

5A Police services — attachment

Definitions for the indicators and descriptors in this attachment are in section 5.11 of the chapter. Data in this Report are examined by the Police Working Group, but have not been formally audited by the Secretariat. A peer review process is also undertaken by the Police Practitioners' Group in the development of the data definitions. Unsourced information was obtained from the Australian, State and Territory governments.

This file is available in Adobe PDF format on the Review web page (www.pc.gov.au/service/gsp). Users without Internet access can contact the Secretariat to obtain these tables (see details on the inside front cover of the Report).

Attachment contents

	Descriptors
Table 5A.1	Police service expenditure, staff and asset descriptors, NSW
Table 5A.2	Police service expenditure, staff and asset descriptors, Victoria
Table 5A.3	Police service expenditure, staff and asset descriptors, Queensland
Table 5A.4	Police service expenditure, staff and asset descriptors, WA
Table 5A.5	Police service expenditure, staff and asset descriptors, SA
Table 5A.6	Police service expenditure, staff and asset descriptors, Tasmania
Table 5A.7	Police service expenditure, staff and asset descriptors, ACT
Table 5A.8	Police service expenditure, staff and asset descriptors, NT
Table 5A.9	Treatment of assets by police agencies, 2004-05
Table 5A.10	Concordance of individual police agency outputs with nationally agreed service delivery areas
Table 5A.11	Real recurrent expenditure (less revenue from own sources and payroll tax) on police services per person (2004-05 dollars)
Table 5A.12	Real recurrent expenditure (less revenue from own sources) per person on police services, by service delivery area, 2001-02 (2004-05 dollars)
Table 5A.13	Real recurrent expenditure (less revenue from own sources) per person on police services, by service delivery area, 2002-03 (2004-05 dollars)
Table 5A.14	Real recurrent expenditure (less revenue from own sources) per person on police services, by service delivery area, 2003-04 (2004-05 dollars)
Table 5A.15	Real recurrent expenditure (less revenue from own sources) per person on police services, by service delivery area, 2004-05
Table 5A.16	Police staff, by sworn/unsworn status
Table 5A.17	Police staff, by operational status (per cent)
	Performance Indicators for All Service Delivery Areas
Table 5A.18	General satisfaction with services provided by the police
Table 5A.19	Satisfaction with the police — dealing with public order problems and supporting community programs
Table 5A.20	Contact with police in the past 12 months
Table 5A.21	People who had contact with police in the past 12 months: satisfaction with police in most recent contact
Table 5A.22	People who had contact with police in the past 12 months: main reason for satisfaction and dissatisfaction with police service in most recent contact
Table 5A.23	Opinions on statement 'police perform job professionally'
Table 5A.24	Opinions on statement 'police treat people fairly and equally'
Table 5A.25	Opinions on statement 'most police are honest'
Table 5A.26	Opinions on statement 'have confidence in the police'

Attachment contents

Table 5A.27	Trends in complaints
Table 5A.28	Indigenous, sworn and unsworn police staff
Table 5A.29	Police staff, sworn and unsworn, by gender (per cent)
Performance Indicators for Community Safety and Support	
Table 5A.30	Feelings of safety at home alone
Table 5A.31	Feelings of safety walking or jogging locally
Table 5A.32	Feelings of safety on public transport
Table 5A.33	Opinion on whether family violence, sexual assault and other physical assault are problems in the neighbourhood
Table 5A.34	Opinion on whether illegal drugs, housebreaking and motor vehicle theft are problems in the neighbourhood
Table 5A.35	Opinions on whether speeding cars, dangerous or noisy driving, graffiti or other vandalism, louts or gangs and drunken or disorderly behaviour are problems in the neighbourhood
Table 5A.36	Opinion on whether family violence, sexual assault and other physical assault are problems in your State or Territory
Table 5A.37	Opinion on whether illegal drugs, housebreaking and motor vehicle theft are problems in your State or Territory
Table 5A.38	Opinion on whether speeding cars, dangerous or noisy driving, graffiti or other vandalism, louts or gangs and drunken or disorderly behaviour are problems in your State or Territory
Table 5A.39	Whether worried about being a victim by type of crime
Table 5A.40	Victims of homicide — crimes against the person (per 100 000 people)
Table 5A.41	Victims of recorded crimes — crimes against people (per 100 000 persons)
Table 5A.42	Victims of recorded crime — property crime (per 100 000 persons)
Table 5A.43	Reporting rates for selected major offences (per cent)
Table 5A.44	Estimated total victims of crime (unreported and reported) — crimes against the person (per 100 000 people)
Table 5A.45	Estimated total household victims of crime, reported and unreported — crimes against property (per 100 000 households)
Table 5A.46	Real recurrent expenditure (less revenue from own sources and payroll tax) per person on community safety and support (2004-05 dollars)
Performance Indicators for Criminal Investigation	
Table 5A.47	Outcomes of investigations of crimes against the person: 30 day status, 1 January to 31 December 2004
Table 5A.48	Victims of property crime: outcomes of investigations, 30 day status, 1 January to 31 December 2004

Attachment contents

Table 5A.49	Real recurrent expenditure (less revenue from own sources and payroll tax) per person on crime investigation (2004-05 dollars)
	Performance Indicators for Road Safety and Traffic Management
Table 5A.50	People who have driven a motor vehicle in the past 12 months
Table 5A.51	People who drive and who have travelled in a car not wearing a seat belt
Table 5A.52	People who drive and have driven 10 kilometres per hour or more over speed limit
Table 5A.53	People who drive and have driven while over alcohol limit
Table 5A.54	Road fatalities
Table 5A.55	Land transport hospitalisations
Table 5A.56	Real recurrent expenditure (less revenue from own sources and payroll tax) per person on road safety and traffic management (2004-05 dollars)
	Performance Indicators for Services to the Judicial Process
Table 5A.57	Number of deaths in police custody and custody-related operations, 2000 to 2004
Table 5A.58	Outcomes of court cases
Table 5A.59	Juvenile diversions as a proportion of offenders (per cent)
Table 5A.60	Real recurrent expenditure (less revenue from own sources and payroll tax) per person on services to the judicial process (2004-05 dollars)
Table 5A.61	Real costs awarded against the police through criminal actions (2004-05 dollars)
	Performance Indicators for Other Services
Table 5A.62	Real recurrent expenditure (less revenue from own sources and payroll tax) per person on other services (2004-05 dollars)

Descriptors

Table 5A.1

Table 5A.1 Police service expenditure, staff and asset descriptors, NSW

	<i>Unit</i>	<i>2000-01</i>	<i>2001-02</i>	<i>2002-03</i>	<i>2003-04</i>	<i>2004-05</i>
Expenditure						
Recurrent expenditure (a)						
Salaries and payments in the nature of salaries						
Salaries and related payments	\$m	1 076.9	1 068.3	1 204.0	1 237.5	1 285.6
Superannuation	\$m	104.9	107.2	113.9	120.2	128.4
Payroll tax	\$m	70.0	69.5	84.0	79.5	81.0
Total salaries and payments	\$m	1 251.8	1 245.1	1 401.9	1 437.2	1 494.9
Other recurrent expenditure	\$m	333.2	297.7	335.3	378.4	369.8
Depreciation	\$m	52.8	54.5	61.4	69.7	76.2
Total recurrent expenditure	\$m	1 637.8	1 597.3	1 798.7	1 885.3	1 940.9
Net recurrent expenditure						
Revenue from own sources (ROS)	\$m	95.2	51.8	54.9	40.0	36.6
Total recurrent expenditure less ROS and payroll tax	\$m	1 472.7	1 475.9	1 659.8	1 765.8	1 823.3
Capital expenditure						
User cost of capital (b)	\$m	44.9	46.7	51.2	67.7	72.4
Capital expenditure	\$m	47.1	68.1	82.1	77.4	109.3
Expenditure aggregates						
Total cash expenditure (c)	\$m	1 632.1	1 610.8	1 819.3	1 893.0	1 974.0
Total accrual costs (d)	\$m	1 682.7	1 643.9	1 849.8	1 953.0	2 013.3
Staffing costs						
Average police staff costs	\$	78 179	74 001	81 169	78 539	84 241
Average non-police staff costs	\$	58 087	57 252	65 059	66 063	67 717
Staff by Indigenous and operational status (e)						
Operational FTE staff						
Sworn	FTE	12 423	13 265	13 184	14 141	13 796
Civilian	FTE	1 251	1 358	1 263	1 512	1 477
Other	FTE	287	202	116	–	119
Operational FTE staff (f)	FTE	13 961	14 825	14 563	15 653	15 392
Non-operational FTE staff						
Sworn	FTE	873	451	907	868	847
Civilian	FTE	2 087	2 363	2 548	2 400	2 229
Other	FTE	30	96	41	–	35
Non-operational FTE staff	FTE	2 990	2 910	3 496	3 268	3 111
Total staff	FTE	16 951	17 735	18 059	18 921	18 503
Indigenous FTE staff						
Operational	FTE	na	na	na	na	na
Non-operational	FTE	na	na	na	na	na
Indigenous FTE staff (g)	FTE	141	150	168	191	222

Table 5A.1

Table 5A.1 Police service expenditure, staff and asset descriptors, NSW

	<i>Unit</i>	<i>2000-01</i>	<i>2001-02</i>	<i>2002-03</i>	<i>2003-04</i>	<i>2004-05</i>
Assets by value						
Land	\$'000	173 772	182 844	209 529	266 924	270 636
Buildings and fittings	\$'000	356 132	367 004	410 685	409 225	439 204
Other	\$'000	204 811	216 157	229 120	437 038	465 771
Total value of assets	\$'000	734 715	766 005	849 334	1 113 187	1 175 611

- (a) From 2002-03, salaries and payments in the nature of salaries include long service leave, workers' compensation insurance and fringe benefits tax.
- (b) User cost of capital on value of assets (excluding land).
- (c) Comprises salaries and payments in the nature of salary, other recurrent expenditure, and capital expenditure.
- (d) Comprises salaries and payments in the nature of salary, other recurrent expenditure, depreciation, and the user cost of capital.
- (e) Counts are headcounts at 30 June, except for 2000/01 and 2002/03.
- (f) Staff by operational/ non-operational status are full time equivalent (FTE) for all years apart from 2001-02 when a head count at 30 June was used. The 2001-02 figures are therefore not comparable with other years. As of July 2002 parking patrol staff are no longer part of NSW Police function. A head count is used for Indigenous data for all years.
- (g) Relies on employees self declaring their Indigenous status. Counts are FTE except for 2001-02 and 2003-04 and therefore not comparable.

na Not available. – Nil or rounded to zero.

Source: State and Territory governments (unpublished).

Table 5A.2

Table 5A.2 **Police service expenditure, staff and asset descriptors, Victoria**

	<i>Unit</i>	<i>2000-01</i>	<i>2001-02</i>	<i>2002-03</i>	<i>2003-04</i>	<i>2004-05</i>
Expenditure						
Recurrent expenditure						
Salaries and payments in the nature of salaries						
Salaries and related payments	\$m	640.2	716.0	762.3	794.2	867.7
Superannuation	\$m	78.3	62.7	75.3	86.9	94.5
Payroll tax	\$m	37.1	38.9	42.3	43.6	46.7
Total salaries and payments	\$m	755.6	817.7	879.8	924.8	1 008.9
Other recurrent expenditure	\$m	260.4	266.1	291.3	305.7	296.2
Depreciation	\$m	15.1	14.2	15.8	21.1	27.8
Total recurrent expenditure	\$m	1 031.2	1 097.9	1 186.8	1 251.6	1 332.9
Net recurrent expenditure						
Revenue from own sources (ROS)	\$m	8.9	7.4	4.2	11.1	10.5
Total recurrent expenditure less ROS and payroll tax	\$m	985.2	1 051.6	1 140.3	1 196.8	1 275.6
Capital expenditure						
User cost of capital (a)	\$m	16.7	19.7	24.5	32.9	33.2
Capital expenditure	\$m	20.1	51.8	77.5	69.5	61.0
Expenditure aggregates						
Total cash expenditure (b)	\$m	1 036.2	1 135.6	1 248.6	1 300.0	1 366.1
Total accrual costs (c)	\$m	1 047.9	1 117.6	1 211.3	1 284.5	1 366.1
Staffing costs						
Average police staff costs	\$	71 282	73 341	75 636	78 965	84 779
Average non-police staff costs	\$	35 241	40 356	46 113	45 237	47 624
Staff by Indigenous and operational status						
Operational FTE staff						
Sworn	FTE	9 232	9 642	9 936	9 981	10 097
Civilian	FTE	180	199	276	247	296
Other	FTE	135	141	141	145	146
Operational FTE staff (d)	FTE	9 547	9 982	10 353	10 373	10 539
Non-operational FTE staff						
Sworn	FTE	256	284	320	319	349
Civilian	FTE	1 557	1 615	1 721	1 912	1 936
Other	FTE	379	267	119	160	211
Non-operational FTE staff	FTE	2 192	2 166	2 160	2 391	2 496
Total staff	FTE	11 739	12 148	12 513	12 764	13 035
Indigenous FTE staff						
Operational	FTE	na	na	na	9	na
Non-operational	FTE	na	na	na	–	na
Indigenous FTE staff (d)	FTE	na	na	na	na	–

Table 5A.2

Table 5A.2 Police service expenditure, staff and asset descriptors, Victoria

	<i>Unit</i>	<i>2000-01</i>	<i>2001-02</i>	<i>2002-03</i>	<i>2003-04</i>	<i>2004-05</i>
Assets by value						
Land	\$'000	109 676	110 662	110 883	175 694	179 810
Buildings and fittings	\$'000	158 762	190 463	246 298	340 622	322 275
Other	\$'000	50 200	55 414	59 792	70 658	93 327
Total value of assets	\$'000	318 638	356 539	416 973	586 974	595 412

- (a) User cost of capital on value of assets (excluding land).
- (b) Comprises salaries and payments in the nature of salary, other recurrent expenditure, and capital expenditure.
- (c) Comprises salaries and payments in the nature of salary, other recurrent expenditure, depreciation, and the user cost of capital.
- (d) Prior to 2003-04, Victoria police were unable to separate Indigenous and non-Indigenous staff. Relies on employees self declaring their Indigenous status.

na Not available. – Nil or rounded to zero

Source: State and Territory governments (unpublished).

Table 5A.3

Table 5A.3 Police service expenditure, staff and asset descriptors, Queensland

	<i>Unit</i>	<i>2000-01</i>	<i>2001-02</i>	<i>2002-03</i>	<i>2003-04</i>	<i>2004-05</i>
Expenditure						
Recurrent expenditure						
Salaries and payments in the nature of salaries						
Salaries and related payments	\$m	540.0	581.4	621.7	664.7	711.9
Superannuation	\$m	70.3	75.0	81.5	87.5	94.2
Payroll tax	\$m	29.2	30.6	32.5	34.8	37.6
Total salaries and payments	\$m	639.5	687.0	735.7	787.0	843.8
Other recurrent expenditure	\$m	150.9	164.0	165.8	183.9	164.4
Depreciation (a)	\$m	24.6	32.0	35.4	38.9	45.1
Total recurrent expenditure	\$m	815.1	882.9	936.8	1 009.8	1 053.3
Net recurrent expenditure						
Revenue from own sources (ROS)	\$m	44.8	51.9	32.9	29.3	37.5
Total recurrent expenditure less ROS and payroll tax	\$m	741.0	800.3	871.4	945.7	- 74.1
Capital expenditure						
User cost of capital (b)	\$m	44.5	45.9	49.7	56.5	67.0
Capital expenditure (c)	\$m	83.3	96.5	83.2	88.0	110.8
Expenditure aggregates						
Total cash expenditure (d)	\$m	873.8	947.4	984.7	1 059.0	276.0
Total accrual costs (e)	\$m	859.6	928.8	986.6	1 066.3	277.4
Staffing costs						
Average police staff costs	\$	66 456	68 946	72 327	75 564	79 285
Average non-police staff costs	\$	na	42 441	44 645	45 246	46 731
Staff by Indigenous and operational status						
Operational FTE staff						
Sworn (f)	FTE	6 979	7 254	7 407	7 701	7 967
Civilian (g)	FTE	na	1 842	1 567	1 291	1 295
Other (h)	FTE	135	151	146	143	148
Operational FTE staff (e)	FTE	7 114	9 247	9 120	9 135	9 410
Non-operational FTE staff						
Sworn (f)	FTE	755	741	773	795	798
Civilian (g)	FTE	2 661	891	1 221	1 486	1 443
Other (h)	FTE	325	315	293	285	299
Non-operational FTE staff	FTE	3 741	1 947	2 287	2 566	2 540
Total staff	FTE	10 855	11 194	11 407	11 701	11 950
Indigenous FTE staff						
Operational	FTE	na	na	na	na	na
Non-operational	FTE	na	na	na	na	na
Indigenous FTE staff (i)	FTE	na	na	na	na	na

Table 5A.3

Table 5A.3 Police service expenditure, staff and asset descriptors, Queensland

	<i>Unit</i>	<i>2000-01</i>	<i>2001-02</i>	<i>2002-03</i>	<i>2003-04</i>	<i>2004-05</i>
Assets by value						
Land	\$'000	119 325	125 724	134 437	160 575	229 196
Buildings and fittings	\$'000	427 096	413 973	464 442	557 026	664 477
Other	\$'000	129 108	159 937	157 355	149 215	173 499
Total value of assets	\$'000	675 529	699 634	756 234	866 816	1 067 172

- (a) Depreciation is calculated on a straight-line basis so as to write off net cost or revalued amount of each depreciable asset, less its estimated residual value, progressively over its estimated useful life.
- (b) User cost of capital on value of assets (excluding land).
- (c) For 2000-01, capital expenditure excludes proceeds from sales (for example, motor vehicles) and donated assets and inventory.
- (d) Comprises salaries and payments in the nature of salary, other recurrent expenditure, and capital expenditure.
- (e) Comprises salaries and payments in the nature of salary, other recurrent expenditure, depreciation, and the user cost of capital.
- (f) The Queensland Police's definitions of operational and non-operational status for sworn officers do not align with those of the national data dictionary. Care needs to be taken when comparing these results with other jurisdictions.
- (g) The Queensland Police Service does not count civilians by operational and non-operational status. The data include all civilian staff as non-operational members.
- (h) Operational other includes police liaison officers, assistant watchhouse officers, and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander police. Non-operational other includes police recruits and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander trainees.
- (i) Indigenous staff numbers relate to those staff who self identify as being of Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander descent. Queensland Police does not record target groups by operational status.
- na** Not available – Nil or rounded to zero.

Source: State and Territory governments (unpublished).

Table 5A.4

Table 5A.4 Police service expenditure, staff and asset descriptors, WA

	<i>Unit</i>	<i>2000-01</i>	<i>2001-02</i>	<i>2002-03</i>	<i>2003-04</i>	<i>2004-05</i>
Expenditure						
Recurrent expenditure						
Salaries and payments in the nature of salaries						
Salaries and related payments	\$m	341.0	354.3	367.5	396.8	428.0
Superannuation	\$m	31.3	32.8	40.6	36.1	45.0
Payroll tax (a)	\$m	19.5	20.1	21.3	22.5	24.4
Total salaries and payments	\$m	391.8	407.2	429.4	455.4	497.4
Other recurrent expenditure	\$m	87.5	121.1	126.4	144.5	162.6
Depreciation (b)	\$m	8.7	10.0	14.8	16.8	17.0
Total recurrent expenditure	\$m	488.0	538.4	570.5	616.7	676.9
Net recurrent expenditure						
Revenue from own sources (ROS)	\$m	21.7	17.0	15.6	19.2	19.4
Total recurrent expenditure less ROS and payroll tax	\$m	446.8	501.3	533.7	575.0	633.2
Capital expenditure (d)						
User cost of capital (e)	\$m	18.0	19.3	22.2	23.5	27.0
Capital expenditure	\$m	74.1	26.0	29.9	57.3	43.4
Expenditure aggregates						
Total cash expenditure (f)	\$m	553.4	554.4	585.7	657.2	703.4
Total accrual costs (g)	\$m	505.9	557.7	592.7	640.2	703.9
Staffing costs						
Average police staff costs	\$	69 456	72 072	76 503	80 462	86 480
Average non-police staff costs	\$	51 884	53 323	54 142	56 483	58 105
Staff by Indigenous and operational status						
Operational FTE staff						
Sworn	FTE	4 583	4 622	4 518	4 449	4 507
Civilian	FTE	751	741	706	664	692
Other	FTE	101	105	115	123	128
Operational FTE staff	FTE	5 435	5 468	5 339	5 236	5 327
Non-operational FTE staff						
Sworn	FTE	159	156	268	378	383
Civilian	FTE	313	306	323	376	436
Other	FTE	38	27	24	23	26
Non-operational FTE staff	FTE	510	489	615	777	845
Total staff	FTE	5 945	5 957	5 954	6 013	6 172
Indigenous FTE staff						
Operational	FTE	99	104	136	158	170
Non-operational	FTE	–	–	1	17	20
Indigenous FTE staff (h)	FTE	99	104	137	175	190

Table 5A.4 **Police service expenditure, staff and asset descriptors, WA**

	<i>Unit</i>	<i>2000-01</i>	<i>2001-02</i>	<i>2002-03</i>	<i>2003-04</i>	<i>2004-05</i>
Assets by value						
Land	\$'000	94 883	88 373	92 510	91 777	100 633
Buildings and fittings	\$'000	115 994	165 888	196 332	200 868	215 112
Other	\$'000	108 558	75 190	80 633	93 128	122 361
Total value of assets	\$'000	319 435	329 451	369 475	385 773	438 106

- (a) WA does not pay payroll tax, however the 'notional' payroll tax rate for WA has been estimated.
- (b) Depreciation based on the straight-line method of calculation.
- (c) Revenue from own sources data for 2001-02 have been revised from previously published data.
- (d) Capital expenditure data for 2001-02 have been revised from previously published data.
- (e) User cost of capital on value of assets (excluding land).
- (f) Comprises salaries and payments in the nature of salary, other recurrent expenditure, and capital expenditure.
- (g) Comprises salaries and payments in the nature of salary, other recurrent expenditure, depreciation, and the user cost of capital.
- (h) Employees Indigenous status is provided on a voluntary basis.
– Nil or rounded to zero.

Source: State and Territory governments (unpublished).

Table 5A.5

Table 5A.5 **Police service expenditure, staff and asset descriptors, SA**

	<i>Unit</i>	<i>2000-01</i>	<i>2001-02</i>	<i>2002-03</i>	<i>2003-04</i>	<i>2004-05</i>
Expenditure						
Recurrent expenditure						
Salaries and payments in the nature of salaries						
Salaries and related payments (a)	\$m	242.3	258.8	288.1	281.4	325.9
Superannuation	\$m	31.8	29.7	32.9	34.4	40.2
Payroll tax	\$m	15.2	15.9	16.4	17.0	18.8
Total salaries and payments	\$m	289.2	304.4	337.4	332.8	384.9
Other recurrent expenditure (b)	\$m	67.1	80.8	79.6	86.3	86.2
Depreciation (c)	\$m	9.4	8.5	9.5	9.4	9.7
Total recurrent expenditure	\$m	365.7	393.6	426.5	428.5	480.8
Net recurrent expenditure						
Revenue from own sources (ROS) (d)	\$m	32.7	34.9	36.3	59.4	63.9
Total recurrent expenditure less ROS and payroll tax	\$m	317.9	342.8	373.8	352.0	398.1
Capital expenditure						
User cost of capital (e)	\$m	11.2	12.4	12.1	12.1	11.0
Capital expenditure (f)	\$m	29.5	21.9	5.3	9.7	11.5
Expenditure aggregates						
Total cash expenditure (g)	\$m	385.8	407.1	422.2	428.8	482.6
Total accrual costs (h)	\$m	377.0	406.1	438.6	440.6	491.8
Staffing costs (i)						
Average police staff costs	\$	68 961	72 559	77 507	77 220	88 610
Average non-police staff costs	\$	43 290	36 583	46 480	46 838	45 346
Staff by Indigenous and operational status						
Operational FTE staff						
Sworn	FTE	3 512	3 631	3 690	3 641	3 725
Civilian	FTE	601	625	684	647	665
Other	FTE	33	34	34	30	26
Operational FTE staff	FTE	4 146	4 290	4 408	4 318	4 416
Non-operational FTE staff						
Sworn	FTE	70	71	76	69	76
Civilian	FTE	205	214	213	225	228
Other	FTE	136	105	48	86	141
Non-operational FTE staff	FTE	411	390	337	380	445
Total staff	FTE	4 557	4 680	4 745	4 698	4 861
Indigenous FTE staff						
Operational	FTE	52	58	59	57	55
Non-operational	FTE	2	5	8	6	2
Indigenous FTE staff	FTE	54	63	67	63	57

Table 5A.5

Table 5A.5 Police service expenditure, staff and asset descriptors, SA

	<i>Unit</i>	<i>2000-01</i>	<i>2001-02</i>	<i>2002-03</i>	<i>2003-04</i>	<i>2004-05</i>
Assets by value						
Land (j)	\$'000	16 840	22 987	22 987	23 002	36 705
Buildings and fittings (k)	\$'000	100 136	140 861	135 305	130 274	103 299
Other	\$'000	40 148	14 291	15 521	20 820	34 228
Total value of assets	\$'000	157 124	178 139	173 813	174 096	174 232

- (a) The decrease in salary expenditure in 2003-04 mainly reflects a one-off increase in workers' compensation expense in 2002-03 (\$19.1million) due to a revised methodology for assessing workers' compensation. For 2004-05, the increase in salary mainly reflects Enterprise Bargaining increases
- (b) Other recurrent expenditure rose in 2003-04, due predominantly to the South Australian handgun buyback program, which operated between 1 October 2003 and 31 March 2004, with compensation payments of \$13.2 million. Includes net revaluation decrement of \$5.4 million. 2004 included \$13.2 million one-off expenditure for handgun buyback scheme.
- (c) Depreciation based on the straight-line method of calculation.
- (d) Revenue from own sources for 2003-04 includes \$11.5 million Commonwealth Revenue being reimbursement of the compensation and administrative expenses attributable to the South Australian handgun buyback program, which operated between 1 October 2003 and 31 March 2004, and \$14.9 million increase in funding from the Community Road Safety Fund.
- (e) User cost of capital on value of assets (excluding land).
- (f) For 2003-04, increased capital expenditure mainly reflects higher expenditure on major projects including \$1.5 million on Mobile Data Terminals, Counter Terrorism \$1.0 million, Police Call Centre \$0.3 million and Road Safety Project \$1.0 million. For 2001-02, South Australia Police's (SAPOL) investment program included many one off major capital projects including Adelaide Police Station Relocation and Netley Police Complex.
- (g) Comprises salaries and payments in the nature of salary, other recurrent expenditure, and capital expenditure.
- (h) Comprises salaries and payments in the nature of salary, other recurrent expenditure, depreciation, and the user cost of capital.
- (i) Long service leave accruals from 2001-02 onwards have been calculated on a person by person basis resulting in a more accurate allocation of costs between police and non-police.
- (j) Land revalued in 2005 resulting in a \$14.1 million increment.
- (k) Buildings and improvement revalued in 2005 resulting in a \$21.4 million decrement

Source: State and Territory governments (unpublished).

Table 5A.6

Table 5A.6 Police service expenditure, staff and asset descriptors, Tasmania

	<i>Unit</i>	<i>2000-01</i>	<i>2001-02</i>	<i>2002-03</i>	<i>2003-04</i>	<i>2004-05</i>
Expenditure (a)						
Recurrent expenditure						
Salaries and payments in the nature of salaries						
Salaries and related payments	\$m	66.5	73.3	76.4	80.2	89.3
Superannuation	\$m	6.7	7.4	8.0	8.9	9.0
Payroll tax	\$m	4.5	5.0	5.1	4.9	6.3
Total salaries and payments	\$m	77.7	85.6	89.4	93.9	104.6
Other recurrent expenditure	\$m	24.7	26.9	29.2	32.8	31.9
Depreciation	\$m	1.7	1.8	1.3	1.4	2.3
Total recurrent expenditure	\$m	104.1	114.3	120.0	128.1	138.8
Net recurrent expenditure						
Revenue from own sources (ROS)	\$m	4.8	4.4	7.1	8.7	8.4
Total recurrent expenditure less ROS and payroll tax	\$m	94.8	105.0	107.8	114.5	124.0
Capital expenditure						
User cost of capital (b)	\$m	4.0	4.2	4.1	6.0	6.7
Capital expenditure	\$m	0.4	1.0	2.2	3.0	1.0
Expenditure aggregates						
Total cash expenditure (c)	\$m	102.8	113.5	120.9	129.7	137.5
Total accrual costs (d)	\$m	108.0	118.6	124.1	134.1	145.4
Staffing costs						
Average police staff costs	\$	57 227	61 586	65 463	66 439	73 369
Average non-police staff costs	\$	46 500	50 886	50 597	53 992	57 843
Staff by Indigenous and operational status						
Operational FTE staff						
Sworn	FTE	998	1 004	1 001	1 001	1 008
Civilian	FTE	185	209	202	216	218
Other	FTE	–	–	–	–	–
Operational FTE staff	FTE	1 183	1 213	1 203	1 217	1 226
Non-operational FTE staff						
Sworn	FTE	83	90	93	116	126
Civilian	FTE	155	150	150	149	152
Other	FTE	–	–	–	–	–
Non-operational FTE staff	FTE	238	240	243	265	278
Total staff	FTE	1 421	1 453	1 446	1 482	1 504
Indigenous FTE staff						
Operational	FTE	20	21	21	20	22
Non-operational	FTE	4	4	2	2	2
Indigenous FTE staff	FTE	–	–	–	–	–

Table 5A.6

Table 5A.6 Police service expenditure, staff and asset descriptors, Tasmania

	<i>Unit</i>	<i>2000-01</i>	<i>2001-02</i>	<i>2002-03</i>	<i>2003-04</i>	<i>2004-05</i>
Assets by value						
Land	\$'000	7 917	7 776	7 442	13 819	13 837
Buildings and fittings	\$'000	46 047	46 922	46 230	69 686	77 750
Other	\$'000	3 364	5 885	4 853	5 173	5 471
Total value of assets	\$'000	57 328	60 583	58 525	88 678	97 058

- (a) Financial data for 2000-01 onwards may not be consistent with previous years data because the figures are prepared on an accrual basis rather than an adjusted cash basis.
- (b) User cost of capital on value of assets (excluding land). Capital expenditure includes only capital appropriations
- (c) Comprises salaries and payments in the nature of salary, other recurrent expenditure, and capital expenditure.
- (d) Comprises salaries and payments in the nature of salary, other recurrent expenditure, depreciation, and the user cost of capital.
– Nil or rounded to zero.

Source: State and Territory governments (unpublished).

Table 5A.7

Table 5A.7 Police service expenditure, staff and asset descriptors, ACT (a)

	<i>Unit</i>	<i>2000-01</i>	<i>2001-02</i>	<i>2002-03</i>	<i>2003-04</i>	<i>2004-05</i>
Expenditure						
Recurrent expenditure						
Salaries and payments in the nature of salaries						
Salaries and related payments	\$m	48.2	49.5	53.6	56.0	60.8
Superannuation (b)	\$m	6.3	5.3	6.6	7.7	8.4
Payroll tax (c)	\$m	–	–	–	–	–
Total salaries and payments	\$m	54.4	54.8	60.2	63.7	69.3
Other recurrent expenditure (d)	\$m	17.4	17.0	18.6	21.3	21.0
Depreciation	\$m	1.1	1.9	2.9	2.7	2.3
Total recurrent expenditure	\$m	73.0	73.7	81.7	87.7	92.6
Net recurrent expenditure						
Revenue from own sources (ROS)	\$m	0.4	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.5
Total recurrent expenditure less ROS and payroll tax (e)	\$m	72.6	73.2	81.3	87.3	92.1
Capital expenditure						
User cost of capital (f)	\$m	1.8	2.9	2.8	2.7	2.9
Capital expenditure	\$m	1.1	1.4	1.6	1.4	6.4
Expenditure aggregates						
Total cash expenditure (g)	\$m	73.0	73.2	80.4	86.4	96.7
Total accrual costs (h)	\$m	74.8	76.6	84.5	90.4	95.5
Staffing costs (i)						
Average police staff costs	\$	72 191	70 318	75 301	78 680	86 434
Average non-police staff costs	\$	63 497	69 858	75 610	78 785	86 189
Staff by Indigenous and operational status						
Operational FTE staff						
Sworn	FTE	575	571	585	607	596
Civilian	FTE	99	108	114	122	110
Other	FTE	–	–	–	–	–
Operational FTE staff (c)	FTE	674	679	699	729	706
Non-operational FTE staff						
Sworn	FTE	16	13	9	11	10
Civilian	FTE	86	89	91	69	86
Other	FTE	–	–	–	–	–
Non-operational FTE staff (c)	FTE	102	102	100	80	96
Total staff	FTE	776	781	799	809	802
Indigenous FTE staff						
Operational	FTE	6	7	8	10	9
Non-operational	FTE	–	–	–	–	2
Indigenous FTE staff (c)	FTE	6	7	8	10	11

Table 5A.7

Table 5A.7 Police service expenditure, staff and asset descriptors, ACT (a)

	<i>Unit</i>	<i>2000-01</i>	<i>2001-02</i>	<i>2002-03</i>	<i>2003-04</i>	<i>2004-05</i>
Assets by value						
Land	\$'000	5 500	6 630	6 630	6 630	8 539
Buildings and fittings (h)	\$'000	20 420	34 465	33 597	33 097	35 814
Other	\$'000	2 677	1 325	1 181	1 001	856
Total value of assets	\$'000	28 597	42 420	41 408	40 728	45 209

- (a) Expenditure for police staff is allocated on the basis of number of sworn members as a proportion of total staff numbers applied against total super salaries expenditure. The same applies for non-police staff.
- (b) The variance in superannuation for 2001-02 was a result of new members joining the PSS Super Scheme, which had a lower contribution than the CSS. ComSuper premiums were also lower during the period.
- (c) The Australian Federal Police (AFP) is exempt from paying payroll tax.
- (d) As a result of a comprehensive review of enabling costs applicable to ACT Policing in 2000-01, the formula previously applied to the calculation of staffing and expenditure data has been significantly revised. This methodological shift means that staff and expenditure data for 2000-01 onwards are not directly comparable with data for years prior to 2000-01.
- (e) The ACT does not pay payroll tax, however the 'notional' payroll tax rate for the ACT has been estimated.
- (f) User cost of capital on value of assets (excluding land).
- (g) Comprises salaries and payments in the nature of salary, other recurrent expenditure, and capital expenditure.
- (h) Comprises salaries and payments in the nature of salary, other recurrent expenditure, depreciation, and the user cost of capital.
- (i) The decrease in police staff costs and the increase in police non-staff costs in 2001-02 was due to the additional use of non-police staff following delays in police recruitment.
– Nil or rounded to zero.

Source: State and Territory governments (unpublished).

Table 5A.8

Table 5A.8 Police service expenditure, staff and asset descriptors, NT

	<i>Unit</i>	<i>2000-01</i>	<i>2001-02</i>	<i>2002-03</i>	<i>2003-04</i>	<i>2004-05</i>
Expenditure (a)						
Recurrent expenditure						
Salaries and payments in the nature of salaries						
Salaries and related payments	\$m	71.6	76.6	77.8	90.2	102.4
Superannuation (b)	\$m	7.6	7.9	8.2	9.7	10.7
Payroll tax	\$m	4.7	5.0	6.0	5.7	6.2
Total salaries and payments	\$m	83.8	89.5	92.0	105.6	119.4
Other recurrent expenditure	\$m	18.9	23.0	29.8	36.2	33.5
Depreciation (c)	\$m	–	4.9	4.4	4.6	5.8
Total recurrent expenditure	\$m	102.7	117.5	126.3	146.4	158.7
Net recurrent expenditure						
Revenue from own sources (ROS)	\$m	6.3	9.4	10.4	16.5	17.4
Total recurrent expenditure less ROS and payroll tax	\$m	91.7	103.0	109.9	124.2	135.1
Capital expenditure						
User cost of capital (d)	\$m	12.1	16.1	8.2	8.2	8.8
Capital expenditure (e)	\$m	15.6	11.3	7.9	16.3	16.2
Expenditure aggregates						
Total cash expenditure (f)	\$m	118.4	123.8	129.8	158.1	169.1
Total accrual costs (g)	\$m	114.8	133.6	134.5	154.6	167.5
Staffing costs						
Average police staff costs	\$	77 174	83 144	103 911	109 371	114 099
Average non-police staff costs	\$	61 959	49 646	28 572	33 328	35 000
Staff by Indigenous and operational status						
Operational FTE staff						
Sworn	FTE	850	850	754	809	756
Civilian	FTE	88	93	106	141	51
Other	FTE	–	–	166	175	169
Operational FTE staff	FTE	938	943	1 026	1 125	976
Non-operational FTE staff						
Sworn	FTE	98	104	29	37	160
Civilian	FTE	84	113	102	77	183
Other	FTE	–	–	–	–	21
Non-operational FTE staff	FTE	182	217	131	114	364
Total staff	FTE	1 120	1 160	1 157	1 239	1 340
Indigenous FTE staff						
Operational	FTE	55	45	47	57	66
Non-operational	FTE	5	6	7	7	10
Indigenous FTE staff (h)	FTE	60	51	54	64	76

Table 5A.8

Table 5A.8 Police service expenditure, staff and asset descriptors, NT

	<i>Unit</i>	<i>2000-01</i>	<i>2001-02</i>	<i>2002-03</i>	<i>2003-04</i>	<i>2004-05</i>
Assets by value						
Land	\$'000	na	na	5 226	5 506	5 503
Buildings and fittings (i)	\$'000	116 680	165 206	82 404	80 322	82 466
Other	\$'000	34 943	36 626	19 798	21 728	27 314
Total value of assets	\$'000	151 623	201 832	107 428	107 556	115 283

- (a) The NT Police are part of a tri-service agency incorporating the NT Fire and Rescue Service and the NT Emergency Service. Where possible, all expenditure directly relating to the non-police arms of the department has been excluded.
- (b) Based on actuarial advice on the cost of the schemes, not actuals.
- (c) Depreciation is calculated using a straight-line method.
- (d) Prior to 2002-03 the NT could not separate asset values between land and buildings and therefore, user cost of capital is applied to both land and buildings, plus other assets.
- (e) For 2000-01, data include capital works organised and paid for by another department on an agency basis.
- (f) Comprises salaries and payments in the nature of salary, other recurrent expenditure, and capital expenditure.
- (g) Comprises salaries and payments in the nature of salary, other recurrent expenditure, depreciation, and the user cost of capital.
- (h) Includes police auxiliaries and Aboriginal community police officers.
- (i) Value of assets at 2002-03 is based on written down value. Most land and buildings were revalued at 30 June 2003 based on fair value.

na Not available. – Nil or rounded to zero.

Source: State and Territory governments (unpublished).

Table 5A.9

Table 5A.9 Treatment of assets by police agencies, 2004-05

Revaluation method (b)	Land	Buildings	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT (a)
			Market value	Fair value	Market value	Current use	Deprival	Deprival	Market	Market
			Written down replacement value	Fair value	Police stations/establishment - written down replacement value; residential buildings and commercial style - market value.	Current use	Deprival	Deprival	Market	Market
	Other assets		Straight-line depreciation over useful life	na	Cost	Cost	na	Deprival	Deprival	Cost - only land & buildings revalued
Frequency of revaluations	Land		3 yrs	3 yrs	Annual valuations over 5 year rolling plan	Annual	3 yrs	5 yrs	5 yrs	5yrs
	Buildings		3 yrs	na	Annual valuations over 5 year rolling plan	Annual	3 yrs	5 yrs	na	5yrs
	Other assets		Annual capitalisation of group	na	No other asset classes are revalued	2 yrs	na	5 yrs	3 yrs	na
Useful asset lives (years) (c), (d)	Buildings		40 yrs; subject to revaluation	1-95yrs	50 yrs	50 yrs	15-60 yrs	3-122 yrs	25-60 yrs	20-50yrs

Table 5A.9

Table 5A.9 Treatment of assets by police agencies, 2004-05

	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT (a)
Plant & equip.	Comm. equip. 6.5 years	5-20yrs	5-30 yrs	5-20 yrs	10 yrs	2-20 yrs	3-25 yrs	1-10yrs
IT equip. (e)	4 yrs	5yrs	4yrs	4 yrs	3 yrs	5 yrs	3 yrs	3-5yrs
Office equip. (f)	10 yrs	5-40yrs	3-40 yrs	7 yrs	10 yrs	2-20 yrs	5 yrs	na
Motor vehicles	Owned vehicles 6.5 yrs	6-16yrs	1-10 yrs	5 yrs	3-10 yrs	5 yrs	5 yrs	1-10yrs
Threshold capitalisation levels	Nil	na	1 000	5 000	10 000	5 000	na	5 000
	500	1 000	1 000	5 000	10 000	5 000	2 000	5 000
Other assets (g)	5 000	1 000	1 000	5 000	10 000	5 000	2 000	5 000
Current asset value as at 30 June 2005 (\$'000)	270 636	179 810	229 196	100 633	36 705	13 837	8 539	5 503
	439 204	322 275	664 477	215 112	103 299	77 750	35 814	82 466
Plant and equipment			63 288	11 268	7 334			2 396
IT equip.	75 269	1 604	24 577	21 814	2 752	193	na	143
Office equip.	33 188	2 912	5 265	837	92	-	na	na
Motor vehicles	1 506	5 456	45 849	2 400	3 131	79	na	15 188

(a) Services reported under accrual accounting as at 1 July 2002.

(b) DRC = depreciated replacement cost; CV = current value; market value = current (net) value, market selling price or exchange value; and deprival value may be either the DRC of an asset of a similar service potential or the stream of its future economic benefits.

(c) Estimated as (1/depreciation rate).

(d) Asset lives for some assets have been grouped with other classifications.

(e) For some jurisdictions, IT equipment includes software.

(f) Office equipment includes furniture, fittings and communications equipment.

(g) For WA, other assets include aircraft, vessels and livestock; buildings include leased buildings; and plant and equipment include aircraft, vessels, livestock, artwork and leased equipment.

na Not available. - Nil or rounded to zero.

Source: State and Territory governments (unpublished).

Table 5A.10

Table 5A.10 Concordance of individual police agency outputs with nationally agreed service delivery areas

NSW	Vic	Q/ld	WA	SA (a)	Tas	ACT	NT
Community safety and support (b)							
Community support	Crime prevention; incident; emergency and event management	Proactive problem oriented policing Preservation of public safety	Community spt, crime prevention and public order. Response to offences Emergency mgt & coordination (c)	Public order Emergency Response and Management	Policing spt to the community Major incident and emergency mgt	Crime prevention, public order and response to offences, emergency mgt planning, regulatory processes, external information services and PROMIS data entry	Community safety, prevention and spt programs Emergency mgt, response and recovery services
Crime investigation							
Criminal investigation	Crime identification and investigation	General duty crime detection, investigation and prosecution Combating organised and major crime	Investigation of offences (d)	Crime prevention	Crime detection and investigation	Investigation of offences	Personal safety Property crime Illicit substances
Road safety and traffic management							
Traffic services (no longer includes infringement processing)	Road safety	Traffic policing, speed mgt and camera operations	Traffic mgt and road safety (d)	Road safety	Traffic law enforcement and road safety (includes infringement processing)	Alcohol and speed detection, traffic patrolling and mobile speed detection, attendance at accidents, community education, liaison and partnerships, other traffic mgt activities	Road safety

Table 5A.10

Table 5A.10 **Concordance of individual police agency outputs with nationally agreed service delivery areas**

NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA (a)	Tas	ACT	NT
Services to the judicial process							
Judicial support	Supporting the justice system	na	Services to the judicial process (e)	Criminal justice services	Support to judicial services	Presentation of evidence, prosecution liaison, justice system processes, custodial services, services to the Coroner, brief preparation and processing.	na
Other services							
		Ethical standards and public accountability (f)	Regulatory and information services (g)		Protection of primary industry and fisheries resources	Services provided on behalf of other agencies	..
Emergency mgt (h)							
<p>(a) The South Australian Government decided to replace the previous output-based performance structure with a Program-based performance structure. There is no material variance in the allocation of resources between program and output structures. Output 1.3 Community Programs, formerly within the Community Safety and Support SDA, has now been included in SA's Crime Prevention Program (Crime investigation SDA).</p> <p>(b) Includes station operations, communications, and general and targeted patrols. For NSW, it also includes the firearms registry.</p> <p>(c) Includes emergency response readiness.</p> <p>(d) Includes brief preparation and processing.</p> <p>(e) Excludes the WA Police Service activity of justice system processes — included in 'other services'.</p> <p>(f) Activities related to ethical standards and public accountability are not unique to the Queensland Police Service. Rather, Queensland is unique in the sense that it identifies these functions via a separate output group.</p> <p>(g) Much of the WA Police Service output has been included in 'community safety and support' (activities of regulatory processes administered by the WA Police Service and external information services). The activity that is included is services provided on behalf of other agencies.</p> <p>(h) Emergency management activities funded by police, but undertaken by State Emergency Services officers.</p> <p>.. Not applicable. na Not available.</p> <p>Source: State and Territory governments (unpublished).</p>							
REPORT ON GOVERNMENT SERVICES 2006							
POLICE SERVICES							

Table 5A.11 Real recurrent expenditure (less revenue from own sources and payroll tax) on police services per person (2004-05 dollars) (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f)

	<i>Unit</i>	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>WA</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>ACT</i>	<i>NT</i>	<i>Aust</i>
Real recurrent expenditure										
2000-01	\$m	1 668	1 116	839	506	360	107	82	104	4 782
2001-02	\$m	1 627	1 159	882	553	378	116	81	114	4 910
2002-03	\$m	1 777	1 221	933	571	400	115	87	118	5 223
2003-04	\$m	1 837	1 245	984	598	366	119	91	129	5 371
2004-05	\$m	1 823	1 276	978	633	398	124	92	135	5 457
Real recurrent expenditure on police services per head of population										
2000-01	\$	257	235	235	269	239	228	260	531	249
2001-02	\$	247	241	242	290	250	245	253	574	253
2002-03	\$	268	251	251	297	263	244	271	593	265
2003-04	\$	275	253	258	306	240	249	281	649	270
2004-05	\$	271	256	251	319	259	257	284	675	280
Average annual change in real recurrent expenditure per person										
2000-01 to 2004-05		1.4	2.3	1.7	4.6	2.1	3.2	2.3	6.8	2.2

- (a) Real recurrent expenditure is recurrent expenditure less revenue from own sources and payroll tax.
- (b) Revenue from own sources includes user charges and other types of revenue (for example, from sale of stores and plant). It excludes fine revenue, money received as a result of warrant execution, and revenue from the issuing of firearm licences.
- (c) Excludes the user cost of capital.
- (d) Population based on ABS estimates for 2004.
- (e) Real recurrent expenditure calculated using ABS GDP Expenditure Implicit Price Deflators 2004-05 = 100.
- (f) As a result of a comprehensive review of enabling costs applicable to ACT Policing in 2000-01, the formula previously applied to the calculation for staffing and expenditure data has been significantly revised. This methodological shift means that data for 2000-01 onwards are not directly comparable with data for years prior to 2000-01.

Source: State and Territory governments (unpublished).

Table 5A.12

Table 5A.12 **Real recurrent expenditure (less revenue from own sources) per person on police services, by service delivery area, 2001-02 (2004-05 dollars) (a), (b), (c), (d)**

	Unit	NSW	Vic	Qld (e)	WA	SA (f)	Tas (g)	ACT (h)	NT (e)	Aust
Expenditure per person										
Community safety and support	\$	150	107	na	136	166	na	137	314	109
Crime investigation	\$	50	73	na	52	31	na	77	132	45
Road safety and traffic management										
\$/person	\$	21	20	na	41	23	na	20	37	19
\$/registered vehicle	\$	36	29	na	57	33	na	31	72	36
Services to the judicial process	\$	26	42	na	42	29	na	17	91	27
Other services	\$	-	-	na	6	-	na	2	-	1
All SDAs	\$	247	241	na	277	250	na	253	574	200
Share of total expenditure										
Community safety and support	%	60.8	44.2	na	49.2	66.6	na	54.1	na	54.5
Crime investigation	%	20.2	30.1	na	18.8	12.5	na	30.5	na	22.5
Road safety and traffic management	%	8.4	8.4	na	14.8	9.2	na	7.9	na	9.3
Services to the judicial process	%	10.5	17.3	na	15.1	11.7	na	6.6	na	13.4
Other services	%	-	-	na	2.2	-	na	0.9	na	0.3
Total for all SDAs	%	100.0	100.0	na	100.0	100.0	na	92.5	na	100.0

Table 5A.12

Table 5A.12 Real recurrent expenditure (less revenue from own sources) per person on police services, by service delivery area, 2001-02 (2004-05 dollars) (a), (b), (c), (d)

	Unit	NSW	Vic	Qld (e)	WA	SA (f)	Tas (g)	ACT (h)	NT (e)	Aust	
(a)	Data have not been subject to extensive tests to determine comparability. Further, some differences in counting rules may exist across jurisdictions as a result of the differing mixes of activities undertaken within each of the common Service Delivery Areas (SDAs).										
(b)	Overheads (for example, infrastructure costs, such as rent on buildings, and vehicle and equipment costs) have been apportioned to these SDAs on a pro rata basis. If 20 per cent of expenditure goes toward crime investigation, for example, then 20 per cent of overheads will be apportioned to crime investigation.										
(c)	May not add to the sum of its components as a result of rounding.										
(d)	Real recurrent expenditure calculated using ABS GDP Expenditure Implicit Price Deflators 2004-05 = 100.										
(e)	Data only available for all key SDAs combined.										
(f)	The allocation of resources in 2000-01 was based on both work activity surveys from a representative sample of four major local service areas in February 2001 and data provided by service areas.										
(g)	The total service delivery area budget incorporates overheads and expenditure associated with Ministerial support and Information Services. These costs are distributed evenly throughout the four key service delivery areas. As in the 1999-2000 results, the data exclude expenditure associated with emergency management and the protection of primary industries and fisheries resources. Costs associated with a new section, Forensic Science Safety in July 2000 have also been excluded.										
(h)	Costs are apportioned across SDAs through use of direct and indirect cost attribution. Where a direct and singular relationship can be established, costs are directly attributed against outcomes (SDAs). In situations where no direct relationship can be identified, or where expenditure is attributable to numerous outcomes, indirect costing systems (based on activity survey data) are used. Indirect cost attribution uses statistical analysis of cost centre activities to apportion costs across the range of outcomes.										

na Not available. – Nil or rounded to zero.

Source: State and Territory governments (unpublished); ABS 2001, *Motor Vehicle Census 2001*, Cat.no. 9309.0, AusInfo, Canberra; tables A.2 and A.26.

Table 5A.13

Table 5A.13 Real recurrent expenditure (less revenue from own sources) per person on police services, by service delivery area, 2002-03 (2004-05 dollars) (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f)

Expenditure per person	Unit	NSW	Vic	Qld (e)	WA	SA (f)	Tas (e)	ACT	NT	Aust
Community safety and support	\$	164	111	na	141	131	na	156	340	129
Crime investigation	\$	59	76	na	59	80	na	77	139	95
Road safety and traffic management										
\$/person	\$	18	21	44	45	18	na	18	37	33
\$/registered vehicle	\$	31	30	67	62	26	na	27	70	51
Services to the judicial process	\$	26	43	na	44	34	na	17	77	35
Other services	\$	-	-	na	7	-	na	2	-	2
All SDAs	\$	268	251	na	296	263	na	251	516	295
Share of total expenditure										
Community safety and support	%	61.3	44.2	na	47.5	49.6	na	62.3	65.9	43.8
Crime investigation	%	22.1	30.1	na	19.9	30.4	na	30.7	26.9	32.3
Road safety and traffic management	%	6.8	8.4	na	15.2	6.9	na	7.0	7.1	11.3
Services to the judicial process	%	9.8	17.3	na	14.9	13.1	na	6.3	13.0	11.9
Other services	%	-	-	na	2.4	-	na	0.9	-	0.7
Total for all SDAs	%	100.0	100.0	na	100.0	100.0	na	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table 5A.13

Table 5A.13 Real recurrent expenditure (less revenue from own sources) per person on police services, by service delivery area, 2002-03 (2004-05 dollars) (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f)

	Unit	NSW	Vic	Qld (e)	WA	SA (f)	Tas (e)	ACT	NT	Aust
--	------	-----	-----	---------	----	--------	---------	-----	----	------

(a) Data have not been subject to extensive tests to determine comparability. Further, some differences in counting rules may exist across jurisdictions as a result of the differing mixes of activities undertaken within each of the common Service Delivery Areas (SDAs).

(b) Overheads (for example, infrastructure costs, such as rent on buildings, and vehicle and equipment costs) have been apportioned to these SDAs on a pro rata basis. If 20 per cent of expenditure goes toward crime investigation, for example, then 20 per cent of overheads will be apportioned to crime investigation.

(c) May not add to the sum of its components as a result of rounding.

(d) Real recurrent expenditure calculated using ABS GDP Expenditure Implicit Price Deflators 2004-05 = 100.

(e) Data only available for all key SDAs combined.

(f) Costs are apportioned across SDAs through use of direct and indirect cost attribution. Where a direct and singular relationship can be established, costs are directly attributed against outcomes (SDAs). In situations where no direct relationship can be identified, or where expenditure is attributable to numerous outcomes, indirect costing systems (based on activity survey data) are used. Indirect cost attribution uses statistical analysis of cost centre activities to apportion costs across the range of outcomes.

na Not available. – Nil or rounded to zero.

Source: State and Territory governments (unpublished); ABS 2002, *Motor Vehicle Census 2002*, Cat.no. 9309.0, AusInfo, Canberra; tables A.2 and A.26.

Table 5A.14

Table 5A.14 Real recurrent expenditure (less revenue from own sources) per person on police services, by service delivery area, 2003-04 (2004-05 dollars) (a), (b), (c), (d), (f), (g), (h), (i)

Expenditure per person	Unit	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA (d)	Tas (e)	ACT (f), (g)	NT (h)	Aust
Community safety and support	\$	157	103	87	148	115	na	185	372	128
Crime investigation	\$	73	80	119	59	81	na	56	152	83
Road safety and traffic management										
\$/person	\$	23	25	45	48	9	na	19	40	29
\$/registered vehicle	\$	40	35	67	65	13	na	28	77	45
Services to the judicial process	\$	22	40	na	44	35	na	21	85	26
Other services	\$	—	5	7	8	—	na	—	—	3
All SDAs	\$	275	253	258	306	240	na	281	649	270
Share of total expenditure										
Community safety and support	%	57.1	40.7	33.8	48.4	48.0	na	65.8	57.3	47.4
Crime investigation	%	26.5	31.6	46.0	19.2	33.8	na	19.9	23.4	30.9
Road safety and traffic management	%	8.5	9.9	17.5	15.5	3.7	na	6.7	6.2	10.9
Services to the judicial process	%	7.9	16.0	na	14.4	14.4	na	7.6	13.0	9.6
Other services	%	—	1.8	2.7	2.5	—	na	—	—	1.2
Total for all SDAs	%	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	na	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table 5A.14 Real recurrent expenditure (less revenue from own sources) per person on police services, by service delivery area, 2003-04 (2004-05 dollars) (a), (b), (c), (d), (f), (g), (h), (i)

Unit	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA (d)	Tas (e)	ACT (f), (g)	NT (h)	Aust
------	-----	-----	-----	----	--------	---------	--------------	--------	------

(a) Data have not been subject to extensive tests to determine comparability. Further, some differences in counting rules may exist across jurisdictions as a result of the differing mixes of activities undertaken within each of the common SDAs.

(b) Overheads (for example, infrastructure costs, such as rent on buildings, and vehicle and equipment costs) have been apportioned to these service delivery areas on a pro rata basis. If 20 per cent of expenditure goes toward crime investigation, for example, then 20 per cent of overheads will be apportioned to crime investigation.

(c) May not add to the sum of its components as a result of rounding.

(d) The Government decided to replace the previous output based performance structure with a program based performance structure. These data have been based on SAPOL's 2002-03 program statement. There is no material variance in the allocation of resources between program and output structures. Material variances however exist between SDA's because a proportion of crime investigation costs/ revenues in prior years was apportioned to community safety & support and road safety & traffic management. This has not been done in 2002-03 to ensure consistency with SAPOL's audited Program Statement. The increase in total recurrent expenditure is partly as a result of higher workers compensation expense in 2002-03.

(e) For Tasmania data were only available for SDAs combined.

(f) For the ACT, costs are apportioned across SDAs through use of direct and indirect cost attribution. Where a direct and singular relationship can be established, costs are directly attributed against outcomes (SDAs). In situations where no direct relationship can be identified, or where expenditure is attributable to numerous outcomes, indirect costing systems are utilised. Indirect cost attribution uses statistical analysis of cost centre activities derived from an activity survey to apportion costs across the range of outcomes.

(g) For the ACT, the variation in expenditure for services to the judicial process SDA in 2001-02 from previous years is principally due to the simplification of the indirect cost allocation system. Previously brief preparation by patrols, investigators and their supervisors was recorded against SDA, however the simplified methodology is not able to capture this information.

(h) For the NT, apportionment across the SDAs is based on the results of an activity survey conducted during May 2002.

(i) Real recurrent expenditure calculated using ABS GDP Expenditure Implicit Price Deflators 2004-05 = 100.

– Nil or rounded to zero. **na** Not available.

Source: State and Territory governments (unpublished); ABS 2003, Motor Vehicle Census 2003, Cat.no. 9309.0, AusInfo, Canberratable A.2; table A.26.

Table 5A.15

Table 5A.15 Real recurrent expenditure (less revenue from own sources) per person on police services, by service delivery area, 2004-05 (a), (b), (c)

Expenditure per person	Unit	NSW	Vic	Qld (d)	WA	SA (e)	Tas (f)	ACT (g), (h)	NT (i)	Ave (j)
Community safety and support	\$	150	109	73	156	126	na	176	370	126
Crime investigation	\$	70	81	89	66	90	na	71	162	81
Road safety and traffic management										
\$/person	\$	28	25	53	47	7	na	19	44	32
\$/registered vehicle	\$	46	35	77	63	10	na	28	41	47
Services to the judicial process	\$	23	41	na	43	37	na	18	99	33
Other services	\$	-	-	37	7	-	na	-	-	8
All SDAs	\$	271	256	251	319	259	257	284	675	280
Share of total expenditure										
Community safety and support	%	55.6	42.5	29.0	48.9	48.5	na	62.0	54.8	44.9
Crime investigation	%	25.8	31.6	35.4	20.8	34.8	na	25.2	24.0	28.9
Road safety and traffic management	%	10.2	9.9	21.0	14.7	2.7	na	6.7	6.5	11.6
Services to the judicial process	%	8.4	16.0	na	13.6	14.1	na	6.2	14.6	11.9
Other services	%	-	-	14.6	2.2	-	na	-	-	2.8
Total for all SDAs	%	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	na	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table 5A.15

	Unit	NSW	Vic	Qld (d)	WA	SA (e)	Tas (f)	ACT (g), (h)	NT (i)	Ave (j)
(a)	Data have not been subject to extensive tests to determine comparability. Further, some differences in counting rules may exist across jurisdictions as a result of the differing mixes of activities undertaken within each of the common SDAs.									
(b)	Overheads (for example, infrastructure costs, such as rent on buildings, and vehicle and equipment costs) have been apportioned to these service delivery areas on a pro rata basis. If 20 per cent of expenditure goes toward crime investigation, for example, then 20 per cent of overheads will be apportioned to crime investigation.									
(c)	May not add to the sum of its components as a result of rounding.									
(d)	For Queensland, expenditure data for services to the judicial process is not separately identified. The QPS output activities for 2004/05 changed from six outputs in 2003/04 to four in 2004/05. Hence "Other services" information is now aligned to new QPS output "Professional Standards and Ethical Practice" which includes significant training expenditure which was previously distributed across other Outputs. The 2004/05 training component includes net direct training costs of \$51.307 M as well as indirect training costs.									
(e)	In 2002-03, the Government decided to replace the previous output based performance structure with a program based performance structure. This return has been based on SAPOL's 2002-03 program statement. There is no material variance in the allocation of resources between program and output structures. Material variances however exist between SDA's because a proportion of crime investigation costs/ revenues in prior years was apportioned to community safety & support and road safety & traffic management. This has not been done in 2002-03 to ensure consistency with SAPOL's audited Program Statement. For Community safety and support, total recurrent expenditure has increased mainly as a result of Enterprise Bargaining for Sworn Staff and asset revaluation decrements. Total recurrent expenditure on road safety and traffic management increased in 2004-05. However, net recurrent expenditure reduced as a result of additional revenue from own sources (\$4.6m from Community Road Safety Fund).									
(f)	For Tasmania data were only available for SDAs combined.									
(g)	For the ACT, costs are apportioned across SDAs through use of direct and indirect cost attribution. Where a direct and singular relationship can be established, costs are directly attributed against outcomes (SDAs). In situations where no direct relationship can be identified, or where expenditure is attributable to numerous outcomes, indirect costing systems are utilised. Indirect cost attribution uses statistical analysis of cost centre activities derived from an activity survey to apportion costs across the range of outcomes.									
(h)	For the ACT, the variation in expenditure for services to the judicial process SDA in 2001-02 from previous years is principally due to the simplification of the indirect cost allocation system. Previously brief preparation by patrols, investigators and their supervisors was recorded against SDA, however the simplified methodology is not able to capture this information.									
(i)	For the NT, apportionment across the SDAs is based on the results of an activity survey conducted during May 2002.									
(j)	Represents the weighted average of those jurisdictions that provided data.									
	na Not available. – Nil or rounded to zero.									

Source: State and Territory governments (unpublished).

Table 5A.16

Table 5A.16 **Police staff, by sworn/unsworn status (a)**

	<i>NSW (b)</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>WA</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>ACT (c)</i>	<i>NT (d)</i>	<i>Aust</i>
Sworn police staff									
Number of sworn staff									
2000-01	13 296	9 488	7 734	4 742	3 582	1 081	591	948	41 462
2001-02	13 716	9 926	7 995	4 778	3 702	1 094	584	954	42 749
2002-03	14 091	10 256	8 180	4 786	3 766	1 094	594	783	43 550
2003-04	15 009	10 300	8 496	4 827	3 710	1 117	618	846	44 923
2004-05	14 643	10 446	8 765	4 890	3 801	1 134	606	916	45 201
Sworn staff per 100 000 population									
2000-01	205	200	217	253	238	229	187	484	216
2001-02	208	206	220	251	245	232	183	483	220
2002-03	212	211	220	248	248	231	185	395	221
2003-04	224	209	223	247	243	234	192	425	226
2004-05	217	210	225	246	248	235	187	458	224
Unsworn police staff									
Number of unsworn staff									
2000-01	3 887	2 251	na	1 203	975	340	185	172	9 013
2001-02	4 019	2 222	3 707	1 179	978	359	197	206	12 867
2002-03	3 968	2 257	3 227	1 168	979	352	205	374	12 530
2003-04	3 912	2 464	3 205	1 186	988	365	191	393	12 704
2004-05	3 860	2 589	3 185	1 282	1 060	370	196	424	12 966
Unsworn staff per 100 000 population									
2000-01	60	47	na	64	65	72	59	88	58
2001-02	61	46	102	62	65	76	62	104	66
2002-03	60	46	87	61	64	74	64	189	64
2003-04	58	50	84	61	65	76	59	197	64
2004-05	57	52	82	65	69	77	60	212	64
Total police staff									
Number of police staff									
2000-01	17 183	11 739	na	5 945	4 557	1 421	776	1 120	50 475
2001-02	17 735	12 148	11 702	5 957	4 680	1 453	781	1 160	55 616
2002-03	18 059	12 513	11 407	5 954	4 745	1 446	799	1 157	56 080
2003-04	18 921	12 764	11 701	6 013	4 698	1 482	809	1 239	57 627
2004-05	18 503	13 035	11 950	6 172	4 861	1 504	802	1 340	58 167
Total police staff per 100 000 population									
2000-01	269	247	na	317	303	301	246	572	263
2001-02	269	252	322	313	309	308	245	587	286
2002-03	272	257	306	309	312	306	248	583	285
2003-04	283	259	307	308	308	310	251	623	290
2004-05	275	262	307	311	317	312	248	670	289

Table 5A.16

	<i>NSW (b)</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>WA</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>ACT (c)</i>	<i>NT (d)</i>	<i>Aust</i>
(a)	Comprises all FTE staff.								
(b)	For NSW, more headcounts than currently shown								
(c)	In the ACT, civilianisation of support functions occurred throughout 2000-01 with the communications 'centre' now being substantially staffed by non-sworn staff. In addition, as a result of a comprehensive review of enabling costs applicable to ACT Policing in 2000-01, the formula previously applied to the calculation for staffing and expenditure data has been significantly revised. This methodological shift means that data for 2000-01 onwards are not directly comparable with data for years prior to 2000-01.								
(d)	For the NT, sworn police officers include police auxiliaries and Aboriginal community police officers. na Not available.								

Source: State and Territory governments (unpublished); table A.2.

Table 5A.17

Table 5A.17 Police staff, by operational status (per cent) (a), (b)

	NSW (c)	Vic	Qld (d)	WA	SA (e)	Tas	ACT (f)	NT (g)	Aust
Operational staff									
2000-01	82.4	81.3	65.5	91.4	91.0	83.3	86.9	83.8	79.7
2001-02	83.6	82.2	82.6	91.8	91.7	83.5	86.9	81.3	84.6
2002-03	80.6	82.7	80.0	89.7	92.9	83.2	87.5	88.7	83.3
2003-04	82.7	81.3	78.1	87.1	91.9	82.1	87.3	90.8	82.9
2004-05	83.2	80.9	78.7	86.3	90.8	81.5	88.0	72.8	82.5
Non-operational staff									
2000-01	17.6	18.7	34.5	8.6	9.0	16.7	13.1	16.3	20.3
2001-02	16.4	17.8	17.4	8.2	8.3	16.5	13.1	18.7	15.4
2002-03	19.4	17.3	20.0	10.3	7.1	16.8	12.5	11.3	16.7
2003-04	17.3	18.7	21.9	12.9	8.1	17.9	12.7	9.2	17.1
2004-05	16.8	19.1	21.3	13.7	9.2	18.5	12.0	27.2	17.5

(a) Comprises all FTE staff.

(b) The definition of operational status is quite broad and may be interpreted differently across jurisdictions.

(c) For NSW, more headcounts than currently shown

(d) The definitions of operational and non-operational status does not align with the national data dictionary. Therefore, care needs to be taken when comparing Queensland with other jurisdictions.

(e) For SA, a decrease of 4 operational community constables due to separations & transfers to inactive. An additional 54 cadets were included for 2004-05 together with 1 community constable on EMR. For available and unavailable FTE staff, there was a decrease in the number of employees on leave as at 30 June 2005.

(f) As a result of a comprehensive review of enabling costs applicable to ACT Policing in 2000-01, the formula previously applied to the calculation for staffing and expenditure data has been significantly revised. This methodological shift means that data for 2000-01 onwards are not directly comparable with data for years prior to 2000-01.

(g) In the NT, sworn police officers include police auxiliaries and Aboriginal community police officers.

Source: State and Territory governments (unpublished).

Performance indicators
for all service delivery areas

Table 5A.18

Table 5A.18 **General satisfaction with services provided by the police (a), (b)**

	<i>Unit</i>	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>WA</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>ACT</i>	<i>NT</i>	<i>Aust</i>
2002-03										
Very satisfied	%	21.0	28.7	24.2	18.0	27.4	22.9	19.9	21.2	23.7
Satisfied	%	49.0	49.1	49.4	46.6	50.0	49.1	51.6	46.5	49.0
Neither	%	20.5	15.9	19.5	25.9	16.3	20.0	20.2	22.7	19.4
Dissatisfied	%	5.3	3.1	3.9	6.2	3.3	5.2	5.0	6.5	4.4
Very dissatisfied	%	2.2	1.4	1.5	2.0	1.5	1.7	0.9	1.9	1.7
Don't know	%	2.1	1.8	1.4	1.4	1.5	1.2	2.3	1.3	1.8
<i>Total satisfied</i>	%	<i>70.0</i>	<i>77.8</i>	<i>73.6</i>	<i>64.6</i>	<i>77.4</i>	<i>72.0</i>	<i>71.5</i>	<i>67.7</i>	<i>72.7</i>
<i>Total dissatisfied</i>	%	<i>7.5</i>	<i>4.5</i>	<i>5.4</i>	<i>8.2</i>	<i>4.8</i>	<i>6.9</i>	<i>5.9</i>	<i>8.4</i>	<i>6.1</i>
Sample size	no.	5 132	2 573	4 051	2 133	2 095	2 038	2 027	2 024	22 073
Likert index (b)	Index	3.83	4.02	3.92	3.73	4.00	3.87	3.87	3.80	3.90
2003-04										
Very satisfied	%	19.8	23.9	22.2	16.8	23.6	23.0	16.8	18.6	21.3
Satisfied	%	50.4	50.6	50.5	49.4	52.1	50.2	53.8	50.4	50.5
Neither	%	22.7	19.4	20.7	24.7	17.7	19.7	22.2	23.9	21.2
Dissatisfied	%	4.8	3.7	4.5	6.6	5.1	4.8	5.1	4.9	4.7
Very dissatisfied	%	1.7	1.7	1.4	1.9	0.8	1.9	1.1	1.5	1.6
Don't know	%	0.6	0.7	0.8	0.6	0.6	0.4	0.9	0.6	0.7
<i>Total satisfied</i>	%	<i>70.2</i>	<i>74.5</i>	<i>72.6</i>	<i>66.2</i>	<i>75.7</i>	<i>73.2</i>	<i>70.6</i>	<i>69.0</i>	<i>71.8</i>
<i>Total dissatisfied</i>	%	<i>6.5</i>	<i>5.4</i>	<i>5.9</i>	<i>8.5</i>	<i>6.0</i>	<i>6.7</i>	<i>6.3</i>	<i>6.5</i>	<i>6.3</i>
Sample size	no.	4 960	3 029	3 982	1 976	1 942	1 983	1 985	1 483	21 340
Likert index (b)	Index	3.82	3.92	3.88	3.73	3.93	3.88	3.81	3.80	3.86
2004-05										
Very satisfied	%	20.2	23.7	22.1	15.2	22.7	23.3	13.5	19.6	21.1
Satisfied	%	47.0	48.6	49.2	47.2	45.7	47.5	50.2	48.9	47.8
Neither	%	24.2	20.3	21.1	27.0	24.6	22.4	27.9	23.4	23.0
Dissatisfied	%	5.6	4.4	5.0	6.9	4.1	4.4	5.7	6.5	5.2
Very dissatisfied	%	2.1	1.8	1.7	2.6	1.8	1.6	1.8	0.8	1.9
Don't know	%	0.9	1.2	0.9	1.2	1.1	0.7	0.9	0.7	1.0
<i>Total satisfied</i>	%	<i>67.2</i>	<i>72.3</i>	<i>71.3</i>	<i>62.4</i>	<i>68.4</i>	<i>70.8</i>	<i>63.7</i>	<i>68.5</i>	<i>68.9</i>
<i>Total dissatisfied</i>	%	<i>7.7</i>	<i>6.2</i>	<i>6.7</i>	<i>9.5</i>	<i>5.9</i>	<i>6.0</i>	<i>7.5</i>	<i>7.3</i>	<i>7.1</i>
Sample size	no.	4 654	4 613	5 537	1 804	1 804	1 803	1 984	1 005	23 204
Likert index (b)	Index	3.78	3.89	3.86	3.66	3.84	3.87	3.68	3.81	3.82

(a) Totals may not add up to 100 per cent as a result of rounding.

(b) The Likert summation index method aggregates responses to provide a single measure of the general (or 'average') perceptions of respondents.

Each response category is allocated a weight. The number of responses for the category are multiplied by the weight to give a total score for the category. The total scores for each category are summed and divided by the total number of responses to derive the Likert index for the question. (See box 5.3 in chapter 5 for a detailed example).

Table 5A.18 **General satisfaction with services provided by the police (a), (b)**

<i>Unit</i>	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>WA</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>ACT</i>	<i>NT</i>	<i>Aust</i>
-------------	------------	------------	------------	-----------	-----------	------------	------------	-----------	-------------

For the response categories in the table above, the weights are as follows:

Very satisfied = 5; satisfied = 4; neither = 3; dissatisfied = 2; and very dissatisfied = 1.

Source: Australasian Centre for Policing Research (ACPR) (unpublished).

Table 5A.19

Table 5A.19 **Satisfaction with the police — dealing with public order problems and supporting community programs (a), (b)**

	<i>Unit</i>	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>WA</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>ACT</i>	<i>NT</i>	<i>Aust</i>
Dealing with public order problems 2002-03										
Very satisfied	%	13.4	17.6	15.3	10.8	16.4	12.0	11.9	12.0	14.7
Satisfied	%	37.2	40.7	39.8	34.4	42.5	39.9	41.5	30.4	38.8
Neither	%	26.9	24.1	25.2	31.5	25.1	24.7	27.5	25.3	26.2
Dissatisfied	%	13.8	10.7	13.3	14.4	9.5	15.1	11.8	21.2	12.7
Very dissatisfied	%	5.4	2.9	3.0	5.1	3.0	5.3	2.4	8.7	4.1
Don't know	%	3.3	4.0	3.3	3.7	3.3	2.9	4.9	2.4	3.5
<i>Total satisfied</i>	%	<i>50.6</i>	<i>58.3</i>	<i>55.1</i>	<i>45.2</i>	<i>58.8</i>	<i>51.9</i>	<i>53.4</i>	<i>42.4</i>	<i>53.5</i>
<i>Total dissatisfied</i>	%	<i>19.2</i>	<i>13.6</i>	<i>16.3</i>	<i>19.5</i>	<i>12.5</i>	<i>20.4</i>	<i>14.2</i>	<i>29.9</i>	<i>16.8</i>
Sample size	no.	5 132	2 573	4 051	2 133	2 095	2 038	2 027	2 024	22 073
Likert index (b)	Index	3.41	3.62	3.53	3.33	3.62	3.39	3.51	3.16	3.49
Dealing with public order problems 2003-04										
Very satisfied	%	13.0	14.6	12.7	11.6	13.3	13.7	9.2	10.4	13.2
Satisfied	%	37.6	39.8	40.1	35.7	40.5	38.4	39.7	35.2	38.7
Neither	%	26.6	28.9	28.2	29.9	27.9	27.6	32.3	26.8	28.0
Dissatisfied	%	15.3	11.1	13.5	16.6	12.8	13.5	12.8	20.1	13.8
Very dissatisfied	%	5.7	3.4	3.6	5.0	3.7	4.8	3.5	6.8	4.5
Don't know	%	1.7	2.2	2.0	1.2	1.8	2.0	2.5	0.7	1.9
<i>Total satisfied</i>	%	<i>50.6</i>	<i>54.4</i>	<i>52.8</i>	<i>47.2</i>	<i>53.8</i>	<i>52.1</i>	<i>48.9</i>	<i>45.5</i>	<i>51.8</i>
<i>Total dissatisfied</i>	%	<i>21.1</i>	<i>14.6</i>	<i>17.1</i>	<i>21.6</i>	<i>16.5</i>	<i>18.3</i>	<i>16.3</i>	<i>26.9</i>	<i>18.3</i>
Sample size	no.	4 960	3 029	3 982	1 976	1 942	1 983	1 985	1 483	21 340
Likert index (b)	Index	3.37	3.52	3.46	3.33	3.48	3.44	3.39	3.22	3.43
Dealing with public order problems 2004-05										
Very satisfied	%	14.1	14.9	14.2	12.2	14.1	13.4	9.4	12.6	14.0
Satisfied	%	35.0	38.4	37.8	33.5	36.5	38.0	36.8	36.4	36.5
Neither	%	29.3	28.8	28.5	30.6	30.0	28.0	33.9	28.2	29.3
Dissatisfied	%	15.3	11.9	13.6	16.8	13.1	14.4	14.2	15.8	14.0
Very dissatisfied	%	4.4	3.5	4.0	5.3	3.7	3.8	3.3	6.3	4.1
Don't know	%	1.9	2.6	2.0	1.7	2.5	2.3	2.5	0.7	2.1
<i>Total satisfied</i>	%	<i>49.1</i>	<i>53.3</i>	<i>52.0</i>	<i>45.7</i>	<i>50.6</i>	<i>51.4</i>	<i>46.2</i>	<i>49.0</i>	<i>50.5</i>
<i>Total dissatisfied</i>	%	<i>19.7</i>	<i>15.3</i>	<i>17.6</i>	<i>22.1</i>	<i>16.8</i>	<i>18.2</i>	<i>17.4</i>	<i>22.1</i>	<i>18.2</i>
Sample size	no.	4 654	4 613	5 537	1 804	1 804	1 803	1 984	1 005	23 204
Likert index (b)	Index	3.40	3.51	3.46	3.31	3.45	3.44	3.36	3.33	3.43

Table 5A.19

Table 5A.19 **Satisfaction with the police — dealing with public order problems and supporting community programs (a), (b)**

	<i>Unit</i>	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>WA</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>ACT</i>	<i>NT</i>	<i>Aust</i>
Supporting community programs 2002-03										
Very satisfied	%	22.5	33.6	31.7	27.2	38.3	32.6	22.5	26.5	29.0
Satisfied	%	39.5	40.9	43.8	46.8	43.0	42.5	42.4	42.2	41.8
Neither	%	19.9	14.9	13.9	15.5	11.1	13.8	20.6	17.8	16.3
Dissatisfied	%	6.3	3.0	3.4	4.0	1.5	3.8	4.6	4.3	4.3
Very dissatisfied	%	2.2	1.2	0.7	1.6	1.1	1.3	1.0	2.1	1.5
Don't know	%	9.5	6.4	6.5	4.9	5.0	6.0	8.9	7.1	7.2
<i>Total satisfied</i>	%	<i>62.0</i>	<i>74.5</i>	<i>75.5</i>	<i>74.0</i>	<i>81.3</i>	<i>75.1</i>	<i>64.9</i>	<i>68.7</i>	<i>70.8</i>
<i>Total dissatisfied</i>	%	<i>8.5</i>	<i>4.2</i>	<i>4.1</i>	<i>5.6</i>	<i>2.6</i>	<i>5.1</i>	<i>5.6</i>	<i>6.4</i>	<i>5.8</i>
Sample size	no.	5 132	2 573	4 051	2 133	2 095	2 038	2 027	2 024	22 073
Likert index (b)	Index	3.8	4.1	4.1	4.0	4.2	4.1	3.9	3.9	4.0
Supporting community programs 2003-04										
Very satisfied	%	20.4	31.7	30.6	27.6	34.9	28.2	17.9	25.1	27.1
Satisfied	%	41.2	43.5	43.9	44.7	44.8	45.7	42.1	45.2	43.1
Neither	%	23.2	15.3	14.9	15.9	12.9	16.7	26.4	18.9	18.0
Dissatisfied	%	5.8	4.1	4.2	5.2	2.6	2.7	5.8	3.7	4.7
Very dissatisfied	%	1.9	1.0	0.9	1.6	0.5	1.3	1.2	1.1	1.3
Don't know	%	7.5	4.4	5.6	5.0	4.2	5.4	6.7	5.9	5.8
<i>Total satisfied</i>	%	<i>61.6</i>	<i>75.2</i>	<i>74.5</i>	<i>72.3</i>	<i>79.8</i>	<i>73.9</i>	<i>60.0</i>	<i>70.3</i>	<i>70.2</i>
<i>Total dissatisfied</i>	%	<i>7.7</i>	<i>5.1</i>	<i>5.0</i>	<i>6.8</i>	<i>3.1</i>	<i>4.0</i>	<i>7.0</i>	<i>4.9</i>	<i>6.0</i>
Sample size	no.	4 960	3 029	3 982	1 976	1 942	1 983	1 985	1 483	21 340
Likert index (b)	Index	3.78	4.05	4.05	3.96	4.16	4.02	3.75	3.95	3.96
Supporting community programs 2004-05										
Very satisfied	%	20.8	30.5	30.0	23.3	31.8	30.1	17.3	27.2	26.3
Satisfied	%	39.0	41.5	41.8	42.5	42.9	42.2	40.5	42.3	41.0
Neither	%	24.4	18.0	17.5	22.1	16.1	16.4	27.8	18.5	20.4
Dissatisfied	%	6.5	3.1	3.6	3.7	2.6	3.3	6.2	5.9	4.4
Very dissatisfied	%	1.8	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.2	1.1	1.4	0.8	1.5
Don't know	%	7.4	5.5	5.9	7.1	5.4	6.8	6.9	5.3	6.4
<i>Total satisfied</i>	%	<i>59.8</i>	<i>72.0</i>	<i>71.8</i>	<i>65.8</i>	<i>74.6</i>	<i>72.3</i>	<i>57.7</i>	<i>69.5</i>	<i>67.3</i>
<i>Total dissatisfied</i>	%	<i>8.4</i>	<i>4.4</i>	<i>4.8</i>	<i>5.0</i>	<i>3.8</i>	<i>4.5</i>	<i>7.6</i>	<i>6.7</i>	<i>5.9</i>
Sample size	no.	4 654	4 613	5 537	1 804	1 804	1 803	1 984	1 005	23 204
Likert index (b)	Index	3.76	4.03	4.02	3.89	4.07	4.04	3.71	3.94	3.92

(a) Totals may not add up to 100 per cent as a result of rounding.

(b) The Likert summation index method aggregates responses to provide a single measure of the general (or 'average') perceptions of respondents.

Each response category is allocated a weight. The number of responses for the category are multiplied by the weight to give a total score for the category. The total scores for each category are summed and divided by the total number of responses to derive the Likert index for the question. (See box 5.3 in chapter 5 for a detailed example).

Table 5A.19 **Satisfaction with the police — dealing with public order problems and supporting community programs (a), (b)**

<i>Unit</i>	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>WA</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>ACT</i>	<i>NT</i>	<i>Aust</i>
-------------	------------	------------	------------	-----------	-----------	------------	------------	-----------	-------------

For the response categories in the tables above, the weights are as follows:

Very satisfied = 5; satisfied = 4; neither = 3; dissatisfied = 2; and very dissatisfied = 1.

Source: ACPR (unpublished).

Table 5A.20

Table 5A.20 **Contact with police in the past 12 months (a)**

	<i>Unit</i>	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>WA</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>ACT</i>	<i>NT</i>	<i>Aust</i>
2002-03										
Contact with police	%	44.3	50.4	49.5	50.0	46.8	45.3	49.3	59.8	47.8
No contact with police	%	55.7	49.6	50.5	50.0	53.2	54.7	50.7	40.2	52.2
Sample size	no.	5 132	2 573	4 051	2 133	2 095	2 038	2 027	2 024	22 073
Contact with police by who initiated the most recent contact										
Police initiated	%	56.7	64.0	65.2	60.1	49.6	63.6	56.5	52.5	60.1
Respondent initiated	%	43.3	36.0	34.8	39.9	50.4	36.4	43.5	47.5	39.9
Sample size	no.	2 287	1 295	1 984	1 068	953	903	994	1 229	10 713
2003-04										
Contact with police	%	49.2	56.2	54.2	57.2	51.8	48.3	52.9	58.5	53.0
No contact with police	%	50.8	43.8	45.8	42.8	48.2	51.7	47.1	41.5	47.0
Sample size	no.	4 960	3 029	3 982	1 976	1 942	1 983	1 985	1 483	21 340
Contact with police by who initiated the most recent contact										
Police initiated	%	60.7	64.2	62.8	60.3	55.7	65.6	54.0	55.4	61.5
Respondent initiated	%	39.3	35.8	37.2	39.7	44.3	34.4	46.0	44.6	38.5
Sample size	no.	2 407	1 712	2 105	1 125	968	917	1 057	871	11 162
2004-05										
Contact with police	%	43.6	47.9	46.6	47.6	45.9	46.8	44.4	58.7	46.0
No contact with police	%	56.4	52.1	53.4	52.4	54.1	53.2	55.6	41.3	54.0
Sample size	no.	4 654	4 613	5 537	1 804	1 804	1 803	1 984	1 005	23 204
Contact with police by who initiated the most recent contact										
Police initiated	%	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
Respondent initiated	%	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
Sample size	no.	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na

(a) Totals may not add up to 100 per cent as a result of rounding.

na not available.

Source: ACPR (unpublished).

Table 5A.21

Table 5A.21 **People who had contact with police in the past 12 months: satisfaction with police in most recent contact (a), (b), (c)**

	<i>Unit</i>	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>WA</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>ACT</i>	<i>NT</i>	<i>Aust</i>
2002-03										
Very satisfied	%	50.5	56.1	51.0	52.3	55.6	48.2	47.5	49.3	52.6
Satisfied	%	28.6	27.8	30.9	28.1	29.0	32.0	27.8	30.4	28.9
Neither	%	6.7	5.3	6.8	6.9	6.8	5.8	9.9	6.8	6.4
Dissatisfied	%	6.1	4.4	5.5	6.2	3.4	6.6	8.0	6.9	5.4
Very dissatisfied	%	7.7	6.0	5.4	6.0	5.1	7.1	6.5	6.3	6.4
Don't know	%	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.5	0.1	0.3	0.4	0.2	0.4
<i>Total satisfied</i>	%	<i>79.1</i>	<i>83.9</i>	<i>81.9</i>	<i>80.4</i>	<i>84.6</i>	<i>80.2</i>	<i>75.3</i>	<i>79.7</i>	<i>81.5</i>
<i>Total dissatisfied</i>	%	<i>13.8</i>	<i>10.4</i>	<i>10.9</i>	<i>12.2</i>	<i>8.5</i>	<i>13.7</i>	<i>14.5</i>	<i>13.3</i>	<i>11.8</i>
Sample size	no.	2 287	1 295	1 984	1 068	953	903	994	1 229	10 713
Likert index (c)	Index	4.08	4.24	4.17	4.15	4.27	4.08	4.02	4.10	4.16
2003-04										
Very satisfied	%	49.6	56.0	50.0	50.5	51.0	52.4	45.9	47.0	51.6
Satisfied	%	29.4	27.7	29.4	27.8	30.5	28.2	30.1	32.7	28.8
Neither	%	8.1	6.5	7.3	8.6	7.4	7.8	8.6	7.2	7.5
Dissatisfied	%	6.2	4.3	5.9	5.4	6.3	5.1	8.7	6.2	5.6
Very dissatisfied	%	6.6	5.2	7.1	7.5	4.7	6.4	6.6	6.6	6.3
Don't know	%	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.2	–	0.1	–	0.3	0.2
<i>Total satisfied</i>	%	<i>78.9</i>	<i>83.7</i>	<i>79.4</i>	<i>78.3</i>	<i>81.5</i>	<i>80.6</i>	<i>76.0</i>	<i>79.7</i>	<i>80.4</i>
<i>Total dissatisfied</i>	%	<i>12.7</i>	<i>9.5</i>	<i>13.1</i>	<i>12.9</i>	<i>11.0</i>	<i>11.5</i>	<i>15.3</i>	<i>12.8</i>	<i>11.8</i>
Sample size	no.	2 407	1 712	2 105	1 125	968	917	1 057	871	11 162
Likert index (c)	Index	4.10	4.25	4.09	4.09	4.17	4.15	4.00	4.08	4.14
2004-05										
Very satisfied	%	43.8	49.4	46.9	45.5	50.1	52.3	40.5	46.6	46.7
Satisfied	%	27.3	26.2	27.3	29.4	28.2	26.7	32.0	30.7	27.4
Neither	%	10.2	9.4	10.0	8.5	7.7	6.3	8.6	8.4	9.4
Dissatisfied	%	9.6	7.0	7.5	8.9	7.9	7.2	9.3	9.2	8.2
Very dissatisfied	%	8.7	7.8	8.1	7.5	5.9	7.5	9.3	5.0	7.9
Don't know	%	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.2	–	0.4	0.1	0.3
<i>Total satisfied</i>	%	<i>71.1</i>	<i>75.6</i>	<i>74.2</i>	<i>74.9</i>	<i>78.3</i>	<i>79.0</i>	<i>72.5</i>	<i>77.3</i>	<i>74.1</i>
<i>Total dissatisfied</i>	%	<i>18.3</i>	<i>14.7</i>	<i>15.6</i>	<i>16.4</i>	<i>13.8</i>	<i>14.7</i>	<i>18.6</i>	<i>14.2</i>	<i>16.2</i>
Sample size	no.	2 002	2 231	2 619	926	815	822	872	584	10 871
Likert index (c)	Index	3.88	4.03	3.98	3.97	4.09	4.09	3.85	4.05	3.97

(a) Data for 2002-03 onwards are based on responses from people aged 15 years or over.

(b) Totals may not add up to 100 per cent as a result of rounding.

Table 5A.21 People who had contact with police in the past 12 months: satisfaction with police in most recent contact (a), (b), (c)

	<i>Unit</i>	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>WA</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>ACT</i>	<i>NT</i>	<i>Aust</i>
--	-------------	------------	------------	------------	-----------	-----------	------------	------------	-----------	-------------

(c) The Likert summation index method aggregates responses to provide a single measure of the general (or 'average') perceptions of respondents.

Each response category is allocated a weight. The number of responses for the category are multiplied by the weight to give a total score for the category. The total scores for each category are summed and divided by the total number of responses to derive the Likert index for the question. (See box 5.3 in chapter 5 for a detailed example).

For the response categories in the table above, the weights are as follows:

Very satisfied = 5; satisfied = 4; neither = 3; dissatisfied = 2; and very dissatisfied = 1.

– Nil or rounded to zero

Source: ACPR (unpublished).

Table 5A.22

Table 5A.22 **People who had contact with police in the past 12 months: main reason for satisfaction and dissatisfaction with police service in most recent contact (a), (b)**

	<i>Unit</i>	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>WA</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>ACT</i>	<i>NT</i>	<i>Aust</i>
2002-03										
People who were <i>satisfied</i> with police service in most recent contact by main reason										
Was prompt	%	8.8	8.7	8.4	8.9	10.5	8.3	9.2	11.0	8.9
Approachable/friendly	%	8.2	9.4	9.1	9.6	9.0	8.3	7.5	6.8	8.9
Helpful	%	4.8	4.5	4.6	5.9	6.2	3.2	4.2	5.5	4.9
Courteous	%	12.3	17.6	17.5	11.9	13.7	14.0	11.7	12.3	14.8
Professional/fair	%	12.7	12.1	11.5	8.5	10.7	12.7	14.2	11.0	11.7
Handled the matter well	%	5.1	5.3	4.8	6.3	5.8	5.1	5.8	6.8	5.3
Took appropriate action	%	13.9	12.7	14.6	14.7	15.8	14.0	11.7	15.1	13.9
Efficient	%	5.0	4.2	4.4	4.8	4.9	4.5	5.0	4.1	4.6
Recovered the property	%	0.5	0.6	0.3	0.7	0.8	–	0.8	–	0.6
Kept informed	%	1.8	2.1	2.1	1.8	1.7	1.3	1.7	1.4	1.9
Communicated clearly	%	9.5	5.3	0.3	0.1	–	–	–	–	0.1
Other	%	5.3	4.9	5.2	6.4	5.8	7.0	7.5	5.5	5.4
Don't know	%	6.6	6.7	5.3	7.5	6.2	6.4	5.8	5.5	6.4
Total satisfied	%	94.5	94.2	88.1	87.1	91.0	84.7	85.0	84.9	87.3
People who were <i>dissatisfied</i> with police service in most recent contact by main reason										
Left waiting	%	1.2	0.7	0.9	1.8	1.3	1.3	1.7	1.4	1.1
Unfriendly/impolite	%	1.3	0.9	1.3	2.2	0.2	1.3	0.8	–	1.2
Unhelpful	%	0.8	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	–	0.8	–	0.5
Unprofessional/unfair	%	0.9	0.7	1.4	0.3	0.8	1.9	1.7	1.4	0.9
Took no action	%	2.9	1.9	1.9	3.4	2.3	3.2	3.3	2.7	2.6
Not keep informed	%	1.0	0.4	0.5	1.2	0.4	0.6	1.7	1.4	0.8
Made false accusation	%	0.9	0.6	0.8	1.0	0.6	1.3	0.8	1.4	0.8
Used unnecessary force	%	–	0.4	8.4	–	–	–	–	–	0.1
Poor communication	%	0.3	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Showed not interested	%	1.2	0.6	0.9	0.7	0.6	0.6	1.7	–	0.9
Other	%	3.9	2.5	2.8	1.9	2.4	3.2	3.3	4.1	3.0
Don't know	%	0.7	0.8	0.6	0.4	0.4	0.6	0.8	1.4	0.7
Total dissatisfied	%	15.1	9.9	20.0	13.3	9.2	14.0	16.7	13.7	12.6
Sample size	no.	2 136	1 222	1 845	1 005	895	852	895	1 146	9 996

Table 5A.22

Table 5A.22 **People who had contact with police in the past 12 months: main reason for satisfaction and dissatisfaction with police service in most recent contact (a), (b)**

	<i>Unit</i>	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>WA</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>ACT</i>	<i>NT</i>	<i>Aust</i>
2003-04										
People who were <i>satisfied</i> with police service in most recent contact by main reason										
Was prompt	%	9.0	8.1	8.7	8.0	10.4	7.8	9.0	11.8	8.7
Approachable/friendly	%	8.7	9.5	9.4	8.7	9.7	11.1	6.4	7.1	9.1
Helpful	%	4.2	3.7	4.0	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.6	5.3	4.1
Courteous	%	18.7	20.2	19.5	15.0	14.3	17.0	18.6	13.9	18.4
Professional/fair	%	14.4	11.7	12.1	14.0	11.5	14.1	15.8	15.0	13.0
Handled the matter well	%	5.9	5.8	5.9	6.7	6.3	5.7	6.3	5.6	6.0
Took appropriate action	%	17.7	15.4	18.4	17.0	19.3	17.7	16.6	16.2	17.2
Efficient	%	4.9	8.0	4.9	7.5	7.5	5.2	6.5	7.6	6.3
Recovered the property	%	0.4	1.0	0.2	0.3	0.5	0.4	0.5	0.3	0.5
Kept informed	%	2.1	1.7	1.5	2.1	2.0	1.6	1.7	2.4	1.9
Communicated clearly	%	0.7	0.5	1.0	0.2	0.4	0.3	0.8	0.6	0.6
Other	%	4.1	4.5	5.7	6.0	4.8	5.2	4.7	4.7	4.8
Don't know	%	9.3	9.7	8.8	9.9	8.8	9.4	8.5	9.4	9.3
Total satisfied	%	100.1	99.8	100.1	99.9	100.0	99.9	100.0	99.9	99.9
People who were <i>dissatisfied</i> with police service in most recent contact by main reason										
Left waiting	%	6.3	9.1	16.5	13.1	4.4	5.4	11.6	10.6	9.8
Unfriendly/impolite	%	8.1	13.5	6.7	5.9	11.7	8.3	3.7	7.1	8.9
Unhelpful	%	4.4	3.9	3.5	3.9	2.4	2.1	4.9	6.8	3.9
Unprofessional/unfair	%	8.0	13.2	10.1	5.3	14.9	7.7	6.4	9.9	9.7
Took no action	%	25.4	15.9	15.5	15.4	22.9	16.3	22.3	11.0	19.6
Not keep informed	%	3.8	9.0	8.3	9.1	2.2	5.6	11.7	8.9	6.6
Made false accusation	%	4.0	3.3	3.6	1.9	0.7	3.2	2.6	5.9	3.2
Used unnecessary force	%	2.1	1.8	1.2	1.5	0.8	0.7	0.4	–	1.6
Poor communication	%	0.5	–	–	0.4	2.3	–	2.7	–	0.4
Showed not interested	%	6.0	4.7	4.2	7.7	9.5	11.0	7.0	6.8	6.0
Other	%	22.8	18.4	25.4	30.0	27.6	28.9	20.0	29.8	23.7
Don't know	%	8.5	7.3	5.0	5.8	0.6	10.8	6.7	3.3	6.6
Total dissatisfied	%	99.9	100.1	100	100	100	100	100	100.1	100
Sample size	no.	295	153	248	117	100	102	156	97	1 268

Table 5A.22

Table 5A.22 **People who had contact with police in the past 12 months: main reason for satisfaction and dissatisfaction with police service in most recent contact (a), (b)**

	<i>Unit</i>	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>WA</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>ACT</i>	<i>NT</i>	<i>Aust</i>
2004-05										
People who were <i>satisfied</i> with police service in most recent contact by main reason										
Was prompt	%	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
Approachable/friendly	%	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
Helpful	%	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
Courteous	%	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
Professional/fair	%	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
Handled the matter well	%	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
Took appropriate action	%	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
Efficient	%	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
Recovered the property	%	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
Kept informed	%	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
Communicated clearly	%	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
Other	%	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
Don't know	%	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
Total satisfied	%	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
Sample size	no.	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
People who were <i>dissatisfied</i> with police service in most recent contact by main reason										
Left waiting	%	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
Unfriendly/impolite	%	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
Unhelpful	%	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
Unprofessional/unfair	%	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
Took no action	%	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
Not keep informed	%	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
Made false accusation	%	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
Used unnecessary force	%	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
Poor communication	%	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
Showed not interested	%	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
Other	%	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
Don't know	%	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
Total dissatisfied	%	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
Sample size	no.	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na

(a) Data for 2002-03 onwards are based on responses from people aged 15 years or over.

(b) Totals may not add up to 100 per cent as a result of rounding.

– Nil or rounded to zero.

Source: ACPR (unpublished).

Table 5A.23

Table 5A.23 **Opinions on statement 'police perform job professionally' (a), (b), (c)**

	<i>Unit</i>	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>WA</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>ACT</i>	<i>NT</i>	<i>Aust</i>
2002-03										
Strongly agree	%	24.9	28.0	28.1	20.5	32.3	26.5	29.0	27.0	26.5
Agree	%	54.5	56.3	52.6	54.5	55.1	55.3	53.7	51.1	54.7
Neither	%	12.0	9.6	12.4	16.1	8.7	11.0	11.9	13.5	11.6
Disagree	%	5.7	4.2	4.9	6.8	2.3	4.6	4.0	5.4	5.0
Strongly disagree	%	2.3	1.6	1.6	1.8	1.4	2.0	0.8	2.4	1.8
Don't know	%	0.6	0.3	0.5	0.3	0.2	0.7	0.6	0.7	0.4
<i>Total agree</i>	%	<i>79.4</i>	<i>84.3</i>	<i>80.7</i>	<i>75.0</i>	<i>87.4</i>	<i>81.8</i>	<i>82.7</i>	<i>78.1</i>	<i>81.2</i>
<i>Total disagree</i>	%	<i>8.0</i>	<i>5.8</i>	<i>6.5</i>	<i>8.6</i>	<i>3.7</i>	<i>6.6</i>	<i>4.8</i>	<i>7.8</i>	<i>6.8</i>
Sample size	no.	5 132	2 573	4 051	2 133	2 095	2 038	2 027	2 024	22 073
Likert index (c)	Index	3.94	4.05	4.01	3.85	4.15	4.00	4.07	3.96	4.00
2003-04										
Strongly agree	%	22.7	25.4	23.8	19.2	27.9	26.0	25.4	22.3	23.7
Agree	%	56.5	54.8	55.1	56.3	56.0	54.7	55.0	54.3	55.7
Neither	%	13.8	13.3	14.8	16.0	11.5	12.1	13.7	13.7	13.8
Disagree	%	5.4	4.4	4.5	6.9	3.0	5.1	4.2	7.4	4.9
Strongly disagree	%	1.5	1.7	1.5	1.5	1.4	1.9	1.4	2.1	1.6
Don't know	%	0.2	0.4	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.2	0.2
<i>Total agree</i>	%	<i>79.1</i>	<i>80.2</i>	<i>79.0</i>	<i>75.5</i>	<i>83.9</i>	<i>80.7</i>	<i>80.4</i>	<i>76.6</i>	<i>79.4</i>
<i>Total disagree</i>	%	<i>7.0</i>	<i>6.1</i>	<i>6.0</i>	<i>8.4</i>	<i>4.4</i>	<i>6.9</i>	<i>5.5</i>	<i>9.5</i>	<i>6.5</i>
Sample size	no.	4 960	3 029	3 982	1 976	1 942	1 983	1 985	1 483	21 340
Likert index (c)	Index	3.93	3.98	3.95	3.85	4.06	3.98	3.99	3.88	3.95
2004-05										
Strongly agree	%	20.0	22.1	22.6	18.5	24.4	20.7	21.5	24.0	21.3
Agree	%	55.8	55.1	53.5	56.4	58.3	56.6	57.5	53.1	55.5
Neither	%	16.4	15.1	16.7	18.1	12.7	16.1	14.7	16.6	16.0
Disagree	%	5.8	5.7	4.8	5.5	3.3	4.6	4.8	4.0	5.3
Strongly disagree	%	1.7	1.8	1.9	1.1	1.2	1.6	1.1	2.2	1.6
Don't know	%	0.4	0.2	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.4	0.5	0.1	0.4
<i>Total agree</i>	%	<i>75.8</i>	<i>77.2</i>	<i>76.1</i>	<i>74.9</i>	<i>82.7</i>	<i>77.3</i>	<i>79.0</i>	<i>77.1</i>	<i>76.8</i>
<i>Total disagree</i>	%	<i>7.5</i>	<i>7.4</i>	<i>6.7</i>	<i>6.6</i>	<i>4.4</i>	<i>6.2</i>	<i>5.8</i>	<i>6.2</i>	<i>6.9</i>
Sample size	no.	4 654	4 613	5 537	1 804	1 804	1 803	1 984	1 005	23 204
Likert index (c)	Index	3.87	3.90	3.91	3.86	4.02	3.90	3.94	3.93	3.90

(a) Data for 2002-03 onwards are based on responses from people aged 15 years or over.

(b) Totals may not add up to 100 per cent as a result of rounding.

(c) The Likert summation index method aggregates responses to provide a single measure of the general (or 'average') perceptions of respondents.

Table 5A.23 Opinions on statement 'police perform job professionally' (a), (b), (c)

	<i>Unit</i>	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>WA</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>ACT</i>	<i>NT</i>	<i>Aust</i>
--	-------------	------------	------------	------------	-----------	-----------	------------	------------	-----------	-------------

Each response category is allocated a weight. The number of responses for the category are multiplied by the weight to give a total score for the category. The total scores for each category are summed and divided by the total number of responses to derive the Likert index for the question. (See box 5.3 in chapter 5 for a detailed example).

For the response categories in the table above, the weights are as follows:

Strongly agree = 5; agree = 4; neither = 3; disagree = 2; and strongly disagree = 1.

Source: ACPR (unpublished).

Table 5A.24

Table 5A.24 **Opinions on statement 'police treat people fairly and equally' (a), (b), (c)**

	<i>Unit</i>	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>WA</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>ACT</i>	<i>NT</i>	<i>Aust</i>
2002-03										
Strongly agree	%	17.8	18.5	19.9	13.2	20.9	18.9	17.6	19.8	18.1
Agree	%	50.2	51.2	45.4	48.3	52.6	52.2	51.1	47.2	49.7
Neither	%	14.3	14.5	16.5	17.6	12.9	11.5	16.9	13.4	14.9
Disagree	%	12.3	11.4	12.4	16.1	9.5	11.9	9.1	13.5	12.2
Strongly disagree	%	3.7	2.7	4.0	3.5	2.5	3.3	2.8	4.8	3.4
Don't know	%	1.8	1.7	1.8	1.2	1.6	2.2	2.5	1.4	1.7
<i>Total agree</i>	%	<i>68.0</i>	<i>69.7</i>	<i>65.3</i>	<i>61.5</i>	<i>73.5</i>	<i>71.1</i>	<i>68.7</i>	<i>67.0</i>	<i>67.8</i>
<i>Total disagree</i>	%	<i>16.0</i>	<i>14.1</i>	<i>16.4</i>	<i>19.6</i>	<i>12.0</i>	<i>15.2</i>	<i>11.9</i>	<i>18.3</i>	<i>15.6</i>
Sample size	no.	5 132	2 573	4 051	2 133	2 095	2 038	2 027	2 024	22 073
Likert index (c)	Index	3.67	3.73	3.66	3.52	3.81	3.73	3.73	3.65	3.68
2003-04										
Strongly agree	%	16.6	16.7	16.1	13.6	18.6	19.1	16.5	16.9	16.4
Agree	%	48.4	50.4	48.2	48.0	51.3	49.9	51.1	46.8	49.1
Neither	%	18.5	15.6	17.3	19.7	16.5	15.4	17.7	17.5	17.4
Disagree	%	11.0	12.4	13.6	12.8	9.2	10.8	10.4	13.4	11.9
Strongly disagree	%	4.5	4.0	4.0	5.1	3.3	3.4	2.8	4.4	4.2
Don't know	%	1.1	0.8	0.8	0.8	1.1	1.6	1.5	0.9	1.0
<i>Total agree</i>	%	<i>65.0</i>	<i>67.1</i>	<i>64.3</i>	<i>61.6</i>	<i>69.9</i>	<i>69.0</i>	<i>67.6</i>	<i>63.7</i>	<i>65.5</i>
<i>Total disagree</i>	%	<i>15.5</i>	<i>16.5</i>	<i>17.6</i>	<i>17.9</i>	<i>12.5</i>	<i>14.1</i>	<i>13.2</i>	<i>17.8</i>	<i>16.1</i>
Sample size	no.	4 960	3 029	3 982	1 976	1 942	1 983	1 985	1 483	21 340
Likert index (c)	Index	3.62	3.64	3.59	3.53	3.73	3.72	3.69	3.59	3.62
2004-05										
Strongly agree	%	15.9	16.2	17.0	13.7	18.1	16.5	16.2	18.1	16.2
Agree	%	46.8	47.2	45.9	47.3	49.1	49.6	49.5	44.3	47.1
Neither	%	19.3	20.4	19.9	20.5	18.3	19.0	20.2	19.8	19.7
Disagree	%	13.0	11.4	12.1	13.3	10.4	10.2	10.2	13.2	12.1
Strongly disagree	%	3.6	3.9	4.1	4.3	3.0	3.5	2.4	4.2	3.8
Don't know	%	1.4	0.9	1.0	0.9	1.2	1.2	1.6	0.5	1.1
<i>Total agree</i>	%	<i>62.7</i>	<i>63.4</i>	<i>62.9</i>	<i>61.0</i>	<i>67.2</i>	<i>66.1</i>	<i>65.7</i>	<i>62.4</i>	<i>63.3</i>
<i>Total disagree</i>	%	<i>16.6</i>	<i>15.3</i>	<i>16.2</i>	<i>17.6</i>	<i>13.4</i>	<i>13.7</i>	<i>12.5</i>	<i>17.4</i>	<i>15.9</i>
Sample size	no.	4 654	4 613	5 537	1 804	1 804	1 803	1 984	1 005	23 204
Likert index (c)	Index	3.59	3.61	3.60	3.53	3.70	3.66	3.68	3.59	3.60

(a) Data for 2002-03 onwards are based on responses from people aged 15 years or over.

(b) Totals may not add up to 100 per cent as a result of rounding.

Table 5A.24 Opinions on statement 'police treat people fairly and equally' (a), (b), (c)

	<i>Unit</i>	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>WA</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>ACT</i>	<i>NT</i>	<i>Aust</i>
--	-------------	------------	------------	------------	-----------	-----------	------------	------------	-----------	-------------

(c) The Likert summation index method aggregates responses to provide a single measure of the general (or 'average') perceptions of respondents.

Each response category is allocated a weight. The number of responses for the category are multiplied by the weight to give a total score for the category. The total scores for each category are summed and divided by the total number of responses to derive the Likert index for the question. (See box 5.3 in chapter 5 for a detailed example).

For the response categories in the table above, the weights are as follows:

Strongly agree = 5; agree = 4; neither = 3; disagree = 2; and strongly disagree = 1.

Source: ACPR (unpublished).

Table 5A.25

Table 5A.25		Opinions on statement 'most police are honest' (a), (b), (c)								
	<i>Unit</i>	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>WA</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>ACT</i>	<i>NT</i>	<i>Aust</i>
2002-03										
Strongly agree	%	17.6	19.8	21.8	15.0	22.6	19.8	19.1	21.1	19.1
Agree	%	57.1	55.8	53.8	55.2	58.7	58.8	57.1	56.2	56.2
Neither	%	12.5	13.1	13.4	15.6	11.1	10.8	14.0	12.1	13.0
Disagree	%	8.3	7.9	7.0	9.5	5.0	6.2	5.7	5.8	7.7
Strongly disagree	%	2.2	1.4	2.3	2.2	0.8	2.2	1.3	1.9	1.9
Don't know	%	2.2	2.0	1.7	2.5	1.8	2.2	2.8	2.9	2.1
<i>Total agree</i>	%	<i>74.7</i>	<i>75.6</i>	<i>75.6</i>	<i>70.2</i>	<i>81.3</i>	<i>78.6</i>	<i>76.2</i>	<i>77.3</i>	<i>75.3</i>
<i>Total disagree</i>	%	<i>10.5</i>	<i>9.3</i>	<i>9.3</i>	<i>11.7</i>	<i>5.8</i>	<i>8.4</i>	<i>7.0</i>	<i>7.7</i>	<i>9.6</i>
Sample size	no.	5 132	2 573	4 051	2 133	2 095	2 038	2 027	2 024	22 073
Likert index (c)	Index	3.81	3.86	3.87	3.73	3.99	3.90	3.89	3.91	3.85
2003-04										
Strongly agree	%	18.0	19.0	18.8	18.0	21.5	18.1	19.1	17.1	18.7
Agree	%	56.0	56.6	58.5	54.0	59.5	57.9	56.4	57.8	56.7
Neither	%	15.6	14.0	14.3	16.7	11.9	13.2	14.9	14.6	14.7
Disagree	%	6.8	7.0	5.4	7.2	5.3	6.4	5.8	6.6	6.5
Strongly disagree	%	2.0	2.0	1.9	2.4	0.8	3.3	1.6	2.3	2.0
Don't know	%	1.6	1.4	1.1	1.7	1.1	1.1	2.0	1.7	1.4
<i>Total agree</i>	%	<i>73.9</i>	<i>75.6</i>	<i>77.3</i>	<i>72.0</i>	<i>81.0</i>	<i>76.0</i>	<i>75.6</i>	<i>74.8</i>	<i>75.4</i>
<i>Total disagree</i>	%	<i>8.9</i>	<i>9.0</i>	<i>7.3</i>	<i>9.7</i>	<i>6.0</i>	<i>9.7</i>	<i>7.5</i>	<i>8.9</i>	<i>8.5</i>
Sample size	no.	4 960	3 029	3 982	1 976	1 942	1 983	1 985	1 483	21 340
Likert index (c)	Index	3.82	3.85	3.88	3.79	3.97	3.82	3.87	3.82	3.85
2004-05										
Strongly agree	%	17.3	18.0	19.3	14.1	20.4	16.2	18.5	18.8	17.8
Agree	%	52.6	52.3	52.7	55.4	54.5	55.9	56.2	53.2	53.1
Neither	%	18.5	18.0	17.5	18.6	15.9	17.5	17.0	17.5	17.9
Disagree	%	8.3	7.8	6.4	9.0	5.7	6.6	5.5	5.6	7.6
Strongly disagree	%	1.9	2.6	2.7	1.8	1.5	1.6	1.1	2.7	2.2
Don't know	%	1.4	1.3	1.3	1.2	2.0	2.1	1.7	2.3	1.4
<i>Total agree</i>	%	<i>69.9</i>	<i>70.4</i>	<i>72.1</i>	<i>69.5</i>	<i>74.9</i>	<i>72.1</i>	<i>74.7</i>	<i>72.0</i>	<i>70.9</i>
<i>Total disagree</i>	%	<i>10.2</i>	<i>10.4</i>	<i>9.1</i>	<i>10.7</i>	<i>7.2</i>	<i>8.3</i>	<i>6.6</i>	<i>8.2</i>	<i>9.7</i>
Sample size	no.	4 654	4 613	5 537	1 804	1 804	1 803	1 984	1 005	23 204
Likert index (c)	Index	3.76	3.76	3.81	3.72	3.88	3.80	3.87	3.82	3.78

(a) Data for 2002-03 onwards are based on responses from people aged 15 years or over.

(b) Totals may not add up to 100 per cent as a result of rounding.

Table 5A.25 Opinions on statement 'most police are honest' (a), (b), (c)

	<i>Unit</i>	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>WA</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>ACT</i>	<i>NT</i>	<i>Aust</i>
--	-------------	------------	------------	------------	-----------	-----------	------------	------------	-----------	-------------

(c) The Likert summation index method aggregates responses to provide a single measure of the general (or 'average') perceptions of respondents.

Each response category is allocated a weight. The number of responses for the category are multiplied by the weight to give a total score for the category. The total scores for each category are summed and divided by the total number of responses to derive the Likert index for the question. (See box 5.3 in chapter 5 for a detailed example).

For the response categories in the table above, the weights are as follows:

Strongly agree = 5; agree = 4; neither = 3; disagree = 2; and strongly disagree = 1.

Source: ACPR (unpublished).

Table 5A.26

Table 5A.26		Opinions on statement 'have confidence in the police' (a), (b), (c)								
	Unit	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Aust
2002-03										
Strongly agree	%	25.3	29.2	30.2	20.9	32.5	25.9	26.4	27.1	27.3
Agree	%	54.9	56.2	53.0	58.2	54.4	56.8	56.8	53.5	55.3
Neither	%	10.0	8.3	9.5	11.8	7.4	8.3	10.2	10.1	9.4
Disagree	%	6.7	4.3	4.9	6.7	3.8	6.5	4.7	6.1	5.5
Strongly disagree	%	2.8	1.8	2.2	2.1	1.7	1.9	1.5	2.7	2.2
Don't know	%	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.5	0.3	0.4	0.3
<i>Total agree</i>	%	<i>80.2</i>	<i>85.4</i>	<i>83.2</i>	<i>79.1</i>	<i>86.9</i>	<i>82.7</i>	<i>83.2</i>	<i>80.6</i>	<i>82.6</i>
<i>Total disagree</i>	%	<i>9.5</i>	<i>6.1</i>	<i>7.1</i>	<i>8.8</i>	<i>5.5</i>	<i>8.4</i>	<i>6.2</i>	<i>8.8</i>	<i>7.7</i>
Sample size	no.	5 132	2 573	4 051	2 133	2 095	2 038	2 027	2 024	22 073
Likert index (c)	Index	3.94	4.07	4.04	3.89	4.12	3.99	4.02	3.97	4.00
2003-04										
Strongly agree	%	24.4	27.3	25.7	22.0	28.5	25.8	22.3	22.3	25.4
Agree	%	55.7	54.6	55.9	54.9	57.1	56.8	58.6	58.8	55.6
Neither	%	12.1	11.1	10.1	13.7	7.9	9.0	11.0	10.4	11.2
Disagree	%	5.0	5.0	5.8	6.4	4.8	5.7	6.0	5.5	5.3
Strongly disagree	%	2.5	2.0	2.3	2.9	1.3	2.6	1.9	2.8	2.3
Don't know	%	0.3	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.4	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.2
<i>Total agree</i>	%	<i>80.2</i>	<i>81.8</i>	<i>81.6</i>	<i>77.0</i>	<i>85.6</i>	<i>82.6</i>	<i>80.9</i>	<i>81.1</i>	<i>81.0</i>
<i>Total disagree</i>	%	<i>7.4</i>	<i>7.0</i>	<i>8.1</i>	<i>9.3</i>	<i>6.1</i>	<i>8.2</i>	<i>7.9</i>	<i>8.3</i>	<i>7.6</i>
Sample size	no.	4 960	3 029	3 982	1 976	1 942	1 983	1 985	1 483	21 340
Likert index (c)	Index	3.95	4.00	3.97	3.87	4.07	3.98	3.94	3.93	3.97
2004-05										
Strongly agree	%	24.3	27.1	28.1	20.1	29.3	25.4	23.8	28.0	25.7
Agree	%	54.2	53.2	51.4	54.2	52.5	53.6	54.4	50.2	53.2
Neither	%	12.6	10.9	12.0	15.3	11.8	13.5	12.9	14.6	12.3
Disagree	%	6.2	6.5	6.1	8.5	3.7	5.6	6.5	4.3	6.3
Strongly disagree	%	2.5	2.0	2.3	1.7	2.3	1.8	2.0	2.8	2.2
Don't know	%	0.2	0.4	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.1	0.3	0.1	0.2
<i>Total agree</i>	%	<i>78.5</i>	<i>80.3</i>	<i>79.5</i>	<i>74.4</i>	<i>81.9</i>	<i>79.0</i>	<i>78.3</i>	<i>78.2</i>	<i>79.0</i>
<i>Total disagree</i>	%	<i>8.7</i>	<i>8.5</i>	<i>8.4</i>	<i>10.2</i>	<i>6.0</i>	<i>7.4</i>	<i>8.5</i>	<i>7.1</i>	<i>8.5</i>
Sample size	no.	4 654	4 613	5 537	1 804	1 804	1 803	1 984	1 005	23 204
Likert index (c)	Index	3.92	3.97	3.97	3.83	4.03	3.95	3.92	3.96	3.94

(a) Data for 2002-03 onwards are based on responses from people aged 15 years or over.

(b) Totals may not add up to 100 per cent as a result of rounding.

Table 5A.26 **Opinions on statement 'have confidence in the police' (a), (b), (c)**

	<i>Unit</i>	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>WA</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>ACT</i>	<i>NT</i>	<i>Aust</i>
--	-------------	------------	------------	------------	-----------	-----------	------------	------------	-----------	-------------

(c) The Likert summation index method aggregates responses to provide a single measure of the general (or 'average') perceptions of respondents.

Each response category is allocated a weight. The number of responses for the category are multiplied by the weight to give a total score for the category. The total scores for each category are summed and divided by the total number of responses to derive the Likert index for the question. (See box 5.3 in chapter 5 for a detailed example).

For the response categories in the table above, the weights are as follows:

Strongly agree = 5; agree = 4; neither = 3; disagree = 2; and strongly disagree = 1.

Source: ACPR (unpublished).

Table 5A.27

Table 5A.27	Trends in complaints (a)							
	NSW(b)	Vic(c)	Qld(d), (f)	WA(e)	SA	Tas	ACT(f)	NT(f)
Complaints per 100 000 people								
2000-01	56	11	57	56	77	29	175	105
2001-02	36	11	59	47	78	21	182	107
2002-03	51	8	67	41	85	19	159	136
2003-04	47	13	61	42	83	19	156	146
2004-05	37	23	47	49	76	20	137	166
Complaints per 100 sworn staff								
2000-01	29	na	29	22	33	14	96	24
2001-02	18	na	30	19	33	10	102	25
2002-03	26	4	34	16	35	9	88	36
2003-04	22	6	30	17	35	9	83	36
2004-05	18	11	21	20	31	10	74	44

- (a) Data is are not comparable across jurisdictions. Data are comparable for trends within jurisdictions. Complaints data refers to number of statements of complaints by members of the public regarding police conduct when a person was in police custody or had voluntary dealing with the police.
- (b) For NSW, a new complaints management system (c@ts.i) is being implemented (progressively since December 2001). Figures for 2001-02 include only matters entered into the former Complaints Information System (CIS).
- (c) Victorian data for 2000-01 are not available due to Victoria Police work bans. Therefore, an estimate for this financial year has been provided.
- (d) Figures for 2003-04 include 386 complaint matters where the on-duty status of the subject member is unknown.
- (e) For WA, data for 2000-01 to 2003-04 have been revised. The number of complaints recorded can vary due to the back-capture of previously unreported complaints of a minor nature that are resolved at the local level.
- (f) Data include verbal complaints in the NT, ACT and Qld.
- na** Not available.

Source: State and Territory governments (unpublished).

Table 5A.28

Table 5A.28 **Indigenous, sworn and unsworn police staff (a)**

	<i>Unit</i>	<i>NSW(b)</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>WA</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>ACT</i>	<i>NT</i>
Indigenous staff as proportion of total staff									
2000-01	%	0.8	na	na	1.7	1.2	1.7	0.8	5.4
2001-02	%	0.8	na	na	1.7	1.3	1.8	0.9	4.6
2002-03	%	0.9	na	na	2.3	1.4	1.6	1.0	4.8
2003-04	%	1.1	0.1	na	2.9	1.3	1.5	1.3	5.7
2004-05	%	1.3	na	na	3.1	1.2	1.6	1.4	6.7
Representation of Indigenous people among all people aged 20–64 (30 June 2001)									
Indigenous people	no.	63 779	13 430	59 758	31 717	12 411	8 073	1 966	28 936
All people	000	4 011.1	2 975.3	2 287.0	1166.4	908.4	278.0	205.3	125.0
Proportion Indigenous	%	1.6	0.5	2.6	2.7	1.4	2.9	1.0	23.2

(a) Indigenous staff numbers relate to those staff who self-identify as being of Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander descent.

(b) For NSW, Indigenous status is not necessarily updated from the time of recruitment.

na Not available.

Source: State and Territory governments (unpublished); ABS Population by Age and Sex, Australian States and Territories, Cat. no. 3201.0, (unpublished).

Table 5A.29

Table 5A.29		Police staff, sworn and unsworn, by gender (per cent) (a)								
	<i>NSW</i> (b)	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>WA</i> (c)	<i>SA</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>ACT</i> (d)	<i>NT</i>	<i>Aust</i>	
Male										
2000-01	68.8	77.5	68.5	79.9	74.6	71.5	71.3	70.0	72.5	
2001-02	67.7	77.1	68.6	79.9	73.7	70.5	69.3	68.8	71.9	
2002-03	67.1	75.4	68.4	79.1	72.4	69.9	68.5	69.0	71.0	
2003-04	66.4	74.4	68.3	78.6	72.4	69.9	68.4	68.1	70.4	
2004-05	66.7	73.5	68.0	77.2	72.0	69.0	68.1	67.3	70.1	
Female										
2000-01	31.2	22.5	31.5	20.1	25.4	28.5	28.7	30.0	27.5	
2001-02	32.3	22.9	31.4	20.1	26.3	29.5	30.7	31.2	28.1	
2002-03	32.9	24.6	31.6	20.9	27.6	30.1	31.5	31.0	29.0	
2003-04	33.6	25.6	31.7	21.4	27.6	30.1	31.6	31.9	29.6	
2004-05	33.3	26.5	32.0	22.8	28.0	31.0	31.9	32.7	29.9	

(a) FTE staff.

(b) For NSW, data from 2000-01 onwards based on a headcount at 30 June.

(c) Excludes recruits in training.

(d) As a result of a comprehensive review of enabling costs applicable to ACT policing in 2000-01, the formula previously applied to the calculation of staffing and expenditure data has been significantly revised. This methodological shift means that data prior to 2000-01 are not directly comparable with those for previous years.

Source: State and Territory governments (unpublished).

Performance indicators for community safety and support

Table 5A.30

Table 5A.30 **Feelings of safety at home alone (a), (b), (c)**

	<i>Unit</i>	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>WA</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>ACT</i>	<i>NT</i>	<i>Aust</i>
<i>Home alone during day 2002-03</i>										
Very safe	%	58.7	65.4	64.1	53.9	60.0	67.1	61.0	62.3	61.2
Safe	%	31.9	29.0	29.0	33.6	31.2	26.6	31.4	28.6	30.6
Neither	%	6.0	3.7	4.4	8.1	5.6	4.0	5.2	5.9	5.2
Unsafe	%	2.1	1.2	1.4	3.9	2.4	1.7	1.6	1.3	2.1
Very unsafe	%	0.9	0.4	0.7	1.1	0.8	0.7	0.5	0.9	0.7
Not applicable	%	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.8	0.6	0.3	0.2	0.5	0.4
<i>Total safe</i>	%	<i>90.6</i>	<i>94.4</i>	<i>93.1</i>	<i>87.5</i>	<i>91.2</i>	<i>93.7</i>	<i>92.4</i>	<i>90.9</i>	<i>91.8</i>
<i>Total unsafe</i>	%	<i>3.0</i>	<i>1.6</i>	<i>2.2</i>	<i>3.8</i>	<i>2.8</i>	<i>1.9</i>	<i>1.7</i>	<i>2.6</i>	<i>2.5</i>
Sample size	no.	5 132	2 573	4 051	2 133	2 095	2 038	2 027	2 024	22 073
Likert index (c)	Index	4.5	4.6	4.6	4.4	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.5
<i>Home alone during day 2003-04</i>										
Very safe	%	58.7	63.9	62.5	55.2	58.9	64.2	63.0	61.9	60.6
Safe	%	32.1	29.8	30.1	33.0	34.5	30.0	30.3	30.3	31.4
Neither	%	6.3	4.5	5.1	8.5	4.4	4.6	4.6	5.2	5.6
Unsafe	%	2.2	1.0	1.5	2.3	1.7	0.8	1.9	1.9	1.7
Very unsafe	%	0.6	0.7	0.5	1.1	0.4	0.3	0.1	0.6	0.6
Not applicable	%	0.1	–	0.2	–	0.1	0.1	0.1	–	0.1
<i>Total safe</i>	%	<i>90.8</i>	<i>93.7</i>	<i>92.6</i>	<i>88.2</i>	<i>93.4</i>	<i>94.2</i>	<i>93.3</i>	<i>92.2</i>	<i>91.9</i>
<i>Total unsafe</i>	%	<i>2.9</i>	<i>1.7</i>	<i>2.1</i>	<i>3.3</i>	<i>2.1</i>	<i>1.1</i>	<i>2.0</i>	<i>2.6</i>	<i>2.4</i>
Sample size	no.	4 960	3 029	3 982	1 976	1 942	1 983	1 985	1 483	21 340
Likert index (c)	Index	4.46	4.55	4.53	4.39	4.50	4.57	4.54	4.51	4.50
<i>Home alone during day 2004-05</i>										
Very safe	%	58.6	62.8	63.4	57.3	59.7	67.6	61.8	64.7	60.9
Safe	%	31.9	29.6	29.2	33.2	32.0	26.9	30.1	29.1	30.8
Neither	%	6.9	5.7	4.9	7.6	6.0	3.7	5.5	4.5	6.1
Unsafe	%	2.0	1.2	1.6	1.2	1.4	1.3	1.7	1.2	1.6
Very unsafe	%	0.5	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.6	0.4	0.8	0.2	0.5
Not applicable	%	0.1	0.3	0.3	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.3	0.2
<i>Total safe</i>	%	<i>90.5</i>	<i>92.4</i>	<i>92.6</i>	<i>90.5</i>	<i>91.7</i>	<i>94.5</i>	<i>91.9</i>	<i>93.8</i>	<i>91.7</i>
<i>Total unsafe</i>	%	<i>2.5</i>	<i>1.6</i>	<i>2.2</i>	<i>1.8</i>	<i>2.0</i>	<i>1.7</i>	<i>2.5</i>	<i>1.4</i>	<i>2.1</i>
Sample size	no.	4 654	4 613	5 537	1 804	1 804	1 803	1 984	1 005	23 204
Likert index (c)	Index	4.46	4.54	4.54	4.45	4.49	4.60	4.51	4.57	4.50

Table 5A.30

Table 5A.30 **Feelings of safety at home alone (a), (b), (c)**

	<i>Unit</i>	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>WA</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>ACT</i>	<i>NT</i>	<i>Aust</i>
<i>Home alone after dark 2002-03</i>										
Very safe	%	41.6	47.1	45.7	34.1	43.7	47.6	42.9	43.8	43.3
Safe	%	38.5	37.4	36.9	38.6	36.5	36.8	38.8	35.4	37.7
Neither	%	10.4	10.1	10.2	14.6	11.4	8.4	10.4	11.1	10.8
Unsafe	%	6.5	3.9	4.9	8.1	6.0	4.8	6.0	6.0	5.6
Very unsafe	%	2.5	1.2	1.8	3.9	2.0	2.0	1.6	3.3	2.2
Not applicable	%	0.5	0.3	0.4	0.6	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.4
<i>Total safe</i>	%	<i>80.1</i>	<i>84.5</i>	<i>82.6</i>	<i>72.7</i>	<i>80.2</i>	<i>84.4</i>	<i>81.7</i>	<i>79.2</i>	<i>81.0</i>
<i>Total unsafe</i>	%	<i>9.0</i>	<i>5.1</i>	<i>6.7</i>	<i>12.0</i>	<i>8.0</i>	<i>6.8</i>	<i>7.6</i>	<i>9.3</i>	<i>7.8</i>
Sample size	no.	5 132	2 573	4 051	2 133	2 095	2 038	2 027	2 024	22 073
Likert index (c)	Index	4.11	4.26	4.20	3.91	4.14	4.24	4.16	4.11	4.15
<i>Home alone after dark 2003-04</i>										
Very safe	%	42.1	46.4	45.8	35.9	41.6	47.0	44.4	42.3	43.3
Safe	%	37.7	36.0	37.1	39.1	38.3	36.8	39.9	37.4	37.4
Neither	%	11.4	11.2	10.4	13.6	11.6	9.3	10.3	10.9	11.3
Unsafe	%	6.3	4.8	4.9	8.7	5.9	5.2	4.4	7.6	5.8
Very unsafe	%	2.3	1.5	1.5	2.6	2.4	1.6	1.0	1.8	2.0
Not applicable	%	0.2	0.1	0.3	0.1	0.2	0.1	–	–	0.2
<i>Total safe</i>	%	<i>79.8</i>	<i>82.4</i>	<i>82.9</i>	<i>75.0</i>	<i>79.9</i>	<i>83.9</i>	<i>84.3</i>	<i>79.7</i>	<i>80.7</i>
<i>Total unsafe</i>	%	<i>8.6</i>	<i>6.3</i>	<i>6.4</i>	<i>11.3</i>	<i>8.3</i>	<i>6.7</i>	<i>5.4</i>	<i>9.4</i>	<i>7.8</i>
Sample size	no.	4 960	3 029	3 982	1 976	1 942	1 983	1 985	1 483	21 340
Likert index (c)	Index	4.11	4.21	4.21	3.97	4.11	4.23	4.22	4.11	4.15
<i>Home alone after dark 2004-05</i>										
Very safe	%	42.2	45.2	45.8	38.4	40.8	47.8	42.6	46.6	43.3
Safe	%	37.0	37.8	36.9	37.5	39.6	37.8	39.7	34.3	37.4
Neither	%	12.3	10.1	10.7	14.2	11.0	8.5	10.7	12.7	11.4
Unsafe	%	6.0	4.9	4.7	7.5	6.5	4.1	5.0	4.5	5.6
Very unsafe	%	2.0	1.5	1.7	2.3	1.8	1.5	2.0	1.6	1.8
Not applicable	%	0.5	0.5	0.3	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.3	0.4
<i>Total safe</i>	%	<i>79.2</i>	<i>83.0</i>	<i>82.7</i>	<i>75.9</i>	<i>80.4</i>	<i>85.6</i>	<i>82.3</i>	<i>80.9</i>	<i>80.7</i>
<i>Total unsafe</i>	%	<i>8.0</i>	<i>6.4</i>	<i>6.4</i>	<i>9.8</i>	<i>8.4</i>	<i>5.6</i>	<i>7.0</i>	<i>6.0</i>	<i>7.4</i>
Sample size	no.	4 654	4 613	5 537	1 804	1 804	1 803	1 984	1 005	23 204
Likert index (c)	Index	4.12	4.21	4.21	4.02	4.11	4.27	4.16	4.20	4.15

(a) Data for 2002-03 onwards are based on responses from people aged 15 years or over.

(b) Totals may not add up to 100 per cent as a result of rounding.

Table 5A.30 **Feelings of safety at home alone (a), (b), (c)**

	<i>Unit</i>	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>WA</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>ACT</i>	<i>NT</i>	<i>Aust</i>
--	-------------	------------	------------	------------	-----------	-----------	------------	------------	-----------	-------------

(c) The Likert summation index method aggregates responses to provide a single measure of the general (or 'average') perceptions of respondents.

Each response category is allocated a weight. The number of responses for the category are multiplied by the weight to give a total score for the category. The total scores for each category are summed and divided by the total number of responses to derive the Likert index for the question. (See box 5.3 in chapter 5 for a detailed example).

For the response categories in the table above, the weights are as follows:

Very safe = 5; safe = 4; neither = 3; unsafe = 2; and very unsafe = 1.

Source: ACPR (unpublished).

Table 5A.31

Table 5A.31 **Feelings of safety walking or jogging locally (a), (b), (c)**

	<i>Unit</i>	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>WA</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>ACT</i>	<i>NT</i>	<i>Aust</i>
<i>Walking or jogging during the day 2002-03</i>										
Very safe	%	47.1	53.4	49.7	44.9	48.0	53.6	47.5	44.7	49.2
Safe	%	39.1	36.1	37.7	40.4	38.1	35.8	39.4	37.9	38.0
Neither	%	7.5	5.8	6.9	8.5	7.2	5.8	7.5	9.7	7.0
Unsafe	%	3.2	2.4	2.7	3.1	3.2	1.9	3.2	3.9	2.9
Very unsafe	%	1.1	0.6	0.8	1.3	0.7	0.8	0.7	1.8	0.9
Not applicable	%	2.0	1.8	2.2	1.8	2.8	2.1	1.7	2.0	2.0
<i>Total safe</i>	%	<i>86.2</i>	<i>89.5</i>	<i>87.4</i>	<i>85.3</i>	<i>86.1</i>	<i>89.4</i>	<i>86.9</i>	<i>82.6</i>	<i>87.2</i>
<i>Total unsafe</i>	%	<i>4.3</i>	<i>3.0</i>	<i>3.5</i>	<i>4.4</i>	<i>3.9</i>	<i>2.7</i>	<i>3.9</i>	<i>5.7</i>	<i>3.8</i>
Sample size	no.	5 132	2 573	4 051	2 133	2 095	2 038	2 027	2 024	22 073
Likert index (c)	Index	4.31	4.42	4.36	4.27	4.33	4.42	4.32	4.22	4.34
<i>Walking or jogging during the day 2003-04</i>										
Very safe	%	47.9	50.7	49.9	45.1	48.0	52.2	48.9	44.2	48.8
Safe	%	39.1	38.5	38.0	42.3	39.2	37.3	39.9	41.2	39.1
Neither	%	8.2	6.9	7.0	7.6	7.9	6.7	7.6	9.1	7.5
Unsafe	%	2.8	2.6	3.2	2.8	3.2	1.9	2.8	4.1	2.9
Very unsafe	%	1.2	0.5	0.8	1.4	0.5	0.7	0.3	0.9	0.9
Not applicable	%	0.9	0.8	1.0	0.8	1.1	1.2	0.5	0.4	0.9
<i>Total safe</i>	%	<i>87.0</i>	<i>89.2</i>	<i>87.9</i>	<i>87.4</i>	<i>87.2</i>	<i>89.5</i>	<i>88.8</i>	<i>85.4</i>	<i>87.9</i>
<i>Total unsafe</i>	%	<i>4.0</i>	<i>3.1</i>	<i>4.0</i>	<i>4.3</i>	<i>3.8</i>	<i>2.6</i>	<i>3.1</i>	<i>5.0</i>	<i>3.8</i>
Sample size	no.	4 960	3 029	3 982	1 976	1 942	1 983	1 985	1 483	21 340
Likert index (c)	Index	4.31	4.37	4.34	4.28	4.32	4.40	4.35	4.24	4.33
<i>Walking or jogging during the day 2004-05</i>										
Very safe	%	50.1	52.8	51.4	46.5	48.8	57.2	50.7	49.0	50.7
Safe	%	36.8	36.6	36.0	40.0	37.4	34.2	36.8	36.3	36.9
Neither	%	7.9	6.5	7.6	9.1	8.4	5.4	7.7	8.5	7.6
Unsafe	%	2.6	2.3	2.2	2.8	3.1	1.6	2.8	3.3	2.5
Very unsafe	%	1.0	0.6	0.7	0.4	0.8	0.3	0.8	1.1	0.8
Not applicable	%	1.6	1.2	2.0	1.1	1.7	1.3	1.2	1.9	1.5
<i>Total safe</i>	%	<i>86.9</i>	<i>89.4</i>	<i>87.4</i>	<i>86.5</i>	<i>86.2</i>	<i>91.4</i>	<i>87.5</i>	<i>85.3</i>	<i>87.6</i>
<i>Total unsafe</i>	%	<i>3.6</i>	<i>2.9</i>	<i>3.0</i>	<i>3.2</i>	<i>3.9</i>	<i>2.0</i>	<i>3.6</i>	<i>4.4</i>	<i>3.2</i>
Sample size	no.	4 654	4 613	5 537	1 804	1 804	1 803	1 984	1 005	23 204
Likert index (c)	Index	4.35	4.40	4.38	4.31	4.32	4.48	4.35	4.31	4.36

Table 5A.31

Table 5A.31 **Feelings of safety walking or jogging locally (a), (b), (c)**

	Unit	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Aust
Walking or jogging <i>after dark</i> 2002-03										
Very safe	%	13.7	16.8	16.4	13.1	15.7	18.8	14.0	13.5	15.2
Safe	%	25.6	28.1	25.6	25.2	26.8	26.5	28.5	21.8	26.3
Neither	%	18.8	20.4	18.8	19.2	17.7	18.6	19.3	18.8	19.2
Unsafe	%	22.7	18.7	19.6	20.8	19.6	17.9	21.4	22.6	20.6
Very unsafe	%	13.0	9.0	12.9	15.0	11.8	10.4	11.2	18.3	12.0
Not applicable	%	6.3	7.0	6.7	6.7	8.4	7.8	5.6	5.0	6.8
<i>Total safe</i>	%	<i>39.3</i>	<i>44.9</i>	<i>42.0</i>	<i>38.3</i>	<i>42.5</i>	<i>45.3</i>	<i>42.5</i>	<i>35.3</i>	<i>41.5</i>
<i>Total unsafe</i>	%	<i>35.7</i>	<i>27.7</i>	<i>32.5</i>	<i>44.4</i>	<i>31.4</i>	<i>28.3</i>	<i>32.6</i>	<i>40.9</i>	<i>32.6</i>
Sample size	no.	5 132	2 573	4 051	2 133	2 095	2 038	2 027	2 024	22 073
Likert index (c)	Index	3.04	3.27	3.14	3.01	3.16	3.27	3.14	2.89	3.13
Walking or jogging <i>after dark</i> 2003-04										
Very safe	%	13.5	15.2	14.6	13.1	14.7	17.3	11.9	11.6	14.2
Safe	%	26.4	27.2	25.5	23.4	26.3	27.7	30.1	24.2	26.2
Neither	%	20.9	22.9	20.2	20.8	21.3	20.2	23.5	18.7	21.3
Unsafe	%	23.0	21.4	23.0	24.0	20.4	20.7	23.1	25.9	22.4
Very unsafe	%	13.3	10.3	12.5	14.9	12.8	9.7	9.1	17.9	12.4
Not applicable	%	3.0	3.1	4.3	3.8	4.4	4.4	2.3	1.9	3.5
<i>Total safe</i>	%	<i>39.9</i>	<i>42.4</i>	<i>40.1</i>	<i>36.5</i>	<i>41.0</i>	<i>45.0</i>	<i>42.0</i>	<i>35.8</i>	<i>40.4</i>
<i>Total unsafe</i>	%	<i>36.2</i>	<i>31.7</i>	<i>35.4</i>	<i>38.9</i>	<i>33.2</i>	<i>30.4</i>	<i>32.2</i>	<i>43.8</i>	<i>34.8</i>
Sample size	no.	4 960	3 029	3 982	1 976	1 942	1 983	1 985	1 483	21 340
Likert index (c)	Index	3.04	3.16	3.07	2.96	3.10	3.23	3.13	2.85	3.08
Walking or jogging <i>after dark</i> 2004-05										
Very safe	%	15.7	16.8	17.4	14.2	17.0	17.8	14.3	15.5	16.3
Safe	%	28.9	29.5	26.8	25.7	26.2	31.8	28.7	26.1	28.2
Neither	%	20.8	21.0	22.0	21.9	20.6	21.6	23.6	18.3	21.2
Unsafe	%	19.9	18.4	18.2	20.2	19.1	15.8	19.9	20.7	19.1
Very unsafe	%	9.0	8.7	9.4	11.8	10.8	7.4	9.1	14.5	9.5
Not applicable	%	5.6	5.6	6.1	6.2	6.4	5.5	4.4	4.9	5.8
<i>Total safe</i>	%	<i>44.6</i>	<i>46.3</i>	<i>44.2</i>	<i>39.9</i>	<i>43.2</i>	<i>49.6</i>	<i>43.0</i>	<i>41.6</i>	<i>44.5</i>
<i>Total unsafe</i>	%	<i>28.9</i>	<i>27.1</i>	<i>27.6</i>	<i>32.0</i>	<i>29.9</i>	<i>23.2</i>	<i>29.0</i>	<i>35.2</i>	<i>28.6</i>
Sample size	no.	4 654	4 613	5 537	1 804	1 804	1 803	1 984	1 005	23 204
Likert index (c)	Index	3.24	3.29	3.26	3.11	3.21	3.39	3.2	3.08	3.24

(a) Data for 2002-03 onwards are based on responses from people aged 15 years or over.

(b) Totals may not add up to 100 per cent as a result of rounding.

(c) The Likert summation index method aggregates responses to provide a single measure of the general (or 'average') perceptions of respondents.

Table 5A.31 Feelings of safety walking or jogging locally (a), (b), (c)

<i>Unit</i>	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>WA</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>ACT</i>	<i>NT</i>	<i>Aust</i>
-------------	------------	------------	------------	-----------	-----------	------------	------------	-----------	-------------

Each response category is allocated a weight. The number of responses for the category are multiplied by the weight to give a total score for the category. The total scores for each category are summed and divided by the total number of responses to derive the Likert index for the question. (See box 5.3 in chapter 5 for a detailed example).

For the response categories in the table above, the weights are as follows:

Very safe = 5; safe = 4; neither = 3; unsafe = 2; and very unsafe = 1.

Source: ACPR (unpublished).

Table 5A.32

Table 5A.32 **Feelings of safety on public transport (a), (b), (c)**

	<i>Unit</i>	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>WA</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>ACT</i>	<i>NT</i>	<i>Aust</i>
<i>On public transport during the day 2002-03</i>										
Very safe	%	29.4	32.3	35.5	24.4	33.0	32.9	39.3	26.2	31.2
Safe	%	33.9	32.1	31.8	35.3	29.6	26.0	32.0	24.5	32.6
Neither	%	10.9	8.5	6.1	9.8	6.6	5.7	6.3	7.1	8.8
Unsafe	%	3.7	4.0	1.2	4.9	2.0	1.8	0.8	1.8	3.2
Very unsafe	%	1.8	1.5	0.4	2.1	0.7	0.7	0.6	1.0	1.4
Not applicable	%	20.4	21.6	24.9	23.4	28.1	33.0	20.9	39.4	22.9
<i>Total safe</i>	%	<i>63.3</i>	<i>64.4</i>	<i>67.3</i>	<i>59.7</i>	<i>62.6</i>	<i>58.9</i>	<i>71.3</i>	<i>50.7</i>	<i>63.8</i>
<i>Total unsafe</i>	%	<i>5.5</i>	<i>5.5</i>	<i>1.6</i>	<i>7.0</i>	<i>2.7</i>	<i>2.5</i>	<i>1.4</i>	<i>2.8</i>	<i>4.6</i>
Sample size	no.	5 132	2 573	4 051	2 133	2 095	2 038	2 027	2 024	22 073
Likert index (c)	Index	4.07	4.14	4.34	3.98	4.28	4.32	4.37	4.21	4.15
<i>On public transport during the day 2003-04</i>										
Very safe	%	28.7	28.9	37.3	28.3	34.5	33.4	45.6	26.1	31.1
Safe	%	36.5	36.5	32.6	34.9	31.7	31.0	32.5	31.7	35.0
Neither	%	12.0	11.4	6.7	11.2	9.1	6.7	6.7	7.6	10.4
Unsafe	%	4.8	5.1	2.5	4.4	1.6	1.4	1.2	2.5	4.0
Very unsafe	%	1.5	1.6	0.4	1.3	0.9	0.9	0.3	0.5	1.3
Not applicable	%	16.5	16.5	20.5	19.8	22.2	26.5	13.7	31.6	18.3
<i>Total safe</i>	%	<i>65.2</i>	<i>65.3</i>	<i>69.9</i>	<i>63.3</i>	<i>66.2</i>	<i>64.4</i>	<i>78.0</i>	<i>57.8</i>	<i>66.1</i>
<i>Total unsafe</i>	%	<i>6.3</i>	<i>6.7</i>	<i>2.9</i>	<i>5.7</i>	<i>2.5</i>	<i>2.3</i>	<i>1.5</i>	<i>3.0</i>	<i>5.3</i>
Sample size	no.	4 960	3 029	3 982	1 976	1 942	1 983	1 985	1 483	21 340
Likert index (c)	Index	4.03	4.03	4.31	4.05	4.25	4.29	4.41	4.17	4.11
<i>On public transport during the day 2004-05</i>										
Very safe	%	29.6	27.9	33.1	22.7	29.1	32.3	39.1	22.7	29.3
Safe	%	30.6	32.1	29.9	29.6	28.9	24.6	28.4	27.0	30.4
Neither	%	11.8	11.6	7.0	12.3	8.2	8.4	8.6	7.4	10.4
Unsafe	%	4.1	4.6	1.4	4.5	2.1	1.2	2.1	2.1	3.5
Very unsafe	%	1.4	1.4	0.6	1.2	0.3	0.6	0.7	0.4	1.1
Not applicable	%	22.5	22.4	28.0	29.6	31.5	32.9	21.0	40.3	25.3
<i>Total safe</i>	%	<i>60.2</i>	<i>60.0</i>	<i>62.9</i>	<i>52.3</i>	<i>58.0</i>	<i>56.9</i>	<i>67.6</i>	<i>49.7</i>	<i>59.7</i>
<i>Total unsafe</i>	%	<i>5.5</i>	<i>6.0</i>	<i>2.1</i>	<i>5.8</i>	<i>2.4</i>	<i>1.8</i>	<i>2.8</i>	<i>2.6</i>	<i>4.6</i>
Sample size	no.	4 654	4 613	5 537	1 804	1 804	1 803	1 984	1 005	23 204
Likert index (c)	Index	4.07	4.04	4.30	3.97	4.23	4.29	4.31	4.16	4.11

Table 5A.32

Table 5A.32 **Feelings of safety on public transport (a), (b), (c)**

	<i>Unit</i>	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>WA</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>ACT</i>	<i>NT</i>	<i>Aust</i>
<i>On public transport after dark 2002-03</i>										
Very safe	%	6.3	6.9	10.2	6.0	9.3	11.8	13.2	8.8	7.6
Safe	%	14.5	16.4	18.4	12.3	15.1	17.4	22.1	16.3	15.7
Neither	%	17.0	16.9	17.5	16.0	17.3	13.8	18.2	12.8	16.9
Unsafe	%	21.6	20.5	15.1	20.6	15.3	11.0	14.2	11.8	19.2
Very unsafe	%	14.4	12.9	8.1	16.7	8.3	6.0	6.3	6.4	12.3
Not applicable	%	26.1	26.2	30.6	28.4	34.7	40.1	26.0	43.9	28.3
<i>Total safe</i>	%	<i>20.8</i>	<i>23.3</i>	<i>28.6</i>	<i>18.3</i>	<i>24.4</i>	<i>29.2</i>	<i>35.3</i>	<i>25.1</i>	<i>23.3</i>
<i>Total unsafe</i>	%	<i>36.0</i>	<i>33.4</i>	<i>23.2</i>	<i>37.3</i>	<i>23.6</i>	<i>17.0</i>	<i>20.5</i>	<i>18.2</i>	<i>31.5</i>
Sample size	no.	5 132	2 573	4 051	2 133	2 095	2 038	2 027	2 024	22 073
Likert index (c)	Index	2.69	2.78	3.11	2.59	3.03	3.30	3.29	3.16	2.82
<i>On public transport after dark 2003-04</i>										
Very safe	%	6.3	6.5	8.9	5.6	8.1	12.5	13.6	9.3	7.2
Safe	%	16.7	15.0	21.1	14.3	18.1	19.0	27.4	18.2	17.1
Neither	%	18.6	18.8	19.0	20.2	18.6	17.6	22.6	15.1	18.9
Unsafe	%	22.8	24.7	17.4	21.6	18.4	13.4	14.7	13.1	21.4
Very unsafe	%	15.3	15.6	8.4	14.8	9.7	5.4	4.6	8.3	13.2
Not applicable	%	20.4	19.4	25.2	23.5	27.1	32.1	17.1	36.1	22.2
<i>Total safe</i>	%	<i>23.0</i>	<i>21.5</i>	<i>30.0</i>	<i>19.9</i>	<i>26.2</i>	<i>31.5</i>	<i>41.0</i>	<i>27.5</i>	<i>24.3</i>
<i>Total unsafe</i>	%	<i>38.0</i>	<i>40.3</i>	<i>25.8</i>	<i>36.4</i>	<i>28.1</i>	<i>18.8</i>	<i>19.3</i>	<i>21.4</i>	<i>34.6</i>
Sample size	no.	4 960	3 029	3 982	1 976	1 942	1 983	1 985	1 483	21 340
Likert index (c)	Index	2.70	2.65	3.06	2.66	2.95	3.29	3.37	3.11	2.79
<i>On public transport after dark 2004-05</i>										
Very safe	%	7.4	6.9	8.6	4.3	7.0	10.5	11.1	8.2	7.3
Safe	%	14.7	13.9	19.3	10.3	16.0	18.0	22.1	16.0	15.2
Neither	%	18.6	17.7	17.9	16.6	18.6	16.5	21.4	16.5	18.0
Unsafe	%	19.4	20.9	14.6	22.1	13.7	10.4	13.6	9.2	18.3
Very unsafe	%	11.7	13.4	6.0	12.1	7.2	4.1	5.8	5.0	10.4
Not applicable	%	28.2	27.3	33.6	34.6	37.6	40.5	26.0	45.0	30.8
<i>Total safe</i>	%	<i>22.1</i>	<i>20.8</i>	<i>27.9</i>	<i>14.6</i>	<i>23.0</i>	<i>28.5</i>	<i>33.2</i>	<i>24.2</i>	<i>22.5</i>
<i>Total unsafe</i>	%	<i>31.1</i>	<i>34.3</i>	<i>20.6</i>	<i>34.2</i>	<i>20.9</i>	<i>14.5</i>	<i>19.4</i>	<i>14.2</i>	<i>28.7</i>
Sample size	no.	4 654	4 613	5 537	1 804	1 804	1 803	1 984	1 005	23 204
Likert index (c)	Index	2.81	2.72	3.15	2.58	3.03	3.34	3.26	3.24	2.87

(a) Data for 2002-03 onwards are based on responses from people aged 15 years or over.

(b) Totals may not add up to 100 per cent as a result of rounding.

(c) The Likert summation index method aggregates responses to provide a single measure of the general (or 'average') perceptions of respondents.

Table 5A.32 **Feelings of safety on public transport (a), (b), (c)**

<i>Unit</i>	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>WA</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>ACT</i>	<i>NT</i>	<i>Aust</i>
-------------	------------	------------	------------	-----------	-----------	------------	------------	-----------	-------------

Each response category is allocated a weight. The number of responses for the category are multiplied by the weight to give a total score for the category. The total scores for each category are summed and divided by the total number of responses to derive the Likert index for the question. (See box 5.3 in chapter 5 for a detailed example).

For the response categories in the table above, the weights are as follows:

Very safe = 5; safe = 4; neither = 3; unsafe = 2; and very unsafe = 1.

Source: ACPR (unpublished).

Table 5A.33

Table 5A.33 **Opinion on whether family violence, sexual assault and other physical assault are problems in the neighbourhood (a), (b), (c)**

	<i>Unit</i>	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>WA</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>ACT</i>	<i>NT</i>	<i>Aust</i>
Family violence 2002-03										
Major problem	%	11.6	9.0	10.3	8.7	7.8	6.7	5.5	21.0	10.0
Somewhat a problem	%	38.8	32.4	36.2	33.7	30.7	32.7	27.0	32.7	35.1
<i>Total major or somewhat a problem</i>	%	<i>50.4</i>	<i>41.4</i>	<i>46.5</i>	<i>42.4</i>	<i>38.5</i>	<i>39.4</i>	<i>32.5</i>	<i>53.7</i>	<i>45.1</i>
Not a problem	%	39.0	46.3	43.4	48.3	49.9	50.1	51.3	38.5	44.0
Don't know	%	10.6	12.3	10.1	9.3	11.6	10.5	16.1	7.8	11.0
Sample size	no.	5 132	2 573	4 051	2 133	2 095	2 038	2 027	2 024	22 073
Likert index (c)	Index	1.69	1.58	1.63	1.56	1.52	1.51	1.45	1.81	1.62
Family violence 2003-04										
Major problem	%	12.7	10.0	13.5	11.9	8.9	8.8	6.4	22.0	11.6
Somewhat a problem	%	41.0	36.6	36.3	35.1	35.2	33.7	33.2	37.3	37.6
<i>Total major or somewhat a problem</i>	%	<i>53.7</i>	<i>46.6</i>	<i>49.8</i>	<i>47.0</i>	<i>44.1</i>	<i>42.5</i>	<i>39.6</i>	<i>59.3</i>	<i>49.2</i>
Not a problem	%	40.0	45.5	44.2	44.8	47.8	48.7	49.1	35.9	43.6
Don't know	%	6.3	8.0	6.0	8.1	8.1	8.8	11.4	4.8	7.1
Sample size	no.	4 960	3 029	3 982	1 976	1 942	1 983	1 985	1 483	21 340
Likert index (c)	Index	1.71	1.61	1.67	1.64	1.58	1.56	1.52	1.85	1.66
Family violence 2004-05										
Major problem	%	8.7	7.6	8.1	8.0	6.1	7.5	5.3	14.4	8.0
Somewhat a problem	%	30.4	32.0	29.3	31.2	29.5	28.5	28.5	30.5	30.5
<i>Total major or somewhat a problem</i>	%	<i>39.1</i>	<i>39.6</i>	<i>37.4</i>	<i>39.2</i>	<i>35.6</i>	<i>36.0</i>	<i>33.8</i>	<i>44.9</i>	<i>38.5</i>
Not a problem	%	54.6	52.5	57.5	52.1	55.6	57.3	55.1	49.2	54.5
Don't know	%	6.2	7.9	5.1	8.7	8.8	6.8	11.1	5.9	7.0
Sample size	no.	4 654	4 613	5 537	1 804	1 804	1 803	1 984	1 005	23 204
Likert index (c)	Index	1.51	1.51	1.48	1.52	1.46	1.47	1.44	1.63	1.50
Sexual assault 2002-03										
Major problem	%	12.7	8.5	9.7	8.3	6.7	5.1	5.6	15.1	9.9
Somewhat a problem	%	38.1	32.9	33.7	32.7	30.0	27.2	29.4	33.3	34.3
<i>Total major or somewhat a problem</i>	%	<i>48.0</i>	<i>45.2</i>	<i>41.2</i>	<i>42.9</i>	<i>37.3</i>	<i>32.6</i>	<i>36.1</i>	<i>49.8</i>	<i>44.1</i>
Not a problem	%	40.9	49.0	48.1	49.9	53.7	59.4	51.5	43.6	46.8
Don't know	%	8.3	9.6	8.5	9.2	9.6	8.3	13.5	7.9	9.0
Sample size	no.	5 132	2 573	4 051	2 133	2 095	2 038	2 027	2 024	22 073
Likert index (c)	Index	1.68	1.64	1.56	1.58	1.52	1.46	1.46	1.70	1.62

Table 5A.33

Table 5A.33 **Opinion on whether family violence, sexual assault and other physical assault are problems in the neighbourhood (a), (b), (c)**

	<i>Unit</i>	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>WA</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>ACT</i>	<i>NT</i>	<i>Aust</i>
Sexual assault 2003-04										
Major problem	%	12.1	10.6	11.0	8.9	8.5	5.8	5.0	18.5	10.7
Somewhat a problem	%	40.2	36.3	37.3	34.9	32.2	29.7	33.6	35.4	37.1
<i>Total major or somewhat a problem</i>	%	<i>52.3</i>	<i>46.9</i>	<i>48.3</i>	<i>43.8</i>	<i>40.7</i>	<i>35.5</i>	<i>38.6</i>	<i>53.9</i>	<i>47.8</i>
Not a problem	%	42.9	47.7	46.4	49.3	53.3	57.5	53.1	42.1	46.8
Don't know	%	4.8	5.4	5.2	6.9	6.0	7.0	8.3	4.1	5.5
Sample size	no.	4 960	3 029	3 982	1 976	1 942	1 983	1 985	1 483	21 340
Likert index (c)	Index	1.7	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.5	1.4	1.5	1.8	1.6
Sexual assault 2004-05										
Major problem	%	7.9	7.6	6.6	6.1	5.1	5.1	4.1	10.0	7.1
Somewhat a problem	%	30.3	30.4	23.5	28.5	26.8	22.0	27.4	30.5	28.3
<i>Total major or somewhat a problem</i>	%	<i>38.2</i>	<i>38.0</i>	<i>30.1</i>	<i>34.6</i>	<i>31.9</i>	<i>27.1</i>	<i>31.5</i>	<i>40.5</i>	<i>35.4</i>
Not a problem	%	56.5	55.4	64.3	59.2	61.7	65.5	60.6	54.8	58.7
Don't know	%	5.3	6.6	5.6	6.2	6.4	7.3	8.0	4.8	6.0
Sample size	no.	4 654	4 613	5 537	1 804	1 804	1 803	1 984	1 005	23 204
Likert index (c)	Index	1.49	1.49	1.39	1.43	1.4	1.35	1.39	1.53	1.45
Physical assault (excl. sexual) 2002-03										
Major problem	%	16.8	10.9	12.6	12.1	10.8	9.0	6.3	25.0	13.3
Somewhat a problem	%	44.8	41.0	38.9	38.9	36.1	36.6	34.7	37.0	41.1
<i>Total major or somewhat a problem</i>	%	<i>61.6</i>	<i>51.9</i>	<i>51.5</i>	<i>51.0</i>	<i>46.9</i>	<i>45.6</i>	<i>41.0</i>	<i>62.0</i>	<i>54.4</i>
Not a problem	%	34.5	43.6	44.3	44.4	47.9	50.4	53.4	35.1	41.4
Don't know	%	3.8	4.5	4.2	4.6	5.2	4.0	5.6	2.9	4.3
Sample size	no.	5 132	2 573	4 051	2 133	2 095	2 038	2 027	2 024	22 073
Likert index (c)	Index	1.82	1.66	1.67	1.66	1.61	1.57	1.50	1.90	1.71
Physical assault (excl. sexual) 2003-04										
Major problem	%	17.4	14.4	14.5	12.7	11.0	9.2	6.5	27.3	14.8
Somewhat a problem	%	44.0	42.3	39.8	41.8	37.4	35.6	37.8	37.8	41.7
<i>Total major or somewhat a problem</i>	%	<i>61.4</i>	<i>56.7</i>	<i>54.3</i>	<i>54.5</i>	<i>48.4</i>	<i>44.8</i>	<i>44.3</i>	<i>65.1</i>	<i>56.5</i>
Not a problem	%	36.9	41.4	42.9	43.5	48.6	52.4	51.4	34.0	41.3
Don't know	%	1.8	1.9	2.8	2.0	2.9	2.8	4.3	0.9	2.2
Sample size	no.	4 960	3 029	3 982	1 976	1 942	1 983	1 985	1 483	21 340
Likert index (c)	Index	1.80	1.73	1.71	1.69	1.61	1.55	1.53	1.93	1.73

Table 5A.33

Table 5A.33 Opinion on whether family violence, sexual assault and other physical assault are problems in the neighbourhood (a), (b), (c)

	<i>Unit</i>	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>WA</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>ACT</i>	<i>NT</i>	<i>Aust</i>
Physical assault (excl. sexual) 2004-05										
Major problem	%	10.5	8.4	7.5	8.8	6.2	6.2	5.0	11.8	8.7
Somewhat a problem	%	33.1	33.7	27.2	33.4	31.1	26.3	27.7	34.6	31.8
<i>Total major or somewhat a problem</i>	%	<i>43.6</i>	<i>42.1</i>	<i>34.7</i>	<i>42.2</i>	<i>37.3</i>	<i>32.5</i>	<i>32.7</i>	<i>46.4</i>	<i>40.5</i>
Not a problem	%	54.4	55.4	63.9	56.1	60.4	66.1	65.5	52.4	57.6
Don't know	%	2.0	2.4	1.4	1.8	2.3	1.4	1.8	1.2	2.0
Sample size	no.	4 654	4 613	5 537	1 804	1 804	1 803	1 984	1 005	23 204
Likert index (c)	Index	1.55	1.52	1.43	1.52	1.44	1.39	1.38	1.59	1.5

(a) Data for 2002-03 onwards are based on responses from people aged 15 years or over.

(b) Totals may not add up to 100 per cent as a result of rounding.

(c) The Likert summation index method aggregates responses to provide a single measure of the general (or 'average') perceptions of respondents.

Each response category is allocated a weight. The number of responses for the category are multiplied by the weight to give a total score for the category. The total scores for each category are summed and divided by the total number of responses to derive the Likert index for the question. (See box 5.3 in chapter 5 for a detailed example).

For the response categories in the table above, the weights are as follows:

Very safe = 5; safe = 4; neither = 3; unsafe = 2; and very unsafe = 1.

Source: ACPR (unpublished).

Table 5A.34

Table 5A.34 **Opinion on whether illegal drugs, housebreaking and motor vehicle theft are problems in the neighbourhood (a), (b), (c)**

	<i>Unit</i>	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>WA</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>ACT</i>	<i>NT</i>	<i>Aust</i>
Illegal drugs 2002-03										
Major problem	%	37.1	33.0	30.5	30.5	27.6	23.5	20.3	23.3	32.7
Somewhat a problem	%	38.7	39.1	38.1	40.6	38.6	40.0	39.3	40.2	39.0
<i>Total major or somewhat a problem</i>	%	<i>75.8</i>	<i>72.1</i>	<i>68.6</i>	<i>71.1</i>	<i>66.2</i>	<i>63.5</i>	<i>59.6</i>	<i>63.5</i>	<i>71.7</i>
Not a problem	%	19.9	22.9	24.7	23.5	28.3	29.9	32.9	29.7	23.1
Don't know	%	4.2	5.1	6.6	5.4	5.4	6.6	7.5	6.9	5.2
Sample size	no.	5 132	2 573	4 051	2 133	2 095	2 038	2 027	2 024	22 073
Likert index (c)	Index	2.18	2.11	2.06	2.07	1.99	1.93	1.86	1.93	2.10
Illegal drugs 2003-04										
Major problem	%	37.0	32.4	31.7	33.2	27.9	24.6	20.3	25.7	33.1
Somewhat a problem	%	39.6	41.8	37.4	40.6	40.6	39.7	41.1	40.7	40.0
<i>Total major or somewhat a problem</i>	%	<i>76.6</i>	<i>74.2</i>	<i>69.1</i>	<i>73.8</i>	<i>68.5</i>	<i>64.3</i>	<i>61.4</i>	<i>66.4</i>	<i>73.1</i>
Not a problem	%	21.4	23.1	27.0	22.1	28.1	31.9	33.3	28.8	23.9
Don't know	%	2.1	2.7	3.9	4.1	3.3	3.8	5.3	4.8	3.0
Sample size	no.	4 960	3 029	3 982	1 976	1 942	1 983	1 985	1 483	21 340
Likert index (c)	Index	2.58	2.59	2.53	2.53	2.55	2.39	2.33	2.38	2.55
Illegal drugs 2004-05										
Major problem	%	23.8	24.0	19.0	20.9	20.5	17.8	14.3	14.7	22.0
Somewhat a problem	%	38.2	38.3	34.1	40.3	37.7	37.5	36.9	35.5	37.6
<i>Total major or somewhat a problem</i>	%	<i>62.0</i>	<i>62.3</i>	<i>53.1</i>	<i>61.2</i>	<i>58.2</i>	<i>55.3</i>	<i>51.2</i>	<i>50.2</i>	<i>59.6</i>
Not a problem	%	34.9	33.6	42.0	35.0	37.2	39.9	44.1	43.8	36.5
Don't know	%	3.1	4.1	4.9	3.8	4.6	4.9	4.7	6.0	4.0
Sample size	no.	4 654	4 613	5 537	1 804	1 804	1 803	1 984	1 005	23 204
Likert index (c)	Index	1.89	1.90	1.76	1.85	1.82	1.77	1.69	1.69	1.85
Housebreaking 2002-03										
Major problem	%	30.4	25.6	29.6	35.6	27.1	22.2	25.8	36.0	29.0
Somewhat a problem	%	44.8	46.3	42.2	44.1	45.7	47.7	50.0	38.2	44.8
<i>Total major or somewhat a problem</i>	%	<i>75.2</i>	<i>71.9</i>	<i>71.8</i>	<i>79.7</i>	<i>72.8</i>	<i>69.9</i>	<i>75.8</i>	<i>74.2</i>	<i>73.8</i>
Not a problem	%	23.3	26.1	26.2	19.6	25.2	28.6	22.4	24.3	24.4
Don't know	%	1.6	2.0	2.1	0.8	2.1	1.5	1.9	1.4	1.7
Sample size	no.	5 132	2 573	4 051	2 133	2 095	2 038	2 027	2 024	22 073
Likert index (c)	Index	2.07	2.00	2.03	2.16	2.02	1.93	2.03	2.12	2.05

Table 5A.34

Table 5A.34 **Opinion on whether illegal drugs, housebreaking and motor vehicle theft are problems in the neighbourhood (a), (b), (c)**

	<i>Unit</i>	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>WA</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>ACT</i>	<i>NT</i>	<i>Aust</i>
Housebreaking 2003-04										
Major problem	%	29.6	25.1	28.5	35.8	25.5	21.1	26.0	33.0	28.3
Somewhat a problem	%	45.0	47.9	44.0	43.8	47.3	46.3	50.2	41.5	45.7
<i>Total major or somewhat a problem</i>	%	<i>74.6</i>	<i>73.0</i>	<i>72.5</i>	<i>79.6</i>	<i>72.8</i>	<i>67.4</i>	<i>76.2</i>	<i>74.5</i>	<i>74.0</i>
Not a problem	%	24.5	25.9	26.6	20.0	26.4	31.4	23.0	24.9	25.0
Don't know	%	1.0	1.1	0.9	0.3	0.8	1.2	0.8	0.5	0.9
Sample size	no.	4 960	3 029	3 982	1 976	1 942	1 983	1 985	1 483	21 340
Likert index (c)	Index	2.05	1.99	2.02	2.16	1.99	1.90	2.03	2.08	2.03
Housebreaking 2004-05										
Major problem	%	20.1	20.1	17.8	23.3	18.9	14.6	19.9	19.5	19.8
Somewhat a problem	%	44.6	47.1	43.0	47.2	46.9	43.3	51.5	40.6	45.4
<i>Total major or somewhat a problem</i>	%	<i>64.7</i>	<i>67.2</i>	<i>60.8</i>	<i>70.5</i>	<i>65.8</i>	<i>57.9</i>	<i>71.4</i>	<i>60.1</i>	<i>65.2</i>
Not a problem	%	34.4	31.5	38.1	28.9	33.1	41.1	27.4	39.1	33.8
Don't know	%	0.9	1.3	1.1	0.6	1.0	1.1	1.2	0.8	1.0
Sample size	no.	4 654	4 613	5 537	1 804	1 804	1 803	1 984	1 005	23 204
Likert index (c)	Index	1.86	1.88	1.79	1.94	1.86	1.73	1.92	1.80	1.86
Motor vehicle theft 2002-03										
Major problem	%	28.2	24.1	19.3	22.1	24.0	23.0	15.6	20.5	24.2
Somewhat a problem	%	42.4	44.4	41.7	42.6	41.3	38.6	45.5	39.6	42.7
<i>Total major or somewhat a problem</i>	%	<i>70.6</i>	<i>68.5</i>	<i>61.0</i>	<i>64.7</i>	<i>65.3</i>	<i>61.6</i>	<i>61.1</i>	<i>60.1</i>	<i>66.9</i>
Not a problem	%	26.7	28.3	34.9	32.3	31.8	36.3	33.6	36.7	29.9
Don't know	%	2.7	3.1	4.0	3.0	3.0	2.2	5.3	3.3	3.1
Sample size	no.	4 960	3 029	3 982	1 976	1 942	1 983	1 985	1 483	21 340
Likert index (c)	Index	2.02	1.96	1.84	1.90	1.92	1.86	1.81	1.83	1.94
Motor vehicle theft 2003-04										
Major problem	%	24.0	24.7	19.5	22.7	21.0	19.8	19.3	19.5	22.8
Somewhat a problem	%	44.0	42.8	41.0	45.0	43.8	39.6	44.8	39.8	43.1
<i>Total major or somewhat a problem</i>	%	<i>68.0</i>	<i>67.5</i>	<i>60.5</i>	<i>67.7</i>	<i>64.8</i>	<i>59.4</i>	<i>64.1</i>	<i>59.3</i>	<i>65.9</i>
Not a problem	%	30.3	30.7	36.9	31.0	33.5	38.6	33.2	39.2	32.2
Don't know	%	1.7	1.9	2.5	1.3	1.7	1.9	2.7	1.5	1.9
Sample size	no.	4 960	3 029	3 982	1 976	1 942	1 983	1 985	1 483	21 340
Likert index (c)	Index	1.94	1.94	1.82	1.92	1.87	1.81	1.86	1.80	1.90

Table 5A.34 Opinion on whether illegal drugs, housebreaking and motor vehicle theft are problems in the neighbourhood (a), (b), (c)

	<i>Unit</i>	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>WA</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>ACT</i>	<i>NT</i>	<i>Aust</i>
Motor vehicle theft 2004-05										
Major problem	%	15.3	17.3	11.2	14.2	17.0	13.1	12.2	9.1	14.9
Somewhat a problem	%	41.0	43.7	34.2	40.0	41.1	35.3	41.4	33.5	40.1
<i>Total major or somewhat a problem</i>	%	<i>56.3</i>	<i>61.0</i>	<i>45.4</i>	<i>54.2</i>	<i>58.1</i>	<i>48.4</i>	<i>53.6</i>	<i>42.6</i>	<i>55.0</i>
Not a problem	%	42.1	37.1	52.6	44.8	40.5	49.9	44.0	55.2	43.3
Don't know	%	1.6	1.9	2.1	1.0	1.4	1.7	2.5	2.3	1.7
Sample size	no.	4 654	4 613	5 537	1 804	1 804	1 803	1 984	1 005	23 204
Likert index (c)	Index	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1

- (a) Data for 2002-03 onwards are based on responses from people aged 15 years or over.
 (b) Totals may not add up to 100 per cent as a result of rounding.
 (c) The Likert summation index method aggregates responses to provide a single measure of the general (or 'average') perceptions of respondents.

Each response category is allocated a weight. The number of responses for the category are multiplied by the weight to give a total score for the category. The total scores for each category are summed and divided by the total number of responses to derive the Likert index for the question. (See box 5.3 in chapter 5 for a detailed example).

For the response categories in the table above, the weights are as follows:

Very safe = 5; safe = 4; neither = 3; unsafe = 2; and very unsafe = 1.

Source: ACPR (unpublished).

Table 5A.35

Table 5A.35 Opinions on whether speeding cars, dangerous or noisy driving, graffiti or other vandalism, louts or gangs and drunken or disorderly behaviour are problems in the neighbourhood (a), (b), (c)

<i>Unit</i>	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Aust
Speeding cars, dangerous or noisy driving 2002-03									
Major problem	%	33.4	36.9	30.7	35.4	33.1	30.3	22.8	34.6
Somewhat a problem	%	41.5	37.7	43.6	40.5	40.9	40.6	37.5	40.7
<i>Total major or somewhat a problem</i>	%	74.9	74.6	74.3	75.9	74.0	70.9	60.3	75.3
Not a problem	%	24.4	24.8	24.9	23.5	25.5	28.3	39.3	24.2
Don't know	%	0.7	0.6	0.8	0.6	0.5	0.7	0.4	0.6
Sample size	no.	2 573	4 051	2 133	2 095	2 038	2 027	2 024	22 073
Likert index (c)	Index	2.09	2.12	2.06	2.12	2.08	2.02	1.83	2.10
Speeding cars, dangerous or noisy driving 2003-04									
Major problem	%	33.4	36.5	31.4	35.2	35.2	32.6	26.5	35.2
Somewhat a problem	%	40.8	38.4	40.5	42.4	38.8	40.4	37.2	40.1
<i>Total major or somewhat a problem</i>	%	74.2	74.9	71.9	77.6	74.0	73.0	63.7	75.3
Not a problem	%	25.5	24.9	28.0	22.2	25.8	26.9	36.1	24.4
Don't know	%	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.2
Sample size	no.	3 029	3 982	1 976	1 942	1 983	1 985	1 483	21 340
Likert index (c)	Index	2.08	2.12	2.03	2.13	2.09	2.06	1.90	2.11

Table 5A.35

Table 5A.35 Opinions on whether speeding cars, dangerous or noisy driving, graffiti or other vandalism, louts or gangs and drunken or disorderly behaviour are problems in the neighbourhood (a), (b), (c)

	Unit	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Aust
Speeding cars, dangerous or noisy driving 2004-05										
Major problem	%	33.6	36.3	32.1	33.0	36.1	31.7	31.3	23.4	33.9
Somewhat a problem	%	40.9	39.5	40.4	44.2	39.1	42.2	41.1	37.4	40.6
<i>Total major or somewhat a problem</i>	%	74.5	75.8	72.5	77.2	75.2	73.9	72.4	60.8	74.5
Not a problem	%	25.3	23.9	27.3	22.7	24.6	25.9	27.5	38.6	25.2
Don't know	%	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.3	0.2	-	0.6	0.2
Sample size	no.	4 654	4 613	5 537	1 804	1 804	1 803	1 984	1 005	23 204
Likert index (c)	Index	2.08	2.12	2.05	2.10	2.12	2.06	2.04	1.85	2.09
Graffiti or other vandalism 2002-03										
Major problem	%	21.4	18.6	16.1	17.4	19.3	11.9	14.5	14.8	18.8
Somewhat a problem	%	40.4	39.3	37.0	43.2	41.3	34.1	41.3	33.0	39.7
<i>Total major or somewhat a problem</i>	%	61.8	57.9	53.1	60.6	60.6	46.0	55.8	47.8	58.5
Not a problem	%	37.2	41.0	46.4	38.9	38.7	53.5	43.1	51.2	40.7
Don't know	%	0.9	1.1	0.5	0.5	0.7	0.5	1.2	1.0	0.8
Sample size	no.	5 132	2 573	4 051	2 133	2 095	2 038	2 027	2 024	22 073
Likert index (c)	Index	1.84	1.77	1.70	1.78	1.80	1.58	1.71	1.63	1.78

Table 5A.35

Table 5A.35 Opinions on whether speeding cars, dangerous or noisy driving, graffiti or other vandalism, louts or gangs and drunken or disorderly behaviour are problems in the neighbourhood (a), (b), (c)

	Unit	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Aust
Graffiti or other vandalism 2003-04										
Major problem	%	21.8	17.2	17.8	18.3	20.4	11.0	18.2	18.7	19.1
Somewhat a problem	%	39.5	41.4	35.1	41.6	41.8	32.9	37.0	30.5	39.4
<i>Total major or somewhat a problem</i>	%	61.3	58.6	52.9	59.9	62.2	43.9	55.2	49.2	58.5
Not a problem	%	38.3	40.8	46.7	40.0	37.5	55.9	44.2	50.1	41.1
Don't know	%	0.4	0.6	0.4	0.1	0.3	0.2	0.7	0.7	0.4
Sample size	no.	4 960	3 029	3 982	1 976	1 942	1 983	1 985	1 483	21 340
Likert index (c)	Index	1.83	1.76	1.71	1.78	1.83	1.55	1.74	1.68	1.78
Graffiti or other vandalism 2004-05										
Major problem	%	15.6	14.2	12.4	16.2	17.6	7.7	13.4	11.7	14.6
Somewhat a problem	%	36.2	37.2	32.1	39.3	38.4	25.3	37.5	29.7	35.9
<i>Total major or somewhat a problem</i>	%	51.8	51.4	44.5	55.5	56.0	33.0	50.9	41.4	50.5
Not a problem	%	47.8	48.2	55.0	44.4	43.6	66.7	49.0	58.1	49.2
Don't know	%	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.1	0.4	0.3	0.2	0.5	0.4
Sample size	no.	4 654	4 613	5 537	1 804	1 804	1 803	1 984	1 005	23 204
Likert index (c)	Index	1.68	1.66	1.57	1.72	1.74	1.41	1.64	1.53	1.65

Table 5A.35

Table 5A.35 Opinions on whether speeding cars, dangerous or noisy driving, graffiti or other vandalism, louts or gangs and drunken or disorderly behaviour are problems in the neighbourhood (a), (b), (c)

	Unit	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Aust
Louts or gangs 2002-03										
	%	16.5	10.6	11.3	11.8	11.2	9.1	7.1	22.1	12.8
Major problem	%	38.8	31.9	30.9	33.0	31.7	26.8	28.2	31.2	33.9
Somewhat a problem	%	55.3	42.5	42.2	44.8	42.9	35.9	35.3	53.3	46.7
<i>Total major or somewhat a problem</i>										
Not a problem	%	42.6	54.7	54.6	53.4	54.1	62.0	60.0	44.8	50.6
Don't know	%	2.2	2.8	3.3	1.8	3.0	2.1	4.8	1.9	2.6
Sample size	no.	5 132	2 573	4 051	2 133	2 095	2 038	2 027	2 024	22 073
Likert index (c)	Index	1.73	1.55	1.55	1.58	1.56	1.46	1.44	1.77	1.61
Louts or gangs 2003-04										
	%	17.0	11.3	12.7	10.9	10.8	9.0	7.0	25.0	13.4
Major problem	%	38.1	35.5	31.5	29.0	31.7	30.2	27.9	29.8	34.4
Somewhat a problem	%	55.1	46.8	44.2	39.9	42.5	39.2	34.9	54.8	47.8
<i>Total major or somewhat a problem</i>										
Not a problem	%	44.0	51.5	54.1	58.5	56.2	59.7	62.9	44.1	50.9
Don't know	%	0.8	1.8	1.7	1.6	1.3	1.1	2.1	1.1	1.4
Sample size	no.	4 960	3 029	3 982	1 976	1 942	1 983	1 985	1 483	21 340
Likert index (c)	Index	1.73	1.59	1.58	1.52	1.54	1.49	1.43	1.81	1.62

Table 5A.35

Table 5A.35 Opinions on whether speeding cars, dangerous or noisy driving, graffiti or other vandalism, louts or gangs and drunken or disorderly behaviour are problems in the neighbourhood (a), (b), (c)

	Unit	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Aust
Louts or gangs 2004-05										
Major problem	%	11.9	9.1	8.6	7.7	9.7	6.4	6.5	14.4	9.8
Somewhat a problem	%	32.0	31.9	27.0	28.4	29.9	20.3	24.3	30.7	30.1
<i>Total major or somewhat a problem</i>	%	43.9	41.0	35.6	36.1	39.6	26.7	30.8	45.1	39.9
Not a problem	%	55.1	57.8	63.3	63.0	58.9	72.6	68.2	54.0	59.1
Don't know	%	1.0	1.2	1.1	1.0	1.4	0.8	1.1	0.9	1.1
Sample size	no.	4 654	4 613	5 537	1 804	1 804	1 803	1 984	1 005	23 204
Likert index (c)	Index	1.56	1.51	1.45	1.44	1.50	1.33	1.38	1.60	1.50
Drunken or disorderly behaviour 2002-03										
Major problem	%	15.6	10.7	12.1	11.3	8.9	8.4	6.3	36.7	12.6
Somewhat a problem	%	41.4	35.8	34.2	30.7	31.5	31.0	26.3	31.9	36.2
<i>Total major or somewhat a problem</i>	%	57.0	46.5	46.3	42.0	40.4	39.4	32.6	68.6	48.8
Not a problem	%	41.4	35.8	34.2	30.7	31.5	31.0	26.3	31.9	36.2
Don't know	%	41.1	51.0	51.6	55.5	57.5	58.4	64.7	31.0	49.0
Sample size	no.	5 132	2 573	4 051	2 133	2 095	2 038	2 027	2 024	22 073
Likert index (c)	Index	1.74	1.59	1.60	1.55	1.50	1.49	1.40	2.06	1.63

Table 5A.35

Table 5A.35 Opinions on whether speeding cars, dangerous or noisy driving, graffiti or other vandalism, louts or gangs and drunken or disorderly behaviour are problems in the neighbourhood (a), (b), (c)

<i>Unit</i>	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Aust
Drunken or disorderly behaviour 2003-04									
Major problem	16.8	11.1	14.1	11.7	10.5	9.7	6.8	36.8	13.7
Somewhat a problem	40.9	38.8	35.8	33.5	31.9	32.1	27.0	32.2	37.5
<i>Total major or somewhat a problem</i>	57.7	49.9	49.9	45.2	42.4	41.8	33.8	69.0	51.2
Not a problem	41.4	48.8	48.8	53.5	56.4	56.5	65.0	30.8	47.7
Don't know	0.9	1.3	1.3	1.2	1.3	1.6	1.1	0.3	1.2
Sample size	4 960	3 029	3 982	1 976	1 942	1 983	1 985	1 483	21 340
Likert index (c)	1.75	1.62	1.65	1.58	1.53	1.52	1.41	2.06	1.66
Drunken or disorderly behaviour 2004-05									
Major problem	11.9	9.6	8.1	8.6	7.8	6.7	4.9	24.6	9.8
Somewhat a problem	35.0	31.0	29.1	32.4	29.1	26.9	25.2	31.3	31.8
<i>Total major or somewhat a problem</i>	46.9	40.6	37.2	41.0	36.9	33.6	30.1	55.9	41.6
Not a problem	52.3	58.3	62.2	58.3	61.8	65.6	69.1	43.7	57.6
Don't know	0.8	1.1	0.7	0.7	1.4	0.8	0.8	0.4	0.9
Sample size	4 654	4 613	5 537	1 804	1 804	1 803	1 984	1 005	23 204
Likert index (c)	1.59	1.51	1.46	1.5	1.45	1.41	1.35	1.81	1.52

(a) Data for 2002-03 onwards are based on responses from people aged 15 years or over.

(b) Totals may not add up to 100 per cent as a result of rounding.

(c) The Likert summation index method aggregates responses to provide a single measure of the general (or 'average') perceptions of respondents.

Table 5A.35

Table 5A.35 Opinions on whether speeding cars, dangerous or noisy driving, graffiti or other vandalism, louts or gangs and drunken or disorderly behaviour are problems in the neighbourhood (a), (b), (c)

<i>Unit</i>	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>WA</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>ACT</i>	<i>NT</i>	<i>Aust</i>
-------------	------------	------------	------------	-----------	-----------	------------	------------	-----------	-------------

Each response category is allocated a weight. The number of responses for the category are multiplied by the weight to give a total score for the category. The total scores for each category are summed and divided by the total number of responses to derive the Likert index for the question. (See box 5.3 in chapter 5 for a detailed example).

For the response categories in the table above, the weights are as follows: Very safe = 5; safe = 4; neither = 3; unsafe = 2; and very unsafe = 1.

Source: ACPR (unpublished).

Table 5A.36

Table 5A.36 Opinion on whether family violence, sexual assault and other physical assault are problems in your State or Territory (a), (b), (c)

	Unit	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Aust
Family violence 2002-03										
	%	29.8	23.7	30.4	26.7	24.1	18.4	12.8	42.3	27.1
Major problem										
	%	49.2	49.6	47.2	52.4	48.0	52.2	44.9	38.4	49.1
Somewhat a problem										
<i>Total major or somewhat a problem</i>	%	79.0	73.3	77.6	79.1	72.1	70.6	57.7	80.7	76.2
Not a problem	%	11.7	16.4	12.8	12.5	16.2	18.3	26.4	12.1	14.0
Don't know	%	9.4	10.2	9.6	8.4	11.7	11.1	16.0	7.3	9.9
Sample size	no.	5 132	2 573	4 051	2 133	2 095	2 038	2 027	2 024	22 073
Likert index (c)	Index	2.20	2.08	2.19	2.15	2.09	2.00	1.84	2.33	2.15
Family violence 2003-04										
	%	31.9	28.2	33.2	27.7	25.9	23.9	11.8	46.0	29.8
Major problem										
	%	50.5	51.2	50.8	54.9	53.4	55.0	55.2	40.6	51.5
Somewhat a problem										
<i>Total major or somewhat a problem</i>	%	82.4	79.4	84.0	82.6	79.3	78.9	67.0	86.6	81.3
Not a problem	%	11.0	13.4	10.1	9.8	13.9	13.0	22.1	7.9	11.8
Don't know	%	6.5	7.2	5.9	7.6	6.8	8.1	10.9	5.5	6.8
Sample size	no.	4 960	3 029	3 982	1 976	1 942	1 983	1 985	1 483	21 340
Likert index (c)	Index	2.22	2.16	2.25	2.19	2.13	2.12	1.88	2.40	2.19

Table 5A.36

Table 5A.36 Opinion on whether family violence, sexual assault and other physical assault are problems in your State or Territory (a), (b), (c)

	Unit	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Aust	
Family violence 2004-05											
	Major problem	%	32.9	29.3	34.0	30.8	28.5	28.7	13.6	46.7	31.3
	Somewhat a problem	%	49.7	51.1	49.2	53.1	52.5	52.7	52.6	39.1	50.6
	<i>Total major or somewhat a problem</i>	%	82.6	80.4	83.2	83.9	81.0	81.4	66.2	85.8	81.9
	Not a problem	%	11.5	12.9	10.2	9.8	11.0	11.9	22.3	10.1	11.6
	Don't know	%	5.8	6.7	6.6	6.3	8.0	6.7	11.5	4.1	6.5
	Sample size	no.	4 654	4 613	5 537	1 804	1 804	1 803	1 984	1 005	23 204
	Likert index (c)	Index	2.23	2.18	2.25	2.22	2.19	2.18	1.9	2.38	2.21
Sexual assault 2002-03											
	Major problem	%	42.5	29.1	34.1	35.3	28.9	18.3	15.2	36.2	34.6
	Somewhat a problem	%	42.5	49.0	48.1	50.1	51.0	55.1	51.6	45.7	47.1
	<i>Total major or somewhat a problem</i>	%	85.0	78.1	82.2	85.4	79.9	73.4	66.8	81.9	81.7
	Not a problem	%	8.8	14.1	9.9	9.3	12.9	18.1	21.5	10.9	11.2
	Don't know	%	6.2	7.8	7.9	5.4	7.2	8.5	11.7	7.2	7.1
	Sample size	no.	5 132	2 573	4 051	2 133	2 095	2 038	2 027	2 024	22 073
	Likert index (c)	Index	2.36	2.16	2.26	2.27	2.17	2.00	1.93	2.27	2.25

Table 5A.36

Table 5A.36 Opinion on whether family violence, sexual assault and other physical assault are problems in your State or Territory (a), (b), (c)

	Unit	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Aust
Sexual assault 2003-04										
	%	41.5	33.1	35.9	31.6	31.4	20.7	15.4	40.1	35.5
Major problem	%	45.4	51.1	50.0	53.6	50.8	57.4	56.6	47.1	49.4
Somewhat a problem	%	86.9	84.2	85.9	85.2	82.2	78.1	72.0	87.2	84.9
<i>Total major or somewhat a problem</i>										
Not a problem	%	8.8	10.7	9.3	9.3	12.5	15.3	20.9	8.7	10.1
Don't know	%	4.3	5.1	4.9	5.5	5.4	6.6	7.2	4.1	4.9
Sample size	no.	4 960	3 029	3 982	1 976	1 942	1 983	1 985	1 483	21 340
Likert index (c)	Index	2.3	2.2	2.3	2.2	2.2	2.1	1.9	2.3	2.3
Sexual assault 2004-05										
	%	41.0	35.6	36.1	35.6	40.4	22.6	13.4	41.2	37.2
Major problem	%	47.1	49.3	50.8	51.1	46.6	59.0	58.6	47.1	49.2
Somewhat a problem	%	88.1	84.9	86.9	86.7	87.0	81.6	72.0	88.3	86.4
<i>Total major or somewhat a problem</i>										
Not a problem	%	8.2	10.3	8.6	9.4	8.4	12.0	20.3	8.3	9.2
Don't know	%	3.7	4.8	4.6	3.9	4.6	6.5	7.7	3.4	4.4
Sample size	no.	4 654	4 613	5 537	1 804	1 804	1 803	1 984	1 005	23 204
Likert index (c)	Index	2.34	2.27	2.29	2.27	2.34	2.11	1.92	2.34	2.29

Table 5A.36

Table 5A.36 Opinion on whether family violence, sexual assault and other physical assault are problems in your State or Territory (a), (b), (c)

	Unit	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Aust
Physical assault (excl. sexual) 2002-03										
Major problem	%	41.5	32.2	33.7	39.1	32.0	24.5	16.3	49.6	36.0
Somewhat a problem	%	46.5	51.2	51.4	49.7	52.9	56.9	56.9	41.0	49.8
<i>Total major or somewhat a problem</i>	%	88.0	83.4	85.1	88.8	84.9	81.4	73.2	90.6	85.8
Not a problem	%	8.2	12.1	9.8	7.8	10.7	13.9	21.9	7.0	10.0
Don't know	%	3.8	4.5	5.0	3.4	4.4	4.6	5.0	2.4	4.2
Sample size	no.	5 132	2 573	4 051	2 133	2 095	2 038	2 027	2 024	22 073
Likert index (c)	Index	2.4	2.2	2.3	2.3	2.2	2.1	1.9	2.4	2.3
Physical assault (excl. sexual) 2003-04										
Major problem	%	42.3	36.2	35.9	38.7	32.9	26.7	16.7	51.4	37.7
Somewhat a problem	%	47.8	52.0	52.7	52.1	55.3	57.5	60.8	41.6	51.2
<i>Total major or somewhat a problem</i>	%	90.1	88.2	88.6	90.8	88.2	84.2	77.5	93.0	88.9
Not a problem	%	7.9	8.8	8.6	6.9	9.0	13.1	18.9	5.7	8.5
Don't know	%	2.1	3.1	2.8	2.3	2.8	2.7	3.6	1.3	2.6
Sample size	no.	4 960	3 029	3 982	1 976	1 942	1 983	1 985	1 483	21 340
Likert index (c)	Index	2.4	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.1	2.0	2.5	2.3

Table 5A.36

Table 5A.36 **Opinion on whether family violence, sexual assault and other physical assault are problems in your State or Territory (a), (b), (c)**

	Unit	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Aust
Physical assault (excl. sexual) 2004-05										
Major problem	%	35.2	31.7	35.7	38.8	30.1	24.4	16.0	43.8	33.9
Somewhat a problem	%	51.9	53.4	52.0	49.3	55.3	57.2	58.2	45.3	52.5
<i>Total major or somewhat a problem</i>	%	87.1	85.1	87.7	88.1	85.4	81.6	74.2	89.1	86.4
Not a problem	%	10.8	12.7	10.5	10.5	12.1	16.1	23.4	9.3	11.6
Don't know	%	2.1	2.2	1.8	1.4	2.5	2.2	2.4	1.6	2.0
Sample size	no.	4 654	4 613	5 537	1 804	1 804	1 803	1 984	1 005	23 204
Likert index (c)	Index	2.25	2.19	2.26	2.29	2.18	2.09	1.92	2.35	2.23

(a) Data for 2002-03 onwards are based on responses from people aged 15 years or over.

(b) Totals may not add up to 100 per cent as a result of rounding.

(c) The Likert summation index method aggregates responses to provide a single measure of the general (or 'average') perceptions of respondents.

Each response category is allocated a weight. The number of responses for the category are multiplied by the weight to give a total score for the category. The total scores for each category are summed and divided by the total number of responses to derive the Likert index for the question. (See box 5.3 in chapter 5 for a detailed example).

For the response categories in the table above, the weights are as follows:

Very safe = 5; safe = 4; neither = 3; unsafe = 2; and very unsafe = 1.

Source: ACPR (unpublished).

Table 5A.37

Table 5A.37 Opinion on whether illegal drugs, housebreaking and motor vehicle theft are problems in your State or Territory (a), (b), (c)

	Unit	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Aust
Illegal drugs 2002-03										
Major problem	%	65.6	63.5	58.3	61.2	59.3	44.2	46.9	42.8	61.8
Somewhat a problem	%	26.1	27.5	31.1	30.7	30.9	42.6	37.5	41.5	28.9
<i>Total major or somewhat a problem</i>	%	91.7	91.0	89.4	91.9	90.2	86.8	84.4	84.3	90.7
Not a problem	%	5.5	6.3	6.0	5.4	6.9	8.4	10.5	10.3	6.1
Don't know	%	2.8	2.7	4.5	2.6	3.0	4.8	5.1	5.5	3.2
Sample size	no.	5 132	2 573	4 051	2 133	2 095	2 038	2 027	2 024	22 073
Likert index (c)	Index	2.62	2.59	2.55	2.57	2.54	2.38	2.38	2.34	2.58
Illegal drugs 2003-04										
Major problem	%	67.9	65.9	59.6	60.6	59.3	45.4	49.7	45.5	63.5
Somewhat a problem	%	24.8	27.1	31.0	34.1	33.2	41.7	36.4	41.9	28.9
<i>Total major or somewhat a problem</i>	%	92.7	93.0	90.6	94.7	92.5	87.1	86.1	87.4	92.4
Not a problem	%	5.6	5.6	6.7	3.9	5.4	9.2	10.8	9.0	5.8
Don't know	%	1.6	1.4	2.6	1.4	2.1	3.7	3.2	3.6	1.8
Sample size	no.	4 960	3 029	3 982	1 976	1 942	1 983	1 985	1 483	21 340
Likert index (c)	Index	2.63	2.61	2.54	2.58	2.55	2.37	2.40	2.38	2.59

Table 5A.37

Table 5A.37 Opinion on whether illegal drugs, housebreaking and motor vehicle theft are problems in your State or Territory (a), (b), (c)

	Unit	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Aust
Illegal drugs 2004-05										
Major problem	%	62.8	64.0	57.4	57.5	59.9	45.1	42.9	47.7	60.4
Somewhat a problem	%	29.3	28.0	33.5	34.5	31.7	44.2	43.3	38.1	31.2
<i>Total major or somewhat a problem</i>	%	92.1	92.0	90.9	92.0	91.6	89.3	86.2	85.8	91.6
Not a problem	%	6.0	6.1	6.2	5.6	6.2	7.3	10.8	10.7	6.2
Don't know	%	1.8	1.8	3.0	2.4	2.2	3.4	3.0	3.4	2.2
Sample size	no.	4 654	4 613	5 537	1 804	1 804	1 803	1 984	1 005	23 204
Likert index (c)	Index	2.58	2.59	2.53	2.53	2.55	2.39	2.33	2.38	2.55
Housebreaking 2002-03										
Major problem	%	53.0	44.1	50.3	63.6	51.6	44.8	40.3	61.2	50.9
Somewhat a problem	%	38.3	45.3	40.1	31.4	40.2	45.7	49.3	31.4	40.2
<i>Total major or somewhat a problem</i>	%	91.3	89.4	90.4	95.0	91.8	90.5	89.6	92.6	91.1
Not a problem	%	5.7	6.9	5.8	4.2	5.4	7.6	8.0	5.8	5.9
Don't know	%	3.1	3.6	3.8	0.9	2.7	1.9	2.4	1.6	3.0
Sample size	no.	5 132	2 573	4 051	2 133	2 095	2 038	2 027	2 024	22 073
Likert index (c)	Index	2.49	2.39	2.46	2.60	2.47	2.38	2.33	2.56	2.46

Table 5A.37

Table 5A.37 Opinion on whether illegal drugs, housebreaking and motor vehicle theft are problems in your State or Territory (a), (b), (c)

	Unit	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Aust
Housebreaking 2003-04										
Major problem	%	49.6	44.7	50.6	66.7	50.3	42.2	40.3	55.8	50.1
Somewhat a problem	%	43.7	46.2	41.8	29.3	43.3	48.2	51.7	38.4	42.7
<i>Total major or somewhat a problem</i>	%	93.3	90.9	92.4	96.0	93.6	90.4	92.0	94.2	92.8
Not a problem	%	5.1	7.0	5.7	3.0	4.8	7.8	6.7	4.7	5.5
Don't know	%	1.5	2.1	1.9	1.0	1.6	1.8	1.2	1.1	1.7
Sample size	no.	4 960	3 029	3 982	1 976	1 942	1 983	1 985	1 483	21 340
Likert index (c)	Index	2.45	2.39	2.46	2.64	2.46	2.35	2.34	2.52	2.45
Housebreaking 2004-05										
Major problem	%	46.2	41.6	44.1	58.6	46.7	34.9	35.8	46.2	45.5
Somewhat a problem	%	46.1	49.2	47.3	37.2	46.2	56.1	55.1	43.4	46.6
<i>Total major or somewhat a problem</i>	%	92.3	90.8	91.4	95.8	92.9	91.0	90.9	89.6	92.1
Not a problem	%	5.8	7.0	6.7	3.5	5.2	6.9	8.2	8.6	6.1
Don't know	%	1.9	2.2	1.9	0.8	1.9	2.1	1.0	1.8	1.9
Sample size	no.	4 654	4 613	5 537	1 804	1 804	1 803	1 984	1 005	23 204
Likert index (c)	Index	2.41	2.35	2.38	2.56	2.42	2.29	2.28	2.38	2.40

Table 5A.37

Table 5A.37 Opinion on whether illegal drugs, housebreaking and motor vehicle theft are problems in your State or Territory (a), (b), (c)

	Unit	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Aust
Motor vehicle theft 2002-03										
Major problem	%	52.1	47.9	41.9	48.7	52.2	47.6	29.2	39.0	48.3
Somewhat a problem	%	38.0	39.9	45.2	41.2	38.9	41.6	52.1	46.2	40.5
<i>Total major or somewhat a problem</i>	%	90.1	87.8	87.1	89.9	91.1	89.2	81.3	85.2	88.8
Not a problem	%	6.4	8.8	7.2	7.7	6.1	8.4	13.6	10.8	7.5
Don't know	%	3.6	3.5	5.8	2.3	2.9	2.3	5.1	4.0	3.7
Sample size	no.	5 132	2 573	4 051	2 133	2 095	2 038	2 027	2 024	22 073
Likert index (c)	Index	2.47	2.41	2.37	2.42	2.47	2.40	2.16	2.29	2.42
Motor vehicle theft 2003-04										
Major problem	%	47.5	47.4	41.0	51.1	50.3	45.5	36.0	36.4	46.6
Somewhat a problem	%	42.7	43.3	47.0	42.7	42.9	45.2	49.6	49.0	43.8
<i>Total major or somewhat a problem</i>	%	90.2	90.7	88.0	93.8	93.2	90.7	85.6	85.4	90.4
Not a problem	%	7.4	7.1	8.6	5.0	4.9	7.6	11.4	12.0	7.2
Don't know	%	2.4	2.3	3.4	1.2	1.9	1.7	3.1	2.6	2.4
Sample size	no.	4 960	3 029	3 982	1 976	1 942	1 983	1 985	1 483	21 340
Likert index (c)	Index	2.41	2.41	2.34	2.47	2.46	2.39	2.25	2.25	2.40

Table 5A.37

Table 5A.37 Opinion on whether illegal drugs, housebreaking and motor vehicle theft are problems in your State or Territory (a), (b), (c)

	Unit	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Aust
Motor vehicle theft 2004-05										
Major problem	%	43.7	42.3	36.0	45.5	51.5	39.1	29.8	29.3	42.2
Somewhat a problem	%	46.5	47.0	50.6	45.9	40.5	50.4	52.1	54.4	47.1
<i>Total major or somewhat a problem</i>	%	90.2	89.3	86.6	91.4	92.0	89.5	81.9	83.7	89.3
Not a problem	%	7.4	7.8	10.0	7.1	5.7	8.1	14.9	12.9	8.0
Don't know	%	2.4	2.8	3.5	1.6	2.3	2.4	3.2	3.4	2.7
Sample size	no.	4 654	4 613	5 537	1 804	1 804	1 803	1 984	1 005	23 204
Likert index (c)	Index	2.37	2.35	2.27	2.39	2.47	2.32	2.15	2.17	2.35

(a) Data for 2002-03 onwards are based on responses from people aged 15 years or over.

(b) Totals may not add up to 100 per cent as a result of rounding.

(c) The Likert summation index method aggregates responses to provide a single measure of the general (or 'average') perceptions of respondents.

Each response category is allocated a weight. The number of responses for the category are multiplied by the weight to give a total score for the category. The total scores for each category are summed and divided by the total number of responses to derive the Likert index for the question. (See box 5.3 in chapter 5 for a detailed example).

For the response categories in the table above, the weights are as follows:

Very safe = 5; safe = 4; neither = 3; unsafe = 2; and very unsafe = 1.

Source: ACPR (unpublished).

Table 5A.38

Table 5A.38 **Opinion on whether speeding cars, dangerous or noisy driving, graffiti or other vandalism, louts or gangs and drunken or disorderly behaviour are problems in your State or Territory (a), (b), (c)**

	Unit	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Aust
Speeding cars, dangerous or noisy driving 2002-03										
Major problem	%	48.6	48.0	49.0	46.2	45.7	44.5	36.9	31.9	47.6
Somewhat a problem	%	39.4	39.9	39.2	43.0	43.0	42.7	44.9	44.4	40.4
<i>Total major or somewhat a problem</i>	%	88.0	87.9	88.2	89.2	88.7	87.2	81.8	76.3	88.0
Not a problem	%	9.9	10.4	9.7	9.0	9.8	11.4	16.7	22.2	10.2
Don't know	%	2.0	1.7	2.2	1.9	1.5	1.4	1.5	1.5	1.9
Sample size	no.	5 132	2 573	4 051	2 133	2 095	2 038	2 027	2 024	22 073
Likert index (c)	Index	2.40	2.38	2.40	2.38	2.36	2.34	2.21	2.10	2.38
Speeding cars, dangerous or noisy driving 2003-04										
Major problem	%	50.7	45.7	49.8	45.7	49.3	42.8	40.7	36.3	48.1
Somewhat a problem	%	39.4	40.5	38.5	43.4	41.2	45.1	43.6	42.8	40.3
<i>Total major or somewhat a problem</i>	%	90.1	86.2	88.3	89.1	90.5	87.9	84.3	79.1	88.4
Not a problem	%	8.7	13.0	10.6	10.1	8.8	11.0	15.0	19.9	10.6
Don't know	%	1.1	0.8	1.2	0.7	0.7	1.1	0.6	1.0	1.0
Sample size	no.	4 960	3 029	3 982	1 976	1 942	1 983	1 985	1 483	21 340
Likert index (c)	Index	2.42	2.33	2.40	2.36	2.41	2.32	2.26	2.17	2.38

Table 5A.38

Table 5A.38 Opinion on whether speeding cars, dangerous or noisy driving, graffiti or other vandalism, louts or gangs and drunken or disorderly behaviour are problems in your State or Territory (a), (b), (c)

	Unit	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Aust
Speeding cars, dangerous or noisy driving 2004-05										
Major problem	%	36.9	32.2	33.2	38.4	39.3	17.1	26.0	27.3	34.6
Somewhat a problem	%	49.0	51.9	51.4	50.0	49.6	57.8	51.8	49.3	50.6
<i>Total major or somewhat a problem</i>	%	85.9	84.1	84.6	88.4	88.9	74.9	77.8	76.6	85.2
Not a problem	%	12.4	14.2	13.8	10.8	9.4	23.0	21.4	22.1	13.2
Don't know	%	1.7	1.7	1.7	0.8	1.8	2.2	0.7	1.4	1.6
Sample size	no.	4 654	4 613	5 537	1 804	1 804	1 803	1 984	1 005	23 204
Likert index (c)	Index	2.3	2.2	2.2	2.3	2.3	1.9	2.1	2.1	2.2
Graffiti or other vandalism 2002-03										
Major problem	%	41.2	35.0	35.7	38.1	36.4	20.8	23.0	25.4	37.0
Somewhat a problem	%	44.3	48.5	48.2	48.9	50.4	52.4	52.2	49.0	47.4
<i>Total major or somewhat a problem</i>	%	85.5	83.5	83.9	87.0	86.8	73.2	75.2	74.4	84.4
Not a problem	%	11.8	13.6	13.4	12.0	10.9	23.9	23.5	23.2	13.1
Don't know	%	2.7	2.9	2.6	1.0	2.2	3.0	1.4	2.4	2.5
Sample size	no.	5 132	2 573	4 051	2 133	2 095	2 038	2 027	2 024	22 073
Likert index (c)	Index	2.30	2.22	2.23	2.26	2.26	1.97	1.99	2.02	2.25

Table 5A.38

Table 5A.38 Opinion on whether speeding cars, dangerous or noisy driving, graffiti or other vandalism, louts or gangs and drunken or disorderly behaviour are problems in your State or Territory (a), (b), (c)

	Unit	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Aust
Graffiti or other vandalism 2003-04										
Major problem	%	40.7	34.4	34.0	38.8	41.1	20.1	26.5	28.0	36.9
Somewhat a problem	%	45.5	50.9	50.4	48.7	48.5	54.0	51.9	46.1	48.6
<i>Total major or somewhat a problem</i>	%	86.2	85.3	84.4	87.5	89.6	74.1	78.4	74.1	85.5
Not a problem	%	12.1	13.1	13.6	11.4	9.3	24.4	20.3	24.0	12.9
Don't know	%	1.7	1.6	2.0	1.1	1.1	1.4	1.2	1.9	1.6
Sample size	no.	4 960	3 029	3 982	1 976	1 942	1 983	1 985	1 483	21 340
Likert index (c)	Index	2.29	2.22	2.21	2.28	2.32	1.96	2.06	2.04	2.24
Graffiti or other vandalism 2004-05										
Major problem	%	36.9	32.2	33.2	38.4	39.3	17.1	26.0	27.3	34.6
Somewhat a problem	%	49.0	51.9	51.4	50.0	49.6	57.8	51.8	49.3	50.6
<i>Total major or somewhat a problem</i>	%	85.9	84.1	84.6	88.4	88.9	74.9	77.8	76.6	85.2
Not a problem	%	12.4	14.2	13.8	10.8	9.4	23.0	21.4	22.1	13.2
Don't know	%	1.7	1.7	1.7	0.8	1.8	2.2	0.7	1.4	1.6
Sample size	no.	4 654	4 613	5 537	1 804	1 804	1 803	1 984	1 005	23 204
Likert index (c)	Index	2.3	2.2	2.2	2.3	2.3	1.9	2.1	2.1	2.2

Table 5A.38

Table 5A.38 Opinion on whether speeding cars, dangerous or noisy driving, graffiti or other vandalism, louts or gangs and drunken or disorderly behaviour are problems in your State or Territory (a), (b), (c)

	Unit	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Aust
Louts or gangs 2002-03										
Major problem	%	50.3	31.8	28.3	42.8	32.8	19.3	12.3	43.2	38.1
Somewhat a problem	%	36.6	45.3	48.5	43.7	46.9	49.6	48.9	38.0	43.0
<i>Total major or somewhat a problem</i>	%	86.9	77.1	76.8	86.5	79.7	68.9	61.2	81.2	81.1
Not a problem	%	9.1	17.5	15.9	10.8	14.2	25.1	32.3	15.1	13.9
Don't know	%	3.9	5.4	7.4	2.6	6.1	6.0	6.5	3.6	5.0
Sample size	no.	5 132	2 573	4 051	2 133	2 095	2 038	2 027	2 024	22 073
Likert index (c)	Index	2.43	2.15	2.13	2.33	2.20	1.94	1.79	2.29	2.25
Louts or gangs 2003-04										
Major problem	%	54.7	37.6	29.8	40.6	37.0	20.0	13.0	43.8	41.5
Somewhat a problem	%	35.6	46.7	49.6	46.6	47.7	53.1	51.0	40.5	43.7
<i>Total major or somewhat a problem</i>	%	90.3	84.3	79.4	87.2	84.7	73.1	64.0	84.3	85.2
Not a problem	%	8.0	11.9	16.1	9.9	12.5	22.6	32.1	13.2	11.8
Don't know	%	1.6	3.8	4.5	2.9	2.9	4.3	3.9	2.6	3.0
Sample size	no.	4 960	3 029	3 982	1 976	1 942	1 983	1 985	1 483	21 340
Likert index (c)	Index	2.47	2.27	2.14	2.32	2.25	1.97	1.80	2.31	2.31

Table 5A.38

Table 5A.38 Opinion on whether speeding cars, dangerous or noisy driving, graffiti or other vandalism, louts or gangs and drunken or disorderly behaviour are problems in your State or Territory (a), (b), (c)

	Unit	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Aust
Louts or gangs 2004-05										
Major problem	%	47.0	34.7	31.1	43.1	39.0	18.6	11.1	43.5	38.5
Somewhat a problem	%	41.7	48.3	51.4	45.9	48.0	54.3	49.6	41.9	46.6
<i>Total major or somewhat a problem</i>	%	88.7	83.0	82.5	89.0	87.0	72.9	60.7	85.4	85.1
Not a problem	%	8.9	13.5	13.8	9.0	10.0	23.0	36.2	12.3	11.9
Don't know	%	2.4	3.5	3.7	2.1	3.0	4.0	3.1	2.3	3.0
Sample size	no.	4 654	4 613	5 537	1 804	1 804	1 803	1 984	1 005	23 204
Likert index (c)	Index	2.4	2.2	2.2	2.4	2.3	2.0	1.7	2.3	2.3
Drunken or disorderly behaviour 2002-03										
Major problem	%	28.1	21.4	23.3	22.7	18.7	15.9	12.8	64.8	24.0
Somewhat a problem	%	53.1	52.7	54.6	57.9	54.6	56.2	53.2	28.9	53.7
<i>Total major or somewhat a problem</i>	%	81.2	74.1	77.9	80.6	73.3	72.1	66.0	93.7	77.7
Not a problem	%	14.6	21.4	16.9	15.8	22.5	22.4	29.6	5.6	17.9
Don't know	%	4.2	4.5	5.2	3.6	4.2	5.4	4.4	0.8	4.4
Sample size	no.	5 132	2 573	4 051	2 133	2 095	2 038	2 027	2 024	22 073
Likert index (c)	Index	2.14	2.00	2.07	2.07	1.96	1.93	1.82	2.60	2.06

Table 5A.38

Table 5A.38 **Opinion on whether speeding cars, dangerous or noisy driving, graffiti or other vandalism, louts or gangs and drunken or disorderly behaviour are problems in your State or Territory (a), (b), (c)**

	Unit	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Aust
Drunken or disorderly behaviour 2003-04										
Major problem	%	30.5	22.4	25.4	25.8	20.2	18.4	13.9	64.4	25.9
Somewhat a problem	%	54.5	57.4	55.3	58.5	58.2	58.5	55.5	29.6	56.0
<i>Total major or somewhat a problem</i>	%	85.0	79.8	80.7	84.3	78.4	76.9	69.4	94.0	81.9
Not a problem	%	12.6	17.1	16.1	12.8	17.9	19.3	28.3	5.3	15.2
Don't know	%	2.4	3.1	3.3	2.9	3.7	3.8	2.3	0.7	2.9
Sample size	no.	4 960	3 029	3 982	1 976	1 942	1 983	1 985	1 483	21 340
Likert index (c)	Index	2.18	2.05	2.10	2.13	2.02	1.99	1.85	2.59	2.11
Drunken or disorderly behaviour 2004-05										
Major problem	%	29.9	24.9	28.3	28.3	21.8	20.6	12.9	66.1	27.3
Somewhat a problem	%	55.3	56.6	56.8	59.9	58.2	57.3	58.6	26.5	56.5
<i>Total major or somewhat a problem</i>	%	85.2	81.5	85.1	88.2	80.0	77.9	71.5	92.6	83.8
Not a problem	%	12.6	15.8	12.6	9.6	16.3	18.8	25.8	6.7	13.7
Don't know	%	2.2	2.7	2.3	2.2	3.8	3.2	2.7	0.7	2.5
Sample size	no.	4 654	4 613	5 537	1 804	1 804	1 803	1 984	1 005	23 204
Likert index (c)	Index	2.18	2.09	2.16	2.19	2.06	2.02	1.87	2.60	2.14

(a) Data for 2002-03 onwards are based on responses from people aged 15 years or over.

(b) Totals may not add up to 100 per cent as a result of rounding.

(c) The Likert summation index method aggregates responses to provide a single measure of the general (or 'average') perceptions of respondents.

Table 5A.38

Table 5A.38 Opinion on whether speeding cars, dangerous or noisy driving, graffiti or other vandalism, louts or gangs and drunken or disorderly behaviour are problems in your State or Territory (a), (b), (c)

<i>Unit</i>	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>WA</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>ACT</i>	<i>NT</i>	<i>Aust</i>
-------------	------------	------------	------------	-----------	-----------	------------	------------	-----------	-------------

Each response category is allocated a weight. The number of responses for the category are multiplied by the weight to give a total score for the category. The total scores for each category are summed and divided by the total number of responses to derive the Likert index for the question. (See box 5.3 in chapter 5 for a detailed example).

For the response categories in the table above, the weights are as follows:

Very safe = 5; safe = 4; neither = 3; unsafe = 2; and very unsafe = 1.

Source: ACPR (unpublished).

Table 5A.39

Table 5A.39 **Whether worried about being a victim by type of crime (a), (b), (c)**

	<i>Unit</i>	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>WA</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>ACT</i>	<i>NT</i>	<i>Aust</i>
Physical assault 2002-03										
Very concerned	%	18.2	15.5	15.8	18.5	14.8	12.6	11.2	18.0	16.6
Somewhat concerned	%	41.3	38.6	36.4	43.3	39.2	34.4	39.3	39.2	39.6
<i>Total very or somewhat concerned</i>	%	<i>59.5</i>	<i>54.1</i>	<i>52.2</i>	<i>61.8</i>	<i>54.0</i>	<i>47.0</i>	<i>50.5</i>	<i>57.2</i>	<i>56.2</i>
Not concerned	%	40.0	45.4	47.4	38.0	45.7	52.2	49.4	42.3	43.4
Don't know	%	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.2	0.4	0.7	0.1	0.4	0.4
Sample size	no.	5 132	2 573	4 051	2 133	2 095	2 038	2 027	2 024	22 073
Likert index (c)	Index	1.78	1.70	1.68	1.80	1.69	1.60	1.62	1.76	1.73
Physical assault 2003-04										
Very concerned	%	17.5	15.1	12.4	18.4	13.5	12.7	9.2	17.7	15.5
Somewhat concerned	%	41.0	36.3	38.4	39.4	37.7	35.6	34.1	36.3	38.6
<i>Total very or somewhat concerned</i>	%	<i>58.5</i>	<i>51.4</i>	<i>50.8</i>	<i>57.8</i>	<i>51.2</i>	<i>48.3</i>	<i>43.3</i>	<i>54.0</i>	<i>54.1</i>
Not concerned	%	41.2	48.5	48.9	41.8	48.4	51.6	56.4	46.1	45.6
Don't know	%	0.3	0.1	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.1	0.2	–	0.3
Sample size	no.	4 960	3 029	3 982	1 976	1 942	1 983	1 985	1 483	21 340
Likert index (c)	Index	1.76	1.67	1.63	1.77	1.65	1.61	1.53	1.72	1.70
Physical assault 2004-05										
Very concerned	%	16.7	15.6	15.2	18.0	16.0	12.0	10.3	15.7	16.0
Somewhat concerned	%	42.2	38.4	40.0	43.7	41.5	39.2	38.8	37.5	40.8
<i>Total very or somewhat concerned</i>	%	<i>58.9</i>	<i>54.0</i>	<i>55.2</i>	<i>61.7</i>	<i>57.5</i>	<i>51.2</i>	<i>49.1</i>	<i>53.2</i>	<i>56.8</i>
Not concerned	%	40.9	45.6	44.8	38.2	42.2	48.7	50.7	45.9	43.0
Don't know	%	0.3	0.4	0.1	0.1	0.3	0.1	0.2	0.9	0.2
Sample size	no.	4 654	4 613	5 537	1 804	1 804	1 803	1 984	1 005	23 204
Likert index (c)	Index	1.76	1.70	1.70	1.80	1.74	1.63	1.60	1.70	1.73
Sexual assault 2002-03										
Very concerned	%	17.9	16.0	14.8	20.4	15.9	13.4	11.0	15.1	16.7
Somewhat concerned	%	26.9	25.5	25.5	27.1	24.7	21.1	25.9	25.4	26.0
<i>Total very or somewhat concerned</i>	%	<i>44.8</i>	<i>41.5</i>	<i>40.3</i>	<i>47.5</i>	<i>40.6</i>	<i>34.5</i>	<i>36.9</i>	<i>40.5</i>	<i>42.7</i>
Not concerned	%	54.6	58.0	59.2	51.6	58.9	65.2	62.6	59.3	56.7
Don't know	%	0.6	0.5	0.5	0.9	0.6	0.4	0.5	0.3	0.6
Sample size	no.	5 132	2 573	4 051	2 133	2 095	2 038	2 027	2 024	22 073
Likert index (c)	Index	1.63	1.58	1.55	1.68	1.57	1.48	1.48	1.56	1.60

Table 5A.39

Table 5A.39 **Whether worried about being a victim by type of crime (a), (b), (c)**

	<i>Unit</i>	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>WA</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>ACT</i>	<i>NT</i>	<i>Aust</i>
Sexual assault 2003-04										
Very concerned	%	17.1	13.4	12.8	16.3	13.9	10.7	9.0	15.4	14.8
Somewhat concerned	%	25.3	24.5	26.5	24.2	24.1	24.4	23.6	23.4	25.0
<i>Total very or somewhat concerned</i>	%	<i>42.4</i>	<i>37.9</i>	<i>39.3</i>	<i>40.5</i>	<i>38.0</i>	<i>35.1</i>	<i>32.6</i>	<i>38.8</i>	<i>39.8</i>
Not concerned	%	57.3	61.7	60.6	59.1	61.6	64.5	67.2	61.1	59.9
Don't know	%	0.2	0.3	0.1	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.2	–	0.2
Sample size	no.	4 960	3 029	3 982	1 976	1 942	1 983	1 985	1 483	21 340
Likert index (c)	Index	1.60	1.52	1.52	1.57	1.52	1.46	1.42	1.54	1.55
Sexual assault 2004-05										
Very concerned	%	17.2	15.1	14.1	17.5	15.8	10.4	9.4	13.0	15.7
Somewhat concerned	%	26.7	27.8	28.0	29.0	26.7	25.1	28.2	27.9	27.5
<i>Total very or somewhat concerned</i>	%	<i>43.9</i>	<i>42.9</i>	<i>42.1</i>	<i>46.5</i>	<i>42.5</i>	<i>35.5</i>	<i>37.6</i>	<i>40.9</i>	<i>43.2</i>
Not concerned	%	55.7	56.6	57.6	53.3	56.9	64.3	62.1	58.8	56.5
Don't know	%	0.4	0.5	0.2	0.2	0.6	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.4
Sample size	no.	4 654	4 613	5 537	1 804	1 804	1 803	1 984	1 005	23 204
Likert index (c)	Index	1.61	1.58	1.56	1.64	1.59	1.46	1.47	1.54	1.59
Housebreaking 2002-03										
Very concerned	%	28.9	24.4	27.1	34.2	27.7	24.8	25.2	32.9	27.8
Somewhat concerned	%	45.7	48.2	44.3	45.1	47.5	45.9	53.3	41.3	46.3
<i>Total very or somewhat concerned</i>	%	<i>74.6</i>	<i>72.6</i>	<i>71.4</i>	<i>79.3</i>	<i>75.2</i>	<i>70.7</i>	<i>78.5</i>	<i>74.2</i>	<i>74.1</i>
Not concerned	%	25.2	27.2	28.3	20.6	24.4	29.1	21.4	25.8	25.8
Don't know	%	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.4	0.1	0.1	–	0.2
Sample size	no.	5 132	2 573	4 051	2 133	2 095	2 038	2 027	2 024	22 073
Likert index (c)	Index	2.04	1.97	1.99	2.14	2.03	1.96	2.04	2.07	2.02
Housebreaking 2003-04										
Very concerned	%	26.5	22.9	26.7	34.1	25.8	21.6	26.1	30.0	26.3
Somewhat concerned	%	46.8	47.3	44.2	44.5	47.0	47.3	52.1	41.6	46.3
<i>Total very or somewhat concerned</i>	%	<i>73.3</i>	<i>70.2</i>	<i>70.9</i>	<i>78.6</i>	<i>72.8</i>	<i>68.9</i>	<i>78.2</i>	<i>71.6</i>	<i>72.6</i>
Not concerned	%	26.6	29.8	29.0	21.4	27.1	31.1	21.7	28.3	27.4
Don't know	%	0.1	–	–	–	0.1	–	0.1	0.1	–
Sample size	no.	4 960	3 029	3 982	1 976	1 942	1 983	1 985	1 483	21 340
Likert index (c)	Index	2.00	1.93	1.98	2.13	1.99	1.90	2.04	2.02	1.99

Table 5A.39

Table 5A.39 Whether worried about being a victim by type of crime (a), (b), (c)

	Unit	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Aust
Housebreaking 2004-05										
Very concerned	%	24.7	23.8	21.4	30.5	23.7	19.0	22.8	21.3	24.2
Somewhat concerned	%	46.3	48.1	49.3	47.1	49.2	48.9	53.4	43.6	47.8
<i>Total very or somewhat concerned</i>	%	<i>71.0</i>	<i>71.9</i>	<i>70.7</i>	<i>77.6</i>	<i>72.9</i>	<i>67.9</i>	<i>76.2</i>	<i>64.9</i>	<i>72.0</i>
Not concerned	%	29.0	27.9	29.3	22.3	27.1	31.9	23.8	35.1	27.9
Don't know	%	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.1	–	0.1
Sample size	no.	4 654	4 613	5 537	1 804	1 804	1 803	1 984	1 005	23 204
Likert index (c)	Index	1.96	1.96	1.92	2.08	1.97	1.87	1.99	1.86	1.96
Motor vehicle theft 2002-03										
Very concerned	%	27.3	24.0	21.7	26.6	26.6	23.7	19.6	24.9	25.1
Somewhat concerned	%	43.6	44.3	44.3	43.4	45.5	42.4	48.9	42.6	44.1
<i>Total very or somewhat concerned</i>	%	<i>70.9</i>	<i>68.3</i>	<i>66.0</i>	<i>70.0</i>	<i>72.1</i>	<i>66.1</i>	<i>68.5</i>	<i>67.5</i>	<i>69.2</i>
Not concerned	%	28.2	30.8	33.1	28.9	27.2	33.0	30.6	31.9	29.9
Don't know	%	0.8	0.9	0.9	1.1	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.5	0.9
Sample size	no.	5 132	2 573	4 051	2 133	2 095	2 038	2 027	2 024	22 073
Likert index (c)	Index	1.99	1.93	1.89	1.98	1.99	1.91	1.89	1.93	1.95
Motor vehicle theft 2003-04										
Very concerned	%	24.0	23.2	20.6	27.0	24.5	21.0	20.5	23.9	23.4
Somewhat concerned	%	43.0	44.0	44.3	45.2	47.7	44.6	48.1	38.3	44.1
<i>Total very or somewhat concerned</i>	%	<i>67.0</i>	<i>67.2</i>	<i>64.9</i>	<i>72.2</i>	<i>72.2</i>	<i>65.6</i>	<i>68.6</i>	<i>62.2</i>	<i>67.5</i>
Not concerned	%	32.4	32.3	34.4	27.2	27.2	33.9	31.2	37.4	31.8
Don't know	%	0.6	0.4	0.7	0.6	0.6	0.4	0.2	0.4	0.6
Sample size	no.	4 960	3 029	3 982	1 976	1 942	1 983	1 985	1 483	21 340
Likert index (c)	Index	1.92	1.91	1.86	2.00	1.97	1.87	1.89	1.87	1.92
Motor vehicle theft 2004-05										
Very concerned	%	21.2	21.8	17.3	23.5	24.7	18.8	18.1	15.4	21.0
Somewhat concerned	%	44.3	45.6	45.0	45.2	45.5	45.4	47.5	45.3	45.0
<i>Total very or somewhat concerned</i>	%	<i>65.5</i>	<i>67.4</i>	<i>62.3</i>	<i>68.7</i>	<i>70.2</i>	<i>64.2</i>	<i>65.6</i>	<i>60.7</i>	<i>66.0</i>
Not concerned	%	33.6	31.6	37.1	30.7	29.1	35.4	33.9	38.8	33.2
Don't know	%	0.8	1.0	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.4	0.6	0.5	0.8
Sample size	no.	4 654	4 613	5 537	1 804	1 804	1 803	1 984	1 005	23 204
Likert index (c)	Index	1.88	1.90	1.80	1.93	1.96	1.83	1.84	1.76	1.88

Table 5A.39 **Whether worried about being a victim by type of crime (a), (b), (c)**

	<i>Unit</i>	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>WA</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>ACT</i>	<i>NT</i>	<i>Aust</i>
--	-------------	------------	------------	------------	-----------	-----------	------------	------------	-----------	-------------

(a) Data for 2002-03 onwards are based on responses from people aged 15 years or over.

(b) Totals may not add up to 100 per cent as a result of rounding.

(c) The Likert summation index method aggregates responses to provide a single measure of the general (or 'average') perceptions of respondents.

Each response category is allocated a weight. The number of responses for the category are multiplied by the weight to give a total score for the category. The total scores for each category are summed and divided by the total number of responses to derive the Likert index for the question. (See box 5.3 in chapter 5 for a detailed example).

For the response categories in the table above, the weights are as follows:

Very safe = 5; safe = 4; neither = 3; unsafe = 2; and very unsafe = 1.

Source: ACPR (unpublished).

Table 5A.40

Table 5A.40 **Victims of homicide — crimes against the person
(per 100 000 people) (a), (b)**

	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>WA</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>ACT</i>	<i>NT</i>	<i>Aust</i>
Number of homicide victims									
2000-01	117	55	69	28	23	8	0	17	317
2001-02	111	87	79	35	33	10	2	23	381
2002-03	105	69	70	32	22	6	3	17	323
2003-04	85	73	63	37	28	3	3	12	304
2004-05	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
Homicide rate per 100 000 people									
2000-01	1.8	1.2	1.9	1.5	1.5	1.7	–	8.7	1.7
2001-02	1.7	1.8	2.2	1.8	2.2	2.1	0.6	11.6	2.0
2002-03	1.6	1.4	1.9	1.7	1.4	1.3	0.9	8.6	1.6
2003-04	1.3	1.5	1.7	1.9	1.8	0.6	0.9	6.0	1.5
2004-05	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na

(a) The definition of homicide defined by the criminal law in of each State and Territory. The specific wording of the definition varies somewhat between States and Territories in terms of degree and culpability.

(b) The Australian total for 2001-02 includes one homicide victim in Norfolk Island.

na data for 2004-05 will be available early 2006. – Nil or rounded to zero

Source: Australian Institute of Criminology, *Homicide in Australia: 2003–2004 National Homicide Monitoring Program (NHMP) Annual Report*.

Table 5A.41

Table 5A.41 **Victims of recorded crimes — crimes against people
(per 100 000 persons) (a), (b), (c)**

	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>WA</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>ACT</i>	<i>NT</i>	<i>Aust</i>
Murder									
2000	1.6	1.2	2.2	1.7	1.5	1.7	1.0	8.2	1.6
2001	1.6	1.4	1.8	1.1	1.9	1.7	–	9.1	1.6
2002	1.5	1.4	1.6	2.1	1.9	1.5	0.9	7.6	1.6
2003	1.5	1.4	1.7	1.5	1.2	1.0	1.2	5.5	1.5
2004	1.1	1.0	1.4	1.7	1.8	1.5	–	4.5	1.3
Attempted murder									
2000	2.3	1.1	3.4	0.8	2.9	1.5	–	2.6	2.1
2001	3.1	1.0	4.3	0.9	1.6	2.5	–	–	2.4
2002	2.2	1.1	3.4	1.0	2.6	0.6	–	4.5	2.0
2003	1.8	1.1	3.0	1.0	2.6	1.5	0.9	1.5	1.8
2004	1.1	0.9	2.4	1.5	3.4	1.7	0.9	–	1.5
Manslaughter									
2000	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.7	–	–	–	1.5	0.3
2001	0.1	0.1	0.4	0.3	–	0.6	–	1.5	0.2
2002	0.2	0.1	0.5	0.3	–	–	–	3.0	0.2
2003	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.6	0.2	–	–	3.5	0.2
2004	0.1	0.1	0.3	0.6	–	–	–	4.0	0.2
Driving causing death									
2000	1.5	1.1	1.1	1.6	2.5	0.6	–	–	1.3
2001	1.4	1.6	1.1	1.4	1.3	–	0.9	–	1.3
2002	1.2	1.2	1.0	1.2	0.9	–	0.9	–	1.0
2003	1.8	0.9	1.4	0.7	1.2	–	0.9	–	1.2
2004	1.1	1.2	1.0	–	0.7	0.6	0.9	–	0.9
Assault									
2000	1 063.3	300.7	524.5	750.3	1 030.0	577.9	560.1	1 502.1	724.2
2001	1 147.6	348.1	557.7	798.5	1 077.4	739.1	612.2	1 490.6	784.5
2002	1 206.9	377.9	561.8	794.1	1 089.1	771.0	618.3	1 727.0	809.7
2003	1 194.8	348.6	556.8	771.2	1 047.9	785.0	615.2	1 847.2	798.0
2004	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
Sexual assault									
2000	92.5	52.5	105.2	81.4	97.8	41.2	37.3	113.1	82.3
2001	95.3	54.3	112.6	88.6	104.4	43.7	56.1	144.1	86.4
2002	97.7	55.4	129.3	84.2	107.0	52.9	57.5	166.6	90.6
2003	101.6	52.2	133.5	65.0	121.3	53.9	39.3	152.8	91.7
2004	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na

Table 5A.41

Table 5A.41 **Victims of recorded crimes — crimes against people
(per 100 000 persons) (a), (b), (c)**

	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>WA</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>ACT</i>	<i>NT</i>	<i>Aust</i>
Kidnapping/abduction									
2000	5.9	2.4	2.7	2.3	2.9	2.1	1.6	1.5	3.6
2001	7.2	2.4	2.1	2.5	2.4	2.3	0.9	2.0	3.9
2002	6.5	2.2	2.0	1.9	2.0	1.7	3.1	2.0	3.5
2003	6.3	2.0	2.4	1.8	2.2	0.6	1.9	1.5	3.6
2004	6.9	2.2	2.9	1.3	2.3	1.5	1.9	3.0	3.8
Armed robbery									
2000	72.5	37.7	33.6	52.8	39.1	16.6	36.7	14.8	49.5
2001	85.4	54.3	32.2	52.9	41.1	17.6	30.7	17.2	57.0
2002	57.5	32.6	23.9	47.3	34.2	11.0	11.2	8.6	39.7
2003	49.7	29.1	25.2	40.2	34.7	15.1	21.0	14.6	36.0
2004	42.6	22.3	22.4	23.5	32.9	10.2	32.7	12.0	29.8
Unarmed robbery									
2000	133.6	32.7	32.5	58.0	72.3	19.8	61.7	19.4	72.3
2001	146.3	40.2	38.1	55.8	70.1	22.9	49.2	19.7	80.0
2002	118.4	33.3	31.3	55.0	72.6	17.9	54.4	31.2	66.7
2003	112.7	30.0	29.2	70.1	51.8	13.0	41.4	27.2	63.2
2004	89.4	23.7	27.3	64.5	47.8	16.0	34.6	17.0	52.2
Blackmail /extortion									
2000	0.9	1.6	1.8	1.6	1.7	–	1.0	–	1.3
2001	1.0	2.4	2.5	1.4	3.6	0.6	0.9	–	1.8
2002	1.2	2.6	1.5	1.6	4.0	–	–	–	1.7
2003	1.2	2.3	1.7	3.3	4.0	0.8	–	–	1.9
2004	1.4	1.9	1.5	3.7	3.7	–	1.5	1.5	1.8
Assault - index 2000 = 100									
2000	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
2001	107.9	115.8	106.3	106.4	104.6	127.9	109.3	99.2	108.3
2002	113.5	125.7	107.1	105.8	105.7	133.4	110.4	115.0	111.8
2003	112.4	115.9	106.2	102.8	101.7	135.8	109.8	123.0	110.2
2004	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
Armed robbery - index 2000 = 100									
2000	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
2001	117.8	144.0	95.8	100.2	105.1	106.0	83.7	116.2	115.2
2002	79.3	86.5	71.1	89.6	87.5	66.3	30.5	58.1	80.2
2003	68.6	77.2	75.0	75.4	88.7	91.0	57.2	98.6	72.7
2004	58.8	59.2	66.7	44.5	84.1	61.4	89.1	81.1	60.2

(a) Based on crimes reported to police.

(b) Total (excluding driving causing deaths) uses the overall homicide rate rather than the items murder, attempted murder and manslaughter. This ensures a more accurate total, as it includes rates for not published items.

Table 5A.41 **Victims of recorded crimes — crimes against people
(per 100 000 persons) (a), (b), (c)**

	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>WA</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>ACT</i>	<i>NT</i>	<i>Aust</i>
--	------------	------------	------------	-----------	-----------	------------	------------	-----------	-------------

(c) From 2004 data are no longer available for Assault and Sexual Assault

na Not available. – Zero or rounded to zero. **np** Not published.

Source: ABS 2005, *Recorded Crime Victims Australia, 2004*, Cat. no. 4510.0, Canberra (and previous years).

Table 5A.42

Table 5A.42 **Victims of recorded crime — property crime (per 100 000 persons) (a)**

	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT (b)	Aust
Unlawful entry with intent (UEWI)									
2000	2 485.3	1 655.2	2 166.7	3 230.8	2 424.3	2 131.4	2 452.8	2 744.3	2 281.3
2001	2 464.4	1 688.3	2 031.5	3 265.8	2 318.4	1 962.1	1 857.4	3 310.4	2 244.9
2002	2 127.9	1 465.3	1 839.2	3 194.2	2 176.5	1 567.9	1 903.5	2 852.5	2 007.9
2003	1 922.9	1 235.8	1 645.9	2 960.9	1 868.1	1 375.4	1 619.9	2 126.0	1 781.7
2004	1 645.5	1 127.1	1 457.7	2 251.3	1 742.1	1 034.6	1 605.5	1 712.7	1 533.5
UEWI involving the taking of property									
2000	1 964.3	1 315.3	1 647.1	2 231.4	na	1 664.5	2 075.6	1 754.4	na
2001	1 916.1	1 309.2	1 531.8	2 199.8	1 480.0	1 555.8	1 582.8	2 098.4	1 675.5
2002	1 647.7	1 104.1	1 392.1	2 166.4	1 433.7	1 236.5	1 642.2	1 793.0	1 490.7
2003	1 478.5	933.8	1 250.9	2 038.2	1 204.2	1 081.1	1 410.5	1 315.1	1 321.9
2004	1 248.6	844.0	1 097.0	1 449.3	1 110.0	800.6	1 413.5	920.4	1 117.1
UEWI other									
2000	521.0	339.9	519.6	999.3	na	466.9	377.2	990.0	na
2001	548.4	379.0	499.7	1 066.0	838.4	406.3	274.6	1 212.0	569.5
2002	480.3	361.2	447.2	1 027.8	742.8	331.4	261.3	1 059.6	517.2
2003	444.4	302.0	395.0	922.7	664.0	294.4	209.4	810.9	459.8
2004	397.0	283.1	360.7	801.9	632.1	234.0	192.0	792.3	416.4
Motor vehicle theft (c)									
2000	793.0	765.5	522.1	632.3	899.2	715.9	904.8	508.6	725.2
2001	795.1	819.1	481.4	596.7	837.7	734.0	746.3	474.8	720.7
2002	628.0	594.8	427.2	544.9	738.4	526.0	639.8	406.7	577.7
2003	521.2	485.9	350.8	549.0	668.7	453.8	771.0	355.6	494.7
2004	493.4	403.6	320.8	390.0	685.1	359.0	538.9	233.6	437.2
Other theft									
2000	3 594.5	3 098.1	3 149.0	4 687.3	4 592.4	2 751.2	3 768.9	3 711.3	3 556.8
2001	3 491.5	3 143.7	3 219.1	4 846.7	5 234.7	2 830.5	3 169.9	4 015.3	3 607.0
2002	3 194.2	2 935.3	3 152.5	5 105.2	5 214.0	2 864.3	3 173.4	4 103.9	3 466.7
2003	2 903.4	2 786.8	2 954.4	4 764.0	3 810.7	2 536.5	3 390.3	3 391.7	3 140.6
2004	2 529.8	2 416.7	2 583.4	3 972.8	3 421.9	2 288.4	2 573.9	3 211.9	2 724.2

(a) Data are based on crimes reported to police.

(b) A review of local offences codes by NT Police during 2002 identified that theft of motor vehicle parts or contents offences (ASOC code 0813) and some theft (except motor vehicles) n.e.c. (ASOC code 0829) had been incorrectly included in the motor vehicle offence category. These offences however, were also correctly coded to the 'other theft' offence category.

(c) Victims are based on the number of motor vehicles.

na Not available.

Source: ABS 2005, *Recorded Crime Victims Australia*, 2004, Cat.4510.0 (and previous years).

Table 5A.43

Table 5A.43 Reporting rates for selected major offences (per cent) (a), (b)

	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>WA</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>ACT</i>	<i>NT</i>	<i>Aust</i>
Break and enter (c)									
1998	74.7	83.2	74.6	80.8	79.8	77.8	76.0	66.4	77.5
1999	73.7	na	na	75.3	na	na	na	na	na
2000	71.7	na	na	na	78.8	na	na	na	na
2001	73.1	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
2002	68.0	79.0	74.9	83.7	81.4	79.3	80.9	72.8	75.1
Attempted break and enter (d)									
1998	29.3	37.6	27.1	33.6	31.3	41.9	32.5	32.0	31.7
1999	32.3	na	na	21.7	na	na	na	na	na
2000	19.7	na	na	na	33.8	na	na	na	na
2001	32.2	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
2002	31.2	26.9	31.4	33.6	37.4	28.8	23.4	30.0	31.1
Motor vehicle theft (e)									
1998	95.1	97.1	97.5	92.4	94.4	86.2	85.2	100.0	95.1
1999	95.1	na	na	96.4	na	na	na	na	na
2000	95.2	na	na	na	90.8	na	na	na	na
2001	95.3	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
2002	96.3	95.6	91.0	96.9	96.0	87.4	91.6	89.6	95.0
Robbery (f)									
1998	47.9	46.0	52.4	59.5	42.5	56.5	56.3	79.8	49.8
1999	51.9	na	na	46.9	na	na	na	na	na
2000	42.7	na	na	na	54.8	na	na	na	na
2001	38.6	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
2002	60.7	45.3	36.0	27.9	20.3	57.3	81.7	100.0	50.2
Assault (g)									
1998	30.4	23.2	30.2	25.3	30.8	23.8	19.7	28.8	27.7
1999	34.1	na	na	24.7	na	na	na	na	na
2000	34.9	na	na	na	27.3	na	na	na	na
2001	29.8	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
2002	34.6	24.1	33.2	29.1	31.7	32.4	23.9	45.6	30.8
Sexual assault (h), (i)									
1998	56.0	21.0	31.0	53.0	na	na	na	na	33.0
1999	13.0	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
2000	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
2001	16.1	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
2002	29.2	19.2	13.9	20.9	na	na	na	na	19.8

(a) Surveys were not conducted in all jurisdictions in all years.

(b) Data are for the 12 months to April of the specified year, except for 1999 WA figures, which were for the 12 months to October of that year.

Table 5A.43 **Reporting rates for selected major offences (per cent) (a), (b)**

	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>WA</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>ACT</i>	<i>NT</i>	<i>Aust</i>
(c)	For 2002, the NT and the ACT estimates are subject to a relative standard error of between 25 and 50 per cent.								
(d)	For 2002, SA estimates are subject to a relative standard error of between 25 and 50 per cent and Tasmania, the NT and the ACT estimates are subject to a relative standard error of greater than 50 per cent.								
(e)	For 2002, WA, Tasmania and the ACT estimates are subject to a relative standard error of between 25 and 50 per cent and the NT estimates are subject to a relative standard error of greater than 50 per cent.								
(f)	For 2002, Queensland and WA estimates are subject to a relative standard error of between 25 and 50 per cent and SA, Tasmania, the ACT and the NT estimates are subject to a relative standard error of greater than 50 per cent.								
(g)	For 2002, Tasmania, the ACT and the NT estimates are subject to a relative standard error of between 25 and 50 per cent.								
(h)	For 2002, NSW estimates are subject to a relative standard error of between 25 and 50 per cent and Victoria, Queensland and WA estimates are subject to a relative standard error of greater than 50 per cent.								
(i)	Females aged 18 years and over only.								
	na Not available. – Nil or rounded to zero								

Source: ABS, *Crime and Safety Australia*, Cat.no. 4509.0, (various years), Canberra; ABS, *Crime and Safety New South Wales*, Cat.no. 4509.1, (various years), Canberra; ABS, *Crime and Safety Victoria*, Cat.no. 4509.2, (various years), Canberra; ABS, *Crime and Safety*

Table 5A.44

Table 5A.44 **Estimated total victims of crime (unreported and reported) — crimes against the person (per 100 000 people) (a), (b)**

	<i>Unit</i>	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>WA</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>ACT</i>	<i>NT</i>	<i>Aust</i>
Robbery										
1998	no.	900	300	300	600	500	600	600	900	500
	RSE (c) %	± 10.5	± 21.2	± 17.8	± 18.2	± 20.7	± 25.2	± 24.9	± 30.7	± 7.0
1999	no.	1 200	na	na	800	na	na	na	na	na
2000	no.	1 000	na	na	na	700	na	na	na	na
2001	no.	1 000	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
2002	no.	1 000	500	300	600	500	300	200	np	600
	RSE (c) %	± 10.3	± 15.7	± 22.3	± 17.4	± 20.1	± 35.8	± 38.4	± 94.8	± 6.6
Assault										
1998	no.	3 900	3 800	4 800	4 900	4 200	5 100	6 900	6 300	4 300
	RSE (c) %	± 4.5	± 5.2	± 4.1	± 5.3	± 6.1	± 7.1	± 6.0	± 8.2	± 2.2
1999	no.	3 700	na	na	4 900	na	na	na	na	na
2000	no.	3 600	na	na	na	4 600	na	na	na	na
2001	no.	4 200	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
2002	no.	4 800	4 700	4 400	5 100	4 500	5 000	5 800	7 800	4 700
	RSE (c) %	± 4.0	± 4.2	± 4.6	± 5.2	± 5.6	± 6.7	± 7.0	± 10.8	± 2.1
Sexual assault (d), (e)										
1998	no.	300	700	400	500	300	700	900	600	400
1999	no.	700	na	na	700	na	na	na	na	na
2000	no.	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
2001	no.	500	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
2002	no.	300	200	200	200	np	np	np	np	200
Total personal crimes										
1998	no.	4 600	4 200	5 100	5 600	4 500	5 700	7 700	6 800	4 800
	RSE (c) %	± 4.1	± 4.9	± 3.9	± 4.9	± 5.8	± 6.6	± 5.6	± 7.7	± 2.1
2002	no.	5 700	5 200	4 700	5 700	4 900	5 200	5 900	8 100	5 300
	RSE (c) %	± 3.5	± 3.9	± 4.4	± 4.8	± 5.3	± 6.5	± 6.9	± 10.4	± 2.0

(a) Data derived from surveys of the Australian population. Surveys were not conducted in all jurisdictions in all years.

(b) Data are for the 12 months to April of the specified year, except for 1999 WA figures, which are for the 12 months to October of that year.

(c) Relative standard error. An overview of how to interpret RSEs is contained in Appendix A ('Statistical appendix').

(d) For 2002, Victoria, Queensland and WA estimates are subject to a relative standard error of between 25 and 50 per cent and for SA, Tasmania, the ACT and the NT estimates are subject to a relative standard error of greater than 50 per cent and are not published.

(e) Females aged 18 years and over only.

na Not available. **np** Not published.

Table 5A.44 Estimated total victims of crime (unreported and reported) — crimes against the person (per 100 000 people) (a), (b)

	<i>Unit</i>	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>WA</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>ACT</i>	<i>NT</i>	<i>Aust</i>
Source:	ABS, <i>Crime and Safety Australia</i> , Cat. no. 4509.0, (various years), Canberra; ABS, <i>Crime and Safety New South Wales</i> , Cat. no. 4509.1, (various years), Canberra; ABS, <i>Crime and Safety Victoria</i> , Cat. no. 4509.2, (various years), Canberra; ABS, <i>Crime and Safety Queensland</i> , Cat. no. 4509.3, (various years), Canberra; ABS, <i>Crime and Safety South Australia</i> , Cat. no. 4509.4, (various years), Canberra; ABS, <i>Crime and Safety Western Australia</i> , Cat. no. 4509.5, (various years), Canberra; and ABS, <i>Western Australia Statistical Indicators</i> , Cat. no. 1367.5, 2001.									

Table 5A.45

Table 5A.45 Estimated total household victims of crime, reported and unreported — crimes against property (per 100 000 households) (a), (b)

	<i>Unit</i>	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>WA</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>ACT</i>	<i>NT</i>	<i>Aust</i>
Break and enter (c)										
1993	no.	3 700	3 300	5 200	7 500	5 000	4 000	5 000	7 400	4 400
1998	no.	5 300	3 600	5 400	7 500	4 000	5 000	5 800	6 300	5 000
1999	no.	5 600	na	na	8 100	na	na	na	na	na
2000	no.	5 600	na	na	na	5 100	na	na	na	na
2001	no.	6 300	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
2002	no.	5 000	3 400	5 000	6 200	4 500	5 200	4 400	13 500	4 700
Attempted break and enter (d)										
1993	no.	2 600	2 600	3 200	4 900	3 800	2 000	4 900	5 400	3 100
1998	no.	3 400	2 100	2 900	6 000	2 900	3 600	4 000	5 000	3 200
1999	no.	4 300	na	na	5 400	na	na	na	na	na
2000	no.	3 500	na	na	na	3 800	na	na	na	na
2001	no.	4 400	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
2002	no.	3 700	2 200	3 800	4 400	3 000	3 300	3 800	9 500	3 400
Break and enter or attempted break and enter										
1993	no.	5 700	5 400	7 500	11 000	8 100	5 600	8 900	10 600	6 800
1998	no.	7 900	5 300	7 700	12 400	6 300	8 100	9 100	10 800	7 600
	RSE (e) %	± 4.6	± 6.5	± 4.7	± 4.6	± 7.0	± 8.1	± 7.5	± 9.2	± 2.4
1999	no.	8 800	na	na	12 100	na	na	na	na	na
2000	no.	8 400	na	na	na	8 100	na	na	na	na
2001	no.	3 600	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
2002	no.	7 900	5 300	8 000	9 600	6 700	7 700	7 500	19 400	7 400
	RSE (e) %	± 4.6	± 6.1	± 4.9	± 5.4	± 6.6	± 7.7	± 8.9	± 9.2	± 2.5
Motor vehicle theft										
1993	no.	2 000	1 700	1 300	2 200	1 700	1 000	800	700	1 700
1998	no.	2 100	1 600	1 100	2 400	1 200	1 400	1 300	1 100	1 700
	RSE (e) %	± 9.8	± 12.3	± 14.2	± 12.3	± 18.0	± 22.5	± 24.0	± 43.7	± 5.6
1999	no.	2 200	na	na	1 900	na	na	na	na	na
2000	no.	1 700	na	na	na	2 100	na	na	na	na
2001	no.	2 400	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
2002	no.	2 100	2 000	1 300	1 000	1 800	1 600	2 300	2 600	1 800
	RSE (e) %	± 10.4	± 10.6	± 14.4	± 19.1	± 13.8	± 19.9	± 17.6	± 33.0	± 5.5
Total household crimes										
1993	no.	7 500	7 000	8 600	12 800	9 700	6 600	9 700	11 300	8 300
1998	no.	9 700	6 700	8 500	14 300	7 400	9 300	10 400	11 400	9 000
	RSE (e) %	± 4.1	± 5.7	± 4.4	± 4.2	± 6.4	± 7.4	± 6.9	± 8.9	± 2.2
2002	no.	9 600	7 000	9 000	10 400	8 200	8 900	9 200	20 400	8 900
	RSE (e) %	± 4.0	± 5.1	± 4.5	± 5.1	± 5.8	± 7.0	± 7.9	± 8.9	± 2.2

(a) Data derived from surveys of the Australian population. Surveys were not conducted in all jurisdictions in all years.

Table 5A.45 **Estimated total household victims of crime, reported and unreported — crimes against property (per 100 000 households) (a), (b)**

	<i>Unit</i>	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>WA</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>ACT</i>	<i>NT</i>	<i>Aust</i>
--	-------------	------------	------------	------------	-----------	-----------	------------	------------	-----------	-------------

(b) Data are for the 12 months to April of the specified year, except for 1999 WA figures, which are for the 12 months to October of that year.

(c) For 2002, the ACT and the NT estimates are subject to a relative standard error of between 25 and 50 per cent.

(d) For 2002, Tasmania, the ACT and the NT estimates are subject to a relative standard error of between 25 and 50 per cent.

(e) Relative standard error. An overview of how to interpret RSEs is contained in Appendix A ('Statistical appendix).

na Not available. **np** Not published.

Source: ABS, *Crime and Safety Australia*, Cat.no. 4509.0, (various years), Canberra; ABS, *Crime and Safety New South Wales*, Cat.no. 4509.1, (various years), Canberra; ABS, *Crime and Safety Victoria*, Cat.no. 4509.2, (various years), Canberra; ABS, *Crime and Safety Queensland*, Cat.no. 4509.3, (various years), Canberra; ABS, *Crime and Safety South Australia*, Cat.no. 4509.4, (various years), Canberra; ABS, *Crime and Safety Western Australia*, Cat.no. 4509.5, (various years), Canberra; and ABS, *Western Australia Statistical Indicators*, Cat.no. 1367.5, 2001.

Table 5A.46 Real recurrent expenditure (less revenue from own sources and payroll tax) per person on community safety and support (2004-05 dollars) (a), (b), (c)

	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld</i> (d)	<i>WA</i>	<i>SA</i> (e)	<i>Tas</i>	<i>ACT</i> (f)	<i>NT</i>	<i>Ave</i> (g)
2001-02	150	107	na	136	166	na	137	na	109
2002-03	164	111	na	141	131	na	156	340	129
2003-04	157	103	87	148	115	na	185	379	128
2004-05	150	109	73	156	126	na	176	370	126

- (a) Data have not been subject to extensive tests to determine comparability. Further, some differences in counting rules may exist across jurisdictions as a result of the differing mixes of activities undertaken within each of the common service delivery areas.
- (b) Totals may not add as a result of rounding.
- (c) Calculated by multiplying the proportion of expenditure on salaries and payments for each SDA by the total payroll tax expenditure.
- (d) For Qld, a review of the output structure for 2004-05 has resulted in a change in the distribution of funds across outputs and may have contributed to the redistribution of funds in 2004-05 from this SDA.
- (e) For SA, the decrease in 2003-04 mainly reflects the outcomes of activity surveys conducted in 2004, which resulted in a shift in resources from community safety and support to crime investigation. In 2004-05, total recurrent expenditure has increased mainly as a result of Enterprise Bargaining for Sworn Staff and asset revaluation decrements.
- (f) Includes major events and planning. In the ACT, variation from last year is a result of the review of enabling costs associated with operational support services, which has led to significant improvements in the attribution of costs.
- (g) Represents the weighted average of those jurisdictions that provided data.
- na** Not available.

Source: State and Territory governments (unpublished); tables A.2 and table A.26.

Performance indicators for criminal investigation

Table 5A.47

Table 5A.47 **Outcomes of investigations of crimes against the person: 30 day status, 1 January to 31 December 2004**

	<i>Unit</i>	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>WA</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>ACT</i>	<i>NT</i>	<i>Aust</i>
Investigations of murder										
Investigations finalised	%	68.1	69.2	61.8	57.1	55.9	100.0	66.7	–	65.0
Finalised investigations proceeded against	%	85.7	91.7	82.4	68.4	100.0	100.0	–	100.0	86.8
Total	no.	72	52	55	34	28	7	–	9	257
Investigations of assault										
Investigations finalised	%	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
Finalised investigations proceeded against	%	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
Total	no.	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
Investigations of sexual assault										
Investigations finalised	%	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
Finalised investigations proceeded against	%	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
Total	no.	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
Investigations of kidnapping/abduction										
Investigations finalised	%	38.4	50.0	12.3	48.0	35.1	57.1	50.0	50.0	36.7
Finalised investigations proceeded against	%	69.1	58.2	57.1	25.0	76.9	100.0	–	100.0	64.9
Total	no.	464	110	114	25	37	7	6	6	769
Investigations of armed robbery										
Investigations finalised	%	13.8	35.7	17.5	24.5	24.4	53.1	66.7	34.0	21.0
Finalised investigations proceeded against	%	70.5	84.3	88.8	87.7	83.7	88.5	91.7	81.3	81.0
Total	no.	2 867	1 108	869	465	505	49	106	24	5 993
Investigations of unarmed robbery										
Investigations finalised	%	17.9	30.6	18.7	19.1	21.3	44.2	12.5	41.2	20.0
Finalised investigations proceeded against	%	59.0	82.0	77.3	70.5	61.5	79.4	57.1	78.6	66.6
Total	no.	6 020	1 181	1 060	1 279	734	77	112	34	10 497
Investigations of blackmail/extortion										
Investigations finalised	%	18.1	45.7	18.3	42.5	50.0	–	100.0	100.0	35.5
Finalised investigations proceeded against	%	58.8	88.1	72.7	80.6	50.0	–	50.0	–	71.2
Total	no.	94	92	60	73	44	–	6	3	372

na Not available – Nil or rounded to zero.

Source: ABS 2004, *Recorded Crime - Victims, Australia*, Cat. no. 4510.0, Canberra (and previous).

Table 5A.48

Table 5A.48 Victims of property crime: outcomes of investigations, 30 day status, 1 January to 31 December 2004

	Unit	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Aust
Investigations of unlawful entry with intent										
Investigations finalised	%	7.1	10.0	7.5	7.4	5.9	13.6	3.6	18.8	7.8
Finalised investigations proceeded against	%	66.8	91.4	92.2	73.8	81.7	91.6	90.3	78.7	80.1
Total	no.	110 765	56 047	56 589	44 625	26 728	4 988	5 202	3 424	308 368
Investigations of motor vehicle theft										
Investigations finalised	%	6.8	13.0	12.5	15.1	10.3	22.3	7.7	28.9	10.6
Finalised investigations proceeded against	%	70.0	71.7	78.1	57.5	73.8	79.0	85.8	70.4	71.3
Total	no.	33 209	20 070	12 452	7 730	10 511	1 731	1 746	467	87 916
Investigations of other theft										
Investigations finalised	%	12.0	19.1	15.1	12.6	12.0	24.8	10.3	14.8	14.5
Finalised investigations proceeded against	%	88.7	95.3	84.7	69.3	83.3	88.1	86.5	48.8	86.5
Total	no.	170 290	120 179	100 288	78 749	52 500	11 033	8 340	6 421	547 800

Source: ABS 2004, Recorded Crime - Victims, Australia, Cat. no. 4510.0, AusInfo, Canberra (and previous).

Table 5A.49 Real recurrent expenditure (less revenue from own sources and payroll tax) per person on crime investigation (2004-05 dollars) (a), (b), (c)

	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>WA</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>ACT</i>	<i>NT</i>	<i>Ave (d)</i>
2001-02	44	40	na	52	28	52	74	na	33
2002-03	49	73	na	59	31	na	76	135	45
2003-04	59	76	113	59	81	na	77	142	75
2004-05	70	81	89	66	90	na	71	162	81

- (a) Data have not been subject to extensive tests to determine comparability. Further, some differences in counting rules may exist across jurisdictions as a result of the differing mixes of activities undertaken within each of the common Service Delivery Areas (SDAs).
- (b) Totals may not add as a result of rounding.
- (c) Calculated by multiplying the proportion of expenditure on salaries and payments for each SDA by the total payroll tax expenditure.
- (d) Represents the weighted average of those jurisdictions that provided data.

na Not available.

Source: State and Territory governments (unpublished).

Performance indicators for road safety and traffic management

Table 5A.50

Table 5A.50 People who have driven a motor vehicle in the past 12 months (a), (b)

	<i>Unit</i>	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>WA</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>ACT</i>	<i>NT</i>	<i>Aust</i>
2002-03										
Have driven	%	85.8	88.7	89.3	91.4	88.6	88.7	91.1	93.2	88.2
Have not driven	%	14.2	11.3	10.7	8.6	11.4	11.3	8.9	6.8	11.8
Sample size	no.	5 132	2 573	4 051	2 133	2 095	2 038	2 027	2 024	22 073
2003-04										
Have driven	%	85.8	88.9	89.8	91.4	89.5	88.3	90.4	91.8	88.4
Have not driven	%	14.2	11.1	10.2	8.6	10.5	11.7	9.6	8.2	11.6
Sample size	no.	4 960	3 029	3 982	1 976	1 942	1 983	1 985	1 483	21 340
2004-05 (c)										
Have driven	%	84.6	88.0	89.3	90.6	87.9	88.2	89.6	90.5	87.4
Have not driven	%	15.4	12.0	10.7	9.4	12.1	11.8	10.4	9.5	12.6
Sample size	no.	4 654	4 613	5 537	1 804	1 804	1 803	1 984	1 005	23 204

(a) Data for 2002-03 onwards are based on responses from people aged 15 years or over.

(b) Totals may not add up to 100 per cent as a result of rounding.

(c) The wording of the survey changed in 2004-05 to : *"in the last six months, how often have you driven without wearing a seat belt"*.

Source: ACPR National Survey of Community Satisfaction with Policing (unpublished).

Table 5A.51

Table 5A.51 **People who drive and who have travelled in a car not wearing a seat belt (a), (b), (c), (d)**

	<i>Unit</i>	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>WA</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>ACT</i>	<i>NT</i>	<i>Aust</i>
2002-03										
Always	%	0.7	0.6	0.9	0.3	1.1	0.5	1.0	1.5	0.7
Most of the time	%	0.6	0.9	0.7	0.7	1.1	0.8	0.4	1.7	0.8
Half the time	%	0.3	0.5	0.7	0.8	0.9	0.5	0.8	1.3	0.6
Sometimes	%	8.0	9.1	9.2	7.8	14.0	12.5	6.9	15.9	9.1
Never	%	90.1	89.0	88.6	90.2	82.8	85.8	90.8	79.4	88.8
Refused	%	0.1	–	–	–	–	–	0.1	0.1	–
Don't know	%	0.2	–	–	0.3	0.1	0.1	–	0.1	0.1
<i>Total Always/Most Of The Time</i>	%	1.3	1.5	1.6	1.0	2.3	1.2	1.4	3.2	1.5
<i>Total Never/Sometimes</i>	%	98.1	98.1	97.8	97.9	96.8	98.3	97.7	95.3	97.8
Sample size	no.	4 403	2 282	3 618	1 950	1 856	1 808	1 847	1 886	19 468
Likert Index (c)	Index	1.13	1.15	1.16	1.13	1.24	1.18	1.14	1.30	1.15
2003-04										
Always	%	0.7	1.0	0.8	1.1	0.6	0.6	0.4	1.7	0.8
Most of the time	%	0.4	0.9	0.7	0.9	0.6	0.9	0.4	0.8	0.7
Half the time	%	0.5	1.6	0.9	1.0	1.5	0.9	0.8	2.5	1.0
Sometimes	%	7.4	8.3	8.4	8.0	14.9	12.1	7.1	15.0	8.6
Never	%	91.0	88.2	89.2	89.0	82.3	85.5	91.3	80.8	88.8
Refused	%	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Don't know	%	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
<i>Total Always/Most Of The Time</i>	%	1.1	1.9	1.5	2.0	1.2	1.5	0.8	2.5	1.5
<i>Total Never/Sometimes</i>	%	98.3	96.5	97.5	97.0	97.3	97.6	98.4	95.8	97.4
Sample size	no.	4 280	2 713	3 615	1 840	1 737	1 755	1 820	1 380	19 140
Likert Index (c)	Index	1.12	1.18	1.15	1.17	1.22	1.19	1.10	1.28	1.16
2004-05										
Always	%	0.5	0.5	0.7	1.1	1.2	0.6	0.3	0.7	0.7
Most of the time	%	0.4	0.5	0.5	0.9	0.8	0.7	0.3	2.1	0.6
Half the time	%	0.6	0.5	0.6	0.6	0.7	0.5	0.2	1.8	0.6
Sometimes	%	4.8	7.9	6.4	7.0	10.3	10.0	5.5	13.2	6.8
Never	%	93.7	90.5	91.6	90.4	87.0	87.9	93.5	82.2	91.4
Refused	%	–	–	–	–	0.1	0.2	0.1	–	–
Don't know	%	–	–	–	–	–	0.1	0.1	–	–
<i>Total Always/Most Of The Time</i>	%	0.9	1.0	1.2	2.0	2.0	1.3	0.6	2.8	1.3
<i>Total Never/Sometimes</i>	%	98.5	98.4	98.0	97.4	97.3	97.9	99.0	95.4	98.2
Sample size	no.	3 975	4 072	4 972	1 660	1 592	1 602	1 799	913	20 585
Likert Index (c)	Index	1.09	1.13	1.12	1.15	1.19	1.16	1.08	1.26	1.12

Table 5A.51 People who drive and who have travelled in a car not wearing a seat belt (a), (b), (c), (d)

	<i>Unit</i>	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>WA</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>ACT</i>	<i>NT</i>	<i>Aust</i>
--	-------------	------------	------------	------------	-----------	-----------	------------	------------	-----------	-------------

- (a) Data for 2002-03 onwards are based on responses from people aged 15 years or over.
- (b) Totals may not add up to 100 per cent as a result of rounding.
- (c) The Likert summation index method aggregates responses to provide a single measure of the general (or 'average') perceptions of respondents.
- (d) The wording of the survey changed in 2004-05 to : "*in the last six months, how often have you driven without wearing a seat belt*".

Each response category is allocated a weight. The number of responses for the category are multiplied by the weight to give a total score for the category. The total scores for each category are summed and divided by the total number of responses to derive the Likert index for the question. (See box 5.3 in chapter 5 for a detailed example).

For the response categories in the table above, the weights are as follows:

Always = 5; most of the time = 4; half of the time = 3; sometimes =2; and never =1
 – Nil or rounded to zero.

Source: ACPR National Survey of Community Satisfaction with Policing (unpublished).

Table 5A.52

Table 5A.52 **People who drive and have driven 10 kilometres per hour or more over speed limit (a), (b), (c)**

	<i>Unit</i>	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>WA</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>ACT</i>	<i>NT</i>	<i>Aust</i>
2002-03										
Always	%	1.0	1.1	1.1	0.7	0.9	0.6	1.2	1.7	1.0
Most of the time	%	2.8	2.6	2.4	3.8	1.9	1.4	3.0	3.5	2.7
Half the time	%	4.9	2.7	5.0	5.1	2.8	3.7	5.7	4.4	4.2
Sometimes	%	54.1	51.2	55.9	53.9	55.5	51.6	58.3	55.5	53.7
Never	%	36.8	42.1	35.4	36.3	38.3	42.6	31.3	34.4	38.0
Refused		0.1	0.1	0.1	–	0.3	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.1
Don't know	%	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.2	–	0.3	0.2	0.2
<i>Total Always/Most Of The Time</i>		3.8	3.7	3.5	4.5	2.8	1.9	4.2	5.3	3.7
<i>Total Never/Sometimes</i>	%	90.9	93.2	91.3	90.3	93.8	94.3	89.6	89.9	91.7
Sample size	no.	4 403	2 282	3 618	1 950	1 856	1 808	1 847	1 886	19 468
Likert Index (c)	Index	1.77	1.69	1.78	1.78	1.71	1.65	1.84	1.82	1.75
2003-04										
Always	%	1.4	0.6	1.2	1.6	0.9	1.5	0.8	0.8	1.1
Most of the time	%	3.3	1.6	2.3	3.4	1.3	2.1	2.0	2.5	2.5
Half the time	%	5.8	4.0	5.5	6.7	3.5	3.3	6.3	6.7	5.1
Sometimes	%	53.9	50.4	56.1	54.0	54.3	52.1	56.3	56.7	53.4
Never	%	35.4	43.1	34.7	34.3	39.9	40.6	34.5	33.3	37.6
Refused		–	0.2	–	–	0.1	–	–	–	–
Don't know	%	0.1	0.1	–	–	0.1	–	–	–	–
<i>Total Always/Most Of The Time</i>		4.7	2.2	3.5	5.0	2.2	3.6	2.8	3.3	3.6
<i>Total Never/Sometimes</i>	%	89.3	93.4	90.8	88.3	94.2	92.7	90.9	90.0	91.0
Sample size	no.	4 280	2 713	3 615	1 840	1 737	1 755	1 820	1 380	19 140
Likert Index (c)	Index	1.81	1.66	1.79	1.84	1.69	1.71	1.78	1.82	1.76
2004-05										
Always	%	0.9	1.0	1.1	0.7	0.4	0.6	0.9	1.5	0.9
Most of the time	%	2.8	2.3	3.4	3.1	1.1	1.4	2.7	4.2	2.7
Half the time	%	5.1	3.5	4.6	5.9	3.1	3.6	4.7	5.7	4.5
Sometimes	%	53.1	46.0	53.4	53.2	50.7	52.5	54.9	51.8	51.2
Never	%	37.9	47.0	37.3	37.0	44.4	41.6	36.8	36.7	40.6
Refused	%	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	–	0.2	0.1	–	0.1
Don't know	%	–	0.1	0.1	–	0.2	0.1	–	0.2	0.1

Table 5A.52 People who drive and have driven 10 kilometres per hour or more over speed limit (a), (b), (c)

	<i>Unit</i>	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>WA</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>ACT</i>	<i>NT</i>	<i>Aust</i>
<i>Total Always/Most Of The Time</i>	%	3.7	3.3	4.5	3.8	1.5	2.0	3.6	5.7	3.6
<i>Total Never/Sometimes</i>	%	91.0	93.0	90.7	90.2	95.1	94.1	91.7	88.5	91.8
Sample size	no.	3 975	4 072	4 972	1 660	1 592	1 602	1 799	913	20 585
Likert Index (c)	Index	1.76	1.64	1.77	1.77	1.62	1.67	1.76	1.82	1.72

(a) Data for 2002-03 onwards are based on responses from people aged 15 years or over.

(b) Total may not up to 100 per cent as a result of rounding.

(c) The Likert summation index method aggregates responses to provide a single measure of the general (or 'average') perceptions of respondents.

Each response category is allocated a weight. The number of responses for the category are multiplied by the weight to give a total score for the category. The total scores for each category are summed and divided by the total number of responses to derive the Likert index for the question. (See box 5.3. in chapter 5 for a detailed example).

For the response categories in the table above, the weights are as follows:

Always = 5; most of the time = 4; half of the time = 3; sometimes = 2; and never = 1.

– Nil or rounded to zero.

Source: ACPR (unpublished).

Table 5A.53

Table 5A.53 **People who drive and have driven while over alcohol limit (a), (b), (c)**

	<i>Unit</i>	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>WA</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>ACT</i>	<i>NT</i>	<i>Aust</i>
2002-03										
Always	%	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	–	0.2	0.1
Most of the time	%	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	–	0.2	0.1
Half the time	%	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.3	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.4	0.2
Sometimes	%	8.0	7.9	8.5	13.7	12.0	10.3	11.6	13.4	9.2
Never	%	91.3	91.5	91.2	85.4	87.7	89.2	88.0	85.6	90.2
Refused	%	–	–	–	0.1	0.1	–	0.1	–	–
Don't know	%	0.1	0.1	–	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
<i>Total Always/Most Of The Time</i>	%	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.2</i>	–	<i>0.4</i>	<i>0.2</i>
<i>Total Never/Sometimes</i>	%	<i>99.3</i>	<i>99.4</i>	<i>99.7</i>	<i>99.1</i>	<i>99.7</i>	<i>99.4</i>	<i>99.7</i>	<i>99.0</i>	<i>99.4</i>
Sample size	no.	4 403	2 282	3 618	1 950	1 856	1 808	1 847	1 886	19 468
Likert Index (c)	Index	1.09	1.09	1.10	1.15	1.13	1.11	1.12	1.16	1.10
2003-04										
Always	%	–	–	–	0.1	–	–	–	–	–
Most of the time	%	0.1	–	–	0.6	0.1	0.9	–	–	0.2
Half the time	%	0.3	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.5	0.3	–	0.8	0.2
Sometimes	%	9.7	9.1	9.4	13.9	11.2	10.6	11.5	15.8	10.2
Never	%	89.8	90.5	90.2	85.1	88.2	87.9	88.1	83.3	89.3
Refused	%	–	–	–	0.1	–	–	–	–	–
Don't know	%	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
<i>Total Always/Most Of The Time</i>	%	<i>0.1</i>	–	–	<i>0.7</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.9</i>	–	–	<i>0.2</i>
<i>Total Never/Sometimes</i>	%	<i>99.5</i>	<i>99.6</i>	<i>99.7</i>	<i>99.0</i>	<i>99.5</i>	<i>98.5</i>	<i>99.6</i>	<i>99.2</i>	<i>99.5</i>
Sample size	no.	4 280	2 713	3 615	1 840	1 737	1 755	1 820	1 380	19 140
Likert Index (c)	Index	1.11	1.10	1.10	1.16	1.12	1.14	1.12	1.17	1.11
2004-05										
Always	%	–	–	0.1	–	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.1
Most of the time	%	0.2	0.2	–	0.1	0.1	–	0.1	0.1	0.1
Half the time	%	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.4	0.3	0.2
Sometimes	%	6.8	7.7	8.4	11.6	9.6	8.8	10.2	12.2	8.3
Never	%	92.7	91.7	91.2	88.1	90.0	90.8	89.0	87.1	91.3
Refused	%	–	0.1	–	–	–	0.1	0.1	–	–
Don't know	%	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	0.1	–
<i>Total Always/Most Of The Time</i>	%	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.3</i>	<i>0.4</i>	<i>0.2</i>
<i>Total Never/Sometimes</i>	%	<i>99.5</i>	<i>99.4</i>	<i>99.6</i>	<i>99.7</i>	<i>99.6</i>	<i>99.6</i>	<i>99.2</i>	<i>99.3</i>	<i>99.6</i>
Sample size	no.	3 975	4 072	4 972	1 660	1 592	1 602	1 799	913	20 585
Likert Index (c)	Index	1.08	1.09	1.09	1.12	1.11	1.10	1.12	1.14	1.09

Table 5A.53 **People who drive and have driven while over alcohol limit (a), (b), (c)**

	<i>Unit</i>	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>WA</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>ACT</i>	<i>NT</i>	<i>Aust</i>
--	-------------	------------	------------	------------	-----------	-----------	------------	------------	-----------	-------------

(a) Data for 2002-03 onwards are based on responses from people aged 15 years or over.

(b) Total may not up to 100 per cent as a result of rounding.

(c) The Likert summation index method aggregates responses to provide a single measure of the general (or 'average') perceptions of respondents.

Each response category is allocated a weight. The number of responses for the category are multiplied by the weight to give a total score for the category. The total scores for each category are summed and divided by the total number of responses to derive the Likert index for the question. (See box 5.3. in chapter 5 for a detailed example).

For the response categories in the table above, the weights are as follows:

Always = 5; most of the time = 4; half of the time = 3; sometimes = 2; and never = 1.

– Nil or rounded to zero.

Source: ACPR (unpublished).

Table 5A.54

Table 5A.54 **Road fatalities**

	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>WA</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>ACT</i>	<i>NT</i>	<i>Aust</i>
Total fatalities									
2000-01	549	409	309	199	159	62	20	54	1 761
2001-02	565	451	319	171	144	43	13	44	1 750
2002-03	534	369	337	184	160	33	13	61	1 693
2003-04	549	333	297	168	149	49	9	45	1 599
2004-05	513	339	311	174	143	53	15	40	1 588
Per 100 000 registered vehicles									
2000-01	16	13	14	16	16	19	10	54	15
2001-02	15	14	14	12	14	13	6	43	14
2002-03	14	11	14	13	15	10	6	59	13
2003-04	14	10	12	12	14	14	4	43	12
2004-05	13	10	12	12	12	15	7	38	12

Source: ATSB, Fatal Road Crash Database (data sourced as of 30 September 2005); ABS Motor Vehicle Census, Cat. no. 9309.0, AusInfo, Canberra (unpublished).

Table 5A.55

Table 5A.55 **Land transport hospitalisations**

	<i>Unit</i>	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>WA</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>ACT</i>	<i>NT</i>	<i>Aust</i>
Number of land transport hospitalisations										
2001-02	no.	12 956	10 021	7 476	3 321	2 940	743	541	612	38 610
2002-03	no.	12 290	9 916	7 253	3 199	3 087	na	na	na	37 583
2003-04	no.	13 398	9 587	7 679	3 547	3 025	na	na	na	39 223
Per 100 000 registered vehicles (a)										
2001-02	no.	346	302	318	242	280	224	266	595	309
2002-03	no.	319	290	297	228	290	na	na	na	309
2003-04	no.	340	274	301	247	281	na	na	na	314
Cost of road safety and transport SDA/fatal or serious injuries (b)										
2001-02	\$	10 142	9 347	na	22 610	11 423	na	11 316	11 601	8 986
2002-03	\$	9 406	9 938	21 664	26 163	8 595	na	na	na	13 143
2003-04	\$	11 598	12 359	21 493	25 176	4 360	na	na	na	14 147

(a) Australian total based on total registered vehicles for those jurisdictions for which land transportation data were available.

(b) For SA, total recurrent expenditure on Road Safety and Traffic Management increased slightly in 2003-04. However, between 2002-03 and 2003-04 net recurrent expenditure declined as a result of \$14.9 million in additional revenue from own sources (previously part of appropriation) thereby causing a reduction in 'dollar per fatal or serious injury or collision'

na Not available.

Source: AIHW 2004, *Land Transport Hospitalisations* (unpublished); ATSB, *Road Fatalities Australia, June 2001 (and previous issues)*, Canberra; State and Territory governments (unpublished), ABS Motor Vehicle Census, Cat. no. 9309.0, AusInfo, Canberra (unpublished).

Table 5A.56 **Real recurrent expenditure (less revenue from own sources and payroll tax) per person on road safety and traffic management (2004-05 dollars) (a), (b), (c)**

	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA (d)	Tas	ACT	NT	Ave (e)
Total net recurrent expenditure (excluding payroll tax) per person in the residential population									
2001-02	21	20	na	41	23	na	20	37	19
2002-03	18	21	44	45	18	na	18	37	33
2003-04	23	25	45	48	9	na	19	40	29
2004-05	28	25	53	47	7	na	19	44	32
Total net recurrent expenditure (excluding payroll tax) per registered vehicle									
2001-02	36	29	na	57	33	na	31	72	36
2002-03	31	30	67	62	26	na	27	70	51
2003-04	40	35	67	65	13	na	28	77	45
2004-05	46	35	77	63	10	na	28	41	47

- (a) Data have not been subject to extensive tests to determine comparability. Further, some differences in counting rules may exist across jurisdictions as a result of the differing mixes of activities undertaken within each of the common SDAs.
- (b) Totals may not add as a result of rounding.
- (c) Calculated by multiplying the proportion of expenditure on salaries and payments for each service delivery area by the total payroll tax expenditure.
- (d) For SA, total recurrent expenditure on road safety and traffic management increased slightly in 2003-04. However, the net recurrent expenditure has reduced as a result of \$14.9 million, that was previously part of appropriation, now reflected as additional revenue from own sources (Community Road Safety Fund). This represents a change in funding arrangements. Total recurrent expenditure on road safety and traffic management also increased in 2004-05. However, net recurrent expenditure reduced as a result of additional revenue from own sources (\$4.6 million) Community Road Safety Fund).
- (e) Represents the weighted average of those jurisdictions that provided data.
- na** Not available.

Source: State and Territory governments (unpublished); ABS (2005 and previous years) *Motor Vehicle Census*, Cat. no. 9309.0, AusInfo, Canberra; table A.2.

Performance indicators for services to the judicial process

Table 5A.57

Table 5A.57 **Number of deaths in police custody and custody-related operations, 2000 to 2004 (a)**

Year	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Aust
Non-Indigenous deaths in police custody and custody-related operations									
2000	12	2	2	1	4	–	–	–	21
2001	15	8	4	1	3	–	–	–	31
2002	12	7	4	2	–	1	–	–	26
2003	8	4	7	3	2	–	1	–	25
2004	7	4	5	2	2	–	1	–	21
Indigenous deaths in police custody and custody-related operations									
2000	2	–	1	1	1	–	–	–	5
2001	–	–	–	2	2	–	–	–	4
2002	4	–	–	1	–	–	–	5	10
2003	1	–	1	4	–	–	–	1	7
2004	1	–	2	1	–	–	–	2	6
Total deaths in police custody and custody-related operations									
2000	14	2	3	2	5	–	–	–	26
2001	15	8	4	3	5	–	–	–	35
2002	16	7	4	3	–	1	–	5	36
2003	9	4	8	7	2	–	1	1	32
2004	8	4	7	3	2	–	1	2	27
Total number of deaths 2000 to 2004									
Non-Indigenous	54	25	22	9	11	1	2	–	124
Indigenous	8	–	4	9	3	–	–	8	32
All people	62	25	26	18	14	1	2	8	156

(a) Deaths in police custody include deaths in institutional settings (for example, police stations/lockups and police vehicles) or during transfer to or from such an institution; or deaths in hospitals following transfer from an institution; and other deaths in police operations where officers are in close contact with the deceased (for example, most raids and shootings by police). Deaths in custody-related operations include situations where officers did not have such close contact with the person as to be able to significantly influence or control the person's behaviour (for example, most sieges and most cases where officers were attempting to detain a person, such as pursuits).

– Nil or rounded to zero.

Source: *Australian Institute of Criminology 2002, Australian Deaths in Custody and Custody-related Police Operations 2000*, AIC, Canberra; ABS, *1996 Census of Population and Housing: Community Profiles, Australia*, Cat. no. 2020.0, AusInfo, Canberra.

Table 5A.58

Table 5A.58 **Outcomes of court cases (a), (b)**

	<i>Unit</i>	<i>NSW (c)</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld (d)</i>	<i>WA (e)</i>	<i>SA (f)</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>ACT</i>	<i>NT</i>
Lower court cases resulting in a guilty plea									
2003-04	%	56.0	86.0	59.0	94.0	75.0	na	na	na
2004-05	%	57.0	85.0	na	94.0	80.0	na	na	na
Higher court cases (2002-03)									
Resulting in a guilty finding (c)	%	91.2	92.3	95.6	91.9	92.0	92.2	86.6	86.4
Total adjudicated defendants	no.	2 908	1 990	5 515	2 616	612	485	112	235
Total proven guilty	no.	2 651	1 837	5 272	2 404	563	447	97	203
Higher court cases (2003-04)									
Resulting in a guilty finding	%	91.7	92.1	95.4	90.9	90.8	89.5	84.3	86.6
Total adjudicated defendants	no.	3 137	2 426	5 562	2 456	675	427	235	82
Total proven guilty	no.	2 878	2 234	5 306	2 232	613	382	198	71

(a) Lower court cases data are based on magistrates' criminal court data provided by each jurisdiction.

(b) Higher court cases data are based on ABS higher criminal court data.

(c) For NSW, lower court cases resulting in a guilty plea currently excludes matters heard ex parte.

(d) The Queensland Wide Interlinked Courts database is unable to provide information consistent with the data dictionary. For example, no plea includes ex-parte cases which are not recorded as a finding of guilty in this Report.

(e) For WA, the proportion of lower court cases resulting in a guilty plea is based on the number of guilty pleas expressed as a percentage of the sum of guilty pleas and matters listed for trial. Data includes cases that have been placed before the Children's Court and Court of Petty Sessions throughout the State by the Police Service and may also include a small number of cases placed before the Christmas Island Court by the Australian Federal Police. Criminal cases placed before the District and Supreme Courts are not included.

During 2002-03, the Police Service arranged for the Department of Justice (DOJ) to supply court-sourced data to replace internally sourced data for internal and external reporting purposes. The benefits arising from using DOJ data include greater data accuracy, consistency and validity. Due to methodological differences, direct comparison cannot be made between the DOJ data and the police sourced data previously used for this indicator. For this reason, prosecution data prior to 2002-03 has not been provided.

The 2002-03 figure has been revised from that shown in the previous reports due to updated sources of data and the removal of withdrawn cases from the calculation of the proportion of lower court cases resulting in a guilty plea. Cases are withdrawn for a number of reasons, many of which fall outside the control of the Police Service and do not contribute to the proportion of guilty pleas. As a result of this change, the figures shown in this Report are not comparable with those shown in previous Reports.

(f) For SA, lower court data for 2003-04 and 2004-05 refer to prosecutions finalised. The figure relates to a percentage of the total number of defendants appearing before a court. The court jurisdiction includes the Magistrates and the Youth Court. The percentage figure is a combination of both a guilty plea and a result of a guilty verdict, that is, the defendant was convicted, a charge was found proved without conviction or a charge was found proved with some other penalty/outcome.

na Not available.

Source: ABS (2005 and previous years), Criminal Courts, Cat. no. 4513.0., ABS, Canberra; State and Territory governments (unpublished).

Table 5A.59

Table 5A.59 **Juvenile diversions as a proportion of offenders (per cent) (a)**

	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic (b)</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>WA (c)</i>	<i>SA (d)</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>ACT</i>	<i>NT (e)</i>
2000-01	51	na	44	45	53	59	45	80
2001-02	57	30	44	44	49	68	48	57
2002-03	56	31	45	44	54	57	44	49
2003-04	54	30	45	39	55	56	42	na
2004-05	53	41	44	36	55	66	41	47

- (a) Juvenile diversion is defined as juveniles who would otherwise be proceeded against (that is, taken to court) but who are diverted by police as a proportion of all juvenile offenders formally dealt with by police. The term diverted includes diversions of offenders away from the courts by way of: community conference; diversionary conference; formal cautioning by police; family conferences; and other diversionary programs (for example, to drug assessment/treatment). Offenders who would not normally be sent to court for the offence detected and are treated by police in a less formal manner (for example, issued warnings or infringement notices) are excluded.
- (b) Data also include cautions and community conferences. Results in 2004-05 reflects improved data capture. Result reflects only those instances where a juvenile is taken into police custody and subsequently issued with a formal caution. Instances where a juvenile is released into non-police care or involving a safe-custody application are not included.
- (c) For WA, the data are for calendar years, not financial years. Juvenile diversions include juvenile cautions, and referrals to Juvenile Justice Teams. The proportion of juvenile diversions has been calculated on total recorded police contacts with juvenile offenders comprising juvenile cautions, referrals to Juvenile Justice Teams and charges pertaining to juveniles. A charge is counted as a separate 'arrest' even though the actual event of arrest may have involved more than one charge being laid. Hence, the number of 'arrests' will over estimate the number of actual events of arrest. The proportion of juvenile diversions, therefore, may be understated.
- (d) For SA, 2002-03 data includes figures for the first full year of the SA Drug Diversion Initiative. Includes diversion by the way of: formal cautioning by police, and family conferences.
- (e) Data also include verbal warnings, written warnings, formal caution/family conference and victim offender conference. In 2001-02 there was a significant decrease in the use of verbal warnings in favour of family conferences.

na Not available.

Source: State and Territory governments (unpublished).

Table 5A.60 Real recurrent expenditure (less revenue from own sources and payroll tax) per person on services to the judicial process (2004-05 dollars) (a), (b), (c)

	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>WA</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>ACT</i> (d)	<i>NT</i>	<i>Ave</i> (e)
2001-02	26	42	na	42	29	na	17	na	33
2002-03	26	43	na	44	34	na	17	77	34
2003-04	22	40	na	44	35	na	21	85	32
2004-05	23	41	na	43	37	na	18	99	33

(a) Data have not been subject to extensive tests to determine comparability. Further, some differences in counting rules may exist across jurisdictions as a result of the differing mixes of activities undertaken within each of the common SDAs.

(b) May not add to sum of its components as a result of rounding.

(c) Calculated by multiplying the proportion of expenditure on salaries and payments for each SDA by the total payroll tax expenditure.

(d) The variation in ACT expenditure should be viewed with care as it is due, in part, to the revised method for apportioning direct costs to outcomes and the consequent increase in costs directly attributed to investigations.

(e) Represents the weighted average of those jurisdictions that provided data.

na Not available.

Source: State and Territory governments (unpublished); tables A.2 and A.26.

Table 5A.61 **Real costs awarded against the police through criminal actions (2004-05 dollars) (a)**

	<i>Unit</i>	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic (b)</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>WA (c)</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>ACT</i>	<i>NT</i>
Total costs									
2000-01	\$'000	542	na	170	1 075	328	4	106	na
2001-02	\$'000	573	1 326	227	1 079	553	10	126	na
2002-03	\$'000	715	1 064	180	1 362	494	na	184	na
2003-04	\$'000	613	1 693	109	1 098	497	na	223	na
2004-05	\$'000	487	1 958	98	1 405	689	na	224	na
Total costs per head of population									
2000-01	\$	0.08	na	0.05	0.57	0.22	0.01	0.33	na
2001-02	\$	0.09	0.28	0.06	0.57	0.37	0.02	0.39	na
2002-03	\$	0.11	0.22	0.05	0.71	0.32	na	0.57	na
2003-04	\$	0.09	0.34	0.03	0.56	0.33	na	0.69	na
2004-05	\$	0.07	0.39	0.03	0.71	0.45	na	0.69	na

(a) Total costs awarded against the police resulting from summary offences and indictable offences tried summarily before a court of law.

(b) Data for 2000-01 are not available due to Victoria Police work bans.

(c) For WA, the data for 2000-01 to 2003-04 has been revised significantly due to a change in the source and to reflect costs awarded against the police in Children's Courts and Magistrates' Courts throughout WA.

na Not available.

Source: State and Territory governments (unpublished); tables A.2 and A.26.

Performance indicators for other services

Table 5A.62

Table 5A.62 Real recurrent expenditure (less revenue from own sources and payroll tax) per person on other services (2004-05 dollars) (a), (b)

	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld (c)</i>	<i>WA</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>Tas (c)</i>	<i>ACT (d)</i>	<i>NT</i>	<i>Ave (e)</i>
2001-02	–	–	na	5.96	–	na	2.32	na	0.78
2002-03	–	–	na	7.13	–	na	2.50	–	2.52
2003-04	–	4.56	7.01	7.70	–	na	–	–	3.31
2004-05	–	–	36.8	6.9	–	na	–	–	7.98

(a) Data have not been subject to extensive tests to determine comparability. Further, some differences in counting rules may exist across jurisdictions as a result of the differing mixes of activities undertaken within each of the common SDAs.

(b) Calculated by multiplying the proportion of expenditure on salaries and payments for each SDA by the total payroll tax expenditure.

(c) Data for some years are only available for all key Service Delivery Areas (SDAs) combined. The QPS output activities for 2004-05 changed from six outputs in 2003-04 to four in 2004-05. Hence 'Other Services' information is now aligned to new QPS output 'Professional Standards and Ethical Practice' which includes significant training expenditure which was previously distributed across other Outputs. The 2004-05 training component includes net direct training costs of \$51.307 million as well as indirect training costs.

(d) In the ACT, 'other services' consist of regulatory activities.

(e) Represents the weighted average of those jurisdictions that provided data.

– Nil or rounded to zero. **na** Not available.

Source: State and Territory governments (unpublished); tables A.2 and A.26.