



Title	Japanese public opinion on reporting the real names of juvenile criminals: An examination from the perspective of justification preferences
Author(s)	Watamura, Eiichiro; Ioku, Tomohiro
Citation	Children and Youth Services Review. 2023, 150, p. 107015
Version Type	AM
URL	https://hdl.handle.net/11094/94534
rights	© 2023. This manuscript version is made available under the CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/
Note	

The University of Osaka Institutional Knowledge Archive : OUKA

<https://ir.library.osaka-u.ac.jp/>

The University of Osaka

Supplemental materials

Additional measures included the following items.

“Are you aware that reporting the real names of juvenile offenders is currently banned?”

“Do you know whether the ban will be lifted?”

Participants were asked to respond with “Yes” or “No.”

The following seven items were included as severe punishment orientations (Mukai & Fujino, 2021). The participants were asked to respond on a 6-point scale, from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree); the seven scores were averaged ($\alpha = .93$).

The courts are too lenient with juvenile offenders.

If I am elected as a judge, I would give heavier sentences to juvenile offenders than before.

I sometimes wonder why the punishment for juvenile offenders is so light when I see media reports.

The punishment for juvenile criminals was too light when the trial was conducted only by the judges.

It is not right to lighten punishment for criminals just because they are juveniles.

Regardless of the severity of the crime (e.g., shoplifting or robbery), juvenile offenders should be severely punished.

Juveniles should also be made to pay for their crimes with appropriate punishment (an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth).

Additionally, the participants responded to the question “The death penalty should be maintained” on a 6-point scale ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 6 = strongly agree.

Table. Ordered logit analysis with attitude toward reporting the real names as the dependent variable

Independent variable	β	p	95% CI		VIF	
General deterrence	.12*	.02	-0.16	-0.04	1.21	
Retribution	.06	.23	-0.18	-0.04	1.51	
Incapacitation	.16**	.00	-0.04	0.13	2.00	
Rehabilitation	-.08	.16	-0.05	0.12	2.03	
Age of responsibility	-.31**	.00	-0.43	-0.19	1.14	
Control impulses	-.12**	.00	-0.19	-0.05	1.31	
Childhood abuse	.22**	.00	0.14	0.29	1.49	
Peer pressure	-.04	.21	-0.11	0.02	1.30	
Crime perception	.14**	.00	0.07	0.21	1.52	
Gender	-.10**	.00	-0.16	-0.03	1.31	
Age	-.11**	.00	0.12	0.26	1.49	
Marital status	.05	.30	-0.09	0.04	1.30	
Parental status	.03	.44	0.05	0.19	1.52	
R^2	.43	**				
χ^2	df	p	AIC	BIC	SBIC	
	357.78	13	.00	1896.30	1981.91	1924.74

Note: Coefficients represent standardized coefficients.

CI: confidence interval, VIF: variance inflation factor

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$.