



Creating Perspective

A Blueprint for Crime Prevention and Community Safety *by the Community for the* Community

An ACRO Report of Experiences and Attitudes Toward Crime and Crime Prevention in Logan



Stephanie Whelan

Clive Begg

February 1998

ISBN Number 1 876423 18 8

Copyright : ACRO Australian Community Safety & Research Organisation Incorporated

PO Box 440

LUTWYCHE QLD 4030

This Book is Copyright. Apart from any fair dealing for the purpose of private study, research criticism or review, as permitted under the Copyright Act, no part may be reproduced by any process without written permission. Enquiries should be made to the Publisher.

Contents

| | |
|-------------------------------|-----------|
| Acknowledgements..... | 2 |
| Executive Summary..... | 3 |
| Recommendations..... | 6 |
| Introduction..... | 16 |
| Methodology..... | 26 |
| Analysis..... | 28 |
| References..... | 80 |

Acknowledgements

The authors wish to humbly acknowledge the extraordinary assistance of the following people who provided time, energy commitment and enthusiasm in the realisation of this Report for, and on behalf of, the citizens of Logan:

Councillor Rod Golledge – Mayor, Logan City Council

Logan City Council

The Queensland Police Service

The Queensland Government

Logan City Council Staff:

Kay Dart

The Thomasen Family

Vanessa Kirk

Pauline Thompson

ACRO Staff and Supporters:

Fiona Begg
Leesa Beaumont
Ashley Reid
Andrew McLucas
Corey Beaumont
Michell Morris
Jason Reid
Sharon Pacey
Margaret Gill
Chris Munro
Louise Bignell
Janean Evans
Peter McLean

and of course, the citizens of Logan without whom there would be no story to tell.

Executive Summary

Traditional approaches to crime have focused upon the response to an offense once it has been committed and rely upon detection of crime, apprehension and detention of those responsible for crime as the tools to hopefully reduce future crime occurrences. There is scant evidence that these reactive measures have an anticipated preventive affect on future crime. A more intelligent direction in the debate on crime has seen the development of reduction of opportunity and reduction of desire approaches. The former of these seeks to restrict the ability for crime to occur by eliminating (or reducing) targets for crime (commonly referred to as 'target hardening'), the latter of which seeks to reduce the likelihood of crime through social development measures.

Specific groups within communities are historically identified as experiencing and reporting greater fear or concern about crime. Women, older members of the community and previous victims of crime are groups that are identified as exhibiting heightened levels of concern about crime. This concern is viewed, by the authors, as legitimate in the context of the perceived severity of consequences from possible victimisation and the vulnerability that these groups experience. The authors have adopted a simple definition for crime prevention that is not driven by philosophy nor politics: "any act that prevents crime from occurring is an act of crime prevention", and further, "that crime prevention is not defined by its intentions but by its consequences". This research has sought to provide perspective for Logan in relation to social issues of real concern to individual members and in the knowledge that others share these common concerns.

This Research was undertaken on the premise that effective crime prevention requires the activation of community-based partnerships to deal with the causes of crime from a social justice perspective. That is, crime is influenced by issues such as family dysfunction, unemployment, economic disadvantage (to name a few) and that crime and fear of crime can only

be dealt with in tandem with efforts to minimize risk factors occasioned by these other matters.

The current research further proceeded on the premise that a whole-of-Council, whole-of-government and whole-of-community response is necessary to deal with the complexities of social constructs that contribute to the commissioning of crime and the escalation of concern of crime within the community.

Finally, this research was premised upon the notion that effective community and government based partnerships require information about the community in which the partnership is to operate and that the community should actively participate in the work of any crime prevention partnerships to ensure ownership of the process.

Logan City is one of a number of regions in Queensland that have adopted a proactive stance in the development of a crime prevention partnerships. With the support of the Queensland Government, the Logan City Council is seeking to find local solutions to locally identified criminal and social justice issues that confront their citizens. Logan City Shire was established in 1978. The City of Logan is young both in terms of developmental history and in terms of population. Logan City is comprised of five precincts (North, South, East, West, and Central) each of which is identified as possessing characteristics distinct to that precinct. The North precinct is the oldest precinct is most established in terms of employment and community services. Situated between Brisbane City and Gold Coast City, Logan is an area of rapid growth. A growth rate of 26.7% was recorded for 1986-1991 and a projected growth rate of 21.7% is expected for the period 1996-2001. Immigration is reported to have contributed significantly to the growth of Logan over the past 25 years. Unemployment rates are most significant in the South, East and West precincts with up to one-third of the population experiencing unemployment. Logan City is perhaps best characterised as an area of rapid urban growth with a youthful population posing challenges to the provision of services, which traditionally tend to lag behind population growth. The challenge for Logan is to meet these service provision needs and thus better enable the population to enjoy the best aspects of living within this City.

During December 1997, 8000 randomly selected households throughout Logan City received a questionnaire for self-administration and return by reply-paid envelope to the Logan City Council. 2086 completed Survey documents were received by this process. The questionnaire required responses across four Sections: attitudes, experience, crime prevention and demographic information. The Survey instrument generated responses regarding attitudes toward crime, experiences with crime and community participation and needs in terms of crime prevention. The design of questions across the four Sections was driven by several factors: the focus of the research, the aims of the research, previous research undertaken by ACRO and previous research conducted worldwide.

The Survey results have been analyzed in terms of the local crime prevention needs identified by members of specific regions, within the survey. A particular emphasis was placed on information Survey Respondents provided in terms of past and current involvement in Community programs, and 'willingness' to become involved in local crime prevention initiatives. An important component in the research conducted at Logan was the inclusion of 'participation forms' in all survey packages. Respondents who wished to be informed regarding the results of the survey and future activities of the crime prevention partnership in their region were able to provide their contact details which would then be held by the partnerships for use in newsletter mail outs. Additionally, respondents were given the opportunity to express a desire for greater involvement in crime prevention within their community, through selecting that option on the participation form. This atypical addition (compared to most community social surveys) to the research is a strong indicator of the commitment this project has to whole of community involvement and mobilisation, in action rather than through rhetoric.

Of *Concern about Crime* questions, respondents reported feeling most safe when out alone in their neighbourhood during the day and when traveling to and from work/ school; with diminished feelings of safety when using shopping centres at night and while out alone in their neighbourhood at night. Of the situations respondents were asked about, they felt most unsafe when out alone at night and when using parking lots. The majority of respondents felt diminished feelings of safety when in their own homes, when passing a group of young men on the street and when at shopping centres at night. Respondents tended to agree that crime was a problem (in their suburbs) and had a negative effect on the lifestyle of people in their suburb. Respondents were more likely to report beliefs that property crime had increased in their area, rather than personal/violent crime, however respondents believed that both had increased. The majority of respondents reported that there were no areas in their suburb where they felt unsafe at night. The areas where respondents felt unsafe both day and night were similar; local parks, followed by specific streets and then entertainment and shopping centres. Concern about safety during the day was often for reported reasons 'felt unsafe around people who frequent the place' while concern about safety at night was often for reasons such as 'felt unsafe about people who frequent the place' and 'poor lighting, poor design'.

With respect to *Attitudes towards Crime* questions, the majority of respondents believed that young people are more likely to commit crime than they are to be the victims of crime. Most respondents, however, agreed that young people make a positive contribution to the community. The majority of respondents also believed that elderly people are more likely to be victims of crime. Whilst a comparatively small component of the survey instrument, responses made to these statements are viewed by the researchers as pivotal, in that they

Table 1

clearly and simply define some of the most challenging aspects of contemporary crime prevention; the crime concerns of the elderly and the marginalisation of young people as a 'problem group'.

In relation to *Crime Prevention* questions, the majority of respondents agreed that crime prevention programs should target the underlying causes of crime and that effective crime prevention programs would benefit their suburbs and, further, that the community can be an effective force in crime prevention. Respondents were more unsure as to whether police are doing a good job tackling crime in the community, however, nearly all respondents agreed that police alone cannot prevent crime. 'Foot/bike patrols by police' was commonly selected as a preferred crime prevention program as were programs that targeted young people. The need for improved visibility of police was commonly expressed through unsolicited statements in the Survey (in relation to the former issue) whilst responses in relation to the latter issue (concern about young people) were strongly supported in the general thrust of many responses and comments made throughout the survey. A general widespread level of concern was expressed over the perceived lack of concerted effort being directed both at providing young people with necessary citizenship skills and ensuring that all young people are involved, and have access to, positive activities that will have effectiveness in crime prevention outcomes. Programs that supported individual members of the community (older people and those living alone) were also strongly supported as programs for introduction in their suburb. Respondents also reported taking between one and five reasonable steps to improve the safety of themselves or their family. Of concern was the percentage of respondents who reported restricting activities at night in an effort to improve safety and to a lesser degree changing shopping places and leisure activities.

In relation to the *Crime Experiences* questions, two thirds of respondents reported being the victim of a property-related crime at some point in their lives with the greatest majority of respondents who reported victimisation living in their current suburb at the time of the offence. Respondents reported that the crime most commonly occurred at their place of residence. Most victims of property related crime did not know the offender and had reported the crime to the police. The most common reason for not reporting the crime was that it was not important/valuable enough. Slightly less than half of property victims who reported the crime to the police had been informed of any action taken. Respondents were far more likely to be satisfied with the outcome if they were informed of action taken by police regardless of that outcome. 17.5% of respondents reported being the victim of a personal/violent related crime at some point in their life with one half of personal/violent crime victims living in their current suburb when the crime occurred, and most commonly reported that the crime occurred at their place of residence. Most victims of personal/violent crime knew the offender and reported the crime to the police. Reasons given by respondents for not reporting the offence tended to be varied and coded as 'other'. Of the coded reasons, the most common were reasons related to retribution. Respondents were far more likely to be satisfied with the outcome of any investigation if they were informed of action taken by police. 14.5% of respondents reported bullying victimisation at school in the last three (3) years, of themselves or their children. Most had reported the bullying, and of those that had been informed of action taken, more than half of these satisfied with the outcome. Of those who did not report the bullying, reasons for not reporting were most commonly; handled it themselves, a lack of faith in the school to deal with bullying, incident/s was/were not serious enough. The most common reasons for dissatisfaction with the outcome was that action had been taken but they were not satisfied with that action and that the offender was identified but no action was taken. Respondents most commonly reported witnessing no crime in their suburb in the last year. Respondents were more likely to report violent victimisation based upon their racial/ethnic background rather than violent victimisation based upon their sexuality. Respondents who identified their racial/ethnic background as including Aboriginal or Asian were most likely to report violent victimisation. The majority of respondents who reported victimisation based upon their sexuality were female. 28.1% of respondents reported witnessing no crime in their suburb. Of those who did witness crime, break and enter, vandalism, motor vehicle theft, robbery, domestic violence and drug dealing were the most common crimes witnessed. Of those respondents who reported witnessing crime, most witnessed between one and four crimes.

In the *Community Involvement* questions, respondents were more likely to report past (rather than current) involvement in community groups/programs. Respondents were more likely to report involvement in programs with a crime prevention orientation and groups that targeted children or welfare oriented services, respectively. Most respondents reported that they regularly talked with their neighbours.

The recommendations emanating from this research are not designed to be directive, as it is the view of the authors that the Logan community needs to determine, from the material provided as a consequence of this research, the priorities and order in which they proceed to meet the needs of its own constituency. The recommendations concentrate upon those groups that exhibit heightened levels of concern about crime, namely women, older members of the community and former victims of crime. The authors assert that heightened levels of concern about crime by these groups is not exaggerated nor irrational but rather based upon the specific vulnerabilities to crime that are evident for individuals within these sectors of the community, and the way in which communities can address these vulnerabilities. A significant challenge for communities is to find ways in which these vulnerabilities can be addressed.

The recommendations also pay attention to the problems experienced by young people, their low self-esteem, the way in which they are unreasonably targeted for negative attention by all other sections of the community and the lack of opportunity they experience in terms of citizenship processes and decision-making. A further significant challenge for communities is to find the way in which these deficiencies may be rectified without recourse to tokenism. Directions have been provided within the Report, focusing on enhancing community connectedness and the bringing together of community members to everybody's advantage. Communities that consistently and vigorously pursue enhanced community involved lives for all members, will be those best placed to address the social structures that contribute so significantly to the occurrence of crime.

Recommendations

Respondents' crime experiences and attitudes towards crime prevention as provided within completed surveys were examined in order to define issues for specific groups of people, together with an examination of Logan experiences and attitudes as a single unit of measurement. As discussed elsewhere, specific groups within the community are historically identified as experiencing and reporting greater fear or concern about crime. The fear and concern traditionally reported by these groups may or may not be assessed as realistic given what is known about victimisation of crime within the community. Regardless of this it is not appropriate to dismiss or reject these concerns as exaggerated or irrational as they may well be based on realities other than those explained by official crime statistics. Women, older community members, and previous victims of crime are groups commonly identified as exhibiting heightened levels of concern about crime. A traditional perspective would tend to challenge the concern held by women and older community members on the basis that information suggests that in most cases they are less likely to be the victims of crime than others within the community, namely younger males. The heightened concerns held by previous victims of crime could ostensibly be challenged on the basis that they are no more likely than others in the community to experience victimisation on a future occasion, although recent research would tend to discount this 'rational explanation'. There is evidence to suggest that multiple victimisation is a perception (or concern) often based very strongly in reality and reflected in official crime statistics.

This Report does not support an explanation of heightened levels of concern experienced by these groups as exaggerated or irrational, but supports the argument that proposes that heightened concern about crime within these groups is based on the specific vulnerabilities to crime that is evident for individuals within these sectors of the community. Women should exhibit heightened concern about crime when compared to men for several reasons; women have a unique vulnerability to sexual assault that may only be shared by children (regardless of gender). Almost any victimisation that is experienced by women is accompanied by a fear of sexual assault, a fear generally not experienced by men. Older community members should exhibit heightened concern about crime when compared to younger community members given the apparent physical and financial vulnerability that is evident for these members of the community. Older members of the community who are victimised tend to suffer greater physical injuries (or prolonged healing processes) and tend to suffer a greater financial burden as their capacity to earn an income is greatly diminished. Previous victims of crime are not laboring under the impression that they will not be victimised, they already have been and so are more aware of their individual vulnerability to crime than would be expected for individuals who have not experienced crime victimisation.

This section of the Report will examine the overall experiences of these traditional 'fear of crime' groups as well as considering the household type that was reported by respondents and the length of time respondents had reported living in their current suburb. The lifestyle of any one individual is generally impacted on quite significantly by the type of household in which they live. The needs of someone living in a childless household would be expected to be quite different from the needs expressed by a parent living with children. This Report was driven from its conception with a focus on 'community' and a complete acknowledgement that effective crime prevention is best achieved within communities that exhibit a certain level of connectedness. A tentative measure of this was seen to be the length of time an individual had lived in their current suburb.

The recommendations within this Report will emanate from an examination of data primarily based on gender and age. Specific recommendations will address specific issues relevant to individuals based on victimisation, household type and time lived in suburb. The following recommendations do not propose to address all concerns raised within the survey, but will instead focus on issues that were particularly important to specific groups of respondents or generally important to all respondents. Readers wishing to examine more fully the responses given by; all respondents, differences between males and females, differences between age groups, differences between household types, and differences between respondents based on the length of time they had lived in their suburb are referred to the analysis section of the report where the summaries in bold provide that information in its totality. There is a wealth of material about the issues for the community within the analysis section, much of which is not covered by Recommendations. It is not for the authors to direct any active crime prevention partnership (that will deal with this Report) on matters contained herein. It remains the prerogative of local communities to respond and maintain ownership for the consequences of their responses to this material on behalf of their fellow citizens.

The general findings for survey respondents living in Logan support the proposition that residents of this City have heightened levels of concern about crime. A theme that is important in terms of action in the community is the variation of findings for different areas of Logan. The responses made by residents of specific suburbs tended to obviously differ. This was supported by comments made by respondents referring to Logan as a City with distinctly different cultures, opportunities, and lifestyles. A worthwhile overall purpose of action taken at a community level may be to increase the cohesiveness in the community of Logan, in its entirety, while concentrated efforts to address specific issues are directed to where they are most needed.

"I have lived in 2 suburbs in Logan City, one was very much blue collar workers and the facilities and general look of the suburb really reflected this; no shade area over children's playgrounds so the facility cannot be used during the day. Streets apart from Main Street do not really have tree planting, just the look and feel of the suburb was totally different. I now live in a more white-collar area of Logan City. There are plenty of trees, landscaping, barbecues for families, etc. Perhaps some of this could be done in other areas" Female

It is recommended that all activities undertaken have an overriding philosophy of the development of a cohesive sense of community within Logan City. Direct and indirect actions that provide similar opportunities to all residents should be a component of all program development and implementation. Community connectedness is a key factor in the community based prevention of crime, in areas where community involvement and attachment is diminished the strengthening of such relationships to the community should be a key component of all crime prevention strategies.

"I feel the area in which I live is very safe. This is because of the close knit community structure." Female respondent aged 35-44 years.

The selection of crime prevention strategies by respondents support a four way focus of activity; situational issues that can be addressed by targeting specific locations of concern within the community; general concerns about specific groups; namely older, younger, and female community members; and policing issues.

Older community members

Older respondents tended to report they were unsure about their feelings of safety in all of the situations posed within the survey, even within their own home. This inability, within the current research, of older community members to express clear beliefs about their safety in everyday situations is concerning when viewed in the context of how beliefs can influence behaviour. If an individual believes they are unsafe in a particular situation they will often take action that addresses that belief, actions that could include taking steps to improve their safety in that situation through to avoiding a situation because of beliefs that it is a 'risk' situation in terms of safety. It may be overstating the situation to say that such consistent reporting of 'unsureness' could be paralysing in terms of lifestyle, but one can appreciate that action is made more difficult in any situation that involves uncertainty. Actions that increase older community members ability to be decisive about their safety in any given situation, should then enable affected individuals to make informed decisions about their lifestyle, and just as importantly to be comfortable with those decisions.

Older respondents agreed that they were more likely to be the victims of crime than others. It would seem logical that this misconception (held by the majority of all respondents) is reasonably simple to address. However, in addressing this misconception there should not be an expectation that accurate information about victimisation rates, of themselves, (that clearly shows older community members are less at risk than others) will serve to diminish an individuals concern levels. As stated earlier vulnerability to victimisation and not expectation of victimisation may be the most important factor to address in the reduction of concern about crime.

It is recommended that efforts be undertaken to ensure that accurate information about victimisation rates are provided to older members of the community, within an appropriate context that will not exacerbate concern, rather than reduce it. An example of a program concept is a Swedish initiative that utilises a supportive media. When reports are discussed that talk about parole violations a simple statement is included that places the reported violation within the context that the greatest majority of individuals on parole complete this period without violation. A similar context for the purposes of the current investigation may be, for example, that in Queensland in 1996/1997 a person aged over 55 years was less likely to be the victim of a reported assault than was a child aged between 5 and 9 years of age.

Older respondents expressed strong concerns about their relationship with young people in the community through their responses relating to young people as offenders and a statement eliciting agreement that young people make a positive contribution to the community. Older respondents were most likely to agree that young people are the greatest perpetrators of crime but also most likely to disagree that young people make a positive contribution. Australia, as all western nations, is facing the reality of an aging population, a population that will require the good faith of their 'successors' in future years. It is the researchers belief that this generally negative attitude toward young people, while expressed more strongly in some sections of the community than others, must be directly addressed. Some may consider that the attention paid to this issue is a departure from the most appropriate focus of the current research. However, opportunities must be taken where they arise and the mobilisation of communities to tackle crime prevention in a positive manner should seek to build strong, positive, enduring relationships between groups that may currently be seen to be somewhat oppositional.

It is recommended that programs of mutual benefit are introduced that serve to bring together younger and older community members in a purpose driven manner. Young people have clear and justified concerns about the opportunities available to them in adulthood. The goal of providing young people with practical skills that will enhance their competitiveness in the labour market should utilise the often unrecognised bank of expertise available in our older community members. Young people are

also in a position to assist in the specific needs of older community members in terms of assistance with physical tasks that tend to become more onerous as one becomes older. A program (properly developed) with such mutual benefit will serve to create invested relationships between younger and older community members as well as practically address problematic issues for both parties. It is critical that young people and older people are directly involved in program development, implementation, and ongoing management if outcome effectiveness is to be achieved.

When asked about crime prevention program concepts they believed were useful for introduction in their suburb, older people tended to support *Support networks for those living alone* and *Safety checks for older neighbours*, as age increased selection of these programs generally increased. It may be considered that through their selection of this program older community members were seeking to address some of the concerns they have about crime and vulnerability. A sense of isolation is not a pleasant experience and would certainly contribute to feelings of vulnerability, and isolation is often a reality for older community members for a variety of reasons. A program that implements support networks for those isolated members of the community (aged and otherwise) would be expected to address feelings of vulnerability and enhance lifestyles of affected people.

It is recommended that the development of support networks for isolated members of the community be investigated with particular reference to existing local networks that may be expanded or broadened to address the isolation of community members. A widespread existing network that operates in many areas on a very local level is that of Neighbourhood Watch. 37.1% of respondents in the current research identified membership of Neighbourhood Watch or similar programs. Programs that exist internationally involve assisting older community members in finding housemates that serve the dual functions of financial assistance and reduction of isolation. Another program engages organisations on regular home- visits in neighbourhoods - making specific contact with older community. Postal delivery workers (when delivering mail to older community members) also personally deliver mail to older people thus serving to act as a brief safety check on their wellbeing.

It is acknowledged that concerns have been raised internationally about the effectiveness of Neighbourhood Watch as a crime reduction strategy. It is suggested that the community connectedness expressed by support of Neighbourhood Watch within local communities may be better utilised to enhance the lifestyle of all community members by adopting a 'people' focus rather than a property focus. A simple modification to Neighbourhood Watch could actively reduce isolation within the community by developing, or strengthening, the networks and relationships that may already exist, for some if not all residents.

Another method of reducing the isolation of older community members is also available. To reduce feelings of (and the reality of) isolation there needs to be action that increases inclusion. Given the strong focus of the research findings in terms of issues surrounding the development of citizenship of young people it is worthwhile to consider programs that achieve a dual aim, the reduction of isolation of older community members through inclusion in meaningful community action and the education of young people by older community members in programs that serve a practical skills based purpose but centrally incorporate citizenship skills for young people.

It is recommended that programs of mutual benefit are introduced that serve to bring together younger and older community members in a purpose driven manner. Young people have clear and justified concerns about the opportunities available to them in adulthood. The goal of providing young people with practical skills that will enhance their competitiveness in the labour market should utilise the often unrecognised bank of expertise available in our older community members. Young people are also in a position to assist in the specific needs of older community members in terms of assistance with physical tasks that tend to become more onerous as one becomes older. A program (properly developed) with such mutual benefit will serve to create invested relationships between younger and older community members as well as practically address problematic issues for both parties. It is critical that young people and older people are directly involved in program development, implementation, and ongoing management if outcome effectiveness is to be achieved.

Younger community members

Although generally young people disagreed that they are more likely than others to be the victims of crime, this stated belief belies the reality that they did not feel safe in the situation described above. Young people are more likely than others to be the victims of crime and are more likely to be victimised by another young person. While young peoples beliefs regarding this are not accurate, their reported diminished feelings of safety suggests that they are aware, at some level, that there are certain situations in which they may be more at risk than others to be the victims of crime. Although young people felt safer than any other age group while out alone in their neighbourhood at night, they were also most likely to express a need for more lighting, paths etc when asked about crime prevention programs that they supported for introduction in their suburb.

Traditionally young people are the targets for concern by older age groups and as such are not seen to be a group that should be concerned about victimisation. The current research or official crime statistics does not support this lack of concern traditionally expressed in relation to the victimisation of young people. In the current research, young people were more likely than any other age category to report they had been victims of personal/violent crime. They were also most likely to report that they knew the offender. In Queensland in 1996/1997 young people (males and females) aged between 15 and 19 were most likely to be the victims of assault (Queensland Police Service. 1997).

It is recommended that young people be given opportunities to deal with their concerns about safety. Any crime prevention strategy that targets young people should not focus on the offender issues that are associated with this age group to the exclusion of young people's victim issues. Young people should be educated about victimisation issues (particularly those relevant to their age group) and given opportunities to address these in whichever sector of the community they may arise; public spaces, families, and schools.

Young people are not only at risk for victimisation on the street (and the home) but in the playground as well. At times there may be a tendency to somewhat minimise this aspect of young peoples victimisation experiences, particularly bullying. However, it certainly has an immediate impact on children's emotional and possibly physical wellbeing. As more is becoming known about the long term effects of bullying, which can include; depression, schizophrenia, post traumatic stress disorder (Gibson, R. 1998), so too does the need for concerted effort to its eradication. It is, after all, assaultive or discriminatory behaviour with a more cosmetic label. Almost one in five respondents reported that bullying of them or their children had occurred at school in the last three years and only about half of the people who reported the bullying expressed satisfaction with the outcome. Schools generally have comprehensive policies on the management of bullying, both on an individual and school wide level. It is suggested here that a focused approach to bullying while necessary to deal with the occurrence of bullying, may not be the most effective way of preventing bullying. Research suggests that while policies on how to prevent and manage bullying incidences are important it is the successful transference of these anti-bullying norms to the school wide population (students, teachers, parents) that is most effective in preventing bullying.

It is recommended that as part of recognition of victimisation of young people discussed above, that active school wide campaigns target bullying. Successful programs generally include the following factors; establishing clear rules against bullying, consistent praises and sanctions for behaviour, regular class meetings to clarify norms about bullying, improved supervision of the playground, and teacher involvement of a positive school climate. Some specific successful initiatives that have utilised these components have also utilised booklets provided to staff on bullying with clear directions on how to deal with incidents, a booklet to parents with advice and clear explanations regarding school policies.

Young people may be less than fully aware of the victimisation realities for their age group, but they are clearer on their beliefs regarding the likelihood that they will be the perpetrators of crime. All respondents (including young people) tended to believe that young people aged under 24 years commit most crime. Young people (under 25 years) are more likely than any other age group to be in prison for break and enter, robbery and assault and are clearly overrepresented within the Australian prison population. These matters need to be addressed. However, the overinvolvement of young people within the criminal justice system needs to be balanced by the reality that few young people commit crime, and most crime committed by young people is committed by a small percentage of offenders (Criminal Justice Commission. 1992).

Specific socially constructed risk factors are strongly associated with later involvement in crime. It is widely acknowledged that the most effective crime prevention measures address these risk factors on a long-term basis. It is likely that programs that effect the greatest reduction in crime actually commence in utero, with programs that target the health of pregnant mothers and continue through infancy to adolescence. A multitude of programs exist internationally that have been proven to be effective both for individual development and community safety. The investment in such programs in financial, social and political terms is more than justified. These programs do cost governments money (though not a figure comparable to costs of incarceration) and costs are involved politically, in that for any long term effectiveness, several if not many changes of government will be necessary. This is the nub of successful crime and social justice interventions that more often than not precludes their implementation. Short-term political expediency is more potent to administrators than long-term processes that bear fruit long after the useby date of governments has passed. This Report will assert the call by citizens for courage and determination by government in dealing with the concerns of citizens in ways that are proven but which also require risk-taking.

*"Education of parents to teach their children respect for other people and property. Also respect of themselves, as if they do not like or respect themselves, they will respect nobody."
Female respondent aged 35-44 years.*

A program that provides enriched pre-school programming for at risk children in the United States was introduced in 1962. The High/Scope Perry Preschool program incorporates high quality pre school education, home visits, and group meetings. Longitudinal studies have reported that children who participated in the program had 50% lower criminal arrests at age 27 when compared to similar children who had not participated in the program. A cost benefit analysis was conducted and reported that for every \$1 invested in the program a saving of \$7.16 was achieved in reduced welfare and criminal justice costs (International Centre for the Prevention of Crime, 1997).

A program that provides home visitation in an effort to reduce child abuse/neglect was commenced in the United States in 1985. The Hawaiian Healthy Start program incorporates home visitations by paraprofessionals to identify and support families in the prevention of child/abuse neglect and promotion of healthy child development focused on the first five years of childhood. Initial longitudinal studies have reported that children in participating families are 62% less likely to be victims of child abuse/neglect when compared to similar children/families who had not participated in the program. Also reported is that the reduction in child abuse/neglect cases apparently measured by the program represents a saving of over \$1 million dollars in government expenditure. Evaluative studies of this program are continuing (International Centre for the Prevention of Crime, 1997).

Programs that address risk factors in older children and adolescents within schools are most effective when they incorporate the following factors; instructional programs (delivered over a long period of time to provide continual reinforcement) that focus on a range of social skills including self control, stress management, responsible decision making, social problem solving, and communication skills; programs aimed at clarifying and communicating norms about behaviours, such as bullying, racism, and sexual harassment, by establishing school rules, improving consistency of enforcement through school wide campaigns. Programs that utilise behaviour modification and teach cognitive skills have been effective in preventing substance abuse for high risk youths. Peer led programs have also proven promising in preventing substance abuse. Targeted supportive programs with a case management approach have enhanced school participation with high risk youth and have also proven to be effective.

Respondents strongly supported the introduction of school based crime prevention programs. It is acknowledged that a program targeting crime (and associated inappropriate behaviours) does exist in State schools as a relatively recent introduction. It is the position of this report that lessons must be learnt from the international experiences of crime prevention and those experiences suggest that the most effective crime prevention programs incorporate the factors discussed immediately above. It is certainly a worthwhile exercise to foster positive relationships between young people and police (in the current research young people were least likely to agree that the police are doing a good job tackling crime) but if the stated goal is crime prevention (rather than developing positive relationships) then programs generally need to operate on a more intensive and directed manner than appears currently evident.

It is recommended that crime prevention strategies that involve young people target the risk factors that are associated with crime. The risk factors associated with crime have an effect from infancy and the most effective crime prevention measures will also start to address these factors at this time. Addressing the risk factors associated with crime, some of which are; child abuse/neglect, drug abuse, family violence, and school failure will not only reduce the likelihood that young people will become offenders but more importantly provide many young people with greatly increased opportunities to achieve greater success within the community over a lifetime. Programs that have proven effectiveness have tended to focus on social skills training (on a long term basis) more heavily than education/awareness raising preventive efforts.

The issue that most people raised when asked about their safety in public space is that they are concerned because 'they feel unsafe around the people who frequent those areas'. Overwhelmingly the people referred to in these instances are young people. It is not necessarily the criminal behaviour of young people that is causing alarm among other users (or potential users) of public space, but merely the presence of young people in social groups using the space in a manner that is not considered appropriate by others. Young people do tend to use most public spaces to 'hang out', where others may tend to use these spaces for other purposes. It is certainly true that young people tend to be more visible than other user groups (partly because of their different use of space and partly because of a lack of youth managed or other facilities, which are seen by them to be 'user friendly' to their needs). It is also true that young people may exhibit socially inappropriate behaviour in some instances in some places. It is not appropriate to target young people as a criminal element, nonetheless, merely because of their different use of public space. It is appropriate, however, to target the socially inappropriate behaviour of young people in public space, should it occur.

The separation of the issues of young peoples involvement in crime and young peoples use of public space needs to be clearer than is currently the case. Most of the young people we

see on the street are not likely to be offenders and it must be offensive for them to be viewed in this way. It is entirely appropriate to develop strategies that provide young people with realistic alternatives to 'hanging out' in public spaces, although elimination should not be the goal. Young people are legitimate users of public spaces and have a right to socialise within them. Many young people may prefer to participate in alternative activities that provide greater stimulation than 'hanging out' much of the time, but they will still use these public spaces for social purposes and that legitimate use is acknowledged within this Report. The provision of alternative activities that provide social and recreational opportunities for young people is important, however, the provision of alternative activities that enable young people to face the challenges of contemporary society is just as important. There is a singular lack of opportunity for social engagement and more constructive social discourse and decision-making for young people and an overstated emphasis on physical activity and sport.

The provision of alternative activities that better enable young people to face current and future challenges should address the provision of skills that promote positive citizenship and the enhancement of opportunities available to young people. The provision of such programs not only requires government support but, of equal importance, significant engagement from within the local community. On a local level the provision of alternative recreation and skills programs requires the commitment of business and individual community members either on a permanent or regularly occurring basis. This support can be via sponsorship, provision of space, or provision of assistance through the physical participation in activities.

"There's no more room for kids. We all had paddocks and fields to play in. They are all gone. It's just a concrete jungle now with nothing for the youth." Male respondent aged 35-44 years.

"Supervised skate board ramps and clubhouses, why not use empty shops" Male respondent aged 25-34 years.

While the assistance that government and business can provide tends to be obvious in most cases the assistance that community members can provide is often less clear. Older community members are among some of the most skilled people in the community. Skills acquired throughout a lifetime should remain important and valued long after retirement from the workforce. The inclusion of older community members in programs that seek to address issues faced by youth would not only assist youth (in the provision of skills and training by experienced and knowledgeable members of the community) but also serve to reduce the isolation experienced by many older community members and promote positive relationships locally between young people and older community members. It should be of grave concern that a chasm has been allowed to develop between sections of the community based upon age and misperception. It appears that communities no longer consider themselves as 'extended families' concerned for the welfare of its constituent members irrespective of age. (It will be noted that young people who assisted the authors in the coding of open-ended responses for returned Surveys became extremely distraught at the constant negative perception held against their age group, and therefore, themselves.)

The community, through responses in the Survey, has been very specific about their concerns in relation to young people as evidenced in responses to a variety of questions. Although safety concerns did tend to target young people, particularly in response to open ended questions, this level of concern was also expressed through the selection of crime prevention programs that targeted young people. Of the socially oriented crime prevention programs offered for selection respondents were most likely to desire the introduction of after school activities for youth and school based crime prevention programs. These programs have the ability to target many areas of concern for young people from straight free or affordable recreation activities through to programs that significantly improve the lifetime opportunities of young people. It is time for this recognition and awareness to occur within the governing structures of our country, as it appears to have occurred within the community and within homes.

"I feel strongly if youths had more places to go to amuse themselves it would keep them off the streets and give them interests so they aren't as bored and reckless." Female respondent aged 25-34 years

It is recommended that community mobilisation occur to create positive, sustainable recreation and social programs for young people. These programs need to be supported by government and business but should also include older community members. Programs that enhance the opportunities of young people should be introduced; specifically programs that seek to utilise the skills available in older members of the community and build positive relationships between older and younger community members.

Women

Women generally expressed more diminished feelings of safety in all situations, especially when out alone in their neighbourhood at night, when at Shopping Centres at night, using parking lots at night, and when passing a group of young men on the street. In contrast to this is the finding that women were no more likely than men to consider that crime was a problem in their suburb and less likely to agree that crime had a negative impact on lifestyles in their suburb. A possible explanation for these somewhat contrasting findings is that although women generally feel less safe than men, this is not due to any concern about crime, but rather a knowledge based on lifetime experiences and awareness that women by virtue of their gender are more vulnerable to a range of offences, sexual in nature, and thus have an extra concern regarding their safety in what are perceived as 'risk' situations.

Given this explanation it is difficult to be specific about recommendations that would seek to directly address the concerns that women have based on their vulnerability to sexual assault, apart from the obvious solution of eliminating sexual violence against women. Recommendations can be made regarding the specific locations in which women reported feeling most unsafe in an effort to increase their feelings of safety in these areas if not directly reduce the likelihood of their being victimised in these locations. Having said that it may not be possible to significantly reduce the likelihood that women will be victimised in certain locations without eliminating the threat of sexual violence. It should also be said that the greatest majority of women in the current research (and past research) who reported personal/violent victimisation reported that they knew the offender and that the offence occurred in their own home, not by a stranger in a public space (although this does occur to a lesser degree).

The proportion of the population that utilise shopping centres at night has grown in the last ten years. An increasing usage of shopping centres at night (for shopping and use of ATMs) has been accompanied by an increase in insecurity for people who utilise these facilities during the evening hours. A range of options are available to shopping centres to achieve increased security feelings for customers; some of these include improved lighting, specialised parking facilities for vulnerable groups, physical monitoring of car parks. In areas where there is clearly little lighting, then this should probably be addressed, however, it should not be expected that widespread flood lighting will improve safety, in fact, it can be used by offenders to identify targets. The use of specialised parking for consumers with infants (denoted by signs with a pram depicted) are often a component included in newer shopping centres. There would be little effort involved in the implementation of these reserved parking spaces in existing shopping centres, although the authors would vigorously argue for this concept to be expanded to include women generally and older community members. The use of physical monitoring of the parking facilities at shopping centres can be conducted on several levels that suit large urban centres that employ security staff through to small complexes in neighbourhoods. Any activity that increases the observation of individuals using these facilities is likely to increase feelings of safety for customers.

Any activity that is undertaken at night outside the home, be it recreational or work oriented, will generally require the use of parking facilities. It is difficult to determine which locations are more likely to be utilised by women and as such businesses that have parking facilities that are utilised at night should be provided with information regarding the examination of their facilities in terms of consumer safety (particularly women) and provided with information regarding simple strategies they may use to increase their users feelings of safety.

It is recommended that Specific parking for sections of the community, close to shopping centre entries may serve to address the diminished feelings of safety for some shoppers. Parking facilities specifically for parents with children, women and older community members would be considered priorities for these specialised spaces.

It is recommended that larger complexes better utilise security personnel to maintain a presence in car parks. This method has proven successful in terms of reducing theft, in areas where car parks cover a sizeable area (such as larger suburban complexes). The provision of bikes to security personnel improves the ability to cover these areas effectively and also provides a highly visible presence to shoppers that their safety is monitored outside of the shopping complex as well as while shopping inside. Smaller shopping complexes that do not utilise security personnel can provide a monitoring presence using retail staff to conduct regular walk-throughs in smaller car parks.

It is recommended that parking facilities that may exist outside of shopping centres be incorporated into strategies that enhance feelings of safety. These parking facilities may exist in relation to recreational or sporting facilities, medical facilities, and educational facilities to name a few.

It is recommended that areas where visibility is clearly impaired due to lack of lighting or vegetation are upgraded or subject to more intensive maintenance programs. Furthermore, as Local Government authorities become more aware of the principles of Crime Prevention through Environmental Design, they may consider not only the incorporation of these principles to new development applications, but also the properties of existing facilities.

Of all crimes witnessed, domestic violence was the most commonly reported crime that was categorised as personal/violent. Within this Report women reported greater victimisation than men did, and victimisation that did occur tended to involve personal/violent offences in the home perpetrated by people known to the victim. Women reported greater witnessing of stalking, domestic violence, and child abuse/neglect, all serious offences that are often associated with violence within the home. A small percentage (3.2%) of respondents reported that *violence from family members is a problem in my home*. It is important to note that this question was asked referring to the respondent's present situation. It is the researchers strong belief that if a question had been directly asked about violence within the home in the past many women would have reported in the affirmative. A parent with children (42.3% were female) was more likely to report personal/violent victimisation within the home perpetrated by someone known to them. It is likely given the relationship reported regarding the likelihood that a parent with children would report personal/violent victimisation, that violence within the home was an important contributing factor to the sole parent status of these women. It should not be surprising then, that women expressed a greater desire (than men) to see the introduction of the following programs in their suburb; support services for families, safety checks for older neighbours, and support networks for those living alone. All programs have a strong relationship focus and are based on a micro level within the community, within families and neighbourhoods where these problems are significant for women.

"More community policing with an emphasis on safety for women and children" Female respondent aged 25-34 years.

It is recommended that stronger action be taken regarding the victimisation of women within the home. Local services that target women's safety should be directly involved in the development of programs that address the needs of women within the home by targeting neighbourhood connectedness. Those people best placed to support families within neighbourhoods are people who visit those neighbourhoods and whose activities are based there.

It would seem clear given the consistently high level of victimisation against women that is reported to occur within the home and be perpetrated by someone known to the victim that decisive action at an authoritative level may be necessary. Raising awareness regarding the issues surrounding violence within the home is important and should continue, however, a comprehensive policy targeting family violence from childhood through to adulthood may be a positive step towards positively affecting the nature of families in the future.

Victimisation

It is difficult to succinctly discuss the position of previous victims of crime regarding crime and crime prevention from the current research. This is not due to any lack of information or interpretation, but rather the almost overwhelming effect that victimisation appeared to have on respondents attitudes towards crime and crime prevention. Respondents of personal/violent victimisation were more concerned about crime generally and their own personal safety in response to almost every measure used in the survey, aside from feelings of safety when in their own home and when passing a group of young men on the street. Victimisation tended to be quite specific in its effect, in that victims of property crime appeared more sensitive to questions that referred to property crime increases and witnessing. Personal /violent victimisation was more widespread in its effect, coloring the responses made to general safety feelings in specific situations and in their neighbourhood at night, as well as personal/violent crime increases and witnessing of crime.

No specific recommendations are made regarding previous victims of crime, except for the researchers to state their clear position that crime victimisation has a clear and significant effect on respondents feelings of safety, possibly for a substantial (or permanent) length of time after victimisation has occurred. It is recommended that previous victims of crime must be included as a 'vulnerable group' when programs that target the concerns of other vulnerable groups in the community are considered and wherever possible program design should ensure inclusion of those previous victims of crime as a targeted vulnerable group. Readers who have particular interest in the comparison of responses made by respondents who reported victimisation and those who did not are referred to the analysis section where these findings are clearly outlined and detailed.

A recommendation for future research suggests that victimisation studies include measures of victimisation both for a specific time period and for lifetime occurrence. It is only when such comparative measures are included that we can gauge the long-term effects of victimisation on respondents concerns about safety and behaviours that are affected by this concern.

Public Places

The public places most commonly targeted as areas of concern for all respondents were local parks. This was often related to its inappropriate (perceived) use by young people.

Table 1

Particularly of concern was the use of these facilities in the evening hours. It may be that the hours in the late afternoon and evening are those that most suit the recreational and exercise needs of most people in our community. A reluctance to use these available facilities was consistently expressed by respondents and will be addressed in relation to both the structural and social factors.

In relation to use after dark, parks generally would seem to have patently inadequate lighting to make nighttime use appropriate. Most suburban parks are not lit through their interior and most tend to be lit only by street lighting. Parks generally have a level of seating that enables its users to sit comfortably or even dine at the area should they wish. It is also true that most seating in parks appears to be designed only for daytime use and is not lit during the evening hours.

It is recommended that parks be individually examined regarding appropriate actions that facilitate usage in the nighttime. In parks where nighttime use is desired by local residents, lighting should be spread throughout the park to a degree that severely darkened areas are reduced, and further that lighting be placed in areas where seating is available. The placement of lighting in seated areas has a dual purpose; to encourage use by previously reluctant community members and to discourage the occurrence of inappropriate behaviour that generally decreases when the likelihood of observation increases.

Suburban parks, potentially a focal point of the community have tended to become less well utilised, even during the daytime, as the pressures and pace of contemporary lifestyles have accelerated. It is recommended that initiatives are developed on a micro level locally that will encourage and assist the development of parks as a focal point of community life. The Queensland climate is particularly suited to activities conducted outside, and community development initiatives that serve to bring individuals together within a public space they have tended to feel excluded from using can have a dual effect of building the community connectedness that is so central to successful local crime prevention and to reclaim ownership of these neighbourhood facilities in a positive constructive manner.

It is recommended that initiatives aimed at building community connectedness are developed with specific local communities with a focus of activity to be local parks and an open agenda of reclaiming that public space as somewhere to be enjoyed and utilised by all community members.

Policing

It is a fairly typical response in crime prevention research for respondents to report a 'more police less crime' belief. The Criminal Justice System generally was not a focus for the research and the lack of inclusion of questions about this aspect of crime disappointed a number of respondents. The focus of the Report was on community based crime concerns and crime prevention and as such a limited number of questions related to aspects of policing very directly related to policing at a community level.

Respondents raised two particular issues directly relating to policing. Foot/bike patrols was the most commonly selected program for introduction. Respondents consistently reported a desire for a more visible police presence if not a more numerous police presence. An evaluative report of crime prevention programs active in the United States reported that "a less popular but more effective community policing practice is door to door visits by police to residences during the daytime." (Sherman et al. 1996) Visits made by police (or their representatives in some cases) may be used to seek information, to give out information, or to introduce officers to local residents to further positive relationships between residents and police.

"If police were to "pop in for a coffee and chat?" randomly with residents in trouble spots I feel they would learn so much from people in these areas" Male respondent aged 45-54 years.

"Bring back the suburban Bobby." Male respondent aged 45-54 years.

"Police need to more regular check in neighbourhoods." Female respondent aged 25.34 years.

It is recommended that the use of door to door policing be investigated seriously by those who influence management and policy development within the Police Service. Respondents clearly called for this style of policing and international evidence exists to suggest that this form of policing is effective, in fact more effective than storefront policing (Sherman et al. 1996).

It is recommended that visible policing become an objective to be investigated for implementation. It cannot be overstated how strongly a desire to 'see more police' was reported within survey responses.

The second policing issue raised within the survey was the response of police once a crime has been committed. Although respondents tended to hold a view that police do have important concerns and that less serious property crime may not be seen as a priority issue, they were much less likely to report that they were satisfied with the outcome of any police action if they had not received feedback from the police, regardless of the successful outcome or not of any investigation.

It is recommended that a priority be given to a process whereby all victims of crime receive feedback at regular intervals for a certain period after an offence has occurred. It is envisaged that in many cases (less serious property offences) it may not be necessary to utilise enlisted officers for this purpose but rather train, utilise, and support the use of volunteers within policing to undertake feedback calls with referrals to officers where necessary.

Introduction

Logan City Shire was established in 1978. The City of Logan is young both in terms of developmental history and in terms of population. Logan City is comprised of five precincts (North, South, East, West, and Central) each of which is identified as possessing characteristics distinct to that precinct. The North precinct is the oldest precinct is most established in terms of employment and community services.

Logan City is an area of rapid growth. A growth rate of 26.7% was recorded for 1986-1991 and a projected growth rate of 21.7% is expected for the period 1996-2001. Immigration is reported to have contributed significantly to the growth of Logan over the past 25 years.

Unemployment rates are most significant in the South, East and West precincts with up to one-third of the population experiencing unemployment.

Logan City is perhaps best characterised as an area of rapid urban growth with a youthful population posing challenges to the provision of services, which traditionally tend to lag behind population growth. The challenge for Logan is to meet these service provision needs and thus better enable the population to enjoy the best aspects of living within this City.

The Focus of the Report

Historically, society's response to crime has primarily occurred once an offence has been committed. The motives for this style of reactive response are usually recognised as punishment for the offence committed, and the hope that the punishment meted out will deter the offender and other likely offenders from committing crime in the future. There is scant available evidence that supports the notion that these reactive responses to crime have had an anticipated preventive affect on future crime (The John Howard Society of Alberta).

1995). Crime prevention in more recent decades has evolved from its more reactive roots. Whilst responses after crime has been committed are still a significant ingredient, it has been joined by two other major partners; reduction of opportunity and 'reduction of desire' (The John Howard Society of Alberta. 1995). Reduction of opportunity approaches to crime prevention focus on restricting the ability for crime to occur by eliminating (or reducing) targets for crime, and are often referred to as 'target hardening'⁷. These crime prevention strategies will be referred to within the Report as situational crime prevention, as their impact generally focuses on a specific location. Reduction of desire approaches seek to reduce the likelihood of crime occurring by reducing the likelihood that any one person in the community will become an offender preventing crime through social development (The John Howard Society of Alberta. 1995). These latter crime prevention strategies will be referred to within the Report as social crime prevention, as their impact generally focuses on an individuals functioning within society. It is not the place of this Report to debate the value in punishment, but to provide direction for specific communities based on the needs of people living in those communities and the best practice of available crime prevention programs. As such **the Report will focus on programs that reduce the opportunity for crime to occur and/or reduce the likelihood that any one person will become an offender.**

There are two major ways in which crime intimately affects the lives of all people living in our community, concern about crime and victimisation of crime. Of course crime affects us in other ways as well, the portion of our tax dollar that is utilised within the criminal justice system, the increase in insurance costs that may be attributed to crime occurrences, and the cost of measures individuals may take to prevent becoming a victim of crime, however, for the purposes of this Report discussion will only briefly touch on the economic cost of crime, and instead this Report **will focus on the everyday affect that crime and concern about crime may have on choices that we make, or more exactly lifestyle opportunities that we may not take, because of our emotional and behavioural reaction to crime - the social cost of crime.**

There are two main ways of measuring crime, with very different methodologies. Official police records and victimisation surveys are the most common ways of measuring crime in the community, with most western nations widely utilising both measures when developing responses to crime (U.S. Department of Justice. 1995).

Most people are aware that the Police maintain detailed information regarding crime occurrences, and measurement practices within Police Services worldwide have become increasingly sensitive and sophisticated in recent years (U.S. Department of Justice. 1995). Police generally become aware of offences occurring in two ways; reporting by the public and detection by the police. Reporting of crime by the public can fluctuate for many reasons other than an increase or decrease in crime occurrences, including but not exclusively; reluctance of victims to report particular offences (notably sexual offences), increased reporting as community education and views increasingly consider a particular behaviour as a criminal offence (eg: domestic violence), and police operations that call on public information about specific offences during a specific time period (eg: Operation Noah). Police detection of offences can also fluctuate for many reasons, including but not exclusively; increased/decreased police focus on particular offences, increased/decreased police numbers, increased/decreased police efficiency.

Victimisation surveys are usually conducted on a regular basis (every few years) by a government statistical authority. The content of victimisation surveys can vary widely across different nations, however, typically maintain a standard form (with some variations) to allow for tracking of victimisation to occur across survey years. Victimisation surveys examine individuals (and households) personal experiences of crime and are often restricted to a specific time period. Respondents are generally asked if an offence was reported to the police, and if it wasn't reported the reasons for non reporting. Victimisation surveys often report a different picture of crime than that provided by police statistics as crime is reported as an experienced event, rather than as a reported (or detected) event. Victimisation levels reported within surveys can also fluctuate for reasons other than an increase or decrease in crime occurrences, including but not exclusively; an increasing perception in the community that a particular behaviour is a criminal offence and an increasing/decreasing willingness to discuss crime experiences (U.S. Department of Justice. 1995).

The two measures of crime discussed above have somewhat different purposes. Police information is primarily utilised as a reliable set of criminal justice statistics for law enforcement administration, operations, and management while victimisation surveys aim to provide otherwise unavailable information about crime, victims, and offenders. This Report will provide a limited set of information on available criminal justice statistics for purposes of community awareness and education, but will not draw recommendations from this information. **This Report has a focus on community needs and recognises the differences that may be evident between official information and reported victimisation, and as such recommendations will be drawn solely from the information provided by community members regarding victimisation and crime concerns.**

Crime Prevention

Within the complex field of crime with its myriad of differing definitions, crime prevention is a simple concept, not driven by philosophy or politics. Any act that prevents crime from occurring is an act of crime prevention. Crime prevention is not defined by its intentions, but by its consequences. Offenders may be incarcerated for reasons of punishment but if this

Table 1

act prevents crime from occurring, then it is an act of crime prevention, possibly not by intention but by its consequences. Unfortunately, there is limited evidence that incarceration prevents crime. Australian states with rapidly increasing prison populations are not experiencing a corresponding rapidly decreasing occurrence in crime. This non-relationship between incarceration and crime occurrence is one that is experienced on a worldwide basis.

In some areas of the United States increasing incarceration rates have led to economic crisis for government and the community. California's prison population in December 1995 was 135,000 with predictions for a population of over 300,000 by mid 2005. The cost of expanding incarceration rates is prohibitive for governments and in 1995, it was recommended that the California Legislature "Adopt a long-term strategy for accommodating inmate population based on any legislative actions to reduce inmate population growth and other cost reductions." (Legislative Analysis Office. 1995). The cost of Corrective Services in Australia in 1993-1994 was \$739 million, a 105% increase, over the expenditure of \$305.9 million in 1984-1985. The prison population increased by 31.1% from a population of 10,196 in 1983 to a population of 15,866 in 1993. (Australian Institute of Criminology 1997). The cost of incarceration would seem to be becoming more expensive given that expenditure on corrections increased by 105% while prison population only increased by 31% - a powerful incentive to find alternatives to incarceration.

The focus of this research was on community based crime prevention. Crime prevention has become a significant area of activity in some western nations, particularly Canada and the United States of America. Voluminous information is available regarding specific programs that communities in these nations have implemented in an attempt to prevent crime, from situational crime prevention through to social crime prevention, from community based strategies to policing strategies. Of limited availability however is evaluative information regarding crime prevention programs, and any affect in crime reduction or in crime related behaviour that was targeted by any one program⁷. In *Preventing Crime : What Works, What Doesn't, What's Promising, A Report to the United States Congress*, the authors recommend that a rigorous evaluation of crime prevention programs must be a significant component of any project implemented if monies directed toward crime prevention are going to be effective⁷. Program evaluation can be costly and there may be reluctance to direct the necessary portion of the limited funds available in this area towards evaluation at the cost of wider program implementation, however, there is evidence that some crime prevention programs widely implemented around the world are ineffective in crime prevention and the funding directed at these strategies could be better utilised in the resourcing of effective programs.

While many programs seem like a good idea or look like they should work, implementation of programs should be based on what has been proven to be effective (in reducing crime or crime related behaviour targeted) and transferable (from one community to another) rather than what it seems to be or looks like. Programs utilised in the Recommendations Section of this Report will be those the authors can most confidently report have been effective (through evaluation) and are transferable (effective in more than one community). Social crime prevention programs can be effectively divided in categories in terms of their areas of action, although their targeted area of effect is usually somewhat more widespread; situational crime prevention programs tend to be more specific about their area of effect. Crime prevention programs in schools do not usually aim to prevent crime only in schools, but also to prevent offending by young people in the community. Given what we know about the victimisation of young people, it would seem appropriate that a substantial focus of crime prevention in schools should also be the prevention of victimisation of young people, in the school and the community.

Social Crime Prevention Programs

Given the causal factors that have been identified as contributing to crime, the area of action and focus of specific social crime prevention programs is wide and varied. Risk factors that have been identified as contributing to the likelihood of offending include; failure in school, family problems, substance abuse, behavioural problems, economic disadvantage, unemployment (The John Howard Society of Alberta. 1995). The following list of crime prevention programs is by no means complete and merely attempts to provide illustration of the different sections of the community that can be active in preventing crime and the types of programs that are most commonly associated with crime prevention in the following community sectors. There is no suggestion that specific programs that fit these descriptors have proved effectiveness in crime prevention. The discussion of those programs will be restricted to the Recommendations Section.

Crime prevention programs may be implemented by police that attempt to prevent crime by; community education regarding situational crime prevention, targeting hot spot areas of crime, implementation of a zero tolerance policy (driven by the broken window theory), increasing public involvement in crime prevention and reporting via specific programs, Neighbourhood Watch and Crime Stoppers. Crime prevention programs may be implemented within schools and attempt to prevent crime by; targeting drug and alcohol use, targeting violence prevention, utilizing peer education, peer mentoring and skills based programs to enhance protective responses by young people. Crime prevention programs may be implemented within communities that attempt to prevent crime by; community mobilisation against crime, enhancing community connectedness, community mentoring programs. Crime prevention programs may be implemented within families that attempt to prevent crime by; parenting programs, preschool education programs involving parents, programs that support families in the home, programs for preventing family violence. Crime prevention programs may be implemented in the Labor Market that attempt to prevent crime by; enhancing employment opportunities for the unemployed, vocational programs targeting offenders.

Situational Crime Prevention

The focus on situational crime prevention within this Report will be the prevention of crime in specific places, as it is this specific type of crime prevention that is likely to be relevant for the purposes of the current research. Respondents were asked about specific areas where they felt unsafe and it is likely that situational crime prevention strategies may prove useful in addressing these place specific concerns, though not to the exclusion of social crime prevention programs. There is evidence to suggest that situational crime prevention can be effective in preventing crime in identified 'hot spots'. While the areas nominated by respondents within the current research may or may not qualify as crime 'hot spots', they are hot spots in terms of respondents diminished feelings of safety in those areas and, as the focus of the research is fear reduction and crime prevention, it is appropriate to consider these areas as targets for crime prevention strategies. The following list of situational crime prevention programs is by no means complete and merely attempts to provide illustration of the different strategies that can be implemented in specific places in an attempt to prevent crime. There is no suggestion that specific programs that fit these descriptors have proved effectiveness in crime prevention, the discussion of those programs will be restricted to the Recommendations Section.

Specific places that can be targeted through situational crime prevention include residences, apartment blocks, retail businesses, drinking establishments, financial institutions, transportation places, and public spaces. Situational crime prevention in residences (single and multiple dwellings) often involves 'target hardening' strategies such as property marking, improved locks, and security screens or alarms. Situational crime prevention in retail facilities can include; theft awareness training for staff, aggression management training for security staff, closed circuit television, electronic article surveillance, and installation of alarm systems. Situational crime prevention in drinking establishments can include; codes of practice implemented by a group of venue operators, licensing legislation training for venue operators and staff, and customer handling training for staff (including security staff).

Concern about Crime

This Report will discuss concern about crime and the factors that previous research (and the current research) may contribute to heightened concern about crime for specific community members. A great deal of research had been conducted worldwide regarding 'fear of crime', investigating the contributing factors, differing fear levels for sectors in the community, behaviour changes related to fear levels, methods of fear reduction, and so on. A quick Internet Search located 563,651 sites that matched 'fear of crime'. No doubt a more detailed search would locate many more such sites. Much of the earlier literature referring to fear of crime discussed these fears as 'irrational' and 'exaggerated' (Department of Justice. 1995).

Within the context of human behaviour, fear is a functional emotion. It alerts the individual that a situation may be threatening and action should be taken to address that threat (Franken, R.E. 1988). Fear of being hit by a car would seem to be the logical reason why people look both ways before crossing a road. The elimination of fear of crime would seem to be an impossible goal, given that victimisation *does* occur (to some members of the community more than others) and reasonable steps an individual can take to reduce their fear (and perhaps likelihood) of being victimised should not necessarily be considered as reactions to irrational or exaggerated fears. The delicate balance then needs to be drawn (by the community) between what is reasonable and what is unreasonable in terms of fear levels, and actions taken to address those fear levels. To extend the road crossing analogy, most would agree it is reasonable to look both ways before crossing a road to reduce fear of being hit by a car, however, most would agree that it would be unreasonable to avoid crossing roads altogether to reduce fear of being hit by a car.

Many differing levels of 'fear' have been reported in the literature regarding fear of crime. Debate has, and is, occurring regarding the discussion of an homogenous fear, rather than concern about crime as distinct from fear of crime*. Concern about crime might be expressed in the statement: 'I am worried that crime is increasing and affecting the lifestyle of people in my suburb' whereas fear may be expressed as 'I am fearful of crime when in my own home'. There may or may not be a relationship between concern about crime and fear of crime, but there is no evidence that the two terms are different expressions of one construct. The distinction between concern about crime and fear of crime, if one indeed exists, has not been supported or otherwise by the literature, but perhaps is an area of investigation for future research.

Vulnerability and Heightened Fear Levels

Recent research has tended to move away from discussing 'irrational' or 'exaggerated' fear of crime and has started to discuss fear of crime in a more constructive manner. Investigation has increasingly focused on the reasons *why* specific groups within the community may exhibit 'irrational' or 'exaggerated' levels of fear in relation to crime (Department of Justice. 1995). Three particular sectors of the community have traditionally exhibited heightened fear levels in most research; women, older community members, and victims of crime (Department of Justice. 1995). One suggested explanation for heightened fear levels amongst these groups is their perceived vulnerability to victimisation. Different reasons for feeling vulnerable to victimisation exist for all three groups that may contribute to heightened fear levels amongst them. Of course, increased inclusion in these groups would be expected to further heighten levels of fear, that is, a woman who has been the victim of crime would be expected to have heightened fear levels when compared to a woman who has not experienced any victimisation.

Women

Some literature challenges the notion that women have exaggerated levels of fear in relation to crime, but instead points to the lifetime experiences of women in terms of victimisation. It is a commonly cited statistic that one in four women will have been the victim of sexual assault before the age of eighteen. The accuracy of this statistic will not be debated here, other than to say that women certainly are uniquely vulnerable to sexual violence. Not enough is known about the affects of the range of sexual violence against women in terms of their fear levels. Whilst 'flashing' is not categorised as a serious sexual offence (even by the victim in some cases) it can reinforce a sense of vulnerability to sexual assault, and even influence a victims future behaviour (Department of Justice. 1995). Most women do not become victims of serious violent crime. In fact they are far more likely to be a victim of a sexual offence other than rape or attempted rape. While these other sexual offences may not be considered serious violent offences they may serve to reinforce a woman's sense of vulnerability to serious violent crime, particularly rape. Women's heightened levels of fear may be more due to heightened vulnerability to sexual violence than some unexplained 'irrational' cause (Department of Justice. 1995).

Women are the most common victims of violence within the home. Much of the fear of crime literature has arguably focused on 'stranger offenders' whereas women are most commonly victimised by someone they know intimately. It is not an either/or proposition. Analysis from the Violence Against Women Survey conducted by Statistics Canada in 1993 noted that "one quarter of the women surveyed from 18 to 24 acknowledged they had been assaulted by a stranger at least once since the age of 16 in acts that ranged from unwanted sexual touching to rape involving injury" (Department of Justice. p.19 1995).

Heightened fear levels reported by women may be due to life experiences and awareness of vulnerability to sexual violence, that are generally not experienced by men, rather than some irrational fearfulness.

Older Community Members

Older members of the community have also been described as a group that exhibits 'exaggerated' fear levels in comparison to their actual victimisation rate. The vulnerability perspective has particularly obvious application to older members of the community, in terms of physical vulnerability to violence. Regardless of victimisation rates, older people are likely to be aware that physical defence is less likely to be an option should they become victims of a violent crime, and this may heighten their sense of vulnerability. A contributing factor to heightened levels of vulnerability may also be the more serious consequences that an assault may have for an older member of the community. The Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) (USA) reports that while persons over 65 years are far less likely to be victims of violent crime, those that had been a victim in these circumstances were more likely to suffer serious injuries (9%) than victims under 65 years (5%) (U.S. Department of Justice. 1994). While this assault is highly unlikely to occur an older person is reasonable in expecting that the physical consequence of any assault may be far more serious for them than for a younger person.

Aside from any physical consequences, in victimisation of property crime, older people may expect to suffer more hardship after victimisation of this type of offence. Any possessions lost as a result of property crime may be more difficult to replace as a retiree than as a young person with access to the workforce, this may also contribute to a sense of vulnerability (Department of Justice. 1995). Fear exhibited by older members of the community may not be as strongly related to an expectation of victimisation as it is to fear of consequences of victimisation. This Report did not examine fears regarding consequences of victimisation, but rather used a measure of attitudes towards the victimisation of elderly people. A distinction between attitudes towards the likelihood of victimisation and concern about consequences of victimisation may be an area that deserves more attention.

Victims

Those who have already been victims of crime have a transparently obvious reason for feeling vulnerable and thus fearful of crime. They don't suspect that they may be victimised at some point, they believe they can because it has already happened. Previous research has noted that victims of crime tend to report heightened fear levels compared to people who report experiencing no victimisation (Department of Justice. 1995). The definition of victim can be different between Reports as some research qualifies the victimisation in terms of years (respondents may be asked if they have been a victim of crime in the last year, last three years, at some point in their life, and so on) (Department of Justice. 1995). These different parameters on victimisation can obviously have an effect on the findings of any research that may consider the affect of victimisation on fear levels. If the affects of victimisation are longstanding, then victimisation studies that look at victimisation restricted to a specific time frame are not likely to gain an adequate view of any affects, due to the number of false negatives they may have included as non-victims, that is respondents who had been victims of crime outside of the defined parameters.

Fear Reduction

Strategies aimed at fear reduction often recommend that accurate crime statistics are prominently provided for open debate, theorising, that if groups in the community that are most fearful (but are actually victimised less than others) can be convinced that the rate of victimisation for their sector of the community is less than they believe, then reduction in fear levels should occur. A vulnerability perspective suggests fear of crime is far more complex than that and must be addressed in different ways. Women may feel more fearful because experience of minor or even some property offences is often accompanied by a fear of accompanying sexual violence, and further because they are likely to be victimised by people that they know (in most serious offences) as well as strangers. Older people may feel more fearful not because of a greater expectation of victimisation, but more of a fear of the consequences that victimisation may have for them. Victims would seem to be more fearful because they have already experienced victimisation and know that it can happen to them, and thus, feel more vulnerable (and fearful) than others.

Efforts at fear reduction may be more usefully directed at addressing the vulnerability concerns of the groups most often targeted as those with heightened levels of fear regarding crime. Such fear reduction efforts may include the provision of accurate information in an education process, however, their focus would need to be the reduction of feelings of vulnerability to crime that may be experienced by these specific groups. Strategies that act as protective measures against feelings of vulnerability may be an effective tool in reducing fear levels in women, older members of the community and victims of crime.

Measurement of Crime

Crime in this Report cannot be directly acquainted with any police definition or experience with crime. We are discussing communities and community members emotional and behavioural reactions to crime and concern about crime and thus the importance of perceptions of crime are far more relevant than any proscribed view of crime and crime occurrences. Measures of both aspects of crime will be utilised in the Report, proscribed crime occurrences through official police statistics and community perceptions of victimisation and concern about crime. The traditional provider of official police statistics is the Queensland Police Service, while the Australian Bureau of Statistics publicly provides data regarding crime victimisation of Queenslanders.

It has been suggested there is limited value in directly comparing victimisation rates to recorded offences by the police, because of the variation between the two measures (U.S. Department of Justice. 1995). Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) (1995) reports that "responses obtained in this survey are based on respondents' perceptions of having been the victim of an offence. The terms used...may not necessarily correspond with the legal or police definitions (of an offence)" (Australian Bureau of Statistics. p1 1994). Each method of crime measurement has strengths and weaknesses but in any discussion of crime in the community, measures of both should be utilised. Official police statistics may be affected by (among other reasons) increased reporting of crime by community members, increasing police numbers leading to an increased detection of crime, and specific police focus on particular offences, apart from increasing crime occurrences. Victimisation reporting may be affected by (among other reasons) education programs that encourage community members to identify a particular behaviour or experience as an offence. An example of this phenomenon is the increasing reporting of domestic violence. As community (and legislative) perceptions regarding violence within the family have changed, reporting of domestic violence to the police has increased and almost certainly has increased in victimisation studies. This increased reporting of this form of violence may be due to an increasing incidence of this offence or may be due to a changing community attitude toward domestic violence which recognises it as a criminal offence, or may be a combination of both.

The measurement instrument utilised within this Report contains some information regarding victimisation. Victimisation information was sought regarding property related crime and personal/violent crime, and was not drawn from legal police definitions, although specific examples of these offences were provided within the survey instrument. The measurement of

victimisation can also be problematic in terms of the definition of a victim. Within this Report respondent's perception of being a victim were solicited, and no definition of a victim was provided. The Police definition of a victim utilised within their Statistical Review (Queensland Police Service. 1997) is direct victims of reported offences whereas the ABS considers a victim a person or a household reporting one or more of the offences listed (Australian Bureau of Statistics. 1994). The Victim Compensation Act (1996) defines a victim as "someone who has had a crime committed that involves a violence committed against them in a direct way, or the person is a member of the immediate family of a victim directly affected, or someone who has directly suffered harm in assisting a victim" (Queensland Government. 1996. The survey instrument utilised within this Report did not provide a definition of victim; however, in most cases the respondent (and not the household) was the target of the question. The purposes of the research do not support the preclusion of people's perceptions of victimisation based on a definition that did not include their particular situation.

Victimisation

There are two main sources of victimisation information, that is, information directly relating to rates of victimisation for members of the community. Police statistics provide victimisation information regarding the victims of reported offences, while victimisation studies rely on self report of victimisation, regardless of reported offences to the police. Some victimisation studies note that reporting of all offences to the police may be as low as 31% to 42%, and lower for sexual offences (Census and Statistics. 1995.) The ABS reports in *Crime and Safety* 1995, that the reporting rate for break and enter was 77.6%, attempted break and enter was 28.6%, motor vehicle was 94.1%, robbery was 55.6%, and assault was 36.5% (Australian Bureau of Statistics. 1994). Different sectors of the community are likely to have quite different experiences regarding crime victimisation and those differences will be acknowledged by separate discussion of victimisation by age and gender. Unless stated otherwise information has been drawn from Australian sources.

Age

- Young people aged under 24 years are most likely to be victims of personal violent crime. Victimisation of personal violent crime tends to decrease with age and persons aged over 65 years are least likely to be victims of personal crime, ABS (Australian Bureau of Statistics. 1994).
- In 1996/1997 people aged between 15 and 34 years were more likely to be victims of homicide, than persons younger or older than this age bracket QPS Review (Queensland Police Service. 1997)
- The Highest victimisation of assault occurred with people aged between 15 and 29 years, with the victimisation rate for persons aged over 55 years lower than the reported rate for children aged between 5 and 9 years. QPS Review (Queensland Police Service. 1997)
- The Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) in the United States reports that although persons aged 65 years or over make up 14% of the population they reported less than 2% of all victimisation (U.S. Department of Justice. 1994).
- The BJS reports that persons aged between 12 and 24 have the highest victimisation rates for all crimes, while those aged 65 years and over have the lowest (U.S. Department of Justice. 1994).

Gender

- Males were more likely than females to be the victim of homicide and assault. QPS Review (Queensland Police Service. 1997).
- Female victims of homicide were more likely to have been killed by a husband, ex-husband, or boyfriend (28%) than males were to have been killed by a wife, ex-wife, or girlfriend (3%).BJS (Social Statistic Briefing Room. 1997).
- Males were more likely to be the victim of personal crime, with young men aged between 15 and 24 years most likely to be victimised ABS (Australian Bureau of Statistics. 1994).
- Females were more likely to be the victim of all sexual offences, with women aged between 10 and 19 years most likely to be victimised QPS Review (Queensland Police Service. 1997).
- Women are more likely to be victimised by someone known to them than are men. BJS (Social Statistic Briefing Room. 1997).
- Females victimised by someone known to them were more likely to not report an offence to the police. BJS (Social Statistic Briefing Room. 1997).

Crime in Queensland, South Eastern Region, and Logan

1996-1997 saw the usual variation in the 'crime rate' as compared to other years. Reporting of some crimes increased while others decreased (compared with 1995-1996). This variation is the real picture of crime. There is limited value in comparing crime trends only over several years and attempting to provide a definitive statement regarding the 'crime rate'. Information within this Report regarding official police statistics is provided for the purposes of community education rather than an analysis of 'crime rate' fluctuations.

Statistics will be talked about in rates per 100 000 of population. Percentages have been drawn directly from the Queensland Police Service Statistic Review of 1996/1997. Although the reported rate of a particular offence or set of offences may increase in any one year, the reporting rate per 100 000 adjusts that rate to relate directly to the population. If a population increases significantly in any one year, unfortunately it is likely that a corresponding increase in reported crime will also be apparent. It is therefore more meaningful in terms of community impact to discuss crime within this Report in relation to occurrence per 100 000.

As stated within the Limitations of the Research Section this Report the crime statistics provided by the Queensland Police Service consisted of the Statistical Reviews of 1994/1995, 1995/1996, and 1996/1997. While these reports provide good information regarding reported crime within Queensland and the nine (9) Police Regional Divisions, they provide limited information about specific townships or localities within those divisions and no information regarding police responses that do not result in charges being laid or offences recorded.

Offences against the person

An increase in offences against the person was recorded for Queensland, South Eastern Region and Logan in 1996/1997.

Young men aged between 15 and 29 years are mostly likely to commit offences against the person that are reported to the police. Young women aged between 15 and 19 were most likely to report victimisation of the offences within this category to the police. The most common place for an offence against the person to take place is in a place of residence, followed by on the street or on footpaths.

Homicide

Across Queensland the reported homicide rate fell when compared to 1995/1996. Decreases were also recorded for Logan, but remained stable for the South Eastern Region.

Assault

Assault offences per 100 000 decreased for Queensland, South Eastern Region, but increased for Logan. in 1996/1997. Serious assaults per 100 000 increased for Queensland, South Eastern Region, and Logan, while Minor assaults decreased in Queensland, South Eastern Region and Logan. These contrasting increases in serious assault and decreases in minor assault is attributed to the increasing likelihood that police will assess assaults as serious rather than minor, by the Queensland Police Service Statistical Review of 1996/1997.

Sexual Offences

Sexual offences increased in Queensland, South Eastern Region and Logan in 1996/1997. Rape and attempted rape decreased in Queensland and Logan, but increased for the South Eastern Region. Other sexual offences increased in Queensland and the South Eastern Region, and Logan in 1996/1997.

Queensland Statistical Review reports that the charging of two people with over 1000 offences dating back several decades significantly skewed the 'crime rate' for the sexual offences

category in 1996/1997. This type of incident while unusual can have a significant distortion effect on 'crime rates' both generally and for specific offences, and any significant increase in crime rate most often involves one or more confounding factors (such as that discussed above) rather simply a large increase in the number of offences committed.

The difference between offending rates and reporting rates is particularly problematic for the sexual offence category. All victimisation studies suggest that the reporting rate of sexual offences is very low and there may often be a significant time lapse between the offence and the time of reporting. It is known that females aged between 10 and 19 are most likely to be victims of these offences and women of all age groups more likely to experience victimisation than men. Of the victims who are men, boys aged between 10 and 14 were most commonly victimised. The greatest majority of offenders in reported offences were male. The most common place for sexual offences to take place was in a place of residence.

Robbery

Robbery offences increased in Queensland, South Eastern Region and Logan for 1996/1997. Armed robbery increased in Queensland, South Eastern Region and Logan for 1996/1997. Unarmed robbery decreased in Queensland, but increased for the South Eastern Region and Logan in 1996/1997.

Armed Robberies were most likely to occur in retail locations, while on the street or footpath was the most likely place for Unarmed Robberies to take place. Young men aged between 15 and 24 were most likely to be offenders in reported Robberies and also most likely to be the victims of Robbery.

Kidnapping, Abduction, and Deprivation of Liberty

Kidnapping, abduction, and deprivation of liberty decreased for Queensland, the South Eastern Region and Logan in 1996/1997. Extortion increased for Queensland and Logan, but decreased for the South Eastern Region in 1996/1997.

The Queensland Statistical Review reports that Extortion while a relatively uncommon offence experiences great fluctuation from one year to the next. Victims of Extortion tend to be older than victims of other reported offences against the person.

Other Offences against the Person

Other Offences against the person includes such offences as Stalking, Armed so as to Cause Fear or Alarm, and ill treatment of children. Other Offences against the Person increased for Queensland, South Eastern Region and Logan for 1996/1997.

Offences against Property

Offences against property increased in Queensland, but slight decreases were recorded for the South Eastern Region and Logan in 1996/1997. Young men aged between 15 and 19 years are mostly likely to commit offences against the person that are reported to the police and cleared.

Breaking and Entering

Breaking and entering increased for Queensland, South Eastern Region, but decreased for Logan in 1996/1997. Breaking and entering – shops increased in Queensland, South

Table 1

Eastern Region, and Logan in 1996/1997. Breaking and entering dwellings increased in Queensland, but decreased in South Eastern Region and Logan in 1996/1997. Breaking and entering of other properties increased in Queensland, South Eastern Region, and for Logan in 1996/1997.

Arson

Arson increased in Queensland, but a slight decrease was recorded for the South Eastern Region and Logan in 1996/1997. The most common location for Arson to occur was Open Space, followed by on the street or footpaths, and residential dwellings.

-

Other Property Damage

Other property damages increased in Queensland, South Eastern Region and Logan in 1996/1997.

Motor Vehicle Theft

Motor vehicle theft decreased in Queensland, South Eastern Region, and Logan in 1996/1997. The most common locations for vehicles to be stolen from were the street, residential locations, and retail locations, respectively. Males younger than 30 years were the most common offenders in cleared offences.

-

Stealing

Stealing offences increased in Queensland and the South Eastern Region, but decreased for Logan in 1996/1997. Stealing from dwellings increased for Queensland, South Eastern Region and Logan in 1996/1997. Shop stealing decreased in Queensland and Logan, but increased for South Eastern Region in 1996/1997. Other stealing increased in Queensland, but a slight decrease was recorded for the South Eastern Region and Logan in 1996/1997. Almost one third of offenders in cleared stealing offences were females, with both females and male offenders most commonly aged 19 or under.

Fraud

Fraud offences decreased for Queensland but increased for the South Eastern Region and Logan in 1996/1997. Fraud by credit card increased in Queensland, South Eastern Region and Logan in 1996/1997. Fraud by cheque decreased in Queensland, South Eastern Region and Logan in 1996/1997. Other fraud decreased in Queensland, South Eastern Region, but increased for Logan in 1996/1997. Almost one third of offenders in cleared fraud offences were females, with both females and males offenders most commonly aged between 20 and 29 years.


Crime Trend Information

The Queensland Statistical Review provides information of crime occurrences (as recorded by the police) over a ten year period. Figures 1:1 and Figures 1:2 provide a graphical depiction of the fluctuations in recorded offences for specific offences over ten years. The offences depicted in these figures were selected simply on a basis of having similar reported offence rates (to each other) which enabled them to be placed together in graphical depiction to enable viewing of crime fluctuation.

The minor fluctuations reported for North Coast Region and the Sunshine Coast would become accentuated (as those for Queensland) if they were viewed over a ten year period. It may actually be inappropriate to talk about a definitive crime rate (given the great variation between types of offences), and it is a difficult matter to consider even specific types of offences over less than ten years without losing sight of the fact the crime occurrences fluctuate from year to year. It is not always an increasing trend, and that these fluctuations may be due to many factors, including but not exclusively; an actual increase in the number of offences, increased detection of offences, and increased reporting of offences due to some reason other than increased victimisation.

Figure 1:1

Fluctuation in reported offences of Sexual Offences, Serious Assault, and Minor Assault over ten (10) years




-

-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-

Figure 1:2

Fluctuation in reported offences of Armed Robbery, Rape and Attempted Rape, Homicide, and Kidnapping Abduction and Deprivation of Liberty over ten (10) years

Table 1



Methodology

The Survey Instrument

Design of questions was driven by several factors; the focus of the research, the aims of the research, previous research conducted by ACRO, and previous research conducted worldwide. To be included questions needed to target three broad areas; crime attitudes, crime experiences, and crime prevention needs/attitudes/experiences.

The questionnaire is self administered, combining open/closed response formats. Most closed format questions utilise a likert scale response or dichotomous response. Most questions required single responses, but several allowed for multiple responses.

The questionnaire is composed of four sections; Section One (1) Attitude questions; Section Two (2) Experiential questions; Section Three (3) Crime Prevention questions; Section Four (4) Demographic questions.

The questionnaire contained a total of thirty-eight (38) questions. The questionnaire booklet provided instructions for completion and a comment section for use by respondents. A free call number was provided if respondents had questions about the research or required assistance with completion of the questionnaire.

Throughout development of the questionnaire, individuals within the community (not research population) completed draft surveys and provided feedback on the questions, format, and suggestions for inclusion. Feedback was also sought from crime prevention practitioners via the Internet, and from community organisations working with gay and lesbian community members and victims of domestic violence.

Survey Package

Survey packages were mailed to each dwelling listed on the sample derived from the council database.

Survey packages contained:

Table 1

- A cover letter introducing the questionnaire, establishing the bona fides of the sender, and instructions for questionnaire return.
- A copy of the Questionnaire
- A participation form
- A reply paid envelope

Sample

A sample of 8000 residential dwellings was selected from a population of all households recorded on a database held by Logan City Council as addresses of enrolled voters. Names and any other identifying information was not provided to the researchers.

8000 residential dwellings from a population of 142172 dwellings were selected through random sampling

A spreadsheet file containing the 8000 sample addresses was sent via email to Brisbane where a mail out organisation was contracted to insert survey packages, print envelopes, and present to Australia Post for mailing and delivery.

Survey Distribution and Return

Distribution was handled by Australia Post delivery as per the address labels on survey envelopes. Distribution occurred in the third week of November 1997. Respondents were asked to return the survey as soon as possible, no return date was provided.

Return of surveys occurred through the use of reply paid envelopes provide within the survey package. Surveys were returned to Logan City Council and held for collection by ACRO.

Final collection of surveys occurred on the 17th December 1997.

Limitations of the Research

A small number of survey packages were returned to the Logan City Council undelivered, most commonly labeled that no such address existed. The method of obtaining addresses was to utilise the Electoral Roll through the Logan City Council to randomly select residential addresses. Survey packages were addressed to these residential addresses and not postal addresses that may have been utilised by a number of recipients of the survey package. The sample was selected via the Electoral Roll for this region as the most practicable option to use in the selection of a sample from the targeted population.

It is well known that maximum returns utilising postal surveys are achieved by multiple mail-outs; at least two but three often are required to achieve maximum returns. It is acknowledged here that financial constraints within the real world most often do not permit for such multiple mail outs and that was the case within the current research.

Table 1

Return rates may have been affected by the time of year at which the survey mail out occurred. It is accepted that the month of December (and several weeks each side of that month) is a traditional time for 'wind down' to occur. The research documents produced as a result of the survey were required for use by local Partnerships in a twelve month pilot crime prevention program and as such delays in the processes leading up to the commencement of research were not able to be countered by delaying the survey mail-out until after the December 'wind down' period.

A particular issue for the coding of surveys was the definition of categories into which responses could be recorded. When asked if there were areas in their neighbourhood where they did not feel safe, day and night, a number of respondents reported that they felt unsafe 'everywhere'. This answer was not anticipated and a code did not exist for this response and as such these responses were coded as other. It is suggested that future research include this option when asking about areas where people feel unsafe in a local community.

A category referring to policing issues was also needed in the two questions relating to property and personal/violent victimisation experiences. A number of respondents reported reasons for dissatisfaction with outcomes that referred directly to dissatisfaction with police attitudes or experiences they had had with police after the victimisation had occurred.

Analysis

Figure 2:1

Distribution of Respondents by Age and Gender




Table 2:1**Age of Respondents by Gender of Respondents (All)**

| Age Category | Female | Male | Total |
|---------------------|---------------|-------------|--------------|
| 12-18 years | 1.2% (12) | 0.3% (2) | 0.9% (14) |
| 19-24 years | 5.7% (56) | 1.4% (9) | 4.0% (65) |
| 25-34 years | 21.3% (209) | 8.4% (54) | 16.2% (263) |
| 35-44 years | 30.2% (296) | 18.2% (117) | 25.4% (413) |
| 45-54 years | 26.1% (256) | 38.2% (245) | 30.9% (501) |
| 55-64 years | 11.1% (109) | 20.1% (129) | 14.7% (238) |

Table 1

| | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| 65-74 years | 2.8% (27) | 11.1% (71) | 6.0% (98) |
| 75 years and over | 1.6% (16) | 2.3% (15) | 1.9% (31) |
| Total | 100.0% (981) | 100.0% (642) | 100.0 (1623) |

-

Table 2:2

Racial/Ethnic Background as Identified by Respondents (All)
and for Respondents who selected only one Category

-

| Racial/Ethnic Background | % of Respondents per Category (All) | Racial/Ethnic Background | % of Respondents per Category (one selected) |
|---------------------------------|--|---------------------------------|---|
| Australian | 80.5 | Australian | 79.8 |
| European | 20.1 | European | 12.6 |
| New Zealand | 6.7 | New Zealand | 3.0 |
| Aboriginal Australian | 1.9 | Aboriginal Australian | 0.9 |
| Asian | 4.4 | Asian | 2.1 |
| Torres Strait Islander | 0.6 | Torres Strait Islander | 0.0 |
| Other | 2.2 | Other | 1.7 |

-

-

Table 2:3

Number of Racial/Ethnic Backgrounds Identified by Respondents (All)

| No. of Racial/Ethnic Backgrounds | % of Respondents |
|---|-------------------------|
| One Category | 85.5 |

Table 1

| | |
|-------------------------|-----|
| Two Categories | 9.5 |
| Three Categories | 2.3 |
| Four or more Categories | 2.7 |

Demographics

Gender

Of the 1742 surveys returned, the gender of 103 respondents was unable to be determined because no response was given to this question or a multiple response was given. Of the remaining 1639 respondents, 60.3% (989) were female and 39.7% (650) were male.

Age

Of the 1742 surveys returned the age of 38 respondents was unable to be determined because no response was given to this question or a multiple response was given.

The most common age reported by the remaining respondents was 45 to 54 years, followed by 35-44 years and 25-34 years respectively. Table 2:1 provides the number and percentage of male and female respondents in each age category. This gender and age group comparison was unable to be completed on 119 surveys where no response/or multiple response was given to the questions relating to age and gender.

Figure 2:1 provides a graphical depiction of the distribution of respondents by age and gender. Figure 2:1 shows that while female respondents had greatest representation in the age range of 35 to 44 years, male respondents were most heavily represented in the age range of 45 to 54 years.

Racial/Ethnic Background

Respondents were asked to identify those ethnic categories that they most identified with, more than one choice was acceptable. Most respondents selected an Australian Racial/Ethnic Background and most respondents selected only one category of racial/ethnic background. Refer Tables 2:2 and 2:3. Those people who identified as Australian were less likely than any other group to select an additional racial/ethnic background. As respondents were able to select more than one racial/ethnic background it is difficult to assess this information comparatively with available ABS statistics, however, the information provided by respondents can be broken down in several ways that provides useful information.

Table 2:4 shows the number of Respondents in each racial/ethnic background that selected more than one racial/ethnic background. The greatest majority of respondents who selected two or more racial/ethnic backgrounds selected Australian as one of those categories. This strong identification of respondents as Australians while recognising other racial/ethnic backgrounds would seem to support the notion of an 'Australian Identity' that comprises of many racial/ethnic backgrounds.

Employment

Respondents were asked to indicate which of the categories provided best described their employment situation. The greatest majority of respondents indicated that they had full time

Table 1

employment (34.1%), followed by full time, retired (16.8%), full time homemaker (12.6%), self employed (13.8%), and part time employment (8.6%) respectively. A smaller percentage of respondents selected other categories, such as casual employment (5.4%), unemployed (3.8%), other (2.9%), university/TAFE student (1.1%), student with part time employment (0.6%), and secondary school student (0.4%).

Accommodation

Respondents were asked to indicate which of the categories provided best described their household. The greatest majority of respondents described themselves as a couple with children (46%), followed by couples (28.9%). Smaller percentages of respondents selected the categories living alone (8%), one parent with children (7.1%), extended family (7.6%), and share accommodation (2.4%).

Table 2:4 Racial/Ethnic Background reported by Respondents who chose more than one Racial/Ethnic Background Category

| | Australian | Aboriginal Australian | Torres Strait Islander | Asian | European | New Zealand | Other |
|------------------------|------------|-----------------------|------------------------|-------|----------|-------------|-------|
| Australian | 1403 | 17 | 6 | 41 | 155 | 68 | 12 |
| Aboriginal Australian | 17 | 33 | 7 | 7 | 11 | 10 | 2 |
| Torres Strait Islander | 6 | 7 | 10 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 2 |
| Asian | 41 | 7 | 6 | 76 | 23 | 13 | 5 |
| European | 155 | 11 | 6 | 23 | 350 | 41 | 7 |
| New Zealand | 68 | 10 | 5 | 13 | 41 | 116 | 3 |
| Other | 12 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 7 | 3 | 39 |

Table 2:5

% of Respondents living in each Suburb

Table 1

| Suburb | % of Respondents identified suburb as place of residence |
|-----------------|---|
| Brown Plains | 3.5 |
| Heritage Park | 1.0 |
| Regents Park | 4.9 |
| Rosedale South | 7.9 |
| Boronia Heights | 2.4 |
| Springwood | 5.8 |
| Priestdale | 0.1 |
| Waterford | 0.8 |
| Loganlea | 2.9 |
| Meadowbrook | 0.7 |
| Kingston | 8.7 |
| Woodridge | 8.5 |
| Hillcrest | 0.8 |
| Forestdale | 1.6 |
| Underwood | 0.4 |
| Boronia Heights | 1.3 |
| Greenbank | 0.6 |
| Park Ridge | 1.0 |
| Daisy Hill | 5.5 |
| Slacks Creek | 4.7 |
| Tanah Merah | 2.2 |
| Shailer Park | 6.4 |
| Loganholme | 3.3 |
| Cornubia | 2.9 |

Table 1

| | |
|--------------------------|-----|
| Marsden | 4.9 |
| Logan Reserve | 0.2 |
| Berrinba | 0.3 |
| Hillcrest | 1.3 |
| Heritage Heights/Gardens | 0.6 |
| Underwood | 1.5 |
| Greenbank | 0.5 |
| Carbrook | 0.7 |
| Crestmead | 3.5 |
| Waterford West | 2.2 |
| Rochedale | 3.3 |
| Other | 3.1 |

Suburb

Respondents were asked to provide information about the suburb or town that they lived in and the length of time they had lived in that suburb. Table 2:5 provides the percentage and number of respondents who indicated the listed suburbs as their place of residence, 13 respondents did not provide information regarding which suburb was their place of residence. 68.2% of respondents indicated that they had lived in their current suburb for more than five (5) years, 11.7% between one (1) and three (3) years, 15.7% between three (3) and five (5) years, and 4.4% for less than one (1) year.

Table 2:6

Feelings of Safety - All

| | Response Categories | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---------------------|-------|-------|-------|--------|-------|----------|-------|-------------------|-------|-------|-------|
| | Strongly Agree | | Agree | | Unsure | | Disagree | | Strongly Disagree | | Total | |
| Safety Statements :Section One | % | Count | % | Count | % | Count | % | Count | % | Count | % | Count |
| I feel safe from crime in my own home | 4.0 | 69 | 31.7 | 548 | 20.1 | 348 | 29.9 | 516 | 14.3 | 247 | 100.0 | 1728 |
| I feel safe from crime when at Shopping Centres at night | 1.9 | 32 | 17.6 | 300 | 21.8 | 371 | 37.6 | 640 | 21.1 | 359 | 100.0 | 1702 |

Table 1

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----|-----|------|-----|------|-----|------|-----|------|-----|-------|------|
| I feel safe when passing a group of young men on the street | 1.7 | 30 | 11.8 | 203 | 29.0 | 500 | 37.9 | 653 | 19.6 | 337 | 100.0 | 1723 |
| I feel safe when using parking lots at night | 1.6 | 27 | 6.6 | 113 | 16.4 | 281 | 42.9 | 735 | 32.5 | 557 | 100.0 | 1713 |
| I feel safe when travelling to and from work/school alone | 8.6 | 142 | 52.4 | 864 | 16.4 | 270 | 18.0 | 297 | 4.7 | 77 | 100.0 | 1650 |
| I feel safe when out alone in my neighbourhood during the day | 7.7 | 133 | 48.3 | 833 | 17.6 | 304 | 20.7 | 357 | 5.6 | 97 | 100.0 | 1724 |
| I feel safe when out alone in my neighbourhood at night | 1.8 | 30 | 9.4 | 160 | 15.9 | 272 | 39.2 | 670 | 33.8 | 577 | 100.0 | 1709 |

Table 2:7**Feelings of Safety – Gender**

| Concern Statement : Section One | Response Categories | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---------------------|------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|
| | Strongly Agree | | Agree | | Unsure | | Disagree | | Strongly Disagree | | Total | |
| | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |
| I feel safe from crime in my own home | 19 2.9% | 46 4.7% | 199 30.9% | 319 32.5% | 135 20.9% | 192 19.6% | 195 30.2% | 294 19.6% | 97 30.2% | 131 13.3% | 645 15.0% | 982 100.0% |
| I feel safe from crime when at Shopping Centres at night | 9 1.4% | 19 2.0% | 146 23.0% | 152 15.7% | 147 23.2% | 193 19.9% | 224 35.3% | 377 38.8% | 108 17.0% | 230 23.7 | 634 100.0% | 971 100.0% |
| I feel safe when passing a group of young men on the street | 12 1.9% | 15 1.5% | 100 15.5% | 96 9.8% | 209 32.5% | 263 26.9% | 236 36.6% | 373 38.1% | 87 13.5% | 231 23.6% | 644 100.0% | 978 100.0% |
| I feel safe from crime when using parking lots at night | 7 1.1% | 19 2.0% | 66 10.3% | 42 4.3% | 141 22.0% | 127 13.1% | 268 41.9% | 420 43.2% | 158 24.7% | 365 37.5% | 640 100.0% | 973 100.0% |
| I feel safe when travelling to and from work/school alone | 55 9.0% | 82 8.7% | 346 56.4% | 478 50.6% | 101 16.5% | 145 15.3% | 90 14.7% | 190 20.1% | 21 3.4% | 50 5.3% | 613 100.0% | 945 100.0% |
| I feel safe from crime when out alone in my neighbourhood during the day | 56 8.7% | 75 7.7% | 341 52.7% | 448 45.9% | 108 16.7% | 172 17.6% | 116 17.9% | 217 22.2% | 26 4.0% | 64 6.6% | 647 100.0% | 976 100.0% |
| I feel safe from crime when out alone in my neighbourhood at night | 9 1.4% | 21 2.2% | 95 14.9% | 61 6.3% | 134 21.0% | 119 12.3% | 241 37.8% | 388 40.0% | 159 24.9% | 382 39.3% | 638 100.0% | 971 100.0% |

Table 2:8

Merged Age Categories used in Analysis or Responses by Age

| Merged Age Categories | % (n) of Respondents in Merged Age Category |
|------------------------------|--|
| 12-24 years | 4.7 |
| 25-34 years | 15.8 |
| 35-44 years | 24.6 |
| 45-54 years | 30.6 |
| 55-64 years | 15.1 |
| Over 65 years | 9.1 |
| | |

Concern about Crime

Prior to examining specific issues and locations that are of concern to the community of Logan, it is useful to consider the general level of concern and even fear of crime that is experienced by people living in Logan City.

Feelings of Safety

Survey respondents were asked to respond to statements relating to their personal feelings of safety in specific situations. Seven statements concerning feelings of safety from crime were posed to respondents, with responses ranging along a five-point scale from strongly agree to strongly disagree.

Crime in Suburb

Respondents were asked to respond to two statements relating to crime in their own suburb, response format strongly agree to strongly disagree. Two dichotomous questions were asked about crime increases in their suburb, response format yes or no. Two multi part questions were asked regarding areas in their suburb where they feel unsafe, parts of this question were open ended and responses coded by researchers and volunteers supervised by researchers.

Feelings of Safety – All

Feelings of safety varied between the situations described in the survey statements. Respondents reported diminished feelings in most situations asked about in the survey. Respondents reported most diminished feelings of safety *When out alone in their neighbourhood at night* (73% disagreed they felt safe) and when *Using parking lots at night* (75.4% disagreed they felt safe). Respondents were most likely to disagree that they felt *Safe from crime in their own home*, 44.2% of respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed that they felt safe, while 35.7% agreed or strongly agreed that they felt safe. The majority of respondents reported they did not feel safe *when Passing a group of young men on the street* and when at *Shopping Centres at night*. Respondents felt most safe *When travelling to and from work/school alone* and *when out alone in their neighbourhood during the day*. Refer Table

Respondents felt most safe when out alone in their neighbourhood during the day, and when travelling to and from work/school. Respondents felt diminished feelings of safety when using Shopping Centres at night and while out alone in their neighbourhood at night. Of the situations respondents were asked about, respondents felt most unsafe when out alone in their neighbourhood at night and when using parking lots at night. The majority of respondents felt diminished feelings of safety when in their own home, when passing a group of young men on the street and when at shopping centres at night.

Feelings of Safety – Gender

Responses to all questions were examined to detect any differences in the way surveyed males and females responded. Table 2:7 provides the percentage and number of male and female respondents who selected each of the five response options when answering questions in Section One of the survey that related to concern about crime. The majority of all respondents reported they did not feel *Safe from crime in their own home*, with no significant differences between males and females. Males were slightly more likely than females to report they felt safe *When out alone in their neighbourhood during the day*, 61.4% males and 53.6% females agreeing or strongly agreeing that they felt safe from crime when out alone in their neighbourhood during the day, $\chi^2(4) = 12.39$, $p < 0.05$. Significant differences were found between males and females in their responses to the statement; *I feel safe from crime when out alone in my neighbourhood at night*, with females more likely to disagree or strongly disagree that they felt safe from crime in this situation, $\chi^2(4) = 73.61$, $p < 0.001$.

Significant differences were found between males and females in their responses to the statement; *I feel safe from crime at Shopping Centres at night*, females were most likely to disagree that they felt safe, 62.5% of females reported diminished feelings of safety, while 52.3% of males reported in the same manner, $\chi^2(4) = 23.16$, $p < 0.001$. Significant differences were found between males and females in their responses to the statement; *I feel safe when using parking lots at night*, with females more likely to disagree or strongly disagree that they felt safe in this situation, $\chi^2(4) = 60.97$, $p < 0.001$.

Males were slightly more likely to report that they felt safe *When travelling to and from work/school alone*, 65.4% males, 59.3% females agreeing or strongly agreeing that they felt safe in this situation, $\chi^2(4) = 11.68$, $p < 0.05$. Significant differences were found between males and females in their responses to the statement; *I feel safe when passing a group of young men on the street*, with females more likely to disagree or strongly disagree that they felt safe in this situation, $\chi^2(4) = 35.34$, $p < 0.001$.

Males and females reported similar response levels about their safety from crime when in their own home. Females reported diminished feelings of safety (when compared to males) in most situations; when out alone in their neighbourhood during the day, when out alone in their neighbourhood at night, when at shopping centres at night, when using parking lots at night, when travelling to and from work/school alone, and when passing a group of young men on the street. Females were most different from men in their feelings of safety when out alone in their neighbourhood at night and when using parking lots at night.

Table 2:9

Feelings of Safety – Victimization

| | Response Categories | | | | | |
|--|---------------------|-------|--------|----------|-------------------|-------|
| | Strongly Agree | Agree | Unsure | Disagree | Strongly Disagree | Total |

Table 1

| Concern Statement : Section One | % | Count | % | Count |
|--|------|-------|------|-------|------|-------|------|-------|------|-------|-------|-------|
| I feel safe from crime in my own home | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| No Victimisation | 5.4 | 30 | 42.3 | 235 | 20.1 | 112 | 24.3 | 135 | 7.9 | 44 | 100.0 | 556 |
| Property Victimisation | 3.3 | 29 | 28.9 | 254 | 19.8 | 174 | 32.0 | 281 | 16.0 | 141 | 100.0 | 879 |
| Personal/Violent Victimisation | 6.9 | 5 | 20.8 | 15 | 20.8 | 15 | 30.6 | 22 | 20.8 | 15 | 100.0 | 72 |
| Both Victimisation | 2.3 | 5 | 19.9 | 44 | 21.3 | 47 | 35.3 | 78 | 21.3 | 47 | 100.0 | 221 |
| I feel safe from crime when at Shopping Centres at night | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| No Victimisation | 3.5 | 19 | 18.4 | 101 | 25.6 | 141 | 36.0 | 198 | 16.5 | 91 | 100.0 | 550 |
| Property Victimisation | 0.9 | 8 | 18.6 | 161 | 20.5 | 178 | 37.1 | 322 | 22.8 | 198 | 100.0 | 867 |
| Personal/Violent Victimisation | 3.0 | 2 | 16.7 | 11 | 27.3 | 18 | 33.3 | 22 | 19.7 | 13 | 100.0 | 66 |
| Both Victimisation | 1.4 | 3 | 12.3 | 27 | 15.5 | 34 | 44.7 | 98 | 26.0 | 57 | 100.0 | 219 |
| I feel safe when passing a group of young men on the street | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| No Victimisation | 2.4 | 13 | 14.3 | 79 | 32.4 | 179 | 35.3 | 195 | 15.7 | 87 | 100.0 | 553 |
| Property Victimisation | 1.1 | 10 | 11.6 | 102 | 28.8 | 253 | 39.2 | 344 | 19.2 | 169 | 100.0 | 878 |
| Personal/Violent Victimisation | 4.2 | 3 | 15.3 | 11 | 23.6 | 17 | 26.4 | 19 | 30.6 | 22 | 100.0 | 72 |
| Both Victimisation | 1.8 | 4 | 5.0 | 11 | 23.2 | 51 | 43.2 | 95 | 26.8 | 59 | 100.0 | 220 |
| I feel safe when using parking lots at night | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| No Victimisation | 2.7 | 15 | 6.6 | 36 | 21.0 | 115 | 43.6 | 239 | 26.1 | 143 | 100.0 | 548 |
| Property Victimisation | 0.8 | 7 | 7.3 | 64 | 15.0 | 131 | 42.9 | 375 | 34.1 | 298 | 100.0 | 875 |
| Personal/Violent Victimisation | 2.8 | 2 | 7.0 | 5 | 15.5 | 11 | 38.0 | 27 | 36.6 | 26 | 100.0 | 71 |
| Both Victimisation | 1.4 | 3 | 3.7 | 8 | 11.0 | 24 | 42.9 | 94 | 41.1 | 90 | 100.0 | 219 |
| I feel safe when travelling to and from work/school alone | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| No Victimisation | 9.7 | 51 | 55.3 | 290 | 16.6 | 87 | 15.6 | 82 | 2.7 | 14 | 100.0 | 524 |
| Property Victimisation | 8.8 | 74 | 54.3 | 457 | 15.1 | 127 | 16.6 | 140 | 5.1 | 43 | 100.0 | 841 |
| Personal/Violent Victimisation | 13.2 | 9 | 44.1 | 30 | 17.6 | 12 | 19.1 | 13 | 5.9 | 4 | 100.0 | 68 |

Table 1

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----|----|------|-----|------|-----|------|-----|------|-----|-------|-----|
| Both Victimisation | 3.7 | 8 | 40.1 | 87 | 20.3 | 44 | 28.6 | 62 | 7.4 | 16 | 100.0 | 217 |
| I feel safe when out alone in my neighbourhood during the day | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| No Victimisation | 9.3 | 52 | 52.7 | 294 | 17.9 | 100 | 15.6 | 87 | 4.5 | 25 | 100.0 | 558 |
| Property Victimisation | 7.3 | 64 | 48.9 | 429 | 16.9 | 148 | 21.4 | 188 | 5.5 | 48 | 100.0 | 877 |
| Personal/Violent Victimisation | 8.5 | 6 | 43.7 | 31 | 16.9 | 12 | 25.4 | 18 | 5.6 | 4 | 100.0 | 71 |
| Both Victimisation | 5.0 | 11 | 36.2 | 79 | 20.2 | 44 | 29.4 | 64 | 9.2 | 20 | 100.0 | 218 |
| I feel safe when out alone in my neighbourhood at night | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| No Victimisation | 2.9 | 16 | 13.1 | 72 | 16.9 | 93 | 41.3 | 227 | 25.8 | 142 | 100.0 | 550 |
| Property Victimisation | 1.3 | 11 | 8.6 | 75 | 16.3 | 142 | 38.9 | 338 | 34.9 | 303 | 100.0 | 869 |
| Personal/Violent Victimisation | 0.0 | 0 | 5.8 | 4 | 14.5 | 10 | 34.8 | 24 | 44.9 | 31 | 100.0 | 69 |
| Both Victimisation | 1.4 | 3 | 4.1 | 9 | 12.2 | 27 | 36.7 | 81 | 45.7 | 101 | 100.0 | 221 |

Feelings of Safety – Age

Note: Few respondents reported their age in the categories of 12-18 years (0.9%, 14) and over 75 years (1.9%, 31). To enable these respondents to be included in the analysis of age differences, these categories were merged with 19-24 years and 65-74 years respectively. Table 2:8 shows the age categories utilised in the following analyses.

Respondents aged over 65 years were most likely to disagree or strongly disagree that they felt *Safe from crime in their own home*, and least likely to report they were unsure about their feelings of safety in this situation, $\chi^2(20) = 37.84, p < 0.01$. As age increased the likelihood increased that respondents would disagree or strongly disagree that they felt safe *When out alone in their neighbourhood during the day*, $\chi^2(20) = 35.82, p < 0.05$. There were no significant differences between age categories in response to the statement; *I feel safe while out alone in my neighbourhood at night*, most did not.

Young people aged between 12-24 years were most likely (of all age categories) to agree that they felt safe while at *Shopping Centres at night*, while those aged over 65 years were most likely to disagree that they felt safe in this situation, however the majority of all respondents did not feel safe, $\chi^2(20) = 45.93, p < 0.001$. No significant differences were found between age categories in their responses to the statement; *I feel safe when using parking lots at night*, with most agreeing they did not.

Respondents aged over 55 years were most likely to report that they were unsure about their feelings of safety when *Passing a group of young men on the street*, and were least likely to disagree or strongly disagree with the statement; *I feel safe when passing a group of young men on the street*, $\chi^2(20) = 42.09, p < 0.01$. Although the majority of respondents in all age categories agreed or strongly agreed that they felt safe *When travelling to and from work/school alone*, respondents aged over 65 years were most likely (of all age categories) to report they were unsure or disagreed that they felt safe in this situation, $\chi^2(20) = 65.24, p < 0.001$.

Respondents aged over 65 years reported most diminished feelings of safety when in their own home and when at Shopping Centres at night. Respondents aged between 12-24 years reported greater safety feelings than any other age category when at Shopping Centres at night.

Feelings of Safety – Victimisation

Responses to all questions were examined to detect any differences in the way respondents answered in relation to the level of victimisation they reported within the survey. Victimisation was examined in the following way; no victimisation, responded no when asked if victim of property crime and personal/violent crime; property victimisation, responded yes to property crime but no to personal/violent crime; personal/violent victimisation, responded no to property crime but yes to personal/violent crime; both victimisation, responded yes to property crime and yes to personal/violent crime. For the purposes of comparison personal/violent crime is considered as a higher level of victimisation than is property crime.

Significant differences were found between levels of victimisation and feelings of safety in response to almost all of the statements in Section One of the survey. as victimisation levels increased feelings of safety in the respondents own home decreased. 22.1% of respondents who reported both victimisation agreed or strongly agreed that they felt *Safe from crime in their own home*, while 47.7% of respondents who reported no victimisation responded in the same way, $\chi^2(12)=78.04$, $p<0.001$. See Table 2:9. as victimisation levels increased, feelings of safety *When out alone in their neighbourhood during the day*, decreased. 41.2% of respondents who reported both victimisation agreed or strongly agreed that they felt safe in this situation, while 62% of respondents who reported no victimisation responded in the same way, $\chi^2(12)=36.54$, $p<0.001$. as victimisation levels increased, feelings of safety *When out alone in their neighbourhood at night*, decreased. 82.4% of respondents who reported both victimisation disagreed or strongly disagreed that they felt safe in this situation, while 67.1% of respondents who reported no victimisation responded in the same way, $\chi^2(12)=49.21$, $p<0.001$.

Significant differences were found between levels of victimisation and reported levels of 'safety feelings' when at *Shopping Centres at night*, victims of property crime (either alone or both) were more likely (than all other categories) to disagree or strongly disagree that they felt safe in this situation, $\chi^2(12) = 38.54$, $p<0.001$. Significant differences were found between levels of victimisation and reported levels of 'safety feelings' in respondents answers to the statement; *I feel safe when using parking lots at night*. Significant differences were found between levels of victimisation and reported levels of 'safety feelings' when using parking lots at night, victims of property crime (either alone or both) were more likely (than all other categories) to disagree or strongly disagree that they felt safe in this situation, $\chi^2(12) = 38.54$, $p<0.001$.

As victimisation levels increased the likelihood that respondents would agree that they felt safe *When travelling to and from work/school alone*, decreased. 65% of respondents who reported no victimisation agreed they felt safe while 43.8% of respondents who reported both victimisation responded in the same manner, $\chi^2(12) = 46.62$, $p<0.001$. As victimisation levels increased the likelihood that respondents would disagree that they felt safe when *Passing a group of young men on the street*, increased. 51% of respondents who reported no victimisation disagreed they felt safe while 70% of respondents who reported both victimisation responded in the same manner, $\chi^2(12) = 43.30$, $p<0.001$.

Respondents reported that they had experienced any victimisation felt diminished levels of safety (when compared to respondents who reported no victimisation); when in their own home, when out alone in their neighbourhood during the day, when out alone in their neighbourhood at night, when at shopping centres at night, when using parking lots at night, when travelling to and from/work school alone, and when passing a group of young men on the street. Respondents who reported victimisation reported greatest diminished feelings of safety (when compared to respondents who reported no victimisation) when in their own home. Respondents who reported different types of victimisation (property or personal/violent) responded differently to specific situations.

Feelings of Safety – Household Type

Respondents in share accommodation were most likely to report diminished feelings of safety in response to the statement; *I feel safe from crime in my own home*, $\chi^2(20) = 39.62$, $p<0.01$. No significant differences were found between the reported type of household and feelings of safety *When out alone in their neighbourhood during the day*. One parent with children was slightly more likely to report diminished feelings of safety *When out alone in their neighbourhood at night*, $\chi^2(20) = 32.86$, $p<0.05$.

No significant differences were found between household type and feelings of safety while at *Shopping Centres at night*. No significant differences were found between the reported type of household and feelings of safety when *Using parking lots at night*.

No significant differences were found between the reported type of household and feelings of safety *When travelling to and from work/school alone*. No significant differences were found between the reported type of household and feelings of safety when *Passing a group of young men on the street*.

Household type had a limited effect on feelings of safety in specific situations. Those living in share accommodation felt safest (of all household types) when out alone in their neighbourhood during the day, and when at Shopping Centres at night. A parent with children felt diminished feelings of safety in both of these situations.

Feelings of Safety – Time Lived in Suburb

No significant differences were found between the time lived in current suburb and feelings of safety in the home. No significant differences were found between the reported length of suburb residency and feelings of safety when out alone in their neighbourhood during the day or at night.

No significant differences were found between the reported length of suburb residency and feelings of safety using Shopping Centres or parking lots at night.

No significant differences were found between the reported length of suburb residency and feelings of safety when passing a group of young men on the street. No significant differences were found between the reported length of suburb residency and feelings of safety when travelling to and from work/school alone.

Time lived in suburb had no effect on respondents' feelings of safety in any of the situations asked about in Section One of the survey.

Crime in Suburb – All

58.5% of the total respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement; *Crime is a problem in my suburb*, while 16.8% disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. 40.7% of the total respondents agreed or strongly agreed that *Crime has a negative effect on the lifestyle of people in my suburb*, while 18.4% disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. 79% of respondents said 'yes' when asked the question; *Do you believe that property crime has increased in your suburb in the last three (3) years*, while 57.5% said 'yes' when asked the question; *Do you believe that personal/violent crime has increased in your suburb in the last three (3) years*.

Respondents were also asked if there were areas in their suburb where they did not feel safe during the day followed by a question relating to areas at night. 31.1% of respondents reported that there *Were areas within their suburb where they did not feel safe during the day* and 70.2% reported areas *Where they did not feel safe at night*. The 'other' category was extensively used for responses regarding specific areas where people felt unsafe and their reasons for feeling unsafe. Of the categories that were defined, respondents most commonly nominated local parks (20.6% day, 17.4% night), specific streets (11.6% day, 11.2% night), and entertainment venues or Shopping Centres (19.6% day, 19.4% night). The most common defined reasons respondents gave for feeling unsafe were that they felt unsafe around people who frequent that place (36.7% day, 39.7% night), reputation for being dangerous (14.6% day, 12.2% night) and poor lighting or poor design (20.3% night). Responses were coded as 'felt unsafe around people who frequent that place' if they referred to a specific group of people or a specific type of behaviour by people. Responses were coded as 'poor lighting, poor design' if they referred to lighting, pathways, isolation from open public view (obstructed by buildings or vegetation). More detail regarding respondent's answers to these questions is provided in the Suburbs section, as these questions specifically referred to areas in the respondent's own suburb.

Respondents tended to agree that crime was a problem (in their suburb) and had a negative effect on the lifestyle of people in their suburb. Respondents were more likely to report beliefs that property crime had increased in their suburb, rather than personal violent crime, however, most respondents believed that both crimes had increased.

The majority of respondents reported there were no areas in their suburb where they felt unsafe during the day, while the majority of respondents reported there were areas in their suburb where they felt unsafe at night. The areas where people felt unsafe were similar for both day and night, local parks generated most safety concern, followed by specific streets, and entertainment and shopping venues. Concern about safety during the day was often for reported reasons 'felt unsafe around people who frequent that place', while concern about safety at night was often reasons such as 'felt unsafe around people who frequent that place' and 'poor lighting, poor design'.

Crime in Suburb – Gender

There were no significant differences between males and females in their belief that *crime was a problem in their suburb, affected lifestyle, or had increased*.

Respondents were also asked if there were areas in their suburb where they did not feel safe during the day followed by a question relating to areas at night.

No significant differences were found between males and females when asked if there *Were areas in their suburb where they did not feel safe during the day*. There were no significant differences between males and females in the specific areas they nominated or in the reasons given for feeling unsafe. Females were more likely to report that there *Were areas in their suburb where they did not feel safe at night*, 64.1% of males and 74.3% of females reported that there were areas in their suburb where they felt unsafe at night. There were no significant differences between males and females in the specific areas they nominated or in the reasons given for feeling unsafe.

Respondents gender had no effect on beliefs that crime was a problem in their suburb, but males were more likely to agree that crime had a negative effect on lifestyle in their suburb, while females were unsure. Respondents gender had no effect on their beliefs regarding increases (in their suburb) of property crime or personal/violent crime.

Gender had no effect on respondents safety concerns regarding specific areas in their suburb during the day or at night. Gender had no effect on respondent's reasons for feeling unsafe either during the day or at night.

Crime in Suburb – Age

Significant differences were found between age categories in their response to the statement; *Crime is a problem in my suburb*, as age increased respondents became more definite in their responses, either in agreement or disagreement, $\chi^2 (20) 35.51=0.05$. No significant differences were found between age categories in their responses to the statement; *Crime has a negative effect on the lifestyle of people in my suburb*.

No significant differences were found between age categories in their responses to the question; *Do you believe that property crime has increased in your suburb in the last three (3) years*. No significant differences were found between age categories in their responses to the question; *Do you believe that personal/violent crime has increased in your suburb in the last three (3) years*.

Respondents were also asked if there were areas in their suburb where they did not feel safe during the day followed by a question relating to areas at night.

No significant differences were found between age categories in the responses when asked if there *Were areas in their suburb where they did not feel safe during the day*, in the specific areas nominated, or in the reasons given for feeling unsafe.

Significant differences were found between age categories when asked if there *Were areas in their suburb where they did not feel safe at night*, respondents aged between 25-54 years were most likely to report areas where they felt unsafe, $\chi^2 (20) 14.53=0.05$.

No significant differences were found between age categories in the places in their suburb where they nominated as feeling unsafe at night, respondents aged 12-24 years were less likely (than all other age categories) to report local parks as an area where they felt unsafe. There were no significant differences between age categories in the reasons given for feeling unsafe.

Beliefs about crime being a problem in their suburb and having a negative effect on lifestyle in their suburb become firmer (either agreement or disagreement) as respondents age increased. Respondent's age had no effect on beliefs about property and personal/violent crime increases in their suburb in the last three (3) years.

Crime in Suburb – Victimisation

Significant differences were found between levels of victimisation and responses to the statement; *Crime is a problem in my suburb*. Respondents who reported property victimisation (alone or both) were most likely to agree or strongly agree, and as victimisation level increased respondents became more definite in their beliefs, $\chi^2(12) =101.37, p<0.001$. No significant differences were found between levels of victimisation and responses to the statement; *Crime has a negative effect on the lifestyle of people in my suburb*.

Respondents were asked if they believed that property crime and personal/violent crime had increased in their suburb in the last three (3) years. Significant differences were found between reported levels of victimisation and responses to these questions. Respondents who reported property victimisation (alone or both) were most likely to say 'yes' when asked the question; *Do you believe that property crime has increased in your suburb in the last three (3) years*, although the majority of all respondents held this belief, $\chi^2 (3) = 44.78$, $p<0.001$. When asked about personal/violent crime, respondents who reported personal/violent victimisation (alone or both) were most likely to say 'yes' when asked the question; *Do you believe that personal/violent crime has increased in your suburb in the last three (3) years*, $\chi^2 (3) = 55.77$, $p<0.001$.

Significant differences were found between victimisation levels when respondents were asked if there *Were areas in their suburb where they did not feel safe during the day*, respondents who reported both victimisation (48.8%) were most likely to report that there were such areas in their suburb, while respondents who reported no victimisation (20.8%) were least likely to respond in the same manner, $\chi^2 (3) = 30.28$, $p<0.001$. No significant differences were found between victimisation levels and the specific areas where respondents felt unsafe, or for the reasons given for feeling unsafe, that is respondents reported similar areas and similar reasons regardless of the reported victimisation level.

Significant differences were found between reported victimisation levels when asked if there *Were areas in their suburb where they did not feel safe at night*, respondents who reported both victimisation (84.3%) were most likely to report that there were such areas in their suburb, while respondents who reported no victimisation (57.2%) were least likely to respond in the same manner, $\chi^2 (3) = 62.58$, $p<0.001$.

Respondents who reported any victimisation (as compared to no victimisation) more often believed that crime was a problem in their suburb, with property crime victimisation appearing to have most affect on this belief. Victimization also affected beliefs about crime increases in their suburb; property crime victimisation most affecting belief about property crime increases, and personal/violent victimisation most affecting belief about personal/violent crime increases.

Degree of victimisation appeared to have most effect on increased reporting of areas in their suburb where respondents felt unsafe during the day. Reported victimisation levels had no effect on areas where respondents felt unsafe, or on the reasons they felt unsafe. Personal/violent victimisation appeared to have most affect on increased reporting of areas in their suburb where respondents felt unsafe at night. Respondents who reported personal/violent victimisation also reported most diverse areas where they felt unsafe than did respondents who reported no personal/violent victimisation. Reported victimisation levels had no effect on reasons for feeling unsafe in the nominated areas at night.

Crime in Suburb – Household Type

Significant differences were found between the type of household and responses to the statement; *Crime is a problem in my suburb*. Couples and those living in share accommodation were most likely to agree or strongly agree that crime was problematic, $\chi^2 (20) = 43.55, p < 0.01$. No significant differences were found between household type and responses to the statement; *Crime has a negative effect on the lifestyle of people in my suburb*.

No significant differences were found between the type of household and beliefs that *property crime had increased in their suburb in the last three (3) years*. Respondents living in share accommodation were most likely to say 'yes' when asked the question; *Do you believe that personal/violent crime has increased in your suburb in the last three (3) years*, $\chi^2 (5) = 19.32, p < 0.01$.

No significant differences were found between the type of household and responses when asked if they *Were areas in their suburb where respondents did not feel safe during the day or at night*, nomination of specific areas, or reasons for feeling unsafe.

Couples and those in share accommodation were least likely to indicate that crime was problematic in their suburb or that it had a negative impact on lifestyle. Respondents living in share accommodation were also most likely to indicate they believed that personal/violent crime had increased in their suburb in the last three (3) years.

Crime in Suburb – Time Lived in Suburb

Significant differences were found between the time lived in a current suburb and responses to the statement; *Crime is a problem in my suburb*. As length of residency increased so did the likelihood that respondents would agree or strongly agree with the statement, $\chi^2 (12) = 33.33, p < 0.001$. No significant differences were found between the time lived in current suburb and responses to the statement; *Crime has a negative effect on the lifestyle of people in my suburb*.

No significant differences were found between the time lived in current suburb and belief that *property crime had increased in their suburb in the last three (3) years*. Significant differences were found between length of residency and responses when asked if personal/violent crime had increased in their suburb in the last three (3) years. Respondents who reported living in their suburb for less than one year and those who reported living in their suburb for more than five years were most likely to say 'yes' when asked the question; *Do you believe that personal/violent crime has increased in your suburb in the last three (3) years*.

No significant differences were found between the time lived in current suburb and responses when asked if there *Were areas in their suburb where respondents did not feel safe during the day or at night*, nomination of specific areas where people felt unsafe or the reasons they gave for feeling unsafe.

The longer a respondent had lived in a suburb the more likely they were to indicate that crime was problematic in their suburb.

Attitudes toward Crime

Surveys that examine community attitudes regarding crime issues typically look at attitudes that may be held by respondents; particularly attitudes that may not be supported by

reported evidence such as police statistics. As attitudes towards crime was not the primary focus of this research, the crime attitude questions were limited to those asking directly about groups of people generally of heightened concern to the community when crime is discussed, young people and the elderly.

Attitudes toward Crime

Survey respondents were asked to respond to several statements relating to offender and victim issues. Four statements concerning attitudes towards crime were posed to respondents, with responses ranging along a five-point scale from strongly agree to strongly disagree.

Attitude towards Crime – All

43% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that; *It is young people (under 24 years) who commit most crime*, and only 11.6% agreed or strongly agreed that; *Young people (under 24 years) are more likely than others to be the victims of crime*. The majority of respondents (63.6%) agreed or strongly agreed that; *Young people make a positive contribution to the community*.

61.8% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that; *Elderly people are more likely than others to be victims of crime*.

The majority of respondents believed that young people are more likely to commit crime than they are to be victims of crime. Most respondents agreed that young people make a positive contribution to the community. The majority of respondents believed that elderly people are most likely to be victims of crime.

Attitudes toward Crime – Gender

There were significant differences between males and females in response to the statement; *It is young people (under 24 years) who commit the most crime*, with females tending to disagree more often than males. 46.8% of males and 40% of females agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, while 16.5% of males and 24.4% of females disagreed or strongly disagreed, $\chi^2(4)=14.85$, $p<0.01$. There were no significant differences between males and females in response to the statement; *Young people (under 24 years) are more likely than others to be the victims of crime*.

Significant differences were found between males and females in response to the statement; *I believe that young people make a positive contribution to the Community*. Females were more likely to agree or strongly agree with the statement (60.4% males, 65.9% females), $\chi^2(4)=10.24$, $p<0.01$.

Significant differences were found between males and females in response to the statement; *Elderly people are more likely than others to be the victims of crime*. Although the majority of both males and females agreed with the statement, males were more likely than females to report they were unsure (21.9% males, 17.9% females) and females were more likely than males to disagree (15% males, 21.8% females), $\chi^2(4)=14.99$, $p<0.01$.

Males reported greater belief that young people commit most crime. Gender had no effect on respondent's belief that young people are more likely than others to be victims of crime, few agreed. Females were most likely to agree that young people make a positive contribution to the community.

Females were more likely to disagree that elderly people were more likely than others to be the victims of crime.

Attitude towards Crime – Age

There were no significant differences between age categories in response to the statement; *It is young people (under 24 years) who commit the most crime*. Significant differences were found between age categories in response to the statement; *Young people (under 24 years) are more likely than others to be the victims of crime*, while most respondents either disagreed or were unsure, of all age categories respondents aged over 65 years were most likely to agree that young people were more likely than others to be a victim of crime, $\chi^2(20)=36.10$, $p<0.05$. No significant differences were found between age categories in response to the statement; *I believe that young people make a positive contribution to the Community*.

No significant differences were found between age categories in response to the statement; *Elderly people are more likely than others to be the victims of crime*.

Respondents aged over 65 years were most likely to agree that young people were least likely to believe that young people are more likely than others to be the victims of crime.

Attitude towards Crime – Victimization

There were no significant differences between reported levels of victimisation and responses to the statement; *It is young people (under 24 years) who commit the most crime*. Significant differences were found between reported levels of victimisation and responses to the statement; *Young people (under 24 years) are more likely than others to be the victims of crime*. Whilst a large percentage of all respondents tended to report they were 'unsure' in response to this question, respondents who reported no victimisation were most unsure (39.8%), $\chi^2(12)=24.53$, $p<0.05$. As victimisation level increased respondents were more likely to disagree that; *I believe that young people make a positive contribution to the Community*, $\chi^2(12)=24.99$, $p<0.05$. As victimisation levels increased respondents were more likely to disagree that; *Elderly people are more likely than others to be the victims of crime*, $\chi^2(12)=24.44$, $p<0.05$.

As victimisation increased respondents became more decisive (in agreement or disagreement) in their beliefs that young people commit most crime, became more likely to disagree that young people make a positive contribution to the community, and became more likely to disagree that elderly people are more likely (than others) to be the victims of crime.

Respondents with children were more likely to agree that young people make a positive contribution to the community and less likely to agree that elderly people are more likely than others to be the victims of crime.

Attitudes towards Crime – Household Type

No significant differences were found between the type of household and responses made to the statement; *It is young people (under 24 years) who commit most crime*. No significant differences were found between household type and responses to the statement; *Young people are more likely than others to be the victims of crime*. Couples with children were most likely to agree that *young people make a positive contribution to the community*, while a couple was least likely to agree with this statement, $\chi^2(20)=40.64$, $p<0.01$.

Couples with children and a parent with children were least likely to agree that *elderly people are more likely than others to be the victims of crime*, $\chi^2(20)=42.34$, $p<0.01$.

Attitudes towards Crime – Time Lived in Suburb

Significant differences were found between the time lived in current suburb and responses to the statement; *It is young people (under 24 years) who commit most crime*. Respondents who reported living in their suburb for less than one year were least likely to agree that young people commit most crime (29.8%), $\chi^2 (12) = 32.22, p < 0.001$. No significant differences were found between the time lived in current suburb and responses to the statement; *Young people (under 24 years) are more likely than others to be the victims of crime*. No significant differences were found between the time lived in current suburb and responses to the statement; *I believe that young people make a positive contribution to the Community*.

People who had lived in their suburb for less than one year were also least likely to agree *that elderly people are more likely than others to be the victims of crime* (50.3%) while people who had lived in their suburb for more than five years were most likely to agree with the statement (65.5%), $\chi^2 (12) = 35.25, p < 0.001$.

Length of residency in a suburb had a limited affect on attitudes towards crime within the survey. New residents (less than one year) were more likely to disagree that young people commit most crime and least likely to agree that elderly people are more likely than others to be the victims of crime. Long term residents (more than five years) were most likely to agree that elderly people are more likely to be the victims of crime.

Table 2:10**Attitudes towards Crime Prevention - All**

| | Response Categories | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---------------------|-------|-------|-------|--------|-------|----------|-------|-------------------|-------|-------|-------|
| | Strongly Agree | | Agree | | Unsure | | Disagree | | Strongly Disagree | | Total | |
| Crime Prevention Statements : Section One | % | Count | % | Count | % | Count | % | Count | % | Count | % | Count |
| The Community (with Police/Government support) can be an effective force in preventing crime | 1.9 | 32 | 17.6 | 300 | 21.8 | 371 | 37.6 | 640 | 21.1 | 359 | 100.0 | 1702 |
| Effective community programs that tackle crime issues would benefit my suburb | 22.7 | 390 | 55.3 | 951 | 18.0 | 309 | 2.6 | 45 | 1.4 | 24 | 100.0 | 1719 |
| Police alone cannot prevent crime in the community | 38.6 | 667 | 53.7 | 928 | 2.8 | 49 | 2.7 | 47 | 2.1 | 36 | 100.0 | 1727 |
| The Police are doing a good job tackling crime in the Community | 4.5 | 78 | 28.7 | 494 | 30.2 | 520 | 25.5 | 439 | 11.0 | 190 | 100.0 | 1721 |

Table 1

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|------|-----|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|----|-----|----|-------|------|
| Crime Prevention programs should target the underlying social causes of crime (unemployment, poverty, isolation, etc) | 44.7 | 772 | 41.2 | 712 | 8.5 | 146 | 3.9 | 68 | 1.7 | 29 | 100.0 | 1727 |
|---|------|-----|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|----|-----|----|-------|------|

Table 2:11

Attitudes towards Crime Prevention - Gender

| Merged Response Categories | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------|-------|--------|-------|--------|-------|--------|-------|-------------------------------|-------|--------|-------|-------|-------|--------|-------|
| | Agree or Strongly Agree | | | | Unsure | | | | Disagree or Strongly Disagree | | | | Total | | | |
| | Male | | Female | | Male | | Female | | Male | | Female | | Male | | Female | |
| Crime Prevention Statements : Section One | % | Count | % | Count | % | Count | % | Count | % | Count | % | Count | % | Count | % | Count |
| The Community (with Police/Government support) can be an effective force in preventing crime | 24.4 | 155 | 17.7 | 171 | 23.2 | 147 | 19.9 | 193 | 52.3 | 332 | 62.5 | 607 | 100.0 | 634 | 100.0 | 971 |
| Effective community programs that tackle crime issues would benefit my suburb | 78.1 | 503 | 77.6 | 756 | 17.2 | 111 | 18.8 | 183 | 4.6 | 30 | 3.7 | 36 | 100.0 | 644 | 100.0 | 975 |
| Police alone cannot prevent crime in the community | 91.6 | 593 | 92.7 | 907 | 3.1 | 20 | 2.8 | 27 | 5.2 | 34 | 4.6 | 45 | 100.0 | 647 | 100.0 | 979 |
| The Police are doing a good job tackling crime in the Community | 33.1 | 213 | 32.5 | 317 | 27.3 | 176 | 32.7 | 319 | 39.6 | 255 | 34.8 | 340 | 100.0 | 644 | 100.0 | 976 |
| Crime Prevention programs should target the underlying social causes of crime (unemployment, poverty, isolation, etc) | 85.2 | 550 | 86.2 | 846 | 7.9 | 51 | 8.9 | 87 | 7.0 | 45 | 4.9 | 48 | 100.0 | 646 | 100.0 | 981 |

Crime Prevention

It is considered that the community with appropriate levels of support, in terms of effective program design, resourcing and training can be effective, and are in fact necessary, for crime prevention to reach optimum levels of effectiveness. Community involvement in crime prevention can and should run the gamut of involvement levels, from reporting crime via services such as Crime Stoppers, to attending Neighbourhood Watch meetings, through to active involvement in social programs that seek to prevent crime by addressing causal factors.

Attitudes towards Crime Prevention

Survey respondents were asked to respond to statements relating to attitudes toward crime prevention, specifically the role of the community and the police. Five statements concerning attitudes towards crime prevention were posed to respondents, with responses ranging along a five-point scale from strongly agree to strongly disagree.

Crime Prevention Programs

Respondents were asked one question regarding crime prevention programs/services/facilities they would like introduced in their suburb. Ten (10) program concepts were listed and an 'other' category was provided, multiple selections were allowed.

Safety Strategies undertaken in the last year

Respondents were asked one question regarding strategies they had undertaken in the last year to improve their or their family's safety. Thirteen (13) safety measures were listed and an 'other' category was provided, multiple selections were allowed.

Attitude toward Crime Prevention – All

-

The need for community involvement in crime prevention was supported by the responses made to statements directly targeted at community based crime prevention. 86% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that *the community can be an effective force in crime prevention*, and 72.1% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that *effective community programs that tackle crime issues would benefit their suburb*. In relation to crime prevention programs, 83.8% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that *crime prevention programs should target the underlying social causes of crime*. Refer Table 2:10.

47.3% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that *Police are doing a good job tackling crime in the Community*, while 30.8% were unsure, and 21.9% disagreed or strongly disagreed with this statement, however respondents unequivocally supported the statement; *Police alone cannot prevent crime in the community*, with 93.6% of respondents agreeing or strongly agreeing with this statement.

The majority of respondents agreed that crime prevention programs should target the underlying causes of crime and that effective crime prevention programs would benefit their suburb, and that the community can be an effective force in crime prevention. Respondents were more unsure as to whether police are doing a good job tackling crime in the community, however, nearly all respondents agreed that police alone cannot prevent crime.

Attitude toward Crime Prevention – Gender

Table 2:11 shows the frequency with which males and females selected each of the available response categories. No significant differences were found between males and females

Table 1

in their responses to the statement; *The Community (with Police/Government support) can be an effective force in preventing crime*. No significant differences were found between males and females in response to the statement; *Effective community programs that tackle crime issues would benefit my suburb*. No significant differences were also found between males and females in response to the statement; *Crime prevention programs should target the underlying social causes of crime (unemployment, poverty, isolation, etc)*.

No significant differences were found between males and females in response to the statement *Police alone cannot prevent crime in the community*. Significant differences were also found between males and females in their responses to the statement; *Police are doing a good job tackling crime in the Community*, females were more likely (than males) to agree or strongly agree (43.7% males, 48.8% females), while males were more likely (than females) to disagree or strongly disagree with the statement (27.3% males, 18.5% females), $\chi^2(4)=25.70, p<0.001$.

-
Males were more likely (than females) to disagree that police are doing a good job tackling crime in the community.

-
Attitude toward Crime Prevention – Age

-
Significant differences were found between age categories in response to the statement; *The Community (with Police/Government support) can be an effective force in preventing crime*, although the majority of respondents agreed with the statement, young people (12-24) were most likely to report they were unsure, 18% reported in this manner compared to an average 9.3% of all other respondents who reported they were unsure, $\chi^2(20)= 33.18, p<0.05$. As age increased so did the likelihood that respondents would agree with the statement; *Effective community programs that tackle crime issues would benefit my suburb*, 59% of young people (12-24) agreed with the statement, while 77.4% of respondents aged over 65 years responded in the same manner, $\chi^2(20)= 42.80, p<0.01$. No significant differences were found between age categories in response to the statement; *Crime prevention programs should target the underlying social causes of crime (unemployment, poverty, isolation, etc)*.

Significant differences were found between age categories in response to the statement; *Police are doing a good job tackling crime in the Community*, 29% of young people (12-24) agreed with the statement, while 66% of respondents aged over 65 years responded in the same manner, $\chi^2(20)= 51.86, p<0.001$. As age increased so did the likelihood that respondents would agree with the statement; *Police alone cannot prevent crime in the community*, 80.6% of young people (12-24) agreed with the statement, while 95% of respondents aged over 65 years responded in the same manner, $\chi^2(20)= 51.86, p<0.001$.

As age increased so too did the likelihood that respondents would agree that; The Community (with Police/Government support) can be an effective force in preventing crime; Effective community programs that tackle crime issues would benefit my suburb; Police are doing a good job tackling crime in the Community; and that Police alone cannot prevent crime in the community.

Attitude toward Crime Prevention – Victimization

-
Significant differences were found between reported levels of victimisation and responses to the statement; *The Community (with Police/Government support) can be an effective force in preventing crime*. As victimisation levels increased the likelihood that respondents would agree with the statement decreased, $\chi^2(12)=22.11, p<0.05$. Significant differences were found between reported levels of victimisation and responses to the statement; *Effective community programs that tackle crime issues would benefit my suburb*; respondents who reported personal/violent victimisation (alone or both) were least likely to agree with the statement, $\chi^2(12)=21.79, p<0.05$. No significant differences were found between victimisation levels and responses to the statement; *Crime prevention programs should tackle the underlying causes of crime (unemployment, poverty, isolation, etc)*.

As victimisation levels increased the likelihood that respondents would agree that *the Police are doing a good job tackling crime in the community* decreased, 56.3% of respondents who reported no victimisation agreed with the statement, while 30.9% of respondents who reported both victimisation agreed, $\chi^2(12)=54.91, p<0.001$. Respondents who reported both victimisation were most likely (of all victimisation categories) to disagree that *Police alone cannot prevent crime in the community*, $\chi^2(12)=26.68, p<0.01$.

Respondents who reported personal/violent victimisation were least likely to agree that; Effective community programs would benefit my suburb. Respondents who reported both property and personal/violent victimisation were least likely to agree that; Police alone cannot prevent crime in the community. As victimisation increased respondents became more likely to disagree that; Police are doing a good job tackling crime in the community.

Attitude toward Crime Prevention – Household Type

No significant differences were found between the type of household in response to the statement; *The Community (with Police/Government support) can be an effective force in preventing crime*. No significant differences were found between the type of household in response to the statement; *Effective community programs that tackle crime issues would benefit my suburb*. No significant differences were found between the type of household in response to the statement; *Crime prevention programs should target the underlying social causes of crime (unemployment, poverty, isolation, etc)*.

Significant differences were found between household type and responses to the statement; *Police are doing a good job tackling crime in the Community*, those living in share accommodation were least likely to agree with the statement, $\chi^2(20)=33.83$, $p<0.05$. No significant differences were found between the type of household in response to the statements; *Police alone cannot prevent crime in the Community*.

Respondents living in share accommodation were least likely to agree that; Police are doing a good job tackling crime in the community.

Attitudes towards Crime Prevention – Time Lived in Suburb

No significant differences were found between the time lived in suburb and responses to the statement; *The Community (with Police/Government support) can be an effective force in preventing crime*. No significant differences were found between the time lived in suburb and responses to the statement; *Effective community programs that tackle crime issues would benefit my suburb*. No significant differences were found between the time lived in suburb and responses made to the statement; *Crime prevention programs should target the underlying social causes of crime (unemployment, poverty, isolation, etc)*.

No significant differences were found between the time lived in suburb and responses made to the statement; *Police are doing a good job tackling crime in the community*. As time lived in suburb increased the likelihood that respondents would agree that *Police alone cannot prevent crime*, also slightly increased, $\chi^2(12)=31.58$, $p<0.01$.

Time lived in suburb had no effect on responses to the crime prevention statements.

Crime Prevention Programs – All

Respondents were also asked about specific programs that they would like to see introduced in their suburb. The question asked did not presume respondents had any prior knowledge of crime prevention programs already existing in their suburb and did not utilise currently existing programs, either by concept or by name. Respondents were able to select as many programs/services/facilities as they would like to see introduced in their suburb, and were also provided with an 'Other' section. The low percentage of people who chose to select the 'other' category (5.8%), indicates that respondents were satisfied with the options provided to them in the question. Refer Table 2:12.

The most commonly selected service that respondents selected for introduction in their suburb was foot/bike patrols by police and was supported by comments made by respondents

that they felt the mere presence of Police on patrol was desirable both in terms of crime prevention and in increased feelings of safety for residents. The second most commonly selected program was safety checks for older neighbours. The third and fourth selected programs were targeted at young people and support the general thrust of many responses and comments made by respondents throughout the survey. Lighting, paths etc was the fifth most commonly selected program. The sixth most selected programs was support networks for those living alone.

Foot/bike patrols by police was commonly selected as well as programs for youth. A need for greater personal contact and improved visibility of police was commonly expressed through unsolicited statements in the survey. Programs that targeted young people were strongly supported in responses and further supported by the general thrust of many responses and comments made by respondents throughout the survey. A general widespread level of concern was expressed over the perceived lack of concerted effort being directed both at providing some young people with necessary citizenship skills and ensuring that all young people are involved and have access to positive activities that will have effectiveness in crime prevention outcomes.

Programs that supported individual members of the community (older people and those living alone) were also strongly supported as programs for introduction in their suburb.

Crime Prevention Programs – Gender

Significant differences were found between males and females in the selection of programs/services/facilities they would like to see introduced in their suburb. Females were more likely than males to select *After school activities for youth*, $\chi^2(1)=16.27$, $p<0.001$. Females were more likely than males to select *School based crime prevention programs*, $\chi^2(1)=11.1$, $p<0.001$. Females were more likely to select *Safety checks for older neighbours*, $\chi^2(1)=7.74$, $p<0.01$. Females were more likely to select *Support services for families*, $\chi^2(1)=19.12$, $p<0.05$. Females were more likely to select *Support networks for those living alone*, $\chi^2(1)=19.19$, $p<0.001$. Females were also more likely to select *Facilities such as lighting, paths etc*, $\chi^2(1)=19.53$, $p<0.001$. Refer Table 2:13.

Males were slightly more likely than females to select *Foot/bike patrols by police*, $\chi^2(1)=6.3$, $p<0.5$. Refer Table 2:13.

As initial examination revealed a number of significant differences between males and females in the way they responded to the question regarding crime prevention programs they would like to see in their suburbs, further examination was conducted to examine further differences that may exist. No significant differences were found between males and females in the number of programs they selected as ones they would like to see introduced in their suburb, both males and females most commonly selected between two (2) and four (4) programs/services/facilities. When the programs were ranked according to their popularity in terms of selection (1 being the most popular, 11 being the least popular) the similarity between males and females in their responses to this question was easily discernable. Refer Table 2:14.

Although the overall selection of crime prevention programs was similar between genders, females were generally more likely (than males) to support relationship oriented programs, while males were generally more likely to support action based programs. Females were also slightly more likely to select lighting, paths, etc.

Table 2:12

Crime Prevention Programs selected for introduction - All

Table 1

| Crime Prevention Program/Service/Facility | % of Respondents who would like Program introduced |
|---|--|
| After school activities for youth (12-18 years) | 55.0 |
| Safety checks for older neighbours | 62.2 |
| Support services for families | 28.1 |
| Support networks for those living alone | 46.2 |
| Programs for increased communication between neighbours | 41.3 |
| Neighbourhood graffiti clean-ups | 42.2 |
| Foot/Bike patrols by Police | 63.3 |
| Facility for Community development programs | 23.4 |
| School based crime prevention programs | 57.7 |
| Facilities such as lighting, paths, etc. | 54.8 |
| Other | 8.6 |

Table 2:13**Crime Prevention Programs selected for introduction - Gender**

| | Selected by Respondent | Not selected by Respondent |
|--|------------------------|----------------------------|
| | | |

Table 1

| Crime Prevention Program/Service/Facility : Section Three | Male | | Female | | Male | | Female | |
|--|------|-------|--------|-------|------|-------|--------|-------|
| | % | Count | % | Count | % | Count | % | Count |
| After school activities for youth (12-18 years) | 49.8 | 324 | 60.0 | 593 | 50.2 | 326 | 40.0 | 396 |
| Safety checks for older neighbours | 58.0 | 377 | 64.8 | 641 | 42.0 | 273 | 35.2 | 348 |
| Support services for families | 22.3 | 145 | 32.3 | 319 | 77.7 | 505 | 67.7 | 670 |
| Support networks for those living alone | 39.2 | 255 | 50.3 | 497 | 60.8 | 395 | 49.7 | 492 |
| Programs for increased communication between neighbours | 40.5 | 263 | 42.5 | 420 | 59.5 | 387 | 57.5 | 569 |
| Neighbourhood graffiti clean-ups | 42.0 | 273 | 42.9 | 424 | 58.0 | 377 | 57.1 | 565 |
| Foot/Bike patrols by Police | 67.1 | 436 | 61.0 | 603 | 32.9 | 214 | 39.0 | 386 |
| Facility for Community development programs | 22.5 | 146 | 23.9 | 236 | 77.5 | 504 | 76.1 | 753 |
| School based crime prevention programs | 53.4 | 347 | 61.7 | 610 | 46.6 | 303 | 38.3 | 379 |
| Facilities such as lighting, paths, etc. | 48.8 | 317 | 59.9 | 592 | 51.2 | 333 | 40.1 | 397 |
| Other | 10.0 | 65 | 7.9 | 78 | 90.0 | 585 | 92.1 | 911 |

Table 2:14

Crime Prevention Programs ranked by Popularity - Gender

| Crime Prevention Program/Service/Facility : Section Three | Popularity Ranking | |
|---|--------------------|--------|
| | Male | Female |
| After school activities for youth (12-18 years) | 4 | 4 |
| Safety checks for older neighbours | 2 | 1 |
| Support services for families | 10 | 9 |

Table 1

| | | |
|---|----|----|
| Support networks for those living alone | 8 | 6 |
| Programs for increased communication between neighbours | 7 | 8 |
| Neighbourhood graffiti clean-ups | 6 | 7 |
| Foot/Bike patrols by Police | 1 | 3 |
| Facility for Community development programs | 9 | 10 |
| School based crime prevention programs | 3 | 2 |
| Facilities such as lighting, paths, etc. | 5 | 5 |
| Other | 11 | 11 |

Crime Prevention Programs – Age

Respondents aged over 65 years were least likely to select *After school activities for youth*, $\chi^2 (5) 11.79=0.05$. Respondents aged over 65 years and between 12-24 years were least likely to select *School based crime prevention programs*, $\chi^2 (5) 42.88=0.001$. Respondents aged over 55 years were most likely to select *Safety checks for older neighbours*, $\chi^2 (5) 26.9=0.001$. Respondents aged between 12-34 years were least likely to indicate that they would like the introduction of *Support networks for those living alone*, $\chi^2 (5) 22.03=0.001$. Respondents aged between 12-44 years were more likely (than older respondents) to select *Support services for families*, $\chi^2 (5) 39.42=0.001$.

Respondents aged over 65 years and between 12-24 years were least likely to select *Neighbourhood graffiti clean ups*, $\chi^2 (5) 24.36=0.001$. Respondents aged over 65 years and between 12-24 years were least likely to select *Foot/bike patrols by police*, $\chi^2 (5) 25.02=0.001$. As age increased the likelihood that respondents would select *Lighting, paths etc* decreased, 72.5% of respondents aged between 12-24 years and only 33.5% of respondents aged over 65 years selected this program, $\chi^2 (5) 49.59=0.001$.

No significant differences were found between age categories in the selection of the following program/services/facilities; *Programs for increased communication between neighbours*, *facility for community development programs*.

Age appeared to have limited effect on the selection of crime prevention programs. Young people and people aged over 65 years were least likely to select school based crime prevention programs, neighbourhood graffiti clean ups, foot/bike patrols by police and least likely to select school based crime prevention programs. As aged increased the likelihood decreased that respondents would select lighting, paths, etc. Older respondents supported the introduction of safety checks for older neighbours and support networks for those living alone. Younger respondents were more likely to select support services for families.

Crime Prevention Programs – Victimization

Significant differences were found between reported levels of victimisation in the selection of *After school activities for youth*, with respondents who reported personal/violent victimisation (alone or both) most likely to select this program, $\chi^2 (3)=11.53$, $p<0.01$. Significant differences were found between reported levels of victimisation in the selection of *School based crime prevention*, with respondents who reported personal/violent victimisation (alone) most likely to select this program, $\chi^2 (3)=11.45$, $p<0.01$.

Significant differences were found between reported levels of victimisation in the selection of *Support services for families*, with respondents who reported personal/violent victimisation (alone or both) most likely to select this program, $\chi^2 (3)=26.72$, $p<0.001$. Significant differences were found between reported levels of victimisation in the selection of *Support networks for those living alone*, with respondents who reported personal/violent victimisation (alone or both) most likely to select this program, $\chi^2 (3)=11.07$, $p<0.05$. Significant differences were found between reported levels of victimisation in the selection of *Programs for increased communication between neighbours*, with respondents who reported personal/violent victimisation (alone or both) most likely to select this program, $\chi^2 (3)=10.78$, $p<0.05$.

Significant differences were found between reported levels of victimisation in the selection of *Facilities such as lighting, paths etc*, with respondents who reported personal/violent victimisation (alone or both) most likely to select this program, $\chi^2 (3)=15.9$, $p<0.001$. As victimisation increased so too did the likelihood that respondents would select *Foot/bike patrols by police*, $\chi^2 (3)=30.72$, $p<0.001$.

No significant differences were found between reported levels of victimisation in the selection of; *Facility for community development programs*.

Reported victimisation levels appeared to effect a respondent's selection of crime prevention programs. Respondents who reported personal/violent victimisation (alone or both) were more likely to select the majority of the programs listed.

Attitude toward Crime Prevention – Household Type

Significant differences were found between the type of household in response to the question regarding crime prevention programs they would like to see introduced in their suburb. A parent with children was most likely to select *After school activities for youth*, $\chi^2 (5)=13.58$, $p<0.001$. A parent with children and those in an extended family were most likely to select *Support services for families*, $\chi^2 (5)=25.02$, $p<0.001$.

No significant differences were found between household type and selection of *Safety checks for older neighbours*, *Support networks for those living alone*, *Programs for increased communication between neighbours*, *Neighbourhood graffiti clean-ups*, *Foot/bike patrols by police*, *Facility for community development programs*, *school based crime prevention programs*, and *facilities such as lighting, paths etc*.

A parent with children was most likely to select after school activities for youth and support services for families. A member of an extended family was more likely to select support services for families.

Crime Prevention Programs – Time Lived in Suburb

As time lived in suburb increased the likelihood that respondents would select *Support services for families* decreased, 42.1% of respondents who had lived in their suburb for less than one year selected this program, while 27.1% of respondents who had lived in their suburb for more than five years responded in the same manner $\chi^2 (3)=10.31$, $p<0.05$. As time lived in suburb increased the likelihood that respondents would select *Programs for increased communication between neighbours* decreased, 53.9% of respondents who had lived in their suburb for less than one year selected this program, while 38.3% of respondents who had lived in their suburb for more than five years responded in the same manner $\chi^2 (3)=17.21$, $p<0.001$. As time lived in suburb increased the likelihood that that respondents would select a *Facility for community development programs* decreased, 38.2% of respondents who had lived in their suburb for less than one year selected this program, 22.8% of respondents who had lived in their suburb for more than five years responded in the same manner $\chi^2 (3)=12.12$, $p<0.01$.

Table 1

No significant differences were found between time lived in suburb and the selection of; *After school activities for youth, Safety checks for older neighbours, Support networks for those living alone, Neighbourhood graffiti clean-ups, Foot/bike patrols by police, School based crime prevention, and Lighting, paths etc.*

Newer residents were more likely to select support services for families, programs for increased communication between neighbours, and facility for community development programs.

Safety Strategies Undertaken in the last year - All

Respondents were asked to indicate which, if any, of the thirteen options provided they had utilised in the last year in an effort to improve the safety of them or their family, an 'Other' option was also provided, multiple responses were acceptable for this question. 9.2% of respondents indicated that they had *utilised None of the offered strategies in the last year because they felt safe*, while 4% reported that they had not undertaken any strategies because they were not sure what to do. Of those respondents that had utilised the offered strategies in the last year, the five most commonly utilised were; *Locked doors when travelling in a vehicle, Installed security screens/alarms, Discussed safety with parents/children, Pruned shrubs away from doors/windows and Bought a dog/guard dog.* These five commonly selected options are reasonable steps that community members may take to improve safety for themselves and their family. More disturbing, in terms of effect on lifestyle, is that 25% of respondents reported that they had *Restricted activities at night to improve safety*, and a number had *Changed shopping times/places (17.3%) and Changed leisure activities (6.8%)*. Refer 2:15.

Respondents most commonly reported taking between one (1) and five (5) reasonable steps in the last year to improve the safety of themselves or their family. Of concern was the percentage of respondents who reported restricting activities at night in an effort to improve safety and to a lesser degree changing shopping places and changing leisure activities.

Table 2:15

Strategies undertaken in the last year to improve safety of self and family - All

| Strategy Taken to Improve Safety of Self or Family% of Respondents who reported using strategy | |
|---|------|
| None, we feel safe | 9.2 |
| None, we are not sure what to do | 4.0 |
| Pruned shrubs away from doors/windows | 25.8 |
| Discussed safety with children/parents | 31.2 |
| Bought a dog/guard dog | 25.1 |

Table 1

| | |
|---|------|
| Installed security screens/alarms | 48.9 |
| Moved house | 3.7 |
| Changed method of transport/travel | 4.6 |
| Changed leisure activities | 6.8 |
| Changed shopping times/places | 17.3 |
| Restricted activities (e.g. leisure, work) at night | 25.0 |
| Stopped living alone | 2.2 |
| Locked doors when travelling in a vehicle | 50.0 |
| Other | 8.9 |

Table 2:16

Strategies undertaken in the last year to improve safety of self and family - Gender

| Safety measures taken in the last year | Selected by Respondent | | | | Not selected by Respondent | | | |
|--|------------------------|-------|--------|-------|----------------------------|-------|--------|-------|
| | Male | | Female | | Male | | Female | |
| | % | Count | % | Count | % | Count | % | Count |
| None, we feel safe | 11.8 | 77 | 7.8 | 77 | 88.2 | 573 | 92.2 | 912 |
| None, we are not sure what to do | 5.4 | 35 | 3.1 | 31 | 94.6 | 615 | 96.9 | 958 |
| Pruned shrubs away from doors/windows | 25.5 | 166 | 26.4 | 261 | 74.5 | 484 | 73.6 | 728 |
| Discussed safety with children/parents | 27.1 | 176 | 35.2 | 348 | 72.9 | 474 | 64.8 | 641 |

Table 1

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|------|-----|------|-----|------|-----|------|-----|
| Bought a dog/guard dog | 22.2 | 144 | 26.2 | 259 | 77.8 | 506 | 73.8 | 730 |
| Installed security screens/alarms | 52.3 | 340 | 45.7 | 452 | 47.7 | 310 | 54.3 | 537 |
| Moved house | 2.3 | 15 | 4.6 | 45 | 97.7 | 635 | 95.4 | 944 |
| Changed method of transport/travel | 4.0 | 26 | 4.8 | 47 | 96.0 | 624 | 95.2 | 942 |
| Changed leisure activities | 8.0 | 52 | 5.6 | 55 | 92.0 | 598 | 94.4 | 934 |
| Changed shopping times/places | 14.8 | 96 | 18.6 | 184 | 85.2 | 554 | 81.4 | 805 |
| Restricted activities (e.g. leisure, work) at night | 21.1 | 137 | 27.2 | 269 | 78.9 | 513 | 72.8 | 720 |
| Stopped living alone | 2.0 | 13 | 2.3 | 23 | 98.0 | 637 | 97.7 | 966 |
| Locked doors when travelling in a vehicle | 35.5 | 231 | 59.6 | 589 | 64.5 | 419 | 40.4 | 400 |
| Other | 8.3 | 54 | 9.8 | 97 | 91.7 | 596 | 90.2 | 892 |

Table 2:17

Strategies undertaken in the last year to improve safety of self and family ranked by Popularity – Gender

| Safety measures taken in the last year | Popularity Ranking | |
|--|--------------------|--------|
| | Male | Female |
| None, we feel safe | 8 | 9 |
| None, we are not sure what to do | 11 | 13 |
| Pruned shrubs away from doors/windows | 4 | 5 |
| Discussed safety with children/parents | 3 | 3 |
| Bought a dog/guard dog | 5 | 6 |
| Installed security screens/alarms | 1 | 2 |
| Moved house | 13 | 12 |
| Changed method of transport/travel | 12 | 11 |
| Changed leisure activities | 10 | 10 |

Table 1

| | | |
|---|----|----|
| Changed shopping times/places | 7 | 7 |
| Restricted activities (e.g. leisure, work) at night | 6 | 4 |
| Stopped living alone | 14 | 14 |
| Locked doors when travelling in a vehicle | 2 | 1 |
| Other | 9 | 8 |

Safety Strategies Undertaken in the last year - Gender

Significant differences were found between the responses made by males and females to this question. Males (11.8%) were slightly more likely than females (7.8%) to indicate they had undertaken no safety strategies because they felt safe, $\chi^2(1)=7.6$, $p<0.01$. Females (35.2%) were more likely than males (27.1%) to indicate that they had *Discussed safety with children/parents* in an effort to improve the safety of them or their family, $\chi^2(1)=11.86$, $p<0.001$. Females (27.2%) were more likely than males (21.7%) to report they had *Restricted activities at night*, $\chi^2(1)=7.89$, $p<0.01$. Females (59.6%) were more likely than males (35.5%) to report they *Locked doors when travelling in a vehicle*, $\chi^2(1)=90.49$, $p<0.001$. Table 2:16 refers.

Males (52.3%) were more likely than females (45.7%) to report they had *Installed security screens/alarms*, $\chi^2(1)=6.85$, $p<0.001$.

There were no significant differences between males and females in reported utilisation of; *None, because they did not know what to do, Pruned shrubs away from doors/windows, Bought a dog/guard dog, Moved house, Changed method of transport/travel, and Changed leisure activities and Stopped living alone*.

Despite these significant differences on a number of the 'safety measures' provided, when the measures were ranked according to the frequency with which they were selected (popularity) males and females had chosen them in a very similar manner. Refer Table 2.17. This would seem to indicate that although there are slight differences in the ways males and females go about ensuring their or their families safety, overall the similarities are greater than the differences.

Gender appeared to have an effect on the utilisation of the listed safety strategies. Females tended to utilise more strategies than males and were more likely to discuss safety with children/parents, restricted activities at night, and locked doors when travelling in a vehicle. Males were more likely to have installed security screens/alarms.

Gender had a limited effect on the ranking of the safety strategies listed in terms of frequency of selection.

Safety Strategies Undertaken in the last year - Age

Respondents aged between 35-44 years were more likely to report they had *Discussed safety with children/parents*, $\chi^2(5) 146.24=0.001$. As age increased the likelihood that respondents had *Installed security screens/alarms* increased, 31.3% of respondents aged between 12-24 years selected this option, while 52.3% of respondents aged over 65 years responded in the same manner, $\chi^2(5) 18.26=0.01$. Respondents aged between 12-24 were most likely to report that they had *Moved house* to improve their safety, $\chi^2(5) 32.86=0.001$.

No significant differences were found between age categories in their selection of the remaining safety measures; *None we feel safe, Pruned shrubs away from doors/windows, Bought a dog/guard dog, Changed method of transport/travel, Changed shopping times/places, Restricted activities at night, Stopped living alone and Locked doors when travelling in a vehicle.*

Younger respondents were most likely to indicate they had moved house to improve their safety. Respondents aged between 35-44 years were most likely to report they had discussed safety with children/parents. As age increased so too did the likelihood that respondents had installed security screens/alarms.

Safety Strategies Undertaken in the last year - Victimisation

Significant differences were found between reported levels of victimisation and responses when asked to indicate which of the thirteen (13) strategies had been undertaken to improve the safety of themselves or their family. As victimisation levels increased the likelihood that respondents reported that they had *taken no measures, as they felt safe* decreased, $\chi^2(3)=9.25$, $p<0.05$. Respondents who reported personal/violent victimisation (alone or both) were most likely to indicate they had *Discussed safety with children/parents*, $\chi^2(3)=9.16$, $p<0.05$. Respondents who reported personal/violent victimisation (alone or both) were most likely to have *Changed shopping times/places*, $\chi^2(3)=56.45$, $p<0.001$. Respondents who reported both victimisation were most likely to indicate they had *Restricted activities at night* in an effort to increase their safety, $\chi^2(3)=45.68$, $p<0.001$. Respondents who reported personal/violent victimisation (alone or both) were most likely to have *Moved house*, $\chi^2(3)=24.45$, $p<0.001$.

Respondents who reported personal/violent victimisation were more likely to have discussed safety with children/parents, changed shopping times/places, restricted activities at night, and moved house.

Crime Experiences

Property Crime

Respondents were asked one multi-parted question regarding property crime victimisation. Parts of this question were open ended and responses coded by researchers.

Personal/Violent Crime

Respondents were asked one multi-parted question regarding personal/violent crime victimisation. Parts of this question were open ended and responses coded by researchers and volunteers supervised by researchers.

Bullying at School

Respondents were asked one multi-parted question regarding school bullying victimisation. Parts of this question were open ended and responses coded by researchers and volunteers supervised by researchers.

Bullying in the Workplace

Respondents were asked one multi-parted question regarding workplace bullying victimisation. Parts of this question were open ended and responses coded by researchers and volunteers supervised by researchers.

Violence related to Race and Sexuality

Respondents were asked one question each regarding violence victimisation that they felt was based on their racial background or sexuality. Response format was dichotomous, yes or no.

Violence within the Family

Respondents were asked one question regarding violence within their family. Response format was a five point likert scale.

Witnessed Crime

Respondents were asked to report any of the listed crimes that they or a member of their household had personally seen or heard (witnessed) being committed in their suburb in the last year. Fourteen (14) crimes were listed, and a 'no crime witnessed' and 'other' categories were provided. Multiple selections were allowed.

Property Crime- All

66.9% of respondents reported that they had been the victim of a property related crime, such as break and enter, vandalism, motor vehicle theft, stealing, etc. 77.9% of those people who had been a victim had been living in their current suburb when the offence occurred. 71.6% did not personally know the person who had committed the offence (to their knowledge). 82.1% stated that the offence occurred at their place of residence, 14.4% stated that the offence occurred at their place of business or employment. 87.6% of people had reported the crime to the police, and of these 39.9% were informed of the action taken regarding the crime. Of the 12.4% respondents who did not report the crime to the police, the most common reason given for not reporting it was that it wasn't important/valuable enough.

It was initially difficult to determine satisfaction with outcome and reasons for dissatisfaction due to the manner in which many property crime respondents answered this section of the survey. It was expected that respondents would not answer any further parts of the question, once they indicated that they had not been informed of any action taken. The reason for this expectation was that respondents could not express satisfaction or dissatisfaction with an outcome that they had no knowledge regarding. Many respondents continued to answer the question after indicating they had not been informed of any action, so separate analysis was undertaken of the parts of the question relating to satisfaction of outcome, respondents were placed in categories based on their response to 'being informed of outcome' either yes or no.

Significant differences were found between the respondents informed and not informed and outcome satisfaction levels. Of those respondents who were informed by police of action taken, 68.6% were satisfied with the outcome. Those who were not satisfied with the outcome most often gave reasons that were coded as; offender was not identified and no action was taken. Of those respondents who were not informed by police of action taken, 31.4% were satisfied with the outcome and 68.6% were not. Those who were not satisfied with the outcome indicated they were not satisfied because they were not informed of any action taken.

Two thirds of respondents reported being the victim of a property related crime at some point in their life and the greatest majority of respondents who reported victimisation had been living in their current suburb, and the crime most commonly occurred at their place of residence. Most victims of property related crime did not know the offender and had reported the crime to the police. Respondents who did not report the crime often said that the crime wasn't important or not enough value involved. Slightly less than half of property crime victims who reported the crime had been informed of any action taken. Respondents were far more likely to be satisfied with the outcome if they were informed of action taken by police, regardless of the nature of that outcome.

Property Crime- Gender

No significant differences were found between males and females. Males were more likely than females to report witnessing crime if they had experienced property crime victimisation. No significant differences were found between males and females when asked if they were living in their current suburb when the offence occurred, if they knew the person who committed the offence, if the crime occurred at their place of residence or at their business or place of employment. No significant differences were found between males and females when asked if the crime occurred somewhere other than their place of residence or business/place of employment. No significant differences were found between males and females when asked if they had reported the crime or in the reasons given for not reporting the crime. No significant differences were found between males and females when asked if the police had informed them of any action that had been taken. Males (34.3%) were more likely than females (47%) to express dissatisfaction with the outcome, $\chi^2(3)=14.23$, $p<0.001$. No significant differences were found between males and females in the reasons given for dissatisfaction.

Males were more likely than females to indicate they were dissatisfied with the outcome of police investigations.

-
-

Property Crime- Age

Significant differences were found between age categories when asked if they had been the victims of a property-related crime, respondents aged between 12-24 years and over 65 years were least likely to indicate that they had experienced property victimisation, $\chi^2(5)=17.19$, $p<0.001$. There was significant difference between age categories when asked if they were living in their current suburb when the crime occurred; respondents aged between 12-34 were most likely to indicate that they were living in another suburb when the crime occurred, $\chi^2(5)=26.89$, $p<0.001$. No significant differences were found when respondents were asked if they knew the person who committed the offence. No significant differences were found when respondents were asked if the crime occurred in their place of residence or in their place of business/employment, most crimes had occurred at the place of residence.

No significant differences were found between age categories when respondents were asked if they had reported the crime or in the reasons given for not reporting the crime. No significant differences were found when respondents were asked if they had been informed of any action taken by police, and whether they had been satisfied with the outcome of that action.

Respondents aged between 25-64 years were more likely to report property crime victimisation had occurred. Respondents aged between 25-34 were more likely to have lived in another suburb when the crime occurred.

Property Crime - Victimization

No analysis was conducted on responses to this question because the variable for analysis was already being utilised in respondent categories.

Property Crime – Household Type

No significant differences were found between household type and the likelihood that respondents would report being the victim of a property related crime at some point in their life, or whether they were living in their current suburb when the crime occurred. Respondent living in an extended family or as a parent with children were more likely to report they had known the person who had committed the offence, $\chi^2(5)=12.59$, $p<0.01$. No significant differences were found between household type when respondents were asked if the crime had occurred at their place of residence, at their business/place of employment, or that the crime occurred elsewhere.

No significant differences were found between household type and the likelihood that respondents had reported the matter to the police - reasons for not reporting being; informed of action taken by police, satisfaction with outcome, and reasons for dissatisfaction.

A parent with children and those living in an extended family were more likely to have known the offender.

-

Property Crime – Time lived in Suburb

No significant differences were found between the time lived in suburb and the likelihood that respondents would report being the victim of a property related crime at some point in their life. Significant differences were found between the time lived in suburb and the likelihood that respondents were living in their current suburb when the crime occurred. 88.4% of respondents who had lived in their suburb for more than five years indicated that the crime had occurred while they were living in their current suburb, while only 18% of respondents who had lived in their current suburb for less than one year responded in the same manner, $\chi^2(3)=222.25$, $p<0.001$.

No significant differences were found between the time lived in a suburb and the likelihood that the respondents knew the offender. No significant differences were found between the time lived in a suburb and the likelihood that the crime occurred in their place of residence, that the crime occurred in their place of business, or that the crime occurred elsewhere. No significant differences were found between the time lived in suburb and the likelihood that the respondent had reported the matter to the police. The reasons given for not reporting to the police being informed by police of any action taken, satisfaction with the outcome, or reasons for dissatisfaction.

The longer a respondent had lived in their current suburb the more likely they were to have experienced property crime victimisation while living in their current suburb.

Personal/Violent Crime- All

17.5% of respondents reported that they had been the victim of a violent or personal crime, such as assault, domestic violence, sexual assault, robbery, stalking, etc. 50.3% of those people who had been a victim had been living in their current suburb when the offence occurred. 57.8% personally knew the person who had committed the offence. 58.2% stated that the offence occurred at their place of residence, 14.7% stated that the offence occurred at their place of business or employment. 65% of people had reported the crime to the police. Of the 35% of affected respondents who did not report the crime to the police, the 'other' category had the largest percentage. The most common defined reasons given were fear/concern about revenge, handled it myself, or wasn't important/serious enough.

It was initially difficult to determine satisfaction with outcome and reasons for dissatisfaction due to the manner in which many reported victims of personal/violent crime answered this section of the survey. It was expected that respondents would not answer any further parts of the question, once they indicated that they had not been informed of any action taken. The reason for this expectation was that respondents could not express satisfaction or dissatisfaction with an outcome that they had no knowledge regarding. Many respondents continued to answer the question after indicating they had not been informed of any action, so separate analysis was undertaken of the parts of the question relating to satisfaction of outcome. Respondents were placed in categories based on their response to 'being informed of outcome' either yes or no.

Of those respondents who were informed by police of action taken, 90.8% were satisfied with the outcome. Those who were not satisfied with the outcome most often gave reasons that were coded as; offender not identified and no action taken or that the offender was identified but no charges were laid. Of those respondents who were not informed by police of action taken, 9.2% were satisfied with the outcome.

17.5% of respondents reported being the victim of a personal/violent related crime at some point in their life, one half of personal/violent crime victims had been living in their current suburb when the crime occurred, and the crime most commonly occurred at their place of residence. Most victims of personal/violent related crime knew the offender and had reported the crime to the police. Reasons given by respondents for not reporting the offence tended to be varied and coded as 'other', Of the coded reasons the most common were reasons related to a fear of retribution. Respondents were far more likely to be satisfied with the outcome if they were informed of action taken by police, regardless of the nature of that outcome.

Personal/Violent Crime- Gender

Females (20.4%) were more likely than males (13.7%) to report that they had been the victims of a personal/violent victimisation such as assault, domestic violence, sexual assault, robbery, stalking, etc, $\chi^2(1)=11.58, p<0.001$. Males (60.7%) were more likely than females (46%) to report that they had been living in their current suburb when the crime occurred, $\chi^2(1)=5.29, p<0.05$. Females (68.2%) were more likely than males (36.8%) to indicate that they knew the person who committed the offence, $\chi^2(1)=24.65, p<0.001$. Females (66.5%) were more likely than males (43.2%) to indicate that the crime occurred at their place of residence, $\chi^2(1)=13.77, p<0.001$. No significant differences were found between males and females when asked if the crime had occurred at their business or place of employment. No significant differences were found between males and females when asked if the crime occurred somewhere other than their place of residence or business/place of employment. Males (58.1%) were more likely than females (36.6%) to indicate that the crime had occurred at somewhere other than at their place of residence or place of business/employment, $\chi^2(1)=8.09, p<0.01$.

Males (73.8%) were more likely than females (61.1%) to indicate that they had reported the crime to the police, $\chi^2(1)=4.17, p<0.05$. Significant differences were found between males and females in the reasons given for not reporting the crime; females were more likely to indicate that they did not report for reasons of fear about the consequences from the offender, males were more likely than females to not report because they considered the 'crime' was not serious enough to warrant reporting or that they had handled it themselves, $\chi^2(1)=19.61, p<0.01$. No significant differences were found between males and females when asked if the police had informed them of any action taken, satisfaction with the outcome, or in the reasons given for not being satisfied with the outcome of any investigation by police.

Females were more likely to report personal/violent victimisation and personally knowing the offender, and to report that the crime occurred in their place of residence. Males were more likely to have been living in their current suburb when the crime occurred, and to have reported the crime to the police. Females were more likely to report they had been informed of action taken by police and that they were satisfied with that action. Of those who did not report the crime, females were more likely to report reasons based on a fear of retribution, while males were more likely to indicate the crime was not important or serious enough to warrant reporting.

Personal/Violent Crime- Age

Significant differences were found between age categories when respondents were asked whether they had been the victims of personal/violent victimisation such as assault, domestic violence, sexual assault, robbery, stalking, etc. The younger the age category the higher the likelihood that the respondent would indicate they had been the victim of a personal/violent crime, 26.7% of respondents aged between 12-24 years reported victimisation, while 9.4% of respondents aged over 65 years reported victimisation, $\chi^2(5)=24.75$,

Table 1

$p < 0.001$. No significant differences were found between age categories when asked if they were living in their current suburb when the crime occurred. Significant differences were found when respondents were asked if they had reported the crime. No significant differences were found when respondents were asked if they knew the person who committed the offence. 76.2% of respondents aged between 12-24 years reported that they had known the offender, while 12.5% of respondents aged over 65 years reported in the same manner, $\chi^2(5) = 27.64$, $p < 0.001$. No significant differences were found when respondents were asked if the crime occurred in their place of residence or in their place of business/employment.

Significant differences were found between age categories when respondents were asked if they had reported the crime. 42.9% of respondents aged between 12-24 years indicated that they had reported the crime, while 92.9% of respondents aged over 65 years reported in the same manner, $\chi^2(5) = 14.38$, $p < 0.001$. No significant differences were found in the reasons given for not reporting the crime. No significant differences were found when respondents were asked if they had been informed of any action taken by police. No significant differences were found between age categories when asked whether they had been satisfied with the outcome of that action.

Younger respondents were more likely to report personal/violent crime victimisation, having known the offender, but less likely to indicate they had reported the offence.

Personal/Violent Crime - Victimisation

No analysis was conducted on responses to this question because the variable for analysis was already being utilised in respondent categories.

Personal/Violent Crime – Household Type

A parent with children was most likely to report they had been the victim of a personal violent crime at some point in their life, $\chi^2(5) = 29.43$, $p < 0.001$. A parent living alone (87.2%) was most likely to report they knew the person who committed the offence while a person living in share accommodation (37.5%) was least likely to report in the same manner, $\chi^2(5) = 25.65$, $p < 0.001$. No significant differences were found between household type and the likelihood that that offence had occurred at their place of residence, whether they were living in their current suburb when the crime occurred, or if they had known the person who had committed the offence. No significant differences were found between household type and the likelihood that the crime had occurred at their business/place of employment or elsewhere.

No significant differences were found between household type and the likelihood that respondents had reported the matter to the police, reasons for not reporting, being informed of action taken by police, satisfaction with outcome, and reasons for dissatisfaction.

A parent with children was more likely to report personal/violent crime victimisation and that they had known the offender.

Personal/Violent Crime – Time lived in Suburb

Significant differences were found between the time lived in suburb and the likelihood that respondents would report being the victim of a personal/violent related crime at some point in their life. Those who had lived in their suburb for less than three (3) years were most likely to report personal/violent victimisation, $\chi^2(3) = 12.83$, $p < 0.01$. Significant differences were also found between the time lived in suburb and the likelihood that respondents were living in their current suburb when the crime occurred. 67% respondents who had lived in their suburb for more than five years indicated that the crime had occurred while they were living in their current suburb, while no respondents who had lived in their current suburb for less than one year responded in the same manner, $\chi^2(3) = 61.45$, $p < 0.001$.

No significant differences were found between the time lived in suburb and likelihood that the respondents knew the offender. Significant differences were found between the time lived

Table 1

in suburb and likelihood that the crime occurred in their place of residence. Respondents who had lived in their suburb for less than one year were more likely to report that the crime had occurred in their residence (not necessarily current residence), $\chi^2(3)=9.84, p<0.05$.

No significant differences were found between time lived in suburb and the likelihood that the crime occurred in their place of business, or that the crime occurred elsewhere. No significant differences were found between the time lived in suburb and the likelihood that the respondent had reported the matter to the police, in reasons given for not reporting to the police, being informed by police of any action taken, satisfaction with the outcome, or reasons for dissatisfaction.

Respondents who had lived in their suburb for less than three years were most likely to indicate that they had been the victim of personal/violent crime at some point in their life. Respondents who had lived in their suburb for less than one year were more likely to report the offence had occurred at somewhere other than their place of residence.

Bullying at School – All

The incidence of school bullying reported within the survey is of concern. 1626 respondents answered the question; In the last three (3) years have you (or your children) been bullied at school. Of those respondents who did answer the question, 14.5% indicated that bullying had occurred. The greatest majority (82.2%) of the respondents who reported bullying had reported it to the school. Within the defined categories the most common reasons given for not reporting the bullying were; not important enough/not serious enough incident and the school would not do anything about it anyway.

68.8% of those respondents who said they had reported the bullying had been informed by the school of any action taken regarding the bullying, 55.1% of those said that they were satisfied with the outcome. Of those respondents who were not satisfied with the outcome, the most common reasons given were that offender was identified but no action was taken (31.8%) or that action had been taken but they were not satisfied with that action (15.2%).

14.5% of respondents reported bullying victimisation at school in the last three (3) years, of themselves or their children. Most had reported the bullying, and had been informed of action taken, more than half of these were satisfied with the outcome. Of those who did not report the bullying, reasons for not reporting were most commonly; incident/s was/were not serious enough, handled it themselves, and a lack of faith in the school to deal with bullying. The most common reasons for dissatisfaction with the outcome was that the offender was identified but no action was taken.

Bullying at School - Gender

Females (16.2%) were more likely than males (12.6%) to report that in the last three (3) years they or their children had been bullied at school, $\chi^2(1)=5.43, p<0.05$. No significant differences were found between males and females when asked if they had reported the bullying, reasons for not reporting the bullying, being informed of action taken, satisfaction with the outcome, reasons for dissatisfaction.

Females reported more bullying than males. Gender had no effect on the reporting of bullying, reasons given for not reporting, being informed of any action taken by school, satisfaction with outcome of action taken, and reasons for dissatisfaction.

Bullying at School - Age

Significant differences were found between age categories when respondents were asked if they or their children had been bullied at school in the last three (3) years. Respondents aged between 35-54 years reported the highest incidence of bullying, $\chi^2(5)=95.51, p<0.001$. No significant differences were found between age categories when asked if they had

reported the bullying, reasons given for not reporting the bullying, being informed of action taken, satisfaction with the outcome, reasons for dissatisfaction.

Respondents aged between 35-54 years reported most bullying and were most likely to report the bullying.

Bullying at School - Victimisation

Significant differences were found between reported victimisation levels and responses to the question regarding bullying at school. Respondents who reported personal/violent victimisation (alone or both) were more likely to report that they or their children had been bullied at school in the last three (3) years, $\chi^2(3)=22.43$, $p<0.001$. No significant differences were found between reported levels of victimisation and the following parts of the question; reporting levels, reasons for not reporting, being informed of action, satisfaction with outcome, and reasons for dissatisfaction.

Respondents who reported personal/violent victimisation were more likely to report bullying had occurred.

Bullying at School – Household Type

A parent with children, couples with children, and those living in an extended family (respectively) were most likely to report that they or their children had been bullied at school, $\chi^2(5)=112.16$, $p<0.001$. No significant differences were found between reported levels of victimisation and the following parts of the question; reporting the bullying to the school, reasons for not reporting, being informed of action, satisfaction with outcome, and reasons for dissatisfaction.

Respondents who reported living in a family unit that included children were most likely to report bullying at school had occurred.

Bullying at School – Time lived in Suburb

No significant differences were found between time lived in current suburb and responses to the question; *In the last three (3) years have you (or your children) been bullied at school?*; reported incidence of bullying, level of reporting to school, reasons for not reporting, being informed of action, satisfaction with outcome, and reasons for dissatisfaction.

Time lived in suburb had no effect on bullying at school.

Bullying in the Workplace - All

5.9% of respondents reported that: *In the last three (3) years they or their children had been bullied in the workplace*. 58.3% of those who had been bullied had reported it to the employer, and of these 51.8% had been informed of any action that had been taken regarding the bullying. 28% of those who had been informed of the action taken were satisfied with that action. Of those affected respondents who did not report the bullying to the employer, the 'Other' category had the largest percentage (many of these reported that the employer was involved in the bullying). Aside from this the most common reason given was that the employer would not do anything about it anyway. The most common reason given for dissatisfaction with the outcome was that the offender had been identified but that no action had been taken.

A small percentage of respondents reported bullying in the workplace, over half had reported it to the employer, about half of these had been informed of action taken by the employer, and about one quarter of those informed of action taken were satisfied with that action. Of those who did not report the bullying to the employer, reasons given often related to the involvement of the employer or that the employer would not do anything about it anyway. Of those who were not satisfied with the outcome, the most common reason given was that the offender was identified but that no action was taken.

Bullying in the Workplace - Gender

Females were slightly more likely to report that; *In the last three (3) years they (or their children) had been bullied at work*, $\chi^2 (1)=4.21$, $p<0.05$. No significant differences were found in the responses of males and females when asked the question. No significant differences were found between males and females when asked if they had reported the bullying, reasons for not reporting the bullying, if the employer had informed them of any action taken, satisfaction with outcome, or reasons for dissatisfaction.

Females were slightly more likely to report bullying in the workplace.

Bullying in the Workplace - Age

As age increased the likelihood that respondents would say 'yes' when asked the question; *In the last three (3) years have you (or your children) been bullied at work* decreased. 13% of respondents aged 12-24 reported bullying, while no respondents aged over 65 years reported in the same manner, $\chi^2 (5) = 18.34$, $p> 0.001$. No significant differences were found between males and females when asked if they had reported the bullying, reasons for not reporting the bullying, if the employer had informed them of any action taken, satisfaction with outcome, or reasons for dissatisfaction.

Younger respondents were more likely to report bullying in the workplace had occurred.

-
-

Bullying in the Workplace - Victimization

Significant differences were found between reported victimisation levels and responses to the question regarding bullying in the workplace. Respondents who reported personal/violent victimisation were more likely to report that *they or their children had been bullied in the workplace in the last three (3) years*, $\chi^2 (3)=36.51$, $p<0.001$. No significant differences were found between reported levels of victimisation and responses made to the remaining parts of the question; reporting levels, reasons for not reporting, informed of action, satisfied with outcome, and reasons not satisfied.

Respondents who reported personal/violent victimisation were more likely to report bullying in the workplace.

Bullying in the Workplace – Household Type

No significant differences were found between reported victimisation levels and responses to the question regarding bullying in the workplace. No significant differences were found

Table 1

between household type and responses made to the remaining parts of the question; reporting levels, reasons for not reporting, informed of action, satisfied with outcome, and reasons not satisfied.

Household type had no effect on bullying in the workplace.

Bullying in the Workplace – Time lived in Suburb

No significant differences were found between the time lived in suburb and responses made when asked the question; *In the last three (3) years have you (or your children) been bullied at work*. No significant differences were found between time lived in suburb and responses made to the remaining parts of the question; reporting the bullying to the employer, reasons for not reporting, informed of action, satisfied with outcome, and reasons not satisfied.

Time lived in suburb had no effect on bullying in the workplace.

Table 2.18 Types of Crimes Witnessed by Respondents in Their Suburb (All)

| Type of Crime | % of Respondents who reported witnessing |
|--------------------------|--|
| None | 33.6 |
| Break and Enter | 39.9 |
| Motor Vehicle Theft | 27.6 |
| Vandalism | 38.7 |
| Business theft/vandalism | 15.3 |

Table 1

| | |
|------------------------------|------|
| Bag Snatching | 14.6 |
| Stalking | 3.4 |
| Domestic Violence | 17.7 |
| Assault | 14.7 |
| Robbery | 18.7 |
| Rape | 3.4 |
| Homicide | 4.1 |
| Other Sexual offences | 1.8 |
| Child abuse/neglect | 8.7 |
| Drug dealing | 18.4 |
| Other | 3.7 |

Table 2:19 Number of Crimes Witnessed by Respondents in Their Suburb (All)

| Number of Crimes | % of Respondents who reported witnessing |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| 0 - No crime witnessed | 33.6 |
| 1 - One crime witnessed | 17.3 |
| 2 - Two crimes witnessed | 13.6 |
| 3 - Three crimes witnessed | 11.1 |
| 4 - Four crimes witnessed | 7.0 |
| 5 - Five crimes witnessed | 4.6 |
| 6 - Six crimes witnessed | 3.4 |
| 7 - Seven crimes witnessed | 2.7 |
| 8 - Eight crimes witnessed | 2.6 |
| 9 – Nine or more crimes witnessed | 3.9 |

Violence related to Race and Sexuality - All

3.6% (61) of respondents reported that; *In the last three (3) years they had been a victim of violence based on their racial background*, all racial/ethnic backgrounds (except Torres Strait Islander) were represented within the group of respondents who reported victimisation. Respondents who identified themselves as Aboriginal or Asian were most likely to report violent victimisation. Readers should be reminded that respondents were not required to select a racial/ethnic background to the exclusion of all others and that the majority of respondents who selected a different ethnic/racial background also identified themselves as Australians

2.9% (49) of respondents reported that; *In the last three (3) years they had been a victim of violence based on their sexuality*, of these 81.63% (40) recorded their gender as female.

As the number of respondents who reported being a victim of violence based on their race or sexuality was limited; no comparison on gender, age, victimisation level, household type, or time lived in suburb was conducted on responses to these questions.

Respondents were more likely to report violent victimisation based on their racial/ethnic background rather than violent victimisation based on their sexuality. Respondents who identified their racial/ethnic background as including Aboriginal or Asian were most likely to report violent victimisation. The majority of respondents who reported victimisation based on their sexuality were females.

Violence with the Family – All

3.2% (55) of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement; *Violence from family members is a problem in my home.*

As the number of respondents who reported being a victim of violence based on their race or sexuality was limited no comparison on gender, age, victimisation level, household type, or time lived in suburb was conducted on responses to these questions.

A small percentage of respondents reported that violence from family was currently a problem in their home.

Witnessing Crime - All

28.1% of respondents reported they had witnessed no crime in their suburb in the last year. Of those respondents who did witness crimes in their neighbourhood during the last year, the three most common crimes (not personal/violent related) witnessed were break and enter, vandalism, and motor vehicle theft. The most common personal/violent crimes witnessed were robbery, domestic violence and assault. 18.4% reported witnessing drug dealing. It would seem unlikely that 3.4% (59) of respondents (or members of respondents household) had witnessed rape in the last year. It would seem more likely that 59 respondents (or members of their households) were victims of rape. Refer Table 2:18.

The number of crimes that respondents had witnessed was also examined, with 17.3% reporting they had witnessed one crime, 13.6% reporting that they had witnessed two crimes, and 11.1% reporting that they had witnessed three crimes. Refer Table 2:19.

28.1% of respondents reported witnessing no crime in their suburb in the last year. Of those who did witness crime, break and enter, vandalism, motor vehicle theft, robbery, domestic violence, and drug dealing were the most common crimes witnessed. Of those respondents who reported witnessing crime, most had witnessed between one (1) and three (3) crimes.

-

Witnessing Crime - Gender

Respondents were asked to report any crime that they or a member of their household has personally seen or heard (witnessed) being committed in their suburb in the last year. Respondents were allowed multiple responses and an 'Other' category was provided. Significant differences were found between males and females in their responses to this question. No significant differences were found between males and females in level of report witnessing of no crime in their suburb in the last year.

Females were also slightly more likely to report having witnessed *child abuse/neglect*, $\chi^2(1) = 5.46$, $p < 0.05$.

Males were more likely to report the witnessing of *vandalism*, $\chi^2(1) = 28.19$, $p < 0.001$. Males were also more likely to report the witnessing of *business theft/vandalism*, $\chi^2(1) = 6.70$, $p < 0.01$. Males were also more likely to report the witnessing of *assault*, $\chi^2(1) = 6.70$, $p < 0.01$.

No significant differences were found between males and females in witnessing; *break and enter*, *motor vehicle theft*, *bag snatching*, *robbery*, *rape*, *homicide*, *other sexual offences*, *drug dealing*, and offences in the 'Other' category.

-

Females were more likely to report witnessing of; child abuse/neglect. Males were more likely to report witnessing of; vandalism, business theft/vandalism and assault.

-

Witnessing Crime - Age

Respondents were asked to report any crime that they or a member of their household has personally seen or heard (witnessed) being committed in their suburb in the last year. Respondents were allowed multiple responses and an 'Other' category was provided. Significant differences were found between age categories in the level of witnessing several of the offences listed in the question.

As age increased the likelihood that the respondent had witnessed any crime in the last year gradually decreased, while only 22.5% of respondents aged between 12-24 years reported *witnessing no crime*, 29.1% of respondents aged over 65 years reported in the same way, $\chi^2(5) = 18.91$, $p < 0.01$. Respondents aged between 45-54 were most likely to report witnessing of *break and enter*, $\chi^2(5) = 18.38$, $p < 0.01$. Respondents aged over 55 years were least likely to report witnessing of *motor vehicle theft*, $\chi^2(5) = 13.09$, $p < 0.05$. Respondents aged between 12-24 years and over 65 years were least likely to report witnessing of *vandalism*, $\chi^2(5) = 13.19$, $p < 0.01$. Respondents aged over 65 years were least likely to report witnessing of *business theft/vandalism*, $\chi^2(5) = 15.39$, $p < 0.01$.

Respondents aged between 25-44 years were most likely to report witnessing of *domestic violence*, $\chi^2(5) = 31.06$, $p < 0.001$. Respondents aged between 12-24 years were most likely to report witnessing of *assault*, $\chi^2(5) = 38.98$, $p < 0.001$. Respondents aged over 45 years were least likely to report witnessing *robbery*, $\chi^2(5) = 20.1$, $p < 0.001$. Respondents aged between 12-24 years were most likely to reported witnessing *rape*, $\chi^2(5) = 17.62$, $p < 0.01$. Respondents aged between 12-34 years were most likely to have reported witnessing *child abuse/neglect*, $\chi^2(5) = 37.18$, $p < 0.001$.

Respondents aged between 12-24 years were more likely to report witnessing *drug dealing*, $\chi^2(5) = 34.85$, $p < 0.001$.

No significant differences were found between age categories in the level of reported witnessing of *bag snatching*, *stalking*, *homicide*, *other sexual offences*, and offences listed in the

'other' category.

Generally as age increased the likelihood that respondents reported the witnessing of crime decreased. Younger respondents were more likely to witness reporting of; motor vehicle theft, vandalism, domestic violence, assault, robbery, and child abuse neglect. Respondents aged between 12-24 years were more likely to report witnessing of assault, rape and drug dealing.

Witnessing Crime - Victimisation

Significant differences were found between levels of reported victimisation and responses made to the question about the witnessing of crime. As victimisation levels increased the likelihood that respondents would report witnessing no crime in their suburb in the last year decreased. 40% of respondents who reported no victimisation indicated that they had *witnessed no crime* in the last year while 15.4% of respondents who reported both victimisation responded in the same manner, $\chi^2(3)=65.11$, $p<0.001$.

As victimisation levels increased the likelihood that respondents would report witnessing *break and enter* increased. 7% of respondents who reported no victimisation reported witnessing, while 49.3% of respondents who reported both victimisation responded in the same manner, $\chi^2(3)=43.55$, $p<0.001$. As victimisation levels increased the likelihood that respondents would report witnessing *vandalism* increased. 24.9% of respondents who reported no victimisation reported witnessing, while 48.9% of respondents who reported both victimisation responded in the same manner, $\chi^2(3)=69.17$, $p<0.001$. As victimisation levels increased the likelihood that respondents would report witnessing *business theft/vandalism* increased. 9.4% of respondents who reported no victimisation reported witnessing, while 24% of respondents who reported both victimisation responded in the same manner, $\chi^2(3)=29.54$, $p<0.001$.

As victimisation levels increased the likelihood that respondents would report witnessing *stalking* increased. 0.5% of respondents who reported no victimisation reported witnessing, while 10.9% of respondents who reported both victimisation responded in the same manner, $\chi^2(3)=66.10$, $p<0.001$. As victimisation levels increased the likelihood that respondents would report witnessing *child abuse/neglect* increased. 11.2% of respondents who reported no victimisation reported witnessing, while 33.5% of respondents who reported both victimisation responded in the same manner, $\chi^2(3)=55.07$, $p<0.001$.

Respondents who reported property victimisation (alone or both) were more likely to have witnessed *motor vehicle theft*, $\chi^2(3)=33.28$, $p<0.001$.

Respondents who reported personal/violent victimisation (alone or both) were more likely to have witnessed *domestic violence*, $\chi^2(3)=62.15$, $p<0.001$. Respondents who reported personal/violent victimisation (alone or both) were more likely to have witnessed *assault*, $\chi^2(3)=75.60$, $p<0.001$. Respondents who reported personal/violent victimisation (alone or both) were more likely to have witnessed *homicide*, $\chi^2(3)=12.66$, $p<0.01$. Respondents who reported personal/violent victimisation (alone or both) were more likely to have witnessed *child abuse/neglect*, $\chi^2(3)=25.69$, $p<0.001$.

As victimisation level increased the likelihood that respondents reported no witnessing of crime decreased. As victimisation level increased respondents were more likely to report witnessing of; break and enter, vandalism, business theft/vandalism, stalking, and child abuse/neglect. Respondents who reported property victimisation were more likely to have reported witnessing of; break and enter. Respondents who reported personal/violent victimisation alone were more likely to have reported witnessing of; rape and other sexual offences. Respondents who reported both property and personal/violent victimisation reported more witnessing of; domestic violence, assault, homicide, and child abuse/neglect.

Witnessing Crime – Household Type

Table 1

No significant differences were found between household type and the reported *witnessing of no crime in their suburb in the last year*. Those living in share accommodation and an extended family were most likely to report witnessing *break and enter*, $\chi^2(5)=14.94$, $p<0.05$. A member of an extended family and couples were most likely to report witnessing *vandalism*, $\chi^2(5)=17.60$, $p<0.01$. Those living in share accommodation were least likely to report witnessing *business theft/vandalism*, $\chi^2(5)=15.76$, $p<0.01$. A member of an extended family, those living in share accommodation, and a parent with children were most likely to report witnessing *child abuse/neglect*, $\chi^2(5)=20.46$, $p<0.001$.

A member of an extended family and those living in share accommodation were most likely to have witnessed *domestic violence*, $\chi^2(5)=20.1$, $p<0.001$. A member of an extended family and those living in share accommodation were most likely to have witnessed *robbery*, $\chi^2(5)=19.71$, $p<0.05$. A member of an extended family and those living in share accommodation were most likely to have witnessed *rape*, $\chi^2(5)=19.71$, $p<0.001$.

Those living in share accommodation were most likely to report witnessing *assault*, $\chi^2(5)=14.54$, $p<0.05$. Those living in share accommodation were most likely to report witnessing *other sexual offences*, $\chi^2(5)=14.54$, $p<0.05$.

No significant differences were found between household type and witnessing; *motor vehicle theft, bag snatching, stalking, homicide* and of offences listed in the 'other' category.

Those living in share accommodation were more likely to witness; break and enter, domestic violence, assault, robbery, rape, other sexual offences, child abuse/neglect, and drug dealing. A member of an extended family was more likely to report witnessing of; break and enter, vandalism, business theft/vandalism, robbery, rape, and child abuse/neglect. A parent with children was more likely to report witnessing of child abuse/neglect. A couple was more likely to report witnessing of vandalism.

Witnessing Crime – Time lived in Suburb

No significant differences were found between time lived in suburb and reported witnessing of; *no crime, break and enter, motor vehicle theft, vandalism, business theft/vandalism, bag snatching, stalking, domestic violence, assault, robbery, rape, homicide, other sexual offences, child abuse/neglect, drug dealing, or offences listed in the 'other' category*.

Time lived in suburb had no effect on witnessing of crime in their suburb.

Community Involvement

Community Group/Programs

Respondents were asked two multi-part questions regarding current and past involvement in community groups/programs. Parts of these questions were open ended and responses coded by researchers.

Neighbourly Contact

Respondents were asked one question regarding contact with neighbours. Response format was dichotomous, yes or no.

-

Community Groups/Programs - All

Respondents were asked about their current and past involvement in community based groups/programs. Crime Prevention Partnerships require broadly based community support and involvement to be successful and these questions were utilised as a tool to gain some insight into the number of community members participating in community groups/programs and the types or groups/programs with which they are involved. 20.1% of respondents indicated that they are currently involved in community based groups/programs, and 24% indicated that in the last five (5) years they had been involved in community based groups/programs.

Of those respondents who indicated current and/or past involvement, the most common categories selected were crime prevention groups such as Neighbourhood Watch, Safety House, PCYC, etc (current 37.1%, past 27.9%) and supportive groups involving welfare or children (current 21.5%, past 22.5%).

Neighbourly Contact - All

Respondents were asked if they regularly talked to their neighbours. This question was also designed to be utilised as a gauge of community involvement, on a less formal basis than involvement in structured programs. 75.9% of respondents reported that they regularly talk to people living nearby in their neighbourhood.

Respondents were more likely to report past (rather than current) involvement in community groups/programs. Respondents were most likely to report involvement in programs with crime prevention goals and groups that targeted children or welfare oriented services, respectively. Most respondents reported that they regularly talked to their neighbours.

Community Groups/Programs - Gender

No significant differences were found between males and females when asked if they had been involved in any community groups/programs currently or in the past five years. No significant differences were found between males and females in the types of groups that they reported being involved with, currently and in the past five years.

Neighbourly Contact - Gender

No significant differences were found between males and females in relation to communication with neighbours.

Gender had no effect on community program involvement or communication with neighbours.

Community Groups/Programs - Age

No significant differences were found between age categories in current involvement in community groups/programs. As age increased so did the likelihood that respondents would

Table 1

report past involvement in groups/programs, $\chi^2(5)=28.61$, $p<0.01$. No significant difference between age categories was found for the types of groups/programs that respondents were involved in, either currently or in the past five years.

Neighbourly Contact – Age

As age increased the likelihood that respondents would report that they regularly talked to the people living nearby in their neighbourhood increased. 65.2% of 12-24 year olds reported regularly 'neighbourly contact', while 88.9% of respondents aged over 65 years reported in the same manner, $\chi^2(5)=26.71$, $p<0.001$.

As age increased so too did the level of past involvement in community groups/programs and contact with neighbours.

Community Groups/Programs - Victimization

No significant differences were found between reported levels of victimisation and current involvement in community groups/programs, or in the types of programs respondents were involved in. No significant differences were found between reported levels of victimisation and past involvement in community groups/programs, or in the types of programs respondents were involved in.

Neighbourly Contact - Victimization

No significant differences were found between reported levels of victimisation when respondents were asked if they regularly talked to the people living nearby in their neighbourhood.

Victimization had no effect on current or past involvement in community groups/programs, or on contact with neighbours.

Community Groups/Programs – Household Type

No significant differences were found between household type and current involvement in community groups/programs, or in the types of programs respondents were involved in. No significant differences were found between household type and past involvement in community groups/programs, or in the types of programs respondents were involved in.

-

Neighbourly Contact – Household Type

No significant differences were found between household type when respondents were asked if they regularly talked to the people living nearby in their neighbourhood.

Household type had no effect on current or past involvement in community groups/programs, or on contact with neighbours.

Community Groups/Programs – Time lived in Suburb

No significant differences were found between time lived in suburb and current involvement in community groups/programs. No significant differences were found between time lived in suburb and the types of programs respondents were involved in. As time lived in suburb increased the level of past involvement in community groups/programs increased, $\chi^2(3)=24.78$, $p<0.001$. No significant differences were found between time lived in suburb and the types of programs respondents were involved in. No significant differences were found between time lived in suburb and the types of program respondents had been involved in.

Neighbourly Contact – Time lived in Suburb

Significant differences were found between time lived in a suburb and the likelihood of respondents regularly talking to the people living nearby in their neighbourhood. As time lived in suburb increased so did the likelihood that respondents would report they regularly spoke to people living nearby, $\chi^2(3)=37.2$, $p<0.001$.

The longer a respondent had lived in their current suburb the more likely they were to report past involvement in community groups/programs. The longer a respondent had lived in their current suburb the more likely they were to report that they regularly talked to people living nearby in their neighbourhood.

Suburb Divisions

Suburbs were combined into subsets of the precincts of North, South, East, and West that are applied to Logan City. The rationale behind this combination of suburbs was that some areas received (and thus) returned a limited number of surveys and to enable those areas to be included in locally specific summaries it was most practical to combine certain suburbs

Division 1

Division 1 takes in the areas of: Rochedale, Rochedale South, Underwood, and Priestdale.

Safety Feelings

48.8% of respondents agreed that they felt safe from crime when in their own home. 74.8% felt safe when out alone in their neighbourhood during the day, while 13.8% felt safe when out alone in their neighbourhood at night.

27.7% of respondents agreed that they felt safe when at Shopping Centres at night, while 9.4% agreed that they felt safe when using parking lots at night.

77.8% of respondents agreed that they felt safe when travelling to and from/work school alone, while only 15.1% agreed that they felt safe when passing a group of young men on the street.

Crime in Suburb

Table 1

37% of respondents agreed that crime was a problem in their suburb, while 41.5% agreed that crime had a negative impact on the lifestyles of people living in their suburb. 65% of respondents believed that property crime had increased in their suburb in the last three (3) years. 43% of respondents believed that personal/violent crime had increased in their suburb in the last three (3) years.

12.9% of respondents reported that there were areas in their suburb where they did not feel safe during the day. The most common area was nominated as 'other', followed by local parks (21.1%) and a local entertainment venue/shopping centre (10.5%). The most common reason given for feeling unsafe was that respondents felt unsafe around the people who frequent that area.

61.3% of respondents reported that there were areas in their suburb where they did not feel safe at night. The most common area nominated was a local park. The most common reason given by respondents regarding the reasons they felt unsafe were that they felt unsafe around the people who frequent that place or for reasons of poor lighting/poor design.

Safety strategies undertaken in the last year

10.2% of respondents reported that they had not undertaken any safety strategies in the last year because they felt safe. The most common safety strategies undertaken were locked doors when travelling in a vehicle, installing security screens/alarms, and pruned shrubs away from doors/windows.

Crime Prevention Programs

-

The most common crime prevention program selected by respondents was foot/bike patrols by police, followed by school based crime prevention programs, and safety checks for older neighbours

Witnessing Crime

41% of respondents reported that they had witnessed no crime in their suburb in the last year. The most common crimes respondents reported witnessing were vandalism, break and enter, and motor vehicle theft.

Division 2

Division 2 takes in the areas of: Springwood and Daisy Hill.

Safety Feelings

40.1% of respondents agreed that they felt safe from crime when in their own home. 65.4% felt safe when out alone in their neighbourhood during the day, while 14% felt safe when out alone in their neighbourhood at night.

21.7% of respondents agreed that they felt safe when at Shopping Centres at night, while 9.7% agreed that they felt safe when using parking lots at night.

68.3% of respondents agreed that they felt safe when travelling to and from/work school alone, while only 14.5% agreed that they felt safe when passing a group of young men on the street.

Crime in Suburb

47% of respondents agreed that crime was a problem in their suburb, while 50.8% agreed that crime had a negative impact on the lifestyles of people living in their suburb. 72.2% of respondents believed that property crime had increased in their suburb in the last three (3) years. 46.9% of respondents believed that personal/violent crime had increased in their suburb in the last three (3) years.

24.1% of respondents reported that there were areas in their suburb where they did not feel safe during the day. The most common area was local parks (35.6%) and a local entertainment venue/shopping centre (10.5%). The most common reason given for feeling unsafe was that respondents felt unsafe around the people who frequent that area, and to a lesser degree that the area had a reputation for being dangerous.

69.1% of respondents reported that there were areas in their suburb where they did not feel safe at night. The most common area nominated was entertainment venue/shopping centre (21.7%) and local parks (20%). The most common reason given by respondents regarding the reasons they felt unsafe were that they felt unsafe around the people who frequent that place, for reasons of poor lighting/poor design, and that the place had a reputation for being dangerous.

Safety strategies undertaken in the last year

9.6% of respondents reported that they had not undertaken any safety strategies in the last year because they felt safe. The most common safety strategies undertaken were locked doors when travelling in a vehicle, installing security screens/alarms, locked doors when travelling in a vehicle, pruned shrubs away from doors/windows and restricted activities at night (26.7%).

Crime Prevention Programs

-

The most common crime prevention program selected by respondents was foot/bike patrols by police, followed by safety checks for older neighbours, lighting, paths etc, and support networks for those living alone.

Witnessing Crime

33.7% of respondents reported that they had witnessed no crime in their suburb in the last year. The most common crimes respondents reported witnessing were vandalism, break and enter, and motor vehicle theft.

Division 3

Division 3 takes in the areas of: Woodridge

Safety Feelings

32.9% of respondents agreed that they felt safe from crime when in their own home. 36.7% felt safe when out alone in their neighbourhood during the day, while 5.7% felt safe when out alone in their neighbourhood at night.

10.1% of respondents agreed that they felt safe when at Shopping Centres at night, while 6.4% agreed that they felt safe when using parking lots at night.

45.5% of respondents agreed that they felt safe when travelling to and from/work school alone, while only 9.1% agreed that they felt safe when passing a group of young men on the street.

Crime in Suburb

82.4% of respondents agreed that crime was a problem in their suburb, while 70.7% agreed that crime had a negative impact on the lifestyles of people living in their suburb. 86.8% of respondents believed that property crime had increased in their suburb in the last three (3) years. 86.8% of respondents believed that personal/violent crime had increased in their suburb in the last three (3) years.

54.8% of respondents reported that there were areas in their suburb where they did not feel safe during the day. The most common area was nominated as 'other', followed local entertainment venue/shopping centre (28.6%), local parks (14.3%), and a specific street (14.3%). The most common reasons given for feeling unsafe was that respondents felt unsafe around the people who frequent that area and that the place had a reputation for being dangerous.

83.9% of respondents reported that there were areas in their suburb where they did not feel safe at night. The most common areas nominated were local parks and entertainment venue/shopping centre. The most common reason given by respondents regarding the reasons they felt unsafe were that they felt unsafe around the people who frequent that place or for reasons of poor lighting/poor design.

Safety strategies undertaken in the last year

7% of respondents reported that they had not undertaken any safety strategies in the last year because they felt safe. The most common safety strategies undertaken were locked doors when travelling in a vehicle, installing security screens/alarms, restricted activities at night (37.1%) and discussed safety with children/parents.

Crime Prevention Programs

-

The most common crime prevention programs selected by respondents was foot/bike patrols by police, followed by school based crime prevention programs, safety checks for older neighbours, lighting, paths etc, and after school activities for youth.

Witnessing Crime

18.9% of respondents reported that they had witnessed no crime in their suburb in the last year. The most common crimes respondents reported witnessing were break and enter,

vandalism, domestic violence, and bag snatching.

Division 4

Division 4 takes in the areas of: Slacks Creek

Safety Feelings

22.1% of respondents agreed that they felt safe from crime when in their own home. 45.6% felt safe when out alone in their neighbourhood during the day, while 5.5% felt safe when out alone in their neighbourhood at night.

17.9% of respondents agreed that they felt safe when at Shopping Centres at night, while 5.3% agreed that they felt safe when using parking lots at night.

59.7% of respondents agreed that they felt safe when travelling to and from/work school alone, while only 11.5% agreed that they felt safe when passing a group of young men on the street.

Crime in Suburb

68.8% of respondents agreed that crime was a problem in their suburb, while 67.9% agreed that crime had a negative impact on the lifestyles of people living in their suburb. 81.8% of respondents believed that property crime had increased in their suburb in the last three (3) years. 66.2% of respondents believed that personal/violent crime had increased in their suburb in the last three (3) years.

42.5% of respondents reported that there were areas in their suburb where they did not feel safe during the day. The most common area nominated as local parks (29.4%), followed by a specific street (17.6%), and a local entertainment venue/shopping centre (14.7%). The most common reasons given for feeling unsafe was that respondents felt unsafe around the people who frequent that area and that the place had a reputation for being dangerous.

77.9% of respondents reported that there were areas in their suburb where they did not feel safe at night. The most common areas nominated was a specific street (21.8%), followed by local parks (12.7%) and entertainment venue/shopping centre (9.1%). The most common reason given by respondents regarding the reasons they felt unsafe were that they felt unsafe around the people who frequent that place or for reasons of poor lighting/poor design.

Safety strategies undertaken in the last year

6.3% of respondents reported that they had not undertaken any safety strategies in the last year because they felt safe. The most common safety strategies undertaken were installing security screens/alarms, locked doors when travelling in a vehicle, discussed safety with children/parents, and bought a dog/guard dog.

Crime Prevention Programs

-

The most common crime prevention programs selected by respondents was foot/bike patrols by police, followed by school based crime prevention programs, safety checks for older neighbours, lighting, paths etc, and after school activities for youth.

Witnessing Crime

19% of respondents reported that they had witnessed no crime in their suburb in the last year. The most common crimes respondents reported witnessing were break and enter, vandalism, drug dealing and domestic violence.

Division 5

Division 5 takes in the areas of: Loganlea, Meadowbank, Waterford West, and Logan Reserve.

Safety Feelings

30% of respondents agreed that they felt safe from crime when in their own home. 47.2% felt safe when out alone in their neighbourhood during the day, while 12.5% felt safe when out alone in their neighbourhood at night.

16.1% of respondents agreed that they felt safe when at Shopping Centres at night, while 10.2% agreed that they felt safe when using parking lots at night.

60.2% of respondents agreed that they felt safe when travelling to and from/work school alone, while only 15.6% agreed that they felt safe when passing a group of young men on the street.

Crime in Suburb

67.8% of respondents agreed that crime was a problem in their suburb, while 58% agreed that crime had a negative impact on the lifestyles of people living in their suburb. 80.6% of respondents believed that property crime had increased in their suburb in the last three (3) years. 60.5% of respondents believed that personal/violent crime had increased in their suburb in the last three (3) years.

35% of respondents reported that there were areas in their suburb where they did not feel safe during the day. The most common area nominated as local entertainment venue/shopping centre (13.8%), followed by local parks (10.3%), and a specific street (10.3%). The most common reasons given for feeling unsafe was that respondents felt unsafe around the people who frequent that area and that the place had a reputation for being dangerous.

77.5% of respondents reported that there were areas in their suburb where they did not feel safe at night. The most common areas nominated was an entertainment venue/shopping centre (19.2%) and local parks (12.7%). The most common reason given by respondents regarding the reasons they felt unsafe were that they felt unsafe around the people who frequent that place or for reasons of poor lighting/poor design.

Safety strategies undertaken in the last year

4.4% of respondents reported that they had not undertaken any safety strategies in the last year because they felt safe. The most common safety strategies undertaken were installing security screens/alarms, locked doors when travelling in a vehicle, discussed safety with children/parents, bought a dog/guard dog, restricted activities at night (30%), and changed shopping times/places (26.7%).

Crime Prevention Programs

-

The most common crime prevention programs selected by respondents was foot/bike patrols by police, followed by school based crime prevention programs, safety checks for older neighbours, and after school activities for youth.

Witnessing Crime

23.3% of respondents reported that they had witnessed no crime in their suburb in the last year. The most common crimes respondents reported witnessing were break and enter, vandalism, and drug dealing.

Division 6

Division 6 takes in the areas of: Kingston and Berrinba.

Safety Feelings

30.2% of respondents agreed that they felt safe from crime when in their own home. 40.5% felt safe when out alone in their neighbourhood during the day, while 7.5% felt safe when out alone in their neighbourhood at night.

15.8% of respondents agreed that they felt safe when at Shopping Centres at night, while 5.4% agreed that they felt safe when using parking lots at night.

45.9% of respondents agreed that they felt safe when travelling to and from/work school alone, while only 9.5% agreed that they felt safe when passing a group of young men on the street.

Crime in Suburb

74.8% of respondents agreed that crime was a problem in their suburb, while 67.8% agreed that crime had a negative impact on the lifestyles of people living in their suburb. 80.6% of respondents believed that property crime had increased in their suburb in the last three (3) years. 74.1% of respondents believed that personal/violent crime had increased in their suburb in the last three (3) years.

46.4% of respondents reported that there were areas in their suburb where they did not feel safe during the day. The most common area nominated was defined as 'other' (55%) followed by local entertainment venue/shopping centre (26.7%), followed by a specific street (10%) and local parks (6.7%). The most common reasons given for feeling unsafe was that respondents felt unsafe around the people who frequent that area and that the place had a reputation for being dangerous.

77.3% of respondents reported that there were areas in their suburb where they did not feel safe at night. The most common areas nominated was an entertainment venue/shopping centre (17.8%) and a specific street (15.7%). The most common reason given by respondents regarding the reasons they felt unsafe were that they felt unsafe around the people who frequent that place, reasons of poor lighting/poor design or that the place had reputation for being dangerous.

Safety strategies undertaken in the last year

8.7% of respondents reported that they had not undertaken any safety strategies in the last year because they felt safe. The most common safety strategies undertaken were installing security screens/alarms, locked doors when travelling in a vehicle, discussed safety with children/parents and restricted activities at night (33.6%).

Crime Prevention Programs

-

The most common crime prevention programs selected by respondents was safety checks for older neighbours, foot/bike patrols by police, followed by school based crime prevention programs and after school activities for youth.

Witnessing Crime

18.1% of respondents reported that they had witnessed no crime in their suburb in the last year. The most common crimes respondents reported witnessing were break and enter, vandalism, domestic violence and drug dealing.

Division 7

Division 7 takes in the areas of: Marsden and Crestmead.

Safety Feelings

27% of respondents agreed that they felt safe from crime when in their own home. 44% felt safe when out alone in their neighbourhood during the day, while 5.8% felt safe when out alone in their neighbourhood at night.

13.1% of respondents agreed that they felt safe when at Shopping Centres at night, while 3.6% agreed that they felt safe when using parking lots at night.

52.6% of respondents agreed that they felt safe when travelling to and from/work school alone, while only 11.4% agreed that they felt safe when passing a group of young men on the street.

Crime in Suburb

73.9% of respondents agreed that crime was a problem in their suburb, while 66% agreed that crime had a negative impact on the lifestyles of people living in their suburb. 83.7% of respondents believed that property crime had increased in their suburb in the last three (3) years. 72.3% of respondents believed that personal/violent crime had increased in their suburb in the last three (3) years.

58.9% of respondents reported that there were areas in their suburb where they did not feel safe during the day. The most common area nominated was defined as 'other' (32.7%) followed by local entertainment venue/shopping centre (30.8%), followed by and local parks (21.2%). The most common reasons given for feeling unsafe was that respondents felt unsafe around the people who frequent that area and that the place had a reputation for being dangerous.

73% of respondents reported that there were areas in their suburb where they did not feel safe at night. The most common areas nominated was an entertainment venue/shopping centre (20.4%) and a specific street (11.8%). The most common reason given by respondents regarding the reasons they felt unsafe were that they felt unsafe around the people who frequent that place, reasons of poor lighting/poor design or that the place had reputation for being dangerous.

Safety strategies undertaken in the last year

6.4% of respondents reported that they had not undertaken any safety strategies in the last year because they felt safe. The most common safety strategies undertaken were, locked doors when travelling in a vehicle, installed security screens/alarms, discussed safety with children/parents, bought a dog/guard dog and restricted activities at night (31.2%).

Crime Prevention Programs

-

The most common crime prevention programs selected by respondents was foot/bike patrols by police, school based crime prevention programs, after school activities for youth and safety checks for older neighbours.

Witnessing Crime

16.3% of respondents reported that they had witnessed no crime in their suburb in the last year. The most common crimes respondents reported witnessing were break and enter, vandalism, domestic violence and robbery.

Division 8

Division 8 takes in the areas of: Shailer Park.

Safety Feelings

Table 1

37.7% of respondents agreed that they felt safe from crime when in their own home. 67.6% felt safe when out alone in their neighbourhood during the day, while 10.5% felt safe when out alone in their neighbourhood at night.

26.5% of respondents agreed that they felt safe when at Shopping Centres at night, while 14.3% agreed that they felt safe when using parking lots at night.

68% of respondents agreed that they felt safe when travelling to and from/work school alone, while only 16% agreed that they felt safe when passing a group of young men on the street.

Crime in Suburb

45.7% of respondents agreed that crime was a problem in their suburb, while 47.2% agreed that crime had a negative impact on the lifestyles of people living in their suburb. 78.3% of respondents believed that property crime had increased in their suburb in the last three (3) years. 47.6% of respondents believed that personal/violent crime had increased in their suburb in the last three (3) years.

21.6% of respondents reported that there were areas in their suburb where they did not feel safe during the day. The most common area nominated was defined as 'other' (60%) followed by local entertainment venue/shopping centre (21.7%) and local parks (17.4%). The most common reasons given for feeling unsafe were coded as 'other' and other defined reasons were that respondents felt unsafe around the people who frequent that area and to a lesser degree that the place had a reputation for being dangerous.

66.3% of respondents reported that there were areas in their suburb where they did not feel safe at night. The most common areas nominated was an entertainment venue/shopping centre (29.9%) and a specific street (14.9%). The most common reason given by respondents regarding the reasons stated that they felt unsafe around the people who frequent that place, reasons of poor lighting/poor design or that the place had reputation for being dangerous.

Safety strategies undertaken in the last year

9.3% of respondents reported that they had not undertaken any safety strategies in the last year because they felt safe. The most common safety strategies undertaken were, installed security screens/alarms, locked doors when travelling in a vehicle, discussed safety with children/parents, and bought a dog/guard dog.

Crime Prevention Programs

-

The most common crime prevention programs selected by respondents was safety checks for older neighbours, foot/bike patrols by police, school based crime prevention programs, and after school activities for youth.

Witnessing Crime

34.3% of respondents reported that they had witnessed no crime in their suburb in the last year. The most common crimes respondents reported witnessing were break and enter, vandalism, and motor vehicle theft.

Division 9

Division 9 takes in the areas of: Loganholme and Tanah Merah.

Safety Feelings

40.7% of respondents agreed that they felt safe from crime when in their own home. 69.6% felt safe when out alone in their neighbourhood during the day, while 20% felt safe when out alone in their neighbourhood at night.

22% of respondents agreed that they felt safe when at Shopping Centres at night, while 8.8% agreed that they felt safe when using parking lots at night.

70.8% of respondents agreed that they felt safe when travelling to and from/work school alone, while only 16.3% agreed that they felt safe when passing a group of young men on the street.

Crime in Suburb

44% of respondents agreed that crime was a problem in their suburb, while 40.2% agreed that crime had a negative impact on the lifestyles of people living in their suburb. 77.4% of respondents believed that property crime had increased in their suburb in the last three (3) years. 38.3% of respondents believed that personal/violent crime had increased in their suburb in the last three (3) years.

10.5% of respondents reported that there were areas in their suburb where they did not feel safe during the day. The most common area nominated was defined as a specific street (30%), followed by local entertainment venue/shopping centre (20%) and local parks (20%). The most common reasons given for feeling unsafe that respondents felt unsafe around the people who frequent that area and that the area had poor lighting/poor design.

60.7% of respondents reported that there were areas in their suburb where they did not feel safe at night. The most common areas nominated were local parks (27.7%), specific street (19.1%), and entertainment venue/shopping centre (10.6%). The most common reason given by respondents regarding the reasons stated that they felt unsafe around the people who frequent that place, and reasons of poor lighting/poor design.

Safety strategies undertaken in the last year

16.3% of respondents reported that they had not undertaken any safety strategies in the last year because they felt safe. The most common safety strategies undertaken were, locked doors when travelling in a vehicle, installed security screens/alarms discussed safety with children/parents, and restricted activities at night (20.7%).

Crime Prevention Programs

-

Table 1

The most common crime prevention programs selected by respondents was safety checks for older neighbours, foot/bike patrols by police, after school activities for youth and school based crime prevention programs.

Witnessing Crime

32.6% of respondents reported that they had witnessed no crime in their suburb in the last year. The most common crimes respondents reported witnessing were break and enter, vandalism, and motor vehicle theft.

Division 10

Division 10 takes in the areas of: Carbrook and Cornubia.

Safety Feelings

45.8% of respondents agreed that they felt safe from crime when in their own home. 68.3% felt safe when out alone in their neighbourhood during the day, while 25.4% felt safe when out alone in their neighbourhood at night.

33.3% of respondents agreed that they felt safe when at Shopping Centres at night, while 15.8% agreed that they felt safe when using parking lots at night.

76.8% of respondents agreed that they felt safe when travelling to and from/work school alone, while 24.1% agreed that they felt safe when passing a group of young men on the street.

Crime in Suburb

32.2% of respondents agreed that crime was a problem in their suburb, while 33.3% agreed that crime had a negative impact on the lifestyles of people living in their suburb. 67.9% of respondents believed that property crime had increased in their suburb in the last three (3) years. 26.9% of respondents believed that personal/violent crime had increased in their suburb in the last three (3) years.

24.1% of respondents reported that there were areas in their suburb where they did not feel safe during the day. The most common area nominated was defined as 'other', followed by local parks (21.4%), a specific street (14.3%), and entertainment venue/shopping centre (14.3%). The most common reasons given for feeling unsafe that that the area had poor lighting/poor design and that they felt unsafe around the people who frequent that place.

62% of respondents reported that there were areas in their suburb where they did not feel safe at night. The most common areas nominated were, a specific street (27.6%), local parks (20.7%) and entertainment venue/shopping centre (13.3%). The most common reason given by respondents regarding the reasons stated that they felt unsafe for reasons of poor lighting/poor design, that the area was vandalized/run down, and that they felt unsafe around the people who frequent that place.

Safety strategies undertaken in the last year

16.7% of respondents reported that they had not undertaken any safety strategies in the last year because they felt safe. The most common safety strategies undertaken were, installed security screens/alarms, locked doors when travelling in a vehicle, and discussed safety with children/parents.

Crime Prevention Programs

-

The most common crime prevention programs selected by respondents was after school based crime prevention programs, after school activities for youth, safety checks for older neighbours, and foot/bike patrols by police.

-

Witnessing Crime

-

32.7% of respondents reported that they had witnessed no crime in their suburb in the last year. The most common crimes respondents reported witnessing were break and enter, vandalism, and motor vehicle theft.

Division 11

Division 11 takes in the areas of: Browns Plains, Regents Park, Heritage Park, and Park Ridge.

Safety Feelings

53.6% of respondents agreed that they felt safe from crime when in their own home. 68.3% felt safe when out alone in their neighbourhood during the day, while 10.1% felt safe when out alone in their neighbourhood at night.

15.9% of respondents agreed that they felt safe when at Shopping Centres at night, while 8.9% agreed that they felt safe when using parking lots at night.

55.5% of respondents agreed that they felt safe when travelling to and from/work school alone, while 11.8% agreed that they felt safe when passing a group of young men on the street.

Crime in Suburb

64.4% of respondents agreed that crime was a problem in their suburb, while 50.8% agreed that crime had a negative impact on the lifestyles of people living in their suburb. 87.7% of respondents believed that property crime had increased in their suburb in the last three (3) years. 62.5% of respondents believed that personal/violent crime had increased in their suburb in the last three (3) years.

31.6% of respondents reported that there were areas in their suburb where they did not feel safe during the day. The most common area nominated was defined as 'other', followed by local parks (27.3%), a specific street (12.1%), and entertainment venue/shopping centre (9.1%). The most common reasons given for feeling unsafe that that the area had poor

Table 1

lighting/poor design and that the area was vandalised/run down.

73.3% of respondents reported that there were areas in their suburb where they did not feel safe at night. The most common areas nominated were, local parks (24.2%) and a specific street (17.5%). The most common reason given by respondents regarding the reasons stated that they felt unsafe for reasons of poor lighting/poor design, and that they felt unsafe around the people who frequent that place.

Safety strategies undertaken in the last year

5.2% of respondents reported that they had not undertaken any safety strategies in the last year because they felt safe. The most common safety strategies undertaken were, pruned shrubs away from doors/windows, locked doors when travelling in a vehicle, installed security screens/alarms, and discussed safety with children/parents.

Crime Prevention Programs

-

The most common crime prevention programs selected by respondents was foot/bike patrols by police, safety checks for older neighbours, lighting, paths etc, and after school activities for youth.

Witnessing Crime

28.5% of respondents reported that they had witnessed no crime in their suburb in the last year. The most common crimes respondents reported witnessing were break and enter, vandalism, and motor vehicle theft, and domestic violence.

Division 12

Division 12 takes in the areas of: Boronia Heights, Hillcrest, Forestdale, and Greenbank.

-

-

-

Safety Feelings

38.3% of respondents agreed that they felt safe from crime when in their own home. 57.4% felt safe when out alone in their neighbourhood during the day, while 13.5% felt safe when out alone in their neighbourhood at night.

19.7% of respondents agreed that they felt safe when at Shopping Centres at night, while 7% agreed that they felt safe when using parking lots at night.

59.8% of respondents agreed that they felt safe when travelling to and from/work school alone, while 15% agreed that they felt safe when passing a group of young men on the street.

Crime in Suburb

58.9% of respondents agreed that crime was a problem in their suburb, while 41.5% agreed that crime had a negative impact on the lifestyles of people living in their suburb. 78.5% of respondents believed that property crime had increased in their suburb in the last three (3) years. 41.5% of respondents believed that personal/violent crime had increased in their suburb in the last three (3) years.

30.8% of respondents reported that there were areas in their suburb where they did not feel safe during the day. The most common area nominated was defined as 'other', followed by local parks (27.9%), a specific street (11.6%), and entertainment venue/shopping centre (11.6%). The most common reasons given for feeling unsafe that that they felt unsafe around the people who frequent that place and that the area had poor lighting/poor design.

65% of respondents reported that there were areas in their suburb where they did not feel safe at night. The most common areas nominated were, entertainment venue/shopping centre (22%) and local parks (14.6%). The most common reason given by respondents regarding the reasons stated that they felt unsafe around the people who frequent that place and that the area had poor lighting/poor design.

Safety strategies undertaken in the last year

13.4% of respondents reported that they had not undertaken any safety strategies in the last year because they felt safe. The most common safety strategies undertaken were, locked doors when travelling in a vehicle, installed security screens/alarms, and pruned shrubs away from doors/windows.

Crime Prevention Programs

-

The most common crime prevention programs selected by respondents was foot/bike patrols by police, safety checks for older neighbours, after school activities for youth, and lighting, paths etc.

Witnessing Crime

35.2% of respondents reported that they had witnessed no crime in their suburb in the last year. The most common crimes respondents reported witnessing were break and enter, vandalism, and motor vehicle theft.

References

Australian Bureau of Statistics. 1995. *Crime and Safety, Queensland, April 1995*. ABS. Canberra.

Australian Bureau of Statistic. 1997. *1996 Census of Population and Housing*. ABS. Canberra.

Australian Institute of Criminology. 1997. 'Australian Criminal Justice - Latest Statistics'. <http://www.aic.gov.au> .

Census and Statistics. 1995. 'Crime Victimization Survey Report Published'. <http://www.info.gov.hk> .

Criminal Justice Commission. 1992. *Youth, Crime and Justice in Queensland: An Information and Issues Paper*. Criminal Justice Commission. Brisbane.

Department of Justice. 1995. 'Fear of Crime in Canada: Taking the Pulse of a Nation'. <http://www.acjnet.org> .

Franken, R.E. 1988. *Human Motivation* . 2nd edn. Brooks/Cole Publishing Company. California.

Gibson, R. 1998. 'Expert alert on school bullying'. *Age*. 22 Jan. p.3.

International Centre for the Prevention of Crime. 1997. 'Healthy Start'. <http://www.crime-prevention-int/.org> .

International Centre for the Prevention of Crime. 1997. 'Preventing Crime Through Enriched Preschool Programming for at risk Children'.
<http://www.crime-prevention-int/.org>

Legislative Analysis Office. 1995. 'Accommodating the State's Inmate Population Growth'. <http://www.lao.ca.gov> .

Logan City Council. 1997. *Logan City: A Community Profile*. Logan City Council.

McLennan, W. 1997. *Youth, Australia: A Social Report, 1997*. ABS.Canberra.

Queensland Government. 1996. *The Victim Compensation Act(1996)*. Goprint. Brisbane.

Queensland Police Service. 1997. *Queensland Police Service Statistical Review 1996-1997*.QPS. Brisbane.

Sherman, L.W., Gottfredson, D., Mackenzie, D., Eck, J., Reuter, P. Bushway, S. 1996. *Preventing Crime: What Works, What Doesn't. What's Promising*. National Institute of Justice. Washington.

Social Statistic Briefing Room. 1997. 'Violent Crime Rates by Sex of Victim'. <http://www.whitehouse.gov>.

The John Howard Society of Alberta. 1995. 'Crime Prevention Through Social Development'. <http://www.acjnet.org> .

U.S. Department of Justice. 1994. 'Elderly Crime Victims: National Victimization Survey'. <http://www.sunsoci.niv.edu> .

U.S. Department of Justice. 1995. 'The Nation's two crime measures'. <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov>.

