

# APPENDIX 3: TECHNICAL AND FIELDING REPORTS

## Bulgaria

Survey method:	Face-to-face in home interview with respondent
Sample type and size:	The sampling model used is of a two-stage cluster sample. Clusters (sampling points) represent electoral sections as of last Parliamentary elections (July 2009). Out of 11632 sections 126 sections have been selected at random (first stage). In each electoral section 8 respondents have been interviewed (second stage). Respondents at second stage have been selected using a random walk procedure based in randomly selected start address.  Total number of sampling points: 126. Number of responders in each sampling point: 8.
Completed interviews and response rates:	Contacted respondents: 1599
	Temporary absence: 79
	Refusals: 520
	Other
	Completed interviews: 1000
Response rate:	63%
Fieldwork dates:	October 1 – October 20, 2010
Interviewer training:	Briefing session with local coordinators which included an overview of survey methodology, specific features of the questionnaire and of specific questions, sampling methodology, specific fieldwork requirements, and also reconstruction of a fieldwork situation.
Number of interviewers:	94 interviewers participated in fieldwork. Average number of interviews per interviewer: 11.
Fieldwork control:	Work of interviewers in the field has been supervised by local coordinators. After the end of fieldwork 10% of the sample has been back checked by phone.
Data verification:	All questionnaires were subjected to a logical review before data entry. The logical review was carried out by the VR staff and included: Fulfillment of all questionnaire instructions; Logical correspondence between answers of different questions; Control for accuracy in the cases where there is objective information (e.g. questions on size of the city/village, administrative region, number of the cluster).
Contactor:	Vitosha Research, Sofia

## Acceptance of questionnaire

As a whole the interviewers reported that there were no serious problems with the questionnaire, the most of the respondents understood most of the questions without problems. The main problems are listed below. The interviewers report that the respondents found the questionnaire very long, laborious and quite boring. The main reason for that according to some interviewers is the relatively high register of the language used for the questions – i.e. the questions sound too academic or too elevated to the general public. Many respondents do not have the general knowledge about law that is required to understand some of the questions. This conclusion was made during the cognitive interviewing too when part of the respondents were unfamiliar with distinction between the functions of court (judges) and prosecution service and with the obligations and rights of the latter.

The questions have been perceived as a bit repetitive and some respondents had the feeling that they are being asked the same thing over and over again. The interviewers considered the number of show-cards as excessive and felt this influenced the dynamics of the interview.

The questionnaire was overall a bit difficult for less educated people as well as some of the Roma respondents. Generally, people living in villages were more open to the interviewers, responded more friendly to the questions and were more cooperative. The subjective feeling of some interviewers is that people living in villages are less concerned about crime, although house burglary is quite common in the villages in some parts of the country and this often causes tension between Roma and Bulgarian people.

## Problems with particular questions

Block B: B12–B34 these questions elicited some of the remarks about “too academic style” that are summarized above as a general comment.

B35–B43 this group of questions was the second most often noted problem with the questionnaire. According to the interviewers, the stories and explanations were too long and boring. Some respondents had problems focusing their attention on the story from the questionnaire and spontaneously recalled similar stories. Some respondents found the stories for the Bulgarian context. Some respondents cannot properly differentiate between a robbery and a burglary.

Block C: This group of questions was overall quite hard for the respondents. In many cases people perceive “the police” as traffic police because most often people have experience with the traffic police.

C41 – respondents had problems answering this question because they lack “personal experience” with the criminal courts. C64 and C66 elicited many spontaneous answers “Suspended prison sentence” in combination with the

length of the sentence, although both questions had filters and did not allow length estimation for any other option than “prison sentence”.

Block D: this is the most problematic part of the questionnaire.

Questions D1–D3 and D5 elicited very strong reactions from many respondents because when they responded with “no” to D1, they were still asked to imagine that they stole something. Their response was “I would never do such a thing!” and a strong refusal to answer (which however was not provided as a possible option in the questionnaire). The overall attitude of some respondents changed after D1–D5 and they became more hostile and uncooperative. Overall, females demonstrated stronger reactions than males to the problematic D1–D5 part of the survey which was reflected quantitatively as more answers “I don’t know” to these questions for females.

## Italy

Survey method:	CAPI	
Sample type and size:	<p>The sample was composed by individuals aged 16 years old and over, representative of the Italian population. The sampling procedure followed was a Stratified Random Sample for the following quotas:</p> <p>Regions and City Sizes (interlocked)</p> <p>Gender and Age (interlocked)</p> <p>Level of education</p> <p>Occupation</p> <p>In each of the above quota the sampling points have been selected randomly.</p> <p>The total number of sampling points involved in the Survey was: 111.</p>	
Completed interviews and response rates:	Contacted respondents:	1833
	Temporary absence:	954
	Refusals:	357
	Other	
	Completed interviews:	522
	Response rate:	28%
Fieldwork dates:	October 29 – November 19, 2010	
Interviewer training:	<p>Before start of fieldwork GfK Eurisko interviewers have been instructed through telephone briefing sessions. They were informed about the objective of the survey and instructed on the questionnaire flow and specific issues regarding each question.</p>	
Number of interviewers:	111 interviewers participated in fieldwork. Average number of interviews per interviewer: 4.7	
Fieldwork control:	<p>GfK Eurisko supervisors followed the working process of the fieldwork and controlled that the sampling plan was correctly respected.</p> <p>After the end of the fieldwork, 5% of the completed questionnaires and 20% of the interviewers have been selected at random and called back to verify that the interviews had been correctly carried out.</p>	
Data verification:	<p>The questionnaire, that was programmed (CAPI), was checked by the GfK Eurisko researchers prior to actual fielding, in order to check that all questions were correctly scripted and to verify the consistency of all questions (i.e. flow and filters).</p> <p>After the end of the fieldwork, data were processed in a SPSS file that was further re-checked to control the coherence and the filtered questions.</p>	
Contactors:	GfK Eurisko	

## Acceptance of questionnaire

The interviewers reported a very good level of interest among the respondents to participate in this Survey. The great majority of the respondents considered the subject very up to date and relevant in the context of Italian society and appreciated to have the possibility to state their opinion on it. Older people were happier to participate than youngsters. In particular, the section that respondent found most interesting were section B and section C.

In general, respondents found the questionnaire quite easy and fluent. Most of the questions were clear and the language was appropriate for the most part of the sample.

The interviewers didn't mentioned particular difficulties in carrying out this survey. The only difficulties have been found with few people having a low level of education in relation to the type of language used, but it was a problem not widespread. Even if the questionnaire was interesting and clear, many respondents found it a bit too long and somehow repetitive.

According to the interviewers the only section that generated a general sense of annoyance among the respondents was section D.

## Problems with particular questions

B35 to B43: in part of the sample these questions generated difficulties in empathizing with the characters of the imaginary stories (far from their actual experience). Some respondents were a bit surprised when asked these questions because the answers seemed obvious to them. In addition, in many cases the interviewers reported that it was necessary to repeat the stories because they were a bit too long. Regarding specifically the stories exposed, few respondents noticed that they only referred to poor areas/neighbourhoods, while in their opinion a lot of crimes are committed also in rich areas, so they considered those cases not very comprehensive or not realistic enough.

B19–B20: these questions engendered in part of the sample bother and concern when thinking of possible experiences they had in the past or possible experiences that could occur to them in the future.

C16: seems to bother some interviewees because it was considered too personal and intimate. C72–C73–C74: these questions bothered the majority of the respondents and some found them quite offensive.

D1–D5: seem to generate embarrassment. To some respondents these questions seem a bit strange because they thought that nobody would have answered such questions affirmatively. Many respondents were felt uncomfortable imagining themselves committing a crime. In other cases the questions generated hilarity (due to embarrassment or credibility).

## Lithuania

Survey method:	Face-to-face in home interview.												
Sample type and size:	<p>The sample was composed by individuals aged 16 years old and over. multistage, random sample. The selection procedure of respondents ensures that every inhabitant (16 yrs. and older) of Lithuania has equal probability to be interviewed.</p> <p>Survey covered the regions in Lithuania: Vilnius, Kaunas, Klaipeda, Siauliai, Panevezys, Marijampole; Alytus, Sakiai, Telsiai, Mazeikiai, Pakruojis, Akmene, Silute, Kedainiai, Utena, Taurage, Kupiskis, Rokiskis, Svencionys, Ukmerge, Moletai and Raseiniai districts. Survey was conducted in 18 towns and 54 villages.</p> <p>The total number of sampling points involved in the Survey was: 90.</p>												
Completed interviews and response rates:	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Contacted respondents:</td> <td>2762</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Temporary absence:</td> <td>699</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Refusals:</td> <td>889</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other</td> <td>153</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Completed interviews:</td> <td>1021</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Response rate:</td> <td>37%</td> </tr> </table>	Contacted respondents:	2762	Temporary absence:	699	Refusals:	889	Other	153	Completed interviews:	1021	Response rate:	37%
Contacted respondents:	2762												
Temporary absence:	699												
Refusals:	889												
Other	153												
Completed interviews:	1021												
Response rate:	37%												
Fieldwork dates:	October 15 – October 27, 2010												
Interviewer training:	Interviewers in Vilnius were trained at “Vilmorus” office and interviewers in other loctions – by telephone												
Number of interviewers:	83												
Fieldwork control:	After the end of fieldwork 10% of inteviews were controlled by phone: respondent's selection procedure, length of interview, etc.												
Data verification:	<p>Completed questionnaires were checked for logic prior the data entry by Vilmorus staff.</p> <p>After the data entry the data file was checked for consistency (skip&amp;fill rules, routing, single/multiple answer questions).</p>												
Contactor:	Market and Opinion Research Center “Vilmorus”												

## Acceptance of questionnaire

Questionnaire was quite interesting but too long in respondents' opinion. All questions were understandable for respondents. The use of show cards is considered excessive. Show cards were used in one case and not used in similar questions with same quantity of options. For example questions C1-C3 with cards, questions C8-C15 without cards.

Some question aspects were difficult to apply in Lithuania: group of questions concerning different treatment on race base – there is very small percentage of population of different race than majority so respondents just don't have information to maintain their opinion in this case.

## Problems with particular questions

Block A. Not all respondents read newspapers or watch TV. In this respect the questionnaire does not provide enough opportunities to adequately capture media behaviour which would include use of other media.

Block B. For questions B3 and B8 answer options could be reformulated to better reflect respondent thinking and local routines.

Respondents reacted sensitively to questions D2 and D5. These questions made assumptions that respondent has stolen something. Sometimes respondents felt insulted. Questions C64 and C66 have been perceived similarly.

## Methodological lessons from Bulgaria, Italy and Lithuania

Length of survey and overall acceptance. On the whole the survey was well accepted by respondents, as it relates to an important sphere of everyday life – personal security and moral standards of society. The survey is, however, a bit too long. This is understandable in terms in view of the overall objectives of the project and the need to test different hypotheses for the main indicators. Project objectives are not a motivation factor for respondents and it would be good to seriously consider a reduction of the questionnaire.

Showcard use is a technical issue that needs additional attention. Excessive use of show cards seems, according to interviewer reports, to interfere with the regular “flow” of the interview and acts as a distraction factor. A simple (but not easy fulfil) solution would be to simplify scales (reduce the range) and preferably to use similar scales on most questions. Using agreement-disagreement scales is one possible option and would require a slight rewording of questions. Of course such an alternative could only be considered, if it does not create comparison problems with ESS or other surveys.

Media behaviour questions are another technical issue that needs specific attention. The problem the pilot surveys have shown is that specific types of media behaviour are not adequately captured. This block of questions is newspaper and TV centred. Other types of media behaviour do not have a proper coverage and question routing. The recommendation in this respect would be to combine two blocks of questions: intensity media exposure

(including all types of media) and media evaluation in order to fully cover all types of media usage.

Questions about the police seem problematic in some countries because of the different forms of organization of security services. In addition, many respondents are not fully aware of the specific organization of the police forces in their own country. They usually perceive “police” as including officers that are most often publicly identified in media and/or visibly appear as representatives of this sector, e.g. traffic police and police patrols in the streets. At least in some countries unprompted awareness about the specific services included in the term “police” is most probably not very high. Adding variations between countries introduces further complexity to experience and evaluations of specific respondents in specific countries. In view of these pilot findings, the more general assessments of the work of police services (C29–C39) should be considered with greater attention. More generally, a redesign of this section could be considered in order to reflect direct experience of respondents with specific types of police officers.

The wording of Section D questions (especially D1–D5) seems problematic to respondents in all countries. People perceive interviewing as a mostly formal communication, and, in the context of this scenario, it proves difficult for them to “enter the role of a criminal”. People who are more sensitive and less flexible in their social behaviour feel offended and embarrassed. According to interviewer reports this has had a dual effect. First, it is difficult to say how trustworthy responses to this group of questions are. Second, this specific section seems to negatively influence confidence and attitude towards the questions which follow. Similar, but less pronounced is the effect of imaginary situations (section B). Though the situations respondents are asked to imagine are not embarrassing, they seem to stand out from the regular flow of simpler and more straightforward questions. In view of interviewer reports that some respondents ask to have the story repeated, the trustworthiness of responses should be considered carefully.



# France

## Technical Report

### 1. Survey method

A telephone survey was conducted for those 18 years and older living in metropolitan France.

1,503 individuals were surveyed

Mean length of the questionnaire: 25 minutes

Date: 24th of February to the 18th of March

The sample was divided into two sub-samples:

1/ A whole France subsample

2/ A subsample restricted to the département of Seine-Saint-Denis

According to the quota method, the survey was conducted so that each sub-sample will be representative according to the following variables:

Gender

Age in four categories (15-24, 25-44, 45-59, 60 +)

Socio-professional categories in 3 categories (higher, lower, economically inactive)

Region (9 zones)

City size (5 categories)

The number of persons in the household

Educational attainment

The samples were weighted to improve each sample's representativeness of the adult population it was designed to cover.

### 2. Phone contacts

Refusal rates were higher in Seine-Saint-Denis. The more urban character of the Seine-Saint-Denis subsample largely explains the greater number of refusals. Furthermore, the département of Seine-Saint-Denis includes a greater number of foreigners (22% versus 6% for France as a whole), who tend to be more reluctant to participate because of language difficulties.

**Table 1. Phone contacts**

	FRANCE		SEINE-SAINT-DENIS	
	Number	%	Number	%
Total available addresses	15 000	100	15 000	
Success	751	7	752	6
Contacted	1852	17	690	6
Failure	8063	75	10512	87
Refusal to answer	3742	35	4924	41
Wrong address	2127	20	2472	21

### 3. Duration

Mean length = 25 minutes

Max: 53 minutes

Min: 5 min

72% of the interviews lasted between 20 and 28 minutes.

Younger people and students were quicker at answering the questionnaire.

### 4. Quotas

The following table shows that the quota sample worked well, despite the difficulties concerning the level of diploma. Special attention has been paid to this quota variable so as to reach the objectives. The maximal difference to the objective for the specific category of a given quota variable is 0.1%.

**Table 2. Quota : objectives and results for each subsample**

		France					SSD				
		OBJ.		RES.			OBJ.		RES.		
		Nb	%	Nb	%	Diff.	Nb	%	Nb	%	Diff.
		750	100%	751	100%	1	750	100%	752	100%	2
GENDER	Male	357	48%	347	46%	-10	361	48%	363	48%	2
	Female	393	52%	404	54%	11	389	52%	389	52%	0
AGE	18-29	147	20%	134	18%	-13	181	24%	172	23%	-9
	30-44	202	27%	226	30%	24	229	31%	231	31%	2
	45-59	195	26%	187	25%	-8	194	26%	197	26%	3
	60+	206	27%	204	27%	-2	146	19%	152	20%	6
DIPLOMA	No diploma	136	18%	122	16%	-14	207	28%	183	24%	-24
	< Bac	304	41%	298	40%	-6	251	33%	255	34%	4
	> Bac	274	37%	299	40%	25	251	33%	279	37%	28
	Student	36	5%	32	4%	-4	41	5%	35	5%	-6
REGION	Paris	139	19%	162	22%	23					
	Paris region West	71	9%	75	10%	4					
	Paris region East	60	8%	62	8%	2					
	North	48	6%	49	7%	1					
	West	101	13%	97	13%	-4					
	East	65	9%	58	8%	-7					
	South-West	84	11%	75	10%	-9					
	South-East	90	12%	91	12%	1					
	Mediterranean	92	12%	82	11%	-10					
CITY SIZE	rural town	189	25%	192	26%	3					
	< 20 000 inh.	127	17%	117	16%	-10					
	20 to 200 000	98	13%	96	13%	-2					
	> 200 000 inh.	213	28%	195	26%	-18					
	Paris agglo.	123	16%	151	20%	28					
SOCIO- PROF.	SP ++	175	23%	169	23%	-6	173	23%	185	25%	12
	SP --	273	36%	277	37%	4	314	42%	305	41%	-9
	Econ. inactive	302	40%	305	41%	3	263	35%	262	35%	-1
PERSONS /	1	249	33%	212	28%	-37	232	31%	206	27%	-26

HOUSEHO.	2	247	33%	269	36%	22	202	27%	211	28%	9
	3	111	15%	115	15%	4	124	17%	128	17%	4
	4+	143	19%	155	21%	12	192	26%	207	28%	15

## Fielding Report

The French survey focused on ethnicity, so the French questionnaire is not the exact equivalent of the pilot surveys carried out in the countries discussed above. We paid special attention, in translating and sometimes adapting the questions for the French public. For example, we used simple words available to the French public at large, but also referred to themes or issues which appear to be salient in the French context.

Given the interest indifferences between ethnic groups, the questionnaire focussed on attitudes and experience of the agency with which people have most experience and contact – the police. Attitudes and experience were covered in more depth than in the other pilot surveys. The items on attitudes to the courts were largely dropped, although the question on penalties for burglary was retained.

The survey company outlined that the interviewees were interested in the theme of the survey and answering questions enthusiastically; and that no question was problematic.

## HEUNI Reports

69. Organised crime, corruption and the movement of people across borders in the new enlarged EU: A case study of Estonia, Finland and the UK. Jon Spencer, Rose Broad, Kauko Aromaa et. al. Helsinki 2011. Web-publication.
68. Trafficking for Forced Labour and Labour Exploitation in Finland, Poland and Estonia. Anniina Jokinen, Natalia Ollus and Kauko Aromaa (eds.). Helsinki 2011.
67. Ehdolla millä hyvänsä. Työperäinen ihmiskauppa ja ulkomaalaisten työntekijöiden hyväksikäyttö Suomessa. Anniina Jokinen, Natalia Ollus ja Minna Viuhko. Helsinki 2011.
66. Tuhansien iskujen maa – Miesten kokema väkivalta Suomessa. Markku Heiskanen & Elina Ruuskanen. Helsinki 2010. Verkkojulkaisu/Web publication.
65. Survey of United Nations and other Best Practices in the Treatment of Prisoners in the Criminal Justice System: Proceeding of the workshop held at the Twelfth United Nations Congress on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Salvador, Brazil, 12-19 April 2010. Kauko Aromaa & Terhi Viljanen 2010.
64. International Statistics on Crime and Justice. Edited by S. Harrendorf, M. Heiskanen, S. Malby. Helsinki 2010.
63. Syyttäjiin ja tuomareihin kohdistunut epäasiallinen vaikuttaminen Suomessa 2007-2008. Mika Junninen & Kauko Aromaa. Helsinki 2010. English summary. Verkkojulkaisu/Web-publication.
62. Human Trafficking and Organised Crime. Trafficking for sexual exploitation and organised procuring in Finland. Minna Viuhko and Anniina Jokinen. Helsinki 2009
61. Corruption on the Finnish - Russian border. Experiences and observations of Finnish and Russian civil servants and business persons on corruption on the border between Finland and Russia. Kauko Aromaa et al. Helsinki 2009.
60. Korruptio Suomen ja Venäjän rajalla. Suomalaisten viranomaisten näkemyksiä korruptiosta itärajalla. Minna Viuhko and Martti Lehti. Helsinki 2009.
59. JUSTIS Project Working Papers. Review of Need: Indicators of Public Confidence in Criminal Justice for Policy Assessment. Anniina Jokinen, Elina Ruuskanen et al. Helsinki 2009.
58. Suomalaisten vankiloiden turvallisuus. Mika Junninen Helsinki 2008. Joint publication with the Criminal Sanctions Agency Finland. English description only.
57. Hate Crime. Papers from the 2006 and 2007 Stockholm Criminology Symposiums Joanna Goodey and Kauko Aromaa (eds.). Helsinki 2008.
56. Victimization Surveys in Comparative Perspective. Kauko Aromaa and Markku Heiskanen (eds.). Helsinki 2008.
55. Crime and Criminal Justice Systems in Europe and North America 1995-2004. Kauko Aromaa and Markku Heiskanen (eds.). Helsinki 2008.
54. Service Provision for Detainees with Problematic Drug and Alcohol Use in Police Detention. A Comparative Study of Selected Countries in the European Union. Morag MacDonald et al. Helsinki 2008.
53. For the Rule of Law: Criminal Justice Teaching and Training @cross the World. Kauko Aromaa and Slawomir Redo (eds.). Helsinki 2008.
52. Restorative Justice Theory and Practice: Addressing the Discrepancy. Theo Gavrielides. Helsinki 2007.
51. Violence Against Women in Finland (English summary) Minna Piispa, Markku Heiskanen, Juha Kääriäinen and Reino Sirén. Helsinki 2006.
50. International Key Issues in Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice - Papers in celebration of 25 years of HEUNI. Edited by Kauko Aromaa and Terhi Viljanen. Helsinki 2006.
49. Maximizing the Effectiveness of the Technical Assistance Provided in the Fields of Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice. Edited by Margaret Shaw and Yvon Dandurand. Helsinki 2006.
48. Penal Policy, Justice Reform and Social Exclusion: Plenary presentations held at the Fifth Annual Conference of the European Society of Criminology, Krakow, Poland 2005. Edited by Kauko Aromaa. Helsinki 2007.

47. Adventurers and Risk-Takers: Finnish professional criminals and their organisations in the 1990s cross-border criminality. Mika Junninen. Helsinki 2006.
46. Enhancing International Law Enforcement Cooperation, including Extradition Measures. Edited by Kauko Aromaa and Terhi Viljanen. Helsinki 2005.
45. A Study of the Health Care Provision, Existing Drug Services and Strategies Operating in Prisons in Ten Countries from Central and Eastern Europe. Morag MacDonald. Helsinki 2005.
44. Crime and Crime Control in an Integrating Europe. Plenary presentations held at the Third Annual Conference of the European Society of Criminology, Helsinki 2003. Edited by Kauko Aromaa and Sami Nevala. Helsinki 2004.
43. Self-Reported Juvenile Delinquency in England and Wales, the Netherlands and Spain. Rosemary Barberet, Benjamin Bowling, Josine Junger-Tas, Cristina Rechea-Alberola, John van Kesteren, Andrew Zuruwan. Helsinki 2004.
42. Organised crime, Trafficking, Drugs: Selected papers presented at the Annual Conference of the European Society of Criminology, Helsinki 2003. Edited by Sami Nevala and Kauko Aromaa. Helsinki 2004.
41. Further Developments in the Prison Systems of Central And Eastern Europe: Achievements, problems and objectives. Roy Walmsley. Helsinki 2003.
40. Crime and Criminal Justice Systems in Europe and North America 1995-1997. Kauko Aromaa, Seppo Leppä, Sami Nevala and Natalia Ollus, editors. Helsinki 2003.
39. Crime Victims: Doing Justice to their Support and Protection. Irwin Waller. Helsinki 2003.
38. Trafficking in Human Beings, Illegal Immigration and Finland. Martti Lehti and Kauko Aromaa. Helsinki 2002.
37. Assessing International Assistance in Law Enforcement: Themes, findings and recommendations from a case-study of the Republic of Estonia. Bill Heberton and Jon Spencer. Helsinki 2001.
36. Women in the Criminal Justice System: International examples & national responses. Proceedings of the workshop held at the Tenth United Nations Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders. Vienna, Austria, 10-17 April 2000. Natalia Ollus and Sami Nevala, editors. Helsinki 2001.
35. 2001 directory computerised criminal justice information systems. Richard Scherpenzeel. The Hague/Helsinki 2000.
34. Five Issues in European Criminal Justice: Corruption, Women in the Criminal Justice System, Criminal Policy Indicators, Community Crime Prevention, and Computer Crime. Proceedings of the VI European Colloquium on Crime and Criminal Policy, Helsinki 10-12 December 1998. Matti Joutsen, editor. Helsinki 1999.
33. Profiles of Criminal Justice Systems in Europe and North America, 1990-1994. Kristiina Kangaspunta, Matti Joutsen, Natalia Ollus and Sami Nevala (eds). Helsinki 1999.
32. Crime and Criminal Justice in Europe and North America, 1990-1994. Kristiina Kangaspunta, Matti Joutsen and Natalia Ollus (eds). Helsinki 1998.
31. Organised Crime Around the World. Sabrina Adamoli, Andrea Di Nicola, Ernesto U. Savona and Paola Zoffi. Helsinki 1998.
30. Computerization in the Management of the Criminal Justice System. Edited by Richard Scherpenzeel, The Hague 1996 (published jointly with the Ministry of Justice of the Netherlands).
29. Prison Systems in Central and Eastern Europe. Roy Walmsley. Helsinki 1996.
- 28A. Strategii preduprezdenija prestupnosti v Evropi i Severnoj Amerike. Dzon Grehem i Trevor Bennett. Helsinki 1996.
28. Crime Prevention Strategies in Europe and North America. By John Graham and Trevor Bennett, London/Helsinki 1995 (published jointly with the Home Office).
27. Directory of Computerized Criminal Justice Information Systems 1995. Richard Scherpenzeel. The Hague/Helsinki 1995.
26. Profiles of Criminal Justice Systems in Europe and North America. Kristiina Kangaspunta (ed.). Helsinki 1995.
25. Crime and Criminal Justice in Europe and North America 1986-1990. Kristiina Kangaspunta (ed.), Helsinki 1995.
24. Foreigners in Prison. Katarina Tomasevski. Tampere 1994.

23. Policing in Central and Eastern Europe. Report on a Study Tour. David Fogel. Helsinki 1994.
22. Criminal Law and the Environment. Edited by Hans-Jörg Albrecht and Seppo Leppä. Forssa 1992.
21. Prison Health, International Standards and National Practices in Europe. Katarina Tomasevski. Helsinki 1992.
20. Computerization of Criminal Justice Information Systems, vol. II. Edited by Richard Scherpenzeel, The Hague 1992 (published jointly with the Ministry of Justice of The Netherlands).
- 19 A. Computarizacion de los Sistemas Informaticos en la Justicia Penal, I volumen. Editado por Richard Scherpenzeel. La Haya 1992.
19. Computerization of Criminal Justice Information Systems, vol. I. Edited by Richard Scherpenzeel, The Hague 1992 (published jointly with the Ministry of Justice of The Netherlands).
18. Crime Prevention Strategies in Europe and North America. John Graham. Helsinki 1990.
17. Criminal Justice Systems in Europe and North America. Edited by Ken Pease and Kristiina Hukkila. Helsinki 1990.
16. Changing Victim Policy: The United Nations Victim Declaration and Recent Developments in Europe. Report of the Ad Hoc Expert Meeting held in Helsinki, 16-17 November 1988. Helsinki 1989.
15. Alternatives to Custodial Sanctions. Proceedings of the European Seminar held in Helsinki, Finland, 26-28 September 1987. Helsinki 1988.
14. Non-Custodial Alternatives in Europe. Norman Bishop. Helsinki 1988 (second printing 1988).
13. HEUNI - The First Five Years. Helsinki 1988.
12. Computerization of Criminal Justice Information Systems: Realities, Methods, Prospects and Effects. Report of the European Seminar held in Popowo, Poland, 18-22 May 1987, Helsinki 1987 (published jointly with the Ministry of Justice of the Polish People's Republic) (second printing 1988).
11. The Role of the Victim of Crime in European Criminal Justice Systems. A Cross-National Study of the Role of the Victim. Matti Joutsen. Helsinki 1987.
10. Papers on Crime Policy 2. Contributions from HEUNI scholars. Helsinki 1986.
9. Non-Prosecution in Europe. Report of the European Seminar held in Helsinki, Finland, 22-24 March 1986, Helsinki 1986.
8. The Legal Scope of Non-Prosecution in Europe. Peter J.P. Tak. Helsinki 1986.
7. Papers on Crime Policy. Károly Bárd, Matti Joutsen and Aleksander Yakovlev. Helsinki 1986.
6. Course on United Nations Criminal Justice Policy. Report of the European course held in Helsinki, Finland, 25-29 March 1985. Helsinki 1985.
5. Criminal Justice Systems in Europe. Report of the Ad Hoc Expert Group on a cross-national study on trends in crime and information sources on criminal justice and crime prevention in Europe. Helsinki 1985.
4. Selected Issues in Criminal Justice. Helsinki 1984.
3. Effective, Rational and Humane Criminal Justice. Report of the European Seminar held in Helsinki, Finland, 31 May - 3 June 1984. Helsinki 1984.
2. Towards a Victim Policy in Europe. Report of the Seminar held in Espoo, Finland, 31 October - 2 November 1983. Helsinki 1984.
1. The Feasibility of a European Information System on Trends in Crime and Criminal Justice Report of the Ad Hoc Meeting of Experts held in Helsinki, Finland, 9-10 May 1983. Helsinki 1983.