



04

EU-MIDIS

European Union Minorities and
Discrimination Survey

English

2010



Data in Focus Report
Police Stops and Minorities

European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA)

EU-MIDIS

EUROPEAN UNION MINORITIES AND DISCRIMINATION SURVEY

WHAT is EU-MIDIS?

EU-MIDIS stands for the 'European Union Minorities and Discrimination Survey'.

It is the first EU-wide survey to ask immigrant and ethnic minority groups about their experiences of discrimination and criminal victimisation in everyday life.

As many incidents of discrimination and victimisation go unreported, and as current data collection on discrimination and victimisation against minority groups is limited in many Member States, EU-MIDIS provides the most comprehensive evidence to date of the extent of discrimination and victimisation against minorities in the EU.

In total – 23,500 immigrant and ethnic minority people were surveyed in face-to-face questionnaire interviews in all 27 Member States of the EU during 2008.

A further 5,000 people from the majority population living in the same areas as minorities were interviewed in ten Member States to allow for comparisons of results concerning some key questions.

Each interview lasted between 20 minutes and one hour, and asked people a series of detailed questions.

The Fourth in a Series of 'Data in Focus' Reports

This report focuses on respondents' experiences of police stops, including levels of trust in the police. It is the fourth in a series of EU-MIDIS 'Data in Focus' reports to target specific results from the survey.

EU-MIDIS 'Data in Focus' reports provide only an introductory 'snapshot' of specific results from the survey, and are intended to introduce the reader to some core findings.

A comprehensive EU-MIDIS Main Results Report was released in December 2009, and should be referred to for additional information about sampling and the location of interviews in each Member State, together with detailed findings on different areas covered by the survey.

All reports from the survey are available through the Agency's website (<http://fra.europa.eu/eu-midis>):

- Data in Focus 1: The Roma
- Data in Focus 2: Muslims
- Data in Focus 3: Rights Awareness and Equality Bodies
- EU-MIDIS: Main Results Report
- EU-MIDIS 'At a glance' – introduction to the survey
- Full technical report
- Survey questionnaire

DATA IN FOCUS REPORT 4 – KEY FINDINGS ON POLICE STOPS AND MINORITIES

- In six out of ten Member States where minority and majority groups living in the same neighbourhoods were surveyed, minority respondents were stopped more often by the police in the last 12 months.
- Looking at the frequency of police stops experienced by minority and majority respondents in ten Member States, those experiencing three or more police stops in a 12 month period were only represented by minorities.
- Some minority groups are particularly heavily policed – for example, Roma respondents in Greece experienced on average nearly 6 police stops in a 12 month period.
- In ten Member States where comparisons between minority and majority respondents can be made, minority respondents were more likely than majority respondents to be stopped when on public transport or on the street. For example – In Hungary, 83% of Roma respondents who were stopped by the police were stopped on public transport or on the street, in comparison with 10% of majority respondents; and in Spain, 81% of North Africans who were stopped were on public transport or on the street, in comparison with 30% of majority respondents.
- In ten Member States where comparisons between minority and majority respondents can be made, minority respondents were generally more likely to be asked for their identity papers during police stops than majority respondents. For example – In Italy, 90% of North Africans who were stopped were asked for identity papers in comparison with 48% of majority respondents; and in Greece 88% of Roma and 48% of majority respondents were asked for identity papers.
- In ten Member States where comparisons between minority and majority respondents can be made, majority respondents tend to think that the police were respectful towards them during a stop, whereas more minority respondents indicated that the police were disrespectful towards them.
- Minority groups who perceive they were stopped by the police on the basis of their ethnic or immigrant background have a lower level of trust in the police than minorities who were stopped and considered it to be unrelated to their minority background.
- More than 1 in 5 of all respondents from the following groups considered that they were stopped by the police in the past 12 months because of their immigrant or ethnic minority background: Roma in Greece (39%); North Africans in Spain (31%); Roma in Hungary (24%); Sub-Saharan Africans in France (24%); and North Africans in Italy (21%).
- Every second minority victim of assault, threat or serious harassment said they did not report these incidents to the police because they were not confident the police would be able to do anything about it.
- 13% of minority victims of assault, threat or serious harassment said they did not report these incidents to the police because they disliked or feared the police and/or because they had a previous bad experience with the police.

THE SURVEY

The survey questions in EU-MIDIS covered the following main themes:

- questions about respondents' experiences of discrimination because of their minority background in nine different areas of everyday life, and whether they reported discrimination;
- questions on perceptions of different types of discrimination in the country where they live, as well as questions about awareness of their rights and where to make complaints about discriminatory treatment;
- questions about respondents' experiences of being a victim of crime, including whether they considered their victimisation happened partly or completely because of their minority background, and whether they reported victimisation to the police (including reasons for non-reporting);

The questionnaire for EU-MIDIS is available at:
http://fra.europa.eu/fraWebsite/attachments/EU-MIDIS_Questionnaire.pdf

- questions on encounters with law enforcement, customs and border control, and whether respondents' considered they were victims of discriminatory ethnic profiling practices.

SAMPLE

All EU Member States covered.

Between 500 – 1,500 interviews in each Member State.

Selected ethnic minority, immigrant, and national minority groups surveyed.

Interview period:

May – November 2008

Sampling approach:

Predominantly random sampling: in 22 out of 27 Member States.

<http://fra.europa.eu/eu-midis>

WHY IS IT IMPORTANT TO LOOK AT POLICING AND MINORITIES

Law enforcement based on equality and non-discrimination is a cornerstone of democratic societies. As a reflection of on-going immigration into the European Union and movement within and between Member States, as well as the presence of established national minorities, law enforcement in the EU has to increasingly work with diverse communities.

If we consider that law enforcement not only fights crime but addresses the needs and rights of victims and witnesses, and their wider communities, then we can begin to examine law enforcement as a public service – one which is serving a diverse European population. With this in mind, EU-MIDIS asked minority groups about their perceptions and experiences of discrimination on the basis of their ethnicity and immigrant background in different areas of everyday life – including law enforcement.

The success of the police as a 'public service' is linked to how different communities are and feel treated by the police. Good relations with and trust in the police partly helps to explain high levels of publicly reported crime. In particular, high levels of reported and recorded racist crime are one indicator of good law enforcement and minority community relations.

This report looks at law enforcement through the lens of equality and non-discrimination, and with a view to 'policing as a public service'. Responses from over 23,500 interviewees from minority and immigrant backgrounds provide key evidence about minorities' experiences of policing in each Member State, including evidence of potentially discriminatory treatment. The evidence presented in the report can help Member States to identify and address potential problems in police-community relations.

This EU-MIDIS Data in Focus report should be read alongside the FRA's publication 'Towards More Effective Policing – Understanding and Preventing Discriminatory Ethnic Profiling: A Guide' (2010), which introduces the subject of ethnic profiling in relation to policing.

THE FIRST EU-WIDE SURVEY PROVIDING EVIDENCE ABOUT MINORITIES' EXPERIENCES OF POLICING

As the area of law enforcement and minority groups is under-researched in the majority of Member States, this report produces the first EU-wide overview of how selected minorities and immigrants experience law enforcement. Only a handful of Member States, with the UK leading the way, systematically collect criminal justice data or undertake some level of research on law enforcement practices, including police stops, as they impact on different groups. Yet this kind of data, gathered anonymously as aggregate data, provides essential evidence for the identification of potentially discriminatory police practices that, if unchecked, can serve to damage police-community relations.

Importantly, in an effort to more accurately gauge differences in experiences of law enforcement, **EU-MIDIS devoted part of the survey in ten Member States to interviewing people from the majority population about their experiences of police stops.** These interviews were carried out amongst majority respondents who were living in the same areas as interviewed minorities, so that the results would be more directly comparable. In this regard the findings also present a 'first' as they compare experiences between different minority and majority populations across ten Member States.

WHAT DID THE SURVEY ASK?

The survey asked respondents a series of questions about law enforcement in relation to the following areas:

Being stopped by and in contact with the police

- Before being asked about their encounters with the police, respondents were asked a general question about whether they tended to trust or not to trust the police.
- Respondents were asked whether they had been stopped by the police in the last 12 months in the country where they were interviewed – *experiences of stops*; and, if they had been stopped, whether they considered that they were stopped because of their immigrant or minority background – *perceptions of stops*, or what is commonly referred to as 'ethnic profiling'.
- If they had been stopped a series of questions was asked about the nature of the stop, including what the police did and whether they were treated respectfully by the police.

Being a victim of crime and reporting to the police

- Respondents who had been a victim of assault, threat or serious harassment were asked whether they or anyone else had reported these incidents to the police.
- If incidents weren't reported to the police, respondents were asked 'why'?
- If incidents were reported to the police, respondents were asked whether they were satisfied with how the police dealt with the matter.

BEING STOPPED BY THE POLICE AND PERCEPTIONS OF DISCRIMINATORY TREATMENT: DIFFERENCES BETWEEN MINORITY GROUPS

DISCRIMINATORY ETHNIC PROFILING:

In the FRA's publication 'Towards More Effective Profiling – Understanding and Preventing Discriminatory Ethnic Profiling: A Guide' (2010), *discriminatory* ethnic profiling is described as:

- Treating an individual less favourably than others who are in a similar situation (in other words 'discriminating'), e.g. by exercising police powers such as stop and search.
- Where a decision to exercise police powers is based only or mainly on that person's race, ethnicity or religion.

The FRA's Guide explains when profiling that involves factors such as race, ethnicity and religion can be considered 'unlawful', and uses the term 'discriminatory ethnic profiling' to distinguish unlawful profiling practices from lawful uses of profiling.

There are a number of ways of exploring the survey's results with respect to findings on police stops.

With this in mind, Figure 1 indicates the following for all respondents surveyed:

- (1) The total percentage among each minority group surveyed in each Member State who was stopped by the police in the last 12 months – calculated by adding together the first and second percentage figures.
- (2) The percentage among each minority group surveyed in each Member State who were stopped by the police in the last 12 months and considered that this was because of their ethnic or immigrant background – the first percentage figure.
- (3) The percentage among each minority group surveyed in each Member State who were stopped by the police in the last 12 months but indicated that this was not because of their ethnic or immigrant background – the second percentage figure.

As an example of how to read the results:

Sub-Saharan African respondents in Ireland are heavily policed – 59% of all respondents from this group were stopped in the last 12 months. However, only 6% of all Sub-Saharan Africans surveyed considered they were stopped because of their ethnicity or immigrant background in the last 12 months, while 53% indicated they were stopped by the police in the last 12 months but did not attribute it to discriminatory police profiling.

Roma respondents in Greece are also heavily policed – 56% of all respondents from this group were stopped in the last 12 months; 39% of all Roma interviewed in Greece said they were stopped specifically because of their ethnicity, and only 17% indicated that their experiences of police stops were not connected with their ethnicity.

What is of most concern in relation to the findings in Figure 1 are those respondent groups who indicate the highest levels of perceived discriminatory police profiling. For example, among the following groups more than 1 in 5 of all respondents surveyed indicated they considered they were stopped because of their ethnicity or immigrant background, namely: Roma in Greece (39%), North Africans in Spain (31%), Roma in Hungary (24%), Sub-Saharan Africans in France (24%), and North Africans in Italy (21%).


For those Member States where more than one group was interviewed there are some striking differences and similarities in perceived profiling between the groups surveyed. For example, whereas 31% of all North Africans surveyed in Spain indicated that they were stopped by the police because of their immigrant or ethnic minority background, in comparison 13% of South Americans and 5% of Romanians considered they were stopped for this reason. These results are perhaps indicative of discriminatory police practices that impact disproportionately on certain minority groups more than others. In comparison, in France more similar levels of perceived profiling can be noted between Sub-Saharan Africans (24%) and North Africans (18%), and in Italy between North Africans (21%), Albanians (16%) and Romanians (14%) surveyed.

At the same time, the results indicate how some respondent groups with the same general background perceive police stops differently in Member States. For example, whereas 31% of North Africans in Spain considered they were stopped by the police because of their ethnicity or immigrant background – ‘ethnic profiling’ – 18% of North Africans in France considered this to be the case; and, whereas 39% of Roma in Greece considered they experienced ethnic profiling at the hands of the police, only 5% of Roma in Romania and 2% of Roma in Bulgaria specifically indicated they were stopped by the police because of their ethnicity. One explanation for this disparity, as referred to in the ‘Data in Focus’ report on the Roma, could be that Roma in Bulgaria and Romania are more isolated from mainstream society, including policing, and therefore are less frequently exposed to potential discrimination.

On a positive note, when results between all the groups surveyed are compared they show that, in general, respondents with a Russian background or an ex-Yugoslavian background considered that they are stopped infrequently because of their ethnicity or immigrant background. However, the groups who said they were stopped most frequently by the police because of their ethnic or immigrant background – such as the Roma, North and Sub-Saharan Africans – characteristically have darker skin than those groups who indicated they had the least experience of discriminatory police stops.

One way of understanding these results better is to look at the findings for those ten Member States where the majority population was interviewed too, as this helps to contextualise the results against a benchmark for what is ‘normal’ in terms of policing as experienced by the majority population.

Figure 1

Stopped by the police in the past 12 months (%)

EU-MIDIS, questions F3 and F5

BEING STOPPED BY THE POLICE: DIFFERENCES BETWEEN MINORITY AND MAJORITY GROUPS SURVEYED

Percentage of people stopped by the police

In ten countries members of the majority population living in the same areas as minority respondents were asked if they had been stopped by the police in the last 12 months.¹

Looking at Figure 2, the findings indicate whether minority respondents are being stopped by the police more than majority respondents. However, because members of the majority population were not asked whether they considered they were stopped because of their minority ethnic background, the results only illustrate the percentage stopped among each group, and should be cautiously read as indicative of discriminatory profiling practices. With this in mind the following can be noted:

- In 6 out of 10 Member States where minority and majority respondents were surveyed – minority respondents were stopped more often by the police in the last 12 months.
- In 2 out of 10 Member States where minority and majority respondents were surveyed – majority respondents were stopped more often by the police in the last 12 months; namely: In Italy and Slovakia.
- In Bulgaria a mixed picture emerges – with 14% of Roma, 17% of the majority population, and 22% of Turkish respondents indicating they were stopped by the police in the last 12 months.
- In Romania there is no apparent difference between experiences of stops encountered by the Roma population (20%) and the majority population (19%).


By testing for statistically significant differences between results for majority and minority respondents in ten Member States², EU-MIDIS indicates that in most cases these differences are not occurring by chance.

Herein, some extreme differences can be noted between majority and minority populations’ experiences of police stops; 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.

Figure 2

Stopped by the police in the past 12 months, results for the majority sample and the minority groups surveyed in ten Member States (% out of all respondents)



EU-MIDIS, question F3

¹ The available budget for the survey only allowed for the majority population to be interviewed in ten of the EU’s 27 Member States, which were chosen at random.

² At the 95% confidence level, Pearson chi-square test.

Frequency of being stopped by the police


Of those respondents who indicated they were stopped by the police in the last 12 months, they were then asked how often this had happened to them.

Looking at Figure 3 it is clear that minority respondent groups are stopped on average more often than majority respondents in a number of Member States. **Taking those groups who indicated they were stopped three or more times by the police in the last 12 months, only minority groups qualify in this category** – with Roma respondents in Greece experiencing an average of nearly 6 stops every 12 months.

These findings indicate that some minority groups are heavily policed. The potential implications of differential experiences of policing between majority and minority respondents, particularly in a climate where many minorities are wary of the police, are of concern. As some research and events over the last three decades have shown – from the 1981 ‘race’ riots in the London suburb of Brixton³, through to the 2005 large-scale riots in the predominantly immigrant suburbs of Paris, centred on Clichy-sous-Bois⁴ – it is clear that police action needs to be sensitive to the dangers of fuelling distrust and, at worst, of igniting unrest in communities that already feel discriminated against on the basis of their ethnicity or immigrant background. As the police represent the State (and hence society as a whole), they need to be seen to and to act in a non-discriminatory way. In this regard, the actions of the police can serve to strengthen social cohesion and inclusion.

Figure 3

Incidence of police stops in the past 12 months (among those who were stopped), results for the majority sample and the minority groups surveyed in ten Member States



EU-MIDIS, question F4

³ The Brixton Disorders, 10-12 April 1981 (The Scarman Report), Cmd 8427, London: Home Office (1981).

⁴ <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/4413964.stm>

The circumstances of the stop

The survey asked people about the circumstances of their last police stop with respect to whether they were stopped while in a private vehicle, on public transport or on the street. The results in Figure 4 indicate that between 70-98% of majority respondents interviewed in the ten Member States were in a private vehicle when stopped. In comparison, the likelihood of being stopped in a private vehicle fluctuates significantly between the different minorities surveyed, with more minority respondents than majority respondents likely to be stopped on public transport or on the street. For example: in France, 17% of majority respondents, 27% of North Africans and 57% of Sub-Saharan Africans were stopped by the police on public transport or on the street.

EU-MIDIS indicates that the likelihood of being stopped by the police in the last 12 months is significantly higher for those minority respondents who personally or as part of their household owned a vehicle (31%) when compared with those minority respondents who personally or as part of their household did *not* own a vehicle (15%).

With this in mind, two assumptions, which the survey was

unable to test, can be considered when interpreting these findings: first, the majority population in Member States is more likely to own private transport than some minorities, and, therefore, are more likely to be stopped using private rather than public transport or when on the street; second, police stops are most frequently carried out as routine traffic stops. If both these assumptions are correct, then this would help to explain high stop rates experienced by the majority population in countries such as Italy where 96% of the majority population were stopped when in a private vehicle in comparison with 43% of North Africans, 55% of Romanians and 70% of Albanians surveyed.

What the police did during the stop

Of those who were stopped by the police in the last 12 months, they were asked what the police actually did as a result of the stop.

Figure 5 shows the main actions undertaken during police stops for the minority and majority groups surveyed in ten Member States. As many majority and minority respondents were stopped whilst in a private vehicle, a main police action was to ask for a driving licence or vehicle documents. In some countries and for some minority respondents it was notably the case that the police also searched the respondents themselves or their vehicles; this happened to 68% of Roma in Greece (in comparison with 9% of majority respondents and 4% of Albanian respondents); to 46% of Sub-Saharan Africans and 38% of North Africans in France (in comparison with 21% of majority respondents); and to 33% of North Africans in Belgium (in comparison with 17% of Turkish and 8% of majority respondents).


Figure 5 also indicates that minority respondents were asked for their identity papers more often than the majority population. For example: in Germany, 43% of the majority population were asked for their identity papers by the police in comparison with 75% of Turkish respondents and 75% of respondents from the former Yugoslavia. Minorities were also more often questioned by the police as a result of the stop.

The Roma in Greece emerge as the most heavily policed group who experienced some of the highest levels of intrusive police action, for all majority and minority groups surveyed, across the ten Member States. For example, in the course of their latest experience of being stopped by the police: 49% of Roma in Greece were fined by the police; 41% underwent an alcohol or drug test; and 34% were either arrested and/or taken to a police station.

The results provide evidence that in some Member States the nature of police stops and how individuals or groups are selected for stopping may need to be systematically monitored to ensure that stops are carried out equitably, and that the means are proportionate to the end result obtained.

Currently only the UK among the EU-27 systematically records all police stops, including information concerning the ethnicity of the individual/s stopped, and makes this information available in the public domain. Data such as this is essential to be able to identify any potential for the disproportionate use of stops against certain communities, which must be read alongside evidence of whether these stops were the result of or were able to prevent an illegal action.

Figure 4
Circumstances of the latest stop by the police (among those who were stopped), results for the majority sample and the minority groups surveyed in ten Member States (%)



EU-MIDIS, question F6

Figure 5

What did the police do during the most recent stop

In the past 12 months (%)





Figure 5 (Continued)

What did the police do during the most recent stop

In the past 12 months (%)



Police treatment during the stop and trust in the police

Police treatment during the stop


In relation to the last time they were stopped by the police, respondents were asked how respectful the police were when dealing with them. Figure 6 illustrates how different respondent groups' experienced their treatment at the hands of the police.

What is clear from the results is that majority respondents tended to think that the police were respectful towards them during a stop, whereas more minority respondents indicated that the police were disrespectful towards them. For example, in Belgium, 42% of North African respondents, 55% of Turkish respondents and 85% of majority respondents considered that the police were respectful towards them during their last police stop; whereas 35% of North African respondents, 20% of Turkish respondents and 5% of majority respondents considered the police to be disrespectful.

Notably in Bulgaria, over three quarters of all respondents (76% of Roma respondents, 77% Turkish respondents and 81% majority respondents) indicated that they were treated respectfully by the police the last time they were stopped. This is in stark contrast to Roma respondents in other Member States, with, for example, 36% of Hungarian Roma and 72% of the majority population indicating they were treated respectfully by the police.

Figure 6

How respectful the police were during the latest stop (%)



EU-MIDIS, question F8

General trust in the police – unrelated to stops

Looking at results from another question about general trust in the police that was asked *prior* to specific questions about police stops, a mixed picture emerges when one compares answers between majority and minority respondents in the same Member State. For example, looking at Figure 7:

- **in Spain**, the percentage among different groups who said they ‘tend to trust’ the police was similar: North Africans (52%); South Americans (63%); Romanians (67%); the majority population (62%);
- **in Germany**, high levels of trust in the police can be noted for all groups, but with much higher levels among the majority population (89%) in comparison with Turkish respondents (63%) and respondents from the former Yugoslavia (75%);


- **in Greece**, the immigrant Albanian population shows the highest levels of trust in the police (66%) in comparison with the Roma (36%) and the majority population (49%). Albanians’ high levels of trust in the police may partly be explained by their expectations of policing with regard to their experiences in Albania.

The relationship between trust in the police and police treatment during stops

A clear pattern emerges when comparing results for overall levels of trust in the police with responses to the question that asked minorities whether they considered they were a victim of ethnic profiling during their last police stop; namely:

50% of respondents who were stopped by the police and *did not* consider it to be a result of ethnic profiling said they tended to generally trust the police, whereas 27% of respondents who were stopped by the police and *did* consider it to be a result of ethnic profiling said they tended to trust the police. Hence – a clear connection between perceptions of discriminatory treatment at the hands of the police and overall levels of trust in policing.

Figure 7
Trust in police (%)



EU-MIDIS, question F1

EXPERIENCES AND PERCEPTIONS OF BEING STOPPED ACCORDING TO RESPONDENTS' PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS

Alongside ethnicity and immigrant status, which is the focus of EU-MIDIS, the survey collected information on a range of personal characteristics for all *minority respondents* surveyed; such as gender, age and employment status.

This information provides further insights about differences in *experiences* of stops – the percentage of respondents stopped by the police. It also provides information about *perceptions* of stops – the percentage of respondents who were stopped and considered that this was because of their ethnicity or immigrant background; in other words, 'ethnic profiling'.

These findings indicate those groups who experience more police stops, and who perceive them as being discriminatory, and therefore point to groups that need to be sensitively managed by the police if accusations of discriminatory treatment are to be addressed.

Looking at aggregate results for all minority respondents surveyed, the following highlights some findings:

- **Gender:** Men are stopped more often than women. On average, 35% of male minority respondents and 14% of female minority respondents have been stopped by the police in the last 12 months. Significantly more men (38%) than women (28%) considered that they were stopped as a result of ethnic profiling.
- **Age:** 15% of respondents aged 50 years and older have been stopped by the police in the last 12 months; in comparison 28% of 16-24 year olds, 27% of 25-34 year olds and 25% of 35-49 year olds were stopped in the last 12 months. Respondents over the age of 50 (29%) were less likely to consider that they were stopped as a result of ethnic profiling in comparison with younger age groups.
- **Education:** The higher a respondent's education level (indicated by their years of schooling), the more likely it is that they said they have been stopped by the police in the last 12 months; for example, 16% of respondents with 5 years or less of schooling indicate they were stopped in the last 12 months by the police, in comparison with 22% of those with 6-9 years of schooling, 25% of those with 10-13 years of schooling, and 29% of those with 14 or more years of schooling. Explanations for this pattern might be that educated respondents are more integrated into mainstream society and therefore are more exposed to being stopped by the police as they may be working in or regularly passing through areas that are dominated by the majority population; hence, they are more vulnerable to being stopped by the police as they are perceived as 'out of place' in certain environments⁵. Another explanation could be that people with more years of education are more aware of their rights and perhaps, therefore, more attuned to circumstances that could be considered discriminatory.
- **Employment Status:** Employed and unemployed respondents were more likely to be stopped by the police in the last 12 months (respectively 28% and 26%) in comparison with respondents who classified themselves as home-makers or in unpaid work (14%), or who were 'non active' (19%), which includes retirees and students. These results can be more easily understood if one considers that more women classified themselves as homemakers or were in unpaid work; and women – as indicated above – are less likely to be stopped than men. At the same time, as the results on age indicate, retirees, who are aged over 50, are less likely to be stopped than younger people.
- **Traditional or Religious Clothing:** The survey asked respondents whether they wore traditional or religious clothing when out in public, with the results indicating that this mostly applied to female respondents. When looking at the results with regard to gender, the findings show that women who wear traditional or religious clothing are about as likely to be stopped by the police as women who do not wear such clothing; with the same finding applying to men. At the same time, equal numbers of those wearing traditional clothing and those not wearing traditional clothing considered that they were stopped because of 'ethnic profiling' – which would seem to indicate that one's ethnicity, regardless of clothing, is a determining factor in people's experience and perception of police stops. In comparison with clothing, other factors, such as being male (in combination with ethnicity), appear to have a stronger effect on the likelihood of being stopped and on perceptions of ethnic profiling.
- **National language as mother tongue:** More respondents who speak the national language of the Member State where they live as their mother tongue consider that their last police stop was the result of 'ethnic profiling' (46% who speak the national language as opposed to 33% who do not). One explanation could be that the more integrated respondents are, the more they perceive their treatment to be a result of discrimination.

⁵ Sollund, R. (2006) Racialisation in police stop and search practice – the Norwegian case, in *Critical Criminology* Vol.14(3), special issue on 'Ethnic Profiling, Criminal (In)Justice and Minority Populations', pp.265-292.

BEING A VICTIM OF CRIME AND REPORTING TO THE POLICE


In addition to questions about police stops and trust in the police, EU-MIDIS asked respondents a series of questions about their experiences of being a victim of crime. With respect to 'in person' crimes of assault and threat, and harassment of a serious nature, respondents were asked whether they or anyone else had reported these incidents to the police; and, if not, why they weren't reported.

Figure 8 shows the reasons for not reporting the latest incident of assault, threat or serious harassment for all minority respondents surveyed who indicated they were a victim of in-person crime. Respondents were allowed to describe their reasons for non-reporting, and interviewers classified their responses accordingly across potentially 11 different categories.

- Every second victim of assault, threat or serious harassment – 48% – said they did not report these incidents to the police because they were not confident the police would be able to do anything about it.
- 13% of victims did not report to the police because of the inconvenience of doing so; such as the time and the bureaucracy involved.
- 13% of victims did not report to the police because they disliked or feared the police, and/or because they had a previous bad experience with the police.

These findings indicate low levels of faith in policing as a public service for minorities who are victims of crime. Of particular concern is the finding that 13% of minority victims didn't report to the police because of very negative perceptions and experiences of policing. When we look at these results alongside the survey's findings on general trust in the police and how respectfully minorities consider they were treated by the police during their last experience of a police stop, it is clear that many minority groups have little faith in the police as a public service that can assist them.

Given that for some groups rates of perceived racist victimisation were particularly high – 18% of all Roma and 18% of all Sub-Saharan African respondents considered that they were a victim of racially motivated assault, threat or serious harassment – then the survey's findings on non-reporting indicate that efforts need to be made to build vulnerable victims' faith in the police as a service that can effectively respond to reports of racist victimisation. The survey's detailed findings by individual respondent groups, as reported in the Main Results Report (2009), shed light on those that were particularly vulnerable to what they perceived as racially motivated crime, and identified rates of reporting to the police and, importantly, reasons for non-reporting.



USING THESE RESULTS

The findings in this Data in Focus Report point to a number of issues for policy makers, law enforcement and minority communities that can be addressed at local, national and Community level; namely:


- The collection of anonymous, aggregate data on experiences of police stops by ethnicity, and other variables such as age, can help to identify patterns in potentially discriminatory police profiling practices during stops. This evidence can serve to address discriminatory treatment where it exists.⁶
- Detailed information about the extent, frequency, circumstances and nature of stops can serve to highlight patterns of potential discriminatory treatment. This information can be used by the police to examine and review their own practices with respect to considerations about non-discriminatory treatment and effective policing.
- Efforts should be made to collect data on minority *and* majority populations' experiences of police stops to be able to identify and understand potentially differential treatment.
- Although discriminatory ethnic profiling is difficult to prove as having occurred, high rates of perceived profiling among some minority communities is evidence that work needs to be done to address and improve minority-police relations.
- Minorities who perceive they were victims of discriminatory police profiling tend to have lower levels of trust in the police than other minorities, which suggests that a review of the negative impact of police action needs to be considered alongside efforts to improve minority communities' trust in the police.
- The survey's results point to the need to improve minorities' perceptions of the police as a public service that is able to address the needs of victims of crime, and in particular the needs of victims of racist victimisation.

The results of this Data in Focus Report should be read alongside the findings of the FRA's publication 'Towards More Effective Policing – Understanding and Preventing Discriminatory Ethnic Profiling: A Guide' (2010).

⁶ EU-MIDIS found that, on average, most minority respondents surveyed would be willing to have information about their ethnicity anonymously collected if this would serve to identify discriminatory treatment.

This report relates to article 21, non-discrimination, as enshrined in the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union.

These two reports by the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA) look at closely related issues dealing with the relationship between policing and minorities.



European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights

EU-MIDIS European Union Minorities and Discrimination Survey

Data in Focus Report: Police Stops and Minorities

Design: red hot 'n' cool, Vienna

2010 - 16 pp, - 21 x 29.7 cm

ISBN-13: 978-92-9192-503-2

TK-30-09-255-EN-C

DOI: 10.2811/44997

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, 2010

Reproduction is authorised, except for commercial purposes, provided the source is acknowledged.

For any use or reproduction of photos contained herein, permission must be sought directly from the copyright holder.



© Aaron Kohr - Fotolia.com

ISBN 978-92-9192-503-2



9 789291 925032

TK-30-09-255-EN-C

VISIT:

<http://fra.europa.eu/eu-midis>

SEE ALSO:

EU-MIDIS Main Results Report
EU-MIDIS at a glance
Data In Focus 1: The Roma
Data In Focus 2: Muslims
Data In Focus 3: Rights Awareness
and Equality Bodies

TECHNICAL REPORT (ON-LINE)
SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE (ON-LINE)



■ Publications Office