support or advice to people who have been discriminated against – for whatever reason?

150 Question B2A-C: Have you ever heard of the [NAME OF EQUALITY BODY1-3]? The following Equality Bodies were tested: Austria – “Ombudsman for Equal Treatment” and “National Equality Body”; Germany – “Federal antidiscrimination authority”, “Federal Government Commissioner for migration, refugees and integration” and “Landesstelle für Gleichbehandlung – gegen Diskriminierung (Berlin)”; “Antidiskriminierungsstelle für Menschen mit Migrationshintergrund (AMIGRA)” (München), “Antidiskriminierungsstelle der Stadt Frankfurt im Amt für Multikulturelle Angelegenheiten (AMKA)” (Frankfurt); Luxembourg – “Permanent Special Commission against Racial Discrimination”; Slovenia – “Office for Equal Opportunities”, “Advocate of the Principle of Equality” and “Council for the implementation of the principle of equal treatment”.

151 Question B1a: What do you think, is there a law in [COUNTRY] that forbids discrimination against immigrants and ethnic minority people... (a) when applying for a job?

152 Question B1c: What do you think, is there a law in [COUNTRY] that forbids discrimination against immigrants and ethnic minority people... (c) when renting or buying a flat?

153 Question B1b: What do you think, is there a law in [COUNTRY] that forbids discrimination against immigrants and ethnic minority people... (b) when entering or in a shop, restaurant or club?


154 Question B3: Are you familiar with the “Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union”? 1 – Yes and you know what it is, 2 – Yes, you have heard about it, but you are not sure what it is, 3 – No, you have never heard about it.

their general *experiences* of discrimination in the last 12 months under the same cross section of grounds (see explanatory footnote¹⁵⁵).

Note for reading figures presented in the report:


In a number of figures and tables in the report, the five-year rate is the sum of the percentage given for the past 12 months and that for the 2-5 year period. Similarly, where the 12-month rate is broken down into multiple categories (e.g. those stopped by the police in the 12 months prior to the interview as a result of profiling, and those stopped by the police in the 12 months prior to the interview not as a result of profiling) the percentages in each category should be added up for the actual 12-month prevalence rate. For some questions multiple responses were possible and therefore the reader is advised to look at the question wording as set out in the original questionnaire, which can be downloaded from the FRA's website.

Figure 3.7.4
General experiences of discrimination on different grounds (A2)
In the past 12 months, %



Question A2: In the past 12 months have you personally felt discriminated against or harassed in [COUNTRY] on the basis of one or more of the following grounds [ethnic or immigrant origin, gender, sexual orientation, age, religion or belief, disability, other reason]?

Figure 3.7.5
Personal discrimination experience based on ethnicity (CA1-CI1, CA2-CI2)
Prevalence across 9 domains, %



Questions CA1-CI1: During the last 5 years, [or since you've been in the country if less than 5 years], have you ever been discriminated against when [DOMAIN] in [COUNTRY] because of your immigrant/minority background? CA2-CI2: Thinking about the last time this happened, when was this: in the last twelve months or before then?

Looking at the results on experiences of discrimination across different grounds in the last 12 months (see Figure 3.7.4), the lowest levels of discrimination were identified among respondents in Austria and Luxembourg – only 7% in Austria and 8% in Luxembourg indicated that they had experienced discrimination on grounds including ethnicity in the last 12 months, while 5% in Austria and 7% in Luxembourg said they had experienced discrimination solely on grounds that did not include ethnicity. In comparison, 22% of respondents in Germany had experienced discrimination in the last 12 months on grounds that included ethnicity, and a further 9% said they had experienced discrimination solely on grounds that did not include ethnicity. Similar numbers of Bosnians and Serbians in Slovenia indicated they had been discriminated against in the past 12 months on grounds including ethnicity (respectively, 15% and 13%), while 9% in both groups said they had experienced discrimination solely on grounds excluding ethnicity.

In the case of ex-Yugoslavians in Germany and Bosnians in Slovenia, their general experiences of unequal treatment are almost matched by the average figures recorded in consideration of discrimination experiences on the basis of ethnicity that were tested across nine domains (see Figure

155 Before clarifying specific discrimination experiences for the nine types tested in the survey, EU-MIDIS asked a complementary question to clarify respondents' general thoughts or impressions about their recent discrimination history. In order to do so on a comparative basis, EU-MIDIS used a question from a 2008 Eurobarometer survey (EB 296, 2008), which asked about personal memories of discrimination in multiple domains - Question A2, which asked: 'In the past 12 months have you personally felt discriminated against or harassed in [COUNTRY] on the basis of one or more of the following grounds? Please tell me all that apply. A - Ethnic or immigrant origin, B - Gender, C - Sexual orientation, D - Age, E - Religion or belief, F - Disability, X - For another reason'. Chapter 4 in this report presents a comparison of results between the majority and minority populations' responses to this question from Eurobarometer and EU-MIDIS.

3.7.5) – as discussed in the following paragraphs,¹⁵⁶ in the other three communities differences of ± 3 - 4 percentage points were observed between the above results and the more detailed results of questions asking about discrimination on the basis of ethnicity across nine domains.

Respondents' experiences of discrimination across nine areas of everyday life on the grounds of ethnic or immigrant origin

Looking at the average rate of discrimination across the nine domains surveyed (see Figure 3.7.5): almost three out of 10 Bosnians and Serbs in Slovenia experienced discrimination incidents grounded in ethnicity over the last 5 years (32% and 30%, respectively), and nearly the same number of former Yugoslavians in Germany too (29%). Looking at the average rate of discrimination across the nine areas only in the last 12 months, experiences of unequal treatment based on ethnicity were most widespread among former Yugoslavians living in Germany (21%). In comparison, personal discrimination experiences on the basis of ethnic origin were the least common in Austria, both in consideration of the last 5 years and 12 months (5yrs: 18% and 1yr: 3%).

Looking at the average results for each of the nine domains of discrimination, respondents felt discriminated against the most on the grounds of their ethnicity/immigrant background when they were **looking for work** (5yrs: 18% and 1yr: 8%). On average, the second most common ground for unequal treatment was in relation to being **at work** (5yrs: 9% and 1yr: 4%). Considering the 5-year time span, between 6% and 9% of former Yugoslavians said they had been discriminated against based on their ethnic origin by **social services, healthcare or school personnel**, with the respective one year rates being between 2% and 3%. In the area of **housing**, the 5 year rate was 6%, and the 1 year rate was only 2%. In the other areas surveyed – **shops, cafés and banks** – the average rate of those who experienced unequal treatment grounded in ethnicity over the last 5 years was as low as 1%-4%.

When asked if they avoid certain places, such as shops or cafés, for fear of being treated badly because of their ethnic background, on average, a small proportion of former Yugoslavians confirmed

this (6%). The most likely to avoid certain places are those in Germany (10%), while only 4% of Bosnians in Slovenia claimed that they tended to avoid certain places for fear of discrimination grounded in ethnicity.

Figure 3.7.6 presents the results for each of the nine domains and each of the five groups surveyed.

Within the former Yugoslavian group as a whole, those living in Germany experienced the highest overall level of discrimination grounded in ethnicity in the past 12 months.

One fifth of former Yugoslavians in Germany recalled discrimination experiences *when looking for work* over the past 12 months (1yr: 20% and 5yrs: 29% – these are the highest discrimination rates in this domain among the ex-YU group). With the exception of the *housing* sector, in all of the eight other areas tested, former Yugoslavians in Germany were the most likely in the ex-Yugoslavian group to say that they were subjected to unequal treatment because of their minority background in the last *12 months* (between 2% and 7% depending on the area). Not considering discrimination experienced by those searching for work (presented above), the results show that in the 5-year time span, the ratio for unfair treatment grounded in ethnicity varied between 3% (in the area of commercial services such as *shops*) and 10% (at the *workplace*) in Germany.

Respondents in **Luxembourg** were the second most likely in the group of former Yugoslavians to have experienced discrimination on the grounds of their minority background *when they were looking for work* (5yrs: 20% and 1yr: 10%). Compared to the other communities and considering the past five years, the number of incidents of unequal treatment at the *workplace* were less common for the ex-YU in Luxembourg, as well as for respondents from Austria (7% in both countries – the lowest discrimination ratios for this domain in the ex-YU group). Along with former Yugoslavians in Germany, those in Luxembourg were the most likely to indicate discrimination experiences over the 5-year time span when trying to open a *bank* account (4%).

The overall situation for former Yugoslavians in **Austria** is the best among the groups surveyed. In all of the domains tested in EU-MIDIS, respondents from

¹⁵⁶ Key reference periods are 12 months (e.g. the 12 months that preceded the interview), or five years (preceding the interview). Please note that this section provides some illustrations, where the two reference periods are combined. In these charts and tables, the five-year rate is the sum of the percentage given for the past 12 months and that for the 2-5 year period. Similarly, where the 12-month rate is broken down into multiple categories (e.g. those stopped by the police in the 12 months prior to the interview as a result of anticipated profiling and those stopped by the police in the 12 months prior to the interview not as a result of anticipated profiling) the percentages in each category should be added up for the actual 12-month prevalence rate.


Figure 3.7.6
**Specific discrimination experience
 based on ethnicity (CA1-CI1, CA2-CI2)**

■ In the past 12 months
 ■ In the past 2-5 years
 □ Not discriminated against

Reporting rate (CA4-CI4)

% who reported the most recent incident in the past 12 months

■ Not reported (incl. Don't know/ Refused)
 □ Reported



EU-MIDIS 2008

Questions CA1-CI1 / CA2-CI2 as with Figure 3.7.5. CA4-CI4: Did you or anyone else report this incident anywhere?


Austria reported the lowest ratios of discrimination experiences over the past 12 months (in the case of discrimination in housing the lowest rate among former Yugoslavians in Austria is shared by Ex-

Yugoslavians in Luxembourg and Serbians in Slovenia, and in the case of discrimination at a shop 0% of both Ex-Yugoslavians in Austria and Bosnians in Slovenia felt discriminated against in the past 12 months).

Figure 3.7.7

Reasons for not reporting discrimination (CA5-C15)

Based on the last incident, in the past 12 months, in any of 9 domains, %



EU-MIDIS 2008

Questions CA5-C15: Why wasn't it [the most recent incident of discrimination] reported?

However, former Yugoslavians living in Austria were the most likely amongst the five groups surveyed to have felt discriminated against by a *housing agency* or a *landlord* in the past 5 years (2-5 years 8%; 1yr: 1%).

As in other communities, the primary source for unequal treatment based on ethnic origin to which the **Serbs in Slovenia** were exposed was in relation to *looking for work* (5yrs: 16% and 1yr: 5%). Looking at all domains tested, the second most likely source of discrimination for the Serbs in Slovenia in the 5-year

time span was with respect to *school personnel* (11% – this is also the second highest discrimination rate in the education sector in the ex-YU group for the 5yr period; 1yr: 2%).

Considering the last five years, one out of 10 persons interviewed in this community encountered ethnic discrimination at their *workplace* (10% and 1yr: 4%). Along with respondents in Germany, the Serbs in Slovenia were most likely among the five groups to indicate that they felt discriminated against on the grounds of their minority background when they entered a *café, restaurant or a bar* in the past 5 years (6% and 1yr: 2%).

Among **Bosnians in Slovenia** the most common area to encounter ethnic discrimination in the last 5 years was when they were *looking for work* (15%; 1yr: 6%). In the *5-year time span*, Bosnians in Slovenia were the most likely among the ex-YU group to have experienced unequal treatment grounded in their minority background in relation to *school personnel* (13%; 1yr: 4%), as well as at their *workplace* (12%; 1yr: 6%). Incidents of discrimination from *healthcare or social service* personnel in the last 5 years were reported by 6% of respondents in this community. Having in mind the past 12 months, the Bosnians in Slovenia reported the highest rate of discrimination on the basis of ethnicity compared to other ex-Yugoslavian groups in the *housing* area (3%; 5yr: 5%).

Reporting discrimination

For each domain covered by EU-MIDIS, respondents were asked to state if they had reported the last incident of discrimination they had experienced in the past 12 months. On average, former-Yugoslavians were most likely to report discrimination – either at the place where it occurred or to an office that can receive complaints – in relation to the education system (on average 18% reported these incidents). On the whole, about one in ten respondents from the former-Yugoslavian group reported discriminatory treatment in relation to the area of employment (11% when looking for work, 7% at work), and 10% in relation to the social services sector.¹⁵⁷

Looking at country data, the results indicate that former Yugoslavians in Germany were the most likely to report encounters with discrimination in four of the areas tested:¹⁵⁸ education, restaurants and bars,

social services and the bank sector. Respondents in Luxembourg had the highest reporting rates of discrimination in the other domains: healthcare, housing, shops and the employment sector.

Figure 3.7.7 shows that in all five communities, the primary reason given for not reporting incidents of discrimination rests with the belief that nothing would change as a result of reporting. This belief was most widespread in Germany (81%) and among Serbians in Slovenia (61%). Another relatively important reason given for non-reporting is procedural uncertainty; that is, discrimination victims do not know where or how to report such incidents, especially – again – in Germany and in the community of Serbs in Slovenia (58% and 35%, respectively). While some former Yugoslavians felt that the incidents in question were too trivial to warrant reporting, others were concerned about negative consequences should they report them (both reasons were given most often by respondents in Germany: 56% and 64%, respectively).

3.7.3. Discrimination by respondent characteristics

SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE

While gender, education and income did not influence the experience of discrimination within the former Yugoslavian community, differences in discrimination experiences in consideration of age and employment were observed (see Table 3.7.1).

- **Age group:** Younger respondents ran a higher risk of being discriminated against than older age groups. While approximately one in ten respondents aged 55 and older reported having been the victim of discrimination, among the younger age groups, especially those 16-24 years of age, the proportion having encountered discriminatory behaviour was higher (18%).
- **Employment status:** Unemployed ex-Yugoslavians (23%) were most likely to have experienced discrimination. In other respondent groups, according to employment status, discrimination rates were between 9-12%.
- No marked differences were observed by respondents' **gender, income and education level.**

¹⁵⁷ Please note that the number of persons per country providing answers in this question is extremely low – between 0 and 29 cases – depending on the rate of past 12 months discrimination in each domain. In consequence, in many domains, the sample size for ex-YU group is lower than 30. We mention here the averages for the ex-YU group in the areas where the sample size was higher than 30 cases.

¹⁵⁸ Please be aware that the nominal ratios have limited statistical relevance as the sample sizes vary between 0 and 29 cases.

Table 3.7.1 – Discrimination rate (CA2-CI2, past 12 months)

General group: Ex-Yugoslav
By socio-demographic profile, %

Respondent gender (BG0)	Male	13
	Female	11
Age group (BG1)	16-24 years	18
	25-39 years	12
	40-54 years	11
	55 years or more	9
Household income (quartiles) (BG6)	In the lowest quartile	14
	Between the lowest quartile and the median	10
	Above the median	13
Employment status (BG5)	Employed/self-employed	12
	Homemaker/unpaid work	9
	Unemployed	23
	Non-active	11
Education status (years) (BG7)	5 years or less	10
	6-9 years	11
	10-13 years	13
	14 years or more	13

EU-MIDIS 2008

RESPONDENT STATUS

A number of ‘respondent-status’ variables were collected in the survey – such as citizenship status and length of stay in the country – which can be tested with respect to their influence on discrimination rates.

With respect to these ‘status’ variables, the following appeared to have an influence on former Yugoslavians’ experiences of discrimination: length of stay in the country of residence; citizenship status; and neighbourhood (see Table 3.7.2).

- **Length of stay in country:** Immigrants from the former Yugoslavia who had stayed up to four years in the country of residence ran the highest risk of being discriminated against (21%). Considering the other groups, those who had stayed between five and nine years (11%) and who had been in the country for at least 20 years (9%) were less likely to have experienced discrimination during the past 12 months.
- **Citizenship:** Immigrants from the former Yugoslavia who were citizens of their resident country were discriminated against less often (10%) than those who were citizens of another country (14%).

Table 3.7.2 – Discrimination rate (CA2-CI2, past 12 months)

General group: Ex-Yugoslav
By respondent status and neighbourhood, %

Length of stay in COUNTRY (BG8a)	1-4 years	21
	5-9 years	11
	10-19 years	14
	20+ years	9
	Born in COUNTRY	14
Neighbourhood status relative to other areas of the city (PI01)	Poorer	16
	As other areas	11
	Mixed	13
Language proficiency in the national language (PI04)	Fluent, without foreign sounding accent	12
	Fluent, with foreign sounding accent	11
	Less than fluent	13
Citizenship in COUNTRY (BG9)	Citizen	10
	Not a citizen	14

EU-MIDIS 2008

- **Neighbourhood status:** Based on the interviewers’ subjective assessments of neighbourhoods relative to others, those living in comparably poor city/urban areas more often experienced discrimination (16%) than those living in mixed neighbourhoods (neither poor nor affluent) or areas that have status characteristics similar to areas where the majority population lives (11-13%).

3.7.4. Crime victimisation

EU-MIDIS tested victimisation experiences in relation to five crimes: theft of and from a vehicle, burglary, other theft, assault or threat, and serious harassment.

Across all aggregate minority groups surveyed in EU-MIDIS, respondents from the former Yugoslavia are among those least likely to become victims of crime.


Figure 3.7.8 shows average rates of criminal victimisation for the five crimes tested in consideration of the past 5 years and past 12 months.

The results indicate that **Serbs in Slovenia were the most likely to have been victimised in the past five years (46%); however, only 3% of the crime incidents in the past 12 months had a perceived racial motive.** Criminal victimisation in the *past 12 months* was most prevalent among former Yugoslavians in Germany (21%) – and within the former Yugoslavian group as a whole, these

Figure 3.7.8

Personal victimisation experience (DA1-DE1, DA2-DE2, DA3-DC3, DD4, DE5)

Prevalence across 5 crime types, %



Question DA1: During the last 5 years in [COUNTRY], has [TYPE] happened to you? [IF YES] DA2-DE2: Thinking about the last time this happened, when was this: in the last twelve months or before then? [IF YES] DA3-DC3, DD4, DE5: Do you think that [this incident/any of these incidents] IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS happened partly or completely because of your immigrant/minority background?

respondents were also the most likely to indicate that they were victims of racially motivated crime in the last 12 months (9%). One fifth of the former Yugoslavians in Luxembourg and Austria declared that they were victimised over the previous 5 years (24% and 21%, respectively) and 8% in both countries claimed the same with respect to the last 12 months – these communities had the lowest levels of crime victimisation among the former Yugoslavian group as a whole. **Only 1% of respondents in Austria and Luxembourg attributed an ethnic motivation to their experience of crime in the last 12 months.**

An analysis of the **results in consideration of the last 12 months shows that respondents were most often victims of crime in relation to theft of and from vehicles (7%), followed by incidents of serious harassment (5%).** Considering the broader 5-year time span, *theft of and from vehicles* is still the most likely cause of victimisation (20% – average for ex-YU group), and second place is shared by *thefts of smaller*

belongings (such as a purse, wallet, jewellery, mobile phone, etc.) – on average, one out of 10 former Yugoslavians were victims of such crimes over the last five years – and *serious harassment* (on average, 11% were victims). Notably – **as an average across the 5 groups surveyed, 55% of incidents of serious harassment in the last 12 months were associated with ‘racist’ motives.**

Property crimes

Theft of and from **vehicles**¹⁵⁹ (including all motorised and non-motorised transport) was most widespread in the last 5 years among Serbian vehicle owners in Slovenia (5yrs: 35% and 1yr: 7%) and in the past 12 months among Bosnian vehicle owners in Slovenia (1yr: 13% and 5yrs: 30%). Once again, Austrian respondents emerged with comparatively low rates of victimisation in relation to this crime (5yrs: 7% and 1yr: 3%). One out of 10 thefts of and from vehicles in Germany (12%), 6% of those against Bosnians in Slovenia, and four out of 22 vehicle crimes in Luxembourg were considered by their victims as having a connection to their ethnicity.¹⁶⁰

The other property crime surveyed, **burglary**¹⁶¹, impacted on substantially smaller numbers of respondents. Irrespective of the period of time, Bosnians in Slovenia were most affected by this type of crime (5yrs: 8% and 1yr: 3%). In the other communities between 5% and 7% reported burglaries over the 5-year time period, and 1%-2% during the past 12 months. In consideration of the most recent incident, none of the burglaries in Germany and Austria were perceived by their victims as having ethnic motives, whereas three out of 10 burglaries against Serbs in Slovenia in the past 12 months were thought to be racially motivated.¹⁶²

Regarding **theft of personal belongings**¹⁶³ (such as a purse, wallet, jewellery, mobile phone, etc.), victimisation rates were highest among the former Yugoslavians in Germany (5yrs: 16% and 1yr: 5%) and lowest among respondents in Luxembourg (5yrs: 7% and 1yr: 1%). Similar rates were reported by 12-14% of Bosnians and Serbs in Slovenia, as well as

159 Questions DA1-2: During the [REFERENCE PERIOD] in [COUNTRY], was any car, van, truck, motorbike, moped or bicycle – or some other form of transport belonging to you or your household – stolen, or had something stolen from it? [IF NEEDED, CLARIFY: All forms of motorised and non-motorised transport can be included].

160 Nominally, the percentage of racially motivated vehicle crimes in LU is the highest in the ex-YU group; however, there were only 22 cases of thefts of and from vehicles in LU.

161 Questions DB1-2: During the [REFERENCE PERIOD], did anyone get into your home without permission and steal or try to steal something? [Does include cellars – Does NOT include garages, sheds lock-ups or gardens].

162 The number of burglaries in the past 12 months was small: between 7 and 13 cases depending on the country.

163 Questions DC1-2: Apart from theft involving force or threat, there are many other types of theft of personal property, such as pick-pocketing or theft of a purse, wallet, clothing, jewellery, or mobile phone. This can happen at work, on public transport, in the street – or anywhere. Over the [REFERENCE PERIOD] have you personally been the victim of any of these thefts that did not involve force?

by 8% of respondents in Austria (considering the last 5 years). Ethnic motivation was rarely identified for these crimes by victims in Luxembourg, Austria or among Serbs in Slovenia. Three out of 14 such crimes reported by Bosnians in Slovenia, as well as three out of 26 cases of smaller thefts in Germany were attributed to racial motives.¹⁶⁴

In-person crimes

EU-MIDIS investigated rates of victimisation in two specific instances of in-person crimes: assaults or threats, and serious harassment (although the latter does not necessarily qualify as an offence in a criminal sense).

If respondents indicated they had experienced in-person crime in the last 12 months they were asked detailed follow-up questions with respect to the last incident for each of the two crime types surveyed ('assault or threat', and 'serious harassment'). These follow-up questions provided detailed information about the nature of incidents, including who the perpetrator or perpetrators were.

In some cases relating to respondents from the former Yugoslavia, the numbers experiencing in-person crime, and particularly assault or threat, was very low. Therefore the data has to be interpreted cautiously with respect to any generalisations that may be made from the results.

The probability of becoming a victim of an **assault or threat**¹⁶⁵ varies substantially across the five communities of former Yugoslavians: ranging from 3% in Luxembourg and Austria to a ratio more than four times higher for Serbs in Slovenia (14%, see Table 3.7.3) (considering the past five years). The Serbs in Slovenia were also the most likely to have been assaulted or threatened in the last 12 months (6%), while one out of 10 Bosnians in Slovenia experienced similar crimes over the 5-year period and 4% of them were victims of assault or threat in the past 12 months (which places Bosnians in Slovenia in 'second place' in relation to assaults or threats). The highest number of assault or threat incidents that were

actually *robberies* was among Serbs in Slovenia (eight robberies out of 27 cases).¹⁶⁶ Considering all persons interviewed, robberies were effectively non-existent in the communities of former Yugoslavians living in Germany, Luxembourg and Austria.

In all five communities, in consideration of the 5-year period, **serious harassment** was more widespread than assaults or threats. With one fifth of the former Yugoslavians in Germany having experienced incidents of serious harassment over the past 5 years (19%), and with 10% having these experiences in the last 12 months, the community in Germany proved to be the most exposed to serious harassment among the former Yugoslavian group as a whole. Among other groups, high victimisation rates in relation to serious harassment were noted for Serbs and Bosnians in Slovenia (SI (Serbs): 5yrs – 15% and 1yr: 5%; SI (Bosnians): 5yrs – 12% and 1yr: 5%). The least likely to report incidents of serious harassment during the 5-year period were former Yugoslavians in Luxembourg (5% and 1yr: 2%).

Almost two thirds of serious harassment incidents experienced in the past 12 months by former Yugoslavians in Germany were believed to be ethnically (or religiously) motivated (66%), while 10 out of 13 cases of assaults or threats in the same community were also considered to be racially motivated.¹⁶⁷ Quite often, Bosnians in Slovenia and former Yugoslavians in Austria attributed racial motives to harassment incidents (16 cases out of 26 harassments in Slovenia (Bosnians); seven out of 13 such incidents in Austria (ex-YU)). However, none of the five assaults or threats committed against former Yugoslavians in Austria were considered to be racially motivated.

The assault or threat incidents in Germany from the past 12 months were most often committed by perpetrators from the majority group: this was true in eight incidents out of 13. Assaults or threats in Luxembourg and among Serbs in Slovenia were more likely to be inter-ethnic (LU: four out of 8 cases; SI (Ser): nine out of 27 cases) – that is, between people from different minority ethnic groups. Often, perpetrators in incidents experienced by Bosnians in Slovenia were from the same ethnic group (eight out of 23 cases). In the case of serious harassment,

¹⁶⁴ The indicated number of thefts of smaller belongings in the past 12 months varied between 5 and 26 cases depending on the country.

¹⁶⁵ Questions DD1-2: During the [REFERENCE PERIOD], have you been personally attacked, that is hit or pushed, or threatened by someone in a way that REALLY frightened you? This could have happened at home or elsewhere, such as in the street, on public transport, at your workplace – or anywhere.

¹⁶⁶ Please note that although the nominal proportion of robberies goes up to 28%, the statistical relevancy is limited as the number of assaults in the past 12 months vary between 5 and 27 cases depending on the country.

¹⁶⁷ The number of assaults in the last 12 months in DE (ex-YU): 13. The number of harassments in the past 12 months in the same community: 49.

Table 3.7.3 In-person crimes, main results

	ASSAULT OR THREAT					SERIOUS HARASSMENT				
	DE (ex-YU)	LU (ex-YU)	AT (ex-YU)	SI (Ser)	SI (Bo)	DE (ex-YU)	LU (ex-YU)	AT (ex-YU)	SI (Ser)	SI (Bo)
<i>Victimisation rate (based on DD1, DD2/DE1, DE2)</i>	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Victimised past 12 months	3	2	1	6	4	10	2	2	5	5
Victimised past 2-5 years	3	1	2	8	6	9	3	3	10	7
<i>Attributed racial/ethnic motivation (DD4/DE5)</i>										
Yes, including the most recent	78	21	0	26	25	64	25	53	43	55
Yes, but not including the most recent	0	0	0	5	8	2	0	0	0	7
<i>Racist or religiously offensive language used (DD9/DE9)</i>										
Yes	33	21	0	38	49	52	47	40	49	59
<i>Force actually used (DD10)</i>										
Yes (within all incidents)	60	41	32	44	34
Yes (in the total population)	2	1	0	2	1
<i>Something stolen (DD5)</i>										
Yes (within all incidents)	8	0	16	28	18
Yes (in the total population)	0	0	0	2	1
<i>Perpetrators (DD8/DE8)</i>										
From the same ethnic group	18	41	16	10	33	6	8	19	11	23
From another ethnic group	23	48	32	34	29	30	56	34	45	29
From majority	60	10	52	27	26	66	44	47	31	37
<i>Seriousness (DD14/DE13)</i>										
Very or fairly serious	75	79	84	67	79	64	64	48	43	79
Not very serious	25	21	0	33	21	32	25	19	58	21
<i>Not reported to the police (DD11/DE10)</i>										
Not reported	63	48	16	73	48	65	81	66	91	80
<i>Reasons for not reporting (DD13/DE12, top 3 mentions)</i>										
No confidence in the police	64	79	0	56	43	80	0	29	45	46
Too trivial/not worth reporting	28	0	100	51	43	56	31	20	62	48
Dealt with the problem themselves	40	21	0	41	17	38	0	10	21	30

EU-MIDIS 2008

in all but one community, the pattern relating to perpetrators was similar to the above in consideration of assaults or threats: in Germany and Austria the offenders were more likely to come from the majority population, while in Luxembourg and among Serbs in Slovenia they were more likely to be from another ethnic group. The exception was the community of Bosnians in Slovenia – where in cases of serious harassment, contrary to the pattern in cases of assault or threat, perpetrators were predominantly from the majority population (nine out of 26 cases).

On average, former Yugoslavians stated that in half of the serious harassment incidents over the past 12 months racist or religiously offensive language was used (51%); however, this held true in only one in three assault or threat incidents experienced in the past 12 months. Bosnians in Slovenia reported most often that in-person crimes they experienced were characterised by racist or religiously offensive language (in 12 cases out of 23 assaults or threats; in 15 cases out of 26 harassment incidents). In addition, half of the former Yugoslavians interviewed in Germany indicated that racist or religiously offensive language was used by perpetrators when they were victims of serious harassment (52%¹⁶⁸).

168 N=49.

As discussed, serious harassment incidents against former Yugoslavians in Germany and Austria, as well as against Bosnians in Slovenia, were committed more often by perpetrators belonging to the majority population. **While in Germany about a quarter of victims of serious harassment declared that the perpetrators were members of a right-wing or a racist gang (23%), in all other communities no one felt this to be the case. Confirming the above, significant numbers of victims in Germany said that incidents of serious harassment involved multiple offenders (72%).** In Slovenia and Austria perpetrators of serious harassment were more likely to act alone.¹⁶⁹

With one exception, in each of the five communities the majority of victims rated the last incident of either assault or threat, or serious harassment, as *very or fairly serious*. The exception was the community of Serbs in Slovenia, where respondents were more likely to rate incidents of harassment as *not very serious* (14 cases out of 24 such incidents).

With respect to officially reporting in-person crimes to the police – in all communities victims were less likely to report incidents of serious harassment.¹⁷⁰ The highest ratio of non-reporting for both types of in-person crime was found amongst Serbs in Slovenia – making them the least likely of the five former Yugoslavian groups to report either assaults or threats, or serious harassment. In comparison, victims in Austria were the most likely to officially report incidents that had happened in the past 12 months (though it should be noted here that very few incidents occurred in Austria).

On average, the most prevalent **reason given for not reporting** serious harassment was lack of confidence that the police would be able to do anything about it (on average: 50%);¹⁷¹ for example: 23 harassment incidents out of 29 in Germany were not officially reported because the respondents did not believe that the police could do anything about the incident. On the one hand this could indicate lack of confidence in the police, but on the other hand it could also indicate that respondents did not consider that incidents of serious harassment should be reported to the police – as they typically fall in the grey area between crime and non-crime.

An equal number of respondents indicated that the trivial or everyday nature of ‘harassment’ was a deciding factor in not reporting (on average 49% gave this response). Those who mentioned this reason the most were Serbs in Slovenia (in 14 cases out of 22) and former Yugoslavians in Germany (in 16 out of 29 cases not reported to the police).

Overall, approximately a quarter of former Yugoslavians who were victims of serious harassment, and did not report the last incident to the police, said that they took care of the issue themselves (25%). While no-one gave this response in Luxembourg, respondents in Germany (11 cases out of 29) and Bosnians in Slovenia (six out of 20 cases) were the most likely to have responded in this way.

Given that the number of *unreported* assaults or threats was very low – ranging between 1 and 20 depending on the community – no analysis of reasons for non-reporting is undertaken here as the results would lack statistical solidity.

On average, one out of 10 former Yugoslavians indicated that **they avoid certain places or locations** for fear of being assaulted or threatened, or harassed, because of their ethnic background (9%). The variations among countries range from a low of 6% among Bosnians in Slovenia and a high of 13% among respondents in Germany.

3.7.5. Crime victimisation by respondent characteristics

SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE

While gender and employment status played no or no major role in the risk of becoming a victim of crime, differences in victimisation rates were observed for different age groups, as well as income and education levels (see Table 3.7.4).

- **Age group:** One in five of those aged 16-24 reported having been a victim of crime during that past 12 months (20%). Conversely, only a handful of respondents from the oldest age group reported the same (10%).
- **Household income:** Small differences were observed concerning victimisation rates and household income; a slightly higher victimisation

169 N between 13 and 26 cases

170 Please be aware that the number of assaults in the past 12 months was below 30 cases in all five communities; the same held true in the case of harassments, with the exception of Germany where the number of harassments in the past 12 months was 49.

171 Please note that in the Ex-Yugoslav group the number of non-reported harassment incidents in each community surveyed varied between 9 and 32. There were 93 cases in total for the entire group.

Table 3.7.4 – Victimisation rate (DA2-DE2, past 12 months)

General group: Ex-Yugoslav

By socio-demographic profile, %

Respondent gender (BG0)	Male	14
	Female	14
Age group (BG1)	16-24 years	20
	25-39 years	14
	40-54 years	13
	55 years or more	10
Household income (quartiles) (BG6)	In the lowest quartile	12
	Between the lowest quartile and the median	14
	Above the median	17
Employment status (BG5)	Employed/self-employed	15
	Homemaker/unpaid work	13
	Unemployed	14
	Non-active	13
Education status (years) (BG7)	5 years or less	9
	6-9 years	12
	10-13 years	15
	14 years or more	18

EU-MIDIS 2008

rate exists for those respondents coming from households with an income above the median (17%) in comparison with those who are living in households with incomes in the lowest quartile (12%).

- **Employment status:** There were hardly any differences that could be observed in the rates of victimisation among ex-Yugoslavian respondents according to employment status – all groups having rates between 13-15%.
- **Education:** The likelihood of being a crime victim increased gradually with the respondent's level of education; only 9% of respondents with up to five years of schooling reported that they had been victims of crime, while this number was twice as high for those who had at least 14 years of education (18%).
- **Gender:** Had no impact at all on rates of victimisation, which in itself is an important finding as it contradicts patterns of victimisation noted in surveys on the majority population (where men tend to be victimised more than women).

RESPONDENT STATUS

A number of 'respondent-status' variables were collected in the survey – such as citizenship status and length of stay in the country – which can be tested with respect to their influence on crime victimisation rates (see Table 3.7.5).

- **Length of stay:** While differences can be observed between length of stay in the country and victimisation rates, no clear pattern emerged.

For example, respondents who were born in the country and those who had been there for the briefest time (1-4 years) had similar and relatively high rates of victimisation (19% and 17%, respectively), whereas those who had stayed in the country between five to nine years were the least likely to have been the victim of a crime in the past 12 months (9%).

- **Citizenship:** Respondents who were citizens of the Member State ran a slightly higher risk of becoming a victim of a crime (16%) than those who were not citizens (13%).

- **Language proficiency:** Higher levels of proficiency in the national language of the resident country corresponded to a higher risk of being victimised: nearly one in five of those who spoke the national language fluently said they

Table 3.7.5 – Victimisation rate (DA2-DE2, past 12 months)

General group: Ex-Yugoslav

By respondent status and neighbourhood, %

Length of stay in COUNTRY (BG8a)	1-4 years	17
	5-9 years	9
	10-19 years	14
	20+ years	13
Neighbourhood status relative to other areas of the city (PI01)	Born in COUNTRY	19
	Poorer	13
	As other areas	15
Language proficiency in the national language (PI04)	Mixed	14
	Fluent, without foreign sounding accent	17
	Fluent, with foreign sounding accent	13
Citizenship in COUNTRY (BG9)	Less than fluent	11
	Citizen	16
	Not a citizen	13

EU-MIDIS 2008

had been the victim of a crime in the 12 months prior to the survey (17%), while those who spoke the language with an accent (13%) or those with lower levels of language skills were less likely to have been victimised (11%).

Concerning neighbourhood status - no significant differences in victimisation experiences were found.


3.7.6. Corruption

On average, very few former-Yugoslavians reported that a public official had expected them to pay a bribe¹⁷² in the past 12 months (less than 1%, N=17), and the proportion was the same over the five-year period (1%, N=28)¹⁷³. Out of the 28 respondents who reported such incidents in the past five years, 9 were from Germany, and, regarding the past 12 months, the majority were again from Germany (5) as well as Slovenia (5 Bosnians and 4 Serbs). Overall, eight of the 17 respondents who were asked to pay a bribe by public officials (in the past 12 months) assumed that the incident was linked to their ethnic background. Customs personnel, police officers, and “other public officials” were involved in these incidents (based on information supplied by interviewees concerning the last time this had occurred). Only three out of the 17 “last time” incidents were reported to the authorities; the most frequently mentioned reason for non-reporting was the belief that nothing would happen as a result.

3.7.7. Police and border control

The police are most trusted amongst former Yugoslavians in Austria, Luxembourg and Germany – at least three quarters of the ex-Yugoslavians living in these countries said they tend to trust the police (AT: 80%, LU: 79% and DE: 75%). In addition, less than 10% in the different communities claimed that they tend *not* to trust the police. The situation is quite different in Slovenia, where only a relative majority of the Bosnian and Serb respondents (43% and 41%, respectively) tend to trust the police, while about three out of 10 people from both groups tend not to trust them (31% of Serbs and 29% of Bosnians held this opinion). A further quarter of Serbs and Bosnians had a neutral attitude about the police – 27% from each group said they neither trust nor distrust the police.

Figure 3.7.9
Police contact (F3, F9)
In the past 12 months, %



Question F3: Thinking about the last time you were stopped in this country, when was this? Was it in the last 12 months or before then? F9: Apart from the police stopping you, which I've already asked you about, have you had any contact with the police in this country in the last 12 months? By this I mean you could have reported something to them yourself, or you may have had to register something with them, etc.

Police stops – including perceptions of profiling

See Figure 3.7.9: About two fifths of ex-Yugoslavians in Germany (38%) and the same proportion of Serbs and Bosnians living in Slovenia (39% and 40%, respectively) were either stopped by the police or contacted them themselves during the past 12 months. One third of respondents in the latter two groups (31% and 33%, respectively) said the police stopped them, and a quarter of ex-Yugoslavians in Germany claimed the same (25%). Contact with the police amongst former Yugoslavians in Austria was much lower: 13% had some contact with the police, including 8% who were stopped, while 87% had no contact with the police at all in the past 12 months.

Focusing on those stopped by the police, a large majority of them said that they were stopped while driving a car or riding a motorbike (88% of Serbs and 86% of Bosnians in Slovenia; ex-Yugoslavians in LU: 87%, DE: 87% and AT: 89%). Police stops on the street, when using public transport, or when riding a bicycle, were much less common among the different former Yugoslavian groups studied (e.g. LU: 5%, Bosnians in SI: 13%).¹⁷⁴

172 Questions E1-2: During [REFERENCE PERIOD] did any government official in [COUNTRY], for instance a customs officer, a police officer, a judge or an inspector, ask you or expect you to pay a bribe for his or her services?


173 Note that when counting the proportion of victims of corruption out of all 2,591 ex-Yugoslavian respondents, the number of victims in the past 12 months (N=17) and in the past five years (N=28) both result in 1% when the results are presented without decimals.

174 Question F6: Thinking about THE LAST TIME you were stopped by the police in this country, were you in a car, on a motorbike or bicycle, on public transport or just on the street?

Figure 3.7.10

Perception of profiling at police stops (F5)

Those stopped in the past 12 months, %



Question F5: Do you think that [the last time you were stopped/any time you were stopped] IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS was because of your immigrant/minority background?

Very few respondents believed that the police had stopped them because of their ethnic background (see Figure 3.7.10). In Germany, just over one in 10 former Yugoslavians who were stopped felt that the police singled them out during their last experience of a stop as a result of profiling (12%); in the other communities there were even fewer who believed this to be the case (5% or less). **Between 84% and 95% of those stopped in the past 12 months had no sense of being stopped because of their ethnicity.**

The dominant activity of the police at these stops was to check vehicle documents (mentioned by over three quarters of those stopped) or identity papers (43% overall), and to ask some questions (particularly in Germany: 76%) – however relatively many of the stops resulted in a fine, especially in Luxembourg (29%) and to a lesser extent in Germany and Austria (19% each). Few people were arrested or taken to a police station (mostly in Luxembourg: 5%), and one in 10 people had themselves or their vehicle searched by the police in Germany. In addition, half of the ex-Yugoslavians stopped in Germany were given advice or warned about their behaviour (52%), while alcohol or drug tests were relatively frequent in Slovenia (among 26% of the Serbs and 20% of the Bosnians stopped by the police).¹⁷⁵

Looking at Figure 3.7.11: **Half of the ex-Yugoslavians in Germany and Austria said that the police were**

very or fairly respectful (52% and 50%) with them during their last experience of a police stop, and over a third considered that the police were neutral towards them (35% and 42%, respectively). Furthermore, people in the other three communities evaluated police conduct during stops much more positively: 83% of those stopped in Luxembourg considered the police respectful, and we find similar positive evaluations in Slovenia as well (Serbs: 82%, Bosnians: 78%). On the other hand, **former Yugoslavians in Germany were the most likely to be dissatisfied with police conduct; 13% of those stopped felt that the police were disrespectful to them.** Negative evaluations were least frequent among ex-Yugoslavian respondents from Luxembourg (6%) and Austria (6%).


Evaluation of police in other contacts

Between 6% and 17% of respondents reported contacts with the police other than stops in the last 12 months. Respondents' evaluation of police conduct did not differ very much according to the nature of the contact; the tendencies were rather similar with those seen in relation to police stops. Once again, the vast majority of those who contacted the police in Luxembourg and Slovenia said that the police were respectful, while in Austria only one third considered the police to be respectful and in Germany 50% said that the police's conduct was respectful (see Figure

Figure 3.7.11

Evaluation of police conduct during stops (F8)

Last stop, in the past 12 months, %




Question F8: Again, thinking about the last time you were stopped, how respectful were the police when dealing with you?

¹⁷⁵ Question F7: Thinking about the last time you were stopped, what did the police actually do? 01 – Ask you questions, 02 – Ask for identity papers – ID card/passport/residence permit, 03 – Ask for driving licence or vehicle documents, 04 – Search you or your car/vehicle, 05 – Give some advice or warn you about your behaviour (including your driving or vehicle), 06 – Did an alcohol or drug test, 07 – Fine you, 08 – Arrest you/take you to a police station, 09 – Take money or something from you in the form of a bribe, 10 – Other.

Figure 3.7.12
Evaluation of police conduct in other contacts (F10)

Last contact (other than stop), in the past 12 months, %



Question: F10. Thinking about the last time you had contact with the police in this country - that DID NOT involve them stopping you - how respectful were they to you?

3.7.12). However, few people said that the police were disrespectful in such encounters (none in Austria and 16% of Bosnians in Slovenia).

Border control

The survey asked respondents a couple of ‘screening questions’ about whether, in the last 12 months, they had returned to their country of residence from travel abroad when immigration/border/customs personnel were present, and if they had been stopped by them. These results in themselves cannot present a picture of potential discriminatory treatment as they are dependent on factors such as where respondents were travelling back from, the existence or not of Schengen border controls, and whether respondents had an EU passport. However, having determined that respondents had returned to their country of residence and had been stopped by immigration/border/customs personnel, they were asked a follow-up question about whether they considered they were *singled out for stopping on the basis of their immigrant/ethnic background* when re-entering their country of residence – which was used as a very rough indicator of potential profiling during these encounters.

Those most likely to travel abroad were respondents with a former Yugoslavian background from Germany – in the last 12 months, almost half of them returned to Germany from a visit abroad when either immigration, customs or border control were present (45%).¹⁷⁶ Somewhat fewer among the Serbs and Bosnians in Slovenia (40%-41%) and a third of former Yugoslavians in Austria (32%) reported the same.

Stops at border crossings were most frequent in Slovenia – reported by 73% of Bosnians and 63% of Serbs; however, extremely few of those who were stopped (4% and 9%, respectively) assumed that they were singled out based on their ethnic background. Profiling at border crossings was the most widespread in Germany – where a quarter of those who were stopped when returning to Germany believed that they were singled out because of their ethnic background (23%).

3.7.8. Police stops by respondent characteristics

SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC STATUS

Table 3.7.6 presents results with respect to different socio-demographic characteristics of respondents and their experiences of police stops.

In general, very few respondents from the former Yugoslavian community – across all socio-demographic groups – considered that they were victims of profiling when stopped by the police: no more than 2% of respondents felt this was the case. Due to this very low number, differences in profiling experience across the socio-demographic groups were not significant.

- **Gender:** Men from the former Yugoslavian immigrant community were more likely to have been stopped by the police than women. This clear gender divide occurred both with regard to police stops during the past 12 months (men: 32%, women: 11%) and in the previous five year period (men: 58%, women: 25%). Female respondents did not think that they were stopped by the police because of profiling, and men were only slightly more likely to feel this way (2%).

176 Question G1: During the last 12 months, have you ever entered [COUNTRY] from a visit abroad when either immigration, customs or border control were present?
 ASK IF RESPONSE TO G1 = Yes – G2. During the last 12 months, were you ever stopped by [COUNTRY NATIONALITY] immigration, customs or border control when coming back into the country?
 ASK IF RESPONSE TO G2 = Yes – G3. Do you think you were singled out for stopping by [COUNTRY NATIONALITY] immigration, customs or border control specifically because of your immigrant/minority background?

Table 3.7.6 – Police stops (F2, F3 and F5)**General group: Ex-Yugoslav**

By socio-demographic profile, %

		Not stopped	Stopped in past 2-5 years	Stopped in past 12 months, no profiling	Stopped in past 12 months, with profiling
Respondent gender (BG0)	Male	42	26	30	2
	Female	75	14	11	0
Age group (BG1)	16-24 years	57	16	25	2
	25-39 years	54	21	24	1
	40-54 years	55	23	21	1
	55 years or more	73	16	10	1
Household income (quartiles) (BG6)	In the lowest quartile	68	17	14	2
	Between the lowest quartile and the median	59	22	19	0
	Above the median	50	22	27	1
Employment status (BG5)	Employed/self-employed	51	22	24	2
	Home maker/unpaid work	81	11	8	1
	Unemployed	66	16	17	1
	Non-active	69	16	15	0
Education status (years) (BG7)	5 years or less	86	9	5	0
	6-9 years	66	17	15	1
	10-13 years	53	20	25	1
	14 years or more	46	28	25	1

EU-MIDIS 2008

- **Age:** Regarding age, a broad sweep of different age groups experienced similar rates of police stops when looking at results across five years: between 43% and 46% of respondents aged from 16 to 54 said they had been stopped by the police within the past five years. But looking at the 12 month rates for stops, a clearer pattern emerges with respect to a decrease in police stops as respondents get older – about a quarter of 16-39 year olds were stopped in the past 12 months, while only one in ten respondents aged 55 or older were stopped.

- **Income:** Ex-Yugoslavian immigrants from the highest income group were more often stopped by the police than those from the lowest income group during the past five years (50% vs. 32%).

- **Employment:** Among the different employment groups, workers were more often stopped by the police during the five year time span (49%), followed by the unemployed and non-active respondents (34% and 31%, respectively). The same pattern emerges when we look at the prevalence of stops over 12 months, with the employed/self-employed stopped more frequently, whereas only 8% of homemakers were stopped in the past 12 months (again a factor related to gender).

- **Education:** The reported incidences of being stopped by the police increased with the educational level of respondents from the former Yugoslavia: half of those who had 10 years or more of formal education said that they had been stopped by the police during the past 5 years, while only 14% of those who had 5 years of formal education or less said the same.

RESPONDENT STATUS

- **Length of residence:** With respect to length of residence in the country – those who were born in the country were most likely to have been stopped by the police in the past 12 months (33%), whereas a quarter of those who had been in the country 1-4 years had been stopped (26%) (see Table 3.7.7). In addition, those who had been in the country 1-4 years were more likely to believe that they had been stopped by the police due to profiling (6%) in comparison with respondents who had been longer in the country (0-2%).

- **Neighbourhood:** Immigrants from the former Yugoslavia who were living in a relatively poor neighbourhood (according to the interviewer's subjective evaluation relative to other areas of the city where interviews were being conducted) were least likely to have been stopped by the police

Table 3.7.7 – Police stops (F2, F3 and F5)**General group: Ex-Yugoslav**

By respondent status and neighbourhood, %

		Not stopped	Stopped in past 2-5 years	Stopped in past 12 months, no profiling	Stopped in past 12 months, with profiling
Length of stay in COUNTRY (BG8a)	1-4 years	63	11	20	6
	5-9 years	69	10	19	2
	10-19 years	62	19	18	1
	20+ years	60	21	18	0
	Born in COUNTRY	45	22	31	1
Neighbourhood status relative to other areas of the city (PI01)	Poorer	68	17	13	1
	As other areas	57	21	21	1
	Mixed	58	19	22	1
Language proficiency in the national language (PI04)	Fluent, without foreign sounding accent	48	23	28	1
	Fluent, with foreign sounding accent	61	18	19	1
	Less than fluent	69	17	12	2
Citizenship in COUNTRY (BG9)	Citizen	53	22	25	0
	Not a citizen	64	17	16	2

EU-MIDIS 2008

during the past 5 years (32%), compared to 43% of those living in areas that were as affluent as other parts of the city, or those from 'mixed' income neighbourhoods that were neither poor or affluent (42%).

- **Language proficiency:** As similarly reported with respect to some other aggregate minority groups surveyed in EU-MIDIS, the chance of being stopped by the police increased with language proficiency: half of the former Yugoslavians who were fluent in the national language of their country of residence had been stopped by the police in the past 5 years, in comparison with four in ten of those who spoke fluently

but with an accent (39%) and three in ten of those who were not fluent in the language of their country of residence. A possibility is that language proficiency is linked to specific life styles and behavioural differences which increase or decrease the likelihood of police stops; however, the explanatory factors behind these results are difficult to explain here without further analysis of the survey data.

- **Citizenship:** Those without national citizenship were less likely to have been stopped by the police during the past 5 years (36%) than those with citizenship of their country of residence (47%).

3.7.9. Respondent background

Origins

EU-MIDIS interviewed former Yugoslavians in four Member States: Austria, Germany, Luxembourg and Slovenia. While in AT, DE and LU the samples consisted of former Yugoslavians (ex-YU) without differentiating between them, in Slovenia there were two separate samples: Serbs and Bosnians. In this way, EU-MIDIS interviewed five communities of ex-YU in four EU Member States.

Overall, half of the former Yugoslavians are not citizens of the countries in which they were interviewed (49%). However, there are important variations among the five communities. A vast majority of Serbs, as well as Bosnians in Slovenia, were citizens of Slovenia only (95% and 88%, respectively); and three out of five of the ex-Yugoslavians in Austria were Austrian citizens (59%). In contrast, almost all former Yugoslavians in Luxembourg and Germany were not citizens of these Member States.

Information is provided (below) about the ethnic composition of the samples that were generically classified as 'former Yugoslavian' (based on a composite indicator of nationality, mother tongue and place of birth). Please note that many respondents in Luxembourg refused to categorise themselves in any of the three most typical ethnic groups of the former Yugoslavia, and simply stated that they were "Yugoslavians".

Ethnic background (%)	AT	DE	LU
Bosnian	11	24	33
Croatian	16	29	2
Serbian	62	35	14
Other Ex-Yugoslav	11	11	51

Indicating well-established communities: on average, one third of the respondents had been living in the countries where they were interviewed for 10-19 years (30%), one third had been in these countries for more than 20 years, and one in five were born in these Member States (20%). In Luxembourg, the vast majority of ex-Yugoslavians have been living there for 10-19 years (72%), and in Germany approximately two fifths have been living there for the same period of time (40%) or for more than 20 years (38%). In Austria and Slovenia the majority of those interviewed had been living there for more than 20 years (47%-49%), while 41% of Serbs and 33% of Bosnians in Slovenia were born there. Of those who were not born in their country of residence, most arrived as adults over the age of 16 (between 44% and 72% depending on the community).

Socio-demographic details

Approximately two thirds of the former Yugoslavians in Germany and Austria completed no more 9 years of education (68% and 64%, respectively, said they went to school for 0-9 years). In the other three communities (in Luxembourg and Slovenia), the majority of respondents reported schooling with a duration of 10-13 years (50-58%). The Serbs in Slovenia were the most likely among the ex-Yugoslavian group to report schooling with a longer duration (14 years or more: 32%).

At the time of the interview, in all communities excepting those of former Yugoslavians in Austria, two-thirds of the respondents were employed in paid work (self-employed or in full or part time jobs) (between 62% and 70%). Austria recorded the highest proportion of retired ex-YU (18%); still, 56% of former Yugoslavs in this country held paying jobs.

Cultural background

The majority of former Yugoslavians have as their mother tongue a different language than the (main) national language of the country where they live. Those most likely to be fluent in the (main) national language were Bosnians and Serbs in Slovenia (89%-92% of them, 49%-58% without a noticeable accent), while the least likely to be fluent were those in Germany (65%; 45% are fluent, but with an accent).

In terms of religious denominations, except for the Catholic (e.g. Croat) segment of the former Yugoslavian community in Germany, the majority of respondents declared their religion as being either Christian Orthodox or Muslim. On average, only 2% of respondents in these Member States indicated that they wear apparel specific to their ethnic group. Among the former Yugoslavians who said they were Muslim, 2% indicated that they wore ethnic or religious clothing.

Segregation

Spatial segregation, which means that those surveyed lived – according to the judgment of the interviewer – in areas predominantly populated by their peers, varied between 13% in the case of respondents in Luxembourg and 26%-27% in the case of respondents in Germany, Slovenia and Austria.

4. Comparisons with the majority population

The results in EU-MIDIS allow for a comprehensive comparison of data between the different aggregate groups that were surveyed (in section 2 of the report), and within each aggregate group with respect to the results by Member States (in section 3 of the report).

In addition, parts of the survey's results can be compared with findings on the majority population in some Member States, namely:

(i) data on the majority population's experiences of police stops and border controls was collected in ten Member States as a sub-sample in EU-MIDIS; (ii) some of the questions in EU-MIDIS can be compared with findings from Eurobarometer surveys and the European Crime and Safety Survey.

4.1. EU-MIDIS majority sub-sample: policing and borders

In EU-MIDIS, part of the budget in ten Member States was allocated for interviewing a random sample of the majority population in the same neighbourhoods where minority respondents were interviewed (that is, from the same streets, or, if compact areas were surveyed, then adjacent streets).¹⁷⁷

The Member States were: Belgium, Bulgaria, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Slovakia, Spain and Romania.

The N=500 majority population sample size at the individual country level allowed for the production of results with the same degree of precision as that obtained with the minority groups. Thus, a comparable control sample was created in these ten countries of majority interviewees living in the same areas as minority interviewees; the intention being that groups from the same areas were more likely to share similar socio-economic characteristics.

This majority subsample was interviewed about their experiences of policing and border control.¹⁷⁸

The focus of the analysis in this section is the difference between the majority and minority groups within the ten countries, and not a comparison across countries.

4.1.1. Trust in the police

Before being asked about their experiences of police stops and other contact with the police, respondents were asked a general question about their trust in the police. The results found no clear-cut pattern with respect to how much people belonging to the majority and the minority population 'trust' the police. In other words it is not the case, as it might be assumed, that minorities in all ten Member States have less trust in the police. However, in several Member States EU-MIDIS did find a sharp contrast between minority and majority interviewees' trust in the police. For example: In Hungary, 62% of the majority population and only 28% of the Roma, in the same areas, indicate that they tend to trust the police (and correspondingly, 22% and 51%, respectively, indicated that they do *not* trust them). The situation is almost identical in Slovakia, with 54% of the Roma not trusting the police; a result almost twice as high as the respective figure provided by majority respondents (28%). Results confirm this pattern – however in a less pronounced way – in Belgium, Germany, France and Romania (see Figure 4.1); that is, minorities express less trust in the police than majority interviewees.

On the other hand, in several Member States people with both a majority and a minority background living in the same neighbourhoods have a more similar opinion about the police. For example, in Spain the majority assessment (62% trust and 15% do not trust the police) is more in line with the evaluations given by minority interviewees living in the same streets; where trust ranged between 52%-67% among the three minority communities surveyed, and mistrust


¹⁷⁷ Most of these control samples were urban samples of the national majority population (corresponding to the geographic location of the minority samples, see the introduction chapter for specific details). Non-urban sampling of the majority (as well as minorities) was carried out in Bulgaria, Slovakia and Romania.

¹⁷⁸ The questions used in the majority sub-survey were identical with questions F1 to G3 in the EU-MIDIS main questionnaire, which can be obtained via the Agency's website.

Figure 4.1

Trust in the police (F1)

% of respondents in majority sample and in the minority groups interviewed in EU-MIDIS
Majority results are provided in the first row for each country



EU-MIDIS 2008

Question F1: Would you say you tend to trust the police in [COUNTRY] or tend not to trust them?

was 11% for Romanians and 16% among South Americans, only reaching a different and much higher level of mistrust (23%) with respect to North African interviewees. In Italy, Greece and Bulgaria, the majority assessment of trust in the police falls in-between the results for the different minority groups surveyed in each country; for example, in Italy, while 58% of the majority population indicated their trust in the police, the rates ranged from a low of 37% among North Africans, 55% among Albanians, and a high of 66% among Romanians. In this regard, *not only are differences found between majority and minority*

populations in their trust in the police but also between different minority groups (where more than one was interviewed in a Member State) and the majority population.

Another way of looking at levels of trust is to use an indicator of percentage point difference between the proportion of those who trust the police among the majority population and among the specific ethnic or immigrant minority groups. For example, in Hungary and Slovakia the Roma show, respectively, -35 and -32 percentage points lower levels of trust in the police

than the majority population. There is an emphasised lack of confidence among Roma minorities in the police in these countries as the percentage of Roma also indicating that they do *not* trust the police is significantly high (HU: 51%, SK: 54%). The same can be said of the Roma in Greece, where every second Roma has no trust in the police (53%).

Alongside the Roma, other minorities show markedly lower levels of trust in the police in comparison with the majority population in their neighbourhoods; for example, Sub-Saharan Africans in France (-28); Turkish respondents in Germany (-26); North Africans (-26) and Turkish respondents (-23) in Belgium; North African minorities in Italy (-21).

This situation is reversed in Greece and Bulgaria: Albanians in Greece and the Turkish minority in Bulgaria have a *higher* level of trust in the police than the majority population.

In sum, Roma respondents indicated some of the lowest levels of trust in the police, which were in stark contrast to levels of trust shown among the majority population in the same countries. At the same time, in some Member States there was great variation in levels of trust where more than one minority group was interviewed.

4.1.2. Police stops prevalence

In most of the ten countries examined, the frequency of policing is at similar rates regarding the majority and the minority population.

However, there are a few countries where minority groups are stopped by the police *significantly* more frequently than their majority neighbours (see Figure 4.2). For example, looking at the frequency of stops in the last 12 months: 56% of the Roma in Greece were stopped by the police, while only 23% of the majority had the same experience; 42% of North Africans in Spain were stopped, while only 12% of the majority population was stopped (in addition, the other two minority groups in Spain were stopped more frequently than the majority); and in Hungary the likelihood of being stopped by the police was almost three times higher for the Hungarian Roma (41%) than the majority (15%).

On the whole, the average number of the Belgian, German, French, Bulgarian, Slovakian and Romanian police stops does not vary greatly in ratio between the minority and the majority groups' experiences of stops – especially considering the 5-year rate. However, considering only the last twelve months,

some significant differences emerge in the experiences of stops. In Belgium, Germany and France the percentage of stops of the minority population/s was almost double compared to that of the majority (BE: 12% majority vs. 24% and 18% minorities; DE: 11% majority vs. 24-25%; FR: 22% majority vs. 42% and 38%). Yet, there was no significant difference in Bulgaria, Slovakia and Romania in the past 12 months with respect to police activity targeting different groups.

One result that is quite striking is with regard to Italy: considering the 12 month period, the Italian police stopped the three minority groups that were surveyed in the country less than their majority neighbours. Accordingly, four out of ten among the majority population were stopped in comparison with only two or three in ten Albanians, North Africans or Romanians. As will be shown in further analysis of these results (below), a possible explanatory factor for this is the fact that the majority population in Italy is stopped whilst driving a car, whereas one might assume that fewer of the minority respondents (who are predominantly immigrants) own vehicles in comparison with the majority population and therefore they encounter traffic stops less frequently.

4.1.3. Frequency

The survey asked people who were stopped by the police about the number of times this had occurred in the past 12 months. On the whole, the ratio of single to multiple police stops is 2:3 (see Figure 4.3). That is to say that a larger proportion of those who were stopped experienced this on more than one occasion. **In many countries it is more typical for the police to stop the minority population several times as opposed to the majority.**


Out of the Greek Roma respondents who were stopped in the last 12 months, 15% were stopped once, whereas 83% were stopped on several occasions. In comparison, only a third of the majority population respondents who were stopped by the police in the past 12 months experienced multiple stops (34%).

The number of multiple stops experienced in the previous 12 month period is also significantly higher for minorities in comparison with the majority population in the following Member States: for the Roma in Romania; Sub-Saharan Africans in France; the Roma in Hungary; and Turkish respondents in Germany (RO: 65 vs. 46%, FR: 76 vs. 58%, HU 75 vs. 59%, DE: 56 vs. 41%).

Figure 4.2

Police stops – prevalence (F2, F3)

% of respondents in majority sample and in the minority groups interviewed in EU-MIDIS
Majority results are provided in the first row for each country



EU-MIDIS 2008

Question F2: In this country, within the last five years, have you EVER been stopped by the police when you were in a car, on a motorbike or bicycle, on public transport or just on the street? [IF YES] F3: Thinking about the last time you were stopped in this country, when was this? Was it in the last 12 months or before then?

There is no notable difference in Belgium, Spain and Bulgaria in the frequency of stops of the minority or majority groups. On the other hand, **in 7 out of the ten countries allowing for a comparison between the majority and minority populations, a larger proportion of the minority groups who were stopped by the police experienced this more often in the last 12 months.** In other countries the evidence was either mixed (multiple stops were more common with one of the minority groups surveyed but not the other, compared to the majority population) or multiple stops were equally common

among minority and majority respondents.


4.1.4. Type of stops

In the analysis we might assume that there is a difference between vehicle-related and non vehicle-related police stops, as in the course of the latter the police have more direct visual contact with the person beforehand, meaning that it is easier to assess the appearance of the person prior to the decision to undertake a stop. In the case of pedestrians, public transport users and cyclists, police subjectivity and

Figure 4.3

Police stops – frequency (F4)

% of respondents in majority sample and in the minority groups interviewed in EU-MIDIS, in the past 12 months
Majority results are provided in the first row for each country



EU-MIDIS 2008

Question F4: In the last 12 months, how many times have you been stopped by the police in this country?

discriminatory behaviour (both direct and indirect) are likely to play a larger role when deciding to stop someone. However, there is also evidence from some research that the make of a vehicle also impacts on police decisions regarding traffic stops (with some vehicles being owned more frequently by minority groups, and/or young men), and also when the vehicle's country of registration is displayed, this can have an impact on decisions to stop.

This section compares the motorised or non-motorised nature of stops as reported in the survey by minority and majority respondents: in this analysis we classify vehicle drivers and motorcyclists as


motorised transport, while cyclists, pedestrians and public transport users are classified as non-motorised transport. At the same time it should be noted that perhaps differences in the circumstances of the stops (motorised or non-motorised) arise primarily because of the dissimilar socio-economic background between minority and majority respondents in a number of Member States (e.g. perhaps fewer minority groups own vehicles, thus representing a smaller percentage in the motorised population and maybe a larger one in the pedestrian population).

Considering those who experienced stops – Figure 4.4 would seem to support the above assumption,

Figure 4.4

Location of the last police stop (F6)

% of respondents in majority sample and in the minority groups interviewed in EU-MIDIS, in the past 12 months
Majority results are provided in the first row for each country



EU-MIDIS 2008

Question F6: Thinking about THE LAST TIME you were stopped by the police in this country, were you in a car, on a motorbike or bicycle, on public transport or just on the street?

as a greater proportion of the majority population are stopped when in motorised transport (private vehicles). The percentage of motorised transport stops experienced by the majority population is between 70-96% of all stops across the different countries, whereas the range stopped in private vehicles differs more among the various minority groups – from 15% of stops experienced by Hungarian Roma and North Africans in Spain, through to 92% among the Turkish minority in Bulgaria.

The most significant difference between the circumstances of stops experienced by majority

and minority populations was found in relation to **Hungary: with respect to the last police stop, 85% of the Roma who were stopped experienced a non-motorised stop (that is, on the street, on public transport or on a bicycle), while only one in ten (10%) of the majority population who were stopped were stopped in this manner, and 88% were in motorised transport (that is, a private vehicle).**

It is also more typical in Italy to stop minorities when they are not in a private vehicle: of those who were stopped, 57% of North Africans, 47% of

Romanians, and 28% of Albanians – in comparison with 4% of the majority population – experienced this either when on foot, on public transport, or when riding a bicycle. A finding that perhaps helps to explain higher stop rates for the majority population.

The same pattern emerges in Spain: 82% of North Africans, 73% of South Americans, and 61% of Romanians who were stopped experienced this in 'non-motorised' circumstances (compared with 30% of the majority population). Likewise, Albanians in Greece, the Slovakian Roma, and Sub-Saharan Africans in France are stopped more often while in 'non-motorised' circumstances in comparison with their majority neighbours (EL: 53% vs. 12%, SK: 47% vs. 7%, FR : 57% vs. 18%).

4.1.5. Police activity during stops

The survey asked respondents who were stopped by the police in the last 12 months questions about what the police did during their last experience of a police stop. Respondents were allowed to describe what happened, and interviewers coded as many response options as appropriate. From these results we are able to see some divergent patterns in the nature of the stop experience between majority and minority respondents, and between different minority groups (see Figure 4.5).

For both majority and minority people who were stopped in **Belgium**, the police typically asked questions or checked identity papers or vehicle documents. However, while 8% of the stops of majority respondents involved a search of the respondent and/or their vehicle (where a vehicle stop was involved), 17% of Turkish and 33% of North Africans were searched either in person or their vehicle was searched. On the other hand, an alcohol or drug test was administered more often to majority respondents, but this result probably reflects the fact that they were more often stopped while in a private vehicle.

Minority respondents in **Germany** reported a higher level of police activity during stops; in particular, asking further questions or checking identity papers or vehicle documents was part of a routine stop for three out of four minority respondents in comparison with half of the majority population. Whereas 6% of majority respondents themselves and/or their vehicle were searched, a search was carried out twice as often among Turkish and ex-Yugoslavian respondents (12% and 11% respectively).

Respondents from the majority population in **Spain** were most often stopped while in motorised transport, while minority respondents were stopped predominantly when on foot or on public transport. Due to the different nature of the stops, the majority population was more likely to be asked for vehicle documents, while minority respondents indicated a higher degree of checks concerning identity papers.

In **France**, both the majority respondents and North Africans were stopped mainly in motorised transport, while most of the Sub-Saharan Africans were stopped on foot or on public transport. Practically all Sub-Saharan Africans were asked to present their identity papers during the stop (97% of respondents), while the same applied to only three out of four majority respondents. Searching the respondent and/or their vehicle was also more common for Sub-Saharan Africans (46%) and North Africans (38%) in comparison with respondents from the majority population (21%).

In **Italy**, police stops of minority groups were more likely to involve asking questions and checking identity papers. However, in Italy there are hardly any differences between the rates at which the majority population and minorities were searched (either themselves or their vehicle) during their last stop. However, taking into account the fact that far fewer police stops of minorities in Italy were carried out in relation to a motorised vehicle stop, it is apparent that searches involving minorities were more likely to be of the person – and therefore more intrusive.

In comparison with the Roma, Albanians in **Greece** and the majority population gave a relatively similar description of police activity during the most recent stop. A major difference between the experience of Albanians and the majority population in Greece was that while 11% of Albanians were arrested or taken to the police station as a result of the stop, this applied to only 2% of the majority population.

The Roma in Greece had a very different experience of police stops compared to the majority population or the Albanians interviewed in the same country. Asking questions (84%) and requesting identity papers (88%) were fairly standard elements of police stops among the Roma, while only 40-48% of majority respondents had the same experience. More Roma respondents experienced searches either of themselves or their vehicles (68%), an alcohol or drug test (41%), or a fine (49%), whereas only 9-15% of majority respondents, depending on the measure, were subjected to the same type of police action. Finally, one third of Roma respondents

Figure 4.5
What did the police do during the most recent stop (F7)
 In the past 12 months, %

Majority results are provided in the first row for each country





Figure 4.5 (Continued)
What did the police do during the most recent stop (F7)
 In the past 12 months, %
 Majority results are provided in the first row for each country



who were stopped in the past 12 months said that they were taken to a police station as a result of the stop, while this was rare among the majority population (2%).

In **Bulgaria**, Roma respondents are more often asked to present their identity papers (81% vs. 59% of majority respondents or 62% of Turkish respondents), and they are twice as likely to have their vehicle and/or themselves searched (13% compared to 5% among the majority population).

Roma in **Hungary** have a much higher tendency to be stopped by police than the Hungarian majority, however the action of the police towards the Roma and the majority population is fairly similar during these stops. In **Slovakia**, the Roma are more often asked questions or given some type of advice or warning by the police, while majority respondents have often had to produce their driving licence or vehicle documents, which reflects the fact that far more people from the majority population are stopped whilst in a private vehicle; see Figure 4.4. In **Romania**, members of the majority population and the Roma had about the same ratio of stops, with roughly the same consequences. The biggest difference in the stop experience was that majority respondents in Romania were more often given some advice or a warning when stopped in the past 12 months (33%, compared to 22% of the Roma in Romania).

4.1.6. Evaluation of police conduct

4.1.6.1. Evaluation of police conduct during the last stop

With a few exceptions, minority populations are more inclined than the majority to think that the police's behaviour towards them during their last experience of a police stop was less respectful (see Figure 4.6).

The results suggest significant deviations with regard to the police's behaviour towards (or the way it is perceived by) the minority and majority population.

The biggest discrepancy can be found in Belgium, where among the North African minority only four out of ten (42%) people considered the police to be respectful during their last experience of a police stop, while in the case of the majority population eight out of ten (85%) considered the police to be respectful. Significant numbers of people from the same minority group (35%) also considered the police to be disrespectful towards them, while only a handful of people from the majority felt this way

(5%). The Turkish population in Belgium are also more likely than the majority population to consider the police as less respectful, but these differences are not as pronounced as those observed between North Africans and the majority.

In the same way, Sub-Saharan (27% vs. 65% majority) and North Africans (44% vs. 65% majority) in France consider the police as being respectful in much lower numbers. Among them, the percentage of those who think that the police were specifically disrespectful is also much higher (36%, 32% vs. 15% majority).


To a much lesser extent than majority interviewees, the Roma in Greece (33% vs. 69% majority), Hungary (36% vs. 72% majority) and Slovakia (41% vs. 71% majority) feel that police behaviour towards them is respectful.

In the case of North Africans in Italy (32% vs. 53% majority), Turkish respondents (47% vs. 65% majority) and former Yugoslavians in Germany (52% vs. 65% majority), as well as Roma in Romania (59% vs. 71%), the difference is smaller than in the previous cases; but the rate of those from minority groups who consider the police's behaviour to be respectful is still significantly lower compared with the majority.

Romanians and Albanians in Italy, the Roma and Turkish in Bulgaria, and Albanians in Greece have a more favourable view of their treatment by the police during their last experience of a police stop, as they tend to perceive the behaviour of the police in much the same way as their majority neighbours (here it should be noted that Romanian interviewees in Italy were not sampled as Roma).

Compared to the previous examples (see Figure 4.6), Spain is an exception to the general observed pattern: South American and Romanian interviewees found the behaviour of the police respectful in greater percentages than the majority population (68%, 67% vs. 52% majority). Only North Africans in Spain were less likely to regard police behaviour towards them as respectful (44%). A greater number from the majority population considered the police's behaviour to be specifically disrespectful than all three minority groups; however, more people amongst the North African and Romanian population than the majority population were ambiguous about the police's treatment of them, which indicates that there is room for improvement before these minorities feel that they are being treated in a respectful manner by the police.

Figure 4.6
Evaluation of police conduct during stops (F8)
 Last stop, % of respondents in majority sample and in the minority groups interviewed in EU-MIDIS
 Majority results are provided in the first row for each country



EU-MIDIS 2008

Question F8: Again, thinking about the last time you were stopped, how respectful were the police when dealing with you?

4.1.6.2. Evaluation of police conduct in other contacts

In addition to being asked about their treatment by the police during police stops, interviewees were also asked about what kind of treatment they had encountered from the police on other occasions when they had been in contact with them; for example, when having to report or register something themselves with the police.

In comparison with experiences of police stops, in most of the ten Member States minority and majority

groups have ‘other’ forms of contact with the police in similar numbers (see Figure 4.7).


As reflected in experiences of police treatment during stops, treatment by the police during ‘other’ contacts with them was generally regarded as ‘respectful’ by fewer respondents from a minority background.

The Roma from Hungary (42% vs. 79% majority), Greece (49% vs. 81%) and Slovakia (42% vs. 70%) all considered police treatment to be ‘respectful’ in significantly lower numbers than their majority neighbours.

Figure 4.7

Evaluation of police conduct in other contacts (F9, F10)

Last contact (other than stop), % of respondents in majority sample and in the minority groups interviewed in EU-MIDIS
Majority results are provided in the first row for each country



EU-MIDIS 2008


Question F9: Apart from the police stopping you, which I've already asked you about, have you had any contact with the police in this country in the last 12 months? By this I mean you could have reported something to them yourself, or you may have had to register something with them, etc. [IF YES] F10: Thinking about the last time you had contact with the police in this country – that DID NOT involve them stopping you – how respectful were they to you?

Former Yugoslavians and respondents of Turkish origin in Germany also reported that they were treated respectfully in 'other' encounters with the police in fewer numbers than the majority population (50%, 51% vs. 82% majority). Similar patterns of fewer people reporting 'respectful' treatment in 'other' police contacts were recorded for North Africans living in Belgium (63% vs. 84%), Albanians (48% vs. 65%) and

North Africans (51% vs. 65%) in Italy, and Sub-Saharan Africans in France (60% vs. 76%).

Exceptionally, some minorities considered police behaviour towards them to be respectful during 'other' contacts more often than majority respondents; namely: Romanians in Italy (77% vs. 65% majority), and South Americans (91% vs. 77% majority) and Romanians (82% vs. 77% majority) in Spain.

Figure 4.8
Immigration, customs or border control (G1-G2)
 % of respondents in majority sample and in the minority groups interviewed in EU-MIDIS
 Majority results are provided in the first row for each country



EU-MIDIS 2008

Question G1: During the last 12 months, have you ever entered [COUNTRY] from a visit abroad when either immigration, customs or border control were present? [IF YES] G2: During the last 12 months, were you ever stopped by [COUNTRY NATIONALITY] immigration, customs or border control when coming back into the country?

4.1.7. Immigration, customs or border control

The survey asked respondents a couple of ‘screening questions’ about whether, in the last 12 months, they had returned to their country of residence from travel abroad when immigration/border/customs personnel were present, and if they had been stopped by them. These results in themselves cannot present a picture of potential discriminatory treatment as they are

dependent on factors such as where respondents were travelling back from, the existence or not of Schengen border controls, and whether respondents had an EU passport. However, having determined that respondents had returned to their country of residence in the EU and had been stopped by immigration/border/customs personnel, they were asked a follow-up question about whether they considered they were *singled out for stopping on the basis of their immigrant/ethnic background* when re-

entering their country of residence. This was used as a very rough indicator of potential profiling during these encounters.

The results indicate some interesting patterns of movement involving border crossings that differ between majority and minority populations in some Member States (see Figure 4.8). For example: it appears that North Africans and Romanians who live in Spain travel more often in situations where they cross Schengen borders than their majority compatriots living around them (respectively 45% and 42% vs. 19% majority). This is also more typical of Turkish respondents and ex-Yugoslavians in Germany in comparison with the majority population (respectively 42% and 45% vs. 22% majority), as well as French Sub-Saharan Africans and North Africans in France (respectively 39% and 37% vs. 19% majority), Albanians and Romanians in Italy (respectively 50% and 45% vs. 29%), and Albanians in Greece (61% vs. 10% majority).

Upon returning to their country of residence, **people belonging to minority groups are stopped for inspection, with almost no exception, more often than their majority compatriots.** It is particularly characteristic for the following groups: Turkish respondents from Germany (75% vs. 29% majority), Albanians in Greece (83% vs. 40% majority), North Africans from Spain (40% vs. 8%), North Africans from France (76% vs. 39%), former Yugoslavians from Germany (56% vs. 29%), North Africans from Italy (79% vs. 54%), Turkish respondents from Bulgaria (89% vs. 64%), Sub-Saharan Africans from France (63% vs. 39%) and the Roma from Hungary (60 vs. 36%). However, these findings need to be explored with respect to minorities' citizenship status.

As an illustration: Turkish German citizens are stopped far more often when returning to Germany (60%) than German citizens from the majority population (29%); however, 'Turkish' respondents with German passports are held up at borders less often than Turkish respondents who are not German citizens (75%). In comparison, people from the former Yugoslavia who are German citizens are stopped at borders at essentially the same rate as their German compatriots (33% vs. 29% majority), whereas if one compares former Yugoslavians with and without German citizenship, the figures are starkly different (33% vs. 56% majority).

A similar pattern to the above can be found in Italy amongst those North Africans and Romanians who possess Italian citizenship; namely: Italian citizens of North African background are stopped less frequently (61%) than North African non-citizens (79%); Italian citizens of Romanian background (64%) are stopped less frequently than Romanian non-citizens (72%); however, Italian citizens of North African background and Italian citizens of Romanian background are stopped more often than the majority Italian population (61%, 64% vs. 54%).

Besides citizenship status, an explanatory factor in the above, which the survey was unable to test, is where interviewees were returning from and how they were returning when re-entering their country of residence – which has implications for the presence of border controls (for example, airports versus road crossings). However, controlling for this factor may still fail to explain the significant differences in border stops experienced in some countries between EU passport holders with a majority and minority background. In this regard it would seem that further research is warranted to examine the potential for differential treatment of EU citizens re-entering their country of residence, controlling for factors such as citizenship status and means of re-entry.

4.2. Eurobarometer comparisons

4.2.1. Considerations when comparing results

The EU-MIDIS questionnaire borrowed questions from various Special Eurobarometer surveys that dealt with the subject of discrimination, and which interviewed the 'total' EU population who were, with very few exceptions, from a majority background given the nature of the sampling involved in these surveys. The wording used in these Special Eurobarometer surveys was replicated in EU-MIDIS to allow for comparison of results.¹⁷⁹

It should be taken into account when comparing EU-MIDIS and Special Eurobarometer results that the sampling frames for these surveys are very different, with EU-MIDIS being specific to certain locations (mainly cities) while Special Eurobarometers are 'nationwide'. Therefore, the comparability of results

¹⁷⁹ As this report was going into production the results of Special Eurobarometer 317 on 'Discrimination in the EU in 2009' were published. In the results of this Eurobarometer survey it is stated that the findings are generally very similar to those obtained in the 2008 Eurobarometer on discrimination. However, comparison between EU-MIDIS and Special Eurobarometer 296 on discrimination is more valid as both surveys undertook fieldwork in 2008, whereas Special Eurobarometer 317 was conducted in 2009.

Figure 4.9
Is discrimination based on ethnic/immigrant origin widespread in the Member State?
% of the total population
 (Special Eurobarometer 296, QA1.1)

% of minority groups
 (EU-MIDIS 2008, A1a)





Figure 4.9 (Continued)

**Is discrimination based on ethnic/immigrant origin widespread in the Member State?
% of the total population**
(Special Eurobarometer 296, QA1.1)

% of minority groups
(EU-MIDIS 2008, A1a)



Question A1A: For each of the following types of discrimination, could you please tell me whether, in your opinion, it is very widespread, fairly widespread, fairly rare, or very rare in [COUNTRY]? – Ethnic or immigrant origin

between the surveys is primarily limited due to their different geographical scope, which should always be kept in mind when looking to compare the findings. In turn, the socio-economic background of many of the minority populations interviewed in EU-MIDIS will tend to be more disadvantaged than that of the general population, which will also have implications concerning the comparability of the sample, and hence the comparability of the results. Another consideration is the fact that the dates of EU-MIDIS and the two Special Eurobarometer surveys referred to here are different, with fieldwork undertaken in different periods.

Having noted some limitations concerning the comparability of results between EU-MIDIS and Special Eurobarometer findings, some general level of comparison can be made between the surveys that serves to highlight areas needing further investigation where differences in responses appear to be very significant. It is also perhaps worth noting here that while comparisons between very diverse (majority) populations are regularly and unproblematically made in Eurobarometer surveys – between, for example, respondents in Finland and Cyprus or respondents in France and Bulgaria – a critique of the comparability of these results, which we offer when comparing EU-MIDIS and Eurobarometer findings, is often missing.

4.2.2. Special Eurobarometer Survey No. 296

Special Eurobarometer Survey 296, *Discrimination in the European Union: Perceptions, Experiences and Attitudes* (2008), provided the opportunity to compare the opinions of the majority population (based on the national general population sample of the Eurobarometer) with those of minority populations (based on EU-MIDIS) as to how much discrimination – on grounds of ethnicity – is widespread in a particular Member State (see Figure 4.9).

4.2.2.1. The perceived extent of ethnic discrimination

Opinions vary between the majority population and the minority respondents interviewed in EU-MIDIS when it comes to perceived discrimination against different minority or ethnic groups. The results were intriguing: in several Member States the majority population provided a much less favourable assessment of the situation than minority respondents who were asked the same question.

In Austria, for example, 60% of the general population believed that discrimination based on ethnic or immigrant origin was (very or fairly) widespread, while the same opinion was held by only 32% of Turkish respondents and 17% of the former Yugoslavian respondents in the country. Similar results (e.g. that the evaluation provided by the general population

is worse than that detected among minority respondents) were found in Spain, the Netherlands, Denmark, Finland, Cyprus, Lithuania, Luxembourg and the UK (see Figure 4.9).

In several countries, the opinions of the majority and minority respondents were similar – that is, perceptions about the extent of discrimination against people with an immigrant/ethnic background were similar. In some countries the general population were less inclined than minorities to think that discrimination on the basis of immigrant/ethnic background was widespread: this was most notable in countries with Roma minorities (e.g. 67% of Hungarians thought that such discrimination was widespread as opposed to 90% of the Roma interviewed, and the situation was very similar in the Czech Republic, Poland, and Slovakia as well.)

The Irish, Portuguese, French and Estonian general populations, among others, also tended to consider the level of discrimination to be less widespread when results were contrasted with (some of) the minority groups surveyed in those countries.

These very divergent opinions need investigating further with respect to their causes.

4.2.2.2. Experiences of discrimination on different grounds

The same Eurobarometer survey also included a question on respondents' personal experiences of discrimination in the past 12 months on seven grounds (ethnic origin, gender, sexual orientation, age, religion or belief, disability or 'other' reason). The same question was used in EU-MIDIS and these results have been described in detail in Chapter 3 as part of the analysis by aggregate minority groups.

Comparing the results of the Eurobarometer and EU-MIDIS, it is hardly surprising that immigrant and ethnic minority groups, given their particular background, report more discrimination based on ethnic and immigrant origin than the majority population in Eurobarometer. **What is noticeable, however, is that about three out of five specific groups (that is, 26 groups of the 45 individual minority groups surveyed) indicated a higher rate of discrimination on the basis of gender than majority respondents (see Figure 4.10). Higher levels of gender discrimination among minorities may also suggest the existence of sub-populations which are at risk of multiple or intersectional discrimination.** On the other hand, respondents, when discriminated against, can have difficulties in

identifying a particular reason or a combination of reasons for their unequal treatment unless this was made explicit by those doing the discriminating (that is, a case of discrimination based on a combination of gender and ethnicity could be reported as a gender-based incident, ethnic incident, or both), which serves to complicate the measurement of multiple discrimination in a survey. However, such factors have to be taken into consideration when interpreting the results for both majority and minority respondents.


The relative differences between the majority and minority with respect to gender discrimination were greatest amongst the Roma in Poland and Asians in Cyprus – where gender discrimination of minorities reached a level that is seven times that of the majority population. This result can be partly explained by the fact that more women were interviewed in Cyprus than men, but in Poland there is no ready explanation for this stark difference as nearly equal numbers of women and men were interviewed. The highest prevalence of discrimination based on gender was experienced by North Africans in Italy (23%), but Italy was also among the countries with the highest rate of gender-based discrimination recorded in the Eurobarometer survey (6% in the majority population). An example of differences in the opposite direction are the Turkish and ex-Yugoslavian respondents in Austria, out of whom only 1% were discriminated against because of their gender in the past 12 months, whereas 6% of the majority population felt discriminated against based on this ground – a result that could reflect different expectations in equality of treatment.

The results on discrimination related to age display the opposite pattern to those on gender, with 26 immigrant or ethnic minority groups out of 45 surveyed in EU-MIDIS being less likely to experience discrimination on the basis of age than the majority population in their respective countries (see Figure 4.10). At the extreme end of the scale, Turkish respondents in Austria indicated only one-tenth of the age-related discrimination experiences as the majority population (Austrians had the second highest rate of age discrimination among the 27 Member States in the Eurobarometer). The highest rate of age discrimination in the Eurobarometer was reported in the Czech Republic – where also the Roma respondents in EU-MIDIS had the highest level of discrimination based on age (12% for the majority population vs. 18% among Czech Roma). The most notable exceptions are Roma in Poland and African immigrants in Malta, who were discriminated against based on their age three times as often as majority respondents. These results

Figure 4.10

Experiences of discrimination based on gender and age, EU-MIDIS (A2) and Eurobarometer 296 (QA3)

% of respondents discriminated against because of their gender in the past 12 months, Eurobarometer and EU-MIDIS



% of respondents discriminated against because of their age in the past 12 months, Eurobarometer and EU-MIDIS






Figure 4.10 (Continued)
Experiences of discrimination based on gender and age, EU-MIDIS (A2) and Eurobarometer 296 (QA3)

% of respondents discriminated against because of their gender in the past 12 months, Eurobarometer and EU-MIDIS



% of respondents discriminated against because of their age in the past 12 months, Eurobarometer and EU-MIDIS



EU-MIDIS 2008

Question A2: In the past 12 months have you personally felt discriminated against or harassed in [COUNTRY] on the basis of one or more of the following grounds? B – Gender, D – Age.

require further analysis with respect to the responses of different age cohorts among the majority and minority populations in each Member State. As many minority populations with an immigrant/ethnic background are younger on average than the majority population, one would expect the results to be skewed towards showing higher levels of age-based discrimination against youthful minority populations. However, age discrimination is often assumed to mean discrimination against older people. At the same time it should be remembered that age-based discrimination can be felt by the young, the old, and the middle-aged.

4.2.3. Special Eurobarometer Survey No. 263

4.2.3.1. Ethnic background and workplace advancement

An earlier Special Eurobarometer survey, *Discrimination in the European Union* (No. 263, 2007), included the following question on workplace advancement, which was also used in EU-MIDIS:



“Would you say that, with equivalent qualifications or diplomas, the following people would be less likely, as likely, or more likely than others to get a job, be accepted for training or be promoted in [COUNTRY]? ... A person of different ethnic origin than the rest of the population?”

Figure 4.11
**Workplace advancement with different
 ethnic background**
% of the total population
 (Special Eurobarometer 263, QA7.6)

% of minority groups
 (EU-MIDIS 2008, A4a)

■ Less likely ■ As likely ■ More likely ■ Don't know/No opinion

Countries with 3 groups



Countries with 2 groups






Figure 4.11 (Continued)
Workplace advancement with different ethnic background
% of the total population
 (Special Eurobarometer 263, QA7.6)

% of minority groups
 (EU-MIDIS 2008, A4a)



Question A4A: Would you say that, with equivalent qualifications or diplomas, the following people would be less likely, as likely, or more likely than others to get a job, be accepted for training or be promoted in [COUNTRY]? – A person of different ethnic origin than the rest of the population?

Broadly speaking, looking at results within individual Member States (see Figure 4.11), majority opinions tended to mirror minority respondents' assessments of the extent of discrimination against people from a different ethnic background than that of the majority population.

Once again, primarily the majority population in Member States with significant Roma minorities tend to underestimate the extent of discrimination against minorities as it is perceived by members of the Roma population themselves. Striking differences in this regard were detected in Poland (where 87% of the Roma thought that a non-majority ethnic background could be a barrier in the workplace versus 42% of the general population), in Hungary (85% vs. 60% majority), in Slovakia (77% vs. 53%), and in Greece (78% vs. 57%).

A similar pattern can be noted with respect to Russian respondents in Estonia (72% vs. 39% majority), Central and East European people (predominantly Polish) in the UK (70% vs. 44% majority) and Sub-Saharan Africans in Ireland (65% vs. 42% majority) – where members of minority communities perceive, more than the majority population, that having a minority ethnic or immigrant background is a significant barrier to workplace advancement.

In contrast with the general pattern described above, perceptions of disadvantages for minorities in workplace advancement are *less* among the following minority communities that were surveyed in EU-MIDIS: Iraqis in Sweden (14% vs. 72% among the majority); ex-Yugoslavians and the Turkish in Austria (20% and 27% vs. 55% majority); Romanians, South Americans and North Africans in Spain (36%, 45%, 55% vs. 72% majority); the Russian community in Lithuania (14% vs. 36%).

One consideration for these results that should be borne in mind is that the minorities that were interviewed – with respect to this question and the previous one asking about how widespread discrimination on the basis of ethnicity is – have answered in relation to their own personal experiences rather than in relation to the experiences of minorities as a whole in their country of residence. In comparison, the majority population has had to hypothesise about a situation they themselves are unfamiliar with (unless, for example, a member of their family is from a minority background) when answering this type of question.

4.3. European Crime and Safety Survey Comparisons

4.3.1. Considerations when comparing results

The European Crime and Safety Survey (EU ICS), which is part of the International Crime Victimization Survey (ICVS) project, collected data on experiences of crime in 18 EU Member States in 2005. Some questions included in EU-MIDIS were specifically designed to match the wording of questions asked in EU ICS, to allow for the comparison of results on the prevalence of victimisation between the majority population and minority groups.

This comparison entails a number of caveats, some of which have been referred to earlier with respect to comparisons between EU-MIDIS and Special Eurobarometer surveys. For one, the interviews in EU ICS were carried out in 2005, while EU-MIDIS fieldwork was conducted in 2008. The EU ICS was based on a nationwide sample of respondents, whereas EU-MIDIS data collection efforts focused on major cities where selected immigrant and ethnic minority groups were living in sufficient density for random route sampling purposes (however, the data from EU ICS can be analysed with respect to city-based and national sampling to improve comparability). In the EU ICS random digit dialling was used for drawing a sample of landline telephone numbers, and interviews were conducted over the phone – whereas all EU-MIDIS interviews were conducted face-to-face (that is, with an interviewer and an interviewee sitting together). Finally, EU ICS was conducted in 18 EU Member States, whereas EU-MIDIS was undertaken in the EU's (now) 27 Member States.

Despite these methodological differences, it is informative to see how the results of these two surveys – one on the majority population, the other focusing on selected minority groups – compare where the same questions have been asked. In an effort to enhance the comparability of the results, the 2005 EU ICS results for the main cities were considered in those cases where the sampling in EU-MIDIS was also undertaken in major cities – so ensuring a level of urban comparison; and the EU ICS national results were used where EU-MIDIS interviews were carried out nationwide (e.g. in Poland).¹⁸⁰

As a survey focusing on criminal victimisation, EU ICS asked respondents whether they or their household

had experienced a variety of crimes in the past five years and in the past (calendar) year. Due to the fact that a variety of questions besides those focusing on criminal victimisation were asked in EU-MIDIS, it was not possible to cover all the same crimes in EU-MIDIS as those looked at in EU ICS. The EU-MIDIS survey asked respondents about their experiences of criminal victimisation in relation to the following: 1) theft of or from any type of vehicle belonging to the household; 2) burglary or attempted burglary; 3) theft of personal property; 4) assaults or threats; and 5) harassment of a serious nature. Out of the five crimes covered in EU-MIDIS, 'serious harassment' was not included in the EU ICS. However, the decision was made, after the piloting of EU-MIDIS and in line with the inclusion of questions on harassment in recent versions of the British Crime Survey (which is the largest national victimisation survey of its kind in the EU), to include the 'serious harassment' question in EU-MIDIS as a form of victimisation that is particularly relevant for minority groups.

While the rates of victimisation for all the minority groups covered in EU-MIDIS have been presented in the main results section of this report, the following comparisons look at two of the crimes covered in both surveys: theft of personal property, and assaults or threats. These are the two crimes where the comparisons are easiest to make because in both surveys they are measured at the level of the individual rather than the household; that is, theft of a vehicle and burglary are considered household crimes, and while EU ICS interviewed only one person per household, up to three household members were surveyed in EU-MIDIS, which can have an effect on the victimisation rates.

4.3.2. Theft of personal property


Figure 4.12 presents the results of EU-MIDIS and EU ICS on thefts of personal property with respect to the past 12 months (as was asked in EU-MIDIS) or the previous calendar year (as was asked in EU ICS).

Note: the results on aggregate minority groups and on the most victimised specific minority groups were presented in section 2.2.2.3 in this report.

In the 18 Member States where EU ICS was conducted, EU-MIDIS interviewed a total of 34 individual minority groups across these 18 countries. What can be seen from Figure 4.12 is that in the case of 25 of the 34 minority groups covered in EU-

¹⁸⁰ The results of the EU ICS presented in this section have been taken from van Dijk, J., van Kesteren, J. and Smit, Paul (2007) *Criminal Victimization in International Perspective. Key findings from the 2004-2005 ICVS and EU ICS*. Onderzoek en beleid, No. 257, WODC, The Hague.

Figure 4.12
% of respondents who have been victims of personal theft in the past 12 months (EU-MIDIS (2008)) or in the past calendar year (EU ICS (2005))



Question DC1: Over the last five years have you personally been the victim of any of these thefts that did not involve force? [IF YES] DC2: Thinking about the last time this happened, when was this: in the last twelve months or before then?

MIDIS the level of victimisation indicated by the minority groups was *greater* than that of the majority population. In comparison, in only nine minority groups among the 34 is the rate of personal theft *lower* than the rate among the majority population.¹⁸¹

In sum – minorities are victims of personal theft on average more often than the majority population.

The most notable differences can be seen regarding the Roma in Greece and North Africans and Romanians in Italy (these groups were also among the 10 specific groups with the highest rate of thefts overall in EU-MIDIS): 21% of Roma respondents in Greece said that something was stolen from

them in the past 12 months, while only 3.5% of majority respondents in EU ICS said the same (the rate of personal theft in the other minority group interviewed in Greece, the Albanians, was 6.7%, which is closer to the rate among the majority population although still somewhat higher). All the three minority groups that were interviewed in Italy (Albanians, North Africans and Romanians) indicated rates of personal theft which were 3-6 times the rate among the majority population, as measured in EU ICS (Italian majority population 3.2% – Albanians 9.3%, North Africans 18.6%, and Romanians 13.4%). Other minority groups with theft victimisation rates at least twice that of the majority population are Somalis in the countries of Denmark, Finland and Sweden, and North Africans in Spain.

181 EU ICS samples also include minority respondents according to their proportion in the population, but the number of these respondents is too small to allow for any conclusions to be made on the victimisation of specific minority groups.

Another group with a high rate of thefts are the CEE respondents in the UK, but here the victimisation rate – while higher than that of the majority population – is more in line with the rate experienced by the majority population (majority population: 10.2%, CEE: 14.6%).

Of those cases where the opposite pattern was found – that is, minorities in EU-MIDIS reported a *lower* prevalence of theft victimisation than the majority population – the Turkish in Austria and ex-Yugoslavians in Luxembourg stand out as groups where experiences of theft in the last 12 months were half that of those reported by the majority population (Turkish in Austria 1.9% compared to the majority population at 5.7%; ex-Yugoslavians in Luxembourg 1.2%, majority population 2.9%).

4.3.3. Assaults or threats

Figure 4.13 shows the percentage of respondents who have been victims of assault or threat in the past 12 months (or in the calendar year preceding the survey in the case of EU ICS). Compared to the results already presented in section 2.2.2.4 in this report, the EU-MIDIS rates shown here exclude cases where something was stolen from the respondent in the most recent incident of assault or threat, in order to provide a better comparison with the EU ICS data where these cases were captured and reported separately as robberies.

For 21 of the 34 minority groups interviewed in EU-MIDIS (across the 18 Member States where comparisons can be drawn with the majority population), a higher victimisation rate for assault or threat was recorded than for the majority population interviewed in the same countries in the EU ICS.

In sum – minorities are victims of assault or threat on average more often than the majority population.

This is notably the case with **Somali** respondents in Finland (19.3% vs. 4.5% of the majority in EU ICS) and Denmark (14.1% vs. 3.6% majority), and for **Roma** in Poland (12.6% vs. 3.0% majority) and Hungary (7.6% vs. 1.6% majority). *On average minority respondents in these groups display a level of assault or threat victimisation that is four times the rate of the majority population.* Other minority groups with high rates of victimisation (twice the rate of the majority

population or more) are North Africans in France, Italy and Spain, and Romanians in Italy.


In thirteen minority groups out of 34, the assault and threat victimisation rate is *below* the rate of the majority population surveyed in the same country. The largest relative differences in the rates are found among ex-Yugoslavians in Austria, Russians in Estonia, and CEE respondents in the UK – in all three cases the assault and threat victimisation rate of minorities is about one-third of the majority population rate: 0.7% of ex-Yugoslavian respondents in Austria were victims of assault or threat in the past 12 months while 2.5% of the majority population in EU ICS were victimised; 1.2% of Russian minority respondents in Estonia were assaulted or threatened compared to 3.7% of the majority respondents; and only 2.7% of CEE respondents in the UK were victimised, while 8.6% of the majority population indicated that they were victims of assault or threat in the calendar year preceding the interview in EU ICS.

As in previous chapters, in addition to the measurement of prevalence, it is also interesting to examine the incidence of victimisation – that is, how many times a given crime has taken place in a specified time period.¹⁸² EU-MIDIS did not collect data on the incidence of property crimes in the 12 months preceding the survey, and therefore the discussion on incidence is limited here to assaults or threats.

The presentation of incidence rates differs here from the format used elsewhere in the report (for example in Chapter 2.2.5.1 on the volume of in-person crimes), for two reasons. Firstly, as with the comparison of prevalence rates, cases of assault or threat where something was stolen from the respondent have been excluded from the analysis in order to improve comparability between surveys. Secondly, in addition to the scale of the figures, the numbers also differ slightly since EU ICS used a five-step measure for incidence, asking respondents whether an incident took place once, twice, three times, four times, or five or more times during the previous calendar year, whereas the corresponding question in EU-MIDIS had more categories, asking if the respondent was victimised once, twice, three times, four times, five times, 6-10 times or more than ten times in the past 12 months. For the purpose of comparison, the data collected in EU-MIDIS has been recoded for this analysis to conform to the categories used in EU ICS.

¹⁸² Please refer to Chapter 1.3.2.2 for a discussion on the differences of prevalence and incidence.

Figure 4.13
% of respondents who have been victims of assault or threat in the past 12 months (EU-MIDIS (2008)) or in the past calendar year (EU ICS (2005))



Question DD1: During the last 5 years in [COUNTRY], have you been personally attacked, that is hit or pushed, or threatened by someone in a way that really frightened you? [IF YES] DD2: Thinking about the last time this happened, when was this: in the last twelve months or before then? DD5: Was anything stolen or did they try to steal something?

Looking at Figure 4.14 – as with prevalence rates, the biggest differences in the incidence rates for assault or threat between minority and majority respondents were found amongst the following groups: Somali respondents in Finland (59.2 incidents vs. only 7.5 per 100 in the majority population); Somalis in Denmark (33.4 vs. 5.2 majority); North Africans in Italy (41.7 vs. 1.6 majority); and Roma in Poland (33.5 vs. 3.8 majority). North Africans in Italy also have the greatest relative difference when comparing the rates between the minority and majority respondents within a country, followed by Romanian migrants in Italy (15.7 incidents per 100 compared to 1.6 in the majority population) and Roma in Greece (25.1 vs. 2.7).


ity respondents in EU-MIDIS surpasses the incidence of assaults or threats in the majority population. In sum – in most of the 18 countries where a comparison between the minority and majority populations can be made, minorities experience assaults or threats, on average, more frequently than the majority.

In some cases where the *prevalence* of assaults or threats among the immigrant and ethnic minority groups interviewed in EU-MIDIS was below the rate of victimisation in the majority population, the *incidence* of assaults or threats among minority groups was higher. This indicates that while fewer respondents in the minority groups have experienced assault or threat in the past 12 months, those who have been victimised have suffered a greater number of

Overall, in the case of 25 groups out of 34, the incidence of assaults or threats indicated by the immigrant or ethnic minor-

Figure 4.14

Incidence of assault or threat in the past 12 months (EU-MIDIS (2008)) or in the past calendar year (EU ICS (2005)) per 100 population



Questions DD1, DD2 and DD5 as with Figure 4.13. DD3: How many times has something like this happened to you in the last 12 months?

incidents than the majority population. *This finding is particularly important as it indicates that a subgroup within the minority population are particularly vulnerable to repeat incidents of assault or threat over a 12 month period*, and would suggest that further research is needed to look at the characteristics of these groups together with the circumstances of their victimisation, including the characteristics of perpetrators. High incidence rates could be noted for North African and Turkish respondents in the Netherlands (14.5 and 14.6 incidents per 100 population, compared to 10.1 incidents in EU-ICS), as well as for Iraqis in Sweden and Sub-Saharan Africans in France – although for the two latter groups the difference compared to majority responses was smaller. In other immigrant or ethnic minority groups where the prevalence of assaults or threats was smaller than the prevalence in the majority population, also the incidence of assaults or threats was below the majority population rate. Once again, the most notable examples of this are the

Turkish and ex-Yugoslavian respondents in Austria, ex-Yugoslavians in Germany, and CEE respondents in the UK – in sum, these are groups that are victimised infrequently.

5. Concluding comments

The importance of empirical data for evidence-based policy development:

Policies and action plans that seek to address fundamental rights abuses need to be supported by empirical evidence that documents their extent and nature. This evidence is a vital tool through which to challenge common sense assumptions about fundamental rights problems and in order to develop appropriate responses.

At the heart of the FRA's work lies its mandate to collect objective, reliable and comparable data that can serve to inform different European stakeholders when developing policies and courses of action in the field of fundamental rights. In order to do this the Agency:

Recognises – that a fundamental rights problem exists and determines how to record it

Records – the extent and nature of the problem through scientific research

Responds – to the problem by providing data and opinions based on empirical evidence

Recognise: the problem of 'racist' discrimination and victimisation, and the current lack of objective, reliable and comparable data in the EU

The Agency's annual reports and other research publications, and those of its predecessor the European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia, have consistently highlighted the problem of discrimination and criminal victimisation against ethnic minorities and immigrants in the EU. At the same time, the Agency's work has pointed to the lack of comprehensive and comparable data on these issues throughout much of the EU.

As EU-MIDIS shows, incidents of discrimination and racist crime that are reported to complaints bodies or the police, or which are processed through the courts, cannot be read as a 'true' measure of the extent and nature of these problems in the EU. Reported incidents only represent the 'tip of the iceberg' in relation to the real extent of discrimination and racist crime – the overwhelming majority of which never comes to the attention of either complaints bodies or the police. In this regard, the collection of data from existing government or non-governmental sources – such as the number of complaints or court cases in a Member State – should be complemented

by primary data collection, in the form of survey research, which directly asks members of the public about their experiences and opinions, including their reporting behaviour. The FRA's work highlights the importance of a 'bottom up' approach to measuring and understanding fundamental rights abuses - one which is grounded in objective and reliable research.

While a handful of Member States do have good data collection in the areas of discrimination and racist victimisation, in most of the EU there is a continuing lack of comprehensive empirical evidence on these themes, which makes it difficult to develop fully comprehensive policy responses and action plans. A particular problem when looking to have an overview of the situation in the EU, and to see how different Member States fare relative to each other, is the absence of comparable data.

A number of factors contribute to the paucity of comparable evidence; for example: different traditions concerning the collection or non-collection of empirical data, including data on ethnicity; a general absence of reporting to and trust in the State, particularly by vulnerable groups in society; and the degree of political support for monitoring and the development of mechanisms to monitor fundamental rights abuses, which require human and financial resources. Given the current absence of good quality and comparable data on minorities' experiences of discrimination, criminal victimisation and policing in much of the EU, the Agency responded, in line with its mandate, by undertaking the first EU-wide survey on these themes.

Record: Fieldwork-based survey research to provide evidence

EU-MIDIS results are based on face-to-face interviews with over 23,500 ethnic minority and immigrant people throughout the EU. In this sense the survey presents a 'bottom up' approach to measuring fundamental rights abuses.

There are other EU-wide surveys such as the European Commission's Eurobarometer surveys, Eurofound's Working Conditions Survey, and the European Social Survey – to name just a few. They are common instruments for gauging the public's opinions and experiences of various aspects of life in the Union, the results of which are used by different European and Member State stakeholders when developing policy. Unlike national surveys, these large-scale transnational instruments present data that can be compared between Member States, which allows Member States to gauge their 'performance' relative to other countries. However, what these surveys cannot do is present the opinions and experiences of groups that are not captured in sufficient numbers by existing surveying methodologies – in other words, groups such as ethnic minorities, including EU citizens and resident non-citizens with an immigrant background. In sum, survey research at EU level is addressed at the EU's 'majority' population as minorities are captured in insufficient numbers through established sampling methods.

Building on these existing survey instruments that have interviewed the EU's majority populations, EU-MIDIS has served to fill the existing gap in EU-wide evidence to date on the extent and nature of discrimination and criminal victimisation experienced by ethnic minority and immigrant groups (including the important areas of rights awareness and experiences of police stops). The data presents the opinions and, importantly, the experiences of some of the largest and/or most vulnerable minority populations in Europe as reported by them to the survey interviewers.

For example, the survey shows (amongst other things) that:

- On average, every second Roma and 4 in 10 Sub-Saharan African interviewees was discriminated against on the basis of their ethnicity at *least* once in the last 12 months.
- 82% of those who were discriminated against on the basis of their ethnicity/immigrant background in the last 12 months did *not* report their last experience of discrimination anywhere – either at the place where it occurred or to a complaints body.
- On average, 1 in 5 Sub-Saharan African and Roma respondents were victims of what they considered to be 'racially motivated' assault or threat, or serious harassment, at *least* once in the last 12 months.

- Depending on the groups surveyed, between 57% and 74% of incidents of assault or threat were *not* reported to the police.
- Of those who were stopped by the police in the last 12 months, on average 17% of North Africans and 14% of Roma considered that they were stopped specifically because of their ethnic or immigrant background.

The survey's detailed results, as reported in this report and in other publications, allow for a comparison of findings between the different 'aggregate' respondent groups surveyed – such as North Africans and Turkish respondents – and also within these groups according to the different Member States where research was undertaken. At the same time, the survey's findings on experiences of police stops can be compared with those of the majority population sub-sample that was interviewed in ten Member States. Some of the other results in the survey, for example on rights awareness and crime victimisation, can also be compared with findings from selected Eurobarometer surveys and the European Crime and Safety Survey.

Respond: Where the results can serve to inform policy development

There are a number of avenues through which the findings from EU-MIDIS can be put to use; of which the following are just two examples:

Assessing the impact of legislation 'on the ground'

The Racial Equality Directive (2000/43/EC) presents the key EU legislation prohibiting discrimination on the grounds of ethnic or racial origin in the areas of employment, education, social protection and healthcare, and access to and supply of goods and services, including housing. The Directive requires the establishment of national Equality Bodies, which can be empowered to receive complaints concerning discrimination and to promote awareness of and compliance with anti-discrimination legislation. In addition, Article 17 of the Directive tasks the FRA with contributing to the European Commission's periodic reports to the Parliament and the Council of the European Union on the application of the Directive in the EU. In 2010 the Agency will provide its input to this process, which will draw on several sources: a report which is based on interviews with 300 representatives of trade unions and employers about their awareness, application and understanding of the Directive; and a comparative 'legal' report on the impact of the Directive.

The results from EU-MIDIS will play a key role in contextualising the Agency's analysis of the impact of the Racial Equality Directive as they paint a picture of the 'true' extent and nature of discrimination in the areas covered by the Directive – based as they are on information supplied in interviews with 23,500 respondents. In addition, the survey's key findings present new information about minority populations' awareness of their rights in the area of non-discrimination, their knowledge of Equality Bodies in their Member States, and, importantly, their low reporting rates concerning experiences of discrimination (including reasons for non-reporting). The findings constitute an important critique of the current reach of legislation and the complaints mechanisms that were established to assist precisely the groups that were interviewed in the survey.

Alongside the Racial Equality Directive – the Council Framework Decision 2008/913/JHA on combating racism and xenophobia, which was adopted by the Council in November 2008, has established the approximation of law addressing certain forms of racist and xenophobic crime in the EU. As with non-reporting of discrimination, EU-MIDIS has produced important evidence showing low levels of reporting to the police by minority victims of crime and, in particular, racist crime, as well as valuable data on people's reasons for not reporting to the police. These findings, together with others in the survey that refer to levels of trust in the police and treatment by the police in relation to police stops and other police contacts, provide the first EU-wide data about how minorities experience policing throughout the EU, and whether they consider the police as providing a non-discriminatory service.

Those seeking to enforce legislation, such as the above, can benefit from insights into how these minorities, which the law was established to protect, actually experience their lives – be this in relation to discrimination or racist victimisation – and, critically, how they experience 'justice' through their knowledge of existing legislation and their access to redress.

Assessing the situation at the local level

The results from EU-MIDIS are of particular use at the local level concerning those Member States where the survey was conducted in major urban centres (see paragraph 1.2.2.1 in the main report for an indication of the cities where the survey was undertaken).

Local government and non-governmental organisations in cities covered by the survey can use the results to inform their existing work and

to develop new initiatives in the areas of non-discrimination and integration of minorities. As the results allow for the comparison of groups within a general 'aggregate' group (for example, comparing findings between Roma groups in the seven Member States where they were surveyed), there is scope for countries with similar histories and experiences of minority populations to compare findings and explore ways in which they might learn from each other with respect to both good and bad practices in the area of non-discrimination and integration. At the same time, the survey's findings on criminal victimisation and treatment by the police – including the experience of police stops – presents a rich source of information for police forces working in these urban centres that can be used to address criminal victimisation against, and police responses to, vulnerable minorities.

There are numerous regional and local channels through which the results of the survey can be disseminated; for example, through the Committee of the Regions and, in particular, specialist networks addressing issues related to minorities and integration – such as the 'European network of cities for local integration policies for migrants' (CLIP), which was established by the European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions (EUROFOUND), along with the FRA's own smaller Local Communities Network (LCN). In addition, the results should be of use to networks that have been established to tackle 'traditional' crime – such as the EU Crime Prevention Network – as the findings highlight the neglected problem of minorities as particularly vulnerable victims of crime, and the particular problem of racist victimisation, which is very pertinent to policing and crime prevention initiatives in urban centres with large minority populations.

One obvious and important target group for which the survey's results should be of particular interest is Equality Bodies. Given that EU-MIDIS included specific questions on awareness of named Equality Bodies, the results provide a rich source of data for these organisations that can serve to inform and support their work. For example, where interviewees showed a low level of awareness of an Equality Body, then this finding can be used to examine resource allocation and/or the effectiveness of existing (where appropriate) complaint procedures – at national level and particularly in those locations where the survey was undertaken – to ensure that vulnerable minorities are better informed about where and how to seek assistance.

The resources that were available to the FRA for EU-MIDIS necessarily limited the locations, sample size and the number of different minority groups for surveying. In response to this, the Agency has made available the survey's questionnaire and technical report – concerning its sampling and methodological approach – to encourage further research with other groups, and in different locations.

EU-MIDIS has produced data that is available for further analysis and interpretation by a number of different stakeholders at EU, national and local level, and in particular is a vital source for those working in cities and towns that were covered in the survey.

A tool for policy makers and practitioners

EU-MIDIS is an important tool for policy makers and practitioners at EU, national and local level for the following reasons:

The results present the first EU-wide comparable data on selected ethnic minorities and immigrants' experiences of discrimination and criminal victimisation, including experiences of policing

- Understanding the extent and nature of fundamental rights violations is a precondition for the development of both effective and targeted policies and action against discrimination and victimisation in the EU.
- The findings from EU-MIDIS are particularly important as they present the first EU-wide comparable data on selected minorities' experiences of discrimination in nine areas of everyday life, criminal victimisation across five crime areas (including racially motivated victimisation), and experiences of policing – based on results from over 23,500 face-to-face respondent interviews.
- As data in most Member States on minorities' experiences of discrimination and criminal victimisation is typically very limited, and, where it exists, cannot be compared between Member States, the results from EU-MIDIS present a unique source of comparable information for the development of evidence-based policy and action.

The results highlight problematic areas with regard to discrimination and criminal victimisation as they impact on different groups and in different EU Member States

- Based on results across the nine areas of discrimination and the five areas of criminal victimisation that were surveyed, the data provides information that pinpoints the most problematic areas of discrimination and criminal victimisation experienced by minorities.
- The results identify which 'aggregate' groups (i.e. those groups that share similar 'background characteristics', such as the 'Roma' or 'Sub-Saharan Africans') experience heightened levels of discrimination and crime victimisation. The report also gives examples of specific groups in particular countries that experience very high levels of discrimination or criminal victimisation. In this way, Member States can compare results between countries where the same aggregate groups were surveyed, and can see selected results for specific groups that were interviewed in individual Member States.

The methodology used is a valuable tool that Member States can apply at national and local level to conduct further research on the extent and nature of discrimination and criminal victimisation against minorities

- The survey shows that it is possible to collect data on minorities' experiences of discrimination and criminal victimisation in all EU Member States. This finding is particularly important for those Member States where data is lacking or inadequate, and where it is often considered too difficult or problematic to conduct research on minority groups in the population.
- As an incentive to further research at Member State level, both the survey questionnaire and the detailed technical report on the survey's methodological and sampling approach are available through the Agency's website so that further research can be undertaken at Member State level. The Agency's research reports to date on specific areas of discrimination experienced by immigrants and ethnic minorities, including recognised national minorities, provide a basis with which to explore the context and situation on the ground regarding discrimination experiences in specific areas.¹⁸³

¹⁸³ http://fra.europa.eu/fraWebsite/products/publications_reports/publications_reports_en.htm

- The survey provides only the first inroad to identifying problems that require further investigation and targeted responses at Member State level. Its findings offer evidence about which groups and which areas need to be tackled most urgently. As a follow up to the survey, in depth qualitative research could provide answers about the causes of discrimination.

The results call for a reassessment of barriers to anonymous data collection on ethnicity

- A number of Member States present barriers to the collection of data disaggregated by ‘ethnicity’ or ‘immigrant background’ as being in breach of legislation forbidding the collection of sensitive personal data. Yet in the Racial Equality Directive, to which all Member States are bound, the preamble states that national practice in some Member States ‘may provide in particular for indirect discrimination to be established by any means including on the basis of statistical evidence.’¹⁸⁴ In this regard it is clear that the Directive supports anonymous statistical data collection – in the form of survey instruments where the individual cannot be identified – as a legitimate means for collecting information on discrimination.
- In support of the idea of data collection on ethnicity, the survey provides important evidence that many people from immigrant and ethnic minority backgrounds were willing to take part in the survey *on the basis of their immigrant or ethnic minority background*.
- More tellingly, a question in the survey asked the following: ‘Would you be in favour or opposed to providing, on an anonymous basis, information about your ethnic origin, as part of a census, if that could help to combat discrimination in [COUNTRY NAME]?’ – In sum, 65% of all those interviewed replied that they would be willing to do so.

The results present reliable and objective evidence of the ‘situation on the ground’

- The results are based on objective and extensive fieldwork evidence, gathered by an EU Agency, which has been collected directly from groups that are vulnerable to discrimination.

- The results present an *objective* ‘bottom-up’ approach to identifying problems as they exist in daily life. This contrasts with many initiatives to address the extent and nature of discrimination and victimisation, which either adopt a ‘top-down’ approach to data gathering that is reliant on limited evidence available from official government sources, or which is based on reports from non-governmental organisations that is usually collected in a sporadic and non-systematic way as a reflection of often limited resources.

The results provide evidence for reviewing the implementation of existing anti-discrimination legislation and policies, including legislation in the field of racist crime

- The survey’s findings can be read in the light of existing legislation and policy developments at EU and Member State level to assess whether they are having an impact on the ground, and to identify areas that need attention.
- At the level of Community legislation in the field of non-discrimination, the results provide for a critical reading of the need for effective implementation of the Racial Equality Directive (2000/43/EC), which has established a legal framework for combating discrimination across different areas – such as employment and access to and supply of goods and services – on the grounds of racial or ethnic origin.
- With respect to the field of racist criminal victimisation, the results present valuable insights about the extent and nature of racist victimisation as collected in the survey, and importantly indicate the extent of unreported crime. In this way the survey serves to underline the need to implement and effectively enforce provisions under Council Framework Decision 2008/913/JHA on combating racism and xenophobia.

The results show significant under-reporting of discrimination and criminal victimisation providing evidence for the need to review the operation of current complaints mechanisms

¹⁸⁴ Council Directive (2000/43/EC), preamble, paragraph 15.

- A particularly important result from the survey is the extent to which experiences of discrimination and criminal victimisation go unreported. These results serve to question the effectiveness of current mechanisms for registering complaints, and call for a review of resources and services that have been established to receive, register and respond to complaints of discrimination and criminal victimisation.
- In the area of discrimination, the results show the need for a critical appraisal of vulnerable minorities' knowledge about available complaints mechanisms, and indicate the need for a review of the work undertaken by and resources made available to Equality Bodies, which are required to be established under the Racial Equality

Directive, in an effort to support their work. At the same time, the findings on reporting criminal victimisation show that minorities have little faith in current policing practices as a means of redress, and therefore raise concerns about the extent to which legislation, such as the Council Framework Decision on combating racism and xenophobia, can be effective if reporting of racist crimes remains low.

Further reporting from EU-MIDIS

This report is only one in a series of steps to manage the results from the survey. It sits together with a number of 'Data in Focus' reports that provide a summary overview of survey results focusing on key themes and recommendations. The first two reports in the 'Data in Focus' series were on the Roma and Muslim respondents from the survey, and will be accompanied in due course by other 'Data in Focus' reports on multiple discrimination, rights awareness and law enforcement – to name just three. An introduction to the survey with some key results is available too, called 'EU-MIDIS at a Glance'. The Agency also proposes to present data from the survey in the form of interactive web-based maps, which will allow users to select results from the dataset concerning questions and levels of analysis that are not included in published material.

In addition to the above - the survey's questionnaire and technical report are available through the Agency's website: <http://fra.europa.eu/eu-midis>

European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights

**EU-MIDIS
European Union Minorities and Discrimination Survey**

Main Results Report

Design: red hot 'n' cool, Vienna

2009 - 276 pp, - 21 x 29.7 cm

ISBN-13: 978-92-9192-461-5

DOI: 10.2811/32815

TK-73-09-226-EN-C

A great deal of information on the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights is available on the Internet.
It can be accessed through the FRA website (<http://fra.europa.eu>).

© European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, 2009
Reproduction is authorised, except for commercial purposes, provided the source is acknowledged.

ISBN 978-92-9192-461-5



9 789291 924615

TK-73-09-226-EN-C

VISIT:

fra.europa.eu/eu-midis

SEE ALSO:

- EU-MIDIS AT A GLANCE
- DATA IN FOCUS 1: ROMA
- DATA IN FOCUS 2: MUSLIMS
- TECHNICAL REPORT (ON-LINE)
- SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE (ON-LINE)