



Juristat

Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics



Statistics Canada – Catalogue no. 85-002-XPE Vol. 22 no. 4

CRIMINAL VICTIMIZATION: AN INTERNATIONAL PERSPECTIVE

Results of the 2000 International Crime Victimization Survey

by Sandra Besserer

Highlights

- On average for 13 of the industrialized countries that participated in the 2000 International Crime Victimization Survey (ICVS), 22% of the population aged 16 and older in those countries were victims of at least one of 11 offences in the previous year. Canada's figure was near the average, at 24%.
- Between 1996, the last time the ICVS was conducted, and 2000, victimization rates were fairly stable. Of the ten countries that participated in both survey cycles, six, including Canada, did not experience any significant change in victimization rates. The remaining four countries experienced a decrease in their overall victimization rate.
- Of the 11 crimes measured by the ICVS, the most prevalent in 2000 was car vandalism. On average for the 13 countries, 7% of the population was a victim of this crime. The next most common crime was theft from car, at 5%.
- On average for the 11 crimes, just over one-half of incidents were reported to police in 2000. The figures ranged from a high of 65% for Scotland to a low of 39% for Japan, with Canada's figure near the lower end at 49%. Many incidents were not reported because the victim did not believe they were serious.
- In 2000, a majority of people in each of the 13 countries felt very or fairly safe when walking alone in their area after dark. Figures were highest for Sweden (85% of the population), followed by Canada (83%) and the United States (83%). People in Australia and Poland were least likely to feel safe (64% for each). In four countries, including Canada, there has been an increase in the proportion of the population that feels safe when walking alone at night.
- Satisfaction with police performance is quite high, particularly in the United States and Canada. In 2000, 89% of Americans and 87% of Canadians felt that the police were doing a very or fairly good job at controlling crime in their area, the highest figures among the 13 countries. Canadians and Americans were also most likely to believe that police do everything they can to help people and be of service.
- When asked to decide on a sentence for a burglar convicted for a second time, the majority of people in eight countries, including Canada, preferred a non-prison sanction. Leading the way were France, where 84% of the population preferred a non-prison sanction, and Finland with a figure of 79%. Canada's figure was 52%.
- Canadians do appear to have grown more punitive in their attitudes toward sentencing. In 1989, less than one-third (32%) of the population felt that prison would be an appropriate sentence for a recidivist burglar. This figure climbed to 39% in 1992, 43% in 1996 and 45% in 2000. People in seven other countries also appear to have become harsher in their attitudes.
- In 2000, a majority of households in 11 of the countries used at least one type of security measure, including: a burglar alarm, special door locks, special window/door grills, a dog, a high fence, a neighbourhood watch scheme or a caretaker/security guard. The one exception was Poland, where 40% of households used one of these devices.



Ordering and subscription information

All prices exclude sales tax

This product, Catalogue no. 85-002-XPE, is published as a standard printed publication at a price of CDN \$10.00 per issue and CDN \$93.00 for a one-year subscription.
ISSN 0715-271X

The following additional shipping charges apply for delivery outside Canada:

	Single issue	Annual subscription
United States	CDN \$ 6.00	CDN \$ 78.00
Other countries	CDN \$ 10.00	CDN \$ 130.00

This product is also available in electronic format on the Statistics Canada Internet site as Catalogue no. 85-002-XIE at a price of CDN \$8.00 per issue and CDN \$70.00 for a one-year subscription. To obtain single issues or to subscribe, visit our Web site at www.statcan.ca, and select Products and Services.
ISSN 1209-6393

May 2002

Published by authority of the Minister responsible for Statistics Canada.
© Minister of Industry, 2002

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise without prior written permission from Licence Services, Marketing Division, Statistics Canada, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada K1A 0T6.

Note of appreciation

Canada owes the success of its statistical system to a long-standing partnership between Statistics Canada, the citizens of Canada, its businesses and governments. Accurate and timely statistical information could not be produced without their continued cooperation and goodwill.

Standards of service to the public

Statistics Canada is committed to serving its clients in a prompt, reliable and courteous manner and in the official language of their choice. To this end, the agency has developed standards of service which its employees observe in serving its clients. To obtain a copy of these service standards, please contact your nearest Statistics Canada Regional Reference Centre.

The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements of American national Standard for Information Sciences – Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials, ANSI Z39.48 – 1984.



Introduction

In Canada, information on crime is obtained in two ways: through police-reported surveys such as the Uniform Crime Reporting Survey and through victim-reported surveys such as the 1999 General Social Survey on Victimization. Likewise in other countries, including the United States, the United Kingdom and others, there are both police-reported and victim-reported surveys. Unfortunately, the results of these surveys are very difficult to compare across countries because survey concepts, definitions, scope and methods are quite different from one survey to the next.

To provide comparable information on the nature and extent of crime around the world, the International Crime Victimization Survey (ICVS) was undertaken in 1989. This survey asks respondents for detailed information on 11 types of crime (see Box 1), including when, where and how often offences occurred over the previous five years; whether offences were reported to the police; and whether victimization experiences were considered serious. Participants are also asked for their opinions on public safety, policing and sentencing.

Since first being implemented in 1989, the ICVS has been conducted a total of four times. Other cycles were carried out in 1992, 1996 and, most recently, in 2000. Canada is among the 17 industrialized countries that participated in 2000 and Canada, England & Wales, Finland, Netherlands and the United States are the only five industrialized countries to have participated in all four cycles of the survey. The ICVS has also been conducted at the city-level in a number of non-industrialized countries, including about 20 such countries in 2000. Altogether, over 60 countries have participated at least once since 1989.

Through the use of a standard questionnaire, standard procedures in conducting the survey¹ and standard techniques for producing the results, the ICVS has been able to address many of the problems that arise in comparing data from various national sources. One drawback of the survey is that to keep costs down and encourage participation by as many countries as possible, sample sizes have been kept modest. The number of respondents per country is less than 6,000 and averages about 2,000. This means that the survey results are subject to fairly large sampling errors. Despite this shortcoming, the ICVS provides a unique opportunity to make international comparisons regarding experiences of crime and public opinion of justice issues. (See Methodology section for more detail on the ICVS.)

The purpose of this *Juristat* is to present the results of the 2000 ICVS and to make comparisons to the previous survey cycles. The majority of the analysis will focus on 13 of the 17 industrialized countries that participated, i.e. Canada, Australia, Belgium, England & Wales, Finland, France, Japan, Netherlands, Northern Ireland, Poland, Scotland, Sweden, and the United States. Catalonia (a region of Spain), Denmark and Portugal are being excluded because they have participated only once and thus no trend data are available. Switzerland is being excluded because some key information was not collected in 2000.

Prevalence of victimization

Rates for 2000

On average,² for the 17 industrialized countries that participated in the 2000 ICVS, 21% of people aged 16 and older were victims of at least one of the 11 offences in the previous year (Figure 1).³ The average for the 13 countries that are the focus of this *Juristat* was 22%. The one-year victimization rate ranged from 15% for Northern Ireland up to 30% for Australia. Canada's rate of 24% was in the upper third of the group of countries.

¹ There are some slight variations in survey procedures. For example, in 3 of the 13 countries that are the focus of this *Juristat*, interviews were conducted face-to-face rather than by telephone.

² This is a simple average over the 17 countries, with each country getting equal importance and not being weighted by its population size; all subsequent averages for any group of countries are calculated in the same way.

³ For ease of presentation, the one-year victimization rates for the 2000 ICVS will be referred to as if they pertained to the year 2000. In reality, the victimization incidents took place in 1999.

Box 1: Offence types

The ICVS captures information on 11 different offences. A number of criteria were used to select these offences, including: the offence has individuals as victims; the offence can be described in terms that respondents understand; and the offence has a similar meaning in all countries. In Canada, these 11 offences account for a fairly large proportion of incidents reported to police (roughly 55% of all *Criminal Code* incidents in 2000).

Crime categories used used in <i>Juristat</i>	ICVS Offences	Description
Violent	1. Robbery	Theft or attempted theft in which the perpetrator used or threatened to use force against the victim.
	2. Sexual assault	Forced sexual activity, an attempt at forced sexual activity, or unwanted sexual touching or grabbing. (Not asked of men, except in Canada and Australia.)
	3. Assault	An attack or threat of an attack.
Household burglary	4. Burglary ⁴	Illegal entry into the respondent's home.
	5. Attempted Burglary	Attempted illegal entry into the respondent's home.
Motor vehicle theft	6. Theft of car	Theft of a car, truck, or van belonging to a member of the household.
	7. Theft of motorcycle	Theft of a motorcycle, moped or scooter belonging to a member of the household.
Other theft	8. Theft of personal property	Theft of personal property such as money, credit cards, clothing, jewellery, a purse or a wallet. (Unlike robbery, the perpetrator does not confront the victim.)
	9. Theft from car	Theft of a car radio, car part (e.g. mirror or wheel), or something left in a car belonging to a household member.
	10. Theft of bicycle	Theft of a bicycle belonging to a member of the household.
Car vandalism	11. Car vandalism	Willful damage of a car, truck or van belonging to a household member.

⁴ In Canada, burglary is more commonly referred to as "break and enter".

In the previous five years, results of the 2000 ICVS indicate that on average for the 17 industrialized countries, one-half of the population was victimized. The figures ranged from 36% for Portugal up to 66% for Australia. Canada's figure was 54%. The rankings of the countries for the five-year rates were quite similar to those for the one-year rates.

Trends in rates

Trends in overall victimization for the 13 countries that are the focus of this *Juristat* are provided in Table 1. Looking at the results for 1996 and 2000, victimization rates appear to be fairly stable. Six of the 10 countries that participated in both cycles did not experience any significant⁵ change in their victimization rate. Canada is among this group. The four remaining countries (England & Wales, France, Netherlands, and Scotland) experienced a decrease in rates.


Over a longer time frame, beginning in 1989 when the survey was first conducted, there is no consistent pattern in the trend for victimization rates and many of the changes that occurred are not statistically significant. It does appear, however, that there is a downward trend in Canada, Poland and the U.S., while for Belgium and Sweden the trend is upward. Rates in Australia and Northern Ireland appear to be unchanged. As for the remaining countries, it is difficult to draw any conclusions about the direction of the trend — victimization rates have increased in one cycle, then decreased the next.

Between 1992 and 2000, the ICVS indicates that Canada's victimization rate decreased. In contrast, over a somewhat different time period (1993 to 1999), Canada's national victimization survey, the General Social Survey (GSS) on Victimization, shows that the rate of victimization was virtually unchanged. There could be a number of explanations for this difference. First, the time frames are different and the change is based on just two points in time. Over a longer time frame, the trends might be more alike. Second, the GSS covers a broader range of offences. In particular, the GSS measures all forms of vandalism, not just car vandalism. It also measures theft of all household property, an offence that is not fully covered by the ICVS. Third, the survey methodologies are quite different. For example, the GSS asks about incidents that occurred in the previous 12 months, whereas the ICVS asks about victimization during the previous year and the previous five years. (See Besserer and Trainor 2000 for more information on the 1999 GSS). Police reported data, which are available on a yearly basis, show a trend that is more consistent with the ICVS results. The Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) Survey indicates that Canada's crime rate has been falling since the early 1990's. In 2000, the crime rate declined 1%, the ninth consecutive yearly decrease.

⁵ Throughout this *Juristat*, the use of the term "significant" indicates there is statistical significance ($p \leq .1$).

Figure 1

Australia has the highest victimization rate, 2000¹



¹ Based on persons who were victims of at least one of 11 crime types in the previous year.
Source: International Crime Victimization Survey, 2000.

Rates by offence type

The most prevalent offence in 2000 was car vandalism. On average for the 13 countries, 7% of the population was victimized (Figure 2). The next most common crime was theft from car, at 5%. In 1996, the findings were similar; the most prevalent offence was car vandalism (average rate of 7% of population victimized), followed by theft from car (6%).⁶


Rates by country for the five offence groups are provided in Table 2. The results are fairly consistent with the overall rates of victimization. Australia, which had the highest overall rate, had relatively high rates for violent offences, household burglary and car vandalism. England & Wales, which had the second highest overall victimization rate, also had high rates for these three offence categories. Sweden had one of the highest rates for “other theft”, due primarily to its high rate of bicycle theft.

Offence seriousness

In 2000, victims of car theft were most likely to consider the crime serious. On average, for the 13 countries, 84% of car theft victims felt their most recent incident over the previous five years was very or fairly serious (Figure 3). Car theft led

Figure 2

Car vandalism the most prevalent offence, 2000¹



¹ Based on the average one-year victimization rate for 13 countries.
² Based on the percentage of women, since information not collected for men other than in Australia and Canada.
Source: International Crime Victimization Survey, 2000.

the way in 1996 as well, with a figure of 85%. In fact, in both 2000 and 1996, the same group of four offences were viewed as the most serious: car theft, burglary, robbery and motorcycle theft. All involve theft of property, although robbery is also a violent offence.


The other two violent offences, sexual assault and assault, were not viewed as seriously as the aforementioned crimes. The explanation for this appears to be related to the nature of these crimes. Both sexual assault and assault encompass a wide range of acts. For sexual assault, the range is from unwanted sexual touching, grabbing, kissing or fondling to forced sexual activity. For assault it can be anything from a threat of physical harm to an attack causing injury. The ICVS results indicate that the majority of sexual assaults and assaults involved the less serious forms of the crime and that victims did not view these forms as seriously, thus lowering the overall figure for seriousness. For example, for assaults involving threats alone, 65% were considered serious, whereas for assaults that involved force, 78% were considered serious, but as more than one-half of assaults involved threats alone, the overall figure for seriousness was 70%.

In 2000, the offences considered least serious by victims were car vandalism and theft from car. These findings were unchanged from 1996.

⁶ Figures for 1996 are based on 10 countries. They do not include Australia, Belgium or Japan, which did not participate.

Figure 3

Car theft victims most likely to view the offence as serious, 2000¹




¹ Based on percentage of victims who believed the most recent incident in the previous 5 years was very or fairly serious.

² Figures for sexual assault include female victims only.

Source: International Crime Victimization Survey, 2000.

Figure 4

Up to two-thirds of victimization incidents are reported to the police, 2000¹



¹ Based on the most recent incident in the previous 5 years. The figures are an average for the 11 crime types.

Source: International Crime Victimization Survey, 2000.

Reporting victimization to the police

Not all victimization incidents are reported to the police. According to the 2000 ICVS, an average of just over one-half (55%) of incidents were reported (Figure 4).⁷ Countries with the highest rates of reporting included Scotland, Netherlands and England & Wales, while Japan, Poland and Canada had the lowest rates.

In Canada, reporting to police declined in 2000, falling to an average of 49% of incidents from a figure of 55% in 1996. A similar result was obtained by the 1999 GSS, which found that reporting for eight crime types fell from 42% in 1993 to 37% in 1999.⁸ France also experienced a decline in reporting in 2000. The reverse was true for Finland, Netherlands, and Scotland. The remaining countries did not have any significant change in their reporting rate. Overall, for the group of 13 countries there was very little change in the average reporting rate or in the relative ranking of the countries.

Victimization surveys such as the ICVS reveal that some crime types are more likely than others to be reported to police. On average for the 13 countries, more than 9 in 10 car thefts were reported to police in 2000, compared with less than 2 in 10 sexual assaults (Figure 5). In addition to car theft, motorcycle theft and burglary also had high rates of reporting. These results are quite similar to what was found by the 1996 ICVS. There is also some consistency with the results from the 1999 GSS showing that in Canada, both motor vehicle theft and break and enter have relatively high rates of reporting in comparison to assault and sexual assault.

Reasons for reporting/not reporting

For five of the offences — theft from car, burglary, robbery, sexual assault and assault — respondents to the ICVS were asked why they did or did not report the incident.⁹ The reasons varied depending on the type of crime. For the three offences involving theft of property (theft from car, burglary and robbery) there were five reasons that were all fairly important: to recover property, for insurance reasons, because it should be reported, to catch the offender and to stop a reoccurrence (Table 3). The one exception was in the case of robbery, where “insurance” was mentioned infrequently. The reasons for reporting sexual assault and assault were also similar, with the most common being “to catch the offender” and “to stop a reoccurrence of the crime”. Another common reason for these two offences, mentioned in one-quarter of incidents, was “to get help”.


Regardless of crime type, the 2000 ICVS indicates that victims have similar reasons for not reporting crimes to the police. The top reason for all five offences was because the incident was “not serious” (Table 4). Again, results of the 1999 GSS

⁷ Victims were asked if they reported the last incident to the police. Last incidents include the most recent incident over the previous five years.

⁸ The eight crimes measured by the GSS are: robbery, sexual assault, assault, theft of personal property, break and enter, motor vehicle/parts theft, theft of household property and vandalism.

⁹ Only five offences were chosen in order to keep the length of the survey reasonable. One reason for choosing the five specific offences was to ensure there would be a large enough number of incidents to permit analysis.

Figure 5



¹ Based on the most recent incident in the previous 5 years. The figures are an average for 13 countries.
Source: International Crime Victimization Survey, 2000.

were quite similar. The most common reasons given for not reporting offences were “incident not important enough” and “police couldn’t do anything”.

Profile of violent victimization


Risk factors

The ICVS measures the incidence of three violent crimes: robbery, sexual assault, and assault.¹⁰ In order to examine risks of violent victimization using the ICVS data, it is necessary to look at victimization over the previous five years. Otherwise, the small sample sizes limit the scope of analysis that can be done. On average, for the 13 countries in 2000, 6% of women were victims of sexual assault in the previous 5 years. For the other two violent offences, men were at greater risk of being victimized. The five-year victimization rate for robbery was 4% for men and 2% for women, while for assault, it was 12% and 10%, respectively. In many individual countries, as well, there were significant differences in the rates for men and women, with men having higher rates of robbery and assault. In Canada, for example, the five-year rate for robbery was 4% for men and 2% for women, the same as the overall average for the 13 countries. These results are consistent with previous research. The 1999 GSS found that men are at higher risk than women of being victims of robbery and assault. Further, the GSS, which did ask men if they had been victims of sexual assault, showed that the risk of sexual assault is higher for women than it is for men.

The 2000 ICVS indicates that for each of the three violent offences, the risk of violent victimization decreases with age. For example, for the group of 13 countries, the 5-year rate of

victimization for assault averaged 21% for those 16 to 24 years of age, 14% for 25- to 44-year-olds, 8% for 45- to 64-year-olds and 3% for those aged 65 years and older (Figure 6). Within most countries this same pattern was evident: there was a decline in the risk of violent victimization as age increased. Again, these findings are similar to what has been found previously by both victimization and police-reported surveys. In particular, the 1999 GSS indicated that people aged 15 to 24 were 21 times more likely to be victims of violent crime than were people in the 65+ age group.

Figure 6



¹ Based on average victimization in 13 countries during the previous five years. Sexual assault figures include women only.
Source: International Crime Victimization Survey, 2000.

Incident characteristics¹¹

Results of the ICVS indicate that many victims of violent offences do not know the perpetrator, but this varies quite widely by country. In 2000, victims did not know the offender in 69% of robbery incidents, 48% of assaults and 45% of sexual assaults (based on the average for 13 countries) (Table 5). In Canada and the United States, the perpetrator was not as likely to be a stranger as in many of the other countries. For example, for sexual assault incidents, the perpetrator was least likely to be a stranger in the United States (28% of incidents) and Canada (29%) and most likely to be a stranger in Japan (73%) and Poland (58%). The ICVS findings for Canada are consistent with what is typically found by both police-reported and victim reported surveys. For example, the 1999 GSS shows that for incidents involving a single offender, the perpetrator was a stranger in 51% of robberies, 26% of assaults and 25% of sexual assaults.

¹⁰ Apart from Canada and Australia, men were not asked whether they have been victims of sexual assault. As a result, men are excluded from the analysis of sexual assault.

¹¹ Victims were asked to provide details on the most recent incident in the previous five years.

Weapons are rarely present in violent crime incidents. According to the 2000 ICVS, on average for the 13 countries, the accused had no weapon in 90% of sexual assaults, 75% of assaults, and 52% of robberies. When the 1999 GSS asked victims of the same three violent crimes about weapons, the results were similar, with the accused not having a weapon in 87% of sexual assaults, 69% of assaults, and 53% of robberies.

The 2000 ICVS asked victims of assault if they had been injured as a result of the incident. On average for the 13 countries, just over one-quarter of victims did suffer an injury. In Canada, the GSS indicates that in 1999, 18% of violent incidents resulted in physical injury to the victim. This included a figure of 22% for both assault and robbery.

A minority of violent crime victims (or their families) contact a specialized agency that helps victims of crime. The 2000 ICVS found that on average for the 13 countries, about one in ten people who were victims of a robbery or an assault contacted a victim's agency. The figure for sexual assault was higher, with one in four victims having contacted such an organization. These figures are based on victims who reported the incident to police. Victims who did not report the incident were not asked about victims' agencies. Many victims who did not use the services of a specialized agency believed that one would have been useful. On average for the 13 countries, 51% of sexual assault victims, 36% of assault victims and 32% of assault victims who did not use such an agency thought that one would have been useful.¹² The 1999 GSS asked all violent crime victims if they had contacted certain victim services, such as a crisis line, for help.¹³ The results indicate that the use of these services was limited, with contact or use of one the services having occurred in 8% of violent incidents.

Fear of crime

The 2000 ICVS asked respondents three questions related to fear of crime: fear of walking alone at night, fear of being home alone at night, and fear of a break-in. The results for these three questions indicate that most people feel safe.

In 2000, a majority of people in each of the 13 countries felt very or fairly safe when walking alone in their area after dark (Figure 7). The average for the group of countries was 77% of the population. At 85%, Sweden had the highest proportion of the population that felt safe when walking alone, followed closely by Canada (83%) and the United States (83%). People in Australia and Poland were least likely to feel safe. The 1999 GSS also indicated a high proportion (88%) of Canadians felt safe when walking alone in their area after dark.

The question regarding fear of walking alone at night has been on the ICVS since 1992. Since that time, it appears that there has been some improvement in people's feelings of safety. Out of the 13 countries, Canada, England & Wales, Scotland and the United States have seen an increase in the proportion of the population that feel safe when walking alone at night. For example, 78% of Canadians felt safe in 1992 compared to 83% in 2000. In contrast, Australia, which had the highest victimization rate in 2000, is the one country that has seen a decline, from 69% in 1992 to 64% in 2000. The remaining

countries have experienced little change. Between 1993 and 1999, the GSS also noted an increase in the proportion of Canadians feeling safe when walking alone in their neighbourhoods after dark.

For the first time in 2000, ICVS respondents were asked how safe they felt being home alone at night. The results indicate that the vast majority of people feel secure. For all but one of the countries, more than 9 in 10 persons felt fairly or very safe when home alone. The lowest figure, belonging to Poland, was 83%. The highest figure, of 96%, was observed in five countries, including Canada.

On average for the 13 countries, more than one-half of the population believe the chance of a break-in is unlikely. In 2000, the figure ranged from 43% for France up to 84% for Finland (Figure 8). Canada was above the average at 66%. A number of countries experienced an increase in their feelings of safety in 2000. In particular, in comparison to 1996, seven countries had a greater share of the population that believed a break-in was unlikely (Table 6). The only decrease occurred in Japan, while in Canada, there was no significant change. The improvement noted in 2000 was a reverse of what happened between 1989 and 1992 when six countries experienced a significant decline in feelings of safety associated with a break-in.

Overall, there is some consistency in feelings of safety among the 13 countries. In 2000, for the three questions related to fear of crime, the same six countries (Canada, Finland, Netherlands, Scotland, Sweden and the United States) ranked highest in terms of the percentage of the population that felt safe.

Previous research suggests that personal experiences with crime are related to fear (Skogan and Maxfield 1981). With few exceptions, this proved to be true within individual countries. In Canada, for example, people who had been victimized in the previous year were less likely than those who had not been victimized to feel safe when walking alone at night. The relationship between victimization and fear did not hold true at a country level: countries with relatively high rates of victimization did not necessarily have relatively high levels of fear. A correlation analysis of the 2000 ICVS results for victimization rates and the levels of fear among the 13 countries did not show any significant relationship.

Household security measures

Respondents to the ICVS were asked what security measures were used in their homes: a burglar alarm, special door locks, special window/door grills, a dog, a high fence, a neighbourhood watch scheme or a caretaker/security guard. In 2000, the majority of households in 11 of 12 countries used at least one of these devices (Figure 9).¹⁴ The one exception was


¹² This is based on victims who reported the incident to police, but did not contact a victim's agency.

¹³ The types of services were: crisis centre or crisis line, another counsellor, community centre/family centre, women's centre, men's centre/men's support group, seniors' centre.

¹⁴ Figures for Japan are not available.

Figure 7


The majority of people feel safe when walking alone at night, 2000¹



¹ Based on proportion of population that feel very or fairly safe when walking alone in their area after dark.
Source: International Crime Victimization Survey, 2000.

Figure 8

The majority of people believe the chance of a break-in is unlikely, 2000¹




¹ Based on proportion of population that feel chance of a break-in is unlikely.
Source: International Crime Victimization Survey, 2000.

Poland, where the figure was 40% of households. Perhaps, a lower standard of living in Poland is partly responsible for this finding.¹⁵ On average for the 12 countries, 72% of households used at least one of the devices. In 1996, the figure for 9 countries was 71%.¹⁶

The most commonly used device in 2000 was special door locks, used by an average of 50% of households in the 12 countries. Next most common was having a dog that would detect a burglar, at 25%. Burglar alarms were used by 17% of households on average. The use of burglar alarms appears to be related to past victimization experience. In 8 of the 12 countries, households that had been burglarized in the previous 5 years were more likely than those not burglarized to have a burglar alarm. For example, 26% of Canadian households that had been victims of a burglary had an alarm compared with 21% of non-victims.

Figure 9

The majority of households use at least one security measure, 2000¹



¹ Based on proportion of households that employ at least one of the following security measures: burglar alarm, special door locks, special window/door grills, watch dog, high fence, caretaker/security guard, or neighbourhood watch scheme. A figure for Japan is not available.
Source: International Crime Victimization Survey, 2000.

¹⁵ GDP per capita in Poland in 1999 was US\$3,500 (United Nations 2000). In contrast, GDP in the other 12 countries ranged from US\$20,000 to US\$33,000. It should be noted that the GDP figures for England & Wales, Northern Ireland, and Scotland were combined into a single figure for the United Kingdom.

¹⁶ Figures for 1996 do not include Australia, Belgium or Japan, which did not participate, and Finland, for which data on home security were not available.

Attitudes toward the justice system

Respondents to the ICVS were asked for their opinions regarding two aspects of the justice system: police performance and sentencing.

Police performance

In the United States and Canada in particular, a large proportion of the population is satisfied with police performance. In 2000, 89% of Americans and 87% of Canadians felt that the police were doing a very or fairly good job at controlling crime in their area (Figure 10). Poland was the only country where less than one-half of the population was satisfied with the police.

Satisfaction with the police appears to have grown since 1996. In 2000, in every country except Sweden, there was a significant increase in the proportion of people who felt the police were doing a good job (Table 7). These findings could be due in part to a change in the survey questionnaire. In 2000, for the first time, respondents were given four categories to judge police performance: very good, fairly good, fairly poor and very poor. Previously respondents indicated by a yes or no whether police were doing a good job. It is possible that people who would have said "no" in the past were more likely to respond "fairly good" in 2000. Results of the 1999 GSS also indicate that Canadians are quite satisfied with the performance of the police and that this level of satisfaction increased slightly between 1993 and 1999.


A second question regarding police performance was posed for the first time on the 2000 ICVS. Respondents were asked whether or not they agreed that police do everything they can to help people and be of service. The responses to this question also indicate a high degree of satisfaction with the police. On average for the 13 countries, 72% of the population agreed that police were helpful. The figures ranged from 43% for Netherlands up to 88% for Canada and the United States. The relative rankings of the countries were quite similar to those for the other question on police performance.

Not surprisingly, satisfaction with police performance is linked to victimization experience. Those who were victimized in the previous year were not as satisfied with the police. In Canada in 2000, 84% of people who had been victimized in the previous year felt the police were doing a fairly or very good job at controlling crime in their neighbourhood compared with 89% for non-victims. Significant differences such as this were observed for all but 2 of the 13 countries. (Australia and Northern Ireland were the exceptions.) Victimization experience over a longer time period was also related to opinions of police performance. Those who were victimized in the previous five years were less satisfied with police than those who had not been victimized. The 2000 ICVS figures for Canada were 85% and 90% respectively.

Although victims are less satisfied than non-victims with police performance, those who report their incident to police are often pleased with the response they receive. On average for 13 countries and 4 crime types, 63% of victims stated they were satisfied with the way the police dealt with the matter (Figure 11).¹⁷ The figures ranged from a low of 40% for Poland up to 76% for Finland. Canada was above average at 69%. Those who were not satisfied tended to have two main reasons:

47% felt the police did not do enough and 33% believed the police were not interested. (This is based on the average for the 4 crime types and 13 countries.)

Figure 10



¹ Based on proportion of population that feel police in their area are doing a very or fairly good job of controlling crime.

Source: International Crime Victimization Survey, 2000.


Sentencing

Respondents to the ICVS were asked what would be an appropriate sentence for a 21-year-old found guilty for a second time of burglary: fine, prison, community service, suspended sentence, or another sentence. In 2000, the majority of Canadians (52%) favoured a non-prison sanction (Table 8). However of the five sentencing alternatives, the largest single proportion of Canadians (45%) indicated that prison would be an appropriate sentence, followed by community service at 32%. The same pattern was evident for 7 other countries.

Canada's figure for prison was sixth highest among the group of 13 industrialized countries. The United States was first, with 56% of the population choosing prison, followed by Northern Ireland (54%), Scotland (52%), Japan (51%) and England & Wales (51%). In contrast, 12% of French people and 19% of Finland's population felt prison was an appropriate sentence.

¹⁷ Victims of five crime types (theft from car, burglary, robbery, sexual assault and assault) were asked if they were satisfied with police response for the most recent incident over the previous five years. The number of sexual assault incidents is very low, partly because many are not reported to police. Consequently, sexual assault was not included in the analysis.

Figure 11



¹ Based on the most recent incident in the previous 5 years. The figures indicate the average proportion of victims who were satisfied with police response for four crimes: theft from car, burglary, robbery and assault.

Source: International Crime Victimization Survey, 2000.

Canadians appear to have grown more punitive in their attitudes toward sentencing. ICVS results for 1989 indicate that less than one-third (32%) of the population felt that prison would be an appropriate sentence for a recidivist burglar (Table 9). This figure climbed to 39% in 1992, 43% in 1996 and 45% in 2000. People in seven other countries also appear to have become harsher in their attitudes. In particular, England & Wales, Finland, Japan, Netherlands, Northern Ireland, Scotland and Sweden all had higher proportions of the population choosing prison in 2000 than was the case in earlier cycles of the survey.

Methodology

Survey development

The operation and development of the ICVS is overseen by an international working group of criminologists. This group includes representatives from the Netherlands Institute for the Study of Criminology (NSCR), United Nations Interregional Crime and Justice Research Institute (UNICRI), United Nations' Centre for International Crime Prevention (CICP), and the British Home Office. Each industrialized country has a survey co-ordinator and is responsible for the cost of its own survey. The Dutch Ministry of Justice pays overhead costs for the survey and a Dutch survey company co-ordinates the fieldwork in most countries.

Fieldwork

In 2000, the International Crime Victimization Survey was conducted for a fourth time. For 11 of the 17 industrialized countries that participated, fieldwork for the survey was co-

Box 2: Factors associated with sentencing preferences

Public attitudes regarding sentencing have important implications because public opinion can influence sentencing practices and policies (Roberts, Doob and Marinos 1999; Roberts and Stalans 1997). As well, from a practical perspective, citizens' perceptions of criminal courts may affect their willingness to report crimes and to serve as witnesses or jurors (Flanagan, McGarrell and Brown 1985). They may even influence citizens' willingness to comply with the law (Sarat 1977; Walker 1977; cited in Flanagan, et al. 1985). Thus, for policy makers, members of the criminal justice system and others, it is important to understand what factors play a role in shaping the public's views with regard to sentencing.

A recent analysis of the ICVS data examined whether certain socio-demographic factors, fear of crime, and/or victimization experience were associated with an individual's attitudes toward sentencing. The study used a multivariate logistic regression analysis technique and the ICVS data file for the years 1996 and 2000. (Logistic regression is a technique that is useful in studying the relationship between variables when the dependent variable is a categorical variable, for example, whether someone preferred a prison or a non-prison sanction.) The decision was made to combine the two years because sample sizes for the year 2000 were too small. Nine industrialized countries were included in the analysis: Canada, England & Wales, Finland, France, Netherlands, Northern Ireland, Scotland, Sweden and the United States.

The dependent variable for the analysis was a dichotomous variable with a value of 1 for persons who preferred prison for a recidivist burglar and 0 for persons who preferred a non-prison sanction. This variable was considered to be a proxy for punitiveness. Based on previous research on the subject, the independent variables chosen for the study were as follows:

- a. Socio-demographic: age, gender, marital status, level of education, household income, and employment status.
- b. Fear of crime: fear of walking alone at night, fear of a break-in, belief in the ability of police to control crime.
- c. Victimization experience: violent victimization (assault, robbery or sexual assault) in the current or previous year and non-violent victimization (theft of personal property, theft of car, theft from car, car vandalism, theft of motorcycle/moped, bicycle theft, burglary and attempts) in the current or previous year.

Multivariate models, fitted through logistic regression, were constructed for the nine countries combined, as well as for each individual country. The results of the analysis highlighted many differences among countries in the factors that are linked to punitiveness.

Gender was one of the most consistent predictors of punitiveness when the effects of all other variables in the model were controlled (see Table below). In all nine countries, men were more punitive than women. Fear of crime was also a consistent predictor of attitudes toward sentencing. At least one of the fear variables was a significant factor in predicting attitudes toward sentencing in the nine countries that were studied, with those who were fearful being more punitive than those who were not. For all but one country (Scotland), fear of walking alone at night was significant.

(Continues on next page.)

Age was a significant predictor of punitiveness in all of the countries except Finland, but the effect was not consistent. In five countries, younger people tended to be less punitive, while in three countries the opposite was true. Part of the explanation for this could be related to the fact that age was only available as a categorical variable (i.e. respondent ages were available in categories, such as 16 to 24 years and 25 to 44 years, rather than in individual years). The results may have been different if age were available as a continuous variable.

Although not significant in the overall model, marital status was a predictor of attitudes toward sentencing in five of the nine countries. People who were married tended to be more punitive than those who were not married (i.e. people who were single, divorced, separated, or widowed). In four countries, education was related to punitiveness, with those who were less educated being harsher. As well, in four of the nine countries, individuals with lower income were more punitive. As for employment status, those who worked at a paid job tended to be less punitive than others (i.e. those who were unemployed, a homemaker, retired, or a student). However, the effect for the United States was the reverse.

Victimization experience was a significant factor in six of the countries that were examined. However, the results were inconsistent. In Canada, victims of violent crime were harsher in their attitudes than were non-victims. In Finland, Northern Ireland and the United States, it was victims of non-violent crimes who were more punitive. Finally, in England & Wales, and Scotland, victims of non-violent crime were less punitive than were non-victims. Hough and Moxon (1988) suggested that one explanation for these results might be that non-victims imagine the victimization experience to be worse than what most victims actually experience. For example, non-victims might envision a burglar ransacking and destroying their home, while most victims experience something less severe.

Factors related to the preference for prison, logistic regression partial odds ratio analysis, 1996 and 2000

Factor	Canada	England & Wales	Finland	France	The Netherlands	Northern Ireland	Scotland	Sweeden	United States	All Countries
Socio-demographic										
Age (16-24)										
25-44	1.12	0.57***	n.s.	1.52*	0.57***	1.34**	0.77*	0.91	1.34*	1.11**
45+	0.79**	0.34***	n.s.	0.76	0.35***	1.23*	0.61***	0.46***	0.97	0.83***
Gender (Female)										
Male	1.32***	1.34***	1.62***	1.80***	1.76***	1.33***	1.23***	1.42***	1.50***	1.46***
Marital status (Not married)										
Married	1.20***	1.20**	n.s.	n.s.	1.20*	n.s.	1.29***	n.s.	1.46***	n.s.
Education (1-10 years)										
11+ years	n.s.	0.59***	n.s.	n.s.	0.80**	n.s.	0.77***	0.69***	n.s.	n.s.
Household income (Below average)										
Above average	n.s.	0.74***	0.82**	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	0.79***	n.s.	n.s.	0.86***
Employment status (Other)										
Working at a job	n.s.	n.s.	0.70***	0.54***	0.70***	n.s.	0.83**	n.s.	1.23*	n.s.
Fear of crime										
Fear of walking alone (Feel safe)										
Feel unsafe	1.41***	1.35***	1.24*	1.92***	1.31**	1.35***	n.s.	1.63***	1.50***	1.53***
Chance of a break-in (Not likely)										
Likely	n.s.	1.33***	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	1.29***	1.36**	n.s.	1.20***
Police do a good job of controlling crime (Yes)										
No	n.s.	1.42***	1.30***	n.s.	1.25**	n.s.	1.31***	1.48***	0.70**	n.s.
Victimization experience										
Victim of a violent crime in current or previous year (No)										
Yes	1.30**	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Victim of a non-violent crime in current or previous year (No)										
Yes	n.s.	0.86*	1.25**	n.s.	n.s.	1.44***	0.86*	n.s.	1.23*	n.s.
-2 Log Likelihood	5,322.46	3,621.23	3,956.58	1,334.83	2,260.56	3,339.95	4,066.83	2,255.25	2,221.99	32,576.48
Model Chi-square	65.03***	144.01***	77.06***	43.68***	63.44***	31.09***	66.15***	79.25***	58.40***	455.69***
Df	6	10	6	5	12	5	10	7	8	6

n.s.=not significant
 ***p<.01 **p<.05 *p<.1
 p is the significance level. For example, a significance level of .05 indicates that there is a 5% probability that the survey (sample) data will suggest that there is a relationship between the variables, when no relationship actually exists in the population.
 The reference category is indicated in brackets.
 Source: International Crime Victimization Survey, 2000.

Source: Besserer (2002).

ordinated by the Dutch company Interview-NSS.¹⁸ Local companies were hired to conduct the survey, but Interview-NSS maintained responsibility for the questionnaire, sample selection and interview procedures. For the other 6 countries, national co-ordinators, working in conjunction with researchers at Leiden University (Netherlands), organized the work. This ensured standardized procedures.

Sampling and mode of interview

In each country, a random sample of households was chosen. Random digit dialing was used in the 14 countries where telephone interviews were conducted. With telephone interviewing, households without telephones are excluded from the sample. It is believed that this is not a serious problem, as telephone ownership is quite high in most of the industrialized countries surveyed (van Kesteren et al. 2000).

In 3 of the 17 countries (Japan, Northern Ireland, and Poland), face-to-face interviews were conducted. In Northern Ireland and Poland this method was used because telephone ownership is low. In Japan, face-to-face interviewing was utilized because of the visual nature of the language (Hamai 2000; cited in van Kesteren et al. 2000). Response rates tended to be higher in the three countries where face-to-face interviews were conducted (Table 10). However, it is not believed that this had any significant impact on the survey results. The two modes of interviewing produce similar results, as long as the same standards of fieldwork are applied (van Kesteren et al. 2000).

Once households were chosen, an individual 16 years or older was selected at random to respond to the survey.

Data collection and processing

A standard questionnaire was used to gather the information. Telephone interviews were conducted using computer-assisted telephone interviewing (CATI). Computer assistance helps to better standardize the interview process.

Researchers at Leiden University were responsible for processing the data and making data files available for analysis.

Response rates

The response rate for the 2000 ICVS averaged 63%, ranging from 45% for France to 81% for Northern Ireland (Table 10). It is not believed that the level of response has had any significant impact on the ICVS results. Evidence suggests that countries with low response levels have neither inflated nor deflated the victimization counts relative to other countries (van Kesteren et al. 2000).

Data limitations

It is important to note that the ICVS data are estimates. They are based on information collected from a small fraction of the population. The sample sizes, as indicated in Table 10 (completed interviews), ranged from 1,000 to just over 5,000 respondents. A single respondent can represent anywhere from 1,000 to over 200,000 people, depending on the country. As a result, the data are subject to sampling error. The size of the sampling error depends on many factors, including the sample size, the percentage observed, and the level of confidence chosen. The sampling error for the ICVS, using a 90% confidence interval, is shown in Table 11.

As an example of how this table should be used, consider the overall victimization rate for Canada. The ICVS estimates that 23.8% of the population was victimized in 2000. Using the table, for a sample of 2,000 (closest to the Canadian sample size of 2,078) and an observed percentage of 25, the sampling error is 1.7. This means that the 90% confidence interval is between 22.1% and 25.5% (23.8 ± 1.7). The interpretation of the confidence interval is as follows: if repeated samples of this size were drawn, each one leading to a new confidence interval, then in 90% of the samples, the confidence interval would include the true value for the population.

Because the results are subject to sampling error, the difference between some figures will not be statistically significant. For example, the difference between the 2000 and the 1996 victimization rates for Canada (24% and 25%, respectively) is not statistically significant.

References

Besserer, Sandra. 2002 (forthcoming). "Attitudes toward Sentencing in Nine Industrialized Countries." In *Crime Victimization in Comparative Perspective. Results from the International Crime Victims Survey 1989 -2000*. Edited by P. Nieuwbeerta. The Hague: Boom Publishers.

Besserer, Sandra. 1998. "Criminal Victimization: An International Perspective. Results of the 1996 International Crime Victimization Survey." *Juristat*. (Statistics Canada Catalogue no. 85-002-XPE) Ottawa: Minister responsible for Statistics Canada, Vol. 18, no. 6.

Besserer, Sandra and Catherine Trainor. 2000. "Criminal Victimization in Canada, 1999" *Juristat*. (Statistics Canada Catalogue no. 85-002-XPE) Ottawa: Minister responsible for Statistics Canada, Vol. 20 no.10.

Logan, Ron. 2001. "Crime Statistics in Canada, 2000" *Juristat*. (Statistics Canada Catalogue no. 85-002-XPE) Ottawa: Minister responsible for Statistics Canada, Vol. 21 no.8.

Mihorean, K., S. Besserer, D. Hendrick, J. Brzozowski, C. Trainor and S. Ogg. 2001. *A Profile of Criminal Victimization: Results of the 1999 General Social Survey*. (Statistics Canada Catalogue no. 85-553-XIE) Ottawa: Minister responsible for Statistics Canada.

Skogan, W. and M. Maxfield. 1981. *Coping with Crime*. London: SAGE publications.

United Nations. 2000. *World Statistics Pocketbook*. New York: United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs.

van Kesteren, John, Pat Mayhew and Paul Nieuwbeerta. 2000. *Criminal Victimization in Seventeen Industrialised Countries*. The Hague: Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek-en Documentatie-centrum.

¹⁸ These 11 countries were: Belgium, Canada, Denmark, England & Wales, France, Netherlands, Northern Ireland, Portugal, Scotland, Sweden and the United States.

Table 1



Trends in victimization rates, 1989-2000¹

	Victimized one or more times in the previous year			
	1989	1992	1996	2000
	% of population 16+			
Australia	28	29	..	30
Belgium	18	19	..	21
Canada	28	28	25▼	24
England & Wales	19	30▲	31	26▼
Finland	16	21▲	19▼	19
France	19	..	25▲	21▼
Japan	9	15▲
Netherlands	27	31▲	31	25▼
Northern Ireland	15	..	17	15
Poland	..	27	23▼	23
Scotland	19	..	26▲	23▼
Sweden	..	21	24	25
United States	29	26▼	24	21
Average	21	26	25	22

.. not available for a specific reference period

▲ denotes a statistically significant increase compared to the previous cycle ($p \leq .1$)

▼ denotes a statistically significant decrease compared to the previous cycle ($p \leq .1$)

p is the significance level. A significance level of .1 indicates that there is a 10% probability that the survey results will indicate that there was a change in the estimate (victimization rate) when no change actually occurred.

¹ Based on 11 types of crime.

Source: International Crime Victimization Survey, 2000.

Table 2



Victimization rates by type of offence, 2000¹

	Violent offences ²	Household burglary ³	Motor vehicle theft ⁴	Other theft ⁵	Car vandalism	All offences
	% of population 16+					
Australia	9	7	2	14	9	30
Belgium	4	4	1	10	6	21
Canada	7	4	1	12	5	24
England & Wales	7	5	2	12	9	26
Finland	6	1	1	10	4	19
France	5	2	2	10	8	21
Japan	1	2	1	8	4	15
Netherlands	5	4	1	14	9	25
Northern Ireland	3	3	1	6	5	15
Poland	4	3	1	13	7	23
Scotland	7	3	1	10	9	23
Sweden	5	2	2	16	5	25
United States	5	4	1	12	7	21
Average	5	3	1	11	7	22

¹ Based on persons victimized one or more times in the previous year.

² Includes sexual assault, assault and robbery.

³ Includes attempts.

⁴ Includes theft of cars, vans, trucks or motorcycles.

⁵ Includes personal theft, theft from cars and theft of bicycles.

Notes: Figures do not sum to total due to multiple responses.

Source: International Crime Victimization Survey, 2000.

Table 3



Reasons for reporting to police, 2000¹

Offence	Recover property	Insurance	Should be reported	Catch offender	Stop reoccurrence	Get help	Compensation from offender	Other
% of last incidents reported to police (average 13 countries)								
Theft from car	40	37	38	29	23	8	7	11
Burglary	30	28	42	39	28	11	8	12
Robbery	35	9	41	46	30	16	6	18
Sexual assault	29	49	55	24	2	23
Assault	3	4	34	40	42	25	6	18

... not applicable

¹ Based on the most recent incident over the previous five years. Totals may exceed 100% due to multiple responses.

Source: International Crime Victimization Survey, 2000.

Table 4



Reasons for not reporting to police, 2000¹

Offence	Not serious	Police could do nothing	Police won't do anything	Inappropriate for police	Solved it myself	Other
% of last incidents not reported to police (average 13 countries)						
Theft from car	53	21	17	10	4	22
Burglary	31	13	11	9	14	36
Robbery	39	18	11	9	12	45
Sexual assault	38	13	9	16	17	43
Assault	35	13	11	12	17	39

¹ Based on the most recent incident over the previous five years. Totals may exceed 100% due to multiple responses.

Source: International Crime Victimization Survey, 2000.

Table 5

 **Profile of violent crime incidents, 2000¹**

		Robbery	Sexual assault ²	Assault
		% of last incidents (average 13 countries)		
Victim knew offender	Yes	23	51	46
	No	69	45	48
	Don't know/Not stated	9	3	6
Accused had a weapon	Yes	36	6	18
	No	52	90	75
	Don't know/Not stated	11	4	6
Victim was injured	Yes	.	.	27
	No	.	.	73
	Don't know/Not stated	.	.	0
Victim or their family contacted a victim's agency³	Yes	10	25	11
	No	90	75	89
	Don't know/Not stated	0	0	0
Victim feels a victim's agency would have been useful⁴	Yes	32	51	36
	No	61	42	57
	Don't know/Not stated	7	7	8

. not available for any reference period

Figures may not add to total due to rounding.

¹ Based on the most recent incident over previous five years. Figures are an average for 13 countries.

² Includes women only.

³ Asked of victims who reported the incident to police.

⁴ Asked of victims who reported the incident to police, but did not contact a victim's agency.

Source: International Crime Victimization Survey, 2000.

Table 6

 **Trends in fear of a break-in, 1989-2000**

	Chances of a break-in unlikely			
	1989	1992	1996	2000
% of population 16+				
Australia	50	46▼	..	57▲
Belgium	56	44▼	..	48▲
Canada	67	63▼	64	66
England & Wales	55	47▼	52▲	58▲
Finland	85	79▼	86▲	84
France	54	..	38▼	43▲
Japan	74	53▼
Netherlands	58	55▼	57	62▲
Northern Ireland	66	..	65	62
Poland	..	60	61	60
Scotland	59	..	67▲	71▲
Sweden	..	61	78▲	79
United States	67	..	71▲	78▲
Average	63	57	64	63

.. not available for a specific reference period

▲ denotes a statistically significant increase compared to the previous cycle ($p \leq .1$)

▼ denotes a statistically significant decrease compared to the previous cycle ($p \leq .1$)

p is the significance level. A significance level of .1 indicates that there is a 10% probability that the survey results will indicate that there was a change in the estimate when no change actually occurred.

Source: International Crime Victimization Survey, 2000.

Table 7



Trends in perception of police performance, 1989-2000¹

	Police doing a good job of controlling crime			
	1989	1992	1996	2000
	% of population 16+			
Australia	73	72	..	76▲
Belgium	53	47▼	..	64▲
Canada	89	82▼	80	87▲
England & Wales	70	66▼	68	72▲
Finland	64	53▼	55	70▲
France	62	..	56▼	65▲
Japan	59	64▼
Netherlands	58	50▼	45▼	52▲
Northern Ireland	63	..	63	67▲
Poland	..	37	27▼	46▲
Scotland	71	..	69	77▲
Sweden	..	58	62	61
United States	80	..	77▼	89▲
Average	67	58	60	68

.. not available for a specific reference period

▲ denotes a statistically significant increase compared to the previous cycle ($p \leq .1$)

▼ denotes a statistically significant decrease compared to the previous cycle ($p \leq .1$)

p is the significance level. A significance level of .1 indicates that there is a 10% probability that the survey results will indicate that there was a change in the estimate when no change actually occurred.

¹ The 2000 ICVS added four categories: very good, fairly good, fairly poor and very poor. Previously, respondents answered yes or no to the question.

Source: International Crime Victimization Survey, 2000.

Table 8



Sentencing preferences of the public, 2000¹

	Prison	Non-Prison					Don't know
		Total	Community Service	Fine	Suspended Sentence	Other	
	% of population 16+						
Australia	37	58	35	8	10	4	5
Belgium	21	76	57	11	5	3	3
Canada	45	52	32	9	3	7	3
England & Wales	51	44	28	7	5	4	5
Finland	19	79	47	15	15	2	2
France	12	84	69	8	5	2	5
Japan	51	36	19	17	1	0	13
Netherlands	37	56	30	11	10	5	6
Northern Ireland	54	43	29	8	4	2	3
Poland	21	74	55	10	6	4	5
Scotland	52	44	24	11	5	4	4
Sweden	31	65	47	11	4	3	4
United States	56	38	20	9	1	8	6
Average	37	58	38	10	6	4	5

Figures may not add to total due to rounding.

¹ Respondents were asked what sentence should be given to a 21-year-old man found guilty of burglary for a second time.

Source: International Crime Victimization Survey, 2000.

Table 9



Changes in sentencing preferences, 1989-2000¹

	Prison			
	1989	1992	1996	2000
	% of population 16+			
Australia	36	34	..	37▲
Belgium	26	19▼	..	21
Canada	32	39▲	43▲	45
England & Wales	38	37	49▲	51
Finland	15	14	18▲	19
France	13	..	11	12
Japan	13	51▲
Netherlands	26	26	31▲	37▲
Northern Ireland	45	..	49▲	54▲
Poland	..	31	17▼	21▲
Scotland	39	..	48▲	52▲
Sweden	..	26	22▼	31▲
United States	53	..	56▲	56
Average	30	28	34	37

.. not available for a specific reference period

▲ denotes a statistically significant increase compared to the previous cycle ($p \leq .1$)

▼ denotes a statistically significant decrease compared to the previous cycle ($p \leq .1$)

p is the significance level. A significance level of .1 indicates that there is a 10% probability that the survey results will indicate that there was a change in the estimate when no change actually occurred.

¹ Based on the proportion of the population that indicated a prison sentence was the appropriate sanction for a 21-year-old man found guilty of burglary for a second time.

Source: International Crime Victimization Survey, 2000.

Table 10



Sample size and response rates, 1989-2000¹

	Completed interviews (#) and response rate (%)							
	1989		1992		1996		2000	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Australia	2,012	45	2,006	57	2,005	58
Belgium	2,060	37	1,485	44	2,402	56
Canada	2,074	43	2,152	65	2,134	74	2,078	57
England & Wales	2,006	43	2,001	38	2,171	59	1,947	57
Finland	1,025	70	1,620	86	3,899	86	1,783	77
France	1,502	51	1,003	61	1,000	45
Japan	2,411	80	2,382	79	2,211	74
Netherlands	2,000	65	2,000	66	2,008	63	2,001	58
Northern Ireland	2,000	1,042	84	1,565	81
Poland	2,033	96	3,483	94	5,276	78
Scotland	2,007	41	2,194	63	2,040	58
Sweden	1,707	77	1,000	75	2,000	66
United States	1,996	37	1,501	50	1,003	40	1,000	60
Average		51		66		70		63

.. not available for a specific reference period

¹ Response rate = $100 * (\text{completed interviews} / \text{eligible households})$.

Source: International Crime Victimization Survey, 2000.

Table 11

 **Sampling error (with a 90% level of confidence)**

Sample Size	Percentage observed										
	2 98	5 95	10 90	15 85	20 80	25 75	30 70	35 65	40 60	45 55	50 50
25	4.6	7.2	9.9	11.8	13.2	15.2	15.1	15.7	16.1	16.4	16.5
50	3.3	5.1	7.0	8.3	9.3	10.7	10.7	11.1	11.4	11.6	11.6
100	2.3	3.6	4.9	5.9	6.6	7.6	7.5	7.9	8.1	8.2	8.2
200	1.6	2.5	3.5	4.2	4.7	5.4	5.3	5.6	5.7	5.8	5.8
300	1.3	2.1	2.9	3.4	3.8	4.4	4.4	4.5	4.7	4.7	4.8
400	1.2	1.8	2.5	2.9	3.3	3.8	3.8	3.9	4.0	4.1	4.1
500	1.0	1.6	2.2	2.6	2.9	3.4	3.4	3.5	3.6	3.7	3.7
600	0.9	1.5	2.0	2.4	2.7	3.1	3.1	3.2	3.3	3.3	3.4
700	0.9	1.4	1.9	2.2	2.5	2.9	2.9	3.0	3.0	3.1	3.1
800	0.8	1.3	1.7	2.1	2.3	2.7	2.7	2.8	2.9	2.9	2.9
900	0.8	1.2	1.6	2.0	2.2	2.5	2.5	2.6	2.7	2.7	2.7
1,000	0.7	1.1	1.6	1.9	2.1	2.4	2.4	2.5	2.5	2.6	2.6
1,200	0.7	1.0	1.4	1.7	1.9	2.2	2.2	2.3	2.3	2.4	2.4
1,400	0.6	1.0	1.3	1.6	1.8	2.0	2.0	2.1	2.2	2.2	2.2
1,600	0.6	0.9	1.2	1.5	1.6	1.9	1.9	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.1
1,800	0.5	0.8	1.2	1.4	1.6	1.8	1.8	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9
2,000	0.5	0.8	1.1	1.3	1.5	1.7	1.7	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.8
3,000	0.4	0.7	0.9	1.1	1.2	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.5	1.5	1.5
4,000	0.4	0.6	0.8	0.9	1.0	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.3	1.3	1.3
6,000	0.3	0.5	0.6	0.8	0.8	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.1	1.1

Source: International Crime Victimization Survey, 2000.

Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics

For further information, please contact the Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, 19th floor, R.H. Coats Building, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0T6 at (613) 951-9023 or call toll-free 1 800 387-2231. To order a publication, you may telephone (613) 951-7277 or fax (613) 951-1584 or internet: order@statcan.ca. You may also call 1 800 267-6677 (Canada and United States) toll-free. If you order by telephone, written confirmation is not required.

Recent Juristat Releases

Catalogue 85-002-XPE

2000

- Vol. 20 No. 4 The Justice Factfinder, 1998
- Vol. 20 No. 5 Crime Statistics in Canada, 1999
- Vol. 20 No. 6 Alternative Measures in Canada, 1998-99
- Vol. 20 No. 7 Sentencing of Young Offenders in Canada, 1998/99
- Vol. 20 No. 8 Youth Custody and Community Services in Canada, 1998-99
- Vol. 20 No. 9 Homicide in Canada – 1999
- Vol. 20 No. 10 Criminal Victimization in Canada, 1999
- Vol. 20 No. 11 Criminal Harassment
- Vol. 20 No. 12 Public Attitudes Toward the Criminal Justice System
- Vol. 20 No. 13 Break and Enter, 1999

2001

- Vol. 21 No. 1 Canada's Shelters for Abused Women, 1999-2000
- Vol. 21 No. 2 Adult Criminal Court Statistics, 1999/00
- Vol. 21 No. 3 Youth Court Statistics, 1999/00
- Vol. 21 No. 4 Problem Behaviour and Delinquency in Children and Youth
- Vol. 21 No. 5 Adult Correctional Services in Canada, 1999-00
- Vol. 21 No. 6 Children Witnessing Family Violence
- Vol. 21 No. 7 Spousal Violence after Marital Separation
- Vol. 21 No. 8 Crime Statistics in Canada, 2000
- Vol. 21 No. 9 Homicide in Canada – 2000
- Vol. 21 No. 10 Sentencing in Adult Criminal Courts, 1999/00
- Vol. 21 No. 11 Crime comparisons between Canada and the United States
- Vol. 21 No. 12 Youth custody and community services in Canada, 1999/00

2002

- Vol. 22 No. 1 Case processing in criminal courts, 1999/00
- Vol. 22 No. 2 Adult criminal court statistics, 2000/01
- Vol. 22 No. 3 Youth Court Statistics, 2000/01