AN EVALUATION OF THE SAFE CITY STRATEGY IN CENTRAL SYDNEY

Christine Coumarelos

New South Wales Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research

PREFACE

The high volume of personal 'street' crimes such as assaults and robberies in the Central Sydney area has been the focus of considerable concern over the last decade. Regardless of the actual risk of personal crime in the area, the sheer volume of offences pose a threat to the city's reputation for safety, and consequently, to the area's use and prosperity. As a result, reducing the incidence of personal crime in the Central Sydney area has become an important issue in recent years.

In 1997, the Bureau published a study that mapped the precise locations of assaults and robberies in the Central Sydney area, identifying the area's crime 'hotspots'. It was hoped that such an analysis would be useful for crime prevention planning in the area.

In early 1998, the City Sydney Council began the implementation of a major multi-faceted crime prevention strategy in the Sydney Local Government Area, the *Safe City Strategy*. This Strategy targeted frequently used crime 'hotspots' in the area. City of Sydney approached the Bureau in late 1998, after implementation had begun, for an independent evaluation of the effectiveness of the Strategy, both in terms of its impact on crime, and in terms of its effect on city users' perceptions of personal safety in the area. The present study describes this evaluation.

Dr Don Weatherburn
Director

November 2000

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

DESCRIPTION OF SAFE CITY STRATEGY

The *Safe City Strategy* is an ongoing, multi-faceted crime prevention strategy which was designed to maximise personal safety in the public domain of the central city area of Sydney. The Strategy was developed by the City of Sydney Council in close consultation with the New South Wales Police Service. The Strategy includes the following initiatives: a City Upgrade of footpaths and streets; an Improved Lighting initiative; a Street Safety Camera Program; an Emergency Video Phone trial; a Community Safety Education initiative; an Accord with Licensed Premises; and a Safe Taxi Ranks initiative. Implementation of the Strategy initiatives began in early 1998 and, for most initiatives, was largely completed by mid 1999. To date, the Strategy has targeted six areas within the city: (a) the George Street cinema area and Town Hall; (b) Hyde Park; (c) Central Railway Station and Belmore Park; (d) the Haymarket and Chinatown; (e) Circular Quay and the Rocks; and (e) the Retail Core encompassing Wynyard, Martin Place and Pitt Street Mall.

AIMS OF THE PRESENT STUDY

The present report evaluates the short-term effectiveness of the Safe City Strategy. One major aim of the present evaluation was to examine the level of awareness of the Safe City Strategy initiatives and the impact of the initiatives on the perceived safety of the city area. A second major aim was to examine the Strategy's effectiveness in reducing concern about crime in the city area. The third aim was to evaluate the effectiveness of the Safe City Strategy in impacting on levels of crime in the city area.

The first two aims were addressed via a survey conducted in early 2000 of 1,808 city users aged 14 years or over. To obtain a good cross-section of city users, interviewers were stationed across the city, both during the day and at night, and both during the week and on the weekend. The third aim was addressed via an analysis of recorded criminal incidents.

PERCEPTION OF STRATEGY

With respect to the first aim, survey respondents were asked whether they were aware of the Safe City Strategy initiatives and whether they thought the initiatives would make the city safer.

The survey revealed that the level of awareness of the Safe City Strategy varied considerably across initiatives. As might be expected, the two initiatives that had not been implemented at the time of the survey had the lowest levels of awareness: only about one-quarter of respondents were aware of the Community Safety Education initiative and only about one-third of respondents were aware of the Safe Taxi Ranks initiative. The initiatives that achieved the highest levels of awareness were the Street Safety Camera Program and the City Upgrade, with at least two-thirds of respondents being aware of each of these initiatives.

Despite the varying levels of awareness of the Strategy initiatives, the perceived impact of the initiatives on the city's safety was very positive. Without exception, each initiative was perceived by at least 62 per cent of respondents as likely to make the city safer.

The Improved Lighting and Safe Taxi Ranks initiatives received the highest endorsement levels, with about 90 per cent of respondents rating these initiatives as likely to make the city safer. For some of the initiatives, females were even more likely than males to rate the initiatives positively. The high overall endorsement of the Safe City Strategy initiatives suggests that the City of Sydney Council was successful in developing a crime prevention strategy that appeals to city users and generally addresses any concerns they may have about the city's safety.

PERCEPTION OF SAFETY IN THE CITY

In order to address the second aim, namely to evaluate the Strategy's impact on concern about crime in the city, respondents were asked two series of questions concerning the safety of the city overall and the safety of each of the six city areas targeted by the Safe City Strategy to date. The first series of questions asked about the safety of the city and the city areas at the time of the survey. The second series of questions asked respondents to compare the safety of the city and the city areas at the time of the survey (when most initiatives had been implemented) with one year prior to the survey (when most initiatives had not yet been implemented).

The survey results paint a positive picture of the perceived safety of the city at the time of the survey. The majority of respondents rated the city and the city areas as either 'safe' or 'very safe' at the time of the survey. Generally, males were even more likely than females to rate the city areas positively. Similarly, compared with respondents who had experienced an unsafe incident in the city, those who had not experienced such an incident were more likely to rate the city areas positively. The perceived safety of the individual city areas at the time of the survey was generally not related to age, although adolescents were less likely than older respondents to rate the city overall as safe. The perceived safety of the individual city areas at the time of the survey was also generally not related to city resident status, frequency of city use or awareness of the Strategy initiatives.

Furthermore, at the time of the survey, the majority of the respondents were either not concerned or only a little concerned about victimisation of their person or property during the day. As might be expected, greater proportions of respondents were concerned about victimisation at night than during the day.

The survey results also generally showed an increase in the public's confidence of the city's safety after the implementation of the Safe City Strategy compared with one year previously. Although most respondents, as might be expected, rated the safety of the city and each city area as being the 'same' as one year previously, larger proportions of respondents rated the city and the city areas as being 'safer now' rather than 'worse now'. About 20 to 30 per cent of respondents opted for 'safer now' whereas only about 5 to 15 per cent of respondents opted for 'worse now'. Generally, males were even more likely than females to rate the city and the city areas as being 'safer now', as were adolescents compared with older respondents and 'frequent' city users compared with 'infrequent' city users. Furthermore, awareness of a greater number of initiatives was associated with a greater likelihood to rate the city and city areas as 'safer now'. Thus, the survey results are consistent with the Strategy increasing the public's confidence in the city's safety, particularly for persons who are relatively more familiar with the city or with the Strategy.

The level of concern of most respondents about being victimised in the city overall was the 'same' as one year prior to the survey. However, compared with one year prior to the survey, although relatively more respondents were less concerned about victimisation

during the day, relatively more respondents were more concerned about victimisation at night. The increased concern about night-time victimisation was the only result that was inconsistent with the notion that the Safe City Strategy was effective in increasing the perceived safety of the city.

Although the city was generally perceived as 'safe' at the time of the survey, and as 'safer' after the implementation of the Strategy compared with one year previously, the public's confidence in the city's safety varied according to both individual characteristics and situational factors. Many of these findings were consistent with past research on fear of crime. The present study found that females and prior crime victims remained the most concerned about crime in the city. The present study also found that perceptions of the city's safety varied across city locations. Circular Quay/The Rocks and the Retail Core attracted very little concern about crime while Hyde Park and Central/Belmore Park attracted the most concern about crime.

IMPACT ON CRIME

The third aim of the present evaluation, namely to examine the initial effectiveness of the Safe City Strategy in impacting on crime in the Strategy area, was addressed via an analysis of recorded criminal incidents. Unfortunately, a rigorous evaluation of the Strategy's initial impact on crime was not possible due to the protracted nature of the Strategy and the lack of a truly appropriate comparison area. Nonetheless, the most rigorous evaluation that was possible under the circumstances was conducted. A pre-post analysis of the number of recorded criminal incidents in the Strategy area, namely Postcode 2000, was used to compare recorded incidents in the year 1998 (the period before most of the initiatives were implemented) with recorded incidents in the year 1999 (the period during or after most of the initiatives were implemented). Pre-post analyses were also conducted in two comparison areas. Firstly, the Sydney Local Government Area (LGA), which encompasses Postcode 2000, was used as a comparison area once Postcode 2000 was removed. Secondly, the broader area of the Inner Sydney Statistical Subdivision (SSD) which encompasses the Sydney LGA was also used as a comparison area once Postcode 2000 was removed. Neither of these areas was an ideal comparison area because Postcode 2000 is relatively unique in terms of its high transient population and its built-up nature, and because both Postcode 2000 and the comparison areas were the subject of some crime prevention initiatives that were not part of the Safe City Strategy. Of the two comparison areas, the Sydney LGA was the more suitable given that it is less suburban than the broader area of the Inner Sydney SSD.

Given that the Safe City Strategy was primarily concerned with the safety of persons in the public domain in the city area, but also with the safety of personal property in the public domain, the pre-post analysis examined the following offences: *non-residential serious assault, non-residential common assault, non-residential sexual offences, robbery with a weapon, robbery without a weapon, steal from person* and *malicious damage to property.*

Two types of statistical analyses were conducted on each offence category of interest. The Kendall's rank-order correlation test was used to examine whether there had been an increasing or decreasing trend in the monthly number of recorded criminal incidents for each offence category over the two-year period in the Strategy area and in each comparison area. The Chi-square test was used to compare the pattern in the total number of recorded incidents from 1998 to 1999 in the Strategy area with that in each of the comparison areas.

The results of the analysis of recorded crime clearly varied according to the area used as the comparison area. When Postcode 2000 was compared with the remainder of the Sydney LGA, the results were fairly consistent with an effective Safe City Strategy. The Kendall's results for *robbery without a weapon*, and the Chi-square results for this offence and for *non-residential serious assault*, were all consistent with an effective Strategy. Using the Sydney LGA as the comparison area, the only result directly inconsistent with a successful Strategy was the Kendall's result for *non-residential common assault.*

When the Strategy area was compared with the remainder of the broader area of the Inner Sydney SSD, the results were generally inconsistent with an effective Strategy. Both the Kendall's and Chi-square results for *non-residential common assault* and for *robbery without a weapon* were, prima facie, inconsistent with an effective Strategy. The Chi-square result for *steal from person* was also inconsistent with an effective Strategy. Using the Inner Sydney SSD as the comparison area, only the Kendall's result for *robbery with a weapon* was consistent with an effective Strategy.

However, given that the Sydney LGA was the more appropriate comparison area, on balance, the results were more favourable than unfavourable in terms of the Strategy's initial impact on crime.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the survey results revealed that the Strategy received high levels of endorsement from city users who perceived all of the Strategy initiatives surveyed as likely to make the city area safer. The evaluation also generally suggested that the Strategy was effective in increasing the perceived safety of the city and in reducing fear of crime in the city. Further enhancement of the Strategy might result from targeting (a) the specific groups of individuals who remained most concerned about crime, such as females and prior crime victims, (b) victimisation at night, and (c) the specific city locations which attracted most concern about victimisation, such as Hyde Park and Central/Belmore Park. Raising the level of awareness of the Strategy may further enhance the public's confidence in the safety of the city area of Sydney.

While, overall, the results of the recorded crime analyses were neither consistent nor inconsistent with an effective Strategy, the crime analyses based on the more appropriate comparison area were fairly consistent with the Strategy having a positive initial impact on crime. The longer-term impact of the Strategy on crime remains to be seen.

1. INTRODUCTION

In 1995, the Lord Mayor of Sydney established the City Safety Taskforce to coordinate approaches to personal safety issues within the city area of Sydney, and to act as a policy development, advisory and advocacy body on safety issues in the city area (City of Sydney 1999). In response to concerns regarding personal safety raised by the Taskforce, the *Safe City Strategy* was developed by the City of Sydney Council in close consultation with the New South Wales (NSW) Police Service. The Strategy brings together a range of crime prevention initiatives that were designed to minimise 'street' crime and maximise personal safety in the public domain within the city area (City of Sydney 1999). Implementation of the Strategy began in 1998.

The NSW Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research was asked to evaluate the effectiveness of the Safe City Strategy, both in terms of its impact on the number of criminal incidents in the public domain in the city area, and in terms of its effect on city users' perceptions of personal safety in the area. The present report describes this evaluation and discusses its results.

1.1 BACKGROUND

Crime rates and patterns

Recorded crime rates in the Sydney Local Government Area (LGA),[1] the jurisdiction covered by the City of Sydney Council, have traditionally been high compared with other areas in Sydney and NSW. In 1998, for example, the Inner Sydney Statistical Subdivision (SSD), which encompasses the Sydney LGA (as well as the Botany Bay, Leichhardt, Marrickville and South Sydney LGAs), recorded the highest rates in Sydney of assault, sexual assault, other sexual offences, robbery, break and enter, motor vehicle theft, stealing offences and malicious damage to property (Chilvers 1999). Furthermore, the Inner Sydney SSD has consistently recorded high crime rates throughout the 1990s (see the report series by the NSW Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research entitled *NSW Recorded Crime Statistics*).

To put these crime rates into perspective, however, it is important to recognise that the crime rates are based on the residential population within an area, not on the 'transient' population which resides outside the area but visits the area for work, shopping, entertainment, recreation, leisure, tourism or other reasons. Of all NSW LGAs, the Sydney LGA is unique in that it has a particularly large 'transient' population, with an estimated 500,000 people or more visiting the city area each day, but a relatively small residential population (approximately 24,000 people: City of Sydney 2000a). Because the crime rates do not reflect the city area's high transient population, they give an exaggerated picture of the actual risk of victimisation in the area. Furthermore, the level of crime in Sydney is low compared with that in many other major cities around the world (Price Waterhouse Coopers 1998, cited in City of Sydney 2000a).

Whatever the actual risk of victimisation in the city area of Sydney, the sheer volume of offences in the area has been the focus of considerable public concern. For example, in 1998 in the Inner Sydney SSD (which includes the Sydney LGA) there were close to 6,000 recorded assaults and over 3,000 recorded robberies (Chilvers 1999). The increase in the volume of some offences in inner Sydney in recent years has also raised public concern. For example, there were notable percentage increases in the total number of recorded

incidents in the Inner Sydney SSD between 1996 and 1998 for the following offences: robbery without a weapon (25.3%); robbery with a firearm (33.3%); robbery with a weapon not a firearm (142.3%); steal from dwelling (37.2%); and steal from person (34.9%: see Chilvers 1999). The sheer numbers of offences, and the recent increases in these numbers, pose an inevitable threat to the city's reputation for safety. Whether or not it is deserved, an unsafe reputation has the potential to affect not only the city's use, but also its prosperity. The possibility that the public's concern about personal safety is exaggerated suggests the benefits of any crime prevention strategy in the city area targeting not only real threats to safety, but also any unrealistic perceptions concerning safety.

The city's level of safety varies across city locations. It has been shown that the distribution of recorded criminal incidents is not evenly spread throughout the city area. Jochelson (1997) mapped the locations of recorded assaults and robberies occurring between July 1995 and June 1996 within the Sydney Police District, an area contained within the Inner Sydney SSD but larger than the Sydney LGA. He identified five major hotspots for both assaults and robberies. Three of these hotspots were outside the Sydney LGA: Darlinghurst Road, Kings Cross; Oxford Street, Darlinghurst; and Redfern Railway Station. The two hotspots within the Sydney LGA were both around George Street. One George Street hotspot was around the cinema area (between Liverpool and Park Streets) and Town Hall Railway Station. The other George Street hotspot was at Wynyard, the Rocks and Circular Quay. In addition to these hotspots, there were other notable clusters of assaults and robberies within the Sydney LGA. One such cluster was in the main retail areas of the city, that is, on George, Pitt and Castlereagh Streets between Park Street and Martin Place. Another cluster was in the area around Central Railway Station, Belmore Park, the Haymarket and Chinatown. There were also a considerable number of night-time robberies in Hyde Park.

The observed clustering of crime in particular locations within the city area of Sydney suggests that any crime prevention strategy in the area may benefit by targeting problem locations. Past research has shown that targeting crime hotspots is a useful crime prevention strategy (Sherman 1997).

Fear of crime

While the volume of crime in the city area of Sydney may be cause for concern, research shows that people's fear of criminal victimisation can vary considerably, and is not always related to their actual risk of victimisation.

A considerable body of research has identified groups of individuals who have relatively high levels of fear about being victimised, such as women (e.g. Gordon, Riger, Lebailey & Heath 1980; Maxfield 1984; Riger 1978; Warr 1984, 1985), the elderly (e.g. Baldassare 1986; Clarke & Lewis 1982; Giles-Sims 1984; Lee 1982), previous crime victims (e.g. Hough 1995; Skogan 1987; van Dijk & Mayhew 1992) and various ethnic minorities (e.g. Madriz 1997; Percy 1998). In the case of women and the elderly, the findings pertaining to fear of crime directly contrast with the victimisation rates obtained by victim surveys both in Australia and overseas. Such surveys consistently show higher victimisation rates for men compared with women, and for the young compared with the elderly (e.g. Australian Bureau of Statistics 1999; Rennison 2000).

A growing body of evidence also shows that fear of crime does not totally depend on individuals' characteristics but can be affected by a range of situational or contextual factors. Not surprisingly, for example, people are more likely to feel unsafe at night rather than during the day (e.g. O'Mahony & Quinn 1999), and in urban rather than in

rural areas (e.g. Hale, Pack & Salked 1994; Koffmann 1996). Research has also shown that fear of crime is linked to various physical and social aspects of neighbourhoods. People tend to feel more unsafe in neighbourhoods exhibiting disrepair or disorder in the form of litter, graffiti, vandalism, noise, teenage loiterers, drunks or tramps (e.g. Box, Hale & Andrews 1988; Eve & Eve 1984; Hale, Pack & Salked 1994; Skogan 1990; Skogan & Maxfield 1981), and in neighbourhoods lacking cohesion or undergoing change (e.g. Covington & Taylor 1991; Krannich, Greider & Little 1985).

Fear of crime also varies across offence types, but the findings are less clear-cut. Past research indicates that fear of crime tends to be related not only to the perceived seriousness of different offences, but also to the perceived risk of experiencing different offences. As a result, while personal crimes such as assault, rape and robbery are often nominated as the most frightening crimes (e.g. Gilchrist, Bannister, Ditton & Farrall 1998; Newburn & Stanko 1994; Ortega & Myles 1987), property crimes are sometimes more likely to be nominated when individuals are asked how worried they are about specific crimes actually occurring to them (e.g. Hough 1995; O'Mahony & Quinn 1999).

These findings suggest that the public's confidence about the safety of the city area in Sydney may vary considerably across individuals, across different locations and across different types of crimes.

Approaches to crime prevention

Attempts at crime prevention have involved a myriad of strategies, with no single type of strategy emerging consistently as the most effective in reducing crime. Crime prevention strategies have included intelligence-based and enhanced policing initiatives, broad-based environmental design initiatives, more specific situational prevention initiatives and social approaches to crime prevention.

Crime prevention through environmental design has become entrenched in mainstream criminology and has its origins in the notion that 'natural surveillance' is an effective crime deterrent (Jacobs 1961; Newman 1972). The idea is that the greater the number of people frequenting an area, the more 'eyes on the street' or 'natural surveillance' serving to detect and deter crime. Environmental design initiatives aim to enhance the opportunities for natural surveillance of public areas by enhancing the areas' attractiveness and popularity through architectural design and planning. Thus, environmental design approaches can be seen as broad-based approaches that attempt to 'design out' crime and fear of crime (Brantingham & Brantingham 1981; Geason & Wilson 1989).

Although broad-based environmental design approaches to crime prevention have met with some success, it has been widely recognised that simply treating crime prevention as a design task will not, on its own, eliminate crime. It is also important to take into account the specific situational, motivational and social contexts in which crime occurs (White & Sutton 1995).

Situational crime prevention strategies are aimed at addressing problems in particular locations by increasing the effort required for offending, reducing the rewards for offending and increasing the risk of apprehension in those locations (Brantingham & Brantingham 1990; Clarke 1992). Situational crime prevention has included a wide range of strategies. Examples are 'target hardening' strategies such as installing locks and alarm systems, increased beat police and security guards, enhanced surveillance through security cameras, place management strategies such as responsible serving of alcohol in licensed premises, and education programs about property protection and

'street-wise' behaviour (Clarke 1992; Homel & Clark 1995). Research on situational crime prevention indicates that the most successful initiatives have involved programs oriented at well-defined problems (Clarke 1992; White & Sutton 1995).

Social approaches to crime prevention have traditionally involved approaches aiming to rehabilitate offenders or potential offenders (Cohen 1985). Such approaches have included alternatives to court-based processing of offenders such as Youth Justice Conferences which aim to reintegrate offenders into the community (Braithwaite 1989; Trimboli 2000), and programs such as the NSW Drug Court Program (Freeman, Lawrence Karski & Doak 2000) which aim to treat the underlying problem driving criminal behaviour, such as a drug problem.

In recent years, there has been a call to extend social crime prevention approaches so that, in addition to rehabilitating offenders, they encourage community involvement in crime prevention through supportive partnerships and advocacy programs. It has been argued that such involvement will positively affect the social and economic relationships in the community underlying criminal offending (e.g. White & Sutton 1995).

In the absence of a single, consistently effective crime prevention strategy, multi-faceted crime prevention programs, which attempt to take into account the environmental, situational and social contexts underlying criminal offending, are increasingly being adopted.

1.2 SAFE CITY STRATEGY

The Safe City Strategy is a multi-faceted strategy, combining a number of different types of approaches to crime prevention based on 'best practice'. Although most of the initiatives of the Strategy have already been implemented, many initiatives are ongoing and the aim is to continually enhance the Strategy.

Aims

The aims of the Safe City Strategy are to maximise personal safety in the public domain and to maximise the public's confidence in the safety of the city area by

    (a) preventing crime and anti-social behaviour;

    (b) minimising the fear of crime; and

    (c) assisting the NSW Police Service in their law enforcement task
       (City of Sydney 1999).

Targeted offences

The Strategy primarily targets offences occurring in the public domain that threaten personal safety. As a result, crimes against the person, such as assaults and robberies occurring in the public domain, are of particular interest. However, also of interest are crimes that threaten the safety of a person's property in the public domain, such as steal from person, and crimes that threaten the perception of the city's safety, such as malicious damage to property, the possession of weapons and offensive behaviour.

Targeted area

At the time of the present evaluation, the Safe City Strategy targeted the central area of the Sydney LGA, bounded roughly by Circular Quay to the north, Central Railway Station to the south, Hyde Park and Macquarie Street to the east, and the Bradfield

Highway to the west (see *Appendix 1*). Postcode 2000 largely overlaps with this Strategy area, although Postcode 2000 includes Miller's Point, Dawes Point and Darling Harbour, which have not been targeted by the Strategy.

Within the Strategy area, initiatives to date have concentrated on six specific areas, based on crime statistics, the nature of the area and the volume of people using the area. These six areas are:

    (a) the George Street cinema area and Town Hall;

    (b) Hyde Park;

    (c) Central Railway Station and Belmore Park;

    (d) the Haymarket and Chinatown;

    (e) Circular Quay and the Rocks; and

    (f) the Retail Core encompassing Wynyard, Martin Place and Pitt Street Mall.

Initiatives

The Strategy initiatives are outlined only briefly below given that a detailed description is provided in City of Sydney (1999).

There are five major categories of initiatives comprising the Strategy:

- Environmental Design initiatives;
- Personal Safety initiatives;
- Street Monitoring initiatives;
- Partnership initiatives; and
- Social Support initiatives.

Environmental Design initiatives

This group of initiatives is based on the notion that natural surveillance in public spaces is an effective crime deterrent that can be enhanced through the design and maintenance of these spaces (e.g. Newman 1972). The Environmental Design initiatives consist of an Urban Design initiative, an Improved Lighting initiative and a Graffiti Removal, Street Cleaning and Maintenance initiative.

The Urban Design initiative includes a City Upgrade aimed at increasing the city's attractiveness and pedestrian flow by introducing new paving, wider footpaths, additional street trees and new street furniture. In addition, the initiative includes the development of environmental design guidelines whereby relevant development applications are considered from a crime prevention perspective. The initiative also includes various planning controls requiring certain types of entertainment venues to be located in designated areas and encouraging responsible behaviour by patrons and managers of late night entertainment venues.

The Improved Lighting initiative is based on research showing that the level of lighting is an important environmental design factor in enhancing the real and perceived safety of streets and other public places (e.g. Painter 1992; Trench, Taner & Tiesdell 1992; Valentine 1990). More than 2,000 'Smartpole' lights were installed throughout the Strategy area, upgrading street lighting to more than twice the previous level and in excess of the Australian/New Zealand standard. Additional lighting along footpaths and in public spaces has also been introduced.

The Graffiti Removal, Street Cleaning and Maintenance initiative is based on the finding that public spaces that are clean and in good condition are associated with lower levels of fear and crime (e.g. Eve & Eve 1984; Hale, Pack & Salked 1994). The initiative includes graffiti removal within 24 hours of identification, cleaning of streets, footpaths, malls, plazas and street furniture, litter control, waste collection, and repair of vandalised assets.

Personal Safety initiatives

Personal Safety initiatives include a 12-month trial of four Emergency Video Phones, a Community Safety Education initiative and an Active City Program.

Four Emergency Video Phones have been installed in areas of the city identified by crime statistics as hotspots: the George Street Cinema area, the Haymarket, Hyde Park South and Circular Quay. An emergency call to the police can be made by simply pushing a button on the phone. In addition to audio communication, the button activates both a video camera within the phone structure and the nearest Street Safety Camera (see *Street Monitoring initiative* below). The vision from the cameras assists the Police to assess the gravity of the situation and respond accordingly.

The Community Safety Education initiative aims to inform and educate the community about situations that place persons' safety at risk and 'street-wise' behaviours that can help to prevent victimisation in the public domain.

The Active City Program initiative, like the Environmental Design initiatives, is based on the notion that natural surveillance is an effective crime deterrent. The Active City Program aims to increase opportunities for natural surveillance by introducing supervised recreational and cultural activities in the city.

Street Monitoring initiative

This initiative has to date resulted in the installation of 48 Street Safety Cameras at identified crime (assault and robbery) hotspots throughout the city to assist in the prevention and detection of crimes against the person. Specially trained security personnel monitor the cameras 24 hours a day from a control centre and can transfer live video images to the appropriate local police command. The cameras are believed to act as a deterrent to potential offenders, to assist in early intervention by preventing minor incidents from escalating into more serious incidents, and to assist in crime detection and prosecution. Use of the cameras is governed by a Code of Practice aimed at protecting the rights and privacy of individuals.

Partnership initiatives

This group of initiatives comprises a City Safety Taskforce, an Accord with Licensed Premises, a Safe Taxi Ranks initiative and a number of Precinct Strategies.

The aim of the City Safety Taskforce initiative is to provide a consultative forum to coordinate the efforts of the various public authorities that have a role in improving public safety in the city. Existing members of the Taskforce include government agencies, business organisations, and community representatives.

The Accord with Licensed Premises is based on an extensive body of research showing a relationship between excessive alcohol consumption and both anti-social and criminal behaviour (e.g. Edwards, Hensman & Peto 1971; Nicol et al. 1973; Pernanen 1982; Roncek & Maier 1991; Stevenson 1996). Furthermore, research shows that management practices in licensed premises and enforcement of the licensing legislation can help prevent alcohol-

related offences in and around such premises (e.g. Jeffs & Saunders 1983; Homel & Clark 1995). The Accord is between the City of Sydney Council, the NSW Police Service, licensed premises and various other stakeholders. It aims to promote within licensed premises the responsible service of alcohol and the responsible use of security staff. It establishes new roles and responsibilities for licensees, their staff, police, licensing authorities, City of Sydney staff and patrons.

The NSW Taxi Council has established three taxi ranks in the city that are supervised by trained security staff. As part of the Safe City Strategy, the City of Sydney is working in partnership with the NSW Taxi Council to extend the number and hours of operation of supervised taxi ranks in the city. Under this plan, the ranks will be marketed as 'Safe Taxi Ranks'.

The aim of the Precinct Strategies is to respond to localised crime problems in specific crime hotspots. The first precinct strategy was developed around the George Street cinema precinct to address the high level of crime in and around the George Street amusement centres. A key element of this precinct strategy is an Accord with Amusement Centres designed to combat crime in these centres. At the time of writing, a second precinct strategy had been drafted to provide crime prevention initiatives for key residential areas within the Sydney LGA, especially Millers Point, Pyrmont and Ultimo.

Social Support initiative

The Social Support initiative involves an Illegal Drug Action Plan which recognises the demonstrated link between addiction to illegal drugs and the commission of property crime (e.g. Baker 1998; Salmelainen 1995; Stevenson & Forsythe 1998). The action plan is based on principles of harm minimisation and aims to provide addicts with health, rehabilitative and support services that assist in diverting them from the crime cycle.

Implementation schedule

The implementation of the Safe City Strategy commenced at the beginning of 1998 and continued progressively throughout 1998 and 1999. By mid 1999, the implementation of most initiatives had been largely completed with the exception of the Community Safety Education, Safe Taxi Ranks and City Safety Taskforce initiatives. As already mentioned, however, many of the initiatives were designed to be ongoing.

The Environmental Design initiatives, including the City Upgrade of footpaths and streets, and the Improved Lighting initiative, began in early 1998, progressed throughout 1998 and 1999, and were completed for most major public spaces by the end of 1999.

The 12-month trial of four Emergency Video Phones began in September 1999.

Although the City of Sydney's Community Safety Education initiative did not commence until April 2000, the City of Sydney's major strategy partner, the NSW Police, have delivered ongoing community safety education for many years.

The Active City Program is an ongoing program. Examples of the program to date include a night art market held in Belmore Park from December 1999 to March 2000, a City Night Market held in the Dixon Street Mall in Chinatown in late 1999, and an annual food and wine fair held in Hyde Park.

Progressive installation of the Street Safety Cameras occurred between December 1998 and August 1999, with most cameras being in place by May 1999, although a few more cameras are planned for installation in 2000 and 2001.

At the time of writing, the City of Sydney Council had consulted with the membership of the City Safety Taskforce on the Community Safety Education initiative, the Accord with Licensed Premises and the Accord with Amusement Centres.

The Accord with Licensed Premises was in place in July 1999.

The NSW Taxi Council commenced the operation of three supervised taxi ranks in February 1999. These three taxi ranks operate late on Friday and Saturday nights. To date, the proposed Safe City Strategy initiative to work with the Taxi Council to extend the operation of the supervised taxi ranks and to promote them as 'Safe Taxi Ranks' has not been implemented.

The first of the Precinct Strategies, the Accord with Amusement Centres in George Street, was in place in June 1999.

The City of Sydney resolved in December of 1998 to adopt a set of principles contained in the Australian Capital Cities Resolution on Drugs. These principles support a harm minimisation approach. Although the Illegal Drug Action Plan is yet to be completed, the City of Sydney continues to monitor and provide input, where appropriate, to Commonwealth and State Drug Policy development.

1.3 AIMS OF THE PRESENT STUDY

One major aim of the present evaluation was to examine the level of awareness of the Safe City Strategy initiatives and the impact of the initiatives on perceived safety in the city area. A second major aim was to examine the Strategy's effectiveness in reducing fear of crime in the city area. These two aims were addressed via a survey of city users conducted in early 2000. Respondents were asked whether they were aware of the Safe City Strategy initiatives and whether they thought the initiatives would make the city safer. They were also asked to rate the safety of the city area at the time of the survey (when most initiatives had been implemented), and to compare the safety of the city at the time of the survey with one year prior to the survey (when most initiatives had not yet been implemented).

The third aim of the present study was to evaluate the effectiveness of the Safe City Strategy in impacting on levels of crime in the city area. This aim was addressed via an analysis of recorded criminal incidents for 1998 (the period before most of the initiatives were implemented) and 1999 (the period during or after most of the initiatives were implemented).

2. METHOD

2.1 SURVEY

Sampling technique

City users were surveyed in each of the six city areas of interest between 14 January and 11 February 2000. The six areas were (a) the George Street cinema area and Town Hall; (b) Hyde Park; (c) Central Railway Station and Belmore Park; (d) the Haymarket and Chinatown; (e) Circular Quay and the Rocks; and (e) the Retail Core encompassing Wynyard, Martin Place and Pitt Street Mall. A total of 1,808 city users aged 14 years or over completed the survey.[2] To obtain a cross-section of city users in the six city areas, interviewers were stationed in each of the six areas, both during the day and at night, and both on weekdays and the weekend. 'Day' interviews occurred between 9.00 am and 6.00 pm, while 'night' interviews occurred between 7.00 pm and 10.00 pm. Weekdays were defined as Mondays to Fridays while weekend days were defined as Saturdays and Sundays. Weeknights were defined as Sunday to Thursday nights while weekend nights were defined as Friday and Saturday nights.

Table 1 shows the breakdown of interviews in each area by weekdays and weekends, and by day and night. Approximately 300 city users completed an interview in each city area. In each area, approximately half (150) of the interviews occurred on a weekday and half occurred on the weekend. Furthermore, of the weekday interviews in each area, approximately one-half (75) occurred during the 'day' and one-half occurred at 'night'. The weekend interviews in each area were similarly split between 'day' and 'night'.

Table 1: Number of interviews conducted in each city area, by weekday and weekend, and by day and night

| City area | Weekday | | Weekend | | |
	Day	Night	Day	Night	Total
George St/Town Hall	78	75	76	76	305
Hyde Park	71	77	74	73	295
Central/Belmore Park	76	75	76	75	302
Haymarket/Chinatown	74	76	75	74	299
Circular Quay/The Rocks	79	78	74	77	308
Retail Core	76	75	76	72	299
Total	**454**	**456**	**451**	**447**	**1808**

The instrument

A copy of the survey is presented in *Appendix 2.*

At the outset of the survey, the 'main city area' or 'the city' was defined as the overall area targeted by the Safe City Strategy, that is, the area bounded roughly by Circular Quay to the north, Central Railway Station to the south, Hyde Park and Macquarie Street to the east, and the Bradfield Highway to the west.

The survey first obtained some descriptive information about the sample, including frequency of city use, main reason for being in the city, gender, age, postcode of residence, and language(s) spoken at home and/or with parents (see Questions 1-8 in *Appendix 2*).

The survey then asked a series of questions about the perceived safety of the city 'at the present time', that is, at the time of the survey, including the perceived safety of the city overall, the perceived safety of each city area, and the level of concern about being victimised in each area, both during the day and at night (see Questions 9-14 in *Appendix 2*). Concern about two types of victimisation was examined: being physically attacked or threatened, and having property stolen or damaged.

The next section of the survey asked respondents to rate the safety of the city 'now compared with one year ago'. Respondents were asked to make this comparison in terms of the safety of the city overall, the safety of each city area, and the level of concern about being victimised in the city during the day and at night (see Questions 15-18).

The next section examined the level of awareness of the Safe City Strategy initiatives, and the perceived impact of these initiatives on safety in the city (see Question 19). While the respondents were asked to rate most of the initiatives, not all aspects of all initiatives were examined. Some initiatives that were not very visible, that had not received much publicity or whose implementation was not very advanced were not included in the survey. The survey addressed the following initiatives: the City Upgrade of footpaths and streets; the Improved Lighting initiative; the Street Safety Camera Program; the Emergency Video Phone initiative, the Community Safety Education initiative, the Accord with Licensed Premises and the Safe Taxi Ranks initiative. This section on the Strategy initiatives was deliberately placed after the sections asking about the city's safety 'at the present time' and 'now compared with one year ago'. This order was adopted so that the perceptions of the city's safety were not influenced by any new knowledge about the initiatives gained through doing the survey.

Respondents were then asked a series of questions about whether they or anyone they know had ever felt unsafe in the city. In these questions, 'feeling unsafe' was not explicitly linked to concern about criminal victimisation. In the first question, all respondents were asked whether anything had ever happened to them personally that made them feel unsafe (see Question 20). Respondents who had such personal experience of an unsafe incident were asked how recently the last such incident had occurred and to provide some details about the last such incident (see Questions 21-24). Respondents who had not personally experienced an unsafe incident in the city were asked whether they had any 'vicarious' experience of an unsafe incident in the city. That is, they were asked whether someone they knew had experienced an unsafe incident (see Question 25) and whether they had witnessed an unsafe incident (see Question 26).

Finally, respondents were asked to provide any suggestions they had for further safety initiatives in the city (see Question 27).

Interviewing procedure

In each city area, interviewers stationed themselves in positions of relatively high pedestrian flow, where they could easily approach people passing by. At least three different stationing positions were used in each city area to ensure a cross-section of people using that particular area.

Interviewers randomly approached passers-by who appeared to be at least 14 years of age and asked them whether they would take part in an interview. The length and purpose of the interview were outlined and the confidential nature of the interview was emphasized (see *Appendix 2*).

In addition to being excluded on the basis of age, persons were also excluded if their English was insufficient to do the interview. A total of 804 persons were excluded because of insufficient English. Furthermore, the interviews of 2,288 respondents were terminated because they had not visited the city in the year 1998. These interviews were terminated at Question 2, which asked about the frequency of visiting the city in 1998. These terminations were necessary because persons who had not visited the city in 1998 would be unable to answer the most critical section of the interview which asks respondents to compare the safety of the city in 1998 with that in 1999.[3]

Response rate

In total, 4,096 people agreed to do the survey, with 1,808 of these people completing the survey and 2,288 of these people being terminated at Question 2 because of insufficient city use. A further 3,937 refused to do the survey. These numbers represent an overall response rate of 51.0%.

Table 2 presents the response rate for each city area broken down by time of interview (weekday/weekend and day/night). It can be seen that the response rates for the city areas ranged from 41.6 to 65.3 per cent, while the response rates for time of interview ranged from 47.2 to 53.7 per cent.

**Table 2: Response rate for each city area,
by weekday and weekend, and by day and night**

| City area | Weekday | | Weekend | | |
	Day	Night	Day	Night	All times
George St/Town Hall	57.5	51.8	54.8	32.5	49.1
Hyde Park	56.3	58.2	54.7	49.0	54.8
Central/Belmore Park	47.2	48.6	54.1	48.6	49.4
Haymarket/Chinatown	40.1	45.2	34.9	45.4	41.6
Circular Quay/The Rocks	61.3	62.9	67.3	69.2	65.3
Retail Core	49.6	45.2	54.9	38.9	47.0
All areas	**51.1**	**52.2**	**53.7**	**47.2**	**51.0**

Of the 3,937 people who refused to do the survey, 3,133 (79.6%) did not give a specific reason for refusing. The most common reason given for refusing was that the person could not spare the time to do the survey (834 or 21.2% of refusals).

Reliability checks

As a means of assessing the internal reliability of the survey, a series of Spearman's rank-order correlations were conducted between pairs of variables that, on a theoretical basis, would be expected to be correlated.

Firstly, ratings on all variables examining safety in the city 'at the present time' would be expected to be correlated. Thus, each pair of variables within the following list were examined: the safety of the city overall (Q9); the safety of each city area (Q10a-f); and the level of concern about each type of victimisation in each area, both during the day and at night (Q11a-f, Q12a-f, Q13a-f and Q14a-f).

Secondly, ratings on all variables examining safety in the city 'now compared with one year ago' were also expected to be correlated. Thus, each pair of variables within the following list were examined: the safety of the city overall 'now compared with one year ago' (Q15); the safety of each city area 'now compared with one year ago' (Q16a-f); and the level of concern about each type of victimisation 'now compared with one year ago', both during the day and at night (Q17a-b and Q18a-b).

Consistent with the internal reliability of the survey, without exception, each correlation tested was statistically significant at $p < 0.01$.[4]

Analyses

The analyses of the survey involved basic frequencies and cross-tabulations. For each cross-tabulation, the Chi-square (χ^2) test was used to examine whether the responses of two or more groups of respondents (e.g. different age groups) were statistically different. Statistical significance was examined at the traditional level of a p value of less than 0.05. The direction of any significant relationship is indicated by the percentages of each group falling into each response category.

2.2 CRIME TRENDS

A rigorous evaluation of the impact of any crime prevention strategy on crime levels requires that the strategy be implemented in the target area over a short period of time in the absence of any other crime prevention interventions. If other interventions have occurred in the target area, it is difficult for any evaluation to isolate the effects of the crime prevention strategy of interest from the effects of the other interventions. Furthermore, the longer the time period over which the strategy of interest is implemented, the greater the risk that extraneous factors may also affect crime in the target area.

A rigorous evaluation of any crime prevention strategy also requires a suitable comparison area in which no crime prevention initiatives have taken place over the period of interest. Ideally, any comparison area should be similar to the target area in terms of demographics, urbanisation level and general use in order to minimise the risk of extraneous factors affecting the two areas differentially. An appropriate comparison area enables an examination of whether any changes in crime during the period of interest are restricted, as would be expected, to the area targeted by the strategy, and hence, are not merely part of a more general trend occurring in a broader area.

Furthermore, given that a substantial proportion of crime is not reported to the police, a rigorous evaluation of the impact of any crime prevention strategy on crime levels would ideally not be restricted to recorded crime levels, but would also include an examination of unreported crime. Without examining unreported crime, the extent to which any changes in recorded crime reflect changes in the level of reporting or detecting crime, rather than changes in the actual level of crime, cannot be determined.

Unfortunately, the nature of the Safe City Strategy and the lack of a truly appropriate comparison area precluded a rigorous evaluation of the effectiveness of the Strategy in reducing crime. During the period of implementation of the Safe City Strategy there were also various police initiatives (i.e. *Operation City Safe)* in the area targeted by the Strategy. As a result, while any positive effects on crime would be consistent with an effective Safe City Strategy, they may also be due, at least in part, to the concurrent police initiatives. Furthermore, given that the Safe City Strategy was implemented gradually over a relatively long (i.e. two-year) period, the possibility that extraneous

factors may have influenced crime during the implementation period cannot be easily ruled out. Moreover, there was no ideally suitable comparison area because the target area has relatively unique characteristics and because the areas most similar to the target area were also subject to various crime prevention initiatives. Finally, the crime analysis was restricted to recorded crime because the high transient population in the Strategy area makes it very difficult to obtain reliable estimates of unreported crime.[5]

Nonetheless, the most rigorous evaluation of the Safe City Strategy that was possible under the circumstances and with the available resources was conducted, as outlined below. The evaluation compared a pre-post analysis of crime patterns in the Strategy area with pre-post analyses in two other areas. Although the evaluation's limitations mean that it is not capable of providing definitive conclusions about the impact of the Strategy on crime, it is able to examine whether recorded crime patterns are consistent or inconsistent with the Strategy having a positive impact on crime.

Target area and time period

As outlined earlier, the Safe City Strategy targeted the safety of persons and their property in the public domain of the city area of Sydney, an area which largely coincides with the Postcode 2000 area. Although the Strategy was implemented gradually from the beginning of 1998 to the end of 1999, most of the initiatives were implemented in late 1998 or the first half of 1999. Furthermore, given the time-frame available for the completion of the present evaluation, it was not possible to examine the effects of the Strategy on crime after 1999. As a result, a pre-post crime trend analysis was used to compare the number of recorded criminal incidents in Postcode 2000 in the year 1998 (the period before most of the initiatives were implemented) with the number in 1999 (the period during or after most of the initiatives were implemented). Thus, the evaluation examined the initial impact of the Strategy on recorded crime up until the end of 1999. Given that not all of the Strategy initiatives were implemented and promoted by the end of 1999, it is possible that longer-term effects of the Strategy will emerge after 1999.

The limited time-frame available for the present evaluation also meant that the numbers of recorded criminal incidents for some offences of interest in Postcode 2000 in 1999 were too small to conduct reliable analyses for each of the six areas of interest within the postcode.[6] As a result, the evaluation examined only the overall effect of the Strategy throughout Postcode 2000 and not whether the Strategy had any effects that were localised to specific areas within the postcode.

Offence categories

The Safe City Strategy aimed primarily to increase the safety of persons in the public domain, but also to increase the safety of personal property in the public domain. Thus, the following offence categories were considered relevant to the evaluation of the Strategy: assault, sexual offences, robbery, other offences against the person, steal from person, malicious damage to property, possess weapons and offensive behaviour. Other offences against the person were not examined because there were insufficient numbers in Postcode 2000 for a reliable pre-post analysis. Possess weapons and offensive behaviour were also not examined because the recorded numbers of these offences are substantially affected by the level of police activity.

Unlike the remaining offence categories of interest, a substantial proportion of assaults and sexual offences tend to be of a domestic nature. Because the Safe City Strategy

targeted offences occurring in the public domain rather than domestic offences, the analyses for assaults and sexual offences were restricted to offences occurring on non-residential premises.

As noted earlier, the present evaluation was restricted to recorded crime because of the difficulty in estimating the level of unreported crime in the city. It was recognised, however, that the Street Safety Cameras and Emergency Video Phones had the potential to increase the detection and reporting of crime. Past research has shown that one of the main factors affecting the reporting of personal crimes such as assault, sexual assault and robbery is the severity of the incident, with higher reporting rates for incidents of a serious nature (e.g. incidents where the victim is physically injured) than for minor incidents (e.g. Bachman & Saltzman 1995; Coumarelos and Allen 1999; Rodgers 1994). Given these findings, while it was possible that the Strategy would increase significantly the detection or reporting of minor personal crimes, it was unlikely to affect significantly the detection or reporting of more serious personal crimes. As a result, it was desirable to examine recorded crime trends separately for more and less serious forms of assault, sexual offences and robberies. While it was possible to split assault and robbery according to severity, there were insufficient numbers of sexual offences in Postcode 2000 to do a similar split for sexual offences.

In summary, the following offence categories were examined:

1. *non-residential serious assault* (consisting of incidents of 'grievous bodily harm', 'actual bodily harm' and 'shoot with intent other than to murder' that did not occur on residential premises);

2. *non-residential common assault;*

3. *non-residential sexual offences;*

4. *robbery with a weapon* (consisting of 'robbery with a firearm' and 'robbery with a weapon not a firearm');

5. *robbery without a weapon* (consisting of 'robbery without a weapon' and 'demand money with menaces');[7]

6. *steal from person;* and

7. *malicious damage to property.*

Comparison areas

As already mentioned, there was no truly appropriate comparison area for the present evaluation. The Postcode 2000 area is relatively unique in terms of its high transient population and low residential population, a situation that arises because of the built-up nature of the city and its high concentration of offices, shops, restaurants, entertainment venues and places of interest. The only areas with similar characteristics are other areas within the city region, even though, compared with Postcode 2000, these other city areas would have relatively larger residential and relatively smaller transient populations.

The Kings Cross area of the city, which lies in Postcode 2011, would ordinarily be a reasonable comparison area for Postcode 2000, given that, outside Postcode 2000, Kings Cross is one of the most built-up city areas with a large transient population. However, Kings Cross was ruled out as a comparison area for the present evaluation because, at the time of the Safe City Strategy, Kings Cross was also the subject of a comprehensive crime prevention strategy (the Kings Cross Place Management Project).

With the exclusion of Kings Cross (Postcode 2011), the most suitable comparison areas for Postcode 2000 are the postcodes that, together with Postcode 2000, make up the LGA corresponding to the centre of the city, namely the Sydney LGA. Most of the areas in the remainder of the Sydney LGA were, like Postcode 2000, the subject of the *Operation City Safe* police initiative. Furthermore, although the Safe City Strategy was concentrated in Postcode 2000, a few of the Strategy initiatives may have affected areas in the remainder of the LGA. Specifically, the Accord with Licensed Premises may have affected areas outside Postcode 2000 and, while most lighting improvements were made within Postcode 2000, some lighting was put in place outside the postcode. Unlike Kings Cross, however, the remainder of the Sydney LGA was not the subject of a comprehensive crime prevention strategy that did not occur in Postcode 2000.

Because postcode boundaries do not correspond perfectly with LGA boundaries, postcodes sometimes fall into more than one LGA. The Sydney LGA comprises all of Postcode 2000, all of Postcode 2009 (Pyrmont) and most (90.1%) of Postcode 2007 (Broadway, which includes Ultimo), as well as a small percentage (11.2%) of Postcode 2010 (Darlinghurst) and a small percentage (1.3%) of Postcode 2011 (Kings Cross).[8] The areas making up the Sydney LGA once Postcode 2000 is excluded were combined into a single comparison area. It was not possible to use either Postcode 2009 on its own or Postcode 2007 on its own as a comparison area for Postcode 2000 because the volume of recorded crime in each of these postcodes was too small for a reliable comparison of 1998 and 1999. As a result, criminal incidents recorded as occurring in Postcode 2000 between 1998 and 1999 were compared with criminal incidents recorded as occurring throughout the remainder of the Sydney LGA in these years.[9]

Throughout the rest of this report, for the sake of convenience, the comparison area comprising the remainder of the Sydney LGA will simply be referred to as 'the Sydney LGA' even though criminal incidents recorded in Postcode 2000 are not counted in this area. The *annual numbers* of recorded criminal incidents in the Sydney LGA were sufficient for a reliable pre-post comparison for all the offence categories of interest. However, because a pre-post analysis based on *monthly numbers* would have been unreliable for a few of the offence categories (see *Analyses* section below), the broader area containing the Sydney LGA, namely the Inner Sydney SSD, was also examined as a comparison area. Again, in order to use the SSD as a comparison area for Postcode 2000, the criminal incidents occurring in Postcode 2000 were excluded from the total occurring in the SSD. Furthermore, for the sake of convenience, the label 'the Inner Sydney SSD' will be used henceforth to refer to the remainder of the SSD once Postcode 2000 has been removed.[10] It is important to note, however, that because the majority of the SSD is outside the city area, its characteristics are less similar to those of Postcode 2000 than are the characteristics of the Sydney LGA. Thus, where numbers of recorded crimes are large enough, the Sydney LGA provides a more suitable comparison area than does the Inner Sydney SSD, although, as noted earlier, neither area is an ideal comparison area.

In summary, in addition to the pre-post crime trend analysis in Postcode 2000, for comparison purposes, pre-post crime trend analyses were also conducted in the Sydney LGA (excluding Postcode 2000) and in the Inner Sydney SSD (excluding Postcode 2000).

Analyses

The crime trends *within each geographical area* were examined using the Kendall's rank-order correlation test. The test was used to examine whether there had been an increasing or decreasing trend in the *monthly* recorded number of criminal incidents for each offence

category in each area over the 24-month period from January 1998 to December 1999. Given that the implementation of the Safe City Strategy occurred progressively over the 24-month period, it was considered appropriate to use a statistical test such as Kendall's which is sensitive to gradual changes over time. A statistically significant trend is indicated by a *p* value for the Kendall's test of less than 0.05. For those offence categories where a statistically significant trend was found, the percentage change in the total recorded number of incidents between 1998 and 1999 is used to indicate the magnitude of the trend. For Postcode 2000 and the Inner Sydney SSD, there were sufficient monthly numbers of recorded incidents for all offence categories for the Kendall's tests to be reliable. However, for the Sydney LGA, the monthly recorded numbers were too low for the Kendall's tests to be reliable for the following offence categories: *non-residential serious assault, non-residential sexual offences* and *robbery with a weapon*. Thus, Kendall's results are not presented for these offence categories in the Sydney LGA.

A *comparison* of changes in crime from 1998 to 1999 *in pairs of the geographical areas* was examined using the Chi-square (χ^2) test. Specifically, the Chi-square test was used to compare *Postcode 2000* with the *Sydney LGA* and with the *Inner Sydney SSD*. For each offence category, the Chi-square test examined whether the pattern in the total number of recorded incidents from 1998 to 1999 was similar or different in the two areas being compared. A statistically significant difference between the two areas is denoted by a *p* value for the Chi-square test of less than 0.05. The direction of any significant relationship is indicated by the pattern in the annual numbers of recorded incidents in the two areas. Given that the Chi-square test was based on annual rather than monthly numbers of recorded incidents, it was robust for all the offence categories of interest in all three geographical areas.

Expected crime patterns

Bearing in mind the limitations of the present evaluation, the following patterns in recorded crime would be consistent with an effective Safe City Strategy.

Firstly, from the Kendall's analyses for each offence category, either of the following results for the 24-month period between January 1998 and December 1999 would be *consistent* with an effective Strategy:

  (a) a decreasing trend in Postcode 2000 accompanied by stable or increasing trends in the comparison areas; or

  (b) a stable trend in Postcode 2000 accompanied by increasing trends in the comparison areas.

Secondly, from the Chi-square analyses for each offence category, any of the following patterns for Postcode 2000 compared with the other areas, in the total numbers of recorded incidents in 1998 and 1999, would be *consistent* with an effective Strategy:

  (a) a decrease in Postcode 2000 but an increase or no change in the comparison areas;

  (b) no change in Postcode 2000 but an increase in the comparison areas;

  (c) a relatively greater decrease in Postcode 2000 than in the comparison areas; or

  (d) a relatively smaller increase in Postcode 2000 than in the comparison areas.

3. RESULTS

3.1 SURVEY

Description of sample

As shown in Table 3, 57.7 per cent of the respondents were male and 42.3 per cent were female.

Table 3: Gender (Q5)		
Gender	*No.*	*%*
Males	1043	57.7
Females	765	42.3
Total	**1808**	**100**

Table 4 shows that over one-third of the respondents were aged between 20 and 29 years, and almost one-quarter were aged between 30 and 39 years, with smaller percentages of respondents falling into each of the other three age groups.

Table 4: Age (Q6)		
Age (years)	*No.*	*%*
14-19	206	11.4
20-29	654	36.2
30-39	383	21.2
40-49	259	14.3
50+	306	16.9
Total	**1808**	**100**

Table 5 shows the frequency with which respondents visited the city in 1998 and 1999. In each year, over four-fifths of the respondents visited the city at least six times, with over half of the respondents usually visiting the city each week.

Table 5: Frequency of city use (Q1 & Q2)	*1998*		*1999*	
Frequency	*No.*	*%*	*No.*	*%*
Usually each week	1031	57.0	1181	65.3
At least 6 times	541	29.9	443	24.5
At least twice	167	9.2	122	6.7
Once	69	3.8	33	1.8
Not at all	0	0.0	29	1.6
Total	**1808**	**100**	**1808**	**100**

Table 6 shows the main reason for visiting the city on the day of the survey and the main reason for visiting the city usually. It can be seen that the main two reasons for visiting the city, both on the day of the survey and usually, were for work or business, and for entertainment, recreation or leisure. About 73 per cent of respondents gave one of these two reasons for visiting the city on the day of the survey. Similarly, about 73 per cent of respondents gave one of these two reasons for visiting the city usually. The next most common 'main' reason for visiting the city was for shopping, followed by being a city resident and being a tourist or visitor.

Table 6: Main reason for city use (Q3 & Q4)

Main reason	Today		Usually	
	No.	%	No.	%
Work/business	580	32.1	756	41.8
Shopping	174	9.6	217	12.0
Entertainment/recreation/leisure	735	40.7	556	30.8
Tourist/visitor	75	4.2	60	3.3
Resident	91	5.0	109	6.0
Other	151	8.4	110	6.1
Total	**1806**	**100**	**1808**	**100**

Note: 'Resident' in this table does not correspond perfectly with 'city resident' in Table 7 because (i) the former was self-defined but the latter was based on postcode and (ii) residents may have given a reason other than being a resident for being in the city.

Two responses were missing from the total for 'today'.

Table 7 shows the area of residence of the respondents. It can be seen that 112 respondents (6.2%) were residents of Postcode 2000, 2007 or 2009.[11] These three postcodes are the main postcodes making up the Sydney LGA. Because only a very small percentage of Postcodes 2011 and 2012 fall within the boundaries of the LGA, persons who provided one of these as their postcode of residence were not classified as city residents.[12] Three-quarters of the respondents provided another Sydney postcode as their postcode of residence while a further 13.4 per cent of respondents provided a NSW postcode outside Sydney. Less than three per cent of respondents claimed to reside in an Australian State other than NSW.

Table 7: Area of residence (Q7)

Area	No.	%
'City resident' (postcode 2000, 2007 or 2009)	112	6.2
Elsewhere in Sydney	1368	75.7
Elsewhere in NSW	243	13.4
Elsewhere in Australia	51	2.8
Overseas or missing	34	1.9
Total	**1808**	**100**

Note: 'City resident' in this table does not correspond perfectly with 'resident' in Table 6 because (i) the former was based on postcode but the latter was self-defined and (ii) residents may have given a reason other than being a resident for being in the city.

As shown in Table 8, in terms of languages spoken at home and/or with parents, although 1,272 of the 1,808 respondents (70.4%) stated that they only spoke English, about one-quarter claimed to speak both English and another language, and a further 4.1 per cent claimed to speak only languages other than English. Table 9 excludes the 1,272 respondents who spoke only English at home and/or with their parents. It shows that for the remaining 536 respondents, the main languages spoken by respondents at home and/or with their parents were Cantonese (17.7% of the 536 respondents) and Mandarin (14.4% of the 536 respondents).

Table 8: Language(s) spoken at home and/or with parents (Q8)

Language	No.	%
English only	1272	70.4
English and other language(s)	462	25.6
Other language(s) only	74	4.1
Total	**1808**	**100**

Table 9: Non-English language(s) spoken at home and/or with parents (Q8)

Language	No. of respondents	% of respondents speaking non-English language
Cantonese	95	17.7
Mandarin	77	14.4
Spanish	43	8.0
French	37	6.9
Italian	34	6.3
Indonesian	31	5.8
German	29	5.4
Arabic	25	4.7
Greek	25	4.7
Japanese	16	3.0
Korean	15	2.8
Russian	15	2.8
Vietnamese	13	2.4
Filipino	11	2.1
Dutch	11	2.1
Other	152	28.4
Total repondents speaking a non-English language	**536**	**100**

Note: This table excludes the 1272 respondents who only spoke English. Given that some respondents spoke more than one non-English language, the percentages add to more than 100.

Table 10 examines whether the respondents had any personal or vicarious experience in the city of an unsafe incident (which may or may not have been a criminal incident). All 1,808 respondents were asked whether they had personally experienced an incident in the city that made them feel unsafe (see Q20). Five hundred and thirty respondents

(29.3% of the sample) stated that they had such personal experience, while 1,275 respondents claimed not to have such experience and three respondents did not provide the relevant information. Only the 1,275 respondents who claimed not to have such personal experience were then asked two questions about whether they had any 'vicarious' experience of an unsafe incident. The first of these questions asked whether the respondent knew someone who had experienced an unsafe incident (see Q25), while the second asked whether the respondent had witnessed an unsafe incident (see Q26). Six hundred and sixty respondents (or 36.5% of the sample) claimed to have vicarious (but no personal) experience of an unsafe incident, either knowing someone who had experienced an unsafe incident (500 respondents) or having witnessed an unsafe incident (404 respondents), or both. A total of 605 persons (33.5% of the sample) claimed to have neither personal nor vicarious experience of an unsafe incident in the city area.

Tables 11 to 14 examine various characteristics of the last unsafe incident experienced in the city by the 530 respondents who had personally experienced such an incident. Of these respondents, about a third had experienced such an incident in the last few months while almost a further third had experienced such an incident within the last year but less recently than a few months ago (see Table 11).

Table 10: Experience of unsafe incidents in city (Q20, Q25 & Q26)

Experience	No. who answered 'yes'	No. who were asked question(s)	% of sample
Personal			
You experienced an incident (Q20)	**530**	**1808**	**29.3**[a]
Vicarious only			
You know someone who experienced an incident (Q25)	500	1275	27.7[b]
You witnessed an incident (Q26)	404	1275	22.3[c]
Total (vicarious only)	**660**	**1275**	**36.5**[c]
None	**605**	-	**33.5**[c]

Note: 'Personal' experience represents responses to Q20 ('you experienced an incident'). All 1808 respondents were asked this question.

'Vicarious only' experience represents responses to Q25 ('you know someone who experienced an incident') and to Q26 ('you witnessed an incident'). Only the 1275 respondents who claimed to have no 'personal' experience (by answering 'no' to Q20) were asked Q25 and Q26. Some of these respondents claimed to both 'know someone who experienced an incident' and to have 'witnessed an incident'. Thus, the numbers for these individual categories of 'vicarious only' experience add to more than the number for 'total (vicarious only)'.

'None' represents respondents who claimed to have neither 'personal' nor 'vicarious' experience (by answering 'no' to Q20, Q25 and Q26).

a Data for three respondents were missing.
b Data for 12 respondents were missing.
c Data for 13 respondents were missing.

Table 11: Recency of last unsafe incident (Q21)

Recency	No.	%
In the last few months	178	33.6
In the last year	157	29.6
In the last 5 years	150	28.3
More than 5 years ago	45	8.5
Total	**530**	**100**

Note: This table is based on the 530 respondents with 'personal' experience of an unsafe incident.

Table 12: Time of day of last unsafe incident (Q22)

Time of day	No.	%
Day	179	33.8
Night	314	59.2
Sunrise/dusk	37	7.0
Total	**530**	**100**

Note: This table is based on the 530 respondents with 'personal' experience of an unsafe incident.

Table 13: Location of last unsafe incident (Q23)

City location	No.	%
George St/Town Hall	190	35.9
Hyde Park	65	12.3
Central/Belmore Park	88	16.6
Haymarket/Chinatown	38	7.2
Circular Quay/The Rocks	32	6.0
Retail Core	43	8.1
Elsewhere in city	73	13.8
Total	**529**	**100**

Note: This table is based on the 530 respondents with 'personal' experience of an unsafe incident. One response was missing.

Table 14: Type of attack/threat in last unsafe incident (Q24)

Type of attack/threat	No. of respondents	% of respondents experiencing unsafe incident
Physical attack/threat	208	39.5
Property stolen/damaged or threat to property	177	33.7
Verbal abuse/threat	176	33.5
Something else	116	22.1
Total	**526**	**100**

Note: This table is based on the 530 respondents with 'personal' experience of an unsafe incident. Four respondents did not give any information about the type of unsafe incident they had experienced. Given that some unsafe incidents involved more than one type of attack/threat, the number of attacks/threats is larger than the number of respondents who experienced an unsafe incident.

As shown in Table 12, the 530 respondents who personally experienced an unsafe incident in the city tended to report that the last such incident occurred at night (59.2% of respondents) rather than during the day (33.8% of respondents). Furthermore, the last such incident was more likely to have occurred in the George Street/Town Hall area (35.9% of respondents) than in any of the other five city areas (see Table 13). Table 14 shows that the type of attack or threat experienced in the last such incident was almost equally likely to involve a physical attack or threat (39.5% of respondents) as to involve an attack or threat to property (33.7% of respondents) or to involve verbal abuse (33.5% of respondents).

In summary, the sample comprised a higher proportion of males than females, with over half the respondents being aged between 20 and 39 years. One-quarter of the respondents spoke a language other than English at home or with their parents, with Cantonese and Mandarin being the most commonly spoken non-English languages. The majority of respondents visited the city each week, with the main two reasons for visiting the city being for work or business and for entertainment, recreation or leisure.

The demographic characteristics of the sample are consistent with the demographic profiles of Sydney city residents, workers and visitors. The Sydney city resident, worker and visitor populations all comprise higher proportions of males than females, and all comprise significant proportions of younger adults aged under 40 years (City of Sydney 2000a).[13] Furthermore, significant proportions of the city resident and city worker populations spoke a language other than English, with the most common language spoken being one of the major Chinese dialects (City of Sydney 2000a). Thus, the sample appears to represent a reasonable cross-section of city users.

Perception of safety initiatives

Table 15 shows respondents' awareness of the Safe City Strategy initiatives and their perceptions about the impact of these initiatives on safety in the city. There was considerable variation in the percentage of respondents who were aware of each initiative. Street Safety Cameras achieved the highest awareness level with 77.3 per cent of respondents stating they were aware of the initiative. There was also considerable awareness of the City Upgrade of footpaths and streets (68.2% of respondents) and the Improved Lighting initiative (50.6% of respondents). As might be expected, the two initiatives that had not yet been implemented had the lowest awareness levels: only about one-quarter of respondents were aware of the Community Safety Education initiative and only about one-third of respondents were aware of the Safe Taxi Ranks initiative. Of the initiatives already implemented, the Accord with Licensed Premises had the lowest awareness level (40.2% of respondents).

Table 15: Awareness of initiatives and perceived impact on safety (Q19)

	City Upgrade of footpaths & streets		Improved Lighting		Street Safety Cameras		Emergency Video Phones		Community Safety Education		Accord with Licensed Premises		Safe Taxi Ranks	
	No.	*%*	*No.*	*%*	*No.*	*%*	*No.*	*%*	*No.*	*%*	*No.*	*%*	*No.*	*%*
Awareness														
Aware	1233	68.2	914	50.6	1398	77.3	853	47.2	440	24.3	726	40.2	597	33.0
Not aware	562	31.1	868	48.0	395	21.8	941	52.0	1352	74.8	1066	59.0	1191	65.9
Don't know	13	0.7	26	1.4	15	0.8	14	0.8	16	0.9	16	0.9	20	1.1
Total	**1808**	**100**	**1808**	**100**	**1808**	**100**	**1808**	**100**	**1808**	**100**	**1808**	**100**	**1808**	**100**
Perception														
Safer	1125	62.2	1672	92.5	1508	83.4	1469	81.3	1337	73.9	1473	81.5	1617	89.4
No safer	623	34.5	110	6.1	259	14.3	287	15.9	406	22.5	295	16.3	151	8.4
Don't know	60	3.3	26	1.4	41	2.3	52	2.9	65	3.6	40	2.2	40	2.2
Total	**1808**	**100**	**1808**	**100**	**1808**	**100**	**1808**	**100**	**1808**	**100**	**1808**	**100**	**1808**	**100**

For each initiative, the majority of respondents thought the initiative would make the city safer (see Table 15). The initiative which the smallest proportion of respondents rated as likely to make the city safer was the City Upgrade of footpaths and streets (62.2%). The initiative which was seen by the largest proportion of respondents as likely to improve safety was Improved Lighting (92.5%), followed by Safe Taxi Ranks (89.4%).

Tables 16 and 17, respectively, present data on the number of initiatives that respondents were aware of and the number of initiatives that respondents perceived as likely to improve safety. Two-thirds of the respondents (67.4%) were aware of least three of the seven initiatives surveyed (see Table 16). Almost two-thirds of the respondents (64.3%) thought that at least six of the seven initiatives would make the city safer (see Table 17).

Table 16: Number of initiatives aware of (Q19)

No. of initiatives	*No. of respondents*	*% of respondents*	*Cumulative % of respondents*
7	100	5.5	5.5
6	156	8.6	14.2
5	255	14.1	28.3
4	350	19.4	47.6
3	358	19.8	67.4
2	312	17.3	84.7
1	152	8.4	93.1
0	125	6.9	100.0
Total	**1808**	**100**	

Table 17: Number of initiatives perceived to improve safety (Q19)

No. of initiatives	*No. of respondents*	*% of respondents*	*Cumulative % of respondents*
7	693	38.3	38.3
6	470	26.0	64.3
5	275	15.2	79.5
4	189	10.5	90.0
3	85	4.7	94.7
2	63	3.5	98.2
1	18	1.0	99.2
0	15	0.8	100.0
Total	**1808**	**100**	

Tables 18, 19 and 20 break down the awareness of each initiative by gender, age and city resident status, respectively. Table 18 shows that, generally, larger proportions of males than females said they were aware of the initiatives. The only exceptions were the Community Safety Education initiative and the Accord with Licensed Premises. For each of these initiatives, similar proportions of males and females were aware of the initiative.

Table 18: Awareness of initiatives, by gender (Q19 by Q5)

Gender	City Upgrade of footpaths & streets No.	%	Improved Lighting No.	%	Street Safety Cameras No.	%	Emergency Video Phones No.	%	Community Safety Education No.	%	Accord with Licensed Premises No.	%	Safe Taxi Ranks No.	%
Males														
Aware	735	70.9	579	56.2	848	81.9	533	51.4	253	24.4	432	41.7	380	36.8
Not aware	301	29.1	451	43.8	188	18.1	503	48.6	782	75.6	605	58.3	653	63.2
Total	**1036**	**100**	**1030**	**100**	**1036**	**100**	**1036**	**100**	**1035**	**100**	**1037**	**100**	**1033**	**100**
Females														
Aware	498	65.6	335	44.5	550	72.7	320	42.2	187	24.7	294	38.9	217	28.7
Not aware	261	34.4	417	55.5	207	27.3	438	57.8	570	75.3	461	61.1	538	71.3
Total	**759**	**100**	**752**	**100**	**757**	**100**	**758**	**100**	**757**	**100**	**755**	**100**	**755**	**100**
χ^2	5.794		23.677		21.544		14.957		0.016		1.340		12.691	
p	0.016*		<0.001***		<0.001***		<0.001***		0.900		0.247		<0.001***	

Note: For all χ^2 tests in this table, df=1. *significant at $p<0.05$ ***significant at $p<0.001$

Table 19 shows that, with the exception of the Improved Lighting initiative, awareness of the initiatives was related to age. However, the relationship with age was not always in the same direction. The youngest age group, 14 to 19 year olds, was less likely than the older groups to be aware of the City Upgrade of footpaths and streets, and of Street Safety Cameras. The 14 to 19 and 20 to 29 year olds were less likely than the older groups to be aware of the Community Safety Education initiative. The oldest group, 50 years or over, was less likely than the other groups to be aware of each of the remaining initiatives, namely Emergency Video Phones, the Accord with Licensed Premises and Safe Taxi Ranks.

Table 19: Awareness of initiatives, by age (Q19 by Q6)

Age (years)	*City Upgrade of footpaths & streets*		*Improved Lighting*		*Street Safety Cameras*		*Emergency Video Phones*		*Community Safety Education*		*Accord with Licensed Premises*		*Safe Taxi Ranks*	
	No.	*%*	*No.*	*%*	*No.*	*%*	*No.*	*%*	*No.*	*%*	*No.*	*%*	*No.*	*%*
14-19														
Aware	119	58.9	106	52.7	142	70.6	104	51.7	43	21.4	93	46.3	69	34.7
Not aware	83	41.1	95	47.3	59	29.4	97	48.3	158	78.6	108	53.7	130	65.3
Total	**202**	**100**	**201**	**100**	**201**	**100**	**201**	**100**	**201**	**100**	**201**	**100**	**199**	**100**
20-29														
Aware	445	68.4	336	52.0	526	80.8	340	52.3	138	21.2	289	44.5	248	38.2
Not aware	206	31.6	310	48.0	125	19.2	310	47.7	512	78.8	360	55.5	402	61.8
Total	**651**	**100**	**646**	**100**	**651**	**100**	**650**	**100**	**650**	**100**	**649**	**100**	**650**	**100**
30-39														
Aware	277	72.7	194	51.2	306	80.1	177	46.5	102	26.8	154	40.5	123	32.5
Not aware	104	27.3	185	48.8	76	19.9	204	53.5	278	73.2	226	59.5	256	67.5
Total	**381**	**100**	**379**	**100**	**382**	**100**	**381**	**100**	**380**	**100**	**380**	**100**	**379**	**100**
40-49														
Aware	191	73.7	137	53.3	202	78.0	120	46.3	74	28.6	93	35.9	78	30.2
Not aware	68	26.3	120	46.7	57	22.0	139	53.7	185	71.4	166	64.1	180	69.8
Total	**259**	**100**	**257**	**100**	**259**	**100**	**259**	**100**	**259**	**100**	**259**	**100**	**258**	**100**
50+														
Aware	201	66.6	141	47.2	222	74.0	112	37.0	83	27.5	97	32.0	79	26.2
Not aware	101	33.4	158	52.8	78	26.0	191	63.0	219	72.5	206	68.0	223	73.8
Total	**302**	**100**	**299**	**100**	**300**	**100**	**303**	**100**	**302**	**100**	**303**	**100**	**302**	**100**
χ^2	**15.586**		**2.768**		**13.075**		**21.268**		**9.689**		**18.471**		**15.186**	
p	**0.004****		**0.597**		**0.011***		**<0.001*****		**0.046***		**0.001****		**0.004****	

Note: For all χ^2 tests in this table, df=4. *significant at $p<0.05$ **significant at $p<0.01$ ***significant at $p<0.001$

Table 20: Awareness of initiatives, by city resident status (Q19 by Q7)

Resident status	City Upgrade of footpaths & streets		Improved Lighting		Street Safety Cameras		Emergency Video Phones		Community Safety Education		Accord with Licensed Premises		Safe Taxi Ranks	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
City														
Aware	80	72.7	64	59.3	92	83.6	67	61.5	27	24.8	46	42.2	45	41.3
Not aware	30	27.3	44	40.7	18	16.4	42	38.5	82	75.2	63	57.8	64	58.7
Total	**110**	**100**	**108**	**100**	**110**	**100**	**109**	**100**	**109**	**100**	**109**	**100**	**109**	**100**
Non-city														
Aware	1153	68.4	850	50.8	1306	77.6	786	46.6	413	24.5	680	40.4	552	32.9
Not aware	532	31.6	824	49.2	377	22.4	899	53.4	1270	75.5	1003	59.6	1127	67.1
Total	**1685**	**100**	**1674**	**100**	**1683**	**100**	**1685**	**100**	**1683**	**100**	**1683**	**100**	**1679**	**100**
χ^2	**0.888**		**2.922**		**2.191**		**9.017**		**0.003**		**0.137**		**3.253**	
p	**0.346**		**0.087**		**0.139**		**0.003****		**0.957**		**0.711**		**0.071**	

Note: 'City resident' denotes a resident of Postcode 2000, 2007 or 2009.

For all χ^2 tests in this table, df=1. **significant at $p<0.01$

City resident status was generally not related to awareness of the initiatives, with the exception that a greater proportion of city residents than non-city residents stated they were aware of Emergency Video Phones (see Table 20).

Tables 21, 22 and 23 break down the perceived impact on safety of each initiative by gender, age and city resident status, respectively. As seen in Table 21, for three initiatives,

Table 21: Perceived impact of initiatives on safety, by gender (Q19 by Q5)

Gender	City Upgrade of footpaths & streets		Improved Lighting		Street Safety Cameras		Emergency Video Phones		Community Safety Education		Accord with Licensed Premises		Safe Taxi Ranks	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Males														
Safer	651	64.3	950	92.7	857	84.3	826	82.0	766	76.2	848	83.1	917	90.0
No safer	362	35.7	75	7.3	160	15.7	181	18.0	239	23.8	172	16.9	102	10.0
Total	**1013**	**100**	**1025**	**100**	**1017**	**100**	**1007**	**100**	**1005**	**100**	**1020**	**100**	**1019**	**100**
Females														
Safer	474	64.5	722	95.4	651	86.8	643	85.8	571	77.4	625	83.6	700	93.5
No safer	261	35.5	35	4.6	99	13.2	106	14.2	167	22.6	123	16.4	49	6.5
Total	**735**	**100**	**757**	**100**	**750**	**100**	**749**	**100**	**738**	**100**	**748**	**100**	**749**	**100**
χ^2	**0.009**		**5.454**		**2.213**		**4.589**		**0.316**		**0.054**		**6.646**	
p	**0.923**		**0.020***		**0.137**		**0.032***		**0.574**		**0.815**		**0.010***	

Note: For all χ^2 tests in this table, df=1. *significant at $p<0.05$

namely, Improved Lighting, Emergency Video Phones and Safe Taxi Ranks, the proportion of females who thought the initiative made the city safer was higher than the proportion of males. For the other four initiatives, there was no significant difference between males and females.

Table 22 shows that, for three of the seven initiatives there were differences in the perceived impact of the initiatives according to age. Again, the relationship with age was not always in the same direction. The oldest group was the most likely age group to perceive the City Upgrade of footpaths and streets as making the city safer. Although at least four-fifths of all age groups perceived Street Safety Cameras as likely to make the city safer, the oldest group was the most likely to have this perception and the 30 to 39 year age group was the least likely to have this perception. For Safe Taxi Ranks, the percentage of respondents perceiving the initiative as improving safety was highest for the youngest group and lowest for the 30 to 39 year old group.

Table 22: Perceived impact of initiatives on safety, by age (Q19 by Q6)

Age (years)	City Upgrade of footpaths & streets		Improved Lighting		Street Safety Cameras		Emergency Video Phones		Community Safety Education		Accord with Licensed Premises		Safe Taxi Ranks	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
14-19														
Safer	129	63.5	194	95.6	176	86.3	166	83.8	150	75.4	172	84.3	194	95.1
No safer	74	36.5	9	4.4	28	13.7	32	16.2	49	24.6	32	15.7	10	4.9
Total	**203**	**100**	**203**	**100**	**204**	**100**	**198**	**100**	**199**	**100**	**204**	**100**	**204**	**100**
20-29														
Safer	408	64.5	610	94.4	545	85.6	537	84.0	472	75.0	528	82.5	592	91.8
No safer	225	35.5	36	5.6	92	14.4	102	16.0	157	25.0	112	17.5	53	8.2
Total	**633**	**100**	**646**	**100**	**637**	**100**	**639**	**100**	**629**	**100**	**640**	**100**	**645**	**100**
30-39														
Safer	220	59.3	346	92.0	305	81.1	300	80.0	278	74.5	310	82.9	328	87.7
No safer	151	40.7	30	8.0	71	18.9	75	20.0	95	25.5	64	17.1	46	12.3
Total	**371**	**100**	**376**	**100**	**376**	**100**	**375**	**100**	**373**	**100**	**374**	**100**	**374**	**100**
40-49														
Safer	159	64.1	235	92.2	216	85.0	207	82.8	192	78.0	209	82.0	229	91.6
No safer	89	35.9	20	7.8	38	15.0	43	17.2	54	22.0	46	18.0	21	8.4
Total	**248**	**100**	**255**	**100**	**254**	**100**	**250**	**100**	**246**	**100**	**255**	**100**	**250**	**100**
50+														
Safer	209	71.3	287	95.0	266	89.9	259	88.1	245	82.8	254	86.1	274	92.9
No safer	84	28.7	15	5.0	30	10.1	35	11.9	51	17.2	41	13.9	21	7.1
Total	**293**	**100**	**302**	**100**	**296**	**100**	**294**	**100**	**296**	**100**	**295**	**100**	**295**	**100**
χ^2	**10.417**		**5.566**		**10.390**		**8.110**		**8.502**		**2.468**		**11.079**	
p	**0.034***		**0.234**		**0.034***		**0.088**		**0.075**		**0.647**		**0.026***	

Note: For all χ^2 tests in this table, df=4. *significant at *p*<0.05

Table 23: Perceived impact of initiatives on safety, by city resident status (Q19 by Q7)

Resident status	City Upgrade of footpaths & streets		Improved Lighting		Street Safety Cameras		Emergency Video Phones		Community Safety Education		Accord with Licensed Premises		Safe Taxi Ranks	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
City														
Safer	73	66.4	103	92.8	93	85.3	86	80.4	74	71.2	87	80.6	92	84.4
No safer	37	33.6	8	7.2	16	14.7	21	19.6	30	28.8	21	19.4	17	15.6
Total	**110**	**100**	**111**	**100**	**109**	**100**	**107**	**100**	**104**	**100**	**108**	**100**	**109**	**100**
Non-city														
Safer	1052	64.2	1569	93.9	1415	85.3	1383	83.9	1263	77.1	1386	83.5	1525	91.9
No safer	586	35.8	102	6.1	243	14.7	266	16.1	376	22.9	274	16.5	134	8.1
Total	**1638**	**100**	**1671**	**100**	**1658**	**100**	**1649**	**100**	**1639**	**100**	**1660**	**100**	**1659**	**100**
χ^2	0.206		0.219		0.000		0.898		1.909		0.630		7.403	
p	0.650		0.640		0.995		0.343		0.167		0.427		0.007**	

Note: 'City resident' denotes a resident of Postcode 2000, 2007 or 2009.

For all χ^2 tests in this table, df=1. **significant at $p<0.01$

It can be seen from Table 23 that, with the exception of Safe Taxi Ranks, similar proportions of city residents and non-city residents thought the initiatives would make the city safer. Non-city residents were more likely than city residents to perceive Safe Taxi Ranks as making the city safer.

Table 24 presents the 1,808 respondents' suggestions for further safety initiatives. Some respondents provided more than one suggestion. A total of 964 suggestions pertained to having 'more' police enforcement, either by increasing police presence, increasing police numbers or increasing police power. A further 274 suggestions pertained to increasing security or surveillance. Other suggestions included further improvements to lighting (183 suggestions), initiatives to address problems with drugs and alcohol (146 suggestions), education programs (138 suggestions) and improvements to the public transport system (94 suggestions).

In summary, the overall awareness of the Strategy was moderate, with the level of awareness varying across initiatives. The overall level of awareness of the Strategy is not surprising given that two of the seven initiatives surveyed, namely Community Safety Education and Safe Taxi Ranks, had not yet been implemented. While only one-third of respondents were aware of Safe Taxi Ranks and one-quarter of respondents were aware of the Community Safety Education initiative, at least two-thirds of respondents were aware of Street Safety Cameras and the City Upgrade of footpaths

and streets. Generally, larger proportions of males than females stated that they were aware of the initiatives. Although awareness of the initiatives was sometimes related to age, the relationship was not always in the same direction.

The perceived impact of the initiatives on safety in the city was very positive with the majority of respondents rating each initiative as likely to improve the city's safety. For some of the initiatives, females were even more likely than males to rate the initiatives positively.

Table 24: Suggestions for further safety initiatives (Q27)		
Suggestion	*No.*	*%*
Police		
More visible police presence overall	729	40.3
More visible police presence at night and/or in problem areas	113	6.3
More police per population	96	5.3
More police power/stricter law enforcement	26	1.4
Security/surveillance		
More security guards	149	8.2
More surveillance cameras and/or more publicity of cameras	125	6.9
Lighting - better/more lighting	183	10.1
Drug and alcohol problems		
Stricter alcohol control/deal with drunks	77	4.3
Address drug problems	69	3.8
Education		
Education programs/campaigns re safety	99	5.5
Education programs re personal responsibility/social skills/tolerance	39	2.2
Public transport - improve frequency/security	94	5.2
Homelessness - reduce homelessness/begging	60	3.3
Help points - more safe houses, mobile police stations, phones, video phones	58	3.2
Youth - address gang problems, reduce loitering, improve facilities	57	3.2
Encourage city use - more streetscaping/cafes/night life	42	2.3
Other suggestion	234	12.9
No suggestion/don't know	536	29.6
Total	**1808**	**100**

Note: Percentages add to more than 100 because some respondents had more than one suggestion.

Perceived safety of city now

Table 25 shows the perceived safety of the city overall and of each city area at the time of the survey (i.e. 'now'). Overall, 86.2 per cent of respondents perceived the city to be either 'safe' or 'very safe'. Of the six city areas, the areas least often rated as 'safe' or 'very safe' were Hyde Park (57.0% of respondents), Central/Belmore Park (57.4% of respondents) and George Street/Town Hall (60.0% of respondents). Circular Quay/the Rocks and the Retail Core were rated as 'safe' or 'very safe' by at least 90.9 per cent of the respondents.

Table 25: Perceived safety of city and each city area (Q9 & Q10)

Perception	City overall		George St/ Town Hall		Hyde Park		Central/ Belmore Park		Haymarket/ Chinatown		Circular Quay/ The Rocks		Retail Core	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Very safe	248	13.7	116	6.4	93	5.1	68	3.8	128	7.1	416	23.0	466	25.8
Safe	1311	72.5	969	53.6	938	51.9	969	53.6	1158	64.0	1239	68.5	1177	65.1
Unsafe	229	12.7	579	32.0	569	31.5	599	33.1	368	20.4	107	5.9	95	5.3
Very unsafe	16	0.9	101	5.6	108	6.0	98	5.4	62	3.4	9	0.5	5	0.3
Don't know	4	0.2	43	2.4	100	5.5	74	4.1	92	5.1	37	2.0	65	3.6
Total	**1808**	**100**	**1808**	**100**	**1808**	**100**	**1808**	**100**	**1808**	**100**	**1808**	**100**	**1808**	**100**

Table 26 shows the level of concern about being physically attacked or threatened in each city area during the day and at night, while Table 27 shows the level of concern about having one's property stolen or damaged in each city area during the day and at night. For both types of victimisation, the level of concern during the day tended to be less than that at night. It can also be seen that, for both day and night, there tended to be less concern about physical attack or threat than about stolen or damaged property. During the day in each area, up to 77.6 per cent of respondents were 'not concerned' about being physically attacked or threatened (see Table 26), while up to 59.8 per cent were 'not concerned' about having their property stolen or damaged (see Table 27). At night, these percentages dropped to no more than 42.2 per cent for physical attack/threat and no more than 32.9 per cent for stolen/damaged property. Tables 26 and 27 also show considerable variation across areas in concern about victimisation. Circular Quay/the Rocks and the Retail Core consistently attracted the least concern about victimisation. At night, Hyde Park and Central/Belmore Park consistently attracted the most concern about both types of victimisation. About half the respondents were either 'very' or 'quite' concerned about having their property stolen or damaged in these areas at night.

Table 26: Concern about physical attack/threat in each city area, day and night (Q11 & Q12)

Time of day	George St/ Town Hall		Hyde Park		Central/ Belmore Park		Haymarket/ Chinatown		Circular Quay/ The Rocks		Retail Core	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Day												
Not concerned	1002	55.4	1084	60.0	992	54.9	1123	62.1	1403	77.6	1384	76.5
A little concerned	594	32.9	487	26.9	582	32.2	461	25.5	318	17.6	312	17.3
Quite concerned	130	7.2	140	7.7	152	8.4	132	7.3	46	2.5	55	3.0
Very concerned	61	3.4	62	3.4	52	2.9	48	2.7	19	1.1	18	1.0
Don't know	21	1.2	35	1.9	30	1.7	44	2.4	22	1.2	39	2.2
Total	**1808**	**100**	**1808**	**100**	**1808**	**100**	**1808**	**100**	**1808**	**100**	**1808**	**100**
Night												
Not concerned	324	17.9	203	11.2	268	14.8	483	26.7	763	42.2	753	41.6
A little concerned	715	39.5	606	33.5	669	37.0	634	35.1	646	35.7	653	36.1
Quite concerned	425	23.5	505	27.9	499	27.6	406	22.5	236	13.1	229	12.7
Very concerned	303	16.8	428	23.7	321	17.8	215	11.9	117	6.5	111	6.1
Don't know	41	2.3	66	3.7	51	2.8	70	3.9	46	2.5	62	3.4
Total	**1808**	**100**	**1808**	**100**	**1808**	**100**	**1808**	**100**	**1808**	**100**	**1808**	**100**

Table 27: Concern about stolen/damaged property in each city area, day and night (Q13 & Q14)

Time of day	George St/ Town Hall		Hyde Park		Central/ Belmore Park		Haymarket/ Chinatown		Circular Quay/ The Rocks		Retail Core	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Day												
Not concerned	769	42.5	841	46.5	760	42.0	834	46.1	1082	59.8	1076	59.5
A little concerned	676	37.4	611	33.8	670	37.1	624	34.5	525	29.0	514	28.4
Quite concerned	230	12.7	226	12.5	246	13.6	220	12.2	124	6.9	131	7.2
Very concerned	112	6.2	90	5.0	104	5.8	89	4.9	55	3.0	47	2.6
Don't know	21	1.2	40	2.2	28	1.5	41	2.3	22	1.2	40	2.2
Total	**1808**	**100**	**1808**	**100**	**1808**	**100**	**1808**	**100**	**1808**	**100**	**1808**	**100**
Night												
Not concerned	280	15.5	216	11.9	247	13.7	379	21.0	587	32.5	595	32.9
A little concerned	645	35.7	553	30.6	606	33.5	632	35.0	695	38.4	680	37.6
Quite concerned	482	26.7	530	29.3	541	29.9	437	24.2	296	16.4	292	16.2
Very concerned	362	20.0	450	24.9	365	20.2	301	16.6	194	10.7	183	10.1
Don't know	39	2.2	59	3.3	49	2.7	59	3.3	36	2.0	58	3.2
Total	**1808**	**100**	**1808**	**100**	**1808**	**100**	**1808**	**100**	**1808**	**100**	**1808**	**100**

Tables 28 to 33 present the perceived safety of the city overall and each city area broken down by gender, age, city resident status, frequency of city use, awareness of initiatives and experience of unsafe incidents, respectively. Table 28 shows that there was no difference between males and females in their perception of the safety of the city overall. However, with the exception of Circular Quay/the Rocks, greater proportions of males than females perceived the individual city areas as 'safe' or 'very safe'.

Table 28: Perceived safety of city and each city area, by gender (Q9 & Q10 by Q5)

Gender	City overall No.	%	George St/ Town Hall No.	%	Hyde Park No.	%	Central/ Belmore Park No.	%	Haymarket/ Chinatown No.	%	Circular Quay/ The Rocks No.	%	Retail Core No.	%
Males														
(Very) safe	912	87.6	654	64.4	632	64.2	618	61.9	785	79.1	959	94.1	961	95.3
(Very) unsafe	129	12.4	362	35.6	353	35.8	381	38.1	208	20.9	60	5.9	47	4.7
Total	**1041**	**100**	**1016**	**100**	**985**	**100**	**999**	**100**	**993**	**100**	**1019**	**100**	**1008**	**100**
Females														
(Very) safe	647	84.8	431	57.5	399	55.2	419	57.0	501	69.3	696	92.6	682	92.8
(Very) unsafe	116	15.2	318	42.5	324	44.8	316	43.0	222	30.7	56	7.4	53	7.2
Total	**763**	**100**	**749**	**100**	**723**	**100**	**735**	**100**	**723**	**100**	**752**	**100**	**735**	**100**
χ^2	2.965		8.484		14.040		4.152		21.217		1.717		5.104	
p	0.085		0.004**		<0.001***		0.042*		<0.001***		0.190		0.024*	

Note: '(Very) safe' combines the categories 'very safe' and 'safe'. 'Very (unsafe)' combines the categories 'very unsafe' and 'unsafe'.

For all χ^2 tests in this table, df=1. *significant at p<0.05 **significant at p<0.01 ***significant at p<0.001

Table 29 shows that, although 14 to 19 year olds were less likely than the other age groups to rate the city overall as 'safe' or 'very safe', apart from the Haymarket/Chinatown, this trend was not evident for the individual city areas.

It can be seen from Table 30 that, generally, similar proportions of city residents and non-city residents perceived the city and each city area as 'safe' or 'very safe'. The only exception was Central/Belmore Park, which was relatively more often perceived as 'safe' or 'very safe' by non-city residents than by city residents.

Table 31 compares 'frequent' city users who visited the city at least six times in both 1998 and 1999 with 'infrequent' city users who visited the city fewer than six times in either 1998 or 1999 or both. It can be seen that, with two exceptions, frequency of city use was unrelated to perceptions of safety in different city areas. 'Infrequent' city users

were more likely than 'frequent' city users to rate George Street/Town Hall and Central/Belmore Park as 'safe' or 'very safe'.

Table 32 shows that the perceived safety of the city and each city area at the time of the survey was not dependent on the level of awareness of the initiatives.

Table 29: Perceived safety of city and each city area, by age (Q9 & Q10 by Q6)

Age (years)	City overall		George St/ Town Hall		Hyde Park		Central/ Belmore Park		Haymarket/ Chinatown		Circular Quay/ The Rocks		Retail Core	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
14-19														
(Very) safe	165	80.1	115	58.7	105	53.6	130	64.0	116	60.1	185	92.5	179	93.2
(Very) unsafe	41	19.9	81	41.3	91	46.4	73	36.0	77	39.9	15	7.5	13	6.8
Total	**206**	**100**	**196**	**100**	**196**	**100**	**203**	**100**	**193**	**100**	**200**	**100**	**192**	**100**
20-29														
(Very) safe	574	87.9	417	64.2	389	62.1	382	60.1	454	72.2	604	93.5	601	94.5
(Very) unsafe	79	12.1	233	35.8	237	37.9	254	39.9	175	27.8	42	6.5	35	5.5
Total	**653**	**100**	**650**	**100**	**626**	**100**	**636**	**100**	**629**	**100**	**646**	**100**	**636**	**100**
30-39														
(Very) safe	324	85.0	223	59.0	213	58.7	201	54.5	284	77.6	345	92.5	350	94.3
(Very) unsafe	57	15.0	155	41.0	150	41.3	168	45.5	82	22.4	28	7.5	21	5.7
Total	**381**	**100**	**378**	**100**	**363**	**100**	**369**	**100**	**366**	**100**	**373**	**100**	**371**	**100**
40-49														
(Very) safe	227	88.0	152	60.3	151	63.2	144	58.8	211	83.7	240	93.8	239	93.7
(Very) unsafe	31	12.0	100	39.7	88	36.8	101	41.2	41	16.3	16	6.3	16	6.3
Total	**258**	**100**	**252**	**100**	**239**	**100**	**245**	**100**	**252**	**100**	**256**	**100**	**255**	**100**
50+														
(Very) safe	269	87.9	178	61.6	173	60.9	180	64.1	221	80.1	281	94.9	274	94.8
(Very) unsafe	37	12.1	111	38.4	111	39.1	101	35.9	55	19.9	15	5.1	15	5.2
Total	**306**	**100**	**289**	**100**	**284**	**100**	**281**	**100**	**276**	**100**	**296**	**100**	**289**	**100**
χ^2	9.974		3.745		5.865		8.120		40.792		1.955		0.744	
p	0.041*		0.442		0.209		0.087		<0.001***		0.744		0.946	

Note: '(Very) safe' combines the categories 'very safe' and 'safe'. 'Very (unsafe)' combines the categories 'very unsafe' and 'unsafe'.

For all χ^2 tests in this table, df=4.   *significant at $p<0.05$ ***significant at $p<0.001$

Table 30: Perceived safety of city and each city area, by city resident status (Q9 & Q10 by Q7)

Resident status	City overall		George St/ Town Hall		Hyde Park		Central/ Belmore Park		Haymarket Chinatown		Circular Quay/ The Rocks		Core Retail	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
City														
(Very) safe	91	81.3	69	62.7	59	56.7	53	49.5	82	75.9	101	91.0	104	96.3
(Very) unsafe	21	18.8	41	37.3	45	43.3	54	50.5	26	24.1	10	9.0	4	3.7
Total	**112**	**100**	**110**	**100**	**104**	**100**	**107**	**100**	**108**	**100**	**111**	**100**	**108**	**100**
Non-city														
(Very) safe	1468	86.8	1016	61.4	972	60.6	984	60.5	1204	74.9	1554	93.6	1539	94.1
(Very) unsafe	224	13.2	639	38.6	632	39.4	643	39.5	404	25.1	106	6.4	96	5.9
Total	**1692**	**100**	**1655**	**100**	**1604**	**100**	**1627**	**100**	**1608**	**100**	**1660**	**100**	**1635**	**100**
χ^2		2.719		0.078		0.611		5.005		0.059		1.170		0.880
p		0.099		0.780		0.435		0.025*		0.807		0.279		0.348

Note: 'City resident' denotes a resident of Postcode 2000, 2007 or 2009.

'(Very) safe' combines the categories 'very safe' and 'safe'. '(Very (unsafe)' combines the categories 'very unsafe' and 'unsafe'.

For all χ^2 tests in this table, df=1.   *significant at $p<0.05$

Table 31: Perceived safety of city and each city area, by frequency of city use (Q9 & Q10 by Q1 & Q2)

Frequency	City overall		George St/ Town Hall		Hyde Park		Central/ Belmore Park		Haymarket/ Chinatown		Circular Quay/ The Rocks		Retail Core	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Frequent														
(Very) safe	1322	86.2	899	59.4	876	59.8	856	58.0	1111	75.6	1406	93.4	1407	94.4
(Very) unsafe	211	13.8	615	40.6	589	40.2	621	42.0	359	24.4	100	6.6	84	5.6
Total	**1533**	**100**	**1514**	**100**	**1465**	**100**	**1477**	**100**	**1470**	**100**	**1506**	**100**	**1491**	**100**
Infrequent														
(Very) safe	237	87.5	186	74.1	155	63.8	181	70.4	175	71.1	249	94.0	236	93.7
(Very) unsafe	34	12.5	65	25.9	88	36.2	76	29.6	71	28.9	16	6.0	16	6.3
Total	**271**	**100**	**251**	**100**	**243**	**100**	**257**	**100**	**246**	**100**	**265**	**100**	**252**	**100**
χ^2		0.291		19.710		1.387		14.167		2.212		0.134		0.204
p		0.590		<0.001***		0.239		<0.001***		0.137		0.715		0.652

Note: 'Frequent' denotes at least six times in both 1998 and 1999. 'Infrequent' denotes fewer than six times in either 1998 or 1999 or both. '(Very) safe' combines the categories 'very safe' and 'safe'. 'Very (unsafe)' combines the categories 'very unsafe' and 'unsafe'.

For all χ^2 tests in this table, df=1.   ***significant at p<0.001

Table 32: Perceived safety of city and each city area, by awareness of initiatives (Q9 & Q10 by Q19)

No. of initiatives aware of	City overall		George St/ Town Hall		Hyde Park		Central/ Belmore Park		Haymarket/ Chinatown		Circular Quay/ The Rocks		Retail Core	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
0-2														
(Very) safe	503	85.5	363	64.4	340	62.3	356	63.6	397	73.5	534	92.5	525	93.6
(Very) unsafe	85	14.5	201	35.6	206	37.7	204	36.4	143	26.5	43	7.5	36	6.4
Total	**588**	**100**	**564**	**100**	**546**	**100**	**560**	**100**	**540**	**100**	**577**	**100**	**561**	**100**
3-4														
(Very) safe	620	87.8	422	60.5	399	59.1	388	57.1	515	76.0	652	93.9	644	94.3
(Very) unsafe	86	12.2	276	39.5	276	40.9	292	42.9	163	24.0	42	6.1	39	5.7
Total	**706**	**100**	**698**	**100**	**675**	**100**	**680**	**100**	**678**	**100**	**694**	**100**	**683**	**100**
5-7														
(Very) safe	436	85.5	300	59.6	292	60.0	293	59.3	374	75.1	469	93.8	474	95.0
(Very) unsafe	74	14.5	203	40.4	195	40.0	201	40.7	124	24.9	31	6.2	25	5.0
Total	**510**	**100**	**503**	**100**	**487**	**100**	**494**	**100**	**498**	**100**	**500**	**100**	**499**	**100**
χ^2	**1.937**		**3.002**		**1.306**		**5.488**		**0.963**		**1.149**		**0.968**	
p	**0.380**		**0.223**		**0.520**		**0.064**		**0.618**		**0.563**		**0.616**	

Note: '(Very) safe' combines the categories 'very safe' and 'safe'. 'Very (unsafe)' combines the categories 'very unsafe' and 'unsafe'.

For all χ^2 tests in this table, df=2.

Table 33: Perceived safety of city and each city area, by experience of unsafe incidents (Q9 & Q10 by Q20, Q25 & Q26)

Experience	City overall		George St/ Town Hall		Hyde Park		Central/ Belmore Park		Haymarket/ Chinatown		Circular Quay/ The Rocks		Retail Core	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Personal														
(Very) safe	421	79.4	261	49.8	251	49.2	248	47.9	355	69.2	478	91.2	491	94.1
(Very) unsafe	109	20.6	263	50.2	259	50.8	270	52.1	158	30.8	46	8.8	31	5.9
Total	**530**	**100**	**524**	**100**	**510**	**100**	**518**	**100**	**513**	**100**	**524**	**100**	**522**	**100**
Vicarious only														
(Very) safe	567	86.0	386	59.5	377	59.8	371	58.6	472	74.2	599	93.0	596	93.7
(Very) unsafe	92	14.0	263	40.5	253	40.2	262	41.4	164	25.8	45	7.0	40	6.3
Total	**659**	**100**	**649**	**100**	**630**	**100**	**633**	**100**	**636**	**100**	**644**	**100**	**636**	**100**
None														
(Very) safe	559	92.9	429	74.1	398	71.5	410	71.6	449	81.0	566	95.9	544	94.9
(Very) unsafe	43	7.1	150	25.9	159	28.5	163	28.4	105	19.0	24	4.1	29	5.1
Total	**602**	**100**	**579**	**100**	**557**	**100**	**573**	**100**	**554**	**100**	**590**	**100**	**573**	**100**
χ^2	**43.257**		**70.089**		**55.237**		**63.866**		**20.171**		**10.405**		**0.871**	
p	**<0.001*****		**<0.001*****		**<0.001*****		**<0.001*****		**<0.001*****		**0.006****		**0.647**	

Note: '(Very) safe' combines the categories 'very safe' and 'safe'. 'Very (unsafe)' combines the categories 'very unsafe' and 'unsafe'.

For all χ^2 tests in this table, df=2.   **significant at p<0.01   ***significant at p<0.001

With the exception of the Retail Core, Table 33 shows a clear relationship between perceptions of each area's safety at the time of the survey and experience of unsafe incidents in the city. Perceptions of each area as 'safe' or 'very safe' were least likely for respondents who had personal experience of an unsafe incident in the city, and most likely for respondents who had neither personal nor vicarious experience of an unsafe incident, with respondents who had only vicarious experience falling in between. Perceptions of safety by respondents with personal experience of an unsafe incident varied considerably across areas. Whereas over nine-tenths of these respondents rated Circular Quay/the Rocks and the Retail Core as 'safe' or 'very safe', only about half of these respondents rated Central/Belmore Park, Hyde Park and George Street/Town Hall as 'safe' or 'very safe'. The latter three areas were the main three city areas where these respondents had last experienced an unsafe incident (see Table 13).

In summary, the survey results show that, at the time of the survey, the respondents generally perceived the city to be safe. Firstly, most respondents rated the city and each city area as either 'safe' or 'very safe'. Generally, males were even more likely than females to rate the city areas as 'safe' or 'very safe'. Similarly, respondents who had not experienced an unsafe incident in the city were more likely than those who had to rate the city areas as 'safe' or 'very safe'. While the older age groups were more likely than the 14 to 19 year old group to rate the city overall as 'safe' or 'very safe', generally the perceived safety of the individual city areas was not related to age. The perceived safety of the city and city areas was also generally not related to city resident status, frequency of city use or awareness of the Strategy initiatives.

Secondly, at the time of the survey, the majority of the respondents were either not concerned or only a little concerned about victimisation of their person or property during the day. As might be expected, greater proportions of respondents were concerned about victimisation at night than during the day.

Perceived safety of city now compared with one year ago

Table 34 compares the respondents' perceptions of the safety of the city overall and each city area at the time of the survey (when most of the initiatives had been implemented) with their perceptions one year prior to the survey (prior to when most of the initiatives had been implemented). It can be seen that for each area, the majority of respondents thought the safety of the area was the 'same' as one year prior to the survey. For each area, approximately 20 to 30 per cent of respondents thought that the area was either 'much safer now' or 'a little safer now', while generally less than 15 per cent thought the area was 'a little worse now' or 'much worse now'. Again, there were some apparent differences according to city area, with only about five per cent of respondents rating Circular Quay/the Rocks and the Retail Core as 'a little' or 'much' worse now but around 10 to 15 per cent per cent of respondents rating the other areas as 'a little' or 'much' worse now.

Table 34: Perceived safety of city and each city area now compared with a year ago (Q15 & Q16)

Perception	City overall		George St/ Town Hall		Hyde Park		Central/ Belmore Park		Haymarket/ Chinatown		Circular Quay/ The Rocks		Retail Core	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Much safer now	89	4.9	88	4.9	44	2.4	48	2.7	53	2.9	103	5.7	84	4.6
A little safer now	460	25.4	434	24.0	306	16.9	310	17.1	320	17.7	382	21.1	345	19.1
Same	1000	55.3	966	53.4	1189	65.8	1170	64.7	1191	65.9	1183	65.4	1228	67.9
A little worse now	213	11.8	240	13.3	158	8.7	189	10.5	152	8.4	87	4.8	88	4.9
Much worse now	28	1.5	47	2.6	30	1.7	30	1.7	31	1.7	12	0.7	9	0.5
Don't know	18	1.0	33	1.8	81	4.5	61	3.4	61	3.4	41	2.3	54	3.0
Total	**1808**	**100**	**1808**	**100**	**1808**	**100**	**1808**	**100**	**1808**	**100**	**1808**	**100**	**1808**	**100**

Table 35 presents the level of concern about victimisation compared with one year ago. For the majority of respondents, the level of concern about victimisation was the 'same' as one year ago. During the day, the percentages of persons who were 'less concerned now' were greater than those who were 'more concerned now'. At night, however, the percentages of persons who were 'less concerned now' were smaller than those who were 'more concerned now'.

Table 35: Concern about victimisation now compared with a year ago, day and night (Q17 & Q18)

Time of day	Physical attack/ threat		Stolen/damaged property	
	No.	%	No.	%
Day				
Less concerned now	350	19.4	292	16.2
Same as a year ago	1262	69.8	1260	69.7
More concerned now	192	10.6	249	13.8
Don't know	4	0.2	7	0.4
Total	**1808**	**100**	**1808**	**100**
Night				
Less concerned now	204	11.3	169	9.3
Same as a year ago	1046	57.9	1087	60.1
More concerned now	544	30.1	537	29.7
Don't know	14	0.8	15	0.8
Total	**1808**	**100**	**1808**	**100**

For the city overall and each city area, Tables 36 to 41 break down the perceptions of safety 'now compared with one year ago' by gender, age, city resident status, frequency of city use, awareness of the initiatives and experience of unsafe incidents, respectively. Table 36 shows that, generally, larger proportions of males than females thought that the city and the city areas were 'safer now'. The only exception was the Retail Core where there was no significant difference between males and females.

Table 36: Perceived safety of city and each city area now compared with a year ago, by gender (Q15 & Q16 by Q5)

Gender	City overall		George St/ Town Hall		Hyde Park		Central/ Belmore Park		Haymarket/ Chinatown		Circular Quay/ The Rocks		Retail Core	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Males														
Safer now	353	34.2	344	33.4	237	23.6	233	23.0	237	23.4	302	29.7	264	26.0
Same	543	52.7	546	53.0	666	66.3	664	65.7	686	67.7	665	65.3	701	68.9
Worse now	135	13.1	140	13.6	101	10.1	114	11.3	90	8.9	51	5.0	52	5.1
Total	**1031**	**100**	**1030**	**100**	**1004**	**100**	**1011**	**100**	**1013**	**100**	**1018**	**100**	**1017**	**100**
Females														
Safer now	196	25.8	178	23.9	113	15.6	125	17.0	136	18.5	183	24.4	165	22.4
Same	457	60.2	420	56.4	523	72.3	506	68.8	505	68.8	518	69.2	527	71.5
Worse now	106	14.0	147	19.7	87	12.0	105	14.3	93	12.7	48	6.4	45	6.1
Total	**759**	**100**	**745**	**100**	**723**	**100**	**736**	**100**	**734**	**100**	**749**	**100**	**737**	**100**
χ^2	14.793		24.260		16.898		11.279		10.619		6.760		3.395	
p	0.001**		<0.001***		<0.001***		0.004**		0.005**		0.034*		0.183	

Note: 'Safer now' combines the categories 'much safer now' and 'a little safer now'. 'Worse now' combines the categories 'a little worse now' and 'much worse now'.
For all χ^2 tests in this table, df=2. *significant at $p<0.05$ **significant at $p<0.01$ ***significant at $p<0.001$

Table 37 shows that compared with the older age groups, a larger proportion of the 14 to 19 year old group thought that the city overall and each city area were 'safer now'.

Table 38 shows that similar proportions of city residents and non-city residents thought the city overall and each city area were 'safer now'.

Table 39 compares 'frequent' city users who visited the city at least six times in both 1998 and 1999 with 'infrequent' city users who visited the city fewer than six times in either 1998 or 1999 or both. Generally, 'frequent' city users were more likely than 'infrequent' city users to rate the city and the city areas as 'safer now'. The only exception was Central/Belmore Park where there was no significant difference between these two groups of respondents in their perceptions of safety 'now compared with one year ago'.

Table 37: Perceived safety of city and each city area now compared with a year ago, by age (Q15 & Q16 by Q6)

Age (years)	City overall		George St/ Town Hall		Hyde Park		Central/ Belmore Park		Haymarket/ Chinatown		Circular Quay/ The Rocks		Retail Core	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
14-19														
Safer now	82	40.4	87	43.3	55	28.2	57	28.6	59	30.3	69	34.8	77	39.7
Same	97	47.8	86	42.8	120	61.5	121	60.8	111	56.9	119	60.1	109	56.2
Worse now	24	11.8	28	13.9	20	10.3	21	10.6	25	12.8	10	5.1	8	4.1
Total	**203**	**100**	**201**	**100**	**195**	**100**	**199**	**100**	**195**	**100**	**198**	**100**	**194**	**100**
20-29														
Safer now	209	32.5	196	30.4	129	20.4	140	22.1	130	20.4	185	29.0	156	24.4
Same	356	55.4	345	53.6	446	70.6	424	67.0	448	70.2	427	66.9	455	71.2
Worse now	78	12.1	103	16.0	57	9.0	69	10.9	60	9.4	26	4.1	28	4.4
Total	**643**	**100**	**644**	**100**	**632**	**100**	**633**	**100**	**638**	**100**	**638**	**100**	**639**	**100**
30-39														
Safer now	115	30.2	105	27.6	69	18.7	57	15.3	73	19.6	93	24.8	77	20.5
Same	217	57.0	217	57.1	266	72.1	266	71.3	261	70.0	261	69.6	278	74.1
Worse now	49	12.9	58	15.3	34	9.2	50	13.4	39	10.5	21	5.6	20	5.3
Total	**381**	**100**	**380**	**100**	**369**	**100**	**373**	**100**	**373**	**100**	**375**	**100**	**375**	**100**
40-49														
Safer now	70	27.1	58	22.7	45	18.6	49	19.7	51	20.0	63	24.4	54	21.3
Same	150	58.1	159	62.4	170	70.2	164	65.9	183	71.8	180	69.8	185	73.1
Worse now	38	14.7	38	14.9	27	11.2	36	14.5	21	8.2	15	5.8	14	5.5
Total	**258**	**100**	**255**	**100**	**242**	**100**	**249**	**100**	**255**	**100**	**258**	**100**	**253**	**100**
50+														
Safer now	73	23.9	76	25.8	52	18.0	55	18.8	60	21.0	75	25.2	65	22.2
Same	180	59.0	159	53.9	187	64.7	195	66.6	188	65.7	196	65.8	201	68.6
Worse now	52	17.0	60	20.3	50	17.3	43	14.7	38	13.3	27	9.1	27	9.2
Total	**305**	**100**	**295**	**100**	**289**	**100**	**293**	**100**	**286**	**100**	**298**	**100**	**293**	**100**
χ^2	**20.398**		**31.785**		**24.709**		**18.950**		**18.340**		**18.186**		**38.597**	
p	**0.009****		**<0.001*****		**0.002****		**0.015***		**0.019***		**0.020***		**<0.001*****	

Note: 'Safer now' combines the categories 'much safer now' and 'a little safer now'. 'Worse now' combines the categories 'a little worse now' and 'much worse now'.

For all χ^2 tests in this table, df=8.   *significant at $p<0.05$ **significant at $p<0.01$ ***significant at $p<0.001$

Table 38: Perceived safety of city and each city area now compared with a year ago, by city resident status (Q15 & Q16 by Q7)

Resident status	City overall		George St/ Town Hall		Hyde Park		Central/ Belmore Park		Haymarket/ Chinatown		Circular Quay/ The Rocks		Retail Core	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
City														
Safer now	41	36.9	38	34.5	26	24.3	22	20.2	30	27.3	36	32.7	33	30.6
Same	53	47.7	55	50.0	67	62.6	70	64.2	69	62.7	67	60.9	66	61.1
Worse now	17	15.3	17	15.5	14	13.1	17	15.6	11	10.0	7	6.4	9	8.3
Total	**111**	**100**	**110**	**100**	**107**	**100**	**109**	**100**	**110**	**100**	**110**	**100**	**108**	**100**
Non-city														
Safer now	508	30.3	484	29.1	324	20.0	336	20.5	343	21.0	449	27.1	396	24.1
Same	947	56.4	911	54.7	1122	69.3	1100	67.2	1122	68.5	1116	67.4	1162	70.6
Worse now	224	13.3	270	16.2	174	10.7	202	12.3	172	10.5	92	5.6	88	5.3
Total	**1679**	**100**	**1665**	**100**	**1620**	**100**	**1638**	**100**	**1637**	**100**	**1657**	**100**	**1646**	**100**
χ^2	3.213		1.511		2.065		1.006		2.464		1.952		4.687	
p	0.201		0.470		0.356		0.605		0.292		0.377		0.096	

Note: 'City resident' denotes a resident of Postcode 2000, 2007 or 2009.

'Safer now' combines the categories 'much safer now' and 'a little safer now'. 'Worse now' combines the categories 'a little worse now' and 'much worse now'.

For all χ^2 tests in this table, df=2.

Table 39: Perceived safety of city and each city area now compared with a year ago, by frequency of city use (Q15 & Q16 by Q1 & Q2)

Frequency	City overall		George St/ Town Hall		Hyde Park		Central/ Belmore Park		Haymarket/ Chinatown		Circular Quay/ The Rocks		Retail Core	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Frequent														
Safer now	487	32.0	464	30.7	313	21.2	314	21.1	335	22.6	432	28.7	381	25.4
Same	836	54.9	793	52.4	994	67.5	986	66.4	997	67.1	985	65.5	1032	68.8
Worse now	201	13.2	256	16.9	166	11.3	185	12.5	153	10.3	86	5.7	86	5.7
Total	**1524**	**100**	**1513**	**100**	**1473**	**100**	**1485**	**100**	**1485**	**100**	**1503**	**100**	**1499**	**100**
Infrequent														
Safer now	62	23.3	58	22.1	37	14.6	44	16.8	38	14.5	53	20.1	48	18.8
Same	164	61.7	173	66.0	195	76.8	184	70.2	194	74.0	198	75.0	196	76.9
Worse now	40	15.0	31	11.8	22	8.7	34	13.0	30	11.5	13	4.9	11	4.3
Total	**266**	**100**	**262**	**100**	**254**	**100**	**262**	**100**	**262**	**100**	**264**	**100**	**255**	**100**
χ^2	7.970		16.711		8.843		2.593		8.607		9.405		6.673	
p	0.019*		<0.001***		0.012*		0.273		0.014*		0.009**		0.036*	

Note: 'Frequent' denotes at least six times in both 1998 and 1999. 'Infrequent' denotes fewer than six times in either 1998 or 1999 or both. 'Safer now' combines the categories 'much safer now' and 'a little safer now'. 'Worse now' combines the categories 'a little worse now' and 'much worse now'.

For all χ^2 tests in this table, df=2.   *significant at $p<0.05$ **significant at $p<0.01$ ***significant at $p<0.001$

Table 40: Perceived safety of city and each city area now compared with a year ago, by awareness of initiatives (Q15 & Q16 by Q19)

No. of initiatives aware of	City overall		George St/ Town Hall		Hyde Park		Central/ Belmore Park		Haymarket/ Chinatown		Circular Quay/ The Rocks		Retail Core	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
0-2														
Safer now	122	20.9	102	18.0	68	12.3	83	14.7	71	12.7	105	18.3	87	15.4
Same	376	64.4	371	65.5	425	77.1	408	72.3	425	76.2	435	75.9	448	79.2
Worse now	86	14.7	93	16.4	58	10.5	73	12.9	62	11.1	33	5.8	31	5.5
Total	**584**	**100**	**566**	**100**	**551**	**100**	**564**	**100**	**558**	**100**	**573**	**100**	**566**	**100**
3-4														
Safer now	226	32.4	220	31.5	135	19.9	148	21.6	147	21.3	197	28.5	175	25.4
Same	388	55.6	366	52.4	474	69.9	455	66.3	481	69.6	461	66.7	477	69.3
Worse now	84	12.0	113	16.2	69	10.2	83	12.1	63	9.1	33	4.8	36	5.2
Total	**698**	**100**	**699**	**100**	**678**	**100**	**686**	**100**	**691**	**100**	**691**	**100**	**688**	**100**
5-7														
Safer now	201	39.6	200	39.2	147	29.5	127	25.6	155	31.1	183	36.4	167	33.4
Same	236	46.5	229	44.9	290	58.2	307	61.8	285	57.2	287	57.1	303	60.6
Worse now	71	14.0	81	15.9	61	12.2	63	12.7	58	11.6	33	6.6	30	6.0
Total	**508**	**100**	**510**	**100**	**498**	**100**	**497**	**100**	**498**	**100**	**503**	**100**	**500**	**100**
χ^2	**49.480**		**64.612**		**53.134**		**20.450**		**58.003**		**48.217**		**49.162**	
p	**<0.001*****		**<0.001*****		**<0.001*****		**<0.001*****		**<0.001*****		**<0.001*****		**<0.001*****	

Note: 'Safer now' combines the categories 'much safer now' and 'a little safer now'. 'Worse now' combines the categories 'a little worse now' and 'much worse now'.

For all χ^2 tests in this table, df=4. ***significant at p<0.001

Table 40 shows a clear pattern whereby awareness of a greater number of initiatives was associated with a greater likelihood to rate the city and the city areas as 'safer now'.

Table 41 compares three groups of respondents with different levels of experience of unsafe incidents in the city. Each group was most likely to rate the safety of the city and the city areas as the 'same' as a year ago (45.7% to 75.7%), and more likely to choose 'safer now' (18.6% to 34.5%) rather than 'worse now' (2.7% to 24.9%). However, the group with no experience of unsafe incidents was the most likely to perceive the city's safety as unchanged. The group with personal experience was the most likely to perceive a change in the city's safety, being the group most likely to opt for either 'safer now' or 'worse now'.

In summary, the perceived safety of the city at the time of the survey was favourable compared with its perceived safety one year prior to the survey. Although most respondents, as might be expected, rated the safety of the city and each city area as being the same as one year ago, larger proportions of respondents rated the city and the city areas as being 'safer now' rather than 'worse now'. Increased confidence in the city's safety over the previous year was more likely for males compared with females, adolescents compared with older respondents, and frequent city users compared with infrequent city users. Awareness of a greater number of initiatives was also associated with a greater likelihood to rate the city and city areas as 'safer now'. Furthermore respondents with no experience of unsafe incidents were more likely than other respondents to perceive the city's safety as unchanged.

The level of concern of most respondents about being victimised in the city overall was the same as one year ago. However, compared with one year ago, although relatively more respondents were less concerned about victimisation during the day, relatively more respondents were more concerned about victimisation at night.

Table 41: Perceived safety of city and each city area now compared with a year ago, by experience of unsafe incidents (Q15 & Q16 by Q20, Q25 & Q26)

Experience	City overall		George St/ Town Hall		Hyde Park		Central/ Belmore Park		Haymarket/ Chinatown		Circular Quay/ The Rocks		Retail Core	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Personal														
Safer now	181	34.5	155	29.4	116	22.5	119	23.1	115	22.2	161	30.9	145	27.9
Same	244	46.6	241	45.7	318	61.7	295	57.3	324	62.7	319	61.2	334	64.4
Worse now	99	18.9	131	24.9	81	15.7	101	19.6	78	15.1	41	7.9	40	7.7
Total	**524**	**100**	**527**	**100**	**515**	**100**	**515**	**100**	**517**	**100**	**521**	**100**	**519**	**100**
Vicarious only														
Safer now	208	31.8	200	30.7	125	19.7	122	19.2	137	21.3	170	26.4	153	23.9
Same	355	54.3	351	53.9	436	68.9	437	68.7	439	68.4	439	68.1	445	69.6
Worse now	91	13.9	100	15.4	72	11.4	77	12.1	66	10.3	36	5.6	41	6.4
Total	**654**	**100**	**651**	**100**	**633**	**100**	**636**	**100**	**642**	**100**	**645**	**100**	**639**	**100**
None														
Safer now	154	25.7	161	27.5	106	18.6	113	19.3	117	20.3	149	25.3	126	21.6
Same	395	65.8	370	63.2	429	75.4	431	73.7	421	73.0	418	71.0	442	75.7
Worse now	51	8.5	54	9.2	34	6.0	41	7.0	39	6.8	22	3.7	16	2.7
Total	**600**	**100**	**585**	**100**	**569**	**100**	**585**	**100**	**577**	**100**	**589**	**100**	**584**	**100**
χ^2	**49.210**		**59.049**		**32.268**		**48.770**		**22.747**		**16.009**		**23.179**	
p	**<0.001*****		**<0.001*****		**<0.001*****		**<0.001*****		**<0.001*****		**0.003****		**<0.001*****	

Note: 'Safer now' combines the categories 'much safer now' and 'a little safer now'. 'Worse now' combines the categories 'a little worse now' and 'much worse now'.

For all χ^2 tests in this table, df=4.   **significant at $p<0.01$ ***significant at $p<0.001$

3.2 CRIME TRENDS

The analysis compared recorded crime patterns in 1998 (prior to the implementation of most initiatives) with those in 1999 (during or after the implementation of most initiatives). Crime patterns for these two years in Postcode 2000 (the Strategy area) were compared with those in 'the Sydney LGA' (excluding Postcode 2000) and with those in 'the Inner Sydney SSD' (excluding Postcode 2000).

Kendall's results

Tables 42, 43 and 44, respectively, present the Kendall's results for trends over 1998 and 1999 in Postcode 2000, the Sydney LGA and the Inner Sydney SSD. As outlined earlier, due to the small monthly numbers of some offences in the Sydney LGA, Kendall's results are not presented for the following offences: *non-residential serious assault, non-residential sexual offences* and *robbery with a weapon*.

Table 42: Kendall's results for recorded criminal incidents in Postcode 2000

Offence	1998	1999	% change 1998 to 1999	Kendall test statistic	p
Non-residential serious assault	331	353	6.65↑	-0.155	0.296
Non-residential common assault	850	950	11.76↑	0.302	0.041*
Non-residential sexual offences	107	99	7.48↓	-0.176	0.240
Robbery with a weapon	282	195	30.85↓	-0.294	0.047*
Robbery without a weapon	515	539	4.66↑	-0.040	0.784
Steal from person	2119	2313	9.16↑	0.084	0.568
Malicious damage to property	906	904	0.22↓	0.071	0.636

Note: *significant at $p<0.05$

Table 43: Kendall's results for recorded criminal incidents in Sydney LGA (excluding Postcode 2000)

Offence	1998	1999	% change 1998 to 1999	Kendall test statistic	p
Non-residential serious assault	48	87	81.25↑		
Non-residential common assault	161	170	5.59↑	0.068	0.651
Non-residential sexual offences	16	18	12.50↑		
Robbery with a weapon	77	60	22.08↓		
Robbery without a weapon	101	166	64.36↑	0.414	0.006**
Steal from person	235	220	6.38↓	0.015	0.920
Malicious damage to property	338	325	3.85↓	-0.101	0.501

Note: **significant at $p<0.01$

Table 44: Kendall's results for recorded criminal incidents in Inner Sydney SSD (excluding Postcode 2000)

Offence	1998	1999	% change 1998 to 1999	Kendall test statistic	p
Non-residential serious assault	873	860	1.49↓	-0.048	0.747
Non-residential common assault	2188	2074	5.21↓	-0.176	0.232
Non-residential sexual offences	229	250	9.17↑	-0.011	0.940
Robbery with a weapon	992	695	29.94↓	-0.288	0.050
Robbery without a weapon	1506	1361	9.63↓	-0.385	0.009**
Steal from person	2299	2042	11.18↓	-0.268	0.066
Malicious damage to property	5724	5617	1.87↓	0.055	0.710

Note: **significant at $p<0.01$

Comparing the Kendall's results for Postcode 2000 (Table 42) with those for the Sydney LGA (Table 43), *robbery without a weapon* showed trends that were in the expected direction, consistent with an effective Safe City Strategy. Whereas this offence was stable in Postcode 2000, it showed an increasing trend in the Sydney LGA. However, the trends for *non-residential common assault* were in the wrong direction, being inconsistent with an effective Strategy. This offence showed an increasing trend in Postcode 2000 but a stable trend in the Sydney LGA. For the remaining offences tested, namely, *steal from person* and *malicious damage to property*, the Kendall's trends were stable in both Postcode 2000 and the Sydney LGA, and thus, were inconclusive about the effectiveness of the Strategy.

Comparing the Kendall's results for Postcode 2000 (Table 42) with those for the Inner Sydney SSD (Table 44), it can be seen that *robbery with a weapon* showed trends that were consistent with an effective Safe City Strategy. This offence showed a decreasing trend in Postcode 2000 but a stable trend in the Inner Sydney SSD. However, two offences, namely, *non-residential common assault* and *robbery without a weapon*, showed trends that were inconsistent with an effective Strategy. Whereas *non-residential common assault* showed an increasing trend in Postcode 2000, it was stable in the Inner Sydney SSD. Furthermore, *robbery without a weapon* was stable in Postcode 2000 but showed a decreasing trend in the Inner Sydney SSD. For the remaining offences, namely, *non-residential serious assault*, *non-residential sexual offences*, *steal from person* and *malicious damage to property*, the Kendall's trends were stable in both Postcode 2000 and the Inner Sydney SSD, and thus, were inconclusive about the effectiveness of the Strategy.

Overall, the Kendall's results do not provide a clear pattern that is either consistent with, or inconsistent with, the notion that the Safe City Strategy was effective. While in a few instances, the results were in a direction that was consistent with an effective Safe City Strategy, in other instances they were in the opposite direction.

Table 45: Chi-square results comparing recorded criminal incidents in Postcode 2000 and Sydney LGA (excluding Postcode 2000)

Offence	Postcode 2000			Sydney LGA			χ^2	*p*
	1998	*1999*	*% change 1998 to 1999*	*1998*	*1999*	*% change 1998 to 1999*		
Non-residential serious assault	331	353	6.65↑	48	87	81.25↑	7.472	0.006**
Non-residential common assault	850	950	11.76↑	161	170	5.59↑	0.226	0.635
Non-residential sexual offences	107	99	7.48↓	16	18	12.50↑	0.279	0.598
Robbery with a weapon	282	195	30.85↓	77	60	22.08↓	0.372	0.542
Robbery without a weapon	515	539	4.66↑	101	166	64.36↑	10.422	0.001**
Steal from person	2119	2313	9.16↑	235	220	6.38↓	2.433	0.119
Malicious damage to property	906	904	0.22↓	338	325	3.85↓	0.166	0.684

Note: For all χ^2 tests in this table, df=1. *significant at *p*<0.05 **significant at *p*<0.01

Chi-square results

Table 45 presents the Chi-square results comparing the annual totals of recorded criminal incidents in Postcode 2000 and the Sydney LGA. The Chi-square results were significant for two offences: *non-residential serious assault* and *robbery without a weapon.* For both offences, the Chi-square was consistent with an effective Safe City Strategy, indicating that the increase in Postcode 2000 from 1998 to 1999 was relatively smaller than that in the Sydney LGA. For each of the other offence categories, there was no significant

difference between the patterns for Postcode 2000 and the Sydney LGA. Thus, for these offences, the Chi-square results were inconclusive about the effectiveness of the Strategy.

Table 46 presents the Chi-square results comparing the annual totals of recorded criminal incidents in Postcode 2000 and the Inner Sydney SSD. The Chi-square results were significant for the following three offences: *non-residential common assault, robbery without a weapon* and *steal from person*. For all three of these offences, the result was inconsistent with an effective Safe City Strategy, indicating that, from 1998 to 1999, there tended to be an increase in Postcode 2000 but a decrease in the Inner Sydney SSD. For each of the remaining offences, namely *non-residential serious assault, non-residential sexual offences, robbery with a weapon* and *malicious damage to property*, the Chi-square was not significant. Thus, these Chi-square results were inconclusive about the effectiveness of the Strategy.

Table 46: Chi-square results comparing recorded criminal incidents in Postcode 2000 and Inner Sydney SSD (excluding Postcode 2000)

	Postcode 2000			Inner Sydney SSD				
Offence	*1998*	*1999*	*% change 1998 to 1999*	*1998*	*1999*	*% change 1998 to 1999*	χ^2	*p*
Non-residential serious assault	331	353	6.65↑	873	860	1.49↓	0.772	0.380
Non-residential common assault	850	950	11.76↑	2188	2074	5.21↓	8.573	0.003**
Non-residential sexual offences	107	99	7.48↓	229	250	9.17↑	0.985	0.321
Robbery with a weapon	282	195	30.85↓	992	695	29.94↓	0.015	0.901
Robbery without a weapon	515	539	4.66↑	1506	1361	9.63↓	4.150	0.042*
Steal from person	2119	2313	9.16↑	2299	2042	11.18↓	23.256	<0.001***
Malicious damage to property	906	904	0.22↓	5724	5617	1.87↓	0.108	0.742

Note: For all χ^2 tests in this table, df=1.   *significant at *p*<0.05   **significant at *p*<0.01   ***significant at *p*<0.001

Overall, the Chi-square results comparing Postcode 2000 with the Sydney LGA tended to be consistent with an effective Safe City Strategy, but the Chi-square results comparing Postcode 2000 with the broader area of the Inner Sydney SSD were inconsistent with an effective Strategy.

Impact on detection and reporting of crime

As noted earlier, the Kendall's and Chi-square analyses were conducted on recorded crime due to the difficulty in determining the level of unreported crime in the city area. One concern about using recorded crime data was that any increases in recorded crime may not reflect increases in the actual level of crime but only increases in the reporting or detection of crime. It was considered possible that both the Street Safety Camera Program and the Emergency Video Phone Trial would increase the detection or reporting of some offences, particularly minor personal crimes.

Some data are available on the number of charges directly resulting from the Street Safety Camera initiative and on the number of calls to police via the Emergency Video Phone Trial. These data generally suggest that any increase in detection or reporting of crime resulting from the Camera and Phone initiatives was not of sufficient magnitude to affect the present evaluation of recorded crime.[14]

4. DISCUSSION

The main aims of the present evaluation were to examine

    (1) the level of awareness of the Safe City Strategy and the impact of the Strategy on perceived safety in the city area of Sydney,

    (2) the impact of the Strategy on fear of crime in the city area, and

    (3) the impact of the Strategy on crime levels in the city area.

The survey revealed that, although the level of awareness of the Strategy varied across initiatives, the majority of respondents viewed the initiatives very positively, perceiving that the initiatives were likely to make the city safer. The results of the survey analysis were also generally consistent with the Strategy reducing fear of crime in the city area. However, the results of the crime trend analysis were mixed and did not consistently support the notion that the Strategy had a positive impact on recorded crime in the short term across the whole target area.

4.1 AWARENESS AND PERCEPTION OF STRATEGY

Although the overall awareness of the Safe City Strategy initiatives was moderate, this is not surprising given that two of the seven initiatives surveyed had not been implemented by the time of the survey. About one-third of the respondents were aware of fewer than three of the seven initiatives and over one-half of the respondents were aware of fewer than four of the seven initiatives.

Street Safety Cameras and the City Upgrade of footpaths and streets achieved the highest levels of awareness, while the Community Safety Education initiative and Safe Taxi Ranks had the lowest levels of awareness. The high levels of awareness of the Street Safety Cameras and the City Upgrade are not surprising. The Street Safety Camera Program has received considerable publicity and the Cameras (and signs about the Cameras) are visible throughout much of the city area. The implementation of the City Upgrade has also been very visible throughout much of the city, particularly during the day. The finding that the Community Safety Education initiative had the lowest levels of awareness is also not surprising given that the City of Sydney had not implemented this initiative by the time the survey was conducted. The low awareness of Safe Taxi Ranks may be attributable in part to the fact that there were only three supervised taxi ranks operating when the survey was conducted, and these had not yet been marketed as 'Safe Taxi Ranks' but were the sole responsibility of the NSW Taxi Council.

Although there were some differences in awareness levels according to individual characteristics, the reasons for these differences are not always obvious. It is possible, however, that the greater awareness level among males than females partly reflects frequency of city use. In the present survey, males were significantly more likely than females to be in the city weekly in both 1998 and 1999.[15] The reasons for differences in awareness according to age are not clear. For example, it is not clear why the oldest group would be the age group least aware of Emergency Video Phones and Safe Taxi Ranks. However, the finding that the youngest group was the age group least aware of the City Upgrade might reflect the time of day they typically use the city. The City Upgrade would have been more visible in the day, when construction was actually taking place, rather than at night. Compared with the other age groups, the youngest group are less likely to be part of the business crowd who are typically in the city during the

day: the youngest age group was the least likely to provide 'work/business' as their usual reason for being in the city, and one of the two groups most likely to provide 'entertainment/recreation/leisure' as their usual reason.[16]

Despite the varying levels of awareness of the Safe City Strategy initiatives, the perceived impact of the initiatives on safety was generally very high. Without exception, each initiative was perceived by the majority of respondents as likely to make the city safer. The particularly high endorsement of the Improved Lighting initiative is in keeping with past research showing that street lighting tends to be rated as one of the most important factors contributing to feelings of safety (e.g. Argyrous 1998). It is thought that increasing visibility by improving street lighting dispels the fear that the street could be successfully hiding potential enemies (e.g. Fisher 1997; Laidebeur 1987).

The high overall endorsement of the Safe City Strategy initiatives suggests that the City of Sydney Council was successful in developing a crime prevention strategy that appeals to city users and generally addresses any concerns they may have about the city's safety.

Although the overall endorsement level of the initiatives was high, there were differences according to gender, age and city resident status in the endorsement levels for some initiatives. Again, the reasons for these differences are not obvious. Perhaps the most parsimonious explanation is that differences in the endorsement of an initiative are related to differences in the personal use of that initiative or in the perceived personal benefits of that initiative. For example, the higher endorsement of the Improved Lighting initiative by females compared with males is consistent with females' heightened fear of walking outdoors at night. Past research has shown that street lighting reduces fear of crime and the actual incidence of victimisation in women (e.g. Painter 1992; Trench, Taner & Tiesdell 1992; Valentine 1990).

Similarly, the groups who were more likely to endorse Safe Taxi Ranks, namely females, adolescents and non-city residents, may be the groups who feel most vulnerable when using taxis in the city or the groups who are more likely to use taxis in the city. For example, compared with non-city residents, city residents may be less likely to use taxis to travel between their home and various city destinations.

Finally, the finding that the City Upgrade initiative was most heavily endorsed by the oldest age group may also reflect greater perceived personal benefits from this initiative. Past research has shown that damaged and narrow pedestrian walkways increase the fear of accidents and the fear of surprise attacks from assailants (e.g. Argyrous 1998). Given their increased physical frailty, the oldest age group may feel more at risk of such accidents and attacks, and more likely to benefit from any reduction in this risk.

The suggestion most commonly provided by respondents for further enhancing the city's safety, namely increasing police enforcement, is consistent with past research showing that increasing police presence is perceived as one of the most important factors in increasing safety (e.g. Argyrous 1998).

4.2 IMPACT ON FEAR OF CRIME

The survey results paint a positive picture of the public's perception of the city's safety at the time of the survey. The majority of respondents rated the city overall and each city area as either 'safe' or 'very safe'. Furthermore, most respondents were either 'not concerned' or only 'a little concerned' about victimisation during the day in each area. Although the level of concern about victimisation was increased at night, this finding is not unexpected and has been demonstrated in past research on fear of crime (e.g. O'Mahony & Quinn 1999).

Furthermore, the results generally indicated an increase in the public's confidence of the city's safety after the implementation of the Safe City Strategy compared with one year previously. Thus, the results are generally consistent with the notion that the Strategy successfully reduced city users' fear of crime in the city area. Respondents were more likely to rate the city and each city area as 'safer now' rather than 'worse now'.

Although the city was generally perceived as safe, the survey nonetheless demonstrated that the public's confidence in the city's safety varied according to both individuals' characteristics and situational factors. Many of these findings are consistent with past research on fear of crime.

The present survey found that males were more likely than females to rate the city and each area as safe at the time of the survey, and to rate the city and each area as safer at the time of the survey compared with one year previously. The finding that women are more fearful of crime has been well documented by past research (e.g. Gordon, Riger, Lebailey & Heath 1980; Maxfield 1984; Riger 1978; Warr 1984, 1985), despite the equally well documented finding that victimisation rates are higher for men (e.g. Australian Bureau of Statistics 1999; Rennison 2000). Similarly, the heightened fear of crime for females in the present study was not accompanied by increased levels of victimisation. There was no significant difference in the reported personal experience of unsafe incidents in the city between males and females.[17] The reasons for this apparent paradox between fear of crime and actual victimisation rates have been hotly debated in the literature. Women's heightened levels of fear of crime have been variously attributed to heightened perceptions of physical or emotional vulnerability, greater exposure to particularly frightening crimes such as rape, greater exposure to crimes that do not enter recorded statistics because they tend to go unreported such as domestic violence, and greater exposure to various kinds of harassment (e.g. Goodey 1994; Grabosky 1995; Hale 1996; Stanko 1988, 1992).

Another individual characteristic that has been shown by past research to affect fear of crime is prior victimisation, with prior victims, not surprisingly, reporting higher fear levels (e.g. Hough 1995; Skogan 1987; van Dijk & Mayhew 1992). The heightened fear of crime among crime victims is in line with the finding from victim surveys that there is a high degree of repeat victimisation (e.g. Australian Bureau of Statistics 1996). The present survey also found heightened fear of crime among crime victims. The group who had personal experience of an unsafe incident in the city was the least likely group to perceive the city and the city areas as safe or very safe at the time of the survey. The group with neither personal nor vicarious experience of an unsafe incident was the most likely to perceive the city and the city areas as safe, followed by the group with only vicarious experience.

Perhaps more interesting were the ratings of these three groups when they were asked to compare the safety of the city at the time of the survey with one year previously. All three groups were more likely to report that the city and the city areas were 'safer now' rather than 'worse now'.

However, the group who had personal experience was the least likely to say that the city was the 'same' as one year ago, opting relatively more often for either the 'safer now' or the 'worse now' category. Although the reasons for this finding are not obvious, one possibility is that the changes in the city resulting from the Safe City Strategy (or other interventions) were perceived differently according to the nature of the victimisation experienced. In fact, there were some statistically significant differences in safety ratings 'now compared with one year ago' according to the type of attack/threat

experienced in the last unsafe incident and the recency of the last unsafe incident.[18] Also consistent with such an explanation was the present finding that respondents who personally experienced an unsafe incident in the few months prior to the survey were aware of a greater number of initiatives compared with those whose last unsafe incident was less recent.[19]

Previous research has also generally found heightened levels of fear of crime among the elderly (e.g. Baldassare 1986; Clarke & Lewis 1982; Giles-Sims 1984; Lee 1982). In contrast, the present study did not consistently find a significant relationship between age and the perceived safety of the city at the time of the survey, and when a relationship was found, it was the youngest group who reported heightened concern about crime. The youngest group, 14 to 19 year olds, was more likely than the other age groups to rate both the city overall and the Haymarket/Chinatown as unsafe or very unsafe. One possible explanation for the discrepancy between the present finding and previous research is that the present study did not separate out a true 'elderly' group, with the oldest group being 50 years or over. The present study also included adolescents whereas adolescents were not always included in past studies. It is also worth noting that there have been other exceptions to the finding that the elderly are the age group most fearful of crime. For example, another Australian study found that younger Australians are more fearful of violence in general than are the elderly (Kelley 1992, cited in Grabosky 1995). The relationship between fear of crime and age in the present study is consistent with victimisation rates which show that adolescents and young adults have the highest rates of victimisation, both for personal crime and property crime (e.g. Australian Bureau of Statistics 1999; Rennison 2000). This relationship is also consistent with the finding in the present study showing that the youngest group was more likely than the older age groups to report personal experience of an unsafe incident in the city.[20]

Interestingly, although adolescent respondents were the least likely to rate the city overall as safe at the time of the present survey, they were also the most likely to rate the city and the city areas as 'safer now' compared with one year prior to the survey. This effect was particularly evident for George Street/Town Hall and the Retail core. Given that the George Street cinema area tends to be more often frequented by young people than by older people (ERM Mitchell McCotter 1999a, 1999b), the younger group's heightened perceptions of improved safety in this area may reflect a greater familiarity with the area. The survey results for the youngest group are consistent with the notion that the Strategy was particularly successful in heightening the level of confidence in the city's safety among the age group reporting the greatest fear of crime.

Prior research has found that fear of crime can also be affected by a range of situational and environmental factors, including time of day and neighbourhood characteristics (e.g. Box, Hale & Andrews 1988; Eve & Eve 1984; Hale, Pack & Salked 1994; O'Mahony & Quinn 1999; Skogan 1990; Skogan & Maxfield 1981). In keeping with past research, concern about becoming a victim of crime at the time of the survey was heightened at night. Furthermore, the only result contrary to the Strategy's effectiveness in reducing fear of crime was that relating to the level of concern about night-time victimisation 'now compared with one year ago'. Although most respondents' concern about night-time victimisation was the 'same' as one year previously, respondents who were 'more concerned now' outnumbered those who were 'less concerned now'. This finding contrasted with the finding for day-time victimisation, and with the overall ratings of each area as 'safer now'. The heightened fear of night-time victimisation 'now compared with one year ago' is cause for concern, not only because fear of crime is more a night-time than a day-time phenomenon, but also because there is some evidence that actual victimisation is heightened at night (e.g. Jochelson 1997). The present survey similarly found increased victimisation at night (see Table 12).

In keeping with prior research showing that fear of crime varies across neighbourhoods (e.g. Box, Hale & Andrews 1988; Eve & Eve 1984; Hale, Pack & Salked 1994; Skogan 1990; Skogan & Maxfield 1981), the present survey found that perceptions of safety varied across city areas. Circular Quay/the Rocks and the Retail Core were consistently perceived to be the safest city locations. At the time of the survey, these areas were more likely than other areas to be rated as safe or very safe, and were less likely than other areas to attract concern about victimisation. Furthermore, although all city areas were more likely to be rated as safer at the time of the survey compared with one year previously, smaller percentages of respondents tended to rate Circular Quay/the Rocks and the Retail Core as 'worse now'. The areas which tended to be perceived as most unsafe were Hyde Park and Central/Belmore Park. At the time of the survey, these areas were the least likely to be rated as safe or very safe, and the most likely to attract concern about victimisation at night. These areas were also the least likely to be perceived as safer at the time of the survey compared with one year ago. After Hyde Park and Central/Belmore Park, the area which tended to be perceived as the next most unsafe was George Street/Town Hall. This area was the third least likely area to be perceived as 'safe' or 'very safe' at the time of the survey, and was amongst the three areas most likely to attract concern about victimisation both during the day and at night.

It is worth noting here that while variations in the perceptions of safety across city areas corresponded, to some extent, to variations in the locations where respondents had personally experienced their last unsafe incident, the correspondence was not perfect. The last unsafe incidents were most likely to occur in the three areas which tended to be perceived as most unsafe, that is, Hyde Park, Central/Belmore Park and George Street/Town Hall. However, whereas, George Street/Town Hall was less likely to be perceived as unsafe compared with the other two areas, it accounted for the largest percentage of last unsafe incidents. In fact, the percentage of last unsafe incidents occurring in George Street/Town Hall was about two or three times higher than the corresponding percentages for Hyde Park and Central/Belmore Park. These finding suggests that prior victimisation may not account for all of the variation between areas in perceived safety.[21]

The present study also found that concern about crime in the city depended on the type of victimisation. Respondents were more concerned about having their property stolen or damaged than about being physically attacked or threatened. Past findings regarding variations in fear of crime across offence types have not been clear-cut. Past research indicates that fear of crime tends to be related not only to the perceived seriousness of different offences, but also to the perceived risk of experiencing different offences. As a result, while personal crimes such as assault, rape and robbery, are often nominated as the most frightening crimes (e.g. Gilchrist, Bannister, Ditton & Farrall 1998; Newburn & Stanko 1994; Ortega & Myles 1987), property crimes are sometimes more likely to be nominated when individuals are asked how worried they are about specific crimes actually occurring to them (Hough, 1995; O'Mahony & Quinn 1999). The present finding that property crimes were associated with greater concern may reflect a belief that these are the crimes that one is most at risk of experiencing in the city area. Any such belief would be consistent with recorded crime statistics for the city area which show that the volume of various 'street' property offences tends to be higher than the volume of 'street' personal offences.[22]

The present survey also found that fear of crime sometimes varied according to the frequency of city use. The results were not, however, consistent with the notion that people who are relatively more confident about the city's safety are more likely to frequent the city. When asked about safety 'now', there were differences between

'frequent' and 'infrequent' city users for only two of the six areas, George Street/Town Hall and Central/Belmore Park, and in both cases it was the 'infrequent' city users who were the more likely to rate the areas as safe or very safe. Interestingly, these two areas were among the three areas least likely to be rated as safe or very safe overall. This finding for frequency of city use is consistent with the notion that, overall, greater familiarity with George Street/Town Hall and Central/Belmore Park tends to decrease their perceived safety.

Curiously, although frequent city use seemed to decrease the perceived safety of some city areas 'now', it seemed to increase the perceived safety of most city areas 'now compared with one year ago'. With the exception of Central/Belmore Park, all the city areas were more likely to be rated as 'safer now' by 'frequent' city users rather than by 'infrequent' city users. This finding is consistent with the notion that 'frequent' city users were more likely than 'infrequent' city users to notice the recent changes in the city resulting from the Safe City Strategy and to attribute increased safety to these changes. In fact, the relationship between frequency of city use and awareness of initiatives was statistically significant, indicating that 'frequent' city users tended to be aware of a greater number of initiatives than 'infrequent' city users.[23]

The finding that awareness of the initiatives heightened perceptions of safety 'now compared with one year ago' was not restricted to 'frequent' city users, but was evident across the entire sample. Again, this finding is consistent with the notion that the Safe City Strategy was successful in increasing the public's confidence in the city's safety.

4.3 IMPACT ON CRIME

The results of the crime trend analysis clearly varied according to which area was used as the comparison area for the Strategy area (Postcode 2000). When Postcode 2000 was compared with the Sydney LGA, the results were fairly consistent with an effective Safe City Strategy. The Kendall's results for *robbery without a weapon*, and the Chi-square results for this offence and for *non-residential serious assault*, were all consistent with an effective Strategy. Using the Sydney LGA as the comparison area, the only result directly inconsistent with a successful Strategy was the Kendall's result for *non-residential common assault.*

When the Strategy area was compared with the broader area of the Inner Sydney SSD, however, the results were generally inconsistent with an effective Strategy. Both the Kendall's and Chi-square results for *non-residential common assault* and for *robbery without a weapon* were, prima facie, inconsistent with an effective Strategy. The Chi-square result for *steal from person* was also inconsistent with an effective Strategy. Using the Inner Sydney SSD as the comparison area, only the Kendall's result for *robbery with a weapon* was consistent with an effective Strategy.

The contrasting findings for the Sydney LGA and the Inner Sydney SSD may in part reflect their differential suitability as comparison areas for the present analysis. The more similar a comparison area is to the target area, the less the risk that factors extraneous to the intervention strategy will differentially affect crime in the two areas. As noted earlier, the Sydney LGA was the more appropriate comparison area because, like the Strategy area, it is predominantly a city rather than suburban area. Like the Strategy area, the Sydney LGA is a built-up area with a high concentration of offices, shops, restaurants, entertainment venues and places of interest, and consequently, is an area with a high ratio of transient to residential population. Although the Inner Sydney SSD includes the city area comprising the Sydney LGA, it extends considerably beyond the city area to include large suburban areas with substantial residential populations.

As a result, any factor that impacts on crime predominantly in the city area is likely to impact more on the Strategy area and the Sydney LGA than on the Inner Sydney SSD. One such possible factor would be a change in the size of the city's transient population. In fact, increases in the city's worker and visitor populations suggest that the city's transient population may have increased significantly in recent years (City of Sydney 2000a).[24] Any such increase in the city's transient population may have contributed to the recorded increase in some offence categories in the Strategy area and the Sydney LGA between 1998 and 1999 (see Tables 39 and 40), and to the more negative picture of crime in the Strategy area compared with the Inner Sydney SSD.

In considering the impact of the Safe City Strategy on crime, it should also be noted that the present evaluation examined the immediate or short-term effects on crime. Given that many of the Safe City Strategy initiatives are ongoing, and that the City of Sydney Council aims to continue enhancing the Strategy, the impact of the Strategy on crime over the longer term would also be of interest.

4.4 IMPLICATIONS

Given the moderate overall levels of awareness of the Safe City Strategy, there may be value in further publicising existing Strategy initiatives. The potential benefits of such publicity are suggested by the present finding that the higher the awareness of the initiatives, the more likely the city was to be perceived as 'safer now'. Thus, further publicising the Strategy would be likely to further increase the public's confidence in the safety of the city. Given the observed variation in the level of awareness across initiatives, it may be useful to more heavily publicise the initiatives with the lower levels of awareness such as the Community Safety Education initiative, the Safe Taxi Ranks initiative, the Accord with Licensed Premises and the Emergency Video Phones trial. Furthermore, given that awareness of specific initiatives was particularly low in certain groups of individuals, there may be benefits in more heavily publicising each initiative among the groups who are least aware of that initiative. For example, it may be useful to raise adolescents' awareness of the City Upgrade and the Street Safety Cameras, and to raise older people's awareness of Emergency Video Phones and the Accord with Licensed Premises. Furthermore, given that females were less aware of many of the initiatives than were males, it may be beneficial for publicity campaigns to more heavily target females.

The present results also have implications for any future crime prevention initiatives in the city area, such as any future enhancements to the Safe City Strategy. Firstly, the findings suggest that, in order to further increase the public's confidence in the city's safety, it may be beneficial for any enhancement of the Strategy to target the specific groups of individuals who appear to be most concerned about crime, particularly females and prior crime victims, and to a lesser extent, adolescents. Given that the heightened levels of fear of crime for both adolescents and prior crime victims appear to reflect, at least in part, higher levels of victimisation, further crime prevention strategies should focus on reducing actual victimisation as well as reducing fear of victimisation in these groups. In the case of females, the extent to which heightened levels of fear of crime are grounded in increased levels of victimisation is less clear. Nonetheless, the possibility that females may experience more serious crimes that tend to go unreported suggests the importance of targeting both actual victimisation and fear of crime in women.

Secondly, to further enhance the public's confidence in the city's safety, the survey results suggest that there would be value in reducing fear of crime at night. Again, given that the heightened level of fear of crime at night may well reflect, to some extent, higher levels of victimisation at night, further enhancements of the Strategy should focus on reducing actual night-time victimisation as well as fear of night-time victimisation.

Thirdly, the survey results also suggest that it may be beneficial for new or enhanced initiatives to target the specific locations in the city that appear to be associated with heightened levels of fear of crime, particularly Hyde Park and Central/Belmore Park, and to a lesser extent, George Street/Town Hall.

4.5 CONCLUSION

The Safe City Strategy is an ongoing multi-faceted crime prevention Strategy which aims to maximise personal safety in the public domain of the city area of Sydney and to maximise the public's confidence in the safety of the city area. The present evaluation examined the impact of the Strategy soon after its initial implementation.

The results revealed that the Strategy received high levels of endorsement from city users who perceived all of the Strategy initiatives surveyed as likely to make the city area safer. The evaluation also generally suggested that the Strategy was effective in increasing the perceived safety of the city and in reducing fear of crime in the city. The results suggested that further enhancement to the Strategy might result from targeting (a) the specific groups of individuals who remained most fearful of crime, such as females and prior crime victims, (b) victimisation at night, and (c) the specific city locations which attracted most concern about victimisation, such as Hyde Park and Central/Belmore Park. The results also suggested that raising the level of awareness of the Strategy may further enhance the public's confidence in the safety of the city area of Sydney.

A rigorous evaluation of the Strategy's effectiveness in reducing crime was not possible because of the nature of the Safe City Strategy, and because of the concurrent implementation of other crime prevention initiatives in both the target area and potential comparison areas. Nonetheless, the present evaluation was able to examine whether or not recorded crime patterns were generally consistent with the Strategy having a positive effect on crime in the short term.

The results of the crime analyses were not clear-cut, varying according to which area was compared with the Strategy area. While the analyses tended to be consistent with a positive impact on recorded crime when the Strategy area was compared with another city area, the Sydney LGA, this effect disappeared when the Strategy area was compared with a broader, more suburban area, the Inner Sydney SSD. However, given that the Sydney LGA was the more appropriate comparison area, on balance, the results are more favourable than unfavourable in terms of the Strategy's initial impact on crime. The longer-term impact of the Strategy on crime remains to be seen.

NOTES

1 The Sydney LGA comprises Postcodes 2000 and 2009, as well as the majority of the residential population of Postcode 2007 (90.1%) and small percentages of the residential populations of Postcode 2010 (11.2%) and Postcode 2011 (1.3%). Postcode 2001, the Sydney GPO Private Box, also falls within the Sydney LGA.

2 Under-14 year olds were not interviewed because parental consent would have been required.

3 Respondents were asked to compare the city's safety 'now compared with one year ago', that is, late 1999/early 2000 compared with late 1998/early 1999.

4 The size of the correlations ranged from

- 0.181 to 0.537 among variables measuring perceived safety in each area 'at the present time' (among Q9 and Q10a-f);

- 0.274 to 0.855 among variables measuring concern about victimisation in each area 'at the present time' (among Q11a-f, Q12a-f, Q13a-f and Q14a-f);

- 0.079 to 0.511 between variables measuring safety in each area 'at the present time' and variables measuring concern about victimisation in each area 'at the present time';

- 0.476 to 0.758 among variables measuring safety in each area 'now compared with one year ago' (among Q15 and Q16a-f);

- 0.419 to 0.761 among variables measuring concern about victimisation 'now compared with one year ago' (among Q17a-b and Q18a-b); and

- 0.243 to 0.418 between variables measuring safety in each area 'now compared with one year ago' and variables measuring concern about victimisation 'now compared with one year ago'.

5 Generally, estimates of (both reported and unreported) victimisation in a given geographical area are obtained through large-scale, representative-sample 'victim' surveys of the residential population of the area. Due to the high ratio of transient to residential population in the city area, such surveys would not provide reliable estimates of victimisation within the city.

6 There was also a resource issue associated with analyses based on geographical areas smaller than a postcode because address information is not always readily retrievable from the Computerised Operational Policing Systems (e.g. see Jochelson 1997).

7 Given that the offence category 'demand money with menaces' is operationally the same as the category 'robbery without a weapon' with the exception that the occurrence of a physical threat cannot be substantiated, it was considered appropriate to combine these categories.

8 The postcode for the Sydney GPO Private Box, 2001, also falls within the Sydney LGA. The majority of the residential population of Postcode 2010 (88.8%) and the majority of the residential population of Postcode of 2011 (98.7%) live within the South Sydney LGA.

9 The number of criminal incidents from each postcode that is recorded as occurring in the Sydney LGA corresponds to the percentage of the postcode's population residing in the LGA. Thus, once Postcode 2000 is removed, the number of criminal incidents recorded in the remainder of the Sydney LGA is the sum of the number in Postcode 2009, 90.1 per cent of the number in Postcode 2007, 11.2 per cent of the number in Postcode 2010 and 1.3 per cent of the number in Postcode 2011. It should also be noted that although Postcode 2001 is a GPO Box within the Sydney LGA, a very small number of criminal incidents are recorded as occurring in this postcode and are usually included in the total for the LGA because they are assumed to have occurred somewhere within the LGA. In the present analysis, any such incidents were counted as occurring somewhere in the LGA outside Postcode 2000.

10 Inner Sydney SSD consists of Botany Bay LGA, Leichhardt LGA, Marrickville LGA, South Sydney LGA and Sydney LGA.

11 Although Postcode 2001 is within the Sydney LGA, it is the postcode for the Sydney Private GPO Box. As a result, the five respondents who gave 2001 as their postcode of residence were not categorised as city residents.

12 See note 1. Note also that 'resident' in Table 6 does not correspond perfectly with 'city resident' in Table 7 because (i) the former was self-defined but the latter was based on postcode and (ii) residents may have given a reason other than being a resident for being in the city.

13 In 1996, the ratio of males to females was 54:46 for the city resident population and 53:47 for the city worker population. In 1999, Sydney city attracted more male than female international visitors and more male than female domestic visitors (with the latter ratio being 62:38). In 1996, 47 per cent of city residents were aged between 20 and 35 years, and the average age of city workers was 34.8 years. In 1999, the average age of international visitors to Sydney was 38.7 years and the average age of Sydney metropolitan visitors was 32.6 years.

14 City of Sydney 2000b presents the numbers of charges of each offence type that resulted from detection by the Street Safety Cameras. For the period 23/12/98 to 31/1/00, the following charges resulted from the Cameras that fell into the seven offence types examined in the present evaluation: 2 serious assaults; 12 common assaults; 3 sexual offences; 3 robberies with a weapon; 18 robberies without a weapon; 19 steal from person offences; and 5 malicious damage offences. These numbers represent less than four per cent of the 1999 totals of each offence type in Postcode 2000 (see Table 45). While these numbers are relatively small, the limitations of the data make it difficult to assess the extent to which they accurately reflect any increase in detection of criminal incidents. Firstly, because the data are captured via an optional field on the Computerised Operational Policing Systems (COPS), some charges resulting from the Cameras may not have been recorded on COPS. Thus, the recorded number of charges resulting from the Cameras may be an underestimate of the actual number. Secondly, even if the number of incidents detected by the Cameras were accurately recorded, it would be difficult to determine how many of these incidents would have eventually come to the police's attention via other means. Thus, the extent to which the Cameras merely speed up detection rather than actually increase the level of detection is not clear. Bearing in mind these limitations, the 14 Chi-square results presented in Tables 45 and 46 were re-run with the incidents detected by the Cameras having been subtracted from the 1999 totals for each offence type in Postcode 2000. With only one exception, namely robbery without a weapon in Postcode 2000 compared with the Inner Sydney SSD, the significance of each test remained the same. The number of calls via the Emergency Video Phones also appears too small to have any significant impact on the present analyses. At the time of writing, there were only eight calls made via the Emergency Video Phones that required a police response. Data were not available on whether any of these calls resulted in charges being laid.

15 The chi-square result for 1998 was statistically significant (χ^2=9.807, df=3, p=0.020), as was the chi-square result for 1999 (χ^2=11.720, df=4, p=0.020). Although males were more likely than females to be in the city weekly, there was no significant difference in the percentages of males and females who used the city at least six times in 1998 and 1999 (χ^2=0.004, df=1, p=0.948).

16 χ^2=105.832, df=20, p<0.001.

17 χ^2= 2.063, df=2, p=0.356.

18 For example, respondents who experienced both a physical attack/threat and an attack/threat to their property in the last unsafe incident were more likely than other respondents who had personal experience of an unsafe incident to rate each of the following areas as 'worse now': the city overall (χ^2=8.280, df=2, p=0.016); Hyde Park (χ^2=9.565, df=2, p=0.008) and the Haymarket/Chinatown (χ^2=8.597, df=2, p=0.014). Furthermore, compared with respondents whose last unsafe incident occurred more than a year prior to the survey, those whose last unsafe incident occurred more recently were more likely to rate each of the following areas as 'worse now': George Street/Town Hall (χ^2=6.921, df=2, p=0.031); Hyde Park (χ^2=8.449, df=2, p=0.015); and Circular Quay/the Rocks (χ^2=6.120, df=2, p=0.047).

19 χ^2= 13.371, df=6, p=0.038.

20 χ^2=64.719, df=8, p<0.001.

21 However, it should be kept in mind that the survey (i) collected information on the location of the *last* unsafe incident that each respondent personally experienced, but not the location of any earlier such incidents, and (ii) did not collect information on the location of any vicariously experienced incidents.

22 NSW Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research, unpublished recorded crime statistics. The recorded criminal incidents in 1999 for the entire Sydney LGA (including Postcode 2000) indicate a total of 6,863 'street' property offences (i.e. *steal from person*, *motor vehicle theft* and *steal from motor vehicle*) and a total of 2,637 'street' personal offences (i.e. *non-residential serious assault, non-residential common assault, non-residential sexual offences, robbery with a weapon* and *robbery without a weapon*).

23 χ^2 = 44.595, df = 2, p<0.001.

24 The city workforce increased by 4.6 per cent between 1997 and 1999, with an increase of 2.6 per cent occurring in the 12 months to December 1999. International visitors to Australia rose by 6.9 per cent in the 12 months to December 1999, and it is estimated that over half of the international visitors to Australia visit Sydney. Furthermore, between the September quarter of 1997 and the September quarter of 1999, hotels and serviced apartments in Sydney city experienced record increases of 18.4 per cent in both the average number of visitors per night and the average number of arrivals per day.

REFERENCES

Argyrous, G. 1998, *Pyrmont Community Safety Audit*, City of Sydney, Sydney.

Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) 1996, *Women's Safety Australia,* ABS, Canberra, Cat. no. 4128.0.

Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) 1999, *Crime and Safety New South Wales,* Sydney, Cat. no. 4509.1.

Bachman, R. & Saltzman, L.E. 1995, *Violence Against Women: Estimates from the Redesigned Survey,* Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report, US Department of Justice, Washington.

Baker, J. 1998, *Juveniles in Crime - Part 1: Participation Rates and Risk Factors,* NSW Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research, Sydney.

Baldassare, M. 1986, 'The elderly and fear of crime', *Sociology and Social Research,* vol. 70, pp. 218-221.

Box, S., Hale, C. & Andrews, G. 1988, 'Explaining fear of crime', *British Journal of Criminology,* vol. 28, pp. 340-356.

Braithwaite, J. 1989, *Crime, Shame and Reintergration,* Cambridge University Press, Melbourne.

Brantingham, P. & Brantingham, P. 1981, *Environmental Criminology,* Sage, California.

Brantingham, P. & Brantingham, P. 1990, 'Situational crime prevention in practice', *Canadian Journal of Criminology,* vol. 32, pp. 17-40.

Chilvers, M. 1999, *NSW Recorded Crime Statistics 1998,* NSW Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research, Sydney.

City of Sydney 1999, *City of Sydney's Strategy to Keep Sydney Safe,* City of Sydney, Sydney.

City of Sydney 2000a, *City of Sydney Year Book 1999,* City of Sydney, Sydney.

City of Sydney 2000b, Draft Street Safety Camera Program evaluation report, City of Sydney, Sydney.

Clarke, R. 1992, *Situational Crime Prevention: Successful Case Studies,* Harrow & Heston, New York.

Clarke, A.H., & Lewis, M. 1982, 'Fear of crime among the elderly', *British Journal of Criminology,* vol. 22, pp. 49-62.

Cohen, S. 1985, *Visions of Social Control,* Polity Press, Cambridge.

Coumarelos, C. & Allen, J. 1999, 'Predicting women's responses to violence: The 1996 Women's Safety Survey', *Crime and Justice Bulletin,* no. 9, NSW Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research, Sydney.

Covington, J. & Taylor, R.B. 1991, 'Fear of crime in urban residential neighborhoods: Implications of between-and within-neighborhood sources for current models', *The Sociological Quarterly,* vol. 32, pp. 231-249.

Edwards, G., Hensman, C. & Peto, J. 1971, 'Drinking problems among recidivist prisoners', *Psychological Medicine,* vol. 1, pp. 388-399.

Eve, R.A. & Eve, S.B. 1984, 'The effects of powerlessness, fear of social change, and social integration on fear of crime', *Victimology,* vol. 9, pp. 290-295.

ERM Mitchell McCotter 1999a (March), *Cinema precinct safety research: Final report*, City of Sydney, Sydney.

ERM Mitchell McCotter 1999b (June), Cinema precinct survey summary, City of Sydney, Sydney.

Fisher, A.J. 1997, 'Outdoor lighting: Lighting to deter fear and crime', *Lighting*, December, pp. 32-37.

Freeman, K., Lawrence Karski, R. & Doak, P. 2000, 'New South Wales Drug Court Evaluation: Program and participant profiles', *Crime and Justice Bulletin,* no. 50, NSW Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research, Sydney.

Geason, S. & Wilson, P. 1989, *Designing Out Crime: Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design,* Australian Institute of Criminology, Canberra.

Gilchrist, E., Bannister, J., Ditton, J. & Farrall, S. 1998, 'Women and the "fear of crime"', *British Journal of Criminology,* vol. 38, pp. 283-298.

Giles-Sims, J. 1984, 'A multivariate analysis of perceived likelihood of victimization and degree of worry about crime among older people', *Victimology,* vol. 9, pp. 223-233.

Goodey, J. 1994, 'Fear of crime: What can children tell us?', *International Review of Victimology,* vol. 3, pp. 195-210.

Gordon, M.T., Riger, S., Lebailey, R. K. & Heath, L. 1980, 'Crime, women and the quality of urban life', *Signs,* vol. 5, pp. 144-160.

Grabosky, P.N. 1995, 'Fear of crime and fear reduction strategies', *Trends and Issues in Crime and Criminal Justice*, no. 44, Australian Institute of Criminology, Canberra.

Hale, C. 1996, 'Fear of crime: A review of the literature', *International Review of Victimology,* vol. 4, pp. 79-150.

Hale, C., Pack, P. & Salked, J. 1994, 'The structural determinants of fear of crime: An analysis using census and crime survey data from England and Wales', *International Review of Victimology,* vol. 3, 211-233.

Homel, R. & Clark, J. 1995, 'The prediction and prevention of violence in pubs and clubs' in *Crime Prevention Studies, Vol. 3,* ed. R.V. Clarke, Criminal Justice Press, New York.

Hough, M. 1995, 'Anxiety about crime: Findings from the 1994 British Crime Survey, *Home Office Research Findings,* no. 25, Home Office, London.

Jacobs, J. 1961, *The Death and Life of Great American Cities,* Random House, New York.

Jeffs, B.W. & Saunders, W. M. 1983, 'Minimizing alcohol related offences by enforcement of the existing licensing legislation', *British Journal of Addiction,* vol. 78, pp. 67-77.

Jochelson, R. 1997, *Crime and Place: An Analysis of Assaults and Robberies in Inner Sydney,* NSW Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research, Sydney.

Koffmann, L. 1996, *Crime Surveys and Victims of Crime,* University of Wales Press, Cardiff.

Krannich, R.S., Greider, T. & Little, R.L. 1985, 'Rapid growth and fear of crime: A four-community comparison', *Rural Sociology,* vol. 50, pp. 193-209.

Laidebeur, A. 1987, 'Lighting, pedestrians and the city', *International Lighting Review,* vol. 2, pp. 50-53.

Lee, G.R. 1982, 'Sex differences in fear of crime among older people', *Research on Aging,* vol. 3, pp. 284-298.

Madriz, E. 1997, *Nothing Bad Happens to Good Girls. Fear of Crime in Women's Lives,* University of California Press, Berkeley.

Maxfield, M. 1984, 'Fear of crime in England and Wales', *Home Office Research Study,* no. 78, Home Office, London.

Newburn, T. & Stanko, E.A. 1994, 'When men are victims', in *Just Boys Doing Business? Men, Masculinities and Crime,* eds T. Newburn & E.A. Stanko, Routledge, London.

Newman, O. 1972, *Defensible Space: People and Design in the Violent City,* Architectural Press, London.

NSW Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research 1990-1998, Annual report series *NSW Recorded Crime Statistics,* NSW Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research, Sydney.

Nicol, A.R., Gunn, J. C., Gristwood, J., Foggitt, R.H. & Watson, S.P. 1973, 'The relationship of alcoholism to violent behaviour resulting in long-term imprisonment', *British Journal of Psychiatry,* vol. 123, pp. 47-51.

O'Mahony, D. & Quinn, K. 1999, 'Fear of crime and locale: The impact of community related factors upon fear of crime', *International Review of Victimology,* vol. 6, pp. 231-251.

Ortega, S.T. & Myles, J.L. 1987, 'Race and gender effects on fear of crime: An interactive model with age', *Criminology,* vol. 25, pp. 133-152.

Painter, K. 1992, 'Different worlds: The spatial, temporal and social dimensions of female victimisation', in *Crime, Policing and Place,* eds D. Evans, N. Fyfe & D. Herbert, Routledge, London.

Percy, A. 1998, 'Ethnicity and victimisation: Findings from the 1996 British Crime Survey', *Home Office Statistical Bulletin,* no. 6/98, Home Office, London.

Pernanen, K. 1982, 'Theoretical aspects of the relationship between alcohol use and crime', in *Drinking and Crime,* ed. J. Collins, Tavistock, London.

Rennison, C.M. 2000, 'Criminal victimization 1999: Changes 1998-99 with trends1993-99', *Bureau of Justice Statistics National Crime Victimization Survey*, No. NCJ 182734, Office of Justice Programs, US Department of Justice, Washington.

Riger, S. 1978, 'Women's fear of crime', *Victimology,* vol. 3, pp. 254-264.

Rodgers, K. 1994, 'Wife assault: The findings of a national survey', *Statistics Canada*, vol. 14, no. 9, pp. 1-22

Roncek, D.W. & Maier, P.A. 1991, 'Bars, blocks, and crimes revisited: Linking the theory of routine activities to the empiricism of "hot spots"', *Criminology,* vol. 29, pp. 725-753.

Salmelainen, P. 1995, *The Correlates of Offending Frequency: A Study of Juvenile Theft Offenders in Detention,* NSW Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research, Sydney.

Sherman, L.W. 1997, 'Policing for crime prevention', in *Preventing Crime: What Works, What Doesn't, What's Promising,* (A report to the United States Congress), eds L.W. Sherman, D. Gottfredson, D. MacKenzie, J. Eck, P. Reuter & S. Bushway, National Institute of Justice, Washington.

Skogan, W.G. 1987, 'The impact of victimisation on fear', *Crime and Delinquency,* vol. 33, pp. 135-154.

Skogan, W.G. 1990, *Disorder and Decline: Crime and the Spiral of Decay in American Neighborhoods,* Free Press, New York.

Skogan, W.G. & Maxfield, M.G. 1981, *Coping with Crime,* Sage, London.

Stanko, E. 1988, 'Hidden violence against women', in *Victims of Crime: A New Deal?*, eds M. Maguire & J. Ponting, Open University Press, Milton Keynes.

Stanko, E. 1992, 'The case of fearful women: Gender, Personal safety and fear of crime', *Women Criminal Justice,* vol. 4, pp. 117-135.

Stevenson, R.J. 1996, *The Impact of Alcohol Sales on Violent Crime, Property Destruction and Public Disorder,* NSW Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research, Sydney.

Stevenson, R.J. & Forsythe, L.M. V. 1998, *The Stolen Goods Market in New South Wales,* NSW Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research, Sydney.

Trench, S., Taner, O. & Tiesdell, S. 1992, 'Safer cities for women: Perceived risks and planning measures', *Town Planning Review,* vol. 63, pp. 279-296.

Trimboli, L. 2000, *An Evaluation of the NSW Youth Justice Conferencing Scheme,* NSW Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research, Sydney.

Valentine, G. 1990, 'Women's fear and the design of public space', *Built Environment,* vol. 16, pp. 288-303.

van Dijk, J. & Mayhew, P. 1992, *Criminal Victimization in the Industrialised World: Key Findings of the 1989 and 1992 International Crime Surveys,* Directorate for Crime Prevention, Ministry of Justice, The Hague.

Warr, M. 1984, 'Fear of victimisation: Why are women and the elderly more afraid?', *Social Science Quarterly,* vol. 65, pp. 681-702.

Warr, M. 1985, 'Fear of rape among urban women', *Social Problems,* vol. 32, pp. 238-250.

White, R. & Sutton, A. 1995, 'Crime prevention, urban space and social exclusion', *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology,* vol. 31, pp. 82-99.

APPENDIX 1: SAFE CITY STRATEGY TARGET AREA

Note: The map represents the Strategy target area in 1998 and 1999. The target area was broadened after 1999.

Reproduced from City of Sydney 1999, *City of Sydney's Strategy to Keep Sydney Safe,* City of Sydney, Sydney.

APPENDIX 2: SURVEY OF CITY USERS

Good morning/afternoon/evening. My name is (..........). I am undertaking research on behalf of City of Sydney Council. We are asking people who are aged 14 years and over about their views on safety. Information from people who use or live in the city will assist the Council to help make the city a safer place.

Everything you tell me will be treated confidentially. No individual person or business will be identified.

Do you have five minutes or so to answer some questions?

IF THE PERSON REFUSES,
☞ *THANK THEM FOR THEIR TIME AND COMPLETE RESPONSE MONITORING FORM.*

IF THE PERSON AGREES,
☞ *COMPLETE THE ATTACHED SURVEY.*

RECORD START TIME: ____ : ____ am/pm

INTERVIEW PERIOD: Day   Night *(please circle one)*

DATE: ____ / ____ / 2000

☞ *DO NOT READ OPTIONS.*

George St cinema area/Town Hall 1

Hyde Park (North and South) 2

Central Station/Belmore Park 3   Mon   Tues   Wed   Thurs

Haymarket/Chinatown 4   Fri   Sat   Sun

Circular Quay/The Rocks 5

Retail core (Wynyard/Martin Place/Pitt St Mall) 6

The questions I'm going to ask you relate to the main city area. This is the area roughly bounded by Circular Quay to the north, Central Train Station to the south, Hyde Park and Macquarie St to the east and the Bradfield Highway to the west.

---

1. *In 1999*, how often were you in the city?
☞ *READ OPTIONS.*

usually each week 1

at least six times 2

at least twice 3

once 4

not at all 5

2. *In 1998,* how often were you in the city?
   ☞ *READ OPTIONS.*

usually each week 1

at least six times 2

at least twice 3

once 4

not at all 5   ☞ *END THE INTERVIEW AND THANK THE PERSON FOR THEIR TIME. RECORD TERMINATION ON RESPONSE MONITORING FORM.*

3. What is your main reason for being in the city *today*?
   ☞ *ONLY READ OPTIONS*
      IF ANSWER NOT READILY SUPPLIED.

work/business 1

shopping 2

entertainment/recreation/leisure 3

tourist/visitor 4

resident 5

other *(please specify)* 6
   ....
   ....
   ....

4. What is your *usual* reason for being in the city?
   ☞ *ONLY READ OPTIONS*
      IF ANSWER NOT READILY SUPPLIED.

work/business 1

shopping 2

entertainment/recreation/leisure 3

tourist/visitor 4

resident 5

other *(please specify)* 6
   ....
   ....
   ....

So that we know we have interviewed a good cross-section of the community, I'd like to ask some details about you.

5. ☞ *RECORD PERSON'S GENDER.*
      DO NOT READ OPTIONS.

male 1

female 2

6. What is your age? Are you ...
   ☞ *READ OPTIONS.*

   14 - 19 1

   20 - 29 2

   30 - 39 3

   40 - 49 4

   50 or over 5

7. In which postcode do you live in Australia?
   ☞ *RECORD 9999 IF ANSWER IS 'DON'T KNOW'.*

   ⬜⬜⬜⬜

8. Which languages do you speak at home and/or with your parents?
   ☞ *DO NOT READ OPTIONS. MULTIPLE RESPONSE.*

   English 1

   Arabic 2

   Italian 3

   Greek 4

   Cantonese 5

   Spanish 6

   Other *(please specify all other languages)* 7

   ....

   ....

   ....

The following questions seek your opinions on various aspects of safety in the city *at the present time*.

---

9. Overall, how safe is the city? Is it:
   ☞ *READ OPTIONS.*

   Very safe 1

   Safe 2

   Unsafe 3

   Very unsafe 4

   ☞ *(DO NOT READ)* Don't know 9

10. How safe is each of the following areas within the city?
   ☞ *SHOW CARD 1. READ EACH AREA IN TURN.*

	very safe	safe	unsafe	very unsafe	don't know
a) George St cinema area/Town Hall	1	2	3	4	9
b) Hyde Park (North and South)	1	2	3	4	9
c) Central Station/Belmore Park	1	2	3	4	9
d) Haymarket/Chinatown	1	2	3	4	9
e) Circular Quay/The Rocks	1	2	3	4	9
f) Retail core (Wynyard/Martin Place/Pitt St Mall)	1	2	3	4	9

For each area, I'm now going to ask you how concerned you are about experiencing different types of crime, both during the day and at night.

11. If you were in the (area) during the *day,*
how concerned would you be about being physically attacked or threatened?
☛ *SHOW CARD 2. READ EACH AREA IN TURN. (eg. What about in Hyde Park during the day?)*

	not concerned	a little concerned	quite concerned	very concerned	don't know
a) George St cinema area/Town Hall	1	2	3	4	9
b) Hyde Park (North and South)	1	2	3	4	9
c) Central Station/Belmore Park	1	2	3	4	9
d) Haymarket/Chinatown	1	2	3	4	9
e) Circular Quay/The Rocks	1	2	3	4	9
f) Retail core (Wynyard/Martin Place/Pitt St Mall)	1	2	3	4	9

12. If you were in the (area) during the *night,*
how concerned would you be about being physically attacked or threatened?
☛ *SHOW CARD 2. READ EACH AREA IN TURN. (eg. What about in Hyde Park during the night?)*

	not concerned	a little concerned	quite concerned	very concerned	don't know
a) George St cinema area/Town Hall	1	2	3	4	9
b) Hyde Park (North and South)	1	2	3	4	9
c) Central Station/Belmore Park	1	2	3	4	9
d) Haymarket/Chinatown	1	2	3	4	9
e) Circular Quay/The Rocks	1	2	3	4	9
f) Retail core (Wynyard/Martin Place/Pitt St Mall)	1	2	3	4	9

13. If you were in the (area) during the *day,*
how concerned would you be about your property being stolen or damaged?
☛ *SHOW CARD 2. READ EACH AREA IN TURN. (eg. What about in Hyde Park during the day?)*

	not concerned	a little concerned	quite concerned	very concerned	don't know
a) George St cinema area/Town Hall	1	2	3	4	9
b) Hyde Park (North and South)	1	2	3	4	9
c) Central Station/Belmore Park	1	2	3	4	9
d) Haymarket/Chinatown	1	2	3	4	9
e) Circular Quay/The Rocks	1	2	3	4	9
f) Retail core (Wynyard/Martin Place/Pitt St Mall)	1	2	3	4	9

14. If you were in the (area) during the *night,*
how concerned would you be about your property being stolen or damaged?
☞ **SHOW CARD 2. READ EACH AREA IN TURN. (eg. What about in Hyde Park during the night?)**

	not concerned	a little concerned	quite concerned	very concerned	don't know
a) George St cinema area/Town Hall	1	2	3	4	9
b) Hyde Park (North and South)	1	2	3	4	9
c) Central Station/Belmore Park	1	2	3	4	9
d) Haymarket/Chinatown	1	2	3	4	9
e) Circular Quay/The Rocks	1	2	3	4	9
f) Retail core (Wynyard/Martin Place/Pitt St Mall)	1	2	3	4	9

The following questions seek your opinions on how safe the city is *now compared with one year ago*.

---

15. Overall, how safe is the city now compared with one year ago? Is it:
☞ **READ OPTIONS.**

Much safer now	1
A little safer now	2
Same as a year ago	3
A little worse now	4
Much worse now	5
☞ **(DO NOT READ)** Don't know	9

16. How safe is each of the following areas now compared with one year ago?
☞ **SHOW CARD 3. READ EACH AREA IN TURN.**

	much safer now	a little safer now	same as a year ago	a little worse now	much worse now	don't know
a) George St cinema area/Town Hall	1	2	3	4	5	9
b) Hyde Park (North and South)	1	2	3	4	5	9
c) Central Station/Belmore Park	1	2	3	4	5	9
d) Haymarket/Chinatown	1	2	3	4	5	9
e) Circular Quay/The Rocks	1	2	3	4	5	9
f) Retail core (Wynyard/Martin Place/Pitt St Mall)	1	2	3	4	5	9

17. Compared with one year ago,
how concerned would you be about being physically attacked or threatened if you were in the city:
☞ **READ OPTIONS. DO NOT READ 'DON'T KNOW'.**

	less concerned now	same as a year ago	more concerned now	don't know (DO NOT READ)
a) during the day?	1	2	3	9
b) what about at night?	1	2	3	9

18. Compared with one year ago,
how concerned would you be about your property being stolen or damaged if you were in the city:
☞ *READ OPTIONS. DO NOT READ 'DON'T KNOW'.*

	less concerned now	same as a year ago	more concerned now	don't know (DO NOT READ)
a) during the day?	1	2	3	9
b) what about at night?	1	2	3	9

City of Sydney Council and the NSW Police have undertaken a number of initiatives over the last year which aim to make the city safer.

---

19. I am now going to list these initiatives. Please tell me, firstly,
if you are aware of the initiative and, secondly, if you think this initiative makes the city safer.
☞ *READ OPTIONS. DO NOT READ 'DON'T KNOW'.*

	Are you aware of the initiative?		Does the initiative make the city safer?		(DO NOT READ)
	Yes	No	Yes	No	don't know
a) widened footpaths and upgraded city streets	1	2	1	2	9
b) better lighting in parks and city streets	1	2	1	2	9
c) street safety cameras (video surveillance cameras)	1	2	1	2	9
d) emergency video phones – special phones for emergency calls to the Police	1	2	1	2	9
e) community safety information – about how to better protect your property and yourself from crime	1	2	1	2	9
f) Accord with Licensed Premises – an agreement with pubs and clubs to reduce alcohol-related violence and misbehaviour	1	2	1	2	9
g) Safe Taxi Ranks – night time ranks with security guards	1	2	1	2	9

Finally, I'd like to ask you a few questions about whether you or anyone you know have ever felt unsafe in the city.

---

20. Has anything ever happened in the city to you which made you feel unsafe or in danger?
☞ *DO NOT READ OPTIONS.*

Yes 1

No .... 2 ☞ *GO TO Q.25*

21. How long ago did the most recent incident happen?
☞ *READ OPTIONS.*

in the last few months 1

in the last year 2

in the last 5 years 3

more than 5 years ago 4

22. Did it happen during the day or night?
☞ *DO NOT READ OPTIONS.*

Day 1

Night 2

Sunrise/dusk 3

23. Where did it occur?
☞ *READ OPTIONS.*

George St cinema area/Town Hall 1

Hyde Park (North and South) 2

Central Station/Belmore Park 3

Haymarket/Chinatown 4

Circular Quay/The Rocks 5

Retail core (Wynyard/Martin Place/Pitt St Mall) 6

elsewhere *(please specify)* 7

....

....

....

☞ *(DO NOT READ)* don't know/can't remember 9

24. What happened?
☞ *READ OPTIONS. MULTIPLE RESPONSE.*

you were physically attacked or threatened 1

your property was stolen or damaged or
someone tried to steal/damage your property 2

you were verbally abused or threatened 3

something else *(please specify)* 4

....

....

....

☞ *(DO NOT READ)* prefer not to discuss 5

☞ *GO TO Q. 27*

25. Has anything ever happened in the city to anyone you know which made them feel unsafe?

Yes 1

No 2

26. Have you ever witnessed any incident in the city which made you feel unsafe?

Yes 1

No 2

☞ *ASK ALL RESPONDENTS*

27. Do you have any suggestions on how to make the city safer? If yes, please specify:

....
....
....
....
....
....
....
....

THANK THE PERSON FOR THEIR TIME.

ASK THE PERSON IF THEY'D LIKE MORE INFORMATION ON CITY OF SYDNEY COUNCIL'S SAFE CITY STRATEGY AND, IF YES, GIVE THEM A BROCHURE.

RECORD FINISH TIME: _____ : _____ **am/pm**

INTERVIEWER DECLARATION:
I have conducted this interview. To the best of my knowledge it is a full and accurate recording and has been completed in accordance with my interviewing and ICC/ESOMAR guidelines.

Interviewer's Name: ....

Interviewer's Signature: ....

Interviewer's ID: ⬡⬡⬡⬡⬡⬡

Date: _____ / _____ / 2000