

# INDONESIA<sup>1</sup>

Mardjono Reksodiputro<sup>2</sup>,  
Sarwirini, S.H. M.S. & S.R. Tumanan, S.H. M.S.<sup>3</sup>

## JAKARTA

### Description of sample

The sample was composed of 1,000 respondents in the city of Jakarta. Of these 173 belonged to the upper class, 560 to the middle class; and 267 to the lower class. Thirteen interviewees lived in flats, 940 in various types of houses, and 47 in shanties. Of the sample 557 were male and 443 female and their distribution by age is as follows: 9.9% were born between 1941 and 1942; 13.5% between 1943 and 1945; 66.1% between 1946 and 1967; and 10% between 1968 and 1976. 562 of the respondents were aged between 25 and 49. Most of them (518) had lived in the same abode for 10 years or more, 211 between 5 and 10 years and 227 between 2 and 5 years.

### Data collection technique

Respondents were interviewed face-to-face by a group of 25 senior students and graduates of the Faculty of Social and Political Science of the University of Indonesia (supervised by 2 senior and 3 junior lecturers). The interviewers had previous field research experience and were briefed for two days on the use of the questionnaire (once the questionnaire had been pre-tested by the supervisors). The questionnaire was in Indonesian (translated and adapted by Prof. J.E. Sahetapy). No particular problems were encountered when collecting the data. This took two weeks in the middle of August 1992; however, computer processing of the data and elaboration of collected information were only accomplished on 4 November 1992.

### Response rate and re-contacting

All of the 25 interviewers were assigned specific areas by the supervisors (corresponding to the three social class areas). Daily checks were made to keep track of the number of respondents who had completed the interviews, so as not to surpass the target assigned to each "social class area". Interviewers called at each dwelling and requested permission for an interview. No refusals were recorded and on the last day 1,000 (one thousand) interviews had been completed.

---

<sup>1</sup> The research team was co-ordinated by Prof. J.E. Sahetapy, Department of Criminology, University of Airlangga, Surabaya, Indonesia.

<sup>2</sup> Author of the section on Jakarta, and member of the research team.

<sup>3</sup> Authors of the section on Surabaya and members of the research team.

## **Victimisation rates**

Out of the 44.3% female respondents, 25.5% reported a sexual incident in the last 5 years and 4.51% of these occurred during the last year (1992). Considering that most of the interviewees were males and that a discussion between the sexes on sexual offences is very uncommon in Indonesia, it is very likely that the incidents were under-reported. Consideration should also be given to the fact that buses in Jakarta are usually overcrowded (2-3 times the normal capacity), therefore, an "offensive touch" can easily take place. Victims of consumer fraud may also be under-reported, as most buyers in Indonesia do not insist on checking that scales used by merchants are accurate; in addition, most food items in Indonesia do not have an expiry date printed on the package.

The figure on corruption may also be under-reported. It is considered normal to give a "tip" for services rendered by a government official, and not regard it as "bribery". The data collected shows that 18.8% were government officials and 13.6% police officers.

## **Reasons for not reporting**

Responses stating that the police could do nothing/wouldn't do anything/fear or dislike of the police which recorded around 50% (except for theft of motorcycles and assault/threat), supports the general opinions in the community that the police are helpless in solving those crimes (low clearance rate). Responses to motorcycle theft are more difficult to explain, considering that the ownership of a motorcycle is quite widespread in Indonesia. One possibility could be that the stolen motorcycles did not have proper (legal) ownership documents (police registration documents).

## **Crime seriousness**

There seems to be some contradiction between responses to "reasons for not reporting" and "crime seriousness". Theft of a car is considered "very serious", still the reason given by 50% for not reporting was that the police are helpless. Does this mean that they have other ways or means of recovering their stolen property? This cannot occur through the insurance company because a police report is required in order to pay out insurance money.

## **Victim support**

Victims responded that most support was given by relatives (76.5%) and friends (51.9%), neighbours came next (34.2%) and the police last (19.2%). This appears to be consistent with the "distrust" of the police and the "kinship system" in Indonesian communities.

## **Attitudes toward the police**

Out of 19.7% who reported to the police, 53.8% (10.6% of total respondents) were satisfied. Those who were not satisfied (46.2%) gave as their reason: the police "did not do enough", "did not find the offender". This could be an indication of

their disappointment, due to very high personal expectations of the police. With respect to police controlling the area, only 36.6% (of total respondents) considered that the police had done a good job; and 25.8% responded that police surveillance was sufficient. This shows that the presence of the police in the streets (including traffic police) was considered to be reasonably adequate.

### **Fear of crime**

The feeling of safety was quite high. Respondents felt that they were "fairly safe" (70.9%) and "very safe" (13.8%) after dark. About 75.4% also responded that they do not avoid certain streets or areas in their neighbourhood, and 75.3% said they do not take someone with them for reasons of safety. However, this is not consistent with their responses to the chances of being victimised. Most of them seem to think that it is likely (49.8%) or very likely (1.2%) that they will be victimised.

### **Crime prevention**

Crime prevention measures adopted were mostly window (and door) grills (56.5%) and watchmen (51.2%). Next came door locks (35%), high fences (19.1%), reliance on neighbours (27.4%) and the possession of firearms (4.3%), for which the approval of the authorities (police) is needed.

### **Attitudes towards punishment**

Most of the victims were quite severe towards the offender. Out of the total respondents, 77.7% favoured prison sentences. This can also be ascribed to the very reduced number of fines contemplated (the Criminal Code was enacted in 1918); fines could become another alternative for punishment. Respondents appear to favour (51.5%) prison sentences covering a period of six months to one year.

## **TABLES**

**Table 1: Prevalence victimisation rates (5 years)\***

	Victimisation rate (%)
Theft of car	2.5
Theft from car	15.7
Car vandalism	9.5
Theft of motorcycle	2.1
Theft of bicycle	6.8
(Owners)	
Theft of car	5.3
Theft from car	33.5
Car vandalism	20.2
Theft of motorcycle	6.8
Theft of bicycle	12.7

Burglary with entry	13.6
Attempted burglary	9.0
Robbery	6.3
Personal theft	28.3
Sexual incidents	25.5
Assault/threat	8.0

\* Prevalence - percentage of respondents who have been victims of a specific form of crime once or more.

**Table 2: Prevalence victimisation rates (1 year)\***

	Victimisation rate (%)
Theft of car	0.6
Theft from car	5.0
Car vandalism	2.8
Theft of motorcycle	0.6
Theft of bicycle	1.0
(Owners)	
Theft of car	1.3
Theft from car	10.7
Car vandalism	6.0
Theft of motorcycle	1.9
Theft of bicycle	1.9
Burglary with entry	3.0
Attempted burglary	1.4
Robbery	1.4
Personal theft	7.5
Sexual incidents	4.5
Assault/threat	1.6
Consumer fraud	25.6
Corruption	36.5

\* Prevalence - percentage of respondents who have been victims of a specific form of crime once or more.

**Table 3: Reported crimes**

	%
Theft of car	92.0
Theft from car	32.5
Car vandalism	13.7
Theft of motorcycle	85.7
Theft of bicycle	4.4
Burglary with entry	33.0
Attempted burglary	14.5
Robbery	25.4
Personal theft	38.5
Sexual incidents	2.6
Assault/threat	15.0

**Table 4: Reasons for not reporting\***

	Theft of car %	Theft from car %	Car vandalism %	Theft of motorcycle %	Theft of bicycle %	Burglary with entry %	Robbery %	Personal theft %	Sexual incidents %	Assault/ threat %
Not serious enough		20.0	42.7		33.9	34.1	27.7	42.0	49.1	39.7
Solved it myself		7.6	4.9	33.3	21.5	19.8	8.5	10.2	15.4	29.4
Inappropriate for police		9.5	12.2		21.5	14.2	6.4	13.1	26.4	8.8
Other authorities		8.6	2.4	33.3	4.6	18.7	6.4	7.4		5.9
My family solved it		5.7	7.3	33.3	9.2	5.5	4.2	2.3	10.0	7.3
No insurance		5.7	3.7		4.6	4.4		0.6		1.5
Police could do nothing	50.0	30.5	24.4		24.6	18.7	21.3	21.0	20.0	11.8
Police won't do anything		27.6	21.9		26.1	22.0	8.5	11.9	14.5	7.3
Fear/dislike police		21.9	13.4		16.9	9.9	27.7	9.1	4.5	10.3
Didn't dare					16.9		8.5	1.7	5.4	4.4
Other reasons		1.9	7.3		3.1		2.1	2.3	10.0	
Don't know	50.0							1.1	0.9	

\* Percentages calculated on victims who said they had not reported the last incident of each type of crime to the police - multiple answers possible.

**Table 5: Crime seriousness\***

	Theft of car %	Theft from car %	Car vandalism %	Theft of motorcycle %	Theft of bicycle %	Burglary with entry %	Robbery %	Personal theft %	Sexual incidents %	Assault/ threat %
Very serious	68.0	15.3	10.5	28.6	10.3	24.3	28.6	18.6	15.0	17.5
Fairly serious	32.0	50.3	46.3	71.4	29.4	47.2	47.6	48.8	35.4	40.0
Not serious		34.4	43.2		60.3	27.9	23.8	32.6	49.6	42.5

\* Percentage based on victims of specific crimes.

**Table 6: Crime prevention measures\***

	%
Installed burglar alarm	8.3
Installed door locks	35.0
Installed window/door grills	56.5
Maintain watchdogs	14.1
High fence	19.1
House has a caretaker	5.3
None of these	
Others	2.0
Ask somebody to watch home	51.2
Neighbours watch anyway	27.4
Possession of firearms	4.3
House is insured against burglary	8.3

\* Percentages based on total sample of respondents - multiple answers possible.

