

## JAPAN

Kiyotaka Oda<sup>1</sup>

### Introduction

The main aim of the Criminal Victim Survey in Japan was to discover the crime victimisation rates and the amount of crime that is not reported to the police. Another aim of the survey was to analyse the attitudes and opinions of citizens towards crime, crime prevention, etc.

Since a separate questionnaire was used for the Japanese survey, it was impossible to make a direct comparison between Japanese data and those of other countries.

### Research methodology

The Japan Urban Security Research Institute established a Japanese committee for the international comparative survey on crime. This committee was responsible for the study and analysis of the data resulting from this survey<sup>2</sup>.

When preparing the questionnaire, the Japanese original questionnaire was compared with the first International Crime Survey and the National Crime Survey of 1991.

Interviews were carried out by the New Information Center Co., which used the face-to-face technique.

### Description of sample

The nationwide sample covered 3,000 households, the composition of which is shown according to gender (Table 1) and socio-economic status (Table 2).

### Data collection technique

The sample was selected using a stratified random sampling technique based on the official census data. Interviewing was conducted by the New Information

---

1 Senior Researcher, Research Department, Japan Urban Security Research Institute (JUSRI), Tokyo, Japan.

2 The Chairman of the committee was Prof. Shigeru Ito, Professor of Keio University. The members of the Committee were: Kazuhiko Tokoro, Professor of Rikkyo University; Osamu Koide, Professor of Tokyo University; Takafumi Kobayashi, Director, Crime Prevention Unit, NPA; Yukinobu Izumi, Director, Crime Investigation Unit, NPA; Kanehiro Hoshino, Director General, Crime Prevention Unit, NRIPS; Kenji Kiyonaga, Chief Researcher, Crime Prevention Unit, NRIPS; Ryuji Matsumura, Executive Director, JUSRI. The Working Group consisted of: Yutaka Inoue, Lecturer, Sensyu University; Toshihiko Kasahara, Assistant Director, Crime Prevention Unit, NPA; Yasuhiro Watanabe, Assistant Director, Crime Investigation Unit, NPA; Fujio Otsu, Assistant Director, Crime Investigation Unit, NPA; Nobuo Kikuzawa, Senior Staff, Crime Prevention Unit, NPA; Masato Endo, Senior Staff, Crime Investigation Unit, NPA; Yoshiyasu Tanaka, Secretary General, JUSRI; Kitaro Yoshida, Senior Researcher, JUSRI.

Center, and a team of interviewers was specifically trained for the purpose. The actual interviews were conducted between 7 and 15 February 1992. As mentioned above, the face-to-face method was adopted, whereby the interviewers visited the respondents at dinner time or after 8 p.m. and interviewed them in Japanese.

### **Response rate and recontacting**

2,382 interviews were completed out of a sample of 3,000 households, representing a response rate of 79.4%. This is lower than the 80.4% response rate registered in the 1989 survey, in which 2,411 interviews were completed out of a sample of 3,000. Most of the 20.6% unsuccessful interviews were due to the absence of the respondents at the time of the visit.

### **Victimisation rates**

Table 3 illustrates the prevalence victimisation rates for the whole five-year period and last year preceding both the 1989 and 1992 surveys. The respondents were asked about the victimisation that they or a member of their household had experienced during 1991. Individual experiences of the respondents were not included. Analyses were then made only for those categories that were comparable with other countries.

### **Crime seriousness**

The respondents were asked to evaluate the seriousness of a series of criminal conducts. "Sniffing of marijuana" was considered the most seriousness (with 95%), followed by "shoplifting" (91%), and "stealing a ride without paying for the middle part of the trip" came last with 28%.

### **Victim support**

Two victim support systems exist in Japan; these are the crime victim benefit system and the crime victim relief fund. Both systems were established in 1986. The victim benefit system aims to reduce the mental and economic damage suffered by the relatives of those who were killed or seriously injured during a premeditated crime, as in the case of planting explosives. In this case the state pays benefits to relatives of dead persons and injured persons apart from social solidarity and mutual aid. The crime victim relief system was established to supplement the state's crime victim benefit system. Unfortunately, private and local government victim support systems do not work well together.

### **Attitudes towards the police**

The Japanese questionnaire did not include items regarding satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the work of the police; reporting the crime to the police; and daily policing for crime prevention.

## Fear of crime

Table 7 shows a list of offences and the respondents' fear of falling victim to them. Eight per cent of the respondents expressed no fear whatsoever, but 7% were very fearful, in the case of all listed crimes.

Levels of fear were higher for property crimes than for physical crimes. Burglary with entry, theft of bicycle, trespassing and consumer fraud were relatively high, whereas drug abuse, theft of motorcycle, extortion, threat and rape were lower on the ranking list.

## Changes in fear of crime

A comparison was made between the fears of crime expressed in the 1989 survey and those of the 1992 survey, using the same categories. Fear of crime was registered in all the comparative categories (Table 8).

## Crime prevention

Since the Japanese used different items in their list of crime prevention measures, it proved impossible to effect a direct comparison between Japanese data and those of other countries.

When asked about specific crime prevention measures, most of the respondents expressed a negative attitude towards measures that involved personal expenses or community involvement. On the other hand, they positively evaluated preventive activities on the part of the police or the state (Table 10).

As far as individual crime prevention measures are concerned (Table 11), although the majority of respondents did not use measures that involved personal expenses, nevertheless 50% of them did use several crime prevention measures (such as locking the window/door, not leaving valuable objects in the car, and putting a lock on the car for a short time when leaving a car parked) that did not imply these expenses.

## TABLES

**Table 1: Composition of sample according to gender and age**

Age	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	Total
Male N	40	124	194	268	242	224	67	11	0	1170
(%)	3.4	10.6	16.6	22.9	20.7	19.1	5.7	0.9	0.0	49.1
Female N	40	159	281	294	206	148	68	15	1	1212
(%)	3.3	13.1	23.2	24.3	17.0	12.2	5.6	1.2	0.1	50.9
Total N	80	283	475	562	448	372	135	26	1	2382
(%)	3.4	11.9	19.9	23.6	18.8	15.6	5.7	1.1	0.0	100.0

**Table 2: Composition of sample according to gender and socio-economical status**

Socio-economic status	Upper class	Upper-middle class	Middle class	Lower-middle class	Lower class	N.A.	Total
Male N	5	94	708	300	56	7	1170
(%)	0.4	8.0	60.5	25.6	4.8	0.6	49.1
Female N	7	108	772	248	70	7	1212
(%)	0.6	8.9	63.7	20.5	5.8	0.6	50.9
Total N	12	202	1480	548	126	14	2382
(%)	0.5	8.5	62.1	23.0	5.3	0.6	100.0

**Table 3: Prevalence victimisation rates\***

	Victimisation rates 1989 survey (%)		Victimisation rates 1992 survey (%)	
	5 years	1 year	5 years	1 year
Theft of car	0.7	0.2		1.1
Theft from car	2.1	0.7		2.3
Car vandalism	4.4	2.7		
Theft of motorcycle	1.7	0.4		3.2
Theft of bicycle	9.0	3.7		9.6
Owners (any member of household)				
Theft of car	0.8	0.3		0.9
Theft from car	2.6	0.8		2.1
Car vandalism	5.0	3.1		
Theft of motorcycle	1.7	0.4		3.2
Theft of bicycle	10.0	5.0		9.6
Burglary with entry	2.2	0.7		1.1
Attempted burglary	0.6	0.2		
Robbery (with entry)	0.0	0.0		0.1
Personal theft	0.8	0.2		1.3
Sexual incidents	1.8	1.0		1.8
Assault/threat	0.6	0.7		0.5

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

**Table 4: Reported crimes**

	1989 survey		1992 survey	
	5 years (%)	1 year (%)	5 years (%)	1 year (%)
Theft of car	77.8	66.7		63.0
Theft from car	41.2	52.9		39.3
Car vandalism	21.0	27.3		
Theft of motorcycle	87.5	90.0		38.5
Theft of bicycle	52.5	43.8		47.5
Burglary with entry	80.8	29.4		69.4
Attempted burglary	71.4	100.0		
Robbery	0.0	0.0		
Personal theft	68.4	25.0		47.6
Sexual incidents	9.1	0.10		4.4
Assault/threat	21.4	25.0		63.6

**Table 5: 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/no damage	16.7	25.0		100.0	4.5	7.1	0.0	5.4	0.0	50.0
Offender is a family member/acquaintance	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.7	0.0	0.0
Offender is a child	0.0	5.0		0.0	3.9	7.1	0.0	2.7	100.0	0.0
My own fault	33.3	15.0		0.0	20.6	28.6	0.0	24.3	0.0	0.0
Too late to find victim	0.0	7.5		0.0	1.9	14.3	0.0	13.5	0.0	0.0
Keep secret	0.0	5.0		0.0	0.6	7.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Police won't do anything	16.7	12.5		0.0	6.5	14.3	0.0	8.1	0.0	16.7
Couldn't recover	16.7	15.0		0.0	36.8	21.4	50.0	29.7	0.0	0.0
Complicated procedure	16.7	10.0		0.0	14.8	0.0	50.0	5.4	0.0	0.0
Dislike police	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.7	0.0	0.0
Fear of revenge	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3
No insurance	0.0	2.5		0.0	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other reasons	0.0	2.5		0.0	5.8	0.0	0.0	5.4	0.0	0.0
Total N	6	40		1	155	14	2	37	1	6

\* 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 6: Seriousness of crime**

	Never excuse (%)	Not excuse (%)	Probably excuse (%)	Excuse (%)	Do not know (%)
Taking a ride without paying for middle part of trip (Y200)	14.3	45.0	22.0	6.4	11.2
Riding on other people's bicycle without permission	30.4	59.3	6.1	0.9	3.1
Shoplifting (Y1,000)	40.7	50.4	4.6	0.5	3.2
Play mah-jongg for stakes (Y10,000)	15.9	33.8	26.6	10.3	12.4
Sniffing marijuana	71.8	23.5	0.7	0.4	3.4
Employing unqualified foreigner	14.6	32.6	24.5	5.8	21.3
Drinking by minor	26.3	50.2	15.4	3.1	4.7
Smoking by minor	30.4	51.4	11.3	2.5	4.3

**Table 7: Fear of crime\***

	Male	Female	Total
Theft of car	44.3	40.9	42.6
Theft from car	41.1	40.3	40.7
Car vandalism	39.1	41.2	40.2
Theft of motorcycle	30.4	27.2	28.7
Theft of bicycle	51.1	54.5	52.8
Burglary with entry	63.7	69.9	66.8
Robbery with entry	51.5	57.1	54.4
Trespassing	53.0	58.0	55.5
Kidnapping	37.4	44.6	41.1
Pickpocketing/snatching	38.9	47.1	43.0
Robbery	37.7	40.8	39.2
Extortion	34.4	31.8	33.1
Threat	32.8	29.3	30.9
Assault/aggravated assault	40.2	40.7	40.4
Consumer fraud by a flagrant business	49.3	50.1	49.7
Misuse of cards	41.5	42.7	42.1
Rape	29.5	39.0	34.3
Other sexual incidents	33.1	46.7	40.0
Drug abuse	25.5	23.8	24.6
Crime by foreigner	31.7	29.6	30.6
Japanese mafia crime	45.1	36.9	41.0

\* Percentage of respondents who feared falling victim to each crime.

**Table 8: Changes in fear of crime\***

	1989 survey (%)	1992 survey (%)
Burglary with entry	54.3	66.9
Pickpocketing/snatching	35.4	43.1
Robbery	34.7	54.4
Sexual incidents without rape	28.0	40.0
Kidnapping	36.0	41.1
Crime of Japanese mafia	16.7	41.0
Theft of bicycle	49.1	52.9
Consumer fraud by a flagrant business	47.2	49.7

\* Percentage of respondents who feared falling victim to each crime.



**Table 9: Evaluation of need for crime prevention measures (multiple answers possible)**

	Male (%)	Female (%)	Total (%)
Very necessary	25.0	26.5	25.8
Probably necessary	63.9	61.4	62.6
Unnecessary	10.5	11.7	11.1

**Table 10: Specific crime prevention measures**

	Male (%)	Female (%)	Total (%)
Increasing security lights/street lights	60.9	63.2	62.1
Building-up a strong town against crime	45.9	47.4	46.7
Residents patrol/protection activities	8.5	7.8	8.1
Security camera/burglar alarm	9.8	12.6	11.3
Contract with private security company	1.8	2.1	2.0
Be intimate/co-operate with neighbour	49.4	46.8	48.1
Community crime prevention/by crime prevention organisation	13.9	10.9	12.4
Increase in police activity	49.2	49.7	49.5
Increase in police boxes	20.3	20.0	20.2
Increase in police officers	12.4	11.3	11.8
Security survey by police officer	7.9	7.6	7.8
Others	1.2	0.2	0.7

**Table 11: Individual crime prevention measures (multiple answers possible)**

	Male (%)	Female (%)	Total (%)
Always lock up the window/door	84.8	85.5	85.1
During long absences, inform the neighbour/caretaker	47.1	44.2	45.6
During long absences, stop the delivery of milk/newspaper	27.4	30.3	28.8
Leave the light on when going out at night	35.0	43.2	39.2
Contract with a private security company	0.3	0.7	0.5
Keeping a watchdog	16.9	16.3	16.6
Avoiding dangerous places/streets at night	31.5	48.9	40.3
Being accompanied to/from home by family member at night	13.9	20.5	17.3
Avoid talking to strangers	29.4	44.0	36.8
When going out, holding one's bag tightly to avoid having bag snatched or being pickpocketed	23.8	38.8	31.4
Carry portable burglar alarm	1.1	1.6	1.3
Fix a special lock/chain to bicycle/motorcycle	18.9	14.8	16.8
Effect crime prevention registration	34.5	36.5	35.5
Avoid leaving valuable objects in a parked car	49.9	51.0	50.5
Locking the car when leaving it parked for a short time	55.4	52.1	53.7
Keeping the door chain locked when visited by strangers	11.2	14.9	13.1
Avoid talking with catchesailors on the streets	42.0	50.0	46.1
Avoid riding on the EV with a stranger	2.4	6.6	4.5
Never play alone in the park/outdoors	16.8	20.7	18.8
Others	0.3	0.7	0.5