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ABSTRACT
Prior research has noted a statistical relationship between increased crime rates and tourism in resort destination areas. This study utilizes data from two Hawaii counties to derive independent crime rates for tourist and resident sub-populations. The analysis reveals that tourists in both counties experienced higher rates of larceny, robbery, and rape than residents. In Honolulu, tourists also had a higher rate of burglary. These data suggest that earlier findings of a relationship between tourism and crime are explained, at least in part, by the fact that tourists are disproportionately the victims of crime. A number of factors including certain attributes of tourists themselves as well as certain aspects of the tourist industry are discussed to explain these findings.
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INTRODUCTION

The publication of sensational accounts of crimes against tourists in diverse destination areas has drawn increased attention to the complex relationship between the development of institutional tourism and the incidence of crime in resort communities. Hawaii, for example, became the focus of considerable national and international attention following a series of highly publicized attacks against tourists (Alexander 1980; Dreyfack 1982; Hopkins and O'Hara 1981; Trumbull 1980; Terry 1982; Zonana 1980). Similar problems have been noted in a number of other areas, including the Caribbean (Carlisle 1981; Goodwin 1980), Mexico (McCartney 1984; Miller 1984; Vasquez 1984), France (Dionne 1984), Spain (Darnton 1984), Thailand (Kelly 1982), and other parts of the United States (Light 1977; Harrigan 1981; Lindsey 1982; Morin 1983).

Public attention is generally triggered by the murder or rape of a tourist, but occasionally the concern is with less dramatic but more common sorts of victimizations such as burglary and robbery. This journalistic treatment is consistent with conventional wisdom that travelers are vulnerable to criminal victimization (Turner and Ash 1975). However, a more detailed understanding of the dynamics of tourist-related crime is necessary in order to develop effective preventive strategies for this fragile but economically significant industry.

BACKGROUND

During the last decade, an increasing number of researchers have reported a relationship between the development of tourism and crime. Economists McPeters and Stronge (1974) found that major economic crimes (robbery, larceny, and burglary) had a "similar season to tourism" in Miami, Florida, while auto theft and crimes of passion (murder, forcible rape and aggravated assault) did not. In their estimation, then, "the overall relationship between the seasons in crime and tourism is significant" due largely to the strong relationship between property-related crimes and the level of tourist activity in the community.

Walmsley, Boskovic, and Pigram (1983) compared the crime problems of three resort communities with those of three inland "control" communities in Australia. Like McPeters and Stronge, they noted that "the peaks and troughs in the occurrence of crime coincided with the highs and lows in tourist activity" (1983:154). Tourist communities reported fewer drug offenses and sexual assaults, but they had more day-time crime, particularly shoplifting and burglary.

Fukunaga (1975) examined the incidence of major crimes as part of his wider study of the social consequences of the development of a resort complex in a previously rural area on the island of Hawaii. He noted that in the five years after the hotel opened, the total number of these offenses showed a dramatic 300% increase. Urbanowicz (1977) found a similar situation in Tonga, where theft and crimes of violence, particularly between non-Tongans and Tongans, increased during a decade of rapid tourism growth. Problems with begging at major tourist attractions, prostitution, and public drunkenness were also noted.

Pizam (1982) analyzed the relative importance of state tourism expenditures (compared to nine other variables) in predicting crime rates. Tourism was found to have a small but statistically significant relationship to four of the nine types of crimes considered: property crimes, robbery, rape, and aggravated assault. Pizam noted that although the aggregate state data provided only limited evidence of a general relationship, "in some communities one might find a high association between tourism and crime." He also...
Judd (1975) examined the relationship between tourism and crime in each of the 32 states and territories of Mexico. He found, as did McPeters and Stronge, that "major crimes against property (fraud, larceny, and robbery) appear to be strongly related to tourism. The crimes against persons (assault, murder, rape, abduction, and kidnapping) are, at most, only marginally associated with foreign tourist business." (Judd 1975:328).

Fujii & Mak (1980) report slightly different results of tourism in Hawaii: "one consequence of the displacement of agriculture by resort development is a significantly greater number of burglaries, rapes, and larcenies" (Fujii and Mak 1979:53). In a subsequent time-series analysis (Fujii & Mak 1980:30), they found a statistically significant relationship between tourism and murder, homicide, robbery, rape, and burglary. Cross-sectional analysis confirmed the relationship for rape and robbery, but not for murder. The authors (1979:49) suggest that the latter finding may result from high automobile-related negligent homicide rates in rural areas that would obscure the relationship found by their time-series analysis.

O'Donnell and Lydgate (1980) explored the relationship of crime to the surrounding social environment by analyzing "behavior settings," in Honolulu. "Tourist business," composed of settings characterized by entertainment, transient residences, alcohol consumption, retail goods, and eating places, was determined to be one of two major factors related to the incidence of both property crimes and violent crimes in Honolulu.

Tourism was found to be one of six economic variables explaining changes in juvenile crime in Hawaii between 1961 and 1978 (Ghalt et al., 1983). Finally, the authors own time series analysis (Chesney-Lieb, Linder, and Schaafsma 1983) examined the relationship between tourism and crime in Honolulu over a 23-year period after statehood. The regression analysis revealed that the number of tourists present in the community was significantly related to the rates of most major crimes with the exception of murder and automobile theft. Tourism was, during the period under study, the single most powerful predictor of crime in the resort community of Honolulu. Taken as a whole, these studies indicate that the development of tourism as an industry is strongly related to an increase in property-related crime and with a higher incidence of certain violent crimes. However, the available data is less helpful in understanding the nature of the relationship between tourism and crime. Fujii and Mak (1980:34) note "although it would be attractive, to assume that tourism-generated crimes are committed only against tourists because visitors are generally considered to be easy and lucrative targets, data limitations prevent us from identifying the direct victims of crime." Similarly, Judd reported that he was "unable to empirically separate the proportion of additional crime that is directed exclusively against foreign visitors from that which is in some way precipitated by the influx of tourists but which eventually victimizes Mexican society in general..." (Judd 1975:330).

Thus, due to limitations in available data, previous research has not demonstrated whether tourism, as an industry, generates increases in crime throughout the communities where it operates, or whether it is the victimization of tourists themselves that accounts for the observed increase in crime rates.

METHOD

This article analyzes data on criminal victimization collected by the police departments in two of Hawaii's four counties. These data, which indicate the residency status of each victim, provide a direct means of testing the hypothesis that tourists are disproportionately represented among victims of crimes. The availability of this data offers an excellent opportunity to examine the relationship between tourism and crime. As Fujii and Mak (1980:28) observed, Hawaii is a "particularly appropriate" site for such research because it is geographically isolated, a premier tourist destination, and a model referred to by developing nations.

This study utilizes data from two very different parts of Hawaii, the city and county of Honolulu, and the County of Kauai. The city and county of Honolulu encompasses the entire island of Oahu, and has approximately 80% of the State's population. In 1981, Honolulu had a population of 779,100 (Department of Planning and Economic Development 1981). The famed resort area of Waikiki is located in Honolulu, and virtually all of the 4 million annual visitors to Hawaii spend at least a short period of time in the county. As many as one out of three tourists also report visiting the island of Kauai, an island with a population of only 39,000 and a primarily agricultural economy (Department of Planning and Economic Development 1985:244). Kauai's tourist industry, although still small compared to that of Honolulu, plays an increasingly important economic and social role on the island.
The Kauai County Police Department collected data on the residency status of crime victims during a 32-month period from January 1978 through August 1980. These data were compiled from individual police reports and summarized on an annual basis. The Honolulu Police Department began an ongoing process of gathering similar data in December 1980. The computerized data system used in Honolulu allows publication of crime statistics on a monthly basis.

In both counties, police officers recorded whether each crime victim was a Hawaii resident or a tourist. The data include the entire population of Part One crimes and crime victims in each county rather than a limited sample. The seven Part One index crimes (or offenses) as defined by the Federal Bureau of Investigation were included: murder, forcible rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny-theft, and motor vehicle theft. These major offenses have been selected by law enforcement agencies as the basis for the crime rates that are used for comparative statistical purposes (Federal Bureau of Investigation 1982:1-2).

Official statistics do not provide a complete measure of the incidence of crime (Black 1970). In some cases, victims fail to officially report the crime, while in other cases the police may refuse to treat a reported crime as a formal complaint. More serious offenses included in these data are less subject to such influences. Part One crimes are considered to provide the most reliable measures of crime because they are most likely to be reported to authorities and occur with sufficient frequency to establish a reasonable basis for comparisons.

To permit a meaningful comparison of patterns of victimization, separate crime rates for tourists and residents were calculated. Estimates were first made of the average daily tourist and resident sub-populations. Population estimates for local residents were drawn directly from data published by the State of Hawaii's Department of Planning and Economic Development. The estimates of the average daily tourist population for each county were generated utilizing data collected and published by the Hawaii Visitors Bureau on the number of tourist arrivals and average length of stay in each county.

These population estimates for each group were, in turn, utilized to construct independent tourist and resident crime rates (offenses per 100,000 base population) for each index offense. Thus, a basis for comparing the relative vulnerability of the tourist and local populations to criminal victimization was created.

For purposes of this study, all of the data available from Kauai was utilized. As noted above, the data cover Part One offenses reported to police during a period from January 1978 through August 1980. The Honolulu data were drawn from the contiguous 24-month period of January 1981 through December 1982. To reduce the effects of annual variations, the rates were averaged over the period for which data were available, and these averages were used as the basis for comparison between groups.

RESULTS

These data, drawn from two Hawaii counties over different but contiguous time periods totaling nearly five years, show that tourists are more likely to become victims of crime than residents. Tourists experienced far higher rates of property crimes, and were significantly more likely to become victims of the violent crimes of robbery and rape. Clearly, based on this detailed examination of crime rates in Hawaii, holiday excursions expose tourists to substantial additional risks of criminal victimization beyond those experienced by the local population.

The overall crime rates for tourists and residents are reported in Table 1. The total crime rate for tourists in Honolulu was 29.1% above that of residents. Tourists experienced similarly high rates of both violent and property crimes. The composite rates for Kauai initially appear to be quite different. The total tourist crime rate was one-percent below that of residents. While rates of property crimes for tourists and residents were approximately equal, tourists on Kauai had an overall violent crime rate 12.3% below the comparable rate for residents. These seemingly favorable comparisons should be interpreted cautiously, however, because they tend to mask a situation which is, in important respects, very similar to that found in Honolulu.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crimes</th>
<th>Kauai 1978-80</th>
<th>Honolulu 1981-82</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Tourist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent</td>
<td>228.0</td>
<td>200.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property</td>
<td>5453.0</td>
<td>5416.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5681.0</td>
<td>5616.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The nature of the tourism-crime relationship is more clearly discerned from data for each of the specific crimes which make up the composite rates. Data on criminal victimization in the city and County of Honolulu are presented in Table 2. The Honolulu data reveal that tourists were significantly more likely to be victims of violent and non-violent property crimes than residents. Rates of burglary, larceny, and robbery were substantially higher for tourists. Indeed, the robbery rate among tourists was 62.9% higher than the comparable rate for residents (255.6 vs. 156.9). Tourists in Honolulu were also slightly more likely to be victims of rape, with a rate 11% above that of residents.

Violent crimes of murder and assault show a dramatically different pattern. Tourists in Honolulu were significantly less likely to become victims of these violent crimes than were residents. Tourists fell victim to assaults at one-fifth the rate of residents (8.6 vs. 44.9), while the tourist murder rate was only one-third of the comparable resident rate (1.5 vs. 3.7).

Comparisons between these rates and the overall Hawaii and US averages are also revealing. Tourists in Honolulu have a total crime rate substantially higher than either the Hawaii or US average. However, while the tourist rate of violent crime is higher than that residents in Honolulu, it is still significantly below that of the US a whole. Much of this difference lies in a dramatically lower rate of aggravated assault against tourists (8.6 as compared to a national average of 280.9). In the case of other violent crimes, the comparisons are not as favorable. Tourists in Honolulu were robbed at a rate above the national average, and were victims of rape only slightly less often than the national and Hawaii averages.

Although tourists in Honolulu had a higher than average crime rate, residents had a total rate approximately equal to the national average, and significantly below that of the state as a whole. The resident rate fell below the national average for all offenses except larceny and motor vehicle theft. On Kauai, the total tourist crime rate was slightly below the rate for residents and 23% below the state average. Despite this, the data from Kauai County present a nearly identical pattern to Honolulu in terms of relative victimization for particular offenses. These results are shown in Table 3.

As was the case in Honolulu, tourists had higher rates of robbery, larceny, and rape than residents. Tourists on Kauai were victims of robbery at a rate nearly 6 times that of residents (114.7 vs. 20.4) although both rates are substantially below those found in Honolulu. Tourists on Kauai, like those in Honolulu, were far less likely to be victims of assault or murder than residents.

Only Kauai’s burglary rate diverged from the Honolulu pattern. On Kauai, the tourist burglary rate was only about half the resident rate (959.3 vs. 1722.9), and even substantially below the rate for Honolulu residents.
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**Table 2: Average Annual Crime Rates Per 100,000 Population**

City and County of Honolulu 1981 - 1982

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crimes</th>
<th>Honolulu Resident</th>
<th>Honolulu Tourist</th>
<th>U.S.²</th>
<th>Hawaii²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Murder</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>156.9</td>
<td>255.6</td>
<td>241.3</td>
<td>153.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>280.9</td>
<td>60.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>1407.3</td>
<td>2045.4</td>
<td>1553.7</td>
<td>1685.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larceny</td>
<td>3490.8</td>
<td>4956.2</td>
<td>3096.1</td>
<td>4210.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other¹</td>
<td>554.4</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>460.8</td>
<td>426.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent</td>
<td>233.0</td>
<td>296.2</td>
<td>566.3</td>
<td>252.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property</td>
<td>5452.5</td>
<td>7046.2</td>
<td>5110.6</td>
<td>6322.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5685.5</td>
<td>7342.4</td>
<td>5676.9</td>
<td>6574.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1“Other” category is composed primarily of auto theft.
2 U.S. and Hawaii data are taken from the Annual Statistical Reports of the Honolulu Police Department.
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**Table 3: Average Annual Crime Rates Per 100,000 Population**

County of Kauai 1978-80

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crimes</th>
<th>Kauai Resident</th>
<th>Kauai Tourist</th>
<th>U.S.¹</th>
<th>Hawaii¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Murder</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>114.7</td>
<td>215.6</td>
<td>182.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>176.5</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>275.2</td>
<td>64.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>1722.9</td>
<td>959.3</td>
<td>1530.3</td>
<td>1863.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larceny</td>
<td>3430.1</td>
<td>4342.5</td>
<td>2962.9</td>
<td>4500.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Theft</td>
<td>300.0</td>
<td>115.0</td>
<td>482.6</td>
<td>632.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent</td>
<td>228.0</td>
<td>200.0</td>
<td>534.4</td>
<td>286.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property</td>
<td>5453.0</td>
<td>5416.8</td>
<td>4975.8</td>
<td>6995.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5681.0</td>
<td>5616.8</td>
<td>5510.2</td>
<td>7282.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹The U.S. and Hawaii data are taken from the Annual Statistical Reports of the Honolulu Police Department.
The largely rural county of Kauai had a surprisingly high rate of aggravated assault. The assault rate for Kauai residents is nearly three times the state average (176.5 vs. 64.9). If this rate were not so unusually high, tourists on Kauai would have a higher overall violent crime rate than residents, as is the case in Honolulu.

The high rape rate among tourists on Kauai must also be noted. During the period under study, tourists were victims of rape on Kauai at a rate nearly three times greater than residents, and twice both the state and national averages. While care should be exercised in the interpretation of these results due to the relatively small actual numbers involved, it should be noted that the data utilized included the entire population of crime victims over a period of several years. The results are therefore more valid than if they had been based on a limited statistical sample.

Despite the higher rates of tourist victimization, Hawaii has lower rates of those violent crimes which cause the most public concern. Hawaii's rates of violent crime are generally below those of mainland US cities of comparable size. The 1981 crime rates of cities with populations between 500,000 and 1,000,000 are presented in Table 4.

The violent crime rate for Honolulu residents ranked 27th out of the 29 cities, while the rate for tourists ranked 25th. However, the rate of property crimes among tourists in Honolulu ranked second among cities of comparable size. Only two other cities (Orlando, Florida, also a major tourist destination) experienced a higher property crime rate than tourists in Honolulu. The rate for Honolulu residents, on the other hand, ranked only 17th.

DISCUSSION

This review of the data has established that tourists are more frequent victims of property crimes and certain violent crimes, especially in the urban resort area of Honolulu. However, two important questions remain unanswered. First, is it possible to reject the alternative hypothesis that an increase in the number of tourists is related to a general increase in crime throughout the community? Unfortunately, the data are once again inconclusive in this regard, although the higher rates of tourist victimization might seem able to account for the statistical relationship between tourism and some noted in earlier studies. It seems logical to assume that there remains at least some residual effect on local residents. At a minimum, cases of "mistaken identity" surely take place, and it seems likely that persons who enter criminal careers through offenses against tourists would consistently avoid the resident population.

In addition, there is a limited amount of evidence to suggest that tourism might lead to increased rates of crimes in which residents, rather than visitors, are the primary victims. In their time series analysis of crime in Hawaii between 1961-1975, Fujii and Mak noted a "significant relationship between tourism and murder/
homicides" (1980:30). Their cross section results of crime in the resort area of Waikiki also noted a positive relationship between tourism and assault. A similar positive and significant relationship between tourism and the rate of assaults in Honolulu was found by Chesney-Lind, Lind and Schaafsmma (1983), along with results approaching significance for the murder rate. In the case of both murder and assault, however, this analysis has shown that residents are the primary victims. This would indicate that at least for these offenses, increases in tourism somehow promote higher crime rates among the resident population. However, the evidence is merely suggestive, and further research into the effects of tourism on the levels of crime among the resident population is necessary.

The remaining question which must be addressed is how to account for higher crime rates among Hawaii's tourist population. There would appear to be at least two types of factors involved. First, tourists have certain personal and behavioral attributes which tend to make them "desirable" victims. Second, there are certain structural aspects of tourism in Hawaii which contribute to the perception of tourists as "legitimate" targets of criminal acts.

Tourist Behavior and Victimization

A look at the criminological literature, particularly the new and growing work on victimization reveals that tourists clearly possess a number of characteristics which account for their increased vulnerability (Sparks 1982:30). For example, tourists are tempting targets because they are known to carry large sums of money (Fuji and Mak 1980; Chesney-Lind, Lind, and Schaafsmma 1983).

In addition, tourists carry other forms of "portable wealth" such as cameras and jewelry which are among the more frequently stolen items. Rental cars parked at popular beaches with purses, wallets, and cameras locked inside are a typical target, as are the same materials left on the beach or near a beach chair at a hotel swimming pool. Theft of valuables from tourists' cars is one of the most common offenses in other resort areas as well as in Hawaii (Community Resources 1980; Nicholls 1976a and 1976b).

Moreover, tourists also engage in other activities which facilitate their victimization. Vacations typically involve higher than normal amounts of risk-taking behavior, such as frequenting night clubs and bars at late hours, traveling to remote and unfamiliar areas, or venturing unknowingly into parts of the community which residents consider "dangerous". Tourists may patronize bars, discos, and pornographic theaters which they would avoid in their home town. They may also engage in behaviors in these settings that they would not consider at home, such as buying drugs and "picking up" prostitutes or strangers. Indeed, Uzzell (1984:97) has suggested that risk taking behavior is an important element of fantasy and escape, which are central to the vacation experience.

Fuji and Mak (1979:53) found that such risk-taking accounted, at least in part, for higher rates of rape among tourists. Tourist victims of rape were younger and more likely to be unmarried than resident victims, and typically met their assailants at a bar or disco. "What this suggests is that tourists are more likely to be raped to the extent that they are more likely to enter into casual and dangerous relationships with recent acquaintances."

Those tourists who patronize prostitutes may discover that their money and their pants as well may be missing after the encounter. According to a warning issued by the Honolulu Police Department, for example, "Many prostitutes steal from men whom they have enticed. Some prostitutes work in teams on the street to pick pockets; others go into hotels where they gain entry to rooms and rob the tenants."

Tourists are also vulnerable because they are temporary visitors to communities with which they are not familiar. Consequently, they may not be able to differentiate between "safe" and "unsafe" areas or behaviors. Criminals count on this lack of awareness. As one pimp and drug dealer explained to the authors, "their eyes are open but they can not see" because they are so busy gawking at unfamiliar sights.

The dangers of this situation are compounded by the fact that tourists are unknown in the resort community and isolated from forms of social support and protection that they would have at home. They cannot rely on networks of family and friends to protect them while on vacation. These networks serve as deterrents to crime and, alternately, their absence increases the risk of victimization. The potential social consequences for victimizing tourists are relatively minimal. Since they are strangers, they are clearly not a part of the indigenous community. Consequently, their victimizers do not have to concern themselves with the possibility of triggering active and powerful hostilities of other residents who may be friends or relatives of a local victim. Thus, one of the defendants in a highly publicized rape case involving a young Finnish tourist was quoted to the effect that "she was nobody's girlfriend"
and, presumably as a result, without resources to ward off attack (Altieri 1979; Murray 1983; Trumbull 1980).

Conflicting norms of dress, speech, and behavior can also heighten tensions between tourists and residents. Tourists are often perceived as aggressive and insensitive to the feelings of residents when they fail to recognize or respond to local norms. A New York Times article quotes a young Hawaiian commenting that "we never go to the beach where tourists are, because they make you feel like animals in a zoo" (Trumbull 1980).

These conflicts increase what Doxey (1976) refers to as the "irritation level" and, if unresolved, can eventually result in criminal acts. A publication of the Honolulu Police Department (n.d.), for example, offers visitors advice on how to avoid becoming victims of crime. In addition to routine warnings to avoid dark and isolated areas at night and to be wary of strangers, tourists are advised to avoid criticisms in public places of "local" foods, habits, ethnic groups, and so forth." In a review of problems in Greece, Hawaii, and the Caribbean, Pearce (1982) also noted "a new readiness to cheat, victimize and even assault the tourist" as a result of accumulated local resentment in areas of high tourist density.

When they do become victims of crime, tourists are less likely to carry through with prosecution of offenders. For example, a recent study of rape in Honolulu (Hawaii Criminal Justice Data Center 383:6) found:

When the victim was a visitor, arrests were made in 62.5 percent of the cases as compared to only 30.6 percent when the victim was a resident. However, when the victim was a visitor, a larger proportion of the arrestees were released without being charged (57.9 percent) than when the victim was a resident (17.4 percent).

According to an FBI official in Honolulu quoted by Zonana (1980), the low prosecution rate results from "a natural reluctance when you're away from home to get further involved in an unpleasant situation."

Another factor is the difficulty and expense of returning to the resort area to testify in a subsequent trial. Tourist industry organizations and local governments in Hawaii and Florida are attempting to alleviate this problem by paying the expenses of persons who turn to provide testimony in criminal trials (Haitch 1981; Zonana. 1980).

Industry strategies which rely on efforts to increase public awareness and concern about crimes against tourists may, however, actually increase levels of resentment among residents of resort areas. In at least one highly publicized case in Hawaii, tourist industry efforts to promote dramatic media coverage brought an angry response from residents of the community where the crime occurred. In their view, the special attention was unwarranted and, in the process of creating sympathy for tourist victims, tended to cast residents in the stereotyped image of criminals and victimizers.

Victimization and the Structure of Mass Tourism

Hawaii is a prime example of "mass" tourism, with a host population of less than one million absorbing more than four million annual visitors. Tourism is often described as a "clean* industry free from the pollution and other environmental effects associated with other types of industrial development. However, scholars and policy makers have begun to systematically identify an array of negative social impacts of tourism ranging from family disintegration and cultural denigration to malnutrition, land speculation, and unrestrained urbanization (e.g., Bolabola 1981; Finney and Watson 1975; Hills and Lundgren 1977; Pizam 1978). More importantly, for purposes of this discussion, certain structural aspects of the industry appear to contribute to the problem of tourist-related crime.

First, tourism in Hawaii has become so large and lucrative an industry that it appears put of the control of the communities in which it operates. In an increasing number of cases, resort development has proceeded over the active and vocal objections of a significant part of the local population (Farrell 1982; Finney and Watson 1975; Kent 1983; Siegel 1983; Stannard 1983; Taylor 1983). Such perceptions of a loss of local control appear to be a major source of anti-tourist sentiment among residents in resort areas (Noronha 1977). In a survey of Hawaii residents, Knox (1979:84) found that:

about a third of Oahu residents already agree the island "is being run for tourists at the expense of local people," and less than a half of the sample actively disagree with these statements. And while the most often cited negative aspects of tourists involved crowding and congestion, more specific questions determined there is a higher level of concern over future tourist "takeover" than about crowding per se.

Largely as a result of such conflicts, there is, in many parts of the community, a degree of animosity towards tourism as an industry.
Visitors to such destinations could occupy, again unwittingly, the status of tourists within a political context whose dimensions are familiar to them. Because of local animosity, they may be defined as quasi-legitimate targets of criminal activity. Under such conditions, individual tourists may become the targets of actions which supress the anger, frustration, and resentment against the industry as a whole. Thus, individual victims might usefully be seen as "scapegoats" for the Industry. Like the "dry hustle" of country bumpkins or the blackmail of homosexuals (Sparks 1982:30), the theft of cameras and wallets from rental cars or beach towels could regarded by such hostile communities as an "informal tourists."

Mass tourism further contributes to the problem by reducing the incidence of personal contacts between tourists and residents. Tourists are typically "packaged" in tours and moved from hotel and back in groups. This increases their Isolation and anonymity, and can contribute to the hostility of residents noted above. In addition, as suggested by Bryden (1973:92-93) "tourism density," measured by the annual number of tourists compared to the resident population, would appear to be directly related to the degree of confrontation between tourists and residents. With more than 4 million tourists arriving annually and a resident population of approximately one million, Hawaii's tourism density ranks among the highest in the world.

The tourist industry is highly dependent on mass marketing, and the images used to sell a particular tourist destination may also make a contribution to increased crime. Hawaii has been sold for decades as part of a fantasy of romance and "aloha" (Brown, Ellet, and Giemza 1982). Yielding to the power of these manufactured images, tourists often have difficulty arriving at the practical realization that Hawaii has many of the same crime problems that they would expect in a city of comparable size on the US mainland. As Honolulu's police chief put it, "Most tourists come to paradise with stars in their eyes" (Waldman 1983:48). Unfortunately, the travel industry has typically failed to take affirmative action to provide more realistic expectations. Tourists thus often remain unwary and unprepared for the possibility of crimes, and consequently they may fail to take simple, routine precautions. The magnitude of the problem is perhaps reflected in the increasing willingness of civil courts to award damages to victims of crime in situations which indicate negligence on the part of hotel or condominium management (Catterall 1983; Curley 1983).

The widespread use of romance and sexuality as advertising themes has also been cited as a possible link to crime (Naibavu and Schutz 1974). Images with both implicit and explicit sexual content are used in advertising by airlines, hotels, Industry groups, and others involved in the tourist trade (Goffman 1979). Uzzell (1984) observes that tourism promotional brochures "are trying to sell sun, sea, sand and sex," and argues that their similarity to contemporary soft pornography is not accidental. Such advertising might encourage increased risk-taking in search of romantic or sexual relationships, and contribute to the prevalence of prostitution, which is widely recognized as a serious problem in the Waikiki area (Honolulu Police Department n.d.; Lum 1983). It might also encourage more predatory behavior in the form of the "sexualization" of routine encounters between tourists and residents in service roles, such as employees in bars, restaurants, beach concessions, and hotels. At least one major union representing hotel workers in Hawaii has already responded to increasing problems in such settings by organizing workshops on sexual harassment.

The sexualization of entertainment and service settings is directly related to prostitution in resort areas. One Asian tourism executive commented that this is not something "to be overly hysterical about":

Women in tourism is a worldwide phenomenon. Travellers tend to be more interested in women than while at home and tourism centres of the world have their own ways of meeting the particular needs of tourists, though some are more overt and some others are less so (Kim Myong-sik 1979).

However, interviews with women in Hawaii's prison system indicate that low-paying jobs in tourist settings often serve as entry points into prostitution and criminal careers. Chesney-Lind and Rodriguez (1983:14) report that:

Some women were recruited directly out of what might be called bar-related female professions into prostitution. For example, one woman who is currently doing time for burglary, said she had been a "taxi dancer" when she "met a guy that got me into it." Another had been a "topless dancer," and two others had worked as employees in massage parlors. . . . Half the women were working off and on in these entertainment or bar related jobs while they were involved in prostitution indicating that these occupations, themselves, serve as adjuncts rather than alternatives to female criminal activity.
While holding surprisingly conventional values and aspirations, these women report a lack of realistic economic alternatives to participating in illegal activities. Indeed, hotels and associated retail service industries do report lower wages and hours than other industry groups in Hawaii (DPED 1982).

A similar pattern of "casual" or "part-time" prostitutes working in various parts of the tourist industry has been noted in Fiji by Naibavu and Schutz (1978:61). They also found that "the largest clientele by far of the professional prostitutes are foreign visitors. It seems to be possible to 'arrange a girl' through staff at almost any hotel. . . . "In conversations with the authors, persons involved with prostitution in Hawaii have reported similar linkages. Honolulu police report that "open street solicitation" has been a problem in Waikiki, and over half of the prostitution arrests are made in this resort area.

The findings reported by O'Donnell and Lydgate (1980) confirm this relationship between tourist crime and the sexualization of resort areas. In an examination of crime rates in Honolulu's 75 motorized police beats, they found both violent and property crimes to be significantly higher in those areas containing various tourist-related facilities such as hotels, restaurants, retail stores, movie theaters, bars, and nightclubs. The strongest correlations were found in tourist areas which also were high in "sex-related resources," those featuring goods or services of a sexually-oriented nature such as pornographic bookstores and theaters, strip shows, massage parlors, and clubs with topless dancers.

CONCLUSION

Overall, these findings clearly establish the fact that tourists visiting two different resort settings in the state of Hawaii—the urban center of Honolulu and the rural, picturesque island of Kauai—were significantly more likely than local residents to be the victims of crime. In both communities tourists experienced higher rates of larceny, and in Honolulu tourists were also far more likely than residents to be burglarized. Moreover, while the State's crime problem is chiefly one of a higher property crime, the criminal victimization of tourists is not restricted to property crimes. In both areas studied, tourists were significantly more likely than residents to be victims of rape and robbery.

These data strongly suggest that the relationship between tourism and crime is explained, at least in part, by the fact that tourists are disproportionately the victims of crime. While increases in the numbers of tourists might lead to general increases in crime throughout the community by contributing to urbanization and other forms of social change, it is evident that the tourist industry itself is a factor in increasing crime rates.

Certain aspects of tourism have been suggested as possible explanations for high rates of tourist victimization. Some of these involve possibly unavoidable parts of vacation behavior. On the other hand, this analysis suggests that the policies and practices of the tourist industry in Hawaii must also bear part of the responsibility for criminal acts directed against tourists. Thus, based on this analysis, it can be predicted that crime control strategies which focus exclusively on the offender will fail to stem the rate of tourist victimization.

This relationship between Hawaii's most important industry and a persistent and disturbing social problem calls for further research and immediate action. Clearly, programs to reduce tourist victimization should be established in resort destinations. The tourist industry should engage in two immediate types of activities: those which inform incoming tourists of simple prevention strategies and those which heighten the cost of tourist victimization. To accomplish the former, an attempt should be made to gather further and more specific information on the typical sorts of tourist victimizations. Studies of comparative burglary rates in different hotels could, for example, help identify those strategies which successfully minimize the opportunities for crime. To heighten the cost of tourist victimization, returning witness programs should be publicized more widely. In addition, other industry policies and practices need to be carefully examined for their possible links to the problem of crime.

Tourist industry advertising strategies should also be reviewed to determine if they are themselves contributing to increased crime. Previous work (Fujii and Mak 1979) suggests that different kinds of tourists may have different effects on crime. Efforts to change the composition of the tourist stream toward more family tourism, for example, might well be effective in reducing crime. In addition, more attention should be given to the possible problems created by the sexualization of both marketing images and the actual tourist-resident encounters in resort destination areas. The travel industry may, in such indirect ways, be unintentionally creating environments which are most conducive to crime.

Tourism development plans should be reviewed to avoid the types of projects which engender community hostility and resentment. The perception of a loss of effective community control over tourism...
development is clearly related to the cycle of irritation and resentment that seems to be part of the crime problem. A seminar co-sponsored by the World Bank and Unesco in 1976 concluded that the host community must be involved in the vital process of "determining if they should have tourism, the rate of tourism growth, the types of tourists and investors to be encouraged, and, concomitantly, the type of overall development suitable for the community" (de Kadt 1979:343). Similarly, Knox (1979:viii) cautioned that:

Government and industry decision makers must be very careful to maintain residents' sense of control over "their" islands. Outside investment and tourist-resident mix in recreational areas should be evaluated by these criteria (which have long-term implications for the economic viability of tourism), as well as by the criteria of short-term economic benefits.

Developments which are unwelcome may inadvertently cast the unaware tourist into the role of "legitimate victim:" Clearly, victimization of tourists is made easier if the surrounding community provides a normative structure which either explicitly or implicitly endorses anti-tourist activity.

Finally, while there is obviously need for concerted action to reduce crimes against tourists, it is important to keep the concern in perspective. Despite the higher rates of tourist victimization, Hawaii's rate of violent crime remains below that of most comparable areas on the US mainland.

REFERENCES

Alexander, Charles
Altieri, Janet
Black, Donald
Botabola, Cema
1981 Does Tourism Cause Malnutrition? They Seem to be Connected. Pacific Perspectives 10(1).
Brown, DeSoto, Anne Ellett, and Gary Giemza
Bryden, John M.
Fujii, Edwin T., and James Mak  
Fukunaga, Lawrence  
Ghali, Moheb, Emogene Estores, Francis Okano, and Randall Tanaka  
Goffman, Erving  
Goodwin, Michael  
Haces, Andrew, and Lorrie Millman  
Haitch, Richard  
Harrigan, Susan  
Hawaii Criminal Justice Data Center, Department of the Attorney General  
Hawaii Visitors Bureau  
Honolulu Police Department  
Hopkins, Thomas, and Jane O’Hara  
1981 Islands In the Sun: Trouble clouds the horizon In paradise. Macleans (March 23):43.  
Jud, Donald G.  
Kelly, Neil  
Kent, Noel  
Kim, Myong-sil  
Knox, JohnM.  
Light, Ivan  
Lind, Andrew  
n.d. Aloha Spirit: Is it just a tourist attraction? Honolulu Advertiser.  
Lindsey, Robert .  
Lum, Herman  
1983 My Role as Chief Justice: Speech to the Rotary Club of Honolulu (October 25); Reprinted in Hawaii Bar News (November 1983).  
McCartney, Robert J.  
McPheters, Lee R., and William B. Stronge  
Miller, Marjorie  
1984 Tales of highway banditry in Mexico shake tourist industry. Los Angeles Times (October 14) Section 1:3.  
Morin, Stephen  
Murray, William D.  
Naibavu, Taina, and Betty Schutz  
Nicholls, Leland L.  
Noromha, Raymond  
1977 Social and Cultural Dimensions of Tourism: A Review of the Literature in


Siegel, Barry. 1982 Hawaii: To Grow or Not to Grow. Los Angeles Times (February 3): 1 +.


Vasquez, Juan M. 1984 U.S. may warn Americans against driving in Mexico. Los Angeles Times (October 4) Section 1:1.


Submitted 5 January 1985
Revised version submitted 20 April 1985
Accepted 29 July 1985
Final version received 8 August 1985
Referred anonymously