

## **VICTIMISATION AND PERCEPTIONS THAT CRIME IS A PROBLEM: AN EMPIRICAL COMPARISON OF RURAL PAKISTAN AND AUSTRALIA**

**Patrick Jobes**

Associate Professor in Sociology, University of New England, Armidale NSW 2351.

**ABSTRACT:** This paper describes and compares victimisation in rural Pakistan and Australia. Data from Pakistan were collected in a survey research project of 160 rural households. Questions on the interview schedule were derived from similar instruments currently used in Australia (Australian Bureau of Statistics 1996a). The findings on victimisation permit comparisons between rural Punjab and Australia, as representative nations in the Periphery and the Core (Bhaskar & Glyn, 1995). Substantive differences are presented after considering whether instruments developed in First World settings are appropriate for studying poverty, social problems and crime in the rural Third World (Buttel & Newby, 1980). While overall crime was less frequent among households in rural Pakistan, serious violent crime was much more common. In spite of the prevalence of serious crime, far fewer Pakistanis than Australians perceived crime as a problem. Neither stratification nor gender was associated with victimisation in respondent households or in perceiving crime as a social problem in Pakistan.

### **1. INTRODUCTION: STATEMENT OF PROBLEM**

This paper reports results of research which contrasts how rural social fields in contemporary Australia or Pakistan, as ideal-typical examples from the First and Third Worlds, influence being a victim to crime (Niemann, 2000). These differences are related to being socially advantaged and, comparatively, how seriously crime is regarded in the cultural contexts of advantage and disadvantage. The paper has several goals, namely to:

- Establish an exploratory empirical foundation for examining crime and victimisation in rural Punjab;
- Compare the frequency and types of crime and victimisation in rural Australia and Pakistan, as representative nations in the Periphery and the Core (Bhaskar & Glyn, 1995);
- Consider the applicability of instruments developed in First World to this Third World setting (Buttel & Newby, 1980);
- Identify how gender and economic disadvantage were linked to victimisation; and
- Examine the relative applicability of classic theory for describing the findings.

The analyses are grounded, deriving directly from the data (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Elements of contemporary criminological theory became apparent during interviews and data analyses. Social disorganisation (Petee & Kowalski, 1993)

and conflict (Marx & Engels 1947, Quinney 1977) evolved as the perspectives that most accurately described the Pakistani data.

The classic sociological distinction between community and society is used to compare Australia and Pakistan (Durkheim 1947, Marx & Engels 1947, Toennies, 1957, Weber 1930).<sup>1</sup> Established sociological theory does not clearly apply to rural areas in the late twentieth century, though there are notable attempts to resolve distinctions between traditional and modern, Third World and First World, rural and urban, and similar continua. Elias' (1982) discussion of the process of civilisation emphasises the psychical response to the structural shift from community to society. Bourdieu's (1990) neoclassical concept, habitus emphasises how situated social structures explain the constitution, realisation and transformation of behaviour. To Bourdieu and Elias the specific natures of behaviours by modern and traditional peoples are more than a simple mirroring of modernity and traditionality. Both authors begin with structural theory for considering the complex differences between traditional community and modern society.

Research on rural social problems is uncommon (Summers 1991) and extremely rare in Islamic Third World nations. Comparing the two worlds presents a variety of epistemological difficulties (Bourdieu, Chamboredon, & Passeron, 1991). Conventional analytic methods for studying First World society are questionably appropriate for a Third World community (Wallerstein, 1975). A classic perspective has been adopted for three reasons. Structural concepts: convey a sociological tradition for theoretical and empirical interpretation; establish a foundation for comparing crime rates in Pakistan and Australia (Wallerstein, 1991); are most amenable to the limitations of these data analyses (Mawby, 1999). In keeping with most structural theory examining modernisation, industrialised and modern are equated with the First World, non-industrialised and traditional with the Third World (Westendorff & Ghai, 1993).

Differentiating between types or stages of society is complex. Linking causes of crime and systems of justice within those types becomes all the more complex. In *Ancient Law* (1906) H S Maine described the evolution from *status* to *contract*, familial patriarchy to civil administration. His work heavily influenced Weber's traditional-rational categories and Toennies' *Gemeinschaft*-

---

<sup>1</sup> The term "classic" theory has a lengthy and recurrent lineage in sociology. According to Robert Nisbet (1970:vi), "...classic thought remains fresh and stimulating to the sociological imagination no matter when it is written". One common analytic quality shared by the founding masters, according to Nisbet, was that they described social behaviour in terms of interaction associated with social aggregates that shared distinctive patterns of norms and roles. More recent scholars, such as Norbert Elias and Pierre Bourdieu, have extended the tradition of classic scholarship. Bourdieu (1991:248), insisted, "I wanted to produce an empirical sociology that was theoretically grounded, a sociology that could have critical intentions (like every science) but which had to be performed empirically." *Habitus* exemplifies his epistemological struggle to construct a concept that was applicable across diverse historical and cultural phenomena. This preoccupation led Elias (1982) to consider the more specific questions of how to distinguish traditional from modern European civilisations and the attendant corresponding behaviours of their peoples.

*Gesellschaft* typology. These intellectual roots are relevant for cross-national comparisons between First and Third World nations. Contemporary scholars who attempt to impose either capitalistic or socialistic interpretations on justice systems and trends in the developed and developing nations encounter inevitable tensions (Kamenka and Tay, 1975). Marxian attempts to explain the law merely in terms serving the interests of the ruling class often are inaccurate. Kamenka & Tay (p. 141) suggest a *bureaucratic-administrative* type to compliment *Gemeinschaft* and *Gesellschaft*. The typology “...does not imply a simple straightforward revolutionary schema, in which each stage is replaced by its successor and then thrown into the dustbin of history.” Alert to a profound difference between contemporary societies, whether ‘traditional’, socialist, or capitalist they acknowledge inherent biases among many critical criminologists, who attempt to invalidate justice systems in the Third World. Classic theory, conflict or functional, predicts two relationships between social structure and crime. First, developed industrialised societies, particularly those that are disorganised, are likely to have more crime because they are fragmented and have little cohesion. Second, poor people are more likely to be perpetrators and victims of crime (Vold, Bernard & Snipes, 1998). Modern people and the poor are simultaneously more likely to be alienated (Merton, 1967) and to be defined disadvantageously (Quinney, 1977) by the legal system.

## **2. THE SOCIAL CONTEXTS OF CRIME IN PAKISTAN AND AUSTRALIA: COMMUNITY AND SOCIETY**

Rural Australia and Pakistan are extremely different from their respective urban settings, however they also are distinct from each other. The populations, organisational structure, technology and exploitation of the environments (Duncan & Schnore, 1959) in Australia are largely modern exchange production *Gesellschaft*. In Pakistan they are largely traditional subsistence production *Gemeinschaft*. Australia is among the most technologically advanced and wealthy nations, Pakistan among the poorest (Held *et al.*, 1999). The period of comparison, late-1990's, was relatively stable, politically and economically, for both nations. Both experienced changes in national governments. “Relative stability” in Pakistan implies levels of corruption, inflation and poverty that would be considered chaotic in Australia.

A search of the 1995-1998 IBSS International Social Science Database found no references for Pakistan Crime. Demographic data from Pakistan are difficult to standardise because no census has been collected since 1981. Table 1 summarises selected demographic, family, and achievement measures for Pakistan and Australia for 1996. In this year their comparative life expectancies were 58.8 and 79.6, per capita annual income were \$ 470.00 and \$8647, median education completed was year 4 and year 12, and mean household size was 7.3 and 2.6. Pakistan had among the highest rates of natural increase and net reproduction, as indicated by the total fertility rate of 5.1. The caste-based extended family in Pakistan is the fundamental social unit, an efficient unit for minimising consumption and sharing costs. Large multigenerational families occupy a single house and share everything from energy and possessions to child

and geriatric care, support and opportunity in a nation that has essentially no welfare institutions (Jobes, 1999). Families impose rigid boundaries against the mixing of different castes. The few advantaged consolidate, enhance and perpetuate wealth, status and power through arranged marriages within castes. The poor majority is left a residual of subsistence work and limited opportunity. One respondent cheerfully told us that after several years of saving her family had been able to buy a bicycle. Her adult son would now be able to ride twelve kilometres to a factory where he could earn a wage.

**Table 1.** Selected Demographic, Educational and Income Indicators: Pakistan and Australia 1996

Measure	Pakistan	Australia
Life Expectancy	58.8	79.6
Total Fertility Rate	5.1	1.8
Annual Per Capita Income	\$470 (Aus)	\$8647 (Aus)
Median Education	Year 4	Year 12
Mean Household Size	7.3	2.6

**Notes:** Statistics for 1961-1968 are reported as presented in the *Sourcebook of Criminal Justice Statistics* (Internet: United States Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1997). Statistics for 1980 are calculated from crime frequencies presented in *United Nations World Crime Surveys* (Internet: United Nations Criminal Justice and Crime Prevention Branch, 1997), divided by the number of residents in the country reported by U.S. Bureau of Census (Internet: U.S. Bureau of Census, *International Data Base*, 1997).

Family and the Islamic faith are tightly interrelated with economic and political institutions. These characteristics affect the susceptibility of families to crime. *Gemeinschaft* maintains strict informal control over members, inhibiting most crime. The large size of the extended family may reduce the likelihood that the household or an individual member will be a victim. Homes rarely are empty, reducing their susceptibility to crime. On the other hand, the intense passion of *Gemeinschaft* may make the nature of crimes comparatively volatile when they occur.

Agriculture is the geographic and economic foundation in rural Punjab state. About eighty per cent of the population resides in rural agricultural villages. Land ownership, historically tantamount to prosperity and independence, is widely dispersed. While advantages persist, the prosperity and independence from land ownership are gradually being undermined. Population growth, combined with fragmentation of lands through inheritance, have reduced median farm size to only five acres. Even small farms often are divided into several very small plots, due to norms of inheritance.

Australia stands in dramatic social and economic contrast. Over eighty per cent of Australians live in cities, and even rural communities are technologically modern (Dempsey, 1990). Small subsistence production is almost non-existent (McPheat, 1996). The extended family, and especially caste, is at least as rare (Castles, 1993: 11-23). Families typically are nuclear and highly mobile (Bell, 1992). Fragmented forms of nuclear family are common, including single-parent

households (Australian Bureau of Census, 1996b). Persisting family farms have expanded through consolidation and absorption of neighbouring properties (Bell & Pandey, 1997).

The opportunity structure between social classes and women merits special attention (Becker 1981, Ward 1993). A common and persistent finding in the West is that women and their children are particularly at risk to poverty primarily due to single parenthood associated with high divorce rates and high frequency of out-of wedlock births (Chafetz 1990). Divorces in Australia increased from roughly two divorces per one thousand marriages in 1950 to one hundred and twenty now. Ex-nuptial births increased from about three percent to twenty-five percent (Pitman, Herbert, Land & O'Neill, 2003). High levels of social problems among children of single parent families have been documented (Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990). This is a multigenerational phenomenon, in effect creating ascribed factors in the causation of social problems (Vold, Bernard & Snipes, 1998: 232-248). Family structure and poverty in rural Pakistan are scarcely related to single parenthood, since divorce is rare and illegitimacy is almost non-existent. However, applying almost any criteria, Pakistani women are both economically and politically disadvantaged (Blumberg, 1978). Social disadvantage is only slightly greater in rural Australia than in the city, whereas poverty is disproportionately rural in Pakistan (UNICEF, 1995). Women are universally at greater risk to poverty, which extends inequity into the next generation. Social services common in Australia are almost non-existent in Pakistan. Public education, likewise, is minimal. Most adults are illiterate. Public health care, environmental protections, waste disposal, transportation and communication facilities are minimal by modern standards. Although material disadvantage should not be equated with cultural or moral poverty, manufactured items are luxuries for most rural people. Rural Pakistanis, poor and rich, are devoted to and integrated into traditions of family and faith.

Globalisation has placed small Third World farmers in globally uncompetitive positions (Jobes, 2004). Extreme poverty and high inflation make the difficulties in Pakistan especially difficult. Approximately one-eighth of rural Pakistanis endure the poverty of survival (Ali, 1995, Ahmad, 1993). Poverty of opportunity affects several times that number (Government of Pakistan 1995, 1996).

### **3. THE DEPENDENT VARIABLE: VICTIMISATION**

Victimisation is examined here in conjunction with comparative social advantage in traditional community and in modern society. (Clinard, 1944). The relationship between crime and social disadvantage is extensively developed in the literature (Sampson, Raudenbush & Earls 1997, Hagan 1989). The appropriate unit of victimisation, the respondent, the household, or the persons in the household, is especially important for two reasons. First, household size, hence the number of persons at risk, is much larger in Pakistan than Australia. If the chances of an individual being a victim were the same, the household rates would be nearly three times higher in Pakistan than in Australia. Second,

cultural differences exist between the nations regarding who in the household is at risk. Higher percentages of the young and women are essentially cloistered in Pakistan, reducing their risk. Adult spokespersons, whether men or women, being less isolated, would be at disproportionate risk. The social justice issue of whether the disadvantaged (the poor, women and Pakistanis), are more vulnerable to being victims of crime also is addressed along with perceptions of crime as a social problem.

Contemporary analyses by Western scholars maintain that the poor experience the double disadvantage of poverty and of vulnerability to crime (Smith, 1994). Little has been published about how Third World nations are affected. If the relationship between economic inequity and social problems are markedly different in Pakistan than in Australia, then Western theories of social justice and behaviour will have to be modified for much of the Third World (LaFree & Morris, 2004). The research also allowed a limited examination of whether types of crime in the First and Third Worlds are similar. The seriousness of rural crime has been demonstrated in Western nations (Dingwall & Moody 1999, Jobes, Donnermeyer, Barclay & Weinand 2004, Wells & Weisheit 2004). No reference to international rural crime comparisons was found. International comparisons between Pakistan and Australia are limited and dated. There has been no national victimisation survey in Pakistan. The most comparable in Australia was in 1999. The Comparative Crime Data File (Archer & Gartner, 1984) summarises general murder, rape, burglary, and theft rates for Pakistan for only 1961-1968. These, and data from the World Crime Surveys are presented in Table 2. Both countries experienced increasing levels of crime, particularly property crime, since the 1960's. Australia had much higher total crime in 1980, reflecting higher personal and property crimes in every category, except murder, rape and sex crimes. In general, rural areas in Australia have lower crime rates though a few communities have very high rates.

**Table 2.** Crime Rates (per 100,000 people) for Pakistan and Australia 1961-1980

Offence	Pakistan				Australia			
	1961	1965	1968	1980	1961	1965	1968	1980
Murder	6.62	6.80	6.72	5.34	0.86	1.24	1.19	3.11
Rape/Sex	2.01	1.49	1.57	1.20	0.67	2.26	3.02	8.42
Robbery	26.55	25.05	24.78	6.06	2.12	6.41	10.67	29.11
Theft	35.16	25.22	27.32	44.67	30.79	409.36	196.35	482.69
Assault				16.38				41.72
Fraud				0.46				480.21
Kidnapping				5.47				
TOTAL				79.57				1045.26

**Notes:** Statistics for Pakistan are drawn from *World Population Data Sheet* (Population Reference Bureau, 1997). Statistics for Australia are drawn from *Yearbook Australia 1997* (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 1997).

The theoretical assumption was that the loosely, yet formally, controlled impersonal nature of First World Gesellschaft typify rural areas in Australia more than in Pakistan. Lower integration and cohesion were hypothesised to increase the likelihood and variety of crime. Many of the crimes were expected to be public nuisance and offensive behaviours, which would increase the likelihood of being publicly recognised. Property crime was expected to be common in Australia. Items often for exchange rather than for personal use. Most crimes against the person would be common assault and rape, where perpetrators were recognised. Extreme violence, such as murder and abduction would be rare.

The assumptions for Pakistan were that crime would be a reflection of impoverished Gemeinschaft; close, familiar, and personal. The intense and passionate control of village life was hypothesised to prevent much crime, but would imply powerful consequences for serious crime. Stealing, while common, would be utilitarian, of little material value, and difficult to observe. Crimes against the person, while comparatively less common, would be intensely personal. Whatever the motives for violence -- whether the passion of vendetta or the fear of being recognised -- the likelihood of murder would be increased. Both personal and property crimes would be difficult to observe because violators would seek to avoid being personally identified. Crimes against persons and property were expected to be bi modal with little variation.

The survey data permit general comparisons between Australia and Pakistan. Their relative meanings of crime undoubtedly differ. For example, automobile theft might be considered less serious in Australia than in Pakistan, though how much less serious was unknown. Conversely, some retributive homicide is honourable and expected in Pakistan, while proscribed in Australia. The numbers of offences were too small to allow specification by types of crime. Definitions of conditions in Australia were sometimes found invalid for Pakistan. Questions about wealth have entirely different connotations in the two nations. Our first concern was whether crime was given the same valence in the two nations. Our second concern was how gender and economic disadvantage were related to victimisation in the two countries. Did gender, poverty, caste, and land ownership, (Pakistan) or unemployment, (Australia) increase the likelihood of being a victim? The final question was whether certain types of respondents or households differed in their perceptions of social problems and their experiences with crime.

#### **4. METHODOLOGY**

This project measured and analysed crime and social factors associated with crime in rural Pakistan and compared those findings with crime in rural Australia and New South Wales. Original data for Pakistan were collected for this project. Data for Australia were disaggregated from the 1993 national survey. The following discussion will hopefully be sufficiently transparent to inform readers about the reliability and validity of the empirical comparisons and the theoretical explanations.

Data from Pakistan were collected through personal interviews. Following

pre-testing of the interview schedule, a systematic block sample of 170 households was drawn in three villages that had been randomly selected within the Faisalabad District. All villages had irrigated agriculture of small land holdings. One village had disproportionately lower caste populations. One hundred and sixty respondents were interviewed in their homes during October and November 1996, creating a response rate of 94 percent. Sex of respondent had been randomised for each household before the interview. They were requested to be the most responsible member of their sex in the household. Respondents were interviewed by interviewers of the same sex and away from the opposite sex, in order to respect custom, increase empathy, and reduce bias. Men and women were designated to be interviewed in alternating households within the block.

A quasi-experimental design for analysing data guided the analyses (Cook & Campbell 1979). Level of development (*Gemeinschaft*–*Gesellschaft*) was the independent variable for comparing data from Australia and Pakistan. Gender and stratification (caste, land ownership, savings and income) were the independent variables within Pakistan. The portion of the interview schedule inquiring about social problems, crime and victimisation was sequentially constructed. The effects of variables are cumulative (Zetterberg 1986).

The pre-coded interview schedule was developed to investigate household poverty and victimisation.<sup>2</sup> The section on victimisation began with an open-ended question asking what were the three most important problems affecting the family. Responses to these questions are reported in Table 3. This question established a qualitative context for the consideration of crime, as well as unprompted subjective interpretations of family problems. The second question contextualised the notion of crime by asking how serious a problem crime was to the household, relative to the worst problem mentioned in the preceding question. Table 4 compares Australian and Pakistani responses about how serious of a problem crime is. This question was followed by a series of objective questions about victimisation, drawn from the Australian Bureau of Statistics Crime and Safety Survey (1996a). As self-reported experience, the responses may diverge from reported crime (Biderman & Lynch 1991). The ABS question about vehicular theft was replaced by one about animal theft because of national differentials in ownership of vehicles and animals. These questions helped increase cross-national comparability of responses. Even so, the number of Pakistan victims was so small that responses about location of crime, type of weapon, and relationship of offender to victim could not be analysed. However, more detailed information about factors fundamental to traditional Pakistan communities, caste, land holdings, and household savings, was collected through the Pakistan survey.

Respondents were asked how they and other household members had been victimised during the past twelve months and the past five years. Analyses distinguished between victimisation of respondents, households, and number of persons in households. ABS data report respondent and household victimisation

---

<sup>2</sup> A copy of the interview schedule is available upon request from the author.



rates, but no rate for the number of persons in households. Victimization rates per number of persons in households are reported to control for the much larger size of Pakistani households. A coding protocol summarising responses to the open-ended question was developed upon completion of the interviews. Crime, environment, and inadequate opportunities were identified as categories negatively affecting the households.

**Table 3.** Frequencies of Responses by 160 Heads of Households in Rural Punjab to ‘What are the Three Most Important Problems Facing Your Household?’

Type of Problem	Yes: One of Top 3		No: Not One of Top 3	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Lack of Opportunities	93	58.1	67	41.9
Environment	22	13.8	138	86.2
Crime	11	6.9	149	93.1
Other Problems	6	3.8	154	96.2
No Problems	18	17.4		

**Table 4.** Perception that Crime is a Serious Problem in Rural Pakistan and NSW (Percent of Respondents), 1996

Crime	Pakistan	Australia
Is a Problem	6.9	55.3
Is Not a Problem	93.1	44.7

van Dijk and Mayhew’s (1992) cautions about comparing international crime statistics are relevant to these data. Reservations about the reliability and validity of this type of victimisation survey have been noted by Travis, et al. (1995). The sample size is small. Multiple victimisations of a person or a household, particularly around a single incident, are difficult to specify. Questions related to sexual offences are especially questionable, because of reluctance and culpability of respondents (Coleman & Moynihan, 1996). Despite these cautions the alternative would have been to not conduct the research. These are unique data, drawn from rural traditional communities in an Islamic republic. Though the sample was small, the response rate was very high. The traditional agricultural homogeneity of rural Punjab also may reduce the need for large samples of diverse subpopulations.

The survey provides data on previously unexplored issues in Pakistan. Family is an extremely private institution about which little public admission is made. Most serious crimes are committed in family vendettas. Many acts that legally are violations, especially assaults by family members, are neither perceived to be criminal offences nor likely to be talked about. The responses shed light on the “dark figure” of crime in rural Pakistan in two ways. First, they establish a small initial data set for comparisons with future findings. Second, if gross differences in amounts of victimisation occurred between respondents and other family members or between victimisation during the past year, as opposed to the past five years, then under-reporting will be demonstrated. Table 5

presents estimates of victimisations against respondents and per household member extrapolated from their responses at a single point in time, 1996.

**Table 5.** Number and Type of Crimes Reported by Household Head, Rural Pakistan

Type of Crime	Respondent Reported		Household Reported		Estimate Per	
	Past year	Past 5 years	Past year	Past year	Respondent	Household
					Past 5 years*	Past 5 years
Theft of Animals	7 (64%)	11 (65%)	2 (40%)	4 (33%)	35 (61%)	45 (28%, 3.91%)
Unlawful Entry	-	1 (6%)	1 (20%)	1 (8%)	1 (2%)	5 (3%, .43%)
Blackmail/ Extortion	3 (27%)	3 (18%)	-	1 (8%)	15 (26%)	15 (9%, 1.3%)
Robbery Armed	1 (9%)	1 (6%)	-	-	5 (9%)	5 (3%, .43%)
Robbery Unarmed	-	1 (6%)	-	1 (8%)	1 (2%)	2 (1%, .17%)
Kidnapping/ Abduction	-	-	1 (20%)	1 (8%)	-	5 (3%, .43%)
Sexual Assault	-	-	-	-	-	-
Manslaughter Attempted	-	-	-	-	-	-
Murder Murder	-	-	1 (20%)	4 (33%)	-	9 (6%, .78%)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>11</b> (100%)	<b>17</b> (100%)	<b>5</b> (100%)	<b>12</b> (100%)	<b>57</b> (100%)	<b>93</b> (57%, 8%)

**Notes:** Estimates for victims are 5 times the 1996 violations, when there were no reported offences for the past five years. For households they are 5 times the combined victim and household 1996 violations. When there are five year reports, but no 1996 violations, the estimate is of the combined victim and household five year reports. \* Entries in this column are the estimated # (and %) of respondents who were victims of the corresponding act during the past five years. \*\*Entries in this column are the estimated # and % of households that were victimised through the corresponding act during the past five years, followed by the corresponding estimated % of household members who were victims of the corresponding act. For example, 35 (61%) of the respondents were victims of animal theft during the previous five years. The comparable victimisation figures for animal theft among households were 45 (28%) and for persons per household were 3.91%.

Data from Pakistan are reported per respondent, per household, and per household member, as noted. Victimisations during the past year and for the prior five years are reported. Multiple crimes against a single victim are reported as a single victim and a single crime. This conservative method of summarising data understates the actual amount of reported crime in order to allow more systematic tabulation. Comparisons of national differences for victimisations per respondent, household, and persons per household for one year are reported in Table 6. The divergences and similarities between Australia and Pakistan are summarised as qualitative statements. The limited Pakistani data are only comparable as crude descriptive interpretations.

**Table 6.** Percentage of Persons and Households who were Victims of Selected Crimes in Rural Pakistan (1996), Australia (1993) and NSW (1996)

	Pakistan	Australia	NSW
<b>Households (N)</b>	N=160	N=10,460	N=4,900
Break and Enter	.63%	2%	3%
Attempted Break and Enter	-%	1.1%	2.1%
Total Break and Enter	.63%	3.1%	5.1%
Vehicle (Animal) Theft	5.6%	.4%	0.7%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>6.3%</b>	<b>3.5%</b>	<b>5.8%</b>
<b>Respondents (Persons) (N)</b>	N=160	N=10,460	N=4,900
Robbery (and Extortion)	.63+1.9 = 2.5%	.4%	1.0%
Assault	-%	1.7%	2.1%
Sex Assault (and Abduction)	-%	-%	-%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2.5%</b>	<b>2.1%</b>	<b>3.1%</b>
<b>Persons (in Household) (N)</b>	N=1,156	N=27,200	N=12,790
Robbery (and Extortion)	.09+.25%	.11%	.24%
Assault (and Murder)	.09%	.44%	.55%
Sex Assault (and Abduction)	.09%	-%	-%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>.44%</b>	<b>.55%</b>	<b>.79%</b>

**Notes:** Figures are estimated from data in Table 2. There were 160 respondents and households at risk, and 1156 household members at risk in the Pakistani sample. For example, one (.63) respondent was robbed and three (1.9) were extorted. Similarly, one member (.09) in the 1,156 households, including respondents, was robbed, three (.25) were extorted, one (.09) was murdered, and one (.09) was abducted during the twelve months preceding the interview.

The indicators for relative advantage were gender and employment in Australia, and caste, gender, income, land ownership, and household savings in Pakistan. Employment is a key indicator in industrial countries, but is ambiguous in Third World extended family agricultural settings. The number of respondents, who are not farmers, is small to submit to statistical analysis. Farming is notoriously difficult to classify with regard to occupation or employment. Farm ownership is a powerful and valid economic indicator in rural Pakistan. Farm ownership was measured by whether the households owned less than or more than .25 acres. Even a small plot of land may provide a home

site, adequate food and some income.

Data were analysed through comparisons of raw data and simple statistics. Descriptive measures of dispersion summarised distributions of variables. Gamma (?) and Chi Square ( $\chi^2$ ) measured the zero-order cross-tabulations between categorised independent and independent variables. Data analyses progressed from descriptive to more complex statistics (Hagan 1989) through elaboration and specification. Statistical tests were selected according to the appropriate level of measurement and the number of cases. ? was selected because it offered a PRE interpretation of the small number of cases (Costner 1965).

## 5. DATA ANALYSES AND FINDINGS

### 5.1 Socio-Demographic Characteristics

Davidson (1996) has provided a comprehensive summary of the sampling procedures and data collection techniques used. Sample households closely approximated the size, composition and distribution of rural Punjab state, validating assumptions of randomisation. Economic measures also indicated that the sample had income and land ownership representative of the region. Chronbach's alpha (de Vaus 1995: 255-257) was calculated to measure differences between independent and dependent variables across pre-test and actual responses among villages. All measures reported here correlated higher than .78, indicating that no strong systematic biases occurred in sampling.

The sample of 160 respondents included slightly more women (86 = 54 percent) than men (74 = 46 percent). The total number of persons in the households was 1156. Household size ranged from three to sixteen members (Mean=7.23). The dependency ratio ranged from 0 to 100, with mean, median and mode all close to 50. The high dependency ratio reflected the high fertility rate in rural Pakistan. Forty per cent were landless. Monthly household incomes ranged from no income, reported by thirteen (8 percent) respondents, to 54,500 Pakistani rupees (PRs). Median monthly income was 3,600 PRs. (\$1AU\$=32 PRs at the time of the survey). Mean education was seven years. Most (53 percent) respondents, particularly women, (72 percent) were particularly illiterate. Only eleven (13 percent) women had more than five years of education. The modal occupation among male respondents was farming. All other categories accounted for only one-fifth (21 percent) of the male occupations. Eighty per cent of women respondents were not employed outside the home. Indicators of economic and social status were highly and significantly correlated, indicating they were different measures of a single, underlying dimension of socio-economic position.

In contrast, Australia has relatively low national illiteracy, poverty, and natural growth (Castles 1993). Women are heavily employed in the labour force. A small proportion of rural residents live on agricultural properties or are involved in subsistence agriculture. Questions about caste are not even asked in the Australian population census (ABS 1996b). The victimisation surveys in Australia and NSW are based on random sampling. The respondents represent

all strata and are equally divided by sex (ABS 1996a).

## **5.2 Social Problems, Crime and Victimisation**

Respondents in Pakistan reported twenty-eight specific types of social problems facing their households. Eighteen (17.4 percent) reported no problems. (See Table 3) The three most frequently mentioned serious problems; poverty (14 percent), inflation (13 percent) and unemployment (13 percent), were all economic, indicating that lack of economic opportunities were perceived to be the most important difficulties in rural Pakistani households. Inadequate opportunities included income, employment, marriage expenses, and education difficulties. Opportunity problems (58.1 percent) were much more frequent than environmental (13.8 percent) or crime (6.9 percent) problems, which included civil and other legal disputes.

Crime was perceived to be considerably less problematic for most households than the most serious faced by their family. When asked to compare crime to the most serious problem specified by the respondents, crime was given a mean Likert score of 3.2 (1=No Problem and 5=Most Serious Problem). More respondents perceived crime to be no problem (17.4 percent) than perceived it to be as serious as the most important problem faced by their family (11 percent). Overall, only 6.9 percent of the Pakistan sample said crime was a serious problem, compared to 55.3 percent in NSW (See Table 4). Australians were roughly six times as likely to report that crime was a problem for their households.

Victimisation responses for Pakistan are summarised in Table 7. Eleven respondents (6.9 percent) reported being victims to crime during the past year. Seventeen (10.6 percent) had been victims during the previous five years. Five crimes were reported for other household members during the past year (.4 percent), and twelve household members had been victims during the past five years (1.2 percent). The numbers of crimes were small, because of the small sample. Nevertheless, they provide broad and general observations relevant to Pakistan that are not available through other data (See Table 5). Animal theft (64 percent) was the most common offence against respondents during the previous year, followed by extortion (27 percent) and robbery (9 percent). The findings for respondents during the previous five years followed a similar pattern, though with fewer reported offences. That crimes were more frequently reported for the past year probably indicates under-reporting, particularly of minor offences, for the five-year period. Crimes against other household members were much less frequent, though more serious. For example, the number of murders (4) reported was the same as animal thefts -- an observation that will be discussed in later sections.

The one-year (1996) figures in Table 4 convert to the Pakistani rates of victimisation for total crimes reported in Table 6. The crimes of the two locations were substantively very different. In rural Australia (1993) and NSW (1996) the most common crimes were theft (and motor vehicle theft), and unlawful entry. Data reported in the first two row-cells of the table approximate the data collection techniques and the referent crimes for rural Pakistan and

Australia. An estimated 3.1 percent rural Australian and 5.1 percent NSW households suffered from break and enter or attempted break and enter. Theft in Australia was largely breaking and entering a house or car. Violations of assault (and sexual assault) and robbery were far less common. Murder, manslaughter, blackmail, and extortion were very rare.

**Table 7.** Victims of Past Crimes: Respondents and Family Members During the Past 1 and 5 Years in Rural Pakistan, 1996.

Type of Crime	One Year		Five Years	
	Respondents	Family Members	Respondents	Family Members
No Crime	149 (93.1%)	1151 (99.6%)	143 (89.4%)	1142 (98.8%)
Animal Theft	7 (4.4%)	2 (.17%)	11 (6.9%)	4 (.34%)
Unlawful Entry	-	1 (.08%)	1 (0.6%)	1 (.08%)
Robbery Unarmed	-	-	1 (0.6%)	1 (.08%)
Robbery Armed	1 (.6%)	-	1 (0.6%)	1 (.08%)
Extortion/ Blackmail	3 (1.9%)	-	3 (1.9%)	-
Abduction/ Kidnapping	-	1 (0.08)	-	1 (.08%)
Murder	-	1 (0.08)	-	1 (.08%)
TOTAL	160 (100%)	1156 (100%)	160 (100%)	1156 (100%)

Excepting animal theft, which is extremely common, illegal entry (5.6 percent) was the most common violation against Pakistani households. The frequency of breaking and entering (.63 percent) was approximately about one-fifth as common as in rural Australia (3.1 percent), and one-eighth as high as in rural NSW (5.1 percent). Except for animals, which are kept outside the house and are common to most households, property thefts were much less frequent in Pakistan than in Australia. Other material possessions are locked up inside. Excluding animal theft would have reduced Pakistani crime by more than one-half. However, animal theft is a serious crime in Pakistan. The theft of a goat would be equivalent to two months income. Even the theft of a chicken is a serious loss. Any thefts imply levels of moral and ethical outrage that would far exceed responses to the same crime in the West.

Total violations against respondents were about as frequent in rural Pakistan (2.5 percent) as in rural Australia (2.1 percent) and NSW (3.1 percent). However, the patterns of violations were very different. In rural Australia (1.7 percent) and NSW (2.1 percent) most of the violations were assaults. That is, 1.7 percent of rural residents nationwide and 2.1 percent in NSW had been robbed during the year preceding data collection. Their numbers of extortions was too small to report. No respondents reported being assaulted in Pakistan. All crimes reported against Pakistani respondents were either robbery (.63 percent) or extortion (1.9 percent). These differences are among the most dramatically descriptive in the research.

Data in the final row-cell of Table 6 were estimated on the basis of reported violations against members of the households. The tabulations reported were calculated on the basis of mean family size in the respective populations. The

data for Australia and Pakistan in the bottom row-cells indicate that the per capita risk of crime was less in Pakistan (.44 percent) than in rural Australia (.55 percent) or NSW (.79 percent). Pakistani respondents reported extortion (.25 percent), murder (.09 percent), and abduction (.09 percent) against other family members. None of these acts occurred with sufficient frequency in rural Australia to even report.

Excepting animal theft, Pakistani crimes tended to be extremely serious. Blackmail/extortion and murder were the second and third most common crimes. About one-fourth of respondents, who were victims during the past year, had been blackmailed or extorted. Four murders had been committed against household members during the past five years. These figures are much higher than those reported in Australia and other industrial societies for the same crimes. Conversely, more typical crimes to industrial societies were rarely reported in rural Pakistan. The number of murders is too few to allow precise generalisations, though they are consistent over a five-year period. However, the corresponding household murder rate would be 5/1,000, fifty-five times higher than the comparable rate of .09/1,000 for the past five years in Australia. Similarly, the frequency of blackmail/extortion in rural Pakistan would be over thirty times as high as in rural Australia during the same period. On the other hand, other types of property crime were relatively rare in Pakistan, and no sexual crimes were even reported. The following elaboration examines how social advantage is associated with either the perception of crime as a social problem and of being a victim to crime in Pakistan.

### **5.3 Social Advantage, Social Problems and Victimisation**

This research was particularly interested in how social position in Pakistan was associated with the reporting of social problems, crime and victimisation. Table 8 indicates that advantage, measured by caste, savings, and income, was moderately but insignificantly associated with the frequency of victimisation in Pakistan during the prior year. The insignificance may be due to the bipolarity of the data. The most and least advantaged appear to have been victims more than the middle categories. The perception that crime was a problem was also weak and barely significant. More, larger landowners (30 percent) than landless (6 percent) or small landowners (4 percent) regarded crime as the most serious problem facing their households ( $r = -.27, \chi^2 = .03$ ).

Men and women respondents differed little with regard to their experiences or perceptions related to crime. Approximately the same percentage of both sexes had been victims during the past year. Very few men (5.4 percent) or women (8.1 percent) perceived crime as one of the three most important problems facing their families. No gender-based violations common in the West were reported. Most probably are not reported to the police, though some are reported in newspapers. Some might be considered to be culturally acceptable "discipline", rather than assault. Even if such domestic assaults were illegal, Pakistani law gives higher priority to the testimony of men, making reporting perhaps fruitless and hazardous for female victims. Non-marital sexual attacks often are reported to conclude with murder, presumably to prevent identification

of the assailant. Rape in the West may eventuate as murder in Pakistan. To further complicate matters, women may be selected as victims during family and caste feuds.

**Table 8.** Social Position, Perception of Crime Problems and Victimization against Respondents during the Past Twelve Months, Pakistan 1996.

Social Position	Crime Most	Is Important	Victim in In Last	Household Year	Total
	Agree	Disagree	Yes	No	
<b>Caste</b>					
Low	3 (5.6%)	51 (94.4%)	8 (14.8%)	46 (85.2%)	54 (34%)
Medium	5 (6.3%)	75 (93.8%)	7 (8.8%)	73 (91.3%)	80 (50.3%)
High	3 (12%)	22 (88%)	1 (4%)	24 (96%)	25 (15.7%)
Total	11 (6.9%)	148 (93.1%)	16 (10.1%)	143 (89.9%)	159 (100%)
	$\gamma = -.22$	$\chi^2 = \text{NS}$	$\gamma = .36$	$\chi^2 = \text{NS}$	
<b>Land Acres Owned</b>					
None	4 (6.2%)	60 (93.8%)	7 (10.9%)	57 (89.1%)	64 (40%)
.25-5.0	2 (3.7%)	52 (96.3%)	5 (9.3%)	49 (90.7%)	54 (33.8%)
5.0-12.5	2 (6.2%)	30 (93.8%)	3 (9.4%)	29 (90.6%)	32 (20%)
12.5+	3 (30%)	7 (70%)	1 (10%)	9 (90%)	10 (6.2%)
	$\gamma = -.27$	$\chi^2 = .03$	$\gamma = -.06$	$\chi^2 = \text{NS}$	
<b>Household Savings</b>					
Yes	4 (5.6%)	68 (94.4%)	6 (8.3%)	66 (91.7%)	72 (45.3%)
No	7 (8%)	80 (92%)	10 (11.5%)	77 (88.5%)	87 (54.7%)
	$\gamma = .20$	$\chi^2 = \text{NS}$	$\gamma = .18$	$\chi^2 = \text{NS}$	
<b>Total Income</b>					
Low	3 (7.7%)	36 (92.3%)	6 (15.4%)	33 (84.6%)	39 (24.5%)
Medium	5 (5%)	93 (93%)	8 (8%)	92 (92.0%)	100 (62.6%)
High	3 (15%)	17 (85%)	2 (10%)	18 (90%)	20 (12.9%)
	$\gamma = -.26$	$\chi^2 = \text{NS}$	$\gamma = .21$	$\chi^2 = \text{NS}$	
<b>Gender</b>					
Men	4 (5.4%)	70 (94.6%)	7	67 (90.4%)	74 (46.3%)
Women	7 (8.15%)	79 (91.9%)	9	77 (89.5%)	86 (53.7%)
	$\gamma = .22$	$\chi^2 = \text{NS}$	$\gamma = .05$	$\chi^2 = \text{NS}$	

Gender-based crimes might be under-reported. Gender-based crimes may have been associated with the very high incidences of murder and kidnapping. Sexual assaults probably were less frequent in Pakistan than in the West. Cloistering women from outsiders probably reduced their vulnerability to sexual assault, though seclusion, itself, might be regarded as abusive. Frequencies of such acts, and of the differences between the actual assaults and their reported frequencies, undoubtedly are among the most opaque of the dark figures of crime. The traditional gendered division of labour in rural Pakistan may retard the answers to these questions.

Gender was not strongly related to being a victim in either rural Pakistan or Australia. Economic disadvantage was much more linked to being a victim in Australian than in Pakistani households. (See Table 9.) The unemployed were more than twice as likely to be victims of personal crime (4.9 versus 2.2 percent)



in Australia and in NSW (6.7 versus 2.9 percent) (Australian Bureau of Statistics 1993, 1996). Women were less likely to be robbed and assaulted than were men in Australia (1.6 versus 1.8 percent) and in NSW (1.8 versus 2.9 percent).

**Table 9.** Gender and Economic Indicators of Households with Robberies and Assaults in rural Pakistan (1996), Australia (1993) and NSW (1996)

	Pakistan	Australia	NSW
<b>Gender</b>			
Women	10.5%	1.6%	1.8%
Men	9.6%	1.8%	2.9%
<b>Land/ Labour Force</b>			
Landowner/Employed	10.9%	2.2%	2.9%
Landowner/Unemployed	9.4%	4.9%	6.7%

The comparative importance of the data is apparent. The unit of analysis (whether households, respondents, or persons in household) influenced how to interpret the relationships between independent variables and crime frequency. Whereas victimisations per household were higher in Pakistan, victimisations per person in household were less common. The measures of crime also differentiated the characteristics of crimes in the two areas. General measures of crime indicated equal or even lower rates of crime in Pakistan, and that most crime was comparatively minor. The most important finding may relate to the incidence of a few very serious crimes that were many times more frequent in Pakistan than in Australia.

## 6. CONCLUSION

This comparative analysis of victimisation suffers from difficulties of *epistemological* and *methodological relativism* (Beirne & Messerschmidt, 1995) that are common to exploratory research in the developing world. The sample size is small and limited to a single observation in time. Differences in the meaning of violations and the norms of reporting violations within the cultures are extreme. Cultural measures of some varieties of crime, such as animal theft, make comparisons difficult. Archer and Gartner's (1984) cautions about comparative international victimisation surveys in developed countries pertain to this project.

Despite the methodological morass of such research, the findings are interesting and important. Respondents talked about being victims of extremely serious crimes, such as murder, extortion and kidnapping. Certainly recollections by respondents beyond one year were suspect, except for the most serious crimes. Crimes reported in this survey were hardly the trivial offences that lead Elliott and Ageton (1980) to some criticise self-reported victimisation. Equally important, the variations in response patterns within the sample, provided valuable information regarding the incidence and perceptions about crime.

The theoretical distinction between traditional and modern, *Gemeinschaft* and *Gesellschaft*, was an initial theme of this research. The findings, admittedly

sparse and preliminary, indicate profound differences between rural Australia and rural Punjab. These differences can be inferred to indicate extremely distinct underlying dynamics of crime and victimisation within the two nations. Crime in Australia was predominantly a *Gesellschaft* phenomenon. In Pakistan crime appeared to reflect an essentially *Gemeinschaft* quality. However, while rural Australia and Pakistan are extremely different, they do not facily fall into *Gesellschaft* and *Gemeinschaft*. The findings must be understood within broader social contexts, such as *habitus* and the civilising process, of rural Pakistan and Australia. The poverty in Pakistan is among the poorest of the poor. Caste distinctions in the study area are extensive and intense. The middle class in Pakistan is poor by international standards. Illiteracy, especially among women, was common. Status is largely ascribed from generation to generation. The generational passing of poverty in rural Pakistan occurs through a relatively closed social system. Even child bearing, often blamed for passing poverty to the children, is a survival mechanism. Economic differentials in Pakistan were weakly associated with being a victim to crime, in addition to the broader injustice of being poor. Between Pakistan and Australia, there were no clear indications that poverty caused crime, per se, though more advantaged Pakistanis were more fearful of crime. In spite of their widespread poverty fewer Pakistanis appeared to commit or to be victims of crime. When they are victims, though, the consequences are much more likely to be severe.

The reasons for the variations in the types and amounts of crime in the two nations can be understood in terms of their different social structures. Rural Pakistan is more *Gemeinschaft*, more similar to Maine's status than contract. Approximately eighty per cent of the population is rural. Traditional values and norms are largely intact, despite ubiquitous poverty. The home is sacrosanct in Pakistan. Homes are almost continually occupied because of large families. The extended family is relatively immobile because of the large number of members, the local nature of agricultural work and the allocation of women's activities to the home. Family structure is central to village structure. The proximity of neighbours and the density of acquaintanceship, increase the likelihood of detecting thieves as well as deterring unlawful entry (Freudenburg & Jones, 1986). If property is stolen, it usually is either of unattended animals living outside or in confrontation with a robber, usually outside the home. Confrontations within and between families and castes are likely to be intense because of *Gemeinschaft*. The intensity and passion of *Gemeinschaft* mean that disagreements and differences may lead to extreme intimidation and violent confrontation.

The common occurrence of animal theft, again deserves comment, since it most resembles simple breaking and entering and simple theft in Australia. Animals are ubiquitous in rural Punjab homes. Small animals can be quickly snatched and eaten, leaving little suspicious evidence. However, neighbours often know where they have gone. One informant told us how she walked over to an untrustworthy neighbour's house, where she found her ducks being butchered. She took the butchered ducks home after chastising her neighbour. The context, the crime and the solution all occurred within the close, intimate,

personal, familiar, fact-to-face context of community.

Assaults, sexual or not, are usually gestures of power exchanges within the structures of family and community. Assailants are likely to be part of a local primary group in opposition to a family or caste of the victim. Feuds are justified on religious, political or economic grounds, and are inextricably entangled with caste, family and community affiliations. Women, as individuals, are likely to be dominated by men, a fact that supports Marxian feminist theories that stress patriarchal hegemony (Donovan, 1985). However, community in rural Pakistan is pre-capitalistic and is organised around family and caste, as well as male domination. The extreme victimisation of women may be more effectively explained by dualist feminist theory that acknowledges the distinct influences of broader cultural factors and of male domination (Jaggar, 1983).

Australia is largely multi-cultural *Gesellschaft*, exemplifying Kamenka and Tays's bourgeois individualism. Over eighty per cent of the population resides in cities. Families are typically nuclear. Households are frequently composed of single persons, couples without children, or single parents with children. Adults are likely to be at work and children at school, leaving the home unattended. Mobility is frequent, reducing visibility and weakening support among neighbours. Most property crime is impersonal. Illegal entry is common and is likely to occur in unoccupied dwellings and vehicles. If detected, deadly confrontation rarely occurs. The relatively impersonal and egalitarian quality of the Australian social system increases the likelihood of simple assaults and of sexual assaults. On the other hand, kidnapping, extortion and murder, intensely personal violence, are very rare in Australia.

The data analyses indicate idiosyncrasies about how social structure influenced perceiving and reporting crime. The perception of problems was determined by cultural definitions as well as by objective conditions, like gender and poverty. The perception that economic factors were sources of social problems indicated that the rural traditional village was somewhat rational and materialistic. Both poorer and wealthier families believed economic inopportunities were their most serious problems. While both advantaged and disadvantaged appeared to accept the prevailing metaphor that economic problems were most important, this did little to explain the observed crime differentials. As Mies (1986) has pointed out, single-minded economic explanations may detract from explanations that are fundamentally social and cultural. The theoretical implication of the finding that crime and victimisation were weakly associated with social position is that conflict between socio-economic categories did not appear to cause crime in Pakistan. Similarly, the differences in patterns of victimisation between a privileged Australia and an impoverished Pakistan systematically indicated that cultural and societal characteristics, of which gender bias and caste conflicts are parts, underlie the crimes.

Discrepancies in number of crimes reported implied that respondents did not report all victimisations among family members. The roughly five-fold number of crimes reported by respondents for themselves over other household members implied that crimes among household members were under-reported. The

approximate doubling of the number of crimes reported over a five-year period in comparison to the previous twelve months indicated that there was under-reporting for the longer time period.

In rural Pakistan, family and caste are especially pertinent for explaining crime and victimisation. Frequencies of violent crimes and of extortion and blackmail were high. The relatively low concern about crime may reflect the fact that only a small percentage of the population had been victims. Crime was a serious problem primarily to those who had recently experienced it. Another explanation for the moderate concern about crime is that, however serious, crime still paled in comparison to poor opportunities.

A “dark figure” of crime obviously lurked behind these data. The discrepancies between amount of crime that occurred and the amount that were acknowledged were difficult to establish. Serious violations, assault, kidnapping and murder, probably corresponded closely to the actual number of incidents, since those crimes were likely to be reported to police. The high incidences of murder and blackmail were intriguing, especially since thefts (except of animals) were comparatively rare. Crime patterns indicated intense personal intense entanglements associated with extended family and community. While the victimisation that was acknowledged probably did occur, it is likely that actual victimisation was much higher. Patterns of victimisation might vary according to social characteristics not evident in this analysis, a possibility that deserves future analysis.

Even acts as devastating as murder and kidnapping may mean something very different in Pakistan and Australia. Under some circumstances murder and kidnapping may be morally justifiable from the perspective of the offender and even the victim, as described by Banfield (1958) over four decades ago. While this research was being conducted, there were several jihad murders on campus and in the immediate vicinity. One murderous clash between caste-based religious political parties occurred just outside the department of sociology. Another occurred on death row of the adjacent prison. A member of one caste-based religious political party, who was about to be executed for murdering members of another faction, was himself murdered by a member of the opposing faction although it would lead to the inevitable execution of the convict who murdered him.

The findings offer little reason to be optimistic about imminent declines in victimisation and crime in Pakistan or Australia. The difficulties facing Australia are daunting (Castles, 1993). Many, such as racial and ethnic tensions, unemployment, declining manufacturing, fragmented families and communities, and increasing addiction, are established patterns. Major social forces in Pakistan; rapid population growth, low education opportunity, minimal infrastructures, low investor confidence and feudal-like oppression, a military siege orientation, and an emerging subculture of drugs and violence will continue to impede development well into the Twenty-First Century. Both countries have many attributes that could be developed for their prosperity. Industrious populations, fertile agricultural production, rich mineral resources, major ports, widespread international connections, and educated, practical leaders, potentially

offer great potential. Australia will continue to implement *Gesellschaft* solutions initiated through macro politics and economics to grapple with growing informal disorganisation. Some such solutions, such as family group conferencing, will seek to incorporate informal and personal social structures (Braithwaite & Mugford 1994; Strang 2002). In Pakistan *Gemeinschaft* will provide mechanisms for crime and for coping, as it has for centuries.

Much of the social support of rural Pakistan rests in traditional informal institutions; extended family and caste, village and friends. The cohesive habitus provides relatively dependable and trustworthy support. Family and community provide a haven in the broader social system, which is often inequitable and dishonest. The social integration and cohesion of traditional informal institutions also are impediments to escape from poverty and its associated problems. These problems multiply disadvantages passed on to subsequent generations through limited educational and occupational opportunities. The intense interdependence within extended families benefits a fortunate few whose pooled labour and assets contribute to advantaged status. If neo-Malthusian social scientists are correct, the immediate future may be even bleaker than the recent past, as population soars and resources dwindle (Coombs, 1990). In Australia and the First World, the implications are for further expansion of victimisation and social problems. The scenario for much of the developing world, including rural Pakistan, is for continued and intensified disadvantage and injustice that may strain the existing *Gemeinschaft* into still higher levels of intense violence.

#### **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

The World Bank supported this project through a twinning agreement between the University of Agriculture Faisalabad (UAF) and the University of New England (UNE). Appreciation is given to interviewers and data processors on the project, all of whom were either academic professionals or postgraduate students at the UAF. They were: Salman Asfar, Muhammad Asif Aziz, Rehman Qadir Khan, Shahida Rani, Saif-Ur-Rehman, Lubna Riaz, Muhammad Saif, Abul Saboor, and Saman Zubair. The survey also was made possible by the administrative support and encouragement by Mme Kishwar Ijaz, Mr Chaudhry Mohammed Aslam and Dr Bashir Ahmad. Brian Davidson, was co-investigator on this project.

## REFERENCES

- Ahmad, M. (1993) *Choice of a Norm of Poverty Threshold and Extent of Poverty in Pakistan*, Ministry of Finance: Islamabad, pp. 43-68.
- Ali, M.S. (1995) Poverty assessment: Pakistan's case. *Pakistan Development Review*, 34(2) pp. 43-54.
- Archer, D. & Gartner, R. (1984) *Violence and Crime in Cross-National Perspective*. Yale University Press: New Haven CT.
- Australian Bureau of Statistics (1996a) *Crime and Safety: New South Wales*, Australian Government Printing Service: Canberra.
- Australian Bureau of Statistics (1996b) *Crime and Safety: New South Wales*, Australian Government Printing Service: Canberra.
- Australian Bureau of Statistics (1997) *Yearbook Australia*, Australian Government Printing Service: Canberra.
- Banfield, E.C. (1958) *The Moral Basis of a Backward Society*, Free Press: Glencoe IL.
- Becker, G. (1981) *A Treatise on the Family*, Harvard University Press: Cambridge MA.
- Beirne, P. & Messerschmidt, J. (1995) Chapter 16. *Criminology: Second Edition*, Harcourt Brace: Fort Worth TX, pp. 563-602.
- Bell, J.H & Pandey, U.S. (1997) The persistence of family farm labour farm ownership in advanced capitalist economies. In Lees, J. (ed) *A Legacy Under Threat? Family Farming in Australia*. University of New England Press: Armidale NSW, pp. 213-244.
- Bell, M. (1992) *Internal Migration in Australia*, Australian Government Printing Service: Canberra.
- Bhaskar, V. & Glyn, A. (Eds) (1995) *The North The South and the Environment*, United Nations University Press: Tokyo.
- Biderman A.D. & Lynch, J.P. (1991) *Understanding Crime Incidence Statistics*, Springer-Verlag: New York.
- Blumberg, R.L. (1978) *Stratification: Socio-economic and Sexual Inequality*, William C. Brown: Dubuque IA.
- Bourdieu, P. (1990) *The Logic of Practice*, Polity Press: Oxford.
- Bourdieu, P., Chamboredon, J-C. & Passeron, J-C. (1991) *The Craft of Sociology*. Kraus, B. (ed), (translated by R Nice), de Gruyter: New York.
- Braithwaite, J. & Mugford, S. (1994) Conditions of successful reintegration ceremonies. *British Journal of Criminology*, 34(1) pp. 139-171.
- Buttel, F & Newby, H (eds) (1980) *The Rural Sociology of the Advanced Societies*. Allanheld Osmun: Montclair NJ.
- Castles, I (1993) *Australia's Families--Selected Findings from the Survey of Families in Australia 1992*. Australian Bureau of Statistics: Canberra.
- Chafetz, J.S. (1990) *Gender Equity*. Sage: Newbury Park CA.
- Clinard, M.B. (1944) Rural criminal offenders. *American Journal of Sociology*, 50 (1) pp. 38-45.
- Coleman, C. & Moynihan, J. (1996) *Understanding Crime Data: Haunted by the Dark Figure*, Open University Press: Buckingham.

- Cook, T.D. & Campbell, D.T. (1979) *Experimentation: Design and Analysis Issues for Field Settings*. Rand-McNally: Chicago.
- Coombs, H.C. (1990) *The Return of Scarcity*. Cambridge University Press: Sydney.
- Coser, L.A. (1971) *Masters of Sociological Thought*. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich: New York.
- Costner, H.L. (1965) Criteria for measures of association. *American Sociological Review*, 30(2) pp. 341-353.
- Davidson, B. (1996) *Economic Indicators of Poverty in Pakistan: A Report*. World Bank Twinning Agreement UAF/UNE, Department of Agricultural Economics: Faisalabad.
- Dempsey, K. (1990) *Smalltown*. Oxford University Press: Melbourne.
- de Vaus, D.A. (1995) *Surveys in Social Research: Fourth Edition*. Allen and Unwin: Sydney.
- Dingwall, G. & Moody, S.R. (1999) *Crime and Conflict in the Countryside*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press.
- Donovan, J. (1985) *Feminist Theory*. Ungar: New York.
- Duncan OD & Schnore LP (1959) Cultural, behavioral, and ecological perspectives in the study of social organization. *American Journal of Sociology*, 65(3) pp. 132-146.
- Durkheim, E. (1947) *On the Division of Labor in Society*. translated by G Simpson, Macmillan: New York.
- Elliott, D.S. & Ageton. S.S. (1980) Reconciling race and class differences in self-reported and official estimates of delinquency. *American Sociological Review*, 45(1) pp. 95-110.
- Elias, N. (1982) *State Formation and Civilization*. Blackwell: Oxford.
- Freudenburg, W.R. & Jones, R.E. (1986) The density of acquaintanceship: an overlooked variable in community research. *American Journal of Sociology*, 92(3) pp. 27-63.
- Glaser, B.G. & Strauss, A.L. (1967) *The Discovery of Grounded Theory*. Aldine: Chicago IL.
- Gottfredson, M.R. & Hirschi, T. (1990) *A General Theory of Crime*. Stanford University Press: Palo Alto CA.
- Government of Pakistan (1995) *Economic Survey 1994-94*. Finance Division: Islamabad.
- Government of Pakistan (1996) *Agricultural Statistics of Pakistan 1994-95*. Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Livestock: Islamabad.
- Hagan, J. (1989) *Structural Criminology*. Rutgers University Press: New Brunswick, NJ.
- Held, D., McGrew, A., Goldblatt, D. & Perratan, J. (1999) *Global Transformations; Politics, Economics and Culture*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Jaggar, A. (1983) *Feminist Politics and Human Nature*. Allenheld and Roman: Totowa NJ.
- Jobes, P.C. (1999) Poverty, gender and social justice and social problems in rural Pakistan. in Chekki DA (ed) *Research in Community Sociology, Volume 9*. pp. 89-122. JAI Press: Stamford CT.

- Jobes, P.C. (2004) Colonialization and Crime: Contemporary Consequences of Invasion on Indigenous Peoples in Rural Places. *International Review of Sociology*, 14(1) 51-71.
- Jobes, P.C., Donnermeyer, J.F., Barclay, E.M. & Weinand, H. (2004) A Structural Analysis of Social Disorganisation and Crime in Rural Communities in Australia. *The Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, 37(1) 114-140.
- Kamenka, E. & Tay, A. E-S. (1975) Beyond bourgeois individualism: the contemporary crisis in law and legal ideology. In Kamenka, E. & Neale, R.S. (eds), *Feudalism, Capitalism and Beyond*. Australian National University Press: Canberra.
- LaFree, G. & Morris, N. (2004) Corruption as a Global Social Problem. In Ritzer, G. (ed.) *The International Handbook of Social Problems*. Sage: Thousand Oaks CA, pp 600-618
- Maine, H.S. (1906) *Ancient Law*. Henry Holt: New York.
- Marx, K. & Engels, F. (1947) *The German Ideology*, International, New York.
- Mawby, R.I. (1999) Appropriate comparative analysis: The impossibility of becoming an expert on everywhere. In Mawby, R.I. (ed) *Policing Across the World*, pp. 13-22. UCL Press: London.
- McPheat, D. (1996) Technology and life quality. *Social Indicators Research*, 37(3) pp. 281-301.
- Merton RK (1967) Social structure and anomie. *Social Theory and Social Structure*. The Free Press: Glencoe, IL.
- Mies M (1986) *Patriarchy and Accumulation on a World-Scale*. Zed: London.
- Niemann, M. (2000) *A Spatial Approach to Regionalisms in the Global Economy*. St. Martins: New York.
- Nisbet, R.A. (1970) *The Social Bond*. Alfred A. Knopf: New York.
- Petee, T.A. & Kowalski, G.S. (1993) Modelling rural violent crime rates: a test of social disorganization theory. *Sociological Focus*, 26(2) pp. 87-89.
- Pitman, S., Herbert, T., Land, C. & O'Neill, C. (2003) *Profile of Young Australians: Facts, Figures and Issues*. Melbourne: The Foundation for Young Australians.
- Population Reference Bureau (1997) *World Population Data Sheet*. Population Reference Bureau: Washington DC.
- Quinney, R. (1977) *Class, State and Crime*. Longman: New York.
- Sampson, R.J., Raudenbush, S.W. & Earls, F. (1997) Neighborhoods and violent crime: A multilevel study of collective efficacy. *Science*, 277, pp. 918-924.
- Smith, D. (1994) *Geography and Social Justice*. Blackwell: Oxford.
- Strang, H. (2002) *Repair or Revenge: Victims and Restorative Justice*. Oxford University Press: Oxford.
- Summers, G. (1991) Minorities in rural society. *Rural Sociology*, 56(2) pp. 177-188.
- Toennies, F. (1957) *Community and Society*, (translated by Loomis, C.P.), Michigan State University Press: East Lansing MI.



- Travis, G., Egger, S., O'Toole, B., Brown, D., Hogg, R. & Stubbs, J. (1995) The international crime surveys: some methodological concerns. *Current Issues in Criminal Justice*, 6(3) pp 346-361.
- UNICEF (1995) *The Progress of Nations*. UNICEF: Paris.
- United Nations (1997) *United Nations World Crime Surveys*. United Nations Criminal Justice and Crime Prevention Branch: New York.
- United States Bureau of Census (1997) *International Data Base*. United States Government Printing Office: Washington DC.
- United States Bureau of Justice Statistics (1997) *Sourcebook of Criminal Justice Statistics*. United States Government Printing Office: Washington DC.
- van Dijk, J.J. & Mayhew, P. (1993) *Criminal Victimisation in the Industrialized World: Key Findings of the 1989 and 1992 International Crime Surveys*, Ministry of Justice: The Hague, Netherlands
- Vold, G.B., Bernard, T.J. & Snipes, J.B. (1998) *Theoretical Criminology: fourth edition*. Oxford: New York.
- Wallerstein, I. (ed) (1975) *World Inequality*. Black Rose Books: Montreal.
- Wallerstein, I. (1991) *Geopolitics and Geoculture: Essays on the Changing World System*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.
- Ward, K.B. (1993) Reconceptualizing world system theory to include women. In England, P. (ed) *Theory on Gender/Feminism on Theory*. Aldine de Gruyter: Hawthorne NY, pp. 43-68.
- Weber, M. (1930) *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, translated by T Parsons, Scribner's, New York.
- Wells, E. & Weisheit, R.A. (2004) Patterns of Rural and Urban Crime: A County Level Comparison. *Criminal Justice Review* 29(1) 1-22.
- Westendorff, D.G. & Ghai, D. (eds), (1993) *Monitoring Social Progress in the 1990's: Data Constraints, Concerns and Priorities*. Avebury: Aldershot UK.
- Zetterberg, H.L. (1965) *On Theory and Verification in Sociology*, Third Edition. Bedminster Press: New York.