The National Research Institute
Special Publication No. 40

PORT MORESBY COMMUNITY CRIME SURVEY, 2005

The National Research Institute
and
Justice Advisory Group

The National Research Institute
Special Publication No. 40

PORT MORESBY COMMUNITY CRIME SURVEY, 2005

by

Dr. Gerard Guthrie

Ms. Fiona Hukula

Lt. Col. James Laki

A report prepared for the Government of Papua New Guinea's Law and Justice Sector's National Coordinating Mechanism

The National Research Institute
and
Justice Advisory Group

First published in September 2006

Copyright © 2006, The National Research Institute
NRI Special Publication No. 40

Published by the National Research Institute

This report was originally published as the Port Moresby Community Crime Survey 2005, which was prepared by the National Research Institute and the Justice Advisory Group for the Government of Papua New Guinea's Law and Justice Sector's National Coordinating Mechanism, which was funded by AusAID.

The National Research Institute (NRI) is an independent statutory authority established by an Act of Parliament in 1988 and confirmed by the *IASER (Amendment) Act 1993*. NRI's main aims are to undertake research into the social, political, economic, educational, legal, environmental, and cultural issues and problems of Papua New Guinea and to formulate practical solutions to these problems. Research results are published in the following NRI publication series.

Monographs	Post-Courier Index
Discussion Papers	Bibliographies
Educational Reports	Special Publications
Occasional Papers	Additional Publications

Direct any queries regarding these publications to:

The Publications Sales Coordinator
National Research Institute
P.O. Box 5854
BOROKO. NCD. 111
Papua New Guinea

Tel: (675) 326 0300/326 0061
Fax: (675) 326 0213
E-mail: nri@global.net.pg
Website: www.nri.org.pg

ISBN 9980 75 138 X
National Library Service of Papua New Guinea

ABCDE 2009876

Printed by the NRI Printery

The opinions expressed in this report are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the National Research Institute.

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDEMENTS **vi**
ACRONYMS **vi**

EXTENDED SUMMARY **1**
The Survey 1
Perceptions of Crime in Port Moresby 2
Actual Crime Victimisation 4
Household and Community Responses to Crime 6
Community Views about Government Agencies 7
Policy Implications 9

CHAPTER 1: HOUSEHOLD CRIME SURVEYS IN PORT MORESBY **11**
Baseline Data from 2004 12
Survey Background 14
Objectives 14
Methodology 15

CHAPTER 2: PERCEPTIONS OF CRIME IN PORT MORESBY **17**
Key Perception Indicators from 2004 and 2005 17
Are Crime and Corruption Still Perceived to Be Increasing Nationally? 18
Is Crime Still Perceived to Be Decreasing in Port Moresby 19
Who was Contributing Most to Crime Prevention? 20
What Crimes Are Thought to Occur Most? 22
What Types of Victimisation Trouble People Most in Practice? 24
Do People Feel Safe? 27
Who Thinks Crime Has Changed Most? 27
Do People Change Their Behaviour Because of Fear of Crime? 28

CHAPTER 3: ACTUAL CRIME VICTIMISATION **30**
Key Indicators from 2004 and 2005 for Victimisation across the NCD 30
Key Indicators from 2004 and 2005 for Victimisation within the NCD 31
How Often Does Crime Occur across the NCD? 32
Where Is Safer within Port Moresby 34
Where Do Different Types of Crime Occur? 40

CHAPTER 4: HOUSEHOLD AND COMMUNITY RESPONSES TO CRIME **42**
Key Household and Community Indicators from 2004 and 2005 42
What Levels of Security? 43
What Are Living Conditions Like? 44
What Type of Employment? 46
Who Are the Victims? 47
In What Setting Does Crime Occur? 48
Who Are the Perpetrators? 49
Are the Real Levels of Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault Known? 50
Who Should Be Responsible for Crime Prevention and Control? 51
What Types of Community Action? 52
What Can Be Done for Youth? 53

CHAPTER 5: COMMUNITY VIEWS ABOUT GOVERNMENT AGENCIES **55**
Key Law and Justice Sector Agency Indicators from 2004 and 2005 55

What Do People Know about the Law and Justice Sector Agencies? 57
Are the Agencies Doing a Good Job over Crime and Corruption 58
What Are the Attitudes to the PNG Police and Policing Services? 59
Do the Police Participate in the Community? 62
What about Other Types of Policing? 63
Is Crime Reported to the Police? 63
Are the Police a Deterrent? 64
Are the Police Thought to Be Criminals 65
Are the Police Thought to Respect the Community? 66
Did the Australian Assisting Police Make a Difference? 67

APPENDIX A: TERMS OF REFERENCE 71

APPENDIX B: PERSONNEL 72

APPENDIX C: COMMUNITY CRIME SURVEY METHODOLOGY, NATIONAL CAPITAL DISTRICT, 2005 73
Consultation 73
Objectives 73
Instrumentation 74
Survey Design 74
Target Population 74
Sample Size 75
Sample Sites 75
Sample Reliability 77
Gender Issues 81
Field Work 82
Data Analysis and Population Weighting 82
Timing 84

APPENDIX D: ENGLISH QUESTIONNAIRE 85

TABLES

Table ES1: Summary Perception Indicators, 2004 and 2005 3
Table ES2: Summary Victimisation Indicators for the NCD as a Whole, 2004 and 2005 4
Table ES3: Summary Victimisation Indicators by Area within the NCD, 2004 and 2005 5
Table ES4: Summary Household and Community Indicators, 2004 and 2005 7
Table ES5: Summary Law and Justice Agency Indicators, 2004 and 2005 8

Table 1: Summary Perception Indicators, 2004 and 2005 17
Table 2: Perceived Size of the Crime Problem in PNG 18
Table 3: Perceived Changes to Corruption Levels in PNG 19
Table 4: Perceived Changes in the Level of Crime in Your Area in the Past 12 Months 19
Table 5: Perceived Changes in the Level of Crime in the Past 12 Months, by Area 20
Table 6: Contributions to Changing Crime Levels 21
Table 7: Crime Most Frequently Perceived in the Local Area 23
Table 8: Most Troubling Household Victimisation 24

Table 9:	Feelings of Safety and Security from Crime	27
Table 10:	Changes in the Level of Crime, by Age and Gender	28
Table 11:	Summary Victimisation Indicators for the NCD as a Whole, 2004 and 2005	31
Table 12:	Summary Victimisation Indicators by Area within the NCD, 2004 and 2005	32
Table 13:	Multiple Household Crime in the Past Year in the NCD	33
Table 14:	Property and Violent Crime Victimisation in the Past Year	34
Table 15:	Frequency and Repeat of Household Victimisation, By Area	38
Table 16:	Summary Household and Community Indicators, 2004 and 2005	43
Table 17:	Household Security, 2005	44
Table 18:	Household Utilities, 2005	45
Table 19:	Household Occupancy, 2005	45
Table 20:	Occupational Status	46
Table 21:	Individual Crime Victimisation, by Age and Gender	47
Table 22:	Location of the Most Troubling Crimes	48
Table 23:	The Perpetrators	50
Table 24:	Group Responsibility for Crime Prevention/Community Safety	51
Table 25:	Preferred Government Initiatives on Crime	53
Table 26:	Preferred Community Initiatives on Crime	54
Table 27:	Summary Law and Justice Sector Agency Indicators, 2004 and 2005	56
Table 28:	Contact with the Law and Justice Sector Agencies	57
Table 29:	Satisfaction with Law and Justice Sector Agencies Handling of Own Matter	58
Table 30:	Satisfaction with Law and Justice Sector Agencies over Action on Corruption	59
Table 31:	Opinion on Whether Police Do a Good Job, by Location	60
Table 32:	Improvement in Opinion from Contact with the Police	61
Table 33:	Improvement in Police Discipline	62
Table 34:	Police Participation in Community Consultations about Crime	62
Table 35:	Perceived Police Response Times	63
Table 36:	Reporting of Most Troublesome Incident to the Police	64
Table 37:	The Most Important Things Police Can Do in the Community	65
Table 38:	Reasons Why Police Weer Doing a Good Job	66
Table 39:	Australian Assisting Police Presence	67
Table C1:	Estimated Size of Target Population in the NCD, 2005	74
Table C2:	NCD Population, by Age and Gender, 2000 Census	76
Table C3:	NCD Sample, by Age and Gender	77
Table C4:	Site Sample Age Means and Standard Deviations, Aged 15 Plus	79
Table C5:	Site Interviews, by Age and Gender, 2005	79
Table C6:	Site Interviews, by Marital Status, Aged 15 Plus	80
Table C7:	Site Interviews, by Tertiary Education Qualifications, Aged 15 Plus	81
Table C8:	Sample Fractions and Weighting	84
Table C9:	2005 Survey Timeline	84

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The researchers, the Justice Advisory Group, and the National Research Institute would like to acknowledge the contribution of all the people and organisations involved in the research:

- the Governments of Papua New Guinea and Australia, which sought out the information and made the research possible;
- the various people in Papua New Guinea and Australia who contributed to peer review; and
- the data collectors and field workers who participated in the field work in Port Moresby.

We also thank the community leaders and groups that supported the research, especially the 619 people who gave their time freely to answer our questions openly and helpfully.

ACRONYMS

AAP	Australian Assisting Police
AusAID	Australian Agency for International Development
GoPNG	Government of Papua New Guinea
JAG	Justice Advisory Group
L&J	Law & Justice
LJSP	Law & Justice Sector Program
LJSWG	Law & Justice Sector Working Group
NCD	National Capital District
NCM	Law & Justice Sector National Coordinating Mechanism
NRI	National Research Institute
PMV	Public Motor Vehicle
RPNGC	Royal Papua New Guinea Constabulary

EXTENDED SUMMARY

In 2004, an extensive survey of crime victimisation in Port Moresby gave the first full picture for some time of the nature, frequency, and location of crime affecting the household. It independently and objectively quantified crime from the perspective of the victims in the household. The purpose was different from official statistics, which relate to arrests or cases prosecuted through the legal system. The 2004 survey gave baseline data.

In 2005, this repeat community survey collected trend data to assess similarities and differences, over time. The 2005 findings again show that residents in Port Moresby have adapted remarkably well to a significant crime problem.

From the 2004 surveys, the bad news was:

- *two-thirds of households reported that they had been the victims of crime at least once in the past year; and*
- *public confidence in the police and the delivery of police services was disturbingly low.*

The good news was:

- *two-thirds of people thought that crime in their area had stayed the same or decreased over the past year; and*
- *community groups often took an active role in crime prevention and control.*

These messages remain true of the 2005 survey, but some more good news appeared:

- *very importantly, there were small decreases on all eight key indicators of reported victimisation (although particular locations within Port Moresby varied considerably); and*
- *the percentage of people who thought that the level of crime in Port Moresby was the same or less over the past year improved from 67% in 2004 to 78% in 2005.*

Additional bad news was:

- *very high numbers of people still thought that crime and corruption in Papua New Guinea were very high; and*
- *a very low level of public awareness existed about the actions of Law & Justice Sector agencies in dealing with crime and corruption.*

The Survey

The Government of Papua New Guinea's Law & Justice Sector Strategic Framework Strategy 1.3.1 is "to improve urban safety, especially in Port Moresby". To measure whether an improvement is occurring, it was necessary to implement periodic community crime surveys. The studies are an integral part of law and justice sector performance monitoring. They are also intended to inform the AusAID-funded Law & Justice Sector Program (LJSP), which is working with all sector agencies. Extension and repeat will continue, as required by the sector performance monitoring.

The primary objectives of the community crime surveys are to provide information on the levels, extent, and types of crime in Papua New Guinea, capture community perceptions of the police and other agencies, and monitor changes in perceptions, over time.

The methodology was primarily quantitative, based on a sample survey using a structured questionnaire. In the 2005 survey, 619 people aged 15 years and over were interviewed, in 284 households, which is an average of 2.2 persons per household. The sample was 0.31 percent of the estimated population of 198 069 people aged 15 and over in the National Capital District (NCD) in June 2005.

Sampling occurred in eight sites which were representative of the following types of security level:

1. One high security area (the *Town* site circling Touaguba Hill).
2. One more affluent suburb from a medium security area (*Renbo Estate,* near Gerehu).
3. One less affluent suburb in a medium security area (*Gerehu 2*).
4. One sanctioned settlement (where the government allocated blocks of land and provided basic water, electricity, and road services but left construction of permanent material houses to owners, being part of the suburb of *Tokarara*, near Waigani).
5. One unsanctioned settlement (where uncontrolled occupation of land has occurred in low security areas, resulting in similar physical characteristics to rural villages, being the *East Boroko Settlement*).
6. One low security area containing both sanctioned and unsanctioned housing (*Gordons Ridge and Erima Settlements*).
7. One semi-rural area containing both sanctioned and unsanctioned housing (*Nine Mile*).
8. One traditional village (*Vabukori*).

The sample size was statistically acceptable for the purposes of generalisations to the population of the NCD and for site-level analysis. For the NCD as a whole, and for the eight survey sites separately, the sample had a high level of statistical reliability on key demographic variables, with some minor limitations.

Comparisons with other urban centres in Papua New Guinea will be possible from identical surveys conducted in Arawa and Buka (in both 2004 and 2005), Lae (2005), and Mt. Hagen (2006). These surveys also complement a survey of crime affecting business in Port Moresby, and a study of crime on the Highlands Highway, which were both conducted in 2005. While they do not provide a full national picture of crime, the studies are giving an increasingly wide coverage.

Perceptions of Crime in Port Moresby

Fear of crime arises from perceptions, as much as it does from actual experience. Perceptions are a very important influence over beliefs about crime, whether or not they are objectively true. One influence on fear levels may be that Papua New Guinea has a strong oral culture. Stories and gossip about crime spread fast through informal networks and the media. Whether or not the stories are true, repetition soon makes them social facts.

The 2004 survey found that fear of crime was high in Port Moresby. Even though the level of crime in Port Moresby was high, people seemed more fearful because of its occurrence in the home, group violence, and the perceived ineffectiveness of policing.

In 2005, six of seven key perception indicators were the same as 2004, or showed positive results (see Table ES1).

Table ES1: Summary Perception Indicators, 2004 and 2005

Indicator	**2004 (%)**	**2005 (%)**
Size of crime problem in PNG (large, very large)	84	79
Level of corruption in PNG (same, increasing)	83	83
Perceived level of crime in Port Moresby (same, less)	67	78
Most frequently perceived crimes in Port Moresby:		
Alcohol-related	39	39
Stealing	33	31
Domestic violence	4	6
Sexual assault	3	2

- the overall size of the crime problem in Papua New Guinea was still thought to be very high in 2005, but to have decreased slightly. There was a five percent decline over 2004 in the number of people who thought that it was a large or very large problem;
- the percentage of people who thought that the level of corruption in Papua New Guinea was the same or increasing had not changed, at a very high 83 percent;
- the percentage of people who thought that the level of crime in Port Moresby was the same or less over the previous year increased by 11 percent from 2004:
  - ❖ alcohol-related crime was perceived to be the most common in Port Moresby (39% of total reports, unchanged over the previous year);
  - ❖ stealing (31%, a two percent decrease) was perceived to be the next most common; and
  - ❖ the percentage of people who considered domestic violence and sexual assault the most frequent crimes changed little.

Men in both surveys were more likely to perceive alcohol as a problem, while women focused on stealing.

Why did some people think crime was decreasing? Was it a result of a clean up of the city and heavier policing that occurred during a visit by Princess Anne for the 30th Anniversary of Independence, and with subsequent international events? The data were only partly consistent with this perception.

Respondents who believed that change occurred in their area mainly attributed it to improved work by the community (up from 24% in 2004, to 32% in 2005), and less bad work by the police (down from 15% to 9%).

Actual Crime Victimisation

In this report, responses on victimisation are treated as objective, factually-based reports on events that households have experienced, rather than as subjective perceptions that relate to peoples' beliefs about what happened in Port Moresby and Papua New Guinea.

The 2004 research found that crime victimisation levels in the NCD, as a whole, were high, and that violent crime featured. The summary in Table ES2 shows small decreases for 2005 (from two percent to seven percent) on the levels in all eight indicators of victimisation.

Table ES2: Summary Victimisation Indicators for the NCD as a Whole, 2004 and 2005

Indicator	2004 (%)	2005 (%)
Victim of at least one crime	68	61
Victim of multiple crimes	51	46
Victim of repeat crime	33	31
Property crime	18	15
Violent crime	9	7
Firearm use	11	9
Sexual assault	5	3
Stealing property	35	32

Note: *Property crime* is the mean percentage of households affected by five different types of property crime that were combined to cancel out any effects from different categorisation of the crimes in the different locations — stealing property, breaking, and stealing, destruction or damage to property, vehicle stolen, and stealing property with force.
Violent crime is the mean percentage of seven types of violence combined — assault, unprovoked violence, stealing with force, provoked violence, sexual assault, firearm use, and killing.

- the percentage of households that were the victim of at least one crime decreased six percent, from 68% in 2004, but remained high at 61%;

- the percentage of households that were the victims of multiple crimes decreased by five percent, from 51% in 2004, but remained high at 46%;[1]
- the percentage of households that were the victims of repeat crime decreased by two percent, but remained high at 31%;
- the mean percentage of households affected by five forms of property crime decreased by three percent, from 2004 to 15%;
- the mean percentage of households affected by seven forms of violent crime decreased by two percent to seven percent;
- the percentage of households affected by firearm use decreased by two percent to nine percent;
- reported sexual assault decreased by two percent, to three percent (these statistics are underreported); and
- the percentage of households affected by stealing property decreased by three percent to a still high of 32%.

The most frequent forms of crime involve stealing and property damage. Considerable improvement to the overall level of crime could come from concentrating on reducing these forms.

Table ES3: Summary Victimisation Indicators by Area within the NCD, 2004 and 2005

Location	Property Crime 2004 (%)	Property Crime 2005 (%)	Violent Crime 2004 (%)	Violent Crime 2005 (%)
Town	11	18	6	6
Renbo	14	12	4	4
Gerehu 2	20	13	8	4
Tokarara	33	15	18	7
Gordons Ridge/Erima	12	11	11	6
East Boroko	12	11	8	7
Nine Mile	21	19	7	13
Vabukori	18	18	8	7
NCD	**18**	**15**	**9**	**7**

[1] 'Multiple' is used in this report to refer to situations where people were victims two or more times of any type of crime, while 'repeat' refers to where the same crime occurred more than once.

The summary in Table ES3 shows that crime victimisation in the eight sites within Port Moresby varied from 2004 to 2005. The relative position of areas within the city also fluctuated.

In 2004, there was considerable overlap in levels of overall victimisation between most of the suburbs and the settlements; that is, they reported similar levels of victimisation, except that the area sampled within Tokarara was a pocket of crime in 2004 which increased the NCD averages by virtue of very high rates of victimisation for all crimes.

In 2005, generally:

- average victimisation in the eight sites was similar to 2005 or had decreased:
  - ❖ the major exceptions were increases in property crime in Town, and in violence at Nine Mile; and
  - ❖ Town and the suburbs had a similar average victimisation to the settlements and village, except that reported victimisation decreased markedly in Tokarara, so that in 2005 it now helped to lower the suburban and urban averages.

Household and Community Responses to Crime

In 2005, the home remained a far more likely place than public areas for the crime victimisation that troubled people most. One reason that the homes in Port Moresby are common settings for crime is because they are often occupied by large extended families. Overcrowding appears to contribute to the likelihood of violence and sexual assault, especially. Both surveys have found a variety of living conditions that are factors in crime victimisation in the household and the community.

In 2005, there was again willingness for communities to be involved in crime prevention, which is a positive sign for Port Moresby. A perspective from the 2004 survey was the idea that some survey sites are 'transplanted and adapted' rural villages. This brings with it the concept of traditionally-derived dispute resolution mechanisms and the willingness of communities to adapt to traditional forms of authority; for example, in solving minor internal disputes.

Beyond that, the wishes of the people are clear. They believe that better opportunities for young people and better facilities for communities will help reduce crime.

The summary in Table ES4 shows that while continued emphasis was put on barrier security, overcrowding and unemployment existed, which could be conducive to crime within the family setting:

- the percentage of houses which were fenced and/or walled increased five percent, from 62% in 2004 to 67% in 2005;
- the percentage of people participating in community protection groups was down four percent, from 22% to 18%;
- overcrowding remained high. The percentage of households with four of more adults stayed the same at 78%, although there was an unexplained decrease in the percentage with four or more children, from 59% to 40%;

- the percentage of people reporting that the most troublesome crime occurred in the home increased two percent, from 62% to 64%;
- in 44% of such cases, in both 2004 and 2005, the victims knew the perpetrators;
- in 61% of such cases (down three percent, from 64% in 2004), the perpetrators were in a group;
- the level of reported unemployment among respondents decreased three percent, from 24% to a nonetheless high of 21%; and
- respondents' most preferred government initiative for the reduction of crime remained as more jobs.

Table ES4: Summary Household and Community Indicators, 2004 and 2005

Indicator	**2004 (%)**	**2005 (%)**
Houses fenced and/or walled	62	67
Participate in community crime protection group	22	18
Four or more adults per household	78	78
Four or more children per household	59	40
Most troubling crime occurred in the home	62	64
Victim knew the perpetrator in the most troubling crime	44	44
More than one offender in the most troubling crime	64	61
Unemployed	24	21
Most preferred government initiative on crime	**More jobs (28%)**	**More jobs (25%)**

Unemployment and lack of access to resources and profitable activities were viewed as contributing factors to young people being lawless. Open-ended comments regularly expressed the following type of views:

- employment is a key factor in young people ceasing to commit crimes;
- income-earning opportunities are needed for youths;
- improved social facilities would help provide activities for youth; and
- more recreational activities, such as sports, are also needed for youth.

Community Views about Government Agencies

The 2004 survey specifically focused on the Royal Papua New Guinea Constabulary (RPNGC), finding that public confidence in the police and the delivery of police services was disturbingly low. For 2005, all sector agencies sought more data on the level of public awareness and public satisfaction with the work of the police. These data can only indicate the overall level of agency awareness among the public.

The survey found a low level of public awareness about Law and Justice Sector agencies, and mixed views on police performance (see Table ES5). The results revealed that only nine percent of the public had contact with the formal sector agencies, on average.

- where they did have contact, there was an average level of satisfaction of 61%; and
  - ❖ where the public had contact with the RPNGC, there was a satisfaction level of 57%, similar to other agencies;
- awareness of action over corruption was minimal. The eight percent who were aware had an average level of satisfaction of 54%; and
  - ❖ satisfaction with the RPNGC action over corruption, at 37%, was lower than other agencies.

Table ES5: Summary Law and Justice Agency Indicators, 2004 and 2005

Indicator	**2004 (%)**	**2005 (%)**
Satisfaction with all agencies over handling of own matter	-	61
Satisfaction with RPNGC over handling of own Matter	-	57
Satisfaction with all agencies over handling of corruption	-	54
Satisfaction with RPNGC over handling of corruption	-	37
Police do a good job	27	28
Reported most troubling crime to police	36	33
Improvement in opinion from contact with the police	48	44
Police discipline improved (yes, sometimes)	-	33
Police participate in community consultations (yes, sometimes)	-	31

Satisfaction with other aspects of the performance of the RPNGC varied:

- the percentage of people who thought the police were doing a good job overall increased one percent over 2004, from 27% to 28%;
- the percentage of people who reported their most troubling crime to the police declined three percent from 36% to 33%;
- the percentage of people who improved their opinion of the police because of official contact with them decreased four percent, from 48% in 2004, to 44% in 2005;
- only 33% thought that police discipline had improved in the past 12 months, at least sometimes; and
- some 31% thought that the police participated in community consultations in 2005.

During 2004 and 2005, the Australian Assisting Police (AAP) spent some time in Port Moresby:

- awareness of the AAP was very high, with over 99% of respondents having an opinion about it;
- some 77% of respondents considered that the AAP did make a difference while they were here, in the vast majority of cases thinking that policing did improve; and
- some 69% thought that their subsequent absence also made a difference, dominantly to the effect that policing reverted to its former patterns.

The implications of these data for RPNGC performance monitoring are:

- the 2004 baseline data showed poor public regard for the police force.
- 2005 was a confusing year. With the coming and going of the AAP, there was no clear pattern to changes in public perceptions of crime or the police. However, these was a small reduction in crime victimisation;
- 2006 sees an increase in the RPNGC budget of 20%, with the GoPNG budget cycle taking up the implementation of the 2004 *Ministerial Review of Police Services;* and
- if surveys are conducted in 2006 and 2007, they may assist to establish whether funding for implementation of the Review will help to reduce crime levels and improve public perceptions.

Policy Implications

The findings of the 2005 survey add to the wealth of information from the 2004 survey on crime victimisation, community perceptions of crime, and the credibility of government agencies, most notably the RPNGC. The surveys have the following broad policy implications for crime prevention:

1. ***Income Generation*:** Employment was again nominated throughout the 2005 survey as an important way of reducing criminal activity. Employment, especially for the young males who are both perpetrators and victims of crime, is believed to be the key measure for reducing crime. Increased opportunities for them to be involved in the community, for example through sports, is also thought to be very important.

2. ***Alcohol:*** Alcohol again presented as an important factor in a large number of crimes, particularly violent ones and ones in the domestic setting. While alcohol use is a very complicated issue, it seems to be one of the few preventive areas that could make a rapid impact on crime victimisation.

Policy implications for crime control are:

3. ***Community Mechanisms*:** Community mechanisms again appear to be relatively successful in maintaining the peace in settlements and village-type areas. They are the first avenue of recourse for the public in Port Moresby. Communities with village-derived crime prevention systems often improve public confidence in law and order and reduce fear of victimisation.

The findings in the survey inform and support the directions in the Government's *National Law and Justice Policy*, with its emphasis on restorative justice, which harnesses and develops community-based approaches to crime prevention and control. The most obvious example is the strong emphasis on actual and potential community-based preventive and resolution strategies.

The 2005 survey provides further evidence for the formal Law and Justice Sector agencies to move in this direction so that the informal community mechanisms are further recognised, mobilised, supported, and integrated into broader efforts to prevent and control crime.

4. ***Police Reform:*** The survey findings indicate that the public in Port Moresby do want improved policing services, but will not have respect for police until the RPNGC improves its behaviour and service delivery. However, the community is aware of the resource constraints that the police face, and recognises some of their good work. The positive comments about the presence of the AAP reflected the communities' idea of how policing should occur, but there is clearly a long way to go.

   These findings continue to reinforce the desirability of implementing the 2004 *Ministerial Review of Police Services*. Data from follow-up surveys in 2006 and 2007 could help establish whether budgetary provision for the implementation of the Review will help to reduce crime levels and improve public perceptions.

CHAPTER 1

HOUSEHOLD CRIME SURVEYS IN PORT MORESBY

In 2004, an extensive survey of crime victimisation in Port Moresby gave the first full picture for some time of the nature, frequency, and location of crime affecting the household. It independently and objectively quantified crime from the perspective of the victims in the community, and focused on crime victimisation, as reported by household members, rather than crime for which convictions have been reached through the legal system.

The 2004 survey gave baseline data. Twelve months later, in 2005, a repeat community survey has collected trend data to assess similarities and differences, over time. The 2005 survey interviewed 619 people aged 15 years and over in 284 households located in eight sample sites across the National Capital District. The 2005 survey was smaller than the 2004 one, but did incorporate 68 percent of the households surveyed in 2004. The main findings for 2005 are presented in the Extended Summary.

Eighty-seven percent of Papua New Guinea's population was recorded as rural in the 2000 Census. Port Moresby is the nation's largest city, with an estimated population of 303 321, in 2005. It is physically isolated from much of the rest of the country, being joined to it by air, to ports by sea, and to parts of the southern coast by road. As the nation's capital, Port Moresby contains the country's national political institutions, government department head offices, most commercial head offices, and some industries. It is populated mainly by migrants from elsewhere in the country. However, there are many descendants of the original Motuan people. There are also growing numbers of younger people who have been born in the city (often of 'mixed marriages', where their parents come from different provinces), and without strong ties to their parents' villages. Port Moresby has a well-developed reputation for crime and violence, but there has been little hard data to establish a factual assessment.

Comparisons with other urban centres in Papua New Guinea will be possible from identical surveys conducted in Arawa and Buka (in both 2004 and 2005), Lae (2005) and Mt. Hagen (2006). These surveys also complement a survey of crime affecting business in Port Moresby, and a study of crime on the Highlands Highway, both conducted in 2005.[2] While they do not provide a full national picture of crime, the studies give an increasingly wide coverage.

---

[2] Findlay, M., Guthrie, G., Hukula, F. and Laki, J., 2005. **Port Moresby Community Crime Survey, 2004**. NRI Special Publication No.36, Port Moresby: National Research Institute (NRI).
Findlay, M., Guthrie, G., Hukula, F. and Laki, J., 2005. **Bougainville Community Crime Trends, 2004**. NRI Special Publication No.37, Port Moresby: NRI.
Guthrie, G., Hukula, F. and Laki, J., 2006 (in press). **Bougainville Community Crime Trends, 2005**. NRI Special Publication No. 41, Port Moresby: NRI.
Guthrie, G., Hukula, F. and Laki, J., 2006 (in press). **Lae Community Crime Survey, 2005**. NRI Special Publication No. 43, Port Moresby: NRI.
Guthrie, G., Hukula, F. and Laki, J., 2006 (in press). **Mt. Hagen Community Crime Survey, 2006.** NRI Special Publication No. 44, Port Moresby: NRI.

Baseline Data from 2004

What were the main data from 2004 that the 2005 study set out to follow up?

The 2004 survey reported that residents in Port Moresby had adapted remarkably well to a significant crime problem. Residents were informed and concerned about crime prevention and control. Respondents demonstrated both personal and household experience of crime victimisation, along with considerable involvement in community-based initiatives to deal with the problem. Many groups had adopted a responsibility for crime prevention and control.

Key findings in 2004 were that, on average across NCD:

- some 67% of households had been victims of crime in the past 12 months;*
- some 51% of households had been victims of multiple crimes (two or more crimes of any sort); and*
- some 33% had been victims of repeat crime (the same crime more than once).

By area:

- suburbs and settlements reported similar levels of victimisation;
- while the high security enclave of Town and some high covenant suburbs were generally the safest places of all in which to live, settlements (which generally have greater social cohesion) usually reported average or lower than average victimisation rates. This was mainly true of a village location, too; and
- one suburb contained a pocket of crime that increased the NCD averages by virtue of very high rates of victimisation across all types of crime.

The highest incidence of victimisation was from stealing, which affected some 28 percent of households. Assault had the next highest incidence, affecting 17 percent of households. Some nine percent of households were affected by the use of firearms. Respondents stated that alcohol was a factor in a high proportion of crimes.

The crimes that had most troubled respondents in the previous 12 months were:

- stealing, and breaking and stealing (nearly half of the respondents);
- violence (nearly half of the respondents); and
- domestic violence and sexual assault (despite underreporting, eight percent of responses).

The most troublesome crimes were more likely to occur at home in nearly two-thirds of cases, compared to 25 percent in the street. The crimes were most likely to occur at night (50%) and on Saturday (nearly one-third). Only 25 percent of victims indicated

---

Findlay, M., Hukula, F. and Laki, J., 2006 (in press). **PNG Business Crime Victimisation Survey, 2005**. NRI Special Publication No. 45, Port Moresby: NRI.

Guthrie, G., 2006 (in press). **Highlands Highway Crime Study, 2005.** NRI Special Publication No. 42, Port Moresby: NRI.

Note: * These statistics are slightly amended from the 2004 report. See Table 13 and Footnote 11 in the present report.

that they were alone at the time. Injury occurred in 19 percent of cases. In 75 percent of these cases, respondents knew the reason for the injury; alcohol (32%) and domestic disputes (20%) were the main ones.

Only one-third of respondents nominated outsiders as the perpetrators of these crimes. In 44 percent of cases, the victim knew the offender. In nearly two-thirds of the most troubling crimes, there was more than one offender, and weapons were used in just over 50 percent of such cases.

Generally, crime was indiscriminate – gender and age did not highly predict victimisation. However, there were certain crimes where different groups were more vulnerable. Younger people were more often victims of crime overall, especially theft and assault (except sexual assault). Males were more commonly subject to crimes of violence, in which alcohol was an important factor. Females were more likely to be victims of sexual assault, property crime with force, and vehicle theft. The vulnerable — the old, women, widows, and the retired — were prone to theft with force. The home was a significant site for crime victimisation, where those involved in home duties (predominantly women) were the main occupational victims. Street crimes were more likely against the young and the old.

An apparent contradiction in community perceptions is that respondents thought that crime was declining, but they had low levels of confidence in the police. While the research did not explore whether police do have a real impact on crime, the findings indicate that the public believed that improvements in crime prevention and control had come mainly from within the community itself.

The survey did not reveal a strong partnership between the police and the communities in crime prevention, control, and public safety. People in the areas that were surveyed did not generally trust the police for impartial law enforcement, effective crime prevention or control, community safety, or respectful engagement with the community. Police were seen sometimes as corrupt, and even as perpetrators of crime. On the positive side, there were reported incidences where the police successfully resolved violent disputes, apprehended offenders, regained stolen property, and promoted community cohesion.

Generally, however, contact with police had not generated positive attitudes:

- some 27% of interviewees thought that the police in their area were doing a good job, but 42% thought they were not; and
- of those who did report crimes to the police, 42% were satisfied with the response, but 58% were not.

There was a clear message in the data from open-ended questions, that the police must improve their performance, if they are to win public confidence.

Respondents throughout the survey in 2004 indicated that improvement in employment and opportunities for young people would improve the crime situation in most communities. They frequently believed that much youth crime is associated with unemployment and the absence of productive and profitable occupations. They also considered that more employment should be accompanied by improved social facilities.

Community concerns were not limited to crime in the local area. While crime was usually not thought to be increasing locally, it was thought to be:

- a large or very large problem nationally, by 84% of respondents; and
- some 76% thought corruption was increasing nationally.

The 2005 survey set out to determine whether similar findings would occur 12 months later.

Survey Background

The Government of Papua New Guinea's Law & Justice Sector Strategic Framework Strategy 1.3.1 is "to improve urban safety, especially in Port Moresby". To measure whether any improvement is occurring, it was necessary to implement periodic community crime surveys. The studies are an integral part of the Law and Justice Sector performance monitoring. Community perceptions data are intended to supplement official statistics used for monitoring performance under the Sector Strategic Framework, and provide a fuller and more reliable picture of crime levels and responses to them in the community. The information is intended to assist planning and monitoring of the effectiveness of agencies in the sector. It is also intended to inform the AusAID-funded Law & Justice Sector Program (LJSP), which is working with all sector agencies. Extension and repeat will continue, as required.

In 2004, extensive consultation on the nature and design of the surveys occurred. With minor adjustments from 2004, the 2005 program was approved on 25 August 2005 by the Papua New Guinea Law & Justice Sector National Coordination Mechanism, a committee comprising the heads of all sectoral agencies, on the advice of the Law & Justice Sector Working Group, which comprises senior departmental managers, and by AusAID. The main difference from 2004 is wider coverage to include information on agencies, other than the RPNGC, which was the main agency focus in the 2004 surveys.

Responsibilities for technical advice on monitoring and evaluation of sector performance are held by the Australian-funded Justice Advisory Group (JAG), which is working in partnership on the surveys with the National Research Institute (NRI). Data collection was completed by 20 October 2005, some 12 months after the 2004 survey (contributors are listed in Appendix B).

Objectives

The primary objectives of the community crime surveys are to (see Appendix A):

- provide information on the levels, extent, and types of crime in Papua New Guinea, in order to provide a balance to reported crime data, enable the sector to ascertain trends in crime levels, and provide a measure of the actual environment in Papua New Guinea that can inform programs and strategies to counter crime; and
- capture community perceptions of the police and other agencies, and to monitor changes in perceptions, over time. This should extend more broadly

than the perceptions held by victims of crime, in recognition of the many other forms of experience that people have with the police everyday.

Methodology

The methodology was primarily quantitative, based on a sample survey using a structured questionnaire. The 2005 survey interviewed 619 people aged 15 years and over, in 284 households, which is an average of 2.2 persons per household (full survey design, sampling, and field work details are in Appendix C). The sample was some 0.31 percent of the estimated population of 198 069 people aged 15 and over, in the NCD, in June 2005. The 2004 survey was made as representative as possible through a two-stage area sample, which the 2005 survey replicated. The first stage site selection was disproportionately stratified by security level and geographic spread. The second stage randomly selected household clusters, where interviewer groups had age and gender quotas to fill which reflected the demographics of the NCD. Interviews were conducted in English and Tok Pisin (the English questionnaire is in Appendix D).

The eight locations were chosen to be prima facie representatives of the following types of security level:

1. *One high security area* (with houses and compounds typically surrounded by walls, barbed wire, and often with high technology alarm systems and access to security guards or firms). This Town site circled Touaguba Hill.[3]
2. *One more-affluent suburb from a medium security area* (where wire fences surround blocks, and houses usually have low technology defences, such as bars). The site was Renbo Estate next to Gerehu.
3. *One less-affluent suburb in a medium security area*. Gerehu Stage 2 was selected, but had it some more affluent housing as well.
4. *One sanctioned settlement* (where the government allocated blocks of land and provided basic water, electricity and road services, but left construction of permanent materials houses to owners, usually to standard housing plans). The site was part of the suburb of Tokarara, near Waigani, which did have medium security housing as well.
5. *One unsanctioned settlement* (where uncontrolled occupation of land has occurred in low security areas, which often have similar physical characteristics to rural villages). The site was the East Boroko Settlement.
6. *One low security area containing both sanctioned and unsanctioned housing*. The site comprised Gordons Ridge and Erima Settlements in the area roughly between Parliament House and Six Mile.
7. *One semi-rural area* mainly comprising a low security sanctioned settlement and an unsanctioned village-like settlement centred on Nine Mile.
8. *One traditional village,* which was Vabukori.

For reasons explained under Sample Size in Appendix C, the 2005 survey was smaller than the 1 003 households which were interviewed in 2004, one result being that the 2005 survey collected interviews in only 68 percent of the households from 2004. Nonetheless, the 2005 sample of 619 was statistically acceptable for the purposes of

[3] See maps in the *PNG Telephone Directory White Pages, 2005*, pp.31-41.

generalisations to the total adult population of the NCD, and for site-level analysis.[4] Interviews occurred in 68 percent of the same households that were used in 2004.

For the NCD as a whole, the sample was statistically representative in size, age means and standard deviations, gender, and marital status, which all matched the 2000 census. Tertiary educated people were overrepresented in the sample. At the level of the eight sample sites, age means and standard deviations, gender, and marital status matched the 2000 Census at all sites, with the exception of Town (where the sample had a lower sample age mean than the Census). This was the same as 2004, but five sites overrepresented the technical and university educated population, compared to three in 2004. Generalisations based on age in the Town area and education in Town, Renbo, Gerehu 2, Nine Mile, and Vabukori need to be qualified in data interpretation.

Data in the report parallel the two sampling stages:

1. ***NCD Population Estimates:*** To provide estimates for the NCD as a whole, the questionnaire response numbers were weighted to cancel out the effects of taking disproportionate area samples.

2. ***Sample Site Results:*** Data relating to individual sites are presented without weighting, as each sample was statistically representative of the site, with the limitations, as identified. In site cases, the totals are unweighted.

CD-ROMs with the full data are available to bona fide professionals and researchers free of charge from the JAG and NRI.[5]

---

[4] However, the sample size limits the potential for cross-analysis of households and demographic variables in instances where cell sizes are low and standard errors of the mean are high. This is less of a concern for sociological generalisations to the population of the NCD as a whole, but restricts detailed criminological analysis at the household level. Longitudinal analysis would be possible (although not undertaken in this report) by comparing data on the 68 percent of 2004 households where interviews occurred in 2005.

[5] Educo Pty Ltd, 1 Throsby Place, Griffith, ACT. 2603, Australia; email anastasia@educo.net; National Research Institute, PO Box 5854, Boroko, NCD; email gkaipu@nri.org.pg.

CHAPTER 2

PERCEPTIONS OF CRIME IN PORT MORESBY

Fear of crime arises from perceptions as much as it does from actual experience. Perceptions are a very important influence over fear of crime and beliefs about crime, whether or not they are objectively true. One influence on fear levels is that Papua New Guinea has a strong oral culture. Stories and gossip about crime spread quickly though informal networks. Also, media coverage about crime spreads information quickly among those who access the media. Whether or not the stories are true, repetition soon makes them social facts.

This chapter addresses residents' subjective perceptions about crime in Port Moresby, mainly using data from Section 2 of the questionnaire. Comparisons are also made with the main crime perception findings from 2004 that are summarised in Chapter 1.

Key Perception Indicators from 2004 and 2005

The 2004 survey found that fear of crime was high in Port Moresby. Even though the level of crime in Port Moresby was actually high, people seemed more fearful because of its occurrence in the home, group violence, and the perceived ineffectiveness of policing. In 2005, six of the seven key perception indicators were the same as 2004, or showed positive results (see Table 1).

Table 1: Summary Perception Indicators, 2004 and 2005

Indicator	**2004 (%)**	**2005 (%)**
Size of crime problem in PNG (large, very large)	84	79
Level of corruption in PNG (same, increasing)	83	83
Perceived level of crime in Port Moresby (same, less)	67	78
Most frequently perceived crimes in Port Moresby:		
Alcohol-related	39	39
Stealing	33	31
Domestic violence	4	6
Sexual assault	3	2

- the overall size of the crime problem in Papua New Guinea was still thought to be very high in 2005, but to have decreased slightly. There was a five percent decline over 2004 in the number of people who thought that it was a large or very large problem;

- the percentage of people who thought that the level of corruption in Papua New Guinea was the same or increasing had not changed, at a very high 83%;
- the percentage of people who thought that the level of crime in Port Moresby was the same or less, over the previous year, increased 11% from 2004;
- alcohol-related crime was perceived to be the most common in Port Moresby (39% of total reports, and unchanged over the previous year);
- stealing (31%) was perceived to be the next most common. Men were more likely to perceive alcohol as a problem, while women focused on stealing; and
- the percentages of people who considered domestic violence and sexual assault to be the most frequent crimes changed little.

Are Crime and Corruption Still Perceived to Be Increasing Nationally?

Port Moresby is predominantly a migrant city and its residents are often well-informed about other parts of the country. Respondents considered that crime was a major problem across Papua New Guinea. Table 2 shows results when *the area samples are weighted to give a population estimate for the NCD as a whole* (see Appendix C):

- a very high 79% of respondents thought that the crime problem in Papua New Guinea was large or very large. This was a slight reduction on 84% in 2004.

Table 2: Perceived Size of the Crime Problem in PNG

Size of Crime Problem	2004 (%)	2005 (%)
Very large	61	53
Large	23	26
Average	8	14
Not large	3	4
Don't know	5	3
Total	**100**	**100**

Note: Q.5.11. NCD weighted, *N*=165 318. Non-response=0%.

A very high 83 percent of respondents in 2005 thought that corruption was increasing or the same in Papua New Guinea as a whole. This was the same total as 2004, although with slightly fewer thinking it was increasing (see Table 3).

Is Crime Still Perceived to Be Decreasing in Port Moresby?

While crime and corruption were thought to be increasing nationally, in 2004, some 67 percent of people considered that crime in the past year had stayed the same or decreased in their area within Port Moresby. Table 4 shows that the perception had improved in 2005:

Table 3: Perceived Changes to Corruption Levels in PNG

Level of Corruption	**2004 (%)**	**2005 (%)**
Increasing	76	70
Same	7	13
Decreasing	6	7
Don't know	11	10
Total	**100**	**100**

Note: Q.2.5. NCD weighted, *N*=165 930. Non-response=0%.

- in 2005, some 78% of people believed that crime in their area within Port Moresby had stayed the same or decreased in the previous 12 months (since the end of the 2004 survey), compared to 67% in 2004; and
- only 17% of people believed that crime had increased, compared to 26% in 2004.

Table 4: Perceived Changes in the Level of Crime in Your Area in the Past 12 Months

Level of Crime	**2004 (%)**	**2005 (%)**
Less	41	38
Same	26	40
More	26	17
Don't know	7	6
Total	**100**	**100**

Note: Q.2.1. NCD weighted, *N*=165 708, Non-response=0%.

People thought that there was less crime against people (Q.2.3) and against property (Q.2.4), and these patterns were similar to crime overall. They were also generally similar by age, gender, marital status, and education, but less so by area and occupation.

Perceptions about change within different parts of Port Moresby varied considerably, as Table 5 shows, in ranking the survey areas according to where crime was perceived to be decreasing the most:

- over 50 percent of people in Renbo thought that it had less crime than a year ago, compared to under 25 percent in Tokarara, with a considerable spread in between; and

- compared to 2004, Renbo was the area perceived by its residents to have improved the most, and Tokarara the least.

Table 5: Perceived Changes in the Level of Crime in the Past 12 Months, by Area

Location	Less (%)	Same (%)	More (%)	Don't Know (%)	Total (No.)
Renbo	55	27	10	8	74
East Boroko	47	36	13	4	76
Vabukori	46	37	15	1	78
Gordons Ridge/Erima	46	33	18	4	79
Gerehu 2	42	33	21	5	77
Nine Mile	31	48	16	6	84
Town	24	48	18	10	71
Tokarara	23	43	27	8	79
Total	**39**	**38**	**17**	**6**	**618**

Note: Q.2.1. Sites unweighted. Non-response=0%. Totals differ slightly from Table 4 because of the different method of calculation, with unweighted data for the sites, separately.

Who Was Contributing Most to Crime Prevention?

Why did some people think crime was decreasing? Was it a result of a clean up of the city and heavier policing that coincided with a visit by Princess Anne for the 30th Anniversary of Independence and with subsequent international events? The data in Table 6 are only partly consistent with this perception.

Table 6: Contributions to Changing Crime Levels

Groups	Good (%)	Bad (%)
Community	32	6
Raskols (getting Better/Worse)	13	11
Police	13	9
Courts	1	0
Prisons	1	0
Other	15	

Note: Q.2.2. Multiple responses allowed. NCD weighted, *N*=90 784. Responses=104 861.

- the highest proportion of respondents who believed that change occurred in their area attributed it to improved work by the community (up to 32% of all responses from, 24% on 2004), and less bad work by the police than previously (down from 15% to 9%):
  - ❖ possibly this was the beginning of changing perceptions about the role of the police. The percentage of people who thought that the police were doing a good job stayed the same as 2004, at 13%, but the percentage of people who thought that they were doing a bad job decreased from 15% to 9%;
- as in 2004, neither the courts nor the prisons were thought to be having an impact on crime levels;
- however, the percentage of people who thought that the *raskols* were getting better declined from 17% in 2004 to 13%:
  - ❖ this implies that the populace thought that prevention and control efforts had reduced crime levels, despite *raskols* being worse.

Open-ended responses to Q.2.2 expanded the reasons for the decreases in crime that were believed to have occurred.[6] Some people attributed it to the community, for example:

- *We know each other very well.*
- *People respect each other, so that stops crime from happening.*
- *Introducing community crime stoppers was very effective.*
- *The community belts/punches those who commit crime in the area.*

Some attributed improvement to increased employment:

- *Local contractors are employing young boys to earn a living, so the level of crime is less.*

[6] Italicised comments here and elsewhere are the notes on questionnaires where interviewers recorded comments by respondents to open-ended questions.

- *Micro-finance provides people with income-generating opportunities.*
- *Those who used to be involved are now employed, and others went back home.*

Some attributed change to young people and the criminals themselves:

- *Streets boys changed behaviour.*
- *All youth are into sports.*
- *The community is developing, and those criminals are married, so they don't do those things now.*

Some stated that the Australian Assisting Police had made a difference:

- *Australian Police helped to settle crime.*
- *Australian Police did a good job of communicating with the people and enabled them to take their complaints to the police.*

Other police activity had also contributed in some places. According to some:

- *Police giving warning.*
- *Criminals serving time in prison.*
- *Hard core criminals being killed by police.*
- *Police shot leaders of gangs, so the rest of the gang are now scared.*

Others attributed improvement to religion:

- *Increase in religious activities (praying for peace).*
- *Church activities have increased.*
- *Most criminals have repented and followed Christ, and participate more in church activities.*

On the other hand, some people identified reasons why things were not changing in their area:

- *Low morale.*
- *Parents are failing to discipline their children not to commit crimes.*
- *Because of the police manpower and youth attitude as a result of unemployment.*
- *Laws imposed are not effective or tough.*
- *No police station and no punishment for offenders.*

What Crimes Are Thought to Occur Most?

Crime may have been thought to be reducing overall, but what crimes were still thought to be occurring most? Interviewees were again asked to report on the crimes that were perceived to happen most in their area. Table 7, Columns 2 and 3, show that the overall results for 2004 and 2005 were very similar in both the types of crime and their order of occurrence.

Table 7: Crime Most Frequently Perceived in the Local Area

Type of Crime	Responses 2004 (%)	Responses 2005 (%)	Respondents 2005 (%)	
			Males	**Females**
Alcohol or drug-related crime	39	39	52	38
Stealing	33	31	46	54
Robbery (stealing with violence)	9	8	11	7
Domestic violence	4	6	9	5
Assault	4	4	5	5
Sexual assault	3	2	2	3
Violence outside the home	3	4	3	5
Trespassing	1	1	1	0
Don't know	4	5	5	7
Total	**100**	**100**	**134**	**124**

Note: Q.2.9, multiple responses allowed. NCD weighted, *N*=163 946. Responses=188 866.[7]

In 2005, Column 3 shows that the most common crimes were perceived as:

- alcohol (or drug)-related (39% of total reports);[8]
- stealing (31%) and robbery (8%) together equalled alcohol-related crime (however, some theft may have occurred under the influence of alcohol); and
- crimes involving violence were 24% of the total, even though several types of violence separately had low rates.

From Columns 4 and 5, for 2005, men were more likely to perceive alcohol as a problem, while women focused on stealing. This pattern was the same as 2004. Again, more men than women reported that domestic violence was the crime that happened

[7] The estimated population for 15+ adults in the NCD in 2000 was 165 930. In this case, the equivalent of 1 984 or 1.2 percent did not respond to the question. Column totals for males and females come to more than 100 percent because one male in three and one female in four stated that some crimes were equally common.

[8] This was taken to include both illegal use of alcohol or drugs and crimes in which their usage was a factor. The survey did not specifically focus on drug use, but revealed no apparent concern about illegal drugs at the household level. Interviewers were asked to separate alcohol from drugs, when respondents were asked in Q.4.1 to specify the crime that had concerned them most in the past 12 months. Alcohol outnumbered drug use or dealing 5 to 0 in the five specified cases. This pattern of results was the same as 2004.

most in their area, but there may well have been an element of self-censorship by women.

Within Port Moresby, were the crimes that occurred often the ones most feared? As in 2004, the most serious community concern was violence. Q.2.10 asked what crime was the most feared:

- violence outside the home and sexual assault, which were not common, were the most feared crimes, by 26% and 25%, respectively; and
- stealing, which was very common, was the least feared crime (only seven percent of respondents). Stealing appears to be tolerated by the community. In some communities, the notion that one has to steal to survive has become a common understanding.

What Types of Victimisation Trouble People Most, in Practice?

The crimes that trouble people most, in practice, were investigated in more detail. Interviewees who reported that they or their household had been victimised in the past year were further asked in Section 4 of the questionnaire to self-identify the crime that had concerned them most in the previous year. This did not necessarily mean that this particular crime was the most feared, but that the respondent considered that it was the most troubling crime that had actually happened. Table 8 shows nearly identical results to 2004:

Table 8: Most Troubling Household Victimisation

Type of Victimisation	2004 (%)	2005 (%)
Stealing your property from you	37	27
Breaking into your house and stealing (household)	11	10
Stealing your property from you, with some force or threat	4	10
Assault	15	7
Car, truck, or bike stolen	3	7
Domestic Violence	4	6
Using a firearm against you or your household	8	5
Sexual assault	4	5
Destruction or damage to your property (household)	3	5
Killing (household member)	3	5

Table 8 (continued)

Type of Victimisation	**2004 (%)**	**2005 (%)**
Unprovoked violence (e.g. an attack by a stranger)	5	4
Provoked violence (e.g. pay back)	3	4
Other	0	3
Total	**100**	**100**

Note: Q.4.1. NCD unweighted, *N*=153. Non-response=75%[9]

- stealing, and breaking and stealing were identified by 37% of respondents, as the actual crimes that troubled people most (almost identical to 48% in 2004):
  - ❖ while it was apparent that many interviewees considered minor theft almost insignificant as a crime, open-ended responses showed considerable concern about theft of expensive household items, such as washing machines and television sets;
- crimes of violence, including assault, firearm use, unprovoked violence, domestic violence, sexual assault, stealing with force, provoked violence, and killing accounted for an identical 46% of reports with 2004; and
- domestic violence and sexual assault had slightly increased at 11% (compared to 8% in 2004), despite underreporting.

Some of the reasons for the crime being the most troubling are given here (Q.4.2, open-ended responses).

The most common reason for being troubled was violence involving threat to life and personal injury:

- *Murdered my father. I lost him;*
- *Killed one of my sons;*
- *My parents nearly lost their lives when criminals robbed them;*
- *Because they pointed a firearm at his forehead;*
- *The intruder was carrying a homemade and a factory-made gun;*
- *Because firearms were used against me to get my car off me;*
- *Because they almost shot my mum and sister;*
- *They used weapons to bash up the boys, and the police took sides;*
- *Because our street boys wanted to fight with my brothers;*
- *The in-law nearly lost his life and the car has been taken away by criminals;*

[9] Section 4 answers were conditional upon respondents having identified, in Section 3, crimes experienced by them or other household members in the previous year. The high non-response rate derives mainly from respondents who gave nil responses to Section 3, in part from respondents who did not regard crimes such as petty theft as being troubling, and occasionally from respondents unwilling to discuss traumatic events. Different household members may have considered different crimes to be the most troubling.

- *My partner was stabbed;*
- *We were totally innocent. Maybe the police brand all Goilalas as criminals; We were even beaten up till we bled. The police were also drunk then;*
- *She was beaten up by an in-law;*
- *Dad has serious injuries and went to hospital;*
- *The offender came with his people and attacked us;*
- *Had a broken jaw so she was hospitalised for six months;*
- *She nearly lost her life when she refused to give her bag to the criminals;*
- *Because I was nearly killed and raped by them; and*
- *I was very innocent then.*

Another reason was loss or damage to property:

- *Damage to property.*
- *I lost property. It happens many times.*
- *Clothes are very expensive these days.*
- *Car is expensive to replace and also in danger of losing life during crime.*
- *Bride-price money for my brother was taken when we were attacked.*
- *Lost property of value (laptop computer, fax machine).*
- *The only trousers I have were stolen, so I have to buy new ones, which is quite costly.*
- *Because of cutting the fence and stealing property.*
- *Because the clothes were expensive and the roofing was to be used for a new house.*

A third reason was emotional distress:

- *Because it haunts me all the time when I recall it.*
- *Shocked, as it was a first time incident.*
- *That affected my personal life.*
- *This property was mine through hard labour, and the stealing made me angry.*
- *Restricts movement of general public, especially women and children and instills fear.*
- *Scared because I'm female and vulnerable.*
- *Afraid that dad could have been killed.*
- *Because it involves members of my family.*
- *Because my child wept for his bike.*
- *Because we are human beings and the drunkards or the men from our area should have respect for us and also for other women.*
- *It spoilt the child's life and was unfair to her.*
- *I was innocent and the criminal was my cousin.*

Another reason was the effect on earning a living:

- *Only source of income from this taxi.*
- *It is a pretty hard and expensive exercise raising pigs, especially in the city.*
- *Because a means of income for him was taken.*
- *Because I wasted money in buying the chickens and raising them.*
- *The bilums were very new.*
- *Lost my pay packet.*

Do People Feel Safe?

Sixty-five percent of the people who were interviewed stated that they felt safe and secure from crime in their area, which was a 10 percent increase over 2004 (see Table 9).

Table 9: Feelings of Safety and Security from Crime

Location	**2004 Yes (%)**	**2005 Yes (%)**
Renbo	70	78
Gerehu 2	55	73
Vabukori	63	72
East Boroko	63	71
Gordons Ridge/Erima	43	63
Nine Mile	50	57
Town	66	56
Tokarara	36	48
Total	**55**	**65**

Note: Q.5.1. Sites unweighted, *N*=617. Non-response=0%.

- respondents in all areas, except Town, stated that they felt safer; and
- while those in Tokarara felt least safe, at 48%, this was an improvement from 36%, in 2004.

Bad driving made 85 percent of respondents feel unsafe, which was an increase from 73 percent in 2004 (Q.2.12).

Who Thinks Crime Has Changed Most?

Gender and age continued to influence perceptions about crime and safety. Table 10 further analyses the data presented in Table 5 to view this through peoples' perceptions about the rate of change in crime levels.

Gender: In 2004, the same percentage of men and women (41%) thought that crime had decreased in the past year, but in 2005, women were more inclined to think that there was less crime (32%). Statistics concerning increase in crime were very similar.

Age: While the largest percentages of age groups thought that crime was the same or had decreased, perceptions of decrease were higher among mature adults (48% of 25-34 year olds). Statistics concerning increase in crime were very similar.

Table 10: Changes in the Level of Crime, by Age and Gender

Demographic Variable		Less (%)	Same (%)	More (%)	Don't Know (%)	Total (%)
Gender	***Male***	42	38	17	3	100
	Female	32	42	18	8	100
	Total	**38**	**40**	**17**	**6**	**100**
Age	***15-24***	35	41	17	7	100
	25-34	48	32	16	5	100
	35+	31	45	18	5	100
	Total	**38**	**40**	**17**	**6**	**100**

Note: Q.2.1 x Q.9.1 & 9.2. NCD weighted, *N*=165 319. Non-response=0%.

Do People Change Their Behaviour because of Fear of Crime?

The 2004 survey found that restrictions on freedom of movement were the main change in behaviour that resulted from fear of crime (Q.2.11). This situation remained in 2005:

- some 65% of all responses related to restriction on movement and use of space (compared to 57% in 2004);
- again, women, in particular, specified restrictions on walking to the shops, walking at night, or using PMVs; and
- men were more likely to restrict movement at night, possibly because they considered it an option, whereas women would not.

Despite the domestic location of some of the violent crimes, in 2005, people were still most fearful of crime as some form of incursion or invasion from outside. For women, in particular, and those engaged in home duties, there was a heightened awareness of public behaviour, and for some, a reluctance to leave the home, despite considerable crime occurring within it, as some open-ended responses to Q.2.11 illustrate about restrictions on movement for women:

- *Lack of freedom among women.*
- *Cannot be driving at night when my husband is away.*
- *Keeps her in the house always afraid.*

- *Stops relationship with friends who normally visit at night.*
- *Can't attend church activities in the night.*
- *Since there is no-one in the house, makes me to stay indoors.*
- *Can't allow my small ones (especially girls) to walk around by themselves.*

Fifty percent of people who answered Q.4.23 stated that, after a crime, the most important thing to do was to avoid being victimised again. However, even in cases where victimisation was the most troubling, 25 percent stated that they had not changed their behaviour (Q.4.24). This suggests that many people in Port Moresby are either learning to live with high levels of crime, are resigned to the situation, or do not identify individual and community reactions as being abnormal.

CHAPTER 3

ACTUAL CRIME VICTIMISATION

One purpose of the crime victimisation surveys is to supplement official crime statistics. Quite apparent in all of the household surveys that have been conducted by the JAG and NRI in Papua New Guinea are very high levels of reported victimisation in the household compared to official statistics, which relate to arrests or cases prosecuted in the courts. In this report, responses on victimisation are treated as objective, factually based reports on events that have occurred to households, rather than as subjective perceptions, which relate to peoples' beliefs about what happened generally in Port Moresby.

Patterns of victimisation, which are applicable to the city as a whole, could well conceal variations. Port Moresby still has quite distinctive housing patterns which have been derived from the colonial era. In the terminology of the pre-independence period, there were high, medium, and low covenant areas, plus some villages. Since then, these areas have not been subject to great physical changes. They have underpinned the basis for sampling in these surveys, where sampling has been in eight sample sites found primarily in high, medium, and low security areas.

This chapter presents two types of information:

- the level and type of crime victimisation found in the National Capital District, as a whole, using data from all the sample households together, or from the area samples weighted to give a population estimate for the NCD; and
- victimisation in the sample areas within Port Moresby, using unweighted data about the level and type of crime victimisation in the sample sites, separately.

Key Indicators from 2004 and 2005 for Victimisation across the NCD

The 2004 research found that crime victimisation levels in the NCD, as a whole were high, and that violent crime featured. The summary in Table 11 shows small decreases for 2005 (from two percent to six percent) on the levels in all eight indicators of victimisation:

- the percentage of households that were the victims of at least one crime decreased by seven percent, from 68% in 2004, but remained high at 61%;
- the percentage of households that were the victims of multiple crimes decreased by five percent, from 51% in 2004, but remained high at 46%;[10]
- the percentage of households that were the victims of repeat crime decreased by two percent, but remained high at 31%;
- the mean percentage of households that were affected by five forms of property crime decreased by three percent, from 2004, to 15%;
- the mean percentage of households that were affected by seven forms of violent crime decreased by two percent, to seven percent;

[10] 'Multiple' is used in this report to refer to situations where people have been victims two or more times of any type of crime, while 'repeat' refers to where the same crime occurred more than once.

- the percentage of households that were affected by firearm use decreased by two percent, to nine percent;
- reported sexual assault decreased by two percent, to three percent; and
- the percentage of households that were affected by stealing property decreased by three percent, to a still high of 32%.

Table 11: Summary Victimisation Indicators for the NCD as a Whole, 2004 and 2005

Indicator	**2004 (%)**	**2005 (%)**
Victim of at least one crime	68	61
Victim of multiple crimes	51	46
Victim of repeat crime	33	31
Property crime	18	15
Violent crime	9	7
Firearm use	11	9
Sexual assault	5	3
Stealing property	35	32

Note: *Property crime* is the mean percentage of households affected by five different types of property crime that were combined to cancel out any effects from the different categorisation of the crimes in the different locations: stealing property, breaking and stealing, destruction or damage to property, vehicle stolen, and stealing property with force. *Violent crime* is the mean percentage of seven types of violence combined: assault, unprovoked violence, stealing with force, provoked violence, sexual assault, firearm use, and killing.

The most frequent forms of crime involve stealing and property damage. Considerable improvement to the overall level of crime could come from a focus on reducing them.

Key Indicators from 2004 and 2005 for Victimisation within the NCD

The summary in Table 12 shows that crime victimisation in the eight sites within Port Moresby varied from 2004 to 2005.

- property crime victimisation increased in Town, but halved in Tokarara and decreased by one-third in Gerehu 2:
  - ❖ in 2005, Nine Mile, Town, and Vabukori were most affected by property victimisation, and Gordons Ridge/Erima and East Boroko least so;
- violent crime victimisation doubled in Nine Mile, but decreased by two-thirds in Tokarara, and halved in Gordons Ridge/Erima and Gerehu 2:

- ❖ Nine Mile was most affected by violence in 2005, and Renbo and Gerehu 2 least so.

In 2004, there was a considerable overlap in levels of overall victimisation between most of the suburbs and the settlements; that is, they reported similar levels of victimisation. The exception was that the area sampled within Tokarara, which was a pocket of crime in 2004 that increased the NCD averages by virtue of very high rates of victimisation for all crimes.

Table 12: Summary Victimisation Indicators, by Area within the NCD, 2004 and 2005

Location	Property Crime 2004 (%)	Property Crime 2005 (%)	Violent Crime 2004 (%)	Violent Crime 2005 (%)
Town	11	18	6	6
Renbo	14	12	4	4
Gerehu 2	20	13	8	4
Tokarara	33	15	18	7
Gordons Ridge/Erima	12	11	11	6
East Boroko	12	11	8	7
Nine Mile	21	19	7	13
Vabukori	18	18	8	7
NCD	**18**	**15**	**9**	**7**

In 2005, generally:

- average victimisation in the eight locations was the same or decreased:
  - ❖ the major exceptions were increases in property crime in Town and violence at Nine Mile; and
  - ❖ Town and the suburbs had, on average, similar victimisation to the settlements and village, except that reported victimisation decreased markedly in Tokarara. In 2005, they helped to lower the suburban and urban averages.

How Often Does Crime Occur across the NCD?

The 2004 survey found that crime victimisation was very high in households in the NCD. Table 13 shows respondents' reports of the number of times that they, or other household members, had been victimised, by any of 12 types of crime, in 2005. It also uses data which are calculated according to a different method from 2004, with

Columns 2 and 3 showing the differences from the changed method of calculation, and Columns 3 and 4 comparing the 2005 results with the revised ones from 2004.[11]

Table 13: Multiple Household Crime in the Past Year in the NCD

Number of Crime Victimisations	Households 2004 Means (%)	Households 2004 Frequencies (%)	Households 2005 Frequencies (%)
None	31	33	39
Once	12	17	15
2-4 times	23	27	31
5-9 times	20	18	11
10 or more times	14	6	4
Total	**100**	**100**	**100**

Note: S.3. Households unweighted. *N*=280.[12]

[11] Data formatting in 2004 permitted analysis of the household data according to *weighted mean* crime victimisation in households because the weighting system used for providing data for the NCD, as a whole, gave estimated NCD-wide frequencies rather than *unweighted frequencies* of the respondents in the households in which interviews occurred. To ensure consistency of analysis with the growing number of towns being surveyed elsewhere in PNG (where data are not weighted and household frequencies are used), the 2004 NCD raw data were further interrogated to provide results based on unweighted frequency of household crime victimisation. The different method provides variations of +5% to -8% on the percentages in the separate rows in Columns 2 and 3 in Table 13, and -2% and -6% in the aggregate statistics based on data, row 1, and data, Rows 2-4 combined. Data from the revised method will be used in this and future reports.

[12] In Section 3 of the questionnaire, individual respondents were asked to separately identify whether they or other members of their households had been the victims of 12 different types of crime in the previous 12 months. Household crime victimisation reports were aggregated at two levels to allow an analysis by each household and area (see Appendix 3). *Individual Households:* The victimisation statistics are the mean of the number of any particular type of crime reported by individuals within that household, for that household. In this and most subsequent tables, the responses for individuals and for other household members were taken together because the individuals were members of the households. *Sample Sites:* Means were calculated by adding all crime reports in the households affected in the area and dividing by the number of individuals reporting them. Responses were nearly always received from more than one person in a household. Where tables report by respondent (see Table 7), double-counting of the same crime could occur when individuals in the same household reported on the same victimisation, but double-counting does not occur where mean household totals are reported (see Table 15).

Compared to 2004, there were reduced levels of crime victimisation in the NCD in 2005:

- in 2005, some 39% reported that they had not been victimised in 2005, compared to 33% in 2004;
- conversely, some 61% of households had been victims of crime in the past 12 months, compared to 68% in 2004;
- in 2005, some 46% of households had been victims of multiple crimes (two or more crimes of any sort), compared to 51% in 2004; and
- one household in 25 (4%) had been a victim 10 or more times, compared to one in 17 (6%) in 2004.

Where Is Safer within Port Moresby?

Within the overall picture for the NCD, what differences are there? The two major crime groupings which affect households are property crimes and violent crimes.

Table 14: Property and Violent Crime Victimisation in the Past Year

Location	Property Crime 2004 (%)	Property Crime 2005 (%)	Violent Crime 2004 (%)	Violent Crime 2005 (%)
Town	11	18	6	6
Renbo	14	12	4	4
Gerehu 2	20	13	8	4
Tokarara	33	15	18	7
Gordons Ridge/Erima	12	11	11	6
East Boroko	12	11	8	7
Nine Mile	21	19	7	13
Vabukori	18	18	8	7
NCD	**18**	**15**	**9**	**7**

Note: Section 3 data from Table 15: *Property crime* is the mean percentage of households affected by stealing property, breaking and stealing, destruction or damage to property, vehicle stolen, and stealing property with force.
Violent crime is the mean percentage of assault, unprovoked violence, stealing with force, provoked violence, sexual assault, firearm use, and killing. Stealing with force combines both property crime and violence, and is included in both categories.

Table 14 summarises their levels in the different areas, according to the percentage of households affected, on average, by the different types of crime in each category.[13]

Generally, across the NCD, property crime victimisation occurred twice as often to households as violence, but in both 2004 and 2005 there could be quite different levels of victimisation in different parts of Port Moresby. The 2005 results also show that the relative position of areas within the city can change quite rapidly:

- property crime victimisation occurred, on average, to 15% of households in 2005, whereas violence occurred, on average, to seven percent. The 2004 data were 18% and nine percent respectively;
- property crimes decreased from 18% to 15%, from 2004 to 2005;
- violence decreased from nine percent to seven percent, on average, from 2004 to 2005;
- in 2005, Nine Mile, Town, and Vabukori were the most affected areas, by property victimisation, Gordons Ridge/Erima and East Boroko least so; and
- in 2005, Nine Mile was most affected by violent crime, and Renbo and Gerehu 2 least.

Victimisation in the eight locations fluctuated from 2004 to 2005:

- property crime victimisation increased in Town, but halved in Tokarara, and declined by one-third in Gerehu 2; and
- violent crime victimisation doubled in Nine Mile, but declined by two-thirds in Tokarara, and halved in Gordons Ridge/Erima and Gerehu 2.

In 2004, there was considerable overlap in levels of overall victimisation between most of the suburbs and the settlements; that is, they reported similar levels of victimisation:

- the settlements (Gordons Ridge, Erima, East Boroko, and Nine Mile) usually reported average or lower than average victimisation rates. This was also mainly true of the village location, Vabukori;
- the high security enclave of Town and two of the three suburbs (Renbo and Gerehu 2) were generally below average, although some victimisation rates were above. Town and Renbo were the safest places in which to live; and
- the area sampled within Tokarara was a pocket of crime in 2004 that increased the NCD averages by virtue of very high rates of victimisation for all crimes.

In 2005, generally:

- victimisation everywhere was the same or had decreased:
  - ❖ the major exceptions were the increases in property crime in Town and in violence at Nine Mile; and
  - ❖ Town and the suburbs had, on average, similar victimisation to the settlements and the village, except that reported victimisation decreased markedly in Tokarara. This helped to lower the suburban and urban average for 2005.

[13] Table 14 is the same as Table 12, where it has been used in its entirety to provide victimisation indicators.

Table 15 presents data on how often individual types of victimisation occurred in each area, and how often they were repeated:

- the first row for each area is the percentage of households which reported that they were victimised in the previous year. For example, the most common crime in the NCD was stealing property. Within the Town area, it occurred to 31% of households;
- the second row shows the mean number of times that crime occurred in the affected households. For example, in the Town area, property was stolen twice, on average, from the affected households;
- overall, from the right hand column, 20% of households in Town had repeat crime, with repeat crime occurring twice, on average; and
- the bottom rows of the table present data for the NCD, as a whole, in 2005 and 2004. If Town is compared to the NCD on stealing in 2005, for example, stealing in Town, at 31% of households affected, was virtually the same as the NCD unweighted total of 32% of households that were victimised. Frequency of stealing in Town at 1.9 times, was lower than the NCD average of 2.4 times, in affected households.

In total, in the NCD, in 2005:

- some 31% of households were affected by repeat victimisation, which is a small decrease from 33% in 2004; and
- the mean number of times that crimes occurred in the affected households was 2.4 times. This is an increase over the 1.8 times in 2004 because seven types of victimisation occurred more often.

Reading Table 15, by location, shows the following scenarios:

- ***Town:*** In Town, which is a high security area elite enclave, 20 percent of households were repeat victims in 2005 (virtually the same as the 21% in 2004). Town was above the NCD average for three types of crime, and below on one. Generally, victimisation rates were average or lower than the NCD as a whole, but there was a very high level of repeat of unprovoked violence.

  Compared to 2004, households in Town had increased levels of theft and property destruction — stealing, breaking and stealing, destruction and damage to property, and stealing property with some force or threat. There was also an increased repeat of unprovoked violence, but sexual assault decreased.

- ***Renbo:*** Renbo is a more affluent medium security suburb. In 2004, it had relatively low levels of total repeat victimisation at 22 percent, but at 33 percent in 2005, it was close to the NCD average. Renbo was above average for two types of theft and below for three other types of victimisation. Generally, repeat victimisation was the same or lower than the NCD average, but there were high repeat rates for unprovoked violence and other crime.

  Compared to 2004, households in Renbo had minor increases in levels of stealing property with some force or threat, and unprovoked violence.

However, breaking and stealing, and destruction and damage to property decreased.

- ***Gerehu 2:*** Gerehu 2 was selected as a less affluent medium security suburb, but had some more affluent housing as well. In 2004, it was slightly below the NCD average for total repeat victimisation at 31 percent, but in 2005, decreased considerably to 18 percent. Gerehu 2 was above average for no crimes in 2005, and below for two.

  Compared to 2004, households in Gerehu 2 had decreases in six types of crime, and generally had lower repeat rates for victimisation.

- ***Tokarara*:** An area within Tokarara was selected as a low security sanctioned Housing Commission location, but had medium security housing as well. In 2004, the area was a pocket of crime that increased the NCD averages, with 53 percent of households reporting victimisation.

  In 2005, all types of crime decreased greatly in Tokarara. Total repeat victimisation fell to under half the 2004 level, at 22 percent, and was well below the NCD average of 31 percent. Tokarara was generally average or below for victimisation, except for destruction and damage to property, and unprovoked violence. Nine repeat rates were below the NCD averages.

- ***Gordons Ridge/Erima:*** The sample sites comprised two low security areas, mixing sanctioned and unsanctioned village-like settlements. In 2004, they were below average for victimisation, at 26 percent overall. In 2005, repeat victimisation increased, with 40 percent of households reporting it. Most types were around the NCD averages, but there were higher repeat rates for four types.

  Compared to 2004, households in Gordons Ridge/Erima had increases in crime involving damage to property, but decreases in five types of crime involving theft and violence. However, repeat rates increased for six types of victimisation.

- ***East Boroko*:** This site was chosen as a low security unsanctioned settlement. In 2004, it was below average for total repeat victimisation, at 27 percent, and increased slightly to 31 percent, in 2005. East Boroko was above the NCD average for no crimes, and below on three. However, repeat rates were above average for seven types of victimisation.

  Compared to 2004, there were small fluctuations in the occurrences of crime, but increases in repeat of six types of violence, notably sexual assault.

Table 15: Frequency and Repeat of Household Victimisation, by Area

Location		Stealing Property	Breaking and Stealing	Assault	Destruction or Damage to Property	Using a Firearm	Car, Truck or Bike Stolen	Stealing Property with Some Force or Threat	Unpro-voked Violence	Provoked Violence	Sexual Assault	Killing	Other Crime	Repeat Victim-isation
Town	%	31	**20**	*9*	17	**14**	**11**	9	6	3	0	3	6	*20*
	M	*1.9*	2.1	*1.7*	*1.3*	1.4	1.3	*1.0*	**13.0**	*1.0*	*0.0*	1.0	*1.5*	*2.0*
Renbo	%	**36**	*6*	*8*	*3*	8	**11**	6	6	3	0	0	6	33
	M	*2.0*	*1.5*	*1.3*	2.5	1.8	1.8	1.5	**6.3**	*2.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*	**5.0**	2.3
Gerehu 2	%	*27*	*9*	*6*	15	12	6	9	3	*0*	0	0	6	*18*
	M	*1.4*	*1.5*	*1.0*	*1.1*	*1.0*	1.3	*1.0*	*1.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*	*1.0*	*1.2*
Tokarara	%	32	14	16	**19**	11	5	5	**11**	8	0	0	3	*22*
	M	2.6	*1.0*	**4.0**	*1.4*	**3.0**	*1.0*	*1.0*	*1.4*	*1.3*	*0.0*	*0.0*	*1.0*	*2.1*
Gordons Ridge/ Erima	%	*26*	14	14	14	6	*0*	*3*	3	9	**9**	0	6	**40**
	M	2.4	2.0	**5.0**	**4.0**	*1.0*	*0.0*	**3.0**	*1.0*	**7.7**	4.0	*0.0*	4.0	**3.4**
East Boroko	%	*26*	17	*11*	*6*	6	*0*	9	6	6	6	6	*0*	31
	M	**3.3**	1.7	**4.0**	*1.0*	**3.0**	*0.0*	**2.7**	*1.0*	**6.0**	**9.0**	**2.3**	*0.0*	**3.2**
Nine Mile	%	**42**	**26**	**34**	16	*5*	*0*	**11**	**11**	**16**	5	**8**	3	**42**
	M	2.7	**2.6**	*2.8*	2.7	*1.0*	*0.0*	1.3	*1.8*	*1.6*	*1.0*	1.0	**9.0**	2.4

Table 15 (continued)

Location		Stealing Property	Breaking and Stealing	Assault	Destruction or Damage to Property	Using a Firearm	Car, Truck or Bike Stolen	Stealing Property with Some Force or Threat	Unpro-voked Violence	Provoked Violence	Sexual Assault	Killing	Other Crime	Repeat Victim-isation
Vabukori	%	32	**23**	16	**19**	6	**10**	6	3	6	6	6	6	**42**
	M	**2.8**	1.6	3.2	**4.7**	2.0	**2.0**	**2.0**	*1.0*	*1.5*	*2.0*	1.0	**9.5**	**2.9**
NCD 2005	%	**32**	**16**	**15**	**14**	**9**	**5**	**7**	**6**	**6**	**3**	**3**	**4**	**31**
	M	**2.4**	**1.9**	**3.2**	**2.4**	**1.7**	**1.5**	**1.4**	**3.3**	**2.9**	**4.0**	**1.3**	**4.3**	**2.4**
NCD 2004	%	35	19	18	17	11	9	9	9	8	5	3	4	**33**
	M	2.1	1.7	2.5	1.6	1.3	1.4	1.6	1.8	1.6	1.3	1.0	1.9	**1.8**

Key:

%= Percentage of households reporting victimisation: site figures in **bold**/*italic* are where the unrounded scores are more than three percent **above**/*below* the NCD percentage for that type of crime. The Repeat Victimisation column shows the percentage of all houses in an area affected by repeat victimisation.

M= Mean number of times victimisation occurred in the affected households: site figures in **bold**/*italic* are more than three decimal points **above**/*below the* NCD for that type of crime.

Notes:

1. S.3: Households unweighted, *N*=284. Table 15 is intended to reflect the local area. It only includes crime affecting the households and not individual respondents, who might have been victimised elsewhere in the NCD.
2. In keeping with the changes to Table 13, to improve comparability with surveys in other towns (as stated in Footnote 11), the NCD 2004 row is now unweighted. The different method provides no changes to the percentage of households affected, small variations of +0.3 to -0.2 to seven of the 12 crime means, and does not affect the NCD overall statistics in the bottom right two cells. Data from the revised method will be used in this and future reports.

- ***Nine Mile*:** Nine Mile is a semi-rural area mainly comprising a low security sanctioned settlement and an unsanctioned village-like settlement. In 2004, Nine Mile was slightly above average for total repeat victimisation, at 35 percent, and increased to 42 percent in 2005. Seven types of crime were above the NCD averages, but repeat rates generally were not.

  Compared to 2004, households in Nine Mile had increased levels in five types of violent crime — assault, unprovoked and provoked violence, sexual assault, and killing. Rates of repeat increased for nearly all crimes.

- ***Vabukori*:** This is a traditional low security village. In 2004, it was well above average for total repeat victimisation overall, at 47 percent, but decreased to a still high 42% in 2005. It was above average for three types of property crime and below average on no other types. Five types had high rates of repeat.

  Compared to 2004, households in Vabukori had decreased levels of theft and assault, but small increases in breaking and stealing, provoked violence, and sexual assault. Repeat victimisation levels fluctuated.

Where Do Different Types of Crime Occur?

Reading Table 15, by type of crime, shows the following scenarios:

- ***Stealing Property:*** Some 32 percent of the NCD households in 2005 were victims of theft (which excludes stealing with force), a slight decrease from 35 percent in 2004. These households were targeted on an average of 2.4 times across the NCD. Nine Mile and Renbo were the most prone areas, and Gordons Ridge/Erima, East Boroko, and Gerehu 2 the least.

- ***Breaking and Stealing*:** Some 16 percent of households identified themselves as victims of breaking and stealing, which was a slight decrease from the 19 percent in 2004. These households were targets on an average of 1.9 times. Nine Mile, Vabukori, and Town had the highest levels, while Renbo and Gerehu 2 had by far the lowest ones.

- ***Assault:*** The general category of assault was included in the survey to identify those people who were victimised by threatening or violent behaviour, but who did not necessarily come within any of the more specific categories of victimisation and violence. Some 15 percent of households identified themselves as victims of assault, compared to 18 percent in 2004, at a higher average of 3.2 times. Nine Mile had a very high level, which raised the NCD average. Gerehu 2, Renbo, Town, and East Boroko were below average.

- ***Destruction and Damage to Property:*** Some 14 percent of households identified themselves as victims, compared to 17 percent in 2004. The average, at 2.4 times, was higher than 2004. Tokarara and Vabukori were highest, while Renbo and East Boroko were well under the average.

- ***Using a Firearm:*** Nine percent of households, down from 11 percent in 2004, identified themselves as victims, but at a slightly increased average of 1.7 times. Town was high, with the other areas about average.

- ***Vehicle Theft:*** Vehicle ownership is not widespread. Some 37 percent of respondents reported living in a household where there was a vehicle. Five percent of households identified themselves as victims of vehicle theft, compared to nine percent in 2004. The average was similar, at 1.5 times. Town, Renbo and Vabukori were the worst areas for this crime. Respondents in Gordons Ridge/Erima, East Boroko and Nine Mile (settlements where ownership was low) reported no vehicle thefts.

- ***Stealing Property with Force or Threat:*** Seven percent of households (down slightly from nine percent in 2004) identified themselves as victims, with a similar average of 1.4 times. The differences between areas were small. Nine Mile was the highest area for this crime, with Gordons Ridge/Erima the lowest.

- ***Unprovoked Violence:*** Six percent of households identified themselves as victims, compared to nine percent in 2004. However, there was a higher average of 3.3 times. Tokarara and Nine Mile had high levels of victimisation, while other areas were about average.

- ***Provoked Violence*****:** This category of provoked violence was meant to include those occurrences, such as payback, where violence results as a response to preceding situations. Six percent of households identified themselves as victims, compared to eight percent in 2004. The repeat rate was higher, at 2.9 times. Again, Nine Mile had the highest rate for this victimisation. As could be expected in cycles of payback, two of the settlements (Gordons Ridge/Erima, and East Boroko) had high levels of repeat violence.

- ***Sexual Assault:*** Three percent of households identified themselves as victims, compared to five percent in 2004. Repeat averaged a very high 4.0 times, which was an increase from 1.3 times in 2004. As in 2004, Gordons Ridge/Erima was above average for this type of victimisation, while East Boroko reported a very large increase in repeat.

- The overall figures were probably low because of the unlikelihood of respondents reporting sexual assault when it occurred within the household. It is impossible to tell whether the increased numbers in the two settlements reflect actual increases, or a greater willingness on the part of some respondents to report sexual assault.

- ***Killing*****:** Three percent of households (the same as 2004) identified themselves as victims, at a similar average of 1.3 times. The main area affected was Nine Mile, which was not affected at all in 2004.

- ***Other Crime:*** The unexplained 'other crime' occurred in an average of four percent of households, the same as 2004, but with a high rate of 4.3 times. Repeat rates were high in Vabukori, Nine Mile, and Renbo.

CHAPTER 4

HOUSEHOLD AND COMMUNITY RESPONSES TO CRIME

In 2005, the home remained a far more likely place than public areas for the crime victimisation that troubled people most. One reason that the house in Port Moresby is a common setting for crime is because it is usually occupied by large extended families. Overcrowding appears to contribute to the likelihood of violence, particularly sexual assault.

As in 2004, the survey did not explore any comprehensive measures of wealth or poverty. It does not permit generalisations about the relationship between affluence, forms of property ownership, security levels, and crime. However, the 2005 survey has provided a very similar description to 2004, of living conditions in Port Moresby, and indicated some possible influences on crime victimisation in the household and the community.

In 2005, there was again willingness for communities to be involved in crime prevention, which is a positive scenario for Port Moresby. The idea that some survey sites are 'transplanted and adapted' rural villages, which was a perspective from the 2004 survey, brings the concept of traditionally-derived dispute resolution mechanisms, and a willingness by communities to adapt traditional forms of authority, for example, in solving minor disputes. Beyond that, the wishes of the people are clear. They believe that better opportunities for young people and better facilities for communities will help reduce crime.

Key Household and Community Indicators from 2004 and 2005

The 2004 research found a range of living conditions to be a factor in victimisation in the household. Table 16 shows that, while continued emphasis was put on barrier security in 2005, crowding and unemployment could be conducive to crime within the family:

- the percentage of houses that were fenced, and/or walled increased five percent, from 62% in 2004, to 67% in 2005;
- the percentage of people participating in community protection groups was down from 22% to 18%, in 2005;
- overcrowding remained high. The percentage of households with four of more adults increased from 75% to 78%, although there was an unexplained decrease in the percentage of households with four or more children, from 51% to 40%;
- the percentage of people reporting that the most troublesome crime occurred in the home increased slightly, from 62% to 64%:
  - ❖ in 44% of such cases, in both 2004 and 2005, the victims knew the perpetrators; and
  - ❖ in 61% of such cases (down from 64% in 2004), the perpetrators were in a group;
- the level of reported unemployment among respondents decreased three percent, from 24%, to a nonetheless high 21%; and

- respondents' most preferred government initiative for the reduction of crime remained as more jobs.

Table 16: Summary Household and Community Indicators, 2004 and 2005

Indicator	2004 (%)	2005 (%)
Houses fenced and/or walled	62	67
Participate in community crime protection group	22	18
Four or more adults per household	75	78
Four or more children per household	51	40
Most troubling crime occurred in the home	62	64
Victim knew the perpetrator in the most troubling crime	44	44
More than one offender in the most troubling crime	64	61
Unemployed	24	21
Most preferred government initiative on crime	**More jobs (28%)**	**More jobs (25%)**

What Levels of Security?

Physical security measures, to keep out criminals, are obvious in Port Moresby. An important factor in victimisation is whether residences have some perimeter security to restrict entry. Indeed, the typical level of household security in different locations was the prima facie basis of the first-stage sampling strategy for these surveys. Table 17 shows housing security levels:

- some 67% of respondents lived in houses that were fenced (62%) or walled (5%); and
- some 32% lived in houses that were unfenced.

Consistent with the first-stage sampling principles (see Appendix C):

- the high security location of Town was the only area where walls were common (28%), otherwise houses were all fenced (72%);
- the medium security suburbs all had high proportions of respondents living in houses that were fenced (91% each in Renbo and Gerehu 2, and 70% in Tokarara); and
- the low security settlements and villages had considerable proportions of occupants living in unfenced houses (Vabukori (86%), East Boroko (54%), Gordons Ridge/Erima (41%), and Nine Mile (38%).

Table 17: Household Security, 2005

Location	Walled (%)	Fenced (%)	Unfenced (%)
Town	28	72	0
Renbo	6	91	4
Gerehu 2	7	91	3
Tokarara	1	70	29
Gordons Ridge/Erima	4	55	41
East Boroko	0	46	54
Nine Mile	4	58	38
Vabukori	0	14	86
Total	**5**	**62**	**32**

Note: Q.1.11. NCD unweighted, *N*=618. Non-response=0%.

When asked what a household could do better, to make itself safer (Q.5.2), the principal response was to make the house more secure (32%), which was also the principal reaction in 2004, when 24 percent of respondents stated this.

However, breaching of perimeter security was common, despite walls and fences, and breaches often involved violence, if contact occurred with the residents. As Table 15 showed:

- some 16% of households identified themselves as victims of breaking and stealing. These households were targets on an average of 1.9 times;
- some 14% of households identified themselves as victims of destruction and damage to property, on an average of 2.4 times; and
- some seven percent of households identified themselves as victims of stealing property with force or threat, on an average of 1.4 times.

What Are Living Conditions Like?

Within the NCD, what were the physical services like? Table 18 shows that the level of infrastructure was quite high, but telephones and vehicles were at a more moderate level.

Table 18: Household Utilities, 2005

Utility	Respondents (%)
Permanent water supply	91
Electricity	73
Sewage	65
Telephone	49
Vehicle	38

Note: Q.1.5, 1.7-1.10. NCD weighted, *N*=165 930. Non-response=0%.

Usually, houses were heavily occupied by extended families, and one or some of the occupants owned the house (see Table 19):

- some 78% of respondents stated that their households contained four or more adults, similar to 2004;
- some 40% stated that their households contained four or more children, which is down from 51%; and[14]
- some 80% of respondents stated that they lived in households where the occupants owned the houses.

Table 19: Household Occupancy, 2005

Household Composition	2004 (%)	2005 (%)
Four or more adults	75	78
Four or more children	51	40
Own house[15]	-	80

Note: Q.1.4, 1.6. NCD weighted, *N*=165 389. Non-response 0%.

The high percentage of household occupants may stem partly from traditionally derived household arrangements in some areas, where many individuals in separate dwellings share eating arrangements.[16]

---

[14] The authors have no explanation for the decrease in the statistics for children. It may be a real change, an anomaly from interviews, or random statistical error.

[15] An increase in apparent ownership, from 53% in 2004 to 80% in 2005, is from an alteration in the way in which Q.1.4 was asked. In 2004, some 39% of respondents indicated 'other', which, interviewers reported, usually meant that they lived with relatives. In 2005, the question was clarified to apply to the household not the individual respondent; that is, if one household member owned the house, then the answer for all respondents in that house was that it was owned. As a result, 'other' declined 31% to 8% in 2005, and 'own' increased from 27% to 80%.

What Type of Employment?

Another indicator of occupancy is that, of those surveyed, 58 percent were involved in home duties, were unemployed, or were students (see Table 20). These individuals would be likely to use household space on a regular, constant basis. It was clearly apparent during fieldwork that unemployed members of households routinely stayed at home to perform home duties and provide security:

- only 23% of respondents indicated that they had full-time, government employment, which would place them in an advantaged group; and
- some 21% of respondents reported some they were unemployed. While unemployment was very high, the reduction from 24%, in 2004, is an encouraging sign that is consistent, on the one hand, with community belief that increased employment is a key to crime reduction and, on the other hand, with the overall decrease in victimisation levels (see Chapter 2).

Table 20: Occupational Status

Occupation	**2004 (%)**	**2005 (%)**
Home duties	25	22
Unemployed	24	21
Student	11	15
Full-time (formal)	12	13
Self-employed	10	10
Full-time (informal)	5	6
Retired	3	5
Government employee	5	4
Casual work	4	3
Farmer/fishing	2	2
Total	**100**	**100**

Note: Q.9.5. NCD weighted, *N*=165 542. Non-response=0%.

Who Are the Victims?

Different age and gender groups were sometimes victims of different types of crime. Table 20 shows that:

---

[16] The definition of a household came from the 2000 Census — "a person or group of persons living and eating together and sharing arrangements for cooking and the other necessities …".

- younger people more often reported individually as victims of crime overall (41% on average, versus 36% of 15-24 year olds in the sample). They were especially vulnerable to:
  - ❖ property theft (51%);
  - ❖ violence (unprovoked violence 57%, assault 50%); and
  - ❖ except sexual assault (14%);
- mature adults less often reported as victims of crime overall (24% on average versus 30% of 25-34 year olds in the sample). They were more prone to:
  - ❖ payback (41%) but;
  - ❖ less prone to firearm use (13%), assault (19%), sexual assault (22%), and stealing property with force or threat (24%);

Table 21: Individual Crime Victimisation, by Age and Gender

Type of Crime	Age (%)			Gender (%)		No. of Incidents
	15-24	25-34	35+	Male	Female	
Percentage in Sample	***36***	***30***	***34***	***54***	***46***	**-**
Stealing your property from you	51	27	22	50	50	53
Assault	50	19	31	60	40	42
Unprovoked violence (e.g. an attack by a stranger)	57	26	17	57	43	32
Stealing property with some force or threat	37	24	39	30	70	23
Car, truck, or bike stolen	41	31	28	75	25	17
Using a firearm against you	35	13	52	71	29	13
Provoked violence (e.g. payback)	26	41	33	67	33	12
Sexual assault	14	22	63	22	78	5
Other	61	15	24	20	80	9
Average (%)	**41**	**24**	**34**	**50**	**50**	**-**

Note: S.3 data for individuals only x S.9 demographic data. NCD weighted.

- older adults reported as average victims of crime overall (34% on average versus 34% of people 35 years and over in the sample). They were more prone to:
  - ❖ sexual assault (63%), firearms being used against them (52%), and theft with force or threat (39%); but
  - ❖ less prone to unprovoked violence (17%) and stealing (22%).

Males and females were victims at similar levels overall, but there were distinct differences in the types of crime to which they were vulnerable:

- males were more likely to report as victims of vehicle theft (75% versus 54% in the sample). They were especially prone to many forms of violence:
  - ❖ firearm use (71%), provoked violence (67%), and assault (60%); and
- females reported that they were more likely to be victims of sexual assault (78% versus 46% in the sample), property crime with force (70%), and a very high and unexplained 'other' crime (80%).

In What Setting Does Crime Occur?

Respondents were asked to self-identify the most troubling crimes for them or their household during the past 12 months. They nominated a wide variety of crimes, which were presented in Table 8. It is also relevant to look at the settings in which these crimes occurred. Table 22 shows that:

- crimes were most likely to occur at home (64% of cases, compared to 15% in the street).

Table 22: Location of the Most Troubling Crimes

Location	**2004 (%)**	**2005 (%)**
Home	62	64
Street	24	15
Shops	3	2
Workplace	2	1
Other	10	18
Total	**100**	**100**

Note: Q.4.4. NCD weighted, *N*=79 251. Non-response=52%. S.4 answers were conditional upon respondents having identified, in S.3, crimes experienced by them or other household members in the previous year. The high non-response rate derives mainly from respondents who gave nil responses to S.3.

Additionally, other questions showed very similar findings to 2004:

- only 26% of victims indicated that they were alone at the time (Q.4.5);
- the crimes were most likely to occur at night (57% of the nominated cases, Q.4.6) and on Saturday (28%, Q.4.7); and
- injury from nominated crimes occurred in 26% of cases (Q.4.11). In 86% of these cases, respondents knew the reason for the injury (Q.4.12). Domestic disputes (33%) and alcohol (19%) were most common, although there was a large proportion (44%) of 'other' responses as well.

Open-ended comment on Q.4.4 reinforced messages about alcohol, domestic disputes, and jealousy contributing to violence:

- *after a drinking party, the killing and assault happened;*
- *with the influence of alcohol;*
- *domestic dispute and alcohol;*
- *jealousy;*
- *he didn't want her to talk to others;*
- *jealousy resulted in my daughter being punched;*
- *young boys fighting over a girl;*
- *suspicion in a marriage; and*
- *between co-wives.*

Who Are the Perpetrators?

Because household occupancy is high and constant, unemployment is high, and alcohol abuse is a feature, domestic disputes can be a common trigger for violence.

When asked who was most likely to commit crimes in their area only 32 percent of respondents nominated outsiders (Q.2.13). In 44 percent of the most troubling cases, the victims knew the offenders (Q.4.9). In these cases, the perpetrators were more likely to be a relative, *wantok*, or spouse (41%), or a neighbour or friend (35%) (see Table 23):

- in 61% of those cases, there was more than one offender (Q.4.8);
- weapons were used in 43% of cases (Q.4.10), 26% of which resulted in physical injury (Q.4.11); and
- in 86% of the injury cases, the victims or the observers knew the reason for the violence and injury. Domestic disputes (33%) and alcohol abuse (19%) were the two main explanations (Q.4.12).

Of the 64 percent of people who identified the home as the principal location for victimisation included crime that originated outside the household and inside it. However, the survey was not able to distinguish between the two in any details (see Table 22). However:

- where the offender in the crime that concerned respondents most was a relative, 61% of cases were reported by women; and
- where the offender was a spouse, 91% of cases were reported by women (Q.4.9).

Table 23: The Perpetrators

Perpetrator	2004 (%)	2005 (%)
Relative or wantok	34	26
Spouse	7	15
Neighbour	24	29
Friend	13	6
Gang member	19	8
Someone you had only seen before	4	18
Total	**100**	**100**

Note: Q.4.9. NCD weighted. *N=35 423*, Non-response=79%. The high non-response rate derives from respondents who gave nil responses to S.3, or did not know the perpetrator.

In other words, there is evidence that husbands and male relatives perpetrate a considerable amount of the serious victimisation against women. As with nearly all of the results reported in this chapter, there were close similarities with the findings of the 2004 survey. Essentially:

- crimes tend to be committed in groups in the household at night;
- perpetrators pick on the vulnerable;
- men are more likely to come into conflict with outsiders, where alcohol is often a factor; and
- women tend to be victims of men close to them.

Are the Real Levels of Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault Known?

Table 7 indicated that six percent of respondents considered that domestic violence was the crime that happened most in their area, while two percent said it was sexual assault. Table 15 showed that three of households identified themselves as victims of sexual assault in the previous year, with repeat averaging 4.0 times.

As Appendix C and the 2004 Report (pp.46-47) point out, in many households in 2004 and 2005, there were frank reports on these topics. However, interviewers in both years considered underreporting to be the case, which is consistent with similar studies. The household surveys at least provide an indication of the perpetrators and minimum levels of domestic violence and sexual assault. However, their occurrence is highly likely to be underreported, and the surveys cannot give an accurate indication of their real level.[17]

[17] These problems are grounded in the methodology. Questionnaire surveys based on short, closed-response questions are appropriate for the surveys' prime purpose of providing quantitative information to decision makers about trends in crime victimisation. The methodological problem is magnified by field work constraints. Occupancy rates in the areas

Who Should Be Responsible for Crime Prevention and Control?

As in 2004, respondents believed that communities should have most responsibility for crime prevention and control, with police ranked second (see Table 24). This view is consistent with the other survey findings:

- only 33% reported their most troubling crime to the police (Q.4.13); and
- more people reported crimes to someone in the community — 56% to a relative, 38% to a community group or leader, and four percent to a traditional authority (Q.4.21).

The reporting of crimes to community authorities could be explained by the lack of confidence by the community in the work of the police, and because people believe that some crimes could be resolved within the community itself.

Table 24: Group Responsibility for Crime Prevention/Community Safety

Group	**2004 (%)**	**2005 (%)**
Community	36	36
Police	25	21
Individuals	21	24
Police and community	10	7
Other combinations	8	12
Total	**100**	**100**

Note: Q.8.6. NCD weighted, *N*=164 492. Non-response=1%.

surveyed are high and constant, so that it is difficult to separate interviewees from the influence and observation of other household members. The structure of domestic authority could reduce the independence of the interview because the influence of the dominant male or female in the family structure may have limited candid responses. Open communication between respondent and interviewer may also have been difficult when the victim and the perpetrator were members of the same household and perhaps nearby during the interview. However, these surveys are not intended to obtain the type of in-depth qualitative information necessary to give a more valid understanding of sexual assault and domestic violence relevant to service organisations and social workers. The solution to their need for deeper understanding is additional research using qualitative methodologies.

The survey asked respondents if there were organisations, other than the police, that provided protection against crime in the community. Thirty-three percent stated yes (Q.5.3). The groups mentioned included (Q.5.4):

- Neigbourhood Watch;
- Peace and Good Order committees;
- mediation and church groups; and
- community leaders;
- village courts; and
- various security groups, ranging from commercial companies to local youths.

What Types of Community Action?

The survey reinforces the importance of community leaders in crime prevention and safety, and mediation and dispute resolution committees' work, as well as the importance of informal networks.

The survey asked respondents whether they or their households participated in community crime protection groups (Q.5.5). Eighteen percent indicated that they did, which was a decrease from 22 percent in 2004. When asked what they could do to make themselves or their households safer from crime (Q.5.2):

- some 30% stated that improvements in security for the household would make them more secure;
- some 13% stated that participation in crime prevention activities would, while another 13% stated avoiding certain places;
- other options included praying to God for help (14%); and
- only seven percent of respondents stated that helping the police would help to make them safer, which was less than 2004 (12%).

Fifty-two percent of respondents who answered the question indicated that community crime prevention groups conducted community patrols (Q.5.6). Offenders were dealt with in a variety of ways:

- *they advise the offender not to do it again;*
- *they take the offender to the village court;*
- *handcuff/capture them, talk to them, advise/warn them, and let them off;*
- *solve the problem at community level with local elders and leaders;*
- *beat them up and warn them not to do it again;*
- *they deal with them in the appropriate manner, depending on the offence and refer to the police; or*
- *if serious offences, they are taken to the police, but otherwise, beaten up and sent home.*

When asked about imprisonment or restorative justice options for people who commit crimes (Q.2.14):

- some 63% of respondents stated that people who commit crimes should go to jail (65% in 2004); and

- some 34% of people thought that compensation and supervision was the best option for offenders (the same level as 2004).

What Can Be Done for Youth?

Similar sentiments to 2004 were expressed regarding young people and crime. While the respondents tended to see no reason for special treatment of youth offenders compared to older ones, they clearly saw prevention through change in social conditions as the long-term solution. When asked what the government could do to make their area safer, the replies were very similar to 2004. Table 25 shows that:

- some 61% favoured social changes — more jobs (25%), youth activities (23%), and better living conditions (13%); and
- some 38% favoured law and order solutions — more police (19%), harsher penalties from the courts (8%), fight corruption (6%), and crack down on gangs (5%).

Table 25: Preferred Government Initiatives on Crime

Preferred Initiative	**2004 (%)**	**2005 (%)**
More jobs	28	25
Youth activities	20	23
More police	20	19
Better living conditions	12	13
Harsher penalties from the courts	9	8
Fight corruption	4	6
Crack down on gangs	7	5
Total	**100**	**100**

Note: Q.5.9, multiple responses allowed. NCD weighted *N*=162 420, Responses=279 851.

Responses were very similar to 2004, and advice for community leaders was along the same lines as advice to the government, with 29 percent of people wanting more activities for youth (see Table 26).

Unemployment and lack of access to resources and productive, profitable activities were viewed as contributing factors to young people being lawless. While many open-ended comments on Q.5.10 did focus on law and order issues, comments regularly reinforced views about employment creation and activities for the young.

Table 26: Preferred Community Initiatives on Crime

Preferred Initiative	**2004 (%)**	**2005 (%)**
Develop more activities for young people	27	29
Cooperate better with the police	21	17
See that people caught committing crime are punished	16	11
Better living conditions	8	11
Regulate people coming in from outside your area	6	10
Other	22	22
Total	**100**	**100**

Note: Q.5.10, multiple responses allowed. NCD weighted *N*=165 418, Responses=231 752.

Employment was seen as a key factor in young people ceasing to commit crimes, for example:

- *provide more job opportunities for youth;*
- *youth work should be encouraged;*
- *find jobs for the young people to keep;*
- *create more employment/work contracts to keep them busy and self-reliant;*
- *register a company to employ youths;*
- *involve youths in fishing activities so they can be occupied;*
- *create employment opportunities;*
- *develop projects to involve our village people;*
- *fund rehabilitation projects; and*
- *create job opportunities for young people in the cash economy.*

Improved social and recreational activities for youth within communities also featured:

- *develop more recreational activities, such as sports or contract work;*
- *organise more street-oriented activities, such as sports workshops, and so on, in which youths/ people can participate;*
- *sports, BBQs, and fundraising;*
- *sports, cleanup the streets, and so on;*
- *mobilise all youths to do projects;*
- *sports and jobs, support church activities that advise youths;*
- *improve infrastructure and services; and*
- *send youths to school (vocational).*

The views of the people are clear. They believe that better opportunities for young people, and better facilities for communities will help reduce crime.

CHAPTER 5

COMMUNITY VIEWS ABOUT GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

The 2004 survey focused especially on the RPNGC. It found that public confidence in the police and the delivery of police services was disturbingly low. There was widespread dissatisfaction with the work of the police, which resulted in a reluctance by people in the community to report crime. Many of those people who were surveyed were fearful about the police with whom they had contact. The police were often represented as inefficient and unfair, and sometimes as being violent, corrupt, and even criminals. Having said this, people in the community also acknowledged that lack of resources, such as vehicles and fuel, was a factor that contributed to the poor response from police. There was a clear message in the data from open-ended questions that the police must improve their performance, if they are to win community respect.

For 2005, all sector agencies sought more data on their levels of public awareness, and public satisfaction with their work. This chapter presents the public awareness data, including perceptions of action over corruption by the agencies, updates of findings on the RPNGC, and the public's views about the presence of the Australian Assisting Police (AAP).

These data can only put a frame around the overall level of agency awareness among the public. To find out more information about the thinking of people who come into contact with the agencies, and who therefore have some personal experience of their activities, would require separate client studies.

Key Law and Justice Sector Agency Indicators from 2004 and 2005

The 2005 survey found a low level of public awareness about Law and Justice Sector agencies, and mixed views on police performance (see Table 27). The results revealed that, on average, only nine percent of the public had contact with the formal sector agencies:

- where they did have contact, there was an average level of satisfaction of 61%:
  - ❖ where the public had contact with the RPNGC, there was a level of satisfaction of 57%, which is similar to other agencies; and
- awareness of action over corruption was almost minimal. The small number of people who were aware had an average level of satisfaction of 54%:
  - ❖ satisfaction with the RPNGC's action over corruption, at 37%, was lower than other agencies.

Satisfaction with other aspects of the performance of the RPNGC varied:

- the percentage of people who thought the police were doing a good job overall increased by one percent over 2004, from 27% to 28%;
- the percentage of people who reported their most troubling crime to the police declined by three percent over 2004, from 36% to 33%;

- the percentage who improved their opinion of the police because of official contact with them decreased by four percent, from 48% in 2004 to 44% in 2005;
- only 33% thought that police discipline had improved in the past 12 months, at least sometimes; and
- some 31% thought that the police participated in community consultations in 2005.

Table 27: Summary Law and Justice Sector Agency Indicators, 2004 and 2005

Indicator	**2004 (%)**	**2005 (%)**
Satisfaction with all agencies over handling of own matter	-	61
Satisfaction with RPNGC over handling of own Matter	-	57
Satisfaction with all agencies over handling of corruption	-	54
Satisfaction with RPNGC over handling of corruption	-	37
Police do a good job	27	28
Reported most troubling crime to police	36	33
Improvement in opinion from contact with the police	48	44
Police discipline improved (yes, sometimes)	-	33
Police participate in community consultations (yes, sometimes)	-	31

During part of 2004 and 2005, the AAP had a presence in Port Moresby:

- awareness of the AAP was very high, with over 99% of respondents having an opinion about it;
- some 77% of respondents considered that the AAP did make a difference while they were here, with the majority of people thinking that policing had improved; and
- some 69% thought that their subsequent withdrawal also made a difference, predominantly to the effect that policing reverted to its former patterns.

The implications of the data on RPNGC performance monitoring are:

- the 2004 baseline data showed poor public regard for the police force;
- 2005 was a confusing year, with the coming and going of the AAP. There was no clear pattern to changes in public opinion, but a reduction in crime victimisation;

- 2006 sees an increase in the RPNGC budget of 20%, with the GoPNG budget cycle taking up implementation of the 2004 *Ministerial Review of Police Services*[18]; and
- if surveys are conducted in 2006 and 2007, they may assist to establish whether funding for the implementation of the Review has helped to reduce crime levels and improve public perceptions.

What Do People Know about the Law and Justice Sector Agencies?

The survey results revealed that the public had little contact with the formal sector agencies. Table 28 shows that eight percent, or less, of respondents had come into contact with the six agencies, other than the police and the lower courts.

The contact that did occur mirrored a progression through the justice system:

- from contact with the police (32%);
- to the magistrate court, if a case was prosecuted (17%); and
- to the prisons, if a sentence resulted (8%).[19]

Table 28: Contact with the Law and Justice Sector Agencies

Agency	Yes (%)	No (%)	Don't Know of Them (%)
Police	32	65	3
Magistrates Court	17	79	4
Correctional Service	8	87	5
High Court	6	89	5
Public Prosecutor's Office	3	89	8
Public Solicitor's Office	3	88	8
Department of Justice and Attorney General	2	86	12
Ombudsman Commission	2	91	7
Average	**9**	**84**	**7**

Note: S.2.15-2.36. NCD weighted, *N*=165 930. Non-response=0%.

[18] The RPNGC budget increased from K125.4 million in 2005 to K150.7 million in 2006 (*Post-Courier*, 16 November 2005, p.6).

[19] This is not to imply that the respondents who had contact with the Correctional Service, for example, had been to jail – merely that they might have been associated with a matter that led to an imprisonment, or might have visited a prisoner in jail.

In those matters where people had something to do with the agencies, there were moderate levels of satisfaction with how their matter was handled. Table 29 shows that:

- satisfaction ranged from 35% to 75%; and
- a majority of people were satisfied with their contact with all agencies, except the Ombudsman Commission.[20]

Clearly, however, there were considerable levels of client dissatisfaction with all agencies.

Table 29: Satisfaction with Law and Justice Sector Agencies Handling of Own Matter

Agency	Matters (No.)	Satisfied (%)	Not Satisfied (%)
Public Prosecutor's Office	18	75	25
High Court	31	74	26
Public Solicitor's Office	22	69	31
Correctional Service	41	61	39
Magistrates Court	89	60	40
Police	195	57	43
Department of Justice and Attorney General	13	55	45
Ombudsman Commission	12	35	65
Average	**53**	**61**	**39**

Note: S.2.16-2.37. NCD weighted.

Are the Agencies Doing a Good Job over Crime and Corruption?

While Chapter 2 showed that crime was usually not thought to be increasing locally, crime was thought to be a major problem in Papua New Guinea, as a whole:

- a very high 79% of respondents thought that the crime problem in Papua New Guinea was large or very large (see Table 2); and

[20] In this case, we do not know whether people were dissatisfied because of the process of handling their matter, or because they disagreed with the Ombudsman Commission's finding.

- an even higher 83% of respondents in 2005 thought corruption was increasing, or the same, in Papua New Guinea, as a whole (see Table 3).

When asked what sort of job the Law & Justice Sector agencies were doing over corruption (see Table 30):

- there was an almost total lack of awareness about agency efforts over corruption. Column 4 indicates non-response levels averaging 91% for the agencies;
- among the nine percent of respondents who were aware, there was an average level of satisfaction of 54% (Column 6);
- the Public Prosecutor's Office, the High Court, the Ombudsman Commission, and the Public Solicitor's Office all had a majority of respondents who were satisfied with their action over corruption;
- the police, at 37%, had a lower percentage of respondents who were satisfied; and
- the lowest level of satisfaction was with the Department of Justice Attorney General, at 31%.

Table 30: Satisfaction with the Law and Justice Sector Agencies over Action on Corruption

Agency	Yes (%)	No (%)	Non-response (%)	Responses (No.)	Satisfaction where a Response (%)
Public Prosecutor's Office	2	1	97	17	77
High Court	4	1	95	32	74
Ombudsman Commission	1	1	98	12	62
Public Solicitor's Office	2	1	97	22	56
Magistrates Court	8	7	83	91	47
Correctional Service	4	2	92	41	47
Police	11	17	69	188	37
Department of Justice and Attorney General	1	2	98	13	31
Average	**4**	**4**	**91**	**52**	**54**

Note: S.2.17-2.38. NCD weighted, *N*=165 390. Columns 2-4 omit Don't Know.

What Are the Attitudes to the PNG Police and Policing Services?

Community attitudes to police and policing services, in particular, are an important aspect of community safety and crime prevention. How the community views the police and their work impacts directly on reporting rates and dispute resolution.

The 2005 survey results about the police were as negative as those in 2004. Comments from respondents in 2005 indicated that they had minimal faith in the ability of the police to respond, attend to, and follow through on reported crimes. The fact that people believed that many police are violent and not fair in their dealings enhanced the sense of mistrust within communities about them. Some of the issues that the public highlighted as contributing to their poor view of police included:

- unauthorised use of vehicles;
- slow or no response;
- intoxication;
- disrespectful encounters with the community;
- ill-discipline;
- favouring *wantoks;*
- violence;
- corruption; and
- involvement in crime.

Table 31: Opinion on Whether Police Do a Good Job, by Location

Location	Yes (%)	No (%)	Sometimes (%)	Don't Know (%)	Total (%)
East Boroko	38	20	36	7	**100**
Renbo	30	27	29	14	**100**
Nine Mile	29	48	14	10	**100**
Tokarara	29	44	22	5	**100**
Vabukori	28	45	23	4	**100**
Gordons Ridge/Erima	25	41	24	10	**100**
Town	24	38	27	11	**100**
Gerehu 2	20	56	20	5	**100**
Total 2005	**28**	**40**	**24**	**8**	**100**
Total 2004	**27**	**42**	**24**	**7**	**100**

Note: Q.6.6. Sites unweighted, *N*=617. Non-response=0%.

Table 31 shows that, in 2005:

- only 28% of people thought that the police were doing a good job in their area, while 40% did not; and
- the most positive responses were from people in East Boroko, and the least from people in Gerehu 2.

All of these results were similar to 2004.

In 2005, there were similar results to 2004, demonstrating a moderate degree of contact with the police:

- some 98% of respondents stated that they knew where the local police station was (Q.6.1);
- some 27% of respondents had been to their local police station in the past year (Q.6.2); and
- some 26% of respondents had had official contact with the police, with 57% of these as victims of crime (Q.6.3-4).

Of the 26 percent who had official contact with the police, 44 percent stated that it had improved their opinion of them. This was a decrease from 48 percent, in 2004 (see Table 32). Sixteen of the 23 comments volunteered on Q.6.5 were negative, especially about corruption. For example:

- *don't see them around here too often;*
- *can do better;*
- *when I want to go and lay a complaint, they charge me a fee first. If I don't pay them, they don't attend to my complaint;*
- *they expect to receive certain fees or bribes before they respond to complaints;*
- *they are bunch of corrupt people;*
- *they only tend to deal with the bigger crimes; and*
- *they are not protecting peoples' rights.*

Table 32: Improvement in Opinion from Contact with the Police

Improved Opinion	**2004 (%)**	**2005 (%)**
Yes	48	44
No	52	57
Total	**100**	**100**

Note: Q.6.5. NCD weighted *N*=42 528. Non-response=74%. The high non-response rate derives from respondents who had no formal contact with the police.

Other comments were more positive:

- *they do the best they can;*
- *recover stolen vehicles the same day;*
- *they do things to minimise crime in the community; and*
- *they drive around to check if there are any criminal activities going on.*

In a new question for 2005, at the request of the RPNGC, respondents were asked whether police discipline had improved in the past 12 months. Table 33 shows the largely negative opinion:

Table 33: Improvement in Police Discipline

Improved	**2005 (%)**
Yes	20
Sometimes	13
No	48
Don't Know	19
Total	**100**

Note: Q.7.7. NCD weighted, *N*=165 120. Non-response=1%.

- only 20% considered police discipline had improved, while a further 13% thought it had improved sometimes; and
- some 48% thought that police discipline had not improved.

Do the Police Participate in the Community?

Community policing is an important part of the RPNGC's policy, and the force also sought a new question in 2005 to monitor community perceptions of police participation. Table 34 shows that 31 percent of respondents thought it occurred at least sometimes in the NCD, while 64 percent did not think that it occurred.

Only 20 percent of people were able to provide examples of community-based policing in their area (Q.6.12).

Table 34: Police Participation in Community Consultations about Crime

Participate	**2005 (%)**
Yes	17
Sometimes	14
No	64
Don't know	5
Total	**100**

Note: Q.8.7. NCD weighted, *N*=165 542 Non-response=0%.

What about Other Types of Policing?

Respondents were asked if they could differentiate between regular and auxiliary police:

- some 44% of the people who took part in the survey were unable to tell the difference between regular and auxiliary police (compared to 49% in 2004) (Q.6.10);
- even so, 60% of those who responded preferred the regular police, and only 10% the auxiliaries, compared to 70% and 9% in 2004; and
- the percentage of respondents who preferred neither increased from 15% in 2004, to 23% in 2005 (Q.6.11).

People in the communities were critical of the heavy-handed violence that is often used by fully armed police. In reference to whether mobile squads make people feel any safer, in 2005, some 31 percent of people stated that mobile squads made them feel safer, while 64 percent stated that they did not (Q.6.13). These statistics were more negative than in 2004.

Is Crime Reported to the Police?

Only 15 percent of respondents stated that that they had called the police to their homes in the past 12 months (Q.7.1). In 2005, some 75 percent believed that police do not come as quickly as possible (Q.7.3), compared to 76% in 2004. These results were much the same as in 2004.

Table 35 shows that:

- in 2005, only 41% of people thought that the police respond to calls to homes within one hour. This was similar to the 39% in 2004.

Table 35: Perceived Police Response Times

Response Time	**2004 (%)**	**2005 (%)**
0 - 30 minutes	11	18
30 minutes - 1 hour	28	23
Over 1 hour	30	26
After 2 hours	20	19
Do not come at all	11	14
Total	**100**	**100**

Note: Q.7.2. NCD weighted *N*=161 559. Non-response=3%.

There was a three percent decrease in reporting the most troubling victimisation incidents to police, and a seven percent increase in the reporting of crime to other forms of authority:

- in 2005, some 33% of people reported their most troubling crime to the police, which is a decrease from 36% in 2004 (see Table 36); and
- in 2005, some 72% of people stated that they reported the crime to other forms of authority (such as relatives or councillors), compared to 65% in 2004 (Q.4.21).

Table 36: Reporting of the Most Troublesome Incident to the Police

Reported	**2004 (%)**	**2005 (%)**
Yes	36	33
No	64	67
Total	**100**	**100**

Note: Q.4.13. NCD weighted *N*=79 251. Non-response=53%. S.4 answers were conditional upon respondents having identified (in S.3) crimes experienced by them or other household members in the previous year. The high non-response rate derives mainly from respondents who gave nil responses to S.3.

Open-ended responses concerning the reasons for reporting crime were straightforward (Q.4.14). They were almost invariably requesting the return of property or punishment of the criminals, which one comment encapsulated:

- *because we wanted the criminals to be caught and punished and our properties returned.*

The reasons for not reporting crime were also straightforward:

- *because it was not a big problem;*
- *because they didn't want police to handle the case. The fight was the result of consumption of alcohol, and they can solve it in their own Melanesian way; and*
- *it was a waste of time because they knew that the police will not get the criminals.*

The decrease in the reporting rates and the increase in reporting to other forms of authority demonstrate the lack of confidence in the police. The reporting of crimes to other forms of authority contributes to the arguments for strengthening community-based crime prevention mechanisms.

Are the Police a Deterrent?

Although there were low reporting rates, respondents still believed that police could be a deterrent in the community. They believed that foot patrols and driving around

show that police are present in the community. The result were similar to 2004, in 2005:

- some 88% of respondents thought that having the police around in their community would stop people from committing crimes (Q.7.5).

Table 37 shows that a visible police presence was thought to be the key element in deterrence. Open-ended comments on Q.7.4 also frequently identified patrolling as a key role for the police.

Table 37: The Most Important Things Police Can Do in the Community

Actions	**2004 (%)**	**2005 (%)**
Walking around in groups	26	24
Driving around	21	23
Talking with people	17	19
Just being around	13	14
Cautioning young people	5	7
Attending meetings	4	7
All of these	10	4
They do nothing important in this regard	4	3
Total	**100**	**100**

Note: Q.7.4, multiple responses allowed. NCD weighted *N*=159 725, Responses=295 818.

The police were also mentioned as one of the options for community crime prevention and community safety. When asked, "Who do you think should be most responsible for community crime prevention and community safety" (Q.8.6), the answers were similar to those in 2004:

- the community (36%);
- individuals (24%); and
- police (21%).

Are the Police Thought to Be Criminals?

In 2004, the open-ended responses in the survey showed that there was a belief that police not only fail to meet community expectations for crime control and law enforcement, but also that they create crime. This, in turn, negatively affected community attitudes to police, and the propensity to cooperate with policing activities and policies.

In 2005, similar viewpoints emerged in the open-ended responses to indicate that many people in the community still believed that the police lacked discipline, practised nepotism, and sometimes took bribes. The comments following on from Table 31 reveal community perceptions that police corruption occurs. Other open-ended responses also showed that the community thought that the police sometimes did not attend to matters because their own relatives or family members were involved, or that they had some connection with the suspected criminals, which made it difficult to make arrests or follow up complaints. For example:

- *most times, they get drunk and run around in police vehicles while on duty;*
- *police living in this area don't do anything because they know the offenders well. That's why they kind of ignore them;*
- *their family members sometimes are involved in criminal activities;*
- *they themselves are the lawbreakers;*
- *we do not trust police because they are part and parcel of the crimes committed in the area;*
- *they practise the wantok system and receive bribes; and*
- *they beat young people without any good reason. They think that once they are in their uniforms they can do anything they want under the sun.*

Are the Police Thought to Respect the Community?

One aspect of respect for police is based on the manner in which they carry out their duties. Another aspect is how the police treat the public. In 2004, of the 24 percent of interviewees who thought that the police were doing a good job in their area, more than two-thirds did so because of service delivery rather than attitude. The results in 2005 were similar (see Table 38):

Table 38: Reasons Why Police Were Doing a Good Job

Reasons	**2004 (%)**	**2005 (%)**
They are responsive to crime in your area	36	51
They do things to maintain the safety of the community	36	29
They are fair in their dealings with the community	8	10
They treat the community with respect	7	5
Other	14	6
Total	**100**	**100**

Note: Q.6.7, multiple responses allowed. NCD weighted *N*=53 320, Responses=59 772.

- some 27% of respondents thought that the police in their area were doing a good job (Q.6.6);
- the main reason given by those people who thought so was responsiveness to crime (51%, which is a 15% increase over 2004); and

- only five percent thought that the police treated the community with respect.

Did the Australian Assisting Police Make a Difference?

During parts of 2004 and 2005, the Australian Assisting Police (AAP), under the Enhanced Cooperation Program, had a presence in Port Moresby. While they were here, did people think they made a difference? Their deployment was viewed favourably by most of the respondents, and open-ended comments depicted strong satisfaction with their work. They were viewed as community friendly, non-violent, and prompt, and correct in their behaviour and application of the law.

Table 39 shows that:

- awareness of the AAP was very high, with more than 99% of respondents having an opinion about them;
- some 77% of respondents considered that they did make a difference while they were here. Open-ended opinion was highly positive; and
- some 69% thought that their subsequent withdrawal also made a difference. Open-ended comments were heavily to the effect that policing reverted to its former patterns.

Table 39: Australian Assisting Police Presence

AAP Presence	Yes (%)	No (%)	Don't Know (%)	Total (%)
Did they make a difference?	77	10	13	**100**
After they left, was there a difference?	69	15	16	**100**

Note: Q.6.14, 6.15. NCD weighted, *N*=165 954. Non-response 1%.

When asked in an open-ended question what difference the AAP had made, there was a very high volume of opinion expressed (460 comments on Q.6.14). The opinion was overwhelmingly positive and, in effect, implies what the public would like to see this from the RPNGC.

One reason given for the AAP success was their effectiveness in reducing crime. Some 196 comments were made, the following being representative examples:

- *crime declined;*
- *noise and disturbances were kept at a low level;*
- *generally crime (such as theft) declined;*
- *stealing/snatching bags was kept at a minimum;*
- *women and girls were able to walk freely around without being intimidated;*
- *we females felt safe travelling on PMV buses;*
- *allowed people to do informal business;*
- *no harassment of street vendors;*
- *their presence was felt everywhere in Port Moresby, therefore the level of crime decreased;*

- *they were really doing a good job in minimising basic crimes by setting up roadblocks and doing foot patrols;*
- *because of their professionalism in carrying out their duties, I think the crime rate decreased a bit;*
- *the crime rate seemed to drop down a bit, as the criminals respected the Australian police because of their professional behaviour to conducting their duties, also their frequent patrols; and*
- *because they are a neutral body, they helped in reducing crime.*

Their professionalism and discipline were regarded as high. Some 62 comments were made about this:

- *they go by the book. Feeling of safety and trust in them;*
- *they were more professional and honest;*
- *they did their job in an orderly manner;*
- *they followed the laws and were very disciplined;*
- *bribery system finished;*
- *they treated suspects properly and professionally, unlike the PNG policemen who would bash subjects before establishing any evidence of crime;*
- *they treated everybody according to the law. They were honest and accurate in performing their duties. Crime activities decreased;*
- *rough tactics were not done;*
- *when criminals were caught, they were not beaten up or even shot dead. Instead, the criminals were given to the hands of the law. The area was peaceful; and*
- *they changed the perception about the police force and what it was about.*

A key factor in their effectiveness was seen to be a high visible presence. Some 56 comments were made about this. For example:

- *their presence was seen everywhere;*
- *they did regular patrols and kept the area safer from crime;*
- *they patrol this place at night; and*
- *foot patrolling helped control crime.*

When situations did occur, they were regarded as very responsive. Some 25 comments were made along these lines:

- *the Australian police were responsive to crime in our area;*
- *prompt response to the crime scene;*
- *attended to crime fast, and were very alert; and*
- *they were very responsive to crime and complaints.*

Some 12 comments were made about the AAP being helpful and respectful. For example:

- *they created community relations and treated the community with respect;*
- *they were helpful to ordinary citizens;*
- *they cooperated with the people around the area; and*
- *Australia's police were cooperating with youths.*

Twenty-six people commented that the AAP had a positive effect on the RPNGC:

- *they showed a good working example to our PNG police personnel;*
- *they showed a good example to local police on how to handle criminals;*
- *decreased police brutality;*
- *the crime level reduced, and PNG police worked hard; and*
- *our PNG police were better and prouder.*

Only six negative comments were made. For example:

- *the money could have been used to improve our police force;*
- *did not really make a difference;*
- *crime increased, as criminals were not given severe punishment; and*
- *they weren't here long enough.*

When asked in another open-ended question what difference the departure of the AAP made, again there was a very high volume of opinion expressed (371 comments, Q.6.15), overwhelmingly to the effect that policing reverted to its former patterns.

Crime was said to return to previous levels in 206 comments. For example:

- *level of crime increased again;*
- *resurgence of crime;*
- *huge jump in car jackings in Port Moresby;*
- *people drinking in public places, and crime rate seems to increase again;*
- *we no longer feel safe travelling on the bus;*
- *crime levels have increased dramatically, for example, my cousin, a policeman, was killed at Gordons;*
- *criminals have gone back to their ways and so crime has again become a problem;*
- *people trust the Aussies better than PNG police. People are now reluctant to report criminal activities, so statistics of crime rates have fallen as a result; and*
- *our trust and safety are gone with the Australian police.*

Part of the reason for crime increasing was 'less visible presence' according to 16 comments:

- *there's less police presence around here;*
- *police do not come around regularly;*
- *the PNG police personnel have gone back to being slack just as before, as there are no foot patrols; and*
- *when they left, no PNG police would come and check on us or the area to see if there were any unlawful activities going on.*

Some 95 comments focused on a decline in police professionalism. For example:

- *our police have become slack, and are late in performing their jobs;*
- *back to the slow reaction;*

- *the PNG police have returned to their undisciplined attitude towards people, especially street vendors;*
- *the PNG police went harsh on citizens again;*
- *the PNG police returned to their routine way of bashing people, even if they were innocent of committing crimes;*
- *the PNG police went ahead again in using force to deal with citizens, and were very abusive;*
- *communities are now fearful of the rogue PNG police;*
- *the PNG police abuse human rights and make the community unwilling to assist them;*
- *the PNG police went back to bashing up offenders;*
- *the people are now returning to their lawless behaviour before the arrival of the Aussie police;*
- *the PNG police went back to their old habits. Instead of charging people through proper procedures, they bash them up first or even shoot them;*
- *the PNG police were not responsive to crime in our area when we called them to come to a crime scene. They only performed their duty, if they received bribes; and.*
- *the PNG police started treating the community with disrespect by belting and destroying the goods that were sold by the street vendors. They also stole the goods from them. They don't follow their code of conduct.*

Only six comments were positive. For example:

- *the place continued to be quiet;*
- *most of our police have learned a lot from the Australian police and discipline; and*
- *some PNG police are trying to keep up the good efforts and examples set by the Aussie police, while others are not.*

The issue of community attitudes to police and policing services is a complex one. Forty percent of respondents indicated that they were not happy with the work of the police. The police were viewed as having low levels of respect for communities.

It is also important to point out that the community is aware of the resource constraints that the RPNGC faces. Two positives are the many people who stated that their visit to the nearest police station improved their image of the police, and the recognition that there are good police at work. The positive comments about the presence of the AAP reflected the communities' idea of how police should carry out their duties, but there is clearly a long way to go.

APPENDIX A

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Rationale and Background

As part of the development of the Law & Justice Sector Performance Monitoring Framework, the Government of Papua New Guinea has identified, as a priority, the reduction of crime in urban areas, beginning with Port Moresby. To be able to monitor and measure whether such a reduction is occurring, it is necessary to develop and implement a community crime survey in those urban areas to provide crucial data that counter-balance reported crime rates, and provide a fuller and more reliable picture of crime levels in the community.

This information is also essential for the purposes of monitoring the effectiveness of the RPNGC and other sector agencies in addressing crime. An ongoing and broad-based survey will provide information on trends, over time, so that progress (or regress) in addressing law and justice issues can be measured and responded to effectively. The surveys will be implemented in Port Moresby, Bougainville, Lae, and Mt. Hagen.

Purpose

The primary objectives of the Community Crime Surveys are to:

- provide information on the levels, extent, and types of crime in Papua New Guinea, in order to provide a balance to reported crime data, enable the sector to ascertain trends in crime levels, and provide a measure of the actual environment in Papua New Guinea that can inform programs and strategies to counter crime; and
- capture community perceptions of the police and other agencies, and monitor changes in perceptions, over time. This should extend more broadly than the perceptions held by victims of crime, in recognition of the many other forms of experience that everyday people have with the police.

The JAG will provide quality assurance and overall oversight, as well as ensuring that this work is closely coordinated with the Papua New Guinea Government's Law & Justice Sector Strategic Framework, and other stakeholders in Papua New Guinea, including the NCM, LJSWG, all Law & Justice Sector agencies, and other relevant bodies, such as the NCDC and community groups.

APPENDIX B

PERSONNEL

Research Team

All members of the research team are listed in alphabetical order in their respective groups.

Principal Researchers

- Dr. Gerard Guthrie (Principal Consultant, Educo Pty Ltd, formerly Foundation Professor of Education, University of Goroka) designed the survey, refined the survey instrument, provided training and quality assurance on the field work in NCD, oversighted data entry in Canberra, reported on the survey results, and provided oversight and coordination.
- Ms. Fiona Hukula (Senior Research Officer, NRI) advised on field work in Port Moresby, and reported on the survey results.
- Lt. Col. James Laki (Senior Research Fellow, NRI) managed the data collection and reported on the survey results.

Data Collectors

- Mr. Luii Koeba (Field Superviser), Mr. Eddie Akipe, Mr. Ware Aulakua, Ms. Enid Barlong, Ms. Diana Chung, Ms. Joyce Ding, Mr. Peter Ghandhii, Mr. Michael Gigmai, Mr. Samson Goiye, Ms. Lonnie Hames, Ms. Fiona Harepa, Ms. Jennifer Henao, Mr. Mari Jack, Mr. Robert Homi, Mr. Herman Malir, Ms. Vivien Toaniso, Ms. Sharon Wasma.

Data Processing

- Ms. Barbara Davis, Managing Director, Barbara Davis & Associates, Canberra.
- Ms. Kani Kikman, NRI.
- Ms. Julia Zelenska, Statistician, Barbara Davis & Associates, Canberra.

Peer Review

- Mr. Rohan Downing QC, Project Director, JAG.
- Ms. Anastasia Mason, Project Manager, JAG.
- Mr. Steven Miller, Monitoring & Evaluation Adviser, JAG.

AusAID

- Ms. Joanne Choe, Second Secretary (Governance), Australian High Commission, Port Moresby.
- Mr. Romias Waki, Project Officer, Australian High Commission, Port Moresby.

APPENDIX C

COMMUNITY CRIME SURVEY METHODOLOGY, NATIONAL CAPITAL DISTRICT, 2005

The Government of Papua New Guinea's Law & Justice Sector Strategic Framework Strategy 1.3.1 is 'to improve urban safety, especially in Port Moresby'. To measure whether a reduction is occurring, it was necessary to implement a periodic community crime survey. Community perceptions of data are intended to supplement official statistics and provide a fuller, more reliable picture of crime levels, and responses to them in the community.

The first of the surveys was conducted in Port Moresby in September-October 2004, to provide baseline data. The 2005 survey replicates that one, twelve months later, to provide trend data. This Appendix outlines the methodology, and highlights any differences from 2004.[21]

Responsibilities to support monitoring and evaluation of sector performance are held by the Papua New Guinea Justice Advisory Group (JAG). AusAID has contracted Educo Pty Ltd, Canberra, to manage the JAG, which was tasked by AusAID to provide technical oversight, management, and quality assurance on the survey. The JAG has continued to partner the Papua New Guinea National Research Institute (NRI), which conducts the field work and shares the write-up.

Consultation

Following extensive peer review and quality assurance on the design in 2004, consultation on the 2005 studies was held with the Law & Justice Sector Working Group (LJSWG) and the National Coordinating Mechanism (NCM), in July and August 2005. They sought to widen the coverage of the surveys to include information on agencies other than the Royal Papua New Guinea Constabulary, which was the main focus of the 2004 surveys in Port Moresby and Bougainville.

It was agreed to conduct trend surveys in Port Moresby, Arawa, and Buka in September-October 2005, and baseline surveys in Lae, in November 2005, and Mt. Hagen, in early 2006. This surveys were complemented by a business survey in April-June 2005, mainly in Port Moresby, and a study of the impact of crime on the Highlands Highway, in November 2005. All of the surveys are reported separately. While they do not provide a full national picture of crime, they are increasingly giving wider coverage.

Objectives

The primary objectives of the Community Crime Surveys (Appendix A) are:

---

[21] Fuller background on methodology is in the 2004 report: Findlay, M., Guthrie, G., Hukula, F. and Laki, J., 2005. **Port Moresby Community Crime Survey, 2004.** *NRI Special Publication No.36,* Port Moresby: National Research Institute. pp.59-82.

- provide information on the levels, extent, and types of crime in Papua New Guinea, in order to provide a balance to reported crime data, enable the sector to ascertain trends in crime levels, and provide a measure of the actual environment in Papua New Guinea that can inform programs and strategies to counter crime; and
- capture community perceptions of the police and other agencies, and monitor changes in perceptions, over time. This should extend more broadly than the perceptions held by victims of crime, in recognition of the many other forms of experience that everyday people have with the police.

Instrumentation

The methodology in 2005 remained primarily quantitative, based on a sample survey, using a structured questionnaire. The survey instrument in 2004 was quite satisfactory. For 2005, it was broadened to include Questions 2.15-2.38, which provide coverage of all key sector agencies, as well as Q.6.14-6.15 on the presence of the Australian Assisting Police, Q.7.7 on police discipline, and Q.8.7 on community consultation by the police. Appendix D contains the English Questionnaire.

Survey Design

In 2005, follow-up occurred in the same household sites as 2004. The 2005 survey sample size was 619 people, aged 15 years and over, in 284 households, compared to 1 003 in 354 households, in 2004.

Target Population

The total population of the NCD was 254 158 at the 2000 Census (see Table C1). The population of the NCD, at mid-2005, is estimated at 303 321, by projecting the 2000 population forward five years, at 3.6 percent per annum, which is the average annual growth rate from the previous most reliable census in 1980. The target population was people aged 15 years and over. The 15+ population, at mid-year 2005, is estimated at 198 069. This was derived by reducing the total estimated population to 65.3 percent, which was the percentage of persons aged 15+ in the 2000 Census.[22]

Table C1: Estimated Size of Target Population in the NCD, 2005

Population, 1980	**Population, 2000**	**Growth Rate 1980-2000**	**Population 2005** (est.)	**Population 15+ 2004** (est.)	**Mean Age of Population 15+, 2000**
123 624	254 158	3.6%	303 321	198 069	$31.0^{+}/_{-}12.1$

Note: Columns 1-3 from National Statistical Office, 2002. **Papua New Guinea 2000 Census: Final Figures**. Port Moresby, p.9.

[22] National Statistical Office, 2002. **Papua New Guinea 2000 Census: 2000 Census Basic Tables, Provincial Level, National Capital District**. Port Moresby, pp.1-3.

Sample Size

The 2004 sample used a conservative 99 percent probability level to take a larger sample than the less stringent 95 percent, which is conventional in social science research. The minimum sample size required for the NCD, based on a 99 percent probability of achieving a sample age mean less than one year above or below the mean age of the population aged 15 and above in 2000, is 967.[23] To further increase the numbers for cross-analysis, the 2004 target was set at 1000 (125 persons for each of the eight areas sampled). The actual sample of 1 003 gave a sample fraction of 0.52 percent.

The outcome for 2004 was highly reliable for the type of sociological analysis in the survey report. The sample size was statistically acceptable for the purposes of aggregating data, to give generalisations about the population of the NCD as a whole, as well as for site-level analysis. Making generalisations was consistent with the information needs of high-level decision makers in the Law & Justice Sector, while site data could be useful for police planning. The 2005 sample maintained this approach to reporting.

Because the sample proved larger than necessary in 2004, the 2005 sample was reduced to one acceptable at a 95 percent level of probability (equivalent to a .05 level of confidence). The required minimum sample size was now 562. Interviewing aimed to overshoot this slightly by conducting 75 interviews in each of the eight sample sites; that is, 600 interviews altogether. In the outcome, the sample of 619 that were collected gave a sample fraction of 0.31 percent of the target population. The effects of a smaller sample included reduced data collection costs and increased financial sustainability for the survey.

In both 2004 and 2005, the sample sizes would have been limiting had detailed criminological analysis been undertaken, by disaggregating data to cell size for demographic cross-analysis. The potential for cross-analysis of household and demographic variables was limited in instances where small cell sizes gave high standard errors of the mean.

To achieve reliable criminological results, considerably larger samples would be required, but there has been no requirement from the sector for such analysis.[24] Longitudinal analysis would be possible (although not undertaken in this report), by comparing data on the 68 percent of the 2004 households, where interviews also occurred in 2005.

Sample Sites

---

[23] Sarantakos, S., 1998. **Social Research** . (2nd ed.), Melbourne: Macmillan, pp.160-161.

[24] If criminological analysis is sought, household data from consecutive years can be analysed to provide a longitudinal picture of crime victimisation in the sample households, the same ones being targeted from year to year. The 2004 data have been published as Davis, B., Findlay, M., Guthrie, G., Hukula, F., Laki, J. and Zelenska, J., 2005. **Community Crime Survey Data CD-ROM, Port Moresby and Bougainville, 2004**. Port Moresby: NRI. The 2005 data will also be made available on CD-ROM for bona fide professionals.

The survey used exactly the same sampling as in 2004, including targeting the same households. The aim was to maximise control of sampling variables to ensure that the 2005 trend data reliably built on the 2004 baseline data. The first stage of sampling used the following eight sample sites:

1. *One high security area* (that is, with houses and compounds typically surrounded by walls, barbed wire, and often with high technology alarm systems and access to security guards or firms). This Town site circled Touaguba Hill.[25]
2. *One-more affluent suburb from a medium security area,* (that is,. where wire fences surround blocks, and houses usually have low technology defences such as bars). The site was Renbo Estate, next to Gerehu.
3. *One less-affluent suburb in a medium security area*. Gerehu Stage 2 was selected, but had some more affluent housing as well.
4. *One sanctioned settlement* (that is, where the government allocated blocks of land and provided basic water, electricity, and road services, but left construction of permanent material houses to owners, usually to standard housing plans). The site was part of the suburb of Tokarara, near Waigani, which did have medium security housing as well.
5. *One unsanctioned settlement* (that is, where uncontrolled occupation of land has occurred in low security areas, which often have similar physical characteristics to rural villages). The site was the East Boroko Settlement.
6. *One low security area containing both sanctioned and unsanctioned housing.* The site comprised Gordons Ridge and Erima Settlements in the area roughly between Parliament House and Six Mile.
7. *One semi-rural area* mainly comprising a low security sanctioned settlement and an unsanctioned village-like settlement centred on Nine Mile.
8. *One traditional village*, largely unfenced, being Vabukori.

The second stage of sampling in each of the sites was a random selection of 10 clusters, each containing five households. The same age and gender interview quota principles that were used in 2004 were applied to each site in 2005. The cohorts were males and females aged 15-24 (young adults), 25-34 (adults), and 35+ (older adults). The 15+ group age and gender numbers and percentages from the 2000 Census in the NCD are given in Table C2. These were used to allocate age and gender quotas (*n*) to the sample numbers required from each of the eight sites.

Table C2: NCD Population, by Age and Gender, 2000 Census

Gender	**Age 15-24**			**Age 25-34**			**Age 35+**			**Total**		
	N	*%*	*n*	*N*	*%*	*n*	*N*	*%*	*n*	*N*	*%*	*n*
Males	31 489	19.0	14	27 458	16.5	13	33 599	20.2	15	92 546	55.8	42
Females	27 315	16.5	12	22 832	13.8	10	23 237	14.0	11	73 384	44.2	33
Total	**58 804**	**35.5**	**26**	**50 290**	**30.3**	**23**	**56 836**	**34.2**	**26**	**165 930**	**100.0**	**75**

[25] See maps in the *PNG Telephone Directory White Pages, 2005*, pp. 31-42.

Note: National Statistical Office, 2002. **Papua New Guinea 2000 Census: 2000 Census Basic Tables, Provincial Level, National Capital District**. Port Moresby, pp.1-3.

The one area where sampling had difficulties in 2004 was the high socioeconomic residential enclave surrounding Touaguba Hill, adjacent to the centre of Port Moresby city, where smaller than desired interview numbers were achieved. The smaller sample size in 2005 largely overcame this problem.

Sample Reliability

National Capital District Level

At the NCD aggregate level, the sample was statistically representative in size, age means and standard deviations, gender, and marital status, but overrepresented the tertiary educated.

Sample Size and Age

A total sample of 619 was achieved, which was large enough to reach an acceptable 95.8 percent probability of achieving a sample age mean less than one year above or below the mean age of the population aged 15 and above, in 2000. The NCD 15+ age mean and standard deviation in 2000 was $31.0^{+}/_{-}12.1$ years, and in the outcome, the total 2005 NCD sample achieved nearly identical results at $31.2^{+}/_{-}12.3$ (marginally higher than the $31.0^{+}/_{-}12.1$ in 2004), and was not statistically different from the NCD as a whole (*t=.36, df=616, p=.72)*. The standard error of the sample mean in 2005 was 0.49, compared to 0.38 in 2004.

Gender

Females comprised 44.8 percent of the population of 165 930 people, aged 15+ in the NCD, in the 2000 Census. The proportion in the sample was 46.0% (compared to 45.4 percent in 2004), or 285 out of 619 respondents. Table C3 shows the gender results, by age quota. As in 2004, differences between the sample (observed frequency) and estimates derived from the 2000 Census (expected frequency) were not statistically significant (X^2*=.99, df=5, p=.98);* that is, the total sample was statistically representative of the NCD age and gender cohorts.

Table C3: NCD Sample, by Age and Gender

Data Source	Males 15-24	Males 25-34	Males 35+	Females 15-24	Females 25-34	Females 35+	Total
Survey 2005	115	102	115	105	85	95	**617**
Census 2000	114	104	123	104	84	89	**617**

Marital Status

Married people comprised 59.8 percent of the population aged 15+ in the 2000 Census (55.1% for males, 65.5% for females). The proportion in the sample was 56.3 percent (lower than the 60.1% in 2004), or 347 out of 616 respondents, that being 49.8 percent for males and 63.9 percent for females. As in 2004, the difference between the

sample and the 2000 Census was not statistically significant ($X^2=1.90$, $df=1$, $p=.20$); that is, the total sample was statistically representative of marital status in the NCD.

Education

The proportion of people aged 15+ in the 2000 Census who had technical or university-level educational qualifications, was 16.1 percent. The proportion in the sample was 21.6 percent, or 133 out of 617 respondents. The difference was highly significant statistically ($X^2=77.45$, $df=1$, $p=.0001$); that is, the total sample had statistically more tertiary educated people compared to the NCD as a whole. In 2004, some 17.3 percent of the sample were tertiary educated, which was not statistically different.

Two possibilities arise from the 2005 findings. On the one hand, there may be issues of validity with the 2000 Census data; that is, the number of tertiary educated people in the NCD could be increasing so that the sample frame provided by the census is becoming outdated in this respect (anecdotal evidence supports this proposition). In addition, there may be survey reliability issues, for example, interviewer bias, where the interviewers, who were mainly tertiary educated, were perhaps more likely to identify tertiary educated respondents as part of their quotas, or correspondingly, tertiary educated residents may be more prone to respond to surveys.

Sample Site Level

Second stage sampling was within the eight sample sites. Each contained from one to 15 Census Units (the smallest areas in which data were collected in 2000), making 49 in total.[26] The reliability of sampling for each site was calculated by comparing the data from its Census Units to the survey sample results.

As in 2004, age means and standard deviations, gender, and marital status matched the 2000 Census at all sites, with the exception of Town (where the sample had a lower age mean than the census). Whereas in 2004, three sites were not statistically representative of education levels, in 2005, five sites overrepresented the technical and university educated. Generalisations based on age in the Town area, and education in Town, Renbo, Gerehu 2, Nine Mile, and Vabukori need to be qualified in data interpretation.

Age

As in 2004, all sites, except Town, had age means and standard deviations (see Table C4) that were statistically acceptable, at a 95 percent level of probability.[27] In Town, the sample size was adequate and there was no significant difference in the age/gender cohorts (following). However, the mean age of the 2005 sample was lower by some 4.7 years, than the 2000 Census mean (35.9 years compared to the 2005

---

[26] National Statistical Office, 2002. **Papua New Guinea 2000 Census: 2000 Community Profile System CD-ROM.** Port Moresby.

[27] Town $t=2.99$, $df=70$, $p=.004$; Renbo $t=.52$, $df=72$ $p=.60$; Gerehu $t=.61$, $df=76$, $p=.54$; *Tokarara* $t=1.31$, $df=78$, $p=.19$; East Boroko $t=1.37$, $df=75$, $p=.18$; Gordons Ridge/Erima $t=.89$, $df=78$, $p=.37$; Nine Mile $t=1.13$, $df=83$, $p=.26$; Vabukori $t=.31$, $df=77$, $p=.76$.

sample of 31.2, and the 2004 sample of 29.8). The apparent explanation remains that the difficulty of finding working people at home meant that interviews tended to be conducted among a younger group staying in the house.

Table C4: Site Sample Age Means and Standard Deviations, Aged 15 Plus

Location	Census Units 2000	Sample 2005
Town	35.9^{+}/.11.8	31.2^{+}/.13.2
Renbo	31.0^{+}/.11.0	31.7^{+}/.11.0
Gerehu 2	31.7^{+}/.12.0	32.7^{+}/.14.6
Tokarara	31.3^{+}/.11.8	29.7^{+}/.10.8
East Boroko	31.6^{+}/.10.9	29.8^{+}/.11.4
Gordons Ridge/Erima	31.4^{+}/.10.8	30.3^{+}/.11.3
Nine Mile	29.4^{+}/.11.0	30.8^{+}/.11.4
Vabukori	33.8^{+}/.13.0	33.3^{+}/.13.9
Total	**31.0^{+}/.12.1**	**31.2^{+}/.12.3**

Gender

For all the sites, the age/gender cohort samples were not significantly different compared to the quota based on NCD-level data (see Table C5).[28] This was the same result as in 2004.

Table C5: Site Interviews, by Age and Gender, 2005

Location	Males 15-24	Males 25-34	Males 35+	Females 15-24	Females 25-34	Females 35+	Total
Quota	***14***	***13***	***15***	***12***	***10***	***11***	***75***
Town	13	12	10	12	10	14	71
Renbo	11	11	15	14	12	10	73
Gerehu 2	14	13	13	13	10	14	77
Tokarara	18	12	15	12	11	11	79

[28] Town $X^2=2.63$, $df=5$, $p=.80$; Renbo $X^2=1.77$, $df=5$, $p=.90$; Gerehu $X^2=1.17$, $df=5$, $p=.95$; Tokarara $X^2=1.32$, $df=5$, $p=.95$; East Boroko $X^2=.42$, $df=5$, $p=.99$; Gordons Ridge/Erima $X^2=.84$, $df=5$, $p=.98$; Nine Mile $X^2=1.48$, $df=5$, $p=.95$; Vabukori $X^2=.62$, $df=5$, $p=.99$.

Table C5 continued

Location	Males 15-24	Males 25-34	Males 35+	Females 15-24	Females 25-34	Females 35+	Total
East Boroko	14	14	14	13	9	12	76
Gordons Ridge/Erima	14	13	15	15	10	12	79
Nine Mile	16	14	17	15	11	11	84
Vabukori	15	13	16	11	12	11	78
Total Sample	**115**	**102**	**115**	**105**	**85**	**97**	**617**
Total Census	**31 489**	**27 458**	**33 599**	**27 315**	**22 832**	**23 237**	**165 930**

Marital Status

Married people comprised 59.8 percent of the population aged 15+ in the 2000 Census. Table C6 shows that the differences between the number of married and unmarried people between the sample sites and the 2000 Census were not statistically significant, which was the same result as in 2004.[29]

Table C6: Site Interviews, by Marital Status, Aged 15 Plus

Location	Census Number Married	Census Married *(%)*	Sample Number Married	Sample Married *(%)*
Town	1 439	55.0	36	50.7
Renbo	1 100	55.6	39	53.4
Gerehu 2	1 617	54.0	39	50.6
Tokarara	1 093	56.3	42	53.8
East Boroko	876	67.0	46	60.5
Gordons Ridge/ Erima	3 498	63.9	50	63.3
Nine Mile	5 434	64.6	51	60.7
Vabukori	1 055	55.1	44	56.4
Total	**99 226**	**59.8**	**347**	**56.3**

Education

[29] Town $X^2=.53$, $df=1$, $p=.50$; Renbo $X^2=.00$, $df=1$, $p=.99$; Gerehu $X^2=.35$, $df=1$, $p=.70$; Tokarara $X^2=.19$, $df=1$, $p=.70$; East Boroko $X^2=1.43$, $df=1$, $p=.30$; Gordons Ridge/Erima $X^2=.01$, $df=1$, $p=.95$; Nine Mile $X^2=.57$, $df=1$, $p=.50$; Vabukori $X^2=.05$, $df=1$, $p=.90$.

The proportion of people aged 15+ in the 2000 Census, who had technical or university level educational qualifications, was 16.1 percent. The proportions in the site samples are shown in Table C7. The differences between the number of people with tertiary education, and those without, between the eight samples and the 2000 Census were statistically significant in five cases; that is, the individual samples in Town, Renbo, Gerehu 2, Nine Mile, and Vabukori were not statistically representative on the basis of the 2000 Census educational level for each site (in 2004, three of the eight sites, including Nine Mile and Vabukori, were statistically different). As in 2004, the sites had a higher percentage of interviewees with tertiary education than would be expected.[30]

Table C7: Site Interviews, by Tertiary Education Qualifications, Aged 15 Plus

Location	**Census Number Tert. Educ.**	**Census Tert. Educ. *(%)***	**Sample Number Tert. Educ.**	**Sample Tert. Educ. *(%)***
Town	667	25.5	27	38.0
Renbo	522	26.4	32	43.8
Gerehu 2	605	20.2	27	35.1
Tokarara	318	16.4	14	17.7
East Boroko	44	3.4	2	2.6
Gordons Ridge/Erima	492	8.5	11	8.2
Nine Mile	606	7.2	11	15.7
Vabukori	115	6.0	9	11.9
Total	**26 715**	**16.1**	**133**	**21.6**

Gender Issues

While in many households in 2004 and 2005 there were frank reports on sexual assault and domestic violence, the indication was that reporting was below the level of actual victimisation. Occupancy rates in the areas surveyed were high and constant, so that it remains difficult to separate interviewees from the influence and observation of other household members.

The structure of domestic authority could reduce the independence of the interview because the influence of the dominant male or female in the family structure may have

[30] Town $X^2=5.87$, $df=1$, $p=.02$; Renbo $X^2=11.36$, $df=1$, $p=.001$; Gerehu $X^2=10.45$, $df=1$, $p=.01$; Tokarara $X^2=.09$, $df=1$, $p=.80$; East Boroko $X^2=.14$, $df=1$, $p=.80$; Gordons Ridge/Erima $X^2=3.02$, $df=1$, $p=.10$; Nine Mile $X^2=4.49$, $df=1$, $p=.05$; Vabukori $X^2=4.19$, $df=1$, $p=.05$.

limited candid responses. Open communication between respondents and interviewers may also have been difficult when the victims and the perpetrators were members of the same households, and perhaps nearby during the interview. In both years, the interviewers considered underreporting to be the case, but no approximation of its level is possible.

These problems are grounded in the methodology. Questionnaire surveys which are based on short, closed-response questions are appropriate for the surveys' prime purpose of providing quantitative information to decision makers about trends in crime victimisation. The methodological problem is magnified by field work constraints.

However, these surveys are not intended to obtain the type of in-depth qualitative information that is necessary to give a more valid understanding of sexual assault and domestic violence which is relevant to service organisations and social workers. The solution to their need for deeper understanding is additional research using qualitative methodologies. However, the household surveys do, at least, give an indication of the minimum levels of sexual assault and domestic violence.

To reduce the effect of age and gender bias in non-responses, interviewers were given sample quotas in six age and gender cohorts. One factor that may have contributed to the reporting problem in 2004 is that some interviewers did not adhere to same-gender interviews in the early stages of data collection. In 2005, same-gender interviews were used consistently throughout the whole survey.

Field Work

Data collection had a high level of continuity with 2004. NRI contracted 16 well-qualified and experienced data collectors, eight of whom had been field workers in the 2004 survey. Another of the 2004 personnel was used as the field supervisor in 2005, oversighted by the 2004 survey manager and field supervisor. Eight data collectors were males, eight were females. Their mean age was 27.8, with an age range of 23 to 39. Thirteen had undergraduate degrees. All but two had previous data collection experience. All were fluent in English and Tok Pisin, and additionally, four spoke Motu. The same field and quality assurance procedures were used, as in 2004.

The field supervisor reported that, on three occasions, there were complaints from interviewees that they had not received feedback from 2004, and in one case, this resulted in a household refusal.

No security issues were reported in 2005, compared to two minor ones in 2004. Nonetheless, a major concern remained the safety of the data collectors, and decisions on field work were informed by a duty of care to the data collectors. Radios were actively used by the field workers, and this allowed more efficient field management, as well as a greater sense of security. The 2004 Safety Management Plan was updated and used as guidance by survey personnel.[31]

Data Analysis and Population Weighting

[31] See the 2004 Report, Appendices C & E.

As in 2004, data in this report parallel the two sampling stages:

- *NCD Population Estimates:* To provide estimates for the NCD as a whole, the questionnaire responses were weighted to cancel out the effects of taking disproportionate samples; and
- *Sample Site Results:* Data relating to individual sites are presented without weighting, because each sample was statistically representative of the site on age (except Town), gender, and marital status.

Data coding and statistical analysis were undertaken by Barbara Davis & Associates (BDA), in Canberra. Given the high level of statistical acceptability for the demographic variables in the combined sample, no compensatory weighting was needed on those variables.
Weighting was undertaken on each site's responses to questions in order to provide aggregate estimates for the 15+ population of the NCD at the 2000 Census (that is, 165 930; see Table C1).

Weighting of the raw data was by a coefficient derived from the site as a percentage of the total population of the sites (Sample Fraction Stage 1, Column 3, Table C8; that is, the expected percentage), and the site sample as a percentage of the total sample (Sample Fraction Stage 2, Column 5; that is, the observed percentage), multiplied by a total NCD population coefficient (Rows 10 and 11, total NCD/total sample).

Wherever NCD totals are reported, they are weighted totals except in comparisons with unweighted site totals.

During data analysis, household crime victimisation reports were aggregated at two levels to allow analysis by individual household (for example, to examine domestic violence more closely), and by area (to give overall crime statistics for the long-term analysis of trends):

1. *Individual Households:* The victimisation statistic is the mean of the number of any particular type of crime reported by individuals within that household, for that household. The assumption is that the averaging of multiple responses will be more reliable than a single report from one individual, where the accuracy of individual memory is more of an issue; and
2. *Sample Sites:* Means for the affected households were calculated by adding all crime reports, and dividing by the number of individuals reporting them. Thus, the data are reported in the form: "In Area A, B percent of C households did not report that their household was a victim of Crime D. Of the remaining E households, the mean number of times that crime was reported was F per household".

   This allows identification of both the level of non-occurrence of crime, and the frequency that it occurs in affected households, which provides more detail than averaging crime rates over affected and unaffected households.

Table C8: Sample Fractions and Weighting

Location	Census Unit Population	Sample Fraction Stage 1	Sample Number	Sample Fraction Stage 2	Coefficient	Aggregate Coefficient
Town	2 616	9.71%	72	11.63%	0.83	223.69
Renbo	1 978	7.34%	74	11.95%	0.61	164.57
Gerehu 2	2 994	11.11%	77	12.44%	0.89	239.39
Tokarara	1 942	7.21%	79	12.76%	0.56	151.35
East Boroko	1 307	4.85%	76	12.28%	0.39	105.88
Gordons Ridge/Erima	5 787	21.47%	79	12.76%	1.68	451.00
Nine Mile	8 412	31.21%	84	13.57%	2.30	616.55
Vabukori	1 915	7.11%	78	12.60%	0.56	151.16
Total Sample	**26 951**	**-**	**619**	**-**	**-**	**-**
Total NCD	**165 930**	**-**	**-**		**268.1**	**-**

Timing

The 2005 survey was conducted according to the following timetable (see Table C9).

Table C9: 2005 Survey Timeline

Task	Responsibility	Completed
Survey approval	NCM	23 August 2005
Revise instrumentation	JAG, NRI, LJSWG	3 September
Conduct training	NRI, JAG	7-9 September
Conduct pilot and commence field work	NRI, JAG	10-11 September
Conduct field work	NRI	31 October
Preliminary data analysis	BDA, JAG	8 December
Report submission	JAG, NRI	24 February 2006
Report acceptance	AusAID	24 March

APPENDIX D

ENGLISH QUESTIONNAIRE

PNG Community Crime Survey - 2005

Respondent No. (coders to insert)	
Interviewer Name	
Location	
Household ID No.	
Date	
Checked by Partner (name/date)	

For supervisor/office use only		
Name of Supervisor:		Date checked:
Selected for call-back:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Date of call-back:

Introduction
(The interviewer can shorten this or simplify it if it is appropriate in any particular interview)

(To the person who meets you when you visit the household)
Hello. My name is_____. I am working for the National Research Institute. We are conducting a survey about attitudes to crime and to the police. We need peoples' views on crime and safety in your area to inform Government about crime in your area. We have picked some houses to survey by drawing them from a hat (*In Port Moresby and Bougainville):* This interview repeats interviews we did last year to see if things have changed since then). Is it okay to conduct an interview in your house? To get an overall view we want to speak separately to all persons in each house who are 15 years old or more. Here, we would like to speak to _____.
(describe person as per quota provided) who lives here with you. Are they home? *(If not, ask for someone else who might be of another sex or age).*

(To the respondent)
Hello. I am _____ from the National Research Institute. I would like to ask you a few questions about your views about crime and policing. The survey will take about 30-40 minutes. Your answers will be confidential. This is a chance to inform Government about crime in your area. No-one outside the survey team will have access to your personal information. Please answer as honestly and accurately as you can. If you are uncomfortable with any question, then don't answer.

Time interview commenced: ☐

★**NOTES TO INTERVIEWERS:** ***Numbers for coding are in bold. Use the form that is in the same language (English or Tok Pisin) as the interview.***

Section 1 – Screening Questions and Demographics of the Household

1.1 Do you or anyone in your house, work for the police, the courts, or the prison service?

☐ **1** Yes ☐ **2** No ***(If yes, politely discontinue the interview)***

1.2 Where is your home place? _____

(Interviewer circle number if respondent is an expatriate):

☐ **1** Expatriate

1.3 How long have you lived in this house? _____

1.4 Does the household:

☐ **1** Own

☐ **2** Rent

☐ **3** Other

Specify other: _____

1.5 Does anyone in the household own a:

☐ **1** Car

☐ **2** Truck

☐ **3** Motorbike

☐ **4** Bicycle

☐ **5** Boat, or

☐ **6** None of the above

1.6 How many people usually live in your house? Children under 15(___) Adults 15 and over(___)

1.7 Is the house connected to electricity?

☐ **1** Yes ☐ **2** No

1.8 Do you have a telephone or mobile phone in the house?

1	Yes	**2**	No

1.9 ***(Don't ask this or the next two questions if the answer is obvious to you)***
Is the house connected to a permanent water supply?

1	Yes	**2**	No

1.10 Do you have a toilet connected to the sewer?

1	Yes	**2**	No

1.11 Is this house?

1	Walled
2	Fenced
3	Unfenced

Section 2 – General Thinking/Beliefs about Crime

Interviewer to read out: I would like to ask you some questions about your opinion of crime in this area.

2.1 Do you think the level of crime in your area has changed in the past 12 months **(*In Port Moresby and Bougainville*:** since the last survey 12 months ago)?

1	More
2	Less
3	Stayed the same, or
4	Don't know *(If Stayed the same, or Don't know, go to Q.2.5)*

2.2 If it has changed, then why? *(Don't read out the alternatives*)

1	**2**	The police are doing a good/bad job
3	**4**	The courts are doing a good/bad job
5	**6**	The prisons are doing a good/bad job
7	**8**	The community is doing a good/bad job
9	**10**	The raskols are getting better/worse, and/or
11		Other (specify)_____

2.3 Do you think violent crime against people *(killing, robbery, rape, assault – give examples)* in your area has changed in the past 12 months?

1	More
2	Less
3	Stayed the same, or
4	Don't know

2.4 Do you think property crime (house-breaking, stealing) in your area has changed in the <u>past 12 months</u>?

1	More
2	Less
3	Stayed the same, or
4	Don't know

2.5 Do you think corruption in PNG is:

1	Increasing
2	Decreasing
3	Staying the same, or
4	Don't know

2.6 *(Blank)*

2.7 *(Blank)*

2.8 *(Blank)*

2.9 What crime <u>happens most</u> in your area? ***(Read out the alternatives)***

1	Stealing
2	Assault
3	Robbery (stealing with violence)
4	Sexual assault
5	Violence outside the home
6	Domestic violence
7	Alcohol or drug-related crime
8	Trespassing, or
9	Don't know

2.10 What <u>one crime</u> are you <u>most afraid</u> of happening to you and your family in your area?

1	Stealing
2	Break and enter
3	Assault
4	Robbery (stealing with violence)
5	Sexual assault (including rape)
6	Violence outside the home (including murder)
7	Domestic violence (including murder), or
8	Don't know

2.11 What does crime stop you from doing in your area? ***(Don't read out the alternatives. Use them for coding the answers given. There can be more than one response to this question)***

1	Using PMV
2	Walking to the shops
3	Walking to work/garden
4	Walking to fetch water (if appropriate)
5	Allowing your children to walk to school
6	Using open areas, such as parks or church
7	Walking around at night
8	Investing in this house or in a business
9	Nothing in particular, and/or
10	Other (specify):_____

2.12 Does dangerous driving or dangers on the roads in your area make you feel unsafe?

1 Yes **2** No

2.13 Do you think that crimes in your area are most likely to be committed by:

1	People who live in this place
2	Outsiders

3	Both
4	Don't know

2.14 Do you think it is more effective that people who steal are:

1	Sent to prison, or
2	Given a punishment that does not involve going to prison (e.g. community work, paying compensation)?

2.15 Have you had anything to do with the Department of Justice and Attorney General?

1	Yes
2	No
3	Don't know of them ***(If No or Don't know, go to Q.2.18)***

2.16 Were you satisfied with how they handled your matter?

1 Yes **2** No

2.17 Is the Department of Justice and Attorney General doing a good job over corruption?

1	Yes
2	No
3	Don't know

2.18 Have you had anything to do with the Correctional Service (the prison system)?

1	Yes
2	No
3	Don't know of them ***(If No or Don't know, go to Q2.21)***

2.19 Were you satisfied with how they handled your matter?

1 Yes **2** No

2.20 Is the Correctional Service doing a good job over corruption?

1	Yes
2	No
3	Don't know

2.21 Have you had anything to do with the High Court?

1	Yes
2	No
3	Don't know of them ***(If No or Don't know, go to Q.2.24)***

2.22 Were you satisfied with how it handled your matter?

1 Yes **2** No

2.23 Is the High Court doing a good job over corruption?

1	Yes
2	No
3	Don't know

2.24 Have you had anything to do with the Magistrates Court?

1	Yes
2	No
3	Don't know of them ***(If No or Don't know, go to Q.2.27)***

2.25 Were you satisfied with how they handled your matter?

1 Yes **2** No

2.26 Is the Magistrates Court doing a good job over corruption?

1	Yes
2	No
3	Don't know

2.27 Have you had anything to do with the Ombudsman Commission?

1	Yes
2	No
3	Don't know of them ***(If No or Don't know, go to Q.2.30)***

2.28 Were you satisfied with how they handled your matter?

1 Yes **2** No

2.29 Is the Ombudsman Commission doing a good job over corruption?

1	Yes
2	No

3 Don't know

2.30 Have you had anything to do with the Police?

1 Yes

2 No

3 Don't know of them ***(If No or Don't know, go to Q.2.33)***

2.31 Were you satisfied with how they handled your matter?

1 Yes **2** No

2.32 Are the Police doing a good job over corruption?

1 Yes

2 No

3 Don't know

2.33 Have you had anything to do with the Public Prosecutor's Office?

1 Yes

2 No

3 Don't know of them ***(If No or Don't know, go to Q.2.33)***

2.34 Were you satisfied with how they handled your matter?

1 Yes **2** No

2.35 Is the Public Prosecutor's Office doing a good job over corruption?

1 Yes

2 No

3 Don't know

2.36 Have you had anything to do with the Public Solicitor's Office?

1 Yes

2 No

3 Don't know of them ***(If No or Don't know, go on to next section)***

2.37 Were you satisfied with how they handled your matter?

1 Yes **2** No

2.38 Is the Public Solicitor's Office doing a good job over corruption?

1	Yes
2	No
3	Don't know

Section 3 – Experience of Crime

Interviewer to read out: *Now I will ask you about your personal experiences of crime over the past 12 months (**in Port Moresby and Bougainville**, since the last interviews). I am going to read out a list of crimes that might have affected you or someone else in your house. I would like you to tell me whether you or a house member has been a victim of any of these crimes. If this has been more than once for each crime in the past year, please tell me that, too.* ***(Put down the number of crime instances in the past 12 months and whether it was the respondent that was the victim or another household member)***

3.1 Car, truck or bike stolen:

0	Not victim		
1	Individual	Number of times:	
2	Household	Number of times:	

3.2 Stealing your property from you:

0	Not victim		
1	Individual	Number of times:	
2	Household	Number of times:	

3.3 Stealing your property from you with some force or threat:

0	Not victim		
1	Individual	Number of times:	
2	Household	Number of times:	

3.4 Assault:

0	Not victim		
1	Individual	Number of times:	
2	Household	Number of times:	

3.5 Unprovoked violence (e.g. an attack by a stranger)

0	Not victim		
1	Individual	Number of times:	
2	Household	Number of times:	

(☐ In the home? ☐ Outside the home?)

3.6 Provoked violence (e.g. payback):

0	Not victim		
1	Individual	Number of times:	
2	Household	Number of times:	

3.7 Sexual assault: (☐ In the home? ☐ Outside the home?):

0	Not victim		
1	Individual	Number of times:	
2	Household	Number of times:	

3.8 Using a firearm against you or your household:

0	Not victim		
1	Individual	Number of times:	
2	Household	Number of times:	

3.9 Killing (household member):

0	Not victim		
2	Household	Number of times:	

3.10 Destruction or damage to your property (household):

0	Not victim		
2	Household	Number of times:	

3.11 Breaking into your house and stealing (household):

0	Not victim		
2	Household	Number of times:	

3.12 Other (Specify) _____

0	Not victim		
1	Individual	Number of times:	
2	Household	Number of times:	

If the respondent or household member has been the victim of any particular crime, then move on to Section 4. If not, continue at Section 5.

Section 4 – Experience of Nominated Offences

Interviewer to read out: *Now I will ask you some questions regarding the crimes where you or a member of your house was a victim in the past 12 months. Concentrate on the crime that you or your household found most troubling. I know it might be difficult to talk about this, but do your best. Don't worry about telling me these things.*

(Interviewer: Check for consistency with Section 3).

4.1 What was the crime? _____

4.2 Why do you consider this crime to be the most troubling? _____

4.3 Did it involve you personally as the victim?

1	Yes	**2**	No

4.4 Where did it happen? ***(Don't read out alternatives)***

1	Home
2	Street
3	Shops
4	Workplace
5	Another private space
6	A community space (meeting, school), or
7	Other place (specify) _____

4.5 Were you (house member) on your own?

1	Yes	**2**	No

4.6 When did it happen?

1	Morning
2	Afternoon
3	Night

4.7 Did it happen:

1	During the week
2	Saturday
3	Sunday

4.8 Was there more than one offender?

1	Yes	**2**	No

4.9 Was the offender known to you?

1 Yes **2** No. If yes, was he/she/they a:

3 Spouse

4 Relative

5 Friend

6 Neighbour

7 Wantok

8 Gang, and/or

9 Someone you had only seen before?

4.10 Were any weapons used in the crime?

1 Yes **2** No

4.11 Was anyone hurt?

1 Yes **2** No ***(If no, go to Q.4.13)***

4.12 If someone was hurt, do you know any reason for the violence?

1 Yes **2** No. If yes, was it an:

3 Ethnic dispute

4 Land dispute

5 Domestic dispute

6 Compensation dispute

7 Alcohol, or

8 Other (specify) _____

4.13 Did you report the incident to the police?

1 Yes **2** No ***(If No, go to Q.4.21)***

4.14 Why? (specify) _____

4.15 If you did report, were you satisfied with the police response?

1 Yes **2** No

4.16 Why? (specify) _____

4.17 Was an arrest made in this case?

1	Yes
2	No
3	Don't know ***(If No or Don't know, go to Q.4.21)***

4.18 Did you have to attend court?

1	Yes
2	No, or
3	Case ongoing ***(If no, go to Q.4.21)***

4.19 How long did it take before the case came to court?

1	Up to 1 month
2	Between 1 and 6 months
3	6 to 12 months
4	More than 1 year
5	More than 2 years, or
6	Still waiting

4.20 Were you satisfied with the way the authorities (police/prosecutor/public solicitor/judge) handled the case?

1 Yes **2** No

4.21 Did you report the crime to anyone else (other than the police)?

1 Yes **2** No. If yes, who? ***(Don't read out the alternatives)***

3	Traditional authority
4	Relative
5	Local gang
6	Doctor, and/or
7	Other community group or leader (specify) _____

4.22 ***(Interviewer to ask depending on the crime nominated)*** If your property was taken, was it ever recovered?

1 Yes **2** No

4.23 After the crime was committed against you what was the most important thing for you as the victim? ***(Don't read out the alternatives)***

1	Getting your life back to normal
2	Recovering what you lost
3	That the criminals suffer for the crime
4	Avoid being victimised again
5	That the criminals be taken off the street
6	That the criminals pay for the loss or damage, and/or
7	Nothing

4.24 As a result of this crime or your treatment by the authorities, did you make a claim for compensation?

1 Yes **2** No

4.25 If yes, specify. _____

4.26 Have you changed your behaviour as a result of this crime you or your household experienced?

1 Yes **2** No ***(If no, go to Section 5)***

4.27 If yes, in what way? _____

4.28 Do these measures make you feel safer?

1 Yes **2** No

All respondents continue the questionnaire from here.

Section 5 – Individual and Community Response to Crime

Interviewer to read out: *Next, I would like to ask some questions about what you believe people in your area, the police, and the government can do to bring down the level of crime in your area.*

5.1 Do you feel safe and secure from crime in your area?

1 Yes **2** No **3** Sometimes

5.2 What one thing could you and your household do better to make yourself and your home safer from crime? ***(Don't read out alternatives)***

1	Help the police

2	Make your house more secure
3	Participate more in crime prevention activities in your community (like peace and good order committees)
4	Avoid some places at certain times of the day or night
5	Carry weapons
6	Pray for help from God, and/or
7	Others (specify) _____

5.3 Is there an organisation or group in your area (other than the police) that provides protection against crime in your community?

1 Yes **2** No ***(If Yes, then ask the next five questions. If No, go to Q.5.9)***

5.4 Can you describe it? _____

5.5 Do you or your household participate in this group?

1 Yes **2** No

5.6 Does this group do community patrols?

1 Yes **2** No

5.7 Does this group catch offenders?

1 Yes **2** No

5.8 If yes, what do they do with them? (specify)_____

5.9 If you could tell the government what <u>one thing</u> to do to make your area safer from crime, would it be for? ***(Don't read out alternatives. More than one response possible)***

1	More police
2	Harsher penalties from the courts
3	Crack down on gangs
4	Fight corruption
5	Better living conditions
6	More jobs, and/or
7	Youth activities

5.10 If you could tell your community leaders what <u>one thing</u> to work on to make your area safer from crime, would it be? ***(Don't read out alternatives. More than one response possible)***

1	Cooperate better with the police
2	See that people caught committing crime are punished
3	Develop more activities for young people
4	Regulate people coming in from outside your area
5	Better living conditions, and/or
6	Other (specify) _____

5.11 How big do you feel the crime problem is in PNG?

1	Very large
2	Large
3	Average
4	Not large, or
5	Don't know

Section 6 – Police – General

Interviewer to read out: *Next, I will ask you some general questions concerning what you know about the police.*

6.1 Do you know where the nearest police station is where you could go for help or make a complaint?

1 Yes **2** No

6.2 Have you been to this police station in the past 12 months?

1 Yes **2** No

6.3 Have you ever had official contact with the police other than visiting the police station?

1 Yes **2** No ***(If No to either this or the previous question, go to Q.6.6)***

6.4 If so, was this as a victim of crime?

1 Yes **2** No

6.5 Did this contact with the police, or your visit to the police station improve your opinion of the police?

1 Yes **2** No

6.6 Do you think the police in your area are doing a good job?

1	Yes
2	No
3	Sometimes
4	Don't know

6.7 If Yes to Q.6.6, is it because: ***(Don't read out the alternatives. More than one response possible)***

1	They treat the community with respect
2	They are fair in their dealings with the community
3	They are responsive to crime in your area
4	They do things to maintain the safety of the community, and/or
5	Other (specify) _____

6.8 If No to Q.6.6, is it because: ***(Don't read out the alternatives. More than one response possible)***

1	They do not treat the community with respect
2	They are not fair in their dealings with the community
3	They are not responsive to crime in your area
4	They don't do enough to maintain safety in your community, and/or
5	Other (specify) _____

6.9 Can you tell the difference between the regular police and the auxiliary police?

1 Yes **2** No

6.10 ***(Bougainville only)*** Can you tell the difference between police from Bougainville and others from the rest of PNG?

1 Yes **2** No

6.11 If so, which do you prefer?

1	Regular police
2	Auxiliary police
3	Neither

6.12 Can you give me any examples of community-based policing in your area?

1	Yes

2	No
3	Don't know

(specify where appropriate) _____

6.13 Some police are heavily armed and travel as mobile squads. If you know of these police, do they make you feel:

1	Safer
2	Less safe, or
3	Don't know

6.14 ***(Port Moresby, Arawa, and Buka only).*** Did the presence of the Australian police make any difference to crime in your community?

1	Yes
2	No
3	Don't know

If yes, what difference did they make?_ _ _ _

2	30 minutes -1 hour
3	Over 1 hour
4	After 2 hours, or
5	They do not come at all

7.3 Do you think they come as quickly as possible?

1	Yes
2	No
3	Don't know

7.4 What do you think are the most important things the police can do in your community for crime prevention/community safety? ***(Don't read out alternatives. More than one response possible)***

1	Walk around in groups
2	Drive around
3	Talk with people
4	Just be around
5	Caution young people
6	Attend meetings
7	All of these, and/or
8	They do nothing important in this regard

7.5 Do you think that having the police around your community would stop some people from committing crime?

1	Yes
2	No
3	Don't know

7.6 Do you think that the police around your community provide a good example, particularly to younger people?

1	Yes
2	No
3	Sometimes

4	Don't know

7.7 Has police discipline improved in the past 12 months?

1	Yes
2	No
3	Sometimes
4	Don't know

Section 8 – Police – Community Participation

8.1 In what ways could members of your community better assist the police? ***(Don't read out alternatives. More than one response possible.)***

1	Participate in peace and good order (crime prevention) committees
2	Provide more information to the police
3	Call the police when they see criminal activity
4	Cooperate with the police
5	Be more respectful, and/or
6	Other (specify) _____

8.2 Generally, are people in your community willing to give information about crime to the police?

1	Yes
2	No
3	Sometimes
4	Don't know

8.3 Why? _____

8.4 If you are a victim to a crime in the future, would you report it to the police?

1	Yes
2	No
3	Don't know

8.5 Why? _____

8.6 Who do you think should have most responsibility for crime prevention/community safety?

1	The police
2	The community
3	Individuals, or
4	Don't know

8.7 Do the police participate in community consultations about crime?

1	Yes
2	No
3	Sometimes
4	Don't know

Section 9 – Personal Demographics

Interviewer to note where possible:

9.1 Gender:

1	Male	**2**	Female

9.2 What is your age?_____years ***(Interviewer can check household list or estimate)***

9.3 Marital status:

1	Married/living together
2	Separated/divorced
3	Widowed
4	Never married

9.4 Highest level of education completed:

1	Never went to school
2	Primary (Grade 6)
3	Secondary (Grade 10)
4	Secondary (Grade 12)
5	Technical/vocational

6	University/college

9.5 What best describes your main occupational activity? ***(Probe – what kind of work do you do most of the time?*)**

1	Student
2	Home duties
3	Retired
4	Unemployed
5	Casual work
6	Self-employed
7	Farmer/fishing
8	Full-time (formal)
9	Government employee
10	Full-time (informal)

This ends the interview. Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Time interview concluded:	
Interviewer's initials:	

APPENDIXES