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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Since 2004, extensive surveys of crime victimisation in Port Moresby, Arawa, and Buka have given the first full accounts of the crime victimisation which affects households in those towns. The surveys quantified crime from the perspective of the victims in the community. They were about crime victimisation, as reported by household members, rather than crime for which convictions have been reached through the legal system.

In 2005, a second round of surveys included the collection of baseline data in Lae and Mt. Hagen. The community survey in Mt. Hagen, in March 2006, interviewed 328 people aged 15 years and over, in 124 households. The sample was statistically sound, and enables generalisations for the adult population of Mt. Hagen.

Mt. Hagen is the largest of the five Highlands provincial capitals. It has a reputation as being somewhat of a frontier town. As well as large areas of modern housing, Mt. Hagen has many distinct ethnic settlements. A very distinctive feature is that traditional social controls dominate urban life. Migrants generally concentrate with their wantoks in settlements within the town, which are ‘adopted’ by traditional clans living adjacent to the city. The migrants must follow the clans’ systems of obligations, rights, and responsibilities.

Strong traditional methods for resolution of disputes provide a structure for urban crime control, but the clans also can be very competitive, lively elements in the conflicts and allegiances that are part of collective daily life. Highlands cultures have also long been recognised as conservative and authoritarian.

Mt. Hagen residents reported higher victimisation levels than those in the seven previous surveys in Port Moresby, Arawa, Buka, and Lae, in 2004 and 2005.

- household crime victimisation levels in Mt. Hagen were zero to seven percent higher than Lae, and seven percent to 25 percent higher than Port Moresby in 2005;
- some 84 percent of households reported that they had been the victims of crime at least once in the past year (compared to 78 percent in Lae, and 61 percent in Port Moresby);
- Mt. Hagen residents were the least likely people, in any of the surveys that were carried out, to think that their crime situation was improving;
- many respondents reported that youth gangs, alcohol, and drugs were serious problems; and
- respondents tended to want strong law enforcement, and had more punitive attitudes to lawbreakers than those found in the coastal centres that were surveyed.

Additionally:

- as elsewhere in Papua New Guinea, many people thought that crime and corruption levels were very high; and
- a very low level of public awareness existed about the actions of Law and Justice Sector agencies in dealing with crime and corruption.
The Survey

Strategy 1.3.1 of the Government of Papua New Guinea's Law and Justice Sector, is ‘to improve urban safety’. In order to monitor and measure whether an improvement is occurring, it was necessary to develop and implement periodic community crime surveys in urban areas. The studies are an integral part of law and justice sector performance monitoring.

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

The methodology was primarily quantitative, and based on a sample survey using random grid sampling. The sample size was 328 people aged 15 years and over, who were interviewed in 124 households. This is an average of 2.6 persons per household. The sample was 1.84 percent of the estimated urban population of 17,841 people aged 14 and over, in the 2000 Census. The sample was statistically acceptable for the purposes of generalisation for the total adult population of Mt. Hagen, compared to the 2000 Census data on all the available demographic variables of age, gender, marital status, and education.

Individual Perceptions of Crime in Mt. Hagen

All of the victimisation surveys have found that fear of crime is high in urban areas. Although the levels of crime are very high, people appear to be more afraid because crime occurs in the home and is often violent and conducted by groups. Table ES1 summarises the key perception indicators for the 328 respondents who were interviewed in Mt. Hagen, and provides comparative data for Lae and Port Moresby:

• the percentage of people who thought that crime was a large or a very large problem in Papua New Guinea:
  - at a very high 91 percent in Mt. Hagen, it was the same as Lae, and 12 percent higher than Port Moresby;
• the percentage of people who thought that the level of corruption in Papua New Guinea was the same or had increased from the previous year:
  - at 92 percent in Mt. Hagen, it was four percent higher than Lae, and nine percent higher than Port Moresby; and
• the percentage of people who thought that the level of crime in the local area was the same or less than the past 12 months:
  - at 55 percent in Mt. Hagen, it was three percent lower than Lae, and 20 percent lower than Port Moresby. Mt. Hagen recorded the lowest levels in all the surveys. Its residents were the least likely to think that their crime situation was improving.

---

1 Tables ES1–ES4 summarise key data from the tables within the corresponding chapters in the report, where full statistical details are provided.
Table ES1: Summary of Individual Perception Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Mt. Hagen 2006 (%)</th>
<th>Lae 2005 (%)</th>
<th>Port Moresby 2005 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size of the problem in PNG (large, very large)</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of corruption in PNG (same, increasing)</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived level of crime in the local area (same, less)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most frequently perceived crimes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime Type</th>
<th>Mt. Hagen</th>
<th>Lae</th>
<th>Port Moresby</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol or drug-related</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stealing</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual assault</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The perceptions of key crimes in Mt. Hagen were that:

- alcohol and drug-related crime was perceived to be the most common:
  - at 46 percent in Mt. Hagen, it was 15 percent higher than Lae, and seven percent higher than Port Moresby. As in Lae, drugs received much comment;
- stealing was perceived to be the next most common crime:
  - at 30 percent in Mt. Hagen, it was virtually the same as Lae and Port Moresby;
- the percentage of respondents who thought that domestic violence was the most common crime:
  - at three percent in Mt. Hagen, it was the same as Lae, but half of that in Port Moresby; and
- the percentage of respondents who thought that sexual assault was the most common crime:
  - at five percent in Mt. Hagen, it was the same as Lae, and twice that in Port Moresby.

Overall, people in Mt. Hagen generally perceived their crime situation to be worse than the residents of Lae. Furthermore, the people in Lae perceived their crime situation to be worse than the residents of Port Moresby. As in Lae, the Mt. Hagen people considered 'raskols' to be a major problem.

The Mt. Hagen and Lae surveys are the first to show that drug use appears to be a community concern, although this refers mainly to drug use outside the home rather than in the home. The problem of drug use occurs mainly in places connected by road to marijuana-growing areas in the Highlands Region.

Actual Household Crime Victimisation

The research survey found that crime victimisation levels in Mt. Hagen were higher than Lae and Port Moresby. Table ES2 summarises eight key indicators which are based
on the 124 households in Mt. Hagen. It shows that its victimisation levels were zero to seven percent higher than Lae, and seven to 25 percent higher than Port Moresby. Mt. Hagen has recorded the highest victimisation levels in these surveys.

Table ES2: Summary of Household Victimisation Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Mt. Hagen 2006 (%)</th>
<th>Lae 2005 (%)</th>
<th>Port Moresby 2005 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Victim of at least one crime</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim of multiple crimes</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim of repeat crime</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property crime</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent crime</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firearm use</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual assault</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stealing property</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- the percentage of households that were the victims of at least one crime was 84 percent in Mt. Hagen, which was seven percent higher than Lae, and 23 percent higher than Port Moresby;
- the percentage of households that were the victims of multiple crime was 69 percent in Mt. Hagen, which was two percent higher than Lae, and 23 percent higher than Port Moresby;
- the percentage of households that were the victims of repeat crime was 56 percent in Mt. Hagen, which was six percent higher than Lae, and nearly double the percentage of Port Moresby;
- the average percentage of households affected by each of five forms of property crime was 32 percent in Mt. Hagen, which was seven percent higher than Lae, and double the percentage of Port Moresby;
- the average percentage of households affected by each of seven forms of violent crime was 15 percent in Mt. Hagen, which was two percent higher than Lae, and double the percentage of Port Moresby;
- the percentage of households affected by firearm use was 16 percent in Mt. Hagen, which was four percent higher than Lae, and nearly double the percentage of Port Moresby;
- despite underreporting, the percentage of households affected by sexual assault was the same as the previous highest recorded in any of the urban surveys. Mt. Hagen recorded 11 percent, which was the same as Lae and nearly four times higher than Port Moresby; and
- the percentage of households that had property stolen was 59 percent in Mt. Hagen, which was five percent higher than Lae, and nearly double the percentage of Port Moresby.
Overall, these data show that Mt. Hagen residents were more often victimised than those in the other cities or towns surveyed, so far. Compared to Lae and Port Moresby, in Mt. Hagen:

- higher percentages of households were subject to single, repeat, and multiple victimisation;
- all but one type of victimisation had the same level or higher. Remarkably, every type of victimisation, except killing and other crime, was approximately two to three times greater than in Port Moresby;
- at 11 percent, sexual assault was the same level as Lae, but both cities were well above the zero to five percent recorded in the past six surveys in Port Moresby, Arawa, and Buka; and
- there were only two positive signs:
  - killing was lower than both Lae and Port Moresby; and
  - in two-thirds of cases, repeat victimisation of particular types of crime was lower than in Lae and Port Moresby.

**Household and Community Responses to Crime**

As summarised in Table ES3, the survey found a variety of living conditions that could be factors in crime victimisation in the household:

- the percentage of respondents living in houses that were walled and/or fenced was 75 percent in Mt. Hagen, which was higher than the 48 percent in Lae and the 67 percent in Port Moresby;
- respondents' participation in crime prevention was 23 percent in Mt. Hagen, compared to 35 percent in Lae and 18 percent in Port Moresby;
- overcrowding was high, but the percentage of respondents living in households with four or more adults was 47 percent in Mt. Hagen, which was much lower than the 77 percent in Lae and the 78 percent in Port Moresby;
- the percentage living with four or more children was 71 percent, which was much higher than the 30 percent in Lae and the 40 percent in Port Moresby. This may be attributed, in part, to cultural practices, especially when fathers live separately from children and mothers, which is traditional in some parts of the Highlands Region;
- the percentage of people reporting that the most troublesome crime occurred in the home was 66 percent in Mt. Hagen, compared to 75 percent in Lae and 64 percent in Port Moresby;
- victims who knew the perpetrators of the most troublesome cases were 36 percent of 80 cases in Mt. Hagen, which was lower than the 48 percent in Lae, and the 44 percent in Port Moresby;
- in those cases where the perpetrators were in a group, respondents reported 52 percent in Mt. Hagen, which was lower than the 56 percent in Lae and the 61 percent in Port Moresby;
- the level of reported unemployment among respondents was 15 percent in Mt. Hagen, compared to 16 percent in Lae, and 21 percent in Port Moresby; and
- respondents' most preferred government initiative for the reduction of crime in Mt. Hagen was to have a greater police presence, compared to more jobs in Lae and Port Moresby.
Table ES3: Summary of Household and Community Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Mt. Hagen 2006 (%)</th>
<th>Lae 2005 (%)</th>
<th>Port Moresby 2005 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Houses walled and/or fenced</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in community crime protection group</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four or more adults per household</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four or more children per household</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most troubling crime occurred in the home</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim knew the perpetrator in the most troubling crime</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than one offender in the most troubling crime</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most preferred government initiative on crime</td>
<td>More police (25%)</td>
<td>More jobs (24%)</td>
<td>More jobs (25%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As in other centres, respondents believed that crime would reduce if there were more employment and recreation opportunities for youth. People clearly saw prevention through change in social and economic conditions as a long-term solution to crime, but there was a small majority who wanted law and order solutions. This is the first time that such a finding appeared in these surveys. Mt. Hagen residents tended to want strong law enforcement, and had a more punitive attitude to law-breakers. This seemed to reflect the greater level of victimisation in Mt. Hagen, and more authoritarian attitudes to law and order in the Highlands Region.

Community Views about Government Agencies

The survey recorded moderate levels of public awareness about law and justice agencies and low levels of satisfaction with police performance (see Table ES4). The results show that the public had minimal contact with the formal sector agencies:

- on average, only 12 percent of the public had contact with the agencies. In such cases, satisfaction with how their matter had been handled was moderate, with a mean level of satisfaction of 50 percent, which was less than 62 percent in Lae and 61 percent in Port Moresby;
- where the public had contact with the police in Mt. Hagen, the satisfaction level was 42 percent, which was lower than 54 percent in Lae and 57 percent in Port Moresby; and
- awareness of agency action over corruption was low at 12 percent. The people who were aware had a moderate average level of satisfaction of 50 percent in Mt. Hagen, compared to 54 percent in Lae and 51 percent in Port Moresby:
satisfaction with police action over corruption was lower than other agencies, at 27 percent in Mt. Hagen, compared to 31 percent in Lae and 37 percent in Port Moresby.

Table ES4: Summary of Law and Justice Agency Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Mt. Hagen 2006 (%)</th>
<th>Lae 2005 (%)</th>
<th>Port Moresby 2005 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with all agencies over handling of own matter</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with police over handling of own matter</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with all agencies over handling of corruption</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with police over handling of corruption</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police do a good job</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reported most troubling crime to police</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement in opinion from contact with the police</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police discipline improved (yes, sometimes)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police participate in community consultations (yes, sometimes)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

- the percentage of people in Mt. Hagen who thought that the police were doing a good job overall was 17 percent, compared to 27 percent in both Lae and Port Moresby;
- the percentage of people who reported their most troubling crime to the police was 38 percent in Mt. Hagen, compared to 32 percent in Lae and 33 percent in Port Moresby;
- the percentage of people who improved their opinion of the police as a result of official contact with them was 47 percent in Mt. Hagen, compared to 49 percent in Lae and 44 percent in Port Moresby;
- the percentage of people who thought that police discipline had improved, at least sometimes over the past year, was 20 percent in Mt. Hagen, compared to 27 percent in Lae and 33 percent in Port Moresby; and
- the percentage of people who thought that the police participated in community consultations, at least sometimes, was 18 percent in Mt. Hagen, compared to 42 percent in Lae and 31 percent in Port Moresby.

Public satisfaction with agency action and the police was somewhat lower than in Lae and Port Moresby. Corruption was not an abstract notion for the Mt. Hagen people. There was widespread belief that the police and magisterial courts were open to bribery. There was also low satisfaction with agencies in the Department of the Attorney General.
Policy Implications

The findings of the Mt. Hagen survey add to the wealth of information from the other surveys on crime victimisation, community perceptions of crime, and the credibility of government agencies. All of the surveys have the following broad policy implications for crime control and/or prevention:

- urban priorities;
- income generation;
- alcohol;
- drugs;
- community mechanisms; and
- police reform.

Urban Priorities

The most important implication of the survey is that crime victimisation in Mt. Hagen and Lae is considerably higher than in Port Moresby. Port Moresby is the highest priority in the Law and Justice Sector's strategy to reduce urban crime. However, this survey provides evidence that consideration could be given to increasing the priority accorded to Mt. Hagen and Lae.

Income Generation

As in the other surveys, employment was nominated as an important way of reducing criminal activity. Employment, especially for the young males who are both perpetrators and victims of crime, is widely believed to be a key measure for reducing crime.

Alcohol

Again, alcohol was an important factor in a large number of crimes, particularly violent crimes, and those crimes in the domestic setting. While alcohol use is a very complicated issue, it seems to be one of the few preventive areas that could make a rapid impact on crime victimisation.

Drugs

The surveys in Mt. Hagen and Lae indicate that drug use is a problem in places connected by road to the marijuana-growing areas in the Highlands Region.

Community Mechanisms

The survey findings inform and support the directions in the government’s National Law and Justice Policy, with its emphasis on the development of community-based approaches to crime prevention and control.

While the majority of people in Mt. Hagen saw prevention through change in social and economic conditions as a long-term solution to crime, some wanted law and order solutions. This is the first time that such a finding has appeared in these surveys.
However, the budgetary reality is that Papua New Guinea cannot afford the level of policing that would be required in Mt. Hagen and elsewhere.

The survey provides evidence for the formal and informal law and justice sector agencies to cooperate with local governments to strengthen community mechanisms and integrate them into broader efforts to prevent and control crime.

*Police Reform*

The survey findings indicate that the majority of people in Mt. Hagen want strong policing services, that are free of bribery. The findings continue to reinforce the desire of implementing the 2004 *Review of Police Services*. 
CHAPTER 1
THE HOUSEHOLD CRIME SURVEY IN MT. HAGEN

In 2004, extensive surveys of crime victimisation were conducted in Port Moresby, Arawa, and Buka to give the first full accounts of the nature, frequency, and location of crime affecting households in those towns. The surveys quantified crime from the perspective of the victims in the community. They were about crime victimisation as reported by household members, rather than crime for which convictions have been reached through the legal system. The questionnaire requested information about the nature and extent of crime that affected households and individuals, as reported by residents.

In 2005, the second round of surveys was extended to include the collection of baseline data in Lae and Mt. Hagen. The community survey in Mt. Hagen interviewed 328 people aged 15 years and over, in 124 households. The sample was statistically sound and enabled generalisations for the adult population of Mt. Hagen. This report presents the findings, which are presented at length in the Executive Summary.²

Mt. Hagen

According to the 2000 Census, the Highlands Region contained 38 percent of Papua New Guinea's population. The largest of the five Highlands provincial capitals is Mt. Hagen. In 2000, it had a population of 27,877, placing it close behind Madang as the fourth largest city in the country.³ Mt. Hagen is a service hub for the agriculturally-rich Western Highlands Province. The city is also at a strategic point on the Highlands Highway, which is the most important road in the country. The roads from the resource-rich Enga and Southern Highlands Provinces join the Highway near Mt. Hagen. The city contains many retailing, commercial, agricultural, and transport businesses, as well as government offices.

Mt. Hagen has retained a reputation as somewhat of a frontier town. The Highlands Region was not systematically controlled by the Australian administration until after the Second World War, and Mt. Hagen started to develop only from the late 1950s. It provided a focus for governmental administration, but mainly serviced plantation and village agriculture in the rural areas. Since Independence in 1975, the informal agricultural sector has come to dominate the rural economy of Western Highlands Province. Mt. Hagen also has a very active informal economy which revolves around its market places.

As well as substantial areas of modern housing, Mt. Hagen contains many distinct ethnic settlements from within the province as well as outside it. A very distinctive feature is that traditional social controls dominate the city's life. In-migrants generally concentrate with their wantoks in settlements within the town, which are 'adopted' by traditional clans living adjacent to the city. The migrants must follow the clans' systems

² So that this report is self-contained, it repeats elements of the other studies.
of obligations, rights, and responsibilities. This situation may also be affected by rural tribal disputes over land, payback, and compensation, and the fluctuating alliances that they generate for both urban and rural dwellers.

While there are strong traditional methods of dispute resolution, the clans can be very competitive, lively elements in the conflicts and allegiances that are part of collective daily life. Highlands cultures have also long been recognised as conservative and authoritarian. This was reflected in survey findings, where the Mt. Hagen people tended to want strong law enforcement and had a more punitive attitude to law-breakers than that found in the coastal centres which were surveyed.

Comparisons with crime victimisation in other urban centres in Papua New Guinea are possible through identical surveys conducted in Port Moresby (in 2004 and 2005), Arawa and Buka (also in 2004 and 2005), and Lae (2005). These surveys also complement one concerning crime and its effect on business in Port Moresby, and a study of crime on the Highlands Highway, both conducted in 2005. While they do not provide a full national overview of crime, the studies give an increasingly wide coverage.

This report makes comparisons with Port Moresby (as the national capital, the benchmark for urban crime victimisation in other cities) and Lae (which presents contrasts to Mt. Hagen by having a greater intermixing of ethnic groups in many settlements and fewer village-type social controls). Mt. Hagen had much higher victimisation levels than those recorded in the previous surveys in Lae and Port Moresby, as well as those in Arawa and Buka.

\[4\]


Comparisons with Lae and Port Moresby in this report use the best available data for each location, which was unweighted in the case of Mt. Hagen and Lae, and weighted for Port Moresby (see Appendix C). The Mt. Hagen survey was conducted six months after Port Moresby, and four months after Lae. While comparisons in questions that ask about changes in victimisation over the past 12 months refer to overlapping, but not identical periods, there is no indication, so far in the surveys, that crime levels fluctuate according to national trends; that is, crime patterns appear to be local.

\[5\]
Survey Background

Strategy 1.3.1 of the Government of Papua New Guinea’s Law and Justice Sector is ‘to improve urban safety’. To be able to monitor and measure whether any improvement is occurring, it was necessary to develop and implement periodic community crime surveys in urban areas. The studies are an integral part of the law and justice sector performance monitoring. They supplement official statistics that are used for monitoring performance under the Sector Performance Monitoring Framework, and provide a fuller and more reliable account of crime levels and responses to them in the community. The information is intended to assist planning and monitoring of the effectiveness of agencies in the sector. It is also intended to inform the AusAID-funded Law and Justice Sector Program, which is working with all sector agencies. This report presents the first such survey in Mt. Hagen. An extension and repeat of the survey will occur, if required by sector performance monitoring.

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

Responsibility for technical advice on the monitoring and evaluation of sector performance is held by the Australian-funded Justice Advisory Group (JAG), working in partnership with the National Research Institute (NRI) on the surveys. NRI conducted the field work, completing data collection by 25 March 2006 (contributors are listed in Appendix B).

Objectives

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

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

Methodology

The methodology was primarily quantitative, and was based on a survey using random grid sampling (full survey design, sampling and field work details are included in Appendix C). The sample size was 328 people aged 15 and over, in 124 households, which is an average of 2.6 persons per household. The sample fraction was 1.84 percent
of the estimated urban population of 17,841 aged 15 and above, in the 2000 Census. To compensate for bias in non-response, quotas were filled by data collectors, based on age and gender. A structured questionnaire was used with interviews conducted in English and Tok Pisin (the English questionnaire is attached as Appendix D).

The sample was statistically acceptable for the purposes of generalisation for the total adult population of Mt. Hagen. It was also statistically representative of the adult population compared to 2000 Census data on all the available demographic variables of age, gender, marital status and education.\(^6\)

CD-ROMs with the full survey data are available to bona fide professionals and researchers free of charge from the JAG and NRI.\(^7\)

---

\(^6\) The sample size limits the potential for cross-analysis of households and demographic variables in instances where cell sizes are low and standard errors of the mean are high. This is less of a concern for sociological generalisations for the population of Mt. Hagen as a whole, but restricts detailed criminological analysis at the household level.

\(^7\) Educo Pty Ltd, 1 Throsby Place, Griffith, ACT 2603, Australia; email anastasia@educo.net. PNG National Research Institute, P.O. Box 5854, Boroko, NCD. 111; email jrobins@nri.org.pg.
CHAPTER 2

INDIVIDUAL PERCEPTIONS OF CRIME IN MT. HAGEN

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 the 328 respondents’ subjective perceptions of crime, mainly using data from Section 2 of the Questionnaire. This and other chapters start by comparing findings on key summary measures with the findings from the 2005 surveys in Port Moresby and Lae, which were conducted six and four months earlier, respectively, in September–November 2005.

Key Perception Indicators

All the victimisation surveys have found that fear of crime was high in urban areas. Even though the levels of crime were very high, people were seemingly more afraid because crime occurs in the home and is often violent and conducted by groups. Table 1 summarises the key perception indicators for the 328 respondents who were interviewed in Mt. Hagen, and provides comparative data for Lae and Port Moresby.

Table 1: Summary of Individual Perception Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Mt. Hagen 2006 (%)</th>
<th>Lae 2005 (%)</th>
<th>Port Moresby 2005 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size of the crime problem in PNG (large, very large)</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of corruption in PNG (same, increasing)</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of crime in the local area (same, less)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most frequently perceived crimes:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol or drug-related</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stealing</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual assault</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The summary tables at the start of Chapters 2–5 summarise key data from tables within each chapter, where the statistical details are provided.
• the percentage of respondents who thought that crime was a large or very large problem in Papua New Guinea was 91 percent in Mt. Hagen, which was the same as Lae, and 12 percent higher than Port Moresby;
• the percentage of respondents who thought that the level of corruption in Papua New Guinea was the same or more was 92 percent in Mt. Hagen, which was four percent higher than Lae, and nine percent higher than Port Moresby; and
• the percentage of respondents who thought that the level of crime in the local area was the same or less over the past 12 months was 55 percent in Mt. Hagen, which was three percent lower than Lae, and 23 percent lower than Port Moresby. The Mt. Hagen indicator is the lowest recorded in all the surveys, which means that its residents were the least likely to think that their crime situation was improving.

Perceptions of key crimes in Mt. Hagen were that:

• alcohol and drug-related crime was the most common, at 46 percent in Mt. Hagen, which was 15 percent higher than Lae, and seven percent higher than Port Moresby. As in Lae, drugs received much comment;
• stealing was very common, at 30 percent in Mt. Hagen, which was virtually the same as Lae and Port Moresby;
• the percentage of respondents who thought that domestic violence was the most common crime was three percent in Mt. Hagen, compared to four percent in Lae, and six percent in Port Moresby; and
• the percentage of respondents who thought that sexual assault was the most common crime was five percent in Mt. Hagen, which was the same as Lae, and three percent higher than Port Moresby.

Overall, people in Mt. Hagen generally perceived their crime situation to be worse than the people in Lae, who, in turn, perceived their situation to be worse than the people in Port Moresby. As in Lae, respondents considered ‘raskols’ to be a major problem.

The Mt. Hagen and Lae surveys are the first to show that drug use appears to be a community concern, although this refers mainly to drug use outside the home rather than inside it. The problem of drug use occurs mainly in places that are connected by road to marijuana-growing areas in the Highlands Region.

Are Crime and Corruption Perceived to Be Increasing Nationally?

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

• some 91 percent of respondents in Mt. Hagen thought that the crime problem in Papua New Guinea was either large, or very large; and
• this was the same as Lae (although with a larger percentage in the very large category), and higher than the 79 percent in Port Moresby.9

---

9 Column totals in this and subsequent tables may not appear to total 100 percent. This is the result of rounding item totals up to the nearest whole number, not an error in the total. Non-response percentages in table notes are also subject to rounding.
Table 2: Perceived Size of the Crime Problem in Papua New Guinea

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of Crime Problem</th>
<th>Mt. Hagen 2006 (%)</th>
<th>Lae 2005 (%)</th>
<th>Port Moresby 2005 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very large</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not large</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Q.5.11. Mt. Hagen N=327, non-response=0%. Lae N=400, non-response=1%. NCD weighted, N=165 318, non-response=0%.

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Corruption</th>
<th>Mt. Hagen 2006 (%)</th>
<th>Lae 2005 (%)</th>
<th>Port Moresby 2005 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreasing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Q.2.5. Mt. Hagen N=328, non-response=0%. Lae N=404, non-response=0%. NCD weighted, N=165 930, non-response=0%.

- 92 percent of respondents in Mt. Hagen thought that corruption, nationally, was the same or increasing, compared to 88 percent in Lae and 83 percent in Port Moresby.
Is Crime Perceived to Be Decreasing in the Local Area?

In 2006, some 55 percent of respondents in Mt. Hagen believed that there was less, or the same amount of crime as in the past 12 months. However, opinion weighed towards there being more crime, rather than less crime (see Table 4). Some 43 percent of people in Mt. Hagen believed that crime had increased compared to 35 percent in Lae and 17 percent in Port Moresby.

On more specific types of crime, the opinion in Mt. Hagen was that violent crime had increased. However, the opinion on property crime was evenly divided:

- while 48 percent thought that violent crime against people had increased, 33 percent thought that it had decreased (Q.2.3); and
- while 40 percent thought that crime against property had increased, 40 percent thought that it had decreased (Q.2.4).

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Crime</th>
<th>Mt. Hagen 2006 (%)</th>
<th>Lae 2005 (%)</th>
<th>Port Moresby 2005 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Q.2.1. Mt. Hagen N=328, non-response=0%. Lae N=403, non-response=0%. NCD weighted N=165 706, non-response=0%.

Who Was Contributing Most to Crime Prevention?

Why was change thought to be occurring over the past 12 months? Table 5 indicates that:

- 22 percent of responses indicated that 'raskols' were getting worse; and
- many more people than not, thought that the police were doing a bad job, and that the community was doing a better job than the police.

Compared to Lae and Port Moresby:

- more respondents thought that the police were doing a bad job;
- fewer thought that the community was doing a good job; and
• in both Mt. Hagen and Lae, double the percentage of Port Moresby thought that 'raskols' were getting worse.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mt. Hagen 2006 (%)</th>
<th>Lae 2005 (%)</th>
<th>Port Moresby 2005 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raskols (getting better/worse)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Perceptions about changes in crime levels were found in open-ended responses to Q.2.2, which mainly expanded the reasons why respondents considered crime was worsening in Mt. Hagen. Comments fell into several groups. One group related increased crime to economic and social conditions, lack of employment, and drug use. For example:

- unemployment and low income;
- rural-urban migration and not enough jobs;
- money is becoming hard to find and there are not enough job opportunities for school leavers, so people are engaging themselves in crimes;
- the youths have nothing to keep them busy, so crimes are getting worse;
- too many boys are taking drugs; and
- young men are getting heavily involved in drugs and alcohol, which is increasing crime in the community.

Lack of leadership by those in authority was a contributing factor for another group of commentators. For example:

- community leaders are not performing their duties as leaders, to talk to the people and the police;
- they let the criminals just walk out of the court room;
- police now respond to bribes; and
- the police are involved with the rascals.

The following italicised comments here and elsewhere are the notes on questionnaires, where interviewers recorded comments by respondents to open-ended questions.
Improvements were mainly seen by one group of respondents as coming from church activities. For example:

- Christians in the community fast and pray to bring peace;
- the raskols have now repented and gone into religious activities;
- the street boys have changed and gone to church; and
- youths are starting to join the churches and get involved in church activities.

Another group of respondents saw crime as decreasing on the positive side, from good leadership, and increasing on the negative side, from violent action:

- the Lord Mayor is doing a good job;
- the leaders from the community stop the crime;
- the criminals are scared because of recent killings by the police;
- home owners have been killing the rascals; and
- because they are landowners, they fear them.

What Crimes Are Perceived to Occur Most Often?

Interviewees were asked what crime they thought happened most in their area. Table 6 shows the most common types of crime that respondents perceived occurred most in Mt. Hagen in 2006.

Table 6: Crime Most Frequently Perceived in the Local Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Crime</th>
<th>Mt. Hagen 2006 (%)</th>
<th>Mt. Hagen 2005 (%)</th>
<th>Lae 2005 (%)</th>
<th>Port Moresby 2005 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol or drug-related</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stealing</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery (stealing with violence)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual assault</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence outside the home</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trespassing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Q.2.9, multiple responses allowed. Mt. Hagen N=328, non-response=0%, responses=389. Lae N=403, non-response=0%, responses=597. NCD weighted N=163 946, non-response=1%, responses=188 866.
alcohol and drug-related crime was the type most commonly perceived to occur (46 percent of total responses);
stealing was perceived to be very common, at 30 percent of responses;
robbery (stealing with violence) received nine percent of responses; and
together, the average occurrence of the five crimes that involved violence was four percent each (robbery, sexual assault, violence outside the home, domestic violence, and assault).

These percentages were similar to Lae and Port Moresby, although with higher perceived levels of alcohol and drug-related crime. This was taken to include the illegal use of alcohol or drugs, as well as the crimes in which their usage was a factor. The latter interpretation is the one that respondents usually took. Open-ended questions revealed that alcohol and drugs were of equal concern. Comments across the whole questionnaire mentioned alcohol (mainly home brew, known as steam) 48 times, and drugs (only marijuana) 47 times. Mt. Hagen and Lae are the only two centres in which drug use has appeared to be a community concern. The concern was mainly about use in the community rather than the home. For example:

- young men are getting heavily involved in drugs and alcohol, which is increasing crime in the community;
- stop the young from consuming alcohol (steam) and drugs;
- most of our young people are taking drugs and causing a lot of problems;
- boys who are under the influence of drugs usually come around and destroy our market;
- most young policemen are involved with criminal activities by supplying live ammunition to criminals. They even trade bullets for drugs and, at times, are seen under the influence of liquor during working days; and
- I have personally seen policemen taking drugs in the settlement and drinking beer during working hours.

What Types of Victimization Trouble People the Most, in Practice?

The crimes that trouble people the most, in practice, were investigated in more detail. Interviewees who reported that they, or their household, 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 that it was the most troubling one that had actually happened. Table 7 shows that:

- stealing, and breaking, entering, and stealing were identified by 46 percent of respondents in Mt. Hagen as the actual crimes that troubled them most (between 51 percent in Lae and 37 percent in Port Moresby);
- crimes of violence (assault, unprovoked violence, stealing with force, domestic violence, provoked violence, sexual assault, firearm use, and killing) accounted

The indication is that drug use is mainly a problem in areas connected by road to marijuana-growing areas in the Highlands Region, which is consistent with the 2005 Highlands Highway Crime Study, in which police data showed that drugs were an issue in Highway incidents that were reported to them.
for 38 percent of responses in Mt. Hagen, compared to 35 percent in Lae and 46 percent in Port Moresby; and
- domestic violence and sexual assault were five percent of reports in Mt. Hagen, compared to seven percent in Lae and 11 percent in Port Moresby, despite underreporting.

The rank order of the three most common victimisations was the same in all three cities. Stealing, stealing with violence (robbery), and firearm use were the three most commonly reported problems in Mt. Hagen, Lae, and Port Moresby.

Table 7: Most Troubling Household Victimisation to Self or Other Household Members over the Past Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Victimisation</th>
<th>Mt. Hagen 2006 (%)</th>
<th>Lae 2005 (%)</th>
<th>Port Moresby 2005 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stealing your property from you</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breaking into your house and stealing (household)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stealing your property from you with some force or threat</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using a firearm against you or your household</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unprovoked violence (e.g. an attack by a stranger)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car, truck, or bike stolen</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual assault</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destruction or damage to your property (household)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provoked violence (e.g. payback)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Killing (household member)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Q.4.1. Mt. Hagen N=88, non-response=73%. Lae N=109, non-response=73%. NCD unweighted, N=153, non-response=75%. 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 derived 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.
In Mt. Hagen, the main focus was on the crimes themselves. Assault and violence were the major concern (Q.4.2, open-ended responses):

- he was trying to rape my sister;
- because you never know, sooner or later that same person might attack again, thus putting your life at risk;
- this happens most with ladies in the house who can't defend themselves, and this is hurting;
- in his family, he has many sisters so he is scared that it might happen to any of them again;
- I was assaulted by a landowner because he wanted me to leave this place;
- I fear for the safety of the young women;
- because the victims were young ladies, I need to escort them anywhere to protect them from the same crime or rape;
- the offender was a stranger to us, and caused our lives to be at risk;
- the offender was a stranger to him, and being attacked by a stranger is very dangerous because of our lives;
- we will lose more lives when we, as victims, don't offer anything to the criminals;
- I don't feel at home and secure;
- they nearly killed me;
- weapons were used to threaten our lives, including the little ones;
- an attack by strangers means a life and death situation;
- my husband used dangerous weapons, like a bushknife and kitchen knives, when assaulting me;
- the fight might continue, which may lead to a big problem;
- because the criminals used dangerous weapons, I thought they would rape me;
- our lives were in danger; and
- I saw the firearm pointed at me.

As in the other surveys, many people also focused on theft, the irritations and costs that it incurs, and in some cases, the impact on family income:

- I’m sick and tired of buying new clothes;
- because we live next to the main road, this stealing happens most times and we are already fed up;
- all our property, like TV, blankets, radio, gas cooker and some of our good clothes were stolen;
- I’m angry because I cannot buy what has been stolen from me;
- it is expensive to buy new items these days;
- it is costly to replace the bicycle;
- it is costly to replace the car, and our life was at risk;
- because it’s a company vehicle that only my husband was supposed to drive, I was afraid that the company might lay off my husband;
- the only pair of shoes I had was taken with my favourite clothes;
- my textbooks were stolen and never recovered;
- it is expensive for me, as a school boy, to buy new shoes; and
- it is expensive to buy what’s stolen because living in a settlement, it’s hard to find money.
Do People Feel Safe?

Surprisingly perhaps, given the high levels of victimisation, a moderate 44 percent of respondents in Mt. Hagen said they felt safe, although this was six percent less than Lae and 19 percent less than Port Moresby (see Table 8):

Table 8: Feelings of Safety and Security from Crime

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safe and Secure</th>
<th>Mt. Hagen 2006 (%)</th>
<th>Lae 2005 (%)</th>
<th>Port Moresby 2005 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Q.5.1. Mt. Hagen N=325, non-response=1%. Lae N=403, non-response=0%. NCD weighted, N=165 542, non-response=0%.

Bad driving made 95 percent of respondents feel unsafe in both Mt. Hagen and Lae, compared to 86 percent in Port Moresby (Q.2.12).

Who Thinks Crime Has Changed Most?

Gender and age continued to influence people’s perceptions about crime and safety. In 2005, only 27 percent of people in Mt. Hagen thought that crime had decreased in the past year. Table 9 further analyses the data in Table 4 to see who thought crime was changing in the local area.

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

<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>29</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15–24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25–34</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35+</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Q.2.1 x Q.9.1 & 9.2. N=328, non-response=0%.
Gender: Mt. Hagen males and females both tended to think that local crime had increased.

Age: Young people were less likely to perceive a decrease, while the oldest ones were slightly more likely to perceive an increase.

Do People Change Their Behaviour because of Fear of Crime?

The surveys in all towns have found that restrictions on freedom of movement were the main change in behaviour that resulted from fear of crime. This was also true of Mt. Hagen (Q.2.11):

- some 78 percent of all responses related to restrictions on movement, especially among women. Only five percent said that there was nothing in particular that crime stopped them from doing in their area; and
- some 41 percent stated that crime stopped them walking around at night.
CHAPTER 3

ACTUAL HOUSEHOLD CRIME VICTIMISATION

One purpose of the crime victimisation surveys is to supplement official crime statistics. Quite apparent in all of the household surveys that were conducted by the JAG and NRI in Papua New Guinea are the very high levels of reported victimisation in the household compared to official statistics, which relate to reports to police, police arrests, and cases prosecuted in the courts. In this report, responses on victimisation are treated as factually based reports on events that have actually occurred to respondents and/or their household members. With appropriate procedures, such victimisation reports might provide the basis of courtroom evidence about alleged crimes. These reports are not subjective perceptions, as in Chapter 2, where they related to peoples' beliefs about what happened generally in Mt. Hagen.

This chapter presents data concerning the level and type of crime victimisation in Mt. Hagen in the March 2006 survey. Some comparisons are made with the September–November 2005 surveys in Lae and Port Moresby. On this evidence, Mt. Hagen had higher victimisation levels than the previous highest levels recorded in Lae in 2005, and much higher levels than in the six other surveys in Port Moresby, Arawa, and Buka, in 2004 and 2005.

Key Indicators of Household Victimisation

The survey found that crime victimisation levels in Mt. Hagen were very high, and were higher than Lae or Port Moresby. Table 10 summarises eight key indicators, based on the 124 households in Mt. Hagen, and shows that its victimisation levels were zero to seven percent higher than Lae and seven to 25 percent higher than Port Moresby. So far, Mt. Hagen has recorded the highest levels of victimisation in these surveys:

- the percentage of households that were the victims of at least one crime was 84 percent in Mt. Hagen, which is seven percent higher than Lae, and 23 percent higher than Port Moresby;
- the percentage of households that were the victims of multiple crime was 69 percent in Mt. Hagen, which is two percent higher than Lae, and 23 percent higher than Port Moresby;
- the percentage of households that were the victims of repeat crime was 56 percent in Mt. Hagen, which is six percent higher than Lae, and 29 percent higher than Port Moresby;

12 The 2005 Lae survey estimated that only some two percent of total victimisation was reported to the police, and total arrests were equivalent to approximately one percent of total victimisation.

13 The answers reported in this chapter have direct reference to events experienced by the respondents or members of their households, and with appropriate procedures, could provide the basis of evidence in courts about events that actually occurred. The answers are less subjective than the perceptions reported in Chapter 2, which are more in the nature of hearsay and more prone to a range of perceptual biases.
the average percentage of households affected by each of the five forms of property crime was 32 percent in Mt. Hagen, which is seven percent higher than Lae, and 17 percent higher than Port Moresby;

- the average percentage of households affected by each of the seven forms of violent crime was 15 percent in Mt. Hagen, which is two percent higher than Lae, and eight percent higher than Port Moresby;

- the percentage of households affected by firearm use was 16 percent in Mt. Hagen, which is four percent higher than Lae, and seven percent higher than Port Moresby;

- despite underreporting, the percentage of households affected by sexual assault was the same as the previous highest recorded in any of the urban surveys. It was 11 percent in Mt. Hagen, which is the same as Lae, and eight percent higher than Port Moresby; and

- the percentage of households affected by stealing property was 59 percent in Mt. Hagen, which is five percent higher than Lae, and 27 percent higher than Port Moresby.

Table 10: Summary of Household Victimization Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Mt. Hagen 2006 (%)</th>
<th>Lae 2005 (%)</th>
<th>Port Moresby 2005 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Victim of at least one crime</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim of multiple crimes</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim of repeat crime</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property crime</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent crime</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firearm use</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual assault</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stealing property</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14 In Section 3 of the questionnaire, respondents were asked to separately identify whether they or other members of their households had been the victims of 12 different types of crime in the previous 12 months. Household crime victimisation reports were aggregated at two levels. Individual households: The victimisation statistics are the mean of the number of any particular type of crime reported by individuals within that household, for that household. 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 tables report by respondent (see Table 6), double-counting of the same crime could occur when individuals in the same household reported on the same victimisation, but double-counting does not occur where mean household totals are reported (see Table 13).
Overall, this clearly indicates that Mt. Hagen residents were more often victimised than in any other city or town that has been surveyed so far. Compared to Lae and Port Moresby, in Mt. Hagen:

- a higher percentage of households were subject to repeat victimisation;
- every type of victimisation had the same level or higher, except for killing. Remarkably, every type of victimisation except killing and other crime was some two or three times greater than Port Moresby;
- sexual assault, at 11 percent, was the same level as Lae, but both cities were well above the zero to five percent recorded in the past six surveys in Port Moresby, Arawa, and Buka; and
- there were only two positive signs:
  - killing was lower than Lae and Port Moresby (see Table 13); and
  - in two-thirds of crime types, repeat victimisation was lower than Lae and Port Moresby.

How Often Does Crime Occur?

Table 11 shows how often respondents reported that they or their fellow household members had actually been victims of any of 12 types of crime in the previous 12 months. Of the 124 households surveyed in Mt. Hagen:

- only 16 percent had not been the victims of crime, which is six percent lower than Lae, and 23 percent lower than Port Moresby; and
- some 69 percent of households were victims of multiple crimes; that is, two or more crimes of any sort, which is two percent higher than Lae, and 23 percent higher than Port Moresby.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Crime</th>
<th>Mt. Hagen 2006 (%)</th>
<th>Lae 2005 (%)</th>
<th>Port Moresby 2005 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2–4 times</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5–9 times</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 or more times</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Data from 3 households. Mt. Hagen N=124, Lae N=145, Port Moresby N=284.
The two major crime groupings affecting households are property crimes and violent crimes. Table 12 combines different types of crime to cancel the effect of different categorisation of the crimes that might have occurred among respondents:

- the average percentage of households affected by each of five different types of property crime in Mt. Hagen was 32 percent; and
- the average percentage of households affected by each of seven different types of violence was 15 percent.

Property crime victimisation was twice as common as violent crime. Both were higher in Mt. Hagen than in Lae, and approximately twice as high as Port Moresby.

Table 12: Property and Violent Crime Victimisation for Households in the Past Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Crime</th>
<th>Mt. Hagen 2006 (%)</th>
<th>Lae 2005 (%)</th>
<th>Port Moresby 2005 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property crime</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent crime</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: S.3 household data from Table 13. Mt. Hagen N=124, Lae N=145, Port Moresby N=284.

Property crime is the average (mean) percentage of households affected by each of five different types of property crime that were combined to cancel out any effects from different categorisation of the crimes in the different locations: stealing property, breaking and stealing, destruction or damage to property, vehicle stolen, and stealing property with force. Violent crime is the mean percentage of each 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.

Detailed data on actual victimisation in Table 13 has the frequency of the separate types of crime victimisation and their average levels of repeat for households. The first row shows the percentage of households victimised in the past year. For example, the most common crime in Mt. Hagen in 2006 was stealing property, which occurred in 59 percent of households. The second row shows the mean number of times that affected households were victims. For example, stealing from the 59 percent of households that were affected by this type of crime occurred on an average of 2.8 times.

Table 13 shows that, in Mt. Hagen in 2006:

- 56 percent of households were victims of repeat victimisation:
  - the highest incidence of victimisation was from stealing, with 59 percent of households affected;
  - firearm use affected 16 percent of households; that is, approximately one in six households; and
  - killings affected two percent of households;
- some 11 percent of households had victims of sexual assault; and
### Table 13: 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>Destruction or Damage to Property</th>
<th>Using a Firearm</th>
<th>Car, Truck, or Bike Stolen</th>
<th>Stealing Property with Some Force or Threat</th>
<th>Unprovoked Violence</th>
<th>Sexual Assault</th>
<th>Killing</th>
<th>Other Crime</th>
<th>Repeat Victimisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Hagen</td>
<td>% 59 M 2.8</td>
<td>% 37 M 2.1</td>
<td>% 19 M 2.5</td>
<td>% 27 M 2.2</td>
<td>% 16 M 1.8</td>
<td>% 12 M 2.8</td>
<td>% 23 M 2.2</td>
<td>% 21 M 2.2</td>
<td>% 14 M 1.6</td>
<td>% 11 M 1.5</td>
<td>% 2 M 1.0</td>
<td>% 6 M 3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lae</td>
<td>% 54 M 3.9</td>
<td>% 30 M 2.0</td>
<td>% 19 M 1.7</td>
<td>% 19 M 2.2</td>
<td>% 12 M 2.2</td>
<td>% 6 M 2.2</td>
<td>% 17 M 3.1</td>
<td>% 14 M 2.6</td>
<td>% 10 M 2.4</td>
<td>% 11 M 2.8</td>
<td>% 8 M 1.2</td>
<td>% 8 M 4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Moresby</td>
<td>% 32 M 2.4</td>
<td>% 16 M 1.9</td>
<td>% 15 M 3.2</td>
<td>% 14 M 2.4</td>
<td>% 9 M 1.7</td>
<td>% 5 M 1.5</td>
<td>% 7 M 1.4</td>
<td>% 6 M 3.3</td>
<td>% 6 M 4.0</td>
<td>% 3 M 1.3</td>
<td>% 3 M 4.3</td>
<td>% 4 M 2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**

- % = Percentage of households reporting victimisation. The Repeat Victimisation column shows the percentage of all households affected by any repeat victimisation.
- M = Mean (average) number of times victimisation occurred in the affected households.

**Note:**

- S.3 households. Mt. Hagen N=124, Lae N=145, Port Moresby N=284. The data are unlikely to be double-counted for the same crime where it might overlap two categories. For example, a vehicle stolen with the use of a gun would be rated in the category that the respondent considered the main one.
• the overall mean for repeat of all crimes was 2.4 times with repeat victimisation ranging from 3.5 times for ‘other’ crimes, to 1.0 for killings.

Compared to Lae and Port Moresby, in Mt. Hagen:

• some 56 percent of households were subject to repeat victimisation, compared to 50 percent in Lae, and 31 percent in Port Moresby;
• every type of victimisation had the same or a higher level, except for killing. Remarkably, every type of victimisation, except killing and other crime, was some two or three times greater than Port Moresby;
• sexual assault at 11 percent was the same as Lae, but both cities were well above the zero to five percent recorded in the six previous surveys in Port Moresby, Arawa, and Buka, in 2004 and 2005; and
• there were only two positive signs:
  • killing was lower than in Lae and Port Moresby; and
  • in two-thirds of cases, repeat victimisation was lower than in Lae and Port Moresby.
CHAPTER 4

HOUSEHOLD AND COMMUNITY RESPONSES TO CRIME

The home remained a far more likely place than public areas for the crime victimisation that troubled people most in Mt. Hagen, as was the case in all the other surveys. One reason that the house is a common setting for crime is because it is usually occupied by large extended families. As in other parts of Papua New Guinea, overcrowding appears to contribute to the likelihood of violence, particularly sexual assault.

As in the other surveys, this survey did not explore any comprehensive measures of wealth or poverty. It does not permit generalisations about the relationship between affluence, forms of property ownership, security levels, and crime. This chapter presents data from individual respondents on household and community responses to crime in Mt. Hagen from the March 2006 survey. Some comparisons with Port Moresby and Lae are also made.

Key Household and Community Indicators

The research found a variety of living conditions to be a factor in crime victimisation in the household (see Table 14).

Table 14: Summary of Household and Community Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Mt. Hagen 2006 (%)</th>
<th>Lae 2005 (%)</th>
<th>Port Moresby 2005 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Houses walled and/or fenced</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in community crime protection group</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four or more adults per household</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four or more children per household</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most troubling crime occurred in the home</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim knew the perpetrator in the most troubling crime</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than one offender in the most troubling crime</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most preferred government initiative on crime</td>
<td>More police (25%)</td>
<td>More jobs (24%)</td>
<td>More jobs (25%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- the percentage of respondents who stated that they lived in houses that were walled and/or fenced was 75 percent in Mt. Hagen, compared to 48 percent in Lae, and 67 percent in Port Moresby;
- respondents' participation in crime prevention was 23 percent in Mt. Hagen, compared to 35 percent in Lae, and 18 percent in Port Moresby;
- overcrowding was high, but, the percentage of respondents living in households with four or more adults was 47 percent in Mt. Hagen, which was much lower than the 77 percent in Lae, and 78 percent in Port Moresby;
- the percentage of respondents living with four or more children was 71 percent, compared to 30 percent in Lae, and 40 percent in Port Moresby. Less crowding may be partly attributed to cultural practices, especially when fathers live separately from children and mothers. This is a traditional cultural practice in some parts of the Highlands Region;
- the percentage of people who reported that the most troublesome crime occurred in the home was 66 percent in Mt. Hagen, compared to 75 percent in Lae, and 64 percent in Port Moresby;
- those victims who knew the perpetrators of the most troublesome cases were 36 percent of 80 cases in Mt. Hagen, compared to 48 percent in Lae, and 44 percent in Port Moresby;
- in those cases where the perpetrators were in a group, there were 52 percent in Mt. Hagen, compared to 56 percent in Lae, and 61 percent in Port Moresby;
- the level of reported unemployment among respondents was 15 percent in Mt. Hagen, compared to 16 percent in Lae, and 21 percent in Port Moresby; and
- the respondents' most preferred government initiative for the reduction of crime in Mt. Hagen was to have a greater police presence, compared to more jobs in Lae and Port Moresby.

As in the other centres, respondents believed that crime would be reduced, if there were more employment opportunities for youth, together with more activities for them. People clearly saw prevention through change in social and economic conditions as a long-term solution to crime. However, a small percentage of respondents wanted law and order solutions. This is the first time that such a finding has appeared in these surveys. Mt. Hagen residents tended to want strong law enforcement and had a more punitive attitude to law-breakers. This seemed to reflect the greater level of victimisation in Mt. Hagen and more authoritarian attitudes to law and order in the Highlands Region.

What Levels of Security?

Physical security measures, to keep out criminals, was a common feature in all the surveys, but was much higher in Mt. Hagen (see Table 15). Mt. Hagen had a higher number of respondents (75 percent) who lived in walled or fenced residences, compared to 48 percent in Lae, and 67 percent in Port Moresby. When asked what one action the household could take to best make itself safer (Q.5.2), the principal responses in Mt. Hagen were:

- make their houses more secure (28 percent);
- pray to God for help (21 percent);
- participate more in crime prevention activities (12 percent); and
- help the police (7 percent).
Despite the high levels of crime and victimisation involving firearms, only two percent of respondents in Mt. Hagen stated that they would carry weapons to make the household safer, which was almost the same as Lae and Port Moresby (Q.5.2). This low response was similar to that in other surveys because the general fear is that the same weapons could be used against the household.

**What Are Living Conditions Like?**

The physical housing conditions in Mt. Hagen were generally similar to those in Lae and Port Moresby. Table 16 shows that the levels of infrastructure are different. Similar percentages of respondents lived in houses connected to water in all three cities. Electricity and phone connections were higher in Mt. Hagen, while levels of sewage connection and vehicle ownership were closer to Port Moresby’s than the lower levels in Lae.

**Table 16: Housing Utilities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utility</th>
<th>Mt. Hagen 2006 (%)</th>
<th>Lae 2005 (%)</th>
<th>Port Moresby 2005 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permanent water supply</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewage</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Q.1.5, 1.7–1.10. Mt. Hagen N=328, non-response=0%. Lae N=403, non-response=0%. NCD weighted, N=165,930, non-response=0%.

Unlike Port Moresby and Lae, there were more children than adults resident in the households in Mt. Hagen (see Table 17):
only 47 percent of respondents in Mt. Hagen stated that they had four or more adults in their households, compared to 77 percent in Lae, and 78 percent in Port Moresby;

• some 71 percent stated that there were four or more children in their households, compared to 30 percent in Lae, and 40 percent in Port Moresby; and

• some 64 percent of people in Mt. Hagen owned houses, compared to 59 percent in Lae, and 80 percent in Port Moresby.

### Table 17: Household Occupancy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Composition</th>
<th>Mt. Hagen 2006 (%)</th>
<th>Lae 2005 (%)</th>
<th>Port Moresby 2005 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Four or more adults</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four or more children</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own house</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Q.1.4, 1.6. Mt. Hagen, N=321, non-response=2%. Lae, N=397, non-response=2%. NCD weighted N=165 389, non-response=0%.

Earlier surveys in Port Moresby, Lae, and Bougainville found that the large number of household occupants stemmed from traditionally derived household arrangements in some areas, where many individuals lived in separate dwellings, but shared eating arrangements. Mt. Hagen was quite different, especially where fathers lived separately from children and mothers, which is a traditional cultural practice in some parts of the Highlands Region.

### What Type of Employment?

Another indicator of occupancy is that, of those surveyed, 63 percent were involved in home duties, were unemployed, or were students. This is slightly more than the 57 percent in Lae, and the 58 percent in Port Moresby (see Table 18). These individuals would be likely to use household space on a regular and constant basis. Full-time formal, informal or government employment would normally place people in an advantaged group of the fully employed:

• in Mt. Hagen, 25 percent of respondents were in this group, compared to 24 percent in Lae, and 23 percent in Port Moresby; and

• unemployment was reported at 15 percent, compared to 16 percent in Lae, and 21 percent in Port Moresby.

The definition of a household came from the 2000 Census – "a person or group of persons living and eating together and sharing arrangements for cooking and the other necessities ...".
Table 18: Occupational Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Mt. Hagen 2006 (%)</th>
<th>Lae 2005 (%)</th>
<th>Port Moresby 2005 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home duties</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time (formal)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time (informal)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual work</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government employee</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer/fishing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Q.9.5. Mt. Hagen, N=328, non-response=0%. Lae N=403, non-response=0%. NCD weighted N=165 542, non-response=0%.  

Who Are the Victims?

In Mt. Hagen, different age and gender groups were sometimes victims of different types of crime. Caution is needed when interpreting the data because small numbers of most types of victimisation of individuals were reported within the sample. Victimisation was evenly distributed by age group, although the oldest were slightly less prone to victimisation; that is, those in the age group of 35+ represented 32 percent of the sample and were victims in 25 percent of reported cases: Table 19 shows that:

- younger people were more vulnerable to:
  - stealing property with some threat or force (45%); but
  - were less prone to vehicle theft (18%), assault (29%), and unprovoked and provoked violence (32% and 33%, respectively);
- mature adults were more prone to:
  - vehicle theft (46% versus 31% in the sample), unprovoked violence and assault (44% each), firearm use (39%), and robbery (38%); and
- older adults were more prone to:
  - vehicle theft (36% versus 32% in the sample); but
  - less prone to various forms of violence.
Table 19: Individual Crime Victimisation, by Age and Gender

<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>Percent in Sample</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stealing your property from you</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unprovoked violence (e.g. an attack by a stranger)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stealing property with some force or threat</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provoked violence (e.g. payback)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using a firearm against you</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car, truck, or bike stolen</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual assault</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average %</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: S.3 data for individuals only x S.9 demographic data, N=328, non-response=72%–99%. Further cross-analysis would be limited by small cell sizes.

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

- females were most likely to report as victims of:
  - sexual assault (all the six reported cases) and assault (63% versus 46% in the sample); but
  - were less prone to unprovoked violence (32%) and stealing property with some threat or force (41%); and
- males were especially likely to be individual victims of:
  - unprovoked violence (68% versus 54% in the sample) and robbery (59%).

In What Setting Does Crime Occur?

Respondents were asked to self-identify the most troubling crimes for them or their households during the past 12 months (S.4 of the questionnaire). They nominated a wide range and variety of troubling crimes, which were presented in Table 7. It is also relevant to look at the settings in which these crimes occurred. Table 20 shows that:
66 percent of the most troubling crimes occurred in the home; and
only 16 percent occurred on the street.

This was similar to Lae and Port Moresby.

Additionally, other questions showed that:

- some 31 percent of victims indicated that they were alone at the time (Q.4.5);
- the crimes were most likely to occur at night (57 percent of the nominated cases, Q.4.6) and on Saturday (22 percent, Q.4.7); and
- injury from nominated crimes occurred in nine percent of cases (Q.4.11). In 20 of such cases, 95 percent of respondents knew the reason for the injury (Q.4.12). Domestic disputes (33 percent) and alcohol (22 percent) were the main reasons that were identified.

These patterns were similar to all of the other surveys.

Table 20: Location of the Most Troubling Crimes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Mt. Hagen 2006 (%)</th>
<th>Lae 2005 (%)</th>
<th>Port Moresby 2005 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shops</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Q.4.4. Mt. Hagen, N=225, non-response=31%. Lae N=227, non-response=44%. NCD weighted, N=79251, non-response=52%. S.4 answers were conditional upon respondents having identified, in S.3, crimes experienced by them or other household members in the previous year. The high non-response rates derive mainly from respondents who gave nil responses to S.3.

Who Are the Perpetrators?

The survey showed that the perpetrators in Mt. Hagen were less likely to be known to their victims than in Lae and Port Moresby. When asked who was most likely to commit crimes in their area, 33 percent of respondents nominated outsiders (Q.2.13). In 36 percent of the most troubling cases of victimisation, where the victim knew the offender, these were more likely to be:

- a relative, wantok, or spouse (39 percent); or
- a neighbour or friend (27 percent) (see Table 21).
These percentages were similar to those in Lae and Port Moresby.

Additionally:

- there was more than one offender (Q.4.8) in 75 percent of the most troubling cases, compared to 56 percent in Lae, and 61 percent in Port Moresby; and
- weapons were used in 54 percent of the cases (Q.4.10), and nine percent of these resulted in an injury (Q.4.11).

Table 21: The Perpetrators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perpetrator</th>
<th>Mt. Hagen 2006 (%)</th>
<th>Lae 2005 (%)</th>
<th>Port Moresby 2005 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relative or wantok</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbour</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gang member</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone you had only seen before</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Q.4.9. Mt. Hagen N=80, non-response=76%. Lae N=117, non-response=71%. NCD weighted N=35 423, non-response=79%. The high non-response rates derive from respondents who gave nil responses to S.3, or did not know the perpetrator.

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

Table 6 indicated that five percent of respondents in Mt. Hagen perceived that sexual assault was the crime that happened most in their area, while three percent stated that it was domestic violence. Table 13 showed that 11 percent of households reported that a member was a victim of sexual assault, which is an average of 1.5 times per affected household.

The reported level of sexual assault in Mt. Hagen was similar to Lae, but higher than Port Moresby (three percent of households, although an average of 4.0 times). However, while the household surveys do at least 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, and the surveys cannot give an accurate indication of their real level.\(^{16}\)

\(^{16}\) These problems are grounded in the methodology. Questionnaire surveys based on short, closed-response questions are appropriate for the surveys' prime purpose of providing
What Types of Community Action?

In Mt. Hagen, as in the other surveys, respondents believed that communities should have some responsibility for crime prevention and control (see Table 22). However, police responsibility was ranked first, which was a marked contrast to Lae and Port Moresby.

Table 22: Group Responsibility for Crime Prevention and Community Safety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mt. Hagen 2006 (%)</th>
<th>Lae 2005 (%)</th>
<th>Port Moresby 2005 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police and community</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other combinations</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Q.8.6. Mt. Hagen, N=328, non-response=0%. Lae N=402, non-response=1%. NCD weighted, N=164,492, non-response=1%.

Complementing this finding:

- some 38 percent of respondents in Mt. Hagen reported their most troubling crime to the police (Q.4.13), which was slightly higher than Lae and Port Moresby; and
- some 83 percent also reported crimes to someone in the community, compared to 75 percent in Lae, and 72 percent in Port Moresby. Of the 83 percent in Mt. Hagen, 62 percent reported crimes to a relative, 36 percent to a community group or leader, and nine percent to a traditional authority (Q.4.21).

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 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 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.
• keep youths busy with formal employment so that they would not have time for criminal activities;
• provide contract work for youths;
• create more jobs for youths;
• allocate funds for youth projects;
• provide advice and create awareness for young people;
• encourage Christian activities and church services; and
• the community must not be involved in crime and must work together.

However, emphasis was also placed on law and order solutions. For example:

• stop the home brewing in the area;
• ensure that the community cooperates to remove criminals from the area;
• the offenders must be heavily penalised;
• make strong laws to change behaviour;
• must not follow wantok system (be firm);
• act according to the law;
• allow residents to use guns; and
• all squatter settlers should be evicted and allow only genuine people with improved living conditions to reside.

Table 24: Preferred Community Initiatives on Crime

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mt. Hagen 2006 (%)</th>
<th>Lae 2005 (%)</th>
<th>Port Moresby 2005 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop more activities for young people</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperate better with the police</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See that people caught committing crime are punished</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulate people coming in from outside your area</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better living conditions</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Q.5.10, multiple responses allowed. Mt. Hagen, N=327, non-response=0%, responses=510. Lae N=403, non-response=0%, responses=608. NCD weighted N=165 418, non-response=0%, responses=231 752.

As occurred in the other centres, respondents believed that crime would reduce, if there was more employment for youth, and more activities for them. However, Mt. Hagen residents wanted strong law enforcement and had a punitive attitude to law-breakers. This seemed to reflect the greater level of victimisation in Mt. Hagen, and more authoritarian attitudes to law and order in the Highlands Region.
The relatively high levels of reporting of crimes to both police and community authorities could be explained by an expectation that all authorities have a responsibility to act on law and order issues.

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

- law and order committees, such as Neighbourhood Watch;
- community leaders;
- community groups, including neighbourhood youths; and
- security services.

Some 35 percent stated that someone in the household participated in one of these groups (Q.5.5).

Community patrolling was an important feature of the community crime prevention groups, with 51 percent of those who answered Q.5.6 indicating that patrols were an activity. Offender apprehension was also a function, with 54 percent of people stating this (Q.5.7). Offenders were dealt with in a variety of ways (Q.5.8):

- counsel them and encourage youths not to engage in crimes;
- the community leaders deal with the criminals;
- community leaders talk and settle the dispute between the offender and the victimised people;
- take them to the Village Court;
- the offenders are reported to the police, if the matter is serious. If not, they solve it themselves;
- we bring them to the court or the police, depending on the crime;
- belt them up and refer them to police, or tell them to pay compensation;
- bring them to the police station and lock them behind bars; and
- chase them out of their home.

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

- some 83 percent stated that people who commit crimes should go to prison (which was a higher percentage than all of the other surveys); and
- only 15 percent thought that compensation and supervision was the best option for offenders.

Restorative and retributive options were offered, with an emphasis on payment of compensation:

- at least know the reason why they are stealing, and can act on that reason in a positive way;
- they are put on show in public for the whole community to see and know, then they are sent to jail or told to pay compensation; and
- criminals should be apprehended and sent to prison.
The implication seems to be that in the absence of underlying social cohesion, community retribution does occur. Restorative options were seen as relevant only to less serious crimes, or to ones where the offender is a member of the community rather than an outsider over whom less social control can be wielded. Despite this, the prime emphasis was on punishment.

**What Can Be Done for the Youth?**

As in the other centres, respondents believed that crime would reduce if there was more employment for the youth, coupled with more activities for them. People clearly saw prevention through change in social and economic conditions as a long-term solution to crime. However, there was a small percentage who wanted law and order solutions. This is the first time such a finding has appeared in these surveys.

Table 23 shows what they believe the government could do to make their area safer:

- some 51 percent of respondents in Mt. Hagen favoured law and order solutions — more police (25 percent), fight corruption (11 percent), harsher penalties from the courts (10 percent); and crack down on gangs (five percent) — while Lae (45 percent) and Port Moresby (38 percent) favoured these solutions; and
- some 49 percent of respondents in Mt. Hagen favoured social change — more jobs (23 percent), youth activities (18 percent), and better living conditions (8 percent) — while Lae (55 percent) and Port Moresby (61 percent) favoured these solutions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 23: Preferred Government Initiatives on Crime</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More jobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fight corruption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harsher penalties from the courts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better living conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crack down on gangs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Q.5.9, multiple responses allowed. Mt. Hagen, N=326, non-response=0%, responses=543. Lae N=403, non-response=0%, responses=608. NCD weighted N=162 420, non-response=2%, responses=279 851.

As in Lae and Port Moresby, advice for community leaders in Mt. Hagen was to develop more activities for young people. However, Mt. Hagen people were inclined to want cooperation with the police, and punishment for offenders (see Table 24).

Open-ended comments concerning initiatives for the young people were:
where the public had contact with the police, in Mt. Hagen, the satisfaction level was 42 percent, compared to 54 percent in Lae, and 57 percent in Port Moresby; and

• awareness of agency action over corruption was 12 percent. The people who were aware had a moderate average level of satisfaction of 50 percent in Mt. Hagen, compared to 54 percent in Lae, and 51 percent in Port Moresby;

• satisfaction with police action over corruption was lower than other agencies, with a satisfaction level of 27 percent in Mt. Hagen, compared to 31 percent in Lae, and 37 percent in Port Moresby.

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

• some 17 percent of respondents in Mt. Hagen thought that police were doing a good job, compared to 27 percent in both Lae and Port Moresby;

• the percentage of respondents who reported their most troubling crime to the police was 38 percent in Mt. Hagen, compared to 32 percent in Lae, and 33 percent in Port Moresby;

• the percentage of respondents who improved their opinion of the police as a result of official contact with them was 47 percent in Mt. Hagen, compared to 49 percent in Lae, and 44 percent in Port Moresby;

• the percentage who thought that police discipline had improved, at least sometimes over the past year, was 20 percent in Mt. Hagen, compared to 27 percent in Lae, and 33 percent in Port Moresby; and

• the percentage of respondents who thought that the police participated in community consultations, at least sometimes, was 18 percent in Mt. Hagen, compared to 42 percent in Lae, and 31 percent in Port Moresby.

Public satisfaction with agency action in Mt. Hagen was somewhat lower than in Lae and Port Moresby, and generally this was also true of satisfaction with the police. Corruption was not an abstract notion to the Mt. Hagen people. There was widespread belief that the police and Magistrates Court were open to bribery. There were also low levels of satisfaction with agencies within the Department of Justice and Attorney General.

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

The survey results revealed that the public had little contact with the formal sector agencies. Table 26 shows that four percent, or less, of respondents had come into contact with agencies other than the police, lower courts, and Correctional Service.

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

• from contact with the police (43 percent);
• to the Magistrates Court, if a case was prosecuted (27 percent); and
• to the prisons, if a sentence resulted (eight percent).\(^7\)

\(^7\) This is not to imply that the respondents who had contact with the Correctional Service, for example, had been to jail — merely that they might have been associated with a matter that led to an imprisonment, or might have visited a prisoner in jail.
CHAPTER 5
COMMUNITY VIEWS ABOUT GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Previous surveys have focused on the role of the police. In 2005, other sector agencies sought more data on their levels of public awareness, and public satisfaction with their work. This chapter presents the public awareness data from Mt. Hagen and addresses a second sector concern about the perceptions of action over corruption by the agencies. This information can only put a frame around the overall level of awareness among the public. To find out more information about the thinking of people who come into contact with the agencies, and who therefore have some personal experience of their activities, would require separate client studies.

Key Law and Justice Sector Agency Indicators

The survey found moderate levels of public awareness about Law and Justice Sector agencies, and low levels of satisfaction with police performance (see Table 25). The results revealed that the public had minimal contact with the formal sector agencies.

Table 25: Summary of Law and Justice Sector Agency Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Mt. Hagen 2006 (%)</th>
<th>Lae 2005 (%)</th>
<th>Port Moresby 2005 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with all agencies over handling of own matter</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with police over handling of own matter</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with all agencies over handling of corruption</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with police over handling of corruption</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police do a good job</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reported most troubling crime to police</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement in opinion from contact with the police</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police discipline improved (yes, sometimes)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police participate in community consultations (yes, sometimes)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- on average, only 12 percent of the public in Mt. Hagen had contact with the formal sector agencies. In these few cases, satisfaction with how their matter had been handled was moderate, with a mean level of satisfaction of 50 percent, compared to 62 percent in Lae, and 61 percent in Port Moresby:
The pattern was the same as all other 2005 surveys.

Table 26: Contact with the Law and Justice Sector Agencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Mt. Hagen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magistrates Court</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctional Service</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Court</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Prosecutor’s Office</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Solicitor’s Office</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ombudsman Commission</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Justice and Attorney General</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: S.2.15-2.36. N=328, non-response=0%.

On average, only 12 percent of the public in Mt. Hagen had contact with the formal sector agencies. In these few matters, satisfaction with how their matter had been handled was generally moderate. Table 27 shows that:

- on an average of 11 matters per agency in Mt. Hagen, 50 percent of respondents were satisfied, compared to 62 percent in Lae, and 61 percent in Port Moresby;
- the level of satisfaction with the police was 42 percent in Mt. Hagen, compared to 54 percent in Lae, and 57 percent in Port Moresby; and
- the level of satisfaction with the Police, Magistrates Court, Correctional Service, Public Prosecutor’s Office, and Public Solicitor’s Office were all lower in Mt. Hagen than in Lae and Port Moresby.
### Table 27: Satisfaction with the Law and Justice Sector Agencies over Handling of Own Matter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Mt. Hagen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Matters (No.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Prosecutor’s Office</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Court</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ombudsman Commission</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magistrates Court</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctional Service</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Justice and Attorney General</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Solicitor’s office</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** S.2.16-2.37. Mt. Hagen N=328, non-responses=58-99%. Varying non-response rates derive from respondents who had no knowledge of particular agencies.

### Are the Law and Justice Sector Agencies Doing a Good Job over Corruption?

Chapter 2 showed that crime was thought to be a major problem in Papua New Guinea, as a whole:

- some 91 percent of respondents in Mt. Hagen, which is the same as Lae, and 79 percent in Port Moresby thought that the crime problem in Papua New Guinea was large or very large (see Table 2); and
- some 89 percent in Mt. Hagen thought that corruption was increasing in Papua New Guinea, compared to 78 percent in Lae, and 70 percent in Port Moresby (see Table 3).

Respondents were also asked whether they thought that the Law and Justice Sector agencies were doing a good or bad job over corruption (see Table 28):

- the low levels of awareness of agency actions in Mt. Hagen were indicated by very high levels of non-response, which averaged 89 percent among the eight agencies;
- among the respondents who expressed an opinion, there was a moderate average level of satisfaction of 50 percent; and
- the levels of satisfaction with the actions of the Department of Justice and Attorney General (zero percent, but only two responses), the police (27 percent),
the Public Solicitor’s Office (33 percent), and the Public Prosecutor’s Office (36 percent) were all low.

Table 28: Satisfaction with the Law and Justice Sector Agencies over Action on Corruption

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Mt. Hagen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Responses (No.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ombudsman Commission</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctional Service</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Court</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magistrates Court</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Prosecutor’s Office</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Solicitor’s Office</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Justice and Attorney General</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>37</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: S.2.17-2.38. Mt. Hagen N=328, non-response=60–99%. Varying non-response rates derive from respondents who had no knowledge of particular agencies.

The pattern of responses was similar to Port Moresby and Lae, where satisfaction with police action was also low, although higher than in Mt. Hagen. Notably, the Department of Justice and Attorney General and its two agencies, the Public Solicitor’s Office and the Public Prosecutor’s Office, all had low levels of satisfaction.

**What Are the Attitudes to the Policing Services?**

Respondents in Mt. Hagen, Lae, and Port Moresby all had low levels of satisfaction with the work of the police (see Table 29). The 17 percent in Mt. Hagen, was lower than the 27 percent recorded in both Port Moresby and Lae.
Concerns regarding police efficiency and behaviour were captured in open-ended answers (Q.6.8). For example:

- they arrive late at the crime scene;
- they see boys standing on the road, and swear and bash them up for no good reason;
- misuse of police vehicles; and
- they are lazy.

However, the main concern was bribery. Respondents demonstrated a moderate amount of contact with the police:

- some 96 percent of respondents in Mt. Hagen stated that they knew where the local police station was. This was similar to Lae and Port Moresby with 98 percent (Q.6.1);
- some 49 percent of respondents in Mt. Hagen had been to their local police station in the past year, compared to 31 percent in Lae, and 27 percent in Port Moresby (Q.6.2); and
- some 32 percent had had official contact with the police, of whom 50 percent were victims of crime. These percentages were similar to Lae and Port Moresby (Q.6.3–Q.6.4).

Of those respondents who had official contact with the police, 49 percent in Mt. Hagen stated that it had improved their opinion of them. This was the same percentage in Lae, and similar to the 44 percent in Port Moresby (see Table 30).
Table 30: Improvement in Opinion from Contact with the Police

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improved Opinion</th>
<th>Mt. Hagen 2006 (%)</th>
<th>Lae 2005 (%)</th>
<th>Port Moresby 2005 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Q.6.5. Mt. Hagen N=100, non-response=70%. Lae N=83, non-response=80%. NCD weighted N=42 528, non-response=74%. The high non-response rates derive from respondents who had no formal contact.

Respondents were asked whether police discipline had improved in the past 12 months. Table 31 shows the largely negative opinion.

Table 31: Improvement in Police Discipline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improved</th>
<th>Mt. Hagen 2006 (%)</th>
<th>Lae 2005 (%)</th>
<th>Port Moresby 2005 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Q.7.7. Mt. Hagen N=328, non-response=0%. Lae N=402, non-response=1%. NCD weighted N=165 120, non-response=1%.

- in Mt. Hagen, 10 percent considered that police discipline had improved, while a further 20 percent thought that it had improved sometimes. The percentages were similar to those in Lae and Port Moresby.

Do the Police Participate in the Community?

Another question monitored community perceptions of police participation in the community. Table 32 shows that some 18 percent of respondents in Mt. Hagen thought that participation occurred at least sometimes, compared to 30 percent in Lae, and 14 percent in Port Moresby.
In Mt. Hagen, 22 percent of people were able to provide examples of community-based policing, compared to 34 percent in Lae, and 20 percent in Port Moresby (Q.6.12).

What about Other Types of Policing?

Respondents were asked if they could differentiate between regular and auxiliary police (Q.6.9):

- some 76 percent of respondents in Mt. Hagen were able to tell the difference between regular and auxiliary police, compared to 44 percent in Lae, and 56 percent in Port Moresby;
- some 66 percent of respondents in Mt. Hagen preferred the regular police to the auxiliaries, compared to 70 percent in Lae, and 60 percent in Port Moresby (Q.6.11); and
- only 25 percent of respondents in Mt. Hagen indicated that mobile squads made them feel less safe, compared to 53 percent in Lae, and 64 percent in Port Moresby (Q.6.13).

The clear preference was for regular police, but unusually, in Mt. Hagen, 69 percent of respondents stated that the mobile squads — which are a branch of the regular police — did make them feel safer.

Is Crime Reported to the Police?

Victims of crime were asked whether they reported the most troubling victimisation to the police. Table 33 shows that 38 percent of respondents in Mt. Hagen did report the most troubling crime to the police, compared to 32 percent in Lae, and 33 percent in Port Moresby.
Of those respondents who reported troublesome incidents to the police (Q.4.15), only 20 percent in Mt. Hagen were satisfied with the police response. The level of satisfaction was lower than in Lae (36 percent) and Port Moresby (33 percent).

Most respondents also reported the crime to others beyond the police (Q.4.21). Some 84 percent of people in Mt. Hagen stated that they reported the crime to forms of authority, other than the police (such as relatives or traditional authorities), which is greater than in Lae (75 percent) and Port Moresby (72 percent).

### Table 33: Reporting of the Most Troublesome Incident to the Police

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reported</th>
<th>Mt. Hagen 2006 (%)</th>
<th>Lae 2005 (%)</th>
<th>Port Moresby 2005 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The large number of crimes reported to the police and other forms of authority indicates greater respect for both traditional and modern authority in Mt. Hagen. The strength of traditional ties in Mt. Hagen contributes to the arguments for strengthening community-based crime prevention mechanisms.

### Are the Police a Deterrent?

Table 34 shows that a visible police presence was thought to be a key deterrent in Mt. Hagen. All of the surveys have shown that respondents wanted to see police driving or walking around and talking with people. This response pattern was the same in Lae and Port Moresby.

Some 91 percent of respondents in Mt. Hagen believed that having the police around in their community would stop people from committing crimes (Q.7.5). This was greater than the 86 percent in Lae and the 88 percent in Port Moresby.

The police were also mentioned as only one option for community crime prevention and community safety, but they were the main one given by the Mt. Hagen respondents. Communities and individuals were also thought to have responsibilities. When asked, ‘Who do you think should be most responsible for community crime prevention and community safety?’ (Q.8.6), the answers were:

- the police — 35 percent in Mt. Hagen, compared to 23 percent in Lae, and 21 percent in Port Moresby;
• individuals — 31 percent in Mt. Hagen, compared to 20 percent in Lae, and 24 percent in Port Moresby; and
• the community — 22 percent in Mt. Hagen, compared to 29 percent in Lae, and 36 percent in Port Moresby.

Table 34: The Most Important Things the Police Can Do in the Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Mt. Hagen 2006 (%)</th>
<th>Lae 2005 (%)</th>
<th>Port Moresby 2005 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Driving around</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking around in groups</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking with people</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cautioning young people</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just being around</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending meetings</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All of these</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They do nothing important in this regard</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Q.7.4, multiple responses allowed. Mt. Hagen, N=326, non-response=0%, responses=551. Lae N=400, non-response=1%, responses=847. NCD weighted N=159 725, non-response=4%, responses=295 811.

Are the Police Thought to Be Criminals?

The police in Mt. Hagen were accused of widespread corruption, through bribery. The following comments that were made about the police in the open-ended questions reflect this:

• police are operating on bribery;
• they often accept bribes and practise nepotism;
• they want money for fuel (really a bribe);
• the police operate when/if they are bribed;
• they always want some kind of cash payment for things like car fuel or for themselves;
• when we face a problem and call, they do not respond quickly;
• they always want money first before visiting the crime site;
• wantok system and bribery;
• if you bribe them, they will do their job;
Community Views about Government Agencies

- they deal with the rascals. Instead of fighting crime they get involved; and
- they collaborate with the criminals.

Also, similar views were freely expressed about magistrates. For example:

- magistrates handle court through bribery;
- magistrates sometimes do accept bribes; and
- my first husband was bribing the magistrates to win the court case.

Are the Police Thought to Respect the Community?

One aspect of respect for police is based on the manner in which they carry out their duties. Another aspect is how the police treat the public. As in all the other surveys, the Mt. Hagen respondents who thought that the police were doing a good job did so because of service delivery rather than attitude (see Table 35).

Table 35: Reasons Why the Police Were Doing a Good Job

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Mt. Hagen 2006 (%)</th>
<th>Lae 2005 (%)</th>
<th>Port Moresby 2005 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>They are responsive to crime in your area</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They are fair in their dealings with the community</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They do things to maintain the safety of the community</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They treat the community with respect</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In Mt. Hagen, 17 percent of respondents thought that the police in their area were doing a good job (Q.6.6). The main reasons were:

- responsiveness to crime — 30 percent, compared to 26 percent in Lae, and 51 percent in Port Moresby;
- police maintaining community safety — 21 percent, compared to 36 percent in Lae, and 29 percent in Port Moresby; and
- some 25 percent thought that the police were fair in their dealings, which was higher than Lae and Port Moresby.
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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 counterbalance reported crime rates, and provide a fuller and more reliable picture of crime levels in the community.

This information is also essential for the purposes of monitoring the effectiveness of the 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 other agencies, and monitor changes in perceptions, over time. This should extend more broadly than the perceptions held by victims of crime, in recognition of the many other forms of experience that everyday people have with the police.

The JAG, in partnership with NRI, will provide oversight and quality assurance, as well as ensuring that this work is closely coordinated with the Papua New Guinean Government’s Law and Justice Sector Strategic Framework, and other 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 the Western Highlands Provincial Government.
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METHODOLOGY

The Government of Papua New Guinea’s Law and Justice Sector Strategy 1.3.1 is ‘to improve urban safety’. To measure whether a reduction is occurring, it was necessary to implement periodic community crime surveys. Community perceptions of data are intended to supplement official statistics and provide a fuller, more reliable account of crime levels, and responses to them in the community.

After initial surveys in Port Moresby, Arawa, and Buka in 2004, a second round of surveys was extended to include Lae in late 2005, and Mt. Hagen in early 2006. This first Mt. Hagen survey, which was conducted in March 2006, provides baseline data. This Appendix outlines the methodology.\(^\text{18}\)

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

Consultation

The 2004 surveys had extensive peer review and quality assurance on the design. The second round of surveys was approved by the Papua New Guinea Government’s Law and Justice Sector Working Group (LJSWG) and the National Coordinating Mechanism (NCM), in August 2005.

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 was primarily quantitative, based on random grid sampling, and using a structured questionnaire. The survey instrument from the 2004 surveys was quite satisfactory. For the second round, it was broadened to include Questions 2.15–2.38, which provide coverage of all key sector agencies, as well as Q.7.7 on police discipline, and Q.8.7 on community consultation by the police. Appendix D contains the English Questionnaire.

Survey Design

Mt. Hagen has three separate areas. Town is the heavily populated city area. The Kagamuga airport area, some 7 km along the Highlands Highway to the east, is mainly airport reserve plus a small urban area and some rural land use. Kerebug, an area 2 km to the northwest of the town, contains Mt. Hagen Technical College, a small residential area, and rural land use.

Target Population

The urban population of Mt. Hagen was 27,877 at the 2000 Census (see Table C1). The target population, aged 15 years and over, comprised 64 percent of the population, and was estimated at 17,841 people.19

Table C1: Mt. Hagen Urban Population, by Gender, 2000 Census20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Mt. Hagen Town, including Kerebug</th>
<th>Kagamuga Urban</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>13,500</td>
<td>1,474</td>
<td>14,974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>11,599</td>
<td>1,304</td>
<td>12,903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25,099</td>
<td>2,778</td>
<td>27,877</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample Size

Sample size tables set a sample target of 376, based on a 95 percent probability of achieving a sample age mean less than one year above or below the mean age of the population aged 15 years and over, in 2000.21

Sampling of the target area was based on current maps using random grid sampling, which is a standard and widely accepted geographical and sociological practice. Grid sampling used one variable (house location) overlaid by an arbitrary, independent variable (grid intersections based on compass bearings). From a map of Mt. Hagen, random numbers were allocated to grid point intersections where they overlay residential areas. A random number generator selected the required number of 16 sites. Whether or not houses were on or near a grid intersection was a random matter, thus there was no bias in selection.

Fourteen of the 16 sites were in Town. Twelve of these were southeast of the town centre at various locations accessed along Kum Road, and two were in Kagamuga. Ten of the 16 sites were identified on the maps as being in 'Customary, Informal, or Low Cost Housing Areas', and six were in 'Medium Covenant to High Cost Residential Areas'. The sample site distribution was statistically consistent with the distribution of land use into the two types \( \chi^2 = 2.06, df=1, p=.15 \), and between the three urban areas \( \chi^2 = 0.98, df=2, p=.61 \).

Housing within each site was homogenous. Interviews targeted the 10 houses nearest the grid point at each of the 16 sites. The aim was to collect 25 interviews at each site, with quotas at each site filled by data collectors, based on the variables of age and gender to compensate for any bias in non-response. A 40 percent allowance for non-response was built into the site sampling and interviewers were instructed not to take substitute houses, if people were unavailable. They worked weekends and were instructed to revisit within the 10 selected houses to fill quotas.

Of the 160 households identified (out of the 4,314 found in the 2000 Census), data were collected at 124. Field work constraints meant that the outcome was a sample of 328 people aged 15 years and over. This sample was 13 percent smaller than desirable, but it provided a relatively high sample fraction of 1.84 percent of the urban population aged 15+ (compared to 0.31 percent in Port Moresby in 2005, and 0.53 percent in Lae). The sample numbers were within the statistically acceptable parameters set by the standard sampling tables that were used, and which accept small sampling fractions. The standard error of the sample mean was 0.67.

The sample size proved to be statistically acceptable for the purposes of generalisation for the total adult population of Mt. Hagen. The size 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, but there has been no requirement for such analysis. Longitudinal analysis would be possible in future by comparing household data from this survey with data from the same households in any repeat surveys.

\[ \chi^2 \]

\[ \chi^2 = 2.06, df=1, p=.15 \]

\[ \chi^2 = 0.98, df=2, p=.61 \]

Sample Reliability

Despite the smaller than intended sample size, statistical tests against all available population parameters showed that the sample achieved results which exceeded a 95 percent level of probability, and that it was statistically representative of the population of Mt. Hagen compared to the 2000 Census data. The sample matched all of the key demographic variables — age, gender, marital status, and education — on which data are available for the 15+ population in the limited published census reports. Because of the limited census data available for Lae, some comparisons had to be based on the urban population of Morobe Province.

Age

The sample of 328 people had age means and standard deviations identical to the 2000 Census data for the total urban population of Western Highlands Province (including Banz and Minj, with some seven percent of the total provincial urban population) because separate data were not available for Mt. Hagen (Table C2; \( t = .01, df = 327, p = .99 \)).

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Western Highlands Urban (2000 Census)</td>
<td>30.6+/-.12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Hagen (2006 Survey)</td>
<td>30.6+/-.12.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gender

The same age and gender interview quotas applied to each site. The 15+ group age and gender numbers and percentages from the 2000 Census are given in Table C3. The age and gender proportions were also for Western Highlands Province. These percentages were used for allocating age and gender quotas from three to five people in each category for each sample site in Mt. Hagen.

Table C3: Western Highlands Urban Adult Population Proportions, by Age and Gender, 2000 Census

<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>3,655</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>2,989</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>3,410</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>2,780</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7,065</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>5,769</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table C4 shows the quotas and sample results. Differences between the sample (observed frequency) and estimates derived from the 2000 Census (expected frequency) for this size sample were not statistically significant \( (X^2 = 3.76, df=5, p=.58) \); that is, the sample was highly representative of the known age and gender cohorts.

Table C4: Mt. Hagen 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>63</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample 2005</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marital Status

Married people in Mt. Hagen comprised 61.4 percent of those aged 15 years and over in the 2000 Census (57.8 percent for males and 65.6 percent for females). The proportions in the site samples are shown in Table C5. The differences between the married and unmarried numbers in the sample and the 2000 Census were not statistically significant \( (X^2 = 1.67, df=1, p=.20) \); that is, the sample was representative of marriage levels.

Table C5: 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>Mt. Hagen</td>
<td>10 965</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>58.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Education

The proportion of people in Mt. Hagen in the 2000 Census who had technical or university level educational qualifications was 12.4 percent of those aged 15 years and over. The proportion in the sample is shown in Table C6. The differences between those who were tertiary educated and those with lesser education in the sample and the Census were not statistically significant \( (X^2 = 0.003, df=1, p=.96) \); that is, the sample was statistically highly representative of education levels.

Table C6: Interviews by Tertiary Education Qualifications, Aged 15 Plus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Census Tertiary Educated N</th>
<th>Census Tertiary Educated %</th>
<th>Sample Tertiary Educated N</th>
<th>Sample Tertiary Educated %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Hagen</td>
<td>2 212</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gender Issues

While in many households there were frank reports on sexual assault and domestic violence, the indication was that reporting was below the level of actual victimisation. This problem is grounded in the methodology. Questionnaire surveys which are based on short, closed-response questions are appropriate for the survey’s 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 were high and constant, so that it was 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 the candid responses. Open communication between the respondent and the 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 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 the whole survey.

Field Work, Quality Control, and Safety

NRI visited Mt. Hagen in the second week of February 2006 to develop field work plans and liaise with local authorities. The 2005 Lae field supervisor from NRI was the field supervisor in Mt. Hagen.

NRI contracted qualified and experienced data collectors. The group comprised five men and five women. One of the interviewers had worked on previous crime surveys, while the other nine were recruited locally through the Western Highlands Council of Women. They were aged in their twenties and thirties, and all had tertiary level education, mainly at technical colleges. Fifty percent of the interviewers had previous data collection experience, and all were fluent in English and Tok Pisin.

The safety of the data collectors was a priority concern. The Safety Management Plan that was used in the NCD (reproduced in the 2004 NCD report) was used as a guide by the field supervisor in Mt. Hagen. Radios were actively used by the field workers, and this allowed more efficient field management, as well as a greater sense of security. The field workers reported no security incidents.

However, according to the field supervisor, some field work constraints made data collection difficult to manage, more so than in Lae or Port Moresby. The main constraint was rain, which fell on most days. Often, downpours lasted two to three hours. This
severely restricted interviewing, which, for security reasons, involved sitting and taking notes outside the house. Another important constraint was that because Mt. Hagen has a very strong informal economic sector, many people are out of their houses for long and unpredictable periods. Daily absenteeism among potential interviewees (which was also a similar problem in the 2004 and 2005 Arawa surveys) meant that in order to obtain the required numbers for interviews, interviewing hours were varied, extending into the evenings in some locations. Revisiting of interview sites was extensive. The 328 interviews were achieved in 78 percent of targeted households, compared to 71 percent in Port Moresby and 91 percent in Lae in the 2005 surveys.

Data Analysis

Data coding and statistical analysis were undertaken by Barbara Davies & Associates (BDA) in Canberra. They cross-tabulated data and presented means using SPSS, and provided data files in SPSS and Microsoft Excel.24

Comparisons between Mt. Hagen, Lae, and Port Moresby in this report used the best available data for each location, which was unweighted for Mt. Hagen and Lae, and weighted for Port Moresby.25 Because the Mt. Hagen and Lae samples were a random and accurate representation of their populations, as far as could be judged, weighting was not necessary. The use of age and gender quotas meant that the samples were, in effect, weighted a priori, as best as the available data allowed, and were statistically representative on all available measures. While the use of unweighted data is only accurate to the extent of the .05 level of confidence, this is adequate for the purpose of generalisation. Even if weighting was desirable, the limited and province-wide census data would mean that it would not address any inherent inaccuracies in the data.

In comparison, weighting was necessary with the 2004 and 2005 surveys in Port Moresby because the two-stage sampling was not random at the first stage. This was possible, in practice, because Port Moresby and the NCD (which is a province for census reporting purposes) share the same boundaries and adequate census data and maps were available to weight at the necessary Census Unit level. Even so, the result was that totals varied usually by one percent or less. For example, the NCD 2005 (Q.4.2), unweighted data showed that 53.2 percent of respondents stated that they thought the crime problem in Papua New Guinea was very large. The weighted data were minimally different at 53.4 percent.

If the small changes deriving from the NCD weighting are a guide, minor changes from weighting the Mt. Hagen data would not change interpretations against the NCD (where the Mt. Hagen-Port Moresby differences were generally large). Providing the

24 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.

25 At the city level, the 2005 Port Moresby sample was statistically representative in size, age means and standard deviations, gender, and marital status, but overrepresented the tertiary educated (which may be a consequence of social change since 2000, rather than a bias in sampling — see the 2005 Port Moresby Report, pp.73–74).
unweighted data are used if future surveys are conducted in Mt. Hagen, reliable trend information will be provided, which is the real interest in the findings.

Inferential statistics were not used in the data analysis, with the exception of testing the sampling parameters. This report compares data from three different populations. No attempt is made in any of the survey reports to generalise data beyond the city in which it was collected (for example, to the nation as a whole, by assuming that a city was a sample of the urban population of the nation), so inferential statistics would not be appropriate for comparison between different urban populations. Within Port Moresby, the weighted sample represented the whole population (insofar as known from the 2000 Census).

Because the Mt. Hagen and Lae samples were random and accurate representations of their populations as far as can be judged, weighting would not change the proportions, which effectively makes the use of inferential statistics redundant. While the analysis of variance of site samples in Port Moresby and non-parametric test of small cells in cities would strengthen the statistical interpretation, it would clutter the reports for their intended audience of public servants and community groups in Papua New Guinea.

In the absence of statistical testing, comparisons between Mt. Hagen, Lae, and Port Moresby were guided by the standard errors of the sample means (0.67 in Mt. Hagen, 0.67 in Lae, and 0.49 in Port Moresby in 2005). Little importance was attached to differences of one or two percent, except where they were a part of trends.

Two units of analysis were used — responses from individual interviewees and responses for households (which contained an average of 2.6 interviewees in Mt. Hagen). The first paragraphs of each chapter make clear what type of data is to be presented in the chapter. The text uses 'respondent' when reporting is based on individuals, and 'household' when using household data.

The JAG/NRI surveys of household data generated increased reliability by using multiple responses from each household. Household victimisation surveys typically use one respondent (notionally the head of the household), which can have reliability problems. It is vulnerable to the limitations of the head of households' own memory, and whatever censoring they wish to apply to information about their families or their own behaviour. Averaged responses give a more reliable enumeration of household victimisation than might be obtained from the head of household, who may be a perpetrator of sexual assault and domestic violence.

Household data do not necessarily have less validity than individual responses by virtue of respondents not being independent of each other. Any assumption that an individual's comment has more validity than a group's is not necessarily correct. In Papua New Guinea, and many other cultures, the individual is a less meaningful social unit than the family, clan, or community. Many individuals do not express any opinion other than the revealed household or community truth, consequently, their response is not independent. In any case, no perceptions are independent of social influence, whether from inside or outside the household.

During data analysis, household crime victimisation reports were aggregated at two levels to allow analysis by individual household (for example, to examine repeat crime
more closely in Chapter 3), and by city (to give overall crime statistics for the long-term analysis of trends):

1. **Individual Households:** The victimisation statistic is the mean of the number of any particular type of crime reported by individuals within that household, for that household.

2. **Town:** Means for the affected households were calculated by adding all crime reports, and dividing by the number of individuals reporting them. 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 2006 Mt. Hagen survey was conducted according to the following timetable (see Table C7):

**Table C7: Survey Timetable**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Survey approval</td>
<td>NCM</td>
<td>25 August 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise instrumentation</td>
<td>JAG, NRI, LJSWG</td>
<td>3 September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct training, commence field work</td>
<td>NRI</td>
<td>1–5 March 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete field work</td>
<td>NRI</td>
<td>25 March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary data analysis</td>
<td>BDA, JAG</td>
<td>8 May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report submission</td>
<td>JAG, NRI</td>
<td>25 May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report acceptance</td>
<td>AusAID</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D
QUESTIONNAIRE
PNG Community Crime Survey, 2005

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

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

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

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

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

**Time interview commenced:** __________
Section 1 – Screening Questions and Demographics of the Household

1.1 Do you or anyone in your house, work for the police, the courts or the prison service?
   
   1 Yes  2 No *(If yes, politely discontinue the interview)*

1.2 Where is your home place? *Interviewer circle number if respondent is an expatriate:*
   
   1 Expatriate

1.3 How long have you lived in this house? *

1.4 Does the household:
   
   1 Own  2 Rent  3 Other

   Specify other: *

1.5 Does anyone in the household own a:
   
   1 Car  2 Truck  3 Motor bike  4 Bicycle  5 Boat, or  6 None of the above

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

1.7 Is the house connected to electricity?
   
   1 Yes  2 No

1.8 Do you have a telephone or mobile phone in the house?
   
   1 Yes  2 No
1.9 *(Don’t ask this or the next two questions if the answer is obvious to you)*

Is the house connected to a permanent water supply?

1 Yes  
2 No

1.10 Do you have a toilet connected to the sewer?

1 Yes  
2 No

1.11 Is this house?

1 Walled
2 Fenced
3 Unfenced

Section 2 – General Thinking/ Beliefs about Crime

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

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

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

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

1 2 The police are doing a good/bad job
3 4 The courts are doing a good/bad job
5 6 The prisons are doing a good/bad job
7 8 The community is doing a good/bad job
9 10 The raskols are getting better/worse, and/or
11 Other (specify) ____________________________
2.3 Do you think violent crime against people (killing, robbery, rape, assault — give examples) in your area has changed in the past 12 months?

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

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

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

2.5 Do you think corruption in Papua New Guinea 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 like parks or churches
7. Walking around at night
8. Investing in this house or in a business
9. Nothing in particular, and/or
10. Other (specify): ____________________________

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

1. Yes  2. No

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

1. People who live in this place
2. Outsiders
3. Both
4. Don’t know
2.14 Do you think it is more effective that people who steal are:

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

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

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

2.16 Were you satisfied with how they handled your matter?

1. Yes
2. No

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

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don’t know

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

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don’t know of them (If No or Don’t know, go to Q.2.21)

2.19 Were you satisfied with how they handled your matter?

1. Yes
2. No

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

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don’t know

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

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don’t know of them (If No or Don’t know, go to Q.2.24)
2.22 Were you satisfied with how it handled your matter?

1 Yes  2 No

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

1 Yes  2 No  3 Don’t know

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

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

2.25 Were you satisfied with how it handled your matter?

1 Yes  2 No

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

1 Yes  2 No  3 Don’t know

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

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

2.28 Were you satisfied with how they handled your matter?

1 Yes  2 No

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

1 Yes  2 No  3 Don’t know

2.30 Have you had anything to do with the Police?

1 Yes  2 No  3 Don’t know of them *(If No or Don’t know, go to Q.2.33)*
2.31 Were you satisfied with how they handled your matter?
1 Yes  2 No

2.32 Are the police doing a good job over corruption?
1 Yes  2 No  3 Don’t know

2.33 Have you had anything to do with the Public Prosecutor’s Office?
1 Yes  2 No  3 Don’t know of them (If No or Don’t know, go to Q.2.33)

2.34 Were you satisfied with how they handled your matter?
1 Yes  2 No

2.35 Is the Public Prosecutor’s Office doing a good job over corruption?
1 Yes  2 No  3 Don’t know

2.36 Have you had anything to do with the Public Solicitor’s Office?
1 Yes  2 No  3 Don’t know of them (If No or Don’t know, go on to next section)

2.37 Were you satisfied with how they handled your matter?
1 Yes  2 No

2.38 Is the Public Solicitor’s Office doing a good job over corruption?
1 Yes  2 No  3 Don’t know
Section 3 – Experience of Crime

Interviewer to read out: Now I will ask you about your personal experiences of crime over the past 12 months (in Port Moresby and Bougainville, since the last interviews). I am going to read out a list of crimes that might have affected you or someone else in your house. I would like you to tell me whether you or a 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:

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

3.2 Stealing your property from you:

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

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

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

3.4 Assault:

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

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

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

(☐ In the home? ☐ Outside the home?)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Victim Status</th>
<th>Individual Number of Times</th>
<th>Household Number of Times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Provoked violence (e.g. payback):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Not victim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Individual</td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of times:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Household</td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of times:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>Sexual assault: (☐ In the home? ☐ Outside the home?):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Not victim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Individual</td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of times:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Household</td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of times:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>Using a firearm against you or your household:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Not victim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Individual</td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of times:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Household</td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of times:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>Killing (household member):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Not victim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Household</td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of times:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>Destruction or damage to your property (household):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Not victim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Household</td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of times:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>Breaking into your house and stealing (household):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Not victim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Household</td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of times:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>Other (Specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Not victim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Individual</td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of times:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Household</td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of times:</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 household 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?
   - Yes  - No

4.4 Where did it happen? (Don’t read out alternatives)
   - Home
   - Street
   - Shops
   - Workplace
   - Another private space
   - A community space (meeting, school), or
   - Other place (specify)

4.5 Were you (house member) on your own?
   - Yes  - No

4.6 When did it happen?
   - Morning
   - Afternoon
   - Night

4.7 Did it happen:
   - During the week
   - Saturday
   - Sunday

4.8 Was there more than one offender?
   - Yes  - 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.)*

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Getting your life back to normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Recovering what you lost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>That the criminal suffers for the crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Avoid being victimised again</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>That the criminals be taken off the street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>That the criminals pay for the loss or damage, and/or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Nothing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

4.25 If yes, specify.

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

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No *(If No, go to Part 5)*

4.27 If yes, in what way?

4.28 Do these measures make you feel safer?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] 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?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] 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 the alternatives.)*
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

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 house 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, what would it be? (Don't read out the alternatives. More than one response is 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, what would it be? (Don‘t read out the alternatives. More than one response is 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 to 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 Q.6.2 or Q.6.3, go to Q.6.6)

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

1 Yes  2 No

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

1 Yes  2 No
6.6 Do you think the police in your area are doing a good job?

1 Yes
2 No
3 Sometimes
4 Don’t know

6.7 If Yes to Q.6.6, is it because: *(Don’t read out the alternatives. More than one response is 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 is 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 the police from Bougainville and the police from the rest of Papua New Guinea?

1 Yes 2 No

6.11 If so, which do you prefer?

1 Regular police
2 Auxiliary police
3 Neither
6.12 Can you give me any examples of community-based policing in your area?
1. Yes
2. No
3. Don’t know
(specify where appropriate)

6.13 Some police are heavily armed and travel as mobile squads. If you know of these police, do they make you feel:
1. Safer
2. Less safe, or
3. Don’t know

6.14 (Port Moresby, Arawa, and Buka only). Did the presence of the Australian police make any difference to crime in your community?
1. Yes
2. No
3. Don’t know
If Yes, what difference did they make?

6.15 (Port Moresby, Arawa, and Buka only). Once they left, was there any difference in crime in your community?
1. Yes
2. No
3. Don’t know
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?
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 the alternatives.)

1. 0-30 minutes
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 the alternatives. More than one response is 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?
7.7 Has police discipline improved in the past 12 months?

1  Yes
2  No
3  Sometimes
4  Don’t know

8.1 In what ways could members of your community better assist the police? (Don’t read out the alternatives. More than one response is 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 become a victim of a crime in the future, would you report it to the police?
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 the household list, or estimate.)

9.3 Marital status:

1. Married/living together
2. Separated/divorced
3. Widowed
4. Never married
9.4 Highest level of education completed:

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

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time interview concluded:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewer’s initials:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>