

Dark Figure of Crime in Bangladesh: A Descriptive Study on Gazipur District

Mohammed Jahirul islam¹
Mst. Nurjahan khatun²
Moumita paul³

Abstract

The main intent of the study was to find out the present nature of dark figure of crime in semi-urban Bangladesh through comparing police statistics and victimization survey. Therefore, Tongi thana of Gazipur district were randomly selected as a study area by using random digit method. Data have been collected from police statistics as well as victimization survey has also been conducted to understand the nature of dark figure of crime in semi-urban area. Victimization survey was conducted on three randomly selected wards (Ward-5, 9 and 11) to understand the nature of dark figure of crime. Sixty four samples were drawn out of 26000 populations above 12 years age by using purposive sampling technique. The study shows that corruption in systems, unwillingness of victims, negligence to the nature of crime and publicity are the most important reasons of the non-reporting of crime in respective area. Additionally, age of the respondents, nature of the occupation and income are moderately related to reporting of crime than gender, religion and marital status of the victims. The study concludes that majority (74%) of the crime incidences is non-reported and rate of dark figure is 178.29. So it is an urgent need for the Government to develop positive police public relation, smooth policing and criminal justice system, and swift crime prevention strategies for controlling and reducing crime wholly.

Keywords: Dark Figure of Crime, Victimization Survey, Semi-urban Area, Uniform Crime Report.

¹ Assistant Professor, Department of Criminology and Police Science, Mawlana Bhashani Science and Technology University.

² Assistant Professor, Department of Criminology and Police Science, Mawlana Bhashani Science and Technology University.

³ MS. In Department of Criminology and Police Science, Mawlana Bhashani Science and Technology University.

Introduction

With the dawn of human civilization, in every society the incident of crime also grew in diverse forms and degrees. Historically different culture, same incident is noted as crime or deviance, delinquency or immortality, and even sin. In some cases, these events come forward for the justice such as murder, assault etc. and in other cases, some incidents remain in dark which assists and shapes the “Dark Figure of Crime”.

Crime is a violation of societal rules of behavior as interpreted and expressed by a criminal legal code created by people holding social and political power (Siegel, 1998:19). It is originated from the Latin word “*Crimen*” meaning “Accusation” or “Fault”, and consisted by seven elements: Harm, Legality, *Actus reus*, *Mens rea*, Causation, Concurrence and Punishment. Crime statistics means the indices of intensity of crimes recorded annually in a particular country (Paranjape, 2005:188). But it may be done through several ways with different duration. For instance Uniform Crime Report (1930) under the FBI includes both the eight crimes, termed as index of crimes (murder and non-negligent manslaughter, forcible rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny-theft, motor-vehicle theft and arson) and reported offences annually which is done mainly for administrative purpose (Bohm & Haley, 2005:43). And the Dark Figure of Crime is the number of crimes which are not officially recorded by the police (Bohm & Haley, 2005:39). It was first recognized by the statistician Adolphe Quetelet in 1830 (Young, 2001:01).

It has been argued that the number of crimes known to police is a serious underestimation of actual crime. Police do not know about all criminal incidents, as many crimes are not reported (Reid, 1997). Moreover, all reported crimes are not recorded by the police and this is the prime cause of the dark figure of crime. Beside these it also depends on several factors: geographical area; law enforcement agencies; willingness of victims; social perception; level of disorganization; Level of corruption; Avoidance to embarrass offender (relative etc.); Positive view-points toward crime; Lengthy Criminal justice System; Intimidation by Offender; Publicity after Reporting; and many other factors (Bohm & Haley, 2005:40 & [http: www.criminology studyonline.com](http://www.criminologystudyonline.com)). The nature of crime is also important here, for example, Rape, Domestic Violence, Sexual Harassment, Female Criminality, Pornography, White Collar crimes etc. are the such crimes which unreported rate is high through all over the world.

Although the dark figure of crime, nowadays, is a very popular concept as well as crime and crime statistics but different typical forms of

studies have been done on the latter in whole world whereas, the dark figure of crime has no enough ground of study.

The most important work is done by the prominent Skogan (1977 & 2003), who has discovered the form of the dark figure of crime; social and individual consequences of crime-victims; the lengthy and tough criminal justice system; social disorganization but did not compare between official or non-official crime statistics. Young (2001) has shown that the rate of dark figure of crime is not so high, but in real the picture is totally different and which is shown by Bohm & Haley (2005) through the true amount of crime. Biderman and Reiss (1967) just try to compare the real crime and the institutional crime mainly but there are various multidimensional paths to compare it such as by location, nature of crime etc. Estrada (2001) use the term particularly in : Violence against women, Illegal art market, Juvenile violence, Maternal Mortality respectively.

In Bangladesh, no comprehensive study has done yet on dark figure of crime though this term is used fluently by many authors: Faruk and Khatun (2008); and Islam and Khatun (2012). Among these studies Islam and Khatun has pointed out the 'Female Criminality' as hidden crime.

The main goal of the study was to find out the present condition of dark figure of crime in semi-urban area of Bangladesh. It was done by the comparison between official data (police statistics) and the data collected by victimization survey in the study area. The victimization survey focused on the socio-demographic characteristics of victims, causes of victims, victim-offender relation, nature and causes of non-reported crime etc. In academic point of view, the study is very important because there is no comprehensive study on the dark figure of crime in any study area in Bangladesh as well as in the whole world. In this regard, the present study added new and innovative conceptions in this academic arena. The study mainly followed the method of the National Crime Victimization survey and use individual as respondent rather than household survey. As the study was not depended on reported crime rather covered all types' incidents of crime, so the validity and reliability can be ensured by the study. As the study tries to show the actual picture of crime situations, so it will be more effective to provide some important issues in crime prevention strategies through the law enforcement agencies of Bangladesh.

Objectives of the Study

The prime objective of the study is to explore the nature of dark figure of crime in Bangladesh. With this view in mind, the specific objectives of the study are as follows:

1. To represent the present condition of the Dark figure of crime in semi-urban area;

2. To find out the common forms, nature, patterns, causes and consequences of dark figure of crime;
3. To obtain and present information about the individuals and social background of the victims including age distribution, marital status, religion, occupation, education and monthly income etc.;
4. To calculate the rate of dark figure through comparing police statistics and victimization survey;
5. To explain the reasons of non-reporting of crime and causal relations of its associated socio-demographic factors;

Review of Literature

The dark figure of crime is a term that is used by criminologists and the sociologists to illustrate the number of committed crimes that are never reported or discovered and this puts into doubt the effectiveness and efficiency of the official crimes data. Among the crimes that take place in any given place at a given period of time, some of them are never reported to the police, and some are reported but never recorded by the police officers. Eminent professor Albert Biderman (1967) in his seminal thesis has described Dark Figure in crime as an 'occurrences that by some criteria are called crime yet that are not registered in the statistics of whatever agency was the source of the data being used.' In this situation, the sociologists define the difference between committed crimes and the reported and recorded crimes as the dark figure of crime (<http://www.lawteacher.net>). Generally the conceptual understanding about the dark figure of crime has been evolved after questioning the validity and reliability of the official crime statistics. Crime statistics means the indices of intensity of crimes recorded annually in a particular country (Paranjape, 2005:188). But it may be done through several ways with different duration. For instance Uniform Crime Report (1930) under the FBI includes both the eight crimes, termed as index of crimes (murder and nonnegligent manslaughter, forcible rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny-theft, motor-vehicle theft and arson) and reported offences annually which is done mainly for administrative purpose (Bohm & Haley, 2005:43); National Crime Victimization Survey (1972) is a source of crime statistics based on interviews in which respondents are asked whether they have been victims of any of the FBI's index offences (murder, nonnegligent manslaughter and arson) or other crimes during the past 6 months, if they have, they are asked to provide information about the experience (Bohm & Haley, 2005:47); Self Report Survey (1975) means such crime statistics which compiled on the basis of self-reports by offenders (Inciardi, 2002:112). However, the most common reason for the existence of dark figure is non-reporting of crimes. It is estimated that the dark figure of crimes makes 66% of all committed crimes (<http://crime-study.blogspot.com>). Skogan (1977) has

pointed out some of the negative consequences of unrecorded crime and/or dark figure of crime. He opined that unrecorded crime limits the deterrent capability of the criminal justice system, it contributes to the misallocation of police resources, it renders victims ineligible for public and private benefits, it affects insurance costs, and it helps to shape the police role in society (Skogan, 1977:01).

The dark figure of crime may depend on many factors, and the most common are: (i). Structure of crime in some geographical area; (ii). Number of qualified experts in police, government agencies and state attorney's who have a function to detect and investigate crime and to prosecute criminals; (iii). Confidence, willingness and readiness of victims to pass through the process of secondary victimization in criminal Court and to confront the presumptive or known criminal; (iv). social perception of the public on the effectiveness of criminal detection and confidence in criminal justice system protective function; (v). technical capabilities of police, government agencies and state attorney's; (vi). development of new efficient methods and continuous improvement of the existing methods of crime detection; (vii). level of organization or disorganization of police, government agencies, state attorney's and other subjects; (viii). level of corruption generated by the government agencies, elected political officials and other subjects; and (ix). the openness of government agencies for new qualified human resources. (<http://crime-study.blogspot.com>). Moreover, Bohm and Healy identified some of the other factors which is related to the causes of non-reporting: geographical area, law enforcement agencies, willingness of victim, social perception, level of disorganization, level of corruption, avoidance to embarrass offender (relatives etc.), positive view-points toward crime, lengthy criminal justice system, intimidation by offender, publicity after reporting etc. Furthermore, a number of authors identified the causes of un-reporting and under-reporting. They pointed out the following factors: underreporting due to the dissatisfaction of police (Gordon, 1990:13); racial motives behind incidents and minor disputes (Dunhill, 1989:70) and hostile treatment of police (Gordon, 1990: 1-20), which were the basic causes of underreporting.

Methodology

Research Design of the Study

Descriptive survey design was used to understand the nature of dark figure. Data have been collected from Gazipur through two stages. Firstly, crime related data was collected from the respective Police station. Secondly, the crime-victimization survey was conducted to report the actual statistics of victimization compared with each other and find out the present condition of dark figure of crime in Bangladesh.

Area of the Study

Data were collected from semi-peripheral area like Tongi, Gazipur. Tongi were selected randomly through using random digit number. So, Tongi were the study area of the research. Tongi may be pointed out as the zone in transition where typical dimensions of crime were occurred.

Sampling Design of the Study

The study was conducted on Tongi Thana of Gazipur. Due to comparing police statistics and victimization data, victimization survey was conducted on three wards (Wards-5, 9, 11) of Tongi. The studied populations were the individuals who were above 12 years as because the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS), the most popular form of victimization survey, considers this age limit and it is generalized that during adolescent, individual are being victimized most. So, the individuals above 12 years were the studied population. Out of 26, 000 population, Sixty four people were interviewed accordingly. And 64 individual who are the head of the household in each area were being selected purposively for the assistance of researcher which reflected the whole relevant condition of the each entire family. For that 64 individual above 12 years of each area were considered as sample of the study which represented not the victimized condition of 64 individual but the 64 familial conditions. As the total population of the Tongi Thana was 3, 50, 000. So the crime rate was calculated with per one lac unit.

Data Collection Methods and Techniques

The data were collected mainly two ways. At first data were collected from the Tongi Police station as the police statistics from October, 2011 to March, 2012. Moreover, the survey was conducted on the 64 head of the household of each study area. Data were collected from the respondents by mixed questionnaire as tools and interview schedule as technique. Here, the questionnaire contains various types of question (open ended, close ended, matrix and contingency question types) which helps to find out the purpose of the study. However, the topic of the study was 'Dark Figure of Crime in Bangladesh: A study on Gazipur.' The study was unbiased and preserves every types of privacy of the respondent to find out the real data.

Data Processing and Analysis

From the study basically two types of data (qualitative and quantitative) were collected and after then editing and coding were done respectively. Here, some data were being coded before data collection. After coding these were classified and tabulated. As most of the data were belonging in nominal level, for that frequency, percentage and cross-tabulation were being used. The frequency distributions of the entire variables were

checked by using SPSS 12.0 windows program. For proper analysis, Univariate and bivariate (cross tabulation and association measures ‘Lamda’) analysis were used to assess the relationships among the variables.

Results

Univariate Analysis

1. Socio-Demographic information related to Victimization

Table-01: Comparison of Demographic Characteristics of Respondent and Victim

Demographic characteristics

Variables	Attributes	Respondent (of Victimization Survey)		Victim (from Police Statistics)	
		Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Age	15-25	25	39.1	54	22.8
	25-35	24	37.5	73	30.3
	35-45	10	15.6	41	17.3
	45-55	5	7.8	13	5.5
	55-65+	-	-	7	3
	Unknown	-	-	48	20.06
	Total		64	100	237
Religion	Islam	58	90.6	182	76.8
	Hindu	6	9.4	6	2.5
	Christian	-	-	1	.4
	Unknown	-	-	48	20.3
	Total	64	100	237	100
Marital Status	Married	59	92.2	75	31.6
	Widow	2	3.1	1	.4
	Divorce	1	1.6	3	1.3
	Unmarried	-	-	35	14.8
	Unknown	2	3.1	123	51.9
	Total	64	100	237	100
Gender	Male	9	14.1	172	72.6
	Female	55	85.9	31	13.1
	Unknown	-	-	34	14.3
	Total	64	100	237	100
Occupation	Student	11	17.2	4	1.7
	Housewife	29	45.3	-	-
	Professional Criminal	-	-	78	32.5
	Govt.	3	4.7	-	-

Dark Figure of Crime in Bangladesh: A Descriptive Study on Gazipur District

	Service-holder				
	Employee	15	23.4	19	8.0
	Police officer	-	-	-	-
	Businessman	6	9.4	71	30
	Laborer	-	-	7	3
	Unknown	-	-	58	24.5
	Total	64	100	237	100
Education Qualification	Primary	7	10.9		
	Secondary	29	45.3		
	Higher Secondary	11	17.2		
	Graduation	8	12.5		
	Post-graduation	3	4.7		
	Uneducated	5	7.8		
	Unknown	1	1.6		
	Total	64	100.0		
Monthly Income	Less than 5000	3	4.7		
	5000-8000	7	10.9		
	8000-10000	6	9.4		
	10000-12000	13	20.3		
	12000-15000	8	12.5		
	15000-25000	1	1.6		
	25000-35000+	26	40.6		
	Total	64	100.0		

The above comparative frequency table between the victims of victimization survey and police statistics points out the socio-demographic comparison of the two types of respondents including their age, religion, marital status, gender, occupation, educational qualification and monthly income. In victimization survey, the maximum 39.5% and 37.5% of the respondents belongs to the age group of 15-25years and 25-35years while the age group from 45-55years is the lowest number of victims. In police statistics, the majority 30.3% of the victims belong to the age group of 25-35years and 22.8% belong to the age group 15-25years. Similar findings were established earlier in criminological and also in victimological literature. Mostly young (16-35years) man-woman is involved in crime as an offender due to the outward and adventures and active behavior (Adler, 2004). In addition to this, Larry J. Siegel (2006) also opined that young woman (16-29 years) is affected mostly as a victim due to their passivity and seductiveness.

In case of religion both in victimization survey and police statistics majority are Muslim and the percentage rate is 90.6% and 76.8% respectively. In Bangladesh, eighty-six percent people are belonging as Muslims. Regarding marital status, married person are maximum 92.2% in victimization survey, having a negligible number of widow (2.1%) and divorce (1.6%). On the other-hand, in police statistics, 51% of the respondents' marital status remains unknown while 31.6% of them are married.

In case of gender there is a notable difference between victimization survey and police statistics. While the victimization survey finds 55% of the respondent female, police statistics shows 72.6% of the victims as male. As, Green stated that sex differences in reporting are small but sometimes consistent: women (and especially black women) are more likely than men to report, even controlling for type of crime (Green, 1981)

Housewives are the most victims in victimization survey and the rate is 45.3% while the next majorities 23.4% are employee following 17.2% are student. Police statistics shows that professional criminal are the major victims and the rate is 32.5% while businessman is the next major victims containing 30%. Respondents studied up to secondary level bears the highest rate 45.3% in victimization survey while 12.5% completed graduation and 10.9% are up to primary level.

In case of monthly income, a significant 40.6% of the respondent's income range is between 250000-35000tk while the lowest number of respondent 1.6% bears the income range 15000-25000tk. Among others 20.3% earn 10000-12000tk following 12.5% bears the income range 12000-15000tk. However, from the other studies authorized by other writers there are several similarities and dissimilarities with such explanation. According to Skogan, '...differences in reporting across income levels are of interest because various groups seem to end up at the same point for different reasons' (Skogan, 1984). Moreover, Waller and Okihiro also conclude that income and other class related factors for example, home ownership, insurance, residents of single family related to the nature of reporting (Waller and Okihiro, 1978). In addition to this, Fox (1996) considers the juvenile violence as the unreported crime has shown that juvenile ages (14-17 years) are the most common age of the dark figure of crime. And in national level, Faruk and Khatun (2008) have shown in their study that 26.77% people are being victimized in the period of early adult (18-27 years). From the study 0.8 % is being less

victimized in 55-65 years above. They also pointed out that 8.3% are less victimized aged of 58 years above.

2. Nature of Crime

Table -02: Forms of Violent Crime

Violent Crimes	Unreported (Victimization Survey)		Reported (Police Statistics)	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Accident	-	-	2	.8
Hurt	-	-	10	4.2
Greivous Hurt	-	-	8	3.4
Murder	-	-	16	6.8
Attempt to Murder	7	10.9	15	6.3
Terrorist Attack	8	12.5		
Unknown	49	76.6	186	78.5
Total	64	100	237	100

The above data represents that maximum 76.6% unreported violent crime is unknown in victimization survey while forms of violent crimes like terrorist attacks and attempt to murder belongs to 12.5% and 10.9%. On the other hand, the police statistics also shows that 78.9% of the violent crime remains unknown and 6.8% and 6.3% of the violent crimes in police statistics are in the form of murder and attempt to murder. Because of using unscientific category of crime representation, Bangladesh police does not able to represent every crime with its special characteristics. According to Skogan, 'Rape was not reported in 56 percent of the cases; assault, not reported in 60 percent.'

Table-03: Forms of Property Crimes

Property Crimes	Unreported (Victimization Survey)		Reported (Police Statistics)	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Theft/ motorcycle theft	21	32.8	42	17.7
Illegal Storage	-	-	-	-
Extortion	3	4.7	3	1.3
Criminal Trespass	4	6.3	-	-
Embezzlement	8	12.5	7	3
Attempt to Dacoit	-	-	5	2.1
Threat	-	-	7	3
Smuggling	-	-	2	.8
Attack on Duty Police officer	-	-	2	.8
Cheating	-	-	2	.8

Property Crimes	Unreported (Victimization Survey)		Reported (Police Statistics)	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Forgery	-	-	1	.4
Drugs	-	-	80	33.8
Illegal Arms Dealings	-	-	7	3
Piracy	-	-	2	.8
Unknown	28	43.8	77	32.5
Total	64	100	237	100

The frequency table indicates the among the forms of property crime maximum 43.8% remain unknown and 32.8% of the property crimes are in form of theft according to victimization survey. In case of reported crime in police statistics, 33.8% of the property crimes are committed in forms of drugs taking, 32.5% are unknown, and 17.7% of the property crimes are committed in form of theft. However, Greenberg and Beach (2001) and Skogan (1977) have shown in his study that small financial losses have a great impact for non-reporting. Skogan has also indicates that non-reporting varies considerably by offence type, ranging from 32 percent in incidents of auto theft to 82 percent for larceny. Robberies and burglaries were not reported to the police in a little more than half the instance. Larceny shows the widest gap between actual incidence and official reporting. The most noticeable fact is that there is no record of criminal trespass in police statistics while 0.9% is being victimized of such occurrences.

3. Causes of Crime Commission

Table-04: Causes of Crime Commission

Causes	Unreported (Victimization Survey)		Reported (Police Statistics)	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Monetary gain	30	46.9	149	62.9
Illegal means	6	9.4	20	8.4
Political Conflict	-	-	3	1.3
Power domination	8	12.5	10	4.2
Previous conflict	9	14.1	19	8.0
For Dowry	-	-	4	1.7
Land Conflict	-	-	4	1.7
Others (not specify)	-	-	10	4.2
Unknown	11	17.2	18	7.6
Total	64	100	237	100

Monetary gain was the key cause of major crime commission in both victimization survey and police statistics and the rate is 47% and 63% accordingly. Power domination and previous conflict are the other major causes of crime commission according to victimization survey while in police statistics, illegal means and previous conflict accounts for the commission of crime and the rate is 8.4% and 8% respectively. Surprisingly, in both victimization survey and in police statistics political conflict in causation of crime is negligible although it was assumed more. Greenberg and Beach (2001) and Skogan (1977) have shown in his study that small financial losses have a great impact for non-reporting. But 26.4% and 23.6 % unreported crimes have occurred for dowry and power domination mainly in terms of domestic violence and by powerful group upon minor group. Some unreported crimes are occurred due to previous conflict (8.2%) and illegal means (6.4%) whether it may be sexual or other illicit activities.

4. Common Forms of Dark Figure of Crimes

Table-05: Common Forms of Dark Figure of Crimes*

Common Forms of Dark Figure of Crimes	Frequency	Percentage
Harassment	6	9.4
Sexual harassment	17	26.6
Domestic Violence	2	3.1
White collar crime	15	23.4
Threat	5	7.8
Eve teasing		
Rape/Marital rape	17	26.6
Theft	1	1.6
Unknown	1	1.6
Total	64	100

*Source: *Victimization Survey*

The above table shows that sexual harassment and rape remain maximum in dark figure of crime and both accounts rate of 26.6%. White collar crime is another major crime and it is 23.4% in the dark figure of crime. Crimes like harassment, threat are 9.4% and 7.8% among common forms of dark figures of crime. Structurally, Bangladesh is a religiously conservative country. That is why, people are not willingly reported sexual harassment and rape related crime. In this regard Skogan has found that common forms of dark figure of crimes are theft (32%), robbery (51%) and Rape (56%). On the otherhand, Greenberg and Beach (2001) have found that sexual assault (78%) and burglary (78%) are not reported accordingly.

5. Forms of Unreported Crimes within family

Table-06: Unreported Crime due to the nature of Relationships*

Nature of relationships	Frequency	Percentage
Neighbor	5	7.8
Relative/Family member	5	7.8
Known	4	6.3
Stranger	29	45.3
Unknown Missing	21	32.8
Total	64	100.0

*Source: Victimization Survey

The frequency table states that crimes committed by stranger belongs the majority of unreported crime while crimes committed by known person is unreported and the rate is 6.3%. Among others 5% of the victim being victimized by neighbour, 5% by relative/family member remains unreported due to this nature of relationship.

Table: 07: Forms of Unreported Crimes within Family*

Nature of Unreported Crime within the family	Frequency	Percent
Physical Torture	3	4.7
Mental Torture	1	1.6
Unknown	60	93.8
Total	64	100.0

*Source: Victimization Survey

Among the little amount of unreported crime committed by the family members, 4.7% are caused by physical torture and 1.6% is caused by mental torture.

6. Reasons for non-reporting

Table- 08: Reasons for Non-reporting of Crime

Reasons of Non-reporting	Frequency	Percentage
Male-dominated society	2	3.1
Publicity	8	12.5
Negligence to the nature of Crime	12	18.8
Indispensible Women Suppression	1	1.6
Traditional Culture	6	9.4
Mistrust in outside	4	6.3
Lengthy Criminal Justice System	4	6.3
Unwillingness of victim	12	18.8
Corruption in System	14	21.9
Relationship with offender	1	1.6
Total	64	100

*Source: Victimization Survey

From the above table it is found that corruption in system, unwillingness of victim, negligence to the nature of crime are the major reasons for non-reporting of crime and they are 21.9%, 18.8%, respectively. Publicity, traditional culture, mistrust in outside, lengthy criminal justice system are the other major causes of non-reporting of crime. Indispensible women suppression and relationship with offenders are the minor reasons for non-reporting of crime and thus the rate is negligible.

Bivariate Analysis

Cross-tabulation between age and Common forms of dark figure of crime

Table -09: Cross-tabulation of Age of the Respondent and Common forms of Dark figure of Crime

		Common forms of Dark figure of Crime							Total	
		Harassment	Sexual harassment	Domestic Violence	White collar crime	Threat	Rape/Marital rape	Theft		Unknown
Age of the Respondent	15-25	6 (24.0%)	12 (48.0%)	1 (4.0%)	4 (16.0%)		1 (4.0%)		1 (4.0%)	25 (100.0%)
	25-35		5 (20.8%)		7 (29.2%)		12 (50.0%)			24 (100.0%)
	35-45			1 (10.0%)	3 (30.0%)	5 (50.0%)	1 (10.0%)			10 (100.0%)
	45-55				1 (20.0%)		3 (60.0%)	1 (20.0%)		5 (100.0%)
Total		6 (9.4%)	17 (26.6%)	2 (3.1%)	15 (23.4%)	5 (7.8%)	17 (26.6%)	1 (1.6%)	1 (1.6%)	64 (100.0%)

Calculated value of Lambda (λ)=0.407

The cross table between the age of the respondents and common figures of dark figures of crime states the relationship between the forms of crime and age group of victims. The age group of 15-25years and 25-35years belongs the majority forms of dark figure of crime while the age group of 45-55years belongs the lowest rate of victimization. Sexual harassment and rape are the major forms of dark figures of crime faced by the respondents and the rate is 26.6% in both cases. Age group from 15-25years is the most victims of sexual harassment while majority 50% respondents of age group from 25-35years are the victims of rape. From these cross tabulation it has been taken the association measurement, Lamda (λ) with the value of only 0.407 that means the association between age of the respondents and the common forms of dark figure of crime is moderate. So it can claim that common forms of dark figure of crime moderately depend on respondent age.

Cross-tabulation between Gender and Common forms of dark figure of crime

Table-10: Cross-tabulation of Gender of the Respondent and Common forms of Dark figure of Crime

		Common forms of Dark figure of Crime								Total
		Harassment	Sexual harassment	Domestic Violence	White collar crime	Threat	Rape/Marital rape	Theft	Unknown	
Gender of the Respondent	Male	1 (11.1%)			3 (33.3%)	5 (55.6%)				9 (100.0%)
	Female	5 (9.1%)	17 (30.9%)	2 (3.6%)	12 (21.8%)		17 (30.9%)	1 (1.8%)	1 (1.8%)	55 (100.0%)
Total		6 (9.4%)	17 (26.6%)	2 (3.1%)	15 (23.4%)	5 (7.8%)	17 (26.6%)	1 (1.6%)	1 (1.6%)	64 (100.0%)

Calculated value of Lambda (λ)=0.179

The relationship between gender and common forms of dark figure of crime shows strong relationship with the female. The rate of female victimization is comparatively more in dark figure than male. Specifically among the female victimization equally 30.9% are victim of sexual harassment, another 30.9% Rape/Marital Rape crime are in dark figure of crime. From these cross tabulation it has been taken the association measurement, Lamda (λ) with the value of only 0.179 that means the association between gender of the respondents and the common forms of dark figure of crime is slightly weak. So it can claim that common forms of dark figure of crime slightly depended on respondent gender.

Cross-tabulation between Marital Status and Common forms of dark figure of crime

Table-11: Cross-tabulation between marital status and Common forms of dark figure of crime

Marital Status of the Respondent	Common forms of dark figure of crime								Total
	Harassment	Sexual harassment	Domestic Violence	White collar crime	Threat	Rape/ Marital rape	Theft	Unknown	
Married	6 (10.2)	17 (28.8%)	1 (1.7%)	14 (23.7%)	5 (8.5%)	16 (27.1%)			59 (100%)
Widow						1 (50%)			1 (100%)
Divorce							1 (100%)	1 (100%)	2 (100%)
Others			1 (50%)	1 (50%)					2 (100%)
Total	6 (9.4%)	17 (26.6%)	2 (3.1%)	15 (23.4%)	5 (7.8%)	17 (26.6%)	1 (1.6%)	1 (1.6%)	64 (100%)

Calculated value of Lambda (λ)=0.096

The cross tabulation analysis shows that married person is more victimized than widow and divorced. More Specifically among the married person notably 28.8% sexual harassment, 27.1% Rape/marital rape and 23.7% white collar crime are hidden or dark figure of crime. 50% Widows are the victim of Rape/Marital Rape and the table also shows that among the divorce person 50% are the victim of theft and 50% crime are unknown which are also hidden and goes to dark figure of crime. From these cross tabulation it has been taken the association measurement, Lamda (λ) with the value of only 0.096 that means the association between marital status of the respondents and the common forms of dark figure of crime is too much weak. So it can claim that common forms of dark figure of crime are not depended on respondent marital status.

Cross-tabulation between Religion and Common forms of dark figure of crime

Table-12: Cross-tabulation between Religion and Common forms of dark figure of crime

Religious status of the Respondent	Common forms of dark figure of crime								
	Harassment	Sexual harassment	Domestic Violence	White collar crime	Threat	Rape/ Marital rape	Theft	Unknown	Total
Muslim	5 (8.6%)	17 (29.3%)	2 (3.4%)	11 (19%)	5 (8.6%)	17 (29.3%)		1 (1.7)	59 (100%)
Hindu	1 (16.7%)			4 (66.7%)			1 (16.7%)		1 (100%)
Total	6 (9.4%)	17 (26.6%)	2 (3.1%)	15 (23.4%)	5 (7.8%)	17 (26.6%)	1 (1.6)	1 (1.6%)	64 (100%)

Calculated value of Lambda (λ)=0.094

The relationship between religion and common forms of dark figure of crime shows that Muslims are more victimized and the crime is in dark figure than the Hindus. As a Muslim majority country though it is normal the specific relation between religion and types of crime contains significant interpretation. The table shows that maximum 29.3% Muslim are victim of Sexual Harassment and another equal portion 29.3% are the victim of Rape/Marital rape which is in dark figure of crime. In case of Hindu Maximum 66.7% white collar crime are not reported or counted. From these cross tabulation it has been taken the association measurement, Lamda (λ) with the value of only 0.094 that means the association between religion of the respondents and the common forms of dark figure of crime is too much weak. So it can claim that common

forms of dark figure of crime are not depended on respondent religious status.

Cross-tabulation between Monthly Income and Common forms of dark figure of crime

Table-13: Cross-tabulation of Monthly Income of the Respondent and common form of Dark figure of Crime

		Common forms of Dark figure of Crime							Total	
		Harassment	Sexual harassment	Domestic Violence	White collar crime	Threat	Rape/Marital rape	Theft		Unknown
Age of the Respondent	Less than 5000		3 (100%)							3 (100.0%)
	5000-8000	1 (14.3%)			1 (14.3%)		4 (57.1%)		1 (14.3%)	7 (100.0%)
	8000-10000				6 (46.2%)					6 (100.0%)
	10000-12000		5 (38.5%)	2 (15.4%)	6 (100%)					13 (100.0%)
	12000-15000	5 (62.5%)	2 (25%)		1 (12.5%)					8 (100.0%)
	15000-25000						1 (100%)			1 (100.0%)
	25000-35000+		7 (26.9%)		1 (3.8%)	5 (19.2%)	12 (46.2%)	1 (3.8%)		26 (100.0%)
Total	6 (9.4%)	17 (26.6%)	2 (3.1%)	15 (23.4%)	5 (7.8%)	17 (26.6%)	1 (1.6%)	1 (1.6%)	64 (100.0%)	
Calculated value of Lambda (λ)=0.388										

The cross table between the monthly income of the respondents and common figures of dark figure of crime states the relationship between the forms of crime and monthly income. The income group of 25000-35000+ taka (26) and 10000-12000 taka (13) belongs the majority forms of dark figure of crime. While the income group of 15000-25000 taka belongs the lowest number (1) of victimization. Majority of the upper income groups (25000-35000+ taka) are not reported their sexual victimization, for example, sexual harassment (26.9%) and rape (46.2%). So, we conclude that upper class people hide their sexual victimization. Sexual harassment and rape are the major forms of dark figures of crime

faced by the respondents and the rate is 26.6% in both cases. Income group of 25000-35000+ taka, is the most victims of sexual harassment while majority 50% respondents of the same group are the victims of rape. From these cross tabulation it has been taken the association measurement, Lamda (λ) with the value of only 0.388 that means the association between income of the respondents and the common forms of dark figure of crime is moderate. So it can claim that common forms of dark figure of crime moderately depended on respondent income.

Cross-tabulation between Occupation and Common forms of dark figure of crime

Table-14: Cross-tabulation Occupation of the Respondent and Common forms of Dark figure of Crime

		Common form of Dark figure of Crime							Total	
		Harassment	Sexual harassment	Domestic Violence	White collar crime	Threat	Rape/Marital rape	Theft		Unknown
Occupation of the Respondent	Student		8 (72.7%)		3 (27.3%)					11 (100.0%)
	Housewife	1 (3.4%)	7 (24.1%)	1 (3.4%)	3 (10.3%)		16 (55.2%)	1 (3.4%)		29 (100.0%)
	Business				1 (16.7%)	5 (83.3%)				6 (100.0%)
	Service				3 (100.0%)					3 (100.0%)
	Employee	5 (33.3%)	2 (13.3%)	1 (6.7%)	5 (33.3%)		1 (6.7%)		1 (6.7%)	15 (100.0%)
Total		6 (9.4%)	17 (26.6%)	2 (3.1%)	15 (23.4%)	5 (7.8%)	17 (26.6%)	1 (1.6%)	1 (1.6%)	64 (100.0%)
Calculated value of Lambda (λ)=0.402										

The cross tabulation analysis shows that housewife is more victimized than Serviceman and employee. More specifically among the housewife notably 55.2% Rape/marital rape, 24.1% sexual harassment and 10.3% white collar crime are hidden or dark figure of crime. About seventy two percent students are the victims of sexual harassment and the table also shows that among the business man 83.3% are the victims of threat and only 1.6% crimes are unknown which are hidden and also goes to dark

figure of crime. From these cross tabulation it has been taken the association measurement, Lamda (λ) with the value of only 0.402 that means the association between occupation of the respondents and the common forms of dark figure of crime is moderate. So it can claim that common forms of dark figure of crime are fairly depended on respondent occupation.

Rate of Dark figure of Crime in Tongi

Total number of population = 3, 50,000

Crime rate from the victimization Survey = $\frac{64}{26000} \times 100000$
=246

Crime rate of from police Statistics:

Total number of population = 3, 50,000

Total Number of incidents = 237

So, Crime rate = $\frac{237}{350000} \times 100000$
= 67.71

Rate of the Dark figure of Crime = 246-67.71
= 178.29

Rate of dark figure of crime is about 178.29. It can be said that the rate of dark figure of crime is high. It is related to the nature of geographical space. That is, the dark figure of crime in urban area is higher than from the rural area. Moreover, rate of dark figure of crime is high due to the floating nature of the area. As we know from criminological literature, the nature of floating people promotes crime, the rate of dark figure is also determined by the floating nature of people and urban space.

Conclusion

Dark figure of crime is the number of undetected, unreported and underreported crimes. Dark figure of crime includes all criminal acts which are not known to the police or other government agencies. The most common reason for the existence of dark figure is non-reporting of crimes. It is estimated that the dark figure of crimes makes 74% of all committed crimes. From the study it is being found that, the rate of dark figure of crime in Tongi is 178.29. The study also has shown that the most common form of the dark figure of crime is unknown to the police.

Physical torture (4.7%) and marital rape (1.6%) are not reported due to the unconsciousness of the people. And most of the victims of the dark figure of crime are being victimized by relatives or family member mainly. Major reasons of the non-reporting of crime and/or dark figure of crime are corruption in systems as well as police, unwillingness of victims, negligence to the nature of crime and publicity. Among the socio-demographic variables, Age of the respondents, Nature of the occupation and Income are mostly related to reporting of crime than gender, religion and marital status. So, the government must take some necessary steps immediately for eliminating such crimes such as developing the policing system, the police-public relation etc.

References

- Adler, Freda, Mueller, G.O.W. and Laufer, William S. (2004). *Criminology and the Criminal Justice System*, New York: McGraw-Hill Companies.
- Akers, Ronald (1994). *Criminological theories: Introduction and Evaluation*. United States of America: Roxbury Publishing Company.
- Biderman, Albert D. and Reiss Albert J. (1967), *On exploring the Dark Figure of Crime*, London: Sage Publications Inc.
- Bohm, Robert M. and Haley, Keith N. (2005). *Introduction to Criminal Justice*, New York: McGraw-Hill Companies.
- Carcach, Carlos (1997). *Reporting Crime to the Police*. Australian Institute of Criminology, Director: Adam Graycar, vol-68, page 01-06. Internet site: www.aic.gov.au
- Clare, Joe and Morgan, Frank (2009). *Factors affecting perceived criminality: evidence from victims of assault*. Australian Institute of Criminology, General Manager: Judy Putt, Vol- 376, page 01-06.
- Dunhill, C. (1989) 'Women, Racist Attacks and the Response from Anti-racist Groups' in C. Dunhill (ed.) *The Boys in Blue: Women's Challenge to the Police*, London: Virago.
- Estrada, Felipe (2001). Juvenile Violence as a Social Problem- Trends, Media Attention and Societal Response, *British Journal of Criminology*, Vol-41, pages 639-655
- Faruk, Omar and Khatun, Nurjahan (2008). *Crime Index Bangladesh 2007*. Bangladesh: Academic Press and Publishers library.
- Fox, James Alan (1996). *Trends in Juvenile Violence- A Report to the United States Attorney General on Current and Future Rates of Juvenile Offending*, Boston: College of Criminal Justice.
- Green, G. (1981). *Citizen reporting of the police: an analysis of common theft and assault*, Ph D dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.

- Greenberg, Martin S. & Beach, Scott R. (2004) Property Crime Victims' Decision to Notify the Police: Social, Cognitive, and Affective Determinants, *Law and Human Behavior*, Volume 28, Issue 2, pp 177-186.
- Gordon, P. (1990). *Racial Violence and Harassment*, 2nd edn, London: Runnymede Trust.
- Hagan, John (1987). *Modern Criminology- Crime, Criminal Behavior, and its Control (1985)*. Singapore: McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- Inciardi, James A. (1984). *Criminal justice (2002)*. Orlando: Harcourt College Publishers.
- Islam, Jahirul and Khatun, Nurjahan (January- February, 2012). *Bangladesher Narir Oporadher Dhoron, Prokriti O Karjokaron: Ekti Tattik Porjalochona*. Shomaj Nirikkhon, Vol-120, page: 44-70, Dhaka: Shomaj Nirikkhon Kendro.
- Mayhew, Pat (2003). *Trends & Issues in Crime and Criminal Justice*. Director: Adam Graycar.
- Martin, Elizabeth, A. and Law, Jonathan (2009), *Oxford Dictionary of Law*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Paranjape, Dr. N.V. (2005). *Criminology and Penology*, Allahabad: Central Law Publications.
- Paulsen, Derek J., and Robinson, Matthew B. (2004). *Spatial Aspects of Crime- Theory and Practice*. United States of America: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Rahman, Mohammad Azizur, Rahman, Mir Shamsur, Haque, Md. Nazmul and Kashem, Mohammed Bin (2009). *A Dictionary of Criminology and Police Science*. Bangladesh: Centre for Criminological Research Bangladesh (CCRB).
- Rand, Michael R., Lynch, James P. and Cantor, David (1997). *National Crime Victimization Survey- Criminal Victimization, 1973-1995*. United States of America: US Department of Justice, Director: Jan M. Chaiken, Ph.D.
- Reid, Sue Titus (1996). *Crime and Criminology*, United States of America: McGraw-Hill Higher Education Group, Inc.
- Siegel, Larry J. (1998). *Criminology- Theories, Patterns and Typologies* Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Serajzadeh, Seyed Hossein: "Islam and Crime- The Moral Community of Muslims" *Journal of Arabic and Islamic Studies*, Vol-4 (2001-2002).
- Skogan, Wesley G. (1977). *Dimensions of the Dark Figure of Unreported Crime*. *Journal of Crime and Delinquency*, January, UK: Sage Publications.
- Skogan, Wesley G. (1976) *Sample Surveys of the Victims of Crime (2002)*. Public Data Use, Vol- 04.
- Skogan, Wesley G. (1990). *The Polls- A Review: The National Crime Survey Redesign*. American Association for the Public Opinion Research, Chicago: The University of the Chicago Press, Vol-54, pages 256-272.

Dark Figure of Crime in Bangladesh: A Descriptive Study on Gazipur District

Vold, George B. and Bernard, Thomas J. (1979). *Theoretical Criminology*, United States of America: Oxford University Press.

Waller, I. & N. Okihiro. (1978), *Burglary: The Victim and the Public*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Yanich, Danilo (2001). Location, Location, Location: Urban & Suburban Crime on Local TV News, *Journal of Urban Affairs*, Vol- 23.

Young, Jock (2001). *The Extent of Crime*.

Internet Site:

www.criminology.studyonline.com

<http://en.wikipedia.org>

<http://crime-study.blogspot.com>

<http://www.lawteacher.net>

<http://crime-study.blogspot.com>