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Introduction

**KaukoAromaa\***

TheUnitedNationsSurveysonCrimeTrendsand

theOperationsCriminalJusticeSystems(denoted

UN􀇦CTS below for the sake of brevity) collect

basic information on recorded crime and on

resources of \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_criminal justice systems in the

Its mandate being Europe and

North America, HEUNI has analysed and

reportedonthesurveysforthispartoftheworld

fromtheverybeginning.Forotherregionsofthe

world,suchreportinghasnotbeenachieved.

The present volume, prepared in partnership of

HEUNIand theUNODC, for the first timepulls

together global responses to the UN􀇦CTS

questionnaire,themostrecentoneincludedhere

isUN􀇦CTS􀇦10 that allows the analysis of data up

to2006.

In the current report, the improvement

introduced in the previous one (looking only at

Europe and North America; Aromaa and

Heiskanen2008)wasretained:alsothistime,the

reportaddressesa timeperiodofabouttenyears

inordertoprovidemorestabilitytothesituation

assessment.Inaglobalreport,itismoredifficult

to keep to the ten􀇦year framework since many

countries have not responded regularly but data

gapsare frequent.Inthiscase,thebasicsolution

has been that data for 1996, 2000, and 2006 are

used for the ten􀇦year (actually, eleven􀇦year)

perspective to be covered. For many countries,

this could be achieved, for many others, one or

more of these years had to be complemented by

data for adjacent years because the country

responseforone(orseveral)oftherequiredyears

hadnotbeenmadeavailable.

Reporting for more recent years has not been

possible. This may not be satisfactory to those

who require more up􀇦to􀇦date information.

However, the timeliness of large􀇦scale

comparative data has always been a significant

problem and remains one. First of

all, statisticaldataon crimeand criminal justice

are typically notavailableuntil after the relevant

year.Country􀇦leveldataonpolice􀇦recordedcrime

areoftenreleasedrelativelysoonaftertheshiftof

the year, but statistics on later stages of the

criminal justice procedure are more delayed.

Next, disseminating the UN􀇦CTS data collection

instrument to collecting and

validatingtheresponses,draftingareportingplan

andcreatingadatabasenecessaryfortheanalysis,

analysing the data andwriting up the report are

stagesintheprocessthatcannotbeavoided,and

theydoconsumetime.

Asaconsequence,reportsofthiskindarealways

providing results thatdo not refer to thecurrent

yearorthepreviousonebutwillshedlightonthe

situation 3􀇦4 years back in time. So far, ways to

introduce significant improvements to this

dilemmahave not been found.Formany,adelay

of3􀇦4yearswouldseemtobetoolongforanup􀇦

to􀇦date assessment of the current situation,

whether globally or for one region only, even

consideringthatexperiencehasshownthatcrime

dataofthekindanalysedhereusuallydonotvary

radically over short time periods. A marked

improvementwouldhowever requiremuchmore

advanced statistical systems in many

tates,andamuch higher priority to be given to

the UN data collection exercise than is the case

today.

Another, even more disturbing observation that

has been made repeatedly is that many

continue to be unable to answer the UN􀇦

CTS questionnaire at all, or are only able to

provideapartial response.This stateof affairs is

in partdue toavery basic reason: someor allof

therequireddataarenotavailable.However, less

excusable is the situation for many other

countries thatareknown topossess the required

databutdonotrespond.

**\***Director,EuropeanInstituteforCrimePreventionandControl,affiliatedwiththeUnitedNations

member states.
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Forthoseinneedofimprovingtheirstatistics,the

UNODC has been working on a support and

assistanceapproachwhichisalsobearingfruitin

the long term. Those that, for a

multiplicityof reasons,have failed to respond to

theSurveysalthoughtheyareinthepossessionof

the relevant data, should take this task more

seriouslyinthefuture.Thiswouldalsobeintheir

owninterestastheywouldbenefitfromknowing

their position in a global dataset. Also others in

the global community would be keen to know

how others have been doing in core issues of

crimeandcriminaljustice.

Some of the unavoidable delay problems have

been partially resolved by the UNODC in that

they publish some data from the country

responses on their website as soon as they are

made available by the The

advantageisthatthedelayisasshortasitcanbe

under the circumstances, where national

responsesarethebasis.Ofcourse,beforethereis

a national response, nothing can be made

available.Itisthereforeofparamountimportance

that delays caused by tates are

minimized. –The drawback of the UNODC

solutionisthattheinformationonthewebsiteis

not – and cannot be – validated and processed,

leaving the potential user without expert

assistancewhen tryingto interpretthedata. It is

highly problematic and perhaps not advisable at

all to publish raw data of this kind without

adequatecommentaryregardingknownproblems

related to its validity and interpretation

problems.

The ten􀇦year time span applied should illustrate

that for many criteria, it is often of no massive

importance that the data are never fully up to

date:manyofthetrendsdisplayedcanbeseento

be rather stable, meaning that simple basic

indicators of features of recorded crime and

operationsofthecriminaljusticesystemareoften

of a rather robust nature. Consequently, a large

proportion of the presented data and findings,

even if outdated, are unlikely to change

significantly from one year to another.

Consequently,thecurrentdelayinthetimeliness

of the presented data is mostly of no major

concern.Themostobviousexceptionsare

countries undergoing irregular rapid

transformations – for such countries, however, a

UN􀇦CTSishardlyofimmediateinterestanyway.

We have not reproduced the data collection

instruments in this volume. Due to various

changesovertime,eachUN􀇦CTSquestionnaireis

slightly different. The questionnaires can be

foundinallUNlanguagesattheaddress:

http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/data􀇦and􀇦

analysis/Ninth(Tenth)􀇦United􀇦Nations􀇦Survey􀇦

on􀇦Crime􀇦Trends􀇦and􀇦the􀇦Operations􀇦of􀇦

Criminal􀇦Justice􀇦Systems.html

The report comprises eight chapters. They are

designedtodealwithallcentral issuesaddressed

inthequestionnaires.First,police􀇦recordedcrime

isdiscussed,withseparatechaptersonhomicides

(chapter 1), other police􀇦recorded crimes

(chapter 2), and drug􀇦related crime and drug

trafficking (chapter 3). Also,complex crimes are

analysedseparately,suchasorganisedcrime,and

trafficking in human beings ( hapter 4). Such

offenceshaveplayedamarginalroleintraditional

crime statistics, and in order to improve the

relevance of the data on such offences, new

solutions need to be developed. Chapter 5,

shifting to the next stage of the criminal justice

system, presents data on responses of the

criminal justice system, including an innovation

where attrition issues are being discussed. A

parallel issue to responsesof thecriminal justice

systemare resourcesandperformance.Theseare

discussedin 6wherealsoadiscussionon

the punitivity of criminal justice systems is

included. Next, a presentation on prison

populations of the world closes the analysis of

criminal justice data. The last chapter, finally

discusses challenges with crime and criminal

justice statistics, arguing for the importance of

furtherimprovementsinthearea.

The objective of this report is to show potential

usersofinternationalcrimedatawhattheycould

learn from these, and provide guidance as to

restrictions, pitfalls and strengths of the unique

set of data that is now available thanks to the

countriesthathaverespondedtotheUNSurveys.

chapter

c

member states

member states.

member s
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Homicide

**StevenMalby\***

**Abstract**

This chapter presents available data on the crime of intentional homicide – the intentional killing of a

person by another. As one of the most effectively recorded crimes, law enforcement data on intentional

homicideistypicallymorereadilyavailablethanforothercrimes.Assuch,ratesofintentionalhomicideper

100,000populationhavesometimesbeenusedasaproxy for levels of violent crimeorevenoverallcrime.

Data from both law enforcementand public healthsourcesmay becombined to increasedata availability

and geographic coverage.Results suggest that the highest homicide levels are found in the Americasand

Africaregion,withthe lowesthomicide levelsgenerally incountries inEurope.Forthosecountrieswhere

trend data is available, the majority show decreasing or stable homicide rates, with the exception of a

number of countries, predominantly in the Americas that show highand increasing rates.\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Such increases

may be linked to the challenges of organized crime, drug trafficking, and gang activity. Significant data

challenges remain however, particularly in Africa,where criminal justice data on intentional homicide is

presentlyverylimited.

**Introduction**

The intentional killing of a person by another

(‘intentional homicide’) represents the most

serious end of the spectrum of violent crime.

Recent attention on the issue of armed violence

and the growing importance of homicide as an

indicator has resulted in increased efforts to

improve statistics at international, regional and

nationallevels.

The results presented in this chapter derive

primarily from criminal justice data. Despite

varying definitions, ‘homicide’ is perhaps the

mostwidely collectedand reported crime in law

enforcement and criminal justice statistics. Due

toitsseriousness,thekillingofapersontendsto

berecordedmoreeffectivelythanothercrimes.

Nonetheless, the challenges of cross􀇦national

comparability are considerable. National legal

systems may have different thresholds for

categorising a death as intentional homicide.

Whilstintentionalhomicideusuallyrequiresthat

theperpetratorpurposefullyintendstocausethe

death or serious injury of a victim, in some

countries a death that occurs in the act or

attempted act ofanother serious crimemay also

qualify as ‘intentional’ homicide or murder.

Infanticide, assault leading todeathand killings

carried out by law enforcement officers (acting

legitimatelyinthelineofdutyornot)allmayor

maynotbeincludedinpolice􀇦recordedstatistics.

In addition, differences in police recording

practices such as differences in counting units

(offences, suspects or cases), whether or not

attempted homicide or non􀇦intentional

homicidesareincludedinpublishedfigures,and

the point in the investigation at which a

suspiciousdeathisclassifiedashomicideallvary

asbetweencountries.

Moreover, as forms of organized criminality and

stateinsecuritybecomeincreasinglyintertwined,

the line between violent deaths that occur in

armed conflict and those that can be labelled

‘crime’isoftenblurred.Actswhicharelikelytobe

recordedbylawenforcementandcriminaljustice

institutions as intentional homicide can take

place in a wide range of contexts, including the

home, family, social or domestic setting, in the

courseofburglary,theftorrobbery,orassociated

with gang, organized, or drug􀇦related crime.

\*ResearchOfficer,UnitedNationsOfficeonDrugsandCrime(UNODC)
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**Combiningdatasources**

This chapter differs from others in this

publication in that – for criminal justice

information – it draws on data wider than that

reported through the United Nations Survey of

CrimeTrendsandOperationsofCriminalJustice

Systems(UN􀇦CTS).

Whilst UN􀇦CTS data is included in the analysis,

inordertoprovideaswideageographiccoverage

as possible the chapter uses data from other

available criminal justice sources. These include

other cross􀇦national data sources, such as data

collected and published by the Statistical Office

of the European Communities (Eurostat), the

United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF), the

InternationalPoliceOrganization (Interpol),and

the Observatorio Centroamericano sobre

Violencia (OCAVI). The analysis also makes use

of data available at the national level, including

that published on national police, Ministry of

InteriorandMinistryof Justicewebsites. Priority

was given to data available at the regional or

international level over national data due to the

fact that cross􀇦national data collections (such as

the UN􀇦CTS and Eurostat) make use of

standardized definitions of intentional homicide

and are usually supported byextensivemetadata

that allows the user to better understand the

contentofreportednumbers.

Althoughthischapterderivesitsresultsprimarily

from such ‘multi􀇦source’ *police􀇦recorded* crime

statistics, the fact of a death means that

homicides are usually processed both by the

medical system and the criminal justice system,

creating two potential sources of administrative

statistics. These two systems measure subtly

differentphenomenonand–whilstfigurescanbe

expected to show reasonable levels of agreement

–theyareunlikelytogenerateidenticalnumbers.

In order to provide as complete a picture of

possibleofthelevelandtrendofhomicidesinthe

world,andforcomparativepurposes,thischapter

providesdataavailablefrompublichealthsources

alongsidethosefromcriminaljustice.Thepublic

health sources used are predominantly cross􀇦

national, including data published by theWorld

Health Organization (WHO) and the Pan􀇦

American Health Organization (PAHO). Public

healthstatisticsonintentionalhomicidetypically

consist \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_of data recorded under the International

Classification of Disease (ICD􀇦10) codes

corresponding to ‘injuries inflicted by another

personwithintenttoinjureorkill,byanymeans’.

Foradeathtobeclassifiedinthiscategory,there

must be sufficient evidence for a medical

professionaltodeterminethatthecauseofdeath

wasassaultandnotanaccidentorself􀇦harm.

Whether from criminal justice or public health

sources, it must be remembered that official

statistics rarely capture the number of actual

criminaleventsthathaveoccurred.Homicidecan

be reported by relatives and witnesses, but

obviouslycannotbemeasuredthroughreportsby

victims. The quality of homicide figures is also

affected byapproaches tocase recordingand the

capacity of national institutions to gather data

andaccuratelyrecordevents.

The capacity gap between developed and

developing countries particularly affects the

cross􀇦national comparison of police􀇦recorded

crime statistics, with the result that

administrative statistics are not a particularly

strong basis for the study of cross􀇦national

differences in criminal activity. As shown in this

Chapter, the differences between health and

police statistics are especially marked in

developingcountries.Inhigherincomecountries,

such as those in West and Central Europe,

significant differences also remain for countries

between police and health statistics. Such

differences may be linked to limitations in the

capacity of police and law enforcement agencies

to identify and record homicide events, and to

other factors such as the lethality of assaults.

Indeed, the lethality of assaults can be a

particularly important factor in understanding

cross􀇦national differences and long􀇦term trends

inhomicides.Evidencesuggeststhatthelethality

ofassaultsinNorthAmericaandWesternEurope

for example has dropped dramatically due to

developmentsinmedicaltechnologyandmedical

supportservices(Aebi2004).

**Globalhomicidelevels**

DatapreviouslypublishedbytheUnitedNations

Office on Drugs and Crime suggests that

approximately 490,000 deaths from intentional

homicide occurred in 2004 (Geneva Declaration

2008).Thisrepresentedaworldaveragehomicide

rate in 2004 of 7.6 per 100,000 population. The

dataset used for this calculation focused on

maximum geographic coverage at the expense of

morerecentlyavailabledataforsomecountriesin

9
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order to produce a single global dataset for one

pointintime(UNODC2008).

In contrast, this chapter takes the approach of

‘latest available year’ data in order to provide as

timely information as possible, whilst also

maintainingwidegeographiccoverage.

In order to represent the distribution of this

nearlyhalfamillionannualhomicidesbyregions

oftheworld,figure1belowshowstheaverageofa

limited set of countries in each sub􀇦region (144

countriesintotal);beingthose forwhichat least

one criminal justice *and* public health value for

intentional homicide are available during the

period 2003 to 2008. The range of countries for

which data is available for each source alone is

somewhat greater and it should be noted that

average rates calculated on this wider set of

countrieswouldbedifferent.

**Figure1.Averageintentionalhomicideratebysub􀍲region,latestavailableyear,criminaljusticeand**

**publichealthdata**

Note: Figure 1 includes only those countries for which at least one criminal justice and one public health value for intentional

homicide are available in the period 2003􀍲2008. This is indicated alongside each sub􀍲region name by the number of countries

includedoutofthetotalcountriesinthesub􀍲region.

Overall, figure 1 shows comparatively low

homicidelevelsincountriesinEurope,Asiaand

North America, with reasonable agreement

betweencriminaljusticeandpublichealthdata.

In contrast, both criminal justice and public

healthdata(albeitwithlessagreement)indicate

significantly higher rates in South America,

Central America, the Caribbean, and Southern

Africa. Large data discrepancies remain for

Middle,Western,andEasternAfrica.Substantive

workonadministrativedatarecordingsystemsin

boththecriminaljusticeandpublichealthfields

is required in these sub􀇦regions before

meaningfulcomparisonscanbemadewithother

sub􀇦regionsoftheworld.

Figure 1 also reveals the continued existence of

signficant data limitations. In particular, very

fewcountriesinMiddle,WestandEasternAfrica

0 10 20 30 40 50 60

WesternEurope(8/9countries)
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CentralAsia(5/5countries)

South􀍲EasternAsia(8/11countries)

EasternEurope(10/10countries)

Caribbean(9/24countries)

CentralAmerica(8/8countries)
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MiddleAfrica(2/9countries)
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are able to provide criminal justice data on

intentional homicide. Where data is available,

significant differences exist as compared with

publichealthfigures.Thelimitationsincriminal

justicedataavailabilityinAfricarelativetoother

regionsareshowninfigure2.

**Figure 2.Availability of criminal justice data on intentionalhomicide: Countries with at least one**

**criminaljusticesourceavailable(2003􀍲2008)**

Note:TheboundariesanddesignationsusedonthismapdonotimplyendorsementoracceptancebytheUnitedNations

For those countries where both criminal justice

and public health data are available, significant

differences often exist. As shown in figure 1, for

nine countries in Western Africa, for example,

thepublichealthaveragerateistentimesthatof

thecriminaljusticeaveragerate.

In countries in both Central America and the

Caribbean sub􀇦regions, the average rate of

intentionalhomicidereportedbycriminaljustice

institutionsishigherthanthatreportedbypublic

healthinstitutions.Thismaybeduetoanumber

of factors. The dataset used in figure 1 relies

primarily on national data for countries in

Central America and the Caribbean. Data

published by national authorities may be less

comparable than that collected through cross􀇦

national initiatives, such as the UN􀇦CTS, which

make use of standard definitions andmetadata.

Further, with respect to the public health data,

somecountries in these regionshave incomplete

death registration data, resulting in possible

under􀇦captureofviolentdeaths.Finally,asshown

later in thischapter,homicide rates inanumber

of countries in the Central America and

Caribbean sub􀇦regions have increased in recent

years.Criminaljusticedataforcountriesinthese

sub􀇦regions corresponds to more recent years

(mostly 2007 and 2008) than public health data

(mostly 2003􀇦2006). A combination of these

factorsmayexplainthepatternobserved.

The pattern of differences between criminal

justice and public health data, and indeed the

level of availability of criminal justice data on

homicide, can be more clearly seen at the

individual country level. Figures 3 to 5 represent

the latest year criminal justice data available by

country, presented alongside a set of country

‘death by violence’ estimates produced by the

World Health Organization for the year 2004

(WHO2009).
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**Figure3.Homiciderateper100,000population,Africaregion,bycountry(criminaljustice,latest**

**availableyear;publichealth,2004)**

Note:Numberbycountrynamesignifiesyearofcriminaljusticedata

Figure 3 shows clearly the extremely limited

availability of police􀇦recorded data on homicide

in Africa. Of allcountries in thecontinent,only

25 report police􀇦recorded homicide data at the

international level or make such information

publiclyavailableatthenationallevel.Thisisnot

to say that the other countries do not record

deathsthatcometotheattentionofthepolice,or

thatsuchdataisnotavailabletolawenforcement

institutions and government ministries

internally. The situation of data completeness

andavailabilitywithinthepoliceandgovernment

institutionslikelyvariesfromcountrytocountry.

Nonetheless,itisthecasethatalthoughonefifth

oftheworld’spopulationlivesinAfricaandmore

thanaquarterofallcountriesintheworldarein

Africa, the continent is, by far, the least

documented region in terms of data on crime.

This absence of reliable information contributes

tothelimitedattentiondevotedtosolvingcrime

andsafetychallengesintheregion.

Where police􀇦recorded homicide data is

available, rates per 100,000 population are

typically significantly lower than WHO 2004

estimates, with the exception of a few countries

includingEgypt,Tunisia,Mauritius, LibyanArab
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Jamahiriya, and Cape Verde. Further research is

needed to identify ‘true’ underlying homicide

rates in countries in Africa.WHO estimates of

death by violence rates for the majority of

4 -1.2658 countries on the continent (with the exception

mostlyofcountriesinNorthAfrica)aretypically

high, ranging from around 7 to 40 times that of

averagesinWesternEurope.Countryinformation

on mortality is not available for the majority of

countries in Africa and public health values for

thesecountriesaremostlyderivedfromestimates

usingcause􀇦of􀇦deathmodels.(WHO2009)Only

inveryfewcountriesareestimatesbasedoncause

of death registration data with complete or

almostcompletegeographiccoverage.Whilstthe

accuracy ofWHO estimates is unknown, at the

same time it is likely that law enforcement and

criminaljusticeinstitutionsinthesecountriesdo

significantly under􀇦capture levels of violent

deaths. This can be due to factors including

limitations in the capacity of police and law

enforcement agencies to identify and record

homicideevents.

Figure 4 shows significantly greater criminal

justice data availability in the Americas but also

some significant differences at the country level

as between criminal justice and public health

data. As noted above, this may be due to a

number of factors, including the fact that some

WHO country estimates are not based on

complete cause of death recording systems and

the fact that a number of countries in the

Americas show significantly increased homicide

rates as between 2004and 2006/2007.Asshown

later in this chapter, increasing homicide rates

may explain the significant public

health/criminal justice differences for Belize,

Trinidad and Tobago, Honduras, and Jamaica in

particular.

Both criminal justice and public health data are

clear, however, that some of the countries with

the highest homicide rates in the world can be

found in the Americas region. El Salvador,

Guatemala, Venezuela, Honduras, Trinidad and

Tobago and Jamaica all show police􀇦recorded

homicide rates over 40 per 100,000 population.

Colombia has shown declines in police􀇦recorded

homicide rates in recent years and according to

police data for 2008 is now well under 40

homicides per 100,000 population. WHO 2004

data for Colombia estimates a far higher figure

andthismaybeduetoboththedifferenceinyear

ofmeasurementandthepossibilitythatahigher

proportionofconflict􀇦relateddeaths(asopposed

to criminal homicide) are captured by public

healthfigures.

As shown later in this chapter, a number of the

countries with some of the highest homicide

rates have shown significant increases in

homicide rate over the last five years. Research

suggeststhathomiciderelatedtointimate,family

or other close/known persons tends to stay

relativelystable,oronlychangeslowlyovertime.

As such, it is likely that particularly high and

increasing homicide rates in a number of

countries in the Americas are due on the most

part to increasing presence of organized crime,

drug trafficking and gang activity (UNODC

2007).
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**Figure4.Homiciderateper100,000population,Americasregion,bycountry(criminaljustice,latest**

**availableyear;publichealth,2004)**

Note:Numberbycountrynamesignifiesyearofcriminaljusticedata

Figure 5 shows yet another different pattern to

thatforAfricaandtheAmericas.Criminaljustice

data availability is very high with reasonable or

goodagreementwithpublichealthfiguresforthe

majority of countries. Notably, those countries

with poorer agreement between public health

figures and criminal justice data are also those

with the overall higher homicide rates in the

region.The linkmay bemorethancoincidental.

Good agreement between data sources suggests

effective administrative recording systems. High

qualitycrimedataisinturnbothavaluabletool

forcrimepreventionandindicativeofmethodical

and organized policing. Indeed, countries in

Europe with low homicide rates (under 2 per

100,000population)havegenerallyachievedsuch

rates through a focus on crime prevention and

evidence􀇦led policing.Overall, homicide rates in

the region are relatively similaracrosscountries,

with countries in Northern andWestern Europe

showing rates typically under 2.5 per 100,000

population. In contrast, countries in Eastern

Europeshowratesfromthisleveluptoaround10

per100,000.
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**Figure5.Homiciderateper100,000population,Europeregion,bycountry(criminaljustice,latest**

**availableyear;publichealth,2004)**

Note:Numberbycountrynamesignifiesyearofcriminaljusticedata

**Trendsin ntentional omicide**

Whilst country and regional homicide rates can

be used for cross􀇦national comparison only with

caution, somewhat greater confidence may be

placed in the analysis of yearly *trend* data. As

longas factorssuchasapproachestopolicedata

recording remain constant, then changes over

time can be effectively followed, irrespective of

absolute levels.Inso faras intentionalhomicide

has been used as a proxy indicator for forms of

violent crime, and even crime in general, such

informationisimportantindeterminingpatterns

ofcrimeandemergingthreats.

The underlying dataset used in this chapter

contained sufficient information for calculation

ofyearly trenddata forsome88countries inthe

Americas, Asia, EuropeandOceania.This set of

countries is smaller than that used in figure 1.

Whilst many countries have a value for at least

one recent year available, far fewer are able to

report a consistent time series. Figures 6 to 9

showaverage intentionalhomicideratesinthese

88 countries, organized by sub􀇦region. Overall

averages for countries in the Americas, Asiaand

Oceania, and Europe regions are also shown.

0 5 10 15 20 25 30

Montenegro􀍲 07

Liechtenstein􀍲 07

Cyprus􀍲 07

Germany􀍲 07

Ireland􀍲 07

Austria􀍲 07

Andorra

France􀍲 07

Norway􀍲 07

Malta􀍲 07

Greece􀍲 07

Switzerland􀍲 07

Denmark􀍲 07

Italy􀍲 07

Iceland􀍲 07

Luxembourg􀍲 07

Netherlands􀍲 07

Sweden􀍲 07

CzechRepublic􀍲 07

Spain􀍲 07

Belgium􀍲 07

Poland􀍲 07

Portugal􀍲 07

Croatia􀍲 07

BosniaandHerzegovina􀍲 08

Slovakia􀍲 07

UnitedKingdomofGreatBritainandNorthernIreland􀍲 07

Slovenia􀍲 07

Hungary􀍲 07

Finland􀍲07

Serbia􀍲 07

Turkey􀍲 07

Bulgaria􀍲 07

Romania􀍲 07

TheformerYugoslavRepublicofMacedonia􀍲 07

Albania􀍲 07

RepublicofMoldova􀍲 07

Estonia􀍲 07

Lithuania􀍲 07

Belarus􀍲 07

Latvia􀍲 07

Ukraine􀍲 07

RussianFederation􀍲 07

**Intentionalhomicideper100,000population**

Criminaljustice

WHO2004

**i h**

15

*International Statistics on Crime and Criminal Justice*

Homicide

**Figure6.AverageintentionalhomicideratesforcountriesintheAmericas(2003􀍲2008)**

Note:Weightedaverageofhomicideratesin\_\_\_\_\_\_\_u563countriesconsistentlyreportinghomicidefortheentireperiod2003􀍲

2008(basis:2003=100)

**Figure7.AverageintentionalhomicideratesforcountriesinAsiaandOceania(2003􀍲2008)**
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**Figure8.AverageintentionalhomicideratesforcountriesinEurope(2003–2008)**

At the regional level, average intentional

homicide rates recorded by criminal justice

institutions decreased over the time period for

counties in Asia andOceania and Europe.They

stayed largely constant for countries in the

Americas. At the sub􀇦regional level however,

sub􀇦regions with high homicide rates such as

Central America and the Caribbean showed

average increases over time. Nonetheless, sub􀇦

regional rates in general changed reasonable

slowly and did not exhibit unpredictable large

increasesordecreasesfromyeartoyear.

The story can be different at national level. As

shown in figure 9, countries in the Central

America and Caribbean sub􀇦regions such as

Belize,Guatemala, Honduras, Jamaica, Trinidad

and Tobago, as well as in Venezuela, show

significant increases in homicide rates in recent

years. According to police statistics, the

homicide rate in Honduras, for example,

approximatelydoubled between 2004and 2008.

(UNODC 2010) Increases in homicide rates in

the Central Americaand Caribbean sub􀇦regions

maybelinkedtohomicideassociatedwithgang,

drug􀇦relatedororganizedcrime.Thedrug trade

fuels crime innumerous ways, through violence

linked to trafficking, by normalizing illegal

behaviour,bydivertingcriminaljusticeresources

from other activities, and importantly with

respect to homicide, by contributing to the

widespreadavailabilityoffirearms.
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**Figure9.Increasinghomicideratesinselectedcountries**

In contrast, those sub􀇦regions with lower

homicide rates also tend to be those that show

either stable or gradually decreasing homicide

rates over time. Countries in Central Asia,

Eastern Europe and Western Europe show

consistent decreasing trends over the time

period. Whilst trends in these sub􀇦regions are

encouraging, continued concerted crime

prevention action is required to maintain low

and decreasing homicide rates. At the national

level, a number of countries in the Europe

region,includingSwitzerland,Latvia,Lithuania,

and the Republic of Moldova show small but

noticeable increases in police􀇦recorded

intentional homicide rates from 2007 to 2008.

Such changesmust be interpreted with caution

as theymay be related to changes, for example,

in police recording methods. Nonetheless, the

pattern isparticularlystrikingwhenobservedin

morethanonecountryforthesameyear.

**Figure10.Decreasinghomicideratesinselectedcountries**

0

20

40

60

80

100

120

140

160

180

2003 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008

**Basis:**

**2003=100**

Jamaica Belize

Venezuela Honduras

18

**Homicideweapons**

Althoughfirearmsarenottheonlyweaponsused

inhomicide,theiravailabilitycanbeakeyfactor

indrivinglevelsofarmedviolenceandhomicide

rates.Sub􀇦regionswithhighhomicideratestend

tobeamongstthosewherea highpercentageof

homicides are committed by firearm. Available

data from 61 countries indicate that the

percentage of homicides committed by firearm

varies from 10 percent in countries in East and

Southeast Europe to around 75 percent in

CentralAmericaandtheCaribbean.

**Figure11.Percentageofhomicidescommittedwithafirearm,latestavailableyear(2003􀍲2008)**

Although a number of interpretations may be

given to the data, such as the effect of gun

control laws and differing availability of

firearms, the results must be interpreted with

caution. Countries operate different recording

systemsandmayinaccuratelyrecordthenumber

of homicides committed by firearms. This may

be the result of limited criminal justice

statistics􀇦gathering capacity or factual

difficultiesinidentifyingthecauseofdeath.

**Summaryandconclusions**

Theoverallglobalhomicideratewasestimatedat

7.6 per 100,000 population in 2004,

correspondingtosome490,000violentdeathsin

thatyear. ‘Latestavailableyear’datashows that,

despite significant difference between criminal

justice and public health data in some sub􀇦

regions, the highest homicide rates are likely in

Southern Africa, Central America and the

Caribbeansub􀇦regions.Basedoncriminaljustice

data, these sub􀇦regions show rates between 20

and30per100,000population.Thelowestglobal

homicide rates are found in Western Europe,

Southern Europe, Oceania, Eastern Asia and

Northern Europe sub􀇦regions. Both criminal

justiceandpublichealthdatashowratesunder3

per100,000populationinthesesub􀇦regions.The

majority of countries for which trend data is

available show decreasing or stable homicide

trends over the period 2003 – 2008. Overall

regionalratesbasedondatafromthesecountries

showdecreasingtrends.Atthesub􀇦regionallevel

however, increasing sub􀇦regional rates are seen

in the Caribbean and Central America. Such

increasesarelikelyduetoarelativelylimitedset

ofcountriesthatshowincreasinghomiciderates

including Guatemala, Venezuela, Jamaica,

Belize, Trinidad and Tobago, and Honduras.

Increasingratesinthesecountriesmaybelinked

in particular to the challenges of organized

crime,drugtraffickingandgangactivity.
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Chapter2– TrendsinPoliceRecordedCrime

**MarkkuHeiskanen\***

**Abstract**

This chapter presents prevalence rates and trends on five “traditional” crimes: assault, rape, robbery,

burglary and motor vehicle theft. Also data on kidnapping and crime suspects are shown. The source of

informationistheUnitedNationsSurveyofCrimeTrendsandOperationsofCriminalJusticeSystems(UN􀇦

CTS) covering the years 1996􀇦2006. The results of this chapter are based on police data and describe

therefore only those crimes that are recorded by the police. In general, it seems that recorded property

crimes,burglariesandmotorvehiclethefts,havedecreased.Rapesandrobberieshaveslightlyincreased,and

assaults have increased considerably. The average level of kidnappings has not changed. The large

differences in crime between regions and countries can partly be explained by diverging criminalisation,

efficiencyofthecriminaljusticesystemsandrecordingpractices.Countrylevelresultsshowthatespecially

the latestdata isoften fromWesternEurope,NorthAmericaandOceania.Asmallernumberofcountries

arerepresentedfromAfricaandLatinAmerica,buteventhescarceavailableinformationshowsthatcrime

iscommonintheseareas.IntheAsianregion,thelevelofrecordedcrimesislowerthaninotherregions.

**Introduction**

Police recorded crime is, as known, not

equivalent to “all” crime. A well known fact is

that a large proportion of “all” crime remains

unrecorded. Recorded crime may vary

significantly as a consequence of dissimilar

reporting rates and recording practices. In the

UN􀇦CTS, the total of all recorded crimes was

included. However, the crimes comprised in the

figurefortotalcrimeareinpracticeincomparable

across countries, because the scope of criminal

codes indifferentcountries isfar fromidentical.

Furthermore, the concept of total crime is very

abstractmaking it very difficult to interpret any

figuresonthislevel.

Data on recorded crime, collected by the UN􀇦

CTS, is available for over 100 countries. The

number of countries to be included in the

analysiscanbemaximised ifwe focusoncertain

commoncrimecategories.Bothratecomparisons

and trends of those particular crimes can be

presented.Countrylevelfiguresshould,however,

rather be seen as examples than as comparable

indicators.

Levels and trends of the following recorded

crimesaredescribedinthischapter:assault,rape,

robbery, burglary, motor vehicle theft and

kidnapping. Assault, rape, robbery, burglaryand

motor vehicle theft represent types of offences

thatarecommoninmanycountries.Kidnapping

isamoreseriouscrime thatviolatesseverelythe

personalintegrityofthevictim.Intheendofthe

chapter, also total rates ofpersonssuspectedare

analysed. Analysis of homicide has not been

included here, because a separate chapter has

beendevotedtolethalviolence.

The crimes are reported first by presenting

regional estimates of the volume of recorded

offences. Non􀇦weighted median values of the

crime rates (crimes / 100,000 population) are

usedintheanalysis.Thismeansthattheratesof

largeandsmallcountrieshaveequalweightwhen

calculating the median. The choice is based on

the argument thatwe oftencompare crime rates

between countries without taking into account

the size of the country. On the other hand, if

countries would be represented by the actual

number of crimes, very large countries would

totallydominate their regions.The disadvantage

of the chosenmethod is thatwe cannot say, for

instance, how common rapes are in Europe

overall. Accurate regional comparisons are

however impossible, because not all countries

have responded to the UN􀇦CTS. Furthermore,

countries with a population of less than 100,000

wereexcludedfromtheanalysis.

\*SeniorResearchOfficer,EuropeanInstituteforCrimePreventionandControl,

affiliatedwiththeUnitedNations(HEUNI)
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Figures are presented also on the country level.

These comparisons are based on latest available

data since the year 2000. The results are

interpretedagainstthemetadatacollected inthe

survey. Crime definitions differ between the

countries because of different penal codes, and

dissimilar reporting behaviour and recording

practices; consequently the differences of crime

levels in different countries may be based on

different definitions, reporting behaviour and

recording practices rather than differences in

actual crime. Therefore trend analysis is a more

fruitful approach as it shows how crime has

developed.The problem in trend analysis is that

the available data will be considerably reduced

when describing the trends between 1996􀇦2001􀇦

2006 because of missing data from many

countries.

Victimsurveys (e.g.vanDijketal.2007)provide

more extensive and comparable data of criminal

victimisation of households than the police

records, since they capture also crimes that are

not reported to the police, and because similar

crime definitions can be applied in the

participating countries. This Chapter focuses on

an overview of the results of the UN􀇦CTS,

comprisingpolicedataonly.

**Assault**

According to the definition in the Crime Trends

Survey questionnaire: “*Assault* may be

understood to mean physical attack against the

body of another person, including battery but

excluding indecent assault”. The respondents

wereaskedwhetherthedefinitionwasappliedin

theircountriesinthe2005􀇦2006survey.One􀇦half

ofthe80countriesthatprovideddataonassaults

in the 2005􀇦2006 survey replied that they had

applied this standard definition. Many of those

countriesthatdidnotsaythattheyusedthebasic

definition did also not specify the difference in

the definition they had applied. Therefore the

proportion of the countries that were following

thestandarddefinitionisprobablyhigherthan50

per cent. However, applying the standard

definition does not yet guarantee the

comparability;20percentofthecountriesreplied

that their data on assault included threats, and

almost 60 per cent said that they included

punching and/or slapping. The inclusion of

threats and punching/slapping may increase the

number of assaults.On the other hand, in some

countries the penal code limits assaults to

comprise incidents causing visible injuries. The

basicstandarddefinitionisthereforenotaccurate

enoughforreliablecomparison.

In the 10thUN􀇦CTS, the respondents were asked

whether adistinctionwasmade in their country

between aggravated and simple assault,

dependingonthedegreeoftheresultinginjury.If

yes, theywere asked for themain criteria for the

distinction. Nearly one􀇦half of the countries

made the distinction, but the criteria for the

distinction differed. For instance, the Canadian

response stated that “simple assault is the least

serious form of assault and includes pushing,

slapping, punching and face􀇦to􀇦face verbal

threats. Aggravated assault involves wounding,

maiming, disfiguring or endangering the life of

someone.”Somecountriesdefinedthedistinction

bytheresultingdaysofmedicalcareordisability

towork.Becausesomecountriesdidnotmakethe

distinction between simple and major assault,

there are fewer data on major assault and these

arealsolesscomparable.

Large differences in the police􀇦recorded assaults

exist between Oceania, West, Central and

Southern Africa, North America and Asia,

Southeast and East Europe. West and Central

Europe are located between these extremes

(figure 1). West, Central and Southern Africa

show the highest rates of reportedmajor assault

(nearly50%ofallassaultsintheregion),whilein

Oceania nine out of ten assaults were simple

assaults. The difference between the European

sub􀇦regionsthatwasclearlyvisibleinallassaults

decreases considerably for major assaults (figure

2). Simple assault recorded by the police is

uncommon inEastandSoutheastEurope, but in

West and Central Europe over 90 per cent of

assaultsweresimpleones.

According to victimisation surveys, the

differencesinassaultsandthreatsbetweenNorth

America and West & Central Europe are small,

andthefiguresfromthecountriesofOceaniaare

somewhat higher. Unfortunately, the last

international crime victimisation surveys are

available for these regions only (van Dijk et al.

2007,81).
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**Figure1.Majorandsimpleassaultsper100,000populationindifferentregions,**

**median,2006orlatestavailablerate(n=122,numberofcountriesinparentheses)**
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**Figure2.Majorassaultsper100,000populationindifferentareas,median,2006or**

**latestrate(n=99)**
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The country level comparisons do not evidently

describe differences in real crime between the

countries because of different crime definitions,

reporting behaviour and recording practices.

Nevertheless, the figures reveal how many

offences are handled in the criminal justice

system. The region of West and Central Europe

was located in the middle of the regional

comparison,butcountriesfromWestandCentral

Europescorehighoncountrylevel(table1inthe

Annex). Below the first quartile (the group with

lowest assault rates), there is only one country

fromWestandCentralEurope(Cyprus).Byrates

of major assault, many countries with a high

assault rate would not have been high ranking

countries.Victimisation surveys show that many

Europeancountriesabovethethirdquartile(table

1)werealsoabovetheWesternaverageinassaults.

Mostofthecountrieswithlowassaultratescome

fromAsia.

Total assault has increased between 1996 and

2006, while major assaults have increased since

1996, but not between 2001 and 2006 (table 1).

The trend in ten selectedcountries (10countries

withhighestassaultrates)isincreasing,andfrom

2001 to 2006 in many more countries, and the

increase is larger than from 1996 to 2001 (figure

3).Table 2 in theAnnex shows themeanannual

changes in the individual countries.
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**Table1.Trendofassaultandmajorassault(medianrates)**

**Crime 1996 2001 2006 n**

Assault rate, total 178 264 349 37

Assault, trend 100 149 196

Major assault rate 24 30 27 19

Major assault, trend 100 126 111

**Figure3.Trendofassaultinselectedcountries(10highestrates,log.scale)**

**Rape**

RapewasdefinedintheUNCrimeTrendsSurvey

questionnaire to mean sexual intercourse

without valid consent. Two out of three

respondents to the 10th survey replied that they

were able to follow the definition. One reason

why the definition was not followed was that

attemptedrapeswereincludedintheirdata.This

problem applies to other crime types as well,

includingassault.

Thenumberofrecordedrapes isrelativelysmall

since these offences are rarely reported to the

police.Becauseoftheverysensitivenatureofthe

offence, it has been concluded that also

victimisationsurveysunderestimatethenumber

of rapes.Rapes aremostlycommitted by males,

and thevictims arewomen.1Thepenalcodes of

somecountriesdefine,however,rapeasagender

neutraloffence (inthemetadatasomecountries

explained that they could not follow the

standard definition given in the questionnaire

becauseaccordingtotheirpenalcodethevictim

couldonlybeawoman).IntheUN􀇦CTSdata,the

rape rate is calculated per 100,000 population.

Therefore the rates for the female population,

beingtheprincipalvictims,areinpracticetwice

ashighasthosepresentedinthischapter.

Southern Africa, Oceania and North America

have the highest recorded rape rates, Asia the

lowest. The differences between the regions are

large. The comparability between the regions is

limited because many figures from developing

countries are from older surveys (e.g. no data

were provided for Southern Africa in the most

recentCrimeTrendssurvey).

1Comparableinformationofthegenderofthevictimsisnotavailable.TheEuropeanSourcebookasksforthe

sexoftheoffender.Inaboutonepercentofrecordedrapesin24Europeancountriesthesuspectedoffender

wasawoman(year2006).Thisis,however,notevidenceforthatthevictimwasaman,andthefemale

offendermayhaveparticipatedintheoffencetogetherwithamaleoffender.Norisitcertainthatinthecases

withmaleperpetrators,thevictimisawoman,althoughthisisthesituationinmostcases.
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The differences between the rape rates of

individual countries are large in the highest

quartile (figure 5, table 3 in the Annex). This

indicatesthatthedefinitionofrapeislikelytobe

broader in North America, for instance in

Canada (Canada’s comment in the metadata:

“Data includes sexual assaults, i.e. any physical

sexualcontact(includestouching)withaperson

againsttheir willorwithoutproperconsentand

may or may not include sexual intercourse.”),

comparedtotheEuropeancountries.

**Figure4.Rapesper100,000populationindifferentregions,median,2006orlatest**

**rate(n=116)**
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**Figure5.Countriesabovethe3rdQuartileaccordingtotheraperate(policerecorded**

**rapes/100,000population,latestrate)**
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Australia (2003)

South Africa (2002)
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Fromthelowestquartilethedevelopedcountries

aremissing.Somedevelopingcountrieshavenear

tozeroratesofrape,andsomeofthesecountries

have also been recently in a state of war2 and

suffered from internal conflicts. In these

countries rapes may not be recorded in a way

comparabletoothercountries.

Thetrendinrapeisincreasing(table2).Figure6

shows the ten countries with the highest rape

ratesanddata for all three (or nearby)points in

time. The figure comprises developed countries

only.The rates are levelling off; rapes in Canada

and the United States were most frequent in

1996, but have decreased by 2006, while in the

othercountriestheyhaveincreased(figure6).

**Table2.Trendinrape(n=49)**

**1996 2001 2006**

Median 5.3 5.8 6.8

Trend 100 110 129

**Figure6.Trendofrapeinselectedcountries(10highestrates,log.scale)**

**Robbery**

Robbery isapropertycrimethatinvolvestheuse

ofviolenceorthreatofviolence.Itwasdefinedin

the 10thUN􀇦CTS Questionnaire tomean theft of

propertyfromaperson,overcomingresistanceby

force or threat of force. Robbery included

muggings,bag􀇦snatchingandtheftwithviolence.

The responses in the metadata comprised

specifications of the crime scenes (e.g. banks,

post offices, commercial businesses or streets),

andtheinclusionofattemptswasreported.Two􀇦

thirds of the countries were able to apply the

definitiongiveninthequestionnaire.

Bag􀇦snatchingwas includedin54percentofthe

countries, but in Poland, and some other

countries, offences below a certain monetary

valueareclassifiedasmisdemeanours.59percent

of the countries responded that theft with

violencewasincludedinrobbery.

2“Theincidence of violenceagainstwomen inarmedconflict,particularlysexual violence including rape,has

beenincreasinglyacknowledgedanddocumented.Violenceagainstwomenhasbeenreportedfromconflictor

post 􀍲conflict situations in many countries or areas including Afghanistan, Burundi, Chad, Colombia, Côte

d’Ivoire,DemocraticRepublicoftheCongo,Liberia,Peru,Rwanda,SierraLeone,Chechnya/RussianFederation,

Darfur, Sudan, northern Uganda and the former Yugoslavia” (Secretary􀍲General's study on violence against

women.http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/vaw/violenceagainstwomenstudydoc.pdf,6.11.2009)

1

10

100

1996 2001 2006

Canada

Sweden

NewZealand

UnitedStatesofAmerica

NorthernIreland

EnglandandWales

Scotland

Finland

Germany

Denmark

27

*International Statistics on Crime and Criminal Justice*

Police Recorded Crime

Robbery was most common in Southern Africa

and in the Americas. East and Central & West

Europe, North Africa and Oceania are on the

globalaveragelevel(figure7).

**Figure7.Robberiesper100,000populationindifferentregions,median,2006or**

**latestrate(n=112)**
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The trend of 35 countries is slightly increasing

(table 3).The trend seems to be in linewith the

trend of assaults: both have increased over the

ten year period studied. The level and trend in

robbery in individual countries are presented in

theAnnextables5and6.

**Table3.Trendinrobbery(n=35)**

**1996 2001 2006**

Median 49 56 60

Trend 100 115 122

**Housebreaking/ urglary**

Burglarywasdescribedtomean“togainaccessto

a closed part of a building or other premises by

use of force with the intent to steal goods”.

Figures on burglary were asked to include theft

from a factory, shop or office, theft from a

military establishment, theft by using false keys,

and to exclude theft from a car, theft from a

container, theft from a vending machine, theft

from a parking meter and theft from fenced

meadow/compound.The inclusionandexclusion

criteriawerequitedetailed,and41percentofthe

71 countries that responded to the metadata

section replied that theywere able to follow the

definition. The metadata does not give

information on the influence of the included or

excludeditemsonthefigures.

Domesticburglaryisnotdistinguishedfromtotal

burglary. Domestic burglary is an important

safety indicator, because it resembles a crime

againstaperson,suchasviolence,byitssensitive

nature to the victim. According to the European

Sourcebook, in most countries the majority of

burglaries are, however, committed against

businessesandcorporations(Aebietal.2006).

The burglary rate is highest in the region of

Oceania (especially in Australia and New

Zealand). Of North America, Canada and the

USA, as well as South Africa, Swaziland and

ZimbabweofSouthernAfrica(figure8andAnnex

table 7) have high rates. All of these regions are

representedby3􀇦4countries.Severalcountriesin

West & Central Europe have high burglary rates

(the highest in Denmark, Austria, England &

WalesandSweden),butsomehavealsorelatively

low rates (Estonia, Latvia, Norway). Israel

belongs to the region Near and Middle East

/South􀇦WestAsia,andithadahighburglaryrate.

In the other seven countries of the region the

burglary rate is very low. No European orNorth

American countries belong to the low crime

category(belowthe1stQuartile).

**b**
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**Figure8.Burglariesper100,000populationindifferentregions,median,2006orlatestrate(n=95)**

0 200 400 600 800 1000 1200 1400 1600

SouthAsia(5)

NearandMiddleEast/South􀍲West Asia(8)

CentralAsiaandTranscaucasian countries(5)

EastAfrica(3)

NorthAfrica(3)

LatinAmericaandCaribbean(13)

EastandSouth􀍲East Asia(9)

SoutheastandEastEurope(9)

West&CentralEurope(30)

SouthernAfrica(3)

NorthAmerica(2)

Oceania(3)

The trend of burglary is declining in most

countries (table 4, figure 9, Annex table 8). At

thesametimedifferencesbetweenthecountries

are decreasing. In only five of 25 countries

(Belarus, Croatia, Cyprus, Mauritius and

Slovenia) burglary had increased from 1996 to

2006.

**Table4.Trendinburglary(n=25)**

**1996 2001 2006**

Median 676 619 458

Trend 100 91 68

**Figure9.Trendofburglaryinselectedcountries(10highestrates,log.scale)**

**Motorvehicle/automobiletheft**

Crimes against motor vehicles represent an

importantelementofpropertycrime3.According

to victimisation surveys, motor vehicle theft is

very often reported to the police; in developed

countries 80􀇦90 per cent of car and motorcycle

thefts are reported (Alvazzi del Frate 2005, van

Dijketal.2007).Thereason forreporting isthe

relatively high value of the commodities.

Furthermore,inmanycountriespolicereporting

isrequiredforinsurancecompensation.
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Automobiletheftwasdefinedas “theremovalof

amotorvehiclewithouttheconsentoftheowner

of the vehicle”. 47 of the 74 countries reported

that the definition could be applied in their

countries in 2005/2006. For most countries, it

was not clear, what the difference was, if the

suggesteddefinitionwasnotapplied.Alsosome

countriesthatfollowedthedefinitionreportedof

differences, for instance that attempts were

included, and limitations in counting different

typesofmotorvehicles(e.g.Canada:“Refersonly

to theft of automobiles and station wagons;

excludes vans, trucks, and motorcycles”). The

metadatacollectedonthequestionnairesuggest

that most countries do not record separately

different types of motor vehicles (motorcycle

was, however, recorded separately in 22 of 74

countries).

Reasonsformotorvehicletheftsdiffer.Somecars

are stolen for joyriding, and the vehicle is

abandoned after a short􀇦term driving.

Sometimes, a stolen car has been used in the

context of committing other crimes. Some

vehicles are stolen with the purpose of keeping

the commodity. Organised crime groups may

move the stolen vehicles abroad. In different

partsoftheworld,thestructureofvehiclethefts

differs, and so do the chances for the stolen

propertytoberetrieved.

**Figure10.Motorvehicletheftindifferentregionsper100,000population,median,**

**latestyear**
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Differences inmotor vehicle theft are very large

between developed (highest Quartile) and

developing countries (lowest Quartile).

Improved security systems of new cars,and the

overall increase of cars outside the developed

countriesmaychangethesituationinthefuture,

andalsobetweenregions,ifmoreexpensivecars

that are sold in wealthier countries are better

protected against theft. Advanced protection of

thevehiclesmayalsochangethewaythevehicles

are stolen, for instance ifcar hijacking becomes

the only feasible way to drive the vehicle away

fromthecrimescene.

Thecontents of the category ofvehiclesmay be

dissimilar in different parts of the world: e.g.

motorcycles are probably more common in the

developingcountriescomparedto industrialised

countries.

Adjusting the rates to the number of

automobiles, automobile thefts were most

common (in the highest Quartile) in Israel,

SouthAfrica,MalaysiaandSweden.

Trend data show decrease in most countries in

the 2000s (table 5, Annex table 10). Of the ten

countries that had the highest theft rates only

Malaysia showed an increasing trend from 1996

to 2006 (figure 11). According to the

International Crime Victimisation Surveys,

thefts of cars have decreased slightly in all

subsequent surveys since the beginning of the

1990s(vanDijketal.2007).

3IntheendofDecember2008\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_thedatabaseofInterpolheldmorethan4,6millionrecordsofstolenmotor

vehicles(http://www.interpol.int/public/vehicle/default.asp,5.11.2009)
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**Table5.Trendinmotorvehiclethefts(n=43)**

**1996 2001 2006**

Median 137 141 99

Trend 100 103 72

**Figure11.Motorvehicletheftratetrendinselectedcountries(10highestrates,log.scale)**

**Kidnapping**

The definition of kidnapping was as follows:

“*Kidnapping* may be understood to mean

unlawfullydetainingapersonorpersonsagainst

theirwill(ornationalequivalente.g.usingforce,

threat, fraud or enticement) for the purpose of

demanding for their liberation an illicit gain or

any other economic gain or other material

benefit, or in order to oblige someone to do or

not to do something.” About one􀇦half of the

countriesrepliedthatthedefinitionwasapplied

in their countries. Examples of specified

definitionscomefromCanada(includesforcible

confinementandtransportingpersonsoutsideof

Canada (i.e. human trafficking, etc.)) and

Scotland (kidnapping is classified as abduction

and plagium (child theft); it is simply the

carryingoff,orconfiningofanyperson,forcibly,

andwithoutlawfulauthority,andneednothave

a particular motive or purpose). Both countries

had high kidnapping rates. In theUnited States

data on kidnapping is not collected at national

levelintheUniformCrimeReport.

The kidnapping rate was highest in Southern

Africa (figure 12).HereSouthernAfricaconsists

of three countries (South Africa (2002),

Swaziland and Zimbabwe (both have provided

data for 2004). In Zimbabwe the recorded rate

was lower (1,6/100,000pop.)compared toSouth

Africa and Swaziland. Of individual counties,

Turkeyhasthehighestscore.
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**Figure12.Kidnappingsper100,000populationindifferentregions,median,2006or**

**latestrate(n=89)**
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**Figure13.Countriesabovethe3rdquartileaccordingtothekidnappingrate(police**

**recordedkidnappings/100,000population,latestrate**
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In India the kidnapping rate was one of the

lowestinthehighestquartile.Theirnumberwas,

however, highest among the countries, nearly

24,000offencesin2006.

Data on kidnapping have been collected from

1980 to 1986and since 2001.Therefore theyears

1986􀇦2001􀇦2006wereavailablefortrendanalysis.

Thetrendoftencountriesshowsmedianratesof

1.3 – 2.0 – 1.3; the average level of kidnappings

doesnotseemtohavechangedoverthe20years.
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**Suspects**

The total number of persons brought into

contactwiththepoliceorotherwisecontactedby

thecriminal justicesystem–personssuspected,

arrestedorcautioned–weredefinedinasimilar

manner as the number of recorded crimes,

excluding minor trafficoffencesandotherpetty

offences. The number of suspects is in most

countries smaller than the number of recorded

crimes,becausemanycrimesarenotcleared,i.e.

asuspectfortheoffencehasnotbeenfound.On

theotherhand,onecrimemayinvolvemorethan

one offender, and one offender may have

committed many crimes. On the average, the

ratiobetweenoffendersandoffencesislessthan

one (mean=0.69, median=0.48, in the highest

quartile0.85).Thetotalnumberofoffendershas

been increasing steadily since 1996 (table 9).

According to the 9th UN􀇦CTS (detailed

information on suspects was not asked in the

10thSurvey)inEuropeandNorthAmerica14per

cent of suspects were women in 2004 (the

proportion varied between 2 and 26 per cent

between the countries; Heiskanen 2008).

**Table9.Trendofsuspects(n=104)**

**1996 2001 2006**

Median 765 842 876

Trend 100 110 115

North America has the highest suspect rates

(figure 14), but of individual countries Finland

has the highest suspect rates since 2001 (figure

15).Thereasonfortheincreaseinthenumberof

suspectsinFinlandbetween1996and2001isthe

penal code reform; from 1999 traffic offences

have been included in the penal code. After

subtractingsuspects for trafficoffences,therate

of suspects in Finland still remains high; the

suspects are often coming from violent and

property crimes, as is also the case in the USA

andNewZealand.IntheUSAalsodrugsuspects

increase the rate. The background for the high

and increasing level of suspects in the Republic

of Korea is not clear. It is not based on a high

number of traditional violent, property or drug

offences.

**Figure14.Totalrateofsuspectsper100,000populationindifferentregions,median,**

**2006orlatestrate**
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**Figure15.Suspectratetrendinselectedcountries(10highestrates,log.scale)**

Countriesthataremissingfromthetrendfigure,

but had high rates of suspects were Uruguay

(2004), Chile (2004), Austria (2006), England

andWales (2006), Swaziland (2004), Zimbabwe

(2004), Sri Lanka (2004), Israel (2004) and El

Salvador(2006)(suspectratesinthesecountries

wereover2,000/100,000pop.).

**Summaryandconclusions**

“Traditional” violent and property crimes have

taken different directions (figure 16; the figure

summarises trends of individual crime rates

presented earlier in this chapter). Assaults have

increased,andtheincreaseislargerfrom2001to

2006 as compared to the period 1996􀇦2001. Also

rapes and robberies have increased, but to a

lesserextent.Propertycrimes,measuredhereby

burglaryandmotorvehicletheft,havedecreased.

The decrease of motor vehicle thefts has

occurred during the latter time period 2001􀇦

2006.

**Figure16.Trendsofviolentandpropertycrimes**
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Crimesrecordedbythepoliceareinmanywaysa

problematic measure for criminality, and in

particular for country comparisons, because all

crimes are not reported to the police (see e.g.

Lewis 1999, Barclay et al. 2009). Especially

violent crimes are very sensitive by nature, and

for instance rapes are often not reported to

authorities in fear of secondary victimisation

(process of blaming the victims for their

victimisation; it is also known that in many

countries the perpetrator is rarely punished for

therape).Thepenalcodesmayalsodefinelimits

for the cases (e.g. certain monetary values for

propertycrimes)tobeaccepted forrecordingas

crimes. On the other hand, mostmotor vehicle

thefts and burglaries are in many countries

reportedtothepolice;thesecrimecategoriesare

therefore better represented in the police

statistics.

The shortcomings of the police statistics speak

strongly for victimisation surveys. From the

developed world we have national trends and

international comparisons. Unfortunately,

representative victimisation surveys are scarce

among the developing countries. But also the

police data from the developing countries are

defective;toomanycountriesaretotallymissing

from the UN􀇦CTS data, and even those

developing countries that have participated do

notoftenhavethe possibility todeliverthedata

regularly;thereforetheirlatestdatamaybeold.

Nevertheless,theresultsofthischapterindicate

thatmanydevelopingcountriesaremoreheavily

affected by crime that the developed countries.

On the other hand, the more developed

surveillance systems in the developed countries

may produce relatively high crime rates

compared to less developed statistical

monitoring.

There are also large differences between

developing countries in the different regions. It

seemsthatviolence isinAsia lesscommonthan

elsewhere in the developing world, and certain

areas of Africa, Oceania and America suffer

severely from violence. Also inside the same

region, the differences in recorded crime rates

are often very large: developing countries from

the same region are often found in the highest

and the lowest quartile of a particular offence

type.

Property crimes are more common in the

developedworld. For instance, burglary is more

prevalentinOceania,NorthAmericaandWest&

Central Europe (and also in Southern Africa)

compared to other parts of the world. Motor

vehicle theft rates are high in the developed

countries, because of the number of cars. The

rates, which are calculated against the

population,notthenumberofcars,are likelyto

exaggeratethedifferencesfurther.

Also one crime that does not belong to volume

crimes was studied; kidnapping seems to be

overallin2006atthesamelevelasitwasin1986,

but its variation across regions is considerable.

**Dataanalysis**

The crime rates in the data were validated by

studying the trends between the surveys in the

respective countries. If there was reason to

believe that the figure was incorrect, it was

removed.InEuropetwointernationalsourcesare

available for validating the data: The European

Sourcebook (European Sourcebook… 2003, Aebi

etal.2006andthe fourthEuropeanSourcebook

database covering the years 2003􀇦2007), and

Statistics inFocusbyEurostat(Tavares,Thomas

2009).TheUN􀇦CTSdatawerecontrolledagainst

these sources, and replaced if needed. No

individual missing countries were, however,

addedtothedatafromtheothersources.

Thecrimesarereportedbyregionifatleastthree

countries in the region had provided data.

Otherwise,thecountrieswereaddedtoadjacent

regions. North America is an exception

comprising Canada and USA. Countries with a

populationlessthan100,000wereexcludedfrom

theanalysis.

Non􀇦weighted median values of the crime rates

(crimes / 100,000 population) are used in the

figures. This means that the rates of large and

small countries have equal weight when

calculatingthemedian.Thechoicewasmadeto

facilitate comparison of crime rates between

countrieswithouttakingintoaccountthesizeof

the country. The disadvantage of the method is

that we cannot exactly estimate the volume of

crime in different regions. Accurate and

complete regional comparisons are, however,

impossible because not all countries have

respondedtotheCrimeTrendsSurvey.

Country level data are based on latest available

data since the year 2000. The results are

interpretedagainstthemetadatacollectedinthe

survey. Crime definitions differ between the
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countries because of different penal codes,

reporting behaviour, and recording practices,

andconsequently differences inthe crime levels

in different countries may depend more on

different definitions and features of the system

than on actual crime. Therefore trend analysis

represents a more fruitful approach: it shows

how crime has changed in the countries under

comparablecircumstances.

Themeanannualchangeincrimerateshasbeen

calculatedusingtheformula

**(x**2**/x**1**)1/(t2􀇦t1)􀇦1**,

wherex1isthevalueatyeart1andx2thevalueat

yeart2.

In describing the trends between 1996􀇦2001􀇦

2006, missing data is replaced by adjacent

observation, if available. E.g. if valid data was

available for theyears 1996,2000and 2006, but

notfor2001,datafor2000wasusedasaproxyfor

theyear2001.
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**AnnexBto hapter2**

**Table 1. Assault and major assault rates in different countries (police recorded assaults/100,000**

**population)4**

**Below the lowest Quartile (1)**

**Lowest Quartile - Median (2)**

Country

Assault

total Major assault Country

Assault

total

Major

assault

Albania (2002) 18.0 14.3 Belarus (2006) 46.3 20.3

Armenia (2006) 20.7 6.5 Bolivia (2006) 54.2 1.4

Azerbaijan (2006) 1.9 0.2 Bosnia and Herzegovina (2006) 39.6 12.4

Bangladesh (2006/-) 0.4 .. Bulgaria (2004) 47.6 0.9

China (2000/-) 9.5 .. Colombia (2000) 63.4 0.2

Costa Rica (2006) 19.7 15.9 Czech Republic (2006/2000) 78.1 8.3

Croatia (2006) 27.9 24.1 Ecuador (2006/2004) 49.8 27.9

Cyprus (2006) 15.9 12.3 El Salvador (2006) 75.9 3.5

India (2006/-) 23.1 .. Georgia (2006) 49.0 0.3

Indonesia (2000) 9.0 5.2 Greece (2006/-) 66.7 ..

Kyrgyzstan (2006) 3.9 0.7 Guatemala (2000/-) 48.1 ..

Lebanon (2006) 10.0 0.1 Japan (2006) 51.0 26.7

Malaysia (2006/2000) 21.9 21.9 Kenya (2006/-) 35.9 ..

Myanmar (2002) 17.0 5.9 Kuwait (2002) 86.0 24.8

Nepal (2006) 3.8 0.1 Latvia (2006) 67.9 3.8

Oman (2002) 28.9 2.0 Panama (2006) 54.2 36.3

Pakistan (2000) 0.1 0.0 Paraguay (2006) 36.3 7.8

Papua New Guinea (2000) 25.1 0.0 Poland (2006) 76.3 38.9

Philippines (2002) 0.1 0.0 Qatar (2002/2004) 37.4 2.5

Republic of Moldova (2004) 32.3 8.7 Republic of Korea (2002/-) 34.3 ..

Sao Tome and Principe (2004) 0.7 0.0 Romania (2006) 43.9 3.1

Singapore (2006) 14.6 2.6 Saudi Arabia (2002/2000) 63.2 7.2

Syrian Arab Republic (2006) 28.0 0.9 Serbia (2006) 36.9 15.9

Tajikistan (2006) 14.5 1.7 Slovakia (2006/2002) 60.9 8.0

Turkmenistan (2006) 1.7 0.8 Thailand (2006/-) 38.8 ..

Ukraine (2006/-) 13.9 .. Uganda (2004) 92.7 15.9

Yemen (2000/-) 5.6 .. United Arab Emirates (2004/2006) 53.7 17.9

**Median - highest Quartile (3) Above the highest Quartile (4)**

Country

Assault

total Major assault Country

Assault

total

Major

assault

Algeria (2006) 108.6 91.8 Argentina (2006/-) 366.4 0.0

Brunei Darussalam (2006) 119.5 0.8 Australia (2003/2006) 797.0 3.1

Denmark (2006/2004) 214.1 26.7 Austria (2006/-) 440.3 ..

Dominican Republic (2006/-) 155.1 .. Bahrain (2006/2004) 464.7 5.9

Estonia (2006) 291.5 10.5 Barbados (2000) 611.9 109.3

France (2000) 180.1 0.3 Belgium (2004/-) 627.2 ..

Hungary (2004) 127.0 80.7 Canada (2006) 737.5 173.8

Ireland (2006) 93.9 93.9 Chile (2004) 531.3 49.4

Italy (2006) 123.7 100.3 England and Wales (2006) 1365.3 32.2

Jordan (2006) 273.1 11.5 Finland (2006) 586.9 39.1

Lithuania (2006) 131.2 10.0 Germany (2006) 619.9 183.1

Luxembourg (2002) 296.5 91.8 Iceland (2004) 394.0 20.2

Maldives (2004/2002) 212.6 15.0 Israel (2004) 763.3 50.3

Malta (2006) 272.9 27.5 Jamaica (2000) 421.9 220.0

Mexico (2006) 223.5 160.4 Mauritius (2006) 1044.9 9.8

Mongolia (2006) 144.0 16.3 Netherlands (2006/-) 351.8 ..

Morocco (2006) 186.0 113.3 New Zealand (2006) 839.4 150.4

Nicaragua (2006/-) 332.9 .. Northern Ireland (2006) 1426.0 70.3

Norway (2006) 346.0 69.1 Portugal (2006) 377.4 6.5

Occupied Palestinian Territory (2005) 174.7 14.4 Scotland (2006) 1655.1 127.5

Peru (2002) 99.9 70.3 South Africa (2002) 1188.0 576.5

Slovenia (2006) 120.2 1.0 Spain (2006/2000) 414.7 25.2

4Thecountriesaredividedintofourgroupsofequalsizeaccordingtotherecordedassaultrate.Thecategory“belowthe1st

quartile”(lowerquartile)containsthose25%ofcountrieswithlowestrecordedcrimerate,thegroup“abovethe3rdquartile”

(upperquartile)the25%thathavehighestrate.

**c**
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**Median - highest Quartile (3) Above the highest Quartile (4)**

Country

Assault

total Major assault Country

Assault

total

Major

assault

(Contd.)

Sri Lanka (2004) 109.4 35.1 Swaziland (2004) 1308.2 516.1

Switzerland (2006/2000) 108.3 2.9 Sweden (2006) 845.2 52.8

Turkey (2006/-) 192.7 .. Tunisia (2002) 371.2 154.7

Uruguay (2004) 336.4 48.1 United States of America (1999/2006) 786.7 281.6

Zambia (2000/-) 211.4 .. Zimbabwe (2004) 765.1 226.8

**Only major assault** Major assault Mean 251 50

Côte d'Ivoire (-/2000) 66.1 Median 93 16

Egypt (-/2004) .. 0.3 1st Quartile 34 3

Iran. Islamic Republic of (-/2004) .. 114.4 3rd Quartile 347 52

Montenegro (-/2006) .. 26.4

Russian Federation (-/2000) .. 26.9 No data ..

The fYRepublic of Macedonia (-/2006) .. 21.6

Venezuela ( -/2000) .. 104.2

**Table2.Meanannualchangesintheassaultrates**

Assault rate

1996 2001 2006

Mean annual

change

2001-2006

Mean annual

change

1996-2006

Mean annual

change

1996-2006

Azerbaijan 17.2 2.4 1.9 -32.4 -5.0 -19.9

Belarus 15.1 19.8 46.3 5.5 18.5 11.8

Belgium 488.3 584.0 627.2 3.6 1.4 2.5

Bulgaria 39.4 38.5 47.6 -0.4 4.3 1.9

Canada 743.4 764.5 737.5 0.6 -0.7 -0.1

Chile 162.4 274.7 531.3 11.1 14.1 12.6

Costa Rica 17.3 55.9 19.7 26.5 -18.8 1.3

Croatia 24.2 98.9 27.9 32.5 -22.4 1.4

Denmark 163.6 188.3 214.1 2.8 2.6 2.7

England and Wales 444.7 936.5 1365.3 16.1 7.8 11.9

Estonia 35.5 33.6 291.5 -1.1 54.1 23.4

Finland 478.9 527.0 586.9 1.9 2.2 2.1

Georgia 5.8 10.3 49.0 12.0 36.6 23.7

Hungary 100.1 107.7 127.0 1.5 3.3 2.4

India 23.1 23.1 23.1 0.0 0.0 0.0

Italy 41.5 53.6 123.7 5.2 18.2 11.5

Japan 19.2 40.1 51.0 15.9 4.9 10.3

Latvia 29.6 35.0 67.9 3.4 14.2 8.7

Maldives 127.1 137.1 212.6 1.5 9.2 5.3

Mauritius 1070.3 902.6 1044.9 -3.4 3.0 -0.2

Mexico 250.7 256.6 223.5 0.5 -2.7 -1.1

Netherlands 192.9 304.3 351.8 9.5 2.9 6.2

New Zealand 818.0 804.1 839.4 -0.3 0.9 0.3

Norway 230.3 328.4 346.0 7.4 1.0 4.2

Occupied Palestinian Territory 218.1 211.3 174.7 -0.6 -3.7 -2.2

Poland 80.2 81.6 76.3 0.4 -1.4 -0.5

Portugal 352.2 371.4 377.4 1.1 0.3 0.7

Republic of Korea 11.0 32.1 34.3 24.0 1.3 12.1

Republic of Moldova 29.8 27.6 3.7 -1.5 -33.2 -18.9

Romania 6.1 59.0 43.9 57.7 -5.7 21.9

Scotland 1055.6 1211.3 1655.1 2.8 6.4 4.6

Singapore 21.8 13.3 14.6 -9.4 1.9 -4.0

Slovenia 92.9 111.1 120.2 3.6 1.6 2.6

Spain 132.2 224.6 414.7 11.2 13.0 12.1

Sweden 607.4 669.1 845.2 2.0 4.8 3.4

Turkey 72.6 80.5 192.7 2.1 19.1 10.3

Ukraine 9.7 10.8 13.9 2.1 5.2 3.6
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**Table3.Raperatesindifferentcountries(policerecordedassaults/100.000population)**

**Below the lowest Quartile (1) Lowest Quartile - Median (2)**

Rape Rape

Albania (2006) 1.5 Belarus (2006) 3.6

Algeria (2006) 1.5 China (2000) 2.8

Armenia (2006) 0.3 Colombia (2000) 4.7

Azerbaijan (2006) 0.4 Croatia (2006) 4.2

Bahrain (2006) 2.3 Cyprus (2006) 3.4

Bosnia and Herzegovina (2006) 1.1 Georgia (2006) 3.8

Côte d'Ivoire (2000) 1.9 Greece (2006) 2.4

Egypt (2005) 0.2 Guatemala (2000) 3.3

Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of China (2004) 1.3 Hungary (2004) 2.6

India (2006) 1.7 Kenya (2006) 3.5

Indonesia (2000) 0.7 Kyrgyzstan (2006) 5.1

Japan (2006) 1.5 Malta (2006) 4.2

Jordan (2006) 1.9 Mauritius (2006) 5.1

Lebanon (2006) 0.5 Morocco (2006) 3.4

Maldives (2004) 0.3 Occupied Palestinian Territory (2004) 2.8

Montenegro (2006) 1.8 Oman (2002) 4.6

Myanmar (2002) 0.5 Philippines (2006) 3.0

Nepal (2006) 0.8 Portugal (2006) 3.2

Pakistan (2000) 0.0 Russian Federation (2000) 4.8

Qatar (2004) 1.6 Singapore (2006) 2.7

Saudi Arabia (2002) 0.3 Slovakia (2006) 3.2

Serbia (2006) 1.1 Slovenia (2006) 2.7

Syrian Arab Republic (2006) 0.6 Spain (2006) 4.8

Tajikistan (2006) 1.1 The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (2006) 5.1

Turkmenistan (2006) 0.5 Tunisia (2002) 3.2

Uganda (2004) 2.0 Turkey (2006) 2.5

Ukraine (2006) 2.1 Zambia (2000) 2.9

United Arab Emirates (2006) 1.7

Yemen (2000) 0.4

**Median - highest Quartile (3)** Rape **Above the highest Quartile (4)** Rape

Argentina (2006) 8.3 Australia (2003) 91.6

Austria (2006) 8.5 Barbados (2000) 27.0

Bangladesh (2006) 7.5 Belgium (2004) 26.3

Bolivia (2006) 7.8 Belize (2006) 15.3

Brunei Darussalam (2006) 7.4 Canada (2006) 68.2

Bulgaria (2004) 6.8 El Salvador (2006) 18.7

Chile (2004) 11.4 England and Wales (2006) 25.6

Costa Rica (2006) 11.0 France (2004) 17.3

Czech Republic (2006) 5.2 Iceland (2004) 17.5

Denmark (2006) 9.7 Israel (2004) 15.2

Ecuador (2006) 11.2 Jamaica (2000) 50.8

Estonia (2006) 11.4 Mexico (2006) 12.8
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**Median - highest Quartile (3) Above the highest Quartile (4)**

Rape Rape

(Contd.)

Finland (2006) 11.6 Mongolia (2006) 13.5

Germany (2006) 9.9 Namibia (2002) 15.1

Ireland (2006) 10.0 New Zealand (2006) 32.2

Italy (2006) 7.7 Nicaragua (2006) 27.6

Kazakhstan (2006) 10.4 Northern Ireland (2006) 26.2

Latvia (2006) 5.7 Norway (2006) 18.0

Lithuania (2006) 7.5 Panama (2006) 24.1

Luxembourg (2002) 8.7 Papua New Guinea (2000) 24.0

Malaysia (2000) 5.2 Peru (2004) 20.8

Netherlands (2006) 8.7 Republic of Korea (2004) 13.3

Paraguay (2006) 6.0 Scotland (2006) 18.0

Poland (2006) 5.2 South Africa (2002) 113.5

Republic of Moldova (2006) 6.2 Suriname (2004) 45.2

Romania (2006) 5.2 Swaziland (2004) 76.1

Sri Lanka (2004) 7.4 Sweden (2006) 40.6

Switzerland (2006) 8.5 United States of America (2006) 30.2

Thailand (2006) 8.0 Zimbabwe (2004) 40.0

Uruguay (2000) 9.8

Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) (2000) 12.0

Mean 11.7

1st Quartile 2.4

Median 5.2

3 rd Quartile 12.2
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**Table4.Meanannualchangesintheraperates**

Rape rate

Country

1996 2001 2006

Mean annual

change

1996-2001

Mean annual

change

2001-2006

Mean annual

change

1996-2006

Armenia \* 1.2 0.9 0.3 -5.3 -18.6 -12.2

Azerbaijan 0.9 0.5 0.4 -11.6 -3.9 -7.8

Belarus 5.4 7.5 3.6 6.6 -13.5 -4.0

Belgium 14.2 22.6 26.3 9.8 3.0 6.4

Bulgaria \* 9.3 7.4 6.8 -4.4 -1.7 -3.1

Canada 91.4 77.6 68.2 -3.2 -2.6 -2.9

Chile \* 4.2 8.8 11.4 16.1 5.4 10.6

Croatia 2.0 3.9 4.2 13.8 1.8 7.6

Cyprus 1.1 2.3 3.4 16.0 8.7 12.3

Czech Republic 6.6 5.5 5.2 -3.5 -1.2 -2.4

Denmark 7.4 9.2 9.7 4.5 1.1 2.8

England and Wales 11.7 18.6 25.6 9.8 6.7 8.2

Estonia \* 6.6 5.3 11.4 -4.3 16.4 5.6

Finland 7.7 8.9 11.6 2.8 5.6 4.2

Georgia \* 0.9 1.0 3.8 1.0 30.8 14.9

Germany 7.6 9.6 9.9 4.8 0.5 2.6

Greece \* 1.3 1.0 2.4 -4.9 18.2 6.0

Hungary \* 4.1 5.8 2.6 7.1 -14.5 -4.3

India \* 1.5 1.5 1.7 -0.3 2.2 1.0

Ireland \* 4.9 5.8 10.0 3.3 11.4 7.3

Italy 2.0 4.3 7.7 16.2 12.4 14.3

Japan 1.2 1.8 1.5 8.3 -2.7 2.6

Kyrgyzstan \* 7.8 6.5 5.1 -3.6 -4.6 -4.1

Latvia 5.3 5.1 5.7 -0.6 1.9 0.7

Lithuania 4.7 5.1 7.5 1.6 8.1 4.8

Maldives \* 2.8 1.8 0.3 -8.1 -28.1 -18.7

Mauritius \* 3.5 2.3 5.1 -8.4 17.5 3.8

Netherlands 9.2 10.8 8.7 3.3 -4.1 -0.5

New Zealand 26.6 21.5 32.2 -4.2 8.4 1.9

Northern Ireland 17.6 17.3 26.2 -0.3 8.7 4.1

Norway \* 9.6 12.4 18.0 5.1 7.7 6.4

Peru \* 18.5 22.5 20.8 4.0 -1.5 1.2

Poland 5.1 6.1 5.2 3.5 -3.0 0.2

Portugal 4.9 3.6 3.2 -5.8 -2.4 -4.1

Republic of Korea \* 11.8 13.2 13.3 2.3 0.2 1.2

Republic of Moldova 5.8 4.7 6.2 -4.3 5.7 0.6

Romania 6.0 5.8 5.2 -0.9 -2.1 -1.5

Scotland 11.8 11.6 18.0 -0.2 9.2 4.4

Singapore \* 2.8 3.0 2.7 2.0 -2.3 -0.2

Slovakia 3.9 3.1 3.2 -4.0 0.5 -1.8

Slovenia 3.4 5.0 2.7 7.6 -11.2 -2.3

Sri Lanka \* 3.9 6.4 7.4 10.4 2.9 6.6

Sweden 14.2 23.5 40.6 10.6 11.6 11.1

Switzerland 4.9 6.3 8.5 5.3 6.3 5.8

Thailand\* 5.9 6.4 8.0 1.7 4.4 3.0

Turkey \* 1.2 1.9 2.5 10.2 5.5 7.8

Ukraine \* 3.5 2.4 2.1 -7.4 -2.0 -4.7

United States of America 35.1 31.2 30.2 -2.3 -0.6 -1.5

Zimbabwe 28.7 44.7 40.0 9.3 -2.2 3.4

\* Figure from adjacent year used as proxy
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**Table5.Robberyratesindifferentcountries(policerecordedassaults/100,000population)**

**Below the lowest Quartile (1) Lowest Quartile - Median (2)**

Robbery Robbery

Albania (2002) 7.2 Bahrain (2006) 31.3

Armenia (2006) 5.6 Bosnia and Herzegovina (2006) 20.4

Azerbaijan (2006) 2.8 China (2000) 24.5

Bangladesh (2006) 0.6 Croatia (2006) 32.6

Brunei Darussalam (2006) 0.5 Czech Republic (2006) 46.8

Cyprus (2006) 9.5 Denmark (2006) 48.8

France (2004) 10.8 Finland (2006) 32.3

Iceland (2004) 12.0 Greece (2006) 23.4

India (2006) 1.6 Hungary (2004) 31.9

Japan (2006) 4.0 Indonesia (2000) 29.8

Jordan (2006) 14.0 Israel (2004) 36.3

Kuwait (2002) 11.2 Kenya (2006) 14.2

Lebanon (2006) 3.5 Kyrgyzstan (2006) 45.5

Montenegro (2006) 12.9 Mongolia (2006) 33.8

Myanmar (2002) 0.01 Norway (2006) 29.7

Nepal (2006) 0.5 Panama (2006) 38.1

Occupied Palestinian Territory (2005) 5.4 Paraguay (2006) 31.5

Oman (2002) 6.7 Republic of Moldova (2006) 23.3

Pakistan (2000) 0.1 Romania (2006) 18.9

Philippines (2006) 8.4 Serbia (2006) 37.5

Qatar (2004) 2.6 Singapore (2006) 21.7

Republic of Korea (2004) 10.4 Slovakia (2006) 29.6

Saudi Arabia (2000) 2.9 Slovenia (2006) 31.5

Syrian Arab Republic (2006) 4.3 Sri Lanka (2004) 41.0

Tajikistan (2006) 2.7 The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (2006) 24.7

Tunisia (2002) 11.5 Turkey (2006) 28.5

Turkmenistan (2006) 2.9 Uganda (2004) 17.7

United Arab Emirates (2006) 13.2 Zambia (2000) 25.8

**Median - highest Quartile (3) Above the highest Quartile (4)**

Robbery Robbery

Algeria (2006) 72.4 Argentina (2006) 905.3

Australia (2002) 81.8 Barbados (2000) 170.1

Austria (2006) 61.6 Belarus (2006) 100.2

Bulgaria (2004) 53.0 Belgium (2004) 211.4

Canada (2006) 94.2 Belize (2006) 182.4

Colombia (2000) 61.7 Bolivia (2002) 110.9

El Salvador (2006) 92.0 Chile (2004) 1275.6

Estonia (2006) 74.7 Costa Rica (2006) 527.3

Georgia (2006) 62.4 Dominican Republic (2006) 556.4

Germany (2006) 65.2 Ecuador (2006) 398.8

Ireland (2006) 55.7 England and Wales (2006) 188.7

Jamaica (2000) 90.8 Guatemala (2000) 102.8

Kazakhstan (2006) 88.9 Italy (2006) 121.7

Luxembourg (2002) 95.8 Latvia (2006) 98.6

Malaysia (2006) 82.1 Lithuania (2006) 128.2

Malta (2006) 54.9 Maldives (2004) 161.9

Mauritius (2006) 88.3 Mexico (2006) 504.7

Morocco (2006) 83.4 Nicaragua (2006) 440.7

Netherlands (2006) 83.7 Peru (2004) 156.1

New Zealand (2006) 59.7 Portugal (2006) 197.3

Northern Ireland (2006) 90.4 South Africa (2002) 494.5

Papua New Guinea (2000) 63.0 Spain (2006) 201.2

Poland (2006) 92.2 Swaziland (2004) 304.2

Russian Federation (2000) 90.3 Thailand (2006) 107.1

Scotland (2006) 69.9 United States of America (2006) 146.4

Sweden (2006) 94.2 Uruguay (2004) 277.5

Switzerland (2006) 54.6 Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) (2000) 143.3

Ukraine (2006) 89.4 Zimbabwe (2004) 101.4
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**Table6.Meanannualchangesintherobberyrates**

Robbery rate

Mean annual

change

Mean annual

change

Mean annual

change

1996 2001 2006 1996-2001 2001-2006 1996-2006

Armenia \* 3.7 5.3 5.6 7.6 1.1 4.3

Azerbaijan 3.2 2.2 2.8 -7.5 5.0 -1.5

Belarus \* 52.9 56.4 100.2 1.3 12.2 6.6

Canada 107.5 88.0 94.2 -3.9 1.4 -1.3

Croatia 10.5 17.9 32.6 11.2 12.8 12.0

Cyprus 2.6 5.3 9.5 15.5 12.4 14.0

Czech Republic 41.5 42.8 46.8 0.6 1.8 1.2

Denmark 43.4 59.6 48.8 6.5 -3.9 1.2

England and Wales 144.0 231.8 188.7 10.0 -4.0 2.7

Estonia \* 199.7 346.9 74.7 11.7 -26.4 -9.4

Finland 40.7 41.6 32.3 0.4 -4.9 -2.3

Germany 82.6 69.5 65.2 -3.4 -1.3 -2.3

Italy 54.7 66.4 121.7 4.0 12.9 8.3

Japan 2.0 5.0 4.0 20.8 -4.5 7.4

Kyrgyzstan \* 36.1 30.2 45.5 -3.5 8.6 2.3

Latvia 118.9 129.9 98.6 1.8 -5.4 -1.9

Lithuania 96.6 120.2 128.2 4.5 1.3 2.9

Malaysia \* 33.5 63.1 82.1 13.5 5.4 9.4

Mauritius \* 84.4 97.6 88.3 2.9 -2.0 0.4

Netherlands 97.4 131.6 83.7 6.2 -8.7 -1.5

New Zealand 49.1 42.4 59.7 -2.9 7.1 2.0

Northern Ireland 103.8 131.5 90.4 4.8 -7.2 -1.4

Norway \* 18.8 39.7 29.7 16.1 -5.7 4.7

Poland 68.0 129.9 92.2 13.8 -6.6 3.1

Portugal 128.1 169.3 197.3 5.7 3.1 4.4

Republic of Moldova 55.0 66.7 23.3 3.9 -19.0 -8.2

Romania 17.1 15.7 18.9 -1.7 3.8 1.0

Scotland 103.2 83.5 69.9 -4.1 -3.5 -3.8

Singapore \* 21.4 11.5 21.7 -11.6 13.5 0.1

Slovakia 23.8 23.0 29.6 -0.7 5.2 2.2

Slovenia 25.7 27.1 31.5 1.1 3.1 2.1

Sweden 65.8 96.1 94.2 7.9 -0.4 3.7

Switzerland 31.6 31.2 54.6 -0.3 11.9 5.6

Turkey 2.4 2.5 28.5 0.1 63.2 27.8

Ukraine 54.4 43.8 89.4 -4.2 15.3 5.1

\*Figurefromadjacentyearusedasproxy
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**Table7.Burglaryratesindifferentcountries(policerecordedcases/100,000population)**

**Below the lowest Quartile (1) Lowest Quartile - Median (2)**

Burglary Burglary

Azerbaijan (2006) 1.7 Algeria (2006) 28.3

Bangladesh (2006) 2.2 Armenia (2006) 27.8

Bolivia (2002) 10.4 Bahrain (2006) 52.9

Costa Rica (2004) 3.9 Bosnia and Herzegovina (2006) 106.3

El Salvador (2006) 0.0 Brunei Darussalam (2006) 145.7

India (2006) 8.0 Chile (2004) 134.0

Kenya (2006) 5.6 China (2000) 90.7

Kyrgyzstan (2006) 19.9 Colombia (2000) 33.6

Maldives (2004) 9.0 Ecuador (2006) 111.3

Mexico (2006) 20.6 Estonia (2004) 40.5

Morocco (2006) 23.3 Georgia (2006) 113.7

Myanmar (2002) 0.0 Jamaica (2000) 94.5

Nepal (2006) 0.1 Latvia (2006) 89.2

Occupied Palestinian Territory (2005) 3.0 Malaysia (2006) 104.7

Pakistan (2000) 0.1 Mongolia (2006) 88.5

Paraguay (2006) 13.4 Norway (2006) 75.0

Peru (2002) 26.9 Papua New Guinea (2000) 48.6

Republic of Korea (2004) 4.4 Qatar (2004) 50.6

Saudi Arabia (2002) 0.1 Republic of Moldova (2006) 105.2

Singapore (2006) 25.7 Romania (2006) 79.8

Syrian Arab Republic (2006) 14.1 Sri Lanka (2004) 88.5

Tajikistan (2006) 1.5 Tunisia (2000) 81.3

Thailand (2000) 21.2 United Arab Emirates (2004) 54.7

Uganda (2004) 25.1 Zambia (2000) 94.3

**Median - highest Quartile (3) Above the highest Quartile (4)**

Burglary Burglary

Belarus (2006) 316.6 Australia (2006) 1530.2

Belize (2006) 523.9 Austria (2006) 1203.3

Bulgaria (2004) 328.2 Barbados (2000) 1177.4

Croatia (2006) 458.1 Belgium (2004) 586.6

Cyprus (2006) 363.1 Canada (2006) 680.9

Czech Republic (2006) 523.3 Denmark (2006) 1317.9

Finland (2006) 467.2 England and Wales (2006) 1157.7

Greece (2006) 292.3 France (2004) 622.4

Hungary (2004) 442.2 Germany (2006) 631.6

Italy (2006) 190.2 Iceland (2004) 950.4

Japan (2000) 234.0 Ireland (2006) 567.9

Lithuania (2006) 195.9 Israel (2004) 1844.5

Malta (2006) 321.1 Luxembourg (2002) 659.1

Mauritius (2006) 186.4 New Zealand (2006) 1476.3

Netherlands (2006) 427.5 Northern Ireland (2006) 663.9

Poland (2006) 455.3 Scotland (2006) 597.6

Portugal (2006) 429.1 Slovenia (2006) 902.9

Serbia (2006) 151.0 South Africa (2002) 852.8

Slovakia (2006) 186.8 Spain (2006) 878.9

Suriname (2004) 442.1 Swaziland (2004) 749.1

The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (2006) 443.7 Sweden (2006) 1094.2

Turkey (2006) 216.9 Switzerland (2006) 758.1

Uruguay (2004) 251.9 United States of America (2006) 714.4

Zimbabwe (2004) 540.8

Mean 339

1st Quartile 27

Median 146

3rd Quartile 532
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**Table8.Meanannualchangesintheburglaryrates**

Burglary rate

Mean annual

change

Mean annual

change

Mean annual

change

1996 2001 2006 1996-2001 2001-2006 1996-2006

Belarus 120.7 266.7 316.6 17.2 3.5 10.1

Canada 1 342.1 901.7 680.9 -7.6 -5.5 -6.6

Croatia 316.7 477.7 458.1 8.6 -0.8 3.8

Cyprus 177.5 100.5 363.1 -10.8 29.3 7.4

Czech Republic 955.4 618.9 523.3 -8.3 -3.3 -5.8

Denmark 2 083.7 1 774.5 1 317.9 -3.2 -5.8 -4.5

England and Wales 2 265.3 1 677.9 1 157.7 -5.8 -7.2 -6.5

Finland 1 015.5 767.0 467.2 -5.5 -9.4 -7.5

Latvia 41.9 524.2 89.2 65.7 -29.8 7.8

Malaysia \* 108.1 141.4 104.7 5.5 -5.8 -0.3

Mauritius \* 99.1 132.6 186.4 6.0 7.0 6.5

Netherlands 676.4 573.1 427.5 -3.3 -5.7 -4.5

New Zealand 2 148.2 1 521.2 1 476.3 -6.7 -0.6 -3.7

Northern Ireland 969.7 1 014.8 663.9 0.9 -8.1 -3.7

Norway \* 100.6 118.1 75.0 3.3 -8.7 -2.9

Poland 791.9 848.6 455.3 1.4 -11.7 -5.4

Portugal 499.1 422.0 429.1 -3.3 0.3 -1.5

Republic of Moldova 110.7 53.6 105.2 -13.5 14.4 -0.5

Romania 128.6 79.8 79.8 -9.1 0.0 -4.7

Scotland 1 266.1 886.0 597.6 -6.9 -7.6 -7.2

Singapore \* 48.3 24.7 25.7 -12.6 0.8 -6.1

Slovakia 586.5 437.5 186.8 -5.7 -15.6 -10.8

Slovenia 392.0 744.4 902.9 13.7 3.9 8.7

Sweden 1 638.0 1 327.7 1 094.2 -4.1 -3.8 -4.0

Switzerland 1 050.1 793.7 758.1 -5.4 -0.9 -3.2

United States of America 914.5 727.3 714.4 -4.5 -0.4 -2.4

\*Figurefromadjacentyearusedasproxy

**Table9.Motorvehicletheftratesindifferentcountries(policerecordedcases/100,000population)**

**Below the lowest Quartile (1) Lowest Quartile - Median (2)**

Car theft Car theft

Albania (2002) 6.4 Belarus (2006) 16.0

Algeria (2006) 6.9 Belize (2006) 21.5

Armenia (2006) 4.3 Bolivia (2006) 35.1

Azerbaijan (2006) 1.4 China (2000) 35.5

Bangladesh (2006) 0.7 Côte d'Ivoire (2000) 17.1

Georgia (2006) 4.1 Dominican Republic (2006) 30.6

India (2006) 7.9 El Salvador (2006) 20.7

Kazakhstan (2006) 3.0 Hong Kong (2004) 25.4

Kenya (2006) 0.1 Indonesia (2000) 14.2

Kyrgyzstan (2006) 4.1 Jamaica (2000) 10.0

Mongolia (2006) 3.6 Japan (2006) 28.3

Morocco (2006) 4.4 Jordan (2006) 42.4

Myanmar (2002) 0.1 Lesotho (1997) 27.7

Namibia (2002) 3.2 Montenegro (2006) 15.8

Nepal (2006) 0.1 Oman (2002) 17.0

Nicaragua (2006) 3.6 Panama (2006) 18.8

Occupied Palestinian Territory (2005) 7.6 Papua New Guinea (2000) 14.0

Pakistan (2000) 0.1 Paraguay (2006) 24.6

Qatar (2004) 7.9 Peru (2004) 38.7

Republic of Moldova (2006) 3.7 Russian Federation (2006) 17.8

Romania (2006) 5.9 Serbia (2006) 39.0

Sri Lanka (2004) 4.2 Singapore (2006) 20.6

45

*International Statistics on Crime and Criminal Justice*

Police Recorded Crime

**Below the lowest Quartile (1) Lowest Quartile - Median (2)**

Car theft Car theft

(Contd.)

Syrian Arab Republic (2006) 4.5 Suriname (2004) 8.1

Tajikistan (2006) 0.6 Swaziland (2004) 27.5

Turkmenistan (2006) 0.0 Thailand (2006) 35.1

Uganda (1997) 2.1

The Former Yugoslavian Republic of

Macedonia (2006) 17.9

United Republic of Tanzania (1997) 0.8 Tunisia (2002) 17.6

Yemen (2000) 4.5 Ukraine (2006) 11.9

Zambia (2000) 7.6 United Arab Emirates (2006) 14.3

Zimbabwe (2000) 8.8

**Median - highest Quartile (3) Above the highest Quartile (4)**

Car theft Car theft

Argentina (2006) 84.9 Australia (2004) 436.2

Austria (2006) 78.5 Bahamas (1997) 334.0

Barbados (2000) 88.6 Bahrain (2006) 289.3

Bosnia and Herzegovina (2006) 64.5 Belgium (2004) 180.4

Brunei Darussalam (2006) 44.8 Canada (2006) 268.3

Bulgaria (2000) 99.0 Cyprus (2006) 211.1

Chile (2004) 57.9 Czech Republic (2006) 205.3

Colombia (2000) 83.3 Denmark (2006) 281.9

Costa Rica (2006) 127.4 England and Wales (2006) 360.0

Croatia (2006) 45.8 Finland (2006) 290.3

Ecuador (2006) 53.7 France (2004) 323.4

Estonia (2004) 46.5 Greece (2006) 138.6

Fiji (1997) 54.9 Iceland (2004) 150.3

Germany (2006) 51.4 Ireland (2004) 326.3

Guatemala (2000) 63.0 Israel (2004) 469.4

Hungary (2004) 73.8 Italy (2006) 475.0

Iran (2004) 134.9 Malaysia (2006) 315.3

Kuwait (1996) 57.3 Malta (2006) 144.4

Latvia (2006) 95.1 Netherlands (2006) 138.3

Lebanon (2006) 47.8 New Zealand (2006) 563.2

Lithuania (2006) 93.7 Northern Ireland (2006) 196.3

Luxembourg (2002) 128.4 Norway (2006) 312.6

Maldives (2004) 109.6 Portugal (2006) 231.3

Mauritius (2006) 79.6 Scotland (2006) 293.1

Mexico (2006) 136.8 South Africa (2002) 201.6

Poland (2006) 80.0 Spain (2006) 271.9

Saudi Arabia (2002) 85.4 Sweden (2006) 566.7

Slovakia (2006) 96.9 Switzerland (2006) 768.8

Slovenia (2006) 42.5 United States of America (2006) 390.2

Turkey (2006) 45.9 Uruguay (2004) 140.7

Mean 118

1st Quartile 4

Median 46

3rd Quartile 135
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**Table10.Meanannualchangesinthemotorvehicletheftrates**

Motor vechile theft rate

Mean annual

change

Mean annual

change Mean annual

change

1996 2001 2006 1996-2001 2001-2006 1996-2006

Azerbaijan 1.4 0.9 1.4 -8.8 9.0 -0.3

Belarus 19.5 16.6 16.0 -3.2 -0.7 -2.0

Bulgaria \* 145.6 140.9 99.0 -0.6 -6.8 -3.8

Canada 608.8 544.0 268.3 -2.2 -13.2 -7.9

Costa Rica 30.5 109.1 127.4 29.0 3.2 15.4

Croatia 44.0 49.6 45.8 2.4 -1.6 0.4

Czech Republic 267.0 230.6 205.3 -2.9 -2.3 -2.6

Denmark 822.7 550.3 281.9 -7.7 -12.5 -10.2

England and Wales 959.9 626.7 360.0 -8.2 -10.5 -9.3

Finland 395.3 435.5 290.3 2.0 -7.8 -3.0

Georgia 9.2 5.1 4.1 -11.0 -4.4 -7.8

Germany 208.9 91.8 51.4 -15.2 -11.0 -13.1

Greece \* 136.6 77.6 138.6 -10.7 12.3 0.2

Hong Kong Ukraine \* 40.5 42.1 42.1 0.7 0.0 0.4

Hungary \* 156.7 91.1 73.8 -10.3 -4.1 -7.2

Ireland \* 368.5 396.0 396.0 1.5 0.0 0.7

Italy 556.1 411.7 475.0 -5.8 2.9 -1.6

Japan 218.0 49.9 28.3 -25.5 -10.7 -18.5

Kyrgyzstan \* 5.6 3.3 4.1 -10.1 4.6 -3.0

Latvia 102.4 117.6 95.1 2.8 -4.2 -0.7

Lithuania 108.3 167.2 93.7 9.1 -10.9 -1.4

Malaysia (2006) 119.2 240.1 315.3 15.0 5.6 10.2

Mexico (2006) 158.9 148.5 136.8 -1.4 -1.6 -1.5

Netherlands 235.5 219.0 138.3 -1.4 -8.8 -5.2

New Zealand 849.1 538.3 563.2 -8.7 0.9 -4.0

Northern Ireland 505.7 688.7 196.3 6.4 -22.2 -9.0

Norway \* 393.4 520.5 312.6 5.8 -9.7 -2.3

Paraguay \* 37.0 26.2 24.6 -6.6 -1.3 -4.0

Poland 123.2 154.9 80.0 4.7 -12.4 -4.2

Portugal 198.7 254.4 231.3 5.1 -1.9 1.5

Republic of Moldova 36.0 17.4 3.7 -13.5 -26.7 -20.4

Romania 8.0 8.5 5.9 1.3 -7.1 -3.0

Scotland 670.8 458.3 293.1 -7.3 -8.5 -7.9

Singapore \* 68.7 41.1 20.6 -9.8 -12.9 -11.3

Slovakia 124.6 94.6 96.9 -5.4 0.5 -2.5

Slovenia 74.1 43.2 42.5 -10.3 -0.3 -5.4

Spain \* 233.6 334.3 271.9 7.4 -4.0 1.5

Sweden 809.0 675.7 566.7 -3.5 -3.5 -3.5

Turkey \* 36.2 22.5 45.9 -9.1 15.3 2.4

Ukraine \* 7.8 6.5 11.9 -3.6 12.9 4.4

United States of America 508.7 422.1 390.2 -3.7 -1.6 -2.6

Zimbabwe \* 11.4 10.8 8.8 -1.1 -4.0 -2.6

\* adjacent year used as proxy
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**Table11.Kidnappingratesindifferentcountries(policerecordedcases/100,000population)**

**Below the lowest Quartile (1) Lowest Quartile - Median (2)**

Kidnapping Kidnapping

Austria (2004) 0.05 Albania (2001) 0.49

Brunei Darussalam (2004) 0.00 Algeria (2006) 0.44

Costa Rica (2006) 0.11 Azerbaijan (2006) 0.25

Croatia (2006) 0.16 Belarus (2006) 0.24

Czech Republic (2002) 0.16 Bosnia and Herzegovina (2006) 0.24

Dominican Republic (2006) 0.14 Denmark (2006) 0.30

Egypt (2006) 0.02 Ecuador (2006) 0.36

El Salvador (2006) 0.13 Hungary (2006) 0.19

Estonia (2006) 0.07 Italy (2006) 0.47

Finland (2004) 0.02 Kyrgyzstan (2002) 0.25

Germany (2002) 0.17 Latvia (2004) 0.35

Japan (2006) 0.15 Maldives (2006) 0.35

Mongolia (2006) 0.04 Morocco (2006) 0.27

Myanmar (2006) 0.004 Oman (2006) 0.20

Nicaragua (2004) 0.11 Panama (2006) 0.46

Paraguay (2005) 0.08 Peru (2002) 0.41

Philippines (2006) 0.03 Republic of Moldova (2006) 0.35

Poland (2005) 0.06 Saudi Arabia (2002) 0.49

Singapore (2006) 0.02 Serbia (2006) 0.19

Tajikistan (2006) 0.08 Slovakia (2006) 0.30

Thailand (2006) 0.02 Slovenia (2006) 0.30

Uruguay (2006) 0.09 Syrian Arab Republic (2002) 0.27

**Median - highest Quartile (3) Above the highest Quartile (4)**

Kidnapping Kidnapping

Armenia (2006) 0.85 Australia (2006) 3.81

Bangladesh (2006) 0.72 Bahrain (2004) 2.82

Bolivia (2002) 0.53 Belgium (2006) 3.68

Chile (2006) 0.71 Belize (2002) 2.77

Cyprus (2006) 1.78 Bulgaria (2002) 2.46

Georgia (2003) 0.77 Canada (2006) 13.82

Iceland (2006) 0.70 England and Wales (2006) 4.41

Ireland (2006) 1.87 France (2006) 3.53

Jordan (2005) 0.59 India (2006) 2.09

Kazakhstan (2006) 0.55 Kuwait (2006) 11.52

Lebanon (2004) 0.90 Luxembourg (2006) 5.14

Lithuania (2006) 1.77 Northern Ireland (2006) 3.10

Mexico (2006) 0.56 Occupied Palestinian Territory (2006) 5.37

Montenegro (2006) 0.64 Portugal (2006) 5.25

Nepal (2006) 0.89 Scotland (2004) 7.45

New Zealand (2006) 0.91 South Africa (2004) 6.65

Qatar (2004) 0.75 Sri Lanka (2006) 4.48

Romania (2006) 1.34 Swaziland (2006) 8.61

Spain (2004) 0.51 Switzerland (2004) 3.66

The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (2002) 1.18 Tunisia (2006) 5.77

Ukraine (2004) 0.50 Turkey (2006) 14.84

Zimbabwe (2006) 1.58 Turkmenistan (2006) 2.66

United Arab Emirates (2006) 1.94

Mean 1.7

1st Quartile 0.2

Median 0.5

3rd Quartile 1.9
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Chapter3– Drugcrime

**StevenMalby\***

**Abstract**

This chapter presents available police􀇦recorded data on drug crime. Whilst many forms of crime may

ultimately be driven by or related in some way to the use or effects of narcotic drugs or psychotropic

substances,mostcountriesalsoemployspecific lawsconcerningtheproduction,use,purchaseandsaleof

drugs. It is offences under these specific laws with which this is concerned. The

demonstrates the challenges of collection and cross􀇦national comparability of data on drug crime with

referencetoapplicableinternationaldefinitionsandthetranslationofsuchdefinitionsintonationallaws.It

exploresregionaldifferencesbetweentheproportionofmajortominorpolice􀇦recordeddrugoffencesand

examinesavailabletrendsindrug􀇦crime.Itconcludesthatlevelsofpolice􀇦recordeddrugoffencesarelikely

driven as much by law enforcement policies and priorities concerning narcotic drugs and psychotropic

substancesastheyarebyunderlyinglevelsofdruguseandmarkets.

**Introduction**

Crimerecordedbylawenforcementagenciesmay

be directly or indirectly related to drugs. A

proportion of crimes such as robbery, theft,

assault or burglary are driven by underlying

factors such as drug use. However, from a

statisticalpointofview,theextenttowhichdrug

use is responsible for such crimes is not easily

capturedandrarelyformspartofofficialreports.

On theotherhand, lawenforcementagencies in

most countries produce and retain information

onoffencesthatdirectlyinvolvenarcoticdrugsor

psychotropicsubstances.

Collecting and analyzing such data on a cross􀇦

national basis presents a considerablechallenge.

Nationaldrug lawsshowsignificantvariationsin

theextenttowhichtherangeofpossibleactions

involving drugs (such as cultivation, possession,

use, or sale) are made into criminal offences.

National laws further differ on the extent to

which criminal sanctions apply according to the

particular drug and the specific amount in

question.

Guidance on appropriate definitions in this

respect may be obtained from the international

frameworkfordrugcontrol.Thisconsistsofthree

drug􀇦related treaties: The Single Convention on

Narcotic Drugs of 1961 (asamended by the 1972

Protocol), the Convention on \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Psychotropic

Substances of 1971, and the United Nations

Convention against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic

DrugsandPsychotropicSubstancesof1988.Over

95 percent of all States have chosen to become

parties to the conventions. The conventions

requirepartiestoestablishawiderangeofdrug􀇦

relatedactivitiesascriminaloffencesundertheir

domesticlaw.

The Conventions do, however, grant some

latitude with regard to the penalization of

personalconsumption􀇦relatedoffences.Partiesto

the 1961 Convention, for example, are under

obligation not to permit thepossession ofdrugs

forpersonalnon􀇦medicalconsumption.Partiesto

the 1988Convention are required to establish as

criminal offences activities preparatory to

personal consumption (possession, purchase or

cultivation),subjecttoeachparty’sconstitutional

principlesandbasiclegalconcepts.

Analysis of the wording of the Conventions

indicates that there is a sharp distinction

between offences related to drug *trafficking* and

offences related to *personal use* of illicit drugs.

Thisdistinctioncanbeusedtodefinethreebroad

categories for data collection on offences

involvingdrugs:

\*ResearchOfficer,UnitedNationsOfficeonDrugsandCrime(UNODC)
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􀁸 **Drug􀇦related crime (**corresponding to all

offencesinvolvingdrugs);

􀁸 **Drug possession/use** (the ‘less serious’

offence corresponding most closely to

personaluseoffences);and

􀁸 **Drugtrafficking**(the‘moreserious’offence

corresponding more closely to the

production,manufacture,deliveryorsaleof

drugsnotforpersonaluse).

The Sixth to Tenth United Nations Surveys of

CrimeTrendsandOperationsofCriminalJustice

Systems (UN􀇦CTS), covering the years 1995 to

2006, collected data on the first of these

categories; total drug􀇦related crime. The

definition supplied was drawn from the

international drug conventions and included

cultivation,production,manufacture,extraction,

preparation, offering for sale, distribution,

purchase,sale,deliveryonanytermswhatsoever,

brokerage, dispatch, dispatch in transit,

transport,importation,exportation,possessionor

traffickingofinternationallycontrolleddrugs.

The Tenth UN􀇦CTS (2005􀇦2006) collected data

both on total drug􀇦related crime, and also on

drug trafficking, which it defined as ‘drug

offences, which are not in connection with

personal use’.The EleventhUN􀇦CTS (2007􀇦2008)

(datafromwhichisnotincludedinthisanalysis)

expandedthequestionsfurthertocoverallthree

categories – total drug􀇦related crime,

possession/use,anddrugtrafficking.

**Drugcrimedatacollectionatthenationalandinternationallevel**

Whilst the exact border between possession/use

and trafficking offences will differ as between

countries, the use of these categories offers a

broad approach to data collection on less and

more serious drug offences. In national law and

practice, the distinction is likely to be made

either by reference to the quantity of drugs

involvedorthroughthewayinwhichtheoffender

operates (such as part of organized criminal

operations). The distinction may be set out in a

separate ‘trafficking’ offence, or simply by an

additional criterion applied to a single general

drug􀇦relatedcrimeoffence.

For example, in Austria, offences akin to

‘trafficking’ are distinguished based on the

quantityofdruginvolvedandan‘*intentiontoput*

*it on the market*’. The ‘trafficking’ offence is set

outseparatelyinlaw(Articles28(narcoticdrugs)

and 31 (psychotropic substances) of theNarcotic

Substances Act (*Suchtmittelgesetz*)) and Austria

reportsoffencesrecordedunderArticles28and31

at the international level when asked for drug

‘trafficking’ offences under the definition ‘*not*

*solely in connection with personal use*’.Ageneral

primary offence (Article 27) covers possession,

production, import, export and purchase of

quantitiesthatdonotqualifyforthemoreserious

Article 28 offence. Article 27 further includes a

‘*personal use’* exception that allows for a lesser

sentenceinthecaseofpersonaluse.

InGermany,ageneralprimaryoffence(Article29

Narcotic Substances Act

(*Betäubungsmittelgesetz*)) covers all drug􀇦related

activities, including cultivation, production,

trade, import, export, sale, transfer, making

available, buyingand possession.The law allows

the prosecutor or the court to drop a case with

respect to small quantities for personal

consumption only. In addition to the ‘small

quantity’ provisions, the Act also specifies ‘large

quantities’ (most important in Article 29a). In

order to construct the number of drug

‘trafficking’ offences it is necessary to add the

relevant criminological categories of police

statistics together from the general primary

offence and the different qualified offences

(Articles 29a to 30b, mainly covering aggravated

forms of trafficking, such as trafficking of large

quantities). These statistical categories include

illegal trade or smuggling, illegal importation of

large quantities, cultivation, production or

trading,givingdrugstominors,andirresponsibly

causingthedeathofanotherbygivinghimorher

drugs. Moreover, the distinction for these

categories can be made with respect to either

‘medium’ quantities of drugs (not ‘small’ or

‘large’) or only in respect of ‘large quantities’. As

shown in ox 2 in this chapter, this distinction

cancausedifficultiesinthecomparabilityofdata,

depending upon the approach adopted to

reportingofdata at the internationalor regional

level.

Such examples illustrate the complexity of

translating data recorded under national offence

definitionsintofigureswithsomedegreeofcross􀇦

national comparability. Such differences are not

limitedtothenationallevelonlyhowever.Atthe

international and regional level, a range of

approachestodatacollectionondrugcrimeexist.

b
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Table1belowsetsoutthedefinitionsandunitsof

count used for data collection by five cross􀇦

national data collection initiatives – (i) the

United Nations Survey of Crime Trends and

Operations of Criminal Justice Systems, (ii) the

UNODC‘AnnualReportsQuestionnaire’usedfor

datacollectionondrugissues,(iii)thecrimeand

criminal justice data collection of the Statistical

OfficeoftheEuropeanUnion(Eurostat),(iv)the

European Sourcebook of Crime and Criminal

Justice Statistics (EuropeanSourcebook),and (v)

data collected by the European Monitoring

CentreforDrugsandDrugAddiction(EMCDDA).

As table 1 demonstrates, whilst these five data

collection initiatives adopt the same underlying

approachtodatacollection(basedontotaldrug􀇦

related crime, drug possession/use, and drug

trafficking) they sometimes use subtly different

definitionsandcountingunitapproaches.

Asshowninbox1,thiscanresult,forexample,in

different \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_data being provided for the same

definition, or even the same data provided for

different definitions. As such, reconciling data

collected on drug crime by different cross􀇦

national initiatives represents a significant

challengeinunderstandingunderlyingchangesin

levels and trends of drug offences.

**Table1.Definitions,unitsofcountandmetadatausedbyfivecross􀍲nationaldatacollection**

**initiativesondrugcrime**

**Data Collection**

**Instrument** 􀂃 **UNCTS**

**Geographic**

**Coverage** 􀂃 **All UN Member states**

**Data Collection**

**Frequency** 􀂃 **Biennial**

**Crime Category Definition applied Unit of Count**

**Cases/**

**Offences**

**Arrested Convicted**

**Other Metadata**

**Total** Intentional acts that involve the

cultivation, production, manufacture,

extraction, preparation, offering for

sale, distribution, purchase, sale,

delivery on any terms whatsoever,

brokerage, dispatch, dispatch in

transit, transport, importation,

exportation and possession of

internationally controlled drugs

􀀹 􀀹 􀀹 􀂃 Tick box for where definition

differs

􀂃 Free text comments field

**Use** Drug offences related to drug use or

possession for use (11th CTS only)

􀀹 􀀹 􀀹 􀂃 Tick box for where definition

differs

􀂃 Free text comments field

**Trafficking** Drug offences, which are not in

connection with personal use

􀀹 􀀹 􀀹 􀂃 Tick box for where definition

differs

􀂃 Free text comments field

**Data Collection**

**Instrument** 􀂃 **UN ARQ**

**Geographic**

**Coverage** 􀂃 **All UN Member States**

**Data Collection**

**Frequency** 􀂃 **Annual**

**Crime Category Definition applied Unit of Count**

**Cases/**

**Offences**

**Arrested Convicted**

**Other Metadata**

**Total** Data not collected

**Use** Possession/abuse of drugs 􀀹 􀀹 􀀹 􀂃 Disaggregation for offences and

persons arrested by drug type,

gender, age group and

occupation of perpetrator

􀂃 Tick box for unit of count and

option to use other unit

**Trafficking** Trafficking of drugs (includes arrests

made in the context of illicit cultivation

and manufacture of drugs)

􀀹 􀀹 􀀹 􀂃 Disaggregation for offences and

persons arrested by drug type,

gender, age group, occupation,

nationality of perpetrator

􀂃 Tick box for unit of count and

option to use other unit

􀂃 Free text field for description of

drug trafficking groups
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**Data Collection**

**Instrument** 􀂃 **Eurostat crime and criminal justice statistics**

**Geographic**

**Coverage**

􀂃 **EU-27**

􀂃 **EU Candidate: HR, MK, TR**

􀂃 **EU Potential Candidate: AL, BiH, Kosovo under UNSCR 1244, Montenegro, Serbia**

􀂃 **EFTA/EEA: IS, LI, NO, CH**

􀂃 **Other countries: Australia, Canada, Japan, New Zealand, Russian Federation, USA, South Africa**

**Data Collection**

**Frequency** 􀂃 **Annual**

**Crime Category Definition applied Unit of Count**

**Cases/**

**Offences**

**Arrested Convicted**

**Other Metadata**

**Total** Data not collected

**Use** Data not collected

**Trafficking** Includes illegal possession,

cultivation, production, supplying,

transportation, importing, exporting,

financing etc. of drug operations

which are not solely in connection

with personal use

􀀹 􀂃 Metadata by country including

information on penal code,

counting unit and attempts

**Data Collection**

**Instrument** 􀂃 **European Sourcebook of Crime and Criminal Justice Statistics**

**Geographic**

**Coverage**

􀂃 **EU-27 except LU, MT, ES**

􀂃 **EU Candidate: HR, TR**

􀂃 **EU Potential Candidate: AL**

􀂃 **EFTA/EEA: IS, CH**

􀂃 **Other countries: Armenia, Georgia, Russian Federation, Moldova, Ukraine**

**Data Collection**

**Frequency** 􀂃 **Ad hoc**

**Crime Category Definition applied Unit of Count**

**Cases/**

**Offences**

**Arrested Convicted**

**Other Metadata**

**Total** Included possession, cultivation,

production, sale, supplying,

transportation, importation,

exportation and financing of drug

operations

􀀹 􀀹 􀀹 􀂃 Metadata by country including

whether total drug offences

includes possession of small

quantities, transportation,

importation, exportation and

financing of drug operations.

**Use** Data not collected

**Trafficking** Includes, where possible, drug

offences which are not in connection

with personal use

􀀹 􀀹 􀀹 􀂃 Metadata by country

**Data Collection**

**Instrument** 􀂃 **European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction (EMCDDA)**

**Geographic**

**Coverage**

􀂃 **EU-27 (except HU & SK)**

􀂃 **EU Candidate: HR, TR (MK not reporting)**

􀂃 **EFTA/EEA: NO**

**Data Collection**

**Frequency** 􀂃 **Annual**

**Crime Category Definition applied Unit of Count**

**Cases/**

**Offences**

**Arrested Convicted**

**Other Metadata**

**Total** Number of reports of all offences

against national drug legislation (use,

possession, trafficking, etc.) – criminal

and non criminal – reported by all law

enforcement agencies at national

level during the year

􀀹 􀀹? 􀂃 Metadata by country for

statistical units and counting

rules [*Unit of count varies by*

*country between offences*

*(all/main), persons (double*

*counting possible) and*

*cases(double counting*

*possible)*], stage in the criminal

justice system of the statistics,

geographic coverage, details of

categories ‘other’, details on

deviations.

􀂃 Data by drug type and broad

type of drug law offence (use,

supply)

**Use** The category 'Drug-related

use/possession' refers to drug law

offences which are related to drug use

and/or possession for use. (PT-ES-IT-

􀀹 􀀹?
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includes administrative sanctions)

**Supply** The category 'Drug-related

dealing/trafficking/production' refers to

drug law offences which are related to

drug dealing and/or drug

trafficking/smuggling and/or drug

production or any other offence

related to these types of illicit activities

􀀹 􀀹?

**Use and supply** The category 'Drug-related use and

trafficking' refers to offences of use

and trafficking simultaneously (not

applicable when counting offences or

main offences); it may also refer to a

specific category existing in some

countries in their national monitoring

system.

􀀹 􀀹?

In addition to exact definitions used, further

challenges arise from thecountingunit used by

law enforcement authorities and requested by

cross􀇦national data collections. The UN􀇦CTS

questionnaire,forinstance,requestsbothpolice􀇦

recorded drug ‘offences’ and ‘suspects’. The

definition of ‘suspects’ in particular may differ

significantlyatdifferentstagesofthesystem(for

example, persons ‘suspected’ by the police of

having committed an offence, or persons

‘referred’ by the police to prosecutorial or

judicial authorities). Due to the challenges of

comparing ‘suspect’ data, the analysis in this

chapter is limited to police􀇦recorded *offences*.

Theanalysiscoversbothmostrecentdata (rates

per 100,000 population) reported for as many

countries as possible, in addition to trend

analysisforasmallerselectionofcountries.

Box1.Cross􀍲nationaldatacollectionchallenges

ResponsesprovidedtotheUN􀍲CTS,EurostatandEuropeanSourcebookquestionsondrugtraffickingfortheyear

2006illustratethedatacollectionchallengesforthiscrimetype.Useofthe*same*definitionbytwoquestionnaires

(UN􀍲CTSandEurostat)resultedinthereportingof*different*databySwitzerland.Incontrast,Denmarkreported

approximatelythe*same*datafortwo*different*definitions:

**Samedefinition/differentdata:**

**Switzerland2006**

**10thCTS**

Drugtrafficking(‘notinconnection

withpersonaluse’)

**Eurostat**

Drugtrafficking(‘notin

connectionwithpersonaluse’)

**47,001 6,296**

**Differentdefinitions/samedata:**

**Denmark2006**

**EuropeanSourcebook**

Aggravateddrug􀍲trafficking

**Eurostat(2008edition)**

Drug􀍲trafficking

**EuropeanSourcebook**

Drugtrafficking

**1,106 1,111 2,912**

Possiblereasons forsuch differencesmayincludethe factthat differentnationalagenciesrespondto different

data collections, that data may refer to different points in time, and that lack of metadata in data collection

instrumentsdonotallowforcorrectinterpretationoffiguresprovided.Remediesincludeenrichingdatawithas

much additional information (metadata) as possible, in addition to the nomination of a single focal point

responsible for provision of data at the international or regional level. The inconsistencies shown above have

largelybeenresolvedinsubsequentyears.Switzerland,forexample,reviseditsfigurefordrugtraffickingfor2006

to6,296initslaterreportingtothe11thUN􀍲CTS.Denmarkreviseditsfigurefor2006fordrugtraffickingreported

toEurostatto2,917inthe2009editionofEurostat*StatisticsinFocus*.
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**Relationshipbetweentotaldrug􀍲relatedcrimeanddrugtrafficking**

Despite the challenges of drug crime data

recording and collection at national and

international level, it nonetheless remains

possibletocarryoutsomeanalysis,atleastwhen

dealingwithasingledatasourcesuchastheUN􀇦

CTS.

A first approach to analysis that may prove

informative concerns the relationship between

overall,ortotal,drug􀇦relatedcrime,andthemore

seriousendof thespectrumofdrug crime,such

as drug trafficking. Whilst drug trafficking

offences are themselves often included in the

total number of drug􀇦related crime offences

reported, examination of the relative size of the

two \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_numbers (total offences and trafficking

offences) nonetheless provides some indication

of the responseof thecriminal justice system to

drugissues.

Where a large number of, more minor, drug

personal use offences are recorded, the total

number of recorded drug􀇦related offences is

likelytoberelativelylargeincomparisontodrug

trafficking offences. In comparison, where the

criminal justice system does not focus on more

minor offences, drug trafficking offences may

constitute a greater proportion of overall drug􀇦

relatedcrime.

ThetableintheAnnextothischaptershowsrates

per 100,000 population of police􀇦recorded total

drug􀇦related crime and drug trafficking as

reported to the UN􀇦CTS, for the latest available

year after 2000. As noted above, data for drug

traffickingwereonlycollected by theTenthUN􀇦

CTS,coveringtheyears2005and2006.

Data from some 109 countries for which

informationisavailableindicatesthatthemedian

rate for total drug􀇦related offences (latest

available year, 2002􀇦2006) is **45 per 100,000**

**population**.

In contrast, the median rate for drug trafficking

offences(55countries,latestavailableyear,2005􀇦

2006)is**20per100,000population**.

Both measures, however, show a huge range of

values. Total drug􀇦related offences show a

maximum of 868 per 100,000 population and a

minimum reported value of 0.15 per 100,000

population. The range of responses for drug

traffickingoffencesshowsamaximumof628per

100,000 population and a minimum of 0.07 per

100,000population.

Caution must however be exercised in the

interpretation of results. The number of drug

offencesrecordedisaproductbothoftheextent

ofunderlyingdrugactivityandtheextentofdrug

enforcement activities. As a result, it is possible

that countries with relatively minor drug

problemscanhavedrugoffencerateshigherthan

thosewithverysevereones.

Data published by UNODC in the World Drug

Report 2009, for example, suggests that law

enforcement priorities play a particularly

importantrolewhen itcomesto levelsofpolice􀇦

recorded drug offences. Of all countries which

showed an increase in drug trafficking offences

over a two year period, for example, almost 70

percent also showed an increase in possession

offences (UNODC 2009).This strongassociation

suggests that overall levels of recorded offences

may be driven by law enforcement priorities as

muchaschangesinthedrugsituationitself.

Attheregionallevel,despitethelimitednumber

ofcountriesforwhichdata isavailable(Africa,4

countries; Americas, 6 countries; Asia, 14

countries; Europe, 26 countries) some patterns

cannonethelessbeidentified.

Figure 1 shows police􀇦recorded rates per 100,000

population for both total drug􀇦related offences

anddrugtraffickingoffences.

Median rates of police􀇦recorded drug trafficking

offencesarereasonablycomparable.Thisislikely

due to the somewhat more restricted definition

of this crime, than themore general ‘totaldrug􀇦

relatedoffences’.

Police􀇦recordeddrugtraffickingratesper100,000

population were highest in Europe (around 30

per 100,000 population) and lowest in Asia

(around10per100,000population).Ratesoftotal

police􀇦recorded drug􀇦related crime showed

considerablygreatervariabilitywithaparticularly

high number of drug􀇦related crime offences in

Europe (over 80 per 100,000 population) as

comparedwithotherregions.
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**Figure 1. Median regional drug trafficking and total drug􀍲related offence rates (2005/2006) per**

**100,000population**

In interpretation of the results, it should be

noted that reporting practices differed as

between respondent States with respect to

whether numbers for the more serious

‘trafficking’ offence were included in the ‘total’

drug􀇦relatedcrimefigure.

Nonetheless, ingeneral,whether traffickingwas

includedinthetotalornot,itcanbeconsidered

thatthemajorityofthe‘totaldrug􀇦relatedcrime’

figure likely corresponds to the less serious

possession/use offence. Thiswould suggest that

lawenforcementplaceagreateremphasis inthe

countries of Europe on less serious offences

relative to more serious offences than in other

regionsoftheworld.

Furtherexplorationofthelinkbetweenlevelsof

police􀇦recorded total drug􀇦related crime and

drugtraffickingshowsaweakassociation.Figure

2showsascatterplotofratesofpolice􀇦recorded

total drug􀇦related crime (x) against police􀇦

recordeddrugtrafficking(y)forthe51countries

(excluding2outliers)thatreportedboth figures

totheTenthUN􀇦CTS.
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**Figure2.Police􀍲recordeddrug􀍲relatedcrimeanddrug􀍲trafficking,byregion(eachdatapointcorrespondsto**

**onecountry)**

Figure 2 shows a range of values of police􀇦

recorded drug trafficking compared to police􀇦

recorded total drug􀇦related crime. In very

general terms however, at the national level,

increased levels of police􀇦recorded drug􀇦related

crime do seem to go hand􀇦in􀇦hand with

increased levels of police􀇦recorded drug

traffickingoffences.

Both the broad correlation and variability can

likely be explained by a combination of

underlying drug use/trafficking levels and the

range of law enforcement priorities. A higher

underlying level of drug use naturally requires

cultivation, manufacture, import, handling and

sale of drugs. Assuming equal distribution of

policeresourcesacrosscrimetypes,thismaywell

be ref lected in increased contact of both drug

traffickersanddrug userswith lawenforcement

officers.

On the other hand, in some countries, national

drug policies that specifically target the more

serious drug offences, such as trafficking, may

result in a different ratio ofoveralldrug􀇦related

crimetodrugtrafficking.

Figure 2 suggests thatsuch variability is greater

for countries in Europe, than for Africa, the

Americasand Asia.Countries inEastandSouth

East Europe, for example, show rates of drug

traffickingoffencesthataremuchclosertototal

drug􀇦related crime than those for countries in

West and Central Europe. This likely indicates

either different distinctions between less and

more serious drug offences in criminal laws, or

differentlawenforcementprioritiesinpractice.

Overall, figure 2 shows that a large range of

national approaches lie behind the global

median values of 45 offences per 100,000

population for total drug􀇦related crime and 20

offences per 100,000 population for drug

trafficking (a ratio of around 2:1). A number of

factorsmaymeanthatinanyindividualcountry,

law enforcement authorities could record up to

more than one hundred times as many total

drug􀇦related offences as drug trafficking

offences.
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Box2.Drug􀍲crimedatacollectionchallenges(Countryexample:Germany)

**Countryexample:Germany**

Data reported \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_by Germany

to a number of cross􀍲

national data collection

initiatives wellexemplifythe

challenges of data collection

on drug crime. Figures Iand

IIshowcountsfortotaldrug􀍲

related crime (figure I) and

drug trafficking (figure II)

reported to four different

sources for the period 1997

to2008.

The four sources used in

I and II are the

United Nations Survey of

CrimeTrendsandOperations

of Criminal Justice Systems

(UN􀍲CTS),theUnitedNations

drug Annual Reports

Questionnaire(UN􀍲ARQ),the

European Sourcebook on

Crime and Criminal Justice

(ESB) and the Statistical

Office of the European

Communities (Eurostat).

Figure I (total drug􀍲related

crime) shows clearly the

difference between drug

crime *suspects* identified by

the police and police􀍲

recorded *offences* in

Germany. The number of

suspectsreportedtotheUN􀍲

CTSisconsistentlyaround25

percent lower than the

number of recorded

offences. Whilst thenumber

of total drug􀍲related

offencesreportedtotheUN􀍲

CTS agrees with that

reported to the European

Sourcebook, igure I shows

that data reported to the

UN􀍲ARQdoesnotmatchthat

reported to the other

sources and varies between

approximateagreementwith

suspectandoffencedata.

Figure IIshowsdatareported totheUN􀍲CTS,EuropeanSourcebookand Eurostat fordrug trafficking offences.Two

broad categories of data reporting are apparent – drug trafficking and *aggravated* drug trafficking. The European

Sourcebookcorrespondentreportedaggravatedtraffickinginsteadoftotaltraffickinguntil2002,whereafterfigures

reportedareclosertodrugtraffickingcountsreportedtotheUN􀍲CTSandEurostat.Nonetheless,between2003and

2008,thereisnoclearagreementonthecountofpolice􀍲recordeddrug􀍲traffickingoffencesbetweendatareportedto

theUN􀍲CTS,Eurostat,UN􀍲ARQandtheEuropeanSourcebook.Countscorrespondingtoaggravated traffickingwere

reportedtotheUN􀍲ARQforoneyear(2002)butcorrespondmorecloselytothebroaderdrugtraffickingcategoryfor

allotheryears.
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**Trendsindrug􀍲relatedcrime**

In addition to comparison of levels of total

recorded drug􀇦related offences and recorded

drug trafficking offences, a second productive

approach to analysis concerns examination of

*trends*indrugcrime.

Whilst absolute levels of police􀇦recorded drug􀇦

related crime and drug trafficking may be

particularly challenging to interpret, *changes*

*over time* may nonetheless be more accurately

followed. Even trends monitoring, however, is

dependent upon the maintenance over time of

equivalent police􀇦recording systems within a

country.

Long􀇦term trends monitoring further requires

consistent periodic reporting by Member States

attheinternationallevel.

Over a ten year period, the number of Member

States for which data on drug􀇦related crime is

available for each year is comparatively small,

withthemajorityofcountrieslocatedinCentral

and Eastern Europe. Despite this limited subset

of countries, analysis of national level data on

drug􀇦related crime shows a clear emerging

picture.

Figure 3 shows trends in drug􀇦related crime

compared to trends in robbery for 20 countries

(Canada, Belarus, Bulgaria, Czech Republic,

EnglandandWales,Finland,Germany,Hungary,

Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Mauritius, Poland,

Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania,

Russian Federation (robbery only), Slovakia,

Slovenia,andSwitzerland)fortheperiod1995to

2008asreportedtotheUN􀇦CTS.Themedianof

the rates of each crime type was calculated for

each year, followed by ‘normalization’ to a

starting value of 100 for the year 1995. As such,

the figure shows percentage change for each

subsequentyear,comparedtotheinitialyear.

**Figure3.Trendsintotaldrug􀍲relatedcrimeandrobberyin20countries(Median,1995􀍲2008)**

The pattern is quite striking. Whereas police􀇦

recorded rates of robbery stayed reasonably

constant over the time period, police􀇦recorded

drug􀇦related crime increased some three􀇦fold.

Such trends cannot, however, be interpreted as

indicative of changes in the underlying amount

of drug crime in these countries. Rather, it is

likelythattheincreaseisduetoacombinationof
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both changes in underlying drug levels and law

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_enforcement activity. Policy considerations may

result, for example, in increased police and law

enforcement focus on relatively minor offences,

including drug possession/use. Whilst drug􀇦

related crime has almost certainly received

increased attention by law enforcement

authoritiesinthepastdecade,drugdemanddata

nonetheless does show rising demand in

countriesinEurope(includingcountriesusedin

figure 3above)forcocaineat leastfromthe late

ninetiesuntilaround2007(UNODC2009).

Thepatternisalsointerestingwhenviewedfrom

the individual country perspective. Figure 4

showsrelativelysimilaroverall increases intotal

drug􀇦related crime reported to the UN􀇦CTS for

the period 1995 to 2008 in four countries with

reasonable geographic dispersion: Canada,

Finland,GermanyandMauritius.

**Figure4.Trendsintotaldrug􀍲relatedcrimeinselectedcountries**

Such patterns in geographically􀇦dispersed

countries reinforce theproposition that levelsof

police􀇦recorded drug crime may be as – if not

more–affectedbylawenforcementprioritiesand

focus than by underlying changes in levels of

druguseandmarkets.

Moreover,asshowninbox2,evenmonitoringof

trendsovertimeindrugcrimecreatessignificant

challenges, particularly where the exact content

of data reported for a broad offence category,

such as ‘total’ drug􀇦related crime or drug

traffickingchangesfromyeartoyear.

**Summaryandconclusions**

Police􀇦recorded data on drug crime is typically

collected by countries using categories inspired,

at least in part, by definitions found in the

international drug control conventions. These

include ‘total’ drug􀇦related crime and the

distinction between the more minor offence of

drug ‘possession/use’andamore seriousoffence

of ‘drug trafficking’. At the regional level,

comparison of median levels of police􀇦recorded

total drug􀇦related crimeand drug trafficking for

countrieswheredataisavailableshowsignificant

differences as between regions. Police􀇦recorded
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drug trafficking rates per 100,000 population

were highest in Europe (around 30 per 100,000

population) and lowest in Asia (around 10 per

100,000 population). Rates of total police􀇦

recordeddrug􀇦relatedcrimeshowedconsiderably

greater variability with a particularly high

numberofdrug􀇦relatedcrimeoffencesinEurope

(over 80 per 100,000 population) as compared

withotherregions.Cautionmustbeexercisedin

interpretation of such results however. The

content of data reported as drug􀇦trafficking

offencesdifferssignificantlyasbetweencountries

in terms of the range of actions (such as

production, selling, transport) that are included

and the seriousness threshold (such as

weight/amount of drug or intent to supply). In

addition, overall numbers of police recorded

offences are likely to be as related to law

enforcementpoliciesandactivitiesastheyareto

underlyinglevelsofdruguseandmarkets.

Indeed,trendanalysisincountrieswithavailable

data suggests that a number of geographically􀇦

dispersed countries show broadly equivalent

increasing trends in drug􀇦related crime,

supporting the proposition that such changes

may be related to law enforcement activity.

Analysis of trend data from individual countries

using multiple sources further highlights the

challenges in collection and reporting of drug

crime data. A number of cross􀇦national sources

areseentoreportnon􀇦identicaldataforthesame

definitionandsameyearforthesamecountry.

Improvementofdataaccuracyandavailabilityon

drug crime requires careful use of definitions in

cross􀇦national data collection instruments and

the inclusion of additionalquestions (metadata)

in order to understand the content of offence

counts reported by national law enforcement

authorities.
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**Annexto hapter3**

**Table1.Drug􀍲relatedcrimeanddrugtraffickingoffences(ratesper100,000population)reportedto**

**theUN􀍲CTS,latestavailableyear**

**Drug-Related Crime Drug Trafficking**

**Region Sub-Region Country**

**Rate per**

**100,000**

**population**

**Year**

**Rate per**

**100,000**

**population**

**Year**

Kenya 16 2006 1 2006

Mauritius 305 2006 70 2006

Seychelles 314 2000

**East Africa**

Uganda 6 2004

Algeria 13 2006 4 2006

Morocco 56 2006 27 2006

**North Africa**

Tunisia 8 2002

South Africa 116 2002

Swaziland 67 2004

Zambia 4 2000

**Southern Africa**

Zimbabwe 41 2004

**Africa**

**West and Central**

**Africa** Côte d'Ivoire 2 2000

Argentina 63 2006

Barbados 580 2000

Belize 425 2006

Bolivia 45 2002

Chile 4 2004

Colombia 53 2000

Costa Rica 9 2006 7 2006

Dominican Rep. 34 2006 19 2006

Ecuador 22 2006

El Salvador 18 2006

Jamaica 463 2000

Mexico 52 2006 0 2006

Nicaragua 29 2006 33 2006

Panama 96 2006 26 2006

Paraguay 4 2006 3 2006

Peru 35 2004

Suriname 32 2004

Uruguay 22 2004

**Americas Latin America and the**

**Caribbean**

Venezuela 11 2000

Armenia 18 2006 5 2006

Azerbaijan 27 2006 11 2006

Georgia 80 2006 37 2006

Kazakhstan 68 2006

Kyrgyzstan 46 2006 31 2006

**Asia Central Asia and**

**Transcaucasian**

**countries**

Tajikistan 10 2006 9 2006

**c**
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**Drug-Related Crime Drug Trafficking**

**Region Sub-Region Country**

**Rate per**

**100,000**

**population**

**Year**

**Rate per**

**100,000**

**population**

**Year**

Turkmenistan 25 2006 21 2006

Brunei Darussalam 43 2006

Hong Kong SAR, China 32 2004

Indonesia 3 2000

Japan 17 2006 0 2006

Korea, Rep. 8 2004

Malaysia 59 2000

Mongolia 0 2006 0 2006

Myanmar 6 2002

Philippines 5 2006

Singapore 10 2006 9 2006

**East and South-East**

**Asia**

Taiwan, Prov. of China 167 2006

Bahrain 107 2006

Israel 448 2004

Jordan 5 2006

Lebanon 35 2006 17 2006

Oman 10 2002

Pakistan 0 2000

Palestinian Territory 23 2005 3 2005

Qatar 23 2004

Saudi Arabia 52 2000

Syria 19 2006 4 2006

United Arab Emirates 23 2006 2 2006

**Near and Middle East**

**/South-West Asia**

Yemen 1 2000

Bangladesh 10 2006 10 2006

India 3 2006

Maldives 250 2004

Nepal 1 2006

**South Asia**

Sri Lanka 228 2004

Belarus 51 2006 49 2006

Moldova, Rep. 56 2006 84 2006

Russian Federation 166 2000

**East Europe**

Ukraine 139 2006 52 2006

Albania 8 2002

Bosnia & Herzegovina 5 2006 35 2006

Bulgaria 31 2004

Croatia 188 2006 56 2006

Macedonia, FYR 13 2006 3 2006

Montenegro 70 2006

Romania 15 2006 7 2006

**Europe**

**Southeast Europe**

Serbia 52 2006 49 2006
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**Drug-Related Crime Drug Trafficking**

**Region Sub-Region Country**

**Rate per**

**100,000**

**population**

**Year**

**Rate per**

**100,000**

**population**

**Year**

Turkey 4 2006 4 2006

Austria 24 2006

Belgium 427 2004

Cyprus 77 2006 24 2006

Czech Rep. 29 2006 22 2006

Denmark 374 2006 2 2006

Estonia 73 2006

Finland 253 2006 92 2006

France 57 2004

Germany 310 2006 74 2006

Greece 74 2006

Hungary 66 2004

Iceland 574 2004

Ireland 85 2006

Italy 55 2006 40 2006

Latvia 44 2006

Liechtenstein 114 2006

Lithuania 34 2006 20 2006

Luxembourg 295 2002

Malta 157 2006 27 2006

Monaco 320 2006 9 2006

Netherlands 100 2006

Norway 622 2006

Poland 184 2006 0 2006

Portugal 42 2006 34 2006

Slovakia 32 2006 4 2006

Slovenia 89 2006 79 2006

Spain 29 2006

Sweden 734 2006 10 2006

Switzerland 628 2006

UK - England and Wales 362 2006 49 2006

UK - Northern Ireland 138 2006 27 2006

**West & Central Europe**

UK - Scotland 868 2006 213 2006

**Oceania Oceania** New Zealand 312 2006 103 2006

Papua New Guinea 16 2000
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Chapter4– Complexcrimes

**AnnaAlvazzidelFrate\***

**Abstract**

Thischapterpresentsavailabledataon‘complexcrimes’, i.e.acategoryofcrimeswhichare legallydefined

and identified by nationaland international law, but hardly fall into the category of ‘volume’ crime. Yet,

suchcrimesarehighlyrelevantfromapolicypointofview,sincetheymaybeconsideredamongthemost

serious threatsto stabilityofanycountry,andareoften transnational in their nature,thus affectingmore

than one country at the same time. Organized crime, trafficking in persons, smuggling of migrants,

currencycounterfeitingandcorruption are surely consideredamong the mostdangerouscrimes affecting

societies but their seriousness cannot be assessed by their frequency in administrative statistics.

Nevertheless,awarenessofthedimensionsofsuchphenomenamaybecrucial forthedevelopmentofany

prevention and control strategy. However, the current availability of data, especially administrative

statistics, on such crimes is particularly limited, thus making the analysis and understanding of the

dimensionsandcharacteristicsofcrimeproblemsaverydifficulttask.

**Introduction**

An accurate description of the crime situation

requires development of statistics and research

that reveal the nature and extent of both

‘conventional’crimeandorganized,transnational

or complex crimes. Organized crime, trafficking

in persons, smuggling of migrants, bribery/

corruption and counterfeited currency were

covered by the Tenth United Nations Survey of

CrimeTrendsandOperationsofCriminalJustice

Systems(UN􀇦CTS)forthefirsttime.

Thesetypesofcrimearefrequentlycomposedby

morethanasingleaction,oftenacombinationof

different illicit behaviours (thus ‘complex’

crimes).Itisnoteasy,andactuallynotadvisable,

to measure them by using administrative

statistics. Indeed, in􀇦depth research and

population􀇦based surveys may be better tools to

assess the extent of these phenomena. While

most ‘conventional’ crimes correspond to quite

simple behaviours (killing, stealing and raping

are almost universal concepts), some crime

definitions are so complex that it is extremely

difficulttotranslatethemintosingleacts.

Simpler acts are more likely to be measured as

they occur. In practice, whilst it is relatively

simple to count how many homicides are

committed, counting episodes in trafficking in

personsrequireseitheralegislativeconstructthat

criminalizes trafficking or splitting the concept

into the different crimes which may be

committed in the course of the more complex

traffickingaction.Administrativedata areuseful

toanalysetheavailabilityofstatisticsoncriminal

justice response to these phenomena. Some of

these crimes have recently been defined by

international law (UN Convention against

TransnationalOrganizedCrimeanditsProtocols,

UN Convention Against Corruption), which

foresees criminalization of specific illicit

behaviours. Once the new types of crime are

translated intodomesticcriminal law – as is the

case, for example, when countries introduce a

specific crime of trafficking in persons after

ratifying the TOC convention – the new

legislationmay beused insomecases insteadof

other types of crime.On the other hand, itmay

happen that courts tend to continue using old

legislation even in the presence of new specific

formsofcrime.

\*ResearchOfficer,UnitedNationsOfficeonDrugsandCrime(UNODC)
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In both scenarios it will be relatively difficult to

analysetrends.Fromthestatisticalpointofview,

every time new specific legislation isadopted to

deal with a ‘complex’ type of crimeand relevant

data are collected, a drop in another type of

offence is likelytobeobserved.Onthecontrary,

in cases where new legislation may be initially

difficult to use for the judiciary, very few cases

may be registered under the new category. This

maydependonlackofadequateinformationand

training on the application of the new legal

instruments.Furthermore,due totheabsenceof

trend data, criminological interpretation of

statistics on new types of offences may be

particularlydifficult.

**Organizedcrime,traffickinginpersonsandsmugglingofmigrants**

In principle, transnational organized crime is

betterdefined at the international level than the

majority of ‘conventional’ or ‘volume’ crime.

International instruments such as the United

Nations Convention on Transnational Organized

Crime (UNTOC) reflect consensus on the core

elementsoforganizedcrime.TheUNTOCandits

Protocols on Trafficking in persons and

Smuggling of migrants include several types of

illicitbehaviourswhichshouldbecriminalizedin

all countries ratifying these international

instruments. (United Nations 2003) Relevant

crimes included in the 10th UN􀇦CTS were the

following: a) participation in organized criminal

groups,b)traffickinginpersonsandc)smuggling

of migrants. Definitions of these crimes are

presentedinbox1.

**A.Participationinorganizedcriminalgroups**

The definition of participation in organized

criminal groups was taken from the UNTOC. It

may apply to anyone who, being aware of the

group’s criminal objectives, becomes involved in

activities that contribute to the achievement of

such objectives. Statistics were collected at the

police, prosecution and courts level. Figure 1

shows that relatively few countries were able to

respond. Thirty􀇦six countries provided statistics

of police recorded crimes for the years 2005􀇦06,

38providedprosecutionstatisticsfor2005and37

for2006,whilecourtdataweretheleastavailable,

with only 31 countries for both 2005 and 2006.

However,only some 20 countries confirmed that

the definition applied by the UN􀇦CTS matched

theonetheyhadbeenusingatthenationallevel.

Box1.UN􀍲CTScrimesfromtheUNConventiononTransnationalOrganizedCrime

DefinitionsofParticipationinorganizedcriminalgroups,HumanTraffickingandSmugglingofMigrantsinthe10thUN􀍲CTS:

**Participationinorganizedcriminalgroups**

“Participationinorganizedcriminalgroups”maybeunderstoodasparticipatingintheactivitiesofanorganized

criminalgroupand/ororganizing,directing,aiding,abetting,facilitatingorcounsellingseriouscrimesinvolving

organizedcriminalgroups.Thisdefinitionmayapplytoanyonewho,beingawareofthegroup’scriminal

objectives,becomesinvolvedinactivitiesthatcontributetotheachievementofsuchobjectives.When

applicable,referencemaybemadetotheprovisionsoftheUnitedNationsConventionagainstTransnational

OrganizedCrime.

**HumanTrafficking**

“HumanTrafficking”maybeunderstoodtomeantherecruitment,transportation,transfer,harbouringor

receiptofpersons,bymeansofthreatoruseofforceorotherformsofcoercion,ofabduction,offraud,of

deception,ofabuseofpowerorpositionofvulnerabilityorofgivingorreceivingpaymentsorbenefitsto

achievetheconsentofapersonhavingcontroloveranotherperson,forthepurposeofexploitation.When

applicablereferencemaybemadetotheprovisionsoftheProtocoltoPrevent,Suppress,andPunish

TraffickinginPersons,supplementingtheUnitedNationsConventionagainstTransnationalOrganizedCrime.

**Smugglingofmigrants**

“Smugglingofmigrants”maybeunderstoodtomeantheprocurement,inordertoobtain,directlyor

indirectly,afinancialorothermaterialbenefitsofillegalentryintothecountryofapersonwhoisnota

nationalorapermanentresident.WhenapplicablereferencemaybemadetotheprovisionsoftheProtocol

againsttheSmugglingofMigrantsbyLand,SeaandAirsupplementingtheUnitedNationsConventionagainst

TransnationalOrganizedCrime.
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**Figure1.Numberofcountries respondingtothe**

**10th UN􀍲CTS question on participation in**

**organizedcriminalgroups**

It is difficult to draw conclusions about the

frequency of this crime on the basis of the

available statistics. At the police level, high

variations can be observed between countries,

with a median rate of 0.9 crimes per 100,000

population in 2005 and 1.4 in 2006. Figure 2

shows the distribution of countries in five

categories depending on the observed rate in

2006,withthecategorybelow1crimeper100,000

population counting 18 countries, i.e. half of the

responses received. Approximately one third of

the countries showed rates above \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_2 per 100,000

population,with7countries(19%)abovefive.The

observedtrendtowardsincrease,althoughlimited

to two years, is determined by half of the

countries, while in the other half the observed

ratesweremostlystable.

**Figure 2. Participation in organized criminal**

**groups, police recorded offences. Number and**

**percentage ofcountries responding to the Tenth**

**United Nations Survey of Crime Trends and**

**OperationsofCriminalJusticeSystems(UN􀍲CTS),**

**bycategory,2006**

Similar rates were observed in prosecution

statistics, with a median rate of approximately 1

personprosecutedper100,000population(0.9in

2005and1.0in2006).Only13outof31reporting

countries showed an increase between 2005 and

2006. The distribution across the categories

largelyreflectedthatobservedatthepolicelevel,

with 40% of the countries below 1 per 100,000

pop.,40%between 1and 5,and20%above 5per

100,000 population. Participation in organized

criminal groups is of high relevance for the

criminal justice system, and is more likely to

appearinperson􀇦basedratherthanoffence􀇦based

statistics.Asthetypeofcrimewouldsuggest,the

numberofoffendersislikelytobelargerthanthe

numberofoffences,thusexplainingtherelatively

high rates and no attrition observed at the

prosecution level. However, at the court level,

rates ofpersonsconvicted fall toamedianof 0.3

per100,000population(bothin2005and2006).

**B.Traffickinginpersons**

Specific legislation on trafficking in persons was

passed in many countries pursuant to the entry

intoforceoftheProtocoltoPrevent,Suppressand

Punish Trafficking in Persons (December 2003).

The number of countries having specific anti􀇦

traffickinglegislationmorethandoubledbetween

2003 and 2008 (UNODC 2009). Still, many

countriesmayuselegislationonspecificformsor

aspects of trafficking in persons to criminalize

this phenomenon. For example, laws on slavery,

sexualorlabourexploitation,orchildprotection,

may be applied instead or in the absence of

specificlegislationontrafficking.

Themeasurement of trafficking inpersons is the

object of considerable attention at the

international level. Criminal justice data alone

cannot measure the extent of human trafficking

flows,whichwouldrequireabroaderapproachto

include survey􀇦based information. Criminal

justicestatisticsmaydealwithvictims(trafficked

persons)andoffenders.Bycollectinginformation

fromawide rangeofsources in 111countries, the

UNODC Global Reporton Trafficking in Persons

found over 21,400 identified victims of human

traffickingfortheyear2006.

The 10th UN􀇦CTS only covered statistics on

recorded offences and offenders arrested,

prosecuted and convicted, based on the UNTOC

Protocol definition. Data were collected at the

police, prosecution and court level. The number

ofpolice􀇦recordedcasesishighlydependentupon

the extent of law enforcement activities and

counter􀇦trafficking operations. Figure 3 shows

18,50.0%

5,13.9%

6,16.7%

4,11.1%

3,8.3%

Below1per100,000population

Between1and2per100,000population

Between2and5per100,000population

Between5and10per100,000population

Morethan10per100,000population
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that responses to the Police section were more

numerousthanthosetotheotherparts,andwere

received from 51 countries as regards the year

2005and52asregards2006.

In many countries (33 out of 52 in 2006), the

definition applied by the UN􀇦CTS was the same

used in national statistics, thus demonstrating

the increased availability of data on this specific

formofcrime.

**Figure3.Numberofcountries respondingtothe**

**10thUN􀍲CTSquestionontraffickinginpersons**

As regards the actual crime levels observed, it

should be noted that the seriousness of these

crimes cannot be measured by their frequency,

especially as regards the number of incidents

recordedoroffendersarrested.In2006,amedian

of0.2per100,000populationwasobservedatthe

police and prosecution level, while the median

rateatthecourtlevelwas0.1per100,000pop.The

highest rate of police recordedoffences (49.4per

100,000 population, almost 7 times higher than

thesecondhighestrateof7.8)wasactuallyfroma

country in which theUNTOC definitionwas not

used,thusthehighernumberofoffencesrecorded

mayindeedrefertodifferenttypesofcrime.

**C.Smugglingofmigrants**

A slightly lower number of countries were able to

provide data on smuggling of migrants than on

trafficking in persons. Figure 4 shows that only 45

countries could provide dataon the question about

police recorded offences for the year 2006 (33 of

whichconfirmedusingthesamedefinitionasinthe

UN protocol). Many less countries could provide

dataonprosecution (39fortheyear2005and37for

2006) and courts (35 for 2005 and 34 for 2006). As

wasthecaseforhumantrafficking,themedianrates

per 100,000 population are very low (1.4 police

recorded offences, 1 person prosecuted and 0.7

persons convicted for the year 2006). Contrary to

trafficking in persons, the two countries with the

highratesofrecordedoffencesin2006(131.1and61.5

per 100,000 population respectively)were using the

samedefinitionaspertheUNProtocol.

**Figure4.Numberofcountriesrespondingtothe**

**10thUN􀍲CTSquestiononsmugglingofmigrants**
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**Briberyandcorruption**

Data based on reported cases of bribery/

corruption usually do not reflect the real extent

of corruption. Administrative statistics on

bribery and corruption cannot provide much

information on the extent of the phenomenon.

Nevertheless, it is important to look at them in

ordertoconsiderthecriminaljusticeresponseto

behaviourswhichhaverecentlybeentheobjectof

international treaties (UN Convention Against

Corruption)andgainedmorevisibilityintheeyes

ofthepublic.

The UNCAC concepts of ‘active’ and ‘passive’

bribery(seebox2),includedinallarticlesofthe

Convention dealing with criminalization, have

been used in the 10th UN􀇦CTS to formulate

questions aimed at collecting relevant statistics.

Activecorruptionreferstothesituationinwhich

acitizenoracompanyactivelyseeksfavoursfrom

a public official by promising or offering other

favours, gifts or money. Passive bribery/

corruption instead is the case inwhich a public

official who is in the position to provide

advantages or favours to private citizens or

companies, requests them for gifts, money or

otherfavoursinexchange.

Datafromthe10thUN􀇦CTSthereforedealwith

totalrecordedoffencesatthepolicelevelfora)

bribery/corruption, b) active bribery, and c)

passive bribery. Availability of detailed

statistics is still limited, nevertheless 53

countrieswereabletoprovidedataongeneral

offences related to bribery/corruption, 35 on

activebriberyand30onpassivebribery(figure

5). Among them, more than half confirmed that

their definitions matched those provided by the

UN􀇦CTS. Thirteen countries specified that no

distinction between active and passive

bribery/corruption exists in their countries. One

countryspecifiedthatwhilethedistinctionexistsin

thelaw,noseparatestatisticsarecollected.

Box2.Briberyandcorruption:definitions

TheUNConventionAgainstCorruption(UNCAC)providesabroadframeworkforthecriminalizationofcorruptbehaviours.In

particular,itispossibletoidentifythetwoaspectsof‘active’and‘passive’bribery.

**Briberyand/orcorruption**

“Briberyand/orcorruption”maybeunderstoodtomeanrequestingand/oraccepting

materialorpersonalbenefits,orthepromisethereof,inconnectionwiththe

performanceofapublicfunctionforanactionthatmayormaynotbeaviolationoflaw

and/orpromisingaswellasgivingmaterialorpersonalbenefitstoapublicofficerin

exchangeforarequestedfavour.Whereappropriate,referencemaybemadetothe

provisionsoftheUnitedNationsConventionagainstCorruption.

**Activebribery Passivebribery**

Thepromise,offeringorgiving,toapublicofficial,

directlyorindirectly,ofanundueadvantage,for

theofficialhimselforherselforanotherpersonor

entity,inorderthattheofficialactorrefrainfrom

actingintheexerciseofhisorherofficialduties.

Thesolicitationoracceptancebyapublicofficial,

directlyorindirectly,ofanundueadvantage,for

theofficialhimselforherselforanotherpersonor

entity,inorderthattheofficialactorrefrainfrom

actingintheexerciseofhisorherofficialduties.

Source:UNCAC,UnitedNationsConventionagainstCorruption(GeneralAssemblyresolution58/4,Annex),ChapterIII,Criminalizationandlawenforcement.
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**Figure5.Numberofcountriesrespondingtothe**

**10th UN􀍲CTS questions on corruption, police**

**recordedoffences**

Themedianrateforthegeneralcrimeofbribery/

corruption is 1.3 per 100,000 population, while

activeandpassivebriberyshowedratesof0.6and

0.7 per 100,000 population respectively. The

majority of countries showed a rate below 1 per

100,000 population, while only 6 countries had

rates \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_above 10 per 100,000 population. In many

countries, the small number of cases reported

may depend on the difficulty of considering

corruption as a matter for the police. Indeed,

somecountrieshaveestablishedspecializedanti􀇦

corruptionauthorities.Inordertoobtainamore

comprehensive picture itwould be important to

capture incidentsreportedtosuchauthoritiesas

well.

A number of alternative approaches to

administrative statistics have been developed.

Several attempts at measuring the worldwide

extent of corruption have been made, both in

broadcontextsandspecificareas.Theseattempts

include the use of population􀇦based surveysand

theproductionofcomposite indices,suchasthe

Corruption Perception Index of Transparency

International. Increased information on the

nature and extent of corruption is necessary to

assessitsimpactoneconomyanddevelopmentas

well as for monitoring trends. In this context,

UNODC has developed a ‘package’ of surveys

capable of providing information on the

experience and perception of corruption events,

risk factors, modalities of corruption, and

attitudes on integrity. Such surveys may be

targeted to the general population, to the

business sector, to civil servants, or to specific

government institutions, such as the justice

sector.

Samplepopulationsurveys,whenconductedina

methodologicallysoundmanner,cansupplement

informationon theproportion of individuals (or

enterprises)thatpaidabribeinthepreviousyear,

the characteristics of victims and perpetrators,

changesinthelevelofcorruptionovertime,and

the sectors/regions most affected by corruption.

Results from recent surveys conducted in five

African countries, for example, indicated that

between around 30 percent and 3 percent of

respondents had paid a bribe to apublic official

inthe12monthsbeforethesurvey(seefigure6).

(UNODC 2009a)Survey results alsosuggest that

bribes paid by businesses are more frequently

paid to some government sectors, including the

police and medical sectors, than to other

institutions, such as tax or municipal officials.

Further survey responses indicated that police

investigations and traffic offences were typical

situationsinwhichbribeshadbeenpaid.

**Figure 6. Percentage of survey respondents**

**(individuals and/or businesses) who were**

**requested to pay at least one bribe over the**

**previousyear,bycountry(UNODC2008􀍲09)**
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**Counterfeitedcurrency**

Aquestiononcounterfeitcurrencywasincluded

for the first time in the 10thUN􀇦CTS.According

toInterpol,thecrimeofcounterfeitingcurrency

continuestopresentaseriousdangertonational

economies, as well as financial losses to

consumers. Interpol used tocollect statisticson

this type of crime.Upon discontinuation of the

Interpolseriesin2004,UNODCagreedtoinsert

thisquestioninthepolicesectionoftheUN􀇦CTS

for continuity. Among the 64 countries which

provided information to the UN􀇦CTS for the

years 2005􀇦06, only 27 had provided data to

Interpol fortheyear2004.Forthreecountries it

was clear that the source used to respond to

Interpolwasnotthesameastheonereplyingto

UNODC, so they have been excluded from the

trend analysis presented in figure 7. It appears

that, at least in the 24 countries under

consideration,adecreaseinthistypeofoffences

hasbeenobserved.

**Figure7.Counterfeitedcurrency.Trendinpolice**

**recorded offences (2004 = 100). Sources:**

**Interpol and Tenth United Nations Survey of**

**Crime TrendsandOperationsofCriminalJustice**

**Systems(UN􀍲CTS)**

Indeed, one country observed that “the large

decreaseincounterfeitinginrecentyearsmaybe

partiallyattributedtoenhancedsecurityfeatures

thatmake the replicationof billsmoredifficult,

increasededucationandawarenessbymerchants

andretailersindetectingcounterfeitbills,andto

law enforcement efforts”. (UNODC 2008) The

majority of countries (44) indicated that the

definition in use matched that provided by the

questionnaire. Interestingly, one country

specified that thecounting unitwaseach single

counterfeitnote,whichleavessomedoubtabout

whichcountingothercountriesmayuse.

**Figure8.Counterfeitedcurrency,policerecorded**

**offences. Number and percentage of countries**

**responding to the Tenth United Nations Survey**

**of Crime Trends and Operations of Criminal**

**JusticeSystems(UN􀍲CTS),bycategory,2006.**

Figure8showsthatratesper100,000population

varied in reporting countries, with the same

numberofcountries(17,i.e.27%)fallingintothe

lowestandhighestcategories(below1andabove

10 per 100,000 population). Another quarter of

responding countries, 15, were in the category

between 2 and 5 per 100,000 population, while

the remaining countries were distributed in the

categories between 1 and 2 per 100,000

population (6 countries) and between 5 and 10

per100,000population(9countries).Themedian

observedamongthe64respondingcountrieswas

4.3 per 100,000 population in 2005 and 3.5 in

2006, thus confirming the decreasing trend

observed in the 24 countries having data for a

longerperiod.
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**Summaryandconclusions**

This chapter has analysed the available

statistics on a number of ‘complex’ types of

crimeincludedinthe10thUN􀇦CTS.Thesedata

represent a small treasure to which more

information should be added to develop

further analysis. Figure 9 shows that only for

three ‘complex’ types of crime (counterfeit

currency, corruption and smuggling of

migrants) could the majority of countries

responding to the 10th UN􀇦CTS provide data.

Forsmugglingofmigrantsandparticipationin

organized crime groups, it appears that a

comprehensive collection of international

statistics may be too early. More than half of

theresponsestothe10thUN􀇦CTSweremissing

thisinformation.

It is well known, however, that at the

international level, data on trafficked persons

andsmugglingofmigrantsareoftenconfused,

together with statistics on migrants, illegal

migrants, asylum seekers, and refugees. It is

therefore important to note that many

countries are aligning their definitions for

statistical purposes to those provided by the

relevant international instruments. Despite

the excellent collaboration of several

respondents to the 10th UN􀇦CTS who provided

extensivecommentstothesequestions,information

receivedappearsinsufficient.

Themechanismsformonitoringimplementationof

the UNTOC and UNCAC will definitely require a

parallel mechanism for the collection of

informationontheextentofthephenomenaaswell

as on the response of the criminal justice system.

The UN􀇦CTS may indeed represent the most

appropriate vehicle for collecting the \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_latter type of

information, while specific methodologies should

bedevelopedandused(includingpopulationbased

surveys and other types of research) for the

assessment of the extent and flows of the

phenomena.

This suggests that in the future the UN􀇦CTS may

opt for in􀇦depth modules, which may even go

beyond criminal justice data, on each ‘complex’

crime. The questionnaire could be conceived in a

waytoaccommodatemoremetadataandadditional

references. This will result in supplementing the

scarce numbers with relevant qualitative

information.

**Figure9.Percentageofcountriesrespondingtothe10thUN􀍲CTSwhoansweredpolicequestionson**

**organizedcrime,traffickinginpersons,smugglingofmigrants,corruptionandcounterfeited**

**currency,2005and2006**
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**Annextochapter4**

**Table1.Participationinorganizedcriminalgroups:policerecordedoffences,personsprosecuted,persons**

**convicted,2005and2006**

Police-recorded offences Definition Persons prosecuted Persons convicted

consistent

Count Rate Count Rate Count Rate

Country

2005 2006 2005 2006 2005 2006 2005 2006 2005 2006 2005 2006 2005 2006

Algeria Yes Yes 1,586 437 4.8 1.3 2,782 543 8.5 1.6

Armenia 15 95 0.5 3.2 13 31 0.4 1.0 17 101 0.6 3.4

Austria 234 156 2.8 1.9 716 518 8.6 6.2 28 17 0.3 0.2

Azerbaijan 52 117 0.6 1.4 65 118 0.8 1.4

Belarus Yes Yes 867 590 8.9 6.1 346 433 3.5 4.4 150 149 1.5 1.5

Belize 1 1 0.4 0.4 0 0 0.0 0.0

Bermuda 0 0 0.0 0.0

Bolivia

Bosnia and

Herzegovina

Yes Yes 0 15 0.0 0.4

Brunei Darussalam 0 0 0.0 0.0

Canada 19 42 0.1 0.1

Costa Rica Yes Yes 1 2 0.0 0.0

Croatia Yes Yes 29 26 0.6 0.6 132 94 2.9 2.1 1 0.0

Cyprus 0 0 0.0 0.0 0 0 0.0 0.0

Czech Republic 902 623 8.9 6.1 181 118 1.8 1.2 9 21 0.1 0.2

Ecuador 311 242 2.4 1.8 178 176 1.4 1.3

El Salvador 148 243 2.2 3.6 9 84 0.1 1.2

Estonia 217 332 16.1 24.8

Finland Yes Yes 3 0 0.1 0.0 0 0 0.0 0.0 0 0 0.0 0.0

Georgia Yes Yes 24 15 0.5 0.3 31 38 0.7 0.9

Germany 23 8 0.0 0.0 15 6 0.0 0.0

Hong Kong SAR of

China

356 449 5.0 6.3 169 249 2.4 3.5

Hungary 69 57 0.7 0.6

Ireland Yes Yes 5 18 0.1 0.4

Italy 153 128 0.3 0.2 457 0.8 2,109 1,656 3.6 2.8

Japan

Kazakhstan 70 54 0.5 0.4 359 345 2.4 2.3 6 5 0.0 0.0

Kyrgyzstan Yes Yes 47 24 0.9 0.5 47 24 0.9 0.5

Latvia Yes Yes 102 61 4.4 2.7 16 0.7 13 27 0.6 1.2

Liechtenstein Yes Yes 2 2 5.8 5.7 1 0 2.9 0.0 0 0 0.0 0.0

Lithuania Yes Yes 31 5 0.9 0.1 20 19 0.6 0.6 2 10 0.1 0.3

Malaysia 2,996 2,364 11.7 9.1 1,179 1,077 4.6 4.1

Malta 4 1 1.0 0.2 4 1 1.0 0.2

Mauritius 0 0 0.0 0.0 4 7 0.3 0.6

Mexico 172 187 0.2 0.2

Monaco 0 0 0.0 0.0 0 0 0.0 0.0

Mongolia 23 11 0.9 0.4 41 18 1.6 0.7

Montenegro 42 263 6.9 43.8

Morocco 94 156 0.3 0.5

Nepal 35 33 0.1 0.1

Netherlands 343 419 2.1 2.6 245 171 1.5 1.0

New Zealand 8 3 0.2 0.1

Nicaragua Yes Yes 82 82 1.5 1.5 753 992 13.8 17.9

Northern Ireland 12 0.7 4 0.2

Panama 11 46 0.3 1.4

Paraguay

Philippines 0 0 0.0 0.0

Poland Yes Yes 868 914 2.3 2.4 337 261 0.9 0.7

Republic of Moldova Yes Yes 78 92 2.0 2.4 4 0.1

Romania Yes Yes 474 897 2.2 4.2 152 305 0.7 1.4 24 0.1

Serbia

Singapore
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Complex crimes

Police-recorded offences Definition Persons prosecuted Persons convicted

consistent

Count Rate Count Rate Count Rate

Country

2005 2006 2005 2006 2005 2006 2005 2006 2005 2006 2005 2006 2005 2006

Slovakia 65 79 1.2 1.5 11 10 0.2 0.2 76 47 1.4 0.9

Slovenia 397 499 19.9 24.9

Spain Yes Yes 1,224 1,140 2.8 2.6 585 623 1.3 1.4

Swaziland 0 0 0.0 0.0

Switzerland 2 2 0.0 0.0

The FYR of

Macedonia

Yes Yes 293 223 14.4 11.0

Turkey Yes Yes 547 613 0.7 0.8 759 911 1.0 1.2 298 219 0.4 0.3

Ukraine Yes Yes 7,741 3,977 16.5 8.5 577 437 1.2 0.9 1,264 931 2.7 2.0

United Arab

Emirates

21 8 0.5 0.2

Venezuela 2,114 1,954 7.9 7.2
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**Table2.Traffickinginpersons(Humantrafficking):policerecordedoffences,personsprosecuted,persons**

**convicted,2005and2006**

Police-recorded offences Definition Persons prosecuted Persons convicted

consistent

Count Rate Count Rate Count Rate

Country

2005 2006 2005 2006 2005 2006 2005 2006 2005 2006 2005 2006 2005 2006

Algeria 1,167 1,693 3.6 5.1

Armenia 31 40 1.0 1.3 14 16 0.5 0.5 17 36 0.6 1.2

Austria Yes Yes 92 7 1.1 0.1 437 395 5.3 4.7 30 19 0.4 0.2

Azerbaijan 1 28 0.0 0.3 1 27 0.0 0.3

Bahrain 3 5 0.4 0.7

Bangladesh 164 107 0.1 0.1

Belarus Yes Yes 169 102 1.7 1.0 62 48 0.6 0.5 18 20 0.2 0.2

Belize Yes Yes 4 7 1.5 2.5 3 0 1.1 0.0

Bermuda 0 0 0.0 0.0

Bosnia and

Herzegovina

Yes Yes 5 6 0.1 0.2

Brunei Darussalam 0 0 0.0 0.0

Canada Yes Yes 0 4 0.0 0.0

Costa Rica Yes Yes 5 4 0.1 0.1 6 0 0.1 0.0 6 0 0.1 0.0

Croatia Yes Yes 5 5 0.1 0.1 6 14 0.1 0.3 1 0.0

Cyprus 0 0 0.0 0.0 0 0 0.0 0.0

Czech Republic Yes Yes 16 18 0.2 0.2 12 15 0.1 0.1 20 2 0.2 0.0

Denmark Yes Yes 3 2 0.1 0.0 1 7 0.0 0.1

Dominican Republic 6 4 0.1 0.0

Ecuador Yes Yes 34 65 0.3 0.5 11 70 0.1 0.5

El Salvador Yes Yes 4 1 0.1 0.0 37 66 0.6 1.0 0 5 0.0 0.1

England and Wales Yes Yes 33 43 0.1 0.1 28 43 0.1 0.1 13 22 0.0 0.0

Finland Yes Yes 2 3 0.0 0.1 0 7 0.0 0.1 0 7 0.0 0.1

Georgia Yes Yes 13 30 0.3 0.7 2 20 0.0 0.5 10 15 0.2 0.3

Germany Yes 621 840 0.8 1.0 183 195 0.2 0.2 136 150 0.2 0.2

Hong Kong SAR of

China

24 6 0.2 0.1 2 1 0.0 0.0

India 149 67 0.0 0.0

Ireland 0 0 0.0 0.0

Italy Yes Yes 181 145 0.3 0.2 35 0.1 43 34 0.1 0.1

Japan Yes Yes 81 72 0.1 0.1 6 17 0.0 0.0 0 12 0.0 0.0

Kazakhstan 10 20 0.1 0.1 3 8 0.0 0.1 303 211 2.0 1.4

Kyrgyzstan Yes Yes 34 36 0.7 0.7 21 24 0.4 0.5 3 7 0.1 0.1

Latvia Yes Yes 4 47 0.2 2.1 14 0.6 22 36 1.0 1.6

Liechtenstein 0 0 0.0 0.0 0 0 0.0 0.0 0 0 0.0 0.0

Lithuania Yes Yes 32 29 0.9 0.9 15 25 0.4 0.7 12 3 0.4 0.1

Malaysia 12,580 12,901 49.0 49.4 924 914 3.6 3.5

Malta 0 1 0.0 0.2 9 10 2.2 2.5 1 0.2

Mauritius 3 5 0.2 0.4 4 6 0.3 0.5 33 13 2.7 1.0

Mexico 1 0 0.0 0.0

Monaco 0 0 0.0 0.0 0 0 0.0 0.0

Mongolia Yes Yes 6 6 0.2 0.2 9 11 0.3 0.4 1 0.0

Montenegro 5 1 0.8 0.2

Nepal 56 59 0.2 0.2 118 75 0.4 0.3 57 60 0.2 0.2

Netherlands 20 0.1

New Zealand 0 0 0.0 0.0

Nicaragua Yes Yes 21 0.4 4 12 0.1 0.2

Northern Ireland 0 0.0 0 0.0

Norway 11 36 0.2 0.8 0 0.0 3 0.1

Panama 1 1 0.0 0.0

Paraguay Yes Yes 0 0 0.0 0.0

Philippines 1 1 0.0 0.0

Poland Yes Yes 22 23 0.1 0.1 271 239 0.7 0.6

Portugal 68 66 0.6 0.6 56 50 0.5 0.5

Republic of Moldova Yes Yes 282 299 7.3 7.8 33 37 0.9 1.0 59 119 1.5 3.1

Romania Yes Yes 1,201 1,383 5.6 6.4 684 574 3.2 2.7 146 187 0.7 0.9
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Complex crimes

Police-recorded offences Definition Persons prosecuted Persons convicted

consistent

Count Rate Count Rate Count Rate

Country

2005 2006 2005 2006 2005 2006 2005 2006 2005 2006 2005 2006 2005 2006

Serbia 39 45 0.4 0.5

Singapore 0 0 0.0 0.0 0 0 0.0 0.0 0 0 0.0 0.0

Slovakia Yes Yes 14 19 0.3 0.4 49 97 0.9 1.8 6 16 0.1 0.3

Slovenia Yes Yes 1 3 0.1 0.1 11 2 0.6 0.1

Spain Yes Yes 3,070 3,062 7.1 7.0

Swaziland 0 1 0.0 0.1

Sweden Yes Yes 44 38 0.5 0.4 26 1 0.3 0.0 7 11 0.1 0.1

Switzerland 12 5 0.2 0.1

Tajikistan 0 0 0.0 0.0 2 3 0.0 0.0

The FYR of

Macedonia

Yes Yes 5 3 0.2 0.1 5 0.2 6 6 0.3 0.3

Turkey Yes Yes 149 132 0.2 0.2 451 403 0.6 0.5 271 301 0.4 0.4

Ukraine Yes Yes 415 376 0.9 0.8 151 121 0.3 0.3 169 164 0.4 0.4

United Arab

Emirates

3 0 0.1 0.0

United States of

America

96 111 0.0 0.0

Venezuela 5 12 0.0 0.0
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**Table3.Smugglingofmigrants:policerecordedoffences,personsprosecuted,personsconvicted,2005and2006**

Police-recorded offences Definition Persons prosecuted Persons convicted

consistent

Count Rate Count Rate Count Rate

Country

2005 2006 2005 2006 2005 2006 2005 2006 2005 2006 2005 2006 2005 2006

Algeria Yes Yes 321 403 1.0 1.2 8,806 3,593 26.8 10.8

Austria Yes Yes 1,298 3,088 15.7 37.1 1,619 1,380 19.5 16.6 369 323 4.5 3.9

Bangladesh Yes Yes 4,181 4,772 2.7 3.1

Belarus 12 10 0.1 0.1

Belize Yes Yes 1 4 0.4 1.4 0 0 0.0 0.0

Bermuda 0 0 0.0 0.0

Bosnia and

Herzegovina

Yes Yes 34 65 0.9 1.7

Brunei Darussalam 0 0 0.0 0.0

Canada

Costa Rica 1 0.0

Croatia Yes Yes 260 320 5.7 7.0 321 371 7.1 8.1 214 200 4.7 4.4

Cyprus Yes Yes 13 10 1.6 1.2

Czech Republic Yes Yes 114 81 1.1 0.8 130 70 1.3 0.7 104 136 1.0 1.3

Denmark Yes Yes 210 199 3.9 3.7 119 132 2.2 2.4

Denmark Yes Yes 210 199 3.9 3.7 119 132 2.2 2.4

Dominican Republic 4 6 0.0 0.1

Ecuador Yes Yes 25 58 0.2 0.4 470 771 3.6 5.8

El Salvador Yes Yes 16 16 0.2 0.2 674 540 10.1 8.0 3 3 0.0 0.0

England and Wales 138 131 0.3 0.2 167 137 0.3 0.3

Estonia

Finland Yes Yes 26 15 0.5 0.3 19 19 0.4 0.4 15 19 0.3 0.4

Georgia Yes Yes 0 0 0.0 0.0

Germany Yes Yes 5,154 3,572 6.2 4.3 1,340 973 1.6 1.2 1,117 766 1.4 0.9

Hong Kong SAR of

China

Yes Yes 2 0 0.0 0.0 2 0 0.0 0.0

Hungary 496 455 4.9 4.5

Ireland 2 3 0.0 0.1

Italy Yes Yes 5,057 5,399 8.6 9.2 939 961 1.6 1.6

Japan 29 23 0.0 0.0 6 26 0.0 0.0

Kazakhstan 42 79 0.3 0.5 37 56 0.2 0.4 85 35 0.6 0.2

Kyrgyzstan

Latvia 14 33 0.6 1.4 8 0.3 4 4 0.2 0.2

Lebanon 3,299 2,496 82.3 61.5

Liechtenstein Yes Yes 8 7 23.1 20.0 0 4 0.0 11.5 0 0 0.0 0.0

Lithuania Yes Yes 9 22 0.3 0.6 3 32 0.1 0.9 7 29 0.2 0.9

Malaysia 650 549 2.5 2.1 1,163 738 4.5 2.8

Malta 0 7 0.0 1.7 0 7 0.0 1.7

Mauritius 0 0 0.0 0.0 0 0 0.0 0.0

Mexico 2,024 1,771 1.9 1.7 964 621 0.9 0.6

Monaco 0 0 0.0 0.0 0 0 0.0 0.0

Mongolia

Montenegro 8 10 1.3 1.7

Morocco 7,687 7,500 25.2 24.3 15,574 12,139 51.1 39.3

Nepal 19 28 0.1 0.1

Netherlands 215 236 1.3 1.4 158 116 1.0 0.7

New Zealand 0 0 0.0 0.0

Nicaragua 23 12 0.4 0.2

Northern Ireland 2 0.1 2 0.1

Norway 33 41 0.7 0.9 7 0.2 5 8 0.1 0.2

Panama 3 14 0.1 0.4

Paraguay Yes Yes 0 0 0.0 0.0

Philippines 0 0 0.0 0.0

Poland Yes Yes 182 111 0.5 0.3 430 288 1.1 0.8

Republic of Moldova Yes 39 1.0

Romania Yes Yes 32 82 0.1 0.4 992 1,448 4.6 6.7

Romania Yes Yes 32 82 0.1 0.4 992 1,448 4.6 6.7

Serbia 90 0.9
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Complex crimes

Police-recorded offences Definition Persons prosecuted Persons convicted

consistent

Count Rate Count Rate Count Rate

Country

2005 2006 2005 2006 2005 2006 2005 2006 2005 2006 2005 2006 2005 2006

Singapore Yes Yes 7,865 5,744 181.7 131.1 6,146 4,987 142.0 113.8

Slovakia Yes Yes 93 130 1.7 2.4 116 93 2.2 1.7 63 52 1.2 1.0

Slovenia Yes Yes 463 348 23.2 17.4 162 300 8.1 15.0

Spain Yes Yes 806 669 1.9 1.5

Swaziland 0 0 0.0 0.0

Sweden 1,478 1,131 16.4 12.5 23 15 0.3 0.2 383 435 4.2 4.8

Switzerland 47 20 0.6 0.3

Syrian Arab

Republic

227 272 1.2 1.4

Thailand 34,241 38,025 54.3 59.9

The FYR of

Macedonia

Yes Yes 35 23 1.7 1.1 14 25 0.7 1.2 11 9 0.5 0.4

Turkey Yes Yes 2,257 2,633 3.1 3.6 3,794 2,181 5.2 3.0 2,042 1,585 2.8 2.1

Ukraine Yes Yes 0 19 0.0 0.0

United Arab

Emirates

83 44 2.0 1.0 114 477 2.8 11.2

United States of

America

3,773 3,831 1.3 1.3

Venezuela 307 86 1.1 0.3
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**Table4.Corruption:policerecordedoffences,2005and2006**

Definition consistent Police-recorded offences

Count Rate

Country

2005 2006 2005 2006 2005 2006

Algeria Yes Yes 93 114 0.3 0.3

Armenia 8 17 0.3 0.6

Austria Yes Yes 27 11 0.3 0.1

Azerbaijan 166 172 2.0 2.0

Bahrain 8 6 1.1 0.8

Bangladesh

Belarus Yes Yes 4,160 3,387 42.5 34.8

Bolivia

Bosnia and Herzegovina Yes Yes 7 16 0.2 0.4

Brunei Darussalam Yes Yes 6 7 1.6 1.8

Canada

Costa Rica Yes Yes 29 38 0.7 0.9

Croatia Yes Yes 442 336 9.7 7.4

Cyprus Yes Yes 4 14 0.5 1.7

Czech Republic Yes Yes 138 138 1.4 1.4

Ecuador Yes Yes 54 0.4

El Salvador Yes Yes 9 17 0.1 0.3

Estonia 117 106 8.7 7.9

Finland 94 71 1.8 1.3

Georgia Yes Yes 104 81 2.3 1.8

Germany 1,807 1,792 2.2 2.2

Hong Kong SAR of China Yes Yes

India 3,008 3,285 0.3 0.3

Ireland 6 2 0.1 0.0

Italy 249 209 0.4 0.4

Japan Yes Yes 112 158 0.1 0.1

Jordan

Kazakhstan 327 538 2.1 3.5

Kenya Yes Yes 107 252 0.3 0.7

Kyrgyzstan Yes Yes 201 243 3.9 4.6

Latvia Yes Yes 49 58 2.1 2.5

Lebanon

Liechtenstein Yes 1 0 2.9 0.0

Lithuania Yes Yes 99 316 2.9 9.3

Malta 5 24 1.2 5.9

Mauritius 7 11 0.6 0.9

Mongolia Yes Yes 114 92 4.4 3.5

Montenegro Yes 7 11 1.2 1.8

Morocco 13 14 0.0 0.0

Nepal 14 25 0.1 0.1

Netherlands 786 780 4.8 4.8

New Zealand 10 8 0.2 0.2

Norway 21 24 0.5 0.5

Occupied Palestinian Territory Yes Yes 487 12.9

Panama

Paraguay

Poland 6,127 6,520 16.0 17.1

Portugal Yes Yes 104 106 1.0 1.0

Republic of Moldova Yes Yes 292 331 7.5 8.6

Romania Yes Yes 8,278 8,357 38.3 38.8

Scotland 7 3 0.1 0.1

Serbia Yes Yes 681 1,813 6.9 18.4

Singapore Yes Yes 617 652 14.3 14.9

Slovakia Yes Yes 238 255 4.4 4.7

Slovenia 18 49 0.9 2.4

Spain Yes Yes 72 90 0.2 0.2
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Complex crimes

Definition consistent Police-recorded offences

Count Rate

Country

2005 2006 2005 2006 2005 2006

Sweden

Syrian Arab Republic Yes

Tajikistan 1,248 967 19.1 14.6

The FYR of Macedonia Yes Yes 19 10 0.9 0.5

Turkey Yes Yes 291 300 0.4 0.4

Turkmenistan 107 64 2.2 1.3

Ukraine Yes Yes 3,771 3,259 8.0 7.0

United Arab Emirates 71 65 1.7 1.5

United States of America
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**Table5.Activeandpassivebribery:policerecordedoffences,2005and2006**

Active bribery Passive bribery

Definition

consistent

Count Rate Definition

consistent

Count Rate

Country

2005 2006 2005 2006 2005 2006 2005 2006 2005 2006 2005 2006

Algeria Yes Yes Yes Yes

Armenia 1 3 0.0 0.1 7 14 0.2 0.5

Austria Yes Yes 25 8 0.3 0.1 Yes Yes 2 3 0.0 0.0

Azerbaijan 3 4 0.0 0.0 10 8 0.1 0.1

Bahrain

Bangladesh 5 7 0.0 0.0

Belarus 362 442 3.7 4.5 954 597 9.7 6.1

Bolivia

Bosnia and

Herzegovina

1 0 0.0 0.0

Brunei Darussalam 0 0 0.0 0.0 0 0 0.0 0.0

Canada

Costa Rica Yes Yes 7 1 0.2 0.0 Yes Yes 8 1 0.2 0.0

Croatia Yes Yes 88 50 1.9 1.1 Yes Yes 51 43 1.1 0.9

Cyprus

Czech Republic Yes Yes 94 89 0.9 0.9 Yes Yes 44 49 0.4 0.5

Ecuador

El Salvador 1 7 0.0 0.1 6 10 0.1 0.1

Estonia 48 49 3.6 3.7 69 57 5.1 4.3

Finland Yes Yes 18 9 0.3 0.2 Yes Yes 19 7 0.4 0.1

Georgia Yes Yes 16 17 0.4 0.4 Yes Yes 88 64 2.0 1.4

Germany Yes Yes 808 713 1.0 0.9 Yes Yes 999 1,079 1.2 1.3

Hong Kong SAR of

China

India

Ireland

Italy Yes Yes 115 86 0.2 0.1 Yes Yes 132 122 0.2 0.2

Japan Yes Yes 18 33 0.0 0.0 Yes Yes 84 110 0.1 0.1

Jordan 80 124 1.4 2.2

Kazakhstan

Kenya

Kyrgyzstan 130 142 2.5 2.7 70 74 1.3 1.4

Latvia 19 26 0.8 1.1 Yes Yes 24 23 1.0 1.0

Lebanon 15 4 0.4 0.1

Liechtenstein Yes Yes 1 0 2.9 0.0 Yes Yes 0 0 0.0 0.0

Lithuania Yes Yes 58 259 1.7 7.6 Yes Yes 41 57 1.2 1.7

Malta

Mauritius 2 9 0.2 0.7 5 2 0.4 0.2

Mongolia Yes Yes 3 2 0.1 0.1 Yes Yes 13 19 0.5 0.7

Montenegro 5 9 0.8 1.5 Yes Yes 2 2 0.3 0.3

Morocco

Nepal

Netherlands

New Zealand

Norway

Occupied

Palestinian

Territory

Yes Yes 487 12.9 Yes Yes 487 12.9

Panama

Paraguay

Poland

Portugal

Republic of

Moldova

Yes Yes 110 126 2.8 3.3 Yes Yes 151 172 3.9 4.5

Romania Yes Yes 2,450 2,652 11.3 12.3 5,005 5,026 23.1 23.3

Scotland

Serbia Yes Yes 84 113 0.9 1.1 Yes Yes 143 166 1.4 1.7

Singapore

Slovakia Yes Yes 97 167 1.8 3.1 Yes Yes 141 88 2.6 1.6
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Complex crimes

Active bribery Passive bribery

Definition

consistent

Count Rate Definition

consistent

Count Rate

Country

2005 2006 2005 2006 2005 2006 2005 2006 2005 2006 2005 2006

Slovenia Yes Yes 5 18 0.3 0.9 Yes Yes 11 17 0.6 0.8

Spain

Sweden

Syrian Arab

Republic

Yes 27 27 0.1 0.1

Tajikistan

The FYR of

Macedonia

Yes Yes 6 4 0.3 0.2 Yes Yes 13 6 0.6 0.3

Turkey Yes Yes Yes Yes

Turkmenistan

Ukraine Yes Yes 911 747 1.9 1.6 Yes Yes 2,857 2,511 6.1 5.4

United Arab

Emirates

United States of

America
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**Table6.Counterfeitedcurrency:policerecordedoffences,2005and2006(UN􀍲CTS)and2004(Interpol)1**

Definition consistent Interpol Police-recorded offences (UN-CTS)

Count Count Count Rate Rate

Country

2005 2006 2004 2005 2006 2005 2006

Armenia 60 52 2.0 1.7

Austria Yes Yes 13,264 9,970 160.0 119.7

Azerbaijan 15 9 0.2 0.1

Bahrain 52 29 7.2 3.9

Bangladesh 325 309 0.2 0.2

Belarus 2,844 2,822 2,120 28.8 21.8

Belize 16 5.7

Bosnia and Herzegovina Yes Yes 301 241 170 6.2 4.3

Brunei Darussalam Yes Yes 19 34 10 9.1 2.6

Canada Yes Yes 165,014 119,405 511.3 366.5

Costa Rica Yes Yes 5 65 33 1.5 0.8

Croatia Yes Yes 496 470 483 10.3 10.6

Cyprus Yes Yes 1 3 0.1 0.4

Czech Republic Yes Yes 2,894 3,989 2,731 39.1 26.8

Denmark Yes Yes 1,127 525 459 9.7 8.5

Ecuador Yes Yes 107 140 0.8 1.1

El Salvador 12 12 15 0.2 0.2

Estonia 607

Finland Yes Yes 1,945 2,344 2,147 44.7 40.8

Georgia Yes Yes 26 82 109 1.8 2.5

Germany 7,873 7,923 9.5 9.6

Greece Yes Yes 4,887 319 249 2.9 2.2

India 2,383 2,169 0.2 0.2

Ireland Yes Yes 242 151 5.8 3.6

Italy Yes Yes 8,824 9,414 9,376 16.1 16.0

Japan Yes Yes 3,765 1,479 2.9 1.2

Kazakhstan 1,077 805 7.1 5.3

Kenya Yes Yes 119 297 0.3 0.8

Kyrgyzstan Yes Yes 43 43 0.8 0.8

Latvia 175 502 609 21.8 26.6

Lebanon 137 133 41 3.3 1.0

Liechtenstein Yes Yes 5 5 1 14.5 2.9

Lithuania Yes Yes 1,170 1,298 34.2 38.1

Malaysia Yes Yes 184 225 0.7 0.9

Malta 20 21 5.0 5.2

Mauritius 17 35 1.4 2.8

Monaco 32 36 18 110.8 55.2

Mongolia Yes Yes 4 12 5 0.5 0.2

Montenegro 73 139 12.0 23.1

Morocco Yes Yes 405 405 1.3 1.3

Nepal 30 27 0.1 0.1

Netherlands Yes Yes 1,525 776 570 4.8 3.5

New Zealand 85 91 65 2.2 1.6

Nicaragua Yes Yes 56 71 1.0 1.3

Northern Ireland Yes Yes 304 146 17.6 8.5

Norway Yes Yes 298 320 240 6.9 5.1

Occupied Palestinian Territory Yes Yes 78 2.1

Panama

Paraguay Yes Yes 0 0 0.0 0.0

Poland Yes Yes 11,954 9,513 8,166 24.9 21.4

Portugal Yes Yes 7,319 7,186 69.5 67.9

Republic of Moldova Yes Yes 27 32 0.7 0.8

Romania Yes Yes 343 759 1.6 3.5

1Interpoldatafor2004wereprovidedtoUNODCforresearchpurposes.
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Complex crimes

Definition consistent Interpol Police-recorded offences (UN-CTS)

Count Count Count Rate Rate

Country

2005 2006 2004 2005 2006 2005 2006

Scotland Yes Yes 719 914 14.1 17.9

Serbia 338 266 3.4 2.7

Singapore Yes Yes 2 10 28 0.2 0.6

Slovakia Yes Yes 881 885 662 16.4 12.3

Slovenia Yes Yes 1,868 1,439 1,823 72.0 91.1

Spain Yes Yes 1,743 2,280 1,652 5.3 3.8

Sweden Yes Yes 2,414 1,982 1,259 21.9 13.9

Syrian Arab Republic Yes Yes 514 678 2.7 3.5

Tajikistan 36 35 0.5 0.5

The FYR of Macedonia Yes Yes 195 172 9.6 8.4

Turkey Yes Yes 2,811 5,243 3.9 7.1

Turkmenistan Yes Yes 9 12 0.2 0.2

Ukraine Yes Yes 1,573 1,436 1,480 3.1 3.2

United Arab Emirates 226 171 5.5 4.0

United States of America
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Criminal Justice System

Chapter5–Responses of the criminal justice system

**PaulSmit\*andStefanHarrendorf\*\***

**Abstract**

In thischapter the responses of the criminal justice systemon crime aredescribed, from themomentan

offender is found until a decision of a judge at a penal court. The number of persons prosecuted and

convictedareanalysed,bothadultsandjuvenilesaswellastheproportionoffemales.\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Thisisdonefortotal

offences and separately for intentional homicide. Where possible, data are given by country and by

continent.Next,theattritionprocessisdiscussedintwoways.Firstlythenumberofoffendersconvictedare

comparedtotheoffendersfound.Secondly,theattritionprocessisshowninmoredetailwithfourmoments

in the criminal justice system, i.e. crimes recorded, offenders found, offenders prosecuted and offenders

convicted.

**Introduction**

This chapter describes the reaction from the

criminal justice system on crime. Although this

canstartatthemomentavictimreportsacrime

to the police 􀇦 or one can argue maybe even

before that with general preventive measures 􀇦

the starting point for this chapter is when a

suspected offender is found. And the end point

will be the decision of a judge at a penal court.

Again, one could also consider the types of

sanctions and the prison population as part of

the criminal justice system. However,

informationontypesofsanctionswasnotasked

for in the 8th, 9th and 10th survey of the UN􀇦

CTS. Information on prisons and prisoners will

bedealtwithinchapter7.

Thismeans thatthemainthemein thischapter

iswhathappens intheprosecution stageand at

the court level. Some attention is given to the

police level as well, but mainly from the

perspective of the prosecution (i.e. as potential

input for the prosecution). The main indicators

in this chapter are the number of persons that

havebeenprosecutedandthenumberofpersons

thathavebeenconvicted.Forbothindicatorsthe

proportions of females and juveniles will be

consideredaswell.Prosecutionsandconvictions

will be given regardless of the crime type with

oneexception:intentionalhomicidewillbedealt

withseparately.

At every phase in the criminal justice system

some attrition is expected to take place. This is

causedbothbytechnical/legalreasons(e.g.not

enough evidence for an alleged offender found)

and by efficiency reasons where police and/or

prosecution make a case ending decision

themselves. \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_In this chapter the attrition process

willbedescribedbetweenthemomentacrimeis

registeredandtheconvictionbyacourt.

Data are taken from the UN􀇦CTS exclusively,

from the 6th to the 10th survey (and for some

countriesthe5thsurveywasusedaswell).Where

possible,datafromthethreeyears1996,2001and

2006 were used. However, in order to minimize

thenumber of ‘missing values’, other years were

taken instead if there were no data available for

one or more of these three years for a specific

country.Besides,aqualitycheckwasmadeonthe

data. This could have resulted in using another

year for a country aswell (or innot considering

thedataatall).SeeAnnexBandCforacomplete

descriptionofthedataselectionprocess.
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In the following sections thenumber of persons

prosecutedandconvictedwillbedescribed,both

themostrecentdataavailableandthetrendsover

the last ten years. Median values per continent

will be presented where possible (see Annex B)

while data will also be given by country. Finally,

the attrition process will be described, starting

with the relation between alleged offenders and

recorded crime and ending with convicted

offenders.

**Prosecutions**

In the 10thUN􀇦CTS the following definitionwas

usedfor‘personsprosecuted’:

“*Personsprosecuted*”maybeunderstoodtomean

alleged offenders prosecuted by means of an

officialcharge,initiatedbythepublicprosecutor

or the law enforcement agency responsible for

prosecution.

In many countries the general procedure in the

criminal justice system is that, afteran offender

is found, the Prosecution Service will be the

institutionthatbringsthe offendertothecourt.

The court then decides on the guilt of the

offender and the appropriate punishment.

Within this generalschememany variations are

possible, depending on the precise function of

theProsecutionService:whetherthecountryhas

alegalityoropportunityprincipleorwhetherthe

ProsecutionServiceinacountryhasamonopoly

to prosecute. Other variations can be found in

the options the police has to end proceedings

without any involvement of the Prosecution

Service.Foramoredetailed discussiononthese

issues see (Elsner, Smit, Zila 2008; Jehle, Smit,

Zila 2008; Smit 2008; Wade 2006) These

variations obviously have a considerable impact

inthefigurespresentedhere.

But other, more technical or statistical factors

are responsible for variations in the figures as

well: three offences by one suspected offender

couldbecounted asoneorthree,dependingon

thestatisticalcountingchoicemadeinacountry.

And although in the UN definition ‘other law

enforcement agencies’ are explicitly included,

presumably not every country would be able to

provide figures for these besides the Public

Prosecutor.

Another factor, probably causing considerable

variation in the total number of persons

prosecuted is the precise operationalisation of

whatisincludedin‘alloffences’inthecontextof

the prosecution process. Are only the most

serious crimes considered here? Or also minor

crimes (even infractions)? That this is probably

an important factor is also shown by the

correlationbetweenthetotalnumberofpersons

prosecuted and the number of prosecutions for

intentional homicide which is remarkably low

(0.25).

In table 1 the latest available figures for person

prosecuted are given. Unless otherwise

mentioned(inthecolumns‘*yr*’),thedataarefor

2006.Theearliestyearpossibleis2000.Onlythe

92 countries that were able to provide at least

one figure for ‘persons prosecuted’ are in the

table. The countries are grouped by continent

and if at least five responseswere available in a

continentthemedianwascomputed.Bothforall

offences and for intentional homicide the total

number of persons prosecuted are given (in the

case of ‘all offences’ the total number was split

betweenadultsandjuveniles)aswellastherates

per 100,000 inhabitants. Both for adults and

juveniles the proportion of females was

computed.

As expected, when looking at the rates per

100,000 there is considerable variation in the

number of persons prosecuted. Nepal and

Pakistan are the lowest with 5 and 6 persons

prosecuted per 100,000 inhabitants. Other

countries with less than 50 are Guatemala,

Venezuela, the Republic of Moldova and Papua

New Guinea. For most of these countries, by

comparing with the persons prosecuted for

intentionalhomicide,thereisastrongsuspicion

that only the most serious crimes are included

here.Asanexample,inVenezuelaalmosthalfof

the 9,550persons prosecuted are prosecuted for

homicide.

Countries with the highest number of persons

prosecuted are Belgium (6,512) and Turkey

(4,588). Other countries withnumbers of 2,000

ormoreareSouthAfrica,theRepublicofKorea,

Austria, Finland, England & Wales and New

Zealand.

Clearly, most countries with higher numbers of

personsprosecutedcanbefoundinEurope,with

amedianof973.Americahasthelowestmedian

(191).However,duetotheconsiderablevariation

and the low number of countries responding in

some continents (only 6 in Africa) it is very

problematictodrawconclusionsfromthis.
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Less variation can be seen in the proportion of

juveniles among persons prosecuted. However

thereisoneoutlieratthehighend(Ukrainewith

44% juveniles). Also there are several countries

with very low percentages (3% or less) which

should be interpreted with some caution: in

manycountriesjuvenilescommittingacrimeare

for a large part dealt with outside the Criminal

JusticeSystem.Generallythehighestpercentages

ofjuvenilescanbefoundinAmericaandEurope

(median8%).

Theproportionoffemalesprosecutedistypically

between10% and 15%, again with some outliers

suchasSingaporewith28%andHongKongand

Slovenia with 27% adult females, or Barbados

and Swaziland with more than 30% juvenile

females. And on the low end Pakistan with 0%

adult females, Jordan with 0% juvenile females

and Georgia with 1% for both adults and

juveniles.Someoftheoutliersarepossiblydueto

lowabsolutenumbers.Theproportionoffemales

tend to be a little higher in Europe, particularly

foradultfemales.AndwithinEuropemainlythe

Northern and Western countries have a higher

proportion of females, possibly due to

shoplifting(Smit2008).

Forhomicideagainthevariationisconsiderable.

Partlythis isbecausesomecountriescouldhave

presented the data including attempts (see

Annex B). In Asia and Europe most countries

have a low number of persons prosecuted for

intentional homicide per 100,000, typically

between1.0and3.0.However,somecountriesin

thesecontinentsdohavemuchhighernumbers,

from 8.0 upwards. This is the case for

Kazakhstan, Mongolia, Sri Lanka, Albania,

Belgium, Belarus, Estonia, Lithuania, the

Russian federation,andTurkey. Stillthemedian

for Asia is 2.1and forEurope 2.3which is lower

thanforAfricaandAmerica.

In table 2 (Annex A) the trends in persons

prosecuted are shown. Trends for adults and

juveniles are computed separately, as well as

trendsforhomicides.Fortwoperiodstheaverage

annualchangeisgiven:forthemostrecentyears

2001 to 2006, and for the whole period 1996 to

2006. It was not possible to use these exact

periods for every country, in some cases other

years we taken as substitute. SeeAnnex B for a

detaileddescription.However,bycomputingthe

averageannualchangethefiguresinthetableare

comparable. For 44 countries at least one trend

figurecouldbecomputed.

In general the number of adults prosecuted

seems to increase over the years, particularly in

the last few years. Some of the increases are

remarkable,suchasforGeorgiaandIceland.The

increases in Finland, England & Wales and

Northern Ireland have mainly occurred in the

1996–2001period.

The trendsinjuvenilesprosecutediscompletely

different.Here there is a decrease, again mainly

in the last few years.There aresomeexceptions

such as the very high increase in juveniles

prosecutedinPortugal,mostprobablythiscould

beexplainedbyachangeinthesystemthere.

Forhomicideadecreasecanbeseenaswell,

althoughthevariationseemstobesomewhat

higherbetweencountries.

**Convictions**

In the 10thUN􀇦CTS the following definitionwas

usedfor‘personsconvicted’:

“*Persons convicted*”maybeunderstood tomean

persons found guilty by any legal body duly

authorized to pronounce them convicted under

national law, whether the conviction was later

upheldornot.

Not allpersonsagainstwhomaprosecutionhas

started willbeconvicted.Apartfroma–usually

small – percentage of alleged offenders found

not guilty in court, in many countries this is

mainly dependent on the possibilities for the

prosecutor toend acase, eitherwith or without

consequences for the alleged offender.For some

Europeancountriesthe differentoptions forthe

prosecutor has been shown in (Jehle,Smit, Zila

2008; Wade 2006). Other factors, like special

procedures for juveniles or for minor offences

willalsocausesomevariationinthefigures.

As was the case with persons prosecuted,

technical or statistical factors could be

responsible for variations in the figures as well.

And also here, the issue of which offences are

exactly included in ‘all offences’ is important.

Themoresoasthecorrelationbetweenthetotal

numberofpersonsconvictedandthenumberof

persons convicted for intentional homicide is

almostzero(􀇦0.07).

In table 3 (Annex A) the latest available figures

forpersonconvictedaregiven.Unlessotherwise

mentioned(inthecolumns‘*yr*’),thedataarefor

2006.Theearliestyearpossibleis2000.Onlythe
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95 countries that were able to provide at least

onefigurefor‘personsconvicted’areinthetable.

Thecountriesaregroupedbycontinentandifat

leastfiveresponseswereavailableinacontinent

the medianwas computed. Both for alloffences

andforintentionalhomicidethetotalnumberof

persons convicted are given (in the case of ‘all

offences’ the total number was split between

adults and juveniles) as well as the rates per

100,000 inhabitants. Both for adults and

juveniles the proportion of females was

computed.

Generallyand formostcountries, looking atthe

rates per 100,000, the number of persons

convicted is somewhat lower than persons

prosecuted.Thiswillbediscussedmoreindetail

below. Still, there is a considerable variation in

therates.Colombiawitharateof0andEthiopia

and Papua New Guinea with 4 are the lowest.

Other countries with a rate less than 30 are

Zambia, Bolivia, Ecuador, Venezuela,

Afghanistan, Nepal, the Philippines and Malta.

Aswealsosawwiththeprosecutionsintable5.1,

by comparing with the persons convicted for

intentionalhomicide,thereisastrongsuspicion

for some of these countries that only the most

seriouscrimesareincludedhere.Asanexample,

inPapuaNewGuineaalmostall(220ofthe283)

personsconvictedareconvictedforhomicide.

Countries with the highest number of persons

convicted are Mauritius (10,762) and Egypt

(7,105). Other countries with numbers of 2,000

ormore are Finland,England&WalesandNew

Zealand.

Clearly, most countries with higher numbers of

personsconvictedcanbefoundinEurope,witha

median of 698. America has the lowest median

(75).However,duetotheconsiderable variation

and the low number of countries responding in

some continents (only 7 in Africa) it is very

problematictodrawconclusionsfromthis.

Thehighestpercentagesofjuvenilescomparedto

the total number of persons convicted can be

found in Malta (60%) and Australia (46%). In

thecaseofMaltathiscouldwellbecausedbythe

low absolute numbers. The highest percentages

can be found in America (median 11%) and

Europe (median 7%). In general the proportion

of juveniles convicted is somewhat lower than

juveniles prosecuted. A possible explanation

could be that a prosecutor is more inclined to

endacasewithjuvenilesoutsidethecourt.

Thepercentageoffemalesconvicted isgenerally

about 10%, for adultssomewhat higher than for

juveniles. Outliers are Barbados (53%, possibly

duetolowabsolutenumbers),HongKong(28%

for adults) and Thailand (26% for adults).

Mauritius, Afghanistan, Armenia, the Occupied

Palestinian Territory, the Philippines and Qatar

have very low proportions of females convicted,

either for adults, juveniles or both. The highest

percentages can \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_be found in Europe and

America. The median proportion of females

convicted is considerably lower than females

prosecuted.This couldwell be explained by the

fact that crimes committed by female offenders

tend to be less serious and thus have a greater

chancetogetasettlementoutsidethecourt.

As with prosecution, possibly because some

countries could have presented the data

including attempts (see Annex B), the variation

inpersonsconvicted for intentionalhomicide is

considerable. Guatemala (26.3), Turkey (18.6),

theRussianFederation(13.2)Mongolia(11.0)and

Belarus(10.0)arethehighestwhileontheother

hand for 15 countries the rate is 0.5 or less.The

median is about 1 for all continents except for

Americawhereitis3.6.

In table 4 the trends in persons convicted are

shown. Trends for adults and juveniles are

computed separately, as well as trends for

homicides. For two periods the average annual

changeisgiven:forthemostrecentyears2001to

2006, and for thewhole period 1996 to 2006. It

was not possible to use these exact periods for

everycountry,insomecasesotheryearswetaken

as substitute. See Annex B for a detailed

description.However,bycomputingthe average

annual change the figures in the table are

comparable. For 57 countries at least one trend

figurecouldbecomputed.

In most countries the number of adults

convicted seems to increase over the years,

particularly in the last few years (themedian of

theaverageannualincreaseis3.0%).Thelargest

increases can be seen inMalaysia (24.4% in the

whole period 1996 – 2006), England & Wales

(20.2% in 1996 – 2006) and Northern Ireland

(37.6% in the period 2001 – 2006). Kazakhstan

(􀇦13.6%)andArmenia(􀇦11.8%)showadecreasein

the period 2001 – 2006. With some exceptions

(Georgia, Spain, Sweden and Northern Ireland)

the trends in juveniles convicted is downward.

This is consistent with what we saw for

prosecutions: for adults an increase and for

juvenilesadecrease.

Forhomicidehoweverthereisanincreaseinthe

numberofpersonsconvictedinthelastperiod

(2001–2006).Butthevariationbetweencountries

isconsiderable.
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**Possiblemeasuresofattrition**

Inonly asmallminority of all criminal offences

committed an offender will be convicted. In

every step between the commitment of a crime

and the conviction of the offender(s) some

attritioncanandwilloccur:

a) Firstly, the crime must be recognized and

considered as a crime by someone, either the

offender,thevictim,awitnessorthepolice.This

isnotalwaysthecase:whenadeadbodyisfound

it could be labelled an accident while in fact it

was a homicide. But also for other crimes (e.g.

fraud, domestic violence) the offender and

sometimes even the victim could well be

convincedthatwhathappenedwasnotacrimeat

all.

b) The next step is that the crime must be

broughttotheattentionofthepolice,usuallyby

avictimreportingthecrime.FromCrimeVictim

Surveys(vanDijk,vanKesteren,Smit2008)itis

known that, depending on the type of crime,

only about half of the crimes are actually

reportedtothepolice.

c) Then, the crime has to be registered by the

police. Again, although in many countries the

police are obliged to register every crime, this

does not happen in practice. This could be

because the crime is not considered serious

enoughbythepolice.Orbecausethepolicewill

not do anything about that particular crime

anyhow.

d) After a crime is registered 􀇦 and by this

registrationformallyenteredthecriminaljustice

system􀇦anoffenderwillbefoundornot.Aswe

will see in this paragraph on average for every

two crimes registered one offender is found.

There is a statistical complication here: the

counting unit changes now from crime to

offender. Since a crime can be committed by

more than one offender (and possibly for some

crimes more than one offender is actually

found),onecannotsaythathalfofthecrimesare

'solved'. Indeed it is possible, and for some

countriesthisactuallyoccurs,thatthenumberof

offenders found is larger than the number of

crimesregistered.

e) Not all offenders that are found will be

prosecuted. Both police and prosecution can

decide not to continue proceedings against an

offender, either for technical reasons (not

enough evidence) or policy reasons. And, in

some countries and under specific conditions,

the police can end a procedure with some

sanctionfortheoffender.

f ) After a prosecution against an offender has

started,notalloffenderswillbebroughtbeforea

penal court. As in the preceding step, the

prosecutor can end a procedure as well, either

with or without any consequences for the

offender.

g)Not all offenders brought before a judge will

get a conviction. Although in practice this is a

small percentage in most countries not all

allegedoffenderswillbefoundguilty.

Essentially this ends the attrition, although one

canconsider thepossibility ajudgehas in some

countries, i.e. to convict an offender *without*

imposing a penalty as another step in the

attrition process. Another possible step in the

attritionprocessisthatthepenaltycouldnotbe

executed for some reason (e.g. the offender has

escaped). But these are very small percentages

anyhow. See also (Marshall 1998; Mayhew 2003;

Tonry, Farrington 2005)on the attrition process

inthecriminaljusticesystem.

It is important to realize that the various steps

described above are not independent of each

other. In particular the attrition in step c) can

influence the outcome of the attrition in d): if

the police records a crime only when there is a

realisticpossibilitytofindtheoffender,thenthe

attritioninstepc)isexpectedtobehighwhileit

is low in step d). But there is also a mutually

dependency between e) and f ) according to the

possibilities of either the police or the

prosecution. This is very different across

countries as was shown in (Elsner, Smit, Zila

2008;Wade2006).

In theUN Crime Survey information can

be obtained for crimes recorded, offenders

found, offenders prosecuted and offenders

convicted. This relates to the above mentioned

steps c), d), e) and g). In table 5 the attrition

betweenthestepsd)andg)isshown.Assuming

that the 'offenders found' is the potential input

for the prosecution this essentially shows the

total attrition in the combined prosecution and

courtsprocess.

Theconvictionsare given asapercentageofthe

numberofoffendersfound,foradults,juveniles,

females and homicides. Data are for the year

2006 where available. If another year was used,

this is indicated in the columns 'C' (for

Trends
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convicted)or'O'(foroffendersfound).Onlythe

81 countries where at least one attrition rate

could be computed are in the table. The

countriesaregroupedbycontinentandifatleast

five responses were available in a continent the

medianwascomputed.

As in previous tables the variations between

countries seem to be considerable. Indeed, very

low percentages (under 10%) or percentages

much higher than 100% are difficult to

understand. Possibly these are due to data

availability or other statistical artefacts. If, for

example, all convictions are counted regardless

of crime type but for offenders found only

offenderssuspectedofmoreseriouscrimes(e.g.

excluding traffic offences) are counted, a

percentage higher than 100% could well be the

result.

For adults, themedian Convictions / Offenders

quotient is 60%. Not surprisingly this is

somewhat lower for females (49%). Except for

some Asian countries 􀇦 where the attrition

measuredinthiswayisactuallylowerforfemales

􀇦 in almost all countries the Conviction /

Offendersquotientislowerforfemales.

GenerallytheattritionisinAsiasomewhatlower

than in Europe. Due to the small number of

countries responding in AfricaandAmerica the

highmedianattritioninthesecontinentscannot

beseenasrepresentativeforthesecontinents.

Clearly juvenile offenders are usually dealt with

outsideapenalcourt,atleastcomparedtoadult

offenders. Only 35% of the juvenile offenders

(andwith22%evenlessfemalejuveniles)willbe

convicted in court. Again, the attrition is

somewhat lower in Asia. As expected, the

attrition rate for homicide offenders is much

lower,i.e.higherpercentagesfortheConvictions

/Offendersquotients.Themedianrateis71%,in

Europetherateisthehighestwith84%.

In figure 1 the trends are shown for the

convictionsaspercentageoftheoffendersfound.

Duetothelackoftrenddataitwasnotusefulto

givetheinformationbycontinent.Also,because

the data used for the trends analysis are not

exactly the same as those for the 'last year

available' (see Annex B for an explanation), the

percentagesfor2006infigure1arenotthesame

as in table 5. Trends for adults, juveniles and

homicidesareshowninthefigure.

**Figure1.Percentageofpersonsconvictedpersuspectedoffenders,trends1996􀍲2006**
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Both for adults and for homicides attrition

seemedtoincrease(i.e.lowerpercentages)inthe

period1996􀇦2001.Thistrendwasreversedinthe

period 2001 􀇦 2006 resulting in a level

comparable to 1996. For juveniles however the

attrition increased during the whole 10 year

period. This possibly indicates that there has

beenachangeinattitudetowardsjuveniles,i.e.a

tendency to deal with juvenile offenders more

andmoreoutsideapenalcourt.

Tables6and 7 look into the attrition process in

more detail. Here, the number of offenders

found,offendersprosecutedandconvicted(steps

d), e)and g) as earlier described) are related to

thenumberofoffencesrecorded(stepc)).Table

6 gives the information for all offences, table 7

for homicide. In table 6 the offenders are

separated into adult and juveniles. Where

available, the year 2006 is taken, otherwise

another year (butnotbefore2000) isused.This

is indicated in the tables. In the 'recorded'

column the rates of offences recorded per

100,000inhabitantsaregiven.Theothercolumns

give the number of offenders ('found',

'prosecuted' and 'convicted') per 100 offences

recorded. Since the counting unit has changed

from offences to offenders these are *not*

percentages and could well be more than 100.

Thecountriesaregroupedbycontinentandifat

leastfiveresponseswereavailableinacontinent

themedianwascomputed.

Figure 2 shows the medians over all countries

andalloffences,foradultsandjuveniles.Thisis

agraphicalrepresentationofthelastlineintable

6.

**Figure 2. Attrition in the criminal justice system for all offences, 2006. Median of all countries.**

**IndexedwithRecorded=100**
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almostall(37outof41)adultoffendersfoundare

prosecuted,butonly21areconvicted.

In Asia the attrition is less than in the other

continents. However, the rate of offences

recorded is low for Asia. A possiblemechanism

here could be that crimes with a low chance of

finding an offender are not always recorded. In

America the overall attrition is very high with

only 4.6 adult and 0.5 juvenile offenders

convictedper100crimesrecorded.

For homicide the attrition is much less.

Obviously because the criminal justice system,

starting with a police investigation, will give a

higherprioritytohomicidesthanto lessserious

offences. Also, when an offender is found the

casewillusuallybebroughtbeforeapenalcourt.

Inmanycountriesmoreoffendersarefoundthan

offences recorded. One of the reasons is that,

whilesomehomicides willneverbe solved (and

no offenders will be found) there will also be

homicides withmore than one offender. Hardly

anyattritionisfoundfortheprosecution:almost

all (102 out of 108) offenders found will be

prosecuted. But in the next stage there is some

attrition:threeoutoffourprosecutionsendina

conviction.

Different from other offences, the attrition for

homicideislessinEuropethaninAsia.Thedata

intheothercontinentsaretoounstabletodraw

anyconclusions.Remarkably,inmanyEuropean

countries the number of persons prosecuted is

higherthanthenumberofoffendersfound.This

couldbeduetothefactthatwhereacasestarts

asa'threat'or'assault'case,theprosecutorcould

decide to prosecute for (attempted) homicide

instead.

**Summaryandconclusions**

In this chapter the responses of the criminal

justice system on crime are described, in

particular fromthemomentan allegedoffender

is founduntilthedecision of ajudge ata penal

court. The main indicators are persons

prosecuted and persons convicted. Both the

latest information available and trend data over

thelast10yearsareused.

Due to organisational, technical and statistical

factors the variation in the number of persons

prosecutedandconvictedisveryhigh.Countries

with the highest rate per 100,000 inhabitants

havearateofmorethan1,000timesofcountries

with the lowest rate, both for prosecutions and

for convictions. Countries in Europe show the

highestrates,inAmericathelowest.

The proportion of juveniles is about 7% for

persons prosecuted and 6% for persons

convicted.Thehighestproportionscanbefound

in Europe and America. The proportion of

femalesprosecutedistypicallybetween10%and

15% and about 10% for convictions. The

proportion of adult females is somewhat larger

than for juveniles, and the highest proportion

can be seen in Europe. For juveniles the lower

percentages for convictions could be explained

by the fact that a prosecutor will be more

inclinedtoendacasewithjuvenilesoutsidethe

court. For female offenders this is probably

because crimes committed by female offenders

tend to be less serious and thus have a greater

chancetogetasettlementoutsidethecourt.

Looking at trends, for both prosecutions and

convictionsthereisanincreaseinthenumberof

adults,mainly inthe last 5 yearsand adecrease

in the number of juveniles, also mainly in the

last 5 years. Differences between continents are

small.

The variations in persons prosecuted and

convictedforintentionalhomicidearealsolarge.

Partly this is because probably some countries

included attempts as well in their responses.

Although some countries in Europe and Asia

haveveryhighratesper100,000inhabitants,the

medianvaluesforthesetwocontinentsarelower

than in America and Africa. While there is a

decreaseofpersonsprosecutedforhomicide,the

trendforconvictionsisupward.

In every step between the commitment of a

crimeandtheconvictionoftheoffender(s)some

attrition can and will occur. This can be due to

technical or legal reasons – e.g. the offender is

not found, or there is notenough evidence – or

becauseofefficiencyreasons.Inmanycountries

the prosecution and/or the police have the

possibility toend aproceeding, with or without

consequencesfortheallegedoffender.

Looking atpersonsconvicted asapercentage of

suspectedoffenders,themedianforallcountries

that answered both questions in theUN􀇦CTS is

60%foradultsand35%forjuveniles.Forfemales

these percentages are considerably lower: 49%

for adults and 22% for females. But, not

surprisingly, for homicide it is higher: 71%.

Becauseofthescarcityofdataitishardtoshow
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differencesbetweencontinents.Itseemsthatthe

percentages are somewhat higher (meaning less

attrition) in Asia. Remarkably, the attrition for

adultfemalesinAsiaislessthanforadultstotal.

For adultsand forhomicide the trends over the

last ten years are similar: more attrition in the

period 1996 – 2001 and less attrition in the

period2001–2006.For juvenilesthereseemsto

bemoreattritionforthewholeperiod.

Looking in more detail at the attrition process

(considering the number of persons prosecuted

as well) and starting one step before offenders

found,i.e.crimesrecordedwefindthefollowing

results:

Forevery100crimesrecorded:

􀁸 45.4 adult and 4.1 juvenile alleged

offendersarefound

􀁸 30.4 adult and 2.2 juvenile alleged

offendersareprosecuted

􀁸 18.5 adult and 1.4 juvenile offenders are

convicted

In Asia the figures are higher, particularly for

adultsandforoffendersfound,whileinAmerica

the figures are somewhat lower. For homicide,

the figures are much higher: for every 100

homicides recorded108 offendersare found,102

prosecutedand76convicted.

**References**

vanDijkJ,vanKesterenJ,SmitP2007.Criminal

Victimisation in International Perspective; Key

findings from the 2004􀇦2005 ICVS and EU ICS.

JuridischeUitgevers.ReeksOnderzoekenBeleid,

nr.257.DenHaag:Boom.

Elsner B,Smit P,Zila J2008.PoliceCase􀇦ending

Possibilities within Criminal Investigations, in

European Journal of Criminal Policy and

Research,14.2􀇦3,191–201.

Jehle J􀇦M2000.ProsecutionsinEurope:Varying

structures, convergent trends, in European

JournalofCriminalPolicyandResearch,8.1,3–

12.

Jehle J􀇦M, Smit P, Zila J 2008. The public

prosecutor asthekeyplayer:Prosecutorialcase􀇦

ending decisions.European JournalonCriminal

PolicyandResearch,14(2–3),161–179.

Marshall I H 1998. Operation of the Criminal

Justice System 1998, in Kangaspunta K, Joutsen

M, Ollus N (eds.), Crime and Criminal Justice

Systems in Europe and North America 1990 􀇦

1994.Helsinki:HEUNI.

Mayhew P 2003. Operation of the Criminal

Justice System, inAromaa K,Leppä S,Nevala S,

Ollus N (eds.), Crime and Criminal Justice

Systems in Europe and North America 1995 􀇦

1997.Helsinki:HEUNI.

SmitP2008.ProsecutionandCourts,inAromaa

K, Heiskanen M (eds.), Crime and Criminal

Justice Systems in Europe and North America

1995–2004.Helsinki:HEUNI:94–117.

Tonry M, Farrington D 2005. Punishment \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_and

Crime across Space and Time. In Tonry M,

Farrington D (eds.), Crime and Punishment in

Western Countries 1980 􀇦 1999. Crime and

Justice,vol.33.Chicago.

Wade M 2006. The Power to Decide –

Prosecutorial Control, Diversion and

Punishment in European Criminal Justice

Systems Today, in Jehle J􀇦M, Wade M (eds.),

Coping with Overloaded Criminal Justice

Systems,The Rise ofProsecutorial Power across

Europe.Berlin,Heidelberg:Springer,27–126.

96

**AnnexAto hapter5:Tables**

**Table1.Personsprosecuted,2006**

All offences International homicide

Total Adults Juveniles %

juvenile

s

Total

Continent Country rate/

100k

yr persons yr %

females

yr persons yr %

females

yr of total rate/

100k

persons yr

Africa Algeria *1.686* 544.891 5% 11.571 4% 2%

Egypt *0.6* 428 *00*

Ethiopia 291.479 *02* 13% *02* 55.904 *02* 12% *02* 16% *12.5* 8.660 *02*

Mauritius *912* 10.926 7% 589 14% 5% *4.0* 51

Morocco 447.509 13% 20.946 15% 4% *2.2* 676

Namibia *6.6* 126 *02*

South Africa *2.689 00 23.8* 10.696 *00*

Swaziland *70* 743 8% 54 31% 7% *3.8* 43

Uganda *194 04 3.8* 1.055 *04*

Zambia *0.1* 11 *00*

Zimbabwe *457 00* 54.934 *00* 6% *00* 1.958 *00* 19% *00* 3% *7.6* 948 *00*

***median 685 8% 15% 5% 3.9***

Americas Barbados *1.845 00* 4.643 *00* 7% *00* 69 *00* 36% *00* 1% *7.2* 18 *00*

Belize *61* 174 5% 1 0% 1% *13.2* 38

Canada *1.313* 372.084 16% 56.463 21% 13% *1.0* 328

Chile 26.862 *04 4.3* 689 *04*

Costa Rica *192* 7.800 4% 644 8% *5.4* 237

Dominican Republic *94*

Ecuador *1.405 6.2* 800 *04*

El Salvador *1.186 02* 68.031 *02* 13% *02* 3.083 *02* 11% *02* 4% *13.3* 795 *02*

Guatemala *14 00 2.9* 329 *00*

Mexico *105 02* 91.000 *02* 5% *02* 16.589 *02* 10% *02* 15% *0.8* 769 *02*

Nicaragua *463* 21.839 8% 3.747 10% 15% *7.2* 398

Panama *597* 17.431 12% 1.893 9% 10% *11.9* 391

Peru *169 02*

Uruguay *190 00*

Venezuela (Bolivarian

Republic of)

*38 02* 9.550 *02* 797 11% 8% *15.2* 4.123

***median 191 8% 10% 8% 6.7***

Asia Armenia *126* 3.481 17% 325 2% 9% *2.6* 80

Azerbaijan *144* 18.077 15% 487 6% 3% *2.4* 208

Bahrain *1.980* 14.566 159 14% *04* 1% *3.2* 24

China *56 00* 667.935 *00* 40.901 *00* 6%

Georgia *404* 16.915 1% 888 1% 5% *4.2* 187

Hong Kong Special

Administrative Region

of China

*411* 27.259 27% 1.146 18% 4% *0.4* 28

Israel *623* 38.639 9% 3.784 8% 9% *0.4* 27 *04*

Japan *141* 178.689 9% 1.351 6% 1% *0.5* 696

Jordan 3.109 *02* 0% *02*

Kazakhstan *347* 48.736 18% 4.316 20% 8% *11.2* 1.720

Kyrgyzstan *305* 14.491 1.151 7% *9.0* 476

Malaysia *489* 45.680 17% 3.100 7% 6% *2.7* 713

Maldives *1.123 02* 2.828 *02* 322 *02* 10% *1.8* 5 *02*

Mongolia *652* 15.938 10% 887 5% 5% *12.9* 332

Myanmar *51 02* 16.129 *02* 14% *02 2.7* 1.291 *02*

Nepal *5 1.3* 348

Oman *695 02 0.7* 17 *02*

Pakistan *6 00* 9.213 *00* 0% *00* 3 *00* 0% *0.1* 198 *00*

Republic of Korea *2.893 04*

1.349.214

*04* 13% *04* 21.125 *04* 13% *04* 2% *1.7* 802 *04*

Saudi Arabia *0.5* 112 *02*

Singapore *283* 12.096 28% 267 11% 2% *1.0* 45

Sri Lanka *1.642 04* 45.979 *04* 4% *04* 812 *04* 5% *04* 2% *10.0* 1.939 *04*

**c**
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Syrian Arab Republic *1.6* 263 *00*

Thailand *1.191 00* 572.083 *00*

146.890

*00* 20% *5.5* 3.417 *00*

Turkmenistan *132* 6.351 16% 127 9% 2% *4.5* 221

United Arab Emirates *0.3* 14

***median 375 14% 7% 5% 2.1***

Europe Albania *249 04* 6.127 *04* 1.955 *04* 24% *9.3* 288 *04*

Austria *3.565* 226.349 21% 58.725 20% 21% *4.1* 342

Belgium *6.512 02* 668.591 *02* 19% *02 11.4* 1.171 *02*

Bosnia and

Herzegovina

*638* 22.130 1.994 8%

Bulgaria *816 04* 59.750 *04* 4.274 *04* 7% *3.3* 254 *04*

Belarus *806* 72.638 14% 6.061 10% 8% *10.6* 1.040

Croatia *1.774* 44.226 13% 2.830 7% 6% *5.9* 262

Cyprus *0.2* 2

Czech Republic *1.388* 135.178 9% *00* 6.725 11% *00* 5% *1.6* 163

Denmark *549 02 0.4* 22 *02*

Estonia *1.295* 12.526 *04* 7% *00* 1.415 *04* 13% *00* 10% *8.9* 120

Finland *4.248* 212.419 18% 11.138 18% 5% *3.5* 185

Germany *888* 653.102 19% 78.901 19% 11% *0.3* 232

Hungary *1.028* 95.459 15% 7.943 12% 8% *1.7* 174

Iceland *865 04* 3.549 *04* 271 *04* 7% *0.7* 2 *04*

Ireland *151* 19.970 *04* 23% *04* 2.384 *04* 14% *04* 11% *0.9* 38

Italy *940 05* 531.701 *05* 15% *05* 19.289 *05* 15% *05* 4% *2.8* 1.665 *05*

Latvia *363* 7.292 10% 976 6% 12% *4.0* 91

Lithuania *510* 13.794 10% 3.472 6% 20% *8.3* 280

Luxembourg *1.009 02* 4.401 *02 1.1* 5 *02*

Malta *663 0.5* 2

The former Yugoslav

Republic of

Macedonia

*1.154* 23.514 4% 1.500 3% 6% *4.4* 89

Republic of Moldova *30 04* 14.884 *04* 12% *04* 3.187 *04* 8% *04* 18% *4.9* 181

Netherlands *1.568* 220.501 14% 36.516 17% 14% *1.1* 180

Norway *601 05* 25.659 *05* 14% *05* 2.215 *05* 18% *05* 8% *1.1* 52 *05*

Poland *1.645* 638.860 *04 2.6* 980 *04*

Portugal *1.007* 94.533 12% 12.170 8% 11% *2.2* 235

Romania *246* 46.234 7% 6.709 5% 13% *2.0* 424

Russian Federation *1.037 00 19.6* 28.694 *00*

Slovenia *772* 11.945 27% *00* 720 8% *02* 6% *1.0* 21

Slovakia *863* 42.950 14% 3.541 6% 8% *2.3* 125 *04*

Spain *2.8* 1.145 *00*

Sweden *1.340* 91.064 *02* 15.247 14% *0.9* 86

Turkey *4.588*

2.250.430

*04* 8% *04*

136.358

*04* 9% *04* 6% *23.7* 17.062

Ukraine *442* 20.662 *04* 16.526 44% *6.9* 3.233

England and Wales *3.312*

1.641.989 19% 126.189 15% 7% *1.3* 700

Northern Ireland *1.775 05* 28.816 *05* 13% *05* 1.793 *05* 13% *05* 6% *2.1* 36 *05*

Scotland *1.256 05* 46.839 *05* 18% *05* 17.137 *05* 12% *05* 27% *1.0* 53 *05*

***median 973 14% 11% 8% 2.3***

Oceania New Zealand *3.401 00* 125.323 *00* 18% *00* 3.876 *00* 16% *00* 3% *1.2* 49 *02*

Papua New Guinea *20 00* 1.041 *00* 1% *00 1.2* 65 *00*

All

countries ***median 657 13% 11% 7% 2.7***
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**Table2.Personsprosecuted,trends2001–2006;1996–2006**

**Adults Juveniles Homicides**

**Continent Country 2001-2006 1996-2006 2001-2006 1996-2006 2001-2006 1996-2006**

Africa Morocco -0.2%

Americas Canada -3.8% -1.1% -8.0% -6.5% -10.5% -1.2%

Chile 2.0% 19.0%

Costa Rica 0.9% 17.7% 7.8%

Asia Armenia -4.6% 0.5% -4.0%

Azerbaijan 18.9% 0.0% -5.0%

Georgia 16.0% 22.3% 13.1% 2.1% 3.4% -5.2%

Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of China 1.1% -2.8% -4.0% -5.8% -8.6% -8.4%

Israel 0.1% 2.1% -3.2%

Japan 3.0% 3.7% -0.5% 4.9% -3.4% -0.8%

Kazakhstan -7.7% -6.5% -3.2%

Kyrgyzstan -6.3% -4.0% -6.4% -3.7% -1.6% -3.6%

Nepal -19.5%

Republic of Korea 2.0% 5.1% -22.0% -10.1% -9.0% 2.7%

Singapore 2.0% -0.3% 9.8% 0.6% 1.6% 4.9%

***median 2.0% -0.1% -2.3% 0.3% -3.7% -3.2%***

Europe Albania -22.1%

Bulgaria 8.3% 8.6% 4.6% 15.4% 3.4%

Belarus 2.7% 1.9% -0.3% -0.8% -3.6% -1.4%

Croatia 6.9% -0.7% 8.8% 2.2% 23.8% -1.9%

Cyprus -8.8%

Czech Republic 5.8% 3.6% -5.1% -7.1% -6.6% -3.2%

Estonia 2.4% 4.5% -7.3% -4.5% -3.5% -5.1%

Finland 1.4% 10.6% -1.8% 2.3% 13.6% 5.1%

Germany 5.0% 1.8% 1.7% -3.5% 1.6% 1.1%

Hungary -2.6% -1.1% -5.4% -4.6% -2.5% -4.5%

Iceland 23.8% -19.8% 0.0% -9.4%

Ireland 4.7%

Italy 1.8% -0.7% 0.4% -2.6% -15.9% 2.3%

Latvia -15.2% -5.6% -21.3% -5.3% -13.1%

Lithuania -9.7% -1.1% -3.2%

The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia 2.5% 1.9% -3.1% -1.2% -1.1% 3.2%

Republic of Moldova 0.9% 5.0% -15.9% -5.2%

Netherlands 4.1% 1.4% 5.3% 3.4%

Norway 16.4% 9.6% 14.6% 10.5% 12.4% 8.5%

Portugal -1.8% 0.5% 64.3% 24.9% -0.6% 0.6%

Romania -8.8% -7.7% -4.8% -6.0% -10.6% -6.1%

Slovenia -3.6% -2.2% -10.4% -13.1% -13.4% -10.1%

Slovakia 4.2% 3.0% -3.0% -4.0% -6.5% 0.0%

Sweden -7.4% 4.5% 1.0%

Turkey 3.6% 7.3% 2.1%

Ukraine -9.3% -6.2% -5.1% -2.1%

England and Wales 2.5% 17.5% -19.4% -2.8% -2.9% 1.1%

Northern Ireland -0.5% 12.6% 12.5% 8.1% 14.4% 3.2%

Scotland 0.8% -1.5% -3.5% -4.5% 5.4% -3.5%

***median 2.5% 1.9% -3.1% -2.6% -2.9% 0.0%***

***All countries median 2.0% 1.1% -3.1% -1.0% -3.0% -1.3%***
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**Table3.Personsconvicted,2006**

All offences International homicide

Total Adults Juveniles %

juveniles

Total

Continent Country rate/

100k

yr persons yr %

females

yr persons yr %

females

yr of

total

rate/

100k

persons yr

Africa Algeria *1.3* 406 *04*

Egypt *7.105* 5.548.300 12% 36.758 3% *00* 1% *4.0* 3.123

Ethiopia *4 02 0.4* 310 *02*

Mauritius *10.762* 135.557 1% 263 11% 0% *0.8* 10

Morocco 26.539 *04* 3% *04* 364 *04* 5% *04* 1%

Swaziland *1.291 00 0.9* 10 *00*

Uganda *68 04 0.0* 6 *04*

Zambia *19 00* 1.309 *00* 1% *00* 1 *00* 0% *0.9* 98 *00*

Zimbabwe *277 04* 53.782 *04* 12% *04* 1.710 *04* 22% *04* 3% *1.0* 130 *00*

***Median 277 3% 1% 0.9***

Americas Argentina *68 02*

Barbados 15 *00* 53% *00 8.3* 21 *00*

Bolivia *20* 1.735 13% 180 13% 9% *2.3* 198 *02*

Canada *849* 242.988 14% 34.065 19% 12% *0.5* 161

Chile *318 04* 15.494 *04* 10% *04* 2.845 *04* 6% *04* 16% *2.7* 432 *04*

Colombia *0 04* 38 *04* 16% *04*

Costa Rica *82* 3.586 10% 236 2% *00* 6% *2.9* 128

Dominican

Republic

*38* 3.416 17% 213 17% 6% *5.0* 485

Ecuador *18 04* 2.345 *04 2.5* 325 *04*

El Salvador *39 02* 2.059 *02* 5% *02* 270 *02* 7% *02* 12% *7.2* 429 *02*

Guatemala *312 00* 34.115 *00* 14% *00 26.3* 2.954 *00*

Mexico *135* 143.214 9% *3.6* 3.846

Panama *141* 4.130 8% 499 6% 11% *2.6* 85

Uruguay *147 00* 7.704 *00* 8% *00 7.3* 243 *00*

Venezuela

(Bolivarian

Republic of)

*18 00* 4.294 *00* 4% *00 6.4* 1.555 *00*

***Median 75 10% 10% 11% 3.6***

Asia Afghanistan *12 02* 738 *02* 1% *02* 80 *02* 10% *1.0* 215 *02*

Armenia *106* 3.070 6% 168 1% 5% *1.1* 34

Azerbaijan *159 04* 13.054 *04* 10% *04* 299 *04* 3% *04* 2% *3.7* 311 *04*

Bahrain *302 04 0.1* 1 *03*

China *51 00* 598.106 *00*

Georgia *383* 15.909 6% 1.002 2% 6% *7.1* 311

Hong Kong

Special

Administrative

Region of

China

*341* 22.763 28% 843 18% 4% *0.2* 16

Indonesia

1.088.678

*00* 3% *00* 29.106 *00* 3% *0.9* 1.912 *00*

Israel *578* 35.835 9% 3.563 8% 9% *0.4* 26 *04*

Japan *68* 86.218 164 0% *0.5* 696

Jordan 399 *02*

Kazakhstan *213* 30.176 11% 2.406 8% 7% *8.4* 1.287

Kyrgyzstan *255* 12.606 12% 874 7% 6% *7.6* 403

Malaysia *321* 64.687 11% 2.908 6% 4% *0.6* 159

Mongolia *302* 7.065 9% 727 5% 9% *11.0* 284

Myanmar *33 02* 15.848 *02* 15% *02* 1.444 *02* 20% *02* 8% *1.4* 673 *02*

Nepal *11* 2.908 6% 23 4% 1% *0.9* 261

Occupied

Palestinian

Territory

*52* 1.530 0% 498 3% 25% *0.9* 35

Philippines *6* 5.240 23% 32 0% 1% *0.1* 72

Qatar *423 00* 3.387 *00* 1% *00* 107 *00* 3%

Republic of

Korea

*451 04* 233.253 *04* 13% *04* 3.817 *04* 8% *04* 2%

Saudi Arabia *273 02* 59.875 *02*

100

Singapore *293 00 0.4* 17

Syrian Arab

Republic

*421 03* 13.376 *03 1.7* 275 *00*

Tajikistan *109 3.4* 225

Thailand *962* 620.957 26% 18.799 8% 3%

Turkmenistan *181* 8.770 15% 141 5% 2% *4.5* 222

United Arab

Emirates

*1.934* 81.060 15% 803 1% *0.7* 28

***median 264 10% 6% 4% 1.0***

Europe Albania *142 02* 4.064 *02* 7% *02* 274 *02* 6% *8.2* 253 *02*

Austria *525* 40.525 14% 2.889 14% 7% *0.7* 59

Belgium *1.372 02* 132.053 *02* 485 *02* 0% *1.8* 188 *02*

Bosnia and

Herzegovina

*481* 18.200 7 0%

Bulgaria *381 04* 26.238 *04* 8% *04* 3.408 *04* 6% *04* 11% *2.0* 158 *04*

Belarus *801* 72.426 14% 5.812 10% 7% *10.0* 975

Croatia *568* 24.216 10% 974 5% 4% *4.3* 189

Cyprus *0.2* 2

Czech

Republic

*679* 66.672 12% *04* 2.773 9% *04* 4% *1.2* 123

Denmark *945* 44.051 17% 7.250 18% 14% *0.9* 51

Estonia *942 04* 9.746 *04* 7% *04* 1.181 *04* 7% *04* 11% *7.9* 106 *04*

Finland *4.169* 208.517 18% 10.874 18% 5% *3.3* 172

France *981 00* 540.980 *00* 10% *00* 39.059 *00* 9% *00* 7% *0.8* 494 *00*

Germany *698* 524.627 19% 50.525 17% 9% *0.2* 204

Hungary *979 04* 91.890 *04* 14% *04* 7.059 *04* 10% *04* 7% *1.9* 195 *04*

Iceland *881 04* 2.450 *04* 14% *04* 118 *04* 14% *04* 5% *0.3* 1 *03*

Ireland *0.6* 23 *04*

Italy *336* 195.394 14% 2.869 19% 1% *1.2* 718

Latvia *439* 8.656 9% 1.350 6% 13% *4.4* 101

Lithuania *384* 11.773 1.240 10% *8.2* 278

Luxembourg *959 02* 4.269 *02* 6% *02 0.9* 4 *02*

Malta *8 04* 32 *04* 3% *04* 48 15% 60% *0.2* 1

The former

Yugoslav

Republic of

Macedonia

*497* 9.280 6% 844 4% 8% *1.8* 37

Republic of

Moldova

*335* 11.118 11% 1.316 5% 11% *7.5* 280

Netherlands *748* 111.163 12% 11.415 14% 9% *0.9* 142 *04*

Norway *303* 13.318 13% 864 12% 6% *0.5* 25

Poland *1.285* 462.937 8% 27.419 14% 6% *1.0* 374

Portugal *659* 61.056 9% 8.761 6% 13% *1.5* 162

Romania *263* 50.560 8% 6.145 8% 11% *3.9* 845

Russian

Federation

*807 00*

1.035.071

*00* 14% *00* 148.560 *00* 7% *00* 13% *13.2* 19.415 *00*

Slovenia *430* 8.119 12% 511 8% 6% *2.2* 44

Slovakia *478* 24.180 15% 1.584 6% 6% *1.1* 59

Spain 16.229 *0.1* 34

Sweden *1.313* 94.295 16% 25.390 23% 21% *1.8* 163

Switzerland *1.497* 97.911 14% 14.045 21% 13% *1.3* 98

Turkey *1.306* 918.936 7% 22.596 8% 2% *18.6* 13.424

Ukraine *345* 146.926 14% 13.939 7% 9% *4.8* 2.228

England and

Wales

*2.646*

1.320.084

20% 93.689 15% 7% *0.7* 373

Northern

Ireland

*1.523 05* 24.800 *05* 13% *05* 1.455 *05* 13% *05* 6% *0.9* 15 *05*

Scotland *1.090 05* 40.876 *05* 18% *05* 14.650 *05* 12% *05* 26% *0.8* 42 *05*

***median 698 13% 10% 7% 1.3***

Oceania Australia *69 04* 14.998 *04* 13% *04* 12.856 *00* 46% *1.7* 349 *04*

New Zealand *2.475 00* 93.877 *00* 17% *00* 560 *00* 13% *00* 1% *0.6* 24 *02*

Papua New

Guinea

*4 00* 283 *00* 8% *00* 18 *00* 6% *4.1* 220 *00*

All

countries median *341* 11% 8% 6% *1.4*
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**Table4.Personsconvicted,trends2001–2006;1996–2006**

**Adults Juveniles Homicide**

**Continent Country 2001-2006 1996-2006 2001-2006 1996-2006 2001-2006 1996-2006**

Africa Egypt -1.7% 4.0% 8.7%

Mauritius 12.9% 15.8%

Zimbabwe -1.2% -27.5%

Americas Bolivia -3.0% -14.4%

Canada -2.2% -0.7% -8.1% -7.6% -1.5% 14.4%

Chile -8.0% 2.3%

Costa Rica 3.0% -6.6% -2.1% -8.6% 0.6% 1.3%

Dominican Republic 39.8%

Mexico 3.9% 1.7% 5.2% -4.4%

Panama 1.8% -5.3%

***median -0.7% 2.3%***

Asia Armenia -11.8% -7.1% -7.2% -7.4% -16.7%

Azerbaijan -0.8% 0.2% -3.5% -5.0% 10.9% -4.4%

Georgia 12.4% 7.2% 17.1% 7.4% 7.8% 0.4%

Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of China 1.7% -2.1% 2.1% -3.7% 6.4% 2.9%

Israel 0.8% 2.9% -1.8%

Japan 1.3% 3.2% -3.6% 0.1% 7.2% 5.9%

Kazakhstan -13.6% -9.2% -12.6% -8.2% -2.9%

Kyrgyzstan -2.4% -1.9% -2.4% -2.8%

Malaysia 6.8% 24.4% -0.6% 39.5% 23.0% 20.3%

Occupied Palestinian Territory 7.3% 1.2% 5.2% 34.9% -6.1% -3.1%

Republic of Korea 9.1% 7.1% -22.6% -16.4%

Singapore -2.5%

Tajikistan 0.4%

***median 1.7% 0.8% -3.5% -1.9% 6.8% -1.8%***

Europe Austria -4.0% -1.2%

Bulgaria -0.7% 7.1% 0.1% 14.1% 2.9% -2.1%

Belarus 9.8% 2.7% 2.9% -0.8% 3.4% 1.3%

Croatia 6.6% 6.2% 3.6% 2.9% 1.1% 4.0%

Cyprus 18.9% -8.8%

Czech Republic 3.4% 2.6% -6.1% -7.8% -3.6% -4.9%

Denmark -5.4% -4.5% 2.5% 1.8% 4.1% -1.8%

Estonia 3.0% 4.3% -7.6% -3.3% -0.9% -2.6%

Finland 1.4% 10.8% -1.9% 2.3% 12.6% 4.7%

Germany 4.7% 1.7% 2.5% -3.1% 0.7% 1.0%

Hungary 1.2% 2.5% -1.6% -1.2% -10.4% -2.8%

Iceland 7.7% 7.5%

Italy -3.6% -2.1% -7.4% -3.2% 0.1% 7.6%

Latvia -4.5% -0.6% -5.1% 0.9% -1.1% 0.0%

Lithuania -8.4% -2.3% -13.9% -5.5% -20.7% -1.5%

Malta -30.1%

The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia 6.1% 3.9% -1.8% -3.1% 1.9% 1.2%

Republic of Moldova -6.1% -0.7% -7.0% -2.1% -6.7% 3.8%

Netherlands 3.9% 2.6% 4.7% 4.6%

Norway 4.9% -2.2% 1.1% -5.8% 2.9% -2.1%

Poland 8.0% 7.9% -15.4% -2.8% -8.0% -2.1%

Portugal 4.1% 6.2% -3.8% 11.2% -3.9% -0.9%

Romania -7.9% -6.0% -1.8% -5.1% -5.5% -0.3%

Slovenia 2.9% 7.5% -2.2% 0.2% 17.1% 1.7%

Slovakia 3.2% 0.3% -8.9% -6.1% -5.7% 0.7%

Spain 25.3% -10.9%

Sweden 13.2% 7.1% 39.9% 9.2% 13.1% 2.3%

Switzerland 4.1% 4.1% 2.0% 4.7% -0.8% 12.9%

Turkey 2.1% -3.5%

Ukraine -5.8% -4.1% -5.9% -3.1% -9.5% -4.6%
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England and Wales 4.0% 20.2% -18.1% -1.2% 5.2% 3.6%

Northern Ireland 37.6% 14.4% 22.4% 7.9% 1.7% 1.6%

Scotland 2.8% -0.7% -2.0% -3.7% 5.4% -3.1%

***median 3.3% 2.6% -1.8% -1.2% 0.4% -0.1%***

Oceania Australia 3.0% -0.8% -13.2%

***All countries median 3.0% 1.7% -2.1% -1.8% 1.1% 0.0%***

**Table5.Percentagepersonsconvictedpersuspectedoffenders,2006**

**All offences Homicide**

**Adults Juveniles**

**Continent Country total C O females C O total C O females C O total C**

Africa Algeria 91% *04*

Mauritius 200% 7% 15% 6% 14%

Morocco 9% *04* 2% *04* 3% *04* 1% *04*

Swaziland 48% *00 04* 23% *00 04* 4% *00*

Uganda 40% *04 04* 30% *04 04* 1% *04*

Zambia 5% *00 00* 1% *00 00* 0% *00 00* 15% *00*

Zimbabwe 9% *00*

***median 7% 12%***

Americas Canada 44% 35% 40% 33% 29%

Chile 3% *04 04* 3% *04 04* 5% *04 04* 2% *04 04* 101% *04*

Colombia 0% *04 00*

Costa Rica 39% 50% 46%

Dominican Republic 43%

Ecuador 10% *04* 63% *04*

El Salvador 5% *02 02* 3% *02 02* 6% *02 02* 5% *02 02* 48% *02*

Mexico 98% *02* 91% *02* 77%

Uruguay 6% *00 04* 3% *00 04* 37% *00*

Venezuela (Bolivarian

Republic of)

24% *00 02* 17% *00 02* 103% *00*

***median 10% 17% 48%***

Asia Azerbaijan 72% *04* 50% *04* 61% *04* 30% *04* 145% *04*

Bahrain 153% *04 04* 14% *03*

Georgia 94% 443% 113% 288% 166%

Hong Kong Special

Administrative Region

of China

70% 74% 9% 7% 33%

Israel 84% *04* 70% *04* 9% *04*

Japan 32% 0% 50%

Jordan 6% *02 02*

Kazakhstan 28% 55%

Kyrgyzstan 77% 80% 76% 93% 105%

Malaysia 120%

Mongolia 42% 41% 82% 81% 86%

Myanmar 61% *02 02* 84% *02 02* 566% *02*

Nepal 91% 79% 24% 14% 28%

Occupied Palestinian

Territory

31% 9% 32% 58% 28%

Philippines 9% 21% 2% 0%

Qatar 61% *00 04* 6% *00 04* 175% *00 03*

Republic of Korea 11% *04 04* 8% *04 04* 4% *04 04* 2% *04 04*

Saudi Arabia 140% *02 02*

Singapore 36%

Syrian Arab Republic 187% *03 04* 70% *00*

Tajikistan 104%

Thailand 57% *00* 116% *00* 69% *00* 31% *00*

Turkmenistan 138% 132% 111% 64% 144%

United Arab Emirates 147% 181% 42%
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***median 70% 79% 52% 31% 70%***

Europe Albania 74% *02 02* 51% *02 02* 137% *02*

Austria 20% 15% 8% 4% 37%

Bosnia and

Herzegovina

64% 50%

Bulgaria 41% *04 04* 29% *04 04* 30% *04 04* 14% *04 04* 73% *04*

Belarus 164% 131% 114% 102% 154%

Croatia 82% 74% 29% 17% 282%

Czech Republic 59% 51% *04* 48% 50% *04* 108%

Denmark 89% *04* 88% *04* 104% *04* 110% *04* 121%

Estonia 78% *04 04* 72% *04 00* 83% *04 04* 28% *04 04* 83% *04*

Finland 60% 62% 33% 31% 167%

France 65% *00 04* 40% *00 04* 21% *00 04* 13% *00 04* 56% *00*

Germany 28% 23% 18% 11% 7%

Hungary 78% *04 04* 58% *04 02* 57% *04 04* 44% *04 04* 92% *04*

Iceland 84% *04 03* 62% *04 03* 19% *04 03* 10% *04 03* 33% *03*

Ireland 35% *04*

Italy 25% 20% 9% 11% 71%

Latvia 44% *04* 34% *04* 37% *04* 21% *04* 24%

Lithuania 62% 38% 93%

Luxembourg 40% *02 02* 12% *02 02*

Malta 1% *04* 0% *04* 17% 11%

The former Yugoslav

Republic of Macedonia

63% 20% 88%

Republic of Moldova 73% 61% 61% 39% 184%

Netherlands 39% 35% 16% 13% 71% *04*

Norway 43% *05* 39% *05* 16% *05* 11% *05* 45%

Poland 87% 77% 51% 66% 47%

Portugal 24% *04* 191% 126%

Romania 17% 9% 21% 19% 180%

Russian Federation 66% *00 00* 53% *00 00* 84% *00 00* 71% *00 00* 80% *00*

Slovenia 49% 37% 32% 16% 314%

Slovakia 52% 51% 35% 31% 84%

Spain 75% 6%

Sweden 115% 99% 95% 92% 114%

Switzerland 191% 111%

Turkey 109% 230%

Ukraine 74% 74% 82% 76% 84%

England and Wales 54%

Northern Ireland 54% *05*

***median 63% 51% 37% 21% 84%***

Oceania Australia 196% *04*

New Zealand 57% *00* 54% *00* 1% *00* 1% *00* 40% *02*

Papua New Guinea 47% *00*

All

countries

***median 60% 49% 35% 22% 71%***
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**Table6.Attritioninthecriminaljusticesystemforalloffences,2006**

**Recorded Offenders Prosecuted Convicted**

**Total Adults Juveniles Adults Juveniles Adults Juveniles**

**Continent Country rate/100k (Recorded = 100) (Recorded = 100) (Recorded = 100)**

Africa Algeria *423* 49.7 4.6 385.8 8.2

Côte d'Ivoire *405 00* 11.4 *00* 0.8 *00*

Kenya *196* 104.0

Mauritius *3.847* 139.6 3.6 22.5 1.2 279.2 0.5

Morocco *970* 97.9 4.5 149.5 7.0 8.9 *04* 0.1 *04*

Swaziland *4.544 04* 46.0 *04* 12.5 *04* 1.5 0.1

Tunisia *1.355 02* 98.9 *00* 5.6 *00*

Zambia *568 00* 48.5 *00* 1.4 *00* 2.2 *00* 0.0 *00*

Zimbabwe *1.040 04* 42.3 *00* 1.5 *00* 41.4 *04* 1.3 *04*

***median 970 73.8 4.5 42.3 1.5***

Americas Barbados *4.334 00* 42.6 *00* 0.6 *00* 0.1 *00*

Bolivia *359 02* 5.6 0.6

Belize *3.665* 21.1 11.8 1.6 0.0

Canada *8.304* 20.3 3.2 13.7 2.1 9.0 1.3

Chile *8.013 04* 34.5 *04* 4.4 *04* 2.1 *04* 1.2 *04* 0.2 *04*

Colombia *539 00* 69.7 *00* 3.5 *00* 0.0 *04*

Costa Rica *1.233* 16.9 14.4 1.2 6.6 0.4

Dominican Republic *1.491* 2.4 0.1

Ecuador *815* 21.9 - 2.2 *04*

El Salvador *747 02* 88.5 *02* 9.4 *02* 152.0 *02* 6.9 *02* 4.6 *02* 0.6 *02*

Guatemala *243 00* 124.9 *00*

Mexico *1.445* 9.5 *02* 1.1 *02* 5.9 *02* 1.1 *02* 9.3

Nicaragua *2.180* 31.7 2.1 18.1 3.1

Panama *1.391* 38.1 4.1 9.0 1.1

Paraguay *259* 72.3 9.8

Peru *602 04* 32.2 *02* 0.9 *02*

Uruguay *5.372 04* 66.7 *04* 13.7 *04* 4.3 *00*

United States of

America *3.730* 68.1 12.1

Venezuela (Bolivarian

Republic of) *968 00* 7.5 *02* 1.2 *02* 4.0 *02* 0.3 1.8 *00*

***median 1.391 31.9 3.5 14.1 1.2 4.6 0.5***

Asia Armenia *318* 35.7 3.3 31.5 1.7

Azerbaijan *223* 94.9 2.6 94.9 2.6 68.5 *04* 1.6 *04*

Bahrain *3.762* 41.5 *04* 1.8 *04* 52.1 0.6

Bangladesh *83* 107.8 1.3

Brunei Darussalam *1.161* 45.6 2.9

China *287 00* 18.4 *00* 1.1 *00* 16.4 *00*

Georgia *1.412* 27.2 1.4 27.2 1.4 25.5 1.6

Hong Kong Special

Administrative Region of

China *1.237 04* 38.6 11.2 32.2 1.4 26.9 1.0

India *445* 0.6

Israel *7.859 04* 8.2 *04* 1.0 *04* 7.5 0.7 6.9 0.7

Japan *1.609* 13.2 5.5 8.7 0.1 4.2 0.0

Jordan *501* 21.3 *02* 10.8 *02* 1.4 *02*

Kazakhstan *923* 6.1 34.5 3.1 21.4 1.7

Kuwait *793 02* 98.6 *02* 12.8 *02*

Kyrgyzstan *594* 52.1 3.7 46.2 3.7 40.2 2.8

Lebanon *182* 102.6 4.5

Malaysia *761* 23.0 1.6 32.6 1.5

Maldives *3.171 04* 26.2 *04* 2.9 *04* 30.9 *02* 3.5 *02*

Mongolia *707* 92.2 4.9 87.3 4.9 38.7 4.0

Myanmar *39 02* 142.4 *02* 88.1 *02* 86.6 *02* 7.9 *02*

Nepal *15* 77.2 2.3 70.3 0.6

Oman *474 02* 118.6 *02* 8.4 *02*

Pakistan *2 00* 299.9 *00* 0.1 *00* 299.9 *00* 0.1 *00*
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Occupied Palestinian

Territory *604 05* 22.0 6.9 6.7 2.2

Philippines *82* 83.5 1.8 7.4 0.0

Qatar *604 04* 115.7 *04* 1.3 *03* 70.3 *00* 2.2 *00*

Republic of Korea *3.719 04* 123.8 *04* 4.9 *04* 76.6 *04* 1.2 *04* 13.2 *04* 0.2 *04*

Saudi Arabia *386 02* 50.5 *02* 12.7 *02* 70.8 *02*

Singapore *904* 44.7 5.0 30.6 0.7

Sri Lanka *441 04* 564.6 *04* 13.7 *04* 53.8 *04* 1.0 *04*

Syrian Arab Republic *426* 93.8 *04* 8.5 *04* 15.9 *03*

Tajikistan *169* 7.4 2.5

Thailand *906 00* 193.9 *00* 4.8 *00* 101.2 *00* 26.0 *00* 109.9 3.3

Turkmenistan *96* 135.4 2.7 135.4 2.7 187.0 3.0

United Arab Emirates *1.717* 76.0 2.6 111.5 1.1

***median 594 83.5 3.7 40.9 1.5 32.6 1.6***

Europe Albania *172 02* 103.8 *02* 10.1 *02* 115.5 *04* 36.9 *04* 76.6 *02* 5.2 *02*

Austria *7.126* 34.1 6.2 38.4 10.0 6.9 0.5

Belgium *9.817 04* 65.7 *02* 13.0 *02* 0.0 *02*

Bosnia and Herzegovina *1.104* 68.3 0.0 53.0 43.6 0.0

Bulgaria *1.824 04* 45.4 *04* 7.9 *04* 42.0 *04* 3.0 *04* 18.5 *04* 2.4 *04*

Belarus *1.960* 23.1 2.7 37.9 3.2 37.8 3.0

Croatia *2.650* 25.1 2.9 37.6 2.4 20.6 0.8

Cyprus *938* 36.1 7.4

Czech Republic *3.291* 33.9 1.7 40.2 2.0 19.8 0.8

Denmark *6.811* 13.3 *04* 1.9 *04* 11.9 2.0

Estonia *3.855* 24.2 *04* 2.7 *04* 24.2 *04* 2.7 *04* 18.8 *04* 2.3 *04*

Finland *9.822* 67.6 6.3 41.1 2.2 40.3 2.1

France *6.309 04* 21.8 *04* 4.8 *04* 14.1 *00* 1.0 *00*

Germany *7.651* 30.2 4.4 10.4 1.3 8.3 0.8

Greece *2.174* 81.9 1.5

Hungary *4.146 04* 28.1 *04* 2.9 *04* 22.8 1.9 21.9 *04* 1.7 *04*

Iceland *17.663 04* 5.7 *03* 1.2 *03* 6.9 *04* 0.5 *04* 4.8 *04* 0.2 *04*

Ireland *2.416* 83.7 12.7 19.4 *04* 2.3 *04*

Italy *4.699* 27.8 1.1 19.2 *05* 0.7 *05* 7.1 0.1

Latvia *2.734* 31.3 *04* 5.9 *04* 11.7 1.6 13.9 2.2

Lithuania *2.227* 25.0 4.4 18.3 4.6 15.6 1.6

Luxembourg *5.816 02* 40.7 *02* 5.8 *02* 16.9 *02* 16.4 *02*

Malta *4.086* 17.0 1.7 0.2 *04* 0.3

The former Yugoslav

Republic of Macedonia *1.081* 66.8 18.8 106.8 6.8 42.1 3.8

Republic of Moldova *565* 72.5 10.3 71.0 *04* 15.2 *04* 53.0 6.3

Netherlands *7.434* 23.6 5.8 18.1 3.0 9.1 0.9

Norway *5.924* 11.1 *05* 2.0 *05* 9.3 *05* 0.8 *05* 4.8 0.3

Poland *3.375* 41.5 4.2 49.6 *04* 35.9 2.1

Portugal *3.779* 62.8 *04* 1.1 23.6 3.0 15.2 2.2

Romania *1.080* 131.4 12.4 19.9 2.9 21.7 2.6

Russian Federation *2.013 00* 53.0 *00* 6.0 *00* 35.1 *00* 5.0 *00*

Slovenia *4.506* 18.4 1.8 13.2 0.8 9.0 0.6

Slovakia *2.137* 40.5 4.0 37.3 3.1 21.0 1.4

Spain *2.414* 26.6 2.1 1.5

Sweden *13.442* 6.7 2.2 7.4 *02* 1.2 7.7 2.1

Switzerland *3.852* 17.8 4.4 34.0 4.9

Turkey *1.370* 85.1 227.9 *04* 13.8 *04* 93.1 2.3

Ukraine *903* 46.9 4.0 4.9 *04* 3.9 34.9 3.3

England and Wales *10.103* 30.2 2.3 24.3 1.7

Montenegro *1.539* 76.8 4.8

Northern Ireland *6.956* 23.8 *05* 1.5 *05* 20.5 *05* 1.2 *05*

Scotland *8.194* 11.2 *05* 4.1 *05* 9.7 *05* 3.5 *05*

Serbia *1.007* 5.4 0.1

***median 3.375 33.9 4.1 23.8 2.7 18.8 1.7***

Oceania New Zealand *10.212* 38.8 9.2 29.5 *00* 0.9 *00* 22.1 *00* 0.1 *00*

Papua New Guinea *247 00* 7.8 *00* 2.1 *00* 0.1 *00*

all countries ***median 1.380 45.4 4.1 30.4 2.2 18.5 1.4***
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**Table7.Attritioninthecriminaljusticesystemforhomicide,2006**

**Recorded Offenders Prosecuted Convicted**

**Continent Country rate/**

**100k**

**Value (Recorded =**

**100)**

**(Recorded =**

**100)**

**(Recorded =**

**100)**

Africa Algeria *0.6* 214 208.4 189.7 *04*

Egypt *0.7* 528 *05* 81.1 *00* 591.5

Kenya *5.7* 2.090 85.7

Mauritius *4.0* 50 144.0 102.0 20.0

Morocco *0.5* 162 172.2 417.3

Namibia *6.6* 126 *02* 100.0 *02*

South Africa *46.7* 21.553 *02* 49.6 *00*

Swaziland *12.6* 141 *04* 190.1 *04* 30.5 7.1 *00*

Tunisia *1.2* 119 *02* 169.7 *02*

Uganda *7.4* 2.049 *04* 51.5 *04* 51.5 *04* 0.3 *04*

Zambia *7.6* 797 *00* 84.1 *00* 1.4 *00* 12.3 *00*

Zimbabwe *8.7* 1.092 *04* 129.3 *04* 86.8 *00* 11.9 *00*

***median 6.2 144.0 81.1 12.3***

Americas Barbados *7.9* 20 *00* 90.0 *00* 105.0 *00*

Bolivia *4.9* 454 43.6 *02*

Belize *31.9* 92 83.7 41.3

Canada *1.9* 606 91.9 54.1 26.6

Chile *1.7* 276 *04* 155.4 *04* 249.6 *04* 156.5 *04*

Colombia *66.7* 26.539 *00* 20.6 *00*

Costa Rica *7.9* 348 79.6 68.1 36.8

Dominican Republic *15.9* 1.537 72.9 31.6

Ecuador *18.1* 2.385 21.6 33.5 *04* 13.6 *04*

El Salvador *33.8* 2.024 *02* 44.1 *02* 39.3 *02* 21.2 *02*

Guatemala *25.9* 2.904 *00* 11.3 *00* 101.7 *00*

Jamaica *34.5* 887 *00* 62.3 *00*

Mexico *10.9* 11.558 43.3 *02* 6.7 *02* 33.3

Nicaragua *8.4* 465 90.8 85.6

Panama *11.0* 363 107.7 23.4

Paraguay *12.3* 742 71.0

Peru *5.6* 1.526 *04* 48.8 *04*

Suriname *9.3* 46 *04* 306.5 *04*

Uruguay *5.8* 194 *04* 335.6 *04* 125.3 *00*

United States of America *5.6* 17.034 78.9

Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) *32.9* 8.022 *00* 18.8 *00* 51.4 19.4 *00*

***median 10.9 72.9 52.8 33.3***

Asia Armenia *2.4* 75 106.7 45.3

Azerbaijan *2.2* 190 113.2 109.5 163.7 *04*

Bahrain *0.9* 7 100.0 *04* 342.9 14.3 *03*

Bangladesh *2.7* 4.123 160.4

Brunei Darussalam *0.5* 2 400.0

Georgia *7.3* 323 57.9 57.9 96.3

Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of

China

*0.6* 44 *04* 111.4 63.6 36.4

India *2.8* 32.481 194.2

Indonesia *1.1* 2.204 *00* 86.8 *00*

Israel *2.6* 173 *04* 169.4 *04* 15.6 *04* 15.0 *04*

Japan *0.4* 565 248.7 *02* 123.2 123.2

Jordan *1.7* 100 131.0

Kazakhstan *11.3* 1.729 135.2 *00* 99.5 74.4

Kuwait *0.9* 23 *02* 113.0 *02*

Kyrgyzstan *8.4* 446 85.7 106.7 90.4

Lebanon *0.6* 23 113.0

Malaysia *2.3* 604 22.0 118.0 26.3

Maldives *1.4* 4 *03* 425.0 *04* 125.0 *02*

Mongolia *12.0* 311 106.8 106.8 91.3

Myanmar *0.2* 92 *02* 129.3 *02* 1.403.3 *02* 731.5 *02*

Nepal *1.8* 509 181.3 68.4 51.3
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Oman *0.6* 15 *02* 126.7 *02* 113.3 *02*

Pakistan *0.0* 66 *00* 300.0 *00* 300.0 *00*

Occupied Palestinian Territory *3.9* 145 *05* 85.5 24.1

Philippines *3.8* 3.296 2.2

Qatar *0.8* 6 *04* 100.0 *04*

Republic of Korea *2.2* 1.041 *04* 115.3 *04* 77.0 *04*

Saudi Arabia *0.9* 202 *02* 44.6 *00* 55.4 *02*

Singapore *0.4* 17 276.5 264.7 100.0

Sri Lanka *7.1* 1.377 *04* 140.8 *04* 140.8 *04*

Syrian Arab Republic *1.2* 239 164.4 *04* 110.0 *00* 115.1 *00*

Tajikistan *3.4* 228 94.7 98.7

Thailand *7.6* 5.023 41.4 68.0 *00*

Turkmenistan *2.9* 142 108.5 155.6 156.3

United Arab Emirates *0.9* 39 35.9 71.8

***median 1.8 115.3 108.1 86.8***

Europe Albania *5.8* 179 *02* 103.4 *02* 160.9 *04* 141.3 *02*

Austria *0.7* 61 262.3 560.7 96.7

Belgium *2.1* 214 *04* 547.2 *02* 87.9 *02*

Bosnia and Herzegovina *1.9* 73 108.2

Bulgaria *3.1* 240 *04* 90.4 *04* 105.8 *04* 65.8 *04*

Belarus *7.5* 734 86.5 141.7 132.8

Croatia *1.7* 74 90.5 354.1 255.4

Cyprus *1.7* 14 14.3 14.3

Czech Republic *1.3* 136 83.8 119.9 90.4

Denmark *0.5* 29 144.8 *04* 75.9 *02* 175.9

Estonia *6.8* 91 139.6 131.9 116.5 *04*

Finland *2.1* 112 92.0 165.2 153.6

France *1.6* 990 *04* 89.3 *04* 49.9 *00*

Germany *0.9* 727 389.4 31.9 28.1

Greece *1.0* 109 208.3

Hungary *2.1* 212 *04* 100.0 *04* 82.1 92.0 *04*

Iceland *1.0* 3 *04* 100.0 *04* 66.7 *04* 33.3 *03*

Ireland *1.6* 67 97.0 56.7 34.3 *04*

Italy *1.1* 625 161.3 266.4 *05* 114.9

Latvia *6.5* 148 283.1 61.5 68.2

Lithuania *8.2* 277 108.3 101.1 100.4

Luxembourg *0.9* 4 *02* 125.0 *02* 100.0 *02*

The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia *2.0* 41 102.4 217.1 90.2

Republic of Moldova *5.0* 184 82.6 98.4 152.2

Netherlands *1.0* 159 125.8 *04* 113.2 89.3 *04*

Norway *0.7* 33 166.7 *05* 157.6 *05* 75.8

Poland *1.3* 490 163.1 200.0 *04* 76.3

Portugal *2.1* 227 56.8 103.5 71.4

Romania *2.0* 438 107.3 96.8 192.9

Russian Federation *19.7* 28.904 *00* 84.3 *00* 99.3 *00* 67.2 *00*

Slovenia *0.6* 12 116.7 175.0 366.7

Slovakia *1.2* 65 107.7 192.3 *04* 90.8

Spain *0.8* 336 176.5 340.8 *00* 10.1

Sweden *1.3* 115 124.3 *04* 74.8 141.7

Switzerland *0.8* 60 163.3

Turkey *4.2* 2.999 195.0 568.9 447.6

Ukraine *6.3* 2.958 90.0 109.3 75.3

England and Wales *1.4* 755 91.0 92.7 49.4

Northern Ireland *1.3* 23 121.7 *02* 156.5 *05* 65.2 *05*

Scotland *2.1* 109 48.6 *05* 38.5 *05*

Serbia *1.5* 144 54.2

***median 1.6 107.5 116.5 90.3***

Oceania Australia *1.3* 256 *04* 69.5 *00* 136.3 *04*

New Zealand *1.1* 47 127.7 104.3 *02* 51.1 *02*

Papua New Guinea *8.6* 465 *00* 100.0 *00* 14.0 *00* 47.3 *00*

all countries ***median 2.1 108.0 102.0 76.0***
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**AnnexBtochapter5:Methodologicalnotes**

*Fourdatapointsintime*

Foreverycountryandforeveryvariablefourfigures,representingfourdifferentpointsintime,weretaken

fromtheUNCrime Survey dataset.One of these figures was used for all analyses, tables and graphs

thatarebasedonthelatestyearavailable,theotherthreewereusedforthetables,graphsandanalysesthat

dealwithtrends.Sincenoteverycountryrespondedtoallsurveysthesepointsintimecandifferfrom

countrytocountry.Thefollowingdecisionruleswereusedtoobtainthefourfigures:

*Latestyearavailable*

Ifavailable,theyear2006fromthe10thsurveywastaken.Otherwisethelast\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_availableyearwas

taken,providedthisyearwas2000orlater.Ifthelastavailableyearwas1999orearlierthisdata

pointhadamissingvalue.

*Trends*

Fortrendsthreepointsintimeweretaken.Ifavailabletheseweretheyears1996(designated

'Start'),2001('Mid')and2006('End').

􀀐 If2006wasnotavailableforaspecificvariableandcountry,theyear2005wastakenas'End'

pointoralternativelytheyear2004,if2005wasnotavailableeither.

􀀐 If2001wasnotavailableforaspecificvariableandcountry,theyear2000wastakenas'Mid'

pointoralternativelytheyear2002,if2000wasnotavailableeither.

􀀐 If1996wasnotavailableforaspecificvariableandcountry,theyear1995wastakenas'Start'

pointoralternativelytheyear1994,if1995wasnotavailableeither.Ifnoneofthesethree

yearswereavailable,1997wastakenasanalternative.

Thiswasdonebecauseusingonlytheyears1996,2001and2006wouldhaveresultedintoomany

missingvalues.

*Dataqualitychecking*

Afterdeterminingthe'Latest','Start','Mid'and'End'pointsaqualitycheckwascarriedoutonthedata.

Firstly,becauseoftheinstabilityofthedataduetosmallnumbers,alldatafromcountrieswithlessthan

100,000inhabitantswereremoved.

Nextfortheothercountriesitwasfoundthatsomeofthedatawerenotstableorclearlynotconsistentwith

otherdata(eitherinothersurveysorinthesamesurveycomparedtoothervariables).Examplesof

suspectedinconsistencieswere:

􀀐 Thedatagivenforonesurveywereclearlydifferentfromthedatagivenforothersurveys.

􀀐 Thesumofthenumberofadultsplusthenumberofjuvenileswascompletelydifferentfromthetotal

numberofsuspects/prosecuted/convictedpersons.Althoughthissumdoesnotnecessarilyneedto

beexactlythesame(duetootherdatasourcesused,orduetocountingalsocompaniesasoffenders),

ifthedifferenceistoolargethiscouldbeasignthatthefiguresgivenindicatesomethingdifferent

fromwhatwasmeantinthequestionnaire.

􀀐 Thenumberofpersonsprosecutedwasfromadifferentorderofmagnitudecomparedtothenumber

ofsuspectedoffendersand/orthenumberofconvictedpersons.Thiswouldprobablyreflectan

unusualorganisationorfunctionoftheprosecutionserviceandcouldthereforenotbeusedfor

attritionanalyses.

􀀐 Thenumberofpersonsprosecutedand/orconvictedforhomicidewasmuchlargerthanthenumber

ofsuspects.Actuallythiswasmostprobablyduetothefactthatapparentlythequestionnairewasnot

clearonthispoint:manycountriesincludedthenumberofattemptedhomicidesintheprosecution

andconvictionpartsofthequestionnaire.

Whenasuspectedinconsistencywasfoundadecisionhadtobemadehowtodealwithit.Basicallythere

werethreepossibilities:

Trends
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1. Thesuspectedfigurewasremoved

2. Thesuspectedfigurewasreplacedbyanotherfigureforthesamevariablefromanother

yearifmoreconsistentfigurescouldbefound.Thiswasonlypossiblewithinthe

restricionsforthepointsintimeasdescribedinabove.

3. Anestimatewasmadebasedonothervariables.Asanexample,thenumberofjuveniles

couldsometimesbeestimatedbysubtractingthenumberofadultsfromthetotal.

Acompletelistingofallinconsistenciesfoundandtheactionstakencanbefoundin nnexC.

*Computingtrends*

Whenpresentingandcomparingtrends,thecomplicationisthattheperiodisnotthesameforevery

country:e.g.forsomecountriesthe'Start'yearcouldbe1996andthe'End'year2006,forothersthiscould

be1997and2004.Tocircumventthisthemean*annual*changewascomputedwiththefollowingformula:

If**x1**isthevalueatyear**t1**and**x2**thevalueatyear**t2**(with**t2>t1**),themeanannualchangeis:

**(x**2**/x**1**)1/(t2􀇦t1)􀇦1**

Thismeanannualchangewascomputedfortwoperiods,i.e.between'Start'and'End'(formostcountries

1996􀇦2006)andbetween'Mid'and'End'(formostcountriesbetween2001and2006).

*Figuresbycontinent*

Whencomputingfigurespercontinentthemedianwascalculated.Thiswasdoneonthecontinentallevel

andnotonthesubcontinentallevelbecauseotherwisethenumberofobservations(countries)wouldhave

beentoolowforalmostallsubcontinents.Also,themedianwasonlycomputedwhentherewereatleast

fiveobservations.ThismeantthatnomediansaregivenforOceania,whereonlyfourcountriescould

providedataforthischapter.ForthetrendsanalysesusuallyonlyAsiaandEuropehadatleast5countries

withsufficienttrenddata.Whencomparingmediansbetweentablesorbetweencolumnswithinonetable

oneshouldbeawarethatineverytableandcolumndifferentcountriescontributetothemedian.

A
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**AnnexCtochapter5: Datamodifications**

**Country Variable(s) Observation Solution**

Albania all prosecution variables

except homicide

8th survey not consistent with 9th

survey and obviously too low

Mid point removed

Convicted for homicide 10th survey clearly different and out

of line

The year 2004 used as Latest year and

End point

Algeria

Prosecuted for homicide 10th survey too high and not

consistent with suspects

Latest year and End point removed

Bosnia and Adult suspects Not in line with total suspects Replaced by an estimated 28500

Herzegovina juveniles prosecuted 10th survey not consistent with

suspects and convictions

Latest year and End point removed

total adults prosecuted 8th survey not consistent with other

surveys

Mid point removed

total persons

prosecuted, juveniles

and females prosecuted

8th and 9th survey not consistent with

other surveys and other variables

Only Start point kept

Chili

Juveniles and female

juveniles convicted

5th survey too low compared to 9th

survey

Start point removed

China Juveniles prosecuted Total minus adults is not equal to

juveniles

Juveniles recomputed (= total minus adults)

all prosecution variables 7th and 8th survey not consistent with

other surveys

Mid point removed

adults prosecuted 10th survey too low Latest year and End point estimated by

7800 based on total prosecuted

Costa Rica

Juvenile suspects 10th survey atypically low Latest year and End point removed

all prosecution and

conviction variables

except homicide

9th and 10th survey not consistent

with other surveys. And they can not

be used for comparisons

Cyprus Only Start point kept

homicide suspects 9th and 10th survey apparent break in

series and too low absolute numbers

Latest year and End point removed

Denmark all conviction variables 8th survey inconsistent with other

surveys

The year 2000 used as Mid point

Ecuador Prosecuted for homicide 10th survey too high and not

consistent with suspects

The year 2004 used as Latest year and

End point

Egypt Recorded crimes total 10th survey not consistent with other

surveys

Latest year and End point removed

El Salvador all conviction variables

except homicide

10th survey inconsistent with other

surveys

The year 2004 used as Latest year, End

point removed

France all prosecution variables only 7th survey present, figures

atypically low

Latest year removed

total adults convicted Not consistent with total persons

convicted

Guatemala Year 2000 replaced by estimated 34,115

homicide suspects 7th survey not consistent with other

homicide variables

Latest year and Mid point removed

Indonesia suspected offenders 5th survey not consistent with

prosecution and court figures

Start point removed

TFYR Macedonia homicide suspects The year 2000 is an outlier The year 1999 used as Mid point

Malaysia all offender variables

except homicide

7th and 10th survey inconsistent with

other data

Latest year removed

Malta recorded homicides and

homicide suspects

Too low absolute numbers for

analysis

Latest year and End point removed

juvenile suspects 9th survey obviously too low The year 2002 used as Latest year. End

point removed.

Mexico

adults prosecuted 8th survey not consistent with total Estimated based on total by 91,000 (2002,

Latest year) and 83,000 (2001, Mid point)

all conviction variables 5th survey completely different from

8th survey

Start point removed

total and female juvenile

suspects

8th survey too low Latest year removed

Myanmar

juveniles prosecuted 8th survey atypically low Latest year and Mid point removed

Convicted for homicide Latest year and End point replaced by 142

(year 2004); Start point removed

The Netherlands

Prosecuted for homicide

Numbers in all surveys reflect

attempts as well

Latest year and End point replaced by an

estimated 180 (year 2006); Start point

removed

Peru Prosecuted for homicide 8th survey atypically high Latest year removed

Saudi Arabia persons convicted for

homicide

8th survey too high, not consistent

with suspected and prosecuted

Latest year removed

Slovakia Prosecuted for homicide 10th survey not consistent with other

surveys

The year 2004 used for Latest year and

End point
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**Country Variable(s) Observation Solution**

Sweden homicide suspects 10th survey too low, not consistent

with other surveys

The year 2004 used for Latest year and

End point

Syria Females convicted

(adults and juveniles)

7th survey not clear Latest year and Mid point removed

Thailand Grand total recorded

crimes

10th survey atypically low The year 2000 used as Latest year, End

point removed

all conviction variables 8th survey inconsistent with other

surveys

Mid point removed

total adult suspects not filled in Latest year estimated (840,000)

Turkey

all prosecution variables

except homicide

Not consistent with suspects and

convictions

Data not used for Fig 4.5

UAE all prosecution variables

except homicide

10th survey not consistent with police

and court data

Latest year and End point removed

UK: England &

Wales

total persons prosecuted 8th survey apparently factor 10 too

high

Divided by 10

Ukraine total and female

juveniles prosecuted

Apparently the female juveniles

prosecuted in the 7th survey is

actually the total juveniles.

Replaced total juveniles with female

juveniles for the Mid point.

USA all prosecution variables Apparently only the years '95 to '99

can be used for comparative analysis

Only Start point kept

Venezuela all prosecution variables 8th survey not consistent with 10th

survey

Mid point removed; 2002 used as Latest

year.

Zambia all prosecution variables

except homicide

only 7th survey present, figures

atypically low

Latest year removed
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Chapter6– Attributesofcriminaljusticesystems:

resources,performanceand

punitivity

**StefanHarrendorf\*andPaulSmit\*\***

**Abstract**

Thischapterfocusesonattributesofthecriminaljusticesystemitself,namelyonresourcesofthesystem,its

performance and the systemic punitivity. Regarding resources, it focuses on police and prosecution

personnel, professional judges and the staff in adult prisons. With respect to performance, quantitative

productivityofthedifferentcriminaljusticesystemsisanalyzed,focusingontheratesofpersonssuspected

perpoliceofficer,personsprosecutedperprosecutor,personsbroughtbeforeacriminalcourtperprosecutor

andpersonsconvictedperprosecutor.Finally,systemicpunitivityisestimatedbytherateoftotalpersons

incarceratedpertotalpersonsconvicted.Thechaptercoversdatanotonlyfromthe10thUN􀇦CTS,butalso

fromearlierwaves,backaslateastothe6thwavefortrendanalysis.Asintheotherchapters,thescaleis

worldwide.Tryingtocoverasmanycountriesaspossible,datafortheanalysisofthemostrecentstatusquo

wasnotonly taken from the 10thUN􀇦CTS survey,but also from the 7th to9thwaves,with the year2000

beingtheearliest“latestavailable”yearcoveredhere.Fortrendanalysis,thepreferredstartingyearwas1995,

the first point in time in the 6thwave. If necessary, trend analysis wasmade for shorter periods of time

instead.

**Criminaljusticesystemresources**

Firstly,wewilltakeacloselookatcriminaljustice

system resources. As in preceding publications

based onUN􀇦CTS data (Marshall 1998; Mayhew

2003; Gruszczynska, Marshall 2008), once again

the resources variables analyzed have been

restricted to personnel variables.While theUN􀇦

CTSquestionnaire alsoasksfordataonfinancial

resources in all its sections (police, prosecution,

courts, and prisons), these data have been

excluded from analysis due to problems

regarding the interpretation:The resourceswere

to be added up to a single variable per chapter.

The value had to be given in millions of local

currencyunits.Such a valuewouldbe extremely

hard to compare between countries. First of all,

the comparability of a single monetary value

representingthewholepolice(etc.)budgetwould

be extremely questionable, as long as it is not

clear which budget posts have been included

thereandwhichnot.Moreover,theexchangerate

problem will render comparison between

countries almost impossible, especially with

respect to countries with a large variance in the

rates.

Small countries with a population of less than

100,000 persons have been excluded from

analysis (exceptwhere noted otherwise) because

it could be feared that these data might be

misleadingly different from results for larger

countries because of the special structure and

necessitiesofverysmallcountries.

\* Senior researcher at the Department of Criminology, Institute of Criminal Law and Justice,

University of Göttingen, Germany

\*\* Program Supervisor Modelling and Jus􀆟 ce Sta􀆟 s􀆟 cs WODC, Ministry of Justice, the Netherlands
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**Policepersonnel**

The 10th UN􀇦CTS questionnaire defines “police

personnel or law enforcement personnel” as

“personnel in public \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_agencies whose principal

functions are the prevention, detection and

investigation of crime and the apprehension of

alleged offenders. Data concerning support staff

(secretaries,clerks,etc.)shouldbeexcludedfrom

your replies.” The definition is in line with the

definition used in earlier survey waves covered

here(6thto9th).

Regarding police personnel, the questionnaire

not only asks for the total, but also for the

number of females, males and police officers

assignedtothepolicingoforganizedcrime.Apart

from this, the questionnaire includes some

metadata on the police, like whether there was

morethanonepoliceforceintherelevantcountry

etc.

Still, data analysis in this publication has been

restricted to the total of police personnel (for

analysis of rates of female officers see previous

publications: Mayhew 2003; Gruszczynska,

Marshall2008). Attempting tomeasure the total

police personnel with onlyone value,onehas to

keep in mind the shortcomings of such an

approach: The police force is not a monolithic

entity with similar structures and tasks all over

theworld.Thereareseveraltypesofpoliceforces

that might exist in one country, but not in

another. Also, the tasks executed by the police

maydifferbetweencountries.Thus,figuresmight

include (ornot include) dataon criminal police,

traffic police, border police, gendarmerie,

uniformedpolice,cityguardormunicipalpolice,

but also customs officers, tax police, military

police,secretservicepolice,policereserves,cadet

policeofficersorcourtpolice.Apartfromthis,the

way of counting personnel might differ (e.g.

heads vs. budget posts, which will make a

difference when counting part􀇦time personnel).

Therefore, comparability could be considered

fairly weak. One cannot be sure that each and

every country was able to exclude support staff

from their data, because this would depend on

the statistical possibility to do so. Also, it is not

fullyclearwhether,apartfromsupportstaff,other

civilians in the police force are included or only

uniformedpolicearecounted.

AsinearlierwavesoftheUN􀇦CTS,informationon

private security personnel is not included in the

data, although the private security sector is of

greatimportanceinmanycountries,thusmaking

comparisons even more problematic (Marshall

1998; Mayhew 2003; Gruszczynska, Marshall

2008).

**Figure1.Policepersonnelbypopulation(includingsmallcountries;log.scales)**
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As figure 1 shows,while comparability of police

personnel levels between countries can still be

considered an issue, the absolute police

personnel figures are at least quite clearly

dependent on the population size. I.e., even

taking into account all the differences in police

personnel levels between countries, there is an

almost perfect linear dependency of police

personnel frompopulation size.Thecorrelation

coefficientis0.93,R²0.87.Therefore,about87%

of the variance in the police personnel figures

can be explained by population size. The

distributioninfigure1showsonlyveryfewclear

outliers. Even among small countries below

100,000 population only one real outlier can be

identified, the Holy See with a very high police

personnel value compared to population size.

Thisspecialresultcanofcoursebeexplainedby

the special structure and security necessities of

Vatican City. On the other hand, the police

personnelvaluesforVenezuelaandfortheSyrian

ArabRepublicarefarbelowtheusual.

If one looks at the police personnel rates per

100,000 population (see figure 2 and table 1),

therearesomeinterestingresults.Themedianis

303.3 police officers per 100,000 population,

while themean is 341.8.The standard deviation

isquitehigh(241.5).Thiscanbeexplainedbythe

aforementioned problems in measuring the

strength of the police force(s) of a country in a

single variable, and by \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_structural differences

betweencountries.

The distribution of police personnel values is

clearly positively skewed. An explanation might

be that there is a minimum number of police

officers per 100,000 population that is by any

means necessary in any country to guarantee at

least minimum security, while there is no such

clear limit at the top end (although budgetary

limits will prevent personnel figures from

becomingtoohigh).

**Figure2.Policeofficersper100,000populationbyregionsandsub􀍲regions(medians)**
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presented in table 1in the Annex. Only four

countriesshowpolicepersonnelvalueslowerthan
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Republic)therespectivevaluesaresolow(16and

10, respectively) that one can quite definitely
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clearoutliers.

Figure 2 shows summary results for regions and
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are two regions in theworld with relatively high

numbers of police personnel (around 400), the

Near and Middle East as well as East and South

East Europe. Central, East and South East Asia,

LatinAmericaandtheCaribbean aswellasWest

andCentralEuropeshowmedianratesaroundthe

overall median, i.e. around about 300. Lower

levels ofpolice officers(median around200) can

befoundinAfrica,Canada,USA,SouthAsiaand

Oceania.
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As could be expected, the countries with the

highestpolicepersonnelfiguresareoftenlocated

in regions where the median is quite high, too

(see table 1). This is the case for Bahrain (1867

police officers per 100,000 population), Kuwait

(1065) andMontenegro (891), but not for Brunei

Darussalam(1087)andMauritius(777).

Table 1 alsoshowsthe trendsinthedevelopment

of police personnel figures. Where possible (i.e.

for the minimum of a three􀇦year trend) average

annual change rates have been calculated. The

longest trends cover 11 years (1995 – 2006). Data

have been validated, especially with respect to

trendanalysis,andunreliabledata, e.g. values in

certainsurveywavesthatdidnotfittheresponses

from the other waves, have been deleted, or,

where possible, replaced with the right values.

Details on this process can be found in the

technicalAnnextothischapter.

Ascanbeseen,policepersonnelfigurestendtobe

quitestableacrosstime.Themeanandmedianof

the change rates per year are around 0% with a

standard deviation of 2.5 percentage points.

However,somecountriesshowlargerincreasesor

decreasesacrosslongerperiodsoftime,reflected

in average annual change rates around 5 %, e.g.

theRepublicofMoldova,SloveniaorTurkeywith

averageyearlyincreasesof4.7%,6.4%and7.4%

across an eleven􀇦year period. Remarkable

decreases over longer periods of time can be

observed for example in Hong Kong, Lithuania,

Israel,Estonia,SwedenandChile(􀇦3.0%,􀇦3.3%,􀇦

3.1%,􀇦3.2%,􀇦3.4%,􀇦3.7%).

**Prosecutionpersonnel**

Regarding prosecution personnel, the 10th UN􀇦

CTSusedthefollowingdefinition:

“Prosecution personnel” may be understood to

mean a government official whose duty is to

initiate and maintain criminal proceedings on

behalf of the state against persons accused of

committing a criminal offence. Data concerning

support staff (secretaries, clerks, etc.) should be

excluded.

This definition has also been used in the 6th to

9th UN􀇦CTS waves. As with the police force,

summarising information on the prosecution

serviceinonesinglevariableisveryproblematic.

Theproblemsareeven biggerthanonthe police

level, sincetheprosecutionservice isplacedata

later stage of the criminal justice process.

Therefore, legal differences between systems are

evenmoreremarkablehere.Sizeandstructureof

the prosecution service will be subject to

significant variation across countries due to the

differentlegaltasksassignedtoprosecutors:

Not all cases investigated by the police will

necessarily show up on prosecution level (see

Elsner,Smit,Zila2008andalsoElsner,Lewis,Zila

2008), forexampledueto policecompetencesto

drop cases if no offender was found or if there

was insufficient evidence. In minor cases the

police in some countries can even impose or

suggest some kind of sanction (e.g. a police

caution). Therefore, the input that prosecutors

have to face in different countries is subject to

hugevariation.

Apart from this, the competences of the

prosecutors themselves are quite different (see

Wade2006;Wadeetal.2008).Insomecountries

a strict principle of legality is still more or less

observed, obliging prosecution officers to

investigate each case until the decision can be

made to present an indictment to the court or

dropthecasebasedonlegalorfactualreasons.In

other countries, the binding to a principle of

legality is less strict or even replaced by a

principleofexpediency,allowingtheprosecution

servicetodropcasesnotonlyforlegalorfactual

reasons, but also in cases ofminor guiltwithout

any sanction or dispose of cases under the

condition of a certain activity to be executed by

theaccusedvoluntarily,likepayingacertainsum

of money or doing community work. In some

countriesapartfromthistheprosecutionservice

incertainclearcasescanevenissuerealsanctions

thatcountasconvictions.

In addition, efficiency and structure of the

prosecution servicemay influence the personnel

numbersaswellasstatisticalissueslikecounting

rules (instructive with respect to the effect of

countingrulesonpolicelevelAebi2008).

Table 2 (in the Annex) and figure 3 show the

results for the prosecution personnel rates per

100,000 population. As with police rates,

prosecutor rates are subject to remarkable

variation. The differences are even bigger here

thanon police level,with rates ranging from 0.2

inZambiato44.9inColombia.Inanycase,inall

countries the rate of prosecutors is much lower

thantherateofpoliceofficers.Themedianis6.1,

themean 8.0.The standard deviation is 7.9and

thedistributionofvaluesisonceagainpositively

skewed. Differently from police figures,

prosecution personnel rates do not imply that

there is any minimum rate of prosecutors per
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100,000population.Inquiteafewcountriesthere

are less than three prosecutors per 100,000

population.

As can be seen in figure 3, there are also huge

differencesinregionalandsub􀇦regionalmedians

forprosecutionpersonnelrates.Thehighestrates

of prosecutors can be found in Eastern Europe

(median: 22.1). All countries in that area show

prosecutorratesabove20(Belarus:20.4,Republic

of Moldova: 20.1, Russian Federation: 30.3,

Ukraine: 30.3). All other countries that were

formerlypartoftheSovietUnion(eventheBaltic

countries) also show very high or at least fairly

highprosecutorrates(between25.2forLithuania

and 10.8 for Azerbaijan). To a lesser extent, the

same is true for the countries formerly under

SocialistregimesinCentralEurope,especiallyfor

Poland,Hungaryand Slovakia with rates around

15. Moreover, China (13.5) and Mongolia (14.4)

also support the assumption that there is a

connection between (former) socialist influence

and high prosecution personnel rates (similar

resultsforearlierreferenceyearscanbefoundin

Mayhew 2003, 89; Gruszczynska,Marshall 2008,

19).

The sub􀇦regional medians for Central Asia and

SouthEastEuropeare alsoquitehighduetothe

factthatthefirstmentionedsub􀇦regionincludes

only data from countries that were formerly

Soviet Republics, while the latter (except for

Turkeywitharateofonly4.8)includescountries

from the Balkans that were formerly socialist,

too.

Regarding the Americas, there is considerable

variation inprosecutor rates.BothCanada (11.6)

and the USA (8.8) show prosecutor rates above

the average. For Latin America and the

Caribbean, themedian rate ismuch \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_lower (5.0).

However, there are very different rates to be

found in the different countries of that region,

ranging from 2.2 in the Dominican Republic to

44.9inColombia.

**Figure3.Prosecutorsper100,000populationbyregionsandsub􀍲regions(medians)**
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The same observation (although less extreme)

can be made in Western and Central Europe,

evenifexcludingthecountriesthatwereformerly

socialist: In the remaining countries, rates range

from1.5inMaltato11.6inPortugal,withoutany

clear pattern. For example, in Scandinavia rates

rangefrom2.0inNorwayto11.2inDenmark.

Clearly lowermedian rates can be found for the

Near and Middle East (4.1), for East, South East

andSouthAsia(2.5),forthewholeofAfrica(1.8)

and for the only country fromOceania that was

abletoprovidedata(PapuaNewGuinea:0.5).But

even in these areas, there aresomeoutliers with

muchhighervalues.Forexample,Egyptshows a

rate of 25.4 prosecutors, which is also much

higher than the rates for the other two

participating North African countries (Algeria:

1.7,Morocco:1.8).

Table 2 in the Annex also shows the trends for

prosecution personnel rates over time.

Differently from police personnel, the general

trend shows increasing personnel rates. The

median average annual change rate is 2.0%, the

mean 1.9 %, the standard deviation 3.9

percentage points. There are countries with

remarkable increases up to 11.4% per year in an

eleven􀇦yearperiod(Malaysia).Onlyfewcountries

show relevant decreases, most prominently the

DominicanRepublic withanannual change rate

of􀇦7.4%duringaperiodof8years.
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**Judges**

The data collectedon judges is again evenmore

critical than the data collected on prosecutors.

While the issues addressed in the prosecution

section should also appear at courts level (legal

and factual differences in criminal justice

systems and therefore in the duties of and need

for judges, efficiency and structure of the court

system, differences in statistical counting rules),

thereisalsoasevereproblemwiththedefinition

used:

Firstofall,thequestionnaireasksforthenumber

ofprofessionaljudgesormagistratesanddefines

thisgroupofpersons“tomeanbothfull􀇦timeand

part􀇦time officials authorized to hear civil,

criminal and other cases, including in appeal

courts, and make dispositions in a court of law.

Please include in that category associate judges

and magistrates, who may be authorized as

above”.

The numbers reported are not restricted to

judges deciding criminal cases. Therefore, this

value is not at all directly related to criminal

justice. It does not mean very much in this

respect. The comparability problem might get

even worse because some countries might still

only report the number of judges whose duty is

thejudgment of criminal cases.Apart from this,

it is not clear whether really all judges are

included in the reported figures in all countries.

Numbers will often only include judges at

ordinary courts, but not those working at

specialized courts (like administrative courts

etc.).

Still, thischapter will presentsomemain results

on the rates of professional judges and

magistrates in international comparison. The

reader should, however, keep in mind the

restrictions regarding the comparability of these

figures.We will not report resultson lay judges.

While theUN􀇦CTSquestionnaire also includes a

question regarding this group of judges, their

tasksandtheareasofthecriminaljusticeprocess

and other court hearings where laypersons are

neededaresomuchdependentontheindividual

legalsystemofeachcountrythatvaluesarenotat

allcomparable.

**Figure4.Professionaljudgesper100,000population(medians)**
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Figure 4 and table 3 (in the Annex) show the

distributionofratesofprofessionaljudgesacross

the world. There is significant variation in the

rates, with a median rate of 9.7, a mean of 11.5

and a standard deviation of 9.9. Once again,

skewnessispositive.Ratesforprofessionaljudges

are as wide􀇦ranged as are the rates for

prosecutors: The lowest rate can be found in

Ethiopia(0.2judgesper100,000population),the

highestinSlovenia(50.0).

The highest rates can be found in Europe, with

mediansofmorethan10forallthreesub􀇦regions

thatwereseparatelyanalyzed(WestandCentral,

East, South East). This result is repeated even

moreimpressivelywhenlookingattheindividual

countryresults:Amongthe20countrieswiththe

highest rates of professional judges are 19

countriesfromEurope,withCostaRicabeingthe

only exception (19.6). Additionally, there are 42

countries with judges rates of 10 or more per

100,000population,ofwhich33arefromEurope.
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Among the top􀇦ranking countries, there are also

once again quite many countries from Central,

South East and East Europe with a socialist

history, although the connection is not as

pronounced as it was for the prosecutors. But

apartfromacontinentalEuropeanlegaltradition

(forexampletheUKnotonlyhasadifferentlegal

tradition, but also lower rates of judges) a

socialist history might explain high rates of

judges. This interpretation is supported by the

results for China and Mongolia, where judges

ratesarearound15.

Thenext highest ratesofjudgescanbe foundin

North Africa (9.8), Canada / USA (median: 8.7

with6.5forCanadaand10.8fortheUSA)andthe

Near and Middle East (8.2), with quite uniform

results in North Africa and USA / Canada, but

quitehighvariationintheNearandMiddleEast

(from3.2inSaudiArabiato16.0inBahrain).The

results for Central Asia (5.8) and Latin America

and the Caribbean (5.9) are considerably lower,

althoughtheformercountriesalsohadasocialist

past. This supports the assumption that the

relationship between such a history and judges

ratesisweakerthanitisforprosecutorrates.

Low rates of professionaljudgescanbe found in

East (0.8) and Southern (2.6) Africa and also in

East, South East and South Asia (2.5), however

with some remarkable outliers. Apart from the

already named countries Mongolia and China,

Zambia(9.8)isalsotobementionedhere.

The trend in judges rates is overall quite

comparable with the trend in prosecutors rates,

showing averageannualchange rates of 1.8% in

themedianand2.2%inthemean.Thestandard

deviation is higher with 4.2 percentage points.

The incredible change rate for Tajikistan of 23.7

per cent per year – leading to about ten times

higherratesattheendoftheeleven􀇦yearperiod–

might of course also be due to changes in the

reportingofdata,i.e.notnecessarilyonlyreflect

changes in the real world. However, this could

notbeconfirmedduetothefactthatthecountry

onlyparticipatedinthe6thand10thwaves.There

are also some other countries with quite

remarkableincreases(e.g.:7.1%peryearoveran

eleven􀇦year period for Moldova) or decreases

(e.g.:􀇦7.7%peryearoveraneight􀇦yearperiodfor

Malaysia; but also note the strong increase in

prosecutorsratesforthatcountry[seeabove]).

**Prisonstaff**

The fourth section of theUN􀇦CTSquestionnaire

addressesprisons/penalinstitutions.Apartfrom

budgetandstaffvariables,whichareincludedin

all sections of the UN􀇦CTS questionnaire, the

prisons section also includes questions on the

number of adult and juvenile prisons and the

number of available places (without

overcrowding). These latter variables are not

evaluated here (but see Walmsley in this

publication, chapter 7, for some results on

overcrowding).Thesheernumberof institutions

means nothing with respect to resources (since

thisnumberwouldalsodependonthenumberof

available placesperprisonand isthereforenota

direct indicator of the amount of resources

spent). The number of places available without

overcrowdingisalsonotameasurefortheextent

ofresourcesspent,becausethe“officialcapacity”

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ofprisonsismainlysubjecttodefinitionbyeach

and every country, which does not necessarily

imply a certain minimum standard and thus

minimumstandardcosts.

In thispublication,we aregoing to focuson the

totalstaffinadultprisonsonly.TheUN􀇦CTSalso

asksfordataonjuvenileprisonstaff,butthisdata

can also not be interpreted under the resources

aspect.Theextenttowhichjuvenilescanbesent

to prison is subject to wide variation across the

world.Apartfromorinsteadofprisons,thereare

reformatories, borstals and other types of

custodial institutions for juvenile offenders

availableinsideoroutsideofcriminallaw.Notall

of the custodial institutions would be counted

under a prison staff heading (especially if not

under prison administration, see definition

below). Apart from this, many countries focus

primarilyon non􀇦custodial responses to juvenile

delinquency. The staff figure will therefore be

subject to wide variation and cannot be validly

interpreted without looking in detail into the

differentsystems.

Evenwithrespecttoadultprisonstaff,theresults

have to be interpreted carefully. The staff

numbers are only collected as a total (and

differentiated by sex), but not differentiated by

functions. Therefore, a high number of prison

staff may be an outcome of a high number of

custodialpersonneloritmightbeanoutcomeof

a high number of treatment personnel. The

interpretationwouldbeverydifferent,depending

on the distribution of the different functions

within the total prison staff. With respect to

custodialpersonnel,thenecessarynumbermight

dramaticallybereducedinprisonswheresecurity

is mainly guaranteed by technical means and

architecture(therefore,theinmate/staffratiois
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also no valid indicator for the quality of prison

conditions: see Mayhew 2003, 93, although an

extremely low rate might be a piece of evidence

forlackofquality).

Apart fromthis,prison staff ishighlydependent

on the number of persons sent to prison. This

number – in relation to the total number of

persons in contact with the system and / or the

numberofpersonsconvicted–issubjecttowide

variation, too, and it especially depends on the

punitivity of the system. Therefore, one might

say, personnel rates are high in countrieswere a

highnumberofpersonnelisneededduetoahigh

numberofprisoners (althoughthis isnogeneral

rule; see Mayhew 2003, 93). This makes the

interpretation of staff numbers under a mere

resourcesaspectquestionable.

The 10th UN􀇦CTS questionnaire defines prison

staff “tomean all individualsemployed in penal

or correctional institutions, including

management, treatment, custodial and other

(maintenance, food service etc.) personnel.”

Prisons, penal institutions or correctional

institutions are defined as “all public and

privatelyfinancedinstitutionswherepersonsare

deprived of their liberty. The institutions may

include, but are not limited to, penal,

correctional, and psychiatric facilities under the

prison administration.” This definition is in line

withtheearliereditionscoveredhere,too.

Table 4 (in the Annex) and figure 5 show the

results for the total staff in adult prisons in

internationalcomparison.Onceagaintheresults

are quite wide􀇦ranged, with a minimum of 2.4

prison staff members per 100,000 population in

Nepalandamaximumof160.4staffmembersin

Colombia.Themedianis50.7,themean54.4,the

standard deviation 33.6. The distribution of

valuesisonceagainpositivelyskewed.

Regionalandsub􀇦regionalanalysisshowsthatthe

highestprisonstaffratescanbefoundinthearea

of Canada and the USA (median: 115.4, USA:

138.3,Canada:92.5).Only five other areas inthe

world also showmedian prison staff rates above

the overallmedian: East Africa (54.0), Southern

Africa (61.7), Central Asia (70.5) and West and

CentralEurope(69.3).Clearlylowerratesaround

30 can be found in Latin America and the

Caribbean(33.0),EastandSouthEastAsia(27.7)

and South East Europe (35.8), while the lowest

rates by far can be found in North Africa (16.4)

andespeciallyinSouthAsia(5.4).

**Figure5.Correctionalstaffinadultprisonsper100,000populationbyregionsandsub􀍲regions**
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Ten of the responding countries show staff rates

greater than 100 per 100,000 population, with

Colombia(160.4)atthetop,followedbytheUSA

(138.3) and Latvia (127.5).Many of the countries

ranking high here will do so due to high

incarceration rates, as is known for example for

the USA (see Mayhew 2003, 93; Gruszczynska,

Marshall2008,27).Mostofthecountriesranking

high,evenamongthe“top30”,arecountriesfrom

EuropeandtheAmericas.Ontheotherhand, at

thebottomofthelist,countriesfromAsiaclearly

dominate, although there are also a high

proportion of countries from LatinAmericaand

the Caribbean among these countries with the

lowest personnel rates. There are only six

countries with rates lower than 10, five ofwhich

arefromAsia,threeofthemmorepreciselyfrom

SouthAsia,thusexplainingthe very lowmedian

forthatarea.
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Table 4 in the Annex also informs about the

trends in prison staff. As with prosecution

personnelandjudgesrates,prisonstaffrateshave

beenincreasinginthelastyears,iflookingatthe

generaltrend.Themedianaverageannualchange

rate is 1.2%, themeaneven 1.9%.The standard

deviationisfairlyhighwith4.1percentagepoints.

Accordingly, there are some countries with very

strong increases over long periods of time. For

example, Jordan and the Dominican Republic

showaverage yearly increases ofmorethan 10%

foraneleven􀇦yearperiod.Therearenocountries

withcomparablystrongdecreases.Acountrywith

quitehighdecreaseratesoverquitealongperiod

of time is for example Estonia with 􀇦4.2 % per

yearoveranine􀇦yearperiod,orPanamawith􀇦5.4

%peryearoveraneleven􀇦yearperiod.

**Possiblemeasuresofcriminaljusticeperformance**

Regarding criminal justice system performance,

the indicators the UN􀇦CTS \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_data provide are

somewhatlimited.However,somebriefestimates

can be made by connecting data on criminal

justicepersonnelwiththedataonoffendersthey

have to deal with. This is – of course – only a

restricted view on performance, not looking at

thequality,butonthequantityofworkdoneby

thedifferentactorsinthecriminaljusticesystem:

Quantitative productivitydefined as the relation

between personnel strength and the output

produced (seeMayhew2003andSmit2008with

comparableapproaches).

Theterm“productivity”isusedherewithoutany

judgment or quality assessment connected (for

criticism of this term see Smit 2008, 108). This

means: High quantitative productivity is not a

measure for theoverall performance of a system

or for the quality of the results produced. The

extentofproductivityishighlydependentonthe

structureofacriminaljusticesystem.Therefore,

the resultspresenteddonotimplythata system

withhighproductivityratesperformsbetterthan

asystemwithlowproductivityrates.

In the resources section of this chapter, we

discusseddataonfourdifferentactorswithinthe

criminal justice system, namely the police,

prosecutionservice,judgesandcorrectionalstaff.

In this section, we only focus on the police and

prosecutionservice:

Judges’outputcannotbevalidlymeasureddueto

restrictionsofthedefinitionused.Sinceitisnot

clear to what extent the judgment of criminal

cases is part of the judges’ duties (see above),

their performance cannot be measured by the

output(inconvictions)theyproduced.Regarding

prison staff, one should clearly think about the

meaning of the ratio persons incarcerated per

prisonstaffmember,becauseincarcerationisnot

theproductofprisonstaffmembers.Sincethe

distribution of functions among prison staff is

notclear,thisratecanalsonotbeinterpretedasa

support or attendance rate (see above, and also

Mayhew2003,93,whotestedthis).Neithercanit

be interpreted asasecurity rate,especiallywhen

taking into account the other, technical and

architecturalmeans of achieving security, which

arenotreflectedinstaffrates.

Forthepoliceandprosecutionservicesthereare

alsomany problemsconnectedwith thiskind of

measurement.These problems will be addressed

in detail within the relevant subsections.

However,asageneralremark,itshouldbenoted

thatthe structure ofthe criminal justiceprocess

should be taken into consideration when

measuring the productivity of a system.

Therefore, police productivity can be measured

by the number of suspects they “produced”, but

notbythenumberofprosecutionsorconvictions

that resulted afterwards. This is due to the fact

thatatleastunderusualcircumstancesthepolice

have no powers to prosecute cases in their own

competenceorpresentthemincourt(seeElsner,

Smit, Zila 2008; Elsner, Lewis, Zila 2008).

Therefore,theproducts“personsprosecuted”and

“persons convicted” are not produced by the

police.

Both of these are, however, usually produced by

the prosecution service.This is also the case for

convictions, although these fall primarily under

thedutiesofjudges.Buttheprosecutorwillhave

to present the case in court, thus making the

resultingconvictionshisorherproduct,too (see

Wade, Smit, Aubusson de Cavarlay 2008 on the

influence of prosecutors on the decisions of

criminalcourts).Thesamewouldbetrueforthe

number of persons brought before the criminal

courts. This product, that is located at an

intermediate stage between persons prosecuted

and persons convicted, is also usually produced

bytheprosecutionservice.
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**Personssuspectedperpoliceofficer**

Starting from these initial thoughts, a first

performance indicator would be the number of

suspects produced per police officer. This

relationship is visualized in figure 6; the

connected rates can be found in table 5 in the

Annex. Please note that the figure uses

logarithmic scales for both values, due to large

varianceintherespectiverates.Thediagramalso

does not start with 1, but with 50 for both

variables,duetothefactthatlowervaluesdonot

occur1, and in order to allow looking at the

distributionofcountriesinmoredetail.Thesame

has been done with the other figures in this

section, which also use logarithmic scales and

havesometimesbeentrimmed,too.

As can clearly be seen from the figure, country

valuesdonotsuggestasimplelinearrelationship

between police personnel rates and the rate of

suspects produced (see also Mayhew 2003, 104).

Theassumptionthatmorepoliceofficerswillalso

produce a higher output must therefore be

rejected.This is at least the case with respect to

UN􀇦CTS data with all of its methodological

problems, some of which have already been

addressedabove.Especially,suspects arenot the

only product of the police, which have not only

repressive,but also preventive functions.One of

differentotherproductsofthepoliceistherefore

security.Thispart ofpoliceperformancecannot,

however, be measured in terms of suspects.

Dependingontherelationshipofpreventiveand

repressive functions of the police personnel of

any given country, the importance of the

repressive product of “suspects produced” might

vary.

Of course, the number of police􀇦recorded

suspects also depends on the definition of

“suspect” and other issues of criminal law

(especiallythedefinitionofwhat isconsidereda

“criminal” offence), criminal procedure law

(defining the fields of investigative work to be

done by police officers, in some countries

excludingcertainoffencetypes,liketaxoffences,

from their responsibility)and rules of statistical

recording.

The number of suspects as a system produced

value is also less dependent on the population

sizethan is thenumber of police officers.While

in thebeginning of this chapterwe showed that

thereisaverystrongcorrelationbetweenthesize

ofthepolice forceandthepopulation size (corr.

0.93, R² 0.87), the correlation between the

absolute total number of suspects and the

population size is much weaker (corr. 0.59, R²:

0.35).

In accordance with the distribution shown in

figure6,thereisnocorrelationbetweentherate

of suspects and the rate of police officers in a

country(corr.0.02).Asfigure6indicates,thereis

also no clear relationship between police

productivity and the region a country is located

in.Butitcanbeseenthatthosecountriesranking

lowestonthepoliceproductivityscalearemostly

from Latin America and Asia (countries below

the 1st Quartile). Although there is no linear

relationship between the suspects rate and the

rate of police officers, there seems to exist one

clearcentreinthefigure.

1Withoneexception:TheSyrianArabRepublichasbeenexcludedfromthisdiagramduetoanunrealisticallylow

policepersonnelrateofonlyabout10(seeabove).
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**Figure6.Suspectsperpoliceofficerbycountriesandregions(log.scales)**
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Therateofsuspectsperpoliceofficercanbeseen

intable5,below.Asisvisualizedthereandalsoin

figure 6,theproductivity ofthepolicemeasured

thiswayissubjecttoremarkablevariation,witha

median of 2.4, a mean of 5.2 and a standard

deviation of 8.0.Theminimum is 0.1 for Serbia,

themaximum 46.0 for Finland.The distribution

ispositivelyskewed.

**Personssuspectedperpoliceofficer**

Asecondproductwearegoingtohaveadetailed

look at is the number of prosecutions per

prosecutor.Thisrelationismadevisibleinfigure

7.Thecalculatedratescanbefoundintable5in

theAnnex.Aswiththesuspectsperpoliceofficer,

the rate of persons prosecuted per prosecutor is

subject to wild variation (a result already found

by Mayhew 2003, 106, and Smit 2008, 105). The

median is 82.6 persons prosecuted, the mean

194.0andthestandarddeviation262.3.Again,we

find a positively skewed distribution. The

minimum is 4.1 for China, the maximum 1057.9

forNorthernIreland.

Aswiththesuspectsperpoliceofficerrates,these

values do not mean very much if compared

directlybetweencountries.Onceagainthisisdue

to the differences between criminal justice

systems, inf luencing prosecution input and

output (see above). Apart from this, as always,

differences in statistical recording have to be

taken into account. In addition, there is a

problem related to the definition used for

“persons prosecuted” in the UN􀇦CTS

questionnaire:

“’Personsprosecuted’maybeunderstoodtomean

alleged offenders prosecuted by means of an

officialcharge,initiatedbythepublicprosecutor

or the law enforcement agency responsible for

prosecution.”
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**Figure7.Personsprosecutedperprosecutorbycountriesandregions(log.scales)**
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“Official charge” in this respect might be a

misleading term, because some might

understand this to mean all persons officially

prosecuted, while others might understand

personsindicted.2

Like the ratio between suspects and police

officers, the ratio between persons prosecuted

andthenumberofprosecutorsisnotevenclose

to being a constant. There is no linear

relationship between these two values at all

(corr. 􀇦0.12). There is also once again no clear

relationship between the region in which a

country is located and the quantitative

productivityoftheprosecutionservice,although

thecountrieswitha ratiobelowthe 1stQuartile

areoftenfromAsiaorLatinAmerica.Apartfrom

theseareas,alsosomecountriesfromEuropecan

be foundhere.Many of thecountries from Asia

andallfromEuropebelowthe1stQuartileare

countrieswithasocialistpast,i.e.alsocountries

with a relatively high rate of prosecutors. This

leads to the assumption that the tasks of

prosecutors inthesecountriesmightbe broader

than the tasks in other countries,thus reducing

thequantitativeproductivityasmeasuredbythe

numberofpersonsprosecutedperprosecutor.

If there was any relationship between the

personnel rates \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_and the rates of persons

prosecuted, figure 7 would point at a negative

sloperatherthanapositiveone,aresultwhichis

alsodenotedbythe(thoughextremelyweakand

not significant)negative correlation.This result

wouldmakeclearthattheratiobetweenpersons

prosecutedandthenumberofpersonnelcanby

no means be a measure of the quality of

performance. Different ratios can be explained

by differences in the respective criminal justice

systems.

2Theseambiguitiescouldbeavoided.TheEuropeanSourcebook,forexample,differentiates,interalia,between

aheadlinecategory*“Outputcasestotal”,*whichisdefinedas:*“Alldisposalsmadebytheprosecutingauthorityin*

*thereferenceyear,*”andasubcategory*“Casesbroughtbeforeacourt(e.g.indictment,acted’accusation,*

*Anklageschrift),”*(seeAebietal.2010).
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Earlier publications by Mayhew (2003, 106) and

Smit (2008, 109) could show for Europe and

North America that there was a negative

correlation between the rate of persons

prosecuted (which could be interpreted as the

workload)andtheratiobetweentheconvictions

rate and that number: 􀇦0.56 and 􀇦0.47,

respectively. This was interpreted to provide

some support for the findings of Jehle (2000)

according to which a lower workload of the

prosecution service correlates with a higher

proportionofcasesbroughtbeforeacourt.Data

analyzed for this chapter, for the first timenow

onaworld􀇦wide scale, displayedamuchweaker

correlation(corr.􀇦0.18).Evenifonerestrictsthe

analysistoEuropeandCanada(nodataavailable

for the USA), the correlation is still low, only

􀇦0.22forthelatestavailableyear.

**Personsbroughtbeforeacourtperprosecutor**

Althoughdefinedasaninputvalueatcourtlevel

intheUN􀇦CTSquestionnaire,therateofpersons

broughtbeforeacourtcouldbeinterpretedasan

output by the public prosecution service, since

thisisthepublicbodyinchargeofbringingcases

before the court in most countries. The results

for this variable in relation to the prosecution

personnel variable are, however, equally

problematicastheresultsforpersonsprosecuted

(discussed above). Once again, the rates differ

very much: The median is 85.5 cases brought

beforeacourtperprosecutor,themean is 201.2,

thestandarddeviation266.2.Theminimumrate

is 3.6 for Ecuador, the maximum 1057.9 for

Northern Ireland. The ratio between persons

brought before a court and the number of

prosecutorsisthereforenotevenclosetobeinga

constant.Thereisnolinearrelationshipbetween

thesetwovalues(corr.􀇦0.08).

The distribution is quite similar to the

distribution that can be found for persons

prosecuted per prosecutor. This can also be

confirmed by checking for the correlation

between the rate of persons prosecutedand the

rateofpersonsbroughtbeforeacourt(corr.0.87,

R² 0.75). Additionally, the ratio of persons

broughtbeforeacourtperpersonsprosecutedis

exactly 1 in the median, the mean being 1.28.

However, the interpretation of both variables

seems to be quite different across countries,

sincetheminimumisabitover0.2forJapan(i.e.

about 4 to 5 persons brought before court per 1

person prosecuted), the maximum 5.8 for the

Republic of Korea. The standard deviation is,

accordingly,1.0.

Apart from differences in the criminal justice

systems,theseresultsreflectproblemsrelatedto

the quality and the comprehensibility of these

definitions. The majority of respondents,

however, tend to understand both variables

almost synonymously. Therefore, the ratio of

personsbroughtbeforeacourtperprosecutoris

notanalyzedmorecloselyhere.

**Personsconvictedperprosecutor**

A final “productivity” indicator introduced here

is the ratio between persons convicted and the

number of prosecutors. The results for this

relation can be seen in figure 8 and table 5 (in

theAnnex).

As with the other ratios already discussed, this

final ratio shows once again pronounced

differences (see also the earlier results by

Mayhew 2003, 107). The median is 44.3

convictions per prosecutor, the mean 97.1, the

standarddeviation138.6.Withaminimumof2.3

(Ecuador)andamaximumof654.9(UnitedArab

Emirates), the maximum is once again much

higher than the minimum. The distribution is

positivelyskewed.
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**Figure8.Personsconvictedperprosecutorbycountriesandregions(log.scales)**
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Aswasalreadyshownfortheotherperformance

indicators, itcanbeclearlyseenin figure8that

there is also no linear relationship between

prosecutionpersonnelratesandconvictionrates

(corr. 0.02). However, the relationship between

quantitative productivity and the region a

country is located in seems to be more

pronounced:Whilebelowthe1stQuartilealmost

all countries are located in Asia, Latin America

andtheCaribbean,abovethe 3rdQuartilemost

countries are located in Europe. Apart from

these, three out of four represented countries

from Africacanbe foundhere.There are also a

number of Asian countries in the highest􀇦

rankingquartile.

Of course, as for the other variables discussed

here,onceagaincomparability issueshavetobe

taken into account, based on the differences of

the criminal justice systems and of statistical

recording. At least, the variable of “persons

convicted”islessambiguousthanothervariables

discussed here, especially the “persons

prosecuted”variable.

The definition used by the UN􀇦CTS was:

“’Personsconvicted’maybeunderstoodtomean

persons found guilty by any legal body duly

authorized to pronounce them convicted under

national law, whether the conviction was later

upheldornot.”

However, since the conviction is located at the

end of the criminal justice process of first

instance,thedifferencesofthelegalsystemsare

fully pronounced here. Rates are, for example,

influenced by the percentage of cases that are

subject to diversion and thus not or only

informally sanctioned (for details on attrition

withinthe criminal justiceprocess seeSmitand

Harrendorfinthisbook,chapter5).

**Combiningthemeasures**

So far,we presented four different indicators of

quantitative productivity of criminal justice

systems. One of these measures (persons

brought before the court per prosecutor) was

rejected due to the close interrelation with and

dubious connection to the ratio of person

prosecuted per prosecutor. For the remaining

three ratios, we calculated correlations. The

results are 0.45 for suspects ratio by persons

prosecuted ratio, 0.65 for suspects ratio by

persons convicted ratio and 0.66 for persons

prosecuted ratio by persons convicted ratio.

Therefore, systems with a high quantitative

productivity with respect to one of these
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measures also tend to have a high quantitative

productivity with respect to the other two

measures.Althoughonehasgottokeepinmind

thatquantitativeproductivityisnotameasureof

overall criminal justice performance, especially

notameasureforquality,thisrelationshipmakes

is nevertheless possible to think about a

combined productivity measure, based on all

threeratios.

Such a productivity measure was calculated. In

ordertodoso,thedistributionofallthreeratios

wasstandardizedtotherange0to1.Afterwards,

where all three measures were available for a

country, these were added together and the

resultwasdividedbythree.Ifonlytwomeasures

wereavailable,thesewereaddedand dividedby

two,andiftherewasonlyonemeasure,thiswas

used (in the standardized version, of course).

The results can be seen in table 5 in theAnnex

(CPMcolumn).

Table 5 also shows the separate ratios (non􀇦

standardized) that were used to calculate the

index. For these ratios, the table also features

averageannualchange ratesandinformationon

thetrendlength,whereavailable.

**Punitivityofthesystem**

Punitivity is an ambiguous term that requires

definition. One might understand punitivity to

mean an attitude within the population, a

measure for the demand for harsh punishment.

Thistypeofpunitivitycannotbemeasuredwith

UN􀇦CTS data. However, punitivity can also be

understood to mean a feature of the criminal

justice system itself, e.g. measuring the

harshness of sentences (juridical punitivity; see

Kury,Ferdinand\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_2008).Punitivitywithrespectto

theUN􀇦CTScanonlybeunderstoodinthislatter

way.Therefore,punitivity is regardedhere asan

attribute of any given criminal justice system,

measuring the severity of the response to

criminaloffending.

UN􀇦CTS data does not cover information on

sentencesimposedforsurveywavesafterthe7th

anymore. Therefore, the length and severity of

sentencescannotbedirectlycalculatedwithUN􀇦

CTS data. However, there is another possible

approach: The UN􀇦CTS still covers information

on the number of sentenced persons

incarcerated. It also includes data on the total

number of convictions. Systemic punitivity can

now be estimated by the ratio between the rate

ofsentencedpersonsincarceratedandtherateof

personsconvicted(seeSmit2009):

The number of sentenced persons in prison at

anygivendateisinfluenced1)bythenumberof

persons sent to prison and 2) by the actual

lengths of prison sentences served. The ratio

betweensentencedpersonsincarceratedandthe

total of persons convicted is, however, only an

estimate for systemic punitivity due to the fact

that 1) counting units do not exactly fit and 2)

thepersons actually in prison at a givendate in

the reference year have been sent there before.

They might have already been in prison for a

longer period of time. Therefore, the estimate

calculatedthiswayisnotrobustagainstchanges

inthedegreeofsystemicpunitivityovertime.

Taking all this into account, we calculated

punitivity ratios (see table 6). Additionally,

figure 9 visualizes the connection between the

rates of sentenced persons incarceratedand the

rateofpersonsconvicted.
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**Figure 9. Sentenced persons incarcerated per persons convicted by countries and**

**regions(log.scales)**

There is remarkable variation in the results

producedthisway.Astable6shows,themedian

ratio is 0.23, the mean 0.92. The standard

deviation is 2.56 with a minimum of 0.01 for

FinlandandEgyptandamaximumof19.83forEl

Salvador.Thedistribution is\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_–again– positively

skewed. The results for countries ranking

extremelyhighforthisratioshould,however,be

interpretedwithcare:Resultsmuchabove1need

justification and explanation. Such results are

possible if the input into prison is continuously

higher than the output (in the meaning of

released persons) and the rate of unsuspended

prison sentences per total convictions and the

average sentence lengths are high. However,

extremely high rates are likely to invite some

other explanations: For example, the “top six”

countries in table 6 (in the Annex) all show

extremely low conviction rates. This combined

with the higher incarceration rates leads to the

assumptionthatthesecountriesdonotreportall

of their convictions, but only a small part of

them,intheUN􀇦CTS.

Asfigure9shows,mostofthecountriesranking

lowest for the punitivity ratio are located in

Europe, while most high􀇦ranking countries can

be found in Asia, Latin America and the

Caribbean.

Since the punitivity ratio calculated here gives

only an estimate of the “real” punitivity of a

system, it is useful to test its quality against

othermeasuresofpunitivity.Oneothermeasure

of punitivity of the system is the rate of harsh

sanctionsamong all sanctions imposed, namely

the percentage of longer unsuspended prison

sentences within the total of convictions for a

certainoffenceorforallconvictions.

Based on the approach chosen, there are

differentadvantagesandproblemsconnected: If

onewantstomeasurethepunitivityofthewhole

system,onemightthinkthebestsolutionwould

be to calculate the abovementioned percentage

for all convictions, regardless of offence type.

However, there are certain problems regarding

this solution. The term “total convictions” is a

blackbox with respect to offences covered.This

is due to the fact that the borderline between

criminal and non􀇦criminal behaviour is drawn

somewhat differently in every country. Apart

from this, convictions stand at the end of the

criminal justice process. Therefore, depending

on the system, a larger or smaller quantity of

(especially:minor)offencesmighthavedropped

out of the criminal justice process without any

convictionatall,e.g.duetodiversionetc.Alow

percentage of long prison sentences might also
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beduetoanextensivecriminaljusticesystemin

whichevenminorcasesleadtoaconviction.

One solution might be to refer to a certain,

known offence that iswell􀇦definedandmore or

less comparable instead (like theft). This would

help to calibrate the punitivity measure to a

certain offence severity. However, still huge

problems remain if looking at such a minor

offence:Avaryingpercentageofcaseswillnever

reachtheconvictionslevel,but willbedropped,

divertedordisposedofatearlierstages.

However, it would be short􀇦sighted to draw the

conclusionthatoneshouldlookinsteadatmore

severe, well􀇦defined offences (like robbery). Of

course, for these offences the attrition rate will

belowerinallcountriesthanforminoroffences.

However, another problem will arise: The

severity of sanctions for grave offences will not

necessarily represent overall severity of the

criminal justice response. Long sentences for,

e.g., robbery might also be due to severe

punishment of this specialcrime type,andonly

this.Apart fromthis,withincreasingseverityof

the offence the punishment will increase

everywhere. Since there is an upper limiting

value for sentence severity, this will lead to

decreasing variation in the distribution of

sentenceswithincreasinggravityoftheoffence.

Due to these restrictions, we used a combined

approachintable6intheAnnex,calculatingthe

percentage of unsuspended prison sentences of

more than one year in the total of convictions,

the percentage of sentences above two years in

robbery convictions and the percentage of

sentences longer than one year in theft

convictions.The rateswere calculated using the

raw data of the European Sourcebook of Crime

and Criminal Justice Statistics for the reference

year2006(Aebietal.2010).

Apart from these measures of punitivity of the

system, we also introduced a measure of

punitivityofthegeneralpublicintotable6:The

percentage of the general public opting for

imprisonment as punishment for a recidivist

burglarin2004/2005(takenfromvanDijk,van

Kesteren,Smit2007,149).

**Table1.CorrelationsandR²forpunitivitymeasures**

**Correlations**

incarceration / public

opinion

incarceration / long

sentences total

incarceration / long

robbery sentences

incarceration / long theft

sentences

0.20 0.92 0.46 0.89

public opinion / long

sentences total

public opinion / long

robbery sentences

public opinion / long

theft sentences

-0.03 0.39 -0.01

long sentences total / long

robbery sentences

long sentences total / long

theft sentences

0.53 0.88

long robbery / long theft

sentences

0.70

**R²**

incarceration / public

opinion

incarceration / long

sentences total

incarceration / long

robbery sentences

incarceration / long theft

sentences

0.04 0.85 0.21 0.78

public opinion / long

sentences total

public opinion / long

robbery sentences

public opinion / long

theft sentences

0.00 0.15 0.00

long sentences total / long

robbery sentences

long sentences total / long

theft sentences

0.28 0.77

long robbery / long theft

sentences

0.49
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Correlations and R² between each pair of these

measures are shown in table 1. As can be seen

there, all measures of systemic punitivity are

highly correlated. There is a 0.92 correlation

between the rate of sentenced persons

incarcerated per total convictions and the

percentage of sentences longer thanone year in

all convictions. The punitivity measure

calculatedwithUN􀇦CTSdataisalsoverystrongly

correlated with the percentage of unsuspended

theftsentencesoveroneyearinthetotaloftheft

convictions (corr. 0.89). As could be expected,

based on the theoretical thoughts presented

above, the correlation with long robbery

sentencesabovetwoyearsisweaker,thoughnot

irrelevant(0.46).

The correlation with the measure for the

punitivity of the general public, on the other

hand,isonly0.20.Thissupportstheassumption

that public punitivity and punitivity of the

system are two different issues that have to be

addressed separately (although theremightbe a

weak relationship between them, as was also

foundinvanDijk,vanKesteren,Smit2007,151).

Thishypothesisisalsosupportedbythefactthat

most other measures for the punitivity of the

system used in table 6 (in the Annex) are not

correlated with the public opinion variable.

Accordingtotheresultspresentedintable1,this

is the case for long sentences total (corr. 􀇦0.03)

and long theft sentences (corr. 􀇦0.01). Only the

punishmentformoresevereoffencesseemstobe

more strongly influenced by public opinion (or

inanyotherwayinterrelated):Herewecanfinda

correlationof0.39.Thesefindingssupportother

researchresultsthatshowthattheinterrelations

between public opinion, lawmaking and legal

practice are complex (see i.a. Green 2008;

Theodore, Kury 2008; Kury, Ferdinand,

Obergfell􀇦Fuchs2008).

**Summaryandconclusions**

Thischapterfocusedonthreedifferentattributes

of criminal justice systems all over the world,

namely resources, performance (productivity)

andpunitivity.

**Resources**

Regarding criminal justice resources, four

personnelvariablesprovidedintheUN􀇦CTSdata

were analyzed: police personnel, prosecution

personnel,professionaljudgesand staffinadult

prisons.

With respect to police personnel, the following

main results were found: Absolute police

personnelfiguresarequiteclearlydependenton

thepopulationsize(corr.0.93).Policepersonnel

rates per 100,000 population vary significantly

between countries. The median is 303.3, the

mean 341.8, the standard deviation 241.5. The

distribution is positively skewed. Results imply

that there is a minimum number of police

officersper100,000populationthat isnecessary

in any country. Only four countries worldwide

show police personnel values lower than 100

officers per 100,000 population. There are two

regionsintheworldwithrelativelyhighmedian

ratesofpolicepersonnel(around400),theNear

and Middle East as well as East and South East

Europe, while the regions with the lowest

medianrates(medianaround200)canbefound

in Africa, Canada / USA, South Asia and

Oceania. Police personnel figures were quite

stableacrossthe referenceperiod(1995–2006).

The mean and median of the change rates per

year are around 0 % (standard deviation 2.45

percentagepoints).

For prosecution personnel, we observed that

rates vary remarkably, ranging from 0.2 to 44.9.

In all countries the rate of prosecutors ismuch

lowerthantherateofpoliceofficers.Themedian

is 6.1, the mean 8.0. The standard deviation is

7.9, and the distribution of values is positively

skewed. The highest rates of prosecution

personnelcanbefound\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_inEasternEurope(above

20). All other countries that were formerly part

of the Soviet Union also show high prosecutor

rates(between25.2and10.8).Toalesserextent,

thesameistrueforthecountriesformerlyunder

socialist regimes in Central Europe. Moreover,

results forChinaandMongolia alsosupport the

assumption that there is a connection between

(former) socialist inf luence and high

prosecution personnel rates. Regarding the

Americas, there is considerable variation in

prosecutorrates.BothCanada(11.6)andtheUSA

(8.8) show prosecutor rates above the average.

For Latin America and the Caribbean, the

median rate ismuch lower (5.0).However, rates

rangefrom2.2to44.9.Asimilarobservationcan

be made in Western and Central Europe

(excluding formerly socialist countries): Rates
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range from 1.5 to 11.6 without any clear pattern.

Clearly lowermedian ratescan be found for the

Near andMiddle East (4.1), for East, South East

andSouthAsia(2.5),forthewholeofAfrica(1.8)

andforPapuaNewGuinea(0.5).Butonceagain

there are outliers withmuch higher values.The

general trend shows increasing prosecution

personnel rates. The median average annual

change rate is 2.0 %, the mean 1.9 %, the

standard deviation 3.9 percentage points. There

arecountrieswithremarkableincreasesofupto

11.4%peryearinaneleven􀇦yearperiod,andonly

fewcountriesshowrelevantdecreases.

As regards professional judges, there is

significantvariationwithamedianrateof9.7,a

mean of 11.5 and a standard deviation of 9.9.

Rates range from 0.2to50.00.Thehighest rates

ofjudgescanbe foundinEurope,withmedians

of more than 10 for all three sub􀇦regions that

were separately analyzed (West and Central,

East, South East).Among the 20 countries with

the highest rates of professional judges are 19

countriesfromEuropewithCostaRicabeingthe

onlyexception(19.6).Thelowestmedianratesof

professional judges can be found in East (0.8)

andSouthern(2.6)AfricaandalsoinEast,South

East and South Asia (2.5), however \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_with some

remarkable outliers (Mongolia and China with

rates around 15 and Zambia with about 10).

Trends in judges rates are overall quite

comparable with trends in prosecutors rates,

showingaverageannualchangeratesof1.8%in

the median and 2.2 % in the mean with a

standarddeviationof4.2percentagepoints.

The results for staff rates in adult prisons are

quitewide􀇦rangedonceagainwithaminimumof

2.4prisonstaffmembersper100,000population

and a maximum of 160.4 staff members. The

median is 50.7, the mean 54.4, the standard

deviation 33.6. Regional analysis shows that the

highestprisonstaffratescanbefoundinthearea

ofCanadaandtheUSA(median:115.4),whilethe

lowest ratesbyfarcanbefoundinNorthAfrica

(16.4) and especially in South Asia (5.4). Ten of

therespondingcountriesshowstaffratesgreater

than 100. Many of the countries ranking high

here will do so due to high incarceration rates,

althoughthisisnotnecessarilythecase.Mostof

the countries ranking high are countries from

Europe and the Americas. On the other hand,

among the countries with the lowest rates,

countries from Asia clearly dominate. Prison

staffrateshavebeenincreasinginthelastyears,

if looking at the general trend. The median

averageannualchangerateis1.2%,themean1.9

%, the standarddeviation 4.1percentagepoints.

Accordingly, there are some countries with very

strong increases(more than 10% per year)over

longperiodsoftime.Therearenocountrieswith

comparablystrongdecreases.

**Productivity**

Regarding criminal justice system performance,

the indicators the UN􀇦CTS data provide are

somewhat limited. Estimates can be made by

connecting data on criminal justice personnel

with the data on offenders they have to deal

with: Quantitative productivity defined as the

relation between personnel strength and the

output produced. In this section,we focusedon

thepoliceandprosecutionservice,lookingatthe

“products” persons suspected per police officer,

persons prosecuted per prosecutor, persons

brought before the court per prosecutor and

personsconvictedperprosecutor.

Regardingtheratiopersonssuspectedperpolice

officer,itshouldbenotedthatthereisnolinear

relationship between police personnel ratesand

the rate of suspects produced (corr. 0.02).More

police officers will not necessarily produce a

higheroutput.Thereisalsonoclearrelationship

between police productivity and the region a

countryislocatedin,althoughcountriesranking

lowestonthepoliceproductivityscalearemostly

from Latin America and Asia. The number of

suspects as a system produced value is also less

dependent on the population size than is the

numberofpoliceofficers(corr.0.59).Asaresult,

the ratioofsuspectsper police officer issubject

to remarkable variation,withamedian of 2.4, a

meanof5.2andastandarddeviationof8.0.The

minimumis0.1,themaximum46.0.

Therateofpersonsprosecutedperprosecutoris

varyingstrongly,too:Themedianis82.6persons

prosecuted, the mean 194.0 and the standard

deviation 262.3. The minimum is 4.1, the

maximum1057.9.Aswiththesuspectsperpolice

officerrates,thesevaluesdonotmeanverymuch

ifcompareddirectlyacrosscountries.Onceagain

this is due to the differences between criminal

justice systems and differences in statistical

recording. In addition, the definition used for

personsprosecutedintheUN􀇦CTSisambiguous,

because official charge might be understood to

meanallpersonsofficiallyprosecuted,butmight

alsoalternativelybeunderstoodtomeanpersons

indicted. Accordingly, there is no linear

relationship between the number of persons
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prosecuted and the number of prosecution

personnel (corr. 􀇦0.12). There is also once again

no clear relationship between the region in

which a country is located and the quantitative

productivityoftheprosecutionservice.However,

many of the countries from Asia and all from

Europebelowthe1stQuartilearecountrieswith

a socialist past, i.e. also countries with a

relatively high rate of prosecutors. Tasks of

prosecutorsinthesecountriesmightbebroader,

thusreducingthequantitativeproductivity.

The distributionofthe ratio ofpersonsbrought

before a court per prosecutor ratios is quite

similartothe distributionthatcanbe found for

persons prosecuted per prosecutor as regards

mean, median, standard deviation, minimum

andmaximum.Thecorrelationbetweentherate

of persons prosecuted and the rate of persons

brought before a court is 0.87.Additionally, the

test ratio of persons brought before a court per

persons prosecuted is exactly 1 in the median,

the mean is 1.3. However, the interpretation of

both variables seems to differ across countries.

These results indicate problems related to the

quality and the comprehensibility of these

definitions, although the majority of

respondents seem to understand both variables

almostsynonymously.

Fortheratioofpersonsconvictedperprosecutor,

pronounceddifferencescanonceagainbefound,

withamedianof44.3convictionsperprosecutor,

ameanof97.1andastandarddeviationof138.6.

Accordingly,thedistributioniswide􀇦rangedwith

a minimum of 2.3 and a maximum of 654.9.

There is also no linear relationship between

prosecutionpersonnelratesandconvictionrates

(corr. 0.02). However, the relationship between

quantitative productivity and the region a

country is located in seems to be more

pronounced:Whilebelowthe1stQuartilealmost

all countries are located in Asia, Latin America

andtheCaribbean,abovethe 3rdQuartilemost

countriesarelocatedinEurope.

The interrelation of the three ratios persons

suspected per police officer, persons prosecuted

per prosecutor and persons convicted per

prosecutor was analyzed, too. Correlations are

0.45 for suspects ratio by persons prosecuted

ratio,0.65forsuspectsratiobypersonsconvicted

ratio and 0.66 for persons prosecuted ratio by

personsconvictedratio.Therefore,systemswith

a high quantitative productivity with respect to

one of these measures also tend to have a high

quantitative productivity with respect to the

other two measures. We calculated a combined

productivitymeasurebasedonthesethreeratios

(seetable5intheAnnex).Thisis,however,stilla

measure for quantitative productivity, not for

qualityoftheoutputorworkofacriminaljustice

system.

As regards the overall performance of criminal

justicesystemsininternationalperspective,UN􀇦

CTS data is not able to provide a valid answer.

Such an overall assessment would necessarily

mean an in􀇦depth look at the criminal justice

systems of the differentcountries in theoryand

practice.Andevenwithsufficientknowledgeon

allcriminaljusticesystemsoftheworlditwould

be a very ambitious task to translate this

knowledge into a handy performance index,

allowingforarankingofcountriesbasedonthe

qualityofcriminaljusticeperformance.

**Punitivity**

Finally,thischapterfocusedonthepunitivityof

thesysteminthemeaningoftheseverityofthe

response to criminal offending. Systemic

punitivitywasestimatedbytheratiobetweenthe

rate of sentenced persons incarcerated and the

rate of persons convicted. Punitivity ratioswere

calculated, with remarkable variation in the

results produced this way. The median ratio is

0.23, the mean 0.92. The standard deviation is

2.56withaminimumof0.01andamaximumof

19.83.Theresultsforcountriesrankingextremely

high for this rationeed,however,beinterpreted

with care: Results much above 1 need

justificationandexplanation.

Most of the countries ranking lowest for the

punitivityratioarelocatedinEurope,whilemost

high􀇦ranking countries can be found in Asia,

Latin America and the Caribbean. Since the

punitivity ratio calculated here gives only an

estimate of the “real” punitivity of a system, its

quality was tested against other measures of

punitivity, taken fromtheEuropeanSourcebook

ofCrimeandCriminalJusticeStatistics(Aebiet

al.2010)and fromEUICSandICVSdata(taken

from: van Dijk, van Kesteren, Smit 2007 149).

Results show that we have a good measure of

systemicpunitivitythatishighlycorrelatedwith

punitivity measures taken from the ESB,

especially the percentage of sentences longer

thanone year in all convictions (corr. 0.92)and

the percentage of unsuspended theft sentences

over one year in the total of theft convictions

(corr. 0.89). The correlation with long robbery

sentencesabovetwoyearsisweaker,thoughnot

,
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irrelevant \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_(0.46). There is only a weak

interrelation with the punitivity of the general

public, as measured by ICVS and EU ICS data

(corr.0.20).Twooutofthreesystemicpunitivity

measures taken from the ESB are also not

correlated with public opinion, long sentences

total(corr.􀇦0.03)andlongtheftsentences(corr.

􀇦0.01). Only the punishment for more severe

offences seems to be more strongly connected

with public opinion (corr. 0.39 for long robbery

sentences).

These findings support other research results

thatshowthattheinterrelationsbetweenpublic

opinion, lawmaking and legal practice with

respecttopunitivityarecomplex(Green2008).
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**AnnexAtochapter6:Tables**

**Table1.Policeofficersper100,000populationbycountry**

**Country Region Sub-region Latest**

**available**

**Year Trend**

**start**

**Year Average**

**annual**

**change**

**rate**

**Trend**

**length in**

**years**

Albania Europe Southeast 389.7 2002 492.9 1997 -4.6% 5

Australia Oceania … 222.7 2004 204.5 1995 1.0% 9

Austria Europe West & Central 328.6 2006 311.2 2001 1.1% 5

Azerbaijan Asia Central 137.0 2006 138.7 2005 … …

Bahrain Asia Near and Middle East 1866.7 2004 … … … …

Bangladesh Asia South 79.2 2006 … … … …

Barbados Americas Latin 548.0 2000 521.7 1998 … …

Belarus Europe East 325.5 2004 … … … …

Belgium Europe West & Central 357.1 2004 353.8 1995 0.1% 9

Belize Americas Latin 377.2 2006 … … … …

Bolivia Americas Latin 223.6 2002 217.7 2001 … …

Bosnia and Herzegovina Europe Southeast 280.0 2006 … … … …

Brunei Darussalam Asia East / South-East 1086.5 2006 … … … …

Canada Americas Canada / USA 191.4 2006 187.7 1995 0.2% 11

Chile Americas Latin 187.6 2004 272.4 1994 -3.7% 10

Colombia Americas Latin 229.2 2000 234.6 1995 -0.5% 5

Costa Rica Americas Latin 275.3 2006 291.8 1995 -0.5% 11

Croatia Europe Southeast 424.4 2006 415.7 1997 0.2% 9

Cyprus Europe West & Central 609.3 2006 520.2 1995 1.4% 11

Czech Republic Europe West & Central 449.6 2006 428.9 1995 0.4% 11

Denmark Europe West & Central 197.8 2006 196.8 1995 0.0% 11

Dominican Republic Americas Latin 303.5 2006 … … … …

Ecuador Americas Latin 292.6 2006 … … … …

El Salvador Americas Latin 275.2 2006 271.0 2001 0.3% 5

England and Wales Europe West & Central 263.4 2006 247.3 1995 0.6% 11

Estonia Europe West & Central 240.8 2006 344.7 1995 -3.2% 11

Finland Europe West & Central 157.9 2006 159.1 1995 -0.1% 11

France Europe West & Central 210.2 2000 195.6 1998 … …

Georgia Asia Central 315.7 2006 252.0 1998 2.9% 8

Germany Europe West & Central 303.8 2006 303.5 1995 0.0% 11

Greece Europe West & Central 376.4 2006 359.9 1995 0.4% 11

Guatemala Americas Latin 237.2 2000 175.9 1998 … …

Hong Kong SARC Asia East / South-East 445.5 2006 625.8 1995 -3.0% 11

Hungary Europe West & Central 310.1 2004 287.5 1998 1.3% 6

Iceland Europe West & Central 271.1 2004 226.9 1995 2.0% 9

India Asia South 122.5 2006 101.7 1995 1.7% 11

Ireland Europe West & Central 303.3 2006 300.0 1995 0.1% 11

Israel Asia Near and Middle East 330.1 2004 437.0 1995 -3.1% 9

Italy Europe West & Central 549.9 2006 552.7 1995 0.0% 11

Jamaica Americas Latin 273.9 2000 269.1 1998 … …

Japan Asia East / South-East 199.8 2006 178.0 1995 1.1% 11

Jordan Asia Near and Middle East 115.9 2006 … … … …

Kazakhstan Asia Central 462.0 2000 606.3 1995 -5.3% 5

Kenya Africa East 98.5 2006 … … … …

Kuwait Asia Near and Middle East 1065.2 2002 881.4 2001 … …

Kyrgyzstan Asia Central 337.6 2000 348.5 1995 -0.6% 5

Latvia Europe West & Central 604.8 2006 446.6 1998 3.9% 8

Lebanon Asia Near and Middle East 574.2 2006 … … … …

Lithuania Europe West & Central 333.5 2006 480.9 1995 -3.3% 11

Luxembourg Europe West & Central 291.8 2002 280.5 2001 … …

Malaysia Asia East / South-East 354.0 2000 403.9 1995 -2.6% 5

Maldives Asia South 302.7 2004 267.5 2003 … …

Malta Europe West & Central 433.8 2006 451.5 2001 -0.8% 5

Mauritius Africa East 776.5 2006 870.2 1995 -1.0% 11
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Mexico Americas Latin 485.9 2002 … … … …

Mongolia Asia East / South-East 277.3 2004 … … … …

Montenegro Europe Southeast 890.9 2006 … … … …

Morocco Africa North 142.8 2006 142.9 2001 0.0% 5

Myanmar Asia East / South-East 145.6 2002 146.6 2001 … …

Nepal Asia South 202.0 2006 185.8 2001 1.7% 5

Netherlands Europe West & Central 215.5 2006 195.4 1995 0.9% 11

New Zealand Oceania … 187.0 2006 185.8 1995 0.1% 11

Nicaragua Americas Latin 166.8 2006 … … … …

Northern Ireland Europe West & Central 523.8 2006 698.3 1995 -2.6% 11

Norway Europe West & Central 248.3 2000 233.9 1998 … …

Panama Americas Latin 498.0 2002 482.8 1997 0.6% 5

Papua New Guinea Oceania … 101.4 2000 114.6 1998 … …

Paraguay Americas Latin 331.5 2006 … … … …

Peru Americas Latin 323.0 2004 … … … …

Philippines Asia East / South-East 131.9 2006 149.1 1998 -1.5% 8

Poland Europe West & Central 259.6 2006 257.9 1995 0.1% 11

Portugal Europe West & Central 419.4 2006 435.7 1995 -0.3% 11

Qatar Asia Near and Middle East 435.5 2004 … … … …

Republic of Korea Asia East / South-East 195.1 2004 180.6 1995 0.9% 9

Republic of Moldova Europe East 281.5 2006 169.7 1995 4.7% 11

Romania Europe Southeast 233.8 2006 237.9 1995 -0.2% 11

Scotland Europe West & Central 317.2 2006 361.4 1995 -1.2% 11

Serbia Europe Southeast 440.1 2006 … … … …

Singapore Asia East / South-East 396.4 2006 264.3 1995 3.8% 11

Slovakia Europe West & Central 378.4 2006 370.3 1998 0.3% 8

Slovenia Europe West & Central 391.8 2006 199.1 1995 6.3% 11

South Africa Africa Southern 219.9 2002 343.5 1995 -6.2% 7

Spain Europe West & Central 313.0 2006 310.7 1995 0.1% 11

Sri Lanka Asia South 330.5 2004 310.7 1995 0.7% 9

Swaziland Africa Southern 263.4 2004 225.0 1998 2.7% 6

Sweden Europe West & Central 191.2 2006 280.5 1995 -3.4% 11

Switzerland Europe West & Central 222.6 2006 201.1 1995 0.9% 11

Syrian Arab Republic Asia Near and Middle East 10.2 2004 … … … …

TFYR Macedonia Europe Southeast 480.0 2006 420.0 1998 1.7% 8

Thailand Asia East / South-East 321.0 2006 365.2 1995 -1.2% 11

Turkey Europe Southeast 451.9 2006 206.1 1995 7.4% 11

Ukraine Europe East 358.2 2006 467.0 1995 -2.4% 11

Uruguay Americas Latin 507.4 2004 532.1 2001 -1.6% 3

USA Americas Canada / USA 223.6 2006 243.6 1995 -0.8% 11

Venezuela Americas Latin 15.6 2002 15.1 2001 … …

Zambia Africa Southern 122.3 2000 111.3 1998 … …

Zimbabwe Africa Southern 186.8 2004 161.3 1997 2.1% 7

**Median** 303.3 272.4 0.1% 11.0

**Mean** 341.8 315.8 0.0% 9.1

**Standard deviation** 241.5 164.4 2.4% 2.5
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**Table2.Prosecutorsper100,000populationbycountry**

**Country Continent Sub-continent Latest**

**available**

**Year Trend**

**start**

**Year Average**

**annual**

**change**

**rate**

**Trend**

**length in**

**years**

Albania Europe Southeast 12.8 2004 11.6 2001 3.4% 3

Algeria Africa North 1.7 2006 … … … …

Armenia Asia Central 19.7 2006 … … … …

Austria Europe West & Central 5.3 2006 … … … …

Azerbaijan Asia Central 10.8 2006 15.8 1995 -3.4% 11

Barbados Americas Latin 3.2 2000 3.2 1998 … …

Belarus Europe East 20.4 2006 19.6 2001 0.8% 5

Belize Americas Latin 2.4 2006 … … … …

Bolivia Americas Latin 4.2 2006 … … … …

Bosnia and Herzegovina Europe Southeast 7.4 2006 … … … …

Bulgaria Europe Southeast 10.7 2004 7.2 1995 4.5% 9

Canada Americas Canada / USA 11.6 2001 10.4 1998 3.9% 3

Chile Americas Latin 15.8 2004 … … … …

China Asia East and South-East 13.5 2000 17.2 1995 -4.7% 5

Colombia Americas Latin 44.9 2000 55.3 1995 -4.1% 5

Costa Rica Americas Latin 7.7 2006 8.4 1995 -0.8% 11

Croatia Europe Southeast 13.0 2006 6.7 1995 6.2% 11

Cyprus Europe West & Central 4.5 2004 6.3 1995 -3.7% 9

Czech Republic Europe West & Central 11.1 2006 8.2 1995 2.8% 11

Denmark Europe West & Central 11.2 2002 8.7 1995 3.6% 7

Dominican Republic Americas Latin 2.2 2006 4.1 1998 -7.4% 8

Ecuador Americas Latin 2.7 2006 … … … …

Egypt Africa North 25.4 2000 22.1 1998 … …

El Salvador Americas Latin 11.1 2002 10.9 2001 … …

England and Wales Europe West & Central 5.8 2006 4.3 1995 2.8% 11

Estonia Europe West & Central 14.2 2006 10.1 1995 3.2% 11

Ethiopia Africa East 0.2 2002 0.2 2001 … …

Finland Europe West & Central 6.9 2006 4.7 1995 3.6% 11

France Europe West & Central 2.7 2000 2.6 1998 … …

Georgia Asia Central 12.2 2006 17.5 1995 -3.3% 11

Germany Europe West & Central 6.1 2006 6.6 1995 -0.7% 11

Greece Europe West & Central 4.8 2006 4.1 1995 1.3% 11

Guatemala Americas Latin 19.0 2000 15.2 1998 … …

Hungary Europe West & Central 15.4 2006 12.2 1998 3.0% 8

Iceland Europe West & Central 11.7 2004 5.6 1995 8.5% 9

Ireland Europe West & Central 1.8 2006 1.6 1995 1.3% 11

Israel Asia Near and Middle East 4.1 2004 6.4 1995 -4.9% 9

Italy Europe West & Central 3.8 2006 3.8 2001 -0.1% 5

Japan Asia East and South-East 2.0 2006 1.7 1995 1.4% 11

Kazakhstan Asia Central 21.8 2000 19.7 1995 2.0% 5

Kyrgyzstan Asia Central 13.4 2006 12.8 1995 0.4% 11

Latvia Europe West & Central 23.1 2006 24.0 1995 -0.4% 11

Lithuania Europe West & Central 25.2 2006 21.2 1995 1.6% 11

Malaysia Asia East and South-East 1.6 2006 0.5 1995 11.4% 11

Maldives Asia South 6.4 2002 7.2 2001 … …

Malta Europe West & Central 1.5 2004 … … … …

Mauritius Africa East 4.0 2006 … … … …

Mexico Americas Latin 2.7 2006 1.6 2001 10.8% 5

Mongolia Asia East and South-East 14.4 2006 … … … …

Morocco Africa North 1.8 2006 … … … …

Myanmar Asia East and South-East 2.5 2002 2.4 2001 … …

Nepal Asia South 0.8 2006 0.9 2001 -2.7% 5

Netherlands Europe West & Central 4.1 2006 3.6 2001 2.9% 5

Nicaragua Americas Latin 5.2 2006 … … … …

Northern Ireland Europe West & Central 1.6 2002 1.5 2001 … …

Norway Europe West & Central 2.0 2006 … … … …

Occupied Palestinian

Territory Asia Near and Middle East 3.0 2006 1.6 1997 7.5% 9

138

138

Oman Asia Near and Middle East 12.0 2002 12.4 2001 … …

Panama Americas Latin 2.4 2006 … … … …

Papua New Guinea Oceania ... 0.5 2000 0.6 1998 … …

Peru Americas Latin 16.3 2004 13.2 2001 7.1% 3

Philippines Asia East and South-East 1.7 2004 … … … …

Poland Europe West & Central 15.6 2006 14.1 2001 2.1% 5

Portugal Europe West & Central 11.6 2006 9.4 1995 2.0% 11

Qatar Asia Near and Middle East 5.7 2000 6.3 1998 … …

Republic of Korea Asia East and South-East 3.1 2004 2.1 1995 4.2% 9

Republic of Moldova Europe East 20.1 2006 10.9 1995 5.8% 11

Romania Europe Southeast 9.5 2006 8.2 1995 1.4% 11

Russian Federation Europe East 30.3 2000 29.8 1999 … …

Saudi Arabia Asia Near and Middle East 6.6 2002 6.0 2001 … …

Scotland Europe West & Central 9.3 2006 5.4 1995 5.1% 11

Singapore Asia East and South-East 2.2 2006 2.0 1995 0.9% 11

Slovakia Europe West & Central 14.5 2006 10.3 1995 3.2% 11

Slovenia Europe West & Central 9.7 2006 7.2 1995 2.8% 11

South Africa Africa Southern 5.5 2002 3.9 1995 4.9% 7

Spain Europe West & Central 3.6 2000 … … … …

Swaziland Africa Southern 4.4 2006 … … … …

Sweden Europe West & Central 8.9 2006 7.9 1995 1.0% 11

Syrian Arab Republic Asia Near and Middle East 1.8 2000 1.9 1998 … …

TFYR Macedonia Europe Southeast 9.1 2006 8.6 1998 0.7% 8

Thailand Asia East and South-East 3.1 2000 2.7 1998 … …

Turkey Europe Southeast 4.8 2006 4.6 1995 0.4% 11

Ukraine Europe East 23.8 2006 … … … …

United Arab Emirates Asia Near and Middle East 3.0 2006 … … … …

Uruguay Americas Latin 12.7 2000 11.7 1998 … …

USA Americas Canada / USA 8.8 2005 8.7 1997 0.1% 8

Venezuela Americas Latin 4.8 2006 … … … …

Zambia Africa Southern 0.2 2000 0.3 1998 … …

Zimbabwe Africa Southern 1.4 2000 1.2 1998 … …

**Median** 6.1 6.9 2.0% 11.0

**Mean** 8.8 8.8 1.9% 8.8

**Standard deviation** 7.9 8.6 3.8% 2.7

**Table3.Professionaljudgesper100,000populationbycountry**

**Country Continent Sub-continent Latest**

**available**

**Year Trend**

**start**

**Year Average**

**annual**

**change**

**rate**

**Trend**

**length in**

**years**

Afghanistan Asia Near and Middle East 8.8 2002 9.1 2001 … …

Albania Europe Southeast 10.8 2002 8.8 1998 5.4% 4

Algeria Africa North 9.3 2006 … … … …

Armenia Asia Central 5.8 2006 … … … …

Austria Europe West & Central 28.5 2006 … … … …

Azerbaijan Asia Central 3.9 2004 2.7 1995 4.2% 9

Bahrain Asia Near and Middle East 15.9 2005 9.3 1995 5.5% 10

Barbados Americas Latin 7.2 2000 7.1 1998 … …

Belarus Europe East 9.7 2006 8.5 1995 1.2% 11

Belgium Europe West & Central 23.2 2002 12.3 1995 9.5% 7

Bolivia Americas Latin 10.3 2006 … … … …

Bosnia and Herzegovina Europe Southeast 22.4 2006 … … … …

Bulgaria Europe Southeast 19.6 2004 12.1 1995 5.5% 9

Canada Americas Canada / USA 6.5 2003 6.6 1998 -0.3% 5

Chile Americas Latin 5.0 2004 3.4 1998 6.8% 6

China Asia East and South-East 15.9 2002 14.0 1995 1.8% 7

Colombia Americas Latin 10.0 2000 11.0 1995 -1.8% 5

Costa Rica Americas Latin 18.0 2006 14.3 1995 2.1% 11

Croatia Europe Southeast 43.7 2006 25.1 1995 5.2% 11

Cyprus Europe West & Central 11.7 2006 8.2 1995 3.3% 11

Czech Republic Europe West & Central 28.6 2006 21.1 1995 2.8% 11
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Denmark Europe West & Central 12.9 2004 12.4 1997 0.6% 7

Dominican Republic Americas Latin 5.9 2006 6.1 2000 -0.3% 6

Ecuador Americas Latin 1.0 2004 … … … …

Egypt Africa North 9.8 2006 … … … …

El Salvador Americas Latin 5.4 2006 … … … …

England and Wales Europe West & Central 7.0 2006 6.3 2000 1.8% 6

Estonia Europe West & Central 17.9 2006 13.0 1995 3.0% 11

Ethiopia Africa East 0.2 2002 0.2 2001 … …

Finland Europe West & Central 13.1 2006 18.2 1995 -2.9% 11

France Europe West & Central 11.5 2000 11.1 1998 … …

Georgia Asia Central 7.3 2004 7.5 1995 -0.3% 9

Germany Europe West & Central 17.8 2006 27.1 1995 -3.7% 11

Greece Europe West & Central 25.0 2006 19.5 1995 2.3% 11

Guatemala Americas Latin 3.4 2000 3.3 1998 … …

Hong Kong SARC Asia East and South-East 2.2 2006 2.4 1995 -0.8% 11

Hungary Europe West & Central 26.8 2004 23.5 1998 2.2% 6

Iceland Europe West & Central 16.1 2004 17.6 1995 -0.9% 9

Ireland Europe West & Central 3.0 2004 2.4 1995 2.5% 9

Israel Asia Near and Middle East 8.2 2004 6.7 1995 2.3% 9

Italy Europe West & Central 10.9 2006 14.4 1995 -2.5% 11

Japan Asia East and South-East 2.6 2006 2.3 1995 1.3% 11

Kenya Africa East 0.8 2006 … … … …

Kyrgyzstan Asia Central 6.2 2006 5.0 1995 1.9% 11

Latvia Europe West & Central 20.4 2006 9.8 1995 6.9% 11

Lithuania Europe West & Central 21.7 2006 12.6 1995 5.1% 11

Luxembourg Europe West & Central 16.5 2002 16.5 2001 … …

Malaysia Asia East and South-East 0.9 2006 1.6 1998 -7.7% 8

Malta Europe West & Central 8.2 2006 8.7 2001 -1.2% 5

Mauritius Africa East 4.1 2006 3.7 1995 0.9% 11

Mexico Americas Latin 0.8 2004 … … … …

Mongolia Asia East and South-East 15.1 2006 … … … …

Morocco Africa North 10.1 2006 … … … …

Myanmar Asia East and South-East 2.4 2002 2.5 2001 … …

Nepal Asia South 0.8 2006 … … … …

Netherlands Europe West & Central 12.6 2006 … … … …

New Zealand Oceania ... 4.0 2002 4.2 1995 -0.6% 7

Northern Ireland Europe West & Central 7.0 2002 6.7 2001 … …

Norway Europe West & Central 11.4 2006 … … … …

Occupied Palestinian

Territory

Asia Near and Middle East 3.7 2006 2.4 1997 4.8% 9

Panama Americas Latin 8.0 2006 7.7 1998 0.5% 8

Papua New Guinea Oceania ... 0.3 2000 0.3 1998 … …

Philippines Asia East and South-East 2.5 2006 2.0 1998 2.4% 8

Poland Europe West & Central 25.9 2006 19.8 2001 5.5% 5

Portugal Europe West & Central 15.6 2006 11.6 1995 2.7% 11

Qatar Asia Near and Middle East 9.2 2000 9.0 1998 … …

Republic of Korea Asia East and South-East 3.5 2004 2.5 1995 3.9% 9

Republic of Moldova Europe East 11.6 2006 5.5 1995 7.1% 11

Romania Europe Southeast 19.0 2006 12.4 1995 4.0% 11

Russian Federation Europe East 46.4 2000 45.0 1999 … …

Saudi Arabia Asia Near and Middle East 3.2 2002 3.1 1998 1.3% 4

Scotland Europe West & Central 3.6 2006 5.1 1995 -3.2% 11

Singapore Asia East and South-East 2.3 2006 2.7 1995 -1.4% 11

Slovakia Europe West & Central 24.7 2004 21.1 1995 1.8% 9

Slovenia Europe West & Central 50.0 2006 34.8 1995 3.3% 11

South Africa Africa Southern 4.3 2002 4.0 1995 1.2% 7

Spain Europe West & Central 9.8 2006 8.1 1995 1.8% 11

Swaziland Africa Southern 0.9 2000 1.0 1998 … …

Sweden Europe West & Central 16.8 2006 13.9 1995 1.8% 11

Switzerland Europe West & Central 10.6 2002 … … … …

Syrian Arab Republic Asia Near and Middle East 6.6 2000 7.4 1998 … …

Tajikistan Asia Central 4.8 2006 0.5 1995 23.7% 11

TFYR Macedonia Europe Southeast 29.5 2006 17.3 1995 5.0% 11

Thailand Asia East and South-East 5.7 2006 3.9 1998 4.8% 8
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Turkey Europe Southeast 8.6 2006 9.0 1995 -0.4% 11

Ukraine Europe East 11.5 2004 13.9 1995 -2.1% 9

Uruguay Americas Latin 13.2 2000 14.1 1995 -1.2% 5

USA Americas Canada / USA 10.8 2001 10.2 1998 1.7% 3

Venezuela Americas Latin 2.6 2000 1.2 1998 … …

Zambia Africa Southern 9.8 2000 … … … …

Zimbabwe Africa Southern 0.7 2000 0.6 1998 … …

**Median** 9.7 8.3 1.8% 9.0

**Mean** 11.4 9.8 2.2% 8.9

**Standard deviation** 9.9 8.2 4.2% 2.4

**Table4.Correctionalstaffinadultprisonsper100,000populationbycountry**

**Country Continent Subcontinent Latest**

**available**

**Year Trend**

**start**

**Year Average**

**annual**

**change**

**rate**

**Trend**

**length in**

**years**

Albania Europe Southeast 48.8 2002 40.0 2001 … …

Algeria Africa North 50.7 2006 … … … …

Armenia Asia Central 36.3 2006 … … … …

Austria Europe West & Central 48.6 2006 … … … …

Azerbaijan Asia Central 70.5 2006 26.9 1995 9.2% 11

Bahrain Asia Near and Middle East 55.4 2004 62.0 1995 -1.2% 9

Bangladesh Asia South 5.4 2006 … … … …

Barbados Americas Latin 18.3 2000 15.8 1998 … …

Belarus Europe East 65.4 2006 61.0 1998 0.9% 8

Belgium Europe West & Central 67.7 2002 42.5 1995 6.9% 7

Belize Americas Latin 95.3 2006 52.2 1995 5.6% 11

Bolivia Americas Latin 13.5 2006 … … … …

Bosnia and Herzegovina Europe Southeast 20.3 2006 … … … …

Botswana Africa Southern 73.0 2000 76.1 1998 … …

Brunei Darussalam Asia East and South-East 93.4 2004 … … … …

Bulgaria Europe Southeast 35.8 2004 32.2 1995 1.2% 9

Canada Americas Canada / USA 92.5 2006 97.5 1995 -0.5% 11

Chile Americas Latin 42.6 2004 47.4 1995 -1.2% 9

China Asia East and South-East 22.1 2000 22.4 1995 -0.3% 5

Colombia Americas Latin 160.4 2004 … … … …

Costa Rica Americas Latin 69.7 2006 50.9 2001 6.5% 5

Croatia Europe Southeast 50.9 2006 69.5 2001 -6.0% 5

Cyprus Europe West & Central 41.2 2006 29.1 1995 3.2% 11

Czech Republic Europe West & Central 104.6 2006 79.5 1995 2.5% 11

Denmark Europe West & Central 92.4 2006 63.7 1995 3.4% 11

Dominican Republic Americas Latin 9.4 2006 2.6 1995 12.3% 11

Ecuador Americas Latin 87.9 2004 … … … …

Egypt Africa North 13.2 2001 … … … …

El Salvador Americas Latin 21.7 2002 … … … …

England and Wales Europe West & Central 85.1 2004 63.7 1997 4.2% 7

Estonia Europe West & Central 109.2 2004 160.1 1995 -4.2% 9

Finland Europe West & Central 52.5 2006 51.7 1995 0.1% 11

Georgia Asia Central 72.5 2004 33.6 1995 8.9% 9

Germany Europe West & Central 43.8 2006 44.1 1997 -0.1% 9

Greece Europe West & Central 35.1 2006 18.4 1995 6.0% 11

Guatemala Americas Latin 62.1 2000 70.7 1999 … …

Hong Kong SARC Asia East and South-East 64.4 2006 63.1 1995 0.2% 11

Hungary Europe West & Central 72.4 2002 59.2 1995 2.9% 7

Iceland Europe West & Central 31.9 2004 32.2 1995 -0.1% 9

India Asia South 4.2 2005 2.4 1995 5.8% 10

Ireland Europe West & Central 73.9 2006 69.1 1995 0.6% 11

Israel Asia Near and Middle East 100.1 2006 69.1 1995 3.4% 11

Italy Europe West & Central 82.6 2006 75.6 1995 0.8% 11

Japan Asia East and South-East 12.8 2006 10.6 1997 2.0% 9

Jordan Asia Near and Middle East 45.4 2006 14.1 1995 11.2% 11
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Kazakhstan Asia Central 111.1 2006 56.3 1995 6.4% 11

Kenya Africa East 34.2 2006 … … … …

Kuwait Asia Near and Middle East 20.3 2002 22.7 2001 … …

Kyrgyzstan Asia Central 32.2 2004 41.2 1995 -2.7% 9

Latvia Europe West & Central 127.5 2006 75.8 1995 4.8% 11

Lebanon Asia Near and Middle East 10.9 2006 … … … …

Lithuania Europe West & Central 90.9 2006 85.0 1995 0.6% 11

Luxembourg Europe West & Central 66.3 2002 65.1 2001 … …

Malaysia Asia East and South-East 43.4 2000 38.7 1995 2.3% 5

Maldives Asia South 54.8 2004 39.1 2001 11.9% 3

Malta Europe West & Central 47.2 2006 52.6 2001 -2.1% 5

Mauritius Africa East 73.8 2006 60.1 1995 1.9% 11

Mongolia Asia East and South-East 82.4 2006 … … … …

Morocco Africa North 16.4 2006 17.1 2001 -0.8% 5

Myanmar Asia East and South-East 6.8 2002 7.0 2001 … …

Nepal Asia South 2.3 2006 … … … …

Netherlands Europe West & Central 85.7 2006 67.4 1995 2.2% 11

New Zealand Oceania ... 54.5 2002 57.8 2001 … …

Northern Ireland Europe West & Central 106.5 2006 156.6 1995 -3.4% 11

Oman Asia Near and Middle East 13.1 2000 13.5 1998 … …

Panama Americas Latin 23.4 2006 43.1 1995 -5.4% 11

Papua New Guinea Oceania ... 27.7 2000 29.2 1998 … …

Paraguay Americas Latin 17.3 2006 21.5 1998 -2.7% 8

Peru Americas Latin 17.8 2004 18.2 2001 -0.9% 3

Philippines Asia East and South-East 10.8 2006 7.8 1998 4.2% 8

Poland Europe West & Central 70.1 2006 62.9 2001 2.2% 5

Portugal Europe West & Central 57.5 2006 43.1 1995 2.7% 11

Qatar Asia Near and Middle East 48.1 2004 56.7 1998 -2.7% 6

Republic of Korea Asia East and South-East 27.7 2006 25.5 1995 0.8% 11

Republic of Moldova Europe East 71.6 2006 41.9 1995 5.0% 11

Romania Europe Southeast 45.5 2006 26.5 1995 5.0% 11

Saudi Arabia Asia Near and Middle East 56.3 2002 55.8 2001 … …

Scotland Europe West & Central 67.8 2006 71.3 1995 -0.5% 11

Singapore Asia East and South-East 45.8 2006 44.3 1995 0.3% 11

Slovakia Europe West & Central 97.5 2006 79.7 1995 1.9% 11

Slovenia Europe West & Central 33.0 2006 36.8 1995 -1.0% 11

South Africa Africa Southern 47.7 2002 71.5 1995 -5.6% 7

Spain Europe West & Central 45.4 2004 47.7 1995 -0.6% 9

Sri Lanka Asia South 23.7 2004 24.1 1995 -0.2% 9

Suriname Americas Latin 85.6 2000 88.1 1998 … …

Swaziland Africa Southern 103.6 2006 97.2 1998 0.8% 8

Sweden Europe West & Central 81.2 2006 63.6 1995 2.2% 11

Switzerland Europe West & Central 68.4 2002 38.8 1995 8.4% 7

Syrian Arab Republic Asia Near and Middle East 8.9 2004 … … … …

TFYR Macedonia Europe Southeast 23.8 2006 20.9 1998 1.7% 8

Thailand Asia East and South-East 16.6 2006 17.5 1998 -0.6% 8

Turkey Europe Southeast 35.3 2006 39.3 1995 -1.0% 11

Ukraine Europe East 102.5 2006 114.2 1998 -1.3% 8

United Arab Emirates Asia Near and Middle East 78.6 2004 … … … …

Uruguay Americas Latin 80.5 2004 … … … …

USA Americas Canada / USA 138.3 2000 119.0 1995 3.1% 5

Venezuela Americas Latin 11.6 2002 6.8 2000 … …

Zambia Africa Southern 17.4 2000 17.7 1998 … …

Zimbabwe Africa Southern 61.7 2004 29.8 1995 8.4% 9

**Median** 50.7 44.3 1.2% 9.0

**Mean** 54.4 49.7 1.9% 9.0

**Standard deviation** 33.6 31.1 4.0% 2.3
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**Table5.Performanceratesandtrendsbycountry**

**Country Region CPM SR Y ACR TL PPR Y ACR TL PCR Y ACR TL**

Albania Europe 0.012 0.5 02 … … 19.5 04 … … 11.8 02 … …

Algeria Africa 0.961 … … … … 1017.0 06 … … … … … …

Armenia Asia 0.003 … … … … 6.4 06 … … 5.4 06 … …

Austria Europe 0.325 8.8 06 1.5% 5 677.1 06 … … 99.7 06 … …

Azerbaijan Asia 0.020 1.6 06 … … 13.3 06 13.9% 11 14.1 04 1.7% 9

Bahrain Asia 0.027 1.4 04 … … … … … … … … … …

Bangladesh Asia 0.024 1.3 06 … … … … … … … … … …

Barbados Americas 0.547 … … … … 580.4 00 … … … … … …

Belarus Europe 0.048 2.6 04 … … 39.5 06 5.1% 5 39.3 06 8.9% 5

Belize Americas 0.053 4.1 06 … … 25.0 06 … … … … … …

Bolivia Americas 0.005 0.3 02 … … … … … … 4.8 06 … …

Bosnia and Herzegovina Europe 0.077 2.8 06 … … 85.9 06 … … 64.8 06 … …

Brunei Darussalam Asia 0.008 0.5 06 … … … … … … … … … …

Bulgaria Europe 0.060 … … … … 76.5 04 7.4% 9 35.7 04 6.9% 9

Canada Americas 0.164 10.2 06 -0.4% 11 149.1 01 -2.3% 3 89.6 01 -3.5% 3

Chile Americas 0.138 16.6 04 7.5% 9 32.5 04 … … 20.1 04 … …

China Asia 0.001 … … … … 4.1 00 7.7% 5 3.7 00 7.5% 5

Colombia Americas 0.035 1.7 00 17.4% 5 … … … … … … … …

Costa Rica Americas 0.015 0.8 06 -4.3% 11 24.9 06 0.8% 9 10.6 06 3.9% 8

Croatia Europe 0.075 1.7 06 1.4% 9 136.6 06 -1.2% 11 43.7 06 -1.0% 11

Cyprus Europe 0.038 1.9 06 3.6% 11 … … … … … … … …

Czech Republic Europe 0.087 2.7 06 -1.0% 8 125.5 06 -0.2% 11 61.4 06 -0.5% 11

Denmark Europe 0.115 5.4 04 -1.0% 9 49.1 02 … … 125.5 00 -6.5% 5

Dominican Republic Americas 0.036 2.4 06 … … 42.2 06 1.7% 7 16.8 06 1.2% 8

Ecuador Americas 0.007 0.6 06 … … 16.0 04 … … 2.3 04 … …

El Salvador Americas 0.091 8.1 06 25.5% 5 107.3 02 … … 3.5 02 … …

England and Wales Europe 0.483 10.4 06 -4.2% 11 566.7 06 … … 452.7 06 -2.7% 11

Estonia Europe 0.102 5.4 06 9.0% 11 91.1 06 2.3% 11 73.5 04 3.2% 9

Ethiopia Africa 0.026 … … … … … … … … 19.3 02 … …

Finland Europe 0.833 46.0 06 5.2% 11 614.2 06 4.9% 11 602.7 06 5.1% 11

France Europe 0.546 … … … … … … … … 358.3 00 … …

Georgia Asia 0.033 1.3 06 … … 33.2 06 12.8% 11 31.6 06 13.3% 11

Germany Europe 0.168 9.1 06 0.6% 11 146.5 06 1.9% 11 115.1 06 2.0% 11

Greece Europe 0.218 10.1 06 3.0% 11 … … … … … … … …

Guatemala Americas 0.062 2.5 00 … … … … … … 16.4 00 … …

Hong Kong SARC Asia 0.027 1.4 06 … … … … … … … … … …

Hungary Europe 0.082 4.2 04 -2.2% 6 66.7 06 -6.3% 8 67.5 04 -2.3% 6

Iceland Europe 0.091 4.4 03 … … 74.1 04 4.6% 9 75.5 04 6.2% 4

India Asia 0.093 4.4 06 4.7% 11 … … … … … … … …

Ireland Europe 0.208 4.0 06 0.7% 11 354.8 04 -5.5% 6 … … … …

Israel Asia 0.163 6.9 04 7.8% 9 148.3 04 2.9% 9 135.8 04 3.6% 9

Italy Europe 0.141 2.5 06 0.3% 11 255.4 05 2.0% 4 88.9 06 -4.1% 5

Jamaica Americas 0.101 4.8 00 … … … … … … … … … …

Japan Asia 0.048 1.5 06 1.3% 11 72.3 06 1.7% 11 34.7 06 1.8% 11

Kazakhstan Asia 0.026 1.3 00 6.4% 5 … … … … … … … …

Kenya Africa 0.042 2.1 06 … … … … … … … … … …

Kuwait Asia 0.013 0.7 02 … … … … … … … … … …

Kyrgyzstan Asia 0.024 1.4 00 1.1% 5 22.7 06 -4.1% 11 19.0 06 -6.3% 8

Latvia Europe 0.026 1.3 06 -3.0% 8 33.6 04 5.7% 9 19.0 06 0.9% 11

Lebanon Asia 0.005 0.3 06 … … … … … … … … … …

Lithuania Europe 0.025 2.0 06 3.7% 11 20.2 06 -9.1% 5 15.2 06 -4.0% 11

Malaysia Asia 0.195 0.4 00 … … 299.4 06 … … 196.9 06 … …

Maldives Asia 0.113 3.1 04 … … 175.0 02 … … … … … …

Malta Europe 0.040 2.0 04 4.5% 3 … … … … … … … …

Mauritius Africa 0.265 2.1 06 -1.7% 11 225.8 06 … … 355.6 04 … …

Mexico Americas 0.043 0.5 02 … … 53.5 02 … … 50.4 06 … …

Mongolia Asia 0.039 2.4 04 … … 45.4 06 … … 21.0 06 … …

Montenegro Europe 0.028 1.4 06 … … … … … … … … … …

Morocco Africa 0.149 7.0 06 2.1% 5 … … … … … … … …

Myanmar Asia 0.012 0.3 02 … … 20.5 02 … … 13.3 02 … …

143

*International Statistics on Crime and Criminal Justice*

Criminal Justice System

Nepal Asia 0.027 0.7 02 … … 58.1 02 … … 13.5 06 … …

Netherlands Europe 0.284 10.1 06 2.0% 11 380.8 06 0.6% 5 181.6 06 0.4% 5

New Zealand Oceania 0.569 26.2 06 0.5% 11 … … … … … … … …

Nicaragua Americas 0.087 4.4 06 … … 89.8 06 … … … … … …

Northern Ireland Europe 0.534 3.3 02 … … 1057.9 02 … … … … … …

Norway Europe 0.195 3.1 00 … … 309.7 05 … … 152.5 06 … …

Occupied Palestinian Territory Asia 0.023 … … … … … … … … 17.5 06 -8.3% 9

Oman Asia 0.051 … … … … 57.9 02 … … … … … …

Panama Americas 0.117 1.4 02 … … 251.6 06 … … 59.4 06 … …

Papua New Guinea Oceania 0.021 1.1 00 … … 39.3 00 … … 7.3 00 … …

Paraguay Americas 0.011 0.6 06 … … … … … … … … … …

Peru Americas 0.008 0.5 04 … … 11.9 02 … … … … … …

Poland Europe 0.115 5.9 06 3.1% 11 105.5 06 4.3% 5 82.4 06 7.2% 5

Portugal Europe 0.096 5.9 06 1.6% 11 86.5 06 -1.0% 11 56.6 06 3.5% 11

Qatar Asia 0.088 1.6 04 … … … … … … 74.6 00 … …

Republic of Korea Asia 0.545 24.5 04 3.2% 9 934.8 04 0.1% 9 145.7 04 -0.1% 9

Republic of Moldova Europe 0.026 1.7 06 -1.3% 11 28.6 00 -3.1% 5 16.7 06 -5.9% 11

Romania Europe 0.046 3.8 06 0.2% 11 25.7 06 -7.8% 11 27.6 06 -6.1% 11

Russian Federation Europe 0.033 … … … … 34.3 00 … … 26.7 00 … …

Saudi Arabia Asia 0.060 … … … … … … … … 41.4 02 … …

Scotland Europe 0.155 … … … … 138.8 05 -6.9% 10 120.5 05 -6.4% 10

Serbia Europe 0.000 0.1 06 … … … … … … … … … …

Singapore Asia 0.085 1.2 06 -4.3% 8 128.8 06 -5.4% 11 77.4 00 -15.5% 5

Slovakia Europe 0.051 2.6 06 0.8% 5 59.5 06 -2.3% 11 33.0 06 -3.1% 11

Slovenia Europe 0.061 2.3 06 -4.2% 11 79.4 06 -4.8% 11 44.3 06 4.2% 11

Spain Europe 0.043 2.1 06 2.6% 11 … … … … … … … …

Sri Lanka Asia 0.165 7.7 04 … … … … … … … … … …

Swaziland Africa 0.453 10.4 04 -5.8% 6 724.1 04 … … … … … …

Sweden Europe 0.166 6.3 06 4.7% 11 151.2 06 -4.8% 8 148.1 06 -2.8% 11

Switzerland Europe 0.081 3.9 06 … … … … … … … … … …

Syrian Arab Republic Asia 0.991 45.6 04 … … … … … … … … … …

TFYR Macedonia Europe 0.078 1.9 06 … … 126.4 06 … … 54.4 06 … …

Thailand Asia 0.187 1.0 00 0.2% 5 379.0 00 … … … … … …

Turkey Europe 0.456 2.7 06 1.9% 11 953.3 06 5.2% 11 271.4 06 … …

Ukraine Europe 0.017 1.0 06 -1.7% 11 18.6 06 … … 14.5 06 … …

United Arab Emirates Asia 1.000 … … … … … … … … 654.9 06 … …

United States of America Americas 0.456 21.0 06 -0.8% 11 … … … … … … … …

Uruguay Americas 0.070 8.7 04 16.7% 3 15.0 00 … … 11.6 00 … …

Venezuela Americas 0.058 … … … … 65.5 06 … … … … … …

Zambia Africa 0.107 1.3 00 … … … … … … 108.2 00 … …

Zimbabwe Africa 0.435 14.0 04 11.6% 7 330.8 00 … … 454.6 00 … …

**Median**

**Mean**

**Standard deviation**

2.4

5.2

8.0

82.6

194.0

262.3

44.3

97.1

138.6

**Legend: CPM** = Combined productivitiy measure; **SR** = Suspects per police officer ratio; **PPR** = Persons prosecuted ratio; **PCR** = Persons convicted ratio; **Y** = Reference year;

**ACR** = Average annual change rate; **TL** = Trend length

**Table 6. Total number of prisoners by total number of convictions and other punitivity**

**measuresbycountry**

**Country Region PR PC Y SIP Y PPO S >1yAO S >2yR S >1yT S**

Albania Europe 0.33 142.1 02 47.5 02 … … … … … … … …

Argentina Americas 0.77 67.8 02 52.5 06 … … … … … … … …

Armenia Asia 0.69 105.5 06 73.3 06 … … … … … … … …

Australia Oceania 1.38 69.2 04 95.5 04 33% ICVS … … … … … …

Austria Europe 0.14 524.8 06 73.5 06 13% EU ICS 5.2% ESB 30.7% ESB 8.5% ESB

Azerbaijan Asia 1.21 159.4 04 192.4 06 17% EU ICS … … … … … …

Bahrain Asia 0.23 302.4 04 70.2 06 … … … … … … … …

Belarus Europe 0.48 800.8 06 382.8 06 … … … … … … … …

Belgium Europe 0.03 1371.7 02 43.8 02 … … … … … … … …

Bolivia Americas 0.97 20.5 06 19.8 06 … … … … … … … …

Bosnia and Herzegovina Europe 0.07 481.5 06 34.7 06 … … … … … … … …

Bulgaria Europe 0.30 380.6 04 114.0 04 50% ICVS 10.9% ESB 18.1% ESB 12.5% ESB
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Canada Americas 0.08 849.1 06 72.1 06 44% ICVS … … … … … …

Chile Americas 0.44 317.7 04 138.7 04 … … … … … … … …

Costa Rica Americas 1.81 81.6 06 147.5 06 … … … … … … … …

Croatia Europe 0.10 567.9 06 54.8 06 … … 3.7% ESB 15.6% ESB 3.8% ESB

Cyprus Europe 0.34 174.4 06 58.6 06 … … 14.3% ESB 26.9% ESB 13.4% ESB

Czech Republic Europe 0.23 679.2 06 158.2 06 … … 5.2% ESB 22.6% ESB

2

5.3% ESB

Denmark Europe 0.05 944.5 06 51.1 06 18% EU ICS … … … … … …

Dominican Republic Americas 0.83 37.5 06 31.0 06 … … … … … … … …

Ecuador Americas 1.95 18.2 04 35.4 04 … … … … … … … …

Egypt Africa 0.01 7105.5 06 70.1 02 … … … … … … … …

El Salvador Americas 19.83 8.2 06 162.7 06 … … … … … … … …

England and Wales Europe 0.04 2645.5 06 118.2 06 51% EU ICS 2.2% ESB 63.8% ESB 6.7% ESB

Estonia Europe 0.26 942.4 04 242.8 06 26% ICVS … … … … … …

Finland Europe 0.01 4168.6 06 60.7 06 15% EU ICS 0.7% ESB 15.2% ESB 0.1% ESB

France Europe 0.06 981.0 00 56.0 00 13% EU ICS 3.6% ESB … … 6.7% ESB

Georgia Asia 0.60 383.4 06 228.2 06 … … 42.3% ESB 78.9% ESB 44.8% ESB

Germany Europe 0.11 698.1 06 74.2 06 19% EU ICS 3.2% ESB 51.3% ESB 3.8% ESB

Guatemala Americas 0.09 311.6 00 27.5 00 … … … … … … … …

Hong Kong SARC Asia 0.43 341.4 06 148.2 06 58% ICVS … … … … … …

Hungary Europe 0.12 979.4 04 120.6 04 29% EU ICS 4.8% ESB 38.2% ESB 3.9% ESB

Iceland Europe 0.03 881.4 04 30.6 04 16% ICVS … … … … … …

Israel Asia 0.38 578.4 06 219.3 06 … … … … … … …

Italy Europe 0.19 336.1 06 64.8 06 24% EU ICS 18.0% ESB 15.4% ESB 4.6% ESB

Japan Asia 0.82 67.8 06 55.4 06 55% ICVS … … … … … …

Kazakhstan Asia 1.33 213.0 06 282.6 06 … … … … … … … …

Kyrgyzstan Asia 0.92 255.2 06 235.7 06 … … … … … … … …

Latvia Europe 0.48 438.9 06 212.2 06 … … 22.7% ESB 34.6% ESB 28.3% ESB

Lithuania Europe 0.52 384.0 06 198.2 06 … … … … … … … …

Luxembourg Europe 0.04 958.6 02 37.7 02 16% EU ICS … … … … … …

Malaysia Asia 0.52 321.4 06 166.4 00 … … … … … … … …

Mauritius Africa 0.09 1431.6 04 132.9 06 … … … … … … … …

Mexico Americas 0.72 135.3 06 97.2 02 70% ICVS … … … … … …

Mongolia Asia 0.66 301.9 06 200.7 06 … … … … … … … …

Myanmar Asia 0.08 33.5 02 2.5 02 … … … … … … … …

Nepal Asia 1.06 10.6 06 11.2 02 … … … … … … … …

Netherlands Europe 0.05 747.9 06 40.1 06 32% EU ICS 1.8% ESB 7.7% ESB 0.9% ESB

New Zealand Oceania 0.05 2474.9 00 126.3 02 40% ICVS … … … … … …

Northern Ireland Europe 0.03 1513.7 06 51.2 06 53% ICVS 2.5% ESB 66.7% ESB 4.5% ESB

Norway Europe 0.18 303.3 06 54.0 05 29% ICVS … … … … … …

Panama Americas 0.96 140.8 06 134.5 06 … … … … … … … …

Papua New Guinea Oceania 10.29 3.8 00 38.8 00 … … … … … … … …

Philippines Asia 6.38 6.1 06 38.6 06 … … … … … … … …

Poland Europe 0.15 1284.9 06 197.5 06 34% ICVS 5.9% ESB 46.6% ESB 11.8% ESB

Portugal Europe 0.14 658.8 06 91.7 06 15% EU ICS 5.1% ESB 32.7% ESB 19.1% ESB

Qatar Asia 0.14 423.1 00 57.2 04 … … … … … … … …

Republic of Korea Asia 0.14 450.8 04 63.1 06 … … … … … … … …

Republic of Moldova Europe 0.60 335.3 06 202.1 06 … … … … … … … …

Romania Europe 0.52 263.2 06 138.1 06 … … 27.1% ESB 91.6% ESB 50.2% ESB

Russian Federation Europe 0.78 807.0 00 629.7 001 … … … … … … … …

Saudi Arabia Asia 0.20 273.1 02 53.9 02 … … … … … … … …

Scotland Europe 0.10 1090.0 05 111.5 06 49% ICVS 2.7% ESB 24.0% ESB 1.1% ESB

Singapore Asia 0.88 292.7 00 258.3 06 … … … … … … … …

Slovakia Europe 0.23 478.0 06 111.5 06 … … 5.1% ESB 16.4% ESB 5.9% ESB

Slovenia Europe 0.11 430.3 06 46.2 06 … … 8.9% ESB 41.7% ESB 9.9% ESB

Swaziland Africa 0.12 1291.0 00 156.9 06 … … … … … … … …

Sweden Europe 0.05 1313.4 06 63.1 06 33% EU ICS 2.5% ESB 13.8% ESB 0.9% ESB

Switzerland Europe 0.03 1496.7 06 43.1 06 12% ICVS 1.2% ESB 12.5% ESB 0.4% ESB

Syrian Arab Republic Asia 0.04 420.9 03 17.1 04 … … … … … … … …

TFYR Macedonia Europe 0.17 496.8 06 86.1 06 … … … … … … … …

Thailand Asia 0.17 961.9 06 163.3 06 … … … … … … … …

Turkey Europe 0.03 1306.1 06 36.5 06 53% ICVS3 1.4% ESB … … … …

Turkmenistan Asia 1.08 181.5 06 195.4 06 … … … … … … … …

Ukraine Europe 0.83 345.2 06 285.6 06 … … … … … … … …
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United Arab Emirates Asia 0.07 1934.1 06 143.2 06 … … … … … … … …

United Kingdom Europe 0.04 2388.1 02 106.3 02 … … … … … … … …

Uruguay Americas 0.80 146.8 00 118.1 04 … … … … … … … …

Venezuela Americas 2.18 17.6 00 38.3 02 … … … … … … … …

Zambia Africa 4.59 18.6 00 85.5 00 … … … … … … … …

Zimbabwe Africa 0.40 276.8 04 109.7 04 … … … … … … … …

**Median** 0.23 384.0 86.1

**Mean** 0.92 710.9 119.4

**Standard deviation** 2.56 1005.3 105.5

Greece Europe … … … 65.3 06 30% EU ICS 5.9% ESB … … … …

Ireland Europe … … … 58.5 06 38% EU ICS … … … … … …

Mozambique Africa … … … … … 42% ICVS6 … … … … … …

Peru Americas … … … 33.9 04 56% ICVS5 … … … … … …

South Africa Africa … … … 276.4 02 76% ICVS4 … … … … … …

Spain Europe … … … 106.9 04 17% EU ICS … … … … … …

United States of

America

Americas … … … 552.7 02 47% ICVS … … … … … …

**Legend:**

**PR** = Punitivity ratio; **PC** = Persons convicted per 100,000 population; **SIP** = Sentenced incarcerated persons per 100,000 population; **Y** = Reference year; **PPO** = Percentage of public

voting for prison in case of recidivist burglar; **>1yAO** = Percentage of all offences punished with unsuspended prison sentences of more than one year; **>2yR** = Percentage of robbery

offences punished with unsuspended prison sentences of more than two years; **>1yT** = Percentage of theft offences punished with unsuspended prison sentences of more than one

year; **S** = Source.

**Sources (other than UN-CTS):**

ICVS = International Crime Victim Survey (data taken from van Dijk. van Kesteren and Smit 2007, 149); EU ICS = European Crime and Safety Survey (data taken from van Dijk, van

Kesteren and Smit 2007, 149); ESB = European Sourcebook of Crime and Criminal Justice Statistics, 4th edition (Aebi et al. 2010).

**Footnotes:**

1 Total prison population instead of sentenced only.

2 Estimated value (only sanction range from one to under five years available).

3 Istanbul only.

4 Johannesburg only.

5 Lima only.

6 Maputo only.
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**AnnexBtochapter6:Methodologicalnotes**

**Datavalidation**

UN􀇦CTSdatawere providedun􀇦validatedby the

UN.Therefore,forthepurposesofthischapter,a

quality check was carried out on the data. All

data from countries with less than 100,000

inhabitantswereremoved(withtheexceptionof

the resultspresented in Figure 1)because ofthe

instabilityofthesedataduetothesmallabsolute

numbers.

Then,threetypesofchecksweremade,thefirst

two of these routinely for all variables used:

Trend check, internal validity check, other

sources check. The internal validity check was

always carried out after the trend check and

thereforealsoafterpossiblemodificationsdueto

thisfirstcheck.Othersourceswereonlychecked

forsuspicious valuesand onlywheresuch other

sourceswereavailable.

*Trend check*was acheck for consistency of data

within responses provided allover the reference

periodofthispublication(6thto10thUN􀇦CTS).It

wasmainlylookedfor significant“jumps”inthe

time series between adjacent UN􀇦CTS waves.

Where a gap in the time series existed since a

country did not respond to all waves, the trend

check was still carried out. However, the

acceptable thresholds for fluctuations were

adaptedinsuchacase.

*Internalvaliditycheck*wasacheckfor:

1.) Extreme, implausible outliers in the

responsesfromthedifferentcountries,i.e.values

totally outside the acceptable and expectable

variationofacertainvariable.

2.) Consistency of data within responses

provided to different questions of theUN􀇦CTS.

Thefollowingconsistencycheckswereroutinely

madeforchapter7:

*a) Prosecution personnel per police personnel:*

This ratiowasexpectedtobe farsmallerthan 1.

Thisrulewasneverviolated.

*b) Judges per police personnel:* This ratio was

expected to be far smaller than 1. This rule was

neverviolated.

*c)Juvenileprison staffbyadultprison staff:*This

ratiowasexpectedtobesmallerthan1.Thisrule

wasneverviolated.

*c)Personsprosecutedbypersonssuspected:*This

ratio was expected to be smaller than 1. If this

rule was violated, data and trend for both

variables were thoroughly checked. If the data

seemed trustworthy except for the violation of

this rule, this was accepted if the ratio was not

much bigger than 1, because this might be

explained by incomplete statistical recording at

police level (e.g. restricted to certain offence

types etc.) and other factors, such as time lags

withinthecriminaljusticeprocess.

*d) Persons brought before court by persons*

*suspected:*This ratiowasexpected tobe smaller

than1.Violationswerehandledasunder2.c).

*e) Persons convicted by persons suspected:* This

ratio was expected to be smaller than 1.

Violationswerehandledasunder2.c).

*f ) Persons convicted by persons prosecuted:*This

ratio was expected to be smaller than 1.

Violationswerehandledasunder2.c).

*g) Persons convicted by persons brought before*

*court:*Thisratiowasexpectedtobesmallerthan

1.Violationswerenotaccepted.

*h) Pre􀇦trial detainees by total prison population:*

This ratio was expected to be smaller than 1.

Violationswerenotaccepted.

*i)Sentencedprisonersbytotalprisonpopulation:*

This ratio was expected to be smaller than or

equalto1.Violationswerenotaccepted.

*j) Pre􀇦trial detainees plus sentenced prisoners by*

*total prison population:* This ratio was expected

to be equal to or moderately lower than 1.

Violations were accepted in both directions, if

not too extreme, for lower ratios already due to

the existence of other categories (“convicted

awaiting sentence” and “other”) in theUN􀇦CTS

data, for higher ratios due to possible

overlapping between both categories and / or

doublecounts.

*k) Adult prisoners by total prison population:*

This ratio was expected to be smaller than or

equal to 1. Violations were not accepted in

principle. However, in the case of very small

differences (excessof lessthan 10%)thesewere

allowed if the data were plausible in all other

respects,becausethedifferencesmightbedueto

different sources or reference dates for these

data.
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*l) Juvenile prisoners by total prison population:*

This ratiowasexpectedtobe farsmallerthan 1.

Thisrulewasneverviolated.

*m)Adultprisonersplusjuvenileprisonersbytotal*

*prisonpopulation:*This ratiowas expected tobe

equal to 1. Violationswere sometimes accepted:

Lower values are possible in general due to the

fact that the breakdown by adults and juveniles

might refer to *sentenced* prisonersonly in some

countries. Higher values than 1 are more

problematic and can only be explained by

differences in statistical recording. These have

only been accepted if the excesswas lower than

10 % and the data were plausible in all other

respects.

When a suspected inconsistency was found, a

decisionhadtobemadeastohowtodealwithit.

Basicallytherewerethreepossibilities:

􀇦 The suspected value was replaced by another

value for the same variable and the same year,

butfromanothersource.

􀇦 The suspected value was replaced by another

value for thesame variable fromanother year if

more consistent figures could be found within

theUN􀇦CTSdata.Thiswas onlypossible within

the restrictions for the points in time as

describedbelow.

􀇦 The suspected value was removed without

replacement.

Apart from the process described, values for a

certain country that were missing in a UN􀇦CTS

surveywavewerenotaddedtothedatafromthe

othersources.

A complete listing of all inconsistencies found

andtheactionstakencanbefoundinAnnexC.

**Latestavailableyearandstart/endyearfortrendanalysis**

If available, the year 2006 from the 10th survey

was taken. Otherwise the latest available year

was taken, provided this yearwas 2000 or later.

Data from 1999orearlierwerenot used for this

datapoint.

Inordertoincludeasmanycountriesaspossible

in trend analysis, trends were computed using

only two points in time (start and end). The

earliest starting date for trends was – different

from most other chapters in this book – not

1996,but 1995,because resources variableswere

only covered for 1995 and 1997 in the 6th UN􀇦

CTS. The years 1995 (preferred) to 2001 were

accepted as possible starting dates for trend

analysis,whereastheyears2006(preferred)back

to2000wereacceptedaspossibleenddates.The

end date for trend analysis is therefore always

identical to the latest available year throughout

chapter7.Thestartingandendyearcanalsobe

seen directlyinthe table, allowingthe readerto

interpret the results correctly. In trend tables

there are always two values printed for each

country which had at least two values available

thatcouldbeconsideredasstartingdateandend

datebasedontherulesabove.

**Averageannualchangerate**

When presenting and comparing trends, the

complication is that the period is not the same

for every country: e.g. for some countries the

'start'yearcouldbe1995andthe'end'year2006,

for others this could be 2000 and 2004. To

circumvent this, the mean *annual* change was

computedwiththefollowingformula:

Ifx1isthevalueatyeart1andx2thevalueatyear

t2(witht2>t1),themeanannualchangeis:

(x2/x1)1/(t

2

􀇦t

1

)􀇦1

This mean annual change was computed

betweenthe 'start'and 'end' (formostcountries

1995–2006).Butofcourseitwouldbeuselessto

calculateanaverageannualchangeratewithonly

one or two years in between these dates.

Therefore,annualaveragechangerateswereonly

calculatedif(endyear􀇦startyear>=3).
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**Summarymeasuresinfiguresandtables**

When computing figures per regions and sub􀇦

regionsthenon􀇦weightedmedianwascalculated.

This means that the rates of large and small

countrieshaveequalweightwhencalculatingthe

median. The choice was made to facilitate

comparison of crime rates between countries

without taking into account the size of the

country. The disadvantage of the method is that

onecannotexactlyestimatetheoverallpictureof

criminaljusticeindifferentregions.Accurateand

complete regional comparisons are, however,

impossible because not all countries have

respondedtotheUN􀇦CTS.

Calculationofmedianswasdonepartiallyonthe

regional and partially on the sub􀇦regional level,

basedontheavailablenumberofobservations.In

general, medians were not calculated for a sub􀇦

region if there were only three or less reporting

countriesthere.Thereweresomeexceptionsfrom

this rule where this was necessary in order to

separately show the results for other sub􀇦regions

within the same region with more than three

reportingcountries.

In order to document the restrictions for the

interpretation of medians, but still be able to

report as differentiated as possible, the total n

valuesforeachregion/sub􀇦regionwereincluded

in the figure. Sometimes, medians were even

calculated for only two values,where considered

necessary (e.g. for Oceania not to lose it

completely).Inordertoavoidmisinterpretations,

inthesecasesthesetwocountrieswereexplicitly

listeddirectlyinthefigure.

The lines “1st Quartile”, “Median” and “3rd

Quartile” in the other figures refer to the non􀇦

weighted Quartiles (1st, 2nd, 3rd) of the respective

ratio(e.g.infigure6:suspectsperpoliceofficer).

Most tables feature the following summary

measures:median,mean,andstandarddeviation.

Aswiththemedianscalculatedforthefiguresby

regions and sub􀇦regions, these measures are

calculated without weighting them by

population. Since these summary measures refer

tothetotalofrespondingcountries,thisdecision

was necessary in order to avoid the

misinterpretation that the total medians, means

and standard deviations would represent “the

world”intotal.
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**AnnexCtochapter6:Datamodifications**

The following modifications only refer to variables

that were analyzed for chapter 7, not to other

variables, also not to those solely used for the

purposesofinternalvaliditychecks.

Ifavalueislistedtohavebeen*deleted*,itisexplicitly

notedifithasbeenreplacedbyavaluefromanother

source or from the UN􀇦CTS, but from outside the

usualtimerange.However,itisnotexplicitlylistedif

ithasbeenreplacedbyavaluefromanadjacentUN􀇦

CTSinaccordancewiththegeneralselectionrulesas

described in Annex B. Such values have been

automatically selected asreplacement values if they

werewithinthegeneralrangeforstartorend(=i.e.:

latestavailable)yearoftrendanalysis.

**Policepersonnel**

**Azerbaijan:** Trend check failed for 8th UN-CTS (2001 / 2002); deleted.

**Belgium:** Trend and other sources check failed for 6th UN-CTS (1995 – 1997); deleted; used ESB 2nd edition data for 1995 instead.

**Chile:** Trend check failed for 6th UN-CTS (1995 – 1997); deleted; used 5th UN-CTS data for 1994 (instead of 1995).

**Costa Rica:** Trend check failed; deleted 7th and 9th UN-CTS (1998 – 2000; 2005 / 2006).

**Maldives:** Trend check failed; deleted 6th and 8th UN-CTS (1995 – 1997; 2001 / 2002).

**Mexico:** Trend check failed for 9th UN-CTS (2003 / 2004); deleted.

**Spain:** Trend and other sources check failed for 6th UN-CTS (1995 – 1997); deleted; used ESB 1st edition data for 1995 instead.

**Turkey:** Corrected typo in 2006 data.

**Totalnumberofpersonssuspected/arrested/cautioned**

**Austria:** Trend and other sources check failed for 8th UN-CTS (2001 / 2002); deleted; used ESB 3rd edition data for 2001 instead.

**England & Wales:** Trend and other sources check failed for 6th UN-CTS (1995 – 1997); deleted; used ESB 2nd edition data for

1995 instead.

**Greece:** Trend and other sources check failed; deleted 7th and 10th UN-CTS (1998 – 2000; 2005 / 2006); deleted; used ESB 4th

edition data for 2006 instead.

**Latvia:** Trend and other sources check failed; deleted 6th and 10th UN-CTS (1995 – 1997; 2005 / 2006); deleted; used ESB 4th

edition data for 2005 / 2006 instead, but not ESB 2nd edition data for 1995 – 1997, because the latter values also failed trend

check.

**Malaysia:** Trend check failed; deleted 6th and 10th UN-CTS (1995 – 1997; 2005 / 2006).

**Morocco:** Trend check failed for 7th UN-CTS (1998 – 2000); deleted.

**Nepal:** Trend check failed for 10th UN-CTS (2005 / 2006); deleted.

**Occupied Palestine Territory:** Trend check failed for 1995 value from 6th UN-CTS; deleted.

**Panama:** Trend check failed; deleted 6th and 7th UN-CTS (1995 – 1997; 1998 – 2000).

**Paraguay:** Trend check failed for 7th UN-CTS (1998 – 2000); deleted.

**Singapore:** Trend check failed for 6th UN-CTS (1995 – 1997); deleted.

**Spain:** Trend and other sources check failed for 6th UN-CTS (1995 – 1997); deleted; used ESB 2nd edition data for 1995 instead.

**Thailand:** Trend check and internal validity check failed for 10th UN-CTS (2005 / 2006); deleted.

**Venezuela:** Internal validity check failed for 7th UN-CTS (1998 – 2000); deleted.

**Prosecutionpersonnel**

**Argentina:** According to 10th UN-CTS metadata, 2006 data only cover federal and Buenos Aires City personnel; excluded from

comparison.

**Bahrain:** Internal validity check failed for 6th UN-CTS; deleted.

**Chile:** Trend check failed; deleted 7th and 8th UN-CTS (1998 – 2000; 2001 / 2002).

**El Salvador:** Trend check failed for 7th UN-CTS (1998 – 2000); deleted.

**England & Wales:** Trend check failed; deleted 7th and 8th UN-CTS (1998 – 2000; 2001 / 2002).

**Georgia:** Trend check failed for 9th UN-CTS (2003 / 2004); deleted.

**Malta:** Trend and internal validity check failed for 2002 value from 8th UN-CTS; deleted.

**Mexico:** Trend and internal validity check failed for 1999 value from 7th UN-CTS; deleted.

**Pakistan:** Internal validity check failed for 7th UN-CTS (1998 – 2000); deleted.

**Peru:** Trend check failed for 6th UN-CTS (1995 – 1997); deleted.

**Sri Lanka:** Internal validity check failed for 9th UN-CTS (2003 / 2004); deleted.

**Sweden:** Trend and other sources check failed for 6th UN-CTS (1995 – 1997); deleted; used ESB 1st edition data for 1995 instead.
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**Totalnumberofpersonsprosecuted**

**Chile:** Trend check failed for 8th UN-CTS (2001 / 2002); deleted.

**Cyprus:** Trend and internal validity check failed for all survey waves; all deleted.

**Ecuador:** Trend and internal validity check failed for 10th UN-CTS (2005 / 2006).

**England & Wales:** Trend check failed for 6th UN-CTS (1995 – 1997); deleted; internal validity check failed for 2001 value from 8th

CTS.

**Guatemala:** Internal validity check failed for 7th UN-CTS (1998 – 2000); deleted.

**Ireland:** Trend check failed for 10th UN-CTS (2005 / 2006); deleted.

**Latvia:** Trend check failed for 2006 value from 10th UN-CTS; deleted.

**Malta:** Trend check failed for 9th UN-CTS (2003 / 2004); deleted.

**Nepal:** Trend and internal validity check failed for 10th UN-CTS (2005 / 2006); deleted.

**Northern Ireland:** Trend check failed for 6th UN-CTS (1995 – 1997); deleted.

**Republic of Moldova:** Trend and internal validity check failed; deleted 8th and 9th UN-CTS values (2001 / 2002; 2003 / 2004).

**Swaziland:** Trend and internal validity check failed for 10th UN-CTS (2005 / 2006); deleted.

**United Arab Emirates:** Internal validity check failed for 10th UN-CTS (2005 / 2006); deleted.

**United States of America:** Trend check failed for 10th UN-CTS (2005 / 2006); deleted.

**Venezuela:** Trend and internal validity check failed for 8th UN-CTS (2001 / 2002); deleted.

**Zambia:** Internal validity check failed for 7th UN-CTS (1998 - 2000); deleted.

**Professionaljudges**

**Colombia:** Trend check failed for 9th UN-CTS (2003 / 2004); deleted.

**Denmark:** Trend check failed for 10th UN-CTS (2005 / 2006); deleted.

**England & Wales:** Trend check failed for 6th UN-CTS (1995 – 1997); deleted.

**Germany:** Trend and other sources check failed; deleted 9th and 10th UN-CTS (2003 / 2004; 2005 / 2006); used data taken from

the Federal Statistical Office in Germany for 2006 instead.

**Maldives:** Trend and internal validity check failed for all survey waves; all deleted.

**Northern Ireland:** Trend check failed for 6th UN-CTS (1995 – 1997); deleted.

**Pakistan:** Internal validity check failed for 7th UN-CTS (1998 – 2000); deleted.

**Slovakia:** Trend check failed for 10th UN-CTS (2005 / 2006); deleted.

**United States of America:** According to 10th UN-CTS metadata, 2005 / 2006 data only cover federal judges; excluded from

comparison. Trend check also failed for 1997 value from 6th UN-CTS; deleted.

**Totalnumberofpersonsbroughtbeforethecriminalcourts**

**Afghanistan:** Internal validity check failed for 8th UN-CTS (2001 / 2002); deleted.

**Australia:** Trend and internal validity check failed for all survey waves; all deleted.

**Bahrain:** Trend and internal validity check failed for all survey waves; all deleted.

**Bolivia:** Trend and internal validity check failed for 10th UN-CTS (2005 / 2006); deleted.

**Colombia:** Trend and internal validity check failed for all survey waves; all deleted.

**Costa Rica:** Trend check failed for 6th UN-CTS (1995 – 1997); deleted.

**Cyprus:** Trend and internal validity check failed for all survey waves; all deleted.

**Denmark:** Trend check failed; deleted 6th to 9th UN-CTS (1995 – 1997; 1998 – 2000; 2001 / 2002; 2003 / 2004).

**El Salvador:** Trend check failed for 6th UN-CTS (1995 – 1997); deleted.

**England & Wales:** Trend check failed for 6th UN-CTS (1995 – 1997); deleted.

**Japan:** Trend check failed; deleted 6th and 7th UN-CTS (1995 – 1997; 1998 – 2000).

**Luxembourg:** Internal validity check failed for 8th UN-CTS (2001 / 2002); deleted.

**Malta:** Trend and internal validity check failed for 9th UN-CTS (2003 / 2004); deleted.

**Mauritius:** Trend and internal validity check failed for 10th UN-CTS (2005 / 2006); deleted.

**Myanmar:** Internal validity check failed for 8th UN-CTS (2001 / 2002); deleted.

**Northern Ireland:** Trend check failed for 6th UN-CTS (1995 – 1997); deleted.

**Occupied Palestine Territory:** Internal validity check failed for 10th UN-CTS (2005 / 2006); deleted.

**Saudi Arabia:** Internal validity check failed for 7th UN-CTS (1998 – 2000); deleted.

**Sweden:** Internal validity check failed for all survey waves; all deleted.

**Turkey:** Trend check failed for 8th UN-CTS (2001 / 2002); deleted.

**Turkmenistan:** Internal validity check failed; deleted 9th and 10th UN-CTS (2003 / 2004; 2005 / 2006).

**United States of America:** Trend and internal validity check failed for 10th UN-CTS (2005 / 2006); deleted.

**Venezuela:** Internal validity check failed for 7th UN-CTS (1998 – 2000); deleted.
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**Totalnumberofpersonsconvicted**

**Chile:** Trend and internal validity check failed; deleted 7th and 8th UN-CTS values (1998 – 2000; 2001 / 2002).

**Colombia:** Trend and internal validity check failed for all survey waves; all deleted.

**Costa Rica:** Trend check failed for 6th UN-CTS (1995 – 1997); deleted.

**Cyprus:** Trend, internal validity and other sources check failed; deleted 7th to 10th; used ESB 4th edition data for 2006 instead.

**Denmark:** Trend check failed for 8th UN-CTS (2001 / 2002); deleted.

**England & Wales:** Trend and other sources check failed for 6th UN-CTS (1995 – 1997); deleted; used ESB 2nd edition data for

1995 / 1996 instead.

**Malta:** Internal validity check failed for 9th UN-CTS (2003 / 2004).

**Mauritius:** Trend and internal validity check failed for 10th UN-CTS (2005 / 2006); deleted.

**Northern Ireland:** Trend and other sources check failed; deleted 6th to 8th UN-CTS (1995 – 1997; 1998 – 2000; 2001 / 2002); used

ESB 2nd edition data for 1995 / 1996 and 4th edition for the missing 2006 instead.

**Sweden:** Trend and other sources check failed; deleted 6th to 9th UN-CTS (1995 – 1997; 1998 – 2000; 2001 / 2002, 2003 / 2004);

used ESB 2nd edition data for 1995 / 1996 instead.

**Turkey:** Trend check failed for 2002 value from 8th UN-CTS; deleted.

**Totalstaffinadultprisons**

**Colombia:** Trend check failed; deleted 6th and 7th UN-CTS (1995 – 1997; 1998 – 2000).

**Ecuador:** Trend check failed for 8th UN-CTS (2001 / 2002); deleted.

**El Salvador:** Trend and internal validity check failed for 10th UN-CTS (2005 / 2006); deleted.

**Maldives:** Trend and internal validity check failed for 7th UN-CTS (1998 – 2000); deleted.

**Mexico:** Trend and internal validity check failed for all survey waves; all deleted.

**Ukraine:** Trend and internal validity check failed for 6th UN-CTS (1995 – 1997); deleted.

**Totalstaffinjuvenileprisons**

**Czech Republic:** Trend check failed; deleted 7th to 9th UN-CTS (1998 – 2000; 2001 / 2002; 2003 / 2004).

**Maldives:** Trend and internal validity check failed for 7th UN-CTS (1998 – 2000); deleted.

**Mexico:** Trend and internal validity check failed for all survey waves; all deleted.

**Phillipines:** Trend and internal validity check failed for all survey waves; all deleted.

**Totalnumberofpersonsincarcerated**

**Argentina:** Trend check failed for 6th UN-CTS (1995 – 1997); deleted.

**Azerbaijan:** Trend check failed for 7th UN-CTS (1998 – 2000); deleted.

**Cyprus:** Trend and other sources check failed; deleted 8th and 10th UN-CTS (2001 / 2002; 2005 / 2006); used ESB 4th edition data

for 2006 instead.

**Jordan:** Trend check failed for 6th UN-CTS (1995 – 1997); deleted.

**Maldives:** Internal validity check failed for 7th UN-CTS (1998 – 2000); deleted.

**Mauritius:** Trend check failed; deleted 6th and 9th UN-CTS (1995 – 1997; 2003 / 2004).

**Sri Lanka:** Trend check failed for 6th UN-CTS (1995 – 1997); deleted.

**Swaziland:** Trend check failed for 7th UN-CTS (1998 – 2000); deleted.

**Numberofsentencedpersonsincarcerated**

**Argentina:** Trend check failed for 6th UN-CTS (1995 – 1997); deleted.

**Cyprus:** Trend and other sources check failed; deleted 8th and 10th UN-CTS (2001 / 2002; 2005 / 2006); used ESB 4th edition data

for 2006 for the variables “total number of prisoners: stock” and “of which in pre-trial detention: stock” to calculate a

replacement value.

**Jordan:** Trend check failed for 6th UN-CTS (1995 – 1997); deleted.

**Kazakhstan:** Trend check failed; deleted 6th and 7th UN-CTS (1995 – 1997; 1998 – 2000).

**Kyrgyzstan:** Trend check failed for 7th UN-CTS (1998 – 2000); deleted.

**Latvia:** Trend check failed for 7th UN-CTS (1998 – 2000); deleted.

**Maldives:** Trend and internal validity check failed for 7th UN-CTS (1998 – 2000); deleted.

**Mauritius:** Trend check failed for 9th UN-CTS (2003 / 2004); deleted.

**Morocco:** Trend check failed for 9th UN-CTS (2003 / 2004); deleted.

**Paraguay:** Trend and internal validity check failed for 7th UN-CTS (1998 – 2000); deleted.

**Phillipines:** Trend and internal validity check failed; deleted 7th and 8th UN-CTS values (1998 – 2000; 2001 / 2002).

**Swaziland:** Trend check failed for 7th UN-CTS (1998 – 2000); deleted.
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Chapter7– Trendsinworldprisonpopulation

**RoyWalmsley\***

**Abstract**

Thechapterfocusesonthreetopicsrelatingtointernationalprisonpopulationlevels.First,itexaminesthe

patternofchangestoprisonpopulationlevelsduringthedecade1997􀇦2007.Changesoverthewholedecade

andinthemostrecentfiveyearsareconsideredseparately.Second,inrespectofpre􀇦trial/remanddetention,

the chapter identifies the countries with the highest proportion of their prison population held in such

conditionsin2007andfinally,asanindicationofovercrowding,attentionisdrawntothehighestoccupancy

levels in 2007. In each case the figures areshown continentby continent.Theoverall trend is that prison

populationshavegrownduringthedecade1997􀇦2007.Prisonpopulationratesrosebetween1997and2007in

68%ofthecountriesstudied.Therewaslittledifferencebetweenthecontinentsintermsoftheproportion

ofcountriesshowinggrowth inprisonpopulationrates: ineverycontinenttherewasgrowth in60􀇦75%of

countries.Thereweresharpcontrastsbetweenthehighestandlowestprisonpopulationlevelsinthesame

continent. Of the countries on which information was available 45% had at least 30% of their prison

population in pre􀇦trial/remand detention in 2007, and in 20% of the countries at least half the prison

populationwereheldinsuchconditions.Pre􀇦trial/remanddetentionlevelsweregenerallyhigherinAfrica,

theAmericasandAsiathaninEuropeandOceania.Ofthecountriesonwhichinformationwasavailablethe

prisonsystemin61%hadmorethan100%occupancyin2007andin22%theoccupancylevelwasover150%.

Occupancy levels were highest in countries in Africa, the Americas and Asia but also exceeded 100% in

almostahalfofEuropeancountries.

**Introduction**

This chapter focuses on three topics relating to

international prison population levels. First, it

examines the pattern of changes to prison

population levels during the decade 1997􀇦2007.

Changes over the whole decade and in themost

recent five years are considered separately. In

addition, attention is drawn to the highest and

lowestprisonpopulationratesin2007.Second,in

respect of pre􀇦trial/remand detention, the

Chapteridentifiesthecountrieswiththehighest

proportion of their prison population held in

such conditions in 2007 and finally, as an

indicationofovercrowding,attentionisdrawnto

thehighestoccupancylevelsin2007.Ineachcase

the figures are shown continent by continent.A

finalsectiondrawstogetherthemainpointsthat

emergefromthesefindings.

The data used are in respect of a total of 144

UnitedNationsmember􀇦states(three􀇦quartersof

all member􀇦states): 30 in Africa, 31 in the

Americas, 27 in Asia, 46 in Europe and 10 in

Oceania.

Sources are the national prison administrations,

the Ministries responsible for prisons, national

statistical offices and data provided by these

bodiesto,forexample,theUnitedNationsCrime

Trends Surveys, the Asian and Pacific

Conferences forCorrectionalAdministratorsand

the Council of Europe Annual Penal Statistics

(SPACE).

\*AssociateoftheInternationalCentreforPrisonStudies,London
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**Changesinprisonpopulationlevels**

Figures 1􀇦18 show the changes in prison

population rates over the years 1997􀇦2007 and

2002􀇦2007. Where figures for one of those two

yearsarenotavailable,thoseforadatewithintwo

years of the intended date are substituted and

asterisked.

**Africa**

Ofthetwenty􀇦fiveUnitedNationsmemberstates

inAfricaonwhichthenecessaryinformationwas

available (1997􀇦2007), the prison population rose

duringthisdecadeintwentyandfellinfive.Rises

of more than 50% were recorded in eight

countries.Infivecountriestheprisonpopulation

fell(Annex1,tables1and2).

However, the best indicator of trends in overall

prison population levels is not the prison

population total but the prison population rate

per 100,000 of the national population. The

former is affected by changes in the size of the

nationalpopulationandprovidesthereforealess

accuratepictureofthetrends.

Removingtheeffectofchangesinthesizeofthe

national population (which was rising in most

countries)revealsthatalthoughtherewasindeed

substantial growth over the decade the growth

affected slightly fewer countries and was less

markedthanthechangesintheprisonpopulation

totalshadindicated.Infacttheprisonpopulation

raterosein15ofthe25countriesandfellin8.In

theremainingtwotheratewasunchanged.

Rises of more than 25% were recorded in eight

countries(figure1).Itistobenotedthatwhereas

eightcountrieshadatleast50%increasesintheir

prisonpopulation totals, thecorresponding level

of increases in prison population rates was

markedly lower. The prison population rate

decreasedineightcountries(figure2).Becauseof

the growth in national populations in most

countries the decreases were greater than the

decreasesinprisonpopulationtotals.

Thefigures1􀇦2haveshownthechangesinprison

population rates over the whole decade 1997􀇦

2007. However, it is changes in the most recent

five years(2002􀇦07)thatareperhaps ofthemost

immediate interest:Ofthe thirtyUnitedNations

member states in Africa on which the necessary

information was available, prison population

rates rose during this five􀇦year period in fifteen

and fell in fifteen. Rises of more than 20% were

recorded in eight countries (figure 3). Falls of

more than 20% were recorded in six countries

(figure4).

**Figure1.LargestincreasesinAfricanprison**

**populationrates(per100,000ofthenational**

**population)1997􀍲2007(%)**
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**Figure2.LargestdecreasesinAfricanprison**

**populationrates(per100,000ofthenational**

**population)1997􀍲2007(%)**
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**Figure3.LargestincreasesinAfricanprison**

**populationrates(per100,000ofthenational**

**population)2002􀍲2007(%)**
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**Figure4.LargestdecreasesinAfricanprison**
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**Americas**

Of the thirty􀇦oneUnited Nationsmember states

in the Americas on which the necessary

informationwasavailable(1997􀇦2007),theprison

population rose in 27 and fell in four. Rises of

more than 50% were recorded in 11 countries

(Annex, table 3) In four countries the prison

populationfell1997􀇦2007(Annex,table4).

However, as stated above, the best indicator of

trends in overall prison population levels is not

the prison population total but the prison

population rate per 100,000 of the national

population.

AsinAfrica,removingtheeffectofchangesinthe

size of the national population reveals that

although there was indeed substantial growth

overthedecade,thegrowthaffectedslightlyfewer

countries and was less marked than the changes

in the prison population totals had indicated. In

facttheprisonpopulationraterosein23ofthe31

countriesandfellineight.

Rises of more than 25% were recorded in 13

countries(figure5).Alsoparalleltothesituation

in Africa, it is to be noted that whereas 11

countries had at least 50% increases in their

prisonpopulation *total*s, thecorresponding level

of increases in prison population *rates* was

markedlylower.

The prison population rate decreased in eight

countries (figure 6). Because of the growth in

national populations in most countries the

decreases were generally greater than the

decreasesinprisonpopulationnumbers.

Of the 31 United Nations ember tates in the

Americasonwhichthenecessaryinformationwas

available (2002􀇦2007), prison population rates

rose during this five􀇦year period in 23, fell in

seven and remained unchanged in one. Rises of

more than 20% were recorded in 12 countries

(figure 7). Only one of the seven countries that

registered falls in this period had a fall of more

than20%(figure8).

**Figure5.Largestincreasesinprisonpopulation**

**ratesintheAmericas(per100,000ofthe**

**nationalpopulation)1997􀍲2007(%)**

0 20 40 60 80 100 120 140

Barbados\*

Paraguay

Guyana

Peru

Chile

Haiti

ElSalvador

Argentina

Mexico

Ecuador

Uruguay\*

Brazil

StKittsandNevis

**Figure6.Largestdecreasesinprisonpopulation**

**ratesintheAmericas(per100,000ofthe**

**nationalpopulation)1997􀍲2007(%)**
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**Figure7.Largestincreasesinprisonpopulation**

**ratesintheAmericas(per100,000ofthe**
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**Figure8.Largestdecreasesinprisonpopulation**

**ratesintheAmericas(per100,000ofthe**

**nationalpopulation)2002􀍲2007(%)**
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**Asia**

Of the 23UnitedNationsmember states in Asia

onwhichthenecessaryinformationwasavailable,

the prisonpopulation roseduring thisdecade in

18 and fell in five. Rises of more than 50% were

recorded in 12 countries. In five countries the

prisonpopulationfell(Annex1,tables5and6).

The prison population rates show that although

there was indeed substantial growth over the

decadethegrowthaffectedonecountryfewerand

was less marked than the changes in the prison

populationtotalshadindicated.Infacttheprison

populationraterosein17ofthe23countriesand

fellinsix.

Rises of more than 25% were recorded in 11

countries (figure 9).Whereas 12countrieshadat

least 50% increases in their prison population

*totals,* the corresponding level of increases in

prisonpopulation*rates*wasmarkedlylower.

The prison population rate decreased in six

countries (figure 10). Because of the growth in

national populations in most countries, the

decreases were generally greater than the

decreasesinprisonpopulationnumbers.

Of the 26UnitedNationsmember states in Asia

onwhichthenecessaryinformationwasavailable,

prisonpopulation ratesroseduringthis five􀇦year

period (2002􀇦2007) in thirteen and fell in

thirteen.Risesofmorethan20%wererecordedin

ninecountries(figure11).

Falls of more than 20% were recorded in six

countries(figure12).

**Figure9.LargestincreasesinAsianprison**

**populationrates(per100,000ofthenational**

**population)1997􀍲2007(%)**

0 40 80 120 160 200

India\*

BruneiDarussalam\*

Vietnam\*

Bangladesh

SaudiArabia\*

Tajikistan\*

Japan

SriLanka

Israel

Cambodia

Indonesia

**Figure10.LargestdecreasesinAsianprison**
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**Figure11.LargestincreasesinAsianprison**
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**Figure12.LargestdecreasesinAsianprison**
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**Europe**

Of the 45 United Nations member states in

Europe on which the necessary information was

available, the prison population rose during this

decade (1997􀇦2007) in 30 and fell in 15. Rises of

morethan50%wererecordedin12countries.Of

the15countrieswheretheprisonpopulationfell,

inninethedecreasewasmorethan20%(Annex1,

tables7and8).

Turning to themore reliable indicator of change

in prison population trends, the prison

population rates show that there was indeed

substantial growth over the decade and it was

scarcely less marked than the changes in the

prisonpopulationtotalshadindicated.Infact,as

with the prison population totals, the prison

populationratesrosein30ofthe45countriesand

fellin15.

WhereasinAfrica,theAmericasandAsiaprison

population rates showed the rises to be less

marked than had been indicated by the prison

population totals, this was much less evident in

European countries; this is because national

population totals were fairly stable in many

countriesandinotherstheywerefalling.Indeed,

ratesrosebyatleast50%intencountries(figure

13), justtwo lessthanrecordedat least50% rises

intheirprisonpopulationtotals.Ratesrosebyat

least25%in18countries.

The prison population rate decreased in 15

countries,ineightofwhichthedecreaseexceeded

20% (figure 14). The size of the decreases was

similar to the size of the decreases in prison

populationtotals.

Of the 45 United Nations member states in

Europe on which the necessary information was

available,prisonpopulationratesroseduringthis

five􀇦year period (2002􀇦2007) in 32 and fell in 14.

Rises of more than 20% were recorded in 13

countries(figure15).Fallsofmorethan20%were

recordedinsevencountries(figure16).

**Figure13.LargestincreasesinEuropeanprison**

**populationrates(per100,000ofthenational**

**population)1997􀍲2007(%)**
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**Figure14.LargestdecreasesinEuropeanprison**

**populationrates(per100,000ofthenational**
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**Figure15.LargestincreasesinEuropeanprison**

**populationrates(per100,000ofthenational**

**population)2002􀍲2007(%)**
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**Figure16.LargestdecreasesinEuropeanprison**

**populationrates(per100,000ofthenational**

**population)2002􀍲2007 (%)**
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**Oceania**

Of the ten United Nations member states in

Oceaniaonwhichthenecessaryinformationwas

available, the prison population rose during this

decade (1997􀇦2007) in nine countries (in two of

them by more than 50%) and fell in one. The

changesareshowninAnnex1,table9.

The prison population rates show that although

there was indeed substantial growth over the

decade the growth affected fewer countries and

was less marked than the changes in the prison

populationtotalshadindicated.Infacttheprison

populationrateroseinsixofthetencountries(in

threeofthembymorethan25%)andfellinfour

(intwoofthembymorethan20%).Thechanges

areshowninfigure17.

Of the ten United Nations member states in

Oceaniaonwhichthenecessaryinformationwas

available, the prison population rose during this

five􀇦year period (2002􀇦2007) in seven countries

(inoneofthemby50%)andfellinthree(intwo

of them by more than 20%). The changes are

showninfigure18.

This chapter has focused on prison population

trendswithoutcommentingontheactualsizeof

theprisonpopulation.Annex2showsthehighest

and lowest prison population rates (per 100,000

of the national population) in each continent in

2007. They are based on an analysis of prison

population levels inthe144countriescoveredby

theabovestudyofprisonpopulationtrends.

**Figure17.Changesinprisonpopulationratesin**

**Oceania(per100,000ofthenationalpopulation)**
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**Figure18.Changesinprisonpopulationratesin**

**Oceania(per100,000ofthenationalpopulation)**

**2002􀍲2007(%)**

􀍲60 􀍲30 0 30 60

Tonga

Samoa

Micronesia(Fed.Statesof)

PapuaNewGuinea

Fiji

Australia

Vanuatu

Kiribati

NewZealand

SolomonIslands

159

*International Statistics on Crime and Criminal Justice*

Prison population

**Countrieswiththehighestproportionoftheirprison**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**population**

**inpre􀍲trial/remanddetention**

International standards emphasise that pre􀇦

trial/remand detention should be used as

sparingly as possible and that those who are so

detainedshouldremaininsuchconditionsforas

shortatimeaspossible.Neverthelessforavariety

of reasons in many countries such prisoners

constitute a high proportion of the total prison

population. The following figures show for each

continent the countries with the highest

proportion of their prison population in pre􀇦

trial/remanddetentionin2007.Wherefiguresfor

2007arenotavailablethoseforadatewithintwo

yearsof2007aresubstitutedandasterisked.

**Africa**

Ofthe29UnitedNationsmemberstatesinAfrica

onwhichthenecessaryinformationwasavailable,

the proportion of the prison population in pre􀇦

trial/remand detention exceeded 30% in 20 and

innineoftheseitexceeded50%(figure19).

**Americas**

Of the 32 United Nations member states in the

Americasonwhichthenecessaryinformationwas

available,theproportionoftheprisonpopulation

inpre􀇦trial/remanddetentionexceeded30%in21

andin11oftheseitexceeded50%(figure20).

**Asia**

Of the 21 United Nations member states in Asia

onwhichthenecessaryinformationwasavailable,

the proportion of the prison population in pre􀇦

trial/remanddetentionexceeded30%in11andin

fiveoftheseitexceeded50%(figure21).

**Europe**

Of the 45 United Nations member states in

Europe on which the necessary information was

available,theproportionoftheprisonpopulation

in pre􀇦trial/remand detention exceeded 30% in

nineandinthreeoftheseitexceeded50%(figure

22).

**Oceania**

Of the nine United Nations member states in

Oceaniaonwhichthenecessaryinformationwas

available,theproportionoftheprisonpopulation

in pre􀇦trial/remand detention exceeded 30% in

onlyone(figure23).

**Figure19.Highestproportionofprisonpopulationin**

**pre􀍲trial/remanddetention􀍲Africa2007(%)**
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**Figure20.Highestproportionofprisonpopulationin**

**pre􀍲trial/remanddetention􀍲Americas2007(%)**
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**Figure21.Highestproportionofprisonpopulationin**

**pre􀍲trial/remanddetention􀍲Asia2007(%)**
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**Figure22.Highestproportionofprisonpopulationin**

**pre􀍲trial/remanddetention􀍲Europe2007(%)**
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**Figure23.Highestproportionofprisonpopulationin**

**pre􀍲trial/remanddetention–Oceania2007(%)**
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**Countrieswiththehighestoccupancylevelsin2007**

Occupancyrates(densitylevels)areanindication

ofthelevelofovercrowdinginaprisonsystembut

they are an imperfect measure because they are

based on the officially declared capacity levels

which in some countries allow so little space per

prisonerastoconstituteovercrowdingthemselves.

Furthermore prison systems that do not exceed

their official capacity levels overall may

nonetheless include individual prisons that are

severelyovercrowded.Table1showingthehighest

occupancylevelsineachcontinentin2007should

therefore be considered with those factors in

mind. Where figures for 2007 are not available

those for a date within two years of 2007 are

substitutedandasterisked.

**Africa**

Ofthe24UnitedNationsmemberstatesinAfrica

onwhichthenecessaryinformationwasavailable,

theoccupancylevelexceeded100%in19countries

and was below 100% in five. Of the countries

where the rate exceeded 100%, in 11 cases it

exceeded150%(table1).

**Americas**

Of the 29 United Nations member states in the

Americasonwhichthenecessaryinformationwas

available,theoccupancylevelexceeded100%in23

countries and was below 100% in six. Of the

countries where the rate exceeded 100%, in 10

casesitwasatleast150.

**Asia**

Of the 20 United Nations member states in Asia

onwhichthenecessaryinformationwasavailable,

theoccupancylevelexceeded100%in11countries

and was below 100% in nine. Of the countries

where the rate exceeded 100%, in eight cases it

exceeded 130.

**Europe**

Ofthe45UnitedNationsmemberstatesinEurope

onwhichthenecessaryinformationwasavailable,

theoccupancylevelexceeded100%in21countries

andwasbelow100%in\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_24.Ofthecountrieswhere

therateexceeded100%,inelevencasesitexceeded

115%.

**Oceania**

Of the six United Nations member􀇦states in

Oceania on which the necessary information was

available, the occupancy level exceeded 100% in

twocountriesandwasbelow100%infour.

**Table1.Highestoccupancyratesindifferent**

**regions2007(%)**

**Africa 2007**

Zambia\* 330.6%

Benin\* 307.1%

Kenya\* 284.3%

Coted'Ivoire 218.0%

Morocco 197.6%

Tanzania\* 193.4%

Uganda 192.3%

Burundi 173.4%

Malawi 172.6%

Algeria 171.8%

Ghana 171.0%

(contd.)
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**Table1(contd.).Highestoccupancyratesin**

**differentregions2007(%)**

**Americas 2007**

Grenada\*\* 374.5%

Haiti\*\* 260.2%

Bolivia 209.3%

ElSalvador 207.0%

Ecuador\* 202.7%

StVincent&theGrenadines 191%

Panama 159.1%

Peru\* 159.1%

Chile 155.0%

DominicanRepublic 150%

**Asia 2007**

Bangladesh 315.6%

Pakistan 249.5%

Thailand 170.0%

Indonesia\* 166.1%

Lebanon\* 155.0%

Cambodia 148.8%

India 135.7%

BruneiDarussalam 132.8%

**Europe 2007**

Cyprus 197.4%

Greece 141.9%

Spain 136.3%

Croatia 130.6%

Georgia 129.3%

Slovenia 122.1%

Hungary 121.0%

Albania 119.4%

Poland 119.1%

Belgium 118.5%

France 118.1%

**Oceania 2007**

PapuaNewGuinea\* 119.7%

Kiribati 110.0%

NewZealand 96.4%

Fiji 88.8%

Vanuatu 61.6%

SolomonIslands 57.3%

\*\*By2009theoccupancyrateinGrenadahadfallen

to195%,whilethatinHaitihadrisento335.7%.

**Conclusion:mainfindings**

The overall trend is that prison populations have

grownduringthedecade1997􀇦2007.

Prison population totals rose between 1997 and

2007 in 104 of the 134 countries on which

informationwasavailable(78%);theyrosebyover

50% in 45 countries (34%). Totals fell in 30

countries (22%); in 16 of these they fell by more

than20%.

However, prison population totals are affected by

changesinthesizeofthenationalpopulation.The

best indicator of trends in overall prison

populationlevelsistheprisonpopulationrateper

100,000ofthenationalpopulation.

Prison population rates rose between 1997 and

2007 in 91 of the countries studied (68%); they

rosebyover50%in30countries(22%).Totalsfell

in 41 countries (31%); in 22 of these they fell by

morethan20%.

Therewaslittledifferencebetweenthecontinents

in terms of the proportion of countries showing

growth in prison population rates between 1997

and 2007: in every continent therewas growth in

60􀇦75% of countries (Africa 60%, Americas 74%,

Asia74%,Europe67%,Oceania60%).

However,the size ofthegrowthdidvarybetween

thecontinents:only4%ofAfricancountries(2/25)

recorded growth of 50% or more, compared with

26% of countries in the Americas (8/31), 39% of

Asiancountries(9/23),22%ofEuropeancountries

(10/45)and10%(1/10)ofthecountriesinOceania.

Wheretheprisonpopulationlevels(i.e.rates)fell

between 1997and 2007 therewas little difference

between the continents in the size of the falls,

with one exception: falls of more than 20% were

recorded by about 20% of countries in Africa

(5/25), Asia (5/23), Europe (8/45) and Oceania

(2/10)butintheAmericasfallsofsuchasizewere

recordedonlyin6%ofcountries(2/31).

Between 2002 and 2007 prison population rates

rose in 90 of the 143 countries on which

informationwasavailable(63%);theyrosebyover

25% in 36 countries (25%). Totals fell in 52

countries (36%); in 22 of these they fell by more

than20%.

Therewassomedifferencebetweenthecontinents

in the proportion of countries showing growth in

prisonpopulationratesbetween2002and2007:it

was somewhat lower in Africa (50% 􀇦 15/30) and

Asia (50% 􀇦 13/26) than in the Americas (74% 􀇦

162

23/31),EuropeandOceania(both70%􀇦32/46and

7/10respectively).

Similarly, therewas somecontinental variation in

thesizeofgrowthbetween2002and2007:growth

of 25% ormorewas recorded in 15% ofEuropean

countries (7/46) and 17% of African countries

(5/30) but in 27% of those in Asia (7/26), 29% of

those in America (9/31) and 30% of those in

Oceania(3/10).

Where the prison population rates fell between

2002and2007 therewas little differencebetween

the continents in the size of the falls, again with

the exception of the Americas: falls ofmore than

20% were recorded by 15􀇦23% of countries in

Africa (6/30), Asia (6/26), Europe (7/46) and

Oceania (2/10) but in only 1 (3%) of the 31

countries in the Americas on which such

informationwasavailable.

Comparisonofthechangesoverthewhole10􀇦year

periodfrom1997withthoseinthefiveyearsfrom

2002 shows that a smaller proportion of African

andAsiancountriesshowedgrowthbetween2002

and 2007 than showed growth over the whole

decade1997􀇦2007.Nosuchchangewasapparentin

thefiguresfortheothercontinents.

There were sharp contrasts between the highest

and lowest prison population levels in the same

continent:

􀁸 In Africa the highest rates tend to be in

southern Africa, and the lowest rates in

westernAfrica.

􀁸 In theAmericasmany of the highest rates are

intheCaribbeanwhilethelowestratestendto

beinsouthernAmerica.

􀁸 InAsiathe highest rates tend tobe in(former

Soviet) central Asia and the lowest rates in

southAsia.

􀁸 InEuropethehighestratesareinthecountries

of the former Soviet Union, while the lowest

ratestendtobeintheNordiccountries.

􀁸 In Oceania the highest rates are in New

Zealand and Australia and the lowest rates in

Pacificislandnations.

Pre􀇦trial/remand detention levels were high in

many countries. Of the 137 countries on which

information was available 62 (45%) had at least

30%oftheirprisonpopulationinpre􀇦trial/remand

detention in 2007 and in 28 countries (20%) at

leasthalftheprisonpopulationwereheldinsuch

conditions.

Pre􀇦trial/remand detention levels were generally

higher in Africa, the Americas and Asia than in

EuropeandOceania:

􀁸 In Africa more than two􀇦thirds of countries

studied had over 30% of their prison

population in pre􀇦trial/remand detention and

almostathirdhadover50%insuchconditions.

􀁸 IntheAmericasalmosttwo􀇦thirdsofcountries

studied had over 30% of their prison

population in pre􀇦trial/remand detention and

more than a third had over 50% in such

conditions.

􀁸 InAsiahalfthecountriesstudiedhadover30%

of their prison population in pre􀇦trial/remand

detentionandnearlyaquarterhadover50%in

suchconditions.

􀁸 By contrast, only one􀇦fifth of European

countriesstudiedhadover30%oftheirprison

population in pre􀇦trial/remand detention and

onlythreehadover50%insuchconditions.

􀁸 Only one of the countries studied in Oceania

hadover30% of the prisonpopulation in pre􀇦

trial/remanddetention.

Of the 124 countries on which information was

available the prison system in76 (61%)hadmore

than100%occupancyin2007andin27(22%)the

occupancylevelwasover150%.

Occupancy levels were highest in countries in

Africa, the Americas and Asia but also exceeded

100%inalmostahalfofEuropeancountries.

􀁸 In 79% of African countries studied the

occupancy level exceeded 100% and in 46% it

exceeded150%.

􀁸 In79%ofcountriesstudiedintheAmericasthe

occupancy level exceeded 100% and in 34% it

exceeded150%.

􀁸 In 55% of Asian countries studied the

occupancy level exceeded 100% and in 25% it

exceeded150%.

􀁸 In 47% of European countries studied the

occupancy level exceeded 100% and in one of

themitexceeded150%.

􀁸 In 2 of 6 countries studied in Oceania (33%)

the occupancy level exceeded 100% but it did

notexceed120%ineitherofthem.
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**Annextochapter7**

**Table1.Changesinprisonpopulationtotals1997􀍲2007(%)**

1.LargestincreasesinAfricanprisonpopulationtotals1997􀍲2007

**Africa 1997-2007**

Malawi +114.7%

Rwanda \* +95.6%

Benin +81.9%

Mozambique +68.3%

Angola \* +61.3%

Algeria +54.6%

Mauritius +53.4%

Lesotho +50.4%

2.LargestdecreasesinAfricanprisonpopulationtotals1997􀍲2007

**Africa 1997-2007**

Nigeria \* -28.3%

Burundi -25.4%

Madagascar -11.4%

Botswana \* -8.3%

Namibia \* -7.6%

3.LargestincreasesinprisonpopulationtotalsintheAmericas

1997􀍲2007

**Americas 1997-2007**

Brazil +150.5%

St Kitts and Nevis +116.8%

Uruguay \* +101.3%

Ecuador +91.6%

Mexico +86.1%

El Salvador +85.5%

Haiti +81.4%

Argentina +76.7%

Chile +68.2%

Paraguay +67.1%

Peru +63.3%

4.Largestdecreasesinprisonpop.totalsintheAmericas1997􀍲2007

**Americas 1997-2007**

Trinidad and Tobago -23.3%

Venezuela -17.6%

St. Vincent & the Grenadines -11.4%

Bahamas \* -0.1%

5.LargestincreasesinAsianprisonpopulationtotals1997􀍲2007

**Asia 1997-2007**

Cambodia +255.3%

Indonesia +209.1%

Israel +152.6%

Sri Lanka +100.5%

Saudi Arabia \* +93.2%

Bangladesh +81.0%

Vietnam \* +67.6%

Tajikistan \* +65.0%

Japan +64.1%

Brunei Darussalam \* +58.7%

India \* +52.6%

Malaysia \* +52.6%

6.LargestdecreasesinAsianprisonpopulationtotals1997􀍲2007

**Asia 1997-2007**

Kazakhstan -33.8%

Singapore -25.3%

Kyrgyzstan -23.8%

Korea (Republic of) -21.9%

Nepal \* -0.7%

7.LargestincreasesinEuropeanprisonpopulationtotals1997􀍲2007

**Europe 1997-2007**

Cyprus (Republic of) +155.1%

Monaco \* +123.1%

Macedonia (former Yugoslav Republic of) +112.4%

Greece +91.9%

Georgia +82.2%

Croatia +77.8%

Slovenia +77.7%

Serbia \* +74.3%

Luxembourg +68.2%

Spain +56.9%

Poland +53.0%

Bosnia and Herzegovina +51.4%

8.LargestdecreasesinEuropeanprisonpopulationtotals1997􀍲

2007

**Europe 1997-2007**

Armenia -59.7%

Latvia -36.5%

Romania -34.9%

Lithuania -33.8%

Andorra \* -31.8%

Ukraine -29.2%

Belarus \* -22.9%

Azerbaijan \* -21.3%

Portugal -20.8%

9.ChangesinprisonpopulationtotalsinOceania1997􀍲2007

**Oceania 1997-2007**

Micronesia (Federated States of) +95.9%

New Zealand +54.5%

Solomon Islands +43.5%

Australia +42.3%

Vanuatu \* +38.2%

Tonga +14.7%

Papua New Guinea \* +5.9%

Samoa \* +5.7%

Kiribati \* +2.2%

Fiji -11.4%

Where figures for 2007 are not available those for a date within

twoyearsof2007aresubstitutedandasterisked.
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**Table2.Countrieswiththehighestandlowestprisonpopulationrates(per100,000ofthenational**

**population)2007**

1.HighestprisonpopulationratesinAfrica

**frica 2007**

SouthAfrica 348

Botswana 329

Seychelles 270

Swaziland 247

Libya 209

Rwanda 202

Namibia 194

Morocco\* 167

Algeria 161

Mauritius 153

2.LowestprisonpopulationratesinAfrica

**Africa 2007**

Nigeria 28

Mali\*\* 33

SierraLeone 33

Angola\* 52

Senegal 53

Ghana 58

Mozambique 73

Benin 76

Malawi 83

SaoTomeePrincipe 83

\*\*thefigureforMalirelatesto2004

3.Highestprisonpopulationratesinthe

Americas

**Americas 2007**

UnitedStatesofAmerica 762

StKitts&Nevis 588

Belize 460

Bahamas 422

Grenada 408

Barbados 384

Dominica 351

Panama 339

StVincent&theGrenadines 323

Guyana 283

Antigua&Barbuda 282

Trinidad&Tobago 270

Chile 265

ElSalvador 235

Brazil 219

4.Lowestprisonpopulationratesinthe

Americas

**Americas 2007**

Guatemala 54

Haiti 71

Venezuela 76

Bolivia 80

Paraguay 98

Nicaragua\* 107

Canada 116

Colombia 128

Argentina 132

Ecuador 134

5.HighestprisonpopulationratesintheAsia

**Asia 2007**

Kazakhstan 366

Israel 313

Kyrgyzstan 283

Singapore 267

Thailand 253

Mongolia\* 250

Turkmenistan\* 224

Iran 222

SaudiArabia\* 178

Lebanon 159

Tajikistan 149

Malaysia\* 147

6.LowestprisonpopulationratesinAsia

**Asia 2007**

Nepal 24

India 32

Pakistan 52

Indonesia 56

Bangladesh 57

Japan 65

Cambodia 71

Korea(Republicof) 96

Vietnam 107

Philippines\* 108

Where figures for 2007 are not available those for a date within

twoyearsof2007aresubstitutedandasterisked.

**A**
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7.HighestprisonpopulationratesintheEurope

**Europe 2007**

RussianFederation 613

Belarus\* 468

Georgia 417

Ukraine 323

Estonia 322

Latvia 287

Moldova 242

Lithuania 239

Poland 230

Azerbaijan\* 229

CzechRepublic 182

Luxembourg 155

8.LowestprisonpopulationratesinEurope

**Europe 2007**

Andorra\* 37

Iceland 37

Bosnia 62

Slovenia 66

Denmark 67

Finland 67

Norway 73

Sweden 74

Ireland 76

Monaco 76

Switzerland 76

Italy 77

9.PrisonpopulationratesinOceania

**Oceania 2007**

NewZealand 188

Australia 130

Fiji 112

Samoa 99

Micronesia 89

Kiribati 86

Tonga 74

PapuaNewGuinea 61

Vanuatu 56

SolomonIslands 42

Wherefiguresfor2007arenotavailablethose

foradatewithintwoyearsof2007are

substitutedandasterisked.
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Chapter8–Crimeandcriminaljusticestatistics

challenges

**AnnaAlvazzidelFrate\***

**Abstract**

An efficient system for the collection, analysis and dissemination of information on crime and criminal

justice is a prerequisite for effective crime prevention. Over the past few yearsmuch emphasis has been

placedonissuesofmeasurementofcrimeattheinternationallevel.Quantitativeinformationoncrimeand

criminal justice remain scarceandmostly limited to thedevelopedworld.Furthermore,theavailability of

internationally comparable statistics is very limited. Different sources may provide slightly different

information, thus increasing the confusion of the users. There is still no unique reliable source of

internationalcrimestatisticswhichcouldguaranteesimpleuseandcomparabilityofdata.Thisisaproblem

whichmayneverfindasolutionbecauseoftheseriouschallengesofmeasuringhiddenphenomena:whatis

measurableisonlywhatcomestolight.

**Introduction**

Administrative statistics on recorded crimes are

themost readily available type of data. Virtually

all law enforcement systems keep records of

crimes committed in their respective

jurisdictions. If these data are regularly

published, they can also be used to monitor

trends in the same jurisdiction over time.

Nevertheless, there arewellknown challenges in

straightforward comparisons of \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_administrative

datainthefieldofcriminaljustice.Victimization

surveys not only provide information that

supplements and complements administrative

statistics, but may be easier to compare across

countries.Thischapterwillhighlightthecurrent

challenges in the collection and analysis of

international statistics on crime and criminal

justice,withparticularreferencetothedifficulties

faced by developing countries in producing

reliablestatistics.

The difficulty or even impossibility to assess the

crime situation depends on the lack or

insufficiency of reliable relevant statistics. There

are three prerequisites to the development of a

solid system of crime and criminal justice

statistics:

a) The availability of specific data collection

methodsand instruments, adapted to the local

context;

b)Theavailabilityoftechnicalexpertiseand/or

equipment to carry out data collection and

analysis;and

c)Thecommitmentandmotivation of relevant

government agencies to introduce a strategic

approachtothecollectionandanalysisofcrime

andcriminaljusticestatistics.

Lack of resourcesmay often be considered the

main obstacle to the collection and analysis of

statistics. However, experts often suggest that

lack of training, lack of commitment either

from the government or heads of responsible

institutions, lack of proper legislation, fear of

misuse of the data or insufficient information

on the good use that can bemade of statistics

may equally represent serious obstacles.

Participantsinaworkshoponcrimestatisticsin

Addis Ababa in 2008 (UNODC􀇦UNECA 2008)

indicated a number of issues they perceived as

priorities to be addressed in order to improve

crime and criminal justice statistics in their

respectivecountries(figure1).

\*ResearchOfficer,UnitedNationsOfficeonDrugsandCrime(UNODC)
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Issues such as better coordination among

agencies, better dissemination of statistics, and

improved IT software and provision of relevant

training were indicated as problems to be

urgently addressed. Respondents alsomentioned

the need to increase the use of surveys and

comparability with other countries. All

participantsintheAddisworkshopalsoindicated

their willingness to have a forum where to

exchange their experiences with other experts in

theregion.

Furthermore, the scattered information

produced by a variety of different sources, the

difficulty of having more than one source

available to reconcile and verify the data, the

irregular frequency of data collection, the lack

of feedback given to communities in which

surveysarecarriedout,thepoorfollowupgiven

to recommendations, and the scarce sharing

and dissemination of information are all

problems shared by many countries in the

world.

**Figure 1. Priority needs for improving crime and criminal justice statistics as indicated by African**

**countries(Numberofrespondingcountries􀍲Source:UNODC􀍲UNECA,2008)**

**Nationaldefinitionsforinternationalproblems**

Which type of data is required to produce the

particular crime information needed by the final

users to measure crime trends? The strict

measurementofcrimecannotbeseparatedfromthe

response to crime, i.e. the enforcement of laws

definingcrime.

Forthepurpose of internationalcomparability, it is

important to ensure that data reflect shared

conceptsandcleardefinitions.Thetypeofoffences

includedinthecoreUN􀇦CTSaregenerallyincluded

in national statistical classifications. Indeed, most

countries are able to provide police statistics on

general categories like homicide, robbery, theft,

assault and rape. When more details on the

circumstances of the crime are requested, it may

be more complicated for countries to meet the

requirements for international reporting. As an

example, whilst more than 90% of countries

respondingtotheUN􀇦CTSareabletoprovidedata

onintentionalhomicidesandapproximatelythree

quarters to indicate the relevant number of

persons arrested, only two􀇦thirds can provide

information on homicides committed *with*

*firearms.*

Nevertheless, in order to advance with

international comparisons of crime statistics, it is

important to gain knowledge on a number of

agreed upon and stable indicators. Different
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countries may have different priorities, which may

result in different ways to collect statistics.

Countries may however need to compare data on

their respective priority issues at the international

level.

Victimization surveys \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_of general population and

businesses,aswellasself􀇦reportsurveys,arewidely

accepted as important tools to understand crime

problems and trends. They also represent a

promising area for the development of

internationallycomparableindicators.TheUNODC􀇦

UNECE Manual on Victimization Surveys has

recentlybeenfinalized(UNODC􀇦UNECE2010).The

Manual was drafted by a Task Force composed of

experts from seven countriesand five international

institutions. Itcoversawide range of issues related

to planning and implementing a victimization

survey. The Manual deals with ways to analyse,

present and interpret data with a view to

communicating key findings and results. It is

addressed in particular to countries that are in the

processofdevelopingvictimsurveyprogrammesfor

the first time and have limited experience in this

field.ItisexpectedthattheManualwillassistinthe

carryingoutofvictimizationsurveys,whichmayas

a result provide important information on a wide

range of issues that are best measured through

population􀇦basedsurvey.

The mix of administrative statistics and survey􀇦

based indicators is considered the best way to go

aboutassessingcrime.Theinternationalcommunity

may also establish priorities in the collectionand

analysis of different crime and criminal justice

indicators.Theidentificationofcoreindicatorsfor

selectedcrimesandcomponentsoftheactivityof

criminal justice systems is also a priority for

UNODC. Part of this work is being conducted in

collaboration with international and regional

organizations.

An interesting approach is the establishment of

sets of regional indicators. For example, a recent

initiative promoted by the Institute CISALVA,

Universidad delValle of Cali, Colombia, with the

support of the Interamerican Development Bank,

consistsofthedevelopmentofasystemofregional

indicatorstomonitorurban safetyandsecurityin

South American countries. The system of

indicatorsincludesadministrativeandsurveydata

and represents an interesting sample of ‘core’

indicators for the comparison across countries.

Table 1 shows the proposed indicators and

indicateswhichareincludedintheUN􀇦CTS.

AninterestingaspectoftheCISALVAprojectisthe

workdone in identifyingnationalsources ineach

countryforeachindicator,whichcanbebasedon

administrative statistics produced by the criminal

justice system or the result of population􀇦based

surveys. Since a number of these indicators are

among those included in the coreUN􀇦CTS, their

useattheregionallevelislikelytostrengthenthe

commitment and motivation of countries to

providerelevantstatistics.
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**Table1.Proposedregionalindicatorsforurbansafety,SouthAmerica,andinclusionintheUN􀍲CTS**

**Type of data Indicator Included in**

**UN-CTS**

Administrative Homicide rate per 100,000 Yes

Administrative Rate of traffic-related deaths per 100,000

Administrative Suicide rate per 100,000

Administrative Rate of homicide with firearm per 100,000 Yes

Administrative Rate of simple theft per 100,000 Yes

Administrative Rate of robbery per 100,000 Yes

Administrative Rate of kidnapping per 100,000 Yes

Administrative Amount of seized drugs per year (Kg)

Administrative Percentage of breaches to traffic regulations

Survey Perception of conflict resolution (percentage of survey respondents who feel

likely that conflicts will be solved)

Survey Percentage of survey respondents who justify the use of violence, by reason

Survey Percentage of survey respondents who trust institutions

Survey Fear of crime (percentage of survey respondents who feel that they may

become victims of crime in the near future)

Survey Feelings of insecurity (percentage of survey respondents feeling insecure at

home or in their neighbourhood)

Administrative Rate of (police) recorded sexual offences per 100,000 Yes (rape)

Survey Prevalence of sexual victimization

Survey Rate of child maltreatment (per 1,000 persons aged 18 or below)

Survey Prevalence of domestic violence

Survey Rate of (police) recorded domestic violence per 100,000 population

Source:CISALVA,2009(translatedbyUNODC)

AttheEuropeanlevel,theEuropeanCommission,

through thework of the Expert Group on policy

needsfordataoncrimeandcriminaljustice(and

relevant sub􀇦groups) as well as a parallel group

established at the Statistical Office of the

European Commission (Eurostat), has promoted

thecollectionofadministrativestatisticsonaset

of indicators (total crime, homicide, violent

crime,robbery,domesticburglary,theftofmotor

vehicle, drug trafficking, prison population and

number of police officers), which are regularly

published(Eurostat2009).Furthermore,asa first

resultoftheongoingexerciseonassessingpolicy

prioritiesforcrimestatisticsattheregionallevel,

Eurostathasstartedthecollectionofstatisticson

money􀇦laundering, based on a set of 24 selected

indicators.

Work on a classification of criminal offences for

statisticalpurposesisbeingcarriedoutattheEU􀇦

level and as a collaboration between UNODC,

UNECE and the Conference of European

Statisticians (CES), through a Task Force

established in 2010. This includes the following

broad activities: (i) developing a set of

principles around international crime

classification systems for statistical use; (ii)

undertaking a case study of defining and

classifying selected offences; and (iii) working

with the EuropeanCommission on the current

EUlevelclassificationproject.

Another activity at the EU level is the

advancement of research aimed at developing

indicators for the effectiveness of criminal

justicesystemsandjuvenilecriminaljustice.

A two year project (2009􀇦2011) coordinated by

UNODC, in partnership with the European

Institute for Crime Prevention and Control

affiliatedwiththeUnitedNations(HEUNI),the

Joint Research Centre on Transnational Crime

(Transcrime), and the International Centre for

Migration Policy Development (ICMPD),

funded by the European Commission, deals

with the ‘Development of monitoring

instruments for judicial and law enforcement

institutionsintheWesternBalkans’.Theaimof

the project is to bring national statistics
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mechanisms in justice and home affairs

institutionstowardscompliancewithrelevantEU

and international standards and good practices,

with the overall objective to strengthen the

responsetocrimeandcorruption.

A further important example of ongoing

statisticalwork at theUN is the development of

indicators on violence against women. (United

Nations 2008) The Friends of the Chair, in their

report to the Statistical Commission,

recommended ‘boththeuseof statisticalsurveys

and administrative records, depending on the

form of violence experienced by women’ and

proposed a core set of statistical indicators for

measuringviolenceagainstwomen,asfollows:

i)Totalandagespecificrateofwomensubjected

to physical violence in the last 12 months by

severity of violence, relationship to the

perpetratorandfrequency;

ii)Totalandagespecificrateofwomensubjected

tophysicalviolenceduringlifetimebyseverityof

violence, relationship to the perpetrator and

frequency;

iii)Totalandagespecificrateofwomensubjected

tosexualviolenceinthelast12monthsbyseverity

of violence, relationship to the perpetrator and

frequency;

iv) Total and age specific rate of women

subjected to sexual violence during lifetime by

severity of violence, relationship to the

perpetratorandfrequency;

v) Total and age specific rate of ever􀇦partnered

women subjected to sexual and/or physical

violence by current or former intimate partner

inthelast12monthsbyfrequency;

vi)Totalandagespecificrateofever􀇦partnered

women subjected to sexual and/or physical

violence by current or former intimate partner

duringlifetimebyfrequency;

vii) Total and age specific rate of women

subjected to psychological violence in the past

12monthsbytheintimatepartner;

viii) Total and age specific rate of women

subjected to economic violence in the past 12

monthsbytheintimatepartner;

ix) Total and age specific rate of women

subjectedtofemalegenitalmutilation.

Theoutcomeofthecurrentworkwillresultina

strongmandateforthecollectionofdataonthe

aboveindicatorsinallMemberStates.

**Internationaldatacollection**

UNODC regularlycollects statisticsoncrimeand

criminal justice through the *United Nations*

*Survey of Crime Trends and the Operations of*

*Criminal Justice Systems* (UN􀇦CTS). Regular

collectionofinformationoncrimetrendsandthe

operations of criminal justice systems by the

UnitedNations started in the 1970s in pursuance

to a request from the General Assembly(GA Res.

3021, XXVII, 1972). A detailed questionnaire for

datacollectionwasdevelopedinthemid􀇦70sand

the UN􀇦CTS started in 1977, aimed at collecting

police and judicial statistics, virtually from all

Member States. Ten surveyshavebeenconcluded

sofar,representingdatafortheperiod1975􀇦2006.

The Eleventh Survey, sent to Member States in

2009,isongoing(UNODC2009).

The UN􀇦CTS consists of a questionnaire dealing

with information from the police, prosecution,

courts and prisons. It is sent to all UN Member

States through diplomatic (Permanent Missions,

Ministries of Foreign Affairs) and statistical

channels (National Statistical Offices, nationally

appointed focal points for crime statistics). Over

the years, replies to the UN􀇦CTS were received

from a variablenumber of countries (see figure

2). After reaching a peak in 1996 with the Fifth

UN􀇦CTS (103 responses received), a decline

followed until 2003, which represented the

minimum with only 66 responding countries.

Since then, the Ninth and Tenth UN􀇦CTS

showedamarkedincrease.Althoughtheoverall

rate of response remains quite low, (50%

approximately at the Tenth UN􀇦CTS), efforts

towards better coordination at the central level

andtoprovidetechnicalassistancetorequesting

countries have proven effective. It can be

observed that the upwards trend in the Tenth

UN􀇦CTS was mostly determined by countries

outside Europe andNorth America, which now

representthemajorityofrespondents(56versus

38).

Whilst there have been a number of recent

initiativestoimprovecrimeandcriminaljustice

statistics in recent years, including the

emergence of crime, violence and delinquency

observatories, the overall availability of crime

andcriminaljusticestatisticsremainsscarce,at

the national, regional and international level.
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Manycountriesstillfacesignificantchallengesin

compiling,processinganddisseminatingrelevant

crime and criminal justice statistics in a

systematicandsustainableway.Theinternational

community has recognized the importance of

buildingthecapacityof tocollect

and report such information. Such capacity

buildingmustinvolveassistancenotonlytothe

processofgenerationandcollectionofcriminal

justice statistics, but also in institutional

reporting at the national, regional and

international levels, including systematic

participationintheUN􀇦CTS.

**Figure 2.Numberof ember tates respondingtotheUnitedNationsSurveyofCrime Trendsand**

**OperationsofCriminalJusticeSystems(UN􀍲CTS),bymainregions(1978􀍲2010)**

UNODC, in cooperation with relevant partners

has begun strengthening its capacity to support

countries in this respect, with the aim of

increasing the quality, availability and

internationalcomparabilityofcrimeandcriminal

justice information. The establishment of a

networkofnationalcontactpointsforcrimeand

criminaljusticestatisticsisalsoanimportantstep

in achieving sustainable reporting of crime and

criminal justice data at the international level.

Such a network should include contact focal

points in national statistical offices, law

enforcement, prosecution, courts and national

penal administrations. For specific crime issues,

including corruption and forms of organized

crime, national focal points should also be

established on a thematic basis as in the case of

the informal EU Network of National

Rapporteurs or Equivalent Mechanisms on

Trafficking in Human Beings. UNODC has

takenconcretestepsinthisdirection,including

throughthedevelopmentofexpertnetworkson

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_aregionalbasis.ExperienceintheAfricaregion

within the ‘Data for Africa’ initiative suggests

that national single points of contact can

represent an effective approach to increasing

country responses and stimulating discussion

onissuesofmutualinterestamongcountriesin

the same region. The number of African

countries responding to the Eleventh UN􀇦CTS

(2007􀇦2008), for example, significantly

increased compared to the Tenth UN􀇦CTS

(2005􀇦2006)asatthetimeofwriting(seefigure

3).

Analysis of missing responses within the

returned questionnaires (figure 4) shows that

eightypercentoftherespondingcountrieswere

able to provide data on more than half of the
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questions included in the Tenth UN􀇦CTS

questionnaire. This was slightly less than in the

NinthUN􀇦CTS(83%),butitshouldbenotedthat

many more developing countries responded to

the Tenth UN􀇦CTS and some of them still have

limited capacity to provide good quality

information. Indeed, the percentage of

countries responding to less than a quarter of

thequestionswentdowntoonly9%.

**Figure3.Percentageof ember tatesrespondingtotheTenthandEleventhUnitedNationsSurveys**

**ofCrimeTrendsandOperationsofCriminalJusticeSystems(UN􀍲CTS),bycontinent**

**Figure4.OverallratesofresponsetoquestionnairevariablesintheNinth,TenthandEleventhUnited**

**NationsSurveyonCrimeTrendsandOperationsofCriminalJusticeSystems(UN􀍲CTS)**

0

10

20

30

40

50

60

0􀍲25 26􀍲50 51􀍲75 76􀍲100

**Percentageofrespondingcountries**

**Percentageofquestionnairevariablesrespondedto**

CTS9 CTS10 CTS11

0

10

20

30

40

50

60

70

80

90

100

Africa Americas Asia Europe Oceania

**Percentageofrespondingcountries**

CTS10 CTS11

**m s**

174

**Figure5.Percentageofnumericalvariablescompleted–Ninth,TenthandEleventhUnited**

**NationsSurveyonCrimeTrendsandOperationsofCriminalJusticeSystems(UN􀍲CTS)**

When considering which parts of the

questionnaire were completed in the TenthUN􀇦

CTS,itshouldbenotedthat21countriesdidnot

return either the prosecution or the courts

section, 15 countries did not provide prison

statistics and only 7 countries did not report

police data. When looking only at the filled

questionnaires, it can be observed that the

percentage of numerical items completed by

countries was quite high, with the majority of

countriesbeingabletorespondtomorethanhalf

ofthequestions(figure4).

It was mostly developing countries that were

unable to complete the questionnaire, thus

indicatingtheneedforfurtherworktobedone

to assisttheminproducing crimeand criminal

justicestatistics.Lackofinformationisnotonly

an obstacle to the formulation of evidence􀇦

based policies and crime prevention strategies,

but also represents a limit to the possibility to

accessinternationaldevelopmentaid.

**Conclusionandwayforward**

UNODC will continue to work to improve the

availability and quality of crime and criminal

justice statistics at national and international

level. In particular, it will, subject to funding,

continue to support countries in building

institutional capacity to conduct victimization

surveyswiththeguidanceofrelevantpartsofthe

Manual on Victimization Surveys. It will also

continue its ongoing work in the area of

corruption surveys in countries that request

assistance in establishing baseline data and

monitoring trends regarding corruption􀇦related

behaviours.

Furthermore,workwillcontinuetowardsabetter

understanding of global and regional homicide

patterns through research on available homicide

statistics from multiple sources. Following the

publication of an international homicide

statistics dataset in December 2008 (UNODC

2008),UNODCpublishedupdatedfiguresearly

in 2010, drawing on multiple sources for the

years2003􀇦2008(UNODC2010).

UNODC homicide statistics are intended to

represent a starting point for further research

andrequiredevelopmentandupdatingasmore

timely information becomes available.

Nonetheless,withintheframeworkofinitiatives

such as the Geneva Declaration on Armed

Violence and Development, such data sources

play an important role in forming the basis of

indicators formeasuring the nature and extent

of non􀇦conflict related armed violence. In

response to the need for a greater

understanding of armed violence,UNODC has

alsocarriedoutrecentresearchonthestructure

and underlying causes of intentional homicide

in selected regions, in addition to

methodologicalapproachestothemeasurement
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ofcriminaljusticesystemperformanceinthecase

ofcrimesinvolvingarmedviolence.

As a follow up to the 2006 open􀇦ended expert

grouponwaysandmeans toimprove crimedata

collection, research and analysis, UNODC

organized an expert group meeting on crime

statistics(Vienna,28􀇦30January2009).Following

the subsequent ECOSOC Resolution 2009/25

(entitled“Improvingthecollection,reportingand

analysis of data toenhanceknowledgeon trends

inspecificareasofcrime),UNODCestablishedan

open􀇦ended intergovernmental expert working

group to prepare recommendations on the

improvement of tools for the collection of

relevantcrimedata,inparticular,theUN􀇦CTS.At

the kind invitation of the Government of

Argentina, the first meeting of the open􀇦ended

intergovernmental expert working group was

heldinBuenosAiresfrom8􀇦10February2010.

The meeting based its work on the

considerations contained within Resolution

2009/25, including the need to simplify and

improvethereportingsystemoftheUN􀇦CTSin

order to encourage more Member States to

report,inacoordinatedand integratedway,on

their efforts, achievements and challenges in

specificareasofcrime.Themeetingresultedin

a set of practical recommendations for the

advancement of work in the collection and

analysis of international crime and criminal

justice statistics.Akeyrecommendationwasto

revise the UN􀇦CTS questionnaire in order to

improvetheresponserate,producemoretimely

data and minimize the reporting burden and

complexityforMemberStates.
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The objec􀆟ve of this report is to show users of interna􀆟onal crime data what they could

learn from these, and provide guidance as to restric􀆟ons, pi􀆞alls and strengths of the

unique set of data that is now available thanks to the countries that have responded to the

United Na􀆟ons Surveys of Crime Trends and Opera􀆟ons of Criminal Jus􀆟ce Systems. The

present report, prepared in partnership of HEUNI and the UNODC, for the first 􀆟me pulls

together global responses of the surveys.

The report comprises eight chapters. They are designed to deal with all central issues

addressed in the surveys. First, police-recorded crime is discussed, with separate chapters

on homicides (Chapter 1), other police-recorded crimes (Chapter 2), and drug-related

crime and drug trafficking (Chapter 3). Also, complex crimes are analysed, such as

organised crime, and trafficking in human beings (Chapter 4). Such offences have played

a marginal role in tradi􀆟onal crime sta􀆟s􀆟cs, and in order to improve the relevance of the

data on such offences, new solu􀆟ons need to be developed. Chapter 5, shi􀅌ing to the next

stage of the criminal jus􀆟ce system, presents data on responses of the criminal jus􀆟ce

system, including an innova􀆟on where a􀆩ri􀆟on issues are being discussed. A parallel issue

to responses of the criminal jus􀆟ce system are resources and performance. These are

discussed in Chapter 6 where also a discussion on the puni􀆟vity of criminal jus􀆟ce systems

is included. Next, a presenta􀆟on on prison popula􀆟ons of the world closes the analysis of

criminal jus􀆟ce data. The last chapter finally discusses challenges with crime and criminal

jus􀆟ce sta􀆟s􀆟cs, arguing for the importance of further improvements in the area.
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