



The electronic version (PDF) of this publication was scanned by the UNICRI Documentation Centre from an original paper document in the UNICRI Library.

La version électronique (PDF) de cette publication a été numérisée par le centre de Documentation d'UNICRI à partir du document papier original de la Bibliothèque d'UNICRI.

Esta versión electrónica (PDF) ha sido escaneada por el Centro de Documentación de UNICRI a partir de un documento impreso original perteneciente a la Biblioteca de UNICRI.

Электронная версия (PDF) данной публикации была отсканирована Центром Документации UNICRI с оригинальной бумажной версии, находящейся в библиотеке UNICRI.

# LATENT CRIME IN RUSSIA

*Issues & Reports*

1



**unicri**

UNITED NATIONS INTERREGIONAL  
CRIME AND JUSTICE RESEARCH INSTITUTE

UNITED NATIONS INTERREGIONAL  
CRIME AND JUSTICE RESEARCH INSTITUTE

MINISTRY OF THE INTERIOR  
OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION

# LATENT CRIME IN RUSSIA

*prepared by*

Anna Alvazzi del Frate

Konstantin Goryainov



Within the framework of the *Memorandum of Understanding regarding co-operation in the field of crime prevention and criminal justice*, between the Ministry of the Interior of the USSR (now Russian Federation) and the United Nations Office at Vienna, the United Nations Interregional Crime and Justice Research Institute (UNICRI) and the European Institute for Crime Prevention and Control (HEUNI), a research project on *Latent Crime in Russia* was undertaken by UNICRI and the Research Institute of the Ministry of the Interior of the Russian Federation.

### *Objectives*

- the acquisition of a wider knowledge of latent crime in Russia, through a study of its dimensions and of influencing factors;
- to develop methodologies suitable for monitoring law enforcement activities oriented towards the reduction of latent crime;
- to recommend guidelines in the spheres of criminal policy, reform of penal law and procedure, and of investigative, as well as organizational levels, aimed at the reduction of latent crime.

### *Project phases*

In addition to the analysis of the relevant literature, the project consisted of the following activities:

- development of the methodology
- selection of regions within Russia
- sampling
- elaboration and testing of instruments
- data collection
- data analysis
- discussion of results
- preparation of the final report
- a joint UNICRI/Russian Ministry of the Interior seminar

**EXECUTIVE  
SUMMARY**

In almost every country, crimes reported to the police are only the tip of the iceberg in terms of actual law-breaking behaviour. According to some estimates, the ratio between crimes actually committed and crimes known to the police is quite high - crimes known to the police constitute no more than 30-40% of crimes committed. For some offences this ratio is much lower - sometimes even 1:10 or less. There is, however, a general pattern: the more serious the offence, the lower the "dark number".

In all countries, the constant search for improved crime prevention policies needs to be grounded on a better knowledge of the levels of crime which affect citizens. The official criminal justice statistics provide mainly data on the operations of the criminal justice agencies. It is therefore important to obtain a picture of the crime situation through appropriate research tools which should overcome the shortcomings of criminal justice statistics. It is also important to know why a certain amount and/or type of crime is not reported, revealing the perceived seriousness of criminal events and/or the quality of police-community relationships.

Trends of crime in Russia are characterized by a growth in the crime rate coupled by a decreasing clearance rate. Russian society is experiencing a growing fear of, and lack of protection from crime.

The concept of "latent crime" adopted in this project refers to those actions with criminal elements which were either not reported to the police (unknown), or reported but not processed by the police (concealed). The research was expected to identify appropriate methodologies for assessment of levels of crime.

The project covered six regions located in the centre and north-west of the European part of Russia: Pskov, Novgorod, Kaluga, Vladimir, Ryazan and Tver, considered to be similar in terms of their socio-economic, demographic and criminological parameters.

Three different research methodologies were identified: victimization surveys, self-report studies, and a survey on law enforcement officials.

**I. Victim survey**

In victimization studies sample survey techniques are usually employed to obtain information from randomly selected parts of the population about experience with criminal victimization, i.e. offences committed against the respondents over a time period. In this type of survey subjects are usually interviewed or requested to complete a questionnaire, part of which is made up of a list of possible crimes of which respondents may have been victims (or sometimes witnesses) during the period under consideration.

At the time of the conceptualization of this project, the second International Crime

(Victim) Survey was about to start<sup>1</sup>. It was therefore deemed important that the survey of public perceptions of crime and the police, which was already envisaged as a component of the "Latent Crime" study, reflected some aspects of the international survey. The questionnaire was developed taking into account the methodology adopted by the International Crime (Victim) Survey and allowed for some comparability as regards victimization rates<sup>2</sup>. In addition, questions on reporting and satisfaction with police activities were formulated in a comparable manner.

The sample consisted of 2,068 respondents. Its composition reflected the socio-demographic structure of the selected regions as regards gender, age, income, education and rural/urban distribution (33.5% of the sample lives in rural areas). The technique adopted consisted in face-to-face interviews. The respondents were approached in households, streets, offices and schools, and 16% of them filled in the questionnaire in groups. Respondents were asked about their own victimization experience and that of relatives/acquaintances as two separate categories.

Self-report studies are based on the assumption that respondents can provide information on their own deviant behaviour for a certain period of time. The questionnaire usually includes examples of offences, socio-demographic data, and sometimes additional questions about victimization, contacts with the police and so called "lie scales". Self-report studies can be considered a research tool for evaluating non-reported crime and delinquency.

## II. Self report studies

Initially, 332 questionnaires were distributed but responses were received from 80 convicted persons (i.e. 24.1%). The respondents were asked to provide responses on the offences (among those covered by the survey) committed by them which had not been reported to the police. Interviewing was carried out by the research group in the male corrective labour colonies located in Pskov and the Novgorod regions. The respondents were assured that the data they provided would remain confidential and would only be used for research purposes.

The overwhelming majority of the interviewed convicts were aged between 19 and 40 (85%) which, on the whole, corresponds to the 1990 census of convicted persons. Nine percent of the interviewees had a higher level of education; 72% were persons with secondary level (general or specialized) education and 19% had not reached a secondary level of education. More than half of the interviewed detainees (54%)

<sup>1</sup>The first International Crime (Victim) Survey was carried out in 1989 and encompassed 17 countries. The results were presented in J.J.M. van Dijk, P.Mayhew, M.Killias. *Experiences of Crime Across the World*. Deventer, Kluwer, 1990. The second survey, which was much larger and comprised about 30 industrialized, developing and Eastern-Central European countries, was carried out in 1992. The main findings were first presented at the International Conference on *Understanding Crime: Experiences of Crime and Crime Control* organized by UNICRI, the Ministry of Interior of Italy and the Dutch Ministry of Justice, held on 18-20 November 1992 in Rome, Italy, and are published in A. Alvazzi del Frate, U. Zvejkic and J.J.M. van Dijk (eds.), *Understanding Crime: Experiences of Crime and Crime Control*, UNICRI publ. 49, Rome 1993.

<sup>2</sup>The following types of crimes are the same in the two surveys: theft of car, theft from car, burglary with entry, robbery, theft of personal property, sexual incidents and assault/threat.

lived in an urban area prior to their conviction, 39% resided in rural areas, while 7% had no permanent residence. 62.5% of the respondents had been previously convicted. It can be assumed that this factor affected the crime techniques and the methods for concealing the offences.

### **III. Survey on law enforcement agencies**

The third component of the study consisted of a survey on attitudes of law enforcement officials. The survey was aimed at completing the information on the functioning of the law enforcement agencies and obtaining the experts' assessment of the level of latent crime in their jurisdiction. The sample consisted of 355 respondents and was composed as follows: heads of city or district agencies of the Ministry of the Interior (28%), detectives of the criminal police (30%), public security officers (19%), investigators (18%) and prosecution officers (23%).

In addition, an analysis of documents containing information on the decision by the law enforcement agencies not to initiate a criminal process was carried out in order to provide information on crime reported but not processed by the police.

## **RESULTS**

The victim survey carried out in the six regions revealed that about 24% of the sample was victimized at least once during the last five years. As regards victimization rates for the specific types of crime, the highest frequencies were registered for personal theft (15%), assault/threat and burglary with entry (both with 7%). These rates refer to crimes committed against the respondents, their close acquaintances or relatives during the last 5 years. As regards one-year victimization rates for 1991, it should be noted that again personal theft, assault/threat and burglary with entry were the most frequent types of crimes registered.

According to the results of the victim survey, about 40% of the crimes experienced by victims were not reported. Almost the same rate (37.5%) of unreported crime was obtained through the self-report study of the convicted persons, while the law enforcement officials estimated this rate at 15.3%.

While victims usually report thefts of car, the vast majority of unreported offences (i.e. two-thirds of the total) are related to other property crimes. Most victims of pickpocketing (60%) did not report the offence to the police; a quarter of bicycle and motorcycle thefts remained unreported; and almost half of the thefts from summer cottages and country houses remained unknown to the law enforcement agencies. Victims also declared not having reported 36% of bodily injuries, and sexual incidents, including rape, were not reported in 40% of the cases. This trend was confirmed by the other two components of the study, although the latency figures provided by the law enforcement experts were somewhat lower, while the convicts affirmed that more than a half of bodily injuries they committed were not reported.

The reasons given for not reporting the incidents to the law enforcement agencies fall mainly into three categories.

Reasons grouped under the first category include lack of confidence in the effectiveness of the law enforcement agencies (i.e. police will do nothing because of lack of

evidence; they deal with crime inefficiently; people do not want to deal with the police; complexity of formal procedures, etc.). Thirty-nine per cent of the respondents were motivated by these considerations.

The second group refers to the "weight" of crime (i.e. not serious enough; no loss, I solved it myself, reconciliation with the offender) and counted for the same proportion of not reporting. Finally, the third group contains reasons related to the avoidance of publicity; fear of revenge; and, in general, the feeling that the police should not be involved due to reasons of privacy.

The survey on law enforcement officials also contained a question on the reasons for not reporting. The results confirmed the same pattern shown above, i.e. according to the experts, the main reason for not reporting is the unwillingness of the citizens to contact the law enforcement agencies because of a belief in their ineffectiveness and the second main reason is the insignificance of the damage incurred.

The sample of convicts, while sharing the main reasons for not reporting as mentioned by victims and law enforcement officials, highlighted that many victims do not report because of their "contribution to the crime", i.e. either they were careless in protecting the property or they provoked the situation themselves.

The results of the victimization survey showed that 36% of reported crimes did not receive any response from the police, either because measures were not taken or because of refusal to prosecute (concealed offences). Nevertheless, failure to take measures does not necessarily mean unwillingness, inability or "malicious intent" on the part of the police. Some of the reported events may not contain the necessary elements to be considered crimes. The interviewed officers of the law enforcement agencies (i.e. those who actually handle crime reports) estimated the corresponding rate as 11.5%. This varies according to the different types of crime. 12% of reports on bodily injuries are concealed, as well as 10% of rapes, 5-6% of robberies and armed robberies, 14% of thefts from houses in rural areas, 13% of bicycle and motorcycle thefts, and 18% of cases of pickpocketing, etc.

The law enforcement agents were asked to single out the reasons for the concealment of offences and to rank them according to their significance and frequency. According to their responses, the first major reason refers to insufficient police manpower, as well as its heavy workload (i.e. limited capacity for processing the cases).

Reasons of a subjective nature ranked second. These included attempts to give the impression that the police were successful in their performance (i.e. decreasing the number of uncleared offences by concealing them). This refers to the inertia of past practices when the figures of recorded crimes and of their clearance rate were the only criteria used for evaluating the effectiveness of the police. Another reason noted related to poor logistic support, low salaries, and a range of factors of a social character.

The analysis of the documentation related to unprocessed reported crimes revealed that a quarter of the refusals to initiate criminal proceedings were unjustified. This was particularly so in those cases where the offender was not identified and circumstances related to the crime were not clear. With reference to the specific categories



of crime, it has been estimated that 25% of all reported cases of bodily injury are concealed, as well as 15% of rapes, 20-25% of robberies and armed robberies, 10% of thefts from apartments and cottages, 25-33% of pickpocketing, 10% of thefts of bicycles and motorcycles, 17% of thefts from cars, etc. Statistical data provide more or less the same figures. According to selected statistics, one-third of complaints lodged by citizens with respect to the concealment of reported crime by the police were found to be well grounded when reviewed by the officials of the Ministry of the Interior. Summing up, it may be assumed that the total level of concealed crime is around 30%.

## CONCLUDING REMARKS

Latent crime is a phenomenon caused by a complex of interrelated factors in the spheres of socio-economic relations; penal and law enforcement policies; and individual attitudes and behaviours. In general terms, the latency level is within a range of 40-70%, although it varies considerably from crime to crime. Most latent crime is represented by criminally-significant acts of a minor character, the vast majority of which might be solved in ways other than through the use of criminal justice.

The main reasons for not reporting the offences to the law enforcement agencies revealed the citizens' lack of confidence in the police ability and potential to cope with the problem of crime.

The "Latent Crime" study is particularly useful for developing and improving police-community relations and the operations of the law enforcement sector itself.

A better response to victim's needs, sensitivity to service orientation, improvement in criteria and procedures for investigating reported crimes, and closer co-operation with the judiciary, the voluntary sector and the community will contribute to the reduction of fear of crime and to the increase in efficiency and effectiveness of crime prevention and control. Research, analysis and evaluation play an important role in this process of policing in and for the community.

Following the recommendations of the First Session of the United Nations Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice (Vienna, April 1992) and the completion of the joint research project on *Latent Crime in Russia*, the Ministry of the Interior of the Russian Federation and the United Nations Interregional Crime and Justice Research Institute (UNICRI) agreed to organize an International Seminar on *Latent Crime: Research, Policy and Strategy* in Moscow from 3 to 5 June 1993<sup>3</sup>.

*Objectives*

- to present and discuss the results of the research project on latent crime;
- to provide an international forum for an exchange of views and experiences on latent crime and related issues;
- to make suggestions for improving the operation of the law enforcement system and practice;
- to make recommendations for improving police-community relationships with regard to ensuring personal safety and property protection;
- to encourage and promote policy-oriented research and to develop appropriate methodologies geared towards the development of crime prevention and control policy, strategy and tactics, and to changes in legislative reforms.

The participants in the Seminar were decision-makers and practitioners of the local police bodies and procurator's offices; specialists of the research and higher educational institutions of the law enforcement system; and international experts in the field from a number of CIS and other countries.

The proceedings of the Seminar in Russian were published by the Ministry of the Interior for distribution to law enforcement agencies in the Russian Federation.

<sup>3</sup>On behalf of the Russian Ministry of the Interior, the organization of the Seminar was carried out by the Foreign Relations Office of the Ministry and the Research Institute.

**PROGRAMME**

**3 JUNE 1993**

***Opening statements***

*Eugeny Abramov*, First Deputy Minister of the Interior, Russian Federation  
*Ugljesa Zvekic*, Research Co-ordinator, UNICRI

***Topic 1: Latent Crime:***

***The Results of the Research Project and Methods of its Control***

Latent Crime: Results of the Research and Methods of Control  
*Konstantin Goryainov*, Laboratory Head, Research Institute, Ministry of the Interior,  
Russian Federation

Victim Component of the "Latent Crime" Study  
*Anna Alvazzi del Frate*, Research Officer, UNICRI

**DISCUSSION**

***Topic 2: International Victimization Survey***

Victimization Surveys: An International Perspective  
*Ugljesa Zvekic*, Research Co-ordinator, UNICRI

On Victimization and Opinions about the Level of Internal Security in Germany  
*Helmut Kury*, Head, Department of Victimology, Max-Planck-Institute for Foreign  
and International Criminal Law, Freiburg i.B., Germany

**DISCUSSION**

**4 JUNE 1993**

***Topic 3: Latent Crime in the Context of Crime Prevention and Crime Clearance***

Latent Crime in the Context of Crime Prevention and Detection  
*Beksoltan Dziov*, Deputy Head, Department of Criminal Investigations, Ministry of  
the Interior, Russian Federation

Latent Crime in the Context of Crime Prevention and Crime Clearance: International  
Developments  
*Irvin Waller*, Professor, Department of Criminology, University of Ottawa, Canada

Crime Prevention in Urban Areas and the Use of Local Crime Surveys  
*Per-Oloff H. Wikstrom*, Head of the Research Division, National Council for Crime  
Prevention, Stockholm, Sweden

**DISCUSSION**

***Topic 4: Latent Crime and the Relationship Between the Law Enforcement Agencies and the Community***

Latent Crime and Co-operation between the Law Enforcement Authorities and the Population

*Vyacheslav Ogorodnikov*, Head, General Department of Public Order Protection, Ministry of the Interior, Russian Federation

Policing, Citizens and Crime Control

*Kees Van der Vijver*, Commissioner of Police, Municipal Police of Amsterdam

DISCUSSION

**5 JUNE 1993**

***Topic 5: Latent Crime and Criminal Legislation and Policy; National and International Perspectives***

Latent Crime: Criminal Legislation and Policy

*Anatoly Gulyayev*, Research Institute, Ministry of the Interior, Russian Federation

Hidden Crime and Criminal Legislation and Policy: National and International Perspectives

*Matti Joutsen*, Interregional Advisor, Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Programme, United Nations Office at Vienna

DISCUSSION

**DISCUSSION AND ADOPTION OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS**

**CLOSURE**

## RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The International Seminar on *Latent Crime: Research, Policy and Strategy* was jointly organized by the Ministry of the Interior of the Russian Federation and the United Nations Interregional Crime and Justice Research Institute (UNICRI), in Moscow, 3-5 June 1993. It was attended by senior police officers and other criminal justice experts from a number of CIS and other countries.
2. The International Seminar reviewed the results of the joint research project on *Latent Crime in Russia* carried out by the organizers within the framework of the *Memorandum of Understanding on Co-operation in Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice*, concluded between the Ministry of the Interior, the Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Branch of the United Nations Office in Vienna, the European Institute for Crime Prevention and Control, affiliated with the United Nations, and UNICRI. The purpose of the project was to study the problem of latent crime and measures to deal with it, as well as to develop recommendations regarding improvements in crime prevention and criminal justice.
3. The project adopted as its working definition of latent crime those acts which are not reported to, or recorded by law enforcement agencies, or in respect of which no further action was taken on the part of the criminal justice system.
4. The participants noted that latent crime could have a variety of consequences. Among these were a potential undermining of public confidence in the capacity of law enforcement agencies to safeguard public security and to protect individuals and their property; a distortion of the true extent and costs of crime, and a reduction in the ability to develop adequate crime prevention programmes and criminal justice policies.
5. The structure and the extent of latent crime was seen to be related to a number of different factors. Some of these factors were related to the subjective or legal assessment of the seriousness of the individual offence, and others were related to the relationship between the victim or witness and the offender, and to his or her attitude towards the criminal justice system.
6. Still others factors affecting the structure and extent of latent crime were related to the operation of the criminal justice system itself, including the professionalism of criminal justice personnel, the resources available, and the administrative and statistical procedures applied. Particular attention was paid to the relationship between the amount of crime and the capacity of the criminal justice system to address the offences in the appropriate manner.
7. The participants further noted that the amount of latent crime varies according to the type of crime. Latent crime was seen to be particularly characteristic of conventional petty offences, violent crime, organized crime and economic crime.
8. Many participants noted that countries undergoing rapid changes are faced with an accelerating increase in crime rates. Drug abuse, crime and fear of crime were seen to be a serious threat to the stability and social climate of cities, to sustainable development, the quality of life and human rights.

9. The discussion touched upon a wide range of issues, in particular the need to develop effective crime prevention measures, improve the operation of the criminal justice system, protect and assist the victim and witness, and promote systematic information gathering, research and evaluation.

10. On the basis of these discussions, the participants agreed on a number of interrelated recommendations for the development of crime prevention and criminal justice.

11. National and local authorities should develop specific crime prevention projects, utilizing the experience gained with programmes that have proved effective in reducing crime. Useful models exist of national crime prevention structures, of municipal crime prevention structures, and of individual projects which have reduced various types of criminal activity.

## **A. CRIME PREVENTION**

12. Law enforcement and criminal justice should be matched by active crime prevention policies that reduce the opportunities for crime and tackle the socio-economic situations that generate offending. In this, municipalities are strategically based to bring together those who can influence the conditions that generate crime. Other governmental bodies should provide financial and technical support.

13. Comprehensive crime prevention programmes should involve long-term action that is responsive to short-term needs, and give priority to partnerships that find better solutions to problems of child poverty, youth, schooling, housing, and policing.

14. Governments should ensure that national crime prevention structures are established that encourage improved national policies, undertake research and development, promote training, and foster the implementation of effective crime prevention programmes, particularly by cities.

15. Municipal authorities should develop crime prevention structures to mobilize partnership between local officials responsible for policies that can influence crime control, such as urban planning, housing, schooling, youth and family, policy, social services, and policing.

16. The public should be encouraged by local, regional, and national governments, and non-governmental groups to participate in comprehensive crime prevention and to understand the importance to community development of implementing effective ways of making communities safer from crime.

17. Governments, municipal authorities, police officials, and others who can influence the factors generating crime should promote the international and national exchange of ideas and experience. In particular, they should establish links with the United Nations network of institutes, including the proposed International Center for the Prevention of Crime (Montreal).

18. Policing agencies should seek ways to promote the safety and security of persons and property in collaboration with citizens and agencies, through means that address strategically the factors that generate insecurity.

19. Governments should give priority to socio-economic and other needs, particularly the needs of vulnerable groups such as children, women and minorities.

20. Particular attention should be paid to the prevention of violence against children at early ages, and to the prevention of violence in situations where it commonly occurs, such as in school or the workplace. "Facilitators" which contribute to the extent and severity of violence, such as alcohol, firearms or depictions of violence in the media, should be controlled.

## **B. THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM**

21. The criminal justice system should adopt policies which allow it to deal more effectively with the problem of crime and latent crime. A rational policy should recognize that increasing the repressiveness of the criminal justice system will not solve the crime problem, but may instead worsen it in many respects. For this reason, penal policy should be more differentiated. Moreover, policy makers should encourage citizens and organizations to take part in controlling the level of safety and security.

### **Legislation**

22. Legislation should allow alternative ways of addressing the crime problem. Examples are decriminalization of petty offences and the possibility of using alternative measures, not connected with criminal proceedings. The role of the victim should be subjected to review; for example, consideration could be given to allowing the institution of criminal proceedings in case of non-serious offences only at the discretion of the victim.

The use of civil law procedures should be encouraged. Mitigation of criminal responsibility, or other advantages, should be provided for offenders guilty of less serious offences, in order to allow the transfer of resources and focus on the prevention or suppression of the more dangerous crimes. Alternative ways should be explored for dealing with new social problems such as organized crime, computer crime, illicit drug trafficking, money laundering.

### **Operation of the criminal justice system**

23. Attention should be paid to three apparatuses in the development of the criminal justice system. In the first place, attention should be devoted to the improvement of efficiency, for example by speeding up proceedings (without weakening the guarantees of due process), by developing standards for workload and criteria for the allocation of budgets, and by improving the capacity of the criminal justice system by relieving it of the need to deal with misdemeanors. In the second place, attention should be paid to the improvement of the level of information, especially as far as latent crime and the attitudes of the population are concerned. In the third place attention should be paid to the possibilities of innovation in the criminal justice system.

24. Consideration should be given to the creation at the national (federal) level of an independent recording service to regulate the influxes of crime and criminal justice information, paying special attention to the protection against possible misuse of such information.

25. The community should play a more prominent role in crime control. Therefore; it is necessary to expand the legal awareness of citizens and their actual participation in crime control by creating networks of contacts, public-private partnership, co-operative foundations; etc.

## **Police-commu- nity relations**

26. The police should know factors causing concern to both individual citizens and communities. This knowledge should be utilized in the development of the policies adopted by the police in crime prevention and law enforcement.

27. In view of the finding of crime surveys that victims of crime, their families, witnesses and others who aid them are subject to loss, injury and emotional harm, and that they are not treated with respect and understanding of their needs is a major reason why victims do not report crime, governments should take the necessary steps to implement the Resolution of the General Assembly on Basic Principles of Justice for Victims of Crime and Abuse of Power.

## **C. RESPECT FOR VICTIMS**

28. Governments should ensure that victims are informed of the possibility of receiving legal, material, medical, psychological and social assistance, and that they receive this aid.

29. Police agencies should treat victims with respect and understanding of their needs, provide them with information on assistance, compensation and criminal justice, and cooperate with organizations capable of providing assistance.

30. Particular attention should be paid to victims with special needs. Wherever possible, police agencies should make female personnel available to take reports from victims of such gender-specific offences as rape.

31. Offenders should be ordered to make fair restitution to their victims, including the return of property. Consideration should be given to the use of this as a sentencing alternative.

32. Where reparation is not fully available from the offender or from insurance companies, national funds should be established for compensation.

33. The police agencies, the prosecutor and the courts should ensure that information is provided to victims on their role and on the scope, timing and progress of police and justice proceedings.

34. The views and concerns of victims should be presented and considered at appropriate stages of the proceedings where their personal interests are affected. Consideration should be given to the strengthening of the possibilities given to victims to present their claims in the course of criminal proceedings.

35. Various measures should be implemented to encourage the support of bystanders and the general public to victims, and reporting by eyewitnesses to the police. Examples are the development of school programmes on civic responsibility, simplified participation in pre-trial and trial proceedings, and moral and material incentives.



## **D. INFORMATION, RESEARCH AND EVALUATION**

36. Adequate methodologies for data collection and analysis should be promoted in order to assess the extent of trends of crime and evaluate the effects of crime prevention programmes. Further efforts are needed in developing topical research, including research on trends and types of crime and social correlates, attitudes of the public towards the criminal justice system, operations of the criminal justice agencies, offenders' and victims' profile, and changes in criminal law and procedure.

37. International co-operation in research should be encouraged, including the promotion of comparative projects. Special attention should be paid to the exchange of knowledge and experience concerning new methods for the collection, analysis and comparison of data, as well as the evaluation of the operation of criminal justice agencies and crime prevention initiatives.

38. Research strategies should follow international research standards. Such strategies should be based on the accumulation of relevant research findings, including the results of longitudinal studies and victimization surveys. Special efforts must be made to make the size of the survey sample scientifically adequate and to integrate the victimization survey into ongoing national crime surveys. Research results should be made available through publications and be utilized in the development of crime prevention and criminal justice policies.

39. Countries are encouraged to participate in the United Nations Survey on Crime Trends and the Operations of Criminal Justice System and in the International Victimization Survey.

40. In order to assist the development and assessment of crime prevention programmes and the operations of criminal justice agencies, studies at local, regional and national level should be carried out on a regular basis. Such surveys should be used to define crime problems to be faced as well as precautions that potential victims might take, ways to reduce fear of crime and foster public support for prevention.

41. Particular attention should be given to surveys of the public on experiences with crime and victimization (victims survey, self-report studies) and surveys of experts, especially of police and criminal justice personnel. In addition, analysis of records produced by different agencies and improvement of research tools and methods should be promoted.

## **E. ADDITIONAL FUNDING**

42. Governments should consider supplementary funding to implement the recommendation in this document through the establishment of "funds to fight crime" to which governments, companies and charitable organizations could contribute. "Proceeds from crime" seized by law enforcement agencies could be contributed. In addition, offenders, particularly those convicted of organized, economic and corruption crimes, could be ordered by courts to contribute.