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Abstract

In most developing countries, some young people (youth) are victims of violence and oppression. In order to escape the victimisation, some have become perpetrators of violence while others have become agents of change and contribute in promoting peace in communities where they live. This paper reports a study of activities of the youth associated with violence, their participation in community events and strategy for promoting peace in the communities. Data originated from survey of youth that were conducted by World Vision Papua New Guinea (PNG) and Childfund PNG in Central province, Morobe province and the National Capital District in PNG and was analysed using descriptive statistics and binary logistic regression model. The results show that most youth believe that a woman has a right to say no to sex. Some believe that a husband should hit his wife if she disobeys him, neglects chores or disrespect in-laws. Participation of youth in community events depend on the type of event and the group they belong. The youth are not involved in decision-making on activities associated with youth development. The results of the logistic model show that youth participation in community events was influenced by factors such as education, marital status and whether the youth is a student. Participation of the youth in community events can be enhanced by involving them in decision-making. The findings will be useful in the planning of initiatives for promoting peace in communities by considering activities of the youth in violence and peace.
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Structure of the report

The report starts with the introduction which discusses factors that promote peace and violence and conflict followed by materials, methods and factors that contributes to violence and crime in PNG. Section three is used to describe data generated from surveys by World Vision, PNG and Childfund, PNG. Sections four and five discusses how the youth has become victims of physical violence and how the youth perceive GBV using intimate partner violence as a case. Section six discusses how the youth participate in community-based activities. Sections seven and eight discusses youth wellbeing and the perceptions of the youth by members of the communities where they live in. Section nine gives the conclusion and some potential recommendations for consideration.
Peace ensures there is justice for all people and it contributes to economic development by providing an environment, which is conducive for investment (Institute for Economics and Peace, 2022). According to the Institute for Economics and Peace (2022), factors that promote peace include low levels of corruption, strong business environment, equitable distribution of resources, free flow of information, acceptance of rights of others, high levels of human capital and a well-functioning government. Peace building has the potential to heal the social wounds created by conflict and violence, address issues that often create conflict situation and keep people safe (Berents and McEvoy-Levy, 2015). However, violence has continued to increase economic costs that threaten fiscal growth and development in some countries, including Papua New Guinea (PNG) and other developing countries (Bowman et al. 2008). Violence can be perceived as an act of force, intentional act of excessive or destructive force or a violation of human rights (Bufacchi, 2005). Violence can take different forms such as Gender-Based Violence (GBV), family violence, sexual violence, Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) and psychological/emotional violence (Krebs et al., 2011; WHO and Pan American Health Organisation, 2012). GBV and IPV, which are often the most common types of violence in communities, are often caused by gender inequality, economic factors, conflict, cultural factors, weak legal mechanism, political factors and abuse of alcohol and drugs (Ellsberg et al., 2021; Patra et al., 2018).

According to the Global Peace Index, which measures the relative position of countries and regions’ peacefulness, PNG rank 101 out of 163 countries in 2020 and it deteriorated to 107 in 2021 (Institute of Economics and Peace, 2022). The country has high crime and violence rates, which restricts long-term economic development (Lakhani and Willman, 2014). Violence is often driven by gender inequality, which influences the social roles of men and women; structural factors such as economic and social policy environment; and institutional factors such as policies or protocols that determine how communities function (Dao et al., 2012; Maternowska and Fry, 2018). In developing interventions and initiatives for addressing violence, it is important to consider these factors.

In order to develop an effective mechanism for addressing violence, there is a need to understand that violence and conflict are not necessarily the same. Conflict is a process in which one party perceives that its interests are being opposed or negatively affected by another party (James et al., 1995). It has effect on characteristics of individuals, relationship and communication between people, behavior of people, and structure of a community such as interdependence and status differences. Conflict can take different forms such as interpersonal conflict, communal conflict, societal conflict and international conflict. Drivers of conflict include economic inequalities, inequality in access to social services, political inequalities and cultural inequalities (Brinkman et al., 2013; Keen, 2012). It is important to address any conflict of interest between parties before it results in violence. This suggests that if communities have effective conflict management mechanisms, the incidence of violence will be minimised and resources used more efficiently to meet their needs.

In PNG, some authors have found that several factors contribute to violence. For instance, Eves (2019) found that men perceive that any gain in power for women is a loss for themselves and therefore men resist women from gaining power, which often results in GBV and IPV. Men believe that they have absolute authority over their wives because of payment of bride price. Ezebilo et al. (2022) found that some youth believe that a husband should hit his wife as a way to discipline her when she disobeys him. Jewkes et al. (2017) found that violence against women is often heightened by conflict such as the Bougainville conflict, which resulted in sexual violence, IPV and GBV. Factors that contribute to violence in PNG include security as a result of remoteness of some rural areas and lack of formal state institution such as the police; and social and cultural factors such as gender inequalities in power and large youth population (Lakhani and Willman 2014). Others include economic factors as a result of rural-urban migration and high level of unemployment; legal factors such as under-resourcing the justice sector; and political factors such as incitement of violence by local politicians.

According to Martin (2003), crime is an act which can be harmful to an individual, community, society or the state and it is forbidden and punishable by law. There are different types of crime such as offence against the person, i.e. crime committed by direct physical harm or force applied to another person (Gardner, 1994). Violent offence, i.e. when an offender uses harmful force or threaten to use force on the victim (Fazel et al. 2014). Others include sexual violence, which means unlawful sexual act (Seth and Srivastava, 2017). Offence against property, i.e. crime to obtain money,
property or some other benefits such as burglary, motor vehicle theft, shoplifting and vandalism (Youngs, 2004).

The youth, which are persons between the ages of 15 to 24 years (UN, 2022) have an important role to play in addressing issues associated with conflict, violence and crime. For instance, some youth have been victims of cultural and structural violence and some of them inflict on others (Felice and Wisler, 2007). Sugimoto-Matsuda and Braun (2014) found that youth violence has been a serious public health issue globally. The youth have the potential to contribute to building a culture of peace. However, little or no attention is often given to the youth. Their interests are not often incorporated in discussions associated with security and in developing mechanisms for addressing conflict and violence (Berents and McEvoy-Levy, 2015). As communities can be engaged at various levels to reduce violence, power sharing among partners, and including the youth can be used for finding lasting solution to violence (Nation et al., 2011). In a life story research with PNG youth, Mafile’O and Api (2009) found that the youth are resilient considering the limited access to formal social services.

In PNG, the growing youth population and social and economic changes is linked to the high rates of crime and violence (Lakhani and Willman, 2014). High youth unemployment contributes to the high levels of crime and violence. The poor quality of education has negative impact on employment opportunities, which restrict the youth from accessing employment. This is because they are not well equipped with social and technical skills. Changes in social norms as a result of colonisation and new ways of life in urban areas contribute to the involvement of youth in crime and violence (Lakhani and Willman, 2014). As the youth are victims and perpetrators of crime and violence, if the intention is to find a lasting solution to the anomaly in the communities, there is a need to engage the youth in developing peace-building mechanisms. Peace building mechanisms have an important role to play in reducing the magnitude of crime and violence among the youth.

The objectives of the project reported in this paper were to:

i. Address conflict and violence through enabling the youth to engage as actors of development and peaceful resolution of conflicts.

ii. Build the capacity of the youth as agents of change to strengthen a culture of peaceful and inclusive development.

This project was conducted in Morobe Province, Central Province and the National Capital District (NCD). World Vision, PNG was responsible for Morobe and Childfund, PNG for Central and NCD.
The project is a baseline assessment that intends to establish an account of the current situation in target communities. World Vision, PNG conducted a study in six wards within the Lae Urban Local Level Government (LLG) in Morobe Province. Childfund, PNG conducted studies in Central Province and NCD. Lae is the second largest city in PNG while NCD or Port Moresby is the capital and largest city in the country. Central Province is the nearest province to Port Moresby. Thus, the study was conducted in urban and rural areas and it targeted the youth (in-school and out-of-school) and members of the communities. It was intended to include Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) as a target group for the study in Lae. However, as the selection of local CSOs as implementing partners was not finalized at the time that the study was conducted they were not included as target group during the study. The age of the youth targeted during the study was from 12 to 25 years.

PNG has several policies aimed at protecting vulnerable people such as PNG National Strategy to Prevent and Respond to GBV 2016-2025 with the goal of prioritising the prevention and response to GBV to enable quality of life without fear of violence (Department of Religion, Youth and Community Development, 2015). PNG National Policy on Social Protection 2015-2020 that focuses on a social protection system that provide appropriate support to vulnerable and disadvantaged individuals and groups (Department for Community Development and Religion, 2014). PNG National Youth Policy 2020-2030 with the goal of improving wellbeing of young people through greater and meaningful participation at all levels of the society and government (National Youth Development Authority, 2019). Lukautim Pikinini Act 2015 (Government of Papua New Guinea, 2016), which focuses on protecting and promoting the rights and well-being of children regardless of their race, nationality, religion, sex, ability or disability. However, different types of violence continued to be a long-standing issue in the country.

Factors that contribute to violence and crime in PNG

According to Lakhani and Willman (2014), the dynamics of conflict, crime and violence in PNG are multiple and more complex than the issues that, historically, have been central to conflict. The fragility of the country, conflict and the different forms of violence emanate from a combination of economic, political, or security stresses and weak institutional capacity to manage the stresses (World Bank, 2011). Some factors that contribute to violence and crime in PNG are the following:

- Large unemployed youth population and socio-economic changes. According to Lakhani and Willman (2014), a growing youth population and socio-economic changes that have transformed PNG societies, contribute to different forms of crime and violence. The high unemployment rates, inadequate educational opportunities and rapid urbanization contribute to tensions that the youth face, which compel some youth to be involved in crime and violence.

- Changes in social norms especially in towns and cities. Towns and cities provide opportunities for people from different areas of PNG to live together to Lakhani and Willman (2014). However, traditional social hierarchies and associated values and codes of conduct, which regulate action and social behaviour is often difficult to implement because of the differences in the tradition and customs of the people. Thus, youth who does not have the necessary skills to ‘make ends meet’ may engage in crime and exhibit violent behaviours.

- Poverty, high cost of living and inadequate economic opportunities. According to Barker (2009), poverty and lack of dynamic employment growth in both the formal and informal economies are key drivers of high crime rates in PNG. Though the country has been experiencing economic growth that have been driven by mining and oil and gas sector the contribution of the sector to poverty reduction and other segments of the economy has been weak (ADB, 2011).

- The unclear role of the State, private sector and community in negotiating land lease or benefits. The lack of clarity on the roles of these three groups results in conflict and violence especially around resource projects (Banks, 2008). It often results in an extended violent conflict, which has adverse effect on the communities, private firm and the State. The youth often play a significant role in conflict and violence around resource project areas.
Family and sexual violence and GBV are highly prevalent in PNG. Violence especially against girls and women are common in the country. Two-thirds to three-quarters of women reported that they have been beaten by their husbands (Lewis et al., 2007). Some women especially those that trade in goods at the market are subject to rape and other serious assault, accusations of sorcery, beatings and intimidation by men (Kopi, 2010, Kipongi, 2022). The youth are often involved in rape and violence against girls and women.

The abuse of alcohol, marijuana and other drugs. The youth especially men who often engage in the abuse of alcohol and drugs often exhibit violent behaviours, which make them a common tool for crime (Eves, 2006).

The system of compensation. The desire to seek compensation payment encourages some of the youth to find ways to trigger a conflict situation, which often results in violence (Dinnen et al. 2011). Once compensation payment is initiated by the youth it often continue unabated, with claims here and there.

The youth often participate in inter-ethnic tensions especially in rural areas. This often linked to the cultural norms which encourages the use of violence in engaging in disputes and retributive actions between social groups. In urban areas, inter-ethnic violence appears to be more common in informal settlements (Kopi et al., 2010). The youth especially men often lead the confrontation against the opposing group. According to Mutz and Baur (2009), education and social background influence youth involvement in violence.

Some youth who have access to firearms often abuse by using it to commit crime such as shoplifting, car theft and offences against people during tribal conflict. Availability of firearms, which has resulted in the growing use of firearms in tribal conflicts and in the perpetration of crime (Kopi et al., 2010).

Data Collection

Data was collected using mixed methods, which involved a questionnaire, interviews and focus group discussion. The questionnaire was developed to reflect several questions related to the role of youth in managing conflict in their communities, their personal characteristics, and their attitude toward the concept of civic engagement, interpersonal communications, self-efficacy and violence as a response to disputes. Other questions include youth participation in the communities where they live, perception of safety where they live, and knowledge of available social services, youth wellbeing, assessment of living standard. It also includes, youth perception of gender equality, rights and protection and familiarity with three Key Acts in PNG. In terms of focus group discussion, the questions focus on how members of the community perceive the youth, the types of interactions and experiences that members of the community have with their youth, challenges that communities face with their youth, and factors that influence the youth to behave the way they do.

A total of 704 participated (ChildFund sample and World Vision sample) in the survey of which 699 were youth and 6 members of the community who were involved in focus group discussion. Of the 699 observations, 335 were females, 358 males and 6 did not disclose their gender. ChildFund had 120 observations (17.2%) and World Vision had 579 observations (82.8%).

For World Vision, in-school youth, students 12-18 years of age (265) were selected by class teachers in selected schools through school counselors- mostly those students that are found to have relationships issues and those that are spotted as having some form of disciplinary issues. In terms of gender of the respondents, 46.4% was male and 53.6% was female.

For out-of-school youth in the World Vision sample, 14-25 years olds (310) were identified and selected by the ward councilors and community leaders and religious leaders in respective community. Of this sample, 166 was male and 138 was female and 6 of the respondents did not disclose their gender. Most of the youth selected were the ones who did not attend any form of education at the time of project inception or either working or engaged in any employment sectors. Generally, those that are at the higher risk of involving in negative lifestyles and involving in violence and crime.

Officials of World Vision, PNG and ChildFund, PNG collected data for the study. The data collection was made using the following tools:

- Youth Healthy Behaviour Survey (YHBS). It was administered to youth-in-school and out-of-school youth corresponding to 269 students and 310 non-students. The YHBS was used to collect quantitative data. It was
developed to complement and inform the use of World Vision’s IMPACT+ programing approach.

- Focus group discussion with community members. This was used to collect qualitative data from members of communities from six targeted wards in Lae Urban LLG. It focused on community members’ perceptions of youth. Six members of the community participated in the focus group discussion.

In terms of Childfund, the baseline survey was conducted in March 2020, which involved survey questionnaires and key informant interviews with target groups. Young people were surveyed in 31 communities and Village Court officials in 14 communities in Lae Urban, Port Moresby, Abau, Hiri and Rigo in Central Province. Of all the young people that were surveyed (135), 120 of them were youth (12 years to 25 years). As we are only interest in the youth, our analysis for Childfund data is based on 120 observations (53 female and 67 male). The questionnaire focused primarily on the perception of the youth on gender equality, citizen rights and child protection and their roles and participation in their communities.

For Village Court officials, the interviews focused on their familiarities with relevant Acts of the Parliament associated with child protection, juvenile justice, family protection and how they respond to such cases in their communities. The officials were also asked about the type of cases they often dealt with and how they address the cases. The total respondents was 42, of which 4 was female and 38 male.

Data Analysis

The data was analysed using both quantitative and qualitative analytical techniques. For quantitative, descriptive statistics such as simple mean and percentages was used and presented in tabular and graphical formats. For inferential statistics, binary logistic model was used to determine factors that influence participation in community activities and wife beating by husband. Content analysis, which involved translating and transcribing transcripts of the texts writing generated from focus group discussion. Answers were compiled and set against pre-identified thematic areas and relevant key baseline questions. The analysis of data also include tallying of recurrent themes were identified through the comparison of the responses.

Limitations of the study

Several issues restricted the baseline study such as the following:

- Travel restrictions as a result of COVID-19 pandemic. The lockdown that the Government of PNG (GoPNG) implemented to restrict travels affected the survey especially in Hiri and Abau Districts in Central Province, which prevented us from surveying the expected number of people.

- We could only interview 36 Village Court officials from the total target audience of 300, which may not be a representative sample of the population.

- In Central Province, assessment notice did not reach all the stakeholders, which resulted in the absence of District and LLG officials, youth and Village Court officials in several communities.

- Communities were not well-informed about the baseline project. It resulted in confusion and unwillingness to engage in the survey.
This section provides a sample description of two baseline surveys: World Vision survey of 2020 and the Child Fund Baseline Survey of 2020 (see Child Fund, 2020). The aim is to provide the key characteristics of two baseline survey samples relating to the youth. This will set the context for the issues discussed relating to youth per the objectives of this study.

World Vision Survey Sample description

The World Vision Baseline Report (World Vision, 2021) focused on three categories relating to the youth sample investigated. These three aspects are: profile of the youth, about the youth, and education. Each of these are discussed, in turn, as follows.

Profile of the Youth

The profile of the youth was categorised according to gender and six profile categories. Gender information was presented in both numerical and percentage terms. There were seven profile categories, which are:

- Respondent type (base data);
- Surveys per target schools for In-School youth;
- Surveys per target communities for Out-of-School youth;
- Age;
- Who respondents lived with; and
- Marital status.

The following discusses the above categories in turn using the survey data.

Respondent type

This category divides the sample data into “In-School”, “Out-of-School” and “Others”, which reflects those that could not be categorised as In-School or Out-of-School. In relation to gender, the “Others” category captures respondents that indicated “others” under gender.

According to the survey data, there were a total of 579 respondents. Out of this total, 305 (about 53%) were Out-of-School youth, 269 were In-School youth (about 46%), and the remaining 5 were categorised as “Others” (about 1%). Figure 3.1 presents a summary of the number of survey respondents by the three survey categories and gender per category.

When responses are disaggregated by gender, just over half of the respondents (291) were male (50.2%); 282 were female (48.7%) and 6 under “Others” (1.1%). For the In-School youth, the majority of the respondents (142) were female. That is, 52.8% of the total In-School youth sample. The male respondents made up 45.7% or 123 of the total In-School youth sample. The remaining 1.5% (or 4 respondents) are those who indicated “Other” for gender. The gender respondent breakdown for the Out-of-School youth is opposite to the In-School youth case. That is, for the Out-of-School youth, the majority of the respondents were male (i.e. 166 or 54.4% of total Out-of-School respondents). Females made up 45.2% (138) of the total Out-of-School respondents. For the “Others” category, there were 2 males, 2 females and one under “Other”.
Surveys per Target Schools (In-School Youth)

The 269 In-School respondents are those currently attending schools. A total of 16 schools in Lae were covered in the survey. These schools and the number of respondents by gender are provided in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1: Survey results for In-School youth by gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 Mile Primary School</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amba Demonstration Primary School</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butibam Primary School</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gantom Primary School</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haicoast Primary School</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huonville Primary School</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Igam Primary School</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanakapi Primary School</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markham Road Primary School</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milfordhaven Primary School</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omili Primary School</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Martin's Primary School</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary's Primary School</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Patricks Primary School</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taraka Primary School</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tent City Primary School</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balancing item</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: authors’ compilation using World Vision survey data

The highest number of respondents by a school was Gantom Primary School with 30 respondents (15 female and 13 male), which is 11.2 percent of the total In-School respondents. At the other extreme, the lowest number of respondents was four (3 male and 1 female) for Haicoast Primary School, representing just 1.5 percent of the total In-School respondents.
It is to be noted that the authors have added a balancing item to address a discrepancy in the data provided in the Baseline Report.¹ That is, in the baseline report, the data on “Surveys per Target (In-School Youth)” does not directly equate to the earlier information as per Figure 3.1 above. In Figure 3.1, the total In-School respondents was 269, comprising 123 males, 142 females and 4 under “Others”. However, in the detailed data on “Surveys per Target (In-School Youth)”, the total In-School respondents was only 266 (122 males, 140 females and 4 “Others”). Hence, to equate the numbers, in Table 4.1 above, 3 respondents are added (2 male and one female) to take the total In-School respondents to 269.

**Surveys per Target Communities (Out-of-School Youth)**

The 305 Out-of-School respondents came from 6 communities or villages. The villages/communities and the number of respondents are provided in Table 3.2 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Butibam Village</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Taraka Community</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huonville Community</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamkumung Village</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wataluc Community</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Taraka Ward 6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balancing item</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: authors’ compilation using World Vision survey data*

The highest number of respondents was from East Taraka Ward 6 with 75 respondents (24.6% of the total Out-of-School respondents. The lowest number of respondents was the Wataluc Community with 25 respondents or 8.2 percent of the total Out-of-School respondents.

Similar to what has been highlighted in the In-School data, there is a discrepancy of 5 respondents for the Out-Of-School Youth in order to derive the total of 305 total respondents (with the respective gender breakdown), to be consistent with the figures in Figure 3.1 relating to Out-of-School respondents.

**Age structure of survey respondents**

Out of the 579 total respondents, 560 or 97% provided information on their age. The age group breakdown of this group is as follows: 319 for those aged 14 to 17 years; 107 for those aged 18-21 years; and 134 for those aged 22-25 years. Out of the remaining 19 respondents (i.e. 579-560=19), 17 did not indicate their age and 2 indicated that they were unsure.

In terms of gender, the age groups and there is provided in Figure 3.2 below.

¹This discrepancy should be corrected in the World Vision Report.
As can be seen from Figure 3.2, the largest number of respondents was in the age group 14 to 17 years (comprising 187 females and 128 males). This is followed by the 22 to 25 age group (46 females and 87 males) and 18 to 21 years age group (37 females and 70 males).

**Residential status of the survey respondents**

Table 3.3 shows the residential status of the respondents under 8 categories and by total and gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residential status</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No parents, live with other family members</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No parents, live alone</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No parents, live with another family who are not relatives</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No parents, I live with friends</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No parents, live with spouse or partner</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With my father, but not my mother</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With my mother, but not my father</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With my mother and father</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>282</strong></td>
<td><strong>291</strong></td>
<td><strong>579</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The residential categories can be broadly grouped into three main groups as follows: those who lived with their parents; those who live with others; and those who lived alone.

A majority of the respondents (325 out of 579 or 56%) lived with both parents (mother and father). Ninety-eight (98) respondents (17% of total) lived with their mother but not father and 25 live with their father but not mother.
For those that live with others, most lived with other family members (74 respondents) with the least been living with friends (9 respondents). Fourteen (14) respondents live with their spouse or partner. For the 15 respondents that lived alone, there were 10 females and 5 males.

Marital status

Out of the 579 total respondents, 411 (71%) responded to have “Never married”. Fifty-one (51) indicated been currently married while 20 indicated been married once before. The remaining 97 respondents did not give a response on marital status.

The gender disaggregation for each of the marital status categories is provided in Figure 3.3. For those that were never married, just over half were males (206). For those who were once married, 70% were female (14). For those that were married, 29 or 57% were males. For those not indicating a response on their marital status, 53% were male.

Figure 3.3: Marital status of the respondents

About the Youth

In this subsection, we discuss the survey results of six aspects about the youth. The information is derived from Graphs 1 to 6 in the World Vision Report (2021). The six aspects or categories are: sense of seeing; sense of hearing; walking and climbing ability; ability to remember things; ability to self-care; and communication ability.

- **Ability to see**: The survey asked whether the respondent has difficulty seeing (even when wearing glasses). The level of difficulty was as follows: No - no difficulty; Yes - some difficulty; Yes - a lot of difficulty; and Cannot do at all. The results indicated that a majority of the respondents (497 or 86%) had no difficulty seeing. Out of this number, 260 were Out-of-School youth and 237 were In-School youth. Five percent of total respondents (30/579) indicated some difficulty seeing. The remaining 9 percent either had a lot of difficulty seeing or not seeing at all.

- **Ability to hear**: The survey asked whether the respondent has difficulty hearing (even with a hearing aid). The same difficulty levels used in seeing was applied here. The results indicated that a majority of the respondents (512 or 88%) had no difficulty hearing. Out of this number, 270 were Out-of-School youth and 242 were In-School youth. Of the remaining respondents, 2.5 percent (15/579) had indicated some difficulty hearing while about 9 percent (52 respondents) indicated a lot of difficulty seeing or not seeing at all.

- **Ability to walk or climb**: The survey asked whether the respondent has difficulty walking or climbing. Most
respondents indicated not have difficulty walking or climbing.

- **Ability to remember or concentrate**: The survey asked whether the respondent has difficulty remembering or concentrating. In general, about equal number of males and females reported not having difficulty remembering. The same applies to the remaining two response categories (i.e. “Yes-some difficulty” and “Yes – a lot of difficulty”). Most respondents responded for the “No-do difficulty” category.

- **Self-care ability**: The survey asked whether the respondent has difficulty with self-care such as washing all over or dressing. Most (400+) respondents indicated having no difficulty with self-care. The second most common response is those having some difficulty, while remaining two categories (i.e. “Yes – a lot of difficulty” and “Cannot do at all”) had few respondents. So overall, most youth have little difficulty with self-care.

- **Ability to communicate**: The survey asked whether the respondent has difficulty with communicating, for example understanding or being understood. Most of the respondents responded for the “Yes-some difficulty” and “No-no difficulty” categories. For example, for the 14 to 17 years age group, 140 respondents indicated having some difficulty with communication, followed by those having no difficulty with communication (115). The other categories had few respondents. Overall, the main groups whose communication needs addressing are the 14 to 17 year olds.

**Education**

To assess youth education, four categories were used in the survey: school attendance; highest level of school attainment; roles of respondents now; and absenteeism from school.

- **School attendance**: This category was to capture whether respondents for the Out-of-School youths had attended school. For the target schools and communities, most Out-of-School youths indicating having attended school. However, according to the survey information, only 80% of respondents answered the question relating to school attendance, with the remaining 20% not accounted by either non-response by respondents or errors by enumerators. This is an issue that should be addressed for future surveys.

- **Highest level of school attainment**: This category was to capture the highest level school education attained by the respondents. Grade 6 attainment was the most common highest level of attainment for both males and females. For males, the next common school attainment level was Grade 5, followed by Grade 7, Grade 10, Grade 8, Grade 12 and post-secondary (i.e. vocational and tertiary), Grade 9, Grade 11, Grade 3, Grade 4, Never attended school, and Grade 2.

  For females, the common school attainment level was Grade 7, followed by Grade 5, Grade 10, Grade 8, Grade 9, Grade 12, post-secondary (i.e. vocational and tertiary), Grade 11, Grade 3, Grade 4, Grade 1, and Grade 2. Overall, lower level of education is most common school attainment level for the youth. This has vital implications for planning and development. That is, how can authorities plan economic and social development initiatives that will involve the youth meaningfully.

- **Roles of respondents now**: This category was to capture what the respondents do now at the time of interview or survey in 2021. Most respondents indicated being in school, which is evident from the respondent data provided earlier (see Figure 4.1). More females (over 200) were at school than males (170). The next common activity was those staying at home or unemployed with more males (80) than females (58) in this category. There were four other categories of current activities which had fewer respondents. These include:
  - Those on a training course;
  - Those working outside home;
  - Those working at home; and
  - Those activities not covered by the above categories.

The main concern is the group who are unemployed, in the context of social problems that are faced in
communities. There must be ways for them to be involved in economic activities.

- **School absenteeism**: This category was to capture the incidence of absenteeism for the youth who were in school for the past four weeks at the time of interview. The specific question asked was: “In the past 4 weeks, have you missed school because you had to work?” There were three possible answers: “No” (meaning student was at school all that time); “Yes” (meaning student did miss class or school); and “I am not in school”. The results showed that most students (376: 171 males and 2015 females) were in school attendance all that time in the past 4 weeks. However, this number appears to be more than the total In-school sample of 269, hence it needs to be addressed.

Of those In-School respondents that were absent from school, most were males.

### Child Fund Baseline Study Sample Description

The Child Fund Study was done in 2020 (Child Fund, 2020). The aim of the study was that “…young people, Village and District Court Officials and Civil Society Organizations in Central and Morobe Provinces are able to address issues of conflict and violence by strengthening a culture of peaceful and inclusive development” (p.6). In this subsection, we present the key features of the report relating to the study sample in general and youth sample in particular.

#### Study sample description

The baseline was done in March 2020 involving survey questionnaires and key informant interviews with target groups. The target groups were: young people in 31 communities and village court officials in 14 communities in Lae Urban, Port Moresby, Abau District, Hiri, and Rigo District.

The total sample size in terms of the number of respondents was 135, comprising 120 youth (12 to 35 years of age) and 42 court officials and duty bearers. Our focus in this report is the youth, hence we discuss further the youth sample next.

#### Youth sample description

**Distribution of youth respondents**

Out of the 120 youth surveyed, 55 (46%) were from Central (Abau, Hiri and Rigo); 36 (30%) from Port Moresby (North East, North West and South), and 29 (24%) from Lae Urban. The objective of the survey was to “…establish the capacity of youth, their perspective on issues in their respective communities pertaining to gender equality, citizen rights and child protection and how they responded to these issues. Additionally, the interviews also sought to perceive their view of their roles and participation as young people in their communities.” (Child Fund PNG, p.12).

**Age range and sex distribution**

In terms of gender disaggregation, 44 percent of the youth interviewed (53) were female with the remaining 56 percent male (67). When distributed by age, the majority of the respondents (90 or 75%) were in the 15 to 25 years age group. The remaining 30 participants were in the 26 to 35 years age group. The study (Child Fund PNG, 2020) noted that the full sample size could not be fully surveyed due to the COVID-19 lockdown during March 2020.

**Highest level of education attained**

The study sought to determine the highest level of education attained for the participants. The education levels and the number of participants attaining each level are as follows:

- Primary (Grade 1-8): 25 respondents (20.8%);
- Secondary (Grade 9-12): 78 respondents (65.0%);
- Vocational/TVET: 8 respondents (6.7%); and
- Tertiary: 9 respondents (7.5%)

From the data collected, the majority of respondents (65%) had attained secondary education, with TVET/vocation
being the lowest attained education level with on 6.7% respondents.

In terms of gender, higher levels of education attainment were found for males in NCD and Central while in Lae, the gender distribution is almost even.

A weakness of the survey for the highest level of education attained is that it does not distinguish particular grades. For example, for Secondary level, we do not know at what grade did the respondent complete: Grade 9 or Grade 10 or Grade 11 or Grade 12? In contrast, the World Vision study (World Vision 2021) in Lae does provide specific grades of education attained.

**Marital status**

According to the survey, most respondents (90 or 75%) were unmarried at the time of survey. This was followed by who were married (22%), with the remaining 3 percent indicating been divorced. The survey claimed that “majority of respondents are unmarried (75%), although it should be noted that there are a number of respondents that are in fact married.” The survey did not provide further clarification on this statement. The statement could be interpreted to mean that those who claimed to be unmarried were in fact married. Or it could be referring to the 22% that were married. The ambiguity should be clarified.

**Disability assessment**

A survey on disability status was done, which was similar to the World Vision study in Lae (World Vision PNG, 2021). The categories are exactly the same ones used in the World Vision study. The report noted that the disability assessments were based on the self-assessment of the respondent and not on diagnosis by a health practitioner. This is the context in which to interpret the results. The categories and results of the survey responses are provided in Table 3.4 below.

**Table 3.4: Survey results for self-diagnosed disability**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disability (self-diagnosed)</th>
<th>No-no difficulty</th>
<th>Yes-some difficulty</th>
<th>Yes-a lot of difficulty</th>
<th>Cannot do at all</th>
<th>No Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty seeing even if wearing glasses</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty hearing, even if using a hearing aid</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty walking or climbing steps</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty remembering or concentrating</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty with self-care such as washing all over or dressing</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty understanding or being understood (communication)</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Child Fund 2020

As can be seen from Table 3.4, the majority of respondents appear not have difficulty with the different disability categories. A few have difficulties, while the incident of “A lot of difficulty” was only indicated by one participant each for “Hearing ability” and “Communication ability”. One respondent did not provide a response for “Difficulty remembering or concentrating” while none of the respondents indicated a response for “Cannot do at all” or having complete difficulty for all of the six Difficulty categories.
In many communities, young people are beaten up or treated badly by other people, with the prevalence rate of witnessing violence, physically abusive punishment, physical assault and sexual assault varying across ethnicities. Youth living in inner city neighbourhoods are particularly at increased risk of exposure to violence. For instance, in a Ugandan study of violence against children and youth in the street Walakira et al. (2014) found that violence against street children is endemic. The violence is often perpetuated by both adults and street children against each other. They suffer abuse from the police and from strangers. Boys are often abused physically and girls abused emotionally and sexually. In PNG, some children are accused of sorcery and are subjected to mistreatment according to Forsyth et al. (2021) in their study of sorcery accusation related to violence. In the US, between 50 and 96% of urban youth have witnessed or experienced some form of violence in their community (Sean et al., 2014). Such high rates of violence against the youth, whether as direct victims or as witnesses of violent acts are concerning public health challenges. The adverse health and behavioural outcomes of youth exposure to violent acts, including of depression, anxiety, aggressive behaviour, suicide, declines in school completion and achievement are costly to society. The burden of violence against youth is believed to be highest in low- and middle-income countries where high prevalence of physical and verbal violence are reported (Golshiri, et al. 2018). It is therefore important to better understand the risk factors associated with violence experienced by the youth, before focussing on primary prevention efforts to reduce youth exposure to violence, as a public health priority. The work by Golshiri et al. (2018) provides a framework for exploring the PNG context.

In this study, we analyse data from the Youth Healthy Behaviour Survey conducted in 6 Wards within the Lae Urban Local Level Government (LLG) of Morobe Province in Papua New Guinea (PNG) to:

i. understand the prevalence, types and perpetrators of physical violence against youths;
ii. identify factors associated with the physical violence victimisation of the youth; and
iii. suggest measures that can be used to prevent violence against the youth in PNG.

Types, Victims and Perpetrators of Physical Violence against the Youth

In this Section we present the responses to the question in the Healthy Behaviour Survey which questioned the respondent concerning how often they experienced any of the following in the last 12 months:

"Hit or slapped you with bare hands; hit you with a belt, stick or hard object; punched, kicked or beat you up; and hurt physically in some other way"

Although the respondents were asked to choose between “never”, “once”, “2-3 times” and “4 or more times”, we first collapsed the responses to “never” and “at least once” dichotomy and disaggregate the affirmative answers as to whether a respondent is in school or not. This summary is presented in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1 show that out of 579 youths who responded to the Youth Healthy Behaviour Survey, 46.5% were in school, 52.7% were out of school, while a few of them (0.8%) did not disclose whether they are in school or not. 167 respondents (28.8%) indicated that they never were physically hurt during the last 12 months prior to the survey, while the rest (71.2%) were physically hit at least once. Among those who were physically hurt at least once, more out-of-school youths (52.9%) were victimised than their counterparts who are in school (46.1%). These proportions are nearly similar to the respondents who were never the victims of physical violence during the same period.
Table 4.1: Victimisation of Youth in Lae Urban Local Level Government

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of respondent</th>
<th>Total Respondents</th>
<th>Whether Physically Hurt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In School</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>46.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of School</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>52.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2 presents the gender of respondents who indicated that they were hit or slapped you with bare hands; hit you with a belt, stick or hard object; punched, kicked or beat you up; and hurt physically in some other way. Of the 288 out of 579 respondents who indicated that they were physically hurt (49.7%), nearly an equal number of males and females were slapped with bare hands (50.7% vs. 49.3%) or hit with a belt (or stick or hard object) (50% vs. 50%). But significantly more males than females were punched, kicked or beaten (59.1% vs. 40.9%) or hurt physically in some other way (54.1% vs. 45.9%).

Table 4.2: Types of Physical Violence against the Youth by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method/Type of Physical Violence</th>
<th>Slapped</th>
<th>Belted</th>
<th>Punched</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table 4.3 we disaggregate the victims of different types of physical violence by their age groups. It is clear from this table that 14-17-year-olds are not only the most victimized youth, but they are also the ones assaulted the most using all forms of physical violence. For example, 60.3% all victims hit with a belt, stick or hard object were 14-17-year-olds, and 56.6% all victims hit or slapped with bare hands were also 14-17-year-olds. Surprisingly, fewer 18-20-year-olds than 21-25-year-olds are victims of all forms of physical violence. For example, 21.9% of youths who were slapped were 21-25-year-olds, compared to 18.1% who were 18-20-year-olds. It is possible then, that 14-17-year-olds are still victims of physically abusive punishment of all forms compared to the older youths. So, in the next tables we show the association between perpetrators of physically abusive acts of violence and the ages and gender of their victims.

Table 4.3: Types of Physical Violence against the Youth by Age Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method/Type of Physical Violence</th>
<th>Hit/Slapped</th>
<th>Belted</th>
<th>Punched</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-17-year-olds</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>56.6%</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>60.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-20-year-olds</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25-year-olds</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age not specified</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the Youth Healthy Behaviour Survey, respondents were asked: “In the last 12 months, have you ever been beaten up or physically hurt in other ways by the following: family member, another adult, boyfriend or girlfriend, friends, stranger or anyone else. Table 4.4 show the number and percent of respondents who answered “yes” to this question, disaggregated by gender. 248 out of 579 respondents (42.8%) said they were beaten up by a family member, with
slightly more females than males being the victims of beating by family members (53.6% vs. 46.4%). Slightly more females than males were also beaten up by their boyfriends or girlfriends, 51.5% vs. 48.5%. On the other hand, males appear to have been victims of physical violence perpetrated by friends, strangers or another adult compared to females.

Table 4.4: Aggressors/perpetrators of Physical Violence and Gender of Victims

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender of Victim</th>
<th>Family Member</th>
<th>Another Adult</th>
<th>Boyfriend or Girlfriend</th>
<th>Friends</th>
<th>Stranger</th>
<th>Anyone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>48.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>51.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5 shows that out of 248 respondents who were beaten up in one way or another by a family member, majority (65.3%) were 14-17-year-olds. But the younger youth are not beaten by their family members only. Other adults, friends, strangers or anyone else also beat more 14-17-year-old youths than they beat 18-20-year-old or 21-25-year-old youths. Table 4.5 also show that 101 out of 579 youths (17.4%) surveyed were physically hurt in different ways by their boyfriends or girlfriends. The number of 14-17-years old youths beaten by their boyfriends or girlfriends are more than the number of 10-20 years old youths.

Table 4.5: Aggressors/perpetrators of Physical Violence and Age of Victims

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age of Victim</th>
<th>Family Member</th>
<th>Another Adult</th>
<th>Boyfriend or Girlfriend</th>
<th>Friends</th>
<th>Stranger</th>
<th>Anyone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-17</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-20</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Having understood the prevalence, nature, categories of victims and perpetrators of physical violence against youths in Lae Urban LLG, we turn in the next section to identify factors associated with the youth experiencing physical violence and attempt to statistically verify if there any significant difference(s) in exposure to physical violence between various categories of victims.

Factors Associated with Physical Violence against the Youth

In this Section we estimate equations of physical violence victimisation of the youth in Lae City using data from the Youth Healthy Behaviour Survey where data from 579 study participants was collected. The survey asked questions assessing the youths’ experience with different types of physical contact that cause physical harm: slapped, belted, punched, and other physical contact that cause harm. We therefore use these four measures of violence victimisation as our dependent variables.

To measure the potential correlates or predictors of violence victimisation of the youth, we used the survey questions on: (i) socio-demographic characteristics of physical violence victims (age, gender, education level); (ii) family context variables (living arrangements and indicators of transition to adulthood); (iii) neighbourhood context variables (feeling safe in the community, and whether they know of a friend who has been physically hurt); and (iv) perpetrators of physical harm on the youth. The specific factors, all categorical, viewed as potential predictors of physical violence causing harm to the youth are listed in the first column of Table 6.
The statistical analysis was carried out using multiple binary logistic regression model implemented in Sata (version 10) and reporting (adjusted) Odds Ratio (OR) and 95% Confidence Interval. The OR enumerate the strength of association between two variables. In general, given the nature of the problem and data used in this work, this model was employed to model the outcomes of categorical variables (experiencing physical violence at 0 and 1 level; ‘0’ for never been physically hurt by anyone and ‘1’ for being a victim of physical violence that hurt one or more times). Table 4.6 give information as to whether the risk factors listed in the first column (exposure/independent variables) are really the risk factors for the occurrence of physical violence against the youth or not.

Table 4.6: Correlates/Predictors of Physical Violence Victimisation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exposure (Independent) Variables (1)</th>
<th>Slapped (2)a</th>
<th>Belted (3)b</th>
<th>Punched (4)c</th>
<th>Other (5)d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OR [95% CI]</td>
<td>OR [95% CI]</td>
<td>OR [95% CI]</td>
<td>OR [95% CI]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (ref: 14-17 years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-20 years</td>
<td>0.61 0.34-1.08</td>
<td>0.67 0.38-1.18</td>
<td>0.78 0.43-1.41</td>
<td>0.91 0.50-1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 25 years</td>
<td>0.61 0.33-1.14</td>
<td>0.52* 0.28-0.97</td>
<td>0.91 0.48-1.73</td>
<td>0.89 0.47-1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (ref: Male)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1.00 0.70-1.43</td>
<td>1.02 0.71-1.45</td>
<td>0.60* 0.41-0.89</td>
<td>0.78 0.54-1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Level (ref: Primary, Grade 1-8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary/High School (Grade 9-12)</td>
<td>0.82 0.48-1.42</td>
<td>0.72 0.42-1.25</td>
<td>0.77 0.43-1.37</td>
<td>0.76 0.43-1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Secondary / Tertiary / Vocational</td>
<td>0.44 0.17-1.16</td>
<td>0.83 0.32-2.14</td>
<td>0.61 0.23-1.64</td>
<td>0.49 0.18-1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have never attended school</td>
<td>2.14 0.89-5.12</td>
<td>2.40* 1.05-5.52</td>
<td>2.75* 1.20-6.35</td>
<td>1.72 0.74-3.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether in- or out-of-school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of school (reference: in-school)</td>
<td>0.90 0.53-1.52</td>
<td>0.92 0.54-1.55</td>
<td>0.99 0.58-1.72</td>
<td>1.14 0.66-1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living arrangement (ref: with mother &amp; father)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with my mother, but not my father</td>
<td>1.28 0.79-2.06</td>
<td>1.15 0.71-1.85</td>
<td>1.81* 1.10-2.97</td>
<td>2.70* 1.66-4.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with my father, but not my mother</td>
<td>1.01 0.42-2.42</td>
<td>0.64 0.26-1.57</td>
<td>0.77 0.29-2.01</td>
<td>0.48 0.18-1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with Others who are not my parent(s)</td>
<td>1.19 0.75-1.88</td>
<td>1.01 0.64-1.59</td>
<td>1.26 0.78-2.03</td>
<td>1.57 0.99-2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition to adulthood (ref: In school)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married/Have Children</td>
<td>0.70 0.47-1.04</td>
<td>0.68* 0.46-1.01</td>
<td>0.78 0.51-1.19</td>
<td>1.00 0.66-1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working/Training/Apprentice</td>
<td>1.50 0.75-2.97</td>
<td>0.66 0.32-1.34</td>
<td>1.15 0.55-2.41</td>
<td>0.85 0.41-1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>1.36 0.83-2.22</td>
<td>1.02 0.63-1.66</td>
<td>1.95* 1.17-3.24</td>
<td>2.05* 1.24-3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety in community (ref: feel safe most of the time)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Never feel safe 4.33* 1.99-9.43 2.29* 1.14-4.62 2.01* 1.00-4.01 3.58* 1.77-7.27
Feel safe some of the time 1.65* 1.14-2.39 1.43* 0.99-2.08 1.67* 1.13-2.49 2.33* 1.59-3.44
Friends physically hurt (ref: a few of my friends)
Most of my friends 2.96* 1.40-6.26 2.10* 1.05-4.18 3.51* 1.74-7.08 1.57 0.79-3.12
All of my friends 0.89 0.31-2.57 1.12 0.40-3.20 1.29 0.44-3.80 1.31 0.44-3.92
Don’t know 0.90 0.58-1.40 1.20 0.77-1.87 0.84 0.52-1.37 0.78 0.48-1.25
Aggressors (ref: non-family member)
Family member 1.23 0.87-1.75 1.05 0.74-1.49 1.03 0.71-1.50 0.72 0.49-1.04

Notes:
a = Slapped you with bare hands; b = Hit you with a belt, stick or hard object; c = Punched, kicked, or beat you up;
d = Hurt you physically in some other ways; OR = Odds Ratio; CI = Confidence Interval; * = p<0.05 for estimated coefficients (for brevity, not reported).

For brevity, the estimated coefficients are not reported but a highlight of those results suffice at this point. After controlling for confounding factors, never feeling safe in the community, feeling safe some of the time, and knowing that most of their friends have been physically hurt are the only factors that are significant predictors of being hit or slapped with bare hands (Column 2). In addition to these risk factors, age 21-25 and being married with children also appear to be predictors of a young person in Lae city being hit with a belt, stick or hard object (Column 3). Column 4 show that gender, never attending school, and living with the mother but not the father, in addition to never feeling safe in the community, feeling safe some of the time, and knowing that most of their friends have been physically hurt, are predictors of being punched, kicked or beaten up. In the last column (5), it is shown that living with mother but not the father, being unemployed, never feel safe and feeling safe some of the time are associated with increasing risk of a youth in Lae being hurt physically in some other ways.

In Table 6, the Odds ratios compares the odds of the physical assaults (slapped, belted, punched, and hurt in some other physical ways) occurring at two different levels of the respective predictor(s). OR greater than 1 indicate that these physical assaults are more likely to occur; while OR less than 1 indicate that the physical assault of youths are less likely to occur. Comparing the results across columns 2-5 suggest that both 18-20 and 21-25-year-old youths are less likely to be victims of any form of physical violence compared to the younger 14-17-year-old youths.

The female youths are equally to be slapped as their male counterparts (OR=1.00) males, but they are slightly more likely to be belted than males. Females are less likely to be punched or hurt physically in some other ways than male youth.

The youth who have completed or are completing either secondary or post-secondary school level education are less likely to be slapped, belted, punched or hurt by other physically violent means than the younger 14-17-year old youths. But the chances of slapping, belting, punching, and physically hurting young people in some other ways appear to increase for the youth who have never attended school compared to primary school educated youth.

Out-of-school youth are less likely to be slapped, belted, or punched compared to their counterparts in school; but they are more likely to be physically hurt in some other ways (OR = 1.14) compared to the youth in school.

Looking at living arrangements, it appears that both living with my mother, but not my father, and living with others who are not parents are risk factors for violence victimisation in that the youth in these living arrangements are more likely to be slapped, belted, punched and physically hurt in some other violent ways than the youth living with both of their parents. Those living with my father, but not my mother, on the other hand, are only more likely to be slapped than those living with both parents (OR = 1.01).
Among the indicators of transition to adulthood, youth who are unemployed are more likely to be victims of physical violence of all sorts – slapping, belting, punching, etc. – compared to the youth who are still in school, with the OR ranging from 1.02 to 2.05. The youth who have ever married and/or have children are less likely to be victims of physical violence compared to the youth in school; but the two categories of youth are equally likely to be hurt physically in some other ways (OR = 1.00).

Safety in the community is a concern; the youth who never feel safe or only feel safe some of the time are more likely to be victims of physical violence than the youth who said they feel safe all the time in the community. Youth who said that most of their friends have been physically hurt are more likely to be physically hurt by all the four ways compared to those who know only a few friends who have been physically hurt. The youth who said all their friends have been physically hurt are more likely to be physically hurt by all violent ways except by being slapped for which they are less likely to victims.

Lastly, family members are more likely to slap, belt or punch youths compared to aggressors who are non-family members. Aggressive family members are, however, less likely to physically hurt their relatives in ways other than slapping, belting and punching.
Men and women have the potential to contribute to the Papua New Guinea’s economy equally to achieve sustainable development. However, Gender-Based Violence (GBV) restricts women from contributing their full potential to the economy, which consequently restricts the country from achieving Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) especially those that focus on gender equality and access to quality education (Department of National Planning and Monitoring, 2020). Several policies address violence such as PNG National Strategy to Prevent and Respond to GBV 2016-2025; PNG National Policy on Social Protection 2015-2020; and PNG National Youth Policy 2020-2030 (Department of Religion, Youth and Community Development, 2015; Department for Community Development and Religion, 2014; National Youth Development Authority, 2019). However, different types of violence continued to be a long-standing issue in the country. The youth have the potential to contribute to address GBV and bring lasting peace to their families and the communities they live in. However, their opinion is not often sought and they are not often involved in the resolution of conflicts because some adults often believe that the youth do not have enough experience needed for addressing violence or conflict (Bickmore et al., 2017). Thus, the youth are not often engaged to contribute their own idea to resolving violence and conflict. The objective of this section is examine how the youth perceive Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) and to determine the potential strategy that can be used to address IPV. This type of violence can be defined as the behaviour and action of partners within the family or between former or current partners that can result in physical, sexual or psychological harm (WHO, 2021). It affects a lot of people and results in infringement of basic human rights, physical and psychological consequences (Patra et al., 2018), which contributes to broken relationships, which has adverse effects on children. Although there are several types of GBV such as physical violence, psychological violence, sexual violence and socio-economic related violence issues these were excluded from the analysis made in this paper.

**Types of IPV**

There are several types of IPV (WHO and Pan American Health Organisation, 2012). Survivors often experience more than one type of violence by an intimate partner (Krebs et al., 2011). For instance, women who had experienced stalking by an intimate partner are more likely to experience other types of IPV. Types of IPV include the following:

- The use of force to make someone to engage in sexual act without survivor’s consent (sexual violence). This also includes threatening the survivor by using words associated with physical or sexual violence; the use of gestures or weapons to pass the message of the intention to kill, maim or cause physical harm.

- Causing trauma to the survivor using threats of acts or coercive tactics (Psychological/emotional violence.). It includes acts associated with humiliating the survivor; act of controlling what the survivor can and cannot do; and isolating the survivor from friends and family.

- The use of force to cause death, maim or harm the survivor (Physical violence). Examples include scratching, pushing, grabbing, biting, choking, shaking, slapping, punching, burning and use of weapon to hurt the survivor.

- Repeated behaviour or action with the intention of frightening the survivor (Stalking)².

**Factors that contribute to IPV**

According to Patra et al. (2018), some factors that contribute to IPV include the following:

- **Cultural.** Some customs and traditions encourage beating of wives under the notion of entitlement and ownership of women. In cases where huge amount of money is paid as bride price, it can generate tension with any slightest provocation. Societies where men often hold power and women are excluded from it (patriarchy)

²These findings are based on WHO's 2012 multi-country study of IPV in Bangladesh, Brazil, Ethiopia, Japan, Namibia, Peru, Samoa, Thailand, the former state union of Serbia and Montenegro, and Tanzania.
Contribute to IPV.

- Economic. The quest to control economic resources can result in tension between partners. For instance, if a woman has more resources than her husband, he may consider using violence to put fear on her to control the woman's resources.

- Legal. As law enforcement agencies often treat IPV offenders with leniency, it encourages them to continue oppressing their victims. This may discourage the survivor from reporting IPV to law enforcement agencies.

- Political. Lack of political will with the believe by some politicians that family is beyond the control of the State. This often makes it difficult to provide an effective mechanism to address issues associated with IPV.

- Alcohol and drug abuse. Some people who have a history of drug abuse and those who use alcohol excessively tend to be aggressive to members of their families especially their wives when they are under the influence of drug or alcohol.

The adverse impact of IPV

IPV can impact the survivor, children, the State and wider society in different ways (WHO and Pan American Health Organisation, 2012; Patra et al., 2018) such as the following:

- It often denies the survivors their basic rights needed to access resources.

- It can restrict a country from achieving human development goals such as SDG 4 and SDG 5 that focus on quality education and gender equality.

- IPV often has adverse impact on the children of survivors. In fact, some children who grew up in an IPV-prone family may think that violence is a way of life.

- IPV is often associated with fatal health outcomes which can result in death, mental health problems, trauma in survivors and their children or maim the survivor.

- IPV is associated with several socio-economic costs which may be direct or indirect costs such as medical, legal and costs associated with time out from work.

Findings from the analysis of how the youth perceive IPV

The analysis is based on 699 youth that were surveyed by World Vision PNG (579) and Childfund PNG (120) in Central Province, Morobe Province and NCD. Of the 120 youths surveyed by CFPNG, 66.7% believed that women should not tolerate beatings to keep their families together (Figure 5.1). 21.7% percent of the respondents believed that women should tolerate beatings.

Figure 5.1. Should women tolerate beatings to keep their family together?

Data source: Childfund 2021
The findings in Figure 5.1 indicate that the some youth believe that women should not tolerate beating in their homes. This group of youth have the potential to contribute in the advocacy that promote the rights of women in their homes and communities and against GBV. However, there is a need for continuous advocacy on women’s rights especially in rural areas where majority of the population live. Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs) in collaboration with relevant government agencies should consider building the capacity of the group of youth who believe that women should not tolerate beating especially in the areas of advocacy in their communities. Women who continue to tolerate beating in their homes may do so because several reasons such as the huge bride price which they find difficult to repay and some may remain in a violent relationship because of their children (Patra et al., 2018).

In terms of gender differences on whether a woman should tolerate beating to keep her family together, more male (37.3 %) than female (28.3 %) reported that a woman should tolerate beating (Figure 5.2). This may be as a result of several factors such as that the female is more affected by the violence, which make only a few to report that the female should tolerate beatings.

Figure 5.2. A woman should tolerate beatings to keep her family together in relation to gender, marital status, educational level and province the respondent resides

More of the respondents (34 %) who were single (single, divorced, widow or widower) than those who were married (30 %) reported that a woman should tolerate beatings to keep her family together. A reason for the result may be that those who were single, divorced or widow or widower had first hand experience on what it means not to have a partner to share life affairs with. Thus, they prefer that a woman who have problems in her family should find way to make the marriage work. Though there may be several factors concerning why some of the respondents believed that a woman should tolerate beating there a need for a more comprehensive study to identify the factors.

For the case of educational level, only a few respondents who had tertiary education (22 %) reported that a woman should tolerate beatings to keep her family together (Figure 2). Of the four categories of educational level, primary school education had the highest number of respondents (42.3 %) who reported that a woman should tolerate beatings to keep her family together. This suggests that education is important in making people know their rights.

In terms of the province that the respondent resides in, of the three provinces (Central province, Morobe province and NCD) Central province had the highest number of respondents (36.3 %, see Figure 2) who think that a woman should tolerate beating to keep her family together and Morobe had the lowest (27.6 %). The differences in the perception of the respondents may be associated with factors such as cultural and societal differences.

Regarding whether a woman has a right to say no to sex, most of the respondents (82.5%) believed that a woman has a right to say no to sex when she is not in the mood to have sex (Figure 5.3). Only a small percentage (7.5%) of the
respondents believed that it is wrong for a woman to say no to sex even when she does not feel like having it.

Figure 5.3. Woman’s rights concerning having sex

The findings suggest that the group of respondents (Figure 5.3) who believed that it is wrong for a woman to say no to sex, it may be that they considered that if a woman would say no to sex to her husband, it may result in IPV. The group of respondents who believed that a woman has a right to say no to sex, it may be that they are aware about the rights of women. However, more research is needed on this subject to provide more information on the perception of the group. Partners should understand that sexual act must be based on mutual respect and consent and that sex without consent may be classified as rape, which is a crime.

In terms of gender, more male (94%) than female (90.6%) reported that a woman has a right to say no to sex when she does not want to have it (Figure 5.4). The result suggests that the male has the potential to play advocacy role on human rights. However, there is a need to address issues that restricts girls and women from accessing information on their rights. This can be done by providing more education for girls and women.

Figure 5.4. Respondent’s view concerning that a woman has a right to say no to sex in relation to gender, marital status, educational level and province
For the case of marital status, both the respondents who were married and the single does not have differences in their perception of a woman's rights when it comes to having sex (Figure 5.4). However, in terms educational level of respondents, all those who had tertiary education reported that a woman has a right to say no to sex when she does not want to have it. This suggests that education is important when it comes to making people to know their rights. In terms of province, though there is no dramatic differences, respondents from Morobe had the highest support (96.6%) for the right of women when it comes to having sex and Central province had the lowest (88.9%), Figure 5.4. This may indicate there is a need for more awareness about women's rights in the Central province.

**Man’s dominance and power in the family**

When it comes to issues associated with the show of man’s dominance and power in the family, of the 579 youths surveyed by WVPNG, more than 50 percent of the respondents believed that men should use beat their wives for any of three reasons listed in the question (Figure 5.5). For instance, 56.7 percent of the respondents believed that a husband should beat his wife when she disobeys him compared to about 30 percent who were not in support of wife beating. In terms of chores, 67 percent of the respondents believed that a husband should beat his wife if she neglects chores and only 19.3 percent believed that the wife should not be beaten.

**Figure 5.5. What a husband should do if his wife disobeys his orders, neglect chores or disrespect in-laws**

![Graph showing responses to questions about a husband's actions in cases of disobedience, neglect of chores, and disrespect to in-laws.]

Data source: World Vision PNG 2021

As extended family is part of the PNG culture, it also has a place in the relationship between husband and wife. It was found that 61 percent of the respondents believed that a husband should beat his wife if she disrespects his in-laws. This suggests that some of the youths have the notion that the husband is the head of the family and that one way to discipline his wife is to beat her. This supports the findings of Patra et al. (2018), who found that some traditions support the beating of wives as a way to show the ownership of women by men.

It appears that youth attach more value to chores followed by relationship with in-laws and attending to orders by the husband was least on the ranking priorities. In the past, women used to be housewives or homemaker and their main responsibility was to take care of their children and do home chores. However, in the modern economy, women compete with men for different types of jobs. In fact, some women are breadwinners and household heads.

The findings in Figure 5.5 may be reflecting the dominance of men in patrilineal societies found in most parts of PNG, which makes some of the respondents think that male dominance is a normal way of life. It may also be that the respondents who believed that a woman should be beaten for disobeying her husband may have witnessed and experienced IPV in their families, clans, communities or neighbourhoods.
In terms of gender of the respondents in relation to whether a husband should beat his wife if she disobeys him, approximately 50 percent of the female respondents want the husband to beat his wife (Figure 5.6). More of the male respondents (60%) than female want husband to beat his wife.

**Figure 5.6. Beating of wife by husband if she disobeys his orders in relation to gender, whether the respondent is in school, and age of the respondent**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Out-of-school youth</th>
<th>In-school youth</th>
<th>14 - 17 years</th>
<th>18 - 21 years</th>
<th>21 - 25 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>50.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data source: World Vision, PNG*

There is no difference between respondents who were in school and those that were out of school (Figure 5.6). Respondents that were between the age of 18 and 21 years (54.7) had the highest support to wife beating when she disobeys her husband and respondents of age between 14 and 17 years had the lowest support to wife beating.

When it comes to whether a husband should beat his wife when she neglect chores, there is only a slight difference between the female and male (Figure 5.7). More female want husband to beat his wife for neglecting chores (66.7%) than male respondents (65.3%). The result is surprising because it is expected that only a few or none of the female would support wife beating by husband. It may be that perception of the respondents was influenced by their experience especially about the neighbourhood where they grew up. If they grew up where woman were often beaten for neglecting chores they may think that it is normal.
Figure 5.7. A husband should beat his wife if she neglects chores in relation to gender, whether the respondent is in school and age

In terms of whether the respondent is schooling, more of the respondents who were out-of-school were of the view that husbands should beat their wives if they neglect chores (92%) than those in school (74.3%). For the case of age, there is no much difference between the age groups. However, age group of 14 to 17 years is slightly higher than other age groups (67%), see Figure 5.7.

In terms of whether a husband should beat his wife if she disobeys in-laws, there is no difference in the perception of female and male respondents (Figure 5.8). However, more of the respondents who were in school support wife beating (63.4%) when compared to the out-of-school respondents (56.6%).

Figure 5.8. Husband should beat their wife if she disobeys in-laws in relation to gender, whether respondent is in school and age

Data source: World Vision, PNG
More of the respondents that belonged to the age group of 14 to 17 years were in support of wife beating (63%) if she disobeys in-laws compared to other age groups. This suggests the need for more awareness among that age group about the importance of avoiding violence and aggression. At the same time, the age group should be provided with more information on woman's rights and the need to promote peace in their communities.

**Factors influencing youth’s perceptions of IPV**

In order to examine demographic factors influencing respondent's perceptions of IPV, we estimated two binary logistic regression models (Tables 5.1 and 5.2). In terms whether a husband should beat his wife when she neglects chores, the results show that the coefficient associated with gender is negative and statistically significant (Table 5.1). This indicates that female is less likely to support wife beating if she neglects chores. The coefficient associated with respondent type was positive and statistically significant. This means that respondents who is in school were likely to support beating of wife when she neglects chores.

**Table 5.1. Binary logistic regression result of factor influencing perception of wife beating if she neglects her chores**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>coeff</th>
<th>Std Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.63**</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENDER</td>
<td>(female = 1; male = 0)</td>
<td>-0.49*</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>(14-17=1; 18-21=2; 21-25=3)</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARITAL</td>
<td>(Married= 1; single=0)</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN-SCHOOL</td>
<td>(in-school=1; out-of-school=0)</td>
<td>0.58*</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNITY</td>
<td>(Participate in community=1; No=0)</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Loglikelihood function -190.4
Restricted loglikelihood function -196.2
No. of observations 367

* and ** are 10% and 5% statistical significant; dependent variable is husband to beat wife for neglecting chores; data from World Vision, PNG

Coefficients associated with age, marital status and youth participation in their communities were not statistically significant. This means age, marital status and participation in community work does not matter when it comes to wife beating. Wife beating can be addressed by using women to promote awareness of the need to avoid violence. Youth in school should be well informed about risk of violence and the need to promote peace in their communities.

In terms of whether husband should beat his wife for disobeying him, coefficient associated with gender is negative and statistically significant (Table 5.2). It indicates that female is less likely to support the beating of wife by her husband when she disobeys him. Coefficient associated with age is positive and statistically significant. It means that an increase in age increases the likelihood of supporting husband beating his wife if she disobeys him.
Table 5.2. Binary logistic regression result of factor influencing perception of wife beating if she disobeys her husband

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>coeff</th>
<th>Std Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.36**</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENDER</td>
<td>(female = 1; male = 0)</td>
<td>-0.72**</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>(14-17=1; 18-21=2; 21-25=3)</td>
<td>0.58*</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARITAL</td>
<td>(Married= 1; single=0)</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN-SCHOOL</td>
<td>(in-school=1; out-of-school=0)</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNITY</td>
<td>(Participate in community=1; No=0)</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Loglikelihood function                       -208.1
Restricted loglikelihood function        -214.0
No. of observations                               366

* and ** are 10% and 5% statistical significant; dependent variable is husband to beat wife for disobeying him; data from World Vision, PNG

The coefficient associated with marital status, being in school and community participation were not statistical significant, i.e. the variables does not matter when it comes to husband beating his wife for disobeying him. Wife beating for disobeying her husband can be addressed by creating more awareness through women and in different age groups on the need for families to live in peace and harmony. It can also be addressed through strategies such as referral pathways for victims of abuse and effective and trusted policing and enforcement of laws.

Alongside a range of other strategies such as referral pathways for victims of abuse and effective and trusted policing and enforcement of laws, to name a few. I note the following section outlines other strategies

### Potential strategies that can be used to address IPV among the youth

IPV in PNG can be addressed using several types of interventions such as (WHO, 2012):

- Use the youth to create more awareness campaign in communities about women's rights and about the existing legislation. Most of PNG's population live in rural areas where people often find it difficult to access information especially on women's rights and existing legislations. The youth can be trained on women's rights and the legislations associated with it and the youth can inturn create awareness about the legislations in the communities where they live. They can also create awareness in primary and high schools through Peer Health Educators club in schools where it exist and the club created in schools where it does not exist. The aim of the awareness in schools will be to mould the younger generation to change the culture of entrenched violence and develop a different mindset that violence against women is unacceptable. The awareness should also include consequences of breaking the laws, referral pathways and resources needed to strengthen the referral pathways.

- Involve the youth in promoting social and economic empowerment of women and girls. As women and girls who are more empowered educationally, economically and socially are often more protected against IPV (Jewkes, 2002), the youth should be engaged in the intervention so that they can be more supportive to it. For instance, more opportunities for accessing education and fund for doing business under small and medium enterprises (SMEs) should be provided to women and girls to empower them.

- Consider developing parenting classes for the youth where they are provided information on how to handle children and how to be a better father and mother. The youth who have attended the classes then create awareness in their families and communities on how the incidence of IPV can be avoided and how to manage IPV. In fact, the youth who have taken parenting classes and have vast experience on how to manage IPV can become GBV counsellors in their communities.
• Consider strengthening PNG’s curriculum on personal development and building the capacity of teachers to deliver it. There is a need for more emphasis on the implementation of student behavioural policies in schools. This will assist schools in training the youth on how to contribute positively in their communities especially in terms of peace building and keeping out of violence. Thus, they can become model and peace making champions in their communities.

• The legal mechanism used to address IPV in PNG should be reformed in collaboration with the youth and strengthened by promoting zero tolerance for IPV and using stringent penalties against offenders. The youth can be involved in creating awareness about the legal mechanisms and it implementation in the communities where they live and in their families.

• Male youth should be engaged in interventions associated with addressing IPV especially at the community level. This has the potential of encouraging more male youth to find lasting solution to issues associated with IPV and by not been a perpetrator of GBV. It can have a multiplier effect on the male youth, which is good for addressing the IPV.

• Promote gender balance in youth associations in communities so that the youth are more familiar with the need for the interest of female and male to be captured in the allocation of resources and governance related issues. Thus, the youth can be used to address the power imbalance between men and women in their communities. This, has the potential to improve the communication between men and women and the respect that men have for women, which can reduce the rate GBV especially IPV in PNG.

• Improve access to services response to survivors and their children. The youth should be provided information on the existing services for survivors so that they can inturn create awareness in their communities on the need for survivors and their children the services when the case arise. The youth can also advocate for the need for facilities where survivors receive shelter should be secure and regular maintenance conducted on existing facilities.
As the youth are among the victims of violence and perpetrators of violence, they have an important role to play in bringing lasting peace to their communities where they live in and PNG at large. The youth can contribute to the resolution of conflict and in promoting peace by engaging them in different activities in the communities where they live so that they can feel sense of belonging and been accepted. This can motivate them to contribute their full potential in peace building and in promoting conflict resolution initiatives.

In terms of youth participation in communities related activities, our findings revealed that more female were involved in the activities (64.5%) than the male (62.5%), see Figure 6.1. More of the youth who were in school were involved in community activities than those who are out-of-school. It may be that leaders in communities do not include out-of-school youth in decision making or activities that would make them feel that they have a responsibility to do something that contribute to peace building in the community they live in.

An increase in age of the respondent results in a lesser involvement in community's activities. Respondents in the age group of 14 to 17 years were the most involved in community activities and 21 to 25 years had the lowest involvement with the communities where they lived in. It may be that people that belonged to the highest age group had other engagements which compete with needed for engagement with the community where they live. It is important for all age groups to understand that their communities need them and for them to make impact and be known in their communities they should consider involving themselves in community activities.

In terms of specific activities in the community, our findings show that more female youth were involved in advocacy (49%) compared to the male (37.3%), see Figure 6.2. More of the single youth were involved in advocacy work (43.6%) than those who are married (38.5%). It may be because women are often more committed than men when it comes to engaging in voluntary work that does not attract money. Married may not have much time for advocacy activities because they have their families that takes much time to take care of. Their partner may also influence their decision to participate in voluntary or advocacy work. For the single, some may use the advocacy work as a way to network with people and meet new people in the communities where they live in.
Figure 6.2. Youth participation in advocacy activities in their communities

Data source: Childfund PNG, 2021

In terms of educational level of youth that engaged in advocacy, those who had tertiary education had the highest engagement and those that had vocational education had the lowest engagement (Figure 6.2). It is expected that advocates of a particular thing should have information about the thing they are advocating for. People who had a tertiary education has more potential to access more information than other educational groups. This may be a reason that some of them were involved in advocacy. Respondents from Morobe province had the highest advocacy engagements compared and Central had the lowest.

In terms of youth participation in peer and community networking, the female was slightly higher (66%) than the male (65%), see Figure 6.3.

Figure 6.3. Youth participation in peer and community networking in relation to gender, marital status and educational level

Data source: Childfund PNG, 2021
For marital status, respondents that were single (single, divorced and widow or widower) had higher participation in peer and community networking (69%) than those who were married (53.8%). This is expected because married people may think that they have their immediate family and extended family to build network with and thus had a broader network base than the single. It is important to note that networking with peer and the community can serve as a safety net and can provide more opportunity for accessing to valuable information, which can be used to address issues related to violence and conflicts within the family and community. Thus, the youth should be encouraged to be involved in peer and community networking.

Youth with primary school education had the highest participation and those who had tertiary education had the lowest participation (Figure 6.3). It may be that the group of youth who had tertiary education may think that they are not in the same class with those who do not have the level of education they had. Thus, the youth who had tertiary education may prefer to network with only young people who have tertiary education, which can creates different classes among the youth. It calls for a need to remind all members of the youth that they should work together to move their communities forward by considering how to promote peace and avoid violence.

In terms of the youth involvement in peer community networking, Morobe province had the highest (86.2%) and Central province had the lowest (56.4%), see Figure 6.3. The differences in the results may be because the study in Morobe province involved urban/city youth (Lae city) and study in Central province involved youth in districts. Thus, the youth who reside in Lae may have more opportunities for networking especially facilities such as community hall and facilities for sport events.

Regarding youth participation in capacity building training, the female participate more in the training than the male (52.8%), see Figure 6.4.

Figure 6.4. Youth participation in capacity building training in relation to gender, marital status, educational level and province

Data source: Childfund PNG, 2021

For marital status, the married had higher participation than the single (53.8%). The youth who had primary school education had the highest participation in capacity building training (61.5%) and those who had tertiary education had the lowest (33.3%), see Figure 6.4. It may be that the youth who had tertiary education may think that they already have a high level education and that there is nothing new to learn in the training. This calls for a need to create more awareness among youth who have tertiary education on the value about participating in capacity building training. There are certainly some new things that one can learn from capacity building training. Further, the training provide an environment for networking with the youth.

Of the three provinces, youth in NCD had the highest participation in capacity building training (58.3%) while there is no clear difference between Central province and Morobe province, however, their participation is below 50%. It may be
that the training is more easily accessible in NCD than other study areas. The capacity building training may exist in the different areas but without awareness the youth in the area may not know it exists. There is a need for more awareness on the importance of participating in capacity building training, available training and venue for the training. They should be informed about the benefits of participating in the training.

**Factors influencing youth participation in community related activities**

In order to understand factors influencing youth participation in community related activities, three binary logistic regression models were estimated (Tables 6.1, 6.2 and 6.3).

The coefficients associated with schooling was positive and statistically significant (Table 6.1). It indicates that the youth currently in school were more likely to participate in community-based activities. Coefficient associated with the interaction of gender and age was positive and statistically significant. This imply that as the female age increases they become more likely to participate in community-based activities.

**Table 6.1. Binary logistic regression result of factors influencing youth participation in community related activities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>coeff</th>
<th>Std Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENDER</td>
<td>(female = 1; male = 0)</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>(14-17=1; 18-21=2; 21-25=3)</td>
<td>-0.37</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARITAL</td>
<td>(Married= 1; single=0)</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN-SCHOOL</td>
<td>(in-school=1; out-of-school=0)</td>
<td>0.67**</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENAGE</td>
<td>(Interaction between gender and age)</td>
<td>0.69*</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Loglikelihood function: -262.1
Restricted loglikelihood function: -269.1
No. of observations: 421

* and ** are 10% and 5% statistical significant; dependent variable is participation in community activities; data from World Vision PNG

Coefficients associated with gender, age and marital status were not statistically significant (Table 6.1). This indicates that gender, age and marital status does not matter in the participation of the youth in community-based activities.

In terms of factors influencing youth participation in capacity building training, coefficient associated with educational level of the youth is negative and statistically significant (Table 6.2). This indicates that the youth who had higher education were less likely to participate in capacity building training. This may be that the youth who had higher education may think that there is nothing new to be learned at the capacity building training, which made them not likely to participate. Other factors may include both study commitments and work commitments.

The coefficient associated with the interaction between gender and marital status of the youth was positive and statistically significant. This means that married females were more likely to participate in capacity building training. A reason for the result may be that married female may think the training may enlarge their capacity on how to manage their families especially in terms of intimate partner violence. Another reason could be that singles may think that they are not yet ready for the type of capacity building offered or that they are not suitable for it.
Table 6.2. Binary logistic regression result of factors influencing participation in capacity building training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>coeff</th>
<th>Std Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENDER</td>
<td>(female = 1; male = 0)</td>
<td>-0.98</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARITAL</td>
<td>(Married= 1; single=0)</td>
<td>-1.75</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td>(Primary=1; Secondary=2; Tertiary=3)</td>
<td>-1.04**</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENED</td>
<td>(Interaction between gender and education)</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENMAT</td>
<td>(Interaction between gender and marital)</td>
<td>2.82**</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Loglikelihood function                     -71.38
Restricted loglikelihood function      -77.35
No. of observations                             112

** is 5% statistical significant; dependent variable is participation in capacity building training; data from Childfund PNG

Coefficients associated with gender, marital status and the interaction between gender and education were not statistically significant, which means that the variables does not matter in the youth participation in capacity building training.

In terms of the youth participation in youth club, coefficients associated with education and the interaction between gender and marital status were positive and statistically significant (Table 6.3). This indicates that youth who had higher education were more likely to participate in youth club. Married female youth were more likely to participate in youth club. A reason for the results may be that the youth that had higher education may see the youth club as an event where they can meet people that have the same vision as them and probably help to organise the club as they are expected to have information on organisational skills. For married female youth, the youth club may be a place where they can meet with their friends to share their views about different life endevours and get feedbacks especially how to deal with intimate partner violence.

The coeffieicent associated with marital status was negative and statistically significant. This indicates that youth that are married are less likely to participate in youth club events. It may be that married youth may think that they have their immediate families to take care of and that the youth club may target only single youth. Thus, married youth are less likely to participate in the club compared to youth who are not married.

Table 6.3. Binary logistic regression result of factors influencing participation in youth club

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>coeff</th>
<th>Std Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.90</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENDER</td>
<td>(female = 1; male = 0)</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARITAL</td>
<td>(Married= 1; single=0)</td>
<td>-2.09**</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td>(Primary=1; Secondary=2; Tertiary=3)</td>
<td>1.17**</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENED</td>
<td>(Interaction between gender and education)</td>
<td>-1.06</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENMAT</td>
<td>(Interaction between gender and marital)</td>
<td>2.28**</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Loglikelihood function                     -59.67
Restricted loglikelihood function      -65.08
No. of observations                             112

** is 5% statistical significant; dependent variable is participation in youth club; data from Childfund PNG

The coefficients associated with gender and the interaction between gender and education were not statistically significant, which means that these variables does not matter when it comes to participation in youth club.
This section focuses on the respondents’ perception of their wellbeing using the care given to them by parents and carers on a range of different needs. The PNG National Youth Policy 2020-2030 (NYDA, 2019) speaks of these in terms of principles, values and rights of young people. Wellbeing was captured using 15 different features. The responses have been segregated into two categories of those who are at school and out of school, though not by sex which would have been interesting with an additional dimension of gender based analysis. The interviewed youth gave one of three responses as to whether the specific need was often met, sometimes or not at all provided by parents or carers. The sample comprised of 574 youth: 265 at school, 304 out of school and 5 not specified.

### Provision of physical or material needs

#### Support school work

Understandably, for those at school, 47.9% (n=127/265) reported that they are sometimes supported while 38.8% (n=103) stated that they are often supported by parents and carers. For those who are out of school, 32.5% (n=99/304) stated that they were sometimes supported while 22.3% (n=68) of out of school youth were often supported and 18.4% (n=56) indicated having received no support at all with school work. A point of caution is the unclear nature of support youth were referring to the type and extent of support parents are not only willing but able to give. For instance, uneducated parents can provide only limited or no support with homework.

#### Buys things

Parents and carers meet the material or physical needs of youth by giving them money, buying needed things and providing all other necessities. When asked about purchase of needed items, just over half, 54% (n=144) of the interviewed at school youth mentioned that parents sometimes buy them things whereas 38.4% (n=102) often had things bought for them.

For out of school youth, a similar percentage of 56.9% (n=173) sometimes had things bought for them whereas 29.2% (n=89) often had things bought for them. The experience of parents not buying anything at all, as reported by youth was higher for out of school youth at 12.8% (n=39) than for youth who are still at school at 8.3% (n=22). The differences in experiences of being gifted with new items could include the purchase to supplies required for school which are essential for those attending school which out of school children would not need.

#### Gives money

Over half of all youth (58.0%), both in and out of school acknowledged that sometimes parents give them money while 31.8% mentioned being given money often and 8.8% (n=51/574) have not been given any money at all. Within sample differences indicate that 61.8% (n=188/304) out of school youth sometimes get money given to them whereas 25.9% are often given money. For those who are in school, 54.9% indicated to receive money from parents some of the time while 39.3% are often given money. The higher percentage of those in school often receiving money from parents is most likely to be a reflection of meeting daily lunch and travel needs for school.

#### Provides necessities

As for providing basic necessities, 47.9% (n=275) of all youth mentioned that parents provided basic necessities sometime of the time compared to a slightly lower 41.4% (n=238) of youth whose basic needs are often provided. Again, as seen with as with giving money above, those who are at school are more likely to have their necessities provided for more often (53.9%, n=143) than those out of school whose necessities are sometimes provided as mentioned by 52.9% of respondents (n=161).
Social

The social aspects of wellbeing refer to spending time with young people and having an open line of communication between parents/carers and children. Responses from youth regarding social aspects of care were extracted from the World Vision Report (World Vision, 2021:23) as presented in Table 7.1 below.

Spends time with youth

In percentage terms, 61% (n=164/269) of in-school youth stated that parents spent some of the time with them compared to 26% (n=70) whose parents often spent time with them. For the out of school respondents, 56.4% (n=172/304) mentioned that parents sometimes spent time with them while 25.6% (n=78) have often been given time by parents. A slightly higher percentage of out of school youth (16%) expressed that parents spend hardly any time with them compared to 13% of in school youth.

Open communication

With reference to having open communication, 48.2% (n=147) of out of school youth have open communication with their parents some of the time and this is higher than 38% (n=102) of at school youth who have open communication with their parents. Similarly, 41.3% (n=126) of out of school youth indicated that they often have open communication with parents and carers compared to a higher, 49% (n=131) of in school youth. More in school youth (16%) have indicated that they do not have an open communication with their parents than those who are not at school at 8.2%. This difference may be explained by the age differences of youth where at school youth may be younger compared to older out of school youth who can engage in adult conversations with parents.

Provides guidance

Responses to the question of how often guidance is provided by parents and guardians shows that 65.8% of the youth who are at school, often get guidance whereas 29.7% sometimes get guidance. As for those who are not at school, there was not much difference between those who often receive guidance 44.5% (n=136) and those who sometimes get guidance at 45.2% (n=138).

Table 7.1: Social aspects of parental care which contribute to youth wellbeing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Missing</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spend time with youth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In school</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of school</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In school</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of school</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides guidance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In school</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of school</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extracted from: World Vision, 2021:23

Emotional and psychological

Emotional and psychological aspects of care relate to providing for non-physical or material needs. These needs are concerned with listening, understanding, trust, respect and giving youth the space and freedom to make their own decisions. It also involves showing affection, and praising them for good performance or deeds and comforting them in their down times. Youth rating of the extent to which their emotional and psychological needs are met are presented in Table 7.2 below.
Table 7.2: Emotional and psychological aspects of parental care which contribute to youth wellbeing (n=574)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect of Care</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Missing</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shows affection</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In school</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of school</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Praises</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In school</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of school</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comforts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In school</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of school</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pays attention and listens</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In school</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of school</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>50.1</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>81</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Understands me</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In school</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of school</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trusts me</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In school</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of school</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>59</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respect and freedom</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In school</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of school</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>82</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>574</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Emotional needs relate to showing love and affection to children and youth and comforting them when they are not well or doing so well in school and life in general. A total of 44.7% (n=257) of all interviewed youths stated that their parents sometimes show affection compared to a slightly higher figure of 47.5% (n=273) who are often treated with affection. In terms of within sample, in or out of school dichotomy, a higher percentage (55.4%, n=147) of those in school are often treated with affection while 41.5% (n=110) are sometimes given affection. In contrast, a higher percentage (48.3%, n=147) of out of school youth expressed that sometimes they are treated with affection compared with a slightly lower 41.4% (n=126) are often treated with affection.

Recognising and praising children for their achievements, however small is vital for boosting self-esteem and confidence building from a young age. The responses to this variable are interesting in that in school youth indicated receiving hardly any praise and encouragement compared to out of school youth who often or sometimes get praised. It is not clear whether or why at school youth did not provide any positive feedback to this question.

Comforting children and youth when they are upset, ill or hurt is also important, it helps them to feel loved and cared for. There was not much difference between the number of school attending youths who were of the view that parents comfort them some of the time at 48.3%(n=130) and those who are often comforted at 46.0% (n=124). As for those who are out of school, a higher figure at 51.1%(n=156) were of the view that they are sometimes comforted compared with a slightly lower 41.4% (n=126) are often treated with affection.

Paying attention and listening to youth is also an important role of parents; it helps young people to feel valued and appreciated as they grow and mature. Overall, half of all the interviewed youth, that is 50.5 % (n=290) stated that their parents sometimes pay attention and listen to them while about one third of all youth (33.7%; n=194) suggested that their parents often pay attention and listen to them. Responses indicate little difference in the attention given to youth and being in or out of school.
In response to the question of whether parents understand the youth, almost the same level of feedback was given in that, 64.3 % (n=173) in school and 64 % (n=195) out of school youth claimed that parents sometimes understand them. This contrasts with a slightly higher percentage (29%; n=78) of youth who mentioned that parents often listen to them and 22.2% (n=68) of out of school youth who mentioned that their parents often listen to them.

Youth perception of parental trust in them ‘sometimes’ differ much between those who are in or out of school at 60.5 % and 62.6 % respectively. More (31 %; n=83) of those who are in school felt that they are often trusted than those who are out of school at 24.3 % (n=74).

Youth views of respect and freedom from parents and did not vary between those who are in school or out of school. In percentage terms, 53.5% (n=144) of the in-school youth felt ‘sometimes’ respected and given the freedom compared to 50.8 (n=155) out of school youth. Those who often felt respected and given freedom comprised 31.2 % (n=84) of the in-school youth and 33.7 % (103) of the out of school youth.

**Youth self-assessment of their position in life**

Youth self-assessment of their current position in life shows that males responded more critically than their female counterparts. Just below half, 49.3% (n=142) of the males considered themselves to be in the best or fair position where as 63.3% of the female youth considered themselves to be doing well or fairly well.

Male youth who considered themselves to be struggling or worst off comprised 29.9% of the sample whereas females who considered themselves to be struggling or worst off comprised 20.7%. The reality of life for youth is self-assessed so, from these results, it seems that male youth are more critical of themselves and probably expect better of themselves which may drive them to push themselves to improve their situation. Most female youth, in contrast, appear to be happy where they are. The difference in the results may partly be explained by the school attendance data which showed that the female cohorts maintained retention and completion of school while males had issues resulting in low retention and increased absenteeism.

**Table 7.3. Youth self-assessment of their position in Life**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Youth self-assessment of their position in Life</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best possible life</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Struggling</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worst</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>288</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Focus group discussions were conducted with members of the community in the localities where the project will be implemented to gauge community views of the existing youth contributions, challenges and support mechanisms for youth. Community views were also sought on how to effectively address challenges facing the youth. Outcomes of focus group discussions were consistently similar across the 6 wards (Lae urban and Ahi) regarding their views and experiences of interacting with youths.

**Challenges:**

Several major challenges facing youth in the communities were highlighted. Substance abuse was the most commonly identified issue faced by communities. Other challenges identified include: involvement in crime, swearing and use of obscene language. Surprisingly, community responses focused mainly on alcohol and drug abuse and the issue of youth violence in communities was not mentioned in the discussions. Lack of youth voice and space for expressing their voice, one of 5 key areas of concern in the National Youth Policy 2020-2030 (NYDA, 2019:14) was also not mentioned in the discussions with the others being lack of education, employment, poor life styles and law and order issues. Only one Focus Group Discuss noted other challenges such as crime and lack of respect.

One of the members of the Focus Group at Ward 6, Lae urban reported that: “Some of the challenges that the youth bring to the community include alcoholic problem – consuming home brewed alcohol, some are involved in petty crimes and others do not attend school.”

One of the members of the Focus Group at Ward 3, Ahi reported that: “Though the youth are helpful during community gathering the biggest challenges about them is that some are taking drugs and drinking.”

The main factors contributing to youth engagement in unacceptable behaviour were attributed to dropping out and not completing formal education and unemployment. This is consistent with the national scenario with youth unemployment as one of the biggest development challenges faced by PNG (World Bank, 2019). Other mentioned causes included lack of parental discipline and youth living in broken homes/families without appropriate care and guidance.

One of the members of the Focus Group at Ward 6, Lae Urban reported that: “Some of the youth have unacceptable behaviours because they do not live with their biological parents, some are not in school and other are not employed”

Attending church was considered to provide positive direction in life and those not attending church and or participating in church activities were considered to be more likely to engage in delinquent behaviour.

One of the members of the Focus Group at Ward 6, Lae Urban reported that: “Some of the youth are very strong in Church activities and it help to change their bad attitudes”

While the use of internet and social media can be a tool for youth to benefit from in many ways, the community viewed that as a challenge. The reason for this may be that increasing use of internet and social media takes time and money youth and parents do not have but also it is viewed as source of unacceptable or illicit information.

**Structures in place for youth**

Focus group discussions revealed that youth participation in three areas: sporting activities, church youth groups and community based activities. Youth engagement in sporting activities has positive effects on their communities. However, a shared concern was that sporting activities/events are often one-off annual events, so when the events end, the youth would return to being involved in activities like substance abuse and crime.

Church youth-groups are another most common avenue for positive youth-engagement. Again, the discussions revealed that involvement in church youth groups was not wide-spread and that instances of youth falling out of these groups and returning to the negative behaviours identified earlier was common.
One of the members of the Focus Group at Ward 15, Ahi reported that: “Youth are involved in sport clubs and Church youth groups and it help them to reduce their participation in other activities such as crime and alcohol consumption.”

Youth participation during community gatherings and community-based socio-cultural activities is held in high regard by members of the community. The discussions showed a general consensus that the youth who participate in these different activities are generally well behaved; it keeps them busy and out of trouble than those who do not engage.

Besides the above three areas of participation and involvement, very little positive things were mentioned about youth in the respective localities. This shows that many young people do not have the opportunity to prepare themselves to lead independent lives.

**Consideration for project implementation**

Enablers for project success identified by community members varied from suggestions to having constant interaction with youth to keep them occupied, creating awareness among youth and communities to communicate the value of project interventions, inclusion of as many youths as possible and working in partnership with local leaders, ward councillors, churches and schools.

One of the members of the Focus Group at Ward 15, Ahi reported that: “Youth leaving the community for employment or studies, their perception of monetary benefits and willingness to involve or remain in the project make it difficult for effective implementation of the project.”

The most commonly identified barrier to project success, discussed by the groups is the possible lack of co-operation and commitment from the youth involved in the project.

An important point raised by Ward 1, Lae Urban is that “…youths who are not part of the group will make it difficult for such projects to operate in their community.” Further, it was also mentioned that youths who are not involved in the project would react negatively (physically or verbally) to being left out and this suggests the need to be inclusive.
This report provides highlight into the importance of the youth in violence and peace in their communities and how members of the communities perceive the youth. The youth can be seen as victims of violence, perpetrators of violence and promoter of peace in their communities. Some have been often abused in different ways and some have been exposed to different types of violence. This influences their behaviour and has made some of the youth to become violent and aggressive and have become perpetrators of violence. This could be one of the contributory factors that has made some youth in the study reported in this paper to support the beating of wife by their husband if she disobeys him, neglects chores or disobeys in-laws. In fact, it is strange that some of the female youth support the beating of a wife by her husband, which tends to encourage men to beat their wives as a way of disciplining them. However, it is encouraging that more of the youth tend to understand women's rights concerning having sex and tolerating beatings to keep their family together. However, more awareness need to be conducted so that the youth in remote areas of PNG can have more access to the information on women's rights. Women and girls should be provided more access to education so that they can learn more about their rights.

The participation of the youth in community related activities is important in addressing violence and promoting sustainable peace in their communities. The activities can provide them with the opportunities to provide their opinion about different issues which can then be addressed. It can also increase networking with different groups of the youth and accessing resources. However, youth participation in community activities was found to depend on several factors such as gender, educational level, age group, marital status, whether the youth is in school and the province where the youth lived in. Thus, in planning community-based activities there is a need to consider these factors, which should be supplemented with awareness on the importance of the community-based activities. In fact, the youth should be fully involved in the choice of activities, planning and in the implementation of the activities.

The data for this study came from two sources (World Vision PNG and Childfund PNG). It is important to note that the aim is not to compare the results from the sources because it is not proper to do so. For instance, sample size of data from Childfund PNG is 120 and that of World Vision PNG is more than 500 and they were not collected from the same communities, which makes it difficult to compare the results. The idea is to use the two sources of data as complementary to enrich the report.

Some members of the community have positive perception about the youth and others perceive the youth negatively. The areas they think that youth are contributing positively to the community include participation of some of them in local sports teams, church youth groups and community organised events. However, opportunities for the civic engagements are limited and do not contribute to decision-making. Adults have often involved in decision-making on behalf of the youth, which can result to tension because adults may not necessarily understand what the youth want. Thus, the youth are not often consulted and their opinions are not taken into account during the decision-making process. This results in the difficulty in implementing youth's development in a sustainable manner. Findings from the study reported in this paper will assist youth managers and planners in understanding the challenges that the youth face, their activities related to violence and peace building and potential ways to address the challenges by considering that the youth have an important role to play in the communities they live in.

Recommendations

It is important to note that the youth are victims of violence and condemnation by member of the community. But they also play important roles in perpetrating violence and in promoting lasting peace in the communities. If the intention is to address the challenges that youth face and to encourage them to promote peace in their communities, the following recommendations should be considered:

i. There is a need for more awareness on the need for the youth to participate actively in decision-making because they are one of the key stakeholders in the communities where they live in. This will ensure that the youth are represented in development. The youth should be provided with opportunities to engage in different roles such as decision-making at the community level. If the youth are not involved in decision-making they may not recognise any decision reached by adults, which might result in conflict of interest between the two groups.
ii. Youth participation in community-based activities is important in the resolution of conflict, networking and capacity building. However, in order to engender the participation of the youth, they should be involved in choosing the activities to be conducted, planning and implementing the activities.

iii. There is a need for more awareness about the rights of women and girls especially in remote areas of PNG where access to information on rights of women have been restricted by the geography of the areas. The awareness should also include consequences of breaking the laws, referral pathways and resources needed to strengthen the referral pathways.

iv. Networks established by church groups, community sporting teams and youth project initiatives can be used as platforms for passing positive messages about the youth to members of the community. This can also be used to identify members of youth that have leadership skills that can be used to reach the youth when the case arises.

v. It is important to mobilise support for youth project from the community, parents and guidians through awareness. This has the potential of improving youth self-efficacy and the perception that members of the community have about the youth as the youth engage in positive development activities.

vi. The youth should be encouraged to be more involved in community related activities by creating more awareness about the importance of working together in a community regardless of educational background, gender, marital status, race, age and areas where they find themselves.

vii. More opportunities for accessing education and fund for doing business under small and medium enterprises (SMEs) should be provided to women and girls to empower them.

viii. There is a need to provide counselling services in rural areas for perpetrators and survivors individually or as couples and facilities provided for the treatment of children and youth at risk.

ix. Consider developing parenting classes where parents are provided information on how to handle their children and how to be a better father and mother.

x. Consider strengthening PNG’s curriculum on personal development and building the capacity of teachers to deliver it. There is a need for more emphasis on the implementation of student behavioural policies in schools.

xi. The legal mechanism used to address GBV such as IPV in PNG should be strengthened by promoting zero tolerance for GBV and using stringent penalties against offenders.

xii. Consider addressing the power imbalance between men and women to correct the dominant patriarchal norms especially in PNG. There is a need to involve more women in decision-making in the country.

xiii. There is a need to provide more secure facilities for taking care of survivors who may be traumatised and in fear of the consequences of speaking up or leaving a violent relationship. Regular maintenance should be conducted on existing facilities.

xiv. Men should be engaged in interventions associated with addressing GBV especially at the community level. This has the potential of encouraging more men to find lasting solution to issues associated with GBV.
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