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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 victimization surveys conducted in Europe and methods of interviewing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>1996 2005</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Pilot 2009</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>CAPI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>CASI PAPI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>1991 2005</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes 2001</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>1996 2005</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes 2004 2006</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1994 2000</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>1995, 1998, 2000</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>CAPI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>1996/7, 2000, 2005</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>PAPI CAPI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>1989 1992 1996 2000 2004</td>
<td>No No No No Yes</td>
<td>No Yes</td>
<td>2004 No No No No 2009 No</td>
<td>No No No</td>
<td>PAPI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>2000 2004</td>
<td>Yes No Yes 1991 1992 1994</td>
<td>Yes No No No No 2009 Yes</td>
<td>Yes CAPI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>1992 1997</td>
<td>No No No Yes No No No No No No 2009 Yes</td>
<td>Yes CAPI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>1992 1996 2001</td>
<td>No No No No No No No No No 2009 Yes</td>
<td>Yes CAPI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain (National Level)</td>
<td>1989 2005</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1999 2002</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>CAPI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalonia (Spain)</td>
<td>1996 2000</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Survey on Public Security in Catalonia (annual since 1999)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>CAPI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK: England &amp; Wales</td>
<td>Pilot ICVS-2 2009</td>
<td>with monthly interviews, since 2001 in England and Wales, see below</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>British Crime Survey (continuous since 2001)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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. 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.
Belgium did not conduct a pilot study on the EU victimisation survey module in 2008/9.

**Bulgaria (България [Bălgarija])**

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 was also used for surveys conducted in 2005, 2007, 2008, and 2009. More details are provided in the table below.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Sample type</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Questionnaire</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>random two stage cluster sample, representative of the GP 15+</td>
<td>N=1615</td>
<td>CSD and Vitosha Research</td>
<td>ICVS</td>
<td>Face to face, in home interview, paper and pencil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Idem</td>
<td>N=1101</td>
<td>Idem (EU ICS)</td>
<td>Idem</td>
<td>Idem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Idem</td>
<td>N=1202</td>
<td>Idem</td>
<td>Idem</td>
<td>Idem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Idem</td>
<td>N=2463</td>
<td>Idem</td>
<td>Idem</td>
<td>Idem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Idem</td>
<td>N=2499</td>
<td>Idem</td>
<td>Idem</td>
<td>Idem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Idem</td>
<td>N=2500</td>
<td>Idem</td>
<td>Idem</td>
<td>Idem</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


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 victimization 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.

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

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.

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 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 "Victimization 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 victimization surveys were conducted with the support of the Ministry of Interior. The first three ones were financed by the research project “Continual Research of Victimization and Feeling of Security of Citizens (2000 - 2002) - Grant of The Ministry of the Interior of the Czech Republic”. Researches of this project (2000-2002) were conducted by the Department of Sociology of Charles University with representative samples at the national level; in 2000 (1386 respondents), 2001 (1418 respondents), 2002 (1259 respondents). The fourth survey was supported by the project of the Ministry of the Interior of the Czech Republic “Continual Research of Victimization and Feeling of Security of Citizens” (Grant OBP-136-4/OK - 2003). 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 also conducted a pilot study on the EU victimisation survey module in 2008/9. The Czech Statistical Office has the responsibility for the realization of the pilot study, while the Institute of Criminology and Social Prevention provides scientific expertise.
**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.

Since 2005, Denmark also has an annual victimisation survey. The project started with two national victimisation surveys in 1995 and 1996. The questionnaire was not based on the ICVS questionnaire, but included some comparable questions. The survey was placed under the responsibility of the National Police. The University of Copenhagen provided expertise, and Statistics Denmark conducted the interviews by using CATI-methodology. In 2005, this victimisation survey was done again using the same questionnaire. Since then, it has been conducted every year and will continue to be conducted annually.

Since the first survey in 1995, the sample size is around 12.000 persons yearly and the response rate is around 65 %. The sample is representative at the national level and is obtained using national registers for choosing a random and representative sample. The survey is conducted using the CATI methodology. 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 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 [Source: Schütt et al. (2008). Dating violence in Denmark. English Summary. Copenhagen: National Institute of Public Health. http://www.Si-folkesundhed.Dk/upload/english_summary-dating_violence_in_denmark.Pdf]

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

**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 victimization 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 victimization 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 victimization 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 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: Victimisation and Insecurity Surveys in Germany according to the review of Obergfell-Fuchs (2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Territorial Scope</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Publication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Stephan</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>local: Stuttgart</td>
<td>general</td>
<td>Stephan 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Schwind</td>
<td>1973/74</td>
<td>local: Goettingen</td>
<td>general</td>
<td>Schwind et al. 1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Kreuzer et al.</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>no area specified</td>
<td>university students</td>
<td>Kreuzer et al. 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Plate et al.</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>local: Solingen</td>
<td>general</td>
<td>Plate et al. 1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Kury</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>national: 1st ICVS</td>
<td>general</td>
<td>Kury 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Aben</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>local: Luebeck</td>
<td>general</td>
<td>Aben 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Territorial Scope</td>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>Publication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Wetzels et al.</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>national: East and West Germany</td>
<td>general</td>
<td>Wetzels et al. 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Schwind et al.</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>local: Bochum</td>
<td>students 6–21y</td>
<td>Schwind et al. 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Heinz et al.</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>national</td>
<td>general</td>
<td>Schnell &amp; Kreuter 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Kury et al.</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>local: Reutlingen</td>
<td>general</td>
<td>Kury et al. 1999a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Kury et al.</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>local: Metzingen</td>
<td>general</td>
<td>Kury et al. 1999b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Territorial Scope</td>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>Publication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Oberwittler et al.</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>local: Freiburg, Cologne</td>
<td>students 13–17y</td>
<td>Oberwittler et al. 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Sessar et al.</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>local/supranational: Hamburg, Amsterdam, Budapest, Cracow, Vienna</td>
<td>general</td>
<td>Sessar 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Dreher et al.</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>local: Rottweil</td>
<td>general</td>
<td>Dreher et al. 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Müller, Schrödtle</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>national</td>
<td>women</td>
<td>Bundesministerium für Familie, Senio-ren, Frauen und Jugend 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Felted, Goldberg</td>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td>local: Bochum</td>
<td>students 11–17y</td>
<td>Felted &amp; Goldberg 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Territorial Scope</td>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>Publication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

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

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 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.

According to the Irish National Crime Council (2009): “In 1996, the Garda Research Unit commissioned the Economic and Social Research Institute (ESRI) to conduct a survey on ‘Victims of Recorded Crime in Ireland’ which drew on Garda records from November 1994 to October 1995. The results of this are published in Watson, D. (2000) *Victims of Recorded Crime in Ireland: Results from the 1996 Survey*. ESRI/ Oak Tree Press. 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 did not conduct a pilot study on the EU victimisation survey module in 2008/9.
**Greece (Ελλάδα)**

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

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. At the moment of the publication of the international results, the survey was still going on.

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.

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

Spain conducted the Violence Against Women Macro-Survey in 1999 and 2002. In 2002 the sample size was 20,552 females and the response rate 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 urbanization. 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, Sobdirección de Cooperación y estudios.
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. In 1994 and 2005, the survey was conducted in Malaga. In 2006, it was conducted in Cordoba, Huelva, and Sevilla. A survey conducted in Sevilla in 2003 remained unpublished.

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

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). 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.

**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, Justice Department.

In the city of Barcelona, a victimization 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 is also conducting a pilot study on the EU victimisation survey module in 2009, with a sample size of 1,200 households, of which 700 through telephone interview (CATI) and 500 through face to face interviews (CAPI).
France (France)

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

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. victimization 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).

The country 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 organized 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, 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 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 Dutch Ministry of Justice.

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 victimization with the support of the Ministry of the Interior. It involved a sample of 2,024 people (minimum age: 16) and over and it has been used mainly for international comparative purposes.

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. Together with the DOXA, the same institute realized a national survey with a sample of 6,291 individuals older than 15.

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. Currently, ISTAT is planning a survey on foreign people and their integration and quality of life in Italy, which will contain a module on victimization 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 2008/9.

Cyprus (Κύπρος [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 1000 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. For the exercise, the CAPI method will be used for sections A-F. Section G will be conducted using self-completion: either the Computer-Assisted Self-Interview (CASI) method will be used or, if the respondent does not wish to use this method (either because s/he is not familiar with, or does not feel comfortable using a computer), s/he will be given the option to fill out a paper questionnaire, i.e. the Paper And Pencil Interview (PAPI) method will be used.

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 is also conducting 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 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.

Unfortunately, even if Lithuania participated in the ICVS7EU ICS in 2005, data arrived after the final deadline and therefore the country is not included in the main publications about the survey.

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.

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 simple 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.

Hungary also conducted a pilot study on the EU victimisation survey module in 2008/9. The Target population is individuals aged 18 and over, living in private households, and the gross sample size is 1,100 persons. Mode of interviews is paper-pencil.

Malta (Malta)

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

Malta did not conduct a pilot study on the EU victimisation survey module in 2008/9.
**Netherlands (Nederland)**

The Netherlands participated in the ICVS in 1989, 1992, 1996 and 2000. The country used national representative sample of 2,000, 2,000, 2,008 and 2,001 households with a response rate of 65%, 66%, 63%, and 58% respectively, and CATI methodology. The Netherlands also participated in the 2005 EU ICS with a national representative sample of 2,010 households and a 46% response rate. 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 victimization 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 victimization surveys since 1980. These surveys are based on random samples taken from private households; they include questions on victimization 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 (POLLS - *Permanent Onderzoek Leefomstandigheden*) 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 POLLS 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 (BCS). 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 to 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 between 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 and 1997 (among immigrants only) and is currently (2009) being conducted again.

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 a sample of 1,000 interviews conducted face to face.

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.

Austria also conducted a pilot study on the EU victimisation survey module in 2008/9. A total of 2,725 interviews have been conducted; 1,225 interviews using CAPI methodology and 1,500 using CATI methodology.
**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, Chair of Criminology. It was financed by a grant of the Ministry of Science and Informatics in Poland.

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 with a national representative sample of 2000 households and a 56% response rate.

The country also participated in the 2004 EU ICS with a national representative sample of 2,011 households and a 43% response rate.

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.

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 Naţional de Statistică, INS) conducted annually the multipurpose Living Conditions Survey (Condiţiile de viaţă ale populaţiei 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 calităţii vieţii, 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 sănătăţii, 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 workplace 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 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.

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.

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.

Slovakia also conducted a pilot study on the EU victimisation survey module in 2008/9. The pilot exercises is conducted by the Statistical Office of the Slovak Republic (SO SR).

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 victimization survey called the Finnish National Safety Survey. Victimizations 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 organized other crime against businesses survey.

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 urbanization. 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 Condition 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. 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 Centralbyrå), 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%.

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 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 Interviews (CAPI) and Computer Aided 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 the Heuni Report (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). According to Hough and Norris (2008), the survey began in the mid 1990s. A series of ad hoc crime surveys were conducted in 1994/95, 1998, 2001 and 2003/4. All these surveys had achieved sample sizes of just over 3,000 and were conducted using CAPI and CASI. The questionnaire used for NICS was closely modelled on that used for the BCS but the smaller sample size meant that it was not possible to split the sample to cover as wide a range of topics as 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.

The country also conducts the Scottish Crime Survey. According to Hough and Norris (2008), the first independent SCS was conducted in 1993 (a year later than the 1992 BCS due to delays associated with the development of the survey). Although similar to the 1992 British
Crime Survey questionnaire, the 1993 SCS included several differences aimed at reflecting the differing context associated with the Scottish criminal justice system. The SCS sampling strategy and questionnaire design remained little altered for the 1996, 2000, and 2003 SCS.

The 2004 SCS involved two separate surveys, a large sample telephone survey and a smaller face-to-face calibration survey, using CAPI and CASI methodology. The last SCS was conducted in 2006. The Scottish Government has now redesigned the survey and re-launched it as the Scottish Crime and Justice Survey. The SCJS follows the BCS and NICS in moving to a continuous collection methodology and will also see an increase in sample size to a proposed level of 16,000. The questionnaire is similar to that of the BCS but by no means identical. The Scottish Crime and Justice Survey is being conducted in 2008-9 and new improvements are being prepared for the 2009-10 sweep.
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**

The International Crime Victims Survey became operational in 1989. The main object was to seek advancement in international comparative criminological research, beyond the constraints of officially recorded crime data. The International Crime Victim Surveys (ICVS) provide information on crime and victimization through a standard questionnaire, the results of which are internationally comparable. To ensure this, all aspects of the methodology have been standardized to the maximum possible extent.

The ICVS is the most comprehensive instrument developed yet to monitor and study volume crimes, perception of crime and attitudes towards the criminal justice system in a comparative, international perspective. The data are from surveys amongst the general public and therefore not influenced by political or ideological agendas of governments of individual countries. Standardisation of questionnaires used and other aspects of data collection assure that data can, within confidence margins, be reliably compared across countries. Independent reviews have attested to the comparability of ICVS results.

The first round of international surveys was done 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 (Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing) technique. That year pilot studies were also done in Indonesia (Jakarta) and Poland (Warsaw). UNICRI (United Nations Interregional Crime and Justice Research Institute) became involved in 1991 with the aim of providing a wider geographical coverage to the project to include countries where telephone interviewing was not possible. A specific face-to-face methodology was developed for this purpose and to increase comparability it was agreed that face-to-face surveys would be mainly conducted in the capital (or largest) cities in participating countries. Pilot studies were carried out to test the comparability of results obtained with the two different methods.

The second round of surveys took place in 1992 with a total of 33 participating countries, including 20 done by the face-to-face technique. The third round of surveys was done in 1996 in 48 countries (36 face-to-face). The fourth round of surveys was done in 2000 with a total of 48 participating countries again, including 30 face-to-face.

The 2004–2005 sweep of surveys was carried out in 30 countries and 33 capital or main cities and compares results with those of earlier sweeps. A large portion of the latest data in this sweep comes from the European Survey on Crime and Safety (EU ICS), organised by a consortium lead by Gallup Europe, co-financed by the European Commission’s Directorate General for Research and Technology Development. To date, over 140 surveys have been done in over 70 different countries.
In each country a sample of approximately 2,000 respondents is interviewed either by telephone (CATI method) or face-to-face. Sample sizes in the ICVS are 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 variables, while caution should be used in looking at issues about which a small proportion of the sample would provide information.

Most countries using the CATI method draw national samples, while the face-to-face method is used in urban areas, usually the capital city, of countries where telephone penetration is not sufficient to carry out telephone surveys.

The standard questionnaire has been translated in the languages of all participating countries. The ICVS deals with thirteen types of crime.

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, in some countries where the interviews were conducted by telephone rates were as low as 40%, while in many face-to-face countries more than 90% of the contacted households accepted being interviewed.

Source:
Jan van Dijk, John van Kesteren, Paul Smit (2007): Criminal Victimisation in International Perspective: Key findings from the 2004-2005 ICVS and EU ICS

**EU ICS**

The European Crime and Safety Survey (EU ICS, which corresponds to the abbreviation of EU International Crime Survey) is carrying on the traditions of the International Crime Victim Survey (ICVS) which was initiated in 1987 by a group of European criminologists with expertise in national crime surveys (Van Dijk, Mayhew, Killias, 1990). The survey was set up with the purpose of producing estimates of victimisation that can be used for comparative purposes. The survey has evolved into the world’s premier program of fully standardised surveys looking at householders’ experience of common crime in different countries. There have so far been four main rounds of the ICVS. After the first round in 1989 the surveys were repeated in 1992, 1996 and 2000. The 2005 EU ICS carries on the main trends of the earlier ICVS sweeps. ICVS has to date been carried out once or more in over 75 countries across the world, coordinated by the United Nations Interregional Criminal Justice Research Institute (UNICRI) in Turin, Italy.

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 old Member States of the EU, and the consortium committed to include at least three of the newly acceded members (Poland, Estonia and Hungary).

The EU ICS is similar to most crime surveys of householders with respect to the types of crime it covers. EU ICS inherited its core questions from ICVS. It is 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 collects information on nonconventional crimes such as petty corruption (bribe-seeking by public officials) and consumer fraud.

Most EU ICS interviews have been carried out with CATI telephone methodology. Telephone surveys have, from the outset, been widely implemented during the ICVS rounds especially in the more industrialised countries with high telephone penetration rates (above 70 percent).

Interviews were carried out via fixed (landline) telephones, with the exception of Finland where a sub-sample was interviewed via mobile phones. The average duration of the interview was 23.2 minutes.

The CATI technique has evolved over the years. Twelve of the countries were surveyed using an Internet-based CATI server that made the questionnaire available in many languages from a single location. The use of this technique makes the interviewing process more flexible and efficient.

Included in the report are results from surveys conducted in Poland and Estonia where the interviews were carried out face to face in the respondent’s home.

Source:

---

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 victimization, 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 finalized 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 victimization 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) 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 was 65% on average.

Source:
**Eurobarometer**

The standard Eurobarometer was established in 1973. Reports are published twice yearly. The survey mentioned in this review and described hereafter is the one conducted in 1996.

The Eurobarometer covers the population of the respective member countries, aged 15 years and over, resident in each of the member states. The basic sample design applied in all member states is a multi-stage, random (probability) one. In each EU country a number of sampling points was drawn, 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 was drawn randomly. Further addresses were selected at every Nth address by standard random walk methods. In each household, the respondent was selected at random. All interviews were face-to-face in people's homes and in their national language. The data of all countries were weighted for gender, age and region. EU averages were calculated on the basis of Eurostat population figures.

In total 16,235 persons were interviewed. In most countries the sample size was 1,000, 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). National samples of 1,000 are rather small for the measurement of rare events such as personal victimisations in the larger EU countries. The budget available for the pilot study did not allow for larger samples. The questions on actual victimisation differed from those used in the ICVS. The resulting rates are likely to be somewhat inflated.

The questions on fear of crime included in the Standard Eurobarometer nº 44.3 (1996) were also included in the Standard Eurobarometer nº 54 (Autumn 2000) and the Standard Eurobarometer nº 58 (Autumn 2002). The questions were the following:

- 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 Eurobarometer nº 58 (Autumn 2002) included also the following questions on public safety:

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

Source:

**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 ay 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:

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:
**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.

**Source:**


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: (Sample size)

- 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; these were: (Sampling procedure)

- 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:
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 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:

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).


   • 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
       • Lithuania
       • Slovenia
     - Two countries are currently using it as their National Crime Survey
       • Bulgaria
       • Estonia

2) ICVS-2 International Crime Victims 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)
    - Finland (Finnish National Survey, periodical since 1980)
    - France (Living conditions of Houseld 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)
    - 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
      – Greece (2003)
      – Poland (2004)

8) National Violence Against Women Surveys
   • 6 countries have conducted such surveys
      – Finland (1997 and 2005)
      – France (2000)
      – Italy (2006)
      – 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)
      – Italy (1994)
      – Lithuania (2000)
      – The Netherlands (1994)
      – Romania (2000)

10) National Business Surveys
    • 4 countries have conducted such surveys
– 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
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