
From: Hayley Boxall [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, 25 September 2024 4:32 PM
To: fvpdata
Subject: RE: Proof transcript | Inquiry into capturing data on family violence perpetrators in Victoria

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

I have given this QON a bit of thought and I don't think I necessarily have much more to add to what Professor Flood noted. However, one of the main issues that we have when attempting to integrate broad bodies of research evidence is the lack of consistent definitions underpinning studies. This is demonstrable in the DFV space where our definitions of DFV change between studies and over time. This tension is particularly noticeable when we attempt to integrate the findings from the analysis of criminal justice administrative justice datasets which are limited by legal definitions of DFV, and qualitative studies which typically have broader definitions. As such, working towards more consistent definitions is an important undertaking in this space.

However, I think integrating qual and quant bodies of research is relatively straight-forward if we understand and accept that different research may tell us different things about the same phenomenon, and that DFV perpetration is not a homogenous phenomenon. A good example of how damaging it can be when we are not comfortable with the idea that we may not be measuring the same thing across different studies are the debates about the gendered nature of IPV. Some community surveys suggest that rates of IPV victimisation are evenly distributed between men and women, while surveys and research conducted with shelter populations suggest, overwhelmingly, that IPV is more gendered (perpetrated by men against women). These findings are viewed as in conflict and have led to a series of unproductive conversations about whether or not IPV is gendered – an argument that has certainly been weaponised by Men's Rights Activists! However, it could be that we are measuring distinctly different forms of IPV when we use different samples, which is certainly what the work of Michael P Johnson suggests. Community-based samples may tell us about rates of 'lower-level' abuse while shelter samples are likely measuring the experiences of higher-level abuse that requires some form of structured intervention.

Let me know if you want me to clarify anything!

Hayley

Dr Hayley Boxall [she/her]
Research Fellow

POLIS@ANU: Centre for Social Policy Research
ANU College of Arts and Social Sciences
RSSS 3.28
The Australian National University
Canberra ACT 2600