CRIME AND JUSTICE BULLETIN

The victimisation of people with disability in NSW: Results from the National Disability Data Asset pilot

Clare Ringland, Stewart Boiteux and Suzanne Poynton

AIM

To examine (1) factors associated with people with disability being victims of crime; (2) characteristics of incidents relating to people with disability; (3) whether persons of interest (POIs) are more or less likely to be proceeded against when incidents involve people with disability as victims, compared with incidents that do not involve people with disability; and (4) whether people with disability who are victims of crime are more or less likely to experience another incident within 12 months than those not known to have a disability. Aims (1), (3), and (4) are examined with a focus on violent and domestic violence (DV) related crimes.

METHOD

Victim and offending data held by the NSW Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research were linked with other State and Commonwealth administrative data collections. People with disability were primarily identified through records of disability-specific services and supports, such as those accessed through the National Disability Insurance Scheme (NDIS), those provided by state-based agencies pre-NDIS and included in the Disability Services National Minimum Data Set, and the disability support pension. Disability types were categorised as cognitive, physical and psychosocial. The proportion of individuals who experienced victimisation recorded by the NSW Police Force, whether a POI was proceeded against, and revictimisation were examined, with comparisons by disability type/s and with people with no disability identified. Analyses focused on incidents recorded by the NSW Police Force during the period 2014 to 2018.

RESULTS

The results from this study of crime committed in NSW, suggest that being younger, female, and/or Aboriginal, were associated with a greater risk of people with disability being victims of violent and DV-related crimes. POIs were less likely to be proceeded against in relation to violent incidents involving victims who were people with disability than incidents involving victims with no disability identified. In particular, in relation to violent and DV-related incidents, POIs were less likely to be proceeded against when incidents involved victims with both cognitive and physical disabilities, with or without psychosocial disability. People with disability who were victims of violent incidents were more likely to experience repeat victimisation than people with no disability identified. Similar, but smaller, effects were found in relation to DV-related repeat victimisation.

CONCLUSION

This is the first study using linked administrative data to examine factors associated with the victimisation of people with disability in New South Wales. Particular groups of people with disability were especially vulnerable to experiencing crime. In the absence of recording disability information in criminal justice system data collections, this study highlights the importance of an enduring linked dataset to ensure that service delivery and outcomes can be effectively monitored and evaluated.

INTRODUCTION

The Royal Commission into Violence, Abuse, Neglect and Exploitation of People with Disability (Royal Commission) has brought to light the breadth and seriousness of crimes and injustices experienced by people with disability. As at the end of March 2022, there had been 3,956 submissions, 930 private sessions, 12,734 phone enquiries, and 685 responses to issues papers. The Royal Commission has highlighted the inadequacy of the criminal justice system in supporting people with disability and the shortage of available information on the type, extent and nature of contact that people with disability have with the criminal justice system (Centre of Research Excellence in Disability and Health (CRE-DH), 2021; Dowse, Rowe, Baldry, & Baker, 2021; Koh, Kembhavi-Tam, Rose, Featherston, & Shlonksy, 2021).

While information on disability is not routinely recorded in administrative justice system data collections, numerous surveys and research studies provide an indication of the prevalence of victimisation for people with disability in Australia. Thirty years ago, Wilson and Brewer (1992) used a survey to compare the extent of criminal victimisation of individuals with intellectual disability with those without disability and found significantly higher levels of both personal and property offence victimisation, with differences in victimisation rates most pronounced for assault, sexual assault and robbery. A more recent study in Victoria examined rates of both victimisation and offending in people with intellectual disability by linking disability, mental health and police databases (Fogden, Thomas, Daffern, & Ogloff, 2016). Fogden et al. (2016) found that people with intellectual disability had significantly higher rates of violent and sexual victimisation and offending than a community sample; the presence of comorbid mental illness aggravated the risk of offending and victimisation.

Increased victimisation rates have also been reported in individuals with disability more generally (i.e., not only those with intellectual or cognitive disability). Emerson, Newland, Vaughan, and Llewellyn (2017) used the Household, Income and Labour Dynamics in Australia (HILDA) Survey to compare the risk of people with and without disability experiencing physical violence and property crime. Emerson et al. (2017) reported that adults with disabilities in New South Wales (NSW) were four times more likely than those without disabilities to report having been the victim of physical violence and 75 per cent more likely to report having been the victim of property crime.

The Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) Personal Safety Survey (PSS) has also been used to examine the prevalence of violence against people with disability. Focusing specifically on violence against women with disabilities, Dowse, Soldatic, Spangaro, and van Toorn (2016) reported that 62 per cent of women with disabilities aged under 50 years had experienced violence since the age of 15,[1] and women with disabilities had experienced three times the rate of sexual violence in the past 12 months compared with those without disabilities. More recently, the Centre of Research Excellence on Disability and Health used the 2016 PSS to report to the Royal Commission on the extent and nature of violence experienced by people with disability (2021). Almost two-thirds of people with disability aged 18-64 years reported experiencing physical violence, sexual violence, intimate partner violence, emotional abuse and/or stalking since the age of 15, compared with 45 per cent of people without disability; 52 per cent had experienced physical violence and 26 per cent had experienced intimate partner violence (compared with 34% and 14%, respectively, of people without disability). Women with disability experienced higher rates of most types of violence than men with disability (with the exception of physical violence), and both women and men with disability experienced higher rates of violence than their counterparts without disability (CRE-DH, 2021). Women with psychological and/or cognitive impairments had particularly high rates of physical violence, sexual violence, intimate partner violence and emotional abuse.

---

1   While we refer to estimates of violence since the age of 15 in this paragraph, the ABS (2021) advises caution as a person's disability status at the time of the survey may not be reflective of their status at the time they experienced violence. Indeed, a person's disability may be the result of violence. The ABS suggests that analysis should be restricted to more recent experiences of violence (last 1-2 years), when examining how disability intersects with violence as a risk factor.

Research examining risk and protective factors associated with experiences of violence of people with disabilities is limited. Little is known about risk factors at the relationship, community, or societal levels, and studies examining factors within the individual tend to focus on static factors, rather than factors that can be modified (Koh, et al., 2021). Further, while a significant body of research has examined police responses to people with mental illness, few studies have focused on the response of police to people with disabilities. Dowse, Rowe, Baldry, and Baker (2021) prepared a report for the Royal Commission, reviewing literature and policies, compiling case studies, and consulting disability advocates and police persons in relation to police interactions with people with disability. A common theme throughout the report was the failure of police to identify disability and to respond to disability appropriately. Among people with disability who are victims of crime, particularly those with cognitive and/or psychosocial disabilities, reports may not be viewed by police as credible, and offenders may be less likely to be charged (Jordan, 2004; Murray & Heenan, 2012). Victims may be less likely/willing to report crimes due to doubts about being believed and adequately supported.

The current study

This report presents findings from the Justice Test Case that was part of the National Disability Data Asset (NDDA) pilot.[2] The Justice Test Case was led by the NSW Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research (BOCSAR) and the Commonwealth Department of Social Services (DSS), and used linked State and Commonwealth data collections to examine the intersection of disability and the criminal justice system (CJS) in NSW.[3] Results reported here relate specifically to victims of crime reported to, or detected by, the NSW Police Force. Specifically, for people with disability we examine the following:

1. factors associated with being a victim of crime, with particular focus on violent and DV-related crime;

2. characteristics of incidents, compared with people with no disability identified;

3. factors associated with whether a person of interest was proceeded against in relation to a violent and/or DV-related incident, including comparisons with incidents involving people with no disability identified;

4. factors associated with whether repeat victimisation is experienced within 12 months of a violent and/or DV-related incident, including comparisons with people with no disability identified.

METHOD

Sample

Data from the NSW Re-offending Database (ROD) and victim records from the NSW Police Force,[4] were provided to the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW) for further linkage with other State and Commonwealth data collections.[5] Of particular interest, the following were included:

- National Disability Insurance Scheme (NDIS) data;

---

2   In 2021, in recognition of the need for improved understanding of the experiences of people with disability, and the shortcomings of existing administrative data collections, the National Disability Data Asset (NDDA) was piloted. The pilot was endorsed and supported by numerous agencies, including State and Commonwealth governments, and the National Disability Insurance Agency, and was informed by the NDDA Disability Advisory Council. Using a range of linked State and Commonwealth administrative data collections, five test cases were undertaken to demonstrate the potential of an enduring asset.
3   Ethics approval was obtained from the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare Ethics Committee (EO2020/1/1140) and the Corrective Services NSW Ethics Committee.
4   ROD and victim data were pre-linked by BOCSAR.
5   The first step was to link CJS data to the AIHW National Linkage Map, which was done using a statistical linkage key (SLK) that allowed privacy preservation. Specifically, SLK-581 was used – a concatenation of 2nd, 3rd and 5th letters of surname, 2nd and 3rd letters of first name, date of birth and sex. The AIHW National Linkage Map contains all individuals who have registered with Medicare since 1984, those in DOMINO since 2000, and those included in the National Death Index since 1997.

- the Disability Services National Minimum Data Set (DS NMDS), including records of disability services and supports provided by the NSW State government prior to the rollout of the NDIS;

- Department of Social Services Data Over Multiple Individual Occurrences (DOMINO), including records relating to the Disability Support Pension (DSP).

These disability services and CJS data collections were used to define the cohort for the Justice Test Case. More specifically, included in the cohort were individuals who were aged 10 years or over between 1 January 2009 and 31 December 2018 (i.e., born before 1 January 1999) who resided in NSW, and who had records in any of the following:

- the NSW Re-offending Database (offenders[6]);

- NSW Police Force Victims data (victims of crime);

- the NDIS dataset, having met the eligibility requirements of the NDIS[7] or working towards getting a plan;

- the DS NMDS, being a NSW funded Disability Services client (regardless of their NDIS status);

- DOMINO as a recipient of the DSP.

Due to incomplete identifiers, around 10 per cent of victim and offender records were either not provided to the AIHW or were not able to be linked by the AIHW. While some records were not linked due to inaccurate or incomplete identifiers, others may not have been linked due to the victim being a tourist or temporary resident not included in the National Linkage Map.

Following the provision and linkage of victim data, further criteria were applied to the types of incidents included in the Justice Test Case, with a small proportion of records excluded. These records involved a subset of offences where a victim is not typically identified within the event (e.g., transport regulatory offences).[8]

As shown in Box 1, the final Justice Test Case cohort included 2,332,763 individuals: 209,243 individuals who received a disability service and had at least one CJS contact between 2009 and 2018; 392,791 individuals who received a disability service or support only; and 1,730,729 individuals who had CJS contact as a victim or offender. The current study focuses on victims of crime during the period 2014 to 2018. The sample includes 1,347,462 individuals who were alive and aged 10 years or over at 31 December 2013, and who received disability services or supports during the period 2009 to 2018[9] (N = 558,868) or were victims of crime reported to, or detected by, the NSW Police Force during the period 2014 to 2018 (N = 890,138).[10] Analyses focusing on people with disability were further restricted to those who were 15 years and over as at 31 December 2013,[11] resulting in a sample of 542,388 individuals.

---

6   While we use the term "offenders", this includes both defendants with proven and unproven offences.

7   To be eligible for the NDIS an individual must be under 65 years of age when an application is made, be an Australian Citizen or resident or permanent visa holder, and meet the disability or early intervention requirements.

8   The following incident types were excluded: assault police, resist or hinder officer, receiving or handling stolen goods, steal from retail store, stock theft, other drug offences, prohibited and regulated weapons offences, betting and gaming offences, liquor offences, escape custody, breach bail conditions, other offences against justice procedures, other driving offences, transport regulatory offences, other offences. These incident types accounted for less than 10 per cent of victim records.

9   In this study, victim records were restricted to the period 2014 to 2018, while disability indicators were based on the period 2009 to 2018. The majority of those in the disability cohort (86% overall, ranging from 72% of those with a physical disability to 81% of those with a psychosocial disability) had received a disability service and/or support prior to 2014. Further, 93 per cent of those in the disability cohort who were victims of crime had received a disability service or support prior to the first event during the period 2014–2018. However, it may be that a criminal incident and/or contact with the criminal justice system occurred prior to any record of a disability service or support, prior to 2014.

10 When a crime is reported to or detected by the NSW Police Force they record it as a criminal event on the Computerised Operational Policing System (COPS). The event date is the date that the crime was reported. One criminal event can contain multiple criminal incidents. Criminal incidents are activities detected by or reported to police which involve the same offender(s) and victim(s); occur at the one location during one uninterrupted period of time; fall into one offence category and one incident type. The incident date is the date that the incident started. Almost 90 per cent of violent and DV-related incidents in this study were recorded by the NSW Police Force within 1 day.

11 This was done to ensure that victimisation reported to, or detected by, police in the 5-year period 2009–2013 would be complete; the Test Case only included data for those who had a record of victimisation reported when an individual was 10 years or over.

Box 1. Flow chart beginning with the Justice Test Case cohort and showing the impact of inclusion criteria on the study sample size

	Initial Justice Test Case Cohort: N = 2,833,604					
	Disability only		Disability + CJS		CJS only	
	N	change	N	change	N	change
Original	480,953		231,250		2,121,401	
Linked	480,953	*0*	231,250	*0*	1,912,407	*-208,994*
In NSW during period	437,767	*-43,186*	230,686	*-564*	1,909,413	*-2,994*
Alive and 10+ years within period	437,508	*-259*	230,670	*-16*	1,909,153	*-260*
Disability record within period & while 10+ years	392,676	*-44,832*	217,929	*-12,741*	1,909,153	*0*
CJS records within scope	392,676	*0*	210,486	*-7,443*	1,823,181	*-85,972*
<65 years at 1/1/2009	385,442	*-7,234*	209,243	*-1,243*	1,718,478	*-104,703*
Final, after reclassification	392,791	*+7,349*	209,243	*0*	1,730,729	*+12,251*
	Final Justice Test Case Cohort: N = 2,332,763					
Alive and 10+ years as at 31/12/2013	N = 2,272,195					
Disability and/or victim event 2014–2018	**Study sample: N = 1,347,462**					

Disability
N=558,868

462,756

96,112

Victim event 2014–2018
N = 890,138

794,026

15+ years as at 31/12/2013 for disability cohort analyses

Disability
N=542,388

450,018

92,370

Victim incident 2014–2018
N = 837,716

745,346

Note. CJS – criminal justice system; NSW – New South Wales.

Variables

Disability

As previously described, people with disability were identified through the use of disability services and supports covered by the NDIS, DS NMDS and the DSP. These individuals formed the core group of people with disability included in this study and are elsewhere referred to as the "disability cohort". An additional group of people likely to have a disability was identified through other sources. These included: medical codes in DOMINO for recipients of Job Seeker, Youth Allowance or Parenting payments who have reduced capacity to work (including temporary or ongoing partial capacity); disability-specific diagnosis codes recorded in the National Hospital Morbidity Database; Medicare Benefits Schedule (MBS) item codes for services relating to autism, pervasive developmental disorder, or disability or consultant psychiatrist attendances; disabilities recorded in the NSW Housing data; disability service needs recorded in the Specialist Homelessness Services Collection (SHSC; see Appendix A, Table A1 for more details). Individuals identified as having a disability through these sources alone are referred to as the "other disability identifier" group. Because of the way the Justice Test Case cohort was defined, these data were only useful for identifying additional people who had CJS contact and may have a disability. Missing from the study are individuals who have a disability, but who did not receive a disability-specific service or support and did not have contact with the CJS. Further, there will be some people with a disability who have contact with the CJS but are not identified as having a disability due to an absence of information in the available data and/or the definitions used.

Type/s of disability

People with disability were further classified as having a cognitive, physical and/or psychosocial disability. These indicators, and the broader indicator of disability (described in the previous section) were developed by researchers from Swinburne University in conjunction with the DSS, as part of the Justice Test Case. Some examples of the most common conditions and disorders within each disability type are presented in Box 2. A full list of the data collections, variables and values that contributed to these indicators is included in Appendix A, Table A1.

Box 2. Examples of conditions and disorders by disability type

Condition/Disorder/Disease	Disability type		
	Cognitive	Physical	Psychosocial
Intellectual Disability (mild to profound)	yes		
Traumatic brain injury	yes		
Autism	yes		
Fetal alcohol syndrome	yes	yes	
Down syndrome	yes	yes	
Cerebral palsy		yes	
Visual impairment (including blindness)		yes	
Hearing loss		yes	
Alcohol or other substance dependency			yes
Schizophrenia			yes
Bipolar affective disorder			yes
Major depressive illness			yes
Borderline personality disorder			yes

Some conditions (for example, intellectual disability, autism, and fetal alcohol syndrome) were always considered disabilities and were potentially picked up across all relevant data collections. Others (for example, major depressive illness and borderline personality disorder) were identified/classified as psychosocial disabilities when recorded in disability-specific data collections or as a disability in the NSW Housing data, but were not picked up across all data collections (notably, hospital admissions).

It is important to note that some conditions may have resulted in an individual being classified as having more than one type of disability. For example, a person recorded as having fetal alcohol syndrome was classified as having both a cognitive and a physical disability. Further, in some cases an individual may have been classified as having multiple disability types due to having multiple conditions. For example, a person recorded as having an intellectual disability and hearing loss was classified as having both a cognitive and a physical disability. There were also some individuals who were identified as having a disability without being classified as having any particular type of disability (referred to elsewhere as "unspecified" disability). Most commonly, these individuals received disability services and supports, but no condition/diagnosis details were available.

Victims of crime

Contact with the CJS as a victim of crime was based on NSW Police Force records of victims of criminal incidents.[12] These were incidents that were reported to, or detected by, the NSW Police Force. For most analyses, incidents were also examined by incident type classified according to the following:

- Violent – including incidents of murder, attempted murder, manslaughter, assault, sexual assault, sexual touching, sexual act and other sexual offences, and robbery.

- Domestic violence (DV) related – including incidents of murder, attempted murder, manslaughter, assault, sexual assault, sexual touching, sexual act and other sexual offences, abduction and kidnapping, intimidation, stalking and harassment, malicious damage and breaches of apprehended violence orders (AVOs) where the incident was flagged as being DV-related.[13]

In addition to whether a person with a disability was recorded as the victim of a violent or DV-related incident over the 5-year period from 2014 to 2018, key outcomes included:

- whether a person of interest (POI) was proceeded against in relation to the criminal incident[14]

- whether a victim experienced a subsequent incident, particularly a violent or DV incident, in the 12 months after the index incident was reported to police.

Other characteristics examined in relation to criminal incidents included:

- the number of victims and POIs recorded in the incident

- the number of incidents recorded as part of the event

- the relationship of the POI to the victim:[15]
    - intimate partner (including spouse/partner, ex-spouse/ex-partner, boyfriend/girlfriend, or ex-boyfriend/ex-girlfriend)
    - parent/guardian, child (including step/foster child)
    - other family member (including sibling)
    - other contact (including carer, household member, person in authority)
    - known, but no relationship
    - unknown, not stated/recorded

---

12   Included in this study are incidents reported (i.e., with an event date) up until 31 December 2019. Events could relate to incidents that occurred any time prior.

13   The DV indicator is not a subset of the violent measure. The DV indicator includes a broader range of incidents (abduction and kidnapping, intimidation, stalking and harassment, malicious damage to property and breaches of AVOs), but does not include robbery (which is included in the violent measure).

14   It is important to note that POIs and their outcomes are not directly connected to victims in COPS data; POIs and victims are connected to incidents. Therefore it is possible, particularly in relation to incidents involving multiple victims and/or offenders, that a POI may have been proceeded against in relation to an offence not directly involving a victim.

15   Only one relationship type is recorded for each victim (for incidents where this information is collected). Thus, for incidents involving more than one POI, it is not possible to examine the relationship of each POI to the victim.

- the premises type of the incident (including residential, outdoor or public place, business or commercial premises, licensed premises, education premises, public transport, or other)

- whether alcohol was recorded as an associated factor

- the number of days between the date the incident started and the date the incident was reported to, or detected by, the police (the event date)

- counts of incidents within 5 years prior (total violent and DV-related).

Other data sources

While disability and victim data were the focus of this study, additional data were also used, for descriptive and/or modelling purposes. These additional variables were derived from the following data sources:

- NSW Reoffending Database (ROD)

- Apprehended Violence Order (AVO) data from the NSW Police Force

- National Hospital Morbidity Database (NHMD)

- Pharmaceutical Benefits Scheme (PBS)

- Medicare Benefits Schedule (MBS)

- NSW Housing and Specialist Homelessness Services Collection (SHSC).

Further details are provided in Appendix A (section "Other data sources", Tables A2, A3, A4). Unless otherwise stated, for analyses using the disability cohort sample, priors were based on the 5-year period preceding 2014 (i.e., 2009 to 2013), while analyses using the victims of crime sample were based on the 5-year period preceding the date the incident was reported to, or detected by, the police (i.e., the event date).

Sociodemographic information

Age, sex, Aboriginality, socio-economic indexes for areas (SEIFA; ABS, 2018) and remoteness of residence (ABS, 2011b), based on postcode and/or statistical area of residence, were included in analyses. These sociodemographic characteristics were compiled from the range of data collections available.[16] A more complex approach, referred to as the Multi-Stage Median Algorithm, was used to develop an indicator for Aboriginality. The method is based on looking both within and across datasets for records where an individual was identified as being an Aboriginal person.[17, 18]

Statistical analysis

As previously outlined, analyses were undertaken to examine:

1. factors associated with people with disability being victims of crime, with particular focus on violent and DV-related incidents (according to the definitions previously described);

2. characteristics of criminal incidents relating to people with disability, compared with people with no disability identified;

3. whether persons of interest were more or less likely to be proceeded against in relation to violent and/or DV-related incidents involving people with disability as victims,[19] compared with incidents involving those with no disability identified;

---

16   A hierarchy of data sources was established and rules were created to determine the characteristics, with agreement between sources examined and evaluated.

17   More specifically, if a person has 2 or fewer records containing information on whether they are an Aboriginal person, one of these must indicate that the person is Aboriginal in order for the individual to be classified as Aboriginal within the dataset. If they have more than 2 records, at least 2 records must indicate that a person is Aboriginal. After applying the rule to all datasets, the same rule is then applied across datasets (but with reference to datasets rather than records). For more details see Christensen et al. (2014).

18   Based on advice from the Aboriginal Services Unit within the NSW Department of Communities and Justice, in this report we predominantly use the term "Aboriginal" to denote people elsewhere referred to as "First Nations people", "First Peoples", "Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people".

19   Police may or may not have been aware of whether a victim was a person with disability.

4. whether people with disability who experienced violent and/or DV-related incidents were more or less likely to experience a subsequent violent or DV incident in the 12 months following the index incident, compared to those with no disability identified.

Analyses focused on the 5-year period from 2014 to 2018. For (1), (3) and (4), logistic regression models were developed, incorporating data on disability, sociodemographic details, victimisation and offending histories, and health and housing services (as referred to in the Data Sources/Variables section of the Method, and further described in Appendix A). The purpose was to explore relationships between these factors and the outcomes of interest, with focus on disability and disability type, rather than to determine the best predictors or the most parsimonious model. Relationships are expressed as odds ratios (ORs), where an OR greater than 1 means that an outcome is more likely to have occurred, and an OR less than 1 means that an outcome is less likely to have occurred. More specifically, adjusted ORs are presented, taking into account the effects of other variables included in the model. The area under the receiver operating characteristic curve (AUC) is presented as an indicator of model performance, with values potentially ranging from .5 (no better than chance; no ability to distinguish individuals with vs. those without the outcome of interest) to 1.0 (perfect prediction/accuracy) (Hosmer & Lemeshow, 2004). A more descriptive analysis was undertaken in relation to (2), to compare characteristics of incidents involving people with disability as victims with incidents involving victims with no disability identified.

In relation to (1), age and "prior" variables were derived as at 1 January 2014. For analyses addressing (2), (3) and (4), age and priors were derived as at the date of the event (i.e., the date the incident was recorded by the NSW Police Force). Logistic regression models include only one record per person. For (3) and (4) this was an incident[20] from the earliest event (police report/contact) within the period 2014 to 2018.[21]

All outcomes were also examined separately for Aboriginal people. These results are included in Appendix B.

RESULTS

Factors associated with people with disability being victims of crime

Table 1 presents the characteristics of the disability cohort, as well as the proportions of people in the disability cohort who were victims of a recorded crime, by disability type, type of disability support received, and demographic characteristics. As at 1 January 2014, 542,388 individuals 15 years and over were identified as people with disability, having received NDIS, NMDS, or DSP services and supports during the period 2009 to 2018. Most commonly, people with disability in the cohort had a psychosocial disability (56.9%), followed by a physical disability (52.1%). A quarter of the disability cohort was identified as having a cognitive disability. Two in five individuals had more than one disability type (e.g., most commonly both physical and psychosocial disabilities, 20.3%).

Of those identified as having a disability, 17.0 per cent were recorded as a victim in one or more criminal incidents during the period 2014 to 2018, 6.5 per cent experienced a violent incident and 4.4 per cent experienced a DV-related incident.[22] The proportion of people who experienced a criminal incident ranged from 10.8 per cent of those with unspecified disability only to 23.7 per cent of those with both cognitive and psychosocial disabilities. Similarly, between 2.4 per cent and 12.7 per cent of the disability cohort were victims of a violent incident, and between 1.8 and 7.3 per cent were victims of a DV-related incident (for those with unspecified disability through to those with both cognitive and psychosocial disabilities). Those who were in the DS-NMDS tended to have higher rates of victimisation than those who

---

20 If there were multiple incidents within an event, the most serious was selected (based on the incident category code, which is indicative of seriousness).
21 This contributes to a decline in the number of incidents included per year.
22 The majority of incidents that are not violent or DV-related are property related. Further information on incident type is included in Table 4.

received NDIS supports and the DSP. In terms of demographic characteristics, Aboriginal females had the highest rates of victimisation, with 34.4 per cent recorded as being victims of any crime, 18.0 per cent victims of violent crime, and 18.8 per cent victims of DV-related crime. Aboriginal males also had higher rates of victimisation than non-Aboriginal males and females; 28.7 per cent were victims of any crime, 14.6 per cent victims of violent crime and 8.6 per cent victims of DV-related crime. Rates of victimisation tended to decrease with increasing age, particularly for violent and DV-related crimes. Of those 15 to 19 years of age, 22.5 per cent were recorded as victims during the 5-year period, 13.3 per cent were recorded in violent incidents and 7.8 per cent in DV-related incidents. In comparison, of those aged 60 to 69 years, 9.6 per cent were recorded as victims during the period, 1.9 per cent were recorded in violent incidents and 1.4 per cent in DV-related incidents.

Table 1. Victims of crime: people with disability aged 15 years and over (N=542,388), by disability type, type of support and demographic characteristics, 2014–2018

| | Disability cohort | | Type of incident | | | | | |
| | | | Any | | Violent | | DV-related | |
	N	per cent (col)	n	per cent (row)	n	per cent (row)	n	per cent (row)
Total	542,388	100.00	92,370	17.03	35,441	6.53	23,681	4.37
Disability type								
Cognitive	139,198	25.66	26,271	18.87	12,368	8.89	7,319	5.26
Physical	282,611	52.10	48,359	17.11	18,031	6.38	12,402	4.39
Psychosocial	308,802	56.93	63,271	20.49	26,919	8.72	17,872	5.79
Combinations of disability type								
Cognitive only	23,505	4.33	4,286	18.23	1,942	8.26	1,135	4.83
Physical only	84,780	15.63	10,600	12.50	2,620	3.09	2,008	2.37
Psychosocial only	122,010	22.49	23,799	19.51	9,872	8.09	6,539	5.36
Cognitive & Physical	38,846	7.16	4,865	12.52	1,886	4.86	1,086	2.80
Cognitive & Psychosocial	27,807	5.13	6,578	23.66	3,522	12.67	2,025	7.28
Physical & Psychosocial	109,945	20.27	22,352	20.33	8,507	7.74	6,235	5.67
Cognitive & Physical & Psychosocial	49,040	9.04	10,542	21.50	5,018	10.23	3,073	6.27
Unspecified only	86,455	15.94	9,348	10.81	2,074	2.40	1,580	1.83
Disability support/service								
DSP	440,783	81.27	72,266	16.39	26,985	6.12	17,931	4.07
DS-NMDS	199,681	36.82	39,232	19.65	17,013	8.52	10,798	5.41
NDIS	57,943	10.68	8,981	15.50	4,313	7.44	2,274	3.92
Sex/Aboriginality								
Female/Non-Aboriginal	227,705	41.98	35,385	15.54	12,687	5.57	11,382	5.00
Female/Aboriginal	17,825	3.29	6,135	34.42	3,211	18.01	3,348	18.78
Male/Non-Aboriginal	275,100	50.72	44,600	16.21	16,372	5.95	7,090	2.58
Male/Aboriginal	21,758	4.01	6,250	28.73	3,171	14.57	1,861	8.55
Age group at 31/12/2013 (years)								
15–19	28,335	5.22	6,369	22.48	3,764	13.28	2,208	7.79
20–29	55,361	10.21	12,450	22.49	6,211	11.22	3,928	7.10
30–39	63,093	11.63	15,422	24.44	7,057	11.19	4,746	7.52
40–49	99,697	18.38	21,738	21.80	8,850	8.88	6,184	6.20
50–59	146,989	27.10	22,067	15.01	6,678	4.54	4,545	3.09
60–69	148,913	27.46	14,324	9.62	2,881	1.93	2,070	1.39

Note. DSP – Disability Support Pension; DS-NMDS – Disability Services National Minimum Dataset; NDIS – National Disability Insurance Scheme. People may have more than one disability type and can receive more than one disability support – percentages do not add up to 100.

A table with additional characteristics, including variables relating to previous offending and victimisation, and health-related contacts, is included in Appendix B (see Table B1).

The number of incidents per person is presented in Table 2. Of those in the disability cohort who were victims of crime over the 5-year period, almost 3 in 5 had one recorded incident, almost 20 per cent had two, and just over 20 per cent had three or more recorded incidents.[23] In relation to violent incidents, almost 90 per cent of individuals had 1–2 incidents during the period. However, of those who experienced a DV-related incident, over one quarter had 3 or more recorded incidents, and 11 per cent had 5 or more recorded incidents during the 5-year period.

Table 2. Number of criminal incidents per person: people with disability aged 15 years and over who were victims of crime, 2014–2018

	Type of incident					
	Any (N = 92,370)		Violent (N = 35,441)		DV-related (N = 23,681)	
Number of incidents per person	n	per cent (col)	n	per cent (col)	n	per cent (col)
1	53,711	58.15	25,163	71.00	13,040	55.07
2	17,868	19.34	6,088	17.18	4,586	19.37
3	7,976	8.63	2,094	5.91	2,194	9.26
4	4,198	4.54	981	2.77	1,235	5.22
5+	8,617	9.33	1,115	3.15	2,626	11.09

Presented in Table 3 are results from logistic regression models examining factors associated with whether people with disability were victims of violent and DV-related crime. Full models are included in Appendix B, Table B2. The results confirm the patterns shown in Table 1: those who were female, Aboriginal, and of younger age were more likely to be recorded as victims of violent and DV-related incidents during the 5-year period. Further, while effects of disability type/s weren't large, those with cognitive disabilities only and those with psychosocial disabilities, with or without cognitive and/or physical disabilities, were more likely to be victims of violent and DV-related incidents than those with other disability types.

Findings for Aboriginal people are included in Appendix B, Table B3 and findings for those who didn't have any prior violent or DV-related incidents recorded during the period 2009 to 2013 are included in Appendix B, Table B4. These subgroup analyses show results which are generally consistent with the overall analyses.

---

23   Multiple incidents may have been recorded at the same time and included in the same event.

Table 3. Relationships between disability type/s, selected demographic characteristics and whether people with disability (N=542,388) were victims of violent or domestic violence related crime, 2014–2018

	Violent			DV-related		
	Adjusted odds ratio	95% confidence interval	*p*	Adjusted odds ratio	95% confidence interval	*p*
Type of disability (vs. physical only)	1.000			1.000		
Cognitive only	1.419	(1.328, 1.517)	<.001	1.153	(1.063, 1.251)	.001
Psychosocial only	1.354	(1.290, 1.422)	<.001	1.183	(1.118, 1.252)	<.001
Cognitive & Physical	1.164	(1.092, 1.240)	<.001	0.901	(0.833, 0.975)	.009
Cognitive & Psychosocial	1.531	(1.441, 1.626)	<.001	1.278	(1.189, 1.375)	<.001
Physical & Psychosocial	1.413	(1.346, 1.483)	<.001	1.295	(1.224, 1.369)	<.001
Cognitive & Physical & Psychosocial	1.599	(1.516, 1.687)	<.001	1.304	(1.224, 1.390)	<.001
Unspecified only	0.944	(0.889, 1.003)	.061	0.963	(0.898, 1.031)	.280
Sex/Aboriginality (vs. Male/Non-Aboriginal)	1.000			1.000		
Female/Non-Aboriginal	1.035	(1.008, 1.063)	.012	2.082	(2.013, 2.153)	<.001
Female/Aboriginal	1.681	(1.599, 1.766)	<.001	4.020	(3.814, 4.236)	<.001
Male/Aboriginal	1.265	(1.208, 1.326)	<.001	1.690	(1.594, 1.791)	<.001
Age group at 31/12/2013 (vs. 60–69 years)	1.000			1.000		
15–19	4.385	(4.138, 4.648)	<.001	3.953	(3.684, 4.242)	<.001
20–29	2.941	(2.793, 3.096)	<.001	2.789	(2.622, 2.967)	<.001
30–39	2.794	(2.660, 2.934)	<.001	2.713	(2.559, 2.876)	<.001
40–49	2.417	(2.308, 2.532)	<.001	2.321	(2.197, 2.452)	<.001
50–59	1.685	(1.609, 1.764)	<.001	1.566	(1.483, 1.654)	<.001

Note. The effects shown are from models that included disability type/s, sex, Aboriginality and age group, and a range of additional factors relating to area of residence, prior victimisation, offending and apprehended violence orders, hospitalisations, Pharmaceutical Benefits Scheme and Medicare Benefits Schedule records, housing and homelessness. Full models are included in Table B2 of the Appendix.

Characteristics of criminal incidents involving people with disability as victims

In the previous section we examined factors associated with whether people with disability were victims of crime. Here we examine all criminal incidents and look at the number and characteristics of incidents that involved people with disability as victims. Overall, there were 1,495,112 criminal incidents recorded during the period 2014 to 2018, relating to 890,138 victims. Nearly 11 per cent of victims were identified as people with disability as per the cohort definition (i.e., they had received disability supports through the DSP, DS-NMDS, or NDIS); 14 per cent of incidents involved these people with disability as victims. An additional 7 per cent of victims were identified as having a disability from other datasets. These victims were associated with an additional 10 per cent of incidents. Thus, we estimate that between 11 and 18 per cent of victims of crime were people with disability and between 14 and 24 per cent of criminal incidents (where a victim was recorded) involved people with disability as victims.

Shown in Table 4 are characteristics of victims and incidents, according to whether the incident involved a victim identified as having a disability, either in the disability cohort or through other disability indicators. In around 47 per cent of incidents that involved a victim who was an Aboriginal person, the victim was identified as being a person with disability; this compares with 23 per cent of incidents where the victim was a non-Aboriginal person. Similarly, victims residing in regional areas and areas of greater socioeconomic disadvantage, were more likely to have a disability than victims in major cities and less disadvantaged areas. Incident characteristics were generally similar regardless of the disability status of victims. However, incidents involving people with disability were more often violent and DV-related, while incidents involving people with no disability identified were more commonly property incidents, such as steal from motor vehicle and fraud. In part reflecting these incident types, a greater proportion of incidents involving people with disability as victims had alcohol recorded as an associated factor, took place on residential premises, and had a person of interest (POI) recorded. Around 90 per cent of incidents had only one victim recorded, and almost 90 per cent of incidents were recorded by police within 7 days of the incident start date.

Table 4. Characteristics of victim incidents, by disability flag, 2014–2018

		Total		Disability cohort		Other disability identifier		No disability identified	
		n	per cent (col)	n	per cent (row)	n	per cent (row)	n	per cent (row)
Total victims	n (row %)	890,138	100.00	96,112	10.80	63,614	7.15	730,412	82.06
Total incidents	n (row %)	1,495,112	100.00	207,828	13.90	151,400	10.13	1,135,884	75.97
Year of event/report	2014	314,129	21.01	45,110	14.36	30,682	9.77	238,337	75.87
	2015	303,776	20.32	42,852	14.11	30,648	10.09	230,276	75.80
	2016	300,108	20.07	42,016	14.00	31,068	10.35	227,024	75.65
	2017	291,074	19.47	39,437	13.55	29,625	10.18	222,012	76.27
	2018	286,025	19.13	38,413	13.43	29,377	10.27	218,235	76.30
Sex	Female	750,556	50.20	104,697	13.95	95,029	12.66	550,830	73.39
	Male	744,556	49.80	103,131	13.85	56,371	7.57	585,054	78.58
Aboriginality	Non-Aboriginal	1282021	85.75	168,737	13.16	117,965	9.20	995,319	77.64
	Aboriginal	153,813	10.29	38,759	25.20	32,871	21.37	82,183	53.43
	Unknown	59,278	3.96	332	0.56	564	0.95	58,382	98.49
Sex/Aboriginality	Female/Non-Aboriginal	648,772	43.39	81,859	12.62	71,694	11.05	495,219	76.33
	Female/Aboriginal	101,784	6.81	22,838	22.44	23,335	22.93	55,611	54.64
	Male/Non-Aboriginal	692,527	46.32	87,210	12.59	46,835	6.76	558,482	80.64
	Male/Aboriginal	52,029	3.48	15,921	30.60	9,536	18.33	26,572	51.07
Age group at event (years)	10–19	143,086	9.57	13,668	9.55	20,973	14.66	108,445	75.79
	20–29	347,932	23.27	30,975	8.90	36,916	10.61	280,041	80.49
	30–39	355,201	23.76	35,847	10.09	39,039	10.99	280,315	78.92
	40–49	304,552	20.37	49,939	16.40	30,976	10.17	223,637	73.43
	50–59	210,070	14.05	45,393	21.61	14,612	6.96	150,065	71.44
	60–74	134,271	8.98	32,006	23.84	8,884	6.62	93,381	69.55
Remoteness of residence	Major City	1031842	69.01	124,924	12.11	98,606	9.56	808,312	78.34
	Inner Regional	325,841	21.79	59,633	18.30	37,734	11.58	228,474	70.12
	Outer Regional	98,599	6.59	17,412	17.66	10,695	10.85	70,492	71.49
	Remote/Very Remote	15,970	1.07	2,357	14.76	1,554	9.73	12,059	75.51
	Unknown	22,860	1.53	3,502	15.32	2,811	12.30	16,547	72.38

Table 4. Characteristics of victim incidents, by disability flag, 2014–2018 (continued)

		Total		Disability cohort		Other disability identifier		No disability identified	
		n	per cent (col)	n	per cent (row)	n	per cent (row)	n	per cent (row)
SEIFA quartile of disadvantage of residence	q1 - Most disadvantaged	379,534	25.38	67,626	17.82	49,782	13.12	262,126	69.07
	q2	400,146	26.76	67,196	16.79	45,192	11.29	287,758	71.91
	q3	398,258	26.64	50,542	12.69	38,182	9.59	309,534	77.72
	q4 - Least disadvantaged	293,673	19.64	18,907	6.44	15,395	5.24	259,371	88.32
	Unknown	23,501	1.57	3,557	15.14	2,849	12.12	17,095	72.74
Property incident	Yes	708,726	47.40	72,456	10.22	44,311	6.25	591,959	83.52
Violent incident	Yes	342,549	22.91	61,212	17.87	51,625	15.07	229,712	67.06
DV-flagged incident	Yes	315,031	21.07	56,173	17.83	56,371	17.89	202,487	64.28
Incident type	Murder, manslaughter	441	0.03	118	26.76	60	13.61	263	59.64
	DV-related assault	138,669	9.27	24,442	17.63	24,908	17.96	89,319	64.41
	Non-DV-related assault	148,426	9.93	26,621	17.94	18,327	12.35	103,478	69.72
	Sexual assault	19,725	1.32	4,576	23.20	3,783	19.18	11,366	57.62
	Other sexual offences	22,936	1.53	3,436	14.98	3,140	13.69	16,360	71.33
	Intimidation, stalking & harassment	138,456	9.26	22,077	15.95	18,310	13.22	98,069	70.83
	Abduction & kidnapping, blackmail, other offences	7,616	0.51	1,007	13.22	976	12.82	5,633	73.96
	Break and enter	155,125	10.38	19,642	12.66	11,468	7.39	124,015	79.95
	Motor vehicle theft	55,547	3.72	6,928	12.47	4,459	8.03	44,160	79.50
	Steal from motor vehicle	169,724	11.35	12,140	7.15	8,577	5.05	149,007	87.79
	Steal from dwelling	83,006	5.55	13,786	16.61	6,617	7.97	62,603	75.42
	Steal from person	20,073	1.34	3,089	15.39	1,996	9.94	14,988	74.67
	Fraud	135,815	9.08	8,594	6.33	5,779	4.26	121,442	89.42
	Other theft	89,436	5.98	8,277	9.25	5,415	6.05	75,744	84.69
	Arson	12,213	0.82	2,035	16.66	1,240	10.15	8,938	73.18
	Malicious damage to property	196,563	13.15	32,036	16.30	19,876	10.11	144,651	73.59
	Trespass & criminal intent	25,692	1.72	4,006	15.59	2,507	9.76	19,179	74.65
	Breach AVO	63,297	4.23	12,999	20.54	12,555	19.84	37,743	59.63

Table 4. Characteristics of victim incidents, by disability flag, 2014–2018 (continued)

		Total		Disability cohort		Other disability identifier		No disability identified	
		n	per cent (col)	n	per cent (row)	n	per cent (row)	n	per cent (row)
POI relationship to victim	Intimate partner	70,783	4.73	9,622	13.59	12,457	17.60	48,704	68.81
	Child/parent	29,356	1.96	6,152	20.96	4,483	15.27	18,721	63.77
	Other family	31,481	2.11	6,362	20.21	5,157	16.38	19,962	63.41
	Other	15,118	1.01	3,839	25.39	2,007	13.28	9,272	61.33
	Known, no relationship	102,024	6.82	22,905	22.45	15,513	15.21	63,606	62.34
	Unknown, not stated/recorded	1,246,350	83.36	158,948	12.75	111,783	8.97	975,619	78.28
Number of victims in incident	1	1322912	88.48	188,317	14.24	135,541	10.25	999,054	75.52
	2	134,720	9.01	15,923	11.82	12,700	9.43	106,097	78.75
	3+	37,480	2.51	3,588	9.57	3,159	8.43	30,733	82.00
Number of POIs in incident	0	809,325	54.13	93,367	11.54	56,219	6.95	659,739	81.52
	1	617,775	41.32	103,941	16.83	86,512	14.00	427,322	69.17
	2+	68,012	4.55	10,520	15.47	8,669	12.75	48,823	71.79
Whether alcohol flagged	Yes	180,063	12.04	32,718	18.17	24,239	13.46	123,106	68.37
Days between incident start and event dates	0–1	1123684	75.16	161,298	14.35	119,673	10.65	842,713	75.00
	2–7	187,982	12.57	23,612	12.56	15,159	8.06	149,211	79.38
	8–30	83,970	5.62	9,825	11.70	6,567	7.82	67,578	80.48
	31–365	60,166	4.02	6,946	11.54	5,265	8.75	47,955	79.70
	366+	18,259	1.22	3,449	18.89	2,417	13.24	12,393	67.87
	Unknown/missing	21,051	1.41	2,698	12.82	2,319	11.02	16,034	76.17
Type of premises	Residential	882,348	59.02	145,972	16.54	103,428	11.72	632,948	71.73
	Outdoor/public place	249,609	16.70	29,901	11.98	22,770	9.12	196,938	78.90
	Business/commercial	148,517	9.93	10,437	7.03	8,357	5.63	129,723	87.35
	Education	20,400	1.36	1,410	6.91	1,753	8.59	17,237	84.50
	Licensed premises	44,753	2.99	3,891	8.69	3,127	6.99	37,735	84.32
	Public transport	20,774	1.39	2,764	13.31	2,058	9.91	15,952	76.79
	Other	128,711	8.61	13,453	10.45	9,907	7.70	105,351	81.85

Note. DV – domestic violence; AVO – apprehended violence order; POI – person of interest. Relationship type "Unknown, not stated/recorded" includes property incidents and breach apprehended violence orders where relationship type isn't recorded, as well as other incidents where a POI was not identified and/or the relationship type was not stated.

Factors associated with whether a person of interest is proceeded against in relation to violent and DV-related incidents

In this section we examine whether persons of interest were more or less likely to be proceeded against when incidents involved victims with disability, relative to incidents involving victims with no disability identified. For these analyses, the first contact with police (i.e., a police event) during the period is included, with a focus on violent and DV-related incidents.[24] Incidents are included regardless of whether a POI was identified.[25] Further, it is important to note that when a POI was identified, POI characteristics (e.g., criminal history) have not been taken into account in these analyses.

In 42 per cent of violent incidents and 57 per cent of DV incidents included in these analyses, a POI was proceeded against. Tables 5 and 6 present percentages, by a range of factors, including whether a victim was a person with disability.[26] Firstly, focusing on violent incidents, shown in Table 5, 38 per cent of incidents involving people in the disability cohort, 42 per cent involving other people with disability, and 43 per cent of those with no disability identified resulted in a POI being proceeded against. Percentages were lower for incidents involving victims with cognitive disabilities (alone or in combination with other disability types) versus those with physical and/or psychosocial, or unspecified disabilities. POIs were more likely to be proceeded against in relation to incidents involving female victims than male victims, and when victims were both female and an Aboriginal person. There was little variation by victim age, however, a POI was less likely to be proceeded against when an incident involved a victim 10–19 years of age. There was a tendency for a greater proportion of POIs to be proceeded against when victims resided in regional and remote areas, compared with major cities. Results by socioeconomic disadvantage were less clear. In 62 per cent of incidents involving DV assault, a POI was proceeded against; POIs were much less likely to be proceeded against in relation to other types of incidents, apart from murder and manslaughter. POIs were more likely to be proceeded against when incidents involved 3 or more victims, when more than one incident was reported as part of the same event, and when the incident was reported (or detected) close to the incident start date. A POI was less likely to be proceeded against when a victim had a criminal history, particularly a prior custodial episode, or had been an AVO defendant. Results in relation to prior health and housing services were mixed. POIs tended to be less likely to be proceeded against when a victim had a history of mental health contacts and services.

---

24   That is, first violent contacts and first DV contacts within the period are included for each person.

25   A POI may not be known/identified in some incidents, particularly more general, non DV-related violent incidents. In 19 per cent of violent incidents and 1 per cent of domestic violence incidents, no POI was identified/recorded.

26   According to the linked data we had access to, not necessarily identified/known by the police.

Table 5. Factors associated with whether persons of interest are proceeded against in violent incidents

		Violent		Violent - proceeded against				
		n	per cent (col)	n	per cent (row)	Adjusted odds ratio	95% confidence interval	p
Total		244,521	100.00	103,818	42.46			
Disability	No disability identified	175,575	71.80	76,388	43.51	1.000		
	Disability cohort	38,695	15.82	14,703	38.00	0.831	(0.808, 0.856)	<.001
	Other disability identifier	30,251	12.37	12,727	42.07	0.904	(0.877, 0.931)	<.001
Type of disability	No disability identified	175,575	71.80	76,388	43.51	1.000		
	Cognitive only	4,526	1.85	1,540	34.03	0.830	(0.775, 0.888)	<.001
	Physical only	5,930	2.43	2,608	43.98	0.923	(0.871, 0.978)	.007
	Psychosocial only	27,798	11.37	11,514	41.42	0.886	(0.858, 0.915)	<.001
	Cognitive & Physical	2,726	1.11	889	32.61	0.680	(0.623, 0.743)	<.001
	Cognitive & Psychosocial	6,023	2.46	2,004	33.27	0.836	(0.786, 0.889)	<.001
	Physical & Psychosocial	12,392	5.07	5,235	42.24	0.896	(0.857, 0.936)	<.001
	Cognitive & Physical & Psychosocial	6,121	2.50	2,060	33.65	0.762	(0.716, 0.810)	<.001
	Unspecified only	3,430	1.40	1,580	46.06	0.967	(0.897, 1.044)	.392
Year of event	2014	60,527	24.75	24,797	40.97	1.000		
	2015	51,257	20.96	21,713	42.36	1.076	(1.048, 1.105)	<.001
	2016	47,133	19.28	20,165	42.78	1.112	(1.082, 1.143)	<.001
	2017	44,362	18.14	19,053	42.95	1.150	(1.119, 1.183)	<.001
	2018	41,242	16.87	18,090	43.86	1.175	(1.141, 1.209)	<.001
Sex/Aboriginality	Male/Non-Aboriginal	112,051	45.82	42,239	37.70	1.000		
	Female/Non-Aboriginal	101,794	41.63	48,055	47.21	1.132	(1.108, 1.157)	<.001
	Female/Aboriginal	17,542	7.17	8,826	50.31	1.147	(1.102, 1.194)	<.001
	Male/Aboriginal	13,134	5.37	4,698	35.77	0.933	(0.894, 0.974)	.001
Age group at event (years)	10–19	49,043	20.06	16,322	33.28	0.934	(0.892, 0.978)	.004
	20–29	63,420	25.94	27,980	44.12	1.108	(1.060, 1.158)	<.001
	30–39	51,528	21.07	23,487	45.58	1.089	(1.042, 1.139)	<.001
	40–49	42,249	17.28	19,196	45.44	1.100	(1.051, 1.150)	<.001
	50–59	25,793	10.55	11,416	44.26	1.092	(1.042, 1.145)	<.001
	60–74	12,488	5.11	5,417	43.38	1.000		
Remoteness of residence	Major City	166,965	68.28	69,213	41.45	1.000		
	Inner Regional	53,082	21.71	23,649	44.55	1.226	(1.198, 1.255)	<.001
	Outer Regional	16,260	6.65	7,536	46.35	1.251	(1.204, 1.299)	<.001
	Remote/Very Remote	2,446	1.00	1,244	50.86	1.349	(1.233, 1.476)	<.001
	Unknown	5,768	2.36	2,176	37.73	1.459	(0.931, 2.287)	.100
SEIFA quartile of disadvantage of residence	q1 - Most disadvantaged	66,392	27.15	29,594	44.57	1.000		
	q2	66,665	27.26	28,554	42.83	0.953	(0.930, 0.976)	<.001
	q3	63,471	25.96	26,172	41.23	0.964	(0.940, 0.989)	.004
	q4 - Least disadvantaged	42,121	17.23	17,288	41.04	1.049	(1.019, 1.080)	.001
	Unknown	5,872	2.40	2,210	37.64	0.716	(0.459, 1.119)	.143
Incident category	DV-related assault	91,498	37.42	56,738	62.01	1.000		
	Non-DV-related assault	115,484	47.23	37,566	32.53	0.337	(0.327, 0.348)	<.001
	Murder, manslaughter, attempted murder	361	0.15	267	73.96	2.224	(1.743, 2.837)	<.001
	Sexual assault	11,806	4.83	2,050	17.36	0.162	(0.152, 0.172)	<.001
	Sexual touching, sexual act & other sexual offences	15,554	6.36	3,581	23.02	0.244	(0.232, 0.256)	<.001
	Robbery	9,818	4.02	3,616	36.83	0.474	(0.451, 0.499)	<.001

Table 5. Factors associated with whether persons of interest are proceeded against in violent incidents (continued)

		Violent		Violent - proceeded against				
		n	per cent (col)	n	per cent (row)	Adjusted odds ratio	95% confidence interval	p
Relationship of POI to victim	Intimate partner	35,086	14.35	22,378	63.78	1.000		
	Child/parent	16,496	6.75	9,325	56.53	0.917	(0.880, 0.957)	<.001
	Other family	17,884	7.31	9,337	52.21	0.872	(0.837, 0.908)	<.001
	Other	8,769	3.59	4,114	46.92	1.047	(0.992, 1.104)	.093
	Known, no relationship	58,129	23.77	19,544	33.62	1.073	(1.031, 1.117)	.001
	Unknown, not stated/recorded	108,157	44.23	39,120	36.17	0.920	(0.887, 0.953)	<.001
Number of victims in incident	1	204,916	83.80	89,772	43.81	1.000		
	2	30,059	12.29	10,045	33.42	0.637	(0.620, 0.655)	<.001
	3+	9,546	3.90	4,001	41.91	1.104	(1.056, 1.154)	<.001
Number of incidents per person per event	1	202,686	82.89	72,859	35.95	1.000		
	2+	41,835	17.11	30,959	74.00	3.982	(3.883, 4.084)	<.001
Days between incident start and event	0–1	210,717	86.18	92,595	43.94	1.000		
	2–7	12,598	5.15	4,306	34.18	0.644	(0.617, 0.672)	<.001
	8–30	5,173	2.12	1,726	33.37	0.564	(0.528, 0.603)	<.001
	31–365	6,031	2.47	1,739	28.83	0.506	(0.473, 0.541)	<.001
	366+	6,538	2.67	1,740	26.61	0.872	(0.814, 0.935)	<.001
	Unknown/missing	3,464	1.42	1,712	49.42	1.225	(1.139, 1.318)	<.001
Priors within 5 years								
Any victim incident, yes vs. no		91,307	37.34	41,032	44.94	0.983	(0.960, 1.007)	.158
Any victim incident with POI proceeded against, yes vs. no		32,620	13.34	16,976	52.04	1.376	(1.328, 1.425)	<.001
Violent/DV victim incident, yes vs. no		37,790	15.45	16,904	44.73	0.978	(0.946, 1.011)	.184
AVO PINOP, yes vs. no		27,977	11.44	14,556	39.55	0.944	(0.912, 0.978)	.001
AVO Defendant, yes vs. no		25,474	10.42	10,001	33.83	0.889	(0.858, 0.921)	<.001
ROD, any contact, yes vs. no		60,332	24.67	23,862	52.03	0.849	(0.827, 0.872)	<.001
Any custodial episode, yes vs. no		18,186	7.44	6,152	39.26	0.840	(0.806, 0.876)	<.001
Emergency department presentation, yes vs. no		160,376	65.59	67,342	41.99	0.964	(0.945, 0.983)	<.001
Hospitalisation, alcohol & drug-related, yes vs. no		18,965	7.76	7,337	38.69	1.029	(0.990, 1.071)	.145
Hospitalisation, mental health related, yes vs. no		22,430	9.17	8,353	37.24	0.873	(0.841, 0.905)	<.001
PBS, mental health related medications, yes vs. no		100,010	40.90	42,442	42.44	0.966	(0.945, 0.989)	.003
MBS, mental health related consultations, yes vs. no		107,430	43.93	44,856	41.75	0.902	(0.883, 0.922)	<.001
Flag for housing services, yes vs. no		34,764	14.22	14,802	42.58	0.967	(0.940, 0.994)	.019
Flag for homelessness services, yes vs. no		28,904	11.82	13,166	45.55	1.015	(0.984, 1.046)	.347
							AUC = 0.7326	

Note. DV – domestic violence; POI – person of interest; AVO – apprehended violence order; PINOP – person in need of protection; PBS – Pharmaceutical Benefits Scheme; MBS – Medicare Benefits Schedule. Disability and type of disability were not included in the models at the same time. The effects shown for other characteristics are from models where type of disability was included. Relationship type "Unknown, not stated/recorded" includes property incidents and breach apprehended violence orders where relationship type isn't recorded, as well as other incidents where a POI was not identified and/or the relationship type was not stated.

A similar pattern was seen for DV-related incidents, shown in Table 6. In 56 per cent of DV-related incidents involving people in the disability cohort and 58 per cent of incidents involving victims with other or no identified disabilities, a POI was proceeded against. Percentages ranged from 51 per cent of incidents involving victims with cognitive and physical disabilities through to 59–60 per cent when incidents involved victims with unspecified or physical disabilities only. Percentages were higher for incidents involving victims who were Aboriginal and female, and lower for incidents with male victims. A POI was more likely to be proceeded against with increasing victim age. There was a tendency for a greater proportion of POIs to be proceeded against when victims resided in areas of most socioeconomic disadvantage, and inner regional areas. In 75 per cent of incidents involving actual/grievous bodily harm and 72 per cent of incidents involving murder, manslaughter, abduction and kidnapping and 70 per cent of incidents involving breach of an apprehended domestic violence order, a POI was proceeded against. POIs were less likely to be proceeded against in relation to other types of incidents. POIs were more likely to be proceeded against when there were 3 or more victims. As with violent incidents, a POI was more likely to be proceeded against when there were two or more incidents recorded as part of the same event (82% vs. 50% for 1 incident), and when an incident was reported (or detected) close to the incident commencing. POIs tended to be less likely to be proceeded against when a victim had a history of mental health contacts and services, and more likely to be proceeded against for DV-related incidents when a victim had prior contacts with housing and homelessness services.

.

Table 6. Factors associated with whether persons of interest are proceeded against in DV-related incidents

		DV-related		DV-related - proceeded against				
		n	per cent (col)	n	per cent (row)	Adjusted odds ratio	95% confidence interval	p
Total		148,902	100.00	85,443	57.38			
Disability	No disability identified	102,436	83.43	59,086	57.68	1.000		
	Disability cohort	24,677	16.57	13,794	55.90	0.959	(0.926, 0.993)	.018
	Other disability identifier	21,789	14.63	12,563	57.66	1.006	(0.972, 1.041)	.726
Type of disability	No disability identified	102,436	68.79	59,086	57.68	1.000		
	Cognitive only	2,347	1.58	1,237	52.71	0.931	(0.851, 1.017)	.114
	Physical only	4,238	2.85	2,515	59.34	1.032	(0.964, 1.105)	.359
	Psychosocial only	19,844	13.33	11,434	57.62	1.009	(0.972, 1.047)	.639
	Cognitive & Physical	1,478	0.99	752	50.88	0.795	(0.711, 0.889)	<.001
	Cognitive & Psychosocial	3,173	2.13	1,668	52.57	0.952	(0.879, 1.030)	.219
	Physical & Psychosocial	9,067	6.09	5,263	58.05	0.999	(0.950, 1.051)	.973
	Cognitive & Physical & Psychosocial	3,598	2.42	1,865	51.83	0.896	(0.832, 0.965)	.004
	Unspecified only	2,721	1.83	1,623	59.65	1.003	(0.921, 1.091)	.949
Year of event	2014	38,017	25.53	21,083	55.46	1.000		
	2015	30,933	20.77	17,388	56.21	1.081	(1.046, 1.117)	<.001
	2016	28,036	18.83	16,307	58.16	1.181	(1.141, 1.222)	<.001
	2017	26,208	17.60	15,396	58.75	1.257	(1.213, 1.302)	<.001
	2018	25,708	17.27	15,269	59.39	1.290	(1.244, 1.338)	<.001
Sex/Aboriginality	Male/Non-Aboriginal	41,159	27.64	21,430	52.07	1.000		
	Female/Non-Aboriginal	84,181	56.53	50,036	59.44	1.384	(1.346, 1.423)	<.001
	Female/Aboriginal	16,800	11.28	10,472	62.33	1.474	(1.411, 1.540)	<.001
	Male/Aboriginal	6,762	4.54	3,505	51.83	1.006	(0.949, 1.065)	.848
Age group at event (years)	10–19	19,998	13.43	11,148	55.75	0.888	(0.838, 0.942)	<.001
	20–29	37,812	25.39	21,922	57.98	0.831	(0.787, 0.877)	<.001
	30–39	35,370	23.75	20,007	56.56	0.775	(0.734, 0.818)	<.001
	40–49	30,060	20.19	16,983	56.50	0.792	(0.750, 0.836)	<.001
	50–59	16,992	11.41	10,063	59.22	0.896	(0.847, 0.949)	<.001
	60–74	8,670	5.82	5,320	61.36	1.000		
Remoteness of residence	Major City	98,736	66.31	56,145	56.86	1.000		
	Inner Regional	34,846	23.40	20,535	58.93	1.088	(1.057, 1.119)	<.001
	Outer Regional	11,112	7.46	6,305	56.74	0.914	(0.873, 0.957)	<.001
	Remote/Very Remote	1,814	1.22	1,091	60.14	0.924	(0.831, 1.027)	.141
	Unknown	2,394	1.61	1,367	57.10	0.707	(0.388, 1.288)	.257
SEIFA quartile of disadvantage of residence	q1 - Most disadvantaged	44,180	29.67	26,409	59.78	1.000		
	q2	43,324	29.10	24,637	56.87	0.890	(0.865, 0.917)	<.001
	q3	37,326	25.07	20,699	55.45	0.860	(0.833, 0.887)	<.001
	q4 - Least disadvantaged	21,624	14.52	12,295	56.86	0.962	(0.927, 0.999)	.044
	Unknown	2,448	1.64	1,403	57.31	1.357	(0.749, 2.458)	.314
Incident category	Common assault	69,232	46.50	39,267	43.28	1.000		
	Actual/grievous bodily harm	22,476	15.09	16,922	75.29	2.616	(2.524, 2.711)	<.001
	Murder, manslaughter, attempted murder, abduction & kidnapping	181	0.12	130	71.82	2.557	(1.827, 3.580)	<.001
	Sexual assault	2,354	1.58	773	32.84	0.584	(0.529, 0.645)	<.001

Table 6. Factors associated with whether persons of interest are proceeded against in DV-related incidents (continued)

		DV-related		DV-related - proceeded against				
		n	per cent (col)	n	per cent (row)	Adjusted odds ratio	95% confidence interval	p
Incident category (cont'd)	Sexual touching, sexual act & other sexual offences	1,328	0.89	564	42.47	0.874	(0.774, 0.987)	.029
	Intimidation, stalking & harassment	31,452	21.12	14,612	46.46	0.776	(0.752, 0.800)	<.001
	Malicious damage to property	16,354	10.98	9,282	56.76	1.512	(1.448, 1.579)	<.001
	Breach AVO	5,525	3.71	3,893	70.46	2.935	(2.741, 3.143)	<.001
Relationship of POI to victim	Intimate partner	40,257	27.04	24,745	61.47	1.000		
	Child/parent	18,444	12.39	10,868	58.92	0.963	(0.924, 1.003)	.070
	Other family	20,608	13.84	11,402	55.33	0.889	(0.855, 0.924)	<.001
	Other	6,681	4.49	3,708	55.50	0.934	(0.882, 0.989)	.020
	Known, no relationship	5,238	3.52	2,941	56.15	1.021	(0.958, 1.089)	.519
	Unknown, not stated/recorded	57,674	38.73	31,779	55.10	0.781	(0.756, 0.808)	<.001
Number of victims in incident	1	122,903	82.54	72,798	59.23	1.000		
	2	20,048	13.46	9,156	45.67	0.676	(0.655, 0.699)	<.001
	3+	5,951	4.00	3,489	58.63	1.258	(1.189, 1.332)	<.001
Number of incidents per person per event	1	115,626	77.65	58,085	50.24	1.000		
	2+	33,276	22.35	27,358	82.22	4.911	(4.756, 5.071)	<.001
Days between incident start and event	0–1	127,495	85.62	75,507	59.22	1.000		
	2–7	8,474	5.69	4,172	49.23	0.587	(0.559, 0.616)	<.001
	8–30	4,329	2.91	1,965	45.39	0.485	(0.453, 0.520)	<.001
	31–365	4,360	2.93	1,751	40.16	0.378	(0.353, 0.406)	<.001
	366+	1,998	1.34	721	36.09	0.366	(0.328, 0.408)	<.001
	Unknown/missing	2,246	1.51	1,327	59.08	0.910	(0.831, 0.997)	.043
Priors within 5 years								
Any victim incident, yes vs. no		65,447	43.95	37,495	57.29	0.914	(0.889, 0.939)	<.001
Any victim incident with POI proceeded against, yes vs. no		26,092	17.52	15,970	61.21	1.182	(1.134, 1.232)	<.001
Violent/DV victim incident, yes vs. no		24,330	16.34	14,702	60.43	1.001	(0.957, 1.047)	.964
AVO PINOP, yes vs. no		26,734	17.95	16,544	61.88	1.014	(0.975, 1.055)	.488
AVO Defendant, yes vs. no		17,748	11.92	9,528	53.68	0.897	(0.861, 0.935)	<.001
ROD, any contact, yes vs. no		37,953	25.49	21,295	56.11	0.958	(0.928, 0.990)	.010
Any custodial episode, yes vs. no		10,414	6.99	5,574	53.52	0.945	(0.898, 0.994)	.030
Emergency department presentation, yes vs. no		101,625	68.25	57,880	56.95	0.944	(0.921, 0.969)	<.001
Hospitalisation, alcohol & drug-related, yes vs. no		11,481	7.71	6,538	56.95	1.050	(1.000, 1.101)	.049
Hospitalisation, mental health related, yes vs. no		14,699	9.87	7,969	54.21	0.893	(0.855, 0.932)	<.001
PBS, mental health related medications, yes vs. no		70,795	47.54	40,164	56.73	0.977	(0.951, 1.004)	.091
MBS, mental health related consultations, yes vs. no		75,097	50.43	42,054	56.00	0.886	(0.863, 0.909)	<.001
Flag for housing services, yes vs. no		25,984	17.45	15,529	59.76	1.056	(1.022, 1.091)	.001
Flag for homelessness services, yes vs. no		23,668	15.90	14,291	60.38	1.072	(1.037, 1.109)	<.001
							AUC = 0.7161	

Note. DV – domestic violence; POI – person of interest; AVO – apprehended violence order; PINOP – person in need of protection; PBS – Pharmaceutical Benefits Scheme; MBS – Medicare Benefits Schedule. Disability and type of disability were not included in the models at the same time. The effects shown for other characteristics are from models where type of disability was included. Relationship type "Unknown, not stated/recorded" includes property incidents and breach apprehended violence orders where relationship type isn't recorded, as well as other incidents where a POI was not identified and/or the relationship type was not stated.

Results specific to Aboriginal people are included in Appendix B, Table B5. In 44 per cent of violent incidents and 59 per cent of DV incidents, a POI was proceeded against. While similar patterns were generally seen for Aboriginal people, fewer differences were statistically significant, including differences by disability indicator (those with disability vs. those with no disability identified) and disability type.

Factors associated with whether victims of violent and DV-related incidents experience repeat victimisation

In this section we examine factors associated with repeat victimisation within 12 months, focusing on differences between victims identified with disability and those not known to have a disability. As in the previous section, these analyses are based on one record/incident per victim and models do not take into account POI characteristics, such as criminal history and whether or how a POI was proceeded against in relation to the incident.

Presented in Table 7 are results relating to violent incidents. Overall, 20 per cent of victims of violent incidents experienced repeat victimisation within 12 months. Percentages varied for those with and without disability, with 18 per cent of those with no identified disability, 22 per cent of those in the disability cohort, and 25 per cent of those otherwise identified as having a disability experiencing another violent incident within 12 months. Rates of violent revictimisation were lowest for those with unspecified and physical disabilities only, and highest for those with both cognitive and psychosocial disabilities, with and without physical disability (25-26%). Aboriginal women were most likely to experience another violent episode within 12 months. Higher revictimisation rates were seen for those of younger age, in remote and very remote areas, with prior contacts as a victim and/or offender, with prior ED presentations and hospitalisations, MBS and PBS mental-health related records, and contacts for housing and homelessness services. Those who were victims of DV-related assault incidents were more likely to experience repeat victimisation than victims of other incident types.

Table 7. Factors associated with whether victims of violent incidents experienced repeat victimisation within 12 months

| | | Violent | | Violent – revictimisation | | | |
		n	per cent (col)	n	per cent (row)	Adjusted odds ratio	95% confidence interval	p
Total		244,521	100.00	6,183	20.16			
Disability	No disability identified	175,575	71.80	2,998	17.65	1.000		
	Disability cohort	38,695	15.82	1,553	21.72	1.344	(1.291, 1.400)	<.001
	Other disability identifier	30,251	12.37	1,632	24.96	1.433	(1.378, 1.490)	<.001
Type of disability	No disability identified	175,575	71.80	2,998	17.65	1.000		
	Cognitive only	4,526	1.85	240	22.02	1.459	(1.339, 1.590)	<.001
	Physical only	5,930	2.43	140	15.09	1.152	(1.053, 1.261)	.002
	Psychosocial only	27,798	11.37	1,418	24.92	1.402	(1.345, 1.463)	<.001
	Cognitive & Physical	2,726	1.11	98	21.83	1.536	(1.368, 1.724)	<.001
	Cognitive & Psychosocial	6,023	2.46	369	26.10	1.515	(1.408, 1.629)	<.001
	Physical & Psychosocial	12,392	5.07	509	21.96	1.331	(1.254, 1.414)	<.001
	Cognitive & Physical & Psychosocial	6,121	2.50	298	24.87	1.538	(1.426, 1.658)	<.001
	Unspecified only	3,430	1.40	113	18.74	1.208	(1.078, 1.353)	.001
Year of event	2014	60,527	24.75	2,217	24.37	1.000		
	2015	51,257	20.96	1,459	21.79	0.924	(0.889, 0.960)	<.001
	2016	47,133	19.28	1,054	18.72	0.900	(0.864, 0.938)	<.001
	2017	44,362	18.14	787	16.05	0.837	(0.801, 0.875)	<.001
	2018	41,242	16.87	666	15.31	0.886	(0.846, 0.927)	<.001
Sex/Aboriginality	Male/Non-Aboriginal	112,051	45.82	10,334	9.22	1.000		
	Female/Non-Aboriginal	101,794	41.63	12,150	11.94	1.221	(1.179, 1.265)	<.001
	Female/Aboriginal	17,542	7.17	4,174	23.79	1.706	(1.623, 1.794)	<.001
	Male/Aboriginal	13,134	5.37	2,009	15.30	1.119	(1.056, 1.187)	<.001
Age group at event (years)	10–19	49,043	20.06	2,008	23.48	2.738	(2.505, 2.993)	<.001
	20–29	63,420	25.94	1,799	19.87	1.633	(1.495, 1.783)	<.001
	30–39	51,528	21.07	1,239	20.46	1.630	(1.492, 1.780)	<.001
	40–49	42,249	17.28	801	18.17	1.492	(1.365, 1.631)	<.001
	50–59	25,793	10.55	273	13.58	1.261	(1.147, 1.386)	<.001
	60–74	12,488	5.11	63	10.59	1.000		
Remoteness of residence	Major City	166,965	68.28	2,511	20.12	1.000		
	Inner Regional	53,082	21.71	2,046	19.53	0.935	(0.903, 0.968)	<.001
	Outer Regional	16,260	6.65	1,076	20.42	1.004	(0.951, 1.060)	.884
	Remote/Very Remote	2,446	1.00	419	25.32	1.281	(1.144, 1.434)	<.001
	Unknown	5,768	2.36	131	16.42	1.328	(0.533, 3.312)	.542
SEIFA quartile of disadvantage of residence	q1 – Most disadvantaged	66,392	27.15	2,475	20.75	1.000		
	q2	66,665	27.26	2,079	20.10	0.981	(0.947, 1.017)	.302
	q3	63,471	25.96	1,233	20.23	0.996	(0.959, 1.035)	.845
	q4 – Least disadvantaged	42,121	17.23	265	17.62	0.823	(0.785, 0.864)	<.001
	Unknown	5,872	2.40	131	16.27	0.581	(0.234, 1.441)	.241
Incident category	DV-related assault	91,498	37.42	3,326	23.00	1.000		
	Non-DV-related assault	115,484	47.23	2,063	16.89	0.663	(0.635, 0.694)	<.001
	Murder, manslaughter, attempted murder	361	0.15	15	4.16	0.147	(0.069, 0.311)	<.001
	Sexual assault	11,806	4.83	399	22.76	0.835	(0.776, 0.898)	<.001

Table 7. Factors associated with whether victims of violent incidents experienced repeat victimisation within 12 months (continued)

		Violent		Violent – revictimisation			
		n	per cent (col)	n	per cent (row)	Adjusted odds ratio	95% confidence interval	p
Incident category (cont'd)	Sexual touching, sexual act & other sexual offences	15,554	6.36	314	19.09	0.687	(0.642, 0.736)	<.001
	Robbery	9,818	4.02	751	7.65	0.520	(0.474, 0.570)	<.001
Relationship of POI to victim	Intimate partner	35,086	14.35	1,110	24.42	1.000		
	Child/parent	16,496	6.75	459	20.46	0.977	(0.919, 1.038)	.450
	Other family	17,884	7.31	661	17.13	0.716	(0.672, 0.762)	<.001
	Other	8,769	3.59	179	19.48	1.221	(1.130, 1.319)	<.001
	Known, no relationship	58,129	23.77	1,645	18.96	1.111	(1.050, 1.177)	<.001
	Unknown, not stated/recorded	108,157	44.23	2,129	20.40	1.089	(1.038, 1.143)	.001
Number of victims in incident	1	204,916	83.80	5,343	20.75			
	2	30,059	12.29	664	17.29	0.885	(0.847, 0.925)	<.001
	3+	9,546	3.90	176	16.13	0.752	(0.692, 0.817)	<.001
Number of incidents per person per event	1	202,686	82.89	4,921	19.81	1.000		
	2+	41,835	17.11	1,262	21.63	0.995	(0.959, 1.031)	.765
Days between incident start and event dates	0–1	210,717	86.18	5,072	18.95	1.000		
	2–7	12,598	5.15	294	20.76	0.930	(0.874, 0.989)	.020
	8–30	5,173	2.12	122	23.11	1.005	(0.918, 1.101)	.907
	31–365	6,031	2.47	123	18.41	0.875	(0.800, 0.957)	.003
	366+	6,538	2.67	131	15.34	0.661	(0.595, 0.734)	<.001
	Unknown/missing	3,464	1.42					
Priors within 5 years								
Any victim incident, yes vs. no		91,307	37.34	4,029	24.93	1.309	(1.262, 1.357)	<.001
Any victim incident with POI proceeded against, yes vs. no		32,620	13.34	2,287	28.93	1.151	(1.100, 1.204)	<.001
Violent/DV victim incident, yes vs. no		37,790	15.45	8,370	22.15	1.305	(1.251, 1.362)	<.001
AVO PINOP, yes vs. no		27,977	11.44	2,319	29.18	1.120	(1.072, 1.169)	<.001
AVO Defendant, yes vs. no		25,474	10.42	1,798	24.55	1.106	(1.058, 1.157)	<.001
ROD, any contact, yes vs. no		60,332	24.67	3,441	23.73	1.326	(1.278, 1.375)	<.001
Any custodial episode, yes vs. no		18,186	7.44	1,447	24.73	1.178	(1.121, 1.239)	<.001
Emergency department presentation, yes vs. no		160,376	65.59	5,151	21.28	1.209	(1.169, 1.250)	<.001
Hospitalisation, alcohol and drug-related, yes vs. no		18,965	7.76	1,048	24.88	1.088	(1.035, 1.143)	.001
Hospitalisation, mental health related, yes vs. no		22,430	9.17	1,046	26.06	1.064	(1.016, 1.114)	.009
PBS, mental health related medications, yes vs. no		100,010	40.90	3,403	22.06	1.076	(1.039, 1.113)	<.001
MBS, mental health related consultations, yes vs. no		107,430	43.93	3,195	21.78	1.054	(1.020, 1.089)	.002
Flag for housing services, yes vs. no		34,764	14.22	2,614	23.69	1.171	(1.130, 1.214)	<.001
Flag for homelessness services, yes vs. no		28,904	11.82	2,349	26.78	1.341	(1.292, 1.392)	<.001
							AUC = 0.7082	

Note. DV – domestic violence; POI – person of interest; AVO – apprehended violence order; PINOP – person in need of protection; PBS – Pharmaceutical Benefits Scheme; MBS – Medicare Benefits Schedule. Disability and type of disability were not included in the models at the same time. The effects shown for other characteristics are from models where type of disability was included. The models included N=241,057 individuals– records where days between incident start and event dates were unknown were excluded. Relationship type "Unknown, not stated/recorded" includes property incidents and breach apprehended violence orders where relationship type isn't recorded, as well as other incidents where a POI was not identified and/or the relationship type was not stated.

Factors associated with whether victims of DV experienced another DV incident within 12 months are shown in Table 8. Overall, 22 per cent of victims of DV incidents experienced repeat victimisation within 12 months, with rates varying for those with and without disability. One in five of those with no disability identified, 25 per cent of those in the disability cohort, and 28 per cent of those otherwise identified as having a disability experienced another DV-related incident within 12 months. In terms of those with disability, rates were lowest for those with cognitive and physical disabilities only, and highest for those with psychosocial disabilities (alone or in combination with other disability types). Highest rates were seen for Aboriginal women, followed by non-Aboriginal women. Unlike violent revictimisation, there were no significant differences by age group. Those in outer regional and remote/very remote areas had higher revictimisation rates, as did those with prior contacts as a victim and/or offender, with prior ED presentations and hospitalisations, MBS and PBS mental-health related records, and contacts for housing and homelessness services. Compared with those who experienced an incident of common assault, those who had experienced a breach AVO incident were more likely to be revictimised, while those with other incident types were less likely. When there was more than 30 days between an incident occurring and being reported, revictimisation was less likely.

Table 8. Factors associated with whether victims of DV-related incidents experienced repeat victimisation within 12 months

		DV-related		DV-related - revictimisation				
		n	per cent (col)	n	per cent (row)	Adjusted odds ratio	95% confidence interval	p
Total		148,902	100.00	32,634	21.92			
Disability	No disability identified	102,436	68.79	20,374	19.89	1.000		
	Disability cohort	24,677	16.57	6,084	24.65	1.093	(1.050, 1.138)	<.001
	Other disability identifier	21,789	14.63	6,176	28.34	1.196	(1.151, 1.243)	<.001
Type of disability	No disability identified	102,436	68.79	20,374	19.89	1.000		
	Cognitive only	2,347	1.58	477	20.32	1.065	(0.953, 1.189)	.266
	Physical only	4,238	2.85	924	21.80	1.078	(0.995, 1.168)	.068
	Psychosocial only	19,844	13.33	5,764	29.05	1.186	(1.139, 1.235)	<.001
	Cognitive & Physical	1,478	0.99	309	20.91	1.140	(0.996, 1.305)	.057
	Cognitive & Psychosocial	3,173	2.13	793	24.99	1.159	(1.059, 1.268)	.001
	Physical & Psychosocial	9,067	6.09	2,437	26.88	1.125	(1.064, 1.191)	<.001
	Cognitive & Physical & Psychosocial	3,598	2.42	918	25.51	1.178	(1.083, 1.282)	<.001
	Unspecified only	2,721	1.83	638	23.45	1.081	(0.980, 1.191)	.119
Year of event	2014	38,017	25.53	9,387	24.69	1.000		
	2015	30,933	20.77	6,886	22.26	0.976	(0.939, 1.014)	.213
	2016	28,036	18.83	6,093	21.73	1.001	(0.961, 1.042)	.967
	2017	26,208	17.60	5,171	19.73	0.907	(0.869, 0.946)	<.001
	2018	25,708	17.27	5,097	19.83	0.968	(0.927, 1.011)	.146
Sex/Aboriginality	Male/Non-Aboriginal	41,159	27.64	5,850	14.21	1.000		
	Female/Non-Aboriginal	84,181	56.53	19,917	23.66	1.633	(1.574, 1.694)	<.001
	Female/Aboriginal	16,800	11.28	5,632	33.52	1.995	(1.898, 2.096)	<.001
	Male/Aboriginal	6,762	4.54	1,235	18.26	1.095	(1.017, 1.179)	.016
Age group at event (years)	10–19	19,998	13.43	3,842	19.21	1.009	(0.937, 1.087)	.809
	20–29	37,812	25.39	8,911	23.57	1.014	(0.947, 1.086)	.684
	30–39	35,370	23.75	8,536	24.13	1.048	(0.979, 1.121)	.175
	40–49	30,060	20.19	6,710	22.32	1.016	(0.950, 1.087)	.643
	50–59	16,992	11.41	3,153	18.56	0.951	(0.884, 1.022)	.169
	60–74	8,670	5.82	1,482	17.09	1.000		
Remoteness of residence	Major City	98,736	66.31	20,745	21.01	1.000		
	Inner Regional	34,846	23.40	8,207	23.55	1.007	(0.974, 1.041)	.699
	Outer Regional	11,112	7.46	2,787	25.08	1.090	(1.035, 1.148)	.001
	Remote/Very Remote	1,814	1.22	515	28.39	1.161	(1.035, 1.303)	.011
	Unknown	2,394	1.61	380	15.87	0.469	(0.243, 0.903)	.024
SEIFA quartile of disadvantage of residence	q1 – Most disadvantaged	44,180	29.67	10,083	22.82	1.000		
	q2	43,324	29.10	9,900	22.85	1.013	(0.979, 1.048)	.463
	q3	37,326	25.07	8,102	21.71	1.024	(0.987, 1.062)	.210
	q4 – Least disadvantaged	21,624	14.52	4,155	19.21	0.967	(0.924, 1.012)	.152
	Unknown	2,448	1.64	394	16.09	1.454	(0.762, 2.772)	.256
Incident category	Common assault	69,232	46.50	14,620	21.12	1.000		
	Actual/grievous bodily harm	22,476	15.09	4,614	20.53	0.923	(0.887, 0.961)	<.001
	Murder, manslaughter, attempted murder, abduction & kidnapping	181	0.12	17	9.39	0.347	(0.200, 0.605)	<.001
	Sexual assault	2,354	1.58	319	13.55	0.655	(0.575, 0.746)	<.001

Table 8. Factors associated with whether victims of DV-related incidents experienced repeat victimisation within 12 months (continued)

		DV-related		DV-related - revictimisation				
		n	per cent (col)	n	per cent (row)	Adjusted odds ratio	95% confidence interval	p
Incident category (cont'd)	Sexual touching, sexual act & other sexual offences	1,328	0.89	168	12.65	0.697	(0.586, 0.829)	<.001
	Intimidation, stalking & harassment	31,452	21.12	7,147	22.72	1.068	(1.030, 1.108)	<.001
	Malicious damage to property	16,354	10.98	3,627	22.18	0.932	(0.885, 0.981)	.007
	Breach AVO	5,525	3.71	2,122	38.41	1.568	(1.463, 1.679)	<.001
Relationship of POI to victim	Intimate partner	40,257	27.04	9,848	24.46	1.000		
	Child/parent	18,444	12.39	3,217	17.44	0.761	(0.724, 0.799)	<.001
	Other family	20,608	13.84	2,785	13.51	0.549	(0.522, 0.578)	<.001
	Other	6,681	4.49	1,079	16.15	0.709	(0.658, 0.765)	<.001
	Known, no relationship	5,238	3.52	652	12.45	0.498	(0.454, 0.547)	<.001
	Unknown, not stated/ recorded	57,674	38.73	15,053	26.10	1.063	(1.025, 1.103)	.001
Number of victims in incident	1	122,903	82.54	28,428	23.13			
	2	20,048	13.46	3,317	16.55	0.826	(0.791, 0.863)	<.001
	3+	5,951	4.00	889	14.94	0.778	(0.719, 0.842)	<.001
Number of incidents per person per event	1	115,626	77.65	23,448	20.28	1.000		
	2+	33,276	22.35	9,186	27.61	1.401	(1.358, 1.445)	<.001
Days between incident start and event dates	0–1	127,495	85.62	26,394	20.70			
	2–7	8,474	5.69	1,916	22.61	1.015	(0.961, 1.073)	.596
	8–30	4,329	2.91	990	22.87	1.021	(0.947, 1.101)	.586
	31–365	4,360	2.93	854	19.59	0.892	(0.823, 0.966)	.005
	366+	1,998	1.34	240	12.01	0.651	(0.563, 0.753)	<.001
	Unknown/missing	2,246	1.51					
Priors within 5 years								
Any victim incident, yes vs. no		65,447	43.95	18,053	27.58	1.234	(1.195, 1.276)	<.001
Any victim incident with POI proceeded against, yes vs. no		26,092	17.52	8,617	33.03	1.051	(1.005, 1.099)	.031
Violent/DV victim incident, yes vs. no		24,330	16.34	8,521	35.02	1.217	(1.160, 1.277)	<.001
AVO PINOP, yes vs. no		26,734	17.95	9,155	34.24	1.182	(1.133, 1.233)	<.001
AVO Defendant, yes vs. no		17,748	11.92	4,954	27.91	1.082	(1.033, 1.133)	.001
ROD, any contact, yes vs. no		37,953	25.49	10,413	27.44	1.207	(1.163, 1.252)	<.001
Any custodial episode, yes vs. no		10,414	6.99	2,927	28.11	1.016	(0.960, 1.075)	.582
Emergency department presentation, yes vs. no		101,625	68.25	24,111	23.73	1.116	(1.082, 1.152)	<.001
Hospitalisation, alcohol and drug-related, yes vs. no		11,481	7.71	3,396	29.58	1.099	(1.043, 1.158)	<.001
Hospitalisation, mental health related, yes vs. no		14,699	9.87	4,095	27.86	0.982	(0.936, 1.030)	.447
PBS, mental health related medications, yes vs. no		70,795	47.54	17,755	25.08	1.081	(1.047, 1.116)	<.001
MBS, mental health related consultations, yes vs. no		75,097	50.43	18,466	24.59	1.058	(1.026, 1.091)	<.001
Flag for housing services, yes vs. no		25,984	17.45	7,741	29.79	1.165	(1.125, 1.207)	<.001
Flag for homelessness services, yes vs. no		23,668	15.90	7,447	31.46	1.246	(1.203, 1.292)	<.001
							AUC = 0.6785	

Note. DV – domestic violence; POI – person of interest; AVO – apprehended violence order; PINOP – person in need of protection; PBS – Pharmaceutical Benefits Scheme; MBS – Medicare Benefits Schedule. Disability and type of disability were not included in the models at the same time. The effects shown for other characteristics are from models where type of disability was included. The models included N=146,656 individuals – records where days between incident start and event dates were unknown were excluded. Relationship type "Unknown, not stated/recorded" includes property incidents and breach apprehended violence orders where relationship type isn't recorded, as well as other incidents where a POI was not identified and/or the relationship type was not stated.

Results specific to Aboriginal people are included in Appendix B, Table B6. One in five Aboriginal people who were victims of a violent incident experienced another violent incident within 12 months; 29 per cent of those who were victims of a DV-related incident experienced another DV-related incident within 12 months. Aboriginal people with disability were more likely to experience another violent incident than Aboriginal people with no disability identified. Rates were higher for all disability types, with the exception of those with physical or unspecified disabilities only, who had rates similar to those with no disability identified. In terms of DV-related revictimisation, no statistically significant differences were found between Aboriginal people with disability and those with no disability identified. The exception is disability type. Aboriginal people with psychosocial disability only were found to have higher rates of DV-related revictimisation than those with no disability identified.

DISCUSSION

In this study we examined the intersection of disability and the criminal justice system (CJS) in NSW, with a focus on victims of crime reported to, or detected by, the police. We found that individuals with certain types of disability were more likely to experience violent and DV-related crime than others. Over the 5-year period from 2014 to 2018, 6.5 per cent of people with disability were victims of violent crime, ranging from 2.4 per cent of those with unspecified disability through to 12.7 per cent of those with both cognitive and psychosocial disabilities. Similarly, 4.4 per cent of people with disability experienced a DV-related incident, ranging from 1.8 per cent of those with unspecified disability through to 7.3 per cent of those with both cognitive and psychosocial disabilities. We also found that persons of interest (POIs) were less likely to be proceeded against when incidents involved people with disability, especially in relation to violent incidents (OR=0.83 for disability cohort and OR=0.90 for other disability identifier). Differences in police action rates were particularly pronounced for those with both cognitive and physical disabilities (with or without psychosocial disabilities). For DV-related incidents, POIs were also less likely to be proceeded against when an incident involved a person with both cognitive and physical disabilities, relative to incidents involving victims with no known disabilities (OR=0.80). Finally, people with disabilities were more likely to experience violent and DV-related revictimisation within 12 months compared with those with no disability identified (OR=1.34-1.43 for violent revictimisation and OR=1.09-1.20 for DV revictimisation). Generally, those with cognitive and/or psychosocial disabilities were at greater risk of revictimisation than those with other or no known disabilities.

This is the first time that NSW Police Force victim records have been linked with other State and Commonwealth data to identify whether a victim is a person with disability – information which is not routinely available in CJS data collections. This research has significance for disability policy development in the justice system, and will be particularly valuable in informing both the NSW Premier's Priority to reduce domestic violence reoffending, and the National Agreement on Closing the Gap to improve the lives of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people. The finding that people with disabilities are more likely to experience violent and DV-related revictimisation within 12 months than those with no known disabilities, suggests that further protection and support of people with disability is needed. Further, consistent with previous reports (e.g., CRE-DH, 2021; ABS, 2016), females and those of younger age were found to be particularly vulnerable. This was particularly so for Aboriginal people. The odds of a female Aboriginal person with disability experiencing a DV-related crime were four times the odds of a male non-Aboriginal person with disability, after adjusting for other characteristics. Increased rates of victimisation were also seen for those with prior contacts with the CJS as a victim, offender, inmate, person in need of protection or defendant in relation to AVOs, and for those with prior health and housing contacts, and those residing in more disadvantaged areas. These findings highlight the complex, compounding life circumstances that contribute to increased vulnerability.

In terms of the CJS response to people with disability who are victims of crime, results from our study suggest that offenders may be less likely to be proceeded against by police in violent and DV-related incidents that involve victims who have a disability. This was particularly evident for incidents involving victims with both cognitive and physical disabilities, with or without psychosocial disability. There are many reasons why an offender may not be proceeded against, including that a person of interest was not identified. Police are also less likely to proceed in matters where there is insufficient evidence, the victim, their family or carer is unwilling to proceed, it is not considered to be in the public interest, or the complaint is withdrawn. Future research should consider whether better support during the prosecution process is needed for people with a disability who are victims of crime, and for their families and advocates.

In NSW, the Justice Advocacy Service (JAS) is a support service provided to victims, witnesses and defendants with cognitive impairment, to assist in their interactions with police, courts and legal representatives (see https://idrs.org.au/jas/). In relation to victims, key objectives of the service are to ensure that victims can effectively report crime to police, and that they are able to understand and participate in criminal matters. JAS also provides training to justice agencies to improve identification and knowledge of cognitive impairment. If an enduring National Disability Data Asset (NDDA) were to be established it could be used to identify groups of individuals who are most in need of additional services and supports, and to evaluate the effectiveness of programs and interventions aimed at improving the outcomes for people with disability. The NDDA could, for example, be used to determine the reach of the JAS, whether it is assisting those most in need of support, and whether it is associated with improved outcomes for people with cognitive disability.

As with any research, the current study has several limitations. These primarily relate to the utility of administrative data collections and the representativeness of the study sample. In this research victimisation was measured using criminal incidents reported to, or detected by, the police. Many crimes are not reported to police, particularly in relation to DV-related events, which means that the estimates presented in this bulletin are likely an underestimate of actual rates of victimisation. Estimates from the ABS crime victimisation survey suggest that over the years 2008/2010 through to 2014/2016, only 50 to 60 per cent of victims of physical domestic and family violence in NSW reported the incident to police (Freeman, 2018). Further, PSS findings suggest similar proportions of people with and without disability or a long-term health condition who experienced assault did not report their most recent incident to police, ranging from 60 to 80 per cent, depending on the victim and incident characteristics (ABS, 2021). Indeed, estimates of physical violence and DV-related violence seen in our study for people with disability are much lower than survey estimates suggest. Based on the 2016 ABS PSS, the CRE-DH (2021) reported that 18 per cent of people with disability aged 18 to 64 years experienced violence in the previous 12 months. Dowse et al. (2016) reported that 5 per cent of women with disability experienced physical violence over a 12-month period, and 3.4 per cent experienced physical assault. In our study, 6.5 per cent of people with disability experienced a violent incident over a 5-year period. No doubt some of the difference can be explained by disparate definitions of violence and disability, however, it is also likely that a significant proportion of violence and abuse is not reported to police.

Another limitation relates to the identification of disability, which in this study is restricted to the information available in administrative datasets. Not all disability will be recorded in these data collections - some people with disability don't need services or supports, some who do will not access them, and some will not be eligible. Further, not all disability information that is recorded is of the same quality. Thus, some victims with a disability may not have been identified, and more detailed types of disability could not be examined. In particular, the lack of more detailed diagnostic information from DOMINO was a major constraint in this project; while it is recorded it was not made available for the Test Case. However, even with the inclusion of more complete data, there will remain inconsistencies and disparities in the way disability is defined and conceptualised. Further development and refinement of disability indicators and approaches will be required for future analysis, and existing data collections may need to be modified in

order to improve identification. On a related note, the breadth of disability data sources used in this study prohibited the examination of variables that are not available and/or consistently recorded across data sets (e.g., relationship status, living arrangements). Focus on a narrower sample in the future may enable a more detailed examination and a better understanding of risk and protective factors, beyond static factors.

In terms of the sample for this study, children and older adults (65 years and over at the start of the period) were not included. These are two important and particularly vulnerable groups. Numerous studies have shown that rates of bullying, maltreatment, physical and sexual abuse against children with disabilities are higher than rates for children without disabilities (Christoffersen, 2020; He et al., 2020; Kavanagh, Priest, Emerson, Milner, & King, 2018; Maclean et al., 2017). Research, while limited, has also shown that the rate of victimisation against older people with disabilities is higher than the rate for those without disabilities, particularly for women (CRE-DH, 2021). In this study disability was largely identified in accordance with the eligibility conditions of State and Commonwealth disability services and supports, which have age restrictions. For example, the disability support pension is only available to those aged between 16 and 64 years of age, and the NDIS is only available to those aged between 7 and 64 years of age. It is hoped that younger and older populations can be further examined in the future, with access to more data collections (e.g., early childhood and education), over a longer period of time. Similarly, the experiences of Aboriginal people and people with culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds should be the focus of further research. These groups face additional complexities in terms of their interactions with the CJS (Dowse et al., 2021).

While studies such as ours are important in forming an understanding of the intersection between disability and victimisation, the true utility of linked administrative datasets is yet to be realised. Providing the governance and infrastructure to facilitate timely access to a comprehensive collection of linked datasets is important. However, an ongoing commitment to the development of methods and resourcing of expertise will be key to the success of any future linked data assets, in terms of contributing to changes in policy and practice and improved outcomes for people with disability.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

REFERENCES

Australian Bureau of Statistics. (2011a). *Australian and New Zealand Standard Offence Classification (ANZSOC) (3rd edition)* (Cat. No. 1234.0). Retrieved 31 Mar. 2022 from https://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/mf/1234.0

Australian Bureau of Statistics. (2011b). *Australian Standard Geographical Classification (ASGC)*(Cat. No. 1216.0). Retrieved 31 Mar. 2022 from https://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/mf/1216.0

 Australian Bureau of Statistics. (2016). *National Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Social Survey, 2014-15* (Cat. No. 4714.0). Retrieved 31 Mar. 2022 from https://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/DetailsPage/4714.02014-15?OpenDocument

Australian Bureau of Statistics. (2018). *Census of Population and Housing: Socio-Economic Indexes for Areas (SEIFA), Australia, 2016* (Cat. No. 2033.0.55.001). Retrieved 31 Mar. 2022 from https://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/mf/2033.0.55.001

Australian Bureau of Statistics. (2021). *Disability and Violence – In Focus.* Retrieved 20 Jul. 2022 from https://www.abs.gov.au/statistics/people/crime-and-justice/focus-crime-and-justice-statistics/latest-release

Centre of Research Excellence in Disability and Health. (2021). *Nature and extent of violence, abuse, neglect and exploitation against people with disability in Australia*. Retrieved 31 Mar. 2022 from Royal Commission into Violence, Abuse, Neglect and Exploitation of People with Disability website: https://disability.royalcommission.gov.au/system/files/2021-08/Research%20Report%20-%20Rapid%20Evidence%20Review%20-%20Violence%2C%20abuse%2C%20neglect%20and%20exploitation%20of%20people%20with%20disability.pdf

Christensen, D., Davis, G., Draper, G., Mitrou, F. McKeown, S., Lawrence, D., McAullay, D., Pearson, G., Rikkers, W., Zubrick, S. R. (2014). Evidence for the use of an algorithm in resolving inconsistent and missing Indigenous status in administrative data collections. *Australian Journal of Social Issues, 49*(4), 424-443.

Christoffersen, M. N. (2020). Sexual crime against schoolchildren with disabilities: A nationwide prospective birth cohort study. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence,* 1–29.

Dowse, L., Rowe, S., Baldry, E., & Baker, M. (2021). *Police responses to people with disability.* Research Report. Retrieved 31 Mar. 2022 from Royal Commission into Violence, Abuse, Neglect and Exploitation of People with Disability website: https://disability.royalcommission.gov.au/system/files/2021-10/Research%20Report%20-%20Police%20responses%20to%20people%20with%20disability.pdf

Dowse, L., Soldatic, K., Spangaro, J., & van Toorn, G. (2016). Mind the gap: the extent of violence against women with disabilities in Australia. *Australian Journal of Social Issues, 51*(3), 341-359.

Emerson, E., Newland, J., Vaughan, C., & Llewellyn, G. (2017). Physical violence and property crime reported by people with and without disability in New South Wales 2002-2015. Retrieved 31 Mar. 2022 from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/318471840_Physical_Violence_and_Property_Crime_Reported_by_People_with_and_without_Disability_in_New_South_Wales_2002-2015

Fogden, B. C., Thomas, S. D. M., Daffern, M., & Ogloff, J. R. P. (2016). Crime and victimisation in people with intellectual disability: a case linkage study. *BMC Psychiatry, 16*(1), 1-9..

Freeman, K. (2018). *Is domestic violence in NSW decreasing?* (Bureau Brief No. 134). Retrieved 31 Mar. 2022 from NSW Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research website: https://www.bocsar.nsw.gov.au/Publications/BB/2018-Report-Is-domestic-violence-in-NSW-decreasing-BB134.pdf

He, V.Y., Guthridge, S., Su, J.Y., Howard, D., Stothers, K., & Leach, A. (2020). The link between hearing impairment and child maltreatment among Aboriginal children in the Northern Territory of Australia: is there an opportunity for a public health approach in child protection?. *BMC Public Health, 20*(449), 1-11.

Hosmer, D. W., & Lemeshow, S. (2004). *Applied logistic regression. 2nd Edition*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Jordan, J. (2004). Beyond belief? Police, rape and women's credibility. *Criminal Justice, 4*(1), 29-59.

Kavanagh, A., Priest, N., Emerson, E., Milner, A., & King, T. (2018). Gender, parental education, and experiences of bullying victimisation by Australian adolescents with and without a disability. *Child: Care, Health and Development, 44*(2), 332–41.

Koh, J., Kembhavi-Tam, G., & Rose, V., Featherston, R., & Shlonsky, A. (2021). *Rapid evidence review: Violence, abuse, neglect and exploitation of people with disability*. Research Report. Retrieved 31 Mar. 2022 from Royal Commission into Violence, Abuse, Neglect and Exploitation of People with Disability website: https://disability.royalcommission.gov.au/system/files/2021-08/Research%20Report%20-%20Rapid%20 Evidence%20Review%20-%20Violence%2C%20abuse%2C%20neglect%20and%20exploitation%20of%20 people%20with%20disability.pdf

Liljeqvist, H. T. G., Muscatello, D., Sara, G., Dinh, M., & Lawrence, G. L. (2014). Accuracy of automatic syndromic classification of coded emergency department diagnoses in identifying mental health-related presentations for public health surveillance. *BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making 2014, 14*:84.

Maclean, M.J., Sims, S., Bower, C., Leonard, H., Stanley, F.J., & O'Donnell, M. (2017). Maltreatment risk among children with disabilities. *Pediatrics, 139*(4).

Murray, S., & Heenan, M. (2012). Reported rapes in Victoria: police responses to victims with a psychiatric disability or mental health issue. *Current Issues in Criminal Justice, 23*(3), 353-368.

Wilson, C., & Brewer, N. (1992). The incidence of criminal victimisation of individuals with an intellectual disability. *Australian Psychologist, 27*(2), 114-117.

World Health Organization (2012). The Anatomical Therapeutic Chemical classification system with Defined Daily Doses (ATC/DDD). Oslo: WHO Collaborating Centre for Drug Statistics Methodology. Retrieved 31 Mar. 2022 from: https://www.whocc.no/atc_ddd_index/