



# 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 by Young People in Logan*

**Stephanie Whelan**

**Clive Begg**

**July 1998**

**ISBN Number 1 876423 36 6**

**Copyright: ACRO Australian Community Safety & Research Organisation Incorporated**

**P O 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.

**Executive Summary**

Discussions of young people and crime traditionally occur on three levels. Firstly the concern expressed about young people as offenders; the perpetrators of crime. Secondly, concern expressed about young people's use of public space. The final level of discussion is the crime victimisation experienced by young people. Discussions in the community often tend to cover at great length concerns about juvenile offending and young people's use of public space, however, it is unlikely that any significant discussion would centre on the issue of the victimisation of young people. The Report is underpinned by a belief that effective crime prevention interventions (that target young people) must include programs that will address the victimisation of young people alongside the more common interventions that target youth offending and public space issues.

The Research was undertaken on the premise that effective crime prevention requires the development of community based partnerships to locally respond to crime on a variety of levels. Localised community based responses to crime often include situational interventions (responses to address a particular problem § graffiti in a particular location § a local park ), however, the current research is premised on the belief that community based partnerships can also effectively deal with the social causes of crime (responses that tackle family violence and family dysfunction, drug and alcohol abuse, failure to participate in schooling, etc).

The Research was further premised on the recognition that young people have a significant stakehold in crime in the community (as victims, as offenders, and as future taxpayers facing the costly burden that incarceration offers as a response to crime) and must directly participate in the identification of problematic issues and the development of strategies for implementation in their community.

The Report follows earlier research conducted by the Australian Community Safety & Research Organisation in Logan City. The earlier research involved the completion of surveys by 1742 residents, providing information about residents concerns regarding their personal safety in specific situations, individual experiences with property and/or personal/violent crime victimisation, and crime prevention initiatives they would like to see introduced in their suburb. The current research involved the completion of surveys by 1515 young people aged between 12 and 24 years. The greatest majority of survey respondents completed the survey while attending secondary school in the Logan City Local Government Area.

The same survey instrument was utilised in both research projects and a comparison of responses made by youth (survey respondents aged between 12 and 24 years) and adults (survey respondents aged 25 years and over) is provided in Section 3 of the Analysis in the current report. In most cases the percentage and actual number of survey participants who responded in a particular way is reported. When discussing differences between groups of respondents (male and female, youth and adult) particular terminology should alert the reader that those differences were significant in the current research. When the terminology of one group was "slightly more likely", "more likely", or "far more likely" to make a particular response the reader should be alerted that the differences between the two discussed groups was statistically significant. Readers who are interested in more information regarding the significance testing used in the current research and the reporting of statistical significance are referred to the section Research Notes.

More than a third of all youth respondents and more than half of all adult respondents (from earlier research) agreed that crime was a problem in their suburb and negatively impacted on the lifestyle of people living in their suburb. In the light of this finding and the finding that respondents reported diminished feelings of safety in a range of situations and areas in their neighbourhood it is recommended that the targeting of a specific problematic issue for priority action may be of assistance in counteracting any perception that the 'problem is too big to tackle'. The issue that is prioritised for action should be subject to a wide range of complementary strategies over a specific time frame.

Respondents provided information regarding their feelings of safety in a range of specific situations. Youth felt safer than adults in all of the situations asked about in the survey and males typically felt safer than females did. Youth and adults reported feeling most vulnerable when using parking lots at night and when out alone in their neighbourhood at night. Half of all youth respondents and nearly three quarters of all adult respondents reported that there were areas in their neighbourhood where they did not feel safe at night. The most common areas (in their neighbourhood) nominated by respondents as generating diminished safety feelings were local parks followed by local streets or the whole suburb. Recommendations are made regarding the targeting of well-utilised parking lots for crime prevention interventions, the targeting of local parks (particularly those specifically named in earlier research) for close scrutiny via safety audits, and the implementation of crime prevention interventions along common thoroughfares as identified in local neighbourhoods.

Youth generally reported higher levels of personal/violent victimisation and more frequently reported that violence was a problem in their home (than adults did). Recommendations are made that programs be implemented which enable young people to address the personal/violent victimisation experienced by them (and that the programs enable the wide range of victimisation experiences to be addressed). Programs should, to a significant degree, actively reflect understanding of the victimisation of young people in the 'safe environment' of the home.

Another form of victimisation experienced by nearly one-third of the young people surveyed was bullying at school. Half of bullied young people had reported the bullying to the school and most were satisfied with the outcome of action taken by the school. A common reason for non-reporting was fear of the perpetrator and a common reason for not being satisfied with the outcome of action taken (by the school) was that the bullying had continued. Recommendations are made regarding the ability of existing programs to respond to these problems reported by survey respondents; the failure to report bullying because of fear and the continuation of bullying despite intervention by the school.

Youth respondents were more than twice as likely as adults to have reported personal awareness of drugs in their community (through reported witnessing of drug dealing). Recommendations are made regarding the provision of drug abuse prevention programs specifically available to young people in the community.

The majority of youth and adult respondents believed that elderly people were more likely than others to be the victims of crime. Safety checks for older neighbours was the second most commonly selected crime prevention initiative desired for introduction in their suburb (for youth and adult respondents). Recommendations are made regarding the implementation of programs whereby young people are actively engaged in promoting the safe and confident living of older community members.

Youth respondents did indicate a need for the increased provision of After-school activities for youth (12-18 years). This option was the third most commonly selected crime prevention program for introduction in their suburb (4<sup>th</sup> for adults). Recommendations are made regarding the collection of information regarding the current availability of activities and regarding the benefit of a cooperative approach by a wide range of service providers to achieve optimum levels of activity provision in the hours outside of schooling.

The Research (in combination with earlier research conducted with adults) has clearly indicated that young people have very similar concerns to adult community members. Young people do tend to feel less vulnerable than adult community members, but also report higher levels of personal/violent victimisation. Young people tend to be less confident (than adult respondents) of the positive contribution their peer group makes to the community but demonstrate altruistic concern regarding the safety needs of older community members. Overall, the safety needs of young people are similar (as identified by respondents) to those of adults, but probably more urgent attention is required in the area of personal/violent victimisation and drug use prevention.

## How to use this Report

**The report contains a great deal of detailed information regarding the survey responses made by young people in Logan City.**

**Readers are encouraged to give some thought (prior to reading the report) regarding what they want to know from the report. Due to the level of detail and wide range of issues covered (in relation to crime) in the report we have provided some guidelines below that we hope will provide assistance to the reader.**

If you are interested in gaining an overview of what young people said and what the broad findings of the report are, then you may only want to read the **executive summary**.

If you are most interested in what recommendations have been made in relation to the survey findings, but would

also like to get an overview of what young people said, then you should read the **executive summary** and the **recommendations**.

If you are interested in the different ways that males and females responded (to the survey) or the different ways that youth and adults responded along with the general survey findings, then you should read the **Analysis section summaries** (page references on the contents page).

If you are interested in a particular issue that may be covered in the report then you are advised to use the **index**. Some examples of issues that are discussed throughout the report and can be found in the index are bullying, personal/violent victimisation, and respondents attitudes towards crime and safety in their neighbourhoods.

If you have read the **recommendations** and are interested in a particular area of discussion and would like to read about some program ideas then you should read the **selected program concepts** (all or related to a particular issue). Some examples of topics for which program ideas are described in that section are older community members, youth, safety in local parks, and Domestic Violence.

## Recommendations

Youth and adult respondents reported feeling most vulnerable (as indicated by survey findings) when using parking lots at night. Females reported most diminished feelings of safety for both youth and adults. It may be that respondents are concerned about crime victimisation generally in this situation, however, given that both female youth and female adults reported feeling more vulnerable than their male counterparts it is likely that there is also considerable level of concern specifically regarding personal/violent victimisation.

**IT IS RECOMMENDED that the parking facilities identified as being subject to regular use by community members (regardless of age) are subject to Safety Audits and the recommendations of such audits are prioritised for action.**

**IT IS RECOMMENDED that Safety Audits are conducted during darkness and identified vulnerable groups (women and the elderly) are well represented in Audit teams.**

**IT IS RECOMMENDED that the audits cover behavioural factors along with static environmental factors.**

Adults and youth identified local parks as the public space where they felt the most concern about safety and crime during the day and at night. Adults and youth expressed concern about the behaviour of people using these public spaces and at night, additionally were concerned about the inadequate level of lighting that exacerbated concerns about the dangers associated with these spaces. It should also be noted that youth respondents rated Facilities such as lighting, paths etc, as the 'crime prevention program' they most desired for introduction in their suburb.

**Given the finding that youth and adults targeted local parks as areas that caused 'safety concerns' during the day and at night IT IS RECOMMENDED that local parks (particularly those specifically identified in the earlier Mail Out Survey) are subject to**

**Safety Audits that clearly identify the factors associated with an individual's sense of vulnerability to crime. The Safety Audit should also be concerned with the behaviours exhibited at these public spaces and these factors are subsequently addressed alongside more static issues, such as vegetation and lighting.**

More than a third of all youth respondents and more than half of all adult respondents agreed that crime was a problem in their suburb and had a negative impact on the lifestyles of people living in their suburb. The greatest majority of respondents (both youth and adult) believed that property crime had increased in their suburb and nearly half of all youth respondents and more than half of all adult respondents believed that personal/violent crime had increased in their suburb in the last three years. These findings clearly illustrate the level of concern about crime that is evident in the attitudes of local residents to their own suburb.

There is a clear belief that the 'crime situation' is worsening, that it is problematic, and that it is negatively impacting on the lifestyle of people living in their own suburb. It is possible that residents are experiencing a sense of powerlessness regarding crime and there may be an attitude that the crime problem is so significant that residents cannot take any action that would be effective in reducing the problem or preventing crime from occurring. It is not possible from the current research to state that residents of Logan City are feeling powerless in the face of their attitudes regarding crime in their local area, but it is a possibility that crime prevention bodies active in the region should consider and be prepared to strategically address if necessary.

**Where crime prevention bodies conclude that a sense of powerlessness is evident in the attitudes and behaviour of local residents to the perhaps overwhelming task of crime prevention, IT IS RECOMMENDED that a single aim be selected, promoted and actively addressed by multiple complementary strategies over a specified period of time. An example may be that the issue of safety at Rail Stations is selected, the aim may be to visibly improve safety and reduce fear of 'users' of these facilities over a six month period. Strategies could include Safety Audits of existing facilities, upgrading of safety facilities at the facilities, a regime of patrols is developed (perhaps cooperatively between Qrail and the Police), a Watch program is developed specifically for the areas surrounding the facility, etc. It is important to the use of this type of intervention that the goals of the overall strategy are carefully defined and measured. For example, if the goal is to reduce fear among 'users', then fear levels of users must be measured before implementation and after the completion of the strategy.**

Nearly a quarter of all youth respondents and nearly one third of all adult respondents reported that there were areas in their neighbourhood where they do not feel safe during the day. More than half of all youth respondents and nearly three quarters of all adult respondents reported that there were areas in the neighbourhood where they do not feel safe at night. The most common areas nominated were local parks/bushland (discussed above in recommendations) followed by local streets or the whole suburb. The reasons given for feeling unsafe most commonly related to 'people' factors, that they felt unsafe around the people who frequent that area. Respondents (talking about areas at night) also commonly gave reasons that referred to poor lighting/poor design and regrettably also gave reasons that the area (they had nominated) had a reputation for being dangerous. Strategies to deal with these heightened levels of concern should then be looking at the behaviour of people in specific areas (encourage positive behaviours), the lighting of the area at night and the general design (for safety issues), and working towards giving these areas a reputation for being safe (as opposed to dangerous). It should also be noted that youth respondents rated Facilities such as lighting, paths etc, as the 'crime prevention program' they most desired for introduction in their suburb.

**IT IS RECOMMENDED that areas of 'common thoroughfare' in neighbourhoods throughout Logan City be subject to interventions designed to enhance residents' feelings of safety when using these routes. Some areas that are often used as 'common thoroughfares' in neighbourhoods are those routes that lead to shopping facilities, to public transport, and to schools. Individual neighbourhoods would need to be active in deciding the route of their own 'common thoroughfare' and Safety Audits can highlight some immediate issues for action to render the area more 'user friendly'. Additionally the maintenance of work implemented in such 'safe passages' is vital and signage can also be used to identify that route as one designed for safety and actioned by local residents.**

Respondents were asked several questions regarding crime victimisation. It is worthwhile noting that similar percentages of youth and adult respondents (who had reported the offences to the police) reported that they had received feedback regarding their complaint. 40.9% of youth and

40.5% of adults who reported property crime victimisation to the police had received feedback, while 51.3% of youth and 58.2% of adult respondents who reported personal/violent crime victimisation to the police had received feedback. Of importance is the difference in satisfaction levels between those respondents who had received feedback and those respondents who had not received any feedback from the police. More than two thirds of all respondents (youth and adult) who had received feedback from police regarding the reported offence were satisfied with the outcome (both property crime and personal/violent crime), while only about a quarter of all respondents (youth and adult) who had not received feedback from police regarding the reported offence reported they were satisfied with the outcome.

**IT IS RECOMMENDED that Police policies regarding the requirements of victim follow up contact are examined with a view to increasing the number of 'victims' who receive feedback or follow up contact from the police after an offence has been reported.**

One in four of youth respondents reported personal/violent crime victimisation. About half of all youth and adults (from earlier Community Survey) reported that the victimisation had occurred in their own home and nearly two thirds (more than half for adults) of victimised youth reported that they had known the person who had committed the offence. In a separate finding more than one out of every ten respondents reported that violence from family members was a problem in their home. Although it is obvious from this finding that many of the young people who reported personal/violent victimisation were victimised outside of their home (read safe) environment by someone unknown to them, it is even clearer that a significant proportion of young people were discussing personal/violent crime victimisation that occurred in their home and by someone known to them. It is extremely concerning that 12.1% of respondents reported that family violence occurred in their home regardless of whether that violence is directed from parents or siblings.

**IT IS RECOMMENDED that the level of personal/violent victimisation of young people be treated as an issue of immediate concern to those agencies directly involved in service provision targeting youth clients (including schools) or violence in the community. A cooperative approach (involving young people as key stakeholders) should be taken in the development of a program that can be provided to a wide range of young people, not just those considered 'at risk'. The program should incorporate protective behaviours and options after victimisation has occurred. Young people (through the program) should be provided with opportunities to develop (with adult support) strategies that target the victimisation of young people in their local community. It is vital that young people are actively provided with opportunities to 'deal with' the victimisation they might be (or previously have) experiencing. It is clear that victimisation programs that do not provide a sufficient focus on family violence will not be applicable to many young people experiencing victimisation.**

29.7% of respondents reported that in the last five (5) years they had been bullied at school. The rate of reporting (to the school) is not particularly high; about half (50.7%) of those who had been bullied had reported it to the school. Of interest are the young people's reasons for non-reporting, nearly one-quarter (of those who hadn't reported the bullying) gave reasons that referred to a fear of further/increased bullying as a result of reporting, more reassuring is the finding that other common reasons (given for non reporting) were that the bullying wasn't serious enough or that the young person had handled it themselves. Most of the respondents who had reported the bullying had received feedback and were satisfied with the outcome. The most common reason given (by respondents) for not being satisfied with the outcome were that action was taken but they were not satisfied with the action, that no action was taken, and that the bullying was still happening/had continued.

**IT IS RECOMMENDED that programs that seek to address bullying be examined in relation to their ability to protect the victimised individual from further bullying. A significant number of young people who are experiencing (or have experienced) bullying clearly have little faith in the ability of school interventions to adequately protect them from the bully, nearly half of all those who had been bullied had not reported it and a quarter of these gave their reason as fear of increased bullying. If current programs are found to be unable to adequately meet the 'protection' needs of young people then consultation with young people should occur to amend programs to more adequately meet these needs. Best practice programs from elsewhere (nationally and internationally) can also be examined to provide information regarding program efficacy.**

**IT IS RECOMMENDED that the ability of current programs to follow-up the effectiveness of action taken regarding bullying victimisation is examined with young people actively involved in providing feedback. In the current research the most common reason a young person reported being dissatisfied with the outcome (of school intervention) was that the bullying was still happening/had continued. If current programs are found to be lacking effectiveness in the prevention of further bullying victimisation then consultation with young people should occur to enable programs to more adequately meet these needs. Best practice programs from elsewhere (nationally and internationally) can also be examined to provide information regarding program efficacy.**

Nearly three quarters of youth respondents reported witnessing at least one offence during the last year. The most common offences reported by respondents were Break and Enter, Vandalism, and Drug Dealing. Youth respondents were far more likely than adults to have reported witnessing Drug Dealing (the 5<sup>th</sup> most commonly witnessed offence for adults). It would seem likely that the similar levels of reported witnessing for Break and Enter for youth and adults (39.6% youth, 39.9% adult) are indicative of the incidence of Break and Enter in the community and the level of awareness that most people have of Break and Enters that occur to someone 'known' to them (friend, relative, neighbours, someone in the street). Youth and adults also reported similarly high levels of witnessing of Vandalism (39.9% youth, 39.2% adult).

It is accepted that respondents (both youth and adult) probably considered personal knowledge of the general distribution of drugs as the witnessing of Drug Dealing. Respondents (both youth and adult) who reported witnessing this offence were not necessarily reporting that they had observed drugs being exchanged for money, although it is likely that some respondents also witnessed this behaviour. Exposure to drugs is considered a risk factor in drug use. The availability of drugs is widely regarded as an important factor in the commencement of drug use by young people, it would seem to be logical that a decision to use drugs is more likely for a young person who is well aware of the steps necessary to obtain drugs in their local community.

**IT IS RECOMMENDED that an audit be conducted of drug use prevention programs currently being provided in the local community. The audit should consider; the age group being targeted, number of participants, the location of program provision, the regularity of program provision, the main content of program (media campaign, educational lecture, educational materials, interactive youth program, etc), evaluative materials available. This audit is to enable further action and should involve streamlined effective activities that do not require significant time expenditure. A suggested strategy is the use of a semi-structured phone interview with local service providers to solicit the required information.**

**Where it is found that the level of drug prevention program provision is inadequate IT IS RECOMMENDED that a plan of program implementation be developed and should incorporate time lines for program delivery by agencies best placed to effectively target young people in the local community. It would not seem necessary to develop a completely new drug use prevention program, but it may be necessary to consider those program factors that have been identified as adding to the effectiveness (in preventing drug use) of drug use prevention programs. Some of these factors include; program delivery to primary school aged children, booster sessions throughout secondary school (follow up program delivery), provision of social skills training, and a significant level of interactive features.**

The majority of youth and adults believed that elderly people were more likely than others to be the victims of crime. It is likely that this erroneous belief was a motivation for the selection of Safety checks for older neighbours as a popular 'crime prevention program' by both youth and adults. Safety checks for older neighbours were ranked 2<sup>nd</sup> for both youth and adults (in terms of frequency of selection). Older community members are not more likely to be victims of crime than other age groups and in fact are far less likely than even very young children to be the victim of violent offences (as indicated by police statistics), however, older community members are a 'group' that typically reports heightened levels of fear of crime. Older community members are certainly often more physically vulnerable to violent victimisation and economically vulnerable to property victimisation. Readers can find a more detailed explanation of fear of crime, vulnerability and older community members in the earlier report published by the Australian Community Safety & Research Organisation regarding research conducted in Logan City.

**IT IS RECOMMENDED that young people be provided with practical opportunities to assist in the safer and more confident living of older community members. A program that actively involved young people as service providers and older community members as the target group for assistance should be developed in cooperation with two key groups of stakeholders, interested young people and older community members. Through involvement in such a program young people will be actively participating in community safety (providing assistance to vulnerable groups) but will also be engaging in the community in such a way, so as to address the concerns of other community members that many young people are disengaged from community life. This strategy is less a crime prevention strategy (given that older people are typically at very low risk of victimisation) than a strategy that seeks to enhance community safety. The program should have widespread involvement and activities multi faceted to provide an opportunity for differing needs of older people to be met and the diversity of the older community to be communicated to young people. The program should be well profiled in local media and actively promoted amongst young people.**

After school activities for youth were the third most frequently selected option for youth respondents (4<sup>th</sup> for adults). It would seem that there is agreement amongst young people that activities that seek to engage young people in the hours after formal schooling has been completed would be to achieve some crime prevention effect. The limited research available does support the notion that recreational activities can prevent youth offending and a wide range of programs nationally and internationally have focused their energies on the hours young people spend outside of school. Some programs provide activities well into the evening hours while others focus on the hours after school and preceding darkness. It would seem obvious that one service provider cannot be all things to all people, however, it is possible that cooperative efforts between agencies (sporting, social services, schools, local government, etc) could achieve a series of activities that better cover young peoples needs and also serve to clearly define the existing gaps that no service currently is (or able) to address.

**IT IS RECOMMENDED that the ability of existing service providers to operate recreational programs (active skills based programs) during the after school and evening period is examined. It is probable that services need to be more proactive in seeking youth participation and should clearly articulate their target group and the methods to be utilised to gain their participation in activities. Projects that take place in young people's own suburb or locality should be encouraged and where**

failure to access activities is a result of transportation difficulties then cooperative arrangements should be developed to address these shortfalls.

**IT IS RECOMMENDED that a cooperative approach be developed by those service providers with some ability to provide after school activities for youth. A cooperative approach would seek to maximise the effect of energies expended by services and highlight any significant service provision 'gaps' regarding recreational opportunities for youth. Agencies that could participate in such a cooperative approach could include youth agencies, the police, schools, sporting clubs, and the local Council.**

## Introduction

Young people are often the focus of concerns about crime and crime prevention. Younger children are most commonly discussed in terms of victimisation issues. Young people of the 'teenage years' would seem to be most commonly the subject of discussions centering on offending behaviour, both that behaviour that involves offences against the law and also that behaviour that involves offences against the expectation of social order. It is time to develop a more comprehensive way of discussing young people and crime. Round table discussions ('mini crime forums') will often generate high levels of apparent concern about 'juvenile offending' and the problem of 'teenagers hanging out' - the same discussions are unlikely to generate comparable levels of concern regarding the criminal victimisation of young people. Young people are often the focus of concerns about crime and crime prevention. Younger children are most commonly discussed in terms of victimisation issues. Young people of the 'teenage years' would seem to be most commonly the subject of discussions centering on offending behaviour, both that behaviour that involves offences against the law and also that behaviour that involves offences against the expectation of social order. There is a clear and direct link between child abuse and neglect and later offending. One study found that being the victim of childhood abuse increased the likelihood of juvenile delinquency and adult criminality by 40%. A mature approach to crime prevention necessitates an acceptance that the prevention of the victimisation of young people is a critical priority.

The picture of juvenile offending is complex. What we know is based on who gets caught. From that base of knowledge it is clear that juvenile offenders are generally overrepresented in the commission of property crimes while generally a higher proportion of adults are processed for violent crimes. There are many valid reasons to develop interventions that seek to prevent juvenile offending. While most juvenile offenders do not commit serious major offences (either physically or economically) it is true that most habitual adult offenders also offended as juveniles. The eventual result of offending is incarceration, a remedy that comes at prohibitive economic cost to the community and has no supported effect on the prevention of future offending or as deterrence for others. Preventing an offence being committed means that you have also prevented a victim being 'created'; criminal victimisation is an important factor in the fear of crime and the emotional and physical effects of victimisation can extend for long periods after the offence was committed.

Local communities appear to be becoming increasingly concerned about young people's use of public space. These concerns may be more complex than what they initially appear and the clear articulation of the issues is important. The expressed concern may be directed at problematic behaviour that is occurring in specific public places, behaviour that may be criminal in nature and which create heightened fears of victimisation for those who witness the behaviour. The expressed concern may be directed at fears that young people are lacking in recreational (or other) opportunities/activities that would appropriately engage their participation (and are in fact at increased risk of alcohol/drug use through their inability to participate in positive activities). Clear expression of the perceived problem is important and if interventions are decided upon, then they should be interventions that seek to engage young people rather than exclude them. A community that is serious about crime prevention is a community that seeks to be inclusive of its members and actively engages all community members in its efforts to create a safer community.

Effective crime prevention for young people needs to be comprehensive in its approach. Much crime prevention is focused on the behaviour of young people in public space with more specific programming designed to target young people identified as 'at risk' for involvement in juvenile offending. To be truly effective and to promote community safety it is critical that the victimisation of young people also be targeted by crime prevention initiatives. **This report will look at the concerns of young people living in Logan as reflected by responses to a survey that examined attitudes, experiences, and crime prevention needs.** Survey respondents are all aged between 15 years and 24 years and this is the definition of young people that will be utilised in the report. The majority of discussion will focus on those young people aged between 12 and 17, as this age group is that which many program initiatives tend to target. This age group is also socially active and generally attending school (and not financially independent). **The report will examine the responses of young people and consider directions that can be taken regarding victimisation, offending, and the activities of young people that concern the wider community.**

### Young People as Victims

The consideration of the victimisation experiences of young people is not the dominant focus of most discussions regarding young people and crime. There seems to be a perception within the community that young people are most appropriately targeted in 'crime discussions' as the perpetrators of crime. Discussions that do refer to the victimisation of young people often leave the impression that the higher personal/violent victimisation rate associated with younger adults is to a large degree the result of the active social life led by individuals in this age group and the associated risk taking behaviour exhibited by some young people (for example excessive alcohol consumption). The official victimisation statistics as provided within the Queensland Police Statistical Review, 1996/1997 does not contradict this widely held belief. However, they do provide additional information regarding the victimisation of more youthful adolescents, additional information that provides a somewhat chilling perspective on aspects of the personal/violent victimisation of individuals aged under 25 years.

In Australia in 1995, over 20% of victims of Sexual Assault were under the age of 10 and nearly 61% were aged less than 20 years. In Queensland in 1996/1997 females aged between 10 and 19 years were most at risk for victimisation of sexual offences, while for males those aged between 10 and 14 years were most at risk. Males and females aged between 15 and 19 years were at the greatest risk of Assault, while males in this age group experienced the greatest rate of victimisation of Robbery offences.

In the South Eastern Region of Queensland (as utilised by Queensland Police Service) in 1996/1997 young people aged less than 14 years experienced greater victimisation in relation to Sexual Offences followed by those aged between 15 and 24 years. In Logan those aged less than 14 years make up 29% of the population but made up 42% of victims of Sexual offences in 1996/1997 (for the South Eastern Region) and those aged between 15 and 24 years make up 17.4% of the population but made up 33.9% of victims for the same offence and period. Young people aged between 15 and 24 years experienced greater victimisation in relation to Assault (30.7% of victims) and Robbery (38.9% of victims). The greatest number of Homicides involved victims aged between 15 and 44 years. More victims of assault and sexual offences were aged under 14 years than were aged over 55 years. The age of victims reported here graphically illustrates the degree to which young people, particularly those aged between 15 and 24 years, are the victim of offences considered to be personal and/or violent in nature.

The victimisation of young people is of course not limited to that which is brought to the awareness of the Police Service, however, the majority of other data collection methods used to gather victimisation information (namely victimisation surveys) do not provide information for those individuals aged under 15 years. Victimisation surveys can also provide information regarding the level of crime reporting to the Police and most surveys that ask about crime reporting tend to find higher rates of reporting to the police for offences involving property than for offences involving personal victimisation. In the 1995 Crime and Safety Survey (for Queensland), 77.6% of respondents who reported victimisation of Break and Enter and 94.1% of respondents who experienced Motor Vehicle Theft indicated they had reported the offence/s to the Police. In the same survey, only 36.5% of victims of Assault and 16.2% of Sexual Assault victims had reported the offences to the Police. It could be stated that the victimisation rate as provided by Police Services worldwide could be considered conservative, perhaps particularly so for the personal/violent victimisation of young people of an age where detection by police can be problematic.

The 1995 Crime and Safety Survey does provide information regarding the victimisation of young people living in Queensland as reported by survey respondents. 10.4% of males aged between 15-24 reported victimisation of a personal crime, higher than any other age group for males, while 7.0% of females aged between 15 and 24 years reported victimisation of a personal crime, higher than any other age group for females. It is important to note that as with official Police statistics victimisation surveys also have limitations and the survey discussed here was concerned with only that personal crime victimisation (defined as Robbery, assault, or sexual assault) that occurred in the twelve (12) months prior to the survey. Young people have been identified as one group who are less likely (than other age groups) to report violent victimisation to the police and even less likely to report victimisation in situations where the offender was known to them.

Bullying is a form of victimisation experienced by many young people during their schooling years and bullying in the workplace has been previously reported with sometimes tragic results. It is difficult to gain a clear understanding of how many young people are bullied while at school. Previous research by the Australian Community Safety & Research Organisation (ACRO) has found (self-report) rates between 37% and 52%. Bullying can be either verbal or physical, it can be perpetrated directly (face to face) or indirectly (through gossip or exclusion). Bullies can gain power over their victims through their physical size and strength, by their status in the peer group, by targeting individual characteristics of the victim, or by recruiting other children into the bullying. The effects of bullying can be significant and distress the victim long after the bullying has ceased. Children who are bullied can exhibit low self-esteem, depression, and anxiety. One study reported that children who are bullied at school are at greater risk of depression, post-traumatic stress disorder, and schizophrenia in later life.

Another 'victimisation' issue that deserves attention by virtue of the significant impact on young people, even though it is not directly related to crime victimisation, is suicide. Australia has one of the highest youth suicide rates in the developed world; Queensland generally recorded higher rates than the Australian average. Suicide is now the leading cause of death for males under 30 years of age,

more common than death resulting from motor vehicle accidents. In Queensland between 1990 and 1995, the rate of completed suicide per 100 000 population were highest for males aged between 20 and 24 years (Queensland rate 37, Australian rate 34.2) followed by males aged between 15 and 19 years (Queensland rate 20, Australian rate 15). While suicide among young people is not a direct concern of the crime prevention focus (of the current research) and is not discussed elsewhere in the report it is the authors experience that discussions with young people regarding victimisation (relevant to their peer group) often invokes discussions of suicide and depression as victimisation issues of significant importance and relevance to young people. Suicide is an experience that many young people have direct or indirect contact with and as a cause of harm should be included in appropriate discussions of youth victimisation along with more traditional offender:victim paradigms.

## Young People as Offenders

Information regarding the offending behaviour of young people can be drawn from a wide variety of sources within Australia, most of which are either Government or quasi-Government reports and reports produced by non-government welfare agencies. The offending behaviour of young people has held sustained interest for the community in general and this is reflected in the amount of information regarding this issue that is increasingly becoming available. The involvement of young people in criminal offending is somewhat complex. Young people within the Criminal Justice System bridge the gap between juvenile and adult. In Queensland a juvenile is considered to be someone aged between 10 and 16 years, after which age they are considered an adult. Information regarding those considered as juveniles (under 17 years of age) and young people (under 25 years of age) will both be presented here, however, the reader should be cautioned to take particular care about which age group is being represented.

In the South Eastern Region in 1996/1997 the majority of offenders apprehended for Homicide were aged between 20-24 years and 30-39 years. The majority of offenders apprehended for Assault were aged between 15 and 29 years. The majority of offenders apprehended for sexual offences were aged between 30 and 59 years. The majority of offenders apprehended for Robbery were aged between 15 and 29 years.

In the South Eastern Region in 1996/1997 the greatest number of offenders apprehended for the listed property offences were aged between 15 and 24 years followed by those aged under 14 years. Young people aged between 15 and 24 years make up 17.4% of the population in Logan. Offenders in this age group made up 67.5% of those apprehended for Break and Enter, 44% for Arson, 60.2% Other Property Damage, 66.2% for Motor Vehicle Theft, 51.7% for Stealing, and 40.5% for Fraud. These figures could be seen to support a perception that juveniles are responsible for the greatest proportion of property related offences, however, the logic of this perception based on the figures presented does not withstand close scrutiny. The figures discussed above are based on the number of offenders apprehended for the listed offences in a particular region of Queensland and it may be unlikely that the age characteristics of apprehended persons accurately reflects the actual age characteristics of all offenders. Several factors characteristic of juvenile offending have been identified as increasing the likelihood that these young people will be apprehended by police at a greater rate than adult offenders; juveniles tend to offend in groups and tend to offend closer to their place of residence.

In order for the age of an offender to be identified and reported within official statistics there is an obvious requirement that some offence reported to the Police has been 'cleared' or in more common language that a specific individual has been identified by Police as having committed that particular offence, although not necessarily charged or found guilty of that offence. Personal/violent offences tend to have higher clear up rates than do those offences that involve higher involvement by juveniles. For Queensland, South Eastern Region in 1996/1997, 93% of all Homicides reported in that year were cleared, 56% of all Assaults, 68% of all Sexual offences, and 30% of all Robberies. In contrast, for the same area and period, 8% of Break and Entering offences reported in that year were cleared, 5% of all Arson offences, 12% of Other Property Damage offences, 14% Motor Vehicle Theft offences, 19% Stealing offences, and 61% of all Fraud offences.

The offences that appear to have the highest involvement of juvenile involvement are also those offences typically with low clear up rates and as such it is impossible to extrapolate the discussion of juvenile involvement in these offences to the level of an expectation that juveniles are responsible for the greatest percentage of these offences. It is true however that for the low percentage of these offences that are cleared by Police, juveniles are often the offenders apprehended. This may say more about the offending behaviour of juveniles and lack of 'criminal expertise' displayed rather than the high level of involvement of these age groups in specific offences against property. Juvenile involvement in any offence is of concern to the community, however, for the reasons stated above it may not be possible to gauge (from Official statistics alone) an accurate level of juvenile involvement based on the level of apprehension for many property related offences.

The Australian Institute of Criminology (AIC) in 1997 provided some long term information regarding the involvement of juveniles and adults in specific cleared offences between 1983-1994, reported as change in the rate per 100,000 of age specific population. Between 1983 and 1994, juvenile involvement in Motor Vehicle Theft (increased by 59.8%), Fraud (increased by 37.7%), and Robbery (increased

by 252.9%) had increased, while juvenile involvement in Break and Enter (decreased by 25.6%) had fallen. Adult involvement in all of the listed offences had increased; Motor Vehicle Theft by 31.8%, Fraud by 146.4%, Robbery by 40%, and Break and Enter by 50.4%.

## Young People and Social Order

"The children of today now love luxury. They have bad manners, contempt for authority, they show disrespect for adults and love to talk rather than work or exercise. They contradict their parents, chatter in front of company, gobble down food at the table, and intimidate their teachers" Socrates, 489-399 BC

The behaviour of young people that most concerns older members of the community may not necessarily involve any criminal act. The use of public space by young people as a place to 'hang out' without any associated tangible activity is often enough to cause concern for those people who observe this youthful ritual. It is not true that all older community members are concerned about the likelihood of young people ('hanging out' in public places) offending against the law, many seem just as concerned about the seeming absence of positively focused, skill building activities that would draw involvement from young people and provide a protective factor against their involvement in a range of antisocial and risk associated behaviour (such as drug and alcohol abuse). The perception of a young generation in opposition with the accepted social order is not new what may be new is the altruistic concern that is demonstrated by older community members regarding the perils that face young people growing up in contemporary society. The seeming lack of engagement of many young people in 'community life' is not only seen as a slight against the social order of that community but also to increase the risk of those disengaged young people becoming involved in activities that will have significant social and economic cost to themselves and the wider community.

Communities that decide to take action on young people's use of public space need to do so thoughtfully and act in a just and equitable manner. If the level of public space 'domination' by young people is considered problematic in specific locations then interventions could be considered. Some important considerations (if intervention is decided upon) that must be formally addressed prior to any action is taken (that seeks to reduce public space usage by youth) are as follows; what alternatives are currently available to young people in that area, recognition that young people have a legitimate right to access public space, whether the concern is generated by the behaviour of young people or simply the presence of young people, whether the behaviour of young people is genuinely problematic (alcohol, drugs, violence etc) or whether the problem behaviour is more symptomatic of a 'generation gap'.

## Conclusion

It is clear, both from victimisation surveys and official Police Statistics that young people aged under 25 years are subject to greater personal victimisation than are people in other age groups. It is perhaps unfortunate that the information available on personal and/or violent crime victimisation does not particularly reflect this situation accurately. It is also true that young people aged under 25 years are over-represented in certain specific criminal offences as perpetrators (as opposed to victims), however, this area of youth involvement in 'crime and safety' does not seem to be subject to the same degree of paucity of information as does the victimisation of youth. Young peoples use of public space is an issue that is generating a significant degree of discussion in local communities across Australia. Discussions may arise due to antisocial behaviour exhibited by young people and directed at or observed by other community members or the discussion may simply arise due to the highly visible nature of young people's presence in public spaces. Communities that enter into interventions regarding young peoples use of public space should be very specific about their concerns and what they are trying to achieve through the development of interventions.

Young people are obviously significant stakeholders in the issues of victimisation, offending, and public spaces. To seek to address the problematic nature of these issues by treating young people as a 'target group' will in all likelihood have effectively failed before commencement. Young people are at greater risk of personal/violent victimisation and as such have much to gain from becoming engaged in preventing victimisation. Young people are overrepresented in specific criminal offences, and given what we know about the implications of involvement in the Criminal Justice System (in terms of future offending), young people certainly have much to gain from interventions that seek to prevent crime. Young people in many communities heavily utilise public spaces (often not many other options are available) and certainly they have a significant stake in community action generally concerning public space (what facilities are available and where) and particularly where that action seeks to impact on their use of that area. Successful communities will be those that actively and consistently engage young people in decision-making processes regarding issues where they are clearly significant stakeholders.

# 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 was 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.

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.

Readers who would like more information regarding the Survey Instrument are advised to contact the Publishers of this report: ACRO

Australian Community Safety

& Research Organisation, Incorporated

PO Box 440

Lutwyche, Q, 4030

## Survey Administration

Survey packages were delivered to each participating organisation, ready for distribution to young people.

Survey packages contained:

- A cover letter introducing the questionnaire, and instructions for questionnaire completion to be read by class leaders.
- Sufficient copies of the survey for each class level and extra copies should they be required.

## Sample

All State Secondary Schools in the Logan City Local Government Area were invited to participate in the survey process. Permission to conduct research in this setting was sought from and granted by Education Queensland. There was no onus on schools to participate and some schools declined to participate, often for stated reasons of 'existing excessive curricula demands'.

Of the nine (9) schools approached, six (6) schools accepted the opportunity to participate, and a selection of year 10 to 12 classes were selected to complete the survey. As a self-administered instrument the survey did require a certain level of literacy and it was felt by the researchers that students in year 10 and onwards would have the optimal skills required for survey completion.

All schools that participated were offered feedback on the survey results.

The sample also includes participants from the earlier Community survey research (via mail) that reported their age as less than 25 years.

### Survey Distribution and Return

A Census day and time was individually nominated by each of the participating schools and the relevant number of class labeled survey packages were delivered to each school for administration during that time. Completed survey packages and any incomplete surveys were collected by the researchers shortly after the Census day.

## Demographics

### Gender

Of the 1515 surveys returned, the gender of 88 respondents was unable to be determined because no response was given to this question or a multiple response was given. Of the remaining respondents, 59.6% (851) were female and 40.4% (576) were male.

### Age

The Youth Report incorporates all respondents who completed surveys through the participation of Secondary State Schools and respondents aged less than 25 years who completed the earlier Community surveys conducted via mail. 93.7% (1419) respondents were aged between 12 and 18 years while 6.7% (96) were aged between 19 and 24 years.

### Grade Level

Of the 1515 surveys returned the grade level of 113 respondents was unable to be determined because no response was given to this question or a multiple response was given. Of the remaining 1402 respondents, 34.5% (483) of respondents were in Grade 10, 30.2% (423) of respondents were in Grade 11 and 35.3% (496) of respondents were in Grade 12.

### Racial/Ethnic Background

Respondents were asked to identify those ethnic categories that they most identified with, more than one choice was acceptable. Nearly three quarters of respondents identified as Australian, followed by European (15.3%), New Zealand (12.1%), Aboriginal Australian (6.8%), Asian (6.9%), and Torres Strait Islander (3.1%). 9.3% of respondent identified a racial/ethnic background other than those listed. Refer Table 4.

**Table 4 Racial/Ethnic Background as Identified by Respondents (All)**

Racial/Ethnic Background	% (n) of Respondents per Category (All)
Australian	72.7% (1093)
Aboriginal Australian	6.2% (89)
Torres Strait Islander	3.1% (44)
Asian	6.9% (99)
European	15.3% (220)

<b>New Zealand</b>	12.1% (174)
<b>Other</b>	9.3% (134)

## Employment

Respondents were asked to indicate which of the categories provided best described their employment situation. One of the options was Secondary Student, but many respondents felt other 'employment' options better fitted their situation. 327 respondents did not answer this question or provided a multiple response that could not be interpreted. Of the 1188 respondents who provided responses, the greatest majority of respondents indicated that they were Secondary school students (51.9%), followed by student with part time employment (19.2%), or unemployed – seeking work (11.9%).

## Household

Respondents were asked to indicate which of the categories provided best described their household. 84 respondents did not answer this question or provided a multiple response that could not be interpreted. More than half of the remaining 1431 respondents described their household as a couple with children (53%), followed by extended families (23.3%), one parent with children (15.2%), share accommodation (4.9%), as a couple (2.1%), and living alone (1.4%).

## Time Lived in Suburb

Respondents were asked to indicate how long they had lived in their current suburb. 62 respondents did not answer this question or provided a multiple response that could not be interpreted. Of the remaining 1453 respondents, 58.4% had lived in their suburb for longer than five years, 16.1% between three and five years, 15.4% between one and three years, and 10.1% for less than one year.

## Analysis

### Section 1

#### Survey Responses of All Youth Respondents

#### Summary

The following summary provides brief highlights of the statistical analysis conducted on the surveys completed by all respondents aged between 12 and 24 years.

- A little more than seven out of ten respondents agreed they **felt safe from crime** when out alone in their neighbourhood during

the day and when travelling to and from work/school alone. A little more than two thirds of respondents agreed they felt safe from crime in their own home.

- Respondents **felt most vulnerable** when using parking lots at night, when passing a group of young men on the street and when out alone in their neighbourhood at night.
- Four out of every ten youth respondents agreed that **young people make a positive contribution to the community**.
- About four out of every ten youth respondents agreed that **young people commit most crime** while a little less than one in five agreed that **young people are more commonly victimised** (than other age groups).
- About half of youth respondents agreed that **elderly people are more commonly victimised** (than other age groups).
- Over one third of all youth respondents agreed that **crime was a problem** (in their suburb) and that crime **negatively impacted on lifestyles** (in their suburb).
- More than half of all respondents believed that **property crime had increased** in their suburb (in the last three years) but slightly less than half believed that **personal/violent crime had increased**.
- A little more than one in five respondents named **areas in their suburb** where they **did not feel safe during the day**. More than half of all respondents named areas in their suburb where they **did not feel safe at night**. One in ten respondents named areas in their **school** where they **did not feel safe**.
- About half of all youth respondents had experienced **property crime victimisation**. Most offences had occurred while they were living in their current suburb and had occurred at their place of residence. About one quarter of respondents claimed to have personally known the person who committed the offence. About three quarters of respondents had reported the offence to the police, the most common reason given for non-reporting was that the matter wasn't serious enough. A little more than one third of respondents who had reported the offence to the police had received feedback regarding action taken. About two thirds of respondents who received feedback from the police were satisfied with the outcome, while only a little more than a quarter of those who had not received feedback felt the same way.
- A little more than one quarter of all youth respondents had experienced **personal/violent victimisation**. More than half of those who reported victimisation said that they had been living in their current suburb. Nearly half of all respondents reported that the offence had occurred at their home. The other places where the victimisation had commonly occurred were on the street, at another home, and at a place of business (including shops, entertainment venues) and at school. Nearly two thirds of respondents (who reported victimisation) said that they personally knew the person who committed the offence. More than one third of respondents had reported the matter to the police, the most common reasons for non-reporting included that the matter wasn't serious enough, fear/concern about revenge from the offender, and that they had handled it themselves. More than one third of respondents who had reported the matter to the police had received feedback regarding action taken. Half of the respondents who had received feedback were satisfied with the outcome, while less than half of the respondents who had not received feedback felt the same way.
- A little more than one in ten respondents agreed that **violence is a problem in their family home**.
- One in ten respondents reported they had experienced **victimisation** they felt was based on their **racial/ethnic background**. A little more than one in ten respondents reported they had experienced **victimisation** they felt was based on their **sexuality**.
- Nearly one third of all youth respondents reported they had been **bullied at school** in the last three years. About half of those who indicated they had been bullied had reported the matter to the school. The most common reasons for non-reporting included the matter wasn't serious enough, fear of further bullying as a result of reporting, that the respondent had handled it themselves, and the belief that the school would not take action. About half of those who had reported the matter to the school indicated they had received feedback regarding the action taken. More than two thirds of those respondents who had received feedback were satisfied with the outcome while less than one quarter of respondents who had not received feedback felt the same way. Common reasons for dissatisfaction were that no action was taken and that the bullying had continued/was still happening.
- One in twenty respondents reported they had been **bullied at work**. Nearly half of those who had been bullied had reported it to the employer. More than half of the respondents who had reported the matter to the employer had received feedback and most of these were satisfied with the outcome.
- More than one third of all youth respondents reported they had **contact with the police** in the last three years. More than half of those respondents reported that the police treated them positively. About one quarter of those respondents who felt they were not treated positively by the police indicated they had been charged with an offence.
- One quarter of respondents indicated they had witnessed no offences during the last year. The most commonly **witnessed offences** were Vandalism, Break and Enter and Robbery. More than half of those respondents who indicated they had witnessed crime in the last year reported between one and three offences.
- About one third of all youth respondents indicated they had not undertaken any **safety strategies** in the last year because they felt safe, while less than one in ten reported they had not undertaken any safety strategies because they were not sure what to do. The most common strategies undertaken by respondents were Installing security screens/alarms, Bought a dog/guard dog, Locked doors when traveling in a car, and Discussed safety with children /parents.
- Nearly one in five youth respondents reported they were currently (or had been in the last five years) **involved in community groups/programs**. The most common groups nominated by respondents were sporting groups, scouts/guides/cadets/service groups, and Neighbourhood Watch, etc.
- Nearly three quarters of all youth respondents reported they regularly **talked to their neighbours**.
- More than half of all youth respondents agreed that the **Community can be an active force in crime prevention**, while nearly half agreed that **effective crime prevention programs would benefit their suburb** and that **crime prevention programs**

should tackle the underlying causes of crime.

- A little less than three quarters of all youth respondents agreed that the **police alone cannot prevent crime**, while a little less than one quarter agreed that the **police were doing a good job tackling crime in the community**.
- The most commonly selected **crime prevention programs** for introduction in their suburb were Facilities such as lighting, paths etc, Safety checks for older neighbours, After school activities for youth, and Foot/bike patrols by Police.

## Section 1

### Survey Responses of All Youth Respondents

#### Detailed Analysis

The following pages contain the details of statistical analysis conducted on the surveys completed by all respondents aged between 12 and 24 years.

#### 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. These statements were designed to gauge a level of general concern that respondents exhibit regarding crime and everyday situations.

Respondents reported feeling most safe when out alone in their neighbourhood during the day, followed by travelling to and from work/school alone, and when in their own home. Respondents felt less safe when using shopping centres at night, when alone in their neighbourhood at night, and when passing a group of young men on the street. Respondents felt least safe when using parking lots at night. Refer Table 5.

**Table 5 Feelings of Safety in Specific Situations**

Safety Statements :Section One	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Total
I feel safe from crime in my own home	68.9% (1037)	14.7% (222)	16.4% (247)	100% (1506)
I feel safe from crime when at Shopping Centres at night	40.6% (607)	26.5% (396)	32.9% (491)	100% (1494)
I feel safe when passing a group of young men on the street	28.6% (430)	25.8% (387)	45.6% (685)	100% (1502)
I feel safe when using parking lots at night	22.6% (336)	31.9% (474)	45.5% (676)	100% (1492)

I feel safe when travelling to and from work/school alone	71.3% (1070)	14.8% (222)	13.9% (208)	100% (1500)
I feel safe when out alone in my neighbourhood during the day	73.1% (1087)	14.7% (219)	12.2% (181)	100% (1487)
I feel safe when out alone in my neighbourhood at night	32.3% (482)	19.8% (296)	47.9% (714)	100% (1492)

### Attitudes towards Crime

Four questions in the survey asked about community perceptions regarding crime and young people. These questions were designed to gauge a level of support for the statements and thus an understanding of the level of community acceptance of the 'perceptions.'

40.5% of respondents believed that *Young people make a positive contribution to the community*, while 17.7% disagreed. Even though this statement directly targeted the respondent group and did not require any 'specialist knowledge' regarding crime issues, 41.8% of young people were unsure of their belief regarding this statement.

A little less than half of the respondents (42.9%) agreed that *Young people (under 24 years) commit most crime* while 27% disagreed with the statement. 17.7% of respondents agreed that *Young people (under 24 years) are more likely than others to be the victims of crime*, while 39.2% disagreed with the statement.

52.6% of respondents agreed that *Elderly people are more likely than others to be the victims of crime*, while 24.2% disagreed with the statement.

### Crime in their Suburb

Four questions in the survey asked about crime in the respondents own suburb. The respondents own suburb was targeted in these questions as it was felt that this was an area the respondents would have greatest 'lived knowledge' regarding the crime situation and their beliefs regarding the prevalence of crime.

A little over a third of the respondents agreed that *Crime is a problem in my suburb* (37.4%) and that *Crime had a negative effect on the lifestyle of people living in my suburb* (38%). Many young people were unsure about their opinions in response to these statements, respondents were most unsure (45.9%) regarding the impact of crime on the lifestyle of people living in their suburb.

Respondents were also asked about their beliefs regarding the change in crime in their suburb in the last three (3) years. Respondents were more likely to believe that property crime had increased (61.2%) than personal/violent crime (48.1%).

### Areas of Concern in their Neighbourhood and School

Respondents were asked about areas in their neighbourhood where they did not feel safe (during the day and at night) and also about areas in their schools where they did not feel safe. Respondents were also asked to provide their reason for feeling unsafe in these areas. Respondents could give any response as the questions were open ended, responses were then coded into the categories that best fitted the response. Responses that did not correspond with any coding category were coded as 'Other'.

22.8% of respondents reported there were areas in their neighbourhood where they did not feel safe during the day. The most common areas nominated were local parks and bushland (41.7%), followed by their local streets/or suburb (19.2%), local entertainment venue or shopping centre (14.1%), and 'everywhere' (8%). The most common reasons for feeling unsafe in these areas was that they felt unsafe around the people who frequent the areas (46.8%), that the area has a reputation for being dangerous (15.2%), and that the area is alone/isolated (10.4%).

51.5% of respondents reported there were areas in their neighbourhood where they did not feel safe at night. The most common areas nominated were local parks and bushland (37.3%), followed by their local streets /or suburb (21.1%), everywhere (13.7%), and local entertainment venue or shopping centre (12.4%). The most common reasons for feeling unsafe in these areas were that they felt unsafe around the people who frequent the areas (45.4%), that the area has poor lighting/poor design (21.9%), that the area has a reputation for being dangerous (13.3%), the area is alone/isolated (5.8%), and that they had been a victim there before (5.5%).

10% of respondents reported areas in their school where they felt unsafe. Readers are reminded that respondents came from many schools throughout the Logan City Area and the areas nominated by respondents obviously relate to areas within their own specific school. The most common areas nominated were the toilets (18.3%), an area near a classroom (15.8%), an area near or on the oval (14.2%), where the 'tough' kids sit (12.5%), an area outside the school grounds (10%), and areas coded as Other (23.3%). The most common reasons for feeling unsafe in these areas were that they felt unsafe around the people who frequent that place (47.3%), the fear of being hurt (20.9%), and that the area has a reputation for being dangerous (10%).

### **Property Crime Victimization**

52.6% (835) of respondents reported that they had been the victim of a property related crime during their lifetime. Of those who had experienced property crime victimisation, 69.1% had been living in their current suburb when the offence occurred, 71.1% reported that the offence had occurred at their place of residence while 31% reported that the offence had occurred somewhere other than their place of residence (some respondents reported victimisation at home and elsewhere resulting in a total exceeding 100%). The most common places (other than the home) reported by respondents were another home/place of residence (26.7%), entertainment venue/shopping centre (19%), school (12.7%), on the street (12.2%), and a carpark (8.6%).

25.7% (214) reported they had known the person who committed the offence.

74.1% had reported the offence to the police. Of those who didn't report the offence to the police the most common reasons for non-reporting were that it wasn't important enough (36%), reasons coded as Other (25.2%), they handled it themselves (often included reporting matter to school where relevant) (9.4%), fear/concern about revenge from offender (7.2%), that the police wouldn't do anything about it (6.5%), and that the police wouldn't catch the person/the courts would be too lenient in sentencing (5.8%).

37.1% of those who had reported the offence to the police indicated that the police had provided feedback regarding the offence. 67% of those who had received feedback were satisfied with the outcome. Of those respondents that did receive feedback (37.1%) the most common reasons for not being satisfied with the outcome were not getting the items back (19.4%), the offender was not identified or apprehended (17.7%), that the respondent believed the police took no action regarding their complaint (12.9%), that the offender was identified but no charges were laid (9.7%), and that the offender was charged but that they were not satisfied with the sentence received in court (8.1%).

Of the respondents who had not received feedback from the police, only 27.9% were satisfied with the outcome. The most common reasons given for not being satisfied were that the offender was not identified or apprehended (22.3%), that the respondent believed the police took no action regarding their complaint (18.3%), that they felt they were not taken seriously by the police (14.8%), not getting the items back (13.4%), and that they were not told of the outcome (6.4%).

### **Personal/ Violent Crime Victimization**

26.2% (394) of respondents reported that they had been the victim of a personal/violent crime during their lifetime. Of those who did report personal/violent victimisation 59.2% reported they had been living in their current suburb at the time of the offence. 44.9% reported that the offence had occurred at their home. Of those who reported the offence occurred at somewhere other than their home the most common locations reported were on the street (30.4%), at another home (28%), at a place of business (including shops, entertainment venues) (13.6%), and school (11.1%).

64.6% (286) had known the person who committed the offence.

40.2% (176) indicated that they had reported the offence to the police. Of those who didn't report the matter to the police the most common reasons given for non-reporting were that the matter wasn't serious enough (23.5%), fear/concern about revenge from the offender (22.4%), that they had handled it themselves (included reporting to the school where relevant) (9.8%), didn't want anyone to know (6%), that nothing would happen to the offender even if they did report it (4.9%), and that they personally knew the offender (4.4%).

39.1% (99) of those who had reported the offence indicated that the police had provided feedback regarding action taken. Of those who had received feedback from the police, 50% were satisfied with the outcome. The most common reasons given for dissatisfaction were that the offender was not identified or apprehended (33.1%), that the offender was identified but that no charges were laid (11.1%), that charges were laid but they were not satisfied with the sentence received in court (11.1%), and that the respondent believed the police had taken no action regarding their complaint (11.1%).

Of the respondents who had not received feedback from the police, 40.3% were satisfied with the outcome. The most common reasons given for not being satisfied were the offender was not identified or apprehended (34.3%), the offender was identified but no charges were laid (14.3%), respondent believed the police took no action regarding their complaint (5.7%), and that they were not told of the outcome (5.7%).

### **Violence in the Home**

12.1% (192) of respondents agreed that *Violence from family members is a problem in my home*.

### **Violence based on Racial/Ethnic Background**

12.2% (182) respondents reported that in the last three (3) years they had been the victim of violence based on their racial /ethnic background.

### **Violence based on Sexuality**

10.1% (151) of respondents reported that in the last three (3) years they had been the victim of violence based on their sexuality.

### **Bullying at School**

29.5% (450) of respondents reported that in the last three (3) years they had been bullied at school. Of those who had been bullied 49.8% had reported it to the school. The most common reasons for non-reporting were that the bullying was not serious enough (35.2%), fear of further/increased bullying as a result of reporting (23.6%), handled it themselves (10.9%), the respondent believed the school wouldn't do anything about it (9.1%), and that the respondent didn't want anyone to know (7.9%)

Of those who had reported the bullying to the school 49.1% had received feedback regarding action taken. Of those who had received feedback from the school 70.1% reported they were satisfied with the outcome. The most common reasons for dissatisfaction with the outcome were that action was taken but they were not satisfied with that action, that the bullying was still happening, and that no action was taken. Note: these reasons are listed in the order of their frequency, percentages cannot be provided, as the number of respondents in this category was small.

Of those respondents who had received no feedback from the school, only 24.7% were satisfied with the outcome. Of the 75.3% who were not satisfied with the outcome the most common reasons given were that no action was taken (47.9%), the bullying continued (18.8%), that action was taken but they were not satisfied with that action.

### **Bullying in the Workplace**

5.1% (76) of respondents reported that in the last three (3) years they had been bullied at work. Of those who had been bullied 42.6% had reported it to the employer. The most common reasons for non-reporting were that the employer wouldn't do anything about it anyway (40%), that they didn't want anyone to know (26.7%), and that the employer was involved (20%).

Of those who had reported the matter to the employer 55.6% had received feedback from the employer and 77.3% of those were satisfied with the outcome. Of those who had reported the matter but had received no feedback 44.4% reported that they were satisfied with the outcome.

### Police Contact

36.9% (578) of respondents reported that they had contact with a member of the Police Service in the last three (3) years (excluding contact due to traffic offences). 56.1% (276) of those who reported 'police contact' reported that they felt they had been treated positively by police. Of the 43.9% (216) who reported the 'police contact' was not positive, 23.4% reported that their contact resulted in charges being laid against them.

### Witnessing Crime

25.4% (385) of respondents reported that they (or a member of their household) had witnessed no crime in the last twelve (12) months. It is highly likely that respondents considered witnessing of the result of a crime (rather than a crime in progress) as 'witnessing' for survey completion. Table 6 shows the percentage and number of respondents who indicated they had witnessed each of the listed crimes on the survey form.

The most commonly reported property related crimes witnessed (as indicated by survey completion) by respondents were Break and Enter, Vandalism, and Motor Vehicle Theft. The most commonly reported personal/violent related crimes witnessed (as indicated by survey completion) by respondents were Robbery, Assault, and Domestic Violence. 38.5% of respondents reported witnessing Drug Dealing, it is likely that the witnessing of the distribution of drugs generally is included as an incident of Drug Dealing.

The majority of respondents (52.9%) who reported witnessing offences in the last twelve (12) months reported witnessing between one (1) and three (3) forms of crime. 29.2% reported witnessing between four (4) and six (6) crimes, and 17.9% reported witnessing more than six (6) crimes.

**Table 6 Crimes Witnessed in Previous Twelve (12) months**

Type of Offence	% (n) Witnesses
Break and Enter	39.6% (600)
Motor Vehicle Theft	24.4% (369)
Vandalism	39.9% (605)
Business Theft/Vandalism	8.6% (131)
Bag Snatching	14.2% (215)
Stalking	12.1% (184)
Domestic Violence	20.8% (315)
Assault	22.8% (346)
Robbery	26.3% (399)
Rape	7.1% (108)
Homicide	5.3% (80)
Other Sexual Offences	6.3% (96)

Child Abuse/Neglect	10.8% (163)
Drug Dealing	38.5% (584)
Other	4.1% (62)

### Safety Strategies

Respondents were asked about strategies they or a member of their household had undertaken in the last year to improve their safety. 34.5% (522) of respondents reported they had not undertaken any of the listed safety strategies because they felt safe while 7.7% (117) reported they had not undertaken strategies as they were not sure what to do. Table 7 shows the percentage and number of respondents who indicated they had undertaken the listed safety strategy on the survey form.

The most common strategies undertaken by respondents were the installation of security screens/alarms, bought a dog/guard dog, locked doors when traveling in a car, and discussed safety with children/parents.

**Table 7 Safety Strategies Undertaken in Previous Twelve (12) Months**

Safety Strategy	% (n) of Respondents
Pruned shrubs away from doors/windows	7.6% (115)
Discussed safety with children/parents	16.4% (249)
Bought a dog/guard dog	24% (363)
Installed security screens/alarms	31.7% (480)
Moved house	7.4% (112)
Changed method of transport/travel	3.6% (54)
Changed leisure activities	1.7% (25)
Changed shopping times/places	4.4% (66)
Restricted activities at night	6.7% (102)
Stopped living alone	2% (31)
Locked doors when traveling in a car	19.5% (295)
Other	7.9% (120)

## Community Involvement

16.4% (243) of respondents reported that they were currently involved in local community groups/programs. The most common groups respondents reported involvement with were sporting groups (33%), scouts/guides/cadets/service groups (20.3%), Neighbourhood Watch, Safety House, YACCA, or PCYC (19.3%), and recreational/leisure groups (15.1%).

19.8% (293) of respondents reported that in the last five (5) years they had been involved in local community groups/programs. The most common groups respondents reported involvement with were sporting groups (31.9%), scouts/guides/cadets/service groups (22.8%), recreational/leisure groups (16.7%), and Neighbourhood Watch, Safety House, YACCA, or PCYC (13.3%).

72.1% (1075) reported that they regularly talked to the people living nearby in their neighbourhood.

## Attitudes towards Crime Prevention

51.8% (776) of respondents agreed that *The Community (with Police/Government support) can be an effective force in preventing crime*, while 17.9% (269) disagreed.

44.1% (663) of respondents agreed that *Effective community programs that tackle crime issues would benefit my suburb*, while 13.6% (204) disagreed. 49.1% (733) of respondents agreed that *Crime prevention programs should target the underlying causes of crime*, while 7.4% disagreed.

73% (1098) of respondents agreed that *Police alone cannot prevent crime occurring in the Community*, while 12% (180) disagreed. 24.3% (364) of respondents agreed that *The Police are doing a good job tackling crime in the Community*, while 43.7% disagreed.

## Crime Prevention Programs

The most commonly selected programs (for introduction in their suburb) were Facilities such as lighting, paths etc, Safety checks for older neighbours, After school activities for youth (12-18 years), and Foot/bike patrols by Police. Programs selected by nearly a quarter of all respondents included Programs for increased communication between neighbours, School based crime prevention programs, Neighbourhood graffiti clean-ups, and Support networks for those living alone. Refer Table 8.

**Table 8 Crime Prevention Programs for Introduction in Suburb**

Crime Prevention Program/Facilities	% (n) of Respondents
After school activities for youth (12-18 years)	31.1% (471)
Safety checks for older neighbours	37.5% (568)
Support services for families	19.3% (293)
Support networks for those living alone	22.2% (336)
Programs for increased communication between neighbours	24% (363)

Neighbourhood graffiti clean-ups	22.6% (342)
Foot/bike patrols by Police	29% (440)
Facility for Community development programs	9.3% (141)
School based crime prevention programs	22.8% (345)
Facilities such as lighting, paths, etc	55% (833)
Other	8.7% (132)

## Section 2

### Survey Responses of All Youth Respondents by Gender

#### Summary

The following summary provides brief highlights of the statistical analysis conducted on the surveys based on gender.

- Male respondents reported **feeling safer** than females in all of the situations asked about in the survey. The greatest **differences in safety feelings between males and females** were evident for the following situations; When out alone in their neighbourhood at night, When using parking lots at night, and When passing a group of young men on the street.
- Similar numbers of males and females agreed that **young people make a positive contribution to the community**.
- Males were more likely than females to agree that **young people commit most crime** while males and females had similar opinions regarding the statement **young people are more likely to experience victimisation** (than other age groups).
- Males were more likely than females to agree that **elderly people are more likely to experience victimisation** (than other age groups).
- Males were more likely than females to agree that **crime negatively affects lifestyles** (in their suburb).
- Females were more likely than males to have believed that **personal/violent crime had increased** in their suburb (in the last three years).
- Female respondents were more likely than males to report **areas in their neighbourhood where they did not feel safe** at night.
- Males were more likely to have experienced **property crime victimisation**. Females (who had reported the offence) were more likely to have received feedback from the police and to have reported they were satisfied with the outcome.
- Females were more likely than males to have experienced **personal/violent victimisation**. Females were slightly more likely than males to have reported the offence occurred at their home. Of those respondents who reported the offence occurred somewhere other than their home, the most common location given by males was on the street while for females the most common location was at another home. Females were more likely than males to have personally known the person who committed the offence. Of those respondents who did report the offence to the police, females were more likely to have received feedback from police.
- Similar numbers of males and females reported that **violence was a problem in their family home**.
- Males were more likely than females to have reported **victimisation** they felt was based on their **racial/ethnic background**, while females were more likely than males to report victimisation they felt was based on their **sexuality**.
- Similar numbers of males and females had experienced **bullying at school**. For those respondents who reported the matter to the school females were more likely than males to have received feedback from the school.
- Females were more likely than males to have experienced **bullying at work**.

## Methodology

- Similar numbers of males and females had **contact with the police** in the last three years. Females were more likely than males to have reported they were treated 'positively' by the police.
- Males were more likely than females to have reported they had not **witnessed crime** in the last year. Females were more likely than males to have witnessed Child/Abuse Neglect.
- Males were more likely than females to have not undertaken any **safety strategies** because they felt safe. Females were more likely than males to have Discussed safety with children/parents, Installed security screens/alarms, Moved house, Changed method of transport/travel, Changed shopping times/places, Restricted activities at night, and Locked doors when traveling in a vehicle.
- Males and females reported similar levels of **involvement in community groups/programs** and were involved in similar groups. Males were more likely than females to have reported involvement with sporting groups while females were more likely than males to have reported involvement in crime prevention groups and recreational/leisure groups.
- Females were more likely than males to have reported that they **regularly talked to their neighbours**.
- Females were more likely than males to have agreed that the **Community to can be an active force in crime prevention**. Males and females had similar opinions regarding the likelihood that **effective crime prevention programs would benefit their suburb** and that **programs should tackle the underlying causes of crime**.
- Males and females had similar opinions when responding to the statement **police alone cannot prevent crime in the community** and also regarding whether the **police are doing a good job tackling crime in the community**.
- When asked about **crime prevention programs** they would like introduced in their suburb, the most popular programs for males and females were Facilities such as lighting, paths, etc (ranked 1<sup>st</sup> for females and males), Safety checks for older neighbours (2<sup>nd</sup> for females, 3<sup>rd</sup> for males), After school activities for youth (3<sup>rd</sup> for females, 4<sup>th</sup> for males), and Foot/bike patrols by Police (4<sup>th</sup> for females, 2<sup>nd</sup> for males).

## Section 2

### Survey Responses of All Youth Respondents by Gender

#### Detailed Analysis

Only the surveys of those respondents who indicated their gender (as male or female) have been used in this analysis. This section provides information regarding the differences between males and females in their completion of the survey.

#### 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. These statements were designed to gauge a level of general concern that respondents exhibit regarding crime and everyday situations.

Male respondents reported feeling safer than females in all situations asked about in the statements. The greatest difference between male and female respondents (with males feeling safer) were in response to the situations *When out alone in their neighbourhood at night*, followed by *When using parking lots at night*, and *When passing a group of young men on the street*. Refer Table 9.

**Table 9 Feelings of Safety in Specific Situations by Gender**

Safety Statements :Section One	Agree		Unsure		Disagree	
	M	F	M	F	M	F
I feel safe from crime in my own home	73.8%	65.3%	13.8%	16%	12.5%	18.7%
I feel safe from crime when at Shopping Centres at night	45.6%	37.2%	25%	27.2%	29.4%	35.6%
I feel safe when passing a group of young men on the street	41.5%	19.1%	25.8%	26.6%	32.8%	54.3%

I feel safe when using parking lots at night	33.3%	14.2%	25.6%	30.5%	31.1%	55.3%
I feel safe when travelling to and from work/school alone	79.7%	67.1%	13%	15.6%	7.3%	17.3%
I feel safe when out alone in my neighbourhood during the day	80.3%	69.5%	12.5%	15.5%	7.2%	15%
I feel safe when out alone in my neighbourhood at night	46.9%	22.3%	21.4%	18.3%	31.7%	59.5%

### Attitudes towards Crime

Four questions in the survey asked about community perceptions regarding crime and young people. These questions were designed to gauge a level of support for the statements and thus an understanding of the level of community acceptance of the 'perceptions.'

Male and Female respondents had similar opinions in response to the statement *I believe that Young people make a positive contribution to the community*, female respondents tended to agree with the statement a little more frequently than male respondents (39.1% male, 41.5% female).

A little less than half of the respondents (42.9%) agreed that *Young people (under 24 years) commit most crime*, however males were more likely to agree with the statement than female (49.3% male, 37.6% female). Male and female respondents had similar opinions regarding the statement *Young people (under 24 years) are more likely than others to be the victims of crime*, although males tended to be slightly more firm in their opinions in agreement or disagreement.

52.6% of respondents agreed that *Elderly people are more likely than others to be the victims of crime*, again males were more likely than females to agree with the statement (61% male, 47.9% female).

### Crime in their Suburb

Four questions in the survey asked about crime in the respondents own suburb. The respondents own suburb was targeted in these questions as it was felt that this was an area the respondents would have greatest 'lived knowledge' regarding the crime situation and their beliefs regarding the prevalence of crime.

A little over a third of the respondents agreed that *Crime is a problem in my suburb* and that *Crime had a negative effect on the lifestyle of people living in my suburb*. Males were more likely (than females) to agree that crime had a negative effect on the lifestyle of people living in their suburb while female respondents tended to be unsure.

Respondents were also asked about their beliefs regarding the change in crime in their suburb in the last three (3) years. Respondents were more likely to believe that property crime had increased (61.2%) than personal/violent crime (48.1%). Females were more likely than males to believe that personal/violent crime had increased (44.1% male, 50% female).

### Areas of Concern in their Neighbourhood and School

Respondents were asked about areas in their neighbourhood where they did not feel safe (during the day and at night) and also about areas in their schools where they did not feel safe. Respondents were also asked to provide their reason for feeling unsafe in these areas. Respondents could give any response as the questions were open ended, responses were then coded into the categories that best fitted the response. Responses that did not correspond with any coding category were coded as 'Other'.

19.9% of male and 24.1% of female respondents reported there were areas in their neighbourhood where they did not feel safe during the day. Female respondents were more likely than males to nominate local parks and bushland (27.3% male, 50.5% female), while

males were more likely to nominate local streets/or suburb (25.3% male, 16.2% female) and local entertainment venue or shopping centres (22.2% male, 10.1% female). The most common reason given by both males and females for feeling unsafe in these areas were that they felt unsafe around the people who frequent the area (58.1% male, 40.8% female), while females were more likely than males to give reasons that referred to the area being alone/isolated (1.2% male, 13.6% female).

Female respondents were more likely than males to report there were areas in their neighbourhood where they did not feel safe at night (41.1% male, 58.8% female). The most common areas nominated for both male and females were local parks and bushland (34.3% male, 38.9% female), followed by their local streets /or suburb (22.7% male, 19.9% female), everywhere (12.5% male, 14.2% female), and local entertainment venue or shopping centres (13.4% male, 12% female). The most common reason given by both males and females for feeling unsafe in these areas were that they felt unsafe around the people who frequent the area (46.7% male, 44.2% female), followed by poor lighting/poor design (19.2% male, 23.2% female) and that the area has a reputation for being dangerous (16.5% male, 11.9% female).

10.5% of male and 9.3% of female respondents reported areas in their school where they felt unsafe. Readers are reminded that respondents came from many schools throughout the Logan City Area and the areas nominated by respondents obviously relate to areas within their own specific school. The area most commonly nominated by both male and female were the toilets (19.1% male, 15.2% female). Females were more likely (than males) an area near a classroom (8.5% male, 18.2% female) or an area of the oval (6.4% male, 21.2% female), while males were more likely to nominate an area where the 'tough' kids sit (19.1% male, 9.1% female). The most common reasons for feeling unsafe in these areas were that they felt unsafe around the people who frequent that place (50% male, 41.7% female), the fear of being hurt (16.7% male, 23.3% female), and that the area has a reputation for being dangerous (7.2% male, 11.7% male).

### **Property Crime Victimization**

Male respondents were more likely to report that they had been the victim of a property related crime during their lifetime (54.1% male, 48.9% female). The majority of males and females had been living in their current suburb when the offence occurred (71.1% male, 68.1% female). The majority of males and females reported that the offence had occurred at their place of residence (68.9% male, 74.4% female). 30% males and 31.5% females reported that the offence had occurred somewhere other than their place of residence (some respondents reported victimisation at home and elsewhere resulting in a total exceeding 100%). The most common places (other than the home) reported by respondents were another home/place of residence, followed by entertainment venue/shopping, school, on the street, and a carpark.

26.7% of males and 22.7% females reported they had known the person who committed the offence.

71.7% of males and 77.3% of females had reported the offence to the police. Of those who didn't report the offence to the police the most common reasons for non-reporting were that it wasn't important enough, followed by reasons coded as Other, they handled it themselves (often included reporting matter to school where relevant), fear/concern about revenge from offender, that the police wouldn't do anything about it, and that the police wouldn't catch the person/the courts would be too lenient in sentencing.

33.6% of males and 40.2% of females who had reported the offence to the police indicated that the police had provided feedback regarding the offence. 61% of males and 71.4% of females who had received feedback were satisfied with the outcome. Of those respondents that did receive feedback the most common reasons for not being satisfied with the outcome were not getting the items back, the offender was not identified or apprehended, that the respondent believed the police took no action regarding their complaint, that the offender was identified but no charges were laid, and that the offender was charged but that they were not satisfied with the sentence received in court.

Of the respondents who had not received feedback from the police, only 28% of males and 30.4% of females were satisfied with the outcome. The most common reasons given for not being satisfied were the offender was not identified or apprehended, that the respondent believed the police took no action regarding their complaint, that they felt they were not taken seriously by the police (14.8%), not getting the items back, and that they were not told of the outcome.

### **Personal/ Violent Crime Victimization**

28.7% of females and 21.2% of males reported that they had been the victim of a personal/violent crime during their lifetime. Of those

who did report personal/violent victimisation most reported they had been living in their current suburb at the time of the offence (60.4% males, 58.9% females). 38.7% of males and 46.2% of females reported that the offence had occurred at their home. Of those who reported the offence occurred at somewhere other than their home the most common location reported by males was on the street (45.6% male, 26.6% female), while for females the most common location was at another home (14% male, 32.4% female).

Females were more likely (than males) to have known the person who committed the offence (53.8% males, 71.2% females).

36.5% of males and 41.3% of females indicated that they had reported the offence to the police. Of those who didn't report the matter to the police the most common reasons given for non-reporting were that the matter wasn't serious enough (30% males, 22.6% females), fear/concern about revenge from the offender (24% male, 21.8% female), that they had handled it themselves (included reporting to the school where relevant) (10% male, 9.7% female), didn't want anyone to know (2% male, 6.8%), that nothing would happen to the offender even if they did report it (2% male, 6.5% female), and that they personally knew the offender (4% male, 4.8% female).

Females were more likely (than males) to indicate that the police had provided feedback regarding action taken (29% male, 46.6% female). Of those who had received feedback from the police, 69.2% of males and 66.7% of females were satisfied with the outcome. The most common reasons given for dissatisfaction were that the offender was not identified or apprehended, that the offender was identified but that no charges were laid, that charges were laid but they were not satisfied with the sentence received in court, and that the respondent believed the police had taken no action regarding their complaint.

Of the respondents who had not received feedback from the police, 21.8% of males and 19% of females were satisfied with the outcome. The most common reasons given for not being satisfied were the offender was not identified or apprehended, the offender was identified but no charges were laid, respondent believed the police took no action regarding their complaint, and that they were not told of the outcome.

## **Violence in the Home**

12.6% of males and 11.4% of females agreed that *Violence from family members is a problem in my home*.

## **Violence based on Racial/Ethnic Background**

Males (14.1%) were more likely than females (9.4%) to report that in the last three (3) years they had been the victim of violence based on their racial/ethnic background.

## **Violence based on Sexuality**

Females (11.2%) were more likely than males (6.1%) to report that in the last three (3) years they had been the victim of violence based on their sexuality.

## **Bullying at School**

29.3% of males and 29.7% of females reported that in the last three (3) years they had been bullied at school. 42.6% of males and 53.5% of females had reported the bullying to the school. The most common reasons for non-reporting were that the bullying was not serious enough (37.5% males, 34.8% females), fear of further/increased bullying as a result of reporting (20.3% males, 25% females), handled it themselves (14.1% males, 8.7% females), the respondent believed the school wouldn't do anything about it (10.9% males, 8.7% females), and that the respondent didn't want anyone to know (7.8% males, 7.6% females)

Females were more likely (than males) to report they received feedback from the school regarding action taken (39.5% males, 57.8% female). Most of those who had received feedback from the school reported they were satisfied with the outcome (65.9% male, 71.4% female). The most common reasons for dissatisfaction with the outcome were that action was taken but they were not satisfied with that action, that the bullying was still happening, and that no action was taken. Note: these reasons are listed in the order of their frequency, percentages cannot be provided, as the number of respondents in this category was small.

Of those respondents who had received no feedback from the school, only 26.6% of males and 21.2% of females were satisfied with the outcome. The most common reasons given for dissatisfaction were that no action was taken, the bullying continued, and that action was taken but they were not satisfied with that action.

### Bullying in the Workplace

3.9% of males and 6.9% of females reported that in the last three (3) years they had been bullied at work. 35.7% of males and 51.8% of females who had been bullied had reported it to the employer. The most common reasons for non-reporting were that the employer wouldn't do anything about it anyway, that they didn't want anyone to know, and that the employer was involved.

The majority of those who had reported the matter to the employer had received feedback from the employer and most of those were satisfied with the outcome. Those who had reported the matter but had received no feedback were less likely to have reported that they were satisfied with the outcome.

### Police Contact

37.2% of males and 36.2% of females reported that they had contact with a member of the Police Service in the last three (3) years (excluding contact due to traffic offences). Females were more likely (than males) to report that they were treated positively by police (38.3% male, 58.5% female). Of those respondents who reported the 'police contact' was not positive, 22.1% of males and 17.7% of females reported that their contact resulted in charges being laid against them.

### Witnessing Crime

Males were more likely (than females) to have reported that they (or a member of their household) had witnessed no crime in the last twelve (12) months (29% male, 24% female). It is highly likely that respondents considered witnessing of the result of a crime (rather than a crime in progress) as 'witnessing' for survey completion. Table 10 shows the percentage and number of respondents who indicated they had witnessed each of the listed crimes on the survey form.

The reported witnessing for specific offences was very similar between males and females, however, females were more likely to report witnessing Child Abuse/Neglect than were males (7.6% male, 12.5% female).

**Table 10 Crimes Witnessed in Previous Twelve (12) months by Gender**

Type of Offence	% (n) Witnesses	
	Male	Female
Break and Enter	39.1% (225)	40.4% (344)
Motor Vehicle Theft	24.8% (143)	24.2% (206)
Vandalism	41.3% (238)	39.6% (337)
Business Theft/Vandalism	9.7% (56)	8.1% (69)
Bag Snatching	13.7% (79)	14.6% (124)
Stalking	10.1% (58)	12.9% (110)
Domestic Violence	20% (115)	22.1% (188)
Assault	24% (138)	21.9% (186)
Robbery	26.7% (154)	26.8% (228)

Rape	5.4% (31)	7.8% (66)
Homicide	5.7% (33)	4.5% (38)
Other Sexual Offences	4.9% (28)	6.8% (58)
Child Abuse/Neglect	7.6% (44)	12.5% (106)
Drug Dealing	39.8% (229)	38.1% (324)
Other	3.6% (21)	4.1% (35)

### Safety Strategies

Respondents were asked about strategies they or a member of their household had undertaken in the last year to improve their safety. Males were more likely to have reported they had not undertaken any of the listed safety strategies because they felt safe (45.5% male, 27.7% female). 6.4% of males and 8.3% of females reported they had not undertaken strategies as they were not sure what to do. Table 11 shows the percentage and number of male and female respondents who indicated they had undertaken the listed safety strategy on the survey form.

Females were more likely than males to have Discussed safety with children/parents, Bought a dog/guard dog, Installed security screens/alarms, Moved house, Changed method of transport/travel, Changed shopping times/places, Restricted activities at night, and Locked doors when traveling in a vehicle.

**Table 11 Safety Strategies Undertaken in Previous Twelve (12) Months by Gender**

Safety Strategy	% (n) of Respondents	
	Male	Female
Pruned shrubs away from doors/windows	6.8% (390)	8.8% (75)
Discussed safety with children/parents	8.7% (50)	22.6% (192)
Bought a dog/guard dog	18.4% (106)	28.3% (241)
Installed security screens/alarms	25.2% (145)	37.5% (3190)
Moved house	4.9% (28)	8.8% (75)
Changed method of transport/travel	2.1% (12)	4.7% (40)
Changed leisure activities	1% (6)	2.1% (18)
Changed shopping times/places	2.4% (14)	5.9% (50)
Restricted activities at night	3.6% (21)	9.3% (79)
Stopped living alone	1% (6)	2.6% (22)
Locked doors when traveling in a car	13.7% (190)	24% (204)
Other	6.1% (35)	9.6% (82)

## Community Involvement

17.2% (98) of males and 16% (135) of females reported that they were currently involved in local community groups/programs. Males were more likely (than females) to have reported involvement with sporting groups (44.2% male, 24.8% female). Females were more likely (than males) to have reported involvement with Neighbourhood Watch, Safety House, YACCA, or PCYC (14% male, 24%), and recreational/leisure groups (10.5% male, 18.2% female).

18.4% (104) of males and 21% (177) of females reported that in the last five (5) years they had been involved in local community groups/programs.

Females were more likely (than males) to report they regularly talked to the people living nearby in their neighbourhood (68.3% male, 75.7% female).

## Attitudes towards Crime Prevention

Females were more likely (than males) to agree that *The Community (with Police/Government support) can be an effective force in preventing crime* (49% male, 55% female), while males were more likely (than females) to disagree (22.2% male, 14.9% male).

42.3% (243) of males and 46.4% (393) of females agreed that *Effective community programs that tackle crime issues would benefit my suburb*. 46.8% (266) of males and 52% (438) of females agreed that *Crime prevention programs should target the underlying causes of crime*.

70.2% (402) of males and 75.2% (637) of females agreed that *Police alone cannot prevent crime occurring in the Community*. 23.6% (135) of males and 24.3% (206) of females agreed that *The Police are doing a good job tackling crime in the Community*, while 47.4% (271) of males and 41.1% (348) of females disagreed.

## Crime Prevention Programs

Respondents were provided with ten (10) options of crime prevention programs/facilities (plus an other category) and were asked to nominate the programs/facilities they would like to see introduced in the their suburb. 1220 respondents selected at least one option from those listed and their responses are provided in Table 12.

Females were more likely (than males) to have selected Safety checks for older neighbours, Support services for families, Programs for increased communication between neighbours, Neighbourhood graffiti clean-ups, and Facilities such as lighting, paths, etc.

**Table 12 Crime Prevention Programs for Introduction in Suburb by Gender**

Crime Prevention Program/Facilities	% (n) of Respondents	
	Male	Female
After school activities for youth (12-18 years)	33.8% (149)	39.4% (307)
Safety checks for older neighbours	34.7% (153)	51.6% (402)
Support services for families	17.7% (78)	26.4% (206)
Support networks for those living alone	24% (106)	28.5% (222)
Programs for increased communication between neighbours	24.5% (108)	31.7% (247)

Neighbourhood graffiti clean-ups	22.7% (100)	29.7% (231)
Foot/bike patrols by Police	36.7% (162)	33.8% (263)
Facility for Community development programs	12% (53)	10.8% (84)
School based crime prevention programs	25.4% (112)	28.5% (222)
Facilities such as lighting, paths, etc	56.5% (249)	72.4% (564)
Other	14.5% (64)	8% (62)

### Section 3

## Survey Responses of Youth and Adult Respondents

### Summary

The following summary provides brief highlights of the statistical analysis conducted on the surveys based on age. Respondents who reported their age as 12-24 years are reported as Youth while respondents aged 25 years and over are reported Adults.

- Youth respondents reported **feeling safer** than adults in all of the situations asked about in the survey. The greatest **differences in safety feelings between youth and adults** were evident for the following situations; I feel safe from crime in my own home, When using parking lots at night, When out alone in their neighbourhood at night, and When at Shopping Centres. The safety feelings of youth and adults were most similar When traveling to and from work/school alone.
- Adults were more likely than youth to agree that **young people make a positive contribution to the community**.
- Adults were more likely than youth to have agreed that **young people commit most crime** while youth were slightly more likely than adults to agree that **young people are more likely to experience victimisation** (than other age groups).
- Adults were more likely than youth to agree that **elderly people are more likely to experience victimisation** (than other age groups).
- Adults were more likely than youth to have agreed that **crime was a problem in their suburb** and that **crime negatively impacted on lifestyles in their suburb**.
- Adults were more likely than youth to have believed that **property crime had increased** in their suburb in the last three years and that **personal/violent crime had increased**.
- Similar numbers of youth and adults respondents reported areas in their **areas in their neighbourhood where they did not feel safe** during the day. Adults were more likely than youth to have reported there were areas in their neighbourhood where they did not feel safe at night.
- Adults were more likely to have experienced **property crime victimisation**. Adults were more likely than youth to have indicated the offence took place at their place of business/employment. Youth were more likely than adults to have claimed they had personally known the person who committed the offence.
- Youth were more likely than adults to have experienced **personal/violent victimisation**. Adults were more likely to have reported the offence occurred at their own home. Youth were more likely than adults to have known the person who committed the offence. Adults were more likely than youth to have reported the offence to the police.
- Youth were more likely than adults to have reported that **violence was a problem in their family home**.
- Youth were more likely than adults have reported **victimisation** they felt was based on their **racial/ethnic background**. Youth were also more likely than adults to report victimisation they felt was based on their **sexuality**.
- Youth were twice as likely than adults to have reported **bullying at school** (of children for adult respondents). Adults were more likely than youth to have reported the bullying to the school and to have received feedback from the school.
- Similar numbers of youth and adults had experienced **bullying at work**.
- Adults were more likely to have had **contact with the police** in the last three years. Adults were more likely than youth to have reported they were treated positively by police. Youth who felt they were not treated positively were more likely than adults to have been charged with an offence.
- Similar numbers of youth and adults reported they had not **witnessed crime** in the last year. Youth were more likely than adults

to have witnessed Stalking, Assault, Robbery, Rape, Other Sexual Offences, and Drug Dealing. Adults were more likely than youth to report witnessing of Business Theft/Vandalism.

- Youth were far more likely than adults to have not undertaken any **safety strategies** because they felt safe. Youth were more likely than adults to have reported they had not undertaken any safety strategies because they were not sure what to do. The three most common strategies undertaken by youth and adults were Locked doors when traveling in a car, Installed security screens/alarms, and Discussed safety with children/parents.
- Adults were slightly more likely than youth to have reported current and past **involvement with community groups/programs**. Youth were more likely than adults to have reported involvement in sporting groups and recreational/leisure groups. Adults were more likely than youth to have reported involvement with Neighbourhood Watch, etc and welfare/supportive groups.
- Similar numbers of youth and adults reported that they **regularly talked to their neighbours**.
- Adults were more likely than youth to have agreed that the **Community can be an active force in crime prevention**, that **effective crime prevention programs would benefit their suburb** and that **crime prevention programs should tackle the underlying causes of crime**.
- The greatest majority of youth and adults agreed that the **police alone cannot prevent crime in the community** while youth were more likely than adults to disagree that the **police are doing a good job tackling crime in the community**.
- When asked about **crime prevention programs** they would like introduced in their suburb, adults generally selected more programs than youth. Facilities such as lighting, paths, etc was most popular for youth but ranked 5<sup>th</sup> for adults. Foot/bike patrols by police was most popular for adults but ranked 4<sup>th</sup> for youth. Safety checks for older neighbours was ranked 2<sup>nd</sup> for both youth and adults.

### Section 3

## Survey Responses of Youth and Adult Respondents

### Detailed Analysis

Only the surveys of those respondents who indicated their gender (as male or female) have been used in this analysis. Respondents who reported their age as 12-24 years are reported as Youth while respondents aged 25 years and over are reported as Adults. This section provides information regarding the differences between Youth and Adults in their completion of the survey.

### 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. These statements were designed to gauge a level of general concern that respondents exhibit regarding crime and everyday situations.

Youth respondents reported feeling safer than adults did in all of the situations asked about. The greatest differences between youth and adult respondents (with youth feeling safer) were in response to the situations *I feel safe from crime in my own home*, *When using parking lots at night*, *When out alone in their neighbourhood at night*, and *When at Shopping Centres at night*. Refer Table 13.

**Table 13 Feelings of Safety in Specific Situations by Age**

Safety Statements :Section One	Agree		Unsure		Disagree	
	Youth	Adult	Youth	Adult	Youth	Adult
I feel safe from crime in my own home	68.9%	35.9%	14.7%	20.3%	16.4%	43.8%
I feel safe from crime when at Shopping Centres at night	40.6%	19.5%	26.5%	22.1%	32.9%	58.4%

I feel safe when passing a group of young men on the street	28.6%	13.8%	25.8%	29.4%	45.6%	56.8%
I feel safe when using parking lots at night	22.6%	8.5%	31.9%	16.3%	45.5%	75.2%
I feel safe when travelling to and from work/school alone	71.3%	61.1%	14.8%	16.3%	13.9%	22.5%
I feel safe when out alone in my neighbourhood during the day	73.1%	55.8%	14.7%	17.6%	12.2%	26.6%
I feel safe when out alone in my neighbourhood at night	32.3%	11.4%	19.8%	15.9%	47.9%	72.7%

### Attitudes towards Crime

Four questions in the survey asked about community perceptions regarding crime and young people. These questions were designed to gauge a level of support for the statements and thus an understanding of the level of community acceptance of the 'perceptions.'

Adult respondents were more likely (than youth) to agree with the statement *Young people make a positive contribution to the community*, (40% youth, 55.5% adult).

A little less than half of the respondents (45.8%) agreed that *Young people (under 24 years) commit most crime*, however adults were more likely to agree with the statement than youth (43.2% youth, 48.1% adult). Youth respondents were more likely (than adults) to agree with the statement *Young people (under 24 years) are more likely than others to be the victims of crime* (18.1% youth, 11.1% adult), and youth were more likely to report they were unsure than disagree.

56.9% of all respondents agreed that *Elderly people are more likely than others to be the victims of crime*, adults were more likely (than youth) to agree with the statement (53.1% youth, 60.2% adult).

### Crime in their Suburb

Four questions in the survey asked about crime in the respondents own suburb. The respondents own suburb was targeted in these questions as it was felt that this was an area the respondents would have greatest 'lived knowledge' regarding the crime situation and their beliefs regarding the prevalence of crime.

Adults were more likely (than youth) to agree that *Crime is a problem in my suburb* (37.4% youth, 58.9% adult) while youth disagreed more often than adults (33.1% youth, 17% adult). Adults were also more likely (than youth) to agree *Crime had a negative effect on the lifestyle of people living in my suburb* (38% youth, 53% adult), however, youth tended to be unsure about their opinions regarding this statement.

Respondents were also asked about their beliefs regarding the change in crime in their suburb in the last three (3) years. Adults were more likely (than youth) to believe that property crime had increased (61.5% youth, 78.8% adult) and that personal/violent crime had increased (47.8% youth, 57.5% adult).

### Areas of Concern in their Neighbourhood

Respondents were asked about areas in their neighbourhood where they did not feel safe (during the day and at night). Respondents were also asked to provide their reason for feeling unsafe in these areas. Respondents could give any response as the questions were open ended, responses were then coded into the categories that best fitted the response. Responses that did not correspond with any coding category were coded as 'Other'.

23.1% of youth and 31.2% of adult respondents reported there were areas in their neighbourhood where they did not feel safe during the day. Youth respondents were more likely (than adults) to nominate local parks and bushland (41.8% youth, 20.8% adult). The most common reason given by both males and females for feeling unsafe in these areas were that they felt unsafe around the people who frequent the area (47.1% youth, 36.1% adult).

Adult respondents were more likely (than youth) to report there were areas in their neighbourhood where they did not feel safe at night (51.5% youth, 70.3% adult). The most common areas nominated for both youth and adults were local parks and bushland, followed by their local streets /or suburb. The most common reason given by both males and females for feeling unsafe in these areas were that they felt unsafe around the people who frequent the area, followed by poor lighting/poor design, and that the area has a reputation for being dangerous.

### **Property Crime Victimization**

Adult respondents were more likely (than youth) to report that they had been the victim of a property related crime during their lifetime (51% youth, 67.4% adult). The majority of youth and adults had been living in their current suburb when the offence occurred (69% youth, 78.5% adult). The majority of youth and adults reported that the offence had occurred at their place of residence (71.6% youth, 81.9% adult). 9.7% of youth and 14.4% of adults reported that the offence had occurred at their business/place of employment.

25.5% of youth and only 8.6% of adults reported they had known the person who committed the offence.

73.6% of youth and 87.1% of adults had reported the offence to the police. 40.9% of youth and 40.5% of adults who had reported the offence to the police indicated that the police had provided feedback regarding the offence. 68.6% of youth and 68.5% of adults who had received feedback were satisfied with the outcome. Of the respondents who had not received feedback from the police, only 27.9% of youth and 22.6% of adults were satisfied with the outcome.

### **Personal/ Violent Crime Victimization**

25.6% of youth and 17.3% of adults reported that they had been the victim of a personal/violent crime during their lifetime. Of those who did report personal/violent victimisation most reported they had been living in their current suburb at the time of the offence (60.1% youth, 51.4% adults). 44.4% of youth and 58.5% of adults reported that the offence had occurred at their home. Of those who reported the offence occurred at somewhere other than their home the most common locations reported by all respondents were at another home (26.8% youth, 27.2% adult).

Youth were more likely (than adults) to have known the person who committed the offence (64.1% youth, 56% adult).

41% of youth and 65.2% of adults indicated that they had reported the offence to the police. Of those who didn't report the matter to the police the most common reasons given by youth and adults for non-reporting were that the matter wasn't serious enough and fear/concern about revenge from the offender.

51.3% of youth and 58.2% of adults who reported the offence indicated that the police had provided feedback regarding action taken. Of those who had received feedback from the police, 70.1% of youth and 68.1% of adults were satisfied with the outcome. Of the respondents who had not received feedback from the police, 25.7% of youth and only 7.8% of adults were satisfied with the outcome.

### **Violence in the Home**

12.1% of youth and 3.3% of adults agreed that *Violence from family members is a problem in my home*.

### **Violence based on Racial/Ethnic Background**

Youth (12.2%) were more likely than adults (4.1%) to report that in the last three (3) years they had been the victim of violence based on their racial/ethnic background.

## Violence based on Sexuality

Youth (10.1%) were more likely than adults (3.0%) to report that in the last three (3) years they had been the victim of violence based on their sexuality.

## Bullying at School

29.7% of youth and 14.8% of adults reported that in the last three (3) years they/or their children had been bullied at school. Adults were more likely (than youth) to have reported the bullying to the school (50.7% youth, 82.7% adult). Adults were more likely (than youth) to report they received feedback from the school regarding action taken (63.4% youth, 74.7% adults). Most of those who had received feedback from the school reported they were satisfied with the outcome (70.1% youth, 72.5% adults). Of those respondents who had received no feedback from the school, only 24.7% of youth and 17.4% of adults were satisfied with the outcome.

## Bullying in the Workplace

5.1% of youth and 5.4% of adults reported that in the last three (3) years they/or their children had been bullied at work. 43.5% of youth and 55.8% of adults who had been bullied had reported it to the employer. The majority of those who had reported the matter to the employer had received feedback from the employer (60% youth, 66.1% adult). Of those who had received feedback from the employer, youth were far more likely to report satisfaction with the outcome (81% youth, 44.1% adult).

## Police Contact

37.3% of youth and 47.9% of adults reported that they had contact with a member of the Police Service in the last three (3) years (excluding contact due to traffic offences). Adults were more likely (than youth) to report that they were treated positively by police (56.1% youth, 76.1% adult). Of those respondents who reported the 'police contact' was not positive, 25.9% of youth and 3.5% of adults reported that their contact resulted in charges being laid against them.

## Witnessing Crime

25.4% of youth and 28.3% of adults that they (or a member of their household) had witnessed no crime in the last twelve (12) months. It is highly likely that respondents considered witnessing of the result of a crime (rather than a crime in progress) as 'witnessing' for survey completion. Table 14 shows the percentage and number of respondents who indicated they had witnessed each of the listed crimes on the survey form.

Youth and adults reported similar levels of witnessing Break and Enter, Motor Vehicle Theft, Vandalism, Bag Snatching, and Homicide. Youth were more likely (than adults) to report witnessing of Stalking, Assault, Robbery, Rape, Other Sexual Offences, and Drug Dealing. Adults were more likely (than youth) to report witnessing of Business Theft/Vandalism.

37.4% of youth and 41.5% of adults reported witnessing between one (1) and three (3) crimes during the last twelve (12) months and 20.6% of youth and 15.3% of adults reported witnessing between four (4) and six (6) crimes during this period.

**Table 14 Crimes Witnessed in Previous Twelve (12) months by Age**

Type of Offence	% (n) Witnesses	
	Youth	Adult
Break and Enter	39.6% (600)	39.9% (674)

Motor Vehicle Theft	24.4% (369)	27.6% (466)
Vandalism	39.9% (605)	39.2% (661)
Business Theft/Vandalism	8.6% (131)	15.2% (257)
Bag Snatching	14.2% (215)	15% (253)
Stalking	12.1% (184)	3.7% (62)
Domestic Violence	20.8% (315)	18% (304)
Assault	22.8% (346)	14.4% (243)
Robbery	26.3% (399)	18.8% (318)
Rape	7.1% (108)	3.4% (57)
Homicide	5.3% (80)	4% (68)
Other Sexual Offences	6.3% (96)	1.8% (30)
Child Abuse/Neglect	10.8% (163)	8.6% (146)
Drug Dealing	38.5% (584)	18.1% (306)
Other	4.1% (62)	3.5% (59)

### Safety Strategies

Respondents were asked about strategies they or a member of their household had undertaken in the last year to improve their safety. Youth were far more likely to have reported they had not undertaken any of the listed safety strategies because they felt safe (34.5% youth, 9.5% adult). 7.7% of youth and 3.7% of adults reported they had not undertaken strategies as they were not sure what to do. Table 15 shows the percentage and number of youth and adult respondents who indicated they had undertaken listed safety strategies on the survey form.

Adults were more likely than youth to report utilising most of the safety strategies listed on the survey form. Similar percentages of youth and adults reported having Changed method of transport/travel and Stopped living alone.

**Table 15 Safety Strategies Undertaken in Previous Twelve (12) Months by Age**

Safety Strategy	% (n) of Respondents	
	Youth	Adult
Pruned shrubs away from doors/windows	7.6% (115)	26.4% (446)
Discussed safety with children/parents	16.4% (249)	32% (540)
Bought a dog/guard dog	24% (363)	24.9% (420)
Installed security screens/alarms	31.7% (480)	49.1% (828)
Moved house	7.4% (112)	3.4% (58)

Changed method of transport/travel	3.6% (54)	4.6% (77)
Changed leisure activities	1.7% (25)	7% (119)
Changed shopping times/places	4.4% (66)	17.2% (291)
Restricted activities at night	6.7% (102)	25.2% (425)
Stopped living alone	2% (31)	2.3% (38)
Locked doors when traveling in a car	19.5% (295)	50.1% (845)
Other	7.9% (120)	8.8% (149)

## Community Involvement

16.4% of youth and 20.8% of adults reported that they were currently involved in local community groups/programs. Youth were more likely (than adults) to have reported involvement with sporting groups and recreational/leisure groups. Adults were more likely (than youth) to have reported involvement with Neighbourhood Watch, Safety House, YACCA, or PCYC and welfare/supportive groups.

19.8% of youth and 24.4% of adults reported that in the last five (5) years they had been involved in local community groups/programs. Youth were more likely (than adults) to have reported involvement with sporting groups and recreational/leisure groups. Adults were more likely (than youth) to have reported involvement with Neighbourhood Watch, Safety House, YACCA, or PCYC and welfare/supportive groups.

72.1% of youth and 76.1% of adults reported that they regularly talked to the people living nearby in their neighbourhood.

## Attitudes towards Crime Prevention

Adults were more likely (than youth) to agree that *The Community (with Police/Government support) can be an effective force in preventing crime* (80.6% adult, 51.8% youth), while youth were more likely (than adults) to report they were unsure or disagreed with the statement.

Adults were more likely (than youth) to agree that *Effective community programs that tackle crime issues would benefit my suburb* (44.1% youth, 78.5% adult). 49.1% of youth and 86.3% of adults agreed that *Crime prevention programs should target the underlying causes of crime*, while 43.5% of youth were unsure about their opinion in response to the statement.

73% of youth and 92.6% of adults agreed that *Police alone cannot prevent crime occurring in the Community*. 24.3% of youth and 33.1% of adults agreed that *The Police are doing a good job tackling crime in the Community*, while 43.7% of youth and 36.5% of adults disagreed.

## Crime Prevention Programs

Respondents were provided with ten (10) options of crime prevention programs/facilities (plus an other category) and were asked to nominate the programs/facilities they would like to see introduced in their suburb. 2856 respondents selected at least one option from those listed and their responses are provided in Table 16. Adults generally selected more of the options than youth respondents, however, there are striking similarities in the 'popularity' of some of the provided crime prevention options for both groups.

Both youth and adults supported Safety checks for older neighbours (ranked 2<sup>nd</sup> for both in 'popularity') and After school activities for youth (4<sup>th</sup> for youth, 3<sup>rd</sup> for adult). Facilities such as lighting, paths etc was most popular for youth (5<sup>th</sup> for adults), while Foot/bike patrols

was the most popular option for adults (ranked 4<sup>th</sup> for youth).

**Table 16 Crime Prevention Programs for Introduction in Suburb by Age**

Crime Prevention Program/Facilities	% (n) of Respondents	
	Youth	Adult
After school activities for youth (12-18 years)	37.4% (471)	58.3% (930)
Safety checks for older neighbours	45.1% (568)	65.7% (1048)
Support services for families	23.3% (293)	29.4% (470)
Support networks for those living alone	26.7% (336)	49.1% (783)
Programs for increased communication between neighbours	28.8% (363)	43.2% (689)
Neighbourhood graffiti clean-ups	27.1% (342)	45% (718)
Foot/bike patrols by Police	34.9% (440)	67.4% (1075)
Facility for Community development programs	11.2% (141)	25.5% (402)
School based crime prevention programs	27.4% (345)	61.2% (977)
Facilities such as lighting, paths, etc	66.1% (833)	57% (910)
Other	10.5% (132)	9.1% (145)

## Selected Program Concepts

The following pages are included as a base level resource guide of community based initiatives that have been implemented with particular target groups or targeting particular issues. The descriptions below are of programs in existence in Australia or Internationally and are provided here in the report to be used as a discussion resource for local communities who may be looking for 'ideas' when developing locally specific strategies.

### Physical Environment

- Local parks are often the focus of crime and safety concerns of people living nearby in the neighbourhood. Parks can be a focus of community (neighbourhood) life. Safety audits of local parks will highlight the major concerns that need to be dealt with to make the park safer for all community members. Lighting should be of a level that no area of the park is in complete darkness, gathering places such as seating, tables, and barbecues should be readily visible through the use of lighting, vegetation should provide ample shade but should not be of a type that obscures visibility and provides places of concealment, play equipment should be well maintained and graffiti free, and regular checks for litter should be conducted. Once you have dealt with the physical issues you can focus efforts on clarifying and reinforcing the purpose of the park; focus neighbourhood activities on that location, activities for mothers with young children, legitimise the use of the park by youth (create ownership of the space – what do young people need to make the park more user friendly for them).
- If travelling in your neighbourhood at night is a concern then you can look at creating a Safepath. A Safepath should be created where the majority of pedestrian (and other transport, excluding motor vehicles) activity occurs in your neighbourhood. These common thoroughfares are often well beaten paths to the local shops, the area near the school, or even leading to the beach. A Safepath is a well-designed landscaped walkway; the lighting is adequate and subject to maintenance programs. Once the key components to a Safepath have been implemented – suitable vegetation, adequate pathways, adequate and well maintained lighting it is then important to incorporate signage that publicly announces the existence of the Safepath. It is largely up to the community what features they would like their Safepath to incorporate, houses along the pedestrian corridor could be lobbied for their involvement in the Safety House program.
- Safety Audits are an important tool in efforts to improve the safety of the physical environments. Safety audits can be conducted anywhere that people are found although it may be important to tailor your Safety Audit tool (questionnaire) to for particular areas. Anyone can be involved in Safety Audits, in fact the more diverse your team of auditors are, the better. You should be very conscious of ensuring the involvement of vulnerable groups of people in your audit teams and conducting the audits at times when the greatest amount of information can be gathered about your target site. Some issues that should be included in Safety Audit tools are: your general impressions of the site (gut reactions), lighting, signage, accessibility, sightlines (clarity of view), isolation, predictability of movement, entrapment sites, escape routes, exits, washrooms, phones, maintenance, civility, and overall design.

### Older Community Members

- Older community members who have been the victims of crime are provided a home visit service by Liaison Workers (who are aged 55 years and over) who ensure clients have access to all social services that can assist with their 'social service needs'.
- A scheme whereby a register of tradesman is developed that can provide free assistance to older victims of crime. The tradesman

repair damage to doors and locks (or replace damaged equipment) for older community members.

- Street wise – a workshop where older community members are provided with information about physical cues that they can utilise to reduce the likelihood of their targeting as a victim. Also incorporates information about avoiding victimisation of 'fraudulent crime'.
- A neighbourhood watch within neighbourhood watch where older community members are actively targeted and provided with special support and contact neighbours from 'support families' who live near by. Older community members benefit from inclusion when the contact provided from 'support families' reduces the sense of isolation experienced and provides close at hand assistance should the need arise. A number of families who live close by set up a network where they can provide immediate assistance. Features include support families numbers are programmed into speed dial of older neighbours, support families are of a combination that seeks to ensure someone will always be available if contact is sought, support families have numbers to contact (on behalf of older neighbour) should the need arise.

## Young people

- The use of mentoring relationships has developed a strong support base in the United States. There are many well-established programs overseas worthy of closer examination and there is little reason why effective programs cannot be imported to this country and be equally effective. A quick reminder that in crime prevention it is vital to "Think Globally, Act Locally". Volunteers are screened, trained, and monitored by coordinators of the program. Orientation is provided to volunteers, parents, and young people prior to inclusion in the program. Young people are carefully matched to a volunteer on a mutually accepted basis by both parties. Of importance are the needs that both parties wish to be met by the mentoring relationship. The mentoring occurs outside of the school environment and can consist of any positive activity that will enrich the young mentees and provide positive opportunities. Mentors and mentees are also provided access to workshops that provide skills in relationship building, communication, values clarification, child development, and problem solving. The aspects of the program and mentoring relationships found to be effective are; high levels of contact and the mentor as friend.
- Bullying reduction and prevention programs that can be effective through altering environmental norms regarding bullying. Educational booklets are distributed to school personnel (booklets define the problem, steps to counteract bullying behaviour), booklets with advice is distributed to parents, students actively targeted through posters throughout school. Other actions taken during the program included; establishing and publicising clear rules about bullying, consistent contingent sanctions, regular student discussions about school norms regarding bullying (reinforcement), and improved supervision of the playground.

## Domestic Violence

- An initiative used elsewhere assists to raise the profile of domestic violence in the local community, to reinforce the idea that domestic violence is an issue that should concern all community members, and to raise funds in support of local domestic violence prevention initiatives. The initiative involves enlisting the support of local businesses (great percentage of involvement is important) to have a nominated day where they donate a percentage of their takings to support local specified domestic violence initiatives. The initiative is sold to the community (publicity and media strategies must be effective) as an opportunity to 'shop till they drop, to prevent domestic violence'. Participating businesses also permanently prominently display stickers that publicises their involvement in the initiative provides local numbers to call, and offers the use of their phone in the event of a 'dangerous situation'.
- Support for women in their communities. Educate Neighbourhood Watch and actively take the responsibility for assistance in domestic violence situations to the local community via an active campaign be Neighbourhood Watch, or other body who can act very locally. An initiative that targets the responsibility of neighbours to call for assistance if they are aware of a domestic violence situation in their neighbourhood, that requires intervention.
- Involve children and adolescents in Campaigns. One initiative to raise the awareness of the effects of violence on children involved primary school aged children drawing an outline of their hand and drawing a caption or illustration that depicted the statement 'Hands are not for Hitting'. Illustrations drawn by children are then prominently displayed at various venues across the local community.
- Local companies physically support the needs of women's shelters by providing free of charge, goods and labor needed to refurbish facilities that often operate on extremely limited funding.

## Drugs

- Research has suggested that drug prevention programs should be introduced in primary school and reinforced (through booster sessions) throughout secondary school. The most effective (as shown from evaluations) programs featured the following components; clarifying and communicating norms about behaviour, instructional programs that focus on a range of social competency skills, such as developing self-control, stress management, decision making, problem solving, and communication skills – including conflict resolution, and behavioural modification programs and programs that teach thinking skills to high-risk youth. The most effective components of drug prevention programs are those that actively impart skills to young people, provide opportunities to practice those skills, and are followed up throughout school attendance to ensure maintenance of skills. There is little evidence that simply educating young people about drugs has any effect on the decision to take drugs.
- Drug education programs can involve the whole community. One program that appeared promising (according to evaluation results) was the Illawarra Drug Education Program targeted at 10 to 11 year olds. The program commenced with a parent

education evening, the participating children are introduced to the program by the previous years 'graduates' and the program is then delivered over several weeks. The program units include instruction on decision-making strategies, information on drug misuse, peer pressure and conformity resistance, and assertiveness skills. During the program there is a second parent's evening. Immediately after the instructional phase of the program the children work together to produce various drug related materials and a short piece of drama. The program culminates in a third parent evening at which the program participants present the projects they have been working on during the program. Evaluations of the program effects over several years found that program participants had lower usage of tobacco and cannabis than did control groups who had not participated in the program.

## Research Notes

### Sampling Procedure

The original parameters of the research sample were the voluntary participation of all state secondary schools in the Logan City Local Government Area. The research was conducted for use by a State Government Program and as such State Government Schools were included in the research sample.

A sample of students from years 10 to 12 in each participating school were included in the sample.

A sample percentage from each eligible school was calculated by the researchers, based on the participation of all schools and a maximum sample of 2000 respondents.

A sample of 1515 respondents was achieved because of the nine (9) eligible schools, six (6) schools agreed to participate in the research.

### Statistical Testing and Reporting

In Sections 2 and 3 of the Analysis of survey responses the differences between groups of respondents was examined. In Section 2 the survey responses of male and female participants were examined to identify any differences in the responses these 'respondent groups' made to each question in the survey. In Section 3 the survey responses of youth and adult participants were examined to identify any differences in the responses these 'respondent groups' made to each question in the survey.

Chi-square statistical testing was conducted to examine any differences. The statistical test is based on the hypothesis that there are no differences in the way different 'respondent groups' answered each question in the survey. If a difference is found between the responses made by the respondent groups (male:female, youth:adult) then a significance level is examined to see whether we can then reject the original hypothesis (that there is no difference). The significance levels accepted in the current research were levels less than .05, .01, and .001. The lower the significance level the more confident we can be that the original hypothesis (that there is no difference) can be rejected.

In the writing of the current research this type of statistical testing was used. The reporting of statistically significant differences between

groups was not presented in a traditional manner. The authors aimed at all times in the report writing to provide information that was accessible and provided detailed information in a non-intimidatory manner to encourage the reports use by young people. It was felt that the extensive use of traditional statistical reporting (with its appearance of mathematical equations) would not promote the use of the report by young people.

Where the differences between groups (male:female, youth:adult) are significant at the level of .05, then one group is described as *slightly more likely* than the other group to have responded in a certain way. Where the differences between groups (male:female, youth:adult) are significant at the level of .01, then one group is described as *more likely* than the other group to have responded in a certain way. Where the differences between groups (male:female, youth:adult) are significant at the level of .001, then one group is described as *far more likely* than the other group to have responded in a certain way.

## Index

### Selected Bibliography

Australian Bureau of Statistics. (1997). 1996 Recorded Crime – Australia.

Australian Bureau of Statistics. (1996). 1996 Women's Safety – Australia.

Australian Bureau of Statistics (1995). Crime and Safety, Queensland, 1995, Main Features.

Australian Bureau of Statistics (1997). Youth, Australia: A Social Report –1997.

Australian Institute of Criminology. (1997). Australian Criminal Justice Latest Statistics. <http://www.aic.gov.au/stats/statbrochure.html>

Carcach, C. (1997). No. 68. Reporting Crime to the Police. Trends & Issues in Crime and Criminal Justice. Australian Institute of Criminology : Canberra

Crane. C., Heywood. P., Earl. G., Egginton. A. & Gleeson, G. (1997). Young People and Major Centres : The Development of Principles for Design, Planning and Management Guidelines in Brisbane City. Brisbane City Council : Brisbane.

Criminal Justice Commission. (1992). Youth, Crime and Justice in Queensland.

Hurry, J. & Lloyd, C. (1997). A Follow-up Evaluation of Project Charlie – A life skills education programme for primary students. Home Office: London.

Justice Institute of British Columbia. (1997). Enhancing School Safety – Workshop Resource Manual. Justice Institute of British Columbia: British Columbia.

Mugford, J. & Nelson, D. (1996). Violence Prevention in Practice: Australian Award-winning programs. Australian Institute of Criminology : Griffith, ACT.

Mukherjee, S., Carcach, C. & Higgins. K. (1997). Juvenile Crime and Justice: Australia 1997. Australian Institute of Criminology : Griffith, ACT.

National Centre on Addiction and Substance Abuse. (1996). 1996 National Survey of American Attitudes and Substance Abuse II. Columbia University.

Queensland Police Service. (1997). Queensland Police Service Statistical Review 1996-1997.

Sherman, L.W., Gottfredson, D., Mackenzie., Eck, J., Reuter, P. & Bushway, S. (1997). Preventing Crime: What Works, What Doesn't, What's Promising. National Institute of Justice.

## Appendix

**Table 1 Victims of Crime by Age and Gender for the South Eastern Region  
1996/1997  
Personal/Violent Offences**

	0-14		15-24		25-34		35-44		45-54		55 &over	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
<b>Homicide</b>	0	0	4	2	9	1	4	2	3	1	3	0
<b>Assault</b>	187	87	421	256	340	227	199	131	139	79	104	33
<b>Sexual Offences</b>	54	176	22	160	9	65	3	32	1	8	0	7

<b>Robbery</b>	22	7	95	28	27	26	22	18	21	19	13	18
----------------	----	---	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----

**Table 2 Offenders by Age and Gender for the South Eastern Region – 1996/1997**

**Personal/Violent Offences**

	10-14		15-19		20-24		25-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60 &over	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
<b>Homicide</b>	1	0	2	0	14	0	5	0	11	3	4	1	2	0	1	0
<b>Assault</b>	63	12	208	50	195	30	170	7	141	30	74	12	32	2	12	2
<b>Sexual Offences</b>	17	1	23	0	6	0	23	0	64	0	53	1	53	0	10	0
<b>Robbery</b>	12	7	46	15	45	8	34	2	18	3	3	0	5	0	0	0

Table 3 Offenders by Age and Gender for the South Eastern Region – 1996/1997

## Property Offences

	10-14		15-19		20-24		25-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60 &over	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
<b>Breaking &amp; Entering</b>	237	22	918	57	294	44	194	41	102	3	17	1	16	0	0	0
<b>Arson</b>	2	1	9	0	1	1	3	0	3	0	3	1	1	0	0	0
<b>Other Property Damage</b>	188	11	487	51	230	42	141	13	120	17	34	2	7	1	1	1
<b>Motor Vehicle Theft</b>	92	11	465	57	168	33	123	10	88	11	27	3	2	0	2	0
<b>Stealing</b>	404	260	935	426	486	242	279	122	319	170	129	97	74	34	44	26
<b>Fraud</b>	31	0	138	74	328	145	270	168	218	103	155	23	17	4	21	0