

Flash Eurobarometer 236
June 2008

Citizens' perceptions of fraud
and the fight against fraud in the EU27

Basic bilingual questionnaire

The GALLUP Organization

Flash 236 – FLASH EUROBAROMETER

D1. Gender

[DO NOT ASK - MARK APPROPRIATE]

- [1] Male
- [2] Female

D2. How old are you?

- [][] years old
- [00] [REFUSAL/NO ANSWER]

D3. How old were you when you stopped full-time education?

[Write in THE AGE WHEN EDUCATION WAS TERMINATED]

- [][] years old
- [00] [STILL IN FULL TIME EDUCATION]
- [01] [NEVER BEEN IN FULL TIME EDUCATION]
- [99] [REFUSAL/NO ANSWER]

D1. Sexe

[NE PAS DEMANDER - NOTER COMME APPROPRIE]

- [1] Homme
- [2] Femme

D2. Quel âge avez-vous?

- [][] ans
- [00] [REFUS/PAS DE REPONSE]

D3. Quel âge aviez-vous quand vous avez terminé vos études à temps plein?

[Noter l'âge de fin d'études]

- [][] ans
- [00] [Toujours en train de poursuivre des études à temps plein]
- [01] [Jamais suivi des études à temps plein]
- [99] [REFUS/PAS DE REPONSE]

D4. As far as your current occupation is concerned, would you say you are self-employed, an employee, a manual worker or would you say that you are without a professional activity? Does it mean that you are a(n)...

[IF A RESPONSE TO THE MAIN CATEGORY IS GIVEN, READ OUT THE RESPECTIVE SUB-CATEGORIES - ONE ANSWER ONLY]

- Self-employed

→ i.e.	- farmer, forester, fisherman	11
	- owner of a shop, craftsman	12
	- professional (lawyer, medical practitioner, accountant, architect,...)	13
	- manager of a company	14
	- other	15

- Employee

→ i.e.	- professional (employed doctor, lawyer, accountant, architect)	21
	- general management, director or top management	22
	- middle management	23
	- Civil servant	24
	- office clerk	25
	- other employee (salesman, nurse, etc...)	26
	- other	27

- Manual worker

→ i.e.	- supervisor / foreman (team manager, etc...)	31
	- Manual worker	32
	- unskilled manual worker	33
	- other	34

- Without a professional activity

→ i.e.	- looking after the home	41
	- student (full time)	42
	- retired	43
	- seeking a job	44
	- other	45
	- [Refusal]	99

D4. Concernant votre emploi actuel, êtes vous indépendant, employé, ouvrier ou sans activité professionnelle? Cela veut-il dire que vous êtes un (une)...

[SI UNE REPONSE EST DONNEE A LA CATEGORIE PRINCIPALE, LIRE LES SOUS CATEGORIES RESPECTIVES - UNE SEULE REPONSE POSSIBLE]

- Profession libérale/ indépendant

→ i.e.	- agriculteur, sylviculteur, pêcheur	11
	- commerçant, artisan	12
	- profession libérale (avocat, médecin, comptable, architecte...)	13
	- Dirigeant d'entreprise	14
	- Autre	15

- Employé (e)

→ i.e.	- Cadre employé (médecin sous convention, avocat, comptable, architecte)	21
	- Direction générale, directeur ou direction supérieure	22
	- Cadre moyen	23
	- Fonctionnaire	24
	- employé(e) de bureau	25
	- Autre salarié (commercial, infirmière etc...)	26
	- Autre	27

- Ouvrier

→ i.e.	- superviseur/agent de maîtrise (chef d'équipe, etc...)	31
	- Ouvrier	32
	- Ouvrier non qualifié	33
	- Autre	34

- Sans activité professionnelle

→ i.e.	- Femme/ Homme au foyer	41
	- Etudiant (temps plein)	42
	- Retraité	43
	- Demandeur d'emploi	44
	- Autre	45
	- [Refus]	99

D6. Would you say you live in a ...?

- metropolitan zone1
- other town/urban centre.....2
- rural zone3
- [Refusal]9

D6. Diriez-vous que vous vivez..?

- zone métropolitaine.....1
- autre ville/centre urbain2
- zone rurale3
- [Refus]9

Q1. Do you think the scale of the problem in the following areas/institutions: is rather frequent or rather rare?

- Rather frequent 1
- Rather rare 2
- [DK/NA] 9

- a) Defrauding the [COUNTRY] State Budget (customs fraud, VAT fraud, fraud with subsidies etc.)1 2 9
- b) Defrauding the European Union budget (customs fraud, misappropriation of aids and grants, etc.)1 2 9
- c) Corruption/Wrongdoing in [COUNTRY] national government and institutions.1 2 9
- d) Corruption/Wrongdoing in European Union institutions;1 2 9
- e) Corruption/Wrongdoing in international organisations (like United Nations, World Bank etc.)1 2 9

Q1. Que pensez-vous de l'ampleur du problème touchant les domaines/institutions suivant(e)s : Est-ce assez fréquent ou plutôt rare?

- Plutôt fréquent 1
- Plutôt rare 2
- [NSP/SR] 9

- a) Escroquer le Budget de l'Etat [adjectif de nationalité] (fraude douanière, fraude à la TVA, fraude aux subventions, etc.) 1 2 9
- b) Escroquer le budget de l'Union européenne (fraude douanière, détournement des aides et des subventions, etc.) 1 2 9
- c) Corruption/Méfais au sein du gouvernement national et des institutions en/au [pays]..... 1 2 9
- d) Corruption/Méfais au sein des institutions de l'Union européenne 1 2 9
- e) Corruption/Méfais au sein d'organisations internationales (telles que les Nations Unies, Banque Mondiale, etc.) 1 2 9

Q2. For each of the following statements about defrauding the European Union budget, could you please tell me if you tend to agree or tend to disagree?

- Tend to agree..... 1
- Tend to disagree 2
- [DK/NA] 9
- a) [OUR COUNTRY] should co-operate more with anti-fraud services of the European Union institutions1 2 9
- b) [OUR COUNTRY] should co-operate more with anti-fraud services of the other EU Member States1 2 9
- c) The European Union should coordinate national investigations of defrauding the European Union budget1 2 9
- d) The EU needs its own European Union level anti-fraud organisation/institution to fight fraud1 2 9

Q3. Have you ever heard of OLAF - European Anti-Fraud Office that fights fraud, corruption and any other irregular activity affecting financial interests of the European Union?

- Yes..... 1
- No 2
- [DK/NA]..... 9

Q2. Pour chacune des affirmations suivantes concernant la fraude au budget de l'Union européenne, pourriez-vous me dire si vous êtes plutôt d'accord ou plutôt pas d'accord?

- Plutôt d'accord..... 1
- Plutôt pas d'accord..... 2
- [NSP/SR] 9
- a) Le/La [pays] devrait coopérer davantage avec les services anti-fraude des institutions de l'Union européenne 1 2 9
- b) Le/La [pays] devrait coopérer davantage avec les services anti-fraude des autres Etats membres de l'Union européenne 1 2 9
- c) L'Union européenne devrait coordonner des enquêtes nationales sur la fraude au budget de l'Union européenne 1 2 9
- d) L'Union européenne a besoin de sa propre organisation/institution anti-fraude pour lutter contre la fraude à son niveau..... 1 2 9

Q3. Avez-vous déjà entendu parler de l'OLAF - Office européen de Lutte Anti-fraude qui lutte contre la fraude, la corruption et toute autre activité illégale affectant les intérêts financiers de l'Union européenne?

- Oui..... 1
- Non..... 2
- [NSP/SR]..... 9

Q4. How much do you trust the following organisations fighting fraud against the European Union budget?

- Trust completely 3
- Trust partly 2
- Do not trust at all 1
- [DK/NA] 9
- a) The police force in [COUNTRY].....3 2 1 9
- b) Customs services in [COUNTRY].....3 2 1 9
- c) The tax authorities in [COUNTRY].....3 2 1 9
- d) The courts, the legal system in [COUNTRY]3 2 1 9
- e) The European anti-fraud office (OLAF)3 2 1 9
- f) Other European bodies (Eurojust, Europol, Court of Auditors, Court of Justice etc.).....3 2 1 9
- g) Press and media3 2 1 9
- h) State auditors in [COUNTRY]3 2 1 9
- i) Private auditing firms in [COUNTRY].....3 2 1 9
- j) [IF APPLICABLE] NAME OF Anti-corruption body in [COUNTRY]3 2 1 9

Q5. During the last 12 months did anyone ask you or expect you to pay a bribe for his services?

- Yes..... 1
- No 2
- [DK/NA]..... 9

Q4. Dans quelle mesure faites-vous confiance aux organisations suivantes luttant contre la fraude relative au budget de l'Union européenne?

- Totalement confiance3
- Confiance en partie2
- Pas du tout confiance..... 1
- [NSP/SR]9
- a) Les forces de police en/au [pays]..... 3 2 1 9
- b) Les services douaniers en/au [pays] 3 2 1 9
- c) Les administrations fiscales en/au [pays] 3 2 1 9
- d) Les tribunaux, le système juridique en/au [pays] 3 2 1 9
- e) L'Office européen de Lutte Anti-Fraude (OLAF) 3 2 1 9
- f) Autres instances européennes (Eurojust, Europol, Cour des comptes, Cour de justice. etc.) 3 2 1 9
- g) Presse et média 3 2 1 9
- h) Auditeurs publics en/au [pays] 3 2 1 9
- i) Les sociétés d'audit privées en/au [pays]..... 3 2 1 9
- j) Autres organismes spécialisés anti-corruption en/au [pays]..... 3 2 1 9

Q5. Au cours des 12 derniers mois est-ce que quelqu'un vous a déjà demandé ou a attendu de vous que vous lui payiez un bakchich pour ses services?

- Oui..... 1
- Non..... 2
- [NSP/SR]..... 9

IF Q5=1

Q5a. The last time this happened Who was involved? Was it a...?

- Police officer 01
- Customs officer 02
- Tax officer 03
- Judge, magistrate, prosecutor 04
- Any kind of inspector (e.g. health, construction, employment, food quality, sanitary control, licensing etc.) 05
- Politician 06
- European institutions' official 07
- Private business 08
- Other 09
- DK/NA 99

SI Q5=1

**Q5a. La dernière fois que cela s'est produit, de qui s'agissait-il ?
Etait-ce...?**

- Un officier de police 01
- Un agent des douanes 02
- Un agent des impôts 03
- Un juge, magistrat, procureur 04
- Tout type d'inspecteur (par exemple : santé, construction, emploi, qualité des aliments, contrôle sanitaire, octroi de licences etc) 05
- Un politicien 06
- Un fonctionnaire des institutions européennes... 07
- Une entreprise privée 08
- Autre 09
- NSP/SR 99

ASK ALL

Q6. How would you prefer to receive information about the fight against fraud detrimental to the EU budget? You can indicate several answers.

- Radio, TV 1
- Newspaper 2
- TV mini series, TV drama/short movie for television 3
- Internet or other web based tools like YouTube, etc 4
- CD-ROM / DVD / Video tape 5
- A brochure or leaflet 6
- DK/NA 9
- I do not want such information 7
- None of these ways 8

POSER A TOUS

Q6. Comment préféreriez-vous recevoir des informations sur la lutte contre la fraude portant atteinte au budget de l'Union européenne? Vous pouvez citer plusieurs réponses:

- Radio, télévision 1
- Journal 2
- Mini séries télévisées, fiction télévisée/court-métrage pour la télévision 3
- Internet ou autres outils sur le web comme YouTube, etc 4
- CD-ROM / DVD / Casette vidéo 5
- Une brochure ou un dépliant 6
- NSP/SR 9
- Je ne veux pas de telles informations 7
- Aucun de ces moyens 8

Flash EB Series #236

Citizens' perceptions of fraud and the fight against it in the EU27

Survey conducted by The Gallup Organization,
Hungary upon the request of the European
Anti-Fraud Office (OLAF) – Directorate D /
Unit D.1 “Spokesman, Communication, Public
Relations”



Coordinated by Directorate-General
Communication

This document does not represent the point of
view of the European Commission.
The interpretations and opinions contained in it
are solely those of the authors.

THE GALLUP ORGANIZATION

Survey details

This survey on the General population on “Perception of Fraud and Fight against Fraud in the EU27” was conducted for the European Commission, European Anti-Fraud Office (OLAF) – Directorate D / Unit D.1 “Spokesman, Communication, Public Relations”

Telephone interviews were conducted in each country with the exception of the Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Hungary Poland, Romania and Slovakia where both telephone and face-to-face interviews were conducted (70% webCATI and 30% F2F interviews).

Telephone interviews were conducted in each country between the 6/26/2008 and the 6/30/2008 by these Institutes:

Belgium	BE	Gallup Europe	(Interviews : 06/26/2008 - 06/30/2008)
Czech Republic	CZ	Focus Agency	(Interviews : 06/26/2008 - 06/30/2008)
Denmark	DK	Hermelin	(Interviews : 06/26/2008 - 06/30/2008)
Germany	DE	IFAK	(Interviews : 06/26/2008 - 06/30/2008)
Estonia	EE	Saar Poll	(Interviews : 06/26/2008 - 06/30/2008)
Greece	EL	Metroanalysis	(Interviews : 06/26/2008 - 06/30/2008)
Spain	ES	Gallup Spain	(Interviews : 06/26/2008 - 06/30/2008)
France	FR	Effience3	(Interviews : 06/26/2008 - 06/30/2008)
Ireland	IE	Gallup UK	(Interviews : 06/26/2008 - 06/30/2008)
Italy	IT	Demoskopoea	(Interviews : 06/26/2008 - 06/30/2008)
Cyprus	CY	CYMAR	(Interviews : 06/26/2008 - 06/30/2008)
Latvia	LV	Latvian Facts	(Interviews : 06/26/2008 - 06/30/2008)
Lithuania	LT	Baltic Survey	(Interviews : 06/26/2008 - 06/30/2008)
Luxembourg	LU	Gallup Europe	(Interviews : 06/26/2008 - 06/30/2008)
Hungary	HU	Gallup Hungary	(Interviews : 06/26/2008 - 06/30/2008)
Malta	MT	MISCO	(Interviews : 06/26/2008 - 06/30/2008)
Netherlands	NL	Telder	(Interviews : 06/26/2008 - 06/30/2008)
Austria	AT	Spectra	(Interviews : 06/26/2008 - 06/30/2008)
Poland	PL	Gallup Poland	(Interviews : 06/26/2008 - 06/30/2008)
Portugal	PT	Consulmark	(Interviews : 06/26/2008 - 06/30/2008)
Slovenia	SI	Cati d.o.o	(Interviews : 06/26/2008 - 06/30/2008)
Slovakia	SK	Focus Agency	(Interviews : 06/26/2008 - 06/30/2008)
Finland	FI	Hermelin	(Interviews : 06/26/2008 - 06/30/2008)
Sweden	SE	Hermelin	(Interviews : 06/26/2008 - 06/30/2008)
United Kingdom	UK	Gallup UK	(Interviews : 06/26/2008 - 06/30/2008)
Bulgaria	BG	Vitoshia	(Interviews : 06/26/2008 - 06/30/2008)
Romania	RO	Gallup Romania	(Interviews : 06/26/2008 - 06/30/2008)

Representativeness of the results

Each national sample is representative of the population aged 15 years and above.

Sizes of the sample

In most EU countries the target sample size was 1000 respondents.
The below table shows the achieved sample size by country

A weighting factor was applied to the national results in order to compute a marginal total where each country contributes to the European Union result in proportion to its population.

The table below presents, for each of the countries:

- (1) the number of interviews actually carried out in each country
- (2) the population-weighted total number of interviews for each country

TOTAL INTERVIEWS

	Total Interviews			
	Conducted	% of Total	EU27 Weighted	% on Total (weighted)
Total	25770	100	25770	100
BE	1000	3.9	547	2.1
BG	1031	4.0	425	1.7
CZ	1000	3.9	553	2.1
DK	1004	3.9	277	1.1
DE	1005	3.9	4518	17.5
EE	1051	4.1	72	0.3
EL	1001	3.9	591	2.3
ES	1003	3.9	2221	8.6
FR	1001	3.9	3057	11.9
IE	1000	3.9	203	0.8
IT	1003	3.9	3161	12.3
CY	506	2.0	39	0.1
LV	1019	4.0	125	0.5
LT	1014	3.9	181	0.7
LU	509	2.0	23	0.1
HU	1024	4.0	532	2.1
MT	509	2.0	21	0.1
NL	1003	3.9	844	3.3
AT	1003	3.9	425	1.6
PL	1019	4.0	2022	7.8
PT	1001	3.9	553	2.1
RO	1013	3.9	1136	4.4
SI	1002	3.9	109	0.4
SK	1046	4.1	284	1.1
FI	1002	3.9	275	1.1
SE	1000	3.9	472	1.8
UK	1001	3.9	3104	12.0

Questionnaires

1. The questionnaire prepared for this survey is reproduced at the end of this results volume, in English (see hereafter).
2. The institutes listed above translated the questionnaire in their respective national language(s).

Sampling error

The results in a survey are valid only between the limits of a statistical margin caused by the sampling process. This margin varies with three factors:

1. The sample size (or the size of the analysed part in the sample): the greater the number of respondents is, the smaller the statistical margin will be;
2. The result in itself: the closer the result approaches 50%, the wider the statistical margin will be;
3. The desired degree of confidence: the more "strict" we are, the wider the statistical margin will be.

As an example, examine this illustrative case:

1. One question has been answered by 500 people;
2. The analysed result is around 50%;
3. We choose a significance level of 95 % (it is the level most often used by the statisticians, and it is the one chosen for the Table hereafter);

In this illustrative case the statistical margin is: (+/- 4.4%) around the observed 50%. And as a conclusion: the result for the whole population lies between 45.6% and 54.4 %.

Hereafter, the statistical margins computed for various observed results are shown, on various sample sizes, at the 95% significance level.

STATISTICAL MARGINS DUE TO THE SAMPLING PROCESS (AT THE 95 % LEVEL OF CONFIDENCE)

Various sample sizes are in rows;

Various observed results are in columns:

	5%	10%	15%	20%	25%	30%	35%	40%	45%	50%
N=50	6.0	8.3	9.9	11.1	12.0	12.7	13.2	13.6	13.8	13.9
N=500	1.9	2.6	3.1	3.5	3.8	4.0	4.2	4.3	4.4	4.4
N=1000	1.4	1.9	2.2	2.5	2.7	2.8	3.0	3.0	3.1	3.1
N=1500	1.1	1.5	1.8	2.0	2.2	2.3	2.4	2.5	2.5	2.5
N=2000	1.0	1.3	1.6	1.8	1.9	2.0	2.1	2.1	2.2	2.2
N=3000	0.8	1.1	1.3	1.4	1.5	1.6	1.7	1.8	1.8	1.8
N=4000	0.7	0.9	1.1	1.2	1.3	1.4	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5
N=5000	0.6	0.8	1.0	1.1	1.2	1.3	1.3	1.4	1.4	1.4
N=6000	0.6	0.8	0.9	1.0	1.1	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.3	1.3

Evaluation of the samples

The attached tables (after the Technical Report tables) provide a detailed insight to the within country weighting of the study. (For cross-country weights please refer to the table on previous page) The weighting of the dataset is a three-fold exercise.

In the *first step* we will apply the basic **selection probability weights**, primarily to avoid the overcoverage of households with multiple telephone lines. In the same step, we calculate the weights that corrects the estimations based on the merged **dual frame** samples, i.e., weights that deal with phone owners;

In the *second step*, on a country-by-country basis, a **nonresponse population weighting** was carried out. As nonresponse rates vary by social segments, the sample characteristics reflect such differences as well (i.e., there are usually less males and especially less young people in the samples than in the universe.) In this step, we compensated for the nonresponse bias that stems from the field execution process. The most advanced method for eliminating such deviations is the so-called *Raking Adjustment for Nonresponse* (raking). Gallup applied this method. This procedure performs iterative proportional fitting in contingency table analysis. This method is also used to deal with the problem of large variability of weights when weighting classes are formed based on full cross-classification of the auxiliary variables, the result is a large number of weighting classes with unstable response rates.

However, one drawback is that raking assumes that the variables used for adjustment are independent. Raking works in the following way:

- 1) sets initial weight factor values in each cross-classification term to 1;
- 2) adjusts the weight factors of the first cross-classification term so the weighted sample is representative for the variables involved;
- 3) adjusts the weight factors for the next cross-classification term so the weighted sample becomes representative with respect to the variables involved (this might disrupt the representativeness with respect to the variables involved);
- 4) repeats this adjustment for all cross-classification terms;
- 5) repeats all steps until the factors do not change.

A common approach to weighting is to determine the sample weights adjusting for unequal probabilities of selection, revise these weights to compensate for different sub-class response rates, and finally modify the weights again to conform the weighted sample distribution for certain variables (e.g., age, gender, education, activity etc.) to the known population distributions of the same variables.

The following variables will be used in all national raking procedures (with categories levels used):

Age X Sex

male, 15-29
male, 30-49
male, 50+
female, 15-29
female, 30-49
female, 50+

Activity

Active worker
retired
Other non-active worker

Regions (NUTS1 - NUTS2)

Please note that levels might be collapsed to achieve convergence or universe information is not available in the necessary detail

© European Communities
The Eurobarometer questionnaires are reproduced
by permission of its publishers,
the Office for Official Publications of the European Communities,
2 rue Mercier, L-2985 Luxembourg