

Queensland Social Survey 2022
**Domestic and Family Violence
Survey Report**

prepared for

Department of the Premier and Cabinet
August 2022



Security, privacy and confidentiality

QGSO is committed to quality and integrity of data and maintains high level security procedures and arrangements to maintain confidentiality of data at all times for all clients. Through our governing legislation, the *Statistical Returns Act 1896*, we have substantial powers to ensure confidentiality of data. QGSO balances its responsibility under the Statistical Returns Act to lawfully collect and publish information with responsibilities contained in the *Human Rights Act 2019*.

QGSO maintains a robust information security environment and identifies and manages risks to information, applications and technologies using Queensland Treasury's Information Security Management Systems (ISMS), in accordance with Queensland Government Information Security policy (IS18:2018). The disclosure and use of these data are subject to IS18:2018, *Right to Information Act 2009* and *Information Privacy Act 2009*.

This survey report has been security classified as OFFICIAL by QGSO using the Queensland Government information security classification framework (QGISCF).

For further information regarding the QGISCF see <https://www.qgcio.qld.gov.au/documents/information-security-classification-framework-qgiscf>.

License

This survey report is released under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International license](#). You are free to copy, communicate and adapt the work, if you attribute the author.



Attribution

To attribute this survey report, cite Queensland Government Statistician's Office, Queensland Treasury, *Queensland Social Survey 2022, Domestic and Family Violence Survey Report*.

Contact details

Contact person: Michael Cole
Queensland Government Statistician's Office, Queensland Treasury
PO Box 15037, City East QLD 4002 Australia
Telephone: 07 3035 6833
govstat@treasury.qld.gov.au
www.qgso.qld.gov.au

Disclaimer

While great care has been used in collecting, processing, analysing and extracting information, Queensland Government Statistician's Office, Queensland Treasury makes no warranty regarding errors or omissions and assumes no legal liability or responsibility for loss or damage resulting from the use of the information.

© The State of Queensland (Queensland Treasury) 2022



CONTENTS

1	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
1.1	Background.....	1
1.2	Key results	1
2	SURVEY OVERVIEW	3
2.1	Background.....	3
2.2	Survey design	3
2.3	Questionnaire design	3
2.4	Survey administration and response rate	3
3	SURVEY RESULTS.....	4
3.1	Presentation	4
3.2	Interpretation.....	4
3.3	Significance testing	4
3.4	Form and seriousness of DFV	5
3.5	Reaction to DFV.....	10
3.6	Awareness of, and response to, DFV in the last 12 months.....	12
3.7	Attitudes towards DFV and gender equality.....	15
3.8	Involvement in DFV initiatives.....	17
	APPENDICES	19
Appendix A	Questionnaire.....	19
Appendix B	Survey method and operations.....	34
Appendix C	Estimation and precision	35
Appendix D	Special collapses.....	37



List of tables

Table 1	Survey methodology and operations summary.....	3
Table 2	Preventing partner from seeing family and friends is a form of DFV	5
Table 3	Seriousness of preventing partner from seeing family and friends.....	5
Table 4	Criticising partner to make them feel bad or useless is a form of DFV	6
Table 5	Seriousness of criticising partner to make them feel bad or useless.....	6
Table 6	Threatening to share intimate, nude or sexual images of a partner is a form of DFV	7
Table 7	Seriousness of threatening to share intimate, nude or sexual images of a partner	7
Table 8	Trying to control partner by denying them access to money is a form of DFV.....	8
Table 9	Seriousness of trying to control partner by denying them access to money.....	8
Table 10	Harassing partner via repeated phone or electronic means is a form of DFV	9
Table 11	Seriousness of harassing partner via repeated phone or electronic means	9
Table 12	Reaction to physical DFV involving neighbours.....	10
Table 13	Reaction to physical DFV involving neighbours (multi-response).....	10
Table 14	Reaction to non-physical DFV involving neighbours.....	11
Table 15	Reaction to non-physical DFV involving neighbours (multi-response)	11
Table 16	Reason for not doing anything about non-physical DFV involving neighbours.....	12
Table 17	Awareness of DFV in the last 12 months involving a family member or close friend	12
Table 18	Response to DFV in the last 12 months involving a family member or close friend.....	13
Table 19	Awareness of DFV in the last 12 months involving neighbours.....	13
Table 20	Response to DFV in the last 12 months involving neighbours	14
Table 21	Awareness of DFV in the last 12 months involving people not known well	14
Table 22	Response to DFV in the last 12 months involving people not known well.....	15
Table 23	Level of agreement – In general, I feel safe from DFV.....	15
Table 24	Level of agreement – An attitude of gender superiority can increase likelihood of DFV in domestic relationship.....	16
Table 25	Level of agreement – Reducing gender inequality would help to reduce DFV	16
Table 26	Level of agreement – Teaching children respectful attitudes and behaviours would help to reduce DFV.....	17
Table 27	Involvement in community DFV initiatives	17
Table 28	Workplace engagement in DFV initiatives	18
Table B1	Survey response and cooperation rates, 2017–22	34
Table C1	Benchmarks used in this survey.....	36



Abbreviations

The following abbreviations and symbols are used in this report:

%	per cent
ABS	Australian Bureau of Statistics
CATI	Computer–assisted telephone interviewing
CALD	culturally and linguistically diverse
DCHDE	Department of Communities, Housing and Digital Economy
DPC	Department of the Premier and Cabinet
DFV	domestic and family violence
N	population size
n	sample size
Q	question
QGSO	Queensland Government Statistician's Office
QSS	Queensland Social Survey
SA4	Statistical Area Level 4 (as classified by the Australian Statistical Geography Standard)



Terms

The following terms are used in this report:

Collapsed categories	Question categories that have been combined to aid interpretation or analysis. For example, 'strongly agree' and 'agree' can be collapsed into 'agree or strongly agree'. See Appendix D for special collapses.
Confidence intervals	The degree of imprecision (sampling error) is represented as a confidence interval (the difference between upper and lower confidence limits). This gives a range of values for the population estimates (e.g. from 70% to 80%) rather than a single value or point estimate (e.g. 75%). Typically, wider confidence intervals indicate less precise estimates.
Culturally and linguistically diverse (CALD) status	Derived from Q32a (Country of birth) and Q32b (Language spoken at home). People from CALD backgrounds include Queensland adults who indicated that they: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • were born in Australia and spoke a language other than English at home • were born overseas and spoke English at home • were born overseas and spoke a language other than English at home.
Estimated adult Queensland resident population	The total estimated resident population of adults (persons aged 18 years or older) in Queensland as at June 2020 (N = 3,986,952), according to ABS (2020), <i>Regional population by Age and Sex</i> [www.abs.gov.au]. Also referred to as 'Queensland adults'.
Multi-response	A question where respondents could select more than one response for specific categories.
Regions	Derived from the survey's scoping questions, where respondents were first asked to confirm that they were a Queensland resident, then asked to provide their postcode and/or suburb. These responses were geocoded into two regions based on Queensland SA4s (South East Queensland and Rest of Queensland) and then weighted to the total estimated population of adults in Queensland as at June 2020.
Respondents	The 1,184 Queensland adults who completed the Queensland Social Survey between 30 May and 16 June 2022. Also referred to as 'in-scope responding'.
Statistical significance	In simplified terms, a difference in survey estimates may be considered approximately significant if the 95% confidence intervals for the two estimates do not overlap.
Uncollapsed categories	Question categories that have not been combined with other categories and are reported as per the questionnaire.
Weighted	The process of weighting aims to reduce bias by ensuring that survey totals for certain variables sum to known population totals. For the Queensland Social Survey, data were weighted so that survey totals matched Queensland totals for age and sex by region.

Acknowledgement

Reports produced by QGSO reflect information provided freely by individuals and businesses. The continued cooperation of respondents is appreciated and enables QGSO to collect and report statistics. Information received by QGSO is treated in strict confidence as required by the Statistical Returns Act.

1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 Background

The Queensland Social Survey 2022 was conducted by the Queensland Government Statistician's Office (QGSO) on behalf of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet (DPC) and the Department of Communities, Housing and Digital Economy (DCHDE), between 30 May and 16 June 2022.

The survey collected information on a variety of important societal issues and has been undertaken by QGSO for six consecutive years. The survey's domestic and family violence (DFV) questions were designed to capture information about awareness of, responses to and attitudes towards DFV.

Computer-assisted telephone interviewing (CATI) obtained 1,184 completed interviews and achieved an overall response rate of 30.9%. All DFV results presented have been weighted to the estimated adult Queensland resident population as at June 2020 (N = 3,986,952).

1.2 Key results

Form and seriousness of DFV

Most Queensland adults thought it was *very or quite serious* in a domestic relationship to:

- threaten to share intimate, nude or sexual images of a partner without their permission (97.8%)
- repeatedly criticise a partner to make them feel bad or useless (95.2%)
- harass a partner via repeated phone or electronic means (94.8%).
- prevent a partner from seeing friends and family (94.5%)
- try to control a partner by denying them access to money (93.1%).

Queensland adults who were not from culturally and linguistically diverse (CALD) backgrounds were significantly more likely than those from CALD backgrounds to think that it was *very or quite serious* to prevent a partner in a domestic relationship from seeing family and friends (96.0% versus 91.0%).

Females were significantly more likely than males to think that:

- trying to control a partner in a domestic relationship by denying them access to money was a form of DFV (97.5% versus 92.2%)
- harassing a partner in a domestic relationship via repeated phone or electronic means such as email, text message or social media (98.0% versus 94.0%).

Reaction to DFV

Most Queensland adults thought they would *do something about it* if they saw or were aware of:

- physical DFV involving neighbours (89.7%)
- non-physical DFV involving neighbours (70.0%).

For both physical and non-physical DFV involving neighbours, males were significantly more likely than females to think they would *try to stop it*.

Males were also significantly more likely than females to think they would *not do anything* in response to non-physical forms of DFV (24.4% versus 15.7%).

The most commonly cited reason (48.5%) for *not doing anything* if Queensland adults became aware of non-physical DFV involving their neighbours was the belief that it was not their responsibility.

Awareness of DFV

Of the estimated adult Queensland resident population, in the last 12 months:

- 15.3% had seen or were aware of DFV involving a family member or close friend
- 14.8% had seen or were aware of DFV involving people they did not know well.
- 9.8% had seen or were aware of DFV involving their neighbours.

Attitudes towards DFV and gender equality

Queensland adults *agreed or strongly agreed* that:

- teaching children about respectful attitudes and behaviours in relationships would help reduce DFV in the future (97.8%)
- in general, they felt safe from DFV (94.4%)
- an attitude of gender superiority in a domestic relationship can increase the likelihood of DFV (78.8%)
- reducing gender inequality would help reduce DFV in Australia (67.4%).

DOMESTIC AND FAMILY VIOLENCE: KEY RESULTS



This is a snapshot of the domestic and family violence (DFV) results from the **Queensland Social Survey 2022**, which obtained responses from 1,184 Queensland adults. Percentages are based on **weighted estimates of the total estimated adult Queensland resident population (N = 3,986,952)**. Icons have been used for illustrative purposes.

Seriousness of DFV

97.8% of adults	thought it was <i>very or quite serious</i> to threaten to share intimate, nude or sexual images of a partner without their permission	▶	98.4% of females	versus	97.2% of males
95.2% of adults	thought it was <i>very or quite serious</i> to repeatedly criticise a partner to make them feel bad or useless	▶	96.3% of females	versus	94.0% of males
94.8% of adults	thought it was <i>very or quite serious</i> to harass a partner by repeated phone or electronic means	▶	95.9% of females	versus	93.6% of males
94.5% of adults	thought it was <i>very or quite serious</i> to prevent a partner from seeing friends and family	▶	94.5% of females	versus	94.6% of males
93.1% of adults	thought it was <i>very or quite serious</i> to try to control a partner by denying them access to money	▶	95.0% of females	versus	91.1% of males

Reaction to DFV

<p>9 in 10 adults thought they <i>would do something about it</i> if they saw or were aware of physical DFV involving their neighbours</p>	<p>7 in 10 adults thought they <i>would do something about it</i> if they saw or were aware of non-physical DFV involving their neighbours</p>
--	--

Awareness of DFV in the last 12 months

15.3% of adults <i>were aware of DFV</i> in the last 12 months involving a family member or close friend	14.8% of adults <i>were aware of DFV</i> in the last 12 months involving people they didn't know well	9.8% of adults <i>were aware of DFV</i> in the last 12 months involving their neighbours
--	---	--

Attitudes towards DFV and gender equality

97.8% of adults	<i>agreed or strongly agreed</i> that teaching children about respectful attitudes and behaviours in relationships would help reduce DFV in the future		78.8% of adults	<i>agreed or strongly agreed</i> that an attitude of gender superiority in a domestic relationship can increase the likelihood of DFV	
94.4% of adults	<i>agreed or strongly agreed</i> that in general, they felt safe from DFV		67.4% of adults	<i>agreed or strongly agreed</i> that reducing gender inequality would help reduce DFV in Australia	

2 SURVEY OVERVIEW

This survey report complements the *Domestic and Family Violence Output Tables* for the **Queensland Social Survey 2022**. It contains information relating to survey design, methods and administration, and the results of the survey's domestic and family violence questions.

2.1 Background

The Queensland Social Survey (QSS) 2022 was conducted by the Queensland Government Statistician's Office (QGSO) on behalf of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet (DPC) and the Department of Communities, Housing and Digital Economy (DCHDE), between 30 May and 16 June 2022.

QSS is an omnibus survey that collects information on important societal issues affecting Queensland adults, and has been conducted by QGSO for six consecutive years on behalf of:

- DPC in 2017
- DPC and the Department of Communities, Disability Services and Seniors (DCDSS) from 2018 to 2020
- DPC and DCHDE in 2021 and 2022.

One such issue being monitored and evaluated by the Queensland Government is domestic and family violence (DFV).

The objective of the survey's DFV questions was to provide measures of Queensland community perceptions and attitudes towards DFV, and to compare with responses from historical collections, where possible.

2.2 Survey design

The in-scope population for QSS 2022 was adults (aged 18 years or older) who were usual residents of Queensland (estimated to be 3,986,952 as at June 2020).

A total of 3,887 Queensland adults were randomly selected for the survey from a contact list constructed from databases that are kept for official statistical purposes under the authority of the *Statistical Returns Act 1896*.

2.3 Questionnaire design

The DFV questions were adapted from the *National Community Attitudes towards Violence Against Women Survey 2013*. Demographic questions were added in accordance with DPC's research and policy objectives, and technical advice was offered by specialists in QGSO.

The DFV module in the questionnaire was designed to capture information about awareness of, response to, and attitudes towards DFV.

Minimal changes were made to the 2021 questionnaire for the 2022 survey.

See **Appendix A** for a copy of the 2022 questionnaire.

2.4 Survey administration and response rate

The survey was administered using computer-assisted telephone interviewing (CATI). A total of 1,184 completed surveys were obtained, giving an overall response rate of 30.9% (see **Table 1**).

Table 1 Survey methodology and operations summary

Survey design	
In-scope population	Adults (aged 18 years or older) who usually reside in Queensland
Sample size	3,887
Data collection	
Mode	Computer-assisted telephone interview (CATI)
Timing	30 May – 16 June 2022
In-scope completed surveys	1,184
Response rate	30.9%
Cooperation rate	70.0%

Survey responses are strictly confidential and were collected under the Statistical Returns Act, which does not allow the unauthorised release of information that identifies an individual.

See **Appendix B** for more details about the survey's methods and operations.

3 SURVEY RESULTS

3.1 Presentation

This section of the report summarises key survey results based on the characteristics of Queensland adults who completed the 2022 QSS. Survey results are presented as estimates calculated from the responding survey sample of 1,184 and weighted to the total estimated adult Queensland resident population (N =3,986,952).

3.2 Interpretation

There are some important issues to consider when interpreting the statistics and evaluating the findings in this report.

Some attitudes and behaviours may change over time. The results presented are designed to be representative of the population at the time of data collection.

Responses provided may not be accurate and may be affected by recall error or social desirability bias (a type of non-sampling error where the respondent perceives that the response given in a certain way is most desirable to the person or body collecting the information).

Demographics are self-reported and, as such, rely on the respondent's ability and willingness to select the appropriate category. Demographic estimates produced for the survey are not comparable with those produced by the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) due to differences in data collection and estimation methodology.

Caution should be exercised when extrapolating results to the entire adult resident population of Queensland. Estimated percentages and counts may not be representative of the population if the characteristic being investigated is structured by a particular attribute that may affect the likelihood of a person responding (known as non-response bias).

Population totals and percentages have been estimated from the sample using methods aimed at minimising bias related to the survey contact list, non-response and refusals.

While the survey has been designed to maximise the representativeness of the results, it is not possible to perfectly represent the entire population. As a result, estimates have an associated level of imprecision (often presented as confidence intervals).

Confidence intervals are available in the output tables that complement this report and have not been repeated here.

Strategies to minimise the effects of common sources of sampling and non-sampling error can be found at [Survey methods](#). See **Appendix C** for strategies frequently used by QGSO.

3.3 Significance testing

The report only highlights population estimate differences that were statistically significant:

- when compared with previous survey responses (2021 and 2017, as appropriate)
- by selected demographic variables of interest (age, gender and CALD status).¹

Collapsed categories were used to increase the power of statistical testing, except in cases where no collapsed categories existed, or interest lay in testing uncollapsed categories.

As significance testing was exploratory, no claims are made about generalisability of results. Statistical calculations such as p-values and confidence intervals are descriptive only and have no inferential content.

See **Appendix D** for special collapses.

¹ Region was not included for significance testing in 2022 but was tested for previous iterations of the survey.

3.4 Form and seriousness of DFV

3.4.1 Preventing partner from seeing family and friends

Form of DFV

All respondents were asked: "If one partner in a domestic relationship controls or tries to control the other partner by preventing them from seeing family and friends, is this a form of DFV?" (Q8a).

Most (95.3%) of the estimated adult Queensland resident population thought that preventing a partner in a domestic relationship from seeing family and friends was a form of DFV. Specifically, 69.3% thought it was always a form of DFV, 17.1% thought it was usually a form of DFV, and 9.0% thought it was sometimes a form of DFV. Only 3.5% thought it was not a form of DFV (see **Table 2**).

Table 2 Preventing partner from seeing family and friends is a form of DFV

	Estimate (per cent)
Yes	95.3%
No	3.5%
Don't know	1.2%
Refused	0.0%
Total	100.0%

Base: All respondents (n = 1,184)

Source: Queensland Government Statistician's Office, Queensland Treasury, Queensland Social Survey 2022
© The State of Queensland (Queensland Treasury) 2022

As this question was not included in QSS until 2020, no comparison could be made with responses given in 2022 and 2017.

Analysis of survey data found no statistically significant differences between responses given to this question in 2022 and 2021.

Demographic comparisons

Analysis of 2022 survey data found that Queensland adults from CALD backgrounds (6.7%) were significantly more likely than those from non-CALD backgrounds (2.2%) to think preventing a partner in a domestic relationship from seeing family and friends was *not* a form of DFV.

Level of seriousness

All respondents were asked: "And how serious is this?" (Q9).

Most (94.5%) of the estimated adult Queensland resident population thought it was very serious or quite serious to prevent a partner in a domestic relationship from seeing family and friends, with 61.2% thinking it was very serious and 33.3% thinking it was quite serious. Only 4.6% thought it was not that serious or not serious at all (see **Table 3**).

Table 3 Seriousness of preventing partner from seeing family and friends

	Estimate (per cent)
Very or quite serious	94.5%
Not that serious or not serious at all	4.6%
Don't know	0.8%
Refused	0.1%
Total	100.0%

Base: All respondents (n = 1,184)

Source: Queensland Government Statistician's Office, Queensland Treasury, Queensland Social Survey 2022
© The State of Queensland (Queensland Treasury) 2022

As this question was not included in QSS until 2020, no comparison could be made with responses given in 2022 and 2017.

Analysis of survey data found no statistically significant differences between responses given to this question in 2022 and 2021.

Demographic comparisons

Analysis of 2022 survey data found that Queensland adults who were not from CALD backgrounds (96.0%) were significantly more likely than those from CALD backgrounds (91.0%) to think that it was very or quite serious to prevent a partner in a domestic relationship from seeing family and friends.

3.4.2 Criticising partner to make them feel bad or useless

Form of DFV

All respondents were asked: "If one partner in a domestic relationship repeatedly criticises the other partner to make them feel bad or useless, is this a form of domestic and family violence?" (Q12).

Most (96.6%) of the estimated adult Queensland resident population thought that repeatedly criticising a partner to make them feel bad or useless was a form of DFV. Specifically, 71.3% thought it was always a form of DFV, 16.2% thought it was usually a form of DFV, and 9.1% thought it was sometimes a form of DFV. Only 2.9% thought it was not a form of DFV (see **Table 4**).

Table 4 Criticising partner to make them feel bad or useless is a form of DFV

	Estimate (per cent)
Yes	96.6%
No	2.9%
Don't know	0.4%
Refused	0.0%
Total	100.0%

Base: All respondents (n = 1,184)

Source: Queensland Government Statistician's Office, Queensland Treasury, Queensland Social Survey 2022
© The State of Queensland (Queensland Treasury) 2022

Analysis of survey data found no statistically significant differences between responses given to this question in 2022, 2021 or 2017.

Demographic comparisons

Analysis of 2022 survey data found no statistically significant differences for responses to this question based on demographic comparisons of age, gender and CALD status.

Level of seriousness

All respondents were asked: "And how serious is this?" (Q13).

Most (95.2%) of the estimated adult Queensland resident population thought it was very serious or quite serious to repeatedly criticise a partner to make them feel bad or useless, with 60.6% thinking it was very serious and 34.5% thinking it was quite serious. Only 4.2% thought it was not that serious or not serious at all (see **Table 5**).

Table 5 Seriousness of criticising partner to make them feel bad or useless

	Estimate (per cent)
Very or quite serious	95.2%
Not that serious or not serious at all	4.2%
Don't know	0.5%
Refused	0.1%
Total	100.0%

Base: All respondents (n = 1,184)

Source: Queensland Government Statistician's Office, Queensland Treasury, Queensland Social Survey 2022
© The State of Queensland (Queensland Treasury) 2022

Analysis of survey data found no statistically significant differences between responses given to this question in 2022, 2021 or 2017.

Demographic comparisons

Analysis of 2022 survey data found no statistically significant differences for responses to this question based on demographic comparisons of age, gender and CALD status.

3.4.3 Threatening to share intimate, nude or sexual images of partner

Form of DFV

All respondents were asked: "If one partner in a domestic relationship threatens to share intimate, nude or sexual images of the other partner without their permission, is this a form of DFV?" (Q12a).

Most (95.3%) of the estimated adult Queensland resident population thought that threatening to share intimate, nude or sexual images of a partner in a domestic relationship without their permission was a form of DFV. Specifically, 88.6% thought it was always a form of DFV, 4.1% thought it was usually a form of DFV, and 2.6% thought it was sometimes a form of DFV. Only 3.4% thought it was not a form of DFV (see **Table 6**).

Table 6 Threatening to share intimate, nude or sexual images of a partner is a form of DFV

	Estimate (per cent)
Yes	95.3%
No	3.4%
Don't know	1.0%
Refused	0.3%
Total	100.0%

Base: All respondents (n = 1,184)

Source: Queensland Government Statistician's Office, Queensland Treasury, Queensland Social Survey 2022

© The State of Queensland (Queensland Treasury) 2022

As this question was not included in QSS until 2020, no comparison could be made with responses given in 2022 and 2017.

Analysis of survey data found no statistically significant differences between responses given to this question in 2022 and 2021.

Demographic comparisons

Analysis of 2022 survey data found no statistically significant differences for responses to this question based on demographic comparisons of age, gender and CALD status.

Level of seriousness

All respondents were asked: "And how serious is this?" (Q13a).

Most (97.8%) of the estimated adult Queensland resident population thought it was very serious or quite serious to threaten to share intimate, nude or sexual images of a partner without their permission, with 88.7% thinking it was very serious and 9.1% thinking it was quite serious. Only 2.0% thought it was not that serious or not serious at all (see **Table 7**).

Table 7 Seriousness of threatening to share intimate, nude or sexual images of a partner

	Estimate (per cent)
Very or quite serious	97.8%
Not that serious or not serious at all	2.0%
Don't know	0.2%
Refused	0.0%
Total	100.0%

Base: All respondents (n = 1,184)

Source: Queensland Government Statistician's Office, Queensland Treasury, Queensland Social Survey 2022

© The State of Queensland (Queensland Treasury) 2022

As this question was not included in QSS until 2020, no comparison could be made with responses given in 2022 and 2017.

Analysis of survey data found no statistically significant differences between responses given to this question in 2022 and 2021.

Demographic comparisons

Analysis of 2022 survey data found no statistically significant differences for responses to this question based on demographic comparisons of age, gender and CALD status.

3.4.4 Trying to control partner by denying them access to money

Form of DFV

All respondents were asked: "Excluding any situation involving addictions such as gambling, alcohol, drugs, etc., if one partner in a domestic relationship tries to control the other partner by denying them access to money, is this a form of DFV?" (Q14).

Most (94.9%) of the estimated adult Queensland resident population thought that trying to control a partner in a domestic relationship by denying them access to money was a form of DFV. Specifically, 64.6% thought it was always a form of DFV, 20.2% thought it was usually a form of DFV, and 10.0% thought it was sometimes a form of DFV. Only 3.9% thought it was not a form of DFV (see **Table 8**).

Table 8 Trying to control partner by denying them access to money is a form of DFV

	Estimate (per cent)
Yes	94.9%
No	3.9%
Don't know	1.0%
Refused	0.2%
Total	100.0%

Base: All respondents (n = 1,184)

Source: Queensland Government Statistician's Office, Queensland Treasury, Queensland Social Survey 2022

© The State of Queensland (Queensland Treasury) 2022

Analysis of survey data found no statistically significant differences between responses given to this question in 2022, 2021 or 2017.

Demographic comparisons

Analysis of 2022 survey data found that females (97.5%) were significantly more likely than males (92.2%) to think that trying to control a partner in a domestic relationship by denying them access to money was a form of DFV.

Level of seriousness

All respondents were asked: "And how serious is this?" (Q15).

Most (93.1%) of the estimated adult Queensland resident population thought it was very serious or quite serious to try to control a partner in a domestic relationship by denying them access to money, with 62.3% thinking it was very serious and 30.8% thinking it was quite serious. Only 5.8% thought it was not that serious or not serious at all (see **Table 9**).

Table 9 Seriousness of trying to control partner by denying them access to money

	Estimate (per cent)
Very or quite serious	93.1%
Not that serious or not serious at all	5.8%
Don't know	1.1%
Refused	0.0%
Total	100.0%

Base: All respondents (n = 1,184)

Source: Queensland Government Statistician's Office, Queensland Treasury, Queensland Social Survey 2022

© The State of Queensland (Queensland Treasury) 2022

Analysis of survey data found no statistically significant differences between responses given to this question in 2022, 2021 or 2017.

Demographic comparisons

Analysis of 2022 survey data found no statistically significant differences for responses to this question based on demographic comparisons of age, gender and CALD status.

3.4.5 Harassing partner via repeated phone or electronic means

Form of DFV

All respondents were asked: "If one partner in a domestic relationship harasses the other partner via repeated phone or electronic means such as email, text message or social media, is this a form of DFV?" (Q16).

Most (96.1%) of the estimated adult Queensland resident population thought that harassing a partner in a domestic relationship via repeated phone or electronic means was a form of DFV. Specifically, 69.4% thought it was always a form of DFV, 19.4% thought it was usually a form of DFV, and 7.3% thought it was sometimes a form of DFV. Only 1.8% thought it was not a form of DFV (see **Table 10**).

Table 10 Harassing partner via repeated phone or electronic means is a form of DFV

	Estimate (per cent)
Yes	96.1%
No	2.6%
Don't know	1.2%
Refused	0.2%
Total	100.0%

Base: All respondents (n = 1,184)

Source: Queensland Government Statistician's Office, Queensland Treasury, Queensland Social Survey 2022

© The State of Queensland (Queensland Treasury) 2022

Analysis of survey data found no statistically significant differences between responses given to this question in 2022, 2021 or 2017.

Demographic comparisons

Analysis of 2022 survey data found that females (98.0%) were significantly more likely than males (94.0%) to think that harassing a partner in a domestic relationship via repeated phone or electronic means was a form of DFV.

Level of seriousness

All respondents were asked: "And how serious is this?" (Q17).

Most (94.8%) of the estimated adult Queensland resident population thought it was very serious or quite serious to harass a partner in a domestic relationship via repeated phone or electronic means, with 61.7% thinking it was very serious and 33.1% thinking it was quite serious. Only 4.0% thought it was not that serious or not serious at all (see **Table 11**).

Table 11 Seriousness of harassing partner via repeated phone or electronic means

	Estimate (per cent)
Very or quite serious	94.8%
Not that serious or not serious at all	4.0%
Don't know	1.2%
Refused	0.0%
Total	100.0%

Base: All respondents (n = 1,184)

Source: Queensland Government Statistician's Office, Queensland Treasury, Queensland Social Survey 2022

© The State of Queensland (Queensland Treasury) 2022

Analysis of survey data found no statistically significant differences between responses given to this question in 2022, 2021 or 2017.

Demographic comparisons

Analysis of 2022 survey data found no statistically significant differences for responses to this question based on demographic comparisons of age, gender and CALD status.

3.5 Reaction to DFV

3.5.1 Reaction to physical DFV involving neighbours

All respondents were asked: "How would you react if you saw or were aware of physical DFV, involving your neighbours?" (Q18). Multiple responses were allowed.

Most (89.7%) of the estimated adult Queensland resident population thought they would do something about it if they saw or were aware of physical DFV involving their neighbours. Due to fear or unstated reasons, 6.3% thought they wouldn't do anything about it (see **Table 12**).

Table 12 Reaction to physical DFV involving neighbours

	Estimate (per cent)
I would do something about it	89.7%
I wouldn't do anything about it	6.3%
Other	1.0%
Don't know	3.0%
Refused	0.0%
Total	100.0%

Base: All respondents (n = 1,184)

Note: See **Appendix D** for how multiple responses were collapsed.

Source: Queensland Government Statistician's Office, Queensland Treasury, Queensland Social Survey 2022

© The State of Queensland (Queensland Treasury) 2022

From the multiple response options, 65.8% thought they would call the police, 23.7% would speak to the victim or the perpetrator about it later and 19.1% would try to stop it (see **Table 13**).

For Queensland adults who thought they would take other actions, some common responses included:

- contacting other authorities such as DVConnect, family services, child services or Lifeline
- reacting based on the severity of the incident, including calling an ambulance
- seeking assistance from property managers
- speaking to other people for advice such as their own friends, family or neighbours, or friends and family of those involved in the incident.
- researching the best course of action.

Table 13 Reaction to physical DFV involving neighbours (multi-response)

	Estimate (per cent)
Would call the police	65.8%
Would speak to victim or perpetrator about it later	23.7%
Would try to stop it	19.1%
Other	2.1%
Wouldn't do anything	5.4%
Wouldn't get involved due to fear	2.4%
Don't know	3.0%
Refused	0.0%

Base: All respondents (n = 1,184)

Note: Multiple responses were allowed.

Source: Queensland Government Statistician's Office, Queensland Treasury, Queensland Social Survey 2022

© The State of Queensland (Queensland Treasury) 2022

Analysis of survey data found that for Queensland adults who saw or became aware of physical DFV involving their neighbours:

- those in 2022 (65.8%) were significantly less likely than those in 2017 (78.9%) to think they would call the police
- those in 2022 (5.4%) were significantly more likely than those in 2021 (2.9%) and those in 2017 (3.2%) to think they would not do anything.

Demographic comparisons

Analysis of 2022 survey data found that for Queensland adults who saw or became aware of physical DFV involving their neighbours:

- males (27.6%) were significantly more likely than females (11.0%) to think that they would try to stop it
- females (72.5%) were significantly more likely than males (58.7%) to think they would call the police
- 18–34 year olds (70.5%) were significantly more likely than those aged 55 years and over (58.8%) to think they would call the police.

3.5.2 Reaction to non-physical DFV involving neighbours

All respondents were asked: "How would you react if you saw or were aware of non-physical DFV, involving your neighbours?" (Q19). Multiple responses were allowed.

More than two-thirds (70.0%) of the estimated adult Queensland resident population thought they would do something about it if they saw or were aware of non-physical DFV involving their neighbours. Due to fear or other reasons stated in Q19, 21.5% thought they wouldn't do anything about it (see **Table 14**).

Table 14 Reaction to non-physical DFV involving neighbours

	Estimate (per cent)
I would do something about it	70.0%
I wouldn't do anything about it	21.5%
Other	1.6%
Don't know	6.9%
Refused	0.0%
Total	100.0%

Base: All respondents (n = 1,184)

Note: See **Appendix D** for how multiple responses were collapsed.

Source: Queensland Government Statistician's Office, Queensland Treasury, Queensland Social Survey 2022

© The State of Queensland (Queensland Treasury) 2022

From the multiple response options, 42.6% thought they would speak to the victim or the perpetrator about it later, 25.8% thought they would call the police and 19.9% thought they wouldn't do anything (see **Table 15**).

For Queensland adults who thought they would take other actions, some common responses included:

- contacting other authorities such as DVConnect, child services or Lifeline
- seeking assistance from property managers
- researching the best course of action
- speaking to other people for advice such as their own friends or family, or the friends and family of those involved in the incident.

Table 15 Reaction to non-physical DFV involving neighbours (multi-response)

	Estimate (per cent)
Would speak to victim or perpetrator about it later	42.6%
Would call the police	25.8%
Would try to stop it	10.0%
Other	2.9%
Wouldn't do anything	19.9%
Wouldn't get involved due to fear	2.1%
Don't know	6.9%
Refused	0.0%

Base: All respondents (n = 1,184)

Note: Multiple responses were allowed

Source: Queensland Government Statistician's Office, Queensland Treasury, Queensland Social Survey 2022

© The State of Queensland (Queensland Treasury) 2022

Analysis of survey data found that for Queensland adults who saw or became aware of non-physical DFV involving their neighbours those in 2022 (42.6%) were significantly more likely than those in 2017 (32.8%) to think they would speak to the victim or perpetrator about it later.

Demographic comparisons

Analysis of 2022 survey data found that for Queensland adults who saw or became aware of non-physical DFV involving their neighbours:

- females (50.3%) were significantly more likely than males (34.5%) to think that they would speak to victim or perpetrator about it later
- males (13.6%) were significantly more likely than females (6.6%) to think they would try to stop it
- males (24.4%) were significantly more likely than females (15.7%) to think they would not do anything.

Reason for not doing anything

Respondents who indicated they wouldn't do anything if they saw or were aware of non-physical DFV involving their neighbours were asked: "Why do you think you wouldn't do anything?" (Q19b). Multiple responses were allowed. Approximately half (48.5%) of the estimated adult Queensland resident population who indicated they wouldn't do anything if they saw or were aware of non-physical

DFV involving their neighbours reasoned that it was not their responsibility, it was a private matter or that it was up to the victim.

From the multiple responses, 19.5% were unsure of what to do, 16.2% felt there was no need to intervene and 10.5% wouldn't do anything due to concerns for safety (see **Table 16**).

Table 16 Reason for not doing anything about non-physical DFV involving neighbours

	Estimate (per cent)
Not my responsibility/Private matter/Up to victim	48.5%
Unsure of what to do/Not confident/Not comfortable	19.5%
No need to intervene	16.2%
Concerns for safety (personal, family or household)	10.5%
It could make things worse/more dangerous for victim	7.0%
Other	1.5%
Don't know	2.2%
Refused	3.7%

Base: Respondents who wouldn't do anything if they saw or were aware of non-physical DFV involving their neighbours (n = 254)

Note: Multiple responses were allowed

Source: Queensland Government Statistician's Office, Queensland Treasury, Queensland Social Survey 2022

© The State of Queensland (Queensland Treasury) 2022

As this question was not included in the 2017 QSS no comparison could be made with 2017 responses.

Analysis of survey data found that for Queensland adults who thought they would not do anything if they saw or became aware of non-physical DFV involving their neighbours those in 2022 were significantly more likely than those in 2021 to think

- they would be unsure of what to do (19.5% and 7.2% respectively)
- there was no need to intervene (16.2% and 4.9% respectively).

Demographic comparisons

Analysis of 2022 survey data found that for Queensland adults who felt they would not do anything if they became aware of non-physical DFV involving their neighbours, 35–54 year olds (28.1%) were significantly more likely than those aged 55 years and over (10.9%) to think that they would be unsure of what to do.

3.6 Awareness of, and response to, DFV in the last 12 months

3.6.1 DFV involving a family member or close friend

Awareness of DFV

All respondents were asked: "In the last 12 months, have you seen or are you aware of any DFV involving a family member or close friend?" (Q20a).

Of the estimated adult Queensland resident population, 15.3% had seen or were aware of DFV in the last 12 months that involved a family member or close friend (see **Table 17**).

Table 17 Awareness of DFV in the last 12 months involving a family member or close friend

	Estimate (per cent)
Aware of DFV involving family member or close friend	15.3%
Not aware of DFV involving family member or close friend	84.5%
Don't know	0.1%
Refused	0.0%
Total	100.0%

Base: All respondents (n = 1,184)

Source: Queensland Government Statistician's Office, Queensland Treasury, Queensland Social Survey 2022

© The State of Queensland (Queensland Treasury) 2022

Analysis of survey data found no statistically significant differences between responses given to this question in 2022, 2021 or 2017.

Demographic comparisons

Analysis of 2022 survey data found no statistically significant differences for responses to this question based on demographic comparisons of age, gender and CALD status.

Response to DFV

Respondents who had seen or were aware of DFV in the last 12 months involving a family member or close friend were asked: "How did you respond when you saw or became aware of this?" (Q20b). Multiple responses were allowed.

Of the estimated 611,952 Queensland adults who had seen or were aware of DFV in the last 12 months involving a family member or close friend, 81.5% said they did something about it and 16.6% didn't do anything about it (see **Table 18**).

Table 18 Response to DFV in the last 12 months involving a family member or close friend

	Estimate (per cent)
I did something about it	81.5%
I didn't do anything about it	16.6%
Other	1.9%
Refused	0.0%
Total	100.0%

Base: Respondents who were aware of DFV in the last 12 months that involved a family member or close friend (n = 175)

Source: Queensland Government Statistician's Office, Queensland Treasury, Queensland Social Survey 2022
© The State of Queensland (Queensland Treasury) 2022

From the multiple response options, 69.2% said they spoke to the victim or perpetrator about it later, 8.2% tried to stop it and 8.1% called the police.

Analysis of survey data found no statistically significant differences between responses given to this question in 2022, 2017 or 2021.

Demographic comparisons

Analysis of 2022 survey data found no statistically significant differences for responses to this question based on demographic comparisons of age, gender and CALD status.

3.6.2 DFV involving neighbours

Awareness of DFV

All respondents were asked: "In the last 12 months, have you seen or are you aware of any DFV involving your neighbours?" (Q21a).

Of the estimated adult Queensland resident population, 9.8% had seen or were aware of DFV in the last 12 months that involved their neighbours (see **Table 19**).

Table 19 Awareness of DFV in the last 12 months involving neighbours

	Estimate (per cent)
Aware of DFV involving neighbours	9.8%
Not aware of DFV involving neighbours	89.9%
Don't know	0.4%
Refused	0.0%
Total	100.0%

Base: All respondents (n = 1,184)

Source: Queensland Government Statistician's Office, Queensland Treasury, Queensland Social Survey 2022
© The State of Queensland (Queensland Treasury) 2022

Analysis of survey data found no statistically significant differences between responses given to this question in 2022, 2021 or 2017.

Demographic comparisons

Analysis of 2022 survey data found no statistically significant differences for responses to this question based on demographic comparisons of age, gender and CALD status.

Response to DFV

Respondents who had seen or were aware of DFV in the last 12 months that involved neighbours were asked: "How did you respond when you saw or became aware of this?" (Q21b). Multiple responses were allowed.

Of the estimated 389,771 Queensland adults who had seen or were aware of DFV in the last 12 months involving their neighbours, 52.3% said they did something about it and 47.1% didn't do anything about it (see **Table 20**).

Table 20 Response to DFV in the last 12 months involving neighbours

	Estimate (per cent)
I did something about it	52.3%
I didn't do anything about it	47.1%
Other	0.6%
Refused	0.0%
Total	100.0%

Base: Respondents who were aware of DFV in the last 12 months that involved their neighbours (n = 118)

Source: Queensland Government Statistician's Office, Queensland Treasury, Queensland Social Survey 2022

© The State of Queensland (Queensland Treasury) 2022

From the multiple response options, 34.1% said they called the police, 17.5% spoke to the victim or perpetrator about it later and 8.1% tried to stop it.

Analysis of survey data found no statistically significant differences between responses given to this question in 2022, 2021 or 2017.

Demographic comparisons

Analysis of 2022 survey data found no statistically significant differences for responses to this question based on demographic comparisons of age, gender and CALD status.

3.6.3 DFV involving people not known well

Awareness of DFV

All respondents were asked: "In the last 12 months, have you seen or are you aware of any DFV involving people you don't know well. For example, people you met at your workplace, a community group or a sports club?" (Q22a).

Of the estimated adult Queensland resident population, 14.8% had seen or were aware of DFV in the last 12 months that involved people they did not know well (see **Table 21**).

Table 21 Awareness of DFV in the last 12 months involving people not known well

	Estimate (per cent)
Aware of DFV involving people not known well	14.8%
Not aware of DFV involving people not known well	84.8%
Don't know	0.4%
Refused	0.0%
Total	100.0%

Base: All respondents (n = 1,184)

Note: Examples given to respondents of people not known well included those met at a workplace, community group or sports club.

Source: Queensland Government Statistician's Office, Queensland Treasury, Queensland Social Survey 2022

© The State of Queensland (Queensland Treasury) 2022

As the wording of this question was modified in 2020, no comparison could be made with responses given in 2022 and 2017.

Analysis of survey data found no statistically significant differences between responses given to this question in 2022 and 2021.

Demographic comparisons

Analysis of 2022 survey data found that Queensland adults aged 18–34 years (19.6%) were significantly more likely than those aged 55 years and over (10.7% to have seen or been aware of DFV involving people they didn't know well, in the last 12 months.

Response to DFV

Respondents who had seen or were aware of DFV in the last 12 months that involved people they did not know well were asked: "How did you respond when you saw or became aware of this?" (Q22b). Multiple responses were allowed.

Of the estimated 590,062 Queensland adults who had seen or were aware of DFV in the last 12 months involving people they did not know well, 67.9% said they did something about it and 31.8% didn't do anything about it (see **Table 22**).

Table 22 Response to DFV in the last 12 months involving people not known well

	Estimate (per cent)
I did something about it	67.9%
I didn't do anything about it	31.8%
Other	0.3%
Refused	0.0%
Total	100.0%

Base: Respondents who were aware of DFV in the last 12 months that involved people they didn't know well (n = 168)

Source: Queensland Government Statistician's Office, Queensland Treasury, Queensland Social Survey 2022

© The State of Queensland (Queensland Treasury) 2022

From the multiple response options, 36.0% said they spoke to the victim or perpetrator about it later, 24.7% spoke to someone in their workplace, community group or club about it, 6.6% tried to stop it and 5.3% called the police.

As the wording of Q22a was modified in 2020, no comparison could be made between responses given in 2022 and 2017 for Q22b.

Analysis of survey data found no statistically significant differences between responses given to this question in 2022 and 2021.

Demographic comparisons

Analysis of 2022 survey data found no statistically significant differences for responses to this question based on demographic comparisons of age, gender and CALD status.

3.7 Attitudes towards DFV and gender equality

3.7.1 Level of agreement

Feel safe from DFV

All respondents were asked how strongly they agreed or disagreed with: "In general, I feel safe from DFV" (Q23d).

Most (94.4%) of the estimated adult Queensland resident population agreed (21.7%) or strongly agreed (72.6%) that in general they felt safe from DFV (see **Table 23**).

Table 23 Level of agreement – In general, I feel safe from DFV

	Estimate (per cent)
Agree or strongly agree	94.4%
Neither agree nor disagree	2.2%
Disagree or strongly disagree	3.0%
Don't know	0.3%
Refused	0.1%
Total	100.0%

Base: All respondents (n = 1,184)

Source: Queensland Government Statistician's Office, Queensland Treasury, Queensland Social Survey 2022

Analysis of survey data found no statistically significant differences between responses given to this question in 2022, 2021 or 2017.

Demographic comparisons

Analysis of 2022 survey data found that females (5.0%) were significantly more likely than males (0.9%) to disagree or strongly disagree that in general they felt safe from DFV.

Gender superiority and DFV

All respondents were asked how strongly they agreed or disagreed with: “When one partner in a domestic relationship believes themselves to be superior to their partner because of their gender, domestic and family violence is more likely to occur” (Q23e).

Most (78.8%) of the estimated adult Queensland resident population agreed (45.6%) or strongly agreed (33.3%) that an attitude of gender superiority in a domestic relationship can increase the likelihood of DFV (see **Table 24**).

Table 24 Level of agreement – An attitude of gender superiority can increase likelihood of DFV in domestic relationship

	Estimate (per cent)
Agree or strongly agree	78.8%
Neither agree nor disagree	10.9%
Disagree or strongly disagree	7.5%
Don't know	2.7%
Refused	0.1%
Total	100.0%

Base: All respondents (n = 1,184)

Source: Queensland Government Statistician's Office, Queensland Treasury, Queensland Social Survey 2022

As this question was not included in the 2017 QSS no comparison could be made with 2017 responses.

Analysis of survey data found no statistically significant differences between responses given to this question in 2022 and 2021.

Demographic comparisons

Analysis of 2022 survey data found no statistically significant differences for responses to this question based on demographic comparisons of age, gender and CALD status.

Gender inequality and DFV

All respondents were asked how strongly they agreed or disagreed with: “Reducing gender inequality will help to reduce DFV in Australia” (Q23f).

Approximately two-thirds (67.4%) of the estimated adult Queensland resident population agreed (40.0%) or strongly agreed (27.4%) that reducing gender inequality would help reduce DFV in Australia (see **Table 25**).

Table 25 Level of agreement – Reducing gender inequality would help to reduce DFV

	Estimate (per cent)
Agree or strongly agree	67.4%
Neither agree nor disagree	12.9%
Disagree or strongly disagree	15.8%
Don't know	3.8%
Refused	0.2%
Total	100.0%

Base: All respondents (n = 1,184)

Source: Queensland Government Statistician's Office, Queensland Treasury, Queensland Social Survey 2022

As this question was not included in the 2017 QSS no comparison could be made with 2017 responses.

Analysis of survey data found no statistically significant differences between responses given to this question in 2022 and 2021.

Demographic comparisons

Analysis of 2022 survey data found no statistically significant differences for responses to this question based on demographic comparisons of age, gender and CALD status.

Teaching respectful attitudes and behaviours

All respondents were asked how strongly they agreed or disagreed with: “Teaching children about respectful attitudes and behaviours in relationships will help reduce DFV in the future” (Q23g).

Most (97.8%) of the estimated adult Queensland resident population agreed (21.0%) or strongly agreed (76.8%) that teaching children about respectful attitudes and behaviours would help reduce DFV in the future (see **Table 26**).

Table 26 Level of agreement – Teaching children respectful attitudes and behaviours would help to reduce DFV

	Estimate (per cent)
Agree or strongly agree	97.8%
Neither agree nor disagree	1.1%
Disagree or strongly disagree	0.9%
Don't know	0.1%
Refused	0.0%
Total	100.0%

Base: All respondents (n = 1,184)

Source: Queensland Government Statistician's Office, Queensland Treasury, Queensland Social Survey 2022

As this question was not included in the 2017 QSS no comparison could be made with 2017 responses.

Analysis of the survey data found no statistically significant differences between responses given to this question in 2022 and 2021.

Demographic comparisons

Analysis of 2022 survey data found no statistically significant differences for responses to this question based on demographic comparisons of age, gender and CALD status.

3.8 Involvement in DFV initiatives

3.8.1 Involvement in community DFV initiatives

All respondents were asked: “Are you involved in any DFV initiatives (e.g. awareness raising, advocacy, fundraising, volunteering etc.) in your community?” (Q24a).

Of the estimated adult Queensland resident population, 6.6% were involved in DFV initiatives in their community (see **Table 27**).

Table 27 Involvement in community DFV initiatives

	Estimate (per cent)
Involved in DFV initiatives	6.6%
Not involved in DFV initiatives	93.2%
Refused	0.2%
Total	100.0%

Base: All respondents (n = 1,184)

Source: Queensland Government Statistician's Office, Queensland Treasury, Queensland Social Survey 2022

Analysis of survey data found no statistically significant differences between responses given to this question in 2022, 2021 or 2017.

Demographic comparisons

Analysis of 2022 survey data found no statistically significant differences for responses to this question based on demographic comparisons of age, gender and CALD status.

3.8.2 Workplace engagement in DFV initiatives

Respondents who indicated they were in paid employment were asked: "Has your workplace engaged in any DFV initiatives in the last 12 months? (e.g. employee support programs, leadership, awareness raising, fundraising etc.)" (Q25a).

Of the estimated 2,795,329 Queensland adults who were in paid employment, 41.1% were in a workplace that had engaged in DFV initiatives in the last 12 months (see **Table 28**).

Table 28 Workplace engagement in DFV initiatives

	Estimate (per cent)
Workplace engaged in DFV initiatives	41.1%
Workplace not engaged in DFV initiatives	58.6%
Refused	0.3 %
Total	100.0%

Base: Respondents in paid employment (n = 750)

Source: Queensland Government Statistician's Office, Queensland Treasury, Queensland Social Survey 2022

Analysis of survey data found that for Queensland adults who were in paid employment, those in 2022 (41.1%) were significantly more likely than those in 2017 (25.9%) to be in a workplace that had engaged in DFV initiatives in the last 12 months.

Demographic comparisons

Analysis of 2022 survey data found no statistically significant differences for responses to this question based on demographic comparisons of age, gender and CALD status.

APPENDICES

Appendix A Questionnaire

Department of the Premier and Cabinet Department of Communities, Housing and Digital Economy Queensland Social Survey 2022

Introduction

CATI intro

Good morning/afternoon/evening, my name is ____ and I work for the Queensland Government Statistician's Office.

Can I confirm I am speaking to <FirstName> <LastName>?

The Queensland Government is conducting a survey to gauge the community's views about a range of social issues including relationships, social connections and attitudes towards violence.

Your responses are strictly confidential and are collected under the Queensland Government Statistical Returns Act. The information you provide will only be used for research purposes.

Some calls are monitored by my supervisor for training and quality purposes.

You may have received a letter from us advising you of the survey.

Screening module

S1 Can I just check - is Queensland your usual place of residence?

(Yes	1
No	2
Refused	99)

S1 > 1 go to NonQld

S2 So we can establish the boundaries of our study, can you give me your postcode where you usually live?

(Text response [Postcode])

Don't know 98
 Refused 99)

If Postcode = FramePostcode go to S4

S3 What is the name of the suburb or town where you usually live?

Select locality from lookup [Locality]	Text response [ProvideLocality]
---	------------------------------------

Don't know 98
 Refused 99)

S4 Can I please have your date of birth?

(Date response)

Refused/reluctant..... 99)

If S4 = 99 go to S5
If Age <18 go to NonEligible
Else go to Isolation_intro

S5 Would you mind giving me your age in years?

(Numeric response {range 0–115})

Refused/reluctant..... 99)

If S5 = 99 go to S6
If S5 < 18 years go to NonEligible
Else go to Isolation_intro



S6 Would you be willing to say which of the following categories your age is in?

18–24	1
25–34	2
35–44	3
45–54	4
55–64	5
65 years or over	6
Refused	99)

If S6 = 99 go to Refused
Else go to Isolation_intro

Social isolation module

Isolation_intro

For the first section of the survey we'll be asking questions about your social groups and connections.

For the first few questions, please answer about people you know, but don't live with. This includes neighbours, friends, and family members who don't live with you.

Q1 In the last three months, how often did you communicate with people you know, **but don't live with**? This could be in person, by phone or online. Would you say:

(INTERVIEWER: 'People you know, but don't live with' includes neighbours, friends and family members who don't live with you.

'In person' includes planned events or casual face-to-face contact with others in groups or one-on-one.

'Phone' includes phone calls, video calls or text messages made by either mobile or landline

'Online' includes instant messages, emails or other forms of communication via social media, internet apps, online gaming or social group forums)

At least once a day	1
At least once a week.....	2
At least once a fortnight	3
At least once a month	4
Less than once a month	5
(Don't know.....	98
Refused	99)

Q2a Would you like to communicate with these people more often than you currently do?

(Yes.....	1
No	2
Don't know	98
Refused	99)

If Q2a = 1 go to Q2b
Else go to Q3

Q2b Who would you like to communicate more often with?

(Family	1
Friends.....	2
Workmates	3
Neighbours	4
People or groups in my local community	5
Other (please specify)	97
Don't know	98
Refused	99)

Q2c What are the main barriers to you communicating more often with them?

(Lack of time	1
COVID-19	2
Distance / Different time zones	3
Lack of motivation	4
Technology reasons	5
Health reasons	6
Transport reasons	7
Financial reasons	8
They don't want to communicate more	9
Other (please specify)	97
No barriers	11
Don't know	98
Refused	99)



Q3 In your city or local community there may be a range of activities provided by sporting clubs, arts groups, business groups (e.g. Lions, Rotary), festivals and Neighbourhood and Community Centres. In **the last three months**, have you investigated the range of groups or activities provided in your city or local community?

(INTERVIEWER: 'local community' can mean the neighbourhood, suburb, or town you live in)

(Yes.....	1
No	2
Don't know	98
Refused	99)

Q4a In the **last three months**, have you been **actively involved** in any groups or activities in your city or local community?

(INTERVIEWER: 'actively involved' means taking part in organised activities individually or as part of a group)

(Yes.....	1
No	2
Don't know	98
Refused	99)

If Q4a = 2 go to Q4b
If Q4a = 1 go to Q4c
Else go to DFV_intro

Q4b What stopped you from being actively involved?

(Not interested / No need	1
COVID-19	2
Lack of time (family/work commitments)	3
Health reasons	4
Financial reasons / Cost	5
No groups or activities I like	6
No childcare available	7
Transport reasons.....	8
No one to go with	9
Potential for conflict / don't like others who attend	10
Lack of technology or connectivity for online options	11
Other (please specify)	97
Don't know	98
Refused	99)

Go to DFV_intro



Q4c What were the main reasons that you became involved?

(To meet new people / expand my social network	1
For fun / my personal enjoyment	2
My child's/children's involvement in groups or activities	3
To fill in time	4
To contribute / volunteer my skills and time	5
Someone invited me	6
To learn a new skill / take up a new hobby	7
For my health / fitness	8
Other (please specify)	97
Don't know	98
Refused	99)

Domestic and family violence module

DFV_intro

The following questions are about your attitude towards domestic and family violence.

(INTERVIEWER: 'Domestic and family violence' is perpetrated in the home or among family members.)

Q8a If one partner in a domestic relationship controls or tries to **control the other partner by preventing them from seeing family and friends**, is this a form of domestic and family violence?

Yes, always.....	1
Yes, usually	2
Yes, sometimes	3
No	4
(Don't know.....	98
Refused	99)

Q9a And how serious is this?

Very serious.....	1
Quite serious.....	2
Not that serious.....	3
Not serious at all.....	4
(Don't know.....	98
Refused	99)



Q12 If one partner in a domestic relationship **repeatedly criticises** the other partner to make them feel bad or useless, is this a form of domestic and family violence?

Yes, always.....	1
Yes, usually	2
Yes, sometimes	3
No	4
(Don't know.....	98
Refused	99)

Q13 And how serious is this?

Very serious.....	1
Quite serious.....	2
Not that serious.....	3
Not serious at all.....	4
(Don't know.....	98
Refused	99)

Q12a If one partner in a domestic relationship threatens to share intimate, nude or sexual images of the other partner without their permission, is this a form of domestic and family violence?

Yes, always.....	1
Yes, usually	2
Yes, sometimes	3
No	4
(Don't know.....	98
Refused	99)

Q13a And how serious is this?

Very serious.....	1
Quite serious.....	2
Not that serious.....	3
Not serious at all.....	4
(Don't know.....	98
Refused	99)



Q14 Excluding any situation involving addictions such as gambling, alcohol, drugs, etc., if one partner in a domestic relationship tries to **control the other partner by denying them access to money**, is this a form of domestic and family violence?

Yes, always.....	1
Yes, usually	2
Yes, sometimes	3
No	4
(Don't know.....	98
Refused	99)

Q15 And how serious is this?

Very serious.....	1
Quite serious.....	2
Not that serious.....	3
Not serious at all.....	4
(Don't know.....	98
Refused.....	99)

Q16 If one partner in a domestic relationship **harasses** the other partner via repeated phone or electronic means such as email, text message or social media, is this a form of domestic and family violence?

Yes, always.....	1
Yes, usually	2
Yes, sometimes	3
No	4
(Don't know.....	98
Refused	99)

Q17 And how serious is this?

Very serious.....	1
Quite serious.....	2
Not that serious.....	3
Not serious at all.....	4
(Don't know.....	98
Refused	99)



Q18 How would you react if you saw or were aware of **physical** domestic and family violence, involving **your neighbours**?

(I would try to stop it.....	1
I wouldn't want to get involved due to fear	2
I would call the police.....	3
I would speak to the victim or perpetrator about it later.....	4
Other (please specify).....	97
I wouldn't do anything	6
Don't know	98
Refused	99)

Q19 How would you react if you saw or were aware of **non-physical** domestic and family violence, involving **your neighbours**?

(I would try to stop it.....	1
I wouldn't want to get involved due to fear	2
I would call the police.....	3
I would speak to the victim or perpetrator about it later.....	4
Other (please specify).....	97
I wouldn't do anything	6
Don't know	98
Refused	99)

If Q19 = 6 go to Q19b
Else go to Q20a

Q19b Why do you think you wouldn't do anything?

(Concerns for safety (personal, family or household).....	1
It could make things worse/more dangerous for victim	2
Unsure of what to do / Not confident / Not comfortable.....	3
Not my responsibility / Private matter / Up to victim	4
No need to intervene	5
Other (please specify).....	97
Don't know	98
Refused	99)

Q20a In the last 12 months, have you seen or are you aware of any domestic and family violence involving a **family member or close friend**?

(Yes.....	1
No	2
Don't know	98
Refused	99)

If Q20a = 1 go to Q20b
Else go to Q21a

Q20b How did you respond when you saw or became aware of this?

(I tried to stop it	1
I called the police	2
I spoke to the victim or perpetrator about it later	3
Other (please specify).....	97
I didn't do anything.....	5
Refused	99)

Q21a In the last 12 months, have you seen or are you aware of any domestic and family violence **involving your neighbours**?

(Yes.....	1
No	2
Don't know	98
Refused	99)

If Q21a = 1 go to Q21b
Else go to Q22a

Q21b How did you respond when you saw or became aware of this?

(I tried to stop it	1
I called the police	2
I spoke to the victim or perpetrator about it later	3
Other (please specify).....	97
I didn't do anything.....	5
Refused	99)



Q.22a In the last 12 months, have you seen or are you aware of any domestic and family violence involving **people you don't know well**. For example, people you met at your workplace, a community group or a sports club?

- (Yes..... 1
- No 2
- Don't know 98
- Refused 99)

If Q22a = 1 go to Q22b
Else go to Q23

Q22b How did you respond when you saw or became aware of this?

- (I tried to stop it..... 1
- I called the police 2
- I spoke to the victim or perpetrator about it later 3
- I spoke to someone in my workplace/community group/
club etc 4
- Other (please specify)..... 97
- I didn't do anything..... 6
- Refused) 99

Q23 The statements I'm about to read describe specific attitudes. For each statement please tell me if you strongly agree, agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree or strongly disagree:

(INTERVIEWER: Q23f – 'Gender inequality' is the opposite of gender equality and can be defined as: unequal treatment or perceptions of individuals based on their gender.)

	1. Strongly agree	2. Agree	3. Neither agree nor disagree	4. Disagree	5. Strongly disagree	98. (Don't know)	99. Refused)
d) In general, I feel safe from domestic and family violence							
e) When one partner in a domestic relationship believes themselves to be superior to their partner because of their gender, domestic and family violence is more likely to occur.							
f) Reducing gender <u>inequality</u> will help to reduce domestic and family violence in Australia.							
g) Teaching children about respectful attitudes and behaviours in relationships will help reduce domestic and family violence in the future.							



Q24a Are you involved in any domestic and family violence initiatives (e.g. awareness raising, advocacy, fundraising, volunteering etc.) in your community?

(INTERVIEWER: 'community' can mean the neighbourhood, suburb, or town you live in)

- (Yes..... 1
- No 2
- Refused 99)

Q24c Now to a question about employment. Are you currently...

(INTERVIEWER: 'full-time' is 35 hours or more a week and 'part-time' is less than 35 hours a week in all jobs)

- In paid work full-time..... 1
- In paid work part-time 2
- Self-employed 3
- Unemployed and seeking paid work..... 4
- Not seeking paid work 5
- Retired 6
- (Other (please specify) 97
- Refused 99)

If Q24c < 4 go to Q25a
Else go to Demographic_intro

Q25a Has your workplace engaged in any domestic and family violence initiatives in the last 12 months? (e.g. employee support programs, leadership, awareness raising, fundraising etc.)

- (Yes..... 1
- No 2
- Refused 99)

Demographic module

Demographic_intro

The following questions are for statistical purposes only.

Q26 As this interview is being conducted over the phone, can you please tell me your gender?

(Male	1
Female	2
Other	3
Refused	99)

Q28 What is the highest year level of **school-based education** that you have completed?

Senior high school (Year 12)	1
Junior high school (Year 10).....	2
Primary school	3
Did not complete primary school	4
No schooling	5
(Other (please specify)	97
Refused	99)

Q29 What is the level of the highest educational qualification that you have completed?

(Doctoral Degree / PhD	1
Master Degree	2
Graduate Diploma.....	3
Graduate Certificate.....	4
Bachelor (Honours) Degree.....	5
Bachelor Degree.....	6
Associate Degree	7
Advanced Diploma.....	8
Diploma.....	9
VET Certificate IV	10
VET Certificate III.....	11
VET Certificate II.....	12
VET Certificate I.....	13
VET Certificate – level not known (QGSO use only).....	14
No educational qualification completed	15
Other (please specify).....	97
Refused	99)

Q31 Do you identify yourself as Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander?

(Yes – Aboriginal	1
Yes – Torres Strait Islander.....	2
Both.....	3
Neither	4
Refused	99)



Q32a Were you born in Australia?

- (Yes – Born in Australia 1
- No – Born outside of Australia 2
- Refused 99)

Q32b Do you speak a language other than English at home?

- (No – English only..... 1
- Yes..... 2
- Refused 99)

Q33 Do you have a limitation, restriction or impairment, which has lasted or is likely to last for at least 6 months, and restricts your everyday activities?

(INTERVIEWER: 'everyday activities' may relate to communication, mobility or self-care)

- (Yes..... 1
- No 2
- Refused 99)

[Go to CATI end survey](#)

End survey

NonQld

This study requires us to speak to people who live in Queensland. Thanks for your time.
Goodbye.

Refused

Thanks for your time but an answer to this question is required for this study.
Goodbye.

NonEligible

This study requires us to speak with people aged 18 and over. Thanks for your time.
Goodbye.



CATI end survey

That concludes the survey.

Your responses are strictly confidential and are collected under the Queensland Government's Statistical Returns Act, which does not allow the unauthorised release of information that identifies you.

Your responses will be combined with those of other participants to compile aggregate information.

If the content of the survey has raised any personal issues you may have in relation to domestic and family violence and you would like to talk, would you like the phone number for DVConnect?

DVConnect Mensline: 1800 600 636

DVConnect Womensline: 1800 811 811

Thank you very much for your assistance.

Appendix B Survey method and operations

Sample design

The survey sample was designed to provide reliable information on individual characteristics at both the whole-of-state and the regional level. To achieve this, survey respondents were selected using a stratified sampling design.²

Queensland was stratified into two regions:

- South East Queensland (Brisbane, Gold Coast, Sunshine Coast and Toowoomba)
- Rest of Queensland.

A quota (target) of 600 completed interviews per region was set for the survey. The final sample of 3,887 achieved a total of 1,184 interviews, with 606 in South East Queensland and 578 in Rest of Queensland.

With this stratified sample design, the probability of selecting an individual varied across the two regions. For example, adults residing in the Rest of Queensland region had a higher probability of being selected than adults in the more populous South East Queensland. Statistical methods used to analyse the survey data account for these different selection probabilities.

Survey response and cooperation rates

Response rate

One measure of the quality of response is the response rate, which is the number of completed surveys that can be used in analysis as a percentage of all attempted in-scope sample. Only 'complete' or 'usable partial complete' interviews with a sufficient number of questions answered were used in analysis.

The estimated overall response rate of 30.9% was derived as follows:

$$\frac{\text{total in-scope responding [1,184]}}{\text{total in-scope responding [1,184] + total in-scope non-responding [2,643]}} \times 100\%$$

Cooperation rate

The cooperation rate indicates the extent to which contacted individuals cooperate with requests to participate in a survey. This can be a function of the interviewer's skills, pre-survey communication effects, sentiment towards the survey topic and motivation of a potential respondent to participate.

The cooperation rate is the number of interviews that can be used in analysis, as a percentage of the number of persons contacted who were capable of participating.

The estimated overall cooperation rate of 70.0% was derived as follows:

$$\frac{\text{total in-scope responding [1,184]}}{\text{total in-scope responding [1,184] + partially completed unusable interviews [36] + refusals [472]}} \times 100\%$$

The response and cooperation rates achieved for the QSS between 2017 and 2022 are shown in **Table B1**.

Table B1 Survey response and cooperation rates, 2017–22

	Response rate	Cooperation rate
2022	30.9%	70.0%
2021	28.4%	59.1%
2020	27.6%	61.4%
2019	27.0%	58.8%
2018	29.5%	66.8%
2017	34.0%	68.2%

² A simple random sample would not support this type of analysis because the final sample would be concentrated in South East Queensland, due to its high population density.

Appendix C

Estimation and precision

QGSO surveyed a sample of 1,184 respondents. However, interest lies in the entire population of adults who usually reside in Queensland, estimated to be 3,986,952. Each subset of respondents sharing similar characteristics is assumed to be representative of a segment of the entire population sharing those same characteristics.

For example, responses of 18–24 year old males from the sample may be considered to be representative of all 18–24 year old males in the population, including those who were not invited, or chose not to respond, to the survey. Accordingly, population totals and percentages have been estimated from the achieved sample using methods aimed at minimising bias related to sample design, the survey contact list, non-response and refusals.

Although the survey was designed to maximize the representativeness of the results, it is not possible to be perfectly representative. Estimation of population characteristics from a random sample entails some imprecision as a result of sampling and non-sampling error.

Sampling errors occur because estimates based on information obtained from a sample of Queensland adults may differ from statistics that would have been produced if all Queensland adults had been included in the survey.

The size of the sampling error is determined by the sampling scheme used, the method used to calculate a value for the estimate, and the size of the sample. Other factors being equal, sampling error may be reduced arbitrarily by increasing the sample size.

Non-sampling errors may occur due to non-response to the survey, inadequacies of the sampling contact list, inaccuracies in reporting by respondents and processing errors.

Strategies designed to minimise non-sampling errors include:

- using a contact list that is as up-to-date and accurate as possible
- communicating with invited participants about the survey prior to interviewing
- providing clear interviewer instructions, appropriate training and field supervision
- emphasising the legal provisions for protecting confidentiality under the Statistical Returns Act with respondents.

An additional strategy used by QGSO that may reduce sampling error is calibration to population benchmarks. Calibration is a process that makes use of variables that are collected in the survey and for which population level totals (benchmarks) are known. Where suitable additional information about the population of interest is known, calibration can reduce non-response bias and/or increase precision.

The source of population totals for calibration variables used in this survey is ABS (2020), *Regional Population by Age and Sex*. These benchmarks are listed in **Table C1**.

Queensland Government Statistician's Office

Table C1 Benchmarks used in this survey

Region	18–24 years	25–34 years	35–44 years	45–54 years	55–64 years	65 years and over
Males						
South East Queensland	177,523	274,097	248,517	236,912	202,940	270,750
Rest of Queensland	59,106	87,383	83,441	89,502	92,375	124,637
Queensland	236,629	361,480	331,958	326,414	295,315	395,387
Females						
South East Queensland	177,228	282,936	259,913	251,072	218,271	311,008
Rest of Queensland	53,801	88,593	87,556	91,685	92,220	125,486
Queensland	231,029	371,529	347,469	342,757	310,491	436,494

Notes:

- 1 South East Queensland includes the SA4s of Brisbane Inner City, Brisbane - North, Brisbane - East, Brisbane - South, Brisbane - West, Gold Coast, Ipswich, Logan - Beaudesert, Moreton Bay - North, Moreton Bay - South, Sunshine Coast and Toowoomba.
- 2 Rest of Queensland includes the SA4s of Cairns, Central Queensland, Darling Downs - Maranoa, Mackay - Isaac - Whitsunday, Queensland - Outback, Townsville and Wide Bay.

Source: ABS (2020) *Regional Population by Age and Sex* [<https://www.abs.gov.au/>]



Appendix D Special collapses

Questions 18 and 19 – Whether respondent would or wouldn't do anything about DFV

Uncollapsed categories	Collapsed categories
1 I would try to stop it	1 I would do something about it (where Q = 1, 3 or 4)
2 I wouldn't want to get involved due to fear	2 I wouldn't do anything about (where Q = 2 or 6)
3 I would call the police	97 Other (where Q = 97)
4 I would speak to the victim or perpetrator about it later	98 Don't know (where Q = 98)
97 Other (please specify)	99 Refused (where Q = 99)
6 I wouldn't do anything	
98 Don't know	
99 Refused	

Questions 20b and 21b – Whether respondent did or didn't do anything about DFV

Uncollapsed categories	Collapsed categories
1 I tried to stop it	1 I did something about it (where Q = 1, 2 or 3)
2 I called the police	2 I didn't do anything about it (where Q = 5)
3 I spoke to the victim or perpetrator about it later	97 Other (where Q = 97)
97 Other (please specify)	99 Refused (where Q = 99)
5 I didn't do anything	
99 Refused	

Question 22b – Whether respondent did or didn't do anything about DFV

Uncollapsed categories	Collapsed categories
1 I tried to stop it	1 I did something about it (where Q = 1, 2, 3 or 4)
2 I called the police	2 I didn't do anything about it (where Q = 6)
3 I spoke to the victim or perpetrator about it later	97 Other (where Q = 97)
4 I spoke to someone in my workplace/community group/club etc.	99 Refused (where Q = 99)
97 Other (please specify)	
6 I didn't do anything	
99 Refused	

Notes:

As the questions listed above were multi-response, it was possible for respondents to select more than one response category. In order to achieve the collapses above, if the respondent indicated they 'would do something about it' (by selecting categories 1, 3 or 4 in Q18 and Q19) or 'did something about it' (by selecting categories 1, 2 or 3 in Q20b and Q21b; by selecting categories, 1, 2, 3 or 4 in Q22b) they were coded to collapsed category 1 (even if they also selected other responses). More specifically,

- only when 'I wouldn't want to get involved due to fear' was selected by itself was it coded to collapsed category 2 'I wouldn't do anything about it'
- only when 'other' was selected by itself was it retained in collapsed category 97 'Other'.

'I wouldn't do anything' (Q18 and Q19) and 'I didn't do anything' (Q20b, Q21b, Q22b) were mutually exclusive and were always coded into the relevant collapsed category 2.

