Hello,

This survey, which serves the purpose of my thesis, should help to develop a model of econometric function to compensate for non-pecuniary damages in the area of invasion of privacy. Non-pecuniary damage is a term in Czech civil law that describes a situation in which there is an interference with personal rights but no exact quantifiable damage.

Please fill in a short questionnaire, it should not take more than a few minutes. Thanks, Honza.

The questionnaire will describe 3 different rumours with different consequences. For each of the cases, a short questionnaire will follow, indicating the areas where the defamation may have affected. For each area, please fill in the intensity of the intervention from 0 to 10 as you perceive it, with 0 being zero intervention and 10 being the highest possible intervention imaginable.

Q31 What is your gender?

- o Male (2)
- o Female (3)
- o Other (4)
- o I do not wish to specify (5)

Q32 What is your age?

**▼** 1 (1) ... 100 (129)

Before the rumour, Mr A was an ordinary 35 year old citizen who commuted to work in an office building of a multinational company where he took an average wage. He was fairly popular in his team, was raising 2 children at home with his wife and living a quiet life, and had started to build a house.

A female work colleague accused Mr A of sexual harassment and attempted rape at a cultural event organised by the company. The rumour spread very quickly and soon Mr A was known as an undesirable person in the company, which led to mobbing at work. As Mr A lived next door to a colleague at work, the gossip spread to his neighbours and logically then to his childrens school.

Mr. A initially tried to continue his job, but after a month he voluntarily quit and also changed his field of work, after six months Mr. A lost his wife, who was subjected to higher levels of stress, and he was also forced to move out, the children at school suffered from bullying. Mr A attends regular psychotherapy and lives alone away from his original home. Mr A now has 20% less income.

After a year, a leaked private conversation by a colleague revealed that she had made the matter up against Mr A because Mr A was, in the colleague's view, free-riding on her work performance. A third of the original colleagues still believe that the rumour has a real basis and continue to spread the rumour, even in places where Mr A originally attended, such as his favourite sport place.

	0 - the least interference (1)	1 (2)	2 (3)	3 (4)	4 (5)	5 (6)	6 (7)	7 (8)	8 (9)	9 (10)	10 - the greatest interference (11)
Duration of the spread of defamation (1)	0	(	(	(	(	(	(	(	(	C	0
Interference in professional life (2)	0	(	(	(	(	(	(	(	(	C	$\circ$
Interference in personal life (3)	0	(	(		(	(	(	(	(	(	$\circ$
Interference in family life (4)	0	(	(	(	(	(	(	(	(	(	$\circ$
Health problems (5)	0	(	(		(	(	(	(	(	(	$\circ$
Need for change (6)	0	(	(	(	(	(	(	(	(		$\circ$
Public recognition (7)	0	(	(	(	(	(	(	(	(		$\circ$
Overall income (8)	0	(	(	(	(	(	(	(	(		$\circ$
Income interference (9)	0	(	(	(	(	(	(	(	(		$\circ$
Defamatory intention (10)	0	(	(		(	(	(	(	(		$\circ$
Degree to which Mr A has voluntarily allowed the defamation to interfere with his life (11)	0	(	(	(	(	(	(	(	(	C	0
Severity of the sexual harassment defamation (12)	0	(	(	(	(	(	(	(	(	(	0
Other reasons not stated (13)	0	(	(	(	(	(	(	(	(	C	$\circ$

Q24 Mr B was a 65 year old widower who lived alone with his two dogs on a retirement pension and never had children. He socialised with several neighbours in the neighbourhood, helping out with what he could on his own. Occasionally he frequented the local pub.

A neighbour claimed Mr B had murdered his own brother 30 years ago, which led to Mr B being ostracised out of fear, and his rent being terminated, although he himself did not know, the reason for this and on the last day of his tenancy he committed suicide in the flat, saying in his suicide note that he felt lonely because he had not been spoken to for the last 3 months (since the rumour spread) and felt lonely.

	0 - the least interference (1)	1 (2)	2 (3)	3 (4)	4 (5)	5 (6)	6 (7)	7 (8)	8 (9)	9 (10)	10 - the greatest interference (11)
Duration of the spread of defamation (1)	0	(	(	(	(	(	(	( (	(	C	0
Interference in professional life (2)	0	(	(	(	(	(		( (	(	C	$\circ$
Interference in personal life (3)	0	(	(	(	(	(		( (	(		$\circ$
Interference in family life (4)	0	(	(	(	(	(		( (	(		$\circ$
Health problems (5)	0	(	(	(	(	(		( (	(	(	$\circ$
Need for change (6)	0	(	(	(	(	(		( (	(	(	$\circ$
Public recognition (7)	0	(	(	(	(	(		( (	(	(	$\circ$
Overall income (8)	0	(	(	(	(	(		( (	(	(	$\circ$
Income interference (9)	0	(	(	(	(	(		( (	(	(	$\circ$
Defamatory intention (10)	0	(	(	(	(	(		( (	(		$\circ$
Degree to which Mr B has voluntarily allowed the defamation to interfere with his life (11)	0	(	(	(	(	(		( (	(	C	0
The seriousness of the defamation of murder (12)	0	(	(	(	(	(		( (	(	(	0
Other reasons not stated (13)	0	(	(	(	(	(		( (	(	(	$\circ$

Q25 Mr C is a man in his fifties, one of his country's most famous personalities, and has a highly superior income, many times higher than the social average. He was photographed at a train station by journalists hugging an unknown lady, whose face they blurred and identified as his mistress.

Mr C defended himself that she was his stepsister, a well-known fact in the family, and documented everything to the newspaper asking for an apology, but the newspaper, strengthened by its high readership, spread this untruth for the next 3 months before the first lawsuits came.

Mr C felt the stress of the family but this led to the whole family bonding together even more, on the other hand Mr C lost 20% of his popularity, his children were bullied at school and Mr C lost part of his work. Paradoxically, the situation led to virtually no change on the income side. Although the matter turned out to be a rumour, Mr C is still repeatedly questioned about his alleged infidelity and faces repeated taunting reactions on the street together with his wife.

	0 - the least interference (1)	1 (2)	2 (3)	3 (4)	4 (5)	5 (6)	6 (7)	7 (8)	8 (9)	9 (10)	10 - the greatest interference (11)
Duration of the spread of defamation (1)	0	(	(	(	(	(	(	( (	(	(	0
Interference in professional life (2)	0	(	(	(	(	(		( (	(	(	$\circ$
Interference in personal life (3)	0	(	(	(	(	(		( (	(	(	$\circ$
Interference in family life (4)	0	(	(	(	(	(		( (	(	(	$\circ$
Health problems (5)	0	(	(	(	(	(		( (	(	(	$\circ$
Need for change (6)	0	(	(	(	(	(		( (	(		$\circ$
Public notoriety (7)	0	(	(	(	(	(		( (	(		$\circ$
Overall income (8)	0	(	(	(	(	(		( (	(		$\circ$
Income interference (9)	0	(	(	(	(	(		( (	(		$\circ$
Defamatory intent (10)	0	(	(	(	(	(		( (	(		$\circ$
Degree to which Mr C has willingly allowed the defamation to interfere with his life (11)	0	(	(	(	(	(	(	( (	(	C	0
Severity of the defamation of infidelity (12)	0	(	(	(	(	(		( (	(	C	$\circ$
Other reasons not stated (13)	0	(	(	(	(	(	(	( (	(	C	$\circ$

Q28 Imagine that you rescued Mr B just before his death and had to divide the total
compensation budget determined between Mr A, Mr B and Mr C, as fairly as possible. How
would you divide this budget as a percentage (the total must be 100%)?
Mr A - defamation of rape : (1)
Mr B - defamation of murder : (2)
Mr C - defamation of a lover : (3)
Total:

Q26 In your opinion, is there any other area where defamation has encroached? Please write it below.

Q27 If you are interested in the results, please leave your email contact here. Thank you