

Aebi M.F. & Linde A. (2012). The Growth of Victimization Surveys in Latin America. In Groenhuijsen M., Letschert R. and Hazenbroek S. *KLM Van Dijk: Liber amicorum prof.dr.mr. J.J.M. van Dijk* (pp. 9-21). Nijmegen: Wolf Legal Publishers.

The Growth of Victimization Surveys in Latin America

Marcelo F. Aebi, Ph.D.
University of Lausanne (Switzerland)
School of Criminal Sciences
Institute of Criminology and Criminal Law

Antonia Linde
Universitat Oberta de Catalunya (Open University of Catalunya, Spain)
Department of Law and Political Science
&
University of Lausanne (Switzerland)
School of Criminal Sciences
Institute of Criminology and Criminal Law

Table of contents

Abstract	2
Introduction.....	2
Victimization surveys in Latin America before the 1992 ICVS	2
The participation of Latin American countries in the ICVS since 1992	4
The institutionalization of victimization surveys in Latin America	5
National Periodical Victimization Surveys in Latin America	6
Victimization Surveys conducted by NGO's, Private Foundations, and Private Organizations .	7
Regional Victimization Surveys.....	8
Conclusion	9
References.....	10

Abstract

This article analyses the development of victimization surveys in Latin American countries through the prism of the influence of the International Crime Victim Survey. The first Latin American victimization surveys were conducted in the 1970s. Until the participation of three countries of the region in the 1992 wave of the ICVS, surveys were scarce and not institutionalized. Since then, many Latin American governments started conducting their own victimization surveys while, in parallel, NGOs and private foundations and organizations also carried out local surveys. During the 2000s, the region registered an explosion of victimization studies: Chile and Mexico introduced annual victimization surveys with samples of tens of thousands of households, most countries carried out one-shot surveys, and two regional periodical victimization surveys were implemented. Almost all these surveys are conducted through face-to-face interviews.

Introduction

This article analyses the development of victimization surveys in countries of the American continent whose main official languages are Spanish and Portuguese, usually known as Latin American countries. At the same time, it attempts to measure the impact of the International Crime Victim Survey (ICVS) on that development.

The first section covers the origins of victimization surveys in Latin America and their evolution until 1992, year in which the second wave of the ICVS –the first one to include Latin American countries– was carried out. The period that goes from 1992 to 2011 has been divided in different sections, according to the characteristics of the victimization surveys carried out during those two decades. Thus, one section is dedicated to the participation of Latin American countries in the different waves of the ICVS, another to the institutionalization of the surveys in many countries, a third one to the development of national periodical surveys in the 2000s, a fourth one to the surveys conducted by non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and private foundations and organizations, and the last one to the regional victimization surveys that currently exist.

Victimization surveys in Latin America before the 1992 ICVS

According to the review of Birkbeck (1983), the first victimization survey conducted in Latin America was a pilot study conducted by the University of Panama in 1973 in the framework of a project organized by the University of Santa Barbara, California (Márquez-de-Villalobos, 1975). The project included pilot surveys in five Latin American countries (Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Panama and Peru) but, according to Salas (1981) and Antoni (1982), only the results from Panama were published. The sample consisted in 312 residents of the State of Panama, of which 47.8% turned out to have been victims of a crime (Antoni, 1982).

The second victimization survey seems to be the one conducted in 1976 in the city of Jalapa (State of Veracruz, México), which showed that 53.9% of a sample of 2,405 individuals had been victimized in 1975 (Rodríguez-Manzanera, 1981). This survey was carried out using the bilingual questionnaire developed by the Texas Department of Public Safety (United States)

and the goal was to compare victimization in Texas and Veracruz, although the results from the United States were not ready when the main findings from Mexico were published (Rodríguez-Manzanera, 1981). With slight modifications, the same questionnaire was used for a survey carried out in 1983 in the Federal District of Mexico and its surroundings that found much lower levels of victimization. In the District, victims represented 19.9% of a sample of 1,969 households, while in the surroundings they represented 14.2% of a sample of 1,000 (Muñoz Sánchez, 1984; Rodríguez-Manzanera, 2003).

In 1978, in the framework of his Ph.D. dissertation, Christopher Birkbeck conducted a victimization survey for selected property offences in the city of Cali, Colombia. Working in collaboration with the Colombian Statistical Institute (DANE – *Departamento Administrativo Nacional de Estadística*), he used a stratified random sample of 1,204 households and an ad-hoc, very detailed, questionnaire (Birkbeck, 1983). Birkbeck, who became later a professor at the University of Los Andes, Venezuela, conducted similar surveys in this country in the cities of Mérida in 1981, 1983 and 1985, and in Maracaibo in 1987 (Birkbeck, 1981, Birkbeck & LaFree, 1990-1991; LaFree & Birkbeck, 1991).

In Colombia, the National Association of Financial Institutions (ANIF – *Asociación Nacional de Instituciones Financieras*) also conducted victimization surveys in the cities of Bogotá, Medellín, Cali, Barranquilla and Cúcuta between 1978 and the early 1980s, although their questionnaire was restricted to a few indicators and they presented several methodological limitations (Birkbeck, 1983). No scientific publications were issued from these surveys.

In 1982, the United Nations Latin American Institute for the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders (ILANUD – *Instituto Latinoamericano de las Naciones Unidas para la Prevención del Delito y el Tratamiento del Delincuente*) carried out a research in a disadvantaged neighborhood of the city of San José, Costa Rica, which included three ad-hoc questionnaires. The sample consisted in 308 households that included 341 individuals. Those who had been victims of a crime (N=62) were asked a series of follow-up questions on victimization (Navarro-Solano, 1983).

In 1985, Colombia included a module on victimization in its national household survey; this module was used again in 1991 and 1995. Brazil followed a similar pattern and, in 1988, carried on its first national victimization survey as a module of a multipurpose survey (PNAD), conducted by the Institute of Geography and Statistics (IBGE) with a sample of 81,628 households and using an ad-hoc questionnaire.

In the Federal District of Mexico and the State of Mexico, the Mexican National Institute of Statistics (INEGI – *Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Geografía*) conducted victimization surveys with an ad-hoc questionnaire in 1988, 1990 and in 1992, year in which the survey was also conducted in other areas of the country (INEGI, 2011).

Finally, in 1989, a victimization survey financed by a private foundation was conducted in Buenos Aires, Argentina, with an ad-hoc questionnaire (Vázquez, 1989).

As can be seen, since the first survey in 1973 until the end of the 1980s, victimization surveys were not institutionalized in Latin America. Usually, they took the form of isolated projects,

like the ones conducted in Panama (1973), México (1976, 1983), Colombia (1979, 1985) Costa Rica (1982), Brazil (1988) and Argentina (1989). A notable exception is Venezuela, where Birkbeck –who had already been responsible of the first survey carried out in Colombia in 1979– conducted four different surveys during the 1980s. Only by the end of the decade, the INEGI introduced some regularity in the surveys conducted in the city of Mexico and its surroundings. This situation was going to change dramatically in the 1990s and particularly in the 2000s, coinciding with the development of the International Crime Victim Survey (ICVS) and its use in Latin American countries since its second wave of 1992.

The participation of Latin American countries in the ICVS since 1992

The official origins of the International Crime Victim Survey (ICVS) can be traced back to the Council of Europe Conference on the Reduction of Urban Security that took place in Barcelona in 1987. In that conference, Jan van Dijk formally unveiled the idea of conducting a victimization survey with a standardized questionnaire across different countries (van Dijk et al., 1987). Immediately after that, a small international working group started working on the project. That working group was composed of Jan van Dijk, Pat Mayhew –who at that time was part of the Research and Planning Unit of the Home Office in England– and Martin Killias, who at that time was professor at the University of Lausanne, Switzerland. The three members of the group had a good experience in the field. Jan van Dijk had been working in the Dutch Victimization Survey since the 1970s; Pat Mayhew was part of the team that was conducting the British Crime Survey since 1982; and Martin Killias had carried out the first national victimization survey in Switzerland, using for the first time the Computer Assisted Telephone Interview (CATI) methodology at large scale in Europe (Killias, 1990). Two years later, in 1989, the first ICVS survey was conducted in fourteen industrialized countries – including eleven Western European nations–, and local surveys using the same questionnaire were carried out in cities of Indonesia (Surabaya), Japan (Tokio) and Poland (Warsaw) (van Dijk, Mayhew & Killias, 1990). Twelve out of the fourteen countries that conducted the first ICVS used the CATI methodology because their telephone penetration rate was higher than 70%; while Spain combined CATI and personal interviews, and Northern Ireland used only personal interviews.

For the second wave of the ICVS, the international working group was composed of Jan van Dijk and Pat Mayhew, as well as Anna Alvazzi del Frate and Ugljesa Zvekic from the United Nations Interregional Criminal Justice Research Institute (UNICRI). The inclusion of UNICRI helped exporting the ICVS questionnaire to the rest of the world. Thus, during the 1990s, UNICRI monitored the ICVS in non-industrialized countries and countries in transition. In particular, it helped developing a face to face version of the questionnaire for these countries in which the CATI methodology could not be applied because the telephone penetration rate was low (Alvazzi del Frate, 1998).

In that context, the ILANUD, based in Costa Rica, was the link between UNICRI and the local governments in Latin America. Thus, in 1992, when the second ICVS was conducted, Argentina, Brazil and Costa Rica took place in it with city samples. The translation of the ICVS questionnaire to Spanish and Portuguese created a basic questionnaire that would be used later –in its original form or with minor or major modifications– for most of the surveys

conducted in Latin America. For the fifth wave of the ICVS (2004-5) the name of the survey was translated into Spanish as *Encuesta Internacional sobre Criminalidad y Victimización* – ENICRIV (van Dijk, van Kesteren & Smit, 2008), which constitutes an enlargement of the title as it means International Survey on Criminality and Victimization. However, in most publications in Spanish and Portuguese, the ICVS questionnaire is quoted as the UNICRI questionnaire or through its original English name.

It is no exaggeration to say that the translation of the ICVS questionnaire into Spanish and Portuguese, and the participation of Argentina, Brazil and Costa Rica in the second wave of the ICVS in 1992, is the turning point in the development of victimization surveys in Latin America. By 1996/7, when the third wave of the ICVS was conducted, the number of Latin American countries participating in it increased to six (Argentina, Brazil, Bolivia, Colombia, Costa Rica, Paraguay). After a drop to only two countries (Colombia and Panama) for the fourth wave of the ICVS in 2000/1 –even if Brazil carried out the survey in 2002–, the participation of Latin American countries increased again in the fifth wave of the ICVS, which took place in 2004/5. On that occasion, the region was represented by four countries (Argentina, Brazil, México and Peru). All the ICVS surveys in Latin America were conducted using face to face interviews and almost all of them with city samples. The exceptions were Mexico, which used a national sample in 2004, and Costa Rica that added a small rural sample both in 1992 and 1996/7.

Thus, in a little bit more than a decade, the ICVS established itself as the main reference for comparative victimization surveys in Latin America. Moreover, during that period, it had a strong influence on the institutionalization of victimization surveys, which will be presented in the next section.

The institutionalization of victimization surveys in Latin America

After the participation of Argentina, Brazil and Costa Rica in the 1992 ICVS, some Latin American countries started using the ICVS questionnaire to conduct local surveys. In particular, that was the case of **Argentina**, where the Ministry of Justice conducted an annual victimization survey from 1997 to 2003 in the city of Buenos Aires and its surroundings. In some of the waves, the cities of Rosario, Mendoza and Cordoba were also included. The governments of the city of Buenos Aires and the province of Santa Fe also used the ICVS questionnaire for local surveys (Sozzo, 2004). In **Brazil**, the ICVS questionnaire inspired also some of the city surveys conducted in the 1990s in Rio de Janeiro and Sao Paulo and, since, the 2000s in cities like Belo Horizonte, Alvorada, Curitiba and Foz do Iguazu (da Silva et al. 2008). It was only in the 2000s that national surveys were conducted again since the experience of the PNAD in 1988. Thus, a module on victimization was included in a multipurpose survey (PESB) of 2002, whose analysis was performed by the Federal University of Fluminense. Finally, in 2009, the Brazilian Institute of Geography and Statistics included again a module on victimization in the PNAD survey (IBGE, 2010). In 2010, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) sponsored also a national survey which used an adapted version of the ICVS questionnaire. **Mexico** followed a similar pattern, with many local surveys carried out by INEGI during the 1990s –in the city and the State of Mexico (in 1988, 1990, 1992 and 1994) and in Monterrey, Oaxaca, Veracruz, Cuernavaca, Ciudad

Juárez and the metropolitan area of the city of México (in 1992, 1993 and 1997)– and the development of a periodical national surveys in the 2000s (see the next Section).

In particular, it is during the decade of the 2000s that the use of victimization surveys extended itself through the whole Latin America. This can clearly be seen in the review of Dammert et al (2010) that we summarize and update here. In **Colombia**, a survey sponsored by the World Bank and the Colombian Statistical Institute (DANE), covering the cities of Bogotá, Cali and Medellín, took place in 2003, a pilot survey took place in Soacha in 2009, and a national survey with the support of the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB) should take place in 2013. In the **Dominican Republic**, a module on victimization was included in a national multipurpose survey (ENHOGAR) conducted by the National Institute of Statistics in 2005. In **Ecuador**, the National Survey on Victimization and Perceptions of Insecurity took place in 2008 and 2010. In **Peru**, a survey sponsored by the Ministry of the Interior was carried out in the main urban centers in 2005, and surveys were also carried out in Lima in that year (ICVS) and in 2007. In **Uruguay**, the Ministry of Interior sponsored surveys at the national level in 2007 and in the cities of Montevideo and Canelones in 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002 and 2004. Finally, in **Paraguay**, the Ministry of Interior conducted a national victimization survey using the ICVS questionnaire in 2009.

All these surveys did not necessarily follow the model of the ICVS, but certainly took it into account while designing their questionnaires. This is particularly true for the surveys financed by the UNDP, which use a questionnaire inspired by the ICVS (see, for example, Gallardo-León, 2009). That is the case of **Guatemala**, where surveys on victimization and insecurity perception are being carried out in Guatemala City every six months since 2004; **Costa Rica**, where surveys were co-sponsored by the National Institute of Statistics and conducted in 2006, 2008 and 2010; and **Bolivia**, where a survey was conducted in 2006 in cities with more than 2,000 inhabitants.

Venezuela followed a particular path and, building on the experience of the local surveys conducted by Birkbeck in the 1980s in Mérida and Maracaibo, carried out national victimization surveys sponsored by the Ministry of Interior in 2001, 2006 and 2009. Apart from that, in 2005, a city survey was conducted in Caracas by the General Directorate of Crime Prevention and, in 2007, a national survey was conducted by a consortium of institutes and universities.

In sum, the use of the ICVS questionnaire in Latin America in 1992 is clearly correlated with the growth of victimization surveys sponsored by the governments of the region in the 1990s and the explosion in the use of them in the 2000s. In particular, as it will be seen in the following section, two countries introduced periodical victimization surveys during that decade.

National Periodical Victimization Surveys in Latin America

Chile and Mexico can be considered as the countries where victimization surveys are completely institutionalized, as they have introduced their own national periodical victimization surveys.

In **Chile**, the National Urban Survey on Citizens Security (ENUSC – *Encuesta Nacional Urbana de Seguridad Ciudadana*) was conducted in 2003 by the Ministry of Interior in collaboration with the Chilean National Institute of Statistics (INE – *Instituto Nacional de Estadísticas*), and it became annual since 2005. Interviews are conducted face-to-face with persons aged 15 or more. While in 2003 the sample was composed of 16,289 households, by 2011 it had grown to 25,933. During the same period, the length of the questionnaire was reduced from 166 to 77 questions¹. Many of the questions included in the questionnaire –in particular the ones regarding victimizations– are identical to the ones foreseen in the ICVS.

In **Mexico**, the National Survey on Victimization and Perception of Public Security (ENVIPE – *Encuesta Nacional de Victimización y Percepción sobre Seguridad Pública*) took that name in 2011, after having been called National Survey on Insecurity (ENSI – *Encuesta Nacional sobre Inseguridad*) during the 2000s. The ENSI was conducted by the ICESI (*Instituto Ciudadano de Estudios sobre la Inseguridad*)², and the first survey took place in 2002 with a sample of 35,001 households. The questionnaire was inspired by the ICVS questionnaire and the one developed by the Autonomous University of Mexico (UNAM) for a small national survey (3,500 households with an overrepresentation of the Federal District) conducted in 2000. The ENSI was conducted again in 2003. In 2004, it was replaced by the ICVS. In 2005, the survey was conducted using a questionnaire that had been revised by the ICESI in collaboration with the INEGI. In 2006, the ENSI was limited to a sample of 16 urban centers. The following year, the ENSI was not carried out but, from 2008 on, it became annual. Since 2011 the ENSI became the ENVIPE and was placed under the responsibility of the INEGI. The contents and the structure of the questionnaire were again modified, but the modifications took into account the experience cumulated through the different ICVS surveys and, in particular, the one conducted in Mexico in 2004 (INEGI, 2011). Thus, the questions on victimizations are comparable to the ones included in the ICVS. In 2011, the sample of the ENVIPE was composed of 78,179 households and the persons interviewed were aged 18 or more. The interviews were conducted face to face (INEGI, 2011). The INEGI also conducts since 2009 the Continuous Survey on the Perception of Public Security (ECOSEP) that generates a monthly index of public security perception³.

Victimization Surveys conducted by NGO's, Private Foundations, and Private Organizations

In parallel with the institutionalization of victimization surveys during the 1990s and the 2000s, some NGO's and private foundations and organizations in Latin America developed their own victimization surveys, whose methodology and contents do not always meet scientific standards. The reasons for this development seem related to an increased perception of insecurity and a certain distrust in official figures.

¹ http://www.seguridadpublica.gov.cl/enusc_2011.html (consulted on 01-08-2012).

² http://www.icesi.org.mx/estadisticas/estadisticas_encuestasNacionales.asp (consulted on 01-08-2012).

³ <http://www.inegi.org.mx/est/contenidos/proyectos/encuestas/hogares/regulares/ecosep/default.aspx> (consulted on 05-09-2012).

For example, in **Colombia**, since 1996, the Chamber of Commerce has created a Security Observatory that conducts periodical victimization surveys in the city of Bogota; the Cisalva Institute of the University del Valle conducted a victimization survey in six cities in 1996 and in Pasto in 2008; and, since 2006, the Foundation Security and Democracy (*Seguridad y Democracia*)⁴ has conducted victimization surveys in the six main urban centers of the country. In **Chile**, since 1999, the Foundation Citizen's Peace in Chile (*Fundación Paz Ciudadana en Chile*) conducts surveys each six months in different municipalities of the main cities of the country. In **Peru**, an annual survey on citizens' security conducted by the NGO Group of Public Opinion (*Grupo de Opinión Pública*) since 2004 includes some questions on victimization; while, in 2011, the Peruvian NGO Our City (*Ciudad Nuestra*) conducted the so-called First National Urban Victimization Survey. In **Mexico**, the Center for Research and Teaching in Economics (CIDE) has been carrying out every six months since 2005 a Survey on Victimization and Institutional Efficacy (ENVEI) in the Federal District and the State of Mexico. In **Argentina**, the private university Torcuato Di Tella conducts monthly, since 2006, a short victimization survey in the main 40 urban centres of the country. In **Bolivia**, the private organization IPSOS Support, Opinion and Market (*IPSOS Apoyo Opinión y Mercado*) conducted a victimization survey in the cities of La Paz, El Alto, Cochabamba and Santa Cruz in 2006⁵ and, during the same year, the Observatory of Democracy and Security (*Observatorio de Democracia y Seguridad*)⁶ also conducted a victimization survey in La Paz and El Alto. Finally, in **El Salvador**, the private University Institute of Public Opinion (IUDOP – *Instituto Universitario de Opinión Pública*) conducted national victimization surveys in 1998, 2004 and 2009, and in the cities of Sonsonate y Cojutepeque in 1999. It is worth mentioning that the surveys of 2004 and 2009 received also the support of the UNDP and the Government of El Salvador.

Regional Victimization Surveys

Apart from the surveys conducted in each country by governments, universities, institutes and NGOs, the American continent has two periodical regional multipurpose surveys that include victimization modules: the *Latinobarómetro*, conducted by a non-profit NGO (Latinobarómetro Corporation), and the *AmericasBarometer* of the Latin American Public Opinion Project (LAPOP) of the Vanderbilt University. The questions included in these surveys are sometimes too broad –for example, the *Latinobarómetro* asks: Have you or a relative been robbed, aggressed or victim of a crime during the last twelve months? (Lagos & Dammert, 2012)– and, as a consequence, they only provide a rough estimate of the extent of victimization.

The *Latinobarómetro* is conducted annually since 1995 in Latin America. Eight countries participated in 1995, 17 from 1996 to 2003, and 18 since 2004. The *AmericasBarometer* is conducted every second year since 2004 in the whole American continent. Eleven nations participated in the first survey in 2004, 20 in 2006, 23 in 2008, and 26 in 2010. Currently, Cuba is the only Latin American country not covered by the *Latinobarómetro* and the *AmericasBarometer*.

⁴ <http://www.seguridadydemocracia.org> (consulted on 01-08-2012).

⁵ <http://www.ipsos-apoyo.com.bo/> (consulted on 01-08-2012).

⁶ <http://www.observatoriodeseguridad.org.bo> (consulted on 01-08-2012).

Finally, in 2007, the *Ecosocial* survey (Encuesta de Cohesión Social en América Latina) was conducted in seven Latin American countries by the non-profit NGO Corporation of Studies for Latin America (CIEPLAN – Corporación de Estudios para Latinoamérica).

Conclusion

During the 1970s and the 1980s, few victimization surveys were carried out in Latin America. The only national one was conducted in Brazil in 1988, while the rest of them were usually one-shot city surveys. That was the case of the first survey conducted in the region –which took place in the State of Panama in 1973– and also of the surveys conducted in cities of Costa Rica (1982), Argentina (1988) and Mexico (1976, 1983). In the latter country, INEGI introduced some periodicity by the end of the 1980s through the surveys carried out every two years in the city of Mexico and its surroundings from 1988 to 1994. The only surveys that followed the same methodology and had the most solid theoretical background were the ones conducted in Cali (Colombia) in 1979, in Mérida (Venezuela) in 1981, 1983 and 1985, and in Maracaibo (1987).

The participation of Argentina, Brazil and Costa Rica in the 1992 ICVS heralds the beginning of a second period in the development of victimization surveys in Latin America. Even if Latin American countries always participated in the ICVS with city samples, the translation of the questionnaire to Spanish and Portuguese and the scientific support of UNICRI and ILANUD encouraged other countries to use victimization surveys as a crime measure and, eventually, to make use of national samples. Until the end of the 1990s, Bolivia, Colombia and Paraguay joined the ICVS and Argentina and Brazil used its questionnaire for city surveys. At the same time, several city surveys were conducted in Mexican cities by INEGI. Since the beginning of the 2000s, the number of countries conducting victimization surveys increased exponentially. Thus, surveys were conducted in most of the countries of the region, including Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Guatemala, Ecuador, El Salvador, Peru, Uruguay, and Venezuela. In particular, Chile and Mexico developed their own periodical victimization surveys. The Chilean ENUSC is conducted annually since 2005 with a sample of roughly 26,000 households (in 2011), while the Mexican ENSI –conducted without a fixed frequency from 2002 to 2006 and annually from 2008 to 2010– became ENVIPE in 2011 and should keep an annual frequency in the future, using a sample of approximately 78,000 households.

Overall, the 2000s can be seen as the decade of the institutionalization of victimization surveys, because most of them were sponsored by the Governments. Indeed, such institutionalisation has its pros and cons. On the one hand, government sponsorship can assure the sustainability and the periodicity of the survey and should assure the quality of the data collection and analyses. On the other hand, Latin American populations usually distrust the figures produced by their governments. That is probably one of the main reasons of the development of surveys conducted by NGO's and other private foundations, as well as regional surveys like the *Latinobarómetro* and the *AmericasBarometer*. The risk with these private surveys is that sometimes they do not meet the scientific standards, mainly because the questionnaires are oversimplified in order to reduce costs. At the same time, it must be

mentioned that, in many cases, the level of analyses of the data collected by public institutions –such as the various national institutes of statistics– remain relatively superficial and descriptive, consisting usually in a report of the main findings, even if the length and quality of the questionnaires would allow a deeper analysis of it.

One of the advantages of a data collection organized by the government is related to the method of administration of the survey. Victimization surveys in Latin America are typically conducted through face-to-face interviews and, usually, obtain high response rates (e.g. 85% for the 2011 ENVIPE, see INEGI, 2011). This means that these countries are not facing the problem of the proliferation of cell phones that is complicating data collection in European countries using CATI. At the same time, the access of interviewers to middle and upper class neighbourhoods has become more difficult due to the proliferation of security guards; while access to low income neighbourhoods is also problematical as interviewers are faced to an increased perception of insecurity (Birkbeck, 1999). In that context, interviewers working for the government have higher chances of getting in contact with the members of the sample.

In sum, almost forty years after Clinard's suggestion about the potential utility of victimization surveys for developing countries (Clinard, 1977), these surveys are solidly established in Latin American countries. A comparison with the situation in Europe (see the review of Aebi & Linde, 2010) shows similarities in terms of the overall use of this crime measure –most countries in both regions are conducting victimization surveys and they are using similar questionnaires–, and differences in the methods of interviewing and the sizes of the samples. The history of these surveys in Latin America suggests that the translation of the ICVS questionnaire to Spanish and Portuguese and its use in some countries of the region at the beginning of the 1990s with the support of UNICRI and ILANUD, boosted their development. Thus, the ICVS project launched by Jan van Dijk, Pat Mayhew and Martin Killias, and the work of Jan van Dijk and Anna Alvazzi del Frate in UNICRI had a major impact at the other side of the Atlantic Ocean.

References

- Aebi, M. F. and Linde, A. (2010). A review of victimization surveys in Europe from 1970 to 2010. In van Dijk, J., Mayhew, P., van Kesteren, J., Aebi, M. F. & Linde, A. *Final report on the study on crime victimization* (pp. D1-D76). Tilburg: Intervict/PrismaPrint Tilburg.
- Alvazzi del Frate, A. (1998). *Victims of crime in the developing world*. UNICRI publication No 57. Rome: UNICRI.
- Antoni, C. (1982). La victimología en América Latina. *ILANUD al día*, 5(13-14): 62-67.
- Birkbeck, C. (1981). Informe metodológico sobre la Encuesta de Víctimas: Mérida, Octubre de 1981. *Cenipec*, 6:205-213.
- Birkbeck, C. (1983). Victimization surveys in Latin America: Some first experiences. *Victimology*, 8(3-4): 7-22.

Birkbeck, C. (1999). *Two Matters Concerning Data Collection in Latin American Criminology*. Paper presented at the conference Rising Violence and the Criminal Justice Response in Latin America: Towards an Agenda for Collaborative Research in the 21st Century. University of Texas, May 6-9, 1999.

Birkbeck, C. & LaFree, G (1990-1991). Hacia el desarrollo del análisis situacional en criminología: Un estudio de tres tipos de delito en Estados Unidos y Venezuela. *Capítulo Criminológico*, 18-19:49-82.

Clinard, M. B. (1977). Comparative Crime Victimization Surveys: Some Problems and Results. *International Journal of Criminology and Penology*, 6:221-31.

Da Silva, P. et al. (2008). *Pesquisa de Condições de Vida e Vitimização – 2007*. Série Análise criminal, Vol. 2. Rio de Janeiro : Riosegurança.

Dammert, L., Salazar, F., Montt, C. and González, P.A. (2010). *Crimen e inseguridad: Indicadores para las Américas*. Santiago de Chile: FLACSO [Facultad Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales, Chile]/Banco Interamericano de Desarrollo (BID).

Gallardo-León, C. (2009). Las encuestas de victimización en Ecuador. *Boletín Ciudad Segura*, 37: 4-9. <http://www.flacsoandes.org/dspace/handle/10469/1650>

IBGE - Instituto Brasileiro de Geografia e Estatística (2010). *Pesquisa Nacional por Amostra de Domicílios: Características da vitimização e do acesso à justiça no Brasil - 2009*. Rio de Janeiro: IBGE, 2010.

INEGI – Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Geografía (2011). *Encuesta Nacional de Victimización y Percepción sobre Seguridad Pública 2011 ENVIPE: Marco Conceptual*. México: INEGI.

Killias, M. (1990). New Methodological Perspectives for Victimization Surveys: The Potentials of Computer-Assisted Telephone Surveys and Some Related Innovations. *International Review of Victimology*, 1(2): 153-167.

LaFree, G. & Birkbeck, C (1991) The neglected situation: A cross-national study of the situational characteristics of crime. *Criminology*, 29(1): 73-98.

LaFree, G. & Birkbeck, C. (1988). El análisis situacional del delito, con referencia a Venezuela y los Estados Unidos. *Revista Cenipec*, 11: 55-83.

Lagos, M. & Dammert, L. (2012). *La seguridad ciudadana: El problema principal de América Latina*. [Santiago de Chile]: Corporación Latinobarómetro.

Márquez-de-Villalobos, M. (1975). *Víctimas de delitos en el área metropolitana de Panamá*. Panamá: Universidad de Panamá, Imprenta Universitaria.

Muñoz-Sánchez, M. S. (1984). Proyecto de Antisocialidad y Control – Plan 1983-1985 – Cifra

Oculto. *Cuadernos del Instituto Nacional de Ciencias Penales* (México), 16.

Navarro-Solano, S. (1983). *Estigmatización, conducta desviada y victimización en una zona marginada*. San José de Costa Rica: ILANUD.

Rodríguez-Manzanera, L. (1981). Victimización en una ciudad mexicana. *ILANUD al día*, 4(10): 77-81.

Rodríguez-Manzanera, L. (2003). *Victimología: Estudio de la víctima*. 8ª ed. México: Editorial Porrúa.

Salas, L. (1981). La justificación de los estudios de victimización en América Latina. *ILANUD al día*, 4(10): 37-45.

Sozzo, M. (2004). ¿Contando el delito? Análisis crítico y comparativo de las encuestas de victimización en Argentina. *Cartapacio*, 5. <http://www.cartapacio.edu.ar>

Van Dijk, J. J. M., Leger, G. J. & Shapland, J. (1987). *Information systems, crime and crime prevention*. Paper presented at the Council of Europe Conference on the Reduction of Urban Insecurity, Barcelona, Spain, 1987.

Van Dijk, J. J. M., Mayhew, P. & Killias, M. (1990). *Experiences of Crime across the World. Key findings from the 1989 International Crime Survey*. Deventer: Kluwer Law and Taxation Publishers.

Van Dijk, J. J. M., van Kesteren, J. & Smit, P. (2008). *Victimización en la Perspectiva Internacional: Resultados principales de la ENICRIV y ENECRIS 2004-2005*. Den Haag: WODC.

Vázquez, R. V. (1989) *Criminología aplicada a la ciudad de Buenos Aires*. Buenos Aires: Fundación Por Nuestros Hijos.