

# Measurement of Social Capital in Japan<sup>1</sup>

OMORI Takashi<sup>2</sup> and YONEZAWA Akiyoshi<sup>3</sup>  
September 2002

## < Abstract >

In line with the guideline shown by the OECD secretariat, social capital measurement in Japan is surveyed. Among the listed areas of social capital, few indicators are available on 'informal networks and social contacts', perhaps because of the difficulty of setting a clear and workable definition. Reflecting the complex nature of the social capital, indicators show different trends. As Japan has a unique social and cultural tradition, there have been some discussions as to how indicators are comparable to those in other developed countries. Possible implications based on such Japanese experience are also discussed.

### 1. Voluntary activities

As for the measures of voluntary and community participation and formal networks, the major official survey is the Survey on Time Use and Leisure Activities (STULA), which has been conducted every five years since 1976 by the Statistical Bureau of the Ministry of Public Management, Home Affairs, Posts and Telecommunications, with the 6th survey done in October 2001, collecting the data of 77 thousand households on 210 thousand people.

This survey covers, among other things, voluntary and other social activities<sup>4</sup>, and is composed of two parts.

The first part asks

what you have done during the preceding year,  
how many days you did for each activity, and  
with whom you did, and whether or not in a group.

The definition of voluntary activity as a whole is broadly comparable across different surveys, except that the youngest generation of age 10-14 was added since 1996 and that "other social activities" such as activities for the benefit of women, youth consumer, labor union activities and religious activities were excluded in some of the surveys including the latest one. However, its subcategories have varied over time. Especially a major reshuffling was made in the 2001 survey according to the beneficiaries of the activities, with a view to realizing a better but not complete correspondence to the classification in the "Law

---

<sup>1</sup> This paper was prepared as a country paper to be presented at Social Capital Measurement Conference, held jointly by the OECD and the UK Office of National Statistics in London on 25-27 September 2002. The views expressed in this paper are those of the authors and do not represent those of the organization they work for.

<sup>2</sup> Executive Research Fellow, Economic and Social Research Institute, Cabinet Office, Government of Japan, and Visiting Professor of Saitama University.

<sup>3</sup> Associate Professor, National Institution for Academic Degrees, Japan

<sup>4</sup> In this survey, voluntary activities are defined activities for the benefit of other people, whereas other social activities are those for themselves as well as for the society.

**to Promote Specified Nonprofit Activities."**

The second part is on the use of time. For example, the 2001 survey asked those 10 years old and older, how they spent time for the specified two days. Among the 20 activity categories, there are Social Activities ( No. 17 ) and Social Life ( No. 18 ). Note that the former includes, in addition to voluntary activities, " other social activities " described above and that neither of the two includes sports, hobbies nor amusements. The social activity classification has varied slightly over time, but is broadly comparable over time. See Table 1 for the details of the STULA classifications. The results of the time use in the 2001 survey will be published in September 2002.

The NHK, the quasi-public broadcasting corporation has been conducting similar surveys, every five years on how people spend time on a smaller sample<sup>5</sup>. The latest one was conducted in 2000. As for activity categories, there are 29, with ' Social Participation ' ( No.15 for which examples are specified in the questionnaire to include Parents and Teachers Association, local community activities, participation in funeral and marriage, and voluntary activities ) and ' Conversation and Social Life ' ( No.16 which covers having time together with family, relatives and friends, including telephones and e-mail conversation. ) Note that meeting eating and drinking with colleagues are under a different category. Leisure sports and hobby are also classified into a different category. Incidentally, this survey classifies the 29 categories into 3 broad groups. The Social Participation ( No. 15 ) is classified into obligatory activities, whereas Conversation and Social Life ( No. 16 ) is classified into free activities. Unlike the above Governmental survey, the face sheet of this survey is limited, not covering the human capital factors such as education and income. Unfortunately, it is difficult to compare the result over time as the classification of the time use has been changing.

There are other sources that tell us the number of people engaged in voluntary activities. The Japan Council of Social Welfare publishes its own estimate of numbers of volunteers every year. According to them, housewives and retired men are two major contributors for voluntary activities. In addition, In the Social Education Survey, Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology reports number of people who have registered their willingness at local public facilities.

As for willingness for voluntary activities, the National Survey of Lifestyle Performance in 2000 shows that the people in the 50s are most willing to do something for the society. For the preferred area, activities on preserving nature and environment was most popular followed by activities on social welfare. As for the relationship with the social class, the willingness was found weakest among those who think they belong to the middle or upper lower class.

The recent surge in the use of local currency is closely associated with the spirit of voluntary work. Although there is yet no official statistics, some private research institutes provide a list of such initiatives. It may be possible, in the future, to make an estimate of the total volume of the services exchanged under such schemes.

A group of sociologist in Japan is also implementing a large-scale

---

<sup>5</sup> The number of the respondents for the latest one is between 2.5 to 5.1 thousand.

research survey on Social Stratification and Mobility (SSM). This survey has been implemented every 10 years since 1955. The last survey in 1995 included several questions concerning voluntary activities, such as participation in the social activities, subjective importance of community participation and social activities in daily life, and willingness to take an initiative in the social community clubs and/or networks. The advantage of this survey is that it includes data on social status, class, education, job history, etc. However, the usage of the data is limited among participating researchers.

Some other public surveys targeting on youth and children are also available. The Basic Survey on the Lives and Opinions of Youth by Cabinet Office shows the data of youth from 10 to 24 years old on participation to the community events such as festivals in the local community, kid' clubs, Christmas parties, cleaning roads and parks, training against disasters, charities, etc. The data shows that older age groups tend to be less active for such community participation. They also ask the similar questions to the parents of those youth. This data can be utilized to understand the community participation of Japanese families.

Two other surveys of youth and children are the comparative survey among the OECD and other countries implemented by the Japanese government. The former Ministry of Public Management (currently the Cabinet Office) has implemented the World Youth Opinion Survey for almost every five year since 1972. The samples are chosen from the 18 to 24 years old in 11 countries (Japan, USA, UK, Germany, France, Sweden, Korea, Philippines, Thai, Brazil, and Russia). The data of 1998 showed that the participation rate of Japanese youth in the voluntary activities is least in 11 countries (2.7% currently participating, 22.2% experienced before, 74.7% never). The Ministry of Education (MEXT) also implemented the Comparative Survey on the Experiences of Children in 1999 in the cities in five countries (Japan, Germany, UK, USA and Korea) to the children in 5<sup>th</sup> grade and 8<sup>th</sup> grade). It also showed that participation rate of Japanese children in voluntary activities is least in five countries (12% frequently), but the participation rate to community events is highest among five countries (50% frequently).

Generally speaking, as is shown in Table 2, there has been an increase in the number of people engaged in voluntary activities. This has been the case especially among young people, while some youth surveys show that the participation is not active compared with other countries. This is likely a combined result of many factors such as the decrease in working hours, the decrease in the average number of children, and some major disasters such as the Kobe earthquake that provided opportunities for the young to participate in the voluntary activities. However, as for time spent for social activities, the STULA has not shown a clear increasing trend. One possible reason for it is that the increased increments of voluntary activities have been concentrated in specific days ( e.g. days after disasters ) not covered by the Survey.

## **2. Informal networks and social contacts**

Except for those covered in the above surveys, there dose not seem to be a survey on the network and social contacts, perhaps because it is not easy to draw a line between formal and informal networks and to define '

network ' as distinct from loose association and acquaintance.

One of the exceptions is the SSM survey mentioned above. It contains questions on personal lifestyle as follows; '*Do you have a tendency to sacrifice your family and personal life for your working life?* ' ; '*Do you have personal lifework or hobbies other than working life and family life?* ' ; '*Do you put importance on enjoying today's life rather than saving money or making efforts for the future?* ' ; '*Do you put importance on the contacts with others and widening your human relationship in your daily life?* ' ; '*Do you put importance on having tasteful hobbies and behaviors?* ' Another question is on the contacts with friends and/or relatives by category (members of assemblies or the Diet, senior public servants of the local authorities, CEOs and/or the board members of private companies, office workers, professionals such as medical doctors and lawyers, owners of retail shops and/or restaurants, workers in the factories, drivers and/or a manual laborers for constructions, farmers, fisheries, the board members of unions).

Comparative Survey on the Experiences of Children (MEXT) also includes questions on experience of children to be scold or praised by neighbors.

### **3. Political participation**

In every election, official estimate of voting rate is published, but it is naturally affected by various factors such as political issues, intensity of rivalry, weather condition, and changes in the constituency system. Taking account of the voting rates for other elections, the general trend seems to be downward. This is consistent with the results on the attitude towards lower-house election surveyed by the Nationwide Survey of the Japanese National Character ( see below ). The numbers of members of the major political parties are made public, but intensity of the activities of the member may not be homogeneous.

The SSM survey gives a typical questionnaire of the opinion surveys on the attitudes against the political participation. It contains yes/no questions as follows; '*I can not understand policy issues because it is too difficult for me* ' ; '*we should leave politics to those who are interested in it* ' ; '*the opinions and demands of the people have no influence to the national policy* ' ; '*there is no trustful political party today* ' , etc. The Japan General Social Survey (JGSS) implemented by a circle of Japanese sociologists also includes similar questions on political participation. JGSS data is open for access through the Institute of Social Sciences at the University of Tokyo.

### **4. General trust**

The Institute of Statistical Mathematics (ISM) of the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology conducts ' Nationwide Survey of the Japanese National Character ' every five year. The 10th survey was conducted in 1998 on 2680 individuals<sup>6</sup>. Although the list of questions are not necessarily the same, frequently asked

---

<sup>6</sup> Early 2001, they conducted an interim survey, through deferent methods: posts, interviews, and three variations of telephone methods. Although its aim was partially to see whether or not the results are different across methods, simple average was calculated by the authors and presented in Table 1.

questions include two questions on general trust: ' *Do you think that other people are trying to find your weakness with a view to taking advantage of it whenever possible?* ' ( tentatively named ' weakness ' question in Table 2 ) and ' *Do you think most people are reliable, or do you think you had better be careful?* ' ( ' trust ' ). They also include three questions on the fairness of the society: ' *Generally speaking, do you think the society at present is fair?* ' ( ' society ' ), ' *Seeing the successful individuals, which do you think contributed more to their success, their own talent and efforts, or luck?* ' ( ' luck ' ), and ' *Do you agree with the view that you are responsible for whatever happens to you?* ' ( ' responsibility ' ). The results are summarized in Table 2, after taking the average based on the authors' own scoring ( giving positive scores for the answers showing stronger trust ).

With a weak exception of ' responsibility,' trust and fairness indicators had improved up to the middle of the 1990s but turned to deteriorate thereafter. As was pointed out by Inaba (2002), this development is similar to that of the number of crimes, especially serious crimes. This may be because there has been a common underlying factor that could be called ' social capital '. However, as we have already seen, this trend is different from the development of the voluntary activities.

Besides these surveys, some sociologists conducted experimental survey on limited number of people. For example Yamagishi and Yamagishi(1994) made a random sample survey on the citizens of Sapporo and Seattle to find higher level of trust in the latter.<sup>7</sup>

As for the surveys for children and youth, the trust issues are rather popular, because many adults have a strong feeling of crisis on the moral-hazard and deterioration of disciplined behaviors among young people. Comparative Survey on the Experiences of Children of MEXT includes questions such as experiences of helping handicapped and/or old people, stop bullying or bad behaviors of friends, etc. Cabinet Office surveys also treat many aspects of moral issues.

## **5. Future developments**

Japanese government seems to have become less keen on social indicators in general. This is partly because the coordinative attitude among workers, firms and government, which was once admired as the source of economic success, is now blamed as an important hindrance for change and mobility. Another reason is that the recent reshuffling of Ministries has made the Social Policy Bureau, especially its research division a little smaller.

Thus, at the moment, there is no major measurement initiative, except that the Cabinet Office is investigating the possibility of collecting data on the way old people live. Their social activities are likely to be one of the important areas for survey.

Besides, changing society brings some serious social issues especially among young people, such as bullying in schools, moral collapse, deteriorating home education, ignorance of the commitment to the

---

<sup>7</sup> However, T. Yamagishi(1998) argues that this does not mean that Japanese people trust less each other. According to him, Japanese are less confident in finding out trustworthiness of each other, and this makes them more cautious in trusting others whom they do not know well. Authors' view on this point will be discussed later.

community. Therefore, we expect the social capital issues and its measurement will increasingly become an important agenda in the framework of social and educational policy. Some indicators such as rapid increase of school violence in high-schools, the increase in the number of students who do not attend primary and secondary schools are available for understanding this situation.

## **6. Possible implication of Japan's experience**

### **(1) Classification by activities vs. incentives**

**Although it is important to distinguish between:**

**voluntary and semi-obliged activities**

**economic and non-economic activities**

**pure friends and business associates etc.,**

**this may not be easy. For example, voluntary activities requested or suggested by the schools of your children may be virtually obligatory. Young people may want to engage in voluntary work with a hope that its record will be advantageous in entering good schools<sup>8</sup>. Charity activities and visiting play to welfare facilities may be conducted as a program of religious or hobby groups. If you eat and drink with friends of the same locality, specialty or business etc., such opportunities may well have an important long-run beneficial implication to your business.**

**To cope with such difficulties, three possible ways can be thought of.**

**First, we may prepare a detailed list of activities, which is pre-classified into some categories so that respondents have little difficulties in classification. This approach is taken in the Japanese Survey on Time Use and Leisure Activities. However, such a classification may not be universal, as different country may have different social context. For example, crafting commodities for school bazaar may be classified obligatory rather than voluntary. This is why we would want to grasp the incentives of activities.**

**Second, we may ask the respondents to classify the activities, based on the their own subjective motivation and/or degree of obligation etc. Then, what we should do from the viewpoint of international comparison, is to agree on the categorization based on the *subjective* motivation.**

**Third, which is a variant of the second, we may prepare a set of guidelines for respondents to help them to classify the activities. The following are some naïve examples.**

- Would most people in your situation do that? Or, did you do that simply because you feel like doing it? ( a criterion for voluntary nature of activity )**
- Is the major incentive an economic one, including possible long-term economic gain through widening or deepening acquaintance? ( a negative criterion for ' non-economic ' activity )**
- Is the major part of the conversation with them spent on issues related to your job? ( a criterion for ' informal ' meeting )**

---

**<sup>8</sup> In July 2002, The Central Council for Education published a report that proposed that high schools can count voluntary works as a part of school education and that universities can request applicants to write a paper on the experience of voluntary work at the entrance examination, etc. with a view to promote voluntary work by the young.**

**This third approach or the combination of the first and third would facilitate comparison among different social context.**

**(2) Strength in activities**

**The indicators on groups and networks should preferably be attached with some measure of the strength of involvement. In addition to ' the time taken ' we may ask how deeply one is involved in comparison to other activities and/or in comparison to other members.**

**(3) Adjustment for bias**

**We have to be careful in interpreting the questionnaire results, especially on the questions on subjective views. There may be a subjective bias, and people may respond in comparison to others. In this regard, we may be able to correct bias by posing additional questions. Suppose, for example, the standard trust question is accompanied by an additional question ' Do you think you are more willing to trust other people than the average member of the society? ' If the answers to the two questions are positively correlated and the percentage of " yes " for the latter is near 50%, then we may conclude there is no distortion. If not, we can make some adjustment using the result of the latter.**

**(4) Reasons for general trust**

**It is would be useful and important to collect information concerning reasons for general trust. This is because social context may be different across countries, and correct interpretation of international comparison would be difficult without an explicit analysis of underlying reasons.**

**Generally speaking, there may be two reasons for one to trust others.**

**One is based on what can be called ' *guarantee by membership* '. If they and you are both members of a group, and if the group membership has a guaranteeing effect, through controlling admission, registering address, dense information exchange of each other's reputation, etc., you can reduce the degree of caution to them than otherwise. This guaranteeing power, naturally, differs from one group to another.**

**The other possible reason for trusting others can be called ' *trust in personality* .' This is based only on your assessment of the personality of the persons, based on what they speak, the way they behave, etc., regardless of which group they belong to. In actuality, this is hardly observed in its pure form, as people often ask each other, in the initial contacts, which group they belong to, implicitly in search for common membership. This is natural, as the guarantee by a common membership reduces the necessity and costs ( time costs as well as psychological costs ) of assessing the personality each other.**

**Then, there can be three possible interpretation of the society-wide general trust indicator as the following:**

**A: Basic guaranteeing power of the society**

**This is the basic guaranteeing power of the society, for a pair of two common members of it, when there is no other common membership between the two. The crime rate may be a good proxy indicator. A society with strong surveillance, whether formal or informal, has a strong guaranteeing power. On the other hand, a large city, in which things can easily be done on anonymous basis, has a weak guaranteeing**

power.

**B: Summation of guaranteeing power times membership**

Most people belong to a number of groups: family, local community, company, alumni associations, sports and hobby clubs, etc. When asked ' *Do you think most people are reliable?* ', you may well respond by roughly taking an average of the people with whom you contact in a certain time span. Then the trust score is higher for the individual of stronger tendency to stay in a group or community of strong guaranteeing power. The average score of the society is higher in a society with many groups of strong guaranteeing power. Such a nature may be self-reinforcing, since in such a society, people tend to save costs of individually assessing personality of others and become introverted. Groups, here, may not necessarily be a formal group, but include a long-term relationship. Similarly, membership may not necessarily be shared. A worker in a well-known company may well be trusted because of the prestige of the company.

**C: Trust under no membership guarantee at all**

Suppose a shipwreck left a group of people of different nationalities on an isolated uninhabited island. There will be a difference among them in the attitude in trusting others. This is not because of the effect of membership, but because of the difference in acquired characteristics, and possibly in the strength of self-confidence of one's ability of assessing trustworthiness of others. The finding of ' trust paradox ' with weaker tendency for trust of Japanese than Americans, by Yamagishi and Yamagishi (1994) can be interpreted as Japanese are less confident, in comparison to Americans, in their ability of assessing others as they have little training and practicing experiences in a society with groups of strong guaranteeing power.

To sum up, there can be three reasons to an affirmative answer to the general trust question as the following:

**A: Yes, because people in the society I live in are generally trustworthy.**

**B: Yes, because I know most people surrounding me for a long time and well. As for those I do not know well in person, they belong to some groups, of which members I can trust.**

**C: Yes, because human beings are potentially good in nature, and it is not sensible to distrust others from the beginning. It is possible and better to start with an open-minded assumption that people are generally trustworthy, and modify it for a particular person, whenever necessary. Such an initial assumption can be modified, whenever necessary, as I accumulate observation with him or her.**

It may be possible and useful to carefully prepare the trust questions so that we can identify the difference between the above three deferent concepts of general trust. One naïve approach would be to set three questions with three different reasons.

**(5) Share of trust-intensive industries**

One possible way, although indirect, but peculiar to international comparison of trust, would be to compare the share of industries, in terms of employment or sales, for which trust is an important factor, or

to put it another way, industries in which information asymmetry is large. Typical examples of such industry would be medical service, housing, transaction of used cars, and consumer loans. Of course, since governments have different regulations and institutional arrangements to cope with market imperfection, one has to take account of the effects of such measures at the same time.

**(6) Definition of volunteer activities**

It may be important to clarify the definition of 'unpaid,' as it has become popular to pay small amount on voluntary work for covering necessary expense such as transportation costs. In addition, some local governments have started to issue 'local currency,' not on yen but on what they call 'help units,' which one can earn by providing voluntary work, and store for future use.

**(7) Difference in connotation etc.**

In international comparison, it has to be kept in mind that the questionnaire results can importantly be influenced by the way questions are presented and by the combination of the connotation of words and nation-specific characteristics. For example, Hayashi and Sakuraba (2002) point out that Japanese people tend to respond positively to the alternative 'it depends' in comparison to definitive 'yes' or 'no', as well as showing reluctance in choosing alternatives that contains a word of stress such as 'very'. Another example they show is that it makes a large difference to Japanese whether or not the above 'weakness' question is preceded by a sentence like '*Some people are trying to find weakness of others with a view to taking advantage of it, but there are others who are not.*' According to them, Japanese respond much less affirmatively when asked with the above introductory sentence than otherwise, while it makes little difference to Americans.

As we cannot sensibly put two questions in a parallel way, careful discussion among the specialists may be worthwhile to achieve a higher degree of comparability.

**< References >**

**Cabinet Office (2001) The Basic Survey on the Lives and Opinions of Youth (Japanese)**

**Cabinet Office (1999) 6<sup>th</sup> World Youth Opinion Survey**

**Economic Planning Agency (2000) White Paper on the National Lifestyle**

**Hayashi, C. and Sakuraba, M. (2002) 'Nihon-Jin no Senzai-Ryoku' ( Potential Power of the Japanese People, only in Japanese ), Kodansha**

**Inaba, Y. and Matsuyama, K. (ed. 2002) 'Nihon-Keizai to Shinrai no Keizaigaku' ( Economics of Trust and Japanese Economy, only in Japanese ), Toyo Keizai**

**Institute of Broadcasting and Culture, NHK( Nippon Housou Kyoukai ) (2001)**

' Survey of Time Use by People, 2000 '

Institute of Statistical Mathematics of the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (1999) ' Survey of attitudes of the people of Japan 1998 '

JGSS, Japan General Social Survey, <http://jgss.daishodai.ac.jp/english/index.html>

Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (2002) White Paper.

Ministry of Public Management, Home Affairs, Posts and Telecommunications (2002) ' Survey on Time Use and Leisure Activities '

Omori T. (2001)" Balancing Economic Growth with Well-being: Implications of the Japanese Experience," Canadian Journal of Policy Research, Spring 200

SSM Research Group, Social Stratification and Mobility Survey, 1995 Code Book.

Yamagishi, T. ( 1998 ) ' Shinrai no Kouzou ' ( Structure of Trust, only in Japanese ), Tokyo University Press

Yamagishi, T. and Yamagishi, M. (1994) Trust and commitment in the United States and Japan. *Motivation and Emotion*, 18, pp 129-166.

Table 1 Social Activities in the ' Surveys on Time Use and Leisure Activities '

	year	1976	1981	1986	1991	1996	2001	
activities in the past one year	name of the relevant category	Volunteer activities	Social voluntary activities	Social voluntary activities	Social activities	Social Activities	Voluntary activities	
	list of sub-categories	1. Voluntary social service	1. Activities for the local community and neighborhood	1. Activities for the local community and neighborhood	1. Activities for the local community and neighborhood	1. Activities for the local community and neighborhood	1. Activities for the local community and neighborhood	1. Health and medical service
		2. Local group work	2. Activities for welfare institutions	2. Activities for welfare institutions	2. Activities for welfare institutions	2. Activities for welfare institutions	2. Activities for welfare institutions	2. For the aged
		3. Taking care of local groups	3. Activities for people in specific categories	3. Activities for children, the aged or the handicapped	3. Activities for children, the aged or the handicapped	3. Activities for children, the aged or the handicapped	3. Activities for children, the aged or the handicapped	3. For the handicapped
		4. Activities for Parents and Teachers Associations	4. Activities for people in certain areas such as disaster area and remote area	4. Activities for people in certain areas such as disaster area and remote area	4. Activities for people in certain areas such as disaster area and remote area	4. Activities for people in certain areas such as disaster area and remote area	4. Activities for people in certain areas such as disaster area and remote area	4. For children
		5. Taking care of other groups	5. Other activities for public	5. Other activities for public	5. Other activities for public	5. Other activities for public	5. Other activities for public	5. Sports, culture and arts
		6. Voluntary activities as a public official	7. Voluntary activities as a public official	7. Voluntary activities as a public official	7. Voluntary activities as a public official	7. Voluntary activities as a public official	7. Voluntary activities as a public official	6. For local community
		7. Other						7. Safety
							8. Nature and environment	
					other social activities	other social activities	9. Disaster relief (excluded)	
time use	number of categories	17	18	19	20	20	20	
	name of the category neighboring activities	Volunteer activities	Volunteer activities	Social voluntary activities	Social activities	Social Activities	Voluntary and other social activities	
		acquaintance	Social Life	Social Life	Social Life	Social Life	Social Life	
		Sports	Sports	Sports	Sports	Sports	Sports	
	Hobbies and amusements	Hobbies and amusements	Hobbies and amusements	Hobbies and amusements	Hobbies and amusements	Hobbies and amusements		
	change from the previous survey		schooling separated from studies and researches	Child-rearing separated from housework	creation of nursing	-	change the naming of Social Activities	
	age of respondents	15 - 191,604	15 - 208,970	15 - 239,228	15 - 247,264	10 - 259,923	10 - about 200,000	
	sample size (person)					15 - 241,166		

Table 2. Trends of Main Indicators on Social Capital

source	social activities				election for lower house			trust			fairness			number of crimes known to the police	
	voluntary activities			social participation	voting rate 2)		attitude	general trust	weakness	society	luck	responsibility	total 5)	serious crimes 6)	
	STULA 1)				Ministry of Home Affairs										I.S.M. 3)
	% of people in the past one year			minutes per day	total	men	women	average score 4)	average score 4)	average score 4)	average score 4)	average score 4)	thousands	cases	
total	men	women													
1975													1,234	12,725	
1976	7.4	7.9	7.0	4	73.45	72.81	74.05						1,248	12,201	
1977													1,268	12,371	
1978								0.84	-0.45	0.15		0.07	0.35	1,337	11,878
1979					68.01	67.42	68.56						1,289	11,792	
1980					74.57	73.72	75.36						1,357	11,480	
1981				2									1,463	11,568	
1982													1,529	11,463	
1983					67.94	67.56	68.3	0.74	-0.33	0.34			1,541	10,674	
1984													1,589	10,307	
1985													1,608	10,168	
1986	25.2	24.9	25.4	2	71.40	70.21	72.52						1,581	9,555	
1987													1,578	9,605	
1988								0.64			0.17		1,641	9,561	
1989													1,673	8,795	
1990					73.31	71.93	74.61						1,637	8,782	
1991	27.7	26.4	28.9	5									1,708	9,387	
1992													1,742	10,114	
1993					67.26	66.39	68.09	0.77	-0.18	0.44	-0.26	0.20	0.24	1,801	10,903
1994													1,784	11,103	
1995													1,783	10,652	
1996	25.3	24.3	26.3	4	59.65	59.03	60.23						1,812	11,286	
1997													1,900	12,366	
1998								0.66	-0.31	0.37	-0.45	0.07	0.26	2,034	12,725
1999													2,166	14,682	
2000					62.49	62.02	62.94						2,443	18,281	
2001	28.5	26.6	30.1					0.60			-0.38		2,736	21,530	
2002															

Notes

- 1) The results are for 15 years old and over.
- 2) In 1996 and 2002, election was conducted in two ways, on small constituencies and regional blocks. The rate for the former is listed, but the ratio for the latter is not much different.
- 3) The results for the year 2001 is the simple average of the answers obtained through different survey methods.
- 4) Average score was calculated by the authors by placing 1 and -1 (1.5, 0.5, -0.5, -1.5 for questions with quadruple choice) to the answers. Higher score indicates stronger trust to others or to the fairness of society.
- 5) Recognized numbers of crimes, except for traffic accidents
- 6) Recognized numbers of homicide, robbery, arson, rape, kidnapping and indecent assaults