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Abstract

A city is considered to be safe when people can move freely, without being concerned about being subjected to any crime. CPTED is a way to work with crime prevention in the society. Although safety and security are two distinct concepts, they can interact with each other in the work towards a more sustainable society.

This bachelor essay explores how the perception of safety, regarding common anxiety, is distributed between men and women in Stockholm City. Furthermore, the perception of safety within the female group is examined in terms of age. This has been conducted in the form of a quantitative analysis, based on data from Stockholm’s safety survey in 2014. The results showed that the perceived safety, in a general sense, is very low among the Stockholm residents. In all but one of the cases, the proportion of women who claimed to be unsafe was bigger than the proportion of men. Most women, who felt unsafe in the neighborhood or transit environment, were between the ages of 25 and 44 years. The results were analyzed in a more qualitative form, by an assessment of its reasonableness and feedback with relevant theory that has been presented. This led to the conclusion that there are differences in people’s perceived safety, which can be explained by its individual characteristics like gender and age.

Sammanfattning

En stad anses vara trygg när människor kan röra sig fritt utan att vara rädda att utsättas för brott av något slag. CPTED är ett sätt att jobba med brottsprevention i samhället. Trots att trygghet och säkerhet är två säregna begrepp, kan de samverka med varandra vid arbetet mot ett mer hållbart samhälle.


Svensk titel: Könsbaserad upplevd trygghet – en undersökning bland Stockholms invånare
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1. Introduction

1.1. Motivation

Safety deals primarily with the social aspect of the concept of sustainability. “A sustainable city is a safe city, one that allows mobility without the fear of crime victimization and harassment” (Ceccato and Loukaitou-Sideris 2018).

The public transport is in one hand considered to be an important tool for developing a more sustainable society that involves, among other things, encouraging of human interaction. On the other hand, shortcomings in the public transport, such as lack of security or personal safety concerns, might limit some residents’ mobility (Iudici, Bertoli and Faccio 2017). In order for cities to be classified as safe and sustainable, it is not sufficient that only one or two social groups feel safe in the environment they are in, but it is required that all communities do.

Crime prevention through environmental design (CPTED) is a method that can be used in attempt to better people’s perception of safety at a location. However, it is important to keep in mind that safety is not the same as security and that the implementation of security measures do not automatically increase the safety rate (Urban Utveckling 2018).

Safety is somewhat subjective (Whitzman 2008) and women declare to be more afraid of becoming victims of crime than men. They are also more likely to change their behavior when feelings of unsafety appear (d’Arbois de Jubainville and Vanier 2017). Also, in comparison to men, women have been underrepresented in the social debate for a long time. Because of this, it is now important to take into account their point of view in safety so that sustainability can be achieved in future urban development.

Stockholm is a city that works a lot with the safety issue and crime prevention. In order to gain increased knowledge about the perceived safety in the different neighborhoods, the city has implemented regulatory safety surveys (Sweco and Stockholm Stad 2014). This report will present an analysis on how the perception of safety in the Stockholm neighborhoods and nearby public transport environment, which will be based on data from a safety survey conducted in 2014.

1.2. Aim and objectives

The aim of this paper is to get an overview of how the perception of safety is distributed between men and women in Stockholm, Sweden. The main focus will be on the general perspective of safety.

In order to achieve this, the main objective will be to look into the perception of safety regarding common anxiety and fear of crime in the neighborhood and transit area. Therefore, the following questions will be answered:

- How does the common anxiety of crime differ between men and women, and within the female gender group, in Stockholm?
- What are the impacts to the residents’ concern about crime? How does it affect their overall sense of safety?

These questions first require a review of what the concept of safety involves.
1.3. Delimitations

Safety is a concern of sustainable development, which focuses on the social dimension. As mentioned in the section above, the main focus regarding the different levels of which safety is defined will be on common anxiety (also known as general concern). As for the remaining levels, the individual and the environmental aspect of safety will be taken into account when discussing the results.

1.4. Disposition

The report begins with a literature review and by a description of the methods and data used. This will be followed by a presentation of the results, in the form of a quantitative analysis. After that, the report will present a discussion with conclusions and final suggestions based on this.

2. Theory

This section provides a theoretical background with relevant information from previous research on the safety issue. The idea is to use this as a complement to the method that has been chosen (see Chapter 3.) in order for better conclusions to be drawn.

2.1. Social sustainability

Sustainable development is defined as ensuring different needs in the society, without the risk of negatively affecting future generations ability to do the same (Barnaby 1987). Social sustainability is one of three dimensions that are generally taken into consideration when discussing the concept of sustainability (Boverket 2010). Social sustainability is a lot about each individual’s need, well-being, rights and power as well as justice (KTH 2016).

A socially sustainable urban development can be seen as a long-term process, which forms the social terms for future generations. It can also be seen as a condition, which regards its impact on the social and economic aspects of life. Consideration to different social groups, improved conditions for human encounters and promoting gender equality are examples of some characteristics that should be used in order to achieve socially sustainable urban development (Boverket 2010).

2.2. Safety

2.2.1. Definition

Safety can be defined as "a state in which hazards and conditions leading to physical, psychological or material harm are controlled in order to preserve the health and well-being of individuals and the community". There are two dimensions of safety: objective safety that regards a behavioral and environmental aspect, and subjective safety, that is the feeling or perception of safety (Whitzman 2008).

2.2.2. Security

In terms of urban planning, safety is separated from security. Security is a quantitative term that can be measured based on facts and/or physical measures. It is harder to measure safety because it is, as mentioned above, more about a feeling or an experience. The perceived safety
of people depends on, among other things, their experiences, the physical design and reputation of the place and its contact with the surrounding environment. Something that is often misinterpreted is that security enhancement would lead to an increased safety. This is not always the case. In some cases security-effective measures can even bring an opposite effect leading to a decrease of safety in a place (Urban Utveckling 2018).

2.2.3. Gender differences

Women tend to feel more afraid than men, but in spite of that, men appear more often as victims of crime in transit environments (Ceccato 2017). Certain acts can be perceived differently for a woman than it does for a man. An example of this is compliments. They may seem pretty harmless, but in reality can be considered as an insult to their gender and amplify the feelings of vulnerability (Vanier and d’Arbois de Jubainville 2017).

Women are more dependent on the public transportation than men. Studies show, that in Sweden, women have less access to a car and often take more, shorter and more varied trips at different times. However, they are less likely than men to travel in the evening. Therefore victimization in the public transport could be seen as a gendered issue (Ceccato 2017). Gender specific violence such as sexual victimization has a big impact on women’s feeling of unsafety. Although not every woman has been assaulted, as a gender group, women do not forget that they are at greater risk at becoming victims of physical or sexual assaults (Vanier and d’Arbois de Jubainville 2017).

2.2.4. Individual factors and intersectionality

The fear of becoming a victim of crime is not only gender based. It might also appear as a result from humans’ individual characteristics like age, ethnic background, previous experiences etcetera (Ceccato 2017). Women with disabilities are especially at risk of being subjected to sexual assault in the public transport environment (Iudici et al. 2017).

Results from a study of the perceived safety among female public transport users in Paris indicated that their feelings depend on their user profile. In this study four profile groups are described: (1) daily working users, (2) young females, (3) less active users and (4) casual users. The first group feels unsafe early in the morning during weekdays, while the second group feel less safe at night hours. While the third group feels less safe in crowded transit areas such as carriages, the last group tend to feel unsafe in deteriorated or empty ones (Vanier and d’Arbois de Jubainville 2017).

2.2.5. Changing behaviors

Women declare to feel less safe than men in general. When it comes to travelling with the public transport, women tend to change their behavior if they are feeling unsafe. This could be caused by real or perceived vulnerability and risk of victimization, greater sensitivity to disorders (d’Arbois de Jubainville and Vanier 2017) or to the configuration (the physical design) of public transport (Ceccato 2013).

Avoidance is defined as keeping a distance from places, times or people that are perceived as dangerous, and is an example of a change of behavior. In the transit environment, this could mean that women avoid certain lines or stations, reduce the number of exchanges (for example from the bus, to the commuter train and then to the metro), avoid long distances of walking or wait for the next means of transport. Avoidance can be based of space, which
suggests to be related to a person’s age and education. Another type of avoidance, that also occurs more often, is time-based avoidance. This is suggested to relate to peoples’ age, education and professional situation. Not everyone is able to use avoidance as a security measure. People who are completely dependent on the public transport, so-called "transit captives", would not benefit from this because they do not have access to any alternative means of transport (d’Arbois de Jubainville and Vanier 2017).

2.3. Crime prevention

2.3.1. Situational crime prevention

It is said that “the opportunity makes the thief”. Situational crime prevention is about making it difficult and, if possible, preventing situations that lead to acts of crime. The occurrence of a crime opportunity can be described according to the "Crime Triangle" (see Figure 2.3.). It is a model used by, among others, the Crime Prevention Council (Brottsförebyggande rådet 2018) that is based on two criminologists theory (Cohen and Felson 1979) about the prerequisites for a crime situation to appear. According to this model, crimes are committed under three conditions. The first thing that is required is a motivated perpetrator and the other one needed is a suitable victim. The third that can lead to a crime occurring is the absence of control (Ibid). For example, if a transit station has a low passenger flow and a lack of guardianship, it can be considered as a criminogenic factor (Ceccato 2013).

![Crime Triangle](image)

Figure 2.3. A model of the Crime Triangle (Brottsförebyggande rådet 2018)

There are five different strategies described in the work of situational crime prevention. The first strategy is about increasing the effort demanded to commit a crime, for instance by inserting security doors or door phones. The second strategy is about increasing the risk of the offender by, for instance, using camera surveillance. The third strategy is about reducing the reward for the offender, for example by labeling theft goods or removing theft prone objects. The fourth strategy is about reducing the provocations that might lead to crime. The fifth and final strategy is about removing excuses for the offender with, for instance control of alcohol service or bring clear information about laws and regulations (Brottsförebyggande rådet 2018).

2.3.2. CPTED – Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design

CPTED stands for Prevention of crime through environmental design and is a way of working with crime prevention by changing the physical design of a place. Places with dark corners and potential hiding places for the perpetrator are examples of environmental features that might affect the criminogenic conditions or its impression of safety (Ceccato 2013). The use
of CPTED can involve minor action, like for instance removing graffiti from a building wall, or major actions, like reconstructing a commuter train station. There are six principles described regarding CPTED, which are presented in the following text below (Brottsförebyggande rådet 2018).

1) Territoriality

This principle was, together with the third and fifth principle, presented in the book Defensible space by (Newman 1972). Territoriality means that a place is entitled to a specific group of people or that it is dedicated to certain activities. With the entitlement comes a feeling of responsibility for the place, which can decrease the rates of crimes committed there. This can be achieved by creating physical or symbolic barriers that separate the public, semi-public and private areas from each other (for example with marked entrances), by using the place for different activities or by removing the signs of disorders like trash and graffiti. This will signal the surrounding environment that there are people who control possible attempts to commit crime on the place (Brottsförebyggande rådet 2018).

2) Access control

Access control means that there is a restriction over who has access to a place or building by, for instance, installing coded doors, door phones or the similar so that it gets more difficult for people to attempt crime there (Ibid).

3) Surveillance

Surveillance means that a place is monitored in some way to complicate potential crime opportunities and thereby also increase the sense of safety. The monitoring can be either formal or informal, depending on what is considered to be necessary at the place in question. Formal surveillance can be achieved with security guards, police patrols or CCTV, that is camera surveillance. Buildings with balconies directed towards the street, good street lighting and removal of large shrubberies are some examples of informal or natural surveillance (Ibid).

4) Obstruction of execution of crimes

The principle Obstruction of crime is about reducing the crime opportunities at a location. This can be done by putting up fences or put locks, burglar alarms etcetera (Ibid).

5) Image

A place’s rate of crime can increase or decrease depending on its Image, in other words, on its reputation and aesthetic impression (Newman 1972). For example, a place that has got buildings with nice facades, without graffiti or destroyed windows, streets where the bus stops are not vandalized or with burned cars by the sidewalk, create signals of social order (Brottsförebyggande rådet 2018).

6) Activity support

Activity support is about implementing measures that encourage “positive activities” that leads to a higher human flow and human interactions. Examples of activities that might
increase the incitement for meetings between humans are playgrounds outdoor gyms and open-air café or restaurants. Bus stops and ATMs could help increase the human flow at a location (Ibid).

2.4. Stockholm

The public transport system is well developed in Stockholm and quite integrated in the residents’ everyday lives. Therefore it is as important to study the safety in the transit environments as in the general neighborhood. This section presents a brief description of the composition of the public transport system in Stockholm.

2.4.1. The public transport system in Stockholm

According to (Mawby 2017), four dimensions can be identified in the public transport system: (1) The micro transit environment, like a bus or a train station, (2) The journey, (3) The meso- and macro settings, that is the neighborhood, and (4) The user principally-traveller-perspective.

SL, which stands for AB Storstockholms Lokaltrafik in Swedish, is the company responsible for the public transport system in Stockholm County. The public transport system consists of different traffic networks. There is the railway traffic that consists of the metro, also known as “the city’s artery”, and the commuter trains. They are designed to allow longer-distance travel within the county (SL 2018a). The trains are running from 5:00 am to 1:00 am the next day (Ceccato 2013). SL also provides buses, which is described as a “flexible compliment to the railway traffic” in Stockholm. There are approximately 800 thousand people every day that are using SL’s services to get to different locations in the county (SL 2018a).

The metro or subway system in Stockholm consists of 100 stations, 47 underground and 53 aboveground, and three lines: the Red, Green and Blue line (see Figure 2.4a.). Based on the number of stations (49 stations) and passengers, the Green line is the largest one. Half of all platforms are underground. A station is composed by a platform that connects to the lobby directly, alternatively with a transition area, which can include elevators, stairs and escalators. Out of all stations, there are only ten stations where the platforms can be seen easily from the lobby area and vice versa. However, no station in the subway system is classified to have a low level of visibility in every considered section, which regards the platform, transition area, lobby and exits (Ceccato 2013).

Because of security purposes, there are in average 29 CCTV cameras placed in every station at the Stockholm metro system. They are placed in what are considered to be “key places” of the stations like the platform, transition and lobby areas. Some of the cameras are not visible for the passengers (Ibid).

Below are two maps; the first one illustrates the railway network over the whole county (see Figure 2.4a.) while the second one illustrates the bus network in the inner city of Stockholm (see Figure 2.4b.).
Figure 2.4a. SL’s Rail Network Map over Stockholm County (SL 2018b)

Figure 2.4b. SL’s bus network over Stockholm City (Ibid)
3. Data and methods

3.1. Method

This project will look into people’s perception of safety by making a quantitative analysis based on data from Stockholm’s safety survey from 2014. The literature review in the previous section (see Chapter 2) more on safety in the public transport system, while the survey focuses more on general safety in the city and the residential areas. The idea is to use these two methods as complements to one another in order to draw better conclusions.

3.2. Study Area

The residents’ perception of safety will be investigated in both the residential areas and the transit environments in Stockholm City. The reason that Stockholm was chosen as the current study area is partly because it is Sweden's largest city, but also because it is a city with well-developed public transport and a city that is constantly working on safety and security issues. The city is divided into 14 different urban districts (Sweco and Stockholm Stad 2014) but since the aim is to examine the general perception of safety, no specific district area/neighborhood or transit line will be analyzed.

3.3. Data

In 2014, the population consisted of nearly 900 thousand (897700) people. Out of these, 23 % are born abroad. The distribution on the education level of the residents between 16-74 years is as such that 50 % have a post-secondary education, 33 % have an upper secondary level, while 14 % have a primary education. 3,2 % of the 2014’s population is unemployed (Sweco and Stockholm Stad 2014).

The data is secondary data that has been collected in 2014 by Sweco Strategy AB. The company was commissioned by Stockholm City to measure the safety among the Stockholm residents. In order to do so, a questionnaire was sent out by mail to a random selection of a little bit over 32 thousand (32279) people. Out of them, about 51 % (16436 people) responded to it. The questionnaire consisted of 64 questions in total, corresponding to general questions about the residents housing area, concerns about crime, unsafety in their residential area and district, their vulnerability to crime and a few questions about themselves (Ibid).

All survey-answers have been compiled in a statistic file, which has been used to make an analysis. Access to this, was provided by the Social Administration in Stockholm City, in order to create and present an own analysis of the data. In this report, a number of the questions will be presented with the participants’ responses. The responses have been compared between the gender groups Women and Men. Some of the questions have been looked into a bit deeper, by comparing the responses between different age groups (of women only). Note that what is presented in the results section below is an independent analysis of the statistic data. This means that there might be some differences between this result in this paper and the result that was presented in the Stockholm Safety Report from 2014.

3.2.1 Adjustments

As previously mentioned the questionnaire consists of 64 questions (go to the Appendix, A.). The quantitative study will deal with nine of these questions, Q8-Q11, Q13, Q20, Q29, Q30, Q42 and Q43, which are considered to be relevant to the paper’s aim and objectives. All of
these have been divided by gender, whereof the questions 13, 29 and 30 also have been divided by age (only women).

Regarding the questions 8, 11, 13, 20, 29 and 30, the number of response options has been changed. For example, Q11, where option 1 has been merged with option 2 to the Greater extent option, while 3 and 4 have been merged to Less/No extent (see Appendix A. to compare with the original questionnaire).

When it comes to the questions 10, 13 and 43, only some of the response options have been analyzed (see Appendix A. to compare with all of the options). Question 10 looks into the options (a), (b), (c), (f) and (i), while question 13 looks into (a), (d), (f) and (h). Question 19 and 43 only deals with one option each, question 19 with the option (i) and 43 with (d). A further explanation of these alternatives will be presented in the results.

4. Results

A total of 16436 people participated in Stockholm’s safety survey 2014. Out of all participants, 56 % consisted of women and 44 % of men. When it comes to the distribution of age regarding the female participants, 7 % out of them were under 25 years, while 37 % were between the ages of 25 and 44 years. 32 % consisted of women between the ages of 45 and 64 years, while 24 % were 65 years or older. Note that the total amount of participants, male and female and the different age groups are the same in all of the questions.

In the subsections below there are several charts, presenting the distribution of the participants’ response to the different questions that have been analyzed. What applies to all but one of them (Chart 3) concerning their stack color is that blue represent all concerned/unsafe participating residents, while the color red represent the non-concerned/safe residents. What applies to Chart 3, concerning the stack color, is that the different colors represent different examples of residents changed behavior because of their concern about crime.

In overview, the results presented below show that there are a larger percentage of residents who do not feel concerned or unsafe of crime, on all questions. When comparing between the two gender groups, on all but one question, there are more women than men who claim to feel unsafe. When looking closer to the female group, the results show that most people who claim to be worried about being subjected to any crime are between the age of 25 and 44 years.

4.1. Common anxiety

Out of all participants, about 45 % answered that they have been concerned about being subjected to any sort of crime in the past twelve months (see Chart 1). 53 % responded that they have not been concerned about this. 60 % out of the concerned responding residents were women and 40 % were men. Women, especially, are proclaiming that this is an issue in their everyday lives.

What are the impacts?

Due to the concern of being subjected to any sort of crime, 5 % of the Stockholm residents, consisting of 65 % women and 35 % men, feel that it is affecting their daily lives to a greater extent. 14 %, of which 66 % are women and 34 % are men, feel that it has less or no
extent at all. 18 % also claimed that there are consequences in the concerned residents daily lives (see Chart 2). About 65 % of them were women and 35 % were men (see Chart 3). Because of this, seven percent do not go out during certain times of the day, whereof 72 % women and 28 % men. Two percent of which 70 % women and 30 % men, are refraining from some activities like going to the movies and restaurants etcetera. 6,5 % often take a taxi home when it is getting late and out of these, 72 % out of these are women, while 28 % are men. Just over 3 %, of which 71 % women and 29 % men, may take detours to get home in the evening. 6,6 %, consisting of 78 % women and 22 % men, do not usually go out alone in the evening because of their concern about crime.

Chart 1: The Stockholm residents’ general concern about crime (Q8), divided by gender

Chart 2: The effect of the residents’ concern about crime in Stockholm (Q9), divided by gender
4.2. Fear of crime in the neighborhood

57 % out of the Stockholm residents feel safe in their neighborhoods. 41 % do not feel safe and claims that they worry about becoming victims of crime from a couple of times a year to almost every single day. 63 % out of the concerned residents are women, while 37 % are men. Most of the female residents that feel unsafe in their neighborhoods are between the ages of 45-64 years old, with a percentage of 59 %. 43 % out of the women concerned are 25-44 years old, 28 % are from 65 years and 7 % are under 25 years.

In the following sections you find the results of the distribution of residents’ fear of different crimes.

Assault or violence

The results show that only a small part of all participating residents, 7,5 % to be precise, are worried to be assaulted or become victims of violence in the public environment in Stockholm (see Chart 4). 88 % are not concerned about this. Also, the distribution between concerned men and women are almost the same, with 52 % out of the concerned residents consisting of women while 48 % consists of men. By taking a closer look into the female gender group (see Chart 5), you find that the women who are most concerned are between the ages of 25 and 44 years (55 %), followed by women under 25 years (23 %). 18 % out of the concerned women are between the ages of 45 and 64 years, while 4,3 % are 65 years or older.
Chart 4: The Stockholm residents’ concern about becoming victims of assault or violence in the public environment (Q13 (a)), divided by gender.

Chart 5: The female respondents concern about becoming victims of assault or violence in the public area, divided by age.

Sexual harassment

Even in this case, the proportion of residents who are not concerned is dominating and the distribution of worried men and women is almost equal. 4.8% of the residents in Stockholm are concerned about being sexually harassed in the public area (see Chart 6). 82% of them are women and 44% are men. Most women, 55% out of all concerned, are between the ages of 25 and 44 years (see Chart 7). Just over 21% are younger 25 years, 18% are between the ages of 45 and 64 years and only 4.3% are from 65 years old.
Almost 7% out of all participants fear of being raped in the public area, while 89% are not concerned about this (see Chart 8). Out of the concerned residents, nearly 83% are women and 17% are men. A closer look at the female gender group (see Chart 9) shows that women between the ages of 25 to 44 years worry most, with 57%. They are followed by in the age between 45 and 64 years (22%). 16% out of the concerned women are under 25 years, while 5.2% are from 65 years old.
Chart 8: The Stockholm residents’ concern about becoming victims of rape in the public area (Q13 (f)), divided by gender

Chart 9: The female respondents’ concern about becoming victims of rape in the public area, divided by age

Robbery

The percentage of concerned residents is somewhat higher than in the previous case. Out of all residents in Stockholm, 13.5% claimed that they are concerned about being robbed in the public area and 82% do not feel concerned about this (see Chart 10). In this case, 6.3% of the concerned residents are women, while 32% are men. Women between the ages of 25-44 and 45-64 were most worried out of the female residents with 36%, respectively 31% (see Chart 11). 23% of the women were 65 years or older. Least concerned are women younger than 25 years (9%).
4.3. Fear of crime in the transit environment

When the Stockholm residents were asked if they feel safe in the metro- or commuter train station closest to where they live, 80% responded that they do while 13% claimed that they do not (see Chart 12). The perception of safety in this matter includes both people who do use the public transportation and those who do not because of their fear of becoming victims of any crime. Out of the residents who felt unsafe in the transit environment, 67% were women and 33% were men. Regarding the concern among the women (see Chart 13), 36% consisted of 25-44 year olds and 32% of 45-64 year olds. 24% out of the concerned women were in the age of 65 or older while 7.8% consisted of women younger than 25 years.
According to the results (see Chart 14) the perception of unsafety among the residents of Stockholm increases on their way home from the metro- or commuter train station closest to where they live. 23 % in total fear of becoming victims of any crime, where 74 % out of them are women and 26 % are men. As for the different age groups (see Chart 15), 37 % of the concerned women are between the ages of 25 and 44 years. 32 % consists of women between the ages of 45 and 64 years, 23 % of women from 65 years and about 8 % consists of women below the age of 25 years.
Ethnic background

In the questionnaire the residents of Stockholm were also asked if they have been victims of crime, including arguments/fights, threats or harassment, during the past twelve months because of their ethnic background (Question 42). A total of 91% claimed that they had been victimized, out of 57% were women and 43 percent were men.

In order to conclude how big of an impact a person’s ethnic background has on the matter of safety, question 43 has been adjusted (as mentioned in section 3.2.1) to only look at one option of response. This option is regarding to the residents experience in being victimized in the transit environment because of their ethnic background. The results show that only 36 people (0.25%) have been victimized because of their ethnicity in the transit environment.
5. Discussion

5.1. Limitations of data sources

Due to the fact that the survey was not sent to the entire population of Stockholm, but to a selection only, the results may not reflect the reality to one hundred percent. Also, the results are based on survey answers from year 2014, which means that the perception of safety is probably different today than from four years ago. However, the results are presumably not that different because drastic changes to this context would probably require more time than four years.

5.1.1. Error sources and deficiencies

Overall, the results are pretty reasonable, but no method has ever been perfectly performed which means that the results might have a few error sources and deficiencies. To begin with, there were more women than men who participated in the survey. This could have had an impact on the results, regarding the distribution of the gender perception of safety, by showing greater differences than it actually is. The same applies to the female gender group, where for example the number of participants under the age of 25 was significantly lower than the remaining age groups, which in the end might have given some deviating results.

This study mainly focused on the general aspect of safety. The data has been analyzed based on each question instead of each participant in the survey, which means that a lot of assumptions have been made regarding the overall perception of safety. What would have been interesting to investigate is how many residents actually experience a complete sense of unsafety, namely which residents fear of being subjected to crime in every imaginable situation. The question of which factors are most crucial to the resulting feeling of unsafety could have been answered more concretely, if one had taken a more quantitative approach by taking a closer look at the correlation between a person’s individual characteristics.

5.2. Synthesis of the results

5.2.1. Common anxiety

There are approximately 700 thousand people who use public transport in Stockholm everyday (SL 2018a). Women are more likely to travel by public transport than men. The perception of safety is considered to be a gendered issue. Although men are being subjected to crime in transit environments more often than women, women tend to feel less safe (Ceccato 2017). Gender specific violence is suggested to have a great impact on women’s perception of safety. When feeling unsafe people, especially women, are more likely to change their behavior in order to minimize the risks of being victimized (Vanier and d’Arbois de Jubainville 2017).

The results showed that women’s general perception of safety is lower than men’s. Out of the residents who claimed that their fear of crime affects the daily lives, 65 % of the claims came from women. The results also showed that around 70 % out of the women who are concerned tend to change their behavior, a percentage that is almost twice as big as the men’s (around 30 %).

Taking into account that there are also more women who have participated in the safety survey, one can imagine that the proportion of female residents who feel unsafe is greater than
male ones because of their higher dependence on the public transport. Due to this, women also face a greater risk of being victimized in the transit environment.

5.2.2. Fear of crime in the neighborhood

The perception of safety can depend on a place’s physical design and its contact with the surrounding environments (Urban Utveckling). It can also be based on a person’s individual characteristics, which regards its gender, age, ethnical background, level of education and job situation etcetera (Ceccato 2017).

Assault and violence

When it comes to general violence it is reasonable that men and women are almost as concerned about being victims, which was shown in the results. It is also reasonable that young women, below 25, worry more about this crime than women from 45 years. In today’s society, it does not come as a surprise if a violent situation occurs when there are a lot of young people present, for example at a party.

Sexual harassment and rape

As mentioned earlier in the text, the fear of being subjected to sexual crimes is greater for women than what it is for men (Ceccato 2017). This is also shown in the quantitative analysis, with the results showing that 83 % out of all residents who are concerned of being sexually harassed or raped is correspondent to women. The results also show that perception of safety, regarding fear of crime, does not change exponentially. Most of the female residents who worry about being victims both sexual harassment and rape are between 25 and 44 years old. Although the second most concerned group is women younger than 25 years, there are significant differences when looking at the distribution of their fear. An explanation to why the youngest participants are not as worried as the others could be that the fear does not increase because of age but because of their life experiences. Perhaps it has become more relevant when they have gotten older, because they become more aware of their risk of being victims, because they have received more information about sexual offenses in the neighborhood and transit areas (Vanier and d’Arbois de Jubainville 2017). This combined with that their use of the public transportation might have been extended makes them more observant of their surroundings.

The perception of safety could suggestively be described out of an "out of sight, out of mind" point of view. This would mean that people do not worry about being subjected to certain crimes until they or people in their surroundings actually experience it themselves. The fact that a crime situation has occurred in their surroundings is a factor per se that might increase peoples’ sense of unsafety.

Robbery

The fact that more men are worried about being robbed than women does not come as a surprise. This could be because women worry more about being exposed to violence and sex crimes (Ceccato 2017) that may be perceived as being worse offenses. Anyone can be exposed to robbery and it affects people's sense of safety differently, but sexual assaults are harder against women as a gender group and perception of safety.
5.2.3. Fear of crime in the transit environment

According to the result, the sense of security decreases when public transport users leave the subway / commuter train station closest to where they live. This could be due to the lack of monitoring in the "intermediate" areas, which according to the Crime Triangle (see Figure 2.3.) is one factor for a crime situation to occur (Cohen and Felson 1979).

The theory that younger travelers are more afraid in the evenings (Vanier and d’Arbois de Jubainville 2017) does not really match the outcome of Stockholm's safety measure. The results show that women under 25 do not feel as unsafe in the transit areas as the other age groups. This could be because young travelers are more likely to travel spontaneously with public transport, both in terms of time and space. Women between the ages of 25 and 64 are presumably corresponded as daily working users, who use the public transportation for more routine travels, like getting home and away from school, getting the kids from school etcetera. (Ibid). This could mean that young women pose a greater risk of being subjected to crimes in both the housing and transit environment. With this, it is still reasonable that women between 25-64 years of age are more concerned about being subjected to crimes when using public transport for spontaneous journeys, as it becomes somewhat unknown from the usual routines.

Ethnicity is, as previously mentioned, another example of an individual characteristic that is suggested to have an impact on the perceived safety among people (Ceccato 2017). According to the results from the quantitative analysis, the link between being assaulted because of someone's ethnic background and being in the transit environment is extremely weak and almost non-existent. However, this is not enough evidence to make any conclusion as to how the connection between people's ethnic background and perceived safety looks like.

5.3. Implications of the results

Although safety and security are two distinctive concepts there is no strong link between (Urban Utveckling), it is nevertheless important that they take each other into account. In one hand, crime opportunities like vandalism in the public space arise in empty and unsupervised areas. But on the other hand, people tend to find crime opportunities at locations where the human flow is big, pickpockets on the subway for instance (Mawby 2017).

People’s fear of crime could lead to inhibition of their mobility as well as to counteraction of sustainable development. When feeling unsafe, people, especially women may take behavior-changing actions in order to avoid situations where they could become victims of different crimes. What is problematic with this is that not everybody has the opportunity to take this type of action because their dependence on public transport as a means of travel dominates their sense of insecurity. But then this is a very short-term solution to an ever-increasing problem. Building sustainable cities requires solutions that increase the sense of security in one place, while reducing incentives for different behavioral changes. The question that needs to be asked is what measures can be taken in order to develop a more safe, and therefore also a sustainable society. As the concept of safety to some extent, is personal, there is no exact solution. So how should we proceed in the work of creating a safer society for everybody? A suggestion is to start using CPTED as this method includes several different approaches to the safety work, thus providing a good basis for other complementary solutions.

Exploiting the tools available for planning security in society is important to try and reach out to the citizens. Not only by informing about the laws and regulations that exist but also about different norms, like what is socially acceptable to people on, for example, the bus home. It is
desirable to believe that all human beings are acting in “common sense”, but the fact is that people are quite irrational, which means that there will be situations where they do wrong and even commit crimes.

6. Conclusions

Based on the results of the quantitative analysis and from the theory, the following conclusions have been drawn regarding the questions below:

- How does the common anxiety of crime differ between men and women, and within the female gender group, in Stockholm?

Gender is one of many factors that play a role in whether people feel safe or not in the society. The results showed overall perception of safety among the residents in Stockholm is pretty good. There are more women than men who are concerned about becoming victims of any crime, regarding assault and violence, sexual harassment or rape. Although, there are more men than women who worry about being robbed.

The perception of safety is also affected by a person’s individual characteristics; age has proven to be one example of this. The study shows that the sense of fear among women is not exponential. Most women, who worry about being subjected to any crime in Stockholm, were between the ages of 25 and 44. The second most concerned age group depends on the type of crime regarded. Young travellers (women under 25 years) tend to be more concerned about being victims of crimes including assault or violence and sexual harassment, while women between the ages of 45 and 64 years are more concerned about crimes that regard rape and robbery. The study also shows that female travellers from 25 years are more concerned, than women younger than 25 years, about crime when being in the transit environments.

- What are the impacts to the residents’ concern about crime? How does it affect their overall sense of safety?

The perceived safety has an impact on people’s mobility, and especially women’s. Their concerns about being subjected to any crime might lead to inhibition of their mobility that involves the likelihood of changed behavior such as avoidance. In the long run, this then leads to a less sustainable society. In order for sustainable cities to be built, both security and safety measures are required so that both the actual safety and the perception of it increase. CPTED is suggestively a good tool to begin with regarding to this matter.
7. Suggestions

There are many ways that the perception of safety could be investigated. This study could have been made in a less general context, in order to map out the residents perception of safety and answer the question of where, in which district/neighborhood/transit station they feel more or less safe.

A further suggestion would be to perform a study with a more quantitative approach by, for instance creating a logit-model, performing a regression, correlation analysis, a chi-squared tests or similar in order to get an understanding in how the different aspects and factors are connected.

Another way to approach this issue could be to add study visits as a complementary method in order to add your own perspective. In addition to statistics from the safety survey, a suggestion would be to get access to police records in order for a broader analysis to be made. This type of data could be used to, among other things, understand how the confidence in the police, number of reported crimes are related to the safety issue.
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A. Questionnaire from Stockholm’s safety survey 2014

Frågorna besvaras genom att du sätter ett kryss i rutan för det/de svarsalternativ som passar bäst. Om svarsalternativen inte passar alls, ber vi dig kommentera med egna ord.

Du kan besvara enkäten på följande sätt:

Internet. Din personliga kod till webbenkäten finner du i följebrevet.


Om du har några frågor är du välkommen att ringa oss på Sweco Strategy AB på telefon 08 – 613 08 35.

Du kan också skriva till Sweco på e-post: falt@sweco.se
Allmänna frågor om dig och ditt bostadsområde

1. I vilken typ av bostad bor du?
   1. Hyreslägenhet ägda av Svenska bostäder
   2. Hyreslägenhet ägda av Familjebostäder
   3. Hyreslägenhet ägda av Stockholmsomh
   4. Hyreslägenhet ägda av privatägar
   5. Bostadsrättslägenhet
   6. Rättshus, kedjehus eller parhus
   7. Villa

2. Hur länge har du bott i ditt nuvarande bostadsområde?
   1. Mindre än ett år
   2. 1 – 5 år
   3. Mer än 5 år

3. Om du fick välja fritt, skulle du flytta ifrån ditt nuvarande bostadsområde?
   1. Ja, p.g.a. otrygghet, mycket brott och ordningsstörningar
   2. Ja, av andra orsaker
   3. Nej
   4. Vet ej

4. Hur trivs du (med att bo) i ditt bostadsområde?
   1. Mycket bra
   2. Ganska bra
   3. Inte särskilt bra
   4. Dåligt

5. Kryssa för det som överensstämmer med dig/din familj
   (Du kan kryssa i flera av alternativen)
   1. Jag/vi äger vår bostad
   2. Jag/vi äger ett fridshus
   3. Jag/vi äger en bil
   4. Jag/vi äger en husvagn och/eller båt för bland annat semesterbrak
   5. Jag/vi åker på en semesterresa varje eller varannan år
   6. Jag/vi kan gå till tandläkare/hygienist vid behov och minst en gång per år
   7. Om jag/vi skulle, p.g.a. olöpade situationer, behöva 14 000 kronor inom en vecka är det möjligt för mig/oss att ordna det
   8. Det har hänt några gånger under de senaste 12 månaderna att jag/vi har haft svårighet att klara av de löpande utgifterna för hyra, mat, räkningar m.m.
   9. Jag/vi har hemförsäkring
   10. Jag/vi pensionsparar regelbundet
6. Instämmer du eller instämmer du inte i följande påståenden om ditt bostadsområde?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instämmer helt och fullt</th>
<th>Instämmer delvis</th>
<th>Varken instämmer eller motsätter</th>
<th>Instämmer inte</th>
<th>Instämmer absolut inte</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jag känner igen många av de personer som bor i mitt bostadsområde.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jag småptar med granar som bor i mitt bostadsområde.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Det finns personer i mitt bostadsområde som jag byter små tjänster med.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vuxna i det område jag bor känner igen vilka barn som bor här.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De som bor i mitt bostadsområde kommer bra överens.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De som bor i mitt bostadsområde är hjälpsamma mot varandra.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man kan lita på dem som bor i mitt bostadsområde.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Om följande händelser skulle inträffa i ditt bostadsområde, hur sannolikt är det att de som bor i området skulle göra någotning ät det?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mycket sannolikt</th>
<th>Ganska sannolikt</th>
<th>Varken sannolikt eller osannolikt</th>
<th>Ganska osannolikt</th>
<th>Mycket osannolikt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Om en grupp barn skolkade från skolan och hängde i bostadsområdet.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Om några barn klottrade på väggarna i ditt bostadsområde.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Om barn betedde sig respektdöst mot en vuxen.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Om det pågick ett slagsmål utanför din bostad och någon blev slagen eller allvarligt hotad.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Om någon försökte göra inbrott i en bil som stod parkerad framför er bostad.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Allmän oro för brott

8. Har det under de senaste tolv månaderna hänt att du varit orolig för att utsättas för brott av något slag?
   1. Ja, varje eller nästan varje dag
   2. Ja, någon gång i veckan
   3. Ja, någon gång i månaden
   4. Ja, några gånger under året
   5. Nej, aldrig → gå till fråga 12

9. Får denna oro några konsekvenser i ditt vardagsliv?
   1. Ja
   2. Nej → gå till fråga 12

10. Vilka är dessa konsekvenser? (Du kan kryssa flera av alternativen)
   1. Gör ej ut under vissa tider på dygnet
   2. Har avstått från någon aktivitet t.ex. att gå på bio, restaurang eller liknande
   3. Är extra välsam och försiktig när jag är ute
   4. Känner mig ofta rädd när jag är ute ensam på kvällen
   5. Tärt ofta taxibon när klockan är mycket
   6. Får gå omvägar för att komma hem på kvällen
   7. Har köpt olika slag av stödsdelaravrustning t.ex. rakrycka till bilen
   8. Lämnar inte lägenheten obevakad under någon längre tid
   9. Gör ofta inte ut ensam på kvällen
   10. Tänker ofta på brott och har ibland svårt att sova
   11. Extra försiktig med värdeföremål och kontanter
   12. Tänker på vilka jag inleder en konversation med
   13. Annat........................................................................................................................................

11. Sammanfattningsvis, i hur stor utsträckning tycker du att oron för att utsättas för brott påverkar ditt vardagsliv och din livsstil?  
   1. I en mycket stor utsträckning
   2. I en stor utsträckning
   3. I en ganska liten utsträckning
   4. I liten utsträckning
   5. Ingen utsträckning alls

12. Har det hänt under de senaste 12 månaderna att du oroat dig för att någon närstående till dig ska drabbas av brott?
   1. Ja, mycket ofta
   2. Ja, ganska ofta
   3. Ganska sällan
   4. Nej, är inte orolig
13. Är du orolig för att utsättas för följande brott?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Förbryllande bild</th>
<th>Orolig (inte)</th>
<th>Ganska sällan</th>
<th>Ganska ofta</th>
<th>Mycket ofta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Överfall eller våld i den offentliga miljön</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Överfall eller våld i hemmet</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inbrott i din bostad</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexuella trakasserier i den offentliga miljön</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexuella trakasserier i hemmet</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Våldtäkt i den offentliga miljön</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Våldtäkt i hemmet</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hot, trakasserier och bedrägeri på Internet</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(t ex sociala medier, sms eller mejl)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Är du orolig för att din bil skall utsättas för stöld, inbrott eller skadegörelse?

1. ☐ Jag har inte bil  
   gå till fråga 16
2. ☐ Ja, mycket ofta
3. ☐ Ja, ganska ofta
4. ☐ Ja, ganska sällan
5. ☐ År inte orolig

15. Skyddar du din (hushålls) bil mot brott på något av följande sätt?
(Du kan kryssa i flera av alternativa)

1. ☐ Jag/vi har inte vidtagit några extra stöldskyddsåtgärder
2. ✑ Inbrottssäkerhet
3. ✑ Rutlycka i bilen
4. ☐ Tänker på var jag parkerar bilen
5. ☐ Använd skydd i bilen
6. ☐ Ser till att aldrig lämna värdesaker kvar i bilen
7. ☐ Ber grannar/bekanta titta till bilen vid behov

16. Skyddar du och ditt hushåll bostaden mot brott på något av följande sätt?
(Överkryssa i flera av alternativa)

1. ☐ Jag/vi har inte vidtagit några extra stöldskyddsåtgärder
2. ☐ Säkerhetslås
3. ☐ Lås på balkongdörr
4. ☐ Säkerhetslås
5. ☐ Gallergrind
6. ☐ Lås på vissa fönster
7. ☐ Hund
8. ☐ Inbrottssäkerhet
9. ☐ Bankfack
10. ☐ Ber grannar/bekanta titta till bostaden när jag/vi åker bort

17. Har det under de senaste 12 månaderna hänt att du känt dig orolig för att utsättas för ett brott av något slag p.g.a. av ditt (svenska eller utländska) ursprung?

1. ☑ Ja, ofta
2. ☐ Ja, ibland
3. ☐ Ja, men endast sällan
4. ☐ Nej, aldrig
Otrygghet i bostadsområdet; frågor om ditt bostadshus och bostadsområde.

18. Känner du dig ibland orolig för att vistas på vissa platser i ditt bostadshus eller dess närhet, därför att du skulle kunna utsättas för ett brott?
1. Ja, på en eller flera platser
2. Nej, ingenstans

19. Vilken eller vilka platser är det som du ibland kan känna oro på?
(Här kan du utveckla fler än ett alternativ)
1. Källaren
2. Trapphuset
3. På vägen till och från bostaden
4. Tvättstugan
5. Garaget
6. I mitt eget hem
7. Vinden
8. Parkeringssplassen
9. Soprum eller dyr
10. Utanför porten och på gården

20. Känner du oro för att bli utsatt för ett brott av något slag i ditt bostadshus?
1. Ja, varje eller nästan varje dag
2. Ja, någon gång i veckan
3. Ja, någon gång i månaden
4. Ja, några gånger under året
5. Nej, aldrig

21. Om du går ut ensam sent en kväll i området du bor i, känner du dig trygg eller otrygg eller går du i stort sett aldrig ut ensam på kvällarna?
1. Mycket trygg
2. Ganska trygg
3. Ganska otrygg
4. Mycket otrygg
5. Går ej ut ensam på kvällen av oro för att utsättas för brott
6. Går ej ut ensam på kvällen av andra orsaker

22. Finns det några personer i ditt bostadshus som du ibland kan uppleva som hotande?
1. Ja, en
2. Ja, flera
3. Nej, ingen

23. Om du är ensam ute efter mörkrets inbrott inom ditt bostadshus, försöker du då att hålla dig borta från vissa platser och gator för att undvika att bli utsatt för något våld eller hot?
1. Ja, alltid
2. Ja, för det mesta
3. Ja, någon enstaka gång
4. Nej, aldrig
5. Går ej ut ensam när det är mörkt pga av oro för brott
6. Går ej ut ensam på kvällen av andra orsaker
24. **Hur trygg eller otrygg känner du dig sammanfattningsvis i ditt bostadsområde?**

   1. Mycket trygg
   2. Trygg
   3. Ganska trygg
   4. Otrygg
   5. Mycket otrygg

25. **Har du sett något brott begås i ditt bostadsområde?**

   1. Nej
   2. Ja, ett brott
   3. Ja, flera brott

26. **Har du hört talas om något brott, t.ex. inbrott, bilrelaterade brott eller skadegörelse, som begåtts i ditt bostadsområde eller i anknytning till detta?**

   1. Det begås inga brott i vårt bostadsområde och dess närhet
   2. Nej
   3. Ja, ett brott
   4. Ja, flera brott

**Otrygghet i din stadsdel, generellt**

27. **Finns det områden eller platser i din stadsdel, där du inte vill röra dig under vissa tider (t.ex. på kvällar och nätter) därför att det förekommer oroligheter och brottslighet där och du är orolig att utsättas för detta?**

   1. Ja, flera
   2. Ja, ett
   3. Nej

   [gå till fråga 29]

28. **Vilken/vilka är dessa platser?**  
   (angående, torg, park eller annan plats så precist du kan)

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

29. **Är du orolig för att vistas på den tunnelbanestation/pendeltågsstation/tvärbanestation som ligger närmast där du bor, därför att du skulle kunna utsättas för ett brott av något slag?**

   1. Ja, mycket ofta
   2. Ja, ganska ofta
   3. Nej, ganska sällan
   4. Nej, aldrig
   5. Använder ej tunnelbanan/pendeltåg/tvärbanan av oro för att utsättas för brott
   6. Använder ej tunnelbanan/pendeltåg/tvärbanan av andra orsaker
30. Är du orolig för att kvälls- eller nattetid gå hem ifrån den tunnelbanestation/pendeltågsstation/ tårvägbanestation som ligger närmast där du bor därför att du skulle kunna utsättas för brott?

1. Ja, mycket ofta
2. Ja, ganska ofta
3. Nej, ganska sällan
4. Nej, aldrig
5. Görd detta av oro för att utsättas för brott
6. Görd detta av andra orsaker

Följande frågor handlar om ordningsproblem i ditt bostadsområde

31. Upplever du att det finns problem med följande fenomen i ditt bostadsområde eller i anknytning till detta?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fenomen</th>
<th>Nej</th>
<th>Ja, i liten utsträckning</th>
<th>Ja, i stor utsträckning</th>
<th>Ja, det finns inget problem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Påträngande tiggeri</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klotter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nedskräpning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skadegörelse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mörka områden och dålig belysning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anlagda bränder i t.ex. papperskorgar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stöckiga granar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berusade personer som stör ordningen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bostäder som är tillhör för narkotikamissbrukare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narkotikamissbrukare på offentliga platser som stör ordningen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folk som bräkar och släss utomhus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folk som bräkar och släss inomhus i sina bostäder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kvinnor som antastas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ungdomar som stör ordningen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

32. I den stadsdel där jag bor ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fenomen</th>
<th>Stämmer inte alls</th>
<th>Stämmer ganska dåligt</th>
<th>Varken eller</th>
<th>Stämmer ganska bra</th>
<th>Stämmer helt</th>
<th>Vet ej</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...tats allt klotter bort snabbt på byggnader och anläggningar t.ex. skolor och förskolor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...är jag nöjd med städningen.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...är jag nöjd med belysningen.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Följande frågor handlar om utsatthet för brott

33. Har du själv under de senaste 12 månaderna varit utsatt för att någon med avsikt slog, sparkade eller utsatte dig för någon annan typ av fysiskt våld som ledde till synliga märken, skador eller smärta?
   1. Nej ➔ gå till fråga 36
   2. Ja, ............... antal gånger.

34. Var det samma gärningsman vid samtliga eller de flesta tillfällena?
   1. Ja
   2. Nej

35. Om du blivit utsatt för någon typ av fysiskt våld, var skedde detta?
   (Här kan du fylla i flera alternativ)
   1. Inomhus i bostad
   2. Inomhus i offentlig lokal
   3. Utomhus i ditt bostadsområde
   4. Utomhus på annan plats, närmigen

36. Har du själv under de senaste 12 månaderna blivit utsatt för hot på ett sådant sätt att du blev rädd?
   1. Nej ➔ gå till fråga 38
   2. Ja, ................ antal gånger.

37. Om du blivit utsatt för någon form av hot, var skedde detta?
   (Här kan du fylla i flera alternativ)
   1. Inomhus i bostad
   2. Inomhus i offentlig lokal
   3. Utomhus i ditt bostadsområde
   4. Utomhus på annan plats, närmigen
   5. På Internet, t ex sociala medier, sms eller mejl

38. Har du själv under de senaste 12 månaderna blivit utsatt för rån, dvs. att någon stal eller för sökte stjäla något från dig genom att använda hot eller våld?
   1. Nej ➔ gå till fråga 40
   2. Ja, ................ antal gånger.

39. Om du blivit utsatt för någon form av rån, var skedde detta?
   (Här kan du fylla i flera alternativ)
   1. Inomhus i bostad
   2. Inomhus i offentlig lokal
   3. Utomhus i ditt bostadsområde
   4. Utomhus på annan plats, närmigen
40. Har du själv under de senaste 12 månaderna blivit utsatt för sexuella trakasserier?
(Med detta menas oliknande närmanden eller kränkande uppspelningar kring sädast man förknippas med sex)

1. Nej  
2. Ja ................................ antal gånger.

41. Om du blivit utsatt för sexuella trakasserier, var skedde detta?
(Hur kan du välja i flera alternativ)

1. Inomhus i bostad
2. Inomhus i offentlig lokal
3. Utomhus på annan plats, närmigen.............................................
4. På Internet, t ex sociala medier, sms eller mejl
5. Utomhus i ditt bostadsområde

42. Har du under de senaste 12 månaderna utsatts för någon form av brott; bråk, hot eller trakasserier p.g.a. ditt (svenska eller utländska) ursprung?

1. Nej  
2. Ja ....................... antal gånger

43. Om Du blivit utsatt för någon form av brott; bråk, hot eller trakasserier p.g.a. ditt (svenska eller utländska) ursprung, var skedde detta?
(Hur kan du välja i flera alternativ)

1. Inomhus i bostad
2. Inomhus i offentlig lokal
3. Utomhus på annan plats, närmigen.............................................
4. På Internet, t ex sociala medier, sms eller mejl
5. Utomhus i ditt bostadsområde

44. Har du under de senaste 12 månaderna, under ett bråk/gräl med den du har eller har haft en relation med, utsatts för lindriga slag, knuffar, hot, trakasserier eller dylikt?

1. Jag har varit ensamstående under denna tid
2. Nej

45. Har ditt hushåll under de senaste 12 månaderna utsatts för någon typ av stöld?

1. Nej  
2. Ja, ....................... antal gånger

46. Vad utsattes för stöld och var hände det? Ange också hur många gånger det skett.
(Kryssa för flera alternativ om det behövs)

1. Ordinarie bostad, antal gånger .................................
2. Utrymme som tillhör bostaden, antal gånger...........................
3. Frihus, huven eller bår, antal gånger.................................
4. Bilen (av eller ur), i eget bostadsområde antal gånger.......................
5. Bilen (av eller ur), på annan plats antal gånger............................
6. Cykel, mopeder eller MC, i eget bostadsområde antal gånger.............
7. Cykel, mopeder eller MC, på annan plats antal gånger.....................
8. Plånbok, mobiltelefon, kreditkort eller dyl, antal gånger.................
9. Annat föremål eller objekt, antal gånger...............................
47. Har ditt hushåll under de senaste 12 månaderna utsatts för någon form av skadegörelse?
1. Nej  
2. Ja, antal gängen.

48. Vad utsattes för skadegörelse och var hände det? Ange också hur många gängen det hänt. (Kryssa flera alternativ om det behövs)
1. Ordinarie bostad, antal gängen.
2. Utomhus som tillhör bostaden, antal gängen.
3. Frискis, husvagn eller båt, antal gängen.
4. Bil i eget bostadsområde, antal gängen.
5. Bil på annan plats, antal gängen.
6. Cykel, moped eller MC i eget bostadsområde, antal gängen.
7. Cykel, moped eller MC på annan plats, antal gängen.
8. Annat föremål eller objekt, antal gängen.

49. Sammanfattningsvis, hur många brott har du utsatts för under de senaste 12 månaderna?
1. Jag har ej utsatts för brott  
2. Antal brott

50. Om du eller ditt hushåll utsattes för något brott under de senaste 12 månaderna, anmäldes detta till polisen?
1. Nej, anmälde ej till polisen
2. Ja, vid något eller några tillfällen
3. Ja, vid alla tillfällen

51. Om du eller ditt hushåll utsattes för brott under de senaste 12 månaderna har ni då fått den hjälp och det stöd ni behövde?
1. Jag/Vi har ej haft behov av mera hjälp och stöd
2. Jag/Vi har haft behov av extra hjälp och stöd men ej fått detta
3. Jag/Vi har fått hjälp och stöd av:
   ...

52. Vilket förtroende har du för den lokala polisen i området där du bor?
1. Mycket stort
2. Ganska stort
3. Varken stort eller litet
4. Ganska litet
5. Mycket litet
6. Vet ej

53. Vilket förtroende har du för stadsdelsförvaltningen i området där du bor?
1. Mycket stort
2. Ganska stort
3. Varken stort eller litet
4. Ganska litet
5. Mycket litet
6. Vet ej

OBS! Fler frågor på baksidan.
Frågor om dig själv

54. År du?
   1. Man
   2. kvinna

55. Vilket är du född?
   .................

56. Vilket av följande gäller för dig?
   1. Gift eller sambo
   2. Särbo
   3. Femsamstående
   4. Annat

57. Hur många personer ingår i ditt hushåll?
   (Räkna även Dig själv)
   ................. st vuxna (över 18 år)
   ................. st barn (under 18 år)

58. År du född i ett annat land än Sverige?
   1. Ja
   2. Nej — gick till fråga 60

59. Hur gammal var du när du kom till Sverige?
   ................. år gammal.

60. Är någon av dinas föräldrar födda utomlands?
   1. Ja, en av dem
   2. Ja, båda
   3. Nej

61. Vilken form av skolutbildning har du?
   1. Ej fullständig grundskoleutbildning
      eller motsvarande
   2. Avslutad grundskoleutbildning eller
      motsvarande
   3. Avslutad gymnasieutbildning
      eller motsvarande
   4. Högskoleexamen eller motsvarande

62. Vilken är din huvudsakliga sysselsättning?
   (Kryssa i endast ett alternativ)
   1. Eigen företagare
   2. Anställd helid
   3. Anställd deltid
   4. Studerande
   5. Arbetsslös
   6. Är pensionär (förtids- sjuk- äldre-
      eller älkespensionär)
   7. Arbetar helid i eget hushåll
   8. Annat, vad? ................................................
      ..........................................................

63. Upplever du att du har någon typ av
    funktionsnedsättning?
   1. Ja
   2. Nej

Slutliga en öppen fråga

64. Finns det något ytterligare som du vill säga om brott, ordningsproblem och trygghet i ditt
    bostadsområde och/eller stadsdel? Vilka behov finns? Har du några idéer till åtänder?
    ................................................................................................................
    ................................................................................................................
    ................................................................................................................
    ................................................................................................................
    ................................................................................................................

Tack för hjälpen!