

Volume 8 No. 4

June 2010

CDFW Re@der



Justice reinvestment – justice for women?

Changing cultures, changing attitudes

Safe homes, solid families – Let's build on it!



www.noviolence.com.au

Director's message

It seems to be hard for the general public to understand how Susan Falls could kill her partner, after planning and preparing for how she would do it, and be found not guilty of murder. The sensationalist headlining by the Courier Mail did nothing but add to the confusion: "He tortured her; she planned his death; she doped him; she shot him; now Susan Falls goes free" screams the front page of the Courier Mail on 4th June.

For the general public the incident raises many questions, most of which go unanswered by the articles that follow the Courier Mail headline. One of the most commonly asked questions about women who are victims of intimate partner violence is, "why doesn't/didn't she just leave him?" As reported in the Courier Mail, Susan was warned that she would be killed if she didn't leave him (and she did leave, for a time).



In Susan's case, as in so many, the abuse continues whether the victim leaves or not. For some women, it seems there is no escape with threats and actual violence continuing no matter what she does. Why is it that we seem so powerless to stop the perpetrator being violent? Why is it that we have a veteran police officer warning Susan that she would be killed if she didn't leave him, rather than the means to have Rodney Falls (or at least his violence) restrained? It is as if there is some level of acceptance of men's violence against women and that the best we can do is remove the victim for her own protection. However, leaving a violent partner can, and often does lead to escalated violence and women are at increased risk of domestic homicide when they have left, or are in the process of leaving the relationship. With the violence perpetrated against Susan extending to death threats against her family and attempts by Rodney to make her complicit in the death of a family member, she saw that taking his life was her only option for self-preservation, and the preservation of others.

It is somewhat surprising that Susan's defence counsel successfully used the laws of self-defence. As discussed in the December 2009 edition of the Re@der (Volume 8, No. 2), the laws of self-defence generally require that an assault has just occurred or is imminent, whereas a defensive response to serious domestic violence is more typically in anticipation of an attack and in response to a series of prior attacks. That is, an assault may not be imminent, but inevitable, based on the history of violence.

It is not surprising that the defence argued self-defence, nor that they relied on the laws of self-defence, rather than the new Criminal Code provision for a defence for victims of serious domestic violence who kill their abusers. As argued in the December 2009 Re@der, the new provision is an inadequate recognition of the circumstances in which victims of serious domestic violence kill their partners, because it is only a partial defence, reducing murder to manslaughter.

While the successful application of the laws of self-defence demonstrates that justice can be done for victims of domestic violence who kill their abusers, it is a tragedy that justice could not be achieved at the onset of the violence to minimise the harm caused. As a society, we failed to protect Susan against Rodney's violence and, thus, we failed to protect her against the need to take this last resort action, which she will have to live with for the rest of her life.

Heather Rancarrow

Inside this issue

Safe homes, solid families – Let's build on it!	3
CDFVRAG.....	5
Justice reinvestment - justice for women?	6
Queensland Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Awards	9
Changing cultures, changing attitudes - preventing violence against women.....	11
Train the trainer workshop – Course in responding to domestic and family violence	15
Review of Domestic and Family Violence Protection Act 1989.....	16
Remembering those who have died because of domestic and family violence	17
Workshops, conferences and date claimers	18

Centre news

We welcome new CDFVR staff Billie Larkin and Renette Viljoen.



Billie (left) is the new Administration Officer at CDFVR and over the years has been in the position of receptionist, secretary and personal assistant as well as weather girl for Imparja Television in Alice Springs. Before coming to CDFVR she worked at Department of Communities as Administration Officer for over three years.

Billie moved to Mackay with her young family from Mt Isa and has now been living here for a year.

Renette (right) commenced work with CDFVR on 22 March and joins the team as Education Officer. She has an honours degree in Communication (B.Business Communication) and post graduate qualifications in business information systems (M.Tech BIS) and education (MEd).

Renette has worked as lecturer and external information technology consultant in South Africa. Before joining the Centre, she was the instructional designer for Central Queensland Institute of TAFE, designing online educational content.



Early Childhood Development in Indigenous Communities

Integrating services for a healthy start to life

21st & 22nd September 2010, Holiday Inn Esplanade, Darwin

Endorsed by



ATTEND and HEAR:

- ✓ How to integrate child development and protection services to improve child wellbeing
- ✓ Priority areas identified in the NT's Inquiry into the Child Protection System
- ✓ Case studies to help you work effectively within a multi-Government framework
- ✓ Strategies to build workforce capacity in Indigenous childcare centres

Safe homes, solid families – Let's build on it!

by Annie Webster, CDFVR

The increasing number of interstate participants over the past few years and feedback from our forum evaluations led to CDFVR's annual Indigenous Family Violence Prevention Forum being a national event this year. The forum, convened in partnership with the Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies and Charles Darwin University, was held at the Mackay Entertainment and Convention Centre on May 19 and 20 and was attended by a record crowd of 206 participants. In response to the 2009 evaluation, the forum theme was separated into three topics: *domestic and family violence and homelessness; abuse of older people and children; and domestic and family violence*. Each topic area had a keynote speaker, a panel of three or four people with expertise in that particular area, and was followed by five or six yarning circles.

Keynote addresses:

Keynote addresses were presented by Mick Gooda, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Social Justice Commissioner, Australian Human Rights Commission; Pam Greer, New South Wales Health Education Centre against Violence; and Judy Atkinson, Gribi College of Indigenous Australian Peoples Director, Southern Cross University.



Mick Gooda

Mick's address focused on the prevention of domestic and family violence by applying justice reinvestment strategies. He explained that the idea of justice reinvestment is that funds that would otherwise have been spent on the costs of imprisonment are

diverted toward community programs, services and activities that are aimed at addressing the underlying causes of crime in those communities. The concept is based on evidence that a large number of offenders come from a relatively small number of disadvantaged communities and so services in those areas should be commensurate with community need. In the context of domestic and family violence, a justice reinvestment approach would target resources toward rehabilitating offenders in communities where there is a high incidence of domestic and family violence. Resources would also flow across to victims and families because justice reinvestment is about resourcing whole communities.

Pam Greer used the story of a woman's life to demonstrate how modern times impact on Aboriginal elders or older people in such a way that value and respect are absent at a time when it is most needed.

She illustrated that the recalling of stories from the past is no longer of interest to the young – they do not know the importance of story-telling. Pam also emphasised that there is great sadness in witnessing an elder, who has kept four generations together, not receiving the respect that is due and the swing away from Aboriginal culture. Our elders are our pioneers, our champions. We must cherish and protect them, as they have protected us, she concluded.



Judy Atkinson

Judy spoke about the generational impacts of violence related trauma and trauma-related violence as cause and effect of colonisation and of the need to change attitudes and behaviours to effect healing. She spoke of how people living in

culturally unsafe environments are more likely to see and experience violence as a child. Being hurt as a child and being surrounded by others with their own hurt means it is more likely that the hurt is not expressed and the pain not acknowledged. Lack of education to understand why people behave in the way they do and having no way to transform the pain without repeating the cycle of abuse on ourselves and others, contributes to escalating levels of violence within Aboriginal families and communities. Consequently, we are now seeing increasing rates of incarceration of Aboriginal men and women. We also see the outcomes of this violence on our children and our elders in their day-to-day lives. Judy called for educational models to provide positive examples for family and community change, embodied within the hope that healing is possible, while we work together to create safe and secure environments for our children, women, men and elders.

There were three panels at this year's forum, each designed to follow a keynote address. The first panel addressed the topic *domestic and family violence and homelessness*. It included **Wayne Fossey** from Beenleigh Housing, Qld; **Pat Cora** from Tenants' Union of Qld; and **Gracelyn Smallwood** from James Cook University, Qld.

Wayne spoke about the good work being done in his Indigenous housing organisation which runs a company with 27 houses, a mowing business and



an Indigenous employment agency program.

Pat Cora outlined his experience of witnessing first-hand the impact that domestic and family violence has on the sustainability of tenancies and about his job in advocating for, and assisting people against the threats of homelessness and incarceration.

Gracelyn spoke about the impact of the top-down approach of the intervention on Aboriginal people and its contribution to homelessness and increased drug dependency.

The second panel, *Abuse of older people*, followed Pam Greer's keynote address. **Dulcie Bronsch**, representing Lifeline Community Care Qld, spoke with **Aunty Jenny Thompson** about the need for programs for elders to be designed, developed and staffed in a bottom-up, grassroots manner. Aunty Jenny emphasised the need for elders to be listened to so their stories could be continued.

Yvette Holt spoke about how our elders deserve to be looked after, not just by the state, but by their communities. She provoked thought with her comment about the disparity between the age of a person considered an elder in Central Australia (35 or 36 years old) to the rest of the country and the need for elders to take on leadership.

Grant Sarra encouraged men to lead by respecting women and encouraged the teaching of cultural ways to young people. He challenged his audience to think about what Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander elders have done for the past 2000 generations to keep them alive and urged people to learn from their elders' experiences, respect their independence and enable social networking for them.



Domestic and family violence and children was the topic for the third panel of the forum and followed Judy Atkinson's address.

The first speakers were **Nancy Sweeney** from Darwin and **Therese Purantatameri** from the Tiwi Islands. Nancy and Therese talked about their work with Save the Children in their 'play scheme' project, which aims to train local people and inspire them to run the project on their own by taking up early childhood and management roles.



Jesse King from St. Joseph's College, in Katherine, spoke about the importance of partnership between families and the education system. He stressed the significance of programs such as cultural awareness training, higher levels of parental involvement and family information sessions toward a proactive solution to the culture of violence experienced by school-aged children.



Eileen Cummings from Charles Darwin University in the Northern Territory presented *Keeping children, families and community safe – 'our way'*. She spoke about how Aboriginal learning is about seeing, hearing and listening and how children are seeing fighting and drinking and hearing and listening to swearing. Eileen talked about the importance of values such as respect, nurturing of children and traditional teachings which can lead to the return of empowerment, pride and dignity.



Matthew Willis from the Australian Institute of Criminology in the ACT discussed the Institute's work on a community safety survey for Indigenous communities. He presented the key findings from the research on community strengths, help-seeking behaviour of female



family violence and sexual assault victims, perceptions of service availability and need, priorities for community safety improvement and positive steps being taken by communities to address community safety issues.

There were four yarning sessions convened at the forum. The first three followed on from the keynote addresses and panel discussions and were structured around the three forum topics. The fourth yarning session, held on day two, was titled *Connecting law and practice with communities* and included yarning circles on training, legal services, disabilities and domestic and family violence, working with men and identifying services for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people.

The karaoke and forum dinner held on the first night of the forum was included in the forum registration

this year enabling most participants to attend. Once again we saw some amazing talent both on the stage and on the dance floor, with some creative dancing and theatrics from Lillian Gray and Grant Sarra!

The evaluation of the national forum was very positive with 95% (n=128) of the evaluation survey respondents agreeing, or strongly agreeing, that they had learnt new things at the forum. the same percentage agreeing, or strongly agreeing, that they could use what they learnt in their work (paid or voluntary). Eighty-one percent of respondents said they would like to come back to the 2011 state forum.

Thank you to all who travelled from around Australia for your valued input, humour and feedback which contributed to the success of our first national forum. We look forward to our state forum next year.



A more detailed report of the forum, including the evaluation, is available via CDFVR's website – www.noviolence.com.au.

CDFVRAG

by Renette Viljoen, CDFVR

On Friday, 30 April, the Queensland Centre for Domestic and Family Violence Research Advisory Group (CDFVRAG) met for the first time face-to-face, in Mackay, to contribute to the strategic planning of the Centre. The group consists of 16 members, representing eight domestic and family violence related networks, five agencies and three individuals with particular expertise relevant to domestic and family violence. Collectively the group brings exceptional depth of expertise and a rich diversity of experience and perspectives and CDFVR welcomes and thanks members for their support and contributions.

Members of the networks include Amanda Lee-Ross (Queensland Domestic Violence Services Network), Gen Houston (Domestic Violence Court Assistance Network), Heather Selke (North Queensland Women's Services Network), Kathy Cave (CQ Women's Refuge Group), Tracey Amos (Combined Women's Refuge Group (SEQ)), Leanne Williams (Services and Practitioners for the Elimination of Abuse Queensland), Karin Cheyne (Queensland Sexual Assault Network), and Shirley Slann (CDFVR Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander reference group).

Members from the specialist agencies are Stephanie Anne (Immigrant Women's Support Service), Chris Procopis (Elder Abuse Prevention Unit), Pam Viti (Mackay and District Australian South Sea Islander Association), Debbie Kilroy (Sister's Inside), and Donna Justo (Women with Disabilities Australia).

The three individuals are Betty Taylor (Training Consultant), Dr Heather Douglas (TC Beirne Law School, University of Queensland) and Jenny Binsiar (Mackay and Region Domestic Violence Service).



Members of the CDFVRAG with CDFVR staff

Justice reinvestment - justice for women?

by Heather Nancarrow, CDFVR

Introduction

In his final report as Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Social Justice Commissioner with the Australian Human Rights Commission, Tom Calma dedicated an entire chapter to discussion of and advocacy for justice reinvestment in Australia. This work is being carried on by the incoming Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Social Justice Commissioner, Mick Gooda, whose keynote address at the National Indigenous Family Violence Prevention Forum centred on this concept and its relationship to family violence (Commissioner Gooda's keynote address can be viewed following this link <http://www.noviolence.com.au/public/forum2010/MickGooda.pdf>).

The idea of justice reinvestment is essentially this: instead of continuing investment in and, therefore, expansion of criminal justice system infrastructure (particularly prisons), Governments would be better off investing in community development and the provision of services and support strategies for disadvantaged communities, where a disproportionate number of people released from prison live.

In a nutshell it is, potentially and perhaps ideally, about investing in social justice rather than criminal justice, as a way of reducing crime. In the Australian context it holds the promise of a "new solution to the problem of Indigenous over-representation in the criminal justice system"; the title of the chapter on justice reinvestment in Tom Calma's 2009 report.

Impetus for justice reinvestment

Justice reinvestment is a concept that was developed by Susan Tucker, Director of the New York based Open Society Institute's After Prison Initiative, and Eric Cadora, Director of the Justice Mapping Center. The 2009 Social Justice Report (p.11) provides some sobering statistics on imprisonment in the USA, including that it imprisons more people than any other nation in the world and that, despite falling crime rates, the rate of imprisonment has increased by more than 50% since 1991. In 2008, one in every 1,000 people was incarcerated; African Americans were eight times more likely to be imprisoned than white Americans; and one in eight African American males aged between 20-34 years were imprisoned.

This trend for increased imprisonment rates, despite falling crime rates, is attributed to the burgeoning law and order (get tough on crime) policies, or

"criminal justice hyperactivity", as Tom Calma puts it in his 2009 Social Justice Report.

The driving force for justice reinvestment in the USA is predominantly economic, rather than social justice, concerns. This helps explain why conservative states of the USA, such as Texas, are pioneering the justice reinvestment cause. Garland (2007) reports that between 1985 and 2005 the prison population in Texas grew by 300 percent, at a cost of \$2.3 billion and that this trend would continue indefinitely, without a radical shift in justice policy. Analysis of the Texan prison population revealed that a large proportion of the growth in the prison population was the result of failed probation, lack of treatment and diversion

programs (within prisons and in the community) and inefficient use of parole. In response, funding was redirected towards access to mental health and substance abuse treatment and diversion programs for "parole and probation technical violators and people with behavioural health needs" (Garland 2007, p. 65), as a more cost-effective way of reducing recidivism.

While appealing to conservatives on economic grounds, justice reinvestment also appeals to liberal ideals. As the 2009 Social Justice Report says its "political currency seems to be growing under the Obama administration" (p. 19).

The justice reinvestment strategy

Justice reinvestment is now a project of The Council of State Governments Justice Center (the "Justice Center"), leading its implementation in 12 states across the USA. The Justice Center describes justice reinvestment as a "data-driven strategy for policy makers to: reduce spending on corrections; increase public safety; and to improve conditions in the neighbourhoods, or places, to which most people released from prison return" (<http://justicereinvestment.org/>).

Implementation of the justice reinvestment strategy in the USA jurisdictions begins with the formation of a high-level, bi-partisan team of officials (elected and appointed) and experts from the Justice Center to consult with key stakeholders (judges, police, service providers and community leaders) within their jurisdiction.

This is followed by three key steps: analyse data and develop policy options; adopt new policies and implement reinvestment strategies; and measure performance.

Justice reinvestment seeks to improve public safety more cost effectively, by downsizing state prison populations and budgets and reforming parole and probation practices. The money saved by these initiatives is then reinvested to strengthen community institutions - schools, job creation, affordable housing and health care - in the neighborhoods where people live before and after prison.

Analyse data and develop policy options

State and local agencies provide data on crime, arrest, conviction, imprisonment, and probation and parole supervision for analysis by Justice Center experts. A mapping exercise is undertaken for specific neighbourhoods where large numbers of people under criminal justice supervision live. The results of this exercise are cross-referenced with information about criminal activity and the need for resources and services, such as mental health and substance abuse treatment programs, employment and education programs, parenting programs and so on, in those specific places. On the basis of this jurisdictional-specific profile, the Justice Center develops policy options for reducing spending on corrections and for the reinvestment of the savings, or a portion of the savings, in community-based strategies to reduce recidivism and improve public safety.

Adopt new policies and implement reinvestment strategies

Policy options are considered and enacted, where relevant, by government officials. The Justice Center assists jurisdictions and their agencies with translating new policies into practice through, for example, the development of implementation plans and keeping officials informed of progress with the implementation and any issues arising with the roll-out of the strategies.

Measure performance

The Justice Center monitors and reports to officials and policy makers on the impact of the reinvestment strategies on prison populations, rates of reincarceration and criminal activity.

Justice reinvestment in the Australian context

Australia is not immune to the kind of criminal justice hyperactivity seen in the USA and we are also seeing increasing prison populations and, consequently, more prisons being built with attendant infrastructure requirements, across the country. This is of particular interest to the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Social Justice Commissioner, as Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people are over-represented in the prison population in Australia.

In 1991, when the Report of the *Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody* (RCIADIC) was handed down, Indigenous Australians made up 14 percent of the total prison population and were up to 15 times more likely to be in prison than non-Indigenous people. In spite of RCIADIC's numerous and wide-ranging recommendations aimed at reducing the over-representation of Indigenous Australians in the prison population, the number of Indigenous prisoners has increased significantly since 1991. The 2008 Social Justice Report notes that, at 30 June 2008, Indigenous prisoners represented 24 percent of the total prisoner population in Australia.

In 2008 there were 6139 Indigenous males and 567 Indigenous females imprisoned in Australia. While there are fewer Indigenous women than men in custody, the Indigenous female imprisonment rate increased by 34 percent between 2002 and 2006 while the imprisonment rate for Indigenous men increased by 22 percent (Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Social Justice Commissioner 2008).

The 2009 Social Justice Report devotes some considerable space to discussion of structural causes of crime and potential links of justice reinvestment to other major policy initiatives, including social inclusion and the COAG Closing the Gap (on Indigenous disadvantage) targets. The 2009 Social Justice Report also argues that justice reinvestment can enable the diversion of savings from decarceration to services for victims of violent crime, including domestic and family violence.

Justice reinvestment, criminological theory and justice for women

As the idea of justice reinvestment begins to emerge in the Australian context, it is important to consider its potential for redirecting the focus away from criminal justice to focusing on social justice as a means of reducing crime and increasing public safety. More specifically, consideration must also be given to the potential of justice reinvestment to achieve social justice for women, as victims and offenders.

As noted above, the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Social Justice Commissioner (2009) highlights the opportunities for justice reinvestment to address the structural causes of crime. On the other hand (and based on a preliminary reading only), the information provided by the Justice Center seems to focus on making non-custodial criminal justice system mechanisms (probation and parole) work more efficiently. This could be a manifestation of the need for the Justice Center to maintain a foot in both the liberal and conservative camps; playing down the potential role of justice reinvestment as a strategy to restructure the social order. As one participant at the National Indigenous Family Violence Prevention Forum observed, there is a risk that justice reinvestment could in fact simply be a "re-arranging of the criminal justice system deck chairs", rather than any real change to societal structures that give rise to hyper-criminalisation of particular groups.

The mapping and cross-referencing of criminal activity and gaps in services and resources in the justice reinvestment enterprise suggests it is underpinned by elements of social ecological, structural strain and sub-cultural strain criminological theories. These theories explain crime as a product of normal people reacting to abnormal situations, such as features of a particular place; culture conflict; social disorganisation and 'deviant' social reorganisation; and denial of, or limiting, opportunity

to achieve legitimate goals or aspirations in the dominant social structure. Strategies with such theoretical underpinnings are instantly recognisable as relevant to addressing the over-representation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people in the criminal justice system. But how do they relate to crimes of violence against women?

Macro-level crime prevention strategies, such as justice reinvestment, must address the fact that the crimes most frequently, and pervasively, perpetrated against women are sexual violence and violence perpetrated by intimate male partners. While social ecological and strain theories may help to understand the higher rates of violence faced by Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women, they are inadequate in explaining the prevalence of violence across all cultural, class and geographic boundaries.

Drawing on the ecological model suggested by the World Health Organisation (WHO), the National Council to Reduce Violence against Women and their Children argues the need for interventions that address factors at multiple levels, including the individual, relationship, community and the broader societal structure. This approach is akin to Bronfenbrenner's nested ecological theory, which describes these four factors as micro, meso, exo and macro systems and explains human behaviour as a product of a continuous interaction between the individual and their environment at these various levels.

Critical to the National Council's position on preventing violence against women is the need for an explicit understanding of and strategies to address gender inequality, which is at the core of men's violence against women, across all four levels. This preliminary examination of the justice reinvestment strategy has not turned up any apparent gender analysis from a theoretical or implementation perspective.

The 2009 Social Justice Report and Commissioner Gooda's keynote address to the National Indigenous Family Violence Prevention Forum, both refer to the benefits of justice reinvestment for victims of family violence. They see that funds saved on reduced recidivism and more efficient probation and parole practices, will divert into a range of community-based services that should include services for victims. While this is reassuring to the extent that it addresses concerns about justice reinvestment taking money away from victim services, it does nothing to stop victimisation in the first place.

Another weakness of justice reinvestment in regard to men's violence against women is that it is rare for perpetrators of violence against women to be imprisoned in the first place. Focussing on reforms to probation and parole will do very little, if anything

to prevent recidivism, among perpetrators of violence against women. There is potential for the investment of savings in community-based services and resources to address the question of justice for women. They must, however, include strategies designed to eliminate gender discrimination and inequality. These strategies must be embedded in the process of mapping crime (recognising that violence against women is usually invisible in notions of 'public safety'), determining community need, negotiation with community leaders and implementing initiatives such as enhanced education and employment opportunities.

Conclusion

Justice reinvestment is a concept full of promise for those of us interested in decarceration and, particularly, addressing the over-representation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people in the criminal justice system. It focuses on re-directing public spending away from building more prisons and prison infrastructure towards building strong and safe communities. Thus, it holds the promise of social justice, rather than criminal justice, for those who are marginalised and alienated from mainstream society.

However, to achieve justice for women as victims of sexual assault and intimate partner violence, rather than reinforcing the status quo, justice reinvestment strategies must be developed and implemented within a framework that includes the elimination of gender discrimination and inequality within its goals.

References

Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Social Justice Commissioner 2009 *Social Justice Report* Australian Human Rights Commission.

Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Social Justice Commissioner 2008 *Social Justice Report* Australian Human Rights Commission.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The Ecology of Human Development: Experiments by Nature and Design*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Garland, C. (2007) *Increasing Public Safety and Reducing Spending: Applying a Justice Reinvestment Strategy in Texas and Kansas* December 2007 *Corrections Today* (accessed on 8 June 2010 at: <http://www.aca.org/publications/pdf/Garland.pdf>)

National Council to Reduce Violence against Women and their Children (2009) *Background Paper to Time for Action: The National Council's Plan for Australia to Reduce Violence against Women and their Children* Commonwealth of Australia

Open Society Institute http://www.soros.org/initiatives/usprograms/focus/justice/news/acsaward_20091110

The Council of State Governments Justice Center *Justice Reinvestment: An Overview* (accessed 8 June 2010 at: <http://justicereinvestment.org/>)



Lee Prince

Lee Prince received the Individual award for her work in Sunshine coast communities. The award recognises individuals whose work has contributed to the prevention of domestic and family violence. Lee has empowered many women to escape violent relationships and has worked closely with Gympie police to establish a fax back scheme that links victims of domestic and family violence directly with support services.



Uncle Wally Saunders

Another individual award was presented to Uncle Wally Saunders.

Uncle Wally received a highly commended award for his work in addressing domestic and family violence in the Woorabinda Community. He also received the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Award for his Djina (Footprints) Spiritual Healing Program. The award recognises an innovative and exceptional project or activity that has contributed to the prevention of domestic and family violence and enhanced the safety of Aboriginal and Torres Strait islander Communities.

Highly commended in the partnership section was the Domestic Violence Service of Central Queensland in collaboration with Police Citizens Youth Club (PCYC) Blackwater, Kids in Focus Central Highlands, Central Queensland Indigenous Development and Queensland Health. The award was presented for the Woora Undoonoo Blackwater Holiday Camp which promotes healthy relationships for young people through art, drama and music.

Sgt Rachel Dubbelman



Sgt Ashley Dubbelman

Act as

support
More
support
<http://www.viole>

Tracey Morris



Jasmin Spaul

Far West Indigenous Family Violence Service in Cunnamulla received the Children and Young People Award which recognises an innovative and exceptional project or activity that has contributed to the prevention of domestic and family violence and enhanced the safety of children and young people between five and 18 years of age. Their Girls Friendship Program aims to educate young women on their safety and support needs; build self esteem; and teach participants about healthy relationships.

Queensland Rail (QR) was awarded the Government Award, which recognises an innovative and exceptional policy, project or activity by local or state government organisations that increases awareness of, and/or community safety from, domestic and family violence. QR's domestic and family violence awareness campaign conducted in conjunction with CEO Challenge involved displaying violence prevention posters and display boards on trains and train stations around south-east Qld. It is estimated the campaign reached approximately 170,000 train commuters each day for 47 days

Karen Struthers, MP, Minister for Community Safety and Housing and for Women launched the Act as One domestic violence awareness campaign in Brisbane on the Domestic Violence awards ceremony.

The Act as One campaign aims to bring domestic and family violence out from behind closed doors and into the open. It seeks to mobilise community support to reduce domestic and family violence and support those affected. The Act as One message is a call to neighbours, friends, family members, work colleagues and community members to take a stand against domestic and family violence by helping someone who is affected. Information and resources to the campaign are available at:

www.communityservices.qld.gov.au/enceprevention/act-as-one/

The Community Organisation award recognises an innovative and exceptional project or activity delivered by a not-for-profit community organisation that demonstrates best practice in the prevention of domestic and family violence. It was won by the Queensland Centre for Domestic and Family violence Research for the Course in Responding to Domestic and Family Violence (30629QLD). This nationally accredited course is designed to lift the benchmark of skill for a wide range of people whose work brings them into contact with people affected by domestic and family violence. It addresses the specific needs of women from culturally and diverse backgrounds and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women.

The Gareema Refuge Partnership between Brisbane City council, Australia's CEO Challenge and Save the Children were highly commended in the government award section. This partnership has been running since 2001 and assists hundreds of women and children who access support from the Gareema Refuge.

Marie Stuart
Linda Anderson



Dianna Dawson
Gail McIntosh

Lenny Vance



Karen Struthers

Di Lucas
Jackie Kaddis



Donna Justo
Marica Ristic

The Domestic Violence Prevention Centre Gold Coast in collaboration with Multicultural Families Organisation and Access Services were the winners of the Partnership Award. This award recognises an innovative and exceptional project or activity delivered through a partnership between individuals and/or community organisations which contribute to the prevention of domestic and family violence. This early intervention and prevention program aims to improve the safety of individuals and families from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds, particularly women and children from new and emerging communities on the Gold Coast.

Heather Nancarrow



Annie Webster

Changing cultures, changing attitudes - preventing violence against women.

A summary of VicHealth's National Community Attitudes Survey by Renette Viljoen, CDFVR

Violence against women is a violation of human rights, sometimes deadly and always unacceptable. The elimination of such violence has become an obligation of all governments. VicHealth, 2010.

Understanding community attitudes is important for shaping and influencing initiatives to prevent violence against women. In February 2009, the Australian Government commissioned the Victorian Health Promotion Foundation (VicHealth) to undertake a National Community Attitudes towards Violence against Women Survey. This is the first national community attitudes survey undertaken since 1995. The key objectives of the 2009 National Survey were to examine factors that influence the formation of community attitudes that support violence against women and to establish a benchmark against which changes in attitudes can be more closely monitored and accessed over time. Simultaneously, the results guide the development and targeting of interventions that can build cultures of non-violence and value equal and respectful relationships between men and women.

This article presents an overview of the findings compiled in the National Community Attitudes Survey (NCAS) Report (VicHealth 2010). It includes findings across several areas of community attitudes towards violence against women: perceptions of what constitutes domestic violence; sexual violence and sexual harassment; the relationship between attitudes towards violence against women and attitudes towards gender equality; understanding of the consequences and harms caused by violence; beliefs regarding whether violence against women is justifiable or excusable; myths and beliefs about victims and offenders; and awareness of community education and the impact of campaign advertising.

The survey

The National Survey comprised three components:

The general community survey:

Telephone interviews were conducted with over 10,000 people, with a minimum of 1,000 in each state/territory across Australia, about their attitudes towards violence against women. In contrast to the previous surveys, the 2009 survey included 16 and 17-year-old respondents where a parent or guardian consented.

The selected culturally and linguistically diverse communities (SCALD) survey:

Telephone interviews were conducted with an additional 2,500 first and second-generation members of the Italian, Greek, Chinese, Vietnamese and Indian communities.

The Indigenous survey:

Face-to-face interviews were conducted with 400 Indigenous Australians in nine metropolitan and regional locations across Australia.

The findings – community attitudes and beliefs and changes since 1995

The findings from the *National Survey on Community Attitudes to Violence Against Women 2009* are grouped according to eight key elements discussed below:

Defining and understanding violence against women

'any act of gender-based violence that results in, or is likely to result in, physical, sexual or psychological harm or suffering to women, including threats of such acts, coercion or arbitrary deprivation of liberty, whether occurring in public or in private life.'
The United Nations Declaration of the Elimination of Violence against Women, 1993.

Although broad in its scope, violence is defined as acts that cause or have the potential to cause harm, and emphasises that these acts are rooted in sex inequality. This focus on women does not deny the fact that men experience violence, however, as violence against men often differs in its etiology and response strategies (Watts & Zimmerman 2002), it warrants separate consideration and falls outside the scope of this project.

In line with legislative changes, community perceptions of what constitutes domestic violence have broadened significantly since 1995. Most people have a broad understanding of domestic and sexual violence, and its impacts, and do not condone it. The vast majority of the community agrees that physical and sexual assault, and threats, is domestic violence. Although it is understood that the essential aspect of domestic violence is the tactical use of systematic control and abuse of power, there is still the reluctance of some members in the community to view emotional, psychological, verbal and economic forms of abuse as domestic violence. This perception remains a concern.

Attitudes and beliefs of what falls 'within' or 'outside' the scope of community understanding of domestic violence are central to the contexts in which violence against women occurs (Flood & Pease 2006). They inform the perpetration of this violence and shape victims' responses to victimisation and how readily they will be able to identify or 'name' their experiences as abuse. In turn, they have implications for the ways our police, our courts, our workplaces and our sports clubs will respond to behaviour regarded as violent, controlling or abusive. Most of all, attitudes and beliefs influence how accurately the prevalence of violence against women can be estimated.

- ***Views about prevalence and seriousness of violence against women***

The majority of the respondents recognise the spectrum of domestic violence behaviours as 'very serious', although women in the SCALD sample and in the general community were more inclined to this view than men. Non-physical forms of violence, such as 'yelling abuse at a partner' and 'controlling a partner by denying them money' still tend to be seen as less serious, while stalking, on the other hand, is considered by two-thirds of the respondents to be very serious violent behaviour. Perceptions about prevalence varied more widely, with Indigenous respondents and women in the general community most likely to believe that violence against women is common.

Research suggests that women's awareness of their vulnerability to violence, or of the limitations placed on their everyday freedoms for fear of physical or sexual victimisation, is substantially different to men's (Katz 2006, Morrison, Ellsberg & Bolt 2007). The survey findings for 2009 were consistent with this, with women significantly more likely than men to be concerned about their personal safety in the home and their public safety especially at night. They were also more likely to fear sexual assault. Most respondents across all samples believe that domestic violence and forced sex by an intimate partner are unlawful acts, whereas men in the general community are less likely than their female counterparts to view domestic violence as a crime.

Community understanding of violence against women with disabilities was very poor and only few respondents recognised the greater vulnerability to violence for these women.

- ***Understanding of who perpetrates and who is affected by violence***

Men as well as women may be subjected to violence in intimate relationships and families, and both may use violence in these contexts. Simultaneously, there are clear gender contrasts in both victimisation and perpetration. Many of the victims in general public violence are male, and like women, men are most at risk from (other) men. This finding is consistent with the findings from the ABS 2005 Personal Safety Survey (ABS 2006) that showed that men are most at risk in public spaces and from men they don't know.

This changes when it comes to violence between intimate partners in particular, where in the majority of cases the victims are female and the perpetrators are male. Women remain far more likely to be assaulted by a partner or ex-partner, therefore being most at risk in the home and from men they know.

22 percent of people in 2009 believe that domestic violence is perpetrated equally by both men and women compared with 9 percent in 1995.

Just over three-quarters of survey respondents (76%) understood that mainly men perpetrate domestic violence,

and the overwhelming majority of victims are women. In spite of the shift among men towards a belief in domestic violence as gender-equal, ninety percent in the general community believe that women are more likely than men to suffer physical harm.

The survey findings suggests that there is a poor understanding that domestic violence is committed mainly by men against women and is frequently characterised by a persistent pattern of controlling and abusive behaviours.

- ***Belief in explanations diminishing men's responsibility for violence***

There are at least three ways in which community attitudes may function to diminish the responsibility for their behaviour of those who use violence against women: justifying this violence, excusing the violence, or blaming the victim. Justifications for violence involve the belief that violence against a wife or partner is acceptable, legitimate or appropriate. Excuses for violence do not offer such a strong endorsement of violence against women, however, they condone or tolerate its use and diminish perpetrators' responsibility. This happens typically by attributing blame for violence to forces or situations outside the perpetrator's control. Victim-blaming involves holding the victim of violence to be wholly or partly responsible for the violence she has experienced.

The vast majority of respondents do not believe that any physical force against a current or former wife, partner or girlfriend could be justified under any circumstances. However, four percent of the general community agree that physical force is justifiable when a partner 'admits to having sex with another man.'

Although most respondents do not accept that there are circumstances under which domestic violence could be excused, a sizeable proportion in the SCALD and general community are prepared to excuse domestic and sexual violence, in particular when the victim is seen somehow to have 'provoked' this violence or the perpetrator shows regret.

Over 34 percent of the general community agree that rape occurs because of men 'not being able to control their need for sex' (42% of the SCALD sample).

Challenging these more violence-supportive attitudes is essential. Excusing or justifying domestic violence or sexual violence in some circumstances risks not only releasing perpetrators from responsibility and appropriate sanctioning, but also undermines the necessary cultural and normative shifts that need to occur to reduce violence. It also reduces the extent to which women will identify the violence perpetrated against them.

On average, 12 percent of the SCALD sample see physical force as justified where a current wife, partner or girlfriend 'admits to having sex with another man' or 'makes him look stupid or insults him in front of another man' (compared to 3% of the community sample).

Overall community attitudes are consistent with the notion that violence against women can only be eliminated when men take responsibility for their use of violence and responsibility for learning non-violent responses (Flood & Pease 2006, VicHealth 2006).

- **Beliefs about responses to violence against women**

Considerable effort has been made in reforming police procedures and legal processes that have historically worked to reduce women's confidence in reporting violence to the police. Nationally, there has been a corresponding increase in women's reports of violence to police (19% in 1995 to 34% in 2005).

However, conflicting views were found amongst the majority of the general community and Indigenous survey respondents who believed that despite more responsive systems, a greater readiness on behalf of victims to disclose and community members (such as themselves) to intervene, most people still turn a 'blind eye' to, or ignore domestic violence.

Amongst the most debilitating of barriers that act as strong disincentives to women coming forward, are women's fears that they will not be believed or that their disclosure will result in separation or isolation from the families or communities to which they feel most socially or culturally connected.

Some stakeholders who participated in the SCALD focus groups with new and emerging refugee communities feel that greater familiarity with relevant support and advocacy services are likely to influence whether women might take formal action, outside of their immediate communities, in relation to violence and harassment.

Although two-thirds (65%) of the general community considers that there had been an increase over the past ten years in the preparedness of victims to talk about domestic violence, they remain poorly informed about the barriers that often work to prevent women from leaving violent relationships.

A majority of the sample agree that 'it is hard to understand why women stay in violent relationships'.

However, the survey results suggested that higher support for gender equity and gender equality influenced whether general community and SCALD respondents understood the difficulties women face with respect to leaving a relationship.

Some of these include: isolation and not knowing where to go; lack of financial support; no family to rely on; lack of support from the community to protect children; and shame.

- **Preparedness to intervene in situations of domestic violence**

Attitudes and beliefs about domestic violence influence the way family members, acquaintances and bystanders respond to victims. As most victims will seek the help of family and friends first, in preference to other professional services or police, their attitudes and knowledge towards how to help are critical. The findings in the survey were consistent with other research, demonstrating that individuals with less violence-supportive attitudes have stronger intentions to intervene and are more likely to intervene in helpful ways (West & Wandrei 2002).

95 percent agree that they will intervene in some way in a domestic violence situation - especially where the victim is a family member or close friend.

The general community is largely in step with expert advice on how best to intervene in cases of domestic violence. The two most frequent responses to ways people would intervene were (1) offering support and advice and talking to the victim; and (2) reporting the situation to police/authorities. However, findings indicated that between 5 and 10 percent of respondents will intervene in ways that are potentially unhelpful, either confronting the perpetrator or stepping in between the perpetrator and the victim.

- **Reach of media coverage and information about violence against women**

Community attitudes may be shaped by the mainstream media coverage of violence against women. While one dimension of media content regarding violence against women is news coverage, another is the deliberate attempt to influence community attitudes through education and social marketing campaigns. Past public education campaigns have attempted to encourage recognition that domestic violence is a crime; that communities must 'break the silence' regarding violence against women; that violence has negative impacts on children or on women themselves; that social norms intolerant of violence against women are more widespread than some believe; that family and friends must intervene in violence; and perpetrating violence will have negative consequences (Donovan & Vlais 2005).

Just over half of the general community reported seeing or hearing some form of advertising or media reporting about violence against women. Younger people were more likely than older people to report seeing some form of advertising. However, no past or recent Australian campaigns have challenged traditional gender roles and relations and prejudices, which have been identified as the key cause of violence against women (Amnesty International 2007). This suggests that greater effort is needed. The effectiveness of social marketing and awareness campaigns is contingent upon them being sustained and greater efficacy is also achieved if they are integrated with reinforcing strategies (Donovan & Vlais 2005).

One-third of women and just over one-third of men in the general community did not know where to go for outside help to support someone about domestic violence.

Furthermore, combining media advertising with community-based education activities and information dissemination on where people can go for outside help to support someone who is exposed to domestic violence would also be beneficial.

• **Factors that help to predict attitudes to violence against women**

An important objective of the NCAS is to improve understanding of the factors that influence or help shape violence-supportive attitudes towards violence against women.

Based on the survey findings, the strongest predictors for holding violence-supportive attitudes were being male and having low levels of support for gender equity or equality. This was consistently the case for a range of measures across the national survey and held firm even when other demographic factors were statistically controlled. Age was predictive for some attitudinal measures as younger respondents were significantly less likely to rate some physical forms of violence as 'very serious'.

Other demographic influences such as levels of education, areas of employment, influence of urban and regional location, and migration and settlement factors were also investigated for how strongly they might predict attitudinal support or tolerance for violence against women. The findings indicate priority areas for future violence prevention efforts and strategies to be targeted.

Changing cultures, changing attitudes – preventing violence against women

Measured across a population, attitudes are a valuable barometer of overall societal progress in creating a violence-free environment. Community attitudes are central to the social and cultural foundations of violence against women. In addition, they indicate the state of play in society regarding other, crucial determinants of violence against women, including the power relations between men and women and levels of and tolerance for community violence.

The findings from this survey provide both opportunity and challenge for tackling violence against women. There are specific areas of concern where action and the nature of a response are clear, while in other areas there will be a need for further enquiry and in-depth analysis.

Key strategies are identified and guided by an evidence-based framework for prevention that identifies three inter-related themes for dealing with the underlying causes of violence against women:

- Promoting equal and respectful relationships between men and women;
- Promoting non-violent social norms and reducing the effects of prior exposure to violence; and
- Improving access to resources and systems of support.

Universal approaches that address attitudes and social norms which support or tolerate violence are therefore important to consolidate at the population level with more targeted strategies designed to address those groups at higher risk of perpetrating or experiencing violence and its impacts at the community level.

The survey findings also reaffirm the importance of national leadership for reducing violence against women. High-level and committed leadership is required to co-ordinate the national violence prevention agenda, across states and territories, and across public and private sectors; build coherent policy platforms and frameworks to guide long-term action; ensure that good practice in respectful relationships programs is implemented; sustain, over longer periods, planned communication campaigns and education programs to redress prevailing myths and misconceptions about violence against women and promote egalitarian and respectful relations; engage workplaces in preventing violence against women; support the ongoing development of an evidence base to inform policy and monitor the impact of interventions; and address the impacts of violence-supportive representations of women in the media by reviewing and applying appropriate community standards for limiting exposure to such materials, encouraging news reporting, and fostering young people's critical media literacy.

Conclusion

The survey findings indubitably indicate that dramatic changes in public awareness and public attitudes have been achieved over the past 14 years since the last survey. Violence against women has become a nationwide focus of governments, courts and police with strategies that seek to improve the rates at which violence is reported, and the quality and responsiveness of systems available to support them through the process (Heath 2005, Marcus 2009). This overall trend is encouraging and provides the impetus for continuing to improve preventive programs that will contribute to the elimination of violence against women. A need remains to identify which programs work to reduce violence and protect victims, and for whom and under what circumstances such programs are effective. Evidence needs to inform and modify ideological positions.

The survey findings demonstrate that people can change what they think. The more people who believe in equal and respectful relationships, the greater likelihood we can all share in a non-violent community.

References

Amnesty International 2008, Setting the standard: International good practice to inform an Australian National plan of action to eliminate violence against women. Stop violence against women, Broadway, Amnesty International Australia.

Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) 2006, Personal safety survey Australia 2005 (Reissue), Catalogue no. 4906.0, ABS, Canberra.

Donovan, RJ & Vlasis, R 2005, VicHealth review of communication components of social marketing/public education campaigns focusing on violence against women, Melbourne, Victorian Health Promotion Foundation.

Flood, M & Pease, B 2006, The factors influencing community attitudes in relation to violence against women: A critical review of the literature, Victorian Health Promotion Foundation, Melbourne.

Heath, M 2005, The law and sexual offences against adults in Australia. Issues Paper 4. Australian Centre for the Study of Sexual Assault, Australian Institute of Family Studies, Melbourne.

Katz, J 2006, The Macho paradox: why some men hurt women and how all men can help, Sourcebooks, Naperville, IL.

Marcus, G 2009, Better policing, better outcomes: changing police culture to prevent domestic violence and homicide, Issues Paper 18, Australian Domestic and Family Violence Clearinghouse, Sydney.

Morrison, A, Ellsberg, M and Bott, S 2007, Addressing gender-based violence: A critical review of interventions, World Bank Research Observer 2007; doi:10.1093/wbro/lkm003vl-27

Office of the Status of Women 1995, Community attitudes to violence against women: detailed report, Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet, AGPS, Canberra.

United Nations 1993, Declaration on the elimination of violence against women, United Nations General Assembly, New York.

VicHealth 2010. National survey on community attitudes to violence against women 2009, Changing cultures, changing attitudes – preventing violence against women, A summary of findings, Victorian Health Promotion Foundation, Melbourne. Available at

VicHealth 2006, Two steps forward, one step back: community attitudes to violence against women. Progress and challenges in creating safe and healthy environments for Victorian women. A summary of findings, Victorian Health Promotion Foundation, Melbourne.

Train the trainer workshop – Course in responding to domestic and family violence

by Betty Taylor, training consultant and Annie Webster, CDFVR

The nationally accredited *Course in Responding to Domestic and Family Violence* has now been delivered in several locations across Queensland with over 100 people now holding the qualification.

The recent Train the Trainer workshop provided an excellent opportunity to extend the delivery of this highly regarded course. Seven experienced and very enthusiastic potential trainers spent three days learning and sharing practical training and assessment strategies relevant to the course content. The development of a pool of trainers who have experience and expertise in responding to domestic violence plus the necessary qualifications in training and assessment will enhance the course's accessibility whilst responding to the course objective of lifting the benchmark of skills and knowledge for people responding to women subjected to domestic and family violence.



All workshop participants indicated they would be keen to form a network of trainers and assessors specific to the *Course in Responding to Domestic and Family Violence*. This will enable them to continue to support and learn from each other as well as share information on new innovative training and assessment trends.

At the end of the Train the Trainer workshop participants were asked to complete an evaluation. Five out of the seven participants responded. All agreed that the workshop assisted them to understand preparation of lesson plans, development of resources and activities and alignment of learning tasks with assessment activities. Participants unanimously agreed that the workshop met their expectations.

The question “*Has your confidence to deliver Course in Responding to Domestic and Family Violence improved since completing the train the trainer workshop*” elicited the following comments:

- I have more confidence, whilst retaining a realistic view of the amount of work/time involved in delivering training.
- Workshop was user friendly. Trainer has wealth of industry expertise. Other participants brought additional knowledge, skills and conversations. Resources well prepared and discussions fruitful in developing practical overview of how to run the course.

All participants are keen to deliver the course in their region (Cairns, Mackay, Toowoomba, Brisbane and Caboolture) and while only one out of the five respondents currently has registered training organisation status (RTO) two others indicated that they have commenced seeking affiliation and extension of scope with an RTO to enable them to commence delivery within their region within the next six months.

Review of Domestic and Family Violence Protection Act 1989.

by Heather Nancarrow, CDFVR

In March 2010, the Community Services Minister Karen Struthers and Police Minister Neil Roberts released a consultation paper as part of the Queensland Government's process for reviewing the *Domestic and Family Violence Protection Act 1989* (the "Act"). The consultation paper was structured around issues concerning:

1. prevention,
2. the balance between civil and criminal law responses,
3. protection for victims of domestic and family violence,
4. accountability of the perpetrators of domestic and family violence, and
5. system planning and co-ordination.

Since the release of the consultation paper, departmental officers have conducted face-to-face consultations in 18 locations across the state. In each location, separate consultations were held for government and non-government agencies. Various organisations, individuals and networks have now prepared and submitted detailed written submissions to the review, which officially closed on 31 May.

The consultation paper announced that this is "the first time a comprehensive review has been undertaken since the Act was introduced more than 20 years ago" (p. 3), although it follows an internal evaluation of significant amendments to the Act, which were passed in 2002 and proclaimed on 10 March 2003. Those amendments followed a four-year review of the Act, initiated by the then Queensland Domestic Violence Council, incorporating the results of research on legislative options for non-spousal domestic violence by Susan Currie, Faculty of Law, Queensland University of Technology.

Largely reflecting the results of the Report on Legislative Options for Non-Spousal Domestic Violence (1996), the amendments broadened the coverage of the Act to include a wider range of relationships where domestic or family violence might occur. The full range of relationships covered in the Act, commencing in 2003, are spousal relationships, intimate personal relationships (some dating relationships, couples who are engaged, betrothed or promised under customary practices), family relationships and informal care relationships.

Previously, the Act was limited to spousal domestic violence, where a spouse was defined as one of a couple who were, or had been, living together in a domestic relationship, or who were the biological

parents of a child, regardless of whether they had ever lived together. The Act had also been amended in 1993 and again in 1999, although nearly all of those amendments were technical in nature and sought to improve the efficient operation of the Act. The one exception to this was the 1999 amendment which explicitly included same-sex relationships in the definition of a spouse, removing a discriminatory provision that had explicitly excluded same sex relationships.

Broadening the coverage of the Act to include non-spousal relationships met with considerable resistance from advocates dealing with spousal domestic violence; they argued that the gendered nature of spousal violence involved a unique set of dynamics and required a specific legislative response in order to capture and address the essence of those dynamics. Therefore, non-spousal domestic violence should be addressed in separate legislation, such as an amended *Peace and Good Behaviour Act*. Others argued that violence and abuse in any relationship is harmful, unacceptable and also gendered, and that victims of non-spousal relationship violence are equally deserving of the same level of protection. In their view, relegating non-spousal domestic violence to a revamped *Peace and Good Behaviour Act* was akin to providing second-rate legislative protection. Although these issues are not canvassed in the review consultation paper, it is likely that the same, or similar, debates will emerge again in this review.

Apart from the relationships to be covered by the Act, ongoing issues of concern (which are not entirely unrelated to the debate over coverage) include the need for a clear articulation of the nature and dynamics of domestic and family violence, particularly spousal domestic violence; the failure of police and courts to identify the 'predominant' aggressor, which results in the ongoing problem of cross-orders and cross-applications; the failure to apply the criminal law where relevant, and the nexus between the domestic violence law and family law, particularly in regard to the protection of children from exposure to violence.

References

Currie, S 1996. A Report on Legislative Options for Non-Spousal Domestic Violence Department of Families, Youth and Community Care

Department of Communities 2010. Review of the Domestic and Family Violence Protection Act 1989 – Consultation paper March 2010.

The consultation paper can be viewed online or downloaded from the Queensland Community Services website at <http://www.communityservices.qld.gov.au/violenceprevention/review-consultation-paper/>

Remembering those who have died because of domestic and family violence.

In 2006-07, there were 65 homicides known to be intimate partner homicides (and likely to be a substantial undercount), with 23 male victims and 42 female victims. These intimate partner homicides accounted for 22 percent of all homicides in Australia in that year. Forty-three percent of the intimate partner homicides involved a history of domestic violence known to the police prior to the homicide (Dearden & Jones 2008).

Each year in Queensland the first Wednesday of May, Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Month, is designated remembrance day in commemoration of those who have died as a result of domestic and family violence. This designation, which dates back to around 1995, was an initiative of the (then) Queensland Domestic Violence Council (QDVC), chaired by Betty Taylor. It was anticipated that the designated Remembrance Day would include candle lighting ceremonies across the state, and this did indeed occur in various ways in various locations. In those days, ceremonies were as diverse as lake-side vigils, with floating candles, attended by hundreds on the Gold Coast and an official QDVC event in Brisbane's King George Square, to the lone woman observing Remembrance Day with a candle stuck in a bottle and placed on the bar at the Birdsville Hotel.

However, ten years later, and frustrated by the lack of resourcing and co-ordination of the initiative, members of the Queensland Domestic Violence Services Network (QDVSN) collaborated to develop a synchronised, state-wide candle-lighting ceremony. They agreed that ceremonies would be conducted in at least 15 locations across the State and at each ceremony, participants would gather at 5.30 pm for candles to be lit at precisely 6 pm. A poster featuring three lit candles was produced and distributed among the members of the QDVSN for their local events.

Since 2005, the event has grown across the state and in 2010 extended to a number of other jurisdictions including Tasmania, South Australia, the Australian Capital Territory and the Northern Territory.

References

Dearden, J & Jones, W 2008 *Homicide in Australia: 2006-2007 National Homicide Monitoring Program (NHMP) annual report*, Australian Institute of Criminology

Displayed here is a sample of photos from various synchronised candle-lighting ceremonies and other events held during DV Prevention month.



Workshops, conferences and date claimers

7-9 July 2010

11th Australian Institute of Family Studies Conference
- Sustaining Families in Challenging Times
Melbourne, VIC
<http://conference.aifs.gov.au/>

7-10 July 2010

XXth International Congress of Cross Cultural
Psychology - Cultural Change: Meeting the challenge
Melbourne, VIC
<http://www.iaccp2010.com/>

9-11 July 2010

Asia Pacific Regional Conference - Coping resilience
and hope building
Brisbane, QLD
<http://www.strengthsbasedpractice.com.au/>

11-13 July 2010

International Family Violence and Child Victimization
Research Conference
Portsmouth, NH, USA
<http://www.unh.edu/fri/conferences/>

19-21 July 2010

Duluth Training in Australia – Creating a Process of
Change for Men who perpetrate domestic violence
Indooroopilly, QLD
http://www.tavan.com.au/attachments/Duluth_Training.pdf

26-27 July 2010

Crime and violence accross the life course
Brisbane, QLD
<http://www.griffith.edu.au/arts-languages-criminology/key-centre-ethics-law-justice-governance/news-events/crime-and-violence-across-the-life-course>

2-4 August 2010

ACWA 2010 Conference - Building a child friendly
Australia: Responding to vulnerable families
Sydney, NSW
<http://www.acwa2010.com/>

18-20 August 2010

11th International Mental Health Conference -
Depression and anxiety
Surfers Paradise Qld
<http://www.anzmmh.asn.au/conference10/default.asp>

28-29 August 2010

National foster carers' conference
Hobart, Tasmania
http://www.fcata.org.au/files/2010_fcata_conference.pdf

1-3 September 2010

The 6th National Homelessness Conference - Many
Ways Home: Ending Homelessness by 2020
Brisbane, QLD
<http://nhc.in-sync.com.au/>

7-9 September 2010

10th National Mediation Conference
Adelaide, South Australia
<http://www.mediationconference.com.au/>

21-22 September 2010

Integrating early childhood services in Aboriginal
and Torres Strait Islander communities – Securing
a healthy start to life for all children
Darwin, NT.
<http://www.atsichildren.com/register.php>
Endorsed by CDFVR, CAIE and ACWA/CCWT
- see more details on page 2

6-8 October, Perth WA

31st Family Therapy Conference
Melbourne, VIC
<http://familytherapyconference2010.com.au/>

1-3 November 2010

2010 Global Domestic Violence Conference
Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia
<http://www.domesticviolenceconference.net>

11-12 November 2010

QEC 6th International Conference – Connecting with
families
Melbourne, VIC
http://www.qec.org.au/conference-2010_.php?id=101

18-19 November 2010

National Indigenous policy and dialogue conference
Sydney, NSW
<http://ipdru.arts.unsw.edu.au/news-and-events/the-inaugural-national-indigenous-policy-and-dialogue-conference-317.html>

19-21 November 2010

Connecting Women, Respecting Differences
Waikato University, Hamilton, New Zealand
<http://www.wsanz.org.nz/conference-2010.htm>

We encourage readers to contribute to the CDFVRe@der. If you have any information or articles you wish to publish, please contact Centre staff.

HAVE YOUR CONTACT DETAILS CHANGED?

We have become aware that some recipients of the CDFVRe@der have relocated or changed contact details, including email address. To enable us to update our records and ensure that you receive our quarterly publication, please contact us at the listed phone, fax or email address with your change of details. Please be assured that the Centre does not release your details to any third parties without your permission.

If you would like to be included on, or removed from, the Centre's mailing list, please ring us on (07) 4940 7834.



Contact Us

Queensland Centre for Domestic and
Family Violence Research
CQUniversity Mackay
P.O. Box 5606
Mackay MC Qld 4741

Tel: 07 4940 7834

Fax: 07 4940 7839

Email: enquiries@noviolence.com.au
www.noviolence.com.au

Staff

Heather Nancarrow
Billie Larkin
Clinton Rawsthorne
Annie Webster
Renette Viljoen

Director
Administration Officer
Multimedia Officer
Education Officer
Education Officer

ISSN 1836-9847 (Print)
ISSN 1836-9855 (Online)

The Queensland Centre for Domestic and Family Violence Research (CDFVR) is located within the Institute for Health and Social Science Research, in the Faculty of Sciences, Engineering and Health at CQUniversity. It is physically located at CQUniversity's Mackay Campus.

The Queensland Centre for Domestic and Family Violence Research receives defined term funding from the Queensland Department of Communities to undertake research and develop educational resources pertaining to domestic and family violence in Queensland.

Disclaimer: The Queensland Centre for Domestic and Family Violence Research welcomes articles from guest contributors. Publication of the articles will be at the discretion of the Director of the Centre. Views expressed in published guest contributions are not necessarily the views of the Centre, CQUniversity or the Queensland Government. Whilst all reasonable care has been taken in the preparation of this publication, no liability is assumed for any errors or omissions.