

# Review of the current situation in respect of the collection of survey data on victimisation

**R  
E  
P  
O  
R  
T**

Marcelo F. Aebi – University of Lausanne – Marcelo.Aebi@unil.ch  
Antonia Linde – University of Lausanne – Antonia.Linde@unil.ch

Revised version N° 4  
18 February 2010

  
**UNIL | Université de Lausanne**  
**Institut de criminologie  
et de droit pénal**

Postal address:  
**Université de Lausanne  
ESC-ICDP  
Sorge-Batochime  
CH-1015 Lausanne  
Switzerland**

Phone: +41 21 692 46 38  
Phone: +41 21 692 46 00  
Fax: + 41 21 692 46 45  
[www.unil.ch/esc](http://www.unil.ch/esc)

Research supported by the European Commission / Eurostat  
(Contract 11002.2008.002-2008.711 - Study on Crime Victimisation)

Postal address:  
**INTERVICT - Tilburg University  
PO Box 90153 - 5000 LE Tilburg  
the Netherlands**

Visiting address:  
**Montesquieu building, 9<sup>th</sup> floor  
Warandelaan 2 – Tilburg - NL**

Phone: +31 13 4663526  
Fax: +31 13 4663546  
E-mail: [INTERVICT@uvt.nl](mailto:INTERVICT@uvt.nl)  
[www.intervict.nl](http://www.intervict.nl)



## Table of contents

Introduction .....	5
Terminology .....	5
Overview of the main victimisation surveys conducted in Europe and methods of interviewing.....	6
Belgium (Belgique/België).....	15
Bulgaria (България [Bǎlgarija]).....	16
Czech Republic (Česká republika) .....	18
Denmark (Danmark) .....	19
Germany (Deutschland).....	20
Estonia (Eesti).....	27
Ireland (Eire/Ireland) .....	28
Greece (Ελλάδα [Elláda]) .....	29
Spain (España).....	29
National Level .....	29
Catalonia (Catalunya).....	31
France (France) .....	32
Italy (Italia).....	34
Cyprus (Κύπρος/Kıbrıs [Kýpros]).....	36
Latvia (Latvija).....	36
Lithuania (Lietuva) .....	37
Luxembourg (Luxembourg).....	37
Hungary (Magyarország) .....	38
Malta (Malta).....	38
Netherlands (Nederland) .....	39
Austria (Österreich) .....	40
Poland (Polska).....	41
Portugal (Portugal) .....	42
Romania (România) .....	43
Slovenia (Slovenija).....	43
Slovakia (Slovensko) .....	44
Finland (Suomi/Finland) .....	44
Sweden (Sverige) .....	45
United Kingdom .....	47
England & Wales .....	48
Northern Ireland .....	49
Scotland.....	49
<b>Summary information about the main international surveys mentioned in this review. 51</b>	
ICVS.....	51
EU ICS .....	52
ICBS / ICCS .....	53
Eurobarometer.....	54
Pilot study on the EU victimisation survey module .....	56
ICVS-2: Pilot study .....	57
IVAWS.....	58
EU-MIDIS European Union Minorities and Discrimination Survey.....	59
The pilot: FRA’s Pilot Victim Survey on Ethnic Minorities and Immigrants.....	59
The survey: EU-MIDIS European Union Minorities and Discrimination Survey .....	60
<b>Costs of a survey.....</b>	<b>62</b>

**Policy objectives of victim surveys..... 62**  
**Conclusion..... 63**  
**References ..... 67**  
    General references..... 67  
    References by country..... 71

## Introduction

The goal of this paper is to present a review of the historical evolution and the current situation in respect of the collection of survey data on victimisation, at the EU level and individually in each one of the 27 Member States. The review includes national surveys, academic/research studies, pilot exercises, and international surveys. It takes into account previous work conducted in this area, including the documentation of existing surveys by the UNECE/UNODC task force, the study conducted for Eurostat by HEUNI in 2007, and the publications produced by the CRIMPREV Network.

The review includes, whenever possible, the following information for each survey: year of the survey, frequency of the survey, type of survey (victimisation, multipurpose, etc.), questionnaire used (ICVS or ad hoc questionnaire), type of sample (national, city, etc.), size of the sample, response rate, methodology (face to face, CATI, CAPI, CAWI, CASI, PAPI, etc.), institution that financed the survey, and institution that conducted the survey.

A synoptic table of the main surveys conducted in each country is provided at the beginning of the review. The following 27 chapters present in detail the surveys conducted in each EU Member State. Countries are presented according to the EU Protocol Order. Finally, the review includes a short description of the main European and International Surveys mentioned constantly throughout the text (ICVS, EU ICS, ICBS / ICCS, Eurobarometer, Pilot study on the EU victimisation survey module, ICVS-2, FRA's Pilot Victim Survey on Ethnic Minorities and Immigrants). The next chapters include information on the costs of a survey and the policy objectives of victim surveys. The conclusions summarize the main surveys conducted in Europe indicating the EU countries that participated in them and the main methods used for conducting such surveys.

The authors would like to thank helpful comments and information provided by Jan van Dijk, John van Kesteren, Andri Ahven, Kauko Aromaa, Jacqueline Azzopardi, Markku Heiskanen, Fritz Huls, Georgeta Istrate, Andreas Kapardis, Klára Kerezsi, Milada Martinková, Maria Giuseppina Muratore, Louis de Schorlemer, Paul Smit, Wolfgang Stangl, Alexander Stoyanov, Cynthia Tavares, Geoffrey Thomas, Christina Zarafonitou, and Renée Zauberman.

## Terminology

When no particular indication is given (e.g. city sample), the sample is a national random sample. Likewise, when no particular indication is given (e.g. multipurpose survey), the survey is a victimisation survey.

Sample size refers to the number of completed interviews (final sample). Whenever possible, we have indicated also the response rate. With these two elements it is possible to calculate the size of the gross sample (e.g. a sample size of 1000 and a response rate of 50% means that the gross sample was 2000). When the final sample was not available, we have indicated clearly that we were mentioning the *gross sample*.

## Overview of the main victimisation surveys conducted in Europe and methods of interviewing

Country	ICVS, EU ICS	Eurobarometer 1996	Periodical National Survey	Other national surveys (non periodical)	EU Pilot 2009	IVAWS	National surveys on violence against women	International Crime Business Survey (ICBS)	National Crime Business Survey	EU-MIDIS European Union Minorities and Discrimination Survey	CATI	Other interview methods
Austria	1996 2005	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	Pilot (2007) 2008	Yes	CAPI
Belgium	1989 1992 2000 2005	Yes	Security Monitor: 1997; (biannual since 1998)  APS-SCV (annual since 1996) (Flanders)	No	No	No	No	No	No	Pilot (2007) 2008	Yes	
Bulgaria	1997 2002 2004	No	IVCS: 2005 2007 2008 2009	2004	No	No	No	2000	2002 2004 2005	Pilot (2007) 2008	No	PAPI
Cyprus	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	2008	No	CAPI CASI PAPI

Country	ICVS, EU ICS	Eurobar ometer 1996	Periodical National Survey	Other national surveys (non periodic al)	EU Pilot 2009	IVAWS	National surveys on violence against women	Internat ional Crime Business Survey (ICBS)	National Crime Business Survey	EU- MIDIS Europea n Union Minoriti es and Discrimi nation Survey	CATI	Other inter- view meth- ods
Czech Republic	1992 1996 2000	No	No	2000 2001 2002 2003 2004 2006	Yes	No	No	1994	No	2008	Yes	PAPI
Denmark	2000 2005  ICVS- 2 in 2009	Yes	National Victimisation Survey. Started in 1996. (Annual since 2005)	2007	Yes	2003	No	No	No	2008	Yes	
Estonia	1993 1995 2000 2004 2009	No	ICVS: 1993 1995 2000 2005 2009	No	No	No	No	No	1998	2008	No	CAPI

Country	ICVS, EU ICS	Eurobar ometer 1996	Periodical National Survey	Other national surveys (non periodic al)	EU Pilot 2009	IVAWS	National surveys on violence against women	Internat ional Crime Business Survey (ICBS)	National Crime Business Survey	EU- MIDIS Europea n Union Minoriti es and Discrimi nation Survey	CATI	Other inter- view meth- ods
Finland	1989 1992 1996 2000 2005	Yes	Finnish National Safety Survey: 1980 1988 1993 1997 2003 2006 2009	No	Yes	No	1997 2005	1994	1996 1997	2008	Yes	FtoF
France	1989 1996 2000 2005	Yes	Living Conditions of Households Survey (annual from 1996 to 2006)  Framework of Live and Security (annual since 2005)	Yes 1986	No	No	2000	1994	No	2008	Yes	CAPI
Germany	1989 2005  Pilot ICVS- 2 2009	Yes	No	Yes 1991 1992 1995 1997 2003	Yes	No	No	1994	No	2008	Yes	PAPI CAWI



Country	ICVS, EU ICS	Eurobar ometer 1996	Periodical National Survey	Other national surveys (non periodic al)	EU Pilot 2009	IVAWS	National surveys on violence against women	Internat ional Crime Business Survey (ICBS)	National Crime Business Survey	EU- MIDIS Europea n Union Minoriti es and Discrimi nation Survey	CATI	Other inter- view meth- ods
Greece	1991 2005	Yes	No	Yes 2001	No	2003	No	No	No	2008	Yes	FtoF
Hungary	1996 2005	No	No	Yes 2004 2006	Yes	No	No	1994 2000	No	2008	Yes	FtoF
Ireland	2005	Yes	The Quarterly National Households Survey (1998, 2003, 2006 2009)  Garda Public Attitudes Survey (annual since 2002)	Yes 1996	No	No	No	No	No	2008	Yes	FtoF

Country	ICVS, EU ICS	Eurobar ometer 1996	Periodical National Survey	Other national surveys (non periodic al)	EU Pilot 2009	IVAWS	National surveys on violence against women	Internat ional Crime Business Survey (ICBS)	National Crime Business Survey	EU- MIDIS Europea n Union Minoriti es and Discrimi nation Survey	CATI	Other inter- view meth- ods
Italy	1992 2005	Yes	The Italian Citizens' Safety Survey (every five years since 1997-98)  Everyday Life Aspects (annual from 1993 to 2003)	1991	Yes	No	2006	1994	No	Pilot (2007)  2008	Yes	PAPI
Latvia	1995 1998 2000	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	2008	Yes	CAPI
Lithuania	1996/7 2000 2005	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	2000	No	2008	No	PAPI CAPI
Luxembourg	2005	Yes	No	2007	No	No	No	No	No	2008	Yes	FtoF
Malta	1997	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	2008	No	FtoF

Country	ICVS, EU ICS	Eurobar ometer 1996	Periodical National Survey	Other national surveys (non periodic al)	EU Pilot 2009	IVAWS	National surveys on violence against women	Internat ional Crime Business Survey (ICBS)	National Crime Business Survey	EU- MIDIS Europea n Union Minoriti es and Discrimi nation Survey	CATI	Other inter- view meth- ods
The Netherlands	1989 1992 1996 2000 2005  ICVS 2 in 2009	Yes	National Victimisation Surveys (periodical from 1974 to 1980)  Crime Victim Survey (ESM) (periodical from 1980 to 2005).  Permanent Survey on Living Conditions (periodical from 1980 to 2005)  National Security Monitor (annual from 2005 to 2008)  Integral Security Monitor (annual since 2009)  Police Monitor	No	No	No	1986 1996 1997 2009	1994	Annual since 2004	2008	Yes	CAPI

Country	ICVS, EU ICS	Eurobar ometer 1996	Periodical National Survey	Other national surveys (non periodic al)	EU Pilot 2009	IVAWS	National surveys on violence against women	Internat ional Crime Business Survey (ICBS)	National Crime Business Survey	EU- MIDIS Europea n Union Minoriti es and Discrimi nation Survey	CATI	Other inter- view meth- ods
			(From 1993 to 2001 every second year. Since 2001 yearly)									
Poland	1989 1992 1996 2000 2004	No	No	No	Yes	2004	No	No	No	2008	No	PAPI
Portugal	2000 2004	Yes	No	Yes 1991 1992 1994	Yes	No	No	No	No	2008	Yes	CAPI
Romania	1996 2000	No	Living Conditions Survey (2001-2006)	No	No	No	No	2000	No	Pilot (2007)  2008	No	PAPI
Slovakia	1992 1997	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	Pilot (2007)  2008		FtoF
Slovenia	1992 1996 2001	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	2008	Yes	CAPI

Country	ICVS, EU ICS	Eurobar ometer 1996	Periodical National Survey	Other national surveys (non periodic al)	EU Pilot 2009	IVAWS	National surveys on violence against women	Internat ional Crime Business Survey (ICBS)	National Crime Business Survey	EU- MIDIS Europea n Union Minoriti es and Discrimi nation Survey	CATI	Other inter- view meth- ods
Spain (National Level)	1989 2005	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	1999 2002 2006	No	No	2008	Yes	CAPI
Catalonia (Spain)	1996 2000	No	Survey on Public Security in Catalonia (annual since 1999)	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	2008	Yes	CAPI
Sweden	1992 1996 2000 2005  Pilot ICVS- 2 2009	Yes	Living Conditions Survey (annual since 1978)  Swedish Crime Survey (annual since 2006)	No	Yes	No	1999/ 2000	No	No	2008	Yes	CAW I PAPI
United Kingdom	1989 1996 2000 2004	Yes	British Crime Survey (periodical from 1982 to 2000. Continuous,	No	No	No	No	1994	No	2008	Yes	CAPI CAWI CASI

Country	ICVS, EU ICS	Eurobar ometer 1996	Periodical National Survey	Other national surveys (non periodic al)	EU Pilot 2009	IVAWS	National surveys on violence against women	Internat ional Crime Business Survey (ICBS)	National Crime Business Survey	EU- MIDIS Europea n Union Minoriti es and Discrimi nation Survey	CATI	Other inter- view meth- ods
	Pilot ICVS- 2 2009		with monthly interviews, since 2001 in England and Wales, see below)									
UK: England & Wales	1989 1992 1996 2000 2005	No	British Crime Survey (continuous since 2001)	No	No	No	No	1994	No	2008	Yes	CASI CAPI PAPI CAWI
UK: Northern Ireland	1989 1996 2000 2005	No	Northern Irelands Crime Survey (periodical since 1994)	No	No	No	No	No	No	2008	Yes	CASI CAPI
UK: Scotland	1989 1996 2000 2005	No	Scottish Crime Survey (periodical since 1993)	No	No	No	No		No	2008	Yes	CAPI CASI

## Belgium (Belgique/België)

Belgium participated four times in the ICVS, in 1989, 1992, 2000 and 2005 (EU ICS). The country used national representative samples of 2,060, 1,485, 2,402 and 2,014 households with responses rates of 37%, 44%, 56% and 55% respectively, and used the CATI methodology.

The country participated in the Eurobarometer of Public Safety in 1996 with a sample of 1,000 interviews conducted face to face.

Since 1997, Belgium conducts regularly a national victimisation survey called Security Monitor (*Moniteur de Sécurité*). This survey has been conducted in 1997, 1998, 2000, 2002, 2004 and 2006. According to Pauwels and Pleysier (2007) “the Security Monitor is the official national crime and victim survey, conducted [and financed] by the Federal Police, under the authority of the Ministry of the Interior. The Belgian *Security Monitor*, inspired by the Dutch *Police Monitor*, is in essence a federal, repeated cross-sectional, victim survey, using Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI). [...] In 1997, the Minister of the Interior ordered a first sweep of the *Security Monitor* at the federal level, and at the local level, in those communities that had a safety-contract (‘veiligheids- en samenlevingscontract’) with the federal government or were ‘pilot police zones’. The second sweep, conducted in 1998, introduced a postal survey as a possible, and cheaper, alternative to the telephone mode, in approximately 70 communities. After a thorough evaluation, it was decided not to offer the postal survey alternative in future sweeps. In order to create more time and budgetary space for further analyses and research, and the implementation of the Security Monitor in local communities, data collection is spread every two years since 1998. [...] The local Monitors are executed in all 73 communities with a safety-contract and in the police zones those communities belong to.”

The Safety Monitor is based on a national, stratified random sample. The sample is selected using multistage probability sampling. Variables used for the stratification are geographical area and degree of urbanisation. In 2004 the Safety Monitor Survey, used a sample of 41,017 (federal and local) households and obtained a response rate of 56% with CATI methodology. In 2006, it used a sample of 43,318 (federal and local) households.

Also according to Pauwels and Pleysier (2007), “Another important repeated cross-sectional survey is the APS-SCV survey (‘Administratie Planning en Statistiek’ - ‘Sociaal Culturele Veranderingen’) of the Flanders Authority. In contrast to the *Security Monitor*, the APS-SCV survey’s main interest is not crime or victimisation; since 1996, it is an annual ‘barometer’ of socio-cultural changes among Dutch speaking inhabitants of the Flemish Community or the Brussels Capital Region. The main interest, therefore, is a broad one, dealing with values, attitudes and opinions of the Flemish on a number of relevant topics. There are some other important differences compared to the Security Monitor. The APS-SCV survey is not a federal survey, but concentrates on only one part of the federal state, i. E. Flanders. Furthermore, the data are gathered in face-to-face surveys (representative sample of 1.500 respondents) with a questionnaire in Dutch only. As the APS-SCV is an annual survey, some of the question blocks rotate; this is the case for the ‘fear of crime’ item set with was used in the questionnaire of the 1999, 2000, 2002 and 2004 sweep of the survey. Previously, we reported on secondary analyses investigating the temporal invariance assumption of the ‘fear of crime’ items of the 1999, 2000 and 2002 round”.

Belgium participated in 2007 in the FRA's Pilot Victim Survey on Ethnic Minorities and Immigrants with a sample of 499 persons with Turkish, North African and Italian origins. The survey used the ICVS questionnaire. The interviews were conducted face-to-face with an interviewer filling out the questionnaire. In 2008, this country participated in the full-scale EU-MIDIS (European Union Minorities and Discrimination Survey) with a sample of 532 persons with Turkish origins and 500 persons with North African origins. The sample covered the cities of Brussels and Antwerp, and the response rate was 81%.

Belgium did not conduct a pilot study on the EU victimisation survey module in 2008/9.

## **Bulgaria (България [Bǎlgarija])**

Bulgaria used the ICVS questionnaire in Sofia in 1997 with the support of The United Nations Institute on Criminal Justice Research (UNICRI). The ICVS was used with national representative samples in 2002 and 2004. Bulgaria participated in the EU ICS in 2004 with a sample of 1,101 households and a response rate of 83%. The country used face to face interviews at the respondent home with a paper questionnaire. The ICVS questionnaire is currently being used for periodical national victimisation surveys conducted in 2005, 2007, 2008, and 2009. More details are provided in the table below.

### **Victimisation surveys conducted in Bulgaria (Source: Stoyanov, 2009)**

Year	Sample type	Sample size	Institution	Questionnaire	Method
2002	random two stage cluster sample, representative of the general population aged 15 or more	N=1615	CSD and Vitosha Research	ICVS	Face to face, in home interview, paper and pencil
2004	Idem	N=1101	Idem	Idem (EU ICS)	Idem
2005	Idem	N=1202	Idem	Idem	Idem
2007	Idem	N=2463	Idem	Idem	Idem
2008	Idem	N=2499	Idem	Idem	Idem
2009	Idem	N=2500	Idem	Idem	Idem

According to the Center for the Study of Democracy (2009): “Following the political and economic crisis in late 1996 and early 1997, a Center for the Study of Democracy (CSD) team, participating in UNDP’s Early Warning project, included in its monthly surveys a set of victimisation questions (UNDP Early Warning Report, Sofia 1998, pp. 93-96)”.

In 2004, the country conducted a Survey on non-registered criminality in the Republic of Bulgaria based on a victimisation survey with a sample of 2619 households, representing 7180 individuals. The sample was selected using multistage probability sampling. The variable used for the stratification was the degree of urbanisation. The sample was representative at the national level. The response rates were 87% for households and 97.5%



for individuals. The survey was based on face to face interviews at the respondent home with a paper questionnaire. The survey used an ad hoc questionnaire. It was placed under the responsibility of the National Statistical Institute, Department of Demographic and Social Statistics.

Bulgaria participated in 2000 in the second round of the International Crime Business Survey. The survey was conducted by Vitosha Research under the supervision of UNICRI as part of an international comparative survey carried out in the capitals of eight other countries: Albania, Croatia, Belarus, Lithuania, Hungary, Romania, Russia and Ukraine. The survey used a sample size of 532 companies in the city of Sofia. Interviews were conducted face to face. It used a random sample of companies stratified by size and sector taken from the database of the National Statistical Institute. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands provided funding. A second business victimisation survey using the same questionnaire was also conducted by Vitosha Research in Sofia in 2004. In September 2005 a third survey was conducted using the same questionnaire but with a national representative sample of 308 companies. It used a random sample of companies stratified by size and sector, representative of the companies in the country. The survey was financed by the Centre for the Study of Democracy. More information on these surveys is given in the table below.

**Business surveys conducted in Bulgaria (Source: Stoyanov, personal communication)**

Year	Sample type	Sample size	Institution	Questionnaire	Method
2000	random sample of companies stratified by size and sector, representative of the companies in Sofia	N=532	CSD and Vitosha Research / Gallup	ICBS	Face to face, paper and pencil
2004	Idem			Idem	Idem
2005	random sample of companies stratified by size and sector, representative of the companies in the country	N=308	CSD and Vitosha Research	Idem	Idem

Bulgaria participated in 2007 in the FRA’s Pilot Victim Survey on Ethnic Minorities and Immigrants with a sample of 900 persons with Roma and Turkish origins. The survey used the ICVS questionnaire. The interviews were conducted face-to-face with an interviewer filling out the questionnaire. In 2008, this country participated in the full-scale EU-MIDIS with a nationwide sample of 500 persons with Turkish origins and 500 persons with Roma origins. The response rate was 68%.

Bulgaria did not conduct a pilot study on the EU victimisation survey module in 2008/9.

## **Czech Republic (Česká republika)**

In 1992, as part of Czechoslovakia, the ICVS was conducted with a national representative sample of 1,821 households. The response rate was 91.0%. The sample was selected using multistage probability sampling. The variables used for the stratification were age, gender, socio-professional qualifications, area of residence, regional distribution, and size of the population. Data were collected through face to face interviews conducted in June 1992 in the Czech and Slovak languages. The final sample for the Czech Republic consisted in 1,262 households. The survey was placed under the responsibility of the Institute of Criminology and Social Prevention.

In 1996, the Czech Republic conducted the ICVS with a sample of multiple cities and a small rural sample. Interviews were conducted face to face. The sample was 1469 respondents above 16 years of age throughout the Czech Republic. The sample was selected using multistage probability sampling. The survey was placed under the responsibility of the Institute of Criminology and Social Prevention.

Then, the ICVS was conducted in the city of Prague in 2000 with a city representative sample of 1,500 households (respondents above 16 years of age) and using the CATI methodology. The sample was selected using multistage probability sampling. The survey was placed under the responsibility of the Institute of Criminology and Social Prevention.

In 2004, the country conducted the study "Victimisation of citizens of the Czech Republic by some types of criminality in the year 2004". It was a multipurpose survey that did not use the ICVS questionnaire but included some comparable questions. It was conducted with a sample of 1,052 households selected through multistage probability sampling. The variables used for the stratification were age, sex, education, size of the city, and degree of urbanisation. The sample was representative at the national level. The survey was conducted using face to face interviews at the respondent's home with a paper questionnaire. The survey was placed under the responsibility of the Institute of Criminology and Social Prevention.

Between 2000 and 2003, four victimisation surveys were conducted with the financial support of the Ministry of Interior of the Czech Republic. The first three ones were part of the research project Continual Research of Victimisation and Feeling of Security of Citizens (2000-2002). Researches of this project were conducted by the Department of Sociology of Charles University with representative samples at the national level in the years 2000 (1386 respondents), 2001 (1418 respondents), and 2002 (1259 respondents). The fourth survey financed by the Ministry of Interior of the Czech Republic was the research project Continual Research of Victimisation and Feeling of Security of Citizens. This research followed up in some actual aspects the preceding research project. It was conducted by the Department of Sociology of Charles University. The representative sample at the national level was 1418 persons above 15 years age. All these surveys did not use the ICVS questionnaire, but an ad hoc one.

In 2006, the country conducted the survey Experiences of Czech Republic Citizens with Some Offences. The survey was based on an adapted version of the ICVS questionnaire. According to Martinková (2008): "The survey was conducted with a group of 3082 respondents over the age of 15 throughout the Czech Republic. The group of respondents was obtained by a stratified, multi-layered selection and was representative in the indicators: age, sex, size of the place of residence, education, higher territorial administrative unit (region). The field research was performed by the firm GfK and the data collection was financed by the National

Committee for Crime Prevention. Polling was conducted face-to-face.” The survey was placed under the responsibility of the Institute of Criminology and Social Prevention.

The country participated in 1994 in the first round of the International Crime Business Survey (ICBS) with a national representative sample. Interviews were conducted face to face. The survey was placed under the responsibility of Dutch Ministry of Justice.

The Czech Republic conducted in 2008 the EU-MIDIS with a nationwide sample of 505 persons of Roma origins. The response rate was 94%.

The Czech Republic also conducted a pilot study on the EU victimisation survey module in 2008/9. The Czech Statistical Office (CZSO) had the responsibility of conducting the pilot study, while the Institute of Criminology and Social Prevention provides scientific expertise. The sample was based on voluntary participation and included 1.000 respondents (total sample was 690 interviews). The response rate was 69.1%. The country used 151 interviewers that were employees of the CZSO performing various fieldworks for the Office. Interviewers also filled an interviewer’s questionnaire about their experience. The survey was conducted combining the following methods: (a) Face-to-face interview with paper and pencil questionnaire (method assessed by 52 interviewers); (b) Face to face interviews assisted with computer (method assessed by 48 interviewers); (c) Phone interview with paper and pencil (method assessed by 54 interviewers); and (d) Phone interview assisted with computer (method assessed by 58 interviewers). Interviewers considered that face to face interview with a respondent (based either on printed questionnaire or assisted with computer) on victimisation was identified by the interviewers generally as more comfortable than phone interviewing.

## **Denmark (Danmark)**

Denmark participated in the ICVS in 2000 and 2005 (EU ICS). Interviews were carried out using the CATI methodology. The national representative samples were composed by 3,007 and 1,984 households and the response rates were 66% and 44% respectively.

The country participated in the Eurobarometer of Public Safety in 1996 with a sample of 1,000 interviews conducted face to face.

From a historical point of view, it has been pointed out that the first victimisation survey took place in the city of Aarhus, Denmark, in 1730 (Wolf & Hauge, 1975). The city council reacted to the complaints of the citizens by asking six persons to go through all the households of the town asking their inhabitants if they had been victims of burglary during the last 3 or 4 year. At that time, Aarhus had a population of approximately 3,500 persons and according to them there had been 188 burglaries, which implies that around 1% to 2% of the households had been victims of such a crime (Balvig, 1987; Garrido, Stangeland y Redondo, 2001: 696-7).

In the contemporary period, the Nordic countries were also pioneers in conducting victimisation surveys. As Sparks (1981) has mentioned, at the beginning of the 1970s the Scandinavian Research Council for Criminology financed a series of victimisation survey on violent crime and on property crimes in Denmark, Finland, Norway, and Sweden (Aromaa 1971, 1974a, 1974b; Wolf and Hauge 1975; Aromaa and Leppa 1973).

Apart from that, since 2005, Denmark also has an annual victimisation survey. The project started with two national victimisation surveys in 1995 and 1996 placed under the responsibility of the National Police with the University of Copenhagen providing expertise, and Statistics Denmark conducting the interviews by using CATI methodology. The questionnaire was not based on the ICVS questionnaire, but included some comparable questions. In 2005, this victimisation survey was carried out again using the same questionnaire and the same methodology. Since then, it has been conducted every year and will continue to be conducted annually. The sample size is approximately 12.000 persons for each survey and the response rate is around 65%. National registers are used to select a random and national representative sample. Since 2005, the survey is financed by the National Police, the Crime Preventive Council and the Ministry of Justice. The University of Copenhagen and The Ministry of Justice provides expertise in conducting the analyses and writing the report.

Denmark also participated in the International Violence Against Women Survey (IVAWS) in 2003 (October-November). The Survey was placed under the responsibility of the Ministry of Justice and the report made in cooperation with The University of Copenhagen. 3,552 females were interviewed and the response rate was 55%. The survey was conducted using the CATI methodology.

In the fall of 2007, a national survey on dating violence took place in Denmark. It was an internet-based survey (CAWI) based on a random sample of 2,123 Danish residents aged 16-24 (drawn from the Danish register of all registered residents in Denmark). The survey also included qualitative information based on focus group discussions. The response rate was 28%. The Survey was conducted by the National Institute of Public Health, the University of Southern Denmark, and the Ministry of Gender Equality.

Denmark conducted in 2008 the EU-MIDIS with a sample of 553 persons with Turkish origins and 561 persons with Somali origins. The sample covered the cities of Copenhagen and Odense, and the response rate was 98%.

Denmark has also participated in the pilot study on the EU victimisation survey module in 2009 with a random sample of 1,073 persons aged 16-75 years. The sample frame was the Population Register, which covers all registered residents in Denmark. 447 interviews were conducted using CATI methodology and 202 using CAWI and CASI methodology. The overall response rate was 64%. The pilot was conducted by Statistics Denmark's Survey Division, Interview services.

## **Germany (Deutschland)**

Germany participated twice in the ICVS, in 1989 and 2005 (EU ICS). The country used national representative samples of 5,274 and 2,025 households with responses rates of 30% and 43% respectively, and used CATI methodology.

The country participated in the Eurobarometer of Public Safety in 1996 with a sample of 2,000 interviews conducted face to face, of which 1,000 in the former Eastern State and 1,000 in the former Western State.

According to Obergfell-Fuchs (2008): "The first (published) victim survey in Germany dates 1973, from then until 1990 the frequency of such surveys was quite low with a mean of about

2 surveys within 5 years. But in the early 1990s a steep increase occurred, up to about 5 surveys per year were conducted and since then, the quantity remained on this higher plateau, which is about the quadruple of the numbers of the 1980s.” Obergfell-Fuchs (2008) identifies 34 surveys on victimisation and insecurity that are included in Table 1 at the end of this chapter. Most of them “were designed by research institutes to answer special scientific questions, some others, especially those in later years, have been developed in cooperation between local governments and research institutes, their major goal was local policy planning. Until now periodic national or statewide victimisation surveys are still lacking in Germany. On a local level, some efforts were made to develop such periodic surveys, but either they cover only a more or less narrow period of time or the intervals between the particular inquiries is quite long hence, longitudinal interpretations might be rather flawed.”

At the national level, Germany conducted a victimisation survey in 1997-1998, which was part of two multi-thematic surveys. An ad-hoc questionnaire survey was used with a national representative sample of 20,070 and 3,272 households with a response rate of 67%. The sampling procedure was multistage probability sampling. The variable used for the stratification was the geographical area. The sample was representative at first regional level. The survey was placed under the responsibility of the University of Constance, School of Law, and it was financed by the Federal Ministry of Justice (Bundesministerium der Justiz).

Another multipurpose survey, called Experiences of victimisation and attitudes to inner security in Germany, was conducted in 2003 using parts of the ICVS questionnaire and face to face interviews at the respondent’s home using paper questionnaire. The sample included 400 households and the response rate 70%. The sampling procedure was simple probability sampling. The sample was representative at the second regional level. This survey was placed under the responsibility of the Max-Planck-Institute and the Bundeskriminalamt. The Department of Criminology of the University of Freiburg provided expertise.

A multipurpose survey called Insecurities in Europe Cities – Crime related fear within the context of new anxieties and community based crime prevention was conducted in 2002. The survey was conducted in Hamburg and used an ad-hoc questionnaire with a sample of 861 households and a response rate of 24%. The survey used face to face interviews at the respondent's home using paper questionnaire. The sampling procedure was simple probability sampling. The sample was representative of two districts or neighbourhoods in the city of Hamburg with specific local problems. The survey was placed under the responsibility of the University of Hamburg, Department of Criminology. It was financed by the European Commission, 5th Framework Programme (1998-2002) "Key Action: Improving the Socio-economic Knowledge base", and the International Advisory Board provided expertise.

In the city of Bochum, the survey Victims of crime in Bochum: A long term comparative study of a large German city, was conducted in 1975, 1986, and 1998. The survey used face to face interviews and, later, the CATI methodology. In 1998 the sample size was 1,661 households and the response rate 80%. The sampling procedure was simple probability sampling. The sample was representative of the city of Bochum. The survey was placed under the responsibility of the University of Bochum, Faculty of Law. It was financed by VW-Stiftung (Volkswagen Foundation), and the International Advisory Board provided expertise.

Germany also participated in 2009 in the pilot of the so-called ICVS-2. Two methodologies were used for the pilot exercise: CATI and a combination of CAWI and PAPI. The country used a total sample of 319 households for CAWI and PAPI methodology (82 households for

CAWI and 237 households for PAPI) and 223 households for CATI methodology. For CAWI and PAPI the overall response rate was 10.6%. In particular, the response rates were 2.7% for the CAWI methodology (2.1% when the questionnaire was included and 2.9% when an answer card was included), 7.9% for the PAPI methodology (15.1% when the questionnaire was included and 0.2% when an answer card was included), and 11.7% for CATI methodology.

The country participated in 1994 in the first round of the International Crime Business Survey (ICBS) with a national representative sample. Regarding sampling procedure, a random sampling was taken of the business population, and each random sample was stratified according to the size and type of business (using a random selection of companies of 1-10 and 11 or more employees in the retail trade). The interviews were conducted by telephone by means of CATI method. The response rates were 49% for companies of 1-10 employees and 66% for companies with 11 or more employees. The survey was placed under the responsibility of Dutch Ministry of Justice.

Germany conducted in 2008 the EU-MIDIS with a sample of 503 persons with Turkish origins and 500 persons with ex-Yugoslavian origins. The sample covered the cities of Berlin, Frankfurt and Munich. The response rate was 80%.

Germany is also conducting a pilot study on the EU victimisation survey module in 2009. The exercise is conducted by the Federal Statistical Office.

Table 1: Victimization and Insecurity Surveys in Germany according to the review of Obergfell-Fuchs (2008)

<b>No</b>	<b>Author</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Territorial Scope</b>	<b>Focus</b>	<b>Publication</b>
1	Stephan	1973	local: Stuttgart	general	Stephan 1976
2	Schwind	1973/74	local: Goettingen	general	Schwind et al. 1975
3	Schwind et al.	1975 – 1986 – 1998	local: Bochum	general	Schwind et al. 2001
4	Kreuzer et al.	1990	no area specified	university students	Kreuzer et al. 1993
5	Arnold et al.	1981	regional/ supranational: Ba-den-Wuerttemberg, Germany – Baranya, Hungary – Texas, USA	general	Teske & Arnold 1991; Arnold & Korinek 1991
6	Plate et al.	1982	local: Solingen	general	Plate et al. 1985
7	Sessar, Boers	1984	local: Hamburg	general	Boers 1991; Ses-sar 1992
8	Kury	1989	national: 1st ICVS	general	Kury 1991
9	Aben	1990	local: Luebeck	general	Aben 1992
10	Kury et al 1990	1991	national: East and West Germany	general	Kury et al. 1992
11	Boers et al.	1991 – 1993 – 1995	national: East and West Germany	general	Boers et al. 1997

<b>No</b>	<b>Author</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Territorial Scope</b>	<b>Focus</b>	<b>Publication</b>
12	Kury et al.	1991/92 – 1995-96	local/regional: Frei-burg – Emmendingen - Loeffingen	general	Kury et al. 2000
13	Kräupl, Ludwig	1991/92 – 1995/96 – 2001/02	local/regional: Jena – Kahla- Suhl	general	Kräupl & Ludwig 1993; 2000; Ludwig & Kräupl 2005
14	Wetzels et al.	1992	national: East and West Germany	general	Wetzels et al. 1995
15	Schwind et al.	1993	local: Bochum	students 6–21y	Schwind et al. 1995
16	Funk et al.	1994	local: Nuremberg	students 12–15y	Funk 1995
17	Research Group Com- munity Crime Prevention in Baden-Wuerttemberg	1994	local/regional: Calw, Freiburg, Ravens-burg, Weingarten	general	Dölling et al. 2003
18	Research Group Com- munity Crime Prevention Baden-Wuerttemberg	1995	national	general	Forschungsgruppe Kommunale Krimi-nalprävention Ba-den- Wuerttemberg 1998
19	Heinz et al.	1997	national	general	Schnell & Kreuter 2000
20	Hermann et al.	1997 – 2004	local: Schwetzingen	general	Hermann & Laue 2005
21	Kury et al.	1998	local: Reutlingen	general	Kury et al. 1999a
22	Kury et al.	1998	local: Metzingen	general	Kury et al. 1999b



<b>No</b>	<b>Author</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Territorial Scope</b>	<b>Focus</b>	<b>Publication</b>
23	Wetzels et al.	1998	local: Munich, Kiel, Hamburg, Hanover, Wunstorf, Lilienthal, Leipzig, Stuttgart, Schwaebisch-Gmuend	students 15–17y	Wetzels et al. 2001
24	Hermann, Dölling	1998	local: Freiburg, Heidelberg	general 14–70y	Hermann & Dölling 2001
25	Oberwittler et al.	1999	local: Freiburg, Cologne	students 13–17y	Oberwittler et al. 2001
26	Kury et al.	2000	local: Mannheim	general	Posch et al. 2001
27	Oberwittler et al.	2000	regional: Markgraefler Land	students 13–18y	Oberwittler et al. 2002
28	Wilmers et al.	2000	local/regional: Hamburg, Hanover, Leipzig, Munich, Friesland	students 15–17y	Wilmers et al. 2002
29	Sessar et al.	2001	local/supranational: Hamburg, Amsterdam, Budapest, Cra-cow, Vienna	general	Sessar 2006
30	Dreher et al.	2003	local: Rottweil	general	Dreher et al. 2005
31	Müller, Schröttle	2003	national	women	Bundesministerium für Familie, Senioren, Frauen und Jugend 2004
32	Feltes, Goldberg	2003/04	local: Bochum	students 11–17y	Feltes & Goldberg 2006
33	Gallup/Europe, Kury et al.	2005	national: ICVS	general	EUICS Report 2005

<b>No</b>	<b>Author</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Territorial Scope</b>	<b>Focus</b>	<b>Publication</b>
34	Pfeiffer et al.	2005	local/regional: Mu-nich, Stuttgart, Schwaebisch-Gmuend, Kassel, Dortmund, Olden-burg, Lehrte, Belm, Wallenhorst, Peine, Soltau-Fallingbostel, Thuringia	students 10–11 y 15–17 y	Baier et al. 2006

Source: Obergfell-Fuchs (2008).

## **Estonia (Eesti)**

Estonia participated in four sweeps of the ICVS, in 1993, 1995, 2000 and 2004 (EU ICS). Indeed, the ICVS has become a sort of regular national victimisation survey and, in that context, it was conducted again in 2009.

In 1993, for the first ICVS conducted in Estonia, the country used a national representative sample of 1,000 households. In 1995, the national representative sample included 1,173 households and the questionnaire was available in two languages (Estonian and Russian). In 2000, the country used a national representative sample that included an urban subsample (N=502) of the city of Tallinn. In 2004, the EU ICS used a sample of 1,678 households (including a subsample of 482 households in Tallinn) and obtained a response rate of 52%.

The results of the 2009 survey will be published in 2010. In 2009, the fieldwork was carried out by the Statistical Office (previously it was done by private companies). The survey is based on the ICVS questionnaire but includes a few modifications. As a consequence, the comparability of the answers' structure with other ICVS surveys should be rather good but, due to a longer fieldwork period (several months instead of 2-3 weeks) and some differences in sampling, the results (including victimisation rates) may not always be fully comparable. According to the first estimations the final sample should include at least 4500 households (the original sample before fieldwork included at least 6500 households).

Samples were drawn from official national registration lists using a multistage probability sampling. They were stratified by geographical area and degree of urbanisation. The methodology is based on face to face interviews in the respondent's home. Since 2000, interviewers use CAPI to register the answers.

The 1993–2004 surveys were placed under the responsibility of the Ministry of the Interior, Internal Security Policy Department. In 2004, it was co-financed by The Ministry of Justice, and the Tartu University provided institutional support by compiling a report on the results. The 2009 survey was carried out by the Statistical Office in cooperation with the Ministry of Justice, Criminal Policy Department.

Apart from that, Estonia conducted in 1998 a crime against businesses survey using the same questionnaire as the one used for the first International Commercial Crime Survey (ICCS) in 1994.

In 2007 the Criminal Policy Department of the Ministry of Justice conducted a study on offences committed against enterprises and employees in 2006 which aim was to analyse (1) the forms and extent of crime directed against enterprises (estimations of enterprise managers of the problem); (2) the nature of the offences directed against the employees of undertakings and agencies (personal experience of the employees with offences committed with respect to them, including by the employer, at the workplace). The study contained two different interviews with a different questionnaire for each target group: (1) a telephone interview with the managers of 702 enterprises; (2) a laptop assisted interview at the homes of 526 employees. Information on enterprises was obtained by random choice from the commercial register, taking account of their classification by size (on the basis of the number of employees). The employees to be interviewed were found by a random choice from the database of the Statistical Office. The sample covered the residents of 15–74 of age who were

employed most of the time in 2006. The response rate for enterprises was 32.4% (702 interviews out of a sample of 2168) and for employees it was 29.9% (742 interviews –of which 526 for this survey– out of a sample of 2482).

Estonia conducted in 2008 the EU-MIDIS with a sample of 500 persons with Russian origins. The sample covered the city of Tallinn, and the response rate was 89%.

Estonia did not conduct a pilot study on the EU victimisation survey module in 2008/9.

## **Ireland (Eire/Ireland)**

Ireland participated in the 2005 EU ICS with a national representative sample of 2,003 households and a 42% response rate using the CATI methodology.

The country participated in the Eurobarometer of Public Safety in 1996 with a sample of 1,000 interviews conducted face to face.

The Irish National Crime Council (2009) points out that a survey on 'Victims of Recorded Crime in Ireland', which drew on Garda records from November 1994 to October 1995, was conducted in 1996 (Watson, 2000). This survey was commissioned by the Garda Research Unit to the Economic and Social Research Institute (ESRI). Before this, the last large scale survey of Crime and Victimisation patterns in Ireland was carried out in the early 1980s. Currently, the Central Statistics Office (CSO) examines Crime and Victimisation rates in Ireland as part of their Quarterly National Household Surveys (QNHS). These have been conducted in 1998, 2003 and most recently, in 2006. [...] The next National Crime and Victimisation Survey scheduled to take place in Ireland will be conducted by the Central Statistics Office in 2009.” Thus, the Quarterly National Household Survey can be considered as a sort of regular national victimisation survey.

In 2003, the QNHS used a sample of 29,436 households selected through multistage probability sampling. The variables used for the stratification were the geographical area and the degree of urbanisation. Age and gender are also used in the weighting process . The sample was representative at the second regional level. It obtained a response rate of 85%, using CAPI methodology. According to the Irish National Crime Council (2009): “In 2006, the CSO surveyed 39,000 households as part of the QNHS. This sample was then mathematically adjusted to be representative of the population of the Republic of Ireland as a whole.”

Also according to the Irish National Crime Council (2009): “In addition to the QNHS, the annual Garda Public Attitudes Survey provides an alternative source of information regarding the 'dark figure' of unreported crime in Ireland.” This survey estimates the percentage of offences recorded to the police and has been conducted annually since 2002.

Ireland also conducted in 2008 the EU-MIDIS with a sample of 609 persons with Central and Eastern European origins and 503 persons with Sub-Saharan African origins. The sample covered the Dublin metro area, and the response rate was 41%.

Ireland did not conduct a pilot study on the EU victimisation survey module in 2008/9.

## **Greece (Ελλάδα [Elláda])**

In 1991, a pilot study of the ICVS was conducted in the city of Athens with the financial support of the University of Athens and Panteion University. The sample was composed of 345 households selected randomly from the archives of a public utility company. Interviews were conducted face to face by a team composed of university postgraduate students. The response rate was 77%. Only a summary of the first results of this research has been published (Spinellis et al. 1991)

Greece participated in the 2005 EU ICS with a national representative sample of 2,020 households and a 44% response rate using CATI methodology.

The country participated in the Eurobarometer of Public Safety in 1996 with a sample of 1,000 interviews conducted face to face.

At the national level, only one victimisation survey has conducted, in 2001. The results are available only in Greek (Karydis, 2004).

Surveys on fear of crime were conducted in the city of Athens in 1998 and 2004 under the supervision of Christina Zarafonitou from Panteion University.

Greece participated in the IVAWS survey in 2003. However, the results were not included in the international publication of the findings because at the moment of the publication, the survey was still going on.

Greece also conducted in 2008 the EU-MIDIS with a sample of 503 persons with Albanian origins and 505 persons with Roma origins. The sample covered the cities of Athens and Thessaloniki, and the response rate was 65%.

Greece did not conduct a pilot study on the EU victimisation survey module in 2008/9.

## **Spain (España)** ***National Level***

Spain participated in the ICVS in 1989 and 2005 (EU ICS) with samples of 862 and 2034 households and responses rates of 33% and 40% respectively. In 1989 the survey was conducted using CATI methodology in urban areas, while in rural areas where telephone penetration was too low interviews were taken face-to-face with some computer assistance. In 2005 it was conducted using the CATI methodology. In 1989, in order to save costs, rural areas were selected applying standard national quota sampling instead of other methods of probability sampling. In 2005, the sample was representative at the national level.

Gondra Bustinza (2008) identifies eight victimisation surveys conducted by the CIS (*Centro de Investigaciones Sociológicas*) of which six were conducted at the national level (in 1978, 1980, 1991 and 1995), one in Madrid in 1980, and one with a sample of several cities in 1982. Apart from that, there was a study on terrorism and citizens' security conducted also by the CIS in 1987. The Barometer conducted periodically by the CIS cannot be considered as a victimisation survey as it only includes a couple of questions on citizens' concerns among which delinquency is often included.

Table 2: Victimization Surveys conducted by the CIS in Spain\*

Year	Survey	Sample (N)	Territorial scope	CIS Study Number
1978	<i>Study on criminality (Estudio sobre criminalidad)</i>	1.204	Spain	1149
1978	<i>Study on victimisation (Estudio sobre victimización)</i>	5.706	Spain	1152
1980	<i>Study on victimisation and drugs (Estudio sobre victimización y droga)</i>	5.738	Spain	1206
1980	<i>Study on citizens' insecurity 1 (Estudio sobre inseguridad ciudadana 1)</i>	1.156	Madrid	1251
1982	<i>Study on citizens' insecurity 2 (Estudio sobre inseguridad ciudadana 2)</i>	3.714	Sample of cities	1313
1991	<i>Study on citizens' insecurity 3 (Estudio sobre inseguridad ciudadana 3)</i>	2.490	Spain	1974
1995	<i>(Delinquency, security and police) Delincuencia, seguridad y policía</i>	3.919	Spain	2200
1995	<i>(Request for insecurity and victimisation) Demanda de Inseguridad y Victimización</i>	14.994	Spain	2200

\* Table adapted from Gondra Bustinza (2008) with additional information from Raldúa Martín (1996).

Spain participated in the Eurobarometer of Public Safety in 1996 with a sample of 1,000 interviews conducted face to face.

The country conducted the Violence Against Women Macro-Survey in 1999, 2002 and 2006, with a national sample of 20,552, 20,652 and 32,426 females respectively. In 1999 the response rate was 44.1%. Face to face interviews and CATI methodology were used. The sample was selected using multistage probability sampling. The variables used for the stratification were the geographical area and the degree of urbanisation. Oversampling was applied for Autonomous Communities (first regional level) with less population. The sample was representative at first regional and national level. The survey was placed under the responsibility of the Instituto de la Mujer, Secretaría General de Políticas de Igualdad.

At the regional level, several city surveys have been conducted in the Autonomous Community of Andalusia under the responsibility of the Andalusian Institute of Criminology. Such surveys were conducted in Málaga in 1994 and 2005, in Córdoba, Huelva and Seville in 2006, and in Almería, Cádiz, Granada and Jaén in 2007. A survey conducted in Seville in 2003 remains unpublished. All these surveys used adapted versions of the ICVS questionnaire. The 1994 Malaga survey used a sample of 1,634 households combining face-to-face and telephone interviews. The rest of the surveys used the CATI methodology with samples of persons aged 16 or more. The sample of the 2005 Malaga survey consisted in 1,343 interviews. The surveys of 2006 and 2007 used samples of 800 interviews in each city. The response rates were 17,2% (Córdoba), 15,1% (Huelva), 18,3% (Sevilla), 18,5% (Almería), 17,6% (Cádiz), 20% (Granada), and 19% (Jaén).

In 1994, the city of Malaga participated in a pilot survey for the first round of the International Crime Business Survey (ICBS).

As far as school victimisation is concerned, the Attorney of the Spanish People (*Defensor del Pueblo español*) conducted, in cooperation with UNICEF, two surveys on school violence in 1999 and 2005-6. The sample included 3,000 students of secondary school attending 300 institutions selected according to the following criteria: urban/rural, public/private, and proportional distribution according to the Spanish Autonomous Regions (Defensor del Pueblo, 2007).

Spain conducted in 2008 the EU-MIDIS with a sample of 514 persons with North African origins, 504 persons with South American origins, and 508 persons with Romanian origins. The sample covered the cities of Madrid and Barcelona, and the response rate was 58%.

Spain also conducted a pilot study on the EU victimisation survey module in 2008/9. The pilot survey is conducted by the Cabinet of Interior Security Studies (GESI) and the National Statistical Institute (INE) and the field test was carried out by TNS-Demoscopia under the technical supervision of the INE. It targets people aged 15-74 (both inclusive), living in family units. Thus, people living alone are excluded from the survey. The geographical scope spanned over ten provinces (out of 50). The pilot test sample was designed by the INE. The theoretical sampling size was 1000 people; 10 for each of the 100 census sections targeted by the study. The households within a section were randomly selected. Once the households had been selected, questions regarding the number of people living in the household were posed, and the respondent was selected using a random number table. The data collection method chosen was personal interviews (CAPI) and telephone interviews (CATI). CAPI interviews were conducted in 96 census sections and CATI (telephone) interviews in 4 sections. The response rate was 53,5%

### ***Catalonia (Catalunya)***

Catalonia participated in the ICVS in 1996 and 2000. In 1996, the data arrived after the final deadline and therefore the region is not included in the main publications about the survey. In 2000, the survey used a sample of 2,909 households. The response rate was 73%. The survey was conducted using telephone interviewing but not CATI methodology. The sampling method was based in random sample from the telephone registry, and therefore does not account for households with non-registered telephone numbers. The survey was financed by the Autonomous Government of Catalonia and was co-ordinated for the Centre of Legal Studies, Ministry of Justice.

In the city of Barcelona, a victimisation survey called Survey on Public Security in Barcelona, is conducted annually since 1983.

Also, since 1999 a survey called Survey on Public Security in Catalonia is conducted annually. The sample is representative of the population of Catalonia. In 1999, the survey pilot used a non-representative sample of 5,320 households. In 2000, the first survey used a sample of 12,806 households. In 2001, the sample was composed of 12,617 households. Since 2002, the Survey on Public Security in Barcelona and the Survey on Public Security in Catalonia are conducted together under the name of the latter. In 2002, the survey used a sample of 18,679 households. The survey is conducted using the CATI methodology. Sample is selected using multistage probability sampling. The variables used for the stratification are age, gender, and geographical area. The sample is representative at first regional level. The

survey is placed under the responsibility of the Government of Catalonia (Generalitat de Catalunya), Department of Justice and Interior.

Catalonia also conducted a pilot study on the EU victimisation survey module in 2009, with a sample size of 1,179 households, of which 707 through telephone interview (CATI) and 472 through face to face interviews (CAPI). ) An extra module on violence was included using a Computer Assisted Self Interview (CASI). The sample was representative of the population of Catalonia. For CATI methodology, a random sample stratified by region, sex and age was used. For CAPI methodology, a two-stage sample involving the selection of census sections as first stage units, understood as conglomerates, and of individuals as the final unit was used. The face to face interviews were only held in the Barcelona metropolitan area. The sample design was provided by the Ministry of Home Affairs, Institutional Relations and Participation and the Statistical Institute of Catalonia (IDESCAT). The response rate was 9.6% for CATI and 40.5% for CAPI.

## France (France)

France participated in the ICVS, in 1989, 1996, 2000, and 2005 (EU ICS). The country used national representative samples of 1,502, 1,003, 1,000, and 2,016 households with responses rates of 51%, 61%, 45%, and 47% respectively, using the CATI methodology. In 2005, the sample included a subsample of 800 households in Paris.

In 1986, the CESDIP (*Centre de recherches sociologiques pour le droit et les institutions pénales*/Center for Sociological Research in Law and Penal Institutions) conducted the first nationwide victimisation survey, covering the years 1984-5. According to Philippe Robert (2007): “A series of screening questions were initially incorporated into an omnibus survey (11,156 interviewees were chosen from quota samples of the target population). Among the victims thus identified, sub-populations were formed – with specific sampling for each type of victimisation, based on frequency – and 1,138 interviews were conducted. The questionnaire borrowed from similar surveys done in other countries, but also made full use of the results of the qualitative research...”. The survey was based on face to face interviews and used individuals -aged over 15- instead of households as counting units (i. E. victimisation rates were calculated for individuals even when the offence concerned a household, e.g. robbery); however, only one individual per household was interviewed.

Between 1996 and 2006, the National Institute of Statistics and Economic Surveys (INSEE) conducted eleven annual surveys on the Living conditions of households that contained a module on victimisation. Interviews were conducted face to face using households as counting units. The questions on victimisation were loosely based on the ones included in the ICVS; however, according to Didier et al. (2009), in the 11 surveys only 6 times the questions were identical to the ones used the year before (1998 and 2000-04). The basic sample was composed by approximately 6'000 households and the samples were “semi-rotating” until 2004. This means that half of the sample interviewed one year was interviewed again the year after. In particular, in 2004, the sample included 6,351 households; in 2005, it included 13,872; and in 2006 it included roughly 13,263. The increase in 2005 is due to the fact that the basic sample of 6,400 households, that included 400 households from disadvantaged urban areas (DUA), was doubled by another one, roughly the same size (7,650 precisely), which included 1,240 households from DUA. With the exception of 2005, the samples were representative at the national level and selected using probability sampling. The variable used for the stratification was the geographical area. In 2006, the response rate was 26% and the



face to face interviews were conducted using the CAPI methodology. The survey was placed under the responsibility of the INSEE. The survey on the living conditions of households disappeared in 2006.

However since 2005, another annual survey started taking place. It is called “Framework of life and security” (*cadre de vie et sécurité*). The new questionnaire is inspired by the one used in the British Crime Survey (Didier et al. 2009) and, thus, the questions are not strictly comparable to the former ones. The survey is directed by the INSEE and the OND (National Observatory of Delinquency, which is part of the INHES, National Institute of Higher Studies for Domestic Security). It is financed by the INHES, the Interministerial agency for urban affairs and social development (DIV) and the OFDT (French Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction). In 2005, a national representative sample of 6,512 households was selected using multistage probability sampling. The variable used for the stratification was the geographical area. The response rate was 30% and surveys were conducted face to face using the CAPI methodology.

France participated in the Eurobarometer of Public Safety in 1996 with a sample of 1,000 interviews conducted face to face.

The country also participated in the European Social Surveys of 2002, 2004 and 2006, with funding for the French participation provided by the Ministry of Research, and scientific expertise provided by the Centre for the studies of French political life (CEVIPOF).

France also conducted the National French Survey on Violence Against Women in 2000. The sample size was 6,970 females. The national representative sample was selected through multistage probability sampling. The variable used for the stratification was the geographical area. The response rate was 71.3% with the CATI methodology. The survey was also placed under the responsibility of the Institute of Demography of Paris 1 University. It was financed by the State Secretariat of Women Rights and Professional Education, Service of Women Rights and Equality.

Regarding local victimisation surveys, France conducted in 1989 two surveys (financed by the abovementioned DIV) using telephone interviews (CATI). One was conducted in Épinay with 1,780 interviews and the other in the Toulouse urban area with 1,576 interviews. In 1999, a pilot survey in Amiens was carried out by the CESDIP with a sample of 1,156 interviews and CATI methodology. The Amiens survey served as the basis for a survey of the Île-de-France region organised by the CESDIP for the Île-de-France regional Institute for urban planning (IAURIF) in 2001. The Île-de-France survey was based on a sample of 10,504 interviewees, and it was replicated in 2003, 2005, 2007 and 2009. The Amiens study also served as the basis for CESDIP telephone surveys conducted in 2005 in five cities that are members of the French Forum for Urban Safety, using samples between 1,000 and 5,000 individuals depending on the area. For details, see Robert (2007).

France also participated in 1994 in the first round of the International Crime Business Survey (ICBS) with a national representative sample. A random sampling was taken of the business population, stratified according to the size and type of business (using a random selection of companies of 1-10 and 11 or more employees in the retail trade). The interviews were conducted by telephone by means of CATI method. Response rates were 49% for companies with 1-10 employees and 66% for companies with 11 or more employees. The survey was placed under the responsibility of the Dutch Ministry of Justice.

France also conducted in 2008 the EU-MIDIS with a sample of 534 persons with North African origins and 466 persons with Sub-Saharan African origins. The sample covered the cities of Paris (metro area), Marseille and Lyon, and the response rate was 69%.

France did not conduct a pilot study on the EU victimisation survey module in 2008/9.

## **Italy (Italia)**

Italy participated two times in the ICVS, in 1992 and 2005 (EU ICS). The country used national representative samples of 2,044 and 2,023 households with response rates of 61% and 54% respectively, and using the CATI methodology.

The country participated in the Eurobarometer of Public Safety in 1996 with a sample of 1,000 interviews conducted face to face.

In 1991, UNICRI carried out an investigation about victimisation with the support of the Ministry of the Interior. It involved a sample of 2,024 people (aged 16 or over) and it has been used mainly for international comparative purposes. In 1994, the Cattaneo Institut (*Istituto Cattaneo*) conducted together with DOXA a national victimisation survey with a sample of 6,291 individuals older than 15 (Barbagli, 1995).

Italy conducts the multipurpose survey called The Italian Citizens' Safety Survey every five years since 1997/98. The second survey was conducted in 2002 and the third one in 2008-2009. In 2002 a national representative sample of 60,000 households was used (with substitution), and the response rate was 64.3% (not considering the out of target phone numbers). The sampling procedure was multistage probability sampling. Variables used for the stratification were geographical area and degree of urbanisation. The sample was representative at the first regional level. The mode of data collection was telephone interviewing (CATI). The survey was placed under the responsibility of the Italian National Institute of Statistics (ISTAT), Central Direction for life conditions and quality of life surveys (DCCV).

Italy also conducts the national multipurpose survey called Everyday Life Aspects. This survey is carried out yearly since 1993. Data on bag-snatching, pick-pocketing were collected from 1993 to 2003. Data on social decay were collected from 1999 to 2003. A question on the perception of risk of criminality in the own area is still collected. The sample across the years is 24,000 households (about 60,000 persons) and the response rate was of around 90% in 1993 and 86% in 2003. Surveys used self-administered questionnaires (for instance for social decay and soft-crimes indicators). The method of data collection is PAPI. The sampling procedure is multistage probability sampling. Variables used for the stratification are geographical area and degree of urbanisation. The sample is representative at the regional level and all regions are covered. All members of the selected households are interviewed. The survey is placed under the responsibility of the ISTAT, DCCV.

On a regional level, in 1997, the Italian Citizens' Safety Survey was extended also to the Emilia-Romagna area through an oversampling of 9,000 individuals (added to the already available 2,000 interviews in the Region; thus the total sample is 11,000 interviewed in an area with 4 millions inhabitants) and according to an agreement between the regional government and the ISTAT. In 2002, Emilia Romagna and four other regions (Tuscany,

Abruzzo, Campania, Lazio) were oversampled. The total oversampling for the five regions was 30,000 interviews. In the city of Bologna, the oversampling was of 1,000 interviews that, added to those already available by the national research with reference to the city, bring the total number of the individuals interviewed to 1,707. In 2008, an oversampling was carried out in 5 provinces (Bari, Napoli, Reggio Calabria, Palermo, Catania) of the South, requested by the Italian Home Office (Ministero dell'Interno).

On a local level, in 1994, the "Istituto Cattaneo" developed a local victimisation survey in the city of Bologna. In this case, the sample was composed by 1,614 individuals (minimum age: 18) and the interviews were conducted face to face.

The country also conducted in 2006 a survey about violence against women called the Women Safety Survey, which has a particular focus on domestic violence. The sample consisted in 25,000 females aged between 16 and 70. The response rate was of 67.7% (not considering the out of target phone numbers). The questionnaire was somehow inspired by the IVAWS questionnaire (some questions are comparable) but it also included some different and new questions. The sampling procedure was multistage probability sampling. Variables used for the stratification were geographical area and degree of urbanisation. The sample was representative at first regional level. The survey was conducted using CATI methodology. It was carried out by the ISTAT, DCCV. It was financed by the Equal Opportunity Department (DPO).

Italy participated in 2007 in the FRA's Pilot Victim Survey on Ethnic Minorities and Immigrants with a sample of 603 persons with Albanian, North African and Romanian origins. The survey used the ICVS questionnaire. The interviews were conducted face-to-face with an interviewer filling out the questionnaire. In 2008, this country also participated in the full-scale EU-MIDIS with a sample of 500 persons with Albanian origins and 501 persons with North African origins and 502 persons with Romanian origins. The sample covered the cities of Rome, Milan and Bari, and the response rate was 88%.

Currently, ISTAT is planning a survey on foreign people and their integration and quality of life in Italy, which will contain a module on victimisation suffered in the last 3 years and last 12 months. The survey will be carried out in 2010 with a sample of 12,000 foreign resident households.

The country participated in 1994 in the first round of the International Crime Business Survey (ICBS). A national representative sample was used. A random sampling was taken of the business population, and each random sample was stratified according to the size and type of business (using a random selection of companies of 1-10 and 11 or more employees in the retail trade). The interviews were conducted by telephone by means of CATI method. Response rates vary between 49% for companies with 1-10 employees and 66% for companies with 11 or more employees. The survey was placed under the responsibility of Dutch Ministry of Justice.

Italy also conducted a pilot study on the EU victimisation survey module in 2009. A total of 503 interviews were carried out with CATI methodology. The response rate was 48%. A random sampling procedure, stratified by region and place size, was used. The survey was conducted by ISTAT.

## Cyprus (Κύπρος/Kıbrıs [Kýpros])

Cyprus did not participate in the ICVS, but in conducting a pilot study on the EU victimisation survey module in 2009. The pilot exercise is conducted by the Statistical Service of Cyprus (CRISTAT). It was decided to test the survey only in the two urban areas in which the highest incidence of crime is usually reported, according to the Police data, namely those of Lefkosia and Lemesos. Regarding sampling procedure, the 2001 Census of Population Register was used as the sampling frame and this was supplemented by the Register from the Electricity Authority of Cyprus (EAC). A two-stage sampling procedure was used. At the first stage, a sample of 1000 households was selected from the above sampling frame, using simple random sampling. At the second stage, an individual in the age group 18-74 is randomly selected, using “the person who had the last birthday” method. The sample of 1.000 households was distributed in the two urban areas based on the latest distribution of households in these two urban areas. The final selection included a gross sample size of 587 households for Lefkosia and 413 households for Lemesos. The Computer Assisted Personal Interview (CAPI) method was applied for Sections A-F of the questionnaire (with show cards for five questions in section D) and respondents were encouraged to complete by themselves the section on violence (section G) either on the computer or on paper (PAPI). However only 15.8% of the sample chose this option; the rest decided to continue the interview with the CAPI method used for sections A-F.

Cyprus conducted in 2008 the EU-MIDIS (European Union Minorities and Discrimination Survey) with a nationwide sample of 500 persons with Asian origins. The response rate was 98%

No other victimisation survey has been conducted in the country.

## Latvia (Latvija)

Latvia conducted the ICVS in 1995, 1998 and 2000. In 1995 and 1998 it used multiple cities samples combined with a small rural sample (in 1998 -year of reference: 1997- it used a sample of 1,411 households), and in 2000 it used a national representative sample.

Latvia conducted in 2008 the EU-MIDIS with a sample of 500 persons with Russian origins. The sample covered the cities of Riga and Daugavpils, and the response rate was 86%.

Latvia has also conducted a pilot study on the EU victimisation survey module in 2009. The exercise is conducted by the Central Statistical Bureau of Latvia (CSB). The questionnaire will be tested using both CAPI and CATI. It is planned to carry out 150 CAPI interviews and 100 CATI interviews. For creating a sample, data from the Latvian Population Register were used. The age group from 18 to 74 years was chosen. Then, one person from the household was selected. The Mathematical Support division of the CSB created the sample. The questionnaire is going to be tested in 5 cities/towns, 5 rural municipalities, and one rural territory. Moreover, in Riga, the suburbs of Latgale, which present the highest crime rate, were selected for the sample.

## **Lithuania (Lietuva)**

Lithuania participated three times in the ICVS, in 1996/97, 2000, and 2005. In 1996/97, it used multiple cities samples combined with a small rural sample. The sample size was 1,176 households with a response rate of 53.7%. In 2000, a sample of 1526 household from Vilnius (capital city) was used. The sample was selected using simple probability sampling and is representative at the city level. The survey was conducted using face-to-face- interviews. It was placed under the responsibility of the Law Institute, Criminological Research Department; and it was financed by UNICRI.

Even if Lithuania participated in the ICVS in 2005, data arrived after the final deadline and therefore the country is not included in the main publications about the survey.

Lithuania conducted in 2008 the EU-MIDIS with a sample of 515 persons with Russian origins. The sample covered the cities of Vilnius and Visaginas, and the response rate was 90%.

Lithuania is also conducting a pilot study on the EU victimisation survey module in 2009. The target population is composed by persons aged 15 and over and living in private households within the territory of the Republic of Lithuania. The Population Register was used as a sampling frame. The sample size of the field-testing covers 300 persons (150 from Šiauliai county and 150 from Panevėžys county). A stratified sample design was used. There were 12 strata: 2 largest cities, other cities, rural areas and age groups (15–19, 20–39, 40–59, 59+). A simple random sample of private households' persons aged 15 and over was selected from the Residents' Register in each stratum. The interview mode will be based on the face-to-face method using laptop computers (CAPI) for sections A–F of the questionnaire. The section on violence of the questionnaire will be filled in through self-completion (PAPI) in a paper questionnaire.

Lithuania also conducted in 2000 the International Crime Business Survey with a sample of 525 persons (one for each company) in Vilnius. The sample was selected using simple probability sampling and is representative only at the city (capital) level. No information on response rate is available. The survey was conducted through face to face interviews. It was placed under the responsibility of the Law Institute, Criminological Research Department. It was financed by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands.

## **Luxembourg (Luxembourg)**

Luxembourg participated in the 2005 EU ICS with a national representative sample of 800 households and a 36.9% response rate. The interviews were carried out using CATI methodology.

The country participated in the Eurobarometer of Public Safety in 1996 with a sample of 600 interviews conducted face to face.

The police services of Luxembourg conducted in March 2007 a survey on feelings of insecurity. The survey used CATI methodology. The sample was selected through random digit dialling and it included 1'000 persons aged 12 or more. The sample was stratified according to age, gender, professional activity, nationality and regional area. It was representative at the national level.

Luxemburg also conducted in 2008 the EU-MIDIS with a nationwide sample of 497 persons with ex-Yugoslavian origins. The response rate was 78%.

Luxembourg did not conduct a pilot study on the EU victimisation survey module in 2008/9.

## **Hungary (Magyarország)**

Hungary participated in the ICVS in 1996 and 2005 (EU ICS) with a sample of 756 and 2,103 households and response rates of 80.7% and 53% respectively. Face to face methodology was used in 1996 and CATI methodology in 2005.

Hungary conducted in 2003 a national survey called Victims and Opinions with a sample of 10,020 households and a response rate of 42.3%. The survey used a probability sample drawn from the register of registered residents in Hungary. The sample was stratified according to the size of the county of residence, age, and gender. It was representative at the national level. The questionnaire was not based on the ICVS questionnaire, but included some comparable questions. The methodology is based on face to face interviews in the respondent's home. The survey was placed under the responsibility of National Institute of Criminology.

Hungary participated in 1994 in the first round of the International Crime Business Survey (ICBS) with a city sample from Budapest. Interviews were conducted face to face. The country also participated in the ICBS in 2000 conducted by GALLUP. Funding was provided by UNICRI and the Ministry of Justice of Hungary. The survey was carried out in the city of Budapest with a sample size of 517 companies using CATI methodology. The sample was drawn from the database of the National Statistical Institute.

This country also conducted in 2008 the EU-MIDIS with a sample of 500 persons with Roma origins. The sample covered the cities of Budapest and Miskolc, and the response rate was 81%.

Hungary also conducted a pilot study on the EU victimisation survey module in 2008/9. The target population was individuals aged 18 and over, living in private households in Budapest and five other counties. The gross sample size was 1,096 persons and the response rate was 59% using face-to-face interviews with paper and pencil questionnaires. The response rate was lower in Budapest (39,2%) than in the other counties, The survey was carried out by the Hungarian Central Statistical Office, using its own most experienced and practiced interviewers. The implementation was coordinated by the Social Services Statistics Department, the operational work was organised by the Regional Directorate Debrecen at local level in the selected counties and in Budapest.

## **Malta (Malta)**

Malta participated in the ICVS in 1997 but the survey remained unpublished and the database is not available. No other victimisation surveys were carried out in the country.

Malta conducted in 2008 the EU-MIDIS with a sample of 500 persons with Sub-Saharan African origins. The interviews were conducted in the common spaces of the semi-open centres for administrative detention. For this reason, the response rate was not calculated.

Malta did not conduct a pilot study on the EU victimisation survey module in 2008/9.

## **Netherlands (Nederland)**

The Netherlands participated in the five sweeps of the ICVS in 1989, 1992, 1996, 2000 and 2005 (EU ICS). The country used national representative sample of 2,000, 2,000, 2,008, 2,001 and 2,010 households with response rates of 65%, 66%, 63%, 58%, and 46 respectively, and CATI methodology. The ICVS-2 will be pilot tested in 2009.

The country participated in the Eurobarometer of Public Safety in 1996 with a sample of 1,000 interviews conducted face to face.

However, national victimisation surveys started in the Netherlands in 1974 under the responsibility of the Research and Documentation Center (WODC) of the Ministry of Justice (Van Dijk, Steinmetz, 1980). These surveys were later adopted by the CBS (Statistics Netherlands) that has been carrying out national victimisation surveys since 1980. These surveys are based on random samples taken from private households; they include questions on victimisation of various forms of crime asked to respondents aged 15 years and older. During the period 1980 to 1992, the Crime Victim Survey (ESM) was held first annually and, from 1984 onwards, biannually. From 1992 onwards, the ESM was succeeded by the Justice and Security Survey (ERV - *Enquête Rechtsbescherming en Veiligheid*). Since 2005, the ERV was replaced by the National Security Monitor (see below).

The Permanent Survey on Living Conditions (POLS - *Permanent Onderzoek Leefsituatie*) including a Justice and Security module was conducted from 1980 to 1985 every year; from 1986 to 1992 every two years (between 1980 and 1992 different design and questionnaires were used); from 1992 to 1996 it was a separate continuous victim survey. This survey was discontinued in 2005. In 2004 (January-December), it used a national representative sample of 10,552 persons and obtained a response rate of 58%, using CAPI methodology. The sampling procedure was multistage probability sampling. Variables used for the stratification were age, gender, geographical area and degree of urbanisation. The sample was representative at the national level. The survey was placed under the responsibility of the Statistics Netherlands, Division of Social and Spatial Statistics (SRS)/Statistical Analysis Heerlen (SAH).

In 2005, the Netherlands introduced the annual National Security Monitor. The questionnaire integrated elements from the former POLS Justice Module and from the Police Monitor (see below). The 2005 survey was a small-scale (pilot) survey, and from 2006 on it was representative at the level of police regions. In 2005 it used a sample of 5,242 persons and obtained a response rate of 70%. CATI and CAPI methodology were applied, and the sampling procedure was multistage probability sampling. Variables used for the stratification were age, gender and geographical area. The survey was placed under the responsibility of Statistics Netherlands, Division of Social and Spatial Statistics (SRS)/Statistical Analysis Heerlen (SAH). It was financed by the Ministry of Justice and the Ministry of the Interior and Kingdom Relations. The survey is conducted in cooperation between the ministries mentioned and Statistics Netherlands. The National Security Monitor was stopped in 2008 and replaced by the Integral Security Monitor. The survey is conducted with the same methodology as the former National Security Monitor. Fieldwork, research and analysis are under the responsibility of Statistics Netherlands (CBS). The police regions and municipalities are allowed to do the same survey with a standard questionnaire but CBS is responsible for the sample.

Also a Police Monitor PMB is conducted in every police region since 1993. Originally, this survey was conducted every second year but, since 2001, it is conducted every year. The Police Monitor uses a very large sample that included 90,000 households in 2003 and 88,000 in the 2008 sweep. It uses telephone interviewing. The Police Monitor is placed under the responsibility of the Ministry of the Interior and Kingdom Relations (BZK) and the Ministry of Justice.

Since 2004, the Netherlands also conducts annually a Business Crime Monitor survey. In 2004, 2005, 2006, and 2007 it was conducted within the following five sectors of industry in the Netherlands: Construction (sample: 5,700, 6,400, 5,800, and 6,700), Retail (sample: 8,800, 9,000, 11,800, and 10,700), Hospitality (sample: 8,900, 9,500, 6,200, and 6,600), Transport (sample: 6,500, 3,900, 4,800, and 3,600), Financial and business services (sample: 7,800, 9,300, 9,000, and 10,100).

The Netherlands participated in 1994 in the first round of the International Crime Business Survey (ICBS) with a national representative sample. A random sampling was taken of the business population, and each random sample was stratified according to the size and type of business. The country used a random selection of companies of 1-10 and 11 or more employees in the retail trade, industry and catering sector. CATI methodology was used. Response rate were 64% and 74% respectively for small and large industrial business, 76% and 72% for the catering sector with 1-10 or 11 and more employees respectively and 79% and 72% respectively for retail trade sector with 1-10 and 11 or more employees. The survey was placed under the responsibility of the Dutch Ministry of Justice.

The country conducted in 1986 the first National Survey on the Prevalence of Wife Abuse in the Netherlands, with a representative sample of 1,016 women between 20 and 60 years of age (Romkens, 1997). This survey was repeated in 1996, 1997 (among immigrants only), and 2009.

The Netherlands also conducted in 2008 the EU-MIDIS with a sample of 459 persons with North African origins, 443 persons with Turkish origins and 471 persons with Surinamese origins. The sample covered the cities of Amsterdam, Rotterdam, The Hague and Utrecht. The response rate was 77%.

The Netherlands did not conduct a pilot study on the EU victimisation survey module in 2008/9.

## **Austria (Österreich)**

Austria participated in the ICVS in 1996 and 2005 (EU ICS). Interviews were carried out using the CATI methodology. The national representative samples were composed by 1,507 and 2,004 households and the response rates were 76% and 46% respectively.

The country participated in the Eurobarometer of Public Safety in 1996 with samples of 1,000 persons interviewed face to face.

The Austrian Safety Board conducts annually since 2006 the Security Barometer (Sicherheitsbarometer). The data collection takes places every spring and is conducted through telephone interviews by the OGM market research institute. This survey asks a



representative sample of the population about (crime related) fears and especially about the fear of domestic burglary. Further questions deal with specific places in terms of crime (neighbourhood, urban area) and specific offences the respondents or someone amongst their acquaintanceship have experienced.

Austria participated in 2007 in the FRA's Pilot Victim Survey on Ethnic Minorities and Immigrants with a sample of 700 persons with Turkish and ex-Yugoslavian origins. The survey used the ICVS questionnaire. The interviews were conducted face-to-face with an interviewer filling out the questionnaire. In 2008, this country participated in the full-scale EU-MIDIS with a sample of 534 persons with Turkish origins and 593 persons with ex-Yugoslavian origins. The sample covered the city of Vienna, and the response rate was 85%.

Austria also conducted a pilot study on the EU victimisation survey module in 2009. A total of 2,725 interviews have been conducted; 1,225 interviews using CAPI methodology and 1,500 using CATI methodology. The fieldwork was conducted by the Institute for Law and Criminal Sociologie (Institut für Rechts- und Kriminalsoziologie) on behalf of Statistics Austria.

At the local scale, the Vienna Department of Urban Planning organised in 2003 the Survey Living in Vienna (Leben in Wien 2003) that included a set of questions related to crime and victimisation, and also on the respondents' evaluation of security in their surrounding, and in the city of Vienna in general. The sample included 8.300 persons living in Vienna and aged over 14. The survey was conducted through a CATI random sampling procedure.

In 2002/03, Austria participated in the INSEC (Insecurities in European Cities) study with a sample 1,079 interviews representative of two Viennese urban areas. The main focus of research was on the whole range of urban disorders and insecurities late modern urban societies, and on the effects of globalisation on urban residents' perception of insecurity, both on a local and regional level. The questionnaire included items on experiences of crime, risk assessment and victimisation.

In 2005, the survey Burglary prevention in private households in Vienna was conducted with a representative sample of 1.000 Viennese households interviewed with CATI methodology. The survey included questions on victimisation experiences and fear of crime, considering namely domestic burglary. The survey was carried out by IFES.

On behalf of the Bureau of Women's Affairs of the city of Vienna, the IFES also conducted in 1998 a Survey on women's living conditions, opinions and satisfaction named Frauenbarometer (Womens' Barometer). The survey was based on a representative sample of the city of Vienna composed by 2,300 women. It included a set of questions that were similar or identical to those used in the Living in Vienna survey.

## **Poland (Polska)**

Poland participated in the ICVS in 1989, 1992, 1996, 2000 and 2004 (EU ICS). In 1989, the survey was conducted in the city of Warsaw with a sample of 500 households. It was conducted through telephone interviewing. In 1992, 1996, 2000 and 2004 (EU ICS), Poland participated with national representative samples of 2,033, 3,482, 5,276 and 5,013 households, and a response rate of 96%, 94%, 78% and 72% respectively. In 2000 and 2004,

the surveys used face to face interviews at the respondent home (with a paper questionnaire) and an adapted form of the ICVS questionnaire. Samples were selected using multistage probability sampling. The variables used for the stratification were age, gender, marital status, and geographical area. Surveys were financed by the Ministry of Sciences.

In 2005, another survey was carried out only in Warsaw using the ICVS questionnaire with a sample of 1,000 households. The response rate was 18%. It was conducted through face to face interviews. The survey was financed by the Ministry of Sciences.

The country participated in the IVAWS survey in 2004 with a sample size of 2,009 females and a response rate of 87%. The survey used face-to face interviews. Sample was selected using multistage probability sampling. The variables used for the stratification were age, gender, and geographical area. The sample was representative at the national level. The survey was placed under the responsibility of Warsaw University, IPSiR (Institute of Social Prevention and Resocialisation), Chair of Criminology. It was financed by a grant of the Ministry of Science and Informatics in Poland.

Poland also conducted in 2008 the EU-MIDIS with a nationwide sample of 500 persons with Roman origins. The response rate was 86%.

Poland is also conducting a pilot study on the EU victimisation survey module in 2009. The pilot exercise is being conducted by the Institute of Justice of Poland.

## **Portugal (Portugal)**

Portugal participated in the ICVS in 2000 and 2004 (EU ICS) with national representative sample of 2,000 and 2,011 households and response rates of 56% and 43% respectively.

Portugal participated in the Eurobarometer of Public Safety in 1996 with a sample of 1,000 interviews conducted face to face.

Portugal also conducted national Victimisation Surveys in 1991, 1992 and 1994. In 1994, a sample of 13,500 households was used. It was selected using multistage probability sampling. The variable used for the stratification was the geographical area and, a posteriori, a stratification was made by gender and age in each of the geographic areas selected. The sample was representative at the national level. The survey did not use the ICVS questionnaire. Data collection was based on face to face interviews at the respondent's home using an electronic questionnaire (CAPI). The survey was placed under the responsibility of the Legal Policy and Planning Office of the Ministry of Justice, Justice Statistics Department. The National Statistics Institute provided expertise.

This country conducted in 2008 the EU-MIDIS with a sample of 505 persons with Brazilian origins and 510 persons with Sub-Saharan African origins. The sample covered the cities of Lisbon (metro area) and Setubal, and the response rate was 72%.

Portugal is also conducting a pilot study on the EU victimisation survey module in 2009.

## Romania (România)

Romania participated two times in the ICVS, in 1996 and 2000. In 1996 the country combined an urban sample of 1,000 households from the capital city, Bucharest, and a small rural sample of 91 households to reach a total sample of 1091 households. The survey was based on face to face interviews. In 2000, the country used a city sample (Bucharest) of 1'506 households. Interviews were conducted face to face and the response rate was 76.7%. The sample was representative at the city level. The surveys were placed under the responsibility of the Juridical Research Institute of the Romanian Academy, Public Law and Criminology Department.

Starting in 2001 –providing data for 2000– the National Institute of Statistics (Institutul Național de Statistică, INS) conducted annually the multipurpose Living Conditions Survey (*Condițiile de viață ale populației din România*, ACOVI). This survey included several questions on victimisation and used national representative samples of approximately 10,000 persons. The variable used for the sample stratification was the geographical area. Interviews were conducted face to face, at the respondent's home, by filling a paper questionnaire. The last Living Conditions Survey was carried out in 2006, providing data for 2005. This survey has been replaced by the Quality of Life Survey (*Ancheta asupra calității vieții*, ACAV) harmonised with the European Survey Statistics on Income and Living Conditions (EU-SILC) which, according to the regulations, do not include questions on victimisation. INS conducted also, in 2008, the Health Interview Survey (*Ancheta asupra sănătății*, SAN 2008), harmonised with the European Health Interview Survey, which includes questions on the extent of exposure at home or in the living area to crime, violence or vandalism and at the work place to harassment, bullying, discrimination, violence or threat of violence. The next Health Interview Survey will be carried out in 2014.

Romania also conducted in 2000 the International Crime Business Survey (ICBS) with a sample of 500 persons (one for each company) in Bucharest. The sample was representative only at the city level. Face to face interviews were used. The survey was conducted by GALLUP and funding was provided by the Dutch Ministry of Justice.

Romania participated in 2007 in the FRA's Pilot Victim Survey on Ethnic Minorities and Immigrants with a sample of 600 persons with Roma and Hungarian origins. Two main sampling frames were tested: Random digit dialling and focused enumeration and Random route cluster sampling. The survey used the ICVS questionnaire. The interviews were conducted face-to-face with an interviewer filling out the questionnaire. In 2008, this country participated in the full-scale EU-MIDIS with a nationwide sample of 500 persons with Roma origins. The response rate was 64 %.

Romania did not conduct a pilot study on the EU victimisation survey module in 2008/9.

## Slovenia (Slovenija)

Slovenia conducted the ICVS in 1992, 1996 and 2001 with samples of 1,000, 2053 and 3,885 households respectively. In 1992, the sample was restricted to the capital city, Ljubljana, and combined CATI and CAPI methodology. In 1996, the country combined an urban (Ljubljana) sample of 1,107 households and a rural sample of 946 and applied the CATI methodology. In 2000, the sample was representative at the national level and the CATI methodology was applied. The sample was selected using stratified random sampling. The survey was placed

under the responsibility of the Statistical Office of Republic of Slovenia (SORS), Social Services Statistics Department.

This country also conducted in 2008 the EU-MIDIS with a sample of 473 persons with Serbian origins and 528 persons with Bosnian/Muslim origins. The sample covered the cities of Ljubljana and Jesenice, and the response rate was 64%.

Slovenia is also conducting a pilot study on the EU victimisation survey module in 2009. The pilot study is conducted by the Statistical office of Slovenia.

## **Slovakia (Slovensko)**

Slovakia participated as part of Czechoslovakia in the ICVS in 1992. The survey was conducted with a national representative sample of 1,821 households. The response rate was 91.0%. The sample was selected using multistage probability sampling. The variables used for the stratification were age, gender, socio-professional qualifications, area of residence, regional distribution, and size of the population. Data were collected through face to face interviews conducted in June 1992 in the Czech and Slovak languages. The final sample for Slovakia consisted in 508 households.

In 1997, the country participated in the ICVS with a sample of 1,105 households and a 75.1% response rate. The survey was conducted using face to face interviews.

Slovakia participated in 2007 in the FRA's Pilot Victim Survey on Ethnic Minorities and Immigrants with a sample of 605 persons with Roma and Hungarian origins. The survey used the ICVS questionnaire. The interviews were conducted face-to-face with an interviewer filling out the questionnaire. In 2008, this country participated in the full-scale EU-MIDIS with a nationwide sample of 500 persons with Roma origins. The response rate was 89%.

Slovakia also conducted a pilot study on the EU victimisation survey module in 2008/9. The pilot exercise was conducted by the Statistical Office of the Slovak Republic (SO SR) using face to face interviews with paper and pencil questionnaires (PAPI). It used a purposive selected sample which assured a response rate of 100%. The sample was composed by 200 households (25 for each of the eight regions of the country) represented by one person aged 18 or over. The average duration of the survey was 1 hour and 32 minutes per respondents.

## **Finland (Suomi/Finland)**

Finland participated in the five sweeps of the ICVS, in 1989, 1992, 1996, 2000 and 2005 (EU ICS). The samples were respectively of 1,025, 1,620, 3,899, 1,783, and 2,500 households with response rates of 70%, 86%, 86%, 77%, and 57%. The surveys were conducted using the CATI methodology.

The country participated in the Eurobarometer of Public Safety in 1996 with a sample of 1,000 interviews conducted face to face.

Finland also carries out a periodical victimisation survey called the Finnish National Safety Survey. Victimisations include crimes but also injuries (traffic, work, home, leisure, and sport). The survey has been conducted in 1980, 1988, 1993, 1997, 2003, and 2006. In 2006, the sample was national and consisted in 8,163 persons with a response rate of 81%. The

sample is selected through simple probability sampling and is representative at the national level. In 2006, the survey was conducted using the CATI methodology, together with CAPI for persons without telephone. In 1980, 1988 and 1997, the survey was financed by Statistics Finland. In 2006, the Finnish National Safety Survey was conducted under the responsibility of the National Research Institute of Legal Policy (OPTULA). It was financed by the Ministry of justice, the Ministry of interior, and the Ministry of social affairs and wealth. The Police college of Finland provided institutional support and expertise. The next sweep of the Finnish National Safety Survey is being carried out in 2009.

Finland has also carried out two times a survey on violence against women called “Faith, hope, battering”. The survey took place in 1997 and 2005. It uses a mail questionnaire. In 1997, the sample consisted in 4,955 females and the response rate was 70%. In 2005, the sample consisted in 4,464 females (aged 18-74) and the response rate was 62%. Samples were selected through simple probability sampling and were representative at the national level. The surveys were placed under the responsibility of Statistics Finland, the Ministry of Social Welfare and Health, the Ministry of Justice the National Research Institute of Legal Policy, the Police college of Finland and HEUNI.

Finland participated in 1994 in the first round of the International Crime Business Survey (ICBS) with a regional sample (District of Oulu) and using the CATI method. Moreover, two crime against businesses surveys were carried out in South-Western Finland in 1994-95, using basically the same questionnaire as the one used for the first International Commercial Crime Survey (ICCS) in 1994. In 1996 and 1997, the Finnish police organised other crime against businesses survey.

Finland conducted in 2008 the EU-MIDIS with a sample of 562 persons with Russian origins and 484 persons with Somali origins in the city of Helsinki (metro area). The response rate was 69%.

Finland also conducted a pilot study on the EU victimisation survey module in 2009. Three institutions are involved in the piloting: HEUNI, Statistics Finland, the Department of Statistics and Applied Mathematics at the University of Helsinki. The Finnish pilot study includes three sub-surveys. Each of these will test a different data collection mode, that is, face-to-face interview, CATI interview and web interview. The original questionnaire was designed for a face-to-face interview in which separate show cards were to be used to improve the quality of the data; but the more detailed questions concerning different types of crime will be dropped from the telephone and web surveys. The gross sample size is 750 in the face to face and CATI versions, and 2,000 in the web version. The sampling strategy will be the same in all three cases. The target population consists of permanent residents in Finland living in private households who are 15 years old or older. The frame population will be divided into strata which will be based on a cross-classification of regions, gender and age bracket and the stratified random sampling strategy will be used.

## **Sweden (Sverige)**

Sweden participated in the ICVS in 1992, 1996, 2000, and 2005 (EU ICS). The samples were composed by 1,707, 1,000, 2,000 and 2,012 households and the response rates were 77%, 75%, 66%, and 55% respectively. The surveys were conducted using the CATI methodology. Samples were selected using simple probability sampling. They were representative at the national level. The ICVS-2 will be tested in 2009.

The country participated in the Eurobarometer of Public Safety in 1996 with a sample of 1,000 interviews conducted face to face.

The country carried out between October 1999 and January 2000 a multipurpose survey called Captured Queen: Men's violence against women in "equal" Sweden – a prevalence study, with a sample of 1,000 females and a response rate of 70%. Sample was selected through multistage probability sampling. The variables used for the stratification were age, gender, marital status, geographical area and degree of urbanisation. The sample was representative at the national level. The methodology was based on self-administered questionnaires sent by the post. The survey was placed under the responsibility of the Feminist Studies in Social Sciences, Uppsala University. It was financed by the Crime Victim Compensation and Support Authority. The National Centre for Battered and Raped Women, Statistics Sweden provided expertise.

Sweden also participated in 2009 in the pilot of the so-called ICVS-2. Two methodologies were used for the pilot exercise: CATI and a combination of CAWI and PAPI. The country used a total sample of 381 households for CAWI and PAPI methodology (117 households for CAWI and 204 households for PAPI) and 205 households for CATI methodology. For CAWI and PAPI the overall response rate was 25.4%. In particular, the response rates were 11.8% for the CAWI methodology (7.1% when the questionnaire was included and 15.9% when an answer card was included), 13.6% for the PAPI methodology (25.1% when the questionnaire was included and 2.1% when an answer card was included) and 16.9% for CATI methodology.

The country also conducted the multipurpose survey called Living Conditions Survey (ULF). It is conducted yearly since 1978 and includes a module on victimisation. In 2005, the sample size consisted in 6000 households and the response rate was 78%. The sample was selected using simple probability sampling and is representative at the national and the first regional level. The ICVS questionnaire was not used. The survey was conducted using Face to face interviews at the respondent's home using paper questionnaire. The survey is placed under the responsibility of Statistics Sweden, Department of Population and Welfare Statistics. The Institute of Criminology of Stockholm University, The Swedish National Council for Crime Prevention, and The National Board of Health and Welfare provided expertise.

Since 2006, the country carries out an annual victimisation survey called the Swedish Crime Survey (NTU). It covers population aged 16-79 and includes questions on victimisation, fear of crime and public confidence in the justice system. In 2006, the national representative sample included almost 8,000 individuals, while subsequent waves of data collection have been conducted using twice the sample size, which has resulted in almost 15,000 respondents annually (BRA, 2009). According to BRA (2009): "interviews are conducted by Statistics Sweden (Statistiska Centralbyrån), mainly by telephone. An abridged version of the questionnaire is sent to those who cannot be reached, or who decline to participate by phone. [...] The response rate is relatively high; just over three quarters of the individuals in the sample have participated in the survey." For example, in 2006 the response rate was 78%.

The country conducted in 2008 the EU-MIDIS with a sample of 494 persons with Iraqi origins and 506 persons with Somali origins in the cities of Stockholm and Malmö. The response rate was 17%

Sweden is also conducting a pilot study on the EU victimisation survey module in 2009. The exercise is conducted by the National Council for Crime Prevention in Sweden (BRA). The sample will be drawn from the Total Population Register maintained by Statistics Sweden, which includes all those permanently resident in Sweden at the time of the sampling (thus the sample does not exclude persons who lack a landline telephone) and the age-range employed includes all those aged between 16 and 79 years. CATI method will be used.

## **United Kingdom**

The United Kingdom participated in 1994 in the first round of the International Crime Business Survey (ICBS) A total of 7,558 companies were interviewed. A random sampling was taken out of the business population, and each random sample was stratified according to the size and type of business (using a random selection of companies of 1-10 and 11 or more employees in the retail trade). The CATI methodology was used. Response rate was between 82% for companies with 1-10 employees and 77% for companies with 11 or more employees. The survey was placed under the responsibility of the Dutch Ministry of Justice.

The United Kingdom participated in the Eurobarometer of Public Safety in 1996 with a sample of 1,300 interviews conducted face to face, of which 1,000 in Great Britain (England & Wales and Scotland) and 300 in Northern Ireland.

The United Kingdom also conducts periodically the British Crime Survey. According to Hough and Norris (2008) the first BCS was conducted in 1982 and included data covering England, Wales and Scotland. Fieldwork in Scotland was conducted by the same company as that in England and Wales and used an identical questionnaire – though it covered only the (densely populated) southern part of Scotland. The absolute sample size was smaller in Scotland although the sampling fraction was much larger (5,000 for a population of 5 million as opposed to 10,000 for a population of 50 million). In the 1980s the BCS was conducted three times in England and Wales (in 1982, 1984 and 1988) and twice in Scotland (1982 and 1988). No crime survey data for Northern Ireland was collected in the 1980s, reflecting funding constraints and the priority that security issues attracted at that time. The 1990s saw increasing divergence between the English and Scottish surveys (see the details under the headings England & Wales and Scotland).

The United Kingdom also participated in the pilot of the so-called ICVS-2. Two methodologies were used for the pilot exercise: CATI and a combination of CAWI and PAPI. The country used a total sample of 175 households for CAWI and PAPI methodology (48 households for CAWI and 127 households for PAPI) and 200 households for CATI methodology. For CAWI and PAPI the overall response rate was 14.6%. In particular, the response rates were 4% for the CAWI methodology (2.5% when the questionnaire was included and 5.5% when an answer card was included), 10.6% for the PAPI methodology (19.5% when the questionnaire was included and 1.7% when an answer card was included) and 5.2% for CATI methodology. A further test will be carried out in the Autumn of 2009.

The United Kingdom conducted in 2008 the EU-MIDIS with a sample of 1,042 persons with Central and Eastern European origins. The sample covered the city of London, and the response rate was 21%.

The United Kingdom did not conduct a pilot study on the EU victimisation survey module in 2008/9.

In the rest of this review, information on the United Kingdom is presented under the three headings of England and Wales, Northern Ireland, and Scotland.

### ***England & Wales***

England and Wales participated in the five sweeps of the ICVS, in 1989, 1992, 1996, 2000 and 2005 (EU ICS). The samples were respectively of 2,006, 2,001, 2,171, 1,947, and 1,775 households with response rates of 43%, 38%, 59%, 57%, and 43%. In 2005, the main sample include a subsample for the city of London composed by 874 households, and the response rate was calculated together with the main sample (43%). The surveys were conducted using the CATI methodology.

As mentioned before (see United Kingdom) the British Crime Survey started in 1982, but since the 1990s there are important differences between the survey conducted in England and Wales and the survey conducted in Scotland. According to Hough and Norris (2008), in England and Wales the BCS was conducted every other year from 1992 onwards. The BCS had a steadily increasing sample size. The core sample size for the 2000 BCS was around 20,000. Booster samples aimed at providing accurate data about ethnic minorities and young people were also regularly included. The interview strategy of the BCS was changed in 1994 to one using Computer Assisted Personal Interviewing (CAPI) and Computer Assisted Self Interviewing (CASI) rather than paper questionnaires. The increased sample size of the BCS also allowed respondents to be split into smaller samples who were asked questions about different topics (victimisation questions are always asked of the full sample). The survey is continuous since 2001 (monthly interviews) with a sample of 40,000 interviews per year and adopted calibration weighting.

According to HEUNI (2007), in 2004-5 the sample of the BCS was approximately 51,000 persons. "Information was collected on persons living in private households and aged 16 and more. The mode of data collection was face-to-face interview (CAPI) and self-administered questionnaire (CASI). The sampling procedure was a multistage probability sample and variables used for the stratification were geographical area, social class of head of household and population density. Oversampling was applied for certain groups of persons/areas like small police force areas, ethnic minority groups and people aged 16-24. The response rate was 75% in 2004. In the case of non-response, no basic information was collected and no new target person was selected, but proxies were allowed in the case of language difficulties. Training of the interviewers, repeated calls and an advance letter containing a token incentive were applied to reduce non-response. The sample was representative at national level and at first and second regional level."

In 2001, the British Crime Survey included a detailed self-completion questionnaire designed to ascertain the extent and nature of domestic violence, sexual assault and stalking for England and Wales. It also included questions on sexual assault against men, as well as questions allowing a clear distinction between different forms of sexual assault and the overlaps between domestic violence, sexual assault and stalking. A nationally representative sample of 22,463 women and men aged 16-59 were asked, via a computerised self-completion questionnaire, whether they had been subject to domestic violence, sexual assault or stalking during their lifetime and during the preceding year. Those who had been subject to such



incidents were asked details about their experiences, enabling distinctions to be made between levels and overlaps of the three forms of violence, the identification of risk factors associated with such violence, the impact it had on people's lives, and the manner in which people sought help. Previous self-completion modules on domestic violence (1996 BCS), sexual victimisation (1998 & 2000 BCS) and stalking (1998 BCS) have been included in the British Crime Survey

### ***Northern Ireland***

Northern Ireland participated four times in the ICVS, in 1989, 1996, 2000 and 2005 (EU ICS). The samples were respectively of 2,000, 1,042, 1,565, and 2,002 households. The response rate for 1989 is not available, but in 1996, 2000, and 2005 the response rates were 84%, 81%, and 41% respectively. The surveys were conducted using the CATI methodology.

The country also conducts the Northern Ireland National Crime Survey (NICS). This survey was conducted in 1994/95, 1998, 2001 and 2003/4 with samples of approximately 3,000 households, representative at the national scale, and using CAPI and CASI methodology. Since 2005, the survey is continuous –following the model of the BCS in England and Wales– and the sample includes 6,420 households in which one person aged 16 or more is randomly selected and interviewed. The questionnaire of the NICS follows closely the one used for the BCS.

### ***Scotland***

Scotland participated four times in the ICVS, in 1989, 1996, 2000 and 2005 (EU ICS). The samples were respectively of 2,007, 2,194, 2,040, and 2,010 households with response rates of 41%, 63%, 58%, and 47%. The surveys were conducted using the CATI methodology.

According to the Scottish Government (2009): “Crime surveys have been carried out in Scotland since the early 1980s. In 1982 and 1988, the SCS formed part of the British Crime Survey (BCS). In 1993, however, the first independent SCS was run in Scotland and was repeated in 1996, 2000 and 2003. The SCS is referred to by the year in which data were collected rather than the year to which the data refer. In June 2004, the Scottish Executive commissioned the Scottish Crime and Victimisation Survey (SCVS), a new survey of victimisation in Scotland. In two distinct ways the SCVS was significantly different from previous sweeps of the SCS that had been undertaken in Scotland since 1993. First, the sample size was increased from 5,000 interviews every three years to an annual sample of 27,000 with continuous interviewing. More importantly, the survey method was changed from a face-to-face survey to a telephone survey. These changes were the outcome of a fundamental review of the SCS undertaken in 2003 and the change of data collection method represented the potential for change in the data series established by the SCS. Reflecting this, the Scottish Executive commissioned MORI Scotland and TNS Social to undertake a parallel face-to-face survey designed as a repeat of the previous waves of the SCS, although with a smaller sample of 3,000 interviews, to provide a measure of victimisation against which the telephone survey could be compared. In addition to the 3,000 full SCS interviews, 2,000 additional short interviews were conducted to bring the total number of adults providing the self-completion data that had been a feature of the previous SCS up to 5,000.”

In April 2008 the Scottish Crime and Justice Survey (SCJS) replaced the SCVS. Interviews for the SCJS began in April 2008 and will run continuously until March 2010. The survey

involves interviewing a randomly selected adult in 16,000 households across Scotland per year (Scottish Government, 2009).

The SCJS follows the BCS and NICS in moving to a continuous collection methodology, and the questionnaire is similar to that of the BCS but by no means identical (Hough and Norris, 2008),

## **Summary information about the main international surveys mentioned in this review**

In the following chapters we have compiled a few comprehensive descriptions of the main international surveys mentioned in this review. The sources of such information are given at the end of each chapter.

### **ICVS<sup>1</sup>**

The International Crime Victim Survey (ICVS) project was initiated in 1987 by a group of European criminologists with experience in national crime surveys (Van Dijk, Mayhew, Killias, 1990). The main objective was to seek advancement in international comparative criminological research, beyond the constraints of officially recorded crime data.

The International Crime Victim Surveys (ICVS) provides information on victimisation experiences, fear of crime, and attitudes towards the criminal justice system through a standard questionnaire, the results of which are internationally comparable. To ensure this, all aspects of the methodology have been standardised to the maximum possible extent.

The first round of the ICVS was conducted in 14 countries in 1989, providing a measurement of crime in 1988, by the Ministry of Justice of The Netherlands in cooperation with the Home Office of the United Kingdom and the University of Lausanne, Switzerland. The interviews were done by phone using CATI method. That year, pilot studies were also done in Indonesia (Jakarta) and Poland (Warsaw).

UNICRI became involved in the ICVS in 1991 with the aim of providing a wider geographical coverage to the project in order to include countries where telephone interviewing was not possible because the telephone penetration rates were low. A specific face-to-face methodology was developed for this purpose. Pilot studies were carried out to test the comparability of results obtained with the two different methods.

The second sweep of the ICVS took place in 1992 with a total of 33 participating countries, of which 20 used face-to-face interviews. The third sweep was done in 1996 in 48 countries, of which 36 used face-to-face interviews. The fourth sweep was conducted in 2000 with, again, a total of 48 participating countries, of which 30 used face-to-face interviews. In 2004-5 took place the fifth sweep with 30 participating countries and including 33 capitals or main cities. As it is explained in the next chapter, in 18 countries, including the first 15 EU Member States, the survey was co-financed by the European Commission's Directorate General for Research and Technology Development and organised by a consortium lead by Gallup Europe. Until 2009, over 140 surveys have been conducted 78 countries, of which 37 used national representative samples.

The first sweeps of the ICVS used samples of approximately 1,000 households. In 2004-5 the samples were usually of 2,000. These samples are relatively small by the standards of most national crime surveys; however, the risk of sampling errors is balanced by keeping the costs within reasonable limits. Comparative analysis of risks can be safely conducted on the main

---

<sup>1</sup> XXXVer Alvazzi del Frate (2004b), van Dijk, van Kesteren y Smit (2007a).

variables, while caution should be used in looking at issues about which a small proportion of the sample provides information. Most countries using the CATI method draw national samples. The face-to-face method was used in countries where the telephone penetration rate was lower than 70%. In such cases, surveys were frequently conducted in urban areas, usually the capital city. In general, it can be said that industrialised countries, including all Western European countries used the CATI method, while face-to-face interviews were used by several Central and Eastern European countries, as well as in the capitals of countries of the Americas, Africa, and Asia.

The standard questionnaire has been translated in the languages of all participating countries. The questionnaire went through different modifications throughout the years, but the fundamental questions –especially the questions on victimisation experiences– remained almost identical in order to assure the continuity of the time series. The 2004-5 version includes information on 15 offences. The time reference normally used in ICVS data analysis is the calendar year preceding the survey. On average, response rate to the ICVS was 60%. However, these percentages vary widely across time and from country to country. In particular, countries that used face-to-face interviews –generally in Central and Eastern Europe– managed sometimes to interview more than 90% of the households contacted, although this percentages have diminished to around 70% in 2004-5. On the other hand, in countries where the CATI method was used –generally in Western Europe–, response rates could vary between 30% and 80% in the 1990s, but went down to a range of 40%-60% in 2004-5.

## ***EU ICS<sup>2</sup>***

The European Crime and Safety Survey (EU ICS, which corresponds to the abbreviation of EU International Crime Survey) was part of the fifth sweep of the ICVS. For the execution of the EU ICS in the member countries of the European Union a consortium was set up, and comprising UNICRI in Turin, Italy, Max Planck Institute for Foreign and International Criminal Law in Freiburg, Germany, CEPS/INSTEAD in Luxembourg and GeoX in Hungary, led by Gallup Europe in Brussels. The consortium received a grant from the European Commission, DG Research, to carry out the EU ICS survey in 2005 among the 15 first Member States of the EU, and committed itself to include at least three of the newly acceded members (Estonia, Hungary, and Poland).

The EU ICS was largely confined to counting crimes against clearly identifiable individuals, excluding children below 16 years of age. The types of crime included cover the bulk of *common crimes* such as theft, burglary, robbery and assault. Through a set of special questions the survey also collected information on nonconventional crimes such as petty corruption (bribe-seeking by public officials) and consumer fraud. Most EU ICS interviews were carried out with CATI methodology, the exceptions were Estonia and Poland, where the interviews were conducted face-to-face in the respondent's home. In Finland, a sub-sample was interviewed via mobile phones. The average duration of the telephone interview was 23.2 minutes. Twelve of the countries were surveyed using an Internet-based CATI server that made the questionnaire available in many languages from a single location.

---

<sup>2</sup> Ver van Dijk, Manchin, van Kesteren y Hideg (2005).

## **ICBS / ICCS**

The first International Commercial Crime Survey (ICCS) was carried out in 1994. A standardised questionnaire for businesses was drafted and eight countries participated. The same questionnaire was used in 1997 in Estonia and 1998 in South Africa. A national survey using a very similar questionnaire was also conducted in Australia, followed by a national survey on the retail sector in 1999. Two surveys were carried out in south-western Finland in 1994–1995, mostly based on the same questionnaire. Between 1995 and 1999 surveys with the same methodology were also replicated in St. Petersburg and Lithuania to address the issue of the security of foreign businesses.

The ICCS questionnaire mostly focused on experiences of victimisation, information on perceptions, and attitudes to several aspects of everyday business. Questions dealt with experiences of crime, safety in the area, pollution issues, security devices and costs involved, attitudes towards the police, and private policing.

In the late 1990s, the ICCS questionnaire was modified to include more items on corruption. At the same time, the ICVS questionnaire was also revised to allow an expanded section on corruption.

The United Nations Interregional Crime and Justice Research Institute (UNICRI) developed a standard questionnaire based on the 1994 ICCS questionnaire, which was revised and finalised in co-operation with the National Institute of Justice, USA, and the Gallup Organisation, Hungary. Some sections were particularly analysed with a view to using them (a) for comparisons with other surveys on corruption, (b) as a complement to the ICVS, and (c) as a part of the assessment component of the Global Programme Against Corruption (GPAC) of the United Nations.

Given that the basic questionnaire was mostly concerned with assessing victimisation experiences by conventional crime, some specific questions on the measurement of corruption and attitudes toward it were added.

An expert group was involved in the finalisation of the questionnaire in order to assess its likelihood to capture attitudes of respondents as well as both conventional crime and corruption experiences.

The International Crime Business Survey (ICBS – a new name for the international survey was deemed necessary at that time), also known as International Crime against Businesses Survey, was launched in 2000 parallel to the ICVS in nine central-eastern European countries. The questionnaire was translated into the languages of all participating countries.

The national co-ordinators appointed for the ICVS (leading criminologists or research institutions) in each participating country were also requested to monitor the progress of the ICBS. The role of the national coordinators included ensuring the correctness of the translation/localisation of the questionnaires, monitoring of the sampling procedure and participation in the training of the interviewers.

Funding was provided by the Ministries of Justice and Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands and the Ministry of Justice of Hungary. In order to provide for the highest comparability of the results, the fieldwork was contracted to a major international survey company, Gallup, which used its branches and associates in each participating country. Survey teams received standard

training and guidelines for the project, along the lines of training provided for the ICVS. Because of the elevated costs involved, it was decided to limit the surveys to capital cities in each participating country

In 2000 the ICBS was carried out in eight capital cities in Central and Eastern Europe. Managers of 4,000 companies were interviewed, 500 in each city, and in such a manner as to ensure a representative sample of differently sized companies and different business sectors. The majority of countries used face-to-face interviews and response rates were 65% on average.

**Sources:**

Anna Alvazzi del Frate (2004). *The International Business Survey: Findings from nine central-Eastern European Cities*. European Journal on Criminal Policy and Research 10: 137–161, 2004.

John van Kesteren (2003). *The International Crime against Businesses Survey*. Global Corruption Report 2003.

### ***Eurobarometer***<sup>3</sup>

The Eurobarometer (EB) are a series of surveys regularly performed on behalf of the European Commission in EU Member States and, currently, in some European countries that do not belong to the EU or that are candidates to join the Union. The standard EB (there are, or there have been, other ones, such as the Flash EB, the Special EB, the EB qualitative, the Central and Eastern EB, and the Candidate Countries EB) was established in 1973 and is conducted twice yearly. In this article we will focused on the Standard EB 44.3 of 1996, which was the first one to include questions on fear of crime, as well as on the Standard EB 54.1 (Autumn 2000) and EB 58.1 (Autumn 2002) that also included questions related to victimisation.

The EB covers the population aged 15 years and over, resident in each of the Member States, and uses a multi-stage random probability sample. The method consists in drawing a number of sampling point, proportional to population size and density and stratified by type of area (metropolitan, urban and rural). In each of the selected sampling points a starting address is drawn randomly. Further addresses are selected at every N<sup>th</sup> address by standard random walk method. In each household, the respondent is selected randomly. All interviews are conducted face-to-face in the respondents' homes and in their national language. Data are weighted for gender, age and region. EU averages are calculated on the basis of Eurostat population figures. The usual sample size of the Eurobarometer is 1,000 in each country, with the exception of Germany (2,000 respondents, of whom 1,000 from the Western states and 1,000 from the Eastern states), the United Kingdom (1,300, of whom 1,000 from Great Britain and 300 from Northern Ireland) and Luxembourg (600). The small size of the sample is explained by the budget available and may have introduced bias that could lead to slightly inflated victimisation rates.

The following questions on fear of crime were included in the Standard EB 44.3 (1996) as well as in the Standard EB 54.1 (2000) and the Standard EB 58.1 (2002):

---

<sup>3</sup> Ver van Dijk y Toornvliet (1996), EC (2001). EORG (2003).

- How safe do you feel walking alone in the area where you live after dark?
- Over the last 12 months, how often were you personally in contact with drug related problems in the area where you live?

The Standard EB 44.3 (1996) as well as in the Standard EB 58.1 (2002) included also the following questions on crime and crime prevention:

- Do you tend to agree or tend to disagree with the following statements on crime and crime prevention?
  - Measures such as burglar alarms and special door locks can reduce crime in my area
  - A neighbourhood watch scheme can reduce crime in my area
  - Better policing would reduce crime in my area
  - Taking everything into account, the police in my area are doing a good job in the fight against crime
  - Police should share responsibility for crime prevention with local and national government
  - Private individuals and organisations could share responsibility for crime prevention with the police
- Do you tend to agree or tend to disagree with the following statements on crime and crime prevention?
  - Young people would commit less crime if they were taught better discipline by their parents or at school
  - Young people would commit less crime if they had better education
  - Poverty and unemployment lead young people to commit crime
  - Young people would commit less crime if jail sentences were tougher
  - There should be more crime prevention programmes targeted at young people

Finally, the Standard EB 58.1 (2002) included also the following questions on the risk of being a victim of a crime and on organised crime:

- Over the next 12 months, do you think that there is *a risk* that you will personally be the victim of one of the following?
  - Risk of theft of mobile phone
  - The risk of theft of other personal property
  - Risk of burglary or break-in at home
  - Risk of mugging/ robbery to steal mobile phone
  - Risk of mugging/ robbery to steal something else
  - Risk of assault or threat of assault
- Do you tend to agree or tend to disagree with the following statements on crime and crime prevention?
  - Organised crime has infiltrated (civil) society
  - Organised crime has infiltrated the economy
  - Organised crime has infiltrated local government
  - organised crime has infiltrated national government

## ***Pilot study on the EU victimisation survey module***

Seventeen national organisations working in the area of statistics on crime and criminal justice statistics are currently engaged in conducting pilot exercises running from 2008 to 2009. This involves translating the common survey module (developed by HEUNI and finalised by the Eurostat task force in June 2007) and testing it in a field environment. These exercises are partly financed by the European Commission, either within the DG JLS Framework Programme or directly by Eurostat.

This action arises from the Commission Communication to the European Parliament, the Council and the European Economic and Social Committee on *Developing a comprehensive and coherent EU strategy to measure crime and criminal justice: An EU Action Plan 2006-2010*.

One of the most important activities identified in the Action Plan is the development of a common survey module on victimisation. The purpose of such a module is to ensure that information on crime victimisation could be collected in the Member States according to an agreed methodology and that the statistics would therefore be comparable.

A draft module was been developed for Eurostat and approved by the Eurostat task force on victimisation surveys at its meeting on 28-29 June. The draft module has been designed to take account of existing experiences with victimisation surveys at both national and international levels. This module takes account of work undertaken by the United Nations Office for Drugs and Crime (UNODC) and the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE) in developing a database of victimisation surveys and on drafting a manual on victimisation surveys.

The next stage in the development of the module under the Action Plan is to translate it into national languages and test it in a fieldwork environment. This testing will enable an evaluation to be made of the feasibility of the module and will serve as a basis for recommendations concerning implementation in line with the EU Action Plan.

The EU Member States are invited to translate this victimisation survey module into national languages and to make proposals for carrying out suitable testing procedures in a personal interview environment using a sample drawn from the national population.

The method of drawing the sample may be chosen by the Member State. Individuals may be selected, or households (all members of the household or only selected members). It is however important to ensure a roughly equal balance of men and women, and an adequate representation of young persons (age under 25).

Interviews may be conducted either face-to-face using laptop computers (Computer Assisted Personal Interviewing - CAPI) or by telephone (Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing - CATI). It is recommended that Member States should use both methods for different sub-sets of the sample, in order to make it possible to assess the advantages and disadvantages of each mode for this type of survey module. Sections of the questionnaire on sensitive subjects such as sexual offences may be handled through self-completion on computer or in writing.

The average sample size in each Member State is expected to be about a thousand individuals, depending on the cost involved. Face-to-face interviews will necessarily be considerably more expensive than telephone interviews.



Before conducting fieldwork, it may be considered appropriate to carry out cognitive testing of the translated survey module using survey laboratory facilities where available.

**Source:**

EUROSTAT, *Project on Translating and Testing a EU Victimisation Survey Module*. Working Group, Statistics on Crime and criminal justice. Luxembourg, 19-20 February 2009

### ***ICVS-2: Pilot study***

By the end of 2008 and the beginning of 2009, a pilot study using a short version of the ICVS questionnaire (called the ICVS-2 questionnaire) was conducted in the following countries: Sweden, Germany, Canada, United Kingdom. The questionnaire was translated into German and Swedish.

To learn what the contribution of CAWI and PAPI in terms of response might be and whether they have an exclusive range or overlap each other, a pilot study was designed. The pilot measured the response rates obtained through variations in method, using both online and printed questionnaires. In addition, a similar survey was conducted through the means of CATI for comparison reasons. Face-to-face interviews were not included in the pilot due to their high costs relative to the other methodologies.

The main goal of the pilot was to have an in-depth analysis of the (non)response of the different methods and approaches used to conduct the survey. The secondary objective was to establish if the questionnaire ICVS-2 would be suitable for use with CAWI and PAPI.

The CATI sample was drawn by random digit dialling (RDD) of telephone numbers. Within a household, there was a random selection of a household member aged over 16 based on the first upcoming birthday in that household. This process continued until the agreed amount of completed interviews (n=200) were reached.

In the CAWI / PAPI mode the sample was drawn from an address register. To examine the overlap of the two methods (CAWI and PAPI), two random subgroups were created from the initial sample. Each group received an invitation letter containing a link to the website where respondents could fill in the survey. In this motivational letter respondents were asked to participate in the survey either online or by filling in a printed copy of the questionnaire.

In the first group a printed copy of the questionnaire was included with the invitation letter. Respondents could fill it in and return it in an prepaid postage addressed envelope that was enclosed. In the second group respondents could request a printed questionnaire by sending back an enclosed answer card. They would then have a copy of the printed questionnaire sent to them which they could fill in and return with an enclosed addressed envelope. It was assumed that including the questionnaire with the invitation letter would lead to higher return rates of the printed copies, but that this would affect the number of people that completed the interview online in a negative way.

In both groups respondents who had not replied received a reminder two weeks after they had received the initial invitation letter. To measure the effects of a reminder, both groups were again divided into two subgroups: one group in which respondents received only one

reminder and one in which respondents received a second reminder sent one week after the first.

The ICVS/2 will be executed among samples of 4,000 respondents in Canada, Denmark, Germany, The Netherlands, Sweden, England/Wales and the USA in the Autumn of 2009 with financial support from the EC.

**Source:**

van Dijk, T & Langerak, R. (06-02-2009). Pilot data collections: Results and conclusions. The Netherlands: Intomart.

## **IVAWS**

The International Violence Against Women Survey (IVAWS) is an international, comparative survey on violence perpetrated by men against women. The IVAWS project was initiated in 1997 when the European Institute for Crime Prevention and Control, affiliated with the United Nations (HEUNI) together with a number of international experts in the field started developing a comparative and standardised survey tool for measuring violence against women worldwide. The project was co-ordinated by HEUNI with inputs from the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC), United Nations Interregional Crime and Justice Research Institute (UNICRI), and Statistics Canada. The IVAWS combines the methodology and contacts developed for the International Crime Victim Survey (ICVS) with the methodology developed for national violence against women surveys by Statistics Canada.

Pilot studies started in early November 2001, with Canada carrying out a 100 respondent survey. Other countries carried out pilot studies during 2002, including Argentina, Costa Rica, Denmark, Italy, Kazakhstan, Poland, Australia, Indonesia, Philippines, Serbia, Switzerland, and Ukraine. On the basis of these experiences, the final questionnaire was established in December 2002. It has already been translated into Chinese, Czech, Danish, French, German, Greek, Italian, Polish, Portuguese, and Spanish.

The questionnaire can be roughly divided into three parts: experienced violence, consequences of violence, and background information. The victimisation screeners are composed of twelve questions, each category beginning with a question on lifetime victimisation, and followed by a more detailed breakdown of prevalence and incidence by perpetrator. The most recent incidents of partner violence and non-partner violence are then explored in closer detail with separate sections dedicated for both types. Case details include things such as possible injuries, need of medical care, reporting (or not reporting) to the police, and the respondent's views on how her voice was heard. The survey methodology package includes, besides the questionnaire and a pre-programmed data capture programme, a Manual with detailed guidelines on how to implement the survey.

In Europe, the IVAWS was conducted in Denmark (2003), Greece (2003), Italy (2006), Poland (2004), and Switzerland (2004). In Denmark, Italy and Switzerland, interviews were conducted over the telephone; the remaining countries interviewed respondents face-to-face. Decisions about interviewing methods were based on practical considerations such as cost, telephone coverage and logistics, and were left to the discretion of coordinators in each country.

**Sources:**

Johnson, H., Ollus, N., & Nevala, S. (2008). "Eliminating Violence against Women: Forms, Strategies and Tools". Workshop presented at the Seventeenth Session of the United Nations Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice. Vienna: UNICRI. 14 April 2008.

Nevala, S. (2005). *Violence against women: a statistical overview, challenges and gaps in data collection and methodology and approaches for overcoming them*. Paper for the expert group meeting organised by UN Division for the Advancement of Women the Economics Commission for Europe (ECE) and World Health Organisation (WHO). Geneva, Switzerland, 11-14 April, 2005

## ***EU-MIDIS European Union Minorities and Discrimination Survey***

### **The pilot: FRA's Pilot Victim Survey on Ethnic Minorities and Immigrants**

In June 2006 the FRA (The European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights) launched a pilot victim survey in six EU Member States under the heading "Ethnic minorities and immigrants' experiences of criminal victimisation and policing". The Member States involved were: Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Italy, Romania and Slovakia. The pilot set out to test different sampling frames and the application of the survey questionnaire on selected immigrant and ethnic minority groups in each Member State. The primary objective of the pilot exercise was to establish whether a survey of this kind could be successfully extended to cover the EU27. The fieldwork for the survey research was undertaken towards the end of 2006 and the beginning of 2007, with the results of the exercise submitted for internal scrutiny by the Agency in May 2007.

For the purpose of the pilot research the following groups were selected for interviewing in the Member States (the sample size is indicated between brackets)

- Austria: Turkish, ex-Yugoslavians (N=700)
- Belgium: Turkish, North Africans, Italians (N=499)
- Bulgaria: Roma, Turkish (N=900)
- Italy: Albanian, North African, Romanian (N=603)
- Romania: Roma, Hungarian (N=600)
- Slovakia: Roma, Hungarian (N=605)

The pilot survey tested two main sampling frames in the six Member States

- Random digit dialling and focused enumeration
- Random route cluster sampling

In every Member State all interviews were conducted face-to-face with an interviewer filling out the questionnaire.

The International Crime Victim Survey (ICVS) and the European Crime and Safety Survey (EU ICS) are primarily useful to the FRA as they provide a majority population control group with which to compare the results of the FRA survey on immigrants and ethnic minorities. They are also useful because they offer an established questionnaire that was adapted for the pilot questionnaire to incorporate new questions needed for a survey on minorities; for

example questions on experiences of police stop and search, and whether there was any indication that experiences of victimisation were racially or ethnically motivated, such as use of racist or religiously offensive language.

Following the success of the pilot survey exercise in six Member States, a full-scale survey has been conducted in the EU27 countries in spring 2008 under the name EU-MIDIS European Union Minorities and Discrimination Survey (see below).

**Source:**

Goodey, J. (2008). Targeted Victimisation Survey on Immigrants and Ethnic Minorities: Considerations for Comparative Research Development. In Aromaa, K. & Heiskanen, M. (eds.) (2008). *Victimisation Survey in comparative Perspective. Papers from the Stockholm Criminology Symposium* (pp 16-33) 2007. Helsinki: HEUNI.

### **The survey: EU-MIDIS European Union Minorities and Discrimination Survey**

EU-MIDIS is a survey conducted with samples of immigrant, ethnic minority and national minority groups in all 27 EU Member States about their experiences of discrimination and victimisation. It was conducted from May to November 2008.

The EU-MIDIS questionnaire was developed by the FRA with valuable input from experts working in the area of comparable international survey research. Questions were taken, where possible, from established international surveys, such as Eurobarometer and the International Crime Victimisation Survey (ICVS), in order to ensure, as far as possible, comparability with existing information from international general population surveys.

Sampling for the EU-MIDIS survey was based on a dual strategy: to cover major cities, including capitals, where immigrant groups for surveying are located, and to adopt an “on-location” approach for Member States where relevant minorities are primarily non-urban, or there are no real distinct urban centres (e.g. in the smallest Member States). EU-MIDIS adopted four distinct sampling approaches: (a) City/Metropolitan: random route sampling (RR) with focused enumeration (FE); (b) Registry-based address sample; (c) Nationwide random route with FE (d) Network sampling (NS). Only one primary sampling approach was used within a Member State.

The survey sampled persons (male and female) aged 16 years and older who: (a) Self-identify themselves as belonging to one of the immigrant, ethnic minority or national minority groups selected for sampling in each Member State, (b) Are resident<sup>7</sup> in the Member State being surveyed, (c) Have been resident in the Member State for at least one year, (d) Have sufficient command of (one of the) the national language(s) of the Member State being surveyed to lead a simple conversation with the interviewer. In each household that contained persons from the designated target groups, up to three eligible persons were invited to take part in the survey

The target sample size per vulnerable group was 500, with 13 countries having 2 target groups, 11 countries having 1 group and 3 countries having 3 groups for surveying. In 10 countries an additional sample of a minimum of 500 majority persons (from the same areas where minority respondents lived) were also interviewed, to provide reference information for

police stop-and-search practices. In total 5068 interviews were achieved with respondents from the majority population.

The highest response rates were achieved in the following type (a)/(b)/(c) groups: Asians in Cyprus (89%); Romanians in Italy (69%); Brazilians in Portugal (67%); Roma in Slovakia (61%); North Africans in Italy (61%); Albanians in Italy (60%); Roma in the Czech Republic (58%). On the other hand, the lowest rates (below 20%) were recorded in the following type (a)/(b)/(c) groups: Somalis in Finland (17%); South American immigrants in Spain (17%); Bosnians in Slovenia (18%). The best response rates were recorded in type (c) samples (58%), when nationwide random route sampling was used in areas with a high density of mostly indigenous (predominantly Roma) minorities (in Bulgaria and in Poland fieldwork facilitators – e.g. community leaders, other trusted persons – were also used in order to gain access to potential participant groups). There was no significant difference on average in response rates between national registry based (type b) urban samples (31%) and focused enumeration-assisted random route urban samples (38%). Samples obtained in interviewer-generated situations produced the second highest response rate overall – type (d): 54%.

**Source:**

FRA –European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (2009). EU-MIDIS European Union Minorities and Discrimination Survey. Technical Report: Methodology, Sampling and Fieldwork. [Vienna]: FRA

## **Costs of a survey**

The costs of a survey depend mainly on the size of the sample, the method of interviewing, the length of the questionnaire, and the country where the interview is conducted.

For example, the overall budget for the 2005 EUICS (described above) which was a telephone survey (CATI methodology) conducted in 18 countries with an average length of the call of 23 minutes was 1.8 million Euros, including the analysis of the data.

Another example is the 2009 FRA survey. The costs of this survey are higher because it is directed to a specific target group only. Indeed, costs for identifying individuals belonging to a specific ethnic or cultural minority are significantly higher than those generated by survey based on a random general population sample. The survey was conducted using the face to face methodology and its total cost was 2.5 million Euros.

## **Policy objectives of victim surveys**

The policy objectives of crime victim surveys can be analyzed according to their influence on criminal policies decisions as well as public policies. According to the analysis conducted by Zaubermann (2008) their use ranges from intensive to low. Summarizing the analysis of Zaubermann (2008) it can be said that in England & Wales the British Crime Survey has become the main measure of crime and are used to evaluate the results of the crime policies introduced by the government, for example the Crime and Disorder Act of 1998. In Belgium, the Security Monitor is linked explicitly to the local security contracts passed between the federal state and towns and the *Politiemonitor Bevolking* constitutes an integral part of the police organisation. In Spain, there are no indications of its use for policy objectives at the National Level or at the level of Catalonia. In France, the results of national surveys are being used by the National Observatory on Destitute Urban Areas (*Observatoire national des zones urbaines sensibles*) and the National Observatory on Delinquency (*Observatoire national de la délinquance*) although police statistics seem to remain the main source of information on crime. In Germany, victim surveys have no clear impact on national or regional policies, even if recent local survey were financed by municipal authorities. In Italy, surveys seem to have no impact at the national level, but regions as Emilia Romagna are making use of them. In sum, some national states and regions are using victim surveys as a tool for orienting for crime prevention and safety policies. At the same time, thematic surveys on specific populations –such as women and young people– are having a notable impact namely in Spain for violence against women and Germany for school violence (Zaubermann, 2008).

## Conclusion

As a conclusion, we will summarize in 13 points the main surveys conducted in Europe indicating the EU countries that participated in them (points 1 to 11) and the main methods used for conducting such surveys (points 12 and 13).

### **1) The ICVS (International Crime Victim Survey) was conducted five times: 1989–1992–1996–2000–2005 (EU ICS in the EU15 + 3 countries)**

- 26 countries participated at least one time
  - Only Cyprus has never participated
  - Four countries and regions participated in the five sweeps
    - Finland
    - The Netherlands
    - Poland
    - UK: England & Wales
  - Six countries and regions participated in four sweeps
    - Belgium
    - Estonia (conducted 5 times, see next slide)
    - France
    - Sweden
    - UK : Northern Ireland
    - UK : Scotland
  - Five countries participated in three sweeps
    - Bulgaria
    - Czech Republic
    - Latvia (1995, 1998 and 2000)
    - Lithuania
    - Slovenia
  - Two countries are currently using it as their National Crime Survey
    - Bulgaria
    - Estonia

### **2) ICVS-2 International Crime Victim Survey 2 - Pilot Study -**

- Three European countries participated in a pilot study using a short version of the ICVS questionnaire in January 2009:
  - Sweden
  - Germany
  - UK: England & Wales
- The survey will be conducted in 2009 with samples of 4,000 respondents in six European countries:
  - Canada
  - Denmark
  - Germany
  - The Netherlands
  - Sweden
  - UK: England & Wales

### **3) Eurobarometer**

- 1996: Included a series of questions on victimisation
- The questions on fear of crime included in 1996, were also included in 2000 and 2002 (which included also other questions on public safety)
- The EU15 countries participated in the 1996 Eurobarometer

### **4) Periodical National Surveys**

- 12 countries + 1 region have periodical national surveys:
  - Belgium (Security Monitor 1997, biannual since 98)
  - Bulgaria (ICVS: 1997, 2002-04-05-07-08-09)
  - Denmark (1996, annual since 2005)
  - Estonia (ICVS: 1993, 1995, 2000, 2005 and 2009)
  - Finland (Finnish National Survey, periodical since 1980)
  - France (Living conditions of Household Surveys 1996-2006; Framework of Life and Security, annual since 2005)
  - Ireland (Quarterly National Household Surveys, every 3 years since 1998; Garda Public Attitudes Survey (annual since 2002)
  - Italy (Italian Citizens' Safety Survey, every 5 years since 1997/8; Everyday Life Aspects, annual since 1993)
  - The Netherlands (1974-1980: National Victimisation Survey; 1980-2005: Crime Victim Survey; 1980-2005: Permanent Survey on Living conditions; 2005-2008: National Security Monitor; since 2009: Integral Security Monitor; Police Monitor: 1993-2001 every two years, annual since then)
  - Romania (Living conditions survey, from 2001 to 2006)
  - Catalonia (Spain) (Survey on Public Security in Catalonia, annual since 1999)
  - Sweden (Living conditions survey, annual since 1978; Swedish Crime Survey, annual since 2006)
  - United Kingdom (BCS, periodical from 1982 to 2000)
  - England & Wales (BCS, continuous since 2001)
  - Northern Ireland (Northern Ireland Crime Survey, periodical since 1994)
  - Scotland (Scottish Crime Survey, periodical since 1993)

### **5) Non Periodical National Surveys**

- 11 countries have conducted at least one non periodical national survey
  - Bulgaria
  - Czech Republic
  - Denmark
  - France
  - Germany
  - Greece
  - Hungary
  - Ireland
  - Italy
  - Luxembourg
  - Portugal



## **6) Pilot study on the EU victimisation survey module**

- 17 Countries and regions are conducting this pilot study
  - Austria
  - Cyprus
  - Czech Republic
  - Denmark
  - Finland
  - Germany
  - Hungary
  - Italy
  - Latvia
  - Lithuania
  - Poland
  - Portugal
  - Slovak Republic
  - Slovenia
  - Spain + Catalonia
  - Sweden

## **7) IVAWS - International Violence Against Women Survey**

- 3 countries participated in this survey
  - Denmark (2003)
  - Greece (2003)
  - Poland (2004)

## **8) National Violence Against Women Surveys**

- 6 countries have conducted such surveys
  - Finland (1997 and 2005)
  - France (2000)
  - Italy (2006)
  - The Netherlands (1996, 1997 and 2009)
  - Spain (1999 and 2002)
  - Sweden (1999 and 2000)

## **9) ICBS / ICCS - The first International Commercial Crime Survey (ICCS)**

- 11 countries have conducted this survey (sometimes with city samples)
  - Bulgaria (2000)
  - Czech Republic (1994)
  - Finland (1994)
  - France (1994)
  - Germany (1994)
  - Hungary (1994 and 2000)
  - Italy (1994)
  - Lithuania (2000)
  - The Netherlands (1994)
  - Romania (2000)
  - UK: England & Wales (1994)

#### **10) National Business Surveys**

- 4 countries have conducted such surveys
  - Bulgaria (2002, 2004 and 2005)
  - Estonia (1998)
  - Finland (1996 and 1997)
  - The Netherlands (annual since 2004)

#### **11) EU-MIDIS European Union Minorities and Discrimination Survey**

- **FRA's (EU Agency for Fundamental Rights) Pilot Victim Survey on Ethnic Minorities and Immigrants**
  - 6 countries have participated in this pilot in 2006/7
    - Austria
    - Belgium
    - Bulgaria
    - Italy
    - Romania
    - Slovak Republic
- **EU-MIDIS European Union Minorities and Discrimination Survey**
  - The 27 EU countries participated in this survey in 2009

#### **12) CATI (Computer assisted telephone interviewing)**

- 19 countries have used this method of interviewing
- 8 countries have not applied CATI
  - Bulgaria
  - Cyprus
  - Estonia
  - Lithuania
  - (Malta)
  - Poland
  - Romania
  - Slovak Republic

#### **13) Face to face interviewing**

- 26 countries have used this method of interviewing
- In Malta the methodology of the 1996 ICVS is not specified

## References

### **General references**

Alvazzi del Frate, A. (1998). *Victims of Crime in the Developing countries*. UNICRI. Publication n° 57. Rome.

Alvazzi del Frate, A. (2004a). The International Business Survey: Findings from nine central-Eastern European Cities. *European Journal on Criminal Policy and Research* 10, 137–161.

Alvazzi del Frate, A. (2004b). *Towards comparable information on crime and victimisation. The International Crime Victim Survey and the International Crime Business Survey*. Working paper n° 7. 1 November 2004.

Alvazzi del Frate, A., Zvekic. U. & van Dijk, J. J. M. (Eds.) (1993). *Understanding Crime Experiences of Crime and Crime Control*. Acts of the International Conference. Rome, 18-20 November 1992. Edited by UN Publication, No.49. Rome, August 1993.

Alvazzi del Frate, A. & van Kesteren, J. N. (2002). Criminal Victimization in Eastern- Central Europe. In: Nieuwbeerta (ed.) *Crime Victimization in comparative perspective. Results from the International Crime Victims Survey, 1989-2000*. Den Haag: Boom juridische uitgevers, pp.53-66.

Alvazzi del Frate, A. & van Kesteren, J. (2004). *Criminal Victimization in Urban Europe. Key findings of the 2000 International Crime Victims Survey*. Turin. UNICRI.

Aromaa, K. (2004). *The International Violence Against Women Survey*. Statistical Commission and UN Economic Commission for Europe. Conference of European Statisticians. Working paper n 9. Geneva: HEUNI.

Aromaa, K., Heiskanen, M., Laaksonen, S. & Viuhko, M. (2007). Final report. Helsinki: HEUNI.

Aromaa, K. & Heiskanen, M. (Eds.) (2008). *Victimisation Survey in comparative Perspective. Papers from the Stockholm Criminology Symposium 2007*. Helsinki: HEUNI.

De Schorlemer, L. (June 2009). Personal communication.

EUROSTAT (2009). *Project on Translating and Testing a EU Victimisation Survey Module*. Working Group, Statistics on Crime and criminal justice. Luxembourg, 19-20 February 2009.

FRA –European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (2009). EU-MIDIS European Union Minorities and Discrimination Survey. Technical Report: Methodology, Sampling and Fieldwork. [Vienna]: FRA.

Goodey, J. (2008). Targeted Victimization Survey on Immigrants and Ethnic Minorities: Considerations for Comparative Research Development. In Aromaa, K. & Heiskanen, M. (eds.) (2008). *Victimisation Survey in comparative Perspective. Papers from the Stockholm Criminology Symposium* (pp 16-33) 2007. Helsinki: HEUNI.

EC - European Commission (2001). Eurobarometer. Public Opinion in the European Union. Report Number 54. Brussels: European Commission.

EORG – European Opinion Research Group (2003). Public Safety, Exposure to Drug-related Problems and Crime: Public Opinion Survey. Brussels: EORG.

[http://ec.europa.eu/public\\_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs\\_181\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs_181_en.pdf)

[http://ec.europa.eu/public\\_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs\\_181\\_tables\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs_181_tables_en.pdf)

Johnson, H., Ollus, N. & Nevala, S. (2007). *Violence Against Women: An international Perspective*. Berlin: Springer Verlag.

Johnson, H., Ollus, N., & Nevala, S. (2008). “Eliminating Violence against Women: Forms, Strategies and Tools”. Workshop presented at the Seventeenth Session of the United Nations Commission on crime Prevention and Criminal Justice. Vienna: UNICRI. 14 April 2008.

Mayhew, P. & Van Dijk, J. J. M. (1997). *Criminal Victimization in the Industrialised countries. Key findings from the 1996 International Crime Victim Survey*. The Hague: WODC 162.

Nevala, S. (2005). *Violence against women: a statistical overview, challenges and gaps in data collection and methodology and approaches for overcoming them*. Paper for the expert group meeting organised by UN Division for the Advancement of Women the Economics Commission for Europe (ECE) and World Health organisation (WHO). Geneva, Switzerland, 11-14 April, 2005.

Smit P. (June 2009). Personal communication.

European Commission (1996). Standard Eurobarometer (EB) 44.3 (1996). European Union; European Commission. Public Opinion.

European Commission (2000). Standard Eurobarometer (EB) 54.1 (autumn 2000). European Union; European Commission. Public Opinion.

European Commission (2002). Standard Eurobarometer (EB) 58.1 (autumn 2002). European Union; European Commission. Public Opinion.

Sparks, R.F. (1981). Surveys of Victimization: An Optimistic Assessment. *Crime and Justice: An Annual Review of Research* 3: 1-60.

Tavares, C. (June 2009). Personal communication.

Thomas, G. (2007). Development of a EU victimisation Module in Aromaa, K. & Heiskanen, M. (eds.) (2008). *Victimisation Survey in comparative Perspective. Papers from the Stockholm Criminology Symposium 2007*. Helsinki: HEUNI.

Thomas, G. (June 2009). Personal communication.

UNECE-UNODC (2004-2006). Inventory of CrimeVictim Surveys, Versions 4, 5, and 6.

Van Dijk, J. J. M. (June 2009). Personal communication.

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. & Mayhew, P. (1992). *Criminal Victimization in the industrialised world. Key findings of the 1989 and 1992 International Crime Surveys*. The Hague: Ministry of Justice, Department of Crime Prevention, Netherlands.

Van Dijk, J. J. M. & Terlouw, G. J. (1996). An International perspective of the Business community as victims of fraud and crime. *Security journal*, 7, 157-167.

Van Dijk, J. J. M. & Toornvliet, L. G. (1996). Towards a Eurobarometer of public safety. Key findings of the first survey on public safety among the residents of the European Union. Report presented the 21-22 November at the *Seminar on the Prevention of Urban Delinquency linked to Drugs Dependence*. Brussels, Belgium. European Commission.

Van Dijk, J. J. M., van Kesteren, J. & Smit, P. (2007). *Criminal victimisation in International Perspective. Key findings from 2004-2005 International Crime Victim Survey and the European Survey of Crime and Safety (EU ICS 2005)*: Onderzoek en beleid, No. 257. Ministry of Justice, WODC.

Van Dijk, J. J. M., Manchin, R., Van Kesteren, J. & Hideg, G. (2007). *The Burden of Crime in the EU, a Comparative Analysis of the European Survey of Crime and Safety (EU ICS 2005)*. Brussels: Gallup Europe.

Van Dijk, T. & Langerak, R. (2009). *Pilot data collections ICVS-2: Results and conclusions*. The Netherlands: Auteursrecht voorbehouden. Intomart GfK.

Van Dijk, J. J. M. & Steinmetz, C. H. D. (1980). *The RDC victim surveys 1974-1979*. The Hague: Ministry of Justice. (Research and Documentation Centre, Ministry of Justice, 35).

Van Kesteren, J. N. (June 2009). Personal communication.

Van Kesteren, J. N., Mayhew, P. & Nieuwbeerta, P. (2000). *Criminal victimisation in seventeen industrialised countries. Key-findings from 2000 international Crime Victim Survey*. The Hague: Onderzoek en beleid, No. 187. Ministry of Justice, WODC.

Van Kesteren, J. (2003): The International Crime Against Business Survey, in: *Transparency International (Hrsg.), Global Corruption Report 2003*, London [u. A.], p. 314-316.

Wolf, P. & Hauge, R. (1975). Criminal Violence in Three Scandinavian Countries. In *Scandinavian Studies in Criminology*, vol. 5. London: Tavistock.

Zauberman, R. (Eds.) (2008a). *Victimation et insécurité en Europe. Un bilan des enquêtes et de leurs usages*. Paris: L'Harmattan.

Zauberman, R. (2008b). *Assessing Deviance, Crime and Prevention in Europe. Surveys on Victimation and Insecurity in Europe*. Paris: CRIMPREV.

Zvekic, U. & Alvazzi del Frate, A. (1995). *Criminal Victimization in the developing World*. United Nations publication No 55. Rome: UNICRI.

## **References by country**

### **AUSTRIA**

Stangl, W. (June 2009). Personal communication.

### **BELGIUM**

Hooghe, M. (s.d.): Social Cohesion Indicators for the Flemish Region. The Development of Comprehensive Social Cohesion Indicators at the Local Level in Flanders. Consulted the 28/04/2009:

[http://users.Ugent.Be/~whardyns/SocialCohesionIndicatorsfortheFlemishRegion\\_WimHardyns.pdf](http://users.Ugent.Be/~whardyns/SocialCohesionIndicatorsfortheFlemishRegion_WimHardyns.pdf)

Kellens, G., Peters, T. & van Kerckvoorde, J. (1993), « L'enquête internationale de victimisations vue de Belgique », in *RDPC*, 825-839;

Pauwels, L. & Pleysier, S. (2007). Crime Victim and Insecurity Surveys in Belgium and the Netherlands. Paper presented at the CRIMPREV WP7 Workshop on *Crime Victims and Insecurity Surveys*. Barcelona, Spain, 15-17 March, 2007.

Pauwels, L. & Pleysier, S. (2008). Victimes de Délinquance et Insécurité: les enquêtes en Belgique et aux Pays-Bas in Zauberman, R., (Eds.) *Victimization et insécurité en Europe. Un bilan des enquêtes et de leurs usages* (pp 41-65). Paris : L'Harmattan.

Police fédérale belge (1997-2006). Moniteur de Sécurité. Brussels: Police fédérale belge.

[http://www.polfed-fedpol.be/pub/veiligheidsMonitor/monitor\\_fr.php](http://www.polfed-fedpol.be/pub/veiligheidsMonitor/monitor_fr.php)

### **BULGARIA**

Bezlov, T., Gounev, P., Hristov, H., Stoyanov, A., Yordanova, M. & Markov, D. (2006). *Crime Trends in Bulgaria 2000-2005*. Center for the Study of Democracy (CSD). Sofia, 2006.

Stoyanov, A. (June 2009). Personal communication.

UNDP - United Nations Development Programme (1998). *National Human Development Report - Bulgaria 1998: The State of Transition and Transition of the State*. Sofia: UNDP.

### **CYPRUS**

Kapardis A. (June 2009). Personal communication.

### **CZECH REPUBLIC**

Martinková, M. (2008). *Experiences of Czech Republic Citizens with Some Delicts Victimological Survey Results*. Consulted the 28/04/2009.

<http://www.Ok.Cz/iksp/en/docs/s339.pdf>

Martinková, M. (June 2009). Personal communication.

### **DENMARK**

Balvig F. (1987). *De tyvagtige dansker*. Copenhagen: Borgen.

Schütt et al. (2008). *Dating violence in Denmark*. English Summary. Copenhagen: National Institute of Public Health. Consulted the 28/04/2009

[http://www.si-folkesundhed.dk/upload/english\\_summary-dating\\_violence\\_in\\_denmark.pdf](http://www.si-folkesundhed.dk/upload/english_summary-dating_violence_in_denmark.pdf)

## **ESTONIA**

Ahven, A. (2008). The new Estonian National Victimization Survey-Objectives and Needs of Knowledge in Aromaa, K. & Heiskanene, M. (eds.), *Victimisation Survey in comparative Perspective. Papers from the Stockholm Criminology Symposium 2007* (pp.78-84). Helsinki: HEUNI.

Ahven, A. (June 2009). Personal communication.

## **FINLAND**

Aromaa, K. (1971). *Arkipaivan Vakivaltaa Suomessa [Everyday Violence in Finland]*. Helsinki: Institute of Criminology. Series M: 11.

Aromaa, K. (1974a). Victimization to Violence: A Gallup Survey. *International Journal of Criminology and Penology* 2: 333-346

Aromaa, K. (1974b). *The Replication of a Survey on Victimization to Violence*. Helsinki: Institute of Criminology. Series M: 36.

Aromaa, K. (June 2009). Personal communication.

Aromaa, K. & Leppa, S. (1973). *Omaisuusrikosten Yksilouhrien Tarkastelua [A Survey on Individual Victims of Property Crimes]*. Helsinki: Institute of Criminology. Series M:26.

Aromaa, K. & Heiskanen, M. (1992). *The Victims of Crime 1992: preliminary Finnish data from the 1992 International Crime Victimization Survey*. Helsinki: National Research Institute of Legal Policy.

Heiskanen, M. (2006, January). *National Victimization Survey in Finland*. Vienna: HEUNI. Meeting on Crime Statistics, Paper No 3.

Heiskanen, M. (June 2009). Personal communication.

Heiskanen, M. & Piispa, M. (1998). *Faith, Hope, Battering. A Survey of Men's Violence against Women in Finland*. Statistics Finland: Justice 1988:20. Helsinki: Yliopistopaino.

Heiskanen, M. & Piispa, M. (2008). Violence Against Women in Finland. Results from Two National Victimization Surveys. In Aromaa, K. & Heiskanen, M. (eds.), *Victimisation Survey in comparative Perspective. Papers from the Stockholm Criminology Symposium 2007* (pp.136-159). Helsinki: HEUNI

## **FRANCE**

Didier, E., Névanen S., Robert Ph. & Zauberman R. (2009). La solidité des institutions. Les statistiques de « victimation » de l'Insee (1996-2006), *Genèses* 2009/1, N° 74, 128-144.

Robert, Ph. (2007). *Research on Victimization and Insecurity in France*. Paper presented at the CRIMPREV WP 7 Workshop on Crime Victims and Insecurity Surveys. Barcelona, Spain. 15-17 March 2007.



Robert, Ph. (2008). Enquêtes françaises sur la Victimation et l'insecurité in Zauberman, R., (Eds.) *Victimation et insécurité en Europe. Un bilan des enquêtes et de leurs usages* (pp 89-103). Paris : L'Harmattan.

Robert, Ph., Zauberman, R., Névanen, S., & Didier, E. (2008). L'Evolution de la délinquance d'après Enquêtes de Victimation, 1984-2005. *Déviance et Société, Vol. 32, No 4*, 435-472.

Zauberman, R. (June 2009). Personal communication.

### **GERMANY**

Obergfell-Fuchs, J. (2007). *Crime victims and insecurity surveys in Germany*. Paper presented at the CRIMPREV WP7 Workshop on Crime Victims and Insecurity Surveys, Barcelona, March 15 – 17, 2007.

Obergfell-Fuchs, J. (2008a). Comparing crime data of different sources – the German situation. Paper presented at the CRIMPREV WP 7 Seminar on Studies comparing crime data based on general population surveys with criminal statistics. Barcelona, Spain. 11-13 September 2008.

Obergfell-Fuchs, J. (2008b). Les Enquêtes sur la Victimation et l'insécurité en Allemagne in Zauberman, R., (Eds.) *Victimation et insécurité en Europe. Un bilan des enquêtes et de leurs usages* (pp 105-126). Paris : L'Harmattan.

### **GREECE**

Karydis, V. (2004). *The invisible criminality. National victimological survey*. Athens-Komotini: A. Sakkoulas Publisher (in Greek).

Spinellis C. D., Chaidou A., Serassis T., (1991). Victim theory and research in Greece. in Kaiser G., Kury H., Albrecht H. J., *Victims and criminal justice*, Freiburg: 123-159.

Zarafonitou, C. (June 2009). Personal communication.

### **HUNGARY**

Kerezsi, K. (June 2009). Personal communication.

### **IRELAND**

Irish National Crime Council. (2009). Consulted the 28/04/2009

[http://www.Crimecouncil.Gov.Ie/statistics\\_cri\\_victim.html](http://www.Crimecouncil.Gov.Ie/statistics_cri_victim.html)

Watson, D. (2000) *Victims of Recorded Crime in Ireland: Results from the 1996 Survey*. ESRI/ Oak Tree Press.

### **ITALY**

Barbagli, M (1995). *L'occasione e l'uomo ladro: Furti e rapine in Italia*. Bologna: Il Mulino.

Muratore, M. G. (2004). *Italian survey on violence against women*. Paper presented at the Work Session on Gender Statistics. Geneva 18-20 October 2004.

Muratore, M. G. (June 2009). Personal communication.

Muratore, M. G. & Corazziari, I., (2008). The New Italian Violence against Women Survey in Aromaa, K. & Heiskanen, M. (eds). *Victimisation Surveys in Comparative Perspective*. Helsinki : HEUNI.

Muratore, M. G. & Tagliacozzo, G. (2008). The Italian National Victimasation Survey. In Aromaa, K. & Heiskanen, M. (eds.), *Victimisation Survey in comparative Perspective*. Papers from the Stockholm Criminology Symposium 2007 (pp.100-121). Helsinki: HEUNI.

Sacchini, G. & Selmini, R. (2007). *Research on Victimisation and Insecurity in Italy*. Paper presented at the CRIMPREV WP7 Workshop on Crime Victims and Insecurity Surveys, Barcelona, March 15 – 17, 2007.

Sacchini, G. & Selmini, R. (2008). La Recherche sur la Victimation et l'Insécurité en Italie in Zauberman, R., (Eds.) *Victimation et insécurité en Europe. Un bilan des enquêtes et de leurs usages* (pp 127-146). Paris : L'Harmattan.

Sacchini, G. (2008). *Comparing Police data and Victimisation survey in Italy*. Paper presented at the CRIMPREV WP 7 Seminar on Studies comparing crime data based on general population surveys with criminal statistics. Barcelona, Spain. 11-13 September 2008.

#### **LUXEMBOURG**

Michaels, T. (2007). *Crime and Victimisation in Luxembourg: results of the European Crime and Safety Survey. Based on the data of the European International Crime Survey*. EU ICS Working Paper Series: Gallup Europe.

Police Grand-Ducale (2007). *Sentiment d' Insécurité au Luxembourg*. Presse release of 25 July 2007. Luxembourg : Sondage TNS IIRes.

#### **MALTA**

Azzopardi J. (June 2009). Personal communication.

#### **THE NETHERLANDS**

B&A Group/Intomart (2003). *Police Monitor Population (2003); National Report*. The Hague/Hilversum: B&A groep/Intomart.

Huls, F. (June 2009). Personal communication.

Pauwels, L. & Pleysier, S. (2007). *Crime Victim and Insecurity Surveys in Belgium and the Netherlands*. Paper presented at the CRIMPREV WP7 Workshop on Crime Victims and Insecurity Surveys. Barcelona, Spain, 15-17 March, 2007.

Pauwels, L. & Pleysier, S. (2008). Victimes de Délinquance et Insécurité: les enquêtes en Belgique et aux Pays-Bas in Zauberman, R., (Eds.) *Victimation et insécurité en Europe. Un bilan des enquêtes et de leurs usages* (pp 41-65). Paris : L'Harmattan.

Römkens, R. (1997) Prevalence of Wife Abuse in The Netherlands: Combining Quantitative and Qualitative Methods in Survey Research. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, Vol. 12, No. 1*, 99-125 (1997).

Van Dijk, J. J. M. van, & Steinmetz, C. H. D. (1980). *The RDC victim surveys 1974-1979*. The Hague: Ministry of Justice. Research and Documentation Centre, Ministry of Justice, 35.

Wittebrood, K. (2008). *Comparing Crime Data in The Netherlands*. Paper presented at the CRIMPREV WP 7 Seminar on Studies comparing crime data based on general population surveys with criminal statistics. Barcelona, Spain. 11-13 September 2008.

WODC (2006). *The Monitor Victims of Human Trafficking* (2006) Woerden & Utrecht (The Netherlands): Adviesbureau Van Montfoort and the Verwey-Jonker Instituut.

WODC (2008). *Monitor Crime in the Business Sector* (MCB) (2007). Management Summary 31 January 2008 (pp.274-290). Amsterdam: WODC.

## **POLAND**

Siemaszko, A. (2009). Personal communication.

## **PORTUGAL**

Recasens i Brunet, A (2008). Les enquêtes de victimation en Péninsule Ibérique. In Zauberman, R., (Eds.) *Victimation et insécurité en Europe. Un bilan des enquêtes et de leurs usages* (pp. 147-164) Paris: L'Harmattan.

## **ROMANIA**

Istrate G. (June 2009). Personal communication.

## **SPAIN**

Defensor del Pueblo (2007). *Violencia escolar: el maltrato entre iguales en la Educación secundaria obligatoria 1999-2006*. Madrid: Defensor del Pueblo.

Garrido, V., Stangeland, P. y Redondo, S. (2001). *Principios de criminología*. 2ª edición. Valencia: Tirant lo Blanch.

Generalitat de Catalunya - Departament de Justícia i Interior (2002). *Encuesta de Seguridad Pública de Cataluña*. Barcelona: Departament de Justícia i Interior, Generalitat de Catalunya.

García España, E., Pérez Jiménez, F., Benítez Jiménez, M.J. (2007). La delincuencia en Córdoba, Huelva y Sevilla: Una encuesta de victimización. Málaga: Instituto Andaluz Interuniversitario de Criminología / Cajasol.

García España, E., Pérez Jiménez, F., Benítez Jiménez M.J. (2008). La delincuencia en las capitales andaluzas: Encuestas de victimización en Andalucía – Especial referencia a Almería, Cádiz, Granada y Jaén. Málaga: Instituto Andaluz Interuniversitario de Criminología / Cajasol.

Gondra Bustinza, J. (2008). Los sentimientos de inseguridad y miedo: El origen de una noción. *Revista Catalana de Seguretat Publica* 18: 93-104.

Instituto de la Mujer (1999, 2002, 2006). *Survey of Domestic Violence against Women*, Madrid, Instituto de la Mujer.

Meil, G. (2005). Social Surveys on Domestic Violence Against Women in Spain. *Statistical Journal of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe*, 22(3-4): 279–287.

Raldúa Martín, E.V. (1996). Cambios en la imagen pública de la policía (1980-1995) y situación actual. *Revista Española de Investigaciones Sociológicas* 74: 327-341.

Recasens i Brunet, A. (2008). Les enquêtes de victimation en Péninsule Ibérique. In Zauberman, R. (Eds.). *Victimation et insécurité en Europe. Un bilan des enquêtes et de leurs usages* (pp. 147-164) Paris: L'Harmattan.

Robert, Ph. (2005). Audit sur les enquêtes de Victimisation en Catalogne. Centre d'Estudis de Seguretat. Secretaria de Seguretat Publica. Departament d'Interior Generalitat de Catalunya.

## **SWEDEN**

BRA – The Swedish National Council for Crime Prevention (2008). *The Swedish Crime Survey 2007. Victimization, Fear of crime and Public Confidence in the criminal Justice System*. Stockholm: The Swedish National Council for Crime Prevention (Brå).

Lundgren, E., Heimer, G., Westerstrand, J. & Kalliokoski, A. (2002). *Captured Queen: Men's Violence Against Women in "equal" Sweden- a prevalence study*. Stockholm, Sweden: Fritzes Offentliga Publikationer. 2002.

Töyrä, A. (2008). The New Swedish Crime Survey-Aim, Contents and Results in Aromaa, K. & Heiskanene, M. (eds.), *Victimization Survey in comparative Perspective Papers from the Stockholm Criminology Symposium 2007* (pp.85-99). Helsinki: HEUNI.

## **UNITED KINGDOM**

Bottoms, A.E., Mawby R.I. & Walker, M.A. (1987). A Localised Crime Survey in Contrasting Areas of a City. *British Journal of Criminology* 27(2): 125-154.

Ditton, J. & Farrall, S. (Eds.) (2000). *The Fear of Crime*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Farrington, D.P. & Dowds, E.A. (1985). Disentangling Criminal Behaviour and Police Reaction. In Farrington, D.P. & Gunn, J. (Eds.). *Reaction to Crime: The Public, the Police, Courts and Prisons* (pp. 41-72). Chichester: John Wiley.

Fitzgerald, M., Hough, M., Joseph, I. & Qureshi T. (2002). *Policing for London*. Collumpton: Willan Publishing.

Flood Page, C., Campbell, S., Harrington, V. & Miller, J. (2000). *Youth Crime: Findings from the 1998/99 Youth Lifestyles Survey*. Home Office Research Study 209. London: Home Office.

Hough, M. & Norris, P. (2008): *Comparisons between survey estimates of crime and crimes recorded by the police: the UK position*. Paper presented at the CRIMPREV WP 7 Seminar on Studies comparing crime data based on general population surveys with criminal statistics. Barcelona, Spain. 11-13 September 2008.

Jones, T., MacLean, B. & Young, J. (1986). *The Islington Crime Survey: Crime, Victimization and Policing in Inner-City London*. Aldershot: Gower.

Kinsey, R (1984). *Merseyside Crime Survey: First Report*. Liverpool: Merseyside Metropolitan Council.

Northern Ireland Statistics & Research Agency (2009). Northern Ireland Crime Survey. <http://www.csu.nisra.gov.uk/survey.asp62.htm> (consulted: 25 November 2009).

Statistics and Research Branch of the Northern Ireland Office (2009). The Northern Ireland Crime Survey Report. <http://www.nio.gov.uk/index/statistics-research.htm/> (consulted: 25 November 2009).

Shury, J., Speed, M., Vivian, D., Kuechel, A. & Nicholas, S. (2005). Crime against retail and manufacturing premises: Findings from the 2002 Commercial Victimization Survey. Home Office Online Report 37/05. London: Home Office.

Smith, D.J. (1983). *Police and People in London: A Survey of Londoners*. London: Policy Studies Institute.

Walker, A. (2008). The British Crime Survey: the Experience of Measuring Crime over 25 years in Aromaa, K. & Heiskanene, M. (eds.), *Victimisation Survey in comparative Perspective. Papers from the Stockholm Criminology Symposium 2007* (pp.122-127). Helsinki: HEUNI.