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Very positive changes occurred in levels of crime victimisation in Arawa and Buka in 2005, compared with 2004. Fourteen of sixteen key victimisation indicators showed reduced victimisation levels for both towns, ranging from one percent to 15 percent. Arawa had greater reductions.

In 2004, extensive surveys of crime victimisation in Arawa and Buka gave the first full picture of the nature and frequency of crime affecting households in those towns. The surveys independently and objectively quantified crime from the perspective of the victims in the community, focusing on crime victimisation, as reported by household members, rather than crimes for which convictions have been reached through the legal system. The 2004 surveys gave baseline data.

In 2005, repeat community surveys collected trend data to assess similarities and differences, over time. The 2005 surveys interviewed 305 people aged 15 years and over in 164 households in Arawa, and 291 people in 106 households in Buka. The samples were statistically sound and enabled generalisations to be made about the adult populations of the two towns. The two samples were independent, and the survey results for the towns are presented separately. Identical community crime victimisation surveys have been conducted in Port Moresby (also in 2004 and 2005), Lae (2005), and Mt. Hagen (2006), which are giving an increasingly wide coverage across the country. However, comparisons between Bougainville and other parts of Papua New Guinea may have limited meaning.

Bougainville’s recent history is different from elsewhere in Papua New Guinea. In Arawa, the State was entirely absent for more than ten years during the civil war, and community-based agencies provided the sole source of authority and social control. In Buka, the State remained in control, in difficult circumstances. The peace process was based around indigenous dispute resolution techniques, and now a role for the State is being reintroduced into post-conflict Bougainville. The election of the Autonomous Bougainville Government in mid-2005 is a major development, but Bougainville is still recovering from a long period of civil war.

Key Findings from 2004

The 2004 survey found that:

- some 56% of households in Arawa and 66% in Buka had been victims of at least one crime in the previous 12 months;
- some 35% of households in Arawa and 41% in Buka had been victims of multiple crimes¹;
- some 32% of households in Arawa and 28% in Buka had been victims of repeat crime;
- some 45% of residents in both Arawa and Buka considered that the most common types of crime were related to alcohol;

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.
• some 75% of households in Arawa and 77% in Buka thought that crime levels were the same or had decreased in the previous 12 months;
• public confidence in the police, policing, and police services in Arawa and Buka was moderate. Sixty percent of people in Arawa and 45% in Buka thought that the police in their area were doing a good job. In both towns, the reduction in crime was attributed to both the police and the community doing a good job;
• respondents saw the police generally as respectful, but not always fair or providing good examples to young people; and
• people in Arawa and Buka were concerned about crime prevention and control. They assumed a responsibility for action in these areas.

In Arawa, crimes of violence and destruction were a major issue that may have reflected trauma related to the civil war. Crime in Buka tended towards theft and unprovoked violence, which was possibly a reflection of a lower sense of identification and a greater concentration of resources than Arawa. It might also have been a feature of recent urban drift, the alienation of young males within the community, and relative poverty.

While crime was usually not thought to be increasing locally, in both towns, two-thirds of the people thought that corruption was increasing nationally. Approximately three-quarters of the people thought crime was a very large problem in Papua New Guinea.

The 2005 Surveys

The surveys are a source of data for ongoing and broad-based studies to provide information on trends, over time, so that progress (or regress) in reducing urban crime can be measured and responded to effectively. This information is intended to assist in planning and monitoring the effectiveness of the governmental agencies. The Autonomous Bougainville Government authorities in Arawa and Buka supported the surveys. Repeat surveys will follow, as required.

The methodology was primarily quantitative, using sample surveys with a structured questionnaire. The 2000 Census reported populations of 2,619 in Arawa, and 1,890 in Buka. In 2005, the follow-up surveys occurred in the same sample households as 2004, using virtually identical sample numbers. The 2005 Arawa survey sampled 305 people aged 15 years and over, in 164 households. The Buka survey sampled 291 people in 106 households. The sample fractions were 21 percent and 24 percent, respectively, of the towns’ populations aged 15+ in 2000. Data collection was completed by 31 October 2005, some 12 months after the first surveys.

The two surveys were based on random area sampling in Arawa, and random grid sampling in Buka. The samples were statistically representative of the populations of Arawa and Buka, compared to the 2000 Census data for Bougainville urban areas on the key demographic variables of age, gender, marital status (in Arawa only), and education. The survey instrument was not designed to recognise the social differences between Arawa and Buka, nor did it refer to the transitional influence of state-sponsored criminal justice.
Arawa was largely abandoned during the civil war, and the reintroduction of infrastructure and services is slow. It still has many destroyed houses, and others now occupied by neighbouring villagers. The population is predominantly people from the same or related cultural groups. Although broadly homogenous in this regard, many of its residents were on different sides during the conflict. However, suspicion and animosity among these groups may be reducing, insofar as reduced crime victimisation in 2005 is an indicator.

A Papua New Guinean Government presence was maintained in Buka throughout the 1990s, when it stayed under the control of pro-Papua New Guinean forces. During the conflict, Buka, which had previously serviced the northern parts of the province, was the only town in Bougainville with central government services. In-migrants (including refugees) from other parts of Bougainville, as well as the rest of Papua New Guinea, provided an ethnic mix. It continues as the main urban centre, and the main channel for government and aid services.

Overall in 2005, compared to 2004:

- fewer people in both towns were victimised;
- fewer people in both towns were subject to multiple or repeat crime;
- fewer people in both towns were subject to violence or property crime; and
- the improvements were greater in Arawa.

In 2005, the trend was for crime victimisation in Arawa to be very similar to, or lower than Buka, which was the reverse of 2004. Compared to Buka, in 2005, Arawa had:

- a slightly lower percentage of households that were the victims of at least one crime (49% in Arawa compared to 51% in Buka);
- a considerably lower percentage of households that were the victims of multiple crimes (21% compared to 33%);
- a similar percentage of households that were the victims of repeat crime (20% compared to 21%);
- a slightly lower average percentage of households affected by five forms of property crime (8% compared to 10%);
- a small and similar average percentage of households affected by seven forms of violent crime (1% compared to 2%);
- a lower percentage of households affected by the stealing of property (23% compared to 30%); and
- virtually the same percentage of households affected by firearm use (1% in both towns), and sexual assault (nil reported in Arawa and 1% in Buka).

While the patterns of crime in household and the community were similar, in Arawa there were indications that outside gangs were increasingly becoming involved in crime. Arawa had increased numbers of people who did not know the perpetrators of the most troublesome victimisation affecting their households (up from 41% in 2004 to 70% in 2005), and a higher amount of victimisation perpetrated by groups (up from 45% to 58%). Unlike 2004, people in Arawa were more likely than those in Buka to think the criminals were outsiders.

Key Differences between Arawa and Buka in 2005
These statistics were coupled with a clear indication in open-ended questions that residents in Arawa had become concerned about a perceived increase in gun use. Given the low percentage of gun use actually reported in household-related victimisation, these concerns may have been triggered by some business sector hold-ups just prior to the survey. Such concerns did not manifest themselves in Buka. Perhaps because of this fear, respondents in Arawa demonstrated lower and decreased levels of satisfaction with the police, especially because of their perceived inability to deal with armed gangs.

Perceptions of Crime in Arawa and Buka

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 fast. Whether or not the stories are true, repetition soon makes them social facts.

The 2004 surveys found that fear of crime was high in Arawa and Buka. In 2005, two indicators of perceived crime and corruption elsewhere in Papua New Guinea showed negative results in Arawa and similar results in Buka, compared to 2004. However, perceptions of crime within both Arawa and Buka showed positive results on four of five indicators (see Table ES1).

Table ES1: Summary Individual Perception Indicators, 2004 and 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Arawa 2004 (%)</th>
<th>Arawa 2005 (%)</th>
<th>Buka 2004 (%)</th>
<th>Buka 2005 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size of the crime problem in PNG (large, very large)</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of corruption in PNG (same, increasing)</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of local crime (same, less)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most frequently perceived crimes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol-related</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stealing</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual assault</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2005, a large percentage of respondents continued to perceive crime and corruption elsewhere in Papua New Guinea to be a large problem:

- the number of people who thought that crime was a large or very large problem in Papua New Guinea:
  - increased from 85% in 2004, to 94% in 2005 in Arawa; and
increased slightly, from 88%, to 89% in Buka;
• those who thought that the level of corruption, nationally, was the same or more:
  ♦ increased in Arawa, from 81% to 90%; and
  ♦ increased slightly in Buka, from 82% to 83%;

Perceptions were that key crimes decreased in the local area, except for alcohol-related crimes:
• the percentage who thought that level of crime in the local area was the same or less over the previous 12 months:
  ♦ decreased in Arawa, from 75% to 60%; and
  ♦ decreased in Buka, from 78% to 74%;
• key crimes were perceived to decrease in both towns, except for alcohol-related crime. The perception that alcohol-related crime was the most common:
  ♦ increased in both Arawa and Buka, from 45% to 49%;
• the percentage of people who thought that stealing was the most common crime:
  ♦ decreased in Arawa, from 14% to 11%; and
  ♦ decreased in Buka, from 30% to 23%;
• the percentage who thought that domestic violence was the most common crime:
  ♦ decreased in Arawa, from 15% to 6%; and
  ♦ decreased in Buka, from 3% to 2%; and
• the percentage who thought that sexual assault was the most common crime:
  ♦ decreased in Arawa, from 6% to 2%; and
  ♦ decreased in Buka, from 4% to 2%.

Actual Crime Victimisation

In this report, responses on victimisation are treated as objective, factually-based accounts of events that have occurred to households, rather than as subjective perceptions that relate to peoples' beliefs about what happened generally in Arawa and Buka. The 2004 surveys found household victimisation levels in Arawa and Buka were high, and violent crime featured.

Very positive changes in 2005 are summarised in Table ES2. Fourteen of sixteen key victimisation indicators showed reduced victimisation levels for both Arawa and Buka, ranging from one percent to 15 percent lower.\(^2\) Reductions were greater in Arawa:

• the percentage of households that were the victims of at least one crime:
  ♦ decreased by 7% in Arawa, from 56% in 2004 to 49% in 2005; and
  ♦ decreased by 15% in Buka, from 66% to 51%;
• the percentage of households that were the victims of multiple crime:
  ♦ decreased by 14% in Arawa, from 35% to 21%; and
  ♦ decreased by 8% in Buka, from 41% to 33%;
• the percentage of households that were the victims of repeat crime:
  ♦ decreased by 12% in Arawa, from 32% to 20%; and

---

\(^2\) The corresponding data for Port Moresby showed lesser reductions (between 2% and 6%).
• decreased by 7% in Buka, from 28% to 21%;
• the average percentage of households affected by five forms of property crime:
  • decreased by 7% in Arawa, from 15% to 8%; and
  • decreased by 3% in Buka, from 13% to 10%;
• the average percentage of households that were affected by seven forms of violent crime:
  • decreased by 3% in Arawa, from 4% to one percent; and
  • decreased by one percent in Buka, from 3% to 2%;
• the average percentage of households that were affected by firearm use:
  • decreased by 5% in Arawa, from 6% to one percent; and
  • stayed the same in Buka, at one percent;
• the average percentage of households that were affected by sexual assault (subject to underreporting):
  • decreased by one percent in Arawa, from 1% to nil; and
  • increased by one percent in Buka, from nil to one percent;
• the average percentage of households that were affected by stealing property:
  • decreased by 7% in Arawa, from 30% to 23%; and
  • decreased by 10% in Buka from 40% to 30%.

Table E52: Summary Household Victimisation Indicators, 2004 and 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Arawa 2004 (%)</th>
<th>Arawa 2005 (%)</th>
<th>Buka 2004 (%)</th>
<th>Buka 2005 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Victim of at least one crime</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim of multiple crimes</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim of repeat crime</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property crime</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent crime</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firearm use</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual assault</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stealing property</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Low levels of sexual assault and violence were reported. There may have been informal pressure in communities not to report such victimisation, and questionnaire techniques do not encourage full reporting. Considerable improvement in overall victimisation could occur, if there is a reduction in the various types of stealing and property damage.
Household and Community Responses to Crime

Similar to 2004, residents in Buka and Arawa were informed and concerned about crime and its prevention and control in their communities. They continued to willingly take part in community crime prevention and control. The chieftain system ensures that social structures incorporate leaders into dispute resolution, which provides some social control within communities. Churches also play a powerful role in mediation.

In 2005, the home remained a more likely place than public areas for victimisation that troubled people most. One reason that homes in Arawa and Buka can be a common setting for crime is their occupation by large extended families. As in other parts of Papua New Guinea, overcrowding contributes to the likelihood of violence. A variety of living conditions influences crime victimisation in the household (see Table ES3).

Table ES3: Summary Household and Community Indicators, 2004 and 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Arawa 2004 (%)</th>
<th>Arawa 2005 (%)</th>
<th>Buka 2004 (%)</th>
<th>Buka 2005 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Houses walled or fenced</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in community crime protection group</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four or more adults per household</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four or more children per household</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most troubling crime occurred in the home</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim knew the perpetrator in the most troubling crime</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than one offender in the most troubling crime</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most preferred government initiative on crime</td>
<td>Youth activities (27%)</td>
<td>More jobs (21%)</td>
<td>Youth activities (33%)</td>
<td>Youth activities (31%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- the percentage of houses that were walled and/or fenced:
  - decreased in Arawa, from 42% in 2004, to 38% in 2005; and
  - increased in Buka, from 4% to 30% (this finding may result from field work error);
- community participation in crime prevention:
  - increased slightly in Arawa, from 12% to 14%, and
increased in Buka, from 9% to 13%;
- in Arawa, many families occupied both town and village houses, while in Buka, houses were more likely to contain large extended families. Adult occupancy by four of more adults:
  - increased in Arawa, from 15% to 33%; and
  - increased in Buka, from 60% to 66%;
- the number of children in households in both towns decreased (in Arawa, from 42% to 13% of respondents reporting four or more children in their house, and in Buka from 39% to 22%). This probably reflects that more schools are now functioning in rural areas;
- the percentage of people reporting that the most troublesome crimes were in the home:
  - increased in Arawa, from 80% in 2004 to 82% in 2005; and
  - increased in Buka, from 82% to 89%;
  - these results may be partly an effect of less crime on the streets leaving a higher proportion to occur in the household;
- victims who knew the perpetrators of the most troublesome cases:
  - decreased substantially in Arawa, from 59% to 30%; and
  - decreased in Buka, from 41% to 36%;
- in such cases, the incidents where the perpetrators were in a group:
  - increased in Arawa, from 45% to 58%; and
  - decreased in Buka, 44% to 23%;
- the level of reported unemployment among respondents:
  - increased considerably in Arawa, from 8% to 17%; and
  - decreased in Buka, from 15% to 12%; and
- respondents' most preferred government initiative for the reduction of crime was more jobs in Arawa, and more youth activities in Buka.

Community Views about Government Agencies

The 2004 survey focused especially on policing. In 2005, law and justice sector agencies sought data on their level of public awareness and public satisfaction with their work. The surveys found a low level of public awareness of the agencies. Only three percent of the public had contact with the formal sector agencies, on average, and mixed views on police performance (see Table ES4).

- where respondents did have contact in 2005, there was a mean level of satisfaction of 52% in Arawa, and 59% in Buka; and
- where the public had contact with the police, there was a moderate level of satisfaction of 47% in Arawa, but 61% in Buka; and
- awareness of action over corruption was minimal. The number of people who were aware had moderate overall levels of satisfaction of 57% in Arawa, and 42% in Buka:
  - awareness of police action over corruption was much lower than other agencies, with a satisfaction level of 41% in both places.

Satisfaction with other aspects of the performance of the police decreased, compared to 2004:
• the percentage of people who thought that the police were doing a good job overall:
  ◦ decreased greatly in Arawa, from 60% in 2004, to 25% in 2005; and
  ◦ decreased by a smaller amount in Buka, from 47% to 36%;
• the already low percentage of people who reported their most troubling crime to the police:
  ◦ decreased in Arawa, from 16% to 15%; and
  ◦ decreased in Buka, from 23% to 18%;

Table ES4: Summary Law and Justice Sector Agency Indicators, 2004 and 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Arawa 2004 (%)</th>
<th>Arawa 2005 (%)</th>
<th>Buka 2004 (%)</th>
<th>Buka 2005 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with all agencies over handling of own matter</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with police over handling of own matter</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with all agencies over handling of corruption</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with police over handling of corruption</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police do a good job</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reported most troubling crime to police</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement in opinion from contact with the police</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police discipline improved (yes, sometimes)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police participate in community consultations (yes, sometimes)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• the percentage of people who improved their opinion of police, as a result of official contact:
  ◦ decreased in Arawa, from 77% to 59%; and
  ◦ decreased in Buka, from 70% to 67%;
• some 76% in Arawa thought that police discipline had improved in 2005, compared to 48% in Buka; and
• in Arawa, some 79% thought that the police had participated in community consultations in 2005, compared to 55% in Buka.

During 2004 and 2005, the Australian Assisting Police (AAP) spent some time in Bougainville. Awareness of the AAP was very high. For example:

• in Arawa, 55% of respondents considered that the AAP did make a difference while they was there, while in Buka, 49% thought the same. In almost all of these cases, people thought that policing improved; and

• in Arawa, 55% thought that the AAP’s departure also made a difference — in Buka, 38% did — to the effect that policing reverted to former patterns.

Policy Implications

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

1. **Aftermath of the Civil War:** Reduced household crime victimisation in 2005 is an encouraging sign that the situation has improved in Arawa and Buka. The indications in the surveys were that community divisions following the civil war are having less of an impact than in the previous year. Both reported that victimisation levels and perceived crime levels had improved from 2004 to 2005. However, guns did become more of a concern in Arawa in 2005.

2. **Community-Based Crime Prevention:** Community mechanisms again appear to be relatively successful in maintaining the peace. They are the first avenue of recourse for the public, in Arawa and Buka. Interviewees again considered the community to have most responsibility for crime prevention, and community-based leadership was active in addressing crime problems. Community responsibility seems to have contributed to a decrease in crime levels since 2004. The Bougainville experience continues to call for state-sponsored criminal justice that adapts to local needs and conditions, and respects and complements community-based endeavours.

The findings in the survey support the directions in the Government’s *National Law and Justice Policy*, and the 2004 Bougainville Constitution, with their emphasis on harnessing and developing community-based approaches to crime prevention and control. The most obvious example is the strong emphasis on community-based preventive and resolution strategies.

A key element in the occurrence of crime, especially those involving violence, is alcohol. Its prevalence in victimisation continues to be a concern for the community.
3. **Police Presence:** Community attitudes to the police are relatively positive, but the kind of police services and the nature of their relationship with existing community-based agencies continue to be critical. To capitalise on the positive attitudes to the community and crime prevention, the Government needs to continue with its work to create and maintain a public safety framework within which community justice can operate. Positive collaboration between communities and policing capacity in Bougainville will remain very important.

Communities do see a need for an increased police presence, despite the communities’ ability to largely police themselves. Caution in progressing the role of the State remains important and sensitive in this post-conflict environment. However, in both Arawa and Buka, residents do want a more efficient, and effective police presence. The public is hopeful that good policing will combat the crime threat, as Bougainville develops. Residents in Arawa, in particular, criticised the police for being unable to curb gun use more fully. The challenge is for the police to live up to the expectations of local communities, or see their approval rate fall further.
CHAPTER 1

THE HOUSEHOLD CRIME SURVEYS IN ARAWA AND BUKA

In 2004, extensive surveys of crime victimisation in Arawa and Buka gave the first full picture of the nature, frequency, and location of crimes that affected households in those towns. The surveys 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 surveys gave baseline data. In 2005, some 12 months later, repeat community surveys collected trend data so that similarities and differences, over time, can be assessed. The 2005 surveys interviewed 305 people aged 15 years and over, in 164 households in Arawa, and 291 people in 106 households in Buka. The samples were statistically sound and permit generalisations to the adult populations of the two towns. The key findings are presented in the Extended Summary.

Bougainville has particular characteristics that are different from elsewhere in Papua New Guinea. The election of the Autonomous Bougainville Government in mid-2005 is a major development, but Bougainville is still recovering from a long period of civil war. Identical community crime victimisation surveys have been conducted in Port Moresby (in both 2004 and 2005), Lae (2005), and Mt. Hagen (2006), which are giving an increasingly wide coverage across Papua New Guinea. However, comparisons of crime levels and types between Bougainville and different parts of Papua New Guinea may have limited meaning.

Recent History of Arawa and Buka

Differences in the recent histories of Arawa and Buka are central to understanding community attitudes to crime and policing. In Arawa, the State was entirely absent for at least 10 years during the civil war, and local, community-based agencies provided the sole source of authority and social control. In Buka, the State remained in control, in difficult circumstances. After the conflict, a slow and cautious reintroduction of governmental services occurred. Now, the Autonomous Bougainville Government is further reintroducing the governmental role into post-conflict Bougainville, including Arawa.

---

3 So that the 2005 Bougainville report is self-contained, some of the material repeats elements of the 2004 report and the Port Moresby studies.

Failure to reach agreement concerning compensation claims over the Bougainville Copper Mine, in 1989, led to a long sequence of events. Violence led to the closure of the mine, declaration of a state of emergency, a communications and economic blockade in 1990, considerable fighting throughout much of the 1990s, and extensive conflict among different sides within the Bougainvillean population. Across Bougainville, civil war disrupted society for a decade. Government education and health services ceased. The economy collapsed with the cessation of commercial plantations, smallholder farming, and business generally.

A framework for political settlement, that was agreed to in 1997, led to a peacekeeping role and later rehabilitation, which has continued steadily. A series of agreements slowly led to a ceasefire, reestablishment of peace, disarmament, and the recent elections. New Zealand, Australia, other Pacific countries, the United Nations, and the Commonwealth have all have played active roles.

One estimate suggests that approximately ten percent of the population — 15 000 people — died between 1989 and 1998, either from combat, or from conditions imposed by the conflict. The Arawa area was at the centre of the conflict over the mine. Much of Arawa and most of its infrastructure and services were destroyed. Arawa town was largely abandoned and the reintroduction of infrastructure and services remains slow. Arawa is still somewhat of a ghost town, with many houses destroyed during the conflict. However, neighbouring villagers occupy many of them. Arawa's population is predominately people from the Nasioi speaking group. Although homogenous in this regard, its people were on different sides during the civil war. The town population includes people who ‘surrendered’ during the crises, those who moved into the town while the ceasefire was in progress, and former resistance fighters. Suspicion and animosity between these groups is still an issue. The nearby Panguna Mine remains a no-go area.

A Papua New Guinean Government presence was maintained in Buka throughout the 1990s, when it stayed under the control of pro-Papua New Guinean forces. During the conflict, Buka, which had previously serviced the northern parts of the province, came to be the only functioning town in Bougainville. In-migrants (including refugees) from other parts of Bougainville, as well as the rest of Papua New Guinea, provided an ethnic mix. Buka continues as the main urban centre and is the main base for the Autonomous Bougainville Government and the provision of aid services.

Families and communities were divided and profoundly destabilised by the civil war. The formal justice system had virtually no presence on mainland Bougainville, including Arawa, from the early 1990s, and the Papua New Guinean police force was evacuated entirely. Militias were active in the fighting, and in Arawa, the police station and court buildings were vandalised and torched. An entire generation grew up with little experience of state institutions, including police, courts, and prisons. A generation of young men has experienced warfare, but no formal education, and few prospects. Many individuals have suffered from post-traumatic stress disorder.

Two other considerations are important in Bougainville, in the mix involving crime, victimisation, community involvement, and policing. First, Bougainvillean society is

---

matrilineal, with women being the principal owners and inheritors of land, and often holding particular influence and authority, including a powerful role in conflict prevention and dispute resolution. Second, a Council of Chiefs emerged as an important group in social control in post-conflict society. Women and chiefs, in their different ways, have been central to the peace process, and bring particular community bases to the application of any findings from this survey. A widely representative Autonomous Bougainville Government reflects these elements.

Acute sensitivities concerning the re-entry of the formal justice system to mainland Bougainville continue. One consequence is the desire for a uniquely Bougainvillean law-enforcement system. The Bougainville Constitution, which was finalised in 2004, seeks restorative and rehabilitative policing systems that work collaboratively with communities and customary systems of justice. The Autonomous Bougainville Government is further developing the Bougainville Police Service. Community-based policing is its guiding philosophy, which is intended to support and encourage community-level authority structures. These services have tended to be more directly supported in Buka than Arawa. Buka had a higher level of presence of Australian and New Zealand community policing advisers in 2004-2005, and for some of the period, had an Australian police presence.

Baseline Data from 2004

The 2005 study set out to compare the main findings from the 2004 survey. The 2004 Bougainvillean surveys found that:

- some 56% of people in Arawa and 66% in Buka had been victims of at least one crime;
- some 35% of people in Arawa and 41% in Buka had been victims of multiple crimes;
- some 32% of people in Arawa and 28% in Buka had been victims of repeat crime;
- some 45% of respondents in both Arawa and Buka considered alcohol to be a factor in the most common types of crime;
- some 75% of people in Arawa and 77% in Buka thought that crime levels were the same or had decreased in the previous 12 months;
- the public had moderate confidence in policing in Arawa and Buka. Some 60% of people in Arawa and 47% in Buka thought that the police in their area were doing a good job. In both areas, the reduction in crime was put down to the police and the community doing good jobs;
- respondents considered the police generally to be respectful, but not always fair or providing good examples for young people; and
- people in Arawa and Buka were concerned about crime prevention and control. They assumed a responsibility for action in these areas.

In Arawa, crimes of violence and destruction were a major issue that may have reflected trauma which was related to the civil war. Crime in Buka tended towards theft and

---

6 '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.
unprovoked violence, which were possibly a reflection of a lower sense of identification and a greater concentration of resources than Arawa. It might also have been a feature of recent urban drift, the alienation of young males within the community, and relative poverty. For example:

- Arawa was more prone to crimes of violence and more property crime overall than Buka, but Buka had considerably higher levels of theft;
- firearm use was more prevalent in Arawa than Buka;
- people in Buka were much more likely to think the criminals were outsiders. Gangs appeared to be a serious problem there;
- the offender was a relative or wantok in a high percentage of cases, especially in Arawa, which is predominately made up of people from that area; and
- crimes of violence were more concerning to people in Arawa, and theft more so in Buka.

Different people were victims of different crimes. For example:

- females were more likely to state that they were victims of property crime with force in Arawa, but not Buka, and of sexual assault in both towns;
- in both places, males were more likely to be victims of stealing, assault, unprovoked and provoked violence, and firearms offences;
- the young and the old were more commonly crime victims (except as victims of sexual assault), while the young suffered high levels of theft; and
- the young, and women, were more likely to be victimised at home. Women were more likely to be on their own, when victimised. Women feared sexual assault more than men, but did not view it as the most prominent crime.

The crimes that troubled people most were more likely to occur at home. For example:

- only 13% of victims in both places indicated that they were alone at the time;
- these crimes were most likely to occur at night and on Saturdays;
- in 59% of cases in Arawa and 41% in Buka, the victims knew the offenders; and
- crimes were often committed in groups.

The most serious area of community concern about crime in Arawa and Buka was violence. This factor was coupled with concern about the likelihood of crime occurring in the home, the unpredictability of crime, and the high level of exposure to crimes committed by groups. Violence in the home was a very difficult issue, and was more so in Arawa, where many people had fresh memories of civil war violence, and remained traumatised by it.

With some crime victimisation categories, perceptions were consistent with the actual risk of victimisation. In other situations, they were not:

- sexual assault was the most feared crime, but not highly likely to happen, and similarly, violence outside the home and assault; and
- the crime most likely to occur (stealing) was not highly feared, at least in Buka.

While half to two-thirds of people felt safe from crime in their area, large proportions did not. Despite the levels of individual and household crime victimisation, approximately 50
percent of respondents in both towns stated that they had not changed their behaviour. This suggests that many people in Arawa and Buka were either learning to live with high levels of crime, or did not identify their own or community reactions as being out of the ordinary. In part, the apparent normalcy of reactions may have stemmed from urban behaviour being an adaptation of village behaviour. It might also reflect the fact that the level of crime in both towns was low, when compared to ten years of civil war. In this context, Bougainville’s crime problems were small.

One of the clearest implications of the 2004 survey was that people in Arawa and Buka were concerned about crime prevention, and control. Respondents demonstrated both personal and household experiences of crime victimisation, along with some involvement in community-based initiatives to deal with the problem. Communities recognised the crime problem. They appeared to have adopted a responsibility for crime prevention and control, along with other community welfare issues.

The 2005 survey set out to see whether findings would be different, 12 months later.

Survey Background

The Papua New Guinean Government’s Law and Justice Sector Strategic Framework Strategy 1.3.1 is ‘to improve urban safety’. To measure whether 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. Community perception data are intended to supplement official statistics and provide a fuller and more reliable picture of crime levels, and responses to them in the community. The need is for an ongoing, broad-based survey that will provide information on trends, over time, so that progress (or regress) in reducing urban crime can be measured and respond to effectively. This information is also intended to assist in planning and monitoring the effectiveness of the governmental agencies.

These requirements are made more complex in Bougainville, which is still in a recovery phase following a long and difficult civil war. The Bougainville government authorities in Arawa and Buka supported the surveys. Consultation also occurred with the Papua New Guinean Law and Justice Sector National Coordination Mechanism, which comprised the heads of all sectoral agencies. The surveys were commissioned by AusAID, and developed and implemented by the Australian-funded Justice Advisory Group (JAG) and the National Research Institute (NRI). Data collection was completed by 31 October 2005, exactly 12 months after the first survey (contributors are listed in Appendix B). This report presents trend data on Arawa and Buka. Extension and repeat of these surveys will follow, as required.

Objectives

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 environment in
Papua New Guinea that can inform programs and strategies to counter crime; and
• capture community perceptions of the police, 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.

Methodology

The methodology was primarily quantitative, using sample surveys with a structured questionnaire. In the 2000 Census, the populations of Arawa and Buka was 2,619 and 1,890, respectively. In 2005, the follow-up survey occurred in the same sample household as 2004, using almost identical sample numbers. In Arawa, the 2005 survey sampled 305 people aged 15 years and over, in 164 households. In Buka, the survey sampled 291 people in 106 households. The sample fractions were 21% and 24%, respectively, of the town’s populations aged 15+, in 2000 (full survey design, sampling, and field work details are given in Appendix C).

The two surveys were based on a random selection of clusters of households in Arawa, and random grid sampling of clusters in Buka. To compensate for bias in non-response, quotas were filled by data collectors, based on the variables of age and gender. Interviews were conducted in English and Tok Pisin, as well as Nasioi, in Arawa (the English Questionnaire is given in Appendix D).

The sample achieved results that were statistically representative of the 15+ populations of Arawa and Buka, compared to the 2000 Census data for Bougainville urban areas, on the key demographic variables of age, gender, marital status (in Arawa only), and education. The findings from the samples can be generalised to represent the views of the two adult populations.

The survey instrument was not designed to recognise the social differences between Arawa and Buka, nor did it refer to the transitional influence of state-sponsored criminal justice. The two samples were independent, and the results of the surveys for the towns are presented separately.

7 However, the sample size does limit the potential for cross-analysis of households and demographic variables in instances where all sizes are low and standard errors of the mean are high. This is less of a concern for sociological generalisations to the populations of Arawa and Buka as wholes, but restricts detailed criminological analysis at the household level.
CD-ROMS with the full data are available free of charge to bona fide professionals and researchers, from the JAG and NRI.\footnote{\textit{Educo Pty Ltd, Throsby Place, Griffith, ACT 2603, Australia; email anastasisa@educo.net, and The National Research Institute, P.O. Box 5854, Boroko. NCD. 111; email jrobins@nri.org.pg.}}
CHAPTER 2

PERCEPTIONS OF CRIME IN ARAWA AND BUKA

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 fast, through informal networks. 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 of crime, mainly using data from Section 2 of the Questionnaire. This chapter starts by comparing 2005 findings on key summary measures with the findings from 2004.

Key Perception Indicators from 2004 and 2005

The 2004 survey found that fear of crime was high in Arawa and Buka. Even though the level of crime was very high, people were seemingly more afraid because crime occurred in the home, and was often violent and perpetrated by groups. Table 1 summarises the key perception indicators for individuals in 2004 and 2005.

Table 1: Summary Individual Perception Indicators, 2004 and 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Arawa 2004 (%)</th>
<th>Arawa 2005 (%)</th>
<th>Buka 2004 (%)</th>
<th>Buka 2005 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size of the crime problem in PNG (large, very large)</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of corruption in PNG (same, increasing)</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of local crime (same, less)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most frequently perceived crimes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Arawa</th>
<th>Arawa</th>
<th>Buka</th>
<th>Buka</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol-related</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stealing</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual assault</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2005, a large percentage of respondents continued to perceive crime and corruption elsewhere in Papua New Guinea to be large.
the number of people who thought that crime was a large or very large problem in Papua New Guinea:
- increased 9%, from 85% in 2004, to 94% in 2005 in Arawa; and
- increased 1%, from 88% in 2004, to 89% in 2005, in Buka; and

those who thought that the level of corruption, nationally, was the same or more:
- increased 9% in Arawa, from 81% to 90%; and
- increased 1% in Buka, from 82% to 83%.

Perceptions were that key crimes decreased in the local area, except for alcohol-related ones. For example:

- the percentage of people who thought that the level of crime in the local area was the same or less over the previous 12 months:
  - decreased 15% in Arawa, from 75% to 60%; and
  - decreased 4% in Buka, from 78% to 74%; and

- the perception of people that alcohol-related crime was the most common:
  - increased 4% in both Arawa and Buka, in both cases from 45% to 49%; and

- the percentage of people who thought that stealing was the most common crime:
  - decreased 3% in Arawa, from 14% to 11%; and
  - decreased 7% in Buka, from 30% to 23%; and

- the percentage of people who thought that domestic violence was the most common crime:
  - decreased 9% in Arawa, from 15% to 6%; and
  - decreased 1% in Buka, from 3% to 2%; and

- the percentage of people who thought that sexual assault was the most common crime:
  - decreased 4% in Arawa, from 6% to 2%; and
  - decreased 2% in Buka, from 4% to 2%.

Are Crime and Corruption Still Perceived to Be Increasing Nationally?

Crime was thought to be a large or very large problem nationally (see Table 2):

- some 94% of respondents in Arawa and 89% in Buka thought that the crime problem in Papua New Guinea was large or very large; and
- these statistics were similar to, or higher, than 2004.
Table 2: Perceived Size of the Crime Problem in Papua New Guinea

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of Crime Problem</th>
<th>Arawa 2004 (%)</th>
<th>Arawa 2005 (%)</th>
<th>Buka 2004 (%)</th>
<th>Buka 2005 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very large</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not large</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Similarly, high percentages of respondents thought that corruption, nationally, was a major issue (see Table 3):

- some 90% of respondents in Arawa and 83% in Buka thought that corruption, nationally, was the same or increasing; and
- these statistics were higher than 2004 in Arawa, but similar in Buka.

Table 3: Perceived Changes to Corruption Levels in Papua New Guinea

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Corruption</th>
<th>Arawa 2004 (%)</th>
<th>Arawa 2005 (%)</th>
<th>Buka 2004 (%)</th>
<th>Buka 2005 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreasing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Q.2.5. Arawa 2004 N=306; 2005 N=305, Non-response=0%. Buka 2004 N=290; 2005 N=291, Non-response=0%.
Is Crime Still Perceived to Be Decreasing in the Local Area?

In 2004, some 75 percent of respondents in Arawa and 78 percent in Buka believed that the crime level in their area was the same or less than 12 months previously.

In 2005, people in both towns generally thought that improvement continued, but at a slower rate. However, within Arawa, 37 percent thought that crime levels had worsened (see Table 4):

- there was a shift in Arawa and Buka from thinking that there was less crime, to thinking that there was the same amount. Some 60% of respondents in Arawa and 74% in Buka believed that there was less or the same amount of crime as 12 months previously. These statistics were 15% lower than 2004 for Arawa, and four percent lower for Buka; and
- in Arawa, more than twice as many people, as in 2004, thought that crime had increased, whereas in Buka, the percentage declined.

Additionally:

- in Arawa, 34% thought that violent crime against people had decreased, and 44% thought that crime against property had decreased (Q.2.2 & Q.2.3); and
- in Buka, 64% thought that violent crime against people had decreased, and 63% thought that crime against property had decreased.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Crime</th>
<th>Arawa 2004 (%)</th>
<th>Arawa 2005 (%)</th>
<th>Buka 2004 (%)</th>
<th>Buka 2005 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Who Was Contributing Most to Crime Prevention?

Table 5 indicates why change was thought to be occurring:

- in Arawa, people thought that the community and the police were generally doing good jobs. However, the percentage that thought the police were doing a good job had decreased considerably, from 47% in 2004 to 19% in 2005. Conversely, 31% stated that raskols were getting worse, compared to three percent in 2004; and
• in Buka, 37% of people thought that the police, in particular, were doing a good job (down from 51% in 2004). However, a larger percentage of people thought that the raskols were getting better, rather than worse.

Table 5: Contributions by Groups to Changing Crime Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Arawa</th>
<th>Buka</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good (%)</td>
<td>Bad (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raskols (getting Better/Worse)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Responses</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Open-ended responses to Q.2.2 expanded the reasons for the changes in crime levels that were believed to have occurred. In Arawa, some 75 percent of comments focused on perceptions that aspects of crime were increasing. Comments fell into three main groups. The largest group related to economic conditions and lack of employment:

• greater disparity between the rich and the poor;
• people do not have jobs and are not occupied;
• unemployed youths are causing problems;
• unemployment is increasing; and
• an increase in unemployment and vagrancy.

A second group saw political issues as the underlying cause of crime:

• outsiders are sponsoring youths to cause problems (politically motivated);
• ex-combatants and unemployed youth are involved; and
• the presence of guns in the community.

A third group focused negatively on the lack of policing (which was linked in open-ended responses to other questions to the inability of police to deal with armed offenders):

• police are afraid to respond to crimes;
• police are not active; and
• police are not doing a good enough job.

Italicised comments here and elsewhere are the notes on questionnaires where interviewers recorded comments by respondents to open-ended questions.
Those people in Arawa who commented on a decrease in crime mainly noted community reasons:

- traditional laws are stabilising law and order;
- they are all going to church and seem to be becoming Christians; and
- religious youth activities are taking place.

In contrast, in Buka, the main comment was on the perception that crime was low or decreasing:

- no trouble;
- stayed the same;
- no crime;
- peace is returning to normal, and youths who caused lawlessness have returned to further their studies; and
- bad criminal behaviour is decreasing.

The reasons given were:

- communication has improved between the government authorities and the people;
- the community cooperates well; and
- God has answered our prayers.

Those people who thought crime was a problem stated that the reasons were:

- people are not respecting the law; and
- alcohol consumption is the cause of major criminal activities.

Stronger policing was the main suggestion for dealing with crime in Buka:

- police are not doing enough;
- police are being too flexible; and
- they should be armed.

**What Crimes Are Thought to Occur Most?**

In 2005, interviewees were again asked what crime they thought happened most in their area (see Table 6).
Columns 3 and 5 show that the most common types of crime in 2005 were perceived to be:

- alcohol-related (49% of total responses in both Arawa and Buka, which was up slightly in both cases from 45% in 2004);\(^\text{10}\)
- robbery (stealing with violence) rated much higher in Arawa (up from five percent in 2004 to 21%). The level perceived in Buka was almost negligible in 2004 and 2005;
- stealing in Arawa at 11% was perceived to be approximately half the level of Buka (23%), but both were rated lower than in 2004; and
- together, the average occurrence of the five crimes that involved violence were slightly down.\(^\text{11}\) They remained higher in Arawa (7% on average in 2005, the

\(^\text{10}\) The question was taken to include the illegal use of alcohol or drugs as well as 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. Where 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 13 to 0 in the 13 cases where they were specified. The same pattern occurred in 2004.
same as 2004) than in Buka (3% in 2004 and 2005). These crimes individually had low rates. Domestic violence was higher in Arawa (6%) than Buka (3%), but rated lower than in 2004.

Together, robbery and stealing were perceived to be higher in Arawa than Buka. However, in Arawa, robbery with violence predominated, whereas in Buka, stealing without violence was perceived to be more common.

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 households had been victimised in the past year were asked to identify the crime that concerned them most. This did not necessarily mean that this particular crime was the most feared, but that the respondent considered it to be the most troubling one that had actually happened.

Table 7 shows comparisons between 2004 and 2005:

- stealing, and breaking and stealing were identified by 53% of respondents in Arawa (an increase from 39% in 2004), and 74% in Buka (compared to 66% in 2004), as the actual crimes that troubled people most;
- crimes of violence (assault, unprovoked violence, stealing with force, domestic violence, provoked violence, sexual assault, firearm use, and killing) accounted for 19% of responses in Arawa (well down from 39% in 2004), and 16% in Buka (compared to 23% in 2004); and
- domestic violence and sexual assault were lower than in 2004, one percent of responses in Arawa (compared to 8% in 2004), and three percent in Buka (compared to 5% in 2004), although subject to underreporting.

In Arawa, the most common reason given for the crime being the most troubling was loss of property (Q.4.2, open-ended responses):

- costs money to buy replacement;
- it's my personal property;
- it costs a lot to purchase such expensive items;
- a lot of money gained through sweat was spent on the bicycle;
- because I sweated my guts out to plant it;
- because I know I won't be compensated for what I've lost;
- expensive property gone, just like that;
- it was a wasted investment;
- it cost money and hard work; and
- it's hard to get a new replacement.

The five crimes were robbery, domestic violence, violence outside the home, assault, and sexual assault.
Table 7: Most Troubling Household Victimization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Victimization</th>
<th>Arawa 2004 (%)</th>
<th>Arawa 2005 (%)</th>
<th>Buka 2004 (%)</th>
<th>Buka 2005 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stealing your property from you</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breaking into your house and stealing (household)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car, truck, or bike stolen</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unprovoked violence (e.g. an attack by a stranger)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stealing your property from you with some force or threat</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using a firearm against you or your household</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destruction or damage to your property (household)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Violence</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual assault</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Killing (household member)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provoked violence (e.g. payback)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Q 4.1. Arawa 2004 N=78; 2005 N=69, Non-response=77%. Buka 2004 N=92; 2005 N=63, Non-response=78%.

Section 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, in part from respondents who did not regard crimes, such as petty theft, as being troubling, and occasionally from respondents who were unwilling to discuss traumatic events. Different household members may have considered different crimes to be the most troubling.

Another less troubling crime was violence. The common reasons associated with this crime were:

- *we were held up and threatened with a knife*;
- *we were held up and threatened with a knife and a screwdriver*;
• rape; and
• it causes domestic violence.

Other reasons were emotional distress, including loss of face:

• mi matured adult na ol brata bilong mi na arapela famili member nogat rait long bosstim laip bilong mi (I'm a mature adult and my brothers and other family members have no right to boss me around);
• no respect for neighbours – they are prying into other people's business;
• the offender was my own relative who I really trusted in everything; and
• no respect.

In Buka, many were concerned about the loss of property, for the following reasons:

• stealing is unlawful and people shouldn't be practising the act;
• obtaining clothes without any proper permission is hurtful;
• money earned through sheer hard work, therefore does not give another person the right to obtain property without any permission;
• I spent most of my savings on it;
• couldn't afford to buy a new one again;
• bought from my own expenses, and most needed items, so it is very upsetting; and
• em bai kostim plenti moa moni gen long painim niupla (It will cost a lot more money to find a new one again).

Others were angered by the most troubling crime because they were:

• afraid of what could have eventuated;
• not happy because this environment is a nice, friendly one to live in, and for a neighbour to do this is upsetting;
• because he is my husband's nephew, I felt really upset and angry at the same time;
• the victim is my child, and for someone trusted, to act this way is disgusting;
• angry and cross; and
• upset at his behaviour.

A few people in Buka were also concerned about victimisation restricting movement, for the following reasons:

• it deprives me from moving freely at nights;
• it restricts my movement; and
• I can't leave my personal belongings outside when I go out.

Do People Feel Safe?

While people in Buka demonstrated similarly high feelings concerning safety and security in their area in 2004, residents in Arawa showed considerably more concern in 2005. In Arawa, only 31 percent answered 'yes' to the question, down from 52% in 2004, and a high 64% stated 'sometimes' (see Table 8). The feelings of less security
were possibly generated by the armed hold-ups of businesses that occurred just prior to the field work in Arawa.

Table 8: Feelings of Safety and Security from Crime

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safe and Secure</th>
<th>Arawa 2004 (%)</th>
<th>Arawa 2005 (%)</th>
<th>Buka 2004 (%)</th>
<th>Buka 2005 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Bad driving made 99 percent of respondents feel unsafe in Arawa, and 97 percent in Buka (Q.2.12).

Who Thinks Crime Has Changed Most?

Gender and age continued to influence people’s perceptions about crime and safety. Tables 9 and 10 further analyse the data in Table 4 to see further who thought crime was changing.

Table 9: Changes in the Level of Crime, by Age and Gender, Arawa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variable</th>
<th>Less (%)</th>
<th>Same (%)</th>
<th>More (%)</th>
<th>Don’t Know (%)</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35+</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Q.2.1 x Q.9.1 and Q. 9.2. N=305. Non-response=0%.

Gender: In 2004, just over 50 percent of people in Arawa and Buka thought that crime had decreased in the past year, while in 2005 these statistics had dropped to
27% in each place. In 2004 and 2005, Arawa males were more likely than females to think that crime had decreased. In 2005, some 41 percent of women thought that there was more crime, compared to 34 percent of men.

**Age:** In 2004 and 2005, perceptions of local crime change had similar patterns among all age groups in both places, although there was a tendency for older people in Buka to think that there was more crime.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variable</th>
<th>Less (%)</th>
<th>Same (%)</th>
<th>More (%)</th>
<th>Don’t Know (%)</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-24</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35+</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Q.2.1 x Q.9.1 and Q. 9.2. N=291. 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 in both Arawa and Buka (Q.2.11). This situation remained in 2005. However, moderate numbers stated that restrictions did not exist:

- in Arawa, 38% of all responses related to restrictions on movement, while 30% stated that there was nothing in particular that crimes stopped them from doing in their area; and
- in Buka, 48% of responses related to restrictions of movement, while 40% stated that there were no particular restrictions.

---

12 Small cell numbers prevent further cross-analysis, for example, by gender.
CHAPTER 3

ACTUAL CRIME VICTIMISATION

One purpose of the crime victimisation surveys is to supplement official crime statistics. Quit apparent in all of the household surveys that have been conducted by the Justice Advisory Group (JAG) and the National Research Institute (NRI) are the very high levels of reported victimisation 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 in the previous chapter related to peoples' beliefs about what happened generally in Arawa and Buka.

This chapter presents data on the level and type of crime victimisation found in households in Arawa and Buka, in the 2005 survey. Comparisons are also made with the main findings from 2004.

Key Indicators of Victimisation from 2004 and 2005

The 2004 research found that household victimisation levels in Arawa and Buka were high, and that violent crime featured.

In 2005, some 14 of 16 key victimisation indicators showed reduced victimisation levels for both Arawa and Buka, ranging from one percent to 15 percent lower. Reductions tended to be greater in Arawa (see Table 11).

Table 11: Summary Household Victimisation Indicators, 2004 and 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Arawa 2004 (%)</th>
<th>Arawa 2005 (%)</th>
<th>Buka 2004 (%)</th>
<th>Buka 2005 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Victim of at least one crime</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim of multiple crimes</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim of repeat crime</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property crime</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent crime</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firearm use</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual assault</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stealing property</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13 The corresponding data for Port Moresby showed lesser reductions (from 2% to 6%).
The following decreases or increases are from 2004 to 2005:

- the percentage of households that were the victims, of at least one crime:
  - decreased 7% in Arawa, from 56% in 2004, to 49% in 2005; and
  - decreased 15% in Buka, from 66% in 2004, to 51% in 2005;
- the percentage of households that were the victims of multiple crime:
  - decreased 14% in Arawa, from 35% to 21%; and
  - decreased 8% in Buka, from 41% to 33%;
- the percentage of households that were the victims of repeat crime:
  - decreased 12% in Arawa, from 32% to 20%; and
  - decreased 7% in Buka, from 28% to 21%;
- the average percentage of households affected by five forms of property crime:
  - decreased 7% in Arawa, from 15% to 8%; and
  - decreased 3% in Buka, from 13% to 10%;
- the average percentage of households affected by seven forms of violent crime:
  - decreased 3% in Arawa, from 4% to 1%; and
  - decreased 1% in Buka, from 3% to 2%;
- the average percentage of households affected by firearm use:
  - decreased 5% in Arawa, from 6% to 1%; and
  - stayed the same in Buka, at 1%;
- the average percentage of households affected by sexual assault:
  - decreased 1% in Arawa, from 1% to nil; and
  - increased 1% in Buka, from nil to 1%;
- the average percentage of households affected by stealing property:
  - decreased 7% in Arawa, from 30% to 23%; and
  - decreased 10% in Buka from 40% to 30%;

Overall, these statistics show that, when compared to 2004:

- fewer people in both towns were victimised;
- fewer people in both towns were subject to multiple or repeat crime;
- fewer people in both towns were subject to violence or property crime; and
- the improvements were greater in Arawa.

Considerable improvement in overall victimisation could come from concentrating on reducing various types of stealing and property damage.

How Often Does Crime Occur in Arawa and Buka?

The 2004 survey found that crime victimisation was very high in both Arawa and Buka households. Table 12 shows how often respondents reported that they or their fellow household members had been the victims of any of twelve types of crime in the previous twelve months.

Of the 164 households surveyed in Arawa, and the 106 surveyed in Buka in 2005:

- some 51% in Arawa and 49% in Buka had not been the victims of crime. In both cases, this was an improvement over 2004, from 44% in Arawa, and 34% in Buka; and
some 21% of households in Arawa and 33% in Buka were victims of multiple crimes. This was an improvement over 2004, from 35% in Arawa, and 41% in Buka.

Table 12: Multiple Household Crime in the Past Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Crime Victimisations</th>
<th>Arawa 2004 (%)</th>
<th>Arawa 2005 (%)</th>
<th>Buka 2004 (%)</th>
<th>Buka 2005 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4 times</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9 times</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 or more times</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total households</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Data from S.3.14

The two major crime groupings which affected households were property crimes and violent crimes. Table 13 combines different types of crime to cancel out the effect of the categorisation of the crimes that might have occurred among respondents in the two towns.

- property crime decreased considerably in both towns, especially in Arawa:
  - in Arawa, the average percentage of households affected by five different types of property crime was 8% in 2005, which is a considerable decrease from 15% in 2004; and
  - in Buka, the average was 10% in 2005, which is a decrease from 13%; and
- violence also decreased:
  - in Arawa, the average percentage of households affected by seven different types of violence was 1% in 2004, which is a decrease from 4%; and
  - in Buka, the average was 2% in 2004, which is a decrease from 3%.

---

14 In Section 3 of the questionnaire, respondents were asked to identify separately whether they or 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. 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. Towns: Means (averages) were calculated by adding all crime reports in the households affected in the town and dividing by the number of individuals reporting them. Where data are reported on individual respondents, double-counting of the same crime could occur, but double-counting does not occur where household mean totals are reported.
Table 13: Property and Violent Crime Victimisation in the Past Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Crime</th>
<th>Arawa 2004 (Mean %)</th>
<th>Arawa 2005 (Mean %)</th>
<th>Buka 2004 (Mean %)</th>
<th>Buka 2005 (Mean %)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property crime</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: S.3 data from Table 14. Property crime is the average (mean) percentage of households affected by five different types of property crime that were combined to cancel out any effects from the 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 percent of seven types of violence combined — 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 shows a more detailed frequency of the separate types of crime victimisation and their levels of repeat for households. The first column shows the percentage of households victimised in the past year. For example, the most common victimisation in Arawa in 2004 was stealing property, which occurred to 30 percent of households. The second column shows the mean number of times affected households were victims. For example, in Arawa, in 2004, stealing from the 30 percent of households affected by it occurred an average of 3.1 times.

- in 2004, Arawa reported slightly more crime victimisation than Buka. However, in 2005, both had approximately the same levels:
  - in Arawa, 20% of households were victims of crime in 2005, which is a decrease from 32%; and
  - in Buka, 21% of households were victims of crime in 2005, which is a decrease from 28%.
- all types of crime in both towns decreased or stayed the same:
  - the highest incidence of victimisation was from stealing, where Buka retained higher levels than Arawa. Stealing property decreased in Arawa, from 30% of households in 2004, to 23% in 2005, and decreased in Buka, from 40% to 30%;
  - importantly, firearm use decreased in Arawa, from 6% in 2004, to one percent in 2005, which is the same level as Buka;
  - no killings were reported; and.
  - reported sexual assault varied by one percent in both towns.

Repeat victimisation declined, except for two elements in Arawa, and one in Buka:

- in Arawa, the mean for all crimes was 2.3 times in 2005, compared to 2.2 in 2004. The repeat of most crimes decreased, but there were considerable increases in the repeat of assault and ‘other crimes’; and
Table 14: Frequency and Repeat of Household Victimisation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Stealing Property</th>
<th>Breaking and Stealing</th>
<th>Assault</th>
<th>Destruct-ion or Damage to Property</th>
<th>Using a Fire-arm</th>
<th>Car, Truck, or Bike Stolen</th>
<th>Stealing Property with Some Violence</th>
<th>Unprovoked Violence</th>
<th>Provoked Violence</th>
<th>Sexual Assault</th>
<th>Killing</th>
<th>Other Crime</th>
<th>Repeat Victimisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arawa 2004</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arawa 2005</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buka 2004</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buka 2005</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: S3. Arawa 2004 N=156, 2005 N=164; Buka 2004 N=119, 2005 N=106. The data are unlikely to double-count the same crime where it might overlap two categories, for example, vehicles stolen with the use of a gun would be rated in the category that the respondent considered the main one.

Key:
- % = Percentage of households reporting victimisation. The Repeat Victimisation column shows the percentage of households affected.
- M = Mean number of times that victimisation occurred in the affected households.

Actual Crime Victimisation
in Buka, the mean decreased from 2.2 times per affected household in 2004, to 1.8 in 2005; that is, victimisation in Buka tended to more thinly spread than Arawa, except for a large increase in the repeat of stealing property with force.
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 Arawa and Buka can be a common setting for crime is because it is often occupied by large, extended families. As in other parts of Papua New Guinea, overcrowding contributes to the likelihood of violence, and in particular, sexual assault.

As in 2004, the survey did not explore any comprehensive measures of wealth or poverty. It does not address 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 the Bougainville towns, and indicated possible influences on crime victimisation in the household and community.

Similar to 2004, residents in both towns were informed and concerned about crime and its prevention and control in their communities. In both towns, communities willingly continue to take part in crime prevention and control. The chieftain system ensures that social structures incorporate leaders into dispute resolution, which provides some social control. Churches also play a powerful role, often in mediation and peacemaking.

Key Household and Community Indicators from 2004 and 2005

The 2004 survey revealed a variety of living conditions as factors in crime victimisation in the household. Table 15 compares the findings from the 2004 and 2005 surveys:

• the percentage of houses that were walled or fenced:
  • decreased in Arawa, from 42% in 2004, to 38% in 2005; but
  • increased in Buka, from 4% in 2004, to 30% in 2005 (this result may be subject to field work error);

• community participation in crime prevention:
  • increased slightly in Arawa in 2004, from 12% in 2004 to 14% in 2005; and
  • increased in Buka, from 9% in 2004 to 13% in 2005;

• in Arawa, many families occupy both town and village houses. In Buka, houses were more likely to contain large, extended families. Adult occupancy by four or more adults:
  • increased in Arawa, from 15% in 2004, to 33% in 2005;
  • increased in Buka, from 60% in 2004, to 66% in 2005; and

• the number of children in both towns decreased. In Arawa, from 42% of respondents, in 2004 reporting four or more children in their house, to 13%, in 2005, and in Buka, from 39% in 2004, to 22% in 2005. (This probably reflected children moving to the increased number of schools now functioning in rural areas);

• the percentage of people reporting that the most troublesome crime occurred in the home:
  • increased slightly in Arawa, from 80% in 2004, to 82% in 2005; and
increased in Buka, from 82% in 2004, to 89% in 2005 (These results may be partly an effect of less crime on the streets leaving a higher proportion to occur in the household);

- victims who knew the perpetrators of the most troublesome cases:
  - decreased substantially in Arawa, from 59% in 2004, to 30% in 2005; and
  - decreased in Buka, from 41% in 2004, to 35% in 2005; and

- in such cases, the incidents where the perpetrators were in a group:
  - increased in Arawa, from 45% in 2004, to 58% in 2005;
  - decreased in Buka, from 44% in 2004, to 23% in 2005;

- the level of reported unemployment among respondents:
  - increased considerably in Arawa, from 8% in 2004, to 15% in 2005; and
  - decreased in Buka from 15% in 2004, to 12% in 2005; and

- respondents' most preferred government initiative for the reduction of crime was more jobs in Arawa, and more youth activities in Buka.

Table 15: Summary Household and Community Indicators, 2004 and 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Arawa 2004 (%)</th>
<th>Arawa 2005 (%)</th>
<th>Buka 2004 (%)</th>
<th>Buka 2005 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Houses walled or fenced</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in community crime protection group</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four or more adults per household</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four or more children per household</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most troubling crime occurred in the home</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim knew the perpetrator in the most troubling crime</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than one offender in the most troubling crime</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most preferred government initiative on crime</td>
<td>Youth activities (27%)</td>
<td>More jobs (21%)</td>
<td>Youth activities (33%)</td>
<td>Youth activities (31%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What Levels of Security?

Houses in Arawa and Buka appear less likely to be walled or fenced than in many other towns and cities in Papua New Guinea. Table 16 shows that, in Arawa, the percentage of houses that were walled or fenced was 38%, while 62% were not. In Buka, 30% were walled or fenced and 70% were not.

Table 16: House Security

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Arawa 2005 (%)</th>
<th>Buka 2005 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walled or fenced</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfenced</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Q.1.11. Arawa N=305, Non-response=0%. Buka N=234, Non-response=20%. Aspects of the Buka data appear anomalous and may be subject to field work error.

When asked what one thing the household could do better to make itself safer (Q.5.2), the principal response was to make the house more secure in Arawa (33%) and Buka (27%).

What Are Living Conditions Like?

Table 17 shows that the level of utilities and physical services in both towns was quite high. Arawa residents were more likely to be connected to water and sewage, but less likely to have phones or vehicles, which is a sign of greater public investment in infrastructure in the past, but lower private incomes at present.

Table 17: Household Utilities, 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utilities</th>
<th>Arawa 2005 (%)</th>
<th>Buka 2005 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permanent water supply</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewage</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Q.1.5, 1.7-1.10. Arawa, N=305, Non-response=0%. Buka, N=291. Non-response=0%. Household occupancy appeared to be in a state of change, especially in Arawa (see Table 18).
in Arawa, many families occupy both town and village houses. Some family members can be resident in a neighbouring village, where adults often garden, or spend time. However, adult occupancy did increase in the town in 2005, with 33% reporting that they lived in houses with four or more adults, compared to 15% in 2004;

- in Buka, houses were more likely to be occupied by large extended families, as is common elsewhere in Papua New Guinea;

- the number of children in both towns decreased from 42% in 2004, to 13% in Arawa, and 39% to 22% in Buka, probably reflecting that more schools are now functioning in rural areas; and

- in Arawa, 77% claimed ownership of the house, which is an increase from 57% in 2004, whereas in Buka only 16% claimed ownership, compared to 24%.

Table 18: Household Occupancy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Composition</th>
<th>Arawa 2004 (%)</th>
<th>Arawa 2005 (%)</th>
<th>Buka 2004 (%)</th>
<th>Buka 2005 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Four or more adults</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four or more children</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own house</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


What Type of Employment?

Another indicator of occupancy is that, in 2005, of those people who were surveyed, 55 percent in Arawa, and 44 percent in Buka were involved in home duties, unemployed, or students (see Table 19). These individuals would be likely to use household space on a regular and constant basis.

Full-time or government employment would normally place people in an advantaged group of the fully employed:

- in Arawa, only 18% of respondents indicated that they were in this group. This was an increase from 12% in 2004, mainly in the informal sector; and

- in Buka, 33% indicated that they were in this group, which was slightly above the 32% in 2004.

In Arawa, 17% reported they were unemployed, as did 12% in Buka, which was a large increase in Arawa and a decrease in Buka.
**Table 19: Occupational Status**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Arawa 2004 (%)</th>
<th>Arawa 2005 (%)</th>
<th>Buka 2004 (%)</th>
<th>Buka 2005 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home duties</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time (informal)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual work</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government employee</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer/fishing</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time (formal)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Who Are the Victims?**

Table 20 shows that, in Arawa, different age and gender groups were sometimes victims of different types of crime. However, caution is needed with the data because very low numbers of most types of crime were reported.
Table 20: Individual Crime Victimisation by Age and Gender, Arawa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Crime</th>
<th>Age (%)</th>
<th>Gender (%)</th>
<th>No. of Incidents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15-24</td>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>35+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent in Sample</strong></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stealing your property from you</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unprovoked violence (e.g. an attack by a stranger)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car, truck, or bike stolen</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stealing property with some force or threat</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using a firearm against you</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provoked violence (e.g. payback)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Assault</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average (%)</strong></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: S.3 x S.9 demographic data for individuals only. Small cell sizes limit further cross-analysis.

In Arawa, victimisation was in proportion to the size of the age groups, for example, 15-24 year olds represented 37 percent of the sample, and were victims in 37 percent of reported cases:

- younger people were more vulnerable to:
  - unprovoked violence (50%), and
  - property theft (43%);
- mature adults were more prone to vehicle theft (50%);
  - the only target of firearm use; but
  - less prone to unprovoked violence (17%);
- older adults were more prone to assault (62%); but
- less prone to unprovoked violence (33%) and vehicle theft (25%);
- females were more victimised than males (60% versus 47% in the sample), but were more likely to report as victims of:
  - unprovoked violence (67%);
  - stealing (63%); and
  - assault (62%); and
• males were less victimised than females (40% versus 53% in the sample), but were more likely to be victims of:
  o vehicle theft (75% versus 52% in the sample); but
  o assault (38%), stealing (37%), and unprovoked violence (33%) less often than women.

No incidents of sexual assault or provoked violence (payback) were reported.

In Buka (see Table 21):

• younger people much more often reported individually as being victims of crime overall (44% on average, versus 36% of 15-24 year olds in the sample), and were more vulnerable to:
  o assault (71%);
  o unprovoked violence (50%); and
  o the only cases of stealing with force and firearm use;

• mature adults were lesser victims of crime overall (12% on average, versus 26% in the sample, which was much lower than the 25% in Arawa). They were prone to an unexplained 'other types of crime' (50%), but the statistics are too low to draw conclusions;

• older adults reported more as being victims of crime overall (44% on average, versus 38% of people 35 and over in the sample). They were more prone to:
  o vehicle theft (60%);
  o unprovoked violence (50%); and
  o stealing (43%); but
  o less prone to assault (29%);

• unusually, females did not report disproportionately, as victims (49% versus 46% in the sample). Females were most prone to:
  o sexual assault (100%, but there was only one reported case); and
  o stealing (60%); and

• male victimisation was about average (51% versus 54% in the sample), especially from:
  o provoked violence (but only one reported case);
  o vehicle theft (80%); and
  o unprovoked violence (75%).

Overall, total numbers and the rank order of types of crime victimisation in Arawa and Buka were very similar, but the demographics were different:

• young and old people in Buka more often reported as being victims of crime, whereas the middle group reported less crime victimisation against themselves. In Arawa, the pattern was much more consistent with the proportions in the sample; and

• in Arawa, women were more victimised, but this was not the case in Buka.
In What Setting Does Crime Occur?

Respondents were asked to self-identify the most troubling crimes for themselves or their households during the past 12 months. They nominated a wide range and variety of troubling crimes (see Table 7). It is also relevant to look at the settings in which these crimes occurred. Table 22 shows that:

- in Arawa, 82% of the most troubling crimes occurred in the home, which is an increase of two percent over 2004; and
- in Buka, 89% of the most troubling crimes occurred in the home, which is an increase of seven percent over 2004.

One possible implication is that policing, in reducing public crime, left a higher proportion to occur in private settings.
Table 22: Location of the Most Troubling Crimes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Arawa 2004 (%)</th>
<th>Arawa 2005 (%)</th>
<th>Buka 2004 (%)</th>
<th>Buka 2005 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shops</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Q.4.4. Arawa 2004 N=106; 2005 N=104, Non-response=66%. Buka 2004 N=125; 2005 N=92, Non-response=68%. S.4 answers were conditional upon respondents having identified in (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 crime settings in both towns:

- only 10% of victims in Arawa and 11% in Buka indicated that they were alone at the time (Q.4.5);
- the crimes were most likely to occur at night (76% of the nominated cases in Arawa and 70% in Buka, Q.4.6), and on Saturdays (45% in Arawa, 38% in Buka, Q.4.7); and
- injury from nominated crimes occurred in only six percent of cases in Arawa, and two percent in Buka (Q.4.11). In 50% of such cases in Arawa, but none in Buka, respondents knew the reason for the injury (Q.4.12). In the six Arawa cases, alcohol (67%) and domestic disputes (33%) were the reasons given.

These patterns were similar to those in 2004.

Who Are the Perpetrators?

The survey showed that, in 2005, there was an apparent increase in crimes in Arawa, which were perpetrated by unknown people from outside the town. Where the perpetrators were known, in both towns they were more likely to be relatives or from the local area, and more so in Arawa, to operate in groups (see Table 23):
Table 23: The Perpetrators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perpetrator</th>
<th>Arawa 2004 (%)</th>
<th>Arawa 2005 (%)</th>
<th>Buka 2004 (%)</th>
<th>Buka 2005 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relative or wantok</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbour</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gang member</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone you had only seen before</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


- the offenders were often known to the victims:
  - in Arawa, in only 30% of cases, which is consistent with the reported increase in outside crime, compared to 59% in 2004. Where known, the offenders were a relative, wantok, or spouse (59%), or a neighbour or friend (19%); and
  - in Buka, the victims knew the offenders in 36% of the most troubling cases, which was a reduction from 41% in 2004. When known, the offenders were a relative, wantok, or spouse (43%), or a neighbour or friend (29%
- there was more than one offender (Q.4.8):  
  - in Arawa, in 58% of the most troubling cases, compared to 45% in 2004; and
  - in Buka, in 23% of cases, compared to 43% in 2004; and
- weapons were used in 12% of cases in both towns (Q.4.10), but few people were injured (Q.4.11).

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

Table 6 indicated that seven percent of respondents in Arawa and four percent in Buka considered that domestic violence and sexual assault were the crimes that happened most in their area. However, Table 7 and Table 14 indicated lower levels of actual reports of these types of victimisation, which were similar or lower than the levels reported in 2004.
was informal pressure in communities not to report on crimes of violence, including sexual assault.

In Arawa, it appears that residents are trying to resolve the issues within the community, as opposed to reporting them to the police, especially when they feel that the police have limited powers. This might explain the large increase in 'other' crimes in Arawa, as shown in Table 7.

While the household surveys give an indication of the perpetrators of domestic violence and sexual assault, and give minimum levels for them, their occurrence is highly likely to be underreported. Consequently, the surveys cannot give an accurate indication of their real level.\(^{15}\)

**Who Should Be Responsible for Crime Prevention and Control?**

Bougainville has strong chieftain systems, and leadership and community cooperation are features of social life on the island. The surveys strongly confirm the importance of the community in crime prevention. Table 24 shows that, in 2005, the community and individuals were again viewed as primarily responsible for their own safety:

- in Arawa, in 2005, individuals were seen as having the prime responsibility by 37% of respondents; and
- in Buka, the community was seen as having the responsibility by 39% of respondents, with individuals coming second.

\(^{15}\) These problems are grounded in the survey 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 that were 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 the 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.
Table 24: Group Responsibility for Crime Prevention and Community Safety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Arawa 2004 (%)</th>
<th>Arawa 2005 (%)</th>
<th>Buka 2004 (%)</th>
<th>Buka 2005 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individuals</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police and Community</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other combinations</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Q.8.6. Arawa 2004 N=304; 2005 N=301, Non-response=1%. Buka 2004 N=287; 2005 N=290, Non-response=0%.

Community responsibility is consistent with the other survey findings:

- only 15% of respondents in Arawa, and 18% in Buka reported their most troubling crime to the police (see Table 35); and
- more people reported crimes to someone in the community — 66% to a relative in Arawa and 48% in Buka, otherwise to a community group or leader, or to a traditional authority (especially in Arawa) (Q.4.21).

The survey asked respondents if there were organisations, other than the police, that provided protection against crime in the community (Q.5.3):

- in Arawa, 19% of respondents stated that there was a local community crime prevention organisation; and
- in Buka, 20% of respondents reported that they had a similar organisation.

Respondents mainly mentioned chiefs and village leaders.

In both towns, community participation in crime prevention had increased slightly (Q.5.5):

- in Arawa, 14% of respondents indicated that they participated, which was a two percent increase over 2004; and
- in Buka, 13% of respondents indicated that they participated in such a group, which was a four percent increase over 2004.

Additionally, household security was important. People showed the same priorities as in 2004 when asked what they could do to make themselves safer from crime. The two principal responses were:
make their houses more secure — Arawa (36%) and Buka (33%); and
participate more in crime prevention activities — Arawa (25%), and Buka (31%) (Q.5.2).

Community patrolling was an important feature of the community crime prevention groups, with 57 percent of respondents who answered Q.5.6 in Arawa, and 51 percent in Buka indicating that patrols were an activity of the group. Offender apprehension was also a function, with 69 percent of people in Arawa and 40 percent of people in Buka stating this.

Offenders were dealt with in a variety of ways. In Arawa, people stated (Q.5.8):

- we talk to them;
- chiefs normally charge them;
- warn them, or sometimes refer them to the police station;
- bring them to the Village Court;
- punish them with community service;
- tell them to compensate for their mean behaviour; and
- tell youths with guns to surrender them to the authorities.

In Buka, there were some clearly expressed examples of restorative justice, as an option, before referral to the police:

- sit with an offender and sort the matter out. If there is a need to refer it to the police, then it is done;
- counselling, otherwise refer them to police;
- depending on how serious the crime is, he or she is put behind bars, tried and sentenced, and sent to prison. If less serious, they appear before the community judiciary committee for counselling. Later, the victim and offender come up with an agreed solution and then pardon each other.

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

- in Arawa, 65% stated that people who commit crimes should go to prison, while in Buka, 53% thought the same; and
- in Arawa, 34% thought that compensation and supervision was the best option for offenders, while in Buka, 45% thought that.

The implication may be that restorative options are seen as only being relevant to less serious crimes, or to crimes where the offender is a member of the community, rather than an outsider over whom less social influence can be wielded.

What Can Be Done for Youth?

As in 2004, respondents believed that crime would reduce, if there were more activities for youth, and more employment opportunities. People clearly saw prevention, through change in social and economic conditions, as the long-term solution to crime. When asked what their government could do to make their area safer, the responses very similar to 2004. Table 25 shows that:
• in Arawa, 56% favoured social change — more jobs (21%), better living conditions (18%), and youth activities (17%), while in Buka, 67% favoured these solutions;
• in Arawa, 43% favoured law and order solutions — more police (18%), harsher penalties from the courts (13%), fight corruption (9%), and crack down on gangs (3%), while in Buka, 32% favoured these solutions; and
• very few people in either town perceived controlling in-migration as an issue.

Table 25: Preferred Government Initiatives on Crime

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Arawa 2004 (%)</th>
<th>Arawa 2005 (%)</th>
<th>Buka 2004 (%)</th>
<th>Buka 2005 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More jobs</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better living conditions</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More police</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth activities</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harsher penalties from the courts</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fight corruption</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crack down on gangs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The message for community leaders in Arawa and Buka was similar, with communities wanting the development of more activities for young people, although cooperation with the police was also considered important (see Table 26).
Unemployment, lack of access to resources, and lack of productive profitable activities were viewed as contributing factors to young people being lawless. Open-ended comments on Q.5.10 in both terms mentioned a variety of things that could be done for the young, for example:

- conduct awareness for younger people on the importance of a safe community;
- improve rural development;
- create an awareness for young people about the importance of a safe society;
- employ more people in community policing;
- conduct awareness, especially for youth, to control themselves when under the influence of liquor, and to respect the law;
- respect traditional authority;
- give training to the uneducated ones; and
- tell them to caution and advise youngsters to stop creating problems at this crucial time of our history.

Community crime prevention and community safety are issues of which Bougainvilleans are very aware. There seemed to be a general feeling that communities and individuals have a responsibility to make sure that they ensure their own safety. The solid social structure of many aspects of island society enables restorative justice to occur, with many people opting to resolve problems within the community. Part of the reason for doing so was the absence for many years of formal criminal justice agencies, so that the people have become accustomed to solving their disputes, using their own resolution mechanisms.
CHAPTER 5
COMMUNITY VIEWS ABOUT GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

The 2004 survey focused especially on policing. In 2005, sector agencies sought data on their level of public awareness and public satisfaction with their work. These data can only put a frame around the overall level of awareness among the public. To solicit more information about the thinking of people who come into contact with the agencies, and have personal experiences of their activities, would require separate client studies.

This chapter presents the public awareness data, and addresses a second sector concern about perceptions of corruption and action over it, by the agencies.

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 the public had scant contact with the formal sector agencies.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Arawa 2004 (%)</th>
<th>Arawa 200 (%)</th>
<th>Buka 2004 (%)</th>
<th>Buka 2005 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with all agencies over handling of own matter</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with police over handling of own matter</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with all agencies over handling of corruption</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with police over handling of corruption</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police do a good job</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reported most troubling crime to police</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement in opinion from contact with the police</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police discipline improved (yes, sometimes)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police participate in community consultations (yes, sometimes)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: - = Question not asked in 2004.

* where respondents did have contact in 2005, there was a mean level of satisfaction of 52% in Arawa and 59% in Buka.
where the public had contact with the police, there was a mean level of satisfaction of 47% in Arawa, but a higher 61% in Buka; and

- awareness of agency action over corruption was minimal. The small number of people who were aware had moderate overall levels of satisfaction of 57% in Arawa and 42% in Buka:
- awareness of police action over corruption was much lower than other agencies, with a satisfaction level of 41% in both towns.

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

- the percentage of people who thought the police were doing a good job overall:
  - decreased greatly in Arawa, from 60% in 2004, to 25% in 2005; and
  - decreased by a smaller amount in Buka, from 47%, to 36% in 2005;
- the percentage of people who reported their most troubling crime to the police:
  - decreased in Arawa, from 16% in 2004, to 15% in 2005; and
  - decreased in Buka, from 23% in 2004, to 18% in 2005;
- the percentage of people who improved their opinion of the police as a result of official contact with them:
  - decreased in Arawa, from 77% in 2004, to 59% in 2005; and
  - decreased in Buka, from 70% in 2004, to 67% in 2005;
- some 76% of people in Arawa thought that police discipline had improved in 2005, compared to 48% in Buka; and
- in Arawa, 79% thought that the police had participated in community consultations in 2005, compared to 55% in Buka.

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

- awareness of the AAP was very high, with virtually every respondent having an opinion about them;
- in Arawa, 55% of respondents considered that the AAP did make a difference while they were there, while in Buka, 49% thought the same. In the vast majority of these cases, people thought that policing did improve; and
- in Arawa, 55% thought that their withdrawal also made a difference, while in Buka, 38% thought the same, to the effect that policing reverted to its former patterns.

The implications of the data on police performance are that:

- the 2004 baseline data showed quite high public regard for the police force; and
- 2005 was a confusing year, with the coming and going of the AAP, often negative changes in public opinion, but considerably reduced crime victimisation.

Two factors may have generated negative opinion. One is that increased police effectiveness (as reflected in the lower victimisation figures) may simply mean that actual and potential perpetrators of crime are now dissatisfied. The other is that willingness to use community options may reduce the perceived need for the police.
What Do People Know of the Law and Justice Sector Agencies?

The survey results show that the public in Arawa and Buka had low awareness of, and little or no contact with, the formal law and justice agencies, except the police (see Table 28):

Table 28: Contact with the Law and Justice Sector Agencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Arawa</th>
<th>Buka</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes (%)</td>
<td>No (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>13 (83)</td>
<td>4 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magistrates Court</td>
<td>6 (69)</td>
<td>25 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Justice and Attorney General</td>
<td>1 (66)</td>
<td>33 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Court</td>
<td>1 (73)</td>
<td>26 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Solicitor’s Office</td>
<td>1 (70)</td>
<td>29 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ombudsman Commission</td>
<td>1 (70)</td>
<td>29 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Prosecutor’s Office</td>
<td>0 (71)</td>
<td>29 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctional Service</td>
<td>0 (75)</td>
<td>25 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (%)</td>
<td>3 (72)</td>
<td>25 (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: S.2.15-2.36. Arawa N=305, Buka N=291. Non-responses=0-2%.

- only 13% of respondents in Arawa and 11% in Buka had contact with the police; and
- beyond the police, six percent or fewer respondents had come into contact with the other agencies:
  - in Arawa, on average, 25% did not know of the agencies, and 71% had no contact with them; and
  - in Buka, the level of awareness was slightly higher but, on average, 17% did not know of the agencies, and 80% had no contact with them.

One implication is that the work of the central government agencies appeared largely irrelevant to people in Arawa and Buka, in part, undoubtedly because of the isolation during and after the civil war.
In the few matters where people had something to do with the agencies, satisfaction with how their matter had been handled was fairly evenly divided (see Table 29):

- in 66 matters in Arawa, 52% of respondents were satisfied, while in 48% of cases, they were not;
- in 61 matters in Buka, 59% of respondents were satisfied, while in 41% of cases, they were not;
- the level of satisfaction with the police was lower in Arawa (47% of 36 cases) than Buka (61% of 31 cases);
- the level of satisfaction with the magistrates courts was similar in both Arawa and Buka; and
- the low levels of contact with other agencies mean that no conclusions can be drawn about them.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Arawa</th>
<th>Buka</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Matters (No.)</td>
<td>Satisfied (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magistrates Court</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Solicitor's Office</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Court</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Justice and Attorney General</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ombudsman Commission</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Prosecutor's Office</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctional Service</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>66</strong></td>
<td><strong>52</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: S.2.16-2.37.
Are the Law and Justice Agencies Doing a Good Job over Corruption?

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

- a very high 94% of respondents in Arawa, and 89% in Buka thought that the crime problem in Papua New Guinea was large or very large (see Table 2); and
- a very high 90% of respondents in Arawa, and 83% in Buka thought that corruption, nationally, was increasing (see Table 3);

When asked whether they thought that the Law and Justice Sector agencies were doing a good or bad job over corruption, the results showed that (see Table 30):

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Arawa</th>
<th>Buka</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magistrates Court</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Solicitor’s Office</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Court</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Justice and Attorney General</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ombudsman Commission</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Prosecutor’s Office</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctional Service</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: S.2.17-2.38. Arawa N=305, Non-response=89-100%. Buka N= 291, Non-response = 89-99%. The very high non-response rates derive from respondents who had no knowledge of the agencies.

- a nearly total lack of awareness of agency actions, as indicated by very high levels of non-response, and almost no knowledge among the general public in either town about the agencies’ efforts over corruption;
- among those who expressed an opinion:
  - in 67 matters in Arawa, 57% of respondents were satisfied; and
  - in 60 matters in Buka, 42% of respondents were satisfied;
- the level of satisfaction with police action was the same in both towns, at 41%;
• the level of satisfaction with the magistrates court was 33% in Buka, compared to 71% in Arawa; and
• the low level of contact with other agencies mean that no conclusions can be drawn about them.

What Are the Attitudes to the Policing Services?

Policing and the work of the police are important on Bougainville. Police work in parallel with local systems of social control, which include the chiefs and village elders. Although, the work of the police was often seen positively, there were concerns. Attitudes to police changed from 2004 to 2005, with a considerable decrease in their approval rating, especially in Arawa (see Table 31).

• in Arawa, in 2005, only 25% thought that the police were doing a good job, which was a major decrease from 60% in 2004; and
• in Buka, in 2005, some 36% thought that the police were doing a good job, which is a smaller decrease from 47% in 2004.

Arawa and Buka each appeared to have one main area of concern about police work.

Table 31: Opinion on Whether Police Do a Good Job

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Arawa</th>
<th>Buka</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2004 (%)</td>
<td>2005 (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In Arawa, the main concern expressed was that the police were ill-equipped to handle major issues, such as gun control. People considered that police work was limited because guns were still in the community (some of the sentiment expressed may have been influenced by armed robberies in Arawa just prior to the commencement of the survey). Open-ended comments to various questions showed these concerns:

• they (police) cannot respond to crime immediately because of fear of guns still in the community;
• they are afraid to respond to crime because of guns present in the community at large;
• there’s not much the police can do in Arawa because of fear of guns or reprisals by armed gangs;
• they haven’t got much power to arrest or press charges against criminals;
• the police are powerless against criminals, especially here in Arawa;
• because they’re outnumbered and afraid of apprehending hardcore criminals;
• police only take offenders to the chiefs who never take action against these people; and
• tell youths with guns to surrender them to the authorities.

The main concern for Buka respondents was police discipline:

• they are ignorant of offenders and drunkards, and only depend on formal complaints that are filed;
• they drink a lot and don’t do their jobs;
• they are not interactive with the community; and
• their discipline isn’t very good.

The 2004 and 2005 results were similar:

• some 98% of respondents in Arawa, and 94% in Buka stated that they knew where the local police station was (Q.6.1);
• some 28% of respondents in Arawa, and 31% in Buka had been to their local police station in the past year (Q.6.2); and
• some 9% of respondents in Arawa had had official contact with the police — 44% of these as victims of crime. In Buka, 16% had had official contact with the police — 54% as a victim of crime (Q.6.3, Q. 6.4).

Of those respondents who had official contact with the police, 59% in Arawa and 67% in Buka stated that it had improved their opinion of them. This was a decrease in Arawa compared to 2004, while Buka remained similar to 2004 (see Table 32).

**Table 32: Improvement in Opinion from Contact with the Police**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improved Opinion</th>
<th>Arawa</th>
<th>Buka</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2004 (%)</td>
<td>2005 (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Q.6.5. Arawa 2004 N=60; 2005 N=27, Non-response=91%. Buka 2004 N=96; 2005 N=42, Non-response=86%. The very high non-response rates derive from respondents who had no formal contact.

In a new question for 2005, respondents were asked whether police discipline had improved in the past 12 months. Table 33 shows a not very positive response:
Table 33: Improvement in Police Discipline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improved</th>
<th>Arawa 2004 (%)</th>
<th>Arawa 2005 (%)</th>
<th>Buka 2004 (%)</th>
<th>Buka 2005 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Q.7.7. Arawa 2005 N=302, Non-response=1%. Buka 2005 N=289, Non-response=1%.

- in Arawa, only 23% considered that police discipline had improved, although a further 53% thought that it had improved sometimes; and
- in Buka, 23% thought police discipline had improved, 38% were negative, and only 25% thought that it had improved sometimes.

Do the Police Participate in the Community?

Another new question in 2005 was to monitor community perceptions of police participation occurring in the community. Table 34 shows that:

- in Arawa, 79% of respondents thought participation occurred, at least sometimes; and
- in Buka, 55% thought that participation occurred, at least sometimes.

Table 34: Police Participation in Community Consultations about Crime

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participate</th>
<th>Arawa (%)</th>
<th>Buka (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Q.8.7. Arawa N=299, Non-response=2%. Buka 2005 N=290, Non-response=0%.
In both Arawa and Buka, only 18% of people were able to provide examples of community-based policing (Q.6.12).

**What about Other Types of Policing?**

Respondents were asked to differentiate between regular and auxiliary police (Q.6.9).

- some 63% in Arawa and 62% in Buka were able to differentiate;
- as in 2004, more than 60% in Arawa preferred the regular police to the auxiliary police (Q.6.11). In Buka, the statistics fell to 48%, while 26% preferred both groups to operate;
- in both towns, approximately 70% of respondents indicated that mobile squads made them feel less safe (Q.6.13); and
- in Arawa, 94% of people could tell the difference between Bougainvillean police and other police, while in Buka, 82% could tell the difference (Q.6.10).

**Is Crime Reported to the Police?**

Victims of crime were asked whether they reported the most troubling victimisation to the police (see Table 35):

- only 15% in Arawa, and 18% in Buka reported that they did this Q.4.13). Both responses were slightly down from 2004.

**Table 35: Reporting of Most Troublesome Incident to the Police**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reported</th>
<th>Arawa</th>
<th>Buka</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2004 (%)</td>
<td>2005 (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Of those respondents who stated that they reported to the police (Q.4.15):

- in Arawa, only 25% were satisfied with the police response, while 75% were not; and
- in Buka, 47% were satisfied with the police response, while 53% were not.

More than 50% of respondents in both towns reported the crime to others beyond the police (Q.4.21):
in Arawa, in 2005, some 42% of people stated that they reported the crime to forms of authority other than the police (such as relatives or traditional authorities), compared to 51% in 2004; and
• in Buka, in 2005, some 55% of people reported it to a form of authority other than the police, compared to 52% in 2004.

The decrease in the reporting rates and the increase in reporting to other forms of authority demonstrate a 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?

In 2004 and 2005, a visible police presence was thought to be a key deterrent (see Table 36).

Table 36: The Most Important Things Police Can Do in the Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Arawa 2004 (%)</th>
<th>Arawa 2005 (%)</th>
<th>Buka 2004 (%)</th>
<th>Buka 2005 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walking around in groups</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cautioning young people</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking with people</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving around</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All of these</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just being around</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending meetings</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They do nothing important in this regard</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In Arawa and Buka, people wanted to see police walking around in groups and talking with the public. Some 72% of respondents in Arawa and 82% in Buka thought that having the police around in their community would stop people from committing crimes (Q.7.5).
The police were also mentioned, more so in Arawa than Buka, as one of 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 following answers were given:

- in Arawa, 37% thought that individuals were, while in Buka, 18% thought so;
- in Arawa, 32% thought that the community was, while in Buka, 39% thought so; and
- in Arawa, 27% thought that the police were, while in Buka, only 10% thought so.

Are the Police Thought to Be Criminals?

In Port Moresby, open-ended responses in the surveys in 2004 and 2005 often accused the police of criminal behaviour and corruption. No such comment was apparent in Arawa or Buka, where the focus was on police ineffectiveness and inefficiency.

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 the attitude that police have towards the public. In both Arawa and Buka, in 2004, interviewees who thought that the police were doing a good job predominantly did so because of service delivery rather than attitude. The response in 2005 was similar (see Table 37):

Table 37: Reasons Why Police Were Doing a Good Job

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Arawa 2004 (%)</th>
<th>Arawa 2005 (%)</th>
<th>Buka 2004 (%)</th>
<th>Buka 2005 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>They do things to maintain the safety of the community</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They are responsive to crime in your area</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They are fair in their dealings with the community</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They treat the community with respect</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

in Arawa, 25% of respondents thought that the police in their area were doing a good job, while in Buka, 36% thought that they did (Q.6.6); and among those who thought that the police were doing a good job, the main reasons were:
- police maintaining community safety (33% in Arawa, and 38% in Buka);
- responsiveness to crime (23% in Arawa, and 40% in Buka); and
- fairness, and treating the community with respect were less frequently given as reasons.

Did the Australian Assisting Police Make a Difference?

During 2004 and 2005, the Australian Assisting Police (AAP) had a presence in Bougainville under the Enhanced Cooperation Program. A majority of respondents viewed their deployment favourably, while they were there (see Table 38). Open-ended comments depicted strong satisfaction with their effectiveness and responsiveness:
- awareness of the AAP was very high, with virtually every respondent having an opinion about their presence;
- some 55% of respondents in Arawa and 49% in Buka considered that they did make a difference, while they were there. Open-ended opinion was very positive; and
- some 55% in Arawa and 38% in Buka also 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 38: Australian Police Presence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AAP Presence</th>
<th>Arawa Yes (%)</th>
<th>Buka Yes (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did they make a difference?</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once they left, was there a difference?</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Q.6.14, Arawa N=303, Non-response=1%. Buka N=290, Non-response=0%. Q.6.15, Arawa N=305, Non-response=0%. Buka N=283, Non-response=3%.

The open-ended question that asked if the AAP made a difference received a very high volume of opinion (460 comments on Q.6.14, from both Arawa and Buka). The opinion was very positive, and in effect, implies what the public would like to see a similar attitude and performance from the Bougainvillean police.

In Arawa, the main reason given for the AAP’s success was their effectiveness in reducing crime. For example:
- crimes long Arawa i bin down liklik (crime in Arawa went down a little);
- the crime rate decreased;
- their presence brought peace to communities;
- a decrease in crime and general maintenance of law and order;
• there was more police control in town;
• alcohol-related problems ceased;
• got the drunkards off the streets;
• there was less public nuisance, especially drunks;
• weekends were so quiet;
• they stopped most of the troublemakers;
• criminal activities ceased;
• people felt safer;
• they were active in preventing crime from happening;
• they created a safer atmosphere to move around;
• law and order was strong; and
• they made the community feel safe.

Several respondents commented on the high visible presence as the key factor in their effectiveness. For example:

• they made foot patrols day and night;
• they did a lot of foot patrols around the town;
• making foot patrols reduced criminal activities; and
• more police patrols, and more confidence in the local police force.

When situations did occur, they were regarded as very responsive, for example:

• they were very punctual;
• they were more responsive to crime, although there wasn’t much action done; and
• they were more responsive to crime.

Several people commented that the AAP had a positive effect on the local police:

• assisted the local police more effectively;
• they provided management skills to our local policemen;
• better assisted local police in carrying out their duties;
• high local police morale; and
• our own police worked well under their direction.

The AAP had a greater presence in Buka, and many people there commented on their effectiveness:

• the crime rate in Buka town decreased;
• helped lower the law and order problems;
• worked with chiefs to prevent crimes;
• alcohol-related problems were starting to decrease;
• they stopped drunkards misbehaving in public;
• helped with lowering law and order problems, especially alcohol-related problems;
• assisted with lowering law and order problems, especially alcohol-related crimes;
• criminal activities decreased;
• they punished and warned offenders accordingly;
the AAP were stricter, and fewer crimes were committed; the prompt arrest of offenders; and persons who carried guns into Buka did not do so anymore.

Others commented on the AAP’s visibility, responsiveness, and resourcing:

- police patrols were on a regular basis;
- there was a fast response to complaints;
- logistical support was very good;
- their mobility was good in terms of logistics;
- they were better equipped with radios and computerised gadgets to help in tracking lawbreakers; and
- they had assets to effectively carry out police service.

Others thought that the AAP worked well with the Bougainvillean police:

- cooperated well with our Bougainvillean police;
- helped the local police;
- police discipline changed from bad to good;
- transparency prevailed;
- helped to discipline the local police force;
- they showed a very good example to the local police, especially work ethics;
- they lifted the morale of the local police;
- our police were disciplined; and
- they trained the local police well.
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TERMS OF REFERENCE

Rationale and Background

As part of the development of the Law and 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-balances reported crime rates and provides 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 police 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, Arawa, Buka, 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 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 Justice Advisory Group (JAG) will partner the National Research Institute (NRI) and provide oversight and quality assurance, as well as ensuring that the work is closely coordinated with the Papua New Guinean Government's Law and Justice Sector Strategic Framework and stakeholders in Papua New Guinea including the National Coordinating Mechanism (NCM), the Law and Justice Sector Working Group (LJSWG), all Law and Justice Sector agencies and, importantly, the Autonomous Bougainville Government.
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PERSONNEL

Research Team

All members of the research team are alphabetically listed 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, developed implementation plans with NRI, oversaw data entry in Canberra, reported on the survey results, and provided oversight and coordination.
• Ms. Fiona Hukula (Senior Research Officer, NRI) managed the surveys in Arawa and Buka, provided training for data collectors in Arawa and Buka, and reported on the survey results.
• Lt. Col. James Laki (Senior Research Fellow, NRI) oversaw NRI’s involvement and reported on the survey results.

Data Collectors

• Arawa: Mr. Leonard Roka (Field Supervisor), Mr. Roger Bowara, Ms. Gladys Harepa, Ms. Jane Monori, Mr. Daniel Nari, Mr. Arnold Ona, Ms. Joanne Ona, Mr. Steven Simiha and Ms. Lucy Sipara.
• Buka: Mr. Patrick Nangoe (Field Supervisor), Mr. Benedict Gimmu, Mr. Cedric Hagena, Mr. Ray Himata, Ms. Barbara Nima, Ms. Roana Patrick, Ms. Jenny Toroken, Ms. Shona Tsirikou, and Mr. David Tupp.

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. Rowan Downing QC, Project Director, JAG.
• Ms. Anatasia 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, ARAWA AND BUKA
2005

The Government of Papua New Guinea's Law and Justice Sector Strategic Framework Strategy 1.3.1 is "to improve urban safety". To measure whether any improvement is occurring, it was necessary to implement periodic community crime surveys.

The community perceptions data are intended to supplement official statistics and provide a fuller and more reliable picture of crime levels, and responses to them in the community. This approach contains many elements that are in common with the Autonomous Bougainville Government, which seeks to implement the law and justice policies imbedded in its Constitution.

The first Bougainvillean surveys were conducted in Arawa and Buka in September-October 2004 to provide baseline data. The 2005 surveys replicated them, 12 months later, to provide trend data. This Appendix outlines the methodology.16

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. of Canberra, to manage the JAG, which was tasked by AusAID to provide technical oversight, management, and quality assurance on the surveys. The JAG has continued to work with the Papua New Guinea National Research Institute (NRIn), which conducts the field work and shares the write up.

Consultation

Following extensive consultation, peer review, and quality assurance on the survey design in 2004, consultation on the 2005 studies was held with the Autonomous Bougainville Government, the GoPNG's Law and Justice Sector Working Group, and the National Coordinating Mechanism in July and August 2005, which approved the surveys.

Objectives

The primary objectives of the community crime surveys (Appendix A) 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 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, and was based on sample surveys 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 Questions 6.14-6.15 on the presence of the Australian Assisting Police, Question 7.7 on police discipline, and Question 8.7 on community consultation by the police.

Appendix D contains the English version of the questionnaire.

Survey Design

In 2005, follow-up occurred in the sample households that were used in 2004. In Arawa, 160 households were drawn out of the 457 identified in the 2000 Census. The 2005 survey sampled 305 people aged 15 years and over, in 164 households, compared to 307 in 156 households in 2004.

In Buka, 145 houses were drawn out of 361. The 2005 survey sampled 291 people, in 106 households, compared to 290 in 119 households in 2004. The two samples were independent, and the survey results for the towns are presented separately.

The two surveys were based on random selection by household in Arawa, and random grid sampling in Buka. To compensate for bias in non-response, quotas were filled by data collectors, based on the variables of age and gender.

Target Population

The urban population of Arawa was 2,217 and of Buka was 1,890, according to the 2000 Census (see Table C1).\(^\text{17}\) The population aged 15 and over comprised 65.2 percent of their combined populations — some 1,445 people in Arawa and 1,232 in Buka.\(^\text{18}\)

\(^{17}\) The accuracy of the 2000 Census in Arawa and Buka is uncertain, but it is used as a base in the absence of alternative data. Data collectors in Arawa considered that the population has grown substantially since the Census.

Table C1: Bougainville Urban Population by Gender, 2000 Census\textsuperscript{19}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Arawa</th>
<th>Buka</th>
<th>Bougainville</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$N$</td>
<td>$%$</td>
<td>$N$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>1 151</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>1 037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>1 066</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2 217</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1 890</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample Size

Sample size tables set a sample target of 304 for Arawa and 293 for Buka, at a 95 percent level of accuracy.\textsuperscript{20} In the outcome, the Arawa sample was 305 people aged 15 or over, and in Buka, it was 291. The sample fractions were 21.1 percent and 23.6 percent, respectively, of the towns’ populations aged 15+, in 2000.

Sample sizes were statistically acceptable for the purposes of generalisations to the total adult populations of Arawa and Buka, respectively. 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 detail, considerably larger samples would be required. However, there has been no requirement for such analysis.\textsuperscript{21} Longitudinal analysis would be possible (although not undertaken in this report) by comparing data on the 52 percent of households in Arawa, and the 30 percent of households in Buka where interviews occurred, in 2004 and 2005.\textsuperscript{22}

Sample Reliability

In both towns, the samples had high levels of statistical reliability on key demographic variables. Age means and standard deviations, gender, marital status, and education levels (in Buka only) matched the 2000 Census, which are the only variables on which the Census has published data for the 15+ population. The Arawa sample had


\textsuperscript{21} If further 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 Zelenaka, J., 2005. \textit{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.

\textsuperscript{22} Inconsistent coding of households on questionnaires (rather than different household sampling) is the reason for the low statistic in Buka.
high numbers of married people compared to the census. Data interpretation has considered this.

Age

The Arawa and Buka samples had age means and standard deviations that were not statistically different from the 2000 Census (see Table C.2: for Arawa, \( t=1.86, df=304, p=.06 \), standard error of the sample mean=0.60; for Buka, \( t=.90, df=290, p=.37 \); standard error of the sample mean = 0.72).

### Table C2: Sample Age Means and Standard Deviations, Aged 15 Plus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Census 2000</th>
<th>Samples 2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arawa</td>
<td>31.6°/12.4</td>
<td>30.7°/10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buka</td>
<td>32.7°/11.6</td>
<td>32.1°/12.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gender

The age and gender proportions in Table C3 are for the combined urban populations because separate data were unavailable. These statistics were used for allocating age and gender quotas for the samples in each town.

### Table C3: Bougainville Urban Adult Population Proportions, by Age and Gender, 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>15-24</th>
<th>25-34</th>
<th>35+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1448</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1229</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2677</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table C4 shows the quotas and sample results for Arawa. Differences between the sample (observed frequency), and estimates derived from the census (expected frequency) were not statistically significant \( (X^2=.10, df=5, p=.99) \); that is, the sample was statistically representative of the age and gender cohorts.

---

Table C4: Arawa Sample Quotas, by Age and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Males 15-24</th>
<th>Males 25-34</th>
<th>Males 35+</th>
<th>Females 15-24</th>
<th>Females 25-34</th>
<th>Females 35+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Census 2000</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample 2005</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table C5 shows the quotas and sample results for Buka. Differences between the sample and estimates derived from the census were not statistically significant ($X^2=0.44$, $df=5$, $p=.99$); that is, the sample was also statistically representative of the age and gender cohorts.

Table C5: Buka Sample Quotas, by Age and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Males 15-24</th>
<th>Males 25-34</th>
<th>Males 35+</th>
<th>Females 15-24</th>
<th>Females 25-34</th>
<th>Females 35+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Census 2000</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample 2005</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marital Status

Married people in Arawa comprised 52.2% of those aged 15+ in the 2000 Census (49.5 percent for males and 55.2 percent for females). The proportions in the site samples are shown in Table C6. The differences between the number of married and unmarried people in the sample and the census were statistically significant ($X^2=9.22$, $df=1$, $p=.01$); that is, the sample interviewed a higher proportion of married people.

Married people in Buka comprised 58.0 percent of those aged 15+ in the 2000 Census (for both males and females). The differences between the number of married and unmarried people in the sample and the census were not statistically significant ($X^2=0.89$, $df=1$, $p=.30$).

Table C6: Interviews by Marital Status, Aged 15 Plus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Census Married $N$</th>
<th>Census Married %</th>
<th>Sample Married $N$</th>
<th>Sample Married %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arawa</td>
<td>1419</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>60.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buka</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>55.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Education

The proportion of people in Arawa in the 2000 Census who had technical or university level educational qualifications was 16.4 percent of those aged 15+. The proportion in the sample is shown in Table C7. The differences between those who were tertiary educated and those with lesser education, in the sample and the census, were not statistically significant \( \chi^2 = 1.88, df = 1, p = .20 \).

The proportion of people in Buka in the 2000 Census who had technical or university level educational qualifications was 26.0 percent of those aged 15+. The differences between those who were tertiary educated and those with lesser education, in the sample and the census, were not statistically significant \( \chi^2 = 0.01, df = 1, p = .90 \).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Census Tertiary Educated</th>
<th>Census Tertiary Educated</th>
<th>Sample Tertiary Educated</th>
<th>Sample Tertiary Educated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arawa</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buka</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gender Issues

In many households, in 2004 and 2005, there were frank reports of sexual assault and domestic violence. However, the indication was that reporting was below the level of actual victimisation. Occupancy rates in the areas that were 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 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 household and perhaps nearby during the interview. As elsewhere in Papua New Guinea, the interviewers in both years considered underreporting to be the case, but no approximation of its level is possible.

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 for 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. Same-gender interviews were used consistently throughout both surveys.

Field Work

Data collection had considerable continuity with 2004. The 2004 NRI survey manager visited Arawa and Buka in the second week of September to renew relations with government agencies and commence field work, and again towards the end of the field work. The Arawa field supervisor was the same person as in 2004, while in Buka, one of the previous data collectors undertook this role. The same field and quality assurance procedures were used in 2005 as in 2004. Some indications of record-keeping problems over household numbering in Buka and some unexpected changes to response patterns in Section 1 of the questionnaire (household demographics) indicate a need for ongoing quality assurance.

The field supervisors contracted eight qualified, experienced data collectors in each town who had a high level of local knowledge. Half of each group were men, and half were women, and they worked in four, two-person teams. Eleven had previous data collection experience (including nine on the 2004 surveys), and nine had tertiary qualifications. All interviewers were fluent in English and Tok Pisin, as well as Nasiol, in Arawa. In Arawa, 56 percent of interviews were in English, while in Buka, 55 percent of interviews were in English. Data collection took 12 days in Buka, and 16 in Arawa, where completion rates were slower because of absenteeism by villagers (just like in 2004).

No security issues were reported in 2004 or 2005. 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. The 2004 Safety Management Plan was updated and used as a guide by the survey personnel.

Data Analysis

Coding and statistical analysis were undertaken in Canberra by Barbara Davis & Associates (BDA). BDA cross-tabulated data and presented means using SPSS, and provided data files in SPSS and Microsoft Excel. Because the samples were random and statistically acceptable, no weighting was undertaken.

During data analysis, household crime victimisation reports were aggregated at two levels to allow analysis by individual household (for example, to examine multiple crime more closely), and by town (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

---

24 See the 2004 Report, Appendix C.
25 CD-ROMs with these data are available free of charge to bona fide professionals and researchers through NRI email jrobins@nri.org.pg, and Educo Pty Ltd, 1 Throsby Place, Griffith, ACT 2603, Australia; email anastasia@educo.net.
that household. The assumption is that 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.

2. **Towns:** 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 Town 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.

**Timing**

The 2005 surveys were conducted according to the following timetable:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Survey approval</td>
<td>NCM, ABG</td>
<td>25 August 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise instrumentation</td>
<td>JAG, NRI, LJSWG</td>
<td>3 September 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct training, commence field work</td>
<td>NRI</td>
<td>14-18 September 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete field work</td>
<td>NRI</td>
<td>31 October 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary data analysis</td>
<td>BDA, JAG</td>
<td>5 January 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report submission</td>
<td>JAG, NRI</td>
<td>15 March 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report acceptance</td>
<td>AusAID</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

ENGLISH QUESTIONNAIRE

PNG Community Crime Survey - 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent No. (coders to insert)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household ID No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checked by Partner (name/date)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For supervisor/office use only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Supervisor:</th>
<th>Date checked:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selected for call-back:</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.
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?
1.2 Where is your home place? (Interviewer circle number if respondent is an expatriate):
1.3 How long have you lived in this house?
1.4 Does the household:
1.5 Does anyone in the household own a:
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?

Yes  No (If yes, politely discontinue the interview)
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?
2.4 Do you think property crime (house-breaking, stealing) in your area has changed in the past 12 months?

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 happens most 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 one crime are you most afraid 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
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?
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
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 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 household 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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not victim</th>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Number of times:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Household</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(☐ In the home? ☐ Outside the home?)

### 3.6 Provoked violence (e.g. payback):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not victim</th>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Number of times:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Household</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not victim</th>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Number of times:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Household</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.8 Using a firearm against you or your household:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not victim</th>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Number of times:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Household</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.9 Killing (household member):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not victim</th>
<th>Household</th>
<th>Number of times:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Household</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.10 Destruction or damage to your property (household):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not victim</th>
<th>Household</th>
<th>Number of times:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Household</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.11 Breaking into your house and stealing (household):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not victim</th>
<th>Household</th>
<th>Number of times:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Household</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.12 Other (Specify) ________________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not victim</th>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Number of times:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Household</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*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
Make your house more secure
Participate more in crime prevention activities in your community (like peace and good order committees)
Avoid some places at certain times of the day or night
Carry weapons
Pray for help from God, and/or
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 one thing 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 one thing 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?
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
6.13 Some police are heavily armed and travel as mobile squads. If you know of these police, do they make you feel:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Safer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Less safe, or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If yes, what difference did they make?

6.15 (Port Moresby, Arawa, and Buka only). Once they left, was there any difference in crime in your community?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If yes, what difference was there?

Section 7 – Police Accessibility and Service Delivery

*Interviewer to read out: Still thinking about the police, I would like to ask you some questions about access to the police and the service they provide.*

7.1 Have you had to call the police to your home in the past 12 months to respond to a crime?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.2 How long do you think it takes for police to respond to such calls and be at the scene?

*(Don’t read out alternatives)*

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0-30 minutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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
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)
9.5 What best describes your main occupational activity? *(Probe – *what kind of work do you do most of the time?*)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Home duties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Retired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Casual work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Self-employed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Farmer/fishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Full-time (formal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Government employee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Full-time (informal)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

*Time interview concluded:*

*Interviewer’s initials:*