



UNODC
United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime

A Standardized Victimization Survey Questionnaire

Salomé Flores
May 2016



Center of Excellence in
**STATISTICAL INFORMATION ON GOVERNMENT,
CRIME, VICTIMIZATION AND JUSTICE**

Victimization surveys in the region (LAC)

- **79% countries in the LAC region** have had at least one study related to victimization and perception of safety.
- **30%** have conducted the study with support from an international donor.
- **58%** have had a victimization survey or a module with national level or urban-national level coverage.
- **51%** involve the National Statistical Offices.
- **55%** of surveys were conducted only once.
- Currently **only 3 countries** have institutionalized victimization surveys. These are conducted annually (Mexico, Chile and Colombia).

Iniciativa para la Encuesta de Victimización Delictiva en Latinoamérica y el Caribe (VICLAC) - Latin American and the Caribbean Crime Victimization Survey Initiative (LACSI)

- Proposes: a Regional Victimization Questionnaire
- Emerges from: the need of developing a common questionnaire and methodology;
- Enhances: the implementation and comparability of victimization surveys in Latin America and the Caribbean;
- Is the result of: 2 years of discussions amongst 12 countries: Argentina, Belize, Chile, Costa Rica, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Mexico, Panama and Peru, with the support and constant participation of UNODC, IADB, UNDP, OAS and the Cisalva Institute.
- Obtains: Reliable and comparable data
- Explores: 11 nuclear crimes and 7 non-nuclear crimes;

Crimes explored

VICLAC-LACSI (core)

Vehicle/truck/pick-up theft	✓
Car parts theft	✓
Motorbike theft	✓
Burglary / housebreaking	✓
Robbery	✓
Theft (larceny)	✓
Bank fraud	✓
Consumer fraud	✓
Assault	✓
Threats	✓
Extortion	✓

VICLAC-LACSI (non core)

Theft of the objects from inside the vehicle	✓
Bicycle theft	✓
Vandalism	✓
Homicide	✓
Kidnapping	✓
Illegal possession of firearms	✓
Corruption (active and passive bribery)	✓

Indicators

VICLAC-LACSI (nuclear)

<u>crime prevalence</u>	✓
<u>crime incidence</u>	✓
<u>dark figure</u>	✓
<u>perceptions on safety</u>	✓

VICLAC-LACSI (annex)

Fear of crime	✓
Perceptions about Institutional Performance	✓
Cost of crime	✓
Antisocial behaviors	✓

Implementation of VICLAC-LACSI in the region

- Comparable with Chile, Colombia & Mexico
- Peru (pilot test in June 2016)
- Panama (July 2016)
- Argentina (2017)
- Guatemala (2016-2017)
- Dominican Republic (review of current module)
- El Salvador
- Honduras
- Costa Rica



Support provided by the UNODC INEGI CoE

- Training
 - Online
 - Onsite
- Technical Assistance
 - During the different phases of the survey process



UNODC

United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime



Center of Excellence in

**STATISTICAL INFORMATION ON GOVERNMENT,
CRIME, VICTIMIZATION AND JUSTICE**

Thank you!



For more information:

salome.flores@unodc.org

<http://www.cdeunodc.inegi.org.mx>

<http://www.unodc.org/>



Centro de Excelencia (UNODC-INEGI)



@Cde_UNODC

Encuesta Nacional de Victimización y Percepción de Seguridad Ciudadana (ENVIP)

- Reference period: July 2015- June 2016 (past 12 months)
- Sample design: Probabilistic: Multi-staged, Stratified and Clustered
- Sample unit: Selected households, household residents and the household selected informant.
- Target population: 18 years and older
- National Sample Size: 16, 296 households
- Data collection: 3-31 July 2016
- Geographic scope: National level, Urban-National, Urban-Province, Urban- Panama District and Urban-*San Miguelito* District.

A. Incidence

➤ **VICLAC-LACSI:**

Explores *the last incident* of each crime.

➤ **ENVIP:**

Explores the *last 3 incidents*, starting from the most recent one (it worked really well in the pilot).

- Provides more substantial information about the characteristics of the occurrence of a crime (trends);
- More importantly: a more precise dark figure.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is proven that if an informant has suffered a crime more than once in the last 12 months, it is less probable that he/she reports to the police the last incident. If only the last incident is explored, the dark figure will be overestimated.

B. Household selection criteria

ENVIP's paper questionnaires (PAPI) lacked a methodology for the household selection (if there were more than 1 in the dwelling), so the following steps were established:

1. The total number of residents in the selected dwelling must be identified.
2. The total number of households within the dwelling must be identified.
3. A list must be made with the names of the heads of each household, as provided by the informant.
4. These names then must be arranged alphabetically.
5. Based on a "random number table", the household should be selected.

RECOMMENDATION:

Implement a household selection criteria similar to ENVIP's in the VICLAC-LACSI questionnaire, giving that the latter lacks one.

C. Questions about reporting to the police

1. A combo was created (3 questions in 1) in order to ask about:
 - to **which competent authority** did the informant report the incident;
 - the **level of satisfaction** while reporting the incident;
 - **reasons** of dissatisfaction (if it applies).

Benefits of the combo:

- ✓ The recording of information is easier (less repetitive)
- ✓ Allows only to investigate authorities who are empowered to investigate an incident.

C. Questions about reporting to the police (cont.)

2. A verification question on the status of the report to the police was added:
 - inquires if the informant signed a document where the informant explained the way in which the incident occurred.

Benefit of this question:

- ✓ Identifies if the report to the police derived in an investigation of the crime incident.

****The Criminal Justice System (prosecution) of the country must be analyzed before using this question in any other country.**

D. Minor modifications

1. Phrasing of the question about crime fear (perception of public security section)

- In the question about habit changes, the phrase “*Have you stopped...*” was added in each response category.

Why? In the pilot was observed that the previous phrasing altered the comprehension of the question and confused the informant.

RECOMMENDATION:

Rephrase the question and add this specification in each response category in the LACSI questionnaire.

D. Minor modifications (cont.)

2. Creation of a combo (4 questions in 1) for public security authorities perception

- **Knowledge of authorities, *effectiveness*, *trustworthiness* and *corruption*** were put together in a combo question to:
 - ✓ Avoid repeating all response categories; and
 - ✓ Evaluate only institutions that the informant reported having knowledge of.

RECOMMENDATION:

Incorporate **trustworthiness** and **corruption**, as it provides a broader picture about the perception of the performance of the authorities.

D. Minor modifications (cont.)

3. Phrasing of crime screening questions

- In each crime screening question the reference period phrase “...this is, between July 2013 and June 2016...” was left out.
 - ✓ In the pilot, it was observed that the questions tend to be very long, so they bored and distracted the informant.
 - ✓ So, the phrase was put at the beginning of the section as a heading and it is repeated **three (3) more times** along the section to reinforce the reference period.

RECOMMENDATION:

Replicate this adjustment in the VICLAC-LACSI questionnaire.

The pilot proved that repeating the phrase after 4 or 5 screening questions, helped the informant retain the reference period in his/her mind, and the interview became more fluent.