



**CRIME SURVEY FOR ENGLAND AND WALES (CSEW)
DATASET USER GUIDE:
CHILDREN AGED 10 TO 15**

2009/10 – 2013/14

**CRIME STATISTICS AND ANALYSIS
OFFICE FOR NATIONAL STATISTICS**

Contents

Chapter 1	Background to the CSEW extension to children aged 10 to 15	3
Chapter 2	Methodology of the CSEW 10 to 15s survey	5
	2.1 Sample design	5
	2.2 Fieldwork	5
	2.3 Questionnaire	5
	2.4 Time periods covered	7
	2.5 Measures of crime	7
	2.6 Offence coding.....	8
	2.7 Classifying incidents reported by children aged 10 to 15	8
Chapter 3	CSEW 10 to 15s survey datasets	11
	3.1 Datasets available	11
	3.2 Variable names.....	12
	3.3 Derived variables	12
	3.4 Don't know and refusal codes.....	12
Chapter 4	Analysis of CSEW 10 to 15s survey data	13
	4.1 Individual-based analysis.....	13
	4.2 Incident-based analysis	13
	4.3 Incidence rates	13
	4.4 Prevalence rates.....	14
	4.5 Repeat and multiple victimisation	14
	4.6 Weighting.....	15
	4.7 Statistical significance.....	16
Chapter 5	Published data from the CSEW 10 to 15s survey	17
Chapter 6	Methodological limitations of the CSEW 10 to 15s survey	18
	6.1 Non-response	18
	6.2 Recall.....	18
	6.3 Unwillingness to report	18
	6.4 Definitions of crime	19
Appendix 1	CSEW 10 to 15s survey offence codes	20
Appendix 2	CSEW datasets available	22
Appendix 3	Offence groups	23
Bibliography		28

Chapter 1: Background to the CSEW extension for children aged 10 to 15

The Crime Survey for England and Wales (CSEW), formerly known as the British Crime Survey (BCS), is a face-to-face victimisation survey in which people resident in households in England and Wales are asked about their experiences of a range of crimes in the 12 months prior to the interview. Respondents to the survey are also asked about their attitudes towards different crime-related issues such as the police and criminal justice system, and perceptions of crime and anti-social behaviour.

The CSEW is a large, nationally representative sample survey of the population resident in households in England and Wales. For the crime types and population it covers, the CSEW provides a better reflection of the extent of crime than police recorded statistics, because it includes crimes that are not reported to, or recorded by, the police.

Following recommendations in two related reviews of crime statistics ([Smith, 2006](#); [Statistics Commission, 2006](#)) the CSEW was extended to children aged 10 to 15 from January 2009.

Before extending the survey, the Home Office (who held responsibility for the CSEW prior to April 2012) commissioned methodological advice on the feasibility of extending the survey to both children and those living in group residences ([Pickering et al., 2008](#)) and subsequently undertook a National Statistics [consultation](#) following the two reviews on plans to extend the survey to children. Following the consultation an extensive period of development and testing work was undertaken throughout 2008 before live data collection started in January 2009 ([Fitzpatrick et al., 2010](#)).

The primary aim of extending the CSEW to children was to provide estimates of the levels of crime experienced by children and their risk of personal victimisation. The survey also provides a rich source of data to assist in understanding the nature and circumstances of crimes experienced by children aged 10 to 15.

Preliminary results from the first calendar year were published in 2010 ([Millard and Flatley](#)) and following a [user consultation](#) these statistics were refined further. The results for 2010/11 were published in two <http://dera.ioe.ac.uk/15752/> reports ([Chaplin et al., 2011](#) and [Smith et al., 2012](#)). The questionnaire was refined again for the 2011/12 survey. The results for 2011/12 were published by the Office for National Statistics in July 2012 ([Crime Statistics, Period Ending March 2012](#)) and have been published on a quarterly basis since then.

The changes to the questions and definitions used should be borne in mind when interpreting the figures. Methodological differences also mean that direct comparisons cannot be made between the adult and child data ([Millard and Flatley, 2010](#)).

All 10 to 15 year old CSEW estimates presented in the figures and tables in the ONS crime statistics publications are based on weighted data; that is, results obtained from surveying a sample of the population of England and Wales are scaled-up to represent the entire population.

Following the 2011 Census, mid-2002 to mid-2012 population estimates for England and Wales were revised. These new 2011 Census-based population estimates have been incorporated into the weighting of all published 10 to 15 year old CSEW data from 2009/10 onwards and have led to revisions of CSEW estimates of incidents of crime. For the data supplied to the UK Data Archive these changes have only be applied to the 2013/14 dataset; revisions to previous archived datasets will be completed in 2015.

A methodological note '[Presentational and Methodological Improvements to National Statistics on the Crime Survey for England and Wales](#)' has been published which provides more detail about the weighting updates to the CSEW, and the impact of these improvements on the CSEW time-series.

There is also a useful [User Guide to Crime Statistics for England and Wales](#) which complements this document and provides detailed information on the datasets used to compile crime statistics. It is designed to be a useful reference guide with explanatory notes regarding the updates, issues, and classifications which are crucial to the production and presentation of the crime statistics.

Chapter 2: Methodology of the CSEW 10 to 15s survey

2.1 Sample design

The Crime Survey for England and Wales (CSEW) sample of children was designed to be representative of the population of children aged 10 to 15 resident in households in England and Wales. The sample itself is obtained from those households already selected to take part in the main adult survey.

In each household containing a child in the eligible age range, the interviewer randomly selects one child for interview following the completion of the main adult interview.

Interviews with a total of 2,933 children aged 10 to 15 were conducted during 2011/12. Compared with other similar household surveys the CSEW has managed to maintain a high response rate. The response rate for the core survey in 2013/14 was 75 per cent. For the children's survey, 68 per cent of children within households responding to the main CSEW participated. The true response rate (taking into account first stage non-response to the main CSEW) was in the region of 50 per cent.

For more information on response rates, see [TNS-BMRB](#), 2013

2.2 Fieldwork

After obtaining informed consent from the parent/guardian and the selected child, child respondents are interviewed, as in the main CSEW, using a combination of computer-assisted personal interviewing (CAPI) and computer-assisted self-interviewing (CASI).

The children's questionnaire takes, on average, around 20 minutes to complete.

2.3 Questionnaire

The CSEW children's questionnaire consists of a core set of modules asked of the whole sample, a set of modules asked only of different sub-samples, and a self-completion module.

The questionnaire for children is modelled on the personal victimisation module (otherwise known as the victim module, see [TNS-BMRB](#), 2013) of the adult questionnaire with the expectation of being able to code incidents to offences on a broadly comparable basis. Like the main survey, the children aged 10 to 15 survey excludes crimes often termed as victimless (for example, possession of drugs) and as a survey that asks people whether they have experienced victimisation, homicides cannot be included.

CASI is used to administer the self-completion section of the questionnaire that covers topics respondents might not be comfortable answering in the presence of an interviewer or their parent or guardian. Audio-CASI is also available for those respondents who might otherwise have found the self-completion module problematic due to reading difficulties.

The children aged 10 to 15 survey is not designed to collect information on sexual offences¹; the small numbers of sexual offences reported by respondents are referred to the Home Office.

Development and testing work showed it was necessary to adapt the existing questions asked of adults to make them suitable for children.

In addition, to reduce respondent burden, and to reflect that some incidents reported by children may be considered relatively minor, in 2009/10 and 2010/11, detailed information about an incident was not collected if:

- the incident happened at school; and
- the offender² was a pupil at the victim's school; and
- the offender did not use a weapon³; and
- the victim was not physically hurt in any way.

Incidents which met these criteria had a limited amount of information collected to enable classification to a high-level crime category and so it was not possible to assign specific offence codes within the appropriate high-level classification according to standard CSEW procedures. As a result, these cases have been designated as 'unspecified' offences. Without an offence code it is not possible to tell which detailed crime type the offence would be classified as. For example, data on whether the stolen item was being carried by the respondent at the time of a theft were not collected, so it is not feasible to determine whether this would be a *theft from the person* or *other theft of personal property*. However, because the respondent reported that there was intent to commit an offence, these incidents are still considered offences under law.

'Unspecified' offences do not fall within the scope of the 'Preferred measure' because the detailed information above was not collected.

In 2011/12 this was changed and full information was collected about all incidents of crime with a reduction in the number of incidents asked about to balance data collection needs with respondent burden. This means that the data are not directly comparable over the three time periods.

It should be noted that questions asked of adults about household crimes, such as burglary or vehicle-related crime, are not included in the children aged 10 to 15 survey as these are already captured from the adult interview. The small number of household incidents reported by children are given household level offence codes but are not included in any further analysis. As such, the composition of crime covered in the children aged 10 to 15 survey differs from the existing adult survey and this should be borne in mind when analysing the data.

In addition to questions about experience of crime, the survey also gathers information on a number of crime-related topics such as perceptions and attitudes to the police, anti-social behaviour, crime prevention and personal security.

¹ The adult survey collects information about sexual offences in a separate self-completion section which is not asked of children aged 10 to 15.

² Where there was more than one offender, detailed information was collected if any of the offenders were not pupils at the respondent's school.

³ A 'weapon' constitutes any item that was considered to be a weapon by the victim; this includes knives, sticks, stones, bottles.

2.4 Time periods covered

Like the adult CSEW, child respondents are asked about crime in the 12 months prior to interview.

Since respondents are interviewed at different times within each month, they are asked about experiences of crime in the current month plus the 12 months prior to interview. Crimes experienced in the 'interview' month are excluded from the 12-month reference period used for analysis. Hence, for the 2013/14 children aged 10 to 15 CSEW, the reference period includes incidents experienced by respondents between April 2012 and February 2014. The centre point of the period for reporting crime is March 2013, the only month to be included in all respondents' reference periods.

2.5 Measures of crime

The CSEW extension to children provides information about personal crimes experienced by children aged 10 to 15. Personal crimes relate to all crimes against the individual and only relate to the respondents' own experience (not that of other people in the household). An example of a personal crime would be an assault.

There are three stages to the questionnaire for measuring experiences of victimisation amongst children aged 10 to 15. First, respondents are asked a series of screener questions on the main part of the questionnaire to assess if they have been a victim of crime. Screener questions do not ask respondents if they have been a victim of explicit crime types, but ask about different experiences, such as whether the respondent has had anything stolen in the last 12 months. This design ensures that all incidents of personal crime within the scope of the children's survey, including relatively minor ones, are included.

Following the screener questions, those who have been victimised are asked a number of short questions about the nature of their victimisation in order to identify relatively low-level incidents. This section of the questionnaire is called the mini victim module and identifies incidents which are minor in nature such as aggressive behaviour resulting in no injury (pushing and shoving), other thefts of low value items (stationery, food), threats (not involving a weapon) and damage to belongings (stationery). The mini victim module was incorporated into the design of the children's questionnaire following questionnaire testing in order to reduce respondent burden – one of the recommendations of the methodological advice on the feasibility of extending the survey had been that the survey not be longer than 20 minutes on average. Only basic information is collected about these types of relatively low-level incidents. Full details of experiences of personal crime are then recorded in the personal victimisation modules of the questionnaire.

Most incidents reported are one-off, single occurrences, but in a minority of cases, respondents may have been victimised a number of times in succession. In these cases respondents are asked whether they consider these incidents to be a 'series'; that is "the same thing, done under the same circumstances and probably by the same people". Where incidents are determined to be in a series, the number of incidents is recorded, but with only one personal victimisation module being completed based on the most recent incident. CSEW estimates only include the first five incidents in this 'series' of victimisations in the count of crime.

The restriction to the first five incidents in a series has been applied since the CSEW began in order to ensure that estimates are not affected by a very small number of respondents who report an extremely high number of incidents and which are highly variable between survey years. The inclusion of such victims could undermine the ability to measure trends consistently. This sort of capping is in line with other surveys of crime and other topics. Prevalence rates are not affected by this procedure (see [TNS-BMRB](#), 2013 for information on the measurement of series data).

2.6 Offence coding

Based on information collected and processed from the personal victimisation modules, specially trained coders determine whether what has been reported constitutes a crime, and if so, what offence code should be assigned to the crime. All incidents are allocated a core offence code except the relatively low-level incidents recorded on mini victim modules which are allocated non-core offence codes. Incidents which met the criteria for a mini victim module have a limited amount of information collected which enables classification to a high-level crime category.

Without detailed information it is not possible to assign specific offence codes within the appropriate high-level classification according to standard CSEW procedures. As a result, these cases are designated as ‘unspecified’ offences. Without an offence code it is not possible to tell which detailed crime type the offence would be classified as. For example, data on whether the stolen item was being carried by the respondent at the time of a theft were not collected, so it is not feasible to determine whether this would be a theft from the person or other theft of personal property. However, because the respondent reported that there was intent to commit an offence, these incidents are still considered offences under law.

The CSEW offence coding system ensures that incidents are recorded as accurately as possible. A full list of core and non-core offence codes for the CSEW children’s extension appears in Appendix 1. For more information on offence coding for the 10 to 15s survey, see [TNS-BMRB](#), 2013.

Final offence codes may not necessarily correspond with the screener questions which lead to information collected in the personal victimisation modules: for example, an incident elicited from the threat screener may turn out to be a case of common assault.

Children aged 10 to 15 crime statistics are produced from the offence-coded data and presented as incidence or prevalence rates, based on data about incidents or victims (see Chapter 3).

2.7 Classifying incidents reported by children aged 10 to 15

Respondents to the CSEW children’s survey report a wide variety of incidents with varying degrees of severity. As part of the development process to extend the CSEW to those aged 10 to 15, the existing CSEW offence coding system was used to code incidents reported by children. Four approaches to counting crime were then published ([Millard and Flatley](#), 2010) and following a [user consultation](#), two approaches were favoured with regard to estimating levels of victimisation among children: the ‘Broad measure’ and ‘Preferred measure’ approaches.⁴

⁴ The remaining two approaches (‘All in law outside school’ and ‘Victim perceived’) may still be derived by users based on existing variables on the dataset.

Broad measure (formerly ‘All in law’)

The ‘Broad measure’ (formerly known as the ‘All in law’ approach) is the widest-possible count but will include minor offences between children and family members that would not normally be treated as criminal matters.

Preferred measure (formerly ‘Norms-based’)

The ‘Preferred measure’ (formerly known as the ‘Norms-based’ approach) is a more focused method which takes into account factors identified as important in determining the severity of an incident but will still include incidents of a serious nature even if they took place at school. These factors were identified from the findings of qualitative research with children that informed the development of the children’s survey.

The ‘Preferred measure’ includes all offences where:

- the offender⁵ was not known (for example, stranger, tradesman, pupil from another school); or
- the offender⁶ was known, but aged 16 or over and not a family member (for example, neighbour, older friend, teacher)⁶; or
- the offender⁶ was known and either a family member or aged under 16 (for example, parent, sibling, school-friend) and there was visible injury or theft or damage involving a ‘high value’ item⁷; or
- a weapon⁸ was involved.

In 2009/10 and 2010/11 a lower level of detail was collected if:

- the incident happened at school; and
- the offender⁹ was a pupil at the respondent’s school; and
- the offender did not use a weapon⁹; and
- the victim was not physically hurt in any way.

This was to reduce respondent burden and to reflect that some incidents reported by children may be considered relatively minor. Incidents which met these criteria had a limited amount of information collected to enable classification to a high-level crime category and so it was not possible to assign specific offence codes within the appropriate high-level classification according to standard CSEW procedures. As a result, these cases have been designated as ‘unspecified’ offences. Without an offence code it is not possible to tell which detailed crime type the offence would be classified as. For example, data on whether the stolen item was being carried by the respondent at the time of a theft were not collected, so it is not feasible to determine whether this would be ‘Theft from the person’ or ‘Other theft of personal property’. However, because the

⁵ If there was more than one offender, the incident was included if just one of the offenders matched this criteria.

⁶ The inclusion of offences committed by a known non-family member irrespective of the nature of the offence represents a change to the approach used for the ‘Norms-based’ measure that was previously published in [Millard and Flatley](#), 2010. This recognises the importance of age in addition to relationship in classifying the severity of an incident.

⁷ This excludes items such as pens, stationery, food, toys, cards, cigarettes.

⁸ A ‘weapon’ constitutes any item that was considered to be a weapon by the victim; this includes knives, sticks, stones, bottles, etc.

⁹ Where there was more than one offender, detailed information was collected if any of the offenders were not pupils at the respondent’s school.

respondent reported that there was intent to commit an offence, these incidents are still considered offences under law.

‘Unspecified’ offences do not fall within the scope of the ‘Preferred measure’ because detailed information on the full victim form was not collected.

In 2011/12 this was changed and full information was collected about all incidents of crime. This means that the ‘unspecified’ categories are not derivable and the data are not directly comparable over the three time periods. In 2009/10 and 2010/11 children aged 10 to 15 were asked detailed information about up to four crimes, from 2011/12 this was reduced to three.

A minor revision has been made to the calculation of the preferred measure in the 2012/13 survey relating to the classification of incidents in terms of the intention to commit an offence and whether the incident should be classed as serious or non-serious. The need for this revision was identified when, during a broader programme of work to reweight survey estimates, a failure to implement a previous methodological change was uncovered. These changes had the effect of reducing estimates for the preferred measure (in particular, for personal theft and vandalism). Revised estimates have been produced for the 2012/13 CSEW, and as a result some figures in the preferred measure may differ from those that were previously published.

Development of the ‘Preferred measure’ approach to producing a total count of crime from the incidents reported by children is described in detail in Chapter 8 of [Fitzpatrick et al.](#), 2010.

Chapter 3: CSEW 10 to 15s survey dataset

The Crime Survey for England and Wales (CSEW) children aged 10 to 15 dataset is large and complex but provides a rich source of data for analysis. However, it is important that anyone undertaking analysis understands the structure of the data. Listed below are some general points about the data and how Office for National Statistics (ONS) analysts use it.

3.1 Datasets available

End-user Licence analysts can download the following CSEW children's datasets from the UK Data Service:

- Child non-victim form; and
- Child victim form.

The victim form dataset contains information collected from the full and mini-victim modules (long and shortened victimisation modules). The non-victim form dataset contains information collected from the rest of the interview (excluding information from victimisation modules).

Each case on the non-victim form refers to an individual respondent, whereas each case on the victim form refers to an individual incident reported by a respondent.

Each individual respondent has a unique case identifier '**rowlabel**' consisting of an eight digit number. This identifier is the same on each data file on which information is held about the respondent and allows files to be combined by matching on this variable. The children's dataset includes key demographic information about the household from the adult survey. But it is also possible to match the CSEW children's dataset with the adult respondent in the same household from the CSEW adult survey.

Data from the self-completion modules and some low-level geographic variables have been removed from these datasets. Analysts who need to access these data for their research can request access under the terms of the ONS Approved Researcher method through the UK Data Service. These requests will be sent to the ONS for approval. The datasets available under this procedure are:

- Child self-completion dataset¹⁰; and
- Low-level geographic variables.

See Appendix 2 for a more detailed list of the different child datasets available along with the level of access assigned to them.

¹⁰ This includes responses to questions about bullying, street gangs, carrying knives, truancy, exclusion from school, cannabis and alcohol use.

3.2 Variable names

CSEW variable names can be found in the questionnaire alongside the question to which they refer.

3.3 Derived variables

In addition to the questions directly asked of respondents, the CSEW data files also include derived variables. There are two sets of derived variables; those produced by the survey contractor (can be found in [TNS-BMRB](#), 2013) and those produced by Home Office/ONS analysts. The derived variables produced by Home Office/ONS analysts have been included on the children's datasets so researchers can replicate the analysis produced in various publications.

3.4 Don't know and refusal codes

Respondents are not usually explicitly given the options 'don't know' or 'refusal'. However, for every question respondents may say they do not know or refuse to answer and these are valid responses. The code for refusal is '8' for code frames up to 7 and '98' for code frames up to 97. The code for don't know is '9' for code frames up to 7 and '99' for code frames up to 97.

In most Home Office/ONS analysis, refusal codes are excluded. 'Don't know' codes are also usually excluded unless there is interest in these responses, for example in the case of attitudinal questions.

After the survey went live in January 2009 and during the testing of the existing CSEW Offence Coding system with the children's data, some minor changes were made to some items in the questionnaire (questionnaire routing changes, for example). For some cases where this resulted in it not being possible to obtain valid data for some questionnaire items due to these changes, responses for these items have been coded as '-1'.

Chapter 4: Analysis of CSEW 10 to 15s survey data

There are two main types of analysis that can be carried out using Crime Survey for England and Wales (CSEW) children's victimisation data: individual-based analysis and incident-based analysis. Each of these types of analysis needs to take into account the appropriate weighting of the data.

It should be noted that methodological differences between the adult and child survey mean that direct comparisons cannot be made between estimates obtained from each data source. However, while the questions asked and levels of detail collected in the children's survey differ from the adult survey there is a similar approach to the coding of incidents to offences in law.

4.1 Individual-based analysis

Individual-based analysis is carried out on the non-victim form to produce incidence and prevalence rates of crime, and also when the intention is to make statements about the characteristics, attitudes or experiences of children in the sample. Analysis of attitudinal questions is individual-based, as is analysis of victims of personal crimes (such as assault). All individual-based analysis should be weighted by '**c11cindivwgt**' ('cindivwgt' between 2009/10 and 2012/13 surveys).

4.2 Incident-based analysis

Incident-based analysis is carried out on the victim form when the intention is to make statements about characteristics of incidents of crime, such as the timing, location or perceived seriousness of offences. All incident-based analysis should be weighted by '**c11cweighti**' ('cweighti' between 2009/10 and 2012/13 surveys).

Although incidents occurring outside of England and Wales are given a valid offence code, only those incidents which occurred within England and Wales should be retained. This should be done by selecting cases based on responses to the variable '**cwherhap**'.

4.3 Incidence rates

For personal crime, incidence rates give the number of crimes experienced per 1,000 children aged 10 to 15 from 2011/12 onwards (per 10,000 children in 2009/10 and 2010/11).

To calculate an incident rate, the number of incidents experienced by respondents is aggregated together for each crime type. This is either one incident per victim module¹¹, or where one of these victim modules contains a 'series', it is the number of incidents in the series (capped at five). The number of incidents for each respondent is then multiplied by 1,000 (or 10,000 in 2009/10 and 2010/11) and added to the non-victim form. A mean of this number produces the incidence rate for

¹¹ For the children aged 10 to 15 survey, respondents completed a maximum of up to four full or six mini victim modules.

a particular offence type. See Appendix 3 for an explanation of the variables used to calculate incidence rates. Incidence variables for each of the offence groups are included on the non-victim form dataset and the variable names include the suffix ‘_i_brd’ or ‘_i_prf’.

Example¹² – producing rates per 1,000 children aged 10 to 15

On a dataset of 4,000 respondents, if 100 respondents have each reported 3 incidents of assault, the total number of assaults is 300. When this is multiplied by 1,000, the mean value across the whole dataset is 75 (300,000/4,000). This means that there are 75 assaults per 1,000 children aged 10 to 15.

The overall number of incidents can be estimated for England and Wales based on the incident rate and using estimates of the populations of children aged 10 to 15 in England and Wales. For the financial year April 2013 to March 2014 the population estimate of 3,763,400 children aged 10 to 15 was used to provide estimates of the number of incidents.

4.4 Prevalence rates

Prevalence rates give the proportion of the population who were victims of an offence once or more.

Unlike incidence rates, prevalence rates only take account of whether a child aged 10 to 15 was a victim of a specific crime once or more during the reference period, not the number of times they were victimised. Respondents are thus designated as victims or non-victims. The proportion of respondents who are victims provides the prevalence rate, equivalent to the risk of being a victim of crime. See Appendix 3 for an explanation of the variables used to calculate prevalence rates. Prevalence variables for each of the offence groups are included on the non-victim form dataset and the variable names include the suffix ‘_p_brd’ or ‘_p_prf’.

The number of victims of personal crimes can also be estimated for England and Wales: the proportion of children aged 10 to 15 that were victims should be multiplied by the total number of children aged 10 to 15 in England and Wales.

4.5 Repeat and multiple victimisation

The CSEW children’s datasets contain variables which allow users to examine rates of repeat and multiple victimisation.

Multiple victimisation is the estimated percentage of children aged 10 to 15 who have been a victim of more than one personal crime.

Repeat victimisation (a subset of multiple victimisation) is defined as being a victim of the same type of crime more than once in the last 12 months (for example, vandalism). Levels of repeat victimisation account for differences between incidence rates and prevalence rates. For instance, high levels of repeat victimisation will be reflected in relatively lower prevalence rates compared with incidence rates. Repeat victimisation variables for each offence group are included on the

¹² Note that this example uses unweighted figures. Analysis should always be weighted appropriately.

non-victim form dataset and the variable names include the suffixes ‘_r_brd’ / ‘_r2_brd’ or ‘_r_prf’ / ‘_r2_prf’.

4.6 Weighting

Two types of weighting are used to ensure that the sample of children is representative of the population of those aged 10 to 15 living in households in England and Wales.

First, the raw data are weighted to compensate for unequal probabilities of selection. A review of the CSEW by survey methodology experts at ONS and the National Centre for Social Research (NatCen) recommended that the calibration weighting method be adopted for the CSEW ([Lynn and Elliot, 2000](#)). The weighting is designed to make adjustments for known differentials in response rates between different regions and different age by sex subgroups and also households with different age and sex composition. The procedure gives different weights to different household types based on their age/sex composition in such a way that the weighted distribution of individuals in the responding households matches the known distribution in the population as a whole and also matches the known distribution of the regional population.

The weights are generated using an algorithm that minimises the differences between the weights implied by sampling and the final weights subject to the weighted data meeting the population controls. They are based on calibration of population figures provided by the ONS Labour Force Survey (LFS). Calibration weights were applied from the 1996 CSEW onwards using CALMAR (a SAS-based macro); since 2006/07 the CSEW has used ‘g-Calib’ within a new SPSS-based data processing system (the weights produced by ‘g-Calib’ are the same as those from CALMAR).

For the children’s survey an additional adjustment was made for possible non-response bias through weighting. The weighting strategy used information about the:

- sampled address, such as type of area;
- household and adult respondent collected during the main interview; and
- the age and sex of the selected child (again collected during the main interview).

CHAID (Chi-Square Automatic Interaction Detector) analysis and logistic regression were used to test which variables were most strongly associated with responses and to develop a non-response model. Once weighting classes were derived, non-response weights were calculated as the inverse of the probability of response within each class. The child response weights were then multiplied by the weights for the household (to take into account probability of household selection) to give an overall weight for non-response at the child and household levels. Calibration weights were then generated in the same way as they are for the main survey.

The individual design weights are calibrated to produce the individual weight ‘**c11cindiwt**’ (‘cindiwt’ between 2009/10 and 2012/13 surveys), which is used for individual-based analysis (attitudinal questions and estimates of personal crime rates) and the incident weight ‘**c11cweighti**’ (‘cweighti’ between 2009/10 and 2012/13 surveys) which is used for incident-based analysis.

4.7 Statistical significance

CSEW estimates are based on a representative sample of children aged 10 to 15 resident in households in England and Wales. A sample, as used in the CSEW children's survey, is a small-scale representation of the population from which it is drawn.

Any sample survey may produce estimates that differ from the figures that would have been obtained if the whole population had been interviewed. The size of this difference depends on the sample size, the size and variability of the estimate, and the design of the survey. The number of cases upon which analysis is based is important as it influences the precision (standard error) of the estimates. CSEW estimates where the unweighted base is less than 50 cases are not generally published.

Because of this variation, changes in estimates between survey years or between population subgroups may occur by chance. In other words, the change may simply be due to which children were randomly selected for interview. It is possible to measure whether this is likely to be the case using standard statistical tests and conclude whether differences are likely to be due to chance or represent a real difference. Analysts should be familiar with how to carry out such tests before conducting analysis on the CSEW children's dataset.

However, please note that no statistical assessment of the change in levels of victimisation between any of the surveys from 2009/10 onwards has currently been made. This is due to the developmental nature of the survey and estimates, which have been subject to further refinement during the periods presented.

Chapter 5: Published data from the CSEW 10 to 15s survey

Due to refinements as part of the development of the survey and presentation of estimates, there have been some amendments to the presentation of figures from the 2009/10 and 2010/11 Crime Surveys for England and Wales (CSEW) ([Chaplin et al., 2011](#)) compared with the first experimental statistics ([Millard and Flatley, 2010](#)):

- For an incident to be a crime in law there must be an element of intent apparent. For example, for an incident to be considered theft there must be intent to permanently deprive someone of their property. The information captured around 'intent' has improved as the survey has developed due to increased focus through questions and interviewer and coder training. Published figures from the 2009/10 and 2010/11 CSEW exclude incidents where the respondent perceived no intent from the perpetrator to hurt, steal or damage¹³.
- Offences of 'Theft from a dwelling', 'Theft from outside a dwelling', 'Bicycle theft' and 'Vandalism' are designated as 'household' offences for adults on the CSEW (respondents reply on behalf of the household). However, they are presented in [Chaplin et al., 2011](#), as offences against children when the property stolen or damaged was reported by the respondent as solely belonging to them. This broadens the scope of personal victimisation which may result in some double-counting of offences with the adult survey (the extent to which this happens will be evaluated in the future).

Question changes during development of the questionnaire in the first three years of the survey should be borne in mind when interpreting the figures. While data presented since the 2011/12 survey year should be comparable, it is difficult to discern a trend as the total number of incidents has shown small fluctuations across the available time series. For this reason no percentage change or statistical significance is presented for any year.

¹³ Each crime type has a specific question relating to intent (e.g. intent to permanently deprive in the case of a theft). However, it is not possible to apply the simple criterion of excluding cases of a certain crime type with no evidence of intent to robbery as this offence involves both threat or violence and theft.

Chapter 6: Methodological limitations of the CSEW 10 to 15s survey

It should be noted that the figures derived from the Crime Survey for England and Wales (CSEW) are estimates. As with any sample survey, the CSEW estimates are subject to sampling error and a range of other methodological limitations.

6.1 Non-response

As in any voluntary survey, the 10-15s CSEW is subject to non-response error. Non-response has implications for the measurement of crime if non-respondents have different experiences of victimisation to respondents.

As well as using the same calibration weighting procedure to account for differing rates of non-response between people of different sex, ages and regions amongst adult respondents (see the 'Weighting' section in Chapter 4), the CSEW children's survey also incorporates additional adjustment for non-response by using a model based on case-level response propensities derived from auxiliary data available about each sampled address in the children's survey (through, for example, the age and sex of the selected child respondent).

To account for non-response all CSEW analysis should be appropriately weighted.

6.2 Recall

The CSEW asks respondents to recall their experiences of crime in the previous 12 months. The CSEW measure of crime is thus dependent on respondents' ability to accurately remember their experiences in the reference period. The accuracy of CSEW estimates could be affected by recall if a respondent simply forgets a relevant incident, reports an incident that occurred outside the reference period as having happened within the reference period or fails to report an incident that occurred within the reference period because they thought it happened outside the reference period.

Furthermore, previous research suggests that children are at a higher risk of victimisation than adults but that they are also frequently the victim of low-level incidents. It may well be that given the number of incidents that children are likely to be victims of that they may not be able to recall all of these incidents when asked.

6.3 Unwillingness to report

Respondents may be unwilling to disclose victimisation experiences in a face-to-face interview setting. The circumstances of the interview may have a greater influence on the children's survey where the child's parent or guardian has to be present in the home in order that the survey can be

completed; such is the mode of administration of the CSEW children's survey that estimates of sexual abuse cannot be obtained using the household survey design.

Self-completion modules are used to collect sensitive information which alleviates this problem to some extent.

6.4 Definitions of crime

Incidents which are legally offences may not be reported to the survey if the respondent does not view them as such. In an attempt to overcome this problem the CSEW screener questions ask whether the respondent has experienced certain types of events. They do not refer to 'crimes', use legal terminology or refer to specific offences. The definitional problem is particularly relevant to minor incidents and some forms of violence. Moreover, different social groups may have different perceptions of what does and does not constitute an incident.

Appendix 1: CSEW 10 to 15s survey offence codes

The children's Crime Survey for England and Wales (CSEW) is designed to collect information about personal victimisation among children aged 10 to 15. The purpose and design of the survey is such that it is not suitable for collecting information on sexual victimisation.

However, children responding to the survey do report small numbers of household and sexually motivated incidents. Household victimisation includes those incidents where any or all members of the household may be regarded as victims. Household-level incidents are coded with existing offence codes but also some new codes specific to the children's questionnaire. Incidents with a sexual motivation or including a sexual element are coded with the corresponding offence codes before then being referred to the Home Office on a case-by-case basis. Sexual offences reported by children are not included in the analysis to calculate estimates of incidence and prevalence of victimisation for children.

Valid core offence codes

Category	Code	Description
Assault	11	Serious wounding
	12	Other wounding
	13	Common assault
Attempted assault	21	Attempted assault
Sexual offences	31	Rape
	32	Serious wounding with a sexual motive
	33	Other wounding with a sexual motive
	34	Attempted rape
	35	Indecent assault
Personal theft	41	Robbery
	42	Attempted robbery
	43	Snatch theft from the person
	44	Other theft from the person
	45	Attempted theft from the person
Theft	67	Other theft
Attempted theft	73	Other attempted theft
Vandalism*	801	Arson to a motor vehicle (10-15s only)
	802	Criminal damage to a motor vehicle (10-15s only)
	803	Arson to the home (10-15s only)
	804	Criminal damage to the home (10-15s only)

	805	Arson to personal property (10-15s only)
	806	Criminal damage to personal property (10-15s only)

* Three digit offence codes are used here to differentiate children's offence codes from those of adults as it is not possible to use the same offence codes because children are not asked whether the item damaged was worth more or less than £20.

Valid non-core offence codes (used prior to 2011/12)

Code	Description
116	Aggressive behaviour
117	Attempted aggressive behaviour
146	Theft with aggressive behaviour
147	Attempted theft with aggressive behaviour
166	Theft
167	Attempted theft
186	Damage to property
187	Attempted damage to property
196	Intimidation/coercion

Appendix 2: CSEW datasets available

Child datasets	Type of Access Required	Provider
Non-Victim Form - crime incidence rates and crime prevalence rates for broad and preferred measure; schooling and perceptions of crime; crime screener questions; perceptions of and attitudes towards the police and anti-social behaviour; personal safety, crime prevention and security	End User Licence	UK Data Service
Victim Form - offence-level data on nature and circumstances of incident; details of offenders	End User Licence	UK Data Service
Self-completion module - use of the internet; bullying; street gangs; school truancy; personal security; drinking behaviour and cannabis use	Special Licence (Approved Researcher)	UK Data Service
Secure Access dataset Contains all standard End User Licence and Special Licence versions above (both adult and 10-15) in one file, plus additional variables on interpersonal violence (IPV), street gangs, knife carrying and drug use, hate crime and motivational crime (lowest geography is Community Safety Partnership/Local Authority)	Secure Access (Approved Researcher)	Virtual Microdata Lab (ONS) Secure Lab (UK Data Service)
Secure Access Low level geography file (down to Lower Layer Super Output Area)	Secure Access (Approved Researcher)	Virtual Microdata Lab (ONS) Secure Lab (UK Data Service)

Appendix 3: Offence groups

Once incidents from the personal victimisation module have been given offence codes, they are then classified into groups of incidents. The different offence groups are listed below as well as offence codes which comprise each group. These groups are used to calculate incidence and prevalence rates.

The letters in brackets after the group name are the root of the variable name for that group. This is followed by ‘_i’ to give the variable name for the incidence rate for that group and ‘_p’ to give the variable name for the prevalence rate for that group.

In addition, because there are two different approaches to classifying incidents reported by children, these classifications are differentiated by the suffix ‘_brd’ (broad measure) and ‘_prf’ (preferred measure).

For example, the name of the variable for the offence groups from which to calculate incidence or prevalence rates for wounding is ‘**cwounding**’. The variable from which to calculate rates of incidence for wounding is ‘**cwounding_i**’. However, there are two different approaches to calculating incidence rates for this offence group each of which can be obtained by using the variables ‘**cwounding_i_brd**’ (broad measure) and ‘**cwounding_i_prf**’ (preferred measure).

Non-core offence codes are only used within the 2009/10 and 2010/11 datasets.

Offence groups for 10 to 15 year olds

Snatch theft from the person (‘csnatch’)

43 Snatch theft from the person

Stealth theft from the person (‘cstealth’)

44 Other theft from the person

45 Attempted theft from the person

Theft from the person (‘ctheftper’)

43 Snatch theft from the person

44 Other theft from the person

45 Attempted theft from the person

For the ‘broad measure’ approach to classifying incidents reported by children aged 10 to 15 this offence group also includes the offences grouped with the following non-core offence codes:

146 Theft with aggressive behaviour

147 Attempted theft with aggressive behaviour

Theft with violence – unspecified (‘crobbeh’)

146 Theft with aggressive behaviour

147 Attempted theft with aggressive behaviour

Other thefts of personal property ('cothpthef')

67 Other theft

73 Other attempted theft

For the 'broad measure' approach to classifying incidents reported by children aged 10 to 15 this offence group also includes the offences grouped with the following non-core offence codes:

166 Theft

167 Attempted theft

Theft of personal property – unspecified ('ctheft')

166 Theft

167 Attempted theft

Bicycle theft ('cbikthft')

64 Theft of a pedal cycle

Theft in a dwelling ('cthindwel')

55 Theft in a dwelling

Theft from outside a dwelling ('cthoutdwel')

65 Theft from outside a dwelling

Theft from in/outside a dwelling ('cthdwel')

55 Theft in a dwelling

65 Theft from outside a dwelling

All thefts within CSEW household crime ('cthhhold')

55 Theft in a dwelling

64 Theft of a pedal cycle

65 Theft from outside a dwelling

Personal acquisitive crime ('cpersacq')

41 Robbery

42 Attempted robbery

43 Snatch theft from the person

44 Other theft from the person

45 Attempted theft from the person

67 Other theft

73 Other attempted theft

For the 'broad measure' approach to classifying incidents reported by children aged 10 to 15 this offence group also includes the offences grouped with the following non-core offence codes:

166 Theft

167 Attempted theft

All personal thefts ('cthpers')

43 Snatch theft from the person

44 Other theft from the person

45 Attempted theft from the person

67 Other theft

73 Other attempted theft

For the 'broad measure' approach to classifying incidents reported by children aged 10 to 15 this offence group also includes the offences grouped with the following non-core offence codes:

166 Theft

167 Attempted theft

All thefts ('ctheftall')

43 Snatch theft from the person

44 Other theft from the person

45 Attempted theft from the person

55 Theft in a dwelling

64 Theft of a pedal cycle

65 Theft from outside a dwelling

67 Other theft

73 Other attempted theft

For the 'broad measure' approach to classifying incidents reported by children aged 10 to 15 this offence group also includes the offences grouped with the following non-core offence codes:

166 Theft

167 Attempted theft

Wounding ('cwounding')

11 Serious wounding

12 Other wounding

Assault ('ccomasinj')

13 Common assault

21 Attempted assault

Robbery ('crobberry')

41 Robbery

42 Attempted robbery

All violence ('cviolnos')

11 Serious wounding

12 Other wounding

13 Common assault

21 Attempted assault

32 Serious wounding with sexual motive

33 Other wounding with sexual motive

41 Robbery

42 Attempted robbery

For the 'broad measure' approach to classifying incidents reported by children aged 10 to 15 this offence group also includes the offences grouped with the following non-core offence codes:

116 Aggressive behaviour

117 *Attempted aggressive behaviour*

Aggressive behaviour – unspecified ('caggbeh')

116 *Aggressive behaviour*

117 *Attempted aggressive behaviour*

Damage to personal property ('ccrimdam')

805 *Arson to personal property (10-15s only)*

806 *Criminal damage to personal property (10-15s only)*

Damage to personal property – unspecified ('cdamage')

186 *Damage to property*

187 *Attempted damage to personal property*

All personal not including sex offences ('calchallp')

11 *Serious wounding*

12 *Other wounding*

13 *Common assault*

21 *Attempted assault*

41 *Robbery*

42 *Attempted robbery*

43 *Snatch theft from the person*

44 *Other theft from the person*

45 *Attempted theft from the person*

67 *Other theft*

73 *Other attempted theft*

805 *Arson to personal property (10-15s only)*

806 *Criminal damage to personal property (10-15s only)*

For the 'broad measure' approach to classifying incidents reported by children aged 10 to 15 this offence group also includes the offences grouped with the following non-core offence codes:

116 *Aggressive behaviour*

117 *Attempted aggressive behaviour*

146 *Theft with aggressive behaviour*

147 *Attempted theft with aggressive behaviour*

166 *Theft*

167 *Attempted theft*

186 *Damage to property*

187 *Attempted damage to personal property*

All crime ('calchall')

11 *Serious wounding*

12 *Other wounding*

13 *Common assault*

21 *Attempted assault*

41 *Robbery*

42 *Attempted robbery*

- 43 Snatch theft from the person
- 44 Other theft from the person
- 45 Attempted theft from the person
- 55 Theft in a dwelling
- 64 Theft of a pedal cycle
- 65 Theft from outside a dwelling
- 67 Other theft
- 73 Other attempted theft
- 805 Arson to personal property (10-15s only)
- 806 Criminal damage to personal property (10-15s only)

For the 'broad measure' approach to classifying incidents reported by children aged 10 to 15 this offence group also includes the offences grouped with the following non-core offence codes:

- 116 *Aggressive behaviour*
- 117 *Attempted aggressive behaviour*
- 146 *Theft with aggressive behaviour*
- 147 *Attempted theft with aggressive behaviour*
- 166 *Theft*
- 167 *Attempted theft*
- 186 *Damage to property*
- 187 *Attempted damage to personal property*

Bibliography

Chaplin, R., Flatley, J. and Smith, K. (Eds.), 2011, 'Crime in England and Wales 2010/11: Findings from the British Crime Survey and police recorded crime'. Home Office Statistical Bulletin 10/11.

<http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/publications/science-research-statistics/research-statistics/crime-research/hosb1011/>

Fitzpatrick, A., Grant, C., Bolling, K., Owen, R. and Millard, B., 2010, 'Extending the British Crime Survey to children: a report on the methodological and development work'. TNS-BMRB and the Home Office.

<http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20110220105210/http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdfs10/bcschildren.pdf>

Lynn, P. and Elliot, D., 2000, 'The British Crime Survey: A review of methodology'. National Centre for Social Research.

<http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20110218135832/http://rds.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdfs08/bcs-methodology-review-2000.pdf>

Millard, B. and Flatley, J., 2010, 'Experimental statistics on victimisation of children aged 10 to 15: Findings from the British Crime Survey for the year ending December 2009'. Home Office Statistical Bulletin 11/10.

<http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20110220105210/rds.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdfs10/hosb1110.pdf>

Pickering, K., Smith, P., Bryson, C. and Farmer, C., 2008, 'British Crime Survey: options for extending the coverage to children and people living in communal establishments'. Home Office Research Report 06.

<http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20110218135832/http://rds.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdfs08/horr06c.pdf>

Smith, A., 2006, 'Crime statistics: An independent review'. Home Office independent report.

<http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20110218135832/http://rds.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdfs06/crime-statistics-independent-review-06.pdf>

Smith, K. (Ed.), Lader, D., Hoare, J. and Lau, I., 2012, 'Hate crime, cyber security and the experience of crime among children: Findings from the 2010/11 British Crime Survey: Supplementary Volume 3 to Crime in England and Wales 2010/11'. Home Office.

<http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/publications/science-research-statistics/research-statistics/crime-research/hosb0612/>

Statistics Commission, 2006, 'Crime statistics: User perspectives'. Statistics Commission Report No. 30.

<http://www.statisticsauthority.gov.uk/reports---correspondence/archive/statistics-commission-archive/research/index.html>

TNS-BMRB, 2012, 'The 2011/12 Crime Survey for England and Wales: Technical Report, Volume One

<http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/guide-method/method-quality/specific/crime-statistics-methodology/user-guides/index.html>