Victimization: Moving Forward

Victimización: Mirando hacia Adelante

Marcelo Bergman

Pending Tasks/ Tareas pendientes

- Data on Crime events/ Entender mejor el evento
- Institutional Performance/ Desempeño percibido de las instituciones ligadas a la seguridad pública
- Supervize and improve survey management/ supervisar y mejorar el trabajo de campo
- Analyze consistency of trends/Analizar la consistencia en la medición de tendencias

Latinobarómetro - México y Centroamérica

México y Centroamérica- Norte



	1997	1998	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
El Salvador	45.3%	70.7%	36.4%	34.2%	38.7%	29.5%	34.3%	25.4%	41.6%	37.7%	72.6%	72.6%
Guatemala	46.3%	53.9%	40.9%	41.4%	32.4%	34.5%	40.3%	44.1%	34.6%	31.7%	37.9%	33.2%
Honduras	43.8%	42.4%	35.6%	34.2%	27.5%	32.9%	32.1%	31.1%	44.9%	36.3%	33.0%	32.0%
México	49.2%	38.3%	78.2%	75.7%	59.8%	61.3%	67.1%	33.3%	39.2%	42.3%	38.5%	30.3%

Resto Centroamérica



	1997	1998	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Costa Rica	32.7%	44.6%	31.4%	35.7%	32.3%	35.9%	44.7%	32.5%	32.0%	33.8%	37.5%	34.6%
Nicaragua	40.8%	48.6%	41.3%	34.6%	29.7%	32.0%	37.0%	28.8%	27.9%	28.1%	31.9%	29.3%
Panamá	28.0%	32.7%	37.3%	28.7%	25.9%	18.6%	21.3%	17.6%	14.8%	11.9%	29.1%	19.2%
República Dominicana						30.3%	31.1%	40.4%	27.6%	25.1%	43.3%	33.7%

Latinobarómetro- Sudamérica

Mercosur



	1997	1998	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Argentina	42.3%	49.8%	46.3%	47.1%	42.7%	35.9%	42.4%	40.4%	47.0%	39.2%	40.9%	36.0%
Brasil	37.9%	42.2%	36.0%	35.6%	36.2%	27.3%	45.0%	33.7%	42.2%	40.2%	41.1%	25.5%
Paraguay	36.8%	31.7%	39.2%	46.0%	37.0%	40.3%	39.3%	24.0%	40.6%	29.6%	31.5%	29.8%
Uruguay	24.8%	32.8%	29.8%	27.7%	26.0%	18.6%	38.7%	31.2%	34.8%	28.7%	31.5%	18.6%

Comunidad Andina



	1997	1998	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Bolivia	38.1%	39.3%	46.4%	33.8%	31.1%	34.1%	45.0%	29.1%	42.5%	33.1%	39.3%	30.5%
Colombia	44.0%	32.7%	34.0%	37.3%	30.9%	24.1%	36.8%	31.0%	34.4%	27.6%	30.5%	32.3%
Ecuador	45.5%	48.7%	56.4%	40.4%	32.2%	37.1%	51.8%	34.2%	38.3%	33.6%	51.1%	35.0%
Perú	42.9%	42.0%	48.6%	37.8%	34.4%	33.4%	47.6%	35.4%	43.5%	37.3%	38.2%	29.4%

Resto Sudamérica



	1997	1998	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Chile	31.9%	30.3%	42.4%	36.0%	33.8%	33.0%	38.9%	34.4%	40.2%	31.6%	31.1%	25.0%
Venezuela	47.9%	49.4%	48.6%	44.2%	46.3%	43.2%	49.0%	36.0%	50.1%	54.2%	39.0%	27.8%

Chile













Fuente: Subsecretaría de Prevención del Delito.

Perú











Fuente: Policía Nacional, Anuarios estadísticos.

México









FUENTE: Secretariado Ejecutivo del Sistema Nacional de Seguridad Pública

Estadística delictiva de Colombia - Totales

Robo de autos



Homicidios



Lesiones personales



Atraco



Hurto a entidades financieras



Fuente: Beltrán y Salcedo Albarán. *Revista Criminalidad Policía Nacional de Colombia 1976-1999*, pp. 80-81. .

Costa Rica













FUENTE: Sistema de Información sobre la violencia y el delito. Ministerio de Justicia

Nicaragua











Fuente: Policía Nacional. Anuarios 1981-2010.

Uruguay











FUENTE:
http://www.minterior.gub.uy/index.php/es/estadisticas

Énfasis en diseños longitudinales

- Muestra estratificada (¿panel?)
- La importancia de la tendencia
- Los problemas de las tasas con n pequeñas
- Frecuencia percibida

Periodicidad de la medición

- Importante: respetar los tiempos

Períodos de referencias: 3 meses, 6 meses, o 1 año?

¿Qué medir?/What is to be measured?

- Trascender tendencias generales y enfocarse en los eventos/
- Transcend general trends and focus on crime events
- Algunos delitos emblemáticos: Violencia/ key Crime events: Violence
- Algunas características de la victimización (circunstancias, contexto, tipo de víctimas)/ Characteristics of circumstances, context, type of victims,

Problemas

* Expandir en delitos poco frecuentes

* Rankings entre estados/ranking among sub-national units

* Alternativas a los rankings: medición intra-estados/ alternative to rankings: measuring intra-units

Crime Trends in Federal District (DF)



Crime Trends: State of Mexico



Distribución porcentual del IPFD en el DF (2005-2008)

	Año			
IPDF (%)	**2005**	**2006**	**2007**	**2008**
0	10.83	13.06	11.93	14.98
1	13.75	13.61	12.48	14.55
2	12.92	17.55	14.15	10.98
3	15.21	14.83	13.04	13.41
4	11.25	14.01	12.21	10.41
5	12.60	9.93	10.68	8.70
6	8.44	6.67	9.57	10.13
7	7.40	5.31	7.07	4.42
8	4.06	3.13	2.91	4.28
9	1.98	1.22	2.50	3.14
10	1.15	0.41	1.80	2.14
11	0.10	0.14	0.97	1.43
12	0.31	0.14	0.69	1.43
Total	100	100	100	100

Base: Encuesta de Victimización y Eficacia Institucional (primeros semestres de 2005-2008)

Evolución del Índice de Percepción de Frecuencia Delictiva (2005-2008)



Base: Encuesta de Victimización y Eficacia Institucional (primeros semestres de 2005-2008)

Satisfacción ciudadana con la policía en el Distrito Federal (tasa anual, 2005-2008)

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Satisfacción con la protección ofrecida	3.7	3.8	3.9	3.7
Satisfacción con la presencia policial	4.3	4.3	4.2	4.1
Satisfacción con el tiempo de respuesta	3.7	3.7	3.6	3.5
Satisfacción con el trato y respeto	5.5	5.4	5.1	4.9

Base: Encuesta de Victimización y Eficacia Institucional (2005-2008).
N: 2005 = 1589, 2006 = 1446, 2007 = 1209, 2008 = 666

Índice de satisfacción ciudadana en el DF (tasa anual, 2005-2008)



Base: Encuesta de Victimización y Eficacia Institucional (2005-2008).
N: 2005 = 1589, 2006 = 1446, 2007 = 1209, 2008 = 666

Índice de Satisfacción de Víctimas con la policía (DF, tasa anual, 2005-2008)



Base: Encuesta de Victimización y Eficacia Institucional (2005-2008).
N: 2005 = 55, 2006 = 44, 2007 = 52, 2008 = 39

Índice de Satisfacción de Víctimas con el Ministerio Público (DF, tasa anual, 2005-2008)

Base: Encuesta de Victimización y Eficacia Institucional (2005-2008).
N: 2005 = 60, 2006 = 49, 2007 = 56, 2008 = 43

Índice de Satisfacción de Víctimas (total, DF, tasa anual, 2005-2008)

Base: Encuesta de Victimización y Eficacia Institucional (2005-2008).
N: 2005 = 115, 2006 = 93, 2007 = 108, 2008 = 82

Algunas Recomendaciones

- Se deben desarrollar encuestas que se puedan sostener en el tiempo. No sirven de mucho encuestas eventuales

- Se debe abdicar la propuesta de la comparación inter-entidades y privilegiar intra-entidades (evolución de la tendencia)

Algunas Recomendaciones

- Las encuestas de victimización deben ser encuestas autónomas con diseño propio.

- Dado su alto costo, debe ser llevada a cabo por los estados nacionales o sub-nacionales en forma periódica

Algunas Recomendaciones

- Una solución sub-óptima pero altamente recomendable es desarrollar un modulo de victimización dentro de las encuestas nacionales de hogares, y con un staff profesional que trabaje sobre el diseño, los ajustes de las muestras correspondientes, así como en la interpretación de sus resultados.